DEC 9 1948

UNITED S

Congressional R

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 94—PART 4

APRIL 12, 1948, TO MAY 11, 1948
(PAGES 4277 TO 5654)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1948

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 12, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, March 29, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Eternal Father, whose kindness is loving and whose patience is infinite, hear us again as we pray, not because of what we say but because of the deep need that drives us to Thee.

We rest in the thought that Thy love knows no change, else it would not love us long.

We are burdened by things that do not matter, bewildered by problems of our own creation.

Thou hast made us heirs of a great heritage and trustees of priceless things, yet we forget the price that was paid for them and the eternal vigilance required to preserve them. Make us strong, O God, in conviction, with insight for our times and courage for our testing. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate on Thursday last having taken a recess, pursuant to a previous order, in the absence of a quorum, the clerk will call the roll to establish the presence of a quorum.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	O'Daniel
Ball	Hayden	Overton
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Reed
Brewster	Hill	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Hoey	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Holland	Russell
Bushfield	Ives	Saltonstall
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Stennis
Capper	Kem	Stewart
Chavez	Kilgore	Taft
Cordon	Knowland	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Downey	Lodge	Tobey
Dworshak	Lucas	Tydings
Eastland	McCarran	Vandenberg
Ecton	McCarthy	Watkins
Ellender	McClellan	Wherry
Ferguson	McKellar	White
Flanders	McMahon	Wiley
Fulbright	Martin	Williams
George	Moore	Wilson
Green	Morse	Young
Gurney	O'Conor	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is absent on official State business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 8, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 9, 1948, the President had approved and signed the following act:

S. 1794. An act to authorize the Houston Council, Navy League of the United States, to construct a reflecting pool at the United States naval hospital, Houston, Tex.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2038) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE FILED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 8th instant,

Mr. BUCK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (S. 2288) to provide for the sale at cost of Public Housing Administration project No. W. Va.-46011, reported it on April 9, 1948, with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 1114) thereon.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, TREASURY DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 143)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Treasury Department, amounting to $5,616,000, fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY (S. Doc. No. 144)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Army, amounting to $41,000,000, fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, HOUSING EXPEDITER (S. Doc. No. 145)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Housing Expediter, amounting to $2,160,000, fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Attorney General, withdrawing the name of Maria de la Luz Marquez de Alvarado from a report relating to aliens whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted by him to the Senate on March 1, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RADIO LABORATORY BUILDING FOR BUREAU OF STANDARDS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the construction and equipment of a radio laboratory building for the National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce (with an accompanying

paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolutions adopted by the Illinois Home Bureau Federation, Paris, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation providing a home economics building at the University of Illinois, and endorsing the President's European recovery program; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Hawaii, T. H., favoring the enactment of House bill 49, granting immediate statehood to Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Woman's National Aeronautical Association, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif., signed by Mrs. R. V. Porter, president, praying for the enactment of House bill 4527, to insure the safety of the United States, and to authorize the construction of certain aircraft; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the North Dakota Farmers Union, Jamestown, N. Dak., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing peacetime selective service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the North Dakota Farmers Union, Jamestown, N. Dak., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing for peacetime universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of legislation providing compulsory military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Memorials of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Del-Mar-Va Volunteer Firemen's Association, Easton, Md., praying for the enactment of legislation to exempt articles purchased for the use of volunteer fire companies from the manufacturers' excise tax; to the Committee on Finance.

Petitions of the Montfaucon Post, No. 4, the American Legion, Baltimore, Md., praying for the enactment of legislation to raise the ceilings on wages and allowances payable to veterans undergoing training on the job; to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and to provide minimum ratings for service-connected arrested tuberculosis; ordered to lie on the table.

A petition of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of House bill 142, to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice and gambling in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments, House bill 73, to permit partially disabled World War II veterans to reenlist in the armed forces of the United States, including the Coast Guard, for limited duty, and House Joint Resolution 213, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prohibit the manufacture, sale, transportation, or possession, within the United States, of beverages containing more than one-half of 1 percent of alcohol by volume; to the Committee on Armed Services.

DAYLIGHT SAVING—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF PORTLAND, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Portland, Oreg., relating to daylight saving.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution No. 23536

Whereas the shift of population to the Pacific coast in the past few years and the unprecedented development of industry in Oregon, Washington, and California has taxed all service facilities and particularly in the field of electric power, and in the State of California this increased demand, combined with the emergency condition of drouth, has resulted in a definite power shortage in that State, while in the States of Oregon and Washington peak utilization of available power is being approached, although no material shortage presently exists; and

Whereas the State of California as a conservation measure has proposed daylight saving during the summer months and it has been suggested to the council of the city of Portland that similar action be taken in this community; and

Whereas the council feels that, while it is in accord with the program of conservation, the objective could not be obtained if one city in the State of Oregon adopted daylight saving but that it would be advantageous for such daylight saving to be on a coast-wide basis with at least the States of Oregon, Washington, and California joining in such a program, and the council recognizes that neither the State Legislature of Washington nor the State Legislature of Oregon are in session this year, therefore legislation on a State level cannot be enacted at this time, but the council desires that its position in this matter be known to State and local officials in the State of Oregon and to State and local officials in the State of Washington: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the council of the city of Portland does by this resolution express itself as being in favor of daylight saving, providing the same may be inaugurated on an area basis of at least the three Pacific Coast States of Oregon, Washington, and California; and be it further

Resolved, That the auditor be and he hereby is directed to send certified copies of this resolution to the Governor of the State of Oregon for the benefit of the State Board of Control, to the League of Oregon Cities representing the municipal corporations of the State of Oregon, to the Governor of the State of Washington, to the League of Washington Cities, and to the Governor of the State of California; and be it further

Resolved, That the council does by this resolution express itself as favoring daylight saving on a national scale as a means of increasing production of consumer goods during the present shortage thereof and the conservation of national resources, particularly in the field of oil and electric energy, and that the auditor be and he hereby is directed to send a certified copy of this resolution to the Members of the Oregon delegation in Congress.

Adopted by the council March 10, 1948.

WILL GIBSON,
Auditor of the City of Portland.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1206. A bill for the relief of Jack O'Donnell Graves; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1120);

H. R. 344. A bill for the relief of Sylvester T. Starling; without amendment (Rept. No. 1122);

H. R. 1747. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Lee Novick and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 1123);

H. R. 2399. A bill for the relief of Joseph W. Beyer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1124);

H. R. 3550. A bill for the relief of Jesse L. Purdy; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1121); and

H. R. 4571. A bill for the relief of the estate of Carl R. Nall; without amendment (Rept. No. 1125).

By Mr. MCCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1052. A bill to fix the salaries of certain justices and judges of the Territory of Hawaii; without amendment (Rept. No. 1116);

S. 1281. A bill for the relief of James B. Walsh; without amendment (Rept. No. 1117);

H. R. 334. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of James Harold Nesbitt, a minor; without amendment (Rept. No. 1118); and

H. R. 4399. A bill for the relief of James C. Smith, Stephen A. Bodkin, Charles A. Marlin, Andrew J. Perlik, and Albert N. James; without amendment (Rept. No. 1119).

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. J. Res. 207. Joint resolution to provide for the commemoration of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the establishment of the Department of the Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1115).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 2477. A bill for the relief of John W. Wagner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 2478. A bill for the relief of certain employees and former employees of the War Assets Administration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2479. A bill providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2480. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Liebermann Gordon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. CAPPER introduced Senate bill 2481, to authorize the awarding of medals to certain war correspondents, which was referred

to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia:

S. 2482. A bill to amend sections 2, 4, and 8 of the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; 16 U. S. C. 718b), as amended, and section 5 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act of February 18, 1929 (45 Stat. 1222; 16 U. S. C. 715), as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 2483. A bill to provide for the payment of a uniform allowance to officers of the Reserve components of the United States Army and the United States Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. MORSE introduced Senate bill 2484, to amend the Internal Revenue Code concerning the determination of the reasonableness of compensation for personal services, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARRAN (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. WAGNER):

S. 2485. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. McCARRAN (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina) introduced Senate bill 2486, to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 2487. A bill to authorize the construction of access roads necessary to the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HILL:

S. J. Res. 208. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of blue and gray stamps to symbolize our national unity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

RECOGNITION OF WAR SERVICE OF PRESS AND RADIO REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I should like to read the context of a brief Senate concurrent resolution, which I now submit:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the many men and women in the organizations of the Associated Press, the International News Service, the United Press, and other news and picture services and on the staffs of the Nation's newspapers, magazines, and radio broadcasting companies have served the United States in a patriotic and beneficial manner throughout the period embraced by World War II. This service in many instances has been beyond the call of ordinary duty and it has demonstrated a general appreciation and acceptance of the responsibilities of good citizenship.

That in accordance with the historic policy of the United States to recognize and publicly acknowledge the gratitude of the people and the Government of the United States for loyal service, the Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit to the Associated Press, the International News Service, and the United Press copies of this resolution for themselves and for distribution to their members or clients.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 49) was received and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, at the same time I also wish to introduce a bill to authorize the awarding of medals to certain war correspondents. The bill applies particularly to the 16 top-flight correspondents, representing the press and radio services of the Allied countries, who on May 7, 1945, had just witnessed the unconditional surrender of Germany at Reims, France, following a secret flight from Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower's headquarters at Paris.

From their battle-battered typewriters the century's biggest news mocked and and challenged them. Here was the scoop they had lived for all their newspaper lives. Here was the story the whole war-weary world waited to hear. But they chose not to breathe a word of it.

It was physically easy for these correspondents to reach a telephone or telegraph instrument and disclose the momentous happening which they had seen and heard, but it was morally and ethically impossible for them to do anything of the kind. Engraved on their minds, each syllable underscored, was the pledge imposed upon them during the flight by Brig. Gen. Frank Allen, Jr., Chief of the Public Relations Division of the Supreme Headquarters of the Allied Expeditionary Force:

> This story is off the record until the respective heads of the Allied Governments announce the fact to the world—
>
> The general had stipulated.
>
> I therefore pledge each and every one of you on your honor not to communicate the results of this conference or the fact of its existence until it has been released by the Supreme Headquarters.

The Army took journalism into its fullest confidence, certain that neither the profession nor any of its members would fail in the test of honor. The 16 correspondents who resisted the temptation which their typewriters flung at them and for more than 24 hours stifled the instinct to be first with the news met the test gloriously and proved anew and forevermore that journalism is a reliable and responsible repository for a public trust.

Many days passed before the correspondents learned the reason for the pact of personal and professional integrity to which they had been bound. Then General Allen said:

> The need for secrecy was intensified by the fact that the Germans were desperately trying, through propaganda and false statements, to create misunderstanding between the Russian forces and the Allies on the western front and even broadcast, as late as noon, May 6, that they intended to begin negotiations with the Allies so as to gain time and strength for the battle with the Russian forces.
>
> Due to the desire of the supreme commander to obtain a surrender at the earliest possible moment, so as to save Allied lives on both fronts, he requested authority from the Russian high command to act, initially, in accepting an unconditional surrender on all fronts, so as to bring the whole matter speedily to a head.
>
> The understanding was that he would observe the greatest secrecy in any negotiations with the German high command, to accept nothing less than simultaneous unconditional surrender on both fronts, and particularly to make no announcement of any kind until the Russian high command could be satisfied through later and more formal contact with the German high command that the surrender was genuine on all fronts and did not represent merely an additional attempt by the Germans to gain advantages at the expense of the Russians.
>
> Because of these considerations, which clearly involved security and the saving of American lives, the supreme commander was doubtful of the propriety of permitting the presence of any individual at the meetings, except those who had official duties in connection therewith.
>
> On the earnest representations that no newspaperman would release any information concerning the proceedings until authorized to do so, he allowed me to invite a pool of pressmen to witness the proceedings.

I believe the Nation owes a debt of gratitude to these 16 correspondents who justified General Eisenhower's confidence in the press in such an exemplary manner and abided so worthily by the highest ideals of journalism. I want their names and accomplishments enshrined in the records of our country's Government—not only because they were able to subordinate their personal ambitions to a world cause, but also because their devotion to duty should endure as a perpetual source of inspiration for the thousands of other men and women who will report the historic happenings of the future.

For that reason, I have asked the Congress to award certificates and medals, in acknowledgment of the gratitude of the people and Government of the United States for patriotic service, to James I. Kilgallen, of the International News Service; Boyd Lewis, of the United Press; W. W. Chaplin, of the National Broadcasting Co.; Charles Collingwood, of the Columbia Broadcasting System; Paul Manning, of the Mutual Broadcasting System; Herbert Clark, of the Blue Network; Margaret Ecker, of the Canadian Press; Gerald Clark, of the Canadian Broadcasting Co.; Sgt. Ross Parry, of the Canadian Army publication, Maple Leaf; Omar White, of the Australian Press; Jean Lagrange, of the French Press; H. C. Taylor, of Reuters; Thomas Cadett, of the British Broadcasting Co.; Sgt. Charles Kiley, of the United States Army publication, Stars and Stripes; Drew Middleton, of the New York Times; and John O'Reilly, of the New York Herald Tribune.

I have simultaneously sponsored a concurrent resolution by the Senate and House of Representatives honoring the thousands of men and women in the Associated Press and other news services and on the staffs of individual newspapers, magazines, and broadcasting companies for their manifold contributions to victory and peace throughout the dark years of World War II. Without their loyal and never-failing assistance, selective service, the war bond drives, the blood banks, food conservation, and most of our other essential activities would have been immeasurably less successful.

Responsible journalism, as exemplified by the 16 correspondents who kept their word at Reims and would not break it, however great the temptation, is an assurance that integrity, decency, and honor will continue to rule the channels of communication and govern the flow of information between nations and nationals.

I say this with pride and pleasure, both as a veteran Member of the United States Senate and a long-time newspaperman.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2481) to authorize the awarding of medals to certain war correspondents, introduced by Mr. CAPPER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS' SALARY ACT OF 1947

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, and request that the bill, together with a statement prepared by me and an analysis of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill, statement and analysis will be printed in the RECORD as requested by the Senator from Nevada.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2486) to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act Amendments of 1948."

SEC. 2. The portion of article II of section 1, title I, of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947 which follows the caption "Department of School Attendance and Work Permits" is amended to read as follows:

"CLASS 30—DIRECTOR

"A basic salary of $4,800 per year, with an annual increase in salary of $100 for 10 years, or until a maximum salary of $5,800 per year is reached.

"CLASS 31—CHIEF ATTENDANCE OFFICERS

"A basic salary of $4,300 per year, with an annual increase in salary of $100 for 10 years, or until a maximum salary of $5,300 per year is reached.

"CLASS 32—ATTENDANCE OFFICERS

"Group A: A basic salary of $2,500 per year, with an annual increase in salary of $100 for 15 years, or until a maximum salary of $4,000 per year is reached.

"Group C: A basic salary of $3,000 per year, with an annual increase in salary of $100 for 15 years, or until a maximum salary of $4,500 per year is reached.

"CLASS 33—CENSUS SUPERVISORS

"Group A: A basic salary of $2,500 per year, with an annual increase in salary of $100 for 15 years, or until a maximum salary of $4,000 per year is reached.

"Group C: A basic salary of $3,000 per year, with an annual increase in salary of $100 for 15 years, or until a maximum salary of $4,500 per year is reached.

"CLASS 34—CHILD-LABOR INSPECTORS

"Group A: A basic salary of $2,500 per year, with an annual increase in salary of $100 for 15 years, or until a maximum salary of $4,000 per year is reached.

"Group C: A basic salary of $3,000 per year, with an annual increase in salary of $100 for 15 years, or until a maximum salary of $4,500 per year is reached.

"The teachers, school officers, and other employees provided for in this title, during the first year of service after the effective date of this act shall receive compensation in accordance with the provisions of sections 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 9 of this act."

SEC. 3. Section 2, title II, of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. (a) The Board of Education is hereby authorized to establish the eligibility requirements and prescribe such methods of appointment or promotion for teachers, officers, and other employees as it may deem proper. The Board of Education is hereby authorized, empowered, and directed, on written recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools, to classify and assign all teachers, school officers, and other employees to the salary classes and positions in the foregoing salary schedule: *Provided*, That teachers, school officers, and other employees in the service of the Board of Education on permanent or probationary tenure on June 30, 1947, shall not be required to take any examinations, either mental or physical, to be continued in the positions in which they were employed on June 30, 1947, or to which they may be transferred and assigned under the provisions of section 6 of this act.

"(b) Except as hereinafter provided, no teacher, school officer, or other employee shall be appointed in or promoted to group C of any class, be appointed in or promoted to classes 9 to 31 (inclusive), or receive a salary in excess of $4,000 in any class or class and group, unless he possesses a master's degree. When used in this act, the words 'master's degree' means a master's degree granted in course by an accredited higher educational institution.

"(c) Nothwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b), any teacher, school officer, or other employee without a master's degree in any one of classes 9 to 31 (inclusive) on June 30, 1947, shall be entitled to receive annual increases in salary until he reaches an annual salary rate not more than 10 percent less than the maximum annual salary rate of his class.

"(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b), any teacher, school officer, or other employee without a master's degree in the service of the Board of Education on June 30, 1947, who—

"(1) was in a postion which did not require a master's degree or its equivalent for appointment at the time he was appointed to such position, but for which a master's degree or its equivalent was required for appointment on or before June 30, 1947, and

"(2) was continued in such position after a master's degree or its equivalent became a requirement for appointment and was accorded the same rights and privileges in such position as a person appointed thereto who possessed a master's degree or its equivalent shall (a) be assigned to group C of the class to which he is assigned pursuant to section 6 if such class is divided into groups A and C, and (b) be entitled to receive annual increases in salary until he reaches the maximum salary rate provided in the foregoing schedule for the class in which he is assigned under the provisions of section 6.

"(e) In determining the placement of teachers of trade and vocational subjects, of officers in vocational schools, and of teachers of art and music the Board of Education may in its discretion credit training and experience in the trades or in the fine arts as though it were experience in and training for teaching, and may appoint and promote such teachers and officers without regard to the educational or academic requirements set forth in this act (including the requirement of a master's degree), or established by the Board of Education pursuant to this act, whenever the Board finds that such training and experience in the trades or in the fine arts warrants such appointment or promotion."

SEC. 4. Section 4, title III, of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. (a) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, each teacher, school officer, or other employee in the service of the Board of Education on permanent or probationary tenure on June 30, 1947, shall receive the salary as provided in the foregoing schedule for his class or class and group (as determined under section 2, 6, and 9 of this act), including the basic salary and all annual increases which he would have been entitled to receive on the basis of the number of years of satisfactory service in the Washington schools, or the number of years of like experience acceptable to and approved by the Board of Education in universities, and other recognized institutions, trades, and industries, if this act had been in effect from the time of his original appointment in such service.

"(b) No teacher, school officer, or other employee in the service of the Board of Education on permanent or probationary tenure on June 30, 1947, shall receive compensation at a rate less than his annual compensation as of June 30, 1947, including the additional compensation authorized by the act entitled 'An act to authorize increases in the salary rates of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia whose pay is fixed and regulated by the "District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1945," as amended,' approved July 31, 1946."

SEC. 5. (a) Subsection (a) of section 5, title III, of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947 is amended by striking out "whose annual compensation is increased under the provisions of this act at the rate of not more than $600 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948,".

(b) Subsection (b) of such section is repealed.

SEC. 6. (a) The first paragraph of section 6, title III, of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947 is amended by inserting after the word "shall" a comma and "except as provided in section 2 of this act,".

(b) Paragraph (al) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(al) Attendance officer, now assigned to salary class 32, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 32, group A, of the foregoing schedule;".

(c) Paragraph (am) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(am) Census supervisors, now assigned to salary class 33, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 33, group A, of the foregoing schedule;".

(d) Paragraph (a) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(an) Child-labor inspectors, now assigned to salary class 34, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 34, group A, of the foregoing schedule;".

(e) Paragraph (ap) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(ap) All teachers, school officers, or other employees, appointed after the effective date of this act, shall be placed in the salary classes and positions in the foregoing schedule by the said Board, and all teachers, librarians, research assistants, counselors, instructors in the teachers' colleges, attendance officers, census supervisors, and child-labor inspectors appointed after the effective date of this act shall receive longevity increases for placement either according to the number of years of experience required by the Board of Education or the number of years of like experience acceptable to and approved by the Board of Education in accredited schools, school systems, colleges, universities, other recognized institutions, trades, and industries, previous to probationary appointment in the public schools

of the District of Columbia. In the case of teachers of vocational subjects the Board of Education is authorized and directed to credit approved training and experience in the trades in the same manner and to the same extent as though it were experience in and training for teaching. In crediting previous experience of any person who has been absent from his duties because of naval or military service in the armed forces of the United States or its allies, the Board of Education is hereby authorized to include such naval or military service as the equivalent of approved experience. Any person who has served in the armed forces of the United States or of its allies prior to his employment as a teacher, officer, or other employee shall receive credit for such service as the equivalent of approved experience on a year-for-year basis within the limits of credit for accepted and approved experience hereafter provided. On July 1, 1947, and thereafter, no teacher or any other employee entitled to longevity increases for placement shall be placed in the foregoing salary schedule for more than the fifth year of accepted and approved experience in salary class 1, group A or group C; salary class 2, group A or group C; salary class 3, group A or group C; salary class 4, group A or group C; salary class 5, group A or group C; salary class 6, group A or group C; salary class 7, group A or group C; salary class 8, group A or group C; salary class 32, group A or group C; salary class 33, group A or group C; and salary class 34, group A or group C; in the foregoing schedule."

SEC. 7. Section 7, title IV, of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. On July 1, 1948, and on the first day of each fiscal year thereafter, if his work is satisfactory, every permanent teacher, school officer, or other employee shall receive an annual increase in salary within his salary class or position as hereinbefore provided without action of the Board of Education. A program of further training under regulations to be formulated by the Board of Education shall be made available to promote continuous professional growth among the teachers, school officers, and other employees."

SEC. 8. Section 9, title IV, of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947 is amended by striking out "and 8" and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and "8, 32, 33, and 34."

SEC. 9. Section 14, title V, of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: "but no such other substitute teacher may be employed for any given day until every annual substitute teacher has been assigned to duty in the place of a regular teacher absent from duty on that day."

SEC. 10. The amendments to the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947 made by this act shall be effective as of July 1, 1947.

The statement and analysis presented by Mr. MCCARRAN are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR M'CARRAN

I have just introduced a bill to correct the major injustices in the Teachers' Salary Act, which was adopted last year.

Let me say immediately that I am sure that the Members of the Senate and House who sponsored the present act did so with the sincere desire to help the teachers, and that they were completely unaware of inequities in the draft of the bill as it passed.

I believe most members of Congress who voted, last year, for the present act, would be eager to correct these inequities. Let me briefly review the major points in the act which require changes, and which the bill I have just introduced would correct.

First. The act recognizes as equivalent to formal classroom work the specialized work of librarians, counselors, and research workers. It is proper that this recognition should be given. But the act fails to recognize the highly important and highly specialized work of the attendance department as also the equivalent of class-room teaching. I think the teacher who deals with the maladjusted truant has at least as hard a time as the ordinary teacher, the librarian, and the research worker, and my bill removes the discrimination.

Second. The act as it passed last year blanketed in all elementary teachers and elementary school principals who do have a bachelor's degree with those elementary teachers and principals who do have a bachelor's degree. That is proper. It is the usual procedure not to penalize the teacher who has taught long and well if she met the requirements when she was first appointed. The same rule applies to all other professions. Many a man in this Chamber was admitted to practice law when he had not completed 2 years of academic college work before he was admitted to study law. Today over half the States of the Union require 2 years or more of academic college work, 3 or 4 years of law college work, before a student is eligible to try a bar examination. Would any man in this Congress say that those men who were admitted to practice before this requirement was put into effect must now either go to college or be denied the right to advance in their profession? Certainly not.

Yet this act singles out a few teachers who had earned the highest level of pay through their work and their specialized study and yet because they have not taken a master's degree the act limited the pay of this small group. This limitation on the classroom teachers' pay is particularly unfortunate because this same act allows a school official to get as much as $8,200 without a master's degree, but limits the pay of a teacher without a master's degree to $4,000. The limitation in salary should be placed on all teachers and all officials hereafter appointed.

Third. The act in requiring a master's degree for all teachers as a condition for their receiving the top pay fails to recognize the educationally sound practice observed in most cities of accepting the equivalent of the master's degree for teachers in trade and vocational subjects and in art and music.

Fourth. The act permitted the superintendent of schools to jump right up to $14,000, a salary which I do not begrudge him; but it denies the teachers under him who have earned a master's degree—the degree which he has earned—full credit for their years of service in our schools. In fact, so inequitable is the placement provision in this act that it would pay a large number of teachers with many years of experience, to resign and be appointed as new teachers so they would get credit for at least 5 years of experience.

Surely the Congress did not mean to create such a situation.

Fifth. Surely, also, no one in this Congress would knowingly have said that the teacher who has taught 10 or more years should receive an increase of $150, but if she has taught less than that, she shall be given a $250 increase. Yet this act, stripped of its involved language, says just that in some cases.

I say "involved language" advisedly. The act purports to give teachers a $600 annual increase when actually, in the line before the $600 is given, the pay raises which were given to the teachers in former years have been taken away. The result is to make it look as if the teachers were given a $600 increase, instead of the $150 or $250 they were actually given. I refer of course to teachers; not to top officials.

Sixth. The act provides a set of standards for promotion which are difficult to interpret and not supported by common sense. The ridiculousness of these provisions is seen in the language which requires school officers to be promoted on evidence of "outstanding service." What is meant by outstanding service?

Does proof of such service require formal national recognition? "Outstanding service" would, properly and probably, be nationally recognized. Yet how many of our school officials, required under this act to render "outstanding service," have been given even a listing in Who's Who in America? So far there are not many of our school officers who are there listed.

Then there is another implication in the language of this act. The implication is that a teacher who develops the mind of a girl or boy, the teacher who helps mold the character of a boy or girl, cannot render "outstanding service." For we must remember the act says that officers must prove that they have rendered "outstanding service," but teachers must prove that they have "grown professionally." Particularly disconcerting is the fact that the salary of both officers and teachers is partially dependent upon the language of this section of the act.

This section of the act has caused greater concern to the school personnel than has any other section. The section has a very good purpose: To assure the continuous professional growth of teachers and school officers.

No one objects to the purpose of this section of the act, but it would be difficult to find a teacher or a school officer who does not have serious misgivings about the language. Does this language mean that an officer who does not render "outstanding service," as the act now requires, is to be dropped from the school system? Or is he simply to lose his annual increments? Or does it mean that once he has attained his $14,000 or $8,700 or $4,000 he may stagnate?

It seems to me that every teacher and officer should be given his salary, including the annual increments he has earned by his years of service, so long as his work is satisfactorily performed. When his work is not satisfactorily performed, he should be so informed, given a chance to defend his record, and if, after a fair hearing, he is found lacking in professional capacity, he should be dropped. A requirement for "outstanding service" invites trouble. There may come a time when jobs paying six, seven, eight, or fourteen thousand dollars will not be so readily available. And if such time comes, it may be possible to prove that some who draw these salaries are not "outstanding" in the opinion of those who may know men and women whom they regard as more "outstanding" and who desire to take these well-paying positions.

I don't like to have these teachers and officers who do a satisfactory, conscientious job subjected to a sense of insecurity, which the present language of the act may develop.

I repeat, the teacher or officer who renders satisfactory service should get his full pay as long as he renders such service.

Completely apart from any salary which may be paid, every teacher and every school officer should be expected to continue his professional growth and betterment.

Seventh. However, if the growth is to be a sound growth, the form and pattern is not to be determined by uniform inflexible law. Individual differences, varied interests, various capacities must be recognized in the program as it is set up. But the act now requires that all teachers and officers shall participate in the in-service training program which the Board of Education shall establish. If all teachers and officers are made to participate in the in-service training program, they would not have time to engage in studies in universities and colleges outside of Washington.

I am well aware of the fact that the present Board of Education has now authorized that a program be evolved and established to meet the requirements of the present law. I have been told that an effort is being made

to make the program a comprehensive one. That's fine. It means that the present Board of Education is trying to give a broad interpretation to the very restricted language of the present act. But what assurance can the officers and teachers of Washington have that the Boards of Education in the future will also interpret "the in-service training program" to mean any work taken outside of the school system? I feel it is wiser and better to have the language of the law state with exactness that the officers and teachers shall participate in a program which would provide opportunities for professional growth and betterment.

Eighth. There is a great deal being said about the need of granting teachers sick leave. I am in sympathy with such a move.

But certain school officials who themselves enjoy the privilege of taking sick leave are protesting that the granting of sick leave to teachers would cost too much. That talk puzzles me.

I wonder how many Members of Congress know that while Congress appropriates thousands of dollars as salaries for "annual substitutes," that in only the rarest cases does an annual substitute actually substitute for an absent teacher. These annual substitutes are assigned to our schools to do all sorts of jobs. They are put to work in school offices doing clerical work, they are assigned to school bookrooms to do odd jobs there; they are used in lieu of temporary teachers over an extended period, thereby making it possible for those who plan the use of public money to use the unappointed teachers' salary for other school business. I contend the annual substitute should substitute for an absent classroom teacher. I therefore propose to make it mandatory that the Superintendent of Schools assign the annual substitute teachers to serve as substitutes for absent—not unappointed—teachers, and for no other purposes unless there be no teacher absent for whom the annual substitute may perform substitute service.

These are, in broad general terms, the major inequities in the bill which was passed last year—inequities which I am seeking to correct.

In closing, I want to say again that I deeply appreciate the fine spirit which prompted the men who worked so hard last year to help enact legislation for the benefit of the teachers of Washintgon.

However, they had not had the opportunity over a long period of time of knowing the teacher's point of view. I am sure the Members of the Senate will forgive me if I say how proud and happy I am to realize that the single-salary schedule for which I pleaded over a period of years is now law. I may say with a pardonable pride that I began my fight for the single-salary schedule in 1945. I continued my fight in 1946. At the hearings in 1946 I said I wanted the inequities of the 1945 act removed. I proposed an amendment in 1946 which was adopted, which required the Board of Education to make a study of the Salary Act and to report back early in 1947 on the inequities therein.

Two major inequities were removed: The adoption of the single-salary schedule removed the inequity to which the elementary teachers and some junior high-school teachers had been subjected. The bill also gave some relatively small pay increases to teachers—$150 to some, $250 to some others. The two good points please me immensely.

However, I am now sponsoring this legislation to remove some of the inequities which are in the act which was to remove the inequities.

So that Senators may know what is in this new bill, not from the lips of its sponsor, but from a recognized expert, I have had the bill analyzed by the office of the Senate legislative counsel, and I now ask unanimous consent that this analysis may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSED BILL MAKING AMENDMENTS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS' SALARY ACT OF 1947

The first section of the bill provides a short title for the bill—the "District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act Amendments of 1948."

Section 2 of the proposed bill amends a portion of section 1 of the act. It increases by $300 the basic and maximum annual salaries payable to directors of the Department of School Attendance and Work Permits (class 30). It provides for a $700 increase in the basic and maximum annual salaries payable to chief attendance officers (class 31). It establishes additional groups within the salary classes pertaining to attendance officers, census supervisors, and child labor inspectors (classes 32, 33, and 34), the effect of which is to increase by $500 the basic and maximum yearly salaries payable to officers and employees in these classes who are assigned to these new groups.

Section 3 of the proposed bill amends section 2 of the Salary Act of 1947. The main change in the act made by this section affects the "master's degree requirement." Under the 1947 act, no teacher, school officer, or other employee may be appointed in or promoted to group C of any class, appointed in or promoted to classes 13 to 30 inclusive, or receive a salary in excess of $4,000 unless he possesses a master's degree. This applies to persons in the service of the Board on June 30, 1947, as well as those appointed subsequent to that date. An exception to the master's degree requirement is made in the case of school officers in classes 13 to 30 on June 30, 1947, to the extent of permitting any such officer to receive annual increases until his salary reaches a rate not more than $500 below the maximum of his class.

The amendment would enlarge the classes specifically enumerated as requiring a master's degree for appointment to include classes 9, 10, 11, 12, and 31.

In lieu of the exception to the master's degree requirement contained in the 1947 act, which covers only school officers without a master's degree in classes 13 to 30 on June 30, 1947, the amendment contains an exception which covers teachers, school officers, and other employees without a master's degree in classes 9 to 31 on June 30, 1947. In lieu of permitting a person who comes within the exception from advancing to a maximum salary $500 less than the maximum of his class, the amendment would entitle such a person to advance to a salary 10 percent less than the maximum of his class.

In addition to this exception from the master's degree requirement, the proposed bill would add another exception. This exception would apply to any person without a master's degree on June 30, 1947 who (1) was in a position which carried no master's degree requirement when he was appointed, but for which a master's degree requirement was established on or before June 30, 1947, and (2) was treated in such position after the master's degree requirement was established the same as if he had a master's degree. Any such person would be entitled to be placed in group C of his salary class (if his class is divided into groups A and C) and to advance to the maximum salary provided for his class.

Another change contained in the amendment to section 2 of the act would permit teachers of trades and vocational subjects, officers in vocational schools, and teachers of art and music to be credited for training and experience in the trades or fine arts as though it were experience in teaching, and would permit the appointment and promotion of such teachers and officers without regard to the educational and academic requirements (including the master's degree requirement) contained in the act whenever the Board of Education found that such training and experience in the trades or fine arts warranted such action.

Section 4 of the proposed bill amends section 4 of the act. This section relates to the salaries which persons in the service of the board on June 30, 1947 are to receive for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948. In general, it was provided in the 1947 act that for the fiscal year 1948, each teacher, school officer, and other employee in the service of the Board of Education on June 30, 1947, would receive an increase in his annual compensation (not including the 1946 pay increase) of $600. (This made an approximate increase of $150 over the total compensation including the 1946 pay increase). However, where this increase did not produce a salary equal to the basic salary of the class to which a person was assigned, such person was to receive the basic salary of his class. In addition it was provided that each person whose salary was increased not more than $600 was to receive an annual increase provided for in his class if he would be entitled to one under the law in effect on June 30, 1947.

The amendment provides that each teacher, school officer, and other employee shall be paid the salary of the class to which he is assigned under the 1947 act (as it would be amended by this bill), including the basic salary and the yearly increases to which he would have been entitled if the provisions of the act (as amended) had been in force from the time of his original appointment in the service. In other words, if a teacher assigned to a salary class having 15 annual increases had on June 30, 1947 completed 15 years' satisfactory service, he would immediately go to the top pay bracket of his class. The section as amended would also contain a provision now contained in section 2 of the act which provides that no teacher, school officer, or other employee shall receive a salary less than the total salary he was receiving on June 30, 1947.

Section 5 of the proposed bill amends section 5 of the act. The effect of the amendment is to make uniform the time of the first annual increase in salary for persons who were on probationary tenure on June 30, 1947, or who are appointed on probationary tenure after June 30, 1947. Under the amendment such increase would be received at the time the probationary employee gained a permanent status.

Section 6 of the proposed bill amends section 6 of the 1947 act. The amendments made in subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of section 6 of the bill are technical amendments made necessary by the amendments to section 1 and 2 of the act by sections 2 and 3 of the bill.

Subsection (e) of section 6 amends paragraph (ap) of section 6 of the act by adding a provision to give credit to a veteran (who is entering the service of the Board for the first time) for his military service within the limits of credit for accepted and approved experience otherwise provided for in the act. This amendment also raises the maximum longevity increases for placement, in the case of employees appointed after July 1, 1947 in class 32, group A or C, class 33, group A or C, or class 34, A or C, to the fifth year of accepted and approved service, thus placing persons appointed in these classes on the same basis as teachers appointed in classes 1 to 8. In addition the last sentence of paragraph (ap) of section 6 of the act would be eliminated by the proposed amendment.

Section 7 of the proposed bill amends section 7 of the act. The effect of this amendment is to provide for automatic yearly increases to the top salary of a class or group if the work of the teacher, school officer, or other employee is satisfactory. Under the act at present, these annual increases are automatic for 5 years. Then, upon approval by the Board of Education, the teacher, school officer, or employee becomes eligible for automatic increases for 5 more years. Upon a second approval, the person becomes eligible for automatic increases for the five re-

maining years (this is the limit of salary ranges provided in the act). The amendment also eliminates from the present act the requirement that teachers, school officers, and other employees make an anual report showing evidence of participation in the in-service training program and other evidence of professional growth. The program of in-service training provided for in the 1947 act is retained but is placed upon a voluntary participation basis.

Section 8 of the proposed bill amends section 9 of the act, which relates to assignments to groups in classes divided into groups A and C. The amendment merely adds classes 32, 33, and 34 to the enumeration of those classes divided into groups A and C.

Section 9 of the proposed bill amends section 14 of the act. Under the 1947 act, the Board of Education is authorized to employ "other substitute teachers" in addition to the anual substitutes provided for in section 14. The proposed amendment stipulates that "such other substitute teachers" are not to be employed until every annual substitute teacher has been assigned to duty in the place of an absent teacher. This amendment has a double effect. First, it requires that annual substitute teachers actually be assigned to teaching duties. Second, it prohibits the employment of other substitute teachers until all annual substitutes are assigned to duty on any given day.

Section 10 of the proposed bill provides that the amendments made by this act are to be effective as of July 1, 1947, that is, as if they had been contained in the 1947 act as it was originally enacted. It is evident that the change in the master's degree requirement as contained in the amendments to section 2 of the act would necessitate some reclassification of the teachers, school officers, and other employees in the service of the Board of Education. It is also evident that the amendments to section 4 of the act (relating to salaries) would necessitate a recomputation of salaries for all teachers, school officers, and employees who were in the service on June 30, 1947. By making these amendments retroactive to July 1, 1947 (which was the effective date of the 1947 act) the salary increases which would result from this recomputation would replace the salary increases which were originally provided for in section 4 of the act. The increases which would result from the amendment could only be determined on an individual basis depending upon the years of satisfactory service in the Washington schools, or the number of years of like service acceptable to the Board of Education in universities, other recognized institutions, trades, and industries, which each individual teacher, school officer, and other employee may have to his credit.

PEACETIME UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING—ARTICLE BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article prepared by him on the subject Peacetime Universal Military Training, and published in the magazine section of the New York Times for April 4, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LEGAL ASPECTS OF CIVIL RIGHTS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CHAVEZ

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD remarks relative to the legal aspects of civil rights, delivered by him before the Harvard Law School Forum, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., on April 9, 1948, which appear in the Appendix.]

FLOOD CONTROL IN OHIO—EDITORIAL FROM CINCINNATI ENQUIRER

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Cough Up, Uncle Sam" published in the Cincinnati Enquirer of April 10, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDUCATION AND THE FATE OF DEMOCRACY—ADDRESS BY JOHN W. STUDEBAKER

[Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Education and the Fate of Democracy," delivered by John W. Studebaker, United States Commissioner of Education, at the fifteenth annual John Adams lecture, at the University of California, Los Angeles, Calif., on March 18, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE COMPROMISE PROCESS OF LEGISLATION—ARTICLE BY OLIVER MARTIN

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Beyond Compromise," by Oliver Martin, professor of philosophy of the University of Ohio, which appears in the Appendix.]

VETERANS' EDUCATION—RELEASE BY AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a series of releases on veterans' education, issued by the American Council on Education, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. YOUNG asked and obtained permission for the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to hold hearings during the afternoon of April 12.

Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained permission for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to hold a hearing this afternoon.

CONFERENCE OF MAJOR POWERS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it appears in contemplating the world picture, we find ourselves involved in the affairs of every continent. That is the price of victory. As someone has said, we are mixed up in everything, and every nation is mixed up with us, especially in getting at our pockets.

One problem facing us is that involving Stalin and those who with him run the great nation of Russia. There has been a great deal of discussion in the American press and among our people generally as to whether it would be advisable to make one more attempt to see if some basis of understanding cannot be arrived at.

Mr. President, war has settled nothing. I recently gave out a release for overseas, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point. The release summarizes my views in relation to seeking to get an understanding with Russia.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY

RECOMMENDATION FOR MAJOR POWER CONFERENCE

Are we to allow ourselves to be caught in a fatal pattern of events which will lead us to war against Russia in the same manner that we eventually warred against Germany? It is the prayer of the American people and, as a matter of fact, of the people of the civilized world that we break such a pattern of events so that we can avert war.

Recognizing that fact, I have suggested that there be called, as soon as the necessary diplomatic arrangements can be made, a conference between Premier Stalin, President Truman, and leading diplomats of the other major powers. Such a conference could, I believe, be a tremendous factor in impressing upon Soviet Russia the truth of America's determination to help halt the march of communism across Europe. It might fulfill the Biblical injunction, "Come, let us reason together."

There have been inspiring instances in recorded history where in the worst of crises, last minute conferences have saved the peace. I pray and I believe that all America prays that this may be another such instance.

The advantages of such a meeting are the following:

TELLING STALIN THE TRUTH

(a) By meeting Mr. Stalin at first hand, the President could present to him the facts which Stalin's intelligence agents have apparently hid from him or have distorted—the facts of America's military preparedness, of the relative unity of the American people (aside from small but articulate pro-Soviet minorities) on this issue of halting communism.

(b) A major conference would serve to help relieve the fear in the hearts of the American people and in particular in the hearts of American mothers who feel that their sons will be soon going to war because of the chain of events which seems to run toward war.

STALIN COULD MAKE DECISIONS IN PERSON

(c) It has been proven that the representatives of the Soviet Union either in the United Nations or in Washington are mere puppets and have no independent power to make decisions of their own. In every instance of important decisions, these Soviet representatives must ask their masters in the Kremlin as to what action should be taken. Moreover, in interpreting instructions from the Kremlin they may be ever more unyielding than they are instructed to be, because of fear of being recalled as being "too soft."

In a Truman-Stalin conference, however, the head man in the Soviet Union, Premier Stalin, could decide those issues, possibly with his Politburo aides, without presumably consulting officials thousands of miles away and without presumably fearing the consequences of being compromising in their approach.

The dangers of such a conference are obvious too.

POSSIBLE FALSE SECURITY

1. Such a conference might lead to a false sense of security on the part of the American people. It might lead them to think that by simply having two or more men get together that all the long-standing points at issue between Russia and the United States could be resolved with a few words. Such is definitely not the case, and no false hopes should be aroused. We must not diminish our defense preparations one bit but must redouble modern-type defense plans.

2. Such a conference might lead to appeasement of the type Henry Wallace suggests. However, if we approach it on the basis that we definitely would not try to buy off Russia (because such a policy is absurd and unworkable), we could prevent any misapprehension as to appeasement.

WE WANT CONSTRUCTIVE ACTIONS, NOT WORDS

3. Such a conference might be used by the Soviet Union in order to make pious pledges which she intends to violate anyway. It is obvious on the basis of Russia's violation of a long succession of treaties and other agreements that her word is not worth the paper it is written on. The question is, therefore, what guaranties, in immediate action, rather than words, could be secured through a conference, if any. I believe that we could secure some constructive action from the Russians in place of mere words, and our own action would, of course, be dependent upon

Russia's action, while remaining ever alert against possible Russian reversal.

4. There is a possibility that such a conference might be used to make secret agreements of the sort made wholesale at Yalta, Potsdam, and Teheran. We can, however, indicate beforehand that the Congress and the people are resolutely against any more such secret commitments and definitely will not be bound by these commitments.

RUSSIAN PROPAGANDA

5. There is still another possibility that Russia would enter into such a conference solely for propaganda value in order to indicate the "desire" for peace and then blame the United States for failure of the conference. We must, however, rely on our overseas information set-up to counter such propaganda if it were to develop.

Weighing the advantages and disadvantages, I believe the advantages outweigh the latter. We must exhaust all possible alternatives for peace rather than simply throw up our hands and say that we must arm to the teeth and simply hope that war can be averted. At stake are not only hundreds of thousands of American lives and Russian lives, hundreds of billions of dollars, but the stake of our civilization itself. Scientists have proven to us beyond reasonable doubt that no one will really win the next war. Atomic devastation can very well erase human life from this planet. Why, then, should we hesitate in trying every reasonable alternative? We should not allow the pride of statesmen to prevent such a conference. We should ask that it be held as soon as possible.

The world needs a new diplomacy, a blunt diplomacy which will call a spade a spade, which will speak language to the Russians which the Russians will understand—frank, fearless, backed by armed might without saber rattling.

THE GOOD-NEIGHBOR POLICY—ARTICLE BY AMERICUS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, Bogotá is in the news today. A great American, our Secretary of State, is in Bogotá representing the United States. Primarily all our actions should be determined by a consideration of what is best for America.

I read in the magazine of the New York Times, under date of March 28, an article entitled "Is the Good-Neighbor Policy Sound?" which purports to have been written by one Americus, that being a nom de plume of a United States Government official who for several decades has specialized in Latin-American affairs.

Mr. President, I believe this article can be read with profit by every American, because I think it brings to our attention the situation we are facing in South America. Therefore I ask that the article be printed following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS THE GOOD-NEIGHBOR POLICY SOUND?—AS WE NEAR THE BOGOTÁ CONFERENCE AN EXPERT SUGGESTS WE REEXAMINE HEMISPHERE RELATIONS

(By Americus)

(Americus is the pseudonym of a United States Government official who for several decades has specialized in Latin-American affairs.)

WASHINGTON.—On next Tuesday the Ninth International Conference of American States will convene at Bogotá, Colombia. While the chief task to be undertaken will be the ratification of a basic organic pact implementing the inter-American system, it is a foregone conclusion that all of the Latin-American countries, with the possible exception of Argentina, will insist on obtaining financial aid from the United States Government and/or from the International Bank and the International Monetary Fund in order to alleviate the current dollar crisis and to continue their respective programs for industrialization, higher standards of living, and generally increased prosperity.

These countries will accuse the United States of devoting its attention exclusively to Europe and of forgetting Latin America. They will say that we wooed them assiduously during the recent war, disrupted their economies by our procurement activities, and are now inclined to leave them entirely to their own devices. They will assert that Europe is a hopeless proposition, whereas Latin America is a going concern, temporarily embarrassed and in need of help, which will yield good returns on our investment. They will contend that it is just as important to remedy conditions that foster the growth of communism in our own hemisphere as it is to wage a losing fight against it in Europe. In short, they will undoubtedly suggest, if not demand, some kind of Marshall plan for Latin America.

The foregoing predictions are based on repeated statements made by prominent Latin-Americans in both official and private circles.

What should be the reaction of the United States Government and people to this concerted move on the part of Latin-American Republics for further financial aid? Before attempting to answer this difficult question let us try to do some clear thinking on the fundamental relationship between the United States and the other nations that will convene.

One elementary, outstanding, and inescapable factor in such relationship is that the destiny of the United States in world affairs is intimately linked to a friendly and prosperous Latin America.

During the past two decades we have made great progress in allaying the fears of Latin America with respect to political aggression and intervention. Our progress toward greater political confidence began in the late 1920's, when we decided to end our armed intervention in some of the smaller Latin-American countries once and for all. This progress continued with accelerated pace under the all-out drive for hemispheric good will that was made under the popular slogan of the "good-neighbor policy," the real core of which, so far as the practical Latin-Americans were concerned, has consisted of the concrete financial aid extended by the Export-Import Bank.

It would be most regrettable if we should lose the gains that have been made toward more friendly relations with Latin America, but it is obvious that we cannot continue indefinitely a program of official subsidization of that area merely on the basis of being good neighbors. Since the Latin-Americans should be as much interested as we are in living under the western system of democracy and private initiative, the United States should not have to bear the entire weight of maintaining hemispheric economy. We are certainly justified in asking that Latin America do its share in helping itself. The immediate problem before us is to determine how high a price we must pay, and are justified in paying, for a friendly and prosperous Latin America.

Without wishing to take issue with the underlying principle of the good-neighbor policy, it must be recognized that, from a realistic point of view, that policy has not placed us in a favorable trading position vis-à-vis the other American Republics. It is extremely questionable whether very many of them have ever believed in our sincerity and altruism in proclaiming such a policy as the keystone of our official relationship with Latin America, but they have not been backward in taking advantage of it and in making it mostly a one-way street financially and economically.

It is very easy for those countries to bring pressure on us to grant any request they may make by asserting that our refusal violates the principles of the good-neighbor policy, but this argument has little or no weight when we ask some favor from them. It is safe to say that this policy, regardless of its convenience and value as a popular slogan, does not appeal to the average thinking Latin-American or command his respect. The first step toward placing ourselves in a stronger trading position, therefore, is to place less emphasis on, or even disavow, the good-neighbor policy as an end in itself, and substitute for it a more realistic approach toward hemispheric problems. The good-neighbor era should be replaced by the era of economic interdependability, in all that the term implies.

We should make a start at Bogotá toward this more realistic and common-sense policy, on a nonpartisan political basis. We should have no scruples in proclaiming a self-evident truth, viz: That philanthropy and sentiment are not sound tests per se of a country's foreign policy in a human world, where intelligent self-interest must be the paramount guiding force. Let us freely admit—what Latin Americans have known all along—that no policy is satisfactory to the United States that does not redound to the common interest of the entire hemisphere—including the United States.

Having tacitly disavowed the sentimental aspect of the good-neighbor policy as an end in itself, we can then talk a language so plain and straightforward that even the most skeptical Latin American will believe what we say. We should make it clear that our past official loans to Latin-American countries were deemed necessary largely for reasons of national security and that future official aid, if extended at all, must be justified by other and more tangible peacetime considerations.

But in attempting to determine how high a price we must pay for a friendly and prosperous Latin America, let us not be too niggardly and too forgetful. Let us admit that the establishing of ceiling prices for Latin America's raw products during the war, despite compensating export ceilings on scarce goods wer supplied to Latin-American countries from our own limited stocks, constituted an important contribution toward winning the war, for which we are duly grateful.

Let us express our regret for not having made it crystal clear that our procurement program during the war was bound to disrupt many aspects of the Latin-American economies, and for not having cooperated more closely with Latin-American countries in lessening the shock of the transition to postwar conditions. Let us also ask ourselves the question whether it was very sporting to go all out for Latin-American cooperation during the war, and not try to reach a meeting of minds as to what should now be done toward aiding Latin-American countries to stabilize their economies as much as possible.

Let us approach Bogotá with an open mind as to whether we may not have some further obligation toward Latin America from the standpoints of both duty and self-interest, and not with the sole attitude that we must stop this Santa Claus business once and for all, regardless of the consequences such a policy may have on our official relations with the other American republics. But, first of all, let us remember that we are representing the interests of the United States, and that our first duty is to our own people.

While we are doing some soul-searching about ourselves, it may be well to put the cards on the table in regard to Latin America. We have grown so accustomed to praising our neighbors to the south that we are often inclined to gloss over some of the more unfavorable aspects of their character and habits. We must remember that a ruling class exists in each republic which has long

preferred to live in a lopsided economy rather than lose any of its own privileges.

Members of this class prefer their own way of life and believe it is their own business whether they shall have any other kind. True, they are now being forced toward a more enlightened policy for reasons of self-preservation. They see that they cannot "have their cake and eat it too," and that the present extremes of wealth and poverty must not continue.

It is the fault of Latin America that a favorable investment climate has not been created for foreign private capital and initiative. This climate has not hitherto existed because of Latin-American exclusivism and excessive nationalism. Each country must bring its economic thinking into line with modern principles, if it wishes to improve its living standards. Prohibitive tariff walls and undue protectionism must go. Excessive official controls that are tying Latin-American economies into hard knots must be eliminated as soon as possible.

If the Latin Americans demand further official American aid at Bogotá in order to perpetuate the anachronistic systems that exist in virtually all of their countries, we shall have no obligation to give them any financial assistance. But if they show a tendency to meet us half way and create a genuinely favorable climate for foreign enterprise and investment, it would be good business to work out a deal. That is the real job to be done at Bogotá.

Having analyzed some of the fundamental aspects of our relations with Latin America, what should our concrete program be at Bogotá? Obviously such a program must be a matter of trading and negotiation and cannot be worked out in advance overnight. We can, however, now outline some of the basic principles of a suggested approach.

First, it must be recognized that the approach of the United States Government at the Bogotá Conference must necessarily be somewhat different from that which might be advocated by certain businessmen and financiers who, although intimately familiar with Latin-American conditions, do not have direct and personal responsibility for the conduct of our foreign relations with Latin America. In other words, the political angle cannot be ignored by our delegation.

Second, we should not close the door in advance to possible further official aid provided we can be reasonably sure of obtaining a quid pro quo in the way of really opening up Latin America to mutually advantageous foreign private initiative and investments and of bringing about an observance of sound fiscal and administrative methods.

Third, we should favor the granting of sound loans to Latin-American governments by the International Bank.

Fourth, we should consider the feasibility of direct industrial loans by the Export-Import Bank to Latin-American industrial concerns having a satisfactory record of management and earnings. In spite of great skepticism by many on this point, it can be safely asserted that such Latin-American concerns do exist, which might profitably utilize additional funds for expansion purposes. The volume of funds that would be required for this phase of the program would be insignificant, compared with the far-reaching effects of such financing.

Fifth, technical panels should be set up, preferably under the auspices of the Pan American Union, from which competent experts could be obtained by countries contracting loans from the International Bank or Export-Import Bank, in order to assist such countries in implanting sound fiscal and administrative methods.

Sixth, no loans should be extended to any Latin-American country or entity unless conditioned on (a) the creation of a favorable climate for private initiative and investment, both domestic and foreign, without discrimination, and (b) the implanting of sound fiscal and administrative practices.

The loans themselves should obviously meet the test of recognized investment standards of a progressive nature. For instance, it would be a major mistake to discourage the continued industrialization of Latin America. It may be assumed that a certain percentage of Latin-American industrial projects will go sour, but this fact should not vitiate the basic principle that industrialization should be encouraged and tried out when adequate security can be given for the desired projects.

The foregoing principles are only some of the more fundamental ones that should guide our negotiators at Bogotá. It is assumed that working committees will be constituted to develop these and other aspects of the problem, particularly with respect to inter-American trade. After a thorough exploration of the ways and means whereby Latin-American aspirations may be achieved, a considerable area of agreement should be attainable.

The most important thing is that the United States delegation should approach the economic phases of the conference with an open mind and should do its utmost to make the goal of inter-American economic interdependability a reality and not merely a topic for meaningless resolutions. Our negotiators must be competent and sincere, and they must inspire confidence in their possession of these attributes.

CHARTERS FOR WAR VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, last week the Senate considered bills for the granting of charters to three different organizations of veterans. As the Senate recalls, I was one of the leaders in opposition to those proposals.

I am in receipt of a short letter from Mr. Eugene F. Taggart, national liaison officer for the Catholic War Veterans of the United States. I should like to read it at this point:

CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., April 9, 1948.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I was present in the Senate the day you opposed the charter for the Catholic War Veterans. I have read the record completely and have had the advantage of discussing the situation with you a few months ago.

You can be assured, Senator, that we are disappointed; however, I would be remiss in my duties if I were not to compliment you on your fine work in opposing the bill. I have listened to your arguments, I have read your arguments, and I find that you have solid reasoning for your viewpoint. It is simply a case of you and we looking at the bill in a different light. However, I shall always be proud that a man of our faith had the fortitude to stand and oppose a bill he deemed wrong. It certainly shows that in the church no one pulls a switch, and we all think the same way.

I shall never worry about my country as long as men of your caliber legislate our laws. Be sure the organization will go on expending its best efforts to bring about the unity that you so well expressed in the term of We the people.

God bless you and believe me to be,
Sincerely yours,

EUGENE F. TAGGART,
National Liaison Officer.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 4739. An act to amend paragraph 1629 of the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to provide for the free importation of exposed X-ray film; and

H. R. 5328. An act to amend paragraph 1803 (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, relating to firewood and other woods.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18) providing for the printing of proceedings at the unveiling of the statue of William E. Borah.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 5214) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of Thursday last the Senate will now proceed to consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with order No. 1075, Senate bill 2225. The clerk will state the first bill on the calendar.

TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE FEDERAL CREDIT UNION ACT TO THE FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

The bill (S. 2225) to transfer administration of the Federal Credit Union Act to the Federal Security Agency, was announced as first in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], who is a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency from which the bill was reported, can give us an explanation of the bill.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I am not familiar with the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there any member of the Committee on Banking and Currency present who can give the Senate an explanation of the bill? Apparently there is no other member of the committee present who can do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2225) to transfer administration of the Federal Credit Union Act to the Federal Security Agency, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all functions, powers, and duties of the Farm Credit Administration and of the Governor thereof under the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, secs. 1751–1772), together with the functions of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect thereto, which were transferred to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation by Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1947, part IV, section 401, are hereby transferred to the Federal Security Agency.

SEC. 2. There is hereby established in the Federal Security Agency a Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, which shall be under the supervision of a Director appointed by the Federal Security Administrator. The Bureau of Federal Credit Unions and the Director thereof shall be under the general direction and supervision of the Federal Security Administrator. The functions, powers, and duties of the Farm Credit Administration under the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended, shall be exercised by the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions. The functions, powers, and duties of the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration under the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended, shall be exercised by the Director of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions.

SEC. 3. There are hereby transferred to the Federal Security Agency, to be used in the administration of the functions hereby transferred, (a) all property, including office equipment, transferred to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation pursuant to Executive Order 9148 of April 27, 1942, and in use on the effective date of this act; (b) all property, including office equipment, purchased by the Corporation for use exclusively in connection with the administration of the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended, the cost of which has been charged to such functions and which is in use on the effective date of this act; (c) all records and files pertaining exclusively to the supervision of Federal Credit Unions; and (d) all personnel employed primarily in the administration of the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended, on the effective date of this act.

SEC. 4. All funds allocated, specifically or otherwise, in the budget of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the administration of the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, which may be unexpended on the effective date of this act, shall be transferred by the Corporation to the Federal Security Agency for use in the administration of the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended. The Corporation shall be reimbursed for the funds so transferred and shall also be reimbursed for all other funds expended by it prior to the effective date of this act in the administration of the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended, in excess of fees from Federal credit unions received by the Corporation by deducting such amounts from the first moneys payable to the Secretary of the Treasury on account of the retirement of the stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation owned by the United States, and the Corporation shall have a charge on such stock for such amounts.

SEC. 5. This act shall become effective on the thirtieth day following the date of enactment.

EXTENSION OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT TO ALASKA RAILROAD EMPLOYEES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2326) to repeal the Alaska Railroad Retirement Act of June 29, 1936, as amended, and to extend the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to officers and employees to whom such act of June 29, 1936, is applicable, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon asks for an explanation of the bill. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] to make an explanation of it.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to abolish the Alaska Railroad retirement system and provide that employees covered by that system in return shall receive benefits now provided by the Civil Service Retirement Act. At the present time the Alaska Railroad employees have their own system of retirement. It is the purpose of the bill to bring those employees under the regular Civil Service Retirement Act, plus two minor additional benefits as a special consideration for working under the conditions they do in Alaska. We would give them a salary preference, and also provide that they may retire at the age of 62, instead of continuing to work to the age of 70. This seems fair and just under the circumstances.

In considering this bill we should remember that railroad employees who work for the Government in Alaska confront conditions different from those facing railroad men who work in the United States. Their wages are such that it is difficult for them to get ahead, educate their children, and own their homes. There is a considerable turnover on the Alaska Railroad. We should also remember that there is a great deal of Government work going on in Alaska at the present time. Many defense projects are under way, on which high wages are paid, and such projects enter into competition for labor with employment on the Alaska Railroad. We have tried in this measure to allow a little extra compensation under the retirement program rather than higher wages. We have endeavored to provide benefits which will induce men to enter the service of the Alaska Railroad and make it their life work.

Mr. CORDON. Is the bill requested by the railroad employees in Alaska?

Mr. ECTON. It is.

Mr. CORDON. How are the preferences which it is contended they should have to be paid for?

Mr. ECTON. By contributions from salaries, just as under any other retirement system. As I understand, 5 per cent of the worker's salary goes into the retirement system.

Mr. CORDON. What bothers me is this: If they become beneficiaries under the Civil Service Retirement Act, whatever benefits they receive must come from the fund created by that act; and if the funds which have accumulated under the Alaska Railroad Retirement Act are insufficient to meet those payments, then the payments must come from elsewhere, and unless they come from an appropriation from the Federal Treasury, it seems to me that they would have to come from funds which have accumulated as the result of payment by others in the general retirement fund. To that extent such payments would prejudice that fund. That is what bothers me. Can the Senator enlighten me on that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ECTON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The point which the Senator from Oregon has raised is valid to the extent that it is proposed under this legislation to pay a part of the increased benefits for employees of the Alaska Railroad through the retirement system. Under the present system they already receive an average of 25 per cent more than the prevailing wage rate in the United States for working in Alaska. Under the provisions of the retirement system they receive an additional 5-year credit which carries over into a 25-percent increase in retirement. I think it is a good idea to consolidate these systems; but I notice that in section 5 of the bill it is proposed to give to the employees of the Alaska Railroad an additional 1-year credit for each 10 years of service, which opens up another formula. In the bill recently passed we worked out a simplified formula under which a person could understand what he was getting. I have checked with the Commission, and I find that if section 5 were entirely eliminated, under the present retirement system these employees would still receive an additional increase over what they are presently receiving. Moreover, they would receive certain survivorship benefits. So I ask the Senator from Montana if he would consider an amendment to the bill eliminating section 5.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair must remind Senators that the Senate is proceeding under the 5-minute rule. The time of the Senator from Montana has expired. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I will yield to the Senator from Montana to answer the question, as to whether he would be willing to accept an amendment to the bill eliminating section 5, which would establish a new formula.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I do not know whether that would be proper or not. If we eliminate section 5, I do not know what effect it might have on retirement benefits.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have checked with the Commission and have the figures to support the statement that eliminating section 5 would not reduce the benefits which any of the employees are now receiving. They would receive an increase. However, the increase would not be so great as it would with section 5 in the bill.

Mr. ECTON. Would they still have the benefit of retirement at age 62?

Mr. WILLIAMS. They would receive the same benefit as they would under the present civil service law.

Mr. ECTON. Then I see no objection to the amendment. I am interested in making it more profitable and more worth while to those men who devote their lives and their energies to the service of the Alaska Railroad. I think they deserve consideration. If the amendment of the Senator from Delaware is as he explains it, I have no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then I have no objection to the bill being considered at this time. I move that section 5 be stricken from the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

RETURN OF CERTAIN CONTRIBUTIONS UNDER CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2325) to enable certain former officers or employees of the United States separated from the service subsequent to January 23, 1942, to elect to forfeit their rights to civil service retirement annuities and to obtain in lieu thereof return of their contributions with interest.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, it is my understanding that this particular piece of legislation would grant to employees who have been separated from the service but who are not eligible for retirement at this time, the right to withdraw their contributions to the fund in the same manner now possible by employees presently in the Government. In the recently enacted law we provided that employees must figure their annuities as though the act had not been passed. This bill would extend to certain employees separated from the service the privilege which I have described.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last paragraph of section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That any such officer or employee may elect to forfeit his right to such annuity and elect to receive in lieu thereof a payment of the total amount credited to his individual account together with interest compounded on December 31 of each year at the rate of 4 percent to the date of his separation or December 31, 1947, whichever may be the earlier, and at the rate of 3 percent for any period thereafter before April 1, 1948."

PAN AMERICAN RAILWAY CONGRESS

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 177) providing for participation by the Government of the United States in the Pan American Railway Congress, and authorizing an appropriation therefor, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with an amendment, on page 2, to strike out:

SEC. 2. To enable the Government of the United States fully to participate as a member in and contribute to the Pan American Railway Congress and its Permanent Commission, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Secretary of State, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to pay the proportionate share of the Government of the United States in the expenses of the Pan American Railway Congress and its Permanent Commission and to pay the expenses incident to participation by the United States in the activities thereof, including expenses of United States delegates, and appropriate staff, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; travel expenses without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended, the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended, and section 10 of the act of March 3, 1933, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, sec. 73b); services as authorized by section 15 of Public Law 600, Seventy-ninth Congress; hire of passenger motor vehicles and other local transportation; official entertainment; and printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 44, sec. 111) and section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 41, sec. 5).

And insert:

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated—

(a) Not more than $5,000 annually for the payment by the United States of its proportionate share of the expenses of the Pan American Railway Congress and its Permanent Commission; and

(b) Such additional sums as may be needed for the payment of all necessary expenses incident to participation by the United States in the activities thereof, including expenses of the United States delegates, their alternates, and appropriate staff, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; personal services in the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section 15 of Public Law 600, Seventy-ninth Congress; hire of passenger motor vehicles and other local transportation; printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111), and section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; and such other expenses as the Secretary of State finds necessary to participation by the United States in the activities of the organization: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 6 of the act of July 30, 1946 (Public Law 565, 79th Cong.), and regulations thereunder, applicable to expenses incurred pursuant to that act shall be applicable to any expenses incurred pursuant to this paragraph (b).

So as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That the President is hereby authorized to accept membership for the Government of the United States in, and to appoint the United States delegates and their alternates to, the Pan American Railway Congress, the constitution and bylaws of which were approved in Montevideo, Uruguay, April 1946, and deposited in the archives of the Pan American Union in Washington.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated—

(a) Not more than $5,000 annually for the payment by the United States of its proportionate share of the expenses of the Pan American Railway Congress and its Permanent Commission; and

(b) Such additional sums as may be needed for the payment of all necessary expenses incident to participation by the United States in the activities thereof, including expenses of the United States delegates, their alternates, and appropriate staff, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; personal services in the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section 15 of Public Law 600, Seventy-ninth Congress; hire of passenger motor vehicles and other local transportation; printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111), and section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; and such other expenses as the Secretary of State finds necessary to participation by the United States in the activities of the organization: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 6 of the act of July 30, 1946 (Public Law 565, 79th Cong.), and regulations thereunder, applicable to expenses incurred pursuant to that act shall be applicable to any expenses incurred pursuant to this paragraph (b).

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3433) to amend the act entitled "An act to classify the officers and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia and for other purposes," was announced as next in order.

Mr. BUCK. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3998) to provide for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BUCK. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

AUTOMOBILE DRIVERS LEARNERS' PERMITS

The bill (H. R. 4572) to amend section 7 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, to provide for learners' permits, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, this bill simply provides that learners' permits may be issued to those who seek to learn to drive automobiles, and a charge of $1 shall be made for it; and after such persons qualify as drivers, they will be able to obtain permits for 3 years for $3.

The bill also would permit a pupil automobile driver over 15 years of age to drive a dual-control car without a permit, provided that he is accompanied by a licensed driver.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REGULATION OF PRACTICE OF THE HEALING ART

The bill (H. R. 4636) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929, as amended, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COMPENSATION OF DISTRICT ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL BOARD

The bill (H. R. 4649) to provide that compensation of members of the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board of the District of Columbia shall be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CORPORATION OR BUSINESS TAX

The bill (S. 2409) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the

District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 16, 1947, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph lettered (h) of section 4 of title I of article I of the act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 16, 1947, is amended by striking out the period at the end of the paragraph, inserting a colon, and the following: *"Provided, however,* That the words 'trade or business' shall not include, for the purposes of this article, sales of tangible personal property whereby title to such property passes within or without the District, by a corporation or unincorporated business which does not physically have or maintain an office, warehouse, or other place of business in the District, and which has no officer, agent, or representative having an office or other place of business in the District, during the taxable year. For purposes of this proviso, the words 'agent' or 'representative' shall not include any independent broker engaged independently in regularly soliciting orders in the District for sellers and who holds himself out as such."

SEC. 2. Section 1 of title X of article I of said act is amended by striking out the period at the end of the section, inserting a colon, and the following: *"Provided further,* That income derived from the sale of tangible personal property by a corporation or unincorporated business not carrying on or engaging in trade or business within the District as defined in title I of this article shall not be considered as income from sources within the District for purposes of this article."

SEC. 3. Section 4 of title XIV of article I of said act is repealed.

SEC. 4. The amendments made by this act shall apply to the taxable year or part thereof beginning on the 1st day of January 1948, and to succeeding taxable years.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF OCEAN STATIONS BY THE COAST GUARD

The bill (S. 2122) to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations was announced as next in order.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, this bill deals with the operation of ocean stations by the Coast Guard, particularly in the Atlantic Ocean, under the terms of an agreement made at an international conference under which this country was to supply seven of such stations and other countries were to supply six more, in accordance with allocations based on the approximate amount of air traffic flowing over the ocean.

The United States has not carried out its obligations in this connection. We have maintained two stations, whereas we should have maintained seven. It costs a considerable amount of money to maintain the stations, but they serve as rescue stations, as well as aids to air navigation; and they are considered vital. We are obligated to maintain them under the terms of the agreement, which I believe has been approved.

It costs approximately $2,000,000 to maintain each station, inasmuch as it is necessary to have three vessels to keep the stations properly serviced—one vessel at the station location, one in port for supplies and relief purposes, and one subject to repairs.

Mr. LODGE. Are all these stations ships?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes, they are.

The question of air navigation as a supplement is being seriously studied, but we have not yet reached a point where we believe it can be substituted for this service.

Heretofore it has been carried on without legal authority; during the war it was carried on under wartime authority. But it was felt that it should not be carried on further without being legitimatized, and the committee agreed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments on page 1, line 3, after the words "in order to", to strike out "provide adequate air navigation," and insert "assist in providing adequate"; in line 4, after "meteorological", to strike out "communications, and" and insert "communication facilities and to provide adequate"; in line 10, before the word "ocean", to insert "floating"; and at the end of the bill to add the following:

SEC. 2. The Coast Guard is authorized, subject to approval by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, to operate, on floating ocean stations authorized by section 1 hereof, such air-navigation facilities as the Administrator may find necessary or desirable for the safe and efficient protection and control of air traffic. The Coast Guard, in establishing, maintaining, or operating any air-navigation facilities herein provided, shall solicit the cooperation of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to the end that the personnel and facilities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration will be utilized to the fullest possible advantage.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to assist in providing adequate meteorological communication facilities and to provide adequate search and rescue facilities for safe, regular, and economic air services over such regions of the oceans as are regularly traversed by commercial or military aircraft of the United States, the Coast Guard is authorized to operate and maintain such floating ocean stations as may be necessary or desirable to serve the needs of the armed forces and of the commerce of the United States, or to fulfill the international obligations of the United States.

SEC. 2. The Coast Guard is authorized, subject to approval by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, to operate, on floating ocean stations authorized by section 1 hereof, such air-navigation facilities as the Administrator may find necessary or desirable for the safe and efficient protection and control of air traffic. The Coast Guard, in establishing, maintaining, or operating any air-navigation facilities herein provided, shall solicit the cooperation of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to the end that the personnel and facilities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration will be utilized to the fullest possible advantage.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LICENSING OF MARINE RADIOTELEGRAPH OPERATORS

The bill (H. R. 1036) to provide for the licensing of marine radiotelegraph operators as ship radio officers, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BREWSTER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the reconsideration of House bill 1036, calendar 1086, which was passed on the call of the calendar, in order to correct a date.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1036) to provide for the licensing of marine radiotelegraph operators as ship radio officers, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine? The Chair hears none, and the vote by which House bill 1036 was passed is reconsidered. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, at the end of section 9, on page 5, line 9, I move to strike out "July 1, 1948," and insert in lieu thereof "April 1, 1949."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ESTABLISHMENT, MAINTENANCE, AND OPERATION OF AIDS TO NAVIGATION

The bill (S. 1853) to authorize the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to guide navigation and to prevent disasters, collisions, and wrecks of vessels and aircraft, the Coast Guard is authorized to establish, maintain, and operate within the United States, its Territories and possessions, and beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the United States at places where naval or military bases of the United States are or may be located, and elsewhere—

(a) aids to maritime navigation required to serve the needs of the armed forces or of the commerce of the United States;

(b) aids to air navigation required to serve the needs of the armed forces of the United States as requested by the Secretary of the appropriate Department within the National Military Establishment; and

(c) Loran stations (1) required to serve the needs of the armed forces of the United States; or (2) required to serve the needs of the maritime commerce of the United States; or (3) required to serve the needs of the air commerce of the United States as determined by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

The Coast Guard in establishing, maintaining, or operating any aids to air navigation herein provided shall solicit the cooperation of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to the end that the personnel and facilities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration will be utilized to the fullest possible advantage. Before locating and operating any such aid on military or naval bases or regions, the consent of the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, shall first be obtained. No such aid shall be located

within the territorial jurisdiction of any foreign country without the consent of the government thereof. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to limit the authority granted by the provisions of section 77 of the act of January 12, 1895 (28 Stat. 621), or by section 5 (f) of the Air Commerce Act of 1926 (49 U. S. C. 175), or by title III of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 451 and the following).

CONSTRUCTION OF CHAPEL AND LIBRARY AT MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The bill (H. R. 3569) to authorize the construction of a chapel and a library at the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y., and to authorize the acceptance of private contributions to assist in defraying the cost of construction thereof, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

APPOINTMENT OF UNITED STATES COMMISSIONERS FOR CERTAIN NATIONAL PARKS

The bill (H. R. 2645) to provide that appointments of United States commissioners for the Isle Royale, Hawaii, Mammoth Cave, and Olympic National Parks shall be made by the United States district courts without the recommendation and approval of the Secretary of the Interior was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CERTAIN NATIONAL CEMETERIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1856) to provide for the utilization as national cemeteries of surplus Army Department-owned military real property at Fort Devens, Mass.; Fort Logan, Colo.; and Fort Lewis, Wash., which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments, on page 1, in line 8, after the word "by", to strike out "existing"; and after the word "law", to strike out "(14 U. S. C. 281)."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That when the Secretary of the Army determines that there is need for an additional cemetery or cemeteries for the burial of members of the armed forces of the United States dying in the service or former members whose last discharge therefrom was honorable and certain other persons as provided for by law, he is authorized to utilize such of the federally owned lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army at Fort Devens, Mass.; Fort Logan, Colo.; and Fort Lewis, Wash., as are not needed for military purposes for the establishment thereon of a national cemetery or cemeteries.

SEC. 2. Upon the selection by the Secretary of the Army of any lands, as provided in section 1 hereof, he is authorized and directed to establish thereon a national cemetery and to provide for the care and maintenance of such cemetery. No national cemetery established pursuant to this act shall have an area in excess of 640 acres.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to prescribe such regulations as he may deem necessary for the administration of this act.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry into effect the purposes of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COMPENSATION OF HOLDERS OF GRAZING PERMITS AND LICENSES

The bill (S. 1874) authorizing the head of the department or agency using the public domain for national defense purposes to compensate holders of grazing permits and licenses for losses was announced as next in order.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. HATCH subsequently said: Mr. President, when Calendar 1091, Senate bill 1874, was reached, I was temporarily absent from the Chamber. I understand the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] asked that the bill go over. Since then I have talked with the Senator and he advises me that he is willing to have the bill considered at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1874) authorizing the head of the department or agency using the public domain for national defense purposes to compensate holders of grazing permits and licenses for losses, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That the act of July 9, 1942 (56 Stat. 654, 43 U. S. C., sec. 315q), is amended by inserting the words "or national defense" between the word "war" and the word "purposes" wherever the latter two words appear in that act.

SEC. 2. This amendment is to take effect as of July 25, 1947.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I am very happy to withdraw my objection, at the request of the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

UINTA AND WASATCH NATIONAL FORESTS, UTAH

The bill (S. 2240) to include certain lands within the Uinta and Wasatch National Forests, Utah, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the boundaries of the Uinta National Forest are hereby extended to include the following-described lands and, subject to valid and existing claims, any lands of the United States included therein are hereby made parts of said national forest and hereafter shall be subject to all laws and regulations applicable thereto:

SALT LAKE MERIDIAN, UTAH

Township 5 south, range 3 east, sections 24, 25, 26, and 34; section 35, north half; section 36; special sections 38 and 39.

Township 6 south, range 3 east, section 4, north half; section 5, north half; section 6.

Township 4 south, range 4 east, sections 22 to 27, inclusive; sections 33 to 36, inclusive.

Township 5 south, range 4 east, sections 1 to 5, inclusive; sections 7 to 36, inclusive.

Township 6 south, range 4 east, sections 2 to 6, inclusive; sections 8 to 10, inclusive; special sections 37, 38, and 39.

Township 3 south, range 5 east, sections 1 to 4, inclusive; section 5, lots 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 11, southwest quarter northeast quarter, southeast quarter northwest quarter, northeast quarter southwest quarter; section 8, east half, east half west half; sections 9 to 16, inclusive; section 17, east half east half; section 20, lots 1, 2, 3, and 4; sections 21 to 27, inclusive; section 28, lots 1, 2, 3, and 4; sections 35 and 36.

Township 4 south, range 5 east, section 1; sections 12 and 13; sections 19 to 36, inclusive.

Township 5 south, range 5 east, all of township.

Township 3 south, range 6 east, sections 7 to 9, inclusive; sections 14 to 36, inclusive.

Township 4 south, range 6 east, all of township.

UINTA SPECIAL MERIDIAN, UTAH

Township 1 north, range 9 west, sections 28 to 33, inclusive.

Township 1 south, range 9 west, sections 4 to 9, inclusive.

Township 2 south, range 9 west, sections 4 to 9, inclusive; sections 16 to 21, inclusive; sections 28 to 33, inclusive.

Township 5 south, range 9 west, sections 32 and 33.

Township 6 south, range 9 west, sections 4, 5, 8, 9, 16, 17, 20, and 21.

Township 2 south, range 10 west, sections 1 to 3, inclusive; sections 10 to 15, inclusive; sections 19 to 36, inclusive.

SEC. 2. The boundaries of the Wasatch National Forest are hereby extended to include the following-described lands and, subject to valid and existing claims, any lands of the United States included therein are herein made parts of said national forest and hereafter shall be subject to all laws and regulations applicable thereto:

SALT LAKE MERIDIAN, UTAH

Township 5 south, range 2 east, section 22, lot 6, west half, west half southeast quarter; section 27, east half; section 35, north half; section 36.

Township 2 south, range 3 east, section 36, east half.

Township 4 south, range 3 east, sections 25 and 36.

Township 5 south, range 3 east, sections 1 to 3, inclusive; sections 10 to 15, inclusive; sections 22, 23, and 27; sections 31 to 33, inclusive; special section 37.

Township 2 south, range 4 east, sections 31 to 34, inclusive.

Township 3 south, range 4 east, sections 2 to 11, inclusive; sections 14 to 20, inclusive; sections 29 to 32, inclusive.

Township 4 south, range 4 east, section 4, north half, southwest quarter; sections 5 to 8, inclusive; section 9, west half, sections 16 to 21, inclusive; sections 28 to 32, inclusive.

Township 5 south, range 4 east, section 6.

RENT CONTROL FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2195) to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had

been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That section 1 (b) of the act entitled "An act to regulate rents in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 2, 1941, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940 ed., sec. 45–1601), is hereby amended by striking out "on April 30, 1948" and inserting in lieu thereof "at the close of March 31, 1949."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of such act, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940 ed., sec. 45–1602), as amended by adding at the end therof the following new subsection:

"(3) After April 30, 1948, the provisions of this act shall not apply to the following housing accommodations, and no maximum rent ceilings or minimum service standards shall be prescribed with respect thereto:

"(a) Any housing accommodations in hotels, used predominantly for transient occupancy; that is, for living quarters for nonresidents upon a short-time basis;

"(b) Any housing accommodations the construction of which was completed after March 31, 1948, or which are additional housing accommodations created by conversion after March 31, 1948;

"(c) Nonhousekeeping, furnished-housing accommodations, located within a single dwelling unit not used as a rooming or boarding house, but only if (A) no more than two paying tenants, not members of the landlord's immediate family, live in such dwelling unit, and (B) the remaining portion of such dwelling unit is occupied by the landlord or his immediate family."

SEC. 3. (a) The first sentence of section 9 (a) of such act, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940 ed., sec. 45–1609), is amended to read as follows: "Within 10 days after issuance of an order of the Administrator under section 4, any party may file a petition to review such action in the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia, and shall forthwith serve a copy of such petition upon the Administrator."

(b) Section 9 (c) of such act, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940 ed., sec. 45–1609), is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia is hereby granted exclusive jurisdiction to review any order of the Administrator made pursuant to section 4 of this act. The judgment and decree of the court shall be final, subject to review as provided by law relative to other judgments of the court."

SEC. 4. All cases now pending before the statutory three-judge court of the municipal court which have not been presented to that court for decision at the time this act takes effect shall forthwith be certified by said court to the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia. Nothing herein contained shall affect the validity of any judgment or decree of the statutory court (consisting of three judges of the municipal court as heretofore provided by law) rendered subsequent to the effective date of this act in cases heretofore presented to that court and now awaiting decision.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, to the committee amendment, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, in line 14, before the word "used", it is proposed to insert "which accommodations are."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, this is the so-called rent-control bill for the District of Columbia; and, with these amendments, it is similar to the bill which was passed last year. The bill decontrols transient accommodations in hotels, and new construction completed after March 31, 1948, and accommodations created by conversion after March 31, 1948, and nonhousekeeping furnished-housing accommodations in single-dwelling units if they contain not more than two paying tenants who are not members of the landlord's family.

There is also an amendment which requires that judicial review of the Administrator's actions, which used to be by the municipal court of the District of Columbia, shall now be handled by the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, composed of three members. Thus the municipal court will be relieved of that work.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BUCK. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. First of all, was the substitute for the bill reported by the committee, or only by the Senator? In other words, is it a committee amendment?

Mr. BUCK. The amendment in the nature of a substitute is the committee amendment or, in effect, the committee bill, with the one amendment which I submitted to it, which is to clarify the language, in order that accommodations of permanent guests in hotels shall not be decontrolled.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understand. So the committee amendment is the suggested permanent bill as reported by the committee; is it?

Mr. BUCK. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, to permit me to ask a question?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. What will happen if this bill is not passed?

Mr. BUCK. The controls will carry on until the end of this month; and after that there will be no controls.

Mr. LODGE. After that there will be no controls at all?

Mr. BUCK. That is correct.

Mr. LODGE. What does the Senator think will happen so far as transients coming to Washington are concerned and the amount they will have to pay for hotel rooms, after this bill is enacted, if it is?

Mr. BUCK. We do not think they will be unduly assessed, because transient hotels in all other parts of the country are decontrolled.

Mr. LODGE. What has been the experience in other sections of the country?

Mr. BUCK. It has been very favorable.

Mr. LODGE. Have the hotels in Washington entered into any understanding that they will not unduly increase their charges?

Mr. BUCK. They have not with the committee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator explain the differences if any between this bill and the national rent control bill already passed by the Senate?

Mr. BUCK. The national bill is much broader than this. In this bill there is no provision permitting a 15-percent increase on leases. The national bill decontrols all transient quarters and transient hotels; this bill does not. It continues the controls on permanent guests of transient hotels. Those are the only differences I think of.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the bill should be studied. I ask that it may go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

BRUCE BROS. GRAIN CO.

The bill (H. R. 3387) for the relief of Bruce Bros. Grain Co. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM M. LOONEY

The bill (S. 1886) for the relief of William M. Looney was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That William M. Looney, a substitute clerk in the post office at Canton, Pa., is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States amount of the overpayment of salary received by him from the date he returned to duty after discharge from the armed services and was paid at the rate of $1.49 per hour to the date when it was determined that the rate properly payable to him was $1.19 per hour. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any postmaster or other transmitting disbursing officer of the Post Office Department or postal service, the payment of an hourly rate of $1.49 to the said William M. Looney during the time specified shall be considered to have been authorized.

SEC. 2. Any amount heretofore credited to the said William M. Looney or refunded to the United States by him on account of the overpayment described in the first section of this act shall be repaid to him out of any money available for the payment of salaries to substitute clerks of first- and second-class post offices.

MARTIN A. KING

The bill (H. R. 3300) for the relief of Martin A. King was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF MARY D. BRIGGS, DECEASED

The bill (H. R. 927) for the relief of the estate of Mary D. Briggs, deceased, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF COPYRIGHTS LAW

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4931) to amend title 17 of the United States Code, entitled "Copyrights," which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 2, in line 23, to strike out "$3" and insert "$4."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4326) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of hankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, in line 7, to strike out "1948" and insert "1949."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

GEORGE ANTHONY YAHOLKOVSKY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1745) for the relief of George Anthony Yaholkovsky, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, to strike out:

Upon the enactment of this act the Attorney General shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Chinese quota for first year that the Chinese quota is available.

And insert:

Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota of China for the first year such quota is available.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admittance for permanent residence of George Anthony Yaholkovsky as of November 3, 1945, and that he shall for all purposes under the immigration and naturalization laws be deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence.

Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota of China for the first year such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GUDRUN EMMA ERICSSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1729) for the relief of Gudrun Emma Ericsson, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after the word "issued", to insert "Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cause the immediate release of Gudrun Emma Ericsson (file No. A-6-619892) from detention at Ellis Island, N. Y., and to permit her entry into the United States for permanent residence. The said Gudrun Emma Ericsson shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which her present detention is based or upon which any outstanding order of exclusion or order and warrant of deportation has been issued. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEO HAMERMANN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1637) for the relief of Leo Hamermann, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That in the administration of the Immigration and Naturalization laws the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Leo Hamermann. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANDREW S. MATHEWES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1256) for the relief of Andrew S. Mathewes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, after line 3, to insert:

Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year such quota is available.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel forthwith any outstanding warrant of arrest, order of deportation, warrant of deportation, and bond in the case of the alien Andrew Mathewes, of New York, N. Y., and is directed not to issue any such further warrants or orders in the case of such alien insofar as any such further warrants or orders are based upon the same grounds as the warrants or orders required by this act to be canceled. For the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the said Andrew Mathewes shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence.

Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

A. J. SPROUFFSKE

The bill (H. R. 2213) for the relief of A. J. Sprouffske was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLAUDE T. THOMAS

The bill (H. R. 2633) for the relief of Claude T. Thomas, legal guardian of Elizabeth Ann Mervine, a minor, and the estates of Mary L. Poole, deceased, and Hazel S. Thomas, deceased, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEE JONES CARDY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 252) for the relief of the estate of Lee Jones Cardy, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$4,244", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Lee Jones Cardy, the sum of $4,244, in full satisfaction of the claims of such estate against the United States for compensation for the death of the said Lee Jones Cardy as a result of personal injuries sustained by him when the automobile in which he was riding was struck by a United States Army vehicle near San Diego, Calif., on November 17, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARGARET KATHERINE HUME

The bill (H. R. 1927) for the relief of Margaret Katherine Hume was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

YASUTARO IKUTA

The bill (S. 193) for the relief of Yasutaro Ikuta was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Yasutaro Ikuta, of route 2, Caldwell, Idaho, shall be held and considered to have lawfully entered the United States for permanent residence in 1937, the year of his actual entry into the United States, upon payment by him of the visa fee of $10 and the head tax of $8; and the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings which may have been commenced in the case of the said Yasutaro Ikuta upon the ground of unlawful residence in the United States.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available Japanese immigration quota.

GUY CHENG

The bill (S. 1483) for the relief of Guy Cheng was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Guy Cheng, of Charlotte, Vt., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry into the United States, upon payment

of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of China.

GIOVANNI BATTISTA ANGELOTTI

The bill (S. 1332) for the relief of Giovanni Battista Angelotti was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Giovanni Battista Angelotti as of 1926. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Italy during the current year.

MRS. KAZUMI NODA

The bill (S. 283) for the relief of Mrs. Kazumi Noda was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration laws, the alien Mrs. Kazumi Noda, of New Haven, Conn., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted in 1929 to the United States for permanent residence.

JIN WATANABE

The bill (S. 996) for the relief of Jin Watanabe (alias Shinichiro Nomura) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration laws, Jin Watanabe, of Denver, Colo., whose wife and infant son are American citizens, shall be considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence in 1929.

SEC. 2. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any warrants of arrest or orders of deportation which may have been issued, and to discontinue any deportation proceedings which may have been commenced in the case of the said Jin Watanabe.

RYOHEI KUBOTA

The bill (S. 253) for the relief of Ryohei Kubota was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration laws Ryohei Kubota shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on the date on which he entered the United States.

SEC. 2. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any warrants of arrest or orders of deportation which may have been issued, and to discontinue any deportation proceedings which may have been commenced in the case of the said Ryohei Kubota.

ESTHER RINGEL

The bill (H. R. 420) for the relief of Esther Ringel was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BETTY ISABEL SCHUNKE

The bill (H. R. 421) for the relief of Betty Isabel Schunke was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MABEL GLADYS VIDUCICH

The bill (H. R. 2557) for the relief of Mabel Gladys Viducich was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. DAISY A. T. JAEGERS

The bill (H. R. 2250) for the relief of Mrs. Daisy A. T. Jaegers was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MITSU M. KOBAYASHI

The bill (H. R. 2303) for the relief of Mitsu M. Kobayashi was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILHEMINA PIPER ENZ

The bill (H. R. 560) to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Wilhemina Piper Enz was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LOWE WAY YUEN AND DANG CHEE

The bill (S. 1365) for the relief of Lowe Way Yuen and Dang Chee was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Lowe Way Yuen and Dang Chee (also known as Ellen Ding), who were admitted into the United States on October 12, 1939, for a temporary stay and who are the mother and sister, respectively, of Hon W. Dang, a citizen and honorably discharged veteran of the armed forces of the United States, shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of October 12, 1939.

ARMAND PULLAI

The bill (S. 1667) for the relief of Armand Pullai was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel the outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, if any, issued in the case of Armand Pullai, of St. Louis, Mo. From and after the date of enactment of this act the said Armand Pullai shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or such warrants and order have issued.

SEC. 2. In the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the said Armand Pullai shall be considered as having been lawfully admitted for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry into the United States on payment of the required visa fee and head tax.

SEC. 3. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of India.

ANNA STEIBEL YOUNGER

The bill (S. 1656) for the relief of Anna Steibel Younger was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Anna Steibel Younger, of Pittsburgh, Pa., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of her last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Rumania.

SEC. 2. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel the outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, if any, issued in the case of Anna Steibel Younger, of Pittsburgh, Pa. From and after the date of enactment of this act the said Anna Steibel Younger shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or such warrants and order have issued.

AUGUST DANE TETUAEARO

The bill (H. R. 2425) for the relief of August Dane Tetuaearo was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HILARIO A. GOITIA

The bill (H. R. 358) for the relief of Hilario A. Goitia was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HAYATO HARRIS OZAWA

The bill (H. R. 387) for the relief of Hayato Harris Ozawa was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSE CABRAL LORENZO

The bill (H. R. 2427) for the relief of Jose Cabral Lorenzo was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PHILIP LEE SJOERDT HUIZENGA

The bill (H. R. 1859) for the relief of Philip Lee Sjoerdt Huizenga was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OLIVE IRENE MILLOGLAV

The bill (H. R. 3968) for the relief of Olive Irene Milloglav was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MARIAN D. McC. PLEIN

The bill (H. R. 3039) for the relief of Mrs. Marian D. McC. Plein was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DOMINGO GANDARIAS

The bill (H. R. 3849) for the relief of Domingo Gandarias was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LADISLAO VAIDA, ELENA VAIDA, AND STEFANO VAIDA

The bill (H. R. 4403) for the relief of Ladislao Vaida, Elena Vaida, and Stefano Vaida was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TECH. SGT. TSUYOSHI MATSUMOTO

The bill (H. R. 3263) for the relief of Tech. Sgt. Tsuyoshi Matsumoto was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN A. DILBOY

The bill (H. R. 1912) for the relief of John A. Dilboy was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. KEUM NYU PARK

The bill (H. R. 899) for the relief of Mrs. Keum Nyu Park was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SPIROS HARRY KEFALAS

The bill (S. 1712) for the relief of Spiros Harry Kefalas was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, directed to cancel forthwith the outstanding warrant of arrest, order of deportation, warrant of deportation, and bond, if any, in the case of the alien, Spiros Harry Kefalas, now residing in the city of Bridgeport, Conn., and is directed not to issue any further such warrants or orders in the case of such alien, insofar as such future warrants or orders are based on the unlawful entry of such alien into the United States prior to the enactment of this act. Hereafter, for the purpose of the immigration and naturalization laws, such alien shall be considered to have been, at Baltimore, Md., on or about June 1, 1928, lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence.

Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Greek quota for the first year that the said Greek quota is available.

LUDMILA BURESOVA ET AL.

The bill (S. 1692) for the relief of Ludmila Buresova, alias Buresh; Kristina Buresova, alias Buresh; and Edward Buresh, alias Eduard Bures, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Ludmila Buresova, alias Buresh; Kristina Buresova, alias Buresh; and Edward Buresh, alias Eduard Bures, as of January 12, 1937, the date on which they were admitted temporarily to the United States, if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than those relating to quotas. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the Czechoslovakian quota of the first year that such quota is available.

ELIMINATION OF WHEAT CARRY-OVER PROVISIONS

The bill (S. 2158) to amend the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 and the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, so as to eliminate certain provisions of such acts requiring the retention of a specified carry-over of wheat in the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, may I request the Senator making the objection to withhold it for a moment, in order that I may explain the bill?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to withhold objection, which I made in behalf of the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], who is not on the floor at the moment. I am glad to withhold the objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the provision which it is proposed to repeal requires that there be a carry-over of 150,000,000 bushels of wheat on the 1st of July 1948. The provision was new legislation entirely and of a nature never before enacted by Congress. It was sponsored by some Members of the House and Senate who feared our crop outlook was such as might result in short supplies here in the United States. At that time the winter wheat outlook was bad, but since then the situation has entirely reversed itself. In February the grain trade, appearing before the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, testified that the reasons for the drop of about 70 cents a bushel in wheat was because of the world wheat situation, which completely reversed itself since. That is quite true. France is now assured of a normal crop, or about double last year's production. The Argentine crop is now harvested and with yields better than a year ago. The Australian and now the forecast for the United States crop which came out Saturday are the third largest in history. The predictions of those competent in the milling and grain trade is that we shall probably have a carry-over of 270,000,000 bushels as against 150,000,000 bushels, as laid down in the legislative provision the bill proposes to eliminate.

The prediction of those who are prominent in the milling and grain trade is that there will probably be a carry-over of 270,000,000 bushels as against 150,000,000 bushels as referred to in the bill. In my opinion, there is no longer existing any reason whatever for the provision, and I can see no reason why it should not be repealed. Certainly every argument the sponsors used to secure its passage, that of poor wheat-crop outlook in the United States, no longer exist. The State Department, in a letter to the Committee on Agriculture, last week pointed out the fact that there is a serious food problem in the greater part of Europe. It was pointed out that in order to maintain even their minimum bread rations they would have to have greatly stepped-up wheat imports.

For the good of the farmers of the United States and for the good of the people in Europe this bill should be passed now.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have already talked to the distinguished Senator and I am in accord with the purposes of the bill. I suggest to the distinguished Senator that he take the matter up with the able Senator from Minnesota, if the Senator from Minnesota will withhold his objection.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I thank the able Senator from Nebraska for his suggestion. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter addressed by me to the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Clinton P. Anderson, and his reply; also a letter addressed to Representative ANDRESEN by M. F. Mulroy, executive vice president of the Russell-Miller Milling Co., one of the largest milling companies in the United States, together with an analysis of estimated use next year, and an analysis of carry-over.

There being no objection, the correspondence and analysis were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 26, 1948.

The Honorable CLINTON ANDERSON,
Chairman, Cabinet Committee on World Food Program, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: The Cabinet Food Committee, of which you are chairman, has, according to my information, announced an export goal and ceiling of 450,000,000 bushels of wheat for the current crop year, ending July 1 next.

This is true despite the fact that reliable authorities estimated that it would be possible for the United States to export as much as 500,000,000 bushels before July 1 without reducing American supplies to a dangerously low point.

I am wondering whether, in the opinion of the Cabinet Food Committee, the legislative proviso requiring that the wheat carry-over on July 1 be not less than 150,000,000 bushels will have the effect of limiting our exports to the present 450,000,000-bushel ceiling.

If this ceiling is retained, will it be impossible, in the opinion of the Cabinet Committee, to export more than 450,000,000 bushels of wheat to the needy countries of the world? If so, do you and the other members of your committee agree with me that it would be wise to repeal the carry-over requirement entirely or at least reduce it to 100,000,000 bushels?

You are aware, of course, that I have introduced a bill which would repeal outright the carry-over provision. I intend to press for early action on this bill, which is now before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

I also intend to offer an amendment to European relief program legislation now pending which would have the same effect, that of repealing the carry-over requirement.

Therefore, your answers to the questions asked above would be very helpful to me in this connection. I would greatly appreciate knowing the position of the Cabinet Committee upon them.

In my opinion, most purchases of food for European aid should be made in the United States, insofar as it is possible to do so without inflating farm prices in this country beyond reason. Our purchases in other exporting countries for shipment to relief nations should be held to a minimum.

It would seem entirely unreasonable to me to spend United States dollars in other countries for food that is available in the United States, particularly when that food costs more elsewhere than here. For example, export wheat prices in the United States are lower than in any other exporting country in the world.

Despite this fact, and probably as a result of the 450,000,000 bushel wheat export ceiling and the 150,000,000 bushel wheat carry-over requirement, American dollars have been paid by our Government for expensive Argentine grain bought for European relief.

I am advised that under the 450,000,000 bushel wheat export goal, it will be impossible to obtain enough wheat in this country to meet minimum committments in bizonal Germany, Korea, and Japan, to name a few

areas for which we are responsible. It has therefore been necessary to make up such difference by buying elsewhere, and I am informed that our Government as a consequence is contemplating the purchase of more grains in other countries.

I would like to point out three adverse effects of any such policy:

1. The cost of grain purchased elsewhere than in this country will be higher, thereby creating a greater burden on the funds available to the buying agency of this Government, and also upon the taxpayers of this country.

2. It will result directly in the building up of agricultural production particularly of wheat—in foreign countries which traditionally compete with the American farmer for the world export market—to a point far out of line with their normal participation in the world market.

3. It will make it difficult for us to exert maximum effort to aid and succor starving Europe, and particularly Germany, Japan, and Korea as occupied areas for which we are directly responsible, to the full degree that they need and expect. If our relief program broke down as a result of such a policy, the bad reaction in those areas would more than offset any good will we might obtain in other ways.

I have repeatedly asserted that in my opinion the 150,000,000 bushel carry-over requirement is entirely unjustifiable and definitely harmful, not only to the American farmer but to our foreign-relief program. Your reply to this letter, particularly as to the effect of the 150,000,000 bushel carry-over provision on our wheat export goal, will be much appreciated.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senator.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., March 1, 1948.

Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: In reply to your letter of February 26 regarding your proposal to repeal the carry-over provision which requires that United States stocks of old-crop wheat be not less than 150,000,000 bushels on June 30, 1948, it is our opinion that such repeal is desirable in the national interest. While a carry-over of much more than this amount may be advisable under certain conditions, it may be equally desirable at times to permit the carry-over to be reduced substantially below 150,000,000 bushels.

One of the principal purposes of carry-over stocks of old wheat is to provide milling supplies for the interim period between the end of the old-crop year and the time new-crop supplies become available in quantity. With continued favorable new-crop prospects, both here and abroad, farmers, the grain trade, and millers will be unwilling to carry over stocks as large as 150,000,000 bushels, and an inflexible legal limitation will tend to cause serious market disturbances toward the end of the marketing year. Very likely the brunt of such disturbances would be borne by producers. Under such conditions, farmers, the grain trade, and millers should be in a position to reduce their inventories of old wheat to a level consistent with operating requirements.

With respect to your question as to the feasibility of exporting more than 450,000,000 bushels of wheat if the legislative carry-over ceiling of 150,000,000 bushels is retained, it would be possible to export as much as 500,000,000 bushels provided not more than 210,000,000 bushels of wheat are fed to livestock and domestic food usage does not exceed 500,000,000 bushels. However, if the spread between wheat and corn prices continues to narrow, as much as 250,000,000 bushels may be fed to livestock. The high level of domestic demand also may be such that as much as 510,000,000 bushels of wheat as food may be consumed in the United States. This larger domestic disappearance combined with 88,000,000 bushels for seed for planting next year's crop and 450,000,000 bushels for export would leave a carry-over of 150,000,000 bushels.

The inadvisability, however, of maintaining a minimum limit of 150,000,000 bushels of wheat to be carried over from one crop year to another is borne out by the fact that on July 1, 1947, the carry-over of 84,000,000 bushels proved to be adequate for all domestic needs. Available information indicates that a very high proportion of this carry-over was spring wheat, the harvesting season of which is fully 2 months later than the carry-over date of July 1.

It is difficult to set a figure which could be considered a minimum carry-over of wheat for any year. During the next 4 years, while foreign demand may be expected to continue urgent, and production at relatively high levels, the year-end carry-over stocks of wheat should be held down to levels no larger than required to maintain adequate operating stocks.

Already there are indications that producers and merchandisers are unwilling to carry large stocks of old-crop wheat in the face of improving new crop conditions. Legal requirements that a minimum of 150,000,000 bushels be carried over, in addition to Government-held stocks for export, will very likely, in the face of favorable crop prospects, force prices below support levels at a time when the demand for wheat to meet the emergency food requirements of foreign countries is urgent.

In the light of these considerations, we believe the outright repeal of the provisions for a minimum carry-over would give greater flexibility for adjusting supplies to new crop and market conditions, as well as to meet greater export requirements.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary.

MEMORANDUM

UNITED STATES SENATE,
February 26, 1948.

Mr. ANDERSON: I understand that the Senate hopes to take up the European aid-authorization bill all next week without interruption. For that reason, and if you find it convenient, I would certainly appreciate a reply to this letter by early next week. That will make it possible for me to use it in connection with my efforts to have the 150,000,000 bushel carry-over provision stricken.

M. R. Y.

APRIL 7, 1948.

Hon. AUGUST ANDRESEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Minneapolis Star carries the story that you are opposed to the repeal of the restriction on the amount of wheat that can be exported. This certainly is not to the interest of the farmers of the Northwest or of the country. Since Congress imposed this restriction, world conditions have changed and our own conditions have changed. Argentina will produce a crop that will enable them to export 60,000,000 bushels more than last year. Australia has a larger crop and reports indicate that Europe might produce 500,000,000 bushels more than last year. You are, therefore, asking that our farmers take a chance on going back to the conditions that prevailed in the early thirties. That was when we had a surplus without any available market. We had to barter part of that surplus for coffee and give away part of it through the Red Cross. We had to allow wheat to go down to 60 cents a bushel and we went through the sad experience of the economy of scarcity before that mess was cleaned up.

There is no scarcity of wheat now and our next year's crop can hardly be reduced so much that we will be faced with a shortage. When this restriction was imposed by Congress, the Department of Agriculture was using a formula to arrive at the carry-over that was safe at that time. Since then conditions have changed and this formula should be changed but the Department of Agriculture might be criticized if the formula is not continued on the same basis to the end of the crop year. The continuance of this formula will result in an actual carry-over of over 270,000,000 bushels of wheat and will mean that we will gamble not with a shortage, but with a burdensome surplus that can easily set our farmers back to the conditions that prevailed in the thirties.

Your intimation that we might have a reduction of 500,000,000 bushels in next year's crop is fantastic. Of course, anything can happen but there is more danger in gambling on the farmers' future than there is in gambling on a shortage that can be avoided by export restrictions next year if necessary.

An average crop (not a bumper crop) on the acreage seeded, or that will be seeded this year, would give us 1,200,000,000 bushels and that would mean a carry-over a year from now of 469,000,000 bushels arrived at as follows:

	Bushels
Actual carry-over	270,000,000
Just average crop	1,200,000,000
Total	1,470,000,000
Domestic use	485,000,000
Seed	88,000,000
Normal feeding	128,000,000
Estimated export	300,000,000
Total use	1,001,000,000
Probable carry-over	469,000,000

Your pessimistic estimate of only 900,000,000 bushels would still leave us 169,000,000 bushels carry-over at the end of the next crop year. With the increased crop prospects in Europe, there is no assurance that we can give Europe enough wheat to enable us to export 300,000,000 bushels next year. If we had a calamity such as you fear, we would not have to export 300,000,000 bushels even if there is a demand for that much wheat next year. There is no gamble with a shortage but the gamble with a burdensome carry-over is too serious for us to take. Even the most selfish Congressman from the East would not want to go back to the conditions that prevailed when the buying power of the farmer was so low that there was no market for the manufactured goods from the East.

Flour or wheat not consumed this month or this year cannot be added to the requirements of next month or next year. That is why it is so important not to curtail consumption now when we have adequate supplies. With no restrictions the Department of Agriculture could not export enough flour and wheat the balance of this crop year to reduce our carry-over to a dangerous basis. It is distinctly to the interest of the whole Northwest to remove this unnecessary limitation on the carry-over of wheat.

Yours very truly,

_____,
Executive Vice President.

Analysis of estimated use next year

	Bushels
Domestic use:	
First 6 months this year	262,000,000
Historical record indicates 54 percent use in first half of year, which would indicate use in second half of year	223,000,000
Total for year	485,000,000
Present use will have to increase or we will not use 485,000,000 bushels this year.	
Wheat used for seed:	
Seed used last year	87,487,000
Estimate for next year	88,000,000
Wheat used for feed:	
Average yearly use 1931 to 1941	128,000,000
Estimate for next year	128,000,000
Wheat exports: Estimate of Department of Agriculture for next year	300,000,000
CARRY-OVER ANALYSIS	
Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Brannon's statement of carry-over	158,000,000
Domestic use shown in Mr. Brannon's statement	510,000,000
Actual use first 6 months	262,000,000
Statistics show 54 percent of yearl. use occurs in first 6 months. Projecting first 6 months' use on that basis indicates yearly use of	[1] 485,000,000
Overstatement of domestic use	25,000,000
Feed requirements shown in Mr. Brannon's statement	250,000,000
Actual use for feed for first 6 months	69,000,000
5 years' use of wheat for feed indicates 52.3 percent used in first 6 months. Projecting first 6 months' use on that basis indicates yearly use of	132,000,000
Safety factor	28,000,000
Probable use of wheat for feed	160,000,000
Overstatement of wheat feeding	90,000,000
Actual potential carry-over	273,000,000

[1] If domestic use continues at present level, we will not use 485,000,000 bushels this year.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will go to the foot of the calendar, to be recalled.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore subsequently said: The consideration of the calendar having been concluded, the clerk will state by title Senate bill 2158, Calendar No. 1137, which went to the end of the calendar.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2158) to amend the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 and the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1948, so as to eliminate certain provisions of such acts requiring the retention of a specified carry-over of wheat in the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, was the objection heretofore raised satisfied? I understood the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] had asked that the bill go over.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator from Minnesota has not withdrawn his objection.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Then I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2376) to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

HEMPSTEAD WAREHOUSE CORP.

The bill (H. R. 1498) for the relief of Hempstead Warehouse Corp. was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I think that bill calls for an explanation. Is there a member of the Committee on the Judiciary present who can give us an explanation? If not, I suggest that it go over temporarily.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. WHERRY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar 1139, House bill 1498, for the relief of Hempstead Warehouse Corp. I now understand that the substitute bill provides relief whereby the applicant may be sued in the Court of Claims, and that the original amount of the appropriation has been denied. So I have no objection to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1498) for the relief of Hempstead Warehouse Corp., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Hempstead Warehouse Corp., a New York corporation, against the United States for loss or damage sustained by it as owner of land adjacent to Mitchel Field, in Nassau County, N. Y., growing out of the extension and enlargement of Mitchel Field and any plans preparatory thereto and any use of said land in connection with the construction, use, and operation of said airfield as extended and enlarged, including but not limited to the temporary possession and use of the land by the United States under an order for immediate possession made by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York, on the 30th day of June 1942. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, and appeals from, and payment of, any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which the Court of Claims has jurisdiction under section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT

The bill (S. 2131) for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Department of the Treasury was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senate bill 2131 is the same as Calendar No. 1148, House bill 5387. Is there objection to the substitution of the House bill for the Senate bill and the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 5387) for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Department of the Treasury was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 2131 is indefinitely postponed.

BERT HARRINGTON, JR.

The bill (H. R. 388) for the relief of Bert Harrington, Jr., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ERN WRIGHT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 825) for the relief of Ern Wright, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, nothwithstanding the provisions of section 420 of the Federal Tort Claims Act, and subject to the provisions of section 422 of such act and the applicable provisions of part 3 of such act, the United States District Court for the District of Utah shall have the same jurisdiction, with respect to the claim of Ernest (Ern) Wright, of Salt Lake City, Utah, resulting from a collision between an automobile driven by Mr. Wright with another automobile driven by one Glen R. Woodward, in Salt Lake City, Utah, on November 10, 1943, that such court would have under the provisions of the Federal Tort Claims Act if such collision had occurred subsequent to January 1, 1945, and action on such claim had been timely brought: *Provided*, That such claim shall be forever barred unless action shall be brought thereon within 6 months after the date of approval of this act: *Provided further*, That no private bill or resolution, and no amendment to any bill or resolution, authorizing or directing the payment of money in settlement of, or otherwise recognizing, such claim except in accordance with a valid judgment rendered by such court, shall hereafter be received or considered in either the Senate or the House of Representatives.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM B. MOORE

The bill (H. R. 990) for the relief of William B. Moore was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 580) relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

ROBERT E. LAURITZEN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 314) for the relief of Robert E. Lauritzen, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to pay to Robert E. Lauritzen, of Pacific Grove, Calif., out of any funds available for the pay of the Army, the sum of $1,017.60, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of amounts paid as fines, and for losses of Army pay resulting from his reduction to the grade of private, pursuant to the sentence of court martial, such sentence having been set aside pursuant to the order of the Secretary of the Army dated November 21, 1947, as follows:

1. Having received and approved the recommendations of the Army Board on Correction of Military Records in the case of Robert E. Lauritzen, Army serial No. 39130813, dated November 17, 1947, and under the authority vested in me by section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.), the Adjutant General is directed to correct the military records of Robert E. Lauritzen, Army serial No. 39130813, to show—

a. that his conviction by special court martial on November 17, 1944, was in error and based on testimony subsequently discovered to be false;

b. that the applicant was a master sergeant from June 15, 1944, until October 20, 1945;

c. that the applicant lost no time under Article of War 107.

2. The Adjutant General is further directed to issue the applicant an honorable discharge in accordance with the record as corrected.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MEAT INSPECTION SERVICE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2256) relating to the meat-inspection service of the Department of Agriculture, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, last year in the appropriation bill the expense of meat inspection which had been paid by the Government was placed upon the processors of the meat to be inspected. The theory of the bill is that it is an unsound arrangement, and that it is not proper for the processor to pay the expense of the inspection. The bill provides that the expense shall hereafter be borne by the United States. The testimony before the committee was to the effect that under the arrangement whereby the processors bear the cost, already a number of processors have become operators in intrastate commerce and have in that way removed themselves from the burden of bearing the cost of inspection. If the present arrangement is continued that procedure will continue, so that there will be a large amount of meat consumed by the American public which is not subject to health inspection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 6, after the words "United States" it is proposed to insert "except the cost of overtime pursuant to the act of July 24, 1919 (7 U. S. C. 394)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the cost of inspection rendered on and after July 1, 1948, under the requirements of laws relating to Federal inspection of meat and meat food products shall be borne by the United States except the cost of overtime pursuant to the act of July 24, 1919 (7 U. S. C. 394).

PROTECTION OF POTATO AND TOMATO PRODUCTION FROM GOLDEN NEMATODE

The bill (S. 2137) to provide for the protection of potato and tomato production from the golden nematode, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask why the Department of Agriculture cannot provide for the protection of potato and tomato production without a special bill for the purpose?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, perhaps it would be advisable for me to give a very brief description of what the bill does and what its purpose is.

The golden nematode is an insect pest which attacks only two cultivated crops: potatoes and tomatoes. Once this organism infests a crop, its growth persists in the soil for at least 8 years, whether or not the host plant is present. The only effective method that is known at this time for suppressing its infestations and for deterring its spread is to refrain from growing potatoes or tomatoes on infested lands.

The golden-nematode disease has seriously affected the crops in several European countries, and in 1941 it was discovered that it had spread to this country. The dangerous nematode was identified on a farm near Hicksville, Long Island, and is now known to infest some 6,000 acres of farm land on Long Island, where, for the most part, it is confined to Nassau County. Examinations of other potato-raising sections of the United States have, thus far, not revealed infestation.

The golden nematode, when permitted to feed freely upon the potato and tomato crops, causes the plants to become increasingly small in size, thereby reducing the quality and worth of the crop in every respect. Losses range from 50 percent of the yield to total loss. The presence of the pest unchecked constitutes a threat to the Nation's two and one-half million acres of potato land, which had a cash value in 1946 of $466,000,000.

A campaign to eradicate the golden nematode has been carried on jointly by the Bureau of Plant Industry of the State of New York and the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine of the Federal Department of Agriculture. For several years the New York Legislature has made substantial appropriations, and this year its appropriation for this purpose was $420,000.

The funds are utilized in two ways, as part of the control program. A substantial part of the appropriations is used to recompense farmers for the loss they sustain in keeping their land completely out of potatoes for the protection of the entire industry. New York State allocates $94.75 per acre for each farmer cooperating in the drive to rid the soil of the nematode organism. At the same time soil treatment, costing about $60 per acre, and research are constantly being conducted to find a remedy for the disease.

Not growing potato or tomato crops on infested land is the essential part of the program to suppress the pest. The purpose of the bill is to authorize the Department of Agriculture to cooperate with the State of New York in compensating growers who sustain losses from the nongrowing of potatoes and tomatoes in carrying out the program of golden nematode control. The Department of Agriculture asserts that the legislation is sound in principle and that it would be in the interest of the Nation to strengthen and enlarge, in this way, the present program. No objection has been raised by the Bureau of the Budget.

Legislative precedents exist for this type of national program. The Department of Agriculture has authority to issue and enforce quarantines and to cooperate with State quarantine programs to prevent and control plant pests and diseases. For instance, the Department is authorized to cooperate with States in compensating growers for losses that may be occasioned from the enforced nonplanting of cotton. .

The total cost of this program of nonproduction of potatoes and tomatoes is to be borne jointly by the State, the Federal Government, and the grower himself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2137) to provide for the protection of potato and tomato production from the golden nematode, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, to protect potato and tomato production in the United States from the destructive pest known as the golden nematode which subsists on the roots of potatoes and tomatoes, causes marked reduction in yield, persists in the soil for many years in an inactive state in the absence of preferred hosts, and becomes active and destructive when potatoes or tomatoes are again planted, it is the policy of the Government of the United States, independently or in cooperation with State and local governmental agencies, and other public and private organizations, associations, and individuals, to eradicate, suppress, control, and prevent the spread of this pest.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture either independently or in cooperation with public or private agencies is authorized to carry out operations or measures to eradicate, suppress, control, or prevent the spread of the golden nematode.

SEC. 3. The activities contemplated by this act include cooperation with States and other agencies in making inspections, applying

suppressive measures, enforcing quarantines, enforcing restrictions on the planting of potatoes and tomatoes, destroying potatoes and tomatoes growing in soil found infested or exposed to infestation with the golden nematode, and compensating growers in areas infected, or exposed to infestation, with the golden nematode for not planting potatoes or tomatoes or for losses resulting from destruction for the purposes of this act of potatoes or tomatoes.

SEC. 4. In the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture no part of any sums appropriated to carry out the purposes of this act shall be expended with respect to any area infested with the golden nematode or exposed to such infestation until the appropriate cooperating agency or agencies have presented evidence satisfactory to the Secretary of Agriculture that they will provide funds, materials, means, and State and local authority necessary for the cooperating agency or agencies to carry out effectively that part of the cooperative program the Secretary of Agriculture may require from the cooperating agency or agencies.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of Agriculture shall not undertake any program involving mandatory restrictions on the planting of potatoes or tomatoes, or mandatory destruction of potatoes or tomatoes unless the State concerned shall have enacted legislation authorizing such restrictions or destruction.

SEC. 6. The amount of compensation to be paid by the Federal Government and any cooperating agency, and the method of computation thereof, shall be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture or the agent or agents designated by him, in cooperation with the responsible officials of the agency concerned and in a manner to assure that necessary records are preserved to show full compliance with the provisions of this act and regulations promulgated in accordance therewith. No payment shall be made to any grower except after compliance in good faith with regulations concerning the golden nematode promulgated by the Secretary of Agriculture and the responsible official of the cooperating agency. The determination by the Secretary of Agriculture, or his authorized agent, of the amount of compensation to be provided by the Federal Government for any grower shall be final.

SEC. 7. To carry out the purposes of this act the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to incur all necessary expenses, including the employment of persons in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, printing and binding, and the purchase of passenger-carrying vehicles.

SEC. 8. The provisions of this act are intended to supplement, and shall not be construed as limiting or repealing existing legislation.

SEC. 9. This act may be cited as the "Golden Nematode Act."

TRANSFER OF SURPLUS REAL PROPERTY TO DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3703) to authorize transfer of surplus real property to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior for consolidation of Federal holdings within areas administered by the National Park Service, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment, on page 1, line 3, after the word "property", to insert "situated within the boundaries of a national park or national monument and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CONFIRMATION OF TITLE IN THOMAS LOFLIN

The bill (H. R. 4118) to confirm title in fee simple in Thomas Loflin to certain lands in Rankin County, Miss., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AWARDING OF STAR-ROUTE CONTRACTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 198) to authorize the Postmaster General to withhold the awarding of star-route contracts for a period of 60 days.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the joint resolution?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, some time ago the Senate passed Senate bill 263, which put all star-routes into the classified service. Contracts have been let in the following manner: The United States is divided into four districts. Every year contracts are let covering one-fourth of the United States. Senate bill 263, which was passed by the Senate, is pending in the House of Representatives, and we do not know whether the bill will be passed by the House or not. In any event, the Postmaster General advertised for bids for star routes last December. The contracts must be awarded each month if they are to be awarded, and at the request of the Postmaster General the Congress by the pending bill would give him power not to award contracts until it was ascertained what the House would do with the bill the Senate has passed.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand the Postmaster General is in favor of the bill now pending?

Mr. LANGER. Yes; he wants the mandatory provision of the present law, which compels the Department to advertise for bids and to make the award to the lowest bidder, held up for 60 days. It is at the request of the Postmaster General that we are asked to pass the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in further explanation of the bill, I may say that no delay will be occasioned if the contracts are not awarded until the 30th of June.

Mr. LUCAS. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 198) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to withhold the awarding of star-route contracts for which bids have been received in the second contract section for a period of 60 days after March 30, 1948.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1949) to provide additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the postal service was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1537) to increase the rate of compensation of heads and assistant heads of executive departments and of other officers was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over. I may explain that I have been asked by other Senators to object to these two bills.

SALE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION PROJECT

The bill (S. 2288) to provide for the sale at cost of Public Housing Administration project No. W. Va.–46011 was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I am sorry the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is not in the Chamber at the moment, but the bill is quite a simple one. There is a housing development in the vicinity of the city of Charleston, W. Va., a region in which housing is extremely short. Since the development was started quite early, the costs of construction were low compared with the costs of later developments.

The proposal in the bill merely is that the houses on this project be sold to the occupants, largely veterans, at cost, instead of at a considerably higher appraised value. The Government will lose nothing on the transaction, since the costs not only of the houses, but of the land and all the facilities and everything connected therewith, are taken care of by the sales price. There are only four of the housing projects to which the bill would apply, and the one in West Virginia is the only one where there is any substantial difference between the cost price and the appraised price.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont a question. Can the Senator give us assurance that these sales are to be made to those living in the houses, who, I understood him to say, are chiefly veterans. The houses are not to be given over, are they, to the possession of various real estate or promotion groups?

Mr. FLANDERS. The occupants, who are for the most part veterans, will have priority in the sale of the houses. There was testimony from the occupants of the houses to the effect that by sheer necessity they were going to be compelled to buy them.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall not object, on the basis of the statement just made by the Senator from Vermont, that the properties are to go to the veterans living in the houses, but I am becoming somewhat weary of seeing the Federal Government turn over for 10 to 20 cents on the dollar property of the taxpayers of this country to various promoters, and then the property being sold at tremendous profit, as has been going on ever since the war. If this case is an exception to that practice, I shall not object, but I think we had better stop giving away the taxpayers' property to different promoters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on

Banking and Currency with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That section 4 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That whenever the Administrator disposes of any permanent house or structure containing not more than four family dwelling units under authority of this act by offering such house or structure for sale on an individual basis, he shall, when the purchaser is a veteran buying for his own occupancy, sell any such house or structure (1) at a purchase price not in excess of the apportioned cost of such house or structure and of the land and appurtenances allocated thereto, together with the apportioned share of the cost of all utilities and other facilities provided for and common to the project of which such house or structure is a part, or (2) at a purchase price not in excess of such considered full market value of such house or structure and the land, appurtenances, utilities and facilities allocated thereto, whichever purchase price is the less."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Lanham Act so as to permit the sale of certain permanent war housing thereunder to veterans at a purchase price not in excess of the cost of construction."

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CREATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider Senate Joint Resolution 207, which was unanimously reported favorably this morning by the Committee on Armed Services. I may State my purpose in making the request. This is a joint resolution to permit the Secretary of the Navy to issue an appropriate order to designate April 30, 1948, as a day to be observed by the Naval Establishment by appropriate ceremonies in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the creation of the Department of the Navy. I have conferred with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], about the matter, and he has no objection to the joint resolution being considered at this time, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to its consideration.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 207) to provide for the commemoration of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the establishment of the Department of the Navy was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Whereas the Department of the Navy was created by the act entitled "An act to establish an Executive Department, to be denominated the Department of the Navy," approved April 30, 1798 (1 Stat. 553); and

Whereas by such act the Secretary of the Navy was charged with the duty "to execute such orders as he shall receive from the President of the United States relative to the procurement of naval stores and materials and the construction, armament, equipment, and employment of vessels of war, as well as all other matters connected with the Naval Establishment of the United States": Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized and directed by appropriate order to designate April 30, 1948, as a day to be observed within the Naval Establishment by appropriate ceremonies in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the creation of the Department of the Navy and in honor of the gallant personnel who have rendered service in the Naval Establishment of the United States since the founding of such Department.

The preamble was agreed to.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, 3 years after the war we find there is no peace. Several wars are raging; in Berlin there is little less than war. We also find, in those treaties which have been made to end World War II, that we have sown seeds for further conflict. We find the rights of the small nations overridden. It is apparent that at the present time there is developing in Europe, and spreading to other parts of the world, the force of two opposing powers. These two opposing power blocks are developing out of the anarchy which now exists and prevails in international relations.

We must admit that the United States' foreign policy is dangerously close to power politics. In the one agency set up to avoid this—the United Nations—we find frustration because of the weaknesses in that organization. We only need to look around to find signs of an armament race. We hear it said that Russia has a greater air force than America today. There is threatened aggression and fear everywhere in the world.

As we look at the world today, the whole situation points to a grievous condition in the peace machinery of the world. World conditions also reflect the attitude of the nations concerned in peace. It is not because we do not have an elaborate paper structure—the United Nations. In fact this structure is at the point where it is asking for a contribution or loan of $65,000,000 from the United States to build its physical house in New York City. The nations are not making it effective in reality, however, but rather are placing emphasis as of old on the old game of self-interest and power politics. Great evidence of this can be seen in the amount of money which is being spent and the emphasis being placed upon means of force.

We are forgetting about the high principles which led to the formation of the United Nations. Then we were at war. We saw and realized what was going on. Today as we move from war, we find that we left behind us those principles—except in the halls of the United Nations where we have unending study and debate but no constructive action, especially where action is clearly needed through the United Nations. We debate such subjects as Palestine and others and then abandon them to the self-interests of ourselves, England, and Russia. Surely we should hold out to the fearful world that statesmen are thinking of peace and not of war. If we do this, we can accomplish something for the future of the world.

The history of the League of Nations should teach us that too much stress was placed upon war and not enough upon peace—that the self-interest of nations and power politics rose above the principle of keeping the peace. In the League the question of armament was debated for years. It debated the question of aggression for years, but it had no real life or vigor or strength really to fight to keep the peace. The League was incapable of correcting the injustices of the last war. We are now having a second chance. We may not have a third one.

The time is at hand for this Nation and the other nations which believe in peace to take as aggressive a stand for peace as they have done in the past in preparing for war. To that end, a group of Senators who have been thinking along these lines now sponsor a resolution aimed at strengthening the peace machinery and actually putting it to work.

I am confident that a program with these objectives will gain the support of the country at large. This is evident from the sponsorship of the resolution, which cuts across party lines and represents every geographical section. These are the 15 Senators with whom I am joined in presenting this resolution: The Senators from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN and Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senators from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

The resolution is aimed at having Congress authorize and request the President immediately to initiate certain amendments to the Charter of the United Nations. It is offered, not as a final commitment, but to provide a basis for concrete discussion.

This is a positive program. It should be effective. We qualify it only by providing that pending its adoption the United States should be kept militarily strong and economically sound in order that she may assume leadership in world affairs through the United Nations.

As the Charter now stands the power of veto by any of the members of the Security Council exists in all matters except procedure, and what is procedural is subject to veto. The veto power should be eliminated in (1) matters of aggression, (2) armament for aggression, and (3) admission to membership into the United Nations. On Saturday we had the experience of seeing one of the members of the Security Council, Russia, veto the admission of Italy into the United Nations.

It is the thought that this can be accomplished by the following provision in the resolution:

Elimination of the veto right by a permanent member in the Security Council, but only in matters of aggression, armament for aggression, and admission to membership in the United Nations.

Aggression shall be prohibited and defined in the Charter, as an attack with weapons of violence by a state (or its citizens) against the recognized territory of a member-state; or illegal occupation by a state of territory outside the recognized and established borders of said state and its possessions. Armament for aggression shall be prohibited and defined in the Charter, as the production of atomic or other weapons of mass destruction in violation of agreements or the production of heavy armament beyond agreed quotas; or refusal to submit to inspection.

If the United Nations is to keep the peace, nations must be prevented from arming for aggression. It is our thought that this can be accomplished by amending the United Nations Charter in the following way:

Prevention of armament for aggression. In the matter of atomic weapons, this shall be accomplished by adoption of the official United States proposal for an Atomic Development Authority; in the matter of heavy armament (such as warships, warplanes, and heavy guns) by a world-wide quota limitation of its production, in the following manner:

The Security Council shall establish yearly the maximum of heavy armament to be produced in the world. Of this total, each of the five permanent member-states shall have an individual production quota which it may not exceed; and the remaining member-states shall have a collective quota, to be produced in their territories by an Armament Authority under the management of the Security Council. Armament production quotas should be: The United States, the British Commonwealth, and the U. S. S. R.—20 percent each of the fixed world total; France and China—10 percent each; 20 percent to be the collective quota of the remaining member states. The Security Council shall have full and enforceable rights of inspection.

Mr. President, the establishment of an international police force dissociated from the political and economic interests of individual nations is essential to world order and peace.

To effectively carry out this thought, it is proposed that the United Nations Charter should be amended by the following:

Establishment of an effective world police force, to consist of one international contingent as the active force and five national contingents operating as reserves when needed.

The international contingent, under the direct control of the Security Council, shall consist of volunteers recruited exclusively from the citizens of the smaller member-states, and shall be equipped with the small nations' collective quota of heavy armament. It shall be stationed, by agreement, in internationalized bases in the smaller states of Europe and Asia, and as policing troops in Germany or other territories when placed under United Nations supervision.

The armed forces of the five major powers shall be the five national contingents. They shall remain under full sovereignty of their respective governments, except that in time of peace their effective strength shall be automatically limited by their agreed quotas of heavy armament production, to be fixed in the United Nations Charter; and except that the governments of the permanent member-states shall, subject to their constitutional limitations or procedures, be pledged to make their national contingents available as reserves to the international contingent upon a majority decision of the revised Security Council and World Court in specific matters of aggression and armament for aggression.

To have peace with justice, international law must be codified, and nations must live under and obey such law.

The final arbiter of international law must be an international court of justice. To carry out this thought, the Charter should be amended by:

To interpret the revised United Nations Charter, the International Court of Justice shall be similarly reorganized, or a new World Court established, with power to judge both governments and individuals in specific matters dealing with aggression.

If the efforts of the United States and other nations to amend the United Nations Charter to effectively preserve the peace are blocked by the veto of any nation in the Security Council, we propose that the United States and other like-minded nations should then join together without the vetoing nation to effectively carry out the perfected machinery of a United Nations for the preservation of world peace.

Under the leadership of my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has given years of study and consideration to these questions which we raise, and to similar questions. I want to repeat that the present resolution is offered to that committee not as a final or a finished commitment. Its design is to provide a concrete basis for constructive study and discussion in order that there may be reported for Senate action positive recommendations to the President, to accomplish the desired results.

Our resolution is not intended as an indictment or a commentary on the failures of world statesmanship that have brought us to our present crisis. It is not directed at any nation which shares our desire for peace. It is designed to give the American people, and the people of the world, that security which frenzied preparations to prevent war cannot provide, as against deliberate and devoted efforts to preserve the peace.

Mr. President, I send to the desk the proposed resolution, and ask that it be referred to the Foreign Relations Committee. I ask unanimous consent to submit the resolution on behalf of myself, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 50) submitted by Mr. FERGUSON (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. BALL, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAIN, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. HOEY, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado; Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. SPARKMAN, MR. STENNIS, and Mr. TOBEY) was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas civilization itself is threatened by the atomic cloud now hanging over the world, and by the back-breaking load of an armament race leading to a terrifying third world war; and

Whereas the maintenance of international peace and security demand affirmative action now by all the nations of the world seeking peace, so that the mutual suspicion and fear now driving the world into opposite military camps may be replaced by mutual confidence in a United Nations strong enough to guarantee any member nation, however large or small and whatever its form of government, against armed violence by any other nation; and

Whereas the Congress favors the revision of the United Nations Charter so that its existing defects, demonstrated by experience, shall be removed, and the United Nations Organization shall be able to fulfill its stated mission as the principal and most effective instrument for world peace; and

Whereas the revision of the United Nations Charter should be undertaken or supported by the United States Government without delay and in a manner that shall most effectively parallel and integrate the measures for world economic recovery already undertaken or yet to be undertaken by the Congress of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is authorized and requested to initiate such measures as will carry out without delay the policies hereinabove enunciated, being guided by such principles as he may deem advisable, including the following:

(1) The revision of the United Nations Charter shall preserve the full sovereignty of member-states except for acts of aggression and armament for aggression to be specifically defined in the Charter.

(2) The revision of the United Nations Charter shall be carried out with the approval of all member-states if possible; but in the event that any permanent member-state should veto the proposals for revision, the United States shall join with other like-minded states in accordance with applicable provisions of the United Nations Charter or in any other manner acceptable to the majority of member-states, in establishing, on the basis of a revised United Nations Charter, a more effective international organization for mutual defense without the participation of the abstaining state or states.

(3) As proof of America's unbending will to peace, membership in the revised international organization shall remain open to any abstaining state or states not engaged at the time in a war of aggression against a member-state, and on the same conditions which prevail for member-states.

(4) The revision of the UN Charter shall contain the following specific provisions which are deemed the minimum necessary to insure the effective operation of the reorganized United Nations:

A. Elimination of the veto right by a permanent member in the Security Council, but only in matters of aggression, armament for

aggression, and admission to membership in the United Nations.

Aggression shall be prohibited and defined in the Charter, as an attack with weapons of violence by a state (or its citizens) against the recognized territory of a member-state; or illegal occupation by a state or territory outside the recognized and established borders of said state and its possessions. Armament for aggression shall be prohibited and defined in the Charter, as the production of atomic or other weapons of mass destruction in violation of agreements or the production of heavy armament beyond agreed quotas; or refusal to submit to inspection.

To conform to the changes in the veto right, representation in the Security Council shall be revised so as to include: Two members each from the United States, the British Commonwealth, and the USSR; one each from France and China; and two selected collectively by the remaining member states. Decisions on vetoless matters shall be made by a majority of six out of 10.

To interpret the revised United Nations Charter, the International Court of Justice shall be similarly reorganized, or a new world court established, with power to judge both governments and individuals in specific matters dealing with aggression.

B. Prevention of armament for aggression. In the matter of atomic weapons, this shall be accomplished by adoption of the official United States proposal for an Atomic Development Authority; in the matter of heavy armament (such as warships, warplanes, and heavy guns) by a world-wide quota limitation of its production, in the following manner:

The Security Council shall establish yearly the maximum of heavy armament to be produced in the world. Of this total, each of the five permanent member-states shall have an individual production quota which it may not exceed; and the remaining member-states shall have a collective quota, to be produced in their territories by an armament authority under the management of the Security Council. Armament production quotas should be the United States, the British Commonwealth, and the USSR—20 percent each of the fixed world total; France and China—10 percent each; 20 percent to be the collective quota of the remaining member states. The Security Council shall have full and enforceable rights of inspection.

C. Establishment of an effective world police force, to consist of one international contingent as the active force and five national contingents operating as reserves when needed.

The international contingent, under direct control of the Security Council, shall consist of volunteers recruited exclusively from the citizens of the smaller member-states, and shall be equipped with the small nations' collective quota of heavy armament. It shall be stationed, by agreement, in internationalized bases in the smaller states of Europe and Asia, and as policing troops in Germany or other territories when placed under United Nations supervision.

The armed forces of the five major powers shall be the five national contingents. They shall remain under full sovereignty of their respective governments, except that in time of peace their effective strength shall be automatically limited by their agreed quotas of heavy armament production, to be fixed in the United Nations Charter and except that the governments of the permanent member-states shall, subject to their constitutional limitations or procedures, be pledged to make their national contingents available as reserves to the international contingent upon majority decision of the revised Security Council and world court in specific matters of aggression and armament for aggression.

This tyranny-proof and yet overwhelming retaliatory power of the world police force shall also serve as a decisive deterrent against aggressors with bacteriological or chemical weapons or other weapons of mass destruction not easily inspectable.

In the event that a major state shall refuse to participate in the foregoing provisions for the elimination of the world armament race and the establishment of a world police force, then the revised Security Council shall proceed at once to the establishment of the international contingent; furthermore, it shall establish an emergency quota of heavy armament production, to be distributed by agreement among the member-states in proportion to their resources, so designed as to make certain that any outside state shall be unable to compete with the overwhelming armament production of the rest of the world, nor engage in acts of aggression against member-states.

(5) Until such time as the foregoing provisions for the revised United Nations (ABC plan), or similar provisions, shall be put into effect, the armed forces of the United States and its weapons of every kind shall be maintained at wholly adequate levels.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I should like to say a brief word regarding the United Nations Organization.

The world has been so filled with talk of war that it is essential that there should be some voice raised in the interest of peace. That voice should be authoritative in order that it might be effective. The one organization capable of dealing with this question is the United Nations Organization. In order that this Organization may be adequately implemented to successfully serve the cause of world peace, it is essential that some amendments should be made to its Charter.

The whole purpose of this resolution is to authorize and direct that the United States shall take the lead in presenting these amendments to the United Nations for its consideration and adoption. Presently this Organization is string-haltered by the veto power which can be exercised by one nation to prevent the adoption of any effective measures safeguarding peace and which would aid in preventing war. One nation, Russia, has already vetoed 23 proposals, and therefore accomplished their defeat.

This resolution would remove the veto power in matters of aggression, armament for aggression, and admission to membership in the United Nations. If adopted, that would assure to the United Nations the authority and the power to halt efforts of aggressive nations to prepare and activate their resources for war, but would still reserve the sovereignty of each nation to manage its internal affairs in all other respects.

All of the amendments proposed would strengthen this Organization and implement it with authority to become effective and powerful in the accomplishment of the purpose for which it was created. With the rejuvenated United Nations Organization, the world might hopefully look forward to the goal of world peace.

This resolution contemplates the inclusion of all nations now members of the Organization and welcomes all nations who believe in peace; but in the event that any nation refuse to go along in the effort to outlaw war and maintain peace, then this resolution would authorize the nations favorable to these great objectives to go forward in their own right without the association of the dissenting members.

The thought underlying this resolution is that no one nation or group of nations ought to be permitted to sabotage the peace of the world and to render ineffective and impotent the United Nations Organization as it strives to accomplish the purpose for which it was organized and to translate into reality the hopes and aspirations for a peaceful world.

THE MARSHALL PLAN—EDITORIAL FROM LONDON DAILY EXPRESS

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, on April 6, 1948, in the London Daily Express there appeared an editorial which has been sent to a great many Members of the Senate, I am sure, by Lord Beaverbrook, with his compliments. Because of the general public interest in the European recovery plan, which now has been made the law of the land, I judge that the people of the United States will be interested in this editorial, inasmuch as it does not accept the full thesis of the recovery plan, but in effect disagrees with what we and the nations of Europe are trying to do in regard to that plan. The thesis of the editorial is that England herself would be better off if she, in connection with the Commonwealth Nations of the British Empire, worked as a unit. The editorial goes on to point out that the loan to Great Britain was also a mistake, and that everyone knew it was a mistake when it was made.

Then the editorial turns to what I would call its constructive points, and it gives to the United States all credit for being a great Christian nation acting in accordance with the fundamental principles of Christianity and also in accordance with what has become our recognized idealism as a result of fighting two world wars and the urges which have been placed by our Government on our people for undertaking what we undertook in World War I and World War II.

Mr. President, the significance of this editorial rests in the fact that now that we have enacted the Marshall plan bill and now that that law is to be administered in accordance with its wording, to a certain extent we shall pass to a stage where we shall forget what General Marshall called the spiritual aspects of what we were trying to do. I should call them the psychological aspects. That is to say, if we gain great friendships in the world, if two great nations learn how to work together for harmony, that is all for the world's good, if those nations are working for the world's good, backed by the idealism which should prevail.

I call attention to the fact that one of the witnesses who favored the plan which we accepted and adopted, in speaking in executive session about the results of the plan, went so far as to give his opinion in regard to what could be accomplished on a dollar-and-cents basis, and in speaking in the spirit of good Americanism and what reflects so basically our dollar diplomacy, he testified that he did not think we were going to get more than 80 cents from each dollar of our expenditures, and that probably 20 percent would, therefore, be lost.

Mr. President, running through my mind immediately is the thought that probably we will get 200 percent out of some of those dollars. The thought is inspired by this unfriendly friendly edi-

torial—and that is what it is; it is an editorial unfriendly to what we are doing, but friendly to the United States and the great ideals which we are reflecting when we call what we are doing acting in our own self-national interest.

I believe, when these byproducts of what is undertaken to be accomplished become effective, we may sometimes get 200, 300, or 400 percent of our dollars. I feel that if General Marshall's spiritual aspects are not considered and kept in mind by the administration, if what I called the psychological aspects of nations joining together in a cooperative plan to help themselves and to help the peoples of all the countries of the world is not kept in mind, if we do not gain something from that, then of course it is all a failure.

I am sure, Mr. President, that several years from now when we are all dead and gone and someone else takes Lord Beaverbrook's place in writing the editorials, then, as the result of what we have been able to do, there will again be written editorials of thanksgiving, probably disagreeing with what our country is doing then, but saying in effect that the fine idealism and splendid Christianity—I use Lord Beaverbrook's word—of the American people, stand in the forefront again and lead the world on to a better condition, not only for the nations but for their inhabitants.

Mr. President, I ask that the whole editorial be made part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AID AND THE EMPIRE

There is much opposition to the Marshall plan which is now in operation.

That opposition is based on the belief that Britain should stand on her own feet, and linked with the Empire, should undertake the task of reconstruction free from any external influence.

True recovery, it is argued, must be based on a plan for Empire unity.

PRAISE AMERICA

But the nation has willed that the Marshall plan shall be part of the foreign and domestic policy of Britain.

Therefore, since the issue is decided, let us frankly comment upon the generous and splendid conduct of the American people and their Congress.

They have gifted these immense sums of money and goods with every intention of rescuing their neighbors in trouble.

They show a kindness of disposition worthy of a people who have for long sustained throughout the world the precepts of the Christian faith. They have declared themselves their brothers' keeper.

REMEMBER: 1

By three actions America has come to the aid of a world distressed, worn, and weary, a world beset by much evil and by the deeds of many tyrant nations, sunk in wickedness.

It began with lease-lend. Has the memory of that tremendous gesture faded? Assuredly not.

It was on March 11, 1941, that America, still neutral, still unassailed, placed vast resources from her fields and factories at Britain's disposal. Britain was the last outpost against German aggression. Country after country had fallen. Lease-lend was an act of faith as well as sustenance and friendship.

When lease-lend ended in August 1945, Opinion said: "For evermore the people of Britain will think of the people of America with warmth and gratitude."

That sentiment is still alive and strong.

REMEMBER: 2

Then came the American loan. It was offered at an uncommercial rate of interest. And in the knowledge from the first that there was no real prospect of repayment, since our own statesmen agreed to conditions which were bound to break down Britain's credit and leave her not stronger for the accommodation but weaker.

But the good will which inspired the hearts of the Americans is not forgotten.

AND NOW—

The crowning deed was the Marshall plan.

It is a gesture more striking than any that has gone before.

Praise the warm feelings of the American Nation.

Recognize the high endeavor to help the distressed world.

Even though the belief must be reiterated that the loan did nothing but injury to Britain and the Empire and the Marshall aid will have the same result.

HOUSING CONSTRUCTION

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, it is my understanding that later this week there will be called up for consideration the housing bill, Senate bill 866, with the committee amendments which were favorably reported last Thursday by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

This proposed legislation deals with one of our most important domestic problems. It is of special interest to a very large number of our citizens. It has received a great deal of study and attention by committees of the Congress. However, we have so many important matters, and the demands upon our time are so great that ordinarily it is a very difficult matter for the Senators to be thoroughly informed as to all the details of pending legislation when called up for consideration. With this difficulty in mind, the Banking and Currency Committee has taken a number of steps to make it possible to obtain very quickly information as to the details of the housing bill and to facilitate its consideration by the Senate.

First. In order to facilitate consideration of the legislation, the committee amendments to S. 866 have been reported in the form of a complete bill.

Second. In order that Senators may readily ascertain the subject matter and general provisions of each of the titles of the committee amendments, there has been included in the supplemental report of the committee, at pages 18 through 20, a brief summary of the provisions of each title.

Third. In order that Senators may readily ascertain exactly what each section of the committee amendments would accomplish, we have prepared a committee print of the amendments with a section-by-section analysis of each provision. The text of the committee amendments is printed on the left-hand side of the pages. On the right hand side of each page, opposite each section of the committee amendments, there is printed the explanation of what the section does. From this document there can be obtained quickly information as to exactly what each section of the committee amendments provides.

There are two principal housing acts which would be affected by the committee amendments. These are the National Housing Act, under which the FHA home mortgage insurance operations are carried out, and the United States Housing Act, under which the low-rent public housing program is carried out. Senators will wish to know how these acts would be changed by the committee amendments. To assist Senators in readily obtaining this information, we have taken two other steps.

First. We have prepared a committee print of the National Housing Act as it would read if the committee amendments were enacted into law. On the left side of the pages of this document there is printed the text of the National Housing Act, with the changes which would be made therein by the committee amendments shown in italics along with the reference to the section of the committee amendments which makes such change. On the right hand side of each page, opposite each such change in the act, there is printed the explanation of what the change does.

Second. We have prepared a similar committee print of the United States Housing Act.

There are several other matters with respect to the committee amendments to S. 866 about which Senators may wish to have readily obtainable information. We have made a special effort to include this type of information in the Supplemental Report of the Banking and Currency Committee, issued as part 2 of Report No. 140.

First. They may wish to know what new provisions are added to S. 866. This information is set forth at pages 3 to 6 of the supplemental report.

Second. They may wish to know what provisions of S. 866 are eliminated. This information is set forth at pages 10 to 12 of the supplemental report.

Third. They may wish to know what changes or modifications are made in the existing provisions of S. 866. This information is set forth at pages 6 to 9 of the supplemental report.

Fourth. They may wish to know what financing is involved. This information is set forth at page 12 of the supplemental report.

Fifth. They may wish to know which of the legislative recommendations of the Joint Committee on Housing are provided for. This information is set forth at pages 13 to 18 of the supplemental report.

Copies of these documents are being delivered to each Senator's office today, and copies will, of course, be on Senators' desks when the housing bill is considered later this week. The Banking and Currency Committee staff have done a very fine job of preparing these materials, and I am sure Senators will find them very helpful.

INVESTIGATION OF THE CHARACTER AND LOYALTY OF OFFICIALS OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1004) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 so as to provide that no person shall be appointed as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission or as General Manager of such Commission until an investigation with respect to the character, associations, and loyalty of such person shall have been made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to the Senate bill 1004.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, considerable discussion relative to the amendment ensued last Thursday just before the Senate recessed. I shall not take a great deal of time today with regard to the matter. However, I do not see present the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and so I suggest the absence of a quorum. I believe we can finish the discussion of the subject within a relatively short time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	O'Daniel
Ball	Hayden	Overton
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Reed
Brewster	Hill	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Hoey	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Holland	Russell
Bushfield	Ives	Saltonstall
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Stennis
Capper	Kem	Stewart
Chavez	Kilgore	Taft
Cordon	Knowland	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Downey	Lodge	Tobey
Dworshak	Lucas	Tydings
Eastland	McCarran	Vandenberg
Ecton	McCarthy	Watkins
Ellender	McClellan	Wherry
Ferguson	McKellar	White
Flanders	McMahon	Wiley
Fulbright	Martin	Williams
George	Moore	Wilson
Green	Morse	Young
Gurney	O'Conor	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, when the Senate concluded its session on Thursday last we were considering Senate bill 1004, introduced by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], which would authorize the Senate Section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to ask for and have an investigation made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation if the Senate Section so desired, in connection with appointees to the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. President, I address a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair. Has the amendment in the nature of a substitute been adopted? What does the RECORD show in that respect?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment in the nature of a substitute has not been adopted. It is now pending, with an amendment to it submitted by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON].

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The question, therefore, is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut to the amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes; to the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from California.

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of perfecting my amendment?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment submitted to me include therein a phrase which will cover the general manager as well as the members of the Commission. The phrase is "and the General Manager thereof," to be inserted after the word "Commission," in line 5.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's amendment will be perfected in accordance with his request.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, my understanding of the effect of the perfecting language offered by the Senator from Connecticut is that the General Manager is included together with the members of the Commission in the exemption from the application of the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from California.

Mr. MCMAHON. That is correct, because the General Manager, as well as the members of the Commission, have been serving for about a year and a half.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes, I understand. I simply wished to make sure that the perfecting phrase in the amendment had only the effect of including with the members of the Commission the General Manager.

Mr. MCMAHON. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, it was my intention on Thursday last, just before the session of the Senate was concluded, to make a very few remarks in connection with the pending legislation, and the amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut to the substitute offered by the Senator from California.

In the first place, in order that there may be no confusion and no misapprehension respecting this particular bill, I want to call to the attention of the Senate that it is not a new piece of legislation. The bill was introduced on March 31, 1947, at the time of or immediately following the debate on the confirmation of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission. The Senator from California, who introduced the bill, did so, as Members will recall, because it affirmatively appeared at that time that there had been no such investigation of the appointed members of the Commission and the General Manager, and that there was no power in the Senate committee to have the Federal Bureau of Investigation make such an investigation. So it is not a new bill; it is not a measure introduced recently. It can by no stretch of the imagination be considered as directed at present members of the Commission. They were confirmed at that time without such an investigation having been made, and, as the Senator from California clearly stated then, and has repeatedly stated since, he wanted the bill to be introduced and to become law prior to any new appointments being made, prior to the time when new or additional nominations would come before the Senate, because if the bill were introduced at such a time, or if it were brought up for action after appointments had been made, it might reasonably be anticipated by some that it was directed at the new appointees. So when there is no nomination before the Senate for confirmation, when there is no one under appointment to be considered, is the proper time to introduce and to act upon this important proposed legislation.

With respect to a committee investigating individuals who are appointed, I want to call the attention of the Members of the Senate to the fact that it was deemed proper to provide in the Atomic Energy Act that every employee of the Commission under the General Manager, and every person employed by contractors operating under contract with the Commission, should be investigated by the FBI prior to his clearance for access to restricted data.

Contrary to some understandings the Federal Bureau of Investigation does not pass upon anyone or approve anyone. The Bureau neither O. K.'s nor turns down anyone. The Federal Bureau investigates the facts as it finds them, gathers information pro and con on individuals, compiles the information into a report, and submits the report to the person or the body which is supposed to make the decision, and that body or that person examines the accumulated information and makes the decision as to whether the individual in question should be cleared or not cleared.

During the course of the debate in the Senate respecting the nominees to the Commission, and the nominee to be General Manager, none of whom had been investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the bill before us was introduced because it was then felt that inasmuch as no investigation of this kind had been had, a loophole of such a nature should be plugged up for the future.

In connection with the operation of an investigation or an inquiry into the qualifications of an individual for confirmation I want to make this statement: Much has been said on the floor of the Senate to the effect that a Senate committee has tremendous power and should be able to investigate satisfactorily. I submit to any Member of the Senate who has ever sat on a committee attempting to secure all the facts respecting an individual, that there simply is no machinery at the command of the Senate committee with which it can do an adequate job, unless the committee has been long in existence and has a considerable staff which devotes its time exclusively to such investigations. I think that is evident to anyone.

Mr. President, to me it is unthinkable for anyone to argue that the Senate of the United States and its committees, which are charged with making investigations, should be denied and forbidden the use of an able, efficient, and extensive arm of the Government which lives by authority of the Congress, and whose duty it is to serve the public. The overall duty of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is not to serve the Executive; it is not to serve any particular group. Its basic duty is to serve the public of the United States. To deny to the Senate of the United States and its committees the right to use that arm of the Government, which costs the taxpayers many million dollars a year, and which over a period of years has demonstrated that it is an able, efficient, and qualified investigating body, is to me unthinkable.

The investigation which would be authorized by the bill could do no harm. It could do only good, because it would make available to Congress the services of the most efficient group of investigators, who could compile information for the committee which has the responsibility of approving or denying its approval of a nominee, and to make recommendation with respect to him to the Senate.

One further point and I shall be through, Mr. President. My last point deals with the question of the constitutionality of the authorization sought in the amendment of the Senator from California. I submit that if the Congress cannot affirmatively direct the action of an administrative body of government in a case like this, then there is no regulatory power; there is no power that the Senate of the United States can exert over any administrative body after it is once established. To carry the argument to its logical conclusion, one might say that under this theory all the Congress can do is to establish an administrative agency, and then not regulate it in any way or prescribe its duties. I submit that if this provision is unconstitutional, then every provision in section 15 of the Atomic Energy Act is also unconstitutional so far as that section prescribes the responsibilities of the Atomic Energy Commission or other branches of Government toward this committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. What provision of the Constitution is it claimed would be violated by this particular statute?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not know. I think perhaps Senators who have referred to that possibility will be able to answer the question a little later, but I cannot answer it at the moment. I do not know what specific provision is claimed to be violated. I know of none, and I do not believe that any provision of the Constitution would be violated.

Mr. FERGUSON. It certainly does not attack the appointing power.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No; it does not attack the appointing power.

Mr. FERGUSON. It deals only with the right of Congress to have the FBI, which is a creature of Congress, perform a function for Congress; and it provides that Congress may use the FBI report as a basis of consideration as to whether or not the nomination of a particular person should be confirmed by the United States Senate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. This measure would not inhibit the appointing power. It would not inhibit the action of the committee. It merely provides that the committee may utilize a presently existing agency of the Government to give the committee information. That is all it provides.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Aside from the policy or wisdom of the bill, I am interested in the discussion, and I am somewhat puzzled by the language of this particular measure. I should like to have the advice of the Senator from Iowa as to what is meant by the language "no individual shall take office"? Does that mean, for example, that the President could nominate, the Senate could confirm, and the President appoint, going through all those constitutional steps——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator is reading from the original bill. We are discussing the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. HATCH. I shall read that first.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I admit that it is somewhat confusing.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I notice that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is leaving the Chamber. If he can conveniently stay for a moment, in answer to the Senator's question as to what provision of the Constitution is involved, let me say to the Senator from Michigan that the question of the division of powers between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government, which have been construed in many cases by the Supreme Court, is involved. I think there is no better statement in our entire judicial reporting system than that in the *Kilbourn* v. *Thompson* (103 U. S. 168), at page 190:

> It is believed to be one of the chief merits of the American system of written constitutional law, that all the powers intrusted to government, whether State or National, are divided into three grand departments, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. That the functions appropriate to each of these branches of government shall be vested, in a separate body of public servants, and that the perfection of the system requires that the lines which separate and divide these departments shall be broadly and clearly defined. It is also essential to the successful working of this system that the persons intrusted with power in any one of these branches shall not be permitted to encroach upon the powers confided to the others, but that each shall by the law of its creation be limited to the exercise of the powers appropriate to its own department and no other.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I invite the attention of the Senator from Connecticut again to the language of the Atomic Energy Act, which he took a considerable part in writing. Paragraph (e) on page 20 of Public Law 585, enacted by the Seventy-ninth Congress, provides as follows:

> The committee—

Meaning the joint committee, consisting of Members of the House and of the Senate—

> is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government.

Personally, I believe that there may be in that section sufficient power for the joint committee to get the type of information which we need; but the difficulty arises from the fact that in performing our constitutional duty as the Senate of the United States, the House Members, of course, have no part in our particular function in passing upon Presidential appointees. As the able Senator from Connecticut knows, the Senate Members act as the Senate section of the joint committee. We want to make it perfectly clear that the powers which we feel the Congress has already given to the joint committee shall also vest in the Senate Members of the committee sitting as the Senate section, when we are endeavoring to carry out our constitutional responsibility of passing upon appointments.

It is the opinion of the junior Senator from California that if we are not able to obtain the full facts in this regard we shall be handicapped in discharging our constitutional responsibilities.

In the field of atomic energy we have created an agency with more power than we have given to any other agency in the entire history of the Republic. The reason we did it is that we are dealing with an unprecedented force, something which has never existed before in the history of the Republic, something which, for good or evil, can affect not only the destiny of the American people, but of the entire world. For that reason, in the discharge of our responsibilities as Senators, and in the discharge of the committee's responsibility, we should not have an iron curtain lowered so that we may not have all the facts which we need in discharging our responsibilities.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator wish to answer the Senator from California?

Mr. McMAHON. Yes; I wish to make an observation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. I will say to the Senator from California that no parent likes to find fault with his child. However, occasionally we must point out small defects. I believe that it is a relatively small defect which we are discussing.

As a member of the joint committee I would certainly try to persuade the executives department to give all the assistance required by the act; but I also say to the Senator that that is quite a different attitude from that which I would have to take as a lawyer in defending or attacking that provision. I point out to the Senator that it makes no difference in what unmistakable terms we write a provision in the law, or how vigorously or insistently we say that the executive department shall do this, that, and the other; there is still resort to the Constitution and to the Supreme Court and its decisions. That is the point which I am trying to bring to the attention of the Senator.

I do not believe that the Congress can say to the President of the United States, "We are bypassing you. We are not going to talk to you. We are not going to talk to the Attorney General, who is one of your Cabinet officers and is responsible to you. We are going to reach over both of you and tell a bureau chief

that he shall do this, that, and the other thing, and report to us." It is my contention that the Constitution will not permit the Congress legally to do such a thing.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Connecticut apparently is questioning the constitutionality of a section of the law which the Congress placed in it at the time of the enactment of the law which created the Atomic Energy Commission.

The able Senator from Connecticut is an attorney; the junior Senator from California is not; but I think I am entitled to take judicial notice of the fact that from time to time the Supreme Court changes its opinions. At one time I think the country would have thought that, standing like the Rock of Gilbraltar, a statement in a bond issued by the Federal Government of the United States that it would be paid in gold coin of a certain weight, fineness, and so on, was something that simply could not be questioned. Yet the Supreme Court in its wisdom and judgment ruled out such provisions in such contracts, and said that the Federal Government had the power to change them. Time after time in the history of the country the Supreme Court has taken a certain position at one time, and later has changed it slightly or even to a greater extent.

I feel that the field of atomic power is so vast and its significance to the American people is so great that certainly I should not think we were discharging our obligation as an Atomic Energy Committee or that the Senate was discharging its obligations unless we were to take every possible step to adequately safeguard the American people in this vast field with which we are dealing; and to my mind this is an essential requirement for the protection of the very safety and security of the Republic itself.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator's statement, let me say that the provision of the Atomic Energy Act which gives the joint committee certain powers is not what is in controversy or dispute. What is in dispute is what the Senator is attempting to do by his amendment in the nature of a substitute. I say to the Senator that I would prefer—because I see that the Senator from Michigan, who is a great constitutional lawyer, is anxious to join issue on the statement I made—to delay making an answer to the Senator as to the necessity of doing this, I say to him that I was merely answering as to the constitutionality of the proposal.

So far as the necessity of it is concerned, I shall take a few minutes to express myself along the lines I did last Thursday as to the lack of necessity of doing what the Senator proposes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. In answer to the statement of the Senator from Connecticut, I wish to say that the question of separation of powers is not involved, as I see it, in this particular proposed legislation. If the Senator from Connecticut is correct in his position that the Congress has no power except to draft and pass laws, then he goes to the very foundation of the authority of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of the Senate and of the House of Representatives. Under the same constitutional provision he would say that that committee could have no power whatever to look into any agency, be it the atomic energy agency or any other.

Mr. President, that is not correct. The Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives of the United States are policy-making bodies. They have a right to obtain the facts in order that they may legislate properly. The Senate has a right to obtain facts in order that it may approve or consent or decline to approve or consent to the nominations of ambassadors and other public officers, as provided for in the Constitution.

When we refer to the separation of powers, we do not mean that we cannot create an agency to do something for Congress. For instance, the Congress by statute created the Comptroller General's office. He works, in effect, directly for the Congress. He audits the books of the executive branch of the Government. If the opinion the Senator has expressed were the actual law, then it could be said that we could not audit the books of the executive agencies and departments through the Comptroller General of the United States, because there must be a separation of powers.

No, Mr. President; that is not what is meant by the separation of powers. As I understand, the Congress can pass a law—and, in effect, that is what the present proposal would be—saying to the FBI, a mere creature of the Congress, that it shall make investigations and submit reports regarding them to the Senate section of the joint committee or to the Senate as a whole. That has nothing to do with the separation of powers.

I think the Senator's argument, if it be correct, goes to the very foundations of the joint committee. What can it do under any legislative powers, if the Senator is correct in his analysis?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield further to me, so that I may reply to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I shall tell the Senator from Michigan what we can do.

Mr. FERGUSON. What can we do?

Mr. McMAHON. We can do what we do all the time. We can ask nominees and other witnesses to come before us and talk with us and answer questions propounded by Senators.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Michigan desires to continue, with the permission of the Senator from Iowa, I shall suspend.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I take it that the committee has greater power than the mere power to ask a man to appear before it as a witness. If the committee has no other power, such a witness would not have to answer the questions propounded to him by the committee. If the Senate is to be advised, I take it that the committee must be empowered to obtain the facts; and the very measure itself provides that the agency known as the FBI may be used in order to obtain the facts.

As has been stated, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is something new. It is something in the national interest and in the national-defense interest, and it relates to the general welfare. Therefore, Congress has a right to regulate it. If Congress could not say to any agency, "You do this in relation to atomic energy," then the original agency could never have been created.

But, Mr. President, we are not talking about the mere separation of powers. We are talking about the right to confer upon a certain agency of the Congress the right to require a report to it and to the Congress.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I appreciate the Senator's courtesy, because I know he wishes to continue with his discussion.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I merely wish to complete what I have to say, and then I shall yield the floor.

Mr. McMAHON. Certainly. But perhaps this is a good time to say that despite the eloquence of the Senator from Michigan, his remarks are directly in the face of the law.

Let me read what Attorney General Jackson said in the course of writing an opinion in 1941, in which he backs his opinion by the law:

> Since the beginning of the Government the executive branch has from time to time been confronted with the unpleasant duty of declining to furnish to the Congress and to the courts information which it has acquired and which is necessary to it in the administration of statutes. As early as 1796—

And that was not at the time of a New Deal—

> the House of Representatives requested President Washington to lay before the House a copy of the instructions to ministers of the United States who negotiated a treaty with Great Britain, together with the correspondence and other documents relating to that treaty. In declining to comply with the request, President Washington said:
>
> "As it is essential to the due administration of the Government that the boundaries fixed by the Constitution between the different departments should be preserved, a just regard to the Constitution and to the duty of my office forbids a compliance with your request."

The opinion also points out that in 1825 the House of Representatives requested President Monroe to transmit certain documents relating to the conduct of the officers of the Navy; and he likewise declined.

I read further from the opinion:

> In 1833, the Senate requested President Jackson to communicate to that body a copy

of a paper purporting to have been read by him to the heads of the executive departments * * *.

The opinion further states that President Jackson declined to do so, and likewise he was upheld.

The opinion further states:

This discretion in the executive branch has been upheld and respected by the judiciary.

And, Mr. President, there are not less than 30 decisions on that point.

I say to the Senator that much though he might desire an investigatory report on the part of the FBI, if the Attorney General refused to give it, it is my prediction that the Senator would find that the Supreme Court would uphold the right of the Attorney General to decline to produce the report. The cases are too clear to admit of question. The Senator may not like the proposition. He may not like it because he is in the Senate. If he were connected with the executive department he might take another view. But that happens to be the law. What I contend is, when we know it is the law, we ought not to pass a bill which flies directly in the face of constitutional provision.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the Senator will make his remarks brief, I will yield. I am trying to finish what I have to say.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall try to be brief. The Senator from Michigan is familiar with the opinion of Attorney General Jackson, but that relates to an entirely different matter. In that case the executive branch had done something within its own constitutional jurisdiction with respect to foreign relations, and the discussion turned on whether access should be given to the particular papers used in that connection, not on the question of the power of Congress to create an agency such as the FBI and to confer upon such agency authority to make an investigation for the Congress. The two questions are entirely different.

I think the Congress is facing the issue head on. The Atomic Energy Commission is now confronting it. We shall meet it probably tomorrow in a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The issue has been raised in the House in the Committee on Un-American Activities. Sooner or later the Senate will face that issue, and the Supreme Court will finally be called upon to decide whether Congress may even see what has been done in the executive department. However, the question now before the Senate is an entirely different one.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me for a parliamentary inquiry, and then for a question?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President, is, to what committee would nominations to the Atomic Energy Commission be referred?

Mr. McMAHON. I suggest to the Senator from New Mexico, they would be referred to Senate members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. HATCH. I am advised, Mr. President, they would go to the Senate members of the Commission.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that nominations heretofore made were referred to the members of the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. HATCH. Would future nominations take the same course?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair future nominations would take the same course.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, merely in order to clarify the matter, the Atomic Energy Act is crystal clear on the point. All matters touching atomic energy go to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and when the matter involved specifically affects either House, it goes to the Members of that House who are on the joint committee. There can be no question about the parliamentary point.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, since I interrupted the Senator, I have read the amendment in the nature of a substitute. I should like to know if I understand it correctly. Is it now proposed that the Senate section of the joint committee, before the committee acts on any nomination, may directly request the FBI to conduct an investigation into the character, loyalty, and associations of the nominee?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct. But let me clarify the point with respect to the substitute. I should like to say to the Senator from New Mexico in response to his question that there is nothing mandatory in any way about the amendment in the nature of a substitute. It says the Senate members "may, prior to the giving of advice and consent or refusal to advise and consent by the Senate," direct the FBI to make an investigation. In other words, clearly if the Senate members do not ask for such an investigation prior to the giving of advice and consent or the refusal to give advice and consent by the Senate, the Senate may go ahead and give the advice and consent, or refuse to advise and consent. The amendment is permissive. The authority may be exercised and, of course, if it is exercised, it must be exercised prior to action on confirmation by the Senate. It does not apply to members of the Commission now in office. It would apply if those members or any of them were reappointed; the Senate committee could ask for an investigation of them. But as to the members who are now in office, advice and consent has already been given by the Senate; therefore it would be impossible under the bill for the Senate members now to ask for an FBI investigation of the present members of the Commission and of the General Manager.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield still further for a question, I will state the reason for the parliamentary inquiry I made a moment ago.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. In the beginning of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, there is a reference to Senate members of the joint committee. But in line 6 it says the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall cause such investigation to be made. It is required that he report to the Senate committee.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. To what Senate committee would he be required to report? That is what puzzled me.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is a very good question.

Mr. HATCH. The same thing is repeated in line 11.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the Senator from California, as the author of the amendment, can either correct me or amplify his meaning, but without doubt that is what is intended. I so understand. I am sure the Senator from California so understands and intends it to mean the Senate committee composed of the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I shall show the Senator why.

Mr. HATCH. I am quite sure that was the intention, but does not the Senator agree that it is not what the substitute says?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No, Mr. President; I do not so agree, and I will tell the Senator why. In line 3 it says:

The Senate members of the joint committee, as a committee—

Then, on page 2, in line 8, it says:

shall report to the Senate committee.

I think lines 3 and 4 clearly establish it as a Senate committee.

To go further, I call the Senator's attention to section 15 (b) of the Atomic Energy Act, about halfway through the section, beginning with the sentence which reads:

The members of the joint committee who are Members of the Senate shall from time to time report to the Senate, and the members of the joint committee who are Members of the House of Representatives shall from time to time report to the House, by bill or otherwise, their recommendations with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of their respective Houses * * *.

It will be noticed that the language in that particular paragraph refers to the members of the joint committee who are Members of the Senate.

My understanding, Mr. President, of the provisions contained in the amendment in the nature of a substitute and of the reason for the language contained in line 3 and the lines following, and of the reference to the committee, is this: It would not be desirable, in my judgment, and it would be bad legislation and bad practice, to let any member of the committee willy-nilly upon his own motion ask for an investigation. The investigation, therefore, should be requested by the committee as an entity. If other language were used, it might easily be interpreted to mean that any Member of the Senate who was a member of the joint committee could, upon his own motion and, without the consent of the other members of the committee, at will ask for an investigation. Personally, I believe that is what the Senator from California had in mind when he prepared the amendment in the

nature of a substitute. He talked to me about it, and I think the procedure as outlined in the amendment is good, in that it guards against individual authority on the part of one Member to have an investigation made, and the authority of another Member to request another kind of investigation. It causes the Members of the Senate, as members of the joint committee, to act as a unit in directing an investigation to be made.

I think such procedure is wise and that it guards against the individual authority of one Member proceeding to hold an investigation, and another Member holding another kind of investigation. It makes the Members of the Senate act as a unit in the conducting of an investigation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HATCH. I merely want to make a brief explanatory statement, which has to do largely with the matter of draftsmanship. I observed in the beginning, as the Senator has said, that the Senate members of the joint committee may direct an investigation. It is not a committee, but acting as a committee they may direct an investigation. I think it is perfectly clear that they should act together.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think the Senator from California will bear me out in my interpretation.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator referred in lines 8 and 9, and again in lines 11 and 12, to a Senate committee, as though it were some different, distinct committee. I am not contentious about the question. I merely want to understand the meaning.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think I can clarify it. I am not saying that I am speaking for the committee entirely, but so far as my own attitude and my own belief and interpretation are concerned, there is no question that in line 8 of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, containing the language "shall report to the Senate committee," and in lines 11 and 12, wherein it is said "the Senate committee," the language refers, I think, specifically, intentionally, directly, and entirely to the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, acting as a committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I also wish to have the RECORD at this time make perfectly clear, first, that I wholly agree with the able Senator from Iowa, the chairman of the committee, that his interpretation is the intent of the amendment. I think the amendment should be read as it is intended, together with the proper sections of the Atomic Energy Act itself, I think, when read in connection with the Atomic Energy Act—and again calling attention to the words "the Senate members of the joint committee, as a committee, and independent of similar power included in the broader authority of the joint committee"—it is perfectly clear that the committee referred to in lines 8 and 9 has reference to the Senate members of the joint committee acting in the discharge of their constitutional obligations.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Perhaps the Senator from California answered the question in his last statement, but as I recall the atomic-energy-law, it provides for 18 members of the joint committee—9 from the House and 9 from the Senate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, any five Members of the Senate could order an investigation to be made by the FBI in the event the bill becomes law.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Acting as a committee; I believe that is correct. That is, five members would be a majority of the Senate members of the joint committee.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct. Five Members would be a majority of the Senate membership of the committee. But notwithstanding the fact that there are 18 members of the committee, all of whom are as much interested in having an FBI investigation made as would be any other Member——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I do not so understand. I cannot quote the law exactly at the moment, but it provides, in effect, that matters of especial or particular interest to the Senate shall be referred to the Senate members of the joint committee. Matters of especial or particular interest to the House in connection with atomic energy shall be referred to the House members on the joint committee. Confirmations, being a matter strictly and specifically within the constitutional and statutory right of the Senate, will be referred to the Senate Members for action and for report to the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that only the Members of the Senate can act upon confirmation. The Senator brings forward a measure which he tells the country is extremely important, to all of which I agree. The Senator from California has stated that no measure, in his opinion, is any more important than is the particular amendment, which is offered as a substitute for the original bill. I respectfully suggest that any member of the joint committee, whether he be in the Senate or in the House, has as much interest in finding out the qualifications, the associations, and the loyalty of an appointee as has any other Member. I do not say that all Members can vote, of course, so far as a confirmation is concerned. But I believe that all investigations should be referred to the entire committee, and that the entire committee should pass all information along to the Members of the Senate, because, surely, if the fate of the Nation depends upon atomic energy or the development of the atomic bomb, as a great many people seem to think, the individual members of the joint committee who are Members of the House are as much interested in ascertaining whether an appointee is loyal and has the proper qualifications and background, as is any Member of the Senate. I think they should have something to say about it. I do not think five Members out of 18 should determine whether an appointee is loyal or is not loyal.

I make that argument because we have attached much importance to the subject. We have established a joint committee between the House and the Senate. We in the Senate do not take jurisdiction alone. We have, as I have said, established a joint committee, and it seems to me that the Members of the House should have something to say about it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I am a little confused about the attitude of the Senator from Illinois, because when the matter was being discussed a week or two ago and there was a provision in the original bill that before a Presidential appointee could take office an investigation should be made, the Senator from Illinois merely stated in the RECORD that if the language were changed to give the committee the right to have the FBI make an investigation, he would support the measure.

Mr. LUCAS. That is what I am talking about now. I am speaking of the joint committee making a final determination on whether an appointee is loyal or is disloyal. Under the provision, 5 Members of the Senate out of the 18 members of the joint committee could either veto an appointee, so far as the committee is concerned, or could approve his confirmation. That probably is the only way the matter can be handled.

The point I am making is that the House Members of the joint committee should have the right to sit in on the conferences, and help make the determination for the whole committee and submit their recommendations to the Senate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It is just as logical for the Senator to take the position that every time a Federal judge is to be confirmed we should call in the members of the House Committee on the Judiciary to advise on what is peculiarly, constitutionally, and legally a prerogative of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. But in that case there would not be a joint committee. Why did we create this independent joint committee?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The joint committee acts only in matters which are not specifically the province of either House. The law provides that matters which are specifically within the special interest of either House shall be considered by the members of the joint committee from that House. Certainly confirmations are matters peculiarly within the province of the Senate, and the law covering that matter provides that such a subject shall be considered by the members of the joint committee who are Members of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator from Iowa agree with the Senator from California that when in the amendment the Senate Committee is referred to, the reference is not to the 18 members on the committee, but only to the members who represent the United States Senate on the committee?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct, as the Senator will find if he will

read carefully the amendment in the nature of a substitute. I will read it, beginning in line 3:

The Senate members of the joint committee, as a committee, and independent of the similar power included in the broader authority of the joint committee as specified in the preceding sentence, may—

All the amendment in the nature of a substitute does is to provide that, in connection with confirmation proceedings, members of the joint committee who are Members of the Senate may, prior to such time as the Senate may confirm or refuse to confirm, ask for an investigation in the performance of their duties.

Mr. President, the Senator will recall that, in connection with hearings on the nominations of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission, I wrote to the President—the letter is in the RECORD—asking for the information he had as to their background. Some of the appointees the committee did not know, and an investigation is a complicated matter, if it is carried on in detail. The Senator will also recall, because he was an interested participant in the debate, that the Senate agreed on the confirmations, and that there was no dispute at that time about the matter. The Senator will also recall that the President replied refusing to make available to the Senate members of the committee any information he had with regard to the appointees.

The Senate members felt that if they were to be called upon in the future to recommend to the Senate whether or not confirmation should be had of any appointees, they certainly should have the benefit of the investigatory powers of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and whatever information could be discovered.

Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate the fact that the Federal Bureau of Investigation was created, and lives, by the power and by the authority of the legislative branch of the Government. The FBI is not a constitutional agency, it is one created by Congress, and it seems far-fetched indeed to say that an agency which can be abolished by the Senate and the House, acting as the legislature, an agency which can be put out of business, if you please, cannot be controlled otherwise and directed as to what it shall do to serve its very creator. It is utterly unthinkable that legal reasoning could be so twisted as to justify such a contention.

Under the constitutional directives of the President in certain fields, under the three-branch system of government we have, it is very easy to see how in certain situations, acting strictly under constitutional authority, the President has the right to surround his actions with certain safeguards so far as he believes his power under the Constitution goes. But are we to understand that the Congress cannot direct the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for instance, to submit reports of its activities to committees of Congress which are investigating and studying its progress? Am I to understand that the Federal Communications Commission, if the President says "No," cannot be brought before Congress for a review of its cases and to inspect the record of its expenditures, and that its agencies, groups, and personnel cannot be utilized to inform the Congress for the benefit of the public? Am I to understand, Mr. President, that the provision in the law creating the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is unconstitutional and illegal when it says—

The Commission—

Meaning the Atomic Energy Commission—

The Commission shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to the Commission's activities.

Am I to understand that the law creating this Commission could not direct the Commission to do that, and that the President can say "No; I will forbid the Commission complying with the provision of the law, because this is the executive branch of the Government"?

Mr. President, I do not believe that can be done, and I do not believe it would be sustained by any court.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls attention to the fact that the question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], as modified, to the substitute offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to Senate bill 1004.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have occupied more time than I had intended to take, and I have expressed in general my views on the proposed legislation. I think the amendment of the Senator from California is not only utterly proper, but that it is needed, because there is at present no power in the Senate committee to get the information covered by the amendment. We have been refused once by the President, and while the joint committee in its activities may have the power to get the information, the Senate members of the committee do not have it. I believe the amendment is perfectly legal. I believe that anyone who cannot stand an investigation should not hold the office of a member of the Commission, and anyone who can stand an investigation has nothing to fear.

Mr. President, I believe the amendment is in the public interest, in the interest of accuracy, and in the interest of inspiring confidence on the part of the committee and on the part of the Senate, which has to confirm appointments.

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President, I shall address myself very briefly to the amendment of the Senator from California and my amendment thereto.

I rise to speak a word for the dignity of the United States Senate. Under the Constitution of the United States, the Senate is charged with the duty of giving its advice and consent to nominations made by the President of the United States. It has been my observation, as a Member of this body, that that constitutional duty is taken very seriously indeed. I know that in the case of the present five Commissioners of the Atomic Energy Commission and the General Manager thereof, that constitutional obligation was meticulously fulfilled. The Senate Members of the joint committee listened for more than 56 hours to testimony by 102 witnesses and held, in addition, many executive sessions wherein the character, associations, loyalty, and qualifications of the present members of the Commission were examined into most minutely and painstakingly. After looking over the thousand pages of testimony which were taken during those proceedings, Mr. President, I dare say it will not be denied that no nominations ever submitted to this body received more rigorous and complete investigation. Notwithstanding that lengthy investigation, we debated the subject upon the floor of the Senate for a week or possibly 10 days, during which we met at 12 o clock and adjourned sometimes nearly 12 hours later. After all those proceedings, the Senate took a vote, and in doing so we discharged our constitutional duty.

Mr. President, we hear a great deal these days about bureaucrats and bureaucracies, and it is the fashion for members of both parties in the Congress to stand on the floor and to denounce those who are giving a lifetime of service in the executive department of the Government. Now, it is proposed that the Senate should divest itself from some of the responsibility which it has, by seeking to foist it upon a subsidiary agency of the executive branch of the Government.

As I pointed out the other day in debating the question, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is now spending $150,000 a year, and has 18 employees working for it. I think the Senate members of the Joint Committee are fully qualified to advise the Senate and the country respecting the qualifications of anyone whose name is submitted by the President of the United States.

So much for the necessity of the substitute amendment. I have already spoken briefly about its constitutionality. Despite the assertions of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] that the citations I gave are not in point, I still must respectfully insist that they are.

It is entirely possible, yes, probable, and I think even certain, that the President of the United States in nominating members of the Atomic Energy Commission will, as President of the United States, avail himself of the right to call upon the Attorney General who in turn will call upon the Director of the Bureau of Investigation for an investigation of his possible nominees. To assert, as the Senator from Michigan did, that it would be possible to call upon the director of the subsidiary bureau to produce a report in the face of the constitutional argument that is made in Marbury against Madison, in the later Kilbourn case, in the recent Meyers case, the Humphrey case, and also a Federal Trade Commission case the title of which escapes me at the moment, is to deny plain English in the reports of those cases.

Mr. President, I thought it wise at least to insist if the substitute amendment is to be adopted that it carry with it a restriction upon the right of the Senate members of the Joint Committee to call for a reinvestigation of the present Commissioners, who are now serving with such

credit to themselves and to the country. I call the Senate's attention to the fact that they have been serving as Commissioners actively for the last year and a half. I call attention to the further fact that in the performance of its duty, the Joint Committee has religiously observed the activities of the Commission. We have as a committee discharged our duties as laid down by the act. Now to say to the Commissioners after a year and a half, "We are going to subject you to reinvestigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation," seems to me to be highly unnecessary and injudicious. I know the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] will point out that the provisions of the bill are merely permissive; that the Senate members of the Joint Committee can or cannot, as in their wisdom they may determine, order a reinvestigation of the members of the Commission.

Mr. President, if we should pass the bill without my amendment we would certainly be paying meager compliment to our own wisdom in confirming the original nominations a year and a half ago, and at the same time we would import into the record some doubt as to the performance of duty on the part of the Commissioners. The Senator from California takes the other position and says that when we urge that these men be exempted from reinvestigation it looks as though they would have something to hide. I do not agree with that contention for a moment.

So, to sum up, Mr. President, I merely say that in the opinion of the Senator from Connecticut, the measure as it is now drawn is unconstitutional, that it will not stand the test of the courts, and that it is unnecessary, and is therefore unwise.

Mr. President, I think we might as well dispose of my perfected amendment to the substitute amendment, if that is satisfactory to the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, proposed by the Senator from Connecticut, to the substitute offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to the Senate bill 1004.

Mr. KNOWLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator from Florida will permit me, I suggest that I believe we should first dispose of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Connecticut. I understand the Senator from Florida desires to suggest some changes in the language of the substitute, but that they do not apply to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct, Mr. President.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I am opposed to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut to the substitute amendment. I believe that it would circumscribe and tie the hands of a committee which is charged with a grave responsibility under the Atomic Energy Act itself. I believe that it would not only circumscribe the powers and obligations and duties of the Senate members of the joint committee in discharging their constitutional responsibilities in the matter of Presidential appointments, but I think that, if adopted, it would even tend to circumscribe the powers which I believe are inherent in the original Atomic Energy Act. For that reason I ask that the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut to the substitute amendment be rejected.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to make a few brief remarks respecting this whole situation. I believe it might be better for me to make them prior to the submission to a vote of the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut to the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from California.

Mr. President, some weeks ago the Senate briefly one afternoon debated the original bill, for which a substitute is now presented. At that time the junior Senator from Florida made strong opposition to certain provisions of the original bill, because he regarded them as not in accordance with the Constitution. The Senate will remember that at that time the bill as then drawn would have required the President of the United States to have an investigation made by the FBI of any prospective appointee before making the appointment, and would likewise have required that before the appointee took office the President of the United States should communicate to the Senate not only the name of the appointee, but also the information file submitted by the FBI. It was the contention of the junior Senator from Florida and others at that time that those provisions would have manifestly restricted the appointive power of the President and would have violated the provisions of the Constitution wth reference thereto. In the course of that debate the junior Senator from Florida stated that he was thoroughly in accord with the ideas of those who were sponsoring this particular legislation, as explained in the debate. The sponsors of the legislation believed that the Senate Members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, discharging their duties as a special Senate committee to investigate the qualifications of appointees for the information of the Senate, should have access to the skill, facilities, and personnel of the FBI, which I suspect is the best known, and perhaps the most capable agency of its kind in existence, if they desired to have the services of the FBI agents. At that time I stated that I would be happy to support any rewriting of the bill which would make such a provision. It seems to me that the substitute now offered attempts to do exactly that—namely, to drop any question whatsoever of either coercing the President or requiring the President to furnish to the Senate the results of the investigation made for him by the FBI. To the contrary, the substitute measure simply provides, in rather clear terms, as I read it, that the Senate Members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, serving as a special Senate committee, shall have the right and privilege, in their judgment, to resort to the facilities and personnel of the FBI, and to direct the FBI to assist them in making an investigation of presidential appointees to membership on the Atomic Energy Commission, as well as in the case of an appointment to the office of General Manager of the Commission.

I do not think this is anything new constitutionally, and I do not believe there is a constitutional question. I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that we are not attempting to coerce any other department by a Senate resolution or by a joint resolution. Instead, we are considering a proposed amendment to an act which, if it becomes law, will have to be passed not only by this body, but by the House, and later will be subjected to the scrutiny of the Executive. It is exactly as if in the beginning, in the creation of this particular Federal agency, the FBI, Congress had decided that the FBI, in addition to being available for the rendition of service to the Executive Department, should be also, on a particular occasion and in a particular matter which materially pertained to the discharge of the constitutional duties of the Senate, available to the committee of the Senate which is charged with responsibility for making investigations.

It seems to me that there is no constitutional question, but that, to the contrary, we are merely asked to consider a proposed amendment to the law which, if it becomes law, will have had to run the gauntlet of both Houses of Congress and of the executive authority, an amendment of the law which does not at all seek to give any Members of this body, or any committee of this body, the power to direct the Executive to submit his file, or to direct the FBI to furnish copies of reports which it has made to the Executive, but instead would simply give power to the special committee of this body to utilize and avail itself of the services, skill, and experience of the personnel of the FBI in this very vital matter, if it felt that it was necessary to do so.

It seems to me that this is a very vital question. In a perfectly constitutional way it is sought to amend the act so as to permit this body to have access to the skill, experience, and personnel of the FBI. I am for it, because I do not believe that a committee of this body could hope to find anywhere else, reaching as it might for specially skilled personnel, a comparable agency already established for the purpose of making special investigations, already having established procedures which would enable it to act skillfully and swiftly in procuring vital information which should be procured and made available to Members of the Senate in the interest of the Nation and of the Senate.

So, Mr. President, I am for the substitute bill. I wish now to speak briefly to the amendment offered by my friend the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], which I think would be an unhappy amendment to add to the proposed substitute for the original bill. The amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut would in effect hold that this investigatorial function for which the members of the Special Senate Committee on Atomic Energy—and that is what it would become—can ask in the event it wishes to

do so, shall apply to all new appointees from now on, but shall not apply in the event some of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission or the present Manager should be renominated by the President to succeed themselves. An exemption often carries with it a suspicion that there is a reason for it. I know that there is no reason for it, because we all know that the members and the General Manager of the Atomic Energy Commission, insofar as their functions have been reported to us, have performed their duty well, and are serving well and ably. I pay tribute to the skillful and continuous contact which has been maintained by Members of our body and Members of the House of Representatives with the Atomic Energy Commission as it has performed its vital functions. We know from all the reports which have come to us that the functions have been well performed, and that the Commission is serving well and ably.

But in the event that there may be after a few months—as there must be under the law—nominations for members to succeed the present members, whether by way of renomination or by way of new nominations, or whether—and I call particular attention to this—it be by way of some renominations and some new nominations, I think that this machinery should be available. The enactment of this provision would be an indication that it is the best machinery available. It is for that reason that we are asked to give our committee access to this machinery. I think that the best machinery should be available to our committee, whether to investigate new appointees or old ones, or whether to investigate some who are new appointees and some who are old appointees.

I invite the attention of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut particularly to this point: If a group of nominations should be submitted to us, part of which were nominations of new members chosen from the general body of the public for the performance of these important functions, and part of them renominations, I think it would be highly unfortunate to have our Senate committee in a position where it could not avail itself of the services of the FBI as to all of them, but must pick and choose, using one service to check on one appointee, and another service to check on another appointee, or other appointees. It seems to me that the democratic method, and also the efficient method, if it be admitted that the FBI is the best possible organization for the rendition of this particular service, is for the services of the FBI to be available to Members of the Senate on this committee, whether it be to examine the qualifications of new members or the continuing qualifications of old members.

Frankly, I feel that those who are now serving as members of the Commission, as well as the present General Manager, would themselves be the first to say that they would prefer to have exactly the same kind of investigatory machinery available to inspect the records which they have made as would be available to inspect the records of others.

One further observation and I shall be through. It seems to me that there is some merit to the contention made by several Senators that the reference in the proposed substitute to "the Senate committee," as those words appear in lines 8 and 9 on page 2, and as they appear again in lines 11 and 12 on page 2, may be confusing or misleading. I suggest that any confusion caused by the use of the words "the Senate committee" can easily be eliminated by the adoption of an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute; and I think the best place to put the proposed clarifying amendment would be in line 4, on page 1, just after the word "committee."

I suggest the insertion of the words, "hereinafter referred to in this subsection (e) as 'the Senate committee.' ", in the sole hope that the submission of this amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute and its adoption and insertion at that place will create a situation under which no possible confusion could continue to exist because of the words "the Senate committee" in the two later places in the amendment.

So, Mr. President, I offer the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, although I think the debate on the floor has clearly indicated the congressional intent in this matter, I believe that the suggestion which has been made by the able junior Senator from Florida is a constructive one, and I am perfectly willing to accept it as a perfecting amendment to my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California so accept it?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is that agreeable to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. HOLLAND. Certainly. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, in closing, let me briefly call attention to the fact that in the judgment of the junior Senator from Florida it is nothing new at all, either to Federal law or to State law, to have, created by statute, agencies which have functions which they perform sometimes for one of the three coordinate branches and sometimes for another. In this connection, I point out that all the States operate under constitutions much like the Federal Constitution in regard to the matter of the division into three separate and independent branches of government.

I recall perfectly well, for instance, that in the State of Florida—and I happen to know that other States have the same kind of set-up, and I believe that it exists in the Federal Government—we have a set-up under which one who is serving as a parole and probation officer may serve for 1 day or for part of a day in obtaining information to advise the court as to what the court may wish to do in imposing sentence and as to whether any probationary provisions are to be included in the sentence which is to be imposed, whereas later during the same day or on a subsequent day the same person may advise the branch of the executive department which has to do with penal institutions, and later on that day or on a subsequent day the same person, serving because he is a good investigator, may be advising the Governor on the question of the granting of clemency, or may be advising the State pardon board in regard to a similar question.

So it is nothing new in State-governmental affairs for that kind of statutory set-up to create offices in which the same personnel, because they are highly qualified, may be called upon for service by one, two, or three, as the case may be, of the coordinate branches of government.

The Senate knows that I have not served for a long time in this body; but I think there are abundant instances wherein Congress has directed, by the enactment of acts of Congress or by the adoption of resolutions on the part of one or the other of the two branches of Congress, an executive department to furnish transportation, through its vehicles or personnel, to Members of Congress or congressional committees. I do not believe it has been urged that there was anything unconstitutional in that respect. Quite to the contrary, unless I have greatly misunderstood the situation, a considerable amount of such transportation, both all over this Nation, and rather generally throughout the world, by means of vehicles and personnel of the military department, an executive agency, has been accorded to Members of Congress or to congressional committees, enabling those Members of Congress or those congressional committees the better to perform their functions. Similarly, I think we could mention many other activities in which a similar situation exists. The distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has mentioned one of them—the General Accounting Office—and has referred to its diverse services rendered one day to the legislative branch and the next day to the executive branch—and very properly so.

Mr. President, we cannot afford to set up a group of skilled experts, and at the same time provide that they cannot serve anyone but one branch of the Government. They may be so highly skilled and it may be so expensive to acquire that skill, that we would not wish to duplicate them or even to have three agencies of that particular kind with that particular skill and that particular experience.

Not only do I believe that no constitutional point is involved here, but I think there are abundant precedents under which, by act of Congress—and that is what we are asked to pass here; not simply to adopt a Senate resolution or to pass a joint resolution of the Congress, but to pass an act of Congress which, when enacted, will become the law—the existing law may be amended in such a way that a skilled agency, which has been set up and has acquired a considerable amount of experience through its service, may be made available to a congressional committee which is rendering service of great importance to the Congress and of vital importance to the Nation.

So I do not believe there is any conceivable reason why this measure should not be adopted.

I regret to say that I hope the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] will be rejected, because it seems to me that its result would be that a proven

piece of governmental machinery would not be available in all cases, and the amendment would make a distinction, which would not be at all justified, between investigating citizens who now are serving and citizens who may be appointed in the future. Furthermore, as I suggested a moment ago, the amendment might bring about a situation in which our committee could turn to the FBI for information in regard to part of a certain group of appointees at a particular time, but would be denied the right of calling upon the FBI for information regarding another part of that group of appointees at exactly the same time.

So I hope the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut will be rejected, and I hope the amendment in the nature of a substitute will be adopted. I believe it is a good thing for the Nation to make available to those who advise the Senate the services of the FBI in this matter which is of vital importance to our national security.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, there does not seem to be a great deal to be gained by pursuing the constitutional argument which I have made earlier. I should say that the argument made by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] follows the argument made by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and that argument finds favor with the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. I think it would be well to insert in the RECORD at this point a very fine compilation of the law and the policy behind the refusals on the part of the Chief Executive to turn over to the Congress certain papers of the executive branch of the Government. They started in George Washington's time, and have been followed ever since. The compilation is in the form of a letter dated April 30, 1941, addressed to Hon. CARL VINSON, of the House of Representatives, by the then Attorney General, Hon. Robert H. Jackson.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 30, 1941.

Hon. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, House Committee on Naval Affairs.

MY DEAR MR. VINSON: I have your letter of April 23, requesting that your committee be furnished with all Federal Bureau of Investigation reports since June 1939, together with all future reports, memoranda, and correspondence of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or the Department of Justice, in connection with "investigations made by the Department of Justice arising out of strikes, subversive activities in connection with labor disputes, or labor disturbances of any kind in industrial establishments which have naval contracts, either as prime contractors or subcontractors."

Your request to be furnished reports of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is one of the many made by congressional committees. I have on my desk at this time two other such requests for access to Federal Bureau of Investigation files. The number of these requests would alone make compliance impracticable, particularly where the requests are of so comprehensive a character as those contained in your letter. In view of the increasing frequency of these requests, I desire to restate our policy at some length, together with the reasons which require it.

It is the position of this Department, restated now with the approval of and at the direction of the President, that all investigative reports are confidential documents of the executive department of the Government, to aid in the duty laid upon the President by the Constitution to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed," and that congressional or public access to them would not be in the public interest.

Disclosure of the reports could not do otherwise than seriously prejudice law enforcement. Counsel for a defendant or prospective defendant, could have no greater help than to know how much or how little information the Government has, and what witnesses or sources of information it can rely upon. This is exactly what these reports are intended to contain.

Disclosure of the reports at this particular time would also prejudice the national defense and be of aid and comfort to the very subversive elements against which you wish to protect the country. For this reason we have made extraordinary efforts to see that the results of counterespionage activities and intelligence activities of this Department involving those elements are kept within the fewest possible hands. A catalogue of persons under investigation or suspicion, and what we know about them, would be of inestimable service to foreign agencies, and information which could be so used cannot be too closely guarded.

Moreover, disclosure of the reports would be of serious prejudice to the future usefulness of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. As you probably know, much of this information is given in confidence and can only be obtained upon pledge not to disclose its sources. A disclosure of the sources would embarrass informants—sometimes in their employment, sometimes in their social relations, and in extreme cases might even endanger their lives. We regard the keeping of faith with confidential informants as an indispensable condition of future efficiency.

Disclosure of information contained in the reports might also be the grossest kind of injustice to innocent individuals. Investigative reports include leads and suspicions, and sometimes even the statements of malicious or misinformed people. Even though later and more complete reports exonerate the individuals, the use of particular or selected reports might constitute the grossest injustice, and we all know that a correction never catches up with an accusation.

In concluding that the public interest does not permit general access to Federal Bureau of Investigation reports for information by the many congressional committees who from time to time ask it, I am following the conclusions reached by a long line of distinguished predecessors in this office who have uniformly taken the same view. Examples of this are to be found in the following letters, among others:

Letter of Attorney General Knox to the Speaker of the House, dated April 27, 1904, declining to comply with a resolution of the House requesting the Attorney General to furnish the House with all papers and documents and other information concerning the investigation of the Northern Securities case.

Letter of Attorney General Bonaparte to the Speaker of the House, dated April 13, 1908, declining to comply with a resolution of the House requesting the Attorney General to furnish to the House information concerning the investigation of certain corporations engaged in the manufacture of wood pulp or print paper.

Letter of Attorney General Wickersham to the Speaker of the House, dated March 18, 1912, declining to comply with a resolution of the House directing the Attorney General to furnish to the House information concerning an investigation of the smelter trust.

Letter of Attorney General McReynolds to the Secretary to the President, dated August 28, 1914, stating that it would be incompatible with the public interest to send to the Senate in response to its resolution, reports made to the Attorney General by his associates regarding violations of law by the Standard Oil Co.

Letter of Attorney General Gregory to the President of the Senate, dated February 23, 1915, declining to comply with a resolution of the Senate requesting the Attorney General to report to the Senate his findings and conclusions in the investigation of the smelting industry.

Letter of Attorney General Sargent to the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, dated June 8, 1926, declining to comply with his request to turn over to the committee all papers in the files of the Department relating to the merger of certain oil companies.

In taking this position my predecessors in this office have followed eminent examples.

Since the beginning of the Government, the executive branch has from time to time been confronted with the unpleasant duty of declining to furnish to the Congress and to the courts information which it has acquired and which is necessary to it in the administration of statutes. As early as 1796, the House of Representatives requested President Washington to lay before the House a copy of the instructions to ministers of the United States who negotiated a treaty with Great Britain, together with the correspondence and other documents relating to that treaty. In declining to comply with the request, President Washington said:

"* * * as it is essential to the due administration of the Government that the boundaries fixed by the Constitution between the different departments should be preserved, a just regard to the Constitution and to the duty of my office * * * forbids a compliance with your request." (See Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, v. 1, pp. 194, 196.)

In 1825, the House of Representatives requested President Monroe to transmit certain documents relating to the conduct of the officers of the Navy of the United States on the Pacific Ocean, and of other public agents in South America. In his reply, President Monroe refused to comply with the request, stating that to do so might subject individuals to unjust criticism; that the individuals involved should not be censured without just cause, which could not be ascertained until after a thorough and impartial investigation of their conduct; and that under those circumstances it was thought that communication of the documents would not comport with the public interest nor with what was due to the parties concerned. (See Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. 2, p. 278.)

In 1833, the Senate requested President Jackson to communicate to that body a copy of a paper purporting to have been read by him to the heads of the executive departments, dated September 18, 1833, relating to the removal of the deposits of the public money from the Bank of the United States. President Jackson declined. See Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. 3, p. 36.)

In 1835 the Senate passed a resolution requesting President Jackson to communicate copies of the charges, if any, which might have been made to him against the official conduct of Gideon Fitz, late surveyor general south of the State of Tennessee, which caused his removal from office. In reply, President Jackson again declined to comply. (See Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. 3, pp. 132–133.)

This discretion in the executive branch has been upheld and respected by the judiciary. The courts have repeatedly held that they will not and cannot require the executive to produce such papers when in the opinion of the executive their production is contrary to the public interests. The courts have also held that the question whether the production of the papers would be against the public interest is one for the

executive and not for the courts to determine. (*Marbury* v. *Madison* (1 Cranch 137, 169); *Totten* v. *United States* (92 U. S. 105); *Kilbourn* v. *Thompson* (103 U. S. 168, 190); *Vogel* v. *Gruaz* (110 U. S. 311); *In re Quarles and Butler* (158 U. S. 532); *Boske* v. *Comingore* (177 U. S. 459); *In re Huttman* (70 Fed. 699); *In re Lamberton* (124 Fed. 446); *In re Valecia Condensed Milk Co.* (240 Fed. 310); *Elrod* v. *Moss* (278 Fed. 123); *Arnstein* v. *United States* (296 Fed. 946); *Gray* v. *Pentland* (2 Sergeant & Rawle's (Pa.), 23, 28); *Thompson* v. *German Valley R. Co.* (22 N. J. Equity 111); *Worthington* v. *Scribner* (109 Mass. 487); *Appeal of Hartranft* (85 Pa. 433, 445); *2 Burr Trials* (533–536); see also 25 Op. A. G. 326.)

In *Kilbourn* v. *Thompson*, supra, the Court said:

"It is believed to be one of the chief merits of the American system of written constitutional law that all the powers intrusted to government, whether State or National, are divided into the three grand departments—the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. That the functions appropriate to each of these branches of government shall be vested in a separate body of public servants, and that the perfection of the system requires that the lines which separate and divide these departments shall be broadly and clearly defined. It is also essential to the successful working of this system that the persons intrusted with power in any one of these branches shall not be permitted to encroach upon the powers confided to the others, but that each shall by the law of its creation be limited to the exercise of the powers appropriate to its own department and no other."

In *Appeal of Hartranft*, supra, the Court said:

"We had better at the outstart recognize the fact, that the executive department is a coordinate branch of the Government, with power to judge what should or should not be done, within its own department, and what of its own doings and communications should or should not be kept secret, and that with it, in the exercise of these constitutional powers, the courts have no more right to interfere, than has the executive, under like conditions, to interfere with the courts."

The information here involved was collected, and is chiefly valuable, for use by the executive branch of the Government in the execution of the laws. It can be of little, if any, value in connection with the framing of legislation or the performance of any other constitutional duty of the Congress. We do not undertake to investigate strikes as to their justification or the lack of it, but confine investigation to alleged violations of law, including of course violation of statutes designed to suppress subversive activity, and to general intelligence to guide executive policy. Certainly, the evil which would necessarily flow from its untimely publication would far outweigh any possible good.

I am not unmindful of your conditional suggestion that your counsel will keep this information "inviolate until such time as the committee determines its disposition." I have no doubt that this pledge would be kept and that you would weigh every consideration before making any matter public. Unfortunately, however, a policy cannot be made anew because of personal confidence of the Attorney General in the integrity and good faith of a particular committee chairman. We cannot be put in the position of discriminating between committees or of attempting to judge between them, and their individual members, each of whom has access to information once placed in the hands of the committee.

Of course, where the public interest has seemed to justify it, information as to particular situations has been supplied to congressional committees by me and by former Attorneys General. For example, I have taken the position that committees called upon to pass on the confirmation of persons recommended for appointment by the Attorney General would be afforded confidential access to any information that we have—because no candidate's name is submitted without his knowledge and the Department does not intend to submit the name of any person whose entire history will not stand light. By way of further illustration, I may mention that pertinent information would be supplied in impeachment proceedings, usually instituted at the suggestion of the Department and for the good of the administration of justice.

It is for the reasons given that I feel it my duty to decline your request, believing that in them you will find justification for my refusal.

Respectfully,

ROBERT H. JACKSON.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I appreciate the fact that the Senator from Michigan does not believe that the opinion expressed by Mr. Jackson is in point. However, that can be determined at a later time, and I presume it will be determined in another forum.

I wish to make one thing clear, and then I shall desist: There is no intention on my part to demonstrate any lack of confidence in the investigatory agency of the Department of Justice, namely, the Federal Bureau of Investigation. That is not my intention, and I am sure I made that point more than clear when I spoke on Thursday. I would take the same attitude if it were the Secret Service that was ordered under legislation to do the kind of thing here suggested, or any other investigating agency of the United States Government.

Furthermore, Mr. President—and let this be in the RECORD—if perchance there should be a change in the Executive at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue at any time while I sit as a Member of this body, the position I take today will be exactly the position I shall take then upon any attempt to destroy what I regard as a very essential provision of the Constitution. Let me say to Senators who are present that there is no provision of the Constitution the religious observance of which is better calculated to insure justice and liberty to the people of the United States than the provision that judges shall judge, legislators shall legislate, and executives shall execute.

I say in closing, and with this I shall take my seat, that implicit in the proposal is a statement by the Senate of the United States that with all the money at our command and with all the services of the Senate at our command we feel we are not capable of discharging the duties imposed upon us by the Constitution of the United States. That is the issue, and I prefer to register my vote as one who believes that the Senate can obtain all the information that is either necessary or desirable in passing upon Presidential nominations.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the fact that the able Senator from Connecticut has introduced the opinion of Mr. Justice Jackson in the RECORD. I think it should be in the RECORD. I think we should all be familiar with it. We faced the same issue in the Joint Committee To Investigate the Pearl Harbor Attack. We were unsuccessful at that time in our efforts to obtain records. We find from day to day that releases have been issued by the Government. Records in the possession of the departments have been published, and it is becoming quite common that all the information is not disclosed to the public, nor is it disclosed to the Senate and House. It seems to me that much of the information in the executive branch is withheld in order that it may later be used in the writing of memoirs and similar books. So I think some day soon we should face this issue of the right of Congress to inquire and to ascertain what is taking place, so that we may legislate properly.

I hope we may get this issue into the courts very soon, and that there may be a decision by the Supreme Court upon the issue. Therefore, I think it is well to have the opinion by Mr. Justice Jackson in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the information of the Senate, the clerk will read the modified amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut to the substitute offered by the Senator from California, as perfected by the latter, to Senate bill 1004.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the perfected substitute amendment of Mr. KNOWLAND, on page 2, line 12, after the word "direct", it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided, however*, That nothing herein shall be applicable to any person serving as a member of the Commission, or the General Manager thereof, on the date of enactment of this proviso in the event any such person is subsequently renominated by the President to be a member of the Commission."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut to the amendment of the Senator from California, as perfected.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs upon agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from California, as by him perfected.

The amendment as perfected was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 so as to provide that no person shall take office as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission or as General Manager of such Commission until an investigation with respect to the character, associations, and loyalty of such person shall have been made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

EXTENSION OF THE RECLAMATION LAWS TO ARKANSAS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar 169, the bill (S. 299) to extend the reclamation laws to the State of Arkansas, be made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. "A bill to extend the reclamation laws to the State of Arkansas."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 299) to extend the reclamation laws to the State of Arkansas, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands, with an amendment, on page 1, in line 9, following the word "Arkansas" to insert: "*Provided*, That the generation by, and the disposal and marketing of electric energy and power from, any Federal reclamation project in the State of Arkansas shall be administered by the Bureau of Reclamation through, and in accordance with, the Federal reclamation laws," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the act entitled "An act appropriating the receipts from the sale and disposal of public lands in certain States and Territories to the construction of irrigation works for the reclamation of arid lands," approved June 17, 1902, as amended and supplemented, are hereby extended so as to include and apply to the State of Arkansas: *Provided*, That the generation by, and the disposal and marketing of electric energy and power from, any Federal reclamation project in the State of Arkansas shall be administered by the Bureau of Reclamation through, and in accordance with, the Federal reclamation laws.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has the floor.

Mr. MORSE. I request the floor in my own right.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The bill S. 299, Calendar 169, is now the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND CIVIL OBEDIENCE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have two or three things I want to take care of before I go to another meeting. I want to comment very briefly on a matter that is giving me some little concern, Mr. President. Some days ago at a public hearing conducted by the Armed Services Committee, Mr. Philip Randolph, president of the Sleeping Car Porters Union of this country, testified in regard to legislation being considered by the Armed Services Committee, in respect to military manpower. In the course of Mr. Randolph's testimony he outlined a proposal which in the press has been referred to as a proposal for civil disobedience.

In essence, as the record will show, Mr. President, Mr. Randolph took the position that, even in case of national emergency when it might be necessary to call up even through a draft the able-bodied manpower of this country, in defense of our country, he would follow, and he testified he would recommend that the young men not only of the Negro race but young men generally sharing his views should follow, a course of civil disobedience until the Congress of the United States enacted legislation which would put to an end what he termed to be various types of discrimination in the armed services because of race, color, and creed.

I was somewhat surprised and no little shocked at the position which Mr. Randolph took, because I have a very high regard for him as a very sincere fighter for legitimate civil rights. He is one who, over the years, has pointed out very effectively, not only to the people of his race but to the country generally, the fact that we are not putting into practice in America many of the constitutional guaranties with respect to civil rights.

I think the record is perfectly clear as to the position I have taken on civil-rights issues. In brief, I have taken the position that our constitutional guaranties are the rights of every citizen, regardless of race, color, or creed. I have also taken the position that we have to be realists in the political field, in respect to civil rights, as we have to be realists in every other phase of American politics, and I recognize that we cannot accomplish the full measure of civil rights through legislation overnight, nor can we make progress in this country in a great many fields of social legislation by way of a social avalanche. The test should be the test of progress. Are we moving ahead? Are we really making progress which can be absorbed by the mores of the American people at a given time? I think that is sound, Mr. President. I think it is also sound to insist that the tenets of the Constitution shall be applied to all groups within the country. Certainly, there is a constitutional obligation on the part of all of us, irrespective of race, color, or creed, to defend this country in time of emergency or war, when the security of the Nation is threatened by any foreign power.

That is the position I took in my cross-examination of Mr. Randolph. It was a kindly cross-examination, and I am willing to let the record speak for itself on that score, also. In fact, it was a cross-examination which I submit was in the form of a plea that Mr. Randolph and those who share his views reconsider their position and recognize that, after all, there is a patriotic duty above the social ideal for which Mr. Randolph was pleading in his sincere desire and attempt, I have no doubt, to do what he could to bring to an end a failure on the part of the American people to grant full civil rights to Negroes. This question of civil rights is the responsibility of the people of this country. Even though some would pass the buck to the Congress of the United States, the fact still remains that the people of the United States have not as yet accepted their full civil rights responsibilities under the Constitution. I sought to point out to Mr. Randolph that he and those for whom he speaks have a responsibility in seeing to it that they live up to their constitutional responsibilities, because two wrongs never make a right. I tried to point out in my cross-examination that it is wrong for Mr. Randolph to propose a program of civil disobedience because he objects, as I object, to the failure on the part of the people of the country to live up to their full responsibilities in keeping faith with the civil-rights guaranties of the Constitution.

I did not persuade him. I did not think I could persuade him on that occasion. But I did ask a series of questions which ended with the conclusion for which I had laid a foundation in my cross-examination, namely, that unless he could point to some legal principle of the Constitution which would support his program of civil disobedience, I saw no way of his escaping the application of the law of treason to any such program as he proposed if he should carry it out in times of national emergency.

Because of the next point I want to mention in regard to the subject, Mr. President, I ask to have printed at this point in my remarks edited excerpts from the hearings before the Armed Services Committee, setting forth my questions and Mr. Randolph's responses to my questions on the occasion to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator MORSE. Mr. Randolph, I want to question you a bit on your proposal for civil disobedience. Up until now refusal to serve in the military forces of this country in time of national emergency has been limited as far as one's psychological attitudes are concerned, to conscientious objections to war, the participating in war.

It is based upon the legal theory of freedom of religion in this country, that if one's religious scruples are such that in good conscience he cannot bring himself to participate in war, which involves the taking of human life, our Government has protected him in that religious belief, and we have our so-called exemption on the ground of conscientious objection.

Now, this proposal of yours—I am not one to minimize your testimony—your proposal is not based upon conscientious objection in the sense that the American law has recognized it to date; am I not right about that?

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is correct.

Senator MORSE. But your proposal, and put me straight on this, your proposal is really based upon conviction that because your Government has not given you certain social, economic, and race protection from discrimination because of race, color, or creed, you feel that even in a time of national emergency, when your Government and the country itself may be at stake, you are justified in saying to any segment of our populace—whether it is the colored group or, as you say in your statement, the white group with like sympathies—that under those circumstances you would be justified then in saying, "Do not shoulder arms in protection of your country in this national emergency"?

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is a correct statement, Mr. Senator.

I may add that it is my deep conviction that in taking such a position we are doing our country a great service. Our country has come out before the world as the moral leader of democracy, and it is preparing its defense forces and aggressive forces upon the theory that it must do this to protect democracy in the world.

Well, now, I consider that if this country does not develop the democratic process at home and make the democratic process work by giving the very people whom they propose to draft in the Army to fight for them democracy, democracy then is not the type of democracy that ought to be fought for, and, as a matter of fact, the policy of segregation in the armed forces and in other avenues of our life is the greatest single propaganda and political weapon in the hands of Russia and international communism today.

Senator MORSE. I understand your position, Mr. Randolph, but for the record I want to direct your attention to certain basic legal principles which I want to say, most kindly are being overlooked in your position. I want to discuss your position from the standpoint of a couple of hypotheticals and relate them to certain legal principles which I think you ought to give very careful consideration to before you follow the course of action which you have indicated.

Let us assume this hypothetical. A country proceeds to attack the United States or commits acts which make it perfectly clear that our choice is only the choice of war. Would you take the position then that unless our Government granted the demands which are set out in your testimony, or most of the demands set out in your testimony, that you would recommend a course of civil disobedience to our Government?

Mr. RANDOLPH. In answer to that question, the Government now has time to change its policy on segregation and discrimination and if the Government does not change its policy on segregation and discrimination in the interests of the very democracy it is fighting for, I would advocate that Negroes take no part in the Army.

Senator MORSE. My hypothetical assumes that up to the time of the emergency set forth in my hypothetical, our Government does not follow in any degree whatsoever the course of action that you recommend.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Senator MORSE. So the facts of the hypothetical then are thrust upon us and I understand your answer to be that under those circumstances even though it was perfectly clear that we would have to fight then to exist as a country, you would still recommend the program of civil disobedience?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Because I would believe that that is in the interest of the soul of our country and I unhesitatingly and very adamantly hold that that is the only way by which we are going to be able to make America wake up and realize that we do not have democracy here as long as one black man is denied all of the rights enjoyed by all the white men in this country.

Senator MORSE. Now, facing realistically that hypothetical situation and the assumption that it has come to pass, do you have any doubt then that this Government as presently constituted under the Constitution that governs us would necessarily follow a legal course of action of applying the legal doctrine of treason to that conduct? Would you question with me that that is the doctrine that undoubtedly will be applied at that time under the circumstances of my hypothetical?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I would anticipate Nationwide terrorism against Negroes who refused to participate in the armed forces, but I believe that that is the price we have to pay for democracy that we want. In other words, if there are sacrifices and sufferings, terrorism, concentration camps, whatever they may be, if that is the only way by which Negroes can get their democratic rights, I unhesitatingly say that we have to face it.

Senator MORSE. But on the basis of the law as it now exists, going back to my premise that you and I know of no legal exemption from participation in military service in the defense of our country other than that of conscientious objection on religious grounds, not on the grounds in which you place your civil disobedience, that then the doctrine of treason would be applied to those people participating in that disobedience?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Exactly. I would be willing to face that doctrine on the theory and on the grounds that we are serving a higher law than the law which applies the act of treason to us when we are attempting to win democracy in this country and to make the soul of America democratic.

I would contend that we are serving a higher law than that law with its legal technicalities, which would include the group which fights for democracy even in the face of a crisis you would portray, I would contend that they are serving a higher law than that law.

Senator MORSE. But you would fully expect that because the law of treason in this country relates to certain specific overt acts on the part of the individual irrespective of what he considers to be his spiritual or moral motivation in justification, that there would not be any other course of action for our Government to follow but indictments for treason?

Mr. RANDOLPH. May I add something there, Mr. Senator?

Senator MORSE. First, do you agree with me that that would be certain to follow?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Let me add here in connection with that that we would participate in no overt acts against our Government, no overt acts of any kind. In other words, ours would be one of nonresistance. Ours would be one of noncooperation; ours would be one of nonparticipation in the military forces of the country.

I want you to know that we would be willing to absorb the violence, to absorb the terrorism, to face the music and to take whatever comes and we, as a matter of fact, consider that we are more loyal to our country than the people who perpetrate segregation and discrimination upon Negroes because of color or race.

I want it thoroughly understood that we would certainly not be guilty of any kind of overt act against the country but we would not participate in any military operation as segregation and Jim Crow slaves in the Army.

Senator MORSE. I think you will agree with me that this is not the time and place for you and me to argue the legal meaning of aiding and abetting the enemy but if you refresh your memory of treason cases, as I have been doing, sitting here this morning, I would only point out to you most kindly that the legal concepts of aiding and abetting are flexible concepts that can be applied to the behavior of individuals which in effect serve the enemy in time of war to the endangerment of the rest of the people of our country.

Furthermore, and I know you are aware of the fact, any such program as you outline would not be a passive program but would be one that would be bound to result in all sorts of overt actions you could not possibly control, but for which you who sponsored it would, as a matter of law, be fixed with the proximate cause of the conduct and, therefore, would be legally responsible for it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I recognize that fact just as for instance a union may call a strike. The union does not promote the violence but the forces that are opposed to the union may create the violence.

Well now, in this instance we are definitely opposed to violence of any kind; we are definitely opposed to any overt acts that would be construed in the form of violence but, nevertheless, we would relentlessly wage a warfare against the Jim Crow, armed forces program and against the Negroes and others participating in that program. That is our position.

Now I do not believe the law up to the present time has been faced with such conditions as to enable it to envisage these principles. In other words, American jurisprudence has never been faced with this kind of a condition and consequently its definition of treason could not possible take in the type and nature of action which we propose in civil disobedience. But however the law may be construed we would be willing to face it on the grounds that our actions would be in obedience and in conformity with the higher law of righteousness than that set forth in the so-called law of treason.

Senator MORSE. I appreciate that the case would go to the United States Supreme Court for final decision as to the application of the legal principles I have discussed here this morning. I would say most kindly and most sincerely that I have no doubt in my mind that under the circumstances of my hypothetical there is only one decision that could be handed down and that is that the law of treason would be applicable.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am through with this line of questioning. I felt it necessary to raise these questions. I know Mr. Randolph and I know the fight he has put up for social justice in support of the principles that he believes to be right. I think he knows me, at least I think he knows that I sincerely believe in fighting for putting into effect in America the civil-rights guaranties of the Constitution which for too long have not been put into effect in their full meaning. I agree that both parties too frequently have been guilty of political professings rather than political action in support of the principles of Constitutional Rights.

I do want to say with all the sincerity that I possess that I do not think the proposal you offer is the way to establish full civil rights in America.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I say I was shocked at the position taken by Mr. Randolph, because I do not think the philosophy of Gandhi, about which he spoke, can, under our written Constitution, be applied in this country through a program of civil disobedience. Gandhi had no responsibility to a written constitution. Mr. Randolph and his followers do have such a responsibility. Gandhi was not subject to the same legal obligations to which Americans are subject under our Constitution. Mr. Randolph and his followers are subject to those obligations. Save and except the legal doctrine under our Constitution which protects conscientious objectors in the name of freedom of religion and religious belief, I know of no constitutional doctrine which would support anyone in America who is an able-bodied male, in time of war, in refusing to don the uniform of his country in the defense of his country.

Mr. Randolph was very fair to me during my exchange with him, because, as will be seen from the testimony which I have inserted in the RECORD, he did not seek to defend himself or justify his program on the ground of religious scruples, thus bringing himself within the principle which protects conscientious objectors under our Constitution in time of war. Rather, he put his position very bluntly and frankly—and I commend him for his frankness—on the ground that it would be his advice that men should not proceed to defend our Government in the name of democracy when, in regard to this issue, according to his views on this issue, our Government does not practice democracy.

I cannot accept his point of view. I shall not accept it. I want the RECORD to show that if his movement should grow in time of national emergency, and persons should follow what I think is his bad advice in regard to a program of civil disobedience, it is my judgment that the law of treason should be applied. I think it is perfectly clear that under such circumstances a course of conduct based upon civil disobedience would constitute aiding and abetting an enemy. I think,

further, as I pointed out to Mr. Randolph, such a program could not remain in a passive state. There would be overt acts. He testified he would not recommend an overt act. But the very passiveness of the program itself would constitute, in my judgment, an overt act. Further, in my judgment, his acts of omission would constitute in the legal sense acts of commission, and would constitute conspiracy in aiding and abetting an enemy.

Mr. President, I shall continue to support civil-rights legislation in the Senate of the United States, but I want to say to a great many Negroes in this country who are communicating with me these days by wire and by letter, mostly unfriendly in their nature because of the fact that I have challenged Mr. Randolph's program, that they, because of their course of action, must assume a great deal of responsibility for setting back a legislative program of civil rights.

My experience over the years convinces me that the suggestion that Negroes in this country participate in a civil disobedience program is not helping the cause of civil rights legislation in the Congress of the United States. However, my efforts in the interest of such legislation are not going to be lessened any because I find myself in disagreement with certain people within the Negro race who are following what I consider to be a very unwise and at this time a particularly unfortunate course of action.

Mr. President, I should like to insert in the RECORD at this point certain newspaper clippings which have been sent to me from the Negro press bearing upon this subject matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the New Amsterdam News of April 10, 1948]

ONCE OVER LIGHTLY

(By Earl Brown)

A. Philip Randolph is no demagog. Therefore, when he recently told the Senate Armed Services Committee that millions of Negroes will refuse to register or serve under the draft or universal military training system, unless racial segregation and discrimination are ended in the Army, it was more than the statement of a publicity-seeking sensationalist.

Randolph is also no Communist. Neither is Commissioner of Corrections Grant Reynolds, who, as president of the Committee Against Jim Crow in Military Service and Training, also spoke before the Senate committee. Randolph is an old-time Socialist, and as such, a bitter enemy of communism. Reynolds is a Republican, who is being supported to run for Congress from the Twenty-second District by Governor Dewey.

It is important to know that Randolph and Reynolds are neither Communists nor crackpots. Randolph's word particularly carries a great deal of weight among the colored people. He is known as a courageous and honest fighter. He, more than any other man, forced the Pullman Co. to recognize the Sleeping Car Porters Union. Reynolds was a captain-chaplain in World War II. Like all other Negroes who were in the armed forces, he saw and no doubt was subjected to the rankest kinds of segregation and discrimination. Naturally, he will remember them until the day he dies.

Even more important than Randolph's and Reynolds' attitude about the draft and UMT, is that of millions of other Negroes. Many of them feel even more bitter about the raw, undemocratic deal they got and are still getting in the armed services than Reynolds and Randolph. They may not be as articulate as these two men, but in their souls they hate the Army, the Navy, and the entire military set-up of the United States. They hate it, because they are made to feel inferior to white soldiers; they are treated like colonials instead of citizens.

The important point for the Senators who serve on the Armed Services Committee to remember about what Randolph and Reynolds said is this: a man, white or black, cannot fight for his country with any heart or courage unless he knows he has the respect of his country. This, the Negroes know they do not have, in spite of some protestations to the contrary by those who want to use the Negro for whatever they can get out of him.

The fact that Randolph and Reynolds voiced the attitude of millions of Negroes about the armed forces should sober the people of this country more than ever before. For the United States is faced with a worldwide revolution with communism and socialism sweeping everything before them. In order to stop the march of the former and in order to get along with the socialistic countries in Europe and elsewhere, America must practice democracy not only in her armed forces but also in her civilian life.

For it is possible that American democracy will lose in the battle against communism because of racial and religious discrimination and segregation.

If colored Americans refuse to shoulder a rifle for their country, they would be guilty of treason under the law. They would also give the native Fascists an excuse to lynch and otherwise terrorize more of them than they are now. But this would not help the United States win in its world-wide fight against communism. On the other hand, it would aid the Communists from Manchuria to England in their determination to gain control of the world.

The challenge is clearly up to the Government and the generals and admirals. The challenge was not made by Randolph and Reynolds, but by democracy itself. For Reynolds and Randolph, though they spoke boldly, did not cause millions of Negroes to hate the Army and the Navy. The Army and Navy did that themselves. The only way they can win the respect and support of the colored citizens is by demonstrating their ability to practice democracy by abolishing Jim Crow and discrimination.

In the meantime, Randolph, in championing civil disobedience or passive resistance relative to the draft and UMT, is taking a leaf out of the late Gandhi's book. Randolph, however, is going a step farther. The Indians were not citizens during Britain's control of India. On the other hand, American Negroes are legally citizens of the United States, and therefore are in a different position than colonials. Indeed, Negroes have a greater responsibility to their country than the Indians had to Britain. By the same token, their country has a greater responsibility to the Negroes. It is time that the United States stopped making a farce out of the citizenship of 15,000,000 colored Americans.

WHAT LEADERS THINK OF RANDOLPH BLAST

A. Philip Randolph's assertion during the Senate hearing on military training and selective service here last week that he would urge Negroes not to bear arms in protest against segregation in the armed forces touched off considerable comment from leaders in the District. Here is what some of them had to say:

Congressman WILLIAM L. DAWSON, Democrat, of Illinois: "I positively believe it is my duty at all times to defend my native land. I was among the first volunteers in the First World War and feel it is a patriotic must."

Attorney George E. C. Hayes (District of Columbia Board of Education): "Citizenship, in my opinion, has a twofold consequence, involving benefits and obligations on the part of individuals and the Government.

"I do not believe, however, that the answer is for the Negro to fail to meet the demands of citizenship."

Judge James A. Cobb (Ex-District of Columbia municipal court judge): "I have a very high regard for the character and integrity of Mr. Randolph, and it is a pity that we have such a situation in America—provoking him to make such a declaration."

Jesse O. Thomas (American Red Cross executive): "What you may say in a church mass meeting, under a lather of emotion, is one thing, but what you say to your government or a formal representation of it, is certainly something else.

"I have not had opportunity to read and digest Mr. Randolph's message as yet, but, on first impulse, I would say it isn't the best procedure to make a threat which you cannot carry out."

Beltran Barker (District of Columbia businessman): "Philip Randolph said what a whole lot of people privately think, and, no doubt, would say in bold words, if they were not, first, Americans. By that, I mean good American citizens.

"Mr. Randolph played a 'winning hand' but what if he were returned loser; where will we (colored Americans) be? We will have gained nothing and, besides, risked our stake in the future of this Nation."

Charles C. Coley (District of Columbia businessman): "I definitely share the opinion which Mr. Randolph so well stated. This is a parallel to the conscientious objector; the difference being that the usual protest is based on religious conviction. Here, the objection is on civil considerations."

The Reverend W. H. Jernagin (Mount Carmel Baptist Church pastor): "It is regrettable that Mr. Randolph was so aggravated that he made that statement. As a Christian leader I have always and will continue to advocate granting of full constitutional rights to minority groups, but I believe it can be achieved through lawful and loyal methods."

Dr. E. B. Henderson (public-school official): "I cannot believe Mr. Randolph would advocate Negroes becoming treasonous, despite his testimony. I rather think he sensed the growing resentment of thousands of Negroes toward America's failure to grant its colored citizens the rights that even former enemy aliens have in this country."

[From the Pittsburgh Courier of April 10, 1948]

SEGREGATION IN THE ARMED SERVICES

As the shadows of world war III gather, the demand for peacetime conscription under digestible euphemisms is spurred by numerous Government officials, publishers, and private citizens of influence throughout the land.

Last week the attitude of many American colored citizens on the subject was expressed by A. Philip Randolph, Grant Reynolds, Truman K. Gibson, and Walter White before the Senate Armed Forces Committee which is considering the matter, and in the public prints.

While none of these spokesmen seemed opposed to the idea of peacetime conscription, all of them denounced the evident intention of proponents of the pending legislation to perpetuate the traditional policy of segregation of Negroes in the armed services.

Messrs. Randolph and Reynolds voiced the extremist viewpoint which advises Negro draftees to ignore the conscription law if passed and to refuse military service unless the segregationist policy is abandoned and one of complete integration adopted, while Messrs. Gibson and White, taking a more moderate view, nevertheless insisted that Jim Crow in the armed services be banned.

The Senate committee was warned of the bitterness of American colored people about the persistent policy of military segregation, and it does not seem that this attitude was exaggerated even by the extremists, although there is little evidence that many colored youths will adopt the drastic course advocated by Randolph and Reynolds.

Negroes are unquestionably bitter about the useless and unnecessary Jim Crow policy which the armed services persist in perpetuating even in the face of a global war of unprecedented intensity and extent, but there is little indication at this time that there is any appreciable support for a policy of civil disobedience in order to defeat it.

The patriotism and sacrifices of the colored citizens in all national emergencies are traditional and well known, and it is extremely unlikely that they will abandon this policy regardless of provocation, no matter how great it may be.

Alone among the various elements constituting the American Nation, the Negro has never produced any traitors and we do not believe he ever will.

Moreover it would be extremely dangerous, and perhaps catastrophic, if the idea became widespread that there was any intention on the part of even a small segment of the colored population to hamper national defense in any way because of refusal of the Government to practice at home what it preaches abroad.

The Pittsburgh Courier was one of the earliest advocates of erasure of the color line in the armed services and will continue to maintain that position, but it is unalterably opposed to the advocacy of any extremist policy which would certainly boomerang against all of our people with unfortunate promptitude.

We want an end to color segregation in the armed services and everywhere else in American life, but we are determinedly set against any policy which would in any way injure this Nation because the majority of its citizens as represented by Congress do not agree with us.

We are for democracy, which means majority rule, and while we hope and work for the adoption of a national policy of complete integration of all of the elements in this country in every field of endeavor without racial or creedal discrimination, we counsel at all times complete cooperation with the adopted policies of the Government which represents that majority.

In a democracy it is necessary to take the bitter with the sweet.

We should battle the issue to the point of decision, and then, if defeated, gracefully accept the decision and cooperate in its implementation. But we should never abandon our fight against discrimination.

[From the Washington Afro-American, April 6, 1948]

SIXTY THOUSAND MINISTERS URGED TO FIGHT JIM-CROW ARMY—REPRESENTATIVE POWELL BACKS RANDOLPH, DEFIES TREASON THREAT; SCORES TESTIMONY BY TRUMAN GIBSON

WASHINGTON.—Representative ADAM C. POWELL, JR. (Democrat, New York), testifying last Friday before the Senate's Armed Services Committee, fully supported A. Philip Randolph's civil disobedience threat to keep colored youth out of a Jim Crow army, and called on 60,000 fellow ministers to preach that doctrine. He declared:

"I want to assure you that the testimony given you by Mr. A. Philip Randolph on March 3 did most emphatically state the mood of the vast majority of the 15,000,000 colored Americans. He did not overestimate it."

TIRED OF HYPOCRISY

"They are sick and tired of the hypocritical pretense at democracy now being evidenced by our Congress * * * of the double dealing and double talk they are receiving from both Houses and both parties.

"I want to emphatically assure you that the opposite viewpoint as expressed by Truman Gibson does not even represent the minority opinion.

"Colored veterans and their families will always remember Gibson as the rubber-stamp Uncle Tom who was used during the war by the War Department to cast aspersions on colored troops in Italy while those same troops were shedding their blood and dying."

CAN'T BE FRIGHTENED

"We are not going to to be frightened by the cry of 'Treason.' We, the colored people, for over 300 years have been the most loyal element of this democracy.

"If the finger of treason can be pointed at anyone, it must be pointed at those of you who are traitors to our Constitution and to our Bill of Rights."

NOT ENOUGH JAILS

"There aren't enough jails in America to hold the colored people who will refuse to bear arms in a Jim Crow army.

"If you threaten our leaders, then the 60,000 pulpits of the colored church will thunder through their ministers, against the immoral hypocrisy of you, the leaders.

"I dare you to arrest the 60,000 ministers of God in order to whitewash your un-Americanism."

CONGRESS SCORED

"Step by step, this Congress is pushing the colored people's backs against the wall. Last March, you refused to accept my amendment and you set up a permanent Nurse Corps for the Armed Services which rigidly excluded colored women. You are now planning to present a bill authorizing a permanent Women's Auxiliary to the Armed Services.

"The bill again rigidly excludes colored people, despite the fact that I appeared before the House Armed Services Committee and presented my amendments, but they were overwhelmingly defeated."

WILL SEEK AMENDMENT

"And now you think you can ram Universal Military Training down the throats of the colored people.

"Well you can't. We won't take it. We refuse to bear arms in un-American Jim-Crow armed services. That choice is forced upon us by our God, our conscience, our Constitution, and the Bill of Rights.

"When UMT comes before the House, I promise you that I will fight vigorously and militantly to amend it so that there will be complete nonsegregation in every phase of our armed services."

[From the Washington Afro-American of April 6, 1948]

RANDOLPH WON'T FIGHT

There were thousands of conscientious objectors in the last war. They refused to don a uniform for various reasons.

Some of them had religious scruples. They belonged to the Church of God or the Quakers; or other sects who abhored war. Others were simply pacifists.

We put the pacifists in jail and let the Quakers and Church of God members do noncombatant service behind the lines.

If A. Philip Randolph has his way, we will have a third class of objectors in the next war.

It will include persons like Lewis P. Jones, of New York, who in 1942, declined to report for a Jim Crow induction in the armed services.

If his idea catches on, it would materially increase the 1,600 objectors we imprisoned in the first years of the last war.

By April 1943, we had 4,630 conscientious objectors in work camps.

Mr. Randolph, who is head of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, told a Senate Armed Services Committee last week that he would urge colored and white youths to refuse to register for another draft, unless the armed services abandoned the present policy of racial segregation.

Commenting on this utterance, the national office of the NAACP said:

"We are not urging colored people to refuse to defend their country in time of danger, but—there is sympathy in many hearts for the point of view expressed by Mr. Randolph."

England's draft policy is broader than ours and recognizes "conscientious objectors to military service without regard to religious belief." In England, the Randolphs could probably get total exemption from all service.

Before we condemn Mr. Randolph too severely, we should recall the case of Mark Ethridge, onetime member of President Roosevelt's Fair Employment Practice Committee, during the last war.

F. D. R., in setting up this committee as a measure designed to help win the war, directed that there should be no discrimination in the employment of workers in war plants because of race, creed, color, or national origins.

In the midst of this effort, Mr. Ethridge objected.

"If," said Mr. Ethridge, "the President's order is designed to stop segregation in war plants, it is futile, if not dangerous, disruptive—a Federal order in the Nazi dictator pattern."

Not only was the Commander in Chief of War compared to Hitler, but Mr. Ethridge declared if that was Mr. Roosevelt's order, the President couldn't enforce it. He said:

"Not even the mechanized armies of the earth, Allied or Axis, could now force the Southern white people to give up the principle of social segregation."

Thus Mr. Ethridge defied the President in time of war. No Senator yelled "Treason."

The best answer to Mr. Ethridge was made by Mr. Randolph, also a member of the committee with Mr. Ethridge, when he said:

"Mr. Ethridge should know that if his statement is true, it is also true that not even all the mechanized armies of the earth, Allies and Axis, could force the colored people to abandon their fight for the destruction of racial discrimination, segregation, and Jim Crow."

It would thus appear that Mr. Randolph's declaration before the Senate Committee last week is a restatement of his position taken 6 years ago.

[From the Pittsburgh Courier of April 10, 1948]

POWELL BLASTS ARMY POLICY—"NOT FRIGHTENED BY CRY OF TREASON"

(By Lem Graves, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—Count Congressman ADAM C. POWELL, JR., Democrat, of New York, in on the "civil disobedience program" if draft legislation which does not abolish Army Jim Crow is passed by Congress.

In a statement filed with the Senate Armed Services Committee last Friday, 2 days after A. Philip Randolph and Grant Reynolds had announced plans for a boycott of a "Jim Crow Army," the Harlem Congressman militantly supported the idea.

Representative POWELL attacked Truman K. Gibson, former civilian aide to the Secretary of War.

Representative POWELL did not testify personally. He sent his testimony in the form of a written statement to Chairman CHAN GURNEY of the Senate committee before

which Mr. Randolph and Mr. Reynolds testified in person Wednesday of last week.

Mr. POWELL's brief statement said, in part:

"I * * * assure you that the testimony by A. Philip Randolph * * * did most emphatically state the mood of a vast majority of the 15,000,000 Negroes in America. He did not overestimate it. Negroes are sick and tired of the hypocritical pretense at democracy now being evidenced by Congress * * * of the double-dealing and double-talk * * * of both Houses and both parties. * * *

"I want to emphatically assure you that the opposite viewpoint as expressed by Truman Gibson does not even represent the minority opinion. Negro veterans and their families will always remember Gibson as the rubber-stamp Uncle Tom who was used by the War Department to cast aspersions on Negro troops in Italy while those same Negroes were shedding their blood and dying.

"We are not going to be frightened by the cry of 'treason.' We, the Negro people, for over 300 years have been the most loyal element of this democracy. If the finger of treason can be pointed at anyone, it must be pointed at those of you who are traitors to our Constitution and to our Bill of Rights.

"There aren't enough jails to hold the Negro people who will refuse to bear arms in a Jim Crow army."

Representative POWELL then said that "60,000 pulpits of the Negro church will thunder * * * against the immoral hypocrisy. I dare you to arrest the 60,000 ministers of God in order to whitewash your un-Americanism."

He pledged to fight universal military training vigorously to amend it so there will be complete nonsegregation.

[From the New York Amsterdam News of April 10, 1948]

MAJORITY BACKS PLEA, BUT WITH A FEW IF'S—VETERAN SPOKESMAN SAYS OLD FOLKS SHOULD LET YOUNGSTERS DECIDE ISSUE

(By S. W. Garlington)

The entire Nation, both black and white, as well as many interested countries throughout the world, showed concern last week when A. Philip Randolph, as spokesman for the Committee Against Jim Crow in Military Service and Training, sounded the tocsin for civil disobedience for black Americans, by declaring that if the powers to be did not outlaw Jim Crow in all forms of military service, that he and his followers would stage a Nation-wide campaign against the draft, which, in plain language, means that the famous Laborite will urge Negroes to ignore a draft call, unless safeguards against racial discrimination and Jim Crow treatment are provided.

Randolph, along with Grant Reynolds, both of Harlem and executives of the Committee Against Jim Crow, issued the demand and threat on Wednesday, March 31, in Washington during a hearing of the Senate Armed Services Committee. As soon as Randolph delivered his ultimatum, Senator WAYNE MORSE (Republican, Oregon) warned that if such (the civil disobedience program) were put into operation, that the leaders, along with millions of other Negroes, would possibly face charges of treason. However, Randolph stood his grounds and said that if such be the price of absolute equality, then he and his followers were willing to accept the consequences.

PARTIAL AGREEMENT

Just like Randolph startled the Nation during the Roosevelt era, with his threatened march on Washington, which led to the now defunct Temporary Federal Fair Employment Practice Committee, his move last week was just as startling—with one single exception. During his threatened march, he consulted various leaders and groups on the subject, and secured almost 100-percent approval. But this year he went into his demand almost single-handed. And as such, groups, leaders, and people in the street would back him—but only with reservation.

One of the first groups to come out in partial support of Randolph's position was the NAACP. Walter White, its (NAACP's) executive secretary, stated that his group was wholeheartedly behind Randolph's appeal to end Jim Crow in the armed forces, but added that the NAACP would not advise the Negro to refuse to take up arms if he were needed to defend his country.

Before White completed his comment, he added that the remedy is not to threaten treason trials, but to give these loyal citizens the democracy they are expected and asked to die to defend.

ROTC PLEDGES LOYALTY

Another partial approval came from the presidents of 13 Negro land-grant colleges, who stated last week: that graduates of ROTC would be obliged to enter the armed forces—if the Government requested that step. This pledge of loyalty was implied in a discussion of college needs before the Gray committee in the District of Columbia, which is studying civilian components of the armed forces.

When contacted by the Amsterdam News for a comment on Randolph's position and program, Dr. Channing H. Tobias, director, Phelp-Stokes Fund, was inclined to refuse this reporter's request. Said he:

"I don't think that we'll get anywhere finding out what old people like me think. The youngsters will have to fight. Find out how they feel and you will have your answer."

However, Dr. Tobias did go on record as against all forms of Jim Crow, in the Army and everywhere else. He even went further and said that Senator MORSE's threat of treason charges was most unfortunate. In fact, he said, "Senator MORSE might have addressed himself to the question of what might have been treasonable in the insistence by reactionary Members of Congress on a Jim Crow armed forces. They might reflect over and over on Willkie's statement: 'The Constitution of the United States does not provide for first- and second-class citizens.'" In brief, Dr. Tobias contends that southerners who insist on racial segregation are just as treasonable as liberals and Negroes who insist on the practice of the ideals of democracy which calls for one type of citizenship—where all men are equal in both theory and practice.

POWELL BACKS RANDOLPH

Representative A. CLAYTON POWELL, from Harlem, in a statement before the Senate Armed Services Committee on Friday, April 2, said in part that "I want to assure you that the testimony given you by Mr. Randolph did most emphatically state the mood of the vast majority of the 15,000,000 Negroes in America. He did not overstate it * * *." Then he concluded by saying that "And you can't ram UMT down the throats of the Negro people. Well, you can't. We won't take it. We refuse to bear arms in an un-American Jim Crow armed services, especially in peacetime. That is the only choice that is forced upon us by our God, our conscience, our Constitution, and our Bill of Rights."

Alan L. Dingle, noted attorney, backed Randolph's whole position—civil disobedience and all—without qualification. "I think," he said, "it's an excellent statement. I heartily concur with his position, I wish it were possible for all Negroes to follow that position and let the world know of the real position the Negro occupies in American life. Furthermore, I believe that much good can be gained by such a program. After all," he concluded, "we must give up something to gain something."

MORE PARTIAL AGREEMENTS

Frank T. Simpson, executive secretary of the Connecticut FEPC Act; D. Oliver Francis, director of the Francis Chemical Laboratory; Mrs. Sadie T. Alexander, member of Mayor O'Dwyer's committee on unity; M. Moran Weston, labor columnist and New York State Civil Liberties chairman of the Elks, and several other Harlemites agreed with Randolph's plea to end Jim Crow in the armed forces, but had no clear-cut comment on the civil-disobedience program. In brief, the local opinion is that Randolph is right, and that we are willing to do all within our power to secure equality within the framework of our Government, as long as peace is with us, but if war comes the Negro must and will take up arms to defend his country, and then start his fight all over again after the end of that war, which all hope will never come.

INTERESTING SIDE LIGHTS

In addition to the general purposes of the plea and threat, there was an interesting sideline which took place in Washington last week, when Grant Reynolds and Truman Gibson almost became involved in a hand to hand fight over words about the proposal.

Gibson, who is a former civilian aide of the Secretary of War and who strongly favors UMT, declared that the opinion of the delegation was not the same as that of the majority of Negro citizens. This statement was issued at the hearing.

When Reynolds took the stand he told the committee that he was not trying to "barter for democracy," as Gibson had charged, and that he, Reynolds, who was an Army chaplain in the last war, wore a uniform in the last war and did not sit in a swivel chair (as did Gibson in his civilian aide post). It was this statement which caused Gibson to rush to Reynolds after the hearing and threaten to hit him. Gibson told Reynolds that had he said such on the outside, he would have hit him in the mouth and sued him. Commenting on the incident, Reynolds said he would ignore any remark made by such a small person.

AND, SO WHAT?

Meanwhile, individuals and groups throughout the country are discussing the antisegregation against civil disobedience issues.

All want the end of jim crowism in the draft and armed services, but—. You fill in that "but" because there are almost as many answers to that "but" as there are different groups and different individuals.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, so far as the letters and telegrams of criticism are concerned, I know that I am hearing principally from those Negroes who apparently share Mr. Randolph's point of view. I know I am not hearing from what I honestly believe to be the overwhelming majority of the people of the colored race of America, who can be counted upon to fulfill as fully as any white person their patriotic duty in time of national emergency or war. I am satisfied that those of the colored race who are talking in terms of civil disobedience are not representing a great majority of the colored people of America.

However, Mr. President, I am a little puzzled at a couple of critical telephone calls I have received today in regard to an exchange which I have had with the secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Mr. Walter White. On April 1 I received a telegram from Mr. White, and so that the telegram may speak for itself, I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted

in the RECORD after I read excerpts from it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. In this telegram Mr. White says:

You have been a good friend of minority groups and supporter of civil-rights legislation, but it apparently is not possible for you to realize how bitterly Negro Americans feel about Jim Crow in the armed services. The treatment of Negroes in uniform seems to be beyond the understanding of United States Senators, even those as sympathetic as yourself. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People will never cease its fight for the abolition of the vicious and undemocratic discrimination and segregation in the armed services.

Mr. President, I digress to say that I shall not cease, either, in trying to end segregation in the armed services. I digress further to say that I am a member of the board of directors of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and I am interested in knowing how far Mr. White would go, as secretary of that association, in supporting Mr. Randolph's position, because if he or the other officials of that association are going to support to any degree whatsoever Mr. Randolph's civil-disobedience program, I serve notice now that I shall dissociate myself from the board of directors of that association. I shall wait for Mr. White to make it clearer than he does in this telegram just where he does specifically stand in regard to Mr. Randolph's program.

Returning to the telegram, he says:

We would have valiant allies if you and some of your colleagues in the Senate could darken their faces and don a uniform for 6 weeks.

I do not have to engage in that type of literalism, Mr. President, to fully appreciate the problem of civil rights in this country. Mr. White is quite mistaken if he thinks I have to be a black man in order to understand the true meanings of the Constitution of the United States. But I suggest that he would strengthen his case if he would be more of a realist about these problems, and recognize the importance of what I said earlier in my remarks as to making progress step by step, but not expecting the impossible. After all, this is a problem which is going to require growth in social attitudes on the part of all the people. I repeat at this point: This is not a problem of Congress alone, as Mr. White knows. This is a problem of proceeding step by step in educating the American people to recognize year by year that we are not going to have complete democracy in America, in the sense that democratic rights are given to all of us under the Constitution, until 140,000,000 of us agree that the Constitution should be observed to its very letter by all of our people.

I know Mr. White's problem, and I wish to pay tribute to the great service he has rendered the Negro people of this country. I pay tribute to the great service the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has rendered, not only to the Negro people but all the people of the country, in making the fight for the sound principles of democracy for which it has contended over the years. But I do want to caution Mr. White and others in the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People that they are not going to help attain the goal believers in civil rights hope to reach in due course of time by giving any aid or comfort to a civil disobedience program in this country.

Mr. White must know that such a program will be bound to lead to emotional reactions in this country. Mr. Randolph on the witness stand said that he was sure that it would lead to "terrorism," to use his exact word.

Mob action, Mr. President, in support of civil rights, or in a fight for civil rights, is just as bad and undesirable as mob action which seeks to prevent the enjoyment of civil rights. I do not want Mr. White or Mr. Randolph to forget that. I do not want them to overlook the fact that they do not help us defeat government by mob in this country by themselves giving any support or sympathy to a program which would encourage government by mob.

They must keep clear headed and themselves live above an emotional attitude for which in many of their statements they are so quick to criticize others.

Returning to Mr. White's telegram, I read:

Our association is not advising Negroes to refuse to defend their country if it is in danger. But those who expect them to be enthusiastic fighters should remember that their memories of mistreatment in the last war are bitter green. Negro veterans returned home to be terrorized in Columbia, Tenn., lynched in Walton County, Ga., denied the ballot in most Southern States, barred from taking GI courses in many schools, and slandered on the floor of the United States Congress. Consequently there is sympathy in many hearts for the Randolph point of view. The remedy is not to threaten treason trials, but to give these loyal citizens the democracy they are expected and asked to defend.

WALTER WHITE,
Secretary.

I was disturbed about that telegram. I am satisfied that Mr. White is right, and he means it when he says:

Our association is not advising Negroes to refuse to defend their country if it is in danger.

But I should like to have an unequivocal rejection and repudiation of the Randolph program in all its aspects from Mr. White. I replied to that telegram under date of April 6, as follows:

Mr. WALTER WHITE,
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People,
New York, N. Y.:

Appreciate your wire of April 1. However, I think you should read discussion which Randolph and I had at the hearing before you give any encouragement whatsoever to Randolph's proposal. I think you perform great disservice to those who are making as good a fight as we can for a sound civil rights program if you give any encouragement to Randolph proposal. I agree with those parts of your wire which point out injustices which Negroes have been receiving in this country but I totally disagree with the other implications of your wire which I think give comfort to the Randolph approach to this problem. If you give any such encouragement to Randolph's point of view it will set back several years our fight for civil rights program. Regards.

WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator.

One more word about this matter, Mr. President, and then I shall proceed to another subject. I want the RECORD to show that I hope that Mr. Randolph, after due reflection and after receiving, as I am sure he must have received by now, many sincere protestations from the people of his race from all over the country in opposition to his suggestion will retract it. I hope he will clarify the situation by making an early announcement that, after careful reflection and reconsideration, he now recommends, not a program of civil disobedience, but a program of full patriotic support on the part of all Negroes to their country in time of national emergency. I hope he will urge them at the same time to use their political strength and their political rights to work in a constitutional way and through a free ballot box for the election of men who will help pass a long overdue civil-rights program in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not a member of the Committee on Armed Services. I did not attend the hearing when Mr. Randolph testified; but I wish to say to the able Senator from Oregon that he has made a very interesting statement as to what occurred before the committee, and of his conclusions as to what ought to be done. However, I thought perhaps his statement would not be complete unless he mentioned something else which happened before the committee. I now refer to a friend of mine in Chicago, a Negro who testified and took direct issue, according to the press, with the Randolph program of civil disobedience. If the Senator would comment on that question I would appreciate it.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad that the Senator from Illinois has made the point which he has just made. I am happy to say to the Senator from Illinois that Mr. Gibson, a Negro who was another witness before the Armed Services Committee, made one of the finest defenses of the Negro race in regard to civil rights that it has been my pleasure to read. He made it very clear that he did not share in any respect the point of view which Mr. Randolph presented in regard to civil disobedience. As I said earlier in my remarks, I am satisfied that Mr. Gibson's point of view represents the point of view of the overwhelming majority of the colored people of this country. By that I mean 99 and a fraction percent. I think that is how strongly the colored people will support the position taken by Mr. Gibson of Illinois, who testified before the Armed Services Committee, in contrast to the civil-disobedience position taken by Mr. Randolph.

I wish to be perfectly fair to Mr. Randolph. As I said at the committee hearings, and I repeat now, there is no question about Mr. Randolph's complete sincerity; there is no question about the fact that Mr. Randolph is no Communist.

The attempt which is being made to charge Mr. Randolph with being a Communist is absolutely wrong, because I know Mr. Randolph well enough to know that he is not a Communist. During the years, he has performed a great service for the union of which he is president, and he has performed a great service over the years, for the colored people of this country. He has been a valiant fighter for civil rights. But on this particular issue, in my judgment, he is dead wrong; and he is now performing, if he presses it, a great disservice to all the causes in support of which he has so effectively performed in the years gone by. That is the only point I wish to make about his position. My confidence in his great intellectual ability and in the sincerity of his motivation is such that I believe that he is big enough to recognize the mistake he is making, and to admit it.

EXHIBIT 1

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 1, 1948.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

You have been a good friend of minority groups and a supporter of civil rights legislation, but it apparently is not possible for you to realize how bitterly Negro Americans feel about Jim Crow in the armed services. The treatment of Negroes in uniform seems to be beyond the understanding of United States Senators, even those as sympathetic as yourself. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People will never cease its fight for the abolition of the vicious and undemocratic discrimination and segregation in the armed services. We would have valiant allies if you and some of your colleagues in the Senate could darken their faces and don a uniform for 6 weeks. Our association is not advising Negroes to refuse to defend their country if it is in danger. But those who expect them to be enthusiastic fighters should remember that their memories of mistreatment in the last war are bitter green. Negro veterans returned home to be terrorized in Columbia, Tenn., lynched in Walton County, Ga., denied the ballot in most Southern States, barred from taking GI courses in many schools, and slandered on the floor of the United States Congress. Consequently there is sympathy in many hearts for the Randolph point of view. The remedy is not to threaten treason trials, but to give these loyal citizens the democracy they are expected and asked to defend.

WALTER WHITE,
Secretary.

DETERMINATION OF REASONABLENESS OF DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME FOR COMPENSATION FOR PERSONAL SERVICES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while I am on my feet I want at this time to offer a bill which seeks to amend the internal revenue laws of the country, so as to put an end to what I consider to be a very arbitrary and capricious practice on the part of the Treasury Department. The bill I now offer relates to the determination of reasonableness of deductions from gross income for compensation for personal services. The bill is as follows:

(a) Publication of Standards for Determining Reasonableness.

Section 23 (a) (1) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new sentence:

"In determining the reasonableness of salaries or other compensation for personal services, the Commissioners shall apply uniform standards to all corporations in like circumstances, and shall prescribe by regulations approved by the Secretary all criteria which shall be employed in determining the reasonableness of such salaries or other compensation and the weight which shall be assigned to each such criterion."

(b) Effective date. The amendment by this section shall be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1947.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2484) to amend the Internal Revenue Code concerning the determination of the reasonableness of compensation for personal services, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer the bill because business concerns have pointed out to me that the Treasury Department is very arbitrarily deducting from tax statements amounts inserted in those statements for salaries, claiming that the salaries allowed their various officers are entirely too large. I recognize that we must guard against income-report padding on the part of corporations, but I submit, Mr. President, that the businessman is entitled to know what criteria the Treasury Department applies in determining whether or not salaries are reasonable. I do not think the Congress can justify leaving that to the whim and caprice of men in the Treasury Department. So once again in regard to this matter I am raising my voice in protest against arbitrary, capricious action on the part of Government administrators.

The Presiding Officer of the Senate at the moment has heard me thus protest many times in the past in connection with other legislation. I am always going to do it, Mr. President, whenever a set of facts is presented to me in support of a finding that some Government official is not properly surrounded with those checks with which I think he ought to be surrounded in order to protect the people as a whole from arbitrary and capricious conduct.

I want to cite, without mentioning the name of the firm, the experience of one firm which is typical of this problem and the like of which gave rise to the bill. On or about June 17, 1947, the Federal Income Tax Department of the Government proposed an additional assessment of taxes against this particular corporation in the amount of, in round figures, $265,000, for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1944, 1945, and 1946. This proposal was subsequently modified to an amount, in round figures, of $217,000. The principal factor involved in this proposal was disallowance of certain proportions of executive salaries which were deemed by the agent making the investigation to be excessive. When the agent was aked for the basis of his finding, for the criteria he applied in determining whether whether or not the salaries in question were reasonable salaries, he was unable to give any measurement whatever in determining his own findings of reasonableness. When we have the Treasury Department applying such an unchecked discretion, one investigator may find that a particular salary is reasonable and another investigator in another part of the country may find, in similar circumstances, that an identical salary is not reasonable. It seems to me that we must always be at work in the Congress checking that type of discretionary abuse. We must do what we can to see to it that our laws are so drafted that the same criteria, the same standards, the same rules of measurement so far as the exercise of discretion is concerned, are applied uniformly throughout the country to all taxpayers. If we do not do that, then the type of injustice to which I am referring today is bound to exist. To what extent it exists I have no way of knowing; but I know that the protests which I have received in regard to this particular problem convince me that it is a rule which ought to be circumscribed by some criteria, which my amendment seeks to establish.

This particular company feels that the compensation paid to its executive officers was entirely in order, since it was based upon a formula which was adopted and consistently followed in both good years and bad years, regardless of tax effects. Moreover, these particular salaries were approved during the war years, under the salary-stabilization program, by other officials of the Treasury Department. It will be recalled that during the war, under our wage and salary stabilization program, changes in salary had to be approved by Government officials, salaries being assigned to the Treasury Department and wages being assigned to the National War Labor Board, of which I was a member at the time. We handled the wage cases and the Treasury handled the salary cases. In this particular instance the Treasury approved these salaries under its Salary Stabilization Division. But years later, when these cases came to the Tax Review Section, this company was assessed a tax charge of approximately $265,000 in back taxes, because these salaries were not approved in the Tax Division, although they had already been approved in the Salary Division.

Is it any wonder that many American people shake their heads in puzzlement and disgust at the administrative practices of our Government, when one division reaches one conclusion on an issue for one purpose, and another division reverses it for another purpose?

This Treasury agent has disallowed a portion of the salaries paid in some of the years merely on the ground that in his personal opinion the amounts involved were excessive. He has failed, however, to state how he arrived at the figure which he considers reasonable; nor has he been able to suggest to the corporation a substitute formula or other basis for calculating compensations upon which the corporation could rely as being reasonable. In other words, the corporation must pay salaries at its own risk. The corporation cannot turn to its Government in advance and find out whether particular salaries will free it from any future tax liability. To deny any company such a rule of certainty is not good government. It is not the type of administration which the taxpayers of the country are entitled to receive, even though they may be corporations. Rules of fair play ought to be applicable to the business interests of the country as well as to other interests.

The result of this action by the Treasury agent is severely and unjustifiably to penalize this corporation. I feel that if proper consideration is given the case, an adequate and reasonable measure of relief should be obtained. Furthermore, the amount of taxes assessed against this corporation wipes out in its entirety the corporation's reserve. It must delve into its capital, consequently working hardship upon the corporation and causing the corporation to run the real danger of having to go out of business. This is a small corporation. There are not very many small corporations which can stand, several years later, an assessment of $265,000 of tax penalty because of the fact that some agent of the Treasury Department, without being able to tell why he reaches the conclusion, decides that the salaries paid have been unreasonably high.

One further word on this point. Dean Griswold, of the Harvard Law Review, in 59 Harvard Law Review, 286, wrote a very interesting note interpreting the provisions of section 23 (a) (1) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code, which authorizes the deduction from gross income of business expenses, "including a reasonable allowance for salaries or other compensation for personnel services actually rendered". After a review of the legislative history of this provision, Dean Griswold concludes:

1. That such provision was inserted for the first time in section 234 (a) (1) of the Revenue Act of 1918 for the purpose of enlarging the deduction in such manner as to include a reasonable allowance for salaries earned but not in fact paid, as in the case of a closely held corporation in which officers are paid only nominal salaries; and

2. That such phrase should not be read as a limitation upon the amount of the deduction which can be taken for salaries actually paid, and provides no authority under which the Commissioner properly can reduce for tax purposes the amount of salaries which in fact are paid for services actually rendered.

I understand that the Bureau of Internal Revenue is not in agreement with Dean Griswold. It has not reached the same conclusions as to the interpretation and meaning of the law in question as has the dean of the Harvard Law School. Nevertheless, after reading his article and after considering the practices of the Internal Revenue Department, I am willing to recommend the approach to this problem offered in the article written by the dean of the Harvard Law School, because I certainly think the time has come for us to surround the Treasury Department with some legislative checks upon its interpretation of reasonableness under this section of our tax law.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3484) to transfer the Remount Service from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture.

EXTENSION OF RECLAMATION LAWS TO ARKANSAS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 299) to extend the reclamation laws to the State of Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to discuss this bill, but I think the hour is rather late. Within the last few minutes I have learned that there will be extended discussion of the bill, much more than I had thought. So I wonder what the acting majority leader thinks about the situation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Arkansas, let me say that, in view of the lateness of the hour and the fact that probably there will be extended discussion of the pending measure, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes tomorrow, the Senator from Arkansas shall be recognized to speak on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg AO15355, Air Force of the United States (major general, U. S. Air Force), for appointment as Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, with rank of general, for the period of 4 years beginning from date of appointment, under the provisions of section 208 of the National Security Act of 1947.

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Brian S. Odem, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas Bayard McCabe, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of 14 years from February 1, 1942.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, from which the nomination has been reported. I wish to make a brief statement regarding it.

It is always more agreeable, more pleasant, and more popular to vote for the confirmation of a nomination than to oppose confirmation. It is especially disagreeable to me to feel compelled to oppose confirmation of the nomination of Mr. McCabe, because he is a good citizen and an able businessman. I like Mr. McCabe. I think most of the people who know him like him.

Mr. President, I feel that it is my duty to oppose this nomination, because I believe that it violates the spirit of the Banking Act, that it is prejudicial to the immediate interests of the South and the long-term interests of the whole Nation.

The Banking Act does not require that the South have a representative on the Federal Reserve Board, but the spirit of the act certainly requires a fair and equitable distribution of the membership. The Federal Reserve Board is the most important agency in our banking structure. It was created to serve all the people of this Nation, and not alone the great banking houses of the metropolitan centers. With this appointment, however, the situation would be that, of the seven governors of the Federal Reserve System, four would come from the cities of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Chicago. The other three are from Iowa, Missouri, and Utah. I do not mean to imply that the four representatives from the great financial centers will consciously conspire together, but men cannot disassociate themselves from their environment, their old friends, and their past experiences.

Mr. President, I do not think it is reasonable for us to expect Mr. McCabe, who, throughout his life, has been closely, if not exclusively, associated with the business circles of Philadelphia and New York, to understand or to have much sympathy for the problems and needs of the South. He is appointed to the vacancy caused by the death of the only southern representative on the Board, the late Mr. Ransom, of Georgia. I think a southerner should be appointed to that vacancy.

The South has had some bitter experiences with Federal agencies which have been dominated by the business interests of the Northeast. For 50 years the Interstate Commerce Commission was dominated by the financial and industrial interests of New York, Boston, and Philadelphia. As a consequence, the Commission created and perpetuated a system of freight rates which retarded, and to a great extent prevented, the growth of industry in the South, except where water transportation was available. These northern interests thought they were justified in this policy, but the result was to hold back the South directly, and indirectly it weakened the entire Nation, including the Northeast.

I am sure if the South and West had been allowed to develop, free from discriminatory burdens, our country today would be better balanced, and stronger economically and socially.

The Federal Reserve Board was in its earlier days greatly influenced by the late Senator Glass. Since the act of 1935 it has been representative of the various sections and interests of the Nation. With this appointment, however, I think I can see the beginning of a determined effort on the part of the great financial institutions of the East to take over the control of our monetary and banking system. If this happens, I do not think it will promote the welfare of the South or of the Nation.

Mr. President, during the examination of Mr. McCabe, I got the impression that he has views about the function of the Federal Reserve Board which will facilitate the domination of the policies of the Federal Reserve Board by the great financial institutions of the East. I believe the primary function of the Federal Reserve Board is to provide leadership in the making of policy. The Board should look to Congress primarily for advice, rather than to the bankers. In other words, I do not think the Reserve Banks, the directors of which are businessmen and bankers, should be the policy makers for the system, because they are too intimately concerned and too directly affected. The Congress and the Board, of course, should respect the views of bankers as they do those of other citizens, but Congress and the Board should formulate the policy.

From the discussions of the matter before the committee, I believe Mr. McCabe feels that the Board should coordinate and follow the views of the Reserve Bank directors rather than direct their policies. The distinction, of course, is largely one of degree; no hard-and-fast line can be drawn. Aside from the impression created by his direct answers to questions, I believe it is only human nature for a man with the experience and background of Mr. McCabe to have a profound respect for and a friendly feeling toward the financial houses of New York and Philadelphia, and, quite likely, to have a distrust of the politicians in Washington. If I had grown up and prospered in that coterie of associates, as Mr. McCabe has, I probably would feel as he does.

I wish to remind the Senate that we have delegated to the Federal Reserve Banks one of the highest prerogatives of a sovereign state, the power to create money. With that power the Federal Reserve Board can control interest rates or the price of money, which is the very life blood of our capitalistic system. I think we must be exceedingly careful that this great power is not abused, lest our people lose faith in our system. I do not think Mr. McCabe will consciously abuse the power, but I do know that in the past the great and powerful interests, in their eagerness to expand and produce and acquire, have followed policies which, as a people, we have condemned and sought to control. It is because of this tendency in private enterprise that we have created the Federal Reserve Board along with other agencies, such as the SEC, FCC, FPC, ICC, and the Federal Trade Commission. Those agencies were created to maintain a balance between the driving initiative of private enterprise and the public welfare. If control of the agencies is given to the business concerned, or if the bureau becomes too detached from reality, the public suffers.

Mr. President, I am sure that some of my colleagues will think I am being too sectional in opposing this nomination. I submit that many of the issues which confront us are inherently sectional. This is a large Nation with diverse interests and aspirations in its various sections. Each section is entitled to fair and just consideration by this body.

Many people in this country are unable to understand the resentment of the South at the gratuitous intermeddling of the North in certain social matters. In the so-called civil rights issues, the people of the North are extremely solicitous of our welfare and progress. They assure us that if we will furnish better schools and abolish poll taxes and segregation, we in the South may approach that happy state of felicity which I assume exists in New York City and its environs. They are critical of our relative poverty and our industrial and social backwardness, and they are generous in their advice about our conduct. Their condescension in these matters is not appreciated. It is not appreciated largely because these same people, who are so generous with their advice, have for more than a half century done everything they could to retard the economic development of the South. It is no secret that the South was considered a conquered territory after 1865. Since that time, the tariff policy and the freight-rate structure were designed by the North to prevent industrial development in the South; to keep that area in the status of a raw-material-producing colony. Above and beyond these direct restrictions, the most insidious of all, the most difficult to put a finger on, is the all-pervading influence of the great financial institutions and the industrial monopolies. These influences are so subtle and so powerful that they have in many instances been able to dominate the political and economic life of the South and West from within those States as well as from Washington.

The war temporarily changed this pattern of power, but there is evidence that the natural impulses of these powerful groups are again asserting themselves. This appointment is, I believe, a step in the direction of reestablishing firm control by the northeastern financial interests over our national economy. It is subtle and it will be difficult to counterbalance if the men who control the governmental agencies are too sympathetic to their purposes. As a practical matter, the only real protection the public generally has is to be represented fairly and equitably in the agencies with the power to control these activities.

Mr. President, I feel very strongly that this appointment should have gone to some man who is familiar with, and sympathetic to, the problems and aspirations of the millions of people in the South and Southwest. It seems to me that these citizens are, in all fairness, entitled to have a spokesman on the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, which has so much power over the economic life of our Nation.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, the man whose nomination is before the Senate, and who was appointed by the President to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, is an outstanding civil and business leader of Philadelphia. Mr. McCabe is president of the Scott Paper Co., and he is chairman of the Board of the Federal Reserve Bank in Philadelphia. His nomination has been strongly endorsed and recommended by men who are outstanding in public life. Mr. Will Clayton appeared before the committee, as did Judge Patterson, the former Secretary of War, endorsing the nomination. The committee also received most commendatory letters from Mr. John S. Sinclair, executive vice president of the New York Life Insurance Co., formerly president of the Federal Reserve Bank at Philadelphia, and also from the dean of the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce at the University of Pennsylvania. I hope the nomination will be confirmed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I commend my colleague from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] for the position he has taken on this nomination. I commend the Senator from Arkansas for what he has said, and I want to associate myself with him in all he has said in opposition to the confirmation of the nomination. I do not believe the nomination should have been made. The Senator from Arkansas has pointed out that there are already two members of the Federal Reserve Board from the northeastern section of the United States. I do not personally know Mr. McCabe, the nominee, but I do know that one's environments has much influence on one's thinking and reactions. I know that environment is often a powerful leaven in the determination of questions.

Mr. President, someone from the southern section of the United States should have been nominated for this position. That is the section in which the vacancy in representation has occurred. The former member of the Board was from Atlanta, Ga. He died, and therefore there was a vacancy to fill for which this nomination has been made.

I shall vote against Mr. McCabe's confirmation in order to voice my protest that the section of the South from which I come was not accorded the recognition which I feel it so much merited and deserved, and to voice my protest against naming too many members of the Board from any one section of the United States. We know that economic and social conditions vary in different sections. If any one thing is fundamental it is that the membership on the Board should constitute a cross section of the United States, so that the viewpoints, the backgrounds, and the opinions of all sections should be represented. The confirmation of this nomination would mean that one of the great sections of the United States will not be represented on the Board. I protest as strongly as I can, and I want the RECORD to show that I shall cast my vote against the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. McCabe.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I am very happy that the Senator from Alabama, who has just spoken, based his objection not on the qualifications of Mr. McCabe, but on the ground that the vacancy occurred in the southern section and should be filled by a person from the southern section, and that the President should have recognized the claim of that great area of the country to representation on a board whose policies can vitally affect the entire banking industry of the Nation. But, Mr. President, I am happy to be able to advise my colleagues of the Senate that I heard all the testimony on the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. McCabe, and on the

basis of the testimony, some of which was very searching, I reached the conclusion, beyond any shadow of doubt, that Mr. McCabe is well qualified for the position for which the President selected him.

Mr. McCabe was asked regarding his attitude concerning the bank holding company bill which had previously been reported by our committee but upon which the Senate has not yet acted. I do not think any member of the committee could take exception to the answers he gave concerning such legislation. He was asked concerning his attitude on tightening credit in the event we should move under the impetus of new defense spending into a period of greater inflation than that which we now have. I do not believe any member of the committee could take exception to the answers he made to those questions.

From the southern standpoint, I should like to tell my distinguished colleague from Alabama that the strongest testimony given on behalf of Mr. McCabe came from William L. Clayton, of Houston, Tex. Everyone knows that Mr. Clayton is a southern man; everyone knows that his business interests are in the South; everyone knows that he is interested in the future welfare of the South; that he is a broad-gage man, and that, over and above being a southerner, he is an American. I would say that if there should be any conflict, Will Clayton would put the interests of the Nation first. Will Clayton gave the committee his unqualified endorsement of Mr. McCabe whom he had known for many years and with whom he had had business relations and official relations, because McCabe served under him when Will Clayton was in charge, for a brief period, of the disposal of surplus war property. He sent McCabe abroad to handle the program for him.

When some comment was made in the committee preceding a vote on the confirmation, as to whether Mr. McCabe possessed all the requirements of the position and whether we should confirm his nomination, I took occasion, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Alabama, to make this comment:

> We do not have the privilege of either backing Mr. McCabe or backing the next man if Mr. McCabe should be turned down by the Senate.

I then made the prediction that if a man of McCabe's stature, business integrity, and reputation should, after many days of close scrutiny and after a hearing before our committee, be turned down, no other man comparable to McCabe would hazard his reputation by permitting the President to send his name to the Senate to be questioned concerning everything that had happened in his life for the last 25, 30, or 40 years, whether or not he were personally responsible.

So I repeat that I heard the testimony. I am personally convinced that Mr. McCabe is a good man for the position. I make no comment on the regret expressed by the distinguished Senator from Alabama that the nominee is not a southern man. But I think it would be unthinkable, on the record before us, to turn down a man of the character of Mr. McCabe.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I dislike to delay the Senate, but because there will not be a record vote on the confirmation, I desire to have the RECORD show that I shall cast my vote against the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. McCabe. That is not predicated upon any personal feeling. I assume that he is a high-type, patriotic American who is anxious to be of service to his country.

I do know, Mr. President, that this land of ours has a most diverse economy. The question is not altogether one of desiring to be fair, it is a question of having understanding of problems. The great section from whence I come has a different economy from that of any other section of the Nation. In agriculture we produce different crops, our industry is centered along one, two, or three lines; the banking structure is not altogether like that of other sections.

I submit that in a board which has the power of life and death over the national economy and over the the welfare of thousands of people who are struggling to earn a livelihood in every section of our land, every section is entitled to representation. I know not when there will be another man from the South on this Board, but inasmuch as we allow Puerto Rico and Hawaiian Delegates to sit in the Congress of the United States, perhaps if we from the South will continue to be patient for another 80 years we will be able to have those who understand our problems take part in the powerful executive branch of the Government.

Mr. President, I would welcome an opportunity to vote for Mr. McCabe if that were all that was involved, if there were on the Board a southern man, a man who had real understanding of our different problems, our diverse economy, but in the circumstances I feel constrained to cast my vote against Mr. McCabe.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination now pending before the Senate and under consideration is that of Mr. Thomas B. McCabe, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of 14 years from February 1, 1942. The question before the Senate is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

On a division, the nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified at once of the confirmation.

THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, this is the third anniversary of the death of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States. I rise on this occasion to pay a brief tribute to his loving memory and his many memorable deeds. I am satisfied that if he were alive today the Nation and the world could well profit by his unusual diplomatic skill and genius, and his understanding of human beings. I am sure that if he were here today he would be in the forefront of all Americans who are so interested in attempting to bring about an everlasting and enduring peace.

RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Senate take a recess until the hour of 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 13, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 12 (legislative day of March 29), 1948:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Herschel V. Johnson, of North Carolina, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Deputy Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Brazil.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

John M. Houston, of Kansas, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 5 years from August 27, 1948. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Julius J. Wichser, of Indiana, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Indiana. (He is now serving under an appointment which expires June 5, 1948.)

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade and arm or service specified, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Army, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 and title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.):

To be lieutenant colonel

Ernest A. Brav, Medical Corps, O240706.

To be major

Karl A. Youngstrom, Medical Corps, O929222.

To be captains

Rollin C. Avenell, Dental Corps, O356395.
Henry C. Dorris, Medical Corps, O327305.
Walter J. Grant, Medical Corps, O481647.
Franklin G. Hoffman, Medical Corps, O1745758.
James B. Joyce, Dental Corps, O535440.
William W. Senn, Dental Corps, O368386.
James L. Schricker, Jr., Medical Corps, O472806.
Fletcher W. Streck, Medical Corps, O364915.
Leo S. Szakalun, Medical Corps, O460908.
Richard S. Waldman, Dental Corps, O1701240.

To be first lieutenants

Cecil A. Baer, Jr., Dental Corps, O1774988.
Clifford A. Baldwin, Jr., Medical Corps, O935915.
Peter R. Brady, Medical Corps, O935842.
Kenneth M. Carroll, Medical Corps, O1724950.
Robert L. Christensen, Medical Corps, O1767253.
Robert E. Crompton, Medical Corps, O935610.
Paul A. Ervin, Jr., Medical Corps, O1734812.
Samuel C. Gallup, Medical Corps, O471395.
Martin B. Giffen, Medical Corps, O1725673.
James L. Hansen, Medical Corps, O1785782.
Frederick G. Harris, Medical Corps, O1736623.
Payne S. Harris, Medical Corps, O1757173.
James N. Harten, Medical Corps, O935455.
Thomas B. Hauschild, Medical Corps, O1787164.
Frank Hladky, Jr., Medical Corps, O1776125.

Robert L. Johnson, Medical Corps, O1765673.
Robert L. Koenig, Medical Corps, O1776396.
James E. Lancaster, Dental Corps, O1774949.
Arthur E. Levy, Medical Corps, O1717757.
Robert C. MacDuffee, Medical Corps, O1718300.
Stephen G. May, Medical Corps, O1706067.
William H. Meroney III, Medical Corps, O1734844.
Harry J. Misch, Medical Corps, O1746105.
Francis D. O'Brien, Medical Corps, O481635.
Ralph H. Potter, Jr., Medical Corps, O1756664.
Robert K. Quinnell, Medical Corps, O1727160.
Donald H. Robinson, Medical Corps, O1725784.
Ernest A. Sarao, Medical Corps, O476341.
Palmer H. Warren, Medical Corps, O1736530.
Ralph D. Wright, Medical Corps, O1775834.
Thomas C. Wright, Medical Corps, O1735045.
Paul G. Yessler, Medical Corps, O1726505.

To be second lieutenant

Karl H. Borcheller, Infantry.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate April 12 (legislative day of March 29), 1948:

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Thomas Bayard McCabe to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of 14 years from February 1, 1942.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 12, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, Thou who art slow to anger and plenteous in mercy, of whose infinite bounty we all partake, calm our spirits that we may find the way of understanding.

As life goes on, we beseech Thee that for the common good we may not heed the plaudits of the crowd, and that prudence replace untried adventure. As Thou dost direct our ministry, may we always place the value of truth above expediency. O move upon the minds of men, lest our time become a weary waste of hours and our people be disappointed in their hopes. Restrain us from idle talk and hear our humble prayer as we pray for peace and national unity. Be near us when the way is rugged, and hold us with the spirit of a conquering faith. We pray in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of Thursday, April 8, 1948, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On April 8, 1948:

H. R. 5049. An act to reopen the revested Oregon & California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands to exploration, location, entry, and disposition under the general mining laws.

On April 9, 1948:

H. R. 2298. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

On April 10, 1948:

H. R. 718. An act for the relief of Clarence J. Wilson and Margaret J. Wilson.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3484. An act to transfer the Remount Service from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5214) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 1 to the above-entitled bill.

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in rising to note the anniversary which this day commemorates, it is with no thought that any eulogy of mine could add a cubit to the stature of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

His niche in history, his place in the hearts and affection of the American people, and his universal recognition as a genius of statesmanship are already assured.

No praise from those who loved him could possibly enhance the quality of his endowments.

No calumny from his detractors can dim the magnificence of his accomplishments.

If he engendered passions in his fellow men, it was because his greatness of soul partook of all of their humanity. He himself lived passionately; and his death, coming when it did, was but a passionate surrender in the cause of all mankind.

Three years ago today God's messenger of death swept him from this earth to the seat of judgment before which all of us must someday stand. I prefer to leave his real appraisal to the judgment there and to the critical verdict of future history.

His public record, therefore, the events of his Presidency, and the inspiration of his masterful world leadership shall not occupy me now. I would speak, rather, of the man himself and his humanity to man, for therein, I think, lie his real greatness.

And this I shall do not as a partisan—not as a eulogist—but in the greatest of capacities in which one man can speak of another—that of his friend.

To all he was the soul of humanitarian sociability.

His dynamic personality and the inspiration it engendered had an electric quality which radiated the courage and confidence of his great soul to the lowly and the mighty in our society.

His concern for the fate of his fellow man and his urgent desire that his lot in this life should be constantly bettered marked him indelibly with the stamp of the true philanthropist.

The broad range of his sympathies was never limited by partisan considerations of either creed, race, politics, or social standing.

These natural sympathies found outlets, through his tremendous energy, in the championship of all the causes of the common man. His faculty for constructive action and the exercise of his daring vision were combined with his gift for leadership to attain gradually the only goal and ambition of his earthly life—the better ordering of our society for all segments of the body politic.

Wholehearted devotion to the cause of the people—the masses he loved—was joined with an overwhelming good will, a keen sense of social responsibility, and an unquenchable thirst for justice.

For the people whom he served, he stood as a symbol of the worth of the human individual; and, through the practical application of his own humanitarian philosophy of government, he gave the utmost expression to the principles of freedom and justice without which democracy is but a hollow and lifeless aspiration.

In all of these qualities—in all of these things—the greatest characteristic was his love of his fellow men, particularly the sick, the suffering, the underprivileged, the exploited. His love of justice was a commanding trait he possessed. It was the warm, friendly, sympathetic, and considerate concern for his fellow man that carried him to the pinnacle of his political success, and from that high station he aspired to only one further goal. That was to be a friend to all mankind.

I knew that friendship. Under its inspiration, I had the privilege of coming to know the man himself and to learn the greatness of heart that prompted all his actions. It is that quality which he so possessed with abundance that is the crying need of the world of today.

States are soulless. It is the human qualities of the men who govern states which need improvement.

The friendly understanding of Franklin Roosevelt, the concern which he constantly evidenced for the fate of his fellow men, and his humanitarian sympathies are the qualities of statesmanship which alone can solve the problems which today separate brother from brother.

It is his exercise of those qualities in the world's affairs which, 3 years after his death, deepens our sense of loss and makes poignant the realization that we have lost a friend and one of the world's outstanding figures of all time.

WHO ARE THE REAL FRIENDS OF BRITAIN?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include an editorial and extract from a speech I made in 1946.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received "with Lord Beaverbrook's compliments," under date of London, April 6, 1948, an editorial from the Daily Express, the world's largest daily, net sale. I call attention to the last paragraph of the editorial, which states:

AND NOW—

The crowning deed was the Marshall plan. It is a gesture more striking than any that has gone before. Praise the warm feelings of the American Nation. Recognize the high endeavor to help the distressed world. Even though the belief must be reiterated that the loan did nothing but injury to Britain and the Empire, and the Marshall aid will have the same result.

I have maintained from the first that in supporting the socialistic regime of Britain financially the proponents of the gift of $3,750,000,000 and the Marshall plan gift of a third of $17,000,000,000 have done irreparable injury to the British people. The Communists and their cohorts who have engineered these gifts have been shrewd in that they have destroyed the prospects of a return to sound government by the British people. This same element, operating through the State Department, aided and abetted by Congress, can lay claim to the very injury of which Lord Beaverbrook complains.

On July 11, 1946, I made some comments on the floor of the House of Representatives which I am inserting as a part of my remarks at this point:

Nobody can question that Britain is moving toward socialism. Nobody can question that Socialist Britain is going to be in competition with constitutional America. Nobody can question that this money will be used by the Socialist Government of Britain to finance its own experiments in the nationalization of British industry. If we want this country to go socialistic, then that proposition ought to be put up to the American people fairly and honestly. It is not American, and it is not honest, to defraud the people of $3,750,000,000 of their money by falsehoods, and half-truths and distortions of statement, in order to help finance socialism in England, which is exactly in contradiction to our own constitutional system of government, economy, and security.

It is the right of people to change their form of government in the United States to socialism if they choose to do it, but it is their right to do it themselves instead of having their money used to finance socialistic governments everywhere else in the world, such as Britain and France, which may, by competition, force the United States further into a trend toward increased Government control of our economy and our society.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting the entire editorial from the Daily Express to which I have referred:

OPINION—AID AND THE EMPIRE

There is much opposition to the Marshall plan which is now in operation.

That opposition is based on the belief that Britain should stand on her own feet and, linked with the Empire, should undertake the task of reconstruction free from any external influence.

True recovery, it is argued, must be based on a plan for Empire unity.

PRAISE AMERICA

But the Nation has willed that the Marshall plan shall be part of the foreign and domestic policy of Britain.

Therefore, since the issue is decided, let us frankly comment upon the generous and splendid conduct of the American people and their Congress.

They have gifted these immense sums of money and goods with every intention of rescuing their neighbors in trouble.

They show a kindness of disposition worthy of a people who have for long sustained throughout the world the precepts of the Christian faith. They have declared themselves their brother's keeper.

REMEMBER: 1

By three actions America has come to the aid of a world distressed, worn, and weary; a world beset by much evil and by the deeds of many tyrant nations, sunk in wickedness.

It begins with lease-lend. Has the memory of that tremendous gesture faded? Assuredly not.

It was on March 11, 1941, that America, still neutral, still unassailed, placed vast resources from her fields and factories at Britain's disposal. Britain was the last outpost against German aggression. Country after country had fallen. Lease-lend was an act of faith as well as sustenance and friendship.

When lease-lend ended in August 1945, opinion said: "Forevermore the people of Britain will think of the people of America with warmth and gratitude."

That sentiment is still alive and strong.

REMEMBER: 2

Then came the America loan.

It was offered at an uncommercial rate of interest. And in the knowledge from the first that there was no real prospect of repayment, since our own statesmen agreed to conditions which were bound to break down Britain's credit and leave her, not stronger for the accommodation, but weaker.

But the good will which inspired the hearts of the Americans is not forgotten.

AND NOW—

The crowning deed was the Marshall plan.

It is a gesture more striking than any that has gone before.

Praise the warm feelings of the American Nation.

Recognize the high endeavor to help the distressed world.

Even though the belief must be reiterated that the loan did nothing but injury to Britain and the Empire, and the Marshall aid will have the same result.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUTLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Grand Army of the Republic Memorial Association of Erie County, N. Y.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a copy of the Nebraska laws on veterans.

Mr. BANTA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. BRAMBLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on voluntary help.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the New Yorker.

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, a tribute to the leadership of this House and to the prestige of our great Speaker is being paid everywhere in America at this moment. Men are going back to work in the Nation's coal mines and the people of our country are resuming their normal way of life. As a Representative of the people of Ohio, I can describe the deep concern and growing anxiety of our State as the effects of this coal strike became apparent. Industry and labor were fearful. The whole economy of America stood once more at the brink of chaos. Fortunately for our country, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., the Speaker of this House, was prepared for the emergency. As an Ohioan, I have had many occasions to praise the ability, the complete honesty, the foresight, and the wisdom of our senior Senator from Ohio, ROBERT A. TAFT. His contribution to the national labor policy of our country set in motion the machinery which has been employed by JOE MARTIN to end a threat to our entire domestic life and indirectly to our influence on foreign affairs as well. In this spirit of gratitude, I am rising to commend our Speaker, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., on his achievement in bringing together the parties to the coal dispute and speeding it to a successful conclusion.

To the many polls of popularity now being conducted throughout our Nation, it would be most helpful to add another, a poll which would be designed to inform the people of the achievements of their public officials worthy of public commendation and national acclaim. I should like to nominate as one of the first to receive the praise of this Nation for public service quietly, efficiently, honorably, and nobly performed, the distinguished American who has served us so well over this critical emergency, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Speaker of the House and a worthy spokesman of the Nation in meeting the challenge of this crisis.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as the representative of one of the largest anthracite-producing sections of the State of Pennsylvania, as well as of the entire world, I want to take this opportunity of joining with my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER],

in expressing the appreciation of the people of my district, and of all the people of the United States, for the splendid work that our Speaker has done in bringing together the principal figures in the present cessation of work in the bituminous coal fields. By his statesmanlike intervention he made possible a settlement of the coal strike which threatened to engulf the whole country in economic chaos, a possibility which this morning became a reality. To him all the people of the United States owe a debt of gratitude.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, history was made and an important contribution given to solving the problems of the day when you brought John L. Lewis and Ezra Van Horn together in your office, Saturday, and obtained their agreement upon Senator STYLES BRIDGES as a third member of the trustee board to administer the miners' welfare fund.

To you, Mr. Speaker, I wish to express congratulations in which I am sure every Member of the House joins.

And to the country, I would say that in this signal act of constructive service, JOSEPH MARTIN was doing what we of the House have seen him doing for years—namely, finding the common denominator of agreement and getting people to work together for the common good.

That is a pretty valuable quality in these days of cold wars, at home and abroad.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mark Sullivan.

Mr. MORTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LOVE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Hon. Harry H. Cook, international president of the American Flint Glass Workers Union of North America.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report of the commissioners of the Black Hawk Soil Conservation District of Iowa.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Walter Lippmann.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Senator STYLES BRIDGES at the meeting of the trustees of the 1947 United Mine Workers of America welfare and retirement fund, Monday, April 12, 1948, and also the resolution which he introduced and which was adopted at the meeting of the trustees of the United Mine Workers of America welfare and retirement fund, Monday morning, April 12, 1948, and which I understand was approved by the trustees. The miners are going back to work because of this agreement and because of the thing which our honorable Speaker, JOE MARTIN, did in helping to bring about this settlement which was of such great importance to the American people.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Missouri (at the request of Mr. REEVES) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Miss Ruth Ellen Halter.

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EDWARD BROWN

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I take this moment to remind the House that Mr. Edward Brown, the Superintendent of the House Office Buildings, is today 74 years old and is about completing his forty-seventh year of service on the Hill. I think I speak for everybody who has ever come in contact with Ed Brown in wishing him health and prosperity for many more years of the very useful life which he has thus far led. His never-failing courtesy and cheerfulness of heart have always been an inspiration and an example to all of us.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I concur in the gentleman's statement.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I want to confirm everything that the gentleman from New Jersey has said. We have had nothing but uniform courtesy from Mr. Brown throughout the years.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. I heartily concur in what the gentleman from New Jersey has said and join with him in congratulating Mr. Brown, who has been such a good friend to all of us.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I confirm everything the gentleman has said. Mr. Brown always is willing to help with a smile and does it as if he were delighted to help you.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I thank the gentlewoman very much.

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN AND THE COAL STRIKE

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor at this time to extend my congratulations as well as the hearty thanks of the entire population of the United States, on your timely intervention over the week-end in the settlement of the strike. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of not only the mine workers and their families, but every citizen of the Twelfth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, the heart of the anthracite region, for your timely, courageous, and effective intercession in the dispute between the mine workers and operators of the bituminous coal producing fields, which controversy also had its effect in the anthracite area and the entire Nation, we indeed commend you.

It again proves what can be accomplished by an orderly and unemotional approach to the problems of our times. It is evidence of what can be achieved by collective bargaining in having respect for the law of the land, the welfare of our citizens, and the interests of our beloved country.

Everyone has reason to rejoice at this turn of events, Mr. Speaker. Mere words are inadequate to express the appreciation of those who will benefit directly and indirectly by your great patriotic spirit and action in making possible settlement of the industrial controversy, which if continued would have had the most serious repercussions at home and abroad at a time when we must all work as a team to preserve the rights of free men everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, by your statesmanship you have proven that you have the welfare of the people of this great country at heart. Our heartiest thanks to you, sir, for your very, very timely intervention.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

UNION PRESSURE

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, the unions are levying unwilling tribute from their members to defeat the Taft-Hartley Act. I include herewith an April 8 letter from a constituent and the tribute letter to which she refers. Please note the threat contained in the last paragraph of the union letter:

STATEN ISLAND, N. Y., *April 8, 1948.*

Hon. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK.

DEAR SIR: Sometime ago the local No. — of the Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Union, CIO, which I was forced to join, distributed cards which were printed by them in protest of the Taft-Hartley law. We were asked to sign our names and send them to our Congressmen, which I hesitatingly did. I don't agree with them in their interpretation of the Taft-Hartley law. But it can be quite uncomfortable working with people who think differently than you do.

In response to the card I sent to you, I received literature on the Taft-Hartley law which enlightened me further. I am grateful to you for the letter and the folder enclosed.

Union meetings usually interfere with meetings at my church, which to me is more important. I pay the $1 fine as penalty for not attending.

At one of these meetings which I hadn't attended, the Taft-Hartley bill was under discussion. They decided that as it was detrimental to the union, they should raise funds to campaign against it. The voting body decided to make an assessment proportionate to the salary of each union member. The constitution of the union states their right to do so. Anyone not complying is subject to penalty.

I am enclosing the letter which was sent to me from the union. I contribute regularly to my church and it seems foolish to continue supporting an organization whose methods and ends are contradictory to my religious and political beliefs. However, I realize I am obliged to pay the $10 assessment or possibly be fired. But I think you should know about their undemocratic and unjust methods of obtaining power.

Thanking you for your interest in this matter, I remain

Respectfully yours,

——— ———.

———

LOCAL NO. —, RETAIL, WHOLESALE AND DEPARTMENT STORE UNION,
New York, N. Y., April 2, 1948.

DEAR MEMBER: Nobody likes to be reminded of money he or she owes.

But this is different, very different. This is the kind of debt every union member should be anxious to settle at once, because it's not a debt, really. It's an investment in your future.

By now you know what this letter is about. We are referring to the assesment that was passed at the last regular membership meeting.

The word "assessment" scares some people—but not our members in this critical year. They know the score, they know the dangers ahead, and so most of the members came through with their contributions to our fighting defense fund at once.

Because that's what it is—a fighting defense fund.

We, like every other union in the country, are under attack as never before. That vicious Taft-Hartley law is going to make life difficult for us and easy for management.

In August our union shop goes out of the window. In February 1949 our contract expires and we must have a new contract.

You don't have to consult a fortuneteller to know that the cards are stacked against us and that we will need all the strength and unity and brains we can muster to see the struggle through successfully.

And we needn't tell you that a defense fund means money. That's why the membership passed the assessment.

The knowledge of what a strong union can do is fresh in the minds of all our members. That retroactive pay was a useful New Year's present. It wasn't just a bag of peanuts.

So let's get that assessment up fast. Compared with the retroactive pay it is peanuts.

Let us remind you of how it works: $10 for straight 40-hour people; $7.50 for part-timers of 28 hours; $5 for part-timers who are on 20 hours or for those who were employed since August 1.

The deadline for payment is April 14, 1948. If it is not paid by that date all names will be submitted to the executive board for further action.

Fraternally yours,

——— ———, *President.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two letters.

LEND-LEASE, THE BRITISH LOAN, AND THE MARSHALL PLAN

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I too was honored to receive this morning, by airmail from London, a clipping from the London Daily Express concerning American lend-lease, the British loan, and now, the Marshall plan. Attached to the clipping was a card which stated, "With Lord Beaverbrook's compliments."

Mr. Speaker, I believe the best friends England had in America were those who voted against the British loan and the Marshall plan. It is obvious that even Lord Beaverbrook feels the same way, for in his column he states:

Even though the belief must be reiterated that the loan did nothing but injury to Britain and the Empire, and the Marshall aid will have the same result.

Those who voted against the British loan and the Marshall plan refused to commit themselves to a program, and a continued program, of aiding, financing and perpetuating the present socialistic government of England. Certainly a great mass of the people of England do not concur with the record of that government. After all, the people of England should have the right to decide the type of government they want to have without combating the effect of American dollars in British politics.

SPEAKER JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include the radio broadcast of commentator Mr. George Reedy which he delivered this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I want to read part of the comment of George Reedy over Station WOL this morning. He says:

MARTIN is now unquestionably a national figure. He has done something that three Democratic Presidents were unable to do. Without the use of troops, the Federal courts, or emotional appeals to the public he has talked Lewis into negotiating.

That is no small feat. President Wilson had to threaten Lewis with the Army. President Roosevelt had to go over his head and appeal directly to the miners. President Truman had to go to the Federal courts and get injunction—and heavy fines against him.

MARTIN'S success thus puts him up in the front ranks of the country's public figures. He has already been discussed as a possible dark horse, in the event the Republican convention should deadlock. Now those discussions must be considered more than speculation.

The full text of Mr. Reedy's broadcast follows:

Last week Speaker of the House JOE MARTIN was just another dark horse in the Republican Presidential stables. Today, he has forged to a commanding position in his party, where he will have to be given serious thought when convention time rolls around.

The transition was sudden and dramatic. It came through the month-old, soft-coal strike, which was threatening to paralyze the Nation's industries. Last Saturday morning all the conflicting parties were deadlocked and a settlement seemed impossible.

MARTIN, entirely on his own initiative, stepped into this delicate situation. Within 2 hours he arranged a conference in his private office between the two principal antagonists. They were John L. Lewis, for the mine workers, and Ezra Van Horn, for the operators.

Neither had spoken to the other in weeks. They had fallen out over the administration of the mine workers' welfare fund. So bitter had their argument become that the third trustee for the money had resigned. His action had ended the possibility of breaking deadlocks.

MARTIN urged the two men to resume their negotiations. He asked them to agree on a third trustee for the fund, and suggested Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, for the job. In 13 minutes of fast talking he won his point. Both accepted.

So, for the first time since the strike started there is a chance for an early settlement. Even if Van Horn and Lewis cannot reconcile their differences, they are at least speaking to each other. In this case, as long as there is talk, there is hope.

But regardless of the outcome, MARTIN is now unquestionably a national figure. He has done something that three Democratic Presidents were unable to do. Without the use of troops, the Federal courts, or emotional appeals to the public he has talked Lewis into negotiating.

That is no small feat. President Wilson had to threaten Lewis with the Army. President Roosevelt had to go over his head and appeal directly to the miners. President Truman had to go to the Federal courts and get an injunction—and heavy fines against him.

MARTIN'S success thus puts him up in the front ranks of the country's public figures. He has already been discussed as a possible dark-horse in the event the Republican Convention should deadlock. Now those discussions must be considered more than speculation.

Of course, MARTIN has issued flat denials that he is a candidate for the Republican nomination. But he has said that he would not turn it down if both the party and the people wanted him. In other words, he is available.

He will certainly go into the Republican Convention in a stronger position than any other candidate that can be called a dark horse. Of course, he will have the pledges of few if any delegates. But at the same time he will not have a record of defeats in primaries.

Then, too, MARTIN'S popularity in the ranks of the Republican Party is great. He has lived and worked in the organization for most of his adult life. It is doubtful whether he has made any bitter enemies. It is definite that he has made many friends.

His only draw-back as a candidate in the past was lack of a national reputation. He has certainly made up for that now. The public will follow with close interest the career of a man who was able to convince John L. Lewis he should be reasonable.

MARTIN will still go into the Republican Convention as a dark-horse candidate. But if the leaders deadlock—and there is every possibility they will do just that—his name is certain to come up as soon as compromise candidates are discussed.

Meanwhile the guy rates neon monograms on his Speaker's gavels.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include newspaper articles.

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the Chicago Herald-American of Tuesday, April 6.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting in the Appendix an address delivered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] in Philadelphia.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and any other special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

THE COAL STRIKE

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDOWELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, Pittsburgh, Pa., the heart of the greatest concentration of soft coal in the world, also expresses its deep appreciation and high gratification about America's leading statesman for his great contribution to the safety and security of America. My coal miners thank him. From the rock-ribbed coast of the old Bay State to the sun-kissed shores of California, a new star has risen in the political firmament.

ERP

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to say anything about what the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOE MARTIN, did to stop the coal strike, because I know he did the country a great service and the country knows it. I do want to say that when Lord Beaverbrook sent this news article which the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] asked to have placed in the RECORD this morning, and which you should all read, I think you Members who were so much interested in ERP, ERP, ERP, should think of the American people and their pocketbooks. I hope the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York, JOHN TABER, will put the screws down on this appropriation and keep the money right here in America, where it belongs, instead of keeping the socialistic government of Great Britain in power. Lord Beaverbrook knows it is wrecking Great Britain with a Socialist government. I wonder how many Members of this House would give a nickel to socialize America. Not many of you, I am sure. I do not think there is one of you who would give a nickel to make America Socialist, but in Great Britain you are keeping, by your large ERP spending, the Socialist government in power. A great wrong to the people in Britain who believe in the private-enterprise system of doing things. I hope the Appropriations Committee will stop the ERP by refusing money for the appropriation and saving our American taxpayers billions of dollars in taxes by saving our Treasury billions of additional debt, by saving the British of continuation of a socialistic government.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

RECOGNITION OF THE PRESS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and include a resolution and a bill which I have today introduced.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I believe the newspapers and newspaper men and women of our country and of the countries allied with us in the recent war made an invaluable contribution to victory and peace.

Without their never-failing assistance, Selective Service, the War bond campaigns, the blood banks, food conservation, and all our other essential wartime activities would have been immeasurably less successful.

It is no exaggeration for me to say that most of the men and women in the newspaper profession served their country in a manner that deserves the highest recognition and reward.

I therefore ask the support of the Congress for an act and resolution which I am sponsoring jointly with Senator ARTHUR CAPPER, of Kansas, himself a great newspaperman.

The act authorizes the presentation of certificates and appropriate medals to the 16 war correspondents who witnessed the surrender of the Germans at Reims, France, on May 7, 1945, and who kept the military secret of that event, in the interest of saving American lives, despite the great temptation to release the story without authorization.

When we honor these 16 war correspondents we also honor all the men and women in journalism, for these correspondents represent the integrity and responsibility that characterize and distinguish journalism.

The resolution expresses the gratitude of the Nation and of the Congress to all the men and women on the staffs of press services, individual newspapers, magazines, and radio broadcasting stations for their wartime patriotism. We cannot name them all, but we can and most certainly should pay our official respects to them as a group.

We are proud of our newspapers.

We are grateful for the newspapers which are bringing our country's message to the people in lands which look to us for help and guidance.

Let us show our pride and gratitude by hastening the passage of this act and resolution.

Let us give tangible proof of the affection we all truly feel for a free press.

House Concurrent Resolution —

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the many men and women in the organizations of the Associated Press, the International News Service, the United Press, and other news and picture services and on the staffs of the Nation's newspapers, magazines and radio broadcasting companies have served the United States in a patriotic and beneficial manner throughout the period embraced by World War II. This service in many instances has been beyond the call of ordinary duty and it has shown a general appreciation and acceptance of the responsibilities of good citizenship.

That in accordance with the historic policy of the United States to recognize and publicly acknowledge the gatitude of the people and the Government of the United States for loyal service, the Clerks of the Senate and the House of Representatives are directed to issue to the Associated Press, the International News Service, and the United Press copies of this resolution for themselves and for distribution to all their members or clients.

H. R. —

Be it enacted, etc., That Congress hereby declares that the 16 members of the official press group selected by the Chief of the Public Relations Division of the Allied Expeditionary Forces to witness the unconditional surrender of the Germans at Rheims, France, on Monday, May 7, 1945, displayed the highest ideals of responsible journalism and brought credit to their profession and security to their respective countries by keeping inviolate the pledge of confidence and military secrecy imposed upon them by the Chief of the Public Relations Division of the Supreme Headquarters of the Allied Expeditionary Forces.

That Congress further declares that in accordance with the historic policy of the United States to recognize and publicly to acknowledge the gratitude of the people and Government of the United States for patriotic service, that certificates and medals in recognition of their integrity and service be awarded to James I. Kilgallen, of the In-

ternational News Service; Boyd Lewis, of United Press, W. W. Chaplin, of the National Broadcasting System; Charles Collingwood, of the Columbia Broadcasting System, Paul Manning, of the Mutual Broadcasting System; Herbert Clark, of the Blue Network, Margaret Ecker, of the Canadian Press; Gerald Clark, of the Canadian Broadcasting Co.; Sgt. Ross Parry, of the Canadian Army publication, Maple Leaf; Omar White, of the Australian Press, Jean Lagrange, of the French Press; H. C. Taylor, of Reuters; Thomas Cadett, of the British Broadcasting Co.; Sgt. Charles Kiley, of the United States Army publication, Stars and Stripes; Drew Middleton, of the New York Times; and John O'Reilly, of the New York Herald Tribune.

SECTION 1. The medal authorized by this act shall be known as the Medal of Journalism and shall be in such form and of such design and material as shall be prescribed by the President.

SEC. 2. The sum of $500 is hereby appropriated for the payment of all expenses incident to the creation and awarding of the certificates and medals authorized by this act.

SEVENTY-GROUP AIR FORCE

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, the supplementary estimate submitted by the Bureau of the Budget for the Air Force is insufficient. We must make up our minds now whether we want a seventy-group Air Force. If we do, the supplemental appropriation must provide $2,388,000,000 additional, with one billion in cash and the balance in contract authorizations. If we do not want 70 groups, let us quit stalling around.

There is no question of getting the three services out of balance involved. None of the advocates of 70 groups want to do that. The question involved is the age-old rivalry between the three services. It is the rivalry denounced by the Congressional Aviation Policy Board when it said: "The loyalty of each service to its traditions is understandable, but unyielding adherents to service loyalties at the expense of national security is a luxury the Nation no longer can afford." Secretary Forrestal has not expressed any disagreement with that statement. In his present most difficult position, I know that he finally appreciates its significance.

All three services must be kept in balance and will be. Starting now on the 70-group program is the first step in placing them in balance. In addition, the design and procurement of aircraft is a long process.

More than 2 years ago the Air Force, while part of the Army, stated 70 groups to be the minimum. The President appointed his Aviation Policy Commission to advise him what the proper program should be. It said 70 groups. This Congress appointed its Congressional Aviation Policy Board to determine a proper program. Your own board said 70 groups. Why is the President waiting? The Congress should not wait.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and insert a statement made by Hon. Albert J. Fitzgerald, president of the UER, MW, and the CIO to the Ways and Means Committee on November 21, 1947, on the subject of taxation of farmers' cooperative associations.

Mr. Speaker, this statement should have been printed in the hearings, but through some mischance it was omitted. That is the reason I am asking that it be put in the Appendix of the RECORD today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances, in one to include an address by Secretary of the Treasury John Snyder at a recent meeting of the Red River Valley Association at Shreveport, La., and in the second a brilliant statement made this morning by Secretary of Defense James Forrestal before the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. ENGLE of California asked and was given permission to extent his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter that appeared in the Washington Post last Saturday.

Mr. COLMER (at the request of Mr. WILLIAMS) was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix in three separate instances, in one to include a newspaper article and in the second a speech by Hon. S. R. Young, executive assistant to the Postmaster General.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. SHEPPARD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from Tide magazine.

HITLER TACTICS IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemen from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the tactics of the late Hitler, the master of deception, are now invading the American political scene.

Hitler believed that a big lie would be more convincing than a little lie. He would frequently accuse those he wished to destroy of the very acts he was himself employing. He preyed upon his defenseless neighbors. Before he devoured them, he always blasted them with propaganda. It is no surprise to see public relation agents of certain California interests try these same tactics.

In press releases issued yesterday, Arizona is accused of raiding California to gain a water project for Arizona. The accusations are clearly deceptive. It is a well known fact that practically the entire State of Arizona is within the Colorado River Basin. The streams of Arizona make up a large part of the flow of the Colorado River. The Colorado River runs from the northern part of Arizona through a great portion of the State and then forms the boundary between Arizona and California. California contributes practically nothing in the way of water to this great river. And Arizona has had to fight a bitter battle with the politically and financially strong California in order to get something out of the Colorado River.

Thus far, Arizona's share out of this great river has been a pittance. California has had a lion's share. Now California interests try to tell the world that the poor little State of Arizona is trying to steal the Colorado River from the great big State of California. At this time California is receiving not only the greater portion of the power produced at the dams of the Colorado River but is also receiving virtually all the water diverted from the river. In order to sabotage Arizona's efforts to get a portion of its rightful share of the river, California interests attack Arizona. It is the old Hitler method of libeling and blasting in order to cover up the sins of the real thief.

Arizona's proposal to take water into central Arizona will be self-liquidating. Arizona can use all of the power produced at the Bridge Canyon Dam. If California does not want to buy any of this power, Arizona interests will be glad to consume all of it. In truth and in fact, California wants to develop the power project and steal some more of Arizona's Colorado River rights without letting Arizona get the water which it has already contracted for with the Department of the Interior.

The story of the Colorado River is a long one. On the California side, thus far, it has been a story of thievery and, from all indications, if California interests could carry out their deceptive and malignant scheme, it would continue to be a saga of plunder. On Arizona's side, it has been a straightforward and public attempt for justice and recognition of her legal and moral rights to a proportionate distribution of Colorado River water. Arizona does not stand alone on the side of justice. It is significant that six States in the Colorado River Basin are unanimously with Arizona in her pleas to get a just and equitable right in the resources of the Colorado River.

Do not be deceived by the dishonest artifice used by certain California interests in their merciless attempt to raid and invade the fundamental rights of a little State. In their depraved endeavor to rape a little State, they publicly turn the accusing finger on my State of Arizona, while backstage they are preparing to make the grand steal. The American people will not be misled by the perverted

LAW LIBRARY FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

tactics of Hitler. Thank God for the wisdom of a democratic people.

COLORADO RIVER

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I noted with interest what my esteemed colleague from the State of Arizona said. He spoke about propaganda and of his desire to bring the facts before the House. We have a bill now pending in committee in which we seek permission to bring this case of "who owns what and where the water belongs" to the highest court in the land, the Supreme Court. The State of Arizona is spreading the propaganda and fighting this very issue of having it settled in the proper place. So when you speak about propaganda, my dear colleague from Arizona, you must remember that we are trying to get the facts before Congress as well as the Supreme Court, and not rely on propaganda. You who live in glass houses should not throw stones.

SPEAKER MARTIN AND THE COAL STRIKE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, the people of my district, the State of Illinois, and, I am sure, the whole Nation, are proud of the effective, quiet, modest accomplishment of our Speaker in settling the coal strike.

Speaker JOE MARTIN'S stature and statesmanship are today the highest in our Nation.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, coming from the bituminous coal region of Pennsylvania—and about all we have in my district is bituminous coal, I cannot forego the opportunity to add my remarks to those that have been made on the floor of the House this morning and to assure our distinguished Speaker that the people of my district are very grateful for the statesmanlike actions of the Speaker of this House to settle the coal strike.

Mr. Speaker, you have been recommended very highly this morning for the Presidency of the United States. In this connection, I merely want to ask the question: Where is the First Lady?

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes today following the disposition of the legislative business of the day and any specal orders heretofore granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

WORLD PEACE

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, peace with freedom is the hope of the civilized world. Any step that an honorable person can take that will strengthen the possibility of world peace should be taken at this time. We saw right here in the Capital last Saturday morning what can be accomplished when parties to a dispute are brought together behind a closed door at the invitation of one whose only interest is in finding a solution to the dispute.

I would like to see President Truman ignore protocol and order the President's plane fueled for a flight to Moscow. I am confident that if President Truman notified Prime Minister Stalin that he was going to call on him and that he was bringing with him the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the minority leader of the House, the President pro tempore of the Senate and the minority leader of the Senate, they would be welcomed.

Some day our dispute with Soviet Russia must be settled. I believe it can still be settled peacefully and without appeasement. World peace with freedom is too important to permit protocol, face-saving or anything else but honor, to stand in the way.

Such a move by the President of the United States would be greeted with acclaim throughout the world and I believe such a conference could succeed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that JOE MARTIN is no longer a dark horse, but is very much in the limelight. If we team up Harold Stassen and JOE MARTIN, we will have a ticket that will sweep the Nation in November.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, you have done exceedingly well in the coal strike. When are we going to cure this bipartisan bankrupt foreign policy we have? Certainly we cannot ask Mr. Truman to retire because his foreign policy is so bad and elect some Republican to the Presidency whose foreign policy is exactly the same as Mr. Truman's and who therefore wants us to believe that he ought to become President because his foreign policy is so good.

Mr. Speaker, we would like to get the true facts from abroad which a two-party system should provide. According to Time, April 12 issue, England approves of ERP only by 55 percent, Sweden by 50 percent, and Switzerland 57 percent among those of their people who know about the so-called Marshall plan. Time is getting the facts on its own account and for our benefit. Surely, starvation is not indicated by this vote.

South America has spurned $500,000,000 which our bankrupt State Department offers them. Why? Because South America wants not the political socialized dollars we offer them. They want money from individual Americans who will go to those countries with the know-how in connection with refrigeration, mines, farming, and with machinery that will bring about the production of food and ultimate economic recovery. This is true of Europe as we are now being told.

Let us work for a free economy in America and abroad and abandon this socialized foreign policy that we are now engaged in. Cheap dollars in a global dole are not working. They cannot work because they support Socialist cabinets that are self-defeating and serve to liquidate recovery itself.

Is it possible that South American countries are spurning our State Department's offer of $500,000,000, because they wanted to play a full and constructive part in European recovery? They are cooperating nations. They asked no doles.

Congress had to take China away from the management of the State Department, a product of a bipartisan foreign policy. A two-party system of government in foreign affairs is clearly indicated. We must have a party of faith in restoration through free commerce and trade. It will make laws to facilitate recovery in the world. The present bipartisan policy of functioning in business through statism violates our fundamental concepts of freedom and is sure to fail.

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I got off the train this morning after spending the week end out in the Midwest. I want

to say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to my colleagues in the House, that when word came over the radio and through the press that the Speaker had intervened in the solution of the problems out of which grew this coal strike, it was like a breath of clean, fresh air spreading over that whole area.

I want you to know, Mr. Speaker, that the people of the great Midwest where I come from are looking to you to take the lead in the solution of some other problems that need attention. They have confidence that you will approach the solution of those problems and solve them in the same direct magnanimous manner that enabled you to bring about solution of the coal strike.

I congratulate you, sir, and so far as I am concerned it is no news when I say that for a year and a half the man who sits in the Speaker's chair I felt should grace the White House.

AMENDING PARAGRAPH 1803 (2) OF THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930 RELATING TO FIREWOOD AND OTHER WOODS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5328) to amend paragraph 1803 (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, relating to firewood and other woods, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Line 6, strike out all after "including" down to and including "compressed" in line 8, and insert: "fuel made by compression from bark, sawdust, or other wood waste of the saw or planing mill."

After line 10 insert:

"(b) This act shall be effective as to merchandise entered for consumption, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on and after the 30th day after the enactment of this act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

X-RAY FILM

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4739) to amend paragraph 1629 of the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to provide for the free importation of exposed X-ray film, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Line 3, after "That" insert: (a)

After line 7 insert:

"(b) This act shall be effective as to merchandise entered for consumption, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on and after the thirtieth day after the enactment of this act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THOMAS JEFFERSON

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow will be the two hundred and fifth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, to my mind the greatest statesman of all time. I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, someone appointed by the Speaker may read Jefferson's first inaugural address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we Democrats are not supposed to get mixed up in this Republican campaign; but I must say that you Republicans are showing signs of improvement in your choice of candidates.

It is a pity that you did not put JOE MARTIN'S name on the ticket in Wisconsin. As it was, you had Stassen down there running on the antioleomargarine ticket, General MacArthur running on his war record, and Governor Dewey, of New York, running on the FEPC ticket. He went back home, as Gov. Bob Taylor once said, "With a hole in his vanity and his pride in a sling."

I do not know whether Mr. MARTIN'S name will be on the ticket in Nebraska tomorrow or not; but I am sure that if it is, and if they know him as we know him, he will lead the ticket in the Nebraska Republican primary.

My distinguished friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. CROW] a while ago, after complimenting Speaker MARTIN very highly, raised the question as to who would be the First Lady in case of his election, indirectly calling attention to the fact Mr. MARTIN is single.

But that provides this bit of consolation: If you should elect JOE MARTIN President of the United States, the country would not be annoyed with Eleanor clubs.

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the laudable remarks this morning about our able Speaker concerning his fine accomplishment. I do not know that it would become me to endorse him for President, being a Democrat, and I did not rise for that purpose. I rise to say this, that while we take cognizance of the fact that we have had one man great enough to settle the crippling coal strike that we, as Members of Congress, should realize that there should not be one man great and powerful enough to cause the coal strike. That is our responsibility, the responsibility of the Congress of the United States, and not the Speaker. How long will we permit John L. Lewis to flaunt his despotic power in our faces? The strike is settled but the cause is still with us.

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with my colleagues from the great State of New Jersey in this nominating convention and to say that we are for the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOE MARTIN, 100 percent. He has done a great service to our country in settling the coal strike which is in accord with his entire record in Congress as a wise and constructive leader. I am delighted to know, from the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] that he has the backing of the Democratic Party as well. As for the Lady in the White House, I have known JOE and his home folks for many years. In North Attleboro, most of the people who vote are relatives of mine, and among them are some of the prettiest girls in America, and I shall be happy to speak to them in his behalf if for some unaccountable reason he should fail to speak for himself.

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. If such misfortune should befall the country and we would be obliged to have a Republican President, I do not know of any gentleman today that I would rather see as Republican President than our Speaker, JOSEPH W. MARTIN. I said that a year and a half ago. But may I say that the Speaker, to make a good President, would be obliged to pry himself loose from the National Association of Manufacturers, which organization, up to this time, seems to control the action of the Republican Party.

Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] obtained unanimous consent that tomorrow, the anniversary of Jefferson's

birth, the Speaker designate some Member to read his address. I hope that not only the gentleman himself but all the Members will take to heart that which Thomas Jefferson believed and advocated. The gentleman from Mississippi also congratulated the Speaker, as did so many Republicans, on account of the part he played in the adjustment of the coal strike. I join other Members in congratulating you in bringing about this adjustment; and at the same time I want to congratulate the miners in obtaining a pension of $100 a month at the age of 62 years, which seems to meet with general approval. Perhaps the action of the Attorney General has been instrumental to some degree in bringing about the adjustment. However, I wonder whether all of the Republicans would have so unanimously approved of the miners gaining their pension, for which they were obliged to strike, if some Democrat, instead of the Speaker, had been instrumental in bringing about the adjustment.

Mr. Speaker, I regret exceedingly that the gentleman from Mississippi has, in view of the remarks he made a short while ago with respect to whom the White House lady should be in the event the Speaker assumed the Presidency, referred by implication to Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt unkindly. I feel that such is ungallant and will be resented by millions of the American people. As the widow of the late President who 3 years ago sacrificially departed this life in the interest of our country, in the interest of Jeffersonian democracy, and humanity, it is generally conceded that she played an important part in his official life and materially aided him in his fight for freedom, peace, and the betterment of mankind. Since she is continuing with outstanding results her efforts to aid in eliminating human discrimination in our country and is tirelessly devoting herself to effecting peace and helping the underprivileged class, it must be acknowledged that she is a woman of ability and superlative attainments. She is unselfishly carrying on the policies for which her late beloved husband worked to the last minute of his life, and, therefore, as I said before, I do regret that the gentleman from Mississippi or anyone else should be so unkind, though she may advocate things the gentleman from Mississippi may not approve but which she believes are fair and just and for the best interest of the country, as to refer to her unkindly.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 154, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 15,000 additional copies each of the report and supplements 1 and 2 of the Subcommittee on National and International Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, entitled "The Strategy and Tactics of World Communism," for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 2, after the comma following the word "concurring", insert the words "That there be printed as a House document and."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution, House Resolution 330, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 176, Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, further amounts not to exceed $25,000, including expenditures for printing and binding, employment of such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution, House Resolution 481, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (h) (1), Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments acting as a whole or for such emergency subcommittees as may be created by the direction of the chairman, not to exceed $50,000, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee, signed by the chairman of the said committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out "$50,000" and insert "$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution, House Resolution 508, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the investigations to be conducted by the Special committee created by H. Res. 461, not to exceed $40,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATION OF PUBLICITY AND PROPAGANDA IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution, House Resolution 517, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations with respect to publicity and propaganda in the Government departments and agencies authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $50,000 additional, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, special counsel, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent funds of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee and signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution, House Resolution 518, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 111, Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Education and Labor, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $50,000 additional, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, clerical, stenographic, special counsel, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATUE OF WILLIAM E. BORAH

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 18, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed, with illustrations, and bound in such form and style as may be directed by the Joint Committee on Printing, 5,900 copies of the proceedings held in connection with the unveiling of the statue of former Senator William E. Borah in Statuary Hall, Capitol Building, Washington, D. C., on June 6, 1947, together with such other matter as may be relevant thereto, of which 1,250 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 3,750 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 900 copies shall be for the use and distribution of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Idaho.

The Joint Committee on Printing is hereby authorized to have the copy prepared for the Public Printer and shall procure suitable illustrations to be published with these proceedings.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROCEEDINGS AT UNVEILING OF PLAQUE COMMEMORATING THE DISCOVERY OF THE TELEGRAPH

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I desire to call up House Resolution 526, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the proceedings held in the Capitol of the United States at the unveiling of the plaque commemorating the centennial of the telegraph be printed, with an illustration, as a House document; and that 5,000 additional copies be printed, of which 2,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 3,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUSING IN AMERICA

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up House Concurrent Resolution 182 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed as a House Document, and that there be printed 15,000 additional copies of the factual analysis on housing prepared for the Joint Committee on Housing, entitled "Housing in America," for the use of the said joint committee.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GOSSETT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, there has been brought to my attention the fact that the Public Housing Authority has recently discovered that they have an unexpended surplus of $10,000,000 which they did not know they had when they asked Congress for $35,000,000 more to complete the reuse housing. Apparently their books were in such bad condition that they were unable to tell exactly how much money they had unexpended. In addition, their estimate of $35,000,000 was some $10,000,000 in excess of what they really needed so that they now have a surplus, I understand, of $20,000,000 which should be turned back into the United States Treasury. Under present plans, however, and probably in order to prevent the necessity of admitting their mistakes in bookkeeping, they are about to try to spend this enormous sum on such things as storm windows and other refinements on temporary houses already built.

The Committee on Banking and Currency or the Appropriations Committee, it seems to me, should immediately look into this matter and demand that the $20,000,000 be returned to the Treasury before PHA spends it uselessly.

VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE RELIEF OF VICTOR C. KAMINSKI (H. DOC. NO. 607)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, the enrolled bill (H. R. 3061) "For the relief of Victor C. Kaminski (also known as Victor Kaminski)."

The bill would direct the Attorney General to cancel deportation proceedings in the case of Victor C. Kaminski, of Wilmington, Del., and would direct that no further warrants or orders be issued in his case insofar as they are based upon the same grounds as the warrants or orders required by this act to be canceled. The bill would further provide that the alien shall be considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on July 23, 1946, at Philadelphia, Pa.

The alien is a native and citizen of Poland who last entered the United States on July 23, 1946, at Philadelphia, Pa., as a member of the crew of the steamship *Wisla* and deserted. He is 24 years of age and single. On September 12, 1946, the Board of Immigration Appeals directed that the alien be deported to Poland but that he be permitted to depart from the United States, or ship foreign one way, without expense to the Government, to any country of his choice, such departure to be verified and considered in compliance with the warrant of deportation. The grounds for this order were that the alien was in the United States in violation of the act of 1917 in that at the time of entry he was afflicted with a dangerous contagious disease, and that at the time of entry he was an immigrant not in possession of a valid immigration visa. He was employed as a seaman for several years before deserting his ship and has no relatives in the United States. The quota to which he is chargeable has been oversubscribed for a number of years to come.

This young man has related a story of suffering and persecution at the hands of the German Gestapo in his native land, which arouses a natural sympathy in his behalf. His situation, however, is not unlike thousands of others throughout the world who are seeking a haven in the United States, but who are obliged to await their turn under established immigration quotas. To grant the special, out-of-turn privilege proposed by this measure would postpone the entry of some other hopeful Polish person rightfully awaiting the opportunity to enjoy the blessings of a new life in this country.

For these reasons I am obliged to withhold approval of the bill.

HARRY TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 12, 1948.*

The SPEAKER. The objection of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the message and bill referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered printed.

LESLIE PRICE ET AL.—VETO MESSAGE (H. DOC. NO. 608)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, the enrolled bill (H. R. 1586) "For the relief of Mrs. Leslie Price, Philip C. Price, Mrs. Louise Keyton, Annie Curry, and James Curry."

The bill would provide for the payment to Mrs. Leslie Price the sum of $1,007.50; to Philip C. Price, the sum of $807.50; to Annie Curry, the sum of $567.19; to James Curry, the sum of $656.26; all of Donovan, Ga.; and to Mrs. Louise Keyton, of Wrightsville, Ga., the sum of $590, in full settlement of all claims for personal injuries, medical expenses, property damage, and loss of earnings as the result of a collision of a car belonging to Mrs. Leslie Price and an Army vehicle on April 4, 1943.

From available information it appears that, at about 10:30 a. m. on April 4, 1943, an Army truck operated by an enlisted man on official business was proceeding north on United States Highway No. 1, near Augusta, Ga. Upon reaching a point where an intersecting road enters that highway from the west, the Army driver, desiring to turn left thereon, stopped his truck on the right-hand side of the pavement to await the passage of a south-bound convoy of Army vehicles,

which was already passing the intersection. An automobile owned by Mrs. Leslie Price and operated by her husband, Philip C. Price, in which Mrs. Price, Mrs. Louise Keyton, James Curry, and his wife, Mrs. Annie Curry, were riding as passengers, was proceeding north on United States Highway No. 1 and approached the stopped Army truck from the rear around a right-hand curve. As the civilian automobile neared the Army truck, Mr. Price turned to the left side of the highway to pass the truck and as he did so his car collided head-on with an oncoming Army command car, the seventh or eighth unit in the south-bound convoy. The civilian vehicle was demolished and all of its occupants sustained personal injuries.

The driver of the Army truck which had stopped at the intersection stated that he had given the proper hand signal before stopping his truck, and this was corroborated by the statement of another enlisted man riding in the truck as a passenger. The civilian driver, Mr. Price, denied seeing the hand signal, and stated that he had been driving at a speed not exceeding 30 miles an hour and following the Army truck at a distance of from 20 to 30 yards. He also made the following statement:

> I did not realize that it [the Army truck] was not moving until I was very close to it, about 20 or 25 feet away. If the driver of the Army truck gave any signal, I did not see it. The part of the road I could see at that point looked like it was clear, so I pulled sharply to the left to go around the parked truck. I saw another Army vehicle, leading a convoy, coming toward me. I immediately put on brakes and tried to cut back to the right and go between the two vehicles, but could not make it. The left front of my car hit the left front of the Army command car. I estimate that my speed and the speed of the Army vehicle were both about 20 miles per hour when we hit.

The above statements show that the civilian driver was not giving proper attention to the Army truck which he was following. This is indicated by his statement that, although he was driving at least 20 yards behind the Army vehicle, he did not observe that it had stopped until he was within 20 or 25 feet of it. It may be that the reason Mr. Price did not see the stop signal given by the Army driver was because he was not watching the truck at the time it was brought to a stop. When he saw that he could not stop in time to avoid striking the truck, he turned into the left lane of the two-lane road without ascertaining that it was clear. The conclusion therefore seems inescapable that the sole proximate cause of the accident and resulting property damage and personal injuries sustained by these claimants was the negligence of the civilian driver.

In the light of all the facts and circumstances surrounding this accident there is no justifiable basis for an appropriation for the relief of these claimants. Therefore, while deeply regretting this unfortunate occurrence, I am constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 12, 1948.*

The SPEAKER. The objection of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the message and bill referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered printed.

AKIKO TSUKADO MILLER—VETO MESSAGE (H. DOC. NO. 609)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, the enrolled bill (H. R. 2347) for the relief of Mrs. Akiko Tsukado Miller.

The bill proposes to provide that notwithstanding the provision of law excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Mrs. Akiko Tsukado Miller, Japanese wife of an officer in the United States Navy, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence upon compliance with the requirements of the so-called "Soldier Brides' Act."

The beneficiary of this bill is now eligible for admission to the United States for permanent residence under the act of July 22, 1947, Public Law 213, Eightieth Congress, which amended the so-called "Soldier Brides' Act," so as to extend the benefits of that act to persons of all races. Accordingly, this legislation is not necessary.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 12, 1948.*

The SPEAKER. The objection of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the message and bill referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO LATIN-AMERICAN COUNTRIES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In recent months the United States has been considering a number of measures to further the achievement of the primary objective of our foreign policy—the establishment throughout the world of the conditions of a just and lasting peace.

One of the essential requirements for the attainment of that objective is continuing cooperation among the American Republics and collaboration in the development of their resources and industries.

Genuine friendship has long existed between the people of the United States and our neighbors to the south. This friendship has been marked by cultural and economic association and close cooperation. The people of the United States have strongly supported the policy of the good neighbor and have a special regard for the peoples of the countries to the south of us.

The United States has long recognized the importance of economic and political stability in the Western Hemisphere. Such stability rests substantially upon the continuation of a satisfactory rate of economic progress. In this respect, we must fairly recognize that the economies of the other American Republics are relatively undeveloped. In these countries, natural resources are abundant but the expansion of production has been restricted due to the lack of capital and of modern production methods. Production can be increased only by means of a considerable volume of capital investment in transportation and power facilities, processing plants and other installations.

To some extent the need for capital in these countries is met by domestic savings, but such savings in general are insufficient to secure the necessary equipment and technical skills. Substantial and continued progress in the development of the resources and industries of the other American Republics therefore requires foreign financing. The United States, by reason of its close relations with these countries and its strong economic position, is the principal source to which the other American Republics look for equipment, materials, and technology, as well as for their financing.

I recommend, therefore, that the Congress increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank by $500,000,000. The proposed increase in the lending authority of the bank would not involve any change in the statutory requirements under which the bank has been operating.

This increased lending authority would place the bank in a position to assist in meeting essential requirements for the financing of economic development in the other American Republics. It would permit the bank to make loans for well-planned development projects which are economically justified, and to cooperate most effectively with private funds.

Such an increase would not, of course, be a substitute for necessary action that the other American Republics can and should take to attract private investment capital and to mobilize fully their own investment resources.

The proposed increase represents, I believe, an important step which this Government should take to assist the economic development of the countries to the south of us.

It is of great importance to the United States, as a member of the American community, that there be continued expansion of production, increasing trade activity and rising standards of living in the other American Republics. It is in our mutual interest to help develop in the countries to the south those essential materials which are becoming less abundant in the United States, as well as others regularly imported from distant regions.

Above all, it is in our mutual interest to assist the American Republics to continue their economic progress, which can contribute so much to the cooperative strength of the independent American Republics.

I request the Congress, therefore, to give favorable consideration to the proposed increase in the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 8, 1948.*

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1948

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned last Thursday it had adopted House Resolution 521 for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5883.

I therefore move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5888, to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5888, with Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, nearly 55 years ago in the city of Chicago, Ill., there was held what was known as the World Columbian Exposition. Over the golden doorway of the Transportation Building at that exposition was inscribed these words: "There be three things that make a nation great and prosperous—a fertile soil, busy workshops, easy conveyance for man and goods from place to place."—Bacon.

The bill before the House today intends to promote and extend the third of these three great things that make a nation great and prosperous, namely, easy conveyance for men and goods from place to place.

The Committee on Public Works brings to the floor of the House H. R. 5888 with an unanimous report. There is no dissenting opinion. The bill is plain in its language. It simply provides, as the gentleman from Iowa so ably explained to the House last Thursday, for a continuation of the national road program for a period of 3 years and extends it through the years 1950, 1951, and 1952. It provides $500,000,000 a year for three years to be allocated and apportioned among the 48 States, this money to be met by matching funds by the States for the purpose of building new roads and perfecting the road system of the United States.

It may be of some interest to know that in this country we have 3,330,000 miles of good roads, including the paved streets in the cities. Eliminating the streets in the cities and towns the United States has 1,300,000 miles of good paved roads. That is enough paved road to girdle this earth 51 times. In my own State of Michigan we have more good roads than they have in all of Russia.

Coming from the State of Michigan as I do, where the capital of the automobile industry is situated, quite naturally I am intensely interested that the Nation's roads be improved and extended, because of the 37,000,000 registered automobiles in the United States. We have the greatest system of highways and roads in the entire world. We have one car for every four people of the Nation. We could put the entire American population on rubber today and move them from one State to another.

The funds are divided exactly the same as they were under the old Road Act, namely, 45 percent for projects on Federal highways systems, 30 percent on principal secondary and feeder roads and 25 percent on the Federal-aid highway system in urban areas. Members of the House who come from the large populous cities of the Nation, I mean large cities, I am sure will be greatly interested, because it assists the cities in constructing the main highways that lead in and out of the great populous centers of the United States. In addition to that there are $25,000,000 annually for the years 1950, 1951, and 1952 for forest highways; $12,500,000 annually for 3 years for forest development roads; $4,250,000 annually for 3 years for the maintenance of trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas; $10,000,000 annually for access to national parks and national monuments and $6,000,000 for Indian reservation roads and trails.

That is the substance of the bill. I do not know of any argument or dissenting opinion in opposition to it. I do not think it is necessary for me to say that the winter of 1947–48 was one of the most severe and hard winters that we have had in this Nation in many years, and as a result of that the highways and roads of this country are now in a bad state of repair. I think I ought to mention that the roads necessarily were neglected somewhat because of the years of the war when attention could not be given to them. This bill is to carry forward the program in order to repair the roads and bring the highway system of the United States to a very high level.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I want to thank the gentleman for his splendid presentation and ask him if he does not agree with me when I say that this is an American bill? It is for the welfare of all the people of the United States, just as the act that our beloved Speaker performed Saturday was for the welfare of all of our people. While I am on my feet, in answer to the gentleman who wondered where the first lady would be, I would say that the first lady will probably be, as she always has been—all the people of the United States. The welfare of all the people has always been close to the heart of our beloved Speaker.

Mr. DONDERO. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution.

May I add at this time my appreciation for the splendid presentation that the gentleman addressing the House made of this bill last Thursday. The gentleman from Iowa is the chairman of the Roads Committee of the Committee on Public Works and as such has devoted a great deal of time and attention to the preparation of this bill. We owe him and his colleagues on that committee on both sides of the aisle, including our very able colleague from the State of Mississippi, the ranking minority member [Mr. WHITTINGTON], who has never failed to make his contribution of a constructive nature in the preparation of this and other legislation, a sincere vote of thanks.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that those of us who have been interested in road matters and have followed the endeavors of the Public Works Committee, deeply appreciate the constructive work that the committee as a whole has done on this bill. There are some notable improvements, particularly in the language which relates to that portion of the bill dealing with the secondary roads, over prior acts on Federal aid.

This bill establishes for the first time the definition that the term "secondary and feeder roads" shall include county and township roads. However, in reading the bill it appears to me that the text does it for the purposes of this act and subsequent acts. Now, it has come to my attention that there are many States where the secondary road allotment funds have not been used because of various difficulties, lack of time, lack of matching funds, lack of personnel, and so forth. The extension of secondary funds to county and township roads will increase the possible matches, so to speak, for this and future programs. But what about the unexpended portions of existing allotments? I am wondering if there would be any objection on the part of the committee to amending that paragraph on page 2 extending the secondary road provisions of the Federal aid act to make it read "except that for the purposes of any act relating to the postwar construction" and so forth, so as to make this definition of secondary and feeder roads include county and township roads, on any unexpended funds now existing as well as future appropriations under the authorizations herein created.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Are you going to take some time to discuss that and offer an amendment, or are you going to ask the committee to accept it?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I was hoping that perhaps the committee might agree that that was their intention and their purpose and that they might frame a committee amendment to cover it; otherwise I would seek to offer such an amendment.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. In reply to the gentleman from South Dakota, I happen to be the author of the amendment that is being discussed. It was the complete intent of the author, and I think the intent of the Subcommittee on Roads as well as the intention of the full committee, that the Federal Works Agency and all previous acts would be taken care of

by this act. We simply wanted to amend the language in the previous legislation relative to the 1944 Highway Act. We had the legislative counsel draft the amendment and it was categoried under the words "this act." I think I am correct in that statement.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentleman from Ohio is correct. The 2-year grace period which is in the present law will give the Public Roads Administration the right to so construe it and according to the testimony before our committee, it is my understanding that that is what it intends to do. I do not believe any amendment as suggested by the gentleman from South Dakota is necessary.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It strikes me that the very language of the act where they use the language "Federal Highway Act of 1944," including county and township roads settles the matter.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thought so too in reading that portion of it, but I went back and read the earlier part of the paragraph where it states "except for the purposes of this act and all subsequent acts." I was just a little afraid that that might be interpreted to mean that it included only the funds appropriated under the authorization of this act.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It does provide for this and subsequent acts. In addition to that, it amends the act so as to make it retroactive to those funds that have not been allocated.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Certainly I would agree that the statement of the gentleman from Ohio who apparently offered the language in committee, together with the statement of the gentleman from Iowa, who is chairman of the subcommittee, which I understand worked out the bill, and the statement of the gentleman from Mississippi, the ranking minority member, that such was the intent. It would be difficult for the lawyers or the General Accounting Office to construe it otherwise. With these positive statements on the part of the gentleman on the floor of the House during the consideration of this bill that should be the way the language will be construed. I appreciate the expressions which have been made.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. May I ask my colleague from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] whether he is satisfied now that the unexpended balances for secondary roads can be used on county and township roads?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Certainly in view of the statements that have been made by the various gentlemen, it would seem they could be so used as well as allocations under any appropriations authorized which have not actually yet been made. But I shall be glad to confer with the gentleman from Nebraska if there is any doubt remaining in his mind and we will talk further with the gentlemen about it.

Mr. STEFAN. I have talked to the distinguished chairman of this committee, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and the gentleman from Iowa was very anxious to put something in the bill, at my suggestion, that would actually get some of these farm-to-market roads constructed. If the gentleman is satisfied that with the assurance of the members of the committee, no amendment is necessary, I would go along with him. But if you think an amendment is necessary to strengthen it, so as to bring about a construction of these farm-to-market roads, I would go along with you on that.

Mr. DONDERO. May I say to the gentleman from South Dakota that the committee devoted more time to the language which was proposed by the gentleman from Ohio than perhaps any other section of the entire bill. The gentleman from Ohio is entitled to a great deal of credit for putting into this bill language which would encourage the improvement of these township roads which come, of course, under the highway system of the United States.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It certainly was a very constructive contribution to the act, because I think every Member of the House wants to see some of these roads get out to where the people live. I am for it so strongly that I want county and township roads made eligible for existing funds as well as those to be appropriated in the future.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. I want to commend the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] for his diligence and painstaking efforts to see to it that the taxpayer gets his money's worth. This is a fine bill. The absence of opposition to the bill is a testimony of the way Congress feels about his work and the work of the chairman of the Roads Committee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM]. I also want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR]. You have properly stated the case in giving him credit for looking after secondary roads. This issue was discussed very fully by the full committee as well as the subcommittee and adequate provision was made. I compliment our chairman [Mr. DONDERO] for his splendid leadership.

Mr. DONDERO. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one additional minute.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Can the gentleman tell me whether this $6,000,000 for Indian reservations is an increase? I think it is, but I am not quite sure.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman from Iowa answer the question whether the $6,000,000 provided in the bill is an increase or the same amount provided in the last bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The same amount as in the last bill. That was put in at the instance of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who offered an amendment on the floor in December 1944 which was adopted by the House at that figure. The committee carried it on at the same figure that was put in at that time.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to commend the committee for that. I wish it might have been more.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. HOBBS. I wish to join the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota in his blanket tribute to all of the chairmen and the members of this committee that have brought in this bill. I would like to ask the gentleman two questions, if I may.

I understand that this extends the appropriation of the 1944 act for grade A highways of the Federal-aid type, and that will not expire on June 30.

Mr. DONDERO. It will not. It extends the entire highway program for 3 years more until 1952.

Mr. HOBBS. That was my understanding.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman. I yield myself one additional minute.

Mr. HOBBS. I understand the Federal Good Roads Bureau has nothing to do with State parks, but inasmuch as the State parks were built by the Federal Government, and some of them are located in national forests, I hope the gentleman can assure us that there will be sympathetic consideration of the cooperative protection that will give us public roads to them.

Mr. DONDERO. I am sure that will be so.

Mr. HOBBS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H. R. 5888, is a substitute for H. R. 4867 and H. R. 4868, upon which extensive hearings were held by the Public Works Committee, of which I am a member. In effect, with some modifications, it continues the 3-year, post-war Federal-aid highway program under which we are now operating, for an additional 3-year period with authorizations for appropriations of $500,000,000 per year, the amount carried in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944. Under that act and under this bill, the appropriation is divided as follows: (a) $225,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system either inside or outside municipalities; (b) $150,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, which includes farm-to-market roads, rural free delivery mail, and public-school bus routes; (c) $125,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid urban highway system.

Testimony was heard by the committee from all parties interested in highway development throughout the Nation, and there was almost unanimity of opinion that the 1944 Federal highway program had met with almost universal approval

and should be continued for another 3 years. Under this bill, the authorizations begin with the termination of the present law and continue for a period of 3 years thereafter.

The program for primary and secondary road systems has proved to be a great boon to our economy, not only in peace but during war. We found, during the war, that adequate public roads were an essential to our war activities. Likewise, in peacetime, they are one of the most important links in the economy of the Nation. The Federal Government has long contributed to the States and their local subdivisions on a 50–50 basis for road construction. With the advent of the automobile and the demand for truck transportation, the program for construction and maintenance of public roads has been a major one. During the year 1947, 7,929 miles of Federal-aid highways of all classes were constructed, as compared with only 2,964 miles in 1946. This was a much curtailed program, however, as in 1941 we constructed 12,936 miles of roads with Federal aid. The total cost of completed projects on the Federal-aid system in 1947 was $142,965,296, and completed secondary roads cost $55,334,860. In money value, the highway program for the year amounted to approximately $1,000,000,000, that is, $932,362,226 for 24,720 miles of highways. The total payments of the States during the year for work done on Federal-aid highways amounted to $193,634,155.

By this bill the Public Works Committee has approved a program for the next 3 years, projected on the needs of speeding up construction to overtake, as far as possible, the lag which was occasioned by the war. The Federal Aid Highways Acts of 1944 authorized appropriations of $500,000,000 annually to aid the States in highway improvement in each of the first 3 postwar fiscal years. This program will expire next year, and our committee has recommended its extension on the same basis. The 1944 act required the designation of a national system of interstate highways not to exceed 40,000 miles in extent, by joint action of the State highway departments and the Public Roads Administration.

It is true we have a heavy budget and will be called upon to expend, in the next several years large sums of money for providing national defense as well as carrying forward our commitments for aid to European and Asiatic countries in the work of rehabilitation and providing a stable peace. However, we will be unable to meet our obligations in these respects if we permit our economy at home to be undermined, and fail to make the necessary appropriations from the Federal Treasury to build up and maintain our domestic economy. The building and maintenance of adequate national highways is an essential part of national defense as well as our domestic economy. Highways are the life lines of our Nation. Without adequate highways we will not be able to carry forward the commerce of the Nation which proved to be the strongest factor in our success in World War II. Moreover, there are in our Nation today more than 25,000 communities wholly dependent upon highway transportation for their commercial life.

Some question was raised before our committee as to the advisability of continuing the program for a 3-year period. There was much support for continuing it for a 5-year period instead of three. It must not be overlooked that the States, in matching these Federal funds, must have sufficient time in advance of receiving the funds, to perfect their plans and enact the necessary legislation to secure the matching money and set up their own road programs. In order to accomplish this, the State legislatures need to be assured that a long-range highway construction program will be maintained. Most of the State legislatures meet only every 2 years, which means that their own programs must be provided for 2 years in advance, and unless they know at the time of the sessions what the Federal program will be, it is impossible for them to act wisely in projecting their plans.

Mr. Chairman, in the Western States and in some of the Southern States, there is a heavy stand of commercial timber. In my own State of Oregon, we have the largest stand of commercial timber of any State in the Nation. In these States forest highways are of great importance to the marketing, conservation and protection of the commercial stands of timber. We are, for that reason, especially interested in the forest highway program and feel that it would be a great mistake if there should be any diminution in support of the program for forest roads. We found, during the war and in the postwar period, that an adequate supply of forest products was essential to our economy. It is, therefore, particularly necessary that we provide the funds for access roads through these forests to market the mature timber and make it available, not only for peacetime use, but to assure an adequate supply of timber products for national defense in case of an emergency.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that this most worthy bill will receive the unanimous support of the House.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there is universal need for the expansion and enlargement of the highways of the Nation. Prior to the act of 1944 there had been no authorization act since 1940. That act provided for authorizations for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943. Our highways proved their worth during the war. No construction was made except for strategic highways or access highways, and highways to military, naval, and airport installations, in aid of the war effort, during the war.

The bill before us has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Public Works. The report is informative. Hearings were conducted and they are extensive and are available to the Members.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 was approved on December 20 of that year, and it was implemented by Concurrent Resolution 81, approved October 2, 1945, to provide authorization for appropriations for the fiscal years 1946, 1947, and 1948. Under the terms of the act, all States had 1 year in which to match the apportionment of funds to the States.

By the act of June 21, 1947, that 1 year was extended to 2 years. There has been delay in construction, there has been scarcity of materials, scarcity of labor. High costs of construction have contributed to the delay in the improvement of highways. While the authorization in the act of 1944 was for 3 years, for practical purposes it includes the year 1949, and is thus for 4 years. The pending bill is for the fiscal years 1950, 1951, and 1952. The act of 1944 provided for an interstate or inter-regional highway system. That system was approved on August 2, 1947. It consists of approximately 40,000 miles. It connects the principal cities of the country.

The needs for highways are multiplied. In the peak year 1941 there were 34,356,000 motor vehicles on the highways of the country. During the year 1947 that number had increased by 2,644,000, having reached a total of 37,000,000, and it is believed that by fiscal year 1950 there will be 50,000,000 motor vehicles registered. This means that our present system of highways is inadequate and that it must be expanded to keep pace with our needs. Formerly, highways were constructed to connect rural areas with cities. Then plans were to bypass municipalities. We now know that was a mistake. There must be express highways and main thoroughfares through urban areas, so that Federal roads may connect; for, after all, the density of traffic is in the urban areas.

Definite planning is essential in both primary and secondary roads.

The present bill is a 3-year authorization, as I have stated. It is substantially in the language of the act of 1944 with two exceptions: One, a clarification of the definition of secondary roads to include what the committee has maintained was provided in the act of 1944, to wit, township and county roads; and, secondly, to provide for the first time 3 years for matching the Federal-aid funds. This is most important.

Funds are allocated about 6 months before the beginning of the fiscal year and there is a definite yardstick. All States are treated alike. After the funds are allocated, contracts may be made, but to protect the taxpayers of the country it is essential that contracts shall not be forced and that the people of the country not be required to pay more than their roads are worth so that if contracts are too high, if labor is too expensive, there are 3 years in which to do the job. That is a most constructive feature of the act.

There are approximately 3,300,000 miles of roads in the United States. Seven percent is the Federal-aid primary system. That 7 percent aggregates about 209,237 miles, of which 189,000 miles have been improved with Federal aid, the remainder having been improved by the States. It is estimated that 36,000 miles of the 189,000 constructed with Federal aid on the Federal-aid system must now be replaced.

We have in the State highway system approximately 246,928 miles.

In the third category, county and local roads, we have approximately 1,034,826 miles.

The pending bill provides that 45 percent of the $500,000,000 authorized shall be for primary Federal-aid roads; 30 percent for secondary or feeder roads; and 25 percent for urban highways, that go through our municipalities.

The States have to match all of these funds and it is essential now for the States to know what funds they must match in 1950, 1951, and 1952. The legislatures of 44 States meet in 1949 and they must know what Federal-aid funds will be available so they can make provision in advance for matching; hence the imperative necessity for an authorization bill at the present time.

Again, it is necessary for plans to be made before contracts can be awarded, and it takes time to make plans.

The Federal-aid highway program has been in operation since 1921—more than 26 years. It has made a great contribution to highway construction. It has resulted in a better type of road. All of the States are in position to profit by the construction. The Federal Public Roads Administration has a laboratory located in the District of Columbia, an experimental laboratory, and better roads are being constructed as a result of research and experimentation. This is an experimental laboratory, as I have stated, and its facilities are being enlarged and increased. Investigations are there being made to improve the various types of roads.

In 1936 we provided for the first time for the improvement of our secondary roads. The result has been that a higher type of secondary road has been constructed in the country. The intention was not to provide merely for another county or township road but for a better road, a dustless road, as far as possible. A great advance has been made as a result of this authorization for the improvement of our secondary roads, the farm-to-market roads, so that the produce of the country may be brought to the markets for disposal. The mail and school-bus routes have been improved.

Federal-aid highway construction was only about 14 percent of the entire construction of roads in this country in 1947. Out of the 3,300,000 miles only about 233,000 miles are Federal-aid highways with 209,237 miles improved.

I referred to the cost of construction as contributing to the delay. Highway construction has increased about 93 percent since 1940. There has been an increase of about 32 percent since 1945. The cost of building the earthen embankment has not increased as much as the cost of the slabs. The mile cost has probably increased 75 percent.

Mr. Chairman, it is essential that this bill be passed now so that we can provide for the improvement of our highways. There was substantially no construction during the war, while, on the other hand, there was widespread deterioration. Roads are often destroyed by hard winters and in the flooded areas. All of the States have said that the authorization of this act is the very minimum amount required to continue the improvement of our roads.

The legislatures of 44 States of the Union are to meet, as I have stated, next year. We must give them an opportunity to match these funds. They must know how much they will be called upon to put up in order to secure Federal funds.

Mr. Chairman, highways influence civilization. They must be permanent. The average life of the better type highway now is about 30 years. We must build permanent roads as the Romans built them. An English author, Horsley, in speaking of the Roman roads, said:

> These Roman ways in Britain have frequently been continued as the public roads so that where a Roman military way is wanting, the presumption is in favor of the present highroad if that be nearly in the same direction.

Permanency has characterized roads in the United States. The Boston Post Road is one of the most famous roads in the Northeast, the Spanish Trail in the Southwest.

Mr. Chairman, when we build our roads we are building America. A strong America is essential to a secure America and a secure America is essential for peace in all the world. The need for highways, for transportation in times of peace, is multiplied in times of war. They serve their purpose during war. In peace strikes may come and strikes may go, but the highways provide for the continuation of transportation.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. If we in Massachusetts appropriate $30,000,000 how much will the Federal Government allow us? Would it match that amount?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No. The Federal Government appropriates this $500,000,000 for all of the 48 States based upon mileage, post roads, and the population. The amount accruing to Massachusetts will be determined by those three factors and Massachusetts will then be required to match what the Federal Government provides under this act.

Mr. NICHOLSON. The Federal Government secures in gasoline taxes in Massachusetts about $11,000,000 a year. Under the old Hayden-Cartwright bill we got about two and three-quarter million dollars back. Are we going to be treated the same way under this bill as we were under the Hayden-Cartwright bill?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I may say that we have improved the allocation for the benefit of the more populous States since the Hayden-Cartwright Act of 1934 in order to give more consideration to the population factor. Under the terms of this bill with an authorization of $500,000,000 Massachusetts' part is about $10,208,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself seven additional minutes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Would the gentleman tell me something about the access roads which we had during the war? Is there any provision in this bill for a continuation of the access roads to mines and forests?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No. There is no provision in this bill, because this is a peacetime or postwar bill, and those authorizations were for the war period. They have been continued only to make the appropriations that were authorized. But there is a provision in this bill for the construction of forest highways and forest development roads and trails.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia The gentleman has made a splendid contribution in explaining this bill. As I understand, 30 percent of the amount carried in this bill is allocated to farm-to-market roads.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia That is more than was allocated in the 1944 bill?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No; that is the same percentage as carried in the 1944 act.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I also understand that this bill extends the period 3 years in which to match the funds allocated to each State.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes. We extend matching from 1 to 3 years.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I will say that I am very much interested in roads, especially the farm-to-market roads. I congratulate the gentleman and his committee for bringing in such a constructive bill.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. In discussing matching or participation by the States, I call attention to section 3, subsection (a), that there is an amount of $4,250,000 appropriated for national parks, monuments, and areas administered by the National Park Service. Now, that is not a matching arrangement, is it?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Not at all, and I did not so state. I said that Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban roads had to be matched. None of the provisions for roads that are to be constructed through the national forests or the park roads or the national parkways or the Indian reservations are to be matched. They never have been matched heretofore under previous highway Federal-aid authorization acts.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I thank the gentleman, and I congratulate him on his fine statement, as well as the committee, for bringing out such a valuable bill in the interest of the people of this country.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. The gentleman always makes a very clear and concise statement. May I ask the gentleman whether or not the funds in this bill are allocated on the same formula as we have had heretofore?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Exactly as heretofore. This bill is an exact copy of the act of 1944 in amounts and in

terms, except in two particulars, and that has to do with the definition so as to provide for county and township roads being considered as secondary roads, and extending the matching from one to three years. Otherwise it is identical with the act of 1944.

Mr. GRANGER. One more question. According to the gentleman's statement, if the prices are too high, that is, the bids on contracts are too high, how long will these funds remain available to the States?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Until 3 years from the close of the fiscal year for which they are authorized.

Mr. GRANGER. Three years?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes. I might say that some advocated a smaller appropriation and some advocated authorization for a shorter time. I believe that by making this provision for 3 years for matching that we have met the views of those who insisted upon a smaller authorization and those who insisted upon a shorter period, because this is a program that is really not adequate for our expanding highway needs. We are building now under the act of 1944 only about 12,000 miles of main Federal-aid highways and only about 36,000 miles of secondary roads, and that is a small part of the 3,300,000 miles of roads in this country. We may have to increase the authorization before the expiration of the last fiscal year, 1952, and certainly we will have to increase it within the 3 years to match, for our highway transportation needs are constantly growing and increasing.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ARNOLD. Within the gentleman's recollection as a member of the committee, has the Public Roads Administration ever expended all the funds that have come to them from the States?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Well, the gentleman understands that the Public Roads Administration does not collect or does not expend any money whatsoever. All contracts for Federal-aid roads, for secondary roads, for roads through municipalities, are made by the State highway commissions, by the State agencies. They are approved by the Public Roads Administration.

I would like you to keep in mind that all of the secondary farm-to-market roads are approved only by the Commissioner of Roads in Washington after the county supervisors or county commissioners have recommended them to the State highway commissions and after the State highway commissions have reported on them. I would like to say also that there is a standard type of Federal aid highway that is being used generally in the country as a result of Federal aid only because prior to Federal aid North Carolina had its type; Illinois had its type; and Missouri and Mississippi didn't have much type at all.

Mr. ARNOLD. If that is the case, you do not come anywhere near spending this fund that is earmarked or that the States send to the Federal Government for spending back in the States. I believe, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] explained, that only 45 percent of the money was being expended. If that is the case, why can we not reduce the tax, let us say, for a year?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think that is a fair question. We build roads, or rather authorize their construction. We do not levy taxes. I think the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] explained it. I tried to explain it, and I will try to explain it again. We authorize $500,000,000 annually for a period of 3 years; on account of high costs and the inability to obtain contracts there was appropriated up to the 1st of January 1948 only $425,000,000 of the $1,500,000,000 authorized. During the current year the House has already appropriated and there is pending in the Senate $452,000,000 for construction under the act of 1944. That will leave substantially $300,000,000 to be provided for construction in 1950. So that the virtue of this act is that we provide for construction and pay the money out of the Treasury as the construction is being done, under the contract provisions of the act.

Mr. ARNOLD. The Public Roads Administration tells me that a great deal of money is being paid in by airplane companies. That airplane companies are paying a cent and a half tax into the road fund. Should not something be done to reimburse the airplane companies or to build strips for them or build roads into the airports with this money?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. My judgment is, and I am not going to be diverted from the main question here, we have made fairly good provision under the Civil Aeronautics Appropriation Act for construction of airfields in this country. There was collected in the calendar year 1946 from all sources from gasoline and other Federal excise taxes $882,000,000. This bill authorizes in round figures an appropriation of $557,750,000 for all purposes. In other words, this program is self-liquidating. It has been self-liquidating from the beginning. Those who use the roads pay for them, and that is the soundness of this legislation.

Mr. ARNOLD. If that money was used for air strips, and roads into the air fields, would not we then have more money for the farm-to-market roads?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Not at all, because we are using money collected from all sources. We are not earmarking it. But we have provided for more money than has ever been provided in any previous appropriation for secondary roads except in the act of 1944.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I believe I can help to answer the question being raised by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. If more money were appropriated at the present time, the States would not be able to handle it. Is that not correct?

Mr. ARNOLD. Then why not reduce the tax?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. This committee has no jurisdiction over tax matters. That is a matter for the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. This committee has no jurisdiction over the tax situation. This is an authorization bill, and we have nothing to do with levying or collecting of taxes.

Mr. PEDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. PEDEN. In regard to the problem that arises in the State of Oklahoma, which has to do with urban funds under this bill, it is my understanding that under the provisions of this act, Federal expenditures can only be made in any urban project in cities of 5,000 or over; is that correct?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes, that is true. Urban-area funds are limited to cities of 5,000 or more.

Mr. PEDEN. Suppose the State highway commission picks a town of 5,000 people in some part of the State and submits it to the Public Roads Administration or to their engineer and the engineer says, "I would rather you would build a road where the population is 10,000 or 15,000 or 20,000." In such a case, who is the authority to determine which road shall be built?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That has to be initiated in the States. While we are on that question, it is well now to keep in mind that the United States is a big country.

We provide for farm to market roads either inside or outside of municipalities of less than 5,000 inhabitants. We provide for highways in urban areas in connection with municipalities or other urban areas of 5,000 or more. The act gives consideration to the countryside and to the great cities. All of the interests of the United States are considered. The act of 1944 and the pending bill really increase the allocation in the more populous States where there are large cities. We cannot provide for the rural districts without providing for the city or urban areas.

Probably those of us who come from rural districts think that our farm-to-market road is a difficult problem, but the municipalities have their problems also, and the primary purpose of this urban provision is to provide for express highways and thoroughfares through our municipalities, because the record is that all of the travel starts and stops within 30 miles of the municipalities. We profited by our experience. I believe the provisions of this act and the act of 1944 with respect to urban highways are sound.

In conclusion, I would like to say that 42 percent of the 189,000 miles in the Federal-aid system of 231,000 miles that have been improved with Federal aid is depreciating. Forty-two percent of the improved primary roads will wear out by 1957. The obsolescence and the depreciation are greater than the rate of replacement. While Federal aid is a small part of the total construction of roads and streets in the United States, it sets the pattern and thus influences road construction. The bill is the most constructive and I believe the most all-embracing ever submitted to the Congress. It will provide for expansion and will thus promote the progress of the

country. It will aid building and reconstruction in peace. It will promote national defense. More highways and better highways are essential in building a better country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] has expired.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the members of the Public Works Committee for their great interest in a good road system for the United States. Especially do I want to compliment our able colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, PAUL CUNNINGHAM, chairman of the Roads Subcommittee of the House, author of this Federal-aid road bill, H. R. 5888, now before us.

I note with a great deal of satisfaction that 30 percent of the funds which this bill authorizes are to be spent on farm-to-market roads. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that anyone who has tried to drive over the dirt roads of America during a rainy season are now ready to help our farmers get out of the mud.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads, and I commend the entire committee on the sound approach they have made to Federal aid for roads in the bill, H. R. 5888, now before us for consideration. The committee has shown keen understanding of the importance of the development of all types of roads but I want to commend them in particular for the increase in the allotment provided for farm-to-market roads, which I understand is increased in the bill, H. R. 5888, to seven times as much Federal aid per year as was ever provided by the Federal Government in any previous year. In these days of greatly increased farm production and greatly increased obligations to feed a war-torn world, the development of farm-to-market roads assumes much greater importance in our national economy than heretofore, because efficient and expanding farm production is very dependent upon efficient transportation to and from all farms that can possibly be reached by a well-developed system of roads.

I was deeply impressed by the statement made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] in the debate last Thursday when he pointed out that 97½ percent of all motor vehicle traffic in the United States originates and terminates within 30 miles of the urban centers and then defined an urban center as a town or city of 2,500 population, or more. I firmly believe that a complete analysis of highway traffic would show a fairly even increase in the volume of traffic from the grass-root farms to the large centers of population so that the bulk of our farm production and farm transportation comes from a relatively small portion of all motor-vehicle traffic. It would be a very serious mistake to distribute Federal-aid highway funds in exact proportion to the volume of automobile traffic, because such a policy would cut deeply into the funds made available for farm-to-market roads.

Furthermore, I want to commend the committee particularly on the policy of avoiding the making of our entire road development program dependent upon revenues received by the Federal Government from particular sources such as excise taxes on new automobiles, automobile parts, tires, tubes, lubricating oil, and gasoline. While it is true that the revenues of the Federal Government from those sources in recent years have exceeded the Federal expenditures on roads, there is no reason to make our road development program entirely dependent upon revenues from those sources. I place the road development program very high in its importance to our entire national economy and I consider the development of every part of the entire road system as essential to the well-being of our national economy.

The general policy governing all Federal expenditures is to make them out of the general funds and not dependent upon revenues from particular sources. While it is very helpful and convincing to know that the Federal Government has been more than compensated from certain excise taxes for all funds expended on Federal aid to highways, it would be a serious mistake to make Federal aid to highways entirely dependent upon such revenues. There are many factors influencing revenue legislation that Congress should be able to consider without any fear of jeopardizing Federal aid to highways. For example, World War II tremendously increased our revenues from excise taxes and this increase has caused a very real problem to arise in the matter of adjusting revenue laws between the Federal Government and the States so as to avoid duplication or overlapping, especially in the field of excise taxes. I would not like to see the Federal Government put in the position of defending its present excise tax program, because Federal aid to highway development might be curtailed if the Federal Government should modify its excise tax program.

I vigorously support the bill, H. R. 5888, and I want the people of my district to know that I consider this legislation so important that it should not be made dependent upon the volume of Federal revenues from certain excise taxes, and I want the people of my district to know and appreciate the foresight and good judgment shown by the Subcommittee on Roads and by the full Committee on Public Works in the writing of this legislation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARNOLD].

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, there is a fairly well-established principle of public finance in this country which earmarks gasoline and other motor-vehicle taxes and regulatory fees to be used for the construction of public highways. That well-established financing principle is in use in 20 States, but it is not used by the Federal Government.

Because it works well in the several States where it is applied, I believe that principle should now be extended to the Federal Government and all such revenues should be earmarked for the construction of highways. These gasoline and motor-vehicle funds should not be permitted to go into the general fund of the Treasury, where they may be spread all over the world for the benefit of everyone but the highway users of this country.

I realize that there is opposition to this proposal, opposition which comes from what I consider strange quarters. For instance, I understand the National Highway Users Conference is opposed to this principle. I assume they fear that as the need arises to speed up our Federal road-building program—needed for peace and for national security—there will be pressure to increase the Federal tax on gasoline in order to finance the program.

I think the statistics will show that quite the opposite might be the result. I firmly believe, and facts which I shall cite appear to back up that belief, that such a system of financing Federal highway construction would result in a reduction of such taxes.

Furthermore, I seriously doubt if an increased Federal gasoline tax—providing the revenue went into new or improved roads—would decrease the use of our highways. In the first place we would no doubt have less opposition to motor-vehicle and motor-fuel taxes and license fees if the highway user knew that all such moneys would be spent on more and improved roads. In the second place, such a program probably would increase the use of our highways, because it would enable us to build more and better highways faster.

I could cite many statistics to show that hand in hand with improved highways has come increases in the number of motor-vehicle registrations. We know from history that the invention of the automobile was the impetus for improved highways, and we know that as highways were improved the demand for new cars has grown. Wherever there are good roads, people will want to use them for pleasure as well as business, and more and more shippers will use motor-vehicle transport for the movement of goods in trade.

The Federal Government collects excise taxes on gasoline, lubricating oil, tires, tubes, automobiles, and motorcycles, trucks, and parts and accessories. There is also a motor-vehicle use tax. The Federal Government has been collecting such taxes in one form or another since 1917. During that time, according to the Public Roads Administration, a grand total of nearly $8,000,000,000 has been collected. Public Roads Administration officials estimate slightly more than $7,000,000,000 of the grand total has been paid by highway users.

During 1946 proceeds of Federal taxes relating to motor vehicles amounted to $882,255,744, of which, it was estimated by the Public Roads Administration, highway users contributed $796,060,301.

That same year Public Roads Administration estimates placed the total of such Federal excise taxes collected in Missouri at $25,128,000, of which $23,146,000 was paid by highway users.

In contrast, the total of Federal-aid payment to States during 1946 for high-

way construction amounted to $146,034,000, of which but $3,557,000 went to Missouri.

Missourians who used the highways paid into the Federal Treasury approximately twenty million more dollars in taxes than came back to the State for construction of roads. Missourians would not necessarily object to this discrepancy if the difference went to build highways in other States, which traveling Missourians might use, and over which goods could be transported; goods which thereby could reach Missouri at a lower cost, or whereby Missouri made or grown goods could be sent to other markets.

But this was obviously not the case. All highway users paid taxes estimated at more than $796,000,000 during 1946, but Federal funds granted for highway construction in the various States amounted to but $146,034,000. In other words, 83 percent of the money paid by highway users in excise taxes relating to motor vehicles went for purposes other than building roads.

Exactly where the highway user's dollar went cannot be determined accurately—but some of it may have gone to the War Department to carry on propaganda to influence the Congress into adopting universal military training, or some of it may have gone to England to help advance the cause of socialism. The summer of 1946, you recall, was when England floated a small loan of three and three-fourths billion plus dollars.

Since 1939, total excise-tax collections relating to motor vehicles have amounted to $4,895,000,000, of which about four and one-fourth billion has been paid by highway users. During that same period slightly more than $1,000,000,000—one-fourth of all money collected from highway users—has gone into the Federal-aid highway program.

In the same period total motor-vehicle excise taxes collected in Missouri amounted to nearly $143,000,000, of which slightly more than one hundred and thirty-two millions came from highway users. Meanwhile, Missouri's share of the Federal-aid highway program amounted to $27,000,000—one-fifth of the funds paid by Missouri drivers and operators of motor vehicles.

Forgetting about the total amount collected and confining ourselves only to the portion paid by highway users, we find that since 1939 through 1946 an average of $528,000,000 was paid out by highway users to the Federal Government each year. In Missouri highway users pay out annually $16,500,000.

Collections will continue at this rate, and probably a much higher one. During the war years driving was curtailed, and this cut into revenue collections. Subsequent to the war, the use of automobiles and motortrucks has increased rapidly, and the trend is still upward. We can expect, probably, to collect $600,000,000 a year from highway users in the future, unless our petroleum supplies dry up. This does not seem likely as our scientists improve methods of turning coal and shale into petroleum products.

While the cost of road building varies greatly, depending upon the type of construction and the location, the cheapest type is about $10,000 per mile and the most costly is about $35,000. A mile of concrete highway, 22 feet in width, costs about $35,000. In some places, where aggregate is literally along the roadside, it runs somewhat less. In others, where sand and gravel must be shipped from a distance, it runs higher. Bituminous construction runs from $10,000 to $20,000 per mile. All other materials cost about $10,000 per mile.

The annual average revenue collected from highway users would provide for construction of more than 15,000 miles of concrete highway a year. Over an 8-year period—the period covered in computing the average—that would be 120,000 miles of concrete highway.

The significance of this figure lies in its comparison with the 38,000 mileage of the interregional highway system approved and recommended by the Public Roads Administration, connecting all cities of 100,000 or more population and most of 50,000 and over.

Using the most inexpensive material, the average annual revenue from highway users only would construct nearly 53,000 miles.

Not all new highway construction would be of concrete, not all of it would be restricted to 22 feet in width. Some would be twice that. Some would be bituminous. Your guess is as good as mine, but probably the average annual revenue from highway users only would pay for construction of something like 30,000 miles of brand new highway. Under our system, States match money made available by the Federal Government. Thus the joint effort, at existing rates, would provide for entirely new highway construction totaling 60,000 miles, far more mileage than is included in the interregional highway system.

Moreover, this refers to new construction, which is not required. Much of the work for bringing the interregional plan up to standard will include widening and repairing of existing highways. Thus the mileage of highways which could be brought up to top standard during a year, by diverting excise taxes paid only by highway users to road construction, would be in excess of 60,000 miles.

Mr. Thomas McDonald, Commissioner of Public Roads for the Federal Government, recently told the American Road Builders Association that deterioration of existing roads required the repair and/or rebuilding of 42 percent of our good surfaced highways, 72 percent of our intermediate highways—and 100 percent of low-type highways during the next 10 years. He said this called for a 40,000-mile-per-year program.

It can readily be seen, then, that the amount of excise taxes paid by highway users is certainly sufficient to carry out this program, and probably somewhat more than sufficient. If my estimate of more than 60,000 miles is reasonably accurate, and I am convinced that it is, then we would satisfy our requirements for highway construction and improvement with two-thirds the annual average amount collected from highway users during the 8-year period from 1939 through 1946.

With the very definite probability that volume of highway use will continue to increase, then we most assuredly could reduce the tax rate of 1½ cents per gallon at least one-third and also keep abreast of our building and repair requirements, and further encourage use of highways.

These data I have presented show conclusively that earmarking Federal excise tax revenues relating to motor vehicles, to highway construction, would be extremely beneficial. These taxes are specific taxes resulting from use of the Nation's highways and byways, and revenues therefrom should be restricted to improving that system of highways and byways. It may be argued that all of us will benefit by improved highways and the direct users of the highways should not be forced to bear the burden alone.

That argument is fallacious. There are no nonusers of our highways today. All of us use them in one way or another—albeit many of us use them indirectly—and all of us pay for that use. When we buy a quart of milk, we pay a fair proportion of the tax which was paid on gasoline necessary to power the several vehicles transporting that milk from dairy farm to doorstep.

There is hardly a thing we buy in stores today in which highway transport has not figured. When highway transport costs are computed, the gasoline and other excise tax is included as a necessary cost of operation. These are not taxes on profits. They are taxes which are properly passed on to the ultimate consumer.

It follows, therefore, that to the extent that each of us benefits, directly or indirectly, from good roads, we would be bearing the cost of providing those roads if we earmarked Federal excise taxes relating to motor vehicles for road construction.

Such an earmarking is a fair proposition, as against the unfairness of having 83 cents of each dollar of such revenue spread all over the world—perhaps even for road construction in Sparta. Earmarking all road revenues received by the Federal Government for road work only is fair and just. It promotes better fiscal and better business policies. I sincerely hope that the House Committee on Public Works will incorporate this idea into immediate legislation. I have so urged and recommended.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK], a member of the committee.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman, I know from personal observation that we need many new highways in western Washington and that also many of our present roads are badly in need of repair.

Passage of this bill, I feel sure, will help get done some of these highway jobs in my State that badly need doing.

What is true in my State I imagine is true in all States, and therefore I am for this bill. Good roads are in my opinion one of the greatest developers of a country, and that is more true than ever now in an age when the number of automobiles is constantly increasing.

I know a river valley in my own county in a section known as Axford Prairie where a new road would open to settlement and development of enough land to accommodate 100 dairy farms. Such a development would return manyfold in new wealth the cost of such a road. It cannot be built today for lack of funds, but under this bill it may be built, for the bill helps counties with their road-building problems.

Doubtless over the country there are hundreds of cases of just this kind where land will be settled and developed because of Federal-aid funds being made available. Under this bill these Federal funds can be used for new road construction.

We have in our State a new east-to-west cross-State road over the mountains on which several millions already have been expended, but this road will remain useless until completed. This road will shorten the distance across the State, save thousands of motorists many miles of driving each year. The road will present real economy in traveling to motorists. More money, however, is needed to finish it. This bill will help, I believe, to make it easier and quicker to complete this cross-State White Pass Highway.

I cite this case of how this bill will help hasten completion of this needed cross-State road merely because I believe many similar roads in other States will likewise benefit.

After all, whether the State or Federal Government supplies the money for highway jobs, the motorists through State and Federal taxes on gasoline and oil and excise taxes contribute more than all of the money that goes into these road programs.

In a very real sense the cost of constructing highways and roads is not an expense borne by the general taxpayers. It is one paid by the motorists.

Under this bill the State of Washington will receive Federal-aid for her highways of $7,304,000 a year or $21,912,000 for the 3 years covered by this bill.

Primary highways of the State of Washington during the 3-year period will receive $10,473,000; secondary roads, $7,092,000; and city or urban roads and streets, $4,347,000.

Every other State will benefit correspondingly, depending on size, population, road systems, and other factors.

I believe it is a good bill that should have the support of Congressmen from all States.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, the State of Iowa is very much interested in this bill. The Eighth Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent, has been a leader in improving its highways and the ultimate goal is, therefore, a farm-to-market road along every farm. In this connection, I am pleased to note that section 1 of the bill enlarges the definition of the term "secondary and feeder roads" as contained in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 to include county and township roads. Section 1 also contains a further provision that in selecting these county and township roads on which funds are to be authorized and expended under provisions of the bill, the State highway departments shall cooperate with township trustees and other appropriate road officials. This is a home-rule provision which will guarantee that the needs of our local rural communities will be more carefully considered and that the roads which need improvement most will receive first attention.

I want to compliment the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works for the excellent bill they have reported for our consideration. I particularly want to compliment my colleague from Iowa, Hon. PAUL CUNNINGHAM, chairman of the subcommittee, for the splendid work he has done in the preparation of the bill. We from Iowa deeply appreciate his efforts in behalf of good roads for Iowa and the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR], a member of the committee.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us for consideration, H. R. 5888, extends the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944. This bill authorizes the sum of $500,000,000 for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1950, 1951, and 1952, a 3-year program. It will enable the various States to arrange for a matching program for highway construction on a 3-year basis. I firmly believe in a long-range highway policy, and this legislation will put that into effect.

No changes have been made in the present law with respect to the allocation of 45 percent for the Federal-aid highway system, with 30 percent on secondary and feeder roads and 25 percent on the projects in urban areas.

Mr. Chairman, this distribution is as fair as any which can be arrived at during this time.

For some time, however, I have felt that our farm-to-market roads were being neglected, as some have failed to recognize the tremendous importance of secondary and farm-to-market roads. These roads are most vital to production and distribution of agricultural commodities, as well as to the local people, the State, and the Nation. I feel that adequate road transportation for the farmers is most essential to the continued prosperity of all Americans.

We must not forget there are 3,300,000 miles of roads, alleys, and streets in our Nation, and of that number 3,000,000 miles are in rural districts, of which 23 percent are graded and drained but not surfaced, while 31 percent are primitive, undrained, and not surfaced. Thus, more than 50 percent of the roads serving our farmers are not all-weather roads. Four million children ride to school daily over secondary and feeder roads and one-fourth of our entire population receives mail delivery over these roads. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, improvement of these roads is an undisputable need in the problem of reduced costs of food products. For this reason, I submitted an amendment to clarify the original wording of the 1944 act, which I quote:

> Thirty percent for projects as set forth in paragraph (b) of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), except that, for the purposes of this act and all subsequent acts continuing the postwar construction and reconstruction of highways in accordance with the provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, (1) the term "secondary and feeder roads" and the term "principal secondary and feeder roads," wherever used in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, shall include county and township roads, and (2) in selecting county and township roads on which funds are to be expended the State highway departments shall cooperate with township trustees and other appropriate local road officials; and—

This amendment guarantees Federal aid for county and township roads, since it specifically describes them to be a part of the secondary system. There is much remaining to be done on our secondary road system, but this is a start in seeing that a definite program is put into effect to get the farmer "out of the mud," and it is my hope that the House will pass this bill by unanimous vote.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In respect to the question asked by the gentleman from Oklahoma a few moments ago, it should be kept in mind that under the provisions for secondary and feeder roads there is authority for carrying those roads through the smaller municipalities of less than 5,000 inhabitants. The provision for urban highways has reference to the larger municipalities of this country where the large populations are centered. There should not be any conflict between the two.

Mr. McGREGOR. That is correct. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. His statement is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the committee for the bill, H. R. 5888, which really extends the postwar Federal-aid Highway Act of 1944. The thorough and extensive hearings recently held on this bill and on the bill reported out by the committee in 1944, I am sure, are greatly appreciated by all Members of the House.

In the debate on the 1944 bill I suggested that many of the States, due to shortage of material, the high cost of building, and so on, would be unable to match the amount apportioned to the States within the time allowed under the act. So, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], introduced the bill, H. R. 1874, which passed Congress last year, extending the grace period for an additional 12 months, making a total grace period of 2 years. Now, I understand the pending bill differs from the 1944 act in that it extends the grace period another 12 months, making a total of 3 years, so that if the money authorized to be appropriated under this bill for the fiscal year ending July 1, 1950, is

not contracted for by that time, the States will have until July 1, 1953, to complete their contracts and finish the work, and they will have 3 years from July 1, 1951, and from July 1, 1952, to complete the contracts and finish the work.

There is no function of government more productive of benefits to citizens of all classes than construction of highways. Highway transportation is essential for agriculture, schools, industry, and community life in every section of the country. Practically all forms of production and distribution and social life are dependent upon the motor vehicles and good road surfaces upon which to operate them.

To furnish the highway transportation service needed by our citizens requires 37,402,000 motor vehicles, including 130,000 busses, and 6,521,000 trucks. An enormous traffic flows over the network of main highways and secondary routes. Billions of dollars are spent for motor vehicles and their upkeep. It is poor business to invest a large part of our wealth in vehicles and not provide road surfaces on which they may operate smoothly, and without dangers and delays arising from congestion. The individual citizen can provide only a part of the means of meeting his need for good highway transportation. He can buy a vehicle and keep it in good condition but he is entirely dependent upon government for the surfaces upon which to operate it.

Since early in the war there has been a serious shortage of motor vehicles. We all know about dealers' waiting lists, the black market in new cars, and high prices for used cars. It is a matter of great public concern. We should be even more concerned about our highway shortages.

At the beginning of the war our highway needs were great. Use of highways of all classes had completely outgrown the improvements made for the traffic of an earlier day. There was serious traffic congestion in all cities. Main rural routes were, to a considerable degree, obsolete. Only a beginning had been made in providing the kind of secondary roads that our farmers need.

The bad condition at the beginning of the war became worse as the war progressed. Normal highway construction ceased but old surfaces continued to wear out. War traffic was particularly severe on the oldest sections of road that had been scheduled for replacement but which had to be continued in service. At the end of the war there was a large accumulation of worn and obsolete roads that would have been replaced but for the war.

Since the end of the war, traffic has grown by leaps and bounds to new high levels while high prices and shortages of various kinds have held back highway improvement. Expenditures for construction have been quite large but the rate of physical improvement has been definitely below the prewar level.

The present situation cannot be viewed without serious misgiving. Commissioner MacDonald, of the Public Roads Administration, has testified before the Subcommittee on Roads of the Public Works Committee that routes of the rural primary Federal-aid system need improvement or replacement of surface at a rate of 12,450 miles per year. The need on urban sections of the system is 650 miles, making a total of 13,100 miles annually. He estimates that 27,000 miles of improvements are required on the secondary Federal-aid system each year. The total for both the primary and secondary systems is approximately 40,000 miles annually.

The bill we are considering is not new and untried legislation. The policy of Federal aid to the States was adopted in 1916 and has been a major factor in creating our far-reaching and invaluable but presently inadequate highway system. It is a policy firmly established and of demonstrated value.

The bill proposes to continue a program to which we are already committed. In 1944, after extensive hearings and extended study of the highway situation, we approved the Federal Aid Highway Act authorizing $500,000,000 for each of the first three postwar fiscal years. These funds were assigned to major routes through cities, the primary Federal-aid system, and to a new system of secondary or farm-to-market roads.

In spite of serious difficulties a substantial beginning has been made on the three classes of work. There is every reason why each class should be continued and at an accelerated pace if possible. You are all familiar with the demands of farmers, businessmen, and citizens of every other class for road improvements. The program is a balanced one that will bring relief from city traffic jams, modernize and make safe the main rural roads, and give to the farmer the kind of roads he needs to get his produce to market, his children to school, and his wife to town for shopping.

However, provision of these long-desired improvements is moving none too fast and will shortly lose the momentum that has been gained unless additional funds are authorized. It will not be long before the funds initially provided are exhausted.

Planning of highway programs and projects is a time-consuming process. Highway officials need to know what Federal-aid funds will be available in the next 4 or 5 years so that they may select the most urgent projects for improvement, arrange for matching the Federal funds, prepare detailed plans, and begin the acquirement of right-of-way where it is needed.

Immediate action is particularly important to larger cities that are reluctant to begin big jobs that will extend over several years without assurance that Federal aid will be available to complete the job.

Still another reason for immediate action results from the serious shortage of highway engineers. Our State highway departments will need to exert the most strenuous efforts to perform the various technical operations required before construction and will need the incentive that this legislation will provide.

I am particularly anxious to see the present program continued because of the impetus given to construction of secondary or farm-to-market roads. For the first time large-scale improvement of a planned system of secondary roads is proceeding in an orderly manner. A system that now includes 350,000 miles has been designated. Many of the State highway departments have created special divisions to deal with secondary road problems. A working partnership between State and county officials is developing that is very similar to the highly beneficial Federal-State cooperation that has existed for many years. Already 12,300 miles of secondary roads have been completed and 11,670 miles are under construction or ready for construction. An additional 12,400 miles are programed for early construction. The total of secondary roads programed or in a more advanced stage is 36,400 miles. It would be a serious mistake not to continue this work.

With regard to the Federal aid program as a whole, there can be no question that it has strong public support—support that is neither sectional nor partisan in character. Our cities clamor for relief from the traffic congestion that is strangling business life. Everyone uses the main highways and demands that the hazards and delays of old obsolete highways be eliminated. Our farmers are no longer content with the isolation, inconvenience, and difficulties occasioned by mud roads or those that are only slightly improved.

The provisions of this bill continue a policy to which we are already committed. It will benefit all sections of the country and all groups of the population. I urge the adoption of this bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this legislation—farm-to-market roads. I appeared before the committee when they had this bill up for consideration and advocated that it be made permanent legislation. However, the committee saw fit to limit the $500,000,000 annual appropriation to a period of 3 years. I appreciate the fact that the committee did make it 3 years, and I am satisfied that, at the end of 3 years, permanent legislation will be passed.

I feel that the farm-to-market roads are essential for the future development of our Nation and our agricultural production. I shall, therefore, wholeheartedly support this legislation, and I want to thank the committee for having brought in this bill. It is an improvement over the 1944 act.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I want to join the several Members who have congratulated the committee on bringing in a good highway authorization bill. I asked the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] concern the amount of money for roads and trails on Indian reservations, and also whether any provision was made in this bill for access roads to mines and forests. He points out that the building

of access roads was a wartime function and that this is a peacetime construction measure, but that the bill does provide generously for forest roads and trails which should have about the same purpose as many of our wartime access roads. I am delighted that the bill contain $6,000,000 for road building on Indian reservations. Such an amount is somewhat more than has been appropriated for that purpose in years past. This is a very significant item for the State of Arizona.

In general, the building of roads on Indian reservations is necessary and helpful, especially in the State of Arizona where the reservations are vast areas and where the State and Federal highway system must cross these Indian reservations. But I am thinking particularly of the possibility of this money being used on such vast reservations as the Navajo. The gentleman from Mississippi has very eloquently reminded us of the Roman system of highways, and the effect of good highways on the advance of civilization. The most backward Indian reservation in America is the Navajo Reservation. Its area is about the same as the entire State of West Virginia. The whole Nation has been aroused to the plight of the Navajo Indians, and Congress has lately been besieged from all parts of the country to do the right thing by the Navajo Indians. Of course, they need schools and many other modern endowments of good society, but I would say that one basic requirement is good roads. I am thinking first of the Navajo Indian Reservation, for the maximum good which an Indian roads program can render.

Some may say, "Will roads on the Navajo Reservation serve and benefit the Navajos only?" Certainly not, for the tourists who pay the gasoline tax which puts up this money will probably receive as much benefit as the Indians in the area. Centered in the Navajo Indian Reservation are some of the most scenic spots in America, such as the Painted Desert, Petrified Forest, Hopi Sky Cities, colorful canyons like Canyon De Chelly and Canyon del Muerto. Such magnificent physical features as the Rainbow Natural Bridge can only be approached through the Navajo Reservation and cannot now be approached by vehicle. There are numerous national monuments on that reservation, seen by only a relatively few people because of the dangerous or impassable roads and trails leading to them. I wish the $6,000,000 had been doubled. I wish it for the Indians' sake, and for the tourists' sake.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the members of the committee on the bill which has been brought before the House today. I appreciate the opportunity I had of expressing my attitude toward this bill while the committee was considering legislation upon this subject.

Mr. Chairman, I represent the Fifth District of Georgia in which lie the counties of Fulton and De Kalb and also the city of Atlanta. While the war was still in progress, the people of the city of Atlanta, and both Fulton and De Kalb Counties, made their plans to change over from war to peace. In order to avoid the shock of unemployment and possible deflation similar to that which followed in the postwar period, after the First World War, a program was worked out which included a large list of public works, new school buildings, hospitals, parks, streets, highways, and expressways. Atlanta lies partly in both of these counties, and in order to realize the greatest benefits from expenditures the governing officials of the city of Atlanta and each of the two counties cooperated to work out a coordinated plan under which a system of modern and safe highways and expressways are to be constructed through the two counties and the city of Atlanta. These plans include Federal and State highways, and contemplate the use of matching funds from both State and Federal Governments.

The people of the city of Atlanta, in order to raise funds for these projects, voted a bond issue. The people of Fulton County, on their part, likewise voted a bond issue, and the people of De Kalb County, on their part, likewise voted a bond issue. The bonds have been issued and sold, and the money is now available, and all the projects contemplated are very much needed.

Atlanta and Fulton County now have under way a definite traffic program, involving some $16,000,000 of city-county bond funds. The major part of this expenditure will be for a north-south express highway. Plans for the construction of this important expressway call for the use of Federal aid and State aid in amounts which are at least equal to the present basis of Federal aid and State aid. A reduction in either at this particular time will completely upset these construction plans.

Comprehensive plans have been worked out also between the city of Atlanta and the county of De Kalb for construction of wide, modern, safe expressways leading from the city of Atlanta eastward through De Kalb County so as to connect with the Federal highways and State highways in that direction. These plans also contemplate, and are dependent upon, the continued extension of Federal aid and State aid upon a basis at least equal to the present percentages. Any reduction at this particular time also will upset and prevent a continuance of this construction. It will tax us to the utmost to carry on this construction with a continuance of Federal aid and State aid, because of the increases in prices which have occurred since the bond issues were voted.

We in the Fifth District of Georgia have joined wholeheartedly with the Federal Government in plans to change over from a wartime economy to a peacetime economy. We have obligated ourselves heavily as I have stated, and, in doing so, we have relied upon the Government to carry its part of the cost of these postwar construction projects.

We were led to believe that the Federal Government would carry its part of these projects and I urge now that these appropriations, upon which our plans were made and based, be continued so that we in our district may proceed with the plans which have already been made, and the funds for which have already been provided so far as matching this money with city, county, and State funds is concerned.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, first may I say that I am wholeheartedly supporting the pending bill. I think the committee has done an excellent job in the preparation of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I secured this time largely for the purpose of directing some questions to the very able chairman of the subcommittee the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM]. We have certain very disturbing questions in my State at the present time in connection with the administration of funds in the road program, not only the primary funds but the urban funds. My State has an eight-man highway commission. One member from each of the respective congressional districts in the State. The people of my State, by a public referendum, set up the present eight-man commission and under implementing legislation our Governor appointed, with the approval of the senate, the present membership on the commission. They are outstanding business and professional men of my State.

The commission, after consultation with the people in the various sections of the State, prepared an over-all program of projects and submitted the same to the bureau of public roads, these projects not only related to the roads that are constructed by Federal-aid funds but also urban road funds. Now, one of the questions in dispute in Oklahoma is the application of the so-called urban funds. It is my understanding that the Congress, when it wrote the program to construct roads for urban sections of the country, set up as a yardstick as to just what cities these urban funds would apply to, by writing into the law that cities or towns which had a population of 5,000 or more would be eligible for urban funds. Am I correct as to my understanding?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RIZLEY. Now, whose duty and obligation is it to initiate and make the final approvals as to these urban projects? Assuming that your State highway commission makes a selection of urban projects and the Public Roads Administration recognizes the fact that these projects come within the law so far as applying to cities of 5,000 or more but say, "Well, in our judgment, you could spend these urban funds in two or three cities of larger population?" Who will finally determine that?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. First, let me read from the 1944 act:

> The term "urban area" means an area including and adjacent to a municipality or other urban place of 5,000 or more, the population of such included municipality or other urban place to be determined by the latest available Federal census. The boundaries of urban areas, as defined herein, will be fixed by the State highway department of each State subject to the approval of the Public Roads Administration.

Now, it is my understanding that the Public Roads Administration does not withhold approval unless the State highway department deviates from the general Federal system program in the area to such an extent that it would disrupt the Federal highway program.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman's understanding is exactly the understanding that I have. If the State highway commission, or a comparable board or commission, of a State makes the designation, and it does not deviate from the general Federal system program, as the gentleman said, then the determination by the local authority shall be final.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That is right. I want to add one more thing, that within the urban area there may be farm-to-market roads. This 25 percent of $125,000,000 under the 1944 act per year applies only to the Federal system within the urban area, the boundaries of which are to be fixed by the State highway department.

Mr. RIZLEY. That is my understanding. Now, one other question. It is my understanding that under the law the State body, whether it be the State highway commission or some other comparable body, initiates the projects on which Federal-aid funds are expended.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That is correct, except for the farm-to-market roads, the counties have a right to come in.

Mr. RIZLEY. I am not talking for the moment about farm-to-market roads.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. RIZLEY. Now, we have this situation in my State. The State highway commission has initiated in my State some 70 projects for approval and has submitted those 70 projects to the Public Roads Administration. The Public Roads Administration comes along and approves 32 of those 70 projects. They say to my State commission: "Now, as far as these other 38 projects are concerned, we think they are feasible, all right, but we think there are 20 other projects in this State that ought to have priority over the additional 38 that you have initiated." Now, my understanding of the law is that the State highway commission in the first instance initiates these projects and that it is not a matter for the Public Roads Administration to say: "Well, we think the projects are all right, but we think there are 20 other projects here that should take priority over some of those projects that you have initiated." The question is who finally determines the priority?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Well, I am not sure that the bill is clear on that, I will say to the gentleman from Oklahoma. However, it is the understanding of the committee that the Public Roads Administration will approve the designation of a State highway commission unless those designations interfere with the national highway system. Possibly the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] can give a better answer. He has been on the committee much longer than I have.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I cannot. I think that is a fair answer. Of course, this provision has only been in the law since 1944, and it is intended primarily for the large urban areas, and provides for cities, where there are bottlenecks, of more than 5,000 population. With the gentleman's permission, I would like to point out that in the previous section on secondary and feeder roads we made provision for the smaller municipalities of 5,000 or under because a secondary road that goes through a municipality of 5,000 or under is in order and can be provided for. So that this law provides both for the large and small cities.

Mr. RIZLEY. I understand that. But my second question was not directed to the use of urban funds but was directed to the use of the Federal-aid funds on projects other than urban.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. I think the intention of the 1944 act is very specific that the promotion of a project goes right back to the local communities and to the State highway department. It cannot be promoted by the Public Roads Administration in Washington. I was a member of the committee when the 1944 act was passed. Certainly it was my understanding that the initiation of these projects is to be made by the States without interference from the Washington level.

Mr. RIZLEY. That is my understanding of the situation.

Mr. McGREGOR. The promotion must start back in the local communities or in the local State highway department.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It seems to me that it is agreed that the initiation of the project should be by a State body. But you have outlined the situation here which if carried out would mean that the Public Roads Administration in effect is doing the initiating when they tell the State highway department, "Here are 20 projects that we think should have priority, and if you will initiate them, we will approve them, and we will disapprove the 38 projects that you want." So they are substituting themselves and they would be doing the initiating instead of the State bodies if that should be carried out.

Mr. RIZLEY. Certainly under the facts as stated by my colleague that would be the situation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The Public Roads Administration is not supposed to impose its will on the State highway department, but only has power under the intent of this act where the State highway department or the State highway association proposes projects which would disrupt the national Federal highway system.

Mr. RIZLEY. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to thank my colleagues of the Subcommittee on Public Roads of the Committee on Public Works for their splendid help and the services they have rendered as well as their cooperation in the preparation of this bill. I also take this opportunity to thank the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]. I would call the attention of the members to the splendid work of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR], in proposing and securing the adoption of an amendment which includes township roads. I think he is to be highly complimented for what he did for the township roads in States east of the Mississippi. He has done this in such a way that it does not interfere with the regular program for the county roads in the States where there are no township roads.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I stated in presenting my views on this bill that standards have been agreed on by the State highway commissions covering Federal-aid roads and approved by the Public Roads Administration. And that is true. Those standards differ as to the different types of roads. The State highway commissions have also proposed, and the Public Roads Administration has approved, standards for the secondary roads. That does not mean those secondary roads are are expensive or as wide or as costly as the Federal-aid primary roads. That means there are different types of roads for different communities and different populations in the several States. In one State it might be black top. In another it might be a gravel road. I think it is fair to make the statement that when I used the word "standards" I meant that there were standard types but different kinds of types in various parts of the country for secondary roads. I would also like to say in this connection that while we had some complaints that the Public Roads Administration undertook to designate the roads either primary or secondary. When the matter was traced down, it finally developed that no one from any State or any highway commission came before the committee and testified that the Public Roads Administration had ever refused to approve a project that had been initiated by the State or county commissioners.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further request for time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, and for continuing the postwar construction and reconstruction of highways in accordance with the provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, a like sum

for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952.

The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be available for expenditure as follows:

Forty-five percent for projects on the Federal-aid highway system.

Thirty percent for projects as set forth in paragraph (b) of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), except that for the purposes of this act and all subsequent acts continuing the postwar construction and reconstruction of highways in accordance with the provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, (1) the term "secondary and feeder roads" and the term "principal secondary and feeder roads," wherever used in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, shall include county and township roads; and (2) in selecting county and township roads on which funds are to be expended, the State highway departments shall cooperate with township trustees and other appropriate local road officials; and

Twenty-five percent for projects on the Federal-aid highway system in urban areas.

The said sums, respectively, for any fiscal year, shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 approved December 20, 1944.

Any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for three fiscal years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized, and any amount so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall elapse: *Provided*, That such funds shall be deemed to have been expended if covered by formal agreement with the Commissioner of Public Roads for the improvement of a specific project as provided by this act.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1921 (42 Stat. 218), as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $25,000,000 for forest highways for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952; and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $12,500,000 for forest development roads and trails for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $12,500,000 for forest development roads and trails for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, subject to the proviso in section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 respecting the apportionment for forest highways in Alaska.

SEC. 3. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, improvement, and maintenance of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas administered by the National Park Service, including areas authorized to be established as national parks and monuments, and national park and monument approach roads authorized by the act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $4,250,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952.

(b) For the construction and maintenance of parkways, to give access to national parks and national monuments, or to become connecting sections of a national parkway plan, over lands to which title has been transferred to the United States by the States or by private individuals, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952.

(c) For the construction, improvement, and maintenance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands under the provisions of the act approved May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $6,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952: *Provided*, That the location, type, and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be approved by the Public Roads Administration before any expenditures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be under the general supervision of the Public Roads Administration.

SEC. 4. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838), not inconsistent with this act, shall remain in full force and effect.

SEC. 5. This act may be cited as the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948.

Mr. DONDERO (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the bill be open for amendment by section.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 1?

Are there any amendments to section 2?

Are there any amendments to section 3?

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. D'EWART: On page 4, line 11, strike out "$4,250,000" and insert "$10,000,000."

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to increase the authorization for the national parks for roads and trails from $4,250,000 to $10,000,000. These roads and trails are found in 179 different areas administered by the national parks. They have 6,359 miles of highway, roads and trails, of which 4,934 are completed, leaving 1,425 that are not completed.

The maintenance of these roads and trails requires at least $3,000,000 per year and maintenance costs are going up, just as are new construction costs.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I am advised that practically none of the $4,250,000 for each of the 3 fiscal years authorized to be appropriated in the act of 1944 has been used. Therefore, there is a sizable balance under the 1944 act.

Mr. D'EWART. That is true at the present time.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In addition to that statement, the further fact is that there are other funds that are used for the maintenance and for the construction of roads and trails through these national parks. It was the consensus of opinion of the committee that we had been more than generous and that we really might have cut this down.

Mr. DONDERO. If a computation is made of these amounts, it will show there are on hand $12,750,000 under the 1944 act. There will be a similar amount under the act of 1948; so that there will be over $25,000,000 on hand to take care of the gentleman's problem.

Mr. D'EWART. I have checked with the Park Service since I talked with the chairman of the subcommittee, and they advise me that in the case of park roads and trails, every dollar they had appropriated will be obligated on June 30. It will all be obligated. The difficulty they had up to that time in obligating this fund was, first, a Presidential order limiting the contracts, and, second, lack of machinery. I know that in the Yellowstone Park the machinery went to to the Alcan Highway, and they have not been able to replace it. Third, the cost of construction of these roads is going up, and this program does not start until a year from now. Therefore, this increased authorization is needed, if we are going to do the construction that needs to be done inside the parks.

Mr. DONDERO. Even though this bill does not begin to operate for a year, you have all the money under the 1944 act, on which to continue the construction of these roads and trails. Even though the money is provided for in the old bill, it may not be entirely appropriated for that purpose. Nevertheless, you will have plenty of money to take care of the needs in all of the gentleman's State and all the other Western States.

Mr. D'EWART. Most of that will be obligated on July 1. The $4,700,000 includes all of the funds that have been appropriated up until that date. In other words, there will be no balance and they will start with the authorization under this bill when the time comes.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. I think possibly the gentleman's figures on the amount appropriated is absolutely correct. I might respectfully refer the gentleman to the fact, however, that the amount authorized is different from the amount appropriated.

Mr. D'EWART. That is correct.

Mr. McGREGOR. I think the authorization is sufficient to carry out the gentleman's program and I recognize his interest in it. I think it is well founded, but I think the authorization is sufficient. The appropriation must be extended if the gentleman expects to get his program into effect.

Mr. D'EWART. If I understand correctly, the authorization under the original bill can be added to the authorization under this bill and they can proceed under the total authorization.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman is correct, because there is no

matching here and the funds remain available until spent. The proper committee for the gentleman to go to is the Committee on Appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment. I think it is unwise and entirely inappropriate in this bill for the reasons stated by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] just a moment ago, and the fact that there are unexpended funds.

I do want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART], who offered the amendment. I know his problem, but, as stated, it is a matter for him to take to the Appropriations Committee. If we were to adopt this amendment I feel it would disrupt the entire highway program and open the bill wide to other amendments and would destroy a well-rounded well-planned program.

In the hearings before our committee, Mr. Chairman, this matter was not brought up unless it was by one member of the Department. No testimony was given to show the committee that it was necessary to increase this amount. We see no reason why it should be increased at this time. I am therefore opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I feel privileged to be able to add my comments in support of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, which, when enacted into law, will provide invaluable assistance to the several States and their respective road-building programs. This act will continue for another 3 years the authorizations of funds at the rate of $500,000,000 a year with the money to be granted to the States as provided in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944.

Most of us have seen the results of the previous highway program throughout the Nation. The money previously authorized will be exhausted this year and therefore this present authorization is vitally necessary in order that the various State highway programs might be completed and expanded.

The inadequacies of our farm roads were demonstrated during the recent severe weather of the past winter. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948 will provide for a Federal grant of $150,000,000 per year for 3 years for projects which include farm-to-market roads, rural free-delivery mail, and public-school bus routes. This type of construction is most urgently needed today.

In recent weeks I have corresponded with all of the county judges and commissioners in the Sixth Texas District regarding the use of previous authorizations of Federal funds for their road program. I was very gratified to have their reports as they indicated the necessity of receiving additional assistance to complete their highway systems. The Texas State Highway Department determines the new road construction or the roads to be improved in cooperation with the county officials.

Testimony offered at the hearings on the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948 indicated that the program provided in this bill is a conservative one when measured against the urgent needs for highway improvement. Mr. D. C. Greer, State highway engineer for Texas, has discussed the highway needs of Texas with me and expressed the approval of his department for the enactment of this legislation.

The allotment for Texas from these yearly grants will amount to $28,433,000, with approximately $10,000,000 of this amount earmarked for secondary roads or farm-to-market roads. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely believe that the Nation as well as the several States will benefit immeasurably from this legislation which will result in an improved highway system.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, this is but another example of the Federal Government stepping in and doing for the States what the States ought to do for themselves. A majority of the Members of this House still seem to believe that there is magic in paying tax money into Washington and receiving it back in the form of Federal aid. The majority is wrong. The magic applies only to certain States. It does not, for example, apply to my State. New York will pay in under this bill $98,500,000. New York will receive back $33,400,000.

In some of the States, however, there is magic in Federal aid. Mississippi, for example, will pay in $1,500,000, receive $7,900,000. Alabama will pay $3,000,000 and receive $9,600,000. The following tabulation shows where this sort of magic operates and where it does not operate:

State	Percent contribution of Federal revenue	Percent receipts under H. R. 5888
Alabama	0.6	2.0
Arizona	.2	1.2
Arkansas	.3	1.5
California	8.0	4.7
Colorado	.7	1.6
Connecticut	1.7	1.0
Delaware	.8	.4
Florida	1.1	1.4
Georgia	1.0	2.3
Idaho	.2	1.0
Illinois	8.8	4.7
Indiana	2.3	2.5
Iowa	.9	2.3
Kansas	.9	2.2
Kentucky	1.9	1.8
Louisiana	.9	1.5
Maine	.3	.8
Maryland	1.7	1.0
Massachusetts	3.4	2.1
Michigan	4.6	3.4
Minnesota	1.6	2.5
Mississippi	.3	1.6
Missouri	2.7	2.9
Montana	.2	1.7
Nebraska	.7	1.7
Nevada	.1	1.0
New Hampshire	.2	.5
New Jersey	3.2	2.0
New Mexico	.1	1.3
New York	19.7	7.0
North Carolina	3.0	2.3
North Dakota	0.1	1.2
Ohio	6.2	4.1
Oklahoma	.8	2.1
Oregon	.7	1.5
Pennsylvania	7.6	5.1
Rhode Island	.6	.6
South Carolina	.5	1.3
South Dakota	.1	1.4
Tennessee	.9	2.1
Texas	2.8	5.8
Utah	.2	1.0
Vermont	.1	.4
Virginia	1.9	1.8
Washington	1.3	1.5
West Virginia	.5	1.1
Wisconsin	1.9	2.4
Wyoming	.1	1.0
District of Columbia	1.2	.6
Puerto Rico	0	.6
Hawaii	.3	.5
Total	100	100

What worries me is my inability to determine where Federal aid will end. It feeds on itself and will continue so to do until there is an awakening on the part of those who pay the cost. I hope they wake up before the country goes bankrupt.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments? [After a pause.] There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Thereupon the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5888) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 521, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BUCK) there were—ayes 46, nays 1.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously no quorum is present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 278, nays 6, not voting 146, as follows:

[Roll No. 42]

YEAS—278

Abernethy	Andresen, August H.	Banta
Albert	Andrews, Ala.	Barrett
Allen, Calif.	Andrews, N. Y.	Bates, Ky.
Allen, La.	Angell	Bates, Mass.
Almond	Arends	Beall
Andersen, H. Carl	Arnold	Beckworth
Anderson, Calif.	Auchincloss	Bennett, Mich.
		Blackney

Bland	Hardy	Morrison
Bloom	Harless, Ariz.	Morton
Boggs, Del.	Harris	Muhlenberg
Bonner	Hart	Multer
Bramblett	Harvey	Murdock
Brehm	Havenner	Murray, Wis.
Brooks	Hays	Nixon
Brophy	Hébert	Norblad
Brown, Ga.	Hedrick	O'Hara
Brown, Ohio	Hess	Pace
Bryson	Hill	Passman
Buchanan	Hobbs	Patman
Burke	Hoeven	Patterson
Busbey	Hoffman	Peden
Butler	Holmes	Peterson
Byrne, N. Y.	Hope	Phillips, Calif.
Byrnes, Wis.	Horan	Phillips, Tenn.
Camp	Huber	Pickett
Cannon	Hull	Plumley
Carson	Jackson, Wash.	Poage
Case, S. Dak.	Javits	Potter
Chelf	Jenison	Potts
Church	Jenkins, Ohio	Poulson
Clason	Jenkins, Pa.	Preston
Clevenger	Jennings	Priest
Coffin	Jensen	Rankin
Cole, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Redden
Combs	Johnson, Ill.	Reed, N. Y.
Cooper	Johnson, Ind.	Rees
Cox	Johnson, Okla.	Reeves
Cravens	Johnson, Tex.	Regan
Crawford	Jones, Ala.	Rich
Crosser	Jones, N. C.	Riehlman
Crow	Jones, Wash.	Riley
Cunningham	Jonkman	Rivers
Curtis	Judd	Rizley
Dague	Karsten, Mo.	Robertson
Davis, Ga.	Kearney	Rockwell
Davis, Tenn.	Kearns	Rogers, Fla.
Davis, Wis.	Kee	Rogers, Mass.
Dawson, Utah	Keefe	Rohrbough
Deane	Kerr	Ross
Delaney	Kilday	Russell
Devitt	King	Sabath
D'Ewart	Kirwan	Sanborn
Dirksen	Klein	Sarbacher
Dolliver	Knutson	Sasscer
Domengeaux	Landis	Schwabe, Mo.
Dondero	Lanham	Schwabe, Okla.
Doughton	Larcade	Scrivner
Durham	LeCompte	Seely-Brown
Eaton	LeFevre	Shafer
Eberharter	Lemke	Sheppard
Ellis	Lesinski	Short
Ellsworth	Lewis	Simpson, Pa.
Engel, Mich.	Lodge	Smathers
Engle, Calif.	Love	Smith, Kans.
Fellows	Lucas	Smith, Maine
Fenton	Lyle	Smith, Va.
Fernandez	Lynch	Smith, Wis.
Fisher	McConnell	Snyder
Flannagan	McCormack	Spence
Fogarty	McCowen	Stanley
Folger	McCulloch	Stefan
Foote	McDonough	Stockman
Forand	McDowell	Taber
Fuller	McGregor	Talle
Gathings	McMillan, S. C.	Teague
Gearhart	Mack	Thomas, N. J.
Gillette	MacKinnon	Thomas, Tex.
Goff	Macy	Tollefson
Goodwin	Madden	Trimble
Gossett	Mahon	Van Zandt
Graham	Mansfield	Vinson
Granger	Martin, Iowa	Vursell
Grant, Ind.	Mason	Wadsworth
Gregory	Mathews	Welch
Gwinn, N. Y.	Meade, Ky.	Wheeler
Gwynne, Iowa	Meyer	Whittington
Hagen	Michener	Wigglesworth
Hale	Miller, Calif.	Williams
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Miller, Conn.	Wilson, Tex.
	Miller, Md.	Winstead
Hall, Leonard W.	Mills	Wolcott
	Monroney	Woodruff
Halleck	Morris	Youngblood

NAYS—6

Buck	Heselton	Keating
Canfield	Kean	Nicholson

NOT VOTING—146

Abbitt	Buckley	Cole, N. Y.
Allen, Ill.	Buffett	Colmer
Bakewell	Bulwinkle	Cooley
Barden	Burleson	Corbett
Battle	Carroll	Cotton
Bell	Case, N. J.	Coudert
Bender	Celler	Courtney
Bennett, Mo.	Chadwick	Dawson, Ill.
Bishop	Chapman	Dingell
Blatnik	Chenoweth	Donohue
Boggs, La.	Chiperfield	Dorn
Bolton	Clark	Douglas
Boykin	Clippinger	Elliott
Bradley	Cole, Kans.	Elsaesser
Elston	Kunkel	Reed, Ill.
Evins	Lane	Richards
Fallon	Latham	Rooney
Feighan	Lea	Sadlak
Fletcher	Lichtenwalter	Sadowski
Fulton	Ludlow	St. George
Gallagher	Lusk	Scoblick
Gamble	McGarvey	Scott, Hardie
Garmatz	McMahon	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Gary	McMillen, Ill.	
Gavin	Maloney	Sikes
Gillie	Manasco	Simpson, Ill.
Gordon	Marcantonio	Smith, Ohio
Gore	Meade, Md.	Somers
Gorski	Merrow	Stevenson
Grant, Ala.	Miller, Nebr.	Stigler
Griffiths	Mitchell	Stratton
Gross	Morgan	Sundstrom
Hand	Mundt	Taylor
Harness, Ind.	Murray, Tenn.	Thompson
Harrison	Nodar	Tibbott
Hartley	Norrell	Towe
Heffernan	Norton	Twyman
Hendricks	O'Brien	Vail
Herter	O'Konski	Vorys
Hinshaw	O'Toole	Walter
Holifield	Owens	Weichel
Isacson	Pfeifer	West
Jackson, Calif.	Philbin	Whitten
Jarman	Ploeser	Wilson, Ind.
Kefauver	Powell	Wolverton
Kelley	Price, Fla.	Wood
Kennedy	Price, Ill.	Worley
Keogh	Rains	
Kersten, Wis.	Ramey	
Kilburn	Rayburn	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Allen of Illinois with Mr. Rayburn.
Mr. Wolverton with Mr. Gordon.
Mr. Hand with Mr. Gorski.
Mr. Kilburn with Mr. Boggs of Louisiana.
Mr. Jackson of California with Mr. Whitten.
Mr. Simpson of Illinois with Mr. Gary.
Mr. Sundstrom with Mr. Carroll.
Mrs. St. George with Mr. Garmatz.
Mr. Reed of Illinois with Mr. Fallon.
Mr. Bender with Mr. Meade of Maryland.
Mr. Case of New Jersey with Mr. Price of Illinois.
Mr. Chiperfield with Mr. Keogh.
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Rooney.
Mr. Latham with Mr. Grant of Alabama.
Mr. McMahon with Mr. Colmer.
Mr. McMillen of Illinois with Mr. Kefauver.
Mr. Lichtenwalter with Mr. Stigler.
Mr. Owens with Mr. Lane.
Mr. Cole of New York with Mr. Pfeifer.
Mr. Corbett with Mr. Battle.
Mr. Elsaesser with Mr. Walter.
Mr. Gavin with Mr. Philbin.
Mr. Gamble with Mr. O'Toole.
Mr. Nodar with Mr. Blatnik.
Mr. Towe with Mr. Kelley.
Mr. Taylor with Mrs. Douglas.
Mr. Hardie Scott with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Cotton with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Ploeser with Mr. Dorn.
Mr. Ramey with Mr. O'Brien.
Mr. Hinshaw with Mr. Donohue.
Mrs. Bolton with Mr. Morgan.
Mr. Elston with Mr. Chapman.
Mr. Chadwick with Mr. Dingell.
Mr. McGarvey with Mrs. Norton.
Mr. Maloney with Mr. Burleson.
Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Cooley.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Evins.
Mr. Tibbott with Mr. Feighan.
Mr. Bennett of Missouri with Mr. Harrison.
Mr. Buffett with Mr. Sikes.
Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Heffernan.
Mr. Griffiths with Mr. Richards.
Mr. Gross with Mr. Holifield.
Mr. Bakewell with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.
Mr. Bishop with Mr. Gore.
Mr. Harness of Indiana with Mr. Somers.
Mr. Herter with Mr. Rains.
Mr. Miller of Nebraska with Mr. Jarman.
Mr. Sadlak with Mr. Manasco.
Mr. Chenoweth with Mrs. Lusk.
Mr. Cole of Kansas with Mr. Lea.
Mr. Gillie with Mr. Worley.
Mr. Kunkel with Mr. Abbitt.
Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Weichel with Mr. Sadowski.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to revise and extend their own remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]?

There was no objection.

TUESDAY'S SPECIAL ORDERS TRANSFERRED TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special orders entered for tomorrow may be transferred to the following day, Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

THE VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

Mr. WELCH. I ask unanimous consent to file a supplemental report on the bill (H. R. 5904) to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include editorials from the Waterbury American.

Mr. KEFAUVER (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from today's Pittsburgh Post-Gazette entitled "Not Academic, Mr. Speaker."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter he wrote.

PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpenaed to appear before the

District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia to give testimony on April 14, 1948, at 10 a. m., in the case of the United States against George Marshall, which is a congressional contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House I am unable to comply with this summons without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I therefore submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

SUBPENA TO TESTIFY

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, CRIMINAL DIVISION

J. HARDIN PETERSON,
Room 1226, New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

You are hereby commanded to appear in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia at Criminal Court No. 1, United States District Courthouse, in the city of Washington on the 14th day of April 1948 at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify in the case of the United States v. George Marshall, Criminal No. 367–47.

This subpena is issued on application of the defendant.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By JAMES M. MENENDEZ,
Deputy Clerk.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 527

Whereas Representative J. HARDIN PETERSON, a Member of this House, has been served with a subpena to appear as a witness before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify at 10 a. m., on the 14th day of April 1948, in the case of the United States v. George Marshall, Criminal No. 367–47; and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify, but by order of the House: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That Representative J. HARDIN PETERSON is authorized to appear in response to the subpena of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia at such time as when the House is not sitting in session; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena of said court.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution to its adoption or rejection.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpenaed to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia to give testimony on April 12, 1948 at 10 a. m. in the case of the United States versus John Howard Lawson, which is a congressional contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House I am unable to comply with this summons without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I therefore submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the Speaker's desk a copy of the subpena.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

SUMMONS

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, CRIMINAL DIVISION

United States of America v. *John Howard Lawson.* No. 1352–47

To JOHN MCDOWELL, of Pennsylvania,
121 Old House Office Building:

You are hereby summoned to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia at the District Courthouse in the city of Washington, D. C., on the 12th day of April 1948 at 10 o'clock a. m. to answer an indictment charging the defendant with violation of section 192, title 2, U. S. Code.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By HELEN M. MCINTOSH,
Deputy Clerk.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 528

Whereas Representative JOHN MCDOWELL has been served with a subpena to appear as a witness before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia to testify at 10 a. m. on the 12th day of April 1948 in the case of the *United States* v. *John Howard Lawson,* Criminal No. 1352–47; and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify but by order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That JOHN MCDOWELL is authorized to appear in response to the subpena of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia at such time as when the House is not sitting in session; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena of said court.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. LARCADE, for 5 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. (at the request of Mr. GRAHAM), for 4 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. BRADLEY, for 4 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. STIGLER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 1 week, on account of official business.

TRANSFER OF THE REMOUNT SERVICE FROM THE WAR DEPARTMENT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3484) to transfer the Remount Service from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out "War Department" and insert "Department of the Army."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "1947" and insert "1948."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "War" and insert "the Army."

Page 2, line 19, strike out "1948" and insert "1949."

Page 2, line 19, strike out "War" and insert "the Army."

Page 3, line 1, strike out "War Department" and insert "Department of the Army."

Page 3, lines 10 and 11, strike out "War Department" and insert "Department of the Army."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to transfer the Remount Service from the Department of the Army to the Department of Agriculture."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANFIELD). Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN] is recognized for 1 hour.

PROMPT DEVELOPMENT OF LOW-COST HYDRO POWER FACILITIES OF PACIFIC NORTHWEST NECESSARY FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AND INDUSTRIAL PROGRESS

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the matter on which I wish to address the House is of monumental importance to every Member here and I am happy to be allotted this time to make the address.

Mr. Speaker, for years this Nation has steadily and solidly advanced while clinging to the theory that our natural resources were inexhaustible. Historically, over a long period of time there was no basis on which to challenge the correctness of this theory. One hundred and sixty years ago this Nation made its real start on the road of progress while Europe was torn to bits by succeeding wars. European resources and European production had then dropped to low levels and this newly formed Nation of ours was called upon to supply European deficiencies. This extensive European depletion situation stimulated our early commercial activities of all types, and the values resulting from such activity quickly gave this Nation a solid and enduring start. At that time our resource base was exactly the same as existed when Columbus discovered this continent. Our resources were then so great and varied that the early commercial demands made little impression on the demonstrated limits of the Nation's reserves. This reserve situation continued unchanged up to the Civil War. The depletions of this war, however, were quickly offset by the opening up of the vast western country following the transcontinental railroad construction immediately after that war.

The West was rich in all kinds of critical resources, and its contributions

quickly corrected any damage to the Nation's resource foundation. Naturally, with such a background, we entered World War I without any substantial appraisal of our available resources or any plan for resource or industrial mobilization in times of emergency. It was only the short duration of World War I which prevented a major break-down in the Nation's industrial and basic supply activities. The lessons of World War I, however, were clearly evident, and Congress instituted the necessary corrective processes in the National Defense Act of 1920. However, up to the start of World War II these resource and industrial provisions were kept in the debate status by the departments, while in the interim technological advances were extremely rapid. Nevertheless, this Nation entered World War II without a substantial resource inventory or the application of the resource lessons demonstrated during the short duration of the earlier war.

Since 1940 we have assumed the position of a world-wide supplier of critical materials. In so doing we have undermined our resource foundation to the point where our future defense barriers will be seriously and dangerously affected unless we proceed with early substantial corrective devices. The problem that is really before us is to appraise the situation in the light of major "material" and then devise ways and means to supplement existing deficiencies or to provide substantial and adequate substitutes.

RESOURCE DEPLETION

Time will not permit an extensive restatement of our basic resource condition. However, I feel that some of the major deficiencies should be called to your attention in order to accentuate the contributions that can be made by the Pacific Northwest in the restoration of major resource depletions.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I anticipate some of the things the gentleman proposes and probably am heartily in agreement with him in regard to them. I have long wanted to call attention to one thing, Mr. Speaker. We have just taken a great mineral inventory during the Second World War. It probably was not a complete inventory, but every agency of government having to do with these strategic and critical metals and minerals did take an inventory. Now, those records are still existent. The same thing was done during the First World War, but the records have been misplaced or destroyed.

However, there is a law on the statute books that provides that agencies like the War Production Board and others shall turn those records over to the Archives and to the Bureau of Mines. That has not been done to any great extent. I believe that that ought to be done as the initial step in the program which the gentleman is going to propose. Money should be appropriated to preserve these records.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I agree with my colleague from Arizona, and I will go into more detail on that topic later. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. I want to commend the gentleman for the valuable contribution he is making on a very important subject. May I ask the gentleman if it is not true that one great natural resource we have is hydroelectric power, which really is not expendable, except that we are allowing much of it to go to waste without utilization?

Mr. STOCKMAN. That statement is quite correct, in my judgment.

Mr. ANGELL. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to what I know he is as fully familiar with as I am, that in the Columbia River Basin alone we have at least 50 percent of the potential hydroelectric power of the United States, and that a great proportion of it is yet undeveloped and is wasting itself to the sea without utilization.

Mr. STOCKMAN. That is correct, and I expect to go into that in more detail in my speech.

Mr. ANGELL. I will be very happy if the gentleman will cover that subject.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Practically all of this Nation's supply of steel comes from the high-grade hematite ores in the Lake Superior region as well as smaller like deposits located around Birmingham, Ala. We all know that steel is not now being produced fast enough to meet the extra heavy demands of the postwar period. This Nation, within the next decade, will be faced with complete depletion of high-grade iron ores. When that time comes, in order to maintain our critical material independence, we must rely on using the lower-grade and more complex ores. Such ores cannot be successfully processed in the conventional fuel contact type furnace, but must come from the electric furnace or from electrolytic action. There is nothing new in this substitution. Sweden long ago found out that she must use electric methods to process the low-grade ores existing in that country. Hydroelectric power was cheaply available, and today Swedish iron has world-wide acceptance for high quality and high strength. Norway has also been a leader in electric processing. This is the principal reason for Hitler's conquest of that country. If we are to overcome our strategic metal and petroleum deficiencies we must depend more and more in the future upon large volume low-cost hydro power. Large discoveries of hematite ore have recently been uncovered in northeastern Canada and in South America. These late discoveries indicate extremely extensive deposits. However, it is always possible that ore shipments can be denied to foreign manufacturers. We have a case in point in the British possessions. The bauxite mined in British Guiana cannot be shipped to this country for processing into aluminum, it can only be shipped to English possessions for manufacturing purposes. As a result of this situation and the large amounts of hydro power available in Canada, we find a very extensive light metal industry growing up in Canada, resulting from restrictive export laws passed by the British Parliament, requiring fabrication in England or its colonies.

In less than 10 years' time we will see our high-grade deposits of lead, zinc, and antimony completely worked out. Here again, to maintain metal independence we must rely on our lower-grade ores and electric processes. Large deposits of lead and zinc are found in Mexico, Canada, and in the South American countries of Peru and Chile, but these are subject to export limitations. Our supply of high-grade copper ores will not last much longer than the high-quality lead, zinc, and antimony deposits. Our supply of bauxite is also almost exhausted, and the material for our aluminum production is now coming from Dutch Guiana. Alumina is the most abundant metal on the face of the globe and we will be able to overcome the short supply of bauxite by perfecting the processing of adulterated clays, and coupling this process to large volumes of low-cost hydro power such as can only be developed on the Columbia. Aluminum and magnesium are the light metals needed for airplane construction. In this atomic age the development and expansion of light metal and ferroalloys production is just as necessary as the production of plutonium. Without the ready availability of a large volume of hydro power we will be helpless in defending against the atom bomb. When this Nation broke down the atom we took upon ourselves the responsibility of expanding our energy base and light-metal production.

Since World War I this Nation has seen its stand of saw timber reduced 43 percent. We are now cutting 1,500 board-feet of lumber for every 1,000 board-feet grown. According to the National Industrial Conference Board, we are consuming 2 tons of copper for every ton mined; 1.75 tons of lead per ton mined; and 1.15 tons of zinc per ton mined. The disparity between consumption and production under a low-reserve leads to depletion. Mr. Speaker, this is a serious situation. Stock piling is necessary, but this alone will not give us security independence.

The relation between our petroleum reserves and our increasing consumption also presents an extremely serious situation. According to the estimates of the American Petroleum Institute, our oil reserves are now slightly under 22,000,000,000 barrels. Ten years ago the discovery of new oil fields was increasing our reserves at the rate of 900,000,000 barrels a year. Our new discoveries were then close to national consumption. In 1944 our new discoveries represented only 511,000,000 barrels, and a year later the rate of discovery had dropped 50 percent. During this period the national consumption of petroleum products steadily increased from 370 gallons per capita to 610 gallons per capita, or an increase of 65 percent. The national overall consumption is now better than 2,000,000,000 barrels a year. Obviously, with the rapid drop in new discoveries, we will be scraping the bottom of the barrel some 15 years hence. As is generally known, all our armed forces now move on petroleum products. To maintain an adequate and independent air

force we must maintain independence in those materials which make such a force possible. These facts point to the absolute need of expanding our hydro base and coupling this energy to the processing of modern materials from lower grade and complex ores.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield.

Mr. D'EWART. I think the gentleman from Oregon should be congratulated on bringing this matter before the House. Our Subcommittee on Mines and Mining has been going into a survey of some of these strategic minerals. We find in the case of manganese that we are importing all of it while we have great reserves in this country. In the case of chromium, we are importing nearly all of it while we have great reserves of chromium in this country. That means that in the case of conflict we will have to close down our steel mills if we cannot develop these resources which you have mentioned because it is very difficult to develop them after war is declared. It seems to me that the gentleman from Oregon is doing a job that needs to be done in bringing home to the Members of the Congress the importance of developing these resources in peacetime and not waiting until after we get into a conflict.

It was brought out in our committee that in the case of manganese and chromium we would close our steel mills in less than a year if the imports were cut down. We are not doing the things we should do to develop our own resources. Those resources are great. I compliment the gentleman on making the argument that he has made.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I thank the gentleman from Montana for his very valuable contribution. I might say that that was the basis in the preparation for the speech I am making today.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield.

Mr. NORBLAD. I also compliment the gentleman on the position he is taking in bringing this matter before the House. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, we are somewhat alarmed and disturbed over the fact that the stock-piling program is not going forward as it should. I hope the House will give every consideration to the proposals which the gentleman is today making and presenting to the House.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I thank the gentleman from Oregon.

ENERGY BASE

The industrial use of power in thermal and electrochemical processes is not new. After the experience of the First World War, Lloyd George, the then English Prime Minister, appointed a techincal commission to investigate this subject. Based on this technical report, Lloyd George reported to Parliament that if England hoped to hold its own in the family of nations it must modernize its industrial structure along electric lines. The English commission found that the greater the amount of electric power utilized in industry, the higher would be the wage level of the industrial workmen; the greater the volume of the project; the lower the market price of the product. Unfortunately England did not follow through on the recommendations of Lloyd George. The condition of the English coal-mining industry today results from the failure to apply the Lloyd George proposal.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I am sure the gentleman knows all about the electrometallurgical laboratory at Albany, Oreg., but I think the Members of the House might find it interesting to know that right there near the great Bonneville Dam and in an area which has hydroelectric power available, the Bureau of Mines has a very fine installation, known as the Electrometallurgical Laboratory, which is engaged in experimentation to develop a process for making metals from low-grade ores, which the gentleman mentioned a moment ago. For example, I am reminded of that fact that we have something like 4,000,000 tons of zinc-bearing ores within 40 or 50 miles of this laboratory. We have the great chrome-bearing sands on the Oregon coast, so that right in the great Northwest, with hydroelectric power developed from the Columbia River, the future of the metal supply of this Nation is being protected by the development of processes for the manufacture of metals from low-grade ores.

Mr. STOCKMAN. That is one more reason why the development of the great natural resource of the Pacific Northwest, namely, hydroelectric power, is so important to the continued well-being of this country.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to congratulate the gentleman on the speech he is making, and I want to congratulate the Pacific Northwest on having that great natural resource. For some time it has been known that many low-grade ores could be reduced by the electrolytic process, but that requires great volumes of cheap hydroelectric power, which your community has. We were told by some of the men from the Bureau of Mines, and other experts in this field, that we could supply our manganese, as the gentleman from Montana mentioned a moment ago, but the cost is prohibitive without cheap power. With cheap electric power it can be done.

Mr. STOCKMAN. That is quite true.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. With reference to the magnesium, the Bureau of Mines Laboratory at Albany now has about 65 percent completed a pilot plant for the development of magnesium from these low-grade sources, which, when completed, will give this Nation a pilot-plant-approved process, which is extremely valuable for war and for protection in peace.

Mr. STOCKMAN. That is quite true.

American agriculture during the past war produced remarkable results. Under the heavy manpower drain of military operations, the American farmer was able to make a much greater contribution than was possible in the First World War. This was due to the progressive and modern application of mechanical and electrical power to farm operations. The American farmer has demonstrated for us what can be accomplished by expanding the application of power. The foresight of American agriculture saved the world from famine.

About the same time that the Lloyd George investigation was under way, the Goelro plan was initiated by the Soviets. The Russian plan conceived the reconstruction of all Russian industry based on electric technique. The Goelro plan later resulted in the so-called Stalin succeeding 5-year plans built around hydro developments.

The first 5-year plan embraced the Dnieperstroi development in the Ukraine, which was completed in 1932. This development was designed by American engineers and all the early machinery was of American manufacture. This development was built around the Dnieper hydro plant, with a total capacity of 756,000 horsepower, consisting of nine generating units operating under a water head of 116 feet. The flow of the Dnieper River is considerably lower than that of the Columbia, but under an increased head this plant produced a larger output than our Bonneville station.

Examining this development apart from any theory of government and considering only the practical defense aspect, we find that the Russians established a new industrial city at Zaporozhe around the Dnieper hydro development. This new industrial city was very near the size of the city of Portland, Oreg. In this industrial city the Russians erected an aluminum industry, using about 50 percent of the hydro station's output. They also established electric smelting of ferroalloys and electrolytic reduction of zinc and magnesium. Another industry built around this power produced alloy steel, such as ferrosilicon, ferrochrome, and ferrotungsten. In addition, they installed a large modern steel and iron industry capable of producing the entire line of structural products. It is significant that these listed industries represented the full manufacturing requirements of a modernized war machine. No wonder the Germans spearheaded their military drive into the Donetz and Dnieper Basins of the Ukraine. The Germans knew that they must destroy this modern material base, which they did. We have full information on the Dnieperstroi development from the American engineers who designed and constructed this modern lay-out. This is information that the iron curtain cannot conceal.

VOLGA DEVELOPMENT

A short time ago I noted news dispatches which indicated that the Russians were starting construction work on the Volga hydro development. It is difficult to secure sufficient facts from behind the iron curtain to fully appraise this latest Russian move. However, Wendell Willkie, on his trip into Russia, was given an opportunity to visit the site of one of the great units of this development. On his return he described the project in such terms that it is possible to secure

a measure of its importance. The rainfall in Russia is light, but the volume flow of the streams is large as a result of the extreme size of the drainage area covered. The Volga River is perhaps the richest source of power in Europe. By the construction of a series of storage and generating dams on the Volga it is possible to secure a power output of some 50,000,000,000 to 60,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year. This amount of electric power is equivalent to the entire American electric output in 1925 and one-quarter of our entire national output in 1947, which exceeded our peak war output. The lay-out which Mr. Willkie described was that of the Ruybyshev plant, located on what is known as the great Samara Bend of the Volga. Ruybyshev, with its companion plants, Kamyshin and Don Volga, will alone produce some 30,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, which is two and one-half times the ultimate production of Grand Coulee and nearly 10 times the production of Bonneville. The upper and lower dams of the river system will generate, on completion, about the same kilowatt-hours as given for these three plants.

Russia is also rapidly rebuilding the Dnieperstroi project. All of this adds up to the fact that Russia is building for the time that her scientists have solved the practical details of producing atomic energy.

What I have briefly described covers the entire material situation applying to air power, and the all-out military utilization of atomic energy. All of this effort rests on the construction of a solid energy base—practically all being hydro power.

Russian mineral and fuel explorations have not been nearly as extensive as ours, but with 8,000,000 square miles of territory, or one-seventh of the total land area of the globe, the operation of natural laws shows that Russian resources are much greater than believed. However, we do know these facts with a fair degree of certainty covering Russian resources:

First. Russia's coal reserves are only second to ours, and are conservatively estimated as about 1,400,000,000,000 tons.

Second. Russia has at least one-third of the world's oil reserves, and perhaps more, as recent geophysical tests indicate a vast oil pool around the Caspian Sea, more extensive than the Arabian pool.

Third. She has extensive hydro power potential, about equally divided between Europe and Asia. The satellite states of the Balkans, also Poland, and Austria are all rich in potential hydro power.

Fourth. Russia has a wider strategic mineral diversity than any like area on the globe.

No wonder Russia has included Scandinavia in its expansion plans. Norway has more developed hydro horsepower per 1,000 population than any nation on the globe. Norway's potential—per 1,000 population—is 10 times that of the United States. The prewar statistics show that Norway had 715 developed hydro horsepower per 1,000 population, compared to our figure of 129 horsepower. Finland is also rich in hydro power. The fact that Russia secured a large amount of generating capacity from the United States under lend-lease also shows the direction in which that nation is proceeding to build a modernized military industrial set-up.

ELECTRICAL EXPORTS TO RUSSIA

Knowing the Russian intent of expanding power production as rapidly as possible, I was interested in securing the amount of electrical equipment exports to Russia in the last 7 years. Accordingly, I asked the Legislative Reference Service of the Congressional Library to find out for me the dollar value of such exports. I am advised by that Service that such exports from 1941 through 1947 amount to $261,440,000, of which amount 90 percent represented electrical equipment obtained under lend-lease. Sixty-eight million one hundred and seventy thousand dollars of this total represented Diesel-generating equipment. This amount of money would purchase approximately half the number of kilowatts scheduled to be installed in the McNary project.

The export of electric generators, transforming, converting, and motor apparatus represented $183,370,000. Such equipment usually represents about one-fifth of the over-all cost of such projects as McNary. Therefore, we have given the Russians the key equipment equivalent to build some $900,000,000 worth of generating stations, or the equivalent of at least four McNary projects. Yet at this time we only appropriate on a basis of bringing McNary into production by 1958, and postpone the construction of the Foster Creek project. In addition to this generating equipment we exported to Russia in the same period $19,895,000 of transmission-line electrical equipment.

SYNTHETIC RUBBER

All are familiar with our unfortunate rubber experience in the last war. This experience forcibly demonstrates that we cannot depend on a foreign source for any critical defense material. If it were not for the outstanding American technological genius and the amazing production feats of a war-devised synthetic-rubber industry, an Allied victory in the last war might have been impossible. To handle this emergency, the Federal Government built sufficient synthetic-rubber plants to produce some 675,000 tons of synthetic-rubber annually.

Germany was likewise handicapped by having its rubber and petroleum supply lines cut. The Germans also produced synthetic rubber and synthetic lubricants as well as synthetic gasoline. The experts tell us, however, that the German drive into Russia failed because these synthetic materials did not hold up in extremely low temperatures, cutting air-force activities and stopping the lines of communication. By all means this Nation should preserve, both in stand-by and operating condition, sufficient synthetic-rubber plants to produce 675,000 tons annually when and if needed. These facilities should be leased to private industrial concerns under lease arrangements requiring at least one-third of these plants being operated. Also, we need further experimentation to better the product so that this synthetic material will stand up in subzero temperatures and meet all military and commercial requirements. Private industry should be encouraged to expand these Government-owned facilities in order to place this Nation in a position of complete rubber independence.

There is a vast field for the commercial utilization of synthetic rubber, and it can be made just as valuable a peacetime commodity as it is a wartime necessity. Due to the apparent commercial opportunities this Federal synthetic-rubber program should be placed on a sound, self-liquidating basis. I mention synthetic rubber as an example of what can be done to repair any lack of critical materials.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. What the distinguished and able gentleman from Oregon is giving the House is not only extremely interesting but highly valuable. I do not think he could discuss a subject of more vital importance to this country and its people at this hour than the one he has dealt with this afternoon in such a comprehensive, clear, and concise manner.

The gentleman is aware of the fact, of course, that the Committee on Armed Services recently reported a bill which has passed both Houses of Congress providing for the continuation of operation of these synthetic-rubber plants which we built at the beginning and during the war at a cost of $700,000,000. We require under this legislation that 225,000 tons of synthetic rubber be used each year along with the natural product and that we keep enough plants in a stand-by condition with a maximum capacity of 600,000 tons of synthetic rubber a year, if necessary, so that our national security will be guaranteed so far as that particular item is concerned.

The very able and distinguished Member from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] rendered a great service not only to this House but to our country and its people by getting that bill passed by this body and agreed to by the Senate.

Since the gentleman has so graciously yielded to me, may I say that last year he will recall we passed a bill that would have continued premium payments on lead, zinc, copper, and manganese $70,000,000 over the next 2 years, but which was unfortunately and unwisely vetoed by the President of the United States. I am happy to inform the gentleman and other Members of the House that we have been given assurances from the leadership that the Russell bill introduced by the gentleman's colleague from Nevada with a few amendments that have been adopted by the committee will perhaps be called up for consideration at an early date on this floor. They cannot bring it forth too soon, because the critical situation of our stock pile is such as to cause all of us grave alarm.

I hope that the gentleman and other Members will give this bill their wholehearted support in order that we can have lead, zinc, copper, and manganese stock piled in case of an emergency.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I thank my colleague from Missouri, and I am pleased to learn that he concurs in the sentiments I express here today.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman is discussing a subject that has been of deep concern to me for the past 9 years or more. I am also glad to hear my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] state that there is a movement on foot to bring back this bill that we passed last year, concerning premium payments to help out these marginal mines. The gentleman has said that stock piling alone will not solve this whole problem. I agree with him on that. Those who have reviewed this stock piling act which was set up by Public Law 520 in 1946, and especially those of us connected with the Committee on the Armed Services, have been deeply concerned about this matter, but so little thought has been given to it by some people downtown. A few weeks ago I introduced a bill to raise the authorization to $500,000,000, and I am happy to say that the President, in the last few days, has recommended an increase in his budget. If this development of hydroelectric power will increase the stock piling in this country, I will certainly support the gentleman in any effort he carries out in that direction.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I appreciate those kind and favorable comments.

With an adequate energy base, synthetic products can be devised to meet the major part of our needs. This Nation will have no opportunity to develop tin, but, aside from the use of tin in bearings, there is no reason why we cannot develop synthetic tin substitutes out of forest wastes, if we make cheap power available.

NATIONAL POLICY AND SECURITY

Today this Nation is committed to a policy of firmness in its foreign relations. We are now talking about backing up this firmness by an expansion of our Air Force and increasing our military manpower. However, we must remember that the expert observers across the ocean are hardheaded realists.

We are considering many plans, but in so doing are we not repeating a previous mistake? It appears that we are now making the same mistake we made just before the start of World War II. There has been talk about mobilizing our resources and our industrials, but to the qualified observers of Europe this must have a hollow sound, as it is apparent that something is missing. We are neglecting the very foundation of our strategic position—that is, electric power required for resources and industrial mobilization. We are not as yet planning for rapid construction of power sources to make good our resource deficiencies. We should have these power sources as soon as possible if we are to secure the needed military strength and if we are to build this strength at the least cost in dollars.

To reconstruct our eroded resource foundation we must first provide additional power dams. I am therefore asking that the Congress hasten the construction of McNary and Hungry Horse Dams and appropriate funds for starting the Foster Creek project. All of these projects are located in the Pacific Northwest.

I am not now arguing for special treatment of the Northwest on the grounds of patriotism. I am merely arguing for the rapid construction of Federal dams—wherever they may be located—provided such dams will produce industrial power with adequate characteristics, and at the same time enable such defense industries to continue in business and thereby permanently add to our national security and national economy. With such a provision we can secure the most important element of a defense set-up on a self-liquidating basis.

It so happens that the Columbia River has the greatest untapped reservoir of low-cost power among all rivers of the United States. The large dams already built at Bonneville and Grand Coulee played a highly important part in winning World War II. With all the power that these two dams can produce there is at least 10 times as much power yet to be developed from the Columbia system. Because of special geography of this river system, this hydro power can be produced at the lowest cost of any such development in the country. It can be produced with the least flooding of farm lands and towns, and with very little cost for road relocation.

The St. Lawrence project is a large one, but the amount of power from this project that will accrue on the American side is small compared to the potentialities of the Columbia. Of course, there are other smaller dams in the country that fall in the low-cost classification that can be built, but, regardless of where these other dams are to be located we must proceed with the rapid construction of those dams where the output characteristics have been demonstrated. We need to proceed on such a program if we are to secure adequate military, industrial, and economic strength.

Without the Federal dams, World War II would have been much more costly both in dollars and in human lives and the war would have lasted much longer. More than 60 percent of the aluminum used by the Air Forces came from such hydro power. If this power had not been available, either our Air Forces would have been cut in half or the power used for aluminum production would have been taken from other essential industries while at the same time greatly increasing the over-all war cost.

ALUMINUM

The Columbia River hydro plants serve four aluminum-ingot developments in Oregon and Washington. Boulder Dam and Shasta provided power for the two aluminum-ingot plants in California, and the dams of the Tennessee Valley powered two like ingot plants in Tennessee and Alabama.

The Hanford atomic-bomb project, as well as Oak Ridge, depended upon Federal hydro sources. Again, if this power had not been available, the atomic plants would have drawn power away from other essential industries.

Other war industries used huge amounts of Federal power. One-sixth of the magnesium capacity of the country was contained in two plants which depended upon Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and Boulder Dams.

Much of the wartime production of calcium carbide necessary for the welding of ships also came from the Federal hydros. The production of phosphorus for war chemicals also depended on these hydros.

Ferroalloys for battleship and tank armor plate, and chlorine for war chemicals largely came from these same power sources.

Particularly in the Northwest, Liberty ships and Victory ships and the Boeing bombers drew construction power from the Federal dams. If we add up the war cost and the cost of all these power projects we will find that the power foundation for victory cost less than one-half of 1 percent of the total war cost. In other words, what the Federal power sources saved the country in war costs would have easily paid for the entire investment and for the future investments that I am now recommending. Nevertheless, in spite of this war saving, such projects are actually completely self-liquidating because of their peacetime potentialities.

I am certain that these facts are not widely appreciated. We must therefore refresh our memories on the power shortages developed early in World War II in order to secure an adequate appraisal of the present situation.

WAR POWER SHORTAGES

In 1940 this country was not worried about a power shortage. The officials and consultants of the war agencies actually opposed expanding the then authorized Federal power projects, especially those in the Pacific Northwest. This history was reviewed in detail in the aluminum hearings before the Senate Small Business Committee on May 14, 1945. The official records exist to substantiate every point I am now making. In these hearings the attitude of the power consultant to the Office of Production Management was shown by his own official record, when he stated in 1940:

> I am convinced * * * that our Government can count upon the availability of an adequate power supply for national defense without the need for expenditures or other special measures on its own account.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield to my friend and colleague from Washington State.

Mr. HORAN. Is it not true that the fortunate completion of Grand Coulee Dam with its tremendous facilities for creating electricity enabled us to be on deck and able to create aluminum when the active war started?

Mr. STOCKMAN. There is no question about it in my mind. I think we would have been under a most serious handicap in World War II had it not been for the completion of these projects.

Mr. HORAN. It was quite fortunate in fact that Grand Coulee Dam started

producing power in August, 3 months before Pearl Harbor.

Mr. STOCKMAN. That is right.

Mr. HORAN. Is it not a fact also that aluminum has been called nothing more nor less than frozen kilowatts?

Mr. STOCKMAN. That is exactly what it is.

Mr. HORAN. Now we are talking of a 70-group air force, which means a tremendous use of structural aluminum and sheet aluminum. Is it not true that a great deal of our aluminum production machinery and aluminum production plants have been cannibalized since VE-day and VJ-day?

Mr. STOCKMAN. That is what I am told. They have been to a very large degree.

Mr. HORAN. If we were to build these airplanes and this 70-group air force with the tremendous call upon production that that would bring about, is it not also true that we would have to look to the Columbia River for the production of the aluminum necessary?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I think your statement is entirely correct, the Columbia River being the largest single source of hydro power available in the United States.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I want to commend the gentleman for his splendid presentation of this matter. I think it is of the highest importance to the country at the present time. As has been brought out earlier today, we depend upon Russia for about 46 percent of our manganese at the present time. If Russia should decide now to cut us off from the imports of manganese, our industrial plants, as far as steel is concerned, would be in a very bad way. So it seems to me, as the gentleman has indicated here, that it is of extreme importance that we develop, as early as possible, the production of manganese, and those other strategic materials in this country.

I note that the gentleman also mentioned the production of crude oil in this country. It is true that our reserves are less than 22,000,000,000 barrels, but the fact of the matter is that our consumption of crude oil at the present time is about 600,000 barrels a day more than it was during the peak of the war.

Mr. STOCKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. BARRETT. Now, it seems to me that means there are two things we have to do. In the first place, we have to develop hydroelectric power, as the gentleman has indicated, so that we can use that instead of diminishing our already small supply of crude oil. Secondly, that we try to develop in this country synthetic oil from coal and shale. I think the gentleman is rendering a great service to the country in bringing out this important subject to the light of day, and letting the people know the exact facts.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I thank the gentleman. This consultant maintained this position into 1941, when the need grew sharply for the expansion of various electro industries, requiring huge blocks of power. By March 1941 this country was arranging to buy Canadian aluminum because of our own power shortage. By May 1941 the Reconstruction Finance Corporation initiated a series of contracts that involved financing of $68,500,000 for the completion of the Canadian power project at Shipshaw, in order to produce aluminum for this Nation. Mr. W. L. Batt, of the Office of Production Management, stated before the Senate Committee on April 10, 1945:

> The Canadian contracts were only a small part of this total program, and at the time they were being made, we were moving heaven and earth to get every kilowatt of energy, water power energy, from any source, so that more aluminum could be made.

The amazing thing about this story, as proven in the Senate hearings of May 14, 1945, was that the Northwest congressional delegation urged in 1940 that the national-defense officials immediately make plans to utilize all power installations at Grand Coulee and Bonneville. This the defense officials refused to do.

By 1941, when the power shortage became acute, defense officials finally took steps to correct these blunders.

However, serious damage had been done. The United States, through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, had embarked on financing a large Canadian power project—about the size of the McNary project. This involved our contributing $68,500,000. This was done instead of pressing for more generator installations in our own constructed western dams. And then, on top of these outside arrangements, our Government arranged for the purchase of over 1,300,000,000 pounds of Canadian aluminum at a price much higher than it could have been produced in his country. At that time the potential influence of the Columbia River plants had dropped the price of aluminum some 5 cents per pound, to a 15 cent level. Nevertheless, we paid an actual average price of 18.1 cents for this Canadian metal. This was 3.1 cents in excess of the then American market price, and practically 6 cents greater than the average cost of producing aluminum in the Columbia River ingot plants. If the defense agencies had planned Federal generating installations sufficiently in advance, using the completed dams, this country would have saved 5.8 cents per pound on the aluminum purchased in Canada, or about $75,000,000 on this transaction alone. Thus we see $75,000,000 thrown away because of inadequacy of power planning. This is only a small part of the total savings, as I will hereafter demonstrate.

In their haste to build up aluminum production, the war agencies approved the building of large ingot plants anywhere in the country where power could be obtained, regardless of power costs. Today many of these plants are shut down or have been cannibalized because they cannot produce low-cost metal, not having low-cost power. Such high-cost plants cannot be used by private enterprise because of the world-wide aluminum competitive situation. On the other hand, the low-cost ingot plants in the northwest are now operating, and the Government has sold or leased them and will recover a substantial part of the original wartime investment.

There are five ingot plants, with an annual production capability in excess of 300,000,000 pounds, which are shut down or cannibalized. The largest of these plants, costing about $33,000,000, is completely cannibalized because of extremely high power costs. Another plant, representing an investment of $17,000,000 is partly cannibalized and cannot be operated because of power shortages. Three other plants are similarly situated, costing about $45,000,000.

Much of the $104,000,000 investment in these nonoperating plants cannot be recovered because these plants cannot be put back in condition to produce aluminum. They are either idle or are being put to other less economical uses which do not permit a return to the Government. On the other hand, much of the investment in the three Northwest ingot plants will be recovered because they have available low-cost power.

The federally owned ingot plants now in production in the Northwest represent an investment of $47,500,000 and are located at Troutdale, Oreg.; Spokane, and Tacoma, Wash.

It is apparent that a $104,000,000 wasted investment is an expensive mistake growing out of inadequate power planning.

Aside from this last expenditure, much more money has been lost in aluminum production. If power for these scrapped plants had been properly planned in advance, these five plants would today be in operation, producing 800,000,000 pounds of aluminum ingot per year. For the years 1946 and 1947 this metal would have been worth $240,000,000 in ingot form, and at least $480,000,000 in finished form. Because this aluminum was not produced, the extraordinary demands for this metal have taken away our defense stock pile and in addition many aluminum users are going without the metal. A black market is now springing up in aluminum. The Nation is poorer by at least $240,000,000 for this item alone. In addition, we have weakened our security by the loss of a defense stockpile. Thus the $75,000,000 and then the $104,000,000 mistakes are being compounded by some $240,000,000 per year in lost aluminum products.

There are other costs resulting from inadequate power planning. We finally produced sufficient aluminum to meet certain needs, but the shortages had forced the Army and Navy to change their equipment plans and reduce the total aluminum needs. Actually, the Army and Navy could have used in the peak war years about 1,000,000,000 pounds more aluminum than they were able to obtain. Confirmation on this point can be obtained from the staff report issued by the Senate Small Business Committee on December 31, 1946, entitled "The Future of Light Metals and Government Plant Disposals."

The armed services, to sharply reduce aluminum appplications, resorted to redesigning. Plans of ships, planes, and other equipment were changed to eliminate aluminum wherever possible. The cited report states: "This delayed production, increased the weight of war products, reduced mobility in combat, and increased costs." For these reasons

this country cannot today provide light metals needed on a scale equal to peak war requirements. Our aluminum industry has been cut down from a capacity of about 2,500,000,000 pounds to under 1,500,000,000 pounds. This difference is represented by idle plants, cannibalized plants, or plants put to other uses because of lack of available power.

The Bureau of Mines stated in its release of March 24, 1948, that aluminum capacity output is impossible because of power limitations, and the production of aluminum is not sufficient to meet peacetime needs.

A highly important point in this connection is that this country has not a reserve stock pile of aluminum. On January 1, 1946, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation had a stock pile of 370,000,000 pounds. All of this stock pile has been used up by American industry. The Army and Navy are not stock piling aluminum.

American civilian industry has only 20,000,000 pounds of aluminum inventory; according to the Bureau of Mines, this is an extremely low point.

MAGNESIUM PRODUCTION

The situation as to the extremely important metal, magnesium, is also bad. The Nation's peak-time annual magnesium capacity was 586,000,000 pounds. Today only one magnesium plant is in operation, and its annual capacity is 18,000,000 pounds.

We have seen that the aluminum industry has been cut back due to power shortages to about one-half of its wartime capability, which was then some billion pounds smaller than actual war requirements. We now find that the magnesium industry has been cut back to a level of 3 percent of the wartime capability. If we needed to expand both industries today we could not do so because of power shortages. I understand that the armed services have requested that the Spokane, Wash., magnesium plant be kept by the War Assets Administration as an emergency reserve. If the Spokane plant were needed tomorrow, it could not be reopened because of existing shortages in the Northwest. The California aluminum ingot plants could not be put back into operation because California is gripped by the worst power shortage in history. In California today, farmers, stores, and factories are operating under rationed electricity and a power czar.

In spite of the lack of power to back such expansion, this country—for its peacetime activities—needs more light metal than at any time before.

Our armed forces are planning to use light metals in more applications than formerly. A redesigning of equipment for airborne service has been ordered to use as much light metal as possible.

The peacetime needs of this country for light metal and the additional amounts required in preparation for an emergency cannot be met until more electric power is provided. The same is true of other electrometals.

ELECTROMETAL INDUSTRIES

In 1939 we did not have sufficient electro industry installations to handle the requirements of a modern war. The experience in the last war has stimulated the development of such industries. These are the fastest growing group of industries in America today. In 1939 these industries consumed 22 percent of all the electric energy consumed by our industry. In 1946 they took 28 percent. These electro industries produce aluminum, magnesium, copper, zinc, steel alloys, carbide, phosphorus, ammonia, chlorine, caustic soda, plastics, rayon, abrasives, and many other vital materials. Such electro industries started to grow about the time of the Spanish-American War of 1898. Without these industries, the United States today would literally have armaments of the same proportion we had in 1898. It is also a well-known fact that the automobile industry in Michigan would not have been possible had it not been for the electro material contributions of Niagara power.

Now, after contributing greatly to the industrial progress of this country, these electro industries are being held back by a lack of suitable low-cost power required for expansion. These reasons show that our fine talk about industrial expansion for security is meaningless unless we can produce additional low-cost hydro power. It is utter fallacy to talk about securing this additional power from steam plants. It is true that the utility industry is expanding steam power today. This is expensive power, which cannot be used in electrometal processes.

Oil, gas, and coal have recently advanced sharply in cost. The cost of building dams has also increased, but even so, power based on steam production would cost a great deal more than power produced from new dams on the Columbia. I doubt whether it is possible to secure oil at a competitive price for additional steam generation. Our petroleum resources, as pointed out, are rapidly being depleted and the Nation needs to save millions of barrels of fuel oil. Hydro power is the answer to our declining petroleum reserves.

When we build hydro plants we also reduce our dependence on foreign oil and eliminate the risks involved in having American soldiers protect foreign pipe lines. When we build low-cost hydros we make it possible for war industries to remain in business during times of peace. We also prevent the waste of millions of dollars spent on plants that cannot be profitably operated after the cessation of the emergency. Hydro developments strengthen our industry and our security.

PRIVATE EXPANSION AND ELECTRO INDUSTRIES

We cannot afford to be led away from Federal hydro construction because the power industry is embarking on a large expansion program. Fortune magazine in January 1948 reported that the American utility industry is planning to add 37 percent to its present workable generating capacity by 1952, or about 15,000,000 additional kilowatts. The largest part of this power addition will be high-cost steam. This is the kind of power which is suitable for homes, farms, stores, and small factories that use small blocks of power. It is not the kind of power that is needed by strategic electro-process industries. The availability of low-cost power is one of the reasons why the greatest migration in history has taken place along the entire Pacific coast.

Today these electro industries are using between 4,000,000 and 5,000,000 kilowatts out of our national capacity of 50,000,000 kilowatts. Between 1939 and 1946 this type of industry doubled its power requirements. If these industries continue to grow at the same rate, they will need about 5,000,000 more kilowatts by 1953. This is a very conservative estimate which I had made by people experienced in this field. If the aluminum industry alone were to grow to the extent considered feasible, it alone would need 2,000,000 to 4,000,000 kilowatts within the next 12 years. The aluminum that the armed services needed in the last war—and did not secure—represents about 2,000,000 kilowatts.

We must therefore think in terms of providing 5,000,000 kilowatts for basic defense industries by 1953 if we desire to balance power capacity with defense needs.

However, recent developments indicate that we cannot wait until 1953 to accomplish such results. Our present power authorizations and appropriations will not accomplish this objective. These new kilowatts will have to be of the kind that these industries need to secure an early peacetime start, namely, low-cost kilowatts. It is obvious from these facts that Congress will have to accelerate the construction of authorized hydros. Under such conditions I regret that the House cut back the McNary appropriations from the budgeted $30,000,000 figure to $20,000,000. This action would lose the Nation 2 years of valuable time. Under normal conditions it would be wise to spread the construction costs over the years in order to avoid concentrating construction in periods of high cost, but we cannot afford to do this in the face of the existing world situation.

I have pointed out roughly what Russia is doing, and her leaders are accordingly in a position to properly evaluate our basic plans. The available power will show whether we can, as a nation, make good on what we are proposing.

COLUMBIA RIVER DAMS

At the present rate of congressional appropriations it will take until 1958 before the Northwest can provide 2,200,000 installed kilowatts from the new installations and dams now under construction. An estimate of this situation is presented in the following tabulation:

Dam	Installed kilowatts	Last year at present rate of congressional appropriations
Grand Coulee (completion)	972,000	1952
Hungry Horse	300,000	1954
Detroit	100,000	1953
McNary	828,000	1958
Total	2,200,000	

Even this 2,200,000 figure is deceptive because it represents peak power. Actually there will not be water available the year round to keep these installations

producing at full capacity 100 percent of the time.

This figure is also deceptively optimistic for the reason that Congress is now actually not appropriating money at a rate to provide this amount of power by 1958. We know that if the 1949 appropriations for McNary could be stepped up to $40,000,000, that dam could produce its first units of power in 1953.

Furthermore, there is no positive assurance that the appropriations for the last three generators at Grand Coulee Dam will enable the Reclamation Bureau to meet the necessary schedules. It may not be necessary to appropriate funds for these last three Coulee generators in this fiscal year, but in order to meet the schedules these units should be ordered within the next few months.

This figure of 2,200,000 kilowatts of new power capacity represents only the hope of the construction agencies as to what may be done.

NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL POWER NEEDS

The facts I have pointed out indicate that we face a tight situation. We should have at least 5,000,000 low-cost kilowatts for defense industries by 1953. A substantial part of this electro process power must come from the Columbia River as there are not many hydro sites in the Nation that can produce the low-cost power required for such production. Higher-cost power will not stimulate electro-industrial expansion. I need not detail this matter further, since I believe that the cited facts speak for themselves.

At this point I want to also emphasize one other factor connected with power deficits. I have today been urging that the hydro developments in the Pacific Northwest be stepped up for defense industries. In so doing I have been arguing in some degree against the best interests of my constituents and neighbors. Careful noncontroversial estimates by all power distributors show that at the present rate of development there will be a substantial power shortage in the Northwest, on a purely normal peacetime development basis, if the dams I have named are not pushed to rapid completion.

We in the Northwest would much prefer to see these dams completed at an early date so that our people could use the power not only for industry but for the many growing needs of agriculture, increased domestic uses, and for commercial ventures. The most experienced utility technicians in the Northwest have found that an additional 1,500,000 kilowatts would be required by the middle fifties over and above any capacity now authorized, just for normal growth.

The plea I am making today discounts these facts. The national need is for 5,000,000 low-cost kilowatts by 1953. The program actually covered by appropriations is considerably less than half of this amount in the Columbia Basin, and this capacity will not be available in full, at the present rate of appropriation, until 5 years after 1953. I have shown that we are nearly 3,000,000 kilowatts too little, and 5 years too late.

It is good business to start now on the development of the authorized Foster Creek project which, if expeditiously pursued, can provide an initial 192,000 kilowatts by 1954, and a total increase in power production of something more than 500,000 kilowatts. Thus far there has been no construction appropriation for Foster Creek Dam. We need to get this dam started as early as possible. There is another 700,000 additional kilowatts that could be provided by the four navigation and flood-control dams now authorized for Army construction on the lower Snake River. I realize and appreciate the contentions of the fish people with regard to the lower Snake River development, but I feel that an adequate solution to this problem can be reached at an early date if all interests would work together for the common defense. Two of these Snake River dams could provide 470,000 kilowatts of peak capacity by 1956.

For security reasons I have not included any remarks covering the atomic bomb or the supersonic requirements. These two developments will take sizable blocks of power. As I see it, we need to complete McNary, Foster Creek, and Hungry Horse as rapidly as it is physically possible to do so, and to cut off several years of the presently too leisurely time schedules covering these projects.

CONCLUSIONS

If this Nation is to restore its resource base we need to expand our low-cost power facilities at an accelerated rate. For this reason I am presenting to the House a bill of particulars on a few of such projects. These projects will not meet the actual requirements that I have indicated.

First. The McNary Dam construction schedule should be accelerated, and such accelerated schedules supported by future appropriations in order to bring this power into production by 1953.

Second. Construction of Foster Creek Dam should be immediately initiated and appropriations provided that will bring its first generators into production by the peak period 1953–54, with completion by 1957.

Third. The $9,800,000 of appropriations for Hungry Horse Dam in the 1949 bill should be allowed, and adequate future appropriations secured to maintain a construction schedule permitting initial production in 1952 and completion by the peak period 1954–55.

Fourth. Early appropriations for the lower Snake River development so that 470,000 additional kilowatts can be provided by 1956, with initial production by 1953–55.

Fifth. Forty million dollars for Bonneville Power Administration for the construction and operation of transmission facilities at such a rate as to deliver power from Grand Coulee Dam to the industrial and population centers; and future appropriations for the requisite transmission to take power from the new dams as fast as they come into production.

I am not presenting these facts only as a sales talk for the Pacific Northwest. I am urging these electro-industrial requirements for the future security and economic needs of our country and the restoration of our modern resource foundations.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

WE CANNOT BUILD AN AIR FORCE WITHOUT NORTHWEST ELECTRIC POWER

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, we have had a great deal of talk around here in the last few weeks about building a 70-group air force. Most of this talk has been in consideration of our manpower requirements—UMT, selective drafts, and the like. But little thought has been given to how we are going to get the airplanes which will make up these 70 groups. I submit that right now, it will be far easier to get the men to fly them and to repair them and supply them on the ground than to build the airplanes themselves.

Last Thursday, on this floor, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] spoke of a proposal to provide 225,000 airframe-tons of aircraft, or approximately 24,000 planes of various types. The plan calls for 42,500 airframe-tons per year in new aircraft.

Personally, I think the gentleman's request is about right. But I wonder how many of us have stopped to consider whether the United States is in a position to produce 42,500 airframe-tons a year right now. That weight in aircraft would consume approximately a billion pounds of aluminum ingot. All the aluminum ingot plants we now have in production in the country can turn out only about 1,300,000,000 pounds annually. Virtually all of this capacity is committed to peacetime production and we have a shortage of aluminum right now. We have no stock pile; we are using all we can get as a substitute for steel, which is even more scarce; and, mainly because of the shortage of cheap electric power, we cannot increase aluminum production capacity until we construct some more hydroelectric dams in the Northwest.

I think it highly important that we try to spell out to everyone what this Northwest power shortage means to our defense situation. Our peak wartime aluminum requirement for all purposes was around 3,700,000,000 pounds annually. Because of power shortages due to inadequate prewar power planning, the best we could produce within the United States during the war was about 2,500,000,000 pounds. We had to make up this deficiency by financing the Canadian Shipshaw aluminum development, at a cost of some $68,000,000. The 1,100,000 kilowatts of power generated at Shipshaw, built with United States RFC money, represents a power installation greater than either that of McNary Dam or Foster Creek Dam in the Northwest.

But where is our wartime aluminum capacity now? Most of the Northwest plants, which are the cheapest producers of this metal so essential to our 70-group Air Force plan, are operating on limited capacity because they cannot get enough electric power to meet their needs. Most of the war-built plants in the rest of the country have been dismantled beyond recall. Aluminum ingot plants requiring nearly 1,000,000 kilowatts of power which operated during the war have either been shut down or cannibalized because of a lack of power.

The largest of these wartime plants, the Mespeth plant on Long Island, had a capacity of 297,000,000 pounds and required 280,000 kilowatts. It has been completely cannibalized and can never again be operated.

The Burlington, N. J., plant, with a capacity of 108,000,000 pounds, has been partially dismantled. So also has the 108,000,000-pound River Bank plant in California. The drought in California has made it inconceivable that either this plant or the Los Angeles plant, a 180,000,000-pound producer, could be put back into operation at this time.

Two more plants at Messena, N. Y., operated during the war on electricity imported from Canada. These plants are now shut down. The one at Jones Mill, Ark., is operating at half capacity, due to power shortages in the Southwest.

Incidentally, I am informed that we cannot depend even upon the Canadian production we used during the war, as civilian power requirements there have taken away all surplus electricity which might be devoted to aluminum production.

Our aluminum ingot industry has been cut back so far by cannibalization and power shortages that it now is strained to supply our civilian and domestic needs for this important light metal. If we are going to entertain any thought whatever of building 42,500 airframe pounds of new airplanes each year for the expanded Air Force—and still have any aluminum left over for Mrs. America's pots and pans and the farmer's barn roof—then we had better get busy and provide the one essential resource which cannot be made available overnight—electric industrial energy. Our aluminum capacity is now just one-half what we need to quickly expand the Air Force and at the same time meet minimum commercial demands.

Virtually the same story can be told of our magnesium and ferroalloy plants, which all over the country have been closed down and dismantled for lack of power. We cannot build airplanes without rehabilitating these two industries.

We can pass all the legislation we would like in this House and in the other body for universal military training, a new draft, calling up the Reserves, and reorganizing the entire military structure. But those measures will all remain paper defenses until we get busy and build McNary, Foster Creek, and Hungry Horse Dams and put to work the millions of kilowatts which must be frozen into aluminum ingots before any of those laws will have any real meaning, either to ourselves or to any potential enemy.

I thank the gentleman from Oregon for granting me this time in the midst of his very fine presentation.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, it is always a delight to me to hear my colleagues from the Pacific Northwest, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN], speak on matters pertaining to their section of the country and its relation to the welfare of the entire Nation. They are both big men in every sense of the term. They come from a magnificent section of our country, and today in discussing the hydroelectric power possibilities of the Columbia River, they deal with a tremendous and momentous question. Both of them know how much in sympathy I am with their proposals for development of irrigation, reclamation, and hydroelectric power. I was pleased to hear the gentleman from Oregon say that the address which he has given us today was not salesmanship for his section of the country solely, but that he spoke in the interest of national defense and the peacetime development of which his area has such great potentiality.

I have no desire to show rivalry, but the gentlemen know that I come from quite a different kind of area, but also a magnificent section of the Pacific Southwest. Time after time I have jokingly but factually said to my friends from the Columbia Basin: "Yes; your Columbia River is five times the volume of my Colorado River, and I do recognize its power potentiality, but let me remind you of something. Where you can build a dam 200 feet high on the Columbia, I could build a dam a thousand feet high on the Colorado, and although your river volume is five times mine, the power potentiality would be the same in those two installations."

I am not attempting to be humorous, for this is a serious fact, and furthermore there are many more sites on the Colorado River where a dam 1,000 feet high could be built than there are sites on the Columbia River where a dam 200 feet high may be built. If you take the mathematical product of the total drop of each of those two rivers, and the total volume of each of the two rivers, converted into units of power, it would be surprising how little one would surpass the other. But I have no disposition to quarrel with my friends from the Pacific Northwest. I stand shoulder to shoulder with them in an effort to get the quickest possible full production of these and other great western rivers in a multiple-purpose program.

The gentleman from Oregon digresses a bit from the hydroelectric power possibilities to make some reference to the agricultural possibilities. Well, now, again I may appear to be joking, but I assure you that I am in serious earnest. Not that my area is a rival of your area, for it is very significantly complementary. In your northern climate, you have a short growing season. Especially is that true east of the coast ranges. Sometimes you develop new varieties of seed which you would like to use in greater abundance than you have seed in supply. I am thinking now of a new, rust-resistant wheat which was recently developed. From up near the Canadian border one autumn, some scientific men found they had 1 bushel of this precious seed wheat which would not go very far as seed the following spring. What did they do? They sent it to the Nation's greenhouse, not glassed in. I refer to Yuma County, Ariz. What happened? The wheat was put in the ground and the crop was grown to maturity during the so-called winter months while your northern land was covered with snow. The following spring 60 bushels of wheat was sent quickly from Yuma to your fields. A few months later your crop was harvested, and 6,400 bushels of wheat were sent down the following autumn to Yuma, where the quick reproduction experiment was repeated and the entire harvest of precious seed early the next spring was ready for use in Montana, Idaho, and other parts of the Northwest.

In October 1946, a seed company in Portland, Oreg., found that it did not have seed peas enough for their demand the following spring. What did they do? They sent what they had to Yuma, Ariz., and 800 acres of peas were grown during the so-called fall and winter and harvested in the early spring of 1947. In this way Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and all your sections of the country got adequate seed supply in half the time by thus doubling up on a sort of a greenhouse-production scale. Where we can grow seed 12 months in the year, we can easily double, treble, or quadruple your seed supply, yes, multiply it by 10 or 100 during those months of the year preceding your seeding time.

The numerous statements made during the speech by the gentleman from Oregon, especially by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], indicate that our Committee on Mines and Mining, as well as the Armed Services Committee, have been struggling with this problem of stock piles as was mentioned. We find that we are terribly dependent upon foreign sources for manganese, and without manganese we can have no steel industry. It is the same way with many of the other critical minerals and metals. Therefore, I join most heartily with all of my colleagues to demand and bring about the greatest possible production of these essential things from our own resources. And again I want to express appreciation to the gentleman from Oregon for a great deal of information which he has given us today and for the able manner in which he has handled this vital matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

PALESTINE—THE NEW SITUATION—JEWISH WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES ACT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, on Friday of this week, the United Nations General Assembly will meet in special session at the request of the United States to reconsider its resolution adopted November 29, 1947, for the solution of the Palestine problem on the basis of partition with economic union. Not only the policy, but the prestige of the United States will be on trial, for it was United States leadership in the General Assembly which had a great deal to do with bringing about the partition resolution. Now the United States proposes to advocate a transitional trusteeship to which the administration has constantly referred since its reversal on partition as the new solution. This solution, we are told, is premised upon a truce between Arabs and Jews in the Palestine fighting, but it is doubtful that this truce can be realized. We might indeed find, therefore, yet another change of administration

policy as sudden and capricious as the change from partition when the General Assembly meets.

CONGRESS AND THE PEOPLE NOW IN CHARGE

With a tragic and unsuccessful effort to appease the small Arab States and the pro-Nazi Grand Mufti before us as the administration policy to date, there seems little hope that we will see any real American leadership in the General Assembly. This means that the solution to the problem is likely to be up to the Congress and to our citizens. The objectives must be to see that the holy places in Palestine are not defiled by blood and violence, and perhaps even destroyed; that the Arab fanatics armed by the surrounding Arab States do not make a charnel house of the Holy Land; that these same Arab States do not continue to arm the Arab guerrillas or to engage directly in armed aggression against Palestine's Jews; that Great Britain does not openly or covertly aid and abet the Arab intransigeance; that Jewish extremists are prevented from taking the law into their own hands; and that peace is not jeopardized in Palestine.

There have been referred to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on Palestine problems, seven joint resolutions, four concurrent resolutions (one introduced by 30 members), and two bills (one my bill H. J. Res. 357 to amend the neutrality act to lift the Palestine arms embargo in aid of United Nations action). All of this legislation awaits hearing.

Together with 29 other Republican Members of the House, in a request in which a number of additional Republican Members have since joined, I asked on April 1, 1948, for a hearing on the Palestine problem and all these bills. A copy of the letter to Chairman EATON is appended. This hearing will give the House an opportunity to make an affirmative contribution to the solution of the Palestine problem which the administration's ineptitude has left in the worst condition in which it has ever been.

But in the face of the administration's depressing record, there came a clear breath of air from the people themselves on Sunday, April 4, 1948, when, under the auspices of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, 40,000 Jewish veterans largely of World War II, marched in a great parade in New York City to protest the betrayal of justice for the Jews in Palestine. Two hundred and fifty thousand turned out to see and hear and to applaud. For almost 3 hours the marchers passed in review before the reviewing stand in old New York's Madison Square Park, before Brig. Gen. Julius Klein, national commander of the Jewish War Veterans; Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, head of the American section of the Jewish Agency for Palestine; Past National Commanders Abraham Kraditor, grand marshal of the parade, and Archie Greenberg, chairman of the meeting, and our guests, Senator Owen Brewster, of Maine, Representative Chet Holifield, of California, and Deputy Mayor John J. Bennett.

I marched in one of the formations as a veteran and JWV member myself, and I know the strength and purpose of the marchers and spectators. Thirteen States were represented in the parade, and other major veterans' organizations sent bands and participating units to demonstrate their sympathy and their devotion to the cause of justice for Palestine. The New York Times reported that among the marchers were, "War maimed veterans, heads lifted proudly, who earned applause as they passed." The chief police inspector in charge, Martin J. Brown, said it was the biggest crowd ever in the park. This was the people's answer. There are appended reports from the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune of April 5, 1948, on the JWV parade.

FAILURE BY AUTHORS TO EXPLAIN POLICY REVERSAL

A calculated effort is new being made to scare the people of the United States with respect to the Palestine issue by some individuals, among others, who are interested in the expansion of the power and financial resources of the major American oil companies which are developing the middle eastern oil fields; and by administration officials, who, following a bankrupt British line, are basing our policy on the belief that the Arabs will be a buffer against the possible incursion of the Soviets into the Middle East. It is this latter type of thinking, developed primarily in the Department of Defense and through the deliberations of the National Defense Council, which may have induced the President to believe that the reversal of the United States Palestine policy was justified by our national security interests. Yet in the face of all the criticism which has been leveled against the administration on Palestine, neither the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Forrestal, nor the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Lovett, nor the head of the Near Eastern and African Affairs Division of the Department of State, Mr. Henderson, all three of whom must have been responsible in a major way for the reversal of policy, have made any explanation to the people of their position. It is time that those who have authored the policy reversal in closed conferences and in private representations to the President, come forward and lay their cards on the table.

Jews, in common with other Americans, share as their first concern, the national security of the United States. Indeed, looked at on any ground, the national security of the United States is the very basis for the survival of any kind of freedom, independence or justice in the world, whether in Palestine or elsewhere. It is very significant, to bear this out, that despite the burden on the hearts of the Members of this House who are Jewish, against Great Britain, due to the Palestine issue, only one such vote was cast against the European recovery program; and I might say with all humility, that my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], and I were among the most active spokesmen for the program.

APPEASEMENT OF ARABS JEOPARDIZES UNITED STATES SECURITY

The time has come for the fairness which is plain speaking. Millions of Americans believe that the reversal and Arab appeasement now being practiced by the administration with respect to Palestine is the very policy which jeopardizes our national security, rather than the other way around. For it seems very clear to us that the violence and disorder in the Middle East already created is greatly increased by this administration policy.

It seems to us that the United States policy reversal was an unmistakable gesture of support to the Arabs fighting the Jews in Palestine, though, no doubt, not so intended, which induced them to believe they could proceed with impunity and expectation of success to defy the UN. It also was likely to have proved a spur to the desperate men in the Jewish extremist groups who could argue that it showed the futility of moderation and compromise.

The break-down of the authority of the United Nations, the jeopardy of the historic shrines of Christendom, Judaism, and Mohammedanism in and around Jerusalem, and the impairment of the leadership and prestige of the United States in connection with the Palestine issue are the most calculated to jeopardize the national security of the United States. Turbulence and violence would be an open invitation to the Soviets to move in if they are so minded and especially if there is a vacuum in the Middle East. The Soviets retreated once before in the face of a determined stand by the United Nations on the issue of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Iran. Is not, therefore, the bankruptcy of the authority of the United Nations with respect to Palestine an open invitation to the Soviets?

MIDDLE EAST OIL

The National Defense Council, I have no doubt, advised the President that we need the oil of the Middle East to help in the European recovery program, and it is a fact that it is expected, by the end of the next four years, that Europe will draw important supplies from the oil reserves of the Middle East. But this reliance on the Middle East oil supplies is not true now and will not be true for the next year or two. Right now only 25 percent of Europe's oil supplies come from the Middle East, and even for this, far eastern production as soon as revived could fill in a good part. Now, therefore, not later, is the time to deal with the Arab states defying the United Nations.

If it be true that the Soviet is casting covetous eyes on middle eastern oil, are there staunch defenders of democracy and freedom in the Middle East? The answer is "No." The Arabs were unreliable in World War II and, in fact, in Iraq revolted against the British in 1941. The very leaders who are now so active in the Arab warfare on the Jews in Palestine, were those who deserted the British and worked for the Nazis in World War II. Even the British themselves could see that the Arabs were undependable, when Britain stood with her back to the well at El Alamein, while the Jews were completely dependable.

The Arabs are accustomed to being a conquered people. They lived for centuries under the subjugation of the

Turks. It is very doubtful that they would resist the Soviets. Indeed, our military leaders know the small military capabilities for withstanding a Russian move now in the Arab countries around Palestine, even if the Arabs fought on our side. It is only reawakened Arab countries on a higher economic and social level, emancipated from feudalism now almost universal there, which could be friends of democracy, which could have the will to resist; and in that job, a Jewish state will be all-important, and the spoke in the wheel.

Nor can the Soviets buy the Middle East oil, for she has neither the dollars nor the manufactures which the Arabs must have in payment. No, the administration was right the first time. American security and American interests are best served by the finality of partition in Palestine. But we face now the challenging question of the implementation of partition, and would face the same question with trusteeship.

TWO ROCKS

Let us be realistic. There are two rocks upon which a Palestine solution is foundering. One, the creation of an international force which will back up the Jewish forces fighting to sustain the authority of the United Nations, and second, the opportunity for Jewish immigration into Palestine. It is obvious that any accommodation between the Arabs and the Jews must founder on this rock of immigration, so long as the Arabs insist that they want to bar Jewish immigration into Palestine and make just another Jewish colony like the colonies that are already held captive in the surrounding Arab countries. Let us not forget that there are as many Jews in the Arab countries now as there are in Palestine.

UN SECURITY FORCE—VOLUNTEERS

The big question is an international force, and where to get it. If the United Nations had the security forces now contemplated by articles 42, 43 and 45 of the United Nations charter, there would be no Palestine problem. To ask United States troops to serve in Palestine directly at this time is unnecessary. To ask for troops of the other great powers is today impracticable. To ask for troops from the small powers alone, can hardly be well received by them if the big powers whose interest is mainly at stake, are not to participate. Yet some force to show the authority of the United Nations in Palestine is needed.

The likelihood of such a force in the near future lies in volunteers. It has variously been estimated that such a force should consist of one to three divisions of troops. The Jews themselves have felt that one United Nations division as a token force would have the necessary effect. The Jewish war veterans of the United States, as long ago as August, 1947, urged the creation of a police force under the direction of the United Nations with participation of American veterans subject to the approval of our own Government and our own laws. The national commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States has now informed me that that organization continues to be willing to place its facilities and its membership at the disposal of our Government and of the United Nations for this purpose. I believe a division of 20,000 could be raised from this membership alone.

For such a volunteer United Nations force, I do not believe there would be found any dearth of financial support, not even from the Congress. In one of the most eloquent pronouncements made by our representatives before the United Nations, the Honorable Hershel Johnson, United States representative on the ad hoc Palestine committee which made the recommendations ultimately adopted by the General Assembly, stated on October 10, 1947, that—

> The latter problem (maintenance of international law and order in Palestine during a transitional period) might require a special constabulary or police force recruited on a volunteer basis.

ARMS EMBARGO

These were prophetic words.

The raising and recruiting of a volunteer UN force will take some time. Also the unity and vigor of American policy which it envisages may be lacking until 1949. Under the circumstances, every intendment of policy makes clear the need for lifting the arms embargo so that when, at last, effective measures to maintain order and sustain justice in Palestine are taken by the United States and the United Nations, they may be administered for live people, not corpses. Accordingly, the first point in policy for all who fight the battle for justice in Palestine, here, must be the lifting of the arms embargo to equip the Jews for self-defense and so long as they fight for the UN, against Arabs armed by Britain and the Arab States, who fight against the UN. To those who say this will increase violence in Palestine, I ask whether they mean that violence will be reduced, and indeed eliminated by the slaughter of all the Jews there. The Jewish community is also in an anomolous position on this account with respect to the Jewish terrorists. The Jewish community condemns these extremists, who constantly embarrass them, but cannot find the means to curb them finally, under the harassment of the British, the attack of the Arabs and the stringency of arms supply.

OTHER INTERIM ACTION

Consideration of the Palestine issue in this transitional phase must include as well, consideration of the other measures which are available to the United States to bring about Charter observance, for it is significant that the Charter of the United Nations demands cooperation by the members of the United Nations, with the United Nations. Article 2 of the Charter says: "All members shall give the United Nations any assistance in the actions it takes in accordance with the present Charter * * *." Yet despite this, with all its protestations of good faith, the administration has never sought to arraign either the British or the Arab States for Charter violation on penalty of expulsion. Also, the United States representative has not asked for the application of the powers of Article 39, 40, and 41, of the Charter, which provide for severance of diplomatic relations, for severance of economic relations, and for a complete embargo by land, sea, and air on Charter violators, cutting off all communication, all trade, and what is very important to these Arab countries, all dollars—a quarantine of the aggressor Arab States.

On March 19, the United States delegate to the United Nations, in announcing the reversal of the United States on partition, said:

> Under the Charter, the Security Council has both an inescapable responsibility, as well as full authority to take the steps necessary to bring about a cease fire in Palestine and a halt to the incursions being made into that country. The powers of articles 39, 40, 41, and 42 are very great, and the Council should not hesitate to use them and all of them, if necessary, to stop the fighting.

CONCLUSION

Until, therefore, measures have been taken, first, to lift the arms embargo in aid directly of the authority of the United Nations as proposed by H. J. Res. 357 to amend the Neutrality Act which I introduced on March 22, 1948; second, to support the establishment by the United Nations of a volunteer police force for Palestine, to which the Jewish War Veterans of the United States have pledged their full cooperation; third, to apply the sanctions of the United Nations Charter regarding severance of diplomatic relations, of economic relations and communications to the Arab States defying the United Nations and arming the Arabs fighting in Palestine; fourth, to join Great Britain with them in arraignment as a violator of the United Nations Charter; and fifth, to take effective measures to safeguard the holy places in and around Jerusalem, it cannot in good faith be claimed that the Palestine problem is insoluble and that the dispatch there of United States troops is the only solution. Finally, where is the public explanation of the Secretary of Defense, the Under Secretary of State, and the head of the Near East and African Affairs Division of the State Department as to their advice to the President on American policy in Palestine? Those who believe that our present Palestine policy is jeopardizing the national security of the United States have spoken. What about the other side? Is not that the American way, or are their arguments such that they cannot stand the light of day?

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 1, 1948.

Hon. CHARLES A. EATON,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. EATON: The undersigned have joined on previous occasions in trying to ascertain the facts about the Palestine situation from the executive department and its agencies. We have now concluded that the time has come for the House to get the facts itself through the kind of thorough hearing which your committee is able to conduct.

Palestine is today a focal point of world interest and of our foreign affairs. It poses the affirmative of our world problem as Greece and China pose the negative; for in Palestine the efficacy of the machinery to maintain peace which we helped to create

in the United Nations is seriously challenged while in Greece and China we are helping to hold off breaches of the peace from outside "police state" forces.

Within the United States there is altogether too much charge and counter charge about the Palestine problem without an authoritative opportunity for getting the true facts; it is said that the influence and very survival of the United Nations are at stake, that the ERP is directly affected and that national security is involved. The location of the shrines of the three great faiths in Palestine and the danger to them of the present disorders gives to the problem universal interest and concern for our people. There is violence and bloodshed in Palestine and it is not being lessened no matter how ardently we may wish it by the acts and reversals of the administration.

There are millions of people in the United States who, whether rightly or wrongly, believe the establishment of the authority of the United Nations to be the paramount issue in Palestine, and to be the most conducive to the national security of the United States and to our efforts for the maintenance of world peace. These Americans put our national security, as do all other good Americans, above every other consideration. They too are entitled to the facts.

There are now pending before your committee a considerable number of joint resolutions, concurrent resolutions, House resolutions, and one bill on the Palestine situation. As the committee will shortly have completed its work on the ERP it is the purpose of this letter to request an early hearing by the committee on the Palestine problem and the legislation referred to the committee for consideration.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT J. TWYMAN, Ninth District, Illinois; W. HOWES MEADE, Seventh District, Kentucky; EDWARD J. DEVITT, Fourth District, Minnesota; FRANKLIN J. MALONEY, Fourth District, Pennsylvania; CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, Tenth District, Massachusetts; MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Second District, Maine; J. CALEB BOGGS, Representative at Large, Delaware; THRUSTON BALLARD MORTON, Third District, Kentucky; JACOB K. JAVITS, Twenty-first District, New York; JOHN C. BROPHY, Fourth District, Wisconsin; ELLSWORTH B. FOOTE, Third District, Connecticut; DAVID M. POTTS, Twenty-sixth District, New York; FRANCIS J. LOVE, First District, West Virginia; GORDON CANFIELD, Eighth District, New Jersey; WILLIAM G. STRATTON, Representative at Large, Illinois; WILLIAM J. CROW, Twenty-third District, Pennsylvania; JAMES G. FULTON, Thirty-first District, Pennsylvania; KENNETH B. KEATING, Fortieth District, New York; FREDERICK A. MUHLENBERG, Thirteenth District, Pennsylvania; R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, Thirty-sixth District, New York; THOR C. TOLLEFSON, Sixth District, Washington; THOMAS L. OWENS, Seventh District, Illinois; GEORGE MACKINNON, Third District, Minnesota; HAROLD F. YOUNGBLOOD, Fourteenth District, Michigan; EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, Thirty-seventh District, New York; RALPH W. GWINN, Twenty-seventh District, New York; JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, Third District, New Jersey; RICHARD B. VAIL, Second District, Illinois; NORRIS POULSON, Thirteenth District, California; GEORGE H. BENDER, Representative at Large, Ohio.

[From the New York Times of April 5, 1948]

40,000 JEWISH VETERANS MARCH IN ZIONIST RALLY—250,000 SEE PARADE ON FIFTH AVENUE; OIL INTERESTS HIT FOR CHANGE IN UNITED STATES POLICY

Jewish war veterans from 13 States held one of the largest pro-Zionist demonstrations in the city's history yesterday morning as they paraded on Fifth Avenue about 40,000 strong.

Another 250,000 persons lined the route of march from Thirty-ninth Street to Madison Square Park and cheered veterans carrying banners denouncing "Arab appeasement" and the influence of oil interests on American policy in the Holy Land.

About 100,000 of the spectators crowded into Madison Square Park after the parade to hear pro-Zionist speakers declare that it is not too late for the United States to support Palestine partition.

Chief Police Inspector Martin J. Brown said that it was the biggest crowd ever in the park." The estimates of the size of the parade and the number of spectators were made by Assistant Chief Inspector Frank Fristensky, jr., in charge of the Manhatton East Borough Command, 153 East Sixty-seventh Street.

For 2¾ hours the marchers passed in review at the speakers platform on the east edge of the park at Twenty-fourth Street, and turned "eyes right" to Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, head of the American section of the Jewish Agency for Palestine; Senator OWEN BREWSTER, Republican, of Maine; and Brig. Gen. Julius Klein, national commander of Jewish War Veterans.

Marching in neat formations with numerous massed color guards, many of the veterans' units chanted "A Jewish State in '48" and "Lift the Arms Embargo" along the entire route. Some of their banners proclaimed "May 16—the Jewish Nation Reborn." The crowd's most enthusiastic applause greeted a banner asking "Oil or Honor?"

The oil interests were given a severe trouncing in most of the speeches delivered to the cheering crowd over loudspeakers after the last units of the parade filed by at 1 p. m.

Dr. Silver told the Jewish veterans that "you need take no lessons in American patriotism from Loy Henderson, or from Robert Lovett, or from James Forrestal, or from Terry Duce and the oil lobbyists."

Senator BREWSTER said that "from the standpoint of our national security, the oil reserves of the Middle East are not worth a tinker's damn—this is the testimony of every competent and responsible military authority."

"In the event of any trouble," Mr. BREWSTER said, "the American and British oil developments in the Middle East will simply serve the Soviet" because "logistics plus American-built transportation (railroads and truck lines) insure possession by the Red Army of the oil wells of the Middle East. Sacrificing our honor in Palestine for the utterly unattainable oil of Arabia is not only dishonorable. It is stupid."

The States represented by the Jewish war veterans were New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Ohio, Virginia, Delaware, New Hampshire, Maine, Vermont, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Maryland, as well as a contingent from the District of Columbia.

Other groups participating included small units and bands of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, United Spanish War Veterans, Catholic War Veterans, American Veterans Committee, American Veterans of World War II, the Army-Navy Union, and the Police Athletic League. However, the non-Jewish units made up only a small part of the parade numerically.

Other speakers included Deputy Mayor John J. Bennett and Rabbi Joseph H. Lookstein, acting president of the Mizrachi Organization of America.

[From the New York Times of April 5, 1948]

100,000 JAM RALLY IN JEWISH PROTEST—HEAR UNITED STATES POLICY ON PALESTINE ASSAILED AT MADISON SQUARE—WAR VETERANS PARADE

Under the auspices of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, a crowd estimated by the police at more than 100,000 persons jammed Madison Square Park and surrounding streets yesterday in a mass protest against the United States reversal of its position on partition of Palestine. Speakers denounced the American position as a betrayal of national honor and a surrender to oil lobbyists. They demanded that the United Nations partition plan be upheld.

The meeting, which Chief Police Inspector Martin J. Brown said was "the biggest crowd ever in the park," was held as a mass demonstration and memorial service for Jews who have died fighting for a Jewish homeland in Palestine. It followed a parade down Fifth Avenue from Thirty-ninth Street, in which Catholic, Protestant, and Negro units marched with the Jewish War Veterans.

For 2½ hours the marchers flowed past the reviewing stand in close ranks—40,000 of them, according to an estimate of Assistant Chief Inspector Frank Fristensky, Jr. Along with the national colors the color guards carried the Star of David Zionist flag and colors of various veterans' organizations. There were representatives of 100 cities and 14 States in the line of march.

Banners proclaimed "We fought for peace, not Arab appeasement." "Oil or honor?" "Save the UN—uphold partition." The marchers chanted "A Jewish State in '48," or called the cadence to the words, "Lift, lift, lift the embargo."

War-minded veterans, heads lifted proudly, earned applause as they passed. Many of the marchers were in uniform—the blue of the Navy, gray-green of the marines, khaki of the Army, and dark blue of veterans' groups. Mufti-clad women and children marched with their menfolk. There was a kilted Irish pipers' band of Clann Eiran.

The sidewalks of Fifth Avenue were lined solidly by a crowd estimated by the police at 250,000. The streets surrounding the speakers' stand, on the east side of the park, were packed so tightly that many of the parade spectators could not crowd in. Loudspeakers carried the talks to all corners of the square.

Abraham Kraditor, past national commander of the Jewish War Veterans, was the grand marshal of the parade, and Archie H. Greenberg, also a past national commander, was the chairman of the meeting.

It was a sympathetic audience that listened to the denunciations of American policy on Palestine. The crowd jeered and booed references to the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, the oil companies, the State Department, and in one instance the President. It cheered assurances of the formation of a Jewish state.

Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, chairman of the American section of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, opened his remarks with a reference to the outpourings of marchers, saying, "While certain people in Washington let the Jewish people down, the Jewish people will not let themselves down."

He asked why the United States had called for a special assembly of the United Nations to reconsider the Palestine decision. "Do the President and the Secretary of State believe that after a period of temporary trusteeship, such as they propose, the Arabs will come to accept partition?" he said.

"Those who truly love America and believe in the high moral role of leadership which destiny has assigned her in this century," Rabbi Silver continued, "wish to see her integrity remain unimpeachable and her position unassailable by any suspicion of profit seeking or power politics."

He declared American prestige had slumped in the United Nations "as a result of the amazing reversal on Palestine."

"It is not yet too late for our beloved country to undo the mischief for which certain officials in Washington are responsible," he asserted. "Neither the Congress nor the American people would approve of these machinations. Why should a little group of conspirators be permitted to lead our great country into a morass of duplicity, undermining our prestige before the world,

shaking the very foundations of the United Nations, and doing grievous wrong to a people which has been struggling to regain freedom in the ancient land of Israel?"

Senator OWEN BREWSTER, of Maine, opened his speech with the declaration, "Palestine and petroleum will not mix." He said that from a standpoint of national security reliance on Middle East oil was futile, and that in case of trouble "American and British oil developments in the Middle East will simply serve the Soviet."

"The righteous wrath of the American people is gradually being aroused against those who would sell America's good faith in the world for a will-'o-the-wisp of thirty billions of utterly unobtainable petroleum," Senator BREWSTER said.

He declared a Jewish state in Palestine will become a reality "either under this administration or under the administration that will certainly succeed it."

Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, of California, appealed for a lifting of the arms embargo against Palestine. He said much of the opposition to a Zionist state stems from anti-Semitism, and that the bug-a-boo of a Jewish state being a threat to American national safety since American soldiers might be sent to Palestine was an error.

"I am afraid a lot of people were impressed by these arguments," he added. "I am afraid that those thus caught include the President of the United States." There were boos at this reference.

Failure to support partition, Mr. HOLIFIELD said, will cause us to "lose an opportunity to strengthen the United Nations and unless we do strengthen the United Nations there is no hope in the world."

Brig. Gen. Julius Klein, national commander of the Jewish War Veterans, said the surrender from the "first forthright and honorable position" with respect to the partition of Palestine is a concession "that United Nations ballots can be nullified by the bullets of any state or group of states in the United Nations that finds itself outvoted." It was such a veto, General Klein said, that "murdered the League of Nations."

Rabbi Joseph H. Lookstein, acting president of the Mizrachi Organization of America, gave a memorial prayer for the Jews killed in Palestine. Deputy Mayor John J. Bennett said the greatness of this country lies in its welcome to all races, creeds, and nationalities, which have made our people sensitive to the claims of freedom and justice everywhere.

During the parade, members of the Stern group were distributing leaflets that bore the black-bordered inscriptions, "In memoriam to the British soldiers who will die in the fight for the freedom of Israel" and "British soldiers will not leave Palestine May 15."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

CHISELING AT SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House all know that the veto message of the President on H. R. 5052, the bill to exclude certain vendors of newspapers or magazines from social-security coverage, will be taken up next Wednesday. The gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] has announced that he will move that the House pass H. R. 5052, the objections of the President notwithstanding. He then proceeds, in his memorandum addressed to the Members of the House of Representatives, to summarize the sequence of events out of which this legislation and the Presidential veto have resulted.

On the surface, this appears to be a matter of small importance in comparison with other legislation of broad national and international implication. When examined, however, as the President must do in deciding whether to affix his signature to an act of Congress, the adverse effects of the Gearhart bill are readily apparent. As the President has said, "This legislation has far greater significance than appears on the surface. It proposes to remove the protection of the social-security law from persons now entitled to its benefits. Thus, it raises the fundamental question of whether or not we shall maintain the integrity of our social-security system."

Mr. Speaker, the benefits of the greatest social legislation ever enacted by this Congress should not be subject to the establishment by employers of artificial legal arrangements governing their relationships with their employees. The Supreme Court has unanimously held that employment relationships under the social-security laws must depend upon realities rather than technical legal concepts, and when the Supreme Court has stricken down the ingenious artifices of employers to evade the social-security laws, Congress certainly should not allow itself to be utilized as an instrument to undermine the social-security system.

In justification of this drastic legislation, the gentleman from California has made several statements which require careful analysis in the light of the decision of the United States district court in the case of Hearst Publications, Inc., against the United States, which has resulted in the demand for this legislation. For example, the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] says that the relation of the employee news vendors to the manufacturers of razor blades, candy makers, and fruit growers "is precisely the same as it is to the newspaper publishers whose newspapers they dispose of to the ultimate consumer."

Now what are the facts? As set forth in the opinion of the court, the following distinctions clearly justify the conclusion that the news vendors of Mr. Hearst were subject to such control that even under the common-law concept of master and servant they would be held to be the employees of the newspaper publisher:

First—

Throughout the period in question the vendors were represented by a labor union of their own choosing chartered by the American Federation of Labor in all dealings with the publishers.

Second—

The publishers selected the vendors, designated their place, days, and hours of service (within the limits agreed on by contracts) and fixed the profits they were to derive from the sale of each newspaper.

Third—

The vendors were expected to be at their corners at press-release time, stay there for the sales period, be able to sell papers, and take an interest in selling as many papers as they could.

Fourth—

To see that they performed properly they were kept under the surveillance of the publisher's employee, the "wholesaler." He was authorized to check in the vendor if the latter failed to so perform or to report any such infraction to the publisher, who could then discontinue further sales to the vendor, or report his conduct to the union for discipline by union agents.

Fifth—

The vendor was required to sell his papers complete with sections in the order designated by the publisher and to display only newspapers on the stands or racks which were furnished by the publisher at the latter's expense.

Sixth—

The vendor incurred no expense or risks save that of having to pay for papers delivered to him which by reason of loss or destruction he was unable to return for credit.

Moreover, a vendor "was guaranteed by contract a minimum weekly profit."

Seventh—

The vendors were not allowed to sell competitive newspapers without the publisher's consent. * * * (In 1937–40 about one-sixth of the approximately 650 vendors were selling other articles and noncompetitive publications.)

Eighth—

Here the vendors were subject to the publisher's control in every respect save the manner in which they personally offered the newspaper for sale to the public and collected the price.

The gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] says that "the vendors habitually sell their corners from one to another without notice to their wholesale suppliers." This is a plain contradiction of the finding of fact of the district court that "such locations were designated, limited, changed, discontinued, or reestablished entirely at the publisher's discretion and in order to coincide with changing public demand." As I have already pointed out, the publishers selected the vendors and designated their place, days, and hours of service. The assertion by the gentleman from California cannot be reconciled by the facts of the Hearst case.

Beyond the merits of this particular bill it is now quite clear, as it may not have been at the time the bill was originally passed by the House, that this is but a part of a three-pronged attack by the Eightieth Congress against the social-security legislation that has been enacted over the past decade. This charge is readily documented: First, there is the Republican record on railroad retirement legislation. Second, House Joint Resolution 296, now pending in the Senate, would deprive some 750,000 workers and their families of social-security coverage principally in the industrial home work and outside distribution fields. Third, there is the bill on which the House must vote next Wednesday—H. R. 5052, removing news vendors from coverage.

First, what is the record of the Eightieth Congress on railroad retirement legislation? The Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is recognition of the extraordinary hazards assumed by railroad employees from death, disability, and unemployment. This legislation removed railroad workers from the social-security system and established them in their own statutory retirement plan with broader and more generous coverage. In the closing days of the Democratic Seventy-ninth Congress, the so-called Crosser

amendments were enacted to liberalize the benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act, as well as the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. On the crucial vote in the House of Representatives, the opposition to the bill lined up by the Association of American Railroads was Republican by more than three to one.

The ink from President Truman's approving pen had hardly dried before the railroad lobby was back on the hill agitating for reversal of this forward step in the social-security field.

Election of the Republican Eightieth Congress made the job seem much easier. In June of 1947, after brief hearings, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported out H. R. 3150. This bill would deprive railroad workers of unemployment compensation for time lost from sickness and maternity, and would reduce the rate of the unemployment tax upon the carriers from 3 percent to one-half percent under present conditions. As the minority report pointed out:

> The bill deprives railroad employees of unemployment benefit payments when they are unemployed because physically unable to work; and there is then turned over to the railroads the savings derived from depriving employees of unemployment benefits.

This attempt to help the roads at the expense of the workers off the job from illness was too brazen even for the Republican leadership. So a more subtle approach was devised. Instead of ramming through H. R. 3150, as reported by the Commerce Committee, it was decided to split up the objective. The tax-reduction scheme was introduced by itself as H. R. 5711 and shunted to a different committee—the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Hearings have now been had on this bill in which spokesmen for the railroad brotherhoods demonstrated that reduction in the tax rate on the railroads would jeopardize the actuarial soundness of the railroad unemployment insurance trust fund. The attorney for the Association of American Railroads reluctantly admitted, when cross-examined, that they would not be satisfied with repeal of the tax alone; they want to make sure the extra $120,000,000 a year for their shareholders comes out of the hides of their sick and unemployed workers.

If H. R. 5711 passes, the attack will then proceed anew against the expanded unemployment benefits granted by the Democratic President and Congress in 1946.

Second, the passage of House Joint Resolution 296 makes it crystal clear that the Republicans who originally opposed the enactment of social-security legislation have never really gotten over their hostility and that they now plan systematically to undermine the foundation of this all-important security legislation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we have this bill. The House must realize that what it does next Wednesday cannot be evaluated apart from the other activities of the Eightieth Congress in the field of social security. The veto of the President states the issues briefly and accurately. The President should be sustained.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an article written by me appearing in the Democratic Digest.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The article is as follows:

HOW SECURE IS SOCIAL SECURITY?

(By HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, Member of Congress from the Thirty-second District of Pennsylvania, member of House Committee on Ways and Means)

Most of us are inclined to accept without question the greatest social program in our history—social security. Millions of workers and their families now protected against old age, unemployment, or premature death of the family breadwinner, may dimly remember the hours of worry and insecurity prior to 1935. Others may recall more vividly the stirring challenge of President Roosevelt in those dark days—"The only thing we have to fear is fear itself"; and his subsequent assurance: "Among our objectives I place the security of the men, women, and children of the Nation first." A Democratic Congress responded to the challenge—and the social-security system was enacted.

Much remains to be done, however. President Truman in his state of the Union message reminded Congress of gaps and inconsistencies that must be corrected. He urged: "We should now extend unemployment compensation, old-age benefits, and survivors' benefits to millions who are not now protected. We should also raise the level of benefits." The response of the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives was to do the exact opposite. They reported out of committee and passed in the House late in February House Joint Resolution 296—a bill that would deprive some 500,000 to 750,000 employees and their families of social-security coverage.

Shocking? Most certainly. Unbelievable? Well, almost—except for the fact that Congress now has a Republican majority. As Representative HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, Democrat, California, said in debate, however, "During the past several months I have grown accustomed to the sight of this Congress turning back the clock—crippling where they do not dare repeal, or boring away like termites in an effort to undermine the progress of the preceding 14 years."

Final enactment into law of House Joint Resolution 296 would be a disastrous blow to the thousands of outside salesmen and industrial homeworkers now entitled to social-security benefits. But the threat of its enactment should be a warning to all—to employers and workers alike. We cannot take for granted even the most fundamental social legislation intended to meet economic insecurity from old age and unemployment. That we should ever have done so under a Republican Congress is proof of how quickly we forget.

Believe it or not, the entire Republican membership of the Ways and Means Committee filed a minority report in 1935 on the original social-security bill, protesting that the old-age and survivors, insurance titles of the act were unconstitutional and expressing doubt whether the unemployment insurance provisions would result in a general national benefit at that time. The present chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means (Representative HAROLD KNUTSON, Republican, Minnesota) filed a supplemental report in which he predicted:

"The two pay-roll taxes which the bill imposes will greatly retard business recovery by driving many industries now operating at a loss into bankruptcy, or by forcing them to close down entirely, thereby further increasing unemployment, which would greatly retard recovery." Instead of establishing the Social Security Board, he would have placed the social-security program in the Veterans' Administration.

The Republican elephant never forgets—at least, not when his name is KNUTSON. Now what happened to force Republicans to show their attitude toward security for the aged, the unemployed, and the widows, and children? Last summer the Supreme Court of the United States in three cases decided for the first time the meaning of the terms "employer" and "employee," as used in the Social Security Act. The Supreme Court agreed unanimously that Congress in 1935 did not intend to incorporate the narrow, technical, restrictive, common-law definitions of these terms in such broad social legislation. Said Mr. Justice Reed, "As the Federal social security legislation is an attack on recognized evils in our national economy, a constricted interpretation of the phrasing by the courts would not comport with its purpose."

The Treasury Department and the Federal Security Agency prepared regulations to conform with the mandate of the Supreme Court, the highest tribunal of the land. Chairman KNUTSON, however, sought to usurp the role of the Court. He directed a formal complaint against the Treasury Regulations to Commissioner George J. Schoeneman in which he charged, "The proposed regulations appear to extend far beyond any coverage intended by Congress under the social-security law, and I desire for you and your representatives to appear before our committee to explain the purpose of the regulations and their legal justification." When Commissioner Schoeneman stood his ground, and insisted upon following the Supreme Court decision, Chairman KNUTSON gave the green light to legislation to reverse the Supreme Court. The employers affected seized the opportunity to fan the smoldering Republican resistance to social-security progress. Some of the most recalcitrant groups in industry, they hired able counsel to draft House Joint Resolution 296.

The craftiness of the draftsmen is suggested by the title, "A joint resolution to maintain the status quo in respect to certain employment taxes and social-security benefits," and so forth. As I pointed out on the House floor, we do not require legislation to maintain the status quo. And since legislation means change—either forward or backward—the clever title could not hide the brutal truth. As stated in the minority report signed by Representatives JOHN DINGELL, Democrat, of Michigan; WALTER A. LYNCH, Democrat, of New York; AIME J. FORAND, Democrat, of Rhode Island; and myself, "* * * the bill would curtail social-security coverage. It cannot be disguised as maintenance of the status quo."

The debate in the House clearly developed this simple issue: Is social-security coverage to be taken away from roughly one-half to three-quarters of a million workers? Representative LYNCH put it this way. The question before Congress, as he viewed it, "is whether the Eightieth Congress is to curtail to a substantial degree the scope of social-security coverage provided by the Seventy-fourth Congress. If this bill becomes law, textile home workers—whose economic status is usually worse than workers in the sweat shop—will be denied coverage. Outside salesmen, who are just as much an integral part of a manufacturer's business as is the man in the foundry, will no longer be insured against the risks of unemployment and old age."

Representative MELVIN PRICE, Democrat, of Illinois, called upon Republican Members of the House to live up to their party's 1944 platform pledge of extension of the existing old-age insurance and unemployment insurance systems, while Representative FORAND

charged that the resolution is part of a plan to sabotage the social-security system.

The bland assurances of Representative BERTRAND GEARHART, Republican, of California, author of House Joint Resolution 296, that he has long favored broadening of social-security coverage, could add no more than mournful mockery to the scene. The bitter truth is that the Republican Eightieth Congress—which on the record of its first session has already been condemned as the worst since the reconstruction after the Civil War—has now voted to restrict social security.

I ask you: In such hands, just how secure is social security?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANFIELD). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES COMMISSION

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, this is the fourth time I have spoken on the President's so-called civil-rights program.

Under date of March 3, 1948, I discussed the pending Federal antilynching bill, as will be seen by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, beginning at page 2057. On March 24, 1948, I discussed the proposal to abolish the poll tax by Federal legislation, as will be seen on page 3397 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Under date of April 1, 1948, I discussed the proposal to outlaw segregation by Federal legislation, as will be seen on page 3965 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I now discuss the so-called Fair Employment Practices Commission as advocated by the President.

Perhaps the greatest moral tragedy of our age is the growing tendency of virtue to make concessions to vice. During the 1930's the greatest example was the repeal of the eighteenth amendment, which sacrified morality to political expediency. During the 1940's the great example is the so-called civil rights issue. On the insistence of a small but powerful group of radical, special-interest minorities, the Chief Executive of our land has been intimidated to the extent that he has advocated legislation that is in direct violation of the fundamental principles upon which our Government was founded. The President has bartered his political virtue for a mess of partisan pottage. It is up to us to see that our American birthright is not a part of the bargain.

The antilynching bill, the anti-poll-tax bill, and the antisegregation bill are bad enough, but the most iniquitous of the President's recommendations is the proposal for a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission. This piece of legislation is the darling of every radical Negro, Communist, and socialistic organization in the Nation. The startling thing is that the President of the United States should give aid and comfort to those who propose to destroy the American way of life. It is difficult to believe that his civil-rights message with its preposterous recommendations was a sincere statement of his own convictions. It is easier to believe that the entire civil-rights message was a shallow bid for votes from the Wallace fringe, a concession from a normally virtuous Democrat to the vicious radical elements of our Nation.

The President has the reputation of being loyal to his friends. The experience of his southern friends fails to justify that reputation. For the President has repudiated the debt of gratitude that he owes to the South. His civil-rights message displayed nothing but contempt for the friendship and loyalty of those who are directly responsible for his being in the White House. If it had not been for the southern delegates to the Democratic Convention in 1944 Henry A. Wallace would today be President of the United States. It was the South that blocked Wallace's nomination and paved the way for the nomination of Harry S. Truman as a running mate to the ailing Franklin D. Roosevelt and made Harry S. Truman heir-apparent to the Presidency. And how does Mr. Truman express his gratitude? By turning his back on his southern friends and supporters, by lending the prestige of his high office to the efforts of conscienceless purveyors of hate and deceit to crush human dignity in the southland.

In his recent special message to the Congress the President said:

> The world situation is too critical, and the responsibilities of this country are too vast, to permit party struggles to weaken our influence for maintaining peace. The American people have the right to assume that political considerations will not affect our working together.

It is difficult to reconcile this attitude with the attempt of the President and his advisers to force antilynching, anti-poll tax, antisegregation, and FEPC legislation on the people of the South, and thus shatter the unity of the Democratic Party during the most critical period in history. For these measures can spell nothing but disunity, not for the Democratic Party alone, but for the entire United States. The enactment of FEPC legislation alone would do more to create social and industrial disunity than all the vicious propaganda of communism.

It is apparent to all but those who refuse to see that the FEPC is nothing but a major objective of the Communist Party. It is designed to destroy our republican form of Government by regimenting the Nation's business and industry. The Communists are counting on the fact that in an election year neither major party will dare to alienate any minority group by refusing to support a measure that is falsely assumed to help minority groups. The Communists are counting on the fact that the Democratic Party, in endeavoring to win back the fickle radicals in the Wallace camp, will pledge itself to any obnoxious platform. And the Communists are counting on the fact that the Republican Party, in its traditional bid for the Negro vote, will continue to wave the Red banner of FEPC. Is it true, then, that "The American people have the right to assume that political considerations will not affect our working together"?

What is in this FEPC that makes it so dangerous? The FEPC would provide severe punishment for employers judged to be guilty of practicing racial discrimination in the hiring and promotion of workers. It proposes to set up a permanent commission to investigate and determine whether an employer is guilty of race prejudice in the conduct of his business.

We had a brief but bitter taste of FEPC during the war, when it functioned on a temporary basis. FEPC has made little progress in any State. In the State of New York, where there is a considerable radical minority, there is a State FEPC. Pressure groups have managed to force similar measures through the legislatures of New Jersey and Connecticut. In no instance in which a State has adopted FEPC have the people been given an opportunity to approve or disapprove. In every case it has been adopted by the legislature acting under pressure. In 1946, the people of California had an opportunity to express their views on FEPC. In spite of the fact that there is a large radical and socialistic minority in California, the FEPC proposal was turned down by clear majorities in every county in the State. The people of the State of Michigan will have an opportunity to vote on this issue this year, and even FEPC supporters acknowledge that it has little chance of being approved. For the people of the United States recognize FEPC for just what it is, a Communist inspired conspiracy to undermine American unity.

The FEPC is not an assault on the South alone. It is equally dangerous to all industry in all parts of the country. FEPC operation at the present time in the State of New York is working a serious hardship on industry in that State, inasmuch as it takes personnel control in a business or industry out of the hands of the owners and places that control in the hands of a bureaucratic commission, which may dictate policies of hiring and firing. In the State of New York it is now illegal to carry on personnel practices which have always been regarded as fundamental to sound business. To indicate how New York's FEPC plays havoc with the hiring procedure alone, let me cite a few examples. It is unlawful—

> To make inquiry into the original name of the applicant for employment, whose name has been changed by court proceedings or otherwise.

It is unlawful—

> To make inquiry into the birthplace of the applicant for employment, the birthplace of the parents, spouse, or other close relative.

It is unlawful to require an applicant for employment to produce a birth certificate.

It is unlawful to inquire "into the religious denomination of an applicant for employment, his religious affiliations, his church, parish pastor, or religious holidays observed."

An employer cannot even ask whether an applicant for employment is an atheist.

It is unlawful to inquire about the race or color of an applicant for employment. It is unlawful also to require an applicant to submit a photograph with his application for employment.

These are just a few of the tyrannical restrictions that the FEPC places on a business or industry. It denies a businessman the right to say what kind of people will work in his organization. If there is a greater imposition on personal liberty than this, it is difficult to imagine what it could be.

It requires no great imagination to see what would be the result if this kind of legislation were foisted upon the people of the United States. It would open wide the doors of every business in the Nation to those agitators who are skillful in fomenting racial unrest. Every industry, every business in the Nation, which did not employ certain minority racial groups would be subject to severe penalties. Every industry, every business in the Nation, could be required to employ unqualified, incompetent persons merely to avoid any stigma of prejudice or discrimination. Every member of every minority group could bring charges, justified or not, against his employer or against a prospective employer, seeking to demonstrate that employment or a coveted promotion was denied him on the basis of his race, creed, or color. With enough Communist agitators in the field, life for a southern businessman would be one continual round of lawsuits and court appearances, a perpetual inquisition conducted by bureaucratic FEPC investigators.

The fact of innocence would be no defense, for an employer could be held responsible for the intolerances and prejudices of his employees, if they happen to resent the employment of a member of a particular race or religious group. There are many industries in which employers have no jurisdiction over the choice of employees, inasmuch as the union dictates who shall be hired. Most unions have written or unwritten regulations limiting their membership to members of the white race. In such a case, if an employer fails to hire a Negro he violates the FEPC laws; if he does hire the Negro he violates his union contract. No matter what happens he is bound to lose.

This is the kind of inequity that we are asked to sanctify by Federal law. To do so is to fly in the face of all history, which teaches that prejudice cannot be overcome by coercion, that the only real answer to discrimination is better racial understanding through the forces of religion and education.

This is a critical period of national and world history. It is no time to allow our legislative machinery to become stalled by FEPC debate. It is no time to permit Communist agitators to disrupt our national unity by spreading distrust and misunderstanding among racial and minority groups. It is no time for virtue to make concessions to vice.

SUBPENA DUCES TECUM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANFIELD) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk, which was read:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C. April 12, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, I have received four subpenas duces tecum, directed to me as Clerk of the House of Representatives, to appear before said court on the thirteenth day of April 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., as a witness in the case of the United States against John Howard Lawson (No. 1352–47 Criminal Docket), and to bring with me certain and sundry papers therein described in the files of the House of Representatives.

The subpenas contain from 5 to 18 paragraphs each, descriptive of the papers in question. A limited number of paragraphs are specific in their description and such papers may readily be identified. The greater number are general, lack specific description, embrace a voluminous quantity of records and in many instances papers which are not part of the file at all. Such of the papers as may be identified as being under the control of the House are the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities and as such are under the unqualified control of the House.

Your attention and that of the House is respectfully invited to a resolution of the House adopted in the Forty-sixth Congress, first session (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 680), upon the recommendation of the Committee on the Judiciary as follows:

"*Resolved*, That no officer or employee of the House of Representatives has the right, either voluntarily or in obedience to a subpena duces tecum, to produce any document, paper, or book belonging to the files of the House before any court or officer, nor to furnish any copy of any testimony given or paper filed in any investigation before the House or any of its committees, or of any paper belonging to the files of the House, except such as may be authorized by statute to be copied and such as the House itself may have made public, to be taken without the consent of the House first obtained."

And to a resolution adopted by the House in the Forty-ninth Congress, first session (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1295), from which the following is quoted:

"*Resolved*, That by the privilege of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate or process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission.

"That when it appears by the order of a court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer for the promotion of justice, this House will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House."

These resolutions result from the issuance of subpena duces tecum upon the Clerk of the House to produce certain original papers in the files of the House.

Permission to remove from their place of file or from the custody of the Clerk any papers was denied by the House but court afforded facilities to make certain copies of papers to be secured from the House. This seems to be the uniform procedure in the case of subpenas duces tecum served upon the Clerk of the House of Representatives to produce original papers from the files of the House.

The subpenas in question are herewith attached, and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

Very respectfully yours,
JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

[Duces tecum—defendant]

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* JOHN HOWARD LAWSON, NO. 1352–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Tuesday, the 13th day of April 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, consisting of 9 pages and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness the Honorable Chief Justice of said court, the 9th day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By ELIZABETH M. KOWALSKI,
Deputy Clerk.

ROBERT W. KENNY,
ALLAN R. ROSENBERG,
Attorneys for John Howard Lawson.

SCHEDULE A

1. Copies of letter sent by KARL E. MUNDT, member of the committee, to Gov. Thomas E. Bailey (Mississippi) and approximately 99 others on or about January 20, 1945, relating to a suitable and working criterion to determine what does and what does not comprise an un-American propaganda activity, together with the data sheet mailed therewith and all replies received thereto, and all further correspondence with the same individuals in connection therewith and such additional correspondence received from other individuals and/or organizations pertaining to the establishment of the working criterion above set forth as to the definition of the terms un-American and/or subversive; all stenographic transcripts of meetings of the committee and all its minutes and other memoranda relating to the said letter.

2. Copies of all letters sent by or on behalf of the committee or by any members thereof to the Brookings Institution between January 3, 1945, and April 15, 1945, relating to a working criterion for determining what constitutes un-American propaganda activity, or relating to an analysis of letters received purporting to define un-American propaganda; together with all letters received from the Brookings Institution in connection therewith.

3. The report or memorandum submitted to the committee by the Brookings Institution between January 3, 1945, and April 15, 1945, relating to or entitled "Suggested Standards for Determining Un-American Activities," and other data and material submitted in connection therewith, and all stenographic transcripts of meetings of the committee and all its minutes and other memoranda relating to the said report or memorandum.

4. Memorandum of six paragraphs sent to the committee or to KARL E. MUNDT, committee member, by the American Civil Liberties Union during February 1945, relating to un-American activities, and letter accompanying same.

5. Stenographic transcript of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee of the same

from May 26, 1938, to August 2, 1946, at which the definition or content of phrases, or any portion of the phrases, "un-American propaganda activities," and/or "subversive and un-American propaganda * * * (which) attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution," were considered and acted upon, or on which any action was taken by the committee in connection with the scope of its authority and powers, or in connection with any constitutional limitations thereon.

6. All press releases issued by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or its chairman or its members from May 26, 1938, to August 2, 1946, dealing with the definition or content of phrases, or any portion of the phrases, "un-American propaganda activities," and/or "subversive and un-American propaganda * * * (which) attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution."

7. Minutes and transcripts of meetings and executive sessions not limited to, but including, committee action on or about February 21, 1945, relating to a request to the Brookings Institution to analyze the replies to Mundt's letter of January 20, 1945, concerning a working criterion of what comprises an un-American propaganda activity, and to suggest standards for determining un-American propaganda activities.

8. All reports of the House Committee on Un-American Activities from May 26, 1938, to date, including but not limited to:

Reports issued by the House Committee on Un-American Activities

Author	Date	House Rept. No.	Congress	Session
Dies		2	76th	1st.
Starnes	Jan. 3, 1940	1476	76th	3d.
Dies	Apr. 8, 1940, contempt, Albert Blumberg.	1937	76th	3d.
Do	Mar. 29, 1940, contempt, James H. Dolsen.	1900	76th	3d.
Do	Apr. 8, 1940, contempt, Phillip Frankfeld.	1936	76th	3d.
Do	Apr. 8, 1940, contempt, Thomas F. P. O'Dea.	1938	76th	3d.
Do	Apr. 2, 1940, contempt, George Powers.	1904	76th	3d.
Do	Jan. 3, 1941	1	77th	1st.
Starnes (pt. 1).	June 25, 1942	2277	77th	2d.
Voorhis (pt. 2).	July 7, 1942	2277	77th	2d.
	Sept. 3, 1942, report of FBI.	[1] 833	77th	2d.
Dies	Jan. 2, 1943	2748	77th	2d.
Costello	Sept. 30, 1943	717	78th	1st.
Dies	Peace Now	1161	78th	2d.
Do	CIO-PAC	1311	78th	2d.
Wood	Mar. 28, 1946	1829	79th	2d.
Do		1936	79th	2d.
Do	May 10, 1946	1996	79th	2d.
Adamson	May 29, 1946, report to Wood.[2]			
Wood		2233	79th	2d.
Do	June 26, 1946, Corliss Lamont.	2354	79th	2d.
Do	July 31, 1946, George Marshall.	2707	79th	2d.
Do	July 31, 1946, Richard Morford.	2708	79th	2d.
Do		2742	79th	2d.
Thomas	AYD	271	80th	1st.
Do	Communist Party	209	80th	1st.
Do	The Communist Party of the United States as an agent of a foreign power.			
Do	Southern Conference	592	80th	1st.
Do	Civil Rights Congress.	1115	80th	1st.

[1] House document.
[2] Citations by official Government agencies and private organizations regarding the character of organizations named.

Report of a subcommittee of the committee to the full committee publicized on October 30, 1944, relating to a reinvestigation of PAC and an investigation of the National Citizens PAC.

9. Transcripts of all hearings, public and executive, held by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, from May 26, 1938, to date, but not limited to the following volumes and subjects:

HEARINGS OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

1938: August 12–23, September 15–17, September 28–October 6, volume 1; October 11–13, October 17–22, volume 2; October 24–November 21, volume 3.

1939: November 19–December 14, volume 4; December 15, supplement to volume 4; May 18–June 1, volume 5; August 16–29, volume 6; September 5–27, volumes 7 and 8.

1940: September 28–October 14, volume 9; October 16–28, volume 10; October 28–December 3, volume 11; February 7–April 4, volume 12.

1941: April 11–May 21, volume 13; August 29, 1940–August 11, 1941, volume 14.

1943: June 8–July 7, volume 15.

1944: November 29–December 20, volume 16; September 27–October 5, volume 17.

1945: Executive hearings that were released by the committee December 15, 1944, September 20, 1939–April 19, 1943, volumes 1 through 7.

1946: September 26–October 19, 1945, Communist Party; June 20, 27, 1945, OPA; January 30, 1946, G. L. K. Smith; April 4, 1946, E. B. Jarg (JAFRC).

1947: November 22, 1946 (revised 1947), Budenz; February 6, 1947, Eisler; bills to outlaw Communist Party March 24–28, 1947.

1947: April 9, Eugene Dennis; July 7, Walter S. Steele; February 27–July 23–25, communism in labor unions; July 22, Kravchenko.

1948: September 24–26, 1947, Hanns Eisler; October 20–30, 1947, Hollywood.

10. Transcripts of all meetings held by individual committee members and specifically including transcripts of a meeting held by Congressman J. PARNELL THOMAS with officials of the State of New Jersey published by the committee in 1939 or 1940.

11. All reports of investigators for the committee issued by the committee from May 26, 1938, to August 2, 1946, including a report published in 1938 by investigator for the committee, Edward E. Sullivan, containing a statement: "Evidence tends to show that all phases of radical and Communist activities are rampant among the studios of Hollywood, and, although well known, is a matter which movie moguls desire to keep from the public."

12. All releases and statements issued by, or on behalf of, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and/or stenographic transcripts of meetings of the committee from May 26, 1938, to August 2, 1946, relating to or discussing the investigation of organizations, groups, or individuals which disseminate propaganda or influence or attempt to influence public opinion.

13. The records of names of all organizations and groups compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from May 26, 1938, to August 2, 1946, which are allegedly "subversive" or "un-American."

14. The records of all names of individuals compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from May 26, 1938, to August 2, 1946, which are allegedly "subversive" or "un-American."

15. Copy of letter sent by the counsel for the Committee on Un-American Activities to the National Committee To Combat Anti-Semitism in which it was stated that the said National Committee To Combat Anti-Semitism "is engaged in solicitation of money for the purpose of controlling the thoughts of American citizens," and all correspondence, minutes, and other records in relation thereto, said letter being referred to in C. R. A., March 1, 1946, at page 1120.

16. Copy of letter sent by counsel for the Committee on Un-American Activities to Drew Pearson, in which letter a demand was made for an explanation of the phrase "make democracy work," and all correspondence, minutes, and other records in relation thereto.

17. Copy of letter sent by counsel for the Committee on Un-American Activities to the Veterans Against Discrimination, in which letter it was noted that the Veterans Against Discrimination had referred to "democracy" several times and in which it was called to the attention of the Veterans Against Discrimination that the United States is a republic and not a democracy, and all correspondence, minutes, and other records in relation thereto.

18. All correspondence and memoranda from and to the committee, or from and to individual members of the committee, or from and to members of the committee staff, between May 26, 1938, and August 2, 1946, relating to findings by the committee or to material in the committee files concerning the names of organizations, groups, or individuals in the files of the committee.

[Duces tecum—defendant]

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* JOHN HOWARD LAWSON, NO. 1352–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Tuesday the 13th day of April 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness the Honorable Chief Justice of said court, the 9th day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.
ROBERT W. KENNY,
ALLAN R. ROSENBERG,
Attorneys for John Howard Lawson.

SCHEDULE A

1. Minutes and memoranda of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee thereof between May 26, 1938, to October 20, 1947, at which investigation of John Howard Lawson was considered, referred to, or acted upon.

2. All releases and statements issued by or on behalf of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, whether to the press or otherwise from May 26, 1938, to date which referred to or discussed John Howard Lawson.

3. All publications, documents, statements, or communications relating to John Howard Lawson and submitted to the House Committee on Un-American Activities between May 26, 1938, and October 20, 1947.

4. Transcripts of committee meetings or executive sessions from May 26, 1938, to date at which the committee considered and/or discussed the said John Howard Lawson.

5. All reports, communications, and correspondence and memoranda relating to the investigation of the said John Howard Lawson by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from May 26, 1938, to October 20, 1947.

[Duces tecum—defendant]

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* JOHN HOWARD LAWSON, NO. 1352–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, the Capitol, Washington, D. C.

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Tuesday the 13th day of April

1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A, annexed hereto and made a part hereof, consisting of two pages, and not to depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable Chief Justice of said court, the 9th day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By ELIZABETH M. KOWALSKI,
Deputy Clerk.

ROBERT W. KENNY,
ALLEN R. ROSENBERG,
Attorneys for John Howard Lawson.

SCHEDULE A

1. Stenographic transcript of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee of the same from August 2, 1946, to date at which the definition or content of phrases, or any portion of the phrases, "un-American propaganda activities," and/or "subversive and un-American propaganda * * * (which) attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution," were considered and acted upon, or on which any action was taken by the committee in connection with the scope of its authority and powers, or in connection with any constitutional limitations thereon.

2. All press releases issued by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or its chairman or its members from August 2, 1946, to date dealing with the definition or content of phrases, or any portion of the phrases, "un-American propaganda activities," and/or "subversive and un-American propaganda * * * (which) attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution."

3. All reports of the House Committee on Un-American Activities from August 2, 1946, to date.

4. Transcripts of all hearings, public and executive, held by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from August 2, 1946, to date.

5. All reports of investigators for the committee issued by the committee, from August 2, 1946, to date.

6. All releases and statements issued by, or on behalf of, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and/or stenographic transcripts of meetings of the committee from August 2, 1946, to date relating to or discussing the investigation of organizations, groups, or individuals which disseminate propaganda or influence or attempt to influence public opinion.

7. The records of names of all organizations and groups compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from August 2, 1946, to date, which are allegedly "subversive" or "un-American."

8. The records of all names of individuals compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from August 2, 1946, to date which are allegedly "subversive" or "un-American."

9. All correspondence and memoranda from and to the committee, or from and to individual members of the committee, or from and to members of the committee staff between August 2, 1946, to date relating to findings by the committee or to material in the committee files concerning the names of organizations, groups, or individuals in the files of the committee.

[Duces tecum—defendant]

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* JOHN HOWARD LAWSON, NO. 1352–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Tuesday, the 13th day of April 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, consisting of three pages, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness the Honorable Chief Justice of said court, the 9th day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

ROBERT W. KENNY,
ALLAN R. ROSENBERG,
Attorneys for John Howard Lawson.

SCHEDULE A

1. Minutes of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee thereof between May 26, 1938, and October 20, 1947, at which investigation of the motion-picture industry was considered, referred to, acted upon, and transcripts of any testimony taken about, or concerning the motion-picture industry during that period, and memoranda and reports of investigators for the committee and other reports and memoranda which was the subject of consideration by the committee.

2. All the releases and statements issued by or on behalf of the House Committee on Un-American Activities whether to the press or otherwise between May 26, 1938, and October 20, 1947, which referred to or discussed the motion-picture industry, and particularly regarding the alleged Communist infiltration in the motion-picture industry.

3. Copies of any letters, reports, or other communications from any person or groups of persons or organizations to the House Committee on Un-American Activities from May 26, 1938, to October 20, 1947, concerning the motion-picture industry.

4. Copy of all letters, correspondence, or other communications from the House Committee on Un-American Activities to any persons, groups, or individuals between May 26, 1938, and October 20, 1947, concerning the motion-picture industry.

5. Transcripts of the hearings held by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any of its subcommittees from October 20 to October 30, 1947, concerning the motion-picture industry and all exhibits and applications and motions of counsel for all witnesses who appeared before the said committee at the said hearings.

6. Transcripts of the hearings held by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee thereof, in Los Angeles, Calif., concerning the motion-picture industry during 1947 and particularly during May 1947, including specifically the testimony of Louis B. Mayer and all other executives in the motion-picture industry.

7. Copy of all reports made to the House Committee on Un-American Activities by any of its investigators and particularly its investigators H. A. Smith and A. B. Leckie, concerning the interviews had by the said investigators with the motion-picture producers in Hollywood, Calif., during the period January 1, 1947, and October 20, 1947.

8. Transcripts of committee meetings or executive sessions held from January 1, 1947, to date, at which the committee considered and/or acted upon matters relating to the motion-picture industry, and witnesses testifying at the hearings held between the aforesaid dates.

9. All correspondence and communications between representatives of the motion-picture industry and the House Committee on Un-American Activities from May 26, 1938, to date.

10. All correspondence and communications between the Motion Picture Alliance and/or any of its representatives and the House Committee on Un-American Activities from May 26, 1938, to date.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 5214. An act making appropriations for the executive office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 8, 1948, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1523. An act for the relief of Edwin H. Griggs, or his estate; and

H. R. 4167. An act to authorize the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Washington to lease their State lands for production of minerals, including leases for exploration for oil, gas, and other hydrocarbons and the extraction thereof, for such terms of years and on such conditions as may be from time to time provided by the legislatures of the respective States.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Wednesday, April 14, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1458. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting a report of the operations of the Export-Import Bank of Washington as of the close of business December 31, 1947; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1459. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the reopening of the entire proceedings of the case against Maria De La Luz Marquez De Alvarado and request that the case be withdrawn from those now before Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1460. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Thirteenth Annual Report of the Securities and Exchange Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1461. A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

1462. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the establishment of internships in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1463. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting volume 3 of the report on the audit of Reconstruction Finance Corporation and affiliated corporations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 605); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 154. Concurrent resolution authorizing a reprint of the report and supplements 1 and 2 of the Subcommittee on National and International Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, entitled "The Strategy and Tactics of World Communism"; with amendments (Rept. No. 1705). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 330. Resolution providing for funds to carry on investigations, studies, and surveys in the Civil Service and Post Office Department, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1706). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 481. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (h) (1); with an amendment (Rept. No. 1707). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 508. Resolution authorizing funds to defray expenses incurred by the special committee created by House Resolution 461; without amendment (Rept. No. 1708). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 517. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; without amendment (Rept. No. 1709). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 518. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on Education and Labor; without amendment (Rept. No. 1710). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 18. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of proceedings at the unveiling of the statue of William E. Borah; without amendment (Rept. No. 1711). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 526. Resolution authorizing the printing of the proceedings held in commemoration of the centennial of the telegraph, May 24, 1944, provided by House Concurrent Resolution 72, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session; without amendment (Rept. No. 1712). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 182. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of 15,000 additional copies of the factual analysis on housing entitled "Housing in America" for use of the Joint Committee on Housing; without amendment (Rept. No. 1713). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 1304. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the organization of Minnesota as a Territory of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1714). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 5174. A bill to authorize Commodity Credit Corporation to make adjustment payments to certain producers of raw cane sugar in Puerto Rico and Hawaii; without amendment (Rept. No. 1715). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5434. A bill authorizing the Attorney General of the United States to recognize and to award to outstanding courageous young Americans a medal for heroism known as the Young American Medal for Bravery, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1716). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 5588. A bill to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans of World War I and World War II with service-connected disabilities who have dependents; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1717). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EBERHARTER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 5933. A bill to permit the temporary free importation of racing shells; without amendment (Rept. No. 1718). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALBERT: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. J. Res. 329. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma; without amendment (Rept. No. 1719). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. J. Res. 333. Joint resolution to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the termination of the war with Spain; without amendment (Rept. No. 1720). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. House Report No. 1699 (pt. II). Supplemental report to accompany H. R. 5904. A bill to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 936. An act for the relief of Burnett A. Pyle; without amendment (Rept. No. 1721). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FOOTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 851. A bill for the relief of Adney W. Gray; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1722). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2064. A bill for the relief of Michael Palazotta; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1723). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2732. A bill for the relief of Dennis Stanton; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1724). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FOOTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3006. A bill for the relief of Laura Spinnichia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1725). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3965. A bill for the relief of John H. Schmitt and Mrs. Mildred Schmitt; without amendment (Rept. No. 1726). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3983. A bill for the relief of Northwest Missouri Fair Association, of Bethany, Harrison County, Mo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1727). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FOOTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4381. A bill for the relief of the Yellow Cab Transit Co., of Oklahoma City; without amendment (Rept. No. 1728). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 6187. A bill to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and to repeal section 2402 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 6188. A bill to confer jurisdiction over the Fort Des Moines Veterans' Village upon the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 6189. A bill authorizing the construction of certain public works at Hubbell, Nebr., for flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. EATON:

H. R. 6190. A bill to control the exportation and importation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, and related items, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOOTE:

H. R. 6191. A bill to enable children under 21 years of age adopted by United States citizens to enter the United States as nonquota immigrants and to become naturalized; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 6192. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 (Public Law 106, 79th Cong., ch. 212, 1st sess.); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 6193. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 6194. A bill to provide for increasing the height of certain parts of the levees on the North Branch of the Susquehanna River, Wilkes-Barre and Hanover Township, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 6195. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital in south Texas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MACKINNON:

H. R. 6196. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 6197. A bill to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, to permit vice presidents and cashiers of national banking associations to sign certain declarations required to be presented to collectors of the customs; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. R. 6198. A bill to amend the Social Security Act of 1935; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 6199. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to convey to the port of Cascade Locks, Oreg., certain lands for municipal or port purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 6200. A bill providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 6201. A bill to raise by $50 the limit on amounts payable in connection with the funeral and burial of certain deceased members of the armed forces and certain deceased veterans; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 6202. A bill to broaden the cooperative extension system as established in the act of May 8, 1914, and acts supplemental thereto, by providing for cooperative extension work between colleges receiving the benefits of this act and the acts of July 2, 1862, and August 30, 1890, and other qualified colleges, universities, and research agencies, and the United States Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'HARA (by request):

H. R. 6203. A bill to incorporate the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington, a corporation sole; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 6204. A bill to extend to commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey the provisions of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BREHM:

H. R. 6205. A bill to provide compensation for service in World War II by residents of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 6206. A bill to extend the time within which application for the benefits of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 may be made by veterans discharged from the armed forces before the effective date of such act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 6207. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to authorize payment of benefits in certain cases to individuals otherwise entitled to such benefits who have failed to apply therefor within the prescribed time limit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 6208. A bill to provide for the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALLECK:

H. R. 6209. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Protestant Episcopal Cathedral Foundation of the District of Columbia," approved January 6, 1893, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 6210. A bill to provide for the liquidation of the trusts under the transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 6211. A bill to amend title X of the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to provide for the encouragement and stimulation of aid to the blind recipients to become wholly or partially self-supporting; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 6212. A bill to recognize and acknowledge the gratitude of the people and Government of the United States for the patriotic service of certain men and women of the news and radio services and to provide medals for them; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 6213. A bill for the relief of certain employees and former employees of the War Assets Administration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 6214. A bill to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. J. Res. 372. Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar years 1948 and 1949; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Con. Res. 183. Concurrent resolution to recognize and publicly acknowledge the gratitude of the people and the Government of the United States for the loyal service of the men and women of the radio and news services during World War II; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. McGARVEY:

H. Res. 529. Resolution providing that an open hearing be held before a joint committee of the members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at which the Secretary of State and the chief of the United States delegation to the United Nations be present, together with such other persons whose testimony may be necessary, in order to give to the Congress the true reasons regarding the reversal of the Palestine decision; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the possession of Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact certain legislation introduced by Resident Commissioner Antonio Fernós-Isern; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 6215. A bill to extend the benefits of section 2 of the act of June 29, 1943, to provide that Lt. Col. Francis R. Hunter, United States Army, retired, shall receive the retired pay of a lieutenant colonel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 6216. A bill to correct possible inequity in the case of a certain application for letters patent of William R. Blair; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 6217. A bill for the relief of Donald J. Otis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 6218. A bill for the relief of William Richard Geoffrey Malpas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

H. R. 6219. A bill for the relief of the Puget Sound Bridge & Dredging Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 6220. A bill for the relief of Alex Bail; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MacKINNON:

H. R. 6221. A bill for the relief of Constantine V. Schmitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 6222. A bill for the relief of Ever Ready Supply Co., and Harold A. Dahlborg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHENER (by request):

H. R. 6223. A bill to correct possible inequity in the case of a certain application for letters patent of William R. Blair; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6224. A bill for the relief of John Watkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. R. 6225. A bill for the relief of Groover O'Connell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1749. By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware: Petition of Women's Christian Temperance Union, of Sussex County, Del., containing 160 signatures, requesting passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1750. By Mr. HALE: Petition of the people of Falmouth, Maine, in town meeting assembled, calling upon their Representatives in Congress, in the executive department of the United States, and in the United Nations to take such steps as may be necessary to have our delegates to the United Nations present or support amendment of the Charter for the purpose of making the United Nations into a world government capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing world law to prevent war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1751. Also, petition of the people of Yarmouth, Maine, in annual meeting assembled, asking their representatives in the legislature and the executive branches of our National Government and the United States delegate to the United Nations to use their offices to bring about changes in the United Nations Charter that will turn it into a limited world government capable of preventing war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1752. Also, resolution of the citizens of Cape Elizabeth, Maine, recognizing the urgent need for peace by declaring themselves in favor of amending the Charter of the United Nations for the purpose of making the United Nations effective as a limited world government capable of enacting and enforcing world law to prevent war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1753. By Mr. HART: Petition of New Jersey Lumbermen's Association, opposing the reinstatement or imposition of any additional controls that would impede the production of lumber, building materials, and housing, etc.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1754. Also, petition of New Jersey Lumbermen's Association, urging that the Fair Labor Standards Act be amended to specifically exempt by law retail lumber and building-materials dealers from its provisions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1755. Also, petition of New Jersey Lumbermen's Association, urging that legislation be adopted to amend the Consumers Cooperative Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1756. Also, petition of New Jersey Lumbermen's Association, opposing the passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1757. Also, petition of New Jersey Lumbermen's Association, urging amendment of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1758. Also, petition of New Jersey Lumbermen's Association, opposing double taxation of corporate earnings and endorsing the current legislation passed by Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1759. Also, petition of New Jersey Lumbermen's Association, urging the abandonment and dissolution of obsolete and unnecessary Government offices and bureaus; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1760. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition signed by 22 citizens of Schenevus, Otsego County, N. Y., in the Thirty-first Congressional District, advocating the passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1761. Also, petition of a group of citizens of Springfield Center, N. Y., and vicinity, calling for legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1762. By Mr. LARCADE: Petition of Louis Bernard and other postal employees at Opelousas, La., in support of H. R. 5667; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1763. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of Mrs. Bertha Campbell and other members of the WCTU, Lamoni, Iowa, expressing opposition to advertising on the radio and in periodicals of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1764. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition signed by Grant H. Cole and 15 other citizens of Yamhill County, Oreg., protesting against universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1765. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution by Kenosha Teachers Union, Local 557, Kenosha, Wis., opposing universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1766. Also, resolutions adopted by Cash Crops Cooperative at their annual meeting held March 16, 1948, at Fond du Lac, Wis., in favor of the Government continuing its sponsoring of a farm program for the recruiting and guiding of migrant labor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1767. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, Associated Synagogues of Boston, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to endorsement of the civil-rights program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1768. Also, petition of the Association of Russian National Organizations in the United States of America, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to resettlement of displaced persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1769. Also, petition of Mrs. M. L. Norton, St. Petersburg, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1770. Also, petition of Hughs Robert Hilliard (through acting warden, United States Penitentiary, Atlanta, Ga.), petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to his petition for a redress of grievances, motion for a change of venue, and a suit to recover liberty with motion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1771. Also, petition of the county clerk, county of San Diego, Calif., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to appropriate funds for the effective control and eradication of certain plant pests; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 13, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, March 29, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Christ our living Lord, Thou hast brought us to this new day and further opportunity.

Help us to work with Thee that it may be a good day with good things done.

We know that a different world cannot be built by indifferent people.

May there be no apathy in this place, no lukewarmness when we should be hot.

Abide with us, O Christ, that our hearts may burn within us and our imaginations be fired with Thy passion to do God's will. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 12, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5888) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 154. Concurrent resolution authorizing a reprint of the report and supplements 1 and 2 of the Subcommittee on National and International Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, entitled "The Strategy and Tactics of World Communism"; and

H. Con. Res. 182. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document the factual analysis on housing entitled "Housing in America" for the use of the Joint Committee on Housing.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT ACCORDING TO PROPORTION OF POPULAR VOTE

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, there is pending before the Committee on the Judiciary a joint resolution providing for an amendment to the Constitution so that in future Presidential elections the electoral votes of the States shall be counted in proportion to the popular vote. That will remedy one of the most serious defects in our present system of electing a President.

A hearing has been held on the joint resolution before a subcommittee consisting of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. In that connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Press-Herald of Portland, Maine, which I think gives a very concise and illuminating picture of what some of us are trying to accomplish by the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"ELECTORAL COLLEGE"

Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, of Massachusetts, has returned from the wars overseas to his own private war to do away with the electoral college and let total majority votes do the electing of President and Vice President. Such a change, of course, would require a constitutional amendment, and up to now it has been thought impossible to get an amendment ratified, because all or most of the small States would refuse. Their argument would be that since each has as many electors as it has Senators and Representatives, each small State, which has just as many Senators as each large State, really has more votes in the college in proportion to population than a larger State.

Senator LODGE has addressed himself to that difficulty. His new bill provides that the present system of electoral college shall be retained, but that its votes shall be cast and counted in direct proportion to the popular vote in the State. That might mean, for instance, that if the Republicans carried Maine by popular vote they would not get the entire electoral college vote of five, but only that part of five votes that should be in direct proportion to the popular vote. If one might suppose that the Republicans cast 300,000 votes for their candidate and the Democrats 200,000 for theirs, instead of Maine's five votes going to the Republican candidate, only three would go, the other two being counted in the electoral college for the Democratic candidate.

Manifestly such a system would be fair, for it would make the popular vote decisive. In the 1944 Presidential election, Governor Dewey carried Ohio. He received 1,582,293 votes. President Roosevelt received 1,570,763 votes. That was a difference of only 11,530 votes. Yet Governor Dewey chalked up all of Ohio's electors. In other words, 11,530 voters determined the election so far as Ohio was concerned, and more than one and one-half million Democratic voters were in effect disfranchised. Senator LODGE has something now that deserves full consideration.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	O'Conor
Ball	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hayden	Overton
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bridges	Hill	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Hoey	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	Holland	Russell
Byrd	Ives	Saltonstall
Capehart	Jenner	Smith
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Stennis
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Cordon	Kem	Taft
Donnell	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	Knowland	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	Langer	Tobey
Eastland	Lodge	Tydings
Ecton	Lucas	Vandenberg
Ellender	McCarran	Watkins
Ferguson	McCarthy	White
Flanders	McKellar	Wiley
Fulbright	Malone	Williams
George	Martin	Wilson
Green	Moore	Young
Gurney	Morse	

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is absent on official state business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

REPORT ON UNITED STATES FOREIGN RELIEF PROGRAM

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, transmitting the second quarterly report on United States foreign relief, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the second quarterly report of expenditures and activities under the United States foreign relief program authorized by Public Law 84 of the Eightieth Congress, approved May 31, 1947.

This report covers the period from October 1, 1947, through December 31, 1947.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 12, 1948.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 118 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Attorney General, withdrawing the name of Louis Enrique Ybarra from a report relating to aliens whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted by him to the Senate on November 15, 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION AND AFFILIATED COMPANIES—WAR DAMAGE CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, volume 3 of a report on the audit of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and affiliated corporations, dealing exclusively with the activities of the War Damage Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolutions adopted by the Board of Supervisors of San Diego County, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation providing sufficient funds to control the Mediterranean fruitfly, the melon fly, the mango fly, and other plant pests, and for the protection of boundaries of the United States against the introduction of plant pests; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Resolutions adopted by representatives of 21 Russian national organizations, New York, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for the resettlement of displaced persons of Europe; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. J. Res. 191. Joint resolution giving the consent of Congress to the compact on regional education entered into between the Southern States at Tallahassee, Fla., on February 8, 1948; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1126); and

S. J. Res. 206. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate boundary compact by and between the States of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin; without amendment (Rept. No. 1127).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Herschel V. Johnson, of North Carolina, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now deputy representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Brazil;

Frank E. Cash, Jr., and sundry other persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service; and

Don C. Bliss, Jr., and sundry other persons for promotion in the Foreign Service.

Executive Q, Eightieth Congress, first session, Consular Convention between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines, signed at Manila on March 14, 1947 (Ex. Rept. No. 1).

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive EE, Eightieth Congress, first session. Final Articles Revision Convention, 1946 (No. 80) adopted at the twenty-ninth session of the International Labor Conference at Montreal on October 9, 1946 (Ex. Rept. No. 2).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 2488. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Mr. John White Bear a patent in fee to certain lands; and

S. 2489. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Mr. George White Eyes a patent in fee to certain lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. 2490. A bill for the relief of Avner Feldman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY (by request):

S. 2491. A bill for the relief of John Watkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 2492. A bill to require the identification of cotton products for the protection and benefit of the producers and consumers thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2493. A bill to authorize the admission of displaced persons into the United States for permanent residence without regard to race or nationality; and

S. 2494. A bill for the relief of George A. Voregarethsos (George Spiro Chatmos); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia:

S. 2495. A bill to authorize adjustments of rentals paid for premises leased for 10 or more years for use as post offices; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENTS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS' SALARY ACT OF 1947—ADDITIONAL SPONSOR

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced the bill (S. 2486) to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. At the time I introduced the bill I inadvertently omitted the name of the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], who wished to join with me in introducing the bill. I now ask unanimous consent that his name be inserted as one of the authors of the bill, with myself, and that the clerk be instructed to have printed a star copy of the bill, carrying his name as one of the Senators introducing it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT BENEFITS TO OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF ALASKA RAILROAD—AMENDMENT

Mr. LANGER submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2326) to repeal the Alaska Railroad Retirement Act of June 29, 1936, as amended, and to extend the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to officers and employees to whom such act of June 29, 1936, is applicable, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NATIONAL HOUSING—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McCARTHY submitted 16 amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 866) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective and to provide for the coordinated execution of such policy through a National Housing Commission, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CONSOLIDATION OF GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILLS—AMENDMENT

Mr. BYRD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6) to include all general appropriation bills in one consolidated general appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 5888) to amend and supplement the Federal-aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (9 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 182) authorizing the printing as a House document the factual analysis on housing entitled "Housing in America" for the use of the Joint Committee on Housing, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT ON CONDITIONS IN UNDERGROUND BITUMINOUS COAL AND LIGNITE MINES—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for a change of reference of the third quarterly report of the Secretary of the Interior covering conditions in the underground bituminous coal and lignite mines, submitted pursuant to Public Law 328. The report was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on the 8th instant. I now ask that that committee be discharged from the further consideration of the report and that it be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has always had jurisdiction of the general question of coal mine safety inspection, and I know that that committee desires to consider this question, and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare does not.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE IMMORTAL CHAPLAINS—ARTICLE BY HARRY H. SCHLACHT

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Immortal Chaplains," by Harry H. Schlacht, reprinted from the New York Journal-American, of March 30, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

SPEAK UP FOR YOUR COUNTRY—ARTICLE BY HARRISON SMITH

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Speak Up for Your Country," by Harrison Smith, from the April issue of Good Housekeeping, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOMO AMERICANUS—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Homo Americanus," published in the Washington Post, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained permission for the Subcommittee on Federal Security of the Committee on Appropriations to meet this afternoon to mark up an appropriation bill.

EXTENSION OF RECLAMATION LAWS TO ARKANSAS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 299) to extend the reclamation laws to the State of Arkansas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 9, after the name "Arkansas", it is proposed to insert the following proviso: "*Provided*, That the generation by, and the disposal and marketing of electric energy and power from, any Federal reclamation project in the State of Arkansas shall be administered by the Bureau of Reclamation through, and in accordance with, the Federal reclamation laws."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the bill was introduced on January 20, 1947, by the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] and myself. It was reported unanimously from the committee. The subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands which handled the bill was headed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

The bill affects only Arkansas. It merely extends the authority of the Reclamation Bureau to investigate and operate in Arkansas. No specific project is authorized by the bill. It is a general authority, in line with the action which was taken in the admission of Texas into the group of States known as the Reclamation States, of which there are now 17.

Since the introduction of the bill I find that there is considerable opposition to it, apparently growing out of a criticism of the Reclamation Service. That question seems to me to be aside from the main purpose of the bill, or irrelevant to the purpose of the bill. If the Reclamation Service is properly subject to the criticism which has been made, and will be made, I understand, in the course of this debate, I think, of course, that that service should be reformed. But that is a different question from the question whether or not the State of Arkansas should be admitted into the circle of States known as the Reclamation States. The objective which the senior Senator from Arkansas and I have in mind is the investigation of the possibilities of the development of irrigation, particularly irrigation and not flood control, which is being adequately taken care of, I believe, by the Corps of Engineers of the Army. As Members of the Senate know, the Army engineers do not have authority to undertake reclamation works as such.

I have been somewhat disturbed and surprised by the opposition to the bill based upon a general opposition to the activities of the Reclamation Service; that is, criticisms of the way in which it has carried on its work in other States.

S. 299, a bill to extend the provisions of the reclamation laws to the State of Arkansas, is of sufficient importance to warrant the support of the entire membership of the Senate. It is important not only to Arkansas but also to the other States of the Union.

Originally the Reclamation Act provided for the use of receipts from the sale and disposal of public lands in certain States and Territories for the examination and survey, construction and maintenance of irrigation works for the reclamation of arid lands in 16 Western States. The creation of new wealth and other extensive benefits accruing from operations under the act in those States, and in Texas, to which it was later extended by an act similar to the pending measure, have demonstrated its value and justify the extension of the provisions of the act to additional areas.

Arkansas, to which the reclamation laws would be extended under S. 299, is at the present time one of the richest States in the Nation in undeveloped agricultural and mineral resources. It seems to me to be in the interest of the national economy for the resources of all the States to be developed and used to the fullest extent.

Reclamation through irrigation is needed in Arkansas, and can best be planned and carried out under the reclamation laws. Both rice and specialty crops could be benefited through irrigation. With St. Louis, Chicago, and eastern markets within the area which could be supplied with vegetables from Arkansas, there is a ready market for its agricultural products. It is believed that the present vegetable crops of Arkansas can be substantially increased, both in quantity and quality, through the use of irrigation, which would furnish a supplemental supply of water when needed.

The Commissioner of Reclamation, on February 6, 1947, in response to an inquiry which I made of him, advised:

> The War Relocation Authority irrigated over 100 acres of vegetables during each of the years 1943 and 1944 at its relocation center near Rohwer, Ark. It is reported that in 1943 yields on irrigated land were from two to three times those of similar nonirrigated land. In 1944, a year of better rainfall distribution, the yield on irrigated land was greatly increased and the quality was improved, although the difference in yields and quality were not as great as those of the previous year. The advantages of irrigation under climatic conditions such as prevail in the State of Arkansas consist of assurance of uniform good quality and insurance against drought during critical growing periods.

The climate and soils of the State of Arkansas are suitable for the production of vegetables; and with a ready market for such products in the northern and eastern States, plus the constantly increasing population of Arkansas itself, the benefits which would come from irrigation can easily be realized. In fact, there has already been a practical demonstration of those benefits in the instance mentioned by the Commissioner of Reclamation.

Arkansas is a large producer of rice. It also contains large tracts of land which are entirely suitable for rice production but which cannot be utilized for this purpose unless a supplemental supply of water is made available through irrigation. I may add that at present rice is one of the products which is in very short supply in the world. Its export is still regulated and controlled by the Department of Commerce. The production of rice in Arkansas has proved economical where an adequate supply of water is available, and the yields per acre compare favorably with the yields

in other rice-producing areas in the United States.

Arkansas possesses an outstanding amount of undeveloped natural resources necessary for a balanced agricultural and industrial economy. The population of the State is increasing rapidly, and it is essential that a sound balance be maintained between agricultural and industrial development in order that the economy of the State may be stabilized, and the per capita income of its citizens be increased.

The Grand Prairie area, where about 640,000 acres have been adapted to rice production, requires a supplemental water supply to offset effects of receding groundwater levels now threatening the present development. It is estimated that an additional 200,000 to 300,000 acre-feet of water will be required annually for sustained production in this area. The Oak Flats area west of Crowley's Ridge includes about 1,500,000 tillable acres of which only a small percentage has been developed for rice production. Many additional acres can be developed in this area by irrigation.

There is a possibility of greatly expanded agricultural production in the area east of the White River and in the St. Francis River Basin through a program which will coordinate drainage and irrigation. Estimates which have been made as to the amount of acreage which could be developed in this area vary from 500,000 to 1,000,000 acres. There is also a field for the development of land through irrigation for the production of vegetables along the Arkansas from 50,000 to 100,000 acres.

I remind the Senate that only a short time ago there was a proposal by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] to increase the production of cereals, and to bring into production 20 percent additional land. This is certainly one way which would contribute to bringing about that result.

By placing the State of Arkansas under the reclamation laws as is provided in Senate bill 299, the opportunity would be opened for the Bureau of Reclamation to carry on a survey to determine the amount of land which should be used to provide a program for making such land available for productive use through a system of irrigation which could cover the areas mentioned.

In order that I might place before the Senate authentic information showing how the Government is reimbursed for reclamation work, the Commissioner of Reclamation has provided, at my request, a letter, dated March 13, 1947, reading in part as follows:

> Two important principles concerning such payments by water users are brought to your attention. The first principle is that the amount of money to be returned by water users is the portion of the cost of constructing project works that is allocated to irrigation and related drainage functions and to be reimbursed by the water users. This is significant because many, if not all, projects which would be constructed in accordance with the authorization in S. 299, if it were enacted, would be multiple-purpose projects to serve, in addition to irrigation and related drainage functions, for the production of electric energy, flood control, fish and wildlife conservation, and possibly also the improvement of navigation. Under the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (55 Stat. 1187), reports are made concerning such multiple-purpose projects that allocate to each of the functions the construction costs attributable to each function. Such allocation reports, furthermore, establish the part of such costs which are reimbursable from the several sources of revenue and which costs are nonreimbursable. For example, flood-control and navigation allocations are nonreimbursable costs, and fish and wildlife conservation costs may, likewise, be nonreimbursable under the terms of the act of August 14, 1946 (Public, No. 732, 79th Cong.). Costs allocated to power are reimbursable, with interest. The costs of irrigation and related drainage works also are reimbursable although power revenues may, where appropriate, be used in part to aid water users in making such return to the Treasury.
>
> The second important principle regarding payments for the cost of construction of irrigation and related drainage work is that the charges to water users shall be within their ability to make such payments. On the basis of factual surveys the repayment ability of water users is determined, taking into account the increased farm income that can be expected to result from construction of the project and taking into account also the increased costs of production that may be involved as well as the portion of the farm income that is needed to maintain suitable standards of family living.
>
> The manner in which payments are made by water users is set forth in contracts between the Secretary of the Interior and organizations of water users established under State law. The individual water users do not contract with the Government, but make their individual payments to the State chartered organization, which is the contracting party. Such contracts between the water-users organization and the Secretary of the Interior, in general, are of one or two types. First might be mentioned the type of contract which provides for the repayment of the construction costs allocated to irrigation in 40 years without interest, beginning after a development period not to exceed 10 years in length. This results in full discharge of the construction obligation at the conclusion of the contract term.
>
> The second type of contract, which is applicable only to water-supply works and not applicable to irrigation distribution works, is a so-called water-service contract. That type of contract, which may be executed for periods not to exceed 40 years, provides the water users with the project water supply at a stated rate per year. Since this type of contract does not necessarily contemplate full return to the United States in 40 years of the construction costs allocated to water supply, it contemplates successive contracts for periods beyond the initial 40 years.
>
> In addition to returning to the United States the construction cost of project features that is allocated to irrigation and related drainage works, water users must pay for the annual costs of operating and maintaining those project features.
>
> Because of your familiarity with the basic concept of the reclamation law I have not discussed in this letter the provision for making the irrigation payments free of interest. Costs allocated to irrigation and related drainage are returned to the United States in accordance with the contracts over stated periods of time without interest charge. You recognize that this results over a 40- or 50-year period in reducing by approximately half the costs to water users.

Mr. President, I quote this letter at some length simply to emphasize the point that this particular project on the Grand Prairie, for the production of rice, can be made a self-liquidating project. The situation is such that the users can pay for it and can reimburse the Government and at the same time can operate much more profitably in the production of rice.

In my judgment it is of great importance to the continued progress of Arkansas that the reclamation laws be extended to the State. It also appears clear that such extension will not only be of great benefit to the State, but also will benefit the Nation as a whole.

Projects set up under the provisions of the reclamation laws will be on a self-liquidating basis, and the advantages to accrue therefrom are such that it seems to me that the advancing of the money, to be repaid by the projects themselves, is justified.

Mr. President, I have before me one or two statements which are taken from studies which have been made by the State of Arkansas agricultural experiment station at the State University. I wish to read first from Bulletin No. 457, a study entitled "Ground Water Supplies for Rice Irrigation in the Grand Prairie Region in Arkansas." These studies have been conducted for a number of years in an attempt to determine just what is happening to the supply of underground water in this area. I may say for the benefit of the Senate that the way this area has been irrigated in the past is by means of wells drilled by the individual farmers, the water being pumped or lifted by electric pumps, or with Diesel motors. That is the traditional way the water is raised there. The problem is that every year the water level recedes. The annual amount which it recedes varies.

In that connection, let me read from Report No. 371, entitled "Problems of Water Resources for Rice Irrigation," at page 29:

> The total withdrawal of water in the Grand Prairie from 1905 through 1937 is estimated at 5,268,000 acre-feet. No estimate can be made of total decline of the ground water level resulting from this withdrawal. An 8-year study based upon complete yearly records from 38 typical wells indicates a total decline of 6.39 feet from 1929 to 1937. This decline was verified by measurements on 59 additional wells measured both in 1929 and 1937.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that the drop in the water plane was only 6 feet in several years?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; those figures were for the period from 1929 to 1937.

Mr. DOWNEY. How much did the water level drop during that period of time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Six and thirty-nine one-hundredths feet, according to this study. In a subsequent paragraph in the study this statement is made:

> A continuous chart record has been maintained since August 1928 on a well in the central part of the Grand Prairie area. In 8 years the depth of water declined 7.24 feet.

Let me say there is a little variation in the decline. In the middle of the area the decline has been greater than it has on the edges of the area. The rate of extraction results in causing a greater amount of recession in the center of the area because there are more wells in that part; and as one goes toward the edges of the so-called Grand Prairie area one finds the decline is somewhat less.

I read further from the report:

In 8 years the depth to water declined 7.24 feet, from 79.05 to 86.29, based upon the spring readings. In each year the highest level reached was less than for the preceding year, and the lowest level reached during the pumping season was generally lower each year.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this point?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I may say that it seems to me that undoubtedly the farmers in Arkansas who are there described are still in a very fortunate condition, at least as compared with the standards that we in California know about. In California we consider a pumping lift of 60 to 75 feet highly economical. We are pumping in some cases as high as 400 feet. Within 10 or 15 years we have had our water plane drop very disastrously, as much as 200 or 300 feet.

I am not suggesting that as any argument that the farmers of Arkansas should not have additional supplemental water to maintain the water plane or to build it up, of course; but the water plane drop in California has averaged more per annum than the total drop in Arkansas for the entire period mentioned by the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not familiar with the conditions in California, but I know they are very different, and the type of crop which is produced will determine whether or not such lifts are economical. In the production of rice, the informed persons we have in that field feel that they are now beginning to get to the point where it is not economical to lift the water, and there is already a pronounced drift of the rice industry to the north, where they have not been pumping it and the water level is as it was 30 years ago in the Grand Prairie region.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I do not make this observation in any way in opposition to the project the Senators from Arkansas desire. I think something should be worked out for that State if the Senators want it, of course, but it is difficult for me to understand how farm operations could be profitable with a lift of 65 feet, say, and become hazardous and unprofitable if it were lifted 70 feet, or 5 feet more. Manifestly the additional cost would be negligible, I should think.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. To follow the Senator's logic, then if it goes to a thousand feet, it would be still better.

Mr. DOWNEY. No.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is a point at which it becomes uneconomical. Does the Senator feel he is qualified to tell us what that point is, in connection with the Grand Prairie?

Mr. DOWNEY. I think probably an easy investigation would determine that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I submit this is not an easy investigation. The two pamphlets are scientific studies conducted for the agricultural experiment station by three men, all of whom are qualified professional men—Mr. Kyle Engler, Mr. David G. Thompson, and Mr. Raphael G. Kazmann. They are not talking out of their hats. The study is based upon very careful investigations conducted over a period of many years. I am not making up merely on the spur of the moment, this statement as to the effect of the extraction of water, nor as to its effect upon the production of rice. I should like to read another statement.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I decline to yield at the moment, and until I finish this point in connection with the report of the experiment station. These are the general conclusions. I do not think it is quite proper to read the whole pamphlet to the Senate, because much of it is technical discussion of the various water levels, but I think the conclusions on page 48 of the pamphlet are understandable by anyone, and I should like to read that one page. I believe the Senator from California can see this is a serious matter to those who are actually engaged in the investigation, and I am setting forth their view rather than mine as a layman.

The data obtained in that investigation lead to the conclusion that the large quantities of ground water that have been used for irrigation of the Grand Prairie region have been partially replaced by percolation of water into the area, and that in the future extensive replenishment of the ground-water supply may be expected each year by natural processes. It has been shown, however, that the consumption of water from the Pleistocene beds, which is the principal source of supply, is greater than the quantity that is annually added to them. It has been estimated that the flow through the Pleistocene beds into the Grand Prairie region is in the magnitude of 135,000 acre-feet a year, which is sufficient for the irrigation of about 75,000 acres of rice. As the acreage irrigated with water pumped from the Pleistocene beds is in excess of this amount, it is imperative that consideration be given to methods for remedying the situation by increasing the water supply or reducing the acreage.

What is going on is that the acreage is being reduced. My whole purpose is to prevent the reducing of acreage. Of course, farmers in Arkansas could simply go out of the rice business if they wanted to, if the price keeps going down. I think they are producing rice now largely because of the very high price rice has been bringing during the last few years. That is, I think it has enabled them to keep pumping deeper and deeper, but we know that is not a normal situation and that soon they will have to find other water supply.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire what happens to the dead acreage, if I may use that term in describing the land that is not suitable for the production of rice?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It goes out of the production of rice and is much less profitable. If used at all, it may be returned to forest or used for grazing purposes. The land in this area is peculiar. The reason rice is concentrated there is because of what is called the hardpan, which is just a little beneath the surface of the soil. Actually, and quite naturally, it is not so rich as the Delta country. It is not in the Delta, but it holds the water well and it simply happens to be naturally adapted to the production of rice. It is not rich enough to produce alfalfa, cotton, or corn; so that, if used at all, some of it goes back into grazing land, which is, of course, much less productive, and some of it goes back to forest. That was true not too long ago—about 50 years ago it was a forest area.

Of the several possible remedial methods that have been suggested, three of them—the use of water for deep-lying Tertiary beds, the impounding of water in small reservoirs—

I interject to say that is what they have been trying to do—

within the region, and the substitution of other crops for rice—may be practiced by the rice growers individually. More water could probably be obtained from the deep-lying Tertiary beds in the region. It is desirable that a thorough study be made to make an estimate of the ultimate perennial yield of these deep-lying beds. The diversion—

This is the thing in which I am particularly interested—

The diversion of water from the White or Arkansas Rivers would necessarily involve collective action by large groups of rice growers, and cooperative action would also be needed for artificial recharge. It is desirable that experimental recharge wells be drilled in the Grand Prairie region, and that thoroughly controlled tests be made to find the best methods of using the wells to replenish the ground-water supply to determine, as conclusively as possible, whether recharge is practicable.

Although in parts of the region the lowering of water levels has not yet become great enough to cause serious inconvenience—

This is particularly on the point the Senator from California makes—

Although in parts of the region the lowering of water levels has not yet become great enough to cause serious inconvenience, it should be recognized that under the present conditions of overdraft, the lowering of water levels will continue throughout the region. Therefore the problem of overdraft is not one of a few rice growers but of the entire community.

That is, as I say, the general conclusion, the final conclusion on the whole study, in which are considered in great detail the various areas within the rice section, and so on.

I think the Senator will find it is as thorough and scientific a study as can be made under modern conditions. The report was printed in 1945.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. I should like to express to the Senator my regret that he thought I was in opposition to the theory or the facts he was stating. My attention was arrested by the fact that apparently there had only been a fall of 6 feet or 7 or 8 feet out of 70 feet, which did not seem to me to be excessive.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is, within that period.

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They have been pumping here, in some places, I may say to the Senator, for well over 30 years. That was the particular aspect with which the study was concerned.

Mr. DOWNEY. There is one thing further, if the Senator will yield—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is one other sentence on that subject, a little ahead of that, not in the conclusion. After a discussion of various wells in certain areas within the Grand Prairie, there appears on page 33 this one sentence:

> Some wells in the central part of the prairie have declined in yield during recent years, in some cases to such an extent that it is no longer economical to pump them for the irrigation of rice.

It goes on to discuss the matter, saying:

> The water level in that area probably will not continue to fall as rapidly in the future as it has in the past.

That is because they have discontinued pumping for rice.

> If irrigation continues at the present rate the water surface at the perimeter of the irrigated area will continue to decline, however, and the area of unwatered sand will continue to expand.

What I had in mind, of course, in the pending bill is not that we are going to rush in next year and relieve the irrigation situation, but in view of the experience that is demonstrated by these studies, and looking at the future, I think it would be a great tragedy to the community and, for that matter, to the whole world, to be compelled to abandon a section that is naturally ideally situated and, I would say, constructed for rice growing. I refer to the construction of the earth with respect to the hardpan, and its relation to the surface of the land, which is very flat, a condition which is a little unusual in that section of the country. In other words, it is perfectly suited to growing rice, if given sufficient water. That is my real purpose in endorsing the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator stated that the whole country should be interested in this reclamation project. As I understand, under the original Reclamation Act the money received from the sale or disposal of public lands had to be restricted to certain Western States for irrigation and reclamation purposes. There were 17 such States——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There were originally 16, and Texas was added.

Mr. LUCAS. My question is, What effect would the addition of Arkansas have upon the 17 States which are already under the reclamation laws?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not very familiar with the details involved, but I understand that originally there were large sums of money obtained from the sale of public lands. I know that the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is better informed upon the subject than I am. But in recent years most of the projects which have been constructed have not been constructed from the funds obtained from the sale of lands, but from direct appropriations out of the Treasury. It is my opinion that if this bill shall be enacted, any survey which may be made and any project which may be developed will be as the result of specific appropriations of money out of the Treasury and will not impinge upon any funds, if any remain, from the sale of public lands. I think the Senator from Utah can probably give the Senator from Illinois a more authentic answer.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I am interested in the question, because I was wondering whether the addition of Arkansas would in any wise affect irrigation and reclamation projects now in progress in the 17 States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I doubt that they would be affected. Originally the money to build the projects came from the sale of lands and from royalties received on leases of oil lands and mining lands in the West, but the program has now extended beyond that stage. As the Senator from Arkansas has pointed out, vast sums of money are now required in connection with reclamation projects, and the remaining projects in the West will require tremendous appropriations from the Treasury if they are to be completed. The easy ones have already been built.

I see no objection to extending the law to cover a State like Arkansas. I was a member of the committee which considered the bill; I voted for the bill in the committee, and I urge its passage.

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to hear the Senator say that. It seemed to me that my question was somewhat material. I was wondering if in anywise the addition of Arkansas to the group of States to which reference has been made would affect the irrigation and reclamation projects in those States. The Senator tells me that in his opinion they would not be affected, because money would have to be appropriated from the Treasury to carry on such projects. So if the bill shall be enacted into law it will be necessary for the people of Arkansas first to present a meritorious case to the Flood Control Committee, I assume, to see whether they are entitled to obtain money to carry on a specific project.

Mr. WATKINS. If the bill is passed, such matters would come under the Department of the Interior, rather than the Flood Control Committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes. I think the Senator is correct in that statement.

Mr. WATKINS. With respect to the effect on the funds obtained from sales of public lands and from royalties, there will be some money coming to the fund from those sources, but the programs are so vast that very little of that money will be required. The projects will require appropriations out of the Treasury for investigation and construction. The program, as it originated, had only a 20-year span of repayment, and included only public lands. At the present time supplemental water rights are involved. So it has simply outgrown completely the original conception of reclamation. It seems to me that any State that wants to come under the program should be permitted to do so. I am certainly in accord with the views of the Senator from Arkansas on that subject.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator know to what extent the projects carried on throughout the 17 States are drainage projects and not irrigation projects?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall be glad to do the best I can to answer the Senator's question, but I want to say in the beginning that, not having had reclamation in my State, I am as poor an authority as anyone could be on the subject. But my understanding is that the primary purpose is irrigation, and that in connection with irrigation projects, if drainage problems are involved, authority is granted to undertake them, but there is no such authority to undertake drainage alone.

Mr. ELLENDER. It was my view that it involved projects in connection with which rainfall was very light and the effort was to hold water back and make the land more productive.

There is before the Senate Calendar No. 1065, House bill 3538, which was unanimously passed by the House several months ago. Has the Senator made a study of that bill to determine whether or not it would be of assistance in curing the difficulty in Arkansas of which he is now complaining?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No. The first time my attention was called to that bill was yesterday when the Senator from Louisiana called it to my attention. I had assumed that the Bureau of Reclamation, having had primary responsibility for irrigation, had probably developed the greatest corps of experts on irrigation subjects that have ever been developed through any other agency. That being the principal problem I had in mind, I naturally thought of reclamation and wondered how the Department of Agriculture would be equipped to undertake the same sort of work as that undertaken by the Bureau of Reclamation itself.

Mr. ELLENDER. If it is a question of drainage, I have known cases in my own State in which the cutting of one canal through to a main bayou leading to the Gulf would drain a large number of acres of land. That practice is followed in the State of Louisiana as well as in Mississippi and Florida. The opening of ditches or canals has a tendency to take the water off and make the land available for cultivation.

What prompted my question of a moment ago was this language from the report of Mr. J. A. Krug, the Secretary of the Interior, as found on page 3 of the committee's report:

> Lack of adequate drainage has prevented profitable use of millions of acres of potentially valuable lands and reclamation through drainage is an outstanding potentiality at a time when productive lands of the Nation are declining. Although the 1940

census reported that 4,592,738 acres were contained in 250 drainage districts in Arkansas, the enterprises have frequently been ineffective. Many of the districts are in financial difficulties, drainage structures in the main are inadequate, maintenance frequently is neglected, and uncoordinated operation of some systems affects adjoining ones adversely. As a result of these difficulties, large bodies of land have reverted to disuse and considerable additional areas eventually will go out of production unless corrective measures are undertaken. To the extent that the Bureau of Reclamation now has or in the future is given authority to reclaim lands by drainage, enactment of S. 299 will enable Arkansas to participate in the benefits of its program.

In the light of that statement from the Interior Department, I am wondering why it is that House bill 3538, to which I referred a moment ago, would not be adequate to meet the situation which the distinguished Senator is now discussing.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Merely as to drainage, the Senator means?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. It seems to me Mr. Krug admits that thousands of acres are not now being cultivated in Arkansas and that the people have been denied their use because of lack of drainage.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is quite true.

Mr. ELLENDER. The bill to which I have referred, which was unanimously reported, as I remember, from the Committee on Agriculture, undertakes, through the Department of Agriculture, to assist communities in handling the drainage problem. Why would not that bill be more effective than the one the Senator now seeks to have passed?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. As I understand the situation in Arkansas, the need is not only for drainage, but for irrigation as well; it is a combination.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is true.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, the rainfall in the particular district in Arkansas to which the Senator is now referring is 44 inches, and certainly it is not a question of arid lands, or anything of the kind. It may be a question of properly distributing the water which falls.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is true.

Mr. ELLENDER. That could be handled through drainage just as well as by irrigation.

Mr. WATKINS. I point out that in connection with the discussion of irrigation and drainage there is a project in Oregon, the Klamath project, which is entirely one of drainage. A lake bed was drained, and that area is farmed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Was that water used for any other purpose?

Mr. WATKINS. It went into the river and on to the Pacific Ocean. Later I think it will be used for some purpose. I do not think it is at the present time.

Mr. ELLENDER. What agency undertook to do that?

Mr. WATKINS. The Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under what authority?

Mr. WATKINS. The act permitted them to reclaim lands.

Mr. ELLENDER. According to the language I have just read, it would seem that in order to carry out fully the ideas expressed by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, the probabilities are that the Interior Department would have to have more laws on the subject. As I just read, it says:

As a result of these difficulties, large bodies of land have reverted to disuse and considerable additional areas eventually will go out of production unless corrective measures are undertaken. To the extent that the Bureau of Reclamation now has or in the future is given authority to reclaim lands by drainage—

It seems to me, according to that language, the Bureau's present authority to reclaim by drainage is limited. It may be that the Bureau may want to come before Congress and get additional authority in order to reclaim more land by drainage.

Mr. WATKINS. We have a project in Utah now under investigation, in which some land will be drained, by the project which is built, and water will be taken off certain land and put on some other land. There is a combination of irrigation and drainage, and that happens many times in the reclamation of land.

In respect to the Arkansas problem, they have the matter of building dams and regular work of reclamation, and while they do have a heavy rainfall, it probably comes at the wrong time of the year. There is a need that it be held back to be used when the farmers need it for growing rice.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As to the rice production, the water has to be controlled. When the farmers plant the rice, there is no water. It grows 6 or 8 inches, and the water has to be put on and taken off at the right time. Unfortunately rainfall does not meet the problem. It is necessary to control it. There is no way to impound water there, and it runs off. That is why we have flood-control programs, with which Senators are familiar, in an attempt to prevent the water going too fast on down to Louisiana all at once. That is an entirely different question from irrigation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe that the bill to which I have referred could operate in two ways, that is, it could serve to help drain these various areas in Arkansas, and also assist to a certain extent in flood control. The water could be retained and later used for the purposes of rice cultivation in Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not say to the Senator that I was against the bill. I have not considered it. From what the Senator says, we might need that bill, too. But I do not see why that is a reason for not passing the bill which I am discussing.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think I can advise the Senator from Louisiana about the so-called drainage authority. The reason why the report from the Secretary of the Interior speaks of authority is that, notwithstanding the fact that the Reclamation Bureau would have authority to use drainage for the particular purpose of reclaiming the land, they do not have such authority in Arkansas, and that might be the authority to which the report refers. That is why the pending bill is presented.

Mr. ELLENDER. The report refers to future laws.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is a future law the Senate is now considering.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the original act, as I indicated a while ago, it was to operate in arid territory.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. In lands where the rainfall was very slight.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. So as to hold the water back, making it possible to use it in order to grow crops where otherwise crops would not be grown. The idea was to retain the water and let it be distributed when needed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct; that was the main purpose.

Mr. ELLENDER. Exactly. Now the desire is to drain the land.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The main purpose is to erect a dam and make a lake, and use the water on arid lands for irrigation.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I understood the purpose to be.

Mr. CHAVEZ. And also to reclaim land.

Mr. ELLENDER. Lands are being reclaimed when water is stored and put on them later.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. It is not only for the purpose of storing water and using it for irrigation, but the word "reclamation" means reclaiming lands. So far as the Reclamation Bureau is concerned, it has authority to go into the arid States and do these things, and if I understand the purpose of the bill the Senator from Arkansas is discussing, it is to have Arkansas come within those provisions.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct; the bill gives general authority to the Bureau to operate in Arkansas. I should like to make it clear that while I emphasized the Grand Prairie area and the rice problem, they are not the exclusive consideration, nor were they ever intended to be. They constitute a pressing need, and in connection with them it is easiest to see the great advantages that would accrue.

I wish now to refer to a statement concerning the experiment which has been carried on near the Rohwer Relocation Center, which has been very profitable on an experimental basis. As the authorities investigate and survey the situation I think they will find along the valley of the Arkansas River and the White River many areas—the letter indicated from 50,000 to 100,000 acres—in which irrigation could profitably be used for other crops than rice. I emphasize rice because that is already there, already developed, it has been studied, and the conditions are well known. But I think there are possibilities in other directions.

I think Arkansas has as many miles of river within its borders as any other State, if not more, yet we have no way of utilizing the water. It comes down in tremendous floods in the fall and spring,

while in the summer, from June to September or October, there is hardly a drop of rain, and everything burns up. While I do not think a study has been made, I should guess from my own experience that if it were possible to determine the loss in dollars and cents from drought over a period of 25 or 30 years, it would approximate that from floods. The trouble is that drought is not so dramatic; no one is killed; it is not mentioned in all the newspapers, and it is a gradual death the people suffer. There is nothing they could do or have been able to do about it. The fact is that in my State no one knows anything about irrigation. If we question them we find they have never seen irrigation projects. A few of us who have visited the West and have seen what has been done in Utah and New Mexico, in the valleys of the West, have the idea that if the technique and the knowledge of those engineers who have done that work could be utilized in the valleys in Arkansas where there is plenty of water, but where our people do not know how to use it the result would mean an important contribution to the welfare of the State and, incidentally, of the Nation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Arkansas comes from a cotton-producing State, as does the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. I see several Senators on the floor who come from cotton-producing States. Let me refer briefly to what irrigation does for cotton. The South raises cotton. The average production per acre in the Cotton Belt of the South, with few exceptions, is 218 pounds lint. The Mesilla Valley of New Mexico, the El Paso Valley of Texas, and the Salt River Valley in Arizona, the Sacramento Valley in California yield from 750 to 800 pounds of cotton lint per acre. There is irrigation in those valleys. That shows what irrigation does. I presume irrigation could do the same thing for rice.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We cannot produce any rice at all without the irrigation water. Irrigation water is a matter of life or death for the Grand Prairie area. If the farmers in that area cannot have adequate water, they must go out of the rice business. Rice farming cannot be carried on in that area without adequate water to flood the fields at the proper time.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. As a citizen of California, who knows something about the heroic history of the West, and something about the heroic history of the State of Utah, I am always disturbed when I hear statements made as to the irrigation which has been accomplished in the West by the Bureau of Reclamation. As a matter of fact, I might say to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas that the work done by that Bureau in the West is inconsequential. Of the 20,000,000 acres which have been redeemed by irrigation in the West, less than 8 percent have been brought under irrigation by the Reclamation Bureau. What was done in Utah, in the Salt Lake area in the early pioneering days, is an epic story which all of us should know. But reclamation in that region was accomplished by the toil and the sweat of the pioneers. The same thing is true almost all over the West.

While in the State of California there are 6,000,000 acres of irrigated land, hardly a single acre has been brought under irrigation by the efforts of the Bureau of Reclamation. We have been waiting for action to be taken in the great Central Valley project for 10 years, and yet not one acre has been irrigated there by the Bureau of Reclamation. Vast resources exist among the peoples of the States themselves. We are not dependent for irrigation upon the Bureau of Reclamation. As a matter of fact, the Bureau of Reclamation today is headed by men not one of whom has ever had the slightest experience in the science of engineering connected with reclamation. As a result, in the Central Valley of California, a calamitous situation of waste, extravagance and delay has existed, with no water yet being made available, though the project was started in 1937.

As one who grew up in the West and knows of the great projects which were developed in New Mexico where irrigation existed, yes, before Columbus discovered America, and in the Salt Lake area for more than a hundred years, I merely want to say that the great bulk of the irrigation work in the West was done by the pioneers, by the builders, by the people of the West themselves, and not at all by the representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, we all appreciate what the pioneers did in Georgia, in California, in Utah, and elsewhere throughout the United States. It is true that there was irrigation in portions of the West before the coming of the white man to the continental United States. The Indians in parts of the western United States had irrigation. But the world does move. We are not doing thing in 1947, not even irrigation work, as it was done before.

I am not trying to defend the Bureau of Reclamation whatsoever, but I am trying to advance the policy of reclamation, whether the reclamation is undertaken by individuals in California or by the Reclamation Bureau by reason of laws Congress may pass. That is the only point I am trying to make. I am not trying to defend any bureau. Personally, as Senators know, I do not like bureaus. But we have to be fair. I know of many instances where the Bureau of Reclamation has failed, but I can say to the Senate that the desert has bloomed by reason of the fact that Congress adopted the policy in the early 1900's of making it possible to irrigate certain lands in the West. I make that statement in spite of the fact that I know that the Bureau of Reclamation has on many occasions done the wrong thing.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to say one word. After I introduced the bill I felt that there were some conflicts between agencies in the Government, and I know there are some conflicts between Senators and others respecting the Bureau of Reclamation. I still insist, however, that that is a little beside the point. I certainly did not anticipate or intend by the bill to solve those particular problems. If the Bureau of Reclamation has done nothing to justify its existence, it should be abolished. I am not passing on that question at all.

It is a perfectly simple matter to understand that we now have an agency which, under the law, is given primary authority over irrigation. All I want to do is to enable that agency to come into Arkansas and do something about irrigation for us. When I am told that that agency is no good, and that the officials who manage it are incompetent, I am distressed, but for an entirely different reason than other Senators may be. We ought to clean up the agency if that is true. But at this moment we are not passing on that point. I do not see why an agency which has the power to undertake irrigation projects should be excluded from Arkansas. If we accept the thesis advanced by several Senators as being correct, I think we have wasted a considerable amount of money, and that we should abolish the agency.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I might suggest that whatever the difficulties are respecting the Bureau of Reclamation, probably they can be cured after the coming election has been held. We should not discard a very valuable institution which has grown up over a considerable period of time, and which means so much to the West as does the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. President, I agree with my friend the Senator from California that the pioneers did a great deal for irrigation and for redemption of land in the West a long time before the Bureau of Reclamation was ever heard of or thought of. That is true. But we are now approaching a period when the risks to capital are too great and the resources of individuals too small to undertake these great projects without some sort of Federal aid such as we in the West are now receiving, at least money lent to us for a long period of time without interest.

While we can all agree that great things were done in the past by the pioneers, we must also keep in mind that the accomplishments of the future will, to a large extent at least in my State, almost equal what has been done in the past by the pioneers themselves. We have projects in the planning stage which, if they are finally built by the very efficient Corps of Engineers—and I will say that the engineers of the lower-level States at least are very able men and have a great deal of experience—will make it possible to more than double the population of my State. That will mean enlargement of industry, it will mean the building of homes for literally thousands of young men and women who are now moving away because opportunity does not now exist for them.

We still have the great Colorado River. A part of it, at least, still belongs to

Utah. We want to develop it by the building of dams which will create additional water for irrigation and power development.

Mr. President, whatever may be wrong with the Bureau of Reclamation I hope will be corrected early in 1949, after the election of 1948.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator a question. Has he considered carefully the effect of bringing the Bureau of Reclamation into the Mississippi Valley on the water-control problems we already have there? I may say to the Senator that I have received communications from a number of citizens of our State which indicate that our people look with apprehension, I may say with fear and trepidation, upon an invitation to the Bureau of Reclamation to come into the valleys of the Mississippi and the Missouri, in view particularly of the record of the Bureau in other States. It seems to me that before we invite this Old Man of the Sea in we want to be sure just what he is going to do, and whether he will confine his activity to the Grand Prairie area to which the Senator from Arkansas has referred, or whether in a little while we will find that the Bureau of Reclamation is dividing its energy and extending its activities and its interest to the problems of water control which are of such great and grave importance to the prosperity, the peace, and the happiness of our people in the Mississippi Valley.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to make an observation with respect to what the Senator from Missouri has just said about the Bureau extending its control and expanding into the river valley, which is under discussion, and the general drainage system which the Senator is discussing.

Perhaps it is not known to the Senator that in the upper reaches of the Missouri and Mississippi River Valleys the Bureau of Reclamation is now undertaking many vast projects which have been authorized by the Congress, running into hundreds of millions of dollars—before they are finished probably into billions of dollars—to control the Missouri River and the Mississippi River in its upper reaches. That work is already under way. Congress makes appropriations each year to further that program. The Senator has probably overlooked the fact that the Bureau is now undertaking that work at the request of the people of those localities.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I certainly have not overlooked that fact. That has been done in the reclamation States—the original 16 or 17 States in which the Bureau has always had jurisdiction. I do not understand that it has extended its operations anywhere else in the valley of the Missouri and Mississippi.

Mr. WATKINS. I do not know how far south they have gone, but they certainly are developing the upper reaches of the Mississippi River and its resources.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the thought has occurred to me that if this agency is so bad the Senator from California should introduce a bill to exclude the Reclamation Service from California. Perhaps he has already done so. If he has not, why does he not do so, if it is such an incompetent agency? I presume the Senate would cooperate if Senators and Representatives from California would like to throw it out.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I believe that one of the darkest and most unfortunate days in the history of California was when the Bureau of Reclamation was brought into our great Central Valley. We are prepared to show by definite figures that because of the extravagance and waste of the Bureau of Reclamation in the Central Valley the cost has been increased by at least one-third. Our farmers will have to pay between $75,000,000 and $100,000,000 additional because of the extra cost. I do not know how they are going to pay it. We are now in the position where we have the Old Man of the Sea on our shoulders. I cannot undertake to say what we shall do if the Congress of the United States or the President does not relieve us from this wasteful, parasitical, subversive group.

I do not wish to intrude upon the time of the Senator, but I shall present to him, in my own time, documentary evidence showing a condition of corruption which is almost incredible. For that very reason the reclamation bill is now being held up in the House of Representatives. Committees in the House have sent out investigators who have been developing the facts with regard to this willful extravagance.

Let me cite one simple set of figures to the Senator. I have not only personally analyzed the figures, but I have had them checked by objective observers of the Federal Government.

The Corps of Army Engineers has available substantially less for the operation of its Washington office than has the Bureau of Reclamation—perhaps not very much more than one-half as much. The Army engineers, with about one-half the sum, oversee between two and two and a half times as much construction work as does the Bureau of Reclamation. The costs chargeable to the Army engineers in Washington are spread out against the particular projects, but the cost of the Bureau of Reclamation falls directly upon the taxpayer.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The taxpayer or those participating in the program.

Mr. DOWNEY. The cost of maintaining the Bureau of Reclamation in Washington is financed out of general taxes. The cost of maintaining the Army engineers in Washington is allocated as a specific cost against the projects which are being built in the various States by the Army engineers. The pay-roll cost of the Bureau of Reclamation is from two to two and a half times as much as that of the projects of the Army engineers, and it is now placing and has placed a burden upon the farmers in the Central Valley which I do not believe they can sustain.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not believe that the statement of the Senator from California was quite responsive to the question which I asked. However, I shall pass that by. I am somewhat surprised by the fact that those who object to the bill have not moved to abolish the Bureau of Reclamation. It would have enlightened me and others who thought reclamation was beneficial, in voting upon appropriations in the past, if Senators who believe that the Bureau of Reclamation is very poorly administered, or wasteful, had moved to abolish it. Certainly it could have been excluded from California in a similar manner to that in which this bill seeks to extend its operations, as they were extended in the case of Texas.

That suggests one further conflict which I did not regard as being of too great importance, namely, the conflict between the jurisdiction of the Army engineers and that of the Bureau of Reclamation. It seems to me that the law is as clear as it could be, although sometimes it is difficult to interpret. It is difficult to say just where to draw the line as between the two agencies. However, when the primary purpose or emphasis is flood control, certainly the Army engineers have jurisdiction, and when it comes to the building of such a project, they should build it. When the primary purpose is irrigation, the Reclamation Service should build the project.

I have always been among those who have had the highest regard for the efficiency of the Army engineers. They have done and are doing some very fine work in connection with flood control in my State. They have not undertaken any irrigation work. Under a special authorization of last year they have undertaken a limited survey centering around Bayou Meto, which is close to the Grand Prairie area, to determine its possibilities. But even when they make the survey, as I understand, when it comes to the construction of an irrigation project, the Bureau of Reclamation is brought in, if it is authorized to construct the project under general legislation, even in the absence of a special act which might be comparable to the pending measure.

I have always understood that many people would object to giving to the Army engineers full authority over irrigation. I explored that subject with certain Members of the Senate, to see whether that might be the solution. Apparently it is not. As I understand, there is just as much opposition in the Senate to extending the power of the Army engineers so as to enable them to undertake irrigation work as there apparently now is to the extension of the reclamation laws to Arkansas. So we are caught between two conflicting, jealous forces.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In a moment. My own theory has been that if we authorized both agencies to operate, we would probably get a little friction, but

very likely we would get something done, too.

I do not believe that a little competition would destroy the Army engineers. However, I am not trying to infringe upon their jurisdiction with respect to the projects which they are now undertaking. I am 100 percent for them and shall support them. But it seems to me that a very important aspect of our economy is being neglected; and I can see no solution except the one which has been suggested.

I now yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, does the Senator suggest that the proper, scientific, efficient way to deal with water problems in the Mississippi Valley is to invite the Bureau of Reclamation to enter the field and engage in a system of free competition with the Army engineers, the Mississippi River Commission, and the other authorities?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I hope the Senator did not misunderstand me. I am suggesting nothing with respect to the Missouri River, or anything in Missouri, and I would not give him any advice on that subject. My suggestion relates only to Arkansas. I suggest that this agency be authorized to make a survey to determine whether there are possibilities for the utilization of water in Arkansas. That is all I am suggesting.

Mr. KEM. The language of the Senator's bill is an invitation to the Bureau of Reclamation to go into the State of Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct—only the State of Arkansas.

Mr. KEM. The State of Arkansas certainly borders on the Mississippi River. Certainly a large part of the activity and the interest of the Corps of Engineers and the Mississippi River Commission has been devoted to the State of Arkansas, and certainly very important results have been obtained from their activities.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I agree that very important results have been obtained, and we anticipate even more important ones. I have no intention of interfering in any way with their work. But in no instance do I understand that they expect to undertake the construction of irrigation works. Irrigation works are all I had in mind in introducing this bill. I gave the reasons as to why that is important, I think, in the beginning of my remarks.

Mr. KEM. Of course, the Senator's intention would not in any way be regarded as a limitation on the power or authority of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am afraid I did not quite hear what the Senator said.

Mr. KEM. I am saying that once the Bureau of Reclamation enters the State of Arkansas, it would not be the intention of the junior Senator from Arkansas in any way to limit their activity. Is that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Only insofar as I might influence appropriations or request the authorization of a project, just as any other Senator may undertake to limit or affect such activities within his State. I had always understood—but apparently that is not so, judging from what I have heard here—that Senators have some influence on such projects in their own States.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, as I read the record, the Senators from 16 or 17 States have had a great deal of difficulty in limiting or directing or influencing the activities of the Bureau of Reclamation in their States. A few months ago the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] was kind enough to send me a very interesting book, written by him, entitled "They Would Rule the Valley." That book has to do largely with the activities of the Bureau of Reclamation in his State. If I read the book correctly, the activities of the Bureau of Reclamation in his State have been carried on very much against the will and in defiance of the views of the senior Senator from California. I am sure he will correct me if I am in error in making that statement.

Glancing through the preface of the book, I find the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation characterized by very positive language. The Senator from California refers to them as attempting "to impose by high-pressure lobbying and propaganda an economic strait-jacket upon a sector of free and successful enterprise." That statement appears on the first page of the preface of the book.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Senator from California has already stated that he will discuss this matter in his own time. So I do not believe at this time we should read his book. I understand he will enlighten us very thoroughly.

Mr. KEM. I thought the Senator from Arkansas was under the impression that once the Bureau of Reclamation is invited into his State, it will be guided largely by his views. I wish to suggest that that has not been the experience of all other Senators.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of course, not all Senators have the same views the senior Senator from California holds, and some Senators have not had the experience he has had. We know there is variety among Senators. I meant that ordinarily the flood-control or irrigation projects are not pushed upon a State if the Senators or Representatives from the State do not wish that to be done. Generally they ask for them.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely wish to say a word, in light of the Senator's remark as to why California did not secede, so to speak, from among the reclamation States. I submit that that is not the question which has been raised by my able colleague, the senior Senator from California. Rather, I think it is a question of the law, which is a perfectly good law. The reclamation law was enacted in 1902, under a Republican administration. It has had the support of both Republican and Democratic administrations in the intervening period of time.

There is nothing wrong with the reclamation laws that proper administration will not correct. But I think the main point—and of course my able colleague will speak for himself—is, not that there is something wrong with the reclamation laws, if properly administered, but that at times they have not been properly administered. Merely because in some instances a State may have had bad administration in connection with those laws is no reason why California, which itself has generally supported reclamation and the reclamation laws, should be invited to secede, so to speak.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of course; and I also think there is no reason why Arkansas should not be admitted to that group as a State in which the Bureau of Reclamation could operate. I pointed out that I thought the Senator's argument was somewhat beside the point. His argument goes to the administration of the law and the persons administering it, whereas my point is that the law should be extended to Arkansas. I think the other questions are very different ones.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me say that I do not wish to take up the time of the Senate all day. I wish to conclude in a moment. However, I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator this question: Would not it be in order for those of us who live in the Mississippi Valley to withhold our invitation to the Bureau of Reclamation until it puts its own house in order or until that has been done for it?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I never make suggestions to the Senator from Missouri. He is responsible for his State, and I am responsible for mine. I do not intend to impose this proposal on Missouri, but I should like to have it available to Arkansas. Obviously, we do not intend to attempt to cross the line into Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I do not think any of us are naive enough to think that the control of the waters of the Mississippi River is the problem of a single State or can be regarded as a State problem. Certainly the people of Arkansas would not attempt to arrogate unto themselves the control of all the waters of the Mississippi Valley.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think the passage of the pending measure will result in the control of the waters of the Mississippi. The real flood-control work and other control of the waters of the Mississippi have already been authorized, and for much of it appropriations have been made. All that work is handled by the Corps of Army Engineers.

The measure which is now before the Senate has nothing to do either with that authority or with those appropriations. It is true that in the future there may be fields in which these two agencies sometimes may come into conflict. I may say that in all the States which now are under the reclamation laws, the Army engineers operate. I think the Senator from California knows that the Army engineers operate in California, and, of course, they operate in Utah and in all the other States which now are subject to the reclamation laws. Neither of these agencies has the exclusive right to operate in any of those States, and I do not see why enactment of the pending measure would result in the destruction

of the program of the Army engineers in Arkansas. If the Bureau of Reclamation receives authority to extend its operations into Arkansas, I see no reason why that would result in the destruction of the program of the Army engineers in our State.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield, but I do not think I should impose on the Senate by taking very much more time. However, I am very happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. KEM. The Senator from Arkansas seems very much surprised that the citizens of my State should be interested in this problem. He seems to think that it is wholly a problem for the State of Arkansas.

I invite his attention to page 3 of the committee report, where the following appears:

> There is a possibility, too, of greatly expanded agricultural production in the area east of the White River and in the St. Francis River Basin through a coordinated drainage and irrigation program.

My recollection is that the White River originates in Missouri and runs for a good many miles through Missouri. I am absolutely certain that the St. Francis River runs for over 100 miles through the State of Missouri.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to correct the Senator from Missouri. The White River does not originate in Missouri. It originates in Madison County, Ark., and then runs through Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I may be wrong about that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I know the Senator is wrong about it.

But the area here referred to is wholly within Arkansas, and it certainly is not contemplated that in order to irrigate this area of Arkansas, Missouri will be disturbed in any way. The White River and the St. Francis River Basin in Arkansas are what I was seeking to affect.

Mr. KEM. Is the Senator proceeding on the theory that the people of Arkansas can take unto themselves the entire waters of the St. Francis River, notwithstanding the fact that it runs for many miles through the State of Missouri?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; and I do not think that is the implication of the statement. But I see no reason why the land and water in Arkansas should not be utilized.

Mr. KEM. When the report speaks of coordinated enterprise, it refers, does it not, to the entire basin or valley of the St. Francis River?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I see no reason or justification for so interpreting it. There is a large area in Arkansas which is what we had in mind. I was in no way thinking about the entire basin of the St. Francis River, nor was the Secretary of the Interior, in my opinion, when he wrote the letter. We are talking about the area in Arkansas. When the Arkansas River is referred to in the report, and when I refer to it in my speech, the reference is to that part of the river which is in Arkansas. We are not going to undertake to go up into Colorado and control it in any way.

Mr. President, I think I had better conclude my remarks. In fact, I have covered about the only points I had in mind. I have taken much more time than I anticipated or felt would be necessary on this very simple bill which affects only the people of Arkansas and will enable them to have an investigation made of the possibilities of the use of the water, which is so abundant within the State, but which now cannot be effectively used. When one contemplates the industrial and the economic conditions in Arkansas, and when he knows that its per capita income is only slightly more than one-half the national average, he understands that we naturally are interested in trying to do something to increase the income and the efficiency of our agriculture. It seems to me quite unreasonable that because some collateral objection is made to a bureau, or to someone within the bureau, objection should also be made to an extension of the work of the bureau to the State of Arkansas. I think that is not a justifiable way to eradicate the evil which may very well exist. I think the remedy is, as suggested by the junior Senator from California, to do something about the administration of the bureau. I am all for that. If there is anything wrong with it, I shall be perfectly glad to cooperate in doing something about it. Unfortunately I do not know much about it, because we in our State have never had any experience with the agency.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am glad to yield for a question. I am about to conclude.

Mr. DOWNEY. What does the distinguished Senator, as one of our leading Democrats, think of the wise counsel of the Senator from Utah, that we should allow the system to be reformed and adjusted following the next election, when his party is in control?

Mr. WATKINS. I appreciate the cooperation of the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I took that as a facetious remark, trying to bolster up the flagging optimism of the Republicans about the next election. The Senator is trying to make us think they still believe there is a chance of winning it; which he, of course, does not believe at all.

But, Mr. President, I want to conclude by earnestly asking the Members of the Senate to put this bill in a proper perspective and not to see in it a devious scheme to undermine the Army engineers. It certainly is not that, nor is it an effort to bolster up the Reclamation Bureau. It is simply what it says, a bill to authorize the Bureau to enter the State of Arkansas, and, I hope, enable citizens of that State to maintain a thriving industry in the rice area, and also to encourage and promote other irrigation projects in other basins within the State.

Mr. OVERTON obtained the floor.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	O'Conor
Ball	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hayden	Overton
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Robertson, Wyo.
Bridges	Hill	Russell
Buck	Hoey	Saltonstall
Bushfield	Holland	Smith
Byrd	Ives	Reed
Capehart	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Stennis
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Cordon	Kem	Taft
Donnell	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	Knowland	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	Langer	Tobey
Eastland	Lodge	Tydings
Ecton	Lucas	Vandenberg
Ellender	McCarran	Watkins
Ferguson	McCarthy	White
Flanders	McKellar	Wiley
Fulbright	Malone	Williams
George	Martin	Wilson
Green	Moore	Young
Gurney	Morse	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the pending bill because I think it my responsibility, as one who has taken an active part in water development during the years I have served in the Senate, to call to the attention of the Senate certain factors involved in the proposed legislation which are contrary to the traditional policy of the United States in dealing with its water resources and their normal use.

The question before the Senate is one much broader than whether or not the reclamation laws should be extended to encompass a single State. When we vote on the bill we may well determine the future course of waterway development in this Nation. There is not a State in this great Union, be it arid, semiarid, or humid, which will remain potentially unaffected should the action on the bill be favorable.

I realize that the junior Senator from Arkansas controverts that proposition. I wish, in support of it, to read excerpts from the report of the Secretary of the Interior on the bill.

First, I read from the report itself:

> The State of Arkansas, to which the reclamation laws would be extended under the provisions of this bill, remains one of the richest States in the Nation in undeveloped agricultural and mineral resources, and it is in the interest of the national economy that the tremendous potentialities for the development of these resources be utilized to the fullest extent.

Emphasis is laid on reclamation, on the fact that what Arkansas needs is reclamation, and I have no doubt that is true. Arkansas resembles Louisiana in that it is a very humid State. There are 48 inches of rainfall a year in the State of Arkansas, and probably a little more in the State of Louisiana. Both are humid States. They do not require irrigation, except perhaps to a limited extent. What they do need is drainage. The Bureau of Reclamation has no authority to undertake drainage of any lands except such as may be incidental to the exercise of their power to irrigate.

I quote now from the report of the Secretary of the Interior, as follows:

The lack of adequate drainage—

Drainage is what is emphasized, and drainage is what is intended to be accomplished by the bill, and not so much irrigation.

Lack of adequate drainage has prevented profitable use of millions of acres of potentially valuable lands and reclamation through drainage is an outstanding potentiality at a time when productive lands of the Nation are declining.

I quote further from the report of the Secretary of the Interior:

To the extent that the Bureau of Reclamation now has or in the future is given authority—

Let me pause there to say that that is a recognition of the fact, admitted by the Secretary of the Interior, that the Bureau of Reclamation now has not the authority. He is depending on legislation to give the Bureau of Reclamation authority to undertake the drainage work in humid States throughout the United States.

To the extent that the Bureau of Reclamation now has or in the future is given authority to reclaim lands by drainage, enactment of S. 299—

Which is the pending bill—

will enable Arkansas to participate in the benefits of its program.

So it is a matter of drainage, something which the Bureau of Reclamation has never undertaken as a distinct, independent activity.

The Bureau of Reclamation, as I stated, is by law confined in its activities to irrigation. As has been pointed out today, and it cannot be emphasized too much, certain public lands in the West could not be disposed of because they were arid or semiarid, and no crops could be raised upon them and therefore the Federal Government, in order to dispose of its own property, undertook to establish the Bureau of Reclamation to irrigate these lands, and when irrigated and capable of cultivation, then to dispose of them. In the interest of the ordinary average farmer, in the interest of what was conceived to be a furtherance of the old homestead law of the United States, the holdings of any proprietor in these irrigated lands was confined to 160 acres. In practice the Bureau of Reclamation has often limited the holdings of land to far below the 160 acres that can be held by any single owner in any of the irrigated areas. Frequently the amount permitted to be retained is 40 acres. Sometimes the amount of land permitted to be held is 100 acres. I can say that perhaps rather rarely 160 acres are permitted to be kept.

I may say in this connection that if Arkansas wants irrigation and drainage to protect its rice culture it will discover that it has brought an economic calamity upon its State, because rice cannot be cultivated on small tracts. It is like sugarcane. Large plantations are required economically to cultivate rice. When the Bureau of Reclamation is permitted by an act of Congress to enter Arkansas and restrict the holdings in the irrigated areas to, at most, 160 acres, and frequently below that, the people of Arkansas will find that they have done nothing to aid rice cultivation; that, on the contrary, they have done that which will be detrimental to the cultivation of rice.

The bill, within the contemplation of the Department of the Interior, is to go much further than any drainage or irrigation bill. I read again from the letter written by Mr. Krug:

The extensive hydroelectric-power potentialities of Arkansas have scarcely been touched. Many of the best power sites between the Rocky Mountains and the Mississippi River are in Arkansas. The White River Basin is one of the largest potential sources for hydroelectric power in the State. There also are excellent potential sources of hydroelectric developments on the Ouachita and Little Missouri Rivers in west-central Arkansas and on the main stem of the Arkansas River.

Another opportunity to obtain benefits through multiple-purpose developments is in the field of municipal, industrial, and rural water supplies. Flows in the lower reaches of the Arkansas and Red Rivers have been polluted by natural mineralization, domestic sewage, oil-field brines, and other industrial wastes. Heavy withdrawals of ground water in the lower White River Valley have reduced the municipal water supplies of several communities. Water courses in the Ozark-Ouachita highlands often are dry during summer. Shallow ground water is scarce and deep wells often are too costly for the average user. Storage of surface flows to carry over dry summers is needed urgently.

Floods have resulted in heavy loss of life and great property damage in Arkansas. Although much has been accomplished through recent protective works, the State is still subject to major losses from this cause. Many multiple-purpose projects constructed in the 17 Western States by the Bureau of Reclamation include provision for flood control. The Bureau also cooperates with the Corps of Engineers, War Department, in the development of flood control and irrigation in the West.

These are the objectives of the bill: It is proposed to take in the whole field of water resources. It is proposed not simply to include irrigation, not simply to include reclamation, not simply to include drainage, but it is proposed to take in the construction of power dams, to take in the construction of flood-control dams. It is proposed to take in every project that can be designed for the use of the water of Arkansas.

I desire to show to the Senate in that connection what has been done in the State of Arkansas by the Corps of Army Engineers. The Corps of Army Engineers have been at work in that State since 1936, when they were given the opportunity to build flood-control projects and navigation projects under the act making general flood control the responsibility of the Nation. They have done a great many things for the State of Arkansas. They have under construction a great many projects which have for their purpose not only flood control and navigation but which also will create hydroelectric power and irrigation. The Engineers have authority to do such things under the law. Some of the projects which are created by the Corps of Army Engineers, such as the dams for navigation and flood control, result in the generation of power. The excess of power generated through the Corps of Army Engineers by one of these dams is turned over to the Department of the Interior to be disposed of by it. That is not only true in the West but true throughout the whole of the United States. Excess surface water, too, is turned over to the Bureau of Reclamation in order that it may be used for the purpose of irrigation. The Bureau has the authority under the law now to use the surplus water created by these great dams which are constructed primarily for flood control or for navigation.

Following are some of the reservoirs, both for flood control and for multiple purposes, in the State of Arkansas constructed or authorized to be constructed by the Army engineers.

On the Ouachita River there is the Blakely Mountain Reservoir, under construction, to cost $22,000,000.

On the Little Missouri River there is under construction the Narrows Reservoir at a cost of $12,700,000.

In the Arkansas Basin are the following: The Nimrod Reservoir, completed, at a cost of $3,800,000; the Blue Mountain Reservoir, completed, at a cost of $5,400,000; the Dardenelle Reservoir, authorized, to cost $69,300,000; and the Ozark Reservoir, authorized, to cost $41,200,000.

In the White River Basin are the following: Greer's Ferry Reservoir, authorized, to cost $9,100,000; the Belle Foley Reservoir, authorized, to cost $5,800,000; the Water Valley project has been authorized at a cost of $8,400,000; the Norfork project has been completed at a cost of $28,700,000; the Lone Rock project has been authorized at an estimated cost of $15,100,000; the Bull Shoals project, about which we have heard so much, is now under construction. The estimated cost is $69,400,000; the Table Rock project has been authorized at an estimated cost of $45,000,000.

In the Red River Basin, most of which is in Arkansas, there is the Millwood project, which has been authorized at an estimated cost of $31,000,000.

Reservoirs, both for flood control and for multipurposes in the State of Arkansas, located on the Ouachita, Little Missouri, Arkansas, White, and Red Rivers represent a total estimated cost of completed work of $37,900,000. There is under construction work with an estimated cost of $104,100,000. In addition, there have been authorized by Congress for construction projects representing a total estimated cost of $224,900,000.

Mr. President, what will the Bureau of Reclamation do with these authorized projects which are being undertaken by the Corps of Engineers? To what extent can it interfere with them if given the authority by the Congress? It can go upon the White River, to which the able Senator from Arkansas refers, and cut the levees in order to siphon water out of the White River upon lands which it is desired to irrigate. It can cut the huge levees on the Arkansas in order to irrigate lands in the Arkansas Valley. It can take waters from the reservoirs to be used for the purpose of irrigation, if given that authority by the Congress of the United States. It can enter into

every field which has been covered—and completely covered—by the Corps of Army Engineers.

There is no need for irrigation projects in the humid States. What we need in the humid States is flood control. Incidentally we might have irrigation. Incidentally we might have land drainage. But we do not want the Bureau of Reclamation, which was created for the purpose of utilizing arid and semiarid lands, to enter into Arkansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Illinois, Ohio, Michigan, or any of the States where rainfall is sufficient for the purposes of cultivation, and frequently in excess of what is needed.

I wish to make it perfectly plain that there is no disagreement, so far as I am concerned, over the compelling need for a broad drainage program in the humid areas of the United States. My own State of Louisiana has millions of acres which are idle and unfit for use because of the lack of drainage facilities. We in the humid States must get rid of water. We do not need irrigation projects to furnish water.

Likewise, the State of Arkansas has large acreages of fertile land which could be brought into production were it free of excess water, or were the excess water controlled for irrigation. Florida, Tennessee, Missouri, and other States come to mind immediately when the question of drainage arises. So we are all agreed on the need which exists; and in my opinion the need is accentuated by the fact that the lands requiring drainage are among perhaps the most fertile and potentially productive lands in the country.

While I have been identified principally with flood control and river and harbor legislation, because those are the primary interests of my State and of my section of the Nation, I have always had an active interest in the reclamation program, as I believe every western Senator can testify. I have vigorously supported the reclamation program in general, and have given much of my time and effort to its furtherance, despite the fact that there is no reclamation within hundreds of miles of my own State.

As chairman of the subcommittee which considered this great problem in the arid and semiarid areas, I conducted weeks of hearings in order to reconcile any differences which might exist between the Corps of Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. I am happy to say that as a result of that inquiry and investigation there was evolved what is known as the Pick-Sloan plan, for which appropriations are now being made, and which is being put into effect.

The Corps of Army Engineers does not disturb the Bureau of Reclamation in its work in arid and semiarid States. It permits it to go untrammeled. There may be occasions when a flood-control project is needed, a project which is essentially and primarily a flood-control project. In that case the project is entrusted to the Army engineers, in the 17 States which are now under the Bureau of Reclamation. But the Army engineers do not seek to take charge of an arid or semiarid area in any of the 17 Western States or any other part of the Union.

The Bureau of Reclamation is endeavoring to extend its authority not only to the State of Arkansas, but throughout the United States. Its entry into the State of Arkansas would be like the camel sticking its nose under the tent. It is trying to extend its authority throughout the United States.

In my own State of Louisiana for the past 2 years it has had its propagandists—some of them probably in the pay of the United States Government—going from one end of the State to the other trying to convince the people of the State of Louisiana that they should place the fortunes of their agriculture under the Bureau of Reclamation. They have not succeeded. I do not believe they will ever succeed. But if we permit the State of Arkansas to come under the provisions of this bill, there will soon be other bills to bring in Louisiana, Mississippi, Georgia, Missouri, Illinois, and other Eastern, Southern, and Northern States.

The underlying purpose, as shown by the report of the Secretary of the Interior, is to extend the authority of the Bureau of Reclamation into new fields, to construct works not to reclaim desert lands, but primarily for the purpose of creating hydroelectric power, for the purpose of flood control, for the purpose of draining lands in humid areas. The Bureau of Reclamation wants to cover the entire field in the State of Arkansas, and it will want to cover the entire field throughout the United States.

Let me say to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], who asked such pointed questions of the junior Senator from Arkansas, that he is perfectly correct in his statements. The State of Missouri is in danger. Under this bill the State of Missouri will be invaded, because the St. Francis River rises in Missouri and flows down into the State of Arkansas. The waters of the St. Francis River would be utilized in the great scheme to build up the agricultural resources of the State of Arkansas.

The able Senator was correct with respect to the White River. While it does not originate in Missouri, it does flow through Missouri after originating in Arkansas.

For several years the Bureau of Reclamation, for reasons unknown to me—and so far as I know, unexpressed publicly—has carried on a deliberately planned campaign to extend its authority beyond the 17 States in which the basic law gave it permission to operate in furnishing water to arid and semiarid lands. As I stated a while ago, in Louisiana Interior Department propagandists have honeycombed the State. They have appeared at numerous public meetings and have participated in a State-wide campaign to interest the people of Louisiana in joining in a reclamation program, ostensibly to further the cause of drainage.

Just how the funds became available for that propaganda effort I am unable to say. Nevertheless it has been done. I know of no funds which have been appropriated for the Bureau of Reclamation to provide for any such missionary work, and why any Bureau of Reclamation man would be in the State of Louisiana on any sort of official business is absolutely beyond my comprehension. However, the effort in Louisiana has been altogether wasted. I have had communications from only two persons in my State expressing an interest in having the Bureau of Reclamation extend its operations into Louisiana. I have heard of two or three other persons who have expressed an interest in the Bureau of Reclamation, but they have not troubled themselves to communicate with me. So the net result of the Bureau's efforts in Louisiana has been nil.

Failing there after considering Louisiana as the No. 1 prospect, so to speak, the Bureau of Reclamation then turned to Arkansas as a likely candidate. Its drainage problem, while not as great as Louisiana's, is of considerable proportions; and it offered a field of opportunity in the campaign of the Bureau of Reclamation to extend the scope of its activities. So today we have before us this bill which would, for the first time, amend the reclamation laws so as to extend the Interior Department's operational authority outside the arid or semiarid areas of the country. Passage of this bill would open the gate; and then we would be faced either with a virtual flood of bills seeking to bring other States into the realm, or in lieu thereof, an omnibus bill having the same effect, and thus extending the authority of the Bureau of Reclamation throughout the United States.

As a matter of fact, the omnibus effort already has been made and failed. A little over a year ago there was introduced in the House a bill which would have given the Bureau of Reclamation authority to engage in drainage work throughout the country. Hearings were held on the bill. When it was reported by the House Public Lands Committee, it had been considerably amended, and the authority which had been sought by the Bureau of Reclamation had been given, instead, to the Department of Agriculture, where it rightfully belongs under the existing situation. As thus amended, the bill has been passed by the House, and has been referred to the Senate. Here our Committee on Agriculture has reported favorably on the bill, and it is now on the calendar awaiting action. My colleague the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] made a very clear statement with regard to this bill. He is on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. He has a thorough understanding of it, and he knows exactly what it can do. He showed that that bill, if enacted into law, would be very effective in reclaiming, through drainage, various areas in the State of Arkansas, as well as in other parts of the Union. It is a good bill, and it is my sincere hope that in due time it will become law. That bill, which I should like to call to the attention of all Senators, is House bill 3538, and is order No. 1065 on the Senate Calendar.

A few years after the adoption of the basic reclamation law, in 1902, the law was amended so as to extend reclamation to the State of Texas. There are some irrigation projects under the Bureau's

dominion in that great State, which is a close neighbor to my own State of Louisiana. But all is not serene in Texas. The people there are unhappy about the plight in which they find themselves.

On April 5, which was less than 10 days ago, the executive committee of the Texas Water Conservation Commission held in Austin, a session at which they vigorously denounced the Bureau of Reclamation and charged that it had—and here I quote the general manager of the association—"consistently been unfair in its dealings with Texas." Because I believe it germane to the matter we now have under discussion, I quote further from a clipping in my possession, from the Dallas Morning News of April 6:

"It is time for the people of Texas to quit listening to the double talk of the Bureau of Reclamation," Guy C. Jackson, of Anahuac, president of the association, declared.

The Reclamation Bureau got rough treatment at a water conference called here recently by Gov. Beauford Jester. The Bureau was charged with extravagance in its operation and with having completed only two projects in Texas, despite the fact it had been making expensive surveys for two decades.

Two decades, but only two projects in Texas, Mr. President.

I continue to read:

Sturrock also charged Monday that the Department of the Interior is trying to keep secret a $3,180,000 appropriation it is seeking for the Southwestern Power Administration, a proposed Federal project which is bitterly opposed by most Texas water groups.

Mr. President, I think I may safely add that it does not have the support of a majority of the Senate of the United States.

In the humid areas of the country, we are now dealing with only two Government bureaus insofar as our water problems are concerned, namely, the Soil Conservation Service and the Corps of Army Engineers. They have done and are doing a magnificent job, and are working in the closest harmony in the solution of the common problem. There have been, insofar as I am informed, no disagreements between these two agencies which have in the slightest deterred or hindered any project anywhere. There has been no friction of which I am aware, and the people generally have benefited from the programs they have administered. The passage and enactment of House bill 3538, to which I have just alluded, will broaden the authority of the Soil Conservation Service so as to permit an even closer and more efficient cooperation between the two agencies in the execution of a Nation-wide drainage program.

On the other hand, in the semiarid areas of the country there have been frequent clashes between the Corps of Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation in the execution of various projects. The great State of California has been the particular victim of this interbureaucratic warfare which has been waged violently at times, and which only recently has erupted into roaring flames again, as the two Senators from California doubtless are aware.

Mr. President, I see the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] now in the Chamber, and I think he will corroborate what I have just said. I know something about that matter, because when I was on the Commerce Committee, we had extensive hearings in regard to the Central Valley. It is my recollection—and if I am in error, because that was several years ago, I know he will correct me—that every irrigation district wanted those dams and reservoirs constructed by the Corps of Army Engineers, not by the Department of the Interior and its Bureau of Reclamation. It is my further recollection that the city of Sacramento, which obtains some of its water from the American River, was very much opposed to the then program of the Bureau of Reclamation, which was undertaking to extend its authority throughout the Central Valley.

I was very much interested in listening to the testimony of a number of the landowners who appeared before the committee. They held those lands by descent from Spanish grants made to their ancestors years ago. They are broad acres. They had prospered on them—father and son and grandson—and they had developed a great agricultural area in the Central Valley. The prosperity of that area was dependent very largely on the collective effort that is possible in large holdings of cultivated soil.

However that may be, they were very much aggrieved that these lands which had come to them by inheritance from their ancestors should be taken from them by the Bureau of Reclamation and divided into 40-acre tracts or 100-acre tracts or, at most, 160-acre tracts. Of course, they realized that the old manor house would be gone; they would be driven from the land of their fathers. That was the implacable demand of the Bureau of Reclamation.

It was my privilege for many years to serve as chairman of the subcommittee dealing with flood control and river and harbor legislation, and I have spent many, many days hearing testimony and holding conferences in an effort to iron out the difficulties which had arisen and which threatened the existence of contemplated improvement programs. I need not dwell on that because most Senators have heard it discussed here by the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and no doubt many of you have read his recent book entitled "They Would Rule the Valley," which, in my estimation, is a very serious indictment of the activities of the Bureau of Reclamation in the Central Valley of California. I think it is fair to say that the remarks which I have heard the junior Senator from California make at recent sessions of the Appropriations Committee indicate that he shares the views of his colleague.

At the very moment there is a controversy in connection with the construction of Folsom Dam in California. The dam was authorized for construction and operation by the Corps of Army Engineers, but now legislation is pending which would require the Corps of Engineers to build the dam, but turn over its operation after completion to the Bureau of Reclamation, and have the Bureau of Reclamation operating a flood-control dam. The mail which I have received from California on this matter indicates that this conflict bodes no good for the people of California and the project itself.

The result has been that the great project for the Central Valley of California, which should be either completed or well along the road to completion, has, as a matter of fact, been continuously delayed and even now is nowhere near completion. The sufferers have been the farmers of that fine section. The penalty has been paid by them. The growth and the development of a rich section has been greatly retarded because of it.

Now, Mr. President, this internecine warfare is one of the things that we in the humid areas can do without. It is to be expected to a certain extent when two or more agencies with overlapping authorities are given jurisdiction in the same general area. I am not attempting here and at this time to judge the merits of the California case as I have cited it. That is not the question before us. The question which faces the humid areas of the Nation in this bill is whether or not they want to become a battleground in a bureaucratic war. Does Arkansas wish to see the great development which it is now experiencing in its waterway resources program delayed and stymied, and perhaps in some instances prevented, simply to satisfy the desire of a Government bureau to grab on to more territory and to increase its grip on the Nation? There will be continuous warfare. The Bureau of Reclamation, according to the very pronouncement by the Secretary of the Interior, will want to build flood-control dams, power dams, irrigation dams, and drainage works. The Department of the Interior will undertake in the State of Arkansas to invade the province the Congress has given the Corps of Army Engineers for the control of the navigable waters of that State as well as the other States of the Union.

The people of Louisiana, despite the efforts of the propagandists of the Bureau of Reclamation, have seen that danger, and the sentiment therefore is overwhelmingly opposed to exposing Louisiana to any such calamity. I do not believe that the people of Arkansas, were they fully informed, would wish to be placed in any such jeopardy, because their stake is too great and their future too promising to be placed upon any such sacrificial altar. If I know the sentiment of Tennessee, the great Volunteer State from whence my forebears came, Tennessee too would repel any such scheme of things. Certain I am that the freedom-loving Mississippian would not stand for one moment having his economic future, and that is what the whole thing means, left at the mercy of the whims of bureaucracy.

Now, Mr. President, I am aware that all of this is of little moment if there is no cure for the problem which we all admit exists. But there is relief which can be offered and is being offered right today.

It was my privilege to sponsor in the Flood Control Act of 1944 an amendment which provided, in general, that the Corps of Engineers could consider major drainage improvements as a part of the

flood-control program. In effect, that section of the bill gave authority to the Corps of Engineers to construct major, and I emphasize the word major, drainage improvements throughout the country. Such authority provides that the Corps of Engineers can, on proper economic justification in an engineering report and the enactment of authorizing legislation by the Congress, improve and construct drainage outlets which serve considerable areas. It does not allow the Corps of Engineers to construct ditches into an individual farmer's holdings, or to construct the small lateral ditches which would carry off the water of perhaps four or five farms. I believed then, and continue to believe, that when the Federal Government had provided the major outlets, its activities should cease there, and the local people should then take up the responsibility.

That is what we are doing in the State of Louisiana where the local subdivisions have voted bond issues amounting to millions of dollars, in order to provide adequate drainage and also to extend irrigation in the State of Louisiana, where needed, on our rice farms. I believe that is sound government and sound fiscal practice, because certainly the United States cannot undertake to drain individual farms as such.

Under this general authority the Corps of Engineers already has favorably reported on the project for Bayous Boeuf, Macon, and Tensas in Louisiana and Arkansas, and the project is already under construction. The Arkansas portion of the project calls for a Federal expenditure of approximately $5,000,000, and the expenditure which will be made in Louisiana will also in a large measure benefit the area in Arkansas to be served by the completed works.

I grant that the major drainage outlets, while of considerable benefit, do not completely solve the problem unless complemented by the necessary local drainage. I know not what steps Arkansas has taken on the Boeuf-Macon-Tensas project. I do know that in Louisiana that project and other similar ones have resulted in the initiation of a State-wide drainage program to which the State government is contributing $5,000,000 which will be matched by the various parishes for the construction of the minor works which will be required. The over-all State expenditure is estimated to be approximately $25,000,000, including the moneys, rights-of-way, and other contributions to be given by State, parish, and local groups. Under this program we in Louisiana expect to reclaim within the immediate future some 5,000,000 acres of the richest land in the world and put it into production. We are proud of this program. We have had a voice in it. It has not been dictated by a czar in Washington. The Army engineers are cleaning out, straightening, and making more efficient the streams which serve as major outlets; and our people, on their own initiative, with their own funds, and under their own horsepower, have rolled up their sleeves to complete the job. As a result, our land will be reclaimed, our State will be made more prosperous, we will contribute substantially more to the national wealth without being told how many acres we can have in our farms, without being told what we can plant and where we shall plant it, and without laboring under excessive liquidation costs padded by high, and in many cases unnecessary, overhead charges.

A few moments ago I referred to my belief that the participation of the Federal Government in a drainage program should not go beyond the construction of the major outlets. One of the bases for this belief is the fact that there are in the humid areas of the country at the present time very little, if any, public lands. Most of the marsh land, for instance, in my own State, is owned by individuals. The swamplands in Louisiana and other Southern States, although largely worthless for agricultural purposes, are nevertheless held in private ownership. This is not necessarily the case in the arid or semiarid regions. In those States there were, at the time of the enactment of the basic reclamation law in 1902, millions upon millions of acres of dry lands held in public ownership which had to be furnished with water before they could be disposed of. That was the basic reason for our going into the reclamation business in the beginning. And this, may I say, is the principal thing to which I wish to direct the attention of the Senators from the humid areas. Where water is furnished to individual owners under the reclamation laws, the owner is restricted to receiving water on only 160 acres of land. That 160-acre restriction clause has been one of the main points of contention in the Central Valley. It will be the source of endless headaches, particularly in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi, where, in the alluvial areas, large land holdings are the rule rather than the exception. Large holdings are necessary for the economic production of such crops, for instance, as rice and sugarcane.

In the first place, I doubt the practicality of draining 160 acres of a 400-acre farm or a 2,000-acre plantation. I can, as a practical matter, see how water could be delivered to 160 acres without any great difficulty, but I doubt that it is a practical proposition to drain a small segment of a farm which has acreage in excess of 160 acres. The result then would be that such a provision of law would require the breaking up of farm units, or, the alternative, the refusal of any drainage benefits by the owner.

The basic reclamation law, as enacted in 1902 and as it has been subsequently amended, does not provide, insofar as I can learn, any authority to the Bureau of Reclamation to engage in the drainage of land in humid areas. This bill, therefore, will not accomplish what it is intended to accomplish; namely, the construction of drainage works in the State of Arkansas. The bill merely extends the reclamation laws to the State of Arkansas and still leaves the Bureau of Reclamation without authority to do any drainage work. I leave it to the judgment of individual Senators, after reading the committee report and particularly the report of the Secretary of the Interior contained therein, as to whether the principal purpose is the undertaking of a vast drainage program. I think it very well demonstrates the misleading propaganda in which the Bureau of Reclamation is indulging in Arkansas and Louisiana, in that the people are being led to believe that they can obtain immediate drainage benefits by authorizing the Bureau of Reclamation to prosecute work in those areas, when, as a matter of fact, it has no such authority under the law under which it operates.

Mr. President, I will say in conclusion that the junior Senator from Arkansas has used as his main thesis in favor of the bill an area between the White and Arkansas Rivers. I should like to ask the junior Senator from Arkansas what that area is called.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Grand Prairie area.

Mr. OVERTON. That area has been under investigation by the Corps of Army Engineers. The division engineer is now preparing a report on the investigation which has been made by the Army engineers. They have had the subject under consideration for some time. While I do not know what the report contains, I have every hope and expectation that the engineers will submit a report which which will bring a satisfactory solution to the problem in the State of Arkansas, a solution more satisfactory than that which the Bureau of Reclamation could possibly give, because the latter would undertake to divide the land holdings in the Grand Prairie area into small units of 40 acres, 60 acres, or possibly 80 acres. That is much more satisfactory, because the work can be authorized much more quickly than it can be if the State of Arkansas is brought under the Bureau of Reclamation. In that event the Bureau of Reclamation would have to start afresh, make an investigation and report, and have the project authorized.

So, Mr. President, I think from every standpoint the bill should be defeated. I feel that it would affect much more than the State of Arkansas. Particularly, it would affect my own State of Louisiana. We cannot permit the Bureau of Reclamation to interfere with stream flows either by building irrigation works or by constructing reservoir projects or power projects when it does not have control of the flood waters which flow down the Arkansas, the White, the St. Francis, and other rivers and streams flowing into the Mississippi River. That statement is also true of Mississippi. Not only do the States below the Arkansas River have an interest in the subject, but I believe all the States of the Nation have an interest in it. They do not need the Bureau of Reclamation, and they should not vote for this effort to extend the authority of the Bureau to projects never contemplated at the time the Bureau was authorized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. DOWNEY obtained the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator yield that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Fulbright	Martin
Byrd	George	Morse
Chavez	Hayden	Overton
Cordon	Hickenlooper	Robertson, Va.
Donnell	Holland	Russell
Downey	Ives	Smith
Dworshak	Johnston, S. C.	Tydings
Eastland	Knowland	Vandenberg
Ellender	McCarran	Williams
Ferguson	McKellar	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Chief Clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. MCCARTHY, and Mr. SALTONSTALL answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-three Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay Mr. GREEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. JENNER, Mr. O'DANIEL, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. MOORE, Mr. BUCK, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. HOEY, Mr. WHITE, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. LANGER, Mr. TAFT, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming, and Mr. KEM entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I hold for the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] both affection and respect. I thoroughly understand his viewpoint that it seems unreasonable to object to the extension of the reclamation law, when the complaint is against the representatives of the Reclamation Bureau. That position is entirely reasonable and sound, and it may be that the Senate will abide by its logic.

However, Mr. President, I pose this question to the Members of the Senate: In view of the volume of evidence of corrupt, wasteful, inefficient, and subversive activities of the Bureau of Reclamation which has been developed before committees of the Congress, should we, I ask the Senate, extend the powers of the Bureau of Reclamation, when it is under such influences and is impregnated by such leaders as is now the case?

Mr. President, a committee of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, for approximately 6 weeks or 2 months has had several investigators analyzing the accounts and the activities of the Bureau of Reclamation. Hearings upon that investigation, I am told, will begin within a short time. I wish to say that it is my measured opinion that the testimony which will there be developed—valid testimony, to my personal knowledge—will and should result in indictments against several of the top members of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior. That is extreme language, but it is measured and guarded, and I feel a sense of confidence as I stand here that it will be vindicated by the passage of time.

Mr. President, one difficulty in dealing with this condition is its great complications and the many acts of corruption and dishonesty and misrepresentation by the representatives of the Interior Department and the Bureau of Reclamation. I hold in my hand a simple letter which, with slight explanations, may be understood by anyone. The letter was obtained by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the House of Representatives. I say it is a sinister and cynical and totally dishonest letter. A large part of its dishonesty is revealed upon its face, and the remainder is shown beyond any reasonable doubt by the statement of admitted facts. The letter was written in August 1945, by Michael W. Straus, then Assistant Secretary of the Interior. He is now Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation. It was written to the then hatchet man of the prior administration, Mr. Ickes, then Secretary of the Interior, and related to an individual, Richard L. Boke, who is now the regional director of the Central Valley project of the State of California, whose appearance in that valley, Mr. President, has added tens of millions of dollars to the burden of that project and of the farmers of the State. Mr. Boke's appearance brought about a flood of dishonest propaganda costing the taxpayers of the Nation millions of dollars every year, and his subversive, truculent, and corrupt activities have bred hate and passion in that valley, which was largely free of those unhappy attributes until the appearance of the Reclamation Bureau's representatives there within the past few years.

Let me repeat, Mr. President, that the letter I am about to read is a memorandum to Secretary Ickes from his then Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Straus, written about Mr. Boke, who soon thereafter became the regional director of the Central Valley project, a project with the most difficult, complicated, and far-reaching operations of any reclamation or irrigation project in the United States or, I assume, in the world.

At the time the letter was written, Mr. Boke, with no prior experience of any kind either as an administrator, an engineer, an irrigationist, a man without any substantial background, and, according to my opinion, of third-rate quality of mind, had, by the manipulation of civil-service records and in violation of them, been installed as engineer, as chief of the operation and maintenance division of that project. The letter was written some 6 months after he had received that position.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that this man to whom he refers did not even have a degree in engineering?

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct. He was totally lacking in all experience with engineering, reclamation, and construction. He had no business experience, no legal experience, no administrative experience.

Mr. President, if I did not know how tragic the letter is, how many insolvencies of farmers will result from it, and how much loss of crops, I could laugh at it. It is a funny letter, as will be disclosed.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Would the Senator tell the Senate the previous experience of the gentleman to whom he refers? To what business or profession or calling did he belong?

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me suggest to the Senator that we look at the experience through the cynical, sinister minds of Mr. Straus and Mr. Boke, and then compare their viewpoint with the facts as narrated by Mr. Boke himself in two public hearings. It is entitled "Memorandum for the Secretary," and is dated August 31, 1945. It reads:

> For your convenience in appraising and interviewing Mr. Richard L. Boke, who has been mentioned in connection with our Central Valley problem, I provide this biographical sketch.
>
> Richard Lathrop Boke, a native-born Californian, is 36 years old. He specialized in economics, biology, and literature (at Antioch College, 1927 to 1931). He is of good family, with some independent means.

In the first paragraph there is a misstatement. He was not at Antioch College for 4 years; he was there for only 2 years. Under the rules of the college the student works half the year and attends school half the year. So he had been in school at Antioch College 1 year and had worked a year.

> He is of good family, with independent means.

Now:

> He engaged in forestry work for the Ohio State Forestry Department and engineering construction work for G. A. Fuller Construction Co.

Mr. President, when "Dick" Boke was 17 and 18 years of age he worked at $50 and $60 a month for G. A. Fuller Construction Co., who were building a motion-picture theater in Columbus, Ohio. That is the basis of Mr. Straus' statement that Boke had engineering and construction experience. Mr. President, we saw an aftermath of this when Secretary Krug was being cross-examined at one of our hearings. I started with his top men, Oscar L. Chapman, Mr. Davidson, Mr. Warne, Mr. Lineweaver, Mr. Straus, and Mr. Boke. Not one of them ever had a single day of administrative, engineering, or reclamation experience before his entry into the Federal Government. I was about to say to the Secretary, in the course of my cross-examination, "And take Mr. Boke." Secretary Krug said to me, "He is an engineer." Mr. Krug, like Mr. Ickes, was evidently deluded by these sinister and cynical minds, and, though Mr. Boke was compelled to admit in the presence of his superior, the Secretary, that he was not an engineer, it was never reported to anyone, and no explanation of it was made to the committee. The great Secretary of the Interior was proclaiming upon that occasion that the regional head in the Central Valley was an engineer, when he

was not, when his sole engineering experience was as a boy of 17 or 18, working for a few months upon the building of a motion-picture theater for the Fuller Construction Co.

Notice, now, this exalted language:

He engaged in forestry work for the Ohio State Forestry Department.

He engaged in that work during his vacation, as all of us have done as boys, and received $50 or $60 a month. He dug holes and lugged trees around. This expression would lead anyone to believe that, as an expert or administrator or contractor, he had worked for the Ohio State Forestry Department.

Mr. President, Mr. Straus goes even beyond that sort of exaggeration and falsehood in the next statement. Again referring to Boke, he says:

He did some publicity work prior to his Federal employment.

Young Boke was so unfortunate as to come out of college in the depths of the depression, approximately 1932 or 1933. He went to New York City and tried to sell books by canvassing on the streets of that city. That is the episode which the Commissioner, who still holds his job, dignifies by calling publicity work. Oh, Mr. President, I can hear the cynical laughter of Mr. Boke and Mr. Straus, because I know them so well, as one of them said, "Well, I was with the public, selling books, and therefore I did publicity work."

I repeat:

He did some publicity work prior to his first Federal employment, which happened to be for you in the Office of Indian Affairs, laying out of a Mexican Springs erosion-control station on the Navajo Reservation.

That is totally false. He went out there when the camp was already in existence, and received $150 a month. He had nothing to do with the laying out of the construction.

Subsequently his Federal employment went forward with the Soil Conservation Service until he became its regional director, with headquarters at Albuquerque.

That is totally false. He never was a regional director of the Soil Conservation Service. He was in the office as a clerk or as an assistant of the regional director, being all of three to five grades of civil-service employment beneath the regional director. Yet, Michael Straus, whose superiors to the very top should know about it, is retained in office in spite of the fact that he could cynically and sinisterly write in almost every statement a falsehood.

This is no isolated instance. Whenever there is a fair, full, and exhaustive hearing, literally scores or hundreds of these kinds of dishonest, corrupt acts will be demonstrated by undeniable documentary evidence. According to my view, the Senate has not yet heard anything in the way of a sinister letter. I read further:

When the war came, he—

Referring to Boke—

joined the Nelson Rockefeller Inter-American Affairs Committee and worked through South America on procurement and land resource and food work, later going to the Foreign Economic Administration as chief program director for the purchase of food supplies for import into the United States, and as administrator in budget work.

Mr. President, I have read the record of what those groups did. I know what Mr. Boke's position was and what he did. That statement is an exaggeration, dignifying the work of Mr. Boke approximately 300 percent above what it actually was.

He returned to the Department of the Interior at the end of last year, through my efforts, when Director Charles Carey, of California, stated that he could find no man in the Bureau of Reclamation qualified to head up the regional operation and maintenance and land use planning work in the Central Valley.

That is a total falsehood. He had to do with a few sand dunes on the Navajo Indian Reservation where there are approximately 50,000 Navajos in an area of 25,000 square miles. He went into an area in California spreading 500 miles through the heart of the State; a valley with tremendous variations in soil and rainfall; a valley in which hundreds of men, graduates of our great universities and members of the Department of Agriculture, have specialized in soil use and analysis for the last 75 years.

Mr. President, Senators should know that it is a highly developed area. The water which will be received is mainly supplementary water. Any farmer would know much more regarding fertilization, working in the soil, and the kind of crops to which the soil is adapted, than Mr. Boke would know during the remainder of his life. There are hundreds of men in the Department of Agriculture, in the universities, in the counties, who have specialized in these important matters. Yet Mr. Straus would affront the dignity of the people of the State of California and lie to his superiors, bear false witness, upon a point of that kind, saying that the need of our valley is land-use planning. What we need is water. We need it vitally. The inefficiencies and subversive activities of these men have delayed this water, in my opinion, at least 2 years, by corrupt design.

Let me read this sentence:

He has devoted over 10 years primarily to resource and land-use planning (virtually our biggest Central Valley problem) and as a section chief in Sacramento, has intimate knowledge of over a year's standing on our current problems.

I say it seems impossible for Mike Straus ever to tell the truth about anything. At the time this letter was written Boke had been in the valley only 6 months, but Mr. Straus had to make it more than a year. I do not think it was very important. He knew nothing about our valley, nothing about our problems, whether he was there for a year or for 6 months. But if Senators would judge of the cynical corruption of this type of pathological mind, here is another instance in which he is casually exaggerating the time over a year, when it was less than 6 months.

Mr. Straus, for a few lines at least, undoubtedly writes the truth:

He is definitely a strong personal believer in acreage restriction, for I have examined him on that score. I know that he is a public-power advocate, but I have never examined him on that policy as his position gave him no administrative responsibility for power policy.

His outstanding accomplishment, as one of the "new school of thought" that we are injecting into the Bureau of Reclamation, is that he succeeded where others either failed or were unwilling to make an attempt, in coming to an agreement with at least some districts in the San Joaquin Valley for selling water with acreage restrictions.

Mr. President, every informed person in the Central Valley knows we can never apply an acreage limitation there, because we are dealing almost wholly with underground water, and there is no way by which we can assure that the ground water will be replenished. I know many constitutional, legal, and physical questions would come to the minds of Senators, but be assured that there is no one, even in the Department of the Interior or in the Bureau of Reclamation or anywhere else, who can suggest any plan by which we can impose an acreage limitation on underground water.

So the Commissioner spoke the truth.

In coming to an agreement with at least some districts in the San Joaquin Valley for selling water with acreage restrictions. Until on his own initiative, under Carey's guidance, he made this attempt, the Bureau and the Department had accepted the frequently proclaimed thesis that Central Valley water could not be sold with acreage restriction.

Mr. President, everybody out there knows it. There is no possible way to impose a limitation upon underground water. These gentlemen in their subversive activities are crystal clear, they are transparent. What are they trying to do? Let me advert to this explanation. Mr. Boke, ever since he went out there, by threat, cajolery, propaganda, promise, every kind of inducement, has been trying to get our irrigation districts to sign up contracts for water, agreeing that no one shall get the benefit who has more than 160 acres. He knows, we all know, that cannot be enforced. Why, then, does he want to try to do the impossible? Why such an Alice-in-Wonderland philosophy, I will tell the Senate.

The same contracts contained another provision that, if the irrigation district does not enforce any provision, immediately the Bureau of Reclamation may go into physical control and operation of all the district work, ousting all the directors, and the Bureau of Reclamation would be in a position of totalitarian power, with every farmer either having to meet their view or be in a most unhappy condition.

I continue reading:

After 5 months of personal contact with some irrigation districts, he negotiated the Southern San Joaquin Municipal Utility District proposed contract, which will be a pattern under which a half dozen similar contracts may be entered.

In that statement the Commissioner was totally wrong. Only one district has ever signed a contract. All the other members are standing as free-born farmers against this abominable usurpation by the Bureau of Reclamation. One district was led to sign, whose directors now

very much regret it, by their Machiavellian methods, which I shall not at the present time enlarge upon.

The letter continues:

This (signing will) effectively shatters the California solid front against acreage restriction and, in my opinion, is the only positive progress in recent years, policywise, in the Central Valley.

Mr. President, I now come to the last short paragraph. It seems so illogical, so ungrammatical, so nonsensical, that I went back to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, who secured this letter, to be sure that the copy I am now reading was correct. It reads as follows:

Boke is distinctly not one of our regulation reliable, noncrusading reclamation engineers and his original arrival in the Bureau of Reclamation was accomplished with considerable difficulty in one of the better jobs (present salary $6,750).

He is now getting $9,975 as regional director. Of course it was a violation of every rule of the civil service, of every decency of Government, to take a man who was not an engineer, a man totally inexperienced in irrigation and reclamation, and put him in a very significant and important engineering job. The representatives of the Bureau and Mr. Straus had a difficult time, by their abominable conduct, their political intrigue, in finally forcing this fellow into a job to which he was not entitled, and for which he was not qualified.

He has demonstrated determination, as well as tact, and has never held a position of comparable responsibility to that now being discussed. We have no other regional director in the Bureau of Reclamation, or, to my knowledge, no other person in the Bureau qualified for the position now being discussed.

So Mr. Straus, in conclusion, represents to the deluded Ickes that there is no other man who has the experience and intellect to fill this job—here is the only man. And, Mr. President, he got the job.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire whether or not the Senator confronted Mr. Straus with that letter when he was testifying before the committee?

Mr. DOWNEY. No; I did not. This letter has been developed only within the last 2 weeks. He will be confronted with it, I assume, by the attorneys of the Committee on Expenditures in the House.

Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate very much longer, except to tell the additional facts concerning a matter which has already been discussed on the Senate floor.

It was developed some 2 or 3 months ago that Mr. Krug, as Secretary of the Interior, instructed Richard Boke, as regional director, to spend, before January 1 of this year, all available funds which had been appropriated by Congress for the full fiscal year. That instruction was passed along to Mr. Calland, the chief engineer out there, and he gave very hysterical instructions that all money which Congress had given for the full year must be used up before January 1.

Mr. President, of course it must have been known to the Secretary, to the Commissioner, to Mr. Boke, and to anyone else, that if all the money given by Congress for the full fiscal year were spent before January 1 a very huge loss and great damages would accrue to the farmers of the Central Valley. Why? Because there were about 3,000 men working there, with millions of dollars' worth of machinery, great contractors and subcontractors, and the exhaustion of funds before January 1, for practical purposes, would have meant the closing down of all those operations, with all the damage and injury which would go with it.

It would seem difficult to believe that the Secretary and the Commissioner and Mr. Boke would maliciously and willfully start out upon a plan, in defiance of the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States, to exhaust all moneys before January 1, with a consequent shut-down of contracts which would cost the farmers of the Central Valley millions upon millions of dollars. But when the testimony is presented before the House committee in a hundred different ways it will be shown that that very vile, vicious, disloyal conspiracy was made and was, to a limited extent, at least, carried out. It would have been carried out totally except that Congress came back into session on November 17, and we were in session from that time on up to January 1.

I merely deduce these conclusions from certain admitted facts. I think that when the President called Congress back into session in the latter part of October these gentlemen by November 1 had abandoned this vile plan of theirs. I think they had. But I believe when Mr. Straus went out to the Central Valley about the first week in November the plan was rejuvenated. In any event, Mr. President, this is what happened: The Bureau of Reclamation had ample money to carry on all these contracts until the middle of March or the first of April. But by falsification of their books, by setting up improper accounts payable, and in many other devious ways, they apparently exhausted their funds, so that on November 26th they served notice of exhaustion of funds upon the contractors in the Friant-Kern district, the largest district there, and as a result, four or five contractors quit work, millions of dollars of machinery became idle, and 1,600 workers were thrown out of work without 1 day's notice. The record clearly indicates that the Washington office forbade any employee letting anybody in California know what was going to happen, and forbade anyone trying to make some kind of an arrangement with the contractors.

When this matter first came up the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations dealing with the subject, heard from the contractors that unexpectedly their operations had been shut down, and on December 1, Mr. Straus wrote one of his blithe, careless letters, a complete and total lie, like almost everything he has ever uttered on a controversial subject.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be inserted in the RECORD at this point without my reading it.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D. C., December 1, 1947.

Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR WHERRY: In response to your letter of December 1, I am glad to furnish the following information relative to the three contracts listed by you. These contracts are:

(a) 12r–15788—Peter Kiewit Co., Friant-Kern canal; schedules 2 and 3; specification 1204.

(b) 12r–16144 — Arizona - Nevada Constructors, Friant-Kern canal, schedules 1, 3, and 4; specification 1204.

(c) 12r–16207—Hubert H. Everest, Delta-Mendota canal, schedules 1 and 2; specification 1183.

In analyzing the fund situation with respect to these contracts it must be understood that appropriated funds for the Central Valley project are divided into 31 separate appropriation subitems fixed by terms of the appropriation acts of 1948 and past years. Funds in each appropriation subitem cannot legally be transferred to another appropriation subitem. Of the 31 appropriation subitems, 4 are available to finance the above 3 contracts. These are:

Subitem	Symbol	Funds available July 1, 1947	Expended (costs) July to November 1947	On hand but obligated as of Nov. 30, 1947	Unobligated as of Nov. 30, 1947
General use	0.001	$2,575,574	$1,411,327	$1,164,247	0
Friant-Kern canal	.006	4,295,165	4,295,165	0	0
Delta-Mendota canal	.015	4,567,562	2,973,910	1,593,652	0
Irrigation facilities	.024	9,372,522	8,059,720	1,312,802	0

In addition to the three contracts listed in your letter, there are a number of other contracts financed from these appropriation subitems. The combined earnings of all the contractors have exhausted available funds.

I believe the table shown above supplies the data listed in the first four items of your letter. Relative to item 5, you are advised that substantially all of the above funds were appropriated for irrigation purposes.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL W. STRAUS,
Commissioner.

Mr. DOWNEY. The letter to the Senator from Nebraska on December 1 shows there was not one single dollar available left to carry on the work in the Friant-Kern area. That was on December 1, Mr. President.

On the 10th of December a chart was given to the Appropriations Committee purporting to show the same facts, but on it it appears that the Bureau of Reclamation had $300,000 available on hand at the time they closed down the project. For the information of the Senate, I might say that to carry on the contract work for 1 month would require about $1,000,000.

About a week after that letter, in oral statements the accountants of the Bureau were compelled to admit they had between $600,000 and $700,000. So we progress from nothing to $300,000, to $600,000 or $700,000.

After February 13 these gentlemen were compelled to admit that their own records showed that at the time they closed these contracts down they had on hand funds which could have been used for the Friant-Kern contracts to the extent of $1,600,000, which would have kept the contracts going 6 weeks, giving them ample time to have come before Congress and received a supplemental appropriation.

For the last 2 or 3 months, working with our subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, I have been trying to analyze the accounting situation of the Bureau of Reclamation. On almost every doubtful controversial item I have had from five to seven different statements, almost all of them wrong, and all of them contradictory. In my years as a lawyer and a public official I have never had any experience which remotely resembled it. Accountants who are now investigating the accounts of the Bureau of Reclamation say they never could conceive of such mistakes and inefficiencies—yes, and falsifications—as appeared in the accounting of this Bureau.

Very well, as of about February 15 the Bureau had been compelled to admit they had about $1,600,000 which could have been used to carry on the work for another 6 weeks.

The next item I discovered was this: In 1947, the last fiscal year, the Bureau of Reclamation spent $2,500,000 in re-equipping a building for the chief engineer's office in Denver, Colo. I think great waste and perhaps worse things will be developed in relation to that building. But in any event the cost of the building was prorated among the different reclamation districts of the West, and $463,000 was prorated against the Central Valley of California. The money was there, the debt was there, and the $463,000 was paid. After weeks of delving, I found that these gentlemen, by some mischance in setting up their accounts payable on November 30, had again charged that $463,000. They have admitted it was an erroneous charge. "Oh," they say, "We are sorry we made that mistake. We had forgotten it had been paid." But in any event there was another $463,000.

These gentlemen presented to the Appropriations Committee in their accounts payable, items of about $700,000, supposed to be for rights-of-way which had been acquired by the Government, and for which an obligation had accrued against the Government, and that again depleted the funds which could be used for the contractors by $500,000, or $600,000, or $700,000.

We now find that almost every one of those items is fictitious. At the time the obligation was entered into, no contracts had been signed, and no obligation existed against the Government of the United States, and again the accountants of the Bureau of Reclamation have been compelled to admit it. So we are now up to $2,500,000, whereas we started without one single penny.

While I do not wish to trespass upon the time of the Senate at any great length, I may say I am very certain that this morning we discovered another fictitious and false entry in the books of the Bureau of Reclamation, accounting for an additional $500,000.

Mr. President, the record is written so plainly that it would not need a distinguished lawyer like my friend the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] to prosecute this case and to have a jury bring in a verdict of guilty beyond all reasonable doubt. By a multitude of facts, a vicious, subversive conspiracy is revealed to spend this money before January 1, the conspiracy involving the Secretary, the Commissioner, and the regional director—and whom else I do not know. They would have failed anyway, because Congress was back in session in late October, except that they had depleted their accounts by falsification and false entries.

I want to say to the Members of the Senate that I realize full well the nature of the appalling charges I am making. I would not be here making them unless they are demonstrable to a certainty. As a matter of fact, everything I have said here about the accretion of this sum from nothing up to millions of dollars is now admitted by representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation, who would have us believe that merely stupid bookkeeping and inefficiency was responsible for it.

Mr. President, I do not desire to detain the Senate any longer, but I should like briefly to advert to a few other matters.

It has been demonstrated beyond any doubt that Mr. Straus and two of his assistants willfully, feloniously, and fraudulently misrepresented their accounts to the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. The gross inefficiency of their accounting system has been clearly established. What makes me most unhappy is that the Bureau of Reclamation, by the expenditure of millions of dollars on propaganda, has convinced many of the small farmers of the Central Valley that the representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation are the saviors of those farmers. When the poor farmers of the Central Valley finally have to pay this bill, at last the truth will be brought home to them, in a most unhappy way.

One of the things which I think will be demonstrated beyond any doubt is that the Bureau of Reclamation, by a delay of from a year to 2 years in procuring rights-of-way, when they could have been obtained in 24 hours by a declaration of taking, delayed construction progress on the Central Valley project by that same length of time, when Congress had appropriated the money, the contractors were ready, and the material was available. We are now in a prolonged drought, which fortunately has been broken to some extent in northern California; but our underground water plane has fallen seriously. The first to suffer from that falling plane were the small farmers. They must pay three or four times as much for their power as does the very large user. Those who will suffer because of this chicanery, this charlatanism, this ideology, these subversive activities, will be the small farmers.

Mr. President, I anticipate that this question will be before the Senate again in other forms. It will certainly be before the House of Representatives. In my opinion, the most abominable series of crimes that have ever been committed against the Government of the United States and against the people have been committed by these individuals. I think the facts will later be developed to show that they are men of subversive activity, not wanting to do a job, desiring to break down the free economy, wanting to breed passion and hate, caring not what standards or what individuals are sacrificed by their corrupt machinations.

Now, Mr. President, back to the issue——

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. KEM. It is apparent from what the Senator has said that he has had a great deal of opportunity to observe the operations of the Bureau of Reclamation in the Central Valley of California. I should like to ask the Senator if, based upon his experience and observation there, he would counsel and advise the people of the central Mississippi Valley to invite the Bureau of Reclamation to come into that valley to assume responsibility in connection with their all-important problems of water control.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am glad to answer that question for the Senator, and also for the benefit of my dear friend the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], whom I very strongly dislike to oppose. It is my opinion that if the Bureau of Reclamation goes into any State in which there are flood-control problems or problems of agriculture, they will immediately involve that State and the Army engineers in vile and vicious propaganda, in an orgy of campaigning to drive the other agency out of the State. The Bureau of Reclamation has had literally hundreds of men in our State vilifying the Army engineers. It has planted in newspapers dozens of editorials against the Army engineers. It has given out false evidence. In doing all that it has criminally violated one of the Federal statutes.

I do not desire to extend the discussion, but we have a situation in which the Congress gave an authorization to the Army engineers, after careful investigation by the committee, and by unanimous vote, to build a great flood-control project—the Folsom project. That project has been near disaster because of the propaganda methods of the Bureau of Reclamation, acting through the President and the Secretary, and committees and groups trying to take that work away from the Army engineers. I should say that the entire Missouri and Mississippi Valley would be involved in a continuing quarrel if those men once got a foothold in that area.

Mr. KEM. A little while ago the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] expressed the opinion that the introduction of the Bureau of Reclamation into

our valley would result in competition between the Bureau and other agencies of the Government, which he said, in effect, would redound to the benefit of the people of our valley. Does the Senator from California believe that free competition between different agencies of the Government is something that we should invite?

Mr. DOWNEY. I doubt it very much, but in this particular case there would be no competition upon the same plane. The Army engineers are trying to do a physical job of construction as cheaply and efficiently and with as little difficulty as possible to the public. The Bureau of Reclamation is primarily engaged in propaganda. The Army does not compete with it in propaganda, and certainly the Bureau of Reclamation is not competing from the standpoint of efficiency. Figures will be developed showing how very much cheaper the Army work is.

I have been in the Senate for almost two terms. I have never once had the experience of an Army engineer lobbying me to try to get appropriations or personnel, and I believe the distinguished Senator from Louisiana would say the same thing.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

Mr. DOWNEY. As long as I was on speaking terms with the group in the Bureau of Reclamation, they lobbied me almost every other week, and the same is true of other Senators. They are engaged largely in spending their money and their activities and energies in trying to get more appropriations and bigger jobs, getting into other States, taking away work from the Department of Agriculture in soil erosion, duplicating the work of the Geological Survey, and trying to drive the Army engineers out of the State of California.

What makes me unhappy is that all that heavy burden of propaganda, which it will be proved amounts to millions of dollars a year, will have to be borne by the farmers of the Central Valley, unless we come back to Congress with hat in hand and say, "This Federal bureaucracy has ruined us, and we cannot pay."

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. DOWNEY. I am glad to yield. The only trouble is that I make a speech each time the Senator asks a question.

Mr. KEM. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] expressed the opinion, or at least indulged the hope, that as a Member of the Senate, through the Appropriations Committee he would be able to guide, or perhaps influence, the activities of the Bureau of Reclamation in his own State along the lines of his own thinking. I should like to ask the Senator from California, based upon his own experience in the Central Valley of California, if this hope or expectation is justified.

Mr. DOWNEY. I should say, subject to a hypothetical assumption, that it would be justified if the distinguished Senator from Arkansas were to adopt the ideological left-wing views of this group. If he were to do so, undoubtedly he would find himself in accord with them. But if he were to endeavor to stand against them and their ideology, I think they would attempt to ride him down.

I cannot help but tell one of the very peculiar things which has just developed in relation to propaganda. I claim that Mike Straus is the ablest propagandist who ever lived. He is wonderful at it. Of course he has had millions to spend, and the prestige of a great Bureau behind him; but even so he is quite a man.

When we got certain papers from the Bureau of Reclamation we found that this condition had developed: The Bureau of Reclamation had written a speech attacking the large landowners in California. It had been forwarded back here, and was broadcast by a Mr. Agronsky, a radio broadcaster in Washington, who, I understand, is a very fine man. The people of Kern County, Calif., thought some of his statements libelous and false, and they shot him a very hot communication. Mr. Agronsky, not knowing anything about the subject, as he himself admitted, sent the letter to the Bureau of Reclamation for reply. The Bureau sent it to a man in the Bureau of Reclamation's regional office at Sacramento, who drafted a letter answering the attacks and sent it back to Washington. It was sent to Mr. Agronsky, who must have decided not to use it as the people in Kern County have never had a reply to their protest.

I merely cite that to show their endless energy in propaganda. They are past masters of propaganda. I believe they have spent between $2,000,000 and $3,000,000 a year in propaganda in the Central Valley alone. I think that fact will be demonstrated.

Mr. KEM. I gather from the Senator's book, They Would Rule the Valley, and also from what the Senator from California has said, that he has not found the Bureau of Reclamation or its officials always in accord with his own thinking.

Mr. DOWNEY. Well, very rarely, because I try to develop and analyze facts, and I am totally opposed to their stream of propaganda.

Mr. KEM. I gather that it is the opinion of the Senator from California that it would be foolish for any Senators from the Mississippi Valley to join in the invitation for the Bureau of Reclamation to come into our valley under the assumption that once they were in our valley they would be guided by our views.

Mr. DOWNEY. I think that is true.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask this question: In the report on the bill there is a letter addressed by Secretary Krug to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the chairman of the committee, under date of March 14, 1947. On page 3 of the report, where that letter appears, we see the following sentence:

> There is a possibility, too, of greatly expanded agricultural production in the area east of the White River and in the St. Francis River Basin through a coordinated drainage and irrigation program.

When we take into consideration the fact that the White River runs for a considerable amount of its course through the State of Missouri and that the St. Francis River originates in the State of Missouri and runs for approximately 100 miles through the State of Missouri before it enters the State of Arkansas, I should like to ask the Senator from California whether, in his opinion, it would be possible for the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake, as Secretary Krug says, "a coordinated drainage and irrigation program" in the basins of the White River and the St. Francis River without affecting materially the interests of the people in Missouri.

Mr. DOWNEY. I would doubt it. It is an interstate stream, and it seems to me that the interests in the one State would have quite a bearing on the interests in the other State.

I may also add that I do not believe the Bureau of Reclamation will ever go into Arkansas without rapidly embarking on a campaign to drive the Corps of Army Engineers out of that State, just as it is now attempting to do in the State of California. I feel very confident when I make that statement.

Mr. President, I wish to make a personal statement at this point. If it in any way smacks of impropriety, I ask the pardon of the Senate. But inasmuch as the Senator from Missouri has referred to a book which I wrote about the Central Valley—a book entitled "They Would Rule the Valley"—I wish to say that one reason why I wrote that book was that the accusations in it are so serious and so terrible that I did not wish to make them on the floor of the Senate, where I would be immune from suit. I have circulated this book, as its author; and in it I attack these men in their professional capacities. So they would have the right to sue me, inasmuch as I attack them in their professional capacities. They would have the right to sue me for general damages; and if they did that, they would not have to prove anything, but I would have to prove everything I said about them in the book. Mr. President, the statements I have been making on the floor of the Senate are so extreme that Senators will understand what I mean, because here is a book which deals with over four long years of corruption and deceit and subversive activities. I wish to read to the Senate at this time what I am prepared to prove in a court of law about Mike Straus, and I say this in the book:

> Mike Straus: Succeeding Bashore, he stepped down from a higher position so that he could enforce his will more directly. As ignorant of engineering, irrigation, and western conditions as any man could be, with no important administrative experience behind his entry into the Government service, Mr. Straus represents the zealot, the politician, the ideologist who lives by the manipulation of propaganda, freely dispatched at public cost; who cares nothing for the truth except how best to obscure it.

Whenever Michael W. Straus wants to file suit and make me prove the truth of that statement, I shall be very happy to have the opportunity to do so.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. KEM. On page 3 of the book I find this statement:

> The Central Valley project is now chiefly under the control of men who are neither engineers nor practical irrigationists; few of them had ever performed important administrative duties before their entry into public service. The incompetence of these men, their failure to comprehend and face engineering, financial, and irrigation reali-

ties have already injured the welfare of the Central Valley. Unless their present destructive policies are soon checked by the executive or congressional branch of the Government, they will, in my opinion, bring ruin to thousands of our California farmers and return to the desert hundreds of thousands of now rich and productive acres.

Mr. President, let me inquire whether the Senator from California is still of that opinion.

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; I am still of the same opinion, and I apprehend that the damages may be even more extreme than I thought they would be when I wrote that paragraph.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask whether the Senator from California would advise the States of the Mississippi Valley to place their water-control problems in whole or in part in the hands of these same men at this time?

Mr. DOWNEY. I certainly would not.

I say to my dear friend, the Senator from Arkansas, that I am reminded of an incident in the story of Tom Sawyer. We recall from our youthful reading of Tom Sawyer that Aunt Polly had some pain killer that she used to give to Tom, and it used to burn him up. One day Tom was about to take his spoonful of pain-killer medicine when the cat came in. It meowed and meowed and walked around the room, and seemed to want some of that spoonful of pain killer. Tom said to the cat, "I don't think you will like this, kitty. Are you sure you want it?"

The cat said, "Meow, meow."

So Tom said, "If you are sure you want it, here it is," and he gave it to the cat.

The cat took it; and the next thing that happened, the cat jumped out of the window.

Mr. President, in this instance I am like Tom; I am saying that of course if people want these things, they are entitled to have them; but my advice to the people of Arkansas and to the Members of the Senate is not to take them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong this discussion, but for the benefit of a few Senators who were not in the Chamber when the earlier discussion occurred, let me say that at that time I said, and I now repeat, that even though all the criticism of the Reclamation Bureau may be justified and correct—I am not passing judgment on it, because I do not know, but I am perfectly willing to take the word of the Senator from California about it, and to accept all of it as being true—but, even accepting all of it as true, I do not see that that is any reason for turning down this bill.

I know the Senator from California does not propose to do away with the reclamation laws. He is critical of the administration of those laws. I think all of us at one time or another have been critical of practically all the agencies of the Government. Certainly I have been critical of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and I believe it to have been discriminatory in ways that have been more injurious to the section from which I come than anything that has been done by the Bureau of Reclamation as described by the Senator from California. So I do not think that is a valid argument, even though I fully sympathize with the difficulties the State of California has had with the Bureau.

Let me say that upon examining the statistics for the State of California, I observe that California is a very prosperous State. The per capita income of California is about twice that of my State. I know the Bureau of Reclamation has been operating in California for many years and is there now, and I know the Army engineers have been active in California for many years and are there now. Judging from the results of the work of those two services in California, as well as their services elsewhere, I should say that that kind of medicine, in the words of Tom Sawyer, would be quite acceptable to Arkansas. We would be delighted to have some reaction in our State along the lines which have developed California into one of the most prosperous garden spots in the whole world, without exception. That, I think, has led many of us to wonder if we might not participate in the work of some of these agencies.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I sat very patiently listening to the Senator from California. I should like to yield for a question only, because I want to finish with this matter today. Does the Senator really want to ask a question, or does he want to make a speech?

Mr. DOWNEY. I merely want to tell the Senator that practically none of our land in California has been irrigated by the Reclamation Bureau. We have millions of vacant acres but only a very few reclamation projects.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I recall the Senator himself stressed the fact that the early pioneers did most of the work. Nevertheless, the fact remains that California is a very prosperous State, and there are in California projects other than the Central Valley project, and there are many fine flood-control dams built by the Army engineers; so that to invite the Bureau of Reclamation to come into the State of Arkansas does not mean that the Army engineers would be excluded, by any means.

There is another point. The Senator from Missouri seems to insist upon interpreting the bill as an invitation to the reclamation service to take over the Mississippi Valley. I wish only to point out that the provisions of the bill are confined exclusively to the State of Arkansas, which adjoins the State of Texas. The service has been in Texas for many years, and, to my knowledge, no one has been contaminated by it.

I desire to state for the RECORD that no one from the Department of the Interior or from the reclamation service at any time solicited me to introduce the bill. To this day they have never consulted with me as to what should be done about it, one of the reasons being that no one had anticipated a controversy about the bill, which, I am frank to say, took me quite unawares. I thought the bill would pass on a call of the Unanimous Consent Calendar, it being primarily directed to affairs in Arkansas, affecting alone the people of Arkansas, who, I think, are the best judges as to whether they want to take this medicine or not.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Just a moment, please. The senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], who unfortunately is absent today, joined in this bill. I consulted with him yesterday and his advice was to proceed with it. He is absent only because he had a previous engagement for a physical check-up. But I believe I speak for him in urging passage of the bill and in stating that the people of Arkansas believe the bill will in the long run result in benefit to the State, particularly to its rice industry and to its irrigation projects.

I do not want to leave the impression that the Bureau of Reclamation is striving to extend its jurisdiction. Representatives of the Bureau came neither to my colleague nor to myself to ask that the bill be introduced. As a matter of fact, I introduced the bill over a year ago, as the result of a visit to the rice section of my State, where I was informed of the very critical situation developing in the water supply on the Grand Prairie area. Allegations about the misdeeds of the Reclamation Service in connection with the background of this bill certainly do not apply so far as I am concerned. The bill was simply offered for what it is, namely, a bill to enable the State of Arkansas, as one of the poorer States, to endeavor to build itself up and bring some prosperity to its agriculture and give it some stability. We in our State suffer really as much over the years from drought as we do from floods, the main difference being that the droughts are not so dramatic, no one is killed, horses are not drowned, mules are not marooned, and so on. But we have recurring droughts, and they are disastrous to many of our principal agricultural products.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. KEM. The Senator will agree that the control of the waters of the Mississippi River and its tributaries is the joint problem of all the States in the valley, will he not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The control of the Mississippi River certainly is a joint problem of the interested States. I do not agree with the thesis of the Senator that the basin of the St. Francis and White Rivers, which lies within the State of Arkansas, is any concern of the Senator or of the people of Missouri. I do not think it is their concern, and I think it is a little odd that the Senator should suggest that it is. I myself have never advocated the AVA principle of development. I have supported the Army engineers' approach in my State, and now, to say that to put it in reverse and bring the Reclamation Service to Arkansas is equivalent to a Nation-wide commitment to the Reclamation Service, simply does not make sense to me. I have no intention of imposing it on Missouri. I cannot see why it should have any such result so long as the people of Missouri do not want it.

Mr. KEM. Does the letter of Secretary Krug to the committee chairman, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER],

concerning the report make sense to the Senator?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I read the letter. The Senator read it to me earlier, and he read it later to the Senator from California. I simply do not feel that it is subject to his interpretation. Secretary Krug wrote the letter in response to an inquiry from me, and of course I was talking about Arkansas, its affairs, and its river basins.

Mr. KEM. What interpretation would the Senator place on this language: "A coordinated drainage and irrigation program?" That is, for the White River and the St. Francis River. What could that mean other than a program throughout the basins of these rivers?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As I say, taking into consideration the background and the inquiry which I addressed to the Secretary, I think it means that the great area which is described in more detail in the remarks I made earlier today, in eastern Arkansas, lying between the St. Francis and the White Rivers, would prove to be a very fertile area, if it could be brought into production through such a program. I think that is what he refers to. It certainly is what I was interested in. But I do not think he had any intention of bringing Missouri into this picture. I certainly did not.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator feel it is a strained construction of that language?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I do not. I think it is a perfectly logical one in view of my inquiry and of my interest in the State of Arkansas and of the effort to extend the irrigation laws to the State of Arkansas, and no further. I have not the slightest desire to infringe upon the sovereignty of the State of Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator feel it is a strained construction of the language to say that Secretary Krug, before he has even obtained a foothold in Arkansas, is dreaming of new worlds to conquer in Missouri?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not here to try to interpret everything Mr. Krug wants, or to say what his designs are. The purposes of the bill are perfectly simple. Reclamation is not a political matter. Someone pointed out here this morning that the Reclamation Service was started under a Republican regime. It has been operating for many years all through the Western States, and I may say that I do not think the Senator from California speaks for all Senators from the reclamation States. I have talked to a good many of them. The bill came out of the Subcommittee on Public Lands. The Senator from Utah was present at the hearings. The Senator from Colorado was, I believe, acting chairman of the subcommittee. The bill was reported unanimously. All the men on the committee are from reclamation States, and they did not seem to feel that it threatened the survival of Arkansas in any way at all. They are friendly people, and I do not think they were intending to do an injustice to me or to the people of Arkansas.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I may call the Senator's attention to the fact that he is not from a reclamation State, and I doubt that he has had any more experience with reclamation than I have had. I do not pretend to be an authority on reclamation law, because we have not had it, but I think that a great many Senators from reclamation States think very highly of the work that has been done by this service in their States.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. KEM. For the Senator's information, I should like to say that the Senator from Missouri spent 10 very pleasant and happy years, if not profitable years, in the State of Wyoming.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that is a very fine State. It is a reclamation State. There, again, I think certain things have been done in that State, as well as in the State of Utah, which impressed me very favorably.

In fact, I think my interest in the whole subject goes back to a trip which I took through those States, where I saw what had been accomplished around cities such as Salt Lake City, and in some of the valleys. That is why I felt it would be highly beneficial to Arkansas to get such projects.

Mr. KEM. The Senator from Arkansas expressed some surprise that the Senator from Missouri should be interested in this matter. Of course the Senator is familiar with that section of Missouri known as the boot heel which extends down into what otherwise might be the confines of the State of Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator means the section which was stolen from Arkansas, which is the best part of Missouri, I believe.

Mr. KEM. No. I am referring to the section which remained when the Territory of Arkansas was knocked off from Missouri's border. The Senator knows that it is a very fertile section, which has literally been won from the Mississippi River, does he not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I know that.

Mr. KEM. The Senator probably knows personally some of the leading citizens of that district who constitute the officials and the directors of the St. Francis levee district, does he not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, at this point I should like to read into the RECORD for the information of the Senator from Arkansas a telegram which I have received from the directors and officials of the St. Francis levee district in Missouri. The telegram reads as follows:

> Please contact Senator OVERTON, of Louisiana, about Senate bill 299 which concerns reclamation of rice lands in the White River Basin of Arkansas. If this be a meritorious project, let it be carried on by and under the United States Engineers and the Mississippi River Commission, who have charge of the Mississippi River and its tributary basins. By so doing we will avoid conflict between United States Government agencies.
>
> St. Francis Levee District of Missouri
> Board: C. F. Blokor, President;
> T. P. Russell, Vice President;
> Crews Reynolds; T. A. Haggard;
> Wayne Delisel; S. P. Reynolds
> and George Glozier, Engineers;
> Ward and Reeves, Attorneys.

I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas if he knows some of the leading citizens whose names are signed to the telegram?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do. I also know that a similar board in my State, with headquarters in Helena, is opposed to the bill. I might also add that very few bills of which I have ever heard have no opposition. We usually find people taking opposite views with regard to bills.

I am somewhat surprised that persons who live in Missouri are concerned regarding what goes on in Arkansas. I am aware of the fact that there are some persons in Arkansas who oppose the bill, but I think if we pass only bills for which there is unanimous support we shall pass very few bills. We have to weigh, I think, pro and con, the merits of the bill. I believe, as does the senior Senator from Arkansas, that the benefits which will accrue from this bill will outweigh any of the fears which arise. I think they are merely fears that in the future some conflict may develop with respect to other activities in connection with the drainage work of the St. Francis Levee Board, and no reclamation work may be undertaken. Whether that will occur I do not know. It may. But I think that when the problem arises we shall meet it.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to read the Senator another telegram and ask him to give the Senate the benefit of any comments he may have to make.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have received many telegrams, but I do not think that makes much difference.

Mr. KEM. The Senator has expressed surprise at the interest and activity of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am surprised at his opposition to the bill, because I do not see how its passage could affect Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I should like to have the benefit, and I want Senators to have the benefit of the Senator's counsel, advice, and comment upon another telegram received from some leading citizens of Missouri. I shall not try his patience further if he will permit me to read it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for the reading of one more telegram.

Mr. KEM. I might say that I could read many more. This particular telegram is from C. E. Barkshire, Columbia, Mo. It reads as follows:

> COLUMBIA, MO., *April 12, 1948.*
>
> Hon. JAMES P. KEM,
> *United States Senator,*
> *Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:*
>
> Re Senate bill 299, reclaiming certain rice lands, White River Basin, Ark. If bill found to have merit, operation should be placed under Corps of Engineers and Mississippi River Commission. These two already have control of Mississippi River and its tributaries. We who live or own property along Mississippi River have seen error of divided control in Government agencies as conflicts arise between Government agencies to disadvantage of services rendered.
>
> Reclamation by Interior Department in this area not only requires duplication of services already available, but Interior Department might not work in harmony with Engineering Corps, who have control of dams and floods along White River. If reclamation project is worth while, request your in-

terest and support in having its operation placed under Corps of Engineers and Mississippi River Commission.

C. E. BARKSHIRE.

Has the Senator any comment to make on the logic or argument contained in that telegram?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it is somewhat repetitious. In the first place, the Army engineers have no authority to undertake irrigation work as such. For 50 years it has been recognized that projects primarily devoted to irrigation are within the jurisdiction of the reclamation service. There being no reclamation service in Arkansas, the result has been that there are no irrigation studies or projects whatever in that State, and there never have been, although the engineers have been there for years. They are doing fine work on the rivers. They have completed one very large dam, as the Senator knows. I refer to the Norfork Dam, which is a very substantial structure. There is a large program in connection with the Arkansas and White Rivers, but there is no attention given to irrigation at all. The State of Arkansas has water resources in many streams, but no studies have been made in connection with them. Nothing has been done to utilize the water for irrigation.

That is the only comment I can make. The question has been asked, Why not let the engineers do it? They have not done it, and I do not think they can do it under their existing authority. It has been suggested to me that instead of introducing this bill I should attempt to give to the Army engineers, through an amendment to the law, the authority to engage in irrigation work, but it was immediately found that there was a considerable difference of opinion between the Senators from the West regarding the subject.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to make this observation with respect to the colloquy which has taken place between the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Arkansas: Irrigation work in the Western States has taken place on interstate streams in many instances. For example, on the Colorado River there are many reclamation projects. Some of them are not very large, but they have been undertaken and have been completed although they are located on an interstate stream. There is no difficulty in that respect. It should be remembered that before an irrigation project can be undertaken and before the necessary money is appropriated, there must be a contract between the United States, through the Bureau of Reclamation, and the persons who are to receive the benefits of the project, in which contract there is an agreement to repay the costs of the project.

So it is not a question of anything being forced on anyone.

As I remember, the senior Senator from Arkansas appeared before the Reclamation Subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. It was not a question of the committee or the Bureau getting Arkansas to take advantage of the Reclamation Act. We were in the position of requiring the proponents of the bill to show any justification whatever for Arkansas coming within the benefits of the act, which had been enacted originally for the benefit of the 17 Western States. It is not a question of taking in more territory, it is a question of whether or not we are willing to let Arkansas in, or whether there is any justification for it.

With regard to the reflections of the senior Senator from California on the Bureau of Reclamation, I am not here to defend the men about whom he was talking, but I call attention to the fact that there are hundreds of very excellent engineers, and probably thousands of employees, in the Bureau of Reclamation, who have done a wonderful job in the United States. All one needs to do is to go out and see the projects and see the farmers who have obtained the water, and the industries which have utilized the power, to be convinced that the Bureau of Reclamation has done a wonderful job. There may have been some connected with the Bureau in the last few years who are subject to criticism. I understood the Senator from California to complain about the Commissioner of the Bureau and a few others. But there are thousands of engineers in the Bureau who are very excellent men. I worked with the Bureau of Reclamation for many years before I came to the Senate, and I never knew a body of men more devoted to their work. They are not politicians, and until some comments were made, probably a year ago, regarding what was said about appropriations, I never knew there was any criticism of the Bureau.

Senators from the West, irrespective of the party to which they belong, usually get together and support a program benefiting the West. I congratulate the State of Arkansas for wanting to have the reclamation program apply to that State, after seeing its results. It is not forced on any State.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FERGUSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is obvious we cannot get a vote on the pending measure this evening, and the acting majority leader is about to move for a recess. However, I ask that when the Senate meets tomorrow the Senator from Arkansas who now has the floor may be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

TRANSFER OF INDUSTRIES FROM NEW ENGLAND TO THE SOUTH

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, time after time, during the short period I have been a Member of this honorable body, I have risen to my feet to defend the South and South Carolina.

This afternoon I am inclined to gloat. I hold in my hand an Associated Press dispatch reporting a speech made by the Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts—Lieutenant Governor Coolidge, that is—before the Greater Lawrence Chamber of Commerce last evening. I imagine the number of active ulcers increased after that dinner.

Let me read this news dispatch:

LAWRENCE, MASS., April 12.—Lt. Gov. Arthur W. Coolidge, of Massachusetts, said tonight the "Bilbo Belt Banjo Strummers" of the South were kidnaping the Massachusetts textile industry.

He said he proposed "to fire an opening gun in the new industrial war between the States" and declared "Dixie Claghorns" have already persuaded several New England woolen and worsted mills to move South.

In a speech prepared for delivery before the Greater Lawrence Chamber of Commerce, Coolidge predicted New England mills would become "hollow shells" if the "kidnapers" were successful.

"All through the Suwannee River region newspapers, public utilities, community projects, and government units are trying to attract outside industry," he asserted.

"Alabama even sent North 'Big Jim' Folsom, her 'kissing governor,' to demonstrate what the cotton kingdom has to offer northern girls in leap year.

"But although pictures of the playboy's smooching antics appeared in the papers, I do not find any of our young men worried by competition from the land of moonlight, magnolia blossoms, and mud-waddlers," he added.

Declaring Mississippi, Kentucky, and Louisiana are offering "tempting bait" for new industries, Coolidge said "these razorback-hog States are operating on the principle of robbing Northern Peter to pay Southern Paul."

Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, South Carolina, and "some other Tobacco Road States" return to the Federal Government "only $2 for every $7 they wheedle from Washington," the Lieutenant Governor contended.

By contrast, he added, Massachusetts gets back $2.50 out of every $6 it gives to Washington.

Louisiana, Coolidge claimed, "takes the money which Bay State taxpayers send to Washington and uses this Federal aid to offset the local 10-year tax exemptions which its communities give to industries that migrate from Massachusetts.

"Thus we of Massachusetts are paying for the bullets that are fired to kill our industrial State," he said.

Calling southern labor a "raw mass, inexperienced, and undisciplined," Coolidge warned it was "a potential source of labor violence, race riots, and other disturbances."

Massachusetts manufacturers moving south would be confronted with "suffocating summer heat, lower educational standards, and a higher rate of disease," he told the gathering.

"Naturally, Dixie Claghorns keep mum about these drawbacks when they use their southern charm on northerners," he added.

"If we do our part to promote Bay State industry," Coolidge continued, "we need not bite our fingernails in despair every time a chamber of commerce in honeysuckle heaven whistles the wolf call to Miss Massachusetts."

Well, well, well. Old Rip Van Winkle has been aroused from his 40 years of slumber. He has discovered that a great and proud people who were raped, plundered, burned, pillaged, and feloniously robbed of great wealth and honor by the lordly forebears of this same Van Winkle, and then, bruised and bleeding, abandoned to die, have with determination and courage unexcelled in example

among all the annals of mankind's history staged a recovery program the success of which alarms the mighty conquerors. And they did it without the benefit of an ERP or any other sort of outside charity.

Mr. President, I do take vigorous exception to one irresponsible assertion in this otherwise thoroughly enjoyable, but somewhat pathetic, diatribe.

Mr. Coolidge—extraordinarily loquacious and pedantic for one of his name—parrots the oft-repeated but absolutely untrue and reprehensible charge that southern labor is "raw mass, inexperienced, and undisciplined."

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I resent that scurrilous remark. The Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts advertises his own ignorance of social and economic conditions in the South and impugns the intelligence and business acumen of his own Massachusetts manufacturers who have moved to South Carolina, and other points nearer heaven, and he also insults the remainder of his industrialist constituents who at this very moment cast longing eyes through the Massachusetts mist and fog toward the land of sunshine and magnolias.

For the enlightenment of the Massachusetts executive, I would point out that, according to the Department of Commerce of the United States, there was a total of 10,441,000,000 spindle-hours operated in the United States during the month of February 1948. Of this number, South Carolina had 2,852,000,000, compared to only 848,000,000 in the State of Massachusetts.

In other words, South Carolina operated 27⅓ percent of the Nation's total spindle-hours, while Massachusetts had only 8 percent of the Nation's total.

I deem it unnecessary at this time to apologize for the scars and the still festering sores of my own Southland. We recognize our faults, our own deficiencies, and our own limitations. We know them—as the Lieutenant Governor from the land of the bean and the cod does not—and we understand them.

We also have constructive programs for their solution. We have made tremendous progress in the years which have followed that debacle of human misery, human lawlessness, brutality, and inhumane disregard for the honor and the welfare of other human beings, which we knew as the nightmare of reconstruction.

I might say to the distinguished Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts that not every southerner is illiterate. According to the 1940 census, South Carolina and Arizona led the States of the Union with the largest number of white residents who have completed four or more years of college. Each of these has 7 percent of its population 25 years and above in this category. The same table indicates that Massachusetts ranks eleventh in the Nation, with 5.5 percent of her white population having completed four or more years of college.

The South will continue to advance. Each year will find her a better place for men to live and work. It will be progress without sympathy or understanding or assistance from blue-blooded financial barons of Boston or the money lenders of New York who have constantly thrown up road blocks against us in the form of discriminatory freight rates and restrictive credit policies.

It will be progress without interference from the agitators and extremists or the dreamy theorists and reformists who constantly fall in old abandoned wells while gazing upward at the stars.

What God gave us in the South the Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts or no man can put asunder—and, thank God, never again can he plunder.

Our temperate climate, our abundant supplies of sturdy, stable, enlightened, and cooperative labor, progressive State governments, and our helpful and active chambers of commerce and industrial-development agencies will continue to remove the cataracts from the eyes of mill owners and industrialists of the North and East and expose to them the beauties and the advantages of the Southland.

No, Mr. Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts; we will not kidnap your industries. All we will do will be to continue to propose matrimony, and they will elope in steadily increasing droves.

We are not running any underground railroads through which enslaved industries can gain freedom by clandestine escape. There are broad, straight, one-way, super-highways, all headed south. There are no stop lights, no detours.

The Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts has done more to advertise the appeal and attraction of the Southland than we heretofore have been able to do with a sizeable advertising budget. For this we are grateful and as an expression of my appreciation I am today tendering him an invitation to tour South Carolina as my guest and I promise that we will entertain his application for citizenship. However, our office of lieutenant governor is ably filled at the present time.

RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Senate take a recess until the hour of 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 14, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 14, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, March 29, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, in this moment of prayer, when there is silence in this Senate Chamber, may there not be silence in Thy presence.

May our prayers be heard.

May no short circuits be made by our lack of faith, our high professions joined to low attainments, our fine words hiding shabby thoughts, or friendly faces masking cold hearts.

Out of the same old needs, conscious of the same old faults, we pray on the same old terms for new mercies and new blessings.

In the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 13, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MASSACHUSETTS HOUSING LAW FOR VETERANS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, at the statehouse in Boston on April 6 there was signed by the Governor a new veterans' housing law which had received the unanimous votes of both branches of the legislature. The law is known as the Sears housing law for veterans because of the fact that Senator Mason Sears, of Dedham, Mass., was chairman of the special commission which reported the law.

The bill recommended a $200,000,000 housing program to relieve the acute housing shortage facing veterans in Massachusetts. It sets up local housing authorities; authorizes the State to enter into agreements with these housing authorities for the purpose of guaranteeing payment of principal and interest up to an aggregate of $200,000,000; it sets up a $5,000,000 a year subsidy for a period of 25 years in order to keep rents at a reasonable figure; it limits occupancy to veterans and their families; and it also provides that the State or local housing authority may accept Federal assistance. It is expected that rents for each family unit will average in the vicinity of $40 a month and that some 20,000 veterans' families will receive shelter as a result of this legislation.

During legislative consideration of this measure, it was submitted to the Supreme Court of Massachusetts for an advisory opinion on its constitutional phases. The supreme court in its opinion emphatically approved the law and referred to it as "an activity the primary purpose of which would be to maintain the strength of the State for the benefit of all its people." The court then said that the strength of the State would be weakened unless military service were kept honorable and that military service could not be kept honorable in the face of "the disgraceful spectacle of veterans, possibly because of their very absence from home, unable to obtain suitable living accommodations in the community they have aided to defend."

Mr. President, the action of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts may well be an inspiration to us here to take similar action that the Federal Government may supplement what has already been done in the Bay State and, I understand, in New York State as well. I believe that Senator Sears and all who worked with him are to be commended.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks excerpts from the report of the special commission of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts which was set up in order to make a survey of the problems relating to veterans.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMISSION TO MAKE A SURVEY AND STUDY OF PROBLEMS RELATING TO VETERANS, INCLUDING HOUSING AND HOSPITAL FACILITIES

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,

December 3, 1947.

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives:

In accordance with said chapter 68, Resolves of 1947, the commission organized on September 15, 1947, with the election of Senator Mason Sears, Dedham, as chairman, and Representative Michael J. McCarthy, East Bridgewater, as vice chairman.

Paul C. Ryan, Boston, was elected secretary.

VETERANS' HOUSING

The shortage of low-cost rental dwelling units for veterans of World War II, particularly in the industrial cities of this Commonwealth, is so great at the present time that an immediate solution can no longer be delayed. This inescapable conclusion was reached by this commission following an intensive 10 weeks' survey of the entire problem in cooperation with the State board of housing and the emergency housing commission.

There must be action of a definite nature in 1948, or conditions, now extremely acute, will become disastrous. The need for veterans' housing within the ability to pay is so serious as to warrant prompt consideration by your honorable bodies. In the opinion of this commission, it is the No. 1 problem in the Commonwealth today.

It has been conservatively estimated families of more than 50,000 Massachusetts veterans are in desperate need of housing. A total of 11,000 dwelling units of all types will have been completed in 1947, of which less than 10 percent are rental units. This number is woefully insufficient. It is also estimated approximately 350,000 new residential units in this Commonwealth will be necessary during the next 10 years.

Private industry, all statements to the contrary, cannot meet this demand. Eighty percent of the veterans in this State requiring housing are financially unable to purchase a home at present high costs of such dwellings. Their need—and it is this need the commission desires to emphasize throughout the report—is for low-rental housing.

Only 62 communities in the Commonwealth have started or served notice of their intention to start housing projects under existing statutes. The State board of housing has given approval for 1,502 dwelling units under appropriations of more than $29,000,000, of which amount Boston appropriated $20,000,000.

At a conference, mayors of various cities were emphatic in their statements that, in order to relieve existing conditions in their respective municipalities, financial assistance from either the Federal or State government must be forthcoming. Based on surveys conducted in their cities, these mayors pointed out that the average veteran can meet rentals between $35 to $50 a month. Any cost beyond that figure is prohibitive, based on present earning capacities. These same mayors were reluctant to place their municipalities in the real-estate business, but agreed private industry would have difficulty in solving the problem in producing sufficient housing units. Each mayor assured the commission, however, of his ability to meet the local housing shortage, provided sufficient financial assistance was guaranteed by the Commonwealth.

Suggestions have been made for tax exemptions for a stated period of years to veterans or private builders as an incentive to obtain the investment of private capital in large-scale housing developments.[1]

Assuming such tax exemptions were constitutional, this commission questions the wisdom of such a move, as it would, at best, assist only 20 percent of the veterans desiring homes and who have the ability to purchase the same. The problem still revolves around the so-called 80-percent rental group. The reason there has not been a large influx of private capital for housing projects, despite enabling legislation, is that there is no guaranty at the present time, and under prevailing prices, of a reasonable return on, or even of, such investments. This is unfortunate, but, nevertheless, true.

Representatives of builders and housing construction companies stated the cost per room at the present time ranges from $2,000 to $2,400. While their purpose is to erect a low-cost house these builders were agreed they would have to build on a mass-production basis in order to keep prices down. It was also claimed by these same builders that a great majority of the cities and towns within the confines of the Commonwealth refused to cooperate in housing projects by the installation of streets and other necessary public utilities. These builders were hampered in many instances by the restrictions and differences in local building codes. This was cited as another reason for the failure of private capital to invest in housing.

In all the conferences held by the Commission, nobody, with the possible exception of the Savings Banks Association of Massachusetts, with respect to interest rates, appeared desirous to reduce costs even a fraction to get a housing program under way. The Commission has been asked not to place the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in the direct construction of housing in competition with its private citizens. By the same token these private citizens in various phases of the housing industry have indicated an unwillingness to make concessions which might, in some degree, assist the Commonwealth in alleviating the acute need for homes. Actually there is no veterans' housing construction, as such, under way in the State today.

This commission is not as concerned with the needs of the individual who can purchase a home at a cost of $10,000 or more as with the veteran whose income is too low to make such purchases. It must be borne in mind that the majority of veterans are young men, endeavoring to earn a living and establish a home for their families during a period of rising prices. Their task is no easy one.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts has a positive obligation to such veterans. Any government in time of war which was able to erect thousands of units to house war workers should be equally ready to take care of the veteran who responded to the call of his Government, and is now entitled to every possible assistance within the command of the state to provide. This is no time for short memories.

LEGISLATION

1. In the form of proposed legislation this commission herewith submits a program which, in the opinion of the members, will produce low-cost rental dwelling units for veterans in this Commonwealth. It is the opinion of this Commission that the most effective and the lowest in cost method for producing homes, and one which, incidentally, has been tried by the States of New York and New Hampshire, is to have local housing authority do its own borrowing, constructing, tenant selection, and managing, with the State government providing its credit and an annual contribution to bridge the gap between the ability of veterans to pay and the rentals that would normally be required from new construction.

Therefore, this commission has determined that the Commonwealth should provide its credit, thereby guaranteeing the loans of housing authorities, and, in addition, agreeing to make an annual contribution for the purpose of lowering rents in order to bring them within the capacity of veterans to pay.

It is futile to think in terms of any less than 20,000 rental units if an appreciable dent is to be made in this problem.

This commission recommends, as provided in appendix I, that the credit of the Commonwealth to the amount of $200,000,000 be made available to local housing authorities.

The average cost of $10,000 a dwelling unit may be insufficient for the type of apartments for larger families, but, on the other hand, it should be more than sufficient for smaller apartments for newly married veterans. Information from State administrative agencies indicate this average cost should provide veterans with decent, safe, and sanitary housing.

Annual contributions not exceeding $3,000,000, or 1½ percent of the total development cost of a project, for a period not exceeding 45 years, would enable the local authorities to maintain rents veterans can afford. The contributions would be used to apply against the interest and principal of bonds, and thus make the possible liability by the Commonwealth under its guaranty remote. The proposed State housing division would impose cost limitations, but the program would be local in its planning, construction, and management.

Until March 31, 1953, or such further period as the proposed State housing division should determine that a housing shortage for veterans exists, the housing constructed under this program would be occupied exclusively by veterans, with priority to veterans of World War II of low income. Thereafter, the projects would be occupied by low-income families, with priority to families of low-income veterans. When Federal assistance becomes available, upon order of the proposed State housing division, the projects would be converted to federally aided projects, and State financial assistance would end.

The bill also authorizes supplementary aid by the Commonwealth to local housing authorities, where Federal assistance is available only for a part of the total cost; and other enabling provisions permit the Commonwealth to take advantage of new proposed Federal legislation. Even at a cost of $10,000 a dwelling unit, 20,000 houses throughout the Commonwealth could be provided by this legislation. Because there is no local cash outlay, this program should produce results quickly and effectively.

During and to the extent of occupancy by veterans of World War II, the veterans' services fund should be the source of the annual contributions; and the same taxes which now produce this fund should be continued to provide the necessary annual contributions under the bill, thus avoiding the necessity of any new sources of revenue.

We believe that the housing program proposed would provide homes more quickly, at less cost, over a wider area and with greater effectiveness, than any other method we know. The local communities can and will do the job, if they are relieved of the financial burdens which present legislation imposes. The selection of sites and tenants, the construction by local authorities, the planning and management, should

[1] The testimony of authorities in this field placed some doubt as to the constitutionality of these suggestions.

be left to local authorities. Massachusetts, which was the first State in the Union to spend money for housing and the first State in the Union to establish a housing commission, should extend its credit and its energies to the solution of our greatest domestic problem.

The commission at this point wishes to express its thanks for the work performed by its secretary, Mr. Paul C. Ryan, whose experience and ability contributed materially to its efforts.

CONCLUSION

War veterans of Massachusetts in need of housing are expecting, and rightfully so, the same type of leadership from their elected representatives in solving this problem which was manifest by the enactment of many veterans benefit laws by the general court. Valuable time already has been wasted in providing low-cost rental dwelling units for veterans. The housing program, as recommended in this report, should be the answer and the fulfillment of their expectations. It is, in the opinion of this commission, if adopted in its entirety, a definite solution. There is no painless method of constructing houses.

Necessary funds it is hoped, will be available under the veterans' service fund of the Commonwealth. In order to be effective this housing program must be promptly enacted by the general court, as plans for rental dwelling units should be prepared prior to March 1 in order to permit construction to start by April 1, 1948. Therefore this commission respectfully recommends the legislation contained herein be referred without delay to the joint ways and means committee and any other committee designated by the presiding officers of both branches, sitting jointly, for hearings and report thereon.

Respectfully submitted.

Senator MASON SEARS, *Chairman.*
Representative MICHAEL J. MCCARTHY, *Vice Chairman.*
Representative ANDREW E. FAULKNER,
Representative JAMES A. BURKE,
EDWIN B. H. PRATT.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, Senator DONNELL was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate until 3 o'clock today.

MEETING OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained consent for the Subcommittee on Labor and Federal Security of the Committee on Appropriations to sit during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP, COMMERCE, AND NAVIGATION WITH ITALIAN REPUBLIC—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As in executive session, the Chair hands down a message from the President of the United States, submitting a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between the United States of America and the Italian Republic, together with a protocol, and an additional protocol relating thereto. The message will be printed in the RECORD; and without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the treaty, and the message and treaty will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The message is as follows:

EXECUTIVE E, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between the United States of America and the Italian Republic, together with a protocol and an additional protocol relating thereto, signed at Rome on February 2, 1948.

The enclosed treaty, together with the two related protocols, was negotiated on a basis of complete equality between the two Governments. It is comprehensive and is designed to provide an effective basis for the future development of cultural, business, and trade relationships between the two countries. I consider that this treaty is an important manifestation of the friendly relations which exist between this country and post-Fascist Italy, and that it confirms the determination of the two Governments to apply in their economic and cultural intercourse the liberal principles that are fundamental to the democratic way of life. I commend it to the early consideration of the Senate.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, a copy of each of two notes, signed and exchanged on the same date, and a report on the treaty made to me by the Acting Secretary of State.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 14, 1948.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Acting Secretary of State; (2) treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation, with protocol and additional protocol, signed at Rome February 2, 1948; (3) exchange of notes signed at Rome February 2, 1948.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. For the information of the Senate, the Chair will state that the Committee on Foreign Relations has already taken cognizance of the fact that the treaty was to be presented today. It has already taken under consideration the fact that a similar treaty with the Republic of China is now pending before the committee, and both will be taken up for immediate exploration and action.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

REPORT OF GOVERNOR OF PANAMA CANAL (H. DOC. NO. 613)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, transmitting the Annual Report of the Governor of the Panama Canal, 1947, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Annual Report of the Governor of the Panama Canal, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 14, 1948.*

PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the mayor and Council of the Borough of Roselle, N. J., favoring the enactment of House bill 6012, to amend section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A cablegram in the nature of a petition, from Dr. Francisco M. Susoni, Speaker of the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico, San Juan, P. R., praying for the enactment of legislation to repeal the limitation on exportation of refined sugar from Puerto Rico to the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from Wesley K. Bender, of Freeport, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of House bill 5732, to prohibit unqualified individuals from receiving compensation for preparing or assisting in the preparation of income-tax returns; to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM RELATING TO AIRCRAFT (PT. 3 OF REPT. NO. 440)

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, I ask unanimous consent to submit an additional report on aircraft. This report was approved by a majority of the subcommittee and a majority of the full committee, and was ordered filed with the Senate. The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], chairman of the committee, took no part in the drafting or consideration of the subcommittee report or the report from the full committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and printed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that any member of the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, if he so desires, may file minority views or a statement on or before April 30, 1948.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. PEPPER):

S. 2496. A bill to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 2497. A bill for the relief of Jozef Szajnfeld and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY (by request):

S. 2498. A bill for the relief of Ali Ipar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2499. A bill to provide for the development, administration, and maintenance of

the Baltimore-Washington Parkway and the Suitland Parkway in the State of Maryland as extensions of the park system of the District of Columbia and its environs by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2500. A bill to provide for expanded investigation and research at the experiment station at Golden, Colo.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2501. A bill for the relief of King F. Trione and Dera Trione; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THOMAS JEFFERSON ANNIVERSARY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MORSE

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator MORSE at the celebration of the two hundred and fifth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, at the Jefferson National Memorial, Washington, D. C., on April 13, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

GREEK CHILDREN AS IMMIGRANTS—ARTICLE BY SOTERIOS NICHOLSON

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Greek Children as Immigrants," written by Soterios Nicholson, of Washington, D. C., and published in the Washington Post of April 10, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

BRASS HATISM IN THE ARMY—ARTICLE BY DREW PEARSON

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Army Advised To Clean Out Brass Hatism," by Drew Pearson, from the Denver Post of April 6, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE COAL STRIKE—EDITORIAL FROM THE PROVIDENCE EVENING BULLETIN

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Politics in Coal," published in the Providence Evening Bulletin, Tuesday, April 13, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Is UMT Needed?—The Pros and Cons," by Howard C. Petersen, former Assistant Secretary of War, and Senator THOMAS of Utah, published in the New York Times of April 4, which appears in the Appendix.]

INVITATION TO MEMBERS OF THE SENATE TO VISIT EXHIBITION AT NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to an invitation from the National Gallery of Art to view, this afternoon at 5:15, the works of art recovered in Germany during the war. The gallery is being kept open for the benefit of Senators, their wives, and principal secretaries.

As Senators know, large crowds have been in attendance since the exhibition opened, and it has been exceedingly difficult to see the pictures. I am informed that 67,000 persons went through the museum on Sunday. It has not been possible to see the pictures with any degree of comfort, so I requested that the museum make the exhibition available to Members of Congress. That will be done this afternoon from 5:15 to 7.

In that connection, a bill has been introduced concerning the pictures. The bill will be considered by the Armed Services Committee tomorrow, and I expect later by the Senate. So I hope every Senator who can do so will take advantage of the opportunity to see the pictures.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I have seen the pictures, and I can tell my colleagues that they are will worth seeing.

SENATOR VANDENBERG'S ADVICE TO STALIN

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, a very fine statement has been made by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] with regard to the stand taken by Mr. Stalin with respect to the policies approved by the United States. I ask that the Senator's remarks, as recently published by Magazine Digest, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LISTEN, MR. STALIN

(By Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG)

(Now that the United States has announced its backing of the union of western Europe, we are at last committed to leadership of the countries still outside the Soviet sphere. What can the world expect from this leadership, particularly as it applies to our relations with Russia? The best statement of America's aims, we believe, is that given by Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG. As head of the decisive Senate Foreign Relations Committee, VANDENBERG is the man who determines congressional approval of our foreign policy. His advice to Stalin, therefore, is the voice of America.)

First, you should understand, with complete conviction, that we deeply respect the great Russian people and their inalienable right to rule themselves to suit themselves, precisely as we insist on this right for ourselves and others.

Second, you should understand, with complete conviction, that we are just as determined as you are that military aggression from any source, and no matter what its guise, shall never curse the earth again, and we are enlisted in this cause for keeps.

Third, you should understand, with complete conviction, that we are prepared for enlightened, progressive cooperation with every land which invites and deserves our mutual good will.

Fourth, you should understand, with equally complete conviction, that we cannot be driven, coerced, or pressured into positions which we decline voluntarily to assume; and that we will not bargain in human rights and fundamental liberties anywhere on earth.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT ENTITLED "THE STRATEGY AND TACTICS OF WORLD COMMUNISM"

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 154, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed as a House document, and that there be printed 15,000 additional copies each of the report and supplements 1 and 2 of the Subcommittee on National and International Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, entitled "The Strategy and Tactics of World Communism" for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. JENNER. I move that the Senate agree to the concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE RESEARCH

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill from the Senate (S. 2038) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, is hereby amended by adding a new section 12 reading as follows:

"SEC. 12. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to establish research laboratories, including the acquisition of necessary land, buildings, or facilities, and also the making of research contracts under the authority contained in section 10 (a) of the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935, as amended by the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, for research and study, in the United States or elsewhere, of foot-and-mouth disease and other animal diseases which in the opinion of the Secretary constitute a threat to the livestock industry of the United States: *Provided*, That no live virus of foot-and-mouth disease may be introduced for any purpose into any part of the mainland of the United States except coastal islands separated therefrom by waters navigable for deep-water navigation and which shall not be connected with the mainland by any tunnel, and except further, that in the event of outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in this country, the Secretary of Agriculture may, at his discretion, permit said virus to be brought into the United States under adequate safeguards. To carry out the provisions of this section, the Secretary is authorized to employ technical experts or scientists without regard to the Classification Act: *Provided*, That the number so employed shall not exceed five and that the maximum compensation for each shall not exceed $15,000 per annum. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as Congress may deem necessary; in addition, the Secretary is authorized to utilize, in carrying out this section, funds otherwise available for the control or eradication of such diseases."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder if the Senator would indicate what change the House made in the Senate bill.

Mr. THYE. Primarily the research laboratory will have to be located out in the open. It cannot be on any peninsula or any lands adjacent so that there would be any danger of fire.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understand the House has strengthened the amendment which the junior Senator from California submitted, and which the Senator from Minnesota accepted in the Senate, and that it has been strengthened even beyond that. Is that correct?

Mr. THYE. The junior Senator from California is correct. It has been strengthened.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to.

DECENTRALIZATION AND RECENTRALIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, for a number of years I have been seeking to stimulate decentralization of government, of industry, and of population. My efforts began quite a while before atomic energy was discovered. Atomic energy has precipitated this matter to the fore, as I see it, in a rather dramatic way. If the bomb which fell on Hiroshima had fallen on Tokyo, it would have decidedly decentralized the political establishment of Japan; it would have put out of business the legislative branch, the executive branch, and all other branches.

Mr. President, recently I inquired of the Bureau of the Budget as to experiences and costs of recentralization of agencies to Washington, D. C. Governmental agencies have been returning to Washington instead of leaving Washington.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, the text of the Bureau's letter to me, prefaced by a statement which I released on the subject of the Bureau's communication. I intend to continue my fight to secure decentralization, particularly of Government agencies from Washington. What I should like to have, Mr. President, is a committee especially delegated, consisting of Members of both Houses, who would take the subject in hand and study it, in view of the present aspect of affairs in the world today. We cannot close our eyes to what would happen if war should come. Airplanes equipped with bombs could put out of commission cities such as New York, and if they should put out of commission the oil-producing centers of this country the effect would be that we would be practically out of business so far as farming is concerned, because what we are actually doing is mechanizing our farms and dispensing with horses on the farms. That is another angle of the complete study which I have in mind.

So, Mr. President, I ask that the statement and letter to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM WISCONSIN, APRIL 11, 1948

There is reprinted below the text of a letter which I have just received from the United States Bureau of the Budget regarding the cost of recentralizing those Government agencies which have been brought back to Washington, about which I had inquired. I was particularly interested in the comments made by the Bureau's Acting Director to the effect that the President is keenly aware of the problems brought about by overcentralization in Washington, particularly, in the event of offensive warfare against our country. The Acting Director, however, went on to say that he does not regard it "within the jurisdiction of the Bureau of the Budget to take active leadership" in planning decentralization.

On March 19, Secretary of the Air Force Symington wrote to me that while the military aspects of decentralization have been separated into various segments by the Joint Chiefs of Staff for study by the military arms, he felt that "Congress is the proper agency to resolve the problem of dispersion of Government facilities in Washington, based upon recommendations made by the President." The big question is: When, if ever, will such recommendations be forthcoming? Moreover, how can the President make these recommendations, if his own control arm—the Bureau of the Budget—says that it connot take active leadership in studying this problem?

DANGERS OF OVERCENTRALIZATION

I reaffirm that I regard the overcentralization in Washington as absolutely suicidal from a military standpoint and as ruinous from an administrative standpoint, because it discourages State and local handling of problems at State and local levels. Moreover, overcentralization in all our congested cities is also ruinous from military, political, economic, and social standpoints. There is too much buck passing on this decentralization issue. Obviously, the President and the Congress must both act along this line and act fast. This means (a) that every congressional committee should begin to think in terms of encouraging decentralization of every Government department within its jurisdiction and (b) the President should submit an integrated plan for decentralization to the Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government. Our next Pearl Harbor might be in Washington, D. C. God willing, we will have the vision and the judgment to prevent that.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., April 8, 1948.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: This letter will acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 9 and confirm the telephone conversations between members of your staff and Mr. R. W. Jones of staff of the Bureau.

With respect to the recentralization program which was undertaken shortly after the surrender of Japan, almost all of the major moves either have been completed or have been scheduled. The number of activities and positions returned to Washington is considerably less than the number moved out in 1941 and 1942. Normal administrative consolidations and reorganizations accounted for the permanent location in the field of a number of minor activities removed early in the war; others were liquidated in the field; and some important activities have been permanently located away from Washington since there was no demonstrable benefit to be derived from bringing them back to the Washington area. In this latter category are several financial activities of the Navy Department, that part of the Bureau of Public Debt handling savings and war bonds, the Railroad Retirement Board, and several technical installations of the Department of the Army, including the Demobilized Records Branch and the Office of Dependency Benefits.

The Postal Accounts Division of the General Accounting Office will not return to Washington until the new General Accounting Office building has been completed. No decision has been taken as to the final location of the Bureau of Old Age and Survivors' Insurance now occupying an unsatisfactory loft building in Baltimore, Md. This is a large statistical operation which ultimately should be housed in a Federal building, but no decision has been taken as to the location of that building or as to the time for its construction.

Summary financial data with respect to recentralization costs are as follows:

Total appropriations authorized by Congress	$1,395,020
Total estimated cost to date	1,014,834
Unallotted and unobligated balance	380,186

The March 31 financial report of the Public Buildings Administration is attached. This report shows the pertinent detailed obligations by agencies.

In the Bureau's letter to you, dated June 11, 1947, the Acting Director pointed out the reason why it was deemed to be sound policy to return the agencies which had been removed from the Washington area during the war. This recentralization does not mean that the executive branch has adopted a continuing policy for heavy concentration of as much Federal activity as possible in the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C. The President is keenly aware of the difficult problems presented by the concentration of Federal activities within a small area in the event of offensive warfare against the United States. Further, while it is not within the jurisdiction of the Bureau of the Budget to take active leadership in studying both these problems and the equally difficult problems of major decentralization, we have recognized the need for such work and have attempted to keep the issues involved before the agencies best equipped to work on them.

Your staff has informed us that you are in touch with the thinking and planning of the Office of Secretary of Defense both with respect to military defense and civilian defense against atomic weapons. This work will be of great importance to the preparation of any strategic plan for decentralization of the Federal Government as a whole, for which the National Security Resources Board has more clearly defined authority than any other Federal agency. I am taking the liberty of sending to that organization copies of both exchanges of correspondence between you and this office. I am also suggesting to the Executive Secretary of the National Security Resources Board that he read and obtain for staff use your article, We Must Decentralize, published in the February 1948 issue of the Reserve Officer.

The Bureau of the Budget will facilitate background studies in any way possible, and will participate to the extent determined by the President in planning the organization and location of Government activities in the event of another war.

Very truly yours,

FRANK PACE, JR.,
Acting Director.

OPERATIONS OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, there are substantial and compelling reasons for careful and thorough scrutiny by this body of the operations of agreements under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and the effect upon American industry resulting from the manner in which that act is being administered by the State Department.

There is growing concern on the part of many industries, and the workers who find employment in those industries, that these agreements, intended to achieve reciprocal tariff concessions mutually advantageous to the countries involved, are being administered by the State Department to accomplish purposes never contemplated by Congress.

This has inflicted hardships upon American business, particularly small business and farmers, to which they should not be subjected and from which it is our duty to provide protection.

For the information of my colleagues I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in my remarks a letter from Mr. Charles E. Bohlen, counselor of the State Department, addressed to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and also a letter to me from Mr. John

Breckinridge, representing a large group of agricultural producers, commenting on this situation.

These letters are highly informative. They will serve to clarify our thinking on the important principles involved and the policies which guide the State Department in administering the reciprocal trade agreements.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 17, 1948.

The Honorable EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR MILLIKIN: I have received your letter of February 22, 1948, with which you enclosed a copy of a communication from Mr. John Breckinridge, of Pope, Ballard and Loos, Washington, D. C., representatives of the American producers of fluorspar, relating to forthcoming negotiations with Mexico for the revision of schedule I of the existing trade agreement with that country. I may add that Mr. Breckinridge has provided the Department with a copy of the letter on the same subject which he addressed to you on February 24.

In his letters, Mr. Breckinridge referred to the brief and supplementary briefs which his organization submitted to the Committee for Reciprocity Information on behalf of United States producers of fluorspar for consideration in connection with forthcoming negotiations with Mexico for a revision of schedule I of the existing agreement. Schedule I relates to the customs treatment accorded United States products upon importation into Mexico. He implied that his organization would be denied the right to appear at the public hearings before the committee in view of the fact that fluorspar is a product imported from Mexico rather than a product exported to Mexico, and hence not within the scope of the negotiations. He did, however, appear on February 27.

Mr. Breckinridge has taken the position, in his letters and the briefs submitted for the fluorspar producers that the trade agreement with Mexico, signed December 23, 1942, was in effect terminated by action taken by the Mexican Government on December 20, 1947, and that this Government should, therefore, take immediate steps to withdraw the concessions granted to Mexico in the agreement, including those on fluorspar, which threaten serious injury to domestic producers.

I believe that it will be helpful to you, in your consideration of Mr. Breckinridge's letters, to know the reasons underlying the action taken by the Mexican Government, as well as that taken by this Government which led to the announcement of the forthcoming negotiations.

Several times during 1945 and 1946 the Mexican Government urged a revision of the trade agreement which would involve the adjustment of the Mexican specific duties in schedule I to restore their protective incidence (impaired by price increases) to that in effect when the agreement was signed, and which would also involve further tariff concessions by the United States. The Mexican Government hoped that such a revision would enable it to meet two acute domestic problems, namely, an imbalance in its trade with the United States resulting in the lowering of its foreign exchange reserves to admittedly inadequate levels, and strong pressure for increased protection of Mexican industries. This Government indicated reluctance to undertake this kind of negotiation and the Mexican Government made no concrete proposals until the United States had become engrossed in preparations for the Geneva negotiations and was not in a position to undertake any others.

On July 11, 1947, when its foreign exchange reserves had become dangerously low, the Mexican Government suspended entirely the import of a large number of products, including some products in schedule I of the agreement. This action was permissible, in view of the exchange situation, under article X of the agreement.

On November 13, 1947, as part of its program to remedy the situation, the Mexican Government decreed a general increase in all import duties not covered by the trade agreement to compound duties, i. e., a combination of a specific and an ad valorem duty, which would bring the element of protection to the level existing in 1942 or higher. The decree became effective on December 13. Approximately 5,000 fractions of the Mexican tariff were involved. That measure had the effect of increasing the already strong pressure for similar action with respect to products included in schedule I of the trade agreement.

The Mexican Government also invoked the escape clause of the agreement (article XI), and on December 15, 1947, after consultation with representatives of this Government, converted the specific rates on 12 fractions included in schedule I to compound duties designed to accord a greater element of protection than that accorded by the specific rates shown in the schedule when the agreement first went into effect. The rates finally announced were, it should be noted, substantially less than those desired by the Mexican Government.

During this time pressure in Mexico for a full revision of the trade agreement increased. Mass meetings were held in Mexico City denouncing the agreement as an instrument by which the United States was oppressing Mexico. It became apparent that Mexico would take unilateral action to increase its duties on schedule I items, leaving the United States no alternative but to denounce the agreement.

It was the view of this Government that any such result would have been most unfortunate for the United States. It would have lost for the United States the opportunity to check the amount by which the Mexicans would increase the rates on schedule I items and to obtain compensation for such increases by further bargaining. It would have involved the increase of United States tariff rates on schedule II items, thus adding significantly to Mexico's admittedly acute foreign exchange shortage. It would have added fuel to the flame of anti-United States feeling which was already being fanned in Mexico, making much more difficult the achievement of United States objectives at Habana and Bogota. For these reasons, the United States finally consented to the provisional conversion of the specific rates of duty on remaining schedule I items to compound duties which would provide protection approximately equivalent to that provided by the duties in the schedule when the agreement was put into effect. In return, Mexico agreed to a satisfactory basis for negotiating a revision of schedule I.

I enclose a copy of the Department's press release No. 996 of December 30, 1947, announcing the intention of this Government to negotiate, pursuant to the Trade Agreements Act, the definitive revision of schedule I. The reason why the negotiation is limited to schedule I is that under the circumstances this Government did not feel disposed to grant Mexico any further tariff concessions. This negotiation is intended to restore the balance of schedule I by revision of the new rates on schedule I items and obtaining of concessions on new items. The United States is in no way precluded from denouncing the entire agreement or revising schedule II by withdrawal of concessions should satisfactory adjustment of schedule I prove impossible. If such revision becomes necessary, the customary procedure of public hearing will be followed.

What I have said is not of course meant to imply that there would be no way in which fluorspar producers or producers of other products in schedule II could obtain relief in the event imports should, as a result of a concession, constitute a real threat of serious injury to them. Article XI of the agreement can always be invoked on the basis of proper facts.

I hope the foregoing comments will be helpful to you in your consideration of the problem referred to by Mr. Breckinridge.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. BOHLEN,
Counselor
(For the Secretary of State).

POPE BALLARD & LOOS,
Washington, D. C., April 6, 1948.

Hon. EDWARD MARTIN,
Senate Finance Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Re Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and State Department Deception Thereunder.

DEAR SENATOR MARTIN: You will recall that I have written you and other members of the Senate Finance Committee under dates of February 19, 21, and 28, 1948, concerning the 1942 trade agreement with Mexico, Mexico's termination of that agreement, the effect of such termination on American producers of fluorspar, as well as upon other American producers, and, more generally, the State Department policy of administering the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. With my letter of February 19 I enclosed a copy of our brief presented to the Committee for Reciprocity Information on Behalf of American Producers of Fluorspar. These letters, together with the fluorspar brief, all appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of March 3, 1948, at pages 2048 and 2049, and in the Appendix of the RECORD at page A1344.

The fluorspar brief together with these letters were forwarded to the State Department by Senator MILLIKIN with the request that the State Department report to him concerning its views on the matter. The State Department made its report to Senator MILLIKIN in a letter dated March 17, 1948, signed by Mr. Charles E. Bohlen, Counselor of the State Department, a copy of which is enclosed. I believe the State Department report is very significant and deserves the careful study of your committee and of every Congressman in their consideration of the President's request for a 3-year extension, as is, of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. However, complete understanding of the implications contained in the State Department report require a study of our fluorspar brief and my previous letters referred to above. I should emphasize here that the specific effect on fluorspar is relatively unimportant except as an example of the manner in which the State Department has administered the act. The important point in this whole matter is the principle involved and the policy which the State Department is admittedly following.

I believe you, and everyone, will agree that Congress originally intended, and has always intended, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to be a hard-boiled instrument of Yankee horse trading under which the United States would grant tariff concessions if, and only if, reciprocal tariff concessions or quota concessions of equivalent value to exporters of the United States were granted and kept in force by the foreign country party to any reciprocal trade agreement negotiated by the State Department. Certainly that is what the American public and Congress have been led to believe by the State Department. There is nothing in the legislative history of the act or its repeated extensions or in statements made by the State

Department that the act was intended as a political bargaining instrument under which American tariffs could be cut for purely political considerations, or that it was intended as a congressonal authorization for a unilateral tariff-cutting policy to be administered by the State Department.

You will recall that in my previous letters, referred to above, I pointed out that the State Department was following a policy, in administering the act, of unilateral tariff cutting. I endeavored to prove this statement with various examples and cited the State Department action in this Mexican case as final and conclusive proof of my statement. Events subsequent to the writing of these letters also seem to substantiate that contention. The State Department's apparent determination to proceed with putting into effect the tariff concessions tentatively made to Czechoslovakia in the Geneva Agreement even after that country has been taken over by Russia is an example.

I also stated in my letters that the State Department policy favored many of our large mass-production industries at the expense of the American farmers and American small-business men. I have subsequently written two letters to Senator HAWKES of your committee relating facts which I believe substantiate this statement. These letters appear at pages A2094 and A2095 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I have gone to some length in trying to substantiate the contention that the State Department is using the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to implement a policy of unilateral tariff cutting—a policy which was never contemplated or authorized by Congress. The State Department, of course, has attempted in the past to accomplish this policy by pacifying Congress and the public with statements that the agreements are actually reciprocal in their operation and effect.

Only recently has the State Department been so bold as to attempt such a negotiation as they are now conducting with Mexico or to publicly admit that the agreements are not actually reciprocal and that their basic considerations in negotiating an agreement with a foreign country are political rather than a businesslike reciprocal reduction of tariffs.

I believe a careful study of the enclosed State Department report to Senator MILLIKIN proves all of the contentions I have made. You will notice that the State Department does not deny any of these contentions, and that the considerations given as a basis for failure to reciprocally withdraw the American tariff concessions made to Mexico in the now terminated 1942 agreement are primarily political considerations which are not authorized or contemplated by the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

You will also note that the considerations cited by the State Department as underlying the action taken by the Mexican Government in withdrawing the concessions made to the United States in the 1942 agreement are all inconsistent with the Congressional policy and purpose of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Yet the State Department admittedly has agreed in each case and authorized Mexico to take such action.

Mexico has withdrawn all of the concessions made in the 1942 agreement and has greatly increased all duties on items of import from the United States which were not covered in the 1943 agreement. Yet the concessions made to Mexico in the 1942 agreement remain in effect. Certainly one cannot find anything reciprocal in such an arrangement which was agreed to all along the line by the State Department.

The State Department states that it hopes, in the current negotiations with Mexico, to obtain some concessions from the new and greatly increased rates of duty. Even if the State Department succeeds in accomplishing this desire, the resulting level of duties will be in excess of those existing in 1942 prior to the agreement, and there would still be no reciprocity involved in the trade relations between the United States and Mexico and certainly not in the alleged trade agreement. Certainly arrangements such as this and negotiations such as the current negotiations with Mexico were never contemplated by Congress in passing or extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

The State Department cites as considerations for its failure to withdraw concessions made to Mexico the following:

"It was the view of this Government that any such result would have been most unfortunate for the United States. It would have lost for the United States the opportunity to check the amount by which the Mexicans would increase the rates on schedule I items and to obtain compensation for such increases by further bargaining. It would have involved the increase of United States tariff rates on schedule II items thus adding significantly to Mexico's admittedly acute foreign exchange shortage. It would have added fuel to the flame of anti-United States feeling which was already being fanned in Mexico, making much more difficult the achievement of United States objectives at Habana and Bogota. For these reasons, the United States finally consented to the provisional conversion of the specific rates of duty on remaining schedule I items to compound duties which would provide protection approximately equivalent to that provided by the duties in the schedule when the agreement was put into effect." (That is to duties which were in effect prior to the 1942 agreement.)

I believe that you will agree that none of these reasons cited by the State Department involve reciprocal tariff concessions. Also, I believe you will agree that none of the reasons cited are authorized under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act as a basis for cutting United States tariffs or for leaving them at a reduced level to which they were cut under a former trade agreement which has been terminated by the foreign government involved. The reasons cited by the State Department sum up to purely political considerations which result in the unilateral reduction of United States tariffs for the purpose of furthering the objectives which the State Department has been striving for at Habana (the ITO Charter) and Bogota (perhaps a Latin-American recovery program). Incidentally, none of the objectives which the State Department is so striving for and for which they are using the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to help accomplish have been authorized by Congress. Certainly that is not reciprocal trade bargaining.

The problem boils down to this. Did Congress contemplate and does the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act authorize the President to unilaterally reduce American tariffs?

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act involves a questionable surrender by the legislative to the executive of its constitutional duty to fix American tariff rates on imports. The delegation of that power to the President should be strictly construed and carefully checked by the Congress to make certain that the executive branch does not exceed its authority or use it in a manner other than that intended by the Congress.

The considerations cited by the State Department in justification of the manner in which it has administered the act may be entirely sound and such political considerations may justify a national policy of unilaterally lowering tariffs. For example, conditions of today may, if properly presented, justify the United States in eliminating all tariffs on goods imported from Mexico and the increasing by Mexico of all tariffs on imports into that country from the United States. However, such a policy is not authorized by the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

If such a policy is justified, and I will not argue the point here, the reasons and justification for such a policy should be presented to Congress for appropriate action. If such a policy is justified, it must be authorized and implemented by some legislative act other than the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

The President should not and the Congress should not permit him to unilaterally reduce tariffs under the authority of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act which was intended only for businesslike "reciprocal" tariff reductions.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN BRECKINRIDGE.

EXTENSION OF RECLAMATION LAWS TO ARKANSAS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 299) to extend the reclamation laws to the State of Arkansas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Conor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hoey	Overton
Bridges	Holland	Reed
Buck	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Capper	Kem	Smith
Chavez	Kilgore	Stennis
Cordon	Knowland	Stewart
Downey	Langer	Taft
Dworshak	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Ecton	McCarran	Thye
Ellender	McCarthy	Tydings
Ferguson	McKellar	Vandenberg
Flanders	McMahon	Watkins
Fulbright	Malone	White
George	Martin	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Williams
Gurney	Moore	Wilson
Hatch	Morse	Young

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is absent on official State business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROLS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate resume the consideration of Senate bill 2195, Calendar No. 1093, the District of Columbia rent-control bill. When this bill was reached on the call of the calendar the other day, certain amendments were made to the committee amendment. For the information of the Senate, I wish to state that I have consulted with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and he is agreeable to laying aside the unfinished business temporarily.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 2195) to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, the pending measure would extend rent control for the District of Columbia to March 31, 1949. The bill before us differs from the present law in the following respects:

It decontrols transient hotels.

It decontrols new houses constructed after March 31, 1948.

It decontrols additional housing accommodations created by conversion, the construction of which was completed after March 31, 1948; and

It decontrols nonhousekeeping furnished accommodations in private homes where not more than two guests are cared for, and where the landlord and his immediate family reside.

The bill further grants to the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia exclusive jurisdiction to review any order of the Administrator. That authority now rests with the municipal court of the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, those comprise the changes in the present law, as approved and reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia. The present law expires on April 30, and I urge prompt passage of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 (b) of the act entitled "An act to regulate rents in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 2, 1941, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940 ed., sec. 45–1601), is hereby amended by striking out "on April 30, 1948" and inserting in lieu thereof "at the close of March 31, 1949."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of such act, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940 ed., sec. 45–1602), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(3) After April 30, 1948, the provisions of this act shall not apply to the following housing accommodations, and no maximum rent ceilings or minimum service standards shall be prescribed with respect thereto:

"(a) Any housing accommodations in hotels, which accommodations are used predominantly for transient occupancy, that is, for living quarters for nonresidents upon a short-time basis;

"(b) Any housing accommodations the construction of which was completed after March 31, 1948, or which are additional housing accommodations created by conversion after March 31, 1948;

"(c) Nonhousekeeping, furnished housing accommodations, located within a single dwelling unit not used as a rooming or boarding house, but only if (A) no more than two paying tenants, not members of the landlord's immediate family, live in such dwelling unit, and (B) the remaining portion of such dwelling unit is occupied by the landlord or his immediate family."

SEC. 3. (a) The first sentence of section 9 (a) of such act, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940 edition, sec. 45–1609), is amended to read as follows: "Within 10 days after issuance of an order of the Administrator under section 4, any party may file a petition to review such action in the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia, and shall forthwith serve a copy of such petition upon the Administrator."

(b) Section 9 (c) of such act, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940 ed., sec. 45–1609), is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia is hereby granted exclusive jurisdiction to review any order of the Administrator made pursuant to section 4 of this act. The judgment and decree of the court shall be final, subject to review as provided by law relative to other judgments of the court."

SEC. 4. All cases now pending before the statutory three-judge court of the municipal court which have not been presented to that court for decision at the time this act takes effect shall forthwith be certified by said court to the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia. Nothing herein contained shall affect the validity of any judgment or decree of the statutory court (consisting of three judges of the municipal court as heretofore provided by law) rendered subsequent to the effective date of this act in cases heretofore presented to that court and now awaiting decision.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended."

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I was not on the floor when the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] brought up the District of Columbia rent control bill this afternoon, because I was attending a hearing before the Maritime Commission with the other members of the Oregon delegation. I want the RECORD to show, however, that, as the one who objected to consideration of the District rent control bill on the call of the Unanimous Consent Calendar on Monday, I did so because I wanted time to study it. I have since studied it.

Yesterday I had a telephone conversation with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] with regard to a certain provision of the bill. He completely satisfied me that the bill provides protection to tenants at least equal to the protection given to tenants under the national bill. He further satisfied me that the District bill is likewise fair to landlords. He pointed out to me that we have had right along in the District of Columbia what has amounted to a rent control bill rather than a rent freeze, which has characterized the rent controls in so many other parts of the country. Therefore, had I been here a few moments ago when the vote was taken on the rent control bill, I should have voted for it, on the basis of the study I have made of it.

EXTENSION OF RECLAMATION LAWS TO ARKANSAS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 299) to extend the reclamation laws to the State of Arkansas.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement, we now revert to Senate bill 299.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under its previous order the Senate reverts to Senate bill 299. The pending question is on agreeing to the committee amendment at the end of the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I explained our position on the bill yesterday. I do not wish to delay longer a vote on the bill. I wish only to add this further comment:

The objections raised by the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] seem to me to be wholly irrelevant to the bill. He has raised questions of a serious nature, requiring a great deal of study. They are under study now by committees of the Congress, and it seems to be a wholly unjustifiable procedure to hold up this bill on the theory that thereby we can accomplish some purpose relating to the competency of the personnel of the Bureau of Reclamation. I hope the Senate will proceed to a vote on the bill.

I cannot imagine that there is any serious objection to the merits of the bill, that is, the extension of the authority of the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake surveys in the State of Arkansas to determine what can be done about our problems of irrigation. The Senate well understands that the Bureau cannot undertake a project on its own initiative without the agreement of the parties concerned in that State. I do not believe that there is merit in the great solicitude for the welfare of the people of Arkansas exhibited by Senators from other States, when it is strictly a local matter, in my opinion. I think the Senate ought to proceed to vote on the bill.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. As I understand the statement made by the Senator from Arkansas yesterday, one of the main things to be accomplished by the Bureau of Reclamation is the irrigation of the Grand Prairie section.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. One of the principal immediate projects which we have

in mind is to devise an economical and feasible method to bring water into the Grand Prairie area. But I believe that there are further opportunities for the use of water in the valley of the Arkansas River and the White River.

Mr. OVERTON. Irrigation will be brought about by the utilization of the waters of either the White River or the Arkansas River, will it not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. I think it would be the White River, because of the quality of the water in the White River. That is the general view.

Mr. OVERTON. Along the White River there are levees constructed by the Corps of Army Engineers, are there not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. OVERTON. What will the Bureau of Reclamation do about those levees? Will it cut through them? How are the waters of the White River to be used without cutting through the levees constructed by the Army engineers?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If I knew the answers to those questions, or if anyone in Arkansas knew the answers, we would not need this bill. One of the objectives is to investigate and find out how water can be made available to the areas which need it. From the point of view of a layman, in discussions among those who are not engineers, it is believed that the water level near Duvalls Bluff can be raised. The water would then run by gravity into the Grand Prairie area. Duvalls Bluff is higher than the Grand Prairie area, and it is a considerable distance up the river from the nearest point to the Grand Prairie area. The plan would take advantage of gravity flow. But that is purely an amateur's view as to what may be done. I do not know how the levee problem would be handled. I do not quite see why it would be necessary to cross the levee if the water is taken at Duvall's Bluff, because that is above where the levee is constructed.

Mr. OVERTON. The Army engineers have constructed a number of flood-control and irrigation dams in Arkansas, and they are also constructing other dams for that purpose, and others are authorized. Does it not occur to the Senator from Arkansas that there will be a constant conflict between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers as to what dams shall be built by the Bureau of Reclamation and what ones shall be built by the Army engineers and what shall be done by each for flood-control and irrigation?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know; but I know that in 17 States both agencies have operated, and apparently have worked in considerable harmony, and they have accomplished a great deal in those States during a period of 40 years. So I do not know why that conflict should be any different in Arkansas than it has been, let us say, in California or Utah. They have done a wonderful job there; and I do not see why it should be insuperable to have them do similar work on the rivers of Arkansas. As I said yesterday, I shall not support, and I do not intend to permit, if I can help it, abandonment or changing in any way of the program which already has been authorized for the Army engineers on those rivers.

Mr. OVERTON. The 17 States to which the Senator from Arkansas has referred are properly subject to the operations of the Bureau of Reclamation, for they are arid or semiarid States. But Arkansas is a humid State, where the Bureau of Reclamation would not be supposed to have or to exercise any authority at all. The Bureau of Reclamation was organized for the purpose of irrigating arid and semiarid lands.

The able Senator from Arkansas is in error when he says that there is no conflict in the West between the Corps of Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. There was a considerable conflict. There was what was known as the Sloan plan, which dealt with irrigation and reclamation, and there was the Pick plan, which dealt with flood control. There was a conflict, and both sides came before congressional committees in order to have their particular plans authorized. There was a very heated and a very bitter conflict, so much so that when I had the honor of being chairman of the subcommittee of the Commerce Committee which had this matter under consideration, I had that subcommittee recess the hearings until the next session, with instructions to the Bureau of Reclamation and to the Corps of Army Engineers that they had better get together and reconcile their differences, and that they could be and they should be reconciled.

The upshot of the matter was that in the end their differences were reconciled, and there was evolved from that situation the Pick-Sloan plan. Under that plan the Bureau of Reclamation has its work to do out yonder in the 16 western States, and the Army engineers have their work to do, mainly outside of the arid States, in the Missouri Basin, with respect to flood control and navigation and incidental irrigation and the generation of hydroelectric power. But the conflict was inevitable.

In the State of Arkansas or in any other humid State into which the Bureau of Reclamation is permitted to enter, there will be a conflict such as that which exists today in the Central Valley, where the conflict has paralyzed that great valley of California. I am pointing out to the Senator from Arkansas that a conflict will be inevitable. It is inescapable.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Louisiana quoted me quite correctly. I did not say I thought there would be no conflict. I said I did not think the conflict in Arkansas would be any different from the conflict which has existed in other States where both agencies have operated, and in those States great progress has been made, particularly in irrigation. When we consider the progress which has been made and the per capita income and the economic level in the States in which both agencies have operated, I think it is apparent that they compare very favorably with Arkansas and some of the other States—particularly with Arkansas.

That is the real purpose behind the pending bill. Perhaps some conflict may have contributed to that progress; I do not know. We certainly have plenty of conflict in the United States Senate, and it seems to me it is inherent in the democratic process. I am not so sure that to isolate an area and say that only one group or agency may operate there is the ultimate solution or the best solution. All I know is that both agencies have operated in those States, and eventually the two agencies have made compromises and have proceeded to accomplish a great deal in the way of irrigation.

Mr. President, the idea that Arkansas is a humid State has only recently been injected into the discussion. It is true that Arkansas has an annual rainfall which, if distributed properly and at the proper time, would be quite adequate. But it is also true that Arkansas has suffered and does suffer recurring droughts nearly every summer—at least in two out of every three summers, I think—during which from June until October there is practically no rain. That has been very damaging.

In fact, last summer, despite the fact that over the Nation there was a very good crop year, we had almost a crop failure in Arkansas, except in the delta region, comprising the strip of land along the Mississippi River. But the northern and western sections of Arkansas are classified as semiarid land, much like Oklahoma. Of course, Arkansas adjoins Oklahoma. Even in the so-called humid region of Arkansas, there must be irrigation in order to grow rice, because in the production of rice the water must be controlled.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I call attention to the Columbia River area in the States of Oregon and Washington. There the Bonneville project has been constructed by the Army engineers. That is a flood-control and power project. Then there is the Grand Coulee project, an irrigation project, which was built farther up the river by the Bureau of Reclamation. They get along very well together. There have been conflicts in the past; but as the Senator from Arkansas has said, they have been ironed out.

I invite attention to the fact that in portions of Washington and Oregon along the coast there is a humid area, and yet there is the semiarid area in the eastern sections of those States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I always thought Oregon and Washington were humid. They are noted for their fogs and rain; are they not?

Mr. WATKINS. In portions of those States such a condition prevails. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who stands near the Senator at this time, can speak best about the conditions there, of course.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Certainly those States would not be classified as arid States, in the same sense that Arizona or New Mexico are.

Mr. WATKINS. Of course not.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In Arkansas the situation is very much the same. The eastern section of Arkansas is, I would

say, humid; but the western section is arid, particularly in the summertime.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. For a long time past I have wanted the Senator from Arkansas to be a personal guest of mine in the State of Oregon, and I am going to invite him to come there during the summer, so that I may take him to both the arid and the humid regions of my State.

Of course, on the west coast of Oregon there is a very humid area, whereas the eastern part of Oregon is an arid area, similar in many respects to the great State of Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, may I interject that I was in Oregon last summer, both in the arid and the humid portions. In the humid portion, along in the summer, I was wearing a raincoat a great deal of the time, and in the other portions, of course, it was extremely dry.

Mr. MORSE. Good Oregonians never wear raincoats.

Mr. WATKINS. I was not a good Oregonian; I was merely a visitor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, one other point has been raised about bringing the reclamation service into the Mississippi Valley. I simply do not understand the significance of that contention, because there is no area recognized legally as the Mississippi Valley, so that if the service is extended into the State of Arkansas alone it naturally contaminates or commits the rest of that area. None of the other States have applied for the admission of this service. However, I have understood that Mississippi is considering a project, and that State may apply for irrigation in the area in that State.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. What about the States of Nebraska and the Dakotas? Are they not considered to be a part of the river valley of the Mississippi and the Missouri?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think they are.

Mr. WATKINS. They are all within the reclamation area.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. And they are included in the 17 irrigation States, are they not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think a State like Nebraska probably compares somewhat similarly to Arkansas as to humidity and aridity. That is, a part of it is arid and a part of it, in the eastern section, I think, is quite humid. Is it not?

Mr. WATKINS. I understand so. In the eastern part of the State they do not have reclamation projects, which they have in the western part of the State.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that is true.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to invite the Senator's attention to the fact that the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs and the subcommittee on reclamation of that committee, in fact the entire committee, which is made up of western Senators from reclamation States, voted unanimously in favor of this bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. It seems to me certainly the Senate would be impressed by the fact that this committee, made up of men who are the best qualified to speak and to know about reclamation, submitted a unanimous report on this bill.

I should like to make one further point. It is in connection with the question of conflict between the agencies, as it applies to the Grand Coulee and Bonneville projects, which have just been mentioned. It seems to me it would better be characterized as a bit of competition between the agencies, as a result of which, I would say, in Oregon particularly, two of the largest and finest and, I think, most important projects of this character in the world have been constructed, one by one agency, the other by another agency. That leads me to believe we can further a little more competition and out of it get better and greater progress in a shorter time than if either of the agencies operates alone. I do not see the logic in saying that there will be conflicts, and thereby the program will be destroyed. I think it is exactly the opposite, that where both agencies operate there may be some competition, and they will outdo one another, thereby benefiting the public, the State, and the Nation.

Mr. President, I do not want to delay the Senate any longer. I hope the Senate will proceed to vote and dispose of this bill as soon as possible.

Mr. DOWNEY obtained the floor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the Senator intend to address the Senate on the pending measure for some time? I apprehend that he does.

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator yield, so that, with the consent of the majority leader, I may ask for a brief executive session to attend to one or two matters which are quite without controversy and which require attention?

Mr. DOWNEY. I am most happy to yield for any length of time. Can the Senator give us some indication of how much time he will require?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should say 10 minutes at the outside.

Mr. DOWNEY. I shall be very happy to yield for an unlimited time.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consideration of executive business.

NOMINATIONS OF REPRESENTATIVES AND ALTERNATES TO SPECIAL SESSION OF THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reports of committees are in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations I report the nominations of persons to represent the United States at the special session of the General Assembly which meets in New York on Friday. Obviously action today is necessary. The names are recommended by the Committee on Foreign Relations. I ask for the present consideration of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the nominations.

The Chief Clerk read the nominations of Warren R. Austin, Francis B. Sayre, and Philip C. Jessup to be representatives of the United States of America, and of Dean Rusk and John C. Ross to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to be held in New York, beginning April 16, 1948.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation this day of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified immediately.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, in calling the calendar, I ask that the first item under Treaties be passed over, because it is controversial. The next two items are, I think, entirely without controversy, and I ask that they be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, of the Air Force of the United States, to be Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force, with rank of general, for the period of 4 years beginning from date of appointment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Brian S. Odem, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Texas.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that that nomination go over today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Again I ask that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President will be notified immediately.

TREATIES

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask that the two treaties which are the second and third items at the head of the Executive Calendar be considered. I am asking that Calendar No. 11, which is highly controversial, be passed over. I am asking that the next two be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

CONSULAR CONVENTION WITH THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the convention, Executive Q (80th Cong., 1st sess.), a consular convention between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines, signed at Manila on March 14, 1947, which was read the second time, as follows:

CONSULAR CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

The President of the United States of America, and the President of the Philippines, being desirous of defining the rights, privileges, exemptions and immunities of consular officers of each country in the territories of the other country, have decided to conclude a convention for that purpose and have appointed as their plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America:

His Excellency Paul V. McNutt, Ambassador of the United States of America, and

The President of the Philippines:

His Excellency Elpidio Quirino, Vice President and concurrently Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of the Philippines,

Who, having communicated to each other their respective full powers, found to be in good and due form, have agreed on the following articles:

ARTICLE I

1. The Government of each High Contracting Party shall, in respect of any consular officer duly commissioned by it to exercise consular functions in the territories of the other High Contracting Party, give written notice to the Government of such other High Contracting Party of the appointment of such consular officer and shall request that recognition be accorded to such consular officer. The Government of each High Contracting Party shall furnish free of charge the necessary exequatur of any consular officer of the other High Contracting Party who presents a regular commission signed by the Chief Executive of the appointing country and under its great seal, and shall issue to a subordinate or substitute consular officer who is duly appointed by an accepted superior consular officer or by any other competent officer of his Government, such documents as according to the laws of the respective High Contracting Parties shall be requisite for the exercise by the appointee of the consular function; provided in either case that the person applying for an exequatur or other document is found acceptable.

2. Consular officers of each High Contracting Party shall, after entering upon their duties, enjoy reciprocally in the territories of the other High Contracting Party rights, privileges, exemptions and immunities no less favorable in any respect than the rights, privileges, exemptions and immunities which are enjoyed by consular officers of the same grade of any third country and in conformity with modern international usage. As official agents, such officers shall be entitled to the high consideration of all officials, national, state, provincial or municipal, with whom they have official intercourse in the territories of the High Contracting Party which receives them. It is understood that the term "consular officers," as used in the present Convention, includes consuls general, consuls and vice consuls who are not honorary.

3. Upon the death, incapacity, or absence of a consular officer having no subordinate consular officer at his post, any secretary, chancellor or assistant, whose official character as an employee in the consulate may previously have been made known to the Government of the High Contracting Party in whose territories the consular function was exercised, may temporarily exercise the consular functions of the deceased or incapacitated or absent consular officer; and while so acting shall enjoy all the rights, privileges, exemptions and immunities that were granted to the consular officer.

4. A consular officer or a diplomatic officer of either High Contracting Party, a national of the country by which he is appointed and duly commissioned or accredited, may, in the territories of the other High Contracting Party, have the rank also of a diplomatic officer or consular officer, as the case may be, it being understood that permission for him to exercise such dual functions shall have been duly granted by the Government of the High Contracting Party in the territories of which he exercises his functions.

ARTICLE II

1. Consular officers, nationals of the High Contracting Party by which they are appointed, and not engaged in any private occupations for gain within the territories of the country in which they exercise their functions, shall be exempt from arrest in such territories except when charged with the commission of an offense designated by local legislation as a crime other than a misdemeanor and subjecting the individual guilty thereof to punishment by imprisonment. Such officers shall be exempt from military billetings, and from service of any military or naval administrative or police character whatsoever, and the exemptions provided for by this sentence shall apply equally to employees in a consulate who are nationals of the High Contracting Party by which they are employed, and not engaged in any private occupation for gain.

2. In criminal cases the attendance at court by a consular officer as witness may be demanded by the plaintiff, the defense, or the court. The demand shall be made with all possible respect for the consular dignity and the duties of the office, and when so made there shall be compliance on the part of the consular officer.

3. In civil cases, consular officers shall be subject to the jurisdiction of the courts in the territories of the High Contracting Party which receives them. When the testimony of a consular officer who is a national of the High Contracting Party which appoints him and who is not engaged in any private occupation for gain is taken in civil cases, it shall be taken orally or in writing at his residence or office and with due regard for his convenience. The officer should, however, voluntarily give his testimony at court whenever it is possible to do so without serious interference with his official duties.

4. Consular officers and employees in a consulate shall not be required to testify in criminal or civil cases, regarding acts performed by them in their official capacity.

ARTICLE III

1. The Government of each High Contracting Party shall have the right to acquire and hold, lease, and occupy land and buildings required for diplomatic or consular purposes in the territories of the other High Contracting Party, and shall have the right to erect buildings on land which is held by or on behalf of such Government in the territories of the other High Contracting Party for diplomatic or consular purposes, subject to local building regulations.

2. No tax of any kind, national, state, provincial or municipal, shall be levied in the territories of either High Contracting Party on the Government of the other High Contracting Party, or on any officer or employee of such other High Contracting Party, in respect of land or buildings acquired, leased, or occupied by such other High Contracting Party and used exclusively for the conduct of official business, except assessments levied for services or local public improvements by which the premises are benefited, provided the right of each High Contracting Party to tax the owner of property leased to the other High Contracting Party is not hereby abridged.

ARTICLE IV

Consular officers and employees in a consulate, nationals of the High Contracting Party by which they are appointed or employed, and not engaged in any private occupation for gain within the territories in which they exercise their functions, shall be exempt from all taxes, national, state, provincial and municipal, levied on their persons or property, except taxes levied on account of the possession or ownership of immovable property situated within the territories in which they exercise their functions or taxes levied on account of income derived from property of any kind situated within such territories. Consular officers and employees in a consulate, nationals of the High Contracting Party by which they are appointed or employed, shall be exempt from the payment of all taxes, national, state, provincial and municipal, on the salaries, allowances, fees or wages received by them in compensation for consular services.

ARTICLE V

1. All furniture, equipment, and supplies intended for official use in the consular offices and official consular residences of either High Contracting Party in the territories of the other High Contracting Party shall be permitted entry into such territories free of all duty.

2. Consular Officers of either High Contracting Party and members of their families and suites, including employees in a consulate and their families, shall be exempt from the payment of any duty in respect of the entry into the territories of the other High Contracting Party of their baggage and all other personal property, whether preceding or accompanying them to a consular post, either upon first arrival or upon subsequent arrivals, or imported at any time while assigned to or employed at such post.

3. It is understood, however,

(a) that the exemptions provided in paragraph 2 of this Article shall not be extended to consular officers and members of their suites, including employees in a consulate, who are not nationals of the High Contracting Party by which they are appointed or employed or who are engaged in any private occupation for gain within the territories of the other High Contracting Party;

(b) that in the case of each consignment of articles imported for the personal use of consular officers or members of their families or suites, including employees in a consulate and their families, at any time during their official residence within the territories in which they exercise their functions, a request for entry free of duty shall be made through diplomatic channels; and

(c) that nothing herein shall be construed to permit the entry into the territory of either High Contracting Party of any article the importation of which is specifically prohibited by law.

ARTICLE VI

1. Consular officers of either High Contracting Party may place over the outer door of their respective offices the arms of their country with an appropriate inscription

designating the nature of the office, and they may place the coat of arms and fly the flag of their country on automobiles employed by them in the exercise of their consular functions. Such officers may also fly the flag of their country on their offices, including those situated in the capitals of the respective countries. They may likewise fly such flag over any boat, vessel, or aircraft employed in the exercise of their consular functions.

2. The quarters where consular business is conducted, all consular correspondence in transit under official seal, and all papers, records, and correspondence comprising the consular archives shall at all times be inviolable and under no pretext shall any authorities of any character of the country in which such quarters or archives are located invade such premises or make any examination or seizure of papers or other property in such quarters or of such archives. When the consular officers are engaged in business within the territories in which they exercise their functions, the consular files and documents shall be kept in a place entirely separate from the place where private or business papers are kept. Consular offices shall not be used as places of asylum. No consular officer shall be required to produce official archives in court or to testify as to their contents.

ARTICLE VII

1. Consular officers of either High Contracting Party shall have the right, within their respective consular districts, to apply to or address the authorities, national, state, provincial, or municipal, for the purpose of protecting the nationals of the High Contracting Party by which they were appointed in the enjoyment of rights accruing by treaty or otherwise. Complaint may be made for the infraction of those rights. Failure upon the part of the proper authorities to grant redress or to accord protection shall justify interposition through the diplomatic channel, and in the absence of a diplomatic representative, a consul general or the consular officer stationed at the capital shall have the right to apply directly to the Government of the country.

2. Consular officers of either High Contracting Party shall, within their respective districts, have the right to interview, to communicate with, and to advise nationals of their country; to inquire into any incidents which have occurred affecting the interests of such nationals; and to assist such nationals in proceedings before or relations with authorities in the territories of the other High Contracting Party. Consular officers of either High Contracting Party shall be informed immediately whenever nationals of their country are under detention or arrest or in prison or are awaiting trial in their consular districts and they shall, upon notification to the appropriate authorities, be permitted without delay to visit and communicate with any such national.

3. Nationals of either High Contracting Party in the territories of the other High Contracting Party shall have the right at all times to communicate with the consular officers of their country. Communications to their consular officers from nationals of either High Contracting Party who are under detention of arrest or in prison or are awaiting trial in the territories of the other High Contracting Party shall be forwarded without delay to such consular officers by the local authorities.

ARTICLE VIII

1. Consular officers in pursuance of the laws of their respective countries shall have the right, within their respective consular districts:

(a) To take and attest the oaths, affirmations, or depositions of any occupant of a vessel of their country, or of any national of their country, or of any person having permanent residence within the territories of their country;

(b) To authenticate signatures;

(c) To draw up, attest, certify, and authenticate unilateral acts, translations, deeds, testamentary dispositions, and contracts of the nationals of the High Contracting Party by which the consular officers are appointed; and

(d) To draw up, attest, certify, and authenticate unilateral acts, deeds, contracts, testamentary dispositions and written instruments of any kind, which are intended to have application, execution, and legal effect principally in the territories of the High Contracting Party by which the consular officers are appointed.

2. Instruments and documents thus executed and copies and translations thereof, when duly authenticated by the consular officer, under his official seal, shall be received as evidence in the territories of either High Contracting Party as original documents or authenticated copies, as the case may be, and shall have the same force and effect as if drawn by or executed before a notary or other public officer duly authorized in the territories of the High Contracting Party by which the consular officer was appointed; provided, always, that such documents shall have been drawn and executed in conformity with the laws and regulations of the country where they are designed to take effect.

ARTICLE IX

1. In case of the death of a national of either High Contracting Party in the territories of the other High Contracting Party, without having in the locality of his decease any known heirs or testamentary executors by him appointed, the competent local authorities shall at once inform the nearest consular officer of the High Contracting Party of which the deceased was a national of the fact of his death, in order that necessary information may be forwarded to the persons concerned.

2. In case of the death of a national of either High Contracting Party in the territories of the other High Contracting Party, without will or testament whereby he has appointed a testamentary executor, the consular officer of the High Contracting Party of which the deceased was a national and within whose district the deceased made his home at the time of death, shall, so far as the laws of the country permit and pending the appointment of an administrator and until letters of administration have been granted, be deemed qualified to take charge of the property left by the decedent for the preservation and protection of such property. Such consular officer shall have the right to be appointed as administrator within the discretion of a court or other agency controlling the administration of estates, provided the laws governing administration of the estate so permit.

3. Whenever a consular officer accepts the office of administrator of the estate of a deceased countryman, he subjects himself in that capacity to the jurisdiction of the court or other agency making the appointment for all necessary purposes to the same extent as if he were a national of the High Contracting Party by which he has been received.

ARTICLE X

1. A consular officer of either High Contracting Party shall within his district have the right to appear personally or by authorized representative in all matters concerning the administration and distribution of the estate of a deceased person under the jurisdiction of the local authorities, for all such heirs or legatees in the estate, either minors or adults, as may be nonresidents of the country and nationals of the High Contracting Party by which the consular officer was appointed, unless such heirs or legatees have appeared, either in person or by duly authorized representatives.

2. A consular officer of either High Contracting Party shall have the right, on behalf of the nonresident nationals of the High Contracting Party by which he was appointed, to collect and receipt for their distributive shares derived from estates in process of probate or accruing under the provisions of workmen's compensation laws or other like statutes, for transmission through channels prescribed by his Government to the proper distributees, provided that the court or other agency making distribution through him may require him to furnish reasonable evidence of the remission of the funds to the distributees, it being understood that his responsibility with respect to remission of such funds shall cease when such evidence has been furnished by him to and accepted by such court or other agency.

ARTICLE XI

1. A consular officer of either High Contracting Party shall have exclusive jurisdiction over controversies arising out of the internal order of private vessels of his country and shall alone exercise jurisdiction in situations, wherever arising, between officers and crews, pertaining to the enforcement of discipline on board, provided the vessel and the persons charged with wrongdoing shall have entered the territorial waters or territories within his consular district. Consular officers shall also have jurisdiction over issues concerning the adjustment of wages of the crews and the execution of contracts relating to their wages or conditions of employment, provided the local laws so permit.

2. When acts committed on board private vessels of the country by which the consular officer has been appointed and within the territories or the territorial waters of the High Contracting Party by which he has been received, constitute crimes according to the laws of the receiving country, subjecting the persons guilty thereof to punishment by a sentence of death or of imprisonment for a period of at least one year, the consular officer shall not exercise jurisdiction except insofar as he is permitted to do so by the laws of the receiving country.

3. A consular officer shall have the right freely to invoke the assistance of the local police authorities in all matters pertaining to the maintenance of internal order on board vessels of his country within the territories or the territorial waters of the country by which he has been received, and upon such request the requisite assistance shall be given promptly.

4. A consular officer shall have the right to appear with the officers and crews of vessels of his country before the judicial authorities of the country by which he has been received for the purpose of observing proceedings or of rendering assistance as an interpreter or agent.

ARTICLE XII

1. A consular officer of either High Contracting Party shall have the right to inspect within the ports of the other High Contracting Party within his consular district, the private vessels of any flag destined to and about to clear for the ports of his country, for the sole purpose of observing the sanitary conditions and measures taken on board such vessels, in order that he may be enabled thereby to execute intelligently bills of health and other documents required by the laws of his country, and to inform his Government concerning the extent to which its sanitary regulations have been observed at ports of departure by vessels destined to its ports, with a view to facilitating entry of such vessels.

2. In exercising the right conferred upon them by this Article, consular officers shall act with all possible dispatch and without unnecessary delay.

ARTICLE XIII

1. All proceedings relative to the salvage of vessels of either High Contracting Party

wrecked upon the coasts of the other High Contracting Party shall be directed by the consular officer of the country to which the vessel belongs and within whose district the wreck may have occurred, or by some other person authorized for such purpose by the law of such country and whose identity and authority shall be made known to the local authorities by the consular officer.

2. The local authorities of the country where the wreck has occurred shall immediately inform the consular officer, or such other authorized person, of the occurrence. Pending the arrival of the consular officer or such other authorized person, the local authorities shall take all necessary measures for the protection of persons and the preservation of the wrecked property. The local authorities shall intervene only to maintain order, to protect the interests of the salvors, if the salvors do not belong to the crew of the wrecked vessel, and to ensure the execution of the arrangements which shall be made for the entry and exportation of the salvaged merchandise and equipment. It is understood that such merchandise and equipment shall not be subjected to any customs or customhouse charges unless intended for consumption in the country where the wreck has occurred.

3. When the wreck occurs within a port, there shall be observed also those arrangements which may be ordered by the local authorities with a view to avoiding any damage that might otherwise be caused thereby to the port and to other ships.

4. The intervention of the local authorities shall occasion no expense of any kind to the owners or operators of the wrecked vessels, except such expenses as may be caused by the operations of salvage and the preservation of the merchandise and equipment saved, together with expenses that would be incurred under similar circumstances by vessels of the country.

ARTICLE XIV

Honorary consuls or vice consuls of either High Contracting Party, as the case may be, shall enjoy those rights, privileges, exemptions and immunities provided for in Article I, paragraph 1, Article II, paragraph 1, Articles VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, XIII, and XIV of the present Convention, for which they have received authority in conformity with the laws of the High Contracting Party by which they are appointed; and they shall enjoy in any case all the rights, privileges, exemptions and immunities enjoyed by honorary consular officers of the same rank of any third country.

ARTICLE XV

A consular officer shall cease to discharge his functions (1) by virtue of an official communication from the Government of the High Contracting Party by which appointed addressed to the Government of the High Contracting Party by which he has been received advising that his functions have ceased, or (2) by virtue of a request from the Government of the High Contracting Party by which appointed that an exequatur be issued to a successor, or (3) by withdrawal of the exequatur granted him by the Government of the High Contracting Party in whose territory he has been discharging his duties.

ARTICLE XVI

1. The present Convention shall be ratified and the ratification thereof shall be exchanged at Manila. The Convention shall take effect in all its provisions immediately upon the exchange of ratifications and shall continue in force for the term of ten years.

2. If, six months before the expiration of the aforesaid period of ten years, the Government of neither High Contracting Party shall have given notice to the Government of the other High Contracting Party of an intention to terminate the Convention upon the expiration of the aforesaid period of ten years, the Convention shall continue in effect after the aforesaid period and until six months from the date on which the Government of either High Contracting Party shall have notified to the Government of the other High Contracting Party an intention to terminate the Convention.

In faith whereof the above-named plenipotentiaries have signed the present Convention and have affixed thereto their seals.

Done in duplicate at Manila, this fourteenth day of March in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and forty-seven and of the Independence of the Republic of the Philippines the first.

For the Government of the United States of America:

[SEAL] PAUL V. MCNUTT.

For the Government of the Republic of the Philippines:

[SEAL] E. QUIRINO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The convention is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the convention will be reported to the Senate.

The convention was reported to the Senate without amendment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, this convention is simply the standard convention with the new Republic of the Philippines, and is essential to standardize our consular relationship. It has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I know of no possible controversy in connection with it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive Q, Eightieth Congress, first session, a consular convention between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines, signed at Manila on March 14, 1947.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification is agreed to, and the convention is ratified.

FINAL ARTICLES REVISION CONVENTION, 1946 (NO. 80)

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the convention, Executive EE (80th Cong., 1st sess.), the Final Articles Revision Convention, 1946 (No. 80), adopted at the twenty-ninth session of the International Labor conference at Montreal on October 9, 1946, which was read the second time, as follows:

CONVENTION (NO. 80) FOR THE PARTIAL REVISION OF THE CONVENTIONS ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL CONFERENCE OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANISATION AT ITS FIRST TWENTY-EIGHT SESSIONS FOR THE PURPOSE OF MAKING PROVISION FOR THE FUTURE DISCHARGE OF CERTAIN CHANCERY FUNCTIONS ENTRUSTED BY THE SAID CONVENTIONS TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS AND INTRODUCING THEREIN CERTAIN FURTHER AMENDMENTS CONSEQUENTIAL UPON THE DISSOLUTION OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS AND THE AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANISATION

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation,

Having been convened at Montreal by the Governing Body of the International Labour Office, and having met in its Twenty-ninth Session on 19 September 1946, and

Having decided upon the adoption of certain proposals with regard to the partial revision of the Conventions adopted by the Conference at its first twenty-eight sessions for the purpose of making provision for the future discharge of certain chancery functions entrusted by the said Conventions to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations and introducing therein certain further amendments consequential upon the dissolution of the League of Nations and the amendment of the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation, a question which is included in the second item on the agenda of the Session, and

Considering that these proposals must take the form of an international Convention,

adopts this ninth day of October of the year one thousand nine hundred and forty-six the following Convention which may be cited as the Final Articles Revision Convention, 1946:

ARTICLE 1

1. In the texts of the Conventions adopted by the International Labor Conference in the course of its first twenty-five sessions the words "the Director-General of the International Labour Office" shall be substituted for the words "the Secretary-General of the League of Nations", the words "the Director-General" shall be substituted for the words "the Secretary-General", and the words "the International Labour Office" shall be substituted for the words "the Secretariat" in all passages where these various expressions respectively occur.

2. The registration by the Director-General of the International Labour Office of the ratifications of Conventions and amendments, acts of denunciation, and declarations provided for in the Conventions adopted by the Conference in the course of its first twenty-five sessions shall have the same force and effect for all purposes as the registration of such ratifications, acts of denunciation and declarations by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations in accordance with the terms of the original texts of the said Conventions.

3. The Director-General of the International Labour Office shall communicate to the Secretary-General of the United Nations for registration in accordance with Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations full particulars of all ratifications, acts of denunciation and declarations registered by him in accordance with the provisions of the Conventions adopted by the Conference at its first twenty-five sessions as amended by the foregoing provisions of this Article.

ARTICLE 2

1. The words "of the League of Nations" shall be deleted from the first paragraph of the Preamble of each of the Conventions adopted by the Conference in the course of its first eighteen sessions.

2. The words "in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation" shall be substituted for the words "in accordance with the provisions of Part XIII of the Treaty of Versailles and of the corresponding Parts of the other Treaties of Peace" and the variants thereof contained in the Preambles of the Conventions adopted by the Conference in the course of its first seventeen sessions.

3. The words "under the conditions set forth in the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation" shall be substituted for the words "under the conditions set forth in Part XIII of the Treaty of Versailles and the corresponding Parts of the other Treaties of Peace" or any variant thereof in all articles of the Conventions adopted by the Conference in the course of its first twenty-five sessions in which the latter words or any variant thereof occur.

4. The words "Article 22 of the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation" shall be substituted for the words "Article 408 of the Treaty of Versailles and the corresponding Articles of the other Treaties of Peace" or any variant thereof in all articles of the Conventions adopted by the Conference in the course of its first twenty-five sessions in which the latter words or any variant thereof occur.

5. The words "Article 35 of the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation" shall be substituted for the words "Article 421 of the Treaty of Versailles and the corresponding Articles of the other Treaties of Peace" in all articles of the Conventions adopted by the Conference in the course of its first twenty-five sessions in which the latter words or any variant thereof occur.

6. The word "Draft" shall be omitted from the expression "Draft Convention" in the Preambles of the Conventions adopted by the Conference in the course of its first twenty-five sessions and in all articles of the said Conventions in which the said expression occurs.

7. The title "Director-General" shall be substituted for the title "Director" in all articles of the Conventions adopted by the Conference in the course of its twenty-eighth session which refer to the Director of the International Labour Office.

8. In each of the Conventions adopted by the Conference in the course of its first seventeen sessions there shall be included in the Preamble the words "which may be cited as" together with the short title currently used by the International Labour Office for the Convention in question.

9. In each of the Conventions adopted by the Conference in the course of its first fourteen sessions all unnumbered paragraphs of articles containing more than one paragraph shall be consecutively numbered.

ARTICLE 3

Any Member of the Organisation which, after the date of the coming into force of this Convention, communicates to the Director-General of the International Labour Office its formal ratification of any Convention adopted by the Conference in the course of its first twenty-eight sessions shall be deemed to have ratified that Convention as modified by this Convention.

ARTICLE 4

Two copies of this Convention shall be authenticated by the signature of the President of the Conference and of the Director-General of the International Labour Office. Of these copies one shall be deposited in the archives of the International Labour Office and the other shall be communicated to the Secretary-General of the United Nations for registration in accordance with Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations. The Director-General shall communicate a certified copy of this Convention to each of the Members of the International Labour Organisation.

ARTICLE 5

1. The formal ratifications of this Convention shall be communicated to the Director-General of the International Labour Office.

2. The Convention shall come into force at the date on which the ratifications of two Members of the International Labour Organisation have been received by the Director-General.

3. On the coming into force of this Convention and on the subsequent receipt of further ratifications of the Convention, the Director-General of the International Labour Office shall so notify all the Members of the International Labour Organisation and the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

4. Each Member of the Organisation which ratifies this Convention thereby recognises the validity of any action taken thereunder during the interval between the first coming into force of the Convention and the date of its own ratification.

ARTICLE 6

On the first coming into force of this Convention the Director-General of the International Labour Office shall cause official texts of the Conventions adopted by the Conference in the course of its first twenty-eight sessions as modified by the provisions of this Convention to be prepared in two original copies, duly authenticated by his signature, one of which shall be deposited in the archives of the International Labour Office and one of which shall be communicated to the Secretary-General of the United Nations for registration in accordance with Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations; the Director-General shall communicate certified copies of these texts to each of the Members of the Organisation.

ARTICLE 7

Notwithstanding anything contained in any of the Conventions adopted by the Conference in the course of its first twenty-eight sessions, the ratification of this Convention by a Member shall not, *ipso jure*, involve the denunciation of any such Convention, nor shall the entry into force of this Convention close any such Convention to further ratification.

ARTICLE 8

1. Should the Conference adopt a new Convention revising this Convention in whole or in part, then, unless the new Convention otherwise provides—

(*a*) the ratification by a Member of the new revising Convention shall, *ipso jure*, involve the denunciation of this Convention if and when the new revising Convention shall have come into force;

(*b*) as from the date when the new revising Convention comes into force this Convention shall cease to be open to ratification by the Members.

2. This Convention shall in any case remain in force in its present form and content for those Members which have ratified it but have not ratified the revising Convention.

ARTICLE 9

The English and French versions of the text of this Convention are equally authoritative.

The foregoing is the authentic text of the Convention duly adopted by the General Conference of the International Labour Organisation during its Twenty-ninth Session which was held at Montreal and declared closed the ninth day of October 1946.

In faith whereof we have appended our signatures this first day of November 1946.

HUMPHREY MITCHELL,
The President of the Conference.
EDWARD PHELAN,
The Director-General of the International Labour Office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The convention is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the convention will be reported to the Senate.

The convention was reported to the Senate without amendment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the only effect of this convention is to transfer the relationship of the International Labor Organization, the ILO, from the old League of Nations to the new United Nations. There is no possible controversy, I am sure, regarding it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive EE, Eightieth Congress, first session, the Final Articles Revision Convention, 1946 (No. 80) adopted at the twenty-ninth session of the International Labor Conference at Montreal on October 9, 1946.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification is agreed to, and the convention is ratified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator from California for permitting the interruption. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to the legislative session.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXTENSION OF RECLAMATION LAWS TO ARKANSAS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 299) to extend the reclamation laws to the State of Arkansas.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I am very much in agreement with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] that the question involved is of profound importance to the entire Nation, and particularly to the States bordering on the Mississippi River. I understand that the hearing in connection with the subject took less than 1 hour. I proclaim here and now that no Senator could understand the full implication of the bill except after several days of intensive study.

Mr. President, I have profound respect for my dear friend, the distinguished junior Senator from the State of Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. He is widely experienced in irrigation and reclamation law. He has an extraordinarily brilliant intellect, and when he gives his attention to anything being said on the Senate floor or in committee, I know he is fully able to evaluate what is being said.

The committee, at the suggestion of the Bureau of Reclamation, accepted an amendment to the bill. The distinguished Senators who are urging the passage of the bill say they do not know why the amendment is offered. They do not know what it means. I understand that one of them said they were willing to abandon that amendment. When it comes to the Senate with an amendment and Senators themselves say they do not know why the amendment is there, does that sound as though there had been a sufficient consideration of the bill? I think a great deal can and should be said upon that amendment alone. That is the pending question; it is not the bill to which the Senators have been addressing themselves.

Mr. President, when the basic Reclamation Act was passed, in 1902, it was clearly understood by Congress and by the Nation that we were establishing the Reclamation Bureau as an agency to deal with irrigation in the arid West. Later the State of Texas was added,

largely for the self-same reason the other 16 States which were denominated as reclamation States were included.

The ninety-eighth meridian, I believe, divides the United States into two equal areas, half lying on the eastern side and half on the western side, and this meridian just about bisects the eastern tier of States in the reclamation area. The States in the reclamation belt on the extreme eastern side are Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, and North Dakota.

It is true that in the eastern portion of all those States are certain humid areas. I believe, however, that in nearly every one of them the greater portion of the land in the eastern tier is what is called arid land requiring irrigation for the successful raising of crops.

I wish to call to the attention of the distinguished junior Senator from Utah the fact that lying just east of that tier of States, the eastern tier in the reclamation area, lie, from south to north, Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri, Iowa, and Minnesota. The problem of irrigation in that tier of States is almost nonexistent.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does not the Senator know that probably the most extensive irrigation systems in the world are in such countries as the East Indies, Java, Burma, and Siam, where the rainfall is much greater than it is in Arkansas? The Senator is entirely in error in saying that because an area is humid irrigation systems are not needed. If rice is produced, the control of the water is what is important in the irrigation. The Senator certainly would not say Java and Indochina are in an arid area. Yet that is where the oldest and I dare say the most extensive irrigation systems exist today.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I reiterate my remark that in this humid area in our country the problem of irrigation is inconsequential and almost negligible, as is revealed in the reports from the State of Arkansas, the Federal Government, and almost every Federal agency. As a matter of fact, the Senator himself, in setting forth the needs of the Reclamation Bureau in the State of Arkansas, mentioned only the need of two or three hundred thousand acre-feet for a supplemental supply on about 600,000 acres, a negligible and small item of irrigation, such as we in the arid West installed without a dollar of assistance, or the assistance of any Federal agency.

Again I repeat, the records of the State of Arkansas, which the Senator himself has in his possession, show that the need for proper drainage in Arkansas, on an acreage basis, is many, many times greater than the need for irrigation. As a matter of fact, in the humid East there are 86,000,000 acres of land now under drainage and requiring drainage. That is more than four times as much as all the irrigation to be found in the entire United States, and the needs of Arkansas for drainage so far surpass the need for irrigation that there is no comparison. As a matter of fact—and I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Arkansas to this—the reports of the State of Arkansas from which the Senator read show there are now 4,000,000 acres of land in Arkansas in need of the application of drainage methods.

The State of Minnesota, the northernmost State in the tier bordering the Mississippi River, is the greatest State in the Union in drainage area. Iowa is next. As a matter of fact, in the States bordering the Mississippi in the same class with Arkansas, namely, Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri, Iowa, and Minnesota, there is need for drainage over more land than is encompassed in all the land irrigated in the Western States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It seems to me to be a complete nonsequitur to argue that because we need drainage, therefore we do not need irrigation. We need both. I merely used the illustration of the Grand Prairie as one example of the immediate need for irrigation. I said there were 640,000 acres in that one area devoted to the raising of rice. But, in addition, I think there are great possibilities in the valleys of the Arkansas and White Rivers which have never been explored. There are no reports on that subject. It is granted that there are no reports on the need for irrigation, because there is no agency authorized to study it. The only study that has been made is the one I read regarding the rice area, which was conducted by the University of Arkansas Experiment Station. There is one experiment station devoted to rice culture, and it carried on the investigation; but there are no figures available. The estimates are merely based on common observation of the conditions, which leads the layman to believe that great benefit could come from the introduction of irrigation. That is why we do not have the figures as to what can be done. One of the principal objectives of the bill is to afford information, and if after a survey it should be revealed that irrigation was not needed, or that there was no call for it, that would be the end of the matter. The Bureau would not have to proceed, under the bill.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Arkansas that before he states that my observations constitute a nonsequitur he give me a chance to reach my conclusion.

There is absolutely no doubt, from the reports of the State of Arkansas and the reports of every other State, together with the reports of the Bureau of Reclamation and the reports of the Army engineers, that the problem of drainage in the humid East far transcends the problem of irrigation in the arid West, and profoundly transcends the negligible amount of irrigation required in the humid East. I know that in certain isolated areas, because rainfall is slight in the summer, even in the humid sections, the average rainfall being about 25 inches a year, irrigation is needed, and I dare say that is true in this rather small area in Arkansas, as we judge it, where rice is cultivated.

What I wish to point out to the distinguished Senator is that by the pending bill we are asked to extend the power of the Bureau of Reclamation into the humid area, and moreover, into the area bordering the Mississippi River.

If Congress believes it advisable to place Arkansas under the reclamation law, by a far greater reason every other State on the western boundary of the Mississippi should be placed under it. Why do I say by a far greater reason? Because I say to the distinguished Senator that we cannot coordinate the operations and the processes of flood control, drainage, and irrigation on interstate streams through an agency which has authority and dominion only in one State.

The distinguished Senator from Utah already emphasized that in stating to the Senate that it was the Federal power operating through the Bureau of Reclamation which had helped to work out the problems in the Colorado River Basin.

We cannot hope, Mr. President, to set up a governmental agency in one State, which is on a great river like the Mississippi, and which has tributaries in neighboring States not under the same sovereign dominion, and cooperate and integrate the operations. It cannot be done, in my opinion.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I invite the attention of the Senator to the Columbia River, one branch of which heads in Canada, while another branch has its source in Idaho and Wyoming. That branch runs through parts of Idaho, Washington, and Oregon. Yet we have the Bonneville project built by the Army engineers and operated by them on that stream, and we also have the Grand Coulee operated by the Bureau of Reclamation. There we have two different groups, two governmental agencies, operating in peace. I think they are at peace, because I am a member of the Public Works Committee of the Senate, which has to do with the operation of the Army engineers, and I have not heard of any friction whatsoever between the group and the Bureau of Reclamation. I am also a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs which handles reclamation. In that committee I have not heard of any conflict between the two groups. The Columbia is an interstate stream, and it presents the very problem the Senator poses. Can the Senator point out to me that the two services are not operating successfully in that connection?

Mr. DOWNEY. I point out to the Senator from Utah that he has been guilty of the very kind of statement that the Senator from Arkansas says I am guilty of—a statement which is a non sequitur. I do not say that if the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation are jointly given authority in all these places along the Mississippi that in good will and tolerance and fair dealing on both sides the problems could not be jointly worked out. What I say to the Senate is that one of those agencies could not be isolated to operate in one State when

common water rights between States exist, and work out the problem successfully. On the Columbia River, on the Snake River, on the tributaries of the Columbia, both agencies have authority in several of the States of the Union. We are now dealing with a situation which the Senator says can be successfully coped with only by allowing the operations of the Bureau of Reclamation in one State.

I might say to the distinguished Senator that I certainly believe that given good will and tolerance, such as the distinguished Senator has, and loyalty to the American Government, the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation ought to be able to work together. As a matter of fact, in the State of California I have found there a disposition on the part of the Army engineers to be tolerant and fair. I have found there an inclination on the part of the Bureau of Reclamation to be dictatorial and unfair and aggressive. What I say to the distinguished Senator is that we cannot hope to have the Bureau of Reclamation work out these problems of drainage and irrigation in a State which is a part of a great water system if it has jurisdiction there alone.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator further?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes, certainly.

Mr. WATKINS. Do not the Army engineers perform work in Arkansas as well as in the other States?

Mr. DOWNEY. The Army engineers have authority over the whole area on the Mississippi for river and harbor protection and flood control.

Mr. WATKINS. But they are still working with the Bureau of Reclamation in many of the States of the Mississippi River Basin. The Dakotas and Nebraska are within the basin. Both the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation are working on dams on the same streams.

Mr. DOWNEY. I may say, Mr. President, that I think already considerable friction and difficulty has developed in the Missouri River Basin, which has been reflected in the Senate and in the other House. I do not believe the issue of how the Missouri Basin is going to be handled has yet been worked out. I will say that in my opinion it is a very critical question now pending here.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator that I believe a totally different condition exists in the latter case. We have this tier of States, five or six States, bordering the Mississippi River on its western boundary. Arkansas is located about in the middle of them. There is not only the Mississippi as a common basin, but there are other streams flowing in and out of the State of Arkansas. I am trying to speak objectively and scientifically. I do not see how the Bureau of Reclamation could carry out the integrated operations which would be required in the State of Arkansas if it were restricted to that State. I might say to the distinguished Senator from Utah that what I think would rapidly follow is that just so soon as it would be discovered that the Bureau of Reclamation could not successfully work in the one State alone, the effort would be made to expand the work of the Bureau at least to the States bordering the Mississippi, and perhaps an attempt would be made to cross the Mississippi to take in the tier of States on the eastern bank of the Mississippi River.

Mr. President, if I were to support the pending bill offered by the Senator from Arkansas which is applicable only to his own State, I should think that I was binding myself as a matter of policy to apply the same law to the tier of States with common water rights and common conditions.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California again yield for a question?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. What about the State of Colorado, one of whose streams runs into one of the States the Senator is talking about, and then into the Missouri and the Mississippi? The State of Colorado is within the reclamation tier. Yet streams run from the Rocky Mountains out of that State into other States. Identically the same problem exists there that exists in Arkansas.

Mr. DOWNEY. No, Mr. President, I cannot see that the same problem exists at all. Let me say that as a young attorney I saw decades of legislative strife between the State of Colorado and the State of Wyoming, and between the State of Nebraska and the State of Wyoming, and between the State of Colorado and the State of Arkansas, and other States. We have seen irrigation delayed for decades because of the strife over questions of that kind.

Mr. WATKINS. Is it not true, as a matter of fact, that there would be such strife anyway, whether or not the Reclamation Bureau was involved in the matter? Is it not a fact that in the West a fight can be started over water quicker than over any other subject?

Mr. DOWNEY. If the Senator will permit me to interrogate him, let me ask: In the hearing on this bill were the common waterways examined into by States? Was the problem of multipurpose projects examined in connection with the whole question? I may say to the distinguished Senator from Utah that if he is now of the opinion, without further investigation, that the Bureau of Reclamation is the proper agency to take up the problem of drainage in the United States, in the humid East, then he is assuming a natural position. Perhaps that is the best thing to do. But let me point out that under the reclamation law drainage is only legally possible for the Bureau of Reclamation when it is incidental to irrigation. There is nothing in the basic reclamation law giving the Bureau of Reclamation the power to engage in drainage enterprises. If drainage is necessary for irrigation, then that incidental power is conferred upon the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I should like to give the Senator from Utah an illustration, and he can reply and comment upon it. Louisiana, as we all know, lies immediately south of Arkansas. Some of the streams that flow through Arkansas flow down through Louisiana. There are the Red River, the Ouachita River, and other streams. On the eastern side of Louisiana, bordering on the Mississippi River, there are three streams which have their origin in the State of Arkansas. There is the Bayou Macon, the Boeuf River, and the Tensas River. The three flow out of Arkansas right down along the eastern border of Louisiana. Both in Arkansas and in Louisiana they flow through swampy regions which, very largely, had to be drained. They required drainage very badly. What was done was that the Congress of the United States authorized the Corps of Army Engineers to proceed with an interstate development along drainage lines. If that had not been done, if the activities of the Army engineers had been confined to the State of Louisiana, there would not have been any coordination of effort, there would not have been any coordination of a program between the Arkansas swamp area and the Louisiana swamp area, and the result would have been possibly a futile undertaking. I mention that because it illustrates the very point the able Senator from California is making.

Mr. DOWNEY. I appreciate that contribution to the discussion.

I now yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I wish to point out in connection with this discussion that the Bureau of Reclamation does not undertake any drainage except in connection with irrigation. That has been true in all the Western States. Yesterday I called attention to projects in my own State, in which the Bureau of Reclamation is planning drainage of some lands. It takes water from those lands and pumps it into another section, which needs water and makes use of it. That is done repeatedly in connection with reclamation projects.

I called attention to the Klamath, Oreg., project, where a lake was drained and land was reclaimed. That is one of the finest farming sections in Oregon.

Mr. DOWNEY. It is principally in California.

Mr. WATKINS. Perhaps it is. I understood that there was an argument between California and Oregon over this very lake, and this very water.

Mr. DOWNEY. The boundaries of the State of California take in practically all the area.

Mr. WATKINS. When we get down to the State of Arkansas, as I understand the situation—I have not been there, and I am relying upon the statements of witnesses before the committee—one part of that State is arid, or at least semiarid. It requires irrigation to reclaim much of the land.

As the Senator knows, in many States of the West on interstate streams we have what we call application of water to a beneficial use and to a consumptive use. As I understand, the problem in Louisiana and other States immediately adjoining Arkansas is to get rid of water. If water is put to irrigation use in Arkansas, a great deal of the water will be consumed, and there will not be so much drainage. I know from experience that

in its operations the Bureau of Reclamation takes in a particular project only when it has a contract with those who are to receive the benefits. There must be a contract to repay the money which is expended in the construction of the project. So in the State of Arkansas the Bureau of Reclamation could operate exactly as it operates in Utah, Arizona, California, or any of the other Western States. Many States have interstate streams, and the problem in Arkansas is no more complicated than it is in other States.

In my own State the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation are working hand in hand on many of our streams. When they look into a stream and see irrigation possibilities, if floods can be stayed by the work of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau is given that project. There is no lack of harmony. Sometimes there is a little friendly competition; but since the settlement of the upper Mississippi Basin fight over the Pick-Sloan plan, I think there has been a great deal of harmony between those organizations. They are working side by side, as I have said, on the upper waters of the Missouri and the Mississippi.

The committee, after looking into this question, felt that the situation in Arkansas was comparable to that in other States where there are interstate streams. There would be no conflict. The problem could be solved under the reclamation law, and the Army engineers could continue with their work, which is largely flood control.

I am surprised to find that the Army engineers have gone into the drainage business. That is a little departure from what we are discussing, but I am wondering if those whose lands are drained are required to pay the cost of the drainage.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not see why the Senator is surprised, because we enacted the law which placed the Corps of Army Engineers in the drainage business. It was passed unanimously.

Mr. WATKINS. Was that law enacted recently?

Mr. OVERTON. It was enacted in 1945.

Mr. WATKINS. I was not here at the time. It may have escaped my attention.

Mr. DOWNEY. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana has probably a more profound knowledge of this particular subject than has any other Member of the Senate, or perhaps any other Member of Congress. He will bear me out when I say that drainage is an essential part of flood control, and generally an accompanying part. The streams must be straightened, and the flow must be taken care of. When the drainage problem is taken care of, very often the flood control problem is solved. Is not that true?

Mr. OVERTON. That is largely true. The authority of the Corps of Army Engineers is to construct major drainage in various areas throughout the United States. That work relates largely to the major streams, such as the Bayou Teche, the Bayou Macon, and the Bayou Rapides. We now have a project in Louisiana which extends from Bayou Rapides, near Alexandria, my home city, to the southwest. Its waters finally debouch into the Gulf of Mexico.

The Corps of Army Engineers does not undertake to construct drainage ditches to help the individual farmer, or to help a group of farmers. It takes care of the major streams, and then local citizens and local communities construct their drainage inlets into the major streams.

Let me illustrate how beneficial that program is. In Louisiana we are improving certain streams for drainage purposes through the Corps of Army Engineers. The Department of Public Works of the State of Louisiana, in cooperation with the local communities, have made extensive surveys. As a result of those surveys the local communities are going to build the drainage ditches at their own expense. The Federal Government has nothing at all to do with it. We bear the expense of drainage ditches leading into the major streams. All the Federal Government does is to develop the major streams to take care of the water to be borne by them and conduct it into the Mississippi or into the Gulf. We have issued millions of dollars worth of bonds for that purpose, and the work is going along satisfactorily.

Lands are being rapidly developed. The people of Louisiana are satisfied with the program. They are not calling upon the Federal Government to come in and build their drainage ditches for them. They are undertaking to do that work for themselves. It is a local obligation, and it ought to be met locally, leaving the Federal Government to take care of the major work.

The same thing would be true of irrigation in humid States. When the Corps of Engineers improves a stream, more water flows down it. The drainage land which we are putting into operation in Louisiana throws more water into the smaller streams, with the result that when those streams reach lands which need irrigation, the local people can take that water and convert it into an irrigation system. That is done in the rice-producing area of Louisiana. We do not run to the Federal Government, and I hope to God we never shall. We do not invite the Bureau of Reclamation into Louisiana in order that, at the expense of all the people of the United States, we can have irrigation ditches through Louisiana. We do not propose to follow that plan. We propose to nip this plan in the bud if we possibly can. This is the entering wedge.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to make an observation in connection with the very eloquent description which the Senator from Louisiana has given of the drainage system in Louisiana, and the independence and willingness of the people of Louisiana, after the main drain is dug and put in place at the expense of all the taxpayers of the United States, to cut their ditches down to it and drain into it. If the United States will provide the main canals to furnish irrigation water, farmers in the West will do exactly the same thing. They will build their own laterals onto the land. That process is just the reverse of what is done in Louisiana. In Louisiana ditches are dug to drain the water off. We cut ditches from the main stream furnished by the Bureau of Reclamation—which, by the way, we have to pay for, unlike the situation in Louisiana. We make our own laterals from that system out over our lands. In every reclamation system of which I know the laterals are cut by the farmers and paid for by them.

The process of irrigation is practically the reverse of what is done in drainage, since we put the water on the land instead of taking it off. In addition, we pay for the main stream to bring the water into the laterals. As I understand, the cost of flood control is borne by all the people of the United States, including the people of the arid West, and none of the cost is returned by the people in other States who receive the benefit of it. That is the difference between drainage, as operated by the Army engineers, and reclamation, as operated by the Bureau of Reclamation. In one case the United States gets a return of its capital. In the other case it never does, except through improved farms, greater income, and more taxes. Of course, that principle operates in the reclamation States, as well.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this time?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I am rather surprised that any Senator from the West should undertake to represent me as a foe to irrigation in the arid and semi-arid States. If the junior Senator from Utah remains in the Senate for 20 years, he will not have done half as much work as I have done in order to obtain irrigation for the West. I had a fight on my hands, as every Senator knows. I fought day in and day out, and I used all the diplomacy and all the arguments I could, not only to convince the Congress but also to bring the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Army Engineers into harmony in the great Missouri Basin. That was done.

The problems are entirely different. I certainly am in favor of irrigation in the West, and I am not objecting to the law which places irrigation projects in the arid West. But irrigation projects cannot be brought from the arid Western States into the humid States. I am quite willing to have Senators from the Western States work out the irrigation problems in the Western States; but for God's sake do not attempt to bring them into the Mississippi Valley.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, let me say that all of us are very familiar with the great work the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has done for irrigation work in the West. He has dealt with us patiently, intelligently, and justly, although our demands upon the Government were totally different from any which exist in his area.

I may say to the Senator from Utah that in trying to decide any of the various

issues, we reach very complicated matters, such as the ones we are discussing. I am merely suggesting that when we embark upon a new program of allowing the Bureau of Reclamation to go into the humid States along the Mississippi River, where the problems of irrigation, flood control, and drainage are inextricably interwoven, both within the individual States and between the States, every State, including the State of Minnesota, at the very northern boundary—the State which stands first in the United States in its drainage operations—is entitled to be heard and to know what is happening. We cannot introduce the Bureau of Reclamation into the State of Arkansas without ultimately affecting Mississippi, Oklahoma, Louisiana, and every other State which borders on the Mississippi River.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I intended no reflection upon the Senator from Louisiana, who I know has been a good friend to reclamation. I was trying to point out the difference between drainage and irrigation. One is the reverse of the other. I was only replying to the Senator's statements about letting them stand on their own feet and be willing to do this themselves.

We have had almost exactly the same problem with our laterals from the irrigation canals and reservoirs, as the Senator from California well knows. The farmers themselves take care of the laterals.

I do not intend to reflect upon what the Senator from Louisiana has done. We appreciate it. We are glad to have friends in various parts of the United States, so that these projects can be built.

It is only with the idea of being unselfish about the matter that we are willing to extend the same privilege to the State of Arkansas, which is partly humid and partly semiarid. As a matter of fact, from the standpoint of the well-being of the Western States which need these vast reclamation projects, it probably would be better if we did not take in any other States for the reclamation service, for to leave them out would result in having more funds available to our States for these purposes. But it did not seem entirely fair that, having enjoyed this program, we should deny the same opportunity to States on the borders of such regions, States in which the land is partly arid and partly humid.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Utah for his statement. I had misunderstood him. I thought he was rather critical of my attitude.

Mr. President, if this matter concerned Arkansas only, I should say let it go. But it does not concern Arkansas alone; it concerns Louisiana, Missouri, and all the other States of the Mississippi Valley and all the humid States in the United States of America.

The Senator from Utah has said that Arkansas wants the reclamation laws extended to it. I take issue with him on that proposition. There are certain boards which do take a direct and important interest in water and water uses and water control in the State of Arkansas, as is the case in all the other States in the lower Mississippi River Valley. They are the levee boards of Arkansas. The levee boards of Arkansas and their membership are against the enactment of this bill. If the junior Senator from Arkansas were in the Chamber at this time, I am sure he would corroborate my statement in that respect.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I assume that the distinguished Senator from Utah has read the letter from Secretary Krug reporting on the bill which now is before the Senate. Among many rather peculiar facts concerning the reporting of the bill from the committee is a statement in the letter that the bill has never been submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, and it is not known whether it is in conformity with the national plan or national policy as accepted by the President of the United States. I cannot concede that this is a minor measure, introducing, as it does for the first time, the Reclamation Bureau into the Missouri River area. I believe that this measure should have careful consideration by the Presidential advisers and by the Bureau of the Budget and by the Army engineers and by the various Senators and Representatives who come from States which, with Arkansas, are in the Mississippi River Basin.

I also wish to call to the Senator's attention a statement which I am about to read from Mr. Krug's letter. The Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Utah are undoubtedly sincere in believing that all that is sought by means of the pending measure is merely power for the Bureau of Reclamation to bring into being an irrigation project involving the rather inconsequential amount of 200,000 or 300,000 acre-feet of water to meet conditions peculiar to Arkansas, and not to attempt to embark upon a grandiose scheme of power generation and reclamation and flood control and erosion control. But let us read Mr. Krug's letter, to see what is the ambition of the Bureau of Reclamation, advanced under the guise of this bill.

I read now from page 4 of the committee report:

> Floods have resulted in heavy loss of life and great property damage in Arkansas.

Mr. President, note the covert insinuation in the next sentence that the Bureau of Reclamation might do a better job in flood control than the Army engineers are doing, a claim which is now being vociferously made, at a cost to the Government of millions of dollars annually, by representatives of the Reclamation Bureau.

I return now to the report, and I shall read the next sentence:

> Although much has been accomplished through recent protective works, the State is still subject to major losses from this cause. Many multipurpose projects constructed in the 17 Western States by the Bureau of Reclamation include provision for flood control.

Mr. President, is not that a clear indication of the mind of the Secretary of the Interior that by means of the enactment of this proposed legislation he will be given power to embark upon multipurpose projects, involving flood control and undoubtedly involving attempts to oust the Army engineers from the jurisdiction given to them by Congress?

I continue to read from the report:

> The Bureau also cooperates with the Corps of Engineers, War Department, in the development of flood control and irrigation in the West. It is desirable that this same cooperation be extended into Arkansas and that, where it is feasible to do so, the flood-control dams built by the corps of engineers be made to serve the purposes of irrigation, power, and fish and wildlife development as well.

The Senator from Utah has endeavored to corroborate his statement that the Bureau of Reclamation might successfully work in one State alone by the fact that the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation are engaged in work upon interstate streams. I now ask the distinguished Senator, does he think the Bureau of Reclamation could successfully perform its duties on the Colorado River, if its power were limited to the State of Nevada alone, Arizona alone, Utah alone, or Colorado alone? The distinguished Senator would of course be the first to say, "No, the Bureau of Reclamation must have power along that whole stream to successfully carry out the duties prescribed for it by law."

By the selfsame reasoning the Bureau of Reclamation could not cooperate in dealing with multipurpose dams, with interstate streams, or with power projects distributing power from one State to many States, if its jurisdiction were limited to a single State in the Mississippi River Basin alone.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator asked whether the Bureau could operate under those circumstances. I should say yes. The history of the Bureau of Reclamation has been that, back in the early times, it operated in Colorado before it had built projects in some of the other States of the Colorado River Basin.

As the Senator knows, in the arid States the water itself is owned by the people of each State. The water itself does not belong to anyone else except the people of each State. That is the theory upon which our western irrigation laws are based. Projects were built, for instance, in Utah, partly on a tributary of the Colorado River. The Strawberry project was built without any reference to what was going on down the river. It was taken care of and built by the Bureau. It would not have interfered in the slightest with any other operation if the Bureau had not been in Arizona or in the State of California. We even operate the Colorado River in a country that is not within our jurisdiction. I refer to Mexico, into which the Colorado River drains; a part of it runs through Mexico, and yet the Bureau of Reclamation is not there. We still operate the stream; we still go on building. That is a much more difficult situation than the one mentioned by the Senator.

In the case of the semihumid States, such as Arkansas, there is no question as

to who would get the water. They want to get rid of it. That is the big problem, except in the western section, which is the humid, arid, or semiarid portion of Arkansas. There is not the same problem in that area that we have in the Western States, where each State and each community is fighting to get all the water it can. The situation is just the reverse in Louisiana and certain other places, where the problem is to get rid of water. It is a matter of drainage, of getting the water into the ocean. Ordinarily I see no difficulty whatever in the Bureau's operating there, any more than in connection with the operation of the Colorado River, which flows into Mexico, an area, of course, which is not under the Bureau of Reclamation. I sometimes wish it were, but unfortunately it is not.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I must admit to rather severe surprise at the last remarks of the distinguished Senator, my friend from Utah. He and I, I take it, are both well aware of the history of the Colorado River and of the endless conflicts and difficulties which have arisen in connection with it. I am sure he knows that before the compact between the different States under which rights on the river as a whole were settled, and before the Bureau of Reclamation was given power to build the great Boulder Dam, the advancement and progress on the Colorado River were strictly limited, and the waste was enormous. As a matter of fact, if one were now to take the Bureau of Reclamation out of the Colorado River Basin and not substitute there some other governmental agency that could operate the basin as a whole, I think almost revolution and civil war would develop. Due to the tremendous torrential floods on the Colorado River within 2 or 3 months and a drought the rest of the time, conditions were such that the agricultural lands of all the States along the boundaries were about to be destroyed; and we found it necessary to build the great Shasta Dam and other dams. I do not know any way that could have been accomplished except through the governmental agency that had power in Nevada and Arizona, between which the great dam rests, over the upper basin States from which water comes, and from the lower basin States in which the earliest rights in large amount were established.

Mr. WATKINS. I point out to the Senator that he mentioned Shasta Dam. Is he not talking about the Sacramento?

Mr. DOWNEY. I beg the Senator's pardon. I did mean to say the Boulder Dam, but I should have said the Hoover Dam.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator said the Shasta Dam. I wondered whether he was taking us up on the Sacramento now.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am very glad the Senator corrected me. I meant to say the Boulder Dam, but I should have said the Hoover Dam, because now under the control and directions of our beloved Republican majority, that is the name of our great western dam.

Mr. President, we are presently engaged in considering an amendment to the bill. I can hazard two or three reasons why the peculiar language is placed in the amendment, though I have no certainty that my intellectual processes fully understand the purposes of the Bureau of Reclamation in recommending the amendment. I have sought for counsel and guidance from my good friend from Utah, and he, himself, apparently is unable to advise me, and the distinguished Senator from Arkansas does not know the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, may I interrupt for a moment, with the Senator's permission?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I have been studying the bill since the discussion began, and I am quite sure that the amendment was necessary in order to permit a successful operation of the reclamation projects. I think it is more or less a technical amendment to bring the whole matter under the Bureau of Reclamation. Any project it constructs will have to be under the direction of that Bureau and under its operation alone. At first I had the impression that the provision in the first part of the bill would be sufficient; that is, the provision which reads:

> That the provisions of the act entitled "An act appropriating the receipts from the sale and disposal of public lands in certain States and Territories to the construction of irrigation works for the reclamation of arid lands," approved June 17, 1902, as amended and supplemented, are hereby extended so as to include and apply to the State of Arkansas.

I thought probably that would be sufficient to bring Arkansas under all the provisions of the reclamation law.

I think the amendment was added for technical reasons. If we are to permit the Bureau of Reclamation to operate in the State of Arkansas, then the projects which it constructs, and projects incidental to them, should be under the control of the Bureau, just as is the case in California, Utah, or any of the other States in which there are projects which are incidental to irrigation projects. That is all the amendment means. I do not think there is anything sinister about it. I am quite sure there is not.

Mr. DOWNEY. The Senator may be entirely correct in that statement. I must admit that I cannot understand the meaning of the amendment, unless it has some ulterior purpose. The amendment would seem to do nothing more than to declare that the Federal reclamation laws shall be applicable to the situation in Arkansas. That has already been stated in the bill. The amendment reads as follows:

> *Provided*, That the generation by, and the disposal and marketing of electric energy and power from, any Federal reclamation project in the State of Arkansas shall be administered by the Bureau of Reclamation through, and in accordance with, the Federal reclamation laws.

Assuming that the amendment adds nothing to the present powers of the Bureau of Reclamation, the bill would have the same effect as if the amendment were not added. I think we still have a problem which will require a great deal of attention.

I might say to the junior Senator from Arkansas that I read from the report of Mr. Krug in which he shows that his group anticipates, through this bill, if it shall be enacted into law, entering into multipurpose projects, including flood control, the protection of wildlife, the advancement of recreational facilities, and other activities. I, for one, cannot see how the Bureau could participate in those multipurpose projects, including the generation of power, without necessarily being involved in the transmission of power from one State to another, and the integration of the operations. I am not entirely familiar with the governmental agency which has been established in that area, but I think it is the Southwestern Power Administration. I should think, if the Bureau of Reclamation intends to construct power projects, it probably should be tied in to the same power facilities and operated in the same way as are other power facilities under governmental control. But the amendment apparently, unless it should subsequently be repealed, would preclude the Bureau of Reclamation dealing with any such proposal. Whether it would compel the retailing of power by the Bureau of Reclamation I do not know. I do not know why the amendment is included. I would have thought that if the present powers of the Bureau of Reclamation were maintained, that would have been sufficient.

Again, in view of the very slight consideration of the bill, involving, as it does, vast consequences to the Mississippi Basin, I think there ought to be a further hearing on the amendment so that at least someone can state positively who suggested it, why it is included, why it is necessary, and whether the Bureau of Reclamation in Arkansas would be able to handle all its own power without integration of all the other power units in that State. Frankly, I cannot conceive that the committee has given the subject proper attention. The report of the committee is comprised almost wholly of a statement by Mr. Krug, no reference having been made to the President or to the Bureau of the Budget. Apparently no Senators from that area have been advised of the general nature of the bill, at least to the extent that they desired to attend.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator, being a lawyer, has knowledge, I think, of the manner in which the Bureau of Reclamation operates, and he is fairly well acquainted with the handling of power in connection with reclamation projects. Whatever is in effect in California, whatever is being done in Utah, Idaho, or any other State in that group, will be permitted in Arkansas. That is all the amendment means. The Bureau can do the same things it is doing in California with respect to the handling of power. I have not heard the Senator say very much about the power end of the subject. Whatever applies to California will apply to Arkansas.

As I said before, the members of the committee are Senators from reclamation States and are fairly well acquainted with what the law means and how it

operates. All that was intended was to permit Arkansas to come into the family of reclamation States and have all the reclamation laws applying to the other States apply to Arkansas. I do not know what the Bureau of Reclamation has in mind. It could have in mind becoming a great and expanding bureau, as the Senator from California has charged in the debate. On the other hand, I know the Bureau cannot build any kind of a project, under the law, unless there is a contract providing for payment, and in the case of large projects there must be an authorization by the Congress of the United States.

The Bureau cannot go on year after year without coming to Congress for money in connection with the construction of projects. Every year representatives of the Bureau have to come to Congress for appropriations. Sometimes they come in between times, as the Senator has mentioned in the discussion. Congress has complete control over the Bureau of Reclamation. Through all of its history, up until a few years ago, it has not been criticized seriously by anyone. Its conduct has been, I believe, to the satisfaction of everyone, including the Senator from California. It is only within the past 4 years that there has been complaint, and, so far as I am concerned, only within the last year. The Bureau has accomplished a great deal of good. It has had a successful history. Whatever laws give it authority to act should be extended to the State of Arkansas. I think the amendment was intended to make sure that whatever laws operate in other States should operate in Arkansas with respect to the work of the Bureau of Reclamation and to the projects constructed by it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTIN in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Conor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hoey	Overton
Bridges	Holland	Reed
Buck	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Capper	Kem	Smith
Chavez	Kilgore	Stennis
Cordon	Knowland	Stewart
Downey	Langer	Taft
Dworshak	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Ecton	McCarran	Thye
Ellender	McCarthy	Tydings
Ferguson	McKellar	Vandenberg
Flanders	McMahon	Watkins
Fulbright	Malone	White
George	Martin	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Williams
Gurney	Moore	Wilson
Hatch	Morse	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 5052) to exclude certain vendors of newspapers or magazines from certain provisions of the Social Security Act and Internal Revenue Code, returned by the President of the United States, with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, it was—

Resolved, That the said bill pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives agreeing to pass the same.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 184) amending House Concurrent Resolution 139, Eightieth Congress, providing for a joint session of the two Houses on Monday, April 19, 1948, in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the liberation of Cuba, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 358. An act for relief of Hilario A. Goitia;

H. R. 387. An act for relief of Hayato Harris Ozawa;

H. R. 388. An act for relief of Bert Harrington, Jr.;

H. R. 420. An act for relief of Esther Ringel;

H. R. 421. An act for relief of Betty Isabel Schunke;

H. R. 560. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Wilhemina Piper Enz;

H. R. 899. An act for relief of Mrs. Keum Nyu Park;

H. R. 927. An act for relief of the estate of Mary D. Briggs, deceased;

H. R. 990. An act for the relief of William B. Moore;

H. R. 1859. An act for relief of Philip Lee Sjoerdt Huizenga;

H. R. 1912. An act for relief of John A. Dilboy;

H. R. 1927. An act for relief of Margaret Katherine Hume;

H.R. 2213. An act for relief of A. J. Sprouffske;

H. R. 2250. An act for relief of Mrs. Daisy A. T. Jaegers;

H. R. 2303. An act for relief of Mitsu M. Kobayashi, who is the wife of Edward T. Kobayashi, a citizen of the United States;

H. R. 2425. An act for relief of August Dane Tetuaero;

H. R. 2427. An act for the relief of Jose Cabral Lorenzo;

H. R. 2557. An act for relief of Mable Gladys Viducich;

H. R. 2633. An act for relief of Claude T. Thomas, legal guardian of Elizabeth Ann Mervine, a minor, and the estates of Mary L. Poole, deceased, and Hazel S. Thomas, deceased;

H. R. 2645. An act to provide that appointments of United States commissioners for the Isle Royale, Hawaii, Mammoth Cave, and Olympic National Parks shall be made by the United States district courts without the recommendations and approval of the Secretary of the Interior;

H. R. 3039. An act for relief of Mrs. Marian D. McC. Plein;

H. R. 3263. An act for relief of Technical Sergeant Tsuyoshi Matsumoto;

H. R. 3300. An act for the relief of Martin A. King;

H. R. 3387. An act for relief of Bruce Brothers Grain Co.;

H. R. 3484. An act to transfer the Remount Service from the Department of the Army to the Department of Agriculture;

H. R. 3569. An act to authorize the construction of a chapel and a library at the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y., and to authorize the acceptance of private contributions to assist in defraying the cost of construction thereof;

H. R. 3849. An act for relief of Domingo Gandarias;

H. R. 3968. An act for relief of Olive Irene Milloglav;

H. R. 4118. An act to confirm title in fee simple in Thomas Loflin to certain lands in Rankin County, Miss.;

H. R. 4403. An act for relief of Ladislao Vaida, Elena Vaida, and Stefano Vaida;

H. R. 4572. An act to amend section 7 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, to provide for learners' permits, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4636. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929, as amended;

H. R. 4649. An act to provide that compensation of members of the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board of the District of Columbia shall be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended;

H. R. 4739. An act to amend paragraph 1629 of the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to provide for the free importation of exposed X-ray film;

H. R. 5328. An act to amend paragraph 1803 (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, relating to firewood and other woods; and

H. R. 5387. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Department of the Treasury who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions and whose claims for such losses have been considered and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury upon the recommendations of a Treasury-claim board.

EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN VENDORS OF NEWSPAPERS OR MAGAZINES FROM PROVISIONS OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AND INTERNAL REVENUE CODE—VETO MESSAGE (H. DOC. NO. 594)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, H. R. 5052, a bill to exclude certain vendors of newspapers or magazines from certain provision of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code.

This bill is identical with H. R. 3997, which I declined to approve in August 1947.

This legislation has far greater significance than appears on the surface. It proposes to remove the protection of the social-security law from persons now entitled to its benefits. Thus, it raises the fundamental question of whether or not we shall maintain the integrity of our social-security system.

H. R. 5052 would remove social-security protection from news vendors who make a full-time job of selling papers and who are dependent on that job for their livelihood. Many vendors of newspapers are

excluded even at present from coverage under the Social Security Act because they are not employees of the publishers whose papers they sell. But some vendors work under arrangements which make them bona fide employees of the publishers and, consequently, are entitled to the benefits of the Social Security Act.

If enacted into law, this bill would make the social-security rights of these employees depend almost completely upon the form in which their employers might choose to cast their employment contracts. Employers desiring to avoid the payment of taxes which would be the basis for social-security benefits for their employees could do so by the establishment of artificial legal arrangements governing their relationship with their employees. It was this sort of manipulation which the Supreme Court effectively outlawed in June of 1947 when the Court unanimously declared that employment relationships under the social-security laws should be determined in the light of realities rather than on the basis of technical legal forms. I cannot believe that this sound principle announced by the Court should be disregarded, as it would be by the present bill.

The principal consideration offered in support of the bill appears to be a concern for the administrative difficulties of certain employers in keeping the necessary records and in collecting the employee contributions required by the social-security system. In appraising these difficulties, it should be recognized that the employers have control over the form of the employment contracts and the methods by which their salesmen are compensated. The salesmen are dependent upon the employers, and whatever remittances or reports are required for withholding and reporting purposes should be within each employer's reach. Certainly, the difficulties involved are not so formidable as to warrant the exclusion of these employees from coverage in the social-security system and the consequent destruction of their benefit rights and those of their dependents.

It is said that the news vendors affected by this bill could more appropriately be covered by the social-security law as independent contractors, when and if coverage is extended to the self-employed. Whether that is true or not, surely they should continue to receive the benefits to which they are now entitled until the broader coverage is provided. It would be most inequitable to extinguish their present rights pending a determination as to whether it is more appropriate for them to be covered on some other basis.

In withholding my approval from H. R. 3997 last August, I expressed my concern that such a bill would open our social-security structure to piecemeal attack and to slow undermining. That concern was well founded. The House of Representatives has recently passed a joint resolution which would destroy the social-security coverage of several hundred thousand additional employees. As in the case of H. R. 5052, the joint resolution passed by the House is directed toward upsetting the doctrine established by the Supreme Court last summer that employment relationship should be determined on the basis of realities. The present bill must be appraised, therefore, as but one step in a larger process of the erosion of our social-security structure.

The security and welfare of our Nation demand an expansion of social security to cover the groups which are now excluded from the program. Any step in the opposite direction can only serve to undermine the program and destroy the confidence of our people in the permanence of its protection against the hazards of old age, premature death, and unemployment.

For these reasons, I am compelled to return H. R. 5052 without my approval.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 5, 1948.*

Mr. MILLIKIN. I move that the message and the bill lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LIBERATION OF CUBA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 184, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the first paragraph of House Concurrent Resolution 139, Eightieth Congress, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the liberation of Cuba, the two Houses of Congress shall assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives at 12 o'clock meridian, on Monday, April 19, 1948."

Mr. MARTIN. I move that the Senate agree to the concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to inquire of my colleague as to the time which he anticipates will be taken on the pending amendment and the pending bill.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I am hopeful that the measure may be rather promptly disposed of by a motion which the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] and I intend to make to recommit the bill to the committee for further investigation. Perhaps the Senator from Arkansas would not resist such a motion. It is apparent from the discussion that the bill ought to have further investigation. It was never submitted to the Bureau of Reclamation. No one knows what the amendment means. Neither the Department of Agriculture nor the Department of the Army was called upon for an opinion. Either by the consent of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas or by vote of the Senate, we might very promptly dispose of the bill by recommitting it to the committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Am I to interpret the Senator's statement to mean that he is willing to permit the Senate to vote upon a motion to recommit, and then upon the passage of the bill?

Mr. DOWNEY. No. We have certain amendments which we desire to offer. We consider the bill to be in very poor form. If it is to be further considered, we have certain amendments to offer.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it a proper interpretation of the Senator's statement that it is his purpose to delay a vote on the bill until such time as the majority will be forced to lay it aside?

Mr. DOWNEY. It is the purpose of the Senator from California to oppose what he considers to be an unhappy piece of legislation until it has been fully and adequately considered by the Senate, especially since it was not adequately considered by the committee. It is my intention to present at considerable length the questions which are involved, which are of profound importance to the Nation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In view of the fact that at the time the pending bill was made the unfinished business it was thought to be more or less of a noncontroversial bill, and in view of the fact that there is legislation of national importance to be considered, namely, the National Housing Act, I have discussed the question with the Senator from Arkansas, and as acting majority leader I propose to move that the unfinished business be laid aside for the consideration of Senate bill 866, Calendar No. 139.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, may I inquire what would then be the parliamentary situation with respect to the pending bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. As the junior Senator from California understands, the parliamentary situation would be that the bill which is now the unfinished business would be on the Senate Calendar.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand that to be the correct interpretation? I understand that the bill would be on the Senate Calendar, but would it not be the order of business?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It would be if unanimous consent were asked.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It could be laid aside temporarily by unanimous consent. Then it would come before the Senate upon the disposition of the bill for which it was laid aside.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is, if it were laid aside by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As acting majority leader I propose to move that the pending bill be supplanted by Senate bill 866, Calendar No. 139.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands, the Senator intends to move to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 866.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If that motion should prevail, then the pending bill would be set aside.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And would take its place on the calendar.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I correct in my understanding that all the debate we have had thus far would go for naught, and that we would start all over again when we finally took up the bill once more?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senate has been informed today that the bill is of a highly controversial character.

Mr. LUCAS. We have had 2 days of debate on the bill and have got nowhere.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is only passing upon the parliamentary situation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in view of the statement of the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] that he intends to make a motion to recommit the bill, I wonder if the acting majority leader would permit a vote to be taken upon that motion before making his motion to lay the bill aside?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Inasmuch as apparently that would not solve the situation, unless the motion to recommit were carried, the acting majority leader believes, because of the importance of the housing legislation which we propose to bring up at this time, that it would be better to proceed with that measure.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not believe that we are justified in trying to sit out a filibuster on a bill which is of local importance only to my State.

I will say for the benefit of my colleagues that I was taken wholly unawares by the opposition of the Senator from California. The bill has been on the calendar for a year. As I understand, it was unanimously reported from the committee last year. Never once during many months has the Senator from California indicated in any way that he opposed the bill. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] has made objection. I knew of his position and discussed it with him last week. I also discussed the question with the acting majority leader at that time, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and we agreed to bring up the bill last Monday.

During all these discussions, which were no secret, the Senator from California did not indicate that he opposed the bill in any way. I knew exactly what the issue was so far as the Senator from Louisiana was concerned.

It is evident that the Senator from California has no real opposition to the merits of the bill—or did not have when he began—but he has a private view as to certain members of the Bureau of Reclamation, which is perfectly all right with me. In view of his allegations, I think they ought to be investigated. However, I am quite unable to see the justification for trying to attack this bill, which in no way affects his State or any other State, by bringing that controversy into the Senate and holding up the bill. The Senator from California has practically said that he will not permit a vote on the bill one way or the other.

Knowing the circumstances in the Senate, and knowing that the majority must move on to important measures, I cannot in good conscience resist the motion to lay the bill aside; but I think it is a very unusual practice with regard to a bill of a local nature, such as this.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I wish to repeat to my distinguished friend from Arkansas that I regret very much that I consider that my national duties compel me to present my arguments against the bill. I must admit that at the beginning of this argument I was largely motivated by the fact that I did not think we should extend the power of the Bureau of Reclamation into other States, in view of corrupt, inefficient, and wasteful acts of which I have knowledge.

However, having become acquainted with the bill, I am satisfied that it had nothing but a superficial investigation of less than an hour. I know that the Bureau of the Budget was never called upon for a report. I find an amendment attached to the bill which I consider sinister in its nature, the meaning of which no one seems to know. It is not mentioned in the report.

Mr. President, I believe that there are issues involved which profoundly affect the future development of the Mississippi River Basin. It is my opinion that the bill should go back to the committee. The Bureau of the Budget and the President should be called upon for a report, as should the Army Engineers and the Department of Agriculture. Senators from the Mississippi Basin ought at least to be made to realize the importance of this measure as I see it.

I regret that the Senator from Arkansas believes that I have been guilty of improper conduct, because I have for him the highest affection and friendship. I know that throughout this debate he has conducted himself with fidelity and a high sense of obligation to his State.

NATIONAL HOUSING

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 866, calendar No. 139.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 866) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective and to provide for the coordinated execution of such policy through a National Housing Commission, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported on April 8 by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] on behalf of the committee, striking out all after the enacting clause of the bill and inserting in lieu thereof certain other words.

Mr. FLANDERS obtained the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARTHY. I understand that the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] has an amendment which is in the nature of a substitute for the original Senate bill 866. I have some perfecting amendments to offer to the original bill. I assume they will take precedence over the amendment which is in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, the amendments which I am about to discuss are the committee amendments.

Mr. McCARTHY. In order that the Chair may be fully apprised of the situation, let me point out——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. So that all Senators may understand the situation, the Chair will have the clerk read Senate rule XVIII.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> If the question in debate contains several propositions, any Senator may have the same divided, except a motion to strike out and insert, which shall not be divided; but the rejection of a motion to strike out and insert one proposition shall not prevent a motion to strike out and insert a different proposition; nor shall it prevent a motion simply to strike out; nor shall the rejection of a motion to strike out prevent a motion to strike out and insert. But pending a motion to strike out and insert, the part to be stricken out and the part to be inserted shall each be regarded for the purpose of amendment as a question; and motions to amend the part to be stricken out shall have precedence.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to have that rule interpreted in plain English, as applied to this particular situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An amendment to the original bill takes precedence over a substitute for the original bill.

So the Chair recognizes the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I have a total of 16 perfecting amendments to Senate bill 866. The first is of rather minor importance. It merely changes the name of the act from the National Housing Commission Act to the Housing Act of 1948. The reason for that is that presently there is no National Housing Commission. I believe there will be no opposition to this particular amendment. Therefore, I shall ask for the immediate consideration of the amendment.

Then, instead of attempting to have all the remaining amendments taken up at once, I should like to have them taken up individually and in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. I think the procedure the Senator proposes is open to some question.

The situation is that we have on the calendar a bill which I introduced, which was recommended by the Banking and Currency Committee last year. Now the Banking and Currency Committee has offered a complete substitute for the bill which it recommended last year. When the substitute is perfected, I intend to ask the Senate to accept the substitute for the original bill.

So I see no point in amending the original bill. It seems to me that all amendments should be offered to the substitute. The only effect of offering amendments to the original bill will be that in the end the whole thing will be succeeded by the substitute. So it seems

to me obvious that we must work primarily on the substitute.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Ohio will agree with me that under the parliamentary rules, I have a right to perfect the original bill; and inasmuch as the committee amendment is in the nature of a complete substitute, it will not take precedence over my perfecting amendments to the original bill.

Let me say for the benefit of the Senator from Ohio—that I have 16 amendments which, will if adopted, change the nature of Senate bill 866 very materially. If they are adopted, I believe there will be no need to offer the substitute bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, of course amendments are in order now, either to the original bill or to the substitute. However, when the substitute is perfected and the original bill is perfected, if it is, I shall strongly urge the Senate to accept the substitute bill as it then may be amended; and I believe the Senate then will accept the substitute bill, which has been recommended by the Banking and Currency Committee, and which the author of the original bill will accept.

Consequently, I think the Senator from Wisconsin is rather wasting our time if he offers amendments to the original bill. I suggest that the Senator offer amendments to the substitute bill, which finally will be accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What the Senator from Ohio suggests may be true. Nevertheless, according to the rule, amendments to the original bill take precedence.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, let me suggest that before the Senator from Ohio says he will urge acceptance by the Senate of the substitute, I think he should wait to determine the nature of my amendments. I am inclined to think that he will not disagree at all about the amendments, except perhaps about one, and I do not believe he will disagree too greatly as to it.

My reason for suggesting that we proceed in this fashion, rather than by substituting a 98-page bill for the original 112-page bill, is that I wish to get away from what, I think, has been the condition for some time, namely, a complete misconception on the part of some persons as to what is in the proposed housing legislation. For that reason, I believe we should take up each point separately, one at a time, so that the Senate will thoroughly understand the measure, and so that when the measure is completed, we shall have a workable piece of legislation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator's method will so confuse the Senate that it will be impossible for anyone to understand what we are doing.

Mr. McCARTHY. Has the Senator from Ohio seen my amendments?

Mr. TAFT. That makes no difference. If the Senator from Wisconsin proceeds to go back to the original bill, which now has been worked over by the Banking and Currency Committee, and every title amended, and if the Senator from Wisconsin proceeds to offer amendments to the original bill, and if, later, we have to offer amendments, if any, to the substitute bill, I do not think the Senate will understand the procedure.

The substitute bill is easier to understand than the original bill. The substitute bill makes so many amendments to the original bill that, as I view the situation, it will be impossible to change the original bill into the substitute bill, if that is what the Senator is trying to do. Frankly, I do not know exactly what he is trying to do.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, let me state what I am trying to do. I have spent the last 6 months on this subject alone. I have traveled approximately 32,000 miles. I have had practically everyone who has driven a nail tell me what he thinks is the solution of the housing problem. I have discussed proposed amendments with many Members of the Senate and many Members of the House of Representatives. I have discussed them with the Senator from Ohio—not as amendments, but in the nature of a bill which I drafted 3 or 4 months ago.

I have the impression that there is very little I am proposing today that the Senator from Ohio will disagree with. I believe that if he will study the amendments in the sequence in which I am offering them, he will agree that by adopting them, we shall undoubtedly work out a sensible and workable piece of legislation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am sorry to say that if the Senator from Wisconsin offers the amendments, I shall have to oppose them, because they will only result in confusion, unless they are identical with the titles of the substitute bill. It seems to me I shall have to oppose them regardless of the particular amendment, because it can only result in confusion. We then have three different provisions to consider: One in the original bill, one in the substitute, and one in the Senator's amendments. Why cannot the Senator offer his amendments to the substitute bill? The Senator of course has every right to offer any amendment to either measure, but I suggest in the interest of clarification of thought that the Senator offer them to the substitute bill. The substitute bill is certainly open to amendment, and I am not wedded to any particular provisions of the substitute bill. I am willing to accept them, but I am certainly willing to see them amended.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not get the Senator's thought, I am sure. I wonder if he is aware of the history of the housing legislation, and will understand why we are taking it up.

Mr. TAFT. I began with the history of the legislation, and I have been aware of it every minute since that time.

Mr. McCARTHY. I was not needling the Senator. I wonder if the Senator is aware of the history of the housing legislation during the past 4 or 5 months. I should like to explain why I am proceeding in this fashion. First, Mr. President, I ask that the clerk read my amendment lettered "C," and that it be given immediate consideration and acceptance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire to call up amendment C ahead of the amendments A and B?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am skipping A and B for the time being, and taking up C.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I inquire if the amendment is offered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is offered.

Mr. TAFT. Since the bill is open to debate, may I suggest that the distinguished Senator from Vermont now present the substitute bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not yield for that purpose, Mr. President.

Mr. TAFT. Mr President, the Senator has no choice, if he wants his amendment voted on He is required to yield the floor before the amendment is voted on.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I am prepared to debate the bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I shall yield to the Senator from Vermont as soon as I get through discussing the amendment which I have proposed.

Mr. TAFT. That is satisfactory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the amendment be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, beginning with line 5, strike out through line 2 on page 9.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say to the Senator from Vermont that I shall be glad to yield to him. In fact, I shall yield the floor to the Senator as soon as I have completed discussing my amendment C.

In order to make the matter completely intelligible to the Senate, I think it will be necessary to discuss briefly certain of the other amendments proposed. Amendments C and D taken together will strike out sections 2 and 3 of the T-E-W bill. Those are the sections which were adopted when we adopted the President's Reorganization Plan No. 3, I believe it was. They were not adopted in toto, but substantially adopted, so the sections 2 and 3 of the T-E-W bill are no longer necessary. The reorganization plan, as Senators know, set up the so-called superhousing agency, under Mr. Foley, of the H and HFA, which has been working out very well. I believe there is no one who will disagree with the statement that sections 2 and 3 of the T-E-W bill should be stricken, and that is the purpose of amendments C and D. And, so the Senate may have clearly in mind all the amendments which I propose, I shall briefly go over them, after which I will yield the floor to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield for a question at this time.

Mr. TAFT. No; the Senator from Vermont does not want to ask a question.

Mr. FLANDERS. No; I do not want to ask any questions.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then I cannot yield, without losing the floor. I shall yield the floor to the Senator from Vermont as soon as I finish my discussion of the amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Of the one amendment, or does the Senator mean all the amendments?

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall briefly discuss all the amendments, after which I shall discuss each one in detail as it is brought up.

Amendment E merely deals with what we consider to be necessary changes in title 6; that is, extending title 6. As Senators know, that title has been extended for a period of 30 days, until April 30. Certain changes have been made in title 6, some of which have been very severely criticised. I think I should call to the attention of the Senate those which have been opposed by particular groups. One of the substantial changes we made was to get away from the per-room limitation, under the loan guarantees of FHA. We have adopted a per-unit limitation of $8,100. The reason for shifting from the per-room to the per-unit limitation is that we found in various parts of the country the per-room limitation lent itself to a great distortion in design, in an attempt by some contractors to get additional rooms within a unit. There are many who think the $8,100 limitation is too low. I had in my office this morning a group from New York who are doing substantial building. They tell me that the $8,100 limitation will work a great hardship upon them. I told them, and I have told Senators with whom I have discussed the matter, that if anyone sees fit to offer an amendment increasing that amount by $500, while I would not heartily approve the amendment, I certainly would take no position against it.

I think it is impossible to pick any one figure out of the air and say that is the proper figure. Whether it should be 81 or 86 would be hard to say.

We have increased the loan authorization by a total of $1,600,000,000, earmarking a substantial amount of it for rental housing rather than "for sale" housing, and making it easier for a contractor who wants to build rental units than units for speculation and sale. We have found that there is a tremendous artificial buyer's market. A great many young men are now buying houses solely because they cannot find a decent place to rent.

We have made changes in title II, which are substantially the same as the title II amendments in the old T-E-W bill, the only difference being that while the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill increased the loan authorization all the way up and down the line, we merely increase the authorization as to the lower-cost homes in an attempt to channelize more material into the cheaper home construction and less into the more expensive homes.

We have also provided for a more liberal loan provision, insofar as States and municipalities are concerned, for those who desire to embark upon a housing program. I shall cover that in greater detail later.

Amendment F provides for a number of things. It liquidates what many of us have known as "Fanny May," the Federal National Mortgage Association, which has acted as a secondary market to some extent for H. and H. F. A. and GI loans. We have liquidated that agency and have established within the H. and H. F. A. almost an identical corporation. This corporation, which will operate within the framework of H. and H. F. A., will act as a secondary market to be used at such times and in such areas as the Administrator may find it necessary.

We have also made one change which has been subject to some criticism. Perhaps I should first cover the background and give the reasons for making the change. We found in various parts of the country that banks simply were not taking the GI and H. and H. F. A. loans, especially since the yield of Federal bonds has increased. So we have provided that when the head of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the head of the Treasury Department find it necessary, they can increase the maximum interest rate by one-half of 1 percent.

Going on to amendment H, it establishes certain aids for housing cooperatives. It is modeled much along the line of the section in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, except that we give additional consideration to cooperatives who are principally veterans. It provides a 95 percent guaranteed loan. With a 40-year amortization period it also provides, which is more important, for the necessary technical assistance from the H. and H. F. A. That means that additional personnel will be necessary and it will cost additional money.

I may say that it is not the product of any one person's mind. I have discussed it with veterans' organizations throughout the country—the Legion, the AMVETS, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the AVC, and others—and while they did not all heartily approve of the section in its present form, they all felt that it was decidedly a substantial improvement over what we have at this time. We felt that merely making liberal loans to young veterans to build homes might do more harm than good. We felt that to have a workable veterans' cooperative the young veterans who wanted to form such a cooperative should be able to call upon the H. and H. F. A. for the necessary technical assistance. Otherwise we did not feel that a veterans' cooperative would accomplish very much.

Amendment I is modeled largely after the yield insurance provision of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. In this connection we owe a great debt of gratitude to Columbia University and its Mr. Jones, who spent months making a study of yield insurance and interviewing potential investors, both insurance companies, industrial corporations, and labor unions. While the yield insurance provision of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill was principally directed toward insurance companies, we feel that this also interests industrial corporations and some of the labor unions which have money to invest in housing. There have been no radical changes made. The only material change was to provide incentives for equity investors building housing which will rent for less than $40 a month in certain areas and for less than $50 in the larger metropolitan areas. In those cases the investor shall have the right to take a 10-percent depreciation for income-tax purposes each year for 5 years. There is nothing new about the idea. It largely follows the reasoning followed when rapid depreciation was allowed in order to stimulate the production of war plants, the only difference being the time covered. On its face it might appear that an increased cost will be involved by way of loss of tax revenue. However, over a period of years it will cost nothing, because ultimately the full depreciation would be taken anyway.

Those of us who have been studying in detail the subject of high rentals are firmly convinced that we can never have cheap housing unless and until we can get equity money invested in rental housing. As is well known, there is practically no equity money in the rental-housing business. It is practically all borrowed money. Our statisticians tell us that if we take the formula under which rentals are set for the title 608 projects, and compare that with the 3½-percent return under the yield insurance, it will make a difference of approximately 21 percent in rental. In other words, under the title 608 projects, the rent is set to yield approximately 6½-percent return, with amortization between 25 and 33 years, which adds another 3½ percent. Fees and insurance bring it up to 10 or 10½ percent. The yield under this plan amounts to 3½ percent, and with amortization of 2 percent there is a total of 5½ percent.

The average rental of section 608 projects as of today is between $82 and $84. If we can get equity money into that particular field, it will be reduced to around $66. That is not low enough, hence the additional considerations to get the equity money down to the lower rental field. That substantially covers amendment I.

Amendment G deals with housing research, and we attempt to point up two things which we feel of utmost importance. The first is to get the acceptance of standardized codes throughout the country. In our studies we found that the one road block in the way of getting cheaper rental housing and cheaper for-sale housing was the large number of codes, which vary from city to city. As an example, let us take the greater Detroit metropolitan area. There are there some 66 different codes, each suburb having its own code, which makes it almost impossible for a contractor to plan intelligently, or for an investor to invest his money with the hope of bringing out some better housing material. Let us say that Mr. X develops material that is far superior to brick, far superior to any material we now have, and which is far cheaper. Before he could get that material widely used he would, in effect, have to send a staff of attorneys into some 2,500 different cities and get them to lobby for the acceptance of his material in the particular municipalities.

We know there is no way of passing a Federal law to establish a model code. We know, however, that unless we can bring about some semblance of standardization of codes, no matter whatever else we do, we will never get our money's worth in housing.

We set up within the H. and H. F. A. a division whose job will be threefold.

First, it is to work toward acceptance of standard codes, and a standardization of measurements. If I may deal with that for a moment, a group in the industry have been developing what is known as modular coordination. In simpler terms, that merely means planning everything in construction in multiples of 4 inches. That seems rather simple on the surface, and one would not think it meant much saving, but even the most pessimistic will admit that if we can secure widespread adoption of this modular coordination, in other words, standardization of measurements, it will result in a widespread cutting of materials which enter into homes, and ultimately have the result of saving from 25 to 30 percent. As an example, it will mean the retooling of the brick industry. Instead of making an 8-inch brick, as is now done, the manufacturers will make a 7½-inch brick, and with the plaster it will come up to 8 inches. Some of the brick industry have adopted that. In brickwork, where modular coordination is accepted, the industry has been eliminating a lot of work such as cutting out masonry around doors and windows.

Amendment J deals with slum clearance. We made no change in the amount the Federal Government would contribute toward slum clearance. However, we have made a very radical change in the method of paying the costs of slum clearance. In speaking of slum clearance, we are referring to nothing but the demolition job, the job of taking over the blighted area, having the city condemn it, and clean it off, so that it can be sold for a fair value. Contrary to what many think, this has nothing whatsoever to do with paying any money for rebuilding the area.

We have made a very radical change in the method of payment, and I understand that the original sponsors of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill do not object to this. In fact, I believe they approve it. Instead of providing for payment on an annual contribution basis, which we thought was completely unrealistic, we provide that it be handled by capital grants. We feel that with the half billion dollars, the $500,000,000, provided in the slum clearance section, we can accomplish more clearance of slums than could be accomplished with the $850,000,000 authorized in the old Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. So far no one has differed from us in respect to that.

The reason for that is that under the old Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill the Government would be spending a tremendous amount each year for bookkeeping. After the Federal Government knew what it would cost, $2 on the part of the Federal Government for $1 on the part of each municipality—instead of providing for paying out that cash, the old Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill set up a rather intricate bookkeeping system, providing for the payment over some 40 or 45 years, resulting in expense and inconvenience on the part of the Federal Government and the cities. We provide for the payments to be made in cash.

We also provide for loans to the cities in the amount of $200,000,000 a year for 5 years. These are in the nature of what could be called interim construction loans. This part of the bill will cost the Federal Government nothing. So far as the loans are concerned, the $1,000,000,000 in loans, they will cost the Federal Government nothing. It is merely to enable a city to proceed to condemn and take over a blighted area, do the job of demolition, and then decide whether it will sell the property to a housing authority for public housing, whether it will sell it for private housing, will use it for a park, or put some industry into the area. When it gets to that point, the city turns in $1 and the Federal Government $2, and the loan is at that time repaid. So much for slum clearance.

I also have an amendment which deals with the public housing feature of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. We have found throughout the country that perhaps there has been no greater confusion in the minds of the people about any one subject than about the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. They all confuse the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill with the one small section of our bill dealing with public housing. Those against public housing gave blanket disapproval to the T-E-W bills. Those who were for public housing gave blanket approval to the T-E-W bill.

All of us were very much impressed with the tremendous amount of work and the good, solid thought that went into the drafting of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. In his travels throughout the country did not the Senator find very little opposition to the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill except as to the public housing feature?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think that is true. I think the people as a whole who have studied that bill realize that the bill contains many good, sensible provisions, which was attested by the mere fact that the President took sections 2 and 3 in toto, and adopted their provisions as his Reorganization Plan No. 3, I believe it was.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. The Senate acted on the proposal, and that was why the subject matter was referred back to the Committee on Banking and Currency. That committee came back with a substitute which I understand is to be submitted by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

Mr. President, before the Senator completes his presentation of all his amendments, I wonder if he will be good enough to tell the Senate how all the amendments differ from the substitute which is proposed by the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall be glad to do so. First I will give the Senate a history of the development of the substitute presented by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. I want to pay tribute to the Senator from Vermont for the amount of study he has given to the matter, at least in the last few weeks. Before that he was doing a tremendous amount of work in the committee which he headed which was investigating high prices throughout the country. When I speak of the work he has done in the past few weeks, that is in no way to be taken as a criticism of what he had done before that, because before that he was engaged in doing an equally important job. He was heading a committee studying the high cost of living, and I believe he and his committee did a thoroughly fine piece of work. At that time I and several other Senators were studying the subject of housing. Along with that study we slowly evolved a bill during the past 6 months. From time to time we would tear something from it or add something to it, until we finally had a bill which we thought was a good housing bill. Months ago I presented that bill to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and along with it I gave the two Senators a résumé, a review, of everything that was in that piece of legislation. Up to that point none of the members of the committee had the time, by reason of the work in which they were engaged, to go about the work of drafting housing legislation.

The 14-man housing committee met and voted unanimously to accept everything that was in my bill, except one provision, which had to do with income tax exemption for those who would produce cheap rental housing, and I felt that their objection to that provision was sound. Therefore I struck it from my bill. Up to that point, Senators will understand, no member of the committee had drafted any other housing legislation.

The Senator from Vermont, in conformity with the suggestion by the committee, introduced, or so I thought originally, everything that was in my bill, by way of an amendment to the T-E-W bill. His staff informed me that everything in my bill was in his amendment. If that were so I would have been very glad to go along and support that as an amendment to the T-E-W bill, because I frankly do not care whether this is done by way of an amendment, or by way of original legislation. I do not care whose name tops the bill. However, I find on going through the Senator's amendment that he has left out some material parts. I think that was done inadvertently. In fact I am sure it was done inadvertently, or his staff would have notified me.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to correct one misapprehension. I am sure my staff did not tell the Senator that the two bills were identical, though they followed each other fairly closely, because of the fact I think that the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Vermont drew very largely on the same sources of information and experience. I wish to correct any apprehension that the substitute bill was drawn from the original bill offered by the Senator from Wisconsin. They were both drawn from the same sources.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me make myself perfectly clear. I do not claim that I am responsible for the authorship of this housing legislation. Take, for example, the veterans' co-op section. Veterans organizations are almost entirely

responsible for getting a good section dealing with veterans' co-ops.

The section dealing with changes in yield insurance is due almost entirely to the work of Mr. Jones of Columbia University, who spent an unlimited amount of time interviewing the heads of insurance companies, the heads of labor unions, the heads of industrial corporations.

I have no pride of authorship in this matter. All I have done is to talk to everyone interested in having them, and have tried to put together all the good thoughts I have received into workable housing legislation. We have also tried to take the housing legislation which is now on the books and, in effect, streamline it.

One of the things we copied from the bill of the Senator from Vermont and placed in what I call my bill—and I would rather not call it my bill, because it is a composite of all our good thoughts—is the pay schedule.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. It is my understanding that when the Senator's committee held its hearings the various lumber companies also testified. Is that not true?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. Representatives of lumber companies from different regions of the United States appeared and testified, did they not?

Mr. McCARTHY. From every region of the United States.

Mr. LANGER. In other words, the subcommittee gave them a full and complete hearing, and if they had any substitute to offer for the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill or any other bill, they had a chance to present it; did they not?

Mr. McCARTHY. I would not say we gave everyone a full hearing. We heard everyone who wanted to be heard. We spent as much time in receiving testimony as possible in every place in which we had hearings. As an example of what we were confronted with, let us assume that I was in Detroit today and 32 witnesses desired to be heard. Obviously 32 witnesses cannot be heard in full when I must be in Denver, Colo., the next day. I traveled 32,000 miles between the time of the adjournment of the regular session and the time when the special session convened. We canceled many hearings because the special session was called. But everyone who appeared in any city had a chance at least to file his or her statement, even though we could not hear them orally in full.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. When the committee had a hearing in Detroit, for example, all the lumbermen of that area could have one spokesman to speak for them?

Mr. McCARTHY. No; we did not restrict them as to the number of spokesmen.

Mr. LANGER. No; but I mean if they wanted to, they could have appointed one man to represent them and to speak for them?

Mr. McCARTHY. They could have appointed 1 man or 10 men. That applied not only to the lumber industry but to the brick industry, to social organizations, to churches, or to any organization which wanted to be heard. They could present as many witnesses as they desired. The only restriction was that we could not hear them all orally in full. We would accept their statements.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in response to a question I asked the Senator a moment ago——

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not finish my answer. The Senator from Louisiana wanted to know how my bill differed from the Flanders amendment. The Senator asked me a question and I should like to complete it by explaining the differences which exist between the two.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am obliged to leave in a few moments, and I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator permit me to complete my previous answer first?

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well.

Mr. McCARTHY. One of the other differences is the failure to include the tax-rapid-depreciation feature to stimulate rental-housing production. A very important omission has been the failure to include in the bill a section dealing with housing for paraplegics. I think I understand why the Senator from Vermont did not do that. I believe he had in mind that the House had already passed a separate bill on that subject, and he thought it would be unnecessary to include that subject in his amendment.

As the Senator may recall, last year the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the junior Senator from Wisconsin introduced a bill providing for a special housing fund for paraplegics, veterans who suffered spinal-cord injury and are doomed to a wheel chair for life. That bill was brought up and referred back to the committee. I think there were some valid objections to it. We have redrafted that bill to try to meet the objections of the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Georgia, who made the principal objections. I believe that we have met those objections. As I recall, the principal objection was that the paraplegic bill, if not too far-reaching in its scope, was too indefinite as to who should be included. We included all permanent wheel-chair cases. As I recall, certain Senators brought up the point that that might include heart cases, and that we could not tell how far afield we might go.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does not the Senator believe that a bill of that character should be treated separately, and not involved with a long-range housing program?

Mr. McCARTHY. If that bill should be treated separately, I think there is 10 times as much reason to treat separately the question of welfare housing. I shall deal with that question. I do believe that many things should stand or fall upon their own merits. Many of us are vitally concerned with the unfortunate men of World War II. They are pretty much the forgotten men. Many of them are doomed to hospitals for life. They are permanently crippled. Many of them have wives and families. During the present housing shortage many of them have their families living 60 or 70 or 80 miles away. Since last year, when we turned down the opportunity to give those young men a chance to have some semblance of a normal life, I know of three families which have been separated. I do not believe that they would have been separated had we passed that bill last year. I personally intend to do everything in my power to see that that piece of proper housing legislation is passed. I should be glad to lay aside the pending business before the Senate today and pass such a housing bill; but in the absence of that, I shall do everything possible to try to make this an amendment to the omnibus housing measure.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not object to its being put in; but the Senator seems to think it is necessary for such legislation to pass at once; and rather than have it involved with a long-range housing program, I thought it might be possible to treat it separately.

A moment ago the Senator referred to the work which he has done in connection with housing.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have done no more work than has any other Senator. I have merely concentrated my activities on housing. When I introduced the housing resolution last year, before I could get the leadership of the Senate to go along with me and have it passed, I promised that if that resolution were passed I would concentrate all my energies on housing. I am not intimating that I have done any more work than have other Senators. I have not done nearly as much as have some other Senators. I believe that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] has perhaps done as much work as any other Senator, if not more. I think he did an excellent job as chairman of the subcommittee studying the high cost of living. So I ask the Senator not to misunderstand me as saying that I have done more work than have other Senators. I have merely concentrated my work on housing.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator mentioned the fact that he had sent to me, to the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and other Senators, the draft of a bill which he called the McCarthy bill——

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not call it the McCarthy bill. I did not have my name on that bill at all.

Mr. ELLENDER. It was the subcommittee bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not call it anything.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it not a fact that the legislation proposed by the distinguished Senator in the report which he made to the Senator from Ohio and to me contained most of the provisions of Senate bill 866, except as to public housing?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think that is an excellent question. First we must analyze what is left of Senate bill 866. Do not misunderstand me as criticizing that

bill. I believe that those who drafted that bill did a great deal of work.

Sections 2 and 3 are obsolete.

Mr. ELLENDER. They are obsolete because of the adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 3.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes. Section 4, which deals with research, left out two all-important tasks: First, the task of attempting to get standardization of codes, without which we cannot get any cheap housing; and second, the standardization of measurements.

Section 5 dealt largely with technical changes in the Home-Loan Bank Act. Many of those provisions, as the Senators know, have been passed by the House and Senate and signed by the President.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senate has agreed to all of them.

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly. I voted for them. I am only saying that there is nothing left of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill except a skeleton. I am showing why.

Section 6 dealt with the amendments to title II. There is nothing in the bill in regard to amendments to title VI. We adopted that section almost in toto, except that where an increase in loan guarantee was granted all up and down the line, we have restricted it largely to cheaper-cost homes, on the theory that we should not artificially channelize any scarce building material into more expensive homes. We felt that a man who wants to build a $15,000 or $16,000 home should be able to get credit through channels other than the Government.

Section 7 dealt with yield insurance. While on the surface the changes may appear to be relatively unimportant, they actually are very important. For example, with only one exception representatives of insurance companies testified that they would not be able to take advantage of the yield-insurance provision in the T-E-W bill. If true, that meant that the yield insurance provision in that bill was meaningless.

We asked Professor Jones, of Columbia University, to take over the job of making a thorough and complete study of that subject. He did so. He spent months upon it. He found that the principal objection on the part of the insurance companies to the yield-insurance provision of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill was not the 2¾-percent guaranty. They had no objection to the 2¾-percent guaranty in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. They had very little objection to the 3¼-percent yield which would be allowed in setting rents. I do not quite know how to describe the situation so that it will be clear in the RECORD; but in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill it was provided that all the profit above 3¼ percent could be considered as profit, but could not all go on the insurance companies' books as profit.

Mr. ELLENDER. Up to a certain point.

Mr. McCARTHY. Up to a certain point. Beyond that point——

Mr. ELLENDER. It was to be used to amortize.

Mr. McCARTHY. Beyond that point half of it had to be used, on the books, for amortization. It would all go into the same cash drawer, but on their books they had to consider a certain percentage for amortization.

Mr. ELLENDER. And they had to reduce the debt accordingly.

Mr. McCARTHY. There is no debt in the case of equity money.

Mr. ELLENDER. I know; but they had to reduce the obligations. Let us put it that way.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let us get this straight. We are dealing with equity investment. A man is investing his own money. He is not borrowing a cent. Therefore there can be no debt. The only way this could affect the insurance companies would be as to the manner in which they would carry it on their books. Inasmuch as it was their own money, they were not borrowing money.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand.

Mr. McCARTHY. Beyond a certain figure—4 percent or 4½ percent, I think—all the profit had to be considered as amortization.

Their objection was that it was merely a bookkeeping matter, anyway, but that their commitments to their policyholders are such that they could not take advantage of that yield-insurance provision in that form. We have met that objection.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, the language is left as it is in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, is it?

Mr. McCARTHY. We thought we had to provide some additional incentive in order to get industrial corporations into the business of building homes. We felt that we could never obtain cheap rentals unless and until equity money could be brought into the housing field, for it is impossible to borrow money at 5 percent and pay the additional necessary charges and build homes that the average young man can afford to pay for. So we provided that if the equity investor would construct housing units which would rent for less than $40 in certain areas, or less than $50 in other areas, he would be able to have the benefit of the type of rapid depreciation for income-tax purposes that was allowed in wartime in order to stimulate the production of war plants. We felt that if that could be done in wartime to stimulate the production of war plants, certainly it could be done in peacetime to stimulate the production of homes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is that proposal contained in the substitute reported by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] from the committee?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not think it is. However, I pointed out that the amendment reported from the committee by the Senator from Vermont did not have the incontestability clause with respect to GI loans. That was adopted later, at the suggestion of Representative FLETCHER, when he introduced in the House of Representatives the identical bill which I introduced in the Senate. I did not think it was brought to the attention of the Senator from Vermont. However, I see now that it was, and that it is in his substitute bill. I am happy that it is.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. My recollection is that that subcommittee of four—the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], and myself—when it considered perfecting the committee amendments, brought that up and agreed to it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the next amendment is numbered "K." It has to do with the so-called public housing section of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. I still feel that it is a mistake to confuse all of this badly needed legislation with public housing. I think we should have two separate bills. I think public housing should stand or fall on its own feet. However, I am suggesting some amendments to the public-housing section of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. If these amendments are accepted, I intend to vote for the public-housing provisions, although I shall still ask to have them separated and introduced as a separate bill, which, if the Senate agrees to the wisdom of these amendments, I would support. In no way would the amendments affect the number of public-housing units.

The amendments I have suggested may cost additional money, however. In them I merely provide that we shall do what so many well-meaning groups of persons throughout the country think we are doing by way of public housing. I have had any number of church groups and social-minded organizations urge public housing, and the whole tenor of their testimony has been that we should help those in the very low income groups, those at the very bottom. I do not think that a single witness who has appeared before me at any time or any place, all the way from San Francisco to New York, and from New Orleans to St. Paul, realizes that public housing as presently constituted bars the very low income groups. However, it does definitely bar them. In some regions there is a rule by which up to 10 percent of the so-called welfare cases may be admitted to public-housing units. In no area have I found more than 4 or 5 percent of the welfare cases—those who really need proper housing—actually in public housing. We found that wherever slums were allegedly cleared out, and public housing built to house the slum dwellers, only the cream of the crop got into public housing.

My amendment simply provides that they shall start at the bottom, and not leave at the bottom a group which would receive no attention, and pick out the cream of that crop. My amendment merely provides priority for the very low-income groups, of course keeping the usual priority for disabled veterans and veterans with families, if they are in that particular group. Of course, that may cost additional amounts of money. It is entirely possible that if we get down into the lower brackets and really take care of the ones who need public housing, a greater subsidy may be called for.

On the question of farm housing, which was the subject of title X of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, we assigned that subject to Representative PATMAN, of Texas, for study. His report indicates the wisdom of continuing the study of

that subject. I believe that the committee and all those with whom we have discussed this matter have felt, without exception, that the most badly drawn and badly thought-out sections of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill are sections 10 and 11, which deal with farm housing and rural nonfarm housing. So, as a substitute for those two sections, I have an amendment which will provide that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator shall prepare a report on housing and present it to the next Congress. I believe there is no opposition to that proposal.

I have discussed it with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and I believe he is heartily in agreement with that proposed substitute.

My amendment No. M is the section dealing with aid to paraplegics, which I discussed in answer to a question from the Senator from Louisiana. It simply provides that in the case of a veteran of World War I or II who suffered a service-connected spinal cord injury which will permanently condemn him to a wheel chair, the Federal Government shall furnish him with plans free of cost and also cover half the cost of building a home for him. The reasoning behind that is sound, in that it costs much more to build a home for a paraplegic than for a normal individual. Instead of stairways he must have ramps; the doorways must be wider; there must be bathrooms of a special type, special types of exercising equipment, and so on. So we feel we are not giving him a thing. We are merely in effect saying we will make up the difference between the cost of a normal home and a home for a paraplegic.

In that connection I might point out that entirely separate and apart from our moral obligation to make it possible for these young men to live some semblance of a normal life, it is economically sound. The cost of hospitalization of a paraplegic runs from $7,000 to $8,000 a year, so we can pay $10,000 to help build the home, and in less than a year and a half more than recoup the cost of the home.

Amendment N would strike out section 12 of the TEW bill. That section had to do with the disposal of war housing, and the bill covering that subject had been passed at the last session. I may say we are presently working on legislation dealing with the disposal of war housing. We find that the war housing disposal program is a complete mess and is in utter confusion. We are working on that now, but I personally did not think it wise to confuse that very controversial subject with other badly needed pieces of legislation such as that now proposed.

Title IX merely deals with administrative changes. We made one substantial change in the pay scale, and I may say there we adopted the schedule contained in the Baldwin-Flanders bill, insofar as it applies to the heads of the housing agencies. We feel it is impossible to continue to get good men to head the various housing agencies at the salaries they are now receiving. For example, Mr. Foley, who is doing an excellent job, was promoted when we accepted the President's reorganization plan, giving him a more important job under the law. When he was promoted his salary was diminished from $12,000 to $10,000 a year. Another excellent man in the Government service last year having to do with housing was Mr. Creedon. He left the Government service and went into industry. He has never told me he left because he could not live on $10,000 a year in Washington, but I firmly believe that if we desire to continue to get good men in our housing agencies it will be necessary that we at least to some extent compete with private industry in the matter of salaries.

Amendment P will merely change the title of the act.

At this time, Mr. President, I move the adoption of amendment C, which does nothing more nor less than strike out a section of the TEW bill which has already been adopted by reason of the acceptance of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 3.

Before I yield the floor to the Senator from Vermont I should like to comment on the question he asked me, which I have not fully answered. In commenting upon the fact that his bill is parallel to ours, he expressed the opinion that he thought the reason for that was that he drew on the same sources we did. I assume by that the Senator from Vermont meant that the Housing and Home Finance Agency took an active part in drafting his bill. What we did was this: As we drafted various sections of the bill, during the past 3 or 4 months, we submitted every proposed section to the Housing and Home Finance Agency, to get their comment. Most of the sections were passed through the Treasury Department and the various departments concerned. I may say that, so far as I know, the only amendment which the Treasury will object to is the amendment dealing with the rapid depreciation for income-tax purposes.

So we kept the various Government agencies fully and completely informed as to what we were doing. We found it was very helpful. We did not accept their ideas, but we thought that passing these proposals through the various Federal agencies would help us to iron out any kinks from the administrative standpoint, and for that reason I am very happy to know that much of what we passed through those agencies is incorporated in the bill of the Senator from Vermont.

Before yielding the floor, I may further say that I think the Senator from Vermont has done an unlimited amount of work on housing since the committee gave him the task of preparing amendments. Prior to that, as I said before, I think he did perhaps as much if not more than any other Senator, both with respect to housing and the equally important matter of the high cost of living. For that reason, when I call his attention to certain things which are in this bill, with which he is not fully familiar, it is no criticism of him.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to present the committee amendments to Senate bill 866. The pending legislation deals with one of our most important domestic problems. As Senators know, it is of special interest to a very large number of our citizens. During the past 4 years it has received a great deal of investigation, study, and attention by committees of the Congress.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I merely want to ask the Senator from Wisconsin a question. I think it is important that we have an opportunity overnight to analyze his amendments. I presume the Senator is not going to press for a vote on the amendments this evening.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have no desire to press for a vote until the Senate fully understands the amendments. I may say I am fully convinced that if the Senator will go through the amendments, he will be supporting them tomorrow instead of opposing them.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am not opposing the amendments of the Senator from Wisconsin. I am only raising a question as to the procedure, because, so far as I can judge, roughly, with few exceptions the amendments offered by the Senator from Wisconsin are the same as the substitute bill, except that he prefers to amend the original bill by a series of amendments, instead of taking the substitute bill, which already incorporates most of his amendments, and perhaps adding a few more which he thinks should be added, or striking something out. I am afraid his method of dealing with it confuses the issue so that it will be rather difficult to keep the minds of Senators clear as to what is really being considered. However, I should like this evening to be able to analyze the amendments and compare them with the substitute bill. In common with the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Vermont, I think we can boil down whatever differences there are in substance to a few issues which can be presented to the Senate and be determined by the Senate before either the bill or the substitute or the amendments are voted on.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say for the benefit of the Senator from Vermont that one of the reasons why I am proceeding in this fashion——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am sorry.

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator. I may say to the Senator that one of the reasons I am proceeding in this fashion is that I am fully, completely, 100 percent aware of everything that is in each of my amendments. I have gone over the amendments with each of the veterans' organizations and with practically everyone who has ever driven a nail. Originally I thought the Senator from Vermont presented the identical bill I did. I told him that in that case I should be glad to support his amendment, but I find now that in the drafting, either the department that drafted it or someone else has taken out words here and inserted words there.

and I frankly do not know to what extent. I have not had a chance to go over the proposed substitute in detail to make a thorough study of these changes, and what effect they would have on the legislation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I understand that when the Senator referred to the bill of the Senator from Vermont he had in mind the bill or a substitute bill prepared by the Joint Committee on Housing, approved by the Joint Committee on Housing as well as by the Committee on Banking and Currency. Am I correct? Or did the Joint Committee on Housing take no action on any bill?

Mr. FLANDERS. The joint committee took no action on a bill, but its recommendations were transmitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate and were very largely accepted.

Mr. TAFT. And the substitute which the Senator is presenting is merely the crystallization of those recommendations in a substitute which the Banking and Currency Committee has now recommended. Is that correct?

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes; and which in its final form was agreed to by a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, consisting of the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. For the benefit of the Senator from Ohio, what I am presenting by way of amendment is identical with that which I presented approximately 3 months ago in order to obtain the Senator's comments. There is nothing new about it. It was presented long before the joint committee met. It has for months been a process of being drafted. There is no question about what I am presenting. I think it points up the reason that we have had so much difficulty in getting housing legislation passed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the senior Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Wisconsin some time ago presented a substitute, which I went over with him. In general it appeared all right, and was taken up by the committee. I appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee and stated that I was perfectly willing to have amendments of that nature adopted, instead of the original bill which was recommended last year, some of the features of which are out of date. The joint committee received additional information. The Banking and Currency Committee asked me to work with the committee in perfecting the bill. So far as I am concerned, the substitute bill presented by the Senator from Vermont is merely in crystallized and final form that which the Senator from Wisconsin presented to me. I still do not know what the differences are. It seems to me it would be a somewhat simpler method to work on the substitute. But we shall certainly examine the amendments offered by the Senator from Wisconsin and see how they differ from the substitute.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I have just heard the colloquy engaged in by the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Vermont. In checking over the group of amendments offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, I am wondering whether any or all of them have been considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency before this complex bill was reported.

Mr. FLANDERS. I will say to the Senator from Idaho that in spite of the fact that the subject was before the Banking and Currency Committee for many weeks and that the Senator from Wisconsin had a large part in preparing committee amendments, these particular amendments appear on the floor for the first time.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, however, they deal with the same subjects and are merely minor variations from what is in the substitute bill, with the exception of the amendment covering paraplegic cases, which I think is entirely new. The question of whether the public-housing section will remain in the bill, I imagine, will be the principal question before the Senate.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not moving to strike the public-housing section; I am merely moving to amend it so that it will accomplish that which so many people think should be accomplished, namely, to make public housing available for the lowest-income strata of society.

I should like to call to the attention of the Senator from Ohio, if he wishes to study the amendments tonight, the section dealing with research. I do not at this moment recall the lettering of that amendment. I think it is an amendment with which the Senator is concerned personally. The major difference between my amendment and the one submitted by the Senator from Vermont is that my amendment points up the job of standardization of the codes and standardization of measurements and makes it the principal job. That is one with which I am personally concerned.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Members of the Senate now on the floor, including the Senator from Wisconsin, that while they have been engaged in a very pretty tactical game in connection with this subject, the thing which I am sure the Senator from Wisconsin has in mind, the thing, certainly, which the junior Senator from Vermont has in mind, and the thing which I know the authors of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill have in mind, is to have presented to the Senate a good housing bill which the Senate will pass, send to the House for passage by that body and subsequent approval by the President. Our full activities should be devoted to that end.

Proceeding with my statement with regard to the substitute bill before the Senate, this legislation does not contain any very unusual or novel proposals. In fact most of the proposals grow out of the housing study and investigation undertaken in 1944 and 1945 at the direction of the Senate. The various additional housing studies subsequently undertaken by committees of the Congress have confirmed and emphasized the necessity for the enactment of these proposals, with such changes and modifications as are needed to bring them entirely up to date. I think it would be helpful, therefore, to summarize rather briefly the background of this legislation.

In general, this legislation has its origin in a Senate resolution introduced during the Seventy-eighth Congress, which called for the establishment of a special committee composed of members from the Banking and Currency and Education and Labor Committees. These were the committees which, at that time, had jurisdiction over housing matters. This resolution directed the special committee to investigate every phase of the housing problem and the housing activities of the Federal Government. It also called for this special committee to prepare a comprehensive postwar program, with special reference to the encouragement of home ownership, the elimination of slums and blighted areas, and the extent of the necessity of federally subsidized housing for low-income families.

Shortly after this resolution was favorably reported, the Senate established its Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning. To avoid duplication of effort, a subcommittee of this Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning was established to make the housing investigation and report called for by the earlier resolution. This subcommittee was headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], with representation from the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Education and Labor.

In 1944 this subcommittee examined every aspect of the housing problem. It communicated with the major organizations concerned with housing from the financing, construction, management, or consumer standpoint. In 1945, extensive hearings were held by the subcommittee and testimony was presented by every source of informed opinion. In August of 1945, the subcommittee issued its report setting forth its recommendations for the comprehensive postwar housing program required to meet the housing needs of the country. Most of the recommendations contained in this report, and which were subsequently embodied in the pending legislation, are retained in the committee amendments to Senate bill 866.

On the basis of these studies, and investigations, and the recommendations of the subcommittee, and after many meetings to agree upon the specific methods best suited to accomplish the desired objectives, Senate bill 1592, a comprehensive housing bill similar to Senate bill 866 was introduced in November of 1945, un-

der the joint sponsorship of Senators WAGNER, ELLENDER, and TAFT. The Senate Committee on Banking and Currency conducted hearings on that bill for a period of several months. After further consideration by a subcommittee, it was taken up by the full committee, reported to the Senate, and passed without a dissenting vote. Before the House had completed hearings on the bill, the Seventy-ninth Congress adjourned.

During the early part of the Eightieth Congress, Senate bill 866 was introduced by the same three cosponsors. While Senate bill 866 contained a number of changes from the provisions of Senate bill 1592, the major change, of course, was with respect to the administrative organization of the proposed over-all housing agency. Otherwise, however, its major provisions were almost identical with the major provisions of the predecessor bill. In March and April of last year the Committee on Banking and Currency held hearings on Senate bill 866. In April of last year the committee favorably reported Senate bill 866 to the Senate.

The first session of the Eightieth Congress adjourned before Senate bill 866 was acted upon. Nevertheless, it had become increasingly apparent that, if we were to deal effectively with this important problem, the Congress would have to give consideration to our long-term housing requirements and to legislation designed to assist in meeting these requirements. So, in July of last year, just prior to the adjournment of the first session, the Joint Committee on Housing was established by Concurrent Resolution No. 104, and this committee was instructed to conduct a thorough study and investigation of the entire field of housing.

Certainly one of the primary purposes which we sought to achieve in establishing this joint committee and directing that it undertake this additional housing study was to provide the basis for a further unification of ideas as to the kind of legislation which ought to be enacted in order to enable us to deal effectively with the housing problem. I believe that the work of the joint committee did much to accomplish this primary objective.

As the Senators know, the Joint Committee on Housing was composed of 14 members—7 from each House, appointed from their respective Banking and Currency Committees. Over a period of 7 or 8 months this committee undertook investigations and hearings not only in Washington but in some 32 cities throughout the country. On March 15, in accordance with the requirements of the concurrent resolution establishing it, the Joint Committee on Housing reported to the Congress the results of its study and investigations, together with its recommendations as to necessary legislation.

In the main, most of the legislative proposals recommended by the Joint Committee on Housing in its final report were already contained in Senate bill 866 which was then pending on the Senate Calendar. Of course, the final report of the joint committee recommended a number of changes and modifications in the provisions already contained in Senate bill 866, and also recommended one or two additional major legislative proposals. Also, the Senators will recall that during the first session of the Eightieth Congress there were enacted several separate bills affecting matters contained in S. 866.

Accordingly, on March 15, I submitted amendments intended to be proposed to S. 866, and these amendments were referred to the Banking and Currency Committee. The amendments which I introduced were designed to make in the housing bill, then pending on the Senate Calendar, the changes needed:

First, to carry out the recommendations as to necessary legislation contained in the report of the Joint Committee on Housing; and

Second, to reflect legislative action previously taken during the first session of the Eightieth Congress affecting matters contained in the bill.

In view of the exhaustive hearings and studies which had already been undertaken by these special committees and by the Banking and Currency Committee with respect to the matters contained in the amendments, we held brief hearings on the amendments. In this connection, perhaps I should point out that the hearings before the special Senate subcommittee in 1944 and 1945 cover more than 2,200 printed pages. The hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee in 1945 and 1946 on the predecessor bill, S. 1592, cover more than 1,200 printed pages. The hearings before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in 1947 on S. 866 cover almost 700 printed pages. The hearings before the Joint Committee on Housing in 1947 and 1948 will cover some 4,000 printed pages. The results of these several hearings and studies are embodied in the reports submitted by these committees, and all of these reports have consistently recommended the enactment of legislation along the lines of the several proposals contained in the pending bill.

During his testimony before the Banking and Currency Committee on the amendments to S. 866, the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], coauthor of the original legislation, suggested that there were perhaps half a dozen policy questions which ought to be settled by a vote of the committee. The committee was in agreement, and the chairman asked a subcommittee composed of Senator TAFT, Senator MCCARTHY, Senator ROBERTSON of Virginia, and myself, to go over the amendments and to recommend any changes or additions which we thought desirable or necessary. This we did. Most of our recommendations, including the recommended elimination, at this time, of the provisions relating to farm housing, were accepted by the full committee. The amendments, with these changes, were then adopted by the committee and were reported favorably to the Senate as committee amendments to the pending bill.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I should like to have the record clear at this time that at the time we did the work to which the Senator refers, I did not put my stamp of approval upon what is referred to as the Flanders amendments, but I worked with the Senator in an effort to get them in the best possible shape, especially insofar as the public housing section was concerned. I have maintained at all times that this section should be amended to cover, not the upper income strata, now taken care of, but the lower income strata, and that there should be a separate bill. I merely wish to keep the record straight that at no time have I ever approved public housing in its present form.

Mr. FLANDERS. I agree completely with the Senator from Wisconsin that he did make reservations as to the public housing section of the bill.

This is the background of the legislation now under consideration. I do not think there is anything I could add to this, except to say that I do not know of any measure to which more careful consideration has been given by the members of the committee and many other Senators who have been directly interested in this subject.

Many of the provisions of the committee amendments are directed toward making various perfecting changes in the existing provisions contained in S. 866 as reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency during the first session. Most of these perfecting changes were recommended by the final report of the Joint Committee on Housing.

There are two or three additional major housing proposals contained in the committee amendments which are not included in any form in the existing provisions of S. 866, and I should like to touch briefly on these.

First of all, provision is made for an extension of title VI of the National Housing Act on a revised and transitional basis. Provision is made for extending title VI until March 31, 1949. The insurance authorization would be increased by $1,600,000,000. With the $400,000,000 authorized by the temporary 30-day extension of title VI which we recently approved, this would provide an additional $2,000,000,000 of insurance authorization. Also, it is provided that at least half of this additional amount must be allocated for rental housing on which commitments are issued after March 31, 1948. Furthermore, we have kept in mind present conditions and the necessity for moving from the very liberalized forms of insurance aid in title VI to the sounder permanent operations under title II. Therefore, in connection with large scale rental housing under section 608, where the formula of 90 percent of necessary current cost is retained as the statutory basis for insuring loans, the legislation adds a further limitation designed to prevent this rather liberal insurance from being used to support any additional increases in the costs or prices of housing. We provide that in no event shall the insurance granted thereunder be for more than 90 percent of the replacement cost of the particular project on the basis of the costs prevailing in the locality on December 31, 1948, for projects of comparable quality. Also, since the extension of title VI is on this transitional basis,

most of the S. 866 amendments to title II of the National Housing Act are incorporated.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator from Vermont yield again?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. In going over the Senator's amendments this morning, I noticed something which I should like to call to his attention, and I wonder if he can explain the reason for it.

In the secondary market provision as drawn, and as it is in my amendment, a secondary market is provided for title I, class 3, loans. Such a loan is one upon the lower cost house, the house which will not qualify for a section 603 or section 203 loan, the type which normally would be built perhaps where the streets are not improved, where there may not be all the facilities required for the section 203 or section 603 loans. I have provided in my amendment for a secondary market for that type of loan, and I think that is where the secondary market is most needed.

If we provide a secondary market for other FHA and VA loans, and eliminate the title I, class 3, loans, that will make the situation even worse than it was before. Even now they are all on a par, and bankers are reluctant to take title I, class 3, loans.

If we provide a secondary market for all the VA and FHA loans, I cannot see that a banker would ever take a title I, class 3 loan, which would work a serious hardship on the young man who wants to build a cheaper home. That is especially true in some semirural areas in the South. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and I heartily agree that instead of giving less consideration to that particular group, we should give more consideration to it. I have not discussed this matter with the Senator from Alabama, but we have discussed the absolute necessity of doing something toward making those particular loans more marketable. I notice, in reading the Senator's bill, that he eliminates them from the secondary market entirely, and I wonder if he will tell me why.

Mr. FLANDERS. In general, Mr. President, we have tried to throw around the secondary market the same provisions for soundness in operation that are thrown around the market that has existed up to this time in FHA, which goes popularly under the name of "Fanny May."

I think the Senator raises an interesting question which may be worthy of further consideration. I certainly shall be prepared to give further consideration to it, but I feel that we should not make provisions for loans which automatically go into the secondary market because they are unsound on any other basis.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Vermont understands that the title I, class 3 loans is a 10 percent guaranteed loan; not 10 percent of the loan of each individual, but 10 percent of the entire portfolio held by the bank. Bankers tell us that is the soundest sort of loan they really can secure, but that in building up the portfolio there is an interim period during which the risk is rather great, and for that reason they do not take the loans. So far as the loan being sound or unsound is concerned, I believe there is not a single individual anywhere who will say that such a loan is not equally sound, if not sounder than the section 603 or section 203 loan.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin if he would refer me to which of his amendments, or which part of one of his amendments, takes care of that situation.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the Senator will refer to his amendment, he will find that it covers only loans guaranteed under title II or title VI, and the VA loans.

Mr. FLANDERS. That is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am speaking of title I. I cover all loans insured or guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration or the FHA. In other words I cover all FHA and VA guaranteed or insured loans. I wondered whether the title I loans were not inadvertently left out of the Senator's amendment.

Mr. FLANDERS. Will the Senator from Wisconsin refer me to that particular one of his amendments which relates to this matter?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; my amendment lettered "F."

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me once more?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have not had a chance to check the particular item to which I referred in the Senator's amendment. Will the Senator tell me to what extent he has increased the amount of a loan under title I, class 3. Has the Senator increased the amount to $4,000, or to $5,000?

Mr. FLANDERS. Will the Senator repeat his question?

Mr. McCARTHY. I understand that the Senator has increased the amount of the maximum loan that can be guaranteed under title 1, class 3. In my amendment I have increased the amount to $5,000. I wondered what the Senator's amendment provided. The reason I ask is that there is a great deal of concern about this particular section of the bill on the part of the builders engaged in erecting the lower-cost homes.

Mr. FLANDERS. My recollection is that the figure is $5,000. I may be mistaken, and I shall have that matter looked up.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the amount is not $5,000, would the Senator from Vermont have any objection to increasing it to $5,000, in case his amendment should be adopted? I wish to point out in that connection, that a great number of builders, especially those on the west coast, and in warmer climates, find they can build a low-cost home for about $5,000. A number of builders find they cannot go below $4,000 and build a stable home. If the limitation were increased to $5,000 the builders feel there would be a considerable boom in the building of the cheaper homes. I wonder if the Senator from Vermont would have any serious objection to increasing the amount to $5,000?

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like first to find out just what the amendment provides. My recollection is that it provides for $5,000, but I cannot be sure until I have looked it up.

Since the extension of title VI is on this transitional basis, most of the amendments of Senate bill 866 to Title II of the National Housing Act are incorporated. The result is that the changes in title II which appear necessary to offer reasonable assurance that during this extension period it will operate with increasing effectiveness and thus make possible an orderly transition, will be made concurrently with this extension of title VI.

The committee amendments also add other perfecting amendments to title VI of the National Housing Act. These include changes in section 609 relating to the insurance of loans for the manufacture of houses, so as to eliminate some of the difficulties which have come up in connection with this section since its enactment a year ago. They include an amendment to section 610 relating to FHA insurance of mortgages to finance the sale of federally owned permanent war housing now being disposed of by the Government so that such insurance would also be available to finance the sale of the federally owned Greenbelt towns known as Green Hills, Ohio; Greenbelt, Md., and Greendale, Wis. They also include addition of a new section 611 which would authorize the FHA to insure construction advances in the case of larger scale projects—that is properties on which there is to be constructed 25 or more family units consisting of a group of one-family or two-family dwellings. Incidentially, these latter provisions are so drafted as to include the case where the builder has located on the property covered by the mortgage, during the course of construction, a plant for the fabrication of dwellings or parts thereof. Thus, this section would particularly encourage large-scale operations which precutting and prefabricating is performed in a plant on the site. I may say parenthetically that to my mind this is one of the most hopeful undertakings in the way of reducing the ultimate cost of first-class housing.

Another major addition to the existing provisions of S. 866 is the provision, in the Housing and Home Finance Agency, of a secondary market for FHA insured and GI guaranteed home mortgage loans. Many of the Senators have been very much interested in the question of a secondary source of credit for Government guaranteed or insured home mortgage loans, particularly those insured or guaranteed under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. However, I suppose most of us have felt rather strongly that if provision for this kind of Government assistance were to be made it should be on a carefully restricted basis, rather than upon the relatively unrestricted basis which obtained prior to the time when the Congress terminated these operations with respect to GI loans last June. I believe the provisions of the committee amendments would accomplish this essential objective.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I wonder if the Senator would have any serious objec-

tion—assuming that after checking his amendment and mine tonight we can make the changes upon which we both agree—to including in his amendment an extension of the secondary market feature to title I loans as well as title II and title VI loans. I wonder why the Senator omitted title I loans?

Mr. FLANDERS. I should wish to investigate that question a little further, and to assure myself that such loans applied to types of housing which were really permanent. It seems that title related to not-too-good housing.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator's own amendment provides that the head of the corporation may establish rules and specifications which such homes must meet before they are covered.

Mr. FLANDERS. That is correct. I shall certainly take that suggestion under consideration without prejudice.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to get the Senator's thought, if I may. I do not desire to bother him too much at this time, but I wish he could tell me why he has deleted that one provision in his amendment, why he has eliminated title I loans. The reason I am concerned with this subject is that it is the source of great irritation all over the country. Many young men want to build lower-cost homes. The contractors want to build lower-cost homes. They run up against a stone wall because they cannot get that type of loan. I assume that when the Senator deleted that provision from the bill as originally drafted, he must have had some good reason. If I knew what his reason was, I could furnish him with data and facts to convince him that perhaps he is mistaken. But I do not know what the Senator's reason was for deleting that provision.

Mr. FLANDERS. What would be their reason for not building under title II, for example?

Mr. McCARTHY. Under title II, in order to obtain a loan, first, there must be improved streets; and second, all the utilities must be available. In some areas that requirement is interpreted as meaning concrete streets. We find that in the outskirts of many cities concrete streets are not laid. There are good gravel roads. Perhaps the location is outside the high-tax area, and the contractor finds that he can build cheap veterans' housing. As of today, he cannot get that type of loan guaranteed under title II or title VI. If we take the Senator's amendment as it is, we make it even more difficult. I assume that the Senator had some reason for eliminating title I loans. If I knew what the Senator's reason was, I could dig through the testimony tonight and give him the advice of those who testified before the committee. I am sure I could convince him that even in his amendment title I loans should be included.

Mr. FLANDERS. I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I should be glad to have him do so, because I certainly wish to support any safe and useful provision.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not know what to look for unless I know what the Senator's reason was for eliminating title I loans. I know that the Senator had some good reason when he redrafted the bill.

Mr. FLANDERS. As I endeavored to explain earlier, I had the feeling, as I think we all have, that this rediscount provision needs to be soundly hedged about. The title I buildings are presumably of the less desirable sort from the standpoint of Government risk. Fundamentally that is the thing to which I ask the Senator to address himself in preparing the case for including such loans.

Mr. McCARTHY. Has the Senator gone over the testimony of any of the bankers, representatives of lending institutions, or contractors touching on that subject? We have an unlimited amount of testimony on the subject; but I do not know of any witnesses who agree with the Senator. I sincerely hope that the Senator will have his staff dig out that portion of the testimony for him, so that he may read the testimony of bankers, representatives of lending institutions, contractors, and FHA officials. I am sure that after the Senator reads that testimony he will agree with me that he should put back in his amendment coverage of title I loans.

Mr. FLANDERS. I shall be glad to consider the suggestion.

I think the provisions of the committee amendments would accomplish the essential objective. The total amount of funds which would be available under the legislation for this purpose without further authorization from the Congress would be limited to $500,000,000. Of this amount, $250,000,000 would be available immediately. The additional $250,000,000 could be made available only with the approval of the President.

Mr. President, the operations under this title of the bill would be carried out through a corporation in the Housing and Home Finance Agency. There would be an advisory board to the Corporation consisting of the president of the Corporation as chairman and the heads of certain other agencies or their designees. These other agencies include the Treasury Department, the Veterans' Administration, the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Housing Administration, and the Home Loan Bank Board.

The purchase operations are carefully restricted. Purchases are restricted to areas where a scarcity of private secondary credit for home-mortgage loans develops to the extent of threatening continued production and availability of sale or rental housing generally in the area, and where the purchase operations would not reasonably be expected to contribute to substantially increased costs and prices of housing.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I note in the Senator's amendment covering the secondary market that he provides a secondary market only in case the guaranteed loan is a first lien upon real estate. I am curious to know why the Senator has that particular provision in his amendment. That would eliminate all the combination 505 (a) loans, that is a loan under which a veteran would get an 80-percent FHA loan and a 20-percent VA loan. There would be no secondary market for that type of loan. Nor would there be any secondary market under the Senator's amendment for loans for veterans' cooperatives—at least that portion of the loan which was not guaranteed by the FHA. That situation has caused a great deal of concern to a number of veterans' organizations and a number of builders. I wonder why the Senator has inserted that particular phrase in his amendment.

Mr. FLANDERS. In general it was desired, as I stated in another connection, to hedge the secondary market about with such restrictions as would make it a safe undertaking for the Government, as applied to those particular undertakings and those particular places where the secondary market was badly needed.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. In view of the fact that we are dealing only with loans which are fully guaranteed, fully insured—a Government agency has already guaranteed or insured the full face of the paper—there is no chance of the new agency losing any money. In the light of that fact, I wonder why the Senator eliminated certain veterans' loans from the secondary market. The Senator speaks of losing money. The new agency can lose no money, because it is only taking paper which is 100 percent guaranteed by FHA or VA. The Senator's amendment would eliminate certain types of loans. I cannot see that they differ in any respect, so far as soundness is concerned, from the other loans. Again, I know that the Senator had a good reason for what he did. I wish I knew what it was, because I could refer the Senator to testimony which I think might change his mind.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, this also goes back to the question of overstimulation of housing beyond the limits of available men and material, and to the question of adding too much to the inflationary structure. The whole bill, wherever it touches upon stimulating construction under conditions which might make it inflationary, has been revised downward. An example of that, of course, was the basis on which the valuations were made for FHA mortgages, which were described earlier. We do not want to add to inflationary pressures. We do want to get the maximum volume of housing which present limitations on employees and materials will permit. In general that has meant a slight shading of the availability of credit.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the Senator have in mind that he is discriminating in his amendment against veterans' loans only because the Veterans' Admnistration has not required that they be a first lien upon the property? We are not dealing with the soundness of the loan. If the Veterans' Administration would

revise its rules, and would say, "We will not loan you this money unless you give a mortgage; we will not take the type of note that you give to a veterans' cooperative," that would be different. But all they do is create an administrative muddle, and make it necessary to change a great many rules and regulations.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin has raised a point which is worth a little further study on my part, and I shall be prepared to discuss it later.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, purchases may not be made in any area unless there is no active private market willing to purchase the loans at appropriate prices. Furthermore, purchase operations in any area must be terminated whenever it appears that the volume of such purchases contributes to substantial increases in the costs and prices of housing.

That is the point I was raising earlier, and the provision is anti-inflationary in character.

No loan can be purchased if it is made prior to the time when this legislation becomes law.

No loan could be purchased if the original principal amount thereof exceeds $7,000 for each dwelling unit covered by the mortgage. However, authority is granted to prescribe higher maximum amounts not to exceed $10,000 per family dwelling units, if at any time, or in any area, it is not feasible to construct dwellings of sound standards of construction and livability within the limitations of lower maximum amounts.

No loans can be purchased except from mortgagees qualified by experience and facilities to service the loan. Also, no loan may be purchased unless supporting data are submitted to show compliance with requirements, to be prescribed by regulation, with respect to the ability of the borrower to meet his monthly payments and with respect to the physical soundness of the property covered by the mortgage.

Other additions to the existing provisions of Senate bill 866 made by the committee amendments include the addition of an incontestability clause to title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, bringing such mortgages into line with FHA practice. They include an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code to permit investors in rental housing constructed after March 15, 1948, at their option, to take a special amortization deduction consisting of an increased depreciation allowance, for income-tax purposes, of 10 percent a year for each of the 5 years following the completion of construction. This would be in lieu of present depreciation allowance, which is generally 2½ percent a year. They also include an amendment to the Banking Act which would permit national banks and State member banks of the Federal Reserve System to purchase local housing authority obligations in larger amounts and to underwrite such obligations.

I may say to the Senate that to that particular point I myself wish to give a little more thought, and I may wish to present an amendment regarding it, perhaps tomorrow.

Such banks are now authorized by the Banking Act to do this in connection with obligations of the United States and certain other types of obligations with special security provisions similar to those which would attach to local housing authority obligations as the result of other amendments to the United States Housing Act made by the pending proposed legislation.

There are two or three other major provisions in Senate bill 866 which I should like to comment upon very briefly. First of all, the provisions of title II and III of Senate bill 866, dealing with the establishment of the permanent over-all housing agency, have been eliminated. These titles, of course, are no longer necessary, since this matter was covered by the establishment, during the first session of the Eightieth Congress, of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The provisions of title X of Senate bill 866, relating to farm-housing assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture, have been eliminated, since the committee felt that this required some additional study. Accordingly, we have substituted provisions which direct the Secretary of Agriculture and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to prepare a report on farm housing. This report, together with such recommendations as these officials may have as to legislation, must be submitted to the Congress not later than January 15 of next year.

The other principal significant change in the provisions of Senate bill 866 relates to the form in which Federal assistance shall be given to the localities for the assembly and clearance of land in slums and blighted areas, and its preparation for sale or lease for redevelopment. The existing provisions of Senate bill 866 would have established for this purpose a system of Federal loans and annual contributions over a 45-year period. The proposed legislation would substitute a system of capital grants in lieu of the system of annual contributions. This was feasible in the case of slum clearance because the amount of the loss is definitely ascertainable when the land has been assembled, cleared, and sold or leased. No portion of that loss is recoverable in the course of subsequent operations, and the full amount of the subsidy must therefore be paid. This change has also resulted in some simplification of this particular title of Senate bill 866.

I should also like to point out that the provisions of Senate bill 866 relating to Federal aid to the localities for the provision of low-rent public housing for families who are living in the slums and who have incomes so low that they cannot otherwise obtain decent housing, new or old, are retained in the proposed legislation. The major changes here are that the separate authorizations originally provided in Senate bill 866 for urban low-rent public housing and for rural low-rent public housing have been combined into a single authorization, and the authorization for the program of a maximum of 500,000 units is spread over a 5-year period rather than the 4-year period originally proposed.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to ask a question. I have been over the public-housing section of the bill very carefully. I notice that it provides for a maximum subsidy of $160,000,000 a year, after the public-housing program has been completed. That is the same maximum that is provided in the old Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, and originally in the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill. In view of the fact that the same formula for subsidy is being used, but a formula which now must be based upon 1948 building costs, whereas the formula in the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill was based upon 1944 building costs, which were very much lower, am I correct in assuming that although the pending bill provides for a maximum of 500,000 public-housing units, unless the maximum subsidy is substantially increased, the figure of 500,000 public-housing units is entirely deceptive, inasmuch as it would not be possible to obtain more than approximately 300,000 public-housing units under present circumstances and prices? Does the Senator from Vermont follow me on that point?

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes. Of course there is a question as to whether we wish to increase the amount, in view of the cost, or whether we wish to restrict ourselves to the amount presently provided for carrying out this undertaking. The committee report restricts the dollar amount.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, while costs have gone up, it must also be remembered that incomes have correspondingly gone up. Consequently, the amount of the subsidy involved need not be increased substantially over what was originally contemplated. As a matter of fact, there is an increase in the subsidy over that of last year, is there not?

Mr. McCARTHY. No. According to the testimony of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], $160,000,000 would be the maximum. The program has never cost that much. We have never come up to the maximum formula; but I should say the Senator's testimony was that his bill would have provided a maximum subsidy of $160,000,000 a year. I noticed the Senator from Vermont provides the same maximum subsidy. I do not believe he has changed the formula, and that makes it contradictory. In other words, if the bill is taken as it now is, and we leave in it the provision for 500,000 units, with a subsidy of $160,000,000, the one is completely contradictory of the other.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The original T-E-W bill provided a subsidy of $26,400,000, or a total amount of $130,000,000 after completion of the entire program, whereas this bill would raise the subsidy to $32,000,000 a year, or a total of $160,000,000; so there has been an increase of about 20 percent over what we included last year, which was an increase over the original bill of

2 years ago. We have increased the subsidy, and, as I may point out, that may not be necessary, because incomes have increased as much as costs, and it would be expected that in the public-housing units today there would be a higher rental than would have been expected before the war.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am speaking of the provisions for the maximum subsidy, which has nothing to do with rental. The rental received will, of course, have something to do with whether the maximum is paid.

Mr. TAFT. The rental has a very direct relation to the maximum subsidy.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to ask a question with respect to the Senator's formula. His formula for the subsidy is roughly this: The Federal Government pays the Housing Authority an amount equal to the amount of interest due on the bonds, plus, roughly 2 percent; the city then pays approximately 20 percent of what the Federal Government pays; so that if the formula in the bill is followed today we must directly tie that up to building costs in some manner, in order to provide 500,000 units.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. In any event, without arguing the question of whether there will be higher rents or lower rents, in order to allow for the increase in cost in this bill, the subsidy is increased from $26,400,000 a year to $32,000,000 a year.

Mr. FLANDERS. Furthermore, there is no very clear relation between 500,000 units and $160,000,000, and it is not known which ceiling would be encountered first. We have two ceilings which would be encountered, but I should like to note that the program is spread over a 5-year period rather than over the 4-year period originally proposed.

I believe the subsidies for this program are sound and proper. They are selected subsidies in that they are strictly limited to the people who need them—the very low-income families who cannot otherwise obtain decent housing. I hope the Senate will agree that the Government has an obligation to assist in making it possible for the children in this country to have a fairly even start, so that during the formative years of their childhood they will have the opportunity of a decent home and a suitable living environment.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say to the Senator from Vermont that a member of his staff has just called my attention to the fact that I was referring to the testimony of the Senator from Ohio given on the amendments, not on his own bill, so that he is correct when he says there has been an increase in the subsidy.

Mr. FLANDERS. There is only one other matter which I would like to bring to the attention of the Senators. I am sure that in the last few days many of the Senators have received indications of one sort or another that the enactment of the proposed legislation would do irreparable damage to our private enterprise system. I suppose most of us have about the same reaction to this sort of thing as we have to the hobgoblins which the children bring out every Halloween. I do not propose to consume time discussing such matters. I shall merely ad lib for a moment, rather than read too much from my statement, for the time is getting short. I think a careful study of the provisions contained in the bill will convince anyone that we are confining public housing to that field which private initiative has never served, and which it never can and never will undertake to serve, except on the basis of substandard housing, of old and decayed dwellings, in which no human being ought to live.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for what I hope will be the last question?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator has noted the amendment which I have to section 9 of the T-E-W bill. Let me ask the Senator whether he would have any serious objection to providing that the Public Housing Administration shall do what I believe the vast number of people want done, and which were intended to be done when we established the Authority; that is, not to start half way up the income level, taking the cream of the crop of the low-income group, but forcing the Administration to go right down to the bottom where housing is needed the most. Let us take the welfare case, the crippled, the disabled, the veterans with large families and small incomes. A priority could be given in such cases without in any way affecting the number of units proposed. Instead of starting with the nonwelfare class, let us start right at the bottom.

As Senators know, people from one end of the country to the other have testified before the committee and evidenced much concern for the extremely low income group. As of today, we say we will help the poor fellow at the bottom, but if he is at the bottom of the social scale he is not entitled to a decent place in which to live. If the children are from a family that is on relief, for example, then they are not entitled to receive federally supported housing.

I am wondering if Senators will not agree with me that that theory is all wrong, and that if there is to be a permanent public housing program, we should start exactly at the bottom, provide for those who have the greatest need, and gradually work up until we come to a group perhaps that is now being taken care of, keeping always in mind that today there are many people making $3,000, $4,000, and $5,000 a year, who are living in homes provided through public housing.

Mr. FLANDERS. The point the Senator from Wisconsin raises is one that was very much in the minds of the committee in preparing the bill. Should we take the lower end of the small income group, or the upper end of the lower income group? It becomes a question as to how they shall be defined. One method is described in the bill. The Senator from Wisconsin has another definition, which seems on the whole to be rather loose. I think we should take the opportunity of comparing the two definitions, to see which meets the objective, which is apparently the same. I may call the Senator's attention to the fact that when he includes the veteran with the low income and the large family of children, he is including a group which I should like to see included, but which is not necessarily a welfare group in the ordinary sense of that term.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator will understand that when I speak of the veteran, I refer only to the veteran who is in that particular income strata.

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. I ask the Senator if he is aware, as I am sure he is, that in a number of areas there is an absolute maximum of 10 percent of what may be called welfare tenants in public housing?

In a number of areas there is an absolute maximum of 10 percent of what may be called welfare tenants in public housing. In other words, in public housing projects there is a maximum of 10 percent of persons on relief, or receiving some assistance from the city or from the State. In no areas which we visited did we ever find more than 4, 5, or 6 percent of the welfare group in public housing. At the same time, well-meaning men and children, church groups, have pointed out the very bad condition of welfare groups. They think that if we pass a public housing bill we should make room for such groups and then come up the line.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I am very much impressed with what the junior Senator from Wisconsin has said regarding low-income workers and their housing needs. Having listened to the debate, I want to say to the very able Senator from Wisconsin that he has touched on the very question that is so vital and important in the matter of public housing. Unfortunately it is the individual who is in the extreme low brackets of income who is always in dire need of some assistance or otherwise is compelled to live in some type of hovel which is not fit for him or his family and small children. Usually it is in an area which does not furnish any type of playground for children. I want to say to the able junior Senator from Wisconsin that I was very much impressed by the remarks he has just made on the question.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Minnesota that I think it would be unfortunate to make almost complete dependence on public charity a requirement for entrance into low-cost housing. That makes such housing, in effect, a poorhouse. I hope we can give some degree of respectability to the family which is unfortunate enough to be compelled to have their living quarters publicly subsidized.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. There is one other thought I have in mind. Besides considering the very extreme low-income group, there is also to be taken into consideration the blighted areas within large cities. The only way such blighted areas can be erased or corrected is through public housing projects, whereby a certain blighted area is either improved or made into a public park, and the building project is proceeded with in some more desirable location. I realize that there are really two phases of public housing. One is to correct a situation which would never be corrected without such a project, and the other is to correct the situation with regard to the unfortunate.

Mr. FLANDERS. The first step in a blighted area or slum situation is the slum-clearance element of the housing bill.

Mr. THYE. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Without passing finally on the question raised by the Senator from Wisconsin, I should be inclined to oppose his amendment. What he is suggesting is public housing for persons on relief who are ill, lame, or otherwise physically incapacitated. My own view is that public housing should not be used for such persons. They constitute relief problems. They go from town to town. Many of them should be in institutions rather than in public housing. I think public housing should be utilized for the lowest income persons who are regularly employed, namely, persons who are receiving in large cities, for instance, $100 a month, on which they cannot live. They are the persons who should be taken care of in public housing.

I think the relief problem is entirely different. It is one which simply has to be taken care of from time to time by direct charitable relief to particular persons. So I think I should be inclined to oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin. I think what I have suggested is the general theory of all public housing as I have seen it developed and discussed in recent years.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have in mind an example which can be multiplied by 500,000 or a million. A widow with four or five children is receiving a small pension, which is not large enough to enable her to rent a decent place in which to rear her children as of today. Under the theory of public housing as we have approved it up to this time, she would be ineligible to live in a public-housing unit. Let us say we build a public-housing unit. Then there is the question of who should live in it. If the theory of public housing is sound, and I think it is, although I would rather refer to it as welfare housing, it seems only logical to make such units available to the persons who need them most. To deny such housing to those who are so unfortunate as to require aid from the municipality in order to live, and to say that they are too low in the social scale to be considered..is so unsound that I cannot conceive of any justification for it under any circumstances.

Mr. FLANDERS. The question raised by the Senator from Wisconsin is an interesting one, but it brings the Federal Government into the relief problem, whereas, on the whole, we have wanted to keep it within the bounds of the responsibility of State and local governments.

Mr. President, there is only one other matter which I would like to bring to the attention of the Senators. I am sure that in the last few days many of the Senators have received indications of one sort or another that the enactment of this proposed legislation would do irreparable damage to our private enterprise system. I suppose most of us have about the same reaction to this sort of thing as we have to the hobgoblins which the children bring out every Halloween.

I have stated on every occasion that the primary responsibility for solving the housing crisis rests with private enterprise. The core of this bill is concentrated upon aid to the house-building industry so that it can meet the need of 15,000,000 houses during the next 10 years. However, there is a need for housing for people who cannot possibly afford to pay the rents required to make private housing profitable. This bill contains a provision to aid this group but I want it clearly understood that such housing constitutes less than 4 percent of the total housing contemplated to be built until 1960.

In drafting this legislation I wanted to be very certain that the units to be built by private contractors under the low-rent housing provision should in no way compete with private enterprise. It is required as a condition of Federal financial assistance that the local public housing agency must submit an analysis of the local housing market showing not only that there is a need for low-rent housing which cannot be met by private enterprise, but also that a gap of at least 20 percent has been left between the upper rental limits for admission to the proposed project and the lowest rents at which private enterprise is providing safe and sanitary housing.

To make sure that such housing does not divert families from the market for private housing, it is required by this bill that every family admitted to a public project unless that of a veteran must come from an unsafe, unsanitary or overcrowded dwelling. Every family including veterans admitted to such a project must be of such a low income as to be unable to secure other acceptable housing. If during occupancy, a family's income increases to such a level as to be able to afford private housing, the family is forced to move from the project.

There is some misunderstanding on the distinction between slum clearance and public housing. Although this confusion does not exist on the floor of the Senate, I should like to clear it up for the record. Slum clearance relates to the section that authorizes a limited program of Federal aid to local communities to enable them to undertake positive and comprehensive steps for the clearance of their slums and blighted areas, so as to make such areas available for redevelopment. Once the land is cleared, it may be sold or leased to private interests for new building. The Federal and local government provide the margin of money between the price that private enterprise can reasonably pay for land to provide moderate rentals and the actual cost of buying the land and clearing it. This is primarily an aid for private enterprise.

The low-rent housing program, however, provides for Federal financial assistance to local public housing authorities to aid them in building low-cost rental housing which will be operated by the local authority. The local housing authority issues its own bonds to provide funds for the construction of the housing project. The Federal Government fills the gap between what remains after operating costs are deducted from rentals and the amount necessary for amortization of the principal. This Federal aid fluctuates from year to year. The figures stipulated in this bill represent the maximum annual liability of the Federal Government, but I would like to point out that during the past 5 or 6 years the actual Federal contribution has amounted to about 65 percent of the maximum possible contribution.

Mr. President, I have received hundreds of telegrams with relation to this bill. I shall read only two or three because they have some particular significance.

Here is one from John S. Davis, mayor of Reading, Pa. He says:

READING, PA., *April 12, 1948.*

HON. RALPH FLANDERS,
United States Senate Building:

We respectfully urge and beseech you to do everything possible to pass Senate bill 866, as we feel the passage of this legislation will do much to alleviate our national housing problem.

JOHN S. DAVIS,
Mayor.

C. A. Harrell, city manager, Norfolk, Va., urges early action by the Senate on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill as amended by recent action of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Aloys P. Kaufmann, mayor of St. Louis, Mo., says:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *April 10, 1948.*

Senator RALPH E. FLANDERS,
Senate Office Building:

Respectfully urge your vigorous support of Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill. Although St. Louis is contemplating large bond issue to further slum clearance and provide additional recent housing, neither private capital nor local government alone and unassisted can perform titanic task of rebuilding decayed and blighted areas which afflict virtually every city in America. Aid of Federal Government is imperative in our all-out war on slums and substandard housing.

ALOYS P. KAUFMANN,
Mayor.

The membership of Raymond C. Paul Post 880, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Galveston, Tex., unanimously voted to endorse the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. They say that the passage of the bill is most urgent.

From the city of Bristol, Va., the mayor sends a telegram to the same effect, as does the mayor of the city of Long Branch, N. J.

Those are only a few of the hundreds of telegrams which I have received. I do not know who got after the mayors. It may be that they are aware of the situation on their own initiative. I hope so.

RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Senate take a recess until the hour of 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, April 15, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 14 (legislative day of March 29), 1948:

UNITED NATIONS

The following-named persons to be representatives of the United States of America to the Special Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to be held in New York, N. Y., beginning April 16, 1948:

Warren R. Austin, of Vermont.

Francis B. Sayre, of the District of Columbia.

Philip C. Jessup, of New York.

The following-named persons to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the Special Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to be held in New York, N. Y., beginning April 16, 1948:

Dean Rusk, of Virginia.

John C. Ross, of New York.

The following-named cadets to be ensigns in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 4th day of June 1948:

Irving Louis Apgar II
Stuart Scott Beckwith
Kenneth Judson Boedecker, Jr.
Robert John Bosnak
James Byron Brook
William Parker Butler, Jr.
John Kerwin Byerlein
Wayne Eugene Caldwell
Donald Morgan Chapman
Maxwell Seymour Charleston
James Timothy Clune
Luigi Colucciello
John Denis Crowley
Harry Augustus Davenport III
Robert Ellwood Deaver
Robert Emerson Dolliver
Joseph Clyde Dorsky
Robert Alan Duin
Robert Walker Durfey
Norman Paul Ensrud
William Henry Fitzgerald, Jr.
Philippe Cheney Gaucher
Robert Franklin Goebel
Harry Frederick Gregg
Robert Saxby Hall
Clarence Reinhold Hallberg
Charles Briggs Hathaway
Edward LeRoy Hauff
James Richard Hope
Herbert Edward Lindemann
Carl Stevens Mathews
Robert James McCune
Samuel Murray Moore III
Eli Curtis Nielson
Walter Charles Ochman
Howard William Pagel
Alfred Prunski
LeRoy Reinburg, Jr.
Virgil Willard Rinehart
Duane Gordon Ross
George Schmidt
Stuart Talmage Scharfenstein
Bernard Shapiro
Darrel Williams Starr, Jr.
Richard Chatfield Taylor
Robert Charles Taylor
Bernie Eunie Thompson
Paul Wilbur Tifft, Jr.
Richard Joseph Tomozer
Robert Everett Walsh
William Randolph Weadon
Thomas Trask Wetmore III

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 14 (legislative day of March 29), 1948:

UNITED NATIONS

The following-named persons to be representatives of the United States of America to the special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to be held in New York, N. Y., beginning April 16, 1948:

Warren R. Austin, of Vermont.

Francis B. Sayre, of the District of Columbia.

Philip C. Jessup, of New York.

The following-named persons to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to be held in New York, N. Y., beginning April 16, 1948:

Dean Rusk, of Virginia.

John C. Ross, of New York.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Air Force of the United States, to be chief of staff, United States Air Force, with rank of general, for the period of 4 years beginning from date of appointment.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

APPOINTMENTS IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Brazil

Herschel V. Johnson

To be Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Frank E. Cash, Jr.	William F. Penniman, Jr.
John H. Holdridge	
Stephen H. McClintic	

PROMOTIONS IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To be Foreign Service officers of class 1

Don C. Bliss, Jr.	Austin R. Preston
Clarence C. Brooks	Joseph C. Satterthwaite
Lewis Clark	
Edward S. Crocker 2d	George P. Shaw
Paul R. Josselyn	Howard H. Tewksbury

To be Foreign Service Officers of class 2

George M. Abbott	Cecil B. Lyon
Garret G. Ackerson, Jr.	James S. Moose, Jr.
Ware Adams	Edward Page, Jr.
Walworth Barbour	Avery F. Peterson
Jacob D. Beam	James B. Pilcher
Sidney H. Browne	Harold M. Randall
DuWayne G. Clark	Charles S. Reed 2d
John Davies, Jr.	John S. Service
Allan Dawson	Francis Bowden Stevens
Charles H. Derry	
Hooker A. Doolittle	Laurence W. Taylor
C. Burke Elbrick	Tyler Thompson
Wilson C. Flake	William C. Trimble
Raleigh A. Gibson	William T. Turner
Franklin C. Gowen	Walter N. Walmsley, Jr.
Benjamin M. Hulley	
J. Wesley Jones	Miss Frances E. Willis
Kenneth C. Krentz	Robert F. Woodward
Charles W. Lewis, Jr.	

To be Foreign Service officers of class 3

Stephen E. Aguirre	Edmund A. Gullion
Daniel V. Anderson	Theodore J. Hadraba
Ralph A. Boernstein	Parker T. Hart
Aaron S. Brown	James E. Henderson
Howard Elting, Jr.	Fred W. Jandrey
Herbert P. Fales	Robert B. Memminger
John C. Pool	Robert M. Taylor
Paul J. Reveley	Charles W. Thayer
Edward E. Rice	Joseph I. Touchette
Fred K. Salter	Rolland Welch
John F. Stone	Milton K. Wells

To be Foreign Service officers of class 4

William L. Blue	David LeBreton, Jr.
Robert M. Brandin	Frederick J. Mann
John A. Calhoun	Paul Paddock
Robert J. Cavanaugh	Claude G. Ross
Adrian B. Colquitt	Terry B. Sanders, Jr.
Bartley P. Gordon	Byron B. Snyder

To be Foreign Service officers of class 5

Robert W. Adams	Spencer M. King
Robert G. Bailey	William E. Knight 2d
Quentin R. Bates	Stephen A. Koczak
Williams Beal	William K. Leonhart
Robert M. Beaudry	Oliver M. Marcy
Harry H. Bell	James V. Martin, Jr.
John Q. Blodgett	Thomas W. McElhiney
Mrs. Katherine W. Bracken	William A. McFadden
	Thomas D. McKiernan
William L. Brewster	Francis E. Meloy, Jr.
Maurice J. Broderick	Lee E. Metcalf
Miss Lora C. Bryning	Miss Betty Ann Middleton
Rolland H. Bushner	
James M. Byrne	John Y. Millar
Charles C. Carson	Joseph J. Montllor
Wilbur P. Chase	Robert W. Moore
Keld Christensen	Warren S. Moore, Jr.
Edward W. Clark	James O. Morgan
Bruce R. Crooks	David G. Nes
John B. Crume	Miss Helen R. Nicholl
William N. Dale	Albert V. Nyren
Rodger P. Davies	Miss Mary S. Olmsted
Alexander J. Davit	Andrew E. Olson
Richard C. Desmond	Douglas W. Overton
Dwight Dickinson	Arthur L. Paddock, Jr.
Donald P. Downs	Alexander L. Peaslee
Thomas J. Duffield, Jr.	Robert J. Redington
Enoch S. Duncan	John G. Riddick
Paul F. DuVivier	Edward F. Rivinus, Jr.
Cornelius J. Dwyer	Frederick D. Sharp 3d
David I. Ferber	Albert W. Sherer, Jr.
Arthur D. Foley	Joseph A. Silberstein
William H. Friedman	Levi P. Smith, Jr.
Charles Gilbert	Leslie Albion Squires
Richard M. Herndon	Richard H. Stephens
Martin F. Herz	Gerald Stryker
Deane R. Hinton	Emory C. Swank
C. H. Walter Howe	Oliver L. Troxel, Jr.
John J. Ingersoll	Alfred W. Wells
Walter C. Isenberg, Jr.	Robert E. Whedbee
Thomas M. Judd	Louis A. Wiesner
Ben D. Kimpel	Harris H. Williams

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 14, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of "The Americas" and "World Affairs," offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

Almighty God, Father of light and love, look down with favor upon the Speaker of this House and bestow Thy benediction upon all the Members of the United States Congress.

Trusting in the merits of Thy Divine Son, Our Redeemer, we offer our devoted prayers, on this Pan American Day, 1948, for each and every member of the United States delegation at Santa Fe de Bogotá, Colombia, as well as for all their colleagues from the other American Republics. Crown their work with complete success. Protect our Good Neighbors and ourselves, dear Saviour, from the deceits

and violence of the Nazi-minded followers of Karl Marx; disperse the minions of wickedness who would destroy the spiritual unity of the Americas; preserve, by Thy Grace, the ideals of truth, justice and charity, which are the best pledge of freedom and democracy.

Bless, we beseech Thee, the deliberations of this body and the Conference of our brother Americans, assembled under the banners of inter-American friendship. Grateful for Thy Divine gifts, we implore a special blessing for the children of America that they may grow strong and happy in one world, peaceful, but with liberty. This we ask in the Holy Name of God, Our Life and Our Inspiration. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 12, 1948, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on April 13, 1948, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1523. An act for the relief of Edwin H. Griggs, or his estate; and

H. R. 4167. An act to authorize the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Washington to lease their State lands for production of minerals, including leases for exploration for oil, gas, and other hydrocarbons and the extraction thereof, for such terms of years and on such conditions as may be from time to time provided by the legislatures of the respective States.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 358. An act for the relief of Hilario A. Goitia;

H. R. 387. An act for the relief of Hayato Harris Ozawa;

H. R. 388. An act for the relief of Bert Harrington, Jr.;

H. R. 420. An act for the relief of Esther Ringel;

H. R. 421. An act for the relief of Betty Isabel Schunke;

H. R. 560. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Wilhemina Piper Enz;

H. R. 899. An act for the relief of Mrs. Keum Nyu Park;

H. R. 927. An act for the relief of the estate of Mary D. Briggs, deceased;

H. R. 990. An act for the relief of William B. Moore;

H. R. 1859. An act for the relief of Philip Sjoerdt Huizenga;

H. R. 1912. An act for the relief of John A. Dilboy;

H. R. 1927. An act for the relief of Margaret Katherine Hume;

H. R. 2213. An act for the relief of A. J. Sprouffske;

H. R. 2250. An act for the relief of Mrs. Daisy A. T. Jaegers;

H. R. 2303. An act for the relief of Mitsu M. Kobayashi, who is the wife of Edward T. Kobayashi, a citizen of the United States;

H. R. 2425. An act for the relief of August Dane Tetuaearo;

H. R. 2427. An act for the relief of Jose Cabral Lorenzo;

H. R. 2557. An act for the relief of Mable Gladys Viducich;

H. R. 2633. An act for the relief of Claude T. Thomas, legal guardian of Elizabeth Ann Mervine, a minor, and the estates of Mary L. Poole, deceased, and Hazel S. Thomas, deceased;

H. R. 2645. An act to provide that appointments of United States commissioners for the Isle Royale, Hawaii, Mammoth Cave, and Olympic National Parks shall be made by the United States district courts without the recommendation and approval of the Secretary of the Interior;

H. R. 3039. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marian D. McC. Plein;

H. R. 3263. An act for the relief of Tech. Sgt. Tsuyoshi Matsumoto;

H. R. 3300. An act for the relief of Martin A. King;

H. R. 3387. An act for the relief of Bruce Bros. Grain Co.;

H. R. 3569. An act to authorize the construction of a chapel and a library at the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y., and to authorize the acceptance of private contributions to assist in defraying the cost of construction thereof;

H. R. 3849. An act for the relief of Domingo Gandarias;

H. R. 3968. An act for the relief of Olive Irene Milloglav;

H. R. 4118. An act to confirm title in fee simple in Thomas Loflin to certain lands in Rankin County, Miss.;

H. R. 4403. An act for the relief of Ladislao Vaida, Elena Vaida, and Stefano Vaida;

H. R. 4572. An act to amend section 7 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, to provide for learners' permits, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4636. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929, as amended;

H. R. 4649. An act to provide that compensation of members of the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board of the District of Columbia shall be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; and

H. R. 5387. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Department of the Treasury who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions and whose claims for such losses have been considered and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury upon the recommendations of a Treasury claim board.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1036. An act to provide for the licensing of marine radiotelegraph operators as ship radio officers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1498. An act for the relief of Hempstead Warehouse Corp.;

H. R. 3703. An act to authorize transfer of surplus real property to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior for consolidation of Federal holdings within areas administered by the National Park Service;

H. R. 4326. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; and

H. R. 4931. An act to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 193. An act for the relief of Yasutaro Ikuta;

S. 252. An act for the relief of the estate of Lee Jones Cardy;

S. 253. An act for the relief of Ryohei Kubota;

S. 283. An act for the relief of Mrs. Kazumi Noda;

S. 314. An act for the relief of Robert E. Lauritzen;

S. 825. An act for the relief of Ern Wright;

S. 996. An act for the relief of Jin Watanabe (alias Shinichiro Nomura);

S. 1004. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 so as to grant specific authority to the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to require investigations by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the character, associations, and loyalty of persons nominated for appointment, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to offices established by such act;

S. 1256. An act for the relief of Andrew Mathewes;

S. 1332. An act for the relief of Giovanni Battista Angelotti;

S. 1365. An act for the relief of Lowe Way Yuen and Dang Chee;

S. 1483. An act for the relief of Guy Cheng;

S. 1637. An act for the relief of Leo Hamermann;

S. 1656. An act for the relief of Anna Steibel Younger;

S. 1667. An act for the relief of Armand Pullai;

S. 1692. An act for the relief of Ludmila Buresova, alias Buresh; Kristina Buresova, alias Buresh; and Edward Buresh, alias Eduard Bures;

S. 1712. An act for the relief of Spiros Harry Kefalas;

S. 1729. An act for the relief of Gudrun Emma Ericsson;

S. 1745. An act for the relief of George Anthony Yaholkovsky;

S. 1853. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation;

S. 1856. An act to provide for the utilization as national cemeteries of surplus Army Department-owned military real property at Fort Devens, Mass.; Fort Logan, Colo.; and Fort Lewis, Wash.;

S. 1874. An act authorizing the head of the department or agency using the public domain for national defense purposes to compensate holders of grazing permits and licenses for losses sustained by reason of such use of public lands for national defense purposes;

S. 1886. An act for the relief of William M. Looney;

S. 2122. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations;

S. 2137. An act to provide for the protection of potato and tomato production from the golden nematode, and for other purposes;

S. 2225. An act to transfer administration of the Federal Credit Union Act to the Federal Security Agency;

S. 2240. An act to include certain lands within the Uinta and Wasatch National Forests, Utah, and for other purposes;

S. 2256. Relating to the meat-inspection service of the Department of Agriculture;

S. 2288. To amend the Lanham Act so as to permit the sale of certain permanent war housing thereunder to veterans at a purchase price not in excess of the cost of construction;

S. 2325. An act to enable certain former officers or employees of the United States separated from the service subsequent to January 23, 1942, to elect to forfeit their rights to civil-service retirement annuities and to obtain in lieu thereof returns of their contributions with interest;

S. 2409. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 16, 1947;

S. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution providing for participation by the Government of the United States in the Pan American Railway Congress, and authorizing an appropriation therefor;

S. J. Res. 198. Joint resolution to authorize the Postmaster General to withhold the awarding of star-route contracts for a period of 60 days; and

S. J. Res. 207. Joint resolution to provide for the commemoration of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the establishment of the Department of the Navy.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of the Interior.
2. Department of Justice.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Post Office Department.
5. Federal Communications Commission.
6. United States District Court (Northern District of New York).

SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1948

Mr. TABER, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 6226) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1729), which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CANNON reserved all points of order on the bill.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to state the order of business.

The unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President of the United States on the bill (H. R. 5052) to exclude certain vendors of newspapers or magazines from certain provisions of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code.

Following that, under a special order Jefferson's First Inaugural Address will be read. Following that, the Chair will recognize Members to submit consent requests to extend remarks and to address the House for 1 minute.

VENDORS OF NEWSPAPERS OR MAGAZINES

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 43]

Allen, Ill.	Gorski	Owens
Andrews, N. Y.	Gross	Pfeifer
Bakewell	Hall,	Ploeser
Barden	Edwin Arthur	Powell
Battle	Harless, Ariz.	Price, Fla.
Bell	Harrison	Price, Ill.
Bishop	Hart	Rains
Boggs, La.	Hartley	Reed, Ill.
Bolton	Havenner	Riehlman
Boykin	Heffernan	Rivers
Bulwinkle	Holifield	Rooney
Canfield	Jackson, Calif.	Sabath
Carroll	Jarman	Sikes
Celler	Jenkins, Ohio	Simpson, Ill.
Chapman	Jenkins, Pa.	Simpson, Pa.
Chiperfield	Kearns	Smith, Maine
Church	Kee	Stigler
Clark	Kefauver	Stratton
Cole, N. Y.	Kennedy	Taylor
Colmer	Larcade	Teague
Courtney	Lichtenwalter	Thomas, N. J.
Cunningham	Lusk	Thompson, Tex.
Dawson, Ill.	McMillen, Ill.	Twyman
Dingell	Manasco	Vail
Eaton	Meade, Md.	Welch
Elliott	Miller, Nebr.	West
Feighan	Morgan	Whitten
Flannagan	Morton	Williams
Fogarty	Murray, Tenn.	Wood
Gallagher	Norrell	Worley
Gillie	O'Konski	
Gordon	O'Toole	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and thirty-six Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

VENDORS OF NEWSPAPERS OR MAGAZINES—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 594)

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the course of my remarks I may be permitted to send to the Clerk's desk for reading several documents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may extend their remarks on this bill at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] has suggested—in fact, requested—that the veto message of the President may again be read for the edification of the membership. I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may again read the veto message of the President.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, H. R. 5052, a bill to exclude certain vendors of newspapers or magazines from certain provisions of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code.

This bill is identical with H. R. 3997, which I declined to approve in August 1947.

This legislation has far greater significance than appears on the surface. It proposes to remove the protection of the social-security law from persons now entitled to its benefits. Thus, it raises the fundamental question of whether or not we shall maintain the integrity of our social-security system.

H. R. 5052 would remove social-security protection from news vendors who make a full-time job of selling papers and who are dependent on that job for their livelihood. Many vendors of newspapers are excluded even at present from coverage under the Social Security Act because they are not employees of the publishers whose papers they sell. But some vendors work under arrangements which make them bona fide employees of the publishers and, consequently, are entitled to the benefits of the Social Security Act.

If enacted into law, this bill would make the social-security rights of these employees depend almost completely upon the form in which their employers might choose to cast their employment contracts. Employers desiring to avoid the payment of taxes which would be the basis for social-security benefits for their employees could do so by the establishment of artificial legal arrangements governing their relationships with their employees. It was this sort of manipulation which the Supreme Court effectively outlawed in June of 1947 when the Court unanimously declared that employment relationships under the social-security laws should be determined in the light of realities rather than on the basis of technical legal forms. I cannot believe that this sound principle announced by the Court should be disregarded, as it would be by the present bill.

The principal consideration offered in support of the bill appears to be a concern for the administrative difficulties of certain employers in keeping the necessary records and in collecting the employee contributions required by the social-security system. In appraising these difficulties, it should be recognized that the employers have control over the form of the employment contracts and the methods by which their salesmen are compensated. The salesmen are dependent upon the employers, and whatever remittances or reports are required for withholding and reporting purposes should be within each employer's reach. Certainly, the difficulties involved are not so formidable as to warrant the exclusion of these employees from coverage in the social-security system and the consequent destruction of their benefit rights and those of their dependents.

It is said that the news vendors affected by this bill could more appropriately be covered by the social-security law as independent contractors, when and if coverage is extended to the self-employed. Whether that is true or not, surely they should continue to receive the benefits to which they are now entitled until the broader coverage is provided. It would be most inequitable to

extinguish their present rights pending a determination as to whether it is more appropriate for them to be covered on some other basis.

In withholding my approval from H. R. 3997 last August, I expressed my concern that such a bill would open our social-security structure to piecemeal attack and to slow undermining. That concern was well founded. The House of Representatives has recently passed a joint resolution which would destroy the social-security coverage of several hundred thousand additional employees. As in the case of H. R. 5052, the joint resolution passed by the House is directed toward upsetting the doctrine established by the Supreme Court last summer that employment relationships should be determined on the basis of realities. The present bill must be appraised, therefore, as but one step in a larger process of the erosion of our social-security structure.

The security and welfare of our Nation demand an expansion of social security to cover the groups which are now excluded from the program. Any step in the opposite direction can only serve to undermine the program and destroy the confidence of our people in the permanence of its protection against the hazards of old age, premature death, and unemployment.

For these reasons, I am compelled to return H. R. 5052 without my approval.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 5, 1948.*

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] is recognized.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Has the gentleman made a motion to call up the bill?

Mr. GEARHART. The Parliamentarian advises me that is not necessary. The Speaker has already stated the issue.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I just wanted the record to be certain. I did not hear the gentleman make a motion to call up the bill.

Mr. GEARHART. I believe the gentleman's question has already been answered.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the bill is before the House now automatically.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. GEARHART. Gladly.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that he has already put the question, but he will repeat it if the gentleman desires.

Mr. EBERHARTER. No. I just want to have the record straight.

The SPEAKER. The veto message was originally read on April 6, and the request of the gentleman from California was that it be reread for the information of the House. Previous to that request the Chair had stated that the question before the House was, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, if this bill is not passed, the veto of the President notwithstanding, the social security structure of our country will be thrown into confusion. If the House does not act decisively it will indeed open a Pandora's box of legalistic uncertainties. Though the number of individuals, that is, the news vendors themselves, are but few, the court legislated principle which scoops them into the Social Security System will entangle many, many hundreds, perhaps thousands of others, under such conditions that no one in the United States, whatever his status, will know whether he is under social security or not. Whenever a situation like that arises there is only one thing that one can do, and that is to apply to the courts for clarifying decisions. If the Congress is unwilling to clarify by legislated definition the relation of master and servant, or exclude by arbitrary measures those that manifestly are not employees, a multiplicity of suits in all corners of the country is bound to be the result. If common sense, reason, and understanding is to prevail, this bill must be passed, the President's veto notwithstanding.

As I indicated a moment ago, the passage of H. R. 5052 will only affect a handful of people in the first instance, only newspaper vendors, perhaps no more than 1,000 scattered, as they are, throughout the country.

The news vendors have always considered themselves to be independent contractors, private businessmen, as self-employed, in that they buy their wares, stock in trade, at wholesale prices and sell them at retail prices. Not only is this true of the newspapers they handle, but it is likewise the method by which they acquire their stocks of magazines and books, printed as they are, by many different publishers. The difference between these two figures is the profit on such transactions, the profit from which they derive their livelihood. That is precisely the way any private, self-employed businessman operates his private enterprises.

Because there may be some uncertainty in the minds of some as to just what kind of businessmen I am referring to when I speak of newspaper vendors I am only sorry that I did not have these pictures which I have in my hands in time to have had them enlarged, as they reveal quite clearly the nature and character of their calling. A newspaper vendor is not a boy. A newspaper vendor is someone over the age of 18, usually an old man between 65 and 70, who is following this business because it is not too arduous and because it is a lucrative means of obtaining a livelihood. A news vendor is one who has a rack down on the street corner. He is one who handles not only all of the newspapers printed in the city by separate arrangement with each of the publishers, but as many magazines as he can crowd on his stand; hundreds of different kinds. He also handles in great numbers those thrillers often referred to as "Who done it" mysteries; in other words, detective story books, yours for 25 cents each. He merchandises sensational pamphlets such as The Death of the Dictator, and muck-raking exposures such as those that brought fame to Thomas W. Lawson of a generation ago.

He also provides an eager public with glamor girl pictures, racing charts, song books, lists of the latest song hits, all these in addition to such well-known magazines as Red Book, Good Housekeeping, Cosmopolitan, Reader's Digest, the Argonaut, every type of periodical, even the unspeakable and very hush-hush Police Gazette.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. How would it be possible to determine who the employer of that particular person is?

Mr. GEARHART. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has placed his finger on what would be one of the most perplexing problems which would arise if this bill is not passed, the President's veto notwithstanding. The arrangements that these newspaper vendors make with their different suppliers are identically the same in all cases. They buy their stock in trade at wholesale prices and they sell their goods, wares, and merchandise at retail prices. Since the news vendors' arrangements with the newspaper publishers are precisely the same as those they make with other publishers, by the same token they are the employees of all the other publishers as well. As these vendors handle all of the newspapers published in a given city, for instance, four in San Francisco, four in Los Angeles, many in New York City and in Chicago—they are by unavoidable consequence the employees of each of those newspaper publishers, likewise of the publishers of each of the magazines, picture books, racing charts, novels, whose merchandise they handle, with the result that every newspaper publisher and every other person or firm with which they deal would have to find out who these vendors are, get their names on their books, subtract the social-security tax, and remit it to the Government. In view of the known propensity of newspaper vendors to keep on the move from town to town, to sell their stands on short notice, this is practically an impossible task for the suppliers of their stocks in trade who will be charged with the collection and remission of pay-roll taxes.

According to the practices, these men buy these street corners from previous occupants, and then without any permission from anybody they sell them to other persons and move on their way, which makes it utterly impossible for the publishers to keep track of those with whom they are doing business on the street corners from day to day. As there is absolutely no permanency in the newsvendor set-up, changes in personnel occurring almost daily without notice, the failure to pass this bill will create an impossible situation, an impossible situation from the standpoint of the newspaper vendors, an impossible situation from the standpoint of the newspaper distributors, and an utterly impossible situation insofar as the newspaper publishers are concerned.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I am happy to yield to the very able gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. A newspaper vendor is simply an independent merchant. He sells reading matter.

Mr. GEARHART. And many other things besides reading matter. Under precisely the same arrangements he sells safety-razor blades, Sun-Maid raisins, oranges, and bananas; he sells chewing gum, all sorts of confections, even trinkets are dispensed from his racks. The main difference between a newspaper vendor and the storekeeper is that a newspaper vendor does not usually have a roof over his head, although in a great many cases they do. I have in mind one newspaper vendor in Los Angeles who has a stand 150 feet long. He handles not only every newspaper which is published in Los Angeles and every well-known magazine published in the United States, a great variety of books and pamphlets, 25-cent detective stories, but he insists that he handles everybody's home-town newspaper published in the United States and Canada. And from the appearance of his racks, I do not think he is exaggerating one bit.

If this ridiculous decision that was rendered in San Francisco is allowed to stand, that newspaper vendor becomes the employee of every one of the individuals, firms, and corporations with whom or with which the vendor did business. In fact, if this bill does not pass, the news vendors will have more employers than a dog has fleas.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MATHEWS. Can the gentleman tell us what effect this decision, if left unchanged, would have on the workmen's compensation situation of the so-called employer?

Mr. GEARHART. As the able gentleman from New Jersey well knows in all of our States we have workmen's compensation laws and other laws which turn on the relation of master and servant. If the Congress is going to stand mute and permit great questions like this to be legislated for us by the courts in judicial decisions, that is, supinely submit to judicial usurpation of the legislative prerogative, it means that all of our State laws are also going to be thrown into confusion. Many of our State laws which operated upon the employer-employee relationship, if such an absurd definition of the relationship as the district court in San Francisco announced is permitted to stand, will become utterly unenforceable. I thank the gentleman for raising that point.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I am pleased to be able to yield to the very distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, my colleague of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. COOPER. I think it would be of interest to the House, and probably it should be done in fairness to the House, if the distinguished gentleman from California would point out the fact that this is entirely different and a separate matter from House Joint Resolution 296, of which the gentleman from California was also the author, and which has passed the House and is now pending in the Senate. That joint resolution went to the question involved in a decision by the Supreme Court of the United States, but, as I understand, the Supreme Court has not acted on the subject matter covered in the pending bill. I think it would be helpful if the gentleman would clearly draw the attention of the House to the distinction between the pending bill and House Joint Resolution 296.

Mr. GEARHART. There is a vast difference between the two pieces of legislation. This bill will merely exclude from the social-security coverage those persons who are known as newspaper vendors. In other words, it will grant to them the same exclusion which has already been granted by this Congress to all of the newsboys who are under the age of 18 years. The other measure, House Joint Resolution 296, would legislate a definition of master and servant, or, employer and employee, by whatever name you may choose to describe it, which would apply generally insofar as the social-security system is concerned. In other words, House Joint Resolution 296, which is pending in the Senate is a much broader measure than the one we are now considering.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I am pleased to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I am receiving letters from insurance agents who want to be covered under the Social Security Act and who therefore favor this veto. Can the gentleman advise me whether or not they are under a misapprehension and in what way this affects them?

Mr. GEARHART. H. R. 5052 does not affect anybody who has been found to be an employee of the insurance company, only newspaper vendors. Neither will H. J. Res. 296 deprive any insurance solicitor of coverage who is in fact an employee. The gentleman says he has heard from some insurance agents in opposition to one or the other of these two measures. Permit me to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the National Insurance Agents Association, with a membership of 300,000, is supporting House Joint Resolution 296 as vigorously as they know how, as their members, so they tell me, cherish their status of independent contractors and resent a courts' arbitrary declaration that they are not the self-employed they have always regarded themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude my remarks, because I think everybody understands this question by now, by reading some telegrams which have come to me from the newspaper vendors themselves.

I have this telegram from Mr. Sam Jacobs, president, and Mr. A. J. McNamee, secretary-treasurer of the Newspaper and Periodical Vendors and Distributors Union, Local No. 468, American Federation of Labor:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *April 6, 1948.*

Hon. BERTRAND W. GEARHART,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Since President Truman has vetoed H. R. 5052, it is our belief that now is the time to remind you that the San Francisco News Vendors Union, AFL, Local 468, has consistently fought for the objective outlined in this bill. We cannot too strongly urge that you vote to override the veto.

SAM JACOBS, *President.*
A. J. MCNAMEE, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

I also have a telegram from a former secretary of that same union reading as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *January 23, 1948.*

Hon. BERTRAND W. GEARHART,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Membership of News Vendors Union Local 468 happy that H. R. 5052 reintroduced. Hope when bill passed will be approved by President. News Vendors Union particularly interested in section of bill dealing with sale of papers by adults under an independent contractor relationship.

WILLIAM PARRISH,
Secretary Treasurer,
News Vendors Union Local 468

Mr. Speaker, I also have telegrams from other interested people. One of them is from the newspaper distributors of Chicago, which reads as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *March 19, 1948.*

Representative BERTRAND W. GEARHART,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge passage of your bill to exempt newspaper vendors from the Social Security Act. We heartily endorse your contention that vendors are independent contractors and not employees under the law. You and your associates are to be commended for your work on this worthy bill.

C. A. NEWSPAPER DISTRIBUTORS,
Chicago, Ill.

Then I have a telegram from Mr. Cranston Williams, general manager of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, representing the publishers, reading as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 14, 1948.*

Hon. BERTRAND W. GEARHART,
House of Representatives:

Your splendid leadership is greatly appreciated and I hope the House as well as the Senate will vote to make bill H. R. 5052 a law notwithstanding veto of the President. Regards.

CRANSTON WILLIAMS,
General Manager, American Newspaper Publishers Association.

That it be established that the California Newspaper Publishers Association shares the views of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, I will now read a telegram from Mr. John B. Long, its highly respected and warmly regarded managing director. It is:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *April 6, 1948.*

Hon. BERTRAND W. GEARHART,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Hope you can see your way clear to vote to override this second veto on news-vendors problem solved by H. R. 5052.

JOHN B. LONG,
California Newspaper Publishers Association.

As it has already been made to appear that the provisions of H. R. 5052 are identical with those of H. R. 3704, a bill which was late in the last session passed by the Congress only to be pocket-vetoed by the President after the adjournment of the National Legislature, I would like to read a letter from the secretary-treasurer of the Newspaper and Periodical Vendors and Distributors Union as it constitutes further evidence of the earnest desire of the vendors to retain their cherished status of independent contractors. It is the following:

NEWSPAPER AND PERIODICAL
VENDORS AND DISTRIBUTORS
UNION, LOCAL NO. 468,
San Francisco, Calif., June 21, 1947.

Hon. BERTRAND W. GEARHART,
Congressman of California, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The news vendors of San Francisco request that you support H. R. 3704 when it comes before you for action.

Since the inception of this union in 1937 the membership has consistently voted for continuing a contractual relationship with the publishers which is one of buyer and seller—an independent contractor relationship. It is now firmly established as an important part of the foundation upon which the members of this union have succeeded in attaining a status in the economic scheme of things which enables the individual members to have an adequate living throughout the more difficult years of their lives and to retain their self-respect as self-supporting persons.

The members of this union who are engaged in the street sales of newspapers in San Francisco have problems which are different and apart from those of the employable class. By virtue of physical handicaps and age they are not in position to compete for jobs in the employment market. Nevertheless, the membership voted unanimously to send two representatives to appear before the Treasury Department at Washington, D. C., for the purpose of showing by means of extensive data that we are not employees. Our petition was denied.

Legal intervention is not available to the union, hence the only recourse the membership of this union has is to ask that Congress enact the Gearhart bill, H. R. 3704.

Respectfully yours,
ANDREW J. MCNAMEE,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Mr. Speaker, I have had requests for time from two Members of the House, so I now yield 14 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], which is the same time that I have consumed in this debate.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I know that the Members are anxious to vote on this matter and get it out of the way as quickly as possible. I take this time to give the Members what I consider the issues involved here today. The gentleman from California in the first instance said that there were very few people affected by this particular measure. I agree with him in that statement wholeheartedly. However, the gentleman said immediately following that statement that it would affect thousands and thousands of independent contractors and thousands and thousands of corner newspaper vendors. Those two statements do not jibe. The first one emphasized that independent contractors, whether news vendors or anybody else who can be classified as an independent contractor, have never been asked to pay any social-security tax. Neither has the person with whom he contracted.

This is what happened in this particular case: The publishers have not taken the case to a higher court. It went before the district court in California, and this is what the court found: This newspaper union, of which the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART], spoke, represented the employees of the publisher, the Hearst Corp. This union and the corporation fixed terms and conditions of employment with these newspaper vendors. It fixed minimum wages, minimum commissions that the newspaper boys could earn. It fixed hours of employment; it fixed the conditions under which they must work. It even had supervisors to go around to the various corners to see that these men were following their duties in accordance with the contract as made with the unions and which contract the unions had with the publishers. This is what the court found: The court merely said these men were in fact and in reality employees. The gentleman's bill would say, no matter whether you are an employee, if you work for a publisher you are not entitled to social-security protection. That is what this bill would do. The court found as a matter of fact that the vendors were represented by an American Federation of Labor union. Does that not in itself say that they were employees? It was not an association of businessmen or independent contractors. They were members of a labor union.

In the second place, the court found as a matter of fact that the publishers selected the vendors, designated their places, their days, their hours of service, and the profit per newspaper. The vendors were under the surveillance of the publisher's employee, the wholesaler, who reported any infraction of performance to the publisher. The vendor was required to sell his papers in the manner described by the publisher, in stands or racks furnished by the publisher at the publisher's expense. The vendor incurred no risk nor expense except that of payment for the papers which were lost or destroyed. The vendor was guaranteed by contract a minimum weekly wage or profit, and the vendor was not allowed to sell competitive newspapers without the publisher's consent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what it is proposed to do here in this bill is to say that these newsboys and men who are on the corners shall not be entitled to social-security protection, when as a matter of fact they are employees in any sense you can possibly imagine.

Right now, Mr. Speaker, do you know anybody in this country who is more entitled to social-security protection than the men who sell newspapers on the corner and whose every act is directed by the publisher by whom he is employed? Those men need protection. Are we going to say that, as a class, these particular persons, because they work for a publisher, and the publisher is their employer, they shall have no protection under the social-security laws? That they shall have no protection under the unemployment laws of the country? Certainly, Mr. Speaker, that would not be the proper thing for this House to do. I know there is a false impression around that the Federal Security Agency and the Court, by its decision, are trying to affect newsboys who deliver papers to your door. That is not true at all. There are only comparatively few people who were declared by the Court and the Social Security Board to be employees in fact. Nobody ever attempted to take newsboys into the social-security laws. Nobody attempted to take these independent contractors who run newsstands and sell different newspapers and magazines and candy and peanuts and things like that, under the social-security laws, unless the publisher exercised the controls that the Hearst Corporation maintained in this case. Nobody has ever attempted to bring them under the social-security law because they are recognized under the basic law as independent contractors. If you take the action proposed here, you are saying that these newspaper vendors who are actually employees shall not have the protection that other employees in this country are entitled to.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am trying to state the facts, Mr. Speaker, as held by the Court, and all this talk we have heard about the Social Security Board's trying to take newsboys in is absolutely not the truth and not the fact.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has made a very fine plea for the vendors, but I wonder if he has any proof that the vendors themselves want this so-called social-security coverage?

Mr. EBERHARTER. As the gentleman knows, social-security protection is mandatory. The law states that whoever is an employee must pay social-security taxes and his employer must pay social-security taxes. Are you going to waive the act as to a certain group of employers because these employees say they do not want this coverage, this Social Security protection? Do not forget there are many employers in this country who would like to evade the tax; but the fundamental basis of this legislation is, and it is public policy, that every employee must be protected by social security, and therefore we should not take into consideration the fact that some employees say they do not want the protection. That is a matter of public policy which this country has adopted, in social security; that is the basis on which we must go.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I have only 2 minutes left; I cannot yield, I am sorry.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, has not been given the consideration it deserves. On one Friday evening for about an hour and a half there were public hearings on this measure. It was scarcely debated in the committee. Only a few minutes' consideration was given to it and then the statement went out all over the country and to the membership of the House that the Social Security Board was trying to take in newsboys. That is not the fact. The President is right in this instance, absolutely right. If you vote to

override the President's veto and his position then you are yielding to the chiselers and yielding to the misrepresentation that has been made.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California himself states that some men handle many different types of magazines and newspapers and are not employees. But they are not taken in by the Supreme Court decision or the lower court decision as a general rule. But whenever a publisher hires a man and sets out everything that the man is allowed to do, sets out a minimum wage, bargains with a union as to working conditions, that man is entitled to social-security protection. Keep in mind that the publisher contracted with a union labor organization as to whether the news vendors would be permitted to sell anything else unless the publisher agreed to it. What more do you want to make a person an employee? I do not think we ought to start here in this Eightieth Congress and chisel away a part of what has been considered the finest step in social legislation ever enacted by any Congress. We passed the fundamental law in 1935. We excluded all those boys who were under 18 years of age. This bill does not refer to those at all, it refers to actual employees.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that this House will vote to sustain the President's veto on the facts and on the real issue.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH].

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for this bill, the President's veto notwithstanding. I believe that this legislation is vitally necessary because otherwise we are going to get into a great deal of unnecessary litigation trying to determine who of all these publishers of magazines and newspapers and other articles of merchandise are the ones who will be supposed to pay the employers' part of the social security tax. Inquiry has been made as to the difference between this bill and House Joint Resolution 296. I voted against House Joint Resolution 296 for the reason that that resolution sought to take out from under social security thousands upon thousands of people who had already paid social security taxes. This bill, on the other hand, endeavors to put in under social security news vendors who heretofore have never paid any social security tax whatsoever. To me there is a substantial difference. And, furthermore, to my mind the news vendor is an independent contractor.

Let me put the proposition to you as we see it in New York from the point of view of the news vendor. In New York City a news vendor must get a license from the city in order to sell newspapers or magazines or other articles on the streets. It is clear to me that that in itself makes the licensee from the city an independent contractor. He gets papers from maybe a half dozen newspaper-publishing companies, from a dozen or more magazine companies, razor blades, and what not from other organizations, and he carries on an independent business of his own.

To show that they have always been recognized, and are still recognized, as independent contractors, even by the Treasury Department, there has been no attempt on the part of the Treasury Department to have the publishers deduct the withholding tax from the news vendors. When you have one branch of our Government recognizing that withholding taxes are not necessary because the news vendors, in its opinion, are independent contractors, and you have another branch of the Government, not by legislative fiat but by court decree, saying that for the first time after all these years news vendors over the age of 18 are to be considered as employees, under the circumstances I say it is time for us to clarify the legislation.

The point has been raised that these news vendors would be without protection, but that is not correct. If you will recall, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] raised the point the other day in the discussion on House Joint Resolution 296. I told him at that time that these people can be covered by social security if we go about it in the right way, and that is to cover them as self-employed persons, which we are now considering in the committee.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. There is one thing that troubles me in connection with the pending bill. Suppose the Congress should pass a law making it possible for self-employed people to come under the provisions of the Social Security Act. In that event who would determine whether they are employees in a given case or they are self-employed?

Mr. LYNCH. It would appear to me in that particular case that in the definition of "self-employed" we must set forth precisely what we mean.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Would we not be right back where we are right now?

Mr. LYNCH. No.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. In other words, we would have to have the Court decide it unless we could draft language in such a way that the definitions of "employee," "employer," and "self-employed" could be made unmistakably clear.

Mr. LYNCH. I think that as between the two definitions of "self-employed" and "employee" and the third definition of "employer" there could be but very, very few people who could possibly escape from social security under those circumstances.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I agree with the gentleman that they should all be covered, but the question is who is going to pay the tax? The Court would have to decide again whether they are self-employed or whether they are employees.

Mr. LYNCH. I think insofar as that definition is concerned as to self-employers, such a definition should and could be properly written out.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. REDDEN. Under the holding of the Court in the case now before us, it seems to me that you might have 100 or more employers. For instance, if he had a separate contract with a news dealer and with 100 different magazine dealers, fruit dealers, and so forth, he might be classified as an employee of all of them.

Mr. LYNCH. That is correct.

Mr. REDDEN. I wonder how it would be possible to ever collect the tax or determine who should pay?

Mr. LYNCH. I think the gentleman is quite correct, and I think it would be utterly impossible to determine who of the employers would pay the tax.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Is it true that under the case which this legislation is designed to correct, that the vendor in that case sold papers and magazines for more than one employer?

Mr. LYNCH. As I remember under this particular case there was only the one newspaper involved, and whether or not other papers were sold, it seems to me, is not altogether involved, for this reason, that although he may have been restricted to one newspaper, he still could sell other articles besides newspapers.

Mr. GARY. Did he sell magazines and other articles besides the newspapers for one newspaper company?

Mr. LYNCH. He did not, as I recollect the case. In this particular instance, as I understand, that was the only paper in that particular community that was involved.

Mr. GARY. Did he sell other articles besides that one paper, or did he just sell the one paper and that paper alone, and no other articles?

Mr. LYNCH. There was nothing before the committee as to what this particular individual had done. There was testimony insofar as others were concerned. The theory of this legislation was not only with respect to those who are under a contract with that employer, such as the Hearst publications in this particular case, but it was felt that that was an opening wedge that would force all newspaper vendors in under social security, and for that reason it was determined that it would probably be better to clarify the situation to exclude those news vendors as entrepreneurs. As I say, vendors under 18 years of age are presently excluded, and it was felt that that could be clarified later on.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. According to the telegrams read by the gentleman from California, of those who would come under the provisions of this act, news vendors have requested that they not be brought under. Should the Congress attempt to force something on them which they themselves state that they do not want?

Mr. LYNCH. Insofar as that is concerned, let me say to the gentleman from Ohio, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] has said, social security is not a matter that is to be considered only from the viewpoint of those who want to come under it. There

are certain circumstances when an election should be given, and, generally speaking, the theory of social security has been that it should be compulsory.

Mr. BREHM. Is it not true that the union representing these vendors has requested that they not be brought under this legislation? Should we not consider the wishes of those whom this legislation would affect?

Mr. LYNCH. Before the committee we did not consider the point of view of the union whatsoever, for the reason that no testimony was brought up with respect to it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, in reference to the discussion just a few moments ago as to the number of newspapers involved in the San Francisco case, I will say that there were four: The San Francisco Examiner, the San Francisco Chronicle, the San Francisco Call-Bulletin and the San Francisco News. In addition to that they handled various magazines and other merchandise.

Mr. LYNCH. When I said one newspaper I intended to say it was one publisher that was involved, although I am not quite so certain as to that fact.

Mr. GARY. That is what I should like to ask the gentleman, if there was more than one publisher involved although there was more than one newspaper involved.

Mr. GEARHART. The suits were against the San Francisco Examiner and the San Francisco Chronicle. The other two papers stood by and awaited the decision. The newspaper vendors who were involved in the first two suits were also selling the papers of the two evening newspapers.

Mr. GARY. They were different publishers?

Mr. GEARHART. Each newspaper had its own publisher before, and the newspaper vendors had relations with each one of these publishers.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. Would not the newspaper vendors who joined the American Federation of Labor consider themselves employees? If they were independent contractors, could they join the union? Would they not have to consider themselves employees before the American Federation of Labor would permit them to join?

Mr. LYNCH. It has never been customary to determine whether a person is employed because he or she belongs to a labor union.

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, it is my desire to concur wholeheartedly with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California, Hon. B. W. GEARHART, in urging the Members of the House to vote overwhelmingly to override President Truman's veto of H. R. 5052, a bill to exclude newspaper vendors from the provisions of the Social Security Act. Congressman GEARHART has presented the issue so completely and so clearly there is no need for me to amplify it. I desire to emphasize endorsement of his attitude from a background of 20 years' experience in the daily newspaper publishing field. Further, I would like to speak on behalf of my associates in the field of newspaper publishing who are unanimous in their feeling that the bill should be passed to correct court decisions carrying the Social Security Act far afield from the legislative intent of the Congress and into a field where administration of the act would be impossible and the benefits nil.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a communication I have received from Joe M. Bunting, outstanding newspaper executive, who is general manager of the Bloomington, Ill., Daily Pantagraph and president of the Inland Daily Newspaper Association, embracing in its membership the daily newspapers of the entire middle western area. Mr. Bunting says:

BLOOMINGTON, ILL., *April 7, 1948.*

Hon. E. H. JENISON,
House Office Building:

Appreciate your assistance in securing help from other Members of Congress in overriding veto H. R. 5052 designed to protect newspapers from keeping social-security records and paying social-security taxes on newspaper vendors. In veto message the President completely passed over arguments as to independent contractor status of vendors and the well-nigh impossible bookkeeping problem for publishers raised by adverse Federal district court decision. Your help in overriding veto will be greatly appreciated.

JOE M. BUNTING,
President, Inland Daily Press Association.

Further, I invite your attention to an editorial appearing in the current issue of Editor and Publisher, leading trade journal of the daily newspaper field. It reads:

GEARHART RESOLUTION

In passing the Social Security Act Congress had no intention of altering the status of employees in industry. And yet through court decisions the act has been interpreted as covering independent contractors as if they were employees. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue has proposed definitions of "employee," in line with Supreme Court dicta, which in effect will eliminate all independent contractors. A House resolution, written by Congressman GEARHART, now before the Senate would halt the action of the Internal Revenue Department in enforcing these new definitions. However, if the Presidential veto of the Gearhart bill exempting news vendors is sustained the resolution must be dropped.

As is pointed out by the American Newspaper Publishers Association, many firmly established independent contractor relationships will be changed into employer-employee status under the new definitions. Affected will be newspaper vendors, deliverers, and distributors; truckers of newsprint; columnists and feature writers; correspondents; photo-engraving shops operated by others, etc. Other industries will be similarly affected. Industries will be forced to "withhold" social security taxes for persons who have never been on the pay roll and who have operated their own businesses. Independent distributors, wholesalers, and retailers will be involved.

It is not difficult to envisage the confusion that will be created if Congress does not halt this trend.

As has been pointed repeatedly and accurately, passage of H. R. 5052 in no wise indicates a desire to restrict the proper expansion of social security into every proper field. Rather it limits only unwarranted and unjustified expansion by court interpretation rather than by properly considered legislative action. It will be remembered H. R. 5052 passed the House of Representatives after thorough consideration by unanimous consent of the membership. I trust the House will see fit to do so again, the Presidential veto notwithstanding.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I therefore move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 308, nays 28, answered "present" 1, not voting 93, as follows:

[Roll No. 44]

YEAS—308

Abbitt	Coudert	Harvey
Abernethy	Cox	Havenner
Albert	Cravens	Hays
Allen, Calif.	Crawford	Hébert
Allen, La.	Crow	Hedrick
Almond	Curtis	Hendricks
Andersen, H. Carl	Dague	Herter
	Davis, Ga.	Heselton
Anderson, Calif.	Davis, Tenn.	Hess
Andresen, August H.	Davis, Wis.	Hill
	Dawson, Utah	Hinshaw
Andrews, Ala.	Deane	Hobbs
Andrews, N. Y.	Devitt	Hoeven
Angell	D'Ewart	Hoffman
Arends	Dirksen	Holmes
Arnold	Dolliver	Hope
Auchincloss	Domengeaux	Horan
Banta	Dondero	Jenison
Barrett	Donohue	Jennings
Bates, Mass.	Dorn	Jensen
Beall	Doughton	Johnson, Calif.
Beckworth	Douglas	Johnson, Ill.
Bender	Durham	Johnson, Ind.
Bennett, Mich.	Ellis	Johnson, Okla.
Bennett, Mo.	Elsworth	Johnson, Tex.
Blackney	Elsaesser	Jones, Ala.
Bland	Elston	Jones, N. C.
Bloom	Engel, Mich.	Jones, Wash.
Boggs, Del.	Evins	Jonkman
Bonner	Fallon	Judd
Bradley	Fellows	Kean
Bramblett	Fenton	Kearney
Brehm	Fernandez	Keating
Brooks	Fisher	Kee
Brophy	Fletcher	Keefe
Brown, Ga.	Folger	Keogh
Brown, Ohio	Foote	Kerr
Bryson	Fuller	Kersten, Wis.
Buck	Fulton	Kilburn
Buckley	Gallagher	Kilday
Buffett	Gamble	King
Burke	Gary	Knutson
Burleson	Gathings	Kunkel
Busbey	Gavin	Landis
Butler	Gearhart	Lane
Byrnes, Wis.	Gillette	Lanham
Camp	Goff	Latham
Canfield	Goodwin	Lea
Cannon	Gore	LeCompte
Carson	Gossett	LeFevre
Case, N. J.	Graham	Lemke
Case, S. Dak.	Grant, Ind.	Lewis
Chadwick	Gregory	Lichtenwalter
Chelf	Griffiths	Lodge
Chenoweth	Gwinn, N. Y.	Love
Clason	Gwynne, Iowa	Lucas
Clevenger	Hagen	Ludlow
Clippinger	Hale	Lyle
Coffin	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Lynch
Cole, Kans.		McConnell
Cole, Mo.	Hall, Leonard W.	McCowen
Combs		McDonough
Cooley	Halleck	McDowell
Cooper	Hardy	McGarvey
Corbett	Harness, Ind.	McGregor
Cotton	Harris	McMahon

McMillan, S. C.	Pickett	Short
Mack	Plumley	Simpson, Pa.
MacKinnon	Poage	Smathers
Macy	Potter	Smith, Kans.
Mahon	Potts	Smith, Ohio
Maloney	Poulson	Smith, Va.
Martin, Iowa	Preston	Smith, Wis.
Mason	Priest	Snyder
Mathews	Ramey	Somers
Meade, Ky.	Rankin	Stanley
Merrow	Redden	Stefan
Meyer	Reed, N. Y.	Stevenson
Michener	Rees	Stockman
Miller, Conn.	Reeves	Sundstrom
Miller, Md.	Regan	Taber
Mills	Rich	Talle
Mitchell	Richards	Tibbott
Monroney	Riley	Tollefson
Morris	Rizley	Towe
Morrison	Robertson	Trimble
Muhlenberg	Rockwell	Van Zandt
Mundt	Rogers, Fla.	Vinson
Murray, Wis.	Rogers, Mass.	Vorys
Nicholson	Rohrbough	Vursell
Nixon	Ross	Wadsworth
Nodar	Russell	Walter
Norblad	Sadlak	Weichel
O'Brien	St. George	Wheeler
O'Hara	Sanborn	Whittington
O'Konski	Schwabe, Mo.	Wigglesworth
Pace	Schwabe, Okla.	Wilson, Ind.
Passman	Scoblick	Wilson, Tex.
Patman	Scott, Hardie	Winstead
Patterson	Scott,	Wolcott
Peden	Hugh D., Jr.	Wolverton
Peterson	Scrivner	Woodruff
Philbin	Seely-Brown	Youngblood
Phillips, Calif.	Shafer	
Phillips, Tenn.	Sheppard	

NAYS—28

Bates, Ky	Huber	Mansfield
Blatnik	Hull	Marcantonio
Buchanan	Isacson	Multer
Byrne, N. Y.	Jackson, Wash.	Norton
Crosser	Javits	Powell
Delaney	Karsten, Mo.	Sadowski
Eberharter	Kelley	Sasscer
Forand	Kirwan	Spence
Garmatz	Klein	
Granger	Lesinski	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Hand

NOT VOTING—93

Allen, Ill.	Grant, Ala.	Owens
Bakewell	Gross	Pfeifer
Barden	Harless, Ariz.	Ploeser
Battle	Harrison	Price, Fla.
Bell	Hart	Price, Ill.
Bishop	Hartley	Rains
Boggs, La.	Heffernan	Rayburn
Bolton	Holifield	Reed, Ill.
Boykin	Jackson, Calif.	Riehlman
Bulwinkle	Jarman	Rivers
Carroll	Jenkins, Ohio	Rooney
Celler	Jenkins, Pa.	Sabath
Chapman	Kearns	Sarbacher
Chiperfield	Kefauver	Sikes
Church	Kennedy	Simpson, Ill.
Clark	Larcade	Smith, Maine
Cole, N. Y.	Lusk	Stigler
Colmer	McCormack	Stratton
Courtney	McCulloch	Taylor
Cunningham	McMillen, Ill.	Teague
Dawson, Ill.	Madden	Thomas, N. J.
Dingell	Manasco	Thomas, Tex.
Eaton	Meade, Md.	Thompson
Elliott	Miller, Calif.	Twyman
Engle, Calif.	Miller, Nebr.	Vail
Feighan	Morgan	Welch
Flannagan	Morton	West
Fogarty	Murdock	Whitten
Gillie	Murray, Tenn.	Williams
Gordon	Norrell	Wood
Gorski	O'Toole	Worley

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the bill was passed, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Eaton and Mr. Reed of Illinois for, with Mr. Price of Illinois against.

Mr. Allen of Illinois and Mr. Gordon for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mrs. Smith of Maine and Mr. Kefauver for, with Mr. Hart against.

Mr. Chiperfield and Mr. Harless of Arizona for, with Mr. Carroll against.

Mr. Williams and Mr. McMillen of Illinois for, with Mr. Morgan against.

Mr. Morton and Mr. Rivers for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

Mr. Grant of Alabama and Mr. Gorski for, with Mr. Fogarty against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Jenkins of Ohio with Mrs. Lusk.

Mr. Kearns with Mr. Pfeifer.

Mr. Cole of New York with Mr. O'Toole.

Mrs. Bolton with Mr. Stigler.

Mr. Miller of Nebraska with Mr. Boggs of Louisiana.

Mr. Sarbacher with Mr. Whitten.

Mr. Simpson of Illinois with Mr. Holifield.

Mr. Riehlman with Mr. West.

Mr. Ploeser with Mr. Jarman.

Mr. Bishop with Mr. Colmer.

Mr. Bakewell with Mr. Boykin.

Mr. Gross with Mr. Larcade.

Mr. Stratton with Mr. Meade of Maryland.

Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Harrison.

Mr. Jackson of California with Mr. Battle.

Mr. Gillie with Mr. Sikes.

Mr. Welch with Mr. Thomas of Texas.

Mr. Owens with Mr. Celler.

Mr. Hartley with Mr. Bulwinkle.

Mr. Church with Mr. Murdock.

Mr. Cunningham with Mr. Manasco.

Mr. Taylor with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Barden.

Mr. Twyman with Mr. Rains.

Mr. Vail with Mr. Wood.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

JEFFERSON'S FIRST INAUGURAL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to order of the House on Monday, April 12, 1948, the Chair appoints the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] to read Jefferson's first inaugural address.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT read Jefferson's first inaugural address, as follows:

Friends and fellow citizens, called upon to undertake the duties of the First Executive Office of our country, I avail myself of the presence of that portion of my fellow citizens which is here assembled, to express my grateful thanks for the favor with which they have been pleased to look toward me, to declare a sincere consciousness that the task is above my talents, and that I approach it with those anxious and awful presentiments which the greatness of the charge and the weakness of my powers so justly inspire. A rising Nation, spread over a wide and fruitful land, traversing all the seas with the rich productions of their industry, engaged in commerce with nations who feel power and forget right, advancing rapidly to destinies beyond the reach of mortal eye—when I contemplate these transcendent objects and see the honor, the happiness, and the hopes of this beloved country committed to the issue and the auspices of this day, I shrink from the contemplation, and humble myself before the magnitude of the undertaking. Utterly, indeed, should I despair, did not the presence of many whom I here see remind me, that in the other high authorities provided by our Constitution, I shall find resources of wisdom, of virtue, and of zeal on which to rely under all difficulties. To you, then, gentlemen, who are charged with the sovereign function of legislation, and to those associated with you, I look with encouragement for that guidance and support which may enable us to steer with safety the vessel in which we are all embarked amid the conflicting elements of a troubled world.

During the contest of opinion through which we have passed, the animation of discussion and of exertions has sometimes worn an aspect which might impose on strangers unused to think freely and to speak and to write what they think; but this being now decided by the voice of the Nation, announced according to the rules of the Constitution, all will, of course, arrange themselves under the will of the law, and unite in common efforts for the common good. All, too, will bear in mind this sacred principle, that though the will of the majority is in all cases to prevail, that will, to be rightful, must be reasonable; that the minority possess their equal rights, which equal laws must protect, and to violate which would be oppression. Let us, then, fellow citizens, unite with one heart and one mind. Let us restore to social intercourse that harmony and affection without which liberty and even life itself are but dreary things. And let us reflect that having banished from our land that religious intolerance under which mankind so long bled and suffered, we have yet gained little if we countenance a political intolerance as despotic, as wicked, and capable of as bitter and bloody persecutions. During the throes and convulsions of the ancient world, during the agonizing spasms of infuriated man, seeking through blood and slaughter his long-lost liberty, it was not wonderful that the agitation of the billows should reach even this distant and peaceful shore; that this should be more felt and feared by some and less by others; that this should divide opinions as to measures of safety. But every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle. We have called by different names brethren of the same principle. We are all Republicans—we are Federalists. If there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this Union or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it. I know, indeed, that some honest men fear that a republican government cannot be strong; that this Government is not strong enough. But would the honest patriot, in the full tide of successful experiment, abandon a government which has so far kept us free and firm, on the theoretic and visionary fear that this Government, the world's best hope, may by possibility want energy to preserve itself? I trust not. I believe this, on the contrary, the strongest Government on earth. I believe it is the only one where every man, at the call of the laws, would fly to the standard of the law, and would meet invasions of the public order as his own personal concern. Sometimes it is said that man cannot be trusted with the government of himself. Can he, then, be trusted with the government of others? Or have we found angels in the forms of kinds to govern him? Let history answer this question.

Let us then, with courage and confidence pursue our own Federal and republican principles, our attachment to our union and representative Government. Kindly separated by nature and a wide ocean from the exterminating havoc of one quarter of the globe; too high-minded to endure the degradations of the others; possessing a chosen country, with room enough for our descendants to the hundredth and thousandth generation; entertaining a due sense of our equal right to the use of our own faculties, to the acquisitions of our industry, to honor and confidence from our fellow citizens, resulting not from birth but from our actions and their sense of them; enlightened by a benign religion, professed, indeed, and practiced in various forms, yet all of them including honesty, truth, temperance, gratitude, and the love of man; acknowledging and adoring an overruling Providence, which by all its dispensations proves that it delights in the happiness of man here and his greater happiness hereafter; with all these blessings, what more is necessary to

make us a happy and prosperous people? Still one thing more, fellow citizens—a wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, which shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government, and this is necessary to close the circle of our felicities.

About to enter, fellow citizens, on the exercise of duties which comprehend everything dear and valuable to you, it is proper that you should understand what I deem the essential principles of our Government, and consequently those which ought to shape its administration. I will compress them within the narrowest compass they will bear, stating the general principle, but not all its limitations. Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship, with all nations—entangling alliances with none; the support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against anti-Republican tendencies; the preservation of the General Government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad; a jealous care of the right of election by the people—a mild and safe corrective of abuses which are lopped by the sword of the revolution where peaceable remedies are unprovided; absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority—the vital principle of republics, from which there is no appeal but to force, the vital principle and immediate parent of despotism; a well-disciplined militia—our best reliance in peace and for the first moments of war, till regulars may relieve them; the supremacy of the civil over the military authority; economy in the public expense, that labor may be lightly burdened; the honest payment of our debts and sacred preservation of the public faith; encouragement of agriculture, and of commerce as its handmaid; the diffusion of information and the arraignment of all abuses at the bar of public reason; freedom of religion; freedom of the press; freedom of person under the protection of the habeas corpus; and trial by juries impartially selected—these principles form the bright constellation which has gone before us, and guided our steps through an age of revolution and reformation. The wisdom of our sages and the blood of our heroes have been devoted to their attainment. They should be the creed of our political faith—the text of civil instruction—the touchstone by which to try the services of those we trust; and should we wander from them in moments of error or alarm, let us hasten to retrace our steps and to regain the road which alone leads to peace, liberty, and safety.

I repair, then, fellow citizens, to the post you have assigned me. With experience enough in subordinate offices to have seen the difficulties of this, the greatest of all, I have learned to expect that it will rarely fall to the lot of imperfect man to retire from this station with the reputation and the favor which bring him into it. Without pretensions to that high confidence reposed in our first and great revolutionary character, whose preeminent services had entitled him to the first place in his country's love and destined for him the fairest page in the volume of faithful history, I ask so much confidence only as may give firmness and effect to the legal administration of your affairs. I shall often go wrong through defect of judgment. When right, I shall often be thought wrong by those whose positions will not command a view of the whole ground. I ask your indulgence for my own errors, which will never be intentional, and your support against the errors of others who may condemn what they would not if seen in all its parts. The approbation implied by your suffrage is a consolation to me for the past, and my future solicitude will be to retain the good opinion of those who have bestowed it in advance, to conciliate that of others by doing them all the good in my power, and to be instrumental to the happiness and freedom of all.

Relying, then, on the patronage of your good will, I advance with obedience to the work, ready to retire from it whenever you become sensible how much better choice it is in your power to make. And may that Infinite Power which rules the destinies of the universe lead our councils to what is best and give them a favorable issue for your peace and prosperity.

ANNUAL REPORT OF GOVERNOR OF THE PANAMA CANAL—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 613)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Annual Report of the Governor of the Panama Canal, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 14, 1948.*

SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the House Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments may be permitted to sit tomorrow, notwithstanding the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN-RELIEF PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 612)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk, and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the second quarterly report of expenditures and activities under the United States foreign-relief program authorized by Public Law 84 of the Eightieth Congress, approved May 31, 1947.

This report covers the period from October 1, 1947, through December 31, 1947.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 12, 1948.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADLAK asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

NATIONAL SUNDAY SCHOOL WEEK

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, today it is my privilege to talk to you concerning a matter that is near and dear to the heart of every right-thinking person, irrespective of class, creed, color, or position. April 12 marked the beginning of National Sunday School Week, sponsored by the Laymen's National Committee of New York City, a nonsectarian organization.

The purpose of this week is to bring about a more sober realization of the importance of providing the children of our Nation with an early religious education. Today we are face to face with the stark reality that the enemies of religion are now both within and without our frontiers. For the first time in the history of our country we have a rising generation which is being influenced to believe that there is no God, and what is more, to feel no need for one. We are all aware of the fact that Christian civilization is under attack all over the world by an ideology which seeks to destroy religion and the Christian faith. It is, therefore, of growing importance that the fundamentals of religion be emphasized. We all know that a civilization survives or perishes on the basis of religious faith.

Every parent, therefore, owes his child a knowledge of God. Our Nation has notified the world, "In God we trust." National Sunday School Week does not claim to be a cure-all for these ills, but we feel it is a step in the right direction.

America was not an accident. America was founded on man's consciousness of God, man's daily labor, and the fruits therefrom. Let us never forget that. Let us not deprive our children of these heritages. Let us not deprive them of that sense of courage, that sense of self-reliance, that sense of righteousness which can come only by having acquired a knowledge of God.

Let us resolve today to resolutely set our face against moral decay and stop in one full sweep the enemies within our gates who would replace our American ideals with an alien, godless ideology. Let us resolve this week that every child in America be given an opportunity to acquire a knowledge of God. Let us do this by thought, word, and deed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include editorial matter.

Mr. BANTA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS asked and was given permision to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut asked and was given permission to extend his re-

marks in the RECORD in two separate instances, in one to include an article from the New York Times and in the other a resolution from the National Association of State Aviation Officials.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on today and 30 minutes on tomorrow following the legislative business of each day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes today following the legislative business of the day and other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

THE WORLD'S BEST POTATO AND RECORD HAM AND BACON SALE IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, when people think of West Virginia they generally think of coal and hardwood lumber. On several occasions, I have, with just pride, brought to your attention our enormous production in these fields. Now, it is my purpose to speak briefly about our agricultural production.

West Virginia in its relationship to the great farm States of the Middle West is not generally considered an agricultural State. I want to impress you with the fact that the products of our farms are an important contribution to the national economy. In 1948, West Virginia produced 555,000 head of cattle, value, $56,610,000; 295,000 hogs, value, $8,230,000; 305,000 sheep, value, $4,728,000; 3,957,000 chickens, value $5,540,000. We have thousands of acres producing wheat, corn, oats, alfalfa, and other agricultural commodities.

Today I want to pay my respects specifically to the Little Kanawha Regional Council, an organization of the farmers and other businessmen who have associated themselves together to promote the economic and social interests of eight West Virginia counties. Six of these counties, Tyler, Pleasants, Wood, Wirt, Jackson, and Roane, are situated in the district I have the honor to represent. Ritchie and Calhoun Counties are situated in the district of our colleague, the Honorable E. G. ROHRBOUGH. This group organized early in 1946, and in these two short years their progress and accomplishments have been far beyond expectations. Time will not permit a detailed history of the organization and its progress, consequently, I shall set out only a few of the outstanding accomplishments.

This area has made progress and has produced economic wealth in greater volume than ever before. Their uppermost aim has been always that rural income be increased to the point where the people who live in these beautiful hills and valleys could provide for themselves and for their families these things we call better things for better living.

The year has demonstrated that they are on the march together. There are no longer any doubters as to whether or not it can or cannot be done—it is being done. The opportunities for the future are greater than ever before. The problems are not simple, they are tough and complicated, but they truly and undeniably have a fast-growing area in a fast-growing State. Their future is indeed very bright.

Speaking of industry for a moment, over $123,000,000 has been earmarked for industrial construction and expansion in the area represented by the council and they have been instrumental in making this possible by the assistance it was able to give chambers of commerce and other organizations.

They are growing the world's finest potato and its fame is spreading rapidly throughout the country. More than 300,000 pounds were marketed last year under the L-K brand, and their quality and their standard, all being United States No. 1, grade A, is now well established in trade channels. This program is to be expanded during the coming year and has already resulted in much additional rural income in the area.

One of the counties of the area reports that dairying passed the million-dollar mark last year which is an increase of nearly $400,000 in income.

In Parkersburg, Wood County, W. Va., a few days ago, what had generally been expected to be one of the outstanding ham and bacon sales of the State turned into a record breaker when the entries in the Little Kanawha Regional Council's first ham and bacon show went on sale with Col. A. W. Hamilton, of Morlunda Farms, as the auctioneer. The sale was not many minutes old when E. D. Knight, president of the Virginian Electric Co., broke all previous records in the State by buying the grand champion ham at $10 per pound. A few minutes later after one of the wildest bidding scenes ever staged, Gene Panoz, owner of the Believe It or Not Restaurant in Ripley, and Dr. Gay H. Duke drove the champion 4–H entry up to the point where Panoz took it at $33 per pound and set what developed to be a new world record.

But that was by no means the end of the sale. Dr. Duke then took the champion FFA entry, at $5.80 per pound, which he presented to the Henry Logan Children's Home in Parkersburg, and the Thompson Walgreen store in Ripley took down the next one at $5 per pound, to be followed by the Brotherton Food Market, of Charleston, for another at $5 per pound and then Thompson countered by taking another one at $5 per pound. Thus the bidding proceeded until the last of the hams had been sold for a sales average of $4.11 per pound, another State record.

In the bacon sale Miss Lawson, who buys for the Chancellor Hotel in Parkersburg, Prosecuting Attorney Harry Moats, of Ritchie County, and the Brotherton Food Market, of Charleston, teed off on bidding which sent the champion 4–H entry to $7 per pound, which Miss Lawson took for the hotel.

Buyers were numerous and bidding was strong and those who had entries found satisfaction in the fact that the prices paid was a good barometer for quality hams produced in this area of the State.

GERMAN SCRAP IRON

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks ago in a comment on this floor to my fellow Members of the House I called attention to the possible drastic curtailment of our steel production in the event of an emergency. Scrap is a vital ingredient to the making of steel. Capacity steel production in this country is predicated on an adequate supply of such scrap. Every ton of scrap saves 3 tons of our natural resources of iron and metallurgical coal. But even more serious at the present time is the shocking fact that in the event of a national emergency our present inadequate reserve of scrap would be exhausted in 5 to 6 weeks. It is estimated that this would reduce our steel production 50 percent during the following 6 months since the lack of transportation facilities and mining development would prevent the substitution of iron ore for scrap.

Approximately 10,000,000 tons of scrap is available in the bizonal area of Germany and the every effort should be made to secure at least a part of this scrap to ease our acute domestic situation and remove this material from the possible grasp of an aggressor nation. Replies from letters which our committee sent last month to the Departments of State and Defense and to the Maritime Commission concerning this problem have recently come to hand. The Chairman of the Maritime Commission states that there are adequate shipping facilities to transport scrap from Germany but the Departments of State and Defense gave no indication that we can reasonably expect any movement of this scrap to the United States within the near future.

Great Britain, taking a realistic attitude, has already obtaned 500,000 tons of scrap from Germany, and expects to acquire close to 1,000,000 tons more during 1948. Industry, small and large, in the United States needs this valuable resource, too. Our committee is, therefore, making preparations for a public hearing early next week to induce action, already long overdue.

UNITED STATES SHOULD WITHDRAW FROM INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill providing for the withdrawal of the United States from the International Monetary Fund. Action taken by the French political authorities respecting the currency of France should put an end to any hope that this scheme can accomplish any of its alleged purposes. It demonstrates the danger which the fund poses to international relations.

Under a special order which I have today I shall further discuss this matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an article appearing in the Chicago Herald-American of April 7, showing the Communist domination of the CIO Packing House Workers Union, and in the second to include a letter from a constituent which he has entitled "The Power To Tax Is the Power To Destroy."

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include certain laws of the State of Oregon with reference to veterans' benefits.

Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mark Sullivan.

Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short editorial from the Washington Star.

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an article relative to a great American, Mrs. Robert Taft, and in the other an essay written by one of the essay winners from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an essay by Theresa Vlacancich.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by a colleague.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD show that on Monday, April 12, 1948, I was absent on official business for the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I had a pair with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI]. Had I been present at that time I would have voted for the Federal-aid road bill, H. R. 5888.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

A FOREIGN POLICY LEADING TO PEACE

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, this Nation can profitably use an administration which would follow a foreign policy of open negotiations leading to peace instead of a policy of secret commitments leading to war.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PAN-AMERICAN DAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, today is Pan-American Day, symbolizing the unity of interest among the 21 American Republics. The question of the hour is the lesson of Bogota. The lesson is that economic, political, and social conditions in the vast areas of Central and South America, and among the 125,000,000 people there, can also create tools for the police-state forces right here on our doorstep.

Standards of living for the great majority of the people in too many of the other American Republics are lower than those in Europe even today. Here, too, there is an enormous job of reconstruction in which the leadership is ours out of sheer necessity to protect our own hemisphere security and our free institutions.

We have known the ways of war and they are hard. The way of peace is hard, too, but certainly our people prefer it. Failure to read into the events of Bogota the confirmation that our foreign policy and our responsibility are both world wide, requiring much simultaneous action, will catch us as unprepared as it caught our delegates at Bogota.

THE COMING ITALIAN ELECTION

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 18, the attention of all freedom-loving people around the world will be focused on the Italian election. The turning point has arrived in the bitter, cold war that has been raging since VE-day between the forces fighting for the Communist enslavement of Europe, and those who would encourage the peaceful embrace of the freedoms inherent in this our great republic.

All of us who supported the European recovery program are keenly awaiting the outcome of the Italian elections for the first indication of the effectiveness and value of our foreign-aid program. The elections in Italy will have a profound significance to all Americans. These elections will have, of course, a particular meaning to the millions of Americans of Italian descent who came to this country in search of the unique political, social, and economic advantages which are so much a part of our American heritage.

Through their active support of the European recovery program, the Americans of Italian origin are privileged today to assist their families and friends who remained in Italy, to seek and enjoy the basic freedoms and opportunities that lie ahead for those who reject the chains of Communist dictatorship.

If the forces of free government can resist through the ballot the evils of Communist domination in Italy, credit will be due in no small part to the influence of the Americans of Italian descent who acted as the spokesmen for freedom when freedom's cause was threatened.

SENATE BILL 1263

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 1263 be restored to the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

THE X AT BOGOTA

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Washington Post yesterday morning an editorial entitled "The X at Bogota." If the Members have not read it, I urge them to do so. I am asking that it be inserted in the record for that purpose.

I want to voice my endorsement of the questions raised by this article, and, at the same time, to commend my fellow-member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] for his demand for an inquiry into the status of the Nation's intelligence system.

Recent events in Bogota make it abundantly clear that the Central Intelligence Agency, and its director, Admiral Hillenkoetter, have failed their responsibility as America's first line of defense. That Secretary of State Marshall was not forewarned of impending embarrassing developments at Bogota is an irreparable defeat. And Admiral Hillenkoetter and his Central Intelligence

Agency must accept responsibility for that defeat.

No investigation is necessary to determine that fact. It is self-evident.

And it must be abundantly clear that this Nation cannot afford a similar failure in the future.

During the last war, this Government schooled and trained many men and women for intelligence work. Gifted with the know-how of intelligence, they contributed invaluable service toward defeat of the enemy.

To my personal knowledge, many of these men and women went to the Central Intelligence Agency during recent months, and volunteered their services and abilities in the war of intelligence against our present enemies. But Central Intelligence has become so bureaucratic an agency, overweighted with military brass, that it had no place for these people trained in the hard, intricate science of intelligence work.

May I suggest that American prestige and American security have no place for another Bogota.

I urgently petition those officials who are responsible for this Nation's security, to revitalize our intelligence agency, and to expand its operations. If that means recalling William J. Donovan and his civilian experts, who know what to do, and how and when to do it, then let us recall them.

In any event, let the Nation have an intelligence agency, staffed with seasoned personnel, and worthy of the name.

[From the Washington Post of April 13, 1948]

THE X AT BOGOTA

Whether the Daily Worker is right in saying that the sordid misadventure in Bogota has dealt the United States a terrific black eye depends upon American statesmanship. The damage would be complete if this conference were abandoned. Argentina and Cuba (who, incidentally, were the conference's most vociferous critics of United States policy) are reported already to have left, but, if Secretary Marshall succeeds in holding the remaining delegates together, Argentina and Cuba will doubtless return. It doesn't matter if they don't. What matters is that the remaining delegates put themselves on record (a record to which, we are sure, Cuba, if not Argentina, would subscribe) in fulfillment of the task which brought this conference together. This was to concert measures for dealing with Communist aggression and for laying the groundwork for economic union.

The loss of the conference papers need not be a deterrent. This act, together with the events of which this was an incident, merely adds to the challenge to Pan American statesmanship to complete the job—a job which is now shown with the vividness of a lightning flash to be an urgent requirement of hemispherical security. The chance is golden to turn this dastardly deed against its perpetrators. By going ahead with their work, elsewhere if not in Bogota, the delegates could return the black eye, and make it permanent. The initiative belongs to Mr. Marshall. He will probably find those of his quondam critics who are not in flight in a condition of sheepishness as they contemplate the implications of the outrage in the conference capital.

In the meantime the question arises: Was the American intelligence system caught napping? It is the intelligence function to save policy makers from walking ignominiously into such traps as they are now in in Bogota. Yet, judging from the State Department's surprise, they were kept in blissful ignorance that anything might go amiss. We heartily subscribe to Representative CLARENCE BROWN's demand for an inquiry into the status of the Nation's intelligence system. Either the country is not being served by a service that in this cold war is situated in the very front line of the national defense, or the service is not being used as a guide to conduct.

It is simply not reasonable to accept the explanation that the outbreak in Colombia was spontaneous. Organization is not spontaneous, and the American pool correspondent, Mr. Milton Bracker, refers to "the incredible swiftness with which an assassination by a single shot spread and the revolutionary strategy whereby all centers of communications were the first objectives of the insurgents." It had long been known that a plot had been in process of hatching to scuttle the conference. This parley was as anathema to the moguls of the conspiratorial Kremlin as the Marshall plan. News of a plot had appeared in messages from Buenos Aires, where the Communists, who voted for Peron in the last election as the best bet in the anti-American campaign, were said to be the hatchers. What happened in Bogota turned out to be the perfect sabotage that had been contemplated. Maybe the assassination of Gaitan was not planned. But Gaitan hadn't the national standing to evoke in death at an assassin's hand such an extraordinary outburst as has occurred, such a reversion to barbarism. Nor is Colombia that kind of a country. To anybody but a simpleton it is obvious that a train of consequences had been laid beforehand.

Certainly no coup we can think of fits an exhibit of black propaganda better. Here was a perfect example of what Stein, one of the founding fathers of Germany, called a jacquerie organized from above. How it was done will probably never come to light; for black propaganda, which means incitement to sabotage, operates by deception of source and intent. It is its characteristic to separate nature from origin. The fact is that the plotters' purpose was accomplished—in the sense of exploding the conference. Everything about the affair belies the appearance of natural causes.

Only a person lost to a sense of smell could have failed to get a whiff of the witches' caldron that was brewing. For that caldron was so obviously brewing that others, if not our delegates, had been forewarned, of an explosion. Where were our agents? The FBI used to operate in South America. There is an intelligence unit in the State Department; another in the Army Department, yet another in the Navy Department, and presumably a fourth in the Air Department. Over all is the Central Intelligence Agency. This latter, which has a statutory mandate, was the precursor of interservice unification. It is supposed to have agents of its own in the field, though its primary task is to evaluate all intelligence reports, and give the low-down every day to the White House and the Secretary of State. The suspicion (unless the State Department is self-insulated) will be created that the CIA is just another agency. Is it? We now know that the armed services have been backward in carrying out both letter and spirit of the Unification Act. Is this true of the intelligence function?

In this matter the public has long been left in a fool's paradise. The perilous times call for an end to it. This newspaper has agreed on the necessity of partial mobilization and an increase in the budget for the armed services. But these in themselves are the modern version of a Maginot Line. What is needed is a recognition of the true nature of the force with which we have to contend and with which we must appropriately contend as the price of survival and as a safeguard against a shooting war. That nature is the cold-war technique of intimidation and propaganda and infiltration. Knowing the nature of the opposing force, knowing how it operates, policy makers could easily develop a policy of counteraction. But, without any such clear view, officials are left like Mahomet's coffin, in midair, unable even to make an assumption whether we are in a hot war or a cold war.

Brains are more important than brawn in coping with the Soviet's engine of conquest, ideals more than arms. They should be enlisted, and the intelligence system accorded the status it deserves, so as to hammer out and operate effective counteraction. Mr. John Foster Dulles has made this suggestion. If the events at Bogota are regarded as underlining it, as well as treated as an imperative to push the conference to a conclusion, then the saboteurs would find they have loosed a boomerang.

ELECTION TO A COMMITTEE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 531) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That EMORY H. PRICE, of Florida, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on District of Columbia.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, to include in one an address he delivered at the Democratic State Convention in Maine, in one to include an editorial, and in the other a letter including a statement.

Mr. BLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain extracts, letters, and editorials.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LIBERATION OF CUBA

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 184, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the first paragraph of House Concurrent Resolution 139, Eightieth Congress, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the liberation of Cuba, the two Houses of Congress shall assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives at 12 o'clock meridian, on Monday, April 19, 1948."

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL MEMORIAL CEMETERY FOR OHIO

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, the great State of Ohio has no national cemetery, even though it ranks fifth in the number of war dead in World War II, and, I believe, fourth in World War I.

In an effort to have the Army consider Ohio for such a national cemetery, I have

contacted Gen. T. B. Larkin, head of the Quartermaster Corps of the Army, under whose jurisdiction a program of this kind originates. General Larkin agreed with me that Ohio should have such a cemetery and stated that in his opinion a tract of at least 200 acres would be required. The general informed me that he would gladly order a survey of the State in an effort to locate desirable sites, but I suggested to him that he wait until I had made known his requirement of 200 acres in the hope that prospective sites might be submitted to me. In this way those making the survey would visit these prospective sites as well as others and submit their report. General Larkin agreed with this idea, so I am hoping that chambers of commerce, Kiwanis, Lions, Rotary, Exchange, Veterans organizations, or any other civic club will attempt to locate a site and submit their findings to me in order that I might in turn transmit this report to General Larkin.

It is quite obvious that one argument made regarding a location will be that it should be near the center of the State in order to accommodate all sections of the State. However, as General Larkin pointed out, the distance of traveling across Ohio is infinitesimal when compared with the great distances traveled in the Western States in order to reach a national cemetery. It seems to me that other assets such as historical or scenic areas would be much more appropriate than a location based on mere proximity to the center of the State.

Naturally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to see this cemetery located in the Eleventh Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent. This is not based on any selfish motive but on the following facts, which, in my opinion, offer sound arguments in favor of locating this cemetery in any one of the five counties comprising this area.

Somerset in Perry County, for instance, is the home of Gen. Phil Sheridan. Fairfield County is the home of Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman. Pickaway County is the home of the Logan Elm. Hocking County has natural scenery, such as the Rock House, Cantwell Cliffs, Ash Cave, Old Man's Cave, Conkle's Hollow, and so forth, which are equal in scenic beauty to the Grand Canyon. Then, Mr. Speaker, we come to Ross County and the city of Chillicothe, which was the first capital of the State of Ohio. Mount Logan, which is so closely associated with the great seal of the State of Ohio, would serve as a beautiful back-drop for this site. The graves of four of Ohio's pioneer Governor's are located in this area. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I could go on indefinitely citing historical facts and natural beauty which would be irrefutable by any argument to show that this area of Ohio offers everything which should be required in order to establish a national shrine to those to whom we owe so much.

Where could we find more beautiful and hallowed ground than in this section of the great State of Ohio.

SOUTHERN TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, the press of yesterday carries a story in which His Excellency, Lt. Gov. Arthur W. Coolidge of the historic State of Massachusetts, charges our southland with kidnaping the Massachusetts textile industry.

I am astounded at such a statement being attributed to this high official of the State which has been said to have produced more men of brains than all of the States south of the Mason and Dixon's line. Surely this gentleman, learned in the law as he must be, is familiar with the Federal law enacted a few years ago referred to as the Lindbergh kidnaping law under which extreme penalties, including death, may be imposed upon one charged with kidnaping.

As the Representative in this great body of the largest textile district in the world and having worked in the cotton mills for many years, I resent the implications that undue and persuasive influences have induced New England mills to come southward. If the Lieutenant Governor had read the prophetic words spoken in his own city of Boston some 60 years ago by that matchless, silver-tongued orator from Georgia, Henry W. Grady, he would not be surprised at the facts about which he complains. I quote Mr. Grady:

> Far to the south, Mr. President * * * lies the fairest and richest domain of this earth. It is the home of a brave and hospitable people. There is centered all that can please or prosper humankind. A perfect climate, above a fertile soil, yields to the husbandman every product of the Temperate Zone. There, by night, the cotton whitens beneath the stars, and, by day, the wheat locks the sunshine in its bearded sheaf. In the same field the clover steals the fragrance of the wind and the tobacco catches the quick aroma of the rains. There are mountains stored with exhaustless treasures; forests, vast and primeval, and rivers that, tumbling or loitering, run wanton to the sea. Of the three essential items of all industries—cotton, iron, and wood—that region has easy control. In cotton, a fixed monopoly; in iron, proven supremacy; in timber, the reserve supply of the Republic. From this assured and permanent advantage, against which artificial conditions cannot much longer prevail, has grown an amazing system of industries. Not maintained by human contrivance of tariff or capital, afar off from the fullest and cheapest source of supply, but resting in divine assurance, within touch of field and mine and forest—not set amid costly farms from which competition has driven the farmer in despair, but amid cheap and sunny lands, rich with agriculture, to which neither season nor soil has set a limit—this system of industries is mounting to a splendor that shall dazzle and illumine the world.

In spite of artificial shackles imposed upon southern industry and agriculture in unjust freight rates, taxes on oleomargarine, and other discriminations, industry of the South is coming into its own. We have a homogeneous, patriotic people who believe in work, and have always done so. A textile worker in the South is worth as much and should be paid the same rate as similar workers elsewhere.

Without reflecting on the native State of our distinguished presiding officer, the Speaker, and the home of so many of my fine colleagues here in the Congress, I must say that on a trip last fall through New England I was impressed with the lack of new buildings. There came a thought that this was the finished section of our great country. In the South, on every hand, new buildings for industry, business, and homes are being erected as fast as materials can be had.

The trend of business and industry is definitely toward the South, for which fact we are very grateful.

What other results could be reasonably expected when we realize that we sprang from the loins of the country's greatest sires?

> It was the South whose Patrick Henry kindled the fires of the Revolution, whose Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence, whose Washington commanded the Continental Armies, whose Madison framed the Constitution, whose Marshall interpreted the organic law, whose Andrew Jackson fought the Battle of New Orleans and whose Winfield Scott planted Old Glory upon the walls of Mexico. Aye, it was the South to whom the Union was indebted for existence; and, if from 1 61 to 1865, she drew her sword against the Union's flag, it was in defense of the Union's Constitution.

STRENGTHEN THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the words of Thomas Jefferson which we have just heard so ably read by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] are as pertinent and apropos today as the day they were uttered, except that they are applicable in wider scope.

Had I the funds, I would translate that address into every foreign language and transmit it to every resident of every land, starting with those living in Russia and its satellite countries.

For the third time Russia has prevented the admission of Italy to the United Nations. The only reason for such action is the fact that Italy and the patriotic Italians can be counted on to vote and fight for the democratic way of life.

Every democratic country can expect to be opposed at every step by totalitarian Russia.

We must make up our minds once and for all that if the United Nations is to become a world-wide force for peace, no country must be permitted to stand in the way.

We are faced with two alternatives, and the sooner we decide on one or the other the faster we will make progress.

Either we amend the United Nations Charter at once and eliminate the veto power, or we organize a new world-wide United Nations in which the democratic countries can move forward together.

Our State Department should forthwith assure the Italian Government that we condemn Russia's action in keeping

Italy out of the family of nations, and that we will nevertheless continue to render to Italy every possible aid to rehabilitate herself and her people as an honorable member of the democratic and freedom-loving peoples of the world.

Democracy must and will triumph.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DAWSON of Utah asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include in one a statement from the triple-A of Washington County, in another an editorial from the Springdale News, and in the third an editorial from the Baxter Bulletin.

DISTILLERS' USE OF GRAIN

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I asked the Secretary of Agriculture for some figures regarding the consumption of grain by the distillers. The most startling figure he gave me in this whole report, which I shall include in my remarks, relates to the tremendous increase in the consumption of grain between January, when the controls were in effect—they ended on January 31—and March, when there were no controls. In January 1,700,000 bushels of grain were used by the distillers and in March the amount reached a total of 7,700,000 bushels.

This cannot be dismissed by the claim that it is a revival of old social issues pertaining to prohibition. Certainly that is far from my mind in directing the attention of the House to this problem. Our concern should be to provide more food for people who need it both here and abroad—and if that should mean less liquor for some, that is incidental. I hope the Members will read this enlightening statement by the Secretary of Agriculture, and then I hope we will do something about it either by passing the Senate bill sponsored by Senator Flanders of Vermont, or giving the Administration power under some other bill to prevent the inordinate use by the distilleries of grain needed for food. Unless we do this, I cannot see how the Nation's conscience can be easy.

Mr. Speaker, the statement by Secretary Anderson is as follows:

APRIL 12, 1948.

Hon. BROOKS HAYS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HAYS: In response to your inquiry of April 8, we are glad to set forth the present situation with regard to distillers' use of grain.

As you well know, distillers have refused to limit their use of grain to 2,500,000 bushels a month as requested by the President. In fact, they have actually increased their consumption of grain, mostly corn, to a near record high.

In January, the last month of Government allocations, distillers used 1,700,000 bushels. But in the succeeding short month of February, they increased their grain consumption to slightly over 6,000,000 bushels. In March they further increased the amount of grain used to approximately 7,700,000. This was 1,200,000 bushels more than they used in March 1947 and is a near record for any peacetime month.

As stocks of whisky equal or exceed a 6-year supply, the distillers would suffer no hardship through the generous monthly allocation of 2,500,000 bushels as proposed in the bill the Senate has already passed. Moreover, the supply of distilled spirits at the end of January and before the industry increased its use of grain was enough to carry the industry for more than a year without any new production.

The distilling industry is a heavy consumer of corn, and the United States supply of this grain is much smaller than it was last year. Our supply when we entered the present crop year was 720,000,000 bushels less than a year earlier. The latest crop report shows, moreover, that the supply of corn on farms, as of April 1, was a third less than that on hand a year ago and the smallest since 1937.

Short supplies of corn, the country's principal feed grain, are partly responsible for the shrinkage in our livestock and poultry numbers. This, in turn, has contributed to the rise in food prices. An ample feed supply is one of the fundamental solutions to high prices, as abundant feed is necessary to enable farmers to raise more meat, milk, and eggs. The present short feed supply effectively prevents farmers from planning to expand their output. Continued abnormal use of grain for nonessential purposes, such as the manufacture of alcoholic spirits in a country that has a 6 years' supply, threatens to postpone the time when farm production can match market demands. There are indications, in fact, that farmers are reducing the breeding stock they should keep to increase their production for market if the United States is fortunate in having good crops this year.

Another aspect of the problem involves the recovery of feed from distillers' residues which contain perhaps a third of the original feed value. We have been informed that 62 distillers using 17 percent of all the grain consumed in distilleries do not recover the residues. This failure resulted in a loss estimated during March at nearly 11,000 tons of dry feed for commercial distribution to farmers. Some distillers, of course, are known to feed their residues as wet mash to their own cattle or those of nearby farmers. This, in itself, is a wasteful feeding practice. But more to the point is the fact that residues are often dumped as industrial waste with no effort to recover the protein feed they contain. This is a sheer waste of our food resources at a time when the world needs all the food it can produce.

The savings from an allocation program from February 1 to October 31 were estimated at 22,000,000 bushels. Unlimited use of grain in February and March, however, has already allowed distillers to use 8,700,000 bushels more than they would have used if the requested legislation had been in force. This is nearly half the possible savings for 9 months. Distillers, in fact, have used grain in February and March at a rate two and one-half times what the President and the Senate consider in the national interest.

The Congressional Joint Committee on the Economic Report apparently foresaw this condition on February 11, 1948, when it recommended government allocation of grain to distillers. At any rate, the committee declared: "The operation of the distilling industry without restriction would result in diversion of grain to this nonessential use to the detriment of farmers, consumers, and other essential businesses who are being requested to reduce their use of grain. * * * If the distillers who have been unable to agree on voluntary conservation are permitted to use grain without restriction, it is difficult to see how any other group could be expected to carry out grain conservation measures."

In view of these facts, I wish to encourage you in continuing your vigorous effort to obtain legislation which would provide authority to safeguard our limited supply of grain from diversion to nonessential and even wasteful uses.

Sincerely,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter or resolution and certain other statements.

Mr. KELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette and in the other some excerpts and an editorial from the Pittsburgh Catholic.

Mr. KEFAUVER (at the request of Mr. JACKSON of Washington) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial and in the other an article.

POLITICAL DOUBLE TALK

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I was rather impressed by an editorial appearing in the Washington Evening Star referring to political double talk. It refers to a recent publication of the Republican National Committee. I would like to see that the majority leader of the Republican Party sees to it that I get a copy of this Republican fiction, because I know that the thing to do these days, of course, is to take these things in stride.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FISHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. LESINSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address which he made over radio station WWJ in Detroit, Mich., on April 12, 1948.

Mr. JARMAN (at the request of Mr. JONES of Alabama) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Decatur (Ala.) Daily.

Mr. CHELF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Hancock Clarion, the editor of which is Roscoe I. Downs, the subject of the editorial being A Challenge of Prayer.

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement from the secretary of Greater Arizona, Inc.

REV. DR. JOSEPH F. THORNING

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the

House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a brilliant priest, a recognized scholar of international fame, a great American, I think it is singularly appropriate to have the Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning offer the prayer on Pan-American Day. Father Thorning, who has been a friend of mine for many years, always impresses me by his sincerity, loyalty and conscientious devotion to the good neighbor policy. Long before many of our citizens were aware of the value of inter-American friendship, Dr. Thorning had organized the Inter-American Seminars at the University of San Marcos, Lima, Peru; the University of Havana, Havana, Cuba; and the National University of Mexico. He is the only living United States Honorary Fellow of the Historical and Geographic Institute of Brazil, having been unanimously elected to that position after the death of Professor Percy Alvin Martin of Stanford University, Palo Alto, Calif. Father Thorning is now active as associate editor of "The Americas" and "World Affairs," two quarterlies published in Washington, D. C. Recently, he was the only ecclesiastic in the whole world invited to Venezuela, as an honor guest of the Republic, for the inauguration of President Don Romulo Gallegos. We in the United States are grateful to the Republic of Venezuela for this mark of esteem and confidence toward one of our apostles of the good neighbor policy.

It is good news for the people of the Western Hemisphere that President Gallegos in Venezuela and the Honorable Sumner Welles, the architect of the good-neighbor policy, are writing the Spanish and English prefaces, respectively, for Dr. Thorning's new book, Miranda: World Citizen. This will represent statesmanship and scholarship at their best. Pan-American Day furnishes a suitable occasion for putting these facts on record. As an admirer of President Gallegos, Sumner Welles, and Dr. Thorning, I am happy to make this statement.

SUPPLEMENTARY ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to offer an amendment to the bill H. R. 6226 in Committee of the Whole, which I send to the desk, and ask the Clerk to read for the information of the Members.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the text of the amendment for the information of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, after line 1, insert:

"SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of Defense shall report to the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services of the Congress not later than June 30, 1948, and quarterly thereafter, the amounts obligated under the contract authorizations provided for in this act and such reports shall include a statement of finding by the President that the contracts let are necessary in the interests of the national defense and that the contract specifications insure the maximum utilization of improvements in aircraft and equipment consistent with the defense needs of the United States.

"(b) All contracts entered into under this act shall include a clause providing for final settlement in accord with the provisions of the Renegotiation Act as it was in effect July 1, 1945."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to amend that request to make it page 4 instead of page 2.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the correction will be made.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we are familiar with the provisions of the amendment. We consider them highly advantageous; in fact, imperative. We have no objection to the request of the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an outline article.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement from the National Federation of Small Business.

Mr. GORE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. MAHON asked and was granted permission to revise and extend the remarks which he expects to make in Committee of the Whole and include some brief excerpts.

CORRUPTION AND DECEPTION INHERENT IN PUBLIC HOUSING

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I propose to show the utter corruption and deception inherent in public housing.

Congress has before it a proposal to corrupt permanently our free political system with all of the evils in subsidized housing inherited from the New Deal. What is more, the present proposals double or even treble the corruption. The New Deal was a piker in buying votes. The political party that builds the public housing naturally selects the tenants. Tenants vote, naturally, in appreciation for the favors extended by the party. In cities such as New York, Detroit, and Cincinnati, the public-housing tenants now cast 92 percent of their votes in some districts in appreciation of what the party has done for them. The projects are still new. The vote will improve. Thus space cards are granted and withheld under NKVD American plan.

The T-E-W bill makes building and renting houses and controlling votes a permanent activity of the party running the Federal Government. Washington is going into the business for 45 years with approximately $7,000,000,000. It will cease to function as our constitutional, limited Federal Government. It will become a form of statism, almost identical with European forms, to run a WPA having power over families, over their votes, over labor, prices, credit and finance, contractors—even the land itself. It will have the power to exempt itself from taxes. It will have the power to reward in greater degree those who stand still in contrast with their neighbors who work harder and pay more rent and taxes. They, too, will lose their incentives. A recent cartoon showed a worker begging his boss to reduce his salary so he could remain in a public-housing project. And still another problem remains—how will our American form of statism decide who is qualified as a low-income tenant. A supreme court in New York has just held that $4,500 is a low income.

The corruption is the more obvious when we examine the thin pretense of removing slums from the cities by way of Washington. The slums to be removed are in the big cities. All the big cities are in the richest States. Therefore money is not the need. Those are the States that have the money. Washington has none except what it takes by force away from those very States. Does it make sense to take the money in the first place from the States which have it and then return only part of it to the places where it came from in the first place, to remove slums?

The deception in the propaganda from Washington that Government housing will increase the number of houses for the needy has been demonstrated often to be a total impossibility. At this present moment it is obvious to everyone that all building craftsmen, every available board and nail are being utilized. The abnormal demand has already pushed prices to the limit to induce all men and get all material to build the 800,000 houses now being built. That number was built in 1947. If you add Government demand and money to the private demand and money, which is more than can be supplied, you simply raise prices and add confusion rather than increase the number of houses. Such Government building has always reduced the number of houses in every nation that has tried it contrasted with the number from free building.

Thus in a free economy nearly every family rides in an automobile. It is absurd to talk of a new automobile for the lowest-producing group. The great majority run hand-me-downs according to their capacity to keep them running. So houses have been provided in exactly the same way and will continue to be provided if we can eliminate government itself which has been the culprit that has been slowing up our housing for nearly 50 years. It controls, and harbors labor and contractor monopolies, destroys credit and manipulates money, enforces building codes, rent controls, and material preferences.

Worst of all, by its failure to dissolve the monopolistic, restrictive, and rack-

eteering practices of contractors and labor bosses, it is the primary cause of raising the cost of housing beyond the capacity of many of the people to pay. Government housing merely covers up this cancer which grows worse and increases the housing shortage.

If we could only make government confine itself to its proper function of maintaining freedom of men and material in a free economy?

Public housing cannot add one additional house because it merely takes away from those who would build anyway. That is true in bad or good times. For example, if the Government should build 50,000 houses for veterans, the veterans would simply live in public housing instead of private housing. Veterans do not want public housing. They do not even want new houses that they cannot afford to buy or rent. Few young people start life buying or renting new houses. They want second- and third-hand houses which they can afford. This is true of possibly 80 percent of all people.

All people in a free economy get houses by the following steps. The 800,000 private houses now being built per year benefit many times 800,000 families. The first group of people move into new houses. They vacate at the same time approximately 800,000 older houses and apartments. The second and third group follow the same pattern. Every move of each group lowers the price of the housing vacated. At the bottom is still good housing at very low depreciated cost. Thus housing is lowered in cost to each group just as an automobile is lowered until at last each person has as good a house and car as he can take care of. Most of us live in secondhand houses. The President of the United States lives in a good secondhand house.

Slums are positively increased by public housing. Public housing did not clear the slums or increase the number of houses under the New Deal.

Private industry from 1920 to 1930 had nearly cleared up the slums. In New York City slums became 70 percent vacant. In the 1930 to 1940 era of public housing, WPA, lack of confidence in housing investments, and money devaluation, the slums filled up again almost to capacity. Thus they have remained due to an ever increasing measure of governmental control—including the worst Government robbery of all, rent controls. As the top productive groups were stopped cold, the short supply of houses that reached clear down the line forced and crowded the group of lowest productivity back into the slums.

Slums cannot clear up again until Congress destroys this utterly corrupt and deceitful encroachment of statism and reestablishes and makes constitutional government perform again its true function.

Under socialistic statism it is possible to spend billions of dollars to build houses. Or we can restore a free society and spend a few score thousands of dollars prosecuting and wiping out monopolistic, restrictive, and racketeering combinations and get the nearest approach to adequate housing possible.

If we add to the present public employees, amounting to approximately 2,000,000, another million of public housing tenants, and then add 850,000 public-school teachers, and 150,000 janitors and other school personnel, and then add possibly 750,000 unemployed persons who cannot earn the proposed enforced governmental minimum wage, and then multiply all these by four to get the total number of bought voters and their relatives, the one-party system will be beyond the possibility of being blasted out.

Word comes from England that the Socialist Parliament came to power partly through socialized housing. Later elections turned on the highest bids of candidates for Parliament to reduce the public housing rents and thus get the organized tenants union's votes. Some of the latest elections turned on the highest bids of candidates to repaper, repaint, refurnish and relandscape the depreciated public housing.

When the Nazi came to power in Vienna, Austria they found the Socialist government officials and party members all neatly bedded down in the Marxhoff and Engelhoff public housing projects—the pride of all the high priests of the socialized states in the world. One night the Nazi party found that by turning their artillery on these famous socialist houses they could completely dispose of the opposition party.

If the madness of public housing and political corruption must extend to our country let me beg my fellow Republicans to let the opposition party be guilty of doing it. We will then know where to find the concentrations of our enemies.

WHO "SHOT THE ALBATROSS" IN BOGOTA

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a short article from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, for the last several days I have been trying to find out, to use the words of Coleridge, Who "shot the albatross" in Bogota?

We were told by one crowd that it was a Communist uprising. Now, this morning, we get the news through the New York Times that this man Gaitán who was assassinated was what they call a superliberal left wing leader and that his assassin was a Conservative from the Province of Santander.

They proposed to give him a State funeral, but this dead man's wife served notice that she would not attend if the President of the Republic attended.

Just where does that leave us? Just what is going on? What is behind all this confusion in Bogota?

Do you not think it is about time the United States, and especially the Congress of the United States, and other branches of our Government began to get back under the American flag, build the strongest air force on earth and let the world know that we are prepared to take care of ourselves first?

Then we would be respected everywhere from Bogota to Trieste, and from Tokyo to Moscow.

The article from today's New York Times follows:

GAITÁN'S ASSASSIN WAS CONSERVATIVE—WIDOW OF LIBERAL COLOMBIAN LEADER WILL NOT ATTEND THE STATE FUNERAL

Immediate resolution of the rebellion in Colombia appeared doubtful last night with the disclosure in this city that Senora Jorge Eliecer Gaitán, wife of the leader of the Liberal Party whose assassination last Friday touched off the insurrection in that country, had refused to attend her husband's funeral if the Conservative President of the country was present.

Highly placed officials of Colombia here disclosed that the assassin of Dr. Gaitán had been a member of the Conservative Party from the Province of Santander. This information, it was said, was learned in telephonic conversation with government officials in Bogota last night.

Dr. Eduardo Santos, former President of Colombia and at present Vice President of that country, said that he had learned that damage to the nation's capital caused by the week-end insurrection was worse than had yet been reported in the United States press. He said, moreover, that news arriving in Bogota from other parts of the country was sketchy, suggesting that communications still were undependable.

RUSSIA'S DETENTION OF ITALIAN PRISONERS OF WORLD WAR II

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, on March 20, 1943, approximately 6 months before the surrender of Italy, the Soviet Embassy in Washington announced through its information bulletin that 46,000 Italians had been taken prisoner on the Russian front and that 69,000 other Italians had been wounded.

In March 1947 Colonel General Golikov of the Soviet Army said that 21,065 Italian prisoners had been returned to their homes between November 1945 and July 1946. He also said that in December 1946 a few others—32 in all—were returned, making a total of 21,097. With this announcement the Soviet Repatriation Commission officially informed the Italians that the process of repatriation had been completed.

In August 1947, when an Italian women's delegation was visiting Moscow, the question of prisoners was raised again, and the Soviet position was restated. At this time the Soviet officials said that some Italians were still being held on war-atrocity charges.

On February 20, 1947, the Italian Minister of Defense, Senor Gasparotto, estimated the number of Italian prisoners in Soviet hands at between sixty and eighty thousand. On December 10, 1947, the right-wing newspaper, Risorgimento Liberale, quoted a former RAF captain as saying that 5,000 Italians were still being held in a prison camp at Cerkasov. The former RAF captain said he had been interned in the same camp from 1942 to 1947. Currently there are posters all over Italy demanding the return by Soviet Russia of 40,000 Italian prisoners.

The Soviet Government has never given any figures showing how many

Italians had died in hospitals or in captivity during the war.

Mr. Speaker, World War II has been over for almost 3 years. I call on the Government of Soviet Russia to release these men who are being held in slavery. I call on Stalin's Italian gauleiter, Palmiro Togliatti, to help to deliver these victims of Soviet despotism from the stinking hellholes of oppression in which they are still languishing.

SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1948

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6226) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue throughout the afternoon, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and myself.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is it the intention of the gentleman from New York to read the first paragraph of the bill before the Committee rises today?

Mr. TABER. I would hope that we might, but I would not go beyond line 5 on the first page.

Mr. CANNON. No amendments will be offered for consideration or taken up during the day?

Mr. TABER. I shall move that the Committee rise if we are able to read the first paragraph.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that general debate continue throughout the afternoon, the time to be equally divided between himself and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6626, the supplemental national defense appropriation bill for 1948, with Mr. O'HARA in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this bill carries contract authorizations for $865,000,000 for new aircraft construction, new cash totaling $358,100,000 and cash to liquidate previous contract authority of $250,000,000 for the Air Force, all of this connected in one way or another with the construction, matériel, equipment and other items relating to air and air activities. It carries new cash for the Bureau of Aeronautics of the Navy of $165,000,000; new contract authority, $588,000,000; and to liquidate previous contract authority, $150,000,000; a total of $903,000,000 for the Navy.

The grand total carried in the bill over-all, including new operations and the liquidation of these obligations that have previously been incurred, is $2,376,100,000.

We were advised by the Navy that they would be able to enter into contracts by the 1st of October for all of these items. We were advised by the Air Force that they could do better than that, but, frankly I do not believe they can. Both forces have considerable amounts remaining of the contract authorizations that were given them a year ago when the Congress provided, as I remember it, something in the nature of $200,000,000, above the budget estimates for aircraft construction in the Services. Perhaps I was wrong on that. It was increased from $769,000,000 to $9$2,000,000 over-all.

Now, this budget estimate was submitted to us Wednesday afternoon, late, last week, and we had hearings upon the matter on Thursday and Friday, and we have presented this bill just as fast as it was mechanically possible to do so. We all recognize that in the present state of the world it is highly desirable that this country be just as thoroughly prepared as possible for any contingency that might arise; in fact, I believe, and I believe those whom I have talked with, who have had a very considerable experience with Mr. Stalin and his crew, that a move toward preparedness will have a very salutary effect upon Mr. Stalin's operations. In any event, I am satisfied that it is the wise thing for us to do at this time; to provide just as far as we can for the building up of our Air Force so that it may be able to meet any contingency.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Where does the information come from that Russia is building 1,000 planes to our 1?

Mr. TABER. Oh, I do not think we have any such information as that. It has been talked about that they are building 10 or 12 to our 1, but I would say that when the production of the Air Force and the Navy is included that we are probably building 1 to 6, perhaps 1 to 5, as many as the Russians. But the Russian figure includes everything including commercial planes as it was given to us in a very unofficial way, and not as absolute information. I would not know what the Russians are doing. I do not believe any of us know.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, if there is such a thing as the iron curtain, and we all know there is, it would be about impossible to get any information as to what they are doing in that country.

Mr. TABER. Well there have been times when large numbers of Russian planes have gathered on certain air fields, and that fact has given some of our people an opportunity to observe them and to get some idea of the type of thing and the manner of thing they have, and to have some judgment as to numbers. I would not say that it was much more definite than a judgment. On the other hand, I do not want the Russians over here, and I do not want to be responsible in the slightest degree for the failure of the United States to build up its defenses to the point where we can take care of and protect the interests of the United States.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. MERROW. Has the gentleman figures available on what our plane production is for the two services at the moment, and how much this would increase the output, roughly?

Mr. TABER. Frankly, I do not care to discuss on the floor here the number of planes we have, because I do not think that is an item that should be discussed on the floor of the House. I have information as to the number of planes the United States possesses and the type of the planes, and the number on order, the number that are proposed to be built under this bill, and the types. Frankly, this is in the nature of a modernization program. It is more than to build up the number of airplanes. I think we probably have sufficient planes in numbers. The thing we have to do is take care of the attrition that comes along, to such an extent that we will have available as modern an air force as anyone in the world, and have it in shape to take care of and protect the interests of the United States.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman knows that there were two Gallup poll favorites who made bad deals at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, and because of that we are having to spend this money. It is well that we spend it, and possibly more, but in any event we are spending the money because of the bad deals which a couple of Gallup poll favorites made for this country, and which this country did not know anything about at the time the deals were being made.

Mr. TABER. I do not think Russia would have been in a position to build up her forces as much as she has if we had not sent so much lend-lease and a lot of that sort of thing to her after the end of the fighting. I frankly think that those people who were representing the United States at Yalta and Potsdam did not realize the serious effect of the concessions they made as to the occupation of Germany. We have also had other trouble resulting from the failure to take hold of the occupation of Germany on the basis of getting Germany on her feet where she could support and feed herself, instead of trying to starve her to death.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I compliment the gentleman on his statesmanship in the handling of this bill. I think this is the clearest way that we can indicate to the world that we are desirous of having peace, but that if we cannot get peace, we are going to be prepared for war.

Mr. TABER. I think we must approach it on that basis. I have always

felt that the only way we can be sure of having any chance of preserving the peace would be to be prepared to defend ourselves. If we do not do that, we cannot expect somebody else to do it for us.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. We are very happy that the gentleman from New York is stressing the necessity for modernization. I think the world now realizes that one of the reasons France fell so quickly was that she was fighting the recent global conflict in terms of the First World War with implements and weapons of 25 years ago while she was depending upon the Maginot line. Notwithstanding that fact, I think our Government has made a serious mistake in scrapping hundreds of thousands of airplanes of all descriptions, particularly the B–29's, until we get these newer types of airplanes into production. The B–29 may be a little obsolete or obsolescent or whatever you want to call it, but even today it will compare most favorably with the planes of any other nation on the face of the earth. We were told only this morning, sir, by the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, Gen. Omar Nelson Bradley, perhaps one of the greatest, if not the greatest general in this recent war that we would be building up our National Guard and our Reserve forces today if we had the equipment. The thought popped up in our minds, "What in the name of common sense have we done with the equipment with which we furnished 12,000,000 men and women in this recent conflict?" We ran off to let the equipment rot and rust and to be swallowed up by the jungles in the Pacific and even sold it at 10 cents on the dollar, besides giving much of it away to foreign nations, and now we do not have the simple weapons to equip the increase that is asked for in our armed forces. It is utter stupidity and is woeful waste.

Mr. TABER. There is a good deal to what the gentleman has said. I do believe that if the Army itself would devote itself presently and as effectively as they can to the building up of the National Guard, that that would provide it with some mobile forces which would be very effective and very useful at this time. I do not think they have the armory capacity to do what perhaps needs to be done along that line and I think we have to go into that question very seriously.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I imagine the members of the committee considering this measure looked into the military strength of Russia, did they not?

Mr. TABER. We did, as far as we could, and got the best information that we could, but frankly I would not want to say that we had accurate information.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is the gentleman convinced that they are stronger today than we are from a military standpoint?

Mr. TABER. Whether they have as many effective planes or as good pilots, I would not want to say. I do not believe they have. I believe our B–29's and our fighting planes are of a caliber sufficient to maintain the supremacy of the United States. But I would not want to take the responsibility for taking chances on what the future might bring.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I am sure the gentleman would not trust the entire future of the United States to the Air Corps alone?

Mr. TABER. Oh, no. I have never taken any such position. We have provided here $753,000,000 of new money for the Navy. Those Navy planes will be used largely off carriers, with which we are equipped. In addition to that, there is $150,000,000 in this bill for liquidating Navy contract authority.

The regular items for the regular services, the Ground Forces of the Army, the items for the regular operating surface craft of the Navy, and their other activities, the items for the Marine Corps, and the items for the Air Force, other than the construction of airplanes, will be brought in in the Regular Army and Navy appropriation bills, which we are delayed in bringing here because of a supplemental estimate which I have been advised is coming up, and which must be considered when we write up those bills. Those bills cannot very well come onto the floor until toward the end of this month, and perhaps one of them will not come until May, but they will be brought in as quickly as possible after the estimates come up.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I am interested in the status of the National Guard. My recollection is that the Congress appropriated for the activation and equipment of the National Guard units of this country about $143,000,000. I am advised that the Army had only obligated, up to the end of January 1948, slightly in excess of $30,000,000 out of the funds made available for expenditure in 1948.

Mr. TABER. That is true.

Mr. KEEFE. As a result, in my own town and in various other towns throughout this country, those who are loyal to the National Guard have found themselves up against severe competition of Naval Reserve units in the same town, the Naval Reserve units being provided with suitable and beautiful new armories, with all the equipment that is necessary to carry on, including uniforms, guns, electronic equipment, and everything else, and the National Guard units, for which an appeal has been made for recruits, have not been able to even get uniforms, let alone guns or equipment that they ought to have. Six months ago, when an intensive campaign was being carried on for recruitment in these National Guard units, the patriotic boys who went into the National Guard were required to use their own uniforms, their own equipment at a time when the store on the corner two blocks away was selling surplus equipment, Mae West vests, Eisenhower vests, and uniforms and everything else.

Mr. SHORT. And they were being sold for 20 cents on the dollar.

Mr. KEEFE. There ought to be some investigation of the facts with reference to that situation, in order that we may give to the component units their proper equipment.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. SHAFER. I have information that the National Guard has in unexpended funds better than $100,000,000.

Mr. KEEFE. I just finished saying that we appropriated $143,000,000, and that they had obligated slightly in excess of $30,000,000. There must be something wrong with the management of a military institution that permits that sort of a situation to prevail.

Mr. TABER. I will say that the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations is going into that question very thoroughly. They are going to bring a report in here on the question with their recommendations just as quickly as it can be done. They recognize the situation to the fullest and they realize that it is absolutely necessary that we develop the National Guard just as rapidly and just as effectively as it is possible to do it. I believe that if we had the right cooperation from the Chief of Staff—and I believe we will get it—that this would be done.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am delighted that the Naval Reserves have some recognition, that they have their armories and their uniforms and the necessary equipment. It was begun by Mr. Knox and continued by Secretary Forrestal. Previously the Naval Reserve had been treated like stepchildren. They had absolutely nothing and no consideration. I rejoice at the betterment that has taken place. I have many Navy boys and naval pilots in my district.

As I understand, this bill is merely one of procurement for the Army and the Navy. Is that true?

Mr. TABER. Only for aircraft and items that relate directly to aircraft, because those are the items where contracts need to be let presently to begin construction on aircraft in such way that we can modernize the equipment of the Air Force.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And the carriers are absolutely necessary, are they not, because a plane cannot go to Russia and come back without carriers?

Mr. TABER. We have the carriers and there are, in my opinion, a sufficient number of them in commission and operating to take care of the present situation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The Navy has done an excellent job in training its pilots, has it not?

Mr. TABER. I think it has.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Then the money for the training of pilots will come in the next bill?

Mr. TABER. That will be in the regular military bill and naval bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it fair to ask if this is all the Navy requested for its needs?

Mr. TABER. On the particular items that we have covered in this bill. We have not attempted to cover anything like maintenance or upkeep or anything of that character. There is one item in

the bill for certain urgent repairs in these forces, but that is all.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman and his committee deserve to be congratulated, and I join with the others in congratulating them.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] a moment ago said that France lost this war because they undertook to prepare for the last war. I call attention to the fact also that we lost Pearl Harbor because a gang of brass hats court-martialed Billy Mitchell during the twenties and refused to build an air force.

Now, if we are going to go on down that path until every city in America is blown to pieces with atom bombs all we have to do is to listen to their twaddle. But I am telling you we had better build the strongest air force on earth and keep sufficient atomic bombs to let the world know that we are prepared to take care of ourselves at all times. Then we will not have another Pearl Harbor.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I wish to make just an observation with reference to this situation which involves the National Guard. I do not pretend to have all the answers on that proposition, although I have attempted to look into it and look into it at the top level of the Army. The fact of the matter is that funds were made available to the War Department to take care of the National Guard, and a showing was made of the necessity for approximately $143,000,000. That appropriation was made on a showing by the War Department of necessity of that amount. They have only obligated a little over $30,000,000. There may be some explanation as to why they have only obligated that amount. I do not know what the explanation is. If they have an explanation then it must be a different one than they had when they got the appropriation in the first place. But the prime fact is, Mr. Chairman, that the National Guard units have not been recruited and have not been made attractive to the boys who would otherwise enlist in the National Guard. They have not been given the equipment that they ought to have in order to make it attractive to the enlistees to go into the National Guard. In the face of the Army's contention that they need more young men in the armed services to the extent that they are carrying on a constant campaign for universal military training, it seems to me there may be some logical connection between their failure to lay emphasis on activation of the National Guard until they get the UMT put over.

Mr. TABER. My information is that the National Guard—I might get the figures wrong and I will ask the privilege of revising if I do—has presently been built up from about 190,000 to 230,000, that there is only capacity for approximately 270,000. To what extent that could be accelerated and doubled up, I do not know. The appropriation of $143,000,000 was based on their getting way beyond that figure. I understand they claim that they cannot go beyond the 270,000 or 280,000 limit. I would hope that some way might be found with the funds that they have available to go up to at least 300,000 before the end of this fiscal year, and I believe they can do it if they conduct the right kind of campaign and supply these people with the proper equipment and the proper information.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. I am glad the gentleman raises this question of the deplorable condition of the National Guard. I raised the question the other day in our Armed Services Committee when Secretary Forrestal was before us. There is no answer to it. We appropriated the money. It is not the fault of the Congress; it is the fault of the people down in the War Department, because they have not initiated and tried to carry out what Congress intended to in regard to the National Guard. The money was appropriated by the Congress and the situation is deplorable as it stands today.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. MERROW. I have long felt we should appropriate all the money necessary to give us the strongest air force in the world. That is, air supremacy. We have heard a great deal about the 70-group program of the Army with 12,441 planes and a reserve of 8,100 and a 14,500-plane Navy as being absolutely necessary for the air protection of the United States. The gentleman spoke about this bill being one that would modernize the present Air Force. I am wondering if the appropriations are sufficient to start us on the road to the achievement of a 70-group program and a 14,500-plane Navy, or are the funds just sufficient to implement the 55-group program and the Navy as we have it at the moment?

Mr. TABER. As I understand it, we have at present a 70-group force, but in a year or two certain items in there become obsolete. There is considerable attrition. There has to be modernization and replacement. There is attrition from crashes and that sort of thing which you have to expect as you go along. I would not want to say that this would provide, and I do not think we can provide in any one year, for a 70-group of modern aircraft. Frankly, unless we are no good at all in our experimental and development work, these planes that we are presently providing for will pretty nearly be obsolete by the time they come off the assembly line. If you are any good at all in your experimental work you have to expect that, and if you do not maintain that degree of progress, you are not doing your job in the present world situation.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I am very much interested in the discussion about the 55-group policy and the modernizing of aircraft as provided for in the present bill. I am wondering whether in the present bill there are any funds to be devoted to the development of air-transport facilities?

Mr. TABER. There are some; yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. That is in addition to the 55-group program.

Mr. TABER. There are some funds for air transport facilities.

I do not know as I should talk any more at this time. I am in hopes that this House will express itself with a considerable degree of unanimity in favor of this bill. Frankly, I would not say that this bill presents all that is ultimately or perhaps within a short period going to be required, but it is all that has presently been presented to us by the Armed Services, and we are in hopes that it will receive prompt and effective consideration by the House.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. I think, Mr. Chairman, that it might be worth while to observe, while we are considering the improvement in efficiency of our military establishment, as I am informed, that as of now in the Army and the Air Force combined there are five civilian employees to every nine persons in uniform; that in the military establishment there are three times as many civilian employees in proportion as there were in June, 1945. I hope that the gentleman's committee, while we are considering this whole problem, will be able to do something about that.

Mr. TABER. We have tried to do that, and we expect to continue to try it.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. In connection with this appropriation for new air equipment, and so forth, I am heartily in favor of all that this committee feels that we can possibly give to that program at this time. I merely wanted to call attention to the Chairman that 95 percent of the airplanes now in service were built prior to 1945.

Mr. TABER. A very considerable portion of them were.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. In answer to the question of the gentleman about civilian employees, the Aviation Policy Board found that what he states is perhaps true. However, a very high proportion of those are engaged in the maintenance and over-all repair of aircraft, because it is impossible to keep in the service sufficiently high qualified personnel as army personnel to do that job, or naval personnel, for that matter. Now, we have proposed that they contract out a good part of that work to civilian organizations, in order that the civilian organizations may be staffed with persons in the Reserve. We hope that that will be done so that we will increase the number of Reserves, which are now a pitiful handful for both the Navy and the Air Force.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, this bill makes available funds and contractual authority proposed in the 1949 budget and subsequent supplements for aircraft procurement and related objects.

It is presented pursuant to and in accordance with the President's recommendation as submitted in House Document No. 602.

Excluding amounts for the liquidation of obligations incurred under prior contract authorizations, it makes available to the Air Force $358,100,000 in cash and $865,000,000 in contract authorization. It makes available to the Navy $165,000,000 in cash and $588,000,000 in contract authorization. Combined, the proposal is to make permissible during the remaining months of the fiscal year 1948—instead of waiting until July 1, 1948—the commitment of $1,976,100,000 in order to expedite the modernization and expansion of our land- and carrier-based air forces.

Later, in all probability, it will be necessary, unless the amounts carried by this bill are increased, to make further provision for the two air forces. So, this measure may be viewed as an interim step to the further reconditioning and improvement of our armed forces—including the development and acceleration of our facilities for production—a vital consideration in the provision of munitions of such highly expendable character.

It is difficult fully to visualize the advantages which would accrue from the application of this vast sum to the development of peacetime projects for the benefit of the American people instead of burning it up in the crucible of war or wasting it in anticipation of war.

But we are permitted no choice. This is an emergency measure providing for an emergency expenditure in an emergency situation too grave to permit temporization. It involves our very existence both individually and as a nation. There is no alternative.

At the close of the Second World War no one on either side of this aisle could have been brought to believe the establishment of permanent peace was not a mere matter of amicable consultation with our allies. Certainly no voice in America suggested any possibility of delay or difficulty.

And we are today further from world peace than we have been since the capitulation of Berlin.

The time for diplomatic amenities is past. Any further self-delusion is vain and perilous. We must now concede bluntly that failure to achieve peace, or any hope of peace, is due to the refusal of Russia to agree to any proposal which leads to peace or to the security of any nation against unprovoked aggression and brutal subjugation accompanied by unspeakable pillage and devastation.

Communism is on the march. From its very nature it cannot pause or parley. It must go forward or die. We had hoped that with the acquisition of surrounding territory it would have spent its force and, confronted by American power, would be willing to abandon further conquest and consolidate its gains, and devote its attention to the development of the resources of its vast territories.

We have made every effort; we have made every sacrifice; we have accepted humiliating impositions in the effort to secure a lasting peace—in the hope of avoiding war. Russia's relentless purpose is now unmistakable. She considers it her mission to conquer every nation and destroy every government and spread the practices and ideologies of communism throughout the world. She accepts no compromise. She entertains no proposals short of abject and unconditional surrender. And in the meantime she leaves her people to starve while she devotes every resource to preparation for a war of extermination.

But the events of the last few months, the subjugation of Czechoslovakia, the domination of Finland—and in the last few days, the provocative insolence of its studied encroachment on the rights of the Allies in the Berlin area, make it all too evident that unless we arm war is inevitable.

Under the impact of this appalling realization it becomes necessary for us to take stock of our military resources. Only a little while ago we were without question the greatest military power in the world. We had a larger and more powerful fleet and a larger number of effective airplanes than the rest of the world combined.

But in the brief period since the close of the war every branch of our armed forces has deteriorated until our military might is but the shadow of its war peak strength. It is no news to anybody that our Air Force is but a fourth of its war strength; that we have half as many planes as Russia; and that Russia is producing at the most conservative estimate a thousand planes a month while we are turning out 978 planes a year.

That information has been carried by the air and the press to every listener and reader. Why try to deceive ourselves by excluding it from the RECORD. And especially why try to deceive Stalin. He is said to have—and there is reason to believe it is true—one of the best systems of espionage ever mobilized. And he has perhaps a more accurate knowledge of the strength of our Military Establishment than nine-tenths of the Members here on the floor.

So let us face the facts. We not only have less airplanes than Russia, but our air power is steadily deteriorating. Every day planes are becoming obsolescent. Attrition and wreckage and failure to modernize is bringing us to a crisis which, if we wait longer, will be irretrievable.

If war comes it will come without notice. The first information we would have would be when radar notified us that Russian airplanes had crossed the Arctic Circle, and very shortly thereafter the radio would flash the news that Detroit was being bombed. News from other cities would follow in rapid succession. Their first objective would be to paralyze our centers of production and render it impossible for us to rally to repel the attack. That is a situation for which we must be prepared.

We have been misled in many respects. The result of one misconception has been our dependence upon the ineptness of Russian engineering and mechanical skills. We were correct in that conclusion, but we overlooked the fact that Russia, immediately upon the close of the war, proceeded to enlist or impress every available German machinist and scientist, second to none in the world, and from that day to this she has the advantage of the world's best talent in science and engineering, until she has today, with her superior manpower, the scientific research, the technical expertness, the know-how, and the production. We are told assuringly that Russia cannot go to war because she does not have steel and does not have coal to make the steel. But our dependable information is that she is producing at a rapid rate, more rapidly than has ever been produced before by any nation, improved submarines, the design of which Germany had perfected just before the collapse of German power, and that she is producing more airplanes than we are producing. They may not have the coal; they may not have the steel; but they are producing modern airplanes and submarines at an unprecedented rate, and we must meet that situation, and meet it promptly.

I do not mean to say that we are yet at a disadvantage militarily. We are not producing as heavily as they are producing, but dependable military authorities tell us that such planes as we have are superior and that our engineers, pilots, and facilities for production are unsurpassed. We have not yet quite passed the deadline beyond which we may not retrieve the situation.

But we have no time to lose. We must maintain our lead and we must be provided at all times with the latest military, air, and naval equipment fully abreast of the latest research findings. Especially must productive capacity be maintained. And that is one of the prime purposes of the expenditures authorized by the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 additional minutes. Nor does this measure commit us to the suggestion that air power is all-sufficient. Any student of the last war realizes the fallacy of such a contention. It was not true in that crucial and decisive conflict and subsequent developments have not altered its component-of-defense status.

In this connection, may I read a statement by General Arnold, probably the most eminent authority on the subject in the last decade, in which he says:

> The enemy was beaten through forceful application and complete coordination of land, sea, and air power. No one service carried the war exclusively; all shared equally.

Then from the report itself I should like to read these paragraphs:

> The greatest lesson of this war has been the extent to which air, land, and sea operations can and must be coordinated by joint planning and unified command. The attainment of better coordination and balance than now exists between services is an essential of national security. Unity of comand is not alone sufficient. Unity of planning, unity of the common-item procurement, and unity of doctrines are equally necessary. In addition, ground, naval, and air forces must each have an equal voice as well as an equal responsibility in all plans and policies. Maximum

efficiency and economy cannot be obtained when one type of force is subservient to another in planning or operational counsels. The full capabilities of the subservient force will never be exploited efficiently and serious blunders are bound to follow.

In order to secure maximum effectiveness with the greatest economy, our fighting forces must be organized so as to provide soundly integrated command of three autonomous services each of which has an equal and direct share of total responsibility.

We cannot, by depending upon air power alone, by providing air facilities alone, assure national defense and national security. But at this time the rapid deterioration of our air power makes it necessary to provide this exceptional emergency provision.

And time is of the essence. For money does not mean procurement. You cannot walk into a munition market and look up at the shelf and say, "Hand me down half a dozen battleships and 500 planes; just wrap up 1,500 tanks and put them down here on the counter; here is the money for them." If we could procure the implements of defense that easily, it would be a simple proposition. We must not only have the money to pay for them but also we must develop the facilities for their production.

Through the enactment of this bill, by advancing by some 30 days to the period in which contracts can be negotiated, it will be possible to expedite and accelerate by some 6 months or a year the delivery of the finished product.

Mr. CANNON. In the committee Members on this side of the aisle have joined fellow Members on that side of the aisle in the common effort to promote national defense. We were unable to agree fully on some features of the measures; we did not originally agree as to amount; but by mutual concessions we have tried to get together. We reached an agreement under which the pending amendment which has been sent to the desk by the chairman will come up for consideration without intervention of points of order. We have agreed to incorporate provisions for renegotiations, as insurance against exorbitant prices for the material which we buy with this money.

It is my understanding that the chairman of the committee will offer an amendment to increase the amount of cash or authorization carried by the bill.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. MERROW. I would like to ask the gentleman about the sum that is appropriated here or proposed in this bill for procurement. The gentleman mentioned the fact that there was a little disagreement in the committee in regard to the amount that should be expended. It calls for $865,000,000 in new authorizations for procurement. My question is this: Will that sum of money be sufficient to start us on the way to the achievement of the so-called 70-group program with its 20,541 planes, or is this just sufficient to implement the 55-group program that we hear so much about at the present time?

Mr. CANNON. I regret to say that the amount provided in the bill as it was reported to the committee and reported to the House is not sufficient even for the 55-group program. As a matter of fact, it is not sufficient to maintain even the present strength of the Air Force. But, with the addition of the amount which it is my understanding the chairman will propose, it is believed that we can carry out approximately a 70-group program. However, I leave that for the discussion of members of the legislative subcommittee and the Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Affairs, who have made a detailed study of the question.

Mr. MERROW. Would the gentleman be willing to give us an estimate of how long it would take to realize the 70-group program with the proposed increase?

Mr. CANNON. Of course, the gentleman understands, as has been said, that time is required to translate the funds in this bill into actual equipment. We are told that from the time the design of an entirely new plane is placed upon the trestleboard it requires about 5 years to put the finished plane in the air.

However, with all of the preliminaries taken care of, it is believed that even the most difficult construction problems can be taken care of in something like 2 years; in other words, that the bombers, which require more time than other aircraft, can be completed in a maximum of 2 years after the money is available. It cannot be said offhand in how much less time it may be done under the authorization provided by this bill.

Mr. MERROW. Would the gentleman be willing to state how much he thinks we ought to appropriate if we were going to appropriate sufficient money to get the 70-group program?

Mr. CANNON. We should certainly appropriate all that is required. The latest estimate is for $922,000,000.

Let me say, in conclusion, because I had not intended to take so much time, that the proposition here is to avoid the situation in which we found ourselves on the 7th day of December 1941, when we found ourselves at war without adequate preparation. Many Members of the House had voted against every measure which would have prepared us for that crisis. Surely we have had our lesson.

We realize that we are in a different situation now; that in every war up to this time we have had allies who held the enemy in check until we had time to retool our factories and start production and prepare for the shock of war before it actually reached us. This time there are no buffer states; there is no ally that can delay for a day the onslaught of the enemy. We must be prepared when the attack comes. If not prepared then, we will never be prepared.

While I deplore the necessity of increasing the amount which has been reported by the committee, I believe not only that it will be highly advantageous in materially expediting the preparation which is necessary for us to make but that the psychological effect will be highly advantageous. It will be unmistakable notice to Russia, which understands no other language, that we will be prepared, that we propose to back up every commitment we have made. And it will be notice to our allies that they can depend upon us; that we are back of them.

To that extent this bill is not a war measure. It is a peace measure. We hope by the adoption of this and supplemental bills which will follow not only to prepare for war but thereby to avoid a third world war.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 15 minutes if it is necessary. I do not think, however, that I will require the extra time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would remind the gentleman from New York that the gentleman from Massachusetts is in control of the time.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I should like to conclude my statement and then submit to questioning if any Members are left in the Chamber at that time. I had not intended to speak today, but it strikes me that a very important decision has to be made. Not only the decision itself, but a number of other considerations are involved which have to do with recent action of the Congress on the so-called unification bill and some other collateral matters. If I were to give a title to what I am going to say generally, I would say that it is "The public is ahead of the Congress" on this subject. I should also like to remind you that this is an election year, a Presidential election year, and that that fact also has a bearing on some features of this general picture.

Supplemental to my remarks that the public is ahead of the Congress, I would say that generally we are all prone to be extremists—the Congress and the American people as well. In granting that the American people are ahead of the Congress on the subject of preparedness, they may overlook the fact that that view is not entirely consistent with their own viewpoint as represented by us, taking into consideration the fact that we voted to override the tax bill. I suspect that the public wants certain things in preparedness which so far they have not shown the Congress they were willing to pay for out of their own pockets in taxes. To begin with, I shall talk in and around an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post this morning, reading a portion of it and then giving some observations of my own on these expressions.

The sole criterion of whether the country should undertake to build a 70-group air force at this juncture is military effectiveness. That means military effectiveness now, when the lack of American military power is a critical factor in Europe, as well as effectiveness in some future day when the 70 groups are a reality. We have no doubt that given the present state of world affairs and the premier role of air power—

We have that—

a 70-ground air force is desirable.

I intend to support an amendment for that purpose.

But to achieve this air force at the expense of other necessary and immediate measures,

as now seems the disposition of Congress, presents to us a very difficult task indeed.

I am reminded of the fact that a great many people today, even some of those who are so strong for the 70-group air force, or even for selective service now, have not been so strong for preparedness in the last 2 or 3 years, and have changed considerably in their viewpoint on these points.

Continuing:

The choice is by no means so simple as that outlined by the Air Force Secretary on Tuesday, yesterday, in [our] committee when he said, "I think our national security would be better served by a 70-group air force than by a group of 18-year-old boys being called in for training."

Obviously, if we had a 70-group air force now, with all its modernization, it would mean more effectiveness as compared to starting to train 18-year-old boys. In that sense he is right, but what he failed to point out is that the larger air force requires a larger amount of land and sea forces solely for air support.

Right now, for example, 30 percent of the Army overhead is devoted to support of the Air Force, and nearly 10 percent of the Army's present meager manpower is engaged in Air Force supply.

That is of 560,000 men in the Army 30,000 to 50,000 of that number today are engaged in Air Force supply. When we raise our Air Force ultimately in manpower to this 70-group strength, we will have to have more men from the Army to supply that program.

According to today's testimony of Gen. Omar N. Bradley, a major combat air base, consisting of 20 air groups and 125,000 Air Force personnel would require Army contingents numbering 375,000 merely to defend and supply it. Naval forces undoubtedly would be needed in proportion. Nor is this all. Since air bases in hostile territory do not capture themselves, both naval and land forces are required to secure them. And before bases can be obtained close to the enemy, naval air operations will have a vital role, for overseas air fields are essential to even the longest-range of the present land-based bombers.

Moreover, what is needed in the way of air strength is not mere size.

Of course, we all appreciate that. It is contractual. It will take a large staff of men in research to inaugurate merely the contractual obligations under the proposed amendment.

It would do no good to augment the present 55 groups with planes already obsolescent. The main thing to concentrate on, it seems to us, is readiness—in other words, a greatly expanded and liberally endowed research program coupled with a preparedness effort in industry. That is the way to dynamic, rather than static, strength.

I might say there were no airplanes, including the B–29, used in World War II, for which the draftsmen's work had not been prepared prior to 1940.

Secretary Forrestal did quite properly, we think, to warn that the failure to enact UMT would mean a draft of indefinite duration. For aside from the support troops entailed by a larger air force, a paramount consideration today is more divisions to back up American and western European diplomacy where they confront aggressive communism. The most economical way to insure more divisions is through a combination of the draft and UMT, and a default on UMT would make the draft that much more important. This is not an argument against augmented air power, but rather an argument against consideration of air power alone as a panacea for American security.

Now, if I may, I should like to take those who are here back almost 3 years, to the end of the war.

I know some of the Members may not agree with some of my observations. Following the defeat of Germany in 1945 the then Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], and the then minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], agreed upon the appointment of what was known as the Select Postwar Military Policy Committee. On that committee were seven members of the then Naval Affairs Committee, seven members of the then Military Affairs Committee, and seven Members of the House at large—civilianwise you might say, in that they belonged to neither of those two committees. That select committee, as I recall, met in long hearings for a period of 2 or 3 months, generally speaking, on three subjects. One was the development of scientific research, the second was unification of the armed forces, and the third was the question of universal training. That committee recommended, I think, unanimously an increase in research and scientific development, and also unification of the armed services. There were, and I think my recollection is correct, 18 of 22 members in favor of the immediate inauguration of a system of universal military training. I cannot understand why there is so much opposition to universal training. There are two chief beneficiaries of the system of universal military training, as passed by the Armed Services Committee—the National Guard and the Reserves. I wish the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] were still here, because it is a fact that the strongest supporters we have had in the entire country for the adoption of universal military training have been the officers and men of the National Guard.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. In just a moment. I will yield at the conclusion of my remarks.

They knew full well that that is the best and in fact the only way that you could get a modern National Guard in a reasonably quick time, for many of the trainees would, under the alternative offered, enter the National Guard.

In further reference to the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin regarding the recommendations of the Postwar Military Policy Committee on UMT, I do not say that had we adopted universal training in 1945 that we would have had an Army of sufficient size today. I think in all probability it might still be necessary to resort to selective service in view of the aggression of the Soviets since then; but, generally speaking, if we had adopted universal training in 1945 and started training in 1946 we would have had at least 1,200,000 or 1,500,000 young men with 6 months' training and in the National Guard or Reserve Corps now. This bill of course has been reported by the committee but has not been passed by the House.

Continuing with universal training, I want to say this: No one, of course, likes public-opinion polls, such as the Gallup poll, when they do not come out the way they want them to or think they should, but the fact is that the poll of last week showed that universal training had reached the highest percentage of popularity of any time during the last 5 years. I think it was 80 percent, whereas the poll on the question of selective service was as low as 66 percent. Why there is so much aversion to the adoption of universal training which only takes a young man away for 6 months and then returns hm to his home, either to a Reserve unit or his own National Guard, or his favorite college ROTC, I cannot understand.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I also wish to speak a little politically, The Democratic President, Mr. Truman, has been for UMT.

General Eisenhower, whether he is a Republican or Democrat, is certainly very strong for UMT. I might give a little advice to the Democrats. I think the longer you continue to talk about General Eisenhower the harder your job is going to be when he says he will not solve the problems of the Democratic Party. You are making it very difficult for yourselves later. Mr. Dewey, the Governor of New York, has been for UMT. The young gentleman from Minnesota, who seems to get along very well in the primaries, former Governor Stassen, has been for UMT. Even General MacArthur is also for UMT.

Those facts should be worth noting. Our congressional leader candidates, however, do not seem to do as well as these other men in the polls or the party primaries.

Now, let me say something on the subject of unification. I never thought unification would be perfect to start off with. Mr. Forrestal has really had only 6 months since he was sworn in on his job. He is the head of an organization today which in size and scope would take in General Motors, United States Steel, A. T. & T., Sears, Roebuck, Montgomery Ward, Westinghouse, and all the other companies you can think of in that category. He took over after the end of the war with many natural jealousies involved. He makes some mistakes. I have made quite a few mistakes since I became chairman of the Armed Services Committee, although we have gotten along very well. In this connection I think it is fair to say that the distinguished former chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] even though he once opposed merger of the armed services and combining the Naval and Military Affairs Committees, is now wholeheartedly for both. In fact, I know it.

Mr. Forrestal has gone far enough now, I think, to believe that one of his difficulties in the situation is internal organization. I think you will agree with that. At any rate, I give it of my own free will.

The three Secretaries—Army, Navy, and Air—do not sit in the Cabinet. They should be Under Secretaries of Defense for Army, Navy, and Air, and then within the Defense Department there should be an Executive Under Secretary on equal rank with the three Under Secretaries of the services. I am quite sure Mr. Forrestal would welcome that change today.

We have heard criticism of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. A lot of people do not know very much about the operation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, myself included. Admiral King was on it until retirement. Admiral Nimitz was there for awhile, and now Admiral Denfeld, General Marshall, then General Eisenhower came in and took over the job. He quit a little sooner than expected and General Bradley has just taken over for the Army. General Arnold retired. General Spaatz took over. Now General Spaatz will retire to be succeeded by General Vandenberg. I mention that because of the fact that for months there has been no continuity on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Mr. Forrestal did a pretty good thing in that connection. He has appointed an executive director who is doing a very capable job. But the new Joint Chiefs are really just getting under way.

Mr. Forrestal has one thing in his hip pocket now against us who wish to raise this to a 70-group air program and all that must go with it. Since he has been head of the Department of Defense, Navy, Army, and Air, and even before that, during the last 2 or 3 years, he has made presentations to the budget. This is generally speaking, I do not say on everything, but these departments have been cut by the budget and then the Committee on Appropriations of the House has cut the budget figures, the Committee on Appropriations for the last 2 years having been under Republican guidance, so he has got a pretty good comeback with those who suddenly say, "Let us spend three or four or five billion more" and at the same time vote to override the President's veto on the tax bill. At least, it seems that way to me.

I think I can say this, and I really mean it, regardless of who the next President is going to be. So far as I am concerned, the thing I would be chiefly interested in, whether it is Mr. Truman again or one of the various Republican candidates who will be the next President, one of the things that would give me greater encouragement for the future I know would be that Mr. Truman, or any Republican-elected President of the United States, would have the good sense to see that Jim Forrestal is kept in charge of the Department of Defense for a year or two longer at least until we are all on better ground.

Now, we have a selective service bill. We are working on it. There is no rush about it. There is one in the Senate, though we are not racing the Senate; we want to get it properly and fairly drawn. We know positively that the Army, at least, has got to have more men.

Something has been said about the National Guard. I was in the National Guard all of my military life. I enlisted in the National Guard as a private. In fact, two of the greatest experiences I have ever had were as a private and a corporal in the National Guard and sitting at the bottom of the Committee on Military Affairs for a long time. The National Guard is an institution of the greatest importance in our military picture—unusual for prestige, for loyalty, and patriotic service. I fought with the National Guard, with the New York Division in France. I came back and helped reorganize the National Guard after World War I. The difficulty with the National Guard after this war, the same as after World War II, was that the officers always wanted to stay in too long. During World War II the State Guards took over, and there are still some conflicts in the various States. Those who were in the State Guards want to be colonels and brigadier generals even over the boys who did the fighting in World War II, and the Federal Government very rightly says "We do not recognize you as a National Guard until you clean your house." I think there should be age and grade in the National Guard so that we will have five colonels in a regiment with 3 years of service each, rather than one colonel for 15 years. The proposed selective service bill, like UMT, goes a long way toward providing men under its exemptions with the proper ceiling for the National Guard. It would raise the National Guard almost immediately to 350,000 men. That we have on the testimony of responsible National Guard officers, and that number is all that the National Guard could care for at the present time unless the Federal Government is ready to go out and give them money to build more armories. But, you cannot do that in 2 years. It is a difficult situation. Some units in some States are in better shape than in other States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Some States have National Guards that, for one reason or another, are in better shape today than others. Some units of the National Guard came home and were demobilized before others. There is more politics in some States than in others. But I am utterly convinced that with the passage of the Selective Service Act in the form in which we generally have it written today—not UMT; of course, UMT would have made the Guard in 2 years—it will add enough men to the National Guard so that they will have all that they possibly can use, and they will be under World War II officers if the Government recognizes them in the way they should be recognized. The reason a lot of the young men from this war have not gone into the National Guard units is that some are commanded by men who were not in World War II. The average young fellow who was in this war wants to go with someone who he knows did some fighting fairly recently.

So I say this in conclusion: It is a problem not of having just the 70-group Air Force, technically speaking. I am not just for that alone. I am for a bigger Army, an increase in the ground forces. There is a good case for that. There ought to be some increase even in the Navy. We are going to have to face it. It will mean greater expense than the Republican policy committee has figured on for 2 or 3 years. It will mean a larger budget. It will be confirming what is necessary to do to meet the threat of the Communists now, and attempting to keep in step with the public.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill.

The need for an adequate Air Force for our national defense all too long has been apparent. The bill before the House to provide funds to immediately build up our military aviation forces is one of prime importance and should have the support of the House.

For many months our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been deeply concerned not only with the size and quality of our Air Force in being, but also with the preservation and development of the facilities necessary when emergency might arise to bring our Air Force once again to the mightiest in the world.

Our committee has given long and earnest consideration to development of the most modern aircraft, to the maintenance of our aircraft manufacturing facilities, to the retention of manufacturing and engineering personnel, to the development and installation of vitally important and helpful aids to air navigation, and to the assurance of needed airway and airport facilities.

The committee has been ever mindful, too, of the interrelation of civil and military aviation in evaluation of our total Air Force strength. Our national security demands an efficient, modern, and financially sound air-transport industry. As a potential military auxiliary, a strong peacetime commercial air fleet operated both in domestic and foreign commerce is of significant value.

While all of these matters have also been given thoughtful consideration by the Joint Congressional Committee on Aviation Policy, of which I am a member, I should like to reemphasize at this time that the special attention long given by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce leads only to a firm conclusion regarding the essentiality of the passage of this bill as a first step in providing our security in the air.

Just this last fall, hearings on the vital experience of our civil air transport in overseas operations were supplemented by an exhaustive on-the-ground study by the committee of our air operations and facilities throughout the world. This was the subject of a report issued in February.

Last year the committee held extensive hearings on air navigational aids, supplemented by thorough personal examination of such important developments as instrument landing systems, ground control approach, fog dispersal, and the like. These also have been the subject of a report.

Hearings and field examinations have been had on the condition of our manu-

facturing facilities and new developments in aircraft design and engineering.

Of prime importance also has it appeared to the committee was the speedy and full development of air facilities in Alaska. Included in such program were two civil fields needed for large international aircraft and for conversion as operational military facilities in time of emergency. Both have been favorably reported, and one has been already passed by the House.

The strategic importance of Alaska in national security cannot be too strongly emphasized. Of this, the committee is convinced by first-hand and on-the-spot examination.

It is on the great circle route between this country and Japan. It is the shortest route to the Orient.

It is over this route that Russia accepted delivery during the last war of lend-lease aircraft.

It is our outpost closest to the North Pole. The shortest distance to Europe is over the North Pole. From Alaskan air bases all of the principal cities of the Northern Hemisphere, in America, Europe, and Asia, are within a radius of 4,000 miles.

Both for purposes of defense and for striking operations, Alaska is our principal strategic outpost.

I am strongly in favor of any measure which will strengthen our defense in Alaska.

The reference which I have made with respect to the importance of building up our air facilities in Alaska is only one aspect of this all-important subject, of providing an adequate air power for the United States.

The bill under consideration deals particularly with the military aspect of the matter. It is all important that in the light of the uncertainty existing throughout the world, that our military air force should be strengthened. It transcends in importance all other means of national defense at this time. It would be a serious mistake to consider it in any other way. We are confronted with a world situation that makes it imperative to give favorable consideration to bills that will strengthen our Air Force and the facilities upon which it depends for its effective operation.

I urge support for the pending bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

EXPANSION AND MODERNIZATION OF UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I do not have a manuscript or extensive notes before me, but I do want to discuss in a very practical way the bill before us, and the urgent necessity for the expansion and modernization of our Air Force.

The bill as originally written by the Committee on Appropriations, and as now before us, does not provide for sufficient implementation of the Air Force for us to secure the so-called 70 groups. I felt that the 70-group program was in the best interests of the country, and I have had no occasion to change my opinion. The program is supported by the Air Force and by many Members of the House—I think by a majority of the Members of the House, and certainly by a majority of the American people. So this morning, prior to the time that it had been determined that the final vote on this bill would not come until tomorrow, I drew an amendment to the bill which would provide for the 70-group program, which amendment I now hold in my hand, and which is as follows:

Page 2, line 17, strike out "$865,000,000" and insert "$1,787,000,000."

At the appropriate time I shall send that amendment to the desk for the consideration of the Committee of the Whole, and I shall urge passage of the amendment by the House.

I know the House must be aware that the Committee on Appropriations is concerned about this matter and, as has been indicated in previous remarks, it may be that the amendment which the House will actually consider tomorrow will not be the amendment which I, and, no doubt, others, propose to offer.

Pride of authorship is not a factor involved. What we want to do is to get results. I think many Members of the House deserve much credit for their aggressive interest in the immediate expansion of United States air power, including the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], chairman of the Armed Services Committee, who spoke to you a few moments ago.

I have never had occasion to check carefully upon the legislative record of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], but I know that last year on about June 4 or 5 when I offered an amendment to provide additional funds to implement our Air Force, the gentleman from New York spoke in favor of the amendment which was ultimately adopted by the House. As you may recall, at that time a majority of the members of the subcommittee upon which I served, the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations, had decided to reduce the amount of funds requested by the President for the military aircraft procurement program. This was, in my judgment, a serious mistake. Consequently, I offered an amendment to restore those funds. I said then that the House in taking action on the amendment would take a very significant step. In that regard, may I quote from my remarks in the House on June 4 of last year:

I think it may be that the vote on this amendment may be one of the most important votes in this House within a decade. I make that statement because of this fact: If we are willing now to begin a course which leads inevitably to a loss of supremacy in the air; if we begin that course today, we will have taken the first step toward the disintegration of the Air Forces, toward the loss of our power in the air, and in the world; toward national peril, fear, and insecurity. If we cut the funds for the airplane-procurement program for the Air Forces below the sum requested by the President; if we take this step today, mark you well, in succeeding years this vote may possibly be referred to as the beginning of that period of our postwar history that lead to world war III. We must not go into that direction.

The bill before us is much more significant than the legislation in June of last year to which I have referred. Today and tomorrow we are going to take a decisive step toward determining what the future military air program of the United States may be. I think it behooves us to take appropriate and immediate steps to modernize our Air Force.

There are some who have not had the opportunity to make any study of the situation who think that we can vote for a modern air force today and have the air force tomorrow. That is utterly impossible. It takes a long time for airplanes to be produced. Most of the airplanes which are provided in this program will not come off the assembly lines at the factories for 18 months. So, while immediate action is required, this is a long-range program. Speed in getting the expansion under way is one of the most important factors. I realize there are those who say, "Well, did not we have many airplanes on hand after the war and are they not adequate to insure our security?" Some reference has been made to that in the debate today. Questions have been asked, "What did we do with those planes? Were not many of them destroyed? Were not many of them left overseas?" Well, those questions are interesting and important, but from the standpoint of the security of this country I am not worried too much about those planes now. It is the future we are concerned about. Airplanes do not last very long. They get out of date very rapidly. Even an automobile, which is a much more conventional type of vehicle, wears out. We can use it for years, but the more we use it and the older it gets the more we have to repair it and the less trustworthy it is in an emergency. And it is in an emergency that military aircraft are required. From the standpoint of the security of our Nation and from the standpoint of the security of men of the Air Force we cannot afford to rely upon obsolete airplanes which have been repaired and preserved but which actually have little military value in the light of rapidly moving developments in aviation. It would be a monstrous blunder for the United States to rely for security on our store of old aircraft.

It is my conviction that we must have the most modern aviation program that science and industry can devise and money can buy. It is economy for us to do so. Unless my amendment, or some similar amendment, is adopted, this bill will fall far short of the mark. I could put the figures for the number and types of planes provided in my amendment in the RECORD, but it is not necessary or proper to do so.

But it is our hope that by expanding the aircraft procurement program now we will have a completely modernized air force by 1953. Of course, we could have the 70-group program with the planes which we have now, but it would not be an effective 70-group program. Our objective is an effective 70-group program. That is the purpose of my amendment.

It has well been said on the best authority that where there is no vision the people perish. That is something the Congress and the American people can well ponder now. If the Congress does not have the vision and the foresight to expand and modernize the Air Force

now, it will be impossible for the Nation to measure up to our world responsibility and make a maximum contribution toward peace and security.

This is indeed a critical moment in our history. We have embarked upon a very comprehensive foreign policy. If we are going to assert ourselves in the world, we must have more than mere words and platitudes to back up what we say. When the representatives of our Government sit at Bogota or elsewhere in the world with the representatives of other nations, their voices are no stronger than the people at home in America who back them up; no stronger than our Air Force; no stronger than our Army and our Navy; no stronger than our industrial capacity to defend ourselves; no stronger than our moral force for human freedom and peace.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to be among those who support this accelerated program for the Air Force. I think we are going to succeed. It is not a partisan program. It is an American program. I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, is to be commended for the speed with which he conducted the hearings and brought this bill to the House for prompt action. The House will be commended by the American people when we take prompt and favorable action tomorrow on the bill and the amendment which I have discussed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. All the Members of the House are aware of the intense interest for many years of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] in having a strong, first-class air force. Did I understand the gentleman to say that at the appropriate time he planned to offer an amendment to add $922,000,000 in contract authorization in order to insure an effective 70-group program?

Mr. MAHON. That was my statement and that is my present purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How does the gentleman's proposed amendment differ from the amendment that it has been reported will be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has made no statement on the floor as to any amendment which he may offer, and I would not speak for the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New York, the able chairman of my committee.

Mr. TABER. I have made no statement to anyone that I was going to offer any amendment as to amount. I have told several that I would talk the thing over with them between now and tomorrow noon.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his statement. I have carefully abstained from making any statement of the plans of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the gentleman will yield further, as I understood the gentleman from Missouri earlier, his statement was that he planned to offer an amendment tomorrow; but in any event the gentleman from Texas gives us assurance that we are going to have an opportunity to vote on the $922,000,000 contract-authorization proposal that will insure a 70-group air force.

Mr. MAHON. If I have my way about it, that is the policy which will be pursued.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. In undertaking to effectuate such an immense program, does not the gentleman think that Congress and the administrative agencies of our Government must give immediate attention to methods for procuring the necessary aluminum, the necessary power, the necessary plants to make it possible?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is right. There is more involved in the program which is being considered today than appears on the surface. There are many factors which enter into it, the availability of materials for construction, whether or not it will be necessary to have some priority for the manufacturers of the different components that go into an airplane program; all those things are factors which must be considered. We must have the planes, we must have the air force, we must have the defense and pay whatever price may be required. At stake in this matter is the security of our Nation and the lives of our people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, this bill started out to speed up airplane procurement for the Air Force and for the Navy. There was lifted out of the estimates for the 1949 fiscal bills an amount for aircraft procurement for both of the services. The Secretary of Defense and his aides also brought before us some supplemental estimates; and it was the total of the amount subtracted from the 1949 estimates plus the supplemental estimates that are represented in the figures which we reported in the bill and are spoken of in the committee report. In my judgment, however, the issue before the country goes beyond expediting aircraft procurement, important as that is.

It is an issue which in spite of the logic which might support addressing ourselves now merely to advancing the program that the country expects the Congress to meet, and it probably will be met. The issue is the place of air in our defense establishment.

There was a sound basis for the limited proposal which was made by the Secretary of Defense. It takes about 18 months from the time you place contracts until you get substantial deliveries. You have to go out and get the raw materials. The contractors and the subcontractors have to get prepared to go ahead. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], in calling upon the Secretary for these estimates, thought that we could advance the program time, and it was a very sound idea. As I sat through the hearings on these estimates I heard the gentleman from New York complimented by the Secretary of Defense and by his aides for the foresight which led him to ask for these estimates for this kind of presentation.

In opening his statement to us, Mr. Forrestal said:

> This meeting, Mr. Chairman, is the outgrowth of your request to me of about 10 days ago to explore with you the general program for aviation and aircraft procurement.

The estimates reached the committee the middle of last week. The chairman immediately began hearings, and we marked up the bill by the end of the week, got the revised committee prints Monday, and reported the bill to the full committee yesterday. Today it is before the House. So the fact that the House has this early opportunity to pass upon aircraft procurement and deal with the issue of the place of air power is due largely to the initiative of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Much has been said in the debate today in comparing our strength with that of a potential enemy. Comparison in numbers means very little when you are talking about aircraft in total numbers. It is like adding up horses and rabbits. You need to know how many are horses and how many are rabbits to make sound deductions.

If somebody is producing pursuit or fighter planes, of course he can produce a great many of them more rapidly than you can produce a modern four-engine bomber plane. If we were to make an intelligent comparison of the respective strength of two countries we would have to know the various categories or types of ships, we would have to know the modern qualities of each of them.

For security reasons, it is not possible in the consideration of a bill of this sort to make available for the RECORD all of the figures in those comparisons that necessarily come before the committee. The members of the committee would be glad to put the figures before the Congress as a whole or before the country, but many of those figures should not become known to a potential enemy. So we talk in round figures, we talk in terms of 55-groups and 70-groups and total numbers of planes, which can be quite misleading as to comparative fighting strength.

The dollar figures that were submitted to the committee as to how much money would be required for a 70-group program were in response to some questions which I asked of the people who were before us. They were repetitions of questions I had asked in the hearings we were having downstairs in the committee dealing with the Army and the Air Force during the past several weeks.

The figure of $922,000,000 for a modern 70-group force will be found on pages 8 and 10 of the hearings that were printed in response to questions when I interrogated General Rawlings.

But we did not have a request from the Department of Defense to provide for a 70-group program. The request before us was simply that we make some money immediately available and give enough contract authority so that they could start placing orders for the Navy's air program as well as that of the Air Force and get it going at once, saving 2 or 3 months' time by getting it under way at once. The committee was 100 percent in response to that.

As I have said, however, there was one development during our hearings which made me think that the whole issue of what valuation the country is to put upon air power and the Air Force in particular is an issue which cannot be avoided in debate on this bill.

This happens to be the first bill that we are dealing with in this session of Congress which looks forward in the procurement of aircraft. It is the first time that this session of Congress has had an opportunity to express itself on whether or not we want to place emphasis upon a modern air force in the Air Force or in the Navy. It is because of that so much interest is evident here today.

During the hearings I asked the people who were representing the Navy whether or not the figures which they were offering us were in any way modified by the decisions that were reached at the much-advertised Key West conference where Secretary Forrestal had the heads of the different branches of the defense establishment together and there reportedly agreed upon missions for the different branches.

I asked Admiral Price this question:

Do any of these figures (either in this supplemental or in the 1949) reflect any change in the concept of mission for the Navy and the Air Force as a result of your Key West conference?

Admiral Price replied:

No, sir; they do not.

Then I asked:

In other words, the Key West conference confirmed the mission in the air which the Navy heretofore has regarded as its particular responsibility?

Admiral PRICE. It defined all missions; yes, sir.

Mr. CASE. That is another matter. Did it confirm the concept of mission which the Navy has heretofore held?

Admiral PRICE. Yes.

Well, then I said, of course, if they did confirm that, I could understand why they made no modification of their request, but I said I felt that the purpose of unification had not been accomplished if there had been no change in the definition of the air mission of the Navy in the whole defense program from that which the Navy itself would and previously had defined for itself. Then Admiral Price said:

We feel every airplane we are requesting here is in furtherance of a mission of a naval program.

Mr. CASE. Who determines that—the Navy or the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

Admiral PRICE. The Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. CASE. The Joint Chiefs of Staff then agree that aeronautical responsibilities of the Navy are the same today as they were before unification.

Admiral PRICE. They were not defined before unification, sir.

There is more along that line—you will find it on pages 24 and 25—but the answers were summed up when I asked:

Has this request as to types of ships and quantities been reviewed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

Admiral PRICE. I believe they have. Is that right, Admiral Pride?

Admiral PRIDE. No, sir.

Admiral PRICE. The 14,500 program has been approved.

Admiral PRIDE. Yes. This program is being presented to the Aircraft Committee of the Munitions Board this afternoon.

Mr. CASE. It has not been passed upon by them yet?

Admiral PRIDE. No, sir. This is their first meeting.

In other words, this was the situation: We passed unification and we expected that there would be a definition of the respective missions of the Air Force and of the Navy in the air, yet we were confronted by the testimony that in spite of the purposes of unification and in spite of the Key West conference, the concept of naval mission in the air remained what the Navy itself said it was before we had unification; that it has not been changed, and that the Joint Chiefs of Staff had not passed upon the requests for naval air procurement which were before us.

And that is the reason why I think that the Congress cannot escape at this time facing the larger question here as to the relative emphasis to be placed upon the Air Force and the Navy in air operations. That is why this morning I went to the gentleman from New York, and later conferred with other Members on how we might give effect to what I think is the judgment of the country that if we have another war our first line of defense is going to be in the air, and that the country wants the Air Force put in such condition as rapidly as is consistent with the procurement of modern types of aircraft that we will have the best relative position against any possible foe.

So, I worked out some legislative language, which was the language the gentleman from New York asked might be in order as an amendment to this appropriation bill, which would require that the Secretary of Defense report quarterly to the committees of the Congress on Appropriations and Armed Services the amounts obligated under these contract authorizations, and include in that report a statement of finding by the President that the contracts let are necessary in the interest of national defense and that the contract specifications are such as to insure the maximum utilization of improvements in aircraft and equipment consistent with the defense needs of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to point out that when we are talking about procurement of aircraft, we always run up against this proposition: How long should we go in getting aircraft in being or how long should we wait for this new improvement that is just coming off the design boards?

Preparedness is not an absolute, it is a relative matter.

If you are going to expend preparedness money wisely, you must try to determine in relation to the defense needs of the country at any given time, how far you can go in waiting for the latest thing. If you always wait to get the latest thing from the drawing board, you would never have an aircraft in being.

So, in an effort to try to insure that this authorization for contracts, carried here for both the Air Force and the Navy, would give us the benefit of the latest inventions in relation to our defense needs, with others I worked out the language which the gentleman from New York reported, which requires that the President certify in connection with the letting of these contracts that they are necessary in the interest of national defense, and that the contract specifications insure the maximum utilization of improvements in aircraft and equipment consistent with the defense needs of the United States.

Further to insure that we get the maximum benefit from this money, the most planes for our money, if you please, I proposed that we insert language to reactivate the principles embodied in the Renegotiation Act. That act, it will be remembered by some Members, was initiated by an amendment which I offered to the Sixth Supplemental Defense Appropriation Act in the spring of 1942. The original terms of the renegotiation statute were modified on the basis of experience as we proceeded through World War II. The language which is proposed is so worded as to incorporate the benefit of our World War II experience with the act.

The wording of the proposed amendment, follows:

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of Defense shall report to the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services of the Congress not later than June 30, 1948, and quarterly thereafter, the amounts obligated under the contract authorizations provided for in this act and such reports shall include a statement of finding by the President that the contracts let are necessary in the interests of the national defense and that the contract specifications insure the maximum utilization of improvements in aircraft and equipment consistent with the defense needs of the United States. (b) All contracts entered into under this act shall include a clause providing for final settlement in accord with the provisions of the Renegotiation Act as it was in effect July 1, 1945.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that the committee approved and reported to the House a bill containing all of the requests made by the Army and the Air Force?

Mr. CASE. Yes. The bill as reported to the House embodied the request submitted to us by Secretary Forrestal and his aides.

Mr. BROOKS. Would it be fair to assume, then, that the subcommittee reporting the bill did not vote against more funds for air power but just failed to pass on it?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If by "more funds," the gentleman means funds to modernize 70 full groups, that is true. That question was not presented to us in that form. The gentleman will find in the report of the committee the exact testimony of Secretary Forrestal on that point. He will bear in mind, of course, that the amount reported in the bill carries the full amount of the supplemental budget estimate submitted by the President plus the full amount for aircraft procurement in the estimates pending before the subcommittees dealing with the Air Force and Navy for the fiscal year 1949.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. On the assignment of missions, of which the gentleman speaks, on yesterday General Spaatz was before us, and on this matter, which I think is highly important, I asked the question if at the present time the assignments were satisfactory to him as worked out and agreed to by the Chiefs of Staff, and he said they were.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the gentleman for his observation. Of course, my comment related to the Navy's assignment as interpreted by the Navy itself. The testimony was that the Joint Chiefs of Staff had not passed upon the estimates before us. They may or may not be within the scope of the Navy's mission. I do not know. I am forced to assume that the Secretary of Defense would not have suported them unless they are.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. MERROW. The gentleman referred to the figure of $922,000,000 in connection with the 70-group program. Am I right in interpreting that to mean that if we were to start the 70-group program at once we would add the $922,000,000 to the $865,000,000 provided on page 2 of the bill?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes, unless taking the program in one bite instead of two or three gives a chance to save some money. The figures were first developed comparing the 55-group plan with the 70-group plan. When we were having the hearings the estimates for 1949 were not yet released. The totals the gentleman will also find in the printed hearings on this bill, so it is permissible to disclose them at this time. The figure that is in the 1949 estimates for the Air Force based on the 55-group plan was $3,054,000,000. I asked for the cost of the 70-group plan. General Rawlings, who is the budget officer for the Air Force. testified that the 70-group plan would call for $5,422,000,000. When General Rawlings was before us on this bill, which deals wholly with aircraft procurement, that is, the procurement of planes, parts, and equipment of planes, I asked him for the comparable figure here. Bear in mind that the over-all figure I have cited for the 1949 budget would take care of personnel, installations, and other things of that sort; the pending bill deals solely with aircraft procurement. He said there, "If you were to go on the basis of a 70-group plan it would take $922,000,000."

Mr. MERROW. That is additional, so it would be $1,787,000,000, would it not?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is right, if the addition is correct—and unless there are economies in launching the entire program at one time as I have previously indicated.

Mr. MERROW. One thing more. The gentleman mentioned that the Air Force did not ask for appropriations for the 70-group program. If we appropriate the money and tell them to get the 70-group program, they will have to do it, will they not?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not know. I suppose the President or the Bureau of the Budget could impound the funds, as has been done on some other occasions, but that would be contrary to the indicated intent of the Congress.

In conclusion may I say that I agree with the idea that when we are talking about certain countries and certain people in this world we need to remember that the only thing they understand is force. I have felt many times in the past few years that our foreign policy has been too much talk in relation to the strength we had on tap.

At the same time, I do not think we should regard force as a substitute for diplomacy. Force may be an implement of diplomacy but it must not be regarded as a substitute for diplomacy.

I hope that the committee will do what the country expects it to do tomorrow in defining the place of the Air Force and that with the improvement of our air strength there may be an improvement in our international relations.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege to serve in the Congress of the United States for some years. During that period much of my effort has been devoted to the security of our country through the provision of an adequate Military Establishment.

It is a basic political and military fact in this democracy of ours that we can never expect to maintain in peacetime the armed forces which will be necessary to enable us to win the ultimate victory in a war which may come. Only two goals can we hope to attain: First, to establish the nucleus out of which armed forces necessary to win a war can grow without ruinous delay; second, to maintain ready for instant activity a force in being which has the power to repel the initial thrust of an aggressor and to deliver blows which will prevent him from building up and concentrating a force to defeat us.

In the past the enemy forces with which we were concerned were land and sea forces and the force in being upon which we relied was the United States Navy. Being a continental power with broad oceans separating us from the brawlings of Europe on the one side and the brawlings of Asia on the other, we were bound to maintain and did maintain sea power capable of protecting our shores from attack across the oceans which were the only avenues of approach by which an aggressor could reach us.

That situation has now changed. Russia, the adversary whose too obvious hostility and aggressiveness forces us to the expenditure of all these billions of dollars which we would prefer to devote to the attainment of more abundant lives for our own people and the other peoples of the world, is a continental power occupying the center of the great Eurasian land mass. It is the forces of Russia that, in the event of war, we must be prepared to hold in check until such time as we are able to build up the armed might necessary to a complete military victory. Let us examine these potentially hostile forces one by one.

Russia has a great army, some 175 divisions counting satellite countries. Neither we nor any other democratic nation can hope to rival the numbers of such an army in time of war, much less in time of peace. In fact, the total number of divisions this country had at the peak of its effort in World War II was 89. We must accept serious numerical inferiority to Russia in ground forces, at least at the start of any conflict.

On the sea, we have the greatest Navy in the world, a greater Navy than all the rest of the naval forces of the world put together. We can and must maintain this force in a position of clear superiority. On the other hand, we must recognize that Russia has not traditionally been a naval power and, largely due to its economic self-sufficiency, does not need naval force for the protection of any life lines of supply. In surface naval forces Russia is not at present a threat. In subsurface forces there are indications of considerable expansion which call for appropriate countermeasures on the part of this country.

The air forces are the subject to which I wish principally to address myself. In the air we are capable of competing with the Russians—and they are capable of competing with us. Preponderance of air power is in the balance. It is this element in which the decisive struggle is likely to take place, for the lesson of World War II, reemphasized by everything that has taken place since VJ-day, is: You cannot lose a war with air supremacy and you cannot win a war without it.

In the bitter event of a war with Russia, there are a number of tasks which the Air Force will be called upon to perform, some alone and some in cooperation with the other two services. The first of these is the defense of the United States against attack by weapons of mass destruction and against air-borne invasion by ground forces. The second task is the protection of our overseas bases and, so far as we are able, the protection of those countries into which we are now pouring billions of dollars to help them resist the external and internal forces of aggressive Soviet communism. The third task is the dealing of blows against enemy concentrations of force, military bases, and industrial resources for the immediate purpose of forestalling the

launching of attacks against us and for the ultimate purpose of reducing the enemy's will and capacity to fight.

As I have studied the military situation of this country, I am driven again and again to the conclusion that these three tasks cannot be performed unless America has an adequate Air Force in being ready for instant use. I am driven to the conclusion that we will be gambling with out national existence if we do not provide the funds by which such an air force can be available to us at the danger date when our military and scientific advisors tell us we must be ready and that is 1951 or 1952.

When the question arises as to how much air power is necessary for these purposes we cannot afford to quibble or skimp. We have an impressive array of evidence before us. For years the civilian and military leaders responsible for national air power have been trying to lay before the Congress their conviction that a 70-group Air Force was the minimum requirement of air power for national safety. Only recently, the President of the United States appointed an all-civilian body to survey this and other issues; this commission independently arrived at the 70-group program as its recommendation. Shortly thereafter, a committee of our own colleagues set themselves the task of reexamining national aviation policy. After some months of deliberation, this committee proffered to the Congress a report from which I wish briefly to quote. The committee said:

> Existence of opposing weapons in quantity, and the means to deliver them, is a restraint upon any nation contemplating attack. Possession of weapons in quantity, and the means to deliver them in overwhelming force, if attack comes, is judged the best and surest protection against defeat and slavery.
>
> Until men of all nations can meet in good will in the council chambers of the world, anything less than this complete supremacy in air power is self-deception.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Therefore, it is the judgment of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board that the capability of the United States most likely to discourage an aggressor against attack upon this Nation, most effective in thwarting such an attack if launched, and most able to deal out retaliation to paralyze further attack, is air power.

It is significant that this committee, which conceived of American air power as a force for peace as well as an instrumentality for winning wars, also arrived at 70 air groups as the minimum force essential for safety.

I for one am not prepared to take the responsibility of refusing to meet the requirement thus triply confirmed. I am not prepared to reject these studied conclusions on the basis of any questionable consideration of ratios or parity between the three armed forces. And I am not prepared to assent to any proposal of delay. On the contrary, I here raise my voice in sponsorship of that program and declare that on the evidence before us it seems to me clear beyond the shadow of a doubt that the provision of an Air Force which will gradually increase in strength until it reaches 70 fully ready groups in 1952 is a requirement of national security.

For many years I have advocated a strong America. Some of my colleagues have been good enough to compliment me on having recognized at an early date the danger that lay in the evil philosophy of Hitler. I feel that I would not be true to my duty if I did not say to you now that in my judgment the sinister forces at loose in the world today are far more dangerous to the very existence of our country than were the forces of Nazi Germany. Fortunately the country at large recognizes this new menace for what it is, and we can be assured that the American people are solidly behind us in our determination to forge for their protection the sword and shield of air power.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

BETTER "TOO MUCH, TOO SOON" THAN "TOO LITTLE, TOO LATE"

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, to those of us who have supported a strong air force for many years, the statements that have been made on the floor this afternoon are very heartening.

This measure in its present form does not provide money for a 70-group air force. Those who believe a 70-group air force is the peacetime essential will, I hope, see to it that an amendment is adopted tomorrow increasing the contractual authority to $922,000,000, thus giving congressional approval for a 70-group air force.

In my judgment, the sentiment in the House today will insure the passage of a bill providing funds sufficient to give us the peacetime air force which our outstanding air strategists and military leaders—men like General Eisenhower—have told us we need.

ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE FAVORS 70 GROUPS

The Finletter Commission, appointed by the President of the United States, has recommended a 70-group air force. The Congressional Aviation Policy Board, of which our distinguished colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW], was vice chairman, and my colleague from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], was a member, has made the same recommendation. The greatest air strategist in the world, General Spaatz, has told us this country should have a 70-group air force. Only a few days ago, the Armed Services Committee of this House passed unanimously a resolution asking for a 70-group air force.

ONE SONG TO SING—TOO MUCH, TOO SOON

While these expert and authoritative conclusions have been made, this country now is being serenaded once again by an old familiar band of troubadours who have only one song to sing—too much, too soon.

Over and over and over again they recite their well-memorized lines and ask us to wait—another month, another 6 months, another year—before taking steps to strengthen the defenses of this land.

Too much, too soon.

Today we hear that chorus being raised against increasing our air force to 70 groups.

Ten years ago we heard the same chorus crying out against expansion of our air forces, crying out against spending too much, too soon.

Too much, too soon.

How abruptly those voices were drowned out by the voices of this Nation's sons crying from the Pacific islands: "Too little, too late."

No indictment of delay and dilly-dallying was ever more severe than that awful phrase—too little, too late.

I am sincerely afraid that the same terrible mistake will be made once more if we listen to the voices which tell us now that a 70 group Air Force would be too much, too soon.

DO NOT ABIDE BY EDICTS OF LAND-LOCKED MINDS

Let us examine, for a moment, some of the reasoning put forth against strengthening our air arm.

We are told that a 70 group Air Force would throw the armed services out of balance. We are asked to abide by the edicts of land-locked minds and keep the Air Force at 55 group strength while we revive the draft and increase the size of our land Army.

This 55-group figure is represented as sacred—a figure that should not be questioned. Some would have us believe that so long as the country has 55 groups, the Air Force is in balance.

Mr. Chairman, I say it is false and dangerous to assume that a 70 group Air Force in any way endangers the balance of the armed services.

BALANCE NOT A MATTER OF SIZE

Balance is not a matter of size. There is only one valid basis for determining balance: Can each force do the job which is assigned to it? I am not a strategist, but the vital responsibility of the Air Force in the event of war should be obvious to all of us.

First, the Air Force must be able to protect the people and the industries in this country from enemy attack through the air on the day war starts, if another conflict should come.

Second, the Air Force must be able to launch an immediate counter offensive to provide a cushion of time which will otherwise be lost forever.

When the Air Force has sufficient strength to perform both those functions, then it will be in balance as a part of our Military Establishment. The Air Force does not have that strength as we meet here this afternoon. So long as the Air Force does not have balance for the task assigned to it, then it is futile to talk about balance among the other forces which would be called upon for the later phases of war.

Unless our Air Force is strong enough to fulfill its first day role, I do not believe that we will see any later phases of a future conflict. I would like to emphasize that the 70 groups is not a war strength Air Force, but is a peacetime program. It is not a new requirement arising from current uncertainties and apprehensions in the world.

EISENHOWER FAVORED 70 GROUPS 18 MONTHS AGO

More than 18 months ago—and I hope the Members of this body will notice this—more than 18 months ago, on July

10, 1946, Gen. Dwight Eisenhower stated in testimony before a committee of this Congress, as follows:

Now, we have reached one conclusion which we think is fixed. We cannot see any chance in the foreseeable future where our Air Force should go below 70 groups.

But, Mr. Chairman, regrettable as the fact may be, the Air Force did go below 70 groups.

EISENHOWER ADVOCATED 70 GROUPS 10 MONTHS AGO

Again, in June 1947, General Eisenhower advocated 70 groups, within the over-all 1,070,000 strength of the Army, which included the Air Force.

As I see the problem now our responsibility is to do first things first. The only lack of balance worrying me this afternoon is the lack of balance between our Air Force and the air force Russia is known to possess now.

Only yesterday before our committee the able Secretary for Air, Mr. Symington, told us that Russia is building planes twelve times faster than we are, because that country apparently wants to reach a decision with the United States and wants to reach that decision in the air. Certainly any layman would recognize that this country is hardly in danger of direct attack from land or from sea. The security of the land will be decided in the air.

I, for one, have no desire to lend my support to any argument that would make our Air Force too small, too weak, too obsolete to win if that "decision in the air," to which Mr. Symington refers should ever come.

Remember, the men who know the needs of the Air Force, the men who must fight the air war, have said—and are saying now—that 55 groups are inadequate either for war or for peace.

An air force cannot be built overnight. It takes years to build planes, months and months to train men to fly them and maintain them. We should give our Air Force the strength it needs—and give that strength now. There can be no wisdom in any economy which seeks to make the Air Force a stepchild.

MONTH LOST NOW WILL MEAN SIX DOWN THE ROAD

Secretary Forrestal, incidentally, in testifying on this bill before the committee, said that a month lost now may mean 6 months on down the road.

If a larger Army is needed, if a larger Navy is needed, I favor expanding those branches, too. Just this morning, General Bradley told us in the Armed Services Committee that a 70-group Air Force, 502,000 men, would require an additional 15,000 men for the Army by 1952. He estimated that would cost $165,000,000.

I do not think that expense is excessive, considering the urgency. Certainly it is small cost to pay for insuring that our first line of defense is adequate in these times of uncertainty.

PUT FIRST THINGS FIRST

But I repeat, let this House put first things first. Let us free ourselves of the hide-bound faith in the invincibility of a larger land Army, and give the Air Force the equipment, planes, and personnel it needs to fulfill its fundamental role in our national defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] such time as he may require.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express for the record my unequivocal approval of the pending bill, which makes immediately available additional funds for Army and Navy aircraft. I voted for this bill at the meeting of the Committee on Appropriations yesterday. Indeed, I would support a bill for even a larger amount than provided in the measure we are considering here today.

As I have stated to the people of my district on innumerable occasions, our national security demands that we maintain an efficient and wholly adequate military defense. I have always and shall continue to support every measure to that end.

It has always been my contention, and I have so stated on many occasions here on the floor that the most powerful defense weapon is the airplane, and I am heartily in accord with any sound program for the development of this weapon for defense purposes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, the basic reason why this bill is here on the floor today, instead of sometime toward the end of this month, or at a later date even, is because the Appropriations Committee of the House and its distinguished chairman have realized the truth of the statement that unless early action is taken to provide additional aircraft orders now, the program for the maintenance of the air forces could be delayed many more months, anywhere from four months to six months. Hence the Appropriations Committee and its distinguished chairman deserve the highest compliments of the House.

The truth of the matter is that at the present time we are producing aircraft for the Air Force at a rate of approximately 13,000,000 airframe pounds per annum, and aircraft for the Navy at the rate of approximately 8,000,000 airframe pounds per annum, a total of 21,000,000.

We are at the same time withdrawing from war-surplus storage approximately 43,000,000 air-frame pounds per annum; in other words, we are feeding into the air arms about 64,000,000 air-frame pounds per annum. However, the effective aircraft being withdrawn from storage will be exhausted by sometime in 1950 or early in 1951. At that point if we do not have aircraft coming off the production lines, the strength of the air forces of the United States will go down very rapidly indeed; hence this bill, to make sure that the strength of the air forces does not decrease in 1950 and 1951, because the deliveries provided for by this bill come approximately in those years, some earlier, a few perhaps later.

The question has been brought up concerning the 70-group program. It is obvious that the Bureau of the Budget and the President have again recommended lumped funds for the armed services and whacked them up between the several departments arbitrarily and without reference to the specific needs of the different departments concerned. There has been a great deal of talk about balance between the forces. The truth of that matter is that, in order to achieve real balance, it is now necessary to increase Air Force contract authorization in this bill by $922,000,000 for a total Air Force contract authorization of $1,787,000,000.

It is quite obvious to me that the Joint Chiefs of Staff in agreeing to the division of funds as contained in this bill are still in disagreement in spite of the much publicized conference at Key West which the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota mentioned a few moments ago, and that they still propose to fight yesterday's war. It is also quite obvious that the Air Force was outvoted by the other forces, and hence in the administration's plan of appropriations for implementing their roles and missions the Air Force has received the small end of the contract authorizations.

The gentleman's agreement for the division of the new fund has obviously been made under great pressure. Once again I repeat the words contained in the report of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board:

Unyielding adherence to service loyalties at the expense of national security is a luxury the Nation can no longer afford.

In the report of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board of which I have the honor to be vice chairman, it is indicated quite clearly that the Air Force contract authorizations for both plan A and plan B are identical for the fiscal years 1949, 1950, and 1951. The contract authority for the 3 years in billions of dollars is set forth as 1.9, 2.6, and 3.2. For plan A, the full 70-group plan, the contract authority continues to be 3.2 billion dollars per annum thereafter. For plan B it drops to 2.4 in 1952 and levels off at $2,000,000,000 beginning in 1953.

The appropriation bill as recommended by Mr. Forrestal on behalf of the administration and approved in this bill H. R. 6226, by the Appropriations Committee of the House provides Air Force contract authority in 1949 of $865,000,000. That amount, plus the new cash in the bill will not provide for the modernization of Air Force aircraft in either the plan A or plan B program. It will not give us a 70-group program or even a 55-group program, but on a continuing basis, will modernize only about 47 groups, and then not until 1956 or 1957 will the modernization be complete.

In order to implement either plan A or plan B as presented to the Aviation Policy Board, the contract authority for the Air Force in the pending bill will have to be increased by about $922,000,000. If a re-evaluation of the international situation next year indicates that this size Air Force is not going to be needed, then it is estimated that cancellation of contracts made pursuant to these authorizations will cost the Government about 20 percent, or perhaps less, of the contracts after being in force a year. If a re-evaluation in 2 years is made indicating that certain contracts could be canceled then with safety, these costs could be cut down to about 50 percent of

the original authorization. Personally I think that is cheap insurance in these very difficult times.

Back in 1934 the Board headed by former Secretary of War Newton D. Baker, recommended in the procurement of aircraft that the then Air Corps should have 60 percent in numbers of aircraft procured and the Navy 40 percent. This ratio has been carried forward almost consistently until the present bill.

In the present bill the money, not the aircraft, is divided 60–40 between the Air Force and the Navy; but because of the difference in size of aircraft used by these forces, the Air Force would receive considerably fewer aircraft than under the old 60–40 arrangement. Throughout the war and in nearly all other recommendations the 60–40 split has been translated into airframe pounds, with the Navy receiving approximately 22½ percent of the production in terms of airframe pounds and the Air Force 77½ percent. If that basis is applied to the contract authorization money to be appropriated to the Navy in this bill, then the contract authority appropriated to the Air Force should be slightly over $2,000,000,000. In this bill for the first time the 60–40 ratio of aircraft procurement has been made on a dollar basis and not on an aircraft basis, which is a new version of the old numbers racket.

I personally do not believe it is necessary at all to consider that a 60–40 basis should be continued in supplying aircraft-procurement money for the Air Force and for the Navy. I believe that when the Joint Chiefs of Staff finally get around to the point of really unifying the armed services and solving the question of roles and missions, perhaps some wholly different figures may come forth, but in the meantime and until they do solve those questions, we can only take what they present to us unilaterally.

In the report of our Aviation Policy Board we called for a unified study to be made of the roles and missions and the requirements necessary to implement those roles and missions on a unified basis, and we asked for that report to be delivered to the Congress or to the appropriate committees of the Congress not later than the 30th of June of this year, and then annually thereafter, in order that the Appropriations Committee of the House and the Armed Services Committee of the House could properly consider what the strength of these respective forces should be.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from California three additional minutes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, what is the situatfon that we face today? As I pointed out a moment ago, we are producing aircraft at the rate of about 21,000,000 airframe pounds per annum. We must produce at the rate of 64,000,000 airframe pounds per annum by 1950 in order to break even with the present supplies coming in part from production and in large part from storage. If we are to build up to this 64,000,000 airframe pounds per annum by 1950 and 1951 when the storage is exhausted, of course, we must start now, because it takes a year to double production and a year and a half to treble production of the plants that are now in being and operating. It goes clear back, as someone before me has said, through the subcontractors and the sub-subcontractors and finally to the finding of rare metals and minerals which are so necessary in the production of aircraft and their instruments and engines. It is a very exceedingly complicated production problem. In order that we may have those airplanes then, we must order now.

Another good reason for it is this, that at the present moment the contracts that have been let by the air arms, both the Air Force and the Navy, over the past couple of years, are running out. It has been reliably reported to me that in a considerable number of places men are about to be laid off in the aircraft industry, skilled technicians and engineers. When they are once laid off, the factories will not get them back again. Many of them will drift into other and more stable industries. We must keep these skilled workers on the aircraft-production job if we are to meet this dead line of 1950, when the storage aircraft give out. That is why the bill is here now instead of some time later this spring.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I want to compliment the gentleman and the Board that he is serving on. I have no doubt that this Congress would not be considering this bill today except for the good work done by the Joint Congressional Committee on Aviation Policy. I want to ask the gentleman this: Has the gentleman received any assurance from the majority that the committee, or some Member of the majority, will offer an amendment providing for an increase in contract authorization of $922,000,000, in order to take another step forward on our 70-group program?

Mr. HINSHAW. I will say to the gentleman that I have no assurance from anyone other than myself. However, I understand, according to the statement made a moment ago by the gentleman from New York, that he intends to confer on that matter in the morning. As for myself, I have had an amendment on the Clerk's desk since this bill has been under consideration this afternoon, increasing the contract authorization to $1,787,000,000 for the Air Force, and I shall offer it at the proper time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who has just addressed the House is vice chairman of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board. I have discussed this 70 air-group program with the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] many times. It is my understanding that he plans to introduce such an amendment; am I right, sir?

Mr. HINSHAW. That is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee, I heartily favor this measure. I think all of us realize that this type of preparedness and implementation of our military forces is one of the most important things we can do by way of strengthening our country. I heartily support this measure for the increase of our air power in the present state of world conditions.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] has stated, the Congressional Aviation Policy Board, of which he and I and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] were members, reported that in its opinion the minimum Air Force necessary is one of 70 groups. However, I go back some 3 years ago when the former Committee on Military Affairs was called to the Pentagon Building, and we were given for the first time the air situation as it existed in the world. At that time it was disclosed that the interim Air Force was intended to be one of 70 groups. That was followed, of course, by the Finletter Commission appointed by the President which also recommended 70 groups. Week before last the Armed Services Committee, by unanimous resolution, endorsed the 70-group program and urged the President and the Secretary of Defense to recommend inclusion in this supplemental appropriation of sufficient funds to assure the procurement of aircraft which would assure the 70-group program.

On April 7, I offered H. R. 6158, a bill designed to give statutory authorization to the 70-group program, properly implemented as to airframe weight. On the following day I spoke with reference to it, calling attention to the bill and the absolute necessity for the adoption of the 70-group program. Again on the 12th of April I called the attention of the House to that matter.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman is a very active member of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board, and served with me on the combat aviation subcommittee. I compliment him on the work he has done.

Mr. KILDAY. I thank my chairman of Combat Subcommittee of the Aviation Policy Board who has put in so much time and effort upon its labors.

When I came here today I had the identical amendment prepared. I announced on yesterday to the press that I would offer the amendment to increase the authorization by $922,000,000. Today we seem to have a rash of amendments. I want to make clear that there is no pride of authorship here. All we want is to get the job done. I am particularly glad to know that there is indication that from the committee itself an adequate amendment may be brought forth. That is the thing we have been attempting to accomplish, and members of the Committee on Armed Services have been most active over a considerable period

in seeking to bring to the attention of those in position to send up the recommendations and the budget estimates that such a program be recommended and that it be started now.

I am not unconscious of the fact that military forces must be kept in balance. There are members on our committee who have served for many years in connection with all phases of the armed services and know the missions and roles of each of the various armed services. We are as firmly convinced as we can be that the 70-group program at this time is the first step in bringing the armed services into balance. We are not talking about 70 complete groups tomorrow or next week, we are hoping to be well started on the program in 1953. We know that we must start now if the force is to be available in 1953.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The gentleman's long and effective work is bringing results, and I hope the unanimity that exists here today will also exist tomorrow when the amendment is voted on.

Mr. KILDAY. May I say that I wish it had existed here 10 days ago.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The information we in the Armed Services Committee have is that, under Secretary Forrestal's recommendation, in 1949 this country will get 1,312 planes, in 1950, 1,095, in 1951 only 579 planes, in 1952, the year that another great power is supposed to have the atomic bomb, we would get a negligible number, and in 1953 again we would get a negligible number.

The difference between the Secretary's recommendation and the 70-group program is that in 1949 under the 70-group program we will get 1,512, in 1950 2,174, in 1951 we will get 3,000, in 1952 we will get 5,000, as compared to the negligible number under the present program, and in 1953 we will get 5,268; but in order to get those in 1952 and 1953 we have to get the designs going and the contracts let now. Am I correct?

Mr. KILDAY. We must start at once. It shows that the 70-group is the proper program, the one that will pay off. The Budget recommendation and the provisions of the bill would leave us in as bad position as we are now, if not worse.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest and approval to much of the debate this afternoon concerning an adequate Air Force for America. Not being on any of the committees dealing with this highly technical matter, I am concerned for the safety of our country in this hour of peril and I have the feeling, amounting to intuition, that our best military defense, most easily and quickly obtained lies in the direction of a powerful Air Force. That, of course, presupposes the best planes which American ingenuity can devise and manufacture, and it means the very acme of training on the part of our young pilots who certainly take second place to none among the fliers of all nations.

During the recent terrible war we set up many great airports, airfields, and similar installations. In my own State of Arizona, we trained at the airfields in that sunny climate an unusual proportion of our aviators, not only aviators from every one of the 48 States for our own forces, but English aviators at certain fields in Arizona and Chinese aviators at other fields in Arizona. These allied flyers were trained by the thousands in an area where flying conditions were such that they could be trained and could fly every day in the year.

It pains me to know that some of those great and very useful airfields have been declared surplus by the War Department and have either been disposed of or are in the process of being disposed of. To my unexpert judgment, it seems that any policy which we are now adopting and appropriating money for should take into consideration adequate airfields and training facilities, as well as sufficient number of planes and well-trained pilots. I hope that all this has been duly considered.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see such perfect unanimity this afternoon on this proposition. It has not always been thus. I have served on the Committee on Military Affairs and on the Committee on Armed Services and the aviation subcommittee, and the struggle to get the Air Force built up to a reasonably well-balanced fighting Air Force has been a long and onerous one. Three years ago, as has been well said, the Air Forces told us that we needed a fighting force of 70 groups. We did not get any unanimous support at that time; we got opposition to it. We got very little results. Over the years we have found the wisdom of their recommendations to this Congress.

We found, as a matter of fact, that we do need that minimum of 70 groups. Today I asked General Bradley when he appeared before our committee whether or not the addition of these 70 groups would throw the Army and the Navy and the defense force generally out of balance or whether it would still be in balance. I think General Bradley, who is a most able and brilliant soldier and rendering magnificent service to this country, was very fair in his answers to the questions propounded this morning. He indicated very clearly that the 70-group air force would not throw our defense forces out of balance. His suggestion was that he might add 15,000 men to the Ground Forces and that he might need $165,000,000 perhaps, but that with the addition of a 70-group air force our defense force would not be thrown out of balance. I hope tomorrow that we will act so as to give this Nation the type of air defense to which we are entitled. I think that more and more the world is beginning to realize that a nation must have a well-balanced efficient modern air force if it is going to defend itself from attack and prevent a violation of its property and its territory by an invading hostile enemy.

Mr. Chairman, the revelation made in hearings yesterday before the Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, that Russia knows the secret of the atom bomb but as yet does not have the know-how to make the bomb impresses me with the need for urgent action in expanding our Air Force. I am informed that many of our planes have fallen into an obsolescent condition and that new and modern planes should replace those which are old and now worn. For a number of years all of the high officials of the Air Force have recommended that we immediately increase this Department of our National Defense from 55 groups to 70 groups. Recently the advisory committee of the President and the joint congressional committee made similar recommendations.

The Air Force meets the enemy far beyond our frontiers of defense and Congress should now—before it is too late—listen to the warnings of those who are interested in the preservation of our Nation. It will take several years to bring our Air Force up to a 70-group organization with proper equipment. We should start now—not wait until tomorrow.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I want to first congratulate the committee on bringing this legislation to the floor of the House. I think it is very timely. For the past 6 months or more, our committee has tried to evaluate the probabilities and possibilities that might occur. I am thoroughly convinced and firmly so that it is proper. I believe that the start on this 70 group is timely. We who have served on committees for the past 8 or 9 or 10 years in regard to aviation matters know that it takes a long time to develop an Air Corps. We had what was the finest Air Corps in the history of the world at the end of the war. I believe that we have been rather negligent in letting it deteriorate as it has today. It is the unanimous sentiment of the House that we should begin to build our force up. I am also glad to know that we have the assurance that an amendment will be offered here tomorrow to carry on this program, or at least begin it, so that we will at least have a fighting force. I think we should all remember that this 70 group is not an offensive Air Corps, but is only what you might call a defensive Air Corps. But it will be assuring to the country to know that we have at least made a beginning.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, some time ago I introduced a bill in this body providing for a 70-group Air Force. Since then, extensive hearings have been held by the Armed Services Committee as well as other committees, in which the needs of our national defense were carefully considered, and other similar bills introduced.

This bill would in effect move to implement at earliest date possible the 70-group Air Force. While the appropriations herein are confined primarily to procurement of aircraft, they will make possible the development of an air force

which can adequately defend the United States in this atomic age. By enacting this bill Congress will be taking an effective step toward the establishment of an up-to-date, modernized air corps which will be able to match our potential enemies.

Modern war is based on integrated, large-scale, well-coordinated land, air, and sea strategic operations. All units of Army, Navy, and Air Corps must cooperate in balanced collaborative efforts in the common defense and in such aggressive warfare as may be necessary. In this balanced program of defense and offense, air power, atomic power, guided missiles, rockets, and biological techniques must necessarily play a leading part. Future wars will be won by that nation which is able to achieve effective superiority in these fields.

Air power is defense. Air power is offense. Air power is peace power if our potential enemies can be induced to listen to our appeals for peace. I favor a strong, mobile, mechanized Army comprised of mature, scientifically trained and experienced personnel recruited in the free American way. I favor a Navy—the mightiest fleet in the world—to defend our shores and protect our shipping and logistical requirements. And above all and preeminently I favor the 70-group Air Force contemplated by this bill. It will ease the tension and hysteria which are so unhappily being generated by advocates of compulsory, anti-American coercive systems. It will serve notice on the Soviet Union and her puppets that our Nation will no longer tolerate appeasement, or threats against our security, or aims to gain world dominion for Red Marxist communism, that we mean to defend ourselves and maintain our self-respect and the dignity and ideals of our Nation.

It will indicate to all peoples that while we seek, desire, and aim for peace, our Nation is prepared to secure itself against sudden unwarranted aggression and world conspiracy directed against our democracy and way of life.

Let us adopt this bill by overwhelming majority and thus demonstrate our unity of purpose, our determination, courage, and faith and our intention to keep America strong, impregnable and inviolable at all times to cope with the dangers and threats exhibited by foreign enemies and enemies within our gates, If we cannot get peace through diplomacy and mutual agreement, let us hope and pray that we may secure peace by demonstrating our strength and potential ability to defend ourselves and our free institutions.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment this committee on bringing in this very constructive and statesmanlike bill. In my opinion, this step is almost as important as the passage of the European relief-program bill. A big air force, modern and ready to strike at all times, is the symbol of the power and unity of the United States of America.

I look upon this not as a matter of war, but it is a step in the direction of peace. Through strength we can obtain peace.

I am one of those who has seen two world wars come and go. We saw the first war fought and wo[illegible] by America turning the balance in joining the Allies in Europe. In the years that followed the war we saw the peace frittered through our hands. We saw a treaty made that laid the seed for the Second World War. Then the Second World War came, and, although we could see it coming for several years, we were not prepared for it when it did come.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. I was interested in the gentleman's reference to the air power of the First World War because I happen to know that the gentleman from California at that time served as a combat pilot, with perhaps 25 missions over the enemy lines in World War I and was decorated for some of his flights. I am sure he thoroughly appreciates what happens when a nation is not prepared.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I thank the gentleman for his reference to my service. It is true I did serve in the First World War. I am proud of the fact. I believe I may modestly say I am the only man sitting in the House of Representatives who flew an airplane in combat during the First World War. Among my associates were General Spaatz, George Kenny, and Gen. Barney Giles, and Col. Tommy Milling, all of whom flew the same kind of plane that I flew.

But now we come to the Second World War. America then spearheaded the attack on the enemies, and finally we were the balance that overpowered the hostile groups in Germany and her allied countries. We are again trying to forge a peace that will last, so that we will not have another devastating war, and the terrible sacrifice of our people will not have been made in vain.

In 1946, the Military Affairs Committee, as has been mentioned, sat down with the Army Air Force and asked them to explain to us what kind of an air force is required now in the transition from war to peace. They told us at that time, over 2 years ago, that a 70-group air force was required for the peace of the world; that if America remained strong she could provide the leadership required to bring peace to the world which was devastated and lying in ruins. Only now, 2 years after that statement by General Arnold and his associates, we are coming to the point of trying to bring into realization the recommendations he made to us.

In the meantime, every person sitting here knows that the peace which the people of the world are praying and crying for today is getting farther and farther away from us. This authorization in this bill, in my opinion, will turn the situation, turn the sentiment of the world even more strongly in favor of peace. I believe that those with whom we have to contract to bring about peace negotiations and settlements respect force more than any other one thing. If we can exhibit force and indicate that we are strong enough to conquer any other power or any group of powers in the world, then they might be willing to sit down with us and bring about a peaceful settlement of these devastating disputes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to compliment the gentleman on the fight that he has put up for many years for a strong air power in this country. I want to applaud what he is saying at this time. The gentleman feels that what we are doing in this bill and the amendment that will be added tomorrow is providing preparedness for prevention instead of preparedness to provoke war.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I believe that very firmly, and appreciate the gentleman's complimentary reference. I think that this may be the supreme opportunity that will bring us to effective and durable world peace. We all know that the world is governed by force. International law now is nothing more than international anarchy, and until we put behind international law collective security backed by force we will not have any stability or peace in this world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from California three additional minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. There is only one nation in the world that has the capacity to furnish that leadership toward peace and that Nation is the United States of America.

This situation reminds me of what happened in my State of California about a hundred years ago following the gold rush to California. We got a great many criminals, outlaws, and the scum of the earth rushing out there to get our gold. We had poor and weak officials. The result was disorder. There was anarchy in the city of San Francisco. The people who believed in law and order and believed in the courts finally organized vigilantes and they made a show of power and said, "We are going to have law and order if we must fight for it." As I see it, we are the Nation in the world that can now lead the world vigilantes in the direction of international law that will bring reorganization and bring the power that will stabilize the world into some system of law.

You all know that law is only effective if it has force behind it to compel obedience to it. That is all that law is. Woodrow Wilson said that 50 years ago. He said that "law is organized force"; and, as I say to you, the might of America is typified in her Air Force, and her industrial organizations, her natural resources, and the determination of our people to be strong and united. These are the forces that will bring about the agreements that we must have in order to get the peace the world needs if it is not to destroy itself. I therefore am heartily in favor of this bill. I hope it will pass unanimously and I believe that it will; and I predict that it may be a turning point that will lead to a peaceful world.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I assume the gentleman expects to support the amendment that will be offered tomorrow to raise the contract authorization an additional $922,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I expect to support the amendment that will bring about the 70-group Air Force. If that is the one I expect to support it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I knew that was the gentleman's feeling because of the fight that he made in our committee for a strong 70-group Air Force.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Through strength we can forge a peace. Through inaction and weakness we could drift into a war. Peace can only be attained by effort, by organization, by determination, and by the capacity to fight if necessary. The more prepared we are to fight the more likely we will get peace. This is the road to liberty, because there is no freedom without reasonable security. World security based on collective action will bring world freedom and we of this Congress have the responsibility of forging policies that will bring the security and peace for which our men died in the last war. I know we will meet that responsibility and this bill is an important link in that program.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rejoice that this bill has come up for action, for I believe it will not only be a great asset in providing new planes, but also in the improvement of old planes. I believe investigations have shown that most of the accidents have occurred because of faulty planes. Certainly, we ought to protect the men we send out to fly them.

The entire country, without exception, I believe, is in favor of an increased air force with the most modern equipment. I have followed aviation from the very beginning and flown in the very frail and inadequate planes of the early days, then the Government planes provided, and we were wicked in sending men out to fly them. I am glad that we have finally come to our senses and are giving our pilots the best.

I wish to speak for a moment on a bill I am introducing today which would authorize the establishment of internships in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration. This bill would provide an internship service in veterans' hospitals comparable to that generally found in the first-class private, State, county, and municipal hospitals and in some Federal institutions.

It would place the Veterans' Administration in a most favorable position with reference to other first-class hospitals in securing the services of medical graduates and in offering them full-time professional careers upon completion of their training. Interns, of course, would be selected from those persons who have received the degree of doctor of medicine from an approved school but who are not yet prepared to engage in the practice of medicine until they have completed a training course, usually of 1 year's duration, under supervision of licensed practitioners.

The establishment of an internship program in the Veterans' Administration would not be a novel procedure for a Federal agency. The Army, Navy, Public Health Service, and other Federal agencies have offered such training in their hospitals for many years. Most of these are approved by the council of medical education and hospitals, of the American Medical Association. I feel sure that the veterans' hospitals will obtain approval of their internship program from the association.

As interns will enable the higher salaried doctors to treat a greater number of patients, some saving will result. It is anticipated, however, that approximately 200 interns would cost a maximum of $440,000 per year, a small sum when you think of the care it will provide for our veterans.

Establishment of the internship program is another vital step in the securing of the very best medical treatment possible for the veterans of our wars. It will materially assist in guaranteeing superior medical care so long as such care is needed.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of improving the medical service of the Veterans' Administration in every way possible. For years I have made every effort to have the best medical service for our disabled.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the agreement is that the first paragraph of the bill shall be read, after which time I will move that the Committee rise. Does the gentleman from Missouri so understand?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the day I was told by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that he will offer an amendment to this bill increasing the amount. I would like to know if there has been any change in that program?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I cannot speak for the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations; however, I do know that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is very much in favor of an effective air force.

When the Air Force came before us with this request they indicated this would be a sufficient amount to carry on the program they had in mind, also that they were going to return to a conference after which they would report back to the committee with what future plans they had. In view of that fact, the chairman of the committee believed that in the interest of national defense this bill should be brought to the floor of the House and passed immediately. However, he did not close the door to any amendment that may be offered. I understand he is very much in favor of an effective Air Force and I understand the agreement has been made to let that proposition go over until tomorrow, that we read the first paragraph of the bill at this time, after which I shall move that the committee rise. Is that agreeable to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I may say that in the event the plan is changed on that side and they do not offer the amendment, we will offer it on this side.

Mr. STEFAN. I assure the gentleman from Missouri that an amendment such as he describes will be offered from this side, so far as I know.

Mr. Chairman, I am very proud to have been a member of the Congressional Aviation Board, and I am also proud of the fact that I served under our distinguished vice chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]. It was a very inspiring task that I and other members of the Congressional Aviation Board had in writing the report which was submitted to the Members of Congress. I again recommend to all Members of Congress a careful and minute reading of that report which reflects a considerable amount of information about aviation; it also reflects much of which is already in this bill and that will be reflected in an amendment that will be offered tomorrow, which amendment I will be very happy to support.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] was a member of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board and sat through practically all of the hearings and made special trips on behalf of the committee, and is very familiar, indeed, with the entire problem involved. I am glad to hear him make these remarks on the subject of the pending bill and I wish to congratulate him and his committee for bringing it in, particularly at this time. It was a fine movement on behalf of the committee.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read down to and including line 5, page 1.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'HARA, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6226) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include quotations on the subject of the recent demand for $3,000,000,000 worth of our gold to implement the Marshall plan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARNOLD (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to ex-

tend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Lowell Mellett.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE LATE ROBERT L. WILLIAMS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to advise the House of the death of one of Oklahoma's most illustrious citizens, the late Robert L. Williams, of Durant, Okla. He died in a hospital at Sherman, Tex., on the morning of April 10, 1948.

In the passing of Judge Williams, Oklahoma and the Nation lost not only a colorful jurist but a statesman of real stature. He was one of the last of those great pioneers who laid the foundation stones of the State of Oklahoma. He took an active part in Oklahoma's constitutional convention. He was the first chief justice of the supreme court of our State, having been elected to that office in 1907. He served as chief justice until 1914 when he was elected Governor of Oklahoma. He was appointed judge of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma in 1919 and later to the tenth United States Circuit Court of Appeals in 1937. His name is a landmark in the development of the law in our State.

Judge Williams was noted for his tireless industry, for his independent thinking, for his character and his courage. He was a fearless and an able judge. In his breast beat the great heart of a great man. On Thanksgiving Day of each year he served as host to a large number of little newspaper boys, treating them to a Thanksgiving day banquet. He was a good man and a great Christian character. His name will always be prominent in the pages of Oklahoma history.

PETROLEUM RESERVES

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include articles by Oliver Pilat.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, for the sake of the huge profits lying in the oil fields of the Middle East this administration has sacrificed the honor of this country in the family of nations, has sacrificed the lives of hundreds of Jews and Arabs in the Holy Land, has sacrificed the authority if not the very life of the United Nations.

Yet statistics prove that in our own country, and in our neighbor, Mexico, and in South America are still untapped billions of natural petroleum—huge reserves which dwarf the subterranean lakes of Iraq and Saudi Arabia.

I have good reasons for believing that the whole project of building a huge pipe line from Arabia to the Mediterranean Sea, which has dislocated the American steel industry and directly led to the astounding reversal of American policy on partition of Palestine, will be scrapped soon.

The only apparent reason for not developing the Mexican oil fields is that American oil companies cannot exploit that oil with the same reckless abandon which once made Tampico a wild and riotous town—that, and the desire to hold up prices.

Mr. Speaker, I am not advocating the wasteful exploitation of our oil reserves which marked the early part of this century. I am advocating a national oil policy based on justice and equity and not on unlimited private profits.

The fact is that oil from the Near East is going to flow whether or not ARAMCO's exploitation there is backed by American armed might. The fact is that in case of actual war we could not hold those fields—they would be captured or destroyed in the first hours' fighting. The fact is that we have in the Western Hemisphere all the oil reserves we can use, in war or in peace.

The United States should conduct its policies accordingly.

The articles are as follows:

[From the New York Post and the Home News of April 1, 1948]

SECRET NEGOTIATIONS WITH MEXICO SEEK READMISSION OF UNITED STATES OIL FIRMS

(By Oliver Pilat)

WASHINGTON, April 1.—Informal and highly secret negotiations are being conducted between the United States and Mexico looking toward the return to Mexico of those major United States oil companies whose properties were expropriated a decade ago.

Military and diplomatic officials ranging from Defense Secretary Forrestal to Walter Thurston, United States Ambassador to Mexico, are taking part in the negotiations, which have now reached a critical stage.

Originally, the State Department had hoped agreement could be reached in time for announcement at the start of the Bogota conference last Tuesday. It is possible some announcement may be made before the conference ends in 5 or 6 weeks.

Any such announcement would have the effect of further discrediting the United States policy of earmarking half a million tons of desperately needed steel for oil exploitations in Saudi Arabia at a time when safe and available oil on our Latin-American doorstep was being ignored.

Military experts now concede that Arabian oil, useful enough under ordinary conditions, would be virtually useless in case of war, since pipe lines and well would be vulnerable to enemy capture or destruction.

Government support for the Arabian oil deal, already whittled down, will probably be whittled further.

Revival of interest in Mexico stems partly from a confidential survey by Dr. Everett De Golyer, world's foremost petroleum engineer, indicating between 10 and 20 billion barrels of undiscovered oil there.

To speak with understatement, this is a terrific estimate. The whole world today boasts less than 100,000,000,000 barrels in proved oil resources. Texas, which has produced more oil than any other field on the globe, has only 11,000,000,000 barrels.

Recently a staff member of the Senate Small Business Committee asked at a public hearing what everybody in the oil business is asking privately these days:

"Have you heard of Dr. De Golyer's estimate that at least 10,000,000,000 barrels should be in Mexico?"

Col. Gustave Vogel, chief military oil expert of the United States, who was testifying, said: "In informal discussions, statements have been made but are they always qualified. Nobody knows."

Nobody knows very much, true enough. Mexico paid De Golyer at least $100,000 for the secret survey. It remains secret, but those who claim to know say the report speaks in terms of 10,000,000,000 barrels under the Continental Shelf offshore in Mexico, and another 10,000,000,000 barrels inland.

It is generally agreed among experts that De Golyer, who was decades ahead of his profession in estimating the immense potentialities of Arabian oil, has proved to his own satisfaction the presence of oil in Mexico all the way from the Rio Grande to the Isthmus of Tehuantepec.

Most of the Mexico oil currently produced—it is isn't much, only 55,000,000 barrels in 1947—comes from the Tampico area.

Thousands of wells are located on the United States side of the Rio Grande River, but there is not a single one on the Mexican side for 100 miles south of the border.

United States experts agreed it is "the same geologic province on both sides of the border." In short, there should be lots of oil in northern Mexico.

De Golyer has selected several hundred specific spots, many of them just across the United States border, where he predicts wells will bring in tremendous supplies.

It is partly against this background of new oil vistas that the available facts on Mexican-United States negotiations must be viewed. The sequence is apparently this:

1. About 3 months ago, when the fuel-oil shortage in the United States was at its height and when public outcry was developing against United States oil adventures in Arabia, and their political effect on Palestine partition, the State Department made some sort of overtures to Pemex, the Mexican corporation handling oil.

2. Early in February, Ambassador Thurston brought to Washington a proposed contract under which United States oil companies would explore and develop areas assigned to them by the Mexican Government.

The United States companies would agree to furnish their skill, capital, and equipment, and be paid 10 to 20 percent of the value of the oil recovered, plus allowances for operating expenses and taxes. They would not have any claim to subsoil rights, and their budgets would be open to Mexican Government scrutiny and control.

3. The tentative Mexican plan was shown by Thurston to Forrestal, Chairman Hill of the National Security Resources Board, and such State Department officials as Malvin G. Hoffman and Paul J. Reveley.

4. The State Department in turn referred the document to what it considered a cross-section of the United States oil industry: five major oil companies, one large independent oil company, and one big engineering firm.

5. The various companies expressed their views for the benefit of our State Department and Pemex. The door was not closed

to further negotiation, but in general the attitude of the United States companies was to ask subsoil rights, a higher rate of profit and elimination of the budget-control idea.

6. Personal meetings between Mexican oil authorities and spokesmen for variou United States companies were arranged and presumably have been held in Mexico City.

FEAR EARLY PUBLICITY

Rumors about the negotiations have been current here for a week. Inquiries run into a stone wall because the State Department is worried about the effect of premature publicity.

Ousting of the "foreign monopolists" who used to "grind down" the poor Mexicans has been a dominant political issue for a decade south of the border.

Mexican officials are concerned lest their public get an exaggerated idea of the extent of the proposed oil concessions.

Like many other countries, Mexico is undergoing a dollar squeeze. It wants help in oil development, but it is determined to keep control of its natural resources, to avoid monopoly, and restrict foreign profits.

In the United States there are two chief views:

1. Major oil company officialdom hints Mexico is trying to take advantage of the United States need for more oil to drive a hard bargain.

2. Some independent oil men charge the State Department with maneuvering to put the United States oil "concentration" or "semimonopoly" back in power in Mexico.

The State Department says it is trying to steer a path between extremes which will enable both Mexico and the United States to benefit from joint exploitation of Mexican oil reserves.

SINCLAIR ALREADY BACK

Despite expropriation, a United States company like Sinclair is now back in the Mexican field, and there is no obvious reason why larger companies should not return, without special industry-wide negotiation.

Independent oilmen here say there is an actual if unannounced boycott of Mexican oil by United States industry leaders. They charge this has extended to the raising of "a steel and dollar curtain" which in the past year has prevented small United States contractors from carrying out oil-exploitation deals with the Mexican Government.

The two chief independents are Gordon Duke, who has just left New York in disgust to live in Mexico City, after the Export-Import Bank refused to help him on a Mexico oil deal, and J. Edward Jones, of 342 Madison Avenue, New York, who has promised to tell a Senate committee next week the names of United States steel companies who refused to sell him steel for new wells south of the border.

[From the New York Post and the Home News]

STEEL FOR ARABS, BUT NONE TO DRILL FOR MEXICAN OIL

(By Oliver Pilat)

WASHINGTON, April 2.—For more than a year, J. Edward Jones, independent oil operator from New York, has been trying to buy some 20,000 tons of steel in the United States to drill 100 test wells in Mexico.

Despite virtually unanimous opinion among geologists that the proposed wells would tap petroleum resources rivaling those of Texas, which has produced more oil so far than any other field, Jones has been unable to buy a single ton of steel.

During this same period, United States Government agencies have been rendering urgent assistance to a scheme to send half a million tons of steel for oil exploitation in Saudi Arabia.

HAD OTHER PLANS TOO

That is the outline of a scandal which, far from subsiding, continues to grow as more details are unearthed by one or another of 17 congressional committees studying various phases of the domestic oil shortage in the United States.

Jones and another New York independent, Gordon Duke, who also had plans to drill for oil as a contractor for the Mexican Government, say their plans have been checkmated by a well-known, if unannounced, boycott against Mexico by major United States oil companies.

These majors were expropriated by Mexico on March 12, 1938. Their holdings were paid for under a contract with Mexico ratified by the United States Government, but the United States oil semimonopoly has never forgiven this check to their control.

"The large oil companies used to operate (in Mexico) by murder, arson, and robbery," said Senator CHAVEZ (Democrat, New Mexico).

"I know American businessmen who would like to go down there and do an honest business, and make money for themselves without robbing the people of Mexico," he added.

"They would like to produce oil for the United States, and bring a little money into Mexico so Mexicans could buy from the United States, but big business wants to get in there under its own terms. That is why the small operators are not getting steel."

How can big oil companies control the flow of steel? Jones says it has been done chiefly by buying up not only all the stocks of steel casing on hand but by placing orders "that tax for as much as two or three years the entire steel mill capacity of the United States."

Jones is scheduled to appear next week before a Senate committee to support his charges through correspondence with steel companies.

Jones told this newspaper he will also document these charges:

1. That a State Department official took part in a conference with the United States Ambassador to Mexico in which a vice president of Standard Oil of New Jersey discussed the Jones contract "in derogatory terms and the alleged fact that I was a so-called dissenter to major oil company policies."

2. That a certain Secretary of Navy countermanded an order for Mexican oil by a naval procurement official "at a time when oil was vitally needed by the armed forces," because of the State Department attitude on the oil situation.

Jones said he would not name names until he appears under oath again before the Senate Small Business Committee.

One way the alleged oil monopoly affects Government policy was indicated by Gordon Duke. He told the Senate Agriculture Committee some time ago that when he asked the United States Maritime Commission for a tanker to operate out of Mexico, his request was refused, not by the commission, but in a letter from Standard Oil of New Jersey.

Within the past 10 days, Duke's chances of financing a drilling deal with Mexico collapsed because the Import-Export Bank refused to discount bonds guaranteed by Pemex, Mexican Government oil corporation, and the Government itself.

"Maybe the State Department didn't think the deal was proper," said Sigurd Scholle, an oil associate of Duke.

Defense Secretary Forrestal recently conceded that Arabian oil would probably be useless in time of war, and that oil from the Western Hemisphere would be preferable.

So far only 70,000 tons of steel has gone to the Arabian-American Oil Co., which runs the Saudi Arabian concession, some 70,000 tons scheduled to leave this quarter having been held in abeyance as a result of congressional pressure.

Along with dwindling interest in the Aramco deal, which would primarily benefit four major United States companies, has come increased scrutiny of the Western Hemisphere as a possible source of more oil. One result has been negotiations between the United States and Mexico to work out conditions under which the majors would return properties to Mexico, as revealed yesterday in this paper.

About 48 percent of all proved oil reserves are located in the Western Hemisphere. Excluding gigantic Mexican fields foreseen in a secret report by Dr. Everett De Golyer, Venezuela and the United States produce about 90 percent of the oil of the Western Hemisphere.

Improvement of transportation facilities to get inland oil to the sea would alone add 100,000 barrels a day to present Venezuelan production, United States Government oil experts declare.

The Venezuelan Government allows dominant American companies to exploit oil on a 50–50 basis, not as generous as previous arrangements in that country, but considerably more lucrative to the companies than the 20 percent profit which Mexico has indicated it would offer.

There are some indications that big United States companies are considering a major expansion of Venezuelan facilities.

Petroleum laws in Argentina, Brazil, and Chile effectively bar foreign companies, but Peru is partially open and is said to have considerable unexploited oil.

Canada does not produce much oil, and currently imports great quantities from the United States, but is developing new fields in Saskatchewan and Alberta, for which steel has been obtained.

Some United States interest has been evinced in the Athasbaska tar sands of Alberta, the largest single occurrence of petroleum on the earth, with an estimated 600,000,000,000 barrels in sand impregnated with asphalt.

United States experts declare the cost of getting this oil out of muskeg country, frozen during a long winter and then mucky during a brief warm spell, would be prohibitive under present conditions.

The easiest place to increase oil production in the Western Hemisphere is the United States, strangely enough. We have a system of State and Federal laws under which State bodies in the oil States limit production to the amount which they believe can be sold at a given price.

Paul E. Hadlick, counsel on oil for the Senate Small Business Committee, charged in a carefully documented report recently that the present system of prorating United States production is a monopoly device to keep production just under demand, which has caused prices to zoom as shortages develop.

Senator WHERRY, Republican, Nebraska, said Texas alone could produce 300,000 to 500,000 more barrels of oil daily "and still stay within safe and sound provisions of their conservation laws." Louisiana can produce 200,000 barrels more a day, without eventual loss of petroleum resources, its State officials concede.

"More domestic oil could also be developed in New Mexico, Oklahoma, Mississippi, and Arkansas," says CHAVEZ.

"It is all right to develop Arabian oil," he adds, "but the public should know that it can be obtained easier at home. If and when an international show-down comes, this is where we have to get it."

The frequently mentioned danger of exhausting United States oil supplies is largely poppycock. Our proved oil reserves have been steadily rising. Back in 1924 they were 6,000,000,000 barrels. Now at the end of the

most oil-wasting war in history they are estimated at 24,000,000,000 barrels.

[From the New York Post and the Home News of April 4, 1948]

STATE DEPARTMENT CONSULTS NEW YORK FIRM ON MEXICAN OIL

(By Oliver Pilat)

WASHINGTON, April 3.—M. W. Kellogg, of New York, coordinator and general manager of the Manhattan district project which produced the first atomic bomb, has been brought by the State Department into negotiations for exploitation of vast newly charted Mexican sources of oil.

Kellogg's is one of seven companies forming a cross-section of the United States oil industry to which the Department referred a Mexican proposal to allow foreign concerns to drill for oil at specific spots under an arrangement providing profit up to 20 percent of the oil found, plus allowances for expenses and taxes.

Strictly speaking, the Kellogg firm is not an oil company at all. It is an engineering outfit which under Morris Kellogg has developed a reputation for being able to handle efficiently almost any complicated technical problem. Before it got into atomic energy, with which it is no longer connected, Kellogg did carry out a number of oil engineering projects.

The new Mexican sources of petroleum have been charted by Dr. Everett de Golyer, most famous oil geologist in the world. They are said to include 10,000,000,000 barrels of oil inland, plus another 10,000,000,000 barrels under the Continental Shelf offshore in Mexico.

The offshore engineering operations provide a technical problem of a type particularly challenging to the Kellogg experts, it was suggested.

Of the six other companies initially acquainted with Mexico's terms for oil development, five were classed by the State Department as major companies. They are: Phillips Petroleum Co., Sun Oil Co., Gulf Oil Co. of Pittsburgh, Cities Service Co., and Sinclair Oil Co. The sixth, considered an independent, is the Ashland (Ky.) Oil & Refining Co., headed by Howard Marshall, former counsel of the Standard Oil Co. of California.

Phillips and Ashland were among a half dozen United States companies which organized the American Independent Oil Co., about a year ago, to follow the example of the Arabian American Oil Co., in exploring and exploiting oil from foreign sources.

Mexican Government sources declared unofficially that Cities Service, Phillips, and Sun were "not too far away" from possible agreement on oil-exploitation terms. From other quarters it was reported the Texas Co. was also negotiating with the Mexican Government.

None of the negotiating companies were among the United States oil concerns whose properties were expropriated by Mexico 10 years ago, and later were compensated under contract initiated by the Mexican and United States Governments. However, the Texas Co. is a partner in Arabian American with Standard Oil of New Jersey, the chief United States company which left Mexico in 1938 as a result of the Cardenas expropriation laws.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement written by him on the labor extension service legislation.

PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpenaed to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia to give testimony on April 15, 1948, at 10 a. m., in the case of the United States against George Marshall, which is a congressional contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House I am unable to comply with this summons without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I therefore submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, CRIMINAL DIVISION

To JOHN R. MURDOCK,
Room 540, Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to appear in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia at Criminal Court No. 1, United States District Courthouse, in the city of Washington, on the 15th day of April 1948 at 10 o'clock a. m. to testify in the case of the *United States* v. *George Marshall*, Criminal No. 367–47.

This subpena is issued on application of the defendant.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By JAMES M. MENENDEZ,
Deputy Clerk.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 534) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas Representative JOHN R. MURDOCK, a Member of this House, has been served with a subpena to appear as a witness before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify at 10 a. m., on the 15th day of April 1948, in the case of the *United States* v. *George Marshall*, Criminal No. 367–47; and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify, but by order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Representative JOHN R. MURDOCK is authorized to appear in response to the subpena of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia at such time as when the House is not sitting in session; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena of said court.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leaves of absence were granted as follows:

To Mr. GROSS (at the request of Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania), for 1 week, on account of illness in family.

To Mr. CROW, for Thursday and Friday, April 15 and 16, on account of official business.

To Mr. CARROLL (at the request of Mr. JACKSON of Washington), for the week of April 12, on account of official business.

To Mr. SARBACHER (at the request of Mr. GAVIN), for 1 day, April 14, 1948, on account of official business.

To Mr. MANSFIELD, indefinitely, on account of official business in behalf of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

To Mr. BULWINKLE, for 10 days, on account of important business.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

COLORADO RIVER

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, out of the States of Arizona and Colorado is flowing a stream of propaganda that has seldom, if ever, been equaled in viciousness, abusiveness, and untruthfulness.

This propaganda is directed against California's sincere efforts to bring about an amicable settlement over division of the waters of the lower Colorado River—waters that are the economic lifeblood of the entire southwestern United States.

It is obvious—but I can support the assertion with factual and documentary evidence—that this deceitful propaganda is the product of immense lobbies. And some of it is officially inspired by the Department of the Interior, in violation of Federal law. In addition, certain newspapers have alined themselves on the side of the propagandists and the lobbyists, and are aiding in confusing the true issues, deceiving the public, as well as attempting to deceive the Members of Congress.

For 25 years a controversy has continued between Arizona and California over their claims to waters of the Colorado River. Having exhausted every effort to reach a settlement, California and Nevada have now proposed legislation in the Congress which would permit the struggle to be placed before the United States Supreme Court for final adjudication.

Arizona is fighting this legislation. Arizona fears to go into the Supreme Court, because Arizona is aware that her contentions are neither legally sound nor honorable. Thus, Arizona is fighting with the weapons of nefarious propaganda, because those are the only real weapons Arizona possesses. In this infamous fight Arizona is joined by Colorado, and other forces in States that properly have no fight with California.

At the same time, Arizona is proposing a billion dollar irrigation project—the Central Arizona project—that could only be built by taking water from the Colorado River that legally belongs to California. Arizona has no intention of paying for this project. Arizona has rigged the financial structure of the project so that California would have to pay for it.

I shall not stand by and see the Members of the Congress, and the people of this country, hoodwinked and deceived by the false statements and charges issuing from the atrocious propaganda mills of Arizona and Colorado.

In a recent press story from Denver the charge was made that California is spending hundreds of thousands of dollars yearly on a lobbying and informational campaign in Washington and throughout the West.

This is a deliberate falsehood. And here are the facts, which are on record with the Clerk of the House:

The Central Arizona Project Association last year spent more than $64,000 in lobbying.

The Colorado River Association, which is supporting the bills calling for the

interstate controversy to be carried before the Supreme Court, spent approximately $17,000.

There you have the comparison. This one lobby from Arizona spent nearly four times what California spent in fighting this issue.

But that is not the only money spent by Arizona. There is another propaganda machine operating. And it has the endorsement of the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Krug, and the Commissioner of Reclamation, Mr. Straus. Their signatures and statements are included in an expensive booklet titled "Presenting the Central Arizona Project to You."

And, Mr. Speaker, this lobby is not even registered with the Congress as required by law. Its members are not registered as individuals.

Now, Governor Osborn, of Arizona, has requested of the Arizona State Legislature an appropriation of $125,000 more with which to conduct lobbying activities in Washington during the coming year. This $125,000 is to be spent to further the attempt of Arizona to steal water from California.

Turning to Colorado, we find a similar situation, although even worse in some aspects. Here we have newspapers using their columns to disseminate false propaganda. Here we have officers of the State government openly lobbying for Arizona while drawing salaries from Colorado. Nor are they registered as lobbyists as required by law.

Let me cite just one example:

Not long ago an engineer named Patterson resigned from his post with the State of Colorado for personal reasons, and moved to live in California. He applied for a post with California water agencies, and was employed.

In this incident the Governor of Colorado saw an opportunity to give the public the impression that a scandal was afoot. The Colorado Governor accused the State of California of stealing the engineer. The Colorado Governor wired the Governor of California making this accusation, and released the telegram to the press even before the Governor of California had seen it.

In the light of what I am about to disclose the audacity and unfairness of the Colorado Governor are astonishing.

Will the State of Colorado explain how it can object to an engineer resigning and going to work for another State when some of Colorado's own officials, on the Colorado State pay roll, are spending their time lobbying for the State of Arizona?

Will the State of Colorado kindly explain the activities of Judge Clifford H. Stone, an attorney, and Royce Tipton, an engineer? Are Judge Stone and Mr. Tipton registered as lobbyists? How much of their time is spent aiding Arizona in lobbying against the State of California and seeking to influence legislation in Congress?

Judge Stone is a vice president of the National Reclamation Association, to which California contributes money each year. Judge Stone, therefore, is speaking for Arizona in the name of the National Reclamation Association.

Now, while California, I know, has every good feeling toward this association, I see no reason why California should subsidize her opponents. I shall propose that California discontinue its contributions to this association until this situation is rectified.

As a striking example of the false propaganda that is issuing from the confusion mills of Colorado and Arizona, I want to call your attention to a story that appeared in the Washington Post of last Sunday, April 11. This story is datelined Denver, and it appears under the byline of a writer called Roscoe Fleming.

I do not recall when I have read a more inaccurate story in a newspaper, nor one that is so false and designed to deceive readers.

In this malicious piece of propaganda is the statement:

The fear of the upper basin States—

Of the Colorado River—

is that California will be able to start using the water while they are arguing over their shares.

If these States have this fear, it is a false fear, and the writer of this story knows that. The Colorado River compact forever prohibits California from using any water apportioned to upper basin States. And California is now demanding strict enforcement of the compact. It is the very thing that California is strenuously trying to achieve by carrying the controversy to the Supreme Court: Strict adherence to the Colorado River compact for all time, which would guarantee to every State of the basin the water apportioned under the compact.

Arizona, the State now seeking to take water from California, fought the compact for years. Arizona refused to ratify the compact, and for 15 years fought against the building of Boulder Dam, now called Hoover Dam.

From this story by Fleming I again quote:

Arizona didn't agree—

To the Colorado River compact—

until 1944, when she wrung from five States the concession that she could keep the waters of the Gila River, about 1,000,000 acre-feet yearly.

Mr. Speaker, the truth is that Arizona now takes in excess of 2,300,000 acre-feet of water from the Gila River every year.

And here I might add that Arizona is now scheming to send water from the Salt River area into the Gila, and to replace the Salt River water with water from the Colorado. This Colorado River water would have to be taken away from California.

Once more I quote from the story by Fleming:

One of the conditions preceding the 1922 compact—

Colorado River compact—

was that California should limit itself forever to 4,400,000 acre-feet yearly from the minimum flow—

Of the Colorado River. This is another falsehood.

There is the language of the California Limitation Act, one of the statutes that made possible the building of Hoover Dam despite Arizona's bitter efforts to prevent the building of the dam:

California agrees to limit its use of Colorado River water to 4,400,000 acre-feet of the waters apportioned to the Lower Basin by paragraph A, plus not more than one-half of any excess or surplus waters.

There, Mr. Speaker, you have another example of the deceitfulness of the propaganda pouring from Colorado and Arizona.

This same story by Fleming also charges that California is spending hundreds of thousands of dollars a year on lobbying, but I have shown where that too is a false statement and cannot be substantiated by any fact.

I believe it is high time that these gigantic lobby mills of Arizona and Colorado be investigated by the committee on publicity and propaganda, and I believe it is high time that the Department of Justice determine why the lobbyists of Arizona and Colorado are not registered under the law.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I understand that many of the lobbyists here who are active in this regard are not registered as required by law.

Mr. POULSON. The gentleman is correct. They are sending publications to Members of Congress and coming here in person, but they are not registered as lobbyists.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Does not the gentleman believe that the attention of the Department of Justice should be called to that, and they should be investigated?

Mr. POULSON. I certainly do. That should be done. I join the gentleman in demanding such an investigation.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Is it not a fact that Arizona herself some 22 years ago desired to carry this matter to the Supreme Court, but, at that time not being a signatory to the pact, had no standing before the Court in this matter and now Arizona opposes the effort of the other States to take the matter into the Court for a settlement?

Mr. POULSON. That is right. I am certainly glad you brought that to my attention.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In reference to the request of California that the Supreme Court decide this issue, is there any knowledge that the gentleman has to the effect that California is seeking more than its just share of the amount of water from the Colorado that was called for in the original pact between Arizona and California?

Mr. POULSON. No, all we are asking is that the Supreme Court settle and adjudicate these rights on the basis of justice and what has already been settled up to this time.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Then the issue before the Congress has nothing to do with the merits or demerits of the water issue itself. It is only a question of the necessity of having the authority of Congress to place the matter in the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court so that some settlement can be made.

Mr. POULSON. That is right. We are not trying to settle the matter. We want it settled in the highest tribunal which we have, which of course is the Supreme Court.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Does the gentleman know any reason why Arizona opposes the Supreme Court making this decision?

Mr. POULSON. I would say that Arizona is opposing it simply because she feels that in the Supreme Court her claims would be turned down because they are not based on factual evidence, but are strictly based on propaganda.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In other words, the pact between California and Arizona which was entered into 22 years ago is so clear-cut that the decision would naturally be that California should get her share of the water of the Colorado and Arizona her share of the water of the Colorado River?

Mr. POULSON. We feel that it should be settled there if there is a dispute. I might say I think our Representatives feel that this case would naturally, from the evidence that is available and on the basis of a fair adjudication, inure to the benefit of California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Is not the gentleman just expressing his hopes as to what the Supreme Court would do? As a matter of fact, California has no more assurance than Arizona has but California is willing to take its chances because it believes that the water issue should be settled one way or the other.

Mr. POULSON. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield for one question and not for any statements.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have two or three questions. Has the gentleman ever heard that occasionally well-known persons in criminal trials have been tried and convicted in the newspapers and other publications regardless of the later findings in the courts? The gentleman has heard of such cases, has he not?

Mr. POULSON. That is just a little more of the Arizona propaganda. You know, at the same time while you are carrying this propaganda fight you are also proposing here in Congress a $1,000,000 irrigation project known as the Central Arizona project, that can only be built up by taking water from the Colorado River, which we claim legally belongs to California. Arizona has no intention of paying for this project. Arizona is rigging the financial structure of the project so that California will have to pay for it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I refuse to yield at this time.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Is it not a matter of record that California in its development of the structures on the Colorado River has paid for those structures out of its own funds, and is now liquidating the cost of the Boulder Canyon Dam from the sale of power and that, under these circumstances, Arizona is seeking to obtain a project that runs into the billions without contributing any money from their own treasury at all?

Mr. POULSON. That is right. Furthermore, the power which would be generated in these particular dams would be sold in California, and the interest on the dams would be used according to the plan advanced by the Department of the Interior, to pay for a part of the cost of the pipe line of the irrigation project in Arizona. So in reality, it would not only be taking our water, but we would be paying for the water and for the pipe lines which they would use to convey that water to Arizona.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, at this late hour and in an impromptu fashion, I cannot and must not attempt adequate answer to the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON] who has just preceded me. I asked the gentleman to yield to me, which he did for a question, a question only. I asked him whether he had ever heard of a famous criminal case, or criminal charges involving well-known persons, which was tried in the newspapers of the country before the courts could give it trial. His answer to that was evasive as if he thought the question had no bearing on his discussion today or on the controversy now going on in the columns of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and in certain of the daily press pertaining to the long-standing controversy between Arizona and California over the waters of the Colorado River.

I was not attempting to be facetious by asking that question for it does have a relationship. All mature persons know of, and distinguished judges and lawyers generally criticize, what is known as newspaper trials or pretrials of prominent persons charged with crime or spectacular offenses in the columns of Nation-wide newspapers, before such a matter can be properly handled by judicial or otherwise proper procedure. This is a thing common in American life but it does not always help the dispensation of justice and is usually condemned. Many a person has been convicted before the public although afterward tried and acquitted by the proper courts of the land. It is one thing to give the people the news but another thing to lead them to accept the naked charge as proof of guilt.

This water controversy is not before any committee of this House, in formal hearings, although it has been heard and further hearings are pending before a committee of the other body. The question whether this controversy shall be settled by the Supreme Court of the United States is not a matter in hearings before any committee of this House, but it is pending, and I understand hearings have been set before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate. Is somebody premature in this body? Here are two vital questions. First, how shall the waters of the lower Colorado River be divided? Second, who shall make that determination? Both of these questions are now and have been pending before committees in the other body. I have confidence in the judgment of those committees. I know that they will give both questions careful and fair treatment, weighing all evidence, but it does occur to me that several gentlemen in this Chamber are deciding this matter in advance of the final action of the committees in the other body and before it is formally brought before this body.

The gentleman from California did not permit me to ask two questions. My second question would have been: "Did I hear you aright when you said Arizona was attempting to steal California's water?" I was listening intently and I think I heard the gentleman use the word "steal," but I wanted to make sure that that was the word he used without the formality of demanding the words taken down. If that was the word, it should go down in imperishable print for us later to look at. The word "steal" is not a pleasant word. I will admit it is a forceful and it is a useful word if it is true, but when an individual is charged with stealing it is a very serious matter unless you can prove it. Of course, if you correctly charge an individual with stealing you ought to prove it and treat the individual accordingly. It is also a serious matter when a State of this Union is charged with stealing, and I think the truth or falsity of the charge ought certainly to be made known. This is a matter that must be looked into. Naturally, I categorically deny that Arizona is attempting to steal any water from California and I also restate what I have heretofore said on the record, that in bills which I have favored Arizona seeks only to get her rightful share of the waters of the Colorado River.

What water does the gentleman say that Arizona is stealing from California? I have in my pocket this Government report dated April 8, 1948, which I have recently received. It is the weekly report of the Geological Survey, Department of the Interior, giving certain data concerning the waters of the lower Colorado River for the 7 days beginning March 29 to April 4, both inclusive. This sheet does not show how much water is going into California for Los Angeles; therefore, that large amount is not in this recording. This report does show the water diverted that week into the All-American Canal into California from the Imperial diversion dam and the waters diverted into Arizona that week from the other end of the Imperial Dam. How do those two amounts compare?

These are some recorded facts: The water diverted that week into California was at the rate of 2,846,170 acre-feet annually. The parallel column showing water diverted into Arizona that week

from the Imperial Dam indicates a diversion at the rate of 42,523 acre-feet annually. While that is not quite an accurate comparison of the two diversions for irrigation purposes into Arizona and into California, thus we see that there is actually being diverted many times as much water into California as is being diverted from the Colorado River into Arizona at that point. Remember this does not include water for Los Angeles and neighboring cities. Does this report show that Arizona is stealing water from California diverted at the Imperial Dam? Of course the gentleman does not mean that Arizona is stealing that trickle of water at the present time from the Imperial diversion dam, for any sort of a thief should be able to get more than that. It does seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that Congress should have the facts in regard to this matter.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under special order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was granted permission to revise and extend her remarks and include certain editorials and a column on the present investigation of Dr. Edward Condon.)

DR. EDWARD CONDON

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, the attacks on Dr. Edward U. Condon during the last year serve the purpose, in my opinion, of aiding and abetting the efforts of some people to undermine the atomic energy legislation passed by the House and Senate some 2 years ago without a recorded vote of dissent. There are, obviously, other motives behind these attacks, but this is the basic and crucial one.

Let there be no mistake. These attacks on Dr. Condon seem to be a part of a general strategy to undermine the McMahon bill; and before we see the end of them, other eminent scientists, legislators, and citizens may be reviled, directly or indirectly. The objective seems glaringly apparent: By discrediting the scientists responsible for atomic energy and the legislators and citizens active in the establishment of the McMahon bill, and then by subsequent overt attacks on the Atomic Energy Commission, it is hoped that the McMahon bill will be revised or recanted and that a totally military bill will be substituted.

Now I do not believe that the National Defense Establishment—or its components, the Army, the Navy, the Air Forces—are behind this strategy. It is evident that the National Defense Establishment is cognizant of the worth of the present vast program for atomic energy, both with respect to its immediate military aspects and to future military developments based on further research, as well as with respect to the national value of the nonmilitary aspects of the work of the Commission. Rather, a very small minority of the Army—a clique that had hoped, for purely personal vanity and power—has consistently worked with a small but persistent and vociferous legislative minority in this direction. Now that the Atomic Energy Commission is about to come up for reappointment, we witness their opening guns in this attempt to undermine the McMahon bill and the present Commission. This is the basic significance of the attacks on Dr. Condon.

Dr. Condon and, ironically, most of the alleged derogatory evidence is ancient material, of the vintage of General Groves, who must thus be responsible—if the attacks have any basis whatever—for he cleared and permitted Dr. Condon to engage in this project during the war.

And this is how concern for the national security, the national defense, the national welfare is shown.

In such a context, it is therefore especially significant and fortunate that from coast to coast the press through editorials and columns has been uniformly outraged at the methods and procedures of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in the Condon case. Prominent individuals and organizations have added their important concurring voices to the comments of the press. Thus, public opinion is alert and aroused to the important issues implicit in the abuses of a congressional committee. I propose to summarize press reaction and enlightened journalistic opinion on this crucial issue of the procedures of this committee.

The importance of public opinion has been well expressed by the Washington Post in an editorial on January 12, 1948:

> In a free country there is no greater power than that of turning on the light. Our people move forward or backward on waves of public opinion, and that opinion is enormously influenced by the flow of information to the people. So vital is the informing function to the successful operation of a representative political system that Woodrow Wilson gave it greater weight in the scales of democracy than the function of making law. Today, with all our means of rapid communication, this power of turning on the light has become even more important.

PRESS REACTION

With no significant dissent, to my knowledge, the press has castigated the procedures of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Beyond that, some portions of the press have speculated on the possible motives of the committee in this unwarranted and absurd attack. The attack may be an attempt to discredit civilian control of atomic energy, as the editors of the Detroit Free Press suggest. Perhaps it is a purely political maneuver, as Mr. Harold Ickes suggested on March 10, 1948. The committee talks about "unwitting tools of the Communists." What greater blow could be struck by the enemies of this Nation against our security and defense than the driving of scientists from Government projects? For modern warfare is waged in laboratories. Would it be far from shrewd logic for the Communists to attempt to discredit our key scientists? I believe that this would be sound strategy for them. And Dr. Condon, considered by the magazine Fortune one of the 10 gretatest native scientists in 200 years of American history, would be a logical target for such underhanded tactics.

Time magazine in an article, How To Win Appropriations, on March 14, 1948, offers another plausible explanation for the conduct of the Committee on Un-American Activities:

> New Jersey's Representative J. PARNELL THOMAS knows that a good headline, come appropriation time, can do more than months of hard work. Last week, as his Committee on Un-American Activities applied for a whopping $200,000 allotment from the House, THOMAS dug deep. What he fetched up was an old file on Dr. Edward U. Condon, director of the National Bureau of Standards. The Bureau is the Government's chief research agency in physics, mathematics, chemistry, and engineering.
>
> Dr. Condon, declared the report, was "one of the weakest links in our atomic security," an associate of "alleged Soviet espionage agents." The report said that Condon was an executive director of the American-Soviet science society, an affiliate of the Communist-front National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. The report cited a letter from the FBI dated May 1947, which declared that Condon had been "in contact as late at 1947 with an individual alleged, by a self-confessed Soviet espionage agent, to have engaged in espionage activities with the Russians in Washington, D. C., from 1941 to 1944."
>
> WEAKEST LINK
>
> Dr. Condon answered sharply: "If I am the weak link in atomic security, then the Nation need have no fear." He said that he had asked THOMAS for a hearing last summer on the charges but had had no reply. Promptly the Commerce Department announced that only 6 days before the Thomas report was issued the departmental loyalty board had held, unanimously, that "no reasonable grounds exist for believing Dr. Condon is disloyal."
>
> THOMAS backed away a trifle. The committee had no evidence that Dr. Condon was disloyal, he admitted, just that he had been indiscreet. But, he added, he could not understand how the loyalty board could have cleared Dr. Condon in view of the evidence. From his bed in Walter Reed Hospital, where he is recuperating from an attack of gastro-intestinal hemorrhages, he issued a subpena, on the ground that it would be unfair to those who had testified in confidence, and would prejudice future loyalty probes. Blustered THOMAS: "If they think they are going to get away with it, they are mistaken."
>
> For scientists in the Government, already weary of being investigated, checked and rechecked, the Condon case seemed close to the last straw. The staid American Physical Society, of which Condon is a former president, warned that actions like these "will make difficult the collaboration between scientists and the Government on which so much of our future depends." Condon himself asked Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER'S Joint Atomic Energy Committee to hold its own investigation in the hope of "restoring conditions in which men of intelligence * * * will not be constantly harassed and harried by irresponsible attacks."
>
> WATCHES AND SLEDGE HAMMERS
>
> Others made a point that the egregious Mr. THOMAS had overlooked. His blundering tactics had undoubtedly aided the Communists. The Government's whole loyalty program would be jeopardized if confidential testimony given in a confidential inquiry were subjected to public review at the whim of a congressional committee. As the New York Herald Tribune said: "These blunderers and publicity seekers are approaching a problem which is as subtle and delicate as a watch with a monkey wrench and a sledge hammer. * * *
>
> "But the ineffable Mr. THOMAS got what he wanted. The Committee on House Administration approved his request for $200,000."

Time sums up the implications succinctly. This is not the isolated case of Dr. Condon so much as the problem relating to national defense. What scientist will be willing to work for the Government when such irresponsible at-

tacks take place? As we shall see, editorials everywhere are asking this question.

The New York Times also pointed to this problem, and lauded Dr. Condon for requesting an investigation by the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee which might, with effort, repair some of the devastation done to the morale of scientists in Government and those who were considering Government research jobs. The Times also questioned the tactics of the Committee on Un-American Activities, calling its methods nothing more than punishment by publicity, based upon evidence trivial to the point of being ludicrous. The editorial on March 5, 1948, declares:

If anything more were needed to discredit the procedure of the House Committee on Un-American Activities the case of Dr. Edward U. Condon, head of the National Bureau of Standards, has done it. This agency's subcommittee, dealing with the special field of national security, stated that the FBI had derogatory information about Dr. Condon as far back as May 1947. In July, Dr. Condon says, he offered Chairman THOMAS "any help I could give him," but had no reply from Mr. THOMAS or any member of the committee's staff. The derogatory information, presented with a flourish of publicity, certainly makes no case against Dr. Condon. The Commerce Department's own loyalty board had, in fact, examined it a few days before the subcommittee burst into print and had found "no reasonable grounds for believing that Dr. Condon is disloyal to the Government of the United States." Concurring in this last night Secretary Harriman, advised by the Attorney General, refused to turn over to the House the files of his Department board.

Some of the evidence against a distinguished public servant is trivial to the point of being ludicrous. Most of it rests on a principle of association under which, if widely applied, any man who had liberal friends who, in turn, had radical friends might be condemned. But it is the method followed—condemnation without fair trial and punishment by publicity—that must offend anyone believing in the principles of due process.

Yesterday Dr. Condon, who has done valuable research in the field of atomic energy, asked Chairman HICKENLOOPER, of the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee for an investigation. He asked this not only for his own exoneration, but, as he said, for the purpose of "restoring conditions in which men of intelligence would be willing to work for their Government and will not be constantly harassed and harried by irresponsible attacks on their character." It seems to us that Dr. Condon, in making this request, is behaving like a loyal and responsible citizen.

The New York Times was not alone in its condemnation of the procedures followed by the Committee on Un-American Activities. The press from coast to coast in large cities and small towns, concurred. The Standard Examiner, of Ogden, Utah, called the blast at Dr. Condon typical of Thomas committee faults. The editorial of March 13, 1948, says:

The House Committee on Un-American Activities' loud blast at Dr. Edward U. Condon came just as the committee was asking for a record high appropriation of $200,000 to continue its work. But its charges were based on information gathered by the FBI, and made public 10 months ago.

In citing this information, the committee omitted one important sentence. It quoted the FBI statement that Dr. Condon last year associated with "an individual alleged, by a self-confessed Soviet espionage agent, to have engaged in espionage activities with the Russians in Washington from 1941 to 1944." It neglected to add this: "There is no evidence to show that contacts between this individual and Dr. Condon were related to this individual's espionage activities."

The timing and the omission may be coincidence and accident. But it is hard to find any logic in the committee's conclusion.

Dr. Condon, like all Government employees, was subject to a loyalty check. The FBI turned over the results of this check to the Department of Commerce, for whom Dr. Condon works as head of the National Bureau of Standards. The Department found in it no evidence of disloyalty. Neither did the committee.

Chairman J. PARNELL THOMAS said, "The committee has no evidence that Dr. Condon is disloyal, but it has ample evidence that he has been at least indiscreet." He also said he could not understand "how the loyalty board could have cleared Dr. Condon in view of the evidence." That is the same evidence, apparently, in which the committee found no evidence of disloyalty.

Congress passed a law requiring all executive departments to set up boards to check their employees' loyalty to the Government. In Dr. Condon's case, no evidence of disloyalty was found. The Thomas committee has agreed with this finding. Yet THOMAS is unable to see how the loyalty board could have cleared Dr. Condon.

There is only one conclusion. Dr. Condon's crime is indiscretion. For that his dismissal is demanded, his reputation is injured, and he is charged by innuendo with being a conspirator and a traitor.

This, unfortunately, is typical of what the country has come to expect from the Committee on Un-American Activities. There are four lawyers and one former law student among its nine members. But it seems to function with little regard for legal precedent and much dependence on congressional immunity. Its history is full of intimidations, insinuations and slanderous conclusions based on flimsy evidence or no evidence at all.

To anyone who has followed this history attentively, the committee's methods tend to discredit any conclusions that the members reach. They have tried to make liberalism and even scientific learning virtual crimes against the State. Yet there must be millions of the inattentive who hear only the committee's accusations and verdicts without learning the evidence.

So it will probably happen once again that the House will vote the committee, if not $200,000 at least a six-figure sum to continue its self-designated position as guardian of Americans' cherished freedom and civil rights.

Calling this procedure "Trial by headline," the Christian Science Monitor on March 5 agreed substantially with the Republican New York Herald Tribune that "no evidence of any sort has been brought forward to substantiate the earlier loose charges which made sensational headlines at a time when the Committee on Un-American Activities is seeking an appropriation of $200,000 to carry on its work." The Herald Tribune calls the methods "hysterical," "witch hunting," "violating every standard of fair investigation." Its editorial on March 3 states:

Dr. Edward U. Condon is a distinguished scientist; he has held the presidency of the American Physical Society, the highest honor in the gift of his professional colleagues, and his technical fitness for his post as head of the Bureau of Standards is beyond question. Whether his opinions and associations make him a security risk in that position is another matter; it is obviously a complex and delicate one, which might involve the close weighing of many factors, some of them—such as the amount of secret material available in his office—only indirectly concerned with Dr. Condon himself. This newspaper has no means of arriving at any valid judgment of this kind of problem. But it feels confident in saying that the exploit of the subcommittee of the Thomas committee in parading his case in the headlines, despite the favorable finding of the Loyalty Board, tend only to make any such determinations totally impossible for everyone.

Unwarned by the Lucas bill, this subcommittee, in its dramatic meeting at the bedside of its stricken leader in Walter Reed Hospital, has violated every standard of fair investigation and rational process which the Lucas bill would impose upon it. Its report, rushed to the press without even reference to the committee for which it is supposedly acting, is in itself a masterpiece of unfair innuendo. It utilizes exactly those hysterical and witch-hunting methods which have provided actual subversion with its strongest and best defenses, which have outraged decent people and thereby tended to blind them to the real dangers which may exist, and which have submerged all the facts—and there are important facts involved in these matters—in a sea of sensation that makes real knowledge and proper action all but impossible.

There is a problem of Communist infiltration in this country. The Thomas committee is doing its best to render the problem insoluble and to leave us paralyzed before the dangers about which it screams.

The Washington Post is equally forthright in defending Dr. Condon against the "injustice of the Committee on Un-American Activities in pronouncing him guilty before trial." Recalling medieval England, the Post draws a parallel between star-chamber proceedings and twentieth-century America. Its editorials ask Congress to explain why it has permitted one of its committees to act in this peremptory manner. On March 5 the Post wrote:

The irresponsibility of the House Committee on Un-American Activities is illustrated anew in the extravagant charges made against Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards. It is worth examining these charges in some detail and with dispassionate detachment for the sake of the insight they afford into the committee's morals and tactics. The Condon case offers abundant proof, we think, that the Committee on Un-American Activities has become an embarrassing liability to Congress, a threat to the rights of citizens who are its victims and actually a handicap to the maintenance of effective security in the sensitive agencies of the Federal Government.

Let us look first at the way—the typical way—in which the charges against Dr. Condon were made. They emanated from a contrivedly theatrical subcommittee meeting held by the side of the chairman's hospital sick bed and were released without even taking time to refer them to the committee as a whole. The justification offered for this haste was urgency—although there was nothing in these charges that the chairman did not divulge at least by innuendo last summer. They were made in such haste, indeed, that the committee never found time even to question Dr. Condon himself, although he had long ago requested a chance to appear before it.

Now let us turn to the nature of the charges. They were sensational in the extreme—sensational and so vague as to be

virtually meaningless. They implied, without directly asserting, that Dr. Condon was engaged in espionage activities, that he constituted a menace to the security of the Nation's atomic secrets. Then, after having stated the case with such extravagance and having done irreparable injury to Dr. Condon's reputation, the subcommittee retreated from its original position and declared it was accusing the scientist of nothing more than indiscretion in some of his personal associations.

And what of the basis for these charges? Well, they were based principally upon a letter from J. Edgar Hoover to W. Averell Harriman which declares that Dr. Condon was in contact with an individual alleged, by a self-confessed Soviet espionage agent, to have engaged in espionage activities with the Russians in Washington, D. C., from 1941 to 1944. Rather, it is based on part of this letter. For Representative THOMAS, the subcommittee chairman, has now acknowledged that his report neglected—inadvertently, he says—to include a sentence from the Hoover letter asserting Dr. Condon's contact with the alleged spy constituted no evidence of disloyalty whatever.

So far as Dr. Condon's discretion as distinct from his loyalty is concerned, this is clearly not within the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. It is in the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce. Secretary Harriman appears to be satisfied with the Director of his Bureau of Standards, and the American public can have confidence, we think, that the former Ambassador to Russia is quite as alert to the dangers of indiscretion as Mr. THOMAS.

Secretary Harriman has satisfied himself, too, as to Dr. Condon's loyalty. For Dr. Condon himself asked the Secretary to have an exhaustive investigation made of his character and conduct. The result of the investigation was a unanimous report by the Commerce Department Loyalty Board that no reasonable grounds exist for believing that Dr. Condon is disloyal to the Government of the United States. This report, it seems to us, is the definitive answer to the Thomas committee's demand for Dr. Condon's immediate dismissal or an explanation of why he is being retained. The explanation is altogether clear. What is still to be explained—what Congress owes it to the American people to explain without delay—is why it permits a committee acting in its name so meanly and groundlessly to defame an American citizen.

On March 12, 1948, the Washington Post presented an editorial properly titled "Star Chamber":

Representative THOMAS' Subcommittee on Un-American Activities, having last week made extravagant charges about Dr. Edward U. Condon, is now engaged in a desperate scramble to find some shreds of substantiating evidence. To this end, it has grilled the members of the Commerce Department Loyalty Board in secret session, has accused them of "laxity" because they came to the conclusion that no "reasonable grounds exist for believing that Dr. Condon is disloyal to the Government of the United States," and has sought to obtain and publish a report submitted to the Secretary of Commerce by the Director of the FBI in absolute confidence. Secretary Harriman is altogether justified in characterizing this conduct as un-American.

Mr. Harriman's assertion that "from my own knowledge of the situation, I can say that the subcommittee's statement is misleading," is bolstered no less by the House committee's notorious irresponsibility than by his own known probity. Perhaps the most obvious revelation of the committee's bias lies in the announcement just made that 2 or 3 weeks from now public hearings will be held and Dr. Condon, the man the committee has condemned, will be afforded an opportunity for the first time to appear before it as he long ago requested and to answer any questions its members may care to put to him.

The San Francisco Chronicle is equally concerned with this "outrageous injustice to Dr. Condon" and the effect on science. It sharply denounces the extra-legality of the action taken by the subcommittee in an editorial of March 8:

The Thomas subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities is now suggesting, with a great show of fairness, that there may be come innocent explanation of Dr. Edward Condon's alleged association with a confessed Soviet agent.

This show of fairness comes belatedly, was dragged out of the subcommittee and is not good enough; the time for that was a week ago when the subcommittee was framing its loud public charges against Dr. Condon. The subcommittee showed no concern with fairness when a spokesman tried to connect Dr. Condon, head of the National Bureau of Standards, with an "extensive Soviet spy ring." "The situation as regards Dr. Condon is by no means an isolated one," ran the subcommittee's statement, which clearly invited the public to take Dr. Condon's guilt for granted.

Insofar as the public accusation contained evidence, it consisted mainly of the charge that Dr. Condon had lent his name and influence to an American Communist endeavor and the association with the above-mentioned individual, who remains unidentified. To the subversive endeavor charge, Dr. Condon retorted that if this meant his membership in the American-Soviet Science Society, this endeavor is endowed by the Rockefeller Foundation.

As to the personal association, it now turns out that the FBI report to this effect contained material to the further effect there was no evidence to doubt Dr. Condon's loyalty. But this latter part of the FBI report was smoked out by the Washington Post; it had been withheld by the subcommittee in raising the hue and cry about Dr. Condon's loyalty.

Dr. Condon's actual innocence, of course, cannot be guaranteed, any more than that of anyone else similarly accused. But on the record to date Dr. Condon's actual innocence is not involved. What can and must be guaranteed is the presumption of Dr. Condon's innocence until and if he is proved guilty. The subcommittee clearly not only dishonored this presumption but has tried by innuendo instead of evidence to create a presumption of guilt, and in the matter of the FBI report has even stooped to tamper with documents. There is massive evidence that tampering with documents is part of the subcommittee's pattern.

Even should real evidence be forthcoming against Dr. Condon, which remains to be seen, the subcommittee has shown itself completely beneath the moral responsibility of its self-sought task, men capable of the most vicious tricks of character assassination. This is an outrageous injustice to Dr. Condon and more. Atomic scientists wonder how we can hope to get competent scientists into necessary Federal service, with all the vocational and other sacrifices involved, when it means running the risk of such a "reward." This is something the country might well keep in mind, while pondering the usefulness of those making up the Thomas subcommittee. As to the committee proper, it is up to its members to explain the subcommittee's conduct, repudiate the subcommittee or be tarred with the same brush.

Finally the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette recommends that the procedures set forth in the Lucas resolution be adopted, while, at the same time it censures the committee for loosely employing the "guilt by association" technique:

Admitted lack of evidence that Dr. Edward U. Condon is disloyal to this country did not prevent a subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities from smearing the distinguished former Pittsburgh scientist.

On the basis of an incomplete investigation, without evidence of disloyalty and without submitting its findings to the full committee, the subcommittee released a report describing Dr. Condon as "one of the weakest links in our atomic security."

This was done although the Commerce Department Loyalty Review Board, on the same evidence as that placed by the FBI before the subcommittee, gave Dr. Condon a clean bill of health. Subsequently, the Atomic Energy Commission told Congress that Dr. Condon has no access to its top secrets.

The subcommittee relied upon guilt by association to indict Dr. Condon. What sort of evidence did it have? The scientist was known to have associated with certain foreigners. One of these acquaintances allegedly purchased 270 books on atomic energy published by the Commerce Department and available to everyone.

Perhaps Dr. Condon is guilty of something, but certainly the subcommittee thus far has presented nothing to support its position. Instead, it has raised anew the question of its own fitness and the justification for its existence.

Congressional investigating committees have served useful purposes in the past and can in the future. Over the years, however, there has developed a need for rules of procedure to protect witnesses and accused persons. Investigating committees should no longer be permitted to make their own rules as they go along because, as the House Committee on Un-American Activities has shown they cannot always be trusted to play by ear.

There is a need, recognized in legislation introduced recently by Senator SCOTT LUCAS, for a code preventing congressional abuse of individual rights. The power of committees to subject citizens to the treatment accorded Dr. Condon should be curbed.

These are only a few samples of editorial comment throughout the Nation's press. On the Pacific coast the Republican Oregonian summed up its editorial Thomas Committee's Methods with the final statement:

The committee's methods are distasteful in the extreme.

The Washington News, a Scripps-Howard newspaper, in its editorial of March 5, 1948, A Job for First-Rate Men, declared:

Investigation of un-American activities is a proper and essential function of Congress, more so now than ever before. The task is one of great difficulty. It calls for the services of first-rate men; men of wisdom, fairness, and sound judgment; men soberly interested in finding facts rather than in creating sensations and obtaining personal publicity.

Commenting later on the need for a fair and impartial clarification of the Condon case, the News has this to say about the qualifications of the committee:

But, just as clearly, the Committee on Un-American Activities disqualified itself to conduct such an investigation when some of its members prejudged the case without getting all the evidence.

The Chicago Sun-Times, in its editorial of March 13, 1948, The Right to Talk Back, stated:

The House Committee on Un-American Activities has a dangerous habit. When it goes on the hunt for disloyal Americans it shoots first and asks questions afterward. More often than not, an innocent person gets hurt under such a method.

The Sun-Times then discusses the attacks on Dr. Condon and points up the need for proper congressional procedure, noting the Lucas resolution:

If Congress hasn't the good sense to put the committee on the shelf or get a better committee, then it ought to take some action on a bill now before the Senate Rules Committee.

The Dallas Morning News on March 6, 1948, starts its editorial, Condon's Case, by advising us to "keep our shirts on during investigations of people in public service."

The Los Angeles Daily News, in its stinging editorial of March 18, 1948, Candidates for Hemlock, begins:

What's behind the current smear campaign being waged against able scientists, outstanding scholars, and noteworthy public servants? Is it all just politics on a low level? Or have fears of Russia and harried uncertainty over the future blinded some folks in our midst—blinded them to the graver dangers of an American society grown full of hate and intolerance, corroded by suspicions, and delivered, through these attitudes, to a nasty, brutish police state exactly like the one we are now arrayed against in a cold, threatening conflict?

The Los Angeles Daily News later strikes at the core of the issues:

Nevertheless the danger of the Condon persecution is not primarily that it smears an individual. The danger is that it sets the pattern for a medieval witch hunt of all scientists. It poses the question of whether American citizens are going to sit back and permit fanatics and politicians-on-the-make to force a cup of hemlock upon free American science.

On March 3, 1948, the Christian Science Monitor editorialized:

We trust that American common sense is not going to be one of the first victims of that coup (the coup of Czechoslovakia). We hope that common sense will be applied to the present situation and that the public will not be so un-American as to condemn Dr. Condon—or any other person—before hearing all the evidence. It will be a sad day in the United States—and one her enemies would rejoice to see—if suspicion ever became the basis of Government.

Six days later, in an editorial entitled "Will Suspicion Rule?" the Christian Science Monitor concluded with the question:

With its record of accusations based on hearsay, of broadcasting assumptions of guilt before its hearings ever begin, is this committee to be allowed a veto over who is or is not to hold posts of trust in the Government of the United States?

On March 11, 1948, the Pittsburgh Post Gazette declared, in its editorial Curbing Thomas Probers:

Certainly a committee which has the power to destroy so easily a man's reputation should be bound by the same rules of evidence and probable cause that govern, say, a grand jury. Rumor, gossip, hearsay, and the like must not pass for truth; the accused should have the right to face and cross-examine his accusers. Such changes, if ordered by the House, will go far to avert future disgraceful performances by the Thomas committee.

The New York Herald Tribune on March 11, 1948, in its editorial, Thomas Gets His Money, stated:

This paper has already expressed the view that Mr. Thomas and his committee are probably two of Washington's greatest gifts to Communist infiltration. From the days of Dies down, for every subversive which the committee has actually exposed, it has provided innumerable columns of effective Communist propaganda; its injudicious methods have been the best kind of screen behind which real subversion could develop, and it has endlessly confused and diverted attention from a rational approach to the true problems of Communist conspiracy in a democracy. To give this committee another $200,000 lease on life without surrounding it with some such safeguards of proper procedure as are advanced in Senator LUCAS' bill seems a fairly reckless business.

The investigatory power of Congress is one of the most important and most useful which it holds; Communist infiltration is precisely the kind of problem in which the investigatory power can be most valuable, and it would be unwise to cripple it by constraining it too completely within the rigid limitations of court procedure. But when it has been blunted and abused as badly as it has been by this committee, Congress itself should impose certain minimum restrictions. The overwhelming vote to continue the committee proves the importance of the Communist problem. That in turn lays Congress under a more imperative obligation to see that it is properly dealt with.

COMMENTS BY JOURNALISTS

Not only was the press uniform in its editorial condemnation of the tactics and procedures of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, but also the leading journalists and columnists. Thus Marquis Childs, in his syndicated column, Washington Calling, stated on March 12, 1948:

The Joint Senate-House Atomic Energy Committee the other day went over the material which the House Committee on Un-American Activities had assembled against Dr. Edward U. Condon and had used as the basis of a public charge that the head of the National Bureau of Standards was the "weakest link" in the chain of atomic security.

* * * * *

The evidence consisted of a mass of hearsay gossip, second-hand reports of Condon's association with alleged foreign agents, and accounts of political opinions expressed by Dr. and Mrs. Condon. Part of it was dredged out of that bane of Washington life, the cocktail party.

Most of the Members present at the session of the joint committee seemed to agree that the "case" was pretty flimsy. What it got down to was that the Condons are people with unconventional opinions. Some might consider that radical.

* * * * *

Anyone doubting the effect of the Condon case on science has only to note the mass meetings at which scientists are rallying to his defense. A meeting is being held in New York this week, and one is planned for Washington in the near future.

* * * * *

A sad commentary is the House vote of 337 to 37 giving the Committee on Un-American Activities $200,000—more than ever before. Surely, now that this has been done, responsible leadership will see to it that procedures are in accord with elementary rules of justice.

Lowell Mellett, in his national column On the Other Hand, discussed how the Thomas committee hampers our country's preparation for war on March 6, 1948:

The case of Dr. Edward U. Condon, now under attack of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, may have a salutary effect on Congress. It may bring the Members to see what their own timidity is costing the country.

Year after year, since the days of Martin Dies, the House has voted appropriations to enable this committee to carry on its reckless operations. Many Members have protested privately and some have protested publicly, but on the show-down only a minority has ever voted to cut it off or curtail it. The reason is simple: Fear of being charged with or suspected of un-American sympathies or activities.

So the timid Congress Members have allowed the committee to have its way, and its way has become dizzier and dizzier. Now, it may be, we are about to see the pay-off.

CONSCIOUS OF WAR THREAT

The Congress Members are conscious of the threat of another great war, more conscious perhaps than average citizens. They want this country to be prepared. Most of all, they want it to be prepared in the field of science, having in mind the atomic bomb and other wonders of the last war. A majority of them, judged by their resistance to universal military training, believe the day of the foot soldier has passed and that the next war will be won with mysterious new weapons they don't even hope to understand. All effort, they feel, should be expended to make certain that our country shall not be behind any other country in the development of such weapons. Research has become a magic word.

Which is where the case of Dr. Condon comes in. The Director of the United States Bureau of Standards, one of the world's great scientific institutions, has, by the very nature of his job, an important place in this program of war preparation. He should be above suspicion, and he was until last Monday. He had an excellent record of service in education, industry, and government. The Committee on Un-American Activities undertook to dispose of that in one of its typical blasts, designed to smother Dr. Condon in a cloud of suspicion.

The committe may be able to prove that Dr. Condon is a disloyal and dangerous citizen. Thus far it has proved nothing. It has only damaged his reputation and caused him to wonder why he ever accepted a Government appointment.

BEST BRAINS WANTED

The Government, including Congress, wants the best of America's scientific brains applied to research and technical advance. Men with brains of that kind are apt to be shy of publicity. They haven't the hides of professional politicians, criticism hurts. They prefer to be left alone in their laboratories and not dragged out on the muddy playing field of politics.

Dr. Hutchins of the University of Chicago understands this. Recently he announced that he would not recommend Government work to any student or faculty member. Other university presidents, less outspoken than Dr. Hutchins, are known to share his view.

Where then are we to find the brains we need? Well, we have brought 200 over from Germany, some of the same men who helped develop V-2 rockets and jet planes for Hitler. Senator HARRY BYRD tells all about it in the

current American magazine. These Germans work on aerodynamics, thermodynamics, supersonics, ballistics, ram jets, rocket fuels, bomb-sights, guided missiles, etc. The Senator intimates, however, that they do not work on projects where our progress is already more advanced than the German, especially in the development of atomic energy.

What we are doing the Russians are doing. They also are using German scientists.

All this seems to assure is that, come the war, we will be just as good as the Russians. Just as good may not be good enough. If Congress decides it is not, Congress may at last summon up the courage to muzzle its mad dog committee.

Joseph and Stewart Alsop, in their column Matter of Fact of March 15, 1948, discuss the implications of the FBI letter:

It is already difficult to persuade competent men to risk their reputation in Government. Since the Condon affair, some are now talking seriously of resigning. Moreover, the very real necessity for proper security measures to deal with pro-Communists in the Government is obscured and distorted, to the delight of the Communists. The most interesting revelation which Representative THOMAS and his chief investigator can now make would not concern the alleged indiscretion of Dr. Condon. It would concern rather how the Thomas Committee came into possession of the FBI letter.

Ralph W. Page, writing on Lesson in Condon Case, in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, March 10, 1948, after noting the committee's using and distorting a letter from the FBI and observing the back-tracking of the committee from the loyalty trench to the reliability trench, sums up:

As a result, THOMAS now says he doesn't question Condon's loyalty—he just doesn't believe he is reliable.

That's the end of the case as far as Condon is concerned.

But it throws wide open again the question of the motives, the purposes, the morals, and the tactics of this extraordinary pathological * * * committee.

Perhaps it might not be amiss to conclude this portion of commentary by the press and journalists with the provoking two-sentence statement on March 15, 1948, of the conservative magazine, Newsweek:

The House GOP leadership is frankly worried over the Subcommittee on Un-American Activities charges against Dr. Edward U. Condon. Some members privately express the fear that Chairman THOMAS may have opened the Republican Party to accusations of irresponsibility.

EFFECTS ON SCIENCE

The reaction of the press so far presented concerns primarily the unfair procedures of a congressional committee and also the fate of an individual whose reputation has been so needlessly and unjustly slandered. Another aspect of this case is the implication of the attacks on the future of science in this country and the future of our national security.

Security now means nothing more or less than progress in science, in particular research in pure science as a basis for subsequent practical developments. The attacks made on Dr. Condon cannot but discourage scientists from working on Government projects and cannot but distract them from their difficult research problems. The New York Times summed the Effects of the Condon Case succinctly on March 7, 1948:

More than an outraged sense of injustice spurred the American Physical Society, 7,000 strong, the Federation of American Scientists, the emergency committee of atomic scientists, of which Dr. Albert Einstein and Harold C. Urey are, respectively, chairman and vice chairman, and some outstanding individual scientists to defend Dr. Edward U. Condon against the accusation of disloyalty leveled at him by the House Subcommittee on Un-American Activities. These scientists are alarmed. And they are alarmed at possible repercussions if a physicist or chemist, whose work necessarily brings him in contact with colleagues of many nationalities and political creeds, or who has not been "cleared" by the Atomic Energy Commission—a process which takes months and to which some able physicists and chemists are now subjected—is regarded as disloyal. Their protests and the letter which Dr. Condon has addressed to the chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy are unanimous in warning that our foremost scientists may decline to undertake research for the Government if their honor and their patriotism are to be questioned for no substantial reason and if they are to be publicly condemned without a hearing or on evidence that will not stand up in a court.

The accusations of the Thomas Committee imply that Dr. Condon may have talked too freely to possible Soviet spies and to sympathizers with communism. Here the record of the atomic physicists, among whom Dr. Condon has been a conspicuous figure, speaks for itself. As soon as the news of the fission of uranium had reached this country in 1939 a few of them urged rather indifferent high officials to begin research which would result in an atomic bomb and thus forestall Germany. It was not until Dr. Einstein appealed personally to President Roosevelt that action was taken. Moreover, in this same period, when nothing was classified so far as atomic energy was concerned, the physicists, Dr. Condon included, imposed secrecy on themselves. After 1940 nothing of importance on atomic energy or the fission of uranium was published even in the scientific journals until the Smyth report appeared. With such a record of knowing when and how to keep silent, it would seem that the physicists, innocent as they are of political experience, may be assumed to possess common technical sense and to know what they can talk about freely and what not.

After the war with Japan had ended, the atomic physicists who had worked on the problem of releasing atomic energy in bombs left almost in a body for their universities. They never had any great interest in solving what were to them largely technological problems. Their sense of national danger and their patriotism prompted them to enter the Government service. Morale was high then. How much lower it may be now it is hard to tell. Unless scientists are assured that they will not be badgered after they have been investigated prior to their acceptance of a Government appointment, we may find it hard to enlist their services when they are vitally needed. This does not mean that we have to put up with Communists and their friends in high places. But it does mean that Thomas Committees can do us far more harm than their unfounded accusations and their suspicions are worth.

The Washington Evening Star, in its editorial, The Condon Case, on March 6, 1948, viewed the problem from the point of view of science and the Government and came to the conclusion that the House Committee on Un-American Activities was not qualified even to hold hearings on the Condon case:

This public investigation should be conducted by the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, and not by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee of the latter group.

Homes Alexander in the Los Angeles Times had this to say of the implications Behind the Condon Case:

Maybe you know a college boy who's on the ragged edge of flunking his science courses. Or a subassistant professor who's getting nowhere in academic life. Or a research slavey in some industrial firm who's looking for a way out.

If so, tell any or all of them to quit worrying about the future. There are plenty of jobs in Government service for second-, third-, and even fourth-rate scientists. In fact, that type of scientist is about all the Government is getting—or expecting to get—for the more than 30,000 highly important research posts, including posts under the Atomic Energy Commission.

Scientists right now are more necessary to the United States than soldiers are. Why can't the country get and keep top-flight men? The answer is now being sharply dramatized in the case of Dr. Edward U. Condon, atomic research expert in the Commerce Department's Bureau of Standards.

THE LARGER QUESTION

Dr. Condon is the latest quarry of Representative J. PARNELL THOMAS, chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Condon isn't being accused of disloyalty, merely of the alleged indiscretion of associating with alleged Communists.

Never mind for the moment how much truth there is in the charge. Some time ago there was a meeting, I'm told by a man who was present, of high echelon loyalty authorities who discussed the Condon case before it ever reached the newspapers. These men foresaw an even larger question than Dr. Condon's alleged indiscretion. They raised this point: "If first-rate scientists are to be subject to disloyalty smears on such flimsy evidence, how can the Government get and keep good men for the vital job of scientific research, especially in the atomic energy field?"

Two personnel experts from the Commerce Department were sent on a field trip to explore this question. They visited universities in 10 or 12 States. They were told, as one of them explained to me, the same thing at virtually every university: "The Government is getting students whom we won't recommend for graduate work or for industrial jobs."

EVER-PRESENT THREAT

But why? Government salaries fall between the salaries paid by universities and by industrial firms. Real scientists don't consider money a major attraction. They look for research facilities—that is, for well-equipped laboratories and well-stocked libraries. The Government has these inducements on hand. Top scientists also look for congenial association among their intellectual peers. The Government by attracting the right men could offer this inducement, too. What scares the right sort of men away from Government service is the ever-present threat of a disloyalty smear.

This factor was spelled out for me by Dr. Richard L. Meier, executive secretary of the Federation of Atomic Scientists. Dr. Meier and his colleagues have also tackled the problem of steering first-rate research men into Government service. The FAS began a detailed survey last January, and will soon turn over the report to the President and Congress. Meanwhile, Dr. Meier had this to say for publication:

"It is certainly a fact that the Government is getting second-raters, and we are collecting the data to prove it. Aside from the salary question, the problem of loyalty checks makes good men very reluctant to leave civilian posts. Any doubt about loyalty is resolved in favor of the investigators and against the man who's willing to accept a Government job. When you take away a scientist's good name you're taking all that he has."

JOBS GO BEGGING

Where did he lay the blame? "Well, department heads, especially in the Atomic Energy Commission, are sympathetic to scientists. But we're up against Congress. It's just that scientists operate on facts and data. But J. PARNELL THOMAS seems to operate on inferences and innuendoes. We find that system hard to understand."

This is the story behind the Condon case. The Commerce Department saw no reason to take action on the flimsy evidence, if any, of indiscretion. But Mr. THOMAS, who is never quite happy when out of the headlines, found the temptation too much to resist. Meanwhile, scientific research jobs in the Government go begging. Between 30 and 40 percent of the Atomic Energy Commission posts are unfilled. They are likely to stay unfilled, so far as top scientists are concerned. So if you know any second-, third-, or even fourth-raters—men with little ability, thick skins, and slow, safe minds—tell them to get in touch with Washington.

On the subject of scientists and their relation to Government, the Pittsburgh Post Gazette presented the following editorial, called Don't Run Scientists Off:

That recurrent wail from Washington about not being able to attract top talent to serve the Government loses some of its appeal when one considers the treatment accorded certain Government officials in recent months.

There was, for instance, the case of James M. Landis, whose faithful service was rewarded with a boot in the pants. Without explanation, President Truman failed to reappoint Mr. Landis as Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Then there was the unexplained demotion of Marriner S. Eccles from the chairmanship to second place on the Federal Reserve Board. These decisions by President Truman came despite his frequent moans about the unavailability of good administrative talent.

Not to be outdone by the White House, a subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities has, in its treatment of Dr. Edward U. Condon, done what it can to frighten scientists away from research for the Government.

How long are scientists going to work for the Government and risk a public smear of the Condon sort if they are so much as seen associating with scientists of other nationalities?

That is the point raised by Dr. Condon in his letter to the Joint Congressional Commission on Atomic Energy and by scores of leading scientists who have come to Dr. Condon's defense.

In a letter to President Truman and House Speaker Martin the American Physical Society had this to say: "We have grave fear that their (House Committee on Un-American Activities) action will tend to frustrate efforts of the Government to avail itself of our scientific resources and will make difficult the collaboration between scientists and the Government, on which so much of the future depends."

Scientists employed by the Government should certainly be required to meet the Nation's security standards. But once they have been investigated and employed, they should not be subjected to public suspicion unless there is evidence to convict.

Meanwhile, the repercussions throughout our universities and colleges have become immediately evident. It is a fact that the students and faculty members throughout the Nation are being warned against Government service by leading educators, simply because of the present atmosphere of fear, suspicion, and the danger of attacks on their reputations. College and university newspapers have been quick to sense the significance of the attacks.

Thus the Dartmouth press discusses the attacks on Dr. Condon in an editorial called Un-American. They conclude with a one-line, one-sentence summary of their attitudes on these attacks: "As the playright says, we may vomit."

So goes the press, from coast to coast, irrespective of party interests or alliances or preferences. The country, without a single dissenting voice that I have been able to detect, does not have much confidence in the procedures of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, to put the matter mildly. Indictment before fair trial is, in itself, antithetic to democratic ideals. Our Bill of Rights has stood unquestioned since 1789; the Committee on Un-American Activities has been questioned from the beginning of its existence some 9 years ago.

The subcommittee report of March 1, 1948, it should be noted, not only assassinated the character and reputation of Dr. Condon; it did more; it passed judgment. What, then, are we to think of the hearings now apparently scheduled? After judgment has been passed, can we expect anything but a frenzied and irrational attempt to justify the judgment already passed? Certainly the report itself suggests the caliber of what might be expected in the hearings.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 20 minutes.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill providing for the withdrawal of the United States from the International Monetary Fund.

The action recently taken by the French political authority in adjusting the red or authoritarian value of the franc to conform more nearly to its true, free, and generally accepted value, and providing for an apparently partially free gold market, in spite of objection from the fund officials, should clearly expose the utter fallaciousness of this scheme. More important, that action ought to demonstrate the danger to international relations inherent in the International Monetary Fund. Particularly should it be a warning to the United States that grave trouble is in store for it unless it withdraws from this international scheme.

France's action should come as no surprise for nothing but the expected and inevitable has happened. It is purely accidental that the French political authority should be the one to initiate repudiation or wrecking of the fund. It could have been any one of the other political authorities belonging to it, not excepting that of the United States itself.

It is vital to the preservation of what is left of normal international relations that we get our thinking straight on this whole matter right now.

The French political authority—erroneously called government—has not violated any rules of the International Monetary Fund, for there are no rules. Certainly none that are founded on reality, or that are not so completely hedged about by extenuating phraseology as to nullify their meaning. Every signatory to the fund agreement knew when it signed that it would violate any provision whenever it suited its purpose to do so.

Every forthright person familiar with the evolution of this clandestinely jerry-built international monetary contrivance knows this to be a fact.

Consider the changes made in the red or official value of the franc from 119 francs equal $1 to 214 equal $1; and from 119 francs equal $1 to 305—or whatever number of francs will exchange in a free market for $1—equal $1. Section 5 (f) of article IV of the fund, provides that a member may alter the red value of its currency to any extent it deems necessary if its domestic social or political policies warrant provided only that fund is so satisfied.

That language was specifically intended as an escape clause. Lord Keynes, who wrote every substantive provision of this international monetary scheme—see page 4909, May 22, 1945, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—in a speech before the House of Lords, May 23, 1944, made this crystal clear. He said:

My noble friend, Lord Addison, asks who fixes the value of gold. If he means, as I assume he does, the sterling value of gold, it is we, ourselves, who fix it initially in consultation with the fund; and this value is subject to change at any time on our initiative, changes in excess of 10 percent requiring the approval of the fund, which must not withhold approval if our domestic equilibrium requires it.

For instead of maintaining the principle that the internal value of a national currency should conform to a prescribed de jure external value, it provides that its external value should be altered if necessary so as to conform to whatever de facto internal value results from domestic policies, which themselves shall be immune from criticism by the fund. Indeed, it is made the duty of the fund to approve changes which will have this effect.

Lord Keynes and Sir John Anderson, according to a news item in the New York Herald Tribune of March 22, 1945, almost a year later, amplified the above assertion.

It stated:

Both Sir John Anderson, Chancelor of the Exchequer, and Lord Keynes have declared that the British Government will adjust the value of the pound whenever Whitehall considers it necessary. The chancelor even said that the policy pursued here would be similar to that of 1933. He said that the government would commit itself only to consult the International Monetary Fund before changing the value of the pound sterling, reserving its right to persist with its intentions should the fund refuse consent.

Then there is article XIV of the fund, which also gives the French political authority a clean bill of health. But that body is completely exonorated from having done any wrong on quite other grounds than those mentioned, which will be considered later.

In contriving this international monetary plan Keynes sought to achieve several objectives. One was to finagle the United States to underwrite his full employment and purchasing power scheme with printing-press dollars; that is, put the producing element of this Nation under compulsion to share the fruits of its toil with other nations—in particular with Great Britain—something not wanted by the sound thinking people of England or any other country. Under the objects of the plan in his international clearing union scheme, of which the fund is but a paraphrase, he said:

> We need a quantum of international currency, which is neither determined in an unpredictable and irrelevant manner, as, for example, by the technical progress of the gold industry, nor subject to large variations depending on the gold reserve policies of individual countries; but is governed by the actual current requirements of world commerce, and is also capable of deliberate expansion and contraction to offset deflationary and inflationary tendencies in effective world demand.

Printing-press money is the only currency that can be made to fit into this formula. Of course, the contraction feature has so seldom been anything but a broken political promise that it can be ruled out as a part of the definition of a printing-press-money system. That system possesses the property of expanding, but not contracting.

Keynes' International Clearing Union called for an international pool of printing-press money amounting initially to about $25,000,000,000 to be drawn upon by the members of the union to produce employment and purchasing power.

About $18,000,000,000, the bulk of which consists of printed money, was provided in the International Monetary Fund and Bank set-up. Fundamentally the fund and bank merge themselves into a single political instrument and serve a common purpose.

Keynes seemed to be satisfied that he had achieved his goal as is evidenced in the speech above referred to where he lists the benefits that would accrue to Britain from the fund. He said:

> Third, the wheels of trade are to be oiled by what is, in effect, a great addition to the world's stock of monetary reserves, distributed, moreover, in a reasonable way. The quotas are not so large as under the Clearing Union, and Lord Addison drew attention to that. But they are substantial and can be increased subsequently if the need is shown. The aggregate for the world is put provisionally at £2,500,000,000. Our own share of this—for ourselves and the Crown Colonies which, I may mention, are treated for all purposes as a part of the British monetary system (in itself a useful acknowledgement)—is £325,000,000.

Since the Keynes' employment and purchasing power concept is predicated on printing-press money it necessarily postulates repudiation of public debts, both domestic and foreign. Sections 5 and 7 of article IV of the fund provide for such repudiation and for making it legal.

Ipso facto, unlimited confiscation of private property is in the very nature of things an integral part of this concept.

Stripped naked of its trappings Keynes' employment and purchasing power scheme is but a streamlined version of Marxism. Marx wrote:

> The theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence; abolition of private property.

To which he added:

> You reproach us with intending to do away with your property. Precisely so; that is just what we intend.

Marx, in his manifesto, advocated progressive taxation as a means for effectuating that end.

Keynes was never so bold in openly stating his ultimate objective, or the end result of his scheming. The fact is, however, that printing-press money is a quicker death to private property ownership and freedom than progressive taxation.

Of course, progressive taxation must inevitably lead to absorption by the political authority of all social power with resultant absolutisms. Such absorption is now developing in the United States, and has already progressed to the extent that it is causing marked retrogression of production capacity. This is the cardinal symptoms of the virus of communism in the body social, and because of its importance will be mentioned again later.

To be sure, Keynes had objectives besides that of jockeying this political authority into expropriating the produce of American labor and giving it to the political authorities of his and other countries. In the speech from which we have previously quoted, he lists, among others, the following advantages accruing to Great Britain from the scheme: First, the right to retain wartime restrictions and other special arrangements during the transition postwar period of uncertain duration—the French political authority did nothing that contravenes this right; second, an indispensable means for maintaining London as the financial center of the world; adding greatly to Britain's monetary reserves; and in Keynes' own words:

> The Americans, who are the most likely to be affected by this, have, of their own free will and honest purpose, offered us a far-reaching formula of protection against a recurrence of the main cause of deflation during the interwar years, namely, the draining of reserves out of the rest of the world to pay a country which was obstinately borrowing and exporting on a scale immensely greater than it was lending and importing. Under clause VI (article VII of final draft) of the plan a country engages itself, in effect, to prevent such a situation from arising again, by promising, should it fail, to release other countries from any obligation to take its exports, or, if taken, to pay for them.

In this connection it should be remembered that Morgenthau's two first drafts for an international monetary plan expressly provided for assumption by the United States of British foreign debts. The provision to accomplish this, no doubt written by Keynes, was so technical and involved that even Treasury so-called experts who led in promoting the passage of the fund proposal did not fully understand it. However, that provision was dropped like a hot potato when Dr. Benjamin M. Anderson and others exposed its hidden purpose.

We should carefully keep in mind the objectives which the political authority of this Nation sought to achieve by this scheme. It was meant to provide artificially high employment and income by exporting huge amounts of goods in excess of imports, and to perpetuate the illusion that the earning element of the Nation is being made richer by giving away its produce.

Then there is the cult of neo-internationalism, one worldism, which is in the process of annihilating all true, natural, and spontaneous internationalism, that is, voluntary international trading and intercourse between private individuals, and substituting therefor international authoritarianism, that is, monetary, financial, commercial, and other transactions only between political authorities under a centralized power.

The ulterior motive was extension of political control over the life of the individual citizen and to promote communitarian imperialism.

It is a purely communistic concept to oppose the free use of gold in the economy. Political ownership and control of gold is the very essence of communism. Gold is a fetish to the communistic mentality only so long as it remains in free use. Once a political authority has complete control of the gold stocks of the country over which it rules, it possesses the essential means for sustaining the Communist State. Experience proves this. The Bolsheviks, before they got control, condemned gold; but the moment they came into power they grabbed the gold stocks with an avidity that characterizes the Communist ideology. Once they were in possession of the gold of Russia their power was complete. Hitler and Mussolini knew the secret. It was the urge for acquiring authoritarian power that caused the architects of the New Deal to seize the gold stocks of the United States in 1933 and 1934. With the gold in their possession they were free to print money and to tax without limit and start the United States on the selfsame road that the Bolsheviks, the Nazis, and Fascists traveled that led to their totalitarian regimes.

When the fund was being devised the gold stocks of practically every nation had been nationalized. Through this scheme its designers sought to centralize control of all gold holdings in a single authority and establish what Lord Keynes, in his clearing union plan, calls "a genuine organ of truly international government," and which he says "might become the pivot of the future economic government of the world," that is, commissar rule over all mankind.

Stalin, who embraces only such internationalism as conduces to his rule, who never joins anything he cannot control, and, although he has the veto power in the United Nations and Trygve Lie is his man, he hesitated to take out membership in the Fund. He just wanted to be sure whose commissar it was going to be.

The International Monetary Fund, like the other foreign aid undertakings, is predicated on the assumption that the United States is in a sound monetary, financial and economic condition; that it is possessed of almost limitless resources and that, withal, it is the richest Nation in the world. Having through the unlimited power of taxation obtained dominion over such resources, the political authority has not only presumed itself to possess the brain power to lift the distressed peoples of almost the whole world—the Soviet, too, was invited to participate in ERP—out of the trouble they have got themselves into, but has appointed itself to execute this task.

But the very basis of this assumption of power belies all the premises upon which it rests, for the political authority is a consuming and not a creative or productive mechanism. Its almighty power can last only so long as resources remain for it to devour.

The fact is, the social organism of the United States is afflicted with the same pernicious virus, state planning or collectivism, that has sickened the countries, the political authority of this Nation alleges it can restore to a state of health. This cannot be overemphasized or too often repeated.

The Federal debt is nearly equal to the total reproducible wealth of the United States which has been accumulated over a period of more than 300 years. The real public debt is considerably more than the Treasury statement shows. One unlisted item alone, uncollected social security taxes pledged for social-security benefits, would add many billions to the debt.

The political authority has outstanding obligations and promises to pay amounting to roundly three and three-fourths trillion grains of gold, or paper with purchasing power equal thereto. However, it actually possesses less than one-tenth that amount of gold. If the United States were called upon to pay much of its short-term net foreign liabilities in gold, by no means an impossibility, the picture would be still darker.

The total Federal debt, including nearly all circulating currency, is composed of inflation, that is, printing-press money or political promise to pay media.

The Marxian system of progressive taxation and New Deal socialism is having a telling effect in annihilating private ownership of capital. It is destroying the private profit system and hindering the plowing back of capital for the creation of new tools of production. It has made this Nation into a welfare or "seed-corn" eating state, the same as England, France, Russia, and the rest.

Quoting from the Tool Owners Union Economic Progress Report No. 2, C. Reinold Noyes states:

> It appears that, for the first time in our recent history and perhaps for the first time in our entire history, the process of growth in reproducible wealth has practically ceased for an entire decade * * * business real capital stood in 1945 considerably below the point at which it stood at the end of 1930 * * * the private economy in the aggregate has not only failed to create any new real capital; it has not even maintained its net real capital intact.

To reverse the trend of shrinkage of tools of production, and to put the Nation back on the road of progress, it is necessary to rid it of the socialism imposed by the New Deal and restore the ratio of taxation to political spending that generally prevailed at some period prior to 1929. Surely not a hopeful outlook.

Accordingly, the assumption by the political authority that the economy of the United States is in a sound state of health is as unfounded as anything possibly can be. The exact opposite is true, however much we might dislike to be told this.

In the final analysis the political authority of this Nation must bear full responsibility for the evils the International Monetary Fund will bring to our people and to those of the rest of the world.

After Keynes had intrigued the Washington politicians to approve the scheme, which was so easy to do, it was in turn sold to the political authorities of other countries. This also seemed not to be a difficult task, for apparently no more was necessary than the dangling before their eyes of billions of dollars worth of free American merchandise. This is no reflection on the producing populations of the countries concerned. They had practically no voice in the matter.

As all who followed the formation of this scheme know, merit played little or no part in committing our Nation to it. The political authority importuned Congress to approve it by its totalitarian propaganda machinery and horse trading with the self-promoting and special privilege-seeking lobbyists that infest the Capitol and Nation. Its alleged purposes, particularly that of peace, were painted in glowing colors and the facts pertaining to its actual provisions were adroitly withheld from the public. The truth is, however, that there were so few people who understood its provisions that an intelligent presentation of them was out of the question.

The Keynesian stabilization feature embodied in the fund scheme, as shown by the hearings relating to its consideration and the publicity given it when it was before Congress, was misrepresented.

The promoters of the plan definitely gave out the impression that the stabilization provisions were intended to prevent currency depreciation. It was to give to each currency a permanently fixed value so that it would continuously command the same amount of goods and services. The public was propagandized to swallow this whole.

Nothing could be further from the truth. That is not at all what the stabilization provisions in the fund mean. In fact, they were specifically designed to do the very opposite and provide a system of continuously depreciating currencies having progressively less purchasing power. The provisions relate to currency parities, not to their absolute purchasing power.

Keynes' idea was to establish by peremptory international law the parities or relative values of the currencies. Section 5 of article IV provides for doing this through devaluation of the red rate of the currencies of individual countries.

Section 7 of article IV provides for continuous uniform more or less intermittent debasement of the currencies of all members. This compliments the Keynesian printing-press money expansionist system. The formula provides that all member political authorities shall uniformly, in a more or less continuous stream, print the same proportionate amount of money. Thus, the parities or relative purchasing power of the several currencies would remain stabilized, as would also, of course, the relative repudiation of debt and plunder of the producing population. Was ever a more immoral and antisocial institution contrived by the mind of man? Marx must be smiling in his grave.

No; do not blame the French political authority for the action it took. Back of that procedure were the peasants and other enterprisers who produce the necessaries of life and pay the taxes. Their refusal to accept the franc at the red rate and their resistance to political robbery—printing-press money is that and nothing else—became so intense that the political authority was compelled to yield and exercise a little integrity.

It is too early to know to what extent the French producers will be able to hold their ground, but in this dark hour of rapidly developing world-wide tyranny their effort shines forth as a most welcome ray of hope.

The French political authority is not doing so well with the scheme to get its fingers on private gold holdings. French peasants and other producers have had much bitter experience with political manipulation of money. It is not surprising that they should be reluctant to give up their gold. They fear that once they have let loose of the metal it will fall into the hands of the political authority, that they will never see it again, and that it will become the ultima ratio for taking from their mouths the last crumb of bread they have earned.

It is political ownership and control of gold that forms the basis of the universal authoritarianism that is submerging civilization, thanks to centralized, politicalized banking. If all the gold stocks of the world were locked up in private hoards, the human race would be infinitely better off than it is with the political authorities possessing it as now is the case.

Potentially, at least, mankind would be strong, secure, and assured of future progress. To the extent that political authorities control the gold stocks civilization must languish and wither away.

Of course, if the political authorities could be dispossessed of all gold and it were recovered by the producing element, to whom it rightfully belongs, it would be freely available in the market functioning to protect each person in his natural right to enjoy the fruit of his labor and to maintain the most equitable distribution of wealth.

On the surface, the fund opposed the French political authority in the action it took. Fundamentally, however, the fund was engaged in resisting the efforts of the peasants and other producers to

stop the political regime of France from robbing them of the produce of their toil. The fund lined itself up squarely on the side of state spoliation and, in so doing, exposed its collectivist feet of clay. The severe rebuke that is being leveled against the French action belongs in the same category.

It is to developments such as that relating to the recent French currency procedure that the world must look for redemption from the chaos that plagues it. In its January 31, 1948, issue the Statist makes some very poignant comments on this subject. It says:

It may even be that, in the long run, the action of France will be seen as the first revolt of national sovereignty against the attempts of the Atlantic Charter period to subdue that primal and persisting emotion. If the revolt spreads, the whole of the world's international relationships may return to something akin to those of the nineteenth century, with national governments again acting as the welfare or supposed welfare of their own people dictates, and not as some remote theorist in some foreign land thinks they ought to act. Such a reaction from the ideology of the past decade would, without doubt, cause the Daily Worker's word "chaos" to become justified, but out of that chaos a new order would emerge, a new order on the model of a very old order, an order of naturalism and patriotism. Should such a revolt from international fiscal collectivism occur, the example might easily spread to more limited, domestic affairs, and the mock governances of quite artificial and largely self-appointed authorities be subject to the same flouting. If a nation—France—or nations—those who may easily take France for their exemplar—now find that the first law is self-preservation, and communal agreements cannot withstand the strain of the need to protect an immediate breach in the national defenses against sociological and economic disaster, it may easily be that individual units, in the sense of enterprises, will be forced to the same conviction, and will act accordingly. The French hazardous experiment may be, in other words, the sign that the primal emotions and needs of men are again conquering the artificial restraints which war made possible upon man's modes of national or personal life.

* * * If other nations do follow that example, Britain will have to do what Britain should have done long ago. She will have to survey her own position and needs in the clear light of national self-interest.

The fund has been in operation since March 1, 1947. Failure and discredit are its record. Its inability to prevent free market operations in gold is complete—thanks to the spirit of liberty that still lives. While condemning the French political authority's action it condoned the establishment of multiple currencies or was unable to prevent this being done in Chile, so it is reported. Ernest Weinwurm, in the Commercial and Financial Chronicle, February 5, 1948, says:

There are persistent rumors in Washington that the American executive director of the Fund cast his vote with the majority against the French proposal while the State Department and the Treasury issued statements expressing satisfaction with the plans * * * the French were by no means the only ones that were shocked by these apparent inconsistencies of American policy. There are indications that they were led to believe that the United States would support their plans for free exchange markets and that this expectation was a contributing factor in their strong defense of those plans * * * certain foreign reports expressed the opinion that the Fund had suffered a heavy and perhaps fatal loss of prestige.

All of which is consonant with the nature of this scheme.

The reports which the fund publishes can tell us nothing about the favoritism, corruption, and pernicious international implications that must eventuate from its operations. Political conduct when exposed to the most enlightened publicity and effective checks has always been bad enough. But what must it be in managing secretively and autonomously an institution like the $18,000,000,000 International Monetary Fund-Bank? The answer may well be foreshadowed in the high, tax exempt salaries and perquisites which the officers of the Fund provided for themselves and employees.

As the International Monetary Fund's financial statement shows, and as everyone who understood this scheme knew when it was passed would be the case, it is being used to supply foreign countries with dollars, the same as all the other foreign-aid schemes. The fund's statement for the month of March 1948 shows that it has "loaned" the dollar equivalent of roundly $600,000,000, approximately 99 percent of which consisted of American dollars.

In order to prevent further injury to international relations and universal degradation of morals inherent in the operation of the International Monetary Fund, and to save the Nation as much as possible from the anathema this is bringing down upon it, I ask the Congress to support my bill for the immediate withdrawal of the United States from this international communitarian scheme.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 193. An act for the relief of Yasutaro Ikuta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 252. An act for the relief of the estate of Lee Jones Cardy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 253. An act for the relief of Ryohei Kubota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 283. An act for the relief of Mrs. Kazumi Noda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 314. An act for the relief of Robert E. Lauritzen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 825. An act for the relief of Ern Wright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 996. An act for the relief of Jin Watanabe (alias Shinichiro Nomura); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1256. An act for the relief of Andrew Mathewes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1332. An act for the relief of Giovanni Battista Angelotti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1365. An act for the relief of Lowe Way Yuen, and Dang Chee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1483. An act for the relief of Guy Cheng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1637. An act for the relief of Leo Hamermann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1656. An act for the relief of Anna Steibel Younger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1667. An act for the relief of Armand Pullai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1692. An act for the relief of Ludmila Buresova, alias Buresh; Kristina Buresova, alias Buresh; and Edward Buresh, alias Eduard Bures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1712. An act for the relief of Spiros Harry Kefalas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1729. An act for the relief of Gudrun Emme Ericsson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1745. An act for the relief of George Anthony Yaholkovsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1853. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to establish maintain, and operate aids to navigation; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 1874. An act authorizing the head of the department or agency using the public domain for national defense purposes to compensate holders of grazing permits and licenses for losses sustained by reason of such use of public lands for national defense purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 1886. An act for the relief of William M. Looney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2122. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2137. An act to provide for the protection of potato and tomato production from the golden nematode, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2225. An act to transfer administration of the Federal Credit Union Act to the Federal Security Agency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2240. An act to include certain lands within the Uinta and Wasatch National Forests, Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 2256. Relating to the meat-inspection service of the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2288. To amend the Lanham Act so as to permit the sale of certain permanent war housing thereunder to veterans at a purchase price not in excess of the cost of construction; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 2325. An act to enable certain former officers or employees of the United States separated from the service subsequent to January 23, 1942, to elect to forfeit their rights to civil-service retirement annuities and to obtain in lieu thereof returns of their contributions with interest; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2409. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 16, 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution providing for participation by the Government of the United States in the Pan-American Railway Congress, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. J. Res. 207. Joint resolution to provide for the commemoration of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the establishment of the Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 358. An act for the relief of Hilario A. Goitia;

H. R. 387. An act for the relief of Hayato Harris Ozawa;

H. R. 388. An act for the relief of Bert Harrington, Jr.;

H. R. 620. An act for the relief of Esther Ringel;

H. R. 421. An act for the relief of Betty Isabel Schunke;

H. R. 560. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Wilhemina Piper Enz;

H. R. 899. An act for the relief of Mrs. Keum Nyu Park;

H. R. 927. An act for the relief of the estate of Mary D. Briggs, deceased;

H. R. 990. An act for the relief of William B. Moore;

H. R. 1859. An act for the relief of Philip Lee Sjoerdt Huizenga;

H. R. 1912. An act for the relief of John A. Dilboy;

H. R. 1927. An act for the relief of Margaret Katherine Hume;

H. R. 2213. An act for the relief of A. J. Sprouffske;

H. R. 2250. An act for the relief of Mrs. Daisy A. T. Jaegers;

H. R. 2303. An act for the relief of Mitsu M. Kobayashi, who is the wife of Edward T. Kobayashi, a citizen of the United States;

H. R. 2425. An act for the relief of August Dane Tetuaero;

H. R. 2427. An act for the relief of Jose Cabral Lorenzo;

H. R. 2557. An act for the relief of Mable Gladys Viducich;

H. R. 2633. An act for the relief of Claude T. Thomas, legal guardian of Elizabeth Ann Mervine, a minor, and the estates of Mary L. Poole, deceased, and Hazel S. Thomas, deceased;

H. R. 2645. An act to provide that appointments of United States commissioners for the Isle Royale, Hawaii, Mammoth Cave, and Olympic National Parks shall be made by the United States district courts without the recommendation and approval of the Secretary of the Interior;

H. R. 3039. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marian D. McC. Plein;

H. R. 3263. An act for the relief of Tech. Sgt. Tsuyoshi Matsumoto;

H. R. 3300. An act for the relief of Martin A. King;

H. R. 3387. An act for the relief of Bruce Bros. Grain Co.;

H. R. 3484. An act to transfer the Remount Service from the Department of the Army to the Department of Agriculture;

H. R. 3569. An act to authorize the construction of a chapel and a library at the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y., and to authorize the acceptance of private contributions to assist in defraying the cost of construction thereof;

H. R. 3849. An act for the relief of Domingo Gandarias;

H. R. 3968. An act for the relief of Olive Irene Milloglav;

H. R. 4118. An act to confirm title in fee simple in Thomas Loflin to certain lands in Rankin County, Miss.;

H. R. 4403. An act for the relief of Ladislao Vaida, Elena Vaida, and Stefano Vaida;

H. R. 4572. An act to amend section 7 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, to provide for learners' permits, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4636. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929, as amended;

H. R. 4649. An act to provide that compensation of members of the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board of the District of Columbia shall be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended;

H. R. 4739. An act to amend paragraph 1629 of the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to provide for the free importation of exposed X-ray film;

H. R. 5328. An act to amend paragraph 1803 (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, relating to firewood and other woods; and

H. R. 5387. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Department of the Treasury who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions and whose claims for such losses have been considered and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury upon the recommendations of a Treasury claim board.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 13, 1948, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5214. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 15, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1464. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $4,245,000,000 for expenses of the European recovery program (H. Doc. No. 610); to the Committtee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1465. A letter from the Attorney General transmitting a request for withdrawal of the case of Louis Enrique Ybarra from those 1,479 cases involving suspension of deportation referred to in letter of November 15, 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1466. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 118 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1467. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 in the amount of $59,500 for the legislative branch, Government Printing Office (H. Doc. No. 611); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TABER: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 6226. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1729). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3785. A bill to authorize the State of Minnesota to condemn lands owned by the United States in the county of Cass, State of Minnesota, for fish propagation, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1730). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 5666. A bill to provide for the admission of Alaska, the forty-ninth State; with amendments (Rept. No. 1731). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 5839. A bill to authorize the conveyance to States, or political subdivisions, of roads leading to certain historical areas administered by the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1732). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLVERTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report re the investigation of export licensing procedures; without amendment (Rept. No. 1733). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 6039. A bill to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Army of one officer in the grade of general and to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Air Force of one officer in the grade of general, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1734). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURKE: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3578. A bill to reduce in area the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge in Essex County, Mass., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1735). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 4393. A bill to provide for the distribution, promotion, separation, and retirement of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1736). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 4804. A bill to allow service credit for certain enlisted men of the Coast Guard who acted as policemen and guards at the Ivigtut Cryolite Mine, Greenland, during 1940 and 1941; without amendment (Rept. 1737). Referred to the Commitee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 4817. A bill to amend the act of July 23, 1947 (61 Stat. 409) (Public Law No. 219 of the 80th Cong.); without amendment (Rept. No. 1738). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 4892. A bill to amend the act of July 23, 1947 (61 Stat. 409) (Public Law No. 219 of the 80th Cong.); with amendments (Rept. No. 1739). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1142. An act for the relief of Anna Pechnik; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1740). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judicity. H. R. 706. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Karl Frederick Kucker; without amendment (Rept. No. 1741). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TABER:

H. R. 6226. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 6227. A bill to provide for home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 6228. A bill to provide for the construction of shore protective works at the town of Nome, Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 6229. A bill to authorize the extension of leases of certain land in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

H. R. 6230. A bill to amend section 7 (a) of the act of May 29, 1930; to the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LEFEVRE:

H. R. 6231. A bill increasing the immigration quotas for Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACKINNON:

H. R. 6232. A bill to transfer certain Federal migratory waterfowl refuges to the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 6233. A bill to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 6234. A bill to authorize the establishment of internships in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GWINN of New York (by request):

H. R. 6235. A bill to incorporate the Army and Navy Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 6236. A bill to increase the capital stock of the Inland Waterways Corporation and to extend the service of such corporation to the Tennessee and Cumberland Rivers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. R. 6237. A bill to authorize the reimbursement of public agencies for the damage to their air-navigation aids and air markers caused by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 6238. A bill to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 6239. A bill to provide for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 6240. A bill to safeguard and consolidate certain areas of exceptional public value within the Superior National Forest, State of Minnesota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 6241. A bill to authorize completion of the land development and settlement of the Angostura project, notwithstanding a limitation of time; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 6242. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1949, the present suspension of import duties on scrap iron, scrap steel, and nonferrous metal scrap; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 6243. A bill amending the act approved December 2, 1942, which provides compensation for injury, death, or detention of employees of contractors with the United States and certain other persons or reimbursement therefor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H. R. 6244. A bill to confer upon the United States Tariff Commission the duty of determining the maximum and minimum limits within which foreign-trade agreements with foreign governments, or instrumentalities thereof, may be negotiated and proclaimed by the President without injury to domestic industry or domestic producers concerned; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 6245. A bill to authorize the temporary admission to the United States as agricultural workers of students in countries receiving assistance pursuant to the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 6246. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain Federal lands within the Chopawamsic Park to the Secretary of the Navy, the addition of lands surplus to the Department of the Army to this park, the acquisition of additional lands needed to round out the boundaries of this park, to change the name of said park to Prince William Forest Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 6247. A bill to provide for the air security and defense of the United States, to establish the composition of the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 6248. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 6249. A bill to broaden the cooperative extension system as established in the act of May 8, 1914, and acts supplemental thereto, by providing for cooperative extension work between colleges receiving the benefits of this act and the acts of July 2, 1862, and August 30, 1890, and other qualified colleges, universities, and research agencies, and the United States Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 6250. A bill to make the Smaller War Plants Corporation a peacetime agency of the Government with power to make loans to small business concerns and to insure loans made to such concerns by banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SMITH of Ohio:

H. J. Res. 373. Joint resolution to provide for withdrawal by the United States from the International Monetary Fund; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACKINNON:

H. Res. 530. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to investigate and study Federal-State relationships with respect to wildlife conservation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MACY:

H. Res. 532. Resolution providing for further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 403; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ISACSON:

H. Res. 533. Resolution to recognize an independent Jewish state in Palestine and guarantee its security against attack; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 535. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 5680; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 536. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 5820; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 537. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 5588; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 6251. A bill for the relief of Hans Kraney and Claire Felton Kraney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 6252. A bill to authorize the issuance of a land patent to certain public lands, situated in the county of Kauai, T. H., for school purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 6253. A bill for the relief of James A. Stapleton, Ruth Burk, Mildred Ovren, copartners doing business under the name and style of Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 6254. A bill for the relief of W. Jefferson Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

H. R. 6255. A bill for the relief of Ali Ipar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUNDSTROM (by request):

H. R. 6256. A bill for the relief of Michael Sisto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6257. A bill for the relief of Laszlo Viranyi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1772. By Mr. BURKE: Petition of William Kirchhoff and 53 others, urging legislation to make possible a reduction of postage for relief packages mailed to worthy and needy peoples of European countries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1773. By Mr. EATON: Resolution of Veterans' Alliance of Somerset County, Somerville, N. J., petitioning Congress to enact into law the European relief program and a peacetime draft; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1774. By Mr. FORAND: Petition of Chor Symfonja of Rhode Island, Central Falls, R. I., urging speedy enactment of a law permitting a substantial number of displaced persons to come to the United States as immigrants, in the belief that 1 year's delay will be most detrimental to the displaced persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1775. By Mr. HUBER: Memorial of Akron City Council, Akron, Ohio, memorializing the Congress of the United States to take the necessary and appropriate steps for the adequate maintenance of our national defenses, especially with regard to combat planes, in order to preserve our country from danger; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1776. By the SPEAKER: Petition of American Legion, Cape Girardeau, Mo., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expression of their profound sorrow at the death of Representative Zimmerman; to the Committee on House Administration.

1777. Also, petition of Charles M. Bond and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition to universal military training and peacetime draft; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1778. Also, petition of F. G. Winkelmiller and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the defeat of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1779. Also, petition of the Sixth Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to amendments to the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1780. Also, petition of the Sixth Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to granting the Virgin Islands $2,000,000 for the construction of two modern hotels; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1781. Also, petition of Sulejman Male and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to admission into the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1782. Also, petition of the clerk, Borough of Roselle, N. J., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to endorsement of H. R. 6012; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 15, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, March 29, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

If these moments, O Christ, can be spent in honest heart-to-heart communion with Thee, and Thou wilt give us Thy Spirit, then will our whole day be changed for us, and we shall be changed for the day. Our moods will become right, and we shall be sensitized. Use these moments, O Lord, to make every thought and feeling what they ought to be, that we may be able to do things for Thy sake that we would not have done for our own or the sake of anyone else. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 14, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

QUARTERLY REPORT ON ACTIVITIES AND TRANSACTIONS OF MARITIME COMMISSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the quarterly report on the activities and transactions of that Commission under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 for the period January 1, 1948, through March 31, 1948, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTE.

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 5275. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of limestone to be used in the manufacture of fertilizer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1129); and

H. R. 5448. A bill to amend sections 212 (b) and 231 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1128).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 2502. A bill to remove officers and employees of the field service of the Post Office Department from the personnel restrictions of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended;

S. 2503. A bill to authorize the establishment of 10 positions in the professional and scientific service in the Department of Commerce with rates of compensation not in excess of $15,000 per annum; and

S. 2504. A bill for the relief of Horace J. Fenton, former associate professor at the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2505. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1947, to clarify the position of the Secretary of the Air Force with respect to such act, and to authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish six additional positions in the professional and scientific service, and for other purposes; and

S. 2506. A bill to credit to active and retired officers of the Medical Department of the Army all service performed as interns in Army hospitals on a civilian-employee status; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 2507. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Nebraska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mrs. Florence Benolken; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2508. A bill to increase the annual salary of the Coordinator of Federal Agencies in Puerto Rico from $7,500 to $10,000; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 2509. A bill relating to the disability pensions payable to veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. J. Res. 209. Joint resolution to provide for the continuing existence and the welfare of the Three Affiliated Tribes of Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

STUDY OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a resolution providing that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be given a supplemental appropriation of $3,000 to finance a visit to the border by the Subcommittee on Foot-and-Mouth Disease, to determine the status of that disease and what control measures are being exercised.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 223) was received and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to make a full and complete investigation of all problems related to foot-and-mouth disease and its incidence in neighboring countries.

SEC. 2. The committee shall make a report of its findings to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but in no event later than ————, together with such recommendations for legislation as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress, to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and to travel, and authorize its assistants to travel, in such places as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $3,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

NATIONAL HOUSING—AMENDMENT

Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. RUSSELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 866) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective and to provide for the coordinated execution of such policy through a National Housing Commission, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PRINTING OF SPECIAL STUDY OF ECONOMIC ASPECT OF MINIMUM WAGE (S. DOC. NO. 146)

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, in connection with the hearings which are to start Monday in the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare regarding a revision of the Wages and Hours Act, I asked Dr. Gustav Peck, senior specialist on labor in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, to make a special study of the economic aspect of the minimum wage. I have his report, which I think is very valuable in connection with the consideration of this subject, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OPEN SEASON ON TRUMAN—ARTICLE BY PETER EDSON

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Open Season on Truman," by Peter Edson, published in the Washington Daily News of March 30, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEETING OF COMMITTEE DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave for a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

to meet during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

PROPOSED INCORPORATION OF CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, in connection with the debate on the floor of the Senate and the testimony involving the chartering of the Catholic War Veterans, I received a letter on April 9 from Mr. Eugene F. Taggart, national liaison officer of that organization. The letter is addressed to me, and reads:

CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., April 9, 1948.

Hon. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This letter will perhaps strike you as being strange. However, as the national liaison officer of the Catholic War Veterans, it was my duty to pursue the legislation for the chartering of our organization. I was present in the gallery during the debate, I have read it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I admire your able opposition.

You have given us a new trend of thought, Senator, that we never considered before and I should like to say that I shall always be proud that the highest legislative body in the world should have given us the benefit of 5 hours of debate. It gives me an abounding faith in democracy that an organization such as ours should be so considered by the finest legislative body on the face of the earth.

I shall always admire you and never fear my country's future when such men serve as guides to our legislative processes.

Hoping you will have many more years in the good service of our country.

Believe me to be,

Yours sincerely,

EUGENE F. TAGGART,
National Liaison Officer.

Mr. President, without reference to what may be the unjustified compliments made by the writer of the letter with reference to me, I should like to say that I think this is one of the most generous letters I have ever received since I have held public office. I admire the breadth of vision of a man who could say what Mr. Taggart states in his letter, even though I was on the other side of the legislation from him. I appreciate the letter.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senate that I also received a letter from Mr. Taggart complimenting the Senate on its action, and indicating the sound, tolerant state of mind of the writer of the letter that has been referred to by the Senator from Iowa.

NATIONAL HOUSING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 866) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective and to provide for the coordinated execution of such policy through a National Housing Commission, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] to the original text of the bill, striking out all after line 4 on page 3, down to and including line 2 on page 9, being title II.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hatch	O'Daniel
Ball	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hayden	Overton
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bricker	Hill	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Hoey	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Holland	Russell
Buck	Ives	Saltonstall
Bushfield	Jenner	Smith
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Stennis
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Capehart	Kem	Taft
Capper	Kilgore	Taylor
Chavez	Knowland	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	Lodge	Thye
Donnell	Lucas	Tydings
Downey	McCarran	Vandenberg
Dworshak	McCarthy	Watkins
Eastland	McKellar	White
Ecton	McMahon	Wiley
Ellender	Malone	Williams
Ferguson	Martin	Wilson
Flanders	Millikin	Young
Fulbright	Moore	
George	Morse	

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is absent on official state business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and myself, I send to the desk an amendment to the committee amendments to Senate bill 866, and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be printed and will lie on the table.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I submit this amendment at the specific request of the Governor of Massachusetts, who has telegraphed me as follows:

BOSTON, MASS., *April 14, 1948.*

Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.,
Senate Office Building:

Request your cooperation in amending the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill to assure that financial assistance under that bill will be available to projects under the Massachusetts veterans' housing law recently enacted as chapter 200 of the acts of 1948.

ROBERT F. BRADFORD,
Governor of Massachusetts.

Mr. President, on page 4391 of the RECORD for yesterday, April 14, there appears a detailed description of the Sears housing law which was enacted into law in Massachusetts on April 6, 1948. The amendment which I now offer is designed to permit the conversion of Sears housing law projects to Federal status under the pending Federal housing legislation now before the Senate. It is based on a draft suggested by the housing authorities in Massachusetts, but has been redrafted by the Office of the Legislative Counsel here at the Capitol in cooperation with the general counsel of the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Sears housing law, chapter 200, acts of 1948, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to which this amendment refers, be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAPTER 200, ACTS OF 1948, THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

An act to provide financial assistance by the Commonwealth to housing authorities in order to alleviate the housing shortage for veterans

Whereas, an acute shortage of housing exists in many of the cities and towns of the Commonwealth, and on account of such shortage many veterans are unable to obtain shelter for themselves and their families, and this shortage is likely to continue for a substantial period of time; and inability to obtain adequate shelter will cause suffering and disease among such veterans unless such shortage is relieved, and this condition has created a public exigency making the provision, as provided by this act, of financial assistance by the Commonwealth to housing authorities, in order to alleviate such shortage an immediate public necessity; therefore this act is declared to be an emergency law, necessary for the immediate preservation of the public health and convenience.

Be it enacted by the senate and house of representatives in general court assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 26I of chapter 121 of the General Laws, inserted by section 1 of chapter 574 of the acts of 1946, is hereby amended by striking out, in line 2, the word "thirty-one" and inserting in place thereof the word: "thirty-four," so as to read as follows: "Section 26I. Designation as Housing Authority Law." This section and the 34 following sections shall be known and may be cited as the housing authority law.

SEC. 2. Section 26J of said chapter 121, as so inserted, is hereby amended by striking out the paragraph defining "Veterans" and inserting in place thereof the following: "Veteran, a man or woman who served for at least 90 consecutive days during time of war or insurrection in the armed forces of the United

States of America and has been separated therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable. The term shall also include the widow, mother or other dependent of a person who so served and who died while in such service and the wife, mother or other dependent of a person who is so serving."

SEC. 3. Said chapter 121 is hereby further amended by striking out section 26NN, and its caption, "Part V. Effect of partial invalidity", as so inserted, and inserting in place thereof the following four sections under the caption "Part V. State-aided projects":

"SEC. 26NN. Contracts for State financial assistance: The Commonwealth, acting by and through the board, may enter into a contract or contracts with a housing authority for State financial assistance in the form of a guaranty by the Commonwealth of notes and/or bonds of the housing authority issued to finance the cost of a housing project or projects, and annual contributions by the Commonwealth. Each such contract shall contain such limitations as to the development cost of the project and administrative and maintenance costs, and such other provisions as the board may require. Each project shall be based upon a separate application made to the board and shall be planned to conform, as nearly as possible, to the existing published requirements of the Federal Government for low-rent or other housing projects, except such requirements as are based upon the cost limitations set forth in Federal legislation. A project so planned shall be deemed to provide adequate performance as set forth in section 3J of chapter 143. A housing authority may, with the approval of the board, acquire under the provisions of section 26P for the purposes of a project under this section or section 26OO, any land acquired by a city or town under the provisions of chapter 372 of the Acts of 1946, as amended: *Provided,* That such city or town has not completed construction of a housing project on such land. Each project developed under this section and section 26OO shall be administered for occupancy in accordance with section 26FF, except clause (c), and except that each such project shall be occupied exclusively by veterans and their families and priority shall be given first to veterans of World War II of low income, then to veterans of low income, such low income to be determined from time to time by the board.

"If Federal assistance for low-rent housing becomes available in any form not applicable to projects under this chapter, the board shall immediately report the circumstances to the general court together with such recommendations for legislation as may be necessary to enable such projects to qualify for such assistance. Upon the availability of Federal financial assistance for low-rent housing projects under this section, each housing authority having a contract for State financial assistance shall, upon receipt of written notice from the board, immediately enter into negotiations with the Federal Government to arrange for Federal financial assistance with respect to any project developed hereunder and for the termination, in whole or in part, of State financial assistance. For any such project the board may order any housing authority (1) to apply for Federal financial assistance, and (2) upon obtaining the approval of the Federal Government, to enter into a contract or contracts for Federal financial assistance, and to make such arrangements as are possible to terminate, reduce, or subordinate the obligation of the Commonwealth to render financial assistance in such amount as is provided by Federal financial assistance. No order of the board shall in any way affect any outstanding obligations of a housing authority or the rights of any holders of notes or bonds. The amount of Federal payments shall be used to the fullest allowable extent to meet the payment of principal and interest on all notes or bonds guaranteed by the Commonwealth.

"After March 31, 1953, or such later date as the board shall determine that an acute shortage of housing for veterans constituting a public exigency, emergency, or distress no longer exists, any project constructed under this section and receiving State financial assistance may, with the approval of the board, be sold for the amount of the fair market value thereof as determined by the board, but not less than the total of the outstanding obligations of the housing authority with respect to such project. Upon the expiration of the period for which the Commonwealth is obligated to furnish State financial assistance, and provided the Federal Government has not become obligated to furnish Federal financial assistance, any such project shall be offered for sale and disposed of as soon as is consistent with sound business judgment: *Provided,* That any such sale shall be approved by the board. The housing authority bonds sinking fund is hereby established and the State treasurer is hereby designated custodian thereof and he shall administer such fund in accordance with the provisions of chapter 29. So long as any notes and/or bonds issued by a housing authority to finance the cost of a project under this section or section 26OO and guaranteed by the Commonwealth are outstanding, the proceeds of any sale of such project shall be paid by the housing authority into such fund and shall be expended from time to time by the State treasurer to pay interest and principal of any notes and/or bonds issued by such housing authority to finance such project. The proceeds of any sale of such project in excess of the total of all obligations of the housing authority with respect to such project shall, after the payment of all notes and/or bonds issued by the housing authority to finance the cost of such project, be paid to the city or town in which such project is located and to the Commonwealth. The respective payments to such city or town and the Commonwealth shall be proportional to the contributions theretofore made by such city or town and the Commonwealth toward the development and maintenance of such project, as determined by the board. In determining the contributions of a city or town, the board shall include the amounts which the city or town would have received if such project had not been exempt from taxes, betterments, and special assessments, less any amounts paid by the housing authority to the city or town in lieu of such taxes, betterments, and special assessments. Payment to the Commonwealth hereunder shall be added to the Veterans' Services Fund, established by chapter 608 of the acts of 1946.

"The provisions of sections 26I to 26II, both inclusive, except section 26GG, shall, as far as apt, be applicable to projects developed under this section and under section 26OO and to housing authorities while engaged in developing and administering such projects; provided, that whenever the phrases 'Federal Government' or 'Federal legislation' are used in said sections 26I to 26II, both inclusive, they shall also mean the commonwealth or the laws of the commonwealth, as the case may be; and that whenever the words 'low-rent housing project' or 'project' are used in said sections 26I to 26II, they shall also mean a State-aided project under this section and section 26OO. Within the period of 90 days from the effective date of this section, no housing authority of a city or town shall be entitled to financial assistance in an amount which is greater than an amount which bears the same ratio to the total State financial assistance hereby authorized as the total assessed valuation of such city or town bears to the total assessed valuation of all the cities and towns of the commonwealth. The board shall accept no application for State financial assistance under this section or section 26OO after 2 years following the effective date of this section.

"The following provisions shall be applicable to each contract for State financial assistance under this section and section 26OO:

"(a) A housing authority may sell temporary notes and/or bonds to finance a project; provided, that the total amount outstanding at any one time shall not be in excess of the cost of the project as approved by the board. Any such notes or bonds may be refunded through the sale of similar notes or bonds, but in no event for a term more than 25 years after completion of the project, as determined by the board.

"Notwithstanding the provisions of section 26W, the payment of the principal of and interest on all such notes and/or bonds shall be guaranteed by the Commonwealth, and the full faith and credit of the Commonwealth is hereby pledged for any such guaranty: *Provided,* That the total amount of notes and/or bonds so guaranteed shall not exceed $200,000,000 in the aggregate for all projects constructed under this section and section 26OO, exclusive of any such notes and/or bonds which may be issued for refunding purposes.

"No housing authority shall sell or offer for sale any such notes or bonds without receiving from the board approval of the amount, the term, the time of sale, the amortization schedule, and any other conditions of sale which the board may deem relevant in connection with the sale of such notes or bonds. The average annual rate of the amortization of bonds issued to finance a project shall be not less than 3 percent of the principal amount of such bonds.

"(b) Each contract for State financial assistance or supplementary State financial assistance shall provide that the Commonwealth will pay to the Housing Authority annual contributions: *Provided, however,* That the total amount of annual contributions contracted for by the Commonwealth for any one year shall not exceed $5,000,000.

"Each such contract shall contain a provision that the annual contributions shall be used for the payment of interest on, and principal of, notes and/or bonds of the housing authority. The annual contributions for any one project shall be payable in an amount not exceeding 2½ percent of the cost of the project, as determined by the board, and for the fixed period during which the bonds issued to finance the cost of the project or any refunding bonds remain outstanding, but in no event for more than 25 years after the completion of the project, as determined by the board. Each such contract shall provide that whenever in any year the receipts of a housing authority in connection with a project exceed its expenditures for that project, including debt service, payments in lieu of taxes, administration, establishment of reserves, and other costs, as determined by the board, an amount equal to such excess, or, in the case or projects under section 26OO, an amount equal to such portion of the excess as the board shall prescribe, shall be applied, or set aside for application, to purposes which shall effect a reduction in the amount of subsequent annual contributions. The full faith and credit of the commonwealth is hereby pledged to the payment of all annual contributions contracted for by the commonwealth. The veterans' service fund, established by chapter 608 of the acts of 1946, shall be used in the first instance, subject to appropriation, to meet the payments of the annual contributions by the commonwealth to housing authorities pursuant to contracts for State financial assistance under this section and section 26OO for such period or periods.

"(c) The board may enforce any of its orders, rules, or regulations or the provisions of any contract between the Commonwealth and a housing authority by a bill in equity filed in the superior court or by a petition for a writ of mandamus filed under the provisions of section 5 of chapter 249. In the event of a breach by a housing authority of any provisions of a contract between it and the Commonwealth relating to a project, the Commonwealth, acting by the board, may take immediate possession of the project, and retain possession and operate the project in the place and stead of the housing authority, with all the rights and powers of the housing authority, and subject to all of its obligations respecting the possession and operation of the project and the revenues therefrom, until such time as such breach shall have been corrected to the satisfaction of the board.

"SEC. 26OO. Contracts for supplementary State financial assistance: The Commonwealth, acting by and through the board, may enter into a contract or contracts with a housing authority for supplementary State financial assistance in the form of a guaranty by the Commonwealth of any loan made by the housing authority to finance that portion of the cost of a housing project or projects not financed with Federal assistance, and annual contributions by the Commonwealth on that portion of the cost of such project or projects for which no Federal contributions are available.

"SEC. 26PP. Relationship with Federal Government and others.—The Commonwealth shall have power to receive loans and grants from the Federal Government or any agency or instrumentality thereof, or from any other source, public or private, and to use any such loan or grant or part thereof for any purpose of the housing authority law, or to act as agent of, or to cooperate in any way with, the Federal Government or any agency or instrumentality thereof on any project authorized by the housing authority law.

"PART VI. EFFECT OF PARTIAL INVALIDITY

"SEC. 26QQ. Separability of provisions.—The provisions of sections 26I to 26PP, inclusive, are hereby declared to be severable and if any such provision, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances, shall be held to be invalid or unconstitutional, such invalidity or unconstitutionality shall not be construed to affect the validity or constitutionality of any of the remaining provisions of said sections or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid. It is hereby declared to be the legislative intent that said sections would have been adopted had such invalid or unconstitutional provision not been included therein."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] has offered an amendment to the original bill striking out title II. I inquire if that is the amendment before the Senate.

Mr. MCCARTHY. My amendment lettered "C" is before the Senate. It would strike out everything beginning with line 5 on page 3 through line 2 on page 9.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. It would strike out all of title II of the original bill.

Mr. MCCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, that amendment is entirely satisfactory, because the reorganization plan adopted last year set up a new organization which I supported, and which is satisfactory to the committee. So I am quite willing to accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] on page 3, beginning with line 5, to strike out through line 2 on page 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I now ask unanimous consent to call up my amendment lettered "D," which is essentially of the same nature; and without commenting on it, I should like to know how the Senator from Ohio feels about it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have no objection to that amendment. It also strikes out certain language.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, beginning with line 3, it is proposed to strike out through line 3 on page 16.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I now offer an amendment to strike out the remainder of the bill from page 16, and insert the committee amendment beginning at page 3 of the so-called Flanders amendment. My amendment would strike out that portion of the bill beginning on page 16, after line 3, down to the end of the bill, and insert the committee amendment beginning at the top of page 3.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be noted in the RECORD. It is pending. It is probably unnecessary to read the amendment.

The amendment was to strike out that portion of the bill beginning on page 16, after line 3, down to the end of the bill, and to insert the committee amendment beginning at the top of page 3, as follows:

TITLE I—FHA TITLE VI AND TRANSITIONAL PERIOD AMENDMENTS

SEC. 101. The National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

TITLE VI AMENDMENTS

(a) Section 603 (a) is amended—

(1) by striking out "$5,350,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$5,950,000,000 except that with the approval of the President such aggregate amount may be increased to not to exceed $6,950,000,000";

(2) by striking out "April 30, 1948" in each place where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "March 31, 1949";

(3) by striking out the period and adding a comma and the following: "and that, of the total authorization provided in this subsection, not less than $800,000,000 shall be made available for the insurance of mortgages on rental properties under section 608, and not less than $200,000,000 shall be made available for the insurance of mortgages on multifamily dwellings under section 603, on which commitments for insurance are issued subsequent to March 31, 1948".

(b) Section 603 (b) (5) is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That the Administrator with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may prescribe by regulation a higher maximum rate of interest, not exceeding 4½ percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time, if he finds that the mortgage market demands it."

(c) Section 608 (b) (3) (B) is amended by striking out the semicolon and the word "and" at the end of the first proviso and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*And provided further*, That the principal obligation of the mortgage shall not, in any event, exceed 90 percent of the Administrator's estimate of the replacement cost of the property or project on the basis of the costs prevailing on December 31, 1947, for properties or projects of comparable quality in the locality where such property or project is to be located; and".

(d) (1) Section 608 (b) (3) (C) is amended by striking out "$1,500 per room" and inserting in lieu thereof "$8,100 per family unit";

(2) Section 608 (b) (3) (C) is amended by striking out the colon and the proviso and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

(e) Section 609 is amended—

(a) By striking out all of paragraph (1) of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) The manufacturer shall establish that binding purchase contracts have been executed satisfactory to the Administrator providing for the purchase and delivery of the houses to be manufactured, which contracts shall provide for the payment of the purchase price at such time as may be agreed to by the parties thereto, but, in no event, shall the purchase price be payable on a date in excess of 30 days after the date of delivery of such houses, unless not less than 20 percent of such purchase price is paid on or before the date of delivery and the lender has accepted and discounted, or has agreed to accept and discount, pursuant to subsection (i) of this section a promissory note or notes, executed by the purchaser, representing the unpaid portion of such purchase price, in which event such unpaid portion of the purchase price may be payable on a date not in excess of 180 days from the date of delivery of such houses."

(b) By striking out the first and second sentences of paragraph (4) of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"The loan shall involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed 90 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the necessary current cost, exclusive of profit, of manufacturing the houses, which are the subject of such purchase contracts assigned to secure the loan, less any sums paid by the purchaser under said purchase contracts prior to the assignment thereof. The loan shall be secured by an assignment of the aforesaid purchase contracts and of all sums payable thereunder on or after the date of such assignment, with the right in the assignee to proceed against such security in case of default as provided in the assignment, which assignment shall be in such form and contain such terms and conditions, as may be prescribed by the Administrator; and the Administrator may require such other agreements and undertakings to further secure the loan as he may determine, including the right, in case of default or at any time necessary to protect the lender, to compel delivery to the lender of any houses then owned and in the possession of the borrower."

(c) By adding at the end of subsection (f) the following new sentence: "The provisions of section 603 (d) shall also be applicable to loans insured under this section and the reference in said section 603 (d) to a mortgage shall be construed to include a loan or loans with respect to which a contract of insurance is issued pursuant to this section."

(d) By adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) (1) In addition to the insurance of the principal loan to finance the manufacture of housing, as provided in this section, and in order to provide short-term financing in the sale of houses to be delivered pursuant to the purchase contract or contracts assigned as security for such principal loan, the Administrator is authorized, under such terms and conditions and subject to such limitations as he may prescribe, to insure the

lender against any losses it may sustain resulting from the acceptance and discount of a promissory note or notes executed by a purchaser of any such houses representing an unpaid portion of the purchase price of any such houses. No such promissory note or notes accepted and discounted by the lender pursuant to this subsection shall involve a principal obligation in excess of 80 percent of the purchase price of the manufactured house or houses; have a maturity in excess of 180 days from the date of the note or bear interest in excess of 4 percent per annum; nor may the principal amount of such promissory notes, with respect to any individual principal loan, outstanding and unpaid at any one time, exceed in the aggregate an amount prescribed by the Administrator.

"(2) The Administrator is authorized to include in any contract of insurance executed by him with respect to the insurance of a loan to finance the manufacture of houses, provisions to effectuate the insurance against any such losses under this subsection.

"(3) The failure of the purchaser to make any payment due under or provided to be paid by the terms of any note or notes executed by the purchaser and accepted and discounted by the lender under the provisions of this subsection, shall be considered as a default under this subsection, and if such default continues for a period of 30 days, the lender shall be entitled to receive the benefits of the insurance, as provided in subsection (d) of this section except that debentures issued pursuant to this subsection shall have a face value equal to the unpaid principal balance of the loan plus interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum from the date of default to the date the application is filed for the insurance benefits.

"(4) Debentures issued with respect to the insurance granted under this subsection shall be issued in accordance with the provisions of section 604 (d) except that such debentures shall be dated as of the date application is filed for the insurance benefits and shall bear interest from such date.

"(5) The Administrator is authorized to fix a premium charge for the insurance granted under this subsection, in addition to the premium charge authorized under subsection (h) of this section. Such premium charge shall not exceed an amount equivalent to 1 percent of the original principal of such promissory note or notes and shall be paid at such time and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Administrator."

(f) Section 610 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"The Administrator is further authorized to insure or to make commitments to insure in accordance with the provisions of this section any mortgage executed in connection with the sale by the Government, or any agency or official thereof, of any of the so-called Greenbelt towns, or parts thereof, including projects, or parts thereof, known as Greenhills, Ohio; Greenbelt, Md.; and Greendale, Wis., developed under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, and any mortgage executed in connection with the first resale, within 2 years from the date of its acquisition from the Government, of any portion of a project or property which is the security for a mortgage insured pursuant to the provisions of this section."

(g) Title VI is amended by adding after section 610 the following new section:

"SEC. 611. (a) In addition to mortgages insured under other sections of this title, and in order to assist and encourage the application of cost-reduction techniques through large-scale modernized site construction of housing and the erection of houses produced by modern industrial processes, the Administrator is authorized to insure mortgages (including advances on such mortgages during construction) which are eligible for insurance as hereinafter provided.

"(b) To be eligible for insurance under this section, a mortgage shall—

"(1) have been made to and be held by a mortgagee approved by the Administrator as responsible and able to service the mortgage properly;

"(2) cover property, held by a mortgagor approved by the Administrator, upon which there is to be constructed or erected dwelling units for not less than 25 families consisting of a group of single-family or two-family dwellings approved by the Administrator for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction: *Provided*, That during the course of construction there may be located upon the mortgaged property a plant for the fabrication or storage of such dwellings or sections or parts thereof, and the Administrator may consent to the removal or release of such plant from the lien of the mortgage upon such terms and conditions as he may approve;

"(3) involve a principal obligation in an amount—

"(A) not to exceed 90 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the completed property or project, exclusive of any plant of the character described in paragraph (2) of this subsection located thereon, and

"(B) not to exceed a sum computed on the individual dwellings comprising the total project as follows:

"(i) $8,100, or 90 percent of the valuation, whichever is less, with respect to each single-family dwelling, and

"(ii) $12,500, or 90 percent of the valuation, whichever is less, with respect to each two-family dwelling.

"With respect to the insurance of advances during construction, the Administrator is authorized to approve advances by the mortgagee to cover the cost of materials delivered upon the mortgaged property and labor performed in the fabrication or erection thereof;

"(4) provide for complete amortization by periodic payments within such term as the Administrator shall prescribe and shall bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance) at not to exceed 4 percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time: *Provided*, That the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may prescribe by regulation a higher maximum rate of interest, not exceeding 4½ percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time, if he finds that the mortgage market demands it. The Administrator may consent to the release of a part or parts of the mortgaged property from the lien of the mortgage upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe and the mortgage may provide for such release.

"(c) Preference or priority of opportunity in the occupancy of the mortgaged property for veterans of World War II and their immediate families and for hardship cases as defined by the Administrator shall be provided under such regulations and procedures as may be prescribed by the Administrator.

"(d) The provisions of subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) of section 608 shall be applicable to mortgages insured under this section."

TITLE II AMENDMENTS

(h) Section 203 (b) (2) (B) is amended by striking out "$5,400" and inserting in lieu thereof "$6,300."

(i) Section 203 (b) (2) (C) is amended—

(1) by striking out "$8,600" and inserting in lieu thereof "$9,500";

(2) by striking out "$6,000" in each place where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$7,000";

(3) by striking out "$10,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$11,000."

(j) Section 203 (b) is amended by striking out in paragraph numbered (3) the following: "of the character described in paragraph (2) (B) of this subsection" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "on property approved for insurance prior to the beginning of construction."

(k) Section 203 (b) is amended as follows:

(1) By striking out the period at the end of paragraph (2) (C), inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the word "or" and adding the following new paragraph:

"(D) not to exceed $6,000 and not to exceed 90 percent of the appraised value, as of the date the mortgage is accepted for insurance (or 95 percent if, in the determination of the Administrator, insurance of mortgages involving a principal obligation in such amount under this paragraph would not reasonably be expected to contribute to substantial increases in costs and prices of housing facilities for families of moderate income), of a property, urban, suburban, or rural, upon which there is located a dwelling designed principally for a single-family residence the construction of which is begun after March 31, 1949, and which is approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction: *Provided*, That the Administrator may by regulation provide that the principal obligation of any mortgage eligible for insurance under this paragraph shall be fixed at a lesser amount than $6,000 when he finds that for any section of the country or at any time a lower-cost dwelling for families of lower income is feasible without sacrifice of sound standards of construction, design, and livability: *And provided further*, That with respect to mortgages insured under this paragraph the mortgagor shall be the owner and occupant of the property at the time of the insurance and shall have paid on account of the property at least 10 percent (or 5 percent in the case of a 95-percent mortgage insured pursuant to this paragraph (D)) of the appraised value in cash or its equivalent, or shall be the builder constructing the dwelling, in which case the principal obligation shall not exceed 85 percent of the appraised value of the property."

(2) By striking out the period at the end of paragraph No. (3), and adding a comma and the following: "or not to exceed 30 years in the case of a mortgage insured under paragraph (2) (D) of this subsection."

(3) By striking out the period at the end of paragraph No. (5), and adding a comma and the following: "or not to exceed 4 percent per annum in the case of a mortgage insured under paragraph (2) (D) of this subsection."

(l) (1) Section 203 (c) is amended (1) by striking out in the last sentence the words "section or section 210" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "title"; and (2) by striking out in said sentence (i) the words "under this section," and (ii) the following: "and a mortgage on the same property is accepted for insurance at the time of such payment,".

(2) Section 603 (c) is amended by striking out in the next to the last sentence the following: "and a mortgage on the same property is accepted for insurance at the time of such payment,".

(m) Section 204 (a) is amended—

(1) by striking out, in the last sentence, the following: "prior to July 1, 1944,";

(2) by inserting between the first and second provisos in the last sentence the following: "*And provided further*, That with respect to mortgages which are accepted for insurance under section 203 (b) (2) (D) or under the second proviso of section 207 (c) (2) of this act, there may be included in the debentures issued by the Administrator on account of the cost of foreclosure (or of acquiring the property by other means) actually paid by the mortgagee and approved by the Administrator an amount, not in excess of two-thirds of such cost or $75, whichever is the greater:".

(n) (1) Section 207 (b) is amended by amending paragraph No. (1) to read as follows:

"(1) Federal or State instrumentalities, municipal corporate instrumentalities of one or more States, or limited dividend or redevelopment or housing corporations restricted by Federal or State laws or regulations of State banking or insurance departments as to rents, charges, capital structure, rate of return, or methods of operation; or."

(2) Section 207 (c) is amended by amending the first sentence to read as follows:

"(c) To be eligible for insurance under this section a mortgage on any property or project shall involve a principal obligation in an amount—

"(1) not to exceed $5,000,000, or, if executed by a mortgagor coming within the provisions of paragraph No. (b) (1) of this section, not to exceed $50,000,000;

"(2) not to exceed 80 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the property or project when the proposed improvements are completed, including the land; the proposed physical improvement; utilities within the boundaries of the property or project; architects' fees; taxes and interest accruing during construction; and other miscellaneous charges incident to construction and approved by the Administrator: *Provided*, That, except with respect to a mortgage executed by a mortgagor coming within the provisions of paragraph No. (b) (1) of this section, such mortgage shall not exceed the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the cost of the completed physical improvements on the property or project, exclusive of public utilities and streets and organization and legal expenses; and

"(3) not to exceed $8,100 per family unit for such part of such property or project as may be attributable to dwelling use."

(o) (1) Section 207 (h) is amended by striking out, in paragraph No. (1), the words "paid to the mortgagor of such property," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "retained by the Administrator and credited to the Housing Insurance Fund."

(2) Section 204 (f) is amended by inserting in clause No. (1), immediately preceding the semicolon, the following: "if the mortgage was insured under section 203 and shall be retained by the Administrator and credited to the Housing Insurance Fund if the mortgage was insured under section 207."

TITLE I AMENDMENTS

(p) Section 2 is amended:

(1) by striking out "$165,000,000" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "$175,000,000";

(2) by striking out "$3,000" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "$4,000";

(3) by striking out the first proviso in the first sentence of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided*, That insurance may be granted to any such financial institution with respect to any obligation not in excess of $10,000 and having a maturity not in excess of 7 years and 32 days representing any such loan, advance of credit, or purchase made by it if such loan, advance of credit, or purchase is made for the purpose of financing the alteration, repair, improvement, or conversion of an existing structure used or to be used as a hotel, apartment house, dwelling for two or more families, hospital, orphanage, college, or school:".

(4) by striking out the last sentence of subsection (b).

SEC. 102. In order to aid housing production, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to make loans to and purchase the obligations of any business enterprise for the purpose of providing financial assistance for the production of prefabricated houses or prefabricated housing components, or for large-scale modernized site construction. Such loans or purchases shall be made under such terms and conditions and with such maturities as the Corporation may determine: *Provided*, That to the extent that the proceeds of such loans or purchases are used for the purchase of equipment, plant, or machinery the principal obligation shall not exceed 75 percent of the purchase price of such equipment, plant, or machinery: *And provided further*, That the total amount of commitments for loans made and obligations purchased under this section shall not exceed 850,000,000 outstanding at any one time, and no financial assistance shall be extended under this section unless it is not otherwise available on reasonable terms.

SEC. 103. The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting immediately after section 510 thereof the following new section:

"INCONTESTABILITY

"SEC. 511. Any evidence of guaranty or insurance issued by the Administrator shall be conclusive evidence of the eligibility of the loan for guaranty or insurance under the provisions of this title and of the amount of such guaranty or insurance, except that nothing in this section shall preclude the Administrator from establishing, as against the original lender, defenses based on fraud or material misrepresentation, and except that the Administrator shall not, by reason of anything contained in this section, be barred from establishing, by regulations in force at the date of such issuance or disbursement, whichever is the earlier, partial defenses to the amount payable on the guaranty or insurance."

TITLE II—SECONDARY MARKET FOR GI HOME LOANS AND FHA INSURED MORTGAGES

PURPOSE

SEC. 201. It is the purpose of this title to provide, with appropriate safeguards against inflationary increases in housing costs and prices, a source of secondary credit for residential mortgage loans which have been insured under title II or title VI of the National Housing Act or guaranteed or insured under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, in order to maintain an orderly market for such loans, to meet liquidity needs of financing institutions, and to encourage economically sound residential construction in any areas where the scarcity of such secondary credit develops to the extent of threatening the continued production and availability of housing for veterans and others.

CREATION OF NATIONAL HOME MORTGAGE CORPORATION AND LIQUIDATION OF FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

SEC. 202. (a) There is hereby created in the Housing and Home Finance Agency a body corporate to be known as the National Home Mortgage Corporation (referred to in this title as the "Corporation") which shall be an agency and instrumentality of the United States. There shall be a President of the Corporation and all of the powers of the Corporation shall be vested in him. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator shall be the President of the Corporation.

(b) At such time as the Corporation shall determine, after funds become available therefor, it shall, after giving adequate advance notice to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, purchase all residential loans held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation by virtue of section 203 of Public Law 132, Eightieth Congress, approved June 30, 1947, and all residential loans held by the Federal National Mortgage Association (established pursuant to title III of the National Housing Act), at prices equal to the unpaid principal plus accrued interest on such loans, and such loans, together with all related rights, and such contracts, documents, and records as may be essential to the proper servicing and resale of the loans so purchased, shall be transferred to the Corporation. At the time of such transfer the Corporation shall assume all outstanding commitments of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (acquired pursuant to said section 203) and the Federal National Mortgage Association to purchase any residential loans. With respect to the loans, commitments, related rights, contracts, documents, and records so transferred, "National Home Mortgage Corporation" is hereby substituted, for all purposes, for "Reconstruction Finance Corporation" and "Federal National Mortgage Association," as the case may be, and no suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or the Federal National Mortgage Association shall abate by reason of the enactment of this act, but the court, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within 12 months after the date of such enactment, showing a necessity for the survival of the suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a determination of the questions involved, may allow the same to be maintained by or against the National Home Mortgage Corporation. The Corporation shall have the same powers to service and sell loans transferred to it pursuant to this subsection as it has with respect to loans purchased under section 205.

(c) The Federal National Mortgage Association shall not purchase any mortgage or lien after the date of enactment of this title (except pursuant to a commitment prior to that date), and shall, after the transfer of its holdings to the National Home Mortgage Corporation as provided in subsection (b) of this section, proceed to liquidate its assets and wind up its affairs as rapidly and economically as feasible and in the public interest. For this purpose, the Association shall dispose of any remaining assets in such manner as it may determine to be in the public interest, pay all outstanding obligations, adjust and settle any claims against the Association, retire its capital stock at the amount paid by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for such stock and the $1,000,000 paid-in surplus supplied by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and cover any remaining funds into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

ADVISORY BOARD

SEC. 203. There shall be an advisory board to the Corporation which shall consist of the President of the Corporation, who shall serve as chairman, and the following or their designees: The Secretary of the Treasury, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Housing Commissioner, the Chairman of the Home Loan Bank Board, and the Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The advisory board is authorized and directed to furnish information and advice to the Corporation on all matters of basic policy involved in the exercise of its powers with a view toward coordinating the operations of the Corporation with the general economic and fiscal policies of the Government and carrying out the purposes of this title.

CAPITAL STOCK AND ISSUANCE OF NOTES

SEC. 204. (a) The Corporation shall have a capital stock of $5,000,000 which shall be subscribed by the United States and paid by the Secretary of the Treasury in such amounts and at such times as requested by the Corporation. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000,000 which shall be available to pay the subscription to the capital stock of the Corporation. Receipt for such payment shall be issued to the Secretary of the Treasury by the Corporation and shall evidence the stock ownership of the United States. Net earnings of the Corporation (as determined by it) shall, after reasonable provision for possible losses, be used for pay-

ment of dividends on capital stock. Any such dividends shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(b) The Corporation may issue and have outstanding at any one time notes and other obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in a maximum amount not exceeding $250,000,000 plus an amount equal to the total purchase price paid for the loans purchased under the requirements of section 202 (b), except that with the approval of the President of the United States this maximum may be increased by an additional amount not exceeding $250,000,000. Such notes or other obligations shall be in such forms and denominations, shall have such maturities, and shall be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Corporation with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of the notes or other obligations by the Corporation. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes or other obligations of the Corporation issued hereunder and for such purposes is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of such obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this section. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States. The Corporation may retire or redeem any notes or other obligations issued by it.

PURCHASE AND SALE OF LOANS

SEC. 205. For the purposes of this title, the Corporation is hereby authorized (in addition to the purchases required under sec. 202 (b)) to purchase, with or without recourse, to service, and to sell without recourse (at such price or prices and under such other terms and conditions as the Corporation may prescribe) (a) any residential loan which is insured under section 203, 207, 603, or 608 of the National Housing Act, or as amended at any time, and secured by a first lien on the realty, or (b) any loan guaranteed under section 501 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, or as amended at any time, and secured by a first lien on the realty, or (c) any loan guaranteed under section 505 (a) of said act or (d) any loan insured under section 508 of said act which could have been guaranteed under section 501 and is secured by a first lien on the realty or which could have been guaranteed under section 505 (a) of said act. The Corporation shall maintain separate accounts with respect to the purchase of (a) loans insured under the National Housing Act and (b) loans guaranteed or insured under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended. Any purchase of a loan pursuant to this section shall be made in accordance with regulations issued by the Corporation and shall be subject to the following qualifications:

(a) Purchases of loans shall be restricted to those areas in which the Corporation determines that a scarcity of a private secondary credit for such loans has developed to the extent of threatening the continued production and availability of sale or rental housing generally throughout the area and that such purchases by the Corporation would not reasonably be expected to contribute to substantial increases in costs and prices of housing facilities. No purchases of loans of any particular amount and character shall be made in any area unless the Corporation has determined that there is no active private market which is willing to purchase loans of that amount or character at prices which the Corporation considers to be appropriate, and the Corporation shall terminate or restrict any such purchases by it whenever it determines that the volume of such purchases contributes to substantial increases in costs and prices of housing facilities.

(b) No loan may be purchased if made prior to the effective date of this act.

(c) No loan may be purchased if the original principal obligation of the loan exceeds or exceeded $7,000 fo reach family residence or dwelling unit covered by the mortgage or other lien securing the loan: *Provided*, That the Corporation may prescribe a higher maximum amount or amounts, not exceeding $10,000 for each family residence or dwelling unit, if it finds at any time or in any area it is not feasible, within the limitations of a lower maximum amount or amounts, to construct or provide dwellings which meet sound standards of construction, design, and livability.

(d) No loan shall be purchased except from mortgagees or lienholders which the Corporation determines to be qualified by experience or facilities and approves for servicing the loan or performing any other obligation of the mortgagee or lien holder in connection with the loan.

(e) No purchase of a loan may be made unless supporting data satisfactory to the Corporation are submitted to show compliance with requirements prescribed by the Corporation with respect to the reasonable ability of the borrower to meet his payments, and the physical soundness of the property covered by the mortgage or other lien securing the loan.

Subject to the above qualifications, the regulations of the Corporation may contain such other conditions and provisions as the Corporation deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this title. Unless hereafter authorized by the Congress, the Corporation shall not purchase any loan under this title after June 30, 1950. At least 90 days prior to that date, the President shall submit to the Congress his recommendations as to any action or legislation with respect to the Corporation which may be necessary or desirable.

GENERAL POWERS OF CORPORATION

SEC. 206. For the purposes of this title, the Corporation—

(a) shall have succession in its corporate name;

(b) may adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed;

(c) may adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations for the conduct of its business and the exercise of its powers; and may provide by regulation for a reasonable fee to be charged for the review of applications for the purchase of loans by the Corporation or for other services;

(d) may make contracts and purchase or otherwise acquire, hold, lease, and dispose (at public or private sale) of such real and personal property as may be necessary or incidental to the conduct of its business, and may accept donations of services and property;

(e) may sue and be sued in any Federal, State, or local court of competent jurisdiction: *Provided*, That the Corporation shall be entitled to such immunities and exemptions from the payment of costs, charges, and fees as are granted to the United States Government: *And provided further*, That the Corporation shall be represented, at its request, in litigated matters by the Attorney General or such attorney or attorneys as he may designate;

(f) may (i) appoint, employ, and fix the compensation and duties of the Executive Vice President of the Corporation and such other officers, attorneys, experts, employees, and agents as the Corporation shall determine; (ii) delegate to them any of the powers and duties vested in the President of the Corporation and provide for the redelegation thereof; and (iii) require bond of such of them as the Corporation may designate and fix the penalties and pay the premium of such bond: *Provided*, That with the exception of experts and consultants, appointments shall be made pursuant to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended;

(g) may utilize, and exercise any powers through, the facilities, officers, and employees of the Federal Home Loan Banks, or of any department, agency, corporation, or establishment of the Government; and may (without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended) contract with any such agency or any other agency or individual or private corporation for the furnishing of any services or facilities, including appraisal, management, title, and other work in connection with property, and contract to make payment or reimbursement for any services or facilities;

(h) may collect, compromise, and release contractual claims and obligations and pursue the same to final collection, institute proceedings for foreclosure on property covered by a mortgage or other lien, acquire any such property by voluntary conveyance or by purchase at foreclosure sale or otherwise, deal with, complete, rent, renovate, modernize, insure, or sell for cash or credit at public or private sale any property acquired by the Corporation, acquire or continue insurance or guaranty of any mortgage or loan held by the Corporation, and take such other action as may be necessary to preserve or protect any loan, mortgage, or lien, or interest therein, or to realize on the value thereof;

(i) may determine the necessity for and the character of its obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, paid, and accounted for, subject to pertinent provisions of law applicable to Government corporations;

(j) shall be entitled to the use of the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as the other executive agencies of the Government;

(k) may use any of the funds of the Corporation from any source to carry out any of its powers and duties and to pay any of its expenses or obligations; and

(l) may exercise all powers specifically granted by the provisions of this title and such incidental powers as are necessary to carry out the powers and duties of the Corporation.

TAXES

SEC. 207. The Corporation, including but not limited to its franchise, capital, reserves, surplus, income, assets, and property of any kind, shall be exempt from all taxation and special assessments now or hereafter imposed by the United States or by any Territory, dependency or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality or local taxing authority, except that any property acquired by the Corporation in foreclosure, or otherwise acquired to protect or realize on the value of a mortgage or other lien, shall be subject to taxation and assessment to the same extent, according to its value, as other property is taxed and assessed. All notes and other obligations of the Corporation shall be exempt, both as to principal and interest, from all taxes (except surtaxes, estate, inheritance, and gift taxes) by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority.

GENERAL STATUTES AND LIMITATIONS

SEC. 208. (a) All general criminal and penal statutes of the United States relating to public moneys, property, or employees of the United States shall apply to public moneys, property, and employees of the Corporation. No officer or employee of the Corporation shall participate in any matter affecting his

personal interests or the interests of any corporation, partnership, or association in which he is directly or indirectly interested. No individual, association, partnership, or corporation shall use the words "National Home Mortgage Corporation," or any combination of these four words, as the name, or part thereof, under which he or it shall do business. Any such use shall constitute a misdemeanor and shall be punishable by a fine not exceeding $1,000.

(b) The Corporation shall have no authority or obligation to adjust, settle, or pay any tort claim arising out of the acts or the negligence of the Corporation or its officers, employees, or agents except as provided in the Federal Tort Claims Act, as amended, or in the act entitled "An Act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended.

(c) Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following before the period at the end thereof: "; and National Home Mortgage Corporation."

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 209. The Corporation shall make an annual report to the President, for transmission to the Congress, for each fiscal year, ending on June 30, to be transmitted not later than January 15 following the close of the fiscal year for which such report is made.

TITLE III—HOUSING RESEARCH

SEC. 301. To assist in progressively reducing housing costs and increasing the production of better housing, and in making available necessary data on housing needs, demand and supply, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator shall—

(a) undertake and conduct a program with respect to technical research and studies to develop, demonstrate, and promote the acceptance and application of new and improved techniques, materials, and methods which will permit progressive reductions in housing construction and maintenance costs, and stimulate the increased and sustained production of housing. Such program may be concerned with improved and standardized building codes and regulations and methods for the more uniform administration thereof, standardized dimensions and methods for the assembly of homebuilding materials and equipment, improved residential design and construction, new and improved types of building materials and equipment, and methods of production, distribution, assembly, and construction, and sound techniques for the testing thereof and for the determination of adequate performance standards, and may relate to appraisal, credit, and other housing market data, housing needs, demand and supply, finance and investment, land costs, use and improvement, site planning and utilities, zoning and other laws, codes and regulations as they apply to housing, other factors affecting the cost of housing, and related technical and economic research;

(b) prepare and submit to the President and to the Congress estimates of national housing needs and reports with respect to the progress being made toward meeting such needs, and correlate and recommend proposals for such executive action or legislation necessary or desirable for the furtherance of the national housing objective and policy established by this act, together with such other reports or information as may be required of the Administrator by the President or the Congress;

(c) encourage localities to make studies of their own housing needs and markets, along with surveys and plans for housing, urban land use and related community development, and provide, where requested and needed by the localities, technical advice and guidance in the making of such studies, surveys, and plans.

SEC. 302. In carrying out research and studies under this title, the Administrator shall utilize, to the full extent feasible, the available facilities of other departments, independent establishments, and agencies of the Federal Government; and the Secretary of Commerce or his designee shall hereafter be included in the membership of the National Housing Council. The Administrator is further authorized, for the purposes of this title, to undertake research and studies cooperatively with agencies of State or local governments, and educational institutions and other nonprofit organizations. The Administrator shall disseminate the results of research and studies undertaken pursuant to this title in such form as may be most useful to industry and to the general public.

SEC. 303. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

TITLE IV—RENTAL HOUSING AIDS FOR FAMILIES OF MODERATE INCOME AND VETERANS

MORTGAGE INVESTMENT AIDS; VETERANS' COOPERATIVES

SEC. 401. (a) Section 207 (c) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

(1) By striking out the semicolon and the word "and" at the end of paragraph No. (2) as amended by this act, inserting in lieu thereof a colon, and adding the following new proviso: *"And provided further,* That, notwithstanding any of the provisions of this paragraph No. (2), a mortgage with respect to a project to be constructed in a locality or metropolitan area where, as determined by the Administrator, there is a need for new dwellings for families of lower income at rentals comparable to the rentals proposed to be charged for the dwellings in such project (or, in the case of a mortgage with respect to a project of a nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporation the permanent occupancy of the dwellings of which is restricted to members of such corporation, or a project constructed by a nonprofit corporation organized for the purpose of construction of homes for members of the corporation, at prices, costs, or charges comparable to the prices, costs, or charges proposed to be charged such members) may involve a principal obligation in an amount not exceeding 90 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the project when the proposed improvements are completed, except that in the case of a mortgage with respect to a project of a nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporation whose membership consists primarily of veterans of World War II, the principal obligation may be in an amount not exceeding 95 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the project when the proposed improvements are completed; and."

(2) By striking out the period at the end of the second sentence, inserting in lieu thereof a comma, and adding the following: "except that with respect to mortgages insured under the provisions of the second proviso of paragraph No. (2) of this subsection, which mortgages are hereby authorized to have a maturity of not exceeding 40 years from the date of the insurance of the mortgage, such interest rate shall not exceed 4 percent per annum."

(3) By adding the following additional sentence at the end thereof: "Such property or project may include such commercial and community facilities as the Administrator deems adequate to serve the occupants."

(b) Section 207 (g) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the number "2" appearing in clause (ii) and inserting in lieu thereof "1."

(c) Section 207 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following new paragraph at the end thereof:

"(q) In order to assure an adequate market for mortgages on cooperative-ownership projects and rental-housing projects for families of lower income and veterans of the character described in the second proviso of paragraph No. (2) of subsection (c) of this section, the powers of the National Home Mortgage Corporation, and of any other Federal corporation or other Federal agency hereafter established, to make real-estate loans, or to purchase, service, or sell any mortgages, or partial interests therein, may be utilized in connection with projects of the character described in said proviso."

EQUITY INVESTMENT AIDS

SEC. 402. The National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following new title:

"TITLE VII—INSURANCE FOR INVESTMENTS IN RENTAL HOUSING FOR FAMILIES OF MODERATE INCOME

"AUTHORITY TO INSURE

"SEC. 701. The purpose of this title is to supplement the existing systems of mortgage insurance for rental housing under this act by a special system of insurance designed to encourage equity investment in rental housing at rents within the capacity of families of moderate income. To effectuate this purpose, the Administrator is authorized, upon application by the investor, to insure as hereinafter provided, and, prior to the execution of insurance contracts and upon such terms as the Administrator shall prescribe, to make commitments to insure, the minimum annual amortization charge and an annual return on the outstanding investment of such investor in any project which is eligible for insurance as hereinafter provided in an amount (herein called the insured annual return) equal to such rate of return, not exceeding 2¾ percent per annum, on such outstanding investment as shall, after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, be fixed in the insurance contract or in the commitment to insure: *Provided,* That any insurance contract made pursuant to this title shall expire as of the first day of the operating year for which the outstanding investment amounts to not more than 10 percent of the established investment: *And provided further,* That the aggregate amount of contingent liabilities outstanding at any one time under insurance contracts and commitments to insure made pursuant to this title shall not exceed $1,000,000,000.

"ELIGIBILITY

"SEC. 702. (a) To be eligible for insurance under this title, a project shall meet the following conditions:

"(1) The Administrator shall be satisfied that there is, in the locality or metropolitan area of such project, a need for new rental dwellings at rents comparable to the rents proposed to be charged for the dwellings in such project.

"(2) Such project shall be economically sound, and the dwellings in such project shall be acceptable to the Administrator as to quality, design, size, and type.

"(b) Any insurance contract executed by the Administrator under this title shall be conclusive evidence of the eligibility of the project and the investor for such insurance, and the validity of any insurance contract so executed shall be incontestable in the hands of an investor from the date of the execution of such contract, except for fraud or misrepresentation on the part of such investor.

"PREMIUMS AND FEES

"SEC. 703. (a) For insurance granted pursuant to this title the Administrator shall fix and collect a premium charge in an amount not exceeding one-half of 1 percent of the outstanding investment for the operating year for which such premium charge

is payable without taking into account the excess earnings, if any, applied, in addition to the minimum annual amortization charge, to amortization of the outstanding investment. Such premium charge shall be payable annually in advance by the investor, either in cash or in debentures issued by the Administrator under this title at par plus accrued interest: *Provided,* That, if in any operating year the gross income shall be less than the operating expenses, the premium charge payable during such operating year shall be waived, but only to the extent of the amount of the difference between such expenses and such income and subject to subsequent payment out of any excess earnings as hereinafter provided.

"(b) With respect to any project offered for insurance under this title, the Administrator is authorized to charge and collect reasonable fees for examination, and for inspection during the construction of the project: *Provided,* That such fees shall not aggregate more than one-half of 1 percent of the estimated investment.

"RENTS

"SEC. 704. The Administrator shall require that the rents for the dwellings in any project insured under this title shall be established in accordance with a rent schedule approved by the Administrator, and that the investor shall not charge or collect rents for any dwellings in the project in excess of the appropriate rents therefor as shown in the latest rent schedule approved pursuant to this section. Prior to approving the initial or any subsequent rent schedule pursuant to this section, the Administrator shall find that such schedule accords reasonable assurance that the rents to be established thereunder are (1) not lower than necessary, together with all other income to be derived from or in connection with the project, to produce reasonably stable revenues sufficient to provide for the payment of the operating expenses, the minimum annual amortization charge, and the minimum annual return; and (2) not higher than necessary to meet the need for dwellings for families of moderate income.

"EXCESS EARNINGS

"SEC. 705. For all of the purposes of any insurance contract made pursuant to this title, 50 percent of the excess earnings, if any, for any operating year may be applied, in addition to the minimum annual return, to return on the outstanding investment but only to the extent that such application thereof does not result in an annual return of more than 5 percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year, and the balance of any such excess earnings shall be applied, in addition to the minimum annual amortization charge, to amortization of the outstanding investment: *Provided,* That if in any preceding operating years the gross income shall have been less than the operating expenses, such excess earnings shall be applied to the extent necessary in whole or in part, first, to the reimbursement of the amount of the difference between such expenses (exclusive of any premium charges previously waived hereunder) and such income, and, second, to the payment of any premium charges previously waived hereunder.

"FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

"SEC. 706. With respect to each project insured under this title, the Administrator shall provide that, after the close of each operating year, the investor shall submit to him for approval a financial and operating statement covering such operating year. If any such financial and operating statement shall not have been submitted or, for proper cause, shall not have been approved by the Administrator, payment of any claim submitted by the investor may, at the option of the Administrator, be withheld, in whole or in part, until such statement shall have been submitted and approved.

"PAYMENT OF CLAIMS

"SEC. 707. If in any operating year the net income of a project insured under this title is less than the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge and the insured annual return, the Administrator, upon submission by the investor of a claim for the payment of the amount of the difference between such net income and the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge and the insured annual return and after proof of the validity of such claim, shall pay to the investor, in cash from the Housing Investment Insurance Fund, the amount of such difference, as determined by the Administrator, but not exceeding, in any event, an amount equal to the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge and the insured annual return.

"DEBENTURES

"SEC. 708. (a) If the aggregate of the amounts paid to the investor pursuant to section 707 hereof with respect to a project insured under this title shall at any time equal or exceed 15 per centum of the established investment, the Administrator thereafter shall have the right, after written notice to the investor of his intention so to do, to acquire, as of the first day of any operating year, such project in consideration of the issuance and delivery to the investor of debentures having a total face value equal to 90 percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year. In any such case the investor shall be obligated to convey to said Administrator title to the project which meets the requirements of the rules and regulations of the Administrator in force at the time the insurance contract was executed and which is evidenced in the manner prescribed by such rules and regulations, and, in the event that the investor fails so to do, said Administrator may, at his option, terminate the insurance contract.

"(b) If in any operating year the aggregate of the differences between the operating expenses (exclusive of any premium charges previously waived hereunder) and the gross income for the preceding operating years, less the aggregate of any deficits in such operating expenses reimbursed from excess earnings as hereinbefore provided, shall at any time equal or exceed 5 percent of the established investment, the investor shall thereafter have the right, after written notice to the Administrator of his intention so to do, to convey to the Administrator, as of the first day of any operating year, title to the project which meets the requirements of the rules and regulations of the Administrator in force at the time the insurance contract was executed and which is evidenced in the manner prescribed by such rules and regulations, and to receive from the Administrator debentures having a total face value equal to 90 percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year.

"(c) Any difference, not exceeding $50, between 90 percent of the outstanding investment for the operating year in which a project is acquired by the Administrator pursuant to this section and the total face value of the debentures to be issued and delivered to the investor pursuant to this section shall be adjusted by the payment of cash by the Administrator to the investor from the Housing Investment Insurance Fund.

"(d) Upon the acquisition of a project by the Administrator pursuant to this section, the insurance contract shall terminate.

"(e) Debentures issued under this title to any investor shall be executed in the name of the Housing Investment Insurance Fund as obligor, shall be signed by the Administrator, by either his written or engraved signature, and shall be negotiable. Such debentures shall be dated as of the first day of the operating year in which the project for which such debentures were issued was acquired by the Administrator, shall bear interest at a rate to be determined by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, at the time the insurance contract was executed, but not to exceed 2¾ percent per annum, payable semiannually on the 1st day of January and the 1st day of July of each year, and shall mature on the 1st day of July in such calendar year or years, not later than the fortieth following the date of the issuance thereof, as shall be determined by the Administrator and stated on the face of such debentures.

"(f) Such debentures shall be in such form and in such denominations in multiples of $50, shall be subject to such terms and conditions, and may include such provisions for redemption as shall be prescribed by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, and may be issued in either coupon or registered form.

"(g) Such debentures shall be exempt, both as to principal and interest, from all taxation (except surtaxes, estate, inheritance, and gift taxes) now or hereafter imposed by any Territory, dependency, or possession of the United States, or by the District of Columbia, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, shall be payable out of the Housing Investment Insurance Fund, which shall be primarily liable therefor, and shall be fully and unconditionally guaranteed, as to both the principal thereof and the interest thereon, by the United States, and such guaranty shall be expressed on the face thereof. In the event that the Housing Investment Insurance Fund fails to pay upon demand, when due, the principal of or the interest on any debentures so guaranteed, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the holders the amount thereof, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and thereupon, to the extent of the amount so paid, the Secretary of the Treasury shall succeed to all the rights of the holders of such debentures.

"(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law relating to the acquisition, handling, or disposal of real and other property by the United States, the Administrator shall have power, for the protection of the Housing Investment Insurance Fund, to pay out of said fund all expenses or charges in connection with, and to deal with, complete, reconstruct, rent, renovate, modernize, insure, make contracts for the management of, or establish suitable agencies for the management of, or sell for cash or credit or lease in his discretion, in whole or in part, any project acquired pursuant to this title; and, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Administrator shall also have power to pursue to final collection by way of compromise or otherwise all claims acquired by, or assigned or transferred to, him in connection with the acquisition or disposal of any project pursuant to this title: *Provided,* That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to any contract for hazard insurance, or to any purchase or contract for services or supplies on account of any project acquired pursuant to this title if the amount of such purchase or contract does not exceed $1,000.

"TERMINATION

"SEC. 709. The investor, after written notice to the Administrator of his intention so to do, may terminate, as of the close of any operating year, any insurance contract made pursuant to this title. The Administrator shall prescribe the events and conditions under which said Administrator shall have the option to terminate any insurance contract made pursuant to this title, and the events and conditions under which said Administrator may reinstate any insurance contract terminated pursuant to this section or section 708 (a). If any insurance

contract is terminated pursuant to this section, the Administrator may require the investor to pay an adjusted premium charge in such amount as the Administrator determines to be equitable, but not in excess of the aggregate amount of the premium charges which such investor otherwise would have been required to pay if such insurance contract had not been so terminated.

"INSURANCE FUND

"SEC. 710. There is hereby created a Housing Investment Insurance Fund which shall be used by the Administrator as a revolving fund for carrying out the provisions of this title and for administrative expenses in connection therewith. For this purpose, the Secretary of the Treasury shall make available to the Administrator such funds as the Administrator shall deem necessary, but not to exceed $10,000,000, which amount is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Premium charges, adjusted premium charges, inspection and other fees, service charges, and any other income received by the Administrator under this title, together with all earnings on the assets of such Housing Investment Insurance Fund, shall be credited to said Fund. All payments made pursuant to claims of investors with respect to projects insured under this title, cash adjustments, the principal of and interest on debentures issued under this title, expenses incurred in connection with or as a consequence of the acquisition and disposal of projects acquired under this title, and all administrative expenses in connection with this title, shall be paid from said Fund. The faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment of all approved claims of investors with respect to projects insured under this title, and, in the event said Fund fails to make any such payment when due, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the investor the amount thereof, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Moneys in the Housing Investment Insurance Fund not needed for current operations under this title shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of said Fund or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed by, the United States. The Administrator may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, purchase in the open market debentures issued under this title. Such purchases shall be made at a price which will provide an investment yield of not less than the yield obtainable from other investments authorized by this section. Debentures so purchased shall be canceled and not reissued.

"TAXATION PROVISIONS

"SEC. 711. Nothing in this title shall be construed to exempt any real property acquired and held by the Administrator under this title from taxation by any State or political subdivision thereof, to the same extent, according to its value, as other real property is taxed.

"RULES AND REGULATIONS

"SEC. 712. The Administrator may make such rules and regulations as may be necessary or desirable to carry out the provisions of this title, including, without limiting the foregoing, rules and regulations, relating to the maintenance by the investor of books, records, and accounts with respect to the project and the examination of such books, records, and accounts by representatives of the Administrator; the submission of financial and operating statements and the approval thereof; the submission of claims for payments under insurance contracts, the proof of the validity of such claims, and the payment or disallowance thereof; the increase of the established investment if the investor shall make capital improvements or additions to the project; the decrease of the established investment if the investor shall sell part of the project; and the reduction of the outstanding investment for the appropriate operating year or operating years pending the restoration of dwelling or nondwelling facilities damaged by fire or other casualty. With respect to any investor which is subject to supervision or regulation by a State banking, insurance, or other State department or agency, the Administrator may, in carrying out any of his supervisory and regulatory functions with respect to projects insured under this title, utilize, contract with, and act through, such department or agency and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 713. The following terms shall have the meanings, respectively, ascribed to them below, and, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise, shall include the plural as well as the singular number:

"(a) 'Investor' shall mean (1) natural person; (2) any group of not more than 10 natural persons; (3) any corporation, company, association, trust, or other legal entity; or (4) any combination of two or more corporations, companies, associations, trusts, or other legal entities, having all the powers necessary to comply with the requirements of this title, which the Administrator (i) shall find to be qualified by business experience and facilities, to afford assurance of the necessary continuity of long-term investment, and to have available the necessary capital required for long-term investment in the project, and (ii) shall approve as eligible for insurance under this title.

"(b) 'Project' shall mean a project (including all property, real and personal, contracts, rights, and choses in action acquired, owned, or held by the investor in connection therewith) or an investor designed and used primarily for the purpose of providing dwellings the occupancy of which is permitted by the investor in consideration of agreed charges: *Provided*, That nothing in this title shall be construed as prohibiting the inclusion in a project of such stores, offices, or other commercial facilities, recreational or community facilities, or other nondwelling facilities as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary or desirable appurtenances to such project.

"(c) 'Estimated investment' shall mean the estimated cost of the development of the project, as stated in the application submitted to the Administrator for insurance under this title.

"(d) 'Established investment' shall mean the amount of the reasonable costs, as approved by the Administrator, incurred by the investor in, and necessary for, carrying out all works and undertakings for the development of a project and shall include the premium charge for the first operating year and the cost of all necessary surveys, plans and specifications, architectural, engineering, or other special services, land acquisition, site preparation, construction, and equipment; a reasonable return on the funds of the investor paid out in course of the development of the project, up to and including the initial occupancy date; necessary expenses in connection with the initial occupancy of the project; and the cost of such other items as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary for the development of the project, (1) less the amount by which the rents and revenues derived from the project up to and including the initial occupancy date exceed the reasonable and proper expenses, as approved by the Administrator, incurred by the investor in, and necessary for, operating and maintaining said project up to and including the initial occupancy date, or (2) plus the amount by which such expenses exceeded such rents and revenues, as the case may be.

"(e) 'Physical completion date' shall mean the last day of the calendar month in which the Administrator determines that the construction of the project is substantially completed and substantially all of the dwellings therein are available for occupancy.

"(f) 'Initial occupancy date' shall mean the last day of the calendar month in which 90 percent in number of the dwellings in the project on the physical completion date shall have been occupied, but shall in no event be later than the last day of the sixth calendar month next following the physical completion date.

"(g) 'Operating year' shall mean the period of 12 consecutive calendar months next following the initial occupancy date and each succeeding period of 12 consecutive calendar months, and the period of the first 12 consecutive calendar months next following the initial occupancy date shall be the first operating year.

"(h) 'Gross income' for any operating year shall mean the total rents and revenues and other income derived from, or in connection with, the project during such operating year.

"(i) 'Operating expenses' for any operating year shall mean the amounts, as approved by the Administrator, necessary to meet the reasonable and proper costs of, and to provide for, operating and maintaining the project, and to establish and maintain reasonable and proper reserves for repairs, maintenance, and replacements, and other necessary reserves during such operating year, and shall include necessary expenses for real-estate taxes, special assessments, premium charges made pursuant to this title, administrative expenses, the annual rental under any lease pursuant to which the real property comprising the site of the project is held by the investor, and insurance charges, together with such other expenses as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary for the proper operation and maintenance of the project, but shall not include income taxes.

"(j) 'Net income' for any operating year shall means gross income remaining after the payment of the operating expenses.

"(k) 'Minimum annual amortization charge' shall mean an amount equal to 2 percent of the established investment, except that, in the case of a project where the real property comprising the site thereof is held by the investor under a lease, if (notwithstanding the proviso of section 703 (a) hereof) the gross income for any operating year shall be less than the amount required to pay the operating expenses (including the annual rental under such lease), the minimum annual amortization charge for such operating year shall mean an amount equal to 2 percent of the established investment plus the amount of the annual rental under such lease to the extent that the same is not paid from the gross income.

"(l) 'Annual return' for any operating year shall mean the net income remaining after the payment of the minimum annual amortization charge.

"(m) 'Insured annual return' shall have the meaning ascribed to it in section 701 hereof.

"(n) 'Minimum annual return' for any operating year shall mean an amount equal to 3½ percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year.

"(o) 'Excess earnings' for any operating year shall mean the net income derived from a project in excess of the minimum annual amortization charge and the minimum annual return.

"(p) 'Outstanding investment' for any operating year shall mean the established investment, less an amount equal to (1) the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge for each preceding operating year, plus (2) the aggregate of the excess earnings, if any during each preceding operating year applied, in addition to the minimum annual amortization charge, to

amortization in accordance with the provisions of section 705 hereof."

SEC. 403. Sections 1 and 5 of the National Housing Act, as amended, are hereby amended by striking out "titles II, III, and VI" wherever they appear in said sections and inserting in lieu thereof "titles II, III, VI, and VII."

SEC. 404. (a) The Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting therein, immediately after the heading preceding section 111, the following new section:

"SEC. 110. Amortization Deduction.

"(a) General rule: Every person, at his election, shall be entitled to a deduction with respect to the amortization during the first 60 months after the completion of a housing amortization facility (as defined in subsection (d)) of the adjusted basis (for determining gain) of such housing amortization facility, based on an amortization period of 120 months. Such amortization deduction shall be an amount, with respect to each month of such 60-month period within the taxable year, equal to the adjusted basis of the facility at the end of such month divided by the number of months (including the month for which the deduction is computed) remaining in the 120-month-amortization period. Such adjusted basis at the end of the month shall be computed without regard to the amortization deduction for such month. The amortization deduction above provided with respect to any month shall be in lieu of the deduction with respect to such facility for such month provided by section 23 (l), relating to exhaustion, wear and tear, and obsolescence.

"(b) Election of amortization: The election of the taxpayer to take the amortization deduction shall be made only by a statement to that effect in its return for the taxable year in which the facility was completed. The election shall be irrevocable.

"(c) Termination of amortization period: Upon the termination of the 60-month period, the taxpayer shall be allowed the deduction provided under section (l), beginning with the first month as to which the amortization deduction is not applicable, and the taxpayer shall not be entitled to any further amortization deductions with respect to the housing amortization facility.

"(d) Definition of housing amortization facility: As used in this section, the term 'housing amortization facility' means any facility, land, building, or part thereof, constructed for rental housing, to the extent constructed after March 15, 1948.

"(e) Taxability on sale of housing amortization facility: Anything to the contrary in this title notwithstanding, any gain realized upon the sale or other disposition of any property with respect to which any amortization deduction has been claimed shall to the extent of any such amortization deduction be considered gain recognized and taxable as ordinary income.

"(f) Life tenant and remainderman: In the case of property held by one person for life with remainder to another person, the deduction shall be computed as if the life tenant were the absolute owner of the property and shall be allowable to the life tenant."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1947.

TITLE V—SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN REDEVELOPMENT

LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY TO AID HOUSING COST REDUCTIONS

SEC. 501. In extending financial assistance under this title, the Administrator shall give consideration to the extent to which the appropriate local public bodies have undertaken a positive program of encouraging housing cost reductions through the adoption, improvement, and modernization of building and other local codes and regulations so as to permit the use of appropriate new materials, techniques, and methods in land and residential planning, design, and construction, the increase of efficiency in residential construction, and the elimination of restrictive practices which unnecessarily increase housing costs.

LOANS

SEC. 502. (a) To assist local communities in eliminating their slums and blighted areas and in providing maximum opportunity for the redevelopment of project areas by private enterprise, the Administrator may make temporary and definitive loans to local public agencies for the undertaking of projects for the assembly, clearance, preparation, and sale and lease of land for redevelopment. Such loans (outstanding at any one time) shall be in such amounts not exceeding the expenditures made by the local public agency as part of gross project cost, bear interest at such rate (not less than the applicable going Federal rate), be secured in such manner, and be repaid within such period (not exceeding 45 years from the date of the notes or bonds evidencing the loans), as may be deemed advisable by the Administrator. Such loans may be made subject to the condition that, if at any time or for any period during the life of the loan contract, the local public agency can obtain loan funds from sources other than the Federal Government at an interest rate lower than provided in the loan contract, it may do so with the consent of the Administrator at such time and for such period without waiving or surrendering any rights to loan funds under the contract for the remainder of the life of such contract, and, in any such case, the Administrator is authorized to consent to a pledge by the local public agency of the loan contract, and any or all of its rights thereunder, as security for the repayment of the loan funds so obtained from other sources.

(b) To obtain funds for loans under this title, the Administrator may, on and after the 1st day of July 1948, issue and have outstanding at any one time notes and other obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury, in an amount not to exceed $10,000,000, which limit on such outstanding amount shall be increased by $200,000,000 on the 1st day of July 1949, and by further amounts of $200,000,000 on the 1st day of July in each of the years 1950, 1951, 1952, and 1953, respectively.

(c) Notes or other obligations issued by the Administrator under this title shall be in such forms and denominations, have such maturities, and be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of such notes or other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and other obligations of the Administrator issued under this title and for such purpose is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such act, as amended are extended to include any purchases of such notes and other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this section. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States.

(d) Obligations, including interest thereon, issued by local public agencies for projects undertaken pursuant to this title, and the income derived by such agencies from such projects, shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States.

CAPITAL GRANTS

SEC. 503. (a) The Administrator may make capital grants to local public agencies to enable such agencies to make land in project areas available for redevelopment at its fair value for the uses specified in the redevelopment plans. The aggregate of such capital grants with respect to all the projects of a local public agency which are assisted under this title shall not exceed two-thirds of the aggregate of the net project costs, and the capital grants with respect to any individual project shall not exceed the difference between the net project cost and the local grants-in-aid required with respect to the project pursuant to section 504.

(b) The Administrator may, on and after the 1st day of July 1948, contract to make capital grants with respect to projects to be assisted pursuant to this title aggregating not more than $100,000,000, which limit shall be increased by further amounts of $100,000,000 on the 1st day of July in each of the years 1949, 1950, 1951, and 1952, respectively. Such contracts for capital grant shall be made subject to the condition that no funds shall be disbursed by the local public agency prior to July 1, 1949, in payment for the purchase of land in connection with the project being assisted under the contract. The faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment of all capital grants contracted for under this title, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the amounts necessary to provide for such payments.

REQUIREMENTS FOR LOCAL GRANTS-IN-AID

SEC. 504. Every contract for capital grant under this title shall require local grants-in-aid in connection with the project involved which, together with the local grants-in-aid to be provided in connection with all other projects of the local public agency on which such contracts have theretofore been made, will be at least equal to one-third of the aggregate net project costs involved (it being the purpose of this provision and section 503 to limit the aggregate of the capital grants made by the Administrator with respect to all the projects of a local public agency which are assisted under this title to an amount not exceeding two-thirds of the difference between the aggregate of the gross project costs of all such projects and the aggregate of the total sales prices and capital values referred to in section 510 (f) of land in such projects).

LOCAL DETERMINATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

SEC. 505. Contracts for financial aid shall be made only with a duly authorized local public agency and shall require that—

(1) the redevelopment plan for the project area be approved by the governing body of the locality in which the project is situated, and that such approval include findings by the governing body that (i) the financial aid to be provided in the contract is necessary to enable the land in the project area to be redeveloped in accordance with the redevelopment plan; (ii) the redevelopment plans for the redevelopment areas in the locality will afford maximum opportunity, consistent with the sound needs of the locality as a whole, for the redevelopment of such areas by private enterprise; and (iii) the redevelopment plan conforms to a general plan for the development of the locality as a whole;

(2) when land acquired or held by the local public agency in connection with the project is sold or leased, the purchasers or lessees shall be obligated (i) to devote such land to the uses specified in the redevelopment plan for the project area; (ii) to begin the building of their improvements on such land

within a reasonable time; and (iii) to comply with such other conditions as the Administrator finds are necessary to carry out the purposes of this title;

(3) there be a feasible method for the temporary relocation of families displaced from the project area, and that there are available or are being provided, in the project area or in other areas not less desirable in regard to public utilities and public and commercial facilities and at rents or prices within the financial means of the families displaced from the project area, decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings equal in number to the number of such displaced families: *Provided*, That, in view of the existing acute housing shortage, each such contract shall further provide that there shall be no demolition of residential structures in connection with the project assisted under the contract prior to July 1, 1950, if in the opinion of the local governing body such demolition would result in undue hardship for the occupants of the structure.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 506. (a) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this title, the Administrator, notwithstanding any other law, shall—

(1) appoint a Director of Urban Redevelopment to administer under his general supervision the provisions of this title;

(2) prepare annually and submit a budget program as provided for wholly owned Government corporations by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended as of the date of enactment of this Act;

(3) maintain an integral set of accounts which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial transactions as provided by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended as of the date of enactment of this Act, and no other audit shall be required: *Provided*, That such financial transactions of the Administrator as the making of loans and capital grants and vouchers approved by the Administrator in connection with such financial transactions shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government;

(4) make an annual report to the President, for transmission to the Congress, for each fiscal year, ending on June 30, to be transmitted not later than January 15 following the close of the fiscal year for which such report is made.

(b) Funds made available to the Administrator pursuant to the provisions of this title shall be deposited in a checking account or accounts with the Treasurer of the United States. Receipts and assets obtained or held by the Administrator in connection with the performance of his functions under this title shall be available for any of the purposes of this title, and all funds available for carrying out the functions of the Administrator under this title (including appropriations therefor, which are hereby authorized) shall be available, in such amounts as may from year to year be authorized by the Congress, for the administrative expenses of the Administrator in connection with the performance of such functions.

(c) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this title, the Administrator, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, may—

(1) sue and be sued;

(2) foreclose on any property or commence any action to protect or enforce any right conferred upon him by any law, contract, or other agreement, and bid for and purchase at any foreclosure or any other sale any project or part thereof in connection with which he has made a loan or capital grant pursuant to this title. In the event of any such acquisition, the Administrator may complete, administer, dispose of, and otherwise deal with, such project or part thereof: *Provided*, That any such acquisition of real property shall not deprive any State or political subdivision thereof of its civil jurisdiction in and over such property or impair the civil rights under the State or local law of the inhabitants on such property;

(3) enter into agreements to pay annual sums in lieu of taxes to any State or local taxing authority with respect to any real property so acquired and owned;

(4) sell or exchange at public or private sale, or lease, real or personal property, and sell or exchange any securities or obligations, upon such terms as he may fix;

(5) obtain insurance against loss in connection with property and other assets held;

(6) subject to the specific limitations in this title, consent to the modification, with respect to rate of interest, time of payment of any installment of principal or interest, security, amount of capital grant, or any other term, of any contract or agreement to which he is a party or which has been transferred to him pursuant to this title;

(7) include in any contract or instrument made pursuant to this title such other covenants, conditions, or provisions as he may deem necessary to assure that the purposes of this title will be achieved. No provision of this title shall be construed or administered to permit speculation in land holding.

(d) Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to any contract for services or supplies on account of any property acquired pursuant to this title if the amount of such contract does not exceed $1,000.

SEC. 507. If the land for a low-rent housing project assisted under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is made available from a project assisted under this title, payment equal to the fair value of the land for the uses specified in accordance with the redevelopment plan shall be made therefor by the public housing agency undertaking the housing project, and such amount shall be included as part of the development cost of the low-rent housing project.

SEC. 508. The President may at any time, in his discretion, transfer to the Administrator any right, title, or interest held by the Federal Government or any department or agency thereof in any land (including buildings thereon) which is surplus to the needs of the Government and which a local public agency certifies will be within the area of a project being planned by it. When such land is sold to the local public agency by the Administrator, it may be sold at a price equal to its fair value for the uses specified in accordance with the redevelopment plan: *Provided*, That the proceeds from such sale shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

PROTECTION OF LABOR STANDARDS

SEC. 509. In order to protect labor standards—

(1) any contract for financial aid pursuant to this title shall contain a provision requiring that the wages or fees prevailing in the locality, as determined or adopted (subsequent to a determination under applicable State or local law) by the Secretary of Labor, shall be paid by any contractor engaged on the project involved; and the Administrator may require certification as to compliance with the provisions of this paragraph prior to making any payment under such contract;

(2) the provisions of sections 1 and 2 of the act of June 13, 1934 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 40, secs. 276b and 276c), shall apply to any project financed in whole or in part with funds made available pursuant to this title;

(3) any contractor engaged on any project financed in whole or in part with funds made available pursuant to this title shall report quarterly to the Secretary of Labor, and shall cause all subcontractors to report in like manner, within 15 days after the close of each quarter and on forms to be furnished by the United States Department of Labor, as to the number of persons on their respective pay rolls on the particular project, the aggregate amount of such pay rolls, the total man-hours worked, and itemized expenditures for materials. Any such contractor shall furnish to the Department of Labor the names and addresses of all subcontractors on the work at the earliest date practicable.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 510. The following terms shall have the meanings, respectively, ascribed to them below, and, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise, shall include the plural as well as the singular number:

(a) "Redevelopment area" means an area within which a project area is located and of such extent and location that the total area is appropriate for development or redevelopment.

(b) "Redevelopment plan" means a plan, as it exists from time to time, for the development or redevelopment of a redevelopment or project area, which plan shall be sufficiently complete (1) to indicate its relationship to definite local objectives as to appropriate land uses and improved traffic, public transportation, public utilities, recreational and community facilities, and other public improvements, and (2) to indicate proposed land uses and building requirements in the project area: *Provided*, That the Administrator shall take such steps as he deems necessary to assure consistency between the redevelopment plan and any highways or other public improvements in the locality receiving financial assistance from the Federal Works Agency.

(c) "Project" may include (1) acquisition of land within (i) a slum area or other deteriorated or deteriorating area which is predominantly residential in character, or (ii) any other area which is to be developed or redeveloped for predominantly residential uses and which prior to such development or redevelopment constitutes a deteriorated or deteriorating area or open urban land which because of obsolete platting or otherwise impairs the sound growth of the community or open suburban land essential for sound community growth; (2) demolition and removal of buildings and improvements; (3) installation, construction, or reconstruction of streets, utilities, and other site improvements essential to the preparation of sites for uses in accordance with the redevelopment plan; and (4) making the land available for development or redevelopment by private enterprise or public agencies (including sale, initial leasing, or retention by the local public agency itself) at its fair value for uses in accordance with the redevelopment plan. For the purposes of this title, the term "project" shall not include the construction of any of the buildings contemplated by the redevelopment plan, and the term "redevelop" and derivatives thereof shall mean develop as well as redevelop.

(d) "Local grants-in-aid" shall mean assistance by a State, municipality, or other public body, or any other entity, in the form of (1) cash grants; (2) donations, at their cash value, of land, demolition or removal work, or site improvements in the project area; and (3) the cost or cash value of the provision by a municipality or other public body of parks, playgrounds, and public buildings or facilities (other than low-rent public housing) which are primarily of direct benefit to the project and which are necessary to serve or support the new uses of land in the project area in accordance with the redevelopment plan.

(e) "Gross project cost" shall comprise (1) the amount of the expenditures by the local public agency with respect to any and all undertakings necessary to carry out the project (including the payment of carrying charges, but not beyond the point where the project is completed), and (2) such local

grants-in-aid as are furnished in forms other than cash.

(f) "Net project cost" shall mean the difference between the gross project cost and the aggregate of (1) the total sales prices of all land sold, and (2) the total capital values (i) imputed, on a basis approved by the Administrator, to all land leased, and (ii) used as a basis for determining the amounts to be transferred to the project from other funds of the local public agency to compensate for any land retained by it for use in accordance with the redevelopment plan.

(g) "Going Federal rate" means the annual rate of interest (or, if there shall be two or more such rates of interest, the lowest thereof) specified in the most recently issued bonds of the Federal Government having a maturity of 20 years or more, determined at the date the contract for loan is made. Any contract for loan made may be revised or superseded by a later contract, so that the going Federal rate, on the basis of which the interest rate on the loan is fixed, shall mean the going Federal rate, as herein defined, on the date that such contract is revised or superseded by such later contract.

(h) "Local public agency" means any State, county, municipality, or other governmental entity or public body which is authorized to undertake the project for which assistance is sought. "State" includes the several States, the District of Columbia, and the Territories, dependencies, and possessions of the United States.

(i) "Administrator" means the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

TITLE VI—LOW-RENT HOUSING

LOCAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND DETERMINATIONS; TENANCY ONLY BY LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

SEC. 601. The United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following additional subsections to section 15:

"(7) In recognition that there should be local determination of the need for public low-rent housing, the Authority shall not make any contract for financial assistance pursuant to this act with respect to any urban low-rent housing initiated after July 1, 1948—

"(a) unless the public housing agency has submitted an analysis of the local housing market demonstrating to the satisfaction of the Authority (i) that there is a need for such low-rent housing which cannot be met by private enterprise; and (ii) that a gap of at least 20 percent has been left between the upper rental limits for admission to the proposed low-rent housing and the lowest rents at which private enterprise is providing (through new construction and existing structures) a substantial supply of decent, safe, and sanitary housing toward meeting the need of an adequate volume thereof; and

"(b) unless the governing body of the locality involved has approved the provision of such low-rent housing, and the contract for financial assistance provides that the Authority shall approve the maximum income limits to be fixed with respect to the admission and continued occupancy of families in such housing, and that such maximum income limits as so approved shall at no time be changed without the prior approval of the Authority.

"(8) Every contract made pursuant to this act for annual contributions for urban low-rent housing projects initiated after July 1, 1948, shall provide that a duly authorized official of the public housing agency involved shall make periodic written statements to the Authority that an investigation has been made of each family admitted to the low-rent housing project involved during the period covered thereby, and that, on the basis of the report of said investigation, he has found that each such family at the time of its admission (a) lived in an unsafe, insanitary, or overcrowded dwelling or had been displaced by a slum-clearance or land assembly and clearance project or by off-site elimination in compliance with the equivalent elimination requirement hereof, and (b) had a net family income not exceeding the maximum income limits theretofore fixed by the public housing agency (and approved by the Authority) for admission of families of low income to such housing: *Provided*, That the requirement in (a) shall not be applicable in the case of the family of any veteran or serviceman (or of any deceased veteran or serviceman) where application for admission to such housing is made not later than 5 years after July 1, 1948.

"(9) Every contract made pursuant to this act for annual contributions for urban low-rent housing projects initiated after July 1, 1948, shall require that the public housing agency make periodic reexaminations of the net incomes of families living in the low-rent housing project involved; and if it is found, upon such reexamination, that the net incomes of any families have increased beyond the maximum income limits theretofore fixed by the public housing agency (and approved by the Authority) for continued occupancy in such housing, such families shall be required to move from the project if there are decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings available to them within their means and appropriate to their use."

VETERANS' PREFERENCE

SEC. 602. The United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

(a) By adding the following new subsection to section 10:

"(g) Every contract made pursuant to this act for annual contributions for low-rent housing projects initiated after July 1, 1948, shall require that the public housing agency in selecting tenants shall give preference, as among applicants eligible for occupancy of the dwelling and at the rent involved, to families of veterans and servicemen (including families of deceased veterans or servicemen), where application for admission to such housing is made not later than 5 years after July 1, 1948. As among applicants entitled to the preference provided in this subsection, first preference shall be given to families of disabled veterans whose disability is service-connected."

(b) By adding the following new subsection to section 2:

"(14) The term 'veteran' shall mean a person who has served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to July 25, 1947, and who shall have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable. The term 'serviceman' shall mean a person in the active military or naval service of the United States who has served therein on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to July 25, 1947."

(c) By adding the following sentence at the end of section 2 (1): "In determining net income for the purposes of tenant eligibility, the Authority is authorized, where it finds such action equitable and in the public interest, to exclude amounts or portions thereof paid by the United States Government as pension or other compensation for disability or death occurring in connection with military service."

COST LIMITS

SEC. 603. The first sentence of section 15 (5) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "No contract for any loan, annual contribution, or capital grant made pursuant to this act shall be entered into by the Authority with respect to any low-rent housing project completed after January 1, 1948, having a cost for construction and equipment of more than $1,250 per room (excluding land demolition, and nondwelling facilities); except that in any city or metropolitan district, as defined by the Bureau of the Census, the population of which exceeds 500,000, and in Alaska, any such contract may be entered into with respect to a project having a cost of construction and equipment of not to exceed $1,500 per room ($2,200 per room in the case of Alaska), excluding land, demolition, and nondwelling facilities, if in the opinion of the Authority such higher cost per room is justified by reason of higher costs of labor and materials and other construction costs: *Provided*, That if the Administrator with respect to any contract for financial assistance made before December 31, 1951, finds that in the geographical area of the low-rent housing project involved (i) it is not feasible under the aforesaid cost limitations to construct the project without sacrifice of sound standards of construction, design, and livability, and (ii) there is an acute need for such housing, he may prescribe in such contract cost limitations which may exceed by not more than $250 per room the limitations that would otherwise be applicable to such project hereunder."

PRIVATE FINANCING

SEC. 604. (a) In order to stimulate increasing private financing of low-rent housing and slum-clearance projects, the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

(1) The last proviso of subsection (b) of section 10 is repealed, and subsection (f) of said section is amended to read as follows: "Payments under annual contributions contracts shall be pledged as security for any loans obtained by a public housing agency to assist the development or acquisition of the housing project to which the annual contributions relate.";

(2) The following is added after section 21:

"PRIVATE FINANCING

"SEC. 22. To facilitate the enlistment of private capital through the sale by public housing agencies of their bonds and other obligations to others than the Authority, in financing low-rent housing and slum-clearance projects, and to maintain the low-rent character of housing projects—

"(a) Every contract for annual contributions (including contracts which amend or supersede contracts previously made) may provide that—

"(1) upon the occurrence of a substantial default in respect of the covenants or conditions to which the public housing agency is subject (as such substantial default shall be defined in such contract), the public housing agency shall be obligated to convey to the Authority the project, as then constituted, to which such contract relates;

"(2) the Authority shall agree to reconvey the project, as constituted at the time of reconveyance, to the public housing agency by which it shall have been so conveyed or to its successor (if such public housing agency or a successor exists) upon such terms as shall be prescribed in such contract and as soon as practicable: (i) after the Authority shall be satisfied that all defaults with respect to the project have been cured, and that the project will, in order to fulfill the purposes of this act, thereafter be operated in accordance with the terms of such contract; or (ii) after the termination of the obligation to make annual contributions available unless there are any obligations or covenants of the public housing agency to the Authority which are then in default. Any prior conveyances and reconveyances shall not exhaust the right to require a conveyance of the project to the Authority pursuant to subparagraph (1), upon the subsequent occurrence of a substantial default.

"(b) Whenever such contract for annual contributions shall include provisions which the Authority, in said contract, determines are in accordance with subsection (a) hereof, and the annual contributions, pursuant to such contract, have been pledged by the

public housing agency as security for the payment of the principal and interest on any of its obligations, the Authority (notwithstanding any other provisions of this act) shall continue to make annual contributions available for the project so long as any of such obligations remain outstanding and may covenant in such contract that in any event such annual contributions shall in each year be at least equal to an amount which, together with such income or other funds as are actually available from the project for the purpose at the time such annual contribution is made, will suffice for the payment of all installments, falling due within the next succeeding 12 months, of principal and interest on the obligations for which the annual contributions provided for in the contract shall have been pledged as security: *Provided,* That such annual contributions shall not be in excess of the maximum sum determined pursuant to the provisions of this act; and in no case shall such annual contributions be in excess of the maximum sum specified in the contract involved, nor for longer than the remainder of the maximum period fixed by the contract.";

(3) Section 2 (10) is amended to read as follows:

"(10) The term 'going Federal rate' means the annual rate of interest (or, if there shall be two or more such rates of interest, the lowest thereof) specified in the most recently issued bonds of the Federal Government having a maturity of 20 years or more, determined, in the case of loans or annual contributions, respectively, at the date of Presidential approval of the contract pursuant to which such loans or contributions are made: *Provided,* That for the purposes of this act the going Federal rate shall be deemed to be not less than 2½ percent.";

(4) Section 9 is amended by striking the period at the end of said section and adding a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That in the case of projects initiated after July 1, 1948, loans shall not be made for a period exceeding 40 years from the date of the bonds evidencing the loan: *And provided further,* That, in the case of such projects or any other projects with respect to which the contracts (including contracts which amend or supersede contracts previously made) provide for loans for a period not exceeding 40 years from the date of the bonds evidencing the loan and for annual contributions for a period not exceeding 40 years from the date the first annual contribution for the project is paid, such loans shall bear interest at a rate not less than the applicable going Federal rate.";

(5) Section 10 (c) is amended by striking the period at the end of the last sentence and adding a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That in the case of projects initiated after July 1, 1948, contracts for annual contributions shall not be made for a period exceeding 40 years from the date the first annual contribution for the project is paid: *And provided further,* That in the case of such projects or any other projects with respect to which the contracts for annual contributions (including contracts which amend or supersede contracts previously made) provide for annual contributions for a period not exceeding 40 years from the date the first annual contribution for the project is paid, the fixed contribution may exceed the amount provided in the first proviso of subsection (b) of this section by 1 percent of development or acquisition cost.";

(6) The first sentence of section 10 (c) is amended to read as follows: "Every contract for annual contributions shall provide that whenever in any year the receipts of a public housing agency in connection with a low-rent housing project exceed its expenditures (including debt service, administration, maintenance, establishment of reserves, and other costs and charges) an amount equal to such excess shall be applied, or set aside for application, to purposes which will effect a reduction in the amount of subsequent annual contributions.";

(7) Section 14 is amended by inserting the following after the first sentence: "When the Authority finds that it would promote economy or be in the financial interest of the Federal Government, any contract heretofore or hereafter made for annual contributions, loans, or both, may, with Presidential approval, be revised or superseded by a contract of the Authority so that the going Federal rate on the basis of which such annual contributions or interest rate on the loans, or both, respectively, are fixed shall mean the going Federal rate, as herein defined, on the date of Presidential approval of such revised or superseded contract: *Provided,* That contracts may not be revised or superseded in a manner which would impair the rights of the holders of any outstanding obligations of the public housing agency involved for which annual contributions have been pledged.";

(8) Section 20 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 20. The Authority may issue and have outstanding at any one time notes and other obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount not to exceed $800,000,000. Such notes or other obligations shall be in such forms and denominations, shall have such maturities, and shall be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Authority with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of the notes or other obligations by the Authority. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes or other obligations of the Authority issued hereunder, and for such purpose is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of the securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of such obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this section. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States.";

(9) Section 2 (5) is amended to read as follows:

"(5) The term 'development' means any or all undertakings necessary for planning, land acquisition, demolition, construction, or equipment, in connection with a low-rent housing or slum-clearance project. The term 'development cost' shall comprise the costs incurred by a public housing agency in such undertakings and their necessary financing (including the payment of carrying charges, but not beyond the point of physical completion), and in otherwise carrying out the development of such project. Construction activity in connection with a low-rent housing project may be confined to the reconstruction, remodeling, or repair of existing buildings."

(b) The last sentence of paragraph 7 of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, is amended by inserting before the colon, after the words "obligations of national mortgage associations", a comma and the following: "or such obligations of any public housing agency (as defined in the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended) as are secured by a pledge of annual contributions under an annual contributions contract between such public housing agency and the Public Housing Administration: *Provided,* That such contract shall contain the covenant by the Public Housing Administration which is authorized by subsection (b) of section 22 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, and that the maximum sum and the maximum period specified in such contract pursuant to said subsection 22 (b) shall not be less than the annual amount and the period for payment which are requisite to provide for the payment when due of all installments of principal and interest on such obligations."

ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 605. Section 10 (e) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting the following after the first sentence thereof: "With respect to projects to be assisted pursuant to this act, the Authority is authorized, in addition to the amount heretofore authorized, to enter into contracts, on and after the 1st day of July 1948, which provide for annual contributions aggregating not more than $32,000,000 per annum, which limit shall be increased by further amounts of $32,000,000 on the 1st day of July in each of the years 1949, 1950, 1951, and 1952, respectively: *Provided,* That the contracts for annual contributions with respect to projects initiated after July 1, 1948, shall not provide for the development of more than 500,000 dwelling units without further authorization from the Congress."

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

SEC. 606. The United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

(1) By adding to section 6 the following new subsection:

"(e) With respect to all projects under title II of Public Law 671, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved June 28, 1940, references therein to the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, shall include all amendments to said act now or hereafter adopted";

(2) By deleting from the proviso in section 10 (a) and in section 11 (a) the following: ", unless the project includes the elimination" and substituting the following: "unless, subsequent to the initiation of the project and within a period specified by the Authority, there has been or will be elimination";

(3) By amending the second sentence of subsection 13 (a) to read as follows: "The Authority may bid for and purchase at any foreclosure by any party or at any other sale, or acquire (pursuant to section 22 or otherwise) any project which it previously owned or in connection with which it has made a loan, annual contribution, or capital grant; and in such event the Authority may complete, administer, dispose of, and otherwise deal with, such projects or parts thereof, subject, however, to the limitations elsewhere in this act governing their administration and disposition.";

(4) By renumbering sections 22 to 30, inclusive, so that they become sections 23 to 31, inclusive.

TITLE VII—FARM HOUSING

SEC. 701. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator shall prepare a report on farm housing which report shall include—

(i) the relationship of farm housing to the entire farm economy;

(ii) the relationship of farm dwellings and related facilities to the operation and management of the farm;

(iii) the extent of the need for housing for farm owners and operators and for tenants, lessees, share croppers, and laborers;

(iv) the operation of existing Federal programs in aid of farm housing and their relationship to other Federal farm programs;

(v) factors which tend to prevent the provision of needed farm housing;

(vi) such other problems and subjects in the field of farm housing as the Secretary of Agriculture and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator may deem appropriate.

Said report, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation and such other recommendations as the Secretary of Agriculture and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator may deem advisable, shall be transmitted to the Congress not later than January 15, 1949.

TITLE VIII—ADMINISTRATIVE AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. Effective upon the date of enactment of this act, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator shall receive compensation at the rate of $16,500 per annum, and the members of the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Housing Commissioner, and the Public Housing Commissioner shall each receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum.

SEC. 802. In carrying out their respective functions, powers, and duties—

(a) The Housing and Home Finance Administrator may appoint such officers and employees as he may find necessary, which appointments shall be subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The Administrator may make such expenditures as may be necessary to carry out his functions, powers, and duties, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out such functions, powers, and duties and for administrative expenses in connection therewith. The Administrator may delegate any of his functions and powers to such officers, agents, or employees as he may designate, and may make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out his functions, powers, and duties. The Administrator shall cause to be prepared for the Housing and Home Finance Agency an official seal of such device as he shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken of said seal.

(b) The Public Housing Administration shall sue and be sued only with respect to its functions under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, and title II of Public Law 671, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved June 28, 1940, as amended. The Public Housing Commissioner may appoint such officers and employees as he may find necessary, which appointments, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, shall hereafter be made hereunder, and shall be subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; delegate any of his functions and powers to such officers, agents, or employees of the Public Housing Administration as he may designate; and make such rules and regulations as he may find necessary to carry out his functions, powers, and duties. Funds made available for carrying out the functions, powers, and duties of the Administration (including appropriations therefor, which are hereby authorized) shall be available, in such amounts as may from year to year be authorized by the Congress, for the administrative expenses of the Administration.

(c) The Housing and Home Finance Administrator, the Home Loan Bank Board (which term as used in this section shall also include and refer to the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and the Chairman of the Home Loan Bank Board), the Federal Housing Commissioner, the Public Housing Commissioner, and the National Home Mortgage Corporation, respectively, may, in addition to and not in derogation of any powers and authorities conferred elsewhere in this act—

(1) with the consent of the agency or organization concerned, accept and utilize equipment, facilities, or the services of employees of any State or local public agency or instrumentality, educational institution, or nonprofit agency or organization and, in connection with the utilization of such services, may make payments for transportation while away from their homes or regular places of business and per diem in lieu of subsistence en route and at place of such service, in accordance with the provisions of 5 U. S. C. 73b–2;

(2) utilize, contract with, and act through, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, any Federal, State, or local public agency or instrumentality, educational institution, or nonprofit agency or organization with the consent of the agency or organization concerned, and any funds available to said officers for carrying out their respective functions, powers, and duties shall be available to reimburse any such agency or organization; and, whenever in the judgment of any such officer necessary, he may make advance, progress, or other payments with respect to such contracts without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes;

(3) make expenditures for all necessary expenses, including preparation, mounting, shipping, and installation of exhibits; purchase and exchange of technical apparatus; and such other expenses as may, from time to time, be found necessary in carrying out their respective functions, powers and duties: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to any purchase or contract by said officers (or their agencies), respectively, for services or supplies if the amount thereof does not exceed $300: *And provided further*, That funds made available for administrative expenses in carrying out the functions, powers, and duties imposed upon the Housing and Home Finance Administrator (except those imposed pursuant to titles II and V hereof), the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Housing Commissioner, and the Public Housing Commissioner, respectively, by or pursuant to law may at their option be consolidated into single administrative expense fund accounts of said officers or agencies for expenditure by them, respectively, in accordance with the provisions hereof.

ACT CONTROLLING

SEC. 803. Insofar as the provisions of any other law are inconsistent with the provisions of this act, the provisions of this act shall be controlling.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 804. Except as may be otherwise expressly provided in this act, all powers and authorities conferred by this act shall be cumulative and additional to and not in derogation of any powers and authorities otherwise existing. Notwithstanding any other evidences of the intention of Congress, it is hereby declared to be the controlling intent of Congress that if any provisions of this act, or the application thereof to any persons or circumstances, shall be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of this act or its applications to other persons and circumstances, but shall be confined in its operation to the provisions of this act, or the application thereof to the persons and circumstances, directly involved in the controversy in which such judgment shall have been rendered.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yesterday I submitted amendments lettered from C to P, inclusive, and asked that they be considered. In view of the fact that I did not obtain unanimous consent to take them up together, I stated that I would call them up separately for consideration. Is not the pending order of business my next amendment, the amendment lettered "E"?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No. Under the circumstances related by the Senator, any Senator who is recognized is entitled to offer an amendment after the disposition of any previous amendment. Therefore the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio is in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to speak briefly, and more or less in a general way regarding the amendment which I have offered, which is the so-called committee substitute beginning at the top of page 3. This amendment replaces all but section 1 of the bill which I introduced last year, and which is known as the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. It represents changes which have been made by the committee; and while I am not entirely satisfied with some of them, and some of them may require amendment, in a general way they have brought the bill of last year up to date. Most of the substantive provisions are approximately the same.

This is a comprehensive housing bill. As Senators know, the attempt to write a housing bill and a housing policy began in 1944 with a subcommittee of the Committee on Reconstruction, which was headed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. Elaborate studies were made at that time, and the bill was developed as a long-term housing policy.

Roughly speaking, the Federal housing policy up to this time has proceeded in three separate groups, besides many minor groups. In general we have two large-scale pieces of legislation to provide for private housing, and one to provide for public housing.

The first is the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, which, through Federal home loan banks, finances building and loan associations and savings associations, which in turn lend money on houses.

The second is the FHA, by which the Government insures private mortgages for builders and for home owners.

The third is the United States Housing Act, under which, before the war, there was a great deal of low-cost housing. Apparently considerable emergency housing was built, which is not analagous at all to the so-called low-cost housing, but of which the Government still owns a very considerable amount. The principal problem in that connection is one of liquidation, because no one proposes that the Government own housing, whether public or private.

What we tried to do was to lay down one Government housing policy. A great many persons have asked me, "Why is the Federal Government concerned with housing at all? Why have any Federal action?" I can only say that it is a little late to ask such a question, because the Federal Government has been in the housing business. The difficulty is that we have had two or three different ideas. Certain individuals made studies to prove that particular programs were better than other programs, and we have had three or four separate agencies. In addition, there were about 10 other bureaus which built housing at one time or another. The effort here is to have a unified policy.

The policy presented in this bill is about nine-tenths private housing, to stimulate private housing by a number of different methods; and about one-tenth to stimulate public housing.

The bill has had a great deal of opposition because of the opposition to public housing. That relates to low-cost subsidized housing, housing with respect to which the rents are subsidized indirectly by the Federal Government, although the housing is owned by local subdivisions.

That is only one title of the entire bill. There has been very little objection to the remainder of it. As I look at the procedure, there will be a number of minor questions as we go through the various private housing sections, but the major battle on the bill probably relates to whether or not public housing shall be included. Personally I am in favor of including it; but the fact that one does not like public housing should be no argument against the bill as a whole. If the Senate approves public housing, it will be in the bill. If it does not, the remainder of the bill is a very valuable assistance, I think, in the long-term problem of constructing housing. Most of the housing built today is indirectly supported by Government action under the FHA, or through the Federal home loan banks.

Since the bill was first drafted, during the war, we adopted the so-called title VI. Title VI provides a more liberal form of FHA insurance than was considered sound in time of peace. Personally I should like to see it ended, but the pressure for continuing it is very strong; and the committee approved the so-called title VI amendments, the transitional period amendments, beginning at page 3 and running through page 12.

The amount involved is increased. The present title VI is changed somewhat by making the requirement that a considerable part of the insurance available shall be for rental housing. We have had much more difficulty in getting FHA and the Government to finance rental housing than to finance homes to be owned by citizens; and yet there is a very large demand for rental housing.

The general purpose of the changes in title VI—and that is all they are; it is not a new section at all—is to make more money available for rental housing; also to increase somewhat the figures which are permitted in costs, because of the rising costs, and to permit the Administrator to increase the rate of interest if he finds that that is necessary in order to get private money to finance the various mortgages. I shall not attempt to deal in detail with title VI. It is extended for one year. I feel that it is somewhat too generous in providing a 90-percent mortgage for any builder, so that a builder with practically no capital of his own can construct a large number of houses and sell them at whatever prices he may choose to charge. However, most of the houses built in the last year, I think, are under title VI, and it has been a great stimulation to the construction of housing. I feel that a 90-percent mortgage for a builder is somewhat high.

The long-term bill provides that there shall be an 80-percent mortgage available for builders. That would require them to have some actual cash capital—probably 10 percent. The long-term bill also provides that they shall have 85 percent when they build very low-cost houses, in order that less capital may be required to build low-cost houses than to build more expensive houses, so that there may be an inducement to build the lowest cost houses that can be built. In other words, the builders would have to put up practically only 5 percent. There is not much use in that law so long as we have title VI; but presumably title VI will expire at the end of this year. Then the other section will come into effect, and after that builders will get 80 percent on houses costing more than $6,000, in a general way, with some possibility of adjustment, and 85 percent on houses under that cost.

The other amendments to the FHA law which are included in title I are amendments designed, in general, to extend the FHA and to induce it to finance more rental housing, as well as to permit a more convenient method for financing universities and private institutions. Under this bill, almost any university could build a dormitory and could get a mortgage to be insured by the FHA.

The bill provides for cooperative veterans' associations and other cooperative ventures in housing to be financed by mortgages to be insured by the FHA.

In general, the bill is designed to make the FHA more extensive and more available. The FHA has done the best single job in housing. It has succeeded in getting a uniform rate of interest established throughout the country for housing, eliminating the old second mortgages, which used to have rates of interest running up to 10 percent, 12 percent, or even 15 percent. Now all the deferred purchase money is handled under one mortgage. The FHA has set a pattern of housing finance by which the deferred purchase money is paid for, on the average, in approximately 13 years, for both principal and interest. That procedure has reduced very much the finance charges for housing.

Today, however, the difficulty with housing is no longer the expense of financing. That has been brought down about as low as it is possible to do, although in this bill we try to make it a little lower. The principal difficulty with housing, as of today, is the actual cost of construction; in other words, the cost of the labor and the materials which go into the housing. That problem is not solved, and I think it is going to be very difficult to solve it.

The bill contains a provision for setting up a corporation to provide a secondary market for GI home loans and FHA insured mortgages. That is title II, beginning on page 20. We found that today the GI mortgages are very difficult to obtain, because many of the smaller banks are filled up with all the mortgages they want. The rate of interest is not very attractive. It was felt that if we were going through at all with the promise to finance homes for veterans, the Federal Government would have to be prepared to take some of those mortgages off the hands of the banks, in order to make more money available in the banks for other such mortgages. I would hope that we might not have to continue this operation for long.

There are a number of restrictions. It is limited to $500,000,000 of purchases of such mortgages, and they can be purchased only where the Corporation determines that additional private credit cannot possibly be obtained. This provision was inserted by the committee, and no doubt the members of the committee will explain it somewhat more than I shall do at the present time.

Title III deals with housing research. It begins on page 34. The Senator from Wisconsin has a slightly different provision which he may offer as an amendment. I think both of them would enable the Housing Administrator to make the studies that are desirable in the effort to try to find a way to reduce the cost of housing.

Primarily, the housing problem arises from the fact that housing is too expensive for the income of the people. Low-income families which are able to purchase sufficient food and adequate clothing for themselves find they are unable to obtain decent housing because the cost of housing is so high that the rental is beyond their means. The reason we have slums is that a large number of people are unable to pay the rents which have to be charged for decent housing, considering what the present cost of housing is.

The provision on page 37 deals further with the extension of the FHA. In fact, I covered it when I was discussing title II.

On page 39 is a new and experimental provision. It was in the bill the Senate passed last year; but the provision in the pending bill extends the insurance principle so that the Government will undertake to insure equity investments in large subdivisions as made by insurance companies or large estates. The Government hereby undertakes to say that if they will conform to various requirements the Government will guarantee a 2¾-percent return on the money invested.

The great difficulty in housing is to get equity money into housing, particularly rental housing. Insurance companies have done this on their own; but without such a guaranty they have, as a rule, not succeeded in getting their rents any lower than any other private builder can get them. Under this guaranty, they have to limit their returns. So, although they can get a guaranty of 2¾ percent, they cannot obtain more than a certain maximum return. Perhaps the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] can tell me that figure. I should like to have him state the maximum return which insurance companies can obtain. Of course, 2¾ percent is the guaranty.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to answer that question?

Mr. TAFT. Certainly.

Mr. McCARTHY. Under my amendment, rentals are set to yield 3½ percent, and I assume that is identical to the provision in the Senator's bill.

Mr. TAFT. Yes, they can set their rents at such a level as to obtain as much as 3½-percent return, and 2¾-percent return is guaranteed. Whether that provision will be used by insurance companies, I do not know. However, I think

it is worth trying, because today a very large amount of the savings of the people has been consolidated in insurance companies; and that money has been available primarily for investment, not for mortgages. With this guaranty, we make available the savings of millions of policy holders for equity investment in housing, if this provision works. I do not think it can possibly do any harm, and it may succeed in stimulating a large number of insurance companies into developing large-scale housing projects. Projects developed in that way are much safer because they are protected against deterioration of the neighborhood. They must necessarily be well planned. In general, the insurance companies consider such an investment to be a safe one.

Title V is the urban redevelopment section. It is a section which, briefly, has no direct relationship to housing. It does have a direct relationship to slum clearance. It provides a plan to be used if a city decides to clean up an area. Last month, I saw in St. Louis such an area, where a large number of blocks practically in the middle of the city have so deteriorated that they have simply become slums; and the city of St. Louis has an elaborate plan by which it will purchase approximately 100 blocks or more, tear them all down, and replan the site, with some areas set aside as boulevards and other areas devoted for other public purposes. Under this provision, the property would be sold for private housing. If public housing is made legal, some of the property could be used for public housing. But the provision separates entirely the slum-clearance problem from the public-housing problem, to which latter subject many persons have objected.

What will happen is, roughly, this: The city will buy the land, and will replan it and revalue it. The Federal Government will pay two-thirds of the cost of clearing the land. It will pay nothing for reconstruction purposes; but inevitably there will be some loss in the slum-clearance operation. Inevitably the buildings will cost more and tearing them down will cost more than the land will be worth after the city has obtained it. Roughly speaking, this measure proposes that the Federal Government by grant shall take care of two-thirds of the loss the city suffers in that connection. For that purpose there is provided a total of $500,000,000 during the next 5 years. I imagine it will take a good deal longer than that to use it. Practically the only city I know of that is ready to go ahead is St. Louis, which is very much interested in the proposal. In general all our cities, particularly the older ones, are faced more and more with the slum problem, and private builders are almost all in favor of this provision, because they say, "It is the way to clear the slums, and we do not need public housing."

My own feeling is that, after the slums have been cleared away, unless there is public housing, other slums will very rapidly develop somewhere else, by reason of the inevitable deterioration and the fact that people will not and cannot pay the rent which is attempted to be charged for better property.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. Would the Senator have any objection to my inserting in the RECORD at this point a copy of a telegraphic message recently received by myself from the mayor of the city of St. Louis, with respect to this matter?

Mr. TAFT. No, certainly not. I should be delighted to have it placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *April 10, 1948.*

United States Senator FORREST C. DONNELL,
Senate Office Building:

Respectfully urge your vigorous support of Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill. Although St. Louis is contemplating large bond issue to further slum clearance and provide additional decent housing, neither private capital nor local government alone and unassisted can perform titanic task of rebuilding decayed and blighted areas which afflict virtually every city in America. Aid of Federal Government is imperative in all-out war on slums and substandard housing.

ALOYS KAUFMANN,
Mayor.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator from Wisconsin does not mind, I should prefer to finish.

Mr. McCARTHY. Very well.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, title VI, then, is the public housing section. I think I shall not try to deal with that at the present time, because it will no doubt be the subject of controversy and debate, and I should rather discuss it at that time. Roughly speaking, it provides for the construction altogether of 500,000 units over a period of 5 years, I think, according to the amendment. With respect to the guaranty of the Federal Government, at the end, would amount to about $160,000,000 a year for 40 years. The provision would be in the nature of a direct subsidy of rents, and would offer rents probably in the neighborhood of $5 a room, which is about the standard which previously existed. It may be somewhat higher than that in view of increasing costs and the general increase in income.

The original title VII directs the Secretary of Agriculture and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to prepare a report on farm housing. The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill contained a rather elaborate farm-housing provision, which was never very satisfactory to me. We asked the Secretary of Agriculture to study the problem and present a plan, which he did. We incorporated it in the bill without any very extensive study. The farm organizations are not satisfied with it. It is a much more complicated problem even than city housing, because of the fact that the house is an economic unit along with the farm and inseparable from the farm. The committee decided they would rather provide simply for a further study and report by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Housing Administrator. Title VIII contains various administrative provisions.

Altogether, Mr. President, the bill, as a long-term bill, is intended to stimulate private housing by every possible means, among others, by enabling the FHA to assist in financing mortgages. It is intended to cover public housing to the extent of about 500,000 additional units. The whole bill was designed originally, I might say, as a long-term proposition, not to meet a particular shortage situation. In fact, the general idea was, during the war, that after the war was over building materials of all kinds would be available in unlimited quantities, both for public and private housing, and all the needed houses could be built. That has not been the condition up to this time, and so there has been some proper objection from the point of view of the private builders who say that an increase in public housing will simply reduce the amount of private housing. I think we have already passed that point. It will take any public housing probably another year to get started anyway, since elaborate contracts and plans must be made; so I feel that we can now proceed with the long-term program, in the meantime continuing for 1 year the emergency FHA provisions of title VI.

Mr. President, I very much hope that the bill may be finally approved. I shall deal with the question of public housing when it arises.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have one or two questions to ask the Senator from Ohio. I have not seen his amendment; but from his analysis of it——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator must have seen my amendment, because it is the committee amendment which the Senator approved. The only provision that is not included is the first section, covering the declaration of principles. Otherwise it is the same as the committee bill; there is nothing new about it.

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not approve it; I voted against it. In other words, this is the amendment which the committee reported by a vote of 6——

Mr. TAFT. I understand that. The Senator was on the committee which considered it, and he voted against it. What I want to make clear to the Senate is that it is not a new amendment. It has been in the bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. I want to know whether it is a new amendment, or whether the Senator has taken that which the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] proposed, so I may know what is in it.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Vermont offered an entire substitute. I have offered simply an amendment from page 16 of the original bill. But it is primarily the committee amendment. My suggestion is that if the Senator from Wisconsin wants to offer amendments, I think he should offer them now to the committee amendment rather than to the original bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I received an objection to the bill, to the effect that it permits, as the old bill did not, commercial banks to make the loans, whereas formerly the loans were made simply by investment houses. Will the Senator from Ohio give his opinion on that point, and state whether or not he thinks the amendment is necessary?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, that particular provision was the subject of controversy last year, and I removed it from my bill. I do not know what the committee did.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. I want to say that I likewise have had growing doubts as to the advisability of the provision, and I should therefore be glad to see it stricken out as being too controversial.

Mr. TAFT. I may say to the Senator, if he will offer an amendment at any time, the committee apparently will accept it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. May I ask one more question of the Senator from Ohio, while I have the opportunity?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I read this morning and endeavored to understand some of the building statistics of last year. Is it reasonably correct to say that residential housing last year amounted to about twice the amount, in figures, of commercial and educational construction?

Mr. TAFT. In dollars?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In dollars.

Mr. TAFT. I am afraid I do not know. I should think that is reasonably correct. It is, I know, by far the largest construction item of all.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Therefore, as opposed to industrial, commercial, educational, and other construction, materials are today going into residential construction to a greater extent than into other forms of construction? Is that a correct statement?

Mr. TAFT. I think that is a correct statement.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So that on the question to which the Senator referred a few moments ago, as to whether furnishing this money would result in less private construction and more public construction, there is some basis for saying that materials are in short supply today and are going principally into residential construction, is there not?

Mr. TAFT. They may be, although there does not seem any longer to be any great handicap in the obtaining of materials. There has been some discussion regarding the shortage of nails. They are now being made in sufficient quantity. I imagine the amount of steel going into other construction is larger than the amount of steel employed in the construction of homes. As the Senator knows, there is not a large amount of steel used in homes. There may be a bottleneck with regard to steel, but I question whether the amount required for homes is a serious problem.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the slum-clearance title were adopted, how much money would be involved in the next year, on the part of the Federal Government? Broadly speaking, does that involve much construction?

Mr. TAFT. I should think that during the next year it would not involve any construction at all. In fact, in all probability it would result in wrecking a number of houses and providing a great many bricks and other material derived from the tearing down of slums. I doubt very much that such work will get started within the next year.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So if we go ahead with slum clearance, under this bill we would not be taking materials away from necessary construction in the next year and adding to the burdens of Government at a time when other expenses would have to be met in connection with rearmament, manpower, and so forth. Is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. I should say that not 1 cent of money for slum clearance would go into the construction of homes. If a city wanted to construct buildings on the cleared land someone would have to provide the necessary money. The bulk of materials to be used during the next 12 months will be almost all financed under the FHA, or the public-housing section. I should think it would be predominantly under the FHA. I think approximately 800,000 residential units have been constructed.

The total public housing would be limited the first year to 100,000. It could not possibly be more than one-eighth, possibly a great deal less. In public housing there must be a metropolitan housing authority, contracts must be worked out, and plans must be drafted and shown to the Federal authorities before a contract can be made. So I should say it would require a full year to get started on any public-housing project. I do not think it would involve any materials during the next 12 months. The FHA provision is the one that will require materials. The continued easy mortgage terms provided for in title VI undoubtedly will result in the construction of more houses than would otherwise be constructed, and that will require material.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Slum clearance in the next year or two would be a matter of planning primarily. Is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. I should think so.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry at the proper time. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio is now the pending amendment. If it is to be treated as an amendment, no other amendment can be offered to the original text of the bill until that amendment is disposed of. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). The Chair advises the Senator that his statement is not correct. Any perfecting amendment is proper.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the theory that this amendment is a substitute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it is not a substitute, because title I, the declaration of national housing policy, is not touched at all. We have already stricken out title II and title III by amendment. This is an amendment to the remainder of the bill, beginning with title IV of the original bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Chair correctly understands the situation, it is an amendment to strike out and insert.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. But it is not a substitute.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I was merely making an effort to clear up the parliamentary situation. Whether it be an amendment or a substitute, amendments to the language proposed to be stricken out are in order prior to the vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct, as the Chair understands.

Mr. TAFT. Amendments to the amendment which I have offered are also in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. I invite the presentation of such amendments.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with the Senator that the logical procedure would be to perfect the Senator's amendment by anyone who wishes to offer an amendment, rather than to wait until it is disposed of before offering amendments on the theory that it might be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will remind the Senate that that procedure can be carried out only to the point of one degree, with reference to the question of amending a substitute.

Mr. TAFT. Or amending an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Colorado. He has been waiting for some time.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I am inquiring primarily to ascertain when would be the most appropriate time to bring up the question which I have in mind. Section 404 in the committee amendments would add section 110 to the Internal Revenue Code, to provide an optional amortization deduction for any rental housing facility constructed after March 15, 1948, to be in lieu of the depreciation allowances normally applicable. The proposed amortization allowances would be based on an amortization period of 120 months, to be taken by the taxpayer over the first 60 months after the completion of the housing facility, and at the end of the 60-month period the regular depreciation would be applicable.

I invite the distinguished Senator's attention to the fact that this is a subject matter very properly within the jurisdiction and, I believe, exclusively within the jurisdiction, of the Senate Finance Committee. It also involves a subject matter which is receiving most careful

consideration by the House Ways and Means Committee not only in connection with housing, but in a dozen different fields in which various new amortization provisions have been suggested.

Mr. TAFT. In answer to the Senator let me say that section 404, on page 58 of the Flanders amendment, the so-called committee amendments, was not in the original bill. It is the proposal of the Banking and Currency Committee, and I should prefer to have that committee handle it. I think now is a good time, if the Senator wishes to move to strike out section 404. It would be entirely agreeable to me. Then the matter could be debated at this time.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, this item of the bill was considered by the committee favorably and left out originally because we felt we have no right to put it in, for the reasons which the distinguished Senator from Colorado has so eloquently described. We were "sold" on the use of this provision that we finally decided to put it in, in order to bring the matter to an issue. We recognized the fact that it was outside our jurisdiction. We ask the cooperative consideration by the best means possible within the experience and judgment of the chairman of the Finance Committee, because we feel it is an exceedingly useful provision.

Mr. MILLIKIN. For the purposes of discussion let us assume it is a desirable thing; but, as I say, we are studying dozens of proposals in very important fields having to do with new amortization allowances. Frankly, our efforts will be very much embarrassed by a precedent established in this oblique fashion on a subject matter which is within the jurisdiction of the Senate Finance Committee and which is not within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, although I should have to agree with the position taken by the Senator from Colorado, I should like to say a word or two with reference to the desirability of this particular provision in this particular place.

While there is in the bill a provision for yield insurance, it was discovered by investigation and after consultation with a considerable number of people that the yield insurance was not a very satisfactory way to accomplish the end desired. It requires a specialized bookkeeping setup by the Federal authority. It requires that the cost accounting be of an authorized type. It requires a great deal of red tape. It is so much simpler to obtain the same result by this simple process of accelerated amortization that we took this as the preferable alternative.

If the Senator from Colorado can assure us that this provision will have attention, if he can assure us that the Banking and Currency Committee will have an opportunity to appear on this subject, it seems to me that perhaps is all we can ask of the chairman of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I do not want to overpromise in this matter. The subject is being very diligently studied by the House Ways and Means Committee. The Senate Committee on Finance will not go into the matter until after the House completes its labors. Therefore I do not know where the Banking and Currency Committee could go at the present time, except to the House Ways and Means Committee, and I do not know what the result would be if that were done. I must necessarily base myself primarily on the constitutional point as to the initiation of revenue measures and on the proposition that the Banking and Currency Committee has proposed something which is clearly outside its jurisdiction, and is clearly within the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Finance.

If it were an unimportant matter, if deep questions of principle were not involved, we might be able to blink it, but the whole question of amortization, as I have said before, runs across a dozen or two dozen different subjects which have been presented to the Committee on Finance and to the House Ways and Means Committee with great earnestness in different fields. A precedent in the pending bill might be very crippling to our effort to do justice in other fields.

Mr. FLANDERS. With due humility, may I inquire whether accelerated depreciation applied to this particular type of capital asset has been under the consideration of the Finance Committee or the House Ways and Means, so far as the chairman of the Finance Committee knows?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It has been my understanding that the House Ways and Means Committee has considered accelerated depreciation in the field of national housing.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado to withhold offering any amendment of the kind suggested, for the reason that I understand under the parliamentary rules we are first allowed to perfect Senate bill 866. I have perfecting amendments which contain an accelerated depreciation provision. It is not nearly so broad, however, as the accelerated depreciation provision in the amendment of the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Ohio. My amendments provide for accelerated depreciation, but only, first, to equity investors, and, second, only where the rent for the rental units is below a certain figure.

Originally we were concerned for fear we were invading the province of the Senator's committee. We went into that in great detail, and we decided—and we had no advice to the contrary from the parliamentarians or their legal staff—that as this was merely incidental to the housing bill it was definitely within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I do think that if we should go so far as the provision in the bill of the Senator from Vermont we would be invading the province of the Committee on Finance.

I earnestly hope the Senator from Colorado will withhold offering his amendment, first, in order to see whether or not the Senate will accept my amendment to the original Senate bill 866.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I would be required to raise a point of order or to make an appropriate motion against any kind of an amendment or any kind of a provision in the bill which would touch the important subject of taxation, which I regard as distinctly within the province of the Senate Committee on Finance and distinctly not within the province, directly or indirectly, of any other committee.

A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. May I raise a point of order on the inclusion in the bill of the provision in question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will observe in this connection that the inquiry of the Senator from Colorado raises a question of a constitutionality, and that a question of constitutionality must be passed on by the Senate itself. Does the Senator from Colorado desire to raise that question?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Would it be in order for me to move now to strike out the section?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It definitely would be, based on the question of constitutionality, at any time.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Am I correct in believing that perfecting amendments to the text of the original bill occurring subsequently to page 16 would now take precedence over any amendments to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio as a substitute? If so, I have several amendments to offer to the original bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In order to clarify the atmosphere, the Chair would like to read a statement pertaining to this whole subject, which does not, by the way, deal with the aspect of constitutionality, but clarifies some of the other questions.

The amendment of the Senator from Ohio proposes to strike out all of the original text of the bill after line 3 on page 16, and in lieu thereof to insert all of the substitute committee amendment after page 2 thereof.

Under the precedents of the Senate, the committee amendment, being a complete substitute for the original text of the bill, is not regarded, for the purpose of amendment, as an amendment in the first degree, but as text. Therefore the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio is an amendment in the first degree only, and is open to amendment in one further degree.

The amendment of the Senator from Ohio is a motion to strike out and insert. Under rule XVIII it is specifically provided that—

> Pending a motion to strike out and insert, the part to be stricken out and the part to be inserted shall each be regarded for the purpose of amendment as a question; and motions to amend the part to be stricken out shall have precedence.

Under this provision of the rule, an amendment to that part of the original bill proposed to be stricken out by the amendment of the Senator from Ohio would be in order as an amendment in the first degree, and would take precedence over the substitute proposed by the Senator from Ohio, and also over any amendment proposed to the substitute.

An amendment to the original text would be subject to amendment in one further degree.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the Senator from Colorado, after reading the provision dealing with this subject in my amendment, still feels strongly that it definitely invades the province of his committee, I shall have no objection to striking that particular provision from my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado desire to yield for that purpose?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will not read the amendment at this time. I will wait until I secure the floor, so I can bring it up in order.

Mr. MILLIKIN. When will the Senator reach that amendment?

Mr. McCARTHY. I can give it to the Senator now. It is in title I. It is very restricted.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin when he will reach that amendment?

Mr. McCARTHY. I intend to begin with my amendment lettered "F" and go through with the others. When I shall reach the amendment in question depends on the length of the debate on each of my other amendments. I should like to reach it in order, otherwise the proceedings may be confusing.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I may not be present in the Senate Chamber when the Senator reaches the amendment we are speaking of, as I am obliged to leave shortly. Could the Senator bring it up out of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair suggests that in view of the constitutional aspect which the amendment seems to have, it ought to be disposed of immediately.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I move that the language of the Taft substitute—committee amendments—beginning on page 58, after line 18, down to and including line 23 on page 60 be stricken on the ground that it is a revenue measure; that under the Constitution revenue measures must originate in the House of Representatives, and on the secondary ground that it is an invasion of the jurisdiction of the Senate Finance Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the provision proposed to be stricken by the Senator from Colorado will be printed in the RECORD without reading.

The provision Mr. MILLIKIN proposes to be stricken is as follows:

SEC. 404. (a) The Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting therein, immediately after the heading preceding section 111, the following new section:

"SEC. 110. Amortization Deduction.

"(a) General rule: Every person, at his election, shall be entitled to a deduction with respect to the amortization during the first 60 months after the completion of a housing amortization facility (as defined in subsection (d)) of the adjusted basis (for determining gain) of such housing amortization facility, based on an amortization period of 120 months. Such amortization deduction shall be an amount, with respect to each month of such 60-month period within the taxable year, equal to the adjusted basis of the facility at the end of such month divided by the number of months (including the month for which the deduction is computed) remaining in the 120-month-amortization period. Such adjusted basis at the end of the month shall be computed without regard to the amortization deduction for such month. The amortization deduction above provided with respect to any month shall be in lieu of the deduction with respect to such facility for such month provided by section 23 (l), relating to exhaustion, wear and tear, and obsolescence.

"(b) Election of amortization: The election of the taxpayer to take the amortization deduction shall be made only by a statement to that effect in its return for the taxable year in which the facility was completed. The election shall be irrevocable.

"(c) Termination of amortization period: Upon the termination of the 60-month period, the taxpayer shall be allowed the deduction provided under section 23 (l), beginning with the first month as to which the amortization deduction is not applicable, and the taxpayer shall not be entitled to any further amortization deductions with respect to the housing amortization facility.

"(d) Definition of housing amortization facility: As used in this section, the term "housing amortization facility" means any facility, land, building, or part thereof, constructed for rental housing, to the extent constructed after March 15, 1948.

"(e) Taxability on sale of housing amortization facility: Anything to the contrary in this title notwithstanding, any gain realized upon the sale or other disposition of any property with respect to which any amortization deduction has been claimed shall to the extent of any such amortization deduction be considered gain recognized and taxable as ordinary income.

"(f) Life tenant and remainderman: In the case of property held by one person for life with remainder to another person, the deduction shall be computed as if the life tenant were the absolute owner of the property and shall be allowable to the life tenant."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1947.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Colorado.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion having been agreed to, the language previously indicated is stricken from the Taft amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. Has the Senator from Colorado concluded?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator now bring up his amendment so we may dispose of it?

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall act in accordance with the action just taken and move to strike from my amendment the similar language when the amendment is reached.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield the floor?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I now offer my amendment lettered "F," and ask that immediate action be taken thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Wisconsin willing to have the amendment printed in the RECORD, due to its length? It will require some time to read the amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the amendment might very well be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment proposed by Mr. McCARTHY is as follows:

On page 16, after line 3, insert the following:

"TITLE II—SECONDARY MARKET FOR GI HOME LOANS AND FHA INSURED MORTGAGES

"PURPOSE

"SEC. 201. It is the purpose of this title to provide, with appropriate safeguards against inflationary increases in housing costs and prices, a source of secondary credit for residential mortgage loans which have been insured under the National Housing Act or guaranteed or insured under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, in order to maintain an orderly market for such loans, to meet liquidity of needs of financing institutions, and to encourage economically sound residential construction in any areas where the scarcity of such secondary credit develops to the extent of threatening the continued production and availability of housing for veterans and others.

"CREATION OF NATIONAL HOME MORTGAGE CORPORATION AND LIQUIDATION OF FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

"SEC. 202. (a) There is hereby created in the Housing and Home Finance Agency a body corporate to be known as the National Home Mortgage Corporation (referred to in this title as the 'Corporation') which shall be an agency and instrumentality of the United States. There shall be a President of the Corporation and all of the powers of the Corporation shall be vested in him. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator shall be the President of the Corporation.

"(b) At such time as the Corporation shall determine, after funds become available therefor, it shall, after giving adequate advance notice to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, purchase all residential loans held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation by virtue of section 203 of Public Law 132, Eightieth Congress, approved June 30, 1947, and all residential loans held by the Federal National Mortgage Association, at prices equal to the unpaid principal plus accrued interest on such loans, and such loans, together with all related rights, and such contracts, documents, and records, as may be essential to the proper servicing and resale of the loans so purchased, shall be transferred to the Corporation. At the time of such transfer the Corporation shall assume all outstanding commitments of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (acquired pursuant to said sec. 203) and the Federal National Mortgage Association to purchase any residential loans. With respect to the loans, commitments, related rights, contracts, documents, and records so transferred, 'National Home Mortgage Corporation' is

hereby substituted, for all purposes, for 'Reconstruction Finance Corporation' and 'Federal National Mortgage Association', as the case may be, and no suit, action, or other proceedings lawfully commenced by or against the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or the Federal National Mortgage Association shall abate by reason of the enactment of this act, but the court, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within 12 months after the date of such enactment, showing a necessity for the survival of suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a determination of the questions involved, may allow the same to be maintained by or against the National Home Mortgage Corporation. The Corporation shall have the same powers to service and sell loans transferred to it pursuant to this subsection as it has with respect to loans purchased under section 205.

"(c) The Federal National Mortgage Association (established by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under title III of the National Housing Act) shall not purchase any mortgage or lien after the date of enactment of this title (except pursuant to a commitment prior to that date), and shall, after the transfer of its holdings to the National Home Mortgage Corporation as provided in subsection (b) of this section, proceed to liquidate its assets and wind up its affairs as rapidly and economically as feasible and in the public interest. For this purpose, the Association shall dispose of any remaining assets in such manner as it may determine to be in the public interest, pay all outstanding obligations, adjust and settle any claims against the Association, retire its capital stock at the amount paid by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for such stock, and the $1,000,000 paid-in surplus supplied by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and cover any remaining funds into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"ADVISORY BOARD

"SEC. 203. There shall be an advisory board to the Corporation which shall consist of the President of the Corporation, who shall serve as Chairman, and the following or their designees: The Secretary of the Treasury, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Housing Commissioner, the Chairman of the Home Loan Bank Board, and the Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The advisory board is authorized and directed to furnish information and advice to the Corporation on all matters of basic policy involved in the exercise of its powers with a view toward coordinating the operations of the Corporation with the general economic and fiscal policies of the Government and carrying out the purposes of this title.

"CAPITAL STOCK AND ISSUANCE OF NOTES

"SEC. 204. (a) The Corporation shall have a capital stock of $5,000,000, which shall be subscribed by the United States and paid by the Secretary of the Treasury in such amounts and at such times as requested by the Corporation. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000,000 which shall be available to pay the subscription to the capital stock of the Corporation. Receipt for such payment shall be issued to the Secretary of the Treasury by the Corporation and shall evidence the stock ownership of the United States. Net earnings of the Corporation (as determined by it) shall, after reasonable provision for possible losses, be used for payment of dividends on capital stock. Any such dividends shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"(b) The Corporation may issue and have outstanding at any one time notes and other obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in a maximum amount not exceeding $250,000,000 plus an amount equal to the total purchase price paid for the loans purchased under the requirements of section 202 (b), except that with the approval of the President of the United States this maximum may be increased by an additional amount not exceeding $250,000,000. Such notes or other obligations shall be in such forms and denominations, shall have such maturities, and shall be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Corporation with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of the notes or other obligations by the Corporation. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes or other obligations of the Corporation issued hereunder and for such purposes is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of such obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this section. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States. The Corporation may retire or redeem any notes or other obligations issued by it.

"PURCHASE AND SALE OF LOANS

"SEC. 205. For the purposes of this title, the Corporation is hereby authorized (in addition to the purchases required under section 202 (b)) to purchase, with or without recourse, to service, and to sell without recourse (at such price or prices and under such other terms and conditions as the Corporation may prescribe) (a) any residential loan which is insured under section 2, 203, 207, 603, or 608 of the National Housing Act, or as amended at any time; or (b) any loan guaranteed under section 501 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, or as amended at any time; or (c) any loan guaranteed under section 505 (a) of said act; or (d) any loan insured under section 508 of said act which could have been guaranteed under section 501 and is secured by a first lien on the realty or which could have been guaranteed under section 505 (a) of said Act. The Corporation shall maintain separate accounts with respect to the purchase of (a) loans insured under the National Housing Act and (b) loans guaranteed or insured under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended. Any purchase of a loan pursuant to this section shall be made in accordance with regulations issued by the Corporation and shall be subject to the following qualifications:

"(a) Purchases of loans shall be restricted to those areas in which the Corporation determines that a scarcity of a private secondary credit for such loans has developed to the extent of threatening the continued production and availability for sale or rental housing generally throughout the area and that such purchases by the Corporation would not reasonably be expected to contribute to substantial increases in costs and prices of housing facilities. No purchases of loans of any particular amount and character shall be made in any area unless the Corporation has determined that there is no active private market which is willing to purchase loans of that amount or character at prices which the Corporation considers to be appropriate, and the Corporation shall terminate or restrict any such purchases by it whenever it determines that the volume of such purchases contributes to substantial increases in costs and prices of housing facilities.

"(b) No loan may be purchased if the original principal obligation of the loan exceeds or exceeded $7,000 for each family residence or dwelling unit covered by the mortgage or other lien securing the loan: *Provided*, That the Corporation may prescribe a higher maximum amount or amounts, not exceeding $10,000 for each family residence or dwelling unit, if it finds that at any time or in any area it is not feasible, within the limitations of a lower maximum amount or amounts, to construct or provide dwellings which meet sound standards of construction, design, and livability.

"(c) No loan shall be purchased except from mortgagees or lienholders which the Corporation determines to be qualified by experience or facilities and approves for servicing the loan or performing any other obligation of the mortgagee or lienholder in connection with the loan.

"(d) No purchase of a loan may be made unless supporting data satisfactory to the Corporation are submitted to show compliance with requirements prescribed by the Corporation with respect to the reasonable ability of the borrower to meet his payments, and the physical soundness of the property covered by the mortgage or other lien securing the loan. Subject to the above qualifications, the regulations of the Corporation may contain such other conditions and provisions as the Corporation deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this title. Unless hereafter authorized by the Congress, the Corporation shall not purchase any loan under this title after June 30, 1950. At least 90 days prior to that date, the President shall submit to the Congress his recommendations as to any action or legislation with respect to the Corporation which may be necessary or desirable.

"GENERAL POWERS OF CORPORATION

"SEC. 206. For the purposes of this title, the Corporation—

"(a) shall have succession in its corporate name;

"(b) may adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed;

"(c) may adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations for the conduct of its business and the exercise of its powers; and may provide by regulation for a reasonable fee to be charged for the review of applications for the purchase of loans by the Corporation or for other services;

"(d) may make contracts and purchase or otherwise acquire, hold, lease, and dispose (at public or private sale) of such real and personal property as may be necessary or incidental to the conduct of its business, and may accept donations of services and property;

"(e) may sue and be sued in any Federal, State, or local court of competent jurisdiction: *Provided*, That the Corporation shall be entitled to such immunities and exemptions from the payment of costs, charges, and fees as are granted to the United States Government: *And provided further*, That the Corporation shall be represented, at its request, in litigated matters by the Attorney General or such attorney or attorneys as he may designate;

"(f) may (i) appoint, employ, and fix the compensation and duties of the Executive Vice President of the Corporation and such other officers, attorneys, experts, employees, and agents as the Corporation shall determine; (ii) delegate to them any of the

powers and duties vested in the President of the Corporation and provide for the redelegation thereof; and (iii) require bond of such of them as the Corporation may designate and fix the penalties and pay the premium of such bond: *Provided*, That with the exception of experts and consultants, appointments shall be made pursuant to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended;

"(g) may utilize, and exercise any powers through, the facilities, officers and employees of the Federal Home Loan Banks, or of any department, agency, corporation, or establishment of the Government; and may (without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended) contract with any such agency or any other agency or individual or private corporation for the furnishing of any services or facilities, including appraisal, management, title, and other work in connection with property, and contract to make payment or reimbursement for any services or facilities;

"(h) may collect, compromise, and release contractual claims and obligations and pursue the same to final collection, institute proceedings for foreclosure on property covered by a mortgage or other lien, acquire any such property by voluntary conveyance or by purchase at foreclosure sale or otherwise, deal with, complete, rent, renovate, modernize, insure, or sell for cash or credit at public or private sale any property acquired by the Corporation, acquire or continue insurance or guaranty of any mortgage or loan held by the Corporation, and take such other action as may be necessary to preserve or protect any loan, mortgage, or lien or interest therein, or to realize on the value thereof;

"(i) may determine the necessity for and the character of its obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, paid, and accounted for, subject to pertinent provisions of law applicable to Government corporations;

"(j) shall be entitled to the use of the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as the other executive agencies of the Government;

"(k) may use any of the funds of the Corporation from any source to carry out any of its powers and duties and to pay any of its expenses or obligations; and

"(l) may exercise all powers specifically granted by the provisions of this title and such incidental powers as are necessary to carry out the powers and duties of the Corporation.

"TAXES

"SEC. 207. The Corporation, including but not limited to its franchise, capital, reserves, surplus, income, assets, and property of any kind, shall be exempt from all taxation and special assessments now or hereafter imposed by the United States or by any Territory, dependency or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, except that any property acquired by the Corporation in foreclosure, or otherwise acquired to protect or realize on the value of a mortgage or other lien, shall be subject to taxation and assessment to the same extent, according to its value, as other property is taxed and assessed. All notes and other obligations of the Corporation shall be exempt, both as to principal and interest, from all taxes (except surtaxes, estate, inheritance, and gift taxes) by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority.

"GENERAL STATUTES AND RESTRICTIONS

"SEC. 208. (a) All general criminal and penal statutes of the United States relating to public moneys, property, or employees of the United States shall apply to public moneys, property, and employees of the Corporation. No officer or employee of the Corporation shall participate in any manner affecting his personal interests or the interests of any corporation, partnership, or association in which he is directly or indirectly interested. No individual, association, partnership, or corporation shall use the words 'National Home Mortgage Corporation,' or any combination of these four words, as the name, or part thereof, under which he or it shall do business. Any such use shall constitute a misdemeanor and shall be punishable by a fine not exceeding $1,000.

"(b) The Corporation shall have no authority or obligation to adjust, settle, or pay any tort claim arising out of the acts or the negligence of the Corporation or its officers, employees, or agents except as provided in the Federal Tort Claims Act, as amended, or in the act entitled 'An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes,' approved September 7, 1916, as amended.

"(c) Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following before the period at the end thereof: '; and National Home Mortgage Corporation.'

"ANNUAL REPORT

"SEC. 209. The Corporation shall make an annual report to the President, for transmission to the Congress, for each fiscal year, ending on June 30, to be transmitted not later than January 15 following the close of the fiscal year for which such report is made."

Mr. McCARTHY. First, I should like to explain why I insist on taking up the amendments piecemeal and perfecting the original Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill piecemeal. The subject, as Senators know, is very highly controversial. We have been drafting a bill for 6 months. The Committee on Banking and Currency differed on the Flanders amendments to the extent that when the question of reporting the amendments to the Senate was acted on it was voted out of the committee by a vote of 7 to 6. In order to have the bill intelligently perfected, I believe we must act in the manner I now propose.

I might also say for the benefit of the Senator from Ohio that I feel that if I did not proceed in this manner I would be actually breaching a promise which I made to him some months ago. At the time I submitted the measure setting up the Joint Housing Committee the Senator from Ohio indicated that he did not feel too kindly toward the establishment of a great number of committees which would not accomplish very much. He went along and cooperated in the passage of the measure only on the condition that at least one Member of the Senate would spend all his time following through the legislation to a conclusion.

Furthermore, I have assured some of the Members of the Committee on Banking and Currency—those who voted against the Flanders amendments—that I would bring up these amendments individually.

Mr. President, I think housing is presently perhaps the most important domestic problem before the Nation. Certainly we can afford to take the additional time to submit the amendments individually, and let each one stand or fall on its own merits.

My amendment lettered "F" deals with establishing a secondary market for GI loans and FHA-insured mortgages. There is no great number of differences between this amendment and that submitted by the Senator from Vermont and the one submitted by the Senator from Ohio. I assume the Senator from Ohio submitted the same amendment earlier today that the Senator from Vermont previously submitted.

There is, however, one very material difference. Unless the Senator from Vermont has changed his amendment since I read it last, in the section setting up a secondary market for GI loans and FHA insured mortgages, no provision is made for a secondary market for title I class 3 loans. By title I class 3 loans I am referring to loans upon construction which would not qualify for a section 603 or a section 203 loan. In other words, they would not qualify under title VI or title II, not because of the nature of the construction, not because of the soundness of the loan, but because both those sections, or the rules promulgated under them, provide that no loan shall be insured unless certain requirements are met, such as an improved street, all utilities being available, and so forth.

We have found it more true on the west coast and in the South, where the climate is warmer than in other sections of the country, that a large number of homes could be built for the lower-income groups under title I class 3 loans. My original reason for starting to draft this section setting up a secondary market was because of the situation in which contractors and others who were building found themselves when they tried to get a title I class 3 loan. That was the primary purpose of myself and of other Members of Congress in advocating the secondary market.

I find that for some reason the Senator from Vermont in redrafting this section left out what I think is the most important part of it. He makes no provision for a secondary market for title I class 3 loans. Unless we do that we will be channelizing a great amount of scarce material into the more expensive homes. Other than that, I believe there exists no material difference. With that explanation, I now move that my amendment lettered "F" be immediately considered and acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on amendment lettered "F" offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I now call up my amendment lettered "E", which deals with title VI. I believe it was fully covered yesterday. Briefly: it provides an additional $1,600,000,000 authorization. We increased the loan maximum by a thousand dollars for the lower cost homes, and made one radical departure from the former title VI. We adopted a per unit limitation of $8,100 instead of a per room limitation. I understand that a number of Senators have amendments to offer to the section. I understand they all have in mind the same amendment, that is to increase the $8,100 to either $8,600 or $9,000. I frankly would have no serious objection to any amendment increasing the amount to $8,600. I believe to increase it to $9,000 would be making the figure slightly high and that it would tend to do what we want to avoid doing, namely, channelize building materials into more expensive homes rather than into cheaper homes.

With that explanation, I now move the adoption of my amendment E.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will it be satisfactory to the Senator from Wisconsin if his amendment lettered "E" is printed in the RECORD at this point without reading? It is rather a long amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is satisfactory, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin lettered "E" will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment proposed by Mr. McCARTHY is as follows:

On page 16, after line 3, insert the following:

"TITLE I—FHA TITLE VI AND TRANSITIONAL PERIOD AMENDMENTS

"SEC. 101. The National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

"TITLE VI AMENDMENTS

"(a) Section 603 (a) is amended—

"(1) by striking out '$5,350,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$5,950,000,000 except that with the approval of the President such aggregate amount may be increased to not to exceed $6,950,000,000';

"(2) by striking out 'April 30, 1948' in each place where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof 'March 31, 1949';

"(3) by striking out the period at the end thereof and adding a comma and the following: 'and that, of the total authorization provided in this subsection, not less than $800,000,000 shall be made available for the insurance of mortgages on rental properties under section 608, and not less than $200,000,000 shall be made available for the insurance of mortgages on multifamily dwellings under section 603, on which commitments for insurance are issued subsequent to the effective date of the Housing Act of 1948.'

"(b) Section 608 (b) (3) (C) is amended—

"(1) by striking out '$1,500 per room' and inserting in lieu thereof '$8,100 per family unit';

"(2) by striking out the colon and the proviso and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

"(c) Section 609 (b) (1) is amended to read as follows:

"'(1) The manufacturer shall establish that binding contracts have been executed satisfactory to the Administrator, providing for the purchase and delivery of the number of houses to be manufactured with the proceeds of the loan and for payment of the purchase price at delivery: *Provided*, That such contracts may provide for payment subsequent to delivery if, at the time of insurance of the loan under this section, the borrower shall establish to the satisfaction of the Administrator that the purchaser has obtained a commitment for a lender to make a mortgage loan or loans secured or to be secured by real property and the improvements to be erected thereon of which the manufactured house will be a part, and the purchaser has assigned all its right, title, and interest in and to such mortgage proceeds, to the extent of the purchase price of the manufactured house or houses, to the seller and the lender under the loan to be insured under this section, together with evidence that the lender which has agreed to make the mortgage loan or loans has accepted such assignment and has agreed to make payment of the proceeds thereof, to the extent of the purchase price of the manufactured house or houses, in accordance with the provisions of such assignment. The commitment and the assignment or assignments required under this paragraph shall be in such form and contain such terms and conditions as may be approved by the Administrator;'.

"(d) Title VI is amended by adding after section 610 the following new section:

"'SEC. 611. (a) In addition to mortgages insured under other sections of this title, and in order to assist and encourage the application of cost reduction techniques through large scale modernized site construction of housing and the erection of houses produced by modern industrial processes, the Administrator is authorized to insure mortgages (including advances on such mortgages during construction) which are eligible for insurance as hereinafter provided.

"'(b) To be eligible for insurance under this section, a mortgage shall—

"'(1) have been made to and be held by a mortgagee approved by the Administrator as responsible and able to service the mortgage properly;

"'(2) cover property, held by a mortgagor approved by the Administrator, upon which there is to be constructed or erected dwelling units for not less than 25 families consisting of a group of single-family or two-family dwellings approved by the Administrator for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction: *Provided*, That during the course of construction there may be located upon the mortgaged property a plant for the fabrication or storage of such dwellings or sections or parts thereof, and the Administrator may consent to the removal or release of such plant from the lien of the mortgage upon such terms and conditions as he may approve;

"'(3) involve a principal obligation in an amount—

"'(A) not to exceed 90 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the completed property or project, exclusive of any plant of the character described in paragraph (2) of this subsection located thereon; and

"'(B) not to exceed a sum computed on the individual dwellings comprising the total project as follows:

"'(i) $8,100 or 90 percent of the valuation, whichever is less, with respect to each single-family dwelling, and

"'(ii) $12,500 or 90 percent of the valuation, whichever is less, with respect to each two-family dwelling.

"'With respect to the insurance of advances during construction, the Administrator is authorized to approve advances by the mortgagee to cover the cost of materials delivered upon the mortgaged property and labor performed in the fabrication or erection thereof;

"'(4) provide for complete amortization by periodic payments within such term as the Administrator shall prescribe and shall bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance) at not to exceed 4 percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time. The Administrator may consent to the release of a part or parts of the mortgaged property from the lien of the mortgage upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe and the mortgage may provide for such release.

"'(c) Preference or priority of opportunity in the occupancy of the mortgaged property for veterans of World War II and their immediate families and for hardship cases as defined by the Administrator shall be provided under such regulations and procedures as may be prescribed by the Administrator.

"'(d) The provisions of subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) of section 608 shall be applicable to mortgages insured under this section.'

"TITLE II AMENDMENTS

"(e) Section 203 (b) (2) (B) is amended by striking out '$5,400' and inserting in lieu thereof '$6,300.'

"(f) Section 203 (b) (2) (C) is amended—

"(1) by striking out '$8,600' and inserting in lieu thereof '$9,500';

"(2) by striking out '$6,000' in each place where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof '$7,000';

"(3) by striking out '$10,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$11,000.'

"(g) Section 203 (b) is amended by striking out in paragraph No. (3) the following: 'of the character described in paragraph (2) (B) of this subsection'; and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'in property approved for insurance prior to the beginning of construction.'

"(h) Section 203 (b) is amended—

"(1) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (2) (C), inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the word 'or', and adding the following new paragraph:

"'(D) not to exceed $6,000 and not to exceed 90 percent of the appraised value, as of the date the mortgage is accepted for insurance (or 95 percent, if, in the determination of the Administrator, insurance of mortgages involving a principal obligation in such amount under this paragraph would not reasonably be expected to contribute to substantial increases in costs and prices of housing facilities for families of moderate income), of a property, urban, suburban, or rural, upon which there is located a dwelling designed principally for a single-family residence the construction of which is begun after March 31, 1949, and which is approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction: *Provided*, That the Administrator may by regulation provide that the principal obligation of any mortgage eligible for insurance under this paragraph shall be fixed at a lesser amount than $6,000 where he finds that for any section of the country or at any time a lower-cost dwelling for families of lower income is feasible without sacrifice of sound standards of construction, design, and livability: *And provided further*, That with respect to mortgages insured under this paragraph the mortgagor shall be the owner and occupant of the property at the time of the insurance and shall have paid on account of the property at least 10 percent (or 5 percent, in the case of a 95 percent mortgage insured pursuant to this paragraph (D)) of the appraised value in cash or its equivalent, or shall be the builder constructing the dwelling in which case the principal obligation shall not exceed 85 percent of the appraised value of the property.'

"(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph No. (3), and adding a comma and the following: 'or not to exceed 30 years in the case of a mortgage insured under paragraph (2) (D) of this subsection.'

"(3) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph No. (5), and adding a comma and the following: 'or not to exceed 4 percent per annum in the case of a mortgage insured under paragraph (2) (D) of this subsection.'

"(i) (1) Section 203 (c) is amended (1) by striking out in the last sentence the words 'section or section 210' and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'title'; and (2) by striking out in said sentence (i) the words 'under this section', and (ii) the following: 'and a mortgage on the same property is accepted for insurance at the time of such payment,'.

"(2) Section 603 (c) is amended by striking out in the next to the last sentence the following: 'and a mortgage on the same property is accepted for insurance at the time of such payment,'.

"(j) Section 204 (a) is amended—

"(1) by striking out, in the last sentence, the following: 'prior to July 1, 1944,';

"(2) by inserting between the first and second provisos in the last sentence the following: '*And provided further*, That with respect to mortgages which are accepted for insurance under section 203 (b) (2) (D) or under the second proviso of section 207 (c) (2) of this act, there may be included in the debentures issued by the Administrator on account of the cost of foreclosure (or of acquiring the property by other means) actually paid by the mortgagee and approved by

the Administrator an amount, not in excess of two-thirds of such cost or $75, whichever is the greater:'.

"(k) (1) Section 207 (b) (1) is amended to read as follows:

"'(1) Federal or State instrumentalities, municipal corporate instrumentalities of one or more States, or limited dividend or redevelopment or housing corporations restricted by Federal or State laws or regulations of State banking or insurance departments as to rents, charges, capital structure, rate of return, or methods of operation; or.'

"(2) The first sentence of section 207 (c) is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) To be eligible for insurance under this section a mortgage on any property or project shall involve a principal obligation in an amount—

"'(1) not to exceed $5,000,000, or, if executed by a mortgagor coming within the provisions of paragraph No. (b) (1) of this section, not to exceed $50,000,000;

"'(2) not to exceed 80 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the property or project when the proposed improvements are completed, including the land; the proposed physical improvements; utilities within the boundaries of the property or project; architects' fees; taxes and interest accruing during construction; and other miscellaneous charges incident to construction and approved by the Administrator: *Provided*, That, except with respect to a mortgage executed by a mortgagor coming within the provisions of paragraph No. (b) (1) of this section, such mortgage shall not exceed the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the cost of the completed physical improvements on the property or project, exclusive of public utilities and streets and organization and legal expenses; and

"'(3) not to exceed $8,100 per family unit for such part of such property or project as may be attributable to dwelling use.'

"(l) (1) Section 207 (h) is amended by striking out, in paragraph No. (1), the words 'paid to the mortgagor of such property' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'retained by the Administrator and credited to the housing insurance fund.'

"(2) Section 204 (f) is amended by inserting in clause No. (1), immediately preceding the semicolon, the following: 'if the mortgage was insured under section 203 and shall be retained by the Administrator and credited to the housing insurance fund if the mortgage was insured under section 207.'

"TITLE I AMENDMENTS

"(m) Section 2 is amended—

"(1) by striking out '$165,000,000' in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof '$175,000,000';

"(2) by striking out '$3,000' in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof '$5,000';

"(3) by striking out the first proviso in the first sentence of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '*Provided*, That insurance may be granted to any such financial institution with respect to any obligation not in excess of $10,000 and having a maturity not in excess of 7 years and 32 days representing any such loan, advance of credit, or purchase made by it if such loan, advance of credit, or purchase is made for the purpose of financing the alteration, repair, improvement, or conversion of an existing structure used or to be used as a hotel, apartment house, dwelling for two or more families, hospital, orphanage, college, or school:';

"(4) by striking out the last sentence of subsection (b).

"INCREASE IN INTEREST RATES

"(n) (1) In any area where the mortgage market so demands, the Federal Housing Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, is authorized to insure under the National Housing Act, as amended, mortgages bearing interest at rates which are not more than one-half of 1 percent in excess of the maximum interest rates prescribed in such act.

"(2) In any area where the loan market so demands, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, is authorized to guarantee, under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, loans bearing interest at rates which are not more than one-half of 1 percent in excess of the maximum interest rates prescribed in such title."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment lettered "E" offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, since the Senator from Wisconsin will not cooperate by working on the committee bill, which I, as author of the original bill, have agreed to, I am willing to have him amend the original bill all he wants to. He can have the original bill. He can rewrite the original bill. But then I shall ask the Senate to adopt the substitute bill. Of course, the effect of that will be to wipe out all his amendments. If he really wants his amendments adopted, he had better offer the amendments to the substitute bill, and change that bill in any way he wishes to change it. The Senator's amendments present a long series of detailed differences with the committee bill. I think it would take an indefinite period for us to try to analyze each amendment which the Senator offers and say, "This is wrong" and "That is right." I see no recourse except to accept all his amendments and let him have the original bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I may say for the benefit of the Senator from Ohio that that would be entirely agreeable to me, except for a number of reasons:

First. The committee amendment was reported by a vote of 7 to 6, and I have assured a sizable number of Members of the Senate that these amendments would be brought up one by one.

Second. After long weeks and months of work, I have perfected amendments to the original bill. Unfortunately, I am not blessed with the legal staff which the Senator from Ohio has. I do not have available to me a legal staff comparable with that of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which is available to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

These amendments are now ready to be offered. Frankly, I have difficulty in understanding the position taken by the Senator from Ohio. Months ago I submitted all these amendments to the Senator from Ohio. I submitted them to him in the form of a bill. That bill was submitted long before the Senator from Vermont began to interest himself in the Housing Committee. The bill was submitted to the Senator from Ohio at a time before the Senator from Vermont had attended a single hearing. It was submitted at a time when the Senator from Vermont was doing an outstanding job as chairman of a subcommittee investigating the high cost of living. I have been working on these amendments. I know every word of them, and I am familiar with them. I do not know the reason for this last-minute maneuvering. I do not know why we cannot forget about politics for a day or two and get some housing legislation.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to correct the impression of the Senator from Wisconsin in one particular. During the same period in which I and other Senators were engaged in the cost-of-living investigation we were also engaged in a cost-of-housing investigation, as a part of the work of the joint committee. The Senator has at his disposal, I am sure, a rather large and complete report on the cost of housing, which was, at the time, my contribution to the joint committee proceedings. So I trust that he will give me credit for having been working on the Joint Housing Committee at the same time that I was working on the Joint Price Committee.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I give the Senator from Vermont credit for being one of our outstanding Senators. I do not give him credit for attending a single housing hearing before this legislation was drafted. I had hoped that we would not have to go into this question. It is unimportant. However, in view of the fact that the question has been raised, I ask the Senator from Vermont if my proposed legislation was not submitted to him long before he attended a single committee hearing, and long before he attempted to draft any legislation. I also ask him whether his amendment was drafted, not by himself but rather by the housing agency. Am I correct?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, we did have a flood of information from the housing agencies before the bill of the Senator from Wisconson appeared. Being somewhat inexperienced in the proceedings of the legislative process, it had seemed to me to be the proper thing to do to get information from the executive branch of the Government on proposed legislation, and then use that as a basis for a legislative policy, it being a procedure suggested by the executive branches of the Government. That process was followed. It was well under way and on toward completion before I had an opportunity to see the bill of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I think it would be unfair to the Senator from Vermont—a man whom I consider to be one of the most outstanding Senators—to ask him to try to explain what are known as the Flanders amendments. I also think it would be unfair to the Senate and unfair to the Nation. For example, yesterday I asked the Senator from Vermont whether or not he had in his amendment certain provisions which I consider to be of the utmost importance. I wanted to know why they were stricken from the amendment, and I asked him to tell the reason why he struck them out. I offered to go through the record and find the evidence which I thought would convince him that he was mistaken in making those omissions; but in view of the fact that he did not know what was in the amendment and could not tell why those provisions were stricken out, I must insist that my amendments be taken up one by one so that the Senate will know what is in them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered "E," offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I now offer my amendment lettered "G." In view of its length, I do not ask that it be read, but I ask that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment offered by Mr. McCARTHY was, on page 16, beginning with line 4, to strike out through line 19 on page 17, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

TITLE III—HOUSING RESEARCH

SEC. 301. To assist in progressively reducing housing costs and increasing the production of better housing, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator shall undertake and conduct a program with respect to technical research and studies to develop, demonstrate, and promote the acceptance and application of standardized building codes and of other new and improved techniques, materials, and methods which will permit progressive reductions in housing construction and maintenance costs, and stimulate the increased and sustained production of housing. Such program shall be primarily concerned with improved and standardized building codes and regulations and methods for the more uniform administration thereof, standardized dimensions and methods for the assembly of home building materials and equipment, improved residential design and construction, new and improved types of building materials and equipment, and methods of production, distribution, assembly, and construction, and sound techniques for the testing thereof and for the determination of adequate performance standards.

SEC. 302. In carrying out research and studies under this title, the Administrator shall utilize, to the full extent feasible, the available facilities of other departments, independent establishments, and agencies of the Federal Government; and the Secretary of Commerce or his designee shall hereafter be included in the membership of the National Housing Council. The Administrator is further authorized, for the purposes of this title, to undertake research and studies cooperatively with agencies of State or local governments, and educational institutions and other nonprofit organizations.

SEC. 303. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in drafting this title we drew heavily upon the excellent thought of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. We thought that the housing research provision in that bill was very good. We have added two important features to it. We direct the division within the H and HFA, in addition to coordinating research, as it was ordered to do in the old Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, to perform two principal functions: First, to work for the standardization of codes; and second, to work toward the standardization of measurements. I dealt with this question at some length yesterday, and I shall not consume the time of the Senate today. Each of us who spent any time in this investigation was convinced that unless and until we get some semblance of standardization of codes we shall not get low-cost housing.

The other day I cited the metropolitan district of Detroit as an example. There are approximately 66 suburbs, each with its own code. As one contractor said, he almost had to have a different staff of lawyers for each suburb in which he built.

I now move the adoption of my amendment lettered "G."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered "G," offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I now offer my amendment lettered "H." I ask that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment offered by Mr. McCARTHY was, on page 17, beginning with line 20, to strike out through line 21 on page 35, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

TITLE IV—RENTAL HOUSING AIDS FOR FAMILIES OF MODERATE INCOME AND VETERANS

MORTGAGE INVESTMENT AIDS; VETERANS' COOPERATIVES

SEC. 401. (a) Section 207 (c) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

(1) By striking out the semicolon and the word "and" at the end of paragraph numbered (2) as amended by this act, inserting in lieu thereof a colon, and adding the following new proviso: "*And provided further*, That, notwithstanding any of the provisions of this paragraph numbered (2), a mortgage with respect to a project to be constructed in a locality or metropolitan area where, as determined by the Administrator, there is a need for new dwellings for families of lower income at rentals comparable to the rentals proposed to be charged for the dwellings in such project (or, in the case of a mortgage with respect to a project of a nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporation the permanent occupancy of which is restricted to members of such corporation, or a project constructed by a nonprofit corporation organized for the purpose of construction of homes for members of the corporation, at prices, costs, or charges comparable to the prices, costs, or charges proposed to be charged such members) may involve a principal obligation in an amount not exceeding 90 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the project when the proposed improvements are completed, except that in the case of a mortgage with respect to a project of a nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporation whose membership consists primarily of veterans of World War II, the principal obligation may be in an amount not exceeding 95 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the project when the proposed improvements are completed; and."

(2) By striking out the period at the end of the second sentence, inserting in lieu thereof a comma, and adding the following: "except that with respect to mortgages insured under the provisions of the second proviso of paragraph numbered (2) of this subsection, which mortgages are hereby authorized to have a maturity of not exceeding 40 years from the date of the insurance of the mortgage, such interest rate shall not exceed 4 percent per annum."

(3) By adding the following additional sentence at the end thereof: "Such property or project may include such commercial and community facilities as the Administrator deems adequate to serve the occupants."

(b) Section 207 (g) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the figure "2" appearing in clause (ii) and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "1."

(c) Section 207 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following new paragraph at the end thereof:

"(q) In order to assure an adequate market for mortgages on cooperative ownership projects and rental housing projects for families of lower income and veterans of the character described in the second proviso of paragraph numbered (2) of subsection (c) of this section, the powers of the National Home Mortgage Corporation, and of any other Federal corporation or other Federal agency hereafter established, to make real-estate loans, or to purchase, service, or sell any mortgages, or partial interests therein, may be utilized in connection with projects of the character described in said proviso."

Mr. McCARTHY. My amendment lettered "H" consists of title IV. It is principally a veterans' cooperative section. It provides for two types of housing cooperatives, one along the lines of the cooperatives provided for in the old Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. The amendment goes a step further and provides also for cooperatives composed principally of veterans. For the veterans' cooperative we allow a 95-percent guaranteed loan, as against a 90-percent guaranteed loan for a nonveterans cooperative. We provide for a 40-year period of amortization for both the veterans' and the nonveterans' cooperative. Then we make a further radical departure from the various cooperative measures that have been kicked around for 5, 10, or 15 years, and a very definite departure from the cooperative measure in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. We provide that in addition to the financial aid and the liberal loans, technical assistance shall be available to the veterans' cooperatives. Of course, that will cost some additional money. Just how much money it will cost, we do not know. It will require some skilled help within the framework of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. It will work out in this way: If a number of young veterans wish to get together and build some low-cost homes, they will be entitled to receive assistance and information which will give them the benefit of other cooperative experience and furnish them all the technical advice possible in planning and reducing the cost of the houses.

This provision is the result of a great deal of thinking, work, and compromise on the part of many veterans' organizations, such as the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Veterans' Committee, the AMVETS, and various other veterans' groups. The provision is not entirely satisfactory to all the veterans' organizations. We took the idea from the American Legion bill, but we did not provide for the technical set-up covered by that bill. We thought it was too technical. We felt that merely to give a group of young veterans a lot of money, and say to them "Go ahead and build a house," would be of no benefit to them at all.

The only serious objection that any veterans' group had to this plan was with respect to the provision that the veterans' cooperative would be composed principally of veterans. Some of them felt that we should use some word other than "principally" and we should adopt

a figure of perhaps 70, 75, or 80 percent. But when it has been pointed out to them that the group will be composed principally of veterans, and that the veterans in the cooperative can control the number of nonveterans, we have received almost universal endorsement of this section.

Therefore, Mr. President, I now move the adoption of my amendment H.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered "H," offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I now call up my amendment J, and offer it. I request that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment offered by Mr. McCARTHY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 54, beginning with line 20, strike out through line 3 on page 69 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE V—SLUM CLEARANCE

"LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY TO AID HOUSING-COST REDUCTIONS

"SEC. 501. In extending financial assistance under this title, the Administrator shall give consideration to the extent to which the appropriate local public bodies have undertaken a positive program of encouraging housing-cost reductions through the adoption, improvement, and modernization of building and other local codes and regulations so as to permit the use of appropriate new materials, techniques, and methods in land and residential planning, design, and construction, the increase of efficiency in residential construction, and the elimination of restrictive practices which unnecessarily increase housing costs.

"LOANS

"SEC. 502. (a) To assist local communities in eliminating their slums and blighted areas and in providing maximum opportunity for the redevelopment of project areas by private enterprise, the Administrator may make temporary and definitive loans to local public agencies for the undertaking of projects for the assembly, clearance, preparation, and sale and lease of land for redevelopment. Such loans (outstanding at any one time) shall be in such amounts not exceeding the expenditures made by the local public agency as part of gross project cost, bear interest at such rate (not less than the applicable going Federal rate), be secured in such manner, and be repaid within such period (not exceeding 45 years from the date of the notes or bonds evidencing the loans), as may be deemed advisable by the Administrator. Such loans may be made subject to the condition that, if at any time or for any period during the life of the loan contract, the local public agency can obtain loan funds from sources other than the Federal Government at an interest rate lower than provided in the loan contract, it may do so with the consent of the Administrator at such time and for such period without waiving or surrendering any rights to loan funds under the contract for the remainder of the life of such contract, and, in any such case, the Administrator is authorized to consent to a pledge by the local public agency of the loan contract, and any or all of its rights thereunder, as security for the repayment of the loan funds so obtained from other sources.

"(b) To obtain funds for loans under this title, the Administrator may, on and after the 1st day of July 1948, issue and have outstanding at any one time notes and other obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury, in an amount not to exceed $10,000,000, which limit on such outstanding amount shall be increased by $200,000,000 on the 1st day of July 1949, and by further amounts of $200,000,000 on the 1st day of July in each of the years 1950, 1951, 1952, and 1953, respectively.

"(c) Notes or other obligations issued by the Administrator under this title shall be in such forms and denominations, have such maturities, and be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of such notes or other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and other obligations of the Administrator issued under this title and for such purpose is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such Act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of such notes and other obligation. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this section. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States.

"(d) Obligations, including interest thereon, issued by local public agencies for projects undertaken pursuant to this title, and the income derived by such agencies from such projects, shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States.

"CAPITAL GRANTS

"SEC. 503. (a) The administrator may make capital grants to local public agencies to enable such agencies to make land in project areas available for redevelopment at its fair value for the uses specified in the redevelopment plans. The aggregate of such capital grants with respect to all the projects of a local public agency which are assisted under this title shall not exceed two-thirds of the aggregate of the net project costs, and the capital grants with respect to any individual project shall not exceed the difference between the net project cost and the local grants-in-aid required with respect to the project pursuant to section 504.

"(b) The Administrator may, on and after the 1st day of July 1948, contract to make capital grants with respect to projects to be assisted pursuant to this title aggregating not more than $100,000,000, which limit shall be increased by further amounts of $100,000,000 on the 1st day of July in each of the years 1949, 1950, 1951, and 1952, respectively. Such contracts for capital grants shall be made subject to the condition that no funds shall be disbursed by the local public agency prior to July 1, 1949, in payment for the purchase of land in connection with the project being assisted under the contract. The faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment of all capital grants contracted for under this title, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the amounts necessary to provide for such payments.

"REQUIREMENTS FOR LOCAL GRANTS-IN-AID

"SEC. 504. Every contract for capital grant under this title shall require local grants-in-aid in connection with the project involved which, together with the local grants-in-aid to be provided in connection with all other projects of the local public agency on which such contracts have theretofore been made, will be at least equal to one-third of the aggregate net project costs involved (it being the purpose of this provision and section 503 to limit the aggregate of the capital grants made by the Administrator with respect to all the projects of a local public agency which are assisted under this title to an amount not exceeding two-thirds of the differences between the aggregate of the gross project costs of all such projects and the aggregate of the total sales prices and capital values referred to in section 510 (f) of land in such projects).

"LOCAL DETERMINATION AND RESPONSIBILITIES

"SEC. 505. Contracts for financial aid shall be made only with a duly authorized local public agency and shall require that—

"(1) the redevelopment plan for the project area be approved by the governing body of the locality in which the project is situated, and that such approval include findings by the governing body that (i) the financial aid to be provided in the contract is necessary to enable the land in the project area to be redeveloped in accordance with the redevelopment plan; (ii) the redevelopment plans for the redevelopment areas in the locality will afford maximum opportunity, consistent with the sound needs of the locality as a whole, for the redevelopment of such areas by private enterprise; and (iii) the redevelopment plan conforms to a general plan for the development of the locality as a whole;

"(2) when land acquired or held by the local public agency in connection with the project is sold or leased, the purchasers or lessees shall be obligated (i) to devote such land to the uses specified in the redevelopment plan for the project area; (ii) to begin the building of their improvements on such land within a reasonable time; and (iii) to comply with such other conditions as the Administrator finds are necessary to carry out the purposes of this title;

"(3) there be a feasible method for the temporary relocation of families displaced from the project area, and that there are available or are being provided, in the project area or in other areas not less desirable in regard to public utilities and public and commercial facilities and at rents or prices within the financial means of the families displaced from the project area, decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings equal in number to the number of such displaced families: *Provided*, That in view of the existing acute housing shortage, each such contract shall further provide that there shall be no demolition of residential structures in connection with the project assisted under the contract prior to July 1, 1950, if in the opinion of the local governing body such demolition would result in undue hardship for the occupants of the structure.

"GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 506. (a) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this title, the Administrator, notwithstanding any other law, shall—

"(1) appoint a Director to administer under his general supervision the provisions of this title;

"(2) prepare annually and submit a budget program as provided for wholly owned Government corporations by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended as of the date of enactment of this Act;

"(3) maintain an integral set of accounts which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial transactions as provided by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended as of the date of enactment of this act, and no other audit shall be required: *Provided*, That such financial transactions of the Administrator as the making of loans and capital grants and vouchers approved by the

Administrator in connection with such financial transactions shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government;

"(4) make an annual report to the President, for transmission to the Congress, for each fiscal year, ending on June 30, to be transmitted not later than January 15 following the close of the fiscal year for which such report is made.

"(b) Funds made available to the Administrator pursuant to the provisions of this title shall be deposited in a checking account or accounts with the Treasurer of the United States. Receipts and assets obtained or held by the Administrator in connection with the performance of his functions under this title shall be available for any of the purposes of this title, and all funds available for carrying out the functions of the Administrator under this title (including appropriations therefor, which are hereby authorized) shall be available, in such amounts as may from year to year be authorized by the Congress, for the administrative expenses of the Administrator in connection with the performance of such functions.

"(c) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this title, the Administrator, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, may—

"(1) sue and be sued;

"(2) foreclose on any property or commence any action to protect or enforce any right conferred upon him by any law, contract, or other agreement, and bid for and purchase at any foreclosure or any other sale any project or part thereof in connection with which he has made a loan or capital grant pursuant to this title. In the event of any such acquisition, the Administrator may complete, administer, dispose of, and otherwise deal with, such project or part thereof: *Provided*, That any such acquisition of real property shall not deprive any State or political subdivision thereof of its civil jurisdiction in and over such property or impair the civil rights under the State or local law of the inhabitants on such property;

"(3) enter into agreements to pay annual sums in lieu of taxes to any State or local taxing authority with respect to any real property so acquired and owned;

"(4) sell or exchange at public or private sale, or lease, real or personal property, and sell or exchange any securities or obligations, upon such terms as he may fix;

"(5) obtain insurance against loss in connection with property and other assets held;

"(6) subject to the specific limitations in this title, consent to the modification, with respect to rate of interest, time of payment of any installment of principal or interest, security, amount of capital grant, or any other term, of any contract or agreement to which he is a party or which has been transferred to him pursuant to this title;

"(7) include in any contract or instrument made pursuant to this title such other covenants, conditions, or provisions as he may deem necessary to assure that the purposes of this title will be achieved. No provision of this title shall be construed or administered to permit speculation in land holding.

"(d) Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to any contract for services or supplies on account of any property acquired pursuant to this title if the amount of such contract does not exceed $1,000.

"SEC. 507. If the land for a low-rent housing project assisted under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is made available from a project assisted under this title, payment equal to the fair value of the land for the uses specified in accordance with the redevelopment plan shall be made therefor by the public agency undertaking the housing project, and such amount shall be included as part of the development cost of the low-rent housing project.

"SEC. 508. The President may at any time, in his discretion, transfer to the Administrator any right, title, or interest held by the Federal Government or any department or agency thereof in any land (including buildings thereon) which is surplus to the needs of the Government and which a local public agency certifies will be within the area of a project being planned by it. When such land is sold to the local public agency by the Administrator, it may be sold at a price equal to its fair value for the uses specified in accordance with the redevelopment plan: *Provided*, That the proceeds from such sale shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"PROTECTION OF LABOR STANDARDS

"SEC. 509. In order to protect labor standards—

"(1) Any contract for financial aid pursuant to this title shall contain a provision requiring that the wages or fees prevailing in the locality, as determined or adopted (subsequent to a determination under applicable State or local law) by the Secretary of Labor, shall be paid by any contractor engaged on the project involved; and the Administrator may require certification as to compliance with the provisions of this paragraph prior to making any payment under such contract.

"(2) The provisions of sections 1 and 2 of the act of June 13, 1934 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 40, secs. 276b and 276c), shall apply to any project financed in whole or in part with funds made available pursuant to this title.

"(3) Any contractor engaged on any project financed in whole or in part with funds made available pursuant to this title shall report quarterly to the Secretary of Labor, and shall cause all subcontractors to report in like manner, within 15 days after the close of each quarter and on forms to be furnished by the United States Department of Labor, as to the number of persons on their respective pay rolls on the particular project, the aggregate amount of such pay rolls, the total man-hours worked, and itemized expenditures for materials. Any such contractor shall furnish to the Department of Labor the names and addresses of all subcontractors on the work at the earliest date practicable.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 510. The following terms shall have the meanings, respectively, ascribed to them below, and, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise, shall include the plural as well as the singular number:

"(a) 'Redevelopment area' means an area within which a project area is located and of such extent and location that the total area is appropriate for development or redevelopment.

"(b) 'Redevelopment plan' means a plan, as it exists from time to time, for the development or redevelopment of a redevelopment or project area, which plan shall be sufficiently complete (1) to indicate its relationship to definite local objectives as to appropriate land uses and improved traffic, public transportation, public utilities, recreational and community facilities, and other public improvements, and (2) to indicate proposed land uses and building requirements in the project area: *Provided*, That the Administrator shall take such steps as he deems necessary to assure consistency between the redevelopment plan and any highways or other public improvements in the locality receiving financial assistance from the Federal Works Agency.

"(c) 'Project' may include (1) acquisition of land within (i) a slum area or other deteriorated or deteriorating area which is predominantly residential in character, or (ii) any other area which is to be developed or redeveloped for predominantly residential uses and which prior to such development or redevelopment constitutes a deteriorated or deteriorating area or open urban land which because of obsolete platting or otherwise impairs the sound growth of the community or open suburban land essential for sound community growth; (2) demolition and removal of buildings and improvements; (3) installation, construction, or reconstruction of streets, utilities, and other site improvements essential to the preparation of sites for uses in accordance with the redevelopment plan; and (4) making the land available for development or redevelopment by private enterprise or public agencies (including sale, initial leasing, or retention by the local public agency itself) at its fair value for uses in accordance with the redevelopment plan. For the purposes of this title, the term 'project' shall not include the construction of any of the buildings contemplated by the redevelopment plan, and the term 'redevelop' and derivatives thereof shall mean develop as well as redevelop.

"(d) 'Local grants-in-aid' shall mean assistance by a State, municipality, or other public body, or any other entity, in the form of (1) cash grants; (2) donations, at their cash value, of land, demolition or removal work, or site improvements in the project area; and (3) the cost or cash value of the provision by a municipality or other public body of parks, playgrounds, and public buildings or facilities (other than low-rent public housing) which are primarily of direct benefit to the project and which are necessary to serve or support the new uses of land in the project area in accordance with the redevelopment plan.

"(e) 'Gross project cost' shall comprise (1) the amount of the expenditures by the local public agency with respect to any and all undertakings necessary to carry out the project (including the payment of carrying charges, but not beyond the point where the project is completed), and (2) such local grants-in-aid as are furnished in forms other than cash.

"(f) 'Net project cost' shall mean the difference between the gross project cost and the aggregate of (1) the total sales prices of all land sold, and (2) the total capital values (i) imputed, on a basis approved by the Administrator, to all land leased, and (ii) used as a basis for determining the amounts to be transferred to the project from other funds of the local public agency to compensate for any land retained by it for use in accordance with the redevelopment plan.

"(g) 'Going Federal rate' means the annual rate of interest (or, if there shall be two or more such rates of interest, the lowest thereof) specified in the most recently issued bonds of the Federal Government having a maturity of 20 years or more, determined at the date the contract for loan is made. Any contract for loan made may be revised or superseded by a later contract, so that the going Federal rate, on the basis of which the interest rate on the loan is fixed, shall mean the going Federal rate, as herein defined, on the date that such contract is revised or superseded by such later contract.

"(h) 'Local public agency' means any State, county, municipality, or other governmental entity or public body which is authorized to undertake the project for which assistance is sought.

"(i) 'Administrator' means the Housing and Home Finance Administrator."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, this amendment deals with the question of slum clearance. There was a slum-clearance provision in the old Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. I think it was a very good provision up to a certain point, but at that point we have now made a very radical departure.

The old Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill provided for Federal expenditures of a total of $850,000,000 over a period of years, to be handled by a system of

annual contributions. In going over that provision, many persons including auditors, bookkeepers, bankers, builders, and planning groups in various cities, felt that it was completely unrealistic, that there was no reason for setting up that cumbersome system of payment, and that the cost to the city and to the Federal Government because of the bookkeeping would be greater than the amount of money spent upon the actual work of clearing the slums.

Therefore we abandoned that system of payment, and took what seems to be the obvious and simplest course, namely, that of providing for capital grants, to be paid in the proportion of $2 on the part of the Federal Government and $1 on the part of the city, such payment to be made upon completion of the job of slum clearance. Incidentally that 2–1 system is the same as that provided in the old Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. In other words, when the city arrives at a point where the area is cleared and when it is known to what extent they must mark down the value of the land, then the Federal Government will put up $2 for every $1 the city puts up.

In the amendment we provide for a total of $500,000,000. We feel confident that that amount will accomplish much more slum clearance than would have been accomplished by the $850,000,000 provided by the old Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. I think it should be pointed out that the figure $500,000,000 actually is rather meaningless. If a vast number of cities decide to clear their slums and to take advantage of this Federal provision, $500,000,000 will not go very far. For instance, when we were talking about slum areas, one man from New York City said, "We can use up more than your $500,000,000 in the city of New York alone." So, Mr. President, I think we must realize that we are embarking upon a long-range slum-clearance program which ultimately may cost billions of dollars. Although it is completely separated from the question of housing, obviously this slum-clearance provision can have a very material effect upon the housing conditions in the country.

In this bill we have also provided for a total of $1,000,000,000 of loans to cities. That is in effect a construction loan or it may be called a wrecking loan. By it, a city can proceed to acquire the land and exercise the right of eminent domain, if it has that right, and clear up the land and mark down the price. Then, when it knows what the land is worth, either for use by a private or public housing agency or by a city for use, for instance, as a city park, the loan is repaid. I wish to make it clear that the cost to the Federal Government by reason of this loan provision should not be anything. The total cost of the slum-clearance provisions I am presenting will be $500,000,000 in the form of capital grants.

Mr. President, I now move the adoption of my amendment, lettered "J."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment lettered "J" offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, temporarily I shall skip over amendment K, which deals with amendments to the public-housing section of the bill.

I shall now go to amendment L, which deals with farm housing. I ask that the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD, without reading.

There being no objection, the amendment offered by Mr. McCARTHY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 84, beginning with line 21, strike out through line 15 on page 104 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE VII—FARM HOUSING

"SEC. 701. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator shall prepare a report on farm housing which report shall include—

"(i) the relationship of farm housing to the entire farm economy;

"(ii) the relationship of farm dwellings and related facilities to the operation and management of the farm;

"(iii) the extent of the need for housing for farm owners and operators and for tenants, lessees, share croppers, and laborers;

"(iv) the operation of existing Federal programs in aid of farm housing and their relationship to other Federal farm programs;

"(v) factors which tend to prevent the provision of needed farm housing;

"(vi) such other problems and subjects in the field of farm housing as the Secretary of Agriculture and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator may deem appropriate.

"Said report, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation and such other recommendations as the Secretary of Agriculture and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator may deem advisable, shall be transmitted to the Congress not later than January 15, 1949."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in the old Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill there was a section 10 and a section 11. This amendment L, entitled "Farm Housing," covers the same ground which was covered by sections 10 and 11 of the old Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Section 10 of that bill dealt with financial aids to rural housing. Section 11 was the rural public-housing section. We assigned to Representative PATMAN, of Texas, who has long been interested in rural housing, the job of making an individual study of the rural and farm housing question. His report is on record. From a reading of it, I think it will be found that it recognizes—although not in so many words—the wisdom of not attempting to draft any farm-housing legislation at this time. Frankly, I think it is generally believed by all persons who have studied this problem that the farm-housing sections of the old Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill were perhaps the most badly drafted sections of that bill. Of course, those sections were based upon prewar statistics and figures, and largely upon prewar costs.

So what I propose today—and I think this is identical with the corresponding provision offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]—is merely to assign to the Housing and Home Finance Agency in the Department of Agriculture the task of making a thorough and complete study of this subject and reporting its recommendations to the next session of Congress.

Mr. President, with that explanation, I now move the adoption of the amendment lettered "L," entitled "Farm Housing."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment lettered "L," offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I now desire to call up my amendment lettered "M," and to ask for its adoption. I request that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that in lieu thereof it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment of Mr. McCARTHY was, on page 104, after line 15, to insert the following:

TITLE VII—HOUSING FOR VETERANS WITH SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES

SEC. 801. Section 1, title I, Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, approved March 20, 1933, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection known as subsection (g) and to read as follows:

"(g) Any person who served in the active military or naval service of the United States who is entitled to compensation under the provisions of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, for permanent and total service-connected disability due to spinal-cord disease or injury with paralysis of the legs and lower part of the body shall be entitled to assistance in acquiring a suitable housing unit with special fixtures or movable facilities made necessary by the nature of the person's disability, and necessary land therefor, subject to the provisions and limitations of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, part IX."

SEC. 802. Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new part to be known as part IX and to read as follows:

"PART IX

"1. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to assist any person (hereinafter referred to as 'veteran') who served in the active military or naval service of the United States, who is entitled to compensation under the provisions of this regulation for permanent and total service-connected disability due to spinal-cord disease or injury with paralysis of the legs and lower part of the body in acquiring a suitable housing unit with special fixtures or movable facilities made necessary by the nature of the veteran's disability, and necessary land therefor: *Provided*, That the regulations of the Administrator shall include, but not be limited to, provisions requiring findings that (a) it is medically feasible for such veteran to reside in the proposed housing unit and in the proposed locality; (b) the proposed housing unit bears a proper relation to the veteran's present and anticipated income and expenses; and (c) that the nature and condition of the proposed housing unit are such as to be suitable to the veteran's needs for dwelling purposes.

"2. The assistance authorized by paragraph 1 shall be limited in the case of any veteran to one housing unit, and necessary land therefor, and shall be afforded under one of the following plans, at the option of the veteran, but shall not exceed $10,000 in any one case—

"(a) where the veteran elects to construct a housing unit on land to be acquired by him, the Administrator shall pay not to exceed 50 percent of the total cost to the veteran of (1) the housing unit and (2) the

necessary land upon which it is to be situated;

"(b) where the veteran elects to construct a housing unit on land acquired by him prior to application for assistance under this part, the Administrator shall pay not to exceed the smaller of the following sums: (1) 50 percent of the total cost to the veteran of the housing unit and the land necessary for such housing unit, or (2) 50 percent of the cost to the veteran of the housing unit plus the full amount of the unpaid balance, if any, of the cost to the veteran of the land necessary for such housing unit;

"(c) where the veteran elects to remodel a dwelling, which is not adapted to the requirements of his disability, acquired by him prior to application for assistance under this part, the Administrator shall pay not to exceed the total of (1) 50 percent of the cost to the veteran of such remodeling, plus (2) the smaller of the following sums: (A) 50 percent of the cost to the veteran of such dwelling and the necessary land upon which it is situated, or (B) the full amount of the unpaid balance, if any, of the cost to the veteran of such dwelling and the necessary land upon which it is situated; and

"(d) where the veteran has acquired a suitable housing unit, the Administrator shall pay not to exceed the smaller of the following sums: (1) 50 percent of the cost to the veteran of such housing unit and the necessary land upon which it is situated, or (2) the full amount of the unpaid balance, if any, of the cost to the veteran of such housing unit and the necessary land upon which it is situated.

"3. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to furnish to veterans eligible for assistance under this part, without cost to the veterans, model plans and specifications of suitable housing units.

"4. Any person who accepts the benefits of this part shall not by reason thereof be denied the benefits of title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended.

"5. The Government of the United States shall have no liability in connection with any housing unit, or necessary land therefor, acquired under the provisions of this part."

SEC. 803. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, this is a section which is identical with a bill passed by the House on April 6, and largely identical with a bill sponsored last year by the junior Senator from Wisconsin, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON]. That bill came before the Senate and was, on motion of the Senator from Ohio, recommitted to the committee by a vote of 40 to 37.

There was considerable opposition to the bill, and as I reread the RECORD recently I gathered that the opposition was not based upon the theory of the bill or upon the objective sought to be accomplished. I believe the Senator from Ohio at the time felt that while we may not have been going too far, the bill was too indefinite as to what we were attempting to do. I believe the Senator from Georgia had the same objection.

I think we have met those objections, and we have restricted the provision in order to meet the objections. The bill last year provided for Fedral aid to all permanent wheelchair cases among veterans; that is to say, if there were a young man who because of service-connected injuries was doomed to occupy a wheelchair for the remainder of his life, he should receive certain Federal aid, consisting of free housing plans and half the cost of construction. That has now been restricted somewhat to cover only what are known as paraplegic cases. By "paraplegic" is meant a veteran who sustained a service-connected spinal-cord injury, as a result of which he lost the use of his limbs and will necessarily be confined permanently to a wheelchair.

I think the reasoning behind the amendment is sound. The cost of a home for a paraplegic is much higher than the cost of a home for the ordinary veteran. In the first place, there must be a ramp to take the place of a stairway, there must be wider hallways, wider doors, larger bathrooms, and exercising equipment. The cost therefore of a home for a paraplegic would be much higher than the cost of the average home. We feel that the Government should make up the difference.

I may say in this connection that, besides discharging a moral obligation to such young men, who have been doomed to wheelchairs for life, the proposal is economically sound. The cost of hospitalization of a paraplegic is in excess of $7,000 a year, so that even though the Government were to pay half the cost of the home for the permanently crippled veteran, within a period of from 1½ to 2 years it would have more than recaptured the entire amount spent.

I may say also in that connection that there are, roughly, 1,500 paraplegic cases, many of whom were married before the war, many of whom have families including one, two, and three children. Under the present circumstances, many of the men have had to provide homes for their families at a distance of 60, 70, or 80 miles from the hospital. Obviously, the young men in question had no chance to make money before entering the service, and they are without the money with which to build houses, even under the liberal loans allowed. They are also handicapped by the fact that banks are reluctant to loan money to a crippled veteran having no income other than his pension. The result has been the breaking up of a large number of homes of veterans. Since we refused last year to give these young men the aid to which they were entitled, I have learned of three separate instances in which families were broken up. I am firmly convinced that had we passed this bill last year, and had those young men been given an opportunity to live some semblance of a normal life with their families, in all probability those families would still be living together today. I believe the provision represents the least that we should do. While this section would affect a small number of individuals, I believe it is the most important section of the entire bill. It enables us to discharge some part of our moral obligation to permanently disabled veterans, which is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. President, I therefore ask the adoption of my amendment M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I now desire to call up my amendment N and to ask its adoption. I request that it be printed in the RECORD in lieu of having it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment was, on page 104, beginning with line 16, to strike out through line 20 on page 106.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, this amendment would merely strike out section 12 of the old Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. That is a section which dealt with the disposal of war housing. A bill has been passed substantially identical with section 12 of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, so it would merely cause confusion to reenact that section at this time.

I may say for the benefit of the Senate that we are at this time attempting to draft legislation covering the disposal of war housing. There is perhaps no greater source of irritation to veterans' organizations throughout the country than the present manner of disposing of war housing. I do not think it can be blamed on the heads of our housing agencies. It is largely our own fault. I do not believe we have given the heads of the housing agencies sensible legislation under which they may act. I have been working with various veterans' organizations and with the Housing Administration, and I hope that within the next few weeks we shall be able to present to the Senate a good, sensible, workable bill dealing with the disposal of war housing. It has been omitted from our present bill purposely, for the reason that we did not want to confuse this largely noncontroversial legislation with the very controversial subject of the disposal of war housing. Mr. President, I therefore ask the adoption of my amendment lettered N.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I now desire to take up my amendment lettered "O," and to ask its adoption. I request that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that in lieu thereof it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment submitted by Mr. MCCARTHY is as follows:

On page 106, beginning with line 21, to strike out through line 20 on page 112 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE IX—ADMINISTRATIVE AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

"ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

"SEC. 901. Effective upon the date of enactment of this act, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator shall receive compensation at the rate of $16,500 per annum, and the members of the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Housing Commissioner, and the Public Housing Commissioner shall each receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum.

"SEC. 902. In carrying out their respective functions, powers, and duties—

"(a) The Housing and Home Finance Administrator may appoint such officers and employees as he may find necessary, which

appointments shall be subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The Administrator may make such expenditures as may be necessary to carry out his functions, powers, and duties, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out such functions, powers, and duties, and for administrative expenses in connection therewith. The Administrator may delegate any of his functions and powers to such officers, agents, or employees as he may designate, and may make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out his functions, powers, and duties. The Administrator shall cause to be prepared for the Housing and Home Finance Agency an official seal of such device as he shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken of said seal.

"(b) The Public Housing Administration shall sue and be sued only with respect to its functions under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, and title II of Public Law 671, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved June 28, 1940, as amended. The Public Housing Commissioner may appoint such officers and employees as he may find necessary, with appointments, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, shall hereafter be made hereunder, and shall be subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; delegate any of his functions and powers to such officers, agents, or employees of the Public Housing Administration as he may designate; and make such rules and regulations as he may find necessary to carry out his functions, powers, and duties. Funds made available for carrying out the functions, powers, and duties of the Administration (including appropriations therefor, which are hereby authorized) shall be available, in such amounts as may from year to year be authorized by the Congress, for the administrative expenses of the Administration. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law except provisions of law hereafter enacted expressly in limitation hereof, the Public Housing Administration, or any State or local public agency administering a low-rent housing project assisted pursuant to the United States Housing Act of 1937 or title II of Public Law 671, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved June 28, 1940, shall continue to have the right to maintain an action or proceeding to recover possession of any housing acommodations operated by it where such action is authorized by the statute or regulations under which such housing accommodations are administered, and, in determining net income for the purposes of tenant eligibility with respect to low-rent housing projects assisted pursuant to said acts, the Public Housing Administration is authorized, where it finds such action equitable and in the public interest, to exclude amounts or portions thereof paid by the United States Government for disability or death occurring in connection with military service.

"(c) The Housing and Home Finance Administrator, the Home Loan Bank Board (which term as used in this section shall also include and refer to the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and the Chairman of the Home Loan Bank Board), the Federal Housing Commissioner, the Public Housing Commissioner, and the National Home Mortgage Corporation, respectively, may, in addition to and not in derogation of any powers and authorities conferred elsewhere in this act—

"(1) with the consent of the agency or organization concerned, accept and utilize equipment, facilities, or the services of employees of any State or local public agency or instrumentality, educational institution, or nonprofit agency or organization and, in connection with the utilization of such services, may make payments for transportation while away from their homes or regular places of business and per diem in lieu of subsistence en route and at place of such service, in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of Public Law 600, Seventy-ninth Congress (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 73b–2);

"(2) utilize, contract with, and act through, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, any Federal, State, or local public agency or instrumentality, educational institution, or nonprofit agency or organization with the consent of the agency or organization concerned, and any funds available to said officers for carrying out their respective functions, powers, and duties shall be available to reimburse any such agency or organization; and, whenever in the judgment of any such officer necessary, he may make advance, progress, or other payments with respect to such contracts without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes;

"(3) make expenditures for all necessary expenses, including preparation, mounting, shipping, and installation of exhibits; purchase and exchange of technical apparatus; and such other expenses as may, from time to time, be found necessary in carrying out their respective functions, powers, and duties: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to any purchase or contract by said officers (or their agencies), respectively, for services or supplies if the amount thereof does not exceed $300: *And provided further*, That funds made available for administrative expenses in carrying out the functions, powers, and duties imposed upon the Housing and Home Finance Administrator (except those imposed pursuant to titles II and V hereof), the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Housing Commissioner, and the Public Housing Commissioner, respectively, by or pursuant to law may at their option be consolidated into single administrative expense fund accounts of said officers or agencies for expenditure by them, respectively, in accordance with the provisions hereof.

"SEC. 903. Section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(f) Any loan guaranty certificate or other evidence of guaranty heretofore or hereafter provided to a lender by the Administrator shall be conclusive evidence of the eligibility of the loan for guaranty, and the validity of any certificate or other evidence of guaranty so provided shall be incontestable from the date of its execution, except for fraud or misrepresentation.'

"ACT CONTROLLING

"SEC. 904. Insofar as the provisions of any other law are inconsistent with the provisions of this act, the provisions of this act shall be controlling.

"SEPARABILITY

"SEC. 905. Except as may be otherwise expressly provided in this act, all powers and authorities conferred by this act shall be cumulative and additional to and not in derogation of any powers and authorities otherwise existing. Notwithstanding any other evidences of the intention of Congress, it is hereby declared to be the controlling intent of Congress that if any provisions of this act, or the application thereof to any persons or circumstances, shall be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of this act or its application to other persons and circumstances, but shall be confined in its operation to the provisions of this act, or the application thereof to the persons and circumstances, directly involved in the controversy in which such judgment shall have been rendered."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, my amendment lettered "O" deals largely with administrative streamlining and administrative changes. The recommendations frankly are largely the result of the thinking of the heads of the housing agencies. They went over the provision rather carefully. While frankly I do not feel so strongly about this amendment as others, I can see no objection whatever to adopting it. There is one section which is not the result of the thinking of heads of the housing agencies, however. They took no part in it, they did not recommend it. They, of course, have not opposed it. The section I refer to deals with the salaries of heads of the housing agencies. It is felt that while we now have some excellent men in our Housing Administration at this time, such men as Mr. Foley, Mr. Richards, and Mr. Fitzpatrick, general counsel, we cannot continue to get competent men to run these huge Federal bureaus for the salaries now being paid. For example, Mr. Foley is now really the head of about a $15,000,000,000 empire. When he was promoted and made the head of that empire, his salary, curiously enough, was, under the law, reduced from $12,000 a year to $10,000.

I have adopted the salary schedule set forth in the Flanders-Baldwin bill. I have merely taken that idea and applied it to the heads of the housing agencies. It provides a salary of $16,500 for the head of the H and HFA, and a salary of $15,000 for the heads of constituent agencies.

Mr. President, with that explanation I move the adoption of my amendment O.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. My next amendment is amendment P. I ask that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to establish a national housing policy and provide for its execution, and for other purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will observe that the amendment which the Senator is now presenting will not be in order until after the passage of the bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have one amendment which I believe will be rather controversial, namely, amendment K. I ask that the reading of it be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TITLE VI—LOW-RENT HOUSING

LOCAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND DETERMINATIONS; TENANCY ONLY BY LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

SEC. 601. The United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following additional subsections to section 15:

"(7) In recognition that there should be local determination of the need for public low-rent housing, the Authority shall not make any contract for financial assistance pursuant to this act with respect to any urban low-rent housing initiated after July 1, 1948—

"(a) unless the public housing agency has submitted an analysis of the local hous-

ing market demonstrating to the satisfaction of the Authority (i) that there is a need for such low-rent housing which cannot be met by private enterprise; and (ii) that a gap of at least 20 percent has been left between the upper rental limits for admission to the proposed low-rent housing and the lowest rents at which private enterprise is providing (through new construction and existing structures) a substantial supply of decent, safe, and sanitary housing toward meeting the need of an adequate volume thereof; and

"(b) unless the governing body of the locality involved has approved the provision of such low-rent housing, and the contract for financial assistance provides that the Authority shall approve the maximum income limits to be fixed with respect to the admission and continued occupancy of families in such housing, and that such maximum income limits as so approved shall at no time be changed without the prior approval of the Authority: *Provided*, That admission and continued occupancy of families in such housing shall be restricted to families at the welfare level so long as applicants in that class are available, subject to the condition that the local agencies shall pay a fair share of relief assistance to such families with no discrimination against the occupants of public housing projects.

"(8) Every contract made pursuant to this act for annual contributions for urban low-rent housing projects initiated after July 1, 1948, shall provide that a duly authorized official of the public housing agency involved shall make periodic written statements to the Authority that an investigation has been made of each family admitted to the low-rent housing project involved during the period covered thereby, and that, on the basis of the report of said investigation, he has found that each such family at the time of its admission (a) lived in an unsafe, insanitary, or overcrowded dwelling or had been displaced by a slum-clearance or land assembly and clearance project or by off-site elimination in compliance with the equivalent elimination requirement hereof, and (b) had a net family income not exceeding the maximum income limits theretofore fixed by the public housing agency (and approved by the Authority) for admission of families of low income to such housing: *Provided*, That the requirement in (a) shall not be applicable in the case of the family of any veteran or serviceman (or of any deceased veteran or serviceman) where application for admission to such housing is made not later than 5 years after July 1, 1948.

"(9) Every contract made pursuant to this act for annual contributions for urban low-rent housing projects initiated after July 1, 1948, shall require that the public housing agency make periodic reexaminations of the net incomes of families living in the low-rent housing project involved; and if it is found, upon such reexamination, that the net incomes of any families have increased beyond the maximum income limits theretofore fixed by the public housing agency (and approved by the Authority) for continued occupancy in such housing, such families shall be required to move from the project if there are decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings available to them within their means and appropriate to their use."

VETERANS' PREFERENCE

SEC. 602. The United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

(a) By adding the following new subsection to section 10:

"(g) Every contract made pursuant to this act for annual contributions for low-rent housing projects initiated after July 1, 1948, shall require that the public housing agency in selecting tenants shall give preference, as among applicants eligible for occupancy of the dwelling and at the rent involved, to families of veterans and servicemen (including families of deceased veterans or servicemen), where application for admission to such housing is made not later than 5 years after July 1, 1948. As among applicants entitled to the preference provided in this subsection, first preference shall be given to families of disabled veterans whose disability is service connected."

(b) By adding the following new subsection to section 2:

"(14) The term 'veteran' shall mean a person who has served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to July 25, 1947, and who shall have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable. The term 'serviceman' shall mean a person in the active military or naval service of the United States who has served therein on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to July 25, 1947."

(c) By adding the following sentence at the end of section 2 (1): "In determining net income for the purposes of tenant eligibility, the Authority is authorized, where it finds such action equitable and in the public interest, to exclude amounts or portions thereof paid by the United States Government as pension or other compensation for disability or death occurring in connection with military service.

COST LIMITS

SEC. 603. The first sentence of section 15 (5) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "No contract for any loan, annual contribution, or capital grant made pursuant to this act shall be entered into by the Authority with respect to any low-rent housing project completed after January 1, 1948, having a cost for construction and equipment of more than $1,250 per room (excluding land demolition, and nondwelling facilities); except that in any city or metropolitan district, as defined by the Bureau of the Census, the population of which exceeds 500,000, and in Alaska, any such contract may be entered into with respect to a project having a cost of construction and equipment of not to exceed $1,500 per room ($2,200 per room in the case of Alaska), excluding land, demolition, and nondwelling facilities, if in the opinion of the Authority such higher cost per room is justified by reason of higher costs of labor and materials and other construction costs: *Provided*, That if the Administrator with respect to any contract for financial assistance made before December 31, 1951, finds that in the geographical area of the low-rent housing project involved (i) it is not feasible under the aforesaid cost limitations to construct the project without sacrifice of sound standards of construction, design, and livability, and (ii) there is an acute need for such housing, he may prescribe in such contract cost limitations which may exceed by not more than $500 per room the limitations that would otherwise be applicable to such project hereunder."

PRIVATE FINANCING

SEC. 604. (a) In order to stimulate increasing private financing of low-rent housing and slum-clearance projects, the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

(1) The last proviso of subsection (b) of section 10 is repealed, and subsection (f) of said section is amended to read as follows: "Payments under annual contributions contracts shall be pledged as security for any loans obtained by a public housing agency to assist the development or acquisition of the housing project to which the annual contributions relate.";

(2) The following is added after section 21:

"PRIVATE FINANCING

"SEC. 22. To facilitate the enlistment of private capital through the sale by public housing agencies of their bonds and other obligations to others than the Authority, in financing low-rent housing and slum-clearance projects, and to maintain the low-rent character of housing projects—

"(a) Every contract for annual contributions (including contracts which amend or supersede contracts previously made) may provide that—

"(1) upon the occurrence of a substantial default in respect of the covenants or conditions to which the public housing agency is subject (as such substantial default shall be defined in such contract), the public housing agency shall be obligated to convey to the Authority the project, as then constituted, to which such contract relates;

"(2) the Authority shall agree to reconvey the project, as constituted at the time of reconveyance, to the public housing agency by which it shall have been so conveyed or to its successor (if such public housing agency or a successor exists) upon such terms as shall be prescribed in such contract and as soon as practicable: (i) after the Authority shall be satisfied that all defaults with respect to the project have been cured, and that the project will, in order to fulfill the purposes of this act, thereafter be operated in accordance with the terms of such contract; or (ii) after the termination of the obligation to make annual contributions available unless there are any obligations or covenants of the public housing agency to the Authority which are then in default. Any prior conveyances and reconveyances shall not exhaust the right to require a conveyance of the project to the Authority pursuant to subparagraph (1), upon the subsequent occurrence of a substantial default.

"(b) Whenever such contract for annual contributions shall include provisions which the Authority, in said contract, determines are in accordance with subsection (a) hereof, and the annual contributions, pursuant to such contract, have been pledged by the public housing agency as security for the payment of the principal and interest on any of its obligations, the Authority (notwithstanding any other provisions of this act) shall continue to make annual contributions available for the project so long as any of such obligations remain outstanding and may covenant in such contract that in any event such annual contributions shall in each year be at least equal to an amount which, together with such income or other funds as are actually available from the project for the purpose at the time such annual contribution is made, will suffice for the payment of all installments, falling due within the next succeeding 12 months, of principal and interest on the obligations for which the annual contributions provided for in the contract shall have been pledged as security: *Provided*, That such annual contributions shall not be in excess of the maximum sum determined pursuant to the provisions of this act; and in no case shall such annual contributions be in excess of the maximum sum specified in the contract involved, nor for longer than the remainder of the maximum period fixed by the contract: *Provided*, That such amount may be increased by the amount by which expenditures exceed receipts owing to the admission of families at the welfare level";

(3) Section 2 (10) is amended to read as follows:

"(10) The term 'going Federal rate' means the annual rate of interest (or, if there shall be two or more such rates of interest, the lowest thereof) specified in the most recently issued bonds of the Federal Government having a maturity of 20 years or more, determined, in the case of loans or annual contributions, respectively, at the date of Presidential approval of the contract pursuant to which such loans or contributions are made: *Provided*, That for the purposes of this act, the going Federal rate shall be deemed to be not less than 2½ percent.";

(4) Section 9 is amended by striking the period at the end of said section and adding a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That in the case of projects initiated after July 1, 1948, loans shall not be made for a period exceeding 40 years from the date of the bonds evidencing the loan: *And provided further,* That, in the case of such projects or any other projects with respect to which the contracts (including contracts which amend or supersede contracts previously made) provide for loans for a period not exceeding 40 years from the date of the bonds evidencing the loan and for annual contributions for a period not exceeding 40 years from the date the first annual contribution for the project is paid, such loans shall bear interest at a rate not less than the applicable going Federal rate.";

(5) Section 10 (c) is amended by striking the period at the end of the last sentence and adding a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That, in the case of projects initiated after July 1, 1948, contracts for annual contributions shall not be made for a period exceeding 40 years from the date the first annual contribution for the project is paid: *And provided further,* That, in the case of such projects or any other projects with respect to which the contracts for annual contributions (including contracts which amend or supersede contracts previously made) provide for annual contributions for a period not exceeding 40 years from the date the first annual contribution for the project is paid, the fixed contribution may exceed the amount provided in the first proviso of subsection (b) of this section by 1 percent of development or acquisition cost."

(6) The first sentence of section 10 (c) is amended to read as follows: "Every contract for annual contributions shall provide that whenever in any year the receipts of a public housing agency in connection with a low-rent housing project exceed its expenditures (including debt service, administration, maintenance, establishment of reserves, and other costs and charges), an amount equal to such excess shall be applied, or set aside for application, to purposes which will effect a reduction in the amount of subsequent annual contributions."

(7) Section 14 is amended by inserting the following after the first sentence: "When the Authority finds that it would promote economy or be in the financial interest of the Federal Government, any contract heretofore or hereafter made for annual contributions, loans, or both, may, with Presidential approval, be revised or superseded by a contract of the Authority so that the going Federal rate on the basis of which such annual contributions or interest rate on the loans, or both, respectively, are fixed shall mean the going Federal rate, as herein defined, on the date of Presidential approval of such revised or superseded contract: *Provided,* That contracts may not be revised or superseded in a manner which would impair the rights of the holders of any outstanding obligations of the public housing agency involved for which annual contributions have been pledged."

(8) Section 20 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 20. The Authority may issue and have outstanding at any one time notes and other obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount not to exceed $800,000,000. Such notes or other obligations shall be in such forms and denominations, shall have such maturities, and shall be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Authority with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of the notes or other obligations by the Authority. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes or other obligations of the Authority issued hereunder and for such purpose is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of the securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of such obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this section. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States.";

(9) Section 2 (5) is amended to read as follows:

"(5) The term 'development' means any or all undertakings necessary for planning, land acquisition, demolition, construction, or equipment, in connection with a low-rent housing or slum-clearance project. The term 'development cost' shall comprise the costs incurred by a public housing agency in such undertakings and their necessary financing (including the payment of carrying charges, but not beyond the point of physical completion), and in otherwise carrying out the development of such project. Construction activity in connection with a low-rent housing project may be confined to the reconstruction, remodeling, or repair of existing buildings."

(b) The last sentence of paragraph Seventh of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, is amended by inserting before the colon, after the words "obligations of national mortgage associations", a comma and the following: "or such obligations of any public housing agency (as defined in the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended) as are secured by a pledge of annual contributions under an annual contributions contract between such public housing agency and the Public Housing Administration: *Provided,* That such contract shall contain the covenant by the Public Housing Administration which is authorized by subsection (b) of section 22 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, and that the maximum sum and the maximum period specified in such contract pursuant to said subsection 22 (b) shall not be less than the annual amount and the period for payment which are requisite to provide for the payment when due of all installments of principal and interest on such obligations."

ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 605. Section 10 (e) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting the following after the first sentence thereof: "With respect to projects to be assisted pursuant to this act, the Authority is authorized, in addition to the amount heretofore authorized, to enter into contracts, on and after the 1st day of July 1948, which provide for annual contributions aggregating not more than $32,000,000 per annum, which limit shall be increased by further amounts of $32,000,000 on the 1st day of July in each of the years 1949, 1950, 1951, and 1952 respectively, but such authorization shall be increased by amounts necessary to make up any deficits resulting by reason of the admission of families at the welfare level: *Provided,* That the contracts for annual contributions with respect to projects initiated after July 1, 1948, shall not provide for the development of more than 500,000 dwelling units without further authorization from the Congress."

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

SEC. 606. The United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

(1) By adding to section 6 the following new subsection:

"(e) With respect to all projects under title II of Public Law 671, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved June 28, 1940, reference therein to the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, shall include all amendments to said act now or hereafter adopted.";

(2) By deleting from the proviso in section 10 (a) and in section 11 (a) the following: ", unless the project includes the elimination" and substituting the following: "unless, subsequent to the initiation of the project and within a period specified by the Authority, there has been or will be elimination";

(3) By amending the second sentence of subsection 13 (a) to read as follows: "The Authority may bid for and purchase at any foreclosure by any party or at any other sale, or acquire (pursuant to section 22 or otherwise) any project which it previously owned or in connection with which it has made a loan, annual contribution, or capital grant; and in such event the Authority may complete, administer, dispose of, and otherwise deal with, such projects or parts thereof, subject, however, to the limitations elsewhere in this act governing their administration and disposition.";

(4) By renumbering sections 22 to 30, inclusive, so that they become sections 23 to 31, inclusive.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, this amendment deals with the highly controversial subject of public housing. I should much rather refer to it as welfare housing; and if this amendment be agreed to I think we can safely refer to it as welfare housing.

The amendment provides for what the vast number of people who are in favor of public housing think is being done. As the Senate well knows, hearings were held all the way from Los Angeles to New York and from New Orleans to St. Paul, and well-meaning groups appeared before the committee, social organizations, and church groups, very much concerned with those persons who are at the very bottom of the income level. I think every one of them, without exception, felt that the present public housing policy is to start at the bottom and work up. It so happens that is not the fact, and there is no controversy about that. The present policy is not to go down to the very bottom. Those who are administering the program say, "Let us take care of the poor man." "But if he is too poor," they say, "We will not take care of him." In other words, there is a certain low-income strata of society, the very lowest in the income groups, not eligible to enter public housing. There is apparently an unwritten rule—it may be written, for all I know—to the effect that not more than 10 percent of the tenants in a public housing project can come from the welfare group. That, in effect, bars from public housing persons who most need help. Let us take as an example a widow with 5 or 6 children. She is receiving relief from the city, but not sufficient to enable her to live in decent quarters. If public housing is sound in theory—and I think the theory behind welfare housing is sound—we should not bar that type of person from public housing. That is the type of person who should be given first consideration. My amendment provides that consideration be given to the lowest-income groups, and that we should start at the bottom and work up, not go half way and then, in a few cases, work down.

As of today there are persons receiving three or four or five thousand dollars a year and living in public housing, while widows and veterans with children are cramped in basements and attics. Those persons who are earning four or five thousand dollars a year are paying enough money to cut down the cost to the Federal Government, but they are still the subjects of subsidy.

In Detroit, Mich., alone we were informed that there are 400 persons in public housing in income brackets above what is allowed by the original law. They are earning three or four or five or six thousand dollars a year. When the committee met in Detroit I asked one of the members of my staff to call the Public Housing Administrator to give us a picture of exactly how many over-income families lived in the project and how high up the scale they ran. The head of the Public Housing Administration sent back word that he would under no circumstances come down and testify before our group. We could have subpenaed him and compelled his attendance, but we thought that a man who was so derelict in his duty that he did not want to give us a picture of the housing project would not give us any testimony that was worth enough to pay for subpenaing him.

Please do not understand my statement as an indictment of all those in charge of public-housing units. We found some very well-administered public-housing projects—one in Little Rock, Ark., and one in Dallas, Tex. There is a good one in Ohio. I forget whether it is in Cleveland or in Cincinnati. We found other good ones. We ran into a number of well-administered public-housing projects in various States. However, such housing has not been for the poor man, for the man at the very bottom, for whom many social organizations think it is intended.

All my amendment does is to give priority to those at the bottom of the income scale and then to work up as high as possible. It merely provides for changing our policy and starting where the need is greatest.

With that explanation, Mr. President, I move the adoption of my amendment K.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the Chair will bear with me, I believe I have not offered amendments A and B yet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is under the impression that amendment I was not acted on.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not sure I offered amendment I.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is now advised that the Senator requested that amendment I be passed over.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will first offer amendment A. It merely changes the title by striking out "National Housing Commission Act" and inserting in lieu thereof "Act of 1948."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire to have the amendment inserted in the RECORD at this point?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do. I waive the reading of the amendment.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be inserted in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike out "National Housing Commission Act" and insert in lieu thereof "Housing Act of 1948."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I shall not call up my amendment B. It covers the policy statement. I have no serious objection to the policy statement in the TEW bill.

Amendment I deals with the yield-insurance program. I covered that subject fully yesterday. I have, however, promised the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] that before offering this amendment I would strike out the section dealing with accelerated depreciation allowance for income-tax purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator now so move?

Mr. McCARTHY. First, Mr. President, I want to explain my position for the RECORD. I think the amendment is a proper one. I do not believe we are invading the province of any other committee. I think it is a necessary incentive to get equity money into the lower-rental field. I do not believe we can get cheap-rental housing from borrowed money. In order to get a great deal of cheap-rental housing we must get equity money into that field. I believe the greatest incentive is by the system of rapid depreciation for income-tax purposes.

There is nothing new about this idea. We did during the wartime what is now proposed, in order to stimulate the production of war plants. It did result in the stimulation of the production of war plants, and it seems to me that if we can do it during wartimes in order to stimulate the production of war plants it is only fair to do the same thing during peacetime to stimulate the production of homes. However, I have a great deal of respect for the legal ability of the Senator from Colorado, and for his ability as a Senator, and in view of the fact that he strongly feels that this is not properly part of a housing bill, I move that the section dealing with amortization, the section commencing on page 14, line 10, and extending down to line 6 on page 17, inclusive, be stricken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Section 110, on the subject of amortization deduction?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would suggest that the motion the Senator is making should include the language beginning with line 7.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Chair. I move that there be stricken out everything commencing on line 7, page 14, down to and including line 6 on page 17.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, with that amendment, I now move the adoption of my amendment lettered "I."

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does that complete the Senator's program?

Mr. McCARTHY. It completes it with the exception of amendment P, which I shall offer later.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to modify the amendment which I have offered by striking out on page 89, lines 13 to 25, inclusive, and on page 90, lines 1 to 5, inclusive.

Mr. McCARTHY. To what document is the Senator referring?

Mr. TAFT. The amendment which I have offered.

Mr. McCARTHY. May we have a copy of it?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator has it on his desk and has had it at all times. It is the committee amendments.

Mr. President, this is the matter referred to by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. It is the provision which permits national banks to invest in certain United States Housing Authority securities.

Objection has been made that this modifies the original provision of the Banking Act, which attempted to take national banks out of the general business of underwriting securities. I think the objection is sound, so I am modifying the amendment in this regard, with the approval of the Senator from Vermont, who speaks, I think, for the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be modified as suggested by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hatch	O'Daniel
Ball	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hayden	Overton
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bricker	Hill	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Hoey	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Holland	Russell
Buck	Ives	Saltonstall
Bushfield	Jenner	Smith
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Stennis
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Capehart	Kem	Taft
Capper	Kilgore	Taylor
Chavez	Knowland	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	Lodge	Thye
Donnell	Lucas	Tydings
Downey	McCarran	Vandenberg
Dworshak	McCarthy	Watkins
Eastland	McKellar	White
Ecton	McMahon	Wiley
Ellender	Malone	Williams
Ferguson	Martin	Wilson
Flanders	Millikin	Young
Fulbright	Moore	
George	Morse	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3703) to authorize transfer of surplus real property to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior for consolidation of Federal holdings within areas administered by the National Park Service.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 2038) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 15, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2038) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF PROPOSED RECESS UNTIL 11:30 O'CLOCK A. M. MONDAY—MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, it is the intention of the acting majority leader to move, when the Senate concludes its business tonight, that it take a recess until 11:30 o'clock Monday morning. The reason for meeting at that hour is that on Monday there will be the commemorative joint session of the two Houses in the Chamber of the House of Representatives. If the Senate approves of the proposed procedure, the acting majority leader respectfully suggests that all Senators be here promptly at 11:30 o'clock on Monday because the Senate will proceed at 11:30 to the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations be allowed to meet during this afternoon's session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consent is granted.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE—RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused for the remainder of the afternoon. I desire to appear before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations dealing with Rural Electrification Administration appropriations.

I might say, Mr. President, that from the beginning of REA North Dakota has been at the very bottom of the list of those benefited by it. Only 7 farmers out of 100 in North Dakota receive REA services. In the neighboring State of Montana 25 farmers out of every 100 receive REA services. In Minnesota 40 out of every 100 farmers receive such services. I do not know of any better job I could do for the farmers of North Dakota than to endeavor to seek justice for them in connection with REA services.

Mr. President, I see the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] in his seat. Last year in Wyoming REA services almost trebled, while in North Dakota we barely struggle along in order to get a few miserable miles of line built. I am not criticizing the Senator from Wyoming. I am complimenting him, and I hope that he will go with me this afternoon to the Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee to obtain for the farmers of North Dakota what I helped secure for the farmers of the State of Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from North Dakota for permission to be absent from the session of the Senate this afternoon, so he may appear before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, is granted.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I rise to ask the distinguished Senator from North Dakota to yield.

Mr. LANGER. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to know that the Senator from North Dakota is undertaking to appear before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations in support of rural electrification. I am well aware of the fact that a year ago, when the question was under consideration in the House of Representatives, some of the distinguished leaders in that body took the position that REA should be very much curtailed. I am glad to be able to tell him, from the experience of the farmers in Wyoming, that it will be very fortunate for the farmers of North Dakota if he succeeds in his mission in securing an increased appropriation to expand this facility. I shall be very happy to cooperate with him in every respect to secure this advance for the farmers of North Dakota.

The money which will be expended in expanding the work of the REA cooperatives will be repaid to the Government of the United States over and over again. The REA cooperatives at this moment are ahead of schedule in the repayment of the Government loans. The Senator from North Dakota may be sure that in advocating this program he is advocating one which is eminently sound. I am happy to know that he has been excused from attendance on the Senate this afternoon in order to do this valuable work.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its work this afternoon it take a recess until the hour of 11:30 o'clock a. m. on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL HOUSING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 866) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective and to provide for the coordinated execution of such policy through a National Housing Commission, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as amended.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I want the Senate to understand the parliamentary situation. This amendment is the amendment prepared by the committee, and acceptable to the authors of the bill. If the amendment is now adopted the bill will not be open to further amendment. I do not want it to be understood that we are trying to cut any one off. If any Senator now desires to offer any amendments to the draft known as committee amendments, this is the time to do it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio as amended.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to make it clear that voting for the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio will result in doing a number of things. No. 1, it will strike out the section dealing with Federal aid for paraplegics, the wheel-chair cases.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is free to offer that section as a separate amendment to the bill, even if my amendment is adopted. Am I not correct in that statement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would advise the Senate that such an amendment would come in outside of the so-called substitute offered by the Senator from Ohio, which is now pending before the Senate.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the amendment of the Senator from Ohio is adopted, will it be subject to further amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will inform the Senate that if the substitute offered by the Senator from Ohio is agreed to, that portion in it, as agreed to, will not be open to further amendment. The portion of the bill covered by the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio cannot be further amended.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. However, since the particular section relating to paraplegics, to which the Senator from Wisconsin refers, is not in my amendment, it may be offered as a separate section of the bill as amended by my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair endeavored to point that out in reply to the Senator's earlier question.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I am not sure that I have the parliamentary situation clearly in mind. Am I to understand that if the Taft amendment is adopted, then there can be added to it the section dealing with aid to paraplegics?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senator from Wisconsin that what he is proposing cannot be added to that amendment, but it may be added to other parts of the bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. In view of the fact that the Taft amendment is in the na-

ture of an entire substitute and strikes out all the amendments which I have offered, is there any way the Taft amendment could be amended if it were adopted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senator from Wisconsin that the amendment now pending, offered by the Senator from Ohio, is not a complete substitute for the entire bill. To be sure, it amends a substantial portion of the bill; but there will still be certain sections of the bill untouched, and the Senator can then offer his amendment to any one of those sections, or as a separate section where it may be appropriate.

Mr. McCARTHY. May I ask the Senator from Ohio what sections will be left untouched?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senator that an amendment can always be added at the end of the bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the second thing which voting for this amendment will do will be to strike out a secondary market for the type of loan w ich is most badly in need of a secondary market. I do not like to go over this ground again, but a number of Senators are now present who were not present earlier this afternoon.

In our investigations one thing was brought to our attention more forcibly, perhaps, than anything else, and that was the lack of a secondary market for certain types of loans.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. For my information I should like to know what type of loans the Senator is referring to, that would be stricken out.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am about to tell the Senate.

In our investigation throughout the country we found that one of the most definite road blocks in the way of lower-cost homes was the inability to obtain loans on them. An FHA guaranteed loan could be obtained under either title VI or title II. However, in order to obtain such a loan there must be improved street, and in many regions that is interpreted to mean concrete streets. A good gravel highway is not sufficient. In some places it is said that a black-top road is sufficient.

The same restriction applies to loans under title II, that is, section 203 loans. Moreover neither section 603 nor section 203 loans are available unless all the utilities are installed. That is not something that is in the law, but that is the interpretation of the law.

Let us assume that a truck driver owns a quarter of an acre of land on a good gravel road. He would not be eligible to get a loan either under section 603 or section 203. Take the case of a contractor who wishes to build a low-cost housing project. He does not want to go to the expense of putting in concrete highways. Perhaps the city will not cooperate. He has accessible to him a good gravel highway. He wants to build some low-cost housing. He is not eligible to get a section 603 or a section 203 loan, so he must resort to what is known as a title I, class 3, loan. For the benefit of the Senator from Vermont, that is the loan to which I now refer. Those are 10 percent guaranteed loans. That does not mean 10 percent of each individual loan. It means a guarantee of 10 percent of the entire portfolio. Once a bank has sufficient of those loans to have a sizable portfolio, normally it considers them fairly good security. But in the opening stages I have found no banks willing to take title I, class 3 loans. That means that we are placing an absolute road block in the way of lower-cost homes. This was bad enough before we started to establish a secondary market for all other loans.

DEATH OF PRESIDENT MANUEL ROXAS, OF THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me for the purpose of making a brief statement which is not apropos to the matter under discussion?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I rise to announce with extreme regret, which I am sure will be shared by all Members of Congress and by countless thousands of our citizens, the passing of President Manuel Roxas, the first President of the Philippine Republic, who has just passed away.

He was one of three great Filipinos—President Quezon, President Osmeña, and President Roxas. Those three men fought for Philippine independence, guided the Republic through the transition period, and were identified with the movement which finally brought their dreams into reality.

It was my privilege to work for many years with President Roxas and to know him as a friend, to form a pretty reliable estimate of him as a man, and to watch his efforts to build the country to which he devoted so much of his energy and all of his loyalty. The great struggle of rehabilitating the war-ravaged Philippine Islands, together with the terrific problem of launching the new Republic on the foundations of war chaos, finally took a toll which resulted in his death.

Manuel Roxas was devoted to his country to a degree that few men are devoted to the land of their nativity. He was a prisoner during much of the war; and notwithstanding the fact that his life was constantly in danger, at all times he did the very best he could to help our own Nation and his beloved Philippines throw off the yoke of the Japanese conquerors. At a time when his nation had very little money, when hundreds of thousands of homes were ruined, and the business of the Philippine Islands was in a chaotic condition, he was elected the first President of the Philippine Republic. With the meager resources at his disposal he sought to rejuvenate and rehabilitate the economy of the Philippine people.

The passing of this patriot will be mourned by all those who were privileged to know him, and by almost all citizens of the Philippine Republic as well as by thousands of liberty-loving people in this country who watched the struggle of the Philippine Islands for independence and watched the work of President Roxas, who played such a major part in the accomplishment of this result. It was with extreme regret that I learned of his passing, and I know that all Senators will share that regret.

Mr. President, as a mark of respect to the memory of President Roxas, I ask that when the Senate recesses or adjourns today, it do so as a token of our high regard for this man who was identified with so much of the history of our own country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I wish to join in the statement just made by the distinguished Senator from Maryland with respect to the passing of the President of the Philippine Republic. It was my privilege and pleasure to be a member of a small group which attended the independence ceremonies held in Manila on July 4, 1946, at which time the Senator from Maryland spoke, representing the people of America. I was there when the late President of the Philippines raised the flag of the Philippines, while Commissioner McNutt lowered the American flag. In the crowd there were some 50,000 or 60,000 people. There was hardly a dry eye, and there was absolute silence, as those flags met midway on the flagpole. That was a moment no one can forget.

My impression of President Roxas at that time was just as the Senator from Maryland has described him today. We not only had the pleasure of becoming acquainted with him but also with his family—his mother and other relatives. As the Senator from Maryland has said, the people of the Philippines respected President Roxas highly. His death brings a great loss, not only to the people of the Philippines but to the people of the world at large.

NATIONAL HOUSING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 866) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective and to provide for the coordinated execution of such policy through a National Housing Commission, and for other purposes.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, in response to the questions asked by the Senator from Wisconsin, let me say that the committee did not consider that loans of this type were of the sort which should be provided with secondary mortgage support. They are not subject to FHA construction and property standards. As the Senator has stated, it is possible that those standards are a little higher than they should be; but in that case the remedy is in legislative action. They are not subject to FHA appraisal or FHA risk-rating procedures. Those safeguards assure that the loans purchased will be economically sound and will not be excessive or inflationary in amount.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, let me interrupt the Senator to correct something he said. The title I, class 3 loans are FHA-approved loans. The

Senator from Vermont has said that they are not subject to FHA approval. We are speaking only of those which are subject to FHA approval. In other words, before a title I, class 3 loan can be guaranteed, it must have FHA approval. If it does not have FHA approval, then obviously it does not come under title I, class 3. I am speaking only of the FHA-approved loans for the lower-cost housing.

The inability to obtain money for a lower-cost house, even after the FHA has approved a loan, has been a source of tremendous irritation all over the country. As the Senator from Vermont well knows at no time at which he was present in the committee has the committee ever discussed title I, class 3 loans. The 14-man housing committee unanimously voted to provide a secondary market for all FHA and VA insured or guaranteed loans. We unanimously agreed as to that.

So I cannot understand why the Senator from Vermont upon his own has eliminated what is the most important section of the part of the bill dealing with the secondary market.

When we began these investigations, we considered setting up a secondary market only because of the inability to obtain title I, class 3 loans. If it had not been for that one thing, we never would have placed this section in the bill at all.

Now, after we have drawn up a section of the bill to provide for that specific problem, the Senator from Vermont has emasculated that section, so that the problem will not be met.

If there is a sound reason for such action, and if the Senator will point it out to me, then I should like to have this matter held up, and not voted on today, so that I may obtain the evidence, which I know the Senator from Vermont has not had an opportunity to study, and present it to him. Unless that is done, we might as well forget about passing this piece of proposed legislation at all, for then we would be channelizing all the scarce building materials into the higher-cost homes. I think the object of everyone is to get the scarce materials into the lower-cost homes.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, in reply to the remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin, I say, first, that there are no limitations on title II or title VI. The cost can go as low as one pleases to have it go. The FHA approval on title I, class 3 loans is on much lower standards than it is on other mortgages. It is for that reason that the secondary market was not provided for them.

I should also call the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin to the fact that in the final majority report of the Joint Committee on Housing, the last sentence on page 3, paragraph 10, reads as follows:

> This secondary market should be authorized to purchase both FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed loans on a limited basis where such purchases do not contribute to inflationary pressures and are necessary to sustain a volume of residential construction.

I do not believe it would be easy for the Senator from Wisconsin to justify the extension of the secondary-mortgage provision into these lower property standards of the title I, class 3 group, as compared to the others.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Vermont realize that the title I, class 3 loans were made available for the semirural housing? They have nothing whatsoever to do with the type of construction or with the soundness of the loan. They are made available where there are no concrete streets, where perhaps all the utilities are not available.

I may say—and if I am wrong as to this matter I ask the Senator to correct me—that at no time at any committee meeting at which the Senator from Vermont was present did we ever discuss removing the title I, class 3 loans from the scope of the provisions of this bill. I ask the Senator if that statement is correct.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I do not remember that at the time when this bill was before the Banking and Currency Committee the Senator from Wisconsin brought up or discussed this question.

I should like to refer again to the original purpose of title I, class 3. It was originally applied to substandard construction of summer cottages, hunting camps, and construction of that sort. There was no original intention to apply it to permanent dwellings. It has been brought into that phase of the subject only by encouragement given to it in a period of scanty housing. It is really an encouragement of substandard housing.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, let me inquire of the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] whether they intend to request a vote upon their amendment today, or whether in view of the fact that, if accepted, it will not be subject to further amendment, they are willing to let it go over until Monday, so that those of us who have been studying the housing problem for some time can decide what amendments we wish to offer to the Taft-Flanders amendment.

I may say in this connection, for the benefit of the Senator from Ohio, that I know that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]—I am not speaking for him, but I have discussed at some length the subject of housing with him, and I have a great deal of respect for his judgment—is very much concerned about the matter of loans, guaranties, and secondary markets for lower-cost housing. I am not referring to substandard housing; I am referring to lower-cost housing. I do not think we should rush through this amendment today until we have had a chance to go through it and decide what amendments we wish to offer.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, these are the committee amendments. They have been on the desks of Senators for several days. I see no particular reason why we should give up the opportunity to have 3 or 4 hours of further consideration of these amendments today.

The amendment has been under consideration, and no amendments have been suggested to it.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am suggesting some now.

Mr. TAFT. I urged the Senator from Wisconsin to suggest amendments to it, but he chose to suggest amendments to the original bill.

As a matter of fact, I think the secondary market section is the most doubtful section of the bill, anyway. Certainly I do not think it should be expanded beyond the very standard type of mortgage. As a matter of fact, it is not a very large feature. The total authorization under title I is only $175,000,000, I think, as compared to approximately $6,000,000,000.

Mr. McCARTHY. The amount has been increased in the Senator's bill.

Mr. TAFT. It has been increased from $165,000,000 to $175,000,000, as compared with approximately $6,000,000,000 for title VI or title VII. Title I is intended for complete modernization loans. In the great majority of cases the loans have been used only for extensive repairs to old houses. There is no call, so far as I know, for a secondary market handling repair loans. Banks ordinarily rather like such loans, but they will make them only if they are absolutely certain of the responsibility of the applicants. As a rule, the applicant has a first mortgage on his home, and is seeking a second mortgage anyway. I see no reason whatever why the Government should provide a secondary market for such loans.

I think the whole business of providing a secondary market for mortgages would degenerate into the Government's simply putting up cash for all mortgages. The committee amendment is limited; it is applicable only in certain cases. The Senator's amendment undertakes to do away with all limitations. Of course, the provision of $500,000,000 is a limitation, but we are putting up a total of three or four billion dollars a year I think on mortgages. It ought to be merely an auxiliary service. If it is an auxiliary service, it certainly is not needed, so far as I can see, for title I modernization loans; I can see no reason for it. Nobody can build a $3,000 home in any event today that is not likely to fall down tomorrow.

Mr. McCARTHY. What limit is provided in the Senator's amendment? Is it $3,000?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President——

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I still have the floor. My question is addressed to the Senator from Ohio. What is the limit in his amendment?

Mr. TAFT. The amount is increased from $3,000 to $4,000, I think.

Mr. FLANDERS. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. It is increased from $3,000 to $4,000, with $10,000 for repairs to a multiple-family home.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the Senator know that under his own amendment there is a provision for the insurance of a total of $1,750,000,000 worth of construction of title I, class 3, loans? It is not $175,000,000; it is a total of $1,750,000,000 worth of construction in the Senator's own amendment. I ask further if the Senator knows that in his own amendment all limits are not taken off, in that the FHA or the HHFA is given the duty of deciding in what areas and in what times the loans shall be

made available? The Senator's amendment is the same as mine in that respect. That is my first point. In the second place, the FHA has the duty of determining what type of construction shall be covered, not by the guaranty, but by the secondary mortgage, so that under the Senator's own amendment, if the FHA feels that any of the title I, class 3, loans are too risky, the HHFA, working with the head of this new corporation which is created, and which is headed by the same head as the HHFA, can exclude such title I, class 3, loans?

Mr. TAFT. As a matter of fact any secondary mortgage can be excluded. There is nothing to force the corporation to buy any mortgage on the secondary market, unless it happens to like the mortgage.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator and I agree, then.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. But why should we in the case of the mortgage corporation make eligible a lot of loans which are unsound? I mean, which are not a standard form of loan, but depend on the personal responsibility of the particular applicant to a local bank. There is no need so far as I know, and no request even, for a secondary mortgage in the secondary market.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me ask the Senator another question. He made a statement that this covers a very small amount of construction. The Senator knows, does he not, that in his own amendment the amount of construction covered is increased by $100,000,000?

Mr. TAFT. No, I do not.

Mr. McCARTHY. I wish the Senator would look at it. He will find that it is increased in that amount, making a total of $1,750,000,000 worth of construction. The Senator would increase the possible liability by $10,000,000, which increases the amount of construction covered by an additional $90,000,000, so that we are dealing here not with a small amount of construction but with construction totaling $1,750,000,000.

I point out to the Senator that the only reason we undertook to draft the provision setting up a secondary market was that we felt it absolutely necessary in order to get lower cost construction. In California and in the South they cannot build——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me finish this sentence first, and then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. TAFT. Very well.

Mr. McCARTHY. In California and in certain sections of the South, they can build good livable quarters for $4,500; that is, FHA approved quarters under title I, class 3. That is one reason we did not limit ours to $4,000 but made it $5,000. I commend that to the attention of the Senator. That is my first point.

Secondly, not only must we increase the limit to $5,000 in order to get low cost homes; we must establish the secondary market. If that is not done, we should eliminate the entire secondary market section of the bill. I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. The whole pressure for the secondary market comes on GI loans. That is what we had last year. That is what the Senate considered reasonable last year. The difficulty with regard to the secondary market comes from the fact that many small banks in various places have built themselves up with as many GI loans as they wanted. They were perfectly good loans. They are under the GI bill of rights. The reason for providing the secondary market, the only really possible justification for it, is so that we may carry out our promise to veterans under that bill. That is what it does. The secondary market is made available for GI loans, and we also have in FHA title 2 and title 6, a standard loan. But this is the first suggestion I have ever heard so far as I am concerned that home-modernization loans should be put into the classification of standard loans and that an effort should be made to create a secondary market for them. There never will be a secondary market for them under any ordinary banking system. They are not loans of that kind.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not speaking of that.

Mr. TAFT. The loans are all right for a small local bank to make to people who are known to the bank and who are living in the same town; but they are not standard loans. There is no reason why there should be a secondary market.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say to the Senator I am not talking about modernization loans; I am speaking of loans on the lower-cost housing—housing that can be built for $4,000, $4,200, and $4,500. The reason we originally increased the limitation to $4,000 was, we thought that would be sufficient. That is the figure adopted by the Senator from Vermont. Since then, in discussing this matter with veterans' organizations and with contractors all over the country, it has been found that that is not sufficiently high. They want to construct cheap or low-cost veterans' housing, and the limit was increased to $5,000.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. One of the things the Senator is trying to do is to increase the limit on modernization loans to $5,000. The committee went as far as $4,000. This is for the special type of home, but all restrictions are off. The homes are not required to meet any of the FHA qualifications. The Senator says they were for summer cottages and that kind of thing. If any considerable number of such houses are built, it will simply create a new source of slums, because it is impossible to build a modern house for $4,000 or $5,000.

I think the whole theory of the Senator is wrong. Having adopted that theory, he then wants to provide a secondary market for this particular type of loans, which I think is also wrong. This is only one of many respects in which he has offered amendments at variance with the opinion of the committee, the opinion of the joint committee, of which he is a member, and with the opinion of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator says that there are no rules or regulations covering construction under title I, class 3, loans. That is not correct. In his amendment and in my amendment we provide that before the HHFA may provide a secondary market the specifications be first set down, together with the rules covering the construction of homes. So there is protection.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Wisconsin that housing within the range which he describes is to be taken care of in sections 2 and 6. I should also like to suggest that he might well have expressed his views when the amendment was before the Banking and Currency Committee, instead of having brought it to our attention for the first time on the floor today.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will say to the Senator from Vermont that the reason I did not go through the Senator's bill very carefully was because his own staff told me it was like my bill. Such being the case, I was justified in assuming that the Senator had not made these changes. I would be justified in assuming that if he wished to make such a radical change he would let me know.

There is one other question which I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Ohio, not having had an opportunity to go over their amendments very carefully. Is there an increase of one-half of 1 percent in the interest rate all across the board, on the approval of the Treasury Department and the head of the housing agency, or is it merely restricted to certain types of loans? Will the Senator from Ohio answer that question? Does the Senator allow a maximum of one-half of 1 percent increase in interest rate upon the approval of the Treasury Department and the head of the housing agency in the case of all VA and HHFA loans?

Mr. TAFT. The differences in the interest rate I can give the Senator. Under section 203 of the National Housing Act there is now a 5-percent maximum interest rate, and we provide that the Administrator may raise it to 6 percent if the mortgage market should demand it. The Senator's amendment provides a maximum of 6½ percent.

Mr. McCARTHY. No; my amendment provides that in the case of VA and HHFA insured or guaranteed loans, if the Treasury Department and the head of the housing agency find that credit has dried up to the extent that loans cannot be obtained, they can increase the interest rate by a maximum of one-half of 1 percent. Where the interest rate is now 5 percent it could be increased to 5½ percent.

Mr. TAFT. I think I have stated the facts. The Senator from Wisconsin, under section 203, would increase it to 6½

percent. The committee amendment provides for 4½ percent, and under the Senator's proposal the rate would go to 5 percent.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is incorrect.

Mr. TAFT. Under section 203 the maximum rate is now 4 percent, and could go to 4½ percent under the Senator's amendment. Under section 608 the maximum rate is 4½, and would go to 5 percent under the Senator's amendment. In general, we have permitted the Administrator to increase the interest rate approximately one-half of 1 percent on a certain type of mortgage, and under the Senator's proposal he is permitted to increase it to 1 percent.

Mr. McCARTHY. We have provided that under all VA and HHFA guaranteed and insured loans, if the Treasury Department or the head of the housing agency should find it necessary, the maximum interest rate may be increased from what it now is by an additional one-half of 1 percent. I should like to know whether the increase of ½ percent in your amendment is permitted clear across the board.

Mr. TAFT. Under sections 203 and 608 only.

Mr. McCARTHY. What about title I?

Mr. TAFT. I do not think there is any change in title I at all.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, there is one further reason why I think the Senate should reject the amendment submitted by the Senator from Ohio. If the amendment should be accepted it would strike out all the amendments which I have previously offered and which have been accepted. I think the principal reason, above all others, for rejecting it is that the theory upon which he is favoring public housing is entirely erroneous. It is not the theory under which public housing was originally provided. I do not think it was the intent of the Congress to exclude the very lowest income groups. I believe the intent of the Congress was to start at the very bottom and then work up. I do not think Congress intended to say it would help the poor man, but not if he is too poor. In the amendment which I have introduced, which will be stricken if the Senator's amendment be accepted, I merely provide what practically every social organization and every church group which appeared before us thought we intended to do, namely, to start at the very bottom and come up. That does not in any way affect the number of public housing units. I do not care whether we provide for 500,000 or 600,000 or 700,000 units, if we take care of the greatest need first. In that connection, I think the Senator knows, when he refers to clearing slums, that up until this time if we cleared a slum area, and utilized the housing bill as he has submitted it, the slum dwellers would never find their way into public housing.

I might call the Senator's attention to what he himself said before our committee in regard to the purpose of public housing. I am merely agreeing with the statement of the Senator from Ohio when he testified before our committee. He said:

> May I say this has nothing to do with the shortage of houses—
>
> Referring to the public-housing section of the bill.
>
> Public housing has nothing to do with the emergency or the present shortage of houses. It is solely a social-welfare program like the long-term educational program.

All I am doing through my amendment is providing that we give some force and some backbone to what the Senator from Ohio himself said regarding the public-housing section of his bill. Those well-meaning persons who came before our committee believed we were trying to take care of the low-income groups. Yesterday the Senator from Ohio said he did not think welfare families should be eligible for public housing. By that statement the Senator would exclude the war widows with families who are receiving pensions and who otherwise cannot get adequate housing. Above all else, I urge the Senate not to accept the Taft amendment for the reason that we would have to spend huge amounts of Federal money, allegedly to help the poor man, and, at the same time, saying that if he is too poor we will not help him.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is an amendment to the Flanders' substitute amendment now in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now before the Senate is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio as modified already by himself. An amendment to that amendment is in order. That is the Flanders amendment, so-called.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to offer an amendment at this time in behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and myself. The junior Senator from Massachusetts presented the amendment this morning to lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 92, after line 2, of the committee amendments, it is proposed to insert the following:

> SEC. 607. Any low-rent or veterans' housing project undertaken or constructed under a program of a State or any political subdivision thereof and with the express purpose indicated in the State legislation of converting the project to a project with Federal assistance (if and when such Federal assistance becomes available), or otherwise authorized by State law to be so converted, shall be approved as a low-rent housing project under the terms of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, if (a) the project is or can become eligible for assistance by the Public Housing Administration in the form of loans and annual contributions under the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, and (b) the State or the public housing agency operating the project in the State makes application to the Public Housing Administration for Federal assistance for the project under the terms of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended: *Provided*, That loans made by the Public Housing Administration for the purpose of so converting the project to a project with Federal assistance shall be deemed, for the purposes of the provisions of section 9 and other sections of the United States Housing Act of 1937, to be loans to assist the development of the project: *Provided further*, That any State which is administering a low-rent or veterans' housing program with annual contributions may, through its administrative agency or department and, with the approval of the Governor, determine to administer the low-rent housing program authorized in the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, under the legislation of that State and receive annual contributions from the Public Housing Administration out of the amounts provided in the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended. In that event, the Public Housing Administration shall deal only with the State administrative agency in that State and (1) shall approve low-rent housing projects for which annual payments on the principal amount of obligations sold to construct those projects do not exceed 3 percent per year and which meet the requirements of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, as to (a) cost limitations for construction, (b) occupancy by low-income families, (c) elimination of unsafe and insanitary dwellings, and (d) local contributions by the State or any of its political subdivisions, and (2) shall make payments of annual contributions to any such State as needed for such approved low-rent housing projects up to the maximum amounts provided in the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I hope this amendment may be accepted by the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Vermont. This year the Legislature of Massachusetts passed a bill which would permit the State, on its credit, to lend $200,000,000 for low-cost housing. As I understand, the bill was drafted in such a way that when, as, and if the Federal Government passed a law, the State law would fit in with the Federal law.

This amendment was submitted to the junior Senator from Massachusetts and myself just this morning by our State government officials. The amendment in its present form has been drafted by the Legislative Counsel of the Senate. It provides, in substance, that where the State has loaned its credit on any housing project, the Federal Government may assist, under the terms of the bill, with that project; and if the Federal Government does come forward and help, then it must be on the basis of the Federal law, and the Federal Government must deal with the State Administrator in cases where the State government has authorized and has started a housing project.

I hope the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Ohio will agree to accept the amendment. If it is found faulty in language in any way, I trust it may be cleared up in conference.

Mr. FLANDERS obtained the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like first to say something about the proposed amendment. Of course, it is a fairly long and far-reaching amendment. A rapid examination of it, I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts, suggests to me that it is all right in principle, except for one thing. It seems unfortunate to introduce the provision for connection and negotiation with the State when the Federal Housing authorities have been so long dealing at the local level. I wonder if it could not be redrafted so that the connections might be at the local levels,

retaining the other elements of the amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It would seem to me that so long as the State had money in the project and was trying to work in cooperation with the Federal Government, it would be proper to have the State Administrator the connecting link between the Federal Government and the project. Naturally, when the State government has recouped all its money from the project, if the Federal Government takes it over, then the Federal Government could deal directly with the local government, but so long as the State government is in it, it seems to me its administrator should have some tie-up and some connection with the administration of the project in dealings with the Federal Government.

I shall be very happy to accept any amendment which may be suggested by the Senator from Vermont so long as the State administrator may keep his position and look after the interests of the State government, as well as of the local government and the Federal Government, in the project.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say, first, that I heartily approve the amendment; but let me ask a question. Does the Senator understand that under the Taft amendment there would be frozen in public housing all the high-income groups which are now in public housing, that the Public Housing Authority would have no right whatsoever to evict a single tenant because of his high income, and that in that way the Taft amendment differs radically from my amendment in dealing with public housing?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. How can the Senator from Wisconsin make any such claim? The amendment contains express provision that the incomes shall be constantly resurveyed, that the people shall be put out the moment their incomes reach a certain point.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is why I think this matter should be put over until Monday.

The House, when it passed the rent-control extension bill, provided that none of the present tenants in public housing could be evicted until the end of the Rent Control Act on the ground of their high incomes. Unless in the Senator's amendment he undoes that, then for the next year all the high-income groups will be frozen in public housing. In my amendment we provide that the Public Housing Administrator may proceed to evict such tenants.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I shall return to the statement of the Senator from Wisconsin, but referring to the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts, the difficulty I find with the Senator's amendment is in this provision:

Provided further, That any State which is administering a low-rent veterans' housing program may * * * determine to administer the low-rent housing program authorized in the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, under the legislation of that State * * *. In that event the Public Housing Administration shall deal only with the State administrative agency in that State—

I misread that at first. I thought the State was undertaking to determine the different factors.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand it, I may say to the Senator from Ohio, the amendment is an effort to tie the State law in with the Federal law and have the State law comply with the Federal provision.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana when the Senator from Ohio has answered my question.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, with some further study I think it might be possible to accept the amendment. I see no particular objection to such a provision. In fact, I think it highly desirable, if the State wishes to enter the picture, that it should have the same privilege as the local administration itself.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is the purpose of the amendment, as I understand it.

Mr. TAFT. But I should like to be certain that the State would have to comply with all the requirements of the act.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. For myself—and I am confident I can speak also for my colleague—I may say that any language the conference committee may frame to cover this point will be acceptable. The amendment was written very hastily, because the suggestion was received only this morning, and the Senate Legislative Counsel has since drafted the amendment. We hope the amendment is in form to comply with the Federal law and permit the States to secure advantage of the Federal law in cases where the State itself is interested financially in a housing project.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would it not be possible to have what the Senator desires accomplished through the State Legislature of Massachusetts? As I understand the Senator's amendment he wants an administrator from the State government to act as go-between between the authority in his State and the Federal Government. That is the principal point of the amendment, as I understand.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The State has passed its law already. It is on its statute books. The administration in the State government already has handed out some of these loans. The purpose of the amendment is to allow a State administrator to have contact with the Federal Government only in cases where the State itself has some money in the project.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think that could be accomplished under State laws without the necessity of having an amendment of this nature in the bill. Under the public housing program of 1937 an authority is created under State law. It strikes me that the State law could provide that the go-between for all State authorities shall be an administrator who administers all public housing projects within the State. Such an administrator could certainly be the go-between for as many authorities as are created within the State.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am confident, I will say to the Senator from Louisiana, that we in Massachusetts would be glad to work that out. What I want to do today is to get the principle involved in the amendment placed in the bill. The amendment was, as I said, drawn rather hastily, because the suggestion for the amendment was received only today. If then there is improvement which should be made to the amendment, that can be readily made in conference, but if the principle is not included in the bill, then the State loses the opportunity to secure its connections with the Federal Government.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wonder if the Senator would object to letting the amendment lie over so as to enable us to look into it further. I do not claim to know what this plan envisions. I doubt if the Senate will vote on the measure this afternoon.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say to the Senator that I offered the amendment at this time because it is my understanding that unless it is offered at this time and the Taft substitute is adopted, then the amendment will no longer be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts that whatever change is to be made in the so-called Taft amendment to the committee amendment, which is now pending, should be made now before the amendment is adopted.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is the understanding of the Senator from Massachusetts also.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to address a question to the Senator from Ohio, in order to determine what we will have to do, so we can know whether we should act on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts. I ask the Senator from Ohio if, upon checking with the legal staff of the Committee on Banking and Currency or in any other way he cares to, he becomes convinced that my version should be adopted, which will allow the Public Housing Administrator to remove the over-income group, would he have any objection to offering such an amendment himself?

Mr. TAFT. No. The situation is perfectly clear. I mean there is no use arguing about it. The amendment which I have offered provides expressly that there shall be——

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not speaking of the new units. I am speaking of the units presently in existence.

Mr. TAFT. We do not change the law respecting the units presently in existence.

Mr. McCARTHY. Am I correct in understanding then that the law in that respect will not be changed? If it will not be changed, the overincome groups are presently frozen in the present units by the rent-control bills to which the Senate agreed—incidentally, when I was not present or I would have raised the point. In other words, if the bill does not change the law in that respect, then the Public Housing Administrator cannot remove the overincome group.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Wisconsin is trying to repeal an act which the House and Senate have just passed. The group referred to cannot be put out unless a place is found in which to put them. The Senate just passed that act. It may have been right or it may have been wrong in doing so, but there is no particular reason why we should in this measure try to deal with the subject over again, so far as I can see.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me call the Senator's attention to this point: I was not at the joint conference which was held, but I understand some of the Senators present were at the joint conference. I understand that at the joint conference Representative WOLCOTT, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, suggested that the units be continued as they now are, but that when the housing legislation was brought up we could deal with the problem. I do not believe the joint conference had any intention of doing what we will do if we accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, in other words, continue the freeze for a full year.

Mr. TAFT. My amendment does not deal with that subject at all. The Senator is arguing that it does not deal with the subject. But there is nothing wrong with the amendment. It does not attempt to deal with the subject. It is true that it does not go back and make a change in the law just passed by Congress.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is dealing with the subject in that it strikes out my amendment, which would allow the Public Housing Administrator to remove this overincome group.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator may offer that amendment if he wishes. The pending amendment is open to such amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Ohio is moving to strike it out. I had previously offered it and it had been accepted.

Mr. TAFT. I am only moving to substitute the committee bill for the Senator's series of individual amendments, which have not been approved by any committee of the Senate, even by the joint committee of which he is a member and of which he was in some respects acting chairman.

Mr. McCARTHY. A minute ago when I brought up the question the Senator from Ohio said his proposal would not freeze the overincome group in the housing units; that in view of the language in his bill the amendment was unnecessary. Do we both agree that unless we adopt the amendment the Senator will have frozen within public housing units for another year the overincome group?

Mr. TAFT. No, we do not agree, because that was covered by a bill passed by the House and Senate a while ago. It does not freeze anybody.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would suggest that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has the floor. The question before the Senate is the amendment which he has offered to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, while I still have the floor I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio a question on the amendment which I understood he had agreed to accept earlier today concerning commercial banks. I understand that that amendment has already been offered by him and been accepted. Am I correct?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is correct. The Senate has approved it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then do I correctly understand that the amendment I am now offering is the pending question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is correct. The perfecting amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio is the question before the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me now?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin whether he wishes to take time to prepare amendments to the amendment which I have offered. I shall not press my amendment for action today. I thought that if the only question was between my amendment and his amendment that that question could be just as well settled today as any other time. If the Senator desires to offer amendments to my amendment which is, in effect, the committee substitute, I certainly am not trying to press for action upon it today. I wonder if that is the Senator's desire.

Mr. McCARTHY. I want to thank the Senator from Ohio, and I will answer that it is my desire. I think the matter should be delayed for an additional reason, Mr. President. I know when I call it to the Senator's attention he will agree with me. I personally was not present at the meeting of the Committee on Banking and Currency the day the committee voted to report the so-called Flanders amendment.

If I am wrong in my recollection of what happened, I wish the Senator would correct me. I understand that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] submitted an amendment striking out certain portions of the Flanders amendment, and that that was rejected by a vote of 7 to 6. I also understand that thereupon, without any consideration whatsoever of the other amendments, it was moved that all the Flanders amendment be adopted, and the motion was agreed to by the same vote of 7 to 6.

I believe that it is the general feeling that this measure should lie over until Monday. I think it should lie over until Monday so that I may discuss this question with the five other Senators who agreed with me in the Banking and Currency Committee, in order that we may determine what amendment, if any, we desire to offer. I may say that I definitely desire to offer one, and probably more than one.

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator desires to offer amendments to my amendment, then I think I should like to study the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts, and let that also lie over, so that if it is placed in the bill it may be drafted in the best possible form.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I understand that my amendment is the pending question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is perfectly agreeable to me to have the Senator from Ohio study it, so long as the amendment is not sidetracked and lost.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, first I wish to compliment the Committee on Banking and Currency for a fine job well done. I do not believe that Senators ought to find fault with the huge size of the bill which we are now considering, when it has been so well explained in the various documents which are now on the desks of Senators. The bill seeks to amend two Federal laws dealing with housing, as well as providing for some new programs. One is the National Housing Act, and the other the United States Housing Act of 1937.

It will be recalled that until about 6 years ago housing, at the Federal level, was being managed by about 16 or 17 separate agencies scattered all over the lot, as it were. Acting under the First War Powers Act, the President, by Executive Order 9070, created the National Housing Agency, under which all agencies of the Government dealing with housing were consolidated. This new set-up was more or less of a temporary nature since the President's authority expired 6 months after a declaration by him that World War II was at an end. Therefore the President sent Reorganization Plan No. 3 to the Congress which had as its purpose the creation of a permanent housing agency, called the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Under this new agency, headed by an Administrator, the following named constituent agencies were lodged:

First. Home Loan Bank Board;

Second. Federal Housing Administration; and

Third. Public Housing Administration.

The plan was adopted by the Congress. The adoption of the plan, by the way, is one of the main reasons we are now confronted with the amendment by way of a substitute to the original Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, which was reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency.

As Senate bill 866 was first reported by the Banking and Currency Committee, it provided for an agency to administer all housing. A few months after that bill was reported, Reorganization Plan No. 3 came into being. It was there-

fore necessary to strike from Senate bill 866 two of its titles which dealt with the subject of administration of housing. Several other amendments were proposed by the joint committee which made a further study of housing. As a proponent of the original Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, Senate bill 866, I felt that instead of amending the bill on the floor of the Senate it might be best to permit the Committee on Banking and Currency to reconsider the question of housing in the light of the additional hearings on the subject held by the Joint Senate-House Committee on Housing, and bring in a more or less clean substitute bill.

Mr. President, it is not my purpose at this late hour to go into the details of the legislation now before us. Today and yesterday the Senate heard from the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] as well as the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], a discussion of the various amendments to the housing legislation now before us for consideration. I should like to point out briefly some of the main provisions of the bill as amended.

Title I extends for 1 year the mortgage-insurance operations which have been operating under title VI of the FHA Act. In doing this, we have taken cognizance of the continuance of the housing shortage, and the extended provisions place emphasis on rental housing. This title likewise gives aids to manufacturers and builders for the use of modern construction processes.

This title is designed to encourage private enterprise to participate in homes for the lower-income groups—those caught in between public-housing activity and the housing for those in the higher-income brackets. Title I authorizes FHA to insure 90 to 95 percent loans for low-cost homes on a 30-year basis, at 4 percent. In addition, the FHA would have the authority to insure firm mortgage commitments up to as high as 85 percent of the value of the house.

Title II provides secondary market backing for FHA's title II and title VI programs, together with the GI home-loan programs. Our investigations have shown that a source of secondary credit for residential-mortgage financing is highly desirable; accordingly, under this title II a National Home Mortgage Corporation is established, as a part of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The corporation would have a borrowing power of $250,000,000, and could be increased to as much as another quarter of a million dollars more, with the approval of the President. There are certain safeguards made a part of the bill to restrict the operations of this corporation where a Government secondary market is necessary, and where it would not have the tendency of increasing inflationary conditions.

Title III recognizes the long-felt need for an extensive program of housing research, in order to effectuate maximum efficiency in the production of good housing. This title authorizes the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to inaugurate a research program designed to increase the production of better housing at a lower cost. The Administrator would also under this title make available data on housing needs, demand, and supply. Efforts would be made to correlate and coordinate efforts made in various parts of the country by all groups to promote greater efficiency in construction and reduction in costs of good housing.

Title IV, as does title I, places emphasis on rental housing. The main objective of any comprehensive housing program, of course, is home ownership, but it must be recognized that a large segment of our population, for various reasons, prefer to rent rather than to own their homes. Investigation has shown that those people who can least afford to pay high rentals are the ones who have been most ignored in home construction. The inadequacy of building programs for rental housing has partly been a result of the reluctance of institutional investors to take part in such housing. This title provides aids in connection with equity as well as mortgage financing. An effort is also made to encourage cooperative ownership housing, through special aids, and especially veterans' cooperatives.

Emphasis is placed on low interest rates, long-term loans through FHA financing. Provision is made for 90 percent FHA insured loans, with 40-year maturities, and a maximum interest rate of 4 percent. Moreover, it helps low-income families, who could not otherwise own their own homes, by making these mortgage-financing terms available to nonprofit cooperatives undertaking such projects. Recognizing the special needs of veterans, this title makes available to them FHA insurance on 95-percent loans.

This title provides in addition a program of yield insurance to encourage investment in rental housing. Administered through FHA, this program guarantees returns of 2¾ percent upon outstanding investment, and authorizes rentals to be set up on the basis of a 3½ to 5 percent return. For this purpose a billion-dollar insurance program is authorized.

Title V provides for Federal aid in the clearance of slums and blighted areas for possible redevelopment. Again emphasis is placed on cooperation with private enterprise in redevelopment of such areas. The plan proposed that Federal and local aid will be combined to scale down the cost of acquisition and preparation for redevelopment so that its reuse may be made feasible through private enterprise.

This program is to be accomplished through a combination of Federal and local grants-in-aid and it is specifically provided that such Federal aid will be extended only to provide for acquisition of the land and preparation for redevelopment, and not for whatever construction may be undertaken afterwards. The grants-in-aid are not to be extended unless local participation equals at least one-third of the net project cost.

To implement this plan, a 5-year program in permanent loans is inaugurated, at the rate of $200,000,000 a year, repayable in full with interest. The bill authorizes, for the Federal subsidy to be extended, capital grants up to $500,000,000 to be contracted for at the rate of $100,000,000 annually.

I should like to insert in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a speech delivered by me in St. Louis, Mo., under date of March 15, 1944, on the subject Common Sense in Postwar Housing. I believe it will be noted that the measure which is now before us follows the outline of my speech very closely.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMON SENSE IN POSTWAR HOUSING

(Address delivered by Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER, United States Senator from Louisiana, on March 25, 1944, in St. Louis, Mo., before the National Public Housing Conference)

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I have been asked to speak on the subject Homes or the Dole. In view of my long interest in public housing, I desire also to discuss with you some of the broader problems and more important considerations than this limited topic ordinarily encompasses. I think that before I conclude my remarks it will be clear to you why I am adopting this course. And I hope that you will agree with what I have to say.

My activities in behalf of public housing go back to its inception. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will indicate that I was in the midst of the battle on the Senate floor for the passage of the United States Housing Act in 1937. I have been in the fight ever since, and you may count upon me to continue to remain in the struggle, so long as I retain my membership in the United States Senate.

As some of you may be aware, I am chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, which has handled slum clearance and low-rent housing legislation, as well as the publicly financed portion of the war-housing program. This subcommittee, as well as the full committee is heartily sympathetic with the aims and objectives of slum clearance and low-rent housing.

I am proud of the record of the low-rent public-housing program, although it has been the subject of harsh, unjust, and uncalled-for criticism. It has performed most satisfactorily in my State. It has done likewise, I am sure, throughout the country, in small places, in medium-sized cities, and in our largest centers of population. The main trouble with the program is that it has been inadequate. After the war we must continue and expand the program. To do this we must begin to get ready now, and it is imperative that the people be told the truth about the program of the past and what is in prospect for the future.

There is no need to tell this group that most of the attacks upon public housing have been unfair, unjustified, selfish, and based upon gross ignorance.

The most common attack has been that the program did not rehouse families of sufficiently low income. The facts refute this charge completely. Before the war the program as a whole achieved an average shelter rent throughout the country of $12.79 per family unit per month. It housed families with average yearly incomes, on a Nationwide basis of $832.

You may be certain that, if the program had housed families of still lower average yearly incomes—that is, if it had housed only the worst relief cases—the opposition would have criticized it as a program solely for people who were indolent or shiftless or undeserving. Of course, I do not believe that families on relief should be so characterized. But I do say, that this is what the enemies of the USHA program would have said about the housing program if it had housed only relief families. In fact, the foes of the program are saying this anyway. They are

consistently moving in two directions at once, half the time arguing that the projects should house lower income families, and the other half of the time arguing that it should house higher income families. They are seesawing between the two groups in the hope of creating confusion and dissatisfaction.

My own belief is that the program has struck a wise and happy medium in this matter. It has not been administered as an emergency poor-relief job. It has been conducted in a manner to provide decent and dignified aid to families of low income—families who are industrious and deserving and a part of the working population, but whom our economic system has not provided with sufficient income in peacetimes to live in decent housing without public aid. Until our economic system can lift the incomes of these families to the point where they can afford to obtain decent housing entirely on their own, we must continue this public assistance. And we must continue it in the self-respecting and desirable form which it has already taken.

For these reasons, I am opposed to any proposal to abolish the present slum clearance and low-rent housing program, or to substitute any method of rent certificates or rent relief which would handle each family on a case-work basis, veiled in an atmosphere of charity. These suggestions should be placed in the same category as the proposals, made a few years ago, to junk the social security system and to substitute therefor the dole.

Furthermore, I am opposed to these rent certificates or rent-relief plans, because they would tend to perpetuate and subsidize the slums. They would provide no method for large-scale, well planned developments to remove the slums, and to rebuild the blighted areas of our American communities.

On the other hand, none of the attacks made upon the financing plan under the United States Housing Act has impressed me in the slightest. I have spent many hours analyzing in detail the method of financial operations used by local housing authorities, in clearing slums and rehousing slum dwellers.

The essence of this plan is that the development cost of projects is put upon a loan basis, with the Federal Government receiving repayment in full for all loans made, at the long-term Federal rate of interest plus one-half of 1 percent. Since the Government has thus far been borrowing money at a substantially lower rate of interest than the prevailing long-term rate, there has been a profit to the Government on the loan transaction. This profit, I am informed, has been about sufficient to cover the administrative expenses of the United States Housing Authority—now the Federal Public Housing Authority—for the slum-clearance and low-rent housing program.

This being the case, the only cost of the program to the Federal Government has been in the annual contributions to help achieve low rents. This annual contributory system, which some of the critics of the program have distorted and even called misleading, is one of the most honest and simple methods of grants-in-aid that has been devised. Anyone who takes the trouble to study the plan, instead of attacking it blindly, can find out exactly what the program costs each year. He will discover also that the amount of aid is measured exactly against the need, and can be decreased in any year when better economic conditions are made available to the beneficiaries of the program and when economies in operation reduce the amount of aid required.

Let me give a factual illustration of this point. The maximum annual contribution to achieve low rents permitted under the law is about 3½ percent. This would result in an annual contribution of about $25,000,000, during normal peacetime, on the 154,189 completed local authority family units under the United States Housing Act. But even before the war, by various economies, the annual contribution rate had been reduced to about 2.8 percent, which would involve annual contributions of about $20,000,000 for a program of the same size. When the war came along, the 154,189 family units under local authorities were divided into 100,355 continued as low-rent projects and 53,834 units converted to war use. For the 100,355 low-rent units, due to higher incomes during the war, the annual contribution rate has been reduced to about 2.2 percent, involving annual contributions of $10,339,356. For the 53,834 units converted to war use, the annual contribution rate has been reduced to twenty-three one-hundredths of 1 percent, involving annual contributions of $607,935. Therefore, at the present time the total annual contributions on the whole 154,189 units is only $10,947,291, contrasted with the maximum of about $25,000,000 which would be available under the law.

To state this another way: The people who are occupying these projects are paying about $14,000,000 more in annual rents than they would be paying if the Government extended as much aid as the law permits. They are paying about $9,000,000 more in rents than the normal prewar rate. To state this in still another way, the occupants of the project are paying almost $45,000,000 in annual rents, as against an anual contribution of less than $11,000,000 by the Government.

Let these figures be the answer to those who talk about the occupants of these projects as if they were irresponsible people, unwilling to pay their own way to the last dollar of their capacity. Let this be the answer to those who claim that the plan now in use is uneconomical or unsound.

Of course, we know that after the war the incomes of the occupants of these housing projects will not be as high as now. Somewhat larger amounts of Government assistance will be necessary. But I think that the country will be more prosperous after the war than it was before the war, that we shall gradually raise our standards of living, and that the program will continue to advance in the economical direction that it was moving before the war began.

It has been particularly shocking to me, that the patriotic service which local housing authorities have rendered in turning 53,834 units in their projects over to war use, has been made the occasion for attack upon the program. When Congress passed the United States Housing Act, it contemplated slum clearance and low-rent housing. Later Congress authorized, but did not compel, the conversion of this housing to war purposes. The local housing authorities have voluntarily made this conversion, with regard to the 53,834 units that I have mentioned. Naturally, the war workers have fairly good incomes in these times, and, as I have indicated, the subsidies on these converted projects have been reduced to a nominal figure. And yet, we hear radio commentators and others berating and vilifying the local housing authorities and the public-housing program—because they have joined in winning the war instead of remaining on a peacetime basis—and because this war work has made the projects temporarily available to families with higher incomes.

A few days ago, I examined another one of the so-called plans which has been trotted out as a substitute for the low-rent housing and the slum-clearance program. This is the so-called tax-abatement plan. It rests upon the proposition that the Federal Government should enable wealthy individuals to avoid Federal income taxes entirely as to that part of their income which they invest in land bonds and housing construction, and also exempt from taxation the income on these bonds and this housing. It is claimed that this would result in better housing at lower cost to slum dwellers—through a system which is attractively called public housing privately owned.

Let us look at just a few figures as to how public housing privately owned would work, in comparison with the United States Housing Act plan. I have before me a table of figures which contrasts the two methods, but I will refer here only to the high lights. Under the United States Housing Act, a housing unit built on expensive central slum land, with the land costing $2,000 and the building costing $4,000, coming to a total of $6,000, might receive, for example, an annual contribution from the Federal Government of about $131 a year. This would achieve a shelter rent of about $16 a month, and would serve a family with an income of about $960 a year. Under the so-called tax-abatement plan, in contrast, for the same unit there would be involved a capital grant of $4,800 in the form of tax abatement (assuming that the taxpayer would receive income placing him in the 80-percent bracket), plus an additional contribution of $110 in the form of additional tax abatement. In addition to the tax abatement of $110, the Government would pay interest on the capital grant abated, which, if paid, could be used to reduce the public debt. And these subsidies, so much larger than the subsidies under the United States Housing Act, would produce a monthly rent for the unit of $45, serving a family-income group of about $2,700. In short, despite much higher cost to the Government, this plan for public housing privately owned would serve the upper income half of the population, rather than the lower income third.

(See following table marked "Exhibit A.")

So much for the opponents of public housing. I have come to talk to you, not as an opponent, but as a friend. But I would be less than a friend if I did not tell you about your errors as well as your achievements—if I did not warn you of the difficulties which public housing faces—if I did not indicate what steps you should take to better your position and strengthen your cause.

We must frankly face the fact that public housing before the war did not receive as much popular support as its merits entitled it to. In fact, 1938 was the last year in which the Congress approved the public housing program. This was only 1 year after the enactment of the original law and before any projects were completed. In the 3 years between 1938 and the outbreak of the war public housing gradually lost ground in the Congress. You know this to be true.

It is foolish to blame this trend on a few individuals. It is short-sighted to think that the situation can be changed after the war just by wishful thinking. There is only one sensible way by which this situation can be changed in a democracy—and that is by making public housing understood and popular in the communities throughout the country. When public housing is really popular and really wanted at home, Washington will respond.

If public housing is not sufficiently popular at home to gain congressional approval, that is not the fault of the people working in Washington for the Federal Government. There is very little that they can do about it. It is up to the local people, interested in public housing throughout the country, to create the urge. If the situation is remedied, these local people will deserve most of the credit. But if the situation remains as it has been in the past, they will deserve most of the blame.

For this reason I am particularly pleased with the reorganization that has recently taken place in the National Public Housing Conference. My understanding is that the conference is going to be a militant, aggressive organization. I hope that it does not confine its fighting to Washington or make the mistake of criticizing its friends. The housing advocates have already spent too

much time criticizing each other. If the conference can work to stimulate the kind of local support and local action which I have mentioned, public housing will have a better chance to move forward. It is up to people like you who are here today to do this job.

A successful campaign for public housing involves something more than loud shouting, or agitation. The way to win this cause is to fight with the head as well as the heart. You must profit by your mistakes. You must conduct your fight in accord with the spirit of the times, and in the light of your past experience.

I should like to summarize some of this experience, and the conclusion to which it seems to lead:

The greatest handicap to housing, until 2 years ago, was the number of housing agencies in the Federal Government. Congress was first bewildered, and then antagonized—and may I add "agonized"—by 16 or more bureaus and agencies, each trying to aggrandize itself instead of making every effort to help housing. Even assuming the noblest motives on the part of all these agencies and bureaus, it was utterly impossible to work out an intelligent housing policy or program under such divided leadership.

The housing reorganization of February 1942, which put all of these 16 or more bureaus and agencies under the National Housing Agency, was long overdue. This reorganization has resulted in economy. It has led to increased efficiency. It has removed squabbling, wrangling, and much scuffling from the Washington housing scene. It has raised housing in the esteem of the Congress. My prediction is that, when Congress considers post-war housing legislation, it will confirm and carry even further this consolidation of the housing activities of the Federal Government. Common sense makes this much certain.

It is my firm conviction that both public and private housing can go ahead most effectively after the war only as a part of this consolidated program, and under the roof of the National Housing Agency, or one similar thereto. The Administrator of the National Housing Agency, Mr. John Blandford, is a warm friend of public housing. He has utilized and helped to keep alive the local authorities during the war. He has used public financing for about half of the recent war-housing construction. When he says that we cannot expect anywhere near so large a proportion of publicly financed housing after the war, he is merely stating a fact. From my discussions with Mr. Blandford, and from some of his recent talks which I have read, I believe that he is following a wise and balanced course, for now and for postwar housing, in terms of the over-all situation.

The Congress is tired of the fighting among bureaucrats. Mr. Blandford has about stopped the bickering and has achieved a more unified housing front. In his congressional relationships he has accurately sized up the situation and has won the confidence of the Congress. The National Housing Agency and the comprehensive approach which it represents is essential to a future in which the whole housing need can be met, private and public, each operating within its proper field.

Another reason why public-housing progress has been slow has been because the program has been too limited in its objectives. We can all agree that slum dwellers need help first, and need help most. But at the same time we must realize that no community can solve its housing problems by public housing alone. Public housing should do only the part of the job that private enterprise cannot accomplish. Private enterprise should be encouraged and facilitated to do as much of the job as possible—in fact, to the limit of its capacity. Only in this way can we really rebuild our communities. Only in this way can we really succeed in obtaining decent housing for all groups of Americans. Only in this way can we raise the postwar housing program to a magnitude through which housing can make its full contribution to postwar employment, prosperity, and high national income.

This means that in the communities private enterprise and public housing should work hand in hand. Local housing authorities, if they are to survive and prosper, must expand their activities and raise their sight. They must take the broad comprehensive view, at the local level, which the National Housing Agency is taking at the Federal level. They must concern themselves with helping to serve the whole housing needs of the community, through good land planning, through stimulation of private enterprise, and through public housing whenever necessary. They should not limit themselves to one narrow job, because the country wants to see the whole job done. In short, each local authority should view the housing needs under its jurisdiction through the small end of the telescope.

I have said that the National Public Housing Conference and the local housing authorities should work for public housing. But they must also work for something bigger than that. The National Public Housing Conference should not get into the role of a pressure group, fighting only to protect one particular housing formula, or one particular housing method, or housing only for one particular group, or one particular kind of local housing agency. If the conference gets into that kind of role, it will not command any more respect or support than any other purely selfish pressure group. The real job of people who call themselves public housers is to express the whole public interest in housing, and not just in public housing, and to work for all the kinds of housing which the people need. I say this to you as a friend of public housing. I know the congressional attitudes, and I think I know the temper of the country. Public housing should not try to go ahead on the old, narrow, limited basis. But if the local authorities, at the community level, adopt the broad and comprehensive approach to the whole job that the National Housing Agency has taken,, under the leadership of the National Housing Agency, they will be very likely to succeed, and I know that the Congress will cheerfuly respond.

I am extremely hopeful that before long there will be an opportunity to propose and enact comprehensive legislation dealing with postwar housing. This legislation should follow these broad lines:

1. The National Housing Agency, and the consolidation which it represents, should be improved and made permanent.

2. The National Housing Agency should be furnished with all the tools which may help and stimulate private enterprise to do as large a part of the postwar housing job as it possibly can do.

3. The National Housing Agency should also have tools to assist communities to provide publicly aided housing for those whom private enterprise—with all the help we can give it—cannot serve.

4. The postwar housing program should operate on an entirely decentralized basis, with the communities determining their own housing needs and requesting such financial assistance as they may require from the Federal Government. The Federal Government should not build houses or conduct direct housing programs.

I know that the National Housing Agency is also moving along this direction. If all those interested in housing will help the agency to continue to follow that course, the prospects for housing will be brighter than ever before.

In addition, I believe that the State enabling legislation, under which local housing authorities were established, should be broadened, to the end that there may be local agencies of Government to perform the role of the National Housing Agency at the local level.

I have tried to be very realistic with you, telling you exactly what the situation is as I see it. Public housing can be stronger if it does not try to move solely on its own steam. It can gather greater strength and go further if it joins hands with private enterprise in a comprehensive approach. Both groups must accommodate their views, avoid any appearance of being ideologist, and move toward housing unity. That is what the National Housing Agency symbolizes. That is what the Congress and the country want.

Permit me to thank you for this opportunity to address you. It is a great pleasure to be here with you and, may I repeat, you may count upon me to continue to help you in every capacity within my power.

EXHIBIT A

Assumption: A unit involving expensive central slum clearance, $2,000 for land, $4,000 for building; total, $6,000.

I. Under United States Housing Act plan

Annual charges to be met:	
Interest and amortization (58 years, 2½ percent)	$197
Operating costs	110
Payments in lieu of taxes (5 percent of shelter rent)	10
Vacancy and collection loss (3 percent)	6
	323
Less Federal annual contribution	131
Annual rent charged occupant	192
Monthly rent charged occupant	16
Family income group served	960
Total annual subsidy cost:	
Federal annual contribution (total subsidy cost to Federal Government)	131
Value of local tax exemption	19
Total	150

II. Under tax-abatement plan

Annual charges:	
Interest and amortization on $2,000 land (100 years, 1¾ percent)	$35
Amortization on $4,000 building (33 years, 3 percent)	120
Operating costs	110
Taxes	100
Vacancy, collection, and contingency loss (10 percent)	54
Profit (3 percent on $4,000)	120
Total annual charges to be met	539
Monthly rental charged tenant	45
Family income group served	2,700
Total subsidy cost to Federal Government:	
(1) Capital grant:	
By tax abatement to purchaser of land bond (80 percent of $2,000)	1,600
By tax abatement to developer of house (80 percent of $4,000)	3,200
Total capital grant	4,800
(2) Annual contribution:	
By tax abatement on profit (80 percent of $120)	96
By tax abatement on yield on land bonds (80 percent of seven-eighths percent of $2,000)	14
Total annual contribution	110

1. Total local projects under U. S. Housing Act

	Number of units	Total development cost
In use as low-rent	100,355	$465,010,000
Converted to war use	53,834	259,322,000
Total	154,189	724,332,000
Suspended	24,940	98,918,000
Total	179,129	823,250,000

2. Annual contributions on 154,189 units

	Percent of development cost	Total amount	Amount per family
Normal prewar	2.8	$20,281,296	$131.54
Wartime:			
On 100,355 low-rent	2.2	10,339,356	103.03
On 53,834 converted	.23	607,935	11.29
Total		10,947,291	

3. Rental paid by occupants of 154,189 units

Prewar	$33,267,818
Wartime:	
On 100,355 low-rent	
On 53,834 converted	
Total	

4. Average shelter rent per unit and incomes before war

	Shelter rent	Family income
North	$14.73	$936
South	10.48	710
National	12.79	832

Mr. ELLENDER. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement showing the cost of housing under the original Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, Senate bill 866, in contrast to the amendment by way of a substitute which came from the Committee on Banking and Currency. I shall not go into details. I am sure that the statement will be of interest to Senators.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT AS TO COSTS OF HOUSING PROGRAM

Under existing law, the Public Housing Administration has been authorized to enter into contracts for annual contributions aggregating not more than $28,000,000 a year. Annual contribution payments under any contracts are limited to periods not exceeding 60 years.

The following two tables, respectively, indicate the maximum cost of the housing program as provided under S. 866, as reported last year, and the maximum cost under the committee amendments to S. 866 reported last week. (Based on past experience, the actual costs may be substantially less.)

Financing under S. 866 (as originally reported)

[In millions of dollars]

[The maximum cost to the Federal Government of programs provided for by the bill is shown in the columns which are headed "Annual contributions"]

Purpose	Insurance authorizations	Repayable loans	Annual contributions: For first year	For second year	For third year	For fourth year	For fifth to thirteenth year	For each succeeding year
Title VII—FHA "Yield insurance" program for direct private investment in housing for families of moderate income	[1] 1,000	[2] 10						
Title VIII—Aid to localities for land assembly, clearance, and preparation for redevelopment		[3] 500	4	8	12	16	20	[4] 20
Title IX—Low-rent housing in urban areas			26.4	52.8	79.2	105.6	105.6	[4] 105.6
Title X—Farm housing aids by Department of Agriculture		[5] 250	2.5	5	7.5	10	[6] 10	
Title XI—Low-rent nonfarm housing in rural areas			5	10	15	20	25	[4] 25
Total	1,000	760	37.9	75.8	113.7	151.6	160.6	150.6

[1] In outstanding insurance and commitments to insure.
[2] To establish insurance fund; funds to be supplied through Reconstruction Finance Corporation.
[3] Loan funds to be obtained through issuance of obligations by National Housing Administrator. Loans must be repaid within 5 years except that $250,000,000 may be used for definitive loans repayable within 45 years. The $250,000,000 definitive loans authorization consists of an initial authorization of $50,000,000, increasing by a like amount at the beginning of the second, third, fourth, and fifth years after enactment, respectively.
[4] Annual contributions under any contract limited to periods not exceeding 45 years.
[5] Loan funds to be supplied by Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Authorization consists of $25,000,000 initial authorization, with additional authorizations of $50,000,000 $75,000,000, and $100,000,000, for second, third, and fourth years, respectively.
[6] Maximum total amount payable annually during each of the 10 years next succeeding third year after enactment.

Financing under committee amendments to S. 866

[In millions of dollars]

Purpose	Capital subscriptions, repayable loans, and FHA insurance authorizations: Capital subscriptions	Repayable loans	FHA insurance authorizations	Subsidy commitments [1]: Fiscal 1949	Fiscal 1950	Fiscal 1951	Fiscal 1952	Fiscal 1953	Each succeeding year
FHA title VI extension			[2] 600–1,600						
FHA title I program			[3] 10						
FHA new "Yield insurance" program	10		[3] 1,000						
RFC loan aids for manufacture and modernized site construction of housing		[3] 50							
Secondary market program (National Home Mortgage Corporation)	5	[4] 250–500							
Slum clearance and urban redevelopment		[5] 1,010		[6] 100	[6] 100	[6] 100	[6] 100	[6] 100	
Low-rent housing				32	64	96	128	160	[7] 160
Total	15	1,310–1,560	1,610–2,610	132	164	196	228	260	160

[1] The columns under this heading indicate year in which contract to make subsidy may be made; payment of subsidy may actually not be made until later fiscal year.
[2] The additional $1,000,000,000 to be available only with approval of the President.
[3] Authorization is with respect to amount of insurance or loans that may be outstanding.
[4] The second $250,000,000 to be available only with approval of the President.
[5] The authorization is with respect to outstanding amount and consists of an initial authorization of $10,000,000 in fiscal 1949, increasing by $200,000,000 in fiscal 1950, and by a like amount in fiscal 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954, respectively. Funds not to be disbursable, however, for use in purchase of land before fiscal 1950.
[6] This subsidy is in form of nonrecurring capital grant. Funds under fiscal 1949 commitment not to be disbursable, however, for use in purchase of land until fiscal 1950.
[7] In form of annual contributions limited to periods not exceeding 40 years.

As indicated by these two tables, the following are the differences, program by program, between S. 866, as originally reported, and S. 866 under the committee amendments:

1. The Committee amendments provide for an increase in the FHA Title VI mortgage insurance program authorization by $600,000,000 (with an additional $1,000,000,000 to be available with the approval of the President). This provision was not contained in S. 866 as originally reported. It is to be noted that this is an insurance authorization and not a subsidy provision.

2. The committee amendments similarly increase the authorization on the FHA title I home repair and modernization loan insurance program by an additional $10,000,000—likewise a provision not contained in S. 866 as reported last year. This is likewise simply an increase in the insurance authorization and not a subsidy authorization.

3. Both S. 866, as originally reported, and the committee amendments provide for a billion-dollar yield insurance program (including a $10,000,000 capital subscription by the Government to set up the program).

Like FHA's other programs, premium charges will be made.

4. The committee amendments authorize RFC loan aids for the manufacture and modernized site construction of housing in the amount of $50,000,000 in outstanding amount. This program was not contained in S. 866, as originally reported. These loans are fully repayable.

5. The committee amendments provide for a secondary market program by the Federal Government for FHA and GI loans. The size of the program is a $250,000,000 one ($500,000,000 with the approval of the President) and involves a $5,000,000 capital subscription by the Government. This program was not contained in S. 866, as originally reported, and likewise involves loans to be repaid.

6. The committee amendments provide for a program of Federal aid for slum clearance and urban redevelopment involving a maximum of $1,010,000,000 in repayable loans, and $500,000,000 (over a 5-year period) in nonrecurring lump-sum capital grants. This compares with an authorization in S. 866, as originally reported, of $500,000,000 in repayable loans and a maximum of $20,000,000 a year in annual contributions (annual contributions under any contract limited to periods not exceeding 45 years).

7. The committee amendments provide for a maximum of $160,000,000 in annual contributions for an extension of the low-rent housing program (to be contracted for over a 5-year period), with such contributions limited to periods not exceeding 40 years. As originally reported, the amount of contributions authorized for low-rent housing was $130,600,000, but such contributions were payable over a 45-year period instead of the 40-year period provided in the committee amendments.

8. The committee amendments do not contain the program of farm housing aids by the Department of Agriculture contained in S. 866, as originally reported, authorizing $250,000,000 in repayable loans and annual contributions in the maximum amount of $10,000,000 a year payable over a 10-year period.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it will be recalled that when the Congress enacted the Public Housing Act in 1937 a borrowing fund of $800,000,000 was created in order to assist in building public housing in various portions of our country. It also authorized total contributions of $28,000,000 annually. I have before me a statement showing how the contributions provided by the Congress were spent. This report shows that, of the entire amount which was authorized, considerably less was actually used. Mr. President, I ask that the report be printed at this point in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS PAID UNDER USHA ACT

The annual contributions which have been paid in respect to low-rent housing under the United States Housing Act are shown in the attached table.

The total contributions authorized under the act are $28,000,000 per year. Although PHA has entered into commitments covering this whole amount, the contributions actually paid, as shown in the attached table, are only a fraction thereof. The reasons for this are as follows:

1. Low-rent projects under the original act which are eligible for contributions have required an average of only 64 percent of the amount authorized for them, due to the increase in the rent-paying ability of the tenants.

2. A few low-rent projects under the original act (for which annual contributions of $800,000,000 are authorized) have not yet been permanently financed and have not become eligible for contributions.

3. The projects under the defense amendment, PL 671 (for which annual contributions of $7,000,000 are authorized), are still financed by short-term notes at very low interest rates. Due to this fact and the increase in the rent-paying ability of tenants, only a very few of these projects have so far required contributions.

4. Contracts for annual contributions totaling $3,800,000 are outstanding on projects which were deferred during the war and which cannot now proceed under the original cost limitations of the act. No contributions are, of course, paid in respect to these projects.

5. The balance of the annual contribution authorization amounting to $1,900,000 is held in connection with federally owned projects which will ultimately be transferred to local authority ownership, at which time they will become eligible for contributions.

Annual contributions paid under USHA Act

Federal fiscal year	Low-rent projects under original act (Public Law 412)			Projects under defense amendment (Public Law 671) contributions actually paid	Total contributions actually paid
	Contributions actually paid	Maximum contribution authorized	Actual as percent of maximum		
1941	$4,747,176	$4,747,176	100.00	----------	$4,747,176
1942	9,925,891	11,258,951	88.16	----------	9,925,891
1943	9,882,882	13,049,251	75.74	----------	9,882,882
1944	10,129,997	14,436,885	70.17	----------	10,129,997
1945	8,681,922	14,477,969	59.97	$40,378	8,722,300
1946	7,091,344	14,501,979	48.90	45,391	7,136,735
1947	5,612,387	14,509,187	38.68	54,243	5,666,630
Total	56,071,599	86,981,398	64.46	140,012	56,211,611

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of Senators, for quick reference, the supplemental report filed by the Banking and Currency Committee in connection with Senate bill 866. It will be noted that on pages 18 to 20 there is a complete summary of each title of the bill. It is very succinct and to the point, and I believe it can be read with advantage by Senators.

On pages 3 to 6 the Banking and Currency Committee has added a few new provisions. I may say that these new provisions were added to the bill so as to provide additional methods for enabling the builders of our country to provide more housing for our citizens. Under the new set-up an additional sum of $1,600,000,000 will be provided so as further to expand the provisions of title VI of the National Housing Act.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. There is a matter which I think is more important to the Senator's State than it is to my own. I refer to loans for lower-cost homes. In talking to the southern legislators, I find that a great number of them, as well as the legislators from the west coast, are concerned with the lack of outlet for loans on the lower-cost, title I, class 3 housing.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. I wonder whether the Senator from Louisiana agrees with me that we should extend the secondary market so as to include loans on such homes, and that there is no danger in doing so, because in both the Taft amendment and my own amendment it is provided that the FHA may lay down the rules and regulations and may make sure that the construction is sound, before any loans are made.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I doubt the necessity for that. As I understand the amendment which now is pending on the subject the only insured loans that are excluded from the secondary market are the class 3 loans provided for under title I of the National Housing Act. That is the way I understand the situation.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is not correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand those loans are not as safe as those made under title 6, for instance, of the National Housing Act. I believe that if we can establish a secondary market to take care of virtually all loans except the class 3 loans under title I of the act, that will go quite a way toward providing more funds for an expanded building program.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, is the Senator from Louisiana aware of the fact that the principal reason for our asking for this secondary market provision is the conditions we found in the Senator's particular part of the country—in the South—and also on the West Coast? In my section of the country we find it impossible, because of the cold weather, to build adequate housing of the lighty constructed type. It was largely at the instance of the Southern legislators and the West Coast legislators that I began to draft this particular section. We included title 6 loans. Frankly, I considered not including them at all, but merely to have a secondary market for title 1, class 3 loans.

But now I find that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] have stricken from the bill the principal reason for this section.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not care to engage in an extended argument with the Senator from Wisconsin on that subject. I think he did that this afternoon with the distinguished Senator from Ohio. I repeat that as I understand the situation, the only loans ex-

cluded from the secondary mortgage market are the class 3 loans under title I of the NHA. Those are about the only ones I know of that are excluded.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question on a different point. I have often heard the Senator from Louisiana discuss the unfortunate plight of the low-income group of our people, and I have enjoyed hearing him discuss it. I think the Senator from Louisiana has done a splendid job in that connection. I gather that he is very much concerned about the situation of the people at the bottom of the income ladder. Bearing that in mind, would the Senator from Louisiana have any objection to enabling the Housing Administration to start, not at the second or third rung of the ladder, as is done now, but at the very bottom of the ladder?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it would take a considerably larger amount of money to do the job as outlined by the Senator than the amount of money provided in this bill. I am in sympathy with what the Senator from Wisconsin is trying to do; but I believe that if we adopt his version of the bill, we shall make more or less "poor houses" out of the public housing which will be constructed under the bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the Senator from Louisiana agree with me that, as of today, practically all the low-cost housing groups are frozen in the housing they now occupy?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is because of the action taken by the Congress last year in not permitting those able to pay high rentals to be evicted. I sponsored legislation on the subject but the Senate would not listen to my protest.

I should also like to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that 8 years ago, as I recall the time, the Congress passed a law providing that war workers could occupy low-rent housing. Many of the war workers are still living in those housing projects, and it is rather difficult to get them out. That problem is made especially difficult by the actions of the Congress itself. I am hopeful that such a condition as that will not occur any more. I am sure it will not be repeated under the pending measure, because we have attempted to prevent its recurrence.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me ask the Senator another question: Will he agree with me that in this proposed legislation we should make it possible for the Public Housing Administrator to remove from such housing the higher-income groups, so as to make way for the lower-income groups?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, by all means. He should return to the original purpose of the Public Housing Act of 1937.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Louisiana does agree with me as to that; does he?

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, continuing with my remarks, I also invite Senators to read in the supplemental report certain provisions of Senate bill 866 which were eliminated. Among those are the provisions dealing with assistance to farm homes. There were several methods by which farmers were to be assisted. I agree that the methods outlined by us were rather complicated. Rather than have the Senate act adversely upon the subject, we decided, instead, to eliminate those sections, and to have a more detailed survey made of the matter, so that it could be more intelligently presented to the Senate at some future date.

Mr. President, I gave a brief résumé of all titles of the bill with the exception of the one dealing with public housing. That title amends the United States Housing Act of 1937 in a few respects. It authorizes contracts for Federal contributions to be entered into at the rate of $32,000,000 a year over the next 5-year period. That title is the one most objected to by real-estate lobbyists. But for that portion of the pending bill, there would be no opposition from that source.

Mr. President, the most important asset of a nation is not the coal or iron under its land, the electric power from its rivers, the fertility of its soil, or the immensity of its industrial plant. The element of a nation's wealth lies in the strength and health of its people—physical health, mental health, and spiritual health. This is something that many of us have known or felt for a long time. It took a war, however, to bring it before us with dramatic realization.

With unlimited natural resources alone we could not have won the war. It took men of endurance, courage, and determination to fly our planes, to man our ships and our tanks, to fire our heavy guns, and to fight on foot in the jungles, the desert, and in heavy snows. Behind the men of the fighting force stood millions of men and women, who worked in the mines, built the factories, riveted the ships and the bombers, made the guns, tanks, and shells, and ran the trains and drove the trucks and sailed the ships to carry the materials of war to the fighting fronts. Yes, we found out that the men and women of our country are our most important asset.

We found out another thing, too. We discovered that we had been negligent in the conservation of our human resources. Of the nearly 18,000,000 men called up for selective service, almost 6,500,000, or 36 percent, were rejected on medical grounds. This was beyond question the broadest and most intensive inquiry ever made into the health of the young men of this country. The results are shocking.

We have the sordid facts. What we want to know is: first, Why? and secondly, What steps can we as a Nation take to conserve the most precious of our assets?

An article in the Boston Globe for November 16, 1944, throws considerable light on the question—Why? This article begins: "War is a great revealer. The draft examinations turn a microscope upon the hidden weaknesses of the social structure." There follows an account of a comprehensive study which had been made under supervision of the chief of the medical staff of the Boston induction station. This study showed that two-and-a-half times as many of the men rejected for mental illnesses came from Boston slums as from the well-to-do suburban towns.

The doctors, in their report, stated that the stronger elements who can afford it move from the crowded city districts into the suburbs which have the advantages of open spaces and the culture of the city without the depressing effects of overcrowding. The weaker and poorer elements are left to struggle against the least favorable conditions.

Findings of the Boston study were supported by a similar investigation of men from our Nation's Capital passing through the Fort Myer induction station. The rejection rate from slum areas was more than 50 percent greater than from areas with good housing.

Physical illnesses as well as emotional disturbances were found to have a higher incidence among men coming from the slums. At the Boston induction station, the percentage of rejections for active or incipient pulmonary tuberculosis was more than twice as great in the case of men coming from the densely populated slums of the central city.

I would not have you believe, Mr. President, that all we have to do to better the health and welfare of our citizens is to provide decent housing. I do say categorically, however, that we can never expect to bring up our children to their full potentialities as American citizens, so long as millions of them are warped physically and spiritually by the slum environment in which they have been doomed to live.

Do not believe for an instant that 6,500,000 young men, who should have been in their very prime, became ill from conditions entirely beyond the control of society. Of course, many had medical histories derived from pure chance. But the failure of still more can be directly charged to the fact that we as a Nation have been wasteful of human assets.

The poverty and disease of crime-ridden slums have exacted their toll. Can we expect sturdy bodies in the midst of filth and squalor? Can we hope for emotional stability in an environment which invites and encourages antisocial behavior?

Surely, the relationship of bad housing and bad neighborhoods to illness and delinquency cannot be news to any Senator. For years and years it has been pointed out to us by competent investigators. Although it may not be news, it is unquestionably a shock to find that the dire predictions of the past have been proved correct by concrete evidence. At the time of our greatest national emergency, when every ounce of manpower was needed, we found there were millions of young men who did not measure up to the medical requirements.

What can we do? We have the blueprint—a blueprint which is not just a theoretical sketch on a drafting table, but one which has been tried and tested in nearly 300 communities of our country. I refer to the United States Housing Act of 1937. I have seen for myself and been completely convinced of the sound accomplishments under this act; else I would not have joined in the sponsorship of a measure which includes an extension of its basic provisions as an

integral part of a national housing policy designed to provide decent homes for American families at rents or prices they can afford.

When the Congress enacted the United States Housing Act in 1937 it was with the full recognition that private enterprise had the major responsibility for providing housing for the families of America. There was also recognition, however, that private enterprise could not provide minimum standard housing, either new or existing, at rents within the means of slum dwellers.

The United States Housing Act provided a system of Federal loans and annual contributions whereby local communities through their duly constituted housing authorities could, if they were willing to make the local contributions required by the act, make a start toward providing decent housing at low rents for families living in slums. Occupancy in the low-rent projects was restricted to families of low income. Let me cite the definition of families of low income contained in the act:

> The term "families of low income" means families who are in the lowest-income groups and who cannot afford to pay enough to cause private enterprise in their locality or metropolitan area to build an adequate supply of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for their use.

There is no competition between the public housing projects of local housing authorities and standard housing provided by private enterprise. Those who claim that public housing unfairly competes with decent private housing are less than honest. Let me cite figures on the incomes of families admitted to public housing under the terms of the original act.

In 1941 the average income of families admitted was $795 per year. In the same year the average income for all urban families was nearly $2,100 with one-third of the families having incomes below $1,600.

By 1945 average income of urban families in the United States had risen to nearly $3,000, with one-third of the families below $2,360 income. In that same year, 1945, the average income of families admitted to public housing was $1,268.

For 1946 urban family income for the country averaged slightly more than $3,100, with the lowest third having incomes of less than $2,450. Families admitted to public housing in 1946 had an average income of only $1,317.

I ask a very simple question. Can families with incomes such as these afford a minimum standard dwelling being provided by private enterprise?

The United States Bureau of Labor Statistics has recently published a study showing how much it costs a typical family of four persons in each of 34 larger urban centers to maintain itself at a minimum adequate standard of living. This typical family consists of a father, aged 38, who is the breadwinner; a wife, aged 36; a boy, aged 13, in high school; and an 8-year-old girl in grade school.

Washington, D. C., had the highest cost of any of the cities. In June 1947 an income of $3,458 was required for this typical family.

I am proud to say that New Orleans, in my own State of Louisiana, had the most reasonable cost not only of any of the 34 cities but also of the 7 southern cities included in the study. Even in New Orleans it cost an average four-person family approximately $3,000 per year to maintain itself at what the Bureau of Labor Statistics describes as "a modest but adequate American standard of living."

To illustrate the minimum nature of this budget, here are some of the items it would cover. The husband would have a coat every 7 years and the wife could buy one wool dress every 5 years. Clothes for the children would be, in part, "hand-me-downs."

The food budget is modest and comprised of the lowest-cost items. Better cuts of meat and poultry are limited to 33 pounds per year, or just over 8 pounds per person. When waste in cooking is taken into account this means that there would be just about enough turkey or better cuts of meat for Thanksgiving, Christmas, and New Year's Day.

In terms of medical care, the budget provides for a regular visit to the dentist by each member of the family once every 2 years and one home call a year by a doctor to each family member.

And as to housing, even in New Orleans with the lowest cost, the rent of a minimum standard unit, including all necessary utilities, was found to be $37 a month—and that for a family requiring a total income of $3,000. Compare this with the $1,300 average income—an average for the country as a whole—of families admitted to public housing.

It must be abundantly clear that families in the lowest-income group, being served by public housing, cannot afford to pay the price demanded by private owners for decent accommodations.

Some people have claimed that local housing authorities permit families to remain in public-housing projects after their incomes have increased to a point where they can afford private housing. Let us examine the facts.

There are two income limits set in public housing. One, a maximum income limit for admission to projects, and the other, a maximum limit for continued occupancy. The income limit for admission is far below the income at which a family could afford even existing housing of a minimum standard. The limit for continued occupancy is a point at which the local authority believes that families should be able to afford private housing of a minimum standard. When a family's income becomes greater than the limit for continued occupancy, the family is no longer eligible to remain in public housing.

What happened was this: During the war, pursuant to the specific authorization of Congress, essential war workers were admitted without reference to income tests. Moreover, many families admitted because of their low-income status have experienced increased incomes along with the remainder of the population. Thus, the local authorities at the end of the war found themselves with a number of ineligible tenants.

While these tenants were ineligible to remain in public housing, the great majority, because of the acute housing shortage, had no hope of finding other homes if they were required to leave the low-rent projects. Despite this, the Public Housing Administration informed the local housing authorities that in accordance with their contracts with the Federal Government to maintain the low-rent character of the projects, ineligible tenants were to be given notice that beginning in 6 months they were to be evicted, a given number each month, starting with those of highest income.

By act of Congress this was, in effect, prohibited up to March 31 and later to April 30. This date has now been extended 1 year, to April 1, 1949, in connection with the rent-control bill recently passed by the Congress.

Mr. President, that was what I was attempting to point out to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, who is not on the floor at the moment. I tried to explain the principal reason for the fact that today some of the public-housing projects have families living in them who are able to care for themselves and are there because of the laws which the Congress has passed.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, my colleague is making a very able and informative address on the subject of the pending bill. I do not think there is exactly a quorum present at this time, and I wonder if the Senator would yield to me in order to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not wish to yield for that purpose, Mr. President. I have almost completed my remarks. I should like to state to my distinguished colleague that I propose to board a plane within the next few hours for a hurried business trip. I thank my colleague very much.

Mr. President, despite a number of ineligible families, the average family income in the original low-rent housing projects in the year 1946 was but $1,691 a year. Where, except in public housing, can families of this income find suitable homes today?

I have taken some time to go into detail regarding the income of the families who have been accommodated in the housing which was provided out of funds authorized in the United States Housing Act. This I have done for two primary reasons.

First, to show clearly that public housing in no way competes with private enterprise. There is no responsible builder or real estate man who can back up with factual evidence a claim that private enterprise can now, or in the foreseeable future, provide decent housing for families of these incomes.

Secondly, to drive home the point that public housing has taken in families of low income, very low income, who otherwise would be forced to live and raise their children in the slums.

The Congress has up to now granted funds which have provided for approximately 190,000 low-rent dwellings. What has been accomplished for these families?

Listen to what has been accomplished. These are not my words but those of mayors, of teachers, of police, and health officers, and of other responsible local officials.

Newark, N. J.: Children rehoused in public housing showed marked improvement over their previous school records. There was an increase of 7 percent in school attendance, 10 percent in academic grades, 16 percent in personality development grades, and 19 percent in health habit grades.

Savannah, Ga.: The chief of police writes:

Before Yamacraw Village (a public housing project) was built, 19 percent of all crimes originated in that area. Now only 1 percent. I hope we can build more like them for our other slum districts. This department is short of 25 men now and it sure helps to have Yamacraw the way it is.

Pittsburgh, Pa.: A principal in the public schools says of children from the public-housing project in his district:

Increased respect for public property and the care and maintenance of it has been noticed. This is true of the school as well as in the homes I visited. * * * Health and cleanliness has been one of the most important gains. As the teachers have commented, this is very noticeable.

Los Angeles, Calif.: A report of the city planning commission shows that the juvenile delinquency rate is more than seven times as prevalent in areas of bad housing as in areas where children are living under good housing conditions. The incidence of venereal disease is 13 times greater in the slum areas.

Cincinnati, Ohio: Pneumonia deaths in Laurel Homes, a public-housing project, 2 per 1,000 population as against 14 in an adjacent slum district, and 6 per 1,000 in the city as a whole. Infant mortality in the adjacent slum area was five times greater than in Laurel Homes.

The commissioner of health of Cincinnati, just last October at hearings before the Joint Senate-House Committee to Investigate Housing, said:

From the point of view of health, the most vital basic need in housing is to find a way to house low-income families in safe and sanitary homes in good environment.

Birmingham, Ala.: The health officer of Jefferson County testified at hearings of the joint committee held in that city:

Most health officers feel that good housing does perhaps more to promote public health and elevate health standards than any other one thing. Personally I think good housing and a program of good housing is more important than any one, two, or three things any health department can do to promote health in its area. We waste money annually each year trying to combat infant mortality and tuberculosis simply because we cannot overcome the terrible environment that contributes to them.

Detroit, Mich.: Juvenile court workers report that there are no gangs in the public housing projects. Only 1½ percent of the 1,600 children have had any contact with the juvenile court and only 2 children must report to the juvenile officer. This, they report, is in extreme contrast to the slum areas of Detroit.

There is the story—from North, East, South, and West. It proves beyond any doubt that one of the most important ways to conserve the human resources of our country is to provide decent housing. I believe implicitly that the steps we first took in 1937 to provide public housing are now proven from actual experience to have been correct.

I said earlier that we had the blueprint. I have given evidence that in practice it works. Not only I, but no less than six congressional committees have come to the same conclusion since 1945 and have advocated an extension of the public housing program. Let me name them:

House Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning—report on Public Works and Construction, 1945.

Senate Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning—report of the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Redevelopment, 1945.

Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Seventy-ninth Congress—report on Senate bill 1592, 1946.

Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Eightieth Congress, report on Senate bill 866, 1947.

Joint House-Senate Committee on Housing, majority report, 1948.

Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Eightieth Congress, report on Senate bill 866, as amended, 1948.

In the face of overwhelming evidence, of an obvious desire on the part of responsible citizens everywhere, of deliberations and searching investigations of six congressional committees, we cannot delay effective action toward the eradication of our slums and the building of decent homes for low-income families.

Before us now is the General Housing Act, Senate bill S. 866, of which I am one of the sponsors, along with the committee amendments which make in it the changes necessary to carry out the recommendations of the Joint Committee on Housing. This legislation has been favorably reported to us by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. We have the opportunity now of providing America with a national housing policy, the ways and means by which the housing problem can be attacked on a broad front, by which private enterprise may be enabled to serve more of the total need. I call special attention to the fact that, although I have spoken principally about public housing, it will constitute only about one-tenth of the total construction expected under this legislation, yet the major attack is centered on this provision—which deals with perhaps 10 percent of the total construction volume contemplated.

But we cannot, in justice or in good conscience, enact legislation designed to set forth and implement a housing policy which is truly a national housing policy without any effective provision for low-income families now living in slums.

Mr. President, there is much more that could be said on the subject. It would be more or less cumulative. I stand ready and willing to try and answer any question that Senators may desire to ask relating to the pending measure. I have been working on the subject of housing for over 10 years and I am deeply interested in the subject. I hope the Senate will pass this legislation by an overwhelming vote.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4326) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

COMPENSATION TO VETERANS TRAINING ON THE JOB—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to call up again the conference report on the veterans' legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1393) to increase the permitted rate of allowance and compensation for training on the job under Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended.

Mr. TAFT obtained the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as the acting majority leader for the time being, I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Oregon if they believe a quorum should be called before the conference report is discussed.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think it is necessary. So far as I know, those who have an interest in the matter have all agreed. I do not believe a quorum call is necessary.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am very happy to report that the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Oregon have reached a mutual understanding with regard to the disposition of the conference report on Senate bill 1393. The proposal was taken up also with the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and this afternoon with the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I am very pleased to report, Mr. President, that the following disposition of the matter has been agreed upon by all of us who have been involved in this argument, subject, of course, to the approval of the Senate. As the first step in the proposed disposition of the issue, I ask unanimous consent to vacate all the proceedings of the Senate to date on the conference report on Senate bill 1393.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in lieu of the conference report, which is now in disagreement, I move that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the House amendment to the bill, S. 1393, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the House amendment, insert the matter I send to the desk and ask to have stated. I say, by way of explanation, that it consists of the legislative provisions of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the conference report will be

considered as disagreed to; and the clerk will read the matter submitted by the Senator from Oregon.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the matter proposed by the House amendment it is proposed to insert the following:

That paragraph 6 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"6. While enrolled in and pursuing a course under this part (including an institutional on-farm training course) such person, upon application to the Administrator, shall be paid a subsistence allowance of $65 per month, if without a dependent or dependents, or $90 per month, if he has a dependent or dependents, including regular holidays and leave not exceeding 30 days in the calendar year: Except, That (1) while so enrolled and pursuing a course of full-time institutional training, such person shall be paid a subsistence allowance of $75 per month if without a dependent or dependents, or $105 per month if he has one dependent or $120 per month if he has more than one dependent, and (2) while so enrolled and pursuing a course of part-time institutional training, including a course of institutional on-farm training, or other combination course, such person shall be paid, subject to the limitations of this paragraph, additional subsistence allowance in an amount bearing the same relation to the difference between the basic rates and the increased rates provided in (1) hereof as the institutional training part of such course bears to a course of full-time institutional training. Such person attending a course on a part-time basis, and such person receiving compensation for productive labor whether performed as part of his apprentice or other training on the job at institutions, business, or other establishments, or otherwise, shall be entitled to receive such lesser sums, if any, as subsistence or dependency allowances as may be determined by the Administrator: *Provided*, That in no event shall the rate of such allowance plus the compensation received exceed $210 per month for a veteran without a dependent, or $270 per month for a veteran with one dependent, or $290 for a veteran with two or more dependents: *Provided further*, That only so much of the compensation as is derived from productive labor based on the standard workweek for the particular trade or industry, exclusive of overtime, shall be considered in computing the rate of allowances payable under this paragraph."

SEC. 2. So much of paragraph 3 of part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) as amended, as precedes the first proviso, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"3. While pursuing training prescribed herein and for 2 months after his employability is determined, each veteran pursuing a course under this part, shall be paid a subsistence allowance of $65 per month, if without a dependent or dependents, or $90 per month, if he has a dependent or dependents: Except, that (1) each veteran pursuing a course of full-time institutional training under this part shall be paid a subsistence allowance of $75 per month, if without a dependent or dependents, or $105 per month, if he has one dependent, or $120 per month, if he has more than one dependent, and (2) each veteran enrolled in and pursuing a course of institutional on-farm training or other combination course, under this part shall be paid, subject to the limitations of this paragraph, additional subsistence allowance in an amount bearing the same relation to the difference between the basic rates and the increased rates provided in (1) hereof as the institutional training part of such course bears to a course of full-time institutional training."

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect on the first day of April 1948.

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide additional subsistence allowances and to raise the ceilings on wages and allowances pertaining to certain veterans."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, my objection to the conference report arose from the fact that the conferees included an increase in the allowances for part-time educational trainees and on-the-farm trainees, also part time, when the original bill as passed by both Houses dealt with the question of ceilings, and did not deal with the question of allowances. I felt, therefore, that the conferees had exceeded their authority.

I had no particular views on the substantive question as to whether the allowances for part-time educational trainees should be increased proportionately or not. That proposal had been turned down, however, by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and I certainly did not think that the conferees had power to turn around and include it in another measure. The bill dealing with that whole subject had been passed by Congress and had become law.

What the Senator is now proposing is that we agree that the conferees' report should be rejected for that reason, but that the Senate itself accept an amendment increasing the allowances paid to part-time educational trainees. I took up that substantive question with the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and that committee recommends to the Senate that it make that increase for part-time educational trainees and for on-the-farm trainees. Therefore, I would urge that the Senate do now adopt this substantive proposal and adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I only have a brief statement to make. I find myself in agreement with practically everything the Senator from Ohio said in regard to the history of the parliamentary situation in which we find ourselves. However, I do want the RECORD to show very clearly that I disagree that the point of order of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] was well taken, because I am still of the opinion that the conference report was completely in order for reasons which I have already expressed at length in the RECORD, and which I shall not take the time to repeat today.

My major interest has been in securing Senate approval of the substance of the legislation proposed in the conference report. The arrangement which we have made, satisfactory to all concerned, puts the substance of the legislation on the statute books. That was my concern and objective as chairman of the subcommittee. It is my concern now, and I am very happy to enter into this parliamentary arrangement because it means the adoption of the legislation as proposed in fact by the conference committee. Further, the arrangement removes the possibility of the ruling of the Chair from which I appealed establishing any precedent.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, may I make an inquiry of the Senator? Will the bill now go back to the House, or will this action end the legislative procedure?

Mr. MORSE. I understand it will have to go back to the House. However, the House has passed this legislation once, and I am confident it will pass it again very quickly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The House will have to act on the Senate amendments.

Mr. GEORGE. It will go back to the House for action on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendments offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The amendments were agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the policy committee of the Senate has been very strongly urged that early action be taken on Senate bill 2376, to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in agricultural areas and sold, providing $150,000,000 for the purchase of cotton and wool in the United States. I do not think a bill of such importance should be brought up at this time of the evening, but I give notice that consideration of the bill will be sought as soon as the housing bill is completed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to state that the question pending before the Senate is the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] to the amendment which was offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], which in turn is the so-called Flanders committee amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask that the bill to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation be given early preference. That is Senate bill 1322.

Mr. TAFT. I think it should accompany the other bill to which I referred.

Mr. AIKEN. Action upon it will not take very long. The bill was passed over twice at the request of two Senators. Perhaps it should come up at the same time as the bill referred to by the Senator from Ohio just now.

Mr. TAFT. Yes, I think that would be appropriate.

SOCIAL UNREST IN AFRICA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, if there is any excuse for us to be contending with the Russians in the present great world crisis, it lies in the fact that we oppose their system of social tyranny with the traditional American principle of human freedom.

This great Nation in its founding principles was concerned primarily with human liberty and human rights.

God only knows, we have departed far enough from these sacred principles of reasoned and decent human conduct on the domestic scene. This is an understandable, though lamentable, fact. It is a situation which badly needs correction in the interests of our great Nation. For no man among us can be safe and secure so long as the minority groups who live in our midst are embittered and soured on the democratic principle by reason of prejudice, discrimination, and suppression of their natural rights.

This is a difficult problem which almost baffles solution, since it is based on

inherent mass prejudices and on the substitution of emotion and calumny for reason and truth. It is a situation for which no logical and fair-minded man can find a logical defense, except to acknowledge that it is rooted in misinformation and ancient phobias.

The existence of such social discriminations has been ingrained in the minds and hearts of the majority since childhood. But in the minds of most Americans they are regretted, and condemned as contrary to both the law and spirit of our great country.

The social evil of race prejudice is an ugly fact, inimical to the welfare of every American. As education and understanding grow, it will be eradicated and cease to exist as a blot upon the social fabric of our democracy.

But whatever circumstances may be found to explain the existence of this evil in our domestic life, we, as a nation, have always proclaimed the principle of liberty and human equality as being the great goal toward which all mankind must strive.

It is generally recognized that in our struggle with the Soviet bureaucracies it is only by a rigid defense of the natural rights of man everywhere in the world that we can make out a case for ourselves. If we are to get down to the gross expediencies of pure materialism and consort with every scoundrel, murderer, and imperialist tyrant who happens to have a passing quarrel with the Russians we are on pretty feeble ground indeed.

Mr. President, in our relations with the British and the other imperial powers of the world whom we are supporting and funding out of the public tax moneys we are running an extremely grave risk. For in many parts of the world of great importance to us the peoples are beginning to believe that our declarations on liberty and freedom are hollow, and our claims for the democratic principle a mockery of truth.

These peoples, who now are groaning under the whip of imperial slave-masters, are the majority population of the world. The Russians are making them glittering promises based on the ultimate equality of man. That these promises are false is of little importance, for these unfortunate peoples, suffering and oppressed, and living in the utmost misery, see in our alliance with the European imperial powers nothing but hopelessness and despair for themselves.

I could speak at length, Mr. President, about the situation throughout Asia, where communism has made gigantic inroads due almost entirely to the colonial system of exploitation, greed, and cynical suppression which makes these peoples easy game for anyone who will promise them relief from the suffering and intolerable abuses of European imperial rule.

But, today, I should like to call particular attention to the Continent of Africa and to what is going on there behind the iron curtain of British, French, Belgian, and Portuguese rule.

The situation is shocking, and it is unbelievable that the United States of America—the champion of world liberty and freedom—should lend itself to its perpetuation.

The condition to which I refer is not only shocking—it is extremely dangerous to the United States. Our military men tell us that Africa, with its 200,000,000 people, is of the utmost strategic importance to us. Indeed, Africa might spell the difference between our ultimate security and the loss of a new world war.

Does anyone propose to tell us that in the event of a world struggle with the Russians we can hope to hold this gigantic continent, with its more than 200,000,000 inhabitants, if these people have learned to hate and fear us as the associates and backers of European enslavers?

To embark on a course which is sure to bring on our heads the bitter hostility of these restless millions of tortured black people is more than a moral mistake. It is a tragic piece of political folly as well, which eventually could cost us dear.

We are used to thinking of Africa as a quiet, mysterious country of veldt and jungle, inhabited by compliant savages who somehow worship the alien taskmaster who rules them. We are used to thinking of the colonial ruler in Africa not as a cold-hearted, greedy ruffian, but as a fine, moral gentleman whose plans for the spiritual and material welfare of the natives are continually frustrated by native ignorance, voodooism, and unprogressiveness.

The only case which can be made out for this concept is based on pure hokum and the conscienceless propaganda of the European colonial masters.

The truth is that Africa is no different from any other portion of the world which in the past has been invaded, abused, and squeezed dry for the benefit of foreign exploiters. Nor are the indignation and anger of these desperately exploited human masses any different from what they would be elsewhere under similar circumstances. The people of Africa are sullen, resentful, and desperate. The situation is so explosive today that it could easily result in a new river of blood flowing over that Dark Continent.

Slavery still exists in Africa. The doctrine of Caucasian race superiority is the ruling principle, and is enforced with guns. The native peoples are deprived of the simplest and most elemental human rights, and are forced to live under conditions so degrading and so miserable as to leave them open for any reckless adventure which might promise them hope for the future. They would be less than human indeed if they did not resent and hate conditions which have reduced them to little more than the level of cattle. Behind the iron wall of imposed silence and careful suppression of the news dispatches, Africa today seethes with bitterness and social unrest.

I shall touch a little later on, in some detail, on the terrible conditions which exist on that continent under the whip of imperial rule. In general, it may be said that the native peoples of Africa live under a type of humiliation which places them exactly in the class of chattel slaves. They are not allowed liberty to travel from one employment to another. They live on reservations and submarginal lands deemed worthless by the imperial master race. They may not have any schooling or do any other than the most menial tasks. Their women are at the mercy of every scoundrel and adventurer who comes along. Natives may be seized for public work without pay. Their cattle and lands are confiscated. They have no representation in law. They may not enter public buildings, and may be killed, exactly like animals, by anyone of the master race whom they offend.

When I consider for what cause we fought the American Revolution, and survey the depths of degradation, misery, and oppression to which the people of Africa have been subjected, it seems to me that our present policy in reference to the Africans is most odious. It cannot earn us the friendship of these peoples, which we one day may desperately need.

There was a period during the nineteenth century when the name of Africa was used frequently in these Halls. That was the period of American idealism, when many high-minded Americans, who I believe are still in the majority in our country, sought to bring the blessings of freedom and hope to the people of the Dark Continent. It was a time when we attempted to live in the spirit of our own principles, and to work toward the day when all the world would be free and bound to us by thongs of gratitude and affection.

Today, that time is past. We now are allied to a grinding Colonial despotism, which thrives on slavery, and which is dedicated to the proposition that there are master races and subject races, and that the subject races are to be hewers of wood and drawers of water forever.

The cupidity and greed of the imperial powers and their allies among the cartelists on our own continent, have been excited by the vast sources of wealth which exist on the continent of Africa. Africa possesses tremendous amounts of rubber, ivory, palm oil, cocoa, cobalt, manganese, zinc, and almost every known mineral. Its copper fields are the greatest in the world. In a single colliery in Southern Rhodesia, there are 4,000,000,000 tons of high-grade coal.

Nor is Africa to be discounted in the trading scheme of the United States. We send Africa mining machinery, motor vehicles, canned goods, electrical implements, drugs, clothing, and many other exports. The amount and value of these exports have steadily increased.

In return, large amounts of African produce are sent to the United States.

It is not commonly known, but Africa is greater in area than North America and South America combined. If Senators will look at the map and will note the peculiar geographic position of Africa, as it juts out into the Atlantic Ocean, they will see that Africa's western coast is only 1,000 miles away from the eastern projection of Brazil—a very short jump in this modern air age. An enemy nation which controlled Africa would be a dreadful menace to the security of the United States.

We should have learned long ago the lesson that the friendship of peoples is based, not upon the temporary residence of some dictator who enforces his rule with bayonets, but upon the good will and devotion of the people themselves. If the inhabitants of Africa are suffi-

ciently aroused, the continuous minor revolts which now agitate that continent will become a sweeping revolution, in which the Russians will pose as the friends and supporters of freedom and democracy, and we shall be accepted as the enemy—the consort of the European bloodletters, exploiters, and tyrants.

Africa no longer is the slumbering giant continent of the past. Its social and economic relations have changed rapidly with the social and industrial conditions which have affected the entire world. Particularly in northern and western Africa, areas which most concern us, mass movements for freedom and for relief from European tyranny have continued to grow and to gain strength.

Those who understand the course of human history know that the present divisions of territory in Africa among the European nations constitute a purely transitory phase. No great area can be held against the will of the resident population, who sooner or later will throw off the hated despotisms by bloody violence, if they can do so by no other means.

Today the bonds which bind African lands to the imperialist nations have grown imperceptibly weaker, just as the imperialist rulers have become increasingly autocratic and repressive in their methods out of the sheer fear which accompanies a realization of their weakness.

At the very moment when the needs for democratic self-government and self-improvement in Africa are becoming self-evident, the opportunities for American leadership to permanently tie the Africans to our own interests are clear enough.

Instead of so acting, to our own real and permanent advantage, we have abandoned our moral principles, and have hooked our wagon to the tissue-paper horse of a dying European imperialism. Sumner Wells has well said what most of us now realize: "The age of imperialism is ended." The trappings are there, and the frightful suppressions of imperial slavery are worse than ever, but nevertheless the age of imperial adventure is about to come to an end.

Can we not realize that with this fact has been born the other fact, namely, that no considerable people in the world can exist, if deprived of freedom, justice, and opportunity, without being a menace to us all?

I remind the Senate that the Communists have made great profit out of the discontent and oppression of peoples who have lived under the lash of privation and social despair. The Communist appeal, with its program of no class or race barriers between peoples, is a most attractive one to human beings who are suffering under the degrading control of European colonial exploitation.

The doorway to the American continent for the Soviets could more easily be by way of Africa than by way of Alaska and the Bering Straits. Communist penetration on the dark continent could be a terrible disaster for us.

Just as we are concerned about the spread of the Communist program beyond the borders of Russia into Europe and Asia, so we should be concerned about its spread into the African continent, where the broken liberties and miserable living conditions of the native peoples provide a fertile soil for the advancement of the Communist doctrine.

Like the peoples of Asia, the Africans have come to the conclusion that God did not make in favor of the Anglo-Saxon race a special dispensation by which it is entitled to oppress all others.

I may say here that, in addition to those among us who speak for freedom for its own sake and who are frightened by the course our State Department has taken in backing a system of corrupt colonial exploitation, already on its last legs, there is a vast group of Americans who, by reason of racial descent, feel the same sentimental sympathy for the suffering of the Africans that the various white groups feel for the countries of their own origin. An American of Negro blood is entitled to the same concern over the condition of the people of Africa, where his own forebears originated, that an American of Irish antecedents has for the welfare of a still ununited Ireland, or that an American of Polish blood has for his kinsfolk who are suffering under the heel of Russian communism.

Indeed, the man of Negro blood in the United States can add to his sentimental concern something even more real—a deep apprehension over the universal racist philosophy which condemns men, because of their skin color, to a life of discrimination and limited rights. Americans of Negro descent rightfully feel that the cause of their own emancipation and freedom is to large degree linked with the cause of emancipation and freedom from oppression of colored peoples elsewhere. If men can be humiliated and deprived of their essential rights in Africa—where they are the overwhelming majority—because of the color of their skins, the effect of this shameful situation will be felt here in the United States, as well. If, on the other hand, Africa is free and is inhabited by a self-governing, self-respecting people, whose contribution to the welfare of a stable world is self-apparent, the status of every individual of Negro blood in the United States will be improved; for, whatever else may be said on the matter, it is unquestionable that human beings tend to operate by example; and many see in the oppression and degradation of the Africans in their native home, a justification for the racist theories which would condemn people of dark skin to humble and obsequious tasks and a life of second-class citizenship.

Our Nation was far more wise in dealing with the Filipinos than in its present dealings with the African problem, a wisdom from which we reaped not only moral but material benefits.

Our Philippine record, quite unlike the record of the European colonial powers, was one of health improvement, educational development, economic rehabilitation and social advance. We assisted the Filipinos to become self-governing. The result was that the loyalty of the Filipinos in the war with our enemy, Japan, was a lasting testimonial to an intelligent and inspired statesmanship. It demonstrated the value of having a people tied to us by gratitude and appreciation, rather than having them sullen, antagonistic, and rebellious.

Let us take a frank look at the conditions under which the African people are living. By far the larger portion of Africa is under the control of the British, whose record is undoubtedly the worst of any of the colonial exploiters. Under British control, the slave trade has been in active operation, most of the slaves being seized in the British colonies and sent on to Arabia, where they are used for heavy labor, or to stock the harems of the Arab effendis. The British pretend that the slave trade is nonexistent, but behind this wall of hyprocrisy the great British trading corporations, backed by the Crown, do not let a little item like slavery interfere with profits.

A striking example is the colony of Kenya. Kenya is a mandated territory given to Great Britain under the premise of conserving the interests of the native inhabitants as against the day of eventual self-government. Under British rule in Kenya, no native is allowed to practice a profession or to attain any status above that of a menial. The native population is forced to live on submarginal lands, their other lands having been seized outright by a small group of plantation owners, whose only interest is to drain off profits as fast as they can. If a native enters a white man's house in Kenya, he may be shot without recourse to law.

The natives of Kenya are of fine, intelligent stock. After Britain found herself in a precarious position in the late war, the repressions existing against natives were lifted in part, but nevertheless no native was allowed a voice in his own affairs, the colony being run by a legislature composed entirely of representatives of the few resident Europeans. The natives were allowed to build factories and to attain the status of skilled workmen and even managers.

The record shows they acquitted themselves magnificently. Under native direction and workmanship, packing plants were built to process meats. Under instruction the natives soon showed themselves skilled in the arts and know-how which attend our own industrial civilization. They became chemists or chemist helpers, medical attendants, and executives, and in other ways they showed a very real capacity to handle themselves under terms of modern social existence.

Immediately after the war, when the need for these services no longer existed, the British closed down on the natives again. They dismantled the factories and returned the native managers and skilled workers to their former menial places. Even worse, they reduced the native tribesmen to near starvation by taking from them their herds of cattle at confiscatory prices. Today in Kenya native life is cheap, and the spirit of hatred for all whites is dangerously rife.

In Nigeria, of extreme importance to us because of its position, there have been armed revolts, which have been put down by the same ruthless means utilized by Russia in the Balkans. Nigeria's 21,000,000 inhabitants are ruled with an

iron hand by the 6,000 resident Europeans. An effort by the natives to obtain some amelioration by sending a delegation to London achieved nothing. In the Union of South Africa, the millions of natives are completely disfranchised by the relatively small European minority, though here it must be said the Europeans have come as residents, not as alien taskmasters. As elsewhere under British rule, the Negro has no political rights, whether he be a half-caste or pure bred.

Throughout Africa, forced labor is common either by direct seizure of person, or by the indirect method of taxation which is to be paid off in labor. By the act of 1925, in the Union of South Africa, any European policeman may demand production of a tax receipt showing that the native has done the free labor demanded of him. If he cannot show one, he is grabbed and thrown into a camp, or his cattle and possessions confiscated. Another device is the so-called pass law. When traveling from one area to another, natives must carry traveling passes. In the mining territory of the Union, a laborer must receive permission from his employer if he wishes to leave the property in which he is employed. In other areas, a man employed on a private farm must have such a document of identification even before he can go to his own home. No one may hire him except with the approval of his former employer. In most of these areas, as in southern Rhodesia, there is a curfew law which compels all natives to be indoors between the hours of 9 in the evening and 5 in the morning.

All skilled occupations are reserved for Caucasians. Laborers are paid on a wage scale based on the color of their skin. For example, in the mines the wages paid to whites for identical work is 8 to 1 as against wages paid to colored. The average wage paid natives in the mines is around $14 a month. Farm wages may be as low as $1.50 a month.

There are two sets of criminal laws, one applied to natives, the other to Europeans. The breaking of a contract for service, for example, is a criminal offense on the part of a native, as is the nonpayment of rent.

Not even in Nazi Europe has there been so evil a set of working and social conditions as that found under the rule of so-called enlightened European masters on the continent of Africa.

This sinister situation, I repeat, will give way to savage political disorders which will be of dreadful portent to our own Nation. It is an ugly piece of business, which bodes nothing but evil for us and throughout the world. In their arrogant master-race philosophy, the British have not only disfranchised the Negro, they have also disfranchised the East Indians, the Arabs, and other dark races who are fairly numerous in the British possessions in Africa. In South Africa, Ghandhi—think of it, Mr. President—even Ghandhi was not allowed to enter a public building because of his dark skin, a fact he never forgot. Throughout India, a great wave of antagonism based on the treatment given Indians in Africa, has extended from the departing British masters, who still control the country economically, to the people of the United States, who are considered to be hand-in-glove with the British.

Again I must refer to the tremendous sums of money which have been voted to the British by this Congress, and which now again have been voted them under the so-called European recovery plan.

The big bulk of this latest sum, which is supposed to be a safeguard against communism, is going to the British.

The British propose to spend the greater part of their share in the so-called development of Africa. They are organizing giant corporations for this purpose.

These corporations will not operate for the good of the people of Africa. They are far away from the pronouncement by President Woodrow Wilson, embodied in the fifth of his fourteen points for settling World War I, that all colonial claims must be adjusted "on the principle that the interests of the population must have equal claims with the claims of the government."

In their operation, the interests of the native population will not be consulted. These corporations will perpetuate all of the vicious evils which now exist. Their purpose will be to drain off as much wealth as they can from the African Continent, and deal with the native peoples as helots and slaves. Any crime and any outrage against the native population will be justified if it will yield profits.

This is a system whose perpetuation is sure to result in revolutionary outbursts and to provide a field day for radical adventurers.

Indeed, in a published comment issued in August of 1947, a British Digest of World Affairs meant for distribution in America, had the effrontery to call for American participation in the so-called African Development Co., on the claim that part of its benefits would be that the Negroes of the United States could be sent back there. This paper, evidently with the blessing of the British ruling powers, suggested that such an act of wholesale expatriation "would be to the enormous advantage of the United States." In short, by this outrageous proposal, Americans of Negro descent are to be cast out and returned to Africa to outright slavery.

The same paper, with an eye to the depressed conditions under which native labor is forced to operate, comments on how profitable the venture could be, remarking that coal produced in southern Rhodesia could be sold at a portion of the price of coal produced in Britain or America, even when the huge costs of transportation were taken into consideration.

The paper remarks smugly that "the whole Anglo-Saxon bloc" must go into this "profit-making development," and asks for an African Development Co. with a minimum capital of approximately $20,000,000,000.

Could anything exceed this for outrage? Our Americans of Negro blood are asked to provide British exploiters with funds, through the tax moneys, with which further to enslave Africa, which is to be a great concentration camp to which Americans of Negro descent themselves are to be sent.

How even the fellow travelers of the British Crown who infest our State Department could have gotten themselves to agree to this damnable proposition is more than sanity can make out.

Through the recent action of this Congress, America has agreed to throw tremendous sums of American tax money into Europe for the declared purpose of stopping communism. Now we discover that an important share of these moneys is going into an African development scheme, a piece of vicious human exploitation which in the end will provide fertile ground for the growth of a powerful African communism. The whole situation is little less than a swindle upon the credulity of the American people.

This swindle is made even more ridiculous by the latest advices from Britain that the current great peanut-growing scheme in central Africa, in which so much American tax money provided to Britain is invested, is doomed to fantastic failure. This adventure alone has cost over $100,000,000.

Thus all of this high-powered activity by which we are being bamboozled against our own interests is not only morally rotten, it is a material failure as well.

Our latest information shows that the British are even euchring us out of our oil in Ethiopia, concessions which are far safer than those across from the Russian border in Arabia. In Ethiopia, which the British control outright through a quisling government, controlled and directed by them, the Somali tribesmen in the Ogaden area, where the Americans have their concessions, have been encouraged to believe that the Americans are the enemy. American motorcars are stoned and British officials refuse to make arrests. British officers told an American oil crew that the police would not be responsible for any assaults if the Americans continued their drilling operations.

On top of this, the United States State Department suggested to the oil company that it withdraw, on the excuse that it could not get sufficient laborers. The oil company immediately pegged this lie with the retort that they had been swamped with applications.

When and where is all of this to end?

I cannot help but believe that a violation of the fundamental moral law of mankind is just as destructive when committed by British enslavers as when committed by the Russians; and that British criminality in Africa is as abominable in the name of profits as is Russian criminality in Poland and Bulgaria in the name of Communist rule.

What I object to principally is that we are footing the bill for all this and that we are operating not only against our own principles and ethics but also directly against our own interests. Joe Stalin must be having a big time watching this insane exhibition.

If we are to make any loans whch are to be spent in Africa, it appears to me that the money could be better spent by making the African people themselves the direct beneficiaries, rather than for the purpose of enabling British cartel associations to extort dividends.

We could repeat what we did in the Philippines, establish schools, public health missions, and build roads and harbors. There would be great results to us in trade through the further introduction of western manufacture and the electrification of settled areas. The introduction of these basic agencies of civilization would bring many benefits to the African peoples, and would encourage them in their programs of self-help and internal development.

Instead of dumping our money into a bottomless sewer, we would actually receive a decent return on these investments, without losses, and in addition, we would have the friendship of these people.

If our policy is to make Africa, with its 200,000,000 inhabitants, a gigantic slum, we shall reap the disaster which must unfailingly accompany such a policy. If, on the other hand, we are anxious to advance the techniques of Western civilization and the common culture of the free nations, we have a great laboratory in Africa in which to work. But this work will have to be done independently of imperialistic economic projects, which are doomed ultimately to failure, anyway.

If we do not demand as part of the price for our help to Europe, the immediate reform of Africa, freeing it of its present abuses, Josef Stalin will be the knight in shining armor to whom the Africans will look for rescue.

The least that can be done is to give the Africans a voice in their own government, and to free them from the disabling regimes by which they now exist exclusively for the purpose of providing profits for foreign self-seekers and oppressors.

Mr. Truman has stated that world peace cannot be attained so long as any part of the world is unfree. We have it in our hands to make this assertion good in practice, and Africa is one of the major areas where the need is self-evident.

Discontent, oppression, and misery in an area the size of the Dark Continent, inhabited by so many millions, is menacing to the United States, to its ideals and to its future. Now, at a time when a world-wide struggle has developed between the Russian system of society and our own, to continue to back the decaying European imperialists in their grubby adventures for profit, is pure madness. Unless we of the democratic west reexamine our world policy in this intensifying struggle for the souls of men everywhere, we may lose Africa through losing the friendship and regard of its people. The revulsion of Africa against the doctrine of imperialist racial superiority easily could turn her on an antidemocratic course.

If our policy is wise, Africa and her peoples could be our friend for the next 1,000 years. The last world war proved that Africans are good soldiers, and competent to build an industrial civilization. With a rising standard of living, there would be a market for the sale of many American manufactured items, such as automobiles, tractors, household goods, and other commodities which cannot be used by exploited peoples living on a subsistence level.

In any case, neither Europe nor America will have peace so long as either Asia or Africa provides an arena for colonial terror and greed, and so long as seeking after profits takes precedence over liberty and human decency.

The least our Government can do would be to send a commission to Africa to investigate and to see for just what purpose the funds we have loaned Britain and the other European states are being used. Our stake in this proposition is immediate and pressing.

TOMORROW'S WORLD—POEM BY GEORGIA D. JOHNSON

Mr. President, I have in my hand a poem entitled "Tomorrow's World." It is from the pen of Georgia Douglas Johnson, who resides in the District of Columbia, a woman of rare literary attainments, a forceful writer, and an American poetess of distinction and renown.

Mrs. Johnson, a colored woman, is prominent as a leader among the women of her race on the national level. She is the widow of the late Col. Henry Lincoln Johnson, who was a great lawyer, a fearless leader of his people, and a stalwart Republican who served as Recorder of Deeds for the District of Columbia under the administration of President Taft. He was also nominated for this position by President Harding, but upon the objection of Tom Watson, a Senator from the State of Georgia, the United States Senate refused to confirm him. Johnson also served as a member of the Republican National Committee from the State of Georgia, which position he held at the time of his death in 1925. He had the distinction of having been elected to every Republican National Convention, as a delegate from the State at large, from 1898 to 1924. Although his election was contested every time, he never lost a contest.

Mrs. Johnson is the mother of two sons, Henry Lincoln Johnson, Jr. a prominent member of the bar of the District of Columbia, and Dr. Peter Douglas Johnson, a prominent physician, also of the District of Columbia.

I ask unanimous consent that the poem be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOMORROW'S WORLD

Come, brothers, from the ends of earth;
  This is the trumpet call,
To understanding, fellowship,
  And tolerance for all.

Why suffer power, arrogance,
  With vanity and greed,
To rise again upon the land
  And on its vitals feed?

Why should we follow brazen drums
  Into the flames of war?
Since we are brothers of one blood,
  What are we fighting for?

Come! Come, before the atom bomb
  Blasts out humanity,
Grinding to ashes all the world
  In bitter mockery.

Come! And tomorrow's world shall rise
  With broad horizons fair,
And weary, watching humankind
  Will know that God is there.

Tomorrow's dawn can make the dream
  Of brotherhood come true,
The prayer for peace and happiness:
  God made this world for you!

THE REA AND THE PLAINS STATES

Mr. LANGER. Finally, Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senate for having excused me from attendance this afternoon so that I might appear before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations in behalf of the Rural Electrification Administration and the extension of its work in the Great Plains States. I was joined by the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] and my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations. We demonstrated that in the Great Plains area the States of North and South Dakota, Montana, Iowa, Nebraska, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and to some extent the State of Illinois, the amounts of money necessary to place the farmers in those States on a par with the farmers of other States have not been received from the REA and the Government.

There is great discrimination among the States in the furnishing of facilities to farmers for light and power. For example, in the State of Rhode Island 95 out of every 100 farmers have light and power. North Dakota is the forty-eighth State in the list, and has been since the REA was inaugurated. From 1934 to the present we have been the forty-eighth State. Only 7 out of every 100 farmers in the State have light and power. The State of South Dakota is the forty-seventh State. Only 9 out of every 100 farmers have light and power.

This afternoon we asked that one-tenth of all the money that is appropriated for REA purposes be turned over to the Administrator of REA, Mr. Claude Wickard, that he might use it in his discretion in the Great Plains area, in those eight or nine States which are still at the very bottom of the list.

Consider for a moment the State of Nebraska. The distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] appeared before the committee that was investigating the REA a short time ago, and to his surprise he discovered that although in 1945 Nebraska was the thirty-fourth State in the Union in REA contributions, because of the lack of development in the State it had sunk and was the forty-fifth State as of the 8th day of January 1948.

I appeal to the fairness of Members of the Senate to see to it, when the appropriation bill comes before the Senate, that provision is made such as that in the Soil Conservation Act, that one-tenth of the sum appropriated may be spent in the discretion of the Administrator of the REA in those States which, either intentionally or unintentionally, by accident or design, may have been discriminated against, with the result that the farmers living therein have not facilities for light and power comparable with those afforded the farmers in other States.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

Nellie Tayloe Ross, of Wyoming, to be Director of the Mint (reappointment);

Walter R. Sturr, of Florida, N. Y., to be collector of internal revenue for the fourteenth district of New York, in place of Harry M. Hickey, resigned; and

James M. Robertson, of Norfolk, Va., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 14, with headquarters at Norfolk, Va., in place of Alexander H. Bell, resigned.

RECESS TO 11:30 A. M. MONDAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Under the order previously entered that when a recess is taken today it be as a mark of respect to the memory of the late President Manuel A. Roxas of the Philippines, I now move that the Senate take a recess until Monday next at 11:30 o'clock a. m.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, April 19, 1948, at 11:30 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 15 (legislative day of March 29), 1948:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Harrington Wimberly, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term expiring June 22, 1953.

Thomas Chalmers Buchanan, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1952.

THE TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named persons to be judges of the Tax Court of the United States for terms of 12 years from June 2, 1948 (reappointments):

Richard L. Disney, of Oklahoma.
Byron B. Harlan, of Ohio.
Miss Marion J. Harron, of California.
Samuel B. Hill, of Washington.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The below-named officer for appointment to the temporary grade of brigadier general in the Marine Corps:

Harry B. Liversedge

The following-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of major general in the Marine Corps:

Louis E. Woods

The following-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of brigadier general in the Marine Corps:

William L. McKittrick

The following-named officer to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Manuel F. Castro

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 15, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Russell W. Lambert, minister, First Methodist Church, De Kalb, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Mindful of the tasks before us and our dependence upon Thee for guidance and discernment, we take this moment for quiet communion with Thy spirit.

We are thankful for the wisdom we possess; may we be constantly aware of its source and humbly accept the responsibility it demands of us. We are grateful for the confidence others have placed in us; may we benefit them to the best of our talent and time by serving the commonweal. We are mindful of the blessings of freedom; may it find constant and intense witness in us.

In this day of tired liberty and frustrated vision, let us become apostles of the dynamic heritage that is ours. Let us not be limited to material expression of that which is best demonstrated in spiritual commitment to eternal verities.

Rekindle, O God, the flame of moral freedom: that the future will have light to guide its venture of faith. From an old world we step into a new age; for it we need all the vision Thou canst yield. The horizon's dawn of peace and fellowship is the prayer of millions of Thy children with whom we join in questing hope.

Give us vision to see the glorious road ahead, and, when we see it, Lord help us to have courage enough to walk on it, even alone. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 154. Concurrent resolution authorizing a reprint of the report on supplements 1 and 2 of the Subcommittee on National and International Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, entitled "The Strategy and Tactics of World Communism"; and

H. Con. Res. 184. Concurrent resolution amending House Concurrent Resolution 139, Eightieth Congress.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2195. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2038. An act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TWYMAN] be granted leave of absence indefinitely on account of important business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a résumé of New York veteran laws.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two places in the RECORD and to include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two different subjects and include newspaper articles.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper item.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement entitled "Reducing 10 Pounds in 18 Days With Oleo in the Diet."

I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement entitled "Operation Oleo Versus Operation Alaska." I understand a lot of men are needed in Alaska. I make the suggestion that one battalion go to Alaska and attend to that situation and not fight the dairy farmers and spend their time and effort trying to ruin the dairy business by serving oleo instead of butter in the Army.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include copies of essays.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Portland Oregonian entitled "First Water for Big Basin."

Mr. CHURCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Washington Times-Herald of today entitled "Taft-Hartley Surprises."

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona (at the request of Mr. BECKWORTH) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. MANSFIELD (at the request of Mr. JACKSON of Washington) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include news items.

Mr. MORRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Mr. KELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Maj. Gen. Philip Fleming, Administrator of the Public Works Agency, given before the Parent-Teacher Association of Dover, N. H.

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include stanzas by the Reverend August F. Bender.

Mr. LUCAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Fort Worth Star-Telegram.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

CARE OF OUR ELDERLY CITIZENS

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, surely this Eightieth Congress will not close their eyes to the need of our elderly citizens. Through no fault of their own, they have been thrown upon the care of the Government.

These are not idle words when we say that in industrial cities, the earning capacity of our citizens is on the decrease from the age of 45 years. Many industries refuse to hire men over 45 and women over 40 years. Realizing this fact, we certainly can then understand the crying need of legislation that will furnish a real security for the elderly citizens of our great Nation, not based on want and misery, but on right of citizenship and age.

Let us, as Members of the Eightieth Congress realize that the elderly men and women and unemployables can be made an asset in every community, not a tax burden, but citizens with a purchasing power to buy the merchandise that industry can produce.

We cannot, as a nation, afford unemployment and lack of buying power, and let us not forget that profits come from sales; no sales, no profits.

The aged want security, consumers want goods, businessmen want business, manufacturers want orders. These goals cannot be achieved without mass buying.

The cost of old people's homes and public and private charities would be drastically cut. Crime cost would be drastically reduced with the abolition of poverty. Much of the heavy overhead of the present old-age assistance systems can be saved by the enactment of such a program as offered under the provisions of H. R. 16.

The Townsend bill will save the dreadful cost of depression. Let us not forget that the unemployment during the last depression cost us, in income loss alone, far more than the First World War.

That depression of the thirties cost at least 70,000,000 man-days of production—a loss to the Nation of $250,000,000,000; enough to buy a $5,000 home for each of our 10,000,000 veterans, and 40,000,000 other people. Who can compute the cost of depression in lowered morale, broken lives, shattered ideals? Such things causes the destruction of faith in the American's way of life.

We must safeguard that which we hold dear in our American way of life, and see to it that the men and women who as citizens helped make this country great, have real security.

TRANSFER OF SURPLUS REAL PROPERTY

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3703) to authorize transfer of surplus real property to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior for consolidation of Federal holdings within areas administered by the National Park Service, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 3, after "property", insert "situated within the boundaries of a national park or national monument and."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include in each newspaper articles.

Mr. DEVITT (at the request of Mr. KEATING) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the St. Paul Pioneer-Press.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennslvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of Casimir Pulaski.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution on the Palestine question adopted by the Chelsea City Council.

Mr. POWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by H. B. Martin.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BREHM asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpenaed to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia to give testimony on April 15, 1948, at 2 p. m., in the case of the United States against John Howard Lawson, which is a congressional contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House I am unable to comply with this summons without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I therefore submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the Speaker's desk a copy of the subpena.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, CRIMINAL DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA V. JOHN HOWARD LAWSON, NO. 1352–47

To HERMAN P. EBERHARTER,
Pennsylvania, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby summoned to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia at the District Courthouse in the city of Washington, D. C., on the 15th day of April 1948 at 2 o'clock p. m. to answer to an indictment charging the defendant with violation of title 2, section 192, USCA.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By HELEN M. MCINTOSH, *Deputy Clerk.*

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 538) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas Representative HERMAN P. EBERHARTER has been served with a subpena to appear as a witness before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia to testify at 2 p. m. on the 15th day of April 1948 in the case of the *United States* v. *John Howard Lawson*, Criminal No. 1352–47; and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify but by order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That HERMAN P. EBERHARTER is authorized to appear in response to the subpena of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia at such time as when the House is not sitting in session; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena of said court.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

"KEEP COLD WITH COOLIDGE"

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the heading of this speech should be "Keep Cold With Coolidge."

You remember back in the days when Calvin Coolidge was President there was a slogan, "Keep Cool With Coolidge," and it was used by both Democrats and Republicans with respect for the distinguished gentleman who was then President of the United States.

That slogan should now be changed. They have a lieutenant governor up there named Coolidge. During the last winter they had a very serious fuel shortage up in that country, and the Southern Democrats in Congress did their best to help them get relief. Yet I see this Lieutenant Governor Coolidge comes out in a vicious and unwarranted attack on the people of the Southern States. So I suggest that the slogan now should be "Keep Cold With Coolidge."

There is only one State outside the South and the West that is outside the "iron curtain" of discriminatory freight rates that produces enough oil to supply its own needs and have any to spare, and that is the State of Illinois.

The oil that supplies New England, as a rule, comes from Texas, Mississippi, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Alabama, Arkansas, and California. We have done everything we could to help those people in their need, and expect to continue to do so, but it certainly comes with poor grace for the Lieutenant Governor of that State to come out and make a vicious attack on the people of the Southern States at this time.

By his attack he suggests the slogan, for his State, "Keep Cold With Coolidge."

ARTHUR COOLIDGE, LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I have great admiration for the gentleman from Mississippi, but Mr. Coolidge is one of the finest men there are in the United States. He thinks more of this country than he does of life itself. Maybe an unfortunate remark was made about North or South Carolina, about taking our business away from Massachusetts, but I want the Members of the House to know that there is no finer man in this country than Arthur Coolidge, Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts. I served with him a great many years in the Massachusetts Legislature, and you would all have the highest respect for him if you knew him.

SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6226) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6226, with Mr. O'HARA in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, April 14, the Clerk had read down to and including line 5 on page 1. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

CONSTRUCTION OF AIRCRAFT AND RELATED PROCUREMENT

For construction, procurement, and modification of aircraft and equipment, spare parts and accessories therefor; electronic and communication equipment, detection and warning systems, and specialized equipment; expansion of public plants, and Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in public or private plants for the foregoing purposes; and personal services necessary for purposes of this appropriation at the seat of the Government and elsewhere; $608,100,000, of which $250,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred under authority granted in the Military Appropriation Act, 1948, to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes; and, in addition, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized, until June 30, 1949, to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes in an amount not to exceed $865,000,000: *Provided*, That the unexpended balance of funds appropriated for the foregoing purposes under the head "Air Corps, Army," in the Military Appropriation Act, 1948, shall be consolidated with this appropriation, to be disbursed and accounted for as one fund which shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That any obligation incurred hereunder shall be subject to the general provisions of the Military Appropriation Act for the fiscal year in which such obligation is incurred.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER to H. R. 6226: Page 2, line 15, strike out "1949" and insert in lieu thereof "1950"; and in line 17, strike out "$865,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,687,000,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment to increase the amount for the purchase of airplane contract authorizations because of the seemingly predominant sentiment in favor of the item at this time. As I stated yesterday, I believe in giving the Air Force all that it needs. On the other hand I do not believe in giving it money that it does not need. I believe that the best airplanes will be procured after a detailed hearing on the part of the Committee on Appropriations as to the needs of the service. But that seems impossible with the present feeling in the House. A cursory examination of the break-down submitted to me last evening by the Secretary for Air confirms that feeling. I am satisfied that the Air Force can make savings in the letting of contracts and in the elimination of items that they either cannot get or that they do not need too badly and which really do not contribute to a 70-group force. So that we can approach a 70-group force thoroughly modernized if we provide the $822,000,000. It will of course need to be supplemented in the years to come. I shall if the Committee on Appropriations permits follow these programs as closely as possible and do everything possible to see that we get the best results from this program.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is gratifying that the gentleman has sufficiently modified his opposition to the program for immediate expansion of the Air Force to offer this amendment. But it is to be regretted that he does not include in the amendment the full amount required for the 70-group program. We are only this morning in receipt of an authoritative statement from the Department advising that $922,000,000 is the minimum amount for which this program can be furnished.

I am going along with the amendment because I believe, as I said yesterday, we should get together on all these provisions with as little division as possible; that we should present a united front in order that both our enemies and our friends abroad understand that the people and the Congress are unitedly back of this program. So, for that reason, although we should provide the full amount at this time, I shall support the amendment.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. How much does this lack in meeting the requirements for a 70-group air force?

Mr. CANNON. According to a statement made this morning by dependable representatives of the Department, it is $100,000,000 short.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Does the distinguished gentleman from Missouri not think he should inform the House that this is the beginning, the first year's program, of a 5-year procurement program, which will have the objective of creating a 70-group force? This program for the initial year, as carried in this bill, carries $1,687,000,000. That does not mean we are going to have a 70-group program. That is merely the beginning. Next year, for procurement, we would have to carry in the 1950 budget $2,738,000,000. In the next year, 1951, we would have to carry for procurement $3,303,000,000. From then on the annual appropriation for procurement would be $3,200,000,000. It is the thought of some that in view of the amendment that will be offered providing for renegotiations, it will be possible to commence this 70-group program with an authorization of $822,000,000, because as you build planes over a length of time, certainly they should grow a little cheaper than if you only order for 1 year. I feel confident, after a thorough study of this matter, that we might be able and will be able to have a 70-group program started and completed with an initial contract authorization of $822,000,000, and I certainly

trust the House will adopt this amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. CANNON. Now, the gentleman has put his finger upon the defect in this amendment. We have grown into the habit in this Congress of legislating and appropriating on the installment plan. No appropriation can be brought in here, regardless of how well supported, but the disposition is to make a feint of saving by arbitrarily cutting it down without reason. And then, later on, when it becomes evident that the amount supplied is insufficient, bring in a hurry-up supplemental bill. That is what is proposed in this amendment. The $100,000,000 is desperately needed to get these planes in the air in time. There is no reason to cut it out. But they affect to save $100,000,000 when as a matter of fact it will have to be provided later on, and there will be no saving at all. The only effect will be to delay, by that much, the commitment of the total amount ultimately required.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment proposes to cut $100,000,000 needed for the integrated 70-group program. Judging by past performance on the part of the Committee on Appropriations, this amount will later be brought in as a supplemental appropriation too late to be as effectively used as it could be, and should be, used today.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a time for cheese paring on the expansion and modernization of equipment for the front line of the national defense. The country is in dire peril. We have now less than half the planes Russia already has, and even with this increased program we will not be manufacturing planes as fast as Russia is manufacturing them now. At a time like this when we must ultimately appropriate the extra hundred million, why not appropriate it now?

Any businessman will tell you that he can produce results more quickly, and handle the job more efficiently, if permitted to go ahead and make permanent long-range commitments at the start and thereby save both time and money. Why not follow business-like procedures here and secure more quickly and effectively the air power we so urgently need and which in the near future we may need even more desperately?

We must have this force ready before Russia goes into production of the A-bomb. The War Department announces that Russia already has the secret, she has the know-how; it is merely a matter now of production. We must have this Air Force ready by the time Russia has the A-bomb ready.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I share the gentleman's sentiment 100 percent. I am keenly disappointed personally that they come in here with a proposition to cut the Air Force down a hundred million at this critical time in world affairs. I am glad that the gentleman has used strong language in presenting this matter.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman expresses the practical common sense point of view.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The sum and substance of the gentleman's argument is that he has no objection to the $822,000,000 and recommends to the House the adoption of $822,000,000.

Mr. CANNON. Half a loaf is better than no bread at all—although we may desperately need the rest of the loaf before we are out of the woods.

This is at least a first installment. We are making the first down payment and will have to make payment on subsequent installments later on. And in the meantime we will pay through the nose in unnecessary delay and additional costs as the installment buyer always does.

Mr. VINSON. And the gentleman's advice to the minority side is to go along with the amendment of the distinguished gentleman from New York of $822,000,000 which lays down and commences this 70-group air program?

Mr. CANNON. From the beginning, I have attempted to reach accord with the majority members of the subcommittee under which we would as rapidly as possible provide this much needed increment for national defense. So I am going along today, but it should be noted that we are wasting precious time as well as actual cash by deferring appropriation of the $100,000,000 which we will ultimately have to provide. And by the delay we are losing the benefits accruing from the prompt adoption of a complete long-range program.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

I wish first to thank the Appropriations Committee for the prompt consideration they have given the request for additional funds for our Air Forces. I regard our air force as our first line of defense and offense. Since the end of the war our air strength has gone down rapidly and our airplane construction facilities have been greatly reduced. This trend must be reversed and we must take immediate steps to reactivate our airplane industry and build the greatest air force on earth, equal to and ready to meet any emergency.

None of us know how far Russia intends to go, but we do know that our national security may be in peril and that we are not now adequately prepared. There are a number of steps which should be taken without delay and which I regard as urgently needed for our protection and security. These include:

First. An air force superior to all others, with not less than the 70 air groups and 502,000 men recommended by the Secretary of the Air Force. Our present strength is 55 groups with only 353,000 men. I am, therefore, glad to have the opportunity to support the pending amendment for the appropriation of a total of $2,300,000,000 for airplane procurement. I hope it will be adopted by a unanimous vote.

Second. The reactivation of our airplane manufacturing plants to begin immediate production of our latest design planes.

Third. A considerable increase in funds for research for airplanes, jet planes, bombers, controlled missiles, and other implements.

Fourth. Increase in the manufacture of atomic bombs.

Fifth. Rapid increase in the procurement and stock piling of critical war materials which are not available in this country.

Sixth. Immediate increase in our Central Intelligence Agency so as to keep informed on what is happening in every part of the world, even behind Russia's iron curtain.

Seventh. Immediate increase of our Regular Army to 1,080,000 men, or 18 divisions, as recommended by General Bradley, now Chief of Staff. On February 1 our Army had only 552,150 men, but we need now a minimum of 18 divisions perfectly trained and fully equipped.

Eighth. Immediate increase of our Navy to about 700,000 men, or the number needed to fully man our ships at sea and get the balance of our Navy out of drydock and ready for action.

Ninth. Immediate increase of our Marine Corps from its present strength of 80,000 to 220,000 men.

Tenth. Immediate passage of a selective service law in order to secure the men needed for these increases in our Air Force, Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, as it now appears they cannot be secured by volunteers.

Eleventh. Early consideration should be given to a universal military training program. The bill now pending before the House to establish a program of universal military training should be immediately reexamined and reconsidered. Our people cannot feel secure unless they know that there is at all times a thoroughly trained reserve available for call to duty in the event of another emergency. But I seriously doubt the pending bill on universal training can provide such trained reserves. It authorizes a training program for only 6 months. The military authorities have reported that it will require at least 2 weeks to get the boys to camp and assigned to duty and that it will take a week or more to get them discharged. This means that the universal training program as set up in the pending bill would really provide for only 5 months' training. We all know that with the weapons we have now such limited training would be of little benefit and would not produce a trained reserve. In fact, the President's Commission, known as the Compton Committee, which formulated the program for universal military training, very plainly states that such limited training would do more than prepare these boys for home-guard duty and states that if they should be called up for active duty it would still be necessary to

give them intensive and extensive military training. In addition, Secretary of Defense Forrestal testified that it would take 4 years to put this training program into full effect, would cost between three and four billion dollars each year, and would require about 100,000 additional officers and noncommissioned officers to do the training. I think this 6 months bill is misleading the people and causing them to think it is a real defense measure, when in fact the plan set out in the pending bill would probably prove to be no more than expensive play camps for the boys. I believe a sound universal training program can be developed and the House Committee on Armed Services should promptly give further consideration to this proposal.

Twelfth. When we return to the draft we must at the same time pass laws to take the profits out of war and to mobilize industry and every man in the Nation if and when the need arises. We must not again let millions make billions out of war profits while our boys are offering their lives in defense of our country.

And while we are making these preparations for our defense there are two other things we must do; that is:

First. We must work for peace just as earnestly and actively as we prepare for war. It would be the greatest crime of all time if we fail to do everything in our power to establish and maintain lasting peace on earth. Peace is the most precious thing on earth because another war could destroy everything we hold precious and could make the world an unfit place to live in. We must support and try to give strength and power to the United Nations Organization, our greatest hope for peace. We must try to find some friendly basis for dealing with Russia, to clear up if possible all present differences and misunderstandings with her, in a manner consistent with our own national honor and security. I much prefer a peace conference to a war council.

Second. And while we strive to stop the march of communism throughout the world we must take prompt and effective measures to end the threat of communism right here in our own country. Communists endanger our national safety, they act as spies, they seek to create disorder, confusion, and unrest; they are enemies in our midst, and strong measures should be taken immediately to corner them, expose them, and suppress them. I hope the Committee on Un-American Activities will soon report the bill they are preparing on this subject.

Then there is one thing we must not do. That is, we must not get hysterical. While we prepare our defenses with all possible dispatch we must proceed in that calm, deliberate, and determined manner consistent with the dangers we are facing. We do not intend to pick a fight but we do intend to get ready to meet any emergency which arises and try to bring this troubled world back to the ways and blessings of peace and understanding.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a consent request?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will that give everybody 5 minutes?

Mr. TABER. No.

Mr. BROOKS. Then I object.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I ask, is there any opposition to this amendment?

Mr. TABER. Not as far as I know.

Mr. RANKIN. I will be willing then to forego my time to speed it up if there is no opposition to it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that there is universal agreement, at least overwhelming agreement, on the adoption of the pending amendment. If we could expedite this matter we would like to.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I suggest to the gentleman that all Members be given the privilege to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York that debate close in 20 minutes?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to have 3 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I am a bit disturbed by the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri in which he attempts to point out that the majority side of the House has reduced the appropriation request of the Air Force by $100,000,000. Of course, that is wholly untrue. The majority side in agreement with the minority has actually offered an amendment to increase the appropriation over that which was requested by the President in the amount of $822,000,000.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman knows that the testimony given by the Department and the latest statement by the Department is that $922,000,000 is the minimum amount for which the program can be financed.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman is correct in the fact that the testimony so stated, but the Bureau of the Budget request and the request of the National Defense Department called for $865,000,000.

Mr. CANNON. The Bureau of the Budget, of course, was governed by the limitations set by the announcement made in the House committee.

Mr. HINSHAW. Was governed by what?

Mr. CANNON. There has been criticism all along that the Bureau of the Budget has sent up small estimates. These curtailed estimates have been in response to announcements made by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations at the beginning of the last two sessions of Congress that the committee would cut the budget from six to seven and a half billion dollars a year. The estimates had to be pared in accordance with those limitations. The Committee on Appropriations is responsible for the lack of adequate funds in this bill. The House now proposes to remedy it.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further on this subject. I merely state that the Department estimate sent up here was for $865,000,000 in contract authorizations. It is quite true that the Department of the Air Force testfied it would take an additional $922,000,000 to carry out the initial phases of the 70-group program. The $822,000,000 presented now by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] in his amendment I believe will give an excellent start for a program which must be carried over a number of years in order to completely modernize the Air Force.

My reason for not presenting an amendment which I had placed on the Clerk's desk to make it $922,000,000 is because of the language which the committee has agreed to and which will be presented as an amendment toward the close of this bill, providing for a renegotiation. In that case I think we are safe in going along with the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York; therefore, speaking for myself and I believe for most of the members of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board, I will not contest the amendment and hope it will be agreed to. However, I do not like to hear people say around here, after they make an agreement, as the gentleman from Missouri has admitted, that it is insufficient.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, after the agreement was made yesterday it was denied here on the floor.

Mr. HINSHAW. No; it was not made yesterday. According to my understanding it was made this morning, and I am willing to go along, and I trust the gentleman from Missouri will do likewise, because he has agreed to it as well.

Mr. CANNON. On the contrary, the agreement was made yesterday and announced on the floor here in the exact terms of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. I have had no understanding this morning with anybody about anything. If anybody has had any agreement with me this morning let him stand up and say so. I am going along with the bob-tailed amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, but it is $100,000,000 short of adequate national defense, as evidenced by the following letter just re-

ceived this morning from Secretary Symington, who is better qualified to judge the components of air power qualified to withstand Russian assaults than anybody else.

APRIL 15, 1948.

Hon. JOHN TABER,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TABER: Thank you for the courtesy of our discussion last evening. After leaving you I got our people together. We went over the program again in detail, and are convinced that an addition of $922,000,000 is essential to the minimum 70-group program.

* * * * *

Kindly note that under this program the total annual number of planes to be purchased in the fiscal year 1950 is just a little more than one-fifth of the monthly peak during the war.

May I again bring up that if we place this business now we will improve our chance of having an adequate air force by the time the Russians have the bomb; and I want to pledge to you in the name of the Air Force and me personally that every effort will be made to purchase these planes to the very best interest of the Government and the taxpayer.

Sincerely yours,

W. STUART SYMINGTON.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I recognize this, that when we came in this morning some kind of an agreement had been made behind closed doors which would cut the Air Force by $100,000,000 so as to prevent the Air Force from having a full 70-group program. I think the agreement is nothing short of tragic to the country and to the world. For several days the Armed Services Committee has been holding hearings on the size and strength of the armed forces, and we had estimates from all of the higher authorities of this Government upon whom we rely for the proper defense and protection and safety of the Government as to what we should have in the way of an air force. Every representative of the Air Force has testified that we should have a 70-group program. This amendment will reduce the amount that they all estimate it will cost by $100,000,000. I think that this Congress ought to go the whole length and give the country the type of protection it needs from the air. We read everyday about the increasing importance of air power. It is the one arm of our defense that is mobile, that can be moved to all parts of the world to protect the interests of the United States and preserve the integrity of this Government and our people. It is the part of our national defense which I think in this crisis has been most sadly neglected, and I think today we should back up the full amount necessary to give the Nation a 70-group air force. I hope that we can put $100,000,000 back into this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and I want to commend the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, for having offered this amendment. As you know, I have been speaking for several days now in support of the 70-group program. Other Members have been doing likewise. I want to remind the membership that we have not been talking about the amount of money during any part of this time; we have been talking about 70 groups. The amount of money provided here certainly is not niggardly. The $1,687,000,000 contract authorization contained under the proposed amendment is a whole lot of money. Added to that is $608,100,000 in cash. I have given this question as much study as any member of the Committee on the Armed Services. A number of us have worked together in connection with it, and I can assure you that with this amount of money we do get 70 groups. We have won our fight for 70 groups. We may not get them as fully equipped as we would have preferred to have them with $922,000,000 additional, but we do get them started. We do get them organized. We have accomplished what we set out to do, secure 70 groups. We have accomplished what the Finletter Commission recommended and what the Congressional Aviation Policy Board recommended, and what we have always wanted to get. So I hope there will be no dissent from the amendment, and that it will be adopted without opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time more to ask the chairman of the committee a question than anything else, although I do want to say that I wholeheartedly support the amendment now presented to us for an additional contract authorization of $822,000,000. I am confident that with the contract renegotiation amendment that will be offered, $822,000,000 will give us the program that was envisioned earlier with $922,000,000.

My question is this. Has the Committee on Appropriations had an opportunity to give any thought or study to the effect this accelerated program will have in the year ahead of us on such matters as priorities, getting material, the effect on other industries, and the whole question of controls as they are involved in a speeding-up program of this kind?

Mr. TABER. We have not been able to go into that in detail. We were told by the Secretary of Defense that we could go through what was originally offered, in his opinion, without the extension of priorities or controls beyond what has been done. It is possible that we will have to do something with this additional amount. On the other hand, I believe that pressure upon the industries will result in the adoption of this program without further controls.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD].

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. On March 24, 1948, I introduced the following bill calling for a 70-group air force:

H. R. 5991

A bill to provide for an Air Force capable of preserving and maintaining peace, the security of the United States, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the United States shall have and maintain an air force fully capable of preserving at all times the security of the United States.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Air Force is hereby authorized and directed to immediately bring the Air Force to a force-in-being capable of instantaneous and effective action in the defense of the United States whenever and wherever necessary, the minimum requirements for which are hereby prescribed as follows:

(a) A Regular Establishment organized into not less than 70 combat groups and 22 special squadrons.

(b) An Air National Guard organized into not less than 27 groups.

(c) An Air Reserve organized into not less than 34 groups.

(d) The required number of modern types of aircraft to equip the Air Force groups described above;

(e) Facilities sufficient to support the Air Force wherever necessary.

(f) Sufficient personnel to adequately maintain and operate the Air Force and proper and adequate facilities to fully train such personnel.

(g) An orderly aircraft replacement program.

(h) A progressive program of research and development in all fields of aerial warfare and the maintenance of an adequate organization and facilities for that purpose.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Air Force to accomplish the purposes of this act.

SEC. 4. This act may be cited as the "Air Security Act of 1948."

I have no pride in authorship, my only interest being in the adequate defense of this country. However, I appreciate the fact that since this bill was introduced our distinguished leader the gentleman from Massachusetts, Speaker JOE MARTIN, and outstanding leaders in both parties have seen fit to take the floor in interest of this legislation. I especially appreciate the fact that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] who is known throughout the country as a very conservative Member of this House, has today offered an amendment to appropriate sufficient funds to make a 70-group air force possible. The fact that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has submitted this amendment, which appears to have the support of practically the entire membership of the House, is an indication to the entire country that this is one of the greatest steps that can be taken at this time to secure the peace and protect the interests of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, this is a momentous day in

the history of this Nation. It is certainly the most significant step that has been taken by this Congress since VJ-day with respect to our military preparedness. It is further a significant day in that the House of Representatives, upon its own volition and without a request from any agency of the Government, is taking this action in expanding and modernizing our Air Force. By our action we are taking a far-reaching step in the direction of national security and world peace.

This is not so much a matter of money as it is a matter of policy. Let it be written in the record today that if we adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York we are committed to a 70-group air program, which not only means the money provided in this bill, but will mean additional money in succeeding years to provide the necessary implementation for the 70-group program.

Legislation is a matter of compromise. Like many others, I am not fully satisfied with the bill before us. In my remarks on yesterday I made my position clear. I read to the House an amendment which I have drawn and placed on the Clerk's desk and which would provide for additional funds for the program. But in view of developments of today and all the circumstances I believe that it is in the public interest for us to take the joint action which has been agreed upon after a give-and-take conference on the subject.

The action which we are taking will mean a vastly improved air force and that is what we are striving for.

There are other component parts to our military force, but air power must not be neglected. It is being irrevocably decided today that air power will not be neglected in this country. I think the House and the country deserve to be congratulated.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I should like to say that the Committee on Appropriations is to be highly complimented for bringing this portion of the regular appropriation bill in in advance of the regular time in order that the program may be expedited from 4 to 6 months.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman. It is indeed a very unusual thing that is being done by the House today. We are prompted to do it in view of world conditions and the desire of the House to promote the national interest.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I wish also to say that, along with the 70-group air force, the Committee on Armed Services has during the past few days had under consideration the necessity of balancing our other military organizations. Steps must be taken by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which I understand are now under consideration, to bring these other organizations up to what we call a balanced military organization.

Secretary of Defense James Forrestal had a good deal to say in regard to a balanced military force when he appeared before the House Committee on Armed Services a few days ago. His statement was as follows:

We need a strong Air Force capable of striking sustained blows far beyond the peripheral bases which we now hold; an Air Force capable of the air defense of our homeland and our protective bases and capable of seeking out and destroying an enemy that might impose war. Such an Air Force requires more aircraft and more manpower than we have today in readiness to meet the war of tomorrow. In order to speed up the work of providing such an Air Force, we have requested the House Appropriations Committee to make very substantial amounts of money immediately available for aircraft procurement, and in this proposal we have had the prompt and whole-hearted cooperation of Chairman TABER and his committee.

We need a ground force to protect our air bases from hostile attack, which it takes much more than airplanes to resist. We need a ground force to seize and hold distant bases—should the attack fall upon us—in order to take the war to the enemy. Such bases, as well as our great cities here at home and our key production centers, require anti-aircraft protection, which is provided by the Army. And a strengthened Air Force will require enlargement of those Army elements which service and support its operations.

We need a Navy capable of defending the necessary sea lanes of the world from submarine attack, of developing antisubmarine warfare, of insuring the sea transportation of our manpower and our logistical supplies and equipment to distant points, and of assisting both attack and defense through air-sea power and amphibious operations.

In other words, our action in the event of any future enemy assault upon us will employ all members of the combat team—the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force—a combat team made up of properly proportioned elements from each service, all in readiness to accomplish assigned objectives.

This is the concept of a balanced force to which I have referred on a number of occasions. Obviously, the word "balance" does not mean that there shall be man-for-man, an equal sized Army, Navy, and Air Force. Balance means that all three services shall be maintained at such size as will best enable them to assist one another, in the accomplishment of their assigned objectives—and this balance rests, in turn, on the strategic plans which the National Security Act directs the Joint Chiefs of Staff to prepare.

Because of this statutory function of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—and because of the fact that military strategy is both logically and legally a matter for our top military leaders—I shall continue to rely heavily on any recommendations the Joint Chiefs of Staff may make, with regard to the proper composition of a balanced force.

To meet the needs which I have just been describing, we require more manpower than we have today. The comfortable assurance of a push-button war is an illusion.

I think the Members of the House ought to know today, however, what we are facing not only from the standpoint of our national and international emergency conditions but also perhaps the cost of a balanced scheme with the so-called 70-Air Force group. Under the appropriations and expenditures for the present fiscal year, and I may say that I received these figures from the Office of the Secretary of Defense yesterday, the outlay for all the military organizations this year will be approximately $10,500,000,000. If we adopt the so-called 70-air group program and balance it up with the needs of the other departments of the military such as the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Marine Corps, the cost next year in expenditures and contract authorizations will be approximately $19,300,000,000; in 1950 the cost will be $21,600,000,000, and the cost in 1951 will be $22,500,000,000.

Before the Congress grasps at any one quick and popular solution to the difficult problem of providing for our defense, consideration should be given to the effect of specifying the ultimate strength of one particular arm or service on the other forces. Then there is the total cost to the Nation to be considered. Estimated figures for the years 1948 to 1951 for the Army, Navy, and Air Force are in the neighborhood of:

[In billions of dollars]

	1948	1949	1950	1951
Army	6,400	6,280	7,200	7,200
Air Force	-------	5,442	6,500	7,300
Navy	4,100	7,580	7,900	7,900
Total	10,500	19,302	21,600	22,500
Cash	-------	15,000	19,000	21,500
Contract authorized	-------	4,302	2,600	1,000

Personnel strength to provide balance for 70-group program

Army	837,000
Navy	556,000
Marines	108,000
Air Force, 70 groups	502,000

The effect on our national economy of such costs are not difficult to foresee.

Whether or not such a program effectively provides for the balanced forces required in military teamwork is easily foreseeable. Too many ships with few ground forces would be as ineffective as too many planes without enough ships to move the heavy material to points where the planes require and use that material.

Let us look to the source of these recommendations. On the one hand there is the proposal that 70 air groups would serve our national security. On the other is the recommendation of the Secretary of National Defense that on present estimates 55 groups are required in the balance with other components of national defense. It would not be wise for us to seize on the figure of 70 air groups as a complete solution. That proposal is a unilateral recommendation unsupported by the Secretary of National Defense and contrary to the joint opinion of his principal military advisers acting within the scope of their primary function.

The real answer must rest on the military effectiveness of any force we provide. If lack of balance reduces military effectiveness, then we should look for balance. Recommendations on such balance are available. Let us give them the proper consideration and not trap ourselves by snatching at any one proposal advanced by enthusiastic proponents of one particular service.

Editorial comment on this very important matter which appeared in the Washington Post on April 14, 1948, and which I feel should be read by every Member of Congress, I am inserting in the RECORD:

SEVENTY-GROUP BOOBY TRAP?

The sole criterion of whether the country should undertake to build a 70-group Air

Force at this juncture is military effectiveness. That means military effectiveness now, when the lack of American military power is a critical factor in Europe, as well as effectiveness in some future day when the 70 groups are a reality. We have no doubt that, given the present state of world affairs and the premier role of air power, a 70-group Air Force is desirable. But to achieve this Air Force at the expense of other necessary and more immediate military measures, as now seems the disposition of Congress, looks to us like a very perilous tack indeed.

The Air Force's part in the present congressional reversal is thinly disguised. If Air Force leaders did not plant the suggestion that Secretary Forrestal be overruled in favor of a larger plane fleet now, at least they did not bother to conceal their pleasure at the turn events took on Capitol Hill last week. What this amounts to, it seems to us, is deliberate scuttling of the balance Mr. Forrestal was seeking to achieve. It makes interservice unification look ridiculous and demonstrates that the recent agreement at Key West was only paper deep. The victim, of course, is universal military training, which according to present reports, has been returned to the shelf.

The choice is by no means so simple as that outlined by Air Force Secretary Symington Tuesday when he said: "I think our national security would be better served by a 70-group Air Force than by a group of 18-year-old boys being called in for training." What the air power zealots have failed to point out, in their rush to grab the gravy, is that a larger Air Force requires larger land and sea forces solely for air support. Right now, for example, 30 percent of the Army overhead is devoted to support of the Air Force, and nearly 10 percent of the Army's present meager manpower is engaged in Air Force supply. According to recent testimony of Gen. Omar N. Bradley, a major combat air base, consisting of 20 air groups and 125,000 Air Force personnel, would require Army contingents numbering 375,000 merely to defend and supply it. Naval forces undoubtedly would be needed in proportion. Nor is this all. Since air bases in hostile territory do not capture themselves, both naval and land forces are required to secure them. And before bases can be obtained close to the enemy, naval air operations will have a vital role—for overseas airfields are essential to even the longest-range of the present land-based bombers.

Moreover, what is needed in the way of air strength is not mere size. It would do no good to augment the present 55 groups with planes already obsolescent. The main thing to concentrate on, it seems to us, is readiness—in other words, a greatly expanded and liberally endowed research program coupled with a preparedness effort in industry. That is the way to dynamic, rather than static, strength.

Secretary Forrestal did quite properly, we think, to warn that the failure to enact UMT would mean a draft of indefinite duration. For, aside from the support troops entailed by a larger Air Force, a paramount consideration today is more divisions to back up American and western European diplomacy where they confront aggressive communism most directly. The most economical way to insure more divisions is through a combination of the draft and UMT, and a default on UMT would make the draft that much more important. This is not an argument against augmented air power, but rather an argument against consideration of air power alone as a panacea for American security.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GORE to the Taber amendment: Strike out the figures "$1,687,000,000" and insert "$1,787,000,000."

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I recognize that a few of our colleagues have entered into an agreement to support the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], but it is $100,000,000 short of the requested amount that is said to be necessary for a 70-group air force. We have heard statements made by some gentlemen, including the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, that the amount in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is not sufficient. Others say that it is. If there is any doubt about it I am one who wants to make it certain that today the House of Representatives is not only willing but has beyond doubt provided adequately for a 70-group air force.

That is my purpose in offering the amendment to increase the funds for the Air Force to the full amount requested by Secretary Symington and which not only he but the House Armed Services Committee says is necessary to provide an adequate Air Force.

Approval of a 70-group air force will, perhaps more eloquently than many other things we have done and may do, serve notice not only upon the one nation that is striking fear into the hearts of people everywhere, but it will also let other nations, particularly those who may now be teetering on the brink, know unmistakably that the United States is not going to repeat the mistakes we made before World Wars I and II of remaining militarily weak and impotent, thereby giving open invitation to aggression and conquest by rampaging dictatorship.

If there is any doubt of this amount being adequate, and doubt has been raised, let us provide the full amount in contract authorization requested by the chiefs of the air force. If later peace should descend upon the world—and God grant it may—this Congress can cancel or recapture. But as of today with the alarming threat to world peace and freedom, let us not stop $100,000,000 short of the goal of a 70-group air force.

A large air force need not and should not be considered as a substitute for adequate strength in other branches of our armed service.

I am prepared to support universal military training, with safeguards which I think proper, and limited selective service, too. So you see, Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment not as an alibi for avoiding our plain duty to meet the requirements of national defense and world security in other respects. Not at all.

Although I lay no claim to being a strategist, I do believe that superiority in the air over any and all possible foes should not be made secondary to any other phase of security or compromised for any reason.

During the recent debate upon the European recovery program, I heard several Members, both Republicans and Democrats, recall the tragic history of the indecision and weakness of free countries and the consequent appeasement of 10 years ago. When the historian chronicles that period I believe one unfortunate fact about America will stand out—we were plagued with disunity and indecision.

I shall not dwell upon the awfully tragic history of the last decade. Suffice it to say that there is good reason to believe that had the United States and the other free nations, which eventually joined together in resisting the axis undertaking to dominate the world, awakened earlier and together marshaled their strength earlier, thereby letting Hitler and his Axis partners know unmistakably that aggression would be resisted, World War II might never have happened. Perhaps it might not be amiss to recall, too, that the Kaiser, as did Hitler, started World War I in the belief that the United States would not or could not come to the aid of freedom before he could accomplish his diabolical ambitions. The Kaiser and Hitler and his partners were wrong, but, by leaving them in doubt as to what the United States would do, two world wars had to be fought with all their calamities and suffering.

Perhaps my colleagues have been as disillusioned as I have been that so soon after a complete victory another aggression threatens freedom. Recalling the acclaim given former Secretary Hull's successful conference in Moscow and the contemporary public approval given President Roosevelt's negotiations at Yalta and Tehran, I believe it is fair to say that the American people sincerely believed that the United States and Russia could work together amicably for world peace and that America's desire to do so was not only sincere but overwhelming. As a nation, we tried; we tried hard, too hard. The late President Roosevelt and President Truman are both now subjected to criticism for trying too hard to get along with Russia. Perhaps the real fault to be found with the agreements our leaders made with Russia in those conferences is not so much that our concessions and compromises were too great in quest of peace, but that we trusted too implicitly. Had Russia sincerely entered and kept the agreements reached with her in the same spirit of cooperation and peaceful intent with which America was imbued, who can say that the agreements would not now be acclaimed as milestones of cooperation and mutual self-respect by two great nations in their progress toward world peace and stability.

I am not one of those who contend that the record of the United States has always been spotless and blameless. Perhaps some of our citizens, perhaps some of our military, perhaps some of our officials have in some ways contributed to the mutual suspicion and distrust that characterizes the struggle between the United States and her allies on the one hand and Russia and her satellites on the other. But I resent, bitterly resent, the apologists for Russia and the American fronts for communism who find no

fault with Russia and charge the United States with imperialism and place upon her the blame for world strife.

One nation and one nation alone has persistently ignored and violated agreements reached by the Allies at Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam.

One nation alone has obstructed the United Nations by the constant abuse of the veto.

One nation and one nation alone has destroyed the independence and democratic character of a whole series of nations in eastern and central Europe.

One nation and one nation alone is violently undertaking to defeat the mutual efforts of the remaining 16 free western European nations, with the aid of the United States, to bring about economic recovery and political stability to their war devastated economies and peoples.

That nation is our so-recent ally, Russia.

The actions of this nation have thrown fear of war and concern for freedom into the hearts of men everywhere. I do not regard war as imminent and hope and pray that it is not, but we must not be blinded to the fact that the aggression of Russia creates conditions which, when allowed to go unchecked in the past, have invariably led to war.

It is a significant world fact that only the United States has the power and influence to give effective world leadership against the onrushing scourge of despotic communism. Either we lead the great majority of nations on the road to recovery, prosperity, and peace for them and for us or we abandon them to strangulation and our own inevitable involvement in the resulting chaos.

As a nation we have come to international maturity by painful and costly processes, but make no mistake about it, one of the dramatic facts of the world today is that America as a Nation is maturing diplomatically and politically under the strain of her responsibilities of world leadership, is, as is characteristic of her individual citizens, rising to the exigencies of a crisis.

This is illustrated by the bipartisan development and support of the gigantic European recovery program, popularly referred to as the Marshall plan. There has never been any peacetime undertaking by this or any other Nation comparable to this in size and scope or generosity. Not only is the $6,000,000,000 expenditure for the next year unexampled but so is the long-term nature of the undertaking. Even more epochal is the unanimity with which our people and our Government have come to this affirmative resolution and policy.

Passage of the European recovery program, however, is only one of the necessary steps we must take. Russia cannot be bluffed; unless we have the power and force to back our words with actions there is no way either to convince Russia to the contrary or apparently to even command her respect for our position. We must mobilize our strength, first to give the necessary protection to our own country and her interests, and second, and perhaps even more important right now, to let the world pointedly, including Russia, know that America is convinced that world peace is not secure anywhere unless it is secure everywhere; that we cherish peace and freedom and are determined to do our utmost to preserve it.

I do hope you will approve the amendment I have offered. We have already passed the European recovery program which I think is a vital part of our great gamble for peace. Let us today set in motion a program that will leave us second to none in the air, another vital and necessary step, and, next, let us proceed to raise our Army and Navy to the required level of strength, push scientific development and train our manpower.

Peace cannot be had merely by wishing for it. The price of peace and security is high and it will remain so until every potential dictator in the world is made to know that civilzed mankind can and will rise up in its organized wrath and might and smite down whoever attempts by force to desecrate the dignity of man and subjugate the world to a despotic will.

The magnitude and character of our danger requires that our course of action be as cautious as it is resolute and strong. As I see it, we are engaged in a long, drawn-out struggle with a powerful nation led by an ambitious and dictatorial political clique who neither honor nor observe any scruples but are actuated by a godless, materialistic ideology. Perhaps the program does not differ greatly from the historic expansionist policy of Russia under the Czars, but it appears more powerful than ever before, better organized and, therefore, more menacing.

The staying power of democracy may be sorely put to test. I firmly believe that our best hope of peace lies in bold, audacious use of our unparalleled power and influence. Failure to act is to default not only our opportunity but our responsibility.

To face this long-term crisis, I want to emphasize the necessity for America and Americans to exercise discriminating judgment. We must avoid the peaks of optimism and valleys of pessimism as the Communist tide alternately surges and recedes in the years ahead. Let us resist the tendency to follow the optimist who, encouraged by a temporary lessening of Russian pressure, says that the time of danger has passed, and avoid, too, the fatalist who says, "War is inevitable. Let us drop the bomb."

Too, we must assiduously guard against becoming so bellicose and militaristic or so filled with hate and distrust that we lose the flexibility and imagination necessary to win through. Nor must we become discouraged because the goal is not easily reached or remains afar. This must be true not just of the politicians but of the people. If it is true of the people it will be true of the politicians. In other words, the test of democracy's staying power will be found in the degree in which our policies are rooted in public understanding and sustained public sentiment. Let us never forget that neither the President nor the Congress nor both can for very long lead where the people will not follow.

When we are tempted to unburden ourselves of the frightful responsibilities that are ours whether we like it or not, let us remember that one conclusion looms up inescapably; we cannot alone have peace and prosperity.

If the cost seems high, as it will, let us ask ourselves if anything really good ever comes without sacrifice. Life itself comes only after pain and travail.

If the struggle appears long and hard, or even threatens to become cataclysmic, just remember that the stakes are high. Peace and freedom are involved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. GOFF].

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, do I understand that this is an amendment to the amendment submitted by the committee?

Mr. GORE. It is.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the original amendment submitted by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and in opposition to the amendment to the amendment.

I think the additional amount that has been put into this bill by the committee is entirely satisfactory to those of us who have persistently favored an increase in our Air Force, and who feel that the chief reliance of this country should be on the air arm to preserve peace and for its refense, if attacked. I think this is a momentous step which the committee is taking. I feel it commits the Congress to the theory that machines, not men, will win the next war if it comes. It looks to the future and not to the past.

I am satisfied with the amendment as originally submitted, and I hope that the amendment to the amendment will be defeated as it is just petty politics.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, this is really a historic day in the life of this country.

We have come to the turning point, when it comes to protecting America against her enemies at home and abroad. This bill, with the proposed amendment, is a long step in the right direction.

I cannot tell you what occurred in the executive session of the Committee on Un-American Activities this morning, but when the legislation agreed upon comes to the floor of the House, you will see a measure that goes further toward protecting American institutions against the enemies within our gates, than anything else that has yet been proposed.

This movement to increase our Air Force is to me the most encouraging step that has yet been taken on this floor. We have reached the time when our Air Force is our first line of defense. The next war will be an atomic conflict. It will be fought with airplanes and atomic bombs. It may mark the end of our civilization. I shall vote for the top amount offered here. If that fails, I shall support the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The safety of all the American people is at stake. We cannot afford to take any chances of having our country blown to pieces for want of an adequate Air Force to protect us.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman knows that the Armed Services Committee unanimously voted for the full amount necessary for a 70-group air force.

Mr. RANKIN. I did not know that. I will say to the gentleman from Louisiana that he does not offend me when he comes out for the top amount proposed by the amendment, because I realize that if we are going to save America, if we are going to save American institutions, we are not only going to have to have the strongest air force on earth, but we are going to have to clean house and fumigate at home.

Let us put the safety of our country above all other considerations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, for 4 months I and other members of the committee have been working on the aviation problem presently confronting you in this House today. We are properly doing something which will result in the United States having the best air force in the word. I agree with my colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] that we must give the Air force our utmost support. I go along with him on his statements regarding the late Billy Mitchell. We cannot, however, write appropriation bills on the floor of the House every time an appropriation bill comes up here without well-conducted hearings and justifications. Those who are responsible for building and organizing and forming our air forces have come before us and told us what they wanted and needed in this deficiency bill. We gave them every penny asked. They did not want anything more at this particular time. They are the ones who will have the responsibility to build this Air Force, not we on the floor of the House.

The chairman of the committee the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] asked Secretary Forrestal if he wanted anything more than was asked in their deficiency bill. Here is what Secretary Forrestal said to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]:

> It is all that I can support at this particular time until I can evaluate the studies now under way.

In spite of this statement the chairman the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] offers an amendment in increase this figure by more than $800,000,000 because he and the rest of us feel we must start a 70-group air force. I will support the chairman's amendment because it follows the recommendations of the congressional air policy board of which I am a member. The figure is well thought out and was pretty well agreed to by many Members on both sides of the aisle. It is a figure which comes to us from a distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who with his colleagues, has held long and detailed hearings on all phases of our aviation needs. The information which we have accumulated was both off and on the record and the amendment is well justified.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] for 2 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, the other day we voted to send $5,000,000,000 overseas to feed the people of Europe. We did it as an auxiliary part of our national defense efforts. But the action that we will take today will mean more to our national security than 40 Marshall plans. You cannot fight Russia or any other country that fights you with guns, unless you have weapons that are more deadly than theirs; nor can you fight them with food alone. By the same token, we cannot afford to fight world war III with the weapons of World Wars I and II. I am going to support the substitute amendment providing the additional $100,000,000 because I do not believe in gambling with our national security by cutting funds for the weapon that is eventually going to save our own necks—our United States Air Force.

Seventy groups has been held by our aviation experts to be the absolute minimum required for peacetime operations. I do not believe that anyone can conscientiously deny that we would be gambling with our security to allow our air arm to remain below this level; particularly in view of the grave international crisis existing today.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I arise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. It it should fail, which I trust it will not, then I shall support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

With few exceptions we agree that the strengthening of our defense would be an act of peace and not of war. With no exceptions we agree that a strong air force constitutes the front line of our defense. So today we are rightly putting first things first, that is, the establishment of the strongest air force in the world.

I am delighted that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has seen fit to offer his amendment. He yields to no one in conserving the dollars of the American taxpayer. The mere fact that he, conservative as he is, has seen fit to offer an amendment increasing this item by $822,000,000 should be sufficient warning of the need that every Member of the House should support his effort. On the other hand, I for one am willing to go even further. Would it not be better that we take no chances at all? I judge from the debate that doubt does exist in the minds of some as to whether or not the Taber amendment goes far enough. It occurs to me that this is a matter on which we should not take the slightest chance. It was only a few years ago that we came up with too little too late. All along the way before Pearl Harbor the doubt was being resolved in the favor of economy or of something else with regard to our defense program. Action was based on the hope that the worst would not come. But it came. And the loss of American lives was terrific, to say nothing of our tax dollars.

Certainly we have by this time learned our lesson. So long as a doubt exists, so long as there are strong differences of opinion as to the need, so long as an additional amount of only $100,000,000 is involved, why shouldn't we resolve the doubt in favor of defense and not economy, and support the Gore amendment? It could prove to be good economy. After all is said, if the additional amount is not needed, the Congress can step in and recapture the unexpended balance.

What does this amount to when compared with the billions our country is pouring into Europe and the rest of the world? This, Mr. Chairman, is no time for taking chances or penny pinching.

I resolve the doubt in favor of a strong air force, a strong defense. I shall support the Gore amendment with the hope that you will do likewise. If it should fail then I shall support the Taber amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] for 2 minutes to close the debate.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the most important thing before the House right now is not a dollar sign; it is unity. It is unity on the proposition that we are going to have a modern 70-group air force.

When the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, asked Secretary Forrestal to come before us with an idea of canvassing the aircraft picture, we had no budget estimates calling for a 70-group program or anything of that sort. We only had a supplemental estimate from the President through the Bureau of the Budget for $725,000,000.

As a result of a conference between the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and Mr. Forrestal, it appeared that considerable time could be saved in procurement if enough funds were appropriated and contract authorization established to put into the letting stage the aircraft procurement portions of the estimates before the Army and Navy subcommittees as well as the President's supplemental estimate. It was agreed that would be done, and that was done in the bill as it was reported to the House. The Secretary of Defense, Mr. Forrestal, was highly pleased and so expressed himself as the portion of his testimony cited in the report clearly shows. The amounts were $608,000,000 in cash and $865,000,000 in contract authorizations.

This proposal of the committee, growing out of the initiative and foresight of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] far exceeded the expectations of the defense establishment when the President's supplemental request was submitted. The members of the committee canceled other plans to give their full time to work on this matter Thursday, Friday, and Saturday of last week and Monday, and reported the bill to the full committee Tuesday.

In the meantime, sentiment had been developing both in Congress and in the country for moving into the complete 70-group Air Force program proposed in the so-called Finletter committee's report and that of the Joint Congressional Aviation Policy Board, of which the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] is vice chairman, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] are members, and the gentleman from Massachusetts and myself are advisory members from our respective committees.

The Appropriations Subcommittee on Deficiencies was cognizant of this sentiment in the country and in the Congress. So, yesterday, in a series of informal conferences between the chairman and various Members interested in this matter, including the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], an effort was made to agree upon a further addition to the authorizations for the Air Force which would definitely and indisputably say, "We are going to have a modern 70-group Air Force."

And that is what is proposed in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, to increase the contract authorizations from $865,000,000 to $1,687,000,000, a further increase over the official request of Secretary Forrestal and the Bureau of the Budget by $822,000,000—to give us a 70-group Air Force in modern planes.

True, it had been estimated by the Air Force itself that $922,000,000 additional was the figure they would like to have for such a purpose. It was not a figure passed upon by the Bureau of the Budget. It was the asking figure of the Air Force. During our hearings we had asked the procurement people if the price did not go down with larger volume. They assured us that it did, and cited lowering of average per pound figures for aircraft when larger orders were placed or when assurance of a steady flow of orders could be given.

So last night we asked Mr. Symington if we took the 70-group program in one bite instead of two would there not be some economies? He said that in his offhand opinion there could be saved somewhere between $50,000,000 and $100,000,000. And upon that basis an agreement was reached within the committee that an amendment would be offered on that basis, and it has been offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. The amendment is before you. Unity and good faith are at stake as well as other things. There ought to be only one answer on the part of the membership here today.

If I were going to do any advertising of a situation before the world which involves security and national defense, I would not advertise weakness, I would advertise strength. And I would advertise unity.

Mr. Chairman, there are many legislative steps taken in the name of national defense. There are many taken in the name of stopping Stalin from engulfing the free nations of the world, many steps taken in the name of stopping communism. Some of those measures, in the opinion of some people have been of uncertain results. Some proposals seem to suggest an invitation to communism to move in—to "Come and get it. The picking's fine." But Mr. Chairman, while opinions might differ on some measures, there can hardly be any difference on this matter now before us.

This is not a bill which now says to Joe Stalin or anybody else: "Come and get it." This is a bill which with the increase provided by the Taber amendment will say to Stalinism or communism or any other man or system that seeks to infringe upon the liberties of the free people of the world: "Stop, look, and listen."

This says to all the world: "We are proposing to defend freedom by building a 70-group air force, thoroughly modernized, just as rapidly as procurement can be obtained."

And it is my earnest hope that by this evidence of determination and strength, that the very need of ever using the force in combat will itself vanish and that reason and justice may prevail in the relations of the nations of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I ask support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I strongly favor the amendment to increase the supplemental estimates of $922,000,000 for aircraft production for the Air Forces, Navy, and Marine Corps. Looking at the matter from a long-range point of view I doubt if even that amount, plus next year's budget estimates, will do what the country expects to be done in the way of aircraft procurement.

It should be pointed out though that the total budget estimates for this purpose for the present fiscal year are $3,298,100,000 if this amendment is adopted. Unquestionably, that is a tremendous sum. However, it should be recalled that this sum is only a small part of the cost of our Air Force procurement when the Air Corps was operating so effectively against Germany. The whole point under discussion boils itself down simply to this: We must start building a tremendous Air Force now. The longer we wait the more trouble we invite from communistic Russia. We cannot pick up a Sears, Roebuck catalog and order these airplanes. From the time the plans are on the drawing board until the planes begin to roll off the assembly lines will require at a minimum about 18 months.

We can never hope to reach perfection in the design of planes, because through scientific investigation and research constant improvement is being made. If we delay our construction program until we think we have the best design of planes on earth, we shall wake up and find ourselves in the same position as we did in 1940 and 1941—namely, without them.

Let us go to work now and work feverishly to prepare. Later we can appropriate more money, which we will unquestionably have to do in order to carry out the wishes and the will of the American people. Frankly, I am convinced that in its thinking on rearmament for peace the American people are at least 12 months ahead of the Republican-dominated Congress and a good many of our leaders of national defense. We should adopt this amendment increasing these funds without further delay.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

OUR NATIONAL SECURITY REQUIRES A STRONG AIR FORCE

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, the United States should have and maintain the strongest air force in the world. As the situation now stands, we are lagging considerably behind Soviet Russia in air power. We have a chance here today to do something about it.

The appropriations bill that is now being debated carries contract authorization for $865,000,000 for new aircraft construction. There are amendments pending on the clerk's desk increasing that figure by $922,000,000, making the total figure $1,787,000,000. I rise in support of that increase just presented by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

SEVENTY GROUP COMBAT UNITS NEEDED

Mr. Chairman, this proposed increase would provide funds to bring our Air Force program up to 70 group combat units. There can be no serious opposition to that goal. We were told on yesterday by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the ranking Democrat on the Appropriations Committee which reported this bill, that the $865,000,000 is not sufficient even for the 55-group program. He went on to say that as a matter of fact this appropriation is not sufficient to maintain the present strength of the Air Corps.

It is obvious, therefore, that the bill as now drawn is wholly inadequate if we are to maintain even a fairly strong air force.

Now what can we expect if the 70-group program is adopted? The procurement requirement for such a program is not a secret. Our Air Force officials tell us that for the 70-group force we need at least 6,869 aircraft, 3,212 for the National Guard, 2,360 for the Air Reserve—comprising a total of at least 12,441 airplanes. Then, a strategic reserve of 8,100 brings this over-all total to 20,541 aircraft.

What do we have today? We have in active service about 10,000 aircraft, mostly trainers. Today, we have only around 500 bombers and 2,000 fighting planes in service, and many of these are obsolescent.

We are told further, Mr. Chairman, that our annual procurement requirement to keep our Air Force up and keep it modern requires 5,200 airplanes annually. It must be kept in mind that the 70-group plan is a minimum to meet our present defense needs. To be effective every unit must, of course, be fully trained and equipped.

Moreover, for the 70-group program to be effective, it must be supported by civilian reserve components, well trained and equipped. These reserves must be able to leave their civilian jobs, if need

be, and step into the cockpits of our modern bombers.

At present the National Air Guard and the Air Reserve program are enabled to train but a small portion of available personnel, and much of this training is being done in obsolete airplanes.

BEST AUTHORITIES FAVOR 70-GROUP PROGRAM

Mr. Chairman, there is much agreement in high places for the imperative need for this 70-group program. General Eisenhower has advocated it. General Spaatz, Chief of the Army Air Forces, has advocated it. Former Deputy Chief of the Air Forces, Lt. Gen. Ira Eaker, has been a long-time advocate of a program of this kind. Air Secretary Stuart Symington supports it vigorously.

It will be remembered that last year the President appointed a five-man Air Policy Commission to evaluate the course the Nation should take in order to obtain "the greatest possible benefits from aviation." The chairman of that Commission was Hon. Thomas K. Finletter. The Commission of known experts recommended a 70-group combat air force as a minimum requirement because "world peace and the security of the United States are now the same thing."

The report, in recommending the pressing need for a stronger air force for our national security made the solemn warning that "even the most optimistic view of the United Nations" does not assure us "that this world organization will develop in time the necessary authority to prevent another great war."

The report proposes that we start immediately on this increase and that by 1952 besides the 70 groups with the 6,869 first-line aircraft, an Air National Guard of 27 groups with 3,212 first-line aircraft, and an adequately equipped 34-group Air Reserve, be provided.

In addition to all this very convincing evidence for the 70-group program, the Congressional Aviation Policy Board and the Armed Services Committee of the House have strongly recommended this increase for our Air Forces.

TIME IS VITAL FACTOR IN PLANNING AND BUILDING PLANES

Mr. Chairman, before I conclude, I want to talk about time for a moment. It has often been said that in a naval building program we could never have a Navy of any value in wartime if it were not planned at least 3 to 5 years beforehand. That is because it takes from 3 to 5 years to build a warship after construction is begun. The same can very nearly be said of planning for the Air Forces.

Germany began bombing England in 1940 and it was not until 1943 that Britain and the United States were able to successfully bomb Germany in the daytime. It took 3 years to get ready to retaliate.

It takes from 5 to 7 years to plan and produce a new airplane. All the planes that were used in the last war were on the drawing boards before the outbreak of hostilities. Time is indeed a precious thing in the aircraft industry. Consider for a moment our famous B–29's. The preliminary designs for those bombers were made in 1938 and 1939 and our Air Forces first contracted for them in 1940. And even with a priority that was second only to the atomic bomb project, it was four more years before the first bombs were dropped on Japan by our great B–29's.

BEFORE PEARL HARBOR ISOLATIONISTS AND APPEASERS OPPOSED PREPAREDNESS

So this aircraft development program is a continuous thing. It calls for vision, for farsightedness. We cannot afford to be caught short again. Only 10 years ago there were men in this Congress who were so completely devoid of vision that they voted against the two-ocean naval expansion bill of 1938. It is fortunate for our Nation that despite the shortsightedness of this minority the bill was passed and resulted in the building of most of the ships that were instrumental in our victories against Germany and Japan. The distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] was the author of that naval and air force expansion bill in 1938. He spoke on this floor yesterday in support of the 70-group air force and his advice of yesterday was quite similar to his advice of 10 years ago when he was pleading with the appeasers and isolationists to vote for a two-ocean Navy and a stronger Air Force to go with it.

It has been charged that this increase in the Air Force will result in the Navy being neglected. That should not and in my judgment will not happen. All the experts agree that the three branches—Army, Navy, and Air Force—are interdependent upon each other.

Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, retired, who is the greatest authority in this country, and perhaps in any country, on the role of the Navy in modern warfare, recently wrote me a letter in which he strongly defended the part of the Navy in our future scheme of national security.

It is my conviction—

The admiral wrote—

that the battleship is not obsolete, nor is the time foreseeable now when such ships may be discarded as one of the most important parts of the sea defense of the United States.

Admiral Nimitz went on to say that if it had not been for the battleships such as were built under the Naval Expansion Act of 1938 "we could not have won the war."

This distinguished expert on naval warfare pointed out that land invasions may be necessary in the future in order to strike at the source of the enemy's weapon centers.

When men and the weapons are landed in enemy territory, it is the Navy which must take them there and it is the Navy which makes it possible for such forces to land and obtain a beachhead—

He continued.

The admiral concluded by saying that while in the future the composition of fleets may change radically—

I am thoroughly convinced that whatever the new strategy, the battleship will have its irreplaceable part in tactics.

IF ANOTHER WAR OCCURS AMERICA WILL BE GIVEN NO TIME TO GET READY

Mr. Chairman, the future belongs to those who hurry. Let's not be too late with too little next time, if another war should befall mankind. As General Eaker has so ably pointed out many times, the United States will undoubtedly be the first target if there unhappily should be another full-scale war. We must be prepared to meet such attack with devastating force.

In every war up to the present we have had allies to hold the enemy in check until we could get our production going and prepare ourselves. But we will not have that advantage in the future. No longer can we expect such good fortune.

The best way to have peace today is to be prepared for war. In one short generation we have witnessed two devastating wars. And another is now threatened. Despite our victories, despotism and tyranny still prevail in Soviet Russia and the countries she dominates. Let us arm ourselves with a strong army, navy, and air force, and continue relentlessly in the struggle for world peace. That struggle will not succeed if we are weak or if we appease. Surely history of the past decade has taught us the utter futility of appeasing a dictator.

The late Jan Masaryk, who died a martyr to the cause of human freedom recently in Czechoslovakia, who knew the Russian mind and the Russian ambition, said not long before his tragic death:

America is the only country in the world that can make Russia go slow.

He went on to give us some good advice:

If I were an American—

He said—

I'd go all out for a tough policy toward Russia. That's the only way for you to keep her in line: get tough.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

It authorizes the Secretary of the Air Force to enter into contracts for airplanes and other items required by his Department to an amount of $822,000,000, in addition to the sum provided in the bill as it now stands before us.

Yesterday I introduced H. R. 6247, a bill which provides that the United States Air Force shall consist of 70 Regular Air Force groups, 22 separate Regular Air Force squadrons, 27 National Guard air groups and 34 Air Reserve groups and their auxiliary units. It also authorizes an active duty strength of 502,000 in the Air Force, consisting of 70,500 officers, 4,800 warrant officers, and 426,700 enlisted persons. The need for such an Air Force as our first line of defense in a future war has been stressed by our military leaders. Today, any hostile nation attempting to attack the United States must rely on airplanes, guided missiles, and aerial operations. Our Navy is now larger than all other navies in the world combined. Our Army must be increased to render effective service in the occupation and defense areas. We cannot hope to keep as many enlisted men in active service as some possible enemies but our committee has been advised that a 70 combat group Air Force, with its proper

components, can beat back any probable attack on the United States and immediately start a devastating offensive on vital enemy targets. The knowledge that we have such an Air Force will be a great deterrent to any nation which desires to attack us. One of its most important results will be the maintenance of our aviation industry on a basis which will permit quick expansion to meet war needs.

Our only possible enemy now has more jet planes than the United States and is producing military planes at a far greater rate than we are. The expense of this program is large but it will be our best insurance of peace. It will take from 3 to 5 years to put our Air Force on a sound basis in accordance with this program. Following the passage of this bill, I would expect that further legislation may be brought before Congress for action which will establish legally a 70-group air force for the United States with a personnel limit of 502,000 officers and men. I feel that this program is sound and should be carried into effect at an early date.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas.

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Air power is our first line of defense. There is no substitute to being strong. There is no middle ground.

World conditions are uncertain. There exists turmoil in Italy, violence in Colombia, trouble with Red terrorists in Austria, the Scandinavian countries, and in other parts of the world.

We can take no chances on a matter as vital as our freedom and independence. Russia is arming and has been building large quantities of planes, tanks, and submarines for many months past.

To provide for a 70-group air force will cause any would-be aggressor to take stock before attacking us. Nothing short of an air force of that size and magnitude should be provided at this time.

We will be flirting with disaster if we do less.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. Chairman, while I am in favor of the provisions of the pending bill H. R. 6226, I am more in favor of the bill as amended by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and still more in favor of the amendment offered to the Taber amendment by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Our people have a well founded and justified feeling, in which I concur, that our very first line of defense is in aviation. It is shocking to know how helpless we, the richest nation on the face of the earth, seem to be as compared with Russia. I believe the passage of this measure, carrying the maximum amount that might be needed, coupled with the fact that we have the atomic bomb, will deter any present possible aggressor nation. The next war, if there be another one and God forbid, will be largely fought in the air. Airplane development moves so swiftly until some equipment is obsolete soon after it leaves the assembly line.

The law of self-preservation makes it mandatory for us to look to our military strength without delay. I predict that this measure will pass with but few, if any, dissenting votes. The news of its passage will cause those nations who are disturbing the peace of the world to stop, look, and listen. The passage of this bill will bring comfort to the hearts of so many parents, although willing for their sons to leave home for military service are praying that such will not be necessary. I am conscious of the fact that we cannot rely solely on air defenses. Even in this fast moving age, foot soldiers are still required to prosecute a war. I am disappointed more men have not volunteered for military service, especially in view of the fact that the pay allowances and other opportunities and advantages exceed those ever dreamed of by any other nation. It is my purpose to not only vote for this bill but to vote as soon as opportunity is given for a revival of selective service. Also, I am in favor of universal military training, especially in view of present world conditions.

Let us speed up the passage of these essential measures providing for adequate military strength in all of the phases so essential for the preservation of our free way of life.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I think I need take no time to remind the Members of the House that these are times that call for strong preparedness measures. Not a day passes that our public press does not report some event that emphasizes the fact. The tension over Berlin and Vienna, the open revolt in Bogota, the uncertainty over the outcome of the coming elections in Italy—these are matters to cause us to take stock of our military resources, and to ask ourselves, "Are we prepared to meet and defeat an act of aggression such as that which plunged us into war on December the 7th, 1941?" Are we prepared to take such retaliatory action that the outcome of whatever struggle may ensue will never for one moment be in doubt? Can we guarantee in another war victory for the United States that in the 167 years of its existence has been forced to fight many wars but which, thank God, has not—up to now—ever suffered final defeat in any war.

An issue of prime importance before the House at this moment is the size of the United States Air Force which this Congress has established to maintain the air defense of the United States, and to conduct the air operations necessary to victory in any war that may take place in this air age of the world's history. The Secretary of the Air Force has asked for appropriations large enough to give us a 70-group air force and in the request he has been seconded by Gen. Carl Spaatz, Chief of Staff of our Air Force and distinguished air strategist whose knowledge and whose leadership contributed so notably to our victory in World War II.

Opposition to so large an air force—an air force that is only one-seventh the size of the Air Force necessary to our victories of only 3 years ago—has been registered by the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Operations. The Secretary of Defense has himself requested that appropriations be made for strengthening our defenses, but it is clear from his testimony that the appropriations he has recommended will not permit a 70-group air force. That is why the Secretary of the Air Force has appealed to Congress, and—through Congress—to the American people.

Opponents of an increase of strength in our Air Force suggest that the fight for a stronger air force represents a scuttling of the balanced strength of the armed forces that the Secretary of Defense is trying to achieve. They claim that an increase in air force strength would require larger land and sea forces solely for air support. They claim that an increase in air force strength now denies the principle of unification of the armed services that was the intention of the National Security Act of 1947, and violates the Key West agreements, worked out only a few weeks ago by the several Secretaries and the Chiefs of Staff of the National Military Establishment.

In the discussions which presently occupy us we have lost sight of the fact that plans for a 70-group air force are not new, and are in fact inherent in all postwar planning for the national military establishment. Even before the victory had been won in World War II, the 70-group program for the peacetime Air Force had been evolved. The goal, accepted then, has been the objective of all Air Force planning ever since.

On November the 8th, 1945, representatives of the air force and of the War Department General Staff established the 70-group program as the basis for Air Force planning, and allocated 400,000 men out of the 1,070,000 authorized by Congress, for Air Force troop basis. In accepting this figure, the Air Force pointed out that the training and support of the Air National Guard, the Air Reserve, the Air ROTC would require an additional allocation of personnel. The Air Force also pointed out that with separation from the Army, and with the transfer of additional responsibilities from the Army, an increase in personnel would be necessary.

Since that time the Air Force has requested further allocation of personnel, but its request has been consistently refused. The Air Force now feels that 502,000 men are necessary to man a 70-group air force. The acceleration of the program, in the face of the increasingly troubled international situation, requires an increase in personnel. The achievement of autonomy for the Air Force has given it responsibility for functions, not taken into consideration under the original estimates, for which additional personnel are likewise required. But while the estimate of personnel to man the 70-group program has been revised since November 1945, the number of groups needed for a stabilized, peacetime air force has never once been revised. In asking for a 70-group air force, with their proper complements of aircraft and

of personnel, the Secretary of the Air Force has merely requested fulfillment now, instead of at some future date, of the goal established 3 years ago.

I want to speak for a moment about the reasons why we have not already attained that goal. Until March 1947—just 1 year ago—the Air Force progressed steadily toward the goal of the 70-group program. At that time notice of reduction in funds caused the Air Force to reconsider. The air staff determined that on its new financial basis the Air Force could support only 55 groups. Since the budget reduction was not accompanied by any change whatsoever in the commitments which generated the requirement for the 70-group program, it was decided that rather than abandon the program, the Air Force would proceed on the assumption that the 55 groups would represent a phase of the ultimate 70-group program. In July 1947, General Spaatz directed that all groups of the 55-group phase would be activated, organized, and in place with some degree of operating mobility by January 1, 1948. General Spaatz' order was carried out. We now have our 55 groups. No one dare say that the Air Force has ever agreed, or assumed, that there would not eventually be 15 groups more.

The Air Force has made its plans, from the time it undertook the necessary demobilization of men who had served in World War II, for a 70-group air force. Its planes were not secret. They were announced to the world. It is reasonable to assume that the Army and the Navy made plans consistent with an Air Force of the size agreed upon and sought after. The Army strength goal was set at 669,000, and remains there. The Navy has an authorized strength of 552,000 men. When the Key West agreements were reached, only a few weeks ago, in an atmosphere of what we were led to assume was complete harmony, the assignment of functions and missions of the armed services contemplated a 70-group air force. The 55-group phase for which volunteer enlistment was providing more personnel than the Air Force could support or employ, was and is but a temporary phase of a program that in itself will be expanded greatly in the event of war.

No citizen of the United States might at any time during the last 3 years have been in ignorance as to the proposed size of the United States Air Force. No citizen needed ever to ask "How large an air force?"

What the thoughtful citizen might well have asked, and what the citizens of this democracy are asking now, in the face of increasing evidence of totalitarian aggression, is not "How large?" but "When?" When—how soon—are we to have the Air Force that we so earnestly need?

Until an international organization—by some miracle—gives us an international police force for the prevention of war, we have the choice of building a protective machine strong enough to discourage any possible aggressor or of remaining unprepared and defenseless and hoping that war will not occur. The first choice is the only intelligent choice, and it is the choice this Congress has already made. We are going to have a unified military establishment strong enough to discourage acts of aggression against our independence, our sovereignty, and our democracy. And it seems clear that Congress has already decided what the first-line striking power of that establishment is going to be.

It is going to be a modern air force, capable of striking anywhere in the world from the United States, supported by a program of scientific research and development, of industrial readiness, and by adequate manpower. There are no insurmountable obstacles between us and security. We have the best scientists, the best airmen, designers, facilities, materials, and the most money of any nation in the world. There is no insurance we can buy which would be cheaper, or as cheap, as real air power.

Neither an army nor a navy can operate on a surface over which a hostile air force has control of the air. An air force can operate in the air over a surface controlled by a hostile army or navy, and can operate at tremendous speed, from great distance, and with the most disastrous effectiveness the world has yet seen. Obstacles of distance and terrain have been overcome by the Air Force; the barriers to ever-increasing speed is giving way before the attacks of aeronautical scientists and engineers. An adequate air force will permit us to strike at an enemy over any terrain that he controls. An air force adequate to give us this power is essential if our Army and our Navy are to be effectively used in those operations for which, admittedly, a strong army and a strong navy are still required.

An adequate air force is the key to our national security, and for one very significant reason, aside from the reasons I have just suggested. We have three national defense forces, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and one very powerful, possibly decisive, weapon, the atomic bomb. Of our three national defense forces, only one has the means of delivering our decisive weapon to the target where it can be used with most effectiveness. A crew of only a dozen men, flying one Air Force bomber, can carry an atomic bomb to the industrial heart land of an aggressor nation. One such crew dropped one atomic bomb on Nagasaki, another such crew dropped a single atomic bomb on Hiroshima. The rest is history.

When some future historian writes what happened as a result of decisions being made here today, is he to record that we would not provide an air force capable of defending the United States, ready for immediate retaliatory action, and prepared to use the weapon created by American science and American industry? Is he to record that we were unwilling to provide for ourselves the assurance of victory? Or will that historian write that with a proud navy patrolling our shores and a mighty army ready to meet the invader, we still went down in defeat for lack of an air force strong enough to protect us in the one element through which a twentieth-century enemy will first move—the element of the air?

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, it is my considered opinion that this appropriation should be increased so as to provide for a 70-group air force to consist of about 20,000 up-to-date planes.

It seems that rivalry between the different branches of the services has obscured the issues involved. Too many admirals and generals cannot see the woods for the trees.

I have always favored a well-rounded defense program. In this program proper consideration must be given to the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. Primarily we must have adequate manpower for our armed forces. We are not now getting that adequate manpower through the volunteer system and, for that reason, I am ready to support the draft of men from 18 to 25 years of age, and also universal military training to provide a reservoir of partly trained men in the event war comes.

But, Mr. Chairman, what is proper balance between the branches of our armed service? When we speak of balance, we should not approach the subject from the standpoint of desire to provide equal appropriations for each branch of the service. The best balanced defense force is that force which can best meet the challenge of potential enemies. There is only one powerful nation in the world today which could be considered a potential enemy on the battlefield in the immediate years to come.

That nation has unlimited manpower and an active army five times the size of ours. That nation is building 12 times as many war planes today as is our own country. That nation has no Navy to speak of, except submarines, in which field the United States is far outnumbered.

It would seem, therefore, that we should cut our pattern of defense to meet the danger confronting us. We have not an adequate air force now, and the first essential is to build one. A program to build and to keep up to date an Air Force of at least 20,000 planes in the face of world conditions today seems essential.

We have the atom bomb; Russia soon may have it. In any event, we must have an Air Force large enough and strong enough to protect this country and, if necessary, carry the fight to the enemy.

It seems stupid to me for admirals to talk about a 70-group air force unbalancing our defense system. The thing for this Congress to do, in my opinion, is to provide money for this 70-group force and then balance our Army and naval power on this basis. There was a day when manpower and fire power on land were the dominant factors in any war. Later on sea power came into its own. For centuries Great Britain dominated the sea lanes of the world with sea power. During World War II, our Navy was our first line of defense. In another war our first line of denfense will be our Air Force.

This is no time to allow petty jealousies to obscure the needs of the day. Neither time nor the national interest will permit neglect of the welfare of the Nation in order to preserve outmoded tradition

and the status of commanders who have eyes only for their own show.

I reiterate there is a place in our defense system for every branch of the service, and a proper place. We would be blind indeed, however, if we did not learn from the last war that in the next our first line of defense, as well as the first wave of offense, will be our Air Force.

I congratulate the Armed Services Committee on their unanimous backing of a 70-group air force.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I will vote for the pending amendment because it will provide the full measure of Air Force which our military experts have recommended for the national defedense of the United States in time of peace. I want to stress the fact that Secretary of Defense Forrestal, Secretary of the Air Forces Symington, and the Chief of Staff of the Air Forces General Spaatz have all assured the House Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, that the 70-group air force, which this amendment will underwrite, is designed to preserve peace and not to wage war. Secretary Symington, testifying before our committee this week in support of the 70-group program, made the following statement: "This is not a wartime program on any basis." The Chief of Staff, General Spaatz, in his testimony before the committee said:

> The 70-group program is a peacetime air force necessary to give us the proper air posture. This program gives us a basis for expansion in case of an emergency—a platform to build on.

I am convinced, Mr. Chairman, that if America had possessed a 70-group air force of the kind which is here contemplated, together with the atomic bomb, at the time when the dastardly sneak attack was made on Pearl Harbor, we could have knocked Japan out of the war within a very brief time. I am further convinced that if Japan had known that we had such an air force and such a weapon she would not have made any attack upon us. I believe that the knowledge of American air strength will deter any nation from waging war upon us in the future.

So, Mr. Chairman, I regard this vote as a vote for the preservation of peace and for the prevention of war.

To those who contend that any measure for the adequate military defense of this Nation is a gesture toward war, I can only reply that to leave ourselves defenseless while every other nation in the world is arming at a feverish pace would be the equivalent of national suicide. We know that the Russians are building, as fast as they can, what they hope will be the greatest air force in the world. Secretary Symington has stated that even if we get the 70-group air force Russia's air strength will be many times greater than ours. However, our military advisers are confident that with adequate peacetime defensive strength in the air, America will not be in danger of attack from Russia or any other nation.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, I favor the Taber amendment. It is not advisable at this time to overlook the weighty testimony and findings in support of a 70-group air force program.

Scientific skill and technical advancement equal to that of any nation in the world, with a superior ability to use them, is unquestionably a formula for peace.

How cheaply we can purchase peace, no one knows. The development of first-line aircraft is expensive and requires constant research and improvement. Looking forward, however, in the unlimited field of aerial possibilities, we would not be realistic if we failed to keep old weapons ready, manned and in a position to defend our country.

A balanced air force includes a strong and effective naval air arm. We have not progressed to the point that the aircraft carrier is outmoded. It can be truthfully said, I believe, that it is one of the strongest components of our defense program. The strength and further development of the naval air arm complements the program of the United States Air Forces. The roles and missions of the naval air arm are unique, and in ability to accomplish its mission, it is unequalled in the world.

Our present weapons have not become obsolete as rapidly as we feared. Rockets that can be shot around the world are not presently imminent, so we must still concern ourselves with aircraft of known use. Until airplanes have been developed that can fly very swiftly with tons of bombs 10,000 miles or more, we must rely upon land bases and carriers sufficiently close to the target to permit operations in force against the enemy.

As we look to the future, Mr. Chairman, we must not be unmindful of the present, for upon a realistic use of present strength may depend what is to come.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this appropriation to supplement our national defense. In view of recent events, the turmoil, and uncertainties that have been increasing over a period of time makes it imperative that we provide and maintain an adequate preparedness program to meet any emergency.

I am intensely interested in the amendment offered by the chairman of the committee for the increase of funds over that reported by the committee for our Air Force. It think it is highly appropriate that this action be taken to increase our Air Force to the required and authorized strength of 70 groups. In fact, I have advocated this for months, Mr. Chairman, and it is unfortunate there has been some controversy in high places of our Government that has delayed this program.

This amendment would increase the authorization for the procurement of aircraft contracts, and so forth, to the extent of $1,687,000,000. This money and authorization will be available until June 30, 1950, and it assures our Air Force that we will proceed immediately with this expansion program for our national security and well-being.

There is no opposition now to the bill as was reported, and the only question involved is, are we going to supply this additional authorization and funds to give us required strength. This will do it, and I am glad to see the Committee come to this resolution, which I believe will have the complete support and backing of the people throughout the United States.

I was horrified and very much discouraged when I was in Germany last fall and advised by our military authorities that they had instructions to reduce the air force there from 25,000 by July 1 this year to 10,000. Conditions now are much more acute than they were then and such action on our part is wholly indefensible. It is gratifying to know that policy has changed and additional air strength is being provided for our occupation forces. The fleet that has just been sent to Berlin and Frankfurt will in my opinion have a tremendous influence on the constant threat of the Communist aggression.

Only yesterday, Mr. Chairman, did the chief publicity agent for the Communists in Berlin say that the Marshall aid and the strengthening of our forces meant war. This to me means that Russia intends to press her aggression even if it means war. They have their program well planned and it is their policy to continue to absorb nations making them their satellites and if such a program as we have provided and are providing interferes that they will go to war if necessary to accomplish their objectives.

Only today is it reported that 100 Stalin tanks have been sent to Berlin. This obviously is to enforce their present method and the only way that it can be met is by the program provided in this legislation.

I cannot urge too strongly the adoption of this amendment increasing the funds for our Air Force and passing the legislation as expeditiously as possible in order that this program may continue to get under way.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] for an increase in the size of our Air Force.

Until we have an effectively organized world with a functioning police force, we must be strong enough to insure our national self-preservation.

At the same time we must not fall into the grave danger of relying on military might to insure the future. We should accelerate our efforts to revitalize and reorganize the United Nations to give it the power with which to meet future threats to peace.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GORE) there were—ayes 40, noes 74.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 115, noes 0.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POWELL: On page 2, line 25, insert "*Provided further,* That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used in the branches of the Department of the Air Force in which there exists racial segregation."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this amendment is not germane and it is, therefore, not in order on this bill; that it is legislation on an appropriation bill; that imposes additional burdens and restrictions that are entirely out of place.

This is an aircraft procurement bill. This is not a labor bill. I submit that the amendment is out of order from practically every standpoint.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. POWELL. Yes, Mr. Chairman. This is an amendment which has limitations; it is negative; it is the type that has been ruled in order on previous appropriation bills.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from New York has offered an amendment against which the gentleman from Mississippi has made a point of order. The Chair is constrained to rule that the amendment is germane and is in order and consequently overrules the point of order.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I just voted for the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee. I have just voted for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, which was passed. I did this because I believe that this bill before us is a defensive measure and, as a loyal American citizen, I would support any measure aimed at defending our borders. I believe that with the passage of this bill as amended all arguments for UMT or selective service will not be needed. This establishes our Nation now with 22,000 first-line planes, and I do not see the need of the draft or the UMT in such a situation. However, I serve notice now that I will vote against this bill and any bill in connection with our armed services which does not include definite and specific language abolishing Jim Crow of all types.

I do, however, believe that it is time, because this is a "dire emergency," as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has pointed out, to close ranks, and I am offering this amendment to the bill because this amendment will close ranks. If it is passed, I will support the bill. I have a cable from an outstanding Republican, probably the outstanding Negro Republican, Joe Louis. Joe Louis in his cable, printed in April 10 Afro-American, says:

It is time that we veterans who suffered the humiliation of Jim Crow trains, Jim Crow restaurants, Jim Crow railroad stations, Jim Crow Army barracks, and even Jim Crow telephone booths, rise in every corner of the land and say, "This shall not happen to our younger brothers."

It is time for all colored citizens—parents, sisters, wives, and the men in danger of being drafted—to let Congress, the Nation, and the world know in unmistakable terms that they will not accept this would-be permanent curse.

This is from an outstanding Republican, an outstanding citizen of our land.

May I also point out that I have correspondence from the Navy which came to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, in which the Navy, over the signature of its Judge Advocate General, Rear Admiral Colclough, said they had no objection to such an amendment as I am now proposing. The Navy Department interposes no objection to the enactment of the bill H. R. 279, now H. R. 4952, which is my bill, and which is the exact language of this amendment, that is, complete abolition of segregation in the armed forces. The Navy supports this amendment.

I have a letter which was also sent to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] over the signature of the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, E. H. Foley, Jr., also saying that the Treasury has no objection to the enactment of H. R. 279, now H. R. 4952, which is the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I bring this before you as an American citizen who wants to see our ranks closed now, in peacetime. We did this during wartime. We had ships in our service during wartime, in the Coast Guard, in the Navy, and in the merchant marine with mixed crews. Why not do it now, before war comes, so we will be prepared at home?

American democracy practiced at home is the first line of defense. Planes, guns, and ships come next. Unless those planes, guns, and ships are manned in accordance with the democratic spirit of our Constitution and Bill of Rights, they will not be the type of weapon that will successfully bring our Nation to the pinnacle of victory.

I make no excuse, when I present this amendment, for the patriotism of my people, the Negro people. Back in the beginning of this Republic, the first blood that was shed that America might be free was shed on March 5, 1773, on Boston Common by a black man, Prispus Attucks. From the days of then until the days of now Negro people have been the most loyal minority in this democracy. The Negro people will stand ready at all times to defend this Nation, but they are saying, "We want some of the democracy here now at home that you are trying to sell abroad to other people and that you ask us to go ahead and fight for. We have proven our loyalty. We are asking for democracy now."

I ask you to support this amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not in the interest of the Negroes of the country. It would only tend to stir up friction, and at the same time it would embarrass and handicap the Air Force in carrying out the program we are trying to provide.

If you are going to try to inject this kind of amendment into your appropriations, the next one will probably go further and further and further. Are you going to cripple our Air Force in order to carry out the demagoguery of somebody who does not have any interest at all in the masses of the Negro people of the country?

Go down South where I live, where more Negroes are employed than anywhere else in the country, where they enjoy more happiness, more peace, more prosperity, more security and protection than they have ever enjoyed in all history. They are not asking for this amendment.

Do you want us to cripple our Air Force in order to gratify some Negro politician?

If you adopt this amendment you will cripple our Air Force at a time when it will do our country the most harm and the Negroes the least good.

So I submit that this amendment be voted down—unanimously.

ABOLISH RACIAL SEGREGATION IN THE AIR FORCES

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York, Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, to terminate by congressional mandate the practice of racial discrimination and segregation of Jim Crow in the Air Force of the United States.

The policy now in force of segregation and discrimination for reasons of race or for any reason whatsoever is repugnant to our basic democratic principles.

The policy of Jim Crow is unfair, in that it withholds equality of opportunity and advantage from the Negro people who must nevertheless share equally in the cost of all activities and branches of Government on a share and share alike basis. In other words, a policy of discrimination in any activity supported out of general taxes in effect forces that portion of the taxpayers to foot the bill for discrimination against themselves.

A policy of discrimination and segregation is uneconomical. It deprives any enterprise upon which we may launch of the full and unlimited use of all the skills and talents which are available.

Obviously, the best results in any enterprise will be obtained if eligibility is determined solely on the bases of citizenship and qualification. It is clear, furthermore, that any system of selection of manpower by quota defeats itself in the light of this fact.

I am cognizant of the often-advanced theory—heard most recently in the hearings on universal military training—that legislation is the wrong way to advance the cause of integration of our society in any of its endeavors. Education and evolution will bring about the necessary changes, the proponents of this theory say.

This theory is inadequate in general; it is particularly inadequate when applied to the practices of our armed forces.

We have only to witness the recent dispute between the State of New Jersey and the War Department on the subject of segregation and discrimination to be assured that, without legislation, the Army will not relinquish its tradition of race discrimination.

The State of New Jersey by legislative action abolished segregation in its

State guard units. The War Department demanded that standard Army practices of segregation prevail. The State of New Jersey eventually won the argument, and segregation has ended in the armed forces mobilized by that State. But it was over the objections of the Army and not with the Army's cooperation.

This legislative safeguard must be included in order to insure the rights of all eligible citizens that they will not be denied equal opportunity and civil rights in a branch of our Nation's defenses in which they may be required to sacrifice their very lives in defense of democratic principles—which still include, I am sure, our hopes for equal rights and opportunities for all.

I am going to oppose this bill and all other bills providing for military appropriations until Jim Crow is ended—until bias and bigotry and discrimination are wiped from the face of America.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]. It is a matter of simple justice to abolish segregation in all the branches of the armed forces.

We should be especially mindful of the Negro soldier, remembering that he fought and shed his blood for a freedom which he has not as yet been permitted fully to share. He made his contribution in World War II as he has in every other war in which we, a free people, have fought. It should never be forgotten that Negro heroes in that war achieved their proud records under handicaps that did not have to be overcome by most of their white fellow citizens. To ask them again to bear arms in the face of continued discrimination would add to those handicaps and go beyond the bounds of common decency.

It is always my fervent hope that we will have the wisdom to look upon citizens as citizens, and soldiers as soldiers—neither white nor black nor yellow—but simply as citizens of a working democracy and a world community.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York has kindly loaned me this cable from Joe Louis. I read the first sentence:

> It is time that we veterans who suffered the humiliation of Jim Crow trains, Jim Crow restaurants, Jim Crow railroad stations, Jim Crow Army barracks, and even Jim Crow telephone booths, rise in every corner of the land and say "That shall not happen to our younger brothers."

But I understood from the gentleman's remarks that during the war there had been little if any discrimination. Perhaps I am mistaken.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. POWELL. In the Coast Guard none; in the merchant marine none; and in the Navy some.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Some, but very little?

Mr. POWELL. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. So the situation has been gradually growing better. My point was that I would like to advise you—or inform you, perhaps is the better word—that if Joe Louis would stay home where he belongs, and I have always admired Joe Louis, I think he is a fine outstanding—that is I thought he was a fine outstanding—American citizen. I never heard anything against him until this recent love-balm suit or whatever it may be. He has been known as a sober, churchgoing American, a credit to his race and our Nation. Joe Louis spends his summers and is going to do his training in Bloomingdale, Van Buren County, Mich., which is in my own district, so I am happy to tell you that I am a fellow citizen of Joe Louis. If he would quit wandering around in Europe and elsewhere he would be treated all right. He was never discriminated against in the Fourth Congressional District in Michigan. We have a law in Michigan which makes open to all on equal terms our transportation facilities—we do not have any Jim Crow cars, do we? You know that. You have traveled in my territory from Chicago to Detroit, I will say to the gentleman from New York. They all, regardless of race or color or religion, go in where they like. I know this, that the last time I came down from Kalamazoo to Detroit on the Century I noticed that, although I got in ahead of two Negro gentlemen and a Negro lady with a little girl, I was served after they were. The discrimination was against me. I did not care anything about it, made no protest, did not feel hurt, it amused me somewhat to see the colored waiters forget "first come, first served." And then when I went back to my seat in the car, being a little ill and having some little stomach disorder after the meal, I went in there, and right ahead of me was a bowler, a colored gentleman who was going down to New York to bowl in a tournament. The gentleman was smoking. I said to him, "Do you see that no-smoking sign?" He said, "I do not like your criticism. I do not like your talk, your tone." I said, "I apologize for the tone." I said, "I do not like your cigarette smoke." Then I said, "You see that sign?" And then I told him, "I cannot understand just why you are all the time yelling about discrimination and then when you get into this car, into this pullman with the rest of us, everything is all right and everything is nice but you are the only fellow in the car who is smoking, who is violating the rule." There was a smoking room in the car. No doubt the case was exceptional—but there it was—a clear case of discrimination by the one gentleman against all the rest of the occupants of the car. So if you will come to Michigan into the Fourth Congressional District and make your home there you will be happy there and I will welcome you providing you do not run against me for office, because I do not want you to do that. If you will come up there you will be treated just the same as the rest of our folks, there is no discrimination. I repeat, my advice to Joe is to come home to western Michigan and he will see no discrimination. The truth is you will find there has never been discrimination there—in the Fourth District—none at all in Michigan and very little in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 14, noes 103.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

BUREAU OF AERONAUTICS

Construction of aircraft and related procurement

For new construction and procurement of aircraft and equipment, spare parts and accessories therefore, including expansion of public plants, and government-owned equipment and installation thereof in public or private plants, and for the employment of group IVb personnel in the Bureau of Aeronautics necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, to remain available until expended, $315,000,000, of which $150,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes; and in addition, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized, until June 30, 1949, to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed $588,000,000: *Provided*, That the unexpended balances of the appropriations of $310,000,000 and $90,000,000 which were made available until expended for the foregoing purposes by the Navy Department Appropriation Act, 1947, and the Navy Department Appropriation Act, 1948, respectively, shall be consolidated with this appropriation, to be disbursed and accounted for as one fund: *Provided further*, That any obligation incurred hereunder shall be subject to the general provisions of the Navy Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year in which such obligation is incurred.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota.

On page 4, after line 1, insert:

"SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of Defense shall report to the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services of the Congress not later than June 30, 1948, and quarterly thereafter, the amounts obligated under the contract authorizations provided for in this act and such reports shall include a statement of finding by the President that the contracts let are necessary in the interests of the national defense and that the contract specifications insure the maximum utilization of improvements in aircraft and equipment consistent with the defense needs of the United States.

"(b) All contracts entered into under this act shall include a clause providing for final settlement in accord with the provisions of the Renegotiation Act as it was in effect July 1, 1945."

And in line 2 strike out "Section 2" and insert in lieu thereof "Section 3."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, this amendment may be called a committee amendment. It has been approved by members of the Deficiency Subcommittee, and is the amendment for which the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] obtained consent yesterday that it might be in order on this appropriation bill.

The amendment does three things. First, it requires that the Secretary of Defense shall make quarterly reports

upon the progress of letting contracts under the authorizations created by this act.

The second thing is to require that these reports shall include a statement of finding by the President that the contracts let are necessary in the interest of the national defense, and—this latter part is more significant—that the contract specifications insure the maximum utilization of improvements in aircraft and equipment consistent with the defense needs of the United States. At that point I want to inject just this comment:

In our aircraft procurement, probably more than in any other phase of national defense procurement, it is important that we get the latest gadget on the machine when it rolls off at the time we need it. We do not want to be building some flying coffins and get loaded up with them. We want to be sure that we have the very latest thing at the time of maximum need. The language here is designed to insure that that point is kept in mind in the timing and specifications, so that the maximum utilization of improvements in aircraft and equipment will be made, consistent with the probable defense needs of the United States at time of delivery.

The third part of the amendment provides that all contracts entered into under this act shall include a clause providing for final settlement in accord with the provisions of the Renegotiation Act as it was in effect July 1, 1945.

At that point today I merely wish to say that this gives us the benefit of the renegotiation procedure, as worked out in the experience of World War II. The final amendment to the Renegotiation Act was in effect on July 1, 1945, the date cited in this amendment, which, in effect, picks up the provisions of that act.

As I indicated yesterday, with the prospect of entering upon the large program which will be involved in effectuating a modern 70-group airplane program, it seemed to me that we should have the benefit of the renegotiation procedure which was initiated by an amendment which I offered to the sixth supplemental defense bill in the spring of 1942. The members of the subcommittee all heartily agreed. And this morning the chairman of the committee received a letter from Secretary of the Air Force Symington which said, in part:

> Thanks for the wise move we understand you made with respect to installation of a renegotiation clause. * * * We believe * * * your action will result in millions of dollars being saved for the Government.

In the final wind-up following World War II, I might say that former Secretary of War Patterson estimated that over $10,000,000,000 was recovered or saved through the renegotiation procedure and more than that in forward pricing. We are hoping by this amendment to take advantage of that procedure again in this large program of procurement which is being launched.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides vast sums for aircraft procurement for the Air Corps and for the Navy. I am in complete accord with that program. I want to see it carried out promptly in order to realize the establishment of the 70-group air force. I want to call the attention of the Congress to a situation that is developing, that I hope the proper departments of government can take cognizance of today, that is a very vital and necessary component and essential in connection with any over-all national defense program.

I have caused to be placed in the lobby out here an exhibit relating to the production and processing of hemp and hemp fiber. You may think that is of little importance, but let me call your attention to the fact that when we got into this last war we suddenly discovered that due to the interception and intervention of the German submarine the normal supply of foreign fibers that produced the cordage so necessary for our national defense program was cut off. The possible threat of a similar situation prompts me to make this statement.

I rise to discuss the need for a support-price program for American hemp.

Hemp is an annual crop that can be grown successfully in many sections of the United States for the production of fiber. The fiber is obtained from the stalks of the plant.

It is the only proven cordage fiber that has been produced on a large scale in continental United States. Prior to the Civil War it was our principal cordage fiber and all rope was made from hemp. In the 1850's the tropical fibers, abaca, sisal, hennequen, and jute, which could be imported more cheaply, began to supplant hemp. From 1860 on hemp production declined rapidly and from then to about 1915 all hemp grown in the United States was produced in Kentucky. In 1915 hemp growing shifted largely to Wisconsin.

In each of three recent wars in which the United States engaged, the planting of hemp expanded to meet our needs for fiber. Hemp-fiber was in demand during the Spanish-American War and played an important role in World War I. This war was chiefly responsible for the development of the hemp mill and the moving of the industry to Wisconsin, where conditions were favorable to the use of mills. German raiders greatly interfered with our normal supply of tropical fibers and we turned to hemp to augment the reduced supply of hard fiber.

In spite of the vital service this industry rendered in the First World War, it was forgotten soon after the armistice and allowed to wither and nearly die.

Fortunately for America a few patriotic and farsighted men kept the spark alive in Wisconsin, maintaining five small mills. They did so practically without profit to themselves. They were barren years, but the skills necessary to the production and processing of hemp were kept alive.

When America was plunged into World War II we again faced a critical shortage of the fibers which are so essential to our national economy and our national security.

In December of 1941 Germany had overrun all of Europe and Japan appeared likely to cut off our supply of fiber from India and the South Pacific.

It immediately became apparent that our policy of neglect with respect to the hemp industry has been short-sighted and we were facing a serious shortage of fibers needed to wage a global war.

The Government turned to the operators of the mills in Wisconsin for help in a desperate hour of need.

Government engineers went into these plants and made drawings of the special equipment needed to process hemp. They enlisted the aid of the men who had retained the know-how of growing the plant, treating the stalks after the harvest, removing the precious fiber from the stems, and processing it into the rope, twine, yarns, and threads so vitally needed by our armed forces.

The operators gave freely of their knowledge and skills and rallied the farmers of the area to grow hemp and more hemp.

The Government ordered the immediate construction of an additional 42 hemp-processing plants. Crops were grown in Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, and Minnesota.

In 1939 less than 3,000 acres of hemp was being raised. By 1943 a total of 185,000 acres were planted to hemp.

It was never possible during the years the Government hemp program was operating to meet War Production Board directives as to the amount of hemp that should be produced.

It took two full years to get into production on a sizable scale.

Had it not been for the small industry operating in Wisconsin the situation would have been much more difficult if not impossible of achievement.

When the emergency ended Government interest in the product again lapsed.

The 42 plants were declared surplus and 32 have been sold to private users for repair shops, laundries, and warehouses. Only one of the plants sold is now being used for the processing of hemp.

The vast surplus of fiber built up in accordance with War Production Board directives was dumped after the war into commercial channels where it became a glut on the market and a serious threat to the very existence of the original hemp companies that had come to the assistance of the Government so loyally during the war.

Commodity Credit Corporation turned the fiber over to the former customers of the hemp mills. Some of the spinners purchased the fiber in such great quantities at prices so far below the cost of production that they are now sellers instead of buyers.

The market for fiber now being produced in the original companies in my district in Wisconsin has virtually disappeared. Farmers have become hesitant about further plantings and the plant operators are faced with bankruptcy.

The operators of these companies are now pleading with the Department of Agriculture to do something to save the industry. They believe that so long as other crops are given support prices that this industry, because of its importance in times of emergency, merits support.

In addition to being a valuable product in times of war, hemp is an excellent crop for the farmers, especially in the dairy State of Wisconsin. Hemp does not exhaust the soil and is one of the best crops for smothering weeds. Hemp provides the kind of diversion that is needed to balance the profitable operation of a dairy farm.

The farmers who have participated in this hemp program are definitely of the opinion that hemp to them is just as essential as other crops now covered by the agricultural support program instituted in 1943.

The mills are operated on a cooperative plan but are not cooperative in law. The mills are valuable to the communities in which they are located in that they afford winter work for a considerable number of persons in localities where such winter work is often scarce. The period of operation is from November to late spring, making available a supply of farm labor during the season when in greatest demand.

From 1942 to 1945 Commodity Credit Corporation was the principal purchaser of hemp fiber at support prices established by Commodity. In 1946 there was a support price for the fiber but the industry was able to sell at better prices than the support price and no fiber was sold to the Government. The support prices established by Commodity Credit Corporation were as follows:

Line: Prime 28 cents; grade I, 25 cents; grade II, 22 cents; grade III, 18 cents; grade IV, 12 cents.

Tow: Grade I, 12 cents; grade II, 10½ cents; and grade III, 6½ cents.

The Hemp Producers Association has requested that a price-support program be established for American hemp grown in 1948 and milled in 1948–49, at mills operated in 1947. In view of the increased cost of growing and milling help, the association believes higher support prices are warranted on the 1948 crop. They suggest the following:

Line: Prime, 29 cents; grade I, 27 cents; grade II, 25 cents; grade III, 22 cents; grade IV, 15 cents.

Tow: Grade I, 14 cents; grade II, 12 cents; and grade III, 8 cents.

In requesting that a floor price be placed on domestic fiber for 1948, the producers are not asking for an indefinite program. They believe that the importance of the industry to national security justifies support but they also feel that experiments being conducted in the degumming of hemp fiber, so that it can be used in textiles, will soon enable the industry to compete in the domestic bast fiber market without benefit of a support price.

In these experiments hemp fibers are being mixed with synthetic fibers such as rayon to give cloth now made from these fibers greater strength, better wearing quality, and less shrinkage. Textile men are now referring to hemp as the "wonder fiber."

But regardless of these bright prospects for hemp there are a number of important reasons why it is desirable that the Government take steps now to insure the maintenance of at least a small hemp industry in order to guarantee the United States' ability to increase production rapidly should it ever again become necessary.

We all know that the international outlook is alarming. In the event of the United States becoming involved in another war it would very probably be necessary to again produce cordage fibers within the United States in order to have an assured supply of long fiber for rope.

India now supplies about 98 percent of our jute. That country is severing its ties with Great Britain and for months bitter civil strife raged in various parts of India. Civil war in India could seriously curtail our supply of jute. Loss of our source of jute would probably make necessary an increase in the production of hemp.

The gentleman from Wisconsin is in complete accord with the position taken by the hemp growers and processors. The importance of the industry has been proven in the last two wars. With foreign relations as strained as they are, we believe it would be good policy to classify hemp as a critical material. The Government is stock piling fibers that are imported for emergency use. Why should not hemp, grown in our own country, be included in such a program so that our farmers could have this benefit. A stock-piling and support-price program could be coordinated so that all fiber which the domestic program could not use could be stock piled for emergency use.

Mr. Chairman, I have arranged to have a case of hemp and hemp products placed on display in the Speaker's lobby. I hope that the Members will take the time to inspect this material.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much impressed by the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. My only purpose in rising is to suggest that the proper committees of this House give consideration to what he said and the suggestions he made. When the war began and we discovered that we needed to grow hemp in this country to provide rope for the Navy, because of the fact that the raw product from which rope is made could no longer be brought in because of the German submarines, the Government representatives came out to Iowa and established six or seven hemp plants in the Third Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent. The growing of hemp was an entirely new undertaking to us. These plants were built at an expense of over $300,000 apiece. The agents of the Government went to the farmers and sold them the idea as a patriotic thing that they should take some of their land out of corn and put it into hemp. They did, and we discovered that we could grow hemp there in accordance with the desires of the Navy Department. Now, when the submarine menace was ended, we found that these hemp plants could not compete with foreign products. Many people suggested that, as a war measure, if for no other reason, we should work out some kind of a program which would enable hemp to be produced in this country in time of peace, as well as in time of war. The college at Ames, Iowa, has carried on some experiments to demonstrate that if given the proper support by the Government the growing of hemp could be undertaken in many places in the Midwest. I regret to say that, unfortunately, we did not have too much cooperation from the proper agencies of the Government, and these hemp plants have been sold at a very low price of about $30,000 apiece, and hemp growing is out of the window during peacetime. With the situation existing as it now exists, with the threat of another submarine warfare which might be more effective against our shipping than anything we have encountered heretofore, I suggest that the proper committees should now consider the advisability of a program which will enable the hemp production in this country to survive in times of peace.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Would the gentleman go so far, in addition to what he has said, and emphasize the necessity of our getting into this country from the Philippines high-quality fiber so that good rope for American agriculture plus our defense forces could be obtained?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I am not familiar with that, I may say. All I know is that we had difficulty in getting any kind of fiber from any place on account of the submarines. Therefore, during the war we had to produce hemp ourselves.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I know the gentleman is from a great agricultural State, Iowa, and represents a very distinguished district of farmers. You cannot get rope that is worth carrying home unless it is made of the strong fibers from the Philippine Islands. You can buy a piece of rope, but when you put a 1,500-pound steer or a 1,500-pound horse on the other end of a cheap rope you do not have a rope worth throwing toward the animal.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. That may all be true; may I say to the gentleman, nevertheless, when we could not get that kind of rope the Navy was glad to get rope made of hemp grown in the Midwest.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is the reason I say, in addition to what the gentleman said, let us not become dependent, because we will take care of the Philippines,

whether war or peace, and we might just as well let them produce some raw material and ship it to the United States.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman fom Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE] have just called our attention to a wartime substitute for the fiber which we have formerly imported from the tropics. In the Speaker's lobby, I have just examined the interesting and instructive display of hemp and the fiber processed therefrom under the program which was adopted during the recent war. It seems a shame that so much money was invested during the war in these processing plants which afterward sold for so little. It is another illustration of the wastefulness of war. However, we must have such fiber, and if it is no longer to be gotten from abroad, then we must—as in time of war—provide it at home, even at great expense. I have asked for this time that I may call to the attention of my colleagues another fiber possibility which we used slightly in wartime and which we may again want to use either in peace or in war.

I am thinking now of yucca fiber. Most of this is a hard strong fiber obtained from the leaves of the yucca plant, especially that known as Spanish bayonet, which grows over a vast area in the Southwest. There are various kinds of yucca, and one known as beargrass produces a soft fiber very much like the fiber used in making burlap. Since I became Congressman from Arizona, I have asked the Bureau of Standards to give us tests and measurements on rope, cord, twine, and the like made from both hard fiber and soft fiber obtained from desert vegetation. These tests were found to be remarkably good in comparison. Therefore, I cannot feel that anyone may properly speak of such fiber as inferior in quality or strength. There is no question about the utility of the fiber, nor is there any question about the usable quantity which may be obtained. The chief question is about the processing of it.

During the First World War, large quantities of yucca foliage were harvested from the desert areas of Arizona and shipped to East St. Louis for processing. So great was the need at that time, with foreign supplies shut off, that the high cost did not prevent the processing of this fiber. The method used for decortication was rather crude, and left much to be desired, but it did enable a considerable production to be had during the First World War. However, when the war was over and something like normal trade was resumed, the imported article could be obtained at much less cost than this home-made article. During the Second World War, certain men attempted to promote this industry, basing it on improved machinery and processes; however, very little was done in spite of the serious need. One inventor claims that he now has a cheap and effective method to process yucca leaves in mass production on what amounts to an assembly-line basis, and can produce it as cheaply as the foreign article can be had even in peacetime. I am not prepared to vouch for the accuracy of this claim, but I am inclined to give it credence. If it is true, the Nation's need for fiber for almost all industrial uses, including agricultural uses, may be taken from the desert areas of Arizona, California, New Mexico, Nevada, and Texas.

Since only the foliage of the yucca plant is used, and the plant itself is not cut or harmed, and since the foliage reproduces itself at short intervals, the yucca leaves can be harvested from a given area on a sustained-yield basis. This would make possible the location of processing plants in the center of a sufficiently large area to furnish the raw material on that basis.

The yucca plant is a very remarkable desert growth. It has mighty little utility for livestock men, but it has a variety of uses for supplying human needs. At the present moment we think of fiber as being the chief product, but there are several known byproducts which might ultimately become more valuable than the main product. The fiber has a great variety of uses, such as in rope, binder twine, cordage, and the like, but it has even more uses for packing, padding, and upholstering, to say nothing of being woven into fabric. It is thought that the soft fiber of the beargrass might be used for burlap for certain use in the manufacture of rugs and linoleum, and certainly for the use of bags and such containers. This is all dependent upon man's ingenuity and inventive ability to extract the fiber by machinery in mass production in a labor-saving way. Whether this great need is to be supplied from this new industry from the desert areas of the Southwest ought to be a matter of easy answer. I am glad to call it to the attention of the House today as a significant possibility at this critical time of shortage.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I had little expectation that I would ever take the floor on this subject. I refer to the new balcony at the White House. I speak at the suggestion of a number of citizens and constituents who have visited Washington this spring, during the last 2 months, and all Republicans. I assume that all of you likewise have constituents who visit here, and they all seem to want to see the White House from the rear so they can see the balcony, of which they have heard so much.

It was the unanimous opinion of my friends, and I join with them now that the balcony is finished, that it is a fine job. One of these constituents was an architect. I think without any question it improves the general appearance of the White House from the south. It adds to the picture. It fills out a certain vacuum that was there with the columns alone. Furthermore, I understand it will save something through the years in money in the purchase of awnings, in view of the fact it will give some shade to the ground floor below.

I am very happy to make this little statement today on behalf the President's so-called project and compliment him on his good judgment in the architectural design approved and the nerve to go ahead and have the balcony built.

I am very glad to have this opportunity, on behalf of those of my constituents who were here, all Republicans, to say that we thoroughly approve it. As they said, "What a mountain they made out of a molehill."

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. This act may be cited as the "Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1948."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. O'HARA, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6226) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. KERR. I am opposed to some features of it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. The gentleman says that he is opposed to some features of the bill. My understanding of the rules is that the gentleman must be opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has stated that he is opposed to some features of the bill, and the Chair must interpret that to mean that he is opposed to the bill.

The gentleman from North Carolina qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KERR moves that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 343, nays 3, not voting 84, as follows:

[Roll No. 45]

YEAS—343

Abbitt	Donohue	Kearney
Abernethy	Dorn	Kearns
Albert	Doughton	Keating
Allen, Calif.	Douglas	Kee
Allen, Ill.	Durham	Keefe
Allen, La.	Ellis	Kelley
Almond	Ellsworth	Kennedy
Andersen, H. Carl	Elsaesser	Kerr
	Elston	Kilburn
Anderson, Calif.	Engel, Mich.	Kilday
Andresen, August H.	Engle, Calif.	King
	Fallon	Kirwan
Andrews, Ala.	Fellows	Klein
Andrews, N. Y.	Fenton	Knutson
Angell	Fernandez	Kunkel
Arends	Fisher	Landis
Arnold	Fletcher	Lane
Auchincloss	Fogarty	Lanham
Banta	Folger	Latham
Barden	Foote	Lea
Barrett	Forand	LeCompte
Bates, Ky.	Fuller	LeFevre
Bates, Mass.	Fulton	Lemke
Beall	Gamble	Lesinski
Beckworth	Garmatz	Lewis
Bender	Gary	Lichtenwalter
Bennett, Mich.	Gathings	Lodge
Bennett, Mo.	Gavin	Love
Blackney	Gearhart	Lucas
Bland	Gillette	Ludlow
Blatnik	Goff	Lyle
Bloom	Goodwin	Lynch
Boggs, Del.	Gore	McConnell
Bonner	Gossett	McCormack
Bradley	Graham	McCowen
Bramblett	Granger	McCulloch
Brehm	Grant, Ala.	McDonough
Brooks	Grant, Ind.	McDowell
Brophy	Gregory	McGarvey
Brown, Ga.	Griffiths	McGregor
Brown, Ohio	Gwinn, N. Y.	McMahon
Bryson	Gwynne, Iowa	McMillan, S. C.
Buchanan	Hagen	MacKinnon
Buck	Hale	Mack
Buffett	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Madden
Burke		Mahon
Burleson	Hall, Leonard W.	Maloney
Busbey		Martin, Iowa
Butler	Halleck	Mason
Byrnes, Wis.	Hand	Mathews
Camp	Hardy	Meade, Ky.
Canfield	Harness, Ind.	Meade, Md.
Cannon	Hart	Merrow
Carson	Harvey	Meyer
Case, N. J.	Havenner	Michener
Case, S. Dak.	Hays	Miller, Calif.
Celler	Hébert	Miller, Conn.
Chadwick	Hedrick	Miller, Md.
Chapman	Hendricks	Mills
Chelf	Herter	Mitchell
Chenoweth	Heselton	Monroney
Church	Hess	Morris
Clason	Hill	Morrison
Clevenger	Hinshaw	Muhlenberg
Clippinger	Hobbs	Multer
Coffin	Hoeven	Mundt
Cole, Kans.	Hoffman	Murdock
Cole, Mo.	Holmes	Murray, Tenn.
Combs	Hope	Murray, Wis.
Cooley	Horan	Nicholson
Cooper	Huber	Nixon
Corbett	Hull	Nodar
Cotton	Jackson, Wash.	Norblad
Coudert	Jenison	Norton
Courtney	Jenkins, Pa.	O'Brien
Cravens	Jennings	O'Hara
Crawford	Jensen	Owens
Crosser	Johnson, Calif.	Pace
Curtis	Johnson, Ill.	Passman
Dague	Johnson, Ind.	Patman
Davis, Ga.	Johnson, Okla.	Patterson
Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Tex.	Peden
Davis, Wis.	Jones, Ala.	Peterson
Dawson, Utah	Jones, N. C.	Philbin
Deane	Jones, Wash.	Phillips, Calif.
D'Ewart	Jonkman	Phillips, Tenn.
Dolliver	Judd	Pickett
Domengeaux	Karsten, Mo.	Poage
Dondero	Kean	Potter
Potts	Sasscer	Thomas, N. J.
Poulson	Schwabe, Mo.	Thomas, Tex.
Preston	Schwabe, Okla.	Tibbott
Ramey	Scoblick	Tollefson
Rankin	Scrivner	Towe
Rayburn	Seely-Brown	Trimble
Redden	Shafer	Van Zandt
Reed, N. Y.	Sheppard	Vinson
Rees	Short	Vorys
Reeves	Simpson, Ill.	Vursell
Regan	Simpson, Pa.	Wadsworth
Rich	Smathers	Walter
Richards	Smith, Kans.	Welchel
Riley	Smith, Ohio	Welch
Rizley	Smith, Va.	Wheeler
Robertson	Smith, Wis.	Whittington
Rockwell	Snyder	Wigglesworth
Rogers, Fla.	Somers	Williams
Rogers, Mass.	Spence	Wilson, Ind.
Rohrbough	Stanley	Wilson, Tex.
Ross	Stefan	Winstead
Russell	Stevenson	Wolcott
Sabath	Stockman	Wolverton
Sadlak	Sundstrom	Wood
St. George	Taber	Woodruff
Sanborn	Talle	Youngblood
Sarbacher	Teague	

NAYS—3

Isacson	Marcantonio	Powell

NOT VOTING—84

Bakewell	Gallagher	O'Toole
Battle	Gillie	Pfeifer
Bell	Gordon	Ploeser
Bishop	Gorski	Plumley
Boggs, La.	Gross	Price, Fla.
Bolton	Harless, Ariz.	Price, Ill.
Boykin	Harris	Priest
Buckley	Harrison	Rains
Bulwinkle	Hartley	Reed, Ill.
Byrne, N. Y.	Heffernan	Riehlman
Carroll	Holifield	Rivers
Chiperfield	Jackson, Calif.	Rooney
Clark	Jarman	Sadowski
Cole, N. Y.	Javits	Scott, Hardie
Colmer	Jenkins, Ohio	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Cox	Kefauver	
Crow	Keogh	Sikes
Cunningham	Kersten, Wis.	Smith, Maine
Dawson, Ill.	Larcade	Stigler
Delaney	Lusk	Stratton
Devitt	McMillen, Ill.	Taylor
Dingell	Macy	Thompson
Dirksen	Manasco	Twyman
Eaton	Mansfield	Vail
Eberharter	Miller, Nebr.	West
Elliott	Morgan	Whitten
Evins	Morton	Worley
Feighan	Norrell	
Flannagan	O'Konski	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Cole of New York with Mr. Gordon.
Mr. Eaton with Mr. Gorski.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Price of Illinois.
Mr. Dirksen with Mr. Colmer.
Mr. McMillen of Illinois with Mr. Keogh.
Mr. Jenkins of Ohio with Mr. Carroll.
Mr. Hardie Scott with Mr. Boggs of Louisiana.
Mr. Macy with Mr. Larcade.
Mr. Jackson of California with Mr. Whitten.
Mr. Bakewell with Mr. Heffernan.
Mr. Chiperfield with Mr. Rains.
Mr. Crow with Mr. Stigler.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Harrison.
Mr. Miller of Nebraska with Mr. Richards.
Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Dingell.
Mrs. Smith of Maine with Mr. Cox.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Harris.
Mr. Riehlman with Mr. Rivers.
Mr. Ploeser with Mr. Byrne of New York.
Mr. Reed of Illinois with Mr. Delaney.
Mrs. Bolton with Mr. Sikes.
Mr. Cunningham with Mrs. Lusk.
Mr. Bishop with Mr. Mansfield.
Mr. Ross with Mr. Pfeifer.
Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., with Mr. Battle.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Morgan.
Mr. Devitt with Mr. Rooney.
Mr. Twyman with Mr. Eberharter.
Mr. Morton with Mr. Holifield.
Mr. Plumley with Mr. Feighan.
Mr. Vail with Mr. Evins.
Mr. Gillie with Mr. Manasco.
Mr. Gross with Mr. Harless of Arizona.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WE ARE ENTITLED TO KNOW

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been well said that 1948 is America's year of decision. In this year will be decided the question of leadership which may affect our national future in a vital measure. Leadership to be chosen this year may well determine whether the United States of America, as we now know it, will continue to live as a nation of free men.

With that somber thought before us, I urge attention of every Member of Congress, every Representative of a congressional district in each one of the sovereign States, to the need of knowing not only the candidate who seeks elevation to leadership, but the backers of each candidate, what motivates them, and him.

Today we are viewing the returns from the second of two State-wide Presidential preference primaries in which major candidates for the nomination of the Republican Party for President went before the people.

The first was that in Wisconsin on April 6. As you all know, Harold Stassen, former Governor of Minnesota, won 19 delegates to the Republican National Convention, and Gen. Douglas MacArthur 8. Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, third competing candidate, won no delegates.

Examination of that primary's figures reveals that a change of from two to five votes in each of the election precincts in the State would have changed the entire picture.

The Nebraska primary of April 13 shows that Stassen, competing in a seven-man primary race, polled approximately 43 percent of the total vote cast as against approximately 35 percent polled by the second high man, Governor Dewey, of New York. Approximately 22 percent of the vote was spread among the five other candidates—Senator Robert A. Taft of Ohio; Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg of Michigan; General MacArthur; Gov. Earl Warren of California, and Speaker Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts—in that order of finish.

In that 22 percent of the total vote cast for other than the first two candidates in the Nebraska voting is the vote which may determine which of the seven candidates is the real choice of the people of Nebraska. It could elect either.

In both primaries the most cogent observation made is that a well organized, smoothly functioning political organization, working down to the level of the precinct, produced the narrow margin of victory—a 5-percent switch would more than cover a change of top rating.

This evidence of the results of a well-organized machine's ability to win is particularly true of primary elections where a comparatively small portion of the vote at the general Presidential elections in November turn out. Obviously, the fewer the total number of voters, the more effective is the voting of the organized body of voters in the working force of a machine.

Only the naive will say that political machines are not expensive.

Headquarters must be established and manned.

Vast quantities of campaign literature must be printed and distributed.

Radio time must be scheduled—and paid for.

Newspaper advertising must be provided—and paid for.

Halls must be provided for meetings.

Transportation must be provided, and housing accommodations, for speakers and their staffs.

The more extensive the organized political campaign, the greater the amount of money which must be spent.

It is no political secret that some men and certain groups of men, for various reasons, some selfish, some good, some bad, intensely interested in the election of Government leaders, contribute, directly or indirectly, to the campaigns of both major political parties. Under this system, no matter which party wins, these individuals or groups see a man elevated with whom they have favorable contact.

Existing laws provide means by which the voting public may be informed of the amounts of money spent for candidates for national office by all parties in the general elections.

No law provides any means by which the voting public may be informed of the amounts of money spent by candidates seeking party nomination at primaries or at State conventions, at higher than State level. No publication is required under existing law of the amounts spent nationally by candidates seeking party nomination for the office of President, Vice President, or Presidential elector.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this question of financing of candidates for nomination to national or State office is something that every voter is entitled to know before that candidate is nominated. The financing of a candidate may well indicate the motivation of his backers.

Mr. Stassen, the winner in the Wisconsin and the Nebraska primaries, in each of which the smoothly functioning political machine backing Mr. Stassen has been a matter of press comment, has made a practice in his political meetings of opening up the closing periods of those meetings to questions from his audience.

I would like to ask Mr. Stassen, not from the floor of one of his meetings, but from this floor, a few pertinent, relevant questions. I hope that he will answer them as freely and as openly as he has answered other political questions during the last 2 years.

Question 1: In view of reports of the high cost of the Stassen campaign for Presidential nomination—some estimates ranging as high as $750,000—are you willing to state the aggregate amount made available to your campaign, and either spent or remaining available to be spent prior to the Republican National convention? You, or your headquarters, presumably know these amounts on both a national basis and on the basis of funds raised and used in your behalf by State organizations.

Question 2: Are you willing to name the contributors to your campaign funds, National or State, individual or group, whose contributions have exceeded $100? This figure is used because it is the figure on which treasurers of political committees are required to report to the Clerk of the House on contributions and expenditures in general elections.

Question 3: How many of the men active financially or politically in furthering your aspirations for the Republican Presidential nomination were active in the 1940 and 1944 campaigns of Wendell Willkie?

Question 4: How many financial contributors to your campaign for Presidential nomination are connected with international banking interests, or with the so-called big business groups, and with what groups?

I have heard reports, Mr. Speaker, that the aggregate of funds, contributed to National and State committees backing the Stassen campaign, may be as high as $750,000. I do not know that this is so, but if it should be as much as half of that amount I believe the voters of America should know it, and the names and business connection of those who provided the money.

There is no charge that it is illegal, or that it is wrong for individuals or groups seeking the election of a man they believe is a proper man, to provide that man with the necessary funds to put his qualifications before the voters.

But, Mr. Speaker, I contend that the same public accounting for contributions and expenditures for nominated candidates at general elections should also apply to the contributions and expenditures on behalf of candidates seeking nomination. The time for full publicity about backers and motivation is before two men are named by national conventions to go before the people. The time for publicity is not after nomination when the grass-roots voters may only make a choice between two.

Some members of the press, and some professional politicians, seem amazed at the strength shown by Mr. Stassen in Wisconsin and Nebraska. To those of us who are not politicians, there is nothing startling nor amazing in the result of the primary vote. While other candidates have been attending to their official duties, Mr. Stassen, footloose and fancy free, has been personally meeting the voters. To them he is a real individual. They have seen him; they have heard him; many of them have shaken his hand. They have listened to his pleasing generalities, and naturally, as every candidate for office knows, personal contact with the individual voter is the way to get his support. The people, however, are entitled to know just who, what interests, are back of Mr. Stassen. Some, before they vote for the selection of a Republican caindidate for the Presidency, would like to know whether he is an internationalist, whether the candidate thinks more of the interests of other countries than he does of those of our country. They would like to know whether he is supported by or is under obligation to so-called one-worlders or internationalists.

Mr. Stassen appears to be the kind of a young man who would not forget or ignore his friends and supporters. Everyone realizes that friendship creates obligations. Everyone knows that a man is influenced by those who assist him. And because Mr. Stassen—should he win the Presidential nomination and election—will undoubtedly be influenced by those who contribute to his campaign, either financially or in other ways, because he will undoubtedly surround himself, as do all successful candidates, with those who assisted him, the people, as a matter of right and fairness, should be advised by Stassen of the answers to the questions which are here most respectfully submitted.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Maj. Gen. Ulysses S. Grant, III.

Mr. CROSSER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of a world government.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts.

Mr. SARBACHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address recently delivered by Congressman PATTERSON, of Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and includes a resolution adopted by the Queens County Council of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Baltimore Sun.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Henry T. Stichman. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $337, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Consent Calendar be called on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the committees in order on Calendar Wednesday next be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to announce the program for next week. As has been indicated, we will meet at 11 o'clock on Monday. On Monday, as fixed by order, there will be a joint session commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of Cuban independence.

On Tuesday the Consent and Private Calendars will be called.

On Wednesday we expect to take up the bill S. 1641, known as the WAC-WAVE bill.

On Thursday the Condon resolution of inquiry will be considered.

The program for Friday is undetermined.

I think I should point out that additional rules which may be reported out of the Committee on Rules may be called up.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in one to include a radio speech and in the others some extraneous material.

THE LATE GEORGE EWING MARTIN

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce the passing of Judge George Ewing Martin, late Chief Justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. He died last night here in Washington, at the age of 90. Born in Lancaster, Ohio, in 1857, he served 33 years on the bench, first as a common-pleas judge of the old seventh judicial district of Ohio, then, by appointment of three Presidents, as a Federal judge. He was appointed by President Taft to the Court of Customs Appeals in 1911; appointed by President Harding as Chief Justice of that court in 1923, and appointed by President Coolidge in 1924 as Chief Justice of the United States Court of Appeals, serving for 13 years until his retirement in 1937. He was of a distinguished line of lawyers who have carried on for over 100 years in Lancaster, Ohio. His father, John D. Martin, was a lawyer, beginning in the forties of the last century; his son, William K. Martin, now deceased, practiced in Lancaster, and his grandson, George Denman Martin, still carries on the great family tradition in Lancaster.

Judge Martin was my great-uncle, but the courtly, kindly man known always to me as Uncle George will go down in the history of this country's jurisprudence as an able, intelligent, and industrious judge, whose wisdom, scholarship, and fairness for over a third of a century in State and Federal courts dealt even-handed justice in hundreds of cases and helped to form and improve the principles of American law.

AIR DEFENSE

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen on the Committee on Appropriations, as well as on the Aviation Policy Board, and the House in general will be glad to know that in a long distance telephone call I have just received from Mr. Thomas K. Finletter, who was chairman of the President's Commission on Air Policy, he congratulated the committee and the House for providing the additional amount of money for the Air Force. I am sure the House will agree with us, as well as with the President's Commission and the Congressional Aviation Policy Board that proper action was taken today to insure the United States of an adequate air defense.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LICHTENWALTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Allentown Chronicle.

Mr. McCULLOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the winning essay in the contest sponsored by the American Legion of Ohio.

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Chicago Herald-American of April 15, showing the Communist domination of the CIO Packing House Workers Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I obtained permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include some extraneous matter. I am informed by the Public Printer that the extraneous matter exceeds the amount allowed under the rules and will cost $189.34. Notwithstanding, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost, and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY], and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] are absent today on official business in connection with the investigation of the foot-and-mouth disease, and for that reason were not present to vote on the appropriation bill which was just passed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chief of Staff of the United States Army.

Mr. GEARHART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Tilamook News.

THE ITALIAN ELECTIONS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a copy of the Boston Herald of April 8, 1948. The headline says "United States to buy Italian election." Now, nobody can ever accuse the Boston Herald of being either prolabor or even slightly liberal. Yet we have here an open and avowed admission and confession of what certain elements in these United States are trying to do under the name of preserving democracy in Europe.

I would like to know just what kind of democracy this is.

May I call attention also to a sentence in this same article, which reads as follows:

> Political methods similar to those once employed by the old Pendergast machine in Kansas City are to be used by the Truman administration in an effort to sway the April 18 elections in Italy away from the Communists.

This is not limited to just Truman and the Democrats. It also says:

> Dulles master-minds new "cold war" plan under secret agents.

So the bipartisan policy of war and depression for Wall Street monopoly is being carried out to an extent which our children and our children's children will look upon as a disgrace and a blot on the history of the great American people. And I am confident that the American people will respect the Italian people who refuse to be bribed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was granted permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in five instances and to include certain extraneous matter.

Mr. DORN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from the city clerk and treasurer of Greenwood.

Mr. HAYS asked and was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ALMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALMOND. Mr. Speaker, it is not an easy thing to voluntarily dissociate

yourself from membership in this the greatest parliamentary body on the face of the earth. However, I had rather go as a matter of volition than to be recalled, even though I have entertained no fear as to the latter in view of the overwhelming reassurance from my district.

I have enjoyed my brief service here. I have tried in my humble way, with what I considered becoming modesty, to represent a great district and to make my feeble contribution within the limitations of my meager talents to the cause of the greatest Nation on the face of the earth.

This is a great fraternity of men. At times we do not know Democrats from Republicans, because all of us, I am sure, endeavor to the best of our ability to represent that which is for the best interests of this Nation in a critical hour in world history. I go back to Virginia to serve my State as attorney general. No Virginian can be heedless to the call of his native State. I shall never forget and I shall ever treasure as a tender spot in the garden of memory the friendships I have made, the help and the cooperation I have received from both sides of the aisle; and if I had my way, although this statement may be considered as political heresy, with rare exception I would reelect so many in this body now to serve in the next Congress of the United States.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that your fairness, your devotion to duty, your impartiality, your determination to preside over this great body in keeping with the fine and high traditions which have been established by your predecessors have not only endeared you to both sides of the House but have endeared you to the American people. It has been an honor and a privilege to serve under the leadership of the present distinguished Speaker and an equal honor and privilege to serve under the leadership of the great statesman from Texas, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALMOND. I am delighted to yield to my friend from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. Just a word to let you know that we respect to the full the sentiments that you have expressed. We love you, we love the district from which you come, not only because it sent us you but your predecessor, Cliff Woodrum, whom we knew so well, and therefore we loved your district even before you came, and we love it more now. We are so regretful that the good fortune of Virginia is made in having you to ascend the throne with single responsibility as her attorney general.

We wish you all Godspeed and the best of luck in everything wherever it may take you, and as long life as it makes you happy.

Mr. ALMOND. I thank the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALMOND. I yield to my distinguished friend from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I wish to echo the sentiment expressed by the gentleman from Roanoke, Va., and say to the House that it was my privilege to speak in his home city. I learned there that he had endeared himself to the people of Virginia and to the district he represents just as he has endeared himself to the membership of this House on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. ALMOND. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALMOND. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. I, as chairman of the great Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service, wish to acknowledge the very splendid, outstanding, patriotic service on that committee by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia who has the floor.

Mr. ALMOND. I thank the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALMOND. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I have had the privilege of sitting on the gentleman's right in the great Committee on the Post Office and the Civil Service, and I want to tell him that in my heart the chair will always be vacant on the left.

Mr. ALMOND. Mr. Speaker, in closing may I quote those words from the King's Message:

> And I said to the man who stood at the gate of the year: "Give me a light that I may tread safely into the unknown."
>
> And he replied: "Go out into the darkness and put thine hand into the hand of God. That shall be to thee better than light and safer than a known way."

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, as shown on pages 2266–2269 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of March 5, 1948, Mr. John Andrews, Clerk of the House, and Mr. Robert E. Stripling, clerk and chief investigator for the Committee on Un-American Activities, advised the Speaker in writing that each had been served with a subpena duces tecum issuing out of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. These subpenas required each to appear before that court on the day named in the subpenas and to bring with them certain files, papers, and documents which are the property of the House and in the custody of, and under the control of, said Clerk of the House of Representatives and said clerk of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Each of these clerks, recognizing the privileges of the House as established by rule and precedent, asked the Speaker for instruction as to what his action should be in the premises.

Said subpenas were returnable on March 8, 1948. However, the said court proceedings were adjourned until a future date and said clerks now ask for specific instruction concerning their responding to said subpenas duces tecum.

I am sure it is the purpose of the Speaker as well as the House to cooperate at all times with the courts of the land to the end that justice shall prevail. At the same time the privilege and the dignity of the House are involved, and these clerks, performing necessary duties in the functioning of the House, should not and cannot be required to respond to subpenas issuing from the courts at a time and in such manner as will interfere with the functioning of the Congress. The Constitution and the precedents heretofore established confirm this conclusion.

After consultation with the Parliamentarian and the Speaker, I present three privileged resolutions and I ask for their immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 540

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.

Whereas in the case of the *United States* v. *George Marshall* (No. 376–47, Criminal Docket) pending in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, subpena duce tecum was issued by the Chief Justice of said court and addressed to Robert E. Stripling, clerk of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, directing him to appear as a witness before the said court on the 8th day of March 1948, at 10 a. m., and to bring with him certain and sundry papers in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promotion of justice, this House will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

Resolved, That Robert E. Stripling, clerk of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, be authorized to appear at the place and before the court named in the subpena duces tecum befo.e-mentioned, but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in his office or under his control or in his possession as clerk of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives; be it further

Resolved, That when said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers and documents called for in the subpena duces tecum then the said court through any of its officers or agents have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House and take copies of any documents or papers in possession or control of said clerk of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives that the court has found to be material and relevant, except minutes and transcripts of executive sessions, and any evidence of witnesses in respect thereto which the court or other proper officer thereof shall desire, so as, however, the possession of said documents and papers by the said clerk of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives shall not be disturbed, or the same shall not be removed from their place of file or custody under said clerk of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena afore-mentioned.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I note that in the resolution reference is made

to the 8th day of March. That was the date these gentlemen were subpenaed to appear but the case, by agreement, was adjourned until a subsequent date. This resolution will permit these Representatives of the House to appear at such times as will not interfere with the work of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I offer another privileged resolution (H. Res. 541) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas in the case of the *United States* v. *George Marshall* (No. 367–47, Criminal Docket), pending in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, subpena duces tecum was issued by the Chief Justice of said court and addressed to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, directing him to appear as a witness before the said court on the 8th day of March 1948, at 10 a. m., and to bring with him certain and sundry papers in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promoting of justice, this House will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

Resolved, That John Andrews, Clerk of the House, be authorized to appear at the place and before the court named in the subpena duces tecum before-mentioned, but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in his office or under his control or in his possession as Clerk of the House; be it further

Resolved, That when said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers and documents called for in the subpena duces tecum then the said court through any of its officers or agents have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House and take copies of any documents or papers in possession or control of said Clerk that the court has found to be material and relevant, except minutes and transcripts of executive sessions, and any evidence of witnesses in respect thereto which the court or other proper officer thereof shall desire, so as, however, the possession of said documents and papers by the said Clerk shall not be disturbed, or the same shall not be removed from their place of file or custody under said Clerk; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena aforementioned.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further resolution (H. Res. 542).

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas in the case of the *United States* v. *John Howard Lawson* (No. 1352–47, Criminal Docket), pending in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, subpenas duces tecum were issued by the Chief Justice of said court and addressed to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, directing him to appear as a witness before the said court on the 13th day of April 1948, at 10 a. m., and to bring with him certain and sundry papers in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promotion of justice, this House will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

Resolved, That John Andrews, Clerk of the House, be authorized to appear at the place and before the court named in the subpenas duces tecum before-mentioned, but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in his office or under his control or in his possession as Clerk of the House; be it further

Resolved, That when said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers and documents called for in the subpenas duces tecum then the said court through any of its officers or agents have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House and take copies of any documents or papers in possession or control of said Clerk that the court has found to be material and relevant, except minutes and transcripts of executive sessions, and any evidence of witnesses in respect thereto which the court or other proper officer thereof shall desire, so as, however, the possession of said documents and papers by the said Clerk shall not be disturbed, or the same shall not be removed from their place of file or custody under said Clerk; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpenas afore-mentioned.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a poll taken at the American University entitled "Opinionaire for Graduate Seminar in International Affairs."

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, in behalf of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], who has been unavoidably detained en route from his district to the Capitol, may I say that he has wired me that he is in favor of an air force which in number and power should be superior to any air force in the world, and that if it were possible for him to be present at this time he would vote for this appropriation to strengthen our Air Force.

THE LATE PRESIDENT ROXAS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, a message has just been received stating that President Roxas of the Philippine Islands passed away very suddenly this afternoon. I feel that the Members of the House are interested in having this information.

It has been my privilege to know President Roxas for some 15 or 20 years and to work with him on many industrial matters pertaining to the interests of the people of the Philippines and the United States. I considered him one of the outstanding political leaders of the Philippines, a man of great ability in industrial, financial, and political fields. This news comes to me with a great shock. It will mean a tremendous loss to the people of the Philippine Islands. He was a man who could well be used in the reconstruction of the Philippine Islands as a result of the terrible war which occurred in the last few years.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I too am shocked and grieved by this sad news. I want to associate myself with what the gentleman from Michigan has said regarding President Roxas.

He was a man of extraordinary ability, industry, and forthrightness, and was doing an unbelievably good job in a most difficult situation. When the gentleman made this announcement I thought how similar is the situation in the Philippines to that when Abraham Lincoln was stricken down and Seward said, "God is in His heaven, and the Republic still lives." The Republic of the Philippines must live, too, and with increased and renewed support from the United States.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota and join with him in the statement that the Philippine Republic must go ahead. I repeat what I said only a few moments ago on the floor, at which time I did not have this news, that the United States will continue to support the Philippine Republic in peacetime as well as in war.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

DR. CONDON

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, the reaction of the press to the attacks made by the Special Subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities against Dr. E. U. Condon, director of the National Bureau of Standards, is one of the most striking occurrences in my congressional experience. Irrespective of political leanings, the newspapers of this country, from East to West and North to South, have denounced the procedures and tactics used by this committee. Typical of the opinions expressed are these few phrases: "Punishment by publicity," "Trial by headline," "Government by suspicion," "Masterpiece of unfair innuendo," from such reputable journals as the New York Times, the Christian Science Monitor, and the New York Herald Tribune.

But the press of the Nation was not alone in its condemnation of the tactics and procedures in the attacks on Dr. Condon. A great body of citizens—leaders throughout the Nation—has expressed profound indignation at the treatment accorded this honored and distinguished scientist and American. Eminent individuals and important organizations have voiced their distaste for and censure of the conduct of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Organizations and societies, individuals, and spontaneous meetings responded almost instantaneously and electrically to this unsubstantiated indictment and judgment of Dr. Condon.

REACTION OF NOTED SOCIETIES

Foremost among the organizations to express confidence in the integrity of Dr. Condon and speak out in protest against the action of the Committee on Un-American Activities was the American Physical Society, which had never in its long and distinguished history commented upon any public issue. The New York Herald Tribune, commenting on this action, reported on March 5, 1948:

The American Physical Society, in a move unprecedented for an organization devoted exclusively to the affairs of pure science, entered the field of politics yesterday with a letter vigorously assailing the actions of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in reference to Dr. Edward U. Condon.

The letter was addressed to the President and to Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., Speaker of the House. In content it was similar to others sent by organizations of scientists, such as a letter sent yesterday to the President by the American Association of Scientific Workers. The distinction between this message and those from other organizations lies in the fact that the American Physical Society prides itself on its aloofness from all matters except the intricacies of pure physics.

The letter was signed by the council of the society, headed by Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, director of the Institute of Advanced Study in Princeton, N. J., and president, as Dr. Condon was before him, of the American Physical Society.

"Stressing the confidence in Dr. Condon that led 6,000 of his fellow physicists to elect him to the highest post in their possession," continued the Herald Tribune, the American Physical Society addressed the following open letter to the President of the Senate, Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, and the Speaker of the House, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN:

Dr. Edward Condon, whose loyalty has been attacked by a public report of the Subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, is a colleague of ours. That we have every confidence in him as a scientist and as a man is shown by his election 2 years ago to the presidency of the American Physical Society. He has held positions of great responsibility and trust in industry, in universities, in several vital phases of the war effort, and in several branches of the Federal Government. All of these positions are marks of confidence on the part of people whose judgment cannot be ignored.

We are, of course, not qualified to evaluate the incidents which have been adduced as a cause for doubt of his loyalty. Should these incidents provide ground for such doubt they should be most carefully evaluated. Yet it is clear that the action of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities was not to evaluate such incidents or to resolve such doubt but to create a situation in which this would be most difficult. We have grave fear that their action will tend to frustrate efforts of the Government to avail itself of our scientific resources and will make difficult the collaboration between scientists and the Government, on which so much of our future depends.

Respectfully submitted by the officers and council of the American Physical Society.

J. R. Oppenheimer, President; Karl K. Darrow, Secretary; George B. Pegram, Treasurer; J. A. Bearden; J. W. Buchta; Karl T. Compton; Henry Crew; Lee A. Dubridge; Harvey Fletcher; F. W. Loomis; Theodore Lyman; Ernest Merritt; R. A. Millikan; P. M. Morse; I. I. Robi; Frederick Seitz; W. F. G. Swann; John T. Tate; Louis A. Turner; Merle A. Tuve; George E. Uhlenbeck.

Meanwhile the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, one of the most distinguished and venerable groups of scholars and professional men, with a history extending back to colonial times, studied the attacks and advised its members as follows:

To the Fellows of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences:

GENTLEMEN: A committee consisting of the undersigned has been appointed by the council of the academy to report to the fellows regarding the attack on Dr. E. U. Condon, fellow of the academy, and Director of the National Bureau of Standards, by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

We have looked into the published information, consisting of the report to the full committee of the Special Subcommittee on National Security, of the Committee on Un-American Affairs; correspondence and press releases from the committee and the Department of Commerce; and an address and release to the press and radio by Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, of California. These documents leave in our minds no doubt but that the committee has attacked Dr. Condon in the press, by the use of insinuation and innuendo, without producing valid evidence of disloyalty. The Secretary of Commerce takes the same view, and supports Dr. Condon's loyalty, as have the investigating agencies which have looked into his record.

The charges against Dr. Condon consist largely of statements that he has associated with certain diplomatic representatives of Poland and other eastern European countries; that he belongs to a certain American-Soviet Science Society; that he has made friendly speeches regarding Russian scientists; and that he has encouraged the interchange of scientific reports with Russia. They omit to state that the diplomatic representative most discussed was a member of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission, and a fellow physicist, with whom Condon would naturally have scientific dealings; that the American-Soviet Science Society is an organization, sponsored by the Rockefeller Foundation, for the purpose of making reports of Soviet research available in this country; that the friendly speeches were made soon after the war, when a resumption of scientific relations between this country and the Soviet Union was desired generally by American scientists. One gets the impression, from reading the attack, that the House committee is interpreting a natural desire to share the results of scientific research internationally as evidence of disloyalty.

Such persecution of Government scientists can only result in a reluctance on the part of reputable scientists to take Government positions, at a time when effective Government science is of the greatest importance to the welfare of the country. We believe that the academy should go on record as opposing such methods. We propose the following statement of our position:

"The fellows of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences condemn the un-American procedure of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in publishing in the public press charges of disloyalty against Dr. E. U. Condon, on evidence which clearly appears inadequate, and without giving him an adequate opportunity to present his case."

P. W. BRIDGMAN,
Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy, Harvard University.
E. M. MORGAN,
Professor of Law, Harvard University.
J. C. SLATER,
Chairman, Professor of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

In a statement signed by Dr. Albert Einstein and Nobel prize winner Dr. Harold Urey, the Emergency Committee of Atomic Scientists charged the Committee on Un-American Activities with a disservice to the United States in its attack upon Dr. Condon. The New York Herald Tribune summarized the statement of the group as follows:

The attack can have as a result only the effect of making it increasingly difficult for the United States Government to obtain the services of able scientists, the statement said. The committee asserted also that the clearance issued by the Department of Commerce after an investigation of Dr. Condon's loyalty has made it unnecessary for us to enter into a discussion of the merits of the case.

On March 20, 1948, the 3,000 members of the American Societies for Experimental Biology, consisting of five leading scientific societies—the American Physiological Society, the American Society of Biological Chemists, the American Society for Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics, the American Institute of Nutrition, the American Association of Immunologists—adopted resolutions deploring the actions and procedures of the Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities as inimical to the Nation's good. Typical of these resolutions was

that of the American Physiological Society which stated:

Publicity given to accusations and insinuations against the loyalty of scientists and other citizens before full collection and evaluation of the evidence not only does great personal injustice, but also defeats the very purpose for which that House committee was established; for the effect of such attacks is to discourage loyal scientists and other citizens from entering Government service, to distract and intimidate many now in service and to interfere with the effectiveness of their work.

In the city of Pittsburgh, two outstanding organizations—the Association of Pittsburgh Scientists and the Physical Society of Pittsburgh joined—in protest. The Pittsburgh Post-Gazette summarized their protest on March 5, 1948:

The Association of Pittsburgh Scientists sharply criticized the House Committee on Un-American Activities Thursday for publicly questioning the loyalty of Dr. Edward U. Condon, noted atomic scientist and head of the National Bureau of Standards.

Joining with the association, the Physical Society of Pittsburgh also verbally spanked the congressional investigating committee and asked President Truman to rebuke the House group.

* * * * *

Dr. R. H. McCoy, chairman of the association's executive committee and a University of Pittsburgh biochemist, added this comment: "Dr. Condon is an outstanding scientist of unquestioned loyalty." The Committee on Un-American Activities has no evidence to the contrary.

The Physical Society's message to President Truman, drafted at a meeting in the Mellon Institute Thursday night, said that as colleagues of Dr. Condon, a former president of our society, we know how absurd are the (committee's) charges.

At the annual conference of the American Society for Public Administration, Dr. Charles E. Merriam, professor emeritus of political science at the University of Chicago, denounced the "stream of bitter, smearing attacks, which do not tend either to improve the morale of the service or promote attachment to the Government. Indiscriminate baiting of public servants stands across the way of the finest type of service and the liveliest forms of allegiance to the common good. It tends to drive men away from the public service without which the Nation cannot live."

The executive committee of the Atomic Scientists of Chicago asserted on March 2, 1948, that "attacks of this nature on a distinguished scientist will increase the Government's difficulty in obtaining the services of able scientists. If, as a result of such attacks, Dr. Condon should perchance resign his directorship of the Bureau of Standards in disgust, it is unlikely that the Government could find a successor of comparable talent and standing."

Another distinguished organization, the Federation of American Scientists, according to the New York Times on March 4, 1948, accused the Committee on Un-American Activities of destroying the good name of a distinguished American physicist of demonstrated integrity and patriotism. Prof. Robert E. Marshak, who issued the statement on behalf of the federation, denounced the subcommittee's evidence as specious and unfair to a true representative of American scientists, who during World War II played a prominent role in the development of radar and the atomic bomb, which contributed so materially to Allied victory.

These are only a few of the societies and established organizations which protested the attacks. There were many others, including church groups, legal associations, civil liberties groups, and other public-interest organizations. Meanwhile many spontaneous meetings of protest, by unorganized individuals, took place.

SPONTANEOUS MEETINGS OF PROTEST

On March 11, 1948, 200 leading scientists met in the city of New York to discuss the attacks on Dr. Condon. They unanimously adopted the following resolution:

1. Our protest arises from proceedings instituted by the so-called Thomas Committee in the case of Dr. Edward U. Condon, Chief of the Bureau of Standards of the Department of Commerce, formally cleared by the Department's loyalty board. This irresponsible attack has injured the reputation of a foremost scientist by innuendoes, rumor, and half truths. It has thereby adversely affected the national welfare by demonstrating to scientists that employment in vital scientific activities of the Government may expose them to similar intimidation and abuse.

2. Dr. Condon enjoys a reputation of such high standing among all his scientific colleagues and the general public that any suggestion of disloyalty coming from any source should be indignantly repudiated. The attack upon him illustrates the utter ignorance and the irresponsibility of the Thomas Committee.

* * * * *

4. We commend Secretary of Commerce Harriman's decision not to surrender the confidential documents on which the departmental loyalty board's conclusion was based.

5. The recent performances of the House Committee on Un-American Activities forces the conclusion among fair-minded people either that its irresponsible procedures should be curtailed, or failing that, the committee should be abolished as a threat to the liberties of the American people.

At this meeting Dr. Wendell Stanley, noted for his research on virus and winner of the Nobel prize, made the following statement:

It is a tragic and horrible spectacle when a group of men are engaged industriously and almost savagely in the destruction of the very thing that they shout from the housetops they are seeking to defend. Every right-thinking American favors effective and vigorous measures, especially in this time of tension, to protect the security of the Nation, whether by Congress or by other departments of Government, and most scientists are willing to work under such measures, but the methods of the Thomas committee, involving public smears and character assassinations by means of insinuation and the principle of association, do not aid the security of this Nation, for such methods will drive desperately needed scientists from Government service. The Thomas committee is actually destroying the very thing it professes to defend, and it should be abolished or its methods modified drastically. Let the administration and Congress work out the best possible security measure, and let there be an end to this public demonstration of conflict, and above all let us in this country see no more use made of the methods which have become the mark of the Thomas committee. In these times there is a paramount need for able scientists in Government service, and we cannot afford the penalty which will result from a continuation of the methods employed by the Thomas committee in the case of Dr. Condon.

Dr. Frank B. Jewett, recently retired president of the Bell Telephone Laboratories of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., past president of the National Academy of Sciences, and one of the leading Republicans in the State of New Jersey, wired the emergency meeting:

Cannot attend Condon meeting tonight. Without regard to merits of this case, I strongly object to measures of House Committee on Un-American Activities in publicly condemning reputable American citizens without affording them opportunity to know specific charges or disloyalty and to answer same. You may record my views.

Archibald McLeish, famed writer and former Assistant Secretary of State, addressed the emergency meeting, declaring:

The action of the House of Representatives in doubling the appropriation of its Committee on Un-American Activities in the face of damaging and unanswered criticism of the committee in the press, on the floor of Congress, and among the citizens of the country, is a challenge to American opinion which will have to be met. It must be met, however, seriously and soberly and without the recourse to personal disparagement which has characterized the committee's public statements. It is not the personality of Congressman THOMAS—or the personality of Congressman RANKIN or the personality of Congressman Dies—which makes the committee an object of concern to all who know the American past and believe in the American future. It is the damaging effect of the committee's methods on American institutions and the American form of society. Specifically, it is the danger—the very real and present danger—that the committee's conduct will undermine the defenses of individual liberty in the last great stronghold of that liberty—the United States—and betray the American cause, whether knowingly or not, to its most formidable enemy.

The essential struggle of our time is obvious to all of us. It is the struggle between the police state and the citizen state, between government by terror and government under law. The reason why the American people fear Russia and detest communism is that Russia is a police state and communism, wherever communism has come to power, is government by terror. The reason why the American people believe in the United States, and trust the American form of government, is that the United States is a citizen state, and the American Government a government under law.

To maintain the citizen state against the police state, which is its present, and often successful, rival, it is essential at any cost and by every means to maintain the principle and practice of government under law. Only through government under law can the citizen be free to rule himself. The moment government by terror is substituted in any form or over any area, the wooden horse, has been introduced into the walls, and the city is in danger. Government by terror is an insidious and deadly thing. It infiltrates a society, house by house, and street after street, as the men from the wooden horse took Troy. It silences those who oppose it. It closes their mouths, either through force or fear. And in the end, as we ourselves have seen in Russia and in Bulgaria and now in Czechoslovakia and Greece and before in Italy and Germany, it has no opponents. They have disappeared. They are silent—silent or dead but in any case silent.

There are many forms, moreover, of terror: not all of them visible to the eye in automatic rifles, lengths of rubber hose and the more refined instruments of the secret police. Men can be silenced, silenced or discredited but in any case silenced, by defamation. They can be driven out of the public service, or rendered useless to the public service, not by constitutional processes and procedure, but by the publication of discreditable and unverified innuendoes about them in the press, or in that part of the press which is willing to print material of this kind. They can even be driven out of private employment by vilification and disparagement without hearing or proof and their means of livelihood destroyed. They can be disposed of, to all intents and purposes, as completely, and quite as brutally, by defamation as by force. Indeed, to the man who respects himself and his good name and the opinions of his fellow citizens, to the man of honor, that is to say, and the man of sensibility, liquidation by calumny is far more deadly than any other form of public injury.

Let there be no doubt about it—to use public vilification as an instrument of government is to use terror as an instrument of government, and to use terror as an instrument of government is to strike directly at the fundamental American institution—the liberty of the individual under law. What troubles men who have studied the Government of this Republic and who know the tradition out of which it came and who believe that the great American dream of individual liberty can even yet be realized in this world—what troubles men of this kind as they watch the conduct of the House Committee on Un-American Affairs is the growing suspicion that that committee has little understanding of the American tradition and no conception whatever of the disastrous consequences of a policy of government by disparaging publicity.

Certainly the committee has little understanding of government under law. Neither the law which shapes the legislative branch of the Government to which the committee belongs, nor the law which shapes the judicial branch, the powers of which the committee sometimes usurps, is respected in its hearings. As a committee of the legislative branch, the Thomas group exists to advise the House on legislation—which is the House's business. There is little evidence in its hearings that this duty has ever suggested itself to the committee's membership. As a committee arrogating to itself the functions of the FBI and judicial functions which the House—with limited exceptions named in the Constitution—does not possess, the committee might be expected to observe the basic safeguards of individual liberty which are respected by the American police and by American courts at all levels. These safeguards the committee does not respect. It acts regularly as prosecutor and judge, in some cases announcing its judgments even in advance of prosecutions, in articles written by committee members for popular magazines. It has denied those summoned before it the right to be confronted by their accusers, to call witnesses or to be represented by counsel. And it has taken full advantage of the parliamentary immunity of its members to deprive those whose reputations it attacks of relief through suits for libel, while at the same time spreading its allegations and innuendoes over the less self-respecting sections of the press. In brief, it has used the fiction that it is acting as a legislative committee—though it does not act as a legislative committee—to justify its failure to observe the most primitive decencies of a judicial body—which, in fact, and certainly in effect, it presumes to be.

In Washington, the Evening Star of March 20, 1948, reported that an audience of 600 persons attended a meeting on the preceding evening, sponsored by the Washington Association of Scientists, devoted to an examination of the attacks on Dr. Condon and their implications. Dr. D. R. Inglis, professor of physics at Johns Hopkins University, addressed the group on the subject The Present Crisis in American Science:

I do not think it necessary for me to discuss the absurd charges which have been leveled at Dr. Condon during the last year: These ridiculous attacks have already been ably and keenly dissected by Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD in his addresses to the House of Representatives on July 22, 1947, and March 9, 1948, while editorials and radio programs like the one we have heard tonight have aptly summed the story.

There are, however, far-reaching implications to these attacks, implications of which the Nation should be aware: First, those pertaining to science and scientists and the contributions of scientists to the national welfare, and, second, those pertaining to the constitutional liberties of all citizens. As a scientist and as one who has spent his life with scientists, I propose to consider those implications with respect to science, and the crisis which public misunderstanding and abuse bring to American science.

Let us consider what these attacks mean to the Government and its enormous scientific research program at the present time. I do not think it an exaggeration to say that the very possibility of such attacks, such techniques of character assassination, such procedures of "Punishment by publicity" (as the New York Times puts it), mean that scientists and engineers are going to be very reluctant to enter Federal research agencies. This will be particularly true of the abler men.

Enormous harm in this respect has been inflicted by this one attack. Further unwarranted attacks can stifle Government research completely. Unfortunately, there is no evidence that the committee which has attacked Dr. Condon is going to be content with him as the only sacrificial lamb. On the contrary, the witch hunt might even be extended to embrace all scientists as a class. I do not believe, therefore, that even the direct implications of these attacks extend only to scientists in Government. The Government is now engaged in extensive research programs carried on under contract by universities and industry. The scientists here too will inherit the conditions imposed on those actually in Federal service; and, again, scientists will be reluctant to risk their reputations in such situations. It is only a reasonable inference that in the end even those scientists not engaged in Federal research, whether in the Government or under some contractual relationship, will be enmeshed.

The net effect will be simply this: The Government will find it impossible to attract good men for Federal work, whether the relationship is direct or indirect.

Let us, for the sake of a working hypothesis, accept the premise that short-range national security depends on military strength. That, and even more than that, is the contention of the Government; and its present policies are based on this assumption. The question then becomes: what do we mean by military strength? With each succeeding war we have seen that the percentage of our forces actually engaged in combat has decreased. Thus, in the last war only a very small portion of our total forces ever saw actual combat. At the same time, the products of science and technology have played increasingly greater roles. I need only mention radar, the proximity fuze, the atomic bomb and its role in the submarine war as recent decisive contributions of science. So it is apparent that military strength now means the applications of science and technology rather than the mere deployment of vast bodies of infantry.

Therefore, if Congress and the Government are aware of this real meaning of military strength, Congress and the Government should take prompt steps to remedy this situation which is driving and threatens to drive scientists from its service.

Very often the scientist has been looked upon as a gabby, garrulous creature anxious to spill the beans: this is nonsense. Scientists recognize that security measures are inevitably necessary; what they often complain of is an unnecessary amount of such measures in those zones where it is, first, meaningless and, second, actually harmful to use.

Congress and the public must recognize that the truths of science, the laws of nature, are accessible to scientists the world over; it only requires time and diligence. Now, we can handicap our own research by insisting on such security regulations in the dissemination of information that are unrealistic. Moreover, we can hamper our application of the discoveries of research if those results are not incorporated into our technology. For these reasons, scientists have been properly zealous of the needs of the Nation in pointing out the dangers of meaningless restrictions on the dissemination of information.

The remarkable phenomenon of this period is the unwarranted suspicion of scientists. I would like to make two comments on this subject. First, the scientists have demonstrated that they know how to keep secrets. You may remember that long before the scientists were able to interest the Government in the atomic bomb, they imposed of their own accord a successful program of secrecy on their developments in this field. Nothing leaked during that period, and at last the scientists, led by two foreign refugees, convinced the President of the importance of the program, and nothing has leaked from our scientists since then either.

Second, I would like to point out that it is not only scientific matters that are important from the secrecy-of-information point of view. Since the discoveries of science can be made by scientists anywhere—and usually are in different parts of the world within short periods—the unenlightened public has been goaded into an undue apprehension over such matters. On the other hand, political decisions and secrets, whether national or international, can in principle be controlled, and these are in some ways more important. Yet very few days pass by without the disclosure—I should say leak—of some such matter from some statesman to some columnist.

One of the cardinal difficulties in the relationship of scientists to the Government and Congress lies in the fact that the latter, as well as the public, do not understand the nature of research or the methods of the scientist. These are matters that are exceedingly difficult to people without scientific training. Witness the difficulty of obtaining appropriations for Federal research—in contrast to, say, the relative ease with which the House Committee on Un-American Activities obtained a doubling of its appropriation. The latter was simple: the smearing of Dr. Condon got the committee headlines. Research is a quiet working of trained minds and its problems are difficult to formulate in one-syllable headline words; such stuff doesn't hit the headlines.

It is unfortunately easier to convince an American that a scientist is a valuable individual to have around in war than in peace. The contributions of science to war are well known. To see that science is valuable in peace, you must consider that our industrial technology is nothing more than an application of science; obvious though this is, I do not believe that Congress knows this, judging by its conduct. Most Congressmen might agree that the pure research of fifty

or a hundred years ago was a fine thing—it runs our industry today. That pure research was done because scientists then loved knowledge for its own sake.

Think of Michael Faraday, for example, one of dozens of natural philosophers of his day. Faraday was impelled by his curiosity to find out more about the strange behavior of wires with electric currents in them, with no idea that there would be electric locomotives and cities lighted by electric currents as a result of his findings. It is just as important that we let the present scientists seek knowledge for its own sake. Without that incentive, ideas important to our future material welfare would be missed.

Scientists have developed powerful intellectual procedures for seeking answers about how nature works. And they take the trouble to do it because they are curious about how nature works. They develop machines, they develop mathematical methods. But I think it is much more important that they develop a peculiar sort of imagination necessary for this thing called science and research. A man who is not curious about nature but wants only to solve a technical problem can learn about the machines or devices after they have been invented; he can learn the mathematical methods. But I believe that only a scientist curious about the secrets of nature ever develops the kind of imagination necessary to lead on into new fields of investigation with the peculiar agility that has characterized the contributions of great scientists in the past—haphazard contributions to the knowledge and happiness and comfort and scope of mankind. And, by the way, Dr. Condon is one of these rare and unusual, imaginative, and inspiring scientists.

It is possible through formal training to provide men capable of using the techniques of science and capable of talking the language of science. It may always be possible for the Government to hire enough trained men to do routine scientific work and to administer routine projects—perhaps even in spite of witch hunts. But the man who is hard to find is the man with imagination—the man who will do a superlative job leading to something new. These are the men we won't have if the smearing continues.

How is it possible to get scientists to work on developments needed by our Government? First, scientists must be developed—and this means serious attention to our educational system from the grade schools and the high schools, through the college and university levels. This must mean less emphasis on play and more incentive for hard work and really deep study, at least for some selected young people. This would provide a future supply. But how about now? How do we get first-rate mature scientists to work for the Government? Well, paying them more adequately would help some. But the best scientists cannot be merely purchased: They are too curious about the way nature works to sacrifice all scientific opportunities for research for salary alone. They must be given opportunities to do interesting research under conditions suitable for research. Perhaps this is the crux of the matter: the other factors are necessary, but even with them the lack of proper conditions dooms the Government to failure. The proper conditions include freedom from suspicion; freedom from mistrust; freedom from the insecurity that follows on the heels of slander from Congressmen interested only in headlines and forgetful of the Nation's genuine welfare.

Should we then slap the scientists down with unproved and malicious slander as soon as they attain positions of public prominence? Mr. THOMAS and his committee must learn that this is not the way to keep good scientists working for the Government. It is not the way to attract our able young men into the ranks of science for the future greatness of America. America needs the ablest young men the country can produce, now that we can no longer count on continuing to import brilliant Europeans to fill our scientific ranks.

Consider again the objectives and policies of our Government. The present program of opposing Soviet expansion involves military developments, and these bring with them a very real problem of minimizing Soviet espionage. The problem is one that must be faced soberly and solved by genuine diligence and patience. It seems inevitable that this means some limitations on the freedom of those working on these military developments. Reasonable limitations need not interfere seriously with the work to be done nor with the quality of the worker who can be obtained. But attacks of the kind made on Dr. Condon serve only to make much more difficult the real problem. In those attacks there is no evidence; there is nothing but name-calling by innuendo and association. * * * This amounts to a sabotage of the real problem, by an unwarranted and unjustified smearing of a loyal and honored scientist. This has served to delay our Nation's military preparations, by demoralizing the bulk of our scientists—not only those in Government, but throughout the Nation. Even more important in the long run, it has served to undermine the prestige of science and will serve to destroy the quality of our scientific work and reduce general welfare in the coming years.

PROMINENT INDIVIDUALS PROTEST

Such meetings of groups as those above were typical of many throughout the Nation. Meanwhile, nationally known citizens registered their indignation publicly.

In Princeton, a group of leading scientists met and formulated their opinions in a telegram to the Secretary of Commerce on March 3, 1948:

We are profoundly disturbed by the recent charges made against Condon as reported in the press. Condon was a respected member of the department of physics here at Princeton from 1928 to 1929 and from 1930 to 1937, and we considered his departure a serious loss to our staff. Neither in that period nor in the years since have we had any reason to question his loyalty or to lower our opinion of him as a scientist or as a man. From long association with him, both personal and professional, we are convinced that he is completely loyal to the United States, and we believe that the Government is fortunate in having such an able and public-spirited physicist as Director of the Bureau of Standards. We hope that you will welcome this expression of our opinion.

Luther P. Eisenhart, Emeritus Professor of Mathematics; Henry D. Smyth, Chairman, Department of Physics; Solomon Lefschetz, Chairman, Department of Mathematics; Walker Bleakney, Professor of Physics; Rudolf W. Ladenburg, Professor of Physics; Allen G. Shenstone, Professor of Physics; Albert W. Tucker, Professor of Mathematics; John A. Wheeler, Professor of Physics; Milton G. White, Professor of Physics; Samuel S. Wilks, Professor of Mathematics; Eugene P. Wigner, Professor of Mathematical Physics.

Dr. A. N. Richards, dean of the University of Pennsylvania Medical School and president of the National Academy of Sciences, declared on March 3, 1948:

The colleagues of Dr. Condon in the National Academy of Sciences have the utmost confidence in his complete integrity and his loyalty.

Dr. L. C. Dunn, professor of zoology at Columbia University and a member of the National Academy of Sciences, summed up his opinions on the subject in the final paragraph of a letter to the editor of the New York Times on March 3, 1948:

The conclusion to which most sensible people must come after reading of the attack on Dr. Condon is that the Committee on Un-American Activities must be restrained or abolished before it does irreparable harm not only to the reputation of a fine scientist who is serving his country well but to the whole future of science in the United States.

Dr. Walter Rautenstrauch, professor emeritus of industrial engineering at Columbia University and former vice president and general manager of the Liberty Yeast Corp., and vice president of the J. G. White Management Corp., described, on March 11, 1948, Dr. Condon as "very far from being anything but a real, loyal American. I don't think there's any conviction on the part of the Thomas committee that Condon is a subversive person," Dr. Rautenstrauch said.

In the April issue of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, Dr. S. K. Allison, professor of physics, consultant to the National Defense Research Committee, and director of the institute for nuclear studies at the University of Chicago, wrote:

As this issue of the Bulletin goes to press, the latest denunciation by the House Committee on Un-American Activities is a leading feature of the news. A subcommittee has branded Dr. E. U. Condon, head of the National Bureau of Standards, as "one of the weakest links in our atomic security," and demanded that W. Averill Harriman, Secretary of Commerce, either call for his resignation or present a statement "setting forth the reasons" why he is kept in office. In a preliminary reply, Mr. W. C. Foster, Under Secretary of Commerce, has pointed out that only recently the loyalty board of the Department considered Dr. Condon's case and found that "no reasonable grounds exist for believing that Dr. Condon is disloyal to the Government of the United States."

The charges brought against Dr. Condon in the subcommittee's report seem to me, a layman in legal matters, to constitute defamation of character by innuendo. The report contains reckless statements such as the following one concerning the activities of Communists in this country: "They have gotten pretty far, because they got a man as Vice President of the United States, and he is now their candidate for President." This suggestion that the handful of Communists in this country planned and accomplished the election of Mr. Wallace to the Vice Presidency is more suitable to a campaign speech than a written committee report.

In the same vein, Dr. Condon by inference is accused of a crime which carries the death penalty if transmission of atomic "secrets" is involved. It is recommended that the attention of the President be called "to the fact that the situation of Dr. Condon is not an isolated one, but that there are other Government officials in strategic positions who are playing Stalin's game to the detriment of the United States."

Nothing in the evidence presented, consisting of items such as alleged association with personnel of the Polish Embassy, conferences with foreign scientists, application for a passport to visit Russia, and membership in the Rockefeller Foundation sponsored American-Soviet Friendship Society could possibly support so grave a charge, and, assuming good faith, one could only conclude that the subcommittee report was written in a state of hysterical irresponsibility.

To me, having known Dr. Condon for many years, his simple statement that the charges are untrue is sufficient. His alert and critical intelligence, his appreciation of wit and good conversation, lead him to associate with people of similar tastes, with no consideration given to social or class distinctions. All of us have recently met and enjoyed conversation and discussion with foreign scientists visiting us. In my experiences, it has been invariably true that the visitor realized that certain questions could not be answered, and carefully avoided embarrassing me by asking them.

The Japanese were amateurs at supervising the lives of their citizens. There the terror consisted in denunciation of persons for dangerous thoughts. We have, in addition, dangerous acquaintances and dangerous dinner parties.

Treason is a crime abhorrent to everyone. It is specially reprehensible in a democracy where there can be criticism of the Government by those who believe its policies are wrong, and public opposition may be conducted without fear of reprisal or question of loyalty. Charges that such a crime has been committed should not be made in the manner we are now witnessing.

Dr. Condon should obtain legal counsel and, under the law, seek what redress he may for the harm that has been done him.

The attacks on Dr. Condon were recognized by distinguished Americans as long ago as last year. Six of the Nation's best-known leaders in science—four of them winners of the coveted Nobel prize—protested to the New York Times and to Science, official publication of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, which has a membership of approximately 50,000. These, Dr. Irving Langmuir, associate director of the General Electric Corp.'s Research Laboratories; Dr. Wendell M. Stanley and Dr. Duncan MacInnes, of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research; Dr. I. I. Rabi and Dr. George B. Pegram, of Columbia University; and Dr. Harold C. Urey, of the University of Chicago, wrote:

We wish to register a protest against two recent articles by Representative J. PARNELL THOMAS, of New Jersey, chairman of the Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities. These are: Russia Grabs Our Inventions (American Magazine, June) and Reds in Our Atom Plants (Liberty, June 21).

Mr. THOMAS' articles are inaccurate to the point of absurdity. Thus, in one, he says that the National Bureau of Standards tests patents, which will be news to the Bureau and the Patent Office. Nevertheless, his attacks on the patriotism and honesty of American scientists are bound to be taken seriously by many people and will do harm.

We are particularly aroused at the treatment accorded Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the Bureau of Standards, who, by inference and innuendo, is made to appear engaged in reprehensible and subversive activities.

Dr. Condon is a distinguished scientist, the director of a great national institution, a former president of the American Physical Society, sometimes adviser to the Senate on matters concerning atomic energy, and a former associate director of the Westinghouse laboratories. By no stretch of the imagination is he a Communist or an unloyal American.

Mr. THOMAS especially attacks Dr. Condon for his membership on the board of directors of the American-Soviet Science Society. This organization, which has received a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation, is in no way connected with any pro-Soviet agency. It exists solely for the purpose of furthering international exchange of scientific information (something scientists everywhere favor), particularly by making Russian scientific papers available in English.

Mr. THOMAS furthermore plainly implies that Dr. Condon is dodging testifying before the Thomas committee. Dr. Condon, however, can hardly be an unwilling witness, since he has never been invited to testify, although he was visited in March by two of the committee's investigators, with whom he cooperated completely.

One of the most distinguished and famed Americans, a scientist, an engineer, a business executive, and a prominent Republican, is Dr. Frank B. Jewett. It is worth noting some of the positions which Dr. Jewett has held in his long and brilliant career in American science, business, and engineering:

Transmission engineer, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 1904–12.

Assistant chief engineer, Western Electric Co., 1912–16.

Chief engineer, Western Electric Co., 1916–21.

Vice president and chief engineer, Western Electric Co., 1921–22.

Vice president, Western Electric Co., 1922–25.

Vice president in charge of development research, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 1925 until his recent retirement.

President of the Bell Telephone Laboratories of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 1925–40.

Chairman of the board, Bell Telephone Laboratories, 1940 to the present.

Vice chairman of the Engineering Foundation, 1921–25.

Chairman, Division of Engineering and Industrial Research, National Research Council, 1923–27.

Member, National Defense Research Committee, Office of Scientific Research and Development, 1941–47.

Trustee, Carnegie Institution.

Trustee, Princeton University.

Member of the Corporation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

President, National Academy of Sciences, 1939–47.

I will not add other positions, nor will I mention awards and distinctions that have been conferred upon him. As long ago as last June 24, 1947, shortly after two articles by Congressman THOMAS appeared in popular magazines, attacking Dr. Condon, Dr. Jewett took cognizance of the situation and recognized not only the injustice to Dr. Condon but the grave implications to science and the national welfare. On June 24, 1947, Dr. Jewett wrote to a prominent fellow-Republican of New Jersey in the following vein, referring to Congressman THOMAS' articles:

While I know that no one can restrain Members of Congress from writing what they wish, I think it high time that some of you in the New Jersey Republican high command let Thomas know that articles like these are harmful and do neither the Nation nor the Republican Party, and particularly those of us here in New Jersey, any good. They are in the pattern of the worst that the Dies committee members put out.

Referring to Dr. Condon, Dr. Jewett said, in this letter:

By no stretch of the imagination is he a Communist or an unloyal American and yet THOMAS had used his position to make it appear that there is something hidden and reprehensible in what Condon has done and is doing.

Dr. Jewett concluded:

I have written you thus at length merely with the thought that you and others of our New Jersey Republican command should know that some of us good GOP boys disapprove strongly of the type of publicity Thomas is emitting.

I have already included, earlier, Dr. Jewett's recent comments on the March 1, 1948, attacks on Dr. Condon. On March 11, 1948, Dr. Jewett, sensitive to the destructive implications of the attacks on the future of science and government, addressed a statement on Scientists in Government at Work to the editor of the New York Times:

An experience of 8 years as president of the National Academy of Sciences and as a member of the National Defense Research Committee throughout its life makes me conscious of the difficulty of getting many of our ablest scientists to undertake work for the Government under the best of conditions and enables me to confirm the opinion expressed in your editorial of March 8 on the Condon case.

In wartime scientists will volunteer, as all good citizens will, and put up with necessary restraints and irritations. In peacetime, however, the conditions of Government service are not attractive to many if not most of our ablest scientists. The restraints on freedom of operation and the petty annoyances of bureaucracy are repugnant to them. Hence they are not attracted by Government service, even though they know that the problems presented for solution are important.

If to these normal drawbacks is added the constant threat of being publicly pilloried as traitors without opportunity to learn the specific charges made against them and to have their day in court in a public hearing, scientists would be less than human if they declined to assume the risk. Those of us who spend a lifetime in science know the extent and intensity of this feeling and the price the Nation will pay if the feeling persists.

Irrespective of the outcome of the charges which, without giving him an opportunity to defend himself, have been made against Dr. Condon, it is high time that Mr. THOMAS and his associates changed their methods. Even if the promptings of common decency did not bring about a change there is a very practical reason why they should, and the reason is that they are endangering the safety of the Nation at a crucial moment in history.

Still another indication of the reaction of the Nation is the dinner held on April 12, at the Biltmore Hotel in New York City, by scientists from every part of the Nation as an expression of confidence in Dr. Condon. Dr. Harold C. Urey, professor of chemistry at the University of Chicago, Nobel prize winner, and chairman of the dinner committee, had this to say of the attacks on Dr. Condon in announcing the dinner:

The undocumented and irresponsible attacks made by the House Committee on Un-American Activities on Dr. Edward U. Condon, Chief of the United States Bureau of Standards, have disgusted all fair-minded Americans. Conservatives and liberals alike have united in condemning the methods of Congressman THOMAS and his associates, who have it in their power to destroy the reputation of any citizen by vague insinuations.

The scientific community has reason to feel a special sense of outrage at the unwarranted attacks on the loyalty of our colleague. Many of us who have been closely associated with Dr. Condon over a long period—during his years of university teaching, his associate directorship of the Westinghouse research laboratory, and especially his period of invaluable service to his country on the Manhattan District project—have good reason to place full confidence in his complete integrity and loyalty to American institutions.

The sponsors—123 in number—represent a veritable galaxy of scientific stars, Nobel prize winners, heads of departments in leading universities, presidents of universities, national leaders in almost every field of the sciences. The sponsors are:

Dr. S. K. Allison, University of Chicago.
Carl D. Anderson, California Institute of Technology.
Kenneth T. Bainbridge, Harvard University.
E. T. Bell, California Institute of Technology.
Hans A. Bethe, Cornell University.
Raymond T. Birge, University of California.
Francis Bitter, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
Lyle Borst, Brookhaven National Laboratory.
Gregory Breit, Yale University.
F. G. Brickwedde, National Bureau of Standards.
P. W. Bridgman, Harvard University.
Harrison Brown, University of Chicago.
Perry Byerly, University of California.
A. J. Carlson, University of Chicago.
Robert F. Christy, California Institute of Technology.
Karl T. Compton, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
Richard Courant, New York University.
Wheeler P. Daved, Pennsylvania State University.
Peter J. W. Debye, Cornell University.
Milislav Demerec, Carnegie Institute of Washington.
David M. Dennison, University of Michigan.
Theodosius Dobzhansky, Columbia University.
L. C. Dunn, Columbia University.
Vincent du Bigneaud, Cornell University.
Albert Einstein, Institute for Advanced Study.
Paul S. Epstein, California Institute of Technology.
R. D. Evans, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
James Franck, University of Chicago.
W. H. Furry, Harvard University.
Paul Gross, Duke University.
R. G. Gustavson, University of Nebraska.
W. D. Harkins, University of Chicago.
Ross G. Harrison, Yale University.
William Havens, Columbia University.
Michael Heidelberger, Columbia University.
Karl F. Herzfeld, Catholic University.
W. A. Higinbotham, Brookhaven National Laboratory.
Joel H. Hildebrand, University of California.
Thorfin R. Hogness, University of Chicago.
Ernest A. Hooton, Harvard University.
J. C. Hunsaker, Massachusetts Institute of Technology and chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.
D. R. Inglis, Johns Hopkins University.
Edwin C. Kemble, Harvard University.
Earle H. Kennard, Cornell University.
M. S. Kharasch, University of Chicago.
John G. Kirkwood, Cornell University.
P. Gerald Kurger, University of Illinois.
K. S. Lashley, Yerkes Laboratories.
Charles C. Lauritsen, California Institute of Technology.
Andrew C. Lawson, University of California.
Solomon Lefschetz, Princeton University.
Leo Loeb, Washington University.
Ralph Linton, Columbia University.
M. S. Livingston, Brookhaven National Laboratory.
F. W. Loomis, University of Illinois.
Irving Lowen, New York University.
Robert H. Lowie, University of California.
Duncan A. MacInnes, Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research.
Julian Mack, University of Wisconsin.
Henry Margenau, Yale University.
Robert Marshak, University of Rochester.
Joseph E. Mayer, University of Chicago.
Richard L. Meier, Federation of American Scientists.
K. F. Meyer, University of California.
Leonor Michaelis, Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research.
Alan C. G. Mitchell, University of Indiana.
Philip Morrison, Cornell University.
H. Marston Morse, Institute for Advanced Study.
Philip Morse, Brookhaven National Laboratory.
F. R. Moulton, Smithsonian Institute.
H. J. Muller, University of Indiana.
Robert S. Mulliken, University of Chicago.
F. D. Murnaghan, Johns Hopkins University.
Harold H. Nielsen, Ohio State University.
W. Albert Noyes, Jr., University of Rochester.
Linus Pauling, California Institute of Technology.
Ernest Pollard, Yale University.
Daniel Q. Posin, North Dakota State Agricultural College.
James Rainwater, Columbia University.
H. M. Randall, University of Michigan.
William Barita, Brooklyn College.
M. M. Rhoades, Columbia University.
W. H. Rodenbush, University of Illinois.
Vladimir Rojansky, Union College.
Henry Morris Russell, Princeton University.
Edward O. Salant, Brookhaven National Laboratory.
R. A. Sawyer, University of Michigan.
George Scatchard, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
G. T. Seaborg, University of California.
Frederick Seitz, Carnegie Institute of Technology.
Henry Semat, College of the City of New York.
Robert Serber, University of California.
Harlow Shapley, Harvard University.
John C. Slater, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
Homer W. Smith, New York University.
Lloyd P. Smith, Cornell University.
Tracy M. Sonneborn, Indiana University.
Otto Stern, University of California.
Otto Struve, Yerkes Observatory.
Richard M. Sutton, Haverford College.
Leo Szilard, University of Chicago.
Edward Teller, University of Chicago.
Edward L. Thorndike, Columbia University.
M. A. Tuve, Carnegie Institute of Washington.
Harold C. Urey, University of Chicago.
C. B. Van Niel, Stanford University.
J. H. Van Vleck, Harvard University.
Oswald Veblen, The Institute for Advanced Study.
Selman A. Waksman, New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station.
William W. Watson, Yale University.
D. L. Webster, Stanford University.
Victor S. Weisskopf, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
Herman Weyl, Institute for Advanced Study.
George H. Whipple, University of Rochester.
J. B. Whitehead, Johns Hopkins University.
Eugene P. Wigner, Princeton University.
L. A. Wills, College of the City of New York.
R. R. Wilson, Cornell University.
Hugh C. Wolfe, College of the City of New York.
Jerrold Zacharias, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
Oscar Zariski, Harvard University.
M. W. Zemansky, College of the City of New York.
Clarence Zener, University of Chicago.

These illustrations of the reaction of important organizations, groups, and individuals to the unwarranted and unfair attacks on Dr. E. U. Condon are merely representative. Neither time nor space permit the presentation of the full response. Startling though this response is, it is even more significant, for this is a period when we are all seriously concerned with grave national and international issues. In spite of these issues, the best minds of the Nation were so outraged at the attacks that they have reacted—and reacted in no uncertain terms.

Those distinguished Americans who know Dr. Condon—and there are many hundreds of these—have left no doubt about their knowledge of the integrity, the loyalty, the utter reliability, and dependability of this famed scientist, whom Fortune ranked as one of the 10 scientists of top rank which this Nation has developed in 200 years.

Both those who know Dr. Condon and those who do not, have left no doubt about their grave concern over the tac-

tics and procedures of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

All have realized the appalling significance of these tactics and attacks in terms of the future of the progress of science in this country, in terms of the future of the relation of scientists to the Government, in terms of the future of the national security and welfare which rest on uninterrupted progress in science.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on roll call 45 I am not recorded because I was absent from the Chamber on official business. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 45 I am not recorded because I was absent from the chamber on official business. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 45 I am not recorded because I was absent from the chamber on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

REPORT ON BOGOTA

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, to begin with, may I say that never has this great chamber looked as welcome to my eyes as it does at the present moment, nor has the warm feeling I hold for the Members of this body ever seemed quite as cordial. The old adage that "Absence makes the heart grow fonder" is most certainly applicable in the present instance.

Scarcely more than 2 weeks ago, I left Washington as your observer for the Ninth Conference of American States at Bogota, Colombia. Here it was hoped to draft an organic pact in cooperation with the other American Republics, a pact which would act as a guide post in our future relations with each other. The conference was to climax many previous discussions which had contributed so much to a better understanding between the countries in this hemisphere. It was to be a pact within the framework of the United Nations and was intended to lend an added measure of strength and stability to our relationships, not only with Latin-America, but with all of the other countries of the earth.

The opening sessions of the conference were disposed of without untoward incidents, and agreement was early reached which assigned the delegation members to six committees, the duties of which were clearly set forth and whose functions were designed to facilitate consideration of the many questions of mutual self-interest, the resolution of which might contribute to a peaceful and prosperous hemisphere. There was no thought expressed in any United States delegation meeting which I attended, and I was present at most of them, that might have been interpreted by anyone as representing selfish interest on the part of the United States or which could conceivably indicate anything resembling a design for hemispheric imperialism.

Yet the same forces of obstruction—the agents of world chaos—the planners of a world proletariat state—the international Communists, whose god is Lenin and whose prophet is Stalin, were determined that this new move in the direction of world order and stability must be blocked at any cost. Sound economies, public order, juridical processes, constitutional forms, and the expressions of majority opinion have always been and will ever continue to be the greatest road blocks on the path to a Red world.

The Colombian Communist, like his counterpart here in America and in every land, owes no loyalty to his native soil. His only allegiance is paid to the Kremlin, and he has long since lost the habit of original thought. He parrots his Marxian philosophy like a ventriloquist's dummy, and his devotion to civil liberties is a touching thing to behold—until he obtains the whip hand. He is an agent of a police state such as the world has never seen, and his hatred of property and those who hold it is second only to his desire to personally acquire something for nothing. Lacking shoes, he detests those who wear them, and his ideology leads him to set the torch to the shoe factory in order that his innate inferiority complex may better be disguised in a shoeless world. The cold fact that he has never tried to earn a pair of shoes, a suit of clothes, an automobile, or a home never infringes upon a mentality better suited to looting, rapacity, and murder.

The rise of communism offered an international sanctuary for the mass diseased minds of the earth. The international paranoics, under the cloak of humanity long ago set forth to chart a course of world conquest. Using the tools of fear, famine, and disease, these parasites on the social body early discovered that any promise, made often enough and fervently enough would serve to list recruits for any cause, and there were many people ready to listen at the beginning. Peasants who had toiled on fuedal land for centuries were happy to rid themselves of landlords, who had demanded 50 percent of all the crops they raised. However, the tumult of joy subsided quickly under the new masters when from 65 percent to 80 percent of the annual crops disappeared down the red maw of the new master.

But Colombia is a peaceful land. For many years the sounds of war had not been heard. Two generations of Colombians had grown up in an era of tranquillity. Some of the governments were good, some were bad, but none had been so corrupt as to render it necessary to bring it down with the sword.

There was a general dissatisfaction with the government of Ospina Perez, the conservative. The Liberal Party, and it should here be emphasized that the Liberal Party is by no means an agent of communism in Colombia, was determined to change the administration. There is nothing to indicate that the party, as such, had in mind any other course of action than that provided constitutionally. But when one considers courses of action in a world such as ours today, he must also consider whether or not he will be master of the situation when he embarks upon his project. One finds strange bedfellows in world politics today.

So it was with Colombia. I hold no brief for or against the Perez government. Although unpopular with many thousands of Colombians, it had been duly elected and constitutionally installed. Neither do I feel that the Liberal Party sanctions or endorses the actions of the mobs under their anarchist leaders.

But the fact remains that the Red tide last week touched the shores of the Western Hemisphere, and with the sword and torch the agents of international aggression have laid waste a capital city of one of the American Republics. For the first time organized Red leadership has bared its teeth in an expression of riot, pillage, and slaughter that cannot go unnoticed by the other nations whose interest and independence have been so vitally affected by the uprising at Bogota, Colombia, on the afternoon of Friday, April 9.

Whether or not the assassination of the Liberal leader and idol, Jorge Gaitán, was an act of the Communists, a disgruntled Liberal, or the Conservative administration itself will probably never be known, so rapid was the action by which the assassin was hauled through milling mobs and lynched within the sight of thousands. But, sincere patriot or paid hireling, the lips that might have told the world of the true story of his motivation or his purpose have been sealed forever. It is enough to know that the shots fired by his hand not only gave the signal for one of the most violent uprisings in the history of the Western Hemisphere, but, what is more important, gave the United States and the other Republics of the Continent a close-up view of what any country can expect in the face of organized mob violence.

The proportion of Communists and Communist sympathizers in the maddened throngs which for 3 days looted and burned their own national institutions and facilities in Colombia, probably did not exceed 5 percent of the population, but under the prodding and harangues of the Red leaders, they lost their sense of direction and purpose, and turned from a possibly legitimate expression of national dissatisfaction with the Conservative government to violence, bloodshed, arson, and looting. Grief for the untimely death of Gaitán turned in a single hour to unrestricted mob violence, which spared neither shop, church, public utility or institution of public service. Inflamed by initial success the mobs milled in the streets, armed with whatever weapons they could obtain, smashing windows and doors, overturning streetcars and busses, looting shops, markets, and stores, and then setting the torch to the shambles remaining. What could be carried was taken, what could not be lifted was smashed. Bolts of textiles were carried into the streets to be hauled their entire lengths through the gutters. Wanton and useless destruction was the order of the day.

Foreigners sought refuge where they could find it, and it must be said that many found their sanctuary under the

roofs of the sincere and hospitable Colombian people, upon whom the shame of these hours will long lay as a heavy blight. Nor was the open repugnance at the action of the mobs restricted to the upper or small middle class. It is shared by thousands and thousands of ordinary Colombian men and women, men and women who work for low wages and for long hours but in whom love of God, country, and human decency are inherent. All of us who were in Bogota during the first few hours of the uprising were struck by the loyalty of the men and women who served in the most menial positions, but who had come to look upon us as friends and guests within their country. I can best illustrate this point by referring to our flight from the capital building, which was the first of the national structures to feel the impact of the mobs bent on destruction.

The national capitol of Colombia, like the building in which this Congress sits, is a beautiful structure. Its parquet floors, its great chandeliers, its ceiling-high mirrors, and the extreme good taste of its furnishing would have done justice to a much greater state than Colombia. The nation had spared no expense in making what it considered suitable preparations for the Ninth Conference of American states. Modern translation equipment was installed and the complete building was refinished and repaired for what was to be a great and satisfying moment in the history of the country, that moment in which a free and independent Colombia would play proud host to her sister republics. Bedecked with the flags of the conference, the capitol was a sight of splendor dominating the open square on which it faces. Flanked by a magnificent cathedral on one side and shops and stores on the other two sides, the Plaza, during the first days of the conference, gave little indication of the bloody rioting that was to center around its fountains within such a short few days.

On Friday last your observer, together with three other members of the United States delegation was having lunch in the fine restaurant located in the Capitol basement. Gaitán was murdered shortly after 1 p. m. on Friday and within minutes the mobs were surging through the Plaza. The unarmed police were powerless to cope with the situation and were brushed aside by the rioters as they streamed into the building. Red flags were in profusion and I personally saw hammer-and-sickle flags. Using stones, bricks, machetes, and boards, the mob commenced a methodical tour of destruction which was to render the first floor of the capitol building a shambles within a matter of minutes. The police reorganized and in a short while managed to eject the rioters from the building. Delegates were herded to the upper floors and were told that they would be evacuated by army convoy within an hour.

In the meanwhile, the surging mobs turned their attention to automobiles, streetcars, and buses in the Plaza square and within 2 hours after the initial outbreak much of Bogota's transportation was in flames, and the columns of black smoke which were to characterize this city for the next 3 days were rolling skyward. In every group there appeared to be a leader with a plan. Orators harangued the mobs and the most frequently heard phrase was "Abajo," which means "down with." After the first few senseless minutes of apparent confusion, the movement gained added impetus and a new sense of organization. Looting broke out and the first fires in the business district were started. Firing, which was rare in the first several hours became more general as night approached.

Considering that another attack on the Capitol was likely four of us decided on an attempt to reach our hotel at about 3:30 p. m. The crowds were concentrated in the front of the Capitol, so we left by the back street. We passed through a great many groups being harangued by speakers. One of our number, Edward Hidalgo, who speaks fluent Spanish interpreted some of the phrases overheard in passing. They consisted principally of "imperialism," "arise workers," and the usual Communist patter familiar to the members of this body.

What might have occurred had we not come upon a friendly Colombian is difficult to state. In any event, he exposed himself to no little danger in offering us the use of his ancient car which was one of the very few to be seen intact on Bogota streets last Friday. By a circuitous route through the looting and ugly crowds he finally brought us to our hotel where we found a number of other members of the United States delegation.

Friday night found the United States group isolated in three principal locations, although some few others were elsewhere in the city. At the United States Embassy approximately 65 persons under the direction of Assistant Secretary of State Norman Armour, were completely isolated from the American delegation headquarters group directly across the street in the Edifico Americano. The delegation members were headed by Mr. Paul Daniels, Chief of American Republic Affairs in the Department of State. Secretary Marshall and others of the United States group were isolated in their residences elsewhere in the city.

Communications on Friday night, save for the radio in the Embassy building, were nonexistent. Fires almost completely circled the two buildings and a small blaze in the basement of the Embassy building was taken under control before it could seriously damage the structure. There was no food available for the Americans in either building, although others of us at the delegation hotel were more fortunate in this respect. During Friday night a crude bomb was thrown into the United States delegation headquarters, but no casualties resulted.

I feel that I would be remiss in my duty as your observer if I did not mention at this point the courage and high morale of all of the United States delegation members during the entire course of the uprising. Thousands of miles from home, with flame on three sides, with looting and marauding mobs howling through the streets, the courage and devotion to duty of the United States group was an inspiration to all who witnessed the tragedy at Bogota.

Not one American was armed and constant attempts were made by the rioters to enter any and all buildings. In spite of this continuous turmoil on Friday night, the personnel remained orderly and calm and did whatever they could to help facilitate the general welfare.

Frequently we are prone to criticize the work of those who serve us abroad in the various delegations or the Foreign Service. I think I know something of war, and I believe that these were excellent United States soldiers on a dangerous assignment if any ever were.

Later, when evacuations commenced, it was found necessary to order some of the personnel to leave their post of duty to return to Panama and the United States. I, for one, am proud and happy to have gone through the Bogota tragedy with the men and women who comprised our task force at the Conference. They are splendid Americans and all should know of their labors and their courage.

Upon orders of Secretary of State Marshall, evacuations of all but vitally needed personnel commenced on Saturday. Communications were still out of order, but armed convoys were able to move from place to place under heavy sniper fire. A high priority for evacuations was assigned to delegates from all republics and many other men, women, and children of the Latin-American countries were flown out of Bogota by the Twentieth Troop Transport Command, based in Panama. Incoming planes carried rations in case of food shortages, and assurances were given all delegations that such rations would be made available to them as needed.

What then, Mr. Speaker, are the portents for America? What relation does an uprising in such a remote and inaccessible place as Bogota mean in terms of the future welfare and security of the United States? To me, the implications are clear. The uprising in Colombia is not something that just happened, a chance meeting place for opposing forces in basic conflict with each other. The events of the past week, Mr. Speaker, are but additional stitches in the cloth of violence, which will, when completed, represent the triumph of brute force over law and freedom.

What has happened in Bogota can and will happen again in such places as New York City, Chicago, and San Francisco unless we, who still remain free and unfettered gird ourselves for all-out battle with the enemy. This is war as truly as if we were opposed by armed might and a physical enemy. What is more, it is not an enemy who shows quarter to the vanquished or mercy to the noncombatants. It is a foe unlike any monstrosity produced in all history, an adversary to whom any means justify the end.

This body is presently considering legislation to cope with the tragedy of atheistic communism. It is my fervent hope, and I know that this hope is shared by millions of people throughout this country, that the finished measure will bear as many fangs as the creature with

which we have to contend; that it will match blow for blow and lash for lash; that it will guarantee at least one place on the face of the earth where a man can walk upright in human dignity and freedom without fear of the sword, the scourge, or the lash.

There can be no peace in a world divided between these two basic philosophies, and he who contends that there can be speaks out of the sheerest folly or the deepest malice. We could not do business with Hitler and we cannot do business with Stalin. The basic concepts of America with respect to the fundamental rights of man are entirely and completely incompatible with any police state order, no matter how disguised by its apologists and its advocates.

Colombia is a milepost on the road of aggression. Its warning is clear to all who witnessed the violence and the bloodshed in Colombia. It will be followed by other warnings, whose meanings will not lend themselves to misinterpretation. The clamor, the tumult and the shouting will doubtless continue in the Kremlin, on the sad streets and boulevards of an enslaved world, yes Mr. Speaker, here on the floor of this House. There will be those who will proclaim the sins of omission and commission perpetrated by Wall Street bankers, imperialists and all the rest of the nauseuous tommyrot with which our ears are daily filled by the front organizations, and the Communist world press. In the meanwhile, force, brutal and undisguised will continue to ride roughshod over the home, the church, and the popular will.

Fortunately, sound counsel from liberals and conservatives alike appears to prevail for the moment in the Colombian Government. The delegations, proceeding again to their work, have received guaranties of sufficient physical protection to permit the resumption of the discussions. Although foiled temporarily in their efforts to seize the nation for their own purpose, there is no guaranty that the Communist agents will not make early and renewed efforts to seize power—not in the name of the Colombian people, but in the name of bloodshed and carnage.

It is an hour of moment for the United States. It is the hour of decision. To block the Communists in their quest for power here at home may conceivably infringe upon some small measure of the individual rights of those who are not themselves Communists, but whose actions lend every aid and comfort to the enemy. In the interest of the vast majority of the American people this becomes our solemn and sworn duty. If there is one thing certain it is the fact that failing to take action in the near future will mean the permanent loss of an even greater number of our own American rights.

It is better and easier to retain liberty than it will be to regain it, once lost.

UNIFORM SYSTEM OF BANKRUPTCY

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4326) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "1948" and insert "1949."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, and I presume again today, the Member from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] proceeded to malign the Committee on Un-American Activities and to put in the RECORD attacks on the chairman of that committee that should be stricken from the RECORD, and to quote from various papers over the Nation statements on a subject with which they are not familiar, attacking the committee because of the so-called Condon case.

I was not on the subcommittee that handled that case in the beginning. But I know something of the facts in the case.

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, the head of the FBI, a great and patriotic American, wrote a three-page letter on this Condon case, and the Committee on Un-American Activities has asked to see that letter.

Because of our request, and because of the information the Committee on Un-American Activities has uncovered this campaign of malicious attacks on the Committee on un-American Activities is being carried on.

The atomic bomb is the most dangerous weapon the world has ever known. A few of them would almost destroy America if properly placed. This committee has some information which we propose for the House to have. All we are asking now is that this letter be submitted to a committee of the House of Representatives.

I submit that no head of a department has the right to pull down an iron curtain between the Congress and those individuals on the Federal pay roll whom we have a right to investigate.

I have no ax to grind in this matter. I have said time and again on this floor that my country comes first. If it were not for the serious questions that are involved I would not serve on this committee for another day. But I realize we are confronted with some of the most serious problems that have ever come before the Congress of the United States. Some of those questions are going to be brought to a vote to the floor of the House within the next week or 10 days. The Committee on un-American Activities is doing its best to protect this country from the enemies within our gates and I protest against these vicious attacks on the committee by a Member whose record has been one of open antagonism toward that committee from the very beginning.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Waterbury American.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2195. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2038. An act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President for his approval bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 358. An act for relief of Hilario A. Goitia;

H. R. 387. An act for relief of Hayato Harris Ozawa;

H. R. 388. An act for relief of Bert Harrington, Jr.;

H. R. 420. An act for relief of Esther Ringel;

H. R. 421. An act for relief of Betty Isabel Schunke;

H. R. 560. An act for relief of Wilhemina Piper Enz;

H. R. 899. An act for relief of Mrs. Keum Nyu Park;

H. R. 927. An act for relief of the estate of Mary D. Briggs, deceased;

H. R. 990. An act for relief of William B. Moore;

H. R. 1859. An act for relief of Philip Lee Sjoerdt Huizenga;

H. R. 1912. An act for relief of John A. Dilboy;

H. R. 1927. An act for relief of Margaret Katherine Hume;

H. R. 2213. An act for relief of A. J. Sprouffske;

H. R. 2250. An act for relief of Mrs. Daisy A. T. Jaegers;

H. R. 2303. An act for relief of Mitsu M. Kobayashi;

H. R. 2425. An act for relief of August Dane Tetuaearo;

H. R. 2427. An act for relief of Jose Cabral Lorenzo;

H. R. 2557. An act for relief of Mable Gladys Viducich;

H. R. 2633. An act for relief of Claude T. Thomas, and others;

H. R. 2645. An act to provide that appointments of United States commissioners in certain national parks shall be made by

United States district courts without recommendation and approval of Secretary of of Interior;

H. R. 3039. An act for relief of Mrs. Marian D. McC. Plein;

H. R. 3300. An act for relief of Martin King;

H. R. 3387. An act for relief of Bruce Bros. Grain Co.;

H. R. 3263. An act for relief of Tech. Sgt. Tsuyoshi Matsumoto;

H. R. 3484. An act to transfer the Remount Service from the Department of the Army to the Department of Agriculture;

H. R. 3569. An act to authorize the construction of a chapel and a library at the United States Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, N. Y.;

H. R. 3849. An act for relief of Domingo Gandarias;

H. R. 3968. An act for relief of Olive Irene Milloglav;

H. R. 4118. An act to confirm title in fee simple in Thomas Loflin to certain lands in Rankin County, Miss.;

H. R. 4403. An act for relief of Ladislao Vaida and others;

H. R. 4572. An act to amend section 7 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act of 1925;

H. R. 4636. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929, as amended;

H. R. 4649. An act to provide that compensation of members of the Alcholic Beverage Control Board of the District of Columbia shall be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923;

H. R. 4739. An act to amend paragraph 1629 of the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to provide for the free importation of exposed X-ray film;

H. R. 5328. An act to amend paragraph 1803 (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, relating to firewood and other woods; and

H. R. 5387. An act for relief of certain officers and employees of the Department of the Treasury.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, April 19, 1948, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1468. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting the quarterly report of the United States Maritime Commission on the activities and transactions of the Commission under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 from January 1 through March 31, 1948; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1469. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation and a supplemental estimate for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $268,000,000 for the Treasury Department (H. Doc. No. 614); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Committee on Armed Services. Senate Joint Resolution 207. Joint resolution to provide for the commemoration of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the establishment of the Department of the Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1742). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. S. 1545. An act to authorize a bridge, roads and approaches, supports and bents, or other structures, across, over, or upon lands of the United States within the limits of the Colonial National Historical Park at or near Yorktown, Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1744). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. S. 1611. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Sauk Rapids, Minn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1745). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 5543. A bill granting the consent of Congress to Carolina Power & Light Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in the Lumber River; without amendment (Rept. No. 1746). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 6188. A bill to confer jurisdiction over the Fort Des Moines Veterans' Village upon the State of Iowa; without amendment (Rept. No. 1747). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 6228. A bill to provide for the construction of shore protective works at the town of Nome, Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 1748). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHAFER: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5298. A bill to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1749). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 3239. A bill to amend section 4 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, approved September 7, 1916; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1750). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 3915. A bill to increase the size of the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1751). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6224. A bill for the relief of John Watkins; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1743). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 6258. A bill to tax the profits out of war by steeply graduated income and other taxes in order to provide for an effective national defense, to promote peace, to encourage actual neutrality, to discourage war profiteering, to distribute the burdens of war, to keep democracy alive, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. R. 6259. A bill relating to the meat-inspection service of the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ELSAESSER:

H. R. 6260. A bill to review reports on the Buffalo, N. Y., harbor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 6261. A bill to provide for the Adm. David Glasgow Farragut Birthplace National Monument; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. R. 6262. A bill to prevent profiteering in time of war and to equalize the burdens of war and thus provide for the national defense and promote peace; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 6263. A bill to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 6264. A bill to provide reduced annuities at age 55 after 5 years of civilian service for persons involuntarily separated from the Federal service not by removal for cause; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McMAHON:

H. J. Res. 374. Joint resolution to increase the sum authorized to be appropriated for the presentation to Eire of a statue of Commodore John Barry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. J. Res. 375. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim an annual National Rededication to Marriage Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 376. Joint resolution providing for closer cooperation between the legislative and executive branches of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. J. Res. 377. Joint resolution to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to strengthen the American merchant marine, to encourage investment in the American merchant marine, to build more ships, and to remove inequities; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. Res. 539. Resolution providing for the payment to Ella J. Ickes, widow of William G. Ickes, late employee of the House, 6 months' salary and $250 funeral expenses; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. Res. 543. Resolution providing for printing additional 25,000 copies of Fascism in Action; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MacKINNON:

H. R. 6265. A bill for the relief of Adolphson, Huseth, Layser & Welch, a partnership; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 6266. A bill for the relief of Jerzy Adam Szafir; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1783. By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Kent County, Del., containing 400 signa-

tures, requesting passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1784. By Mr. GOFF: Petition of Mrs. F. O. Brocke and 105 others, urging passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1785. By Mr. HART: Petition of the American Legion, Department of New Jersey, expressing opposition to any reduction or curtailment of services or benefits to veterans of World Wars I and II; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1786. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition signed by Mrs. Ethel Ayers and 49 other citizens of Corvallis, Oreg., endorsing a system of universal military training, as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1787. By the SPEAKER: Petition of W. A. Naurman, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1788. Also, petition of F. A. Winchell, Miami, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1789. Also, petition of Mrs. F. A. Winchell, Miami, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1790. Also, petition of Mrs. G. E. Knapp, Orlo Vista, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1791. Also, petition of Pfc. W. C. Farrell, APO 169, care of Postmaster, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to endorsement of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 19, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, March 29, 1948)

The Senate met at 11:30 a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Clarence W. Cranford, pastor of the Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

We cannot enter this room, our Father, without realizing that the lives of millions of people are affected by the decisions that are made here. If ever anyone needed divine guidance, surely it is those who have the responsibility of leading America in these critical days of the world's history. Seeing, therefore, that they are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses around the world, help these who are the lawmakers of our land to face with patience the tasks that are set before them, looking unto Thee for inspiration and guidance. And may the reward of their labors be a peaceful world. We pray in Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 15, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] be granted leave to be absent from the Senate through Wednesday next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6226) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 3703. An act to authorize transfer of surplus real property to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior for consolidation of Federal holdings within areas administered by the National Park Service; and

H. R. 4326. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO NOON TUESDAY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business for today it take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMEMORATION OF FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF LIBERATION OF CUBA—JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to make an announcement for the benefit of the Senate. Under House Concurrent Resolution 184, the Senate will go to the Hall of the House of Representatives where a joint session of the two Houses will be held in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the liberation of Cuba. It is the intention that the Senate shall proceed to the Hall of the House in a body and shall return to the Senate Chamber and reassemble immediately after the ceremonies are concluded.

After the Senate reassembles, there will be an opportunity for Senators to make insertions in the RECORD and for any other business the Senate may desire to transact.

I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bricker	Butler
Baldwin	Bridges	Byrd
Ball	Brooks	Cain
Barkley	Buck	Capehart
Brewster	Bushfield	Capper
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Cordon	Kem	Reed
Donnell	Kilgore	Revercomb
Downey	Knowland	Robertson, Va.
Dworshak	Langer	Robertson, Wyo.
Eastland	Lodge	Russell
Ecton	Lucas	Saltonstall
Ellender	McCarran	Stennis
Ferguson	McCarthy	Stewart
Flanders	McClellan	Taft
Fulbright	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
George	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Green	McKellar	Thye
Gurney	McMahon	Tobey
Hatch	Malone	Tydings
Hawkes	Martin	Vandenberg
Hayden	Maybank	Watkins
Hickenlooper	Millikin	Wherry
Hoey	Moore	White
Holland	Morse	Wiley
Ives	O'Conor	Williams
Jenner	O'Daniel	Wilson
Johnson, Colo.	Overton	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Under the order of the day, the Senate will proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

Thereupon, at 11 o'clock and 41 minutes a. m., the Senate, preceded by its Secretary (Carl A. Loeffler), its Sergeant at Arms (Edward F. McGinnis), and the President pro tempore proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to attend the ceremonies commemorative of the fiftieth anniversary of the liberation of Cuba.

The joint meeting of the two Houses having been dissolved, the Senate returned to its Chamber at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would like to express on behalf of the Senate to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] and his associates the Senate's gratitude for the very able manner in which today's ceremonies were planned and executed. [Applause.]

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED PROVISION PERTAINING TO APPROPRIATION FOR NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD (S. Doc. No. 147)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of

a proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation for the National Mediation Board, fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF NAVAL PICKET BOATS TO DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION OF NEW JERSEY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Department of Conservation of the State of New Jersey had requested the Navy Department to transfer two picket boats for use by the division of shell fisheries of that organization; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EDWIN B. ANDERSON

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Edwin B. Anderson, a city letter carrier in the post office at Newton, Iowa (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF ALASKA OCEAN TRANSPORTATION ACTIVITIES

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the third report of Alaska ocean transportation activities (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Southern Council on International Relations, at Louisville, Ky., favoring the enactment of legislation extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act; to the Committee on Finance.

The memorial of Morde Scher, of New York, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the draft and universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from Ralph W. Sockman, minister of Christ Methodist Church, New York City, N. Y., transmitting a statement adopted by more than 125 representative Christian leaders from 20 different States and 12 denominations in meeting assembled at Washington, D. C., relating to world peace (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Frank Golden, of Nebraska, to be United States marshal for the district of Nebraska, vice George E. Proudfit, resigned; and

Julius J. Wichser, of Indiana, to be a United States marshal for the southern district of Indiana.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2510. A bill to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic tube systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(Mr. CHAVEZ introduced Senate bill 2511, repealing section 202 (e) of the Sugar Act of 1948, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2512. A bill for the relief of Ion Stanescu and Catherina Stanescu; and

S. 2513. A bill for the relief of Sabina N. Heliczer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming:

S. 2514. A bill to extend for 1 year the temporary price support program for wool; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SUGAR ACT OF 1948

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, just a short while ago we heard these words from the President of the United States:

The challenge of our time, like the one met so successfully by those we honor today, tests the mettle of men and their institutions of government.

In order to carry out that idea I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to repeal section 202 (e) of the Sugar Act of 1948.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2511) repealing section 202 (e) of the Sugar Act of 1948, introduced by Mr. CHAVEZ, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. GURNEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 224), which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eightieth Congress, $5,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purpose, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

COORDINATED AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM—AMENDMENT

Mr. LUCAS (for Mr. MAGNUSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MAGNUSON to the bill (S. 2318) to provide for a coordinated agricultural program, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6226) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ABANDONMENT OF PEACE-MAKING PRINCIPLES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MILLIKIN

[Mr. BRICKER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator MILLIKIN before the Ohio Federation of Republican Women's Organizations at Toledo, Ohio, April 12, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CIVIL RIGHTS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR EASTLAND

[Mr. STENNIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator EASTLAND before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MORE ABUNDANT LIFE—ADDRESS BY L. F. WHITTEMORE

[Mr. BALDWIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on "The More Abundant Life," delivered by L. F. Whittemore at the thirty-first annual convention of the American Brush Manufacturers' Association, at Atlantic City, N. J., April 14, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

MISTAKES OF BUSINESSMEN IN POLITICS—ARTICLE BY JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Mistakes Businessmen Make in Politics," written by Hon. James A. Farley, and published in the April 1948 issue of the Nation's Business, which appears in the Appendix.]

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS—EDITORIAL FROM THE RICHMOND TIMES-DISPATCH

[Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Trade Pacts Hang in the Balance," published in the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch of Sunday, April 18, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

DAIRYMEN PROTEST AT MARGARINE PUBLICITY—LETTER BY E. S. TRASK

[Mr. DWORSHAK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter relating to the proposed repeal of oleomargarine taxes, addressed to Life magazine by E. S. Trask, of Idaho Falls, Idaho, which appears in the Appendix.]

ROLE OF THE AIR FORCE IN AN ADEQUATE DEFENSE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, this is a week of decision in Italy. The people in that country have had a chance to stand up and be counted for freedom. Many in the world no longer have such an opportunity. Within this week we shall know if the people of Italy have joined with other believers in free institutions to turn back the Red tide of totalitarianism or have allowed themselves to be engulfed.

We in the United States cannot afford the luxury of continued delay in reaching basic decisions relative to our national defense. Too many months, days, and hours have already passed. The timetable of the Kremlin may long since have been placed in operation.

Of one thing we may be certain. Prior to any overt moves in Europe, an attempt will be made to distract us by outbreaks in Central and South America, of which recent events in Bogotá are but a slight sample. Simultaneously attempts will be made to paralyze the industry and commerce of this Nation.

If the world had paid more attention to Adolf Hitler's Mein Kampf it might have been possible to block his ruthless aggression before he overwhelmed most of Europe.

Recently, I have reread Problems of Leninism, by Joseph Stalin. I call attention to the following paragraphs from that book, published in this country in 1934:

Replying to those who confuse the dictatorship of the proletariat with popular, elected, and nonclass government, Lenin states: "The class which has seized political power has done so conscious of the fact that it has seized power alone. This is implicit in the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This concept has meaning only when one class knows that it alone takes political power in its own hands, and does not deceive either itself or others by talk about popular, elected government, sanctified by the whole people" (Collected Works, vol. XXVI, p. 286, Russian edition).

Pointing to one of the most important aims of the dictatorship, namely, the sup-

pression of the exploiters, Lenin states: "The scientific concept, dictatorship, means nothing more nor less than power which directly rests on violence, which is not limited by any laws or restricted by any absolute rules."

On page 51 of his book, Stalin says:

Well, and what is to be done with the minority, if it does not wish, if it does not agree to submit voluntarily to the will of the majority? When the party enjoys the confidence of the majority, can it and should it force the minority to submit to the will of the majority? Yes, it can and it must.

Further on, at page 57, the following paragraph appears:

(b) On the few occasions that Lenin was obliged, in controversy with opponents, to speak of the dictatorship of the party, he usually referred to the dictatorship of one party, that is, to the fact that our party holds power alone, that it does not share power with other parties.

The final quotation from this book that I intend to read today, found on page 66, is one in which Stalin repeats the statement of Lenin on the inevitability of conflict with non-Soviet states:

We are living—

Lenin writes—

not merely in a state, but in a system of states; and it is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist for a long period side by side with imperialist states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer. Meanwhile a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states is inevitable. This means that if the proletariat, as the ruling class, wants to and will rule, it must prove it also by military organization (Collected Works, vol. XXIV, p. 122, Russian edition).

This is no time for our Nation to kid itself. The danger is too great and the stakes are too high.

An adequate national defense is costly insurance, but the cost is not nearly so high as having this Nation subjected to the dictates of a ruthless aggressor. In the age in which we now live, the civilian population is subject to all the hazards of the military. Nor does the penalty of defeat end with a cease-fire order. Reparation payments of the industrial plants could mean for a modern nation that its progress and prosperity would be set back for half a century.

Winston Churchill, in his War Memoirs, now being published in this country, has this to say regarding British air power:

It would have been possible in 1933, or even in 1934, for Britain to have created an air power which would have imposed the necessary restraints upon Hitler's ambition, or would perhaps have enabled the military leaders of Germany to control his violent acts. More than five whole years had yet to run before we were to be confronted with the supreme ordeal. Had we acted even now with reasonable prudence and healthy energy, it might never have come to pass.

Later on in his memoirs, Churchill says:

Very considerable efforts were made by the British Government in the next 4 years, and there is no doubt that we excelled in air quality; but quantity was henceforth beyond us. The outbreak of the war found us with barely half the German numbers.

These words warrant a warning here and now. Once leadership in this field is lost, it is very difficult to regain. The final paragraph I wish to quote from Winston Churchill's above-mentioned writings, is as follows:

After the loss of air parity we were liable to be blackmailed by Hitler. If we had taken steps betimes to create an air force half as strong again, or twice as strong, as any that Germany could produce in breach of her treaty, we should have kept control of the future. But even air parity, which no one could say was aggressive, would have given us a solid measure of defensive confidence in these critical years, and a broad basis from which to conduct our diplomacy or expand our Air Force. But we had lost air parity. And such attempts as were made to recover it were vain.

Let us now turn to two recent reports filed with the Congress of the United States. The first a report by the President's Air Policy Commission was published on January 1. On page 4 of this report, it states:

Our national security must be redefined in relation to the facts of modern war. Our security includes, as always, winning any war we may get into; but now it includes more than that. It includes not losing the first campaign of the war if the loss would mean that the country would be invaded and occupied.

On page 6, the Commission states:

Reluctantly this Commission has come to the conclusion that this relative security is to be found only in a policy of arming the United States so strongly (1) that other nations will hesitate to attack us or our vital national interests because of the violence of the counterattack they would have to face, and (2) that if we are attacked we will be able to smash the assault at the earliest possible moment.

On page 25 of the report, after reviewing the requirements of the air establishment, the Commission states:

We have concluded that the minimum force necessary at the present time is an Air Force composed of 12,400 modern planes, organized into 70 combat groups, and 22 special squadrons, supplemented by 27 National Guard groups and 34 groups of Air Reserve. All these forces, with the exception of the Air Reserve, must be equipped, trained, and ready for immediate action in the event of war. We should build to this force as rapidly as possible and once it is achieved, never permit it to drop below this level. Nor should we permit it to become impotent and ineffective because of failure to keep it modernized with the very best planes and equipment available.

On March 1, the Congressional Aviation Policy Board reported to the Congress of the United States. In the preface of that report the Policy Board says:

To defend ourselves in the age of atomic bombs, of radioactive dust, of bacteriological contamination and guided missiles—to mention some of the new and terrible weapons—we must have air power that is supreme. We cannot have less if we are to discourage attack or, if attacked, to defend ourselves.

There is one additional paragraph from the report of that Board which I wish to quote at this time. It is found on page 4 of the report, and reads as follows:

Therefore, it is the judgment of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board that the capability of the United States most likely to discourage an aggressor against attack upon this Nation most effective in thwarting such an attack if launched, and most able to deal out retaliation to paralyze further attack, is air power.

Mr. President, I merely rise at this time to reiterate that the hour is getting very late. We have pending in the Armed Services Committee discussions as to an adequate defense program for this country. I firmly believe that it includes as a minimum requirement a 70-group Air Force. Of course we must have balanced armed forces. Certainly no one would claim that air power alone can solve all problems of defense. I submit, however, that we must not assume, if we should be so unfortunate as to become involved in serious trouble in the near future, that we shall be entirely without allies. Wherever they may be and in whatever country we may find them, they themselves will have some ground forces to furnish some protection to the air bases we would necessarily require. Frankly, Mr. President, for that reason I have not been able to agree with the statement of the Secretary of National Defense, who indicated that if we increase our air power from 55 groups to 70 groups, ipso facto we must thereby increase the Federal budget by some $18,000,000,000. I do not believe, Mr. President, that those estimates will stand up under analysis.

Finally, I wish to say merely this, that the House of Representatives has acted on this matter. We have before us the reports of two commissions. I have read today some remarks by Mr. Churchill pointing out that probably the results in Great Britain of not being adequately prepared in the air had a great deal to do with the aggressive acts of Adolf Hitler.

I have read some extracts from a book written some years ago by Joseph Stalin reiterating the doctrines of Lenin. These indicate, I think, that the Communists have believed, since the days of Karl Marx, as a matter of fact, that the world cannot continue half slave and half free, and they are determined that the half free part will not long continue to exist.

Under those circumstances, Mr. President, I feel that the Congress of the United States would be remiss in its duties if it did not proceed forthwith to put our defenses in top-flight order.

PUBLIC HOUSING

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, during the course of the hearings on the housing bill before the Committee on Banking and Currency I made certain references to a conversation with Mr. Frank W. Cortright, executive vice president of the National Association of Home Builders. Mr. Cortright has taken exception to my remarks as printed in the record of the hearings. I think it is due him that the correspondence should be printed in the RECORD, since there is no possibility now of having it put into the hearings. I therefore ask permission to have the excerpt from the hearings printed in the body of the RECORD, followed by Mr. Cortright's letter to me, followed, in turn, by my reply to him.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM HOUSING HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, UNITED STATES SENATE (P. 162, MARCH 31–APRIL 1, 1948)

The CHAIRMAN. Senator FLANDERS has the floor.

Senator FLANDERS. I would like to introduce a piece of pertinent testimony. Mr. Cortright, of the National Association of Home Builders, which has been opposed to public housing, told Representative KENNEDY and myself, after we had engaged in one of these Roman holidays on the radio, that he or his organization, or let us say "he," just to make sure that I do not put words into his mouth that he did not use, would not object to any public housing which was provided solely for those who had incomes so low that they could not rent decent housing now available, or privately provided for.

And this bill takes great care in that situation. There will be no one eligible for the public housing provided by this bill who can afford on his own to rent decent accommodations.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOME BUILDERS,
Washington, D. C., April 6, 1948.

Hon. RALPH E. FLANDERS,
Room 311, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FLANDERS: I have just received a stenographic transcript of the hearings before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on the amended Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, S. 866.

I am astonished to read in this transcript your reference to me and to certain of my remarks following our recent debate on public housing.

In my opinion, your statement is inaccurate and out of place.

The transcript quotes you as saying, "I would like to introduce a piece of pertinent testimony." You then refer to me and to our association "which has been opposed to public housing" and conclude by intimating that I would not object to public housing provided solely for those "who had incomes so low that they could not rent decent housing now available, or privately provided for."

First, you certainly had no authority to "introduce testimony" in my behalf.

Secondly, having publicly debated the subject with great vigor for 30 minutes, you know that we are opposed to public housing—it is not a case of the past tense in any sense of the word.

Third, in talking to you and Representative KENNEDY you will recall that I put particular emphasis on the following points:

1. That public housing in this country is a fraud—that the Congress approved it in 1937 believing that it would be made available to those most urgently in need of housing.

2. The facts disclose that this has never been done. Speaking generally, they have never accepted as tenants the indigent, the lowest income group, those on rent relief, or those dispossessed by the demolition of slum housing.

3. I said that the local public housing authorities have selected the cream of the lower income group—those with incomes above an established minimum amount and they refuse admission to those with income lower than this.

4. I said that our opposition to public housing was based on the fact that it has utterly failed in its purpose; that its cost of construction and maintenance has been far beyond that of private-enterprise construction and management; that it has been used for political purposes; that, if extended to house all of those in the lower-income groups, its cost could bankrupt the Federal Treasury.

5. I said that my position and that of many others would be somewhat different if public housing were made available to those in the direst need, and by that I meant the indigent and those unable to take care of themselves in securing food, clothing, and shelter (which help should be provided and administered by the community and not by the Federal Government).

I am sure you know that neither I, nor the National Association of Home Builders, have ever deviated to the slightest extent from our unalterable opposition to public housing. We have constantly said that public housing, as it has been used in Europe and in this country, is a definite attempt to socialize the housing industry. We have said that private enterprise can and is producing housing in various price brackets—that those in the lowest-income group who require financial assistance should be given such assistance on the local level to enable them to make the rental payments necessary for decent available housing; that it is uneconomic and unjust to other taxpayers to provide new housing for the lowest-income group.

I request, therefore, that you insert this letter in the record of the hearings so that there may be no misunderstanding of my remarks to you and no misunderstanding as to our unalterable opposition to public housing in its present or proposed form.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK W. CORTRIGHT,
Executive Vice President.

APRIL 13, 1948.

Mr. FRANK W. CORTRIGHT,
National Association of Home Builders,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CORTRIGHT: Reply to your letter of April 6 has been delayed longer than it should have been. As you request, I am prepared to insert your letter in full in the final record of the hearings and also to insert this letter of mine in reply.

What we were talking about, as I remember, was not what public housing has been in the past but what it should be. The amended bill now before the Congress is intended by its terms to eliminate your objections 1, 2, 3, and 4. I may have misunderstood you with relation to your objection No. 5. If you insist that a person or a family must have no income in order to be eligible to public housing, then I misunderstood you and most certainly disagree with you.

The purpose of public housing as provided for in this bill is to make sure it goes to those persons of such low income that public assistance is necessary, and it provides that public assistance in the form of subsidized housing.

There is in the bill no competition whatever with private initiative in the housing field. It is carefully drawn so that it operates only where private housing is unable to perform its social function.

Sincerely yours.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, some days ago the Senate passed a bill providing for Federal aid to education. One of the arguments against the bill most loudly and lengthily discussed was on the question of Federal control of education. The proponents of the bill pointed out that under section 2 the States would be able to spend the money appropriated without let or hindrance by the Federal Government, but the States were absolutely guaranteed freedom of control over the expenditures of the funds appropriated by Congress.

The junior Senator from Connecticut at that time questioned not only the wisdom of that course on the part of Congress, but also the right and the power of Congress to make an appropriation over the expenditure of which it had absolutely no control whatsoever.

The point the junior Senator from Connecticut was trying to make was that Congress could not properly grant Federal aid to education, the money to be expended in the States without any control whatsoever, without creating the possibility of great injustices all along the line.

This morning I have received a letter from Mr. Carter W. Atkins, who is executive director of the Connecticut Public Expenditure Council, Inc. The Public Expenditure Council is not a part of the State government. It is a corporation created by citizens of Connecticut to watch the expenditure of Federal funds, and I might add that, while I have not always been in agreement with its proposals, nevertheless I do feel that it has done some excellent work in the State.

I should like to read briefly from Mr. Atkins' letter. He says:

I have just received some information on conditions in some of the Southern States which I think will be of interest to you. Copies of News Letter, a regular publication by the Louisiana Department of Commerce and Industry, for last year, show that the commerce and industry board was regularly granting tax exemptions to new industries in sums of millions of dollars. In their News Letter dated May 1, 1947, it was reported that exemptions granted at that meeting brought the total of such exemptions since the previous December to approximately $60,000,000 and that in addition thereto applications representing approximately $60,000,000 more were on file awaiting approval. Subsequent issues during the year indicated that the total exemptions forecast were being allowed.

Thus, in granting these exemptions, which, by the way, were for a 10-year period, it is, of course, but logical to assume that the communities in which the new industries would be located would receive benefits from the increased employment and pay rolls. And it is possible that the additional wealth brought into the community would tend to offset the loss of revenues on the tax-exempt property. At the same time the State government was increasing its general-fund revenues. In the period from 1940 to 1947 the State revenues were increased from $28,000,000 to $96,000,000, or approximately 243 percent. At the end of their fiscal year in 1946 they reported in excess of $20,000,000 general-fund balance. And yet for the period 1940 to 1946 they increased State aid to schools only 32 percent or approximately $4,500,000, per year.

Under the proposed Federal aid to education program Louisiana would receive $6,829,000 at a cost to them in their share of the Federal taxes of about $2,730,000 which means that Connecticut and other New England States would be called upon to help finance a situation under which tax exemptions are being used to attract their industry. It is somewhat like asking us to pay for the privilege of depreciating our own economy.

We in the Connecticut Public Expenditure Council have never taken a position against the proper support of public schools. We did a great deal of work on our State-aid program in Connecticut under which we increased our State aid to schools in this biennium more than 300 percent. We believe that the economic development of the Southern States is highly important to the welfare of this country, but we are also sure that in Connecticut and the industrial Northeast we must do all that we can to preserve the assets which we have.

The Louisiana bid for industry is being repeated in manner and degree in various other

States. For example, the town of Walnut Ridge, Ark., population 5,000, offered $65,000 for a reliable manufacturer to establish a plant in that town which would employ between 400 and 500 workers. The last biennium report of the Mississippi Agricultural and Industrial Board lists several pages of bond issues voted to aid in financing industry. On the other hand, current ads in national magazines, such as last week's issue of United States News, tell a full-page story of the Middle South which is the term applied to the States of Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi. That ad states that in those three States the individual income payments from 1939 to 1945 increased 145 percent as compared with an increase of 116 percent for the United States average, also that their bank deposits increased 231 percent from 1939 to 1945 as compared with the United States average increase of 143 percent. They go on to cite the extent of the rich natural resources of those States as indicative of the possibilities of future growth and increased wealth.

Now, under these conditions is there proper validity to the great cry of the proponents of Federal aid to education that the so-called poor States cannot finance their educational program from their own resources and we must have Federal aid in order to accomplish it? The facts of economics do not prove that there is a general need, and if there are areas so impoverished as to be unable to finance their schools within the resources of the State, some special consideration might be given them.

And, Mr. President, I am sure such consideration can be given them.

I do not desire to have it understood by these remarks, and the excerpts from the letter I have just read, that I am not anxious to see every part of the United States improved. I am glad if Louisiana can build new plants and employ her people; I am glad if Arkansas can do it; I am glad if Mississippi can do it.

My point is, Mr. President, that to me it hardly seems fair that, as a matter of Federal policy, we should grant Federal funds for aid to education in the States without retaining any control over the funds whatsoever, when a particular State may be granting tax exemptions and devoting its moneys, which could be used for educational purposes, to attract the industries of other States.

I might add, Mr. President, that in the State of Connecticut it is unlawful for any town or city to grant tax exemptions to industry or to any citizen, except on the general terms provided in the statutes, and in those general terms there are no exemptions whatsoever provided for the attraction of industry.

So I say, Mr. President, that a serious question exists respecting our wisdom in passing a bill which grants money from the Federal Treasury, money collected from all the States, and allows it to be expended in the States without any control at all being retained over it.

On the other hand, Mr. President, the converse of that is that if Federal aid to education be granted, then along therewith wisdom and good judgment demand that there be some control as to expenditure, and it is that control Mr. President, that entering wedge of control, which seems to me is the thing concerning which we must be extremely careful. We must find some other way to help those States which need funds from the Federal Treasury for education—and I am sure there are States and communities which need them—than the method adopted in the bill which is now under consideration, as I understand, in the House of Representatives.

NATIONAL HOUSING—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WAGNER

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, we all appreciate the interest which the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has for years manifested in the question of housing. He is one of the authors of the bill now pending before the Senate of the United States. In view of his interest in and authorship of the bill, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, a statement which has been issued by the Senator from New York in regard to the pending housing legislation, as amended by the Flanders amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF ROBERT F. WAGNER, DEMOCRAT, OF NEW YORK, ON TAFT-ELLENDER-WAGNER BILL, AS AMENDED BY SENATOR FLANDERS

As one of the bipartisan sponsors of S. 866, I strongly urge that the Senate pass this comprehensive housing bill with the amendments from the Banking and Currency Committee which Senator FLANDERS reported on April 8.

Aside from the changes reflecting legislative and administrative developments over the past year, the amendments make improvements in the basic provisions of the bill. Particularly to be commended are those amendments directed at achieving improvements in housing-production methods so that costs can be reduced and private enterprise can serve a larger part of the housing need. The strengthening and expansion of the provisions for a national program of housing research and the further adaptation of credit aids to encourage mass-production methods will, I believe, facilitate the achievement of the housing goals established in the original bill. I am in thorough agreement with the greater incentives for rental housing, and believe that the provision of 4-percent, 40-year insured mortgages covering 95 percent of value for veterans' cooperatives will assure financing, with adequate safeguards, to veterans' groups interested in providing housing for their own members.

But in giving my unqualified support to these amendments, I should like to remind my distinguished colleagues that the basic principles and provisions of S. 866 remain substantially as they were in the original bill and in its predecessors, the first of which was introduced over 2½ years ago. It enunciates the same statement of policy. It is based on practically the same finding of housing needs, from 1,250,000 to 1,500,000 new dwelling units a year. It provides credit tools and other aids to enable private enterprise to take care of the need. It establishes Federal aid for local programs for slum clearance and it extends Federal subsidies to local communities providing decent housing for low-income families who cannot be adequately served by private enterprise.

Undoubtedly, we could make further improvements in this legislation if we added more time to the 4 years already given to the study, hearings, investigations, and legislative drafting which have brought us to the present point. But the housing crisis which we are endeavoring to meet has not waited. It is still upon us in full force. It is forcing nearly 3,000,000 families to double up with in-laws and other families. It is making the slums which are the breeding ground for crime, delinquency and crime, the environment in which millions of our children are being reared. Let us begin to provide decent housing for America. Let us get some experience with comprehensive housing legislation, before we think about further refinements.

The statement of national policy contained in S. 866 declares that the general welfare and security of the Nation and the health and living standards of its people require the realization as soon as possible of a decent home and a suitable living environment for all American families. The issue before us today is the extent to which the Federal Government should go toward realization of that objective. No one can seriously question the need. And there is preponderant evidence that neither private enterprise nor the States and localities are in a position to satisfy these needs without Federal assistance. The Joint Committee on Housing authorized by this Congress came to practically unanimous agreement that private enterprise could not expand production to the extent needed or reduce costs without improved Federal aids. In a survey which I conducted in connection with the committee's work, responding mayors and governors reported none of the cities would be able to bear the full cost of providing decent housing for low-income families or of clearing slums. An article in the Wall Street Journal this week, based on a report of the American Municipal Association summarizes the financial plight of municipalities and their search for new sources of revenue with which to pay increasing costs of municipal services.

If decent housing is to be provided American families, the Federal Government will have to assist private enterprise to expand its role and it will have to aid local communities with the clearance of slums and the provision of decent housing for low-income families when private enterprise cannot serve. It is my conviction that improvement of the health and living standards alone justify the modest outlay of public funds provided in S. 866. The evils and costs of the sordid slums and of overcrowding are too great to be tolerated by a nation of our wealth and resources.

But I note also in the statement of policy that the welfare and security of the Nation are stated as reasons for establishing a national housing goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for all American families. In this connection the reports of disorders in the capital of a sister American Republic came to my mind. According to newspaper reports, the mobs mainly responsible for the rioting came out of the slums. I am not suggesting that we are similarly faced with the dangers of such mass violence. But I am suggesting that the seeds of alien philosophies will find their most fertile soil in the slums of America, as they did in Bogotá. It is my conviction, as I am sure it is of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have joined in supporting this bill, that one of the best ways to sustain faith in American institutions and ideals is to offer hope to the millions of families who today live in bad housing conditions. I urge that this hope be kindled by the passage of S. 866, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 20, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 19, 1948

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God under whom all hearts are open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid, cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of Thy Holy Spirit that we may perfectly love Thee and worthily magnify Thy holy name. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the reading of the Journal of Thursday, April 15, will be dispensed with, and the Journal will stand approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill (S. 1393) entitled "An act to increase the permitted rate of allowance and compensation for training on the job under Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended," and concurs therein with an amendment.

PROVISO FOR RECESSES DURING THE DAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time during the day for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time during the day for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONSENT REQUESTS

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the Chair will entertain unanimous-consent requests following the joint session of Congress.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon (at 11 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 11 o'clock and 44 minutes a. m.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE (HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF H. CON. RES. 184)

COMMEMORATION CEREMONY UPON THE OCCASION OF THE FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LIBERATION OF CUBA, 1898–1948, AT A JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AT 12 O'CLOCK NOON, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 19, 1948

THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ARRANGEMENTS
EDWARD MARTIN, chairman

For the Senate: EDWARD MARTIN, of Pennsylvania; C. WAYLAND BROOKS, of Illinois; TOM CONNALLY, of Texas; THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, of Rhode Island.

For the House: EARL C. MICHENER, of Michigan; JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania; BERNARD W. KEARNEY, of New York; THOMAS J. LANE, of Massachusetts.

THE PROGRAM FOR THE JOINT SESSION

Prelude ----------
United States Marine Band Orchestra (Maj. William F. Santelmann, leader)
Presiding officer ---------- The Speaker
Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
Medley of songs of the Spanish-American War period.
Presenting the colors.
Invocation ----------
Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., the Chaplain of the House of Representatives.
Reading of joint resolution ----------
The Honorable EDWARD MARTIN, chairman, Joint Committee on Arrangements.
The national anthem of the Republic of Cuba ---------- Miss Emma Otero
Address ----------
The President of the United States
Response ----------
His Excellency Guillermo Belt, Ambassador of Cuba.
The national anthem of the United States ---
Miss Hollace Shaw, Columbia Concerts
Benediction ----------
Very Rev. Ignatius Smith, O. P., dean of School of Philosophy, Catholic University.
Retiring of the colors.

The SPEAKER of the House of Representatives presided.

The Doorkeeper announced the President pro tempore and Members of the United States Senate.

The Senate, preceded by its President pro tempore, its Secretary, and Sergeant at Arms, entered the Chamber of the House of Representatives.

The President pro tempore of the Senate took the chair at the left of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the following guests, who were escorted to the seats assigned to them:

The ambassadors and ministers of foreign governments.

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The General of the Armies, the Chief of Staff to the Commander in Chief, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and the Commandant of the Coast Guard.

The commander in chief of the United Spanish-American War Veterans and staff.

The Doorkeeper announced the Ambassador of the Republic of Cuba.

The Ambassador of Cuba, accompanied by members of the Joint Committee on Arrangements, entered the Hall and took the seat reserved for him at the Clerk's desk.

There followed a prelude by the United States Marine Band Orchestra.

At 12 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by members of the Joint Committee on Arrangements, entered the Hall and was rendered Presidential honors by the Marine Band.

The President took the seat reserved for him at the Clerk's desk.

The Doorkeeper announced the colors of the United States and the Republic of Cuba.

As the United States Marine Band Orchestra played To the Colors, the colors were advanced to positions in front of the rostrum, the colors of the United States on the right hand of the Speaker, the colors of the Republic of Cuba on the left.

INVOCATION

Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., the Chaplain of the House of Representatives, offered the following invocation:

O Lord, the one God and Father of us all, we are grateful that Thou art the life and light of men. We thank Thee for the inspiration of this day and the lessons it teaches, the Golden Rule and devotion to freedom, which is every man's right.

As today we honor our neighbor republic, compass us with the bonds of unity and cooperation and enjoin us to be one people in purpose, in ambition and good will. In all our efforts keep before us the truth that eternal vigilance is the price of freedom and that national character is achieved only through national honesty and dealing justly. God be merciful to us and bless us and cause His face to shine upon us, that Thy way may be known upon earth, Thy saving health among all nations. Let the people praise Thee, O God; let all the people praise Thee. O let the nations be glad and sing for joy, for Thou shalt judge the people righteously and govern the nations upon earth. Let the people praise Thee, O God; let all the people praise Thee, then shall the earth yield her increase and God, even our own God, shall bless us; God shall bless us, and all the ends of the earth shall fear Him. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

READING OF THE JOINT RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the Honorable EDWIN MARTIN, Senator from the State of Pennsylvania and chairman of the Joint Committee on Arrangements.

Senator MARTIN. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Mr. President pro tempore, Mr. Ambassador, distinguished guests:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversay of the victory over Spain, resulting in the liberation of Cuba, the two Houses of Congress shall assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives at 1 o'clock in the afternoon, on Monday, April 19, 1948.

That the joint committee created by House Concurrent Resolution 108, Eightieth Congress, is empowered to make suitable arrangements for fitting and proper exercises for the joint session of Congress herein authorized.

That invitations to attend the exercises be extended to the President of the United States and the members of his Cabinet, the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, the Diplomatic Corps (through the Secretary of State), the General of the Armies, the Chief of Staff to the Commander in Chief, the Chief of Staff, United States Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and the Commandant of the

Coast Guard, and such other persons as the joint committee shall deem proper.

That the President of the United States is hereby invited to address the American people at the joint session of the Congress in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the victory over Spain.

MEDLEY OF SONGS

The Marine Band Orchestra played a medley of songs.

THE NATIONAL ANTHEM OF THE REPUBLIC OF CUBA

Miss Emma Otero, accompanied by the Marine Band Orchestra, sang the national anthem of the Republic of Cuba.

PRESENTATION OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. I have the honor to present the President of the United States. [Applause, the Members rising.]

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President pro tempore, Mr. Ambassador, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Congress, and distinguished guests, it is eminently fitting that we should assemble here today to pay solemn tribute to the heroic champions of human freedom who brought about the liberation of Cuba. The commemoration of half a century of Cuban independence recalls the valor of the Cuban patriots and American soldiers and sailors who gave liberally of their strength and their blood that Cuba might be free. From that chapter in man's age-old struggle for freedom we can draw inspiration for the hard tasks that confront us in our own time.

The struggle for Cuban independence, like every other effort of its kind, was fraught with hardship and disappointment. But the unconquerable determination of the Cuban people to win freedom overcame all obstacles. From the first the fight for liberation by Cuban patriots evoked the sympathy of the people of the United States. Those in quest of independence have always had the support of the people of this Nation.

Americans watched with admiration the beginning of the final struggle for independence led by Jose Marti and his valiant compatriots, Gomez, Maceo, and Garcia. Our people made increasingly plain their desire to assist the Cuban patriots. The sinking of the United States battleship *Maine* in Habana Harbor on February 15, 1898, crystallized the growing sentiment in this country for joining forces with the Cuban people in their fight for self-government.

The Congress passed a joint resolution expressing in clear terms the conviction of the men and women of the United States that the people of the Island of Cuba should be free and independent. It also expressed our determination that once the Cuban people were liberated, they, and they alone, should govern the island of Cuba. It is the passage of this joint resolution, 50 years ago today, which we are commemorating in this ceremony.

This joint resolution, the foundation upon which our relations with the Cuban Republic are based, brought the military and naval forces of the United States into the conflict at the side of the Cuban patriots. The names of Shafter, Roosevelt, Hobson, and many others were joined with those of Gomez, Maceo, and Garcia.

For 4 months, as Americans fought side by side with their Cuban allies, the opposing forces were driven back. On August 12, Spain signed the protocol of peace and agreed to give up Cuba and withdraw her forces. The dream of Jose Marti became at last a glorious reality.

The sympathetic interest of the United States in the welfare of the Cuban people did not end with victory. We assisted the Cubans in repairing the ravages of war and overcoming problems of health and sanitation. The comradeship of war was succeeded by the notable peacetime collaboration of General Wood, General Gorgas, Dr. Walter Reed, Dr. Agramonte, and other men of science and public life.

From these sound beginnings, relations between the Republic of Cuba and the United States have continued through the years on a mutually satisfactory basis. I believe that few nations of differing languages and cultures have drawn so closely together during the last 50 years, freely and without duress, as have Cuba and the United States.

Many other factors have contributed to the understanding and affection between our two nations. Travel between the two countries is extensive and our peoples have come to know each other, and each other's customs and cultures at first hand. Trade between the two nations has increased steadily in volume and in importance. The experience of Cuba and the United States refutes the false assumption that neighboring peoples of different races and cultures are naturally antagonistic. On the contrary the history of Cuban-American relations demonstrates that when people of different countries enjoy opportunities for frequent personal contacts and a free exchange of information and knowledge, their ties of friendship grow stronger through the years.

Although our two countries are separated by only 90 miles of water, and vary greatly in size and strength, they collaborate harmoniously on a basis of equal sovereignty and independence of action. This relationship provides living proof of the ability of nations great and small to live in peace and to enjoy the full benefits of commercial and cultural exchange. The same harmonious relationship can prevail among all nations, provided they possess a genuine desire for peace and a firm resolve to respect the freedom and the rights of others. [Applause.]

This is a truth the whole world should take to heart, particularly at this time. [Applause.] The basic requirement for peace and understanding is the will that peace and understanding shall prevail. The will to avoid war and to seek an understanding that precludes all violence and aggression is one of the most profound and universal concepts held by the peoples of this earth. I am convinced that the plain people of the world, of whatever race or nationality, desire nothing more passionately than freedom for themselves and for others—freedom to be left in peace to earn their daily bread after their own fashion—freedom to leave their neighbors in peace to do likewise.

This is the great issue of our day: Whether the universal longing of mankind for peace and freedom shall prevail, or whether it is to be flouted and betrayed. The challenge of our time, like the one met so successfully by those we honor today, tests the mettle of men and their institutions of government. Our own moment of history also calls for calmness, for courage, for strength, and above all for the steadfast resolution that, come what may, we shall stand for the right.

We honor today the memory of a noble few among the countless heroes who have fought to advance the cause of human freedom through the ages.

Let us avail ourselves of this occasion to refresh our faith in freedom and to rededicate this Nation and ourselves to the principles of liberty, justice, and peace. [Applause, the Members rising.]

PRESENTATION OF THE AMBASSADOR OF CUBA

The SPEAKER. I have the honor to present His Excellency Guillermo Belt, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Cuba. [Applause, the Members rising.]

ADDRESS OF RESPONSE BY THE AMBASSADOR OF CUBA

His Excellency GUILLERMO BELT, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Cuba. Mr. President, Mr. President pro tempore of the Senate, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Congress, distinguished guests, it is with the deepest emotion that I appear before the Congress of the United States on the fiftieth anniversary of the joint resolution to express once more the undying gratitude, the warm affection, and the sincere friendship of my people for the American people. [Applause.]

This is indeed a fitting occasion to commemorate that resolution which played such a decisive role in the future destiny of my country, not only recognizing at a crucial moment of our long struggle for liberation the right of the people of Cuba to live in freedom and independence, but also disclaiming any intention to exercise sovereignty, control, or jurisdiction over the island.

Our confused and troubled world of today can derive a splendid lesson from that resolution, which genuinely and sincerely expressed the sentiments of the American people.

Since the beginning of Cuba's century-long struggle for freedom and independence, our patriots always had the decided help and warm sympathy of the American people and of the American press. That support was viewed with suspicion by a malicious world which saw in the protection of a mighty power for a small island, nothing more than a secret desire for annexation.

The joint resolution and the policy of the United States toward Cuba in the last 50 years are the best answer to those who could not conceive that the noble American people are not only always ready to fight for their own freedom and independence, but likewise to shed their blood generously and to sacrifice their lives for the liberation of all the peoples of the earth who are suffer-

ing from tyranny and oppression. [Applause.]

As President Truman has so rightly said, the relations between our two countries are a shining example of how nations with different languages, traditions, and culture, may be drawn closely and sincerely together through the strong bonds of mutual respect and trust. [Applause.]

Cuba and the United States offer eloquent proof that the small and the great, the weak and the powerful, can live in harmony and peace when they share the same fundamental concepts of justice, democracy, and liberty.

At this very moment, the Ninth Inter-American Conference is meeting at Bogota, defying whatever powers of darkness there may be, with the firm determination to complete an organic pact designed to regulate in a democratic way the relations among the American states.

Let us take this opportunity to say unequivocally to all the world that, here in this hemisphere, nations can freely associate themselves, not on a basis of coercion and intimidation, but on a plane of equality and mutual respect [applause]; that in the inter-American system we do not permit special privileges to the so-called big powers—not even the veto or a permanent seat. Let us remind the world that in this hemisphere there is a great Nation with no need for an iron curtain to safeguard its frontiers or to maintain its prosperity.

The strength of that Nation and the strength of our inter-American system rest on our firm determination to stand by the principles which gave birth to a free America.

May God give us the courage and the spirit to defend and preserve our precious heritage, so that the lives of our liberators may not have been sacrificed in vain. [Applause, the Members rising.]

THE NATIONAL ANTHEM OF THE UNITED STATES

Miss Hollace Shaw, accompanied by the Marine Band Orchestra, sang the national anthem of the United States.

BENEDICTION

Very Rev. Ignatius Smith, O. P., dean of the school of philosophy of the Catholic University, pronounced the following benediction:

O Lord God of our fathers, Thou art God in heaven, and rulest over all the kingdoms and nations, in Thy hand is strength and power, and no one can resist Thee (Second Paralipomenon xx: 6).

We pray Thee Thy benediction because Thou has said: "The blessing of the Lord maketh men rich, neither shall affliction be joined to them (Proverbs x: 22). "The blessing of God maketh haste to reward the just and in a swift hour his blessing beareth fruit" (Ecclesiasticus xi:24).

Bless, O God of nations, our distinguished visitors and the nation which they represent.

Bless, O God, the Chief Executive of our Nation.

Bless, O God of nations, our people and their representatives in this assembly, on this anniversary of a day that brought to us victory, and to Cuba the opportunity for statehood and democratic liberty.

Bless, O Lord of Hosts, these peoples with continued intelligence to know the value of their freedom and the courage to so regulate it as to keep it free.

Bless us, in Thy divine providence, with a continuance of our godly mission to champion the cause of those underprivileged peoples of the earth who crave democratic freedom and who are capable of enjoying it.

Bless our Republic with the vision and the holy privilege of continuing to serve as the sanctuary of human freedom for the distressed and hampered peoples of the world.

Bless us with holy courage to work and fight for the preservation of the freedoms with which Thou hast blest this country, and to be alert in our readiness to defend our land, our liberty, and our honor.

Bless us, O God of might, with those qualities of life that will make us worthy of great leadership, and guide our chosen Representatives in paths that will lead them and us to happiness here and hereafter.

Bless us, Almighty Creator, to whose sovereignty the founding fathers entrusted the destiny of this Republic, with light and determination to solve the pressing problems of peace with justice and freedom to all. And keep us humble and godly in the victories and prosperity with which we beg Thee to endow us.

Bless us with a high and unfailing respect for the sacred personality of every human being, for the rights inherent in human personality even while we may hate, as Christ did, the sins of men and of governments.

Bless us, O kindly Father, with immunity from that national disintegration which follows inevitably in the wake of war upon Thy government or the neglect of Thy rights.

Bless our homes and our people with happiness now and forever. Amen.

RETIREMENT

The SPEAKER. The colors of the United States and the Republic of Cuba will be retired.

The colors of the United States and the Republic of Cuba were retired, the Marine Band playing the trio of Semper Fidelis.

The President of the United States was rendered Presidential honors by the Marine Band and, escorted by the members of the Joint Committee on Arrangements, retired from the Chamber.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guest from the Hall of the House in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The ambassadors and the ministers of foreign governments.

The General of the Armies, the Chief of Staff of the Commander in Chief, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and the Commandant of the Coast Guard.

The commander in chief of the United Spanish-American War Veterans and other invited guests.

JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The purposes of the joint session having been accomplished, the Chair declares the joint session of the two Houses now dissolved.

Thereupon, at 12 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m., the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

PROCEEDINGS OF JOINT SESSION ORDERED PRINTED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the proceedings of the joint session will be printed as part of the RECORD of the day.

There was no objection.

HOMESTEADS FOR VETERANS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a House concurrent resolution from the legislature of Mississippi.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The resolution is as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 35

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to sell Government lands in Mississipi to residents therein, not to exceed 160 acres per person, as a homestead; and to give preference to the veterans of the armed forces of the United States in any war

Whereas by acquisition of the United States of lands in the State of Mississippi, there has been removed from the tax rolls of many of the counties in the State of Mississippi a major part of the taxable lands therein; and

Whereas the conduct and financing of the affairs in such counties are thereby seriously hindered; and

Whereas veterans of the armed forces of the United States, in many instances, are without homes and places to live and are unable to purchase same due to prevailing high prices: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi (the senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized, requested, and urged to sell said Government lands in the State of Mississippi, or so much thereof as it deems advisable, not to exceed 160 acres per person for the purpose of establishing a homestead thereon, to veterans of the armed forces of the United States in any war, provided they are residents of Mississippi, and thereafter, if other lands are available for purchase, to residents of the State of Mississippi, who are not such veterans and have been residents therein for 5 years or more immediately preceding such sale; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the clerk of the house of representatives to the Members of the Mississippi delegation in Congress.

Adopted by the house of representatives February 20, 1948.

WALTER SILLERS,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Adopted by the senate April 2, 1948.

SAM LUMPKIN,
President of the Senate.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF ASSOCIATED PRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial appearing in today's New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest news services in the world, the Associated Press, is holding its annual meeting in New York today, being 100 years old on this day. This great organization in the collection and dissemination of news has been a powerfully constructive influence for good. It has always maintained a high character of service. While advanced in years so far as the life of news services in our country is concerned, the Associated Press, by maintaining its fine spirit and policy, has always kept young and vigorous. It has always lived up to its duty of maintaining a free press. It has been well said, Mr. Speaker, that a free press is an honest press. The Associated Press enjoys this reputation which could only be earned by constant adherence to the great principle of freedom of the press, such as is enjoyed here today and in few other countries of the world. A right carries with it a responsibility, particularly the responsibility of preserving a guaranteed right. The Associated Press has always maintained its responsibility. On the occasion of this one hundredth anniversary, I extend my congratulations to the Associated Press and express the hope that during its next 100 years of existence, it will continue to serve and render in strength and manner the outstanding service it has rendered during the past 100 years.

[From the New York Times of April 19, 1948]

THE ASSOCIATED PRESS AT 100

The Associated Press, which is holding its annual meeting here today, is 100 years old. It was born at a meeting of 10 men representing 6 New York newspapers, when the telegraph was just beginning to take over from pigeons and ponies, and boats sent out to meet the incoming ships, the task of gathering the news of the world and getting it to the newspaper offices.

It was born when, as now, the fate of Europe hung in the balance, when there were stirrings of the people and alarms of war in many quarters of the globe. In that spring of 1848 our own Mexican War was just ended and the gold rush to California was just about to begin. What distingushed this new news organization was that it was founded on a cooperative basis.

Many things have happened since then, and through all those happenings the Associated Press has gone about its business of gathering the news of what did happen, so that the newspapers and radio stations it serves may keep the public informed, and through it all the mutual ownership of the news service has been maintained and, because those owners have many backgrounds, the objectivity of the service has been constantly enhanced. The world has grown smaller in one sense because swift communication by wire and radio and aircraft has made it so. But the field the news gatherer has to cover has grown greater in inverse ratio, and the service of the Associated Press has kept pace with that expansion.

In the beginning one man did the whole job from a little room, up many stairs, at Broadway and Liberty Street. Now, the organization, grown up, has thousands of helpers in its distributing centers and more thousands at listening posts in every continent and clime. Robert R. McLean, publisher of the Philadelphia Bulletin, as the president, and Kent Cooper, managing director, carry the burdens of the organization. They are to be congratulated, as indeed all the world should be congratulated, that the Associated Press is a virile, young 100-year-old.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Republican Party, I would like to say, "Me, too," to all that has been said by the distinguished whip of the minority regarding the Associated Press. I think they have been manifestly fair. The Associated Press is a credit to the United States and to the newspaper world. I want to add my word of appreciation on this one hundredth anniversary of the Associated Press.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an outline of Connecticut veteran laws.

Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article published in the Oregonian, of Portland, Oreg.

MANUEL ROXAS: BRIDGE BETWEEN WORLDS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, when the news of the tragic and untimely death of President Manuel Roxas, of the Republic of the Philippines, reached those of us who knew him last week it came as such a shock that we who deal in words were at a loss to find words to express our true feelings. Even now, days after his passing, there is a sensation of emptiness in my heart as I think of this outstanding patriot. To me—because he has left us—there will always be a vacant chair at the council table when those who love liberty gather together.

Manuel Roxas bridged the gaps of time, space, and circumstance. He was second to none—no, not even to Jose Rial—in his intense devotion to the Filipino people. Yet, he defended and supported the progressive contributions, both spiritual and material, made to his countrymen by the people of the United States. To him, the Pacific was a pond. His unquenchable desire for freedom and growth made Manila a neighbor to my home city in Nebraska. Like Rudyard Kipling's description of the meeting between the Khyber chief and the son of the British colonel, there was no awareness of differences in "border or breed or birth" when Manuel Roxas spoke. He was, at the same time, a patriot of the Philippines and a citizen of the world.

The late President of the Republic of the Philippines will be long remembered as an inspired realist. During the late war he could have joined the resistance movement in the mountains and jungles of Luzon. Instead, he chose a more perilous post. He deliberately stayed in the strongholds held by the hated Japanese, learned the most carefully guarded secrets of that enemy, and saw to it that those secrets were passed along to General MacArthur and the American army of liberation. The information relayed by Manuel Roxas to our armed forces became bayonets plunged into the oppressors of his people. His people realized his tremendous accomplishments for their freedom. They loved the man who loved them. They showed their affection and their trust by giving him the highest office in the land, at the first opportunity it was in their power to so do.

He was, in the same temple of flesh, a realist and a prophet. Before the war he thundered warnings to his people to be strong, to prepare themselves for any threat to their liberties from any aggressor. His people never forgot these warnings during the dark days of Japanese occupation. Nor did his gift of prophecy fail with the coming of peace and with his election to the presidency. His last public utterances had the ringing tone of an air-raid siren. He put his people on the alert. He told them that there was no security in statism, no common liberty of thought and action in communism. This was the torch he handed to those who must now lead since he has gone. This was his priceless heritage to the Filipino people.

I cannot tell you all that Manuel Roxas means to me. There are some thoughts far too sacred for speech, thoughts that belong to silence and to God. But this I can say: History will write proudly of Manuel Roxas. And that is only just. For Manuel Roxas proudly wrote history.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of Wisconsin veteran laws.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House tomorrow for 10 minutes after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I was one of the Members of the House who voted in favor of the European recovery program, familiarly known as ERP. Incidentally, I see it has already changed

its name, which seems to be a familiar characteristic of the administration now in office. The program is now called the ECA, which stands for Economic Cooperation Administration.

I am sincerely disturbed, Mr. Speaker, by news which I see in the papers and which I hear talked about on the Hill. When I voted for the bill nothing was said about giving away $3,000,000,000 worth of the gold reserve of the United States to the nations of Europe, while at the same time we apparently continue to buy gold from Russia and from England, at a profit to those countries. The price we pay Russia for gold is indirectly a means of supporting that country's government.

It is possible, Mr. Speaker, that the Foreign Affairs Committee was not thoroughly familiar with this situation itself. Whatever the circumstances may have been, I hope the Appropriations Committee will check into this matter carefully and see if there was any other information that should have been given us, of equal importance, before we voted on the bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Bristol Courier entitled "Again the Tariff" and also to extend my remarks in the RECORD in another instance and include an editorial entitled "MARTIN Promises a Purge," which appeared in the Times-Herald of today. The editorial is in reference to the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman JOE MARTIN. When he says he will do a thing, he will do it, and if the President will give consideration to the matter that he is now talking about of purging this country of Communists, then give the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOE MARTIN, the job, and he will see that it is accomplished.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE NEGOTIATED AT GENEVA, SWITZERLAND

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have just filed a resolution asking the President of the United States not to issue any proclamation including such rates of duty listed in Schedule XX of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade signed at Geneva, Switzerland, on October 30, 1947, which were not in effect and which were initially negotiated with the country of Czechoslovakia. I have also addressed a letter to the President bearing on that matter.

The resolution and letter are as follows:

Whereas the United States on October 30, 1947, signed the general agreement on tariffs and trade negotiated at Geneva, Switzerland, and this agreement was also signed provisionally by the country of Czechoslovakia; and

Whereas, between the time of the provisional signing on the part of Czechoslovakia and the time of final ratification of that agreement, the government of that country was overthrown by force by a minority political element; and

Whereas the issuance of a proclamation by the President of the United States putting into effect the concessions granted in the above-mentioned agreement would amount to a recognition of the means by which the present authorities in Czechoslovakia came into power: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this Congress request the President of the United States not to proclaim such rates of duty listed in schedule XX of the general agreement on tariffs and trade signed at Geneva, Switzerland, on October 30, 1948, as are not now in effect and which were initially negotiated with the country of Czechoslovakia.

APRIL 17, 1948.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MR. PRESIDENT: In your address to Congress on March 17 you made accurate and very strong statements concerning agreements made by the United States with certain foreign countries. You said that agreements we have obtained could have furnished the basis for a full peace if they had been kept. You then made the following statement: "But they were not kept. They have been persistently ignored and violated by one nation." In the next paragraph when you discussed the constant abuses of the United Nations' veto, there was no doubt concerning the country to which you referred.

I have been given to understand by high State Department officials that you now intend to put into full force and effect a new agreement with a Communist-dominated satellite of Russia. Surely, Mr. President, you are aware that the Czechoslovakia with which we negotiated during the Geneva Trade Agreements Conference was not the Czechoslovakia that signed the agreement a few days after your address above quoted. You must be aware also of the drastic internal changes in the country that was Czechoslovakia. Laborers in that country producing shoes, glassware, and other products destined for the American market are now in the class of slaves. There is no such thing as costs of production. Products will be sold for whatever price they can bring, and one of the main objectives of flooding the American market with these slave-labor products will be to demoralize American industry.

Your statements concerning the apparent inability of Communist-dominated countries to keep any sort of an agreement indicates that you have full knowledge that the so-called trade agreement with Czechoslovakia would be but a farce in which this country would give everything and take nothing. Surely, if past agreements wth countries which now completely control what was Czechoslovakia have not been kept, we cannot expect this one to be honored.

You further stated in your address to the Congress on March 17, "The Soviet Union and its satellites were invited to cooperate in the European recovery program. They rejected the invitation. More than that, they have declared their violent hostility to the program and are aggressively attempting to wreck it." Czechoslovakia, Mr. President, is among these satellite nations.

I call upon you, Mr. President, not to issue any proclamation giving concessions to the Communists. You have ample legal and moral grounds for saying that we did not negotiate a trade agreement with the Red element now in control.

This is an open letter, Mr. President. Unemployment is already a serious problem in our shoe and leather areas. The opening of the American markets to the free access of goods made by controlled labor and subsidized industries abroad will not only aggravate this situation, but will add dollars to the coffers of satellite governments and Communist Russia.

I again urge you to refrain from putting into effect this trade agreement with Czechoslovakia.

Respectfully.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may meet on Wednesday, notwithstanding that the House may be in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD in four instances. In each instance I support the dairy industry and in none do I say a good word for oleo.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF LEXINGTON

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, while we are celebrating the freedom of other people, it seems to me that we should not overlook the fact that today is one of the most important anniversaries in the history of mankind.

Today is the one hundred and seventy-third anniversary of the Battle of Lexington, where the embattled farmers "fired the shots heard around the world" in the first open engagement in our war for independence which started the onward march of humanity toward that liberty and freedom which we have enjoyed for, lo, these many years, and which we trust the rest of the world may enjoy in the years to come.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from Sunday's Boston Post.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the current issue of Collier's magazine.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROONEY (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. BREHM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

H. R. 403

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 403 be restored to the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman consulted the objectors?

Mr. LANE. No; I have not.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot entertain the gentleman's request until he has done so.

JAMES LINDSAY ALMOND, JR.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to add my statement to the able and appropriate remarks made by the other Members of Congress on the floor of the House, Thursday, April 15, relative to the resignation of the Honorable JAMES LINDSAY ALMOND, JR., from the Eightieth Congress.

The House heard on Thursday with regret the statement made by the Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH that his able colleague, Hon. JAMES LINDSAY ALMOND, JR., had resigned as a Member of the House of Representatives to fill the important office of attorney general for the Commonwealth of Virginia. May I add as a Member of Congress from the neighbor State of North Carolina my deep disappointment that this body is losing so able and worthy a Representative as Congressman ALMOND.

It has been my privilege since the opening of the Eightieth Congress to know the gentleman from Virginia, Representative ALMOND, intimately both in association on the floor of the House and as a neighbor in the House Office Building. It is my well-considered opinion that there are few more capable or conscientious Congressmen than he. In character he is upright, honest, dependable, an exemplary Christian, being a prominent life-long member of the Lutheran Church. In service as a legislator, he is intelligent, reasonable, and independent if he thinks and believes this to be the right course. Furthermore, he has the courage and determination to support his position whether he finds himself in the majority or minority opinion.

The gentleman from Virginia, Congressman ALMOND, had no easy decision to make because he was devoted to service in the Congress and regretted to give it up. He naturally was conscious of the fact that he was serving his State ably and well and had the solid backing of his district. It was not easy to surrender the opportunity to serve Virginia in the Congress of the United States. Yet the call of his native State, which he loves, beckoned and he accepted the offer of the Governor of Virginia to serve his State again, this time in the important office of attorney general, as he had done before in serving his people of Virginia in many highly important offices. Conspicuous in his service to the State was as judge of the Hustings court, Roanoke, Va., from February 3, 1933, to December 31, 1945, and as assistant Commonwealth's attorney from January 1, 1930, to February 3, 1933. With the exception of his service on the bench, he practiced law in his native State continuously from 1923 until elected to the Seventy-ninth Congress. He is a graduate of the University of Virginia with a bachelor of laws degree.

This distinguished Virginian will be missed by the Congress and by the important committee on which he served as a very valuable member, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House. It is a pity that the Congress has to lose men of Congressman ALMOND's type but when a call comes for outstanding and important service to his State, there can be no complaint.

I feel confident every Member of Congress wishes for him in his new field the same distinction and success which came to him as a Member of the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses of the United States.

THE OLEOMARGARINE FIGHT

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have had the honor of representing a district composed of three counties, and in each of those counties the dairy business or industry is one of the major segments of our economy. I have fought this attempt on the part of the oleomargarine people and interests to invade the dairy industry with its fraudulent program for the last 30 years, and I resent this attempt to short-circuit legislation here by bringing it to the floor by petition legislation which is inimical to the farmers.

In that time I have never seen such a shameful lobby organized against the dairy interests as the one here, and I am not one of those who signed the petition to bring this legislation to the floor.

I am not in favor of abolishing the Pure Food and Drug Act and permitting an inferior article to be foisted upon the public, making them believe it is the equal in quality of butter.

THE EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on what is now known as the European Cooperation Administration, I attempted to have included in the bill a provision which would specify without any question that on that program the Congress was committing itself only for 1 year. I was assured by the committee in charge of the program that we were being committed for only 1 year, and that the bill so stated. I contended that it was not and I am suggesting to you today, Mr. Speaker, that I am receiving confirmation from the action of the President and from the action of the Administrator.

The first Executive order issued by the President was to take away the 1-year limit for contracts for supplies; and I understand that when the Administrator received his confirmation from the Senate it was for 5 years.

Now, matters of that kind, plus the information brought to the floor by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] on the attempt to use $3,000,000,000 worth of our gold, make it very necessary for the Committee on Appropriations to look carefully into the expenditure of money under that program.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight tonight to file a report on House Resolution 522, directing the Secretary of Commerce to transmit to the House of Representatives certain letters with respect to Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. KEE (at the request of Mr. HEDRICK), for 3 days, April 19 to 23, on account of the death of his brother.

To Mr. GAVIN, for Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of this week, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3703. An act to authorize transfer of surplus real property to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior for consolidation of Federal holdings within areas administered by the National Park Service; and

H. R. 4326. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 20, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1470. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of proposed transfer to the State of New Jersey of two picket boats without engines; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1471. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting revised estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 involving an increase of $20,341,879 in cash and $44,822,000 in contract authorization, together with certain proposed provisions and increases in limitations for the United States Maritime Commission, in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 618); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1472. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act regulating the retent on contracts with the District of Columbia," approved March 31, 1906; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1473. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting the Third Report of Alaska Ocean Transportation Activities; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1474. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Edwin B. Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLE of Missouri: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 5272. A bill relating to the compensation of certain railway postal clerks; without amendment (Rept. No. 1752). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLVERTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. House Resolution 522. Resolution directing the Secretary of Commerce to transmit to the House of Representatives a certain letter with respect to Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards; without amendment (Rept. No. 1753). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 6267. A bill to repeal sections 1, 2, and 6 of the act of June 28, 1944; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 6268. A bill to amend sections 124 and 3780 of the Internal Revenue Code to extend the time for filing applications for tentative adjustment in certain instances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 6269. A bill to provide for review of military and naval records in World War I, and issue of decorations, medals, and awards in deserving cases; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 6270. A bill to create and establish an international university for the purpose of promoting universal understanding, justice, and permanent peace, to provide for the course of study, management, and operation of the university, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 544. Resolution requesting the President not to proclaim rates of duty listed in schedule XX of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade signed at Geneva, Switzerland, on October 30, 1947; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 6271. A bill for the relief of Robert F. Giblin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 6272. A bill for the relief of Phil H. Hubbard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1792. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of members of the West Side Chapter of Americans for Democratic Action, consisting of 2,000 names, protesting the United States position on the Palestine question and urging a continued fight for the immediate lifting of the arms embargo to Palestine and establishment of a United Nations police force to insure peace in the Holy Land; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1793. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Hughes Robert Hilliard, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to change of venue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1794. Also, petition of Ralph Kuether and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1795. Also, petition of Dr. Allen S. Horn and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to reconsidering its rejection of the partition plan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1796. Also, petition of Michael Roob and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to investigation of the war-crime trials that are now going on; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1797. Also, petition of the Townsend Club, Jacksonville, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1798. Also, petition of Miss Anne M. Schafer, St. Cloud, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1799. Also, petition of Mrs. Bertha M. Miller, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1800. Also, petition of Miss Lizzie E. Beers, Cassadaga, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 20, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, March 29, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Oscar F. Blackwelder, pastor of the Lutheran Church of the Reformation, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, source of life and light, we turn to Thee today for help in facing the pressing problems of our Nation. Remind us, our Father, that we are not owners and proprietors of this planet but only Thy guests for a few years. Grant to those in all places of public trust Thy guidance and strength.

In this moment of quiet and prayer, we especially ask Thy presence in the minds and work of the Members of the Senate. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 19, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On April 15, 1948:

S. 111. An act for the relief of Donat and Laura Laroche;

S. 805. An act authorizing an appropriation for the construction, extension, and improvement of a high-school building near Roosevelt, Utah, for the district embracing the east portion of Duchesne County and the west portion of Uintah County;

S. 1235. An act for the relief of Merchants Motor Freight;

S. 1306. An act relating to the construction and disposition of the San Jacinto-San Vicente aqueduct;

S. 1581. An act to provide additional time to the city of Newark, N. J., for paying certain installments on the purchase price of the Port Newark Army base, and for other purposes; and

S. 1799. An act to amend the act of June 3, 1916, as amended, to make it applicable to the Canal Zone, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

On April 17, 1948:

S. 2081. An act to extend the provisions of the Federal Airport Act to the Virgin Islands.

THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the Senate very likely is well acquainted with the work now being carried on by the Joint Congressional Committee on Labor-Management Relations. This committee has sometimes been referred to as the watchdog committee, and perhaps properly so. One of its chief functions has been to determine the course of policy and procedure which has been and is being established by the National Labor Relations Board and the General Counsel under the Labor-Management Relations Act which was passed last year.

In this connection, I point out, Mr. President, that there is much more to management-labor relations than the law itself. Under the terms of the act which Congress passed last year, a new relationship, insofar as such a relationship can be established by law, was instituted between labor and management; and, as I see it, the law itself is now demonstrating its worth.

However, as I have indicated, there is much more to this relationship than ap-

pears in the context of the statute itself. Much is dependent on the spirit with which the law is being carried out, and with reference to that aspect I take this opportunity to commend the National Labor Relations Boards and the General Counsel for their efforts to carry out not only the letter of the law itself, but the spirit of the law.

To be sure, small errors may have been committed in the matter of policy, but these have been corrected as time has passed. New policies have been adopted to meet new conditions. Of necessity, new procedures have been instituted. But on the whole the general approach has been sound and fair, and the work thus far accomplished by this agency of the Government has been most commendable.

I suggest, however, Mr. President, as I have stated, that there is much more than the law itself and the mere terms of the law. There is the spirit to which I have made mention. If labor relations in this country are to be of a type that we want in the United States, this condition can be brought about only through a state of mind and the philosophy which underlies not only the law but the day-to-day relationship between workers and employers. It is in that field, fully as much as in the field of policy and of procedure, that the National Labor Relations Board today is making an outstanding record.

Mr. President, I wish to insert at the conclusion of these brief remarks an address entitled "The New Duties of the National Labor Relations Board," delivered last night by the Board's Chairman, Mr. Paul M. Herzog, before the Town Hall in Los Angeles, Calif. It should be read by everyone who has any interest whatever in the question of labor relations; indeed, it is well worthy of consideration—careful and studied consideration—by every person in the United States. For this reason, Mr. President, I ask that Mr. Herzog's address be inserted at this point in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

The address is as follows:

Three thousand miles away, at this very moment, the citizens of Massachusetts are celebrating the one hundred and seventy-third anniversary of the shot heard round the world, the first volley fired for liberty at the Battle of Lexington. And 6,000 miles from here men and women are scanning the results of an election that may well determine whether parliamentary democracy is to survive on the continent of Europe. Only time can tell which date will be better remembered by future generations, the one that presaged the birth of democracy in the New World or the one that will mark its rebirth or its dissolution in the Old.

The concept of government with, and only with, the consent of the governed lies at the foundation of democracy. It also forms the foundation of that system of employer-employee relations known as collective bargaining, whose encouragement was the prime purpose of the Wagner Act and is still one of several purposes of the new Taft-Hartley law. In modern industrial society, no matter how generous the instincts of employers, the individual employee has little opportunity to participate in fixing the terms of his hire unless he is free to decide whether to pool his economic strength with his fellows. Nor will he be worthy of that hire unless his dignity as an individual is respected, both by his employer and by those union officials he may select to represent him.

For the past 15 years Congress and the White House have been deeply concerned with this problem. Congress thought legislation necessary, first to foster collective bargaining and remove obstacles that employers had put in its path, and more recently also to discourage certain conduct by labor organizations that it believed inconsistent with the public interest. The pendulum has swung so rapidly in one direction or another that those affected have sometimes felt that it has actually swung to one extreme or the other. To those who called the Wagner Act class legislation, as well as to those who call the Taft-Hartley Act a slave-labor law, I suggest the importance of viewing both in the perspective of history. I doubt whether history will confirm either characterization, although it certainly will be hard to judge the wisdom of both pieces of legislation. The basic fact for those now living to remember is that the transition in both directions has been extremely rapid, and that neither industry, nor labor, nor the public has ever had sufficient time to adjust fully to either declaration of public policy.

Nor, indeed, have those charged with the administration of the law. We, too, have been forced to learn as we act, by trial and occasionally by error. The education of an administrator can be a costly thing, and not always only to himself. But that is one price that probably must be paid whenever society decides that particular human conduct requires regulation by government. The price will not be too high, if those whose conduct inspired that regulation comport themselves so as to reduce its necessity or convince their fellow citizens that further changes are desirable. The important thing is not whether a particular law is good or bad, but that the people continue free to appraise its merit. And because freedom without knowledge has little value, it is essential that forums like the Town Hall remain open for unlimited inquiry into fact and utterance of opinion.

Today, although the members of the National Labor Relations Board have many of the same ultimate responsibilities that we had under the Wagner Act, most of our former administrative functions are now vested in the independent General Counsel. This release from administrative duties has coincided with a broad expansion of the subject matter over which we have jurisdiction. The National Labor Relations Act authorized the Board to conduct elections to determine employees' choice of bargaining representatives, and also to prevent certain unfair labor practices by employers. Title I of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 not only preserves these functions, but further directs the Board to prevent a number of unfair labor practices by unions, and to conduct thousands of elections to ascertain whether employees desire to authorize a union-shop agreement. The Board does not, however, have jurisdiction over such problems as political contributions or national emergencies. Thus we were not directly involved in the recent coal crisis.

Since August 1947, the five Board members and the General Counsel have been applying the new provisions to cases brought under both the new law and the old. The General Counsel's action has been directed primarily at the newer cases. As an administrative officer, in charge of the Board's 19 regional offices and responsible for requests for court injunctions, he naturally has had much fuller opportunity than the Board members to apply the new amendments. The Board itself stands at the end of the Agency's assembly line, with final responsibility to decide those cases that require findings of fact or an interpretation of the law. Because it takes time for a litigated case to pass all the way down that assembly line, the Board members have concentrated until recently upon cases that started in the regional offices while the original Wagner Act was still the law of the land. Today, however, we are preparing to decide a number of important unfair labor practice cases brought under the Taft-Hartley Act, and have already issued several hundred decisions in election cases filed since it went into effect.

About three-quarters of the new cases will not require decision by the Board, because they involve consent elections to authorize union-shop agreements. About 6,000 such elections have already been conducted; the union-shop proposal has been endorsed by a majority of the eligible employees in almost 99 percent of them. The remaining cases filed since August fall into four general categories: Of every 10 such cases, approximately five have been union petitions for representation elections and three have been charges that employers have violated the law—both filed substantially as they were under the Wagner Act. The remaining two cases out of 10 have been of the new type, filed wholly under the Taft-Hartley provisions. One has been an election petition, filed either by an employer or by an individual employee seeking to decertify an incumbent union; the other has alleged the commission of an unfair labor practice by a labor organization.

The Board will decide the first few cases charging union unfair labor practices during the months immediately ahead. They involve such issues as restraint, coercion, and refusals to bargain by labor organizations, both of which were the subject of recent intermediate decisions by Board trial examiners in California cases. Secondary boycotts and pressure to induce employers to enter closed-shop contracts, both prohibited by the new act, are before the Board members in other cases. Until they are decided, by the courts as well as by the Board, it will be difficult to determine the legal and practical impact of the most controversial provisions of the new law. Meanwhile the General Counsel—acting independently of the Board members—has found it necessary or desirable to seek injunctions in a number of these situations.

The Board members, on the other hand, have had fuller opportunity to apply the new law to election cases. We have excluded all foremen from bargaining units; have segregated professional employees from other groups; have barred rank-and-file unions from representing plant guards; and have interpreted the new craft proviso as not making it mandatory for the Board to carve a group of craftsmen out of every preexisting over-all industrial unit, upon the mere request of a craft union. Many other difficult and novel problems lie ahead. At the same time, because employers are not always models of perfect behavior, the Board is continuing to process many unfair labor practice—and representation—cases brought by unions. In these, too, we are applying the new rules, except in a few cases left over from the earlier period where law or fairness or common sense dictates that we still apply the old. Although principles and policies are evolving fast, every case must still be decided on its own merits.

Words on the statute books only take on life when administrators and judges can apply them to concrete situations. That is what we are doing now. The full meaning of the new statute will only be known when we have done it for much longer than 8 months' experience. To date the Board's experience has been both full and varied but it can hardly be called typical, because so much time had to be devoted to constructing the machine tools of administration. For example, we concentrated in the later months of 1947 on applying and interpreting those special provisions of the new law which require union officers to file non-Communist

affidavits before their organizations can use the facilities of the Board. Until these problems were out of the way, as most of them now are, it was not possible to pass on many cases on the merits. Election cases filed by noncomplying unions were completely blocked, and even unfair labor practice cases which they filed under the old law were thought to require some special treatment. Now that all but a few conspicuous international unions have complied, the road is clear for the Board to move more rapidly.

Rapid movement will certainly be necessary, not only because unions and employers have every reason to ask the Board to handle their problems promptly, but also because the flood of cases inundating us permits no other choice. In February and March, we received 10,500 cases, as many as in most full years during the Wagner Act era. Although the General Counsel and the Board did dispose of 3,500 cases during March, 12,000 awaited action on the last day of that month. Fortunately, most of these will be closed at the regional level by consent elections or other agreement of the parties. Nevertheless, a substantial proportion will require decision by the Board members, especially during this early period when unions and employers, and also the Board's own agents, are still feeling their way.

We are devising techniques to cope with this huge case load. The staff has been greatly increased; procedures are being streamlined to the greatest extent consistent with observing due process of law and giving every party the feeling that he has had his day in court. But this will not solve the problem. No matter what miracles we may perform—and I promise none—it cannot be solved until industry and labor determine to deal so reasonably and so unreservedly with one another that neither feels impelled to cry out for the assistance of government except in rare and unusual situations. No matter how friendly and how informal that assistance may be, it is bound—especially where a quasi-judicial agency like the Board is involved—to take on the attributes of a lawsuit. It is often said, referring to ordinary fields of litigation, that a bad settlement is better than a good lawsuit; this is particularly true in the labor relations field, where the parties must continue to live together after a particular controversy is over. An unsatisfactory settlement can always be corrected; a successful lawsuit, prolonged and bitterly fought, leaves wounds that can disturb the victor as much as they gall the vanquished. In the long run, also, government will either lose the confidence or gain complete control over the people it is supposed to serve, if it is forced to adjudicate all the controversies between industry and labor. This trend, begun during the recent war, ought certainly to be reversed while time still remains.

The demands of war often required the Government to take over the task of determining wages, hours and other conditions of employment, customarily arrived at through direct negotiations between employers and labor organizations. Before 1941, negotiations conducted in good faith were likely to result in a written agreement, which became "a business compact, a treaty, and a code of honor, all in one." During the war, however, directive orders frequently sidetracked collective bargaining. It became customary to run to the Government, to let the Government make the decisions, and therefore to take the blame. This generated an attitude that prevented employers and unions from discharging many of their own responsibilities. Unfortunately, this wartime tendency did not terminate with hostilities. It is still a symptom of a serious industrial malady, manifested frequently by management or labor running to the Board or the courts to demand injunctions against one another. The malady is serious because legal pleadings stress rights more than responsibilities; they disclose a greater interest in winning a victory than in finding a solution.

Only the other day a Presidential emergency board made the same diagnosis in the railway industry, where one might have expected a healthier situation, collective bargaining having been established longer there than in most industrial enterprise. The members of the emergency board, after several weeks of hearings, reported that it was compelled to "spend its time trying to unravel a tangle of wrapping string. That these parties were not able to accomplish, by negotiation, even this little kitchen job is cause for real concern. In our judgment this kind of failure has, so far as collective bargaining is concerned, malignant potentialities. * * * We would be derelict," they said, "if we did not give warning of what we consider a bad wash-out on the track ahead. * * * We urge upon the parties that they start revitalizing the cooperative element in their relationship, by working out satisfactory settlements of those issues which cannot possibly be disposed of properly here."

The same tendency to lean on government is noticeable in many cases that are brought before the National Labor Relations Board. As we consider many of them, involving matters on which the law has been repeatedly interpreted or which could have been settled at the plant level, we cannot help wondering why the parties did not resolve their own difficulties. They can usually do it quicker and better than we can do it for them. The day will soon come; I hope, when this fact will be recognized, and equally so by both industry and labor. Then, and only then, will collective bargaining fulfill its promise. Then, and only then, can government conserve its prestige and its energies to assist them when a serious impasse has been reached, or else to protect the public interest when one or both flout its offers of assistance.

There are some encouraging signs on the horizon. One is the decision of the new Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service to refrain from entering either local controversies or those in which the parties have not explored the possibilities of direct bargaining. Another is the national agreement recently reached between the A. F. of L. building-trades unions and the principal contractors' associations of the country. This agreement, stimulated by the new law and encouraged by both the Board and the General Counsel, promises to provide voluntary machinery for the peaceful settlement of jurisdictional disputes in the construction industry. It is encouraging because it represents an attempt by management and labor to solve their own problems through collective bargaining. If the joint arbitration board they have established voluntarily proves successful, its action will represent an extension of the collective-bargaining process. Even though the provisions of the law banning jurisdictional disputes stand in the background, compliance with the joint board's decisions will depend primarily upon the parties' desire to honor their own bargain.

No law can ever take the place of decent human behavior. In the field of labor-management relations, legislation will never remove the need for cooperation, mutual understanding, and confidence, although it certainly can be written and administered so as to stimulate them. Those who seek sole refuge in the statute books make orderly collective bargaining and plant harmony difficult, if not impossible. This was true before the Norris-LaGuardia and Wagner Acts were enacted; it was true while they declared congressional policy; it is true today.

But neither labor nor management can expect the representatives of the people to stand idly by unless they are prepared to fulfill their own obligations. Each must enter negotiations with the assumption that ideas that seem abhorrent at the beginning of the bargaining process may prove acceptable at the end. Men who ask other men to display elasticity of mind must be ready to manifest it themselves. Inflexibility breeds inflexibility; extreme positions engender opposite extremes in others. If labor and management desire to bargain freely without the constant tutelage of government, both must shun the advice of extremists within their own ranks.

This is not only desirable but essential, if we are to avoid imposing an unbearable strain upon governmental processes, whether at the National Labor Relations Board or elsewhere. The more a government has to do, the less likely it is to do it well. The more government does, the less room will be left for industry and labor to solve their own problems. But unless they move toward wise solutions themselves while time still remains, they will find their fellow citizens, who—like nature—abhor a vacuum, calling upon government to fill the void. Once it has done so, it will not be easy to dislodge. Then, and only then, would Americans be tempted to wonder, for the very first time, whether the Battle of Lexington may not have been fought in vain.

THE ELECTION IN ITALY

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, the people of Italy have given their answer at the polls, reaffirming their faith in their newly born democracy. This is the democracy of free men as we understand and practice it here in our country. Their action proves their continued friendship for America. So, I think it opportune to express my congratulations to the people of Italy for the truly democratic manner in which on April 18, 1948, they made this historic decision. I deem it opportune to express also words of praise for the wholehearted cooperation in reaching this decision of our American citizens of Italian extraction.

In this battle of the cold war, in some respects no less ominous than the battles of the last war, they have shown their deep interest in the land of their fathers while at the same time they have again done their full duty toward America in helping to bring victory to the forces of democracy in Italy. Their tens of thousands of letters and telegrams to their Italian relatives and friends, urging them to go to the polls on election day and to cast their ballot for those candidates upholding western democracy; their radio broadcastings to Italy; the appeals of their newspapers in the Italian language; all this upsurge of feeling has made for a splendid spontaneous massing of moral force and mental enlightenment. This has projected into Italy the shining light of our American way of life.

I desire to point out that this campaign by letters had its very inception in the State of Rhode Island. At first it came as a suggestion to our Italo-American citizens from two of our daily newspapers, the Providence Journal and the Evening Bulletin, in an editorial article published on September 27, 1947. It found immediate response and was taken up and adopted by the grand lodge of Rhode Island, Order Sons of Italy in America, which, through its State president, Luigi Scala, began a series of radio appeals and public speakings to Italo-Americans. It was carried on for months with the persuasion of our

esteemed fellow citizen, Judge Luigi De Pasquale.

From Rhode Island this campaign spread all over our country. It became an appeal voiced nationally by the supreme lodge of the Order Sons of Italy, through its supreme venerable, George J. Spatuzza. It was widely disseminated by a fine newspaper in the Italian language, Il Progresso Italo-Americano of the able governor of my State, His Excellency John O. Pastore. It was earn- New York, whose editor, Generoso Pope, is a stanch supporter of every good cause which serves America. It was the subject of a timely broadcast to Italy by estly supported by countless committees and individuals in various effective ways, especially by the former members of our armed services of Italian extraction who, having served in Italy, wrote thousands of letters to residents of Italy whom they met while stationed in that country while serving with our colors. Thus, veterans not only bore arms in the service of our country, but, in their civilian capacities, carried on as ambassadors of good will, and used their best efforts to point out to the citizens of Italy the dread dangers of a communistic government. It was an outpouring of American ideals throbbing with feelings for Italy, feelings for its freedom, and its safety, in fact, for its continued existence. Today it shares in the victory of democracy.

To all of these true Americans, the known and the unknown, the clergy, the public men and the business and professional men, the veterans, the workers in the factory or in trade, to the press and radio station, to all who in their missives or spoken words evinced once more their love for America's principles and their interest in helping at the same time their native land, I wish to record for myself, and, I believe, for the great majority of my fellow citizens, deep appreciation. Communism has been defeated and democracy lives and continues to function in Italy.

EDWARD TRAPIER ROGERS—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 148)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Chief Clerk, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith without my approval the enrolled bill (S. 1307) "For the relief of Edward Trapier Rogers."

This bill would authorize the payment of $25,000 to Edward Trapier Rogers of Raleigh, N. C., for personal injuries which he sustained as the result of an explosion which occurred while he was a civilian employee of the War Department. This amount would be in addition to disability compensation that has been or will be paid to him under the United States Employees' Compensation Act.

On the morning of October 31, 1946, Mr. Rogers, a chemical engineer employed by the Chemical Corps Technical Command at Edgewood Arsenal, Md., was engaged in a chemical experiment, the object of which was to develop a colored smoke shell for the 4.2 chemical mortar. The mixture which was being prepared had previously been made by Mr. Rogers and used experimentally in a number of hand grenades, and had been approved by the Bureau of Mines. The work was being done in a small open-frame building in which was located a laboratory "dough" mixer with an explosion-proof electric motor. Standing instructions were that no one was to be in the building while the motor was running. On this occasion, however, Mr. Rogers remained at the machine after the motor had been started to add another ingredient. He estimated that he was there about 3 minutes when the mixture exploded. The cause of the explosion has not been determined.

In the explosion, Mr. Rogers sustained very serious injuries, necessitating extensive surgery, including the amputation of both arms. He was hospitalized until discharged on August 23, 1947. On October 13, 1947, he returned to work at the Edgewood Arsenal where he has since continued to be employed at a salary of $4,902 per annum.

From the time of the accident until his return to employment, he received total disability compensation from the Government in the amount of $116.66 per month, the maximum amount payable under existing law. The law authorizes the award of an additional sum of not more than $50 a month if the disability sustained is sufficient to require the service of an attendant. Since his discharge from the hospital, Mr. Rogers has received this additional item of compensation. When he is no longer able to work he will again be entitled to draw compensation on account of his disability. Furthermore, the Government will continue to furnish to Mr. Rogers all medical services and hospitalization which may be found to be necessary for the treatment of his injuries, including the cost of appropriate prosthetic appliances.

It is with extreme regret that I am obliged to return this measure without my approval. One's natural impulse is to extend to Mr. Rogers all possible assistance to relieve his suffering and to compensate him for his loss above and beyond the limits of the amounts payable to him under the terms of the existing general law. There are, however, compelling reasons to the contrary. As stated by the committee reports on this measure, there is no evidence of any negligence on the part of the Government or of any agent of the Government. The Federal Employees' Compensation Act as written by the Congress provides only for the payment of compensation for loss of wage-earning capacity. It does not provide indemnity for loss or loss of use of members of the body. Justice demands the uniform application of our compensation laws to all persons alike. The Federal Security Agency advises me that there are many persons on its rolls who have been rated as totally disabled, but who have received no more than the amounts fixed by the general law. Among them are a number who, like the beneficiary in this measure, have suffered the loss of both arms.

The amount of compensation which may be awarded under the act seems inadequate in this instance. The remedy, however, is not to single out one case for a special award. This case brings sharply to focus the need for more adequate compensation for disabilities sustained in the service of the Government. There are several measures now pending in the Congress, the enactment of which would serve that purpose.

Therefore, while deeply regretting this deplorable accident, I feel compelled to withhold my approval from the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 20, 1948.*

MADISON STREET BUILDING CORP. VERSUS UNITED STATES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and recommendation concerning the claim of the Madison Street Building Corp. against the United States, which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXPRESSION OF GRATIFICATION OF GOVERNMENT OF AUSTRIA ON PASSAGE OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting the text of a note from Ludwig Kleinwaechter, Minister of Austria, expressing the gratification of the people and the Government of Austria on the enactment of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Concurrent resolution memorializing the United States Senate and House of Representatives not to ratify any treaty or agreement with the Dominion of Canada or pass any legislation which may provide for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway

Whereas the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, on February 12, 1940, passed a concurrent resolution memorializing the United States Senate not to ratify a treaty with the Dominion of Canada for the proposed St. Lawrence seaway; and

Whereas the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, on January 21, 1941, and on February 11, 1946, and on March 11, 1947, passed concurrent resolutions reaffirming its position in opposition to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway; and

Whereas it appears that the present Congress of the United States may be called upon to approve or authorize the construction of the seaway: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Assembly of the State of New Jersey (the Senate concurring):

1. That this legislature reaffirm its position in opposition to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway because of its economic impracticability, its entire lack of advantage as a defense measure, and its detriment to business in the State of New Jersey; and

2. *Be it further resolved,* That the Senate and the House of Representatives of the

United States, and particularly the Senators and Representatives elected from the State of New Jersey, be memorialized and requested to not ratify any treaty or agreement for the proposed St. Lawrence seaway or to approve or authorize the construction thereof; and

3. *Be it further resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the United States Senate, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative elected from the State of New Jersey.

TRUSTEESHIP PROPOSAL FOR PALESTINE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from Dan Lodge, No. 593, B'nai B'rith, of Charleston, signed by Harold Priluker, secretary, and a resolution adopted by Josiah Morse Lodge, No. 1083, B'nai B'rith, of Columbia, both in the State of South Carolina, in which they express the opinion of the good Jewish people of my State on the subject of the trusteeship proposal for Palestine. I have spoken previously on the situation, and I wish to say that I thoroughly agree with them.

There being no objection, the telegram and resolution were received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARLESTON, S. C., *April 16, 1948.*

Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,
United States Senate Office Building:

The 350 members of Dan Lodge, No. 593, Charleston chapter of B'nai B'rith, urge that you protest on the floor of Congress against the trusteeship proposal for Palestine and support the United Nations Assembly stand on partition. We feel that there is utter lack of justification of the administration's reversal of policy which will definitely undermine the authority of the United Nations.

DAN LODGE, No. 593, B'NAI B'RITH,
HAROLD PRILUKER, *Secretary.*

JOSIAH MORSE LODGE, 1083, B'NAI B'RITH,
Columbia, S. C.

Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Josiah Morse Lodge of B'nai B'rith of Columbia, S. C., numbering 140 in membership, has in full session met this 12th day of April 1948, and unanimously passed the following resolution, which it submits for your earnest and immediate consideration:

"Whereas the United Nations Assembly, representing the only vestige of world authority and world morality, has taken its stand in favor of the partition of Palestine and the formation of a Jewish nation; and

"Whereas this decision was the result of the wholehearted support and encouragement of the American people; and

"Whereas this plan would not only provide a home and refuge for the still many hundreds of thousands of war-torn and weary refugees, but would stand out as a fait accompli for the United Nations; and now

"Whereas the United States has seen fit to reverse its stand on partition and submit in its place, a plan of trusteeship; and

"Whereas such a reversal would undermine the authority of the United Nations organization and substantially weaken its position as an effective instrument for world morality and for the preservation of world peace: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we do hereby emphatically and vigorously oppose any such move that would take away from the Jewish people their rights to their homeland and would deny to them the sacred privilege of freedom and nationhood; and, inasmuch as the trusteeship plan would in effect do this, we therefore oppose such plan and earnestly solicit your active and immediate help in our struggle to secure a home for the homeless by endorsing the partition plan and renewing hope for the desolate and despairing millions by supporting the United Nations organization."

Very sincerely yours,

JOSIAH MORSE LODGE
OF B'NAI B'RITH,
MEYER KATZ, *President.*

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 550. A bill for the relief of Lizzie Reynolds, administratrix of the estate of Grace Reynolds, deceased; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1130);

H. R. 761. A bill for the relief of the estate of Anthony D. Chamberlain, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 1131);

H. R. 762. A bill for the relief of Dudley Tarver; without amendment (Rept. No. 1132);

H. R. 2728. A bill for the relief of Darwin Slump; without amendment (Rept. No. 1133);

H. R. 3113. A bill for the relief of Bessie B. Blacknall; without amendment (Rept. No. 1134); and

H. R. 3328. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Russell Coulter; without amendment (Rept. No. 1135).

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. Res. 224. Resolution increasing the limit of expenditures for hearings before the Committee on Armed Services; without amendment, and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. 2518. A bill to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization (Rept. No. 1136); ordered to be placed on the calendar.

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 1050. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the mining of potash on the public domain," approved February 7, 1927, so as to provide for the disposition of the rentals and royalties from leases issued or renewed under the act entitled "An act to authorize exploration for and disposition of potassium," approved October 2, 1917; without amendment (Rept. No. 1143);

S. 1448. A bill directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and lease certain houses, apartments, and lands in Boulder City, Nev.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1146);

S. 1686. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain obligations of the United States to the Indians of New York; without amendment (Rept. No. 1139);

S. 1687. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the courts of the State of New York with respect to civil actions between Indians or to which Indians are parties; with amendments (Rept. No. 1137);

S. 1925. A bill to convey certain land to the city of Pierre, S. Dak.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1144);

S. 1933. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to School District 55, Roosevelt County, Mont.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1138);

S. 1941. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to John F. Compton, formerly John Crazy Bull, a patent in fee to certain land; without amendment (Rept. No. 1140);

H. R. 1113. A bill to emancipate United States Indians in certain cases; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1141);

H. R. 4725. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the several States over offenses committed by or against Indians on Indian reservations; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1142); and

H. J. Res. 242. Joint resolution to confirm title in fee simple in Joshua Britton to certain lands in Jefferson County, Ill.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1145).

By Mr. WATKINS, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 2622. A bill to authorize loans for Indians, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1147).

By Mr. SMITH, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 2385. A bill to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1151).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 1308. A bill for the relief of H. C. Biering; with amendments (Rept. No. 1150);

H. R. 1667. A bill for the relief of the estate of T. L. Morris; without amendment (Rept. No. 1148); and

H. R. 3089. A bill for the relief of Mississippi Central Railroad Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1149).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. LANGER, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2515. A bill to amend an act of Congress approved February 9, 1881, which granted a right-of-way for railroad purposes through certain lands of the United States in Richmond County, N. Y.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE:

S. 2516. A bill for the relief of David Wallace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 2517. A bill to amend section 12 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original bill (S. 2518) to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization, which was ordered to be placed on the calendar.)

By Mr. WILSON:

S. 2519. A bill to permit the maintenance of the naturally renewable fishery resources of the United States at their optimum of abundance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 2520. A bill to amend section 26 of the Shipping Act of 1916; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2521. A bill to legalize the admission into the United States of Vendelin Krajci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 2522. A bill to permit the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to sell a certain war housing project to the Housing Authority of the city of Manchester, N. H.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(Mr. MORSE introduced Senate bill 2523, to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to provide for a single executive department for the operation and administration of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force; and to give the Secretary of Defense adequate power to enable him to formulate and place in operation integrated programs for the national security, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 2524. A bill for the relief of Carl Plowaty and W. J. Plowaty; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 2525. A bill to provide for the advancement of one grade on the retired list of certain officers who were decorated and recommended for promotion during World War II but who have not attained the rank to which recommended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2526. A bill to remove the limitation upon the maximum deposit insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2527. A bill to amend section 251 (a) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt from taxation certain income earned by employees at naval and air bases leased from Great Britain pursuant to the agreement of March 27, 1941; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2528. A bill to extend the time within which suit may be filed under the Federal Tort Claims Act on the claim of Lela Elizabeth Spencer Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 2529. A bill for the relief of certain nationals of Poland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 2530. A bill to repeal certain excise tax rates on watches and clocks and cases and movements therefor; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2531. A bill for the relief of the East Coast Ship & Yacht Corp., of Noank, Conn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN (for himself and Mr. MCMAHON):

S. 2532. A bill for the relief of R. Wallace & Sons Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 2533. A bill for the relief of Emory T. Wales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON INVESTIGATION OF NATIONAL RESOURCES

Mr. BUTLER submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 51), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That 1,000 additional copies of the hearings held before the Committee on Public Lands on Investigation of National Resources on May 15, 16, and 20, 1947, be printed for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRINTING OF CERTAIN PARTS OF HEARING RELATIVE TO PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of certain parts of the hearings relative to problems of small business, and I request its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 225) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Senate Special Committee to Study Problems of American Small Business be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 400 additional copies of parts 4 and 10 of the hearings relative to problems of small business, held before said committee during the first session of the Eightieth Congress.

AMENDMENT TO TARIFF ACT OF 1930 RELATING TO FERTILIZERS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BUTLER submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5275) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of limestone to be used in the manufacture of fertilizer, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NATIONAL HOUSING—AMENDMENT

Mr. BRIDGES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 866) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective and to provide for the coordinated execution of such policy through a National Housing Commission, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

FEDERAL CHARTER FOR COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1322) to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. KEM, Mr. MALONE, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 1322) supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PRINTING OF REPORT OF ADVISORY COUNCIL ON SOCIAL SECURITY RELATING TO OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS' INSURANCE (S. DOC. NO. 149)

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I present a report of the Advisory Council on Social Security, relating to old-age and survivors' insurance, made to the Committee on Finance of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY—THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the Bar Association of St. Louis at its annual dinner at the Chase Hotel, St. Louis, Mo., on April 16, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR REVERCOMB BEFORE INDIANA REPUBLICAN EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION

[Mr. REVERCOMB asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the Indiana Republican Editorial Association, at Indianapolis, Ind., on February 21, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND NATIONAL DEFENSE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Universal Military Training and National Defense, delivered by him at Fremont, Nebr., on April 7, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHY REVISE THE HATCH ACT?—ARTICLE BY SENATOR BRIDGES

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Why Revise the Hatch Act?" written by himself and published in the Republican magazine for September 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

SHIPMENTS TO RUSSIA—EDITORIAL FROM NEW HAMPSHIRE MORNING UNION

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Shipments to Russia," published in the New Hampshire Morning Union of March 24, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NATIONAL IRRIGATION PROGRAM—ADDRESS BY WILLIAM E. WARNE

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Our National Irrigation Program, by Hon. William E. Warne, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, before the thirty-eighth annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, in Washington, D. C., March 19, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE POSTAL PAY BILL—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK JOURNAL-AMERICAN

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Postal Pay Bill," published in the New York Journal-American of April 17, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

COOPERATION FOR WORLD PEACE—EDITORIAL FROM THE PROGRESSIVE FARMER

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Congress and the People Must Now Cooperate for World Peace," written by Clarence Poe, president and editor of the Progressive Farmer, and published in the May 1948 issue of that publication, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CASE OF THE NAVAJOS

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Amazing Propaganda—the Case of the Navajos," written by E. L. Moulton, which appears in the Appendix.]

FLORIDA VETERAN LAWS

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an outline of Florida laws relating to veterans, prepared by Jack Robins, department adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans, of Daytona Beach, Fla., which appears in the Appendix.]

WESTERN EUROPEAN UNION—ARTICLE BY CHARLES EDMUNDSON

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article regarding the Western European Union, by Charles Edmundson, from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 21, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

EAMON DE VALERA—TRIBUTE BY JOHN S. BURKE

[Mr. MCMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the farewell address on the occasion of the departure of Eamon de Valera, delivered by John S. Burke before the Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, April 5, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM—EDITORIAL FROM THE HARTFORD COURANT

[Mr. MCMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Plan Becomes Real," published in the Hartford (Conn.) Courant, April 1, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PICTURE CRISIS—EDITORIAL FROM PHILADELPHIA BULLETIN

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Philadelphia Bulletin of April 19, 1948, entitled "The Picture Crisis," which appears in the Appendix.]

ADMISSION TO UNION OF TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, in the fore part of the current session of the Congress the House passed a bill providing for the admission of the Territory of Hawaii to statehood. That bill has been pending before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs since shortly after its passage by the House a year ago, and is still pending before the committee.

I believe one of the most important problems before the Senate is a decision as to what shall be done with that bill. I have received many inquiries with reference to its status and with reference to the general feeling in the United States concerning action upon it. I hold in my hand a clipping from the New York World-Telegram of April 15 in the nature of a Gallup poll on the subject, which indicates that today 66 percent of the people interviewed by Dr. Gallup and his staff are in favor of statehood for Hawaii, 15 percent oppose it, and 19 percent have no opinion. That is an increase of 6 percent in favor of statehood since March 1946, at which time 60 percent favored statehood, and an increase of 18 percent since 1941, at which time 48 percent favored statehood.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVITATION TO HAWAII—POLL SHOWS 66 PERCENT FAVOR STATEHOOD

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

Two out of three voters in the United States believe the time has come for Hawaii to be admitted to the Union as the forty-ninth State. Sentiment approving the step is higher now than ever before.

Hearings are being held today and tomorrow by the Senate Committee on Public Lands, of which Senator HUGH BUTLER, Republican, of Nebraska, is chairman on a bill for Hawaiian statehood.

As the hearings take place, field reporters for the American Institute of Public Opinion this week completed an up-to-the-minute testing of sentiment on the question. They interviewed hundreds of typical men and women voters in every section of the country, and found that among those with an opinion on the subject, statehood is favored by a vote of 4 to 1.

This is the question asked of the entire cross section:

"Would you favor or oppose having Hawaii admitted as the forty-ninth State in the Union?"

The identical question has been asked on two other occasions by the institute—once just before the war and again about 2 years ago. A steadily increasing vote favorable to the proposition is shown when the answers are compared as in the following table:

	Today	March 1946	January 1941
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Favor	66	60	48
Oppose	15	19	23
No opinion	19	21	29

Opinions of Hawaiian residents divide approximately the same as in the above survey of mainland sentiment, according to a plebiscite there at the general election of November 1940. At that time the islands' citizens voted 67 percent for statehood and 33 percent against.

After almost 50 years as a Territory, Hawaii's campaign for admission to the Union has been stepped up in recent months, under the leadership of JOSEPH FARRINGTON, the Territory's Delegate to Congress.

Considerable publicity has been given in this country to the efforts to secure statehood for the islands. The House approved statehood last year.

Both former Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes and his successor, Julius Krug, have advocated admission as the next logical step in the development of the islands. President Truman also has recommended the legislation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to join with the senior Senator from Oregon in his statements regarding statehood for Hawaii. We both come from the Pacific coast, which is the nearest point in the continental United States to the Territory of Hawaii. Certainly during the entire period of territoryhood the people of the islands have demonstrated time and time again their ability and capability for statehood. If being a Territory means anything it means a preparation for statehood, and I certainly hope that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate will follow the advice contained in the very able report of the senior Senator from Oregon, and promptly report the Hawaii statehood bill to the Senate of the United States. It should have the early favorable consideration of the Republican leadership in this body so that Hawaii may be put on its way to statehood.

THE PROPOSED EQUAL-RIGHTS CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, in the Eightieth Congress I had the great privilege of introducing Senate Joint Resolution 76 for myself and for the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

In this connection, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of April 5, 1948, in support of this measure which is commonly known as the equal-rights amendment.

I feel that this editorial clearly states our obligation to give effect to our platform pledges to submit the equal rights amendment to the people.

I trust that favorable action can be taken both by the committee and the Congress prior to adjournment of the present session.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENDING AN ANACHRONISM

The constitutional amendment granting equal rights to women stands closer to approval by Congress today than ever before. The reasons are not hard to find.

First of all comes the fact that both parties wholeheartedly approved the measure in their national platforms of 1944. Since then every consideration of practical politics has urged Republicans and Democrats alike to give effect to their pledge. In the year of a Presidential election the political reasons for living up to past promises are stronger than ever.

So far as the merits of the case go, every objection was long ago thoroughly examined and overborne by the facts. When the issue arose with respect to the Charter of the United Nations the equality of men and women was accepted as an axiom of the civilized world. The preamble "reaffirms faith" in "the equal rights of men and women," and the statement of purposes and principles includes human rights and fundamental freedoms "for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion." It is surely an absurd anachronism that the United States Constitution should, in this important item, lag behind a world charter.

There is, in addition, an especial reason why the amendment should pass this year. Exactly 100 years ago, the first equal-rights convention was held in Seneca Falls, N. Y. Lucretia Mott and Elizabeth Cady Stanton called the gathering, and by it Susan B. Anthony was inspired to undertake her lifelong work. Much has happened between 1848 and 1948. The progress of women, in education, in the professions, in playing their natural part in every form of human activity, has been steady. It is 28 years since the nineteenth amendment gave the vote to women. The year 1948 seems the right and fitting one for Congress to act in completion of this long pursuit of right and justice.

UNIFICATION OF THE MILITARY SERVICES—EDITORIAL COMMENT

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, apparently the citizens of the United States are deeply disturbed over the lack of unity in the armed services which has resulted following the adoption of the unification bill last year, which, it was hoped, would bring a greater measure of real unity in the armed services.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point three editorials on the subject, one from the Miami Herald of April 18, 1948, another from the Florida Times-Union of Jack-

sonville, Fla., of April 16, and a third from the Tampa Morning Tribune of April 17.

I call the attention of the Members of this body to the fact that the thinking in Florida, at least as exemplified in these three thoughtful editorials, is along the line of insisting upon a greater degree of unity than has prevailed up to now under the unification of the armed services, and of insisting upon greater and more speedy progress being made in the field of the rearming of our Nation, and in the field of advancement of our military preparedness, both in the material field and in the field of manpower.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald of April 18, 1948]

The plan for unification of the military services is essentially a good one.

Yet the bickering between the Army, Navy, and Air Force is fast making a mockery of the scheme.

The Secretary of the Air Force talks air power, the Secretary of the Navy wants both ships and limited air power, and the Army spokesmen still speak in terms of mass land armies.

In Washington, representatives of all three services are lobbying like mad for their respective appropriations. Congressmen and newspapermen are buttonholed by glib salesmen in uniform, all merchandising their pet wares.

The question we have in mind is simply this: Why aren't these differences between the services resolved by the Secretary of Defense?

Why doesn't Mr. Forrestal present a united plan for national defense, which the public understood was to be the logical outcome of unifying the services?

In his speech before the Wings Club in New York, Senator OWEN BREWSTER correctly stated that the Nation could not afford the luxury of two air forces. But, said the Senator, "The Navy is now air-minded with a vengeance."

He alluded also to some admirals and generals who are so set against changes that they are willing to die in their tracks.

It seems to us that with unprecedented peacetime appropriations being demanded by the military, Mr. Forrestal should advance an over-all plan based upon the requirements of both defensive and strategic warfare.

If he is not able to bring recalcitrant admirals and generals into line and win their support for real unification, he should resign and make way for a new Secretary of Defense who can bring some semblance of order into a tragically chaotic situation.

[From the Florida Times-Union, Jacksonville, Fla., of April 16, 1948]

REVEALING ONE OF HUMAN NATURE'S WORST ASPECTS

One thing stands out clearly in the Washington testimony regarding the need for increased national security measures. The term "unification of the armed forces" is empty of any real meaning. It appears that behind the scenes there is a little acrimony.

The evidence that all does not go well is taken from several significant incidents of the past few weeks. General Spaatz's retirement from his position as head of the Air Force has been interpreted by some observers as a "Billy Mitchell" gesture—the blood-is-on-your-hands sort of attitude toward the powers that be if priority is not given to air development. Then there was the retort which Gen. Omar Bradley, Army Chief of Staff, made the other day to Air Secretary Symington's claim that the proposed 70 air groups are more important to the Nation's security than universal military training.

Said the Chief of Staff:

"There is no relationship between the 70-group program and UMT. The alternative to UMT if we are to have the barest type of security is a standing army big enough to carry the Army portion of a war burden for 1 year until mobilization."

The whole truth of the matter, as it appears to students of such things, is that the Air Force right now has a tactical advantage on the Army and Navy, and it is going to lose no opportunity to exploit it fully. For political reasons, sentiment seems to be on the side of the Department of Air in Congress. Of course, the selfish quest for prestige will influence everybody interested in air development to follow through on that advantage.

This is a picture which puts the Navy and Army in a kind of unaccustomed brothers-in-arms pose. Whereas they have been accustomed for generations of admirals and generals to wage a tug-of-war with each other for top position, now they have a common enemy—the Air Force. The Army fought hard to come out on top in the so-called unification of the armed forces. If possible, it would have gobbled up the Marine Corps, taken peremptory command of all arms, and set itself up in grand style. As it happened, the Army probably profited less than anybody. The Navy puts its former Cabinet member, James Forrestal, at the head of national security as a result of the conflict. And the Air Force is running away with the show.

This is a situation that would be laughable if it were not serious. It reveals human nature at its worst, shatters the ideal of unification, and menaces the Nation's security.

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Morning Tribune of April 17, 1948]

FOR A BALANCED DEFENSE

We believe the House has acted intelligently, so far as it has gone, in moving to meet the military preparedness problem. By its thumping vote in favor of the bill to build up a 70-group air force, it has sided with those who understand that, under the conditions of modern war, our first line of defense lies in the air. But House Members will be making a disastrous mistake if they feel they need go no further.

This is not said to discourage appropriations for defense or to contend that the House has erred on the side of overgenerosity. On the contrary, this newspaper favors the fullest preparation in advance for any emergency that may arise in this alarmed world.

It should be clear to almost everyone that $3,000,000,000 spent now in getting the great airplane factories in operation would be small compared with what would have to be expended if those plants were allowed to disintegrate.

Our protest is against the attitude that the 70-group air force is a politically palatable substitute for universal military training and probably for the draft also. Thus, certain Congressmen seem to be going today to their constituents and saying, in effect: "Look, we've voted three billions for a strong air force. Isn't that enough?"

No, it isn't. The American people must understand that a greatly enlarged air force will require calling up more draftees into all the services as fast as the planes are ready. These additional air groups could not operate against an enemy except from bases defended by Army ground troops and supplied by the Army and Navy. And we seriously doubt that the additional men can be obtained through strictly voluntary means.

PLANES ARE NOT ENOUGH

Thus, to accept the 70-group air force as sufficient in the way of preparedness is to assume that the judgment of our best military and naval leaders is all wrong, and that our defense policy should follow the pattern favored by the House. We prefer to consider the recommendations of skilled military leaders, just as we call in a skillful physician when we are ill.

The point at issue isn't so much the size and cost of a strengthened air force. It is whether the American people are to be deluded into believing that airplanes alone can be the substitute for home boys in uniform.

Needless to say, our defense will not be fully effective unless it is balanced. And it will not be balanced without adequate manpower. This is a fact that is ignored by both the blind adherents of a nonexistent push-button warfare and the groups that oppose the draft on the ground that it would promote militarism.

This, then, is the question to be asked by every American: Have we the courage and foresight in this election year to realize that the largest saving of American youth in the event of conflict is through advance training? Uncounted lives were saved because we had men under arms when the Pearl Harbor attack was launched. More lives would be lost in renewed war if we refused to renew the draft temporarily and to make training well-nigh universal.

NATIONAL HOUSING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 866) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective and to provide for the coordinated execution of such policy through a National Housing Commission, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, I may state that it is the purpose to vote on the veto of House bill 5052 when time permits.

Will the President pro tempore now state what the pending question is?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is glad to have that opportunity.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], for himself and the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as amended, inserting on page 92, after line 2, certain language relating to low-rent or veterans' housing projects.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, on last Thursday the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], on behalf of himself and his colleague [Mr. LODGE], offered an amendment to the committee amendments to Senate bill 866 to permit State-aided low-rent public-housing projects, started in contemplation of an extension of Federal assistance for public housing, to be converted to federally aided projects after the enactment of S. 866. This amendment was particularly designed to apply to the State program recently authorized in Massachusetts. A similar situation exists in New Hampshire.

Some objections were expressed on the floor, not to the basic purpose of the amendment, but rather as to certain administrative problems which would have been presented by the amendment in its original form. The senior Senator from Massachusetts expressed his willingness to accept perfecting modifications which would overcome these objections while

preserving the principal objective of the amendment. This matter has now been discussed with the officials of the Massachusetts State Board of Housing, the staff of the Banking and Currency Committee, and the Housing and Home Finance Agency. I am now offering a substitute amendment which is acceptable to the senior Senator from Massachusetts, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the amendment printed in the RECORD at this point, together with a letter addressed to me as chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee by Mr. Raymond M. Foley, Housing and Home Finance Administrator, on the subject of this modified amendment.

There being no objection, the amendment and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 92, after line 2, of the committee amendments, it is proposed to insert the following:

"SEC. 607. Any low-rent or veterans' housing project undertaken or constructed under a program of a State or any political subdivision thereof and with the express purpose indicated in the State legislation of converting the project to a project with Federal assistance (if and when such Federal assistance becomes available), shall be approved as a low-rent housing project under the terms of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, if (a) a contract for State financial assistance for such project was entered into prior to January 1, 1949, (b) the project is or can become eligible for assistance by the Public Housing Administration in the form of loans and annual contributions under the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended; and (c) the State or the public housing agency operating the project in the State makes application to the Public Housing Administration for Federal assistance for the project under the terms of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended: *Provided*, That loans made by the Public Housing Administration for the purpose of so converting the project with Federal assistance shall be deemed, for the purposes of the provisions of section 9 and other sections, of the United States Housing Act of 1937, to be loans to assist the development of the project."

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY,
Washington, D. C., April 20, 1948.

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: In response to the verbal request of Mr. Raimond Bowles, clerk of the Banking and Currency Committee, I have studied the amendment which Senator SALTONSTALL offered on April 15, 1948, to the committee amendments to S. 866. As you know, this proposed amendment follows very closely a suggested amendment recommended to you by the Governor of New Hampshire.

For the reasons stated in the memorandum which was furnished to you yesterday, I felt very strongly that the proposed amendment required modification. Our general counsel has today discussed the matter with Mr. Bigelow of the Massachusetts State Board of Housing and Mr. L'Heureux, chief counsel for the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, and I am informed that the following modification of the proposed amendment was mutually agreed to:

"SEC. 607. Any low-rent or veterans' housing project undertaken or constructed under a program of a State or any political subdivision thereof and with the express purpose indicated in the State legislation of converting the project to a project with Federal assistance (if and when such Federal assistance becomes available), shall be approved as a low-rent housing project under the terms of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, if (a) a contract for State financial assistance for such project was entered into prior to January 1, 1949; (b) the project is or can become eligible for assistance by the Public Housing Administration in the form of loans and annual contributions under the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended; and (c) the State or the public-housing agency operating the project in the State makes application to the Public Housing Administration for Federal assistance for the project under the terms of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended: *Provided*, That loans made by the Public Housing Administration for the purpose of so converting the project with Federal assistance shall be deemed, for the purposes of the provisions of section 9 and other sections, of the United States Housing Act of 1937, to be loans to assist the development of the project."

I am sending copies of this letter to Senator LODGE, Senator SALTONSTALL, Senator TAFT, and Senator FLANDERS. Within the time available, I have not had an opportunity to submit this report to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Sincerely yours,

RAYMOND M. FOLEY,
Administrator.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I rise to ask whether it would not be better for me to modify my amendment so as to conform to the desires of the Senator from New Hampshire. Otherwise his amendment would be in the third degree, and would not be in order from a parliamentary standpoint.

Mr. TOBEY. I will say to the Senator that counsel for the Committee on Banking and Currency informs me that he conferred with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, who suggested this procedure.

Mr. LODGE. No; that is not correct. I agree with what the Senator is trying to do. However, it is my understanding that under the Senate rules an amendment to an amendment to an amendment is not in order.

Mr. TOBEY. That is correct.

Mr. LODGE. Therefore I thought the expeditious procedure would be for me to modify my amendment in accordance with the desires of the Senator.

Mr. TOBEY. That is entirely satisfactory to me. That course has the added virtue that the amendment would have the name of LODGE on it.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to have the name TOBEY on it, because it would add a great deal of force and eloquence.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, would not the difficulty be resolved by the withdrawal of the original amendment and the offering of the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. LODGE. It can be done either way.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The parliamentary situation is as follows: The amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire is not in order because it is an amendment in the third degree. However, the Senator from Massachusetts can either alter or withdraw his amendment. In either event he can meet the situation.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I modify our amendment in order to make it conform with the language desired by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], for himself and the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], as modified by the language submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire.

MILITARY MANPOWER LEGISLATION—INTEGRATION OF THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I propose to take a few minutes to discuss what I consider to be a vital issue of the hour in this country, namely, the issue relating to military manpower legislation. I think it is a very interesting coincidence that the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] should have made comments just a few minutes ago about the need for greater integration in our military program. He inserted in the RECORD certain editorials from his State which make a plea for greater integration of our armed services and of the program of our armed services.

In my judgment the Senator from Florida and the editorials which he has introduced into the RECORD bespeak very accurately the wish of a great majority of the American people at this time. However, I will say to my good friend from Florida that in my opinion the objective of greater integration of the military program so devoutly to be wished, to which he has addressed himself, is not to be accomplished without some legislation. At this time I wish to address myself to the question of the need of legislation which will force a greater integration between and among our armed services.

Let me make it very clear at the beginning of my remarks that although I am a member of the Armed Services Committee, I speak on this occasion as I usually speak, only for myself. I do not know to what extent, if any, any other member of the Armed Services Committee shares the views which I am about to express. However, I do know that during the past weeks I have devoted myself as studiously and conscientiously as any member of that committee could possibly do to the very critical problem which confronts us. I have followed the record which has been made by spokesmen for the armed services in open hearings and in executive hearings of our committee; and I have no hesitancy in saying that in my opinion up to this time they have made a grand record of utter confusion as to what the program should be. In my judgment those services have miserably failed to give us an integrated program for the national defense.

I believe that the reason for that result has been that the unification bill which we passed last year is a flop. It

has not given us unification, except in name only; in fact, it has not given us an integrated armed services program in the interest of national security. Therefore I am today addressing myself to the details of an overhauling of the unification law which Congress enacted last year, to the end of ascertaining if we cannot by legislation produce an integrated armed services program which will avoid the unhappy spectacle which the country has witnessed in days just gone by, of the lack of integration and coordination between and among the armed services.

After many days of hearings, I do not believe a single member of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate could take an oath and accurately testify before the American people as to just how much the program of the three branches of the service will cost the taxpayers of the country if we grant the conflicting requests which have been made of us to date by representatives of those three services. If I am correct in that statement, I submit that there is something sorely wrong with the unification law which was enacted last year. After weeks of hearings, and after we have called for report after report—and it has been insisted by us several times that a final report be submitted—we are not at this hour able to say what the over-all cost will be. If that be true, then certainly there is not a proper integration of jurisdiction and authority under the act which Congress passed last year.

I submit that what we did last year was to pass a compromise which we thought might satisfy the jealous claims of the three branches of the armed services. I submit that what has transpired in recent days is rather an adequate proof that we did not provide the legislative solution for checking those jealousies.

I have studied the figures. They are very conflicting. It is very difficult to find a common denominator or a common base from which one can analyze the statistics of the armed services. I think I know a little about statistical analysis; in my days of research in the academic field I had to deal with statistical research. Mr. President, I say that I yet have to receive from the armed services any statistical analysis of the cost of the program which is predicated on a common statistical base. So special pleaders can find in the record of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, I submit, almost any statistical base they wish to find on which to build their case of special pleading. Nevertheless, we, the Senate, and the people of the United States are entitled to have presented to us a common base from which to analyze the statistics of the three branches of the Armed Services Establishment that have been testifying before our committee. We are entitled to receive—as I believe the Secretary of Defense has conscientiously been trying to obtain for us—a common understanding among the services as to what the total cost will be and how the expenditures and appropriations will be allocated.

There are some interesting undertones as well as overtones in this controversy, Mr. President. There are some very significant implications, so far as our future program is concerned, to be drawn from the conflicting representations which have been made to us by the authorities in our Armed Services Establishment. It is my opinion that if we should grant the requests which have been made of the committee to date the cost of operating the Military Establishment would be at least $19,000,000,000, and more probably $20,000,000,000; and in all likelihood, Mr. President, if we are to judge the future by the past, in connection with the always-mounting requests for additional appropriations—because of a failure at the time when the first estimate was made to include in the estimate all so-called unforeseen conditions—the amount will be more than $20,000,000,000.

Mr. President, we are at peace. I hope we can stay at peace, and I believe we can, provided we take the steps necessary to make clear to the world that we are determined to keep ourselves in a sufficiently strong position from the standpoint of national defense to enforce the peace.

I am aware that what I am saying at this moment can be, and will be, subject to misinterpretation unless I now make crystal clear the major proposition which motivates me as a member of the Armed Services Committee, namely, that I stand ready and willing to vote for whatever appropriation the facts presented to the committee show should be voted to keep my country secure. If it takes $20,000,000,000, if it takes $25,000,000,000, if it takes X billion dollars, I shall vote for such an appropriation, because no loyal, patriotic American citizen, in or out of the Congress, could do less than that. But, Mr. President, I think the American people should clearly understand that if we have reached the point in international relations where it may be necessary to appropriate $20,000,000,000, in round numbers, for national security, it will be very difficult—and, in my opinion, if such an expenditure will have to be paid out for very many years, almost impossible—to maintain a free economy, as we know it in this country today, with $20,000,000,000 allotted to national defense out of a total Federal budget, in round numbers, of $40,000,000,000. I say a total Federal budget of $40,000,000,000, Mr. President, because I assume that if we increase the appropriation for the Armed Services an attempt will be made to maintain our total budget to at least in the neighborhood of $40,000,000,000. If that is the program, then, of course, we will have to slash out of our appropriation money for many needed civilian services an amount equal to the increase in the armed services budget.

If, on the other hand, it develops that the proposal is adding several more billions to the Federal budget of $40,000,000,000, then I think the danger to our free economy will be even greater than if we attempted to hold our budget ceiling to a total Federal budget of $40,000,000,000. Certainly, if we add the increase in appropriation requested by the armed services to our present $40,000,000,000 budget we will be headed for new deficit spending and for drastic controls which it will be difficult to reconcile with a free economy.

Therefore, in this speech I shall continue to assume that an endeavor will be made through a budget slash of other departments to keep the total Federal budget at approximately $40,000,000,000. But if the plan is to add additional billions to the present $40,000,000,000 Federal budget estimate then everything I say about our free economy being threatened will be just that much more applicable to the budgetary situation which confronts us.

No one in the Armed Services Establishment can change the laws of addition and subtraction. No one in the armed services can change the laws of economics, as they function in a free economy. We cannot pay out half of our budget for national defense and still maintain a free economy with the other half. I have been saying this in public hearings of the committee; and, as my colleagues on the committee, some of whom are on the floor of the Senate at this time, will testify, I have consistently raised this point with witness after witness before the committee. I have tried to point out that if such a huge appropriation is to be the course of our national security expenditures, then—yes, Mr. President, even in a Presidential-election year—let us face the fact that we will have to inaugurate and put into effect some industrial controls, paradoxical as that may seem, in order to preserve a free economy under a plan which may require half of the budget to go for national security expenditures.

Are we ready to do that? Perhaps we shall be after next November, Mr. President; but I have not met very many persons who are ready to do it now. I think that is one of the realities in the situation. I am sorry to have to say it, because it saddens me; but I think the sad fact—and the true fact—is that there are some leaders in high positions in our Armed Services Establishment who recognize the political situation in which the Congress finds itself, and I think they are taking advantage of it. It appears to me that they are making requests for developments which they would not make if we were not almost on the morn of a day of election.

So I have said to some of them in executive sessions of the committee, and now I say it publicly, that I think what is needed is authority at the head of our armed services to give us an integrated and coordinated program which will protect the security of the Nation and at the same time will not saddle it with a Military Establishment which will endanger our free economy. We shall not gain much, Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I prefer not to yield until I finish my major remarks, and then I shall be glad as always to subject myself to cross-examination.

Mr. President, we shall not gain very much—in fact, we shall gain nothing—if we make a fight for democratic principles and a democratic way of life abroad, but at the same time lose it here at home by endangering our free economy. As I have said on the floor of the Senate heretofore, and I repeat it

now, we cannot have political democracy at home unless we have a capitalistic economy. We cannot preserve a capitalistic economy in this country with $20,000,000,000 of a budget of $40,000,000,000 going to the expenses of a military establishment.

It is no answer to my argument, Mr. President, I submit, to say to me as some have said, "But if we become involved in a war, $20,000,000,000 will be a small amount of expenditure in its prosecution." True that is; but, Mr. President, if the dark day of a third world war comes and we are confronted with the military cost of the war, then certainly for its duration, and I am afraid, for a considerable number of years thereafter, if there is a "thereafter" so far as freedom in the world is concerned, we shall have very little that resembles a free economy in the United States. When we take into account the methods which will be used in the prosecution of such a war, when we stop and ponder what we shall have to do on the home front from the standpoint of controlling and transferring industries from one place to another, both above and under ground, I believe no one in his right mind can even think for a moment we can prosecute a third world war and not have most drastic controls placed over the national economy. So, when I ask the question with reference to the $20,000,000,000 which is being recommended by these agencies, that are supposed to be coordinated, but have been, I submit, acting independently of each other in the days just gone by, "Can you explain how it would be possible to spend that amount of money and keep a free economy?", it is no answer to say we would have to spend a great deal more if we became involved in war. Granted. But we would not have a free economy then, either, and I think that needs to be pointed out.

Oh, I know I, too, should like to be able wishfully to think my way out of this great military decision the Congress will have to make in the weeks immediately ahead; I, too, should like to be able to sink my head in the sand and say, "Don't worry; the air boys will protect us." I should like to believe, too, Mr. President, that the American people have reached the point and that the science of war has developed to the point where we can turn the major job of national defense over to the Air Force.

I wish we could assume with national safety that, by unbalancing our Military Establishment and sinking many additional billion dollars into the Air Forces, national security is guaranteed. Oh, that would be a great political advantage, too, if one wanted to think in terms of politics, Mr. President; but I say that one cannot sit on the Armed Services Committee for the weeks I have spent there, or study the record which has been made by all the witnesses before that committee, and safely assume that the answer to the very difficult issue confronting us is to spend great sums of money on the Air Forces to the detriment and the sacrifice of other branches of the service.

I want a strong air force. I serve notice now, I shall vote for the strongest air force the facts show we need in order to protect the national security. But I shall not vote on the basis of a political program. I shall insist, before I vote for what amounts after all to a separate independent request for funds, that the clear evidence before the committee shall show that the request is bottomed on facts, and that the granting of it will actually give us the maximum of national security that we need.

In my opinion, a grand job has been done in affecting public opinion in regard to the Air Force. It is understandable, it is only human, that the mothers and the fathers of this country would like to avoid a drastic manpower legislative program if they can and at the same time remain secure as a Nation. But I am convinced, Mr. President—I said this in open hearing, and I repeat it now—that if the American people, the mothers and fathers of American boys and girls, are given the facts, whatever they may be, which support the need of a balanced manpower program, I have such confidence in their inherent patriotism that they will say to us in the Congress, "Vote for what the facts show to be necessary in order to protect our national security."

Mr. President, the American people need to be told that within this agitation for additional billions of dollars over and above the amounts recommended in the public hearings of the committee for aircraft development and air defense development, an air force is still the most immobile of all our armed services. The average citizen gets the idea, when he sees a squadron of bombers or fighters or jet planes skirt across the sky, that he is looking at a great mobile defense; but he is not, because those planes are no more mobile so far as the ultimate security of our Nation is concerned than the air bases below them, from which they go into the air, and to which, if they are lucky, they return. The security of those air bases and the defense of those air bases and of the lines of communication and supply between them and our country, determine the degree of mobility of our Air Force. Air Force cannot do the job, Mr. President, unless it is backed up on the ground by the Army and Navy. It cannot protect the security of the Nation unless its bases are secure; and it takes men to make them secure.

What are we confronted with? We are confronted in the testimony before the committee with a conflict between the Air Force and representatives of the Army and the Navy as to how many men it will take to keep an air base secure. Whose testimony are we to take, Mr. President? Is it any wonder that many of us find ourselves confused, trying to figure out the conflicts in the testimony before us?

There is another fact that the American people need to be told. We have heard a great deal said about a 70-group air force. How many planes would there be in a 70-group air force, Mr. President? You will never find out by reading the testimony before the Armed Services Committee. In one moment it is thought we have the figure, and in the next moment it has gone, because the qualifiers and indefinite conditions given by the witnesses when they are asked for a definition of a 70-group air force are remarkable. Mr. President, a Philadelphia lawyer holds no candle to the witnesses who have testified before us as to the meaning of a 70-group air force. I do not know how many planes comprise a 70-group air force, and I have not found any member of the armed services to date who has been able to tell me. They say, "It all depends on what you include in a group." Of course, the question is directed to what is in a group. They say, "Well, maybe in this group there will be X number of bombers, and maybe in this group there will be Y number of bombers; but maybe this X number of bombers will be changed, if certain circumstances develop, and Y number of bombers will be changed if another program seems desirable."

The impression left with me, Mr. President, is that they want the money for a 70-group air force, but they want to leave the definition so vague and ambiguous that, subsequently to the appropriation of the money, they can determine for themselves at will what would be in their program. But that will not be done with my vote. I want to know much more specifically than the Air Forces have told me in any testimony up to this time what the details of their program are. I want to know specifically what constitutes their 70-group program, because the American people are talking and hoping in terms of an air slogan, namely, a 70-group program. They are assuming that merely effectuating that slogan and granting to the Air Force the money with which to implement it as the Air Force may wish to implement it will give our people national security. I do not believe that to be so, Mr. President, and I do not believe on the record the Air Forces have made their case by way of indisputable evidence in support of that program.

There are many facets of this question which I shall not take the time to expound today. There is the question of how soon even the planes which they are proposing to build will become obsolete. There is the question as to what reliance we can place upon an air program based on foreign soil. There are many questions involving high policy which I think will bear very close examination and investigation along the line of the great work which the Presiding Officer of the Senate does on the Foreign Relations Committee. It is not a problem of the Armed Services Committee alone. It has many interrelations with the whole question of American foreign policy. Shall we maintain bases in the Middle East? Should we build up an air-force program now on the assumption of maintaining bases in the Middle East? Would a program based on that assumption promote or decrease the chances of peace? What about our relationship with England in regard to bases? Those are not alone Armed Services Committee questions; they are more basically questions which fall within the jurisdiction of the Foreign Relations Committee presided over by the distinguished President pro tempore of this body.

Speaking for myself, I have not been satisfied, as I have listened to the wit-

nesses, that the representatives of our armed services have fully comprehended the implications in respect to war and peace of their recommendations for a military establishment. That is why there is need for greater integration and coordination on the part of the armed services so far as their program is concerned. That is why, in my opinion, the time has come when someone must be entrusted with the authority and the jurisdiction to knock some heads together in the Pentagon Building and the Navy Building.

So, Mr. President, after a careful and thorough examination of all those facets, and many more to which I have alluded, my query is, Is this a program which will best defend our country and protect our national security? Is this a program which has taken into account the economic problems about which I have been speaking and which at least gives some reasonable assurance that we can spend these sums and still have a free economy in this country? We shall never have satisfactory answers to those questions, Mr. President, under the unification law as it is now on the books.

We may surmount this crisis. It may be decided by the armed services that it is the better part of wisdom, strategy, and expediency to come forward at long last with a compromise settlement among themselves. But that is not good enough, because we have had demonstrated to us, in my opinion, that a conviction on the part of the armed services that we should have an integrated program does not exist. I think we in the Halls of Congress, with the legislative responsibility entrusted to us, owe it to the American people to see to it that this lack of integration on the part of the armed services is brought speedily to an end. That is what I seek to do through the proposed legislation which I am offering today; but before I describe it, I want to cover one more point.

A great fallacy has prevailed among the armed services for months. It is a fallacy which I submit is based upon the selfish interest of the individual services. It is the fallacy that we cannot, right down to minute details, have a unified program in procurement for the armed services. Special interests, both in and out of the armed services, have been built up over the years on the fallacy of maintaining separate procurement services. I think the time has come for us to have a unified program in fact as well as in name in procurement, too.

I say it defies common sense to take the position that we cannot have, in fact, a single unified office for procurement for all the armed services. It is nonsensical, Mr. President, to argue that it cannot be done. I am convinced that many million dollars can be saved the taxpayers of the United States if we are willing to come to grips with the subject of unified procurement. We shall have to step on some economic toes in America. Certainly, we must be ready for terrific pressures which will be brought to bear by defense concerns in this country against such a reform, because it is to their economic advantage to keep alive the wasteful conflicts which exist between the armed services in their race for contracts for specific articles which they want to procure for a special branch of the service. I am convinced that if the American people know all the facts as to what a failure to have a unified procurement service has meant to them in tax dollars, they would be startled and shocked, and they ought to be.

We are now at peace. For how long, no one knows. But I think we should set our domestic house in order. I believe we should put our American Military Establishment in order. One of the best ways to put it in order is to scrutinize more carefully than we have to date the procedures of those establishments, including the procedure which relates to procurement.

I think we must recognize, also, Mr. President, that the science of war has changed. I am perfectly aware of the fact that there is much merit in the arguments and testimony presented to us by Air Force witnesses when they discussed with us the developments of science in the field of air defense and air attack. I am perfectly aware of the fact that we must keep ourselves abreast at all times of the newest scientific developments, but it is not necessary, it seems to me, to proceed now with the manufacture of planes which I think the best testimony indicates will be obsolete within 2 or 3 or 4 years. I recognize that we have an air-plant problem, but I think we will save the taxpayers more money and serve the national defense just as well if we enter into a governmental contractual relation with some of the aircraft companies which will make it possible for them, not to profiteer, but will make it profitable for them to proceed on pilot-plant operations. For example, to build test planes, keeping their plants up to date, maintaining the factories at such a point of production that if a sudden catastrophe should strike us in the form of a war, they could rapidly go into full production. I think that is better than for us now to proceed to manufacture planes which will be worthless, in the prosecution of a modern war, by 1950 or 1951. We cannot ignore the economic problem which the requests of these establishments have placed before us.

So, Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill providing a rather thorough revision of the National Security Act of 1947, and I want briefly to outline it.

Section 201 of my proposed act sets up the establishment of a Department of Defense.

Section 202 provides for a Secretary of Defense.

Section 203 provides for an Under Secretary of Defense. We do not have an Under Secretary of Defense now. We have a Secretary of Defense, then we have Secretaries of the Army, of the Navy, and of the Air Force. I want Senators to note that I propose a Secretary of Defense, and in another section an Under Secretary of Defense. In other words, I am seeking to vest authority and jurisdiction in an Office of National Defense to give us a coordinated and integrated military program.

In section 204 I abolish the present offices of Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, and Secretary of the Air Force, and set up in lieu thereof Assistant Secretaries of Defense for the Army, for the Navy, and for the Air Force.

In section 205 I propose civilian and military assistants to the Secretary of Defense, because I think he must be given authority to call in those civilians in the field of science or any other field of service whom he needs in order to assure an integrated and coordinated Military Establishment on a civilian basis, and to assist him in the very critical and important work which his office calls upon him to perform.

Then my bill provides the necessary power on the part of the Secretary of Defense and his Office to present to the Congress an integrated program which will avoid the type of conflict to which we have been treated in the days just gone by. That does not deny to the Congress of the United States the power and the right to call before any of its committees anyone in the Military Establishment and ask him whatever questions the committees desire to ask. But it seems to me we cannot conduct an efficient and effective integrated and coordinated Military Establishment unless, so far as that establishment is concerned, the responsibility for the final program is vested in a central office of a Secretary of National Defense.

Mr. President, I have this section in my proposed bill:

(b) Section 158 of the Revised Statutes is amended to include the Department of Defense, and the provisions of so much of title IV of the Revised Statutes, as now or hereafter amended, as is not inconsistent with this act, shall be applicable to the Department.

(c) All military and civilian personnel and all property, both real and personal (including all records), of the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force are hereby transferred to the Department of Defense.

I can hear all the objections to that. I can see all the scarecrows which will be erected, including the charge of the setting up of a military dictatorship in this country. Charges probably will be that extreme. The fact remains that there is no merit in that type of a fear argument. If we are to have an integrated and coordinated Military Establishment, then the properties and the records of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force should be subject to the jurisdiction and authority of the Office of National Defense.

Then I provide this language:

The offices of Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of the Air Force, Under Secretary of the Army, Under Secretary of the Navy, Under Secretary of the Air Force, Assistant Secretaries of the Army, Assistant Secretaries of the Navy, and Assistant Secretaries of the Air Force are hereby abolished, and the functions, powers, and duties vested in and imposed upon such officers shall hereafter be vested in and imposed upon the Secretary of Defense, who may delegate the same to the Under Secretary of Defense, or to such of the Assistant Secretaries of Defense as he may designate.

Then I set forth in the bill the terms and conditions and qualifications which shall surround the appointment of the Secretary of Defense, the Under Secretary of Defense, and the Assistant Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

I provide in section 205 the following:

(a) The Secretary of Defense is authorized to appoint from civilian life not to exceed three special assistants to advise and assist him in the performance of his duties. * * *

(b) The Secretary of Defense is authorized, subject to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such civilian personnel as may be necessary for the performance of the functions of the Department of Defense.

Without talking to the Senate longer, I close by making a brief comment on section 211, which I think is the second most vital provision of my bill. The first is the provision to vest the power in the Secretary of Defense which he should have if we are to have an integrated program. The other is to set up a single Chief of Staff.

I, too, have talked to a great many military men. I, too, have tried to familiarize myself with some of the experiences of our military leaders in determining joint policy during the last war. At this time I wish only to say that I am satisfied that the creation of the office of a single Chief of Staff will result in a much more efficient Military Establishment, will promote to a greater degree national security, and will bring about a tremendous economic saving to the American people.

Is there any one here who is not aware of the fact that war not only is costly from the standpoint of its unavoidable cost, but that it is costly also because of what have always been avoidable costs of war, in the form of waste because of a lack of coordination in our Military Establishment? I should not like even to make a guess of how many millions of dollars were wasted in the last war because the type of coordinated authority for which I am pleading here today did not exist. I am satisfied that a single Chief of Staff working in close cooperation with a single Secretary of Defense in case we should become embroiled in a third world war would save us some of the unjustifiable wastes which characterized so much of the prosecution of the last war both here and abroad.

I do not want to be misunderstood on this point, Mr. President. I know we cannot eliminate all waste. I know that when we are dealing with precious human lives waste is of insignificant importance. When it comes to rendering a decision as to whether or not a certain expenditure should be made or should not be made, knowing that making it might result in a waste but might also prevent the loss of a single member of the armed services, I am perfectly willing at any time to say "Spend the money." But that is not always the case, Mr. President. That justification cannot be advanced in support of any rationalization of a great deal of the waste of the last war. That waste, in my opinion, resulted because we did not have the coordination that is provided for under my bill.

Hence, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce the bill out of order, with the understanding that it will be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks. In conclusion, I want to assure the Senate as I have in in the meetings of the Armed Services Committee assured the members of the armed forces that they can count on me to vote for whatever program is needed to provide to the maximum possible extent the security of our country. But I also want to make clear to the armed services as I hope I have today, that they, too have a fundamental responsibility to protect the economy of the Nation. They, too, are servants of the American people, and they, too, have the obligation of seeing to it at all times that the military recommendations they make will protect our military security without involving unnecessary expenditures of the taxpayers' money.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received, appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2523) to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to provide for a single executive department for the operation and administration of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force; and to give the Secretary of Defense adequate power to enable him to formulate and place in operation integrated programs for the national security, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the National Security Act of 1947 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SHORT TITLE

"That this act may be cited as the 'National Security Act of 1947.'

"Table of Contents

"Sec. 2. Declaration of policy.
"Title I—Coordination for National Security
"Sec. 101. National Security Council.
"Sec. 102. Central Intelligence Agency.
"Sec. 103. National Security Resources Board.
"Title II—The Department of Defense
"Sec. 201. Establishment of the Department of Defense.
"Sec. 202. Secretary of Defense.
"Sec. 203. Under Secretary of Defense.
"Sec. 204. Assistant Secretaries of Defense for the Army, Navy, and Air Force.
"Sec. 205. Civilian and Military Assistance to the Secretary of Defense.
"Sec. 206. United States Army.
"Sec. 207. United States Navy.
"Sec. 208. United States Air Force.
"Sec. 209. Effective date of transfers.
"Sec. 210. War Council.
"Sec. 211. Chief of Staff of the Armed Services.
"Sec. 212. Joint Chiefs of Staff.
"Sec. 213. Joint staff.
"Sec. 214. Munitions Board.
"Sec. 215. Research and Development Board.
"Title III—Miscellaneous
"Sec. 301. Compensation of Secretary of Defense.
"Sec. 302. Advisory committees and personnel.
"Sec. 303. Status of transferred civilian personnel.
"Sec. 304. Saving provisions.
"Sec. 305. Transfer of funds.
"Sec. 306. Authorization for appropriations.
"Sec. 307. Definitions.
"Sec. 308. Separability.
"Sec. 309. Effective date.
"Sec. 310. Succession to the Presidency.

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 2. In enacting this legislation, it is the intent of Congress to provide a comprehensive program for the future security of the United States; to provide for the establishment of integrated policies and procedures for the departments, agencies, and functions of the Government relating to the national security; to provide a single military department for the operation and administration of the Army, the Navy (including naval aviation and the United States Marine Corps), and the Air Force, with their assigned combat and service components; to provide for authoritative coordination and unified direction of the armed forces under civilian control; to provide for the effective strategic direction of the armed forces and for their integration into an efficient team of land, naval, and air forces.

"TITLE I—COORDINATION FOR NATIONAL SECURITY

"NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

"SEC. 101. (a) There is hereby established a council to be known as the National Security Council (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Council").

"The President of the United States shall preside over meetings of the Council: *Provided,* That in his absence he may designate a member of the Council to preside in his place.

"The function of the Council shall be to advise the President with respect to the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policies relating to the national security so as to enable the military services and the other departments and agencies of the Government to cooperate more effectively in matters involving the national security.

"The Council shall be composed of the President; the Secretary of State; the Secretary of Defense, appointed under section 202; the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, appointed under section 103; and such of the following-named officers as the President may designate from time to time: The Secretaries of the executive departments, the Chairman of the Munitions Board, appointed under section 213, and the Chairman of the Research and Development Board, appointed under section 214; but no such additional member shall be designated until the advice and consent of the Senate has been given to his appointment to the office, the holding of which authorizes his designation as a member of the Council.

"(b) In addition to performing such other functions as the President may direct, for the purpose of more effectively coordinating the policies and functions of the departments and agencies of the Government relating to the national security, it shall, subject to the direction of the President, be the duty of the Council—

"(1) to assess and appraise the objectives, commitments, and risks of the United States in relation to our actual and potential military power, in the interest of national security, for the purpose of making recommendations to the President in connection therewith; and

"(2) to consider policies on matters of common interest to the departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security, and to make recommendations to the President in connection therewith.

"(c) The Council shall have a staff to be headed by a civilian executive secretary who shall be appointed by the President, and who shall receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 a year. The executive secretary, subject to the direction of the Council, is hereby authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to perform such duties as may be prescribed by the Council in connection with the performance of its functions.

"(d) The Council shall, from time to time, make such recommendations, and such other reports to the President as it deems appropriate or as the President may require.

"CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

"SEC. 102. (a) There is hereby established under the National Security Council a Central Intelligence Agency with a Director of Central Intelligence, who shall be the head thereof. The Director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among the commissioned officers of the armed services or from among individuals in civilian life. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $14,000 a year.

"(b) (1) If a commissioned officer of the armed services is appointed as Director then—

"(A) in the performance of his duties as Director, he shall be subject to no supervision, control, restriction, or prohibition (military or otherwise) other than would be operative with respect to him if he were a civilian in no way connected with the Department of Defense, or the armed services or any component thereof; and

"(B) he shall not possess or exercise any supervision, control, powers, or functions (other than such as he possesses, or is authorized or directed to exercise, as Director) with respect to the armed services or any component thereof, the Department of Defense, or any branch, bureau, unit, or division thereof, or with respect to any of the personnel (military or civilian) of any of the foregoing.

"(2) Except as provided in paragraph (1), the appointment to the office of Director of a commissioned officer of the armed services, and his acceptance of and service in such office, shall in no way affect any status, office, rank, or grade he may occupy or hold in the armed services, or any emolument, perquisite, right, privilege, or benefit incident to or arising out of any such status, office, rank, or grade. Any such commissioned officer shall, while serving in the office of Director, receive the military pay and allowances (active or retired, as the case may be) payable to a commissioned officer of his grade and length of service and shall be paid, from any funds available to defray the expenses of the Agency, annual compensation at a rate equal to the amount by which $14,000 exceeds the amount of his annual military pay and allowances.

"(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Director of Central Intelligence may, in his discretion, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Agency whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States, but such termination shall not affect the right of such officer or employee to seek or accept employment in any other department or agency of the Government if declared eligible for such employment by the United States Civil Service Commission.

"(d) For the purpose of coordinating the intelligence activities of the several Government departments and agencies in the interest of national security, it shall be the duty of the Agency, under the direction of the National Security Council—

"(1) to advise the National Security Council in matters concerning such intelligence activities of the Government departments and agencies as relate to national security;

"(2) to make recommendations to the National Security Council for the coordination of such intelligence activities of the departments and agencies of the Government as relate to the national security;

"(3) to correlate and evaluate intelligence relating to the national security, and provide for the appropriate dissemination of such intelligence within the Government using where appropriate existing agencies and facilities: *Provided*, That the Agency shall have no police, subpena, law-enforcement powers, or internal-security functions: *Provided further*, That the departments and other agencies of the Government shall continue to collect, evaluate, correlate, and disseminate departmental intelligence: *And provided further*, That the Director of Central Intelligence shall be responsible for protecting intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure;

"(4) to perform, for the benefit of the existing intelligence agencies, such additional services of common concern as the National Security Council determines can be more efficiently accomplished centrally;

"(5) to perform such other functions and duties related to intelligence affecting the national security as the National Security Council may from time to time direct.

"(e) To the extent recommended by the National Security Council and approved by the President, such intelligence of the departments and agencies of the Government, except as hereinafter provided, relating to the national security shall be open to the inspection of the Director of Central Intelligence, and such intelligence as relates to the national security and is possessed by such departments and other agencies of the Government, except as hereinafter provided, shall be made available to the Director of Central Intelligence for correlation, evaluation, and dissemination: *Provided, however*, That upon the written request of the Director of Central Intelligence, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall make available to the Director of Central Intelligence such information for correlation, evaluation, and dissemination as may be essential to the national security.

"(f) Effective when the Director first appointed under subsection (a) has taken office—

"(1) the National Intelligence Authority (11 Fed. Reg. 1337, 1339, Feb. 5, 1946) shall cease to exist; and

"(2) the personnel, property, and records of the Central Intelligence Group are transferred to the Central Intelligence Agency, and such Group shall cease to exist. Any unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds available or authorized to be made available for such Group shall be available and shall be authorized to be made available in like manner for expenditure by the Agency.

"NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD

"SEC. 103. (a) There is hereby established a National Security Resources Board (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Board'), to be composed of the Chairman of the Board and such heads or representatives of the various executive departments and independent agencies as may from time to time be designated by the President to be members of the Board. The Chairman of the Board shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $14,000 a year.

"(b) The Chairman of the Board, subject to the direction of the President, is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to assist the Board in carrying out its functions.

"(c) It shall be the function of the Board to advise the President concerning the coordination of military, industrial, and civilian mobilization, including—

"(1) policies concerning industrial and civilian mobilization in order to assure the most effective mobilization and maximum utilization of the Nation's manpower in the event of war;

"(2) programs for the effective use in time of war of the Nation's natural and industrial resources for military and civilian needs, for the maintenance and stabilization of the civilian economy in time of war, and for the adjustment of such economy to war needs and conditions;

"(3) policies for unifying, in time of war, the activities of Federal agencies and departments engaged in or concerned with production, procurement, distribution, or transportation of military or civilian supplies, materials, and products;

"(4) the relationship between potential supplies of, and potential requirements for, manpower, resources, and productive facilities in time of war;

"(5) policies for establishing adequate reserves of strategic and critical material, and for the conservation of these reserves;

"(6) the strategic relocation of industries, services, government, and economic activities, the continuous operation of which is essential to the Nation's security.

"(d) In performing its functions, the Board shall utilize to the maximum extent the facilities and resources of the departments and agencies of the Government.

"TITLE II—THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

"ESTABLISHMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

"SEC. 201. (a) There is hereby established the Department of Defense, and the Secretary of Defense shall be the head thereof.

"(b) Section 158 of the Revised Statutes is amended to include the Department of Defense, and the provisions of so much of title IV of the Revised Statutes, as now or hereafter amended, as is not inconsistent with this act, shall be applicable to the Department.

"(c) All military and civilian personnel and all property, both real and personal (including all records), of the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force are hereby transferred to the Department of Defense; and the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force shall cease to exist as executive departments of the Government. The Department of Defense shall consist of (1) all personnel and property transferred to it under the foregoing provisions of this act, and (2) the agencies created under title II of this act.

"(d) The offices of Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of the Air Force, Under Secretary of the Army, Under Secretary of the Navy, Under Secretary of the Air Force, Assistant Secretaries of the Army, Assistant Secretaries of the Navy, and Assistant Secretaries of the Air Force, are hereby abolished, and the functions, powers, and duties vested in and imposed upon such officers shall hereafter be vested in and imposed upon the Secretary of Defense, who may delegate the same to the Under Secretary of Defense or to such of the Assistant Secretaries of Defense as he may designate.

"SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

"SEC. 202. (a) There shall be a Secretary of Defense, who shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That a person who has within 10 years been on active duty as a commissioned officer in a Regular component of the armed services shall not be eligible for appointment as Secretary of Defense. The Secretary of Defense shall be the principal assistant to the President in all matters relating to the national security. Under the direction of the President and subject to the provisions of this act, he shall (1) exercise direction, authority, and control over the Department of Defense, and (2) prepare and submit to the President and to the Congress, from time to time, such integrated programs to provide for the common defense of the United States as he may deem appropriate.

"(b) The Secretary of Defense shall submit annual written reports to the President and the Congress covering expenditures, work, and accomplishments of the Department of Defense, together with such recommendations as he shall deem appropriate.

"(c) The Secretary of Defense shall cause a seal of office to be made for the Department of Defense of such design as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

"UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

"SEC. 203. There shall be in the Department of Defense an Under Secretary of Defense, who shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 a year. The Under Secretary shall perform such duties as may be required by law or prescribed by the Secretary of Defense. The Under Secretary shall, (1) in case of death, resignation, or removal from Office of the Secretary, perform the duties of the Secretary until a successor is appointed; and (2) in case of the absence of the Secretary, perform the duties of the Secretary until such absence shall terminate.

"ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF DEFENSE FOR THE ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

"SEC. 204. There shall be in the Department of Defense an Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Army, an Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Navy, and an Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Air Force, who shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 a year. The said Assistant Secretaries, under the direction and control of the Secretary of Defense, shall administer the United States Army, the United States Navy, and the United States Air Force, respectively, and shall perform such other duties as may be required by law or prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

"CIVILIAN AND MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

"SEC. 205. (a) The Secretary of Defense is authorized to appoint from civilian life not to exceed three special assistants to advise and assist him in the performance of his duties. Each such special assistant shall receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 a year.

"(b) The Secretary of Defense is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such civilian personnel as may be necessary for the performance of the functions of the Department of Defense.

"(c) The Secretary of Defense is authorized to establish a military staff to advise him with respect to the performance of his duties and to detail to such staff any members of the armed services whom he may designate.

"UNITED STATES ARMY

"SEC. 206. In general the United States Army, within the Department of Defense, shall include land combat and service forces and such aviation and water transport as may be organic therein. It shall be organized, trained, and equipped primarily for prompt and sustained combat incident to operations on land. It shall be responsible for the preparation of land forces necessary for the effective prosecution of war except as otherwise assigned and, in accordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of peacetime components of the Army to meet the needs of war.

"UNITED STATES NAVY

"SEC. 207. (a) In general the United States Navy, within the Department of Defense, shall include naval combat and service forces and such aviation as may be organic therein. It shall be organized, trained, and equipped primarily for prompt and sustained combat incident to operations at sea. It shall be responsible for the preparation of naval forces necessary for the effective prosecution of war except as otherwise assigned, and, in accordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of the peacetime components of the Navy to meet the needs of war.

"All naval aviation shall be integrated with the naval service as part thereof. Naval aviation shall consist of combat and service and training forces, and shall include land-based naval aviation, air transport essential for naval operations, all air weapons and air techniques involved in the operations and activities of the United States Navy, and the entire remainder of the aeronautical organization of the United States Navy, together with the personnel necessary therefor.

"The Navy shall be generally responsible for naval reconnaissance, antisubmarine warfare, and protection of shipping.

"The Navy shall develop aircraft, weapons, tactics, technique, organization, and equipment of naval combat and service elements; matters of joint concern as to these functions shall be coordinated by the Secretary of Defense and the Chief of Staff of the armed services among the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy.

"(b) The United States Marine Corps, within the Department of Defense, shall include land combat and service forces and such aviation as may be organic therein. The Marine Corps shall be organized, trained, and equipped to provide fleet marine forces of combined arms, together with supporting air components, for service with the fleet in the seizure or defense of advanced naval bases and for the conduct of such land operations as may be essential to the prosecution of a naval campaign. It shall be the duty of the Marine Corps to develop, in coordination with the Army and the Air Force, and under the supervision of the Chief of Staff of the armed services those phases of amphibious operations which pertain to the tactics, technique, and equipment employed by landing forces. In addition, the Marine Corps shall provide detachments and organizations for service on armed vessels of the Navy, shall provide security detachments for the protection of naval property at naval stations and bases, and shall perform such other duties as the President may direct: *Provided*, That such additional duties shall not detract from or interfere with the operations for which the Marine Corps is primarily organized. The Marine Corps shall be responsible, in accordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of peacetime component of the Marine Corps to meet the needs of war.

"UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

"SEC. 208. (a) The United States Air Force is hereby established under the Department of Defense. The Army Air Forces, the Air Corps, United States Army, and the General Headquarters Air Force (Air Force Combat Command), shall be transferred to the United States Air Force.

"(b) There shall be a Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of 4 years from among the officers of general rank who are assigned to or commissioned in the United States Air Force. Under the direction of the Secretary of Defense and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Air Force, the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, shall exercise command over the United States Air Force and shall be charged with the duty of carrying into execution all lawful orders and directions which may be transmitted to him. The functions of the Commanding General, General Headquarters Air Force (Air Force Combat Command), and of the Chief of the Air Corps and of the Commanding General, Army Air Forces, shall be transferred to the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force. When such transfer becomes effective, the offices of the Chief of the Air Corps, United States Army, and Assistants to the Chief of the Air Corps, United States Army, provided for by the act of June 4, 1920, as amended (41 Stat. 768), and Commanding General, General Headquarters Air Force, provided for by section 5 of the act of June 16, 1936 (49 Stat. 1525), shall cease to exist. While holding office as Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, the incumbent shall hold a grade and receive allowances equivalent to those prescribed by law for the Chief of Staff, United States Army. The Chief of Staff, United States Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, shall take rank among themselves according to their relative dates of appointment as such: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall have the effect of changing the relative rank of the present Chief of Staff, United States Army, and the present Chief of Naval Operations.

"(c) All commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men, commissioned, holding warrants, or enlisted, in the Air Corps, United States Army, or the Army Air Forces, shall be transferred in branch to the United States Air Force. All other commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men, who are commissioned, hold warrants, or are enlisted, in any component of the Army of the United States and who are under the authority or command of the Commanding General, Army Air Forces, shall be continued under the authority or command of the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force. Personnel whose status is affected by this subsection shall retain their existing commissions, warrants, or enlisted status in existing components of the armed forces unless otherwise altered or terminated in accordance with existing law; and they shall not be deemed to have been appointed to a new or different office or grade, or to have vacated their permanent or temporary appointments in an existing component of the armed forces, solely by virtue of any change in status under this subsection. No such change in status shall alter or prejudice the status of any individual so assigned, so as to deprive him of any right, benefit, or privilege to which he may be entitled under existing law.

"(d) Except as otherwise directed by the Secretary of Defense, all property, records, installations, agencies, activities, projects, and civilian personnel under the jurisdiction, control, authority, or command of the Commanding General, Army Air Forces, shall be continued to the same extent under the jurisdiction, control, authority, or command, respectively, of the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force.

"(e) For a period of 2 years from the date of enactment of this act, military personnel, property, records, installations, agencies, activities, and projects may be transferred between the Army and the Air Force by direction of the Secretary of Defense.

"(f) In general the United States Air Force shall include aviation forces, both combat and service, not otherwise assigned. It shall be organized, trained, and equipped primarily for prompt and sustained offensive and defensive air operations. The Air Force shall be responsible for the preparation of the Air Forces necessary for the effective prosecution of war except as otherwise assigned and, in accordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of the peacetime components of the Air Force to meet the needs of war.

"EFFECTIVE DATE OF TRANSFERS

"SEC. 209. Each transfer, assignment, or change in status under section 207 or section 208 shall take effect upon such date or dates as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

"WAR COUNCIL

"SEC. 210. There shall be within the Department of Defense a War Council composed of the Secretary of Defense, as Chairman, who shall have power of decision; the Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Army; the Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Navy;

the Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Air Force; the Chief of Staff of the Armed Services; the Chief of Staff, United States Army; the Chief of Naval Operations; and the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force. The War Council shall advise the Secretary of Defense on matters of broad policy relating to the armed forces, and shall consider and report on such other matters as the Secretary of Defense may direct.

"CHIEF OF STAFF OF THE ARMED SERVICES

"SEC. 211. (a) There shall be in the Department of Defense an officer to be known as the Chief of Staff of the Armed Services, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of 3 years. Said Chief of Staff shall be selected from among the commissioned officers of the armed services of general or flag rank and shall rank above all other officers of the armed services on active duty. The Chief of Staff of the Armed Services shall be the military adviser of the President and the Secretary of Defense, shall supervise the execution by the armed services of the orders of the President and the Secretary of Defense, and shall perform such other military duties as may be assigned him by the President or Secretary of Defense.

"(b) In the appointment of the Chief of Staff of the Armed Services, the President shall, if he deems it proper and desirable, alternate his choice of said Chief of Staff from commissioned officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force in order that the experience of all the services may be utilized in the integration of our defense establishment.

"(c) The Chief of Staff of the Armed Services, while holding office as such, shall have the rank and title of—

"(1) General of the Army, if he is an officer of the United States Army;

"(2) Fleet admiral, if he is an officer of the United States Navy;

"(3) General of the Air Force, or such other comparable rank as may be established for the United States Air Force, if he is an officer of the United States Air Force.

The Chief of Staff of the Armed Services, while holding office as such, shall be entitled to the pay and allowances of a rear admiral (upper half) and to a personal money allowance of $5,000 a year.

"JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

"SEC. 212. (a) There is hereby established within the National Military Establishment the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which shall consist of the Chief of Staff of the Armed Services, who shall have power of decision; the Chief of Staff, United States Army; the Chief of Naval Operations; the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force; and the Chief of Staff to the Commander in Chief, if there be one.

"(b) Subject to the authority and direction of the President and the Secretary of Defense, it shall be the duty of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—

"(1) to prepare strategic plans and to provide for the strategic direction of the military forces;

"(2) to prepare joint logistic plans and to assign to the military services logistic responsibilities in accordance with such plans;

"(3) to establish unified commands in strategic areas when such unified commands are in the interest of national security;

"(4) to formulate policies for joint training of the military forces;

"(5) to formulate policies for coordinating the education of members of the military forces;

"(6) to review major material and personnel requirements of the military forces, in accordance with strategic and logistic plans; and

"(7) to provide United States representation on the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

"(c) The Joint Chiefs of Staff shall act as the principal military advisers to the President and the Secretary of Defense and shall perform such other duties as the President and the Secretary of Defense may direct or as may be prescribed by law.

"JOINT STAFF

"SEC. 213. There shall be, under the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a Joint Staff to consist of not to exceed five hundred officers and to be composed of approximately equal numbers of officers from each of the three armed services. The Joint Staff, operating under a Director thereof appointed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, shall perform such duties as may be directed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The director shall be an officer junior in grade to all members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

"MUNITIONS BOARD

"SEC. 214. (a) There is hereby established in the National Military Establishment a Munitions Board (hereinafter in this section referred to as the Board).

"(b) The Board shall be composed of a Chairman, who shall be the head thereof, and of three civilian officers of the Department of Defense to be designated by the Secretary of Defense. The Chairman shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $14,000 a year.

"(c) It shall be the duty of the Board under the direction of the Secretary of Defense and in support of strategic and logistic plans prepared by the Joint Chiefs of Staff—

"(1) to coordinate the appropriate activities within the Department of Defense with regard to industrial matters, including the procurement, production, and distribution plans of the Department;

"(2) to plan for the military aspects of industrial mobilization;

"(3) to recommend assignment of procurement responsibilities within the Department of Defense and to plan for standardization of specifications and for the greatest practicable allocation of purchase authority of technical equipment and common use items on the basis of single procurement;

"(4) to prepare estimates of potential production, procurement, and personnel for use in evaluation of the logistic feasibility of strategic operations;

"(5) to determine relative priorities of the various segments of the military procurement programs;

"(6) to supervise such subordinate agencies as are or may be created to consider the subjects falling within the scope of the Board's responsibilities;

"(7) to make recommendations to regroup, combine, or dissolve existing interservice agencies operating in the fields of procurement, production, and distribution in such manner as to promote efficiency and economy;

"(8) to maintain liaison with other departments and agencies for the proper correlation of military requirements with the civilian economy, particularly in regard to the procurement or disposition of strategic and critical material and the maintenance of adequate reserves of such material, and to make recommendations as to policies in connection therewith;

"(9) to assemble and review material and personnel requirements presented by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and those presented by the production, procurement, and distribution agencies assigned to meet military needs, and to make recommendations thereon to the Secretary of Defense; and

"(10) to perform such other duties as the Secretary of Defense may direct.

"(d) When the Chairman of the Board first appointed has taken office, the Joint Army and Navy Munitions Board shall cease to exist and all its records and personnel shall be transferred to the Munitions Board.

"(e) The Secretary of Defense shall provide the Board with such personnel and facilities as the Secretary may determine to be required by the Board for the performance of its functions.

"RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD

"SEC. 215. (a) There is hereby established in the Department of Defense a Research and Development Board (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Board"). The Board shall be composed of a Chairman, who shall be the head thereof, and six civilian or military officers of the Department of Defense to be designated by the Secretary of Defense. The Chairman shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $14,000 a year. The purpose of the Board shall be to advise the Secretary of Defense as to the status of scientific research relative to the national security, and to assist him in assuring adequate provision for research and development on scientific problems relating to the national security.

"(b) It shall be the duty of the Board, under the direction of the Secretary of Defense—

"(1) to prepare a complete and integrated program of research and development for military purposes;

"(2) to advise with regard to trends in scientific research relating to national security and the measures necessary to assure continued and increasing progress;

"(3) to recommend measures of coordination of research and development within the Department of Defense, and allocation of responsibilities for specific programs of joint interest to the Army, Navy, and Air Forces;

"(4) to formulate policy for the Department of Defense in connection with research and development matters involving agencies outside the Department;

"(5) to consider the interaction of research and development and strategy, and to advise the Joint Chiefs of Staff in connection therewith; and

"(6) to perform such other duties as the Secretary of Defense may direct.

"(c) When the Chairman of the Board first appointed has taken office, the Joint Research and Development Board shall cease to exist and all its records and personnel shall be transferred to the Research and Development Board.

"(d) The Secretary of Defense shall provide the Board with such personnel and facilities as the Secretary may determine to be required by the Board for the performance of its functions.

"TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

"COMPENSATION OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

"SEC. 301. The Secretary of Defense shall receive the compensation prescribed by law for heads of executive departments.

"ADVISORY COMMITTEES AND PERSONNEL

"SEC. 302. (a) The Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, and the Director of Central Intelligence are authorized to appoint such advisory committees and to employ, consistent with other provisions of this act, such part-time advisory personnel as they may deem necessary in carrying out their respective functions and the functions of agencies under their control. Persons holding other offices or positions under the United States for which they receive compensation while serving as members of such committees shall receive no additional compensation for such service. Other members of such committees and other part-time advisory personnel so employed may serve without compensation or may receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $35 for each day of service, as determined by the appointing authority.

"(b) Service of an individual as a member of any such advisory committee, or in any other part-time capacity for a department or agency hereunder, shall not be considered

as service bringing such individual within the provisions of section 109 or 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 18, secs. 198 and 203), or section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, unless the act of such individual, which by such section is made unlawful when performed by an individual referred to in such section, is with respect to any particular matter which directly involves a department or agency which such person is advising or in which such department or agency is directly interested.

"STATUS OF TRANSFERRED CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

"SEC. 303. All transfers of civilian personnel under this act shall be without change in classification or compensation, but the head of any department or agency to which such a transfer is made is authorized to make such changes in the titles and designations and prescribe such changes in the duties of such personnel commensurate with their classification as he may deem necessary and appropriate.

"SAVING PROVISIONS

"SEC. 304. (a) All laws, orders, regulations, and other actions applicable with respect to any function, activity, personnel, property, records, or other thing transferred under this act, or with respect to any officer, department, or agency, from which such transfer is made, shall, except to the extent rescinded, modified, superseded, terminated, or made inapplicable by or under authority of law, have the same effect as if such transfer had not been made; but, after any such transfer, any such law, order, regulation, or other action which vested functions in or otherwise related to any officer, department, or agency from which such transfer was made shall, insofar as applicable with respect to the function, activity, personnel, property, records or other thing transferred and to the extent not inconsistent with other provisions of this act, be deemed to have vested such function in or relate to the officer, department, or agency to which the transfer was made.

"(b) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the head of any department or agency or other officer of the United States, in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties, shall abate by reason of the taking effect of any transfer or change in title under the provisions of this act; and, in the case of any such transfer, such suit, action, or other proceeding may be maintained by or against the successor of such head or other officer under the transfer, but only if the court shall allow the same to be maintained on motion or supplemental petition filed within 12 months after such transfer takes effect, showing a necessity for the survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain settlement of the questions involved.

"TRANSFER OF FUNDS

"SEC. 305. All unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, nonappropriated funds, or other funds available or hereafter made available for use by or on behalf of the Department of War, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, the United States Army, the United States Navy, or the United States Air Force shall be transferred to the Department of Defense for use in connection with the exercise of its functions. Unexpended balances transferred under this section may be used, under the direction of the Secretary of Defense, for the purposes for which the appropriation, allocation, or other funds were originally made available, or for new expenditures occasioned by the enactment of this act. The transfers herein authorized may be made with or without warrant action as may be appropriate from time to time from any appropriation covered by this section to any other such appropriation or to such new accounts established on the books of the Treasury as may be determined to be necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this act.

"AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 306. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions and purposes of this act.

"DEFINITION

"SEC. 307. As used in this act, the term function includes functions, powers, and duties.

"SEPARABILITY

"SEC. 308. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"EFFECTIVE DATE

"SEC. 309. (a) The first sentence of section 202 (a) and sections 1, 2, 306, 307, 308, and 309 shall take effect immediately upon the enactment of this act.

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (a), the provisions of this act shall take effect on whichever of the following days is the earlier: The day after the day upon which the Secretary of Defense first appointed takes office, or the sixtieth day after the date of the enactment of this act.

"SUCCESSION TO THE PRESIDENCY

"SEC. 310. Paragraph (1) of subsection (d) of section 1 of the act entitled 'An act to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President in case of the removal, resignation, death, or inability both of the President and Vice President,' approved July 18, 1947, is amended by striking out 'Secretary of War' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Secretary of Defense', and by striking out 'Secretary of the Navy.'"

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, we have listened to an address by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], a member of the Armed Services Committee, telling us about the workings, as he sees it, of the Unification Act and the difficulty encountered by the Congress in obtaining accurate information necessary to resolve the manpower and fiscal problems of the defense establishment.

Let me say to the Senate that our committee has worked diligently on the manpower problem, believing that our first objective should be security; that our second objective should be the saving of manpower; and that our third objective should be the saving of dollars.

A sincere effort is being made. I shall not say that unification has proved a failure. In fact, I still believe, as I stated to the Senate a year ago, that we did not merely make a start then, but we went a long way toward getting the kind of defense establishment necessary for the United States. Our action at that time was more than taking merely a few steps. I stated a year ago, and I now repeat, that several years will be required to eliminate the kinks in the defense establishment. They will be presented to Congress possibly over a period of 20 years. Nevertheless, we now have one avenue of approach to the over-all problem of national security, as represented by the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

Our committee will meet tomorrow morning and again tomorrow afternoon. I have high hope that at that time we shall receive from the Secretary of National Defense one recommendation on which there is some agreement in the defense establishment. I realize that Congress will have to meet the problem of dollars, but I am rather hopeful that by the end of this week or the first of next week we shall have a recommendation to make to the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4931) to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights."

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 46) providing for the printing of additional copies of Senate Report No. 986, on Labor-Management Relations.

EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN NEWSPAPER OR MAGAZINE VENDORS FROM CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE—VETO MESSAGE

Mr. MILLIKIN obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so I may make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the reconsideration of House bill 5052.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 5052) to exclude certain vendors of newspapers or magazines from certain provisions of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code, returned by the President on April 6, 1948, without his approval, and passed by the House, on reconsideration, on April 14, 1948.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The veto message has heretofore been read. The question before the Senate is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators anwered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	McKellar
Baldwin	George	Malone
Ball	Green	Martin
Barkley	Gurney	Maybank
Brewster	Hatch	Millikin
Bricker	Hayden	Moore
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Morse
Brooks	Hill	Murray
Buck	Hoey	Myers
Bushfield	Holland	O'Conor
Butler	Ives	O'Daniel
Byrd	Jenner	Overton
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Reed
Capper	Kem	Revercomb
Chavez	Kilgore	Robertson, Va.
Cordon	Knowland	Robertson, Wyo.
Donnell	Langer	Saltonstall
Downey	Lodge	Stennis
Dworshak	Lucas	Stewart
Eastland	McCarran	Taft
Ecton	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McClellan	Thye
Ferguson	McFarland	Tobey
Flanders	McGrath	Tydings

Umstead	Wherry	Williams
Vandenberg	White	Wilson
Watkins	Wiley	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is necessarily absent.

The junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The parliamentary situation is as follows: the business before the Senate is the Presidential veto of House bill 5052, a bill to exclude certain vendors of newspapers or magazines from certain provisions of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code.

The question before the Senate is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding? The Constitution requires that the vote be by yeas and nays.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, has the message been read?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The message was read when it was laid before the Senate on a previous day.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the issue here is whether the Congress shall sustain the decision which it has already made: namely, to exclude from social security the newspaper and magazine vendors. Both Houses of Congress have decided that they should be excluded. The bill went to the President, and the President vetoed it. I think that in common understanding, newspaper and magazine vendors are not employees of the publishers. Many Members of the Senate at some time or other in their lifetimes have sold newspapers or magazines, and from their own experiences they know that a vendor of newspapers or of magazines to the ultimate purchaser is not in fact an employee. That was rather well recognized as a matter of law until the latter part of 1946, when a decision of a Federal district court in the northern district of California held that the newspaper vendors involved in the case there being considered were employees and therefore were entitled to coverage. Since that time the social-security aspects of magazine and newspaper distribution have been in a state of extreme confusion and uncertainty.

Mr. President, the social-security system was intended to apply to employees. There is strong sentiment in Congress, I believe, to extend the coverage to persons in self-employment, to independent contractors, to professional people, and to other persons not now included. I may remind the Senate that the Senate Finance Committee is receiving the benefit of the advice of a very distinguished council of citizens selected from all over the United States as to how our social-security system can be improved. The Senate Finance Committee now has before it the first report of that council; and I may say that the recommendations deal with coverage for independent contractors, self-employed persons, and also other persons who are clearly employees, but who now do not have coverage.

I believe it is a great mistake to mutilate the social-security system in the fanciful judicial or administrative constructions of the word "employee." If we wish to bring into that system people who are in twilight zones or who heretofore have clearly not been considered as employees, let us bring them in by legislation for that specific purpose.

As a practical matter, Mr. President, this tax is not collectible on the type of newspaper vendors and magazine vendors I have described.

The act excludes from coverage an individual who sells newspapers or magazines who at the time of the sale to the ultimate consumer, sells, under an arrangement under which the sale is made, at a fixed price, whose compensation is based on the retention of the excess of such price over the amount at which the newspapers or magazines are charged to him, and whether or not he is guaranteed a minimum amount of compensation for such service, or is entitled to be credited with the unsold newspapers or magazines turned back.

I invite attention to the fact that we are not reaching basic distributors, wholesalers, those who take the newspapers and the magazines to the person who finally sells them to the ultimate purchaser.

At the hearing before the House committee, a witness testified as follows:

1. The tax is not collectible. The Social Security and Federal Unemployment Tax Acts require that "the employee of taxpayer shall deduct the amount of the tax from the wages as and when paid."

Street vendors buy and pay the publishers for newspapers at wholesale rates and sell them at retail rates. All payments are made from the vendors to the publishers. Consequently, making no payments, the publisher can make no withholding or give an accurate computation of tax. No law or regulation authorizes a collection except by withholding.

2. It is impossible to obtain the data necessary for determining the tax. To appreciate this fully it is necessary to understand the operation as it generally involves the vendors.

Mr. President, I think what I am about to read will coincide with the direct observation of Senators:

Each day when the first edition of a newspaper comes off the press it is delivered by employees of the publisher, known as wholesalers, to the vendors. Each vendor is charged with the number of papers delivered to him. As each subsequent edition is released during the day the process is repeated. From time to time during the day or at the end of the day's selling period, the wholesalers pick up any unsold papers from the vendors and collect the wholesale price of all papers not returned.

Frequently wholesalers' working shifts do not correspond with the working periods of the vendors, so that a vendor will deal with one wholesaler during a portion of the day and with another during the rest of the day.

Moreover, editions often follow each other so closely that different wholesalers must handle them—the first man cannot make his deliveries and get back before the next one goes out.

Naturally, then, neither of the wholesalers knows the total number of papers handled by the vendor during the day.

It is generally customary for one vendor to handle the newspapers of several publishers at the same time on his corner. For example, he will handle two morning or two evening papers. Of course, these vendors are served independently by the respective wholesalers of the papers being handled.

The practice of "off sales" also generally exists. An example will illustrate the "off sale."

The first editions of the morning papers appear on the streets during the evening while evening papers are still being sold. When later vendors of the evening papers leave their corners for the day, they turn over and sell the remainder of their evening papers to vendors of the morning papers.

The publishers of the morning papers have no part in this and no means of obtaining any information as to profits made by morning-paper vendors from the sale of these evening papers. The same sort of thing occurs when morning-paper vendors leave their corners for the day.

It was much easier for Judge Goodman to decide that these men were employees and not independent contractors than it is for publishers in practical operation to figure whose employees they are, how much they make, and who owes what to whom, and whose responsibility it is to report how much profits have been made even on transactions to which one is not a party at all. It sounds a little involved, and it is.

The profits of a vendor are neither uniform nor constant. Too many factors influence sales, such as weather, location, and news breaks, and so forth.

For example, the sale of papers on a corner in the financial district will be affected much more by news about the stock market than on a corner in a residential section. And so it follows that from corner to corner and from day to day the vendors' profits are never fixed, but always variable.

It is also well known that many vendors—

And, Mr. President, I am sure this statement will be confirmed by the observations of all of us—

sell things other than newspapers, such as candy, razor blades, gum, magazines, racing forms, and so forth. It would be rather impossible for a publisher to compute these profits, or at least unfair to ask him to do so.

As a matter of fact, the vendor handles the gum, candy, and so forth, on exactly the same basis as he handles the newspapers. How can anyone compute the relative withholding or taxpaying responsibility of the newspaper publisher or two or three more newspaper publishers and the candy maker, the gum manufacturer, the supplier of pencils, racing forms, and miscellaneous other merchandise?

I believe, from that rather brief recital, it is made clear how utterly impractical it is to apply the present withholding-tax provision to newspaper vendors or to magazine vendors.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado whether the men who stand outside hotels and theaters at night selling newspapers are vendors, or whether they are newsboys.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest they can be termed either vendors or newsboys.

Mr. AIKEN. What is the difference between a vendor and a newsboy, assuming the vendor has no fixed place of business but stands on a street corner?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not see any difference. I may say also, as all Senators know, the Social Security Act excludes newsboys under the age of 18 years.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The point made by the Senator is, I take it, that the vendor of papers, the newsboy, is not an employee within the meaning and intent of the Social Security Act.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The coverage of the Social Security Act is now under study by the Finance Committee of the Senate, of which the able Senator from Colorado is chairman, and of course if the question of coverage comes up with respect to independents, or men engaged independently in business, the subject would properly be taken up and considered by that committee under that head.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I agree entirely.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The point made by the Senator is that it has no place in the present act, and could have no place until the present act is properly amended respecting coverage.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I make two points: First, that under the ordinary conception of the term "employee," and I believe, under the legal conception of the term "employee" prior to the California decision which I have mentioned, a newspaper and magazine vendor is not an employee. Second, I make the point that, by reason of the circumstances which have been detailed, it is impracticable to bring such persons within the system, it being simply impossible to establish responsibility for the collection and payment of the withholding tax.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield at that point?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. By the statement that it is impractical to bring certain persons within the system, I assume the Senator means it is impractical under the present law; but if the coverage were extended to independent business, we should then have a different situation as to coverage.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Exactly; and it would be on an entirely different basis.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. To what the Senator from Colorado has said I merely wish to add this particular observation. This matter has been twice before the Congress. It had been so troublesome for publishers of newspapers and magazines that it was presented to the Congress. The President vetoed last August a bill which both Houses had passed. This was the second appearance of the bill, and again the President vetoed it. At this time the House had overridden the President's veto.

I speak as one who has the friendliest interest in the vendors of newspapers and magazines, in that I can understand their desire, some of them, at least, to come under the Social Security System and receive social-security benefits. The distinguished chairman of the committee has correctly said that a group of very eminent men, gathered from all parts of the country, has been studying the whole Social Security System for some time. We are already advised that among their recommendations, and prominently among their recommendations, will be one calling especially for the extension of coverage to classes not now under social security, including the self-employed.

Beyond any doubt, the vendor of newspapers on the street corner or in the hotels or elsewhere who sells to the ultimate consumer is self-employed. He is selling merchandise. He buys it as merchandise, and he may or may not have the option of returning any unsold portions of the papers and magazines entrusted to him for sale. He is self-employed in every fair sense of the term. He is not an employed person within the original meaning of the Social Security Act.

The whole difficulty here arises because of the impatience of those now administering social security to extend the system by construction and by regulation rather than to give the Congress an opportunity of saying who is and who is not intended to be covered.

In this particular case it is practically impossible for the newspaper publisher to withhold anything from a vendor of newspapers sold on the street corners to whoever wishes to buy them. He does not even know in thousands of instances the name of the newspaper vendor. He has no idea of how many newspapers he sells or does not sell, except as it is based upon his own statement. If he returns the paper he may get credit; if he does not return them, he does not get credit, whether he has sold them, thrown them away, or used them for his own purposes. There is no money passing through the publisher's hands that belongs to the newspaper vendor. The publisher has nothing to withhold. The newspaper salesman may represent a half dozen different newspaper publishers, a group of magazine publishers, and a group of manufacturers of ordinary mercantile products. So there is no practical way of administering the law with respect to the ordinary newspaper vendor, whom the Social Security Board has by its regulations undertaken to bring within the system.

Solely for that reason, Mr. President, I shall vote to override the President's veto. It seems to me that when Congress twice passes upon a matter of this character it should be allowed to become law without further action. I am happy to say that I am voting to override because when we extend social security to include the self-employed, undoubtedly then the man who wishes to sell newspapers, or wheat, or corn, or what not, may be brought under the social-security system, but under a system that will enable the taxing authorities really and effectively to collect the tax.

THE BOGOTA CONFERENCE

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I would not delay the vote on the veto message were it not that I feel the few remarks I am about to make are important to the Senate and to the country.

The recent rioting in Bogota, which nearly resulted in stopping the Ninth Pan-American Conference, has aroused the sympathy of the world and focused attention on the Conference.

The pillaging and burning, and the hundreds of bodies lying in the morgues, give stark evidence of the seething unrest of the masses. The revolution in Costa Rica and the rumblings in Chile and Ecuador are ominous warnings of more trouble to come. So long as people are ill-fed, ill-housed, ill-clad, and so long as there are misery, poverty, suffering, and ignorance in the world, Communist propaganda, however false, will have appeal. The mobs in Bogota that burned and robbed and killed were composed of people who were cold and hungry.

If international communism planned to kill the Conference by means of the Bogota riots, the plans miscarried. The Conference has been resumed. The delegations of the American Republics got a first-hand lesson on Communist facts of life. Communism is not some remote bogey; on the contrary, it is a menace ever present in our midst. The riots have inspired and alarmed the delegates as no speeches or discussions could have done.

For us the Bogota riots were a rude awakening. Most of us were hardly aware that a Pan American Conference was taking place. I doubt if we appreciated what the strengthening and developing of pan-Americanism really means.

Do we realize the role which Latin America played in the recent world conflict? Through a series of conferences beginning more than a century ago machinery for inter-American cooperation and defense has been created. This machinery operated successfully during the late war. If it is developed and strengthened even further, it will inure not only to our benefit but to the benefit of the entire Western Hemisphere, which, by tradition, heritage, and geography, should be one in spirit and one in actuality.

We have in this hemisphere wealth and resources, technical ability, and industrial capacity, which, if organized, would create the most efficient, prosperous, happy, and powerful civilization that history has ever known. It would possess the choicest blessing God has given to man—freedom.

It is for us to make the decision. The Bogota Conference must be a success.

Our future, the future of this continent and, in all likelihood, the future of civilization, may well depend on what our diplomats and those of our sister republics evolve at this historic conference.

Our Government should have taken the trouble to enlighten the American people on the historical background of pan-Americanism, so that we might have been better prepared to appreciate the significance of Bogota.

As all of us know, the George Washington of Latin America was Simon Bolivar, the liberator and founder of Colombia. His divinely inspired mind originally conceived the idea of a League of American States.

The Pan-American movement as we know it today had its origin some 50 years ago. Since that time 8 international conferences and approximately 175 special conferences have succeeded in creating a habit of cooperation and mutual assistance, which, God willing, will be translated at Bogota into a specific charter for a living, vigorous, and effective Pan-American movement.

Over the years these conferences have succeeded in establishing certain basic principles to which the 21 Republics all subscribe, and the universality which men of good will the world over revere.

During the recent war a series of emergency meetings of the foreign ministers of the American Republics took place. These conferences made possible the amazing cooperation of all the nations of this hemisphere in successfully waging war against the Axis and in winning the victory.

Perhaps some persons do not know how important it is that the resources, the manpower, and the political strength of Latin America be on our side. How fortunate it was for the world and for democracy that the American hemisphere was united.

When we formally declared war on Japan eight American Republics were already at war with her. Within 3 days of our declaration of war against Germany, 10 of the Latin-American Republics had ranged themselves against Hitler. Never before in history have so many nations accepted the hazards of war and supported their pledged word and national honor.

Latin-American nations did not stop with their prompt declaration of war. They immediately embarked on a broad program of aid to the United Nations in opposition to the Axis Powers. Trade relations with the Axis were severed. Foreign credits, facilities, and capital were seized.

As the war developed, the nations of Latin America took prompt, economic, and military action. The United States, in spite of its tremendous industrial strength, was hard pressed for innumerable kinds of supplies. In that emergency the vast material resources of Latin America proved a tremendous asset. A constantly increasing stream of materials, minerals, and forest and agricultural products necessary for war industry poured northward into the United States. From iron ore to industrial diamonds, and from rubber to coffee, American industry was supported by the resources of our neighbors.

In addition to vital political and economic measures directed against the Axis, Latin-American nations were prompt to participate in the military prosecution of the war. Mexico, Brazil, Cuba, Colombia, and Venezuela, among others, engaged their air, sea, and military forces in protecting the American seaboard and in the war against the Germans' U-boats.

Military airfields, troop bases, and shipping depots, throughout the Latin-American nations were made available or were specially built for the use of all American forces.

Air and ground components of the Brazilian and Mexican armies fought alongside the armies of the United Nations. As our forces drove up the Italian Peninsula, Mexican and Brazilian air and ground units, under the leadership of Mark Clark, distinguished themselves in the fighting which took place in July and August of 1944 and were an important factor in driving back the Germans. The technical skill and daring of the Mexican pilots in the Pacific were commented upon by all nations. Their record is one which must not be forgotten. The value to the United States of these services cannot be overestimated.

For future security of the hemisphere it is essential that we go further in support of Western Hemisphere cooperation and that we lend our weight and direct our energies toward strengthening these bonds.

The Conference at Bogota seeks to strengthen our hemispheric solidiarity by consolidating and carrying forward the decisons made by previous conferences, especially at Mexico City in 1945 and at Rio de Janeiro last year.

The agenda lists reorganization and strengthening of the inter-American system, giving effect to the provisions of the ninth resolution of the Mexico City conference. The proposed organic pact which the Pan American Union has projected will give substance to the dream of Simon Bolivar. The specific rights and duties of the signatory nations will be described in clear, precise language so that each nation, small or great, will understand its position. Up to now the Pan American Union has been little more than an idea and a habit. The Bogota Conference must establish a live, active, vigorous, working organization.

The Conference must also consider the economic issues outlined in the act of Chapultepec. It is the universal ambition of Latin Americans to increase their standard of living. This can be accomplished only if the industrial nations cooperate.

Secretary of State Marshall declared that the United States would support long-term loans by the International Bank for the development of the economies of the American Republics. He also announced that the President of the United States is submitting to the Congress a request for an increase in the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank. General Marshall also informed the Conference that the President has under consideration new measures to reduce taxes on capital invested in foreign countries.

I sincerely hope that the Conference will follow the line of attack urged by the Cuban representative, Dr. Belt. In an impressive and scholarly address he urged the delegates to welcome the assistance of American private and governmental capital and yet recognize that foreign capital must be protected upon investment.

The resumption of the Conference after the bloody rioting of last week is due to the calm and courageous leadership of Secretary Marshall and to the prompt action on the part of Dr. Belt and the Argentine representative when they took up the gauntlet of communism and urged that the Conference continue its sessions.

The Conference is now deliberating these problems. We know that under the tremendous demands of the European recovery program essential materials, machinery, and technical knowledge will be devoted to that sphere. But we must realize that the threat of communism, so active and menacing in Europe, is here in our midst and presents a danger even more menacing. We must realize that no amount of talking, persuasion, loans, or doles will make pan-Americanism work unless we champion the cause of raising their standard of living, help them industrialize, and furnish them with the necessary materials.

There is great merit in the arguments of the Foreign Minister of Mexico, Sr. James Torres Bodet, who brilliantly outlined to the conference the position of the undeveloped nations of this hemisphere. He sympathized with the undernourished war-ravaged peoples of Europe, but he called attention to the fact that the living standards of many of the peoples in our own hemisphere are much lower than the standards existing in Europe today. Inter-American solidarity derives its strength from the universal desire of all the Americas for friendship, security, and peace. If we believe in pan-Americanism only in time of war and forget it in time of peace, that is a travesty.

Here, then, is our formula for forging something good and fine and effective out of inter-American cooperation: Our Nation must firmly and vigorously adopt a program pledging its resources and its industry to assist in the elevation of the standard of living of Latin America. The only answer to communism is to better the standard of living by exporting essential industrial material and machinery to Latin America. Promotion of commerce and the development of industry are essential.

Would we not feel safer, would not the world, disunited by the imminent threat of communism, have more faith in us, in our civilization, and in our institutions, if all America had living standards comparable to those in our own country? Give the humblest Indian peon in Guatemala more privileges, more freedom, more of life's essentials than the average person in Russia, and no one could make him a Communist. That news would penetrate the iron curtain and stop communism more effectively than armies of men or squadrons of airplanes. That weapon is more powerful than the atomic bomb.

Its use rests in the hands of the Conference.

May success attend the efforts of the conferees at Bogota; let us assist them through our prayers.

Mr. President, the National Broadcasting Co. had allotted time last evening for me to deliver this message to the people of the United States. Because of some confusion in timing, or the hour at which the broadcast was to be made, I did not make the broadcast, but I do want the message to go to the country through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN NEWSPAPER OR MAGAZINE VENDORS FROM CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE—VETO MESSAGE

The Senate resumed the reconsideration of the bill (H. R. 5052) to exclude certain vendors of newspapers or magazines from certain provisions of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, it is my opinion, for whatever it may be worth to the Senate, that the veto of the President should be overridden.

During the past 2 or 3 days I have been reading the opinion of the court in this case, rendered at San Francisco; I have talked to certain representatives of the social-security system, and I have likewise talked to some newspaper boys and newspaper vendors. It is my measured opinion that for every dollar which might be collected by the Federal Government under a social-security tax against news vendors there would be several dollars spent in the effort, both by the Government as the collecting and enforcing agency, and by business itself.

I should like to mention the typical situation which is found at the intersection near where I live. There each of two newsboys, on opposite corners, sell both of our morning newspapers from about 6:30 in the morning until a quarter of 9. One of them is slightly past 17 years of age. He would not come under the proposed act, because under the basic Social Security Act all newsboys under 18 years of age are exempt, so the first boy would not come under the act, but someone would have to keep careful track to find when he did become 18 years of age.

The other boy is 18½ years of age, and has been selling papers for about a year, during 6 months of which he would have been under the act, if it had been applicable. He makes about a dollar a day, and will cease selling newspapers when he graduates from high school and goes to college next June.

If the Government should attempt to collect 2 cents a day of the dollar each boy makes, in my opinion it would be perfectly worthless to the young man, as I do not think he would ever get any benefit from it, and I believe it would cost the Government more to collect the 2 cents a day than the amount of money which would finally be accumulated.

At the same intersection is the opposite extreme. There a news vendor sells not only all the Washington newspapers, but 10 or 15 outside papers. He has contracts with the Washington newspapers, exactly the same kind the newsboys have. He has contracts with newspapers in New York, Baltimore, and Philadelphia, which, he tells me, have certain degrees of similarity and certain degrees of dissimilarity. In my opinion there would have to be a decision on every one of those contracts to determine whether or not the sale of the newspapers under those different contracts came under the Social Security Act.

This vendor sells other articles, under somewhat different kinds of contracts, all of which would have to be construed. He sells many of the established magazines and many other articles. His net income from selling newspapers is only 10 percent of his total income. He, like the two newsboys, is totally disinterested in any social-security coverage. He, like them, thinks it means absolutely nothing to him.

As to some of the news vendors, a license is required in certain cities. How does that affect the question of employment or lack of employment? In some cases the news vendor has a right to transfer his operations. What effect does that have on his status as an employee? In some cases he has the right to make a substitution. How does that affect the case?

In going over the myriad conditions of all the contracts, having carefully read the decision rendered in the Federal court at San Francisco, by a judge, by the way, whom I had the honor to recommend, I am convinced that literally years of litigation would be required to determine in what particular cases the act applies and in which it does not. While Judge Goodman's decision is an able and careful analysis of the legal aspects of the subject, it does not, of course, discuss or dispose of the administrative difficulties of enforcing that particular provision of the law. I am convinced that as to the great bulk of newspaper sales the ultimate holding, under the decision given, would be that the relationship of employer and employee does not exist.

I also talked with representatives of the social-security system. They have, today, absolutely no idea how they would attempt to apply the law, how they could collect the tax, to how many it should be applied, in what conditions it should be applied.

Mr. President, I shall vote reluctantly to override the Presidential veto on this social-security measure because I have an abiding confidence that the attempt to carry it out would result, not in any good, but in a great wasting of public funds.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding? Under the Constitution, the yeas and nays are required. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea."

The senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the senior Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea."

The junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent on official business. If present and voting, the junior Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] would vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 77, nays 7, as follows:

YEAS—77

Aiken	Gurney	Myers
Baldwin	Hatch	O'Conor
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hill	Overton
Bricker	Hoey	Reed
Bridges	Holland	Revercomb
Brooks	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Stennis
Byrd	Kem	Stewart
Cain	Knowland	Taft
Capehart	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lodge	Thye
Chavez	Lucas	Tobey
Cordon	McCarran	Tydings
Donnell	McCarthy	Umstead
Downey	McClellan	Vandenberg
Dworshak	McFarland	Watkins
Eastland	McKellar	Wherry
Ecton	Malone	White
Ellender	Martin	Wiley
Ferguson	Maybank	Williams
Flanders	Millikin	Wilson
Fulbright	Moore	Young
George	Morse	

NAYS—7

Barkley	Kilgore	Pepper
Green	McGrath	
Hayden	Murray	

NOT VOTING—12

Connally	Magnuson	Sparkman
Cooper	O'Mahoney	Taylor
Hawkes	Russell	Thomas, Okla.
McMahon	Smith	Wagner

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this question the yeas are 77, the nays 7. More than two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the bill, on reconsideration, is passed, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

NATIONAL HOUSING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 866) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective and to provide for the coordinated execution of such policy through a National Housing Commission, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is now on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the senior Sen-

ator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] for himself and the junior Senator from that State [Mr. LODGE], as modified, to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as amended, inserting on page 92, after line 2, certain language relating to low-rent or veterans' housing projects.

Mr. MALONE obtained the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts, as modified, is entirely satisfactory to the author of the substitute amendment, and also, I think, to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. This amendment being agreeable to all concerned, would the Senator from Nevada permit the question to be put on it before he makes his speech, unless he wishes to speak on that particular amendment?

Mr. MALONE. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] on behalf of himself and the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], as modified, to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] as amended, inserting on page 92, after line 2, certain language relating to low-rent or veterans' housing projects.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAIN. Is it proper at this point to move the deletion of a particular title within the pending house bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The immediate question is on agreeing to the substitute amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as amended. That, in turn, is open to further amendment.

Mr. CAIN. I therefore move that title VI, relating to low-rent housing, be stricken from the bill, beginning on page 77.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is in order. The pending question, therefore, is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] to strike out title VI in the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as amended.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to speak very briefly on my amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nevada yield for that purpose?

Mr. MALONE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, it happens to be the considered opinion of the junior Senator from Washington that the general subject of low-rent housing is very properly and actually a social and welfare problem, as opposed to a housing problem. For that primary reason I think the subject is deserving of full consideration by this body, and ought to have such consideration in its own right. I believe the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has very generally agreed in his testimony before the Banking and Currency Committee that public housing is essentially a welfare or social problem.

I am further of the opinion that it is doubtful if the adoption of this low-rent housing provision at this time would result in creating within the immediate future one additional unit of housing. It seems to many of us that the encouragement to further stimulation of private building within the remainder of the omnibus housing bill before us would so increase private building that there would be no opportunity to accommodate and construct the first 100,000 public housing units requested, other than by means of taking those housing units out of the hands of the builders who are provided additional encouragement and assistance within the bill itself.

I am of the opinion that my feeling of opposition to the desirability of including a public housing program within this bill is shared not only by many other Senators, but by a large percentage of the Membership of the House of Representatives. I think our approach to America's housing shortage will be the more constructive, the more understandable, the more reasonable, and the more practical at this time if title VI, entitled "Low-Rent Housing" is entirely eliminated.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I intend to reply at some length to the Senator from Washington, but I do not wish to interrupt the speech of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, we now have before us another so-called emergency bill, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill. This emergency has been brought about largely through administration policies over a period of months and years. The housing emergency is the result of the prolonged shortage of building materials rather than the lack of funds to finance such construction. The building material shortage can be traced directly to unwise national and international policies, such as the Morgenthau plan of reducing postwar Germany to an agrarian state with no substantial industries, holding the prewar 24,000,000 tons of steel production capacity to less than 4,000,000 tons annually, thereby necessitating large steel exports to the European nations of from 6,000,000 to 8,000,000 tons annually. The steel to meet these requirements was formerly produced by Germany. The needed 6,000,000 to 8,000,000 tons annually could be produced in Germany by existing plants within a few months without substantial repairs, very little damage having been done to many German plants during the war. Our own steel could then be made available for domestic uses, including building construction and housing. Housing construction would then take a new lease on life.

Government departments and bureaus would have us believe that we are a "have not" nation; yet we continually export steel containing such strategic minerals as manganese, chromite, tungsten, and other scarce materials; and in addition the scrap from such steel is lost to us, whereas if it could be utilized in this country the scrap, including these strategic minerals, would be utilized over and over again in this country, as a kind of continuous available stock, as was formerly done.

Lack of money is not the principal cause of the slowing down of building construction. The principal causes are found in the inflated cost and the scarcity of building materials, chiefly steel. For example, veterans have been largely priced out of the market. A $5,000 house now costs them or anyone else from $10,000 to $12,000. Even if they have the necessary funds, ordinary good judgment dictates that they not invest them under present conditions.

The American Legion considered this legislation in connection with its veterans' housing program.

I have in my hand a summary of proceedings of the 29th annual national convention of the American Legion. On page 100, under the heading, "Report of Committee on Veterans Housing," I find that a resolution numbered 35, calling for support of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill, and another resolution No. 719, calling for support of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill were rejected. I know, as a matter of fact, that by a vote of 4 to 1 among the delegates at the National American Legion convention, which was held in New York City on August 28 to 31, 1947, a resolution to support the legislation we are considering today was shouted down. Some 3,500 delegates, representing more than 4,000,000 veterans, voiced their opposition to this long-range, federally-subsidized public-housing legislation. The public housers who proposed American Legion support of this bill insisted upon a roll call vote. Yet it was defeated 4 to 1.

Mr. President, I offer for the RECORD at this point in the RECORD a list of successive Public Housing Acts and the operations of the Federal Housing Administration under the Lanham Act.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I. LEGISLATIVE ORIGINS OF THE FEDERAL PUBLIC HOUSING AUTHORITY

A. THE PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION

The National Recovery Act of 1933 first provided for development of slum clearance projects. These were administered by the Public Works Administration under the National Industrial Recovery Act. When the United States Housing Authority was established in 1937, these functions were transferred to that agency.

B. UNITED STATES HOUSING ACT OF 1937

In 1937, the United States Housing Authority was created pursuant to the United States Housing Act of that year (42 U. S. C. 1401). This agency administered the public housing activities of the Federal Government under its low-rent legislation. Under this legislation, the Federal Government aided local housing agencies in building and managing large-scale housing projects, for families in the lowest income groups.

C. THE UNITED STATES HOUSING ACT AMENDMENT FOR DEFENSE HOUSING

Amendments of United States Housing Act: The United States Housing Act was

amended in June 1940 by Congress. Under this amendment, the United States Housing Authority was authorized to use the funds previously alloted to low-rent housing and slum clearance for housing for defense workers (42 U. S. C. 1501).

D. WORK OF THE FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

Defense Housing Activities of FWA: At the outset with its own Administration, the Federal Works Agency handled allotments to other agencies of the Government relating to defense housing which had been provided for under two laws, the Lanham Act (55 Stat. 14, 197, 810) and the Temporary Shelter Acts (59 Stat. 260).

E. MUTUAL OWNERSHIP DEFENSE HOUSING

Mutual Ownership Defense Housing Division of the Federal Works Agency: Under the Lanham Act, projects were developed by a division of the Federal Works Agency called the Mutual Ownership Defense Housing Division. These projects were to be sold to nonprofit corporations that were set up by those who lived in such projects, under the terms of the Lanham Act, which provided for the disposal of housing.

F. PUBLIC BUILDINGS ADMINISTRATION

The Public Buildings Administration's Defense Housing Program: From funds provided in the Lanham Act (59 Stat. 674), the Public Building Administration undertook defense housing projects. In the various States they consisted of family dwellings, and in the District of Columbia they were dormitories.

G. WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENT HOUSING

1. Housing for the War and Navy Department: The second supplemental National Defense Appropriations Act of 1941 (58 Stat. 765), provided for war housing for the War and Navy Departments. Under the Lanham Act, these funds could be transferred for expenditures under the provisions of that law.

2. The functions transferred to FPHA did not include housing located on military or naval reservations, post, or bases.

H. FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

National Recovery Act: The nonfarm housing projects of the Farm Security Administration were built from the months appropriated by the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933 (40 U. S. C. 401–414) and the Emergency Relief Appropriations Act of 1933 (49 Stat. 115). There were two main types of projects built pursuant to the foregoing.

1. First, there were subsistence homesteads or groups of homes with garden plots. These were intended for low-income families living in cities.

2. Then there were model developments outside the cities for low-salaried office workers. These were known as Greenbelt towns.

I. FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION HOUSING FOR DEFENSE

Under the Lanham Act (42 U. S. C. 1521) and the Temporary Shelter Acts (55 Stat. 14, 197, 810), defense housing was developed in outlying areas. These functions were transferred to FPHA from the Farm Security Administration. Various types of temporary housing were developed, consisting essentially of trailers.

J. WORK OF THE DEFENSE HOMES CORPORATION

Organization: The Defense Homes Corporation was established as a Maryland corporation in October 1940. This was pursuant to the direction of the President in a letter of October 18, 1940.

1. Permanent war housing was provided by this Corporation in war-activity centers where private capital was unable to provide adequate housing, and where it was indicated that such housing would be needed after the war. This housing consisted of groups of individual houses, dormitories, and large-scale projects.

2. The functions of this Corporation were transferred to FPHA by Executive Order 9070. Since January 1, 1945, this Corporation has been in process of liquidation.

K. ADDITIONAL WORK FOR FPHA UNDER LANHAM ACT

Defense housing: Under the Lanham Act (42 U. S. C. 1521), FPHA was given additional funds after the consolidation that was authorized by the basic public defense housing legislation, the Lanham Act, passed October 14, 1940. This law provided for housing for those engaged in national defense work in localities where there was an acute shortage of housing which could not be supplied by private capital.

L. TEMPORARY SHELTER ACTS

Under the Temporary Shelter Acts of 1941, FPHA received additional funds. These were to provide temporary shelter immediately for defense workers (55 Stat. 14, 197, 810).

M. MARITIME COMMISSION ACTIVITIES

Under its own appropriations the United States Maritime Commission constructed defense dormitories and family-dwelling unit projects in connection with the activities of commercial shipbuilding firms performing Government work. On June 30, 1944, most of these projects were transferred to FPHA.

N. HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION ACTIVITIES

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation, under the Lanham Act, inaugurated a home-reconversion program in October 1942. Under this program, the Government leased existing structures and remodeled them into apartments for war workers. The management of this program was turned over to FPHA on August 1, 1944.

O. AUTHORIZING WAR HOUSING FOR VETERANS UNDER THE LANHAM ACT

On June 23, 1945, title V was added to the Lanham Act (59 Stat. 260). This authorized the use of war housing and funds to provide housing for veterans and for families of servicemen. On December 31, 1945, and on March 28, 1946 (59 Stat. 674), this title was amended. Under these amendments, appropriations were made available for either relocating or converting surplus war housing and other facilities for transfer to universities and local bodies, for housing veterans.

P. REHOUSING JAPANESE-AMERICANS

The responsibility for rehousing some 10,000 Japanese-Americans before they entered into normal civilian life was transferred to FPHA by the War Relocation Authority on August 18, 1945.

Q. DISPOSING OF SURPLUS HOUSING PROPERTY OF OTHER AGENCIES

In accordance with the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 765), the National Housing Agency designated FPHA to dispose of surplus housing property of other agencies.

R. PROVIDING EUROPEAN HOUSING AND BARRACKS

The Foreign Economic Administration assigned to FPHA the program of producing 30,000 houses for the United Kingdom and 4,500 for France on December 28, 1944. The United Kingdom cancelled the remainder of its program, including 8,110 partially completed units, on VJ-day. These were declared surplus and sold to the French Government thereafter.

II. PUBLIC WAR HOUSING

A. AMOUNT OF WAR HOUSING CONSTRUCTED

More than 1,900,000 dwelling units for war workers and their families were constructed under the war housing program.

B. SOURCE OF CONSTRUCTION OF WAR HOUSING

1. Private enterprise: More than one-half the total of 1,900,000 dwelling units built for war workers were constructed by private enterprise. These dwellings form a permanent addition to the housing supply of this Nation.

2. Government activities: The remainder of the war dwelling units were financed, and for the most part, owned by the Federal Government. The majority of this construction is temporary and cannot be used for permanent housing.

III. DISPOSITION OF WAR HOUSING

A. PREVAILING PROBLEMS

The disposition of war housing is governed by Federal laws and regulations pursuant thereto. Before homes can be torn down, people living in them must be housed elsewhere. As a result, it becomes a Federal and local problem.

B. NEEDS OF VETERANS

Returning veterans and servicemen require housing. As war workers move out of the housing projects, vacated units are made available to the families of veterans and servicemen. The exception is a civilian personnel completing war functions. They have top priority for all vacancies that occur.

IV. EXTENT OF WAR HOUSING UNITS UNDER FPHA

A. TOTAL AMOUNT

FPHA had approximately 531,000 war housing dwelling units in June 30, 1946.

B. TYPES OF WAR HOUSING

1. Temporary units: There are about 251,000 temporary units that are not suitable for permanent housing. These include family dwellings and dormitories.

2. Permanent construction.

(a) Permanent dwelling units: About 182,000 units of permanent construction are to be disposed of. These include some 111,000 standard permanent dwelling units.

(b) Demountables: About 71,000 demountable dwelling units can be used either permanently on their present sites, or demounted, moved, and reerected at new locations. These include some 8,600 family and dormitory units built by the Defense Homes Corporation, and are only available for sale.

(c) Permanent war housing building under United States Housing Act: Another 14,000 permanent family units, now used for war housing, were built with funds, authorized by Congress under the United States Housing Act. These are to be turned over for the use of low-income families as public low-rent housing, and will not be available for private purchase.

(d) Trailers: FPHA owns a stock of about 35,000 trailers which are being used as temporary emergency housing for veterans. As they become surplus, they are turned over to the War Assets Administration for disposal.

(e) Conversions: There are about 49,000 war housing units which were converted from existing structures. They were leased from private ownership and will be returned to them when the leases expire.

V. LAWS AND REGULATIONS CONCERNING DISPOSITION OF WAR HOUSING

A. THE LANHAM ACT

In this act, Congress laid down the general policy that governs the disposition of federally owned public housing that is under the jurisdiction of the National Housing Agency. The disposal of such housing is exempted from the provisions of the Surplus Property Act which establishes requirements for disposing of most Government war surplus.

B. WHERE LANHAM ACT DOES NOT APPLY

1. Disposal of war housing under NHA: The Lanham Act does not apply to the disposal of war housing under the jurisdiction of the National Housing Agency.

2. Defense Homes Corporation properties: The Lanham Act likewise does not apply to the properties of the Defense Homes Corporation which were financed with loans from RFC.

3. The United States Housing Act: The provisions of the Lanham Act do not apply to properties financed under the United States Housing Act.

4. Subsistence homesteads in the Greenbelt towns: The provisions of the Lanham Act do not apply to nonwar housing such as the subsistence homesteads in Greenbelt towns transferred to FPHA from the Farm Security Administration.

C. AUTHORITY OF NHA UNDER LANHAM ACT TO DISPOSE OF WAR HOUSING

Under the Lanham Act, NHA is responsible for disposing of war housing facilities. This includes land essential thereto. NHA has assigned this function to FPHA which built and manages most of the public war housing programs.

VI. DISPOSAL OF PERMANENT WAR HOUSING

A. PERMANENT WAR HOUSING

1. Disposal: Where permanent war housing is sold to local housing authorities for low-rent use, the community must request it officially and Congress must approve it.

2. Disposal to occupants: Permanent war housing must be sold "as expeditiously as possible" to occupants and prospective occupants with preference to veterans.

3. Exception: Projects that are financed under the United States Housing Act and Defense Homes Projects are exceptions and the rule does not apply to these projects.

4. Veterans preference: Permanent housing sold on-site will be subject to veterans preference in resale until December 31, 1947. The same applies to the resale or rental to veterans.

VII. DISPOSITION OF PERMANENT WAR PROJECTS FOR PUBLIC LOW-RENT HOUSING

A. GENERAL POLICY

Congressional and community approval are necessary for the disposal of permanent projects that become surplus to the demobilization purposes which are to be sold for private residential use. By community approval is meant community approval by a local housing authority for use as public low-rent housing.

B. DISPOSAL OF PERMANENT WAR HOUSING FOR PUBLIC USE

The local housing authority in the community may buy the project for use as low-rent housing under the following three conditions:

1. That the local housing authority and the local governing body determine that such use is in the best interests of the community;

2. That the plan of operation conforms to requirements prescribed by FPHA under the United States Housing Act;

3. That the low-rent use and the operating plan are specifically approved by Congress.

VIII. DISPOSAL OF UNITED STATES HOUSING ACT WAR PROJECTS [1]

A. WAR HOUSING AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS WITH UNITED STATES HOUSING ACT FUNDS

1. Disposal of war housing: War housing that is Federally owned and built by authorization of Congress with United States Housing Act funds, which are distinguished from the Lanham Act funds, will be sold to local housing authorities to provide low-rent housing. The use of such housing for war workers was only temporary. (Cf. 54 Stat. 676, 681, title II, Public Law 671, 76th Cong., 3d sess.)

2. Sales prices for United States Housing Act war projects: Sales prices will be established on the basis of long-range value. To maintain rents within the reach of low-income families such projects will be eligible for subsidy assistance the same as for prewar housing built under the United States Housing Act.

[1] Public Law 412, 75th Cong.; 50 Stat. 888, is the United States Housing Act of 1937.

IX. SPECIFIC LANHAM ACT PROHIBITIONS ON SUBSIDIZED HOUSING

A. LANHAM ACT

The Lanham Act of 1940 as amended in 1942 prohibits the disposal of war housing for subsidized housing, etc., as follows: "*Provided,* * * * said housing or any part thereof shall not, unless specifically authorized by Congress, be conveyed to any public or private agency organized for slum clearance or to provide subsidized housing for persons of low incomes" (U. S. C. A. 40; 1524, 1943 ed., p. 690).

B. NECESSITY FOR CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL OF LANHAM ACT SUBSIDIZED HOUSING

From the foregoing it will be seen that specific congressional approval is required by Congress before FPHA can transfer to subsidized housing permanent war housing under the Lanham Act.

C. NO CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL NEEDED FOR UNITED STATES HOUSING PROJECT

On the other hand where the war housing projects have been built under the United States Housing Act and are federally owned and United States Housing Act funds have been used, as distinguished from Lanham Act funds, no congressional authorization is needed, and FPHA can dispose of such property in accordance with the standards prescribed by Congress under the United States Housing Act.

X. OPINION OF FEDERAL LAW SECTION ON OPERATION OF FPHA UNDER THE LANHAM ACT

A. FEDERAL LAW PROHIBITING THE FPHA DISPOSAL OF WAR HOUSING FOR SLUM CLEARANCE

1. In the attached legal opinion prepared by the Federal Law Section, and analysis is made of the authority of FPHA under the Lanham and United States Housing Authority Acts. This memorandum cites the two main kinds of law that FPHA is subject to in low-rent housing.

2. On page 1 of this opinion the Lanham Act is cited to show that war housing constructed thereunder cannot be used for slum clearance or subsidized housing for persons of low income without specific authorization by Congress.

B. UNITED STATES HOUSING ACT PERMITTING THE USE OF LOW-COST HOUSING FUNDS FOR WAR HOUSING CONSTRUCTION

On page 1 of the attached legal opinion reference is made to Public Law 671 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, under which FPHA could use funds provided for low-cost housing for construction of war housing. Note that this is not war housing under the Lanham Act and that no specific authorization is required of Congress for the return to its original use as prescribed by Congress, namely, low-cost housing.

XI. CONCLUSION

It is a question of fact as to whether FPHA is disposing of permanent war housing under the Lanham Act, or under the United States Housing Act, which provides for war projects.

1. Where FPHA acts pursuant to the Lanham Act it cannot lawfully dispose of permanent war housing for slum clearance or subsidized housing purposes without specific authorization from Congress.

2. Where FPHA is disposing of permanent war housing provided with funds from the United States Housing Act it can dispose of such housing for subsidized housing or slum clearance purposes under the prior standards prescribed by Congress in that act and reasonable regulations pursuant thereto.

OPERATIONS OF THE FPHA UNDER THE LANHAM ACT

Section 4 of the Lanham Act, as amended, provides that "said housing or any part thereof shall not, unless specifically authorized by Congress, be conveyed to any public or private agency organized for slum clearance or to provide subsidized housing for persons of low income." This section was added on January 21, 1942, by Public Law 409 of the Seventy-seventh Congress (56 Stat. 11). It appeared in the conference report as amendment 9 (H. Rept. 1589), and the only reference to this particular amendment in debate pertained to the possibility of disposal of war housing to private individuals and to municipalities (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 1, p. 406).

However, the following provisions for low-rent housing indicate authority for disposal of certain other war housing by Federal Public Housing Authority to local housing authorities for low-rent housing.

The United States Housing Act of 1937, Public Law 412, Seventy-fifth Congress (50 Stat. 888), authorized loans to local housing agencies for low-rent dwellings. On June 28, 1940, in connection with provisions for expediting naval shipbuilding, war housing was authorized to be constructed with funds of the United States Housing Authority under title II of Public Law 671 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, third session (54 Stat. 676, 681). Reference is made to title II of the Conference Report (H. Rept. 2706), as follows:

"Amendments Nos. 35 to 40, inclusive, comprising all of title II of the act: Provide for housing for military personnel (except officers) and for civilian workers under the War and Navy Departments and for workers in national-defense industries, including their families. The two defense departments and the United States Housing Authority are authorized, jointly and severally, to provide such housing wherever needed by our rapidly growing defense program. No funds are provided, but any funds available to United States Housing Authority may be used. All projects will be subject to the approval of the President and a determination by him that an acute shortage of housing exists in the locality which impedes the national defense program.

"Low rentals will be charged, within the financial capacity of the workers, and in the case of the War and Navy Departments, the rental reserved will be sufficient to return to the United States Housing Authority the cost of the project. Projects now under construction by United States Housing Authority may be devoted to the national defense program."

No reference had been made to the subject of the above amendments in the report of the House committee (H. Rept. 2257), or in the report of the Senate committee (S. Rept. 1863, or in the debate.

Section 204 of title II of Public Law 671 provides that although the construction under this title would be war housing, that "such projects shall be deemed projects of a low-rent character for the purpose of any of the applicable provisions of title I of" the United States Housing Act of 1937. It provided for war housing chiefly by making such construction exempt from requirements of the United States Housing Act of 1937 as to eligibility of occupants (not subject to sections 2 (1) and 2 (2)), and exempt from requirement of clearance of slum area (not subject to sections 10 (a) and (11) (a)).

"Functions, powers, and duties" of the United States Housing Authority are administered "as the Federal Public Housing Authority" pursuant to Executive Order 9070 of February 24, 1942. This Executive order, which consolidated housing functions by creating the National Housing Agency, also established the Federal Public Housing Authority as one of its "three main constituent units" and defined its authority, in part, as that of the United States Housing Authority (par. 3).

War housing under the Lanham Act is distinct from war housing under Public Law 671, the latter housing being constructed

from funds of the United States Housing Authority for temporary use as war housing, but otherwise deemed projects of a low-rent character.

During the war, and for advantage in administration, the Lanham Act war housing was leased to the local housing authorities.

In the Eightieth Congress, S. 866 has been introduced which, in part, would permit the Federal Public Housing Authority to pass title in war housing constructed under the Lanham Act to local housing authorities for low-rent housing. (See title XII, sec. 1201 (a) and sec. 1201 (b)).

Mr. MALONE. We often forget, in the press of new legislation, what has gone before—and the mere fact that little of the previous legislation was successful seems to give added impetus to the new proposals instead of combing out and coordinating the old.

Mr. President, I should like to have inserted at this point in the RECORD an excerpt from the New York Sun of Tuesday, April 15, 1947, entitled "United States Housing Agencies' Duplication Is Costly—House Committee Investigators Turn Up Two Pay Rolls of Three Hundred Persons, Each Performing Same Functions." I offer this article for the RECORD, Mr. President.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES HOUSING AGENCIES' DUPLICATION IS COSTLY—HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE INVESTIGATIONS TURN UP TWO PAY ROLLS OF THREE HUNDRED PERSONS, EACH PERFORMING SAME FUNCTIONS

(By Edward Nellor)

Investigators of a special House subcommittee on the Federal Public Housing Authority and other Government corporations have turned in a stinging report on the costly duplication of operations in the New York-New Jersey area, The New York Sun has learned.

Aided by the Treasury Department and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the House staff uncovered evidence that in New York City the Municipal Housing Authority and the Federal Government's Regional Authority operate side by side, duplicating almost to a man the individuals paid from public funds who perform the same work. In all the local Housing Authority and the Regional Office of the FPHA employ over 300 individuals each, with the Federal office laying out $94,000 of Uncle Sam's dollars annually for office and storage space that is unnecessary in the face of the local unit's operations. This cost is in addition to salaries.

In the New Jersey area, one of the States in Housing Region No. 2, the Housing investigators found evidence of irregularities in the expenditure of public funds, as well as indications that efforts are being made to perpetuate the Housing Authority, although the Congress has specifically ordered the disposal of Government-owned home developments. At Audubon, N. J., near Camden, and at Harrison, where two public housing developments are in operation, the investigators uncovered many strange and costly manipulations, including efforts by a CIO official to secure the purchase of dwellings for $5 that cost over $5,000 to construct.

CONDITIONS WORSE ELSEWHERE

Actually however, the findings in the New York-New Jersey area are somewhat less startling than those uncovered in other Federal housing regions in the Nation. In the San Francisco area, for example, the investigators found evidence of fraud, inefficiency, pay-roll padding, drunkenness, domination by the CIO and by Communists. Other housing areas in the country yielded examples of squandered public funds, all of which will be used as the basis of budget-cutting efforts as the housing agencies submit their budget requirements to Congress.

Today the Government is expending a vast sum for salaries and the maintenance of offices for various housing bureaus. All of them have sought more money for the fiscal year 1948, despite the fact that Congress issued the liquidation mandate. In almost all instances subsidies are being paid, although the investigators found that tenants are earning far above the minimum salaries set for renters when the low-cost developments were first constructed. The Government is, in fact, still paying the cost of Federal Works Agency developments started over 10 years ago. One of these developments is still in hock to the United States Treasury for over $360,000,000 and another, also obligated to the United States taxpayer, has set aside funds totaling over $2,000,000 for "contingencies which might arise within the next 60 years."

The local housing authority is the largest local authority operating Federal housing in the United States, with a total of 31 projects, comprising 39,737 dwellings. In all, in region 2, there are 44,715 dweling units in this category, with 35 separate local offices in New York, 24 in New Jersey, 20 in Pennsylvania, 3 in Maryland, 1 in Delaware. In all, New York authorities operate 40 percent of these dwellings, but alongside these functionaires are the region's pay-roll-consuming corps which could well be abolished, the House staff concluded.

FIND MANIPULATION OF FUNDS

At Harrison Gardens, in Harrison, N. J., the House staff learned that there were many questionable manipulations of housing funds being condoned. Coal, in one instance, was purchased for the development after it had been converted to using oil. After pressure from the House staff, a director of the project was removed, but no action was taken to obtain an accounting of the funds. Questions put to Irving Goodman, Director of the Public Housing Auditing Division in Washington, were "unsatisfactorily answered," according to the investigators, who charged that "either the Federal auditors ignored the large number of irregularities and fraudulent transactions by the regional office in New York or the investigators lack the capabilities necessary in this field." No estimate of the amount of the loss to the taxpayer is given in the report.

At Harrison the investigators found evidence of—

1. Collusion in the awarding of contracts.
2. Kick-backs on contracts.
3. Exorbitant cost of work.
4. Nonperformance of work under contracts.
5. Failure to require posting of performance bonds for work under contracts.
6. Failure to make claim for settlement of property damage and guaranties.

Near Camden, where 500 dwellings were erected on a FWA contract by authority of the Seventy-sixth Congress, the investigators found many strange manipulations under way, none of which will be beneficial to the Treasury, the report indicates. The development on 100 acres of ground cost Uncle Sam $2,316,943 at the time it was constructed.

CASE OF AUDUBON MUTUAL

During the investigation the House staff encountered Henry J. Andreas, who, as president of the housing board of a group known as the Audubon Mutual Housing Corp., is seeking to purchase the property. It nows holds a lease on the development. The agents were happy about their encounter with Andreas and charge that he is on the CIO pay roll at a salary of $6,500 annually. He has also been accused of having Communist sentiments.

Andreas is quoted as telling the investigators that the Audubon Mutual Housing Corp. would buy the property from the Government or no one else would. He is charged with having offered $5 each for the homes and with threatening that the 499 tenants would refuse to move and refuse to pay rent if the Government sought to sell the project to anyone else for a fair return on the taxpayers' investment.

Among the other irregularities found at Audubon, according to the report, are the following:

1. Delinquent deposits to the United States Treasury.
2. Cashing tenants' checks contrary to regulations.
3. Excessive travel expenses. (Members of the Audubon Board of Trustees were paid travel expenses out of public funds for trips to Washington in connection with their efforts to secure purchase rights, according to the report. In addition, they were paid their prevailing hourly wage rates while absent, and in some instances double time if their travels kept them moving longer than the regular 8-hour day.)

MULTIPLICITY OF AGENCIES

In all the United States taxpayer is financing, under the title National Housing Agency, the following bureaus which are in one way or another set up to handle Federal housing problems:

Federal Public Housing Authority, Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, United States Housing Corporation, the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, Defense Homes Corporation, Federal Housing Administration, National Housing Agency, and various offshoots connected with veterans' housing and the conversion of barracks and other war developments for housing uses.

On top of this Congress is being asked to establish another housing agency under the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, which will be the granddaddy of them all, according to the report.

Billions are being expended for salaries, travel, office equipment, propaganda, and the maintenance of facilities for the duplicating housing agencies. In one instance an FPHA office has five chauffeur-driven cars at its disposal, plus a Cadillac for the administrator in the area. Such expenditures are unnecessary, the House staff maintains, although they make no estimate of the total cost to the taxpayer in the lengthy report that attempts to untangle the skein of overlapping and duplication that exists in this field today.

In summation the House report seeks to disprove President Truman's statement that he cut the budget to the bone, and offers as proof that considerable paring can be undertaken on the report of its investigators who found countless small examples of waste which add up to a sneak attack on the taxpayers' pocketbook that must be stopped.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I also offer for the RECORD at this point an excerpt from the Washington Post of Sunday, April 18, 1948. The article is entitled "Hearing Sifts Conduct of PHA Employees in San Diego Area."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN SAN DIEGO AREA—HEARING SIFTS CONDUCT OF PHA EMPLOYEES

"You mean to say," queried Representative FOREST HARNESS (Republican, Indiana), "that this man rents two homes and pays only $39 monthly for both?"

"That's right," answered House Expenditures Committee Investigator J. Robert Brown. "He used to have six kids living with him, but now he has only four, but he keeps both houses. His salary is $8,179 yearly."

The Congressman shook his head in amazement.

The surprise was duplicated several times at a congressional subcommittee hearing Thursday which heard testimony by Brown concerning the latter's investigation into alleged misconduct and corruption by Public Housing Administration employees in San Diego, Calif.

Other west coast revelations included:

A PHA employee had used a PHA dwelling as a "week end" house since 1942, although he owned another house in a different section of town. Over 3,000 veterans were waiting for housing in the Government projects at the time.

San Diego PHA employees were overstaffed by 25 percent.

San Diego PHA employees sometimes took too long lunch periods.

Leave records were incomplete.

No restrictions on use of telephones. Brown said anyone could make long-distance calls as long as they told the operator it was on official business.

The personnel officer's background didn't qualify him to handle personnel problems. His background consisted mainly of taxi driving in Denver, recruiting for Alcan Highway workers, unskilled laborer for Army Chemical Warfare Service, and drafting work at Consolidated Aircraft.

One PHA employee was transferred because she wouldn't sign a farewell plaque to a PHA area supervisor who had resigned.

PHA maintenance supervisor had borrowed Government bulldozers, scrapers, and other heavy equipment to grade his new trailer camp. He was later billed $350 but still holds same job.

A PHA employee used a Government car for transportation to and from work in violation of regulations.

Another employee "borrowed" household furnishings from PHA warehouse for use in her own home.

PHA didn't know how much furniture it owned or where it was.

PHA COULDN'T SAY "NO"

Anyone could make application for housing in the Government's housing projects in the San Diego area. An application from two teen-agers, unmarried, was accepted without question.

Scores of public-housing residences were used as business addresses for hauling, painting, beauty parlors, and other enterprises, all in violation of PHA regulations and San Diego zoning laws. To make it worse, said Brown, businesses openly advertised in the telephone book.

A top aircraft company official leased a PHA home and used it from December 1946 to February 1948 to store furniture while he was building a home.

Although PHA had thousands of desperate citizens on application rolls, several San Diego businessmen were given homes in a matter of days after making application.

PHA officials used Government cars and received per diem pay while traveling to and from conventions of the National Association of Housing Officials, all in violation of a criminal code. Brown said NAHO tried to influence housing legislation so its members wouldn't be out of jobs.

Top PHA area officials asked NAHO members to support certain politicians in a San Diego election. Contributions were also solicited.

John Arvin, San Diego area supervisor, now resigned, used a Government car for transportation to and from his fishing camp on the Colorado. Cots, blankets, and tent at the camp were all identified as belonging to Uncle Sam.

PHA Administrator John Taylor Egan, only recently confirmed to that post by President Truman, listened to the testimony with a sad and pained expression. He was scheduled to give PHA's side of the story later. Although Egan was not PHA head during the time the San Diego fiasco occurred, he has fallen heir to all PHA's troubles.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, it is now time to review the entire set-up and to determine, first, what provisions the Congress has already made, through legislation, in the housing field; second, what are the definite policies and principles adopted through such legislation; and, third, what has so far been the effect on the taxpayers of the Nation. In that connection, I have already submitted a list of public-housing legislation and excerpts from discussions in various newspapers.

Mr. President, we have the means at hand to continue using the driving force of private enterprise to meet our housing needs. In the National Housing Act, the Congress wisely provided, through the FHA, the means to aid private builders to do the housing job. To do it that way costs the Government—your constituents and mine—exactly nothing. In fact, FHA actually makes a profit for the Government through its insurance fund.

FHA assistance, in the form of insuring mortgages, provides a long-term financing device that enables builders to go ahead with all types of housing. If we can build enough houses, we can rest assured that the slum housing we all want done away with will disappear. It will no longer be able to compete with better housing that will be available at competitive prices. With enough houses available, the very force of competition will drive bad housing out of the market. That, coupled with real enforcement of our health, sanitation, and safety laws, will bring about an entirely different housing situation—and without taking billions of dollars of public money and threatening our cities with bankruptcy in the process through promoting nontaxable property construction.

We have the means to bring this about with the FHA—an already existing agency that is doing a splendid job. To quote a Detroit builder—a man who is actually providing houses in his city at reasonable prices:

> FHA mortgage insurance is the finest tool the home-building industry has ever had with which to serve the American public. It gets houses built, and it costs the Government nothing.

Before we go sailing off into this proposed dollar-strewn stratosphere, let us look at what FHA has already accomplished.

Something like nine and a half million families in the United States and its possessions are living in homes built, bought, or improved with loans insured by FHA under the National Housing Act.

Of this total, close to a million and a quarter are living in new homes planned and built as well as purchased under the FHA program. Close to 130,000 are living in over 1,900 rental housing projects planned, financed, and built under the FHA program, or will soon move into projects now under construction. Over a million and three-quarters families are living in older homes bought under the FHA program. The remainder are living in homes improved with loans insured by FHA. These homes were financed by private lending institutions with funds totaling well over eleven and a half billion dollars, insured by FHA.

The first rental housing project under the FHA program was built in 1935. During the war, 494 rental housing projects, with 37,889 units, were planned, financed, and built under the FHA program by private enterprise. Since the war, through last January, a total of 1,123 projects, with 51,819 dwelling units, have been planned and financed under the FHA program, chiefly for World War II veterans. Many of them are completed, and practically all of the others are under construction.

The volume of rental housing projects for veterans has been increasing through the past year and seems to be at the flood now. For instance, in the Washington metropolitan area alone 40 new projects, with 2,347 units, were approved in the past 2 weeks and soon will be under construction. In the past year and a quarter 221 projects, with 17,492 units, have been approved in the Washington area. Some are completed and occupied and most of the others are under construction. When the raw materials are available, such building programs will become common in every community needing additional homes.

Mr. President, time moves on. It is admitted that the Federal Housing Act needs some amendments. I shall briefly outline some of the amendments which, in my opinion, will be helpful. It is my current conviction that it will be best for the Congress to work on legislation which it can enact, and which will result in the construction of the needed housing in a businesslike way instead of creating overlapping agencies because of new legislation in addition to the existing public housing acts already on the books, a list of which I have already submitted for the RECORD. It is a long list, culminating in the Lanham Act, which provided for national defense housing.

The National Housing Act which created the Federal Housing Administration, commonly known as FHA, was approved June 27, 1934. In brief, this legislation authorized the Federal Government to insure financial institutions against losses which they might sustain as a result of loans and advances of credit for the purpose of financing alterations, repairs, improvements of existing structures, and the building of new structures. It fixed interest rates and gave the Administrator the discretion of fixing those interest rates up to a ceiling established by the law.

I briefly review that legislation because it is my humble opinion that the Congress passes so much legislation over a period of years that very few persons have any idea of how much legislation and what kind of legislation is already on the books relative to any particular subject.

There are three sections, or better known as titles, of the National Housing Act in which we have an interest. They are title I, which provides for modernization of existing housing and the construction of minimum shelter not to exceed $3,000 in cost. Title II—in order to

encourage home ownership of low-cost homes FHA's title II program includes special provisions such as 90-percent 25-year loans for the financing of such homes. In line with the lower cost levels prevailing in 1938 when this section was last considered these provisions were in effect limited to homes appraised at $6,000 or less. A special subsection of title II provided that a home for owner occupancy appraised at between $6,000 and $10,000 could be made the basis of authorization for insurance of a loan of 90 percent of the first $6,000 of appraised value, 80 percent of such value above $6,000.

The other title in which we are interested is title VI of the National Housing Act, which was added to the National Housing Act March 28, 1941, and has been amended from year to year to provide additional authorization of insurance funds. While this section was primarily designed for defense and war-housing insurance, it has been felt that it is necessary to extend this title for at least another year to provide the much-needed rental housing. Under this title a builder can obtain funds with which to build, insured by FHA up to 90 percent of the project cost.

For the purpose of discussing these three titles, I would suggest that the only legislation we need at the present time to cope with a housing shortage is that designed to stimulate and help FHA to do the job through private enterprise. I would recommend:

First. That title I of the National Housing Act be amended to provide for insurance of modernization loans up to $10,000 or a reasonable amount, as compared to the $2,500 maximum now permitted. This will permit owners of existing housing to renovate their properties and make available additional housing units.

Second. That title II of the National Housing Act be amended to recognize changes in construction cost levels and that the 90 percent 25-year-loan limits be increased from $6,000 to $7,000 of the appraised value, and that the $10,000 limit for 80 percent of such value above $7,000 be increased to $11,000. This merely means that you will increase by $1,000 the amount permitted to be insured under FHA's title II.

Third. The House already passed H. R. 5854, which increases the authorization and extends the life of title VI of the National Housing Act to March 31, 1949. This emergency legislation should be passed by the Senate.

Fourth. Many people in my State of Nevada advise me that a secondary market for GI home loans and FHA insured mortgage is necessary. We already have in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation an association known as the Federal National Mortgage Association, commonly known as the Fannie May. This association was created for the purpose of a source of secondary credit for residential mortgage loans which have been insured or guaranteed under the National Housing Act. I propose that we also include the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, better known as the GI bill. I would not favor setting up a new agency within the Housing and Home Finance Agency for the purpose of creating a secondary market. The Fannie May has been in existence for a number of years within the RFC. They know how to do the job. Their personnel is trained. It would be in the best interest of efficiency and economy to provide the necessary authorization to bring Fannie May back to life, unless evidence, not presently available to me, justifies the creation of another agency.

With these four recommendations we can overcome the existing housing shortage. We do not need to appropriate great sums for a long-range Government housing program in addition to the existing legislation. It will be a lot easier to make our existing laws work and utilize the legislation which we have already created to do this job than to set up new agencies, new bureaus, and additional road blocks in the path of private enterprise builders who have made great strides since the end of the war in solving the housing shortage.

If we would review some of the basic problems and maintain our high-wage living standard instead of adopting policies such as the Selective Free Trade Reciprocal Trade Act, which puts our workers in direct competition with the low-wage European and Asiatic workers, so they would have the means to build, our efforts would offer greater rewards.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington, to strike title VI, as amended, from the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, as amended.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the question raised by the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington is the most controversial feature of the whole housing program. He has moved to strike out the section providing for Federal loans and Federal grants for the construction of public housing, in which the rentals are to be subsidized. A considerable quantity of public housing of this type was built before the war. Since the war there have been other types of straight construction of public housing for war purposes and for war workers.

The general housing program has been very much led astray into other fields from what was intended, because of the war necessity. It was necessary that some of the public housing for low-income tenants should be used for war workers, and consequently many of the units were filled with war workers. It has been possible to get rid of those workers only very slowly. The original purpose in providing rent-subsidized housing for a certain number of the lower income groups, in order that they might not be forced into slum dwellings, which was about all they could pay for, has been diverted.

This is a long-term program. It has no relation to the immediate emergency. It is part of a general program which was worked out by our committees during the war. In 1944 we conducted extensive hearings. The Federal Government of course is up to its neck in the housing program. Under the Federal Home Loan Bank System, begun under President Hoover, Federal money is provided for private enterprise, through building-and-loan associations, to construct a large number of houses, probably as many as any other single group. Then, through FHA, established under President Roosevelt, the Federal Government has undertaken to finance private builders in other categories, and its program has been successful in reducing the cost of the carrying charges on houses. We have gone pretty far in that direction, and the pending bill goes the rest of the way. That is, this bill gives Federal assistance to almost any kind of construction for which people who can live in the houses can pay. I do not think there is any possible field we have neglected, in the effort to stimulate private housing.

The question we have to meet, in addition to private housing, arises from the tremendous number of slum dwellings, of indecent dwellings, in many cities in the United States, and to some extent in the rural districts, which have gradually developed. We have a system of private enterprise which has built millions of houses for us over the years, and yet, regardless of the fact that that system has been free, the houses at the bottom have steadily deteriorated, and there are approximately five or six million homes the rentals of which are about $15, because the homes have deteriorated. Many of them are gradually being replaced, and will be replaced through private enterprise. But I, myself, became convinced that there was nothing to show that private building in the future, any more than private building in the past, would ever eliminate the slums; and the result of simply tearing them down is to develop slums in other areas exactly as the previous slums were developed.

The difficulty arises from the fact that housing is still more expensive than it ought to be for the income of the people. Today the fact still is that the people's income is such that families that are perfectly able to pay for their food and their clothing and their other activities are unable to pay a rent sufficient to obtain a decent house.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. No. I am sorry. I prefer not to yield.

At the present moment, Mr. President, certainly not more than half of all the families in the United States and not more than half the veterans—probably less than half the veterans—can afford to buy new houses of the cheapest type of construction. The cost of housing is high. Income is high also, but, relatively, the problem is no different today from what it was in the 1920's and 1930's. In the 1920's we built more, and more houses were built, until in 1926 there were constructed approximately 900,000 houses, which was more than had ever been built in a single year prior to that time. Then the market collapsed because there was no longer any sale. Only approximately half the people of the country were able to buy new houses.

The answer made by some persons to that question is that there is a "hand-me-down" process. People can live in second-hand and third-hand houses. Of course that is true. That process

works to a certain extent. If a second-hand house is in good condition, if the neighborhood has not deteriorated, it should rent for almost the same amount as would a new house. In fact, it depends largely on whether a new house can be built and whether the rent conforms to the cost of the new house. That theory works, but by the time it gets down to the bottom of the scale there are not enough people who can pay sufficient rent to keep such houses in condition. There are not enough people to pay sufficient rent to maintain the neighborhood in which the houses are located. So the "hand-me-down" theory will go on as it has been in the past, and will always at the bottom of the scale produce a slum problem until we can cut down the cost of housing. If we can reduce the cost of housing I should say we might eliminate the problem of public housing, but otherwise there is a very considerable group of persons who are unable to pay for decent houses, but who are able to pay for everything else.

The question is, What can the Government do about it? It cannot be said that the Government has no interest in the problem. The Government has gone into it through FHA and through private housing. The Government has an interest in seeing that the lower-income groups have decent homes. It has long been recognized in this country and in England and elsewhere that there is an obligation of government to see that every family shall have a minimum amount of food in the form of relief. We have long recognized the principle that persons who cannot pay for medical care should be given a minimum of medical care. We have recognized the principle that persons who cannot pay for education should be given a free education. We have gone further in education than we have in the other fields. We have not, until within the past 10 years, recognized a similar obligation with regard to shelter. I very strongly believe we have that obligation. I believe that if we desire to have reasonable equality of opportunity for the children of this country they must be allowed to grow up in a situation in which there is at least decent shelter in which families can live as human beings and can receive a start in life free from crime and free from the demoralization of character resulting from living in a slum area.

Today housing is a more difficult problem than is relief or medical care. We have tried different methods. Can it be solved through the giving of relief? Can we solve the problem simply by paying tenants a sufficient amount to enable them to pay their rent, if they receive a very low income or no income at all? The general answer is that that will not solve the problem. There are still slum areas, and in all probability we shall not improve them. The persons who own them will simply receive larger rents. They may put the housing in better condition, but no one will build a new home on the chance that 10 years from today someone may not be receiving relief. We do not know whether it will work. We do not know how well relief tenants will be aided. We do not know whether the State will give them relief.

An effort was made to devise some plan of building homes to take the place of those in slum areas. There must be a more direct cash subsidy. There cannot be any tax exemption. Money is not sold as municipal bonds are sold. The full rate of interest must be paid. Approximately twice the cash subsidy will have to be given to subsidize private owners. In the first place, no private owner wants to do that sort of thing. He does not want to build a home on a subsidy basis, because the Government will tell him in detail the rent that must be paid, what kind of tenants he must take in, and what kind of tenants he must exclude. It simply is not worth the trouble for a man to invest his own money and try to run his own affairs in connection with that kind of a subsidized private home. We will not succeed if we want to get housing in conformity with the average income of many million families. For instance, a man who is receiving $100 a month might pay $25 a month for rent. In a city we would have to supply an apartment for him costing approximately $3,000 or $4,000. The universal testimony is that an apartment of any decent character cannot be constructed for less than $6,000 or $7,000 or $8,000. Such a person cannot live in a new apartment unless we are prepared to subsidize it. Without that there does not seem to be any way in which we can get private houses down to the lower level required. I think we should do it.

There has been much criticism of the bill by real estate boards and private contractors. As the bill is written, there is not the slightest competition with private industry. We provide in the bill that no one shall be allowed to occupy a house in one of these areas if he is paying within 20 percent of the rental which must be paid for housing of a reasonably decent character in the particular community. As we have limited the terms of the bill, no private industry is justified in making the claim that there is any competition with industry in the type of public housing proposed in title VI. So far as I can judge, no way can be discovered to eliminate slums, unless while we are reducing the cost, we are helping private industry.

I do not see any way we can eliminate the depreciated housing at the bottom unless we begin at the bottom also and build up with decent subsidized housing. The cost will run from $150,000,000 to $160,000,000 a year, more or less continuously, provided full subsidy is given. Of course, full subsidy has not been given during the war, and if full subsidy is not given there may be very little cost. In recent years it has cost the Federal Government almost nothing, but that is because housing has not been used for the purpose for which it was intended. It has been used for war workers instead of for low-rent tenants, and there has been very little cost to the Government. I think we should contemplate contracts which may cost the Federal Government $160,000,000 a year for 500,000 units. If we can once set the example, if we can establish a 5-year program, I have reasonable hope that by that time we shall find methods of reducing costs, and possibly we may find methods of combining that housing with the elimination of slums. We may ultimately find a solution that may require no further public housing. I certainly do not think it is necessary to house all the people who receive low incomes. A large number of them find perfectly decent housing in the outskirts of cities where plumbing facilities are not so necessary. Certainly a family living in a city without indoor water facilities or toilet facilities is living in a slum, under modern conditions, which no city should tolerate.

Under the plan proposed, the Federal Government will pay most of the cost of the subsidy. I have told the real estate people that if they have any other plan, if they are willing to say, "This should be changed in this way, you ought to think of the limit of the income of the people who live in this area"—if they are willing to require that the States contribute a larger percentage—I am perfectly willing to consider changes in the system. But they have insisted upon complete opposition to public housing, and simply because public housing is included in the bill, they did not even want to have the bill considered. They have objected to the entire bill, although the truth is that 90 percent of it relates to private housing, and 90 percent of it meets with their approval.

As I have said, I think the title we are discussing is an essential part of the bill. A complete housing program cannot be carried on unless we are prepared to provide some public housing at the bottom of the scale, and set an example, help eliminate slums, and take the edge off the problem at the bottom.

The bill is not intended necessarily to take care of so-called perpetual relief clients. Most of them are transient. They go from one town to another. They have jobs, and then lose them. It is intended to take care of the lowest income group, people who have steady employment, or who have some steady income at a low level.

We do not want to turn the project into an institution. Many relief clients should be in institutions and not in public housing. Many relief clients should be taken care of, if they have no families, for the time being, and then let go their own way. The proposal is intended for solid citizens who have jobs, but whose pay is so low that they are not able to provide decent homes for themselves and families.

I now yield to the Senator from Wisconsin if he wishes to ask me a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I had hoped we might be able to attain some unanimity of opinion on the question of public housing, and still hope that we may. As the Senator knows, I have been discussing this subject with him for some time, and going into it in great detail. I have not had an opportunity to talk with him about it in the past few days, unfortunately.

I have been discussing an amendment which was prepared either by the Senator or his staff, and I think it is a substantial improvement amendment which

the Senator originally suggested. However, I note that he still completely bars relief recipients from public housing. I agree with the Senator that public housing should not be for itinerant reliefers, but there are a great many good, substantial people on relief, through no choice of their own, many of them through no fault of their own.

I have in mind, for example, a gentleman in my home town who has one crippled leg, and who has seven children. All he can do is run an elevator. He receives $80 a month, and is getting relief on the side. That man and his children are inadequately housed. With public housing as it is presently administered, he is to all intents and purposes barred from public housing.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, let me interrupt the Senator to say that man to whom he refers is not barred from public housing. Many public housing projects today have 25 or 30 percent relief clients, and particularly in this man's case, he having a definite income of his own, earning an income as an elevator operator, he is not even considered a relief client, even if he gets relief. He is a regularly employed man. He gets relief probably because of having seven children, but he would not be classified as on relief, under most public housing administrations.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me correct the Senator. In our studies of the housing situation we did not find a single public housing project in which there were anywhere near 25-percent relief clients. Dillon Myer testified—and I think he stretched the point very much—that of the 50,000 families in public housing a short time ago, roughly 11 percent were receiving some type of public assistance.

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator will yield, the 50,000 families would include all the families in temporary Government housing and veterans' housing, and many housing projects not included in the proposed program at all.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me finish my thought. I am inclined to believe that if we are to have public housing as a permanent activity, then we must recognize that we should take care of those at the very lowest income level. If we do, I believe we can get the Senate almost unanimously to go along in our public-housing program. But, as the Senator knows, with the presently employed selective process of obtaining tenants for public housing, there is a definite discrimination against the very low-income group.

If the reasoning behind public housing is sound—and I think it is, though I believe it better to call it "welfare housing"—then we should start where the need is greatest, at the very bottom, and if the Senator would join with me in offering an amendment, not to give priority to relief cases, but rather to prevent any discrimination against families because they were receiving some type of public assistance, if he would join with me in that type of an amendment, so that no longer could there be discrimination against families because they were so unfortunate that they had to obtain some type of public assistance, I for one would be glad to support the public housing bill wholeheartedly.

Mr. TAFT. There is an amendment, which I thought had been submitted to the Senator, which, as I read it, provides substantially that—

> Every contract made * * * shall require that, as between families of equally low income otherwise eligible for admission to such housing, the public housing agency shall not discriminate against any such families because their incomes are derived, in whole or in part, from public assistance.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have not seen that amendment.

Mr. TAFT. I should be perfectly willing to accept such an amendment. That seems to carry out the Senator's suggestion, so perhaps we can agree on it.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator. I should like to ask him one other question. In what I say by way of preface I intend no criticism of the present public housing officials.

In our studies we have gotten the definite impression that the present administration of public housing is in rather a bad situation. I do not think we can blame that on any one in particular. As the Senator knows, during the war and subsequent to the war we threw into public housing a great number of different corporations, each with different assets, each with different bookkeeping systems. The final result was, as the Senator knows, that the General Accounting Office and Price & Waterhouse were called in to conduct an audit. They reported to the Senate that they could not conduct an intelligent audit of the books of public housing, since no record was kept of accounts receivable and accounts payable. There was, for example, in the San Francisco area, one item of $97,000, representing the value of building material which apparently had disappeared; no one knew where it went to.

Since that time, under the able supervision of Mr. Foley, I think the situation in respect to public housing has been improved a great deal. I understand that of the 66 accounting deficiencies reported by the General Accounting Office, all except 10 have been substantially cured.

Our study would indicate that one of the reasons why the administration of public housing has been so very bad is the vast number of jobs the Public Housing Administrator has to handle. I wonder if the Senator would be inclined to join with me in an amendment to his public-housing section taking away from the public houser everything but the administration of the public housing; for example, take away from him the responsibility of handling and disposing of the Greenbelt towns, take away from him the handling of war housing, and narrow his job down to the sole work of handling public housing.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator asks me a question, and I would answer in the affirmative. I had not thought of that, but I am very anxious to separate this particular operation from all the excrescences which have grown up during the war. I have not considered the question nor consulted with other proponents of the bill, but I should think something of that kind certainly might be worked out.

Of course, the Senator from Wisconsin understands that the public houser, whoever he is, does not operate the housing. The housing is operated locally. At present the public houser operates the Ohio agency in Cincinnati, but everything else is operated by a local metropolitan housing authority, an agency of the State, or an agency of the city. The public houser does not actually administer the housing. All he does is to approve the loans and the contracts, and to see that provisions respecting them are carried out.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio one further question. It is not that I need enlightenment and rather to make a record, in view of the fact that laws such as this are interpreted in the light of what the sponsors say on the floor while the bill is under discussion. I should like to ask this question: As the Senator from Ohio knows, the cost limitation per unit of public-housing units up until this time has been $4,000 per unit in the cities of less than one-half million population, and $5,000 in cities of over one-half million population. Prior to the war there had been approved roughly some 100 public-housing projects. With increasing costs, however, as the result of the war, all those projects were, in effect, frozen, because the buildings could not be constructed within the limit provided by the act.

At the last session of Congress there was introduced a bill, which was passed by both Houses and signed by the President, known as the McCarthy bill, which gave the cities permission to raise the money to make up the difference between the cost limitation in the public-housing bill and the current costs. For example, in Milwaukee, Wis., it was discovered that the current cost per unit runs about $7,680. That meant the city has gone about the task of raising the difference between $5,000 and the $7,680; $2,680 for each of 222 units. Am I to understand that the Senator's amendment—I understand it will, but I want to have the statement in the RECORD—and my amendment also, will allow the city of Milwaukee, the city of New York, and any of the other cities that took advantage of the bill, in effect to recoup what they themselves have invested because of these costs?

Mr. TAFT. I have not studied the legal connection between the bill passed at the last session and the pending bill. I understand that this measure does not change the power of the Administrator to delegate that authority to the Public Housing Administrator, so that the same process may continue, in my opinion, as could go on before the passage of this bill. That is, the cities may make up the difference as the Senator desires.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to say that the amendment does specifically

provide for the continuance of that which was provided for in the so-called McCarthy bill. It will make the increased cost limitation applicable to any projects which have proceeded, prior to enactment of the pending bill, under the provisions of Public Law 301, Eightieth Congress, permitting the development of projects which cost in excess of the statutory cost limit, provided excess costs are contributed by the locality.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. So that the RECORD will be clear, let me ask the Senator from Ohio a question. As the sponsor of the pending measure I believe it is the Senator's understanding that cities such as Milwaukee and New York which took advantage of the McCarthy bill will not be penalized, but they will be able to recoup and recapture the amount they contributed in order to have their public housing projects unfrozen. Is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator states another question a little different from the first question.

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes, it is not the same question.

Mr. TAFT. As to the recouping, I shall have to study the bill somewhat further, I think.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me ask the Senator this question then: If upon studying his amendment the Senator from Ohio is of the opinion that it does not do that—incidentally my amendment does—if the Senator is of the opinion that his amendment would in effect penalize cities that have gone forward and contributed their own money, would the Senator then be willing to accept my amendment, which does protect cities that took upon themselves the task of making the necessary advances in order to get construction started pending action on this bill?

Mr. TAFT. This bill increases the cost limit, or permits the increase. What the Senator asks is if the city of Milwaukee constructed buildings within the total cost now permitted and paid out some of its own money, could the city get back the difference. Is that it?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, if the construction cost in Milwaukee exceeded even the new limit I do not suppose the Senator would expect the city to get back the excess over the new limit.

Mr. McCARTHY. No. I may say, Mr. President, that I have checked with the chief counsel of the HHFA and he tells me that the Flanders amendment, the one the Senator is sponsoring, does provide for the recoupment; but I wanted that definitely clear in the RECORD so that the question cannot be raised at a later time.

Mr. TAFT. If it is not clear, I shall be glad to have it made clear, because it seems to me that all public housing constructed since the war—and those are about the only cases of public housing built under this general plan—should have the same cost limits.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. On April 15th I introduced into the RECORD, in connection with the discussion of the bill, a telegraphic message from the mayor of the city of St. Louis. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio if he would have any objection at this moment to my presenting a telegraphic message to me from the mayor of Kansas City, Mo., which bears upon the bill?

Mr. TAFT. I should be delighted to have the Senator do so.

Mr. DONNELL. The telegram was received in Washington on April 15, 1948, and is as follows:

> Am advised Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill scheduled for debate in Senate this week. Its provisions will greatly aid one phase of our housing program which is in desperate need of encouragement. City council solidly favor public money aid in slum clearance which problem can never be solved solely by private enterprise because no profit motive there. Public subsidies would be largely offset by decreased costs in crime and disease. Slum areas produce five times more tuberculosis cases and six times more juvenile delinquency than the over-all city average. Sincerely hope you will support Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill which so vitally concerns welfare of large cities particularly.
>
> Mayor WILLIAM E. KEMP.

I thank the Senator from Ohio for permitting the interruption.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, does the Senator from Wisconsin wish to suggest amendments to title VI? Does the amendment I submitted meet with his views as to the nondiscrimination against relief clients?

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to have a few minutes to look it over, if I may.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. I assume that if these amendments are to be submitted they should be submitted before the motion to strike out the entire title is put, and I assume that they are in order. Amendments to title VI which may be proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin or myself, or upon which we might agree, are amendments to my amendment. The only parliamentary inquiry is whether those are in order before the motion to strike out part of my amendment is put. That is the only thing on which I wish assurance. I feel confident that they are in order. They are amendments in the second degree. They are amendments to my amendment. They certainly would be in order if we did not have the Cain amendment. As I understand the rule, an amendment to matter which is sought to be stricken out is in order, and is put before the motion to strike out.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the motion to strike out is itself an amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator's amendment is an amendment in the first degree; and the amendment to strike out a part of it is an amendment in the second degree. Then comes the question whether it is in order to offer another amendment to any part of the text of the Senator's amendment, which would be an amendment in the third degree.

Mr. TAFT. No; it would be an amendment to my amendment. It would not be an amendment to the Cain amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. It would be an amendment to the Senator's amendment; but it would be an amendment proposed to take the place of another amendment which is pending, which is also an amendment to the Senator's amendment. The Cain amendment is an amendment to the Senator's amendment, because it is a motion to strike out a part of it.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. When a motion is made to strike something out, the matter to be stricken out may be perfected first, as I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The ruling of the Chair is that the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, under rule XVIII, is subject to amendment before the motion to strike is put.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, what did the Chair rule?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under rule XVIII the amendment of the Senator from Ohio is subject to amendment prior to putting the motion to strike.

Mr. BARKLEY. That ruling would apply only to that part of the amendment which is sought to be stricken out. It could not apply to some other part of the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. Some other part of his amendment could not be amended while this question is pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. It applies only to title VI.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to know what is proposed to be done.

Mr. TAFT. The amendment has not yet been offered.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I believe that this amendment is infinitely better than the amendment previously suggested. In fairness to many public-housing administrators, I will say that no such provision would be necessary at all in some areas. I know that many administrators now do what I would like to force them all to do. However, I believe that some administrators disregard the question of need. I wonder if the Senator from Ohio would have any serious objection to adding to his amendment the following language:

> In selecting tenants the question of the greatest need shall be given paramount consideration.

The purpose is to avoid a selection of tenants by taking the cream of the crop. As I say, that practice is not characteristic of many housing administrators. The administration in some part of the country is excellent. I have cited Dallas, Tex., and Little Rock, Ark., as examples of those well run. There is an excellent project in Ohio also. On the other hand, there are some projects which are very foully administered, of which I think the Detroit, Mich., project is an example.

There the attempt is made to make selections not on the basis of greatest need, but on the basis of ease of administration. If the Senator would consent to this addition to his amendment, I could feel perfectly free to support his public-housing section.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not think I could agree to that amendment, because it seems to me to take out the very heart of my amendment. Under the terms of the suggested amendment, it seems to me that people who have no income, and who must live entirely on relief, would be given priority in housing. I do not think they should be. If they receive cash every day from relief agencies for food and clothing, I do not believe that they ought to live in public housing, too. Such people ought to be in institutions. Or perhaps they are transients who do not need to be taken care of. It seems to me that public housing is intended for people who have a steady income, and who are therefore people of reliability, but whose income is so low, because of the job they are doing, because of their physical condition, or for some other reason, that it is impossible for them to pay the rent for proper private housing.

The Senator's amendment seems to give complete priority to relief clients, which is just what we do not want. I do not see why the Senator insists upon that point. It seems to me that we have gone far enough when we say that there shall be no discrimination against a man of equal income because he is a relief client. It would even be perfectly satisfactory to me to eliminate the words "equal income" if the Senator desires to do so.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I do not desire to give priority to relief recipients. I think that would be entirely wrong. What I have in mind is that in selecting tenants—and, take my word for it, this procedure is not being followed in a great number of the projects—the Administrator takes into consideration the size of the family, the amount of income, and the type of dwelling in which the family is presently housed. In other words, the need is based not only upon income, but upon the number of children and the quarters presently available, and so forth. I may have gone too far in drafting this amendment; but if we could do something to accomplish the purpose which I have in mind, I do not wish to go a step further than that. I should be glad to have the suggestion of the Senator.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I suggest that in the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Wisconsin the word "paramount" goes much further than the description of his purpose which he has just given. There is nothing higher than "paramount." That is at the top, and there is no way of getting around it. I wonder if the Senator cannot reword his amendment so as to express the purpose which he has just described.

Mr. McCARTHY. How about "due consideration"?

Mr. FLANDERS. It seems to me that "due consideration" would be perfectly satisfactory, if it is agreeable to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I think that would be all right.

Mr. McCARTHY. This amendment would then make clear the intent of Congress to accommodate families in the greatest need. Before the Senator accepts the amendment, let me say that with that amendment I will go along 100 percent with his public housing provision. However, I still believe that it would be well to separate public housing from the remainder of the bill. I do not feel as strongly on the subject with this amendment as I otherwise would; but I want the Senator to know why I shall be voting with the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] in seeking the separation. However, if the separation is not made, I wish to make it clear that I will go along and support the public housing measure with that amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator himself offer the amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 79 of the committee amendments, after line 18, it is proposed to insert the following:

(10) Every contract made pursuant to this act for annual contributions for urban low-rent housing projects initiated after July 1, 1948, shall require that, as between families of equally low income otherwise eligible for admission to such housing, the Public Housing Agency shall not discriminate against any such families because their incomes are derived, in whole or in part, from public assistance. In selecting tenants the question of greatest need shall be given due consideration.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, that amendment is acceptable to me, if it is agreeable to the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] to the substitute amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] as amended.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish very briefly, and without delaying the Senate, to register my opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] to strike the public housing provisions of the pending bill.

When I was a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency for many years the question of housing arose; and this legislation is a sort of extension of the question as it was developed by the Committee on Banking and Currency in years past. I suppose all of us regret the necessity for public housing, the necessity for spending public money to provide housing for individuals, just as all of us regret the necessity for expending money to maintain an Army and a Navy or for any other purpose, however worthy, that calls for an expenditure from the Treasury of the United States.

But now, according to the testimony developed by the Banking and Currency Committee, more than 6,000,000 families in the United States live in substandard housing, housing in which they ought not to be required to raise their children, if there is any feasible remedy for such housing.

I do not contend, Mr. President, that poverty necessarily produces crime or disease, although certainly it militates in their favor. Unwholesome, undesirable domestic conditions and neighborhood conditions undoubtedly do break down the resistance against crime and against disease and against the propagation of invidious and insidious doctrines in the minds of people who live or are reared under such conditions. Therefore it is in the public interest, it is in the interest of a high standard of life, it is in the interest of a more wholesome outlook upon the institutions of our country and our civilization, that men and women and their children be permitted, if possible, to live under wholesome conditions which create respect for our institutions and for themselves. Therefore it is in the interest of the public and it is in the interest of the permanency of our institutions that our housing conditions be as wholesome as it is possible to make them, considering the various conditions which attach to every individual living in this or in any other nation.

There is no way by which what we call slum conditions may be alleviated to any great extent through private industry. The amount of money that it is within the means of people of low incomes to pay as rents really is not sufficient to justify a profitable investment in such houses by private industry or private enterprise, and does not justify any very great expenditure for the repair of such housing, after it has reached a certain age and a certain stage of disintegration. So, as I view the situation now, we are either confronted with the necessity of providing better homes under a public-housing system; or we are required to completely destroy those houses, so that they will no longer be able to create a slum condition; or we are required to close them against human habitation, in which event we would intensify the shortage of houses elsewhere in any such community.

All of us know that so long as the supply of houses is short and inadequate, private investors will invest in the types of housing which bring in the greatest amount of income. I do not say that in criticism. That is merely in confirmation of human nature—in other words, to invest in the types of housing that bring the greatest amount of return. Therefore, in many communities the small types of houses which are within the reach of families in the low-income brackets are practically eliminated from construction and are almost eliminated from repair.

Thus we are confronted with the problem of doing something about that situation, so as to elevate the standard of living in such communities and to elevate the degree of satisfaction among persons in the lowest income brackets. Either better houses must become avail-

able, or in the interest of the health of the community we shall have to embark on a public program of tearing down such houses and not rebuilding them at all, thus creating a greater housing shortage and greater hardship in the communities in which such conditions exist.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me that from every standpoint, including the standpoint of the public good and the standpoint of the health of our people and their attitude toward our institutions and toward their own self-respect—and they must maintain their own self-respect if they are to be good American citizens and are to have respect for the institutions under which they live—we can afford to invest this amount of public money in the public-housing features of this proposed legislation.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall vote against its elimination; and I hope the Senate will reject the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Vermont how much money is involved in this authorization. I cannot find where there is any provision for the termination of such expenditures, as proposed to be authorized under the pending legislation.

Mr. FLANDERS. Five hundred thousand units altogether are provided for. When they have been built, the authorization ceases.

The estimated subsidy commitments for this low-rent housing program, excluding everything else in the bill, will be approximately $32,000,000 for 1949, $64,000,000 for 1950, $96,000,000 for 1951, $128,000,000 for 1952, and $160,000,000 for 1953.

The bill provides for a 40-year amortization; and the program disappears at the end of 40 years.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Let me state it in this way: In the first place, the total subsidies, which run for 40 years from the time of construction, could aggregate at the maximum $160,000,000 a year.

Mr. WHERRY. One hundred and sixty million dollars a year for the 40 years?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. What would that amount to, if that were the maximum? Has the Senator from Ohio figured that?

Mr. TAFT. No; and I do not see what difference it makes.

Mr. WHERRY. It would make a little difference.

Mr. TAFT. What is the cost of subsidizing such housing? It is $160,000,000 a year. We do not add the cost for the next 40 years, any more than we arrive at the total cost of maintaining the Army over a period of 10 years. If we estimate that the cost for the Army will be $10,000,000,000 a year, we do not then say that for a 10-year period it will be $100,000,000,000.

In the case of the program we are here considering, the maximum cost is $160,000,000 a year. Plans for the buildings must be made, contracts let, the property bought, and the money for the housing borrowed. It takes considerable time. I should say that there would be no cost during the fiscal year ending July 1, 1949.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there a limitation of 500,000 units?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. There is a limitation of 500,000 units.

Mr. WHERRY. That is, over the 40 years, is it not?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. So there cannot be more than 500,000 units built within the 40-year period.

Mr. CAIN and Mr. FLANDERS addressed the Chair.

Mr. WHERRY. I understood it was 5 years. Is it 40 years, or 5 years?

Mr. TAFT. No; it is 40 years. Not more than a fifth of these units can be built each year, so they cannot all be built until after 5 years. That is the 5-year amount.

Mr. WHERRY. I see.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should also like to say that the $160,000,000 a year is the maximum possible, and that is to be, and will be, reduced from the rentals obtained. There was approximately a 60-percent reduction in the case of the housing built during the war, but that is not to be expected under peacetime conditions, considering the type of tenant for whom the housing is provided. Still $160,000,000 a year is the maximum, and there will be some reduction.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there is, then, a limitation of one-fifth. That is to say, one-fifth of the entire number of units can be built within any one year. Is that correct?

Mr. FLANDERS. The limit is one hundred thousand a year.

Mr. WHERRY. One hundred thousand?

Mr. FLANDERS. For 5 years.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not quite understand.

Mr. FLANDERS. Five times 100,000 is 500,000.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; but that is over 40 years.

Mr. FLANDERS. No. There is an amortization over 40 years.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, I understand; payment will take 40 years.

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me ask another question. I will ask the question of the Senator from Vermont or the Senator from Ohio. On page 77 of the committee amendments we start with section 7, reading as follows:

> In recognition that there should be local determination of the need for public low-rent housing, the Authority shall not make any contract for financial assistance pursuant to this act with respect to any urban low-rent housing initiated after July 1, 1948;

Then this clause follows:

> (a) unless the public housing agency has submitted an analysis of the local housing market demonstrating to the satisfaction of the Authority—

Now, first, who is that authority?

Mr. TAFT. The authority is in effect the Public Housing Administrator himself, and the public housing agency is the local metropolitan housing authority, which is the creature of the city or the State.

Mr. WHERRY. It might be the mayor or anybody else set up by the city or the State?

Mr. TAFT. As a rule, it is a separate local subdivision, more or less under the control of the city government.

Mr. WHERRY. Who makes the determination under the following clause:

> (1) that there is a need for such low-rent housing which cannot be met by private enterprise;

Is that determination made jointly by the Housing Authority and the local body, or is it made solely by the local body which makes the decision that there is a need for this housing?

Mr. TAFT. It is made by the Administrator himself. Of course, he will have to act in conjunction with the local body, because the local body must present the facts to show such a situation exists, and then the Administrator must also find that it exists. It is correct that he must make a finding that it cannot be done by private enterprise.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly. But the final authority is in the Authority at Washington?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; not altogether as to the finding that it cannot be done by private enterprise.

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. One author of the bill says "No"; another one says "Yes."

Mr. TAFT. Yes. The final determination as to whether there is to be a local metropolitan authority.

Mr. ELLENDER. The local public housing agency makes the survey to determine the need for low-rent housing and must conclude that private industry cannot and will not build homes to meet that need. In addition, the governing body of the locality involved must approve such findings, that is, of need, and that private enterprise will not undertake to do the job to fill the need. After the determination is thus made, as the Senator from Ohio has just intimated, the authority in Washington is in position to enter into a contract for financial assistance by way of contributions to build a project.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. I understand, and I thank the Senator. But after that has been done, and after the papers are sent to Washington, whatever the findings may be, it is still subject to review by the authority here in Washington, and it is for him to determine whether or not the housing will be built. The authority in Washington will have the final say.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Washington authority holds the purse strings, and technically he may have the last say, since there may be more applications than there is money authorized to cover Federal contributions.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly, and it will finally make the determination. That is the question I asked.

Mr. TAFT. Let me say there may be 100 projects, with money sufficient for only 20. Somebody in Washington will have to pass on it.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no assurance that the authority in Washington would approve the recommendations made by the local board, is there?

Mr. TAFT. No.

Mr. WHERRY. The next question I should like to ask is this: How is the money to be distributed? Let us say there were 10 times as many houses needed as could be provided for under the provisions of the act which we are considering. In that event, who would get the money?

Mr. TAFT. That will be determined by the authority.

Mr. WHERRY. By the authority?

Mr. TAFT. The authority in Washington; yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there any geographical allocation?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. I still have the floor. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. TAFT. I may say I agree it might be abused, but it has not been abused, I think, in general. It has been distributed pretty much among the large commodities, in accordance with the need of housing. At least it was in the prewar period, and I see no reason why it should not be so after the war.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is possible, though, is it not, that one or two cities could exhaust the entire quota of 500,000 units? There is nothing in the bill to prevent that happening, is there?

Mr. TAFT. Nothing. New York, for instance, might, I suppose, exhaust the quota, although that would hardly be possible.

Mr. FERGUSON. I mean the bill itself neither restricts the use of the money nor allots it to any State?

Mr. TAFT. No. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. The point has been covered, but it is still left to the final authority, and the final authority, because there are no restrictions or conditions in the bill, could award this construction to one city or to two cities, within his discretion; am I correct? It could be done, could it not?

Mr. TAFT. I think it could be done, but I do not think there would be any possibility of its being done.

Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. FLANDERS addressed the Chair.

Mr. WHERRY. I agreed first to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wanted to ask the distinguished Senator from Nebraska who has, I think, presented a very constructive set of questions, whether or not his fear as to the improper distribution of these units which would be built resulted from the fact that the committee's findings show that there are 6,000,000 such units needed in order to house families presently without standard housing, whereas this program, set up for a minimum of 5 years, purports to deal with 500,000 units only.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TAFT. I only want to correct the Senator from Florida. The findings did not show that there were 6,000,000 dwellings of this kind needed.

Mr. WHERRY. I thought they did.

Mr. TAFT. The findings showed that there were 6,000,000 homes below proper standards, but we are rapidly rebuilding a larger number of them through private enterprise or replacing them through private enterprise, and the figure of 6,000,000 has no direct relation to this question. This question relates more to the income of the families of the United States than to the character of the housing.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for a question, I would appreciate hearing from some sponsor of the bill—presumably its sponsors would know more about the need for this work than would the other Members of the Senate—what, in the opinion of the sponsors of the bill, is the number of families requiring the construction of these public housing units?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I trust that the proponent of the amendment or somebody else may answer the question.

Mr. TAFT and Mr. CAIN addressed the Chair.

Mr. WHERRY. As I have the floor, I am glad to yield, if the Senator from Ohio desires to answer the Senator from Florida.

Mr. TAFT. I suppose we might reasonably say there may be 3,000,000 families, but I should very much hope that long before it would be possible to provide for such a number, the cost of housing would go down and present houses would be replaced and others built. I think the important thing is, so to speak, to take the edge off the bottom, at the worst places. I spent Sunday in Cleveland, in the colored district of Cleveland, where two of the prewar projects have been built. They have completely changed the entire character of that colored district in Cleveland. Around that locality have grown up better stores, better general standards of living, and better morale. Many of the buildings in the neighborhood, not included in the project, have been repaired. If we can once get at the heart of the problem and make a good start, I think there is a reasonable chance of having normal processes operate. We have conducted this free-enterprise system for many years, and the problem with regard to slums has risen. We are possibly edging into it a little bit, but unless we do something more we can never solve the problem. By taking the worst places and establishing dwellings of the character provided for in the bill, I believe very strongly that it may be sufficient to tip the balance so that private-enterprise plans will work and we can get away from the spiral from second-hand to fourth-hand houses which have no possibility of redemption.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to confirm what the Senator from Ohio has said in regard to the city of Cleveland. The same thing which he has described has happened throughout the country in places in which public-housing enterprises have been constructed. In my own city, which has a population of 40,000, two housing projects have been constructed, one for white and one for colored persons. In the neighborhood of both projects the character of the houses has been improved. There has been a sort of local pride injected into the owners of houses in the vicinity of the public-housing projects, so that they have been ashamed, in a sense, to allow their own houses to remain in disrepair, and have improved them because of the public-housing projects in the city. I know that what the Senator from Ohio has said regarding the city of Cleveland is true.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, that confirms the importance of getting answers to the questions which I have been propounding. No one knows where the housing will be located. It is a question of who makes the best guess. What assurance have I that any housing will come to Nebraska?

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator has risen to a position of influence in the Government which entitles him to be absolutely certain that he will get a fair share of housing in Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall not be the final authority, Mr. President. There might be some question about it.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. I merely want to advert to the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and to say that I agree 100 percent with him. I also want to pay tribute to my good friend from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who has demonstrated the qualities of his heart as well as his intellect.

The Senator from Nebraska raises the question, "How do I know that Nebraska will get any housing?" I reply, I hope none will be needed there. But that is beside the point. The time has come in this country to pass fundamental social legislation. Our small individual States are not all important after all. The whole is greater than any part. We are here as Senators of the United States. This is a national problem. It is a cancer spot on the economic body of the country. The social implications of public housing and the eradication of slum conditions are subjects which should appeal to everyone in connection with the elimination of juvenile delinquency and marital infelicity. Good housing is fundamentally needed in America. We must improve conditions over a period of years. So let us not quibble over small details. Let us start on the great need of adequate housing, so that the little people in the country, in the hinterlands, and everywhere else, can say, "Thank God. It is good to be alive in America." And let us always keep in mind that our prime objective is to create a human society in these United States, which purpose should have precedence even over an economic system. We should consider the proposed legislation in the light of its repercussions on America's life.

So, as I conclude I offer this information from page 10 of the report of a sub-

committee of the Joint Committee on Housing.

In answer to the question, "If it is your opinion that private enterprise will not be able to provide decent housing for all such families, do you favor the provision of publicly assisted low-rent housing as a means of supplying decent housing for such families?"

Twenty governors said "Yes," 4 said "No"; 68 mayors of the large cities said "Yes," and 5 said "No."

I have here a large volume of their testimony. I do not want to fill up the RECORD with it because of the cost. But the feeling of the country is for this type of legislation. I believe in the broad basis of it, which is that people in distress will realize that there is a fair deal and a chance to have a decent home in America.

With reference to the cost, go back 3 years ago when we were fighting World War II. At the peak of the war effort we spent $12,000,000,000 each month, for what? To kill men—to destroy property forever. Here we are considering a program involving $156,000,000 a year over a 5-year period. What comes first in America—war or peace? Domestic life, a fair deal for little people, or taking care of the great business interests of the country?

I submit to my friend from Nebraska let us omit the petty things and see the great objective. The United States is greater than any particular State—Nebraska or New Hampshire.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Quiet must be preserved in the galleries.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for his observations. No one is more interested in homes than I am. I was not quibbling; I was simply asking for information. I have had a great deal of experience with Government bureaus and how they operate. Sixty-eight mayors are asking for housing. Who will give it to them? I can subscribe to everything the Senator said. My questions are not quibbling questions.

Mr. TOBEY. Where will the Senator place the responsibility?

Mr. WHERRY. I am asking for information. That is why I asked the Senator where the responsibility would be in the Federal Government. Local people will not have very much determination.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has made his speech.

Mr. TOBEY. Only half of it.

Mr. WHERRY. I cannot see why there should be any objection to asking questions when an appropriation comes up, or the Senate is acting on this, that, or the other bill. I do not want war; I want peace, just as does the Senator from New Hampshire. We shall have war if we do not settle the question properly. If we leave it to the bureaus, that is where war will come. Who will receive the housing involving $160,000,000 a year? Sixty-eight mayors want it at this time. All I am inquiring is as to who will have the final determination. The Authority in Washington will have it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator knows that it cannot be left to the 68 mayors. There must be some central authority acting as the agency of the Government which is appropriating the money. The Senator speaks about bureaucrats. Congress creates a bureau and then there are bureaucrats.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want to create a bureaucrat.

Mr. BARKLEY. What would the Senator call him? If he is the head of the bureau, he is a bureaucrat.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may supply some information?

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to make an observation first.

Mr. FLANDERS. I understood the Senator from Nebraska was seeking information.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield in a moment, but I should like first to make an observation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Are these houses to be built for people who are already married or who are to be married?

Mr. WHERRY. That is another question I was about to ask. But before I do that, I should like to make this observation. The minority leader seems a little irritated at my remarks——

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I am not irritated; I am merely earnest.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is very forceful in his earnest plea. It seems to me that when we appropriate $160,000,000 for this type of housing there will be a regular parade of persons coming forward to get it. The point I was trying to make was simply that even if the need is justified, the final authority is in Washington, and there will be much difficulty in deciding where the housing shall be located.

Mr. FLANDERS. Will the Senator yield for a ray of light?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Vermont. I should like to finish what I wish to say, but I yield to him.

Mr. FLANDERS. I desire to read paragraph (d) of section 2 of the Housing Act of 1937, which reads as follows:

> Not more than 10 percent of the funds provided in this act, either in the form of a loan, grant, or annual contribution, shall be expended within any one State.

That sheds a little ray of light.

Mr. WHERRY. I asked for that information about half an hour ago, and my understanding was that there was no limitation. That adds to the strength of the bill, and I think that is a good thing. Has the Senator any more light he can throw on any of these questions?

Mr. FLANDERS. I may say there is one other item, that is, that the Senator himself, as a Member of the Senate, will have a chance to vote on the appropriation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. There is one other matter to be considered. We had exactly the same situation in the thirties, and so far as I know, there was no criticism of the authority for the manner in which it distributed and adjudged the relative merits of the different projects. So we have a certain history of impartial treatment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was the point I desired to emphasize to the Senator from Nebraska. The Public Housing Act has been on the statute books since 1937, and I have not heard of one criticism as to the distribution of the funds.

Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. ELLENDER. Last Thursday I spoke in favor of the bill, with particular reference to title VI. I felt at that time, as I feel now, that that was the title that would give rise to the most opposition. Apropos of the good that flows from public-housing projects now in operation, I read into my speech a few statements made by mayors, school teachers, policemen, and others of their findings on the question. For instance, the chief of police of Savannah, Ga., wrote as follows:

> Before Yamacraw Village (a public-housing project) was built, 19 percent of all crimes originated in that area. Now only 1 percent. I hope we can build more like them for our other slum districts. This department is short of 25 men now, and it sure helps to have Yamacraw the way it is.

Listen to this concerning a project in Ohio:

> Cincinnati, Ohio: Pneumonia deaths in Laurel Homes, a public-housing project, 2 per 1,000 population as against 14 in an adjacent slum district, and 6 per 1,000 in the city as a whole.

I cited many other instances of the same character in my speech of last Thursday, and I am very hopeful the Senator will take note of all those statements cited by me.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Under the pending bill, what percentage of the 500,000 are to be slum-clearance houses, or can the houses be built outside of the slums?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is for slum-clearance projects and for low rent housing.

Mr. FERGUSON. How many?

Mr. ELLENDER. All of them.

Mr. FERGUSON. Only for slum clearance?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; and for low-rent housing as I have just indicated.

Mr. FERGUSON. Are they to clear slums and erect houses where the slums had been?

Mr. ELLENDER. The act is not specific on the subject.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what I am getting at.

Mr. ELLENDER. The projects that have been built were originally intended to supply decent housing for families having low incomes. Some slums were of course cleared in the process. By providing low-rent housing many slum dwellers were provided for.

Mr. FERGUSON. The claim before the Senate was that the slums were to be cleared and by the clearing of the slums crime and disease and all that went with them would be reduced. What is there in the pending bill that provides that these houses shall be built where the slums are, or can the slums be left with the same ill health, the same crime, and public housing erected somewhere else?

Mr. ELLENDER. It was originally intended, under the 1937 act, to clear slums. However, in order to clear slums it was necessary to provide for those displaced from the slums, and therefore the problem became difficult of solution. Aside from that, in 1938 and 1939, when World War II broke out an acute housing shortage began to develop and as the war progressed more housing was needed. It became more or less necessary to abandon the idea of clearing slums altogether and replace them with decent housing. Notwithstanding the fact that the Public Housing Act of 1937 was originally passed in order to provide housing for low-income groups, Congress voted to permit low-rent housing projects to be used for war workers with high incomes. Such a measure was necessary to relieve the then exceedingly acute housing shortage. It is anticipated that by increasing the number of public housing units to 500,000, under the pending bill, we would be able to revert to the original intent of the 1937 act; that is, to level slums and replace them with decent housing for low-income groups. We have provided, in the pending bill, an additional method of slum clearance. Title V sets out a program for Federal aid to localities for the clearance of slums and blighted areas. Two-thirds of the cost of leveling slums will be borne by the Federal Government with the locality paying one-third. The purpose is to make it possible to write down the cost of land where slums are located, where its reuse in accord with sound planning principles will be possible.

Mr. FERGUSON. Along that line, so that the RECORD may be clear, how much money is provided in the pending bill just to clear the slums, to level the slums?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Federal Government would put up——

Mr. FERGUSON. Two-thirds?

Mr. ELLENDER. Two-thirds, up to $100,000,000 a year, for 5 years. That is the actual slum-clearance program provided for in the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is over and above the $160,000,000 a year which could be used for the erection of houses?

Mr. ELLENDER. Not for the erection of houses but for the Federal contributions for the 500,000 low-rent housing provided for in the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. And the houses need not be erected in the places where the sums were cleared?

Mr. ELLENDER. In several cases it was not done in the past.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am talking about the pending bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. This bill contains a specific provision for clearing slums. The land thus cleared will be available for redevelopment with the active participation of private enterprise. It is not anticipated that the cleared slums will be used for the building of public housing unless Public Housing is willing to pay the reuse value of the land.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it the idea that private enterprise or factories or some thing else will go in on the slum-cleared land?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; in accordance with such plans as may be agreed upon before the slums are cleared. The idea is to level the slums and fix the price of the land at such a figure for reuse purposes as will attract private investors. As I have just indicated the local public housing agency may purchase such property at its reuse value for public housing.

Mr. FERGUSON. Suppose the land is sold for more money than it cost to buy the slums and clear them; will the Federal Government get back its two-thirds?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is optimistic. Such a matter is determined before the slums are cleared. In other words, a plan is submitted which will show how the land will be used. Some may be set aside for parks, others for business establishments, and so on. Values are fixed and plans are made for disposing of the land before the slums are cleared.

Mr. FERGUSON. It will have to be cleared by condemnation?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is there any provision that if it is sold for the amount it cost to purchase it and clear it the Federal Government will receive back its two-thirds?

Mr. ELLENDER. All that the Federal Government puts up is two-thirds of the cost, writing down the land to its reuse value. In other words, from the entire cost of the acquisition and the preparation of the land for reuse there is deducted the reuse value. On the remainder, the Federal Government makes a lump-sum contribution of two-thirds and the local agency of one-third.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Michigan is now talking about the separate section, which has nothing at all to do with section 6, which has to do with the clearing of the land. As to that, the amount is not finally determined until the whole project is completed and all the profits are gotten back. All the Government pays is two-thirds of the net loss after the project is completed, apart from the question of the cost of the new construction, which has nothing to do with it. So that if it is sold for other purposes for as much as was put into it, it costs the Federal Government nothing.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. But it may take a considerable period of years from the date of purchase, when the Federal Government has to put up its money, until it is actually sold for other purposes?

Mr. TAFT. In the first place, the money, is in the form of a loan for which the municipality is responsible. The Federal Government does not actually make a final grant until the whole thing is worked out and the net cost determined, and then it puts up two-thirds of the net cost. In the meantime there is a provision for loans which the city may make from the Federal Government, or it may borrow from outside on its own credit. Most municipalities have plenty of credit, so far as that is concerned. What I am concerned about is who is going to stand the loss when the municipalities get through?

Mr. FERGUSON. Was there any reason why the Senator from Ohio did not tie in together slum clearance and the building of low-rental homes?

Mr. TAFT. They are tied together in title VI. The idea of the other title was to say to a city, "You may not want public housing. Perhaps you do not believe in public housing. Nevertheless, we will help you clear your slums and try your own method of dealing with the problem." It seems to me that the two problems, the matter of getting rid of slums and providing for low-rental housing, are tied together.

A city may proceed to tear down its slums, but unless low-rental housing is provided in their place nothing is really accomplished. Those who occupy the slums will move to other sections and the property to which they move will deteriorate and slums will again appear. If slums are to be abolished it is necessary that some low-rent subsidy housing be constructed in connection with the elimination of slums. That is the theory of title VI. The other title simply says that if a community decides to proceed with slum clearance and take a chance on what happens, we will help it do that also.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I merely want to make the record correct. The Senator from Nebraska asked what the cost of the slum-clearance program would be, and the Senator from Louisiana said $200,000,000 a year for 5 years. The Senator from Louisiana was confusing the loan with the cost of a project. There will be a total of loans of $200,000,000 a year for 5 years. The cost, the capital grants, will be $100,000,000 a year for 5 years. So the cost to the Government is one-half billion dollars, with so-called construction loans of $1,000,000,000. I want to have the record straight on that point.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator from Wisconsin how much is the program going to cost in full? What will be the total cost annually under all titles, and what are the possibilities? Who will receive the benefits?

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall be glad to answer the question. To begin with there are one-half billion dollars in

grants connected with the slum-clearance program over a period of 5 years. Second, the public housing section provides for a maximum——

Mr. WHERRY. A maximum of one-half billion dollars a year, or over a period of 5 years.

Mr. McCARTHY. No, that is the total over a period of 5 years. The public housing section provides a minimum of $160,000,000 a year for 5 years. That does not mean that the maximum will of necessity be used, though I am inclined to think, in view of the amendment submitted today giving a greater priority to the low-income group, that there will be more than $160,000,000 used normally. The increase will not amount to too much. There is a provision in the bill creating, not a research agency, but a division which will coordinate the research of the various Government departments and private industry.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the purpose of that?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is to work primarily toward two objectives, which we cannot accomplish merely by passing a law. No. 1 is to get a standard of codes. If that job is to be done well it will mean the use of a considerable number of competent men, which will cost a great deal of money. How much, I do not know. No. 2 is to get the standardization of measurement. I am talking about the entire bill all the way from top to bottom. I understood the Senator wanted to know the entire cost.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. It will require men to bring about the standardization of measurements.

In that connection, I might say that we have been delving into what is known as modular coordination. That merely means a standardization of measurements. As Senators know, we have standardization in practically every industry except the housing industry, and those engaged in the industry tell us that if we can secure standardization of measurements and standardization of codes those two things alone can result in the ultimate reduction of housing costs by 25, 30, or 35 percent. I think the cost will be low in view of the accomplishments to which we may look forward.

No. 3 is that we are providing technical help for the veterans in setting up co-ops. That again will require a sizable number of competent men. It is impossible, however, to know what the cost will be. It will depend on the number of veterans' co-ops which may be started.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator think that that will be any appreciable amount? What is his opinion about it?

Mr. McCARTHY. Frankly, I will say to the Senator I do not have any idea. We certainly will not begin with any great number, and that item will be controlled, of course, in the appropriations which is provided.

Mr. WHERRY. Is that the largest benefit the veterans will receive under the bill?

Mr. McCARTHY. We are setting up a veterans' cooperative which may obtain a 40-year loan with a 95-percent guaranty. Then, as I said, we go a step further. We provide for technical assistance on the theory that if we merely say to a group of young men, "Here is some money; go ahead and try to build some houses", we will do more harm than good. We feel that if they desire to set up a veterans' cooperative they can call on the housing agency to send to them some competent men to give the veterans the benefit of their advice.

That, Mr. President, covers substantially, I believe, all the cost under the bill. There are a great number of contingent costs, it will be understood. The section setting up the secondary markets might result in an ultimate loss. The extension of title VI, of course, commits us to $160,000,000 by way of loan guarantees.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what was provided in legislation passed previously by Congress, and that will be a part of the pending legislation, as amended, if it is passed.

Mr. McCARTHY. This measure merely extends the old provision and adds more money.

Mr. WHERRY. Such provision has already been made by previous legislation.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes. We add another $10,000,000 in possible liability under title I, section 3, loans; but the only actual cost is one-half billion dollars for slum clearance, and $160,000,000, and then there is the public housing, and the salaries of the additional men required because of the technical assistance furnished.

Mr. WHERRY. Generally speaking it may run as high as $300,000,000 a year. If we take $100,000,000 a year for slum clearance, that would be one-half billion dollars in 5 years, and the $160,000,000 for housing in title VI, and all the remaining items might make the total run as high as $300,000,000 a year. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe it would be somewhat less than that. When we speak of a slum-clearance program costing $100,000,000 a year, the Senator will understand we are merely scratching the surface.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, I understand.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the city of New York wanted to clear its slums it could use the entire sum.

Mr. WHERRY. The city of New York alone could use the entire sum. That is the reason why I made the inquiry as to whether there would be proper distribution. I agree with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] that the problem is a national one. There is no doubt about that. But in view of the fact that $100,000,000 of expenditure is contained in one title, and $150,000,000 in another, it was my thought that some city could use the total amount annually and still not do a complete job in that city. Does the Housing Act of 1937 provide that only 10 percent of the money expended may be used on one project within a State?

Mr. McCARTHY. No, that is not in the slum clearance provision.

Mr. WHERRY. Where is it?

Mr. McCARTHY. It is in the public housing provision. So far as the slum clearance section is concerned, the entire amount could be used in any one city or in any one State.

Mr. WHERRY. Is not that true in the case of public housing? Could not the entire amount be used by one city?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think there is a provision in the Flanders amendment that not more than 10 percent may be used in any one State.

Mr. WHERRY. That is provided in the original bill of 1937.

Mr. McCARTHY. That provision is still in operation.

Mr. WHERRY. But so far as slum clearance is concerned, the entire amount could be spent in one city.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. No doubt the Senator has voted on many occasions for title VI of the National Housing Act, whereby we provided up to $5,350,000,000 to guarantee loans. There is no prescribed method by which such guaranties are to be distributed. It is all handled from Washington.

Mr. WHERRY. The point is—and I think it is a point which should be given further consideration—that this housing bill is complicated.

Mr. ELLENDER. No doubt about that. I am somewhat confused at times, although I have been wrestling with the problem for over 10 years.

Mr. WHERRY. Many amendments are being offered on the floor of the Senate. I think we should try to understand them. If some of the questions seem elementary to those who are working with the problem, let me say that my questions have been asked for constructive reasons, to try to bring out what is involved in the amendment before us. What does it do? What would be the situation if the amendment were agreed to? What would be the situation if the language sought to be stricken were left in the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. I can tell the Senator in a few words what would happen if title VI is stricken. It will mean that what will be left in the bill will provide ways and means by which housing can be provided for those who can pay rentals of from $45 and up per month. The bill then would not take care of that segment of society which needs help the most, namely, the low-income group, that cannot afford to pay an economic rent.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to ask a question, in connection with the question which was propounded and the statement which was made? The statement was made that the money could all be spent in one community for slum clearance. That was not my understanding.

Mr. TOBEY. I was about to speak on that subject.

Mr. President, answering the inquiry of the Senator from South Carolina and the collateral inquiry of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] we all know—and we have never tried to cover it up—that it is not possible under this bill to take care of the entire national slum clearance needs. What we are doing is making a start on a very fundamental and worth-while project.

Under the terms of the bill we localize responsibility for administration in the National Housing Agency in Washington. As one who has been a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency since the inception of the housing legislation, I wish to pay tribute to the Housing Administration in Washington, headed by Mr. Foley. I have great confidence in him and his staff. In my judgment they have done an admirable job. Therefore it is important and necessary to localize the responsibility for administration. So the program is placed in their charge. They will look the situation over, just as the Senator or I would, to see where the sorest spots are, to see where the human needs are greatest, and then they will allocate money for projects in various parts of the country, to give a demonstration of what America can do to ease the situation. We cannot encompass the whole problem, but we shall do the best we can within these limitations.

Mr. President, I wish to quote very briefly and tersely from the report of the subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Housing. This has reference to the remarks which I previously made about the response of mayors and governors. Certain questions were propounded to the mayors of 60 of the largest cities in the country. The first question was:

If there is low-rent housing in your city developed under the United States Housing Act of 1937, has it served low-income families?

There were 51 affirmative answers to that question and 4 in the negative.

The next question was:

Has it been built and operated efficiently?

There were 50 affirmative responses and no negative responses.

The next question was:

Has it increased neighboring real-estate values?

There were 35 affirmative answers and 7 in the negative.

The next question was:

Has it reduced the cost of city services?

Thirty-four mayors answered "Yes" and five answered "No."

The next question was:

Have delinquency and health conditions in the neighborhood improved?

There were 42 affirmative responses and no negative responses.

The sixth and last question was:

Has it competed with standard private housing?

There was 1 affirmative response, and there were 46 negative responses.

I submit that information for the record as a very effective and convincing compilation of the opinions of a considerable number of the mayors of our great cities in America.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to ask one question of the Senator from New Hampshire. On the basis of the answers to the questions asked the mayors, does the Senator believe that the mayors and governors are talking about 500,000 units of public housing?

A few minutes ago the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] asked how many ultimate units were contemplated. I should like to say to him, as one member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, that I wish I could tell him the answer to his question. I cannot. Unfortunately—but truthfully—it cannot be answered by anyone.

A little while ago the very distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], if I correctly remember the figures he stated, was speaking in terms of 6,000,000 as being the number of substandard units throughout the country. Yet I hold in my hand a book covering the hearings held before the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I find that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], a member of that committee, has concluded, on the basis of what he assumed to be the facts, that there are 10,000,000.

I have just concluded a conversation in the anteroom with one of the sponsors of the legislation. I refer to the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. His conclusion is that if a comprehensive study were made—and it has not been made—it would show a figure nearer 2,000,000.

To revert to my original question of the Senator from New Hampshire, mayors and governors throughout the country maintain that private enterprise cannot build houses in which people of limited and low incomes can live. We are not talking about 500,000 units of housing costing ultimately $5,000,000,000 or $6,000,000,000. We are speaking of a figure between 2,000,000 and 10,000,000. I think the question originally posed by the Senator from Florida is extraordinarily important. With the prevailing confusion, uncertainty, and doubt on this question, we ought to divorce the question of welfare housing from a housing bill which is primarily designed to relieve our housing shortage, in order that we may, at the proper time, settle down and determine the welfare and social aspects of housing in this country.

There was no reason for discussing the national aid-to-education bill as a part of another program. When we get around to debating the need for Federal aid to medicine, we shall not confuse it with any other subject. We ought to make up our minds whether we are here to try to relieve and minimize and get rid of our housing shortage, or whether we are here to legislate in terms of social legislation.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President——

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I thought the Senator from Washington propounded a question to me.

Mr. CAIN. I did.

Mr. TOBEY. May I answer it?

Mr. KEM. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri will wait a moment, I should like to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire, because a question was propounded to him.

Mr. TOBEY. I think the question was, Upon what were the answers of the mayors to which I referred premised?

Mr. CAIN. Yes.

Mr. TOBEY. Those answers were premised on the operations of the act of 1937 in the respective communities. Those answers constitute a lesson in experience. They are the voice of experience, speaking through the mayors of 60 cities, in answer to five or six subdivisions of one main question. I believe that the answers are a very impressive lesson.

Coming down to the objections of the Senator from Washington, and his desire to divorce public housing from the pending bill, I am opposed to his amendment. I have lived with this problem for 4 years. The entire housing problem is made up of many factors.

The first factor is the general housing shortage. The second is the question of public housing. In my judgment, the Housing Administration in Washington has done a wonderful job.

A collateral question is the question of slum clearance.

So America, looking upon the great problem of housing, sees it as a threefold problem. We should not separate one part from the other. I presume that in the back of the mind of the Senator from Washington and that of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin there is the thought that if we now divorce public housing from the pending bill, sometime later we shall consider the problem of public housing. In the language of the old flour manufacturer out in the West, I say, "Eventually; why not now?" The need exists.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to respond to the Senator in a few words. If the conclusion of the Senator that we should consider all the component parts of the problem at the same time were agreed to by everyone, those of us who are looking for facts still believe that we are entitled to know what it is that we are discussing, in terms of our final objective. We do not know where the figure of 500,000 units came from. We have not yet been told how much the program is actually to cost, and who is to pay the bill. If it is so desirable to have 500,000 units—and it may be—it must be equally desirable to have as many more units as there are families in need of the same treatment.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to address an inquiry to the Senator from Washington. I was very much interested in the estimate he made of the total cost of this proposed legislation. I believe he quoted the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], one of the sponsors of the bill, as saying that in his judgment probably approximately 2,000,000 units would have to be constructed, in order to accomplish what we have in mind. I should like to ask the Senator from Washington the approximate cost of each of those units.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the only answer I can give the Senator from Missouri is that I have been told that the 500,000 units of public housing contemplated to be constructed under this bill over a 5-year period, and to be amortized over a 40-year period, will cost approximately $6,000,000,000. If that be true, inasmuch as the estimate was that there would be an ultimate need for 2,000,000 units, I suppose that in arriving at the cost of the 2,000,000 units we would use exactly the same ratio. Therefore, instead of having a cost of $6,000,000,000 for 500,000 units, the total

cost for the 2,000,000 units would be four times the $6,000,000,000 figure, or $24,000,000,000—to use the most conservative, long-range prediction that I, at least, have been able to obtain.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. In the first place, I did not say that 2,000,000 units should be built. I said that probably about 2,000,000 new housing units are needed at the present moment, if we are going to do the job all at once. But I said that in my opinion if we can take the edge off that need by providing for the construction of 500,000 units, the rest might well take care of themselves, through reduced building costs and greater private building operations and the operation of other sections of the program which would result in tearing down unsatisfactory housing. I said I would be very hopeful that we might never have to provide more than 500,000 units.

Mr. CAIN. I certainly share the hope of the Senator from Ohio, without having any reason to believe that it represents a reasonable or an attainable goal.

Mr. TAFT. So far as private industry is concerned, the private contractors say they can do the job without any Government aid. My position is that, although they can do something, I do not think they can solve the entire problem by themselves. They say they do not need any of the proposed governmental assistance, and they say that the 2,000,000 units needed will be provided as a result of the use of other construction methods by private enterprise. I agree that there is something to that argument, but I do not believe private industry alone will ever be able to solve the problem. I hope private industry will solve enough of it so that the Government will not have to provide for more than 500,000 units.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, what does the record show as to the number of families now living in slums in the United States?

Mr. TAFT. My estimate, a very rough one, is approximately 2,000,000. That is a very rough estimate, and I do not guarantee it in any way.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from Ohio has said that his very rough estimate is 2,000,000, let me point out that there have been two other guesses, one set forth in the hearings and one given by the Senator from Kentucky. The estimate given at the hearings was 10,000,000. I judge that the rough guess by the Senator from Kentucky is 6,000,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I took the figure of 6,000,000 from the report of the Banking and Currency Committee, which states that there are at least, if not more, 6,000,000 substandard houses. But that does not mean that all of them are slums or that all of them have to be cleared away. That means that there are in the United States that many units which are below the standard of houses in which children should be raised, and that there are that many houses which are below normal health standards.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me I should like to quote from the remarks of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] in his testimony before the Banking and Currency Committee. He is a member of the committee. At page 158 of the hearings we find that he said:

> And that 500,000 public housing units in your bill is just one step toward the 10,000,000 that are in the slums and elsewhere that have as much right to get this housing below its cost as the 500,000?

That is competent testimony—although I do not know the extent of the validity of its background—coming from the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, why was the figure of 500,000 used if there are 10,000,000 families living in slums.

Mr. CAIN. That question is quite a natural one, but the Senator is addressing to me a question about a matter for which I had no responsibility. I have raised that question, and I do not know the answer.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Vermont, to permit him to answer the question.

Mr. FLANDERS. Apparently some dependence is being placed on the figure 10,000,000. I should like to know where the figure 10,000,000 housing units came from.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, all I suggest is that in our report we state that we found that approximately 6,000,000 homes should be replaced in the course of the next 10 years.

The other question which was asked was how many of them are in city slums. I said that 2,000,000 is the estimate for those in city slums. Many of the others are scattered in the outskirts of cities, and many of them are perfectly good houses that could be rehabilitated without any Government assistance, but for one reason or another have been allowed to deteriorate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the committee figure is 2,000,000, why was the figure 500,000 taken, instead of 2,000,000? Is there any reason for doing that? Is there any reason to believe that by improving the situation so far as 500,000—one-quarter—of the total number is concerned, the situation of the other three-quarters will be cured?

Mr. TAFT. One reason is that I, myself, should be very loath to have more than 10 percent of the total amount of new construction required in any year provided as public housing. It seems to me that at least 90 percent of the total should be provided as private housing. So the 10 percent figure sets a limit. We hope the total construction may amount to 1,250,000 units. However, it has not yet reached 800,000 units. One of the amendments I have in mind would provide that public housing should never exceed 10 percent of the total of other types of construction.

This problem is one to be solved by bringing to bear all the different elements and different methods which are proposed or are available. I certainly would be opposed to having the Government attempt to build 2,000,000 new housing units overnight. The process is a long and slow one.

As a matter of fact, the program here contemplated is proposed to be set up for a period of 5 years, but I, myself, would be very much surprised if the program were completed within 10 years. It takes a long time to buy land and decide where houses are to be built and to get together all the parties concerned, both local and Federal. I should guess that it would take nearly 10 years to complete this program.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to read just one paragraph from the committee report accompanying the bill. On page 11 of the report, under the heading "VIII. Low rent public housing," I find the second paragraph reads as follows:

> Evidence has been submitted to this committee and its predecessors—

Of course, Mr. President, this matter has been before that committee for nearly 12 years, and it has been holding hearings on this entire subject. So the report refers to the evidence submitted to previous committees, in addition to the present one—

> showing that in urban and in other nonfarm areas there still exist at least 6,000,000 slum dwellings—

In other words, the committee characterizes 6,000,000 of them as slum dwellings, and then it says—

> 6,000,000 houses in which children ought not to be brought up. The reason for the persistence of the slums is clear. Families of low income who live in substandard housing can afford to pay so little rent that it will not suffice to meet the bare costs of providing and maintaining decent housing and paying taxes on it, let alone providing profit on the investment.

That is the language used by the committee in its report. I assume it has taken a fair average as between the 2,000,000 estimate of the Senator from Ohio and the 10,000,000 estimate of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], based on the hearings that have been going on over a period of 10 or 12 years, and also the estimate of 6,000,000 substandard houses—or, as it is said, slum houses. But I myself doubt very much whether all 6,000,000 of them could be characterized as slum dwellings.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, so far as I know, there are no exact figures to show where those houses are located. These figures come from the 1940 census, which lists both urban and rural houses in bad repair, and also lists houses without running water and houses without inside toilets. From that information it is somewhat difficult to conclude exactly how many are in what places or exactly how many are really so-called slum houses. A house without running water would in some places not be considered a slum house at all; in another place, in the middle of the city, it probably would be.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with the Senator from Ohio that even with the 10,000,000, or 6,000,000, or 2,000,000 houses that can be characterized as slum dwellings, I should doubt the wisdom of undertaking in one bill, or in one appropriation following the enactment of this bill, to take care of that entire number. Private enterprise insists it can take care of the entire problem of slum clearance and proper housing. I doubt it can. In

my opinion they are making a sales argument against a bill of this kind in any form. I imagine, however, they can go a considerable distance in trying to solve it, if they will. There is no way to make them do it. There is no way to compel a private builder or contractor or real-estate owner to build a house or an apartment from which he does not expect to receive a reasonable profit. It seems to me that 500,000 units is a reasonable amount with which to start the ball rolling, and if private enterprise supplements that by building a million and a half or two million more, we can say we are on our way toward solution of the problem in its worst aspects.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I should like to make it plain that my question a few moments ago, addressed to the senior Senator from Ohio, was predicated upon what has just been read by the senior Senator from Kentucky. As I read that statement, it is confined exclusively to the low-rent public-housing features of the bill, because it is under chapter 8, dealing with low-rent public housing, and it certainly states, in the exact words read by the Senator from Kentucky, "There still exist at least 6,000,000 slum dwellings." This excludes farm areas, because the report says that "in urban and other nonfarm areas there still exist at least 6,000,000 slum dwellings."

The purpose of my question was simply to endeavor to bring out the facts as to how big an objective we have in mind when we are considering this title of the bill. It would appear from the report that a possible objective would be 6,000,000 family units. I assume from what the Senator from Ohio has said—and I think he is correct in it—that we would by no means have to meet all that need, because there is in the bill another provision guaranteeing the income on investments of insurance companies in the building of low-cost housing, and there are other attractive features, by which it is sought to promote private building at public expense, as I read the bill.

But as I assume now, as I understand now, from what the Senator has said, he feels that about 2,000,000 family units would be comprised in the permanent objective of this particular part of the bill dealing with low-rent public housing financed by the Federal Government.

Mr. TAFT. Not 2,000,000. Mr. President——

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will allow me to finish, then I shall gladly yield. In all the experience of our Nation with public low-rent housing, we have built only 155,000 low-cost public housing units, at a cost, largely prewar, of $800,000,000, which is around $5,000 per unit; whereas I understand now the costs are doubled, or a little more than doubled. It would appear that the 500,000 units which would be authorized to be constructed in not less than 5 years under the pending bill would represent an investment, even if we do not see costs further increase, of around $5,000,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. And to that must be added the costs of the slum projects under the slum-clearance provision of the bill which has been mentioned by the distinguished Senator, and other costs under the bill.

So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, the only thing he is trying to bring out is that we are entering into a terribly expensive field, with an objective the size of which can hardly be properly guessed, at this stage, because it seems to me that in addition to the fact that we are talking about an immediate objective of $5,000,000,000 or more in the way of building cost investment, we must recognize the fact that the whole set-up which we are adopting here will make building costs higher instead of making them lower, because it will bring greater demand for the lumber and other building materials now available in the Nation. So it seems to me, Mr. President, there is a decided question, and it is a grave question, as to whether or not this Nation, with all the critical problems confronting her, should enter into this particular project, meritorious as it is admitted to be, with its tremendous implications from the standpoint of the investment required, and with much more tremendous implications when we remember that even when this project is completed as now authorized, and even if the number of families living in substandard or slum dwellings should not increase, we should still have accomplished only a small fraction of the long-time objective.

I do not think I have to call the attention of Senators to the fact that we are going to make those who are not served by this program resentful and more ambitious to become served, more anxious to have more public low-cost units built to house them. It seems we may well consider what may be the ultimate cost of this very far-reaching objective, as it is broached in this bill.

That was the sole purpose of my question. I gladly yield now to the Senator from Ohio, because I realize he has worked long and ably on this measure. I am in sympathy with many of the provisions of the bill, and I hope we can get a bill that will pass. I cannot refrain from making one additional comment, however, and that is, I think we are always on unsafe footing when we attempt to pass a bill of this magnitude, which has been largely written on the floor of the Senate. That is what is happening here as we go through this debate. I gladly yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in the first place, we are not writing this bill on the floor of the Senate. The bill has been written over a period of the last 6 months. It has been considered by the committee. We are making no change of substance, so far as I know. The Senator from Wisconsin has made one important change, but that certainly is not rewriting the bill, or writing the bill on the floor of the Senate. We recommended the bill last year. The committee carefully studied the bill, rewrote it, and presented a substitute bill. As the substitute bill has undergone but about four amendments, I do not think it fair to say the bill was written on the floor of the Senate.

In the second place, I do not quite understand the Senator's figures, but if we built 500,000 units, I suppose the cost might be around $3,000,000,000 before we got through.

Mr. HOLLAND. Oh, no. If I read Mr. Foley's report correctly, it is this—that we have built 155,000 such units, largely built in prewar times and at prewar costs, that the total cost of construction of those units was right at $800,000,000—between $775,000,000 and $800,000,000—and that the cost would average about $5,000 per family unit.

Mr. ELLENDER. But that was not in the form of a donation or gift made by the Government. Under the original Public Housing Act of 1937, $800,000,000 was authorized to be appropriated, with the proviso that the money was to be loaned for the purpose of building dwellings for low-income groups. Such funds are to be paid back over a period of 60 years. I fear the Senator is confusing the costs. The way that public housing was financed in the past was that the local housing agency borrowed up to 90 percent of the cost of a project, from the Government or from private sources, all of which must be paid back with interest to the Federal Authority, or such private sources as may have made the loan. The local municipality where the project was built put up 10 percent of the entire cost. The only funds the Federal Government put up, and on which there was no return, are the annual contributions which are made to assist low-income groups in obtaining decent housing at monthly rentals commensurate with their annual earnings. Under title VI of the bill that is before us, the Government would be obligated to put up each year, if 100,000 units were built the first year, $32,000,000. That is as far as the Government would be obligated. It is a sum that would not be repaid, if all utilized. But the building costs are borrowed from banks and other sources and repaid by the local housing agency from rents collected. The cost for the second year, if an additional 100,000 units were built, would be $64,000,000. The third year, if an additional 100,000 units were built, would cost $96,000,000, and so on, until the fifth year is reached, when the entire cost to the Government would be $160,000,000 annually, for a period of 40 years, provided that as many as 500,000 units are built and completed.

Although contributions of as much as $28,000,000 are provided for to assist low-income groups under the Public Housing Act of 1937, only 64 percent of it was actually necessary.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Florida is concerned about the capital cost involved in the construction of the buildings. I would estimate that figure to be approximately $800,000,000. That is for 100,000 units. We are spending today $8,000,000,000 in new residential construction every year. On the same basis, approximately $800,000,000 will be required. That money is to be borrowed from the savings of various people to build private houses. One result of this plan is that $800,000,000 is to be borrowed from private savings to build public housing. There is nothing peculiar about it.

As to the question of adding to the total amount of construction and thereby putting a greater strain on the supply of materials, I doubt very much that this bill, if it is passed by the 1st of July, would have any effect in actually getting construction started before 1950. I see no reason to think there will be any shortage of material. I think there will be far more difficulty in finding a market for privately built homes than in finding materials with which to build them.

I agree that it was a good thing to postpone action for the immediate postwar period, but today the shortage of materials is not a very serious matter in connection with the construction of homes. I have received much more complaint from builders regarding their inability to get money to build homes than I have received regarding the difficulty of getting materials with which to build them. At this moment builders are more concerned about getting the money to build them. So I do not think there should be any fear about imposing a strain on the national economy. Surely after this time we should be able to produce enough materials to build all the homes needed by the people of the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the colloquy in which Senators have been engaged. I do not think we have lost any time, because I think pertinent questions were involved. I hold the floor for one more question. Assuming there is need for low-cost housing that cannot be met by private enterprise, we find the evidence is given by local authorities, but it has to be finally approved by the Federal authorities in Washington.

Referring to page 77, line 16, I should like to ask some Senator to explain the formula there referred to. I should like to ask, also, how it can be enforced after it is explained. A gap of at least 20 percent has been left between the upper limits for admission to the proposed low-rent housing and the lowest rents at which housing by private enterprise is provided.

How do we arrive at what the gap is, the point at which the tenant has to show that there is a difference between what he can rent under private enterprise and under Government housing? Furthermore, how shall we determine his earning power today and what it may be tomorrow?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. It is a question of admission in the first instance.

Mr. WHERRY. Admission into the new housing?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. Let us assume that a finding is made, and the Authority approves the finding, that $30 a month is the lowest amount at which a person can rent a decent apartment in old housing. No one can go into the public housing if he can afford to pay more than $25 a month.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean that no one is entitled to enter public housing if he can afford to pay more than $25 a month?

Mr. TAFT. The usual rule is that he can afford to pay 20 percent of his income for rent. In some cases I think the figure should be 25 percent, but, roughly speaking, it is 20 percent. I have tried from time to time to work out a formula providing that no one having an income over $1,000 can be admitted to public housing. But the difficulty is that it seems to vary greatly in different places. No one seems to be able to develop a formula. There would have to be a much higher limit in New York, and it would have to go down in some cities to reach persons of the same grade of income in those cities. I have not been able to find a formula which would give any definite figures. So it is based on the actual rental available in each city. A person earning $125 a month would receive $1,500 a year. He could afford to pay a rental of $25 a month, and could just get into public housing, but if he earned more than $125 a month he could not enter public housing.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator explain how the determination is made as to the earning power of the different families? If it should change, who keeps informed of the change? If a person earns more, so that he can afford to pay more than $25 a month rent, does he have to leave the apartment?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. He has to move out?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Who makes that determination?

Mr. TAFT. It is made by the public housing agency.

Mr. WHERRY. In Washington?

Mr. TAFT. No. I am referring to the local agency. It is enforced here. A contract is made, and if the contract is not kept the money does not have to be paid.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio, in furtherance of the question asked by the Senator from Nebraska, to explain the last four lines of subparagraph (9), on page 79 of the bill. It compromises, it seems to me, a determination to get tenants out of a public-housing accommodation if their income has increased above an agreed-upon figure.

Mr. TAFT. I think that is a compromise. I think that on the whole I would fix a more definite rule, but of course the moment an attempt is made to actually get people out, and there is no other housing, there is an immediate public outcry.

Mr. WHERRY. How is it to be accomplished?

Mr. TAFT. Presumably we are rapidly reaching the point where there will be housing into which they can go.

Mr. WHERRY. In the period in which we go from five hundred thousand to a million and then three million, let us say, there is a family who, through thrift and energy, earn so much that they were not entitled to live in one of the units. They have to move out, even though there are no rentals available, do they not?

Mr. TAFT. This provision says they do not have to move out if there are not rentals available. There is a difficult problem, and I think the language used here is a reasonable compromise; but it is a compromise. I agree with the Senator from Washington as to that.

Mr. CAIN. I have raised the question because presently there appear to be entirely too many instances of people having high incomes living in public housing accommodations throughout the country who are not being removed from the accommodations because the statement is made—and perhaps it is true—that there are no other places where they can go. Yet some of us are very much concerned with the thought that public housing is built for people of low incomes. They should be coming in from the bottom and going out at the top, and if a decision has to be made between letting a really "low-incomer" moving into a unit, and moving out when his income has increased to a higher level, I should think that with reference to this particular clause there would be a period inserted at the proper place, so as to provide that when their income reaches a fair figure the tenants shall move out and thereby make available their accommodations for other people for whom the structures were originally built.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point I made a moment ago when I asked the question. The compromise, as has been suggested to me by the secretary of the committee, provides that they do not have to move out if they can show there is not a decent, safe, and sanitary dwelling available.

Mr. CAIN. The interpretation of that varies all over the country.

Mr. WHERRY. It can be varied and a different interpretation made in every community in the United States.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to say that it is an act of Congress which prevents the administration from moving them out, so it is not due to any arbitrary action on the part of the administrators.

I was about to suggest that I should be perfectly willing, although I have not yet taken the matter up with the Senator from Ohio, to offer an unfreezing amendment. I can read it and ascertain whether it is acceptable to those who are concerned with the freezing of the high-income families into low-income housing.

On page 77, line 4, I propose to strike out "Sec. 601," and in lieu thereof insert "Sec. 101 (a)" and on page 79, after line 18, insert a new subsection, as follows:

(b) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law except provisions of law hereafter enacted expressly in limitation hereof, the Public Housing Administration, and any State or local public agency administering a low-rent housing project assisted pursuant to the United States Housing Act of 1937 or title II of Public Law 671, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved June 28, 1940, shall continue to have the right to maintain an action or proceeding to recover possession of any housing accommodations operated by it under said Acts where such action is authorized by the statute or regulations under which such housing accommodations are administered.

Mr. CAIN. Will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. FLANDERS. Certainly.

Mr. CAIN. Why would not the Senator's purpose and that of those of us who oppose the freezing be best served by placing a period after the word "project" in line 16, page 79?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, that would not apply, in view of the provision of the Rent Control Act which Congress has passed.

Mr. CAIN. I am speaking of the desirability of placing a period in the place indicated in the bill which is presently before the Senate. Would that put in jeopardy the rent legislation which has recently been passed?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think we would have to go a step beyond that and perfect the amendment I have offered.

Mr. CAIN. Does the Senator think it has been made certain, in the amendment to which he refers, that when annual incomes have risen above the agreed figure the beneficiaries of those incomes must of necessity find other quarters in which to live?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and I have gone over this proposed amendment, and it is the same as the one the Senate accepted a few days ago, and we are both convinced that it will accomplish the desired result.

Mr. CAIN. I think we are seeking the same objective, and if the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Vermont feel that it has been properly accomplished in their amendment, that is what we are desirous of achieving.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, for a great number of years housing bills of one kind or another have been before the Congress of the United States. I am again glad to be able to vote upon a housing measure, and vote upon the amendment which is now pending before the Senate, which seeks to eliminate section 6 of the bill. In my judgment, section 6 is the heart of the entire housing program, and I shall aline myself with those who seek to defeat that amendment.

I am not a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which reported the bill, I am not altogether familiar with the details and the testimony submitted at the hearings, but a decent home for every American family should be the goal and the objective of every individual in the Congess of the United States, and every other thinking civic-minded American who lives in this country today.

Mr. President, I undertake to say that there are deep-rooted social problems in every one of the slum districts throughout America. Coming from the State of Illinois, where we have Chicago and other large cities, we are familiar with these problems, and know something about the crime that breeds in slum areas, the terrible and intolerable conditions which invariably exists in most of them. The State of Illinois and the cities in that State have done practically all that is possible to be done, from the standpoint of their own financial and bonding power, to come to the aid or rescue of people in such conditions.

We are told in this debate that private enterprise can do the job. Mr. President, I wish I could believe that, because no one has more interest in the free enterprise system of American than has the Senator from Illinois. But the truth of the matter is that the continued persistence of the slums throughout America in the larger cities, it seems to me, is a complete answer—that private enterprise is not able to and cannot do the job. Federal assistance, in my humble opinion, is indispensable in some of the special area problems, and we have some of those problems in Illinois.

Mr. President, when the public housing legislation was first introduced in the Senate of the United States, I remember that there were those who then charged that it was a communistic or a socialistic bill. We hear no charge of that kind made at the present time, and in my judgment no such charge can rightfully be made. I am firmly of the opinion that it is just the opposite; that this kind of a bill is a challenge to the menace of communism which breeds easily in some of the slum-blighted areas throughout the country.

The fact that the testimony shows that where these public housing projects have been completed, such as were described by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and other Senators, there has been a decrease in crime, seems to me to be a complete answer to any question that may be raised, and a logical reason why the Federal Government should assist society where society cannot help itself.

Mr. President, we all know what communism feeds upon in America and throughout the world. Communism feeds upon poverty, misery, and distress such as we find in the slum areas in some of our larger cities in America today. Wherever the Federal Government can consistently move in and give aid to a community of that kind, in my opinion we will be doing the kind of thing that is necessary to meet the creeping menace of communism, a menace which is growing not only in the Old World but in our own America as well.

Make no mistake about it. The communist groups are working 24 hours a day in attempting to carry on and achieve their ultimate objective, not only in Italy and France and other countries, but here in America as well. Money spent on public housing, to remove what seems to be the cancer upon the body politic of the Nation today, is money well spent if that money is appropriately and properly applied.

I am not one to debate the rules and regulations and the details. The Congress cannot lay down consistently rules and regulations. We must have faith and confidence and trust in the judgment of someone to do the kind of job that ought to be done with the limited amount of money we are appropriating at the present time.

I am tremendously interested, however, Mr. President, in the pending amendment because, as I said before, it seems to me to be the heart and the core of the entire program, and unless it remains in the measure I may be compelled to vote against the entire bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am not going to take long to state my position on the pending matter. My feeling is that we are asked here to pass upon a bill of tremendous concern to our Nation, a bill which has largely been written upon the floor of the Senate. Regardless of what might or might not be said. We were presented with an original bill—we were shown a substitute bill—we were shown 16 amendments, and there are further amendments pending. I think the conclusion is inescapable that the bill will be in large part written upon the floor, and by the full membership of the Senate, rather than by the members of the committee. But good as that reason is for refusing to pass a bill of this magnitude, I would prefer to predicate my position upon other reasons.

In the first place I am in accord with the statement of the Senator from Illinois that the question of public housing is of tremendous importance, and in my view it is the most important matter which appears in the bill. If there is anything in the bill which I would want to support it would be the subject of public housing on a basis that would tend to bring better housing conditions where they are most needed.

Mr. President, not only have the inescapable facts here shown that by the adoption of the bill we commit ourselves at once to the construction of 500,000 public housing units as compared with only 155,000 built up to now—in all of the course of the public housing program—but that we also commit ourselves inescapably to a building program which will cost from $5,000,000,000 to $6,000,000,000 in the field of public housing alone, and which. from any layman's viewpoint, we must know would increase terribly the inflationary tendencies already present in the Nation.

Mr. President, we do not have to base our position upon any layman's viewpoint. I want to read, if I may, for the attention of Senators, because I think it is entitled to have their attention, a letter addressed to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate, under date of April 5, by Mr. Marriner S. Eccles, once the Chairman of the Federal Reserve System, and serving as Chairman pro tempore at the time he wrote the letter. I read this letter simply because I think it strikes at the very heart of the problem which so clearly concerns itself with making inflation greater, and with contributing confusion and chaos to a situation which is already bad enough from the standpoint of inflation and all the things that go with it. The letter is as follows:

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Board has been advised that your committee is considering general housing legislation, particularly S. 2317, introduced by Senator MCCARTHY, and amendments to S. 866 proposed by Senator FLANDERS—

The very matters now pending.

The Board is in sympathy, of course, with the major objectives of such legislation, and is in accord with some of the provisions of these bills. We feel, however, that in view of the broad responsibilities of the Federal Reserve System in the field of credit, we should call attention to several undesirable

features of the proposed legislation, some of which we have had occasion to comment on previously. In this connection I am enclosing a copy of our statement of November 24, 1947, on housing finance to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

The prospect for inflation is even greater now—

The letter was written on April 5 of this year—

than it was last November. There is still a shortage of many goods in relation to the level of income, and because of the imminent reduction in taxes, coupled with our commitments under the European recovery program and the recent program calling for a large increase in military expenditures, the Government must anticipate a deficit rather than a surplus. There is thus additional reason for the Goverment to take all steps possible to reduce inflationary pressures, particularly those generated by an excess of credit.

For these reasons the Board is opposed to some of the provisions of the bills before your committee which would intensify inflationary pressures by making additional credit available and thus increasing the demand for building labor and materials. In addition, some of their provisions would reduce the capacity of the fiscal and credit agencies of the Government to cope with either further inflation or future deflation.

The Board is particularly concerned about three proposals contained in these bills: First, creation of a Government-financed secondary market for mortgages already underwritten by the Government; second, continuation of the undesirable mortgage-insurance program under title VI of the National Housing Act; and, third, addition to title II of the National Housing Act of a permanent program of excessively easy mortgage credit.

Creation of a Government financed secondary market would be directly inflationary at this time, because, by making available $500,000,000 for the purchase of mortgages, it would represent added Government spending and increased demand for new housing, which is already excessive, considering the available supply of labor and materials. Furthermore, one of the objectives at the time the Government mortgage-insurance and guaranty programs were instituted was to eliminate the need for direct mortgage lending by the Government, partly by removing some of the risks to lenders and increasing the negotiability of mortgages. If private lenders are unwilling to hold or buy guaranteed and insured mortgages, perhaps the solution is to improve the quality of the mortgages or increase the return to levels which make mortgages attractive compared with other investments.

Title VI of the National Housing Act—

Title VI is the one to which the pending motion is addressed, and which it seeks to strike—

Title VI of the National Housing Act, by making credit available on excessively easy terms, has contributed to the large rise in house prices and building costs, and has encouraged buyers to go too deeply into debt. We believe that both builders and buyers should have larger equities in their properties in an inflationary period like the present, and that it is both feasible and desirable to return to the terms offered under title II as far as mortgages on houses for owner-occupancy are concerned. The Board has no objection to the continuation of title VI for rental housing, provided safeguards are maintained against excessive loans in relation to value.

Several of the proposed changes in title II of the National Housing Act are subject to the same criticism as the present title VI program. Mortgages on small houses for 95 percent of value and running for 30 years are excessive and so also are 40-year mortgages of 90 and 95 percent of value for rental housing.

Basically, these three proposals—

And I recognize the fact that one or two of them have been somewhat changed since this letter was written—

Basically, these three proposals are of a type which would be appropriate for combating a serious deflation, and are the opposite of those appropriate in an inflationary situation such as we face today. Measures such as these should be reserved to cushion deflation should it later develop. Otherwise, the only measures available would be direct Government lending or subsidies, on a large enough scale to protect the real estate and housing market from a serious collapse such as developed in the early thirties.

Sincerely yours,

M. S. ECCLES,
Chairman pro tempore.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield in a moment, if I may be permitted to conclude.

In conclusion, I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, without reading, the statement by Chairman Eccles on housing finance before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, on November 25, 1947.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY CHAIRMAN ECCLES ON HOUSING FINANCE BEFORE THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT, NOVEMBER 25, 1947.

One of the most inflationary factors—perhaps the most inflationary single factor—in the present situation is excessively easy mortgage credit for housing. During the past 2 years the amount of such mortgage debt has increased by more than $9,000,000,000 and the rate of current mortgage lending has risen from about $550,000,000 per month to about $1,000,000,000 per month. Terms of lending have eased substantially as compared with prewar. A large proportion of recent loans has been made on an installment basis at 4 percent interest on the unpaid balance for a period of between 20 and 25 years. Most of these loans have been made for a very high percentage of current sale price which is greatly inflated.

More than half of the current unprecedented volume of mortgage lending is sponsored by the Federal Government under legislation enacted by Congress. The Government must, therefore, assume much of the responsibility for any adverse effects of this type of lending. Prices of houses have advanced from 25 to 35 percent during the past 2 years. A large number of families of moderate and low income have been encouraged to assume mortgage debt which will be beyond their means when the present inflationary period is over, and is becoming increasingly burdensome as the cost of living goes up. Sellers and builders of houses have been enabled to make exorbitant profits. The Government has assumed, and continues to assume, contingent liabilities of great proportions.

It is entirely inconsistent to restrict credit terms on automobiles and other consumer durable goods, partly to reduce the inflationary pressures, and partly to protect the buying public, and at the same time to make housing credit terms so easy as to stimulate inflation and encourage people to go too deeply in debt. Any anti-inflationary program of the Government will lose much of its effectiveness so long as the Government sponsors the present inflationary housing credit program.

Easy credit has greatly increased the effective demand for both old and new housing far beyond the supply and this has greatly inflated prices. In an effort to meet the demand and take advantage of this profitable market, builders have undertaken to construct a larger volume of housing than there are resources readily available to finish. As a result, published prices of materials have advanced and, in addition, a gray or premium market has developed for many building materials. In this competitive market the services of labor are also being actively bid for and bonuses and other extras have become common.

The predominant feeling in the building industry is that only by building at current rates or even higher can the housing shortage be met and only by keeping demand high can the current levels of production be maintained. The prices that are being established now, however, are too high for long-sustained building. At inflated prices of materials and labor and inflated profits for builders a few more houses may be produced than would be the case if prices and profits were lower, but that condition makes it less likely that the market next year, and the year after that, will be able to pay the prices necessary to keep building going at the rate needed to overcome the housing shortage and stabilize the segment of the economy. An increasing number of families are being priced out of the market now, in spite of the extremely easy financing terms, even though their need for housing is very great.

If the credit situation were producing a substantial additional volume of housing at supportable values in the long run, it would be justified, but because of the limitations of labor and materials it produces, instead, a dangerously inflated market which cannot be sustained for both new and old houses. I believe that by curtailment of credit for housing in closer relationship to the supply of labor and materials, the price trend would be reversed and a market for houses assured over a long period of years. Good low-cost housing cannot be built with high-cost materials and high-cost labor. Neither Government nor private industry can produce this miracle.

For the reasons which I have stated, Congress should reconsider in the longer-term interest of the country the present policy and program of the Federal Government in the field of housing credit. I shall be glad to be of any assistance I can in making suggestions for changes in the present housing credit programs. At this time I am merely indicating the nature of some of the changes that seem desirable.

Operations under the National Housing Act and the GI bill of rights are closely related in practice but not in law or in administration. These two programs sponsored by the Federal Government should be brought together so that appraisals are made by only one agency.

The "100-percent loans" under the program of the Veterans' Administration for both old and new houses and the nominal 90-percent loans on new houses under title VI of the National Housing Act should be revised so as to reduce the demand for housing and thus bring prices down. This means that both buyers and builders should have more equity in their properties than under the prevailing lending policies so long as present inflationary prices continue for housing.

Lending by members of the Federal Home Loan Bank System should be subject to greater restraints by the use of a conservative, uniform, appraisal system, and by selective restriction on the terms of their loans.

Finally, from the long-range standpoint it is vitally important to prevent inflation in the housing field from getting any worse than it is. The greater the inflation, the more severe will be the aftermath of defaults, foreclosures, liquidations, and bankruptcy.

Over the years the construction industry, which is a major outlet for investment and supports a wide variety of related manufacturing, transportation, and distributing activity has been characterized by violent upswings and downturns. If greater stability could be introduced into this field, it would go far toward achieving the national objective of stabilizing production and employment at high levels. The more the backlog of demand for housing is filled at exorbitant prices now, the smaller will be the cushion under the entire industry when prices come down and, therefore, the more intense the deflation in the industry will be. Manifestly, this is not in the best interest of the general economy, and what is not good for the country as a whole is not good for any group—veterans, or otherwise. As has been well said, there is no such thing as easy credit—true, it is easy to get into debt but the easier it is to get in, the harder it is to get out. That applies to all of us, including war veterans.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in the face of advice of this kind, coming from such a source, there is offered here a program vastly exceeding anything that was even contemplated in the field of public housing from the year 1933 until this time. It seems to me that the Senate would want to hesitate and take note of the fact that we are asked to embark upon a program vastly larger than anything in this field that we have ever dreamed of before. The testimony in the hearing offered by Chairman Foley was to the effect that only 155,000 public housing units of this type, family units, the type involved in this huge title VI public housing program, have been constructed to this time, at a total investment of approximately $800,000,000, and largely at prewar construction costs, whereas now it is proposed at one fell swoop to authorize the construction of 500,000 units of this type within the next 5 years, and to do so at a time when construction costs are vastly greater than they were then—more than twice as much—and at a time when we are advised, by the responsible head of the Federal Reserve Board, that this step would be hopelessly inflationary in character.

I shall not make myself a party to voting either for title VI, which I like much better than the rest of the bill, because there is more need for it, or for the other provisions, which in large measure provide for extended private construction at public cost, or through public financing.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. This may be elementary, but the Senator from Maryland has not been able to follow all the debate, for reasons well known to the Senator from Florida. I should like to ask him, with title VI in the bill, what proportion of the people who are in the class which it is sought to benefit would be aided by the bill?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sorry that I am unable to answer that question. Perhaps the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] or the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] may be able to answer it.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to suggest that the title VI to which Marriner Eccles addressed himself in his letter is not the title VI which we are considering. The title VI to which Mr. Eccles was objecting is the FHA title VI, and not tile VI of this bill, which deals with public housing. So Mr. Eccles did not at all offer objection to public housing in that letter. He was addressing himself to FHA.

Mr. TYDINGS. Can the Senator answer my question? What percentage of the people who would be in the class to be aided would have new homes under title VI?

Mr. FLANDERS. The Senator from Maryland is speaking now about the public housing title VI, not the title VI to which Marriner Eccles was referring. Will the Senator repeat his question? I lost one word.

Mr. TYDINGS. What proportion of the people who fall within the general classification which might be aided, the people who deserve to be helped under title VI, would be aided by title VI?

Mr. FLANDERS. As I remember, the estimate made by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] was that there might be a total of 2,000,000 families involved. This bill would take care of 500,000 in the course of 5 years.

Mr. TYDINGS. What would become of the other 1,500,000 families in the same classification as the 500,000 families who would be aided?

Mr. FLANDERS. I wish I could repeat verbatim the words of the senior Senator from Ohio, because he stated a number of factors which might help to mitigate the situation. If the Senator from Ohio would like to answer that question again, I am glad to yield to him.

Mr. TAFT. My only statement was that we hope that by a reduction in costs and by better methods of building many substandard homes will be replaced by private builders. In my opinion, unless we are willing to swing the scales, we shall always have slum conditions. Private building alone has not eliminated slums in the past. I do not think it will ever do so in the future. We hope that if we can take the edge off the problem at the bottom we can gradually replace all the substandard homes in the United States through a combination of private and public activity.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator. I understand his reasoning. However, as one who is new in this debate——

Mr. TAFT. I may say that I discussed this question at some length this afternoon.

Mr. TYDINGS. What is worrying me is this: If the proposal is good, it ought to apply to all those who are in the same class. If it is not going to apply to all those in the same class, it strikes me as being very undemocratic to single out one from every four families in that class and aid it and let the other three take the chance that perhaps someone will help them.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in the first place, I may say it is impossible to move any faster. I personally would never want the Government to build, in the form of public housing, more than one-tenth of the total amount of houses. If ultimately there is no other solution, if ultimately private enterprise is unable to provide homes, even by means of utilizing improved modern methods, then I think the Government might later be called upon to expand this program and to make it of a larger size. But I hope we may never have to go beyond the 500,000 here provided. It must take 5 years, and I think it will take longer, to provide even that number.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to have the viewpoint of the author of the amendment, so that when I take my seat I may have in mind the point of view of both sides.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I was interested in the answer the Senator from Maryland received to his question.

On the basis of what has been said in the debate this afternoon, I think his question could have been answered in any one of three ways. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] said that on the basis of an estimate of a need for 2,000,000 new housing units, the proposed legislation would take care of one out of every four families having such a need. That is one estimate.

Another estimate, as made by several Senators, is that a total of 6,000,000 units is involved. That figure would give a different answer to the Senator's question.

Then we have the estimate, to be found in the hearings of the Banking and Currency Committee, that the total of ultimate housing units to be replaced is 10,000,000.

So I say the Senator from Maryland can take his choice from among those three best guesses.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I find it extremely interesting that the proponents of this amendment to strike from the bill the public housing section seem to fluctuate, in their position, between wishing to have 2,000,000 housing units constructed or none. That reminds me of the song from the operetta Oklahoma, "For me, it is all or nothing." Mr. President, if it were within the means of the Official Reporters to record music, I could sing that. But under the circumstances I simply say, "For me, it is all or nothing."

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to state the position of the proponents of the amendment. What we have been chiefly concerned with this afternoon has been a determination of the total objective and goal in regard to what the number of public housing units constructed should be, and whether the proper figure is 500,000 or 2,000,000, as stated on the basis of the need which has clearly been demonstrated this afternoon by various Senators, or whether it is 10,000,000, and what percentage of the total number is to be constructed by the Federal Government.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, was it not the testimony before the committee that over a period of years 500,000 units would cost $7,500,000,000?

Mr. CAIN. I cannot say whether that figure is accurate, but I know the last figure I had, which would seem to be accurate, was $6,000,000,000 for 500,000 units.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I do not recall that in the course of the testimony before the committee there was

any challenge to the statement that 500,000 units ultimately would cost $7,500,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I certainly challenge the statement, because it assumes that the annual cost, as presently estimated, will continue to be the same every year for 40 years. It seems to me that is not a proper means of arriving at the total cost. Furthermore, in the matter of appropriations it is not customary to present the cost on the basis of the total cost over a long period of years. For instance, it may be said that the appropriations for the armed services will be $11,000,000,000; and on that basis it might be said that the cost over a period of 40 years would be $440,000,000,000. But obviously it is not proper simply to multiply the present annual cost for any particular agency by a large number, such as 40, and then say that gives a fairly accurate picture of the total cost over such a long period of years. Obviously, it is impossible for us to tell at this time whether the present annual cost will increase or decrease over a considerable number of years in the future. If the method I have just mentioned were pursued in regard to other items of the budget, the result would be astronomical figures for all such activities.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I shall oppose the amendment of the Senator from Washington.

The American people are more disturbed, more alarmed, and more aroused about the Nation-wide lack of adequate housing than they are about any other single domestic question. Adequate housing is the Nation's No. 1 social problem.

I believe that passage of a satisfactory housing bill at this session would prove a tremendous incentive to national morale. But if Congress fails to act, if this bill fails of passage because of postponement or too-long delay, then it is my firm belief that we shall have failed to perform a primary obligation to the American public.

This is not a question of choice; it is a question of the most urgent necessity. Even if this pending measure is enacted, the problem of providing decent homes for decent citizens will not be solved in 1 year, 2 years, or 3 years. Today we are a decade behind in home building. Further delay will simply aggravate an existing situation which already approaches the proportions of a national scandal.

In making that statement, I have no wish to disparage the excellent work performed by those Members of the Senate and House who have worked so hard and so faithfully in drafting this pending legislation. They have done a magnificent piece of work under the most trying circumstances.

But blueprints do not make homes; study and investigation do not make homes. The responsibility now devolves upon us. The American people want action and they want action now. Only the Federal Government is big enough to tackle this problem of providing decent low-cost housing, a problem which if left unsolved will threaten the social foundations of the country.

The cost of the housing aids provided in the bill now before the Senate is not excessive. In fact, measured against the benefits which will accrue to the people of the United States, the bill is an investment in good living which will pay tremendous dividends.

Counted in terms of social savings and human values, this measure represents a definite economic gain for all our people. Bad housing causes juvenile delinquency, and the cost of juvenile delinquency is a large and disturbing item in the national crime bill. Cramped and crowded home conditions lead to a serious increase in nervous and mental disorders. These are among the penalties we pay because, nearly 3 years after the close of hostilities, the physical plant of America is still badly in need of being rebuilt.

The best available figures indicate that between two and one-half and three million families are living as extra families because they have no homes of their own. That means that twice that number, or between four and five million families, are living doubled up. It is impossible to overestimate the nervous and mental strain which such enforced crowding is causing to this vast number of worthy people. Human patience is a grand virtue, but there are limits to its endurance. I hate to think what may happen if these conditions go on indefinitely.

One of the most disturbing facts is the number of war veterans who are the unfortunate victims of this continuing emergency. Upon these youthful homebuilders depend the safety and security of our country for the next several decades, and possibly longer. The housing shortage first became acute when these young men and women were in service. Since their return to civilian life, there has been no apparent easement. In many parts of the country, rural as well as urban, the lack of adequate housing has grown worse instead of better. Certainly there are no prospects for immediate improvement. Even if this bill becomes law at this session, the actual construction of adequate housing will be a gradual process.

I am sure no Member of the Senate or House willingly would condemn these young veterans to another decade of living in the crowded conditions in which so many of them now find themselves. Yet, statistics from every State, including my own, disclose that the number of veterans who lack decent home accommodation is truly alarming. Please remember that the vast majority of these veterans are not among the high-salaried groups. They have not been engaged in civilian pursuits long enough to compete financially for the homes which are available.

The result is that literally thousands of veterans are living the best years of their lives, not in a normal America, but in a make-shift America. They have youthful memories of the stabilizing influences of home life; they want above anything else to provide the blessings of home for their wives and children. Yet, they find this ambition moving further and further from reality because of conditions which exist and over which they have no control.

A place to exist is no substitute for a home. Millions of decent Americans are too well aware of that dismal fact today. Rebuilt garages do not make a home; trailers do not make a home; windowless basements do not make a home; make-shift hovels constructed from scraps of lumber and tin do not make a home. But they constitute home today for all too many American citizens.

I realize there is no quick and easy solution for this problem. There is no overnight remedy, no patented formula which will do the job which must be done. There are honest differences of opinion among legislators as to the best and surest methods of approach. There are differences of viewpoint as to detail, but these differences must not lead to the scuttling of this vital legislation. There is no partisanship in housing—there is no such thing as a Republican plan or a Democratic plan. This is a national emergency in its truest sense, and the problem must be solved on that plane.

The pending legislation has the endorsement of representatives of every major veterans' organization. These organizations have performed a splendid public service in bringing the urgency of this problem to the attention of Congress. They base their appeal for housing legislation upon the harsh facts of living in present-day America as they know them from their own personal observations. I believe every Member of this body can substantiate what these veterans say from the contents of their own daily mail.

The Congress has before it a great deal of legislation of compelling importance. In a time of world-wide stress and danger, the Congress has embarked on a commendable program to insure peace and to protect the Nation's security.

I believe there is one more great defense point which must be strengthened and rebuilt. That defense is the American home which, in the finest sense, is the bulwark of our liberties. I earnestly hope for the prompt passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill at this session.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it had been the intention to vote on the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Washington during this session. There are three or four other Senators who have requested an opportunity to be heard on it.

The Senator from Wisconsin has an amendment, on which I have been told there is an agreement with proponents of the measure. It is now quarter to 6. I believe, in view of the fact that further speeches are to be made, we should proceed now with the amendment to be proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator in order that he may present the amendment; following which, unless there is a feeling that the bill could be voted on tonight, I shall move to recess until tomorrow. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, this morning I discussed with the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from

Ohio an amendment as to which I believe there is no question. I ask that instead of having the amendment read, it be printed in the RECORD at this point. The amendment merely unfreezes the freeze on overincome groups in public housing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, Mr. McCARTHY's amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 77, in line 4, strike out: "'Sec. 601" and insert in lieu thereof "'Sec. 601. (a)"; and on page 79, after line 18, insert a new subsection as follows:

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law except provisions of law hereafter enacted expressly in limitation hereof, the Public Housing Administration, and any State or local public agency administering a low-rent housing project assisted pursuant to the United States Housing Act of 1937 or title II of Public Law 671, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved June 28, 1940, shall continue to have the right to maintain an action or proceeding to recover possession of any housing accommodations operated by it under said acts where such action is authorized by the statute or regulations under which such housing accommodations are administered."

On page 79, line 16, insert a period after the word "project" and strike the remainder of the sentence, to and including line 18 on the same page.

Mr. McCARTHY. I now ask for the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I do not have the least idea of what the amendment is about. It has not been read.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I see no reason why it should not be read. I think it ought to be read. We discussed it here at some length, and so I think the Senator from Wisconsin thought it was understood.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not know what it is about.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the point of order.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the amendment is being read for my benefit, I may say that I did not necessarily request that it be read. I merely wished that some explanation might be made of the amendment, and that I might be told what it is about.

Mr. McCARTHY. The amendment simply provides that the Public Housing Administrator may proceed——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend for a moment. The clerk has not yet completed the reading of the amendment. An order having been made for the reading of the amendment, the clerk will proceed.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the amendment simply provides that the Public Housing Administrator may proceed to remove the over-income groups from the present public housing acommodations, to make room for lower-income groups. It does not mean they will be removed instanter. It simply means the Administrator will give 6 months' notice, so that the over-income groups may find other housing. The Administrator informs me the plan is to give notice to 5 percent of the over-income group each month. That will mean, if the amendment is agreed to, that 6 months from now 5 percent of the over-income groups will be removed; 7 months from now, another 5 percent. It will be done in an orderly fashion. I have discussed the amendment with the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Ohio, neither of whom has any objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, for the RECORD, and for those Senators who are present, I ask that the present occupant of the chair state the pending question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] to strike out title VI, as modified, from the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] as amended.

APOLOGY OF HON. ARTHUR W. COOLIDGE, LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on April 13 I referred on this floor to certain remarks which the Associated Press had attributed to the Honorable Arthur W. Coolidge, Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts.

This afternoon I am in receipt of a telegram from Mr. Coolidge which I wish to read into the RECORD at this point:

BOSTON, MASS., *April 20, 1948.*

Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, of South Carolina,
Senate Office Building:

To you, who were the United States Senate spokesman of the South in reproving recent remarks of mine, let me say with frankness and sincerity that I regret the offense.

Bitterness is not my nature, malice was not intended. I was stirred because the program to induce northern industries to migrate threatens the jobs of New England workers and the livelihood of businessmen. Nevertheless, I should not have said what I did in the way I did.

I trust that southern chivalry will prompt, in all those affronted, an acceptance of my apology, for I do appreciate the sterling merit of Dixie. Without the war industries, agriculture, training camps, and the fighting heart of the South the struggle against the Axis could not have ended so well. That record assures the future.

We can work out our problems in good will. It is my hope that in this era of danger from abroad, all of us, as Americans, will reaffirm steadfast friendship which tactless phrases of mine might impair.

As you have so graciously invited me South as your guest, will you please convey to the South this expression of my deeper feelings?

ARTHUR W. COOLIDGE,
Lieutenant Governor,
Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

I honestly and sincerely thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for this very generous and gracious message which is in the form of an explanation and apology.

Mr. Coolidge announced in his speech before the Greater Lawrence, Mass., Chamber of Commerce on April 12 that he was "firing the opening gun in the new industrial war between the States."

So far as I am concerned, he is entitled to cease firing and sue for peace at any time. I interpret this telegram as a cease-fire order and a suit for peace.

Mr. President, the truce is on. We have granted a full armistice to the State of Massachusetts on its terms of unconditional surrender.

I assure the Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts that the vanquished will suffer no cruel and inhuman treatment.

In all sincerity and all candor I wish to say publicly that I have the highest regard for the integrity, the ability, and the patriotism of Mr. Coolidge. My invitation to visit South Carolina as my guest still stands. I shall welcome the opportunity to further improve the understanding and appreciation of the people of the South and the people of Massachusetts and the East for each other.

All is quiet on the southern front. Peace reigns supreme.

DR. THOMAS S. GATES

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Philadelphia Bulletin of April 9, 1948, expressing the sorrow of all Philadelphians at the passing of a great Philadelphia educator, Dr. Thomas S. Gates, who was president of the University of Pennsylvania for a period of 14 years.

As the editorial states, Dr. Gates "served this city and his alma mater well and faithfully. His fellow citizens unite in mourning his loss and honoring his memory."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. THOMAS S. GATES

An outstanding personality in the business and cultural life of Philadelphia was Dr. Thomas S. Gates, whose sudden death has deeply shocked a host of friends and the students and alumni of the University he served as president for 14 years. He was a man of great energy and activity, and was in good health to the last hours of his useful life. For this reason the gap left by his passing will be plain and painful, and the loss to this city the more keenly felt.

By mere measure of years, Dr. Gates had enjoyed a long and full life. But the famous epigram of Emerson applies well to him: "We do not count a man's years until he has nothing else to count." Among the busiest citizens of Philadelphia are many men of mature years, close friends and contemporaries of Dr. Gates. In many and varied ways they give their time, their experience and their influence to the welfare of the community and their fellowmen. They have much to count, and their least concern is the number of their years.

But death touches them on the shoulder and they are suddenly gone. Then their services are fully known and appreciated, since others are called upon to carry on. None can exactly fill the place of Dr. Thomas S. Gates. In personality and appearance, he was a distinctive figure in the life of Philadelphia. He served this city and his alma mater well and faithfully. His fellow citi-

zens unite in mourning his loss and honoring his memory.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. LODGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive A, Eightieth Congress, second session: A protocol for the extension for 1 year from October 1, 1947, subject to certain conditions, of the inter-American coffee agreement, signed in Washington on November 28, 1940 (Ex. Rept. No. 3); and

Executive C, Eightieth Congress, second session: A protocol dated in London August 29, 1947, prolonging for 1 year after August 31, 1947, the international agreement regarding the regulation of production and marketing of sugar, signed at London on May 6, 1937 (Ex. Rept. No. 4).

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider sundry nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and, as in executive session, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Brian S. Odem to be United States attorney for the southern district of Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Nellie Tayloe Ross to be Director of the Mint.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Walter R. Sturr to be collector of internal revenue for the fourteenth district of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James M. Robertson to be collector of customs of customs collection district No. 14.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Julius J. Wichser to be United States marshal for the southern district of Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank Golden to be United States marshal for the district of Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of these confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 21, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 20 (legislative day of March 29), 1948:

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

David E. Lilienthal, of Tennessee, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the term expiring August 1, 1953.

Sumner T. Pike, of Maine, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the term expiring August 1, 1952.

Lewis L. Strauss, of Virginia, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the term expiring August 1, 1951.

William W. Waymack, of Iowa, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the term expiring August 1, 1950.

Robert F. Bacher, of New York, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the term expiring August 1, 1949.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Raymond E. Thomason, of Alabama, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Alabama. (Mr. Thomason is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 24, 1948.)

Edwin D. Bolger, of Michigan, to be United States marshal for the western district of Michigan. (Mr. Bolger is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 31, 1948.)

Austin J. Mahoney, of Rochester, N. Y., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 8, with headquarters at Rochester, N. Y. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be senior assistant dental surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance:

Edward J. Driscoll
Charles J. Gillooly

To be assistant dental surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance:

William J. Braye
Edmond G. Vanden Bosche
Frank W. Nelson
Robert W. Anderson
Tyler C. Folsom, Jr.

IN THE ARMY

Brig. Gen. John Stewart Bragdon, O3770, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army), for appointment as Assistant to the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, for a period of 4 years, effective on date of appointment, and for appointment to the grade of brigadier general in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of section 11, National Defense Act, as amended, and title V, Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Maj. Gen. Louis Aleck Craig, O3575, to be the Inspector General, United States Army, for a period of 4 years, effective on date of appointment, under the provisions of section 7, National Defense Act, as amended, and section 513, Officer Personnel Act of 1947, vice Maj. Gen. Ira Thomas Wyche.

The following-named officer for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of Public Law 449, Seventy-ninth Congress, June 26, 1946, and section 520 (a) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

TO BE PROFESSOR OF MATHEMATICS AT THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY, WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

Col. Charles Parsons Nicholas, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers for permanent appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the grades hereinafter stated:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Thompson, Wendell C.
Werner, Harold D.

LIEUTENANTS

Laird, Ian M.
Poynter, Lewis L.

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Williams, William C.

ENSIGNS

Clements, Daniel J., Jr.
Dooling, David (n)

The following-named officer for permanent appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in the grade hereinafter stated:

ENSIGN

Hediger, Fritz H.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The below-named officer for appointment to the temporary grade of major general in the United States Marine Corps:

William T. Clement.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARKANSAS

Robert D. O'Keefe, Rosston, Ark., in place of LeRoy May, transferred.

CALIFORNIA

Frank J. Norton, Chula Vista, Calif., in place of R. A. Higgs, resigned.

Pearl C. Kehlet, Meeks Bay, Calif., in place of F. L. Kehlet, resigned.

William J. Wasley, Nevada City, Calif., in place of B. M. West, resigned.

COLORADO

Eldora F. Gilberson, Dillon, Colo., in place of Grace Warren, resigned.

CONNECTICUT

James F. Abbott, Gales Ferry, Conn., in place of J. M. Abbott, deceased.

FLORIDA

Daniel Floyd Fager, Shalimar, Fla., in place of C. H. Meigs, resigned.

Elmer F. Mosley, Wellborn, Fla., in place of S. R. Mallory, retired.

GEORGIA

Maurice F. Smith, Hapeville, Ga., in place of E. L. Hopper, resigned.

ILLINOIS

Fred H. Popp, Jr., Dundee, Ill., in place of H. F. Kuettner, resigned.

Jerry Volny, Jr., Northfield, Ill., in place of Elizabeth Romer, resigned.

William H. Watson, Prospect Heights, Ill., in place of H. L. Galbraith, resigned.

INDIANA

John V. Pinegar, Rockville, Ind., in place of J. C. Hoopingarner, deceased.

IOWA

Donald E. Castle, Alta, Iowa, in place of N. A. Christensen, removed.

KENTUCKY

John B. Adams, Berea, Ky., in place of J. E. Moore, deceased.

Effie M. Voiers, South Shore, Ky., in place of Josephine Shepherd, removed.

LOUISIANA

Vardaman J. Maples, Mount Hermon, La., in place of E. L. Goings, resigned.

Jean H. Clark, Rosedale, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MARYLAND

Dorothy M. Phipps, Shady Side, Md., in place of F. E. Andrews, retired.

MICHIGAN

Reuben S. Eddy, Lake Linden, Mich., in place of H. E. Penninger, retired.

John C. Fremlin, Milford, Mich., in place of W. S. Lovejoy, deceased.

Glenn W. Herzog, Romulus, Mich., in place of N. J. Coash, resigned.

MINNESOTA

Joe W. Cain, Alpha, Minn., in place of K. S. Crawley, transferred.

Harold V. Nelson, Clitherall, Minn., in place of Julius Severson, etired.

Frank A. Heidemann, Courtland, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Bertha H. Avenson, Dorset, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Knute W. Ringstad, Lengby, Minn., in place of C. E. Albright, retired.

George A. Schultz, Ottertail, Minn., in place of E. H. Albers, transferred.

James Monroe Cunningham, Sturgeon Lake, Minn., in place of G. W. Phares, deceased.

MISSOURI

Mary W. Griffin, Breckenridge, Mo., in place of R. E. Chaffin, deceased.

MONTANA

Dorothy W. Carrigan, Birney, Mont., in place of Dessie Burnsides, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

Nicholas M. DaPrile, Port Reading, N. J., in place of C. V. Richardson, declined.

James Abercromby, South Branch, N. J. Office became Presidential October 1, 1947.

NEW YORK

Mary W. Hally, Sonyea, N. Y., in place of E. J. Hally, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Charles L. Ray, Flat Rock, N. C., in place of A. C. King, resigned.

Robert R. Kessinger, Nags Head, N. C., in place of M. G. Hollowell, retired.

John L. Kearns, Seagrove, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

OHIO

Norman W. Eisass, Botkins, Ohio, in place of F. J. Lenhart, transferred.

Elmer E. Caldwell, Gallipolis, Ohio, in place of A. K. Merriman, resigned.

L. Abram Flory, Granville, Ohio, in place of N. H. Overturf, resigned.

Erwin J. Brause, Westlake, Ohio, in place of E. J. Orvis, deceased.

OKLAHOMA

Thelma L. McKnight, Shamrock, Okla., in place of M. A. Ferren, resigned.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Joseph F. Krizan, Jr., Gregory, S. Dak., in place of W. J. Gassen, resigned.

Robert R. Davis, White, S. Dak., in place of C. F. Barg, resigned.

TENNESSEE

Eugene William Beckman, Loretto, Tenn., in place of Monie Orth, resigned.

Richard L. Adkins, Munford, Tenn., in place of J. F. Bryan, retired.

Stella S. Murphy, Rockford, Tenn., in place of Wade Russell, resigned.

TEXAS

J. Edwin McKee, Fort Worth, Tex., in place of H. D. Young, deceased.

Jewel M. Latimer, Olmito, Tex., in place of Hugh Wilbanks, resigned.

Alvin O. Fields, Ozona, Tex., in place of J. R. Kersey, retired.

Earl Bennett Spinks, Raymondville, Tex., in place of J. M. Robbins, transferred.

Guy B. Karr, Spur, Tex., in place of O. C. Arthur, transferred.

VIRGINIA

George E. Mettauer, Annandale, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

O. Ray Vanlandingham, Avalon, Va., in place of H. W. Gill, retired.

Robert C. Sanders, Warsaw, Va., in place of M. C. Sanders, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

Maude L. Copeland, Elk Garden, W. Va., in place of H. T. Williams, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Hugo Van Winkle, Winter, Wis., in place of A. N. Donnellan, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 20 (legislative day of March 29), 1948:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Nellie Tayloe Ross, to be Director of the Mint.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Brian S. Odem, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Texas.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Walter R. Sturr, to be collector of internal revenue for the fourteenth district of New York.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

James M. Robertson, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 14, with headquarters at Norfolk, Va.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Julius J. Wichser, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Indiana.

Frank Golden, to be United States marshal for the district of Nebraska.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate April 20 (legislative day of March 29), 1948:

POSTMASTER

Miss Anne M. Lavindar, to be postmaster at Kingston, in the State of West Virginia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 20, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Russell H. Bonner, pastor, Main Street Methodist Church, West Lafayette, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

Most high and holy God, Father of us all, Ruler of all the earth, who hast assembled men by nations, and yet hast made of one blood all that dwell upon the face of the earth, grant unto us, the citizens of this great Nation, a true sense of the grandeur of our heritage. Bountifully hast Thou given to us beyond all our deserving. Thou hast made us heirs of what the untold ages have created.

"God bless our native land!
Firm may she ever stand.
For her our prayer shall rise
To God, above the skies."

Help us, O God, to understand that as we have greatly received, so in the same measure we are responsible. Forbid that we should be unfaithful to our trust. Help us to be worthy of our fathers and our fathers' God. Give us wisdom and courage enough not to be careless or indifferent or guilty of the worst of sacrilege—the waste of past sacrifices. Move upon our minds and the minds of leaders everywhere that a nobler spirit and a clearer vision may rule our thoughts and our ways.

"Enlarge our vision to behold
The wonders Thou hast wrought of old,
Reveal Thyself in every law,
And gild the towers of truth with holy awe."

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 545, Rept. No. 1755), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1641) to establish the Women's Army Corps in the Regular Army, to authorize the enlistment and appointment of women in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps and the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

THE HONORABLE JOHN TABER, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include as a part of my remarks an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes to remind my colleagues of the public acclaim which accompanied the election of the Republican majority to this Congress a year and a half ago. There was an unmistakable mandate from the voters for economy and efficiency in Government. The people were fed up with irresponsible New Deal spending maladministration, an overloaded pay roll, an ever-increasing public debt, and sheer waste of money, manpower, and materials.

Much credit for carrying out this mandate to cut Government spending goes to the House Appropriations Committee chairman, JOHN TABER, the distinguished Congressman from New York.

Despite harassment and delaying tactics from the administration, trickery and delay from the bureaucrats, and irresponsible attacks from uninformed partisans, the chairman, acting on less than 30 percent of the budget, has managed to make cuts totaling nearly a half billion dollars. This is no small undertaking.

In addition to taking this action, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has made public facts and figures based on responsible investigations proving beyond any shadow of doubt the shameful conditions existing in the executive branch of the Government. So incisive have these revelations been that the bureaucrats and advocates of big spending are using all the tricks of their trade to undo the fine work of the House Appropriations Committee.

In this connection, I wish to read a column appearing in the Washington Times-Herald on April 18, 1948, signed by Frank C. Waldrop. Mr. Waldrop has put his finger on a matter which should be of concern to any Member of the House interested in participating in the activities of the next Congress to be elected by the public next November.

STAND BY TABER

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

It may be forgotten by some, but the Republican Party was swept into control of Congress in 1946 with one instruction from the voters plainer than any other: to cut the cost of government.

Not the cost of national defense. That's one we can't cut.

The cost of the swarming bureaucracy that has built up like a coral reef year by year since 1933 is the item the voters want reduced.

How have the Republicans done at their job?

When they got at the executive budgets for the first time in 1947, they had all the fresh vigor in the world. On the whole, they did a good job in both House and Senate.

But how are they doing this year? Again, let it be emphasized that all this discussion here concerns civil functions only, and has nothing to do with either military or foreign-relief appropriations.

This is strictly the question of how well the Republican majority is holding the line against the civilian bureaucrats, as it was instructed to do by the voters in 1946.

Up to this writing, the House has passed 10 appropriation bills for the new fiscal year, those for independent offices, civil functions of the War Department (rivers, harbors, dams, etc.), State, Justice, Commerce, Labor, Federal Security Administration, Treasury, Post Office, and Agriculture.

Mr. Truman asked $10,000,408,237 of Congress for 1 year's operation of these 10 departments, an average of a billion dollars each. Compare that with the total expenditures for all branches of the Government, civil and military, in 1933.

That year we spent $4,325,150,000 for everything. And even with all the pressure that Roosevelt could put on from there forward, the expenditures for 1940 for everything, civil and military, were only $9,127,374,000.

For just 10 civil departments in 1948, Mr. Truman asks more money than the whole Government got under Roosevelt's magic spell in 1940 even though he had Congress with him and the country had given no orders to turn the spigot off.

The important thing is that in 1946 the country said, "Turn it off."

So how has the House dealt this year with Mr. Truman's request for $10,000,408,237? It whittled him down by $425,107,471. That's less than half a billion, but it's a lot.

Credit for the job, and its a terrible, hard, grinding, and often thankless job, must go to Representative JOHN TABER, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee.

Mr. TABER is an up-State New York Republican who believes in economical government, and believes, more than that, the voters' orders of 1946 have not been revoked.

The question now, however, is how well those orders will be obeyed. The Senate is notoriously softer than the House when it comes to giving in where money is concerned.

Just why? The quick and most obvious answer usually is "Politics," meaning the pressure from the voters. But that doesn't square up with the facts.

The House is inevitably more sensitive to the public mood than the Senate because the whole House comes up for reelection every 2 years and only one-third of the Senate is up in any election year.

It doesn't stand to reason, therefore, that the Senate reflects public opinion more directly than the House. Senators, traditionally, are more independent of and run more often counter to public opinion than any other class of elected officials in any part of any of our myriad of governments, city, county, State, or National.

It is fair to say that the House, in being economical, is doing what the country wants.

Why, then, does the Senate move in the opposite direction so often? Last year, it was the Senate that repeatedly softened up the House's cuts in budgets.

This year, the Senators are up to their old tricks. In the matter of those 10 departmental budgets above mentioned, word comes from within the Senate Appropriations Committee that the House cuts will not only be healed but in plenty of instances more money will be appropriated than Truman even asked for.

Amazing as it is, that is the straight goods. The Republican Senate is quietly working around to contradicting the Republican House on economy in the civil government.

More than 100 Members of Congress (Republican and Democratic) have been heard by the Senate committee so far.

They include Members of the House who were faced down by TABER in their demands for protection of this or that operation affecting their own local interests, and they include Senators who intend to see nothing happens to projects of their own.

If all these special pleadings stick, the Senate will have overturned the economy program and the voters of 1948 will find that their 1946 mandate has flopped.

Why and how has the Senate lost its stinger in this matter?

Keep this question on the agenda for further development.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAHON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial by Mr. Charles A. Guy, an editor and publisher of Lubbock, Tex.

CONTEST WINNER RHODA CULLEN

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an essay by Rhoda Cullen, an essay contest winner sponsored by the American Legion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an essay written by one of my constituents, Rhoda Cullen, of Oxford, Ohio, who is one of the winners of the essay contest sponsored by the American Legion of Ohio.

It was my privilege to personally congratulate Miss Cullen on being one of the winners and upon her achievement, and I respectfully urge the membership of the House of Representatives to read her essay. I also compliment the American Legion of Ohio for sponsoring such a worth-while program and for bringing these winners as their guests to the greatest capital of the world.

The essay follows:

The United Nations offers the best method for international world peace yet put into action and as such deserves the support of all peace-loving people.

Its critics say it is merely an association of fully sovereign nations, each primarily interested in protecting itself, but we must remember that the Constitution of the United States of America was little more than that when written, while today it is a tremendously powerful instrument of government.

The wheels of progress move slowly and we must be patient. When Woodrow Wilson urged the United States to join the League of Nations following the First World War, only a small minority of thoughtful people were willing to cooperate in this effort of world government. The majority were opposed to entangling alliances with European countries and preferred to remain isolated as far as possible. Today the majority favors cooperation with the United Nations and realizes that the world is too small for any country to be independent of its neighbors.

It is encouraging that 57 nations including all the world's major powers now belong to the United Nations.

Concern has been expressed over the number of disagreements which have occurred in the Security Council, but it should be noted that its meetings are conducted in public, while diplomatic meetings for centuries past have been held behind closed doors. In spite of disputes, scores of cases regarding boundaries, reparations, and other important matters have been peacefully settled by the Security Council.

In addition, much worth-while work has been done by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, which comprises nine groups working toward higher standards of living and greater respect for human rights.

The United Nations, therefore, is an organization of which we in the democratic United States can be very proud.

To help it become more effective, we should, first of all, adopt a positive attitude toward it. We should quit saying, "There will always be wars," and "We can't expect utopia."

Instead we should say, "Wars must end. The United Nations must succeed. I will work to help it succeed and contribute generously to its support."

Second, we should encourage a broadening of the work of the Economic and Social Council in order to remove the causes of wars. We would suggest establishment of a worldwide broadcasting network, wider participation in student-exchange programs, elimination of illiteracy, speedier distribution of surplus food items, easier credit for nations in financial distress, higher labor standards, and promotion of international trade. In other words, we would rather spend money on education and economic betterment than on battle equipment. Easing financial, legal, and economic problems may also solve political issues.

Third, a change should be made in the veto provisions of the Security Council. James Burnham has suggested that decisions of the Security Council should become binding when 7 out of 11 members, including the majority of the Big Five, favor such decisions. This seems fair as under such a plan no single

power could veto a measure, but the Big Five would be protected against a majority made up of smaller nations.

Fourth, every effort should be made to establish an international atomic-control board which would create a feeling of greater international security and help halt the armament race. The Baruch-Lilienthal recommendations which point to a pooling of scientific knowledge seem logical.

Fifth, plans for an international police force should be carried to completion, with all member nations having a voice in its control.

Sixth, in our own country, we should quit looking down our noses at other people and try to appreciate the good points of our neighbor nations. We should support the Marshall plan as a means of strengthening democracies, it being natural to expect that individual democracies would support the United Nations more readily than would dictator-ruled countries. We should work through the United Nations and not independently, as we did in the Greek-relief project.

Finally, the United Nations can become more effective if every one of us will take a keen interest in its work and sincerely try to cooperate in understanding and encouraging others to understand its work.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. COLE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Kansas City Star.

Mr. MEYER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by the Speaker at the opening session of the DAR convention.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report by the Armour Research Foundation of the Illinois Institute of Technology.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in Collier's magazine. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $213, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

THE EUROPEAN RECOVERY PLAN

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Mr. Speaker, I was one of the Members of this House who voted in favor of ERP. I did so with some reluctance because I felt, at the time, that a program of aid to Europe might have some value in a rather critical world situation. As the days have gone by I have become more and more disturbed. I was particularly disturbed by the comments in the London Daily Express, a British newspaper with a circulation of almost 7,000,000 copies a day, which the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 12. The editorial spoke highly of what it called the good will which inspired the hearts of the Americans and said that this was characteristic of a people "who has sustained throughout the world the precepts of the Christian faith." The editorial said that the Americans "have declared themselves their brothers' keeper."

Finally, the editorial spoke of ERP as "a gesture more striking than any that has gone before," and then, after praising the warm feelings of the American Nation and recognizing the high ideals back of it, said this:

Even though the belief must be reiterated that the loan—

The editorial writer means the British loan of $3,750,000,000—

did nothing but injury to Britain and the Empire, and the Marshall aid will have the same result.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we should find out whether the people we are trying to help so generously really want this help. I hope the Appropriations Committee will give this serious thought.

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that a bushel of onions is worth more than a ton of grapefruit. It is also interesting to note that while the growers of grapefruit get approximately six or seven dollars a ton, the consumer, when he buys grapefruit, is lucky if he gets it under fifteen or twenty cents a pound. There is entirely too big a spread between what the producer gets and what the consumer must pay. This is true not only in fruits and vegetables but true in other items the farmer must produce. I have frequently urged that the Department of Agriculture and the proper committee in the House make a thorough study of the reasons for such a large spread in the price of the item to the farmer and what the consumer must pay.

The farmer today is frequently accused of high prices when in fact he hardly gets enough for his products to pay the cost of harvesting. This is true of grapefruit and oranges today.

There ought to be a complete investigation as to the cost of production and the price received by the farmer as well as why the consumer must pay such a high price for the food for the family.

The newspaper article reads as follows:

TEXAS ONIONS WORTH MORE THAN CITRUS

EDINBURG, TEX.—The smart kids of the Lower Rio Grande Valley would rather have an onion in their Christmas stocking than an orange.

For they know onions are worth more.

In fact a bushel of onions will bring the farmer more than a ton of grapefruit.

Onions in Willacy County, where 15,000 acres are being harvested, are going at $4.50 to $5 a bushel. Juice grapefruit is as low as $2.50 a ton, white grapefruit for shipment brings $4 a ton.

And red grapefruit, the pride of Texas, was quoted last week as low as $7 a ton, the lowest in the up-and-down history of the citrus industry.

By way of comparison goat manure brings $6 a ton.

All in all, the citrus picture is one of the gloomiest it's been in years while the vegetable deal has some exceptionally bright spots.

A field of Hidalgo County carrots brought $500 an acre and a Starr County farmer, with one of the few fields undamaged by January freezes, is reported to have turned down $600 an acre for his crop.

One patch of onions sold for $651 an acre to a Raymondville shipper.

With the price of citrus down and the weather knocking out many early tomatoes, the valley farmers this season turned to cotton, planting an estimated 600,000 acres for a new acreage record.

And as the growers planted cotton the citrus leaders sought to discover and remedy their price troubles. One proposal, but not taken seriously by most citrus leaders, for remedying the price situation calls for a $1 tax for planting a young citrus tree, a $2 reward for digging up a mature one.

DOES THE ARMY WANT THE RESERVES?

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of this House an article published in Collier's magazine, dated April 10, entitled "Does the Army Want the Reserves?" I have been asking that question for some time, and I am glad to see that one of the Reserve officers has finally published this article.

We have about 15,000,000 men who have returned to civilian life from the last war and they are all war trained and willing and able to go into uniform tomorrow, if necessary, and perform the job that they carried on during the war.

Under the law the Army was required to place all discharged veterans in the Reserve until 6 months after the emergency had ended. This was not carried out by the War Department, but the men were authorized to volunteer in the Reserves. One million one hundred and forty thousand men, both officers and enlisted men, volunteered for the Reserve and only 190,000 officers and 72,000 enlisted men have been assigned to units to date. The majority of these men who have been assigned are assigned to pools rather than organized and designated units.

Mr. Speaker, I charge the War Department with neglect of the greatest defense potential that exists in the United States at this time. I, personally, believe that the Army has neglected the Reserve forces for one purpose only, to make out a case for universal military training. By so doing they have caused a question to arise in the minds of all Reserves, "Does the Army Want the Reserves?" and I believe that the War Department

should be required to answer this question.

The question, as stated above, appears in the article written by Donald Robinson and appears on page 24 of Collier's. I recommend that every Member of this House read the article and consider the position of our Reserves at the present time.

I want to recommend your attention to the fact that one Reserve unit in San Francisco wanted to use training films for the purpose of training their organized Reserve unit so that they could be kept up to date on latest equipment and military methods. When this Reserve group contacted the headquarters of the Sixth Army they were told that the films were only available to the members of the armed services, and that they, as Reserves, were only civilians, and, therefore, could not use these military films. This Reserve unit was furnished a 5-year-old film, "Why We Must Fight the Nazis," to be shown to Reserve officers who are interested in continuing their training to be available in case of emergency.

I believe that our Regular Army should be required to answer for the attitude against the Reserves as demonstrated by their neglect, and as expressed by their testimony before the Armed Services Committee of this House. It is their responsibility to maintain an adequate national defense, and I believe the Reserves to be an integral part of that defense.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article regarding the Communist domination of the CIO Packing House Workers Union in Chicago that appeared in the Chicago Herald-American on Friday, April 9.

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous material in one.

Mr. BRADLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes, and to revise and extend my remarks and include any letters or tables I may wish to include.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

NONDEFENSE EXPENDITURES

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has appropriated a large amount of funds for increasing the Air Force on the ground that this is urgently needed for national defense. This means that nondefense expenditures must be held to the absolute minimum. Every nondefense appropriation that has already passed the House should be reexamined with a view of reducing it to the lowest possible point, and the appropriations still pending should be treated in the same manner.

The Nation must remain solvent in order to have sound defense against possible aggression. It is the patriotic duty of every American citizen to cooperate with the Congress not only to reduce existing burdens, but to prevent others being imposed.

COMMUNISM

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I am receiving many, many post cards similar to these, which I think many Members of Congress are receiving. If not, they ought to take notice.

THE PLACE TO DEFEAT COMMUNISM IS RIGHT HERE

It is ridiculous to spend billions of dollars to stop it abroad and then let Communists hold positions where they can destroy our own Government. Now is the time to get rid of every Communist who is working for the Government. Please use your influence to accomplish this before it is too late.

Lincoln said, "When you see an evil, strike it."

All real Americans of both parties expect you to help.

1. Outlaw communism—immediately.
2. Fire all Communists from Government positions—now.
3. Quit "fattening" Europe for Stalin to gobble up.
4. Be honest and sincere with America's hard-won freedoms.

Make no mistake about it—Americans are thinking and are demanding definite action on your part.

We are pledged to stand behind those next November who will safeguard and protect America's future now.

Liberty is more easily retained than regained.

COMMUNISTS MUST BE CLEANED OUT AT HOME

The American people will not give full support to any war and controlled plans until they see our Government completely clear out of its own ranks and in our country the disloyal—the Communists.

And they will not be satisfied with any halfway measures. Real Americans are for America and will stand behind those who will safeguard and protect America's future.

Be on the square for America.

LET'S NOT CREATE A SET-UP FOR COMMUNISM

Giving more power through laws to use more American men and money before we clean house at home is only creating a clear-cut set-up for communism and Russia. To defeat communism, we must start at home.

We demand that communism be outlawed and Communists be swept from every position in our Government.

Everywhere American people are discussing this and are aroused to action. Make no mistake about that.

Be true and honest with America and for the freedoms for which she stands. Stamp out communism. You can do it now if you half try.

BE HONEST AND TRUE TO AMERICA

Help our Government to—

1. Outlaw communism without further delay.
2. Rid Government of its disloyalists—the Communists.
3. Embargo vital shipments to Russia and her satellites.
4. Keep America safe through strength.

Through discussing these vital issues, all true Americans are arousing to concerted action—make no mistake about that. We are pledged to stand behind those who will safeguard and protect our future.

You can't do business with Stalin.

We are getting many of these post cards, referring to communism in our own country, yet we are spending millions and billions of dollars trying to eradicate it in foreign countries. Let us stay home and take care of America, and do it mighty quick, or we will not have any America to take care of.

BRITAIN'S BUREAUCRATS

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I recommend that the Members read today that part of the Wall Street Journal which states that in Great Britain 2,000,000 toil over 25,000 rules, and that the public responds with evasion. At this time Great Britain has 2,000,000 government employees regulating the conduct of the people of England. The article is as follows:

TWO MILLION TOIL OVER 25,000 RULES—PUBLIC RESPONDS WITH EVASION—NATIONALIZED INDUSTRIES TAKE MORE EXECUTIVES—SALARIES LOW, BUT COSTS ARE UP—SUCCESS IN THE MUSIC HALLS

(By John D. Leonard)

LONDON.—Government control has become Britain's biggest industry and a standard music hall joke.

The Board of Trade produced an edict that metal discs be attached to the horns of pedigreed Angus bulls being exported. Later the order was amended; it required instead that the horns should be branded. Then it was revoked—the board discovered Angus bulls don't have horns at all.

An Australian married in Britain sent pieces of wedding cake home to friends. His packages were returned empty with an official note that confectionery may not be exported.

A regulation was dreamed up to prohibit picking or sale of small green onions. The simple British farmer was given to understand that diameter shall be construed as meaning the maximum diameter of the bulb measured at right angles to the axis through the bulb and shoot.

An American businessman in Britain wanted to accept a typewriter being sent to him from his home office in the United States. No money was involved, yet he had to get an import license. It took 3 weeks to get the application papers; 3 months to get

the license. When it turned out the typewriter was of a different make than specified, the license had to be altered. That took another 3 months.

A group of former Polish soldiers was trained at considerable expense to make surgical instruments. They were to be absorbed in British industry, so set up in business in pre-fab huts. Needing more space, they decided to build additional huts. For this they required a building license. Their application was turned down. So back they went to their resettlement center, to be retrained in some other line of work.

IT TAKES TOIL

Controls like these cannot be effortlessly conceived and administered. They spring from the devoted toil of a vastly swollen army of public servants. The honest efforts of these honest civil workers is driving the honest British public into much law evasion. Britons are breaking many of their tangled rules without even knowing it—but they are also breaking and dodging many quite knowingly, in order to eat what they wish, or have a place to live in, or do business, or move from place to place.

Consider their plight:

The Ministry of Food with its rations tells 47,000,000 Britons what to eat for breakfast, lunch, and dinner.

The Board of Trade decides how much clothing they can buy.

The Ministry of Health controls the building and repair of homes.

The Ministry of Fuel determines which of them may drive an auto—and where they can go in it.

The Treasury prescribes which foreign countries they may visit.

The Ministry of Agriculture has the last word on who can kill a pig.

The Ministry of Supply parcels out steel and other supplies to industry.

BUTTERWORTH'S SERVICE

These are only a few example of the story wrapped up in some 25,000 rules and regulations which harness the life of every British man, woman, and child. Together these orders, shrouded in painful and often almost unintelligible legal language, fill six hefty volumes known as Butterworth's Emergency Legislation Service.

You can go through the alphabet of regulation—anchovies and antiques, beads and blotters. Some, like those dealing with food and clothes rationing, are household bywords to most Britons. Others are obscure or unknown in the public mind. Violation of any one of them carries a penalty. Sometimes the penalty is thousands of dollars.

The government as boss of Britain's planned economy has become the nation's biggest employer. Presently its pay roll numbers over 2,000,000.

Regular government agencies like the Board of Trade, Treasury, and Home Office—the administrative agencies of this brave new Britain—boast a corps of some 700,000 civil servants. Before the war, there were only about 300,000 in these departments. Wartime rationing of food, clothing and other items in short supply led to new controls, and in some cases entirely new agencies to swell the ranks of the British civil service. Now they are semi-permanent fixtures in the British way of life.

For example, the Food Ministry, a war-born agency, boasts a staff of about 50,000. Of these, about 2,000 are busy just rationing bread. The Ministry of Fuel—formerly the pint-sized Ministry of Mines (461 employees)—now has a staff of 6,176 trying to conserve power resources and ration gasoline.

Another newcomer, the Ministry of National Insurance, has 15,737 employees on its pay roll to keep tabs on a new cradle-to-grave insurance scheme. Still another newcomer is the Ministry of Supply, which employs 38,134. As for the old-line agencies, the Board of Trade, whose prewar staff numbered around 4,248, has swollen to 14,566 as boss of government activities connected with industry and trade including everything from clothes rationing to the export drive. The Ministry of Works with a prewar staff of 6,273 now has 20,190 as controller of building other than housing. The Office of Inland Revenue has doubled its prewar staff and now maintains 48,460 employees handling Britain's increasingly complicated taxes.

IT COSTS MORE

Costs of maintaining this corps of bureaucrats have more than doubled from prewar. Taxpaying Britons now foot an estimated $1,400,000,000 annual bill to maintain them, as compared with a prewar $600,000,000.

Salaries are still relatively low. Highest paid civil servant is hardworking Sir Edward Bridges, permanent secretary to the Treasury and financial watchdog of the civil service. He's paid $15,000 annually. Next in line is the permanent secretary of each of the other ministries. Each earns $14,000 annually. And the deputy secretaries are paid $10,000 a year.

At the other end of the ladder embryonic bureaucrats such as 14-year-old juvenile typists earn around $400 annually, stenographers, $832, and secretaries, $1,400 a year.

Beyond the civil service are the nationalized industries such as transport with 800,000 workers and electricity with 120,000. They are supposed to pay their own way but are responsible to various ministers on policy matters—for example the National Coal Board is accountable to Fuel Minister Hugh Gaitskell. So they are part of the government bureaucracy.

MORE MANPOWER

Administration of nationalized industries often demands more workers than it did under private enterprise. The National Coal Board now employs 22,000 administrative workers as compared with about 16,000 under private ownership. Around 1,000 are employed at the board's headquarters in London, the remainder of the administrative staff being scattered throughout the board's 8 divisional and 50 area offices. Then there are 718,000 coal miners.

Wages are comparatively low compared to those paid by private enterprise, particularly in the higher brackets. For example, Lord Hyndley, board chairman and a former industry man, earns $34,000 yearly. The average salary of other administrative officers runs between $2,400 and $2,800 yearly. Clerks and typists get anything from $676 to $832 yearly. However, salaries of many employees in the nationalized industries are higher than those paid to regular civil servants, because they were taken over from private enterprise. War Minister Emanuel Shinwell thinks salaries of top-drawer officials of the nationalized industries are too high and warns they must prepare for a cut. Many here feel that the state will lose these officials to private industry if their salaries are axed—for there still are some private posts to which they could flee.

Government control in the socialist manner dates back to the 1939 and 1940 Emergency Powers Acts to mobilize for war. The emergency powers had to be renewed annually by parliament.

VOTED IN

Retention of controls was a major issue in the 1945 general election and once in office the labor government left no doubt that Britain was destined for a controlled economy so long as it remained in power. Parliament with its big labor majority passed the Supplies and Services Act which allowed the government to continue until 1950 all controls and regulations made under the old 1939 and 1940 Emergency Powers Act. At the same time it also armed itself with new power under which it could regulate prices for goods and services of all kinds. Last August the government obtained still more authority with such vague terms as "for generally insuring that the whole resources of the community are available for use and are used in a manner best calculated to serve the interests of the community."

Under these powers controls have multiplied like rabbits. Since the general election an estimated 6,500 new orders and regulations have been saddled on Britain's economy by acts of Parliament, and many more have come by administrative decree.

Most Britons—socialists and conservatives too—agree that controls such as food, clothes, and gas rationing are here to stay at least until shortages are overcome. In other words, foods must be rationed until Britain can afford to pay for more imports. Clothes will be rationed until production is high enough to meet both export targets and home requirements. Gasoline will be handed out in driblets until Britain can find dollars to buy more. Likewise prices on these and other necessities of life will be fixed until their abundance is achieved.

What about the maze of other regulations which govern British life? Some which fit into the pattern of a planned economy are expected to be retained by the Labor Government so long as it is in power. For instance, there's little doubt that the increasingly complicated system of taxation—income, surtax, profits tax and the capital levy—will continue on its "soak the rich" basis. This fits into the Labor Government policy of "fair shares for all." Industry can expect less and less freedom from the planners. Profits and dividends distributions will be limited by compulsion if voluntary efforts fail in the eyes of the government. The government is also expected to continue purchasing and distribution of such raw materials as cotton, copper, and zinc. British workers will be directed into industry so long as the manpower shortage persists.

BRITISH BURDEN

The burden of many of these controls falls on the individual Englishman.

To build a home he must submit to a complicated routine which requires permits, licenses, and approvals from a galaxy of agencies. The building site must be approved by local authorities under the town and country planning and the restriction of ribbon development acts. Plans must get the blessing of the Ministry of Health; the total cost of the work plus the value of the land must not top a certain limit. Building licenses must be obtained. Applications must be filed with a variety of authorities in order to buy controlled materials such as slate, lumber, iron or steel, paint, plaster, and fittings for electrical work. Applications are even necessary to obtain gasoline to run concrete mixers. Imagine the frustration of home building Britons when one or more of these applications is either lost, neglected, or subject to some other delay by officials dealing with them. This is often the case.

So far, revolt has not tended so much to mass political action as to individual evasion of the rules. For example, householders can only spend $40 on home repairs each year unless they get a license to do additional work. These are hard to come by. To avoid form filling and the possibility that the application may be rejected many simply pay their contractor the first $40 by check and the rest in cash. The contractor puts the check in his bank and the cash in his pocket.

British ingenuity has reached a new high in evasion of the Fuel Ministry's cancellation of the basic gasoline ration. Motorists can't drive their own cars to their favorite gray-

hound race tracks or other amusement centers. But there isn't any ban which prevents their hiring a bus. Well-to-do Britons also resort to chauffeur-driven hired autos which also get enough gas to carry customers. Some drivers have turned their own autos into "hackney carriages" for hire to obtain gas for pleasure purposes. Many autoists who used to get along on their basic pleasure gas ration have squeezed into the ranks of essential motorists. Never have so many Britons had to travel so far by car on so much essential business.

British courts have been doing a brisk business in cases of violations of such restrictions, for acts which would have been legal before the war. The newspapers are full of tales about unlucky folk who've been meted out stiff fines. A big catering firm was fined $114,000 for conspiring to sell onions and for selling pears above the controlled price. A firm of contractors was fined $1,500 for building an office without a license. Hundreds of vacationists have been handed stiff fines for cashing bank checks on the Continent—a violation of the foreign exchange controls which limit the amount of money Britons can take out of Britain.

Mr. Speaker, we are sending them more money, including $265,000,000 for tobacco during the next year, which they are going to sell to their people at high prices in order to get a billion dollars to carry on activities of the kind described in the article. It is about time for us to cut that amount down to $25,000,000, and also cut down the shipment of lumber, steel, and certain other essential commodities which we need so badly in this country in order to construct housing for our veterans and their families. The Committee on Appropriations should take due notice of those items which are in short supply in this country before permitting any more of such items to be shipped abroad. We can be charitable without displaying insanity. The empires of Great Britain and France should not be preserved at the expense of the people of this Nation.

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter I have written the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I may not be able to attend the meeting to be held in Chicago today and tomorrow by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY], chairman of the Subcommittee on Surplus Property. I have called his attention to some situations there and in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, excessive personnel are still employed in WAA in the Chicago area and at the Washington office. The insignificant results the WAA personnel are accomplishing, to my mind, amount to a theft of the taxpayers' money; perhaps I ought to call it legalized theft. Much of this excessive pay roll is waiting around to later be shifted to the ERP pay roll. I have called Mr. RIZLEY's attention to two fiascoes in the Chicago area.

Mr. Speaker, the letter I have sent to the gentleman from Oklahoma is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 19, 1948.

Hon. ROSS RIZLEY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Surplus Property, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: I want to thank you for your invitation for me to join your subcommittee during its meetings in Chicago, Tuesday, April 20 and 21. Because there are two hearings of subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations, of which I am a member, and also a hearing on a resolution before the Rules Committee tomorrow, at which I am scheduled to testify, I regret that I shall be unable to be with you in Chicago on Tuesday. I shall endeavor to be there on Wednesday.

I hope your subcommittee will be able to thoroughly investigate the following:

1. The excessive personnel still employed in WAA in the Chicago area and at the Washington office.

2. The insignificant results WAA personnel is accomplishing.

As I understand it, there is very little surplus property to be disposed of.

One of the outstanding fiascoes in the Chicago area is that of Revere Copper & Brass, Plancor 91, located at 6630 West Fullerton Avenue. This plant was built and equipped during 1942 by the Defense Plant Corporation for the manufacture of brass cartridge disks and cups. The plant was advertised for sale March 29, 1946, and April 3, 1946. The cut-off date for receiving bids was established as April 15, 1946.

Offer received April 15, 1946, to purchase by Garrett Metals Corp., for cash $3,500,000 for real property with selected machinery. This offer was declined by Washington, May 1947. Please note that the Washington office took over 13 months to act upon this offer.

The plant was again advertised June 5, 1947, and one offer was received, $1,800,000 for the entire plant and equipment from Robert Zwikel. This offer was rejected.

Negotiations subsequently conducted produced the following offers:

1. To purchase, made by Fullerton & Associates for $2,500,000 cash for entire plant and equipment.

2. To purchase, made by International Rolling Mills Products Corp. for $2,900,000, for the real property and selected items of production equipment.

3. To lease, with agreement to purchase, made by the Cowles Industries, Inc., at $200,000 per annum for a 5-year-term lease, with agreement to purchase for $4,200,000 at the end of 5 years.

This deal was accepted by the board in Washington, providing Cowles could raise the necessary funds to conduct the business. (Dun & Bradstreet state he has but $100,000 in assets). Cowles was given until May 3, 1948, to raise the money.

The dilatory treatment in Washington lost the market for this plant. There is no assurance that Cowles can raise the money. It costs the Government about $150,000 per annum to maintain and protect this plant.

Another fiasco in the Chicago area is Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., Plancor 328, located in East Chicago, Ill.

This property was advertised for sale and a cut-off date for receiving offers was established as May 16, 1947.

Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. offered to purchase the plant for $510,000. The Washington Board of WAA rejected this and made a counter proposal of $565,589.90. Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. refused to pay more than their offer and then finally refused to make any kind of an offer, saying they were not interested in it at any price.

This action on the part of Washington office was stupidity. It is my understanding that the Chicago office recommended $510,000.

I believe your inquiry in Chicago will disclose that the Washington office has been the bottleneck, apparently desiring to continue its personnel in their present employment.

It is my understanding that Mr. Otto Klein is regional director and Joe Burke, deputy, both at Navy Pier, Chicago. It would be my recommendation that you find out from Mr. Klein the cost for storage, heating, loss in taxes, etc., due to the do-nothing policy of WAA.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH E. CHURCH.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE of Florida (at the request of Mr. ENGLE of California) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

HON. JOHN McCORMACK

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my great personal pleasure in the high honor which has been paid to one of our most distinguished colleagues.

Pope Pius XII has conferred upon the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, of Boston, Mass., the title of Knight of Malta.

The Holy Father has recognized in JOHN MCCORMACK a Catholic gentleman of outstanding ability and character and has awarded to him one of the highest honors within the Catholic Church.

The Order of Knights of Malta is the oldest order of laymen and prelates in the church. It was founded in the middle of the eleventh century, and its history can be traced to the Hospitallers of St. John of Jerusalem, and then through the Knights of Rhodes.

One of the chief conditions for admission to this great order of the church is nobility of character. Those of us who have been associated with JOHN MCCORMACK in the House of Representatives can attest to the fact that he fulfills this condition in a marked degree.

JOHN MCCORMACK is a gentleman of exceptional legal and legislative ability. He has been of immeasurable help to many freshmen Democratic Members of Congress. His patience and understanding have been a tower of strength on which all Democratic Members could rely.

His loyalty and courage are well known to all of us. A skilled parliamentarian, he has been aggressive and fearless in debate. He has been a great champion of the Democratic Party and a fearless

defender whenever it has been under attack.

Yet at all times he has been a gentleman in the full sense of the word. He has been blessed with a high sense of honor and a full appreciation of the dignity of the positicn which he occupies. We can all vouch for the fact that he has treated political friend and foe alike in acknowledging the dignity which goes with membership in this body.

While he has been a forceful advocate of Democratic Party principles he has always treated Members of the other side of the aisle with the respect which is due their positions.

I am proud to be numbered among his friends. I take great pride in this latest honor which has been paid to him.

I pray God will grant him many years of good health so that he can continue for a long time to render valuable service to God and his country.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech on foreign policy.

THE ELECTIONS IN ITALY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, it is evident now that the anticommunistic forces have achieved a smashing victory in Italy. The security of the United States is thus measurably strengthened.

Perhaps the foremost reason for the victory in Italy was the tremendous amount of work that Americans of Italian descent did in writing to their friends and relatives in Italy telling them about democracy in the United States, and explaining to them the contributions that the United States has been making since the end of the war toward the rehabilitation of Italy.

The idea for this campaign was originated, to the best of my knowledge, by Luigi Polcari, of 201 Princeton Street, East Boston, Mass. He wrote to me on July 15, 1947, as a constituent. In his letter he said:

During the war many Americans whose forebears came from Italy broadcast pleas to Italy to join and aid the Allied cause and subsequently many made pleas for a just peace to Italy in keeping with these promises that they made in these broadcasts and to reward Italy for the good work Italy did for the Allied cause after the overthrow of Mussolini.

I believe that the people of Italy do not understand that we Americans are trying to help them.

I think, however, that they could be made to understand if you and other influential Americans would get behind a movement to have the hundreds of thousands of American soldiers of Italian descent and their families write to their relatives in Italy and tell them the things America has done to help them and at the same time explain what these other countries, these so-called friends of Italy, but who are really enemies, have done to increase reparations and to take territory from Italy, contrary to the American point of view.

If this could be distributed on any large scale to these Americans of Italian descent, with the request that they communicate these thoughts to relatives and friends in Italy, I am sure from my conversations with many in greater Boston that the Italian people would rush to send these writings to cement friendship with the United States and do everything to combat those who seek to undermine our friendship and influence in Italy.

I am merely an ordinary workingman, but I am sure that this is a workable plan and if the propaganda division of the State Department will look into this, I believe they would find that this would be our greatest aid in keeping the peace that we hoped we won when we fought the war.

I do not know about other people who have opposed the United States, but I think if this plan was also tried with the French, Germans, English, Yugoslavs, etc., that great strides would be made toward cementing friendly relations with America.

This letter was forwarded to the Department of State. Mr. Francis H. Russell, Director of Public Affairs, wrote me on April 19, 1948, that "Mr. Polcari's suggestion for a letter-writing campaign to Italy was, to the best of my knowledge, the first such proposal to reach the Department, and the idea was so well received that steps were taken to give it wider circulation." Accordingly, with the permission of my office and of Mr. Polcari, the exchange of letters was turned over to the Common Council for American Unity in New York City, to be made available to the various Italian language newspapers in the United States.

Recently, I have learned through that organization that Mr. Polcari's suggestion, in conjunction with several other similar ideas, had been very widely publicized, and had undoubtedly been in great measure responsible for the current letter-writing campaign.

Thus a great contribution had been made by an ordinary citizen toward the security of this country. To Luigi Polcari the citizens of this country owe a lasting debt.

The letters from Mr. Polcari to me, dated July 15, 1947, and from Mr. Russell, of the State Department, to me, dated April 19, 1948, are set forth as follows:

EAST BOSTON, MASS., *July 15, 1947.*

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KENNEDY: I recently read in the editorial page of the Boston Globe an article by Sumner Welles in regard to the Marshall plan in keeping Italy in the Allied orbit.

As the result of reading this and because I am an American, I am writing this letter to you. My parents were born in Italy and I am a war veteran, so naturally I am sympathetic toward the Italian people.

Consequently, I would like to submit the following in line with the Marshall plan.

During the war many Americans whose forebears came from Italy broadcast pleas to Italy to join and aid the Allied cause and subsequently many made pleas for a just peace to Italy in keeping with these promises that they made in these broadcasts and to reward Italy for the good work Italy did for the Allied cause after the overthrow of Mussolini.

I believe that the people of Italy do not understand that we Americans are trying to help them.

I think, however, that they could be made to understand if you and other influential Americans would get behind a movement to have the hundreds of thousands of American soldiers of Italian descent and their families write to their relatives in Italy and tell them the things America has done to help them and at the same time explain what these other countries, these so-called friends of Italy, but who are really enemies, have done to increase reparations and to take territory from Italy, contrary to the American point of view.

If this could be distributed on any large scale to these Americans of Italian descent, with the request that they communicate these thoughts to relatives and friends in Italy, I am sure from my conversations with many in Greater Boston that the Italian people would rush to send these writings to cement friendship with the United States and do everything to combat those who seek to undermine our friendship and influence in Italy.

I am merely an ordinary workingman, but I am sure that this is a workable plan, and if the propaganda division of the State Department will look into this, I believe they would find that this would be our greatest aid in keeping the peace that we hoped we won when we fought the war.

I do not know about other people who have opposed the United States, but I think if this plan was also tried with the French, Germans, English, Yugoslavs, etc., that great strides would be made toward cementing friendly relations with America.

Thanking you for your consideration, I am,

Very truly yours,

LUIGI POLCARI.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 19, 1948.

The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. KENNEDY: Mr. T. J. Reardon of your office has called concerning a letter of July 15, 1947, from Mr. Luigi Polcari of East Boston, Mass., which was referred by you to the Department of State on July 23. Mr. Polcari suggested in his letter that Americans of Italian descent write to their families and friends in Italy, telling them about democracy in the United States and explaining to them the contribution which the United States has been making since the end of the war toward rehabilitation in Italy.

You may remember that the Department pointed out in reply on August 8, 1947, that it welcomed any expression of volunteer participation on the part of United States citizens toward making clear to the peoples of other countries the foreign policies of the United States.

Mr. Polcari's suggestion for a letter-writing campaign to Italy was, to the best of my knowledge, the first such proposal to reach the Department, and the idea was so well received that steps were taken to give it wider circulation. Accordingly, with the prior permission of your office and of Mr. Polcari, the exchange of letters was turned over to the Common Council for American Unity in New York City to be made available to the various Italian language newspapers in the United States. Recently, I have learned through that organization that Mr. Polcari's suggestion, in conjunction with several other similar ideas, had been very widely publicized and had undoubtedly been in great measure responsible for the current letter-writing campaign.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS H. RUSSELL,
Director, Office of Public Affairs.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two letters.

Mr. LUCAS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article in the New York Times dated April 8, 1948, on the subject of reciprocal trade agreements.

Mr. MULTER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and to include various newspaper articles.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three different instances and include newspaper articles.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and include a very interesting and enlightening discussion which took place on the five hundredth consecutive broadcast of the weekly radio program entitled "People's Platform," between the senior Senator from Ohio and Mr. Walter P. Reuther, president of the UAW-CIO. This broadcast was on the CBS network from Station WTOP in Washington on Sunday, April 11, 1948, and was on the question: The American Standard of Living: How Can It Best Be Improved?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT (at the request of Mr. LARCADE) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain extraneous matter.

PALESTINE

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure many of the Members have read in the newspapers recently statements attributed to an Arab leader, King Abdullah, of Transjordania, that Haganah Jewish defense forces in the battle of Mishmar Halmek were led by Russian officers.

This is a Hitlerian lie so monstrous it can be instantly recognized as the technique of Goebbels, and it has been so branded by the Jewish Agency and by newspaper correspondents who entered the battle area and discovered that the actual commander is a Jew who has been in Palestine since 1929. Most of the young people in that colony are from America, England, and South America.

The British puppet state of Transjordania is following the Hitler line that if you tell a big enough lie people will believe it.

Haganah has no need for foreign troops. The 30,000 veterans of the Jewish Brigade are there to serve Palestine as they served England in her time of need against the Nazi hordes.

There is no reason that the Jews of Palestine should turn to the U. S. S. R. As a matter of fact, the Soviet Government has been selling arms to the Arabs, which have been used to kill Jewish people. In Russia it is forbidden to speak Hebrew, to belong to a Zionist organization, to emigrate to Palestine, and God knows how many Jews have died or are dying in Soviet prison camps for being Zionists. The Jews of Palestine look to the western democracies.

Arab spokesmen at the United Nations have tried to draw the red herring of a Soviet alinement across the path of the Jewish agony. They cannot.

I say to you that this so-called march on Washington last week, supposedly to save Palestine, was led by a group of people who had little interest in Palestine or in Zionism, or in the misery of the Jews of Europe. Many of those who came were misguided people sincerely interested in the cause; but they were misled by those willing to use the cause and the sincerity for their own devious purposes. I hope Members of this House will not be misled by such propaganda, nor turned against the Jewish cause by such demonstrations.

Such demonstrations with palpable political motives merely tend to foster the Hitlerian lie that Communists are interested in the Jews, or the Jews in communism. The record is clear, and I hope none of my colleagues will be misled by such propaganda.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] has expired.

FRIENDLY COMMUNICATIONS WITH PEOPLE IN EUROPE

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, on the basis of the current election returns, it appears that the ancient citadel of Christianity, the new Republic of Italy, has been saved from communism. I think this is probably the most significant development since the conclusion of the late war. I think it marks a day for great rejoicing on the part of the American people.

I would like to mention also that, in my opinion, one of the contributing factors to this tremendous victory for democracy was the fact that the American people took the time and the effort and the trouble to write to their friends in Italy, telling them in their own words about our country and its freedom.

In that connection, I should like to make one other suggestion to the Members of this body. The suggestion was made in the Cotton Trade Journal last week that some plan be worked out whereby we send to the countries of Europe discarded magazines and periodicals in this country. I think that is an excellent suggestion. I believe the results in Italy in the last 2 days can well testify to the value of this type of information about our country.

Mr. Speaker, several days ago a prominent resident of the city of New Orleans, Mr. Ben J. Williams, who has been active in the cotton trade for many years, which activity has taken him to Europe on many occasions, made a suggestion which I consider of great worth.

That suggestion was carried in the Cotton Trade Journal, an international newspaper of the cotton industry.

Mr. Williams recommended—

That the United States Post Office Department be authorized and directed to immediately arrange for the acceptance and distribution of millions of discarded magazines of recent issue, free of cost, to all zones of Germany, to Japan, Italy, and other countries where tens of millions of people are misinformed and ignorant of the accomplishments of the United States—where freedom of enterprise offers to the individual the right to pursue happiness and reap a just reward for every contribution to the peacetime economy of the Nation and the world.

Mr. Williams added:

Today I threw away 40 popular magazines of recent date, all containing interesting stories, domestic and world news, and, most important of all, advertisements which evidence large-quantity competitive offerings of high-quality necessities and luxuries.

People over the world are hungry for knowledge as well as for food, clothing, shelter, and opportunity. The individuals of nations do not know each other, and most of their fear and all of their hate are derived from ignorance. They are unable to purchase newspapers, books, and magazines which convey knowledge of life in the United States. They distrust specific articles, official speeches, and radio programs which experience has shown are often prejudiced propaganda.

I hope the above suggestion will immediately receive widespread endorsement.

Mr. Speaker, the battle against communism is a battle of ideas and propaganda as much as a battle of governments and competing national sovereignties.

The effectiveness of using American magazines cannot be overestimated, and it is my firm opinion that this Congress should give serious consideration to the implementation of the excellent suggestion made by Mr. Williams.

At this point I should like to include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Cotton Trade Journal for April 16, entitled "An Effective Weapon":

AN EFFECTIVE WEAPON

On page 1 of last week's issue we carried a box displaying prominently a suggestion by Ben J. Williams, New Orleans cotton shipper, that Congress authorize the United States Post Office Department to arrange for acceptance and distribution of millions of discarded magazines of recent issue free of cost to occupied territories of former enemy nations, and elsewhere where people are ignorant of the accomplishments of American free enterprise.

Outside of the articles and stories which reflect our high standard of living, Mr. Williams pointed out, are "advertisements, which evidence large-quantity competitive offerings of high-quality necessities and luxuries."

Mr. Williams' suggestion has all the potentialities of a high-powered weapon in the ideological warfare between two systems of government which today are at grips in the non-man's lands of Europe and Asia. The effectiveness of Russia's propaganda machine is based on the Red premise that American capitalism is tottering on its last legs, that a catastrophic economic collapse here is both inevitable and imminent.

The most effective counterpropaganda we can send abroad is reading material published by Americans for American consumption. This would make a deeper impression

than stereotyped State Department statements or radio broadcasts beamed abroad specifically for foreign ears.

We trust Mr. Williams' suggestion will be taken up by alert Congressmen and acted upon favorably.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

BULL SHOALS

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, in a long-distance telephone conversation with the office of the chief of the Little Rock district of the Corps of Engineers the other day, they expressed concern over the cut in the appropriations for the Bull Shoals Dam, which is now under construction on the White River in the district which I represent.

I concur in their concern for these reasons: The Bureau of the Budget recommended appropriations of $17,000,000 for the next fiscal year. The House cut that figure to $14,000,000, which will cut the construction program to less than 1 year and unless the deficienc· appropriation is made in January 1949, construction will slow down almost to a standstill.

We have a great power shortage in our State, and the whole Southwest for that matter, and construction of these hydroelectric dams is very necessary. The sooner we can get them into production the better. By the cutting of this appropriation, we may delay the production of hydroelectric energy for a year.

I am told that the dam, when completed, will return to the Treasury in the neighborhood of $2,000,000 annually from the sale of power. In other words, we will begin to liquidate the expenditure of the cost of this project and at the same time relieve the power shortage which exists.

I think this is sound public business and I hope that the appropriation can be raised to at least $25,000,000 when the civil functions appropriation bill returns to the House from the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REEVES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by Dr. Armand Eisler.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances, in one to include a statement with regard to the bill H. R. 6258, which he introduced, and in the other to include a story identifying the figure represented by the statue atop the Capitol dome in Washington.

THE MARSHALL PLAN AND BRITAIN'S RECOVERY—BY A MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have just received four letters from members of the British Parliament by air mail this morning. I want to read one of them and will include them all in the RECORD later:

LONDON, ENGLAND, *April 15, 1948.*

The root cause of Britain's crisis is the application of evil principles of government. Relate all details to the violation or justification of basic principles.

Britain's economic difficulties are not mainly due to the ravages of war. The main obstacle to recovery is the economic policy of our Socialist government. "The central question is not what caused the crisis (and crisis means judgment—judgment on the futility of socialism) but what measures are most likely to cure it." (Hazlitt.)

Our Government squandered the American loan. They say in their 1948 survey, "On no account must such aid be used merely to provide us with greater ease and comfort," yet our Chancelor envisages increases this year, by at least £200,000,000, of the social services. It is hypocrisy run mad. By their policy they are, in fact, creating conditions of misery and hunger which provide a fertile soil in which the foul germs of communism will flourish. The spiritual content of socialism has proved a sham.

In the true interests of the human race, America must insist on supervision of the spending of Marshall aid, otherwise it will be poured down the Socialist drain.

Our crisis is neither financial, economic, nor "dollars." It is a spiritual crisis.

The greatest saying of all times, "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness and all these (material) things shall be added." He did not say, "Seek ye first shorter hours, higher wages, and state help and Marshall aid." Britain is different from all other countries. We are not and cannot become self-supporting. We must export food and services at world competitive prices or starve. Anything that American can do to make our people face facts will be rendering a great service, not only to Britain but also to America.

God, in His wisdom, gave Moses Ten Commandments. Our Government is vainly trying to run Britain with some 24,000—result, chaos.

The battle cry for Britain—and America—must be, "Freedom within the 4 walls of the Ten Commandments." Britain and America, with their common heritage, must and can, with God's help, save the world from being drowned in a flood of atheistic and materialistic communism.

WALDRON SMITHERS,
House of Commons.

SHADES OF UNRRA

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the billions of dollars plus millions which this country spent on UNRRA have long since passed into the limbo of things forgotten and gone, except the fact that we owe the money that we put up for that purpose—and I am not regretting that—it appeared to be necessary at the time in the name of suffering, starving men, women, and children.

But it is now proposed to take a balance of $363,544 left over from these appropriations and spend it to write, so they say, a history of UNRRA. Why not just forget it? It would save this balance of $363,544. Why take that much money when we are spending billions to protect civilization and our own country? Why take that much money and pour it down a rathole?

Who are these so-called historians who propose to make a twice-told tale of this venture? It is embedded in the legislative history of the country. We all know about it. Why can there never be surcease or relief for the sorely beset taxpayers of this country from the cutpurses of this Republic, and these remnants of the New Deal who are undertaking to perpetrate an outrage like this? Why not apply this money as a payment on our debts? Why turn it over to a bunch of loafers? Why not let them go to work?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Is that included in ERP?

Mr. JENNINGS. No; it is just a balance that is left over. They cannot sleep at night until they have spent it. I would like to keep it for the benefit of the taxpayers of the country.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a prize essay written last week and that in the permanent RECORD it be inserted with the others that were included last week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from Pathfinder.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address made by the President of the United States at the annual dinner of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include resolutions passed by the General Court of Massachusetts.

Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement taken from the New York Times.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from Mr. R. H. Rowe, vice president and secretary of the United States Wholesale Grocers Association.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his re-

marks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE REPORT NO. 986

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 46 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 10,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 986 submitted by the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations, pursuant to Public Law 101, Eightieth Congress, for the use of said joint committee.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANSWERING THE ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to direct the attention of the Members of the House to the speech of President Truman which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] has just asked unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD.

I cannot agree with that speech. I cannot agree with the 10 points enunciated therein which provide for price-fixing.

When you start fixing prices in this country, you are bound to ration purchases; and when you fasten upon the American people, in times of peace, price-fixing and rationing of purchases, you start this country down the road toward national socialism such as is now cursing and probably wrecking the British Empire.

I appeal again to the Committees on Banking and Currency of the two Houses to begin a program to control inflation by limiting the issuance of currency by these Federal Reserve banks which we are compelled by the present law to accept as legal tender.

As a result, the volume of our currency has been inflated to more than $28,000,000,000 from $4,500,000,000 only a few years ago.

So instead of starting out on this program of socialism that may ultimately lead to communism and collapse, I appeal to the Members of Congress, and especially to the members of the Committees on Banking and Currency, to take up this question of the issuance of money and regulating the value thereof, which is vested in Congress by the Constitution; and let us get back on the beam and save America from the disaster that now threatens Great Britain.

I repeat what I save said on this floor time and time again, and what every well-informed economist will tell you, that prices in a free country are governed by two things: the volume of the Nation's currency multiplied by the velocity of its circulation.

We are now in the throes of a financial inflation that must be curbed by Congress and regulated by law, or we will spiral into disastrous inflation, and probably then plunge into deflation that may complete the wreckage of this country.

This situation cannot be curbed by any such a socialistic program as that proposed by the President, which would involve the fixing of prices, and the rationing of purchases.

I hope the Banking and Currency Committees of the two Houses will take this matter up and bring in legislation to check this inflation, and to regulate the issuance of currency, before it is everlastingly too late.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

AMENDING TITLE 17 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE ENTITLED "COPYRIGHTS"

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4931) to amend title 17 of the United States Code, entitled "Copyrights," with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 22, strike out "$3.00" and insert "$4.00."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I have just listened to the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] and the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. I have just finished about a 6,000-mile trip, not stopping in many sections of the country, but sufficiently enough to say to the Members of this House that the people are very much concerned about the possibility of war and they are very much concerned about the increase in the cost of living. I should like to suggest to the gentleman from Mississippi—and this is given to him with great sincerity—that when you talk about the spread and growth of socialism, I think we must be concerned with the fact that this body is going to be called upon soon to pass legislation to draft the young men into the armed forces of this Nation. We are aware of the fact that the munitions makers are now pressing their Congressmen, asking them whether or not they should reconvert from a civilian production into wartime production. Every Member of this body today knows that the aviation industry is preparing for war contracts. We must recognize the tremendous economic pressures that are going to give us a further increase in the cost of living.

We have been warned repeatedly by the Council of Economic Advisers and by the President of the United States that week by week and month by month the danger of inflation has become increasingly perilous. Despite these repeated warnings this Congress has failed to take any action to protect the interests of the people and to safeguard our democracy. The billions of dollars that we have spent and intend to spend throughout the world in the cause of peace will have been thrown away and wasted unless and until we take the proper steps to preserve a sound economy within the borders of our own Nation.

We, as a Nation, have been catapulted into a position of world leadership. In the pursuit of that leadership it has become necessary to commit ourselves throughout the world to a tremendous economic program. In the support of that leadership in recent weeks and months we have been called upon to build for ourselves a strong military program of security. Our economic efforts abroad and our obligation to insure our national security have obligated us to the expenditure of billions upon billions of dollars. In addition, we shall soon be called upon to enact legislation drafting the youth of the Nation into military service in time of peace.

It is said that we take these steps to preserve the peace of the world. Therefore, the peace of the world depends upon the soundness of our domestic economy, for the expenditure of these billions of dollars has and is continuing to produce a serious strain upon the economy of this Nation. Every thinking person recognizes this, for it is reflected day by day in the increase in the cost of living. The time has come, then, for us to begin to turn our thought inward upon those matters that affect the general welfare of the people, giving them every possible protection against the ravages of inflation and above all to insure a sound internal economy upon which the very program of world peace itself depends.

JAPANESE MANDATED ISLANDS OF THE PACIFIC

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 129, Rept. No. 1758), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Whereas the President, on behalf of the United States, pursuant to authority contained in Public Law 204 of the first session of the Eightieth Congress, has approved an agreement between the Security Council of the United Nations and the United States of America pursuant to which the United States has become the administering authority for the trust territory of the Pacific islands, heretofore known as the Japanese Mandated Islands of the Pacific; and

Whereas it is the responsibility of the Congress of the United States to provide a permanent government for the trust territory of the Pacific islands; and

Whereas the problem of administration of the trust territory of the Pacific islands is interrelated to the administration of Guam, American Samoa, Wake Island, and other United States island possessions in the Pacific Ocean: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be composed of three members who are members of the Committee on Public Lands of the Senate, to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, and three members who are members of the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. The committee shall make a thorough study and investigation of the islands, groups of islands, and other areas included within the trust territory of the Pacific, and all other islands, groups of islands, and other areas in the Pacific which are possessions of, or subject to the authority of, the United States, including study and investigation of—

(a) the peoples, customs, laws, economies, resources, and governments of such areas;

(b) the interrelation, and the natural or appropriate integration, of such areas;

(c) the interrelation of the security of such areas and the security of the United States;

(d) measures designed to advance the security and well-being of the peoples and economies of such areas; and

(e) such other matters relating to such areas as the committee may deem appropriate.

SEC. 3. The committee shall complete its study and investigation as expeditiously as possible, and shall forthwith thereafter report to the Committee on Public Lands of the Senate and the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Reprensentatives the results thereof, recommending such organic and other legislation as may be necessary to provide for the civil government of such areas, and to assure to the peoples of such areas justice, peace, and tranquillity, a voice in their civic affairs and government, the development of their economies and the protection of their civil rights, all with due regard to the established customs of such peoples.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this concurrent resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress, to employ such consultants, specialists, clerks, and other assistants, to travel, and authorize its assistants to travel, freely through such areas and such other places, to utilize such transportation, housing, and other facilities as the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Air Force may make available, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers approved by the chairman or vice chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of disbursements so made.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 4, beginning with line 3, strike out "The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words."

Page 4, line 6, after the word "committee" strike out ", which shall not exceed $."

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

AMENDING THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1946

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5216) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 so as to provide that no person shall take office as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission or as General Manager of such Commission until an investigation with respect to the character, associations, and loyalty of such person shall have been made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

PECUNIARY INTEREST IN FREIGHT FORWARDERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3692) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, with respect to ownership or stock interest in freight forwarders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CARROLL, Mr. HUBER, and Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri objected.

AMEND IMMIGRATION LAWS RELATING TO STOWAWAYS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5119) to amend the immigration laws relating to stowaways, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BRADLEY. I object, Mr. Speaker.

AIR MAIL DELIVERY BY GOVERNMENT-OWNED TRUCKS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2588) requiring all mails consigned to an airport from a post office or branch, or from an airport to a post office or branch, within a radius of 35 miles of the city in which there has been established a Government-owned vehicle service to be delivered by Government-owned motor vehicles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the effect of this bill is to require that, in 132 cities, efficient private contractors be ousted and the carrying of airport mail be turned over to the motor-vehicle service of the Post Office Department.

As to the efficiency of the motor-vehicle service, I read testimony from the hearings on the bill by a man presumably in favor of its adoption:

The motor-vehicle service in the United States Post Office Department is a monstrosity; the equipment is antiquated; it is broken down almost completely. I really marvel that they can keep the trucks running. Some trucks date back to 1915, and the bulk of them are of the 1932 vintage.

There is other testimony equally damaging. Therefore, I object, Mr. Speaker.

AMENDING THE NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2286) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I understand a rule is being asked for on this bill. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5564) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. CHENOWETH objected.

SALES AND USE TAXES ON CIGARETTES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5645) to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CHURCH and Mr. SHORT objected.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Missouri to withhold his objection, in view of the fact that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], the author of the bill, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, is unavoidably absent and cannot be here today? I was hopeful the request to pass the bill over without prejudice would be agreed to.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

INCREASED ALLOWANCES FOR ESCORTS OF REPATRIATED WAR DEAD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5870) to amend the act of May 16, 1946 (Public Law 383, 79th Cong.), as amended, to provide increased allowances for the escorts of repatriated war dead.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of May 16, 1946, entitled "An act to provide for the evacuation and return of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States" (Public Law 383, 79th Cong.), as amended by the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 368, 80th Cong.), is further amended by adding the following sections:

"SEC. 10. The Secretary of the Army is further authorized to prescribe allowances at such rates as may be necessary to provide for adequate quarters, subsistence, and other necessary incidental expenses for escort personnel utilized in the administration of this act without regard to rates and allowances presented prescribed by sections 10 and 12 of the act of June 16, 1942, as amended: *Provided*, That such allowances prescribed by the Secretary of the Army in no case shall exceed $8 per day.

"SEC. 11. Reference in any of the foregoing sections of this act to the 'Secretary of War' shall be construed to refer to the 'Secretary of the Army', as established by the act of July 26, 1947 (Public Law 253, 80th Cong.)."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5623) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CARROLL, Mr. HUBER, and Mr. BATES of Kentucky objected.

ENLISTMENT OF WOMEN IN ARMED SERVICES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1641) to establish the Women's Army Corps in the Regular Army, to authorize the enlistment and appointment of women in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps and the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mrs. BOLTON. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am advised that a rule has already been granted on this bill. Therefore, I object.

Mr. BUCK. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I object, Mr. Speaker.

DISPOSING OF IRRIGATION EXPERIMENT STATION AT BARD, CALIF.

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 354) to provide for the disposing of the Government irrigation experiment station at Bard, Calif., and the establishment in lieu thereof a similar station at or near Brawley, Calif.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. BUCK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] as to the attitude of the Department of Agriculture on the resolution?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Replying to the gentleman from New York, the Department is very much in favor of this because it is exchanging a piece of ground it now uses for a much better piece of ground, with the farmers of the district paying the difference in cost. The matter which is involved is an authorization which would otherwise have been used at another station. Therefore, there is no additional expenditure in the long run. The Department is very much in favor of the resolution, and it came through the committee unanimously. No one has objected to it at any time.

Mr. BUCK. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas research and experimentation into the agricultural problems of the Imperial Valley of California and its adjacent territory should be improved and intensified: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed, upon such terms and conditions as he may determine, to sell the irrigation experiment station of the Department of Agriculture at Bard, Calif.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized and directed to establish, equip, and maintain an irrigation experiment station at or near Brawley, Calif., and for such purpose he may acquire land and other property and facilities by purchase, lease, or donation.

SEC. 3. The Secretary is authorized to utilize the proceeds of the sale of the Bard station for the purposes of this act or, in lieu of the sale provided for in section 1, he may exchange the Bard station for land, buildings, or facilities at the Brawley station.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as Congress may determine to carry out this act.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1648) to authorize the expenditure of income from Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for training of Federal prisoners.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

STAR-ROUTE CONTRACTS

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 347) to authorize the Postmaster General to withhold the awarding of star-route contracts for a period of 60 days.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4007) to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the rule of the Objectors Committee on the Consent Calendar is not to permit any bill to go through by unanimous consent which will call for an expenditure of more than a million dollars. This bill would call for an expenditure of about $19,000,000. Regardless of the merits of the bill, and I personally believe that it is a meritorious bill, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, one of the Members who is vitally interested in this bill is not present today. I think it was his intention to move to substitute the Senate bill, because the cost involved in the Senate bill is much less this year than it was last year. After consultation with one of the aides of the Veterans' Administration, we have found that it will save money because some will never come out of the hospitals so that they can have the automobiles. The cost of the bill with the suggested amendment would probably amount to $1,500,000 a year. The doctors tell me that it is one of the finest rehabilitation measures that has ever been proposed.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am not questioning the merits of the bill. May I say that in deference to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS], the author of the bill, I have requested that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, and that is the reason I am not saying any more on this subject at this time. He will be back 2 weeks from now.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

DEVELOPMENT OF PROSTHETIC APPLIANCES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5320) to aid in the development of improved prosthetic appliances, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5680) to provide for limiting participation as beneficiary under the National Service

Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

TARIFF ACT OF 1930

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5553) to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish some Member of the Committee on Ways and Means would explain this particular bill.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, this bill pertains to the matter of permitting the free admittance of small newsprint paper in widths of fifteen inches. It continues the condition that has prevailed for 1 year. The larger widths are admitted free of import duty. I can tell the gentleman that this bill has the clearance of the Department of Commerce, the Tariff Commission, and in the trade, the printing industry, the newspaper industry, who say that the bill is O. K. There is no objection so far as I know in the committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is amended by striking out "July 1, 1948" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1949."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FORT PECK TRIBAL EXECUTIVE BOARD

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1021) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay salaries and expenses of the chairman, secretary, and clerk of the Fort Peck General Council, members of the Fort Peck Tribal Executive Board, and other committees appointed by said Fort Peck General Council, and official delegates of the Fort Peck Tribes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, or his duly authorized representative, is hereby authorized beginning as of July 1, 1947, and until otherwise directed by Congress, to pay out of any unobligated tribal funds of the Fort Peck Indians in the Treasury of the United States the following salaries and expenses:

To the chairman, secretary, and clerk of the Fort Peck General Council, and members of the Fort Peck Tribal Executive Board or other committees appointed by the general council, when engaged on business of the tribes, a salary of not to exceed $8 per day and a per diem of not to exceed $3 in lieu of subsistence and all other expenses; to such official delegates of the Fort Peck Tribes who may carry on the business of the tribes at the seat of government a salary of not to exceed $8 per day and a per diem of $10 in lieu of subsistence and all other expenses: *Provided*, That the rate of salary and per diem paid shall be fixed in advance by the general council of said tribes or by the Tribal Executive Board of the said tribes if authorized by said general council: *Provided further*, That the official delegates of the tribes carrying on said business at the seat of government shall also receive the usual railroad and sleeping-car or airplane transportation to and from the seat of government, or, if travel is by automobile, delegates furnishing such transportation shall receive an amount equivalent to the cost of their railroad and sleeping-car transportation to and from the seat of government, but salary and per diem shall not be paid to delegates traveling by automobile for any period in excess of the time required to perform the travel by railroad: *Provided further*, That the total amount of the aforesaid salaries and expenses shall not exceed $10,000 per annum: *And provided further*, That the length of stay of the official delegates at the seat of government shall be determined by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESCALERO APACHE INDIAN TRIBE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1468) providing for payment of $50 to each enrolled member of the Mescalero Apache Indian Tribe from funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to withdraw from the Treasury so much as may be necessary of the trust fund on deposit to the credit of the Mescalero Apache Tribe, and to make therefrom payment of $50 to each enrolled member of such tribe. The money paid to such members under this act shall not be subject to any lien or claim of any nature against any of such members.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1583) to provide for the conveyance to the State of Maryland, for the use of the University of Maryland, of the northern portion of a parcel of land previously conveyed by the State of Maryland to the United States for the use of the Bureau of Mines.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the State of Maryland, for the use of the University of Maryland, a tract of land in Prince Georges County, Md., described as follows: Beginning at the stone monument that marks the corner formed by the intersection of boundary lines of the lands now or formerly owned by John and Rachel Keiley (liber S. D. H. 332, folio 113); Sam and ——— Buckley (liber 47, folio 325); Charles E., Harry W., James E., and Mary E. McNamee; and the University of Maryland (Maryland Agricultural College, liber C. S. M. 2, folio 294); near College Park, Prince Georges County, Maryland, and running thence with the line formerly owned by McNamee on the one side and the Bureau of Mines on the other side, south forty degrees forty-seven minutes, four seconds west nine hundred and thirty-nine and forty-sixth one-hundredths feet to an iron pipe marking what was formerly the Engle-McNamee corner (being part of the north forty-four degrees east two hundred and sixty-two and twenty twenty-fifths perches line of Maryland Agricultural College, liber C. S. M. 2, folio 294); thence north eighty-nine degrees thirty minutes no seconds east until it intersects the east line of the Bureau of Mines property seven hundred and one and eighty-eight one-hundredths feet; thence north no degrees thirty minutes west six hundred and sixty-six and thirty-nine one-hundredths feet to an iron pipe marking the northeast corner of the Bureau of Mines property; thence north sixty-four degrees forty-five minutes twenty-four seconds west ninety-one and seven one-hundredths feet along the University of Maryland (formerly Keiley) line to the point of beginning and containing six and three thousand one hundred and forty-eight ten-one-thousands acres.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FORT SUMTER NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Clerk called Senate Joint Resolution 94, to establish the Fort Sumter National Monument in the State of South Carolina.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to transfer, without consideration, to the Secretary of the Interior title to the site of the historic structure known as Fort Sumter, situated in Charleston Harbor, Charleston, S. C., together with such buildings and other improvements as are appurtenant to such site.

SEC. 2. The property acquired by the Secretary of the Interior under this joint resolution shall constitute the Fort Sumter National Monument and shall be a public national memorial commemorating historical events at or near Fort Sumter. The Director of the National Park Service under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior shall have the supervision, management, and control of such national monument, and shall maintain and preserve it for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of the United States, subject to the provisions of the act entitled "An act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes," approved August 25, 1916, as amended.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CROW TRIBE OF INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2352) to provide for sale to the Crow Tribe of interests in the estates of deceased Crow Indian allottees.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon request of the Crow General Council or a committee empowered to act for it, the Secretary of the Interior may execute an order transferring interests in inherited lands to the United States in trust for the Crow Tribe, provided (a) tribal funds of the Crow Tribe are available for payment of the purchase price, (b) a request is presented in writing by or for the heirs as provided in the Crow Act of June 8, 1940 (54 Stat. 952), and the appraised value as determined by the General Council or said committee is accepted by or for the heirs as above provided. The accrued irrigation operation and maintenance charges, if any, which are a lien on the land may remain as a charge against the land and the amount thereof shall be considered in determining the appraised value of the interests. In transferring interests the Secretary of the

Interior shall give preference so far as possible to transfers to the tribe of interests in estates having the largest number of heirs.

SEC. 2. Upon request of the General Council or said committee, the Secretary of the Interior may approve the sale to any Crow Indian of any lands, title to which is taken in the name of the United States in trust for the Crow Tribe under the first section of this act, but preference in the sale of any such lands so far as possible shall be given to individual heirs of the deceased allottee with the largest interests. Such sale shall not include any mineral interests belonging to the tribe. Upon payment of the purchase price, the Secretary shall, and he is hereby authorized to, convey by appropriate order the interest of the tribe in and to such lands to the purchaser thereof in trust, and such lands shall continue to be nontaxable so long as the lands remain in restricted status. In any case in which irrigation operation and maintenance charges have accrued against the lands sold under this section and remain unpaid at the time of such sale, the obligation to pay such charges shall be assumed by the purchaser. Such charges may be deferred for 10 years and the purchaser shall pay such charges in 10 equal, annual installments, commencing with the eleventh year.

SEC. 3. Interests in lands acquired by the Crow Tribe and sold to one of its members in accordance with the provisions of sections 1 and 2 of this act may again be acquired and sold pursuant to the same provisions.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, insert "or his duly authorized representative."

Page 2, line 2, after the word "Stat.", strike out "952" and insert "252."

Page 2, line 9, after the word "Interior", insert "or his duly authorized representative."

Page 2, line 14, after the word "Interior", insert "or his duly authorized representative."

Page 2, line 23, insert "or his duly authorized representative."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAWAIIAN HOMES COMMISSION ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3633) to amend section 203 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, designating certain public lands as available home lands.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 203 of title II of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of July 9, 1921 (42 Stat. 109; 48 U. S. C. 697), as amended, designating certain public lands as available home lands, is further amended by adding thereto the following:

"Wailuku, Maui: That parcel of Government land, situate in the District of Wailuku, island and county of Maui, comprising twelve and four hundred and fifty-five one-thousandths acres of the Ili of Kou and being a portion of the land covered by General Lease No. 2286 to Wailuku Sugar Co., Ltd., notwithstanding the fact that said parcel is cultivated sugarcane land, subject, however, to the terms of said lease."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 2, after the word "being", insert the word "a."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RATIFYING SECTIONS 1 AND 2 OF JOINT RESOLUTION 7, LEGISLATURE OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3635) to ratify sections 1 and 2 of Joint Resolution 7 enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in its regular session of 1947.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of Joint Resolution 7, enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in its regular session of 1947, amending section 4565 of chapter 78 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945, so as to fix at 4 percent the maximum interest rate chargeable upon the sale of public lands for homestead, residence, or other purposes, and amending section 4601 of such chapter 78 so as to reduce from 6 percent to 4 percent the interest rate a freeholder must pay on the balance of the purchase price under a cash freehold agreement, is hereby ratified.

SEC. 2. Section 2 of such Joint Resolution 7, reducing to 4 percent the interest rate on all special sale agreements and special homestead agreements made prior to the date of enactment of this act, is hereby ratified.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAWAIIAN HOMES COMMISSION ACT, 1920

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3680) to amend sections, 207, 209, 213, 215, 216, 220, 222, and 225, of title 2 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], a question on this bill. When the bill was under consideration by the committee, there was some discussion as to whether or not there would be an amendment inserted in section 2, as a check against this Commission granting franchises for 21 years. Was there further discussion and consideration of that matter?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The committee gave further consideration to that and established the fact that the old law carried that provision as provided, and we did not eliminate it.

Mr. CARROLL. The identical provision is in the old law?

Mr. CRAWFORD. In the old law; 21 years.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 207 (a) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 207. Leases to Hawaiians, licenses:

"(a) The Commission is authorized to lease to native Hawaiians the right to the use and occupancy of a tract or tracts of Hawaiian home lands within the following acreage limits per each lessee: (1) Not less than 1 nor more than 40 acres of agricultural lands; or (2) not less than 100 nor more than 500 acres of first-class pastoral lands; or (3) not less than 250 nor more than 1,000 acres of second-class pastoral lands; or (4) not more than 1 acre of any class of land to be used as a residence lot: *Provided, however*, That, in the case of any existing lease of a farm lot in the Kalanianaole Settlement on Molokai, a residence lot may exceed 1 acre but shall not exceed 4 acres in area, the location of such area to be selected by the lessee concerned: *Provided further*, That a lease granted to any lessee may include two detached farm lots located on the same island and within a reasonable distance of each other, one of which, to be designated by the Commission, shall be occupied by the lessee as his home, the gross acreage of both lots not to exceed the maximum acreage of an agricultural or pastoral lot, as the case may be, as provided in this section."

SEC. 2. Section 207 (c) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"(c) (1) The Commission is authorized to grant licenses for terms of not to exceed 21 years in each case, to public-utility companies or corporations as easements for railroads, telephone lines, electric power and light lines, gas mains and the like. The Commission is also authorized to grant licenses for lots within a district in which lands are leased under the provisions of this section, to—

"(A) churches, hospitals, and public schools;

"(B) theaters, garages, service stations, markets, stores, and other mercantile establishments (all of which shall be owned by lessees of the Commission or by organizations formed and controlled by said lessees).

"(2) The Commission is also authorized, with the approval of the Governor, to grant licenses to the United States for terms not to exceed 5 years, for reservations, roads, and other rights-of-way, water storage and distribution facilities, and practice target ranges: *Provided*, That any such license may be extended from time to time by the Commission, with the approval of the Governor, for additional terms of 3 years: *Provided further*, That any such license shall not restrict the areas required by the Commission in carrying on its duties, nor interfere in any way with the Commission's operation or maintenance activities."

SEC. 3. Section 213 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 213. Hawaiian home-loan fund; Hawaiian home-development fund; Hawaiian home-operating fund; Hawaiian home-administration account: (a) There are hereby established in the treasury of the Territory two revolving funds to be known as the Hawaiian home-loan plan and the Hawaiian home-operating fund, and two special funds to be known as the Hawaiian home-development fund and the Hawaiian home-administration account.

"(b) Hawaiian home-loan fund: Thirty percent of the Territorial receipts derived from the leasing of cultivated sugar-cane lands under any other provisions of law, or from water licenses, shall be deposited into the Hawaiian home-loan fund until the aggregate amount of the fund (including in said amount the principal of all outstanding loans and advances, and all transfers which have been made from this fund to other funds for which this fund has not been or need not be reimbursed) shall equal $2,000,000. In addition to these moneys, there shall be covered into the loan fund the installments of principal paid by lessees upon loans made to them as provided in paragraph 2 of section 215, or as payments representing reimbursements on account of advances made pursuant to section 209 (1), but not including interest on such loans or advances. The moneys in said fund shall be available only for loans to lessees as provided for in this act, and for the payments provided for in section 209 (1), and shall not be expended for any other purpose whatsoever,

except as provided in paragraphs (c) and (d) of this section.

"(c) Hawaiian home-development fund: Twenty-five percent of the amount of moneys covered into the Hawaiian home-loan fund annually shall be transferred into the Hawaiian home-development fund until the aggregate amount of such annual transfers shall equal $400,000. The moneys in said development fund shall be available, with the prior written approval of the Governor, for the construction of sanitary sewerage facilities, for the construction of roads through and over Hawaiian home lands, and for other nonrevenue producing improvements.

"(d) Hawaiian home-operating fund: All moneys received by the Commission from any other source, except moneys received for the Hawaiian home-administration account, shall be deposited in a revolving fund to be known as the Hawaiian home-operating fund. The moneys in said fund shall be available (1) for construction and reconstruction of revenue-producing improvements, including acquisition therefor of real property and interests therein, such as water rights or other interests; (2) for payment into the treasury of the Territory of such amounts as are necessary to meet the following charges for Territorial bonds issued for such revenue-producing improvements, to wit, the interest on such bonds, and the principal of such serial bonds maturing the following year; (3) for operation and maintenance of such improvements, heretofore or hereafter constructed from said fund or other funds; and (4) for the purchase of water or other utilities, goods, commodities, supplies, or equipment and for services, to be resold, rented, or furnished on a charge basis to occupants of Hawaiian home lands. The moneys in said fund may be supplemented by other funds available for, or appropriated by the legislature for, the same purposes. In addition to such moneys, said fund, with the approval of the Governor, may be supplemented by transfers made on a loan basis from the home-loan fund. The amounts of all such transfers shall be repaid into the home-loan fund in not exceeding 10 annual installments, and the aggregate amount of such transfers outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $500,000. No projects or activities shall be undertaken hereunder except as authorized by sections 220 and 221 or the other provisions of this act.

"(e) Match moneys: The Commission is authorized and empowered to use moneys in the development and operating funds, with the prior written approval of the Governor, to match Federal, Territorial, or county funds available for the same purposes and to that end is authorized to enter into such undertaking, agree to such conditions, transfer funds therein available for such expenditure and do and perform such other acts and things, as may be necessary or required, as a condition to securing match funds for such projects or works.

"(f) Hawaiian home-administration account: The entire receipts derived from any leasing of the available lands defined in section 204 shall be deposited into the Hawaiian home-administration account. The moneys in said account shall be expended by the Commission for salaries and all other administration expenses of the Commission, not including structures and other permanent improvements, subject, however, to the following conditions and requirements:

"(1) The Commission shall, at such time as the Governor may prescribe, but not later than November 15 preceding each biennial session of the legislature, submit to the Territorial director of the Bureau of the Budget its budget estimates of expenditures for the next ensuing biennium in the manner and form and as required by Territorial law of Territorial departments and establishments.

"(2) The Commission's budget, if it meets with the approval of the Governor, shall be included in the Governor's budget report and shall be transmitted to the legislature for its approval.

"(3) Upon approval by the legislature of the Commission's budget estimate of expenditures for the ensuing biennium, the amount thereof shall be available to the Commission for said biennium and shall be expendable by the Commission for the expenses hereinabove provided, or, if no action on the budget is taken by the legislature prior to adjournment, the amount submitted to the legislature, but not in excess of $200,000, shall be available for such expenditures; any amount of money in said account in excess of the amount approved by the legislature for the biennium or so made available shall be transferred to the general fund of the treasury of the Territory, such transfer to be made immediately after the amount of moneys deposited in said administration account shall equal the amount approved by the legislature or so made available.

"(4) The money in said administration account shall be expended by the Commission in accordance with Territorial laws, rules, and regulations and practices."

SEC. 4. Section 215 (1) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as last amended by the act of November 26, 1941 (55 Stat. L. 785), is hereby further amended by deleting from the first sentence the figures "$3,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$5,000", and by deleting from the first sentence the figures "$1,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$3,000", so as to cause the portion of the first sentence following the colon and preceding the proviso to read as follows: "The amount of loans at any one time to any lessee, or successor or successors in interest, of a tract of agricultural or pastoral land shall not exceed $5,000 and to any lessee or successor or successors in interest, of a residence lot shall not exceed $3,000."

SEC. 5. Section 215 (2) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"(2) The loans shall be repaid in periodic installments, such installments to be monthly, quarterly, semiannual, or annual, as may be determined by the Commission in each case. The term of the loan shall not exceed 30 years: *Provided*, That payments in any sum in addition to the required installments, or payment of the entire amount of the loan, may be made at any time within the term of the loan. All unpaid balances of principal shall bear interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum, payable periodically or upon demand by the Commission, as the Commission may determine. The payment of any installment due shall, with the concurrence therein of at least three of the five members of the Commission, be postponed in whole or in part by the Commission for such reasons as it deems good and sufficient and until such later date as it deems advisable. Such postponed payments shall continue to bear interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum on the unpaid principal."

SEC. 6. Section 216 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 216. Insurance by borrowers; acceleration of loans; lien and enforcement thereof: The Commission may require the borrower to insure, in such amount as the Commission may by regulation prescribe, all livestock and dwellings and other permanent improvements upon his tract, purchased or constructed out of any moneys loaned from the fund; or in lieu thereof the Commission may directly take out such insurance and add the cost thereof to the amount of principal payable under the loan. Whenever the Commission has reason to believe that the borrower has violated any condition enumerated in paragraph (2), (4), (5), or (6) of section 215 of this title, the Commission shall give due notice and afford opportunity for a hearing to the borrower or the successor or successors to his interest in the tract as the case demands. If upon such hearing the Commission finds that the borrower has violated the condition the Commission may declare all principal and interest of the loan immediately due and payable notwithstanding any provision in the contract of loan to the contrary. The Commission shall have a first lien upon the borrower's or lessee's interest in his tract, growing crops, either on the tract or in any collective contract or program, dwellings, or other permanent improvements thereon, and his livestock, to the amount of all principal and interest due and unpaid and of all taxes and insurance upon such tract and improvements paid by the Commission, and of all indebtedness of the lessee, the payment of which has been assured by the Commission. Such lien shall have priority over any other obligation for which the tract, said growing crops, dwellings, other improvements, or livestock may be security.

"The Commission may, at such times as it deems advisable, enforce any such lien by declaring the borrower's interest in his tract, or his successor's interest therein, as the case may be, together with the said growing crops, dwellings, and other permanent improvements thereon, and the livestock, to be forefeited, the lease in respect to such tract canceled, and shall thereupon order the tract to be vacated and the livestock surrendered within a reasonable time. The right to the use and occupancy of the Hawaiian home lands contained in such tract shall thereupon revest in the Commission, and the Commission may take possession of the tract and the improvements and growing crops thereon: *Provided*, That the Commission shall pay to the borrower any difference which may be due him after the appraisal provided for in paragraph (1) of section 209 of this title has been made."

SEC. 7. Section 220 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 220. Development projects; appropriations by Territorial Legislature; bonds issued by Legislature: The Commission is authorized directly to undertake and carry on general water and other development projects in respect to Hawaiian home lands and to undertake other activities having to do with the economic and social welfare of the homesteaders, including the authority to derive revenue from the sale, to others than homesteaders, of water and other products of such projects or activities, or from the enjoyment thereof by others than homesteaders, where such sale of products or enjoyment of projects or activities by others does not interefere with the proper performance of the duties of the Commission: *Provided, however*, That roads through or over Hawaiian home lands, other than Federal-aid highways and roads, shall be maintained by the county or city and county in which said particular road or roads to be maintained are located. The Legislature of the Territory is authorized to appropriate out of the treasury of the Territory such sums as it deems necessary to augment the Hawaiian home-loan fund, the Hawaiian home-development fund, the Hawaiian home-operating fund, and the Hawaiian home-administration account, and to provide the Commission with funds sufficient to execute and carry on such projects and activities. The legislature is further authorized to issue bonds to the extent required to yield the amount of any sums so appropriated for the payment of which, if issued for revenue-producing improvements, the Commission shall provide, as set forth in section 213 (d)."

SEC. 8. Section 222 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as last amended by the act of November 26, 1941 (55 Stat. L. 787), is hereby further amended by amending the second sentence thereof to read as follows: "All expenditures of the Commission, as herein provided out of the Hawaiian home-administration account, the Hawaiian home-development fund, or the Hawaiian home-

operating fund, and all moneys necessary for loans made by the Commission, in accordance with the provisions of this chapter, from the Hawaiian home-loan fund, shall be allowed and paid upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor, approved by the chairman of the Commission."

SEC. 9. Section 225 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 225. Investment of loan funds; disposition: The Commission shall have the power and authority to invest and reinvest any of the moneys in the loan fund, not otherwise immediately needed for the purposes of the fund, in such bonds and securities as authorized by Terriotorial law for the investment of Territorial sinking fund moneys. Any interest or other earnings arising out of such investments shall be credited to and deposited in the Hawaiian home-operating fund and shall be considered a deposit therein from the other sources mentioned in section 213 (d)."

SEC. 10. This act shall take effect on and after the date of its approval.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 4, line 3, strike out the word "plan" and insert the word "fund."

Page 10, line 17, strike out the word "paragraph" and insert in lieu thereof "paragraphs."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend sections 207, 213, 215, 216, 220, 222, and 225, of title 2 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SESSION LAWS OF 1947 OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3954) to approve Act No. 74 of the Session Laws of 1947 of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act relating to revenue bonds of the Territory of Hawaii," and Act No. 95 of the Session Laws of 1947 of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act relating to Territorial and county public improvements and the financing thereof by the issuance of revenue bonds."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Act No. 74 of the Session Laws of 1947 of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act relating to revenue bonds of the Territory of Hawaii," passed by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii and approved by the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii on May 12, 1947, and Act No. 95 of the Session Laws of 1947 of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act relating to Territorial and county public improvements and the financing thereof by the issuance of revenue bonds," passed by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii and approved by the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii on May 13, 1947, are hereby confirmed and ratified: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be deemed to prohibit the amendment of such Territorial legislation by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii from time to time, subject to the provisions of section 1 of the Act of Congress entitled "An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the issuance of certain bonds, and for other purposes," approved August 3, 1935, or such other act or acts of Congress as may then govern the issuance of revenue bonds by the Territory of Hawaii and its political subdivisions, including without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing the amendment of said Act No. 95 of the Session Laws of 1947 of the Territory of Hawaii to provide for changes in the improvements authorized by said act or in the officers or entities authorized to make said improvements, or otherwise.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RATIFYING ACT 237 OF THE SESSION LAWS OF HAWAII 1947

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4091) to ratify Act 237 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1947.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Act 237 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1947, providing for the development, storage, distribution, and supply of water in and near the District of Wahiawa, in the city and county of Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, is hereby ratified. Nothing therein shall be deemed to approve, add to, alter, or extend any provision of any lease, license, or other instrument issued by the Commissioner of public lands of the Territory of Hawaii, or to confer any water right of, or in lands owned by, the United States of America or the Territory of Hawaii.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAYMENT TO PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS SERVING FORT PECK PROJECT, MONTANA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4201) to authorize payments to the public school district or districts serving the Fort Peck project, Montana, for the education of dependents of persons engaged on that project.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War, payments may be made, in advance or otherwise, from any funds available for the Fort Peck project, Montana, to the school district or districts serving that project as reimbursement for educational facilities (including, where appropriate, transportation to and from school) furnished by the said district or districts to pupils who are dependents of persons engaged in the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project and living at or near Fort Peck upon real property of the United States not subject to taxation by State or local agencies and upon which payments in lieu of taxes are not made by the United States, which payments for any school year shall not exceed that part of the cost of operating and maintaining such facilities which the number of pupils aforesaid in average daily attendance during that year bears to the whole number of pupils in average daily attendance at those schools during that year: *Provided*, That of the whole amount so paid in any fiscal year, the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, shall reimburse the Secretary of War from the continuing fund provided in section 10 of the act of May 18, 1938 (52 Stat. 403), that part which is properly chargeable as an operation expense incident to the generation and transmission of power delivered to the Bureau under that act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "War" and insert "the Army."

Page 2, line 13, strike out "War" and insert "the Army."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELIGIBILITY FOR BURIAL IN NATIONAL CEMETERIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4203) to establish eligibility for burial in national cemeteries, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that S. 1620 be substituted for the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I assume the amendment which the gentleman is going to offer has been discussed with members of the committee. I am sure it is not one of those amendments on which there might be a difference.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The Senate and House bills are identical, except the House bill has an extra sentence defining the term "widow." My amendment adds to the Senate bill the additional sentence in the House bill. That is all there is to the amendment. The chairman of the committee is present and confirms that.

Mr. McCORMACK. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BUCK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this bill covers men in all three branches of the service, yet it gives jurisdiction to the Secretary of the Army. I wanted to ask the sponsor of the bill why the committee did not give that jurisdiction to the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I might point out that the national cemeteries are administered by the cemeterial division of the Quartermaster Corps, which is in the Department of the Army.

Mr. BUCK. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WELCH. All national cemeteries are under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Lands.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, will not the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. LANHAM. I am making this request on behalf of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]. I do not care to withhold it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO THE NORTHEASTERN STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE AT TAHLEQUAH, OKLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4512) to provide for the conveyance of certain land to the Northeastern State Teachers College at Tahlequah, Okla.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to grant and convey, for and in consideration of $1, to the Northeastern State Teachers College, Tahlequah, Okla., all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain land in Tahlequah, Okla., more particularly described as follows:

The south two and one-half acres of the north fifteen and forty-five one hundredths acres of Seminary Park, less twenty-five feet on the east side and twenty-five feet on the north side of such fifteen and forty-five one hundredths acres, reserved for road purposes according to the official plat of the city of Tahlequah, Okla., approved by the Secretary of the Interior on March 4, 1904.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Northeastern State Teachers College" and insert in lieu thereof "State of Oklahoma for the use and benefit of the Northeastern State College."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land to the State of Oklahoma for the use and benefit of the Northeastern State College at Tahlequah, Okla."

CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE RECREATIONAL AREA PROJECT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4551) to provide for the addition of certain surplus Government lands to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area project, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the tract of surplus Federal property, comprising 8 1/10 acres of land, situated in Dare County, N. C., approximately 2 miles north of Kitty Hawk, and designated as "Surplus Real Property No. WH-NC-29, Kitty Hawk, N. C.," which is now subject to disposition by the War Assets Administration, is hereby transferred, without exchange of funds, to the administrative jurisdiction of the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior, to be administered as a part of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area project, authorized by the act of August 17, 1937, as amended (50 Stat. 669; 16 U. S. C., secs. 459–459a–3), and shall be subject to all laws applicable thereto.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRIBAL FUNDS OF THE NAVAJO TRIBE OF INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4642) to provide for disposition and use of tribal funds of the Navajo Tribe of Indians.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of existing law, the tribal funds now on deposit or hereafter placed to the credit of the Navajo Tribe of Indians in the United States Treasury shall be available for such purposes as may be designated by the tribal council of said tribe and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UTILIZATION AS NATIONAL CEMETERIES OF SURPLUS ARMY DEPARTMENT OWNED MILITARY REAL PROPERTY AT FORT DEVENS, MASS.; FORT LOGAN, COLO.; AND FORT LEWIS, WASH.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4722) to provide for the utilization as national cemeteries of surplus Army Department owned military real property at Fort Devens, Mass.; Fort Logan, Colo.; and Fort Lewis, Wash.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute the bill (S. 1856) to provide for the utilization as national cemeteries of surplus Army Department owned military real property at Fort Devens, Mass.; Fort Logan, Colo.; and Fort Lewis, Wash., which is identical with the House bill in every respect.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

Mr. PLUMLEY, Mr. FOGARTY, and Mr. TOLLEFSON objected.

BOULDER CITY, NEV.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4966) directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and lease certain houses, apartments, and lands in Boulder City, Nev.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to sell each house, including furniture, fixtures, and appurtenances, acquired from the Defense Homes Corporation and situated on land in Boulder City, Nev., to the lessee occupant thereof, if such occupant (1) occupied the house for the period of at least 90 days prior to the time it was acquired from the Defense Homes Corporation and occupies it at the time of sale, (2) is at the time of sale an employee of the United States Government or person regularly employed or conducting a business or profession in Boulder City, and (3) desires to purchase the house and to lease the land upon which it is situated. The offer of sale to any such occupant shall be made within 180 days after enactment of this act and the sale shall be completed within a reasonable time after such offer. The sale price shall not exceed the amount at which the house was carried on the books of the Defense Homes Corporation at the date of transfer to the Secretary. The sale contract and documents of title shall contain (1) a provision prohibiting resale within 3 years at a price exceeding the price paid the Secretary and (2) a provision prohibiting resale on any terms during such period unless resale on such terms shall first have been offered to, and refused by, the Secretary. The Secretary is authorized and directed to lease the lot on which each house so sold is situated to the purchaser of such house in accordance with the provisions set out under the heading "Boulder Canyon project" in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1941 (54 Stat. 406, 437).

The Secretary is authorized to lease all apartments acquired from Defense Homes Corporation and all houses so acquired and not sold pursuant to this act, together with the lands upon which situated, upon such terms and conditions as he may see fit in accordance with existing law.

All proceeds from the sale and lease of houses and apartments by the Secretary pursuant to this act shall be deposited in the Treasury and credited to the Colorado River Dam fund established by section 2 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057).

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out all after the words "such occupant" through lines 8, 9, 10, 11, lines 1 and 2 on page 2, and all of line 3 preceding the words "The offer of", and insert in lieu thereof "desires to purchase the house and to lease the land upon which it is situated, and is (1) an employee of an agency of the Department of the Interior who occupied the house on July 1, 1947, and occupies it at the time of sale or (2) is a person regularly employed or conducting a business or profession in Boulder City, Nev., who occupied a Defense Homes Corporation housing unit or house prior to April 1, 1947, and occupies a house at the time of sale."

Page 2, line 21, following the word "authorized" add: "to repossess the houses now occupied by persons who are ineligible to purchase under the provisions of this bill, and."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECONNAISSANCE SURVEY OF CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO CANAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5155) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to have made by the Public Roads Administration and the National Park Service a joint reconnaissance survey of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal between Great Falls, Md., and Cumberland, Md., and to report to the Congress upon the advisability and practicability of constructing thereon a parkway, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be expended from the appropriations made to the National Park Service for parkways the sum of $40,000 for the purpose of making a joint reconnaissance study by the Public Roads Administration and the National Park Service of the federally owned Chesapeake and Ohio Canal between Great Falls, Md., and Cumberland, Md., to determine the advisability and practicability of constructing a parkway along the route of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, including a report of estimated cost.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 203 OF THE HAWAIIAN HOMES COMMISSION ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5173) to amend section 203 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, designating certain public lands as available home lands.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CASE of South Dakota). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 203 of title II of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of July 9, 1921 (42 Stat. 109; 48 U. S. C. 697), as amended, designating certain public lands as available home lands, is further amended by adding thereto the following paragraph:

"Cultivated sugarcane lands: That parcel of Anahola, Island of Kauai, comprising four hundred and one and four hundred and twenty-three one-thousandths acres, hereinafter described and being portion of the land covered by general lease numbered 2724 to the Lihue Plantation Co., Ltd., notwithstanding the fact that said parcel is cultivated sugarcane land, subject, however, to the terms of said lease, said parcel being more particularly described as follows:

"Being a portion of land described in general lease numbered 2724 to the Lihue Plantation Co., situate in the district of Anahola, Kauai, Territory of Hawaii, beginning at the northwest corner of this parcel of land, the coordinates of which referred to government triangulation station south base are three thousand and forty-nine and sixty-two one-hundredths feet south, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-two and twenty-five one-hundredths feet west, and running thence by azimuths measured clockwise from true south two hundred and eighty-four degrees thirty minutes two hundred and fifty feet, thence on the arc of circular curve to the left, with a radius of eight hundred and ninety feet and a central angle of thirty-five degrees fifteen minutes, the direct azimuth and distance being two hundred and sixty-six degrees fifty-two minutes thirty seconds five hundred and thirty-eight and ninety-six one-hundredths feet, thence two hundred and forty-nine degrees fifteen minutes one thousand eight hundred and nine and twenty-five one-hundredths feet, thence two hundred and twenty-four degrees fifteen minutes three thousand and fifty-six feet, thence one hundred and thirty-four degrees fifteen minutes two hundred and seven feet, to the seashore at Anahola Bay, thence along the seashore around Kahala Point, the direct azimuth and distance being two hundred and thirty-seven degrees six minutes seven seconds one thousand and sixty and fourteen one-hundredths feet, thence along the seashore, the direct azimuth and distance being three hundred and thirty-two degrees no minutes one thousand eight hundred and twenty-seven feet, thence along the seashore, the direct azimuth and distance being three hundred and fifty-five degrees no minutes one thousand eight hundred and twenty-seven feet, thence eighty-seven degrees twenty minutes seven hundred and forty feet, thence fifty-nine degrees no minutes two thousand seven hundred and fifteen feet, thence sixty-nine degrees fifteen minutes one thousand eight hundred and eighty-seven and thirty-six one-hundredths feet, thence on the arc of a circular curve to the right with a radius of three thousand and twelve feet, and a central angle of thirty-five degrees fifteen minutes the direct azimuth and distance being eighty-six degrees fifty-two minutes thirty seconds one thousand eight hundred and twenty-three and ninety-eight one-hundredths feet, thence one hundred and four degrees thirty minutes two hundred and fifty feet, thence one hundred and ninety-four degrees thirty minutes one thousand and thirty-one feet, thence on the arc of a circular curve to the left with a radius of six hundred and seven and ninety-five one-hundredths feet and a central angle of fifty-three degrees three minutes thirty seconds the direct azimuth and distance being seventy-seven degrees fifty-eight minutes fifteen seconds five hundred and forty-three and nine one-hundredths feet to the government road, thence two hundred and thirty-one degrees twenty-six minutes thirty seconds one hundred and thirteen and sixty-one one-hundredths feet along the government road, thence along the government road on the arc of a circular curve to the left with a radius of four hundred and seventy-seven feet and a central angle of forty-four degrees twenty-six minutes thirty seconds, the direct azimuth and distance being two hundred and nine degrees thirteen minutes fifteen seconds three hundred and sixty and seventy-eight one-hundredths feet, thence one hundred and eighty-seven degrees no minutes one hundred and sixty-nine and fifty-four one-hundredths feet along the government road, thence on the arc of a circular curve to the left with a radius of three hundred and fifty-one and eight one-hundredths feet and a central angle of eighty-two degrees thirty minutes the direct azimuth and distance being three hundred and twenty-five degrees forty-five minutes four hundred and sixty-two and ninety-seven one-hundredths feet, thence one hundred and ninety-four degrees thirty minutes five hundred and seventy-nine feet, thence one hundred and four degrees thirty minutes three hundred feet, thence one hundred and ninety-four degrees thirty minutes two hundred feet, thence two hundred and eighty-four degrees thirty minutes three hundred feet, thence one hundred and ninety-four degrees thirty minutes two hundred and fifty-two feet to the point of beginning containing an area of four hundred and one and four hundred and twenty-three one-thousands acres more or less."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFIRMING AND RATIFYING ACT 205 OF THE SESSION LAWS OF 1947 OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5175) to confirm and ratify Act 205 of the session laws of 1947 of the Territory of Hawaii, relating to the issuance of public-improvement bonds.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That act No. 205 of the session laws of 1947 of the Territory of Hawaii entitled "An act making appropriations for public improvements and providing for the issuance of public-improvement bonds," to the extent approved by the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii on May 20, 1947, is hereby confirmed and ratified, subject to the provisions of the act of Congress approved July 15, 1947 (Public Law 190, 80 Cong., 1st sess.), any provision of the Hawaiian Organic Act or any other act of Congress to the contrary notwithstanding: *Provided, however*, That nothing herein contained shall be deemed to prohibit the amendment of said act of said Territory by the legislature thereof from time to time to provide for changes in the improvements authorized by said act or for the disposition of unexpended moneys appropriated by said act, subject, however, to the provisions of the act of Congress approved July 15, 1947 (Public Law 190, 80th Cong., 1st sess.), or such other act or acts of Congress as may then govern the issuance of public-improvement bonds by the Territory of Hawaii.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING ACT ALLOWING CREDIT IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN HOMESTEAD ENTRIES FOR MILITARY OR NAVAL SERVICE RENDERED DURING WORLD WAR II

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5244) to amend an act entitled "An act to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War II.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of September 27, 1944, as amended (58 Stat. 747; 43 U. S. C. 279, and the following), is hereby amended by renumbering section 5 to read "Section 6", and by adding the following:

"SEC. 5. As used in this act, the term 'homestead' includes land hereafter disposed of under the act of May 26, 1934 (48 Stat. 809; 48 U. S. C. 461): *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to extend any cultivation requirements to lands disposed of under the act of May 26, 1934."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, add the following sentence: "As used in this act, the words 'equitable claims subject to allowance and confirmation' include claims of holders of permits issued by the Department of Agriculture on lands eliminated from national forests, whose permits have been terminated only because of such elimination and who own valuable improvements on such lands."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SALE OF INDIAN LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5262) to authorize the sale of Indian lands acquired under the act of June 18, 1934, and under the act of June 26, 1926.

There being no objection, the Clerk read bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, or his duly authorized representative, is hereby authorized in his discretion to approve conveyances of lands or interests in lands held by Indians under the provisions of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), or the act of June 26, 1926 (49 Stat. 1967).

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the Secretary of the Interior, or his duly authorized representative, is hereby authorized in his discretion, and upon application of the Indian owners, to issue patents in fee, to remove restrictions against alienation, and to approve conveyances, with respect to lands or interests in lands held by individual Indians under the provisions of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), or the act of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1967)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the sale of individual Indian lands acquired under the act of June 18, 1934, and under the act of June 26, 1936."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SURVEY OF A PROPOSED MISSISSIPPI RIVER PARKWAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5609) to authorize the survey of a proposed Mississippi River Parkway for the purpose of determining the feasibility of such a national parkway, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sum not exceeding $200,000 to be used by the Department of the Interior through the National Park Service and by the Federal Works Agency through the Public Roads Administration to make a joint survey of a route for a national parkway to be known as the Mississippi River Parkway. The survey shall follow, in general, the route of the Mississippi River. An estimate of cost of construction of the national parkway or any portions thereof found to be practicable by said survey, together with such other data as will be valuable, shall be obtained with the objective of determining the desirability of authorizing the construction of the parkway or any portion thereof. A report of the survey, upon its completion, shall be transmitted to the Congress by the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, together with their recommendations thereon.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF INTERIOR TO CONVEY CERTAIN LANDS IN SOUTH DAKOTA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5651) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in South Dakota for municipal or public purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, to convey any or all of the lands contained in the Sioux Sanatorium Farm at Rapid City, S. Dak., without compensation, to the city of Rapid City for municipal purposes, or to any public-school district for educational purposes; or to any church organization for religious purposes; or to the State of South Dakota for use of the South Dakota National Guard: *Provided,* That such land disposals will not interfere with the administration and operation of the Sioux Indian Sanatorium at Rapid City, S. Dak.: *Provided, further,* That the title to any lands so conveyed shall revert to the United States of America when the land is no longer used for the purposes for which it is conveyed.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is also authorized in his discretion to utilize any of the said lands for the rehabilitation of needy Indians, and to exchange any of such lands for other lands in or near Rapid City more suitable for this purpose.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause on page 1 and lines 1 to 5 on page 2 and insert the following: "That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized in his discretion to convey without compensation any lands contained in the Sioux Sanatorium Farm at Rapid City, S. Dak., not necessary for the administration and operation of the Sioux Indian Sanatorium, to the city of Rapid City for municipal purposes, or to any public-school district for educational purposes, or to the State of South Dakota for use of the South Dakota National Guard: *Provided,* That the title to any lands so conveyed shall revert to the United States of America when the land is no longer used for the purposes for which such lands were initially conveyed. The Secretary may also in his discretion convey to any church organization for religious purposes, upon receipt of the reasonable value of such lands, any of such lands not conveyed for any of the purposes above named."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJUSTMENT OF IRRIGATION CHARGES ON THE FLATHEAD INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT, MONTANA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5669) to provide for adjustment of irrigation charges on the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the repayment to the United States of all reimbursable costs heretofore or hereafter incurred for the construction of the irrigation and power systems of the Flathead Indian irrigation project in Montana (hereinafter called the project), including such operation and maintenance costs as have been covered into construction costs under the act of March 7, 1928 (45 Stat. 200, 212–213), and supplemental acts, and including the unpaid operation and maintenance costs for the irrigation seasons of 1926 and 1927 which are hereby covered into construction costs, shall be accomplished as prescribed by this Act, notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary.

SEC. 2. (a) All costs heretofore or hereafter incurred for the construction of the irrigation system shall be allocated to the Mission Valley, Camas, and Jocko divisions of the project in proportion to the amount of such costs incurred for the respective benefit of each of these divisions.

(b) The net revenues heretofore and hereafter accumulated from the power system shall be determined by deducting from the gross revenues the expenses of operating and maintaining the power system, and the funds necessary to provide for the creation and maintenance of appropriate reserves in accordance with section 3 of the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 895; 31 U. S. C., sec. 725s–3).

(c) The deferred obligation established by the act of May 10, 1926 (44 Stat. 453, 464–466), for repayment of the per acre costs of the Camas division in excess of the per acre costs of the Mission Valley division shall be determined on the basis of the costs heretofore incurred for the construction of those divisions, and shall be liquidated from the net revenues heretofore accumulated from the power system.

(d) The remainder of the net revenues heretofore accumulated from the power system shall be applied to reduce the reimbursable costs heretofore incurred for the construction of the power system, and the reimbursable costs heretofore incurred for the construction of the irrigation system (exclusive of the deferred obligation for the excess costs of the Camas division) as allocated among the several divisions pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, in proportion to the respective amounts of each of the foregoing categories of costs.

(e) The reimbursable costs heretofore incurred for the construction of the irrigation system of each division of the project and not repaid through the credits provided for in subsections (c) and (d) of this subsection shall be scheduled for repayment in annual installments of approximately equal amount, in a manner which will provide for liquidation of such costs over a period of 50 years from January 1, 1950. The reimbursable costs hereafter incurred for the construction of the irrigation system shall be added to the schedule of repayments established pursuant to this subsection by increasing the amount or the number, or both, of the annual installments maturing after the incurrence of such costs, in a manner which will provide for their liquidation within a period not exceeding the useful life of the works involved, or not exceeding 50 years from the time when the additional costs are incurred, whichever period is the lesser. Each annual installment shall be distributed over all irrigable lands within the division on an equal per-acre basis, and the costs so charged against any parcel of lands within the division shall constitute a first lien thereon under the act of May 10, 1926 (44 Stat. 453, 464–466). Upon the maturity or prepayment of any annual installment, the amount of the installment shall be reduced by deducting any sums included therein which are chargeable to lands on which the collection of construction costs is then deferred under the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564; 25 U. S. C., sec. 386a), or which are chargeable to other lands and have been already repaid to the United States.

(f) The reimbursable costs heretofore incurred for the construction of the power system and not repaid through the credits provided for in subsections (c) and (d) of this subsection, or through other credits from the revenues of the power system, shall be scheduled for repayment in annual installments of approximately equal amount, in a manner which will provide for liquidation of such costs over a period not exceeding the remaining useful life of the power system as a whole, or not exceeding 50 years from January 1, 1950, whichever period is the lesser. The reimbursable costs hereafter incurred for the construction of the power system shall be added to the schedule of repayments established pursuant to this subsection by increasing the amount or the number, or both, of the annual installments maturing after the incurrence of such costs, in a manner which will provide for their liquidation within a period not exceeding the useful life of the works involved, or not exceeding 50 years from the time when the additional costs are incurred, whichever period is the lesser. Each annual installment shall be repaid to the United States solely out of the revenues from the power system.

(g) Electric energy available for sale through the power system shall be sold at the lowest rates which, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, will produce net revenues sufficient to liquidate the annual installments of the power system construction costs established pursuant to subsection (f) of this section, and (for the purpose of reducing the irrigation system construction costs chargeable against the lands embraced within the project and of insuring the carrying out of the intent and purpose of legislation and repayment contracts applicable to the project) to yield a reasonable return on the unliquidated portion of the power system construction costs, and (for the same purpose) to yield such additional sums as will cover the amount by which the wholesale value of the electric energy sold exceeds the cost thereof where such excess is the result of the electric energy having been obtained on a special basis in return for water rights or other grants.

(h) All net revenues hereafter accumulated from the power system shall be applied annually to the following purposes, in the following order of priority:

(1) To liquidate all matured installments of the schedule of repayments for construction costs of the power system;

(2) To liquidate all matured installments of the schedule of repayments for construction costs of the irrigation system of each division, on an equal per acre basis for all irrigable lands within the division;

(3) To liquidate unmatured installments of the schedule of repayments for construction costs of the power system which will mature at a date not later than the maturity of any unliquidated installment of irrigation system construction costs;

(4) To liquidate unmatured installments of the schedule of repayments for construction costs of the irrigation system of each division which will mature at a date prior to the maturity of any unliquidated installment of power system construction costs, on an equal per acre basis for all irrigable lands within the division;

(5) To liquidate construction costs chargeable against Indian-owned lands the collection of which is deferred under the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564; 25 U. S. C., sec. 386a); and

(6) To liquidate the annual operation and maintenance costs of the irrigation system.

(i) In applying net revenues from the power system to the annual installments of irrigation system construction costs for any division of the project under the preceding subsection, allowance shall be made for any construction costs deferred under the Act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564; 25 U. S. C., sec. 386a), or already repaid to the United States which have been deducted from such installments under subsection (e) of this section, by distributing the net revenues available for such application over all irrigable lands within the division on an equal per acre basis, and by applying the net revenues distributed to the lands chargeable with the construction costs that have been so deferred or repaid, in amounts proportionate to the deductions made on account of such costs, to any then unpaid or subsequently assessed costs of operating and maintaining the irrigation system which are chargeable against the same lands.

(j) Any matured installment of irrigation system construction costs, or portion thereof, which is not liquidated at or before its maturity through the application thereto of net revenues from the power system under subsection (h) of this section shall be repaid to the United States by an assessment against the lands chargeable with the construction costs included in the installment. Such repayment shall be deferred for any period of time that may be requisite to provide for the assessment and collection of such costs in conformity with the laws of the State of Montana, but shall be completed within 2 years after the maturity of the installment concerned.

SEC. 3. The repayment adjustments provided for in sections 1 and 2 of this act shall not become effective unless, within 2 years after the approval of this act, the irrigation districts embracing lands within the project not covered by trust or restricted patents have entered into contracts satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior, whereby such districts (1) obligate themselves for the repayment of the construction costs chargeable against all irrigable lands embraced within the districts contracting (exclusive of Indian-owned lands on which the collection of construction costs is deferred) to the extent and in the manner prescribed by sections 1 and 2 of this act; (2) consent to such revisions in the limits of cost for the project, or any division thereof, as the Secretary and the districts contracting may mutually agree upon in order to facilitate the making of needed improvements and extensions to the irrigation and power systems; (3) provide for redetermination by the Secretary of the irrigable area of the project, or any division thereof, and for the exclusion of lands from the project, with the consent of the holder of any water rights that would be canceled by such exclusion; and (4) make such other changes in the existing repayment contracts as the Secretary and the districts contracting may mutually agree upon for accomplishment of the purposes of this act. In order to facilitate the commencement of repayment at the earliest practicable time, such contracts may provide for adjusting the maturity dates or amounts of the annual installments in a manner which will ultimately place the repayment schedules on substantially the same basis as though such contracts had been entered into prior to their actual execution, but not earlier than January 1, 1949.

SEC. 4. Unpaid charges for operation and maintenance of the irrigation system which were assessed prior to May 10, 1926, against any lands within the project, amounting to a sum not exceeding $40,549.89, and unpaid charges due from consumers for electric energy sold through the power system between July 1, 1931, and June 30, 1942, amounting to a sum not exceeding $2,195.16, are hereby canceled. The cancellation of the operation and maintenance charges shall be reported in the reimbursable accounts rendered to the Comptroller General of the United States, pursuant to the act of April 14, 1910 (36 Stat. 269, 270; 25 U. S. C., sec. 145), as deductions from the total indebtedness of the project without regard to the fiscal years in which, or the appropriations from which, expenditures were made.

SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following sums, for the following purposes, to be reimbursed to the United States as hereinafter provided:

(a) The sum of $64,161.18, with interest thereon at the rate of 4 percent per annum from May 18, 1916, and the sum of $409.38, with interest thereon at the same rate from December 1, 1925, to be used to repay the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation in Montana the balance remaining due them under the act of May 18, 1916 (39 Stat. 123, 141). The aggregate principal amount of $64,570.56 so repaid shall be added to the construction costs of the project and shall be reimbursable.

(b) The sum of $400,000 to be deposited in the United States Treasury to the credit of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation in Montana; of which sum one-half shall be in full settlement of all claims of said tribes on account of the past use of tribal lands for the physical works and facilities of the irrigation and power system of the project, or for wildlife refuges; and the other one-half shall be in full payment to said tribes for a permanent easement to the United States, its grantees and assigns, for the continuation of any and all the foregoing uses, whether heretofore or hereafter initiated, upon the tribal lands now used or reserved for the foregoing purposes. The said tribes shall have the right to use such tribal lands, and to grant leases or concessions thereon, for any and all purposes not inconsistent with such permanent easement. The amount deposited in the Treasury pursuant to this subsection shall be added to the construction costs of the project and shall be reimbursable: *Provided*, That it is not the intent of this act to settle any claims said tribes may have for appropriations of water, nor except as specifically provided by this act.

(c) The sum of $1,000,000 to continue the construction of the irrigation and power systems of the project. Amounts expended pursuant to this subsection shall be added to the construction costs of the project and shall be reimbursable.

(d) No expenditure shall be made from any appropriation granted under the authorizations contained in this section until the repayment of all reimbursable construction costs incurred through such expenditure has been secured by contracts conforming to the requirements of section 3 of this act.

SEC. 6. In each fiscal year commencing after the approval of this act for which an appropriation of the power revenues from the project is made an indefinite amount pursuant to section 3 of the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 895; 31 U. S. C., sec. 725s–3), the power revenues so appropriated shall be available, to the extent of not to exceed $75,000, for the purpose, in addition to those other purposes now required or permitted by law, of making such improvements and extensions to the power system as the Secretary of the Interior may deem requisite for the provision of electric service to persons whose applications for such service could not otherwise be complied with in due course of business. Amounts so expended shall be added to the unmatured portion of the reimbursable construction costs of the power system in accordance with subsection 2 (f) of this act, so as not to reduce the net power revenues available for application under subsection 2 (h) of this act.

SEC. 7. Consistent with the terms of the repayment contracts heretofore or hereafter executed, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to issue such public notices fixing construction costs and apportioning construction charges, to enter into such contracts, to prescribe such regulations, and to do such other acts and things as may be necessary or appropriate to accomplish the purposes of this act.

SEC. 8. All acts or parts thereof inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 11, line 1, after the word "all", insert the word "of."

Page 11, line 25, after the word "made", insert "in."

Page 12, line 19, after the comma, insert "to make such determinations, to effect such adjustments in project accounts,"

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SALE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS IN SAN JUAN COUNTY, UTAH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5763) to authorize the sale of certain public lands in San Juan County, Utah, to the Southwest Indian Mission, Inc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute the bill S. 2278, an identical Senate bill, which passed the Senate on March 29, 1948.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Southwest Indian Mission, Inc., is hereby authorized for a period of 1 year from and after the effective date of this act to file with the Secretary of the Interior an application to purchase, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to issue a patent to it, for use by St. Christopher's Mission to the Navajo, for the following-described lands in San Juan County, Utah:

The east half of the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 20, the west half of the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 21, lot 4, and the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 28 and lots 1, 2, and 5 of section 29, township 40 south, range 22 east, Salt Lake meridian, containing 165$\frac{5}{10}$ acres.

SEC. 2. The patent shall not be issued until after payment has been made by the Southwest Indian Mission, Inc., to the Secretary of the Interior for the land as its reasonable appraised price of not less than $1.25 per acre, to be determined by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of the act of December 22, 1928 (45 Stat. 1069). The patent shall reserve to the United States all of the oil, gas, and all other mineral deposits in the land, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill (H. R. 5763) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE THEODORE ROOSEVELT NATIONAL PARK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5816) to amend the act of April 25, 1947, relating to the establishment of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of April 25, 1947, is hereby amended as follows:

Amend section 1 to read "That all those certain tracts, pieces, or parcels of land, title to which is vested in the United States of America, and being in the State of North Dakota, and within the boundaries particularly described, as follows, to wit: Beginning at the point where the north line of the right-of-way of United States Highway Numbered 10 intersects the east boundary of section 36, township 140 north, range 101 west, fifth principal meridian; thence southwesterly and northwesterly along the north line of said right-of-way through section 1, township 139 north, range 101 west, and sections 36, 35, 34, 27, 28, 29, and 30, township 140 north, range 101 west; thence northwesterly and southwesterly along the north line of the right-of-way of said highway to be relocated as shown on the right-of-way plat for project SNFAP 283C (3) filed for record in the office of the register of deeds, Medora, North Dakota, book numbered 2 of plats, page 68, on June 13, 1942, through section 25 and the east half of the northeast quarter of section 26, township 140 north, range 102 west, to the point of intersection with the east sixteenth section line of said section 26; thence north along the sixteenth section line to the northwest corner of the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of said section 26; thence northwesterly along a line to the northwest corner of the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 23, township 140 north, range 102 west; thence westerly along the sixteenth section line to the northeast corner of the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 22; township 140 north, range 102 west; thence southerly along the east section line to the southeast corner of said section 22; thence westerly along the south line of said section 22 to the point of intersection with the right bank of the Little Missouri River; thence northerly and westerly along the right bank of said river to the point of intersection with the east line of section 21, township 140 north, range 102 west thence southerly along the east line of said section 21, to the intersection with the north line of the right-of-way of the Northern Pacific Railway, which point lies north of said United States Highway Numbered 10; thence westerly along the north line of said right-of-way to the point of intersection with the north line of the right-of-way of said United States Highway Numbered 10; thence westerly along the north line of the right-of-way of said highway through said section 21 to the intersection with the west line of said section 21; thence northerly along the west line of said section 21, and sections 16 and 9, township 140 north, range 102 west, to the northwest corner of said section 9; thence northwesterly along a line to the northwest corner of Government lot 5 of section 5, township 140 north, range 102 west; thence continuing northwesterly along a line to the northwest corner of Government lot 1 of section 6, township 140 north, range 102 west; thence easterly along the township line to the southwest corner of the southeast quarter of section 34, township 141 north, range 102 west; thence northerly along the quarter section line to the northwest corner of the said southeast quarter of section 34; thence northwesterly along a line to the southwest corner of section 27, township 141 north, range 102 west; thence northerly along the west line of said section 27, to the southwest corner of the northwest quarter of said section 27; thence northeasterly along a line to the southwest corner of the southeast quarter of section 22, township 141 north, range 102 west; thence continuing northeasterly along a line to the southwest corner of the northwest quarter of section 23, township 141 north, range 102 west; thence continuing northeasterly along a line to the northeast corner of said northwest quarter of section 23; thence easterly along the north lines of said section 23, and section 24, township 141 north, range 102 west; to the northwest corner of section 19, township 141 north, range 101 west; thence continuing easterly along the north line of said section 19 to the northwest corner of the northeast quarter of said section 19; thence southeasterly along a line to the northwest corner of the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 20, township 141 north, range 101 west; thence easterly along the sixty-fourth section line to the northwest corner of the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter of said section 20; thence southeasterly along a line to the northwest corner of the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 21, township 141 north, range 101 west; thence easterly along the sixteenth section lines to the northwest corner of the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 22, township 141 north, range 101 west; thence southeasterly along a line to the northwest corner of the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 27, township 141 north, range 101 west; thence easterly along the north lines of said section 27, and sections 26 and 25, township 141 north, range 101 west, to the northeast corner of said section 25; thence southerly along the township line to the northwest corner of section 31, township 141 north, range 100 west; thence southeasterly along a line to the southeast corner of said section 31; thence continuing southeasterly along a line to the northwest corner of Government lot 7 of section 2, township 140 north, range 101 west; thence continuing southeasterly along a line to the northwest corner of the southwest quarter of section 1, township 140 north, range 101 west; thence continuing southeasterly along a line to the northwest corner of the northeast quarter of section 12, township 140 north, range 101 west; thence continuing southeasterly along a line to the northwest corner of the southwest quarter of section 7, township 140 north, range 100 west; thence easterly along the quarter section line to the northwest corner of the southeast quarter of said section 7; thence southeasterly along a line to the northwest corner of section 17, township 140 north, range 100 west; thence continuing southeasterly along a line to a point which is 33 feet west of the east line of said section 17, and 33 feet north of the south line of said section 17; thence southerly on a line which lies 33 feet west of and parallel to the east lines of section 20, 29, and 32 of township 140 north, range 100 west, to the point of intersection with the north right-of-way line of United States Highway Numbered 10; thence westerly along the north line of said right-of-way through said sections 32 and 31, township 140 north, range 100 west, to the point of intersection with the east boundary of section 36, township 140 north, range 101 west, the place of beginning, containing forty-nine thousand one hundred and fifty-three and seventy-nine one-hundredths acres more or less."

Amend section 4 by striking out "lots 2, 3, 4, and 6 of section 33, township 144, range 102," and inserting in lieu thereof "lots 6 and 7, section 33, township 144 north, range 102 west; southeast quarter of southeast quarter, section 32, township 144 north, range 102 west; lots 4 and 5, section 4, township 143, range 102 west; lot 1 and southeast quarter of northeast quarter, section 5, township 143, range 102 west, containing two hundred and fifty-eight and eighteen one-hundredths acres,".

Strike out all of section 6 and renumber the remaining sections accordingly.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHING THE SARATOGA NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, N. Y.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5822) to establish the Saratoga National Historical Park, in the State of New York, from the lands that have been acquired by the Federal Government for that purpose pursuant to the act of June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 608), and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of completing the establishment of Saratoga National Historical Park, and to provide adequately for its future development, all lands and other property which have been acquired by the Federal Government pursuant to the Saratoga National Historical Park Act of June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 608; 16 U. S. C., secs. 159–159b), are hereby established as the Saratoga National Historical Park, and shall be administered as provided in section 3 of that act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept all or any portion of the General Philip Schuyler Mansion property, real and personal, situated at Schuylerville, N. Y., comprising approximately 50 acres, and also donations of additional land, interests in land, buildings, structures, and other property in Saratoga County. The authority to acquire property, contained in section 2 of the act of June 1, 1938, may be utilized by the Secretary of the Interior in carrying out the purposes of this act. These properties, upon acquisition by the United States, shall become a part of Saratoga National Historical Park, the total area of which, however, shall not exceed 5,500 acres.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROHIBITING THE OPERATION OF GAMBLING SHIPS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 560) to prohibit the operation of gambling ships, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That as used in this act—

(a) The term "gambling ship" means a vessel used principally for the operation of one or more gambling establishments.

(b) The term "gambling establishment" means any common gaming or gambling establishment operated for the purpose of gaming or gambling, including accepting, recording, or registering bets, or carrying on a policy game or any other lottery, or playing any game of chance, for money or other thing of value.

(c) The term "vessel" includes every kind of water and air craft or other contrivance used or capable of being used as a means of transportation on water, or on water and in the air, as well as any ship, boat, barge, or other water craft or any structure capable of floating on the water.

(d) The term "American vessel" means any vessel documented or numbered under the laws of the United States; and includes any vessel which is neither documented or numbered under the laws of the United States nor documented under the laws of any foreign country, if such vessel is owned by, chartered to, or otherwise controlled by one or more citizens or residents of the United States or corporations organized under the laws of the United States or of any State

(e) The term "United States," when used in a geographical sense, includes the continental United States and the Territories and possessions of the United States, other than the Canal Zone.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be unlawful for any citizen or resident of the United States, or any other person who is on an American vessel or is otherwise under or within the jurisdiction of the United States, directly or indirectly—

(1) to set up, operate, or own or hold any interest in any gambling ship or any gambling establishment on any gambling ship; or

(2) in pursuance of the operation of any gambling establishment on any gambling ship, to conduct or deal any gambling game, or to conduct or operate any gambling device, or to induce, entice, solicit, or permit any person to bet or play at any such establishment, if such gambling ship is on the high seas, or is an American vessel or otherwise under or within the jurisdiction of the United States, and is not within the jurisdiction of any State.

(b) Whoever violates the provisions of subsection (a) shall, upon conviction, be imprisoned for not more than 2 years or fined not more than $10,000, or both.

(c) Whoever, being (1) the owner of an American vessel, or (2) the owner of any vessel under or within the jurisdiction of the United States, or (3) the owner of any vessel and being an American citizen, shall use, or knowingly permit the use of, such vessel in violation of any provision of this section shall, in addition to any other penalties provided by this act, forfeit such vessel, together with her tackle, apparel, and furniture, to the United States.

SEC. 3. (a) It shall be unlawful to operate or use, or to permit the operation or use of, any vessel for the carriage or transportation, or for any part of the carriage or transportation, either directly or indirectly, or any passengers, for hire or otherwise, between any point or place within the United States and any gambling ship which is not within the jurisdiction of any State. The provisions of this section shall not apply to any carriage or transportation to or from any vessel in case of any emergency involving the safety or protection of life or property.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to prescribe such reasonable rules and regulations as may be necessary to enforce the provisions of this section and to prevent violations of such provisions. For the operation or use of any vessel in violation of the provisions of this section or of any rule or regulation issued hereunder, the owner or charterer of such vessel shall be subject to a civil penalty of $200 for each passenger carried or transported in violation of such provisions, and the master or other person in charge of such vessel shall be subject to a civil penalty of $300. Such penalty shall constitute a lien on such vessel, and proceedings to enforce such lien may be brought summarily by way of libel in any court of the United States having jurisdiction thereof. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to mitigate or remit any of the penalties provided by this section on such terms as he may deem proper.

SEC. 4. Nothing in this act shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the several States under the laws thereof, or to preclude action, otherwise valid, by any State or Territory with respect to the navigable waters within the boundaries of such State or Territory.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF JURISDICTION OF HAWAII DISTRICT COURT TO CANTON AND ENDERBURY ISLANDS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1696) to amend the act of August 13, 1940 (54 Stat. 784), so as to extend the jurisdiction of the United States District Court, Territory of Hawaii, over Canton and Enderbury Islands.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of the act entitled "An act to extend the jurisdiction of the United States District Court, Territory of Hawaii, over the Midway Islands, Wake Island, Johnston Island, Sand Island, Kingman Reef, Kure Island, Baker Island, Howland Island, and Jarvis Island, and for other purposes," approved August 13, 1940 (54 Stat. 784, 48 U. S. C., sec. 642a), is hereby amended to read: "The jurisdiction of the United States District Court, Territory of Hawaii, is hereby extended to all civil and criminal cases arising on or within the Midway Islands, Wake Island, Johnston Island, Sand Island, Kingman Reef, Kure Island, Baker Island, Howland Island, Jarvis Island, and, having regard to the special status of Canton and Enderbury Islands pursuant to an agreement of April 6, 1939, between the Governments of the United States and of the United Kingdom to set up a regime for their use in common, the said jurisdiction is also extended to all civil and criminal cases arising on or within Canton Island and Enderbury Island: *Provided*, That such extension to Canton and Enderbury Islands shall in no way be construed to be prejudicial to the claims of the United Kingdom to said islands in accordance with the agreement.

SEC. 2. The title of the said act approved August 13, 1940, is amended to read: "An act to extend the jurisdiction of the United States District Court, Territory of Hawaii, over the Midway Islands, Wake Island, Johnston Island, Sand Island, Kingman Reef, Kure Island, Baker Island, Howland Island, Jarvis Island, Canton Island, and Enderbury Island, and for other purposes."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMPOSING TIME LIMITATION UPON THE FILING OF CLAIMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5040) to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 to provide that claims under section 17 must be filed within 6 months to be allowable, to stop further accrual of such claims, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 17 of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 665; U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, title 41, sec. 117) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof two new subsections, as follows:

"(e) No person shall be entitled to recover compensation or receive a settlement of any alleged obligation, or obtain the benefit of any amendment, confirmation, ratification, or formalization, of any alleged contract or commitment under this section, unless such person shall on or before 6 months after the date of enactment of this subsection have filed a claim with the contracting agency, in the form, and furnishing the information, required by Regulation No. 12 of the Office of Contract Settlement (10 F. R. 1278; 32 C. F. R., 1945 Supp. pt. 8060) as it may be amended from time to time.

"(f) Any instruction or request to proceed, and any defective, informal, or quasi contract, may be the basis of liability under this section only if made or entered into before the date of enactment of this subsection."

SEC. 2. No liability shall accrue by reason of enactment of this act which would not have otherwise accrued.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COINAGE OF 50-CENT PIECES COMMEMORATING THE ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ORGANIZATION OF MINNESOTA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1304) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the organization of Minnesota as a Territory of the United States.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, in the hope of getting a report from the Department, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with this bill I insert at this place in the RECORD an article entitled "The Minnesota Centennial" which appeared in a recent issue of the Bench and Bar of Minnesota:

THE MINNESOTA CENTENNIAL

Minnesota is making preparations to celebrate its 100th birthday. When 1949 rolls into view the North Star State will have existed for a century under the name Minnesota. It was on March 3, 1849, that the Territory of Minnesota was created by an act of Congress.

You may have wondered how Minnesota acquired its name. It came from the river called "Minnisota" by the Dakota Indians, pronounced "Min-nee-sotah" (Mini, water; sotah, whitishly clouded, sky-colored).

Thus Minnesota: The Land of Sky Blue Waters.

For correct pronunciation, the convention held at Stillwater in 1848, to secure a territorial organization, instructed its delegates that the name of the Territory be written Minnesota, inserting e for i.

With the establishment of territorial government in 1849, there began the growth of towns and the spread of settlement, the development of agriculture and industry, the

founding of churches and educational institutions. It was the movement toward an organized civilization and culture from what formerly was an Indian wilderness.

The Minnesota Historical Society, which faces the State capitol, has been designated by Governor Youngdahl and the State Legislature as the agency responsible for the State-wide celebration in 1949. This will commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of Minnesota becoming a Territory.

The beginning of the Minnesota Territory in 1849 was the beginning of the political entity which became the State of Minnesota in 1858.

The new Territory was a big one. It stretched all the way out to the Missouri and White Earth Rivers, including much of what later became the States of North and South Dakota. Alexander Ramsey, of Pennsylvania, was appointed the first Governor of Minnesota Territory by President Polk.

The Centennial Committee will shape its 1949 program so that it will be based upon an honest evaluation of the accomplishments of the people of Minnesota during a century of existence. It will be an appraisal of the social, political, economic, and human resources of the State.

The Centennial is an opportunity to bring to the people of Minnesota a consciousness of their historical backgrounds and to impress on Minnesotans and the Nation the present and future prospects for the State's developments.

A series of programs has been planned to hasten this aim. Included is an educational program to reach every school, an industrial program to show how numerous industries developed, a social program emphasizing religious, cultural, social, and political forces and finally, an agricultural program which will bring to every Minnesota community a keen awareness of Minnesota's rich heritage.

The Minnesota Territorial Centennial is the biggest event of its kind to be celebrated in Minnesota. Every community, industry, and citizen will want to lend a hand to make this colossal celebration a success.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION TO MAKE PAYMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5174) to authorize Commodity Credit Corporation to make adjustment payments to certain producers of raw cane sugar in Puerto Rico and Hawaii.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I call attention to the fact that the statements from the Departments are included in the reports on both of these two last bills. They made a full and complete statement before the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. BUCK. I read the report, but I failed to find that. Will the gentleman read the recommendation of the Department?

Mr. WOLCOTT. On page 3 of the report Mr. Lawrence Myers, Acting Director, testified that there is no disagreement with them. It is a matter wherein they recognize the equity of these claims but find themselves in the embarrassing position of not being able to do equity because of the law. They virtually recommended the bill. They cannot do it under the law, but recognize that the sums are due. Mr. Myers' statement is included in the report on the top of page 3.

Mr. BUCK. I withdraw my unanimous-consent request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Whereas Commodity Credit Corporation entered into contracts with producers of 1945–46 crop Puerto Rican raw cane sugar and 1946 crop Hawaiian raw cane sugar, and subsequently entered into a contract for the purchase of the 1946 and 1947 crops of Cuban raw cane sugar which required payments for 1946 crop Cuban raw cane sugar in excess of those made to the producers of Puerto Rican and Hawaiian sugar of the same crop, after making allowance for the duty and freight advantages of such producers; and

Whereas in connection with its contracts with Puerto Rican and Hawaiian producers for control of the succeeding crop of raw cane sugar from each of such areas, Commodity Credit Corporation made adjustment payments to producers in amounts designed to equalize the prices paid for Puerto Rican and Hawaiian raw cane sugar of the 1946 and 1947 crop years with those paid for Cuban raw cane sugar of the same crop years, but such adjustment payments were denied to the Honolulu Plantation Co., the Plazuela Sugar Co., Godreau, Godreau and Compania (Central Caribe), and Wirshing and Cia, S. en C. (Central Boca Chica), since each of such companies were not engaged in the production of raw cane sugar in the crop year 1947 and were unable to contract with respect to sugar of the 1947 crop year: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and directed to make adjustment payments to the Plazuela Sugar Co., to Godreau, Godreau and Compania (Central Caribe) to Wirshing and Cia, S. en C. (Central Boca Chica) on each company's production of 1945–46 crop Puerto Rican raw cane sugar, and to the Honolulu Plantation Co. on its production of 1946 crop Hawaiian raw cane sugar, each of such payments to be made at the same rate and subject to the same conditions as adjustment payments made to other Puerto Rican and Hawaiian producers of raw cane sugar of such crops, irrespective of the failure of such producers (1) to produce raw cane sugar in any succeeding crop year, or (2) to enter into contracts with Commodity Credit Corporation with respect to such raw cane sugar. Commodity Credit Corporation may require such evidence as it may deem necessary in support of applications for payment made pursuant to the authorization herein contained.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AWARDING OF YOUNG AMERICAN MEDAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5434) authorizing the Attorney General of the United States to recognize and to award to outstanding courageous young Americans a medal for heroism known as the Young American Medal for Bravery, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to promulgate rules and regulations establishing a medal; the method of selecting such recipient thereof and awarding the same to any child residing in the United States, who is 18 years old or under, who has exhibited exceptional courage, extraordinary decision, presence of mind, and unusual swiftness of action, regardless of his or her own personal safety, in an effort to save or successfully saving the life or lives of any person or persons whose life or lives were in actual imminent danger.

SEC. 2. The Attorney General shall also honor by an appropriate medal such American boy or girl citizens, 18 years old or under, who, in the opinion of the Attorney General, shall have achieved outstanding or unusual recognition for character and service during any given year .

SEC. 3. The medal to be awarded for bravery or valor as defined in section 1 of this act shall be known as the Young American Medal for Bravery, while the medal for outstanding character and service as defined in section 2 of this act shall be known as the Young American Medal for Service, and such medals shall be presented by the Attorney General in person, or through a duly authorized representative designated by the Attorney General.

SEC. 4. Accompanying such medals herein designated there shall be an appropriate certificate of commendation presented to the recipient or recipients stating (a) the circumstances under which the act of bravery was performed, and (b) citing the outstanding recognition for character and service.

SEC. 5. It shall be the duty of the Attorney General to make a report to the Congress at the end of each fiscal year and to furnish the Congress with a list of the names of all those upon whom he shall have conferred either of such medals.

SEC. 6. It shall also be the duty of the Attorney General to list in his annual budget request the sum of money necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, which sum is hereby authorized.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POSTAGE STAMP IN HONOR OF THE FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES OF INDIANS IN OKLAHOMA

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 329) to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 189, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That to commemorate the centennial celebration of the Trail of Tears, the Postmaster General is hereby authorized and directed to issue a special postage stamp bearing the likeness of the great seals of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma: Choctaw, Chickasaw, Cherokee, Creek, and Seminole. Such stamp shall be issued in the denomination of 3 cents and for such a period, beginning October 15, 1948, as he may determine. Such special stamp shall be placed on sale in Muskogee, Okla., 1 day before it is made available to the public elsewhere.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 329) was laid on the table.

FIFTY-CENT PIECES COMMEMORATING END OF WAR WITH SPAIN

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 333) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the termination of the war with Spain.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas the year 1948 marks the fiftieth anniversary of the termination of the war with Spain; and

Whereas the valiant services of the volunteer members of the armed forces of the United States brought such armed conflict to a quick conclusion; and

Whereas three-fourths of the veterans of the war with Spain are now deceased; and

Whereas the surviving members of the United Spanish War Veterans, the only Nation-wide organization of veterans of the war with Spain, are having difficulty in financing their national organization in the future: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That, in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the termination of the war with Spain, there shall be coined not to exceed 250,000 silver 50-cent pieces of standard size, weight, and composition, and of a special appropriate design to be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury; but the United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the necessary dies and other preparations for such coinage.

SEC. 2. The coins herein authorized shall bear the date of the year in which they are minted, shall be legal tender to the amount of their face value, and shall be issued only upon the request of a duly authorized representative of the United Spanish War Veterans, upon the payment by such organization of the par value of such coins. Such coins shall be issued in such numbers and at such times during the calendar years 1948 and 1949 as shall be requested by the United Spanish War Veterans and may be disposed of at par or at a premium, and the net proceeds shall inure to the benefit of such organization.

SEC. 3. All laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same; regulating and guarding the process of coinage; providing for the purchase of material, and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of coins; for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting, for the security of the coins, or for any other purpose, whether such laws are penal or otherwise, shall, so far as applicable, apply to the coinage herein authorized.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMOUNT OF FEDERAL AID TO HOMES OF DISABLED

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1562) to increase the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States," approved August 27, 1888, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 24, sec. 134), is amended by striking out in the first paragraph thereof "$300 per annum" and inserting in lieu thereof "$500 per annum."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall apply to payments with respect to the care given to disabled soldiers and sailors on and after the first day of the month next following the month during which this act is enacted: *Provided*, That said payments shall be made regardless of whether said veteran may be receiving domiciliary care or hospitalization in said home and the appropriations of the Veterans' Administration for medical, hospital, and domiciliary care shall be available for this purpose: *Provided further*, That no payment to a State or Territory under this act shall be made for any period prior to the date upon which the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs determines that the veteran on whose account such payment is requested is eligible for such care in a Veterans' Administration facility.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "1940" and insert "1946."

Page 2, line 1, after the word "annum" insert "from the effective date of this amendment through June 30, 1951, and $300 per annum thereafter."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that H. R. 1562 passed the House today. The slight additional compensation made to State veterans' homes by the Federal Government is entirely justified. Every veteran in these homes is one who is entitled to Federal benefits; that is, entitled to avail himself of the Federal facilities, such as a soldiers' home or a hospital. The basic law provides that in no event shall more than one-half of the annual cost of caring for each veteran be paid by the Federal Government. This bill puts a limit of $500 as the outside amount, irrespective of the annual cost. An inspection of the report on this bill shows that over half of the homes are paying more than $1,000 to pay for the care of these veterans. The State of Massachusetts pays the largest amount, namley, $1,866.26 each year for the care of each of the veterans in the Massachusetts home.

It happens that California has the largest veterans' home in the numbers for which it cares. For the period ending June 30, 1947, there were 1,169 veterans in our home. The State has invested over $13,000,000 in its State home located in the beautiful Napa Valley. The commandant of our home, Col. Nelson Holderman, is a distinguished serviceman who is a member of the famous Lost Battalion of the First World War. He received the Congressional Medal of Honor. If medals were given for devotion to service and for efficient administration, Nelson Holderman should receive a medal for the splendid work which he has done in administering and developing the veterans' home of California. I am sure that he typifies the other chief officers of the various veterans' homes in the 26 States of the Union which have established such homes. This bill will be in effect for 3 years. If the cost of living goes down, which we hope it will, it may not be necessary after 1951 to pay the additional $200 which this bill provides for. If the cost of living remains I am sure the Federal Government will be glad to have the provisions of this bill made a permanent policy. At any rate, only time and circumstances can dictate what would be the wise thing to do in 1951. In the meantime the Nation is lucky to have so many excellent State homes where needy veterans can be cared for. Colleagues on both sides of the aisle have given support to this proposition because they realize how meritorious this measure is.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to increase temporarily the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

$100,000 TO THE VILLAGE OF HIGHLAND FALLS, N. Y.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2359) to provide for the construction of a water-filtration plant on the military reservation at West Point, N. Y., and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Whereas on February 28, 1931, the then Secretary of War, in order to secure unanimous consent to a proposed bill to enlarge the military reservation at West Point, N. Y., did in writing undertake that if such consent were secured the War Department would, insofar as it had legal authority, take all necessary steps to acquire the land upon which the watershed for the village of Highland Falls, N. Y., was located, and would grant to such village the right to the use of the water from such watershed without charge; and

Whereas, relying on such written undertaking, the Representative in Congress of such village did withdraw his objection to such bill, which thereupon passed the Congress and was approved March 3, 1931, under the title "An act to authorize the acquisition for military purposes of land in Orange County, N. Y., for use as an addition to the West Point Military Reservation"; and

Whereas such act contained the proviso *"Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall adversely affect the existing water supply, its sources, or pipe lines of the town of Highlands, N. Y."; and

Whereas, pursuant to such act, the War Department has acquired a large part of the land comprising the watershed of such village and has constructed and operated thereon a target range and other facilities, which construction and which operation have, notwithstanding the undertaking and the proviso to the contrary, impaired the water-supply system of such village to the point that it has been condemned and the residents of such village forced to boil all drinking water; and

Whereas the present Secretary of War denies that he has legal authority to give relief to such village: Now, therefore,

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed—

(a) to cause to be constructed on the military reservation at West Point, N. Y., a water-filtration plant at a cost not to exceed $134,000; and

(b) to cause to be made available, without charge, to the incorporated village of Highland Falls, N. Y., so much of the output of such water-filtration plant as shall be necessary to supply the needs of the residents of such village.

SEC. 2. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, strike out the "Whereas" clause ending on page 2, and insert:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled."

Page 2, line 3, strike out down to and including the word "act" on page 3, and insert "That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the village of Highland Falls (sometimes referred to as "Highlands"), in the county of Orange and State of New York, the sum of $100,000 as a contribution to the cost of construction of a water-filtration plant: *Provided*, That said village, as a condition of the payment of said sum, shall undertake to construct a water-filtration plant capable of furnishing potable filtered water to the inhabitants of said village, and to such other users as may now or hereafter be served by the village water system, at a rate of 1,500,000 gallons per day, and the acceptance by the village of the sum herein authorized to be appropriated shall constitute a binding agreement on the part of the village to construct a water-filtration plant which shall meet the requirements prescribed in this proviso: *And provided further*, That said village, upon receipt of payment of said sum, shall give a complete release to the United States for any damage to the village, through increased turbidity of Highlands Brook (otherwise known as Buttermilk Falls Brook), resulting from construction activities heretofore or hereafter undertaken by the Department of the Army in connection with the construction of a moving target range and golf course on the military reservation at West Point."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the payment of a lump sum, in the amount of $100,000, to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y., as a contribution toward the cost of construction of a water-filtration plant, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZE STATE OF MINNESOTA TO CONDEMN LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3785) to authorize the State of Minnesota to condemn lands owned by the United States in the county of Cass, State of Minnesota, for fish propagation, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the State of Minnesota is hereby authorized to aquire by condemnation under judicial process for use in the construction, operation, and maintenance of fish-rearing ponds, a fish hatchery, and other facilities for fish propagation and culture, the following-described lands owned by the United States and located in Cass County, Minn.:

That part of the southwest quarter, section 25, township 146 north, range 47 west, described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the south line of said section 25, fifty-four feet east of the southwest corner of said section 25; thence northeasterly along a line parallel to and one hundred and fifty feet distant from the center line of State Aid Road No. 9 to an intersection of the center line of the present channel of the Mississippi River as reconstructed and improved below the Lake Winnibigoshish Federal Dam; thence down the center line of the said channel of the Mississippi River to an intersection of the south line of said section 25; thence west along the south line of said section 25 to point of beginning, containing twenty-seven and thirty-two one-hundredths acres, more or less; and

That part of the north two thousand feet of section 36, township 146 north, range 47 west, lying southwesterly of the center line of the present channel of the Mississippi River as reconstructed and improved and northerly and easterly of the following-described line:

Beginning at the northwest corner of said section 36; thence southerly along the west line of said section 36 three hundred and eighty feet; thence south thirty-seven degrees twenty-seven minutes east, containing one hundred twenty-four and fourteen one-hundredths acres, more or less; and

That part of the northeast quarter of section 35, township 146 north, range 47 west, described as follows:

Beginning at the northeast corner of said section 35; thence southerly along the east line of said section 35 three hundred and eighty feet; thence north thirty-seven degress twenty-seven minutes west to the center line of State Aid Road No. 9; thence northeasterly along center line of State Aid Road No. 9 to an intersection of the north line of said section 35; thence easterly along the north line of said section 35, to the point of beginning, containing one and twenty-five one-hundredths acres, more or less.

SEC. 2. (a) The United States District Court for the District of Minnesota shall have jurisdiction of the proceedings for such condemnation. The practice, pleadings, forms, and modes of proceedings for such condemnation shall conform, as near as may be, to the practice, pleading, forms, and proceedings in like cases in the courts of record in the State of Minnesota.

(b) The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture may, respectively, by appropriate pleadings in the condemnation proceedings, specify any rights, easements, or other interests in said lands which they deem advisable to reserve to the United States for any purpose under authority pertaining to said lands as prescribed by laws now in force, and thereupon the condemnation shall be subject to such reservations.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "47" and insert "27."

Page 2, line 16, strike out "47" and insert "27."

Page 3, line 19, strike out "War" and insert "the Army."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE TO STATES OF CERTAIN ROADS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5839) to authorize the conveyance to States, or political subdivisions, of roads leading to certain historical areas administered by the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized in his discretion, subject to such conditions as may seem to him proper, to convey by proper quitclaim deed to any State, county, municipality, or proper agency thereof, in which the same is located, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any Government-owned or controlled road leading to any national cemetery, national military park, national historical park, national battlefield park, or national historic site administered by the National Park Service. Prior to the delivery of any conveyance under this act, the State, county, or municipality to which the conveyance herein authorized is to be made shall notify the Secretary of the Interior in writing of its willingness to accept and maintain the road or roads included in such conveyance. Upon the execution and delivery of any conveyance herein authorized, any jurisdiction heretofore ceded to the United States by a State over the roads conveyed shall thereby cease and determine and shall thereafter vest and be in the particular State in which such roads are located.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, at the end of the bill, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. The word 'State' as used in this act includes Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMANENT APPOINTMENT OF GENERALS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6039) to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Army of one officer in the grade of general and to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Air Force of one officer in the grade of general, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint in the Regular Army one officer in the permanent grade of general from among any officers on the active list of the Regular Army who served in the temporary grade of general from March 29, 1945, to the present date, and who successfully commanded an Army group composed of as many as four Armies in the field against the enemy from August 1, 1944, to August 15, 1945. The President is further authorized, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint in the Regular Air Force one officer in the permanent grade of general from among any officers on the active list of the Regular Air Force who served in the temporary grade of general from March 29, 1945, to the present date, and commanded the United States Army Strategic Air Force, European Theater of Operations, from January 1, 1944, to March 1, 1946. Any officer appointed under the provisions of this section who hereafter may be retired, shall be entitled to have his

name placed on the retired list with the highest grade or rank held by him while on the active list and shall be entitled to receive the same pay and allowances while on the retired list as authorized by law for officers on the active list serving in the grade of general.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARKER RIVER NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3578) to reduce in area the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge in Essex County, Mass., and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CARROLL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts a question about this bill? I note that the Department of the Interior has recommended that certain amendments be incorporated in the bill, but these have not been included. Does the gentleman care to explain that?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That has relation only to lands as to which they cannot find ownership. In that case they keep the land anyway.

Mr. CARROLL. The gentleman thinks the present legislation would satisfy the Department of the Interior?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I think so, in every respect, because they cannot dispose of the land anyway if they cannot find the ownership.

Mr. CARROLL. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge in Essex County, Mass., is hereby reduced in area by eliminating therefrom those portions of the refuge designated and known as the Crane Pond, Downfall, and Mill Creek Areas, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to dispose of all of the interests of the United States in such areas in accordance with the provisions of this act.

SEC. 2. (a) Within 90 days following the date of enactment of this act, the Secretary of the Interior shall mail, to each prior owner of such lands within the three areas designated in section 1 as have been acquired by the United States by direct purchase or the ownership of which has been determined and compensation therefor paid to the prior owner thereof in the condemnation proceeding entitled "*United States* v. *12,637.47 Acres More or Less of Land Situate in Essex County, Mass.*, Civil No. 7010, in the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts," or in any other condemnation proceeding instituted by the United States for the acquisition of lands for the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge, a notice stating in effect that title to the lands acquired from such prior owner will be reconveyed to that prior owner upon payment to the United States, within 60 days after the receipt of such notice, of an amount equal to the purchase price paid by the United States for such lands. Upon receipt of payment from the prior owner of the lands in question, the Secretary of the Interior shall convey all right, title, and interest of the United States in such land to the prior owner thereof.

(b) With respect to such other lands as lie within the three areas designated in section 1 and are included in the condemnation proceeding or proceedings referred to, and compensation for the taking of which has not been paid to the prior owners thereof, the Attorney General of the United States is authorized and directed to exclude the same from the condemnation proceedings entitled "*United States* v. *12,637.47 Acres More or Less of Land Situate in Essex County, Mass.*, Civil No. 7010, in the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts," or any other condemnation proceeding instituted by the United States for the acquisition of lands for the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge, in accordance with the provisions of the act of October 21, 1942 (56 Stat. 797; 40 U. S. C., Supp. 258f), within 90 days following the date of enactment of this act or within such additional period as the court in such proceeding may determine to be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act.

(c) Such lands lying within the boundaries of the areas designated in section 1, the title to which cannot be returned to the prior owners thereof in accordance with the provisions of this section, shall be disposed of in such manner and at such prices as the Secretary of the Interior may deem to be in the best interests of the United States.

SEC. 3. All moneys paid to the United States in accordance with the provisions of section 2, for the reconveyance of lands to prior owners or in connection with the disposition of such lands as provided therein, all moneys on deposit with the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts for payment as compensation for the taking of lands within the three areas designated in section 1 as are excluded by stipulation from such condemnation proceeding or proceedings, in accordance with the provisions of section 2, shall be credited to the then current appropriation for carrying out the provisions of section 4 of the act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; 16 U. S. C. 718–718h), as amended, and shall remain available for such purposes until expended.

SEC. 4. In the administration of the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to provide assistance to and cooperate with Federal, State, and public or private agencies and organizations in protecting, developing, and maintaining the edible clam resources found within and adjacent to the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge, all in accordance with the provisions of section 1 of the act of August 14, 1946 (Public Law No. 732, 79th Cong., 2d sess.), and acts supplementary thereto within the limits of available appropriations.

SEC. 5. Management and administration of the propagation and taking of clams within the boundaries of the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge shall continue to be exercised in accordance with State and local laws and ordinances, but subject to the provisions of section 10 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act of February 18, 1929 (45 Stat. 1222), as amended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4393) to provide for the distribution, separation, and retirement of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice, in order to give the Committee on Appropriations time to study it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

COAST GUARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4804) to allow service credit for certain enlisted men of the Coast Guard who acted as policemen and guards at the Ivigtut Cryolite Mine, Greenland, during 1940 and 1941.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That those enlisted men of the Coast Guard who, during 1940 and 1941, were discharged from the Coast Guard to accept employment as policemen and guards at the Ivigtut Cryolite Mine, Greenland, and who reenlisted in the Coast Guard within 3 months after the termination of their service as such policemen and guards, shall be credited with the time between discharge and reenlistment for purposes of longevity pay and retirement, but no increased retroactive pay shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COAST GUARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4817) to amend the act of July 23, 1947 (61 Stat. 409; Public Law No. 219 of the 80th Cong.).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

COAST GUARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4892) to amend the act of July 23, 1947 (61 Stat. 409; Public Law No. 219 of the 80th Cong.).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second sentence of section 2 of the act of July 23, 1947 (61 Stat. 409), is amended to read as follows: Strike out the period at the end of the sentence and add the following: "and upon retirement any officer who is serving, or has served as assistant commandant or engineer in chief (unless entitled to retire at a higher rank or pay under other provisions of law), the retired pay of a rear admiral (upper half)."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after "serving", insert a comma.

Line 7, after "served", insert "not less than 2½ years."

Line 8, after "chief", strike out "shall."

Line 8, before "unless" insert a parenthesis mark.

Line 9, after "law", strike out the comma and "receive" and insert in lieu thereof a parenthesis mark and the words "shall retire with the rank of rear admiral and with."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the call of the eligible bills on the Consent Calendar.

COINAGE OF 50-CENT PIECES FOR MINNESOTA ANNIVERSARY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Consent Calendar No. 524, the bill (S. 1304) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the organization of Minnesota as a Territory of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. CARROLL. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. CARROLL. I will, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, last year the House Committee on Banking and Currency laid down a rule in respect to 50-cent pieces that we would authorize their coinage only to commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of statehood. The State of Minnesota desires to celebrate the centennial of Minnesota as a Territory. We thought that this did not do violence to the rule we adopted last year in respect to centennial programs. For that reason, we authorized the coinage of this 50-cent piece, in order that they might put on this celebration this year. They have assured us that they are not going to ask for a commemorative coin to celebrate the one hundredth anniversary of statehood, which I think comes about 9 years from now.

Mr. CARROLL. One of my reasons for objecting was so that I could get more information as to the rules which guide the committee in its consideration of similar types of legislation. May I say that last year we put in a bill before the committee to see whether or not we could coin money for General Rhoads, and we understood that they would not coin money for that sort of thing. Yet we find a bill here today where they are coining for the Spanish-American War, and now we are making coins commemorating events with reference to States. My understanding is that the Treasury Department objects strenuously to new coins being minted because of the enforcement problems with reference to counterfeiting.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think as an indication of the manner in which these coins will be circulated, we might look at the Iowa bill which was passed 2 years ago where the circulation of the coins was supervised by a commission set up by the State. In this case the coins will be circulated by a historical commission which has been in existence in Minnesota since it was established as a Territory, which is something like 100 years ago.

Mr. CARROLL. Have we done this for other States?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. Is it a practice to continue to do it for other States?

Mr. WOLCOTT. For centennial celebrations, yes.

Mr. CARROLL. What about private institutions within a State?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No.

Mr. CARROLL. You do not go beyond the State level?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No. I may say that the matter was covered thoroughly when we set up the rule last year in a bill which we reported out.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in commemoration of the one-hundredth anniversary of the organization of Minnesota as a Territory of the United States, there shall be coined not to exceed 150,000 silver 50-cent pieces of standard size, weight, and composition, and of a special appropriate design to be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury; but the United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the necessary dies and other preparations for such coinage.

SEC. 2. The coins herein authorized shall bear the date of the year in which they are minted, shall be legal tender to the amount of their face value, and shall be issued only upon the request of the Minnesota Historical Society, the duly authorized representative of the State of Minnesota, or its legal representatives, upon the payment by it of the par value of such coins. Such coins shall be issued in such numbers and at such times during the calendar year 1949 as shall be requested by such Minnesota Historical Society and may be disposed of at par or at a premium, and the net proceeds shall be used for the observation of the centennial as directed by the Minnesota Historical Society or its legal representatives.

SEC. 3. All laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same; regulating and guarding the process of coinage; providing for the purchase of material, and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of coins, for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting; for the security of the coins, or for any other purpose, whether such laws are penal or otherwise, shall, so far as applicable, apply to the coinage herein authorized.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SESQUICENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the Members that the Navy desires to celebrate or commemorate among themselves the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the Navy, which will fall on Friday, the 30th of April. Legislation has come over from the other body at the last minute from the Committee on Armed Services in that connection, and which cannot be reached on the calendar today.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 207) to provide for the commemoration of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the establishment of the Department of the Navy.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas by such act the Secretary of the Navy was charged with the duty "to execute such orders as he shall receive from the President of the United States, relative to the procurement of naval stores and materials and the construction, armament, equipment, and employment of vessels of war, as well as all other matters connected with the Naval Establishment of the United States": Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized and directed by appropriate order to designate April 30, 1948, as a day to be observed within the Naval Establishment by appropriate ceremonies in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the creation of the Department of the Navy and in honor of the gallant personnel who have rendered service in the Naval Establishment of the United States since the founding of such Department.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING ACT OF JULY 23, 1947

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Consent Calendar No. 537, the bill (H. R. 4817) to amend the act of July 23, 1947 (61 Stat. 409) (Public Law No. 219 of the 80th Cong.).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, when the bill was called, I asked unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice for the reason that we did not have sufficient information concerning it. I now have been furnished the information by the author of the bill, the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY], and have no objection to the passage of the bill today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 16 of the act of July 23, 1947 (61 Stat. 409), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 16. All acts or parts of acts inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed; but the act of July 24, 1941, as amended (55 Stat. 603), shall continue to have application to the Coast Guard until such time as the Secretary of the Treasury shall determine that the number of officers holding permanent appointments on the active list of the Coast Guard is equal to 95 percent of the number of such officers authorized by law, exclusive of extra numbers, or on January 1, 1957, whichever shall occur earlier."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

MARDEN CONSTRUCTION CO., INC.

The Clerk called the first bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 2897, for the relief of the Marden Construction Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Marden Construction Co., Inc., of Boston, Mass., the sum of $11,109.89 in full settlement of all claims against the United States as the result of increased cost occasioned by excavation of hard rock not shown in the specifications and for increased cost of material due to the National Recovery Administration, all increased cost growing out of a contract awarded on March 20, 1934, Federal project No. 93 (hangar), Coast Guard Air Station, Winter Island, Salem, Mass.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DORA GREENBAUM (BRENNER)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 926) for the relief of Dora Greenbaum (Brenner).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is directed to cancel forthwith any warrant of arrest, order of deportation, warrant of deportation, and bond, if any, in the case of the alien Dora Greenbaum (Brenner), and is directed not to issue any such further warrants or orders in the case of such alien insofar as any such further warrants or orders are based upon the same grounds as the warrants or orders required by this act to be canceled. For the purpose of the immigration and naturalization laws, the said Dora Greenbaum (Brenner) shall, upon the payment of the required head tax, be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent resident.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, at the end of the bill, insert "as of July 1, 1922."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT E. GRAHAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2193) for the relief of Robert E. Graham.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000 to Mr. Robert E. Graham, of Collins, Miss., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and loss of earnings sustained as a result of a collision between the automobile in which he was riding and a United States Army vehicle on United States Highway 49 in Collins, Miss., on November 14, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$3,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JEANETTE C. JONES AND MINOR CHILDREN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1312) for the relief of Jeanette C. Jones and minor children.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Jeanette C. Jones, of New York, New York, widow of Paul Jones, late a veteran of the World War (XC–1032188), for herself and her minor children by said Paul Jones, the sum of $4,971.33, in full settlement of all claims of the said Jeanette C. Jones and the said minor children for losses sustained due to erroneous advice gratuitously furnished by the Veterans' Administration with regard to her entitlement to death compensation benefits for herself and minor children, and as retroactive payment of death compensation benefits for the period from April 16, 1932, to June 11, 1939: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK J. PATZKE ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 838) for the relief of Frank J. Patzke, Archie Mitchell, J. L. Shoemaker, Einar Engen, and N. L. Gifford.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each of the following persons the sum specified with respect to such person, in full settlement of all claims of such person against the United States on account of the death of the person or persons indicated who were killed in an explosion of a Japanese bomb near Bly, Oreg., on May 5, 1945:

Frank J. Patzke, Grand Forks, N. Dak., the total sum of $10,000 for the death of his minor son, Richard Joe Patzke, and his minor daughter, Ethel Jean Patzke, and $900 for funeral and other expenses;

Archie Mitchell, Bly, Oreg., the sum of $7,500 for the death of his wife, Mrs. Elsie Mitchell and unborn child, and $1,500 for funeral and other expenses;

J. L. Shoemaker, Bly, Oreg., the sum of $5,000 for the death of his minor son, Sherman Shoemaker, and $924 for funeral and other expenses;

Einar Engen, Bly, Oreg., the sum of $5,000 for the death of his minor son, Edward Milian Engen, and $974.25 for funeral and other expenses; and

N. L. Gifford, Bly, Oreg., the sum of $5,000 for the death of his minor son, Jay Gifford and $950 for funeral and other expenses: *Provided*, That no part of any sum appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim satisfied by the payment of such sum, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$6,000"; line 2, strike out ", and $900 for funeral and other expenses"; line 4, strike out "$7,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,000"; line 5, strike out "and unborn child, and $1,500 for funeral and other expenses"; line 7, strike out "$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,000"; line 8, strike out ", and $924 for funeral and other expenses"; line 10, strike out "$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,000"; line 11, strike out ", and $974.25 for funeral and other expenses"; line 13, strike out "$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,000"; line 14, strike out "and $950 for funeral and other expenses."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOSE ALTMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1801) for the relief of Mose Altman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POTTS]?

There was no objection.

NEW AMSTERDAM CASUALTY CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2785) for the relief of the New Amsterdam Casualty Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,378.65 to the New Amsterdam Casualty Co. for reimbursement growing out of a suit for damages against F. E. Cameron, a contractor, whom they had insured against liability. Said Cameron had a contract to move stone on the Newfound Gap Highway in the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, and on July 6, 1936, Homer Ownby, one

of his truck drivers, was injured by being struck by a stone which was hurled by a blast in a stone quarry which was operated by the Federal Government. While the said F. E. Cameron had no conection whatsoever with said stone quarry, under the Workmen's Compensation Act of the State of Tennessee, he was nevertheless held liable. The injury to said Ownby was due to the act of agents of the Federal Government, for which the Federal Government is responsible, and the Federal Government should, therefore, reimburse the New Amsterdam Casualty Co. for the above amount: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUMNER COUNTY COLORED FAIR ASSOCIATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2918) for the relief of the Sumner County Colored Fair Association.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Sumner County Colored Fair Association, Gallatin, Tenn., the sum of $7,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Sumner County Colored Fair Association against the United States for the negligence of certain members of the armed forces of the United States, which negligence caused the destruction by fire on August 27, 1943, of the grandstand and caretaker's house owned by such association: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POTTS: On page 1 line 6, strike out "$7,000" and insert "$5,650."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF JOHN DEIMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3114) for the relief of the estate of John Deiman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000, to the estate of John Deiman, late of St. Paul, Minn., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of the said John Deiman sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Army jeep, near the intersection of West Seventh Street and Otto Avenue, St. Paul, Minn., on July 30, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE HANIOTIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4199) for the relief of George Haniotis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the Immigration and Naturalization laws the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of George Haniotis, Washington, D. C., a national of Greece, who entered the United States as of October 9, 1942, and who served as a member of the Greek Office of Information and the Greek Supply Mission in Washington, as of the date on which he was temporarily admitted to the United States, if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 3, insert at the end of the bill: "Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officers to deduct one number from the immigration quota for Greece for the year then current."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THEODORE LOETSCH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4484) for the relief of Theodore Loetsch.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws, relating to the issuance of immigration visas for admission to the United States for permanent residence and relating to admissions at ports of entry of aliens as immigrants for permanent residence in the United States, the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (39 Stat. 875), as amended (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 136 (e)), shall not hereafter be held to apply to Theodore Loetsch, who is the husband of Esther S. Loetsch, an American citizen, on account of an offense alleged to have been committed abroad. If he is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws an immigration visa may be issued to Theodore Loetsch under this act upon application hereafter filed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. TIMOTHY C. H. LIANG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3358) for the relief of Dr. Timothy C. H. Liang.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the alien, Dr. Timothy C. H. Liang, Cassadaga, N. Y., a national of China, who entered the United States at San Pedro, Calif., on November 8, 1944, to study methods of controlling the disease of tuberculosis, and who is engaged in important medical research at the Newton Memorial Hospital, Cassadaga, N. Y., shall be permitted to remain in the United States for permanent residence.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to dismiss the deportation proceedings now pending against the aliens Dr. Timothy C. H. Liang of the Newton Memorial Hospital, Cassadaga, N. Y.; and his wife, Dr. Esther Chang Liang.

"SEC. 2. That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence in the United States of Dr. Timothy C. H. Liang as of November 18, 1944; and of Dr. Esther Chang Liang as of June 18, 1946, which are the respective dates of their lawful entries.

"SEC. 3. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the quota for Chinese persons of the first year that such quota is hereafter available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Dr. Timothy C. H. Liang and Dr. Esther Chang Liang."

PATENT IN FEE DIRECTED TO ISSUE TO GROWING FOUR TIMES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 608) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Growing Four Times.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Growing Four Times, of Frazier, Mont., a patent in fee to the following-described allotted lands situated in the State of Montana: The northeast quarter of the southeast quarter, and the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter, of section 5, township 26 north, range 45 east, Montana principal meridian.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 10, following the word "meridian", strike out the period, add a semicolon and the following: "*Provided*, That when the land herein described is offered for

sale, the Fort Peck Tribe or any Indian who is a member of said tribe shall have 90 days in which to execute preferential rights to purchase said tract at a price offered to the seller by a prospective buyer willing and able to purchase."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PATENT IN FEE DIRECTED TO ISSUE TO CLAUDE E. MILLIKEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 714) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Claude E. Milliken.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Claude E. Milliken, of Billings, Mont., a patent in fee to the following-described lands allotted to him on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.: Allotment No. 144, the north half, the north half of the south half and the south half of the southwest quarter, of section 21, township 4 south, range 28 east, containing five hundred and sixty acres, and the north half of the northwest half of section 24, township 5 south, range 26 east, Montana principal meridian, containing eighty acres.

With the following committee amendments:

The amendments are as follows:

On page 2, line 1, following the first word "half", strike out the comma and insert in lieu thereof the words "of the."

On page 2, line 1, strike out the second word "half" and insert in lieu thereof the word "quarter."

On page 2, line 3, following the word "acres", strike out the period, add a semicolon and the following: "*Provided*, That when the land herein described is offered for sale, the Crow Tribe or any Indian who is a member of said tribe shall have 90 days in which to execute preferential rights to purchase said tract at a price offered to the seller by a prospective buyer willing and able to purchase."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENTARO TAKAHASHI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 329) for the relief of Gentaro Takahashi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record Gentaro Takahashi as having entered the United States on July 13, 1927, for permanent residence. The said Gentaro Takahashi shall not be subject to deportation by reason of such entry.

SEC. 2. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any warrants of arrest or orders of deportation which may have been issued, and to discontinue any deportation proceedings which may have been commenced, in the case of said Gentaro Takahashi.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BURNETT A. PYLE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 936) for the relief of Burnett A. Pyle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Burnett A. Pyle, of Bradford, Ark., the sum of $6,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him on June 29, 1945, as a result of being knocked to the ground and trampled by a team of mules which he was harnessing and which became frightened when three United States Army planes passed overhead at a very low altitude: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdeameanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADNEY W. GRAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 851) for the relief of Adney W. Gray.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Adney W. Gray, Pepperell, Mass., the sum of $3,810. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for losses sustained by the said Adney W. Gray on account of the operation, during the year 1939, by the Northeastern Timber Salvage Administration (an agency of the Department of Agriculture) of a sawmill located near the fox ranch of the said Adney W. Gray. The unusual noises and commotion from such mill and the trucks and tractors operated in connection therewith so frightened and disturbed the foxes that the female breeders destroyed their young and such breeders had to be replaced.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of bill insert: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MICHAEL PALAZOTTA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2064) for the relief of Michael Palazotta.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Michael Palazotta, of Bethpage, N. Y., the sum of $30,000, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States as compensation for his permanent disability, as the result of an accident involving a United States armed car tank, on April 21, 1944, at Babylon, N. Y.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$30,000" and insert "$7,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DENNIS STANTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2732) for the relief of Dennis Stanton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 5, and Supp. V, secs. 765–770), are hereby waived in favor of Dennis Stanton, of Clarks Green, Pa., and his claim for compensation for disability resulting from his having suffered a total loss of vision in his right eye on or about April 15, 1939, while working for the Works Progress Administration near East Benton, Pa., is authorized and directed to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, and as extended to employees engaged in emergency relief employment, if he files such claim with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this act. No benefits shall accrue under this act for any period prior to the date of its enactment.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 8, after the word "Compensation", insert ", Federal Security Agency."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAURA SPINNICHIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3006) for the relief of Laura Spinnichia.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Laura Spinnichia, of 299 First Street, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her and for reimbursement of medical, hospital, and other expenses incurred by her as the result

of her having slipped and fallen on a dangerously slippery floor in McDonald Hall at the United States Naval Academy on or about the 26th day of September 1938: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN H. SCHMITT AND MRS. MILDRED SCHMITT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3965) for the relief of John H. Schmitt and Mrs. Mildred Schmitt.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John H. Schmitt, of Oak Park, Ill., the sum of $3,010.05, and to pay to Mrs. Mildred Schmitt, of Oak Park, Ill., the sum of $4,021.05, in full settlement of all claims of the said John H. Schmitt and Mrs. Mildred Schmitt against the United States for property damages, personal injuries, and loss of earnings sustained and medical and hospital expenses incurred by them as the result of the automobile in which they were riding having been struck by a United States Army vehicle on June 22, 1944, at the intersection of Roosevelt Road and United States Highway No. 45 in Cook County, Ill.: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NORTHWEST MISSOURI FAIR ASSOCIATION, MISSOURI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3983) for the relief of Northwest Missouri Fair Association, of Bethany, Harrison County, Mo.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

YELLOW CAB TRANSIT CO., OF OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4381) for the relief of the Yellow Cab Transit Co., of Oklahoma City.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Yellow Cab Transit Co., of Oklahoma City, Okla., the sum of $9,702.87. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States by claimant and in payment of all losses incurred by claimant resulting from the death of its employee, Charles Marion Overcash, driver of claimant's vehicle, which occurred in a collision with a United States Army truck on United States Highway 66, near Hazlegreen, Mo., on August 10, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIRE DISTRICT NO. 1 OF THE TOWN OF COLCHESTER, VT.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1263) for the relief of Fire District No. 1 of the town of Colchester, Vt.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Fire District No. 1 of the town of Colchester, Vt., the sum of $30,190.16, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for reimbursement of expenses incurred by it in repairing damage to a sewer line such damage having resulted from improper construction by Army authorities, who installed the sewer line pursuant to an agreement between the fire district and the Army: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNA PECHNIK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1142) for the relief of Anna Pechnik.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

KARL FREDERICK KUCKER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 706) to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Karl Frederick Kucker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Karl Frederick Kucker, who entered the United States at New York, in April 1925, and that he shall, for all purposes under the immigration and naturalization laws, be deemed to have been lawfully admitted for permanent residence only as of that date and nullifying and canceling all other departures and entries which he might have made thereafter.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN WATKINS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6224) for the relief of John Watkins.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $9,616.50 to John Watkins, of Twillingate, Newfoundland, who was injured on May 19, 1947, on North Twillingate Island, Newfoundland, when a wagon on which he was riding was struck by a United States Coast Guard jeep, driven by Roland J. Loewer. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of such accident: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$9,616.50" and insert "$3,556.50."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of bills on the Private Calendar.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EMERGENCY RENT ACT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2195) to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole, and will opportunity be given for the offering of an amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that the bill will be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole, and amendments may be in order.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be

considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 (b) of the act entitled "An act to regulate rents in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 2, 1941, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940 edition, sec. 45–1601), is hereby amended by striking out "on April 30, 1948" and inserting in lieu thereof "at the close of March 31, 1949."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of such act, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940 edition, sec. 45–1602), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(3) After April 30, 1948, the provisions of this act shall not apply to the following housing accommodations, and no maximum rent ceilings or minimum service standards shall be prescribed with respect thereto:

"(a) Any housing accommodations in hotels, which accommodations are used predominantly for transient occupancy, that is, for living quarters for nonresidents upon a short-time basis;

"(b) Any housing accommodations the construction of which was completed after March 31, 1948, or which are additional housing accommodations created by conversion after March 31, 1948:

"(c) Nonhousekeeping, furnished housing accommodations, located within a single dwelling unit not used as a rooming or boarding house, but only if (A) no more than two paying tenants, not members of the landlord's immediate family, live in such dwelling unit, and (B) the remaining portion of such dwelling unit is occupied by the landlord or his immediate family."

SEC. 3. (a) The first sentence of section 9 (a) of such act, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940 edition, sec. 45–1609), is amended to read as follows: "Within 10 days after issuance of an order of the Administrator under section 4, any party may file a petition to review such action in the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia, and shall forthwith serve a copy of such petition upon the Administrator."

(b) Section 9 (c) of such act, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940 edition, sec. 45–1609), is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia is hereby granted exclusive jurisdiction to review any order of the Administrator made pursuant to section 4 of this act. The judgment and decree of the court shall be final, subject to review as provided by law relative to other judgments of the court."

SEC. 4. All cases now pending before the statutory three-judge court of the municipal court which have not been presented to that court for decision at the time this act takes effect shall forthwith be certified by said court to the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia. Nothing herein contained shall affect the validity of any judgment or decree of the statutory court (consisting of three judges of the municipal court as heretofore provided by law) rendered subsequent to the effective date of this act in cases heretofore presented to that court and now awaiting decision.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, strike out lines 5, 6, 7, and 8 and insert "(a) any housing accommodations in hotels, as defined by this act, used exclusively for transient occupancy."

Page 2, line 11, strike out the words "by conversion."

Page 2, line 12, after "1948" insert "by conversion of buildings or facilities or both not heretofore used for housing accommodations."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS: Page 2, line 19, after section 2 insert a new section to read as follows:

"The prohibition against actions to recover possession of any housing accommodations set forth in section 5 (b) of the act approved December 2, 1941, entitled 'District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act' shall not apply unless the tenant is actually occupying such housing accommodations as a home."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the intent of the District rent-control law was to hold rents down on living quarters. This Congress has never extended rent control to commercial properties. By sly maneuverings, the rent-control law is now used as a protection for individuals engaged in commercial ventures, much to the disadvantage of the owners of the property.

A case has been called to my attention of an individual who owns a building in Washington that has five apartments. The agent, without the consent and knowledge of the owner and against his expressed verbal instructions, rented these apartments unfurnished to another real-estate firm, with permission to sublease. This real-estate firm filled these apartments with the cheapest kind of furniture and then subleased them at rent ceilings which gave them 75 percent over and above the basic rent.

This real-estate firm which rented from the owner's agent has never occupied any of the apartments. There is information available which indicates that this firm is also operating such a business in more than 300 units in the city of Washington, no doubt in most cases without the consent of the owners.

The people living in these apartments are required to pay a very high rent, but the real owner gets but a small portion of it. The real owner has no increase in rent with which to meet increasing costs of operation, taxes, redecoration, and repairs.

The existing rent-control law for the District of Columbia in section 5 (b) carries a prohibition against actions to recover the possession of housing accommodations. Such a prohibition no doubt is necessary if we are going to have rent control, or a rent ceiling would be meaningless. However, the protection afforded by this section ought to be for the tenants actually occupying the apartments as their homes. The amendment that I have offered would limit the application of this prohibition to tenants actually so occupying the premises.

If my amendment is adopted it will mean that the owner of these five apartments may bring an action against the real-estate firm to recover possession of the apartments. It will in no wise disturb the individuals actually occupying the apartments as their homes. It will enable the owner to go into court and attempt to remove the exploiting real-estate firm that is subletting. If the owner prevails in such an action the actual occupants of the apartments will still have the protection of the rent-control law.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment ought to be adopted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the purpose the gentleman from Nebraska has in mind is highly meritorious and commendable. However, I have had no occasion to examine the amendment until just a little while ago, but I shall make the suggestion that since the bill must go to conference anyway to iron out one or two other differences with the Senate, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska will get careful consideration, and on that basis I have no objection to its inclusion in the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

I am constrained to comment on some of the remarks made this morning by members on the outcome of the Italian election. It was made to appear that the intervention of the United States was a material factor in deciding the issue. It appears to me that this is a pretty presumptuous construction for a Member of Congress or any other citizen of the United States to place upon the Italian election.

There is nothing to indicate that the vote in Italy was influenced in the slightest degree by what the United States did. To assume anything else would smack too much of egoism on the part of the United States.

Good manners alone should prompt us to credit the Italian citizens with sufficient good sense, sound judgment and patriotism for the outcome of their election.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1481) to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight savings time in the District.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, why do you want to plunge into that kind of a program here when it will not be worth anything to anybody?

You will have one time in Washington, another time in Virginia and Maryland, and throughout the rest of the country. I would just like to know what is the excuse or what is the reason for imposing this kind of a condition at this time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I think I can supply the gentleman from Mississippi with at least half a dozen very favorable, persuasive reasons. The first one is that we had daylight saving here by an act of Congress last summer, and it worked out very nicely. The second is that it found great favor in the outlying sections

of both Maryland and Virginia, as well as Washington, D. C., as well as evidenced by a number of polls showing that it was in very high favor. The third reason is that all up and down the Atlantic seaboard on a State-wide basis we have daylight saving at the present time, and it is in the interest and convenience of the people who travel from nondaylight saving territory to daylight saving territory that we should conform here in the Nation's Capital. That would be notably true in Connecticut and New York and a great many other States. So, it having worked out very well heretofore, and since the matter was very thoroughly considered, and considered at length and thoroughly debated last year, it is nothing more than empowering the Commissioners to apply daylight saving and giving them the authority to do so. The Commissioners will conduct hearings here, take testimony from groups and associations, so that every shade of opinion will be fully represented, so we are simply carrying out the precedent that was established last year. We are simplying carrying out the precedent that was established last year.

Normally this bill would come up on District of Columbia day. The reason it comes up now is that daylight-saving time is supposed to obtain in most sections of the country on the last Sunday in April. If there is to be conformity between the District of Columbia and other areas in the country, it is necessary to follow this course and bring the bill up aside from the regular calendar.

Mr. RANKIN. This morning I heard our friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] bragging about what the Republican Congress had accomplished. With reference to economy, he overlooked the billions of dollars we are spending on ERP.

If we are going to change the Constitution, alter our form of government, destroy the rights of private property, exhaust the resources of America to spend abroad, and change the time of day, I presume it is useless for me to object alone. But I do think this is a mistake. Have the leaders on our side been consulted?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. RAYBURN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that a matter like this should come up by unanimous consent without previous notice.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. First, let me observe that I undertook to make my position thoroughly clear to the Speaker that if there were objection I would be glad to withdraw the bill and bring it up in the course of a regular District Day. It is only because of the fact that daylight-saving time begins on the last Sunday in April, and it will be too late to conform to the custom in other sections of the country if we have to go over until then, that I have asked to have the bill considered today.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman understands that last year when the bill with reference to daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia was under consideration there was serious objection. I certainly knew nothing about any attempt to bring this bill up today. I should like Members who do object to it to have an opportunity to be heard. If the gentleman desires to bring up the bill on tomorrow, and if the Speaker will recognize him then to ask unanimous consent to do so, as far as I am individually concerned I would not object, but I just do not want this thing of daylight saving becoming contagious. My people utterly hate this, as practically all the farming sections of the country do.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the gentleman will yield for a further observation, I may say that the Committee on the District of Columbia authorized the chairman to ask unanimous consent to bring up this bill, if it was agreeable to the Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN. If the Speaker wants to recognize the gentleman to ask unanimous consent to bring this bill up tomorrow, since the matter has been discussed today and the Members who may want to be here have been put on notice, it is all right with me, but I do suggest that the gentleman allow it to go over until tomorrow.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request, with the understanding that perhaps the bill can be brought up tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can always make that request.

EVA L. DUDLEY, GRACE M. COLLINS, AND GUY B. SLATER

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 1799) for the relief of Eva L. Dudley, Grace M. Collins, and Guy B. Slater.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1799) for the relief of Eva L. Dudley, Grace M. Collins, and Guy B. Slater, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the same.

JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.,
CLIFFORD P. CASE,
FADJO CRAVENS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALEXANDER WILEY,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
PAT MCCARRAN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill as passed the House appropriated the sum of $2,000 to Eva L. Dudley, to pay the sum of $2,000 to Grace M. Collins, and to pay the sum of $2,000 to Guy B. Slater, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and property damage, hospital and medical expenses, sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Veterans' Administration fire truck near the main gate of the Bay Pines Veterans' Administration Hospital, on November 26, 1943.

The Senate amended the bill by striking from it the names and appropriation of Grace M. Collins and Guy B. Slater. The recommendation of the committee of conference is that the Senate recede from its amendments and the House agree to the same.

JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.,
CLIFFORD P. CASE,
FADJO CRAVENS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma (at the request of Mr. PEDEN), for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ARNOLD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. RUSSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram from the A. F. of L. and the CIO.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLETTE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

INDUSTRY'S MULTI-BILLION-DOLLAR PROBLEM

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, American industry the length and breadth of the Nation is today faced with a wage-and-hour problem that may well involve a greater amount of money than the question of portal-to-portal pay. Statisticians have calculated that the total charges against business all over the country as a result of this issue—known as overtime on overtime—may reach $6,000,000,000. I repeat, $6,000,000,000.

This enormous assessment carries with it ruin and bankruptcy for management in many lines of business. For organized labor, ostensibly the beneficiary of these huge payments, it spells the loss of gains which have taken years of work and struggle to achieve. This monstrous and destructive Frankenstein has been created by a judicial interpretation of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Ironically enough, the interpretation is exactly the reverse of the intentions of the Congress in writing the act.

Without going into excessive technical detail, the whole issue centers around the method of computing the regular rate of pay mentioned in the act. The act itself does not define what the regular rate is. It merely states that the wages for hours of work over 40 a week or 8 a day shall be at one and one-half times the regular rate. Now, practically every labor agreement in force in the country requires that workers be paid time and a half of the straight time rate of the contract for overtime. Further, a survey by the Bureau of Labor Statistics reveals that four-fifths of the contracts in force have better overtime provisions than those prescribed in the Fair Labor Standards Act.

However, here we come to a serious hitch. These agreements had been reached under the assumption that the regular rate referred to in the act meant the straight-time rate of the contract. This understanding was general on the part of both labor and management for years, until upset by a ruling handed down by the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second District. The court held that the regular rate within the meaning of the act was the average hourly wage received by the worker in any specific week.

So, what does that mean? It means that this divided average hourly wage—weekly pay divided by hours worked, including contract overtime bonus payments, incentive pay, and any other extras—thus becomes the regular rate of the act. Then the employer must for each and every week pay statutory overtime additional for all hours in excess of 40. He may have paid overtime as called for by the contract but now he has to pay statutory overtime computed on contract overtime already paid. You can see where the controversy got its name, "Overtime on overtime."

Then, you may ask, is there much difference between the two methods of figuring the regular rate? How is it that there are billions of dollars involved? On the basis of one overtime hour—there isn't much difference. In one instance from the actual record, the regular rate becomes $1.12 an hour instead of a flat $1. But before you set that aside as being a matter of a few cents, consider the whole problem. This ruling applies to years of war production where every worker put in as much time as could be physically managed—20 to 30 hours of overtime a week was not unusual. Then remember that since VJ-day our peacetime production, with its reconversion of the country's productive plant and industry's strenuous efforts to meet a long-neglected civilian demand, has been going at top speed. Some plants have been working a 48-hour week without interruption for more than 2 years.

So to grasp the full impact of this ruling, figure that it affects millions of American workers who have worked literally hundreds of millions of hours of overtime. Industry is now charged with reviewing their pay rolls for the past several years, averaging the hourly wage of each worker for each week and then paying out staggering sums of money additional for overtime on overtime.

It so happens that the original lawsuit on which this ruling occurred involved only 2 stevedoring companies and 20 of their employees—members of the International Longshoremen's Association. Here we have a disturbing parallel to the Mount Clemens Pottery case in the famous portal-to-portal issue. You will recall that the Mount Clemens decision spread like wildfire throughout all industry until the courts were clogged with nearly 2,000 portal-to-portal suits.

The circuit court of appeals ruling on the Huron and Bay Ridge cases—the test cases on which this overtime-on-overtime decision was reached—will have a like effect. Already, on the east coast, more than 600 overtime-on-overtime suits have been entered on the Federal dockets. I can safely predict that not one single congressional district will escape the havoc worked by this ruling.

To give you a sample—and I mean just a sample—of the types of industry which are going to be hit—I am going to name a few at random. In the field of transport, air lines, and all forms of water carriers are affected. In the line of food, the list includes fresh fruit and vegetable packing, canning of all kinds, dairy and poultry products, candy and confections, meat packing and jobbing; and in addition to those, retail stores of all kinds—drugs, food, candy, grocery, bakery, delicatessen and liquor. Heavy industry will also be hit; steel and iron products, shipbuilding, petroleum and petroleum products, automobile and automotive equipment manufacture, rubber, construction and construction materials, machinery and machine products, lumber. The garment trades are involved, as are producers of leather and leather products and makers of millinery. Because of their labor contracts practically all newspapers are affected.

There are many more businesses on this list. Ceramics, brewers and distillers, morticians, printers, communications of all types, silverware and jewelry, warehousing: A partial survey shows that more than 60 classes or categories of business enterprise are liable for overtime on overtime assessments. In individual cases, these assessments run into millions and sometimes hundreds of millions of dollars. The stevedoring industry alone, faces charges approaching half a billion. For the stevedores, that is equivalent to bankruptcy.

Mr. Speaker, here is a monstrously unjust situation which bears the seeds of national catastrophe. Particularly at this time, such huge judgments against industry will be ruinous. Our program abroad will be endangered and the domestic economy struck a crippling blow.

The carefully and sometimes painfully woven fabric of collective bargaining will suffer serious damage. Representatives of management and labor are confronted with an impossible problem—that of trying to determine in advance what a worker's average hourly wage will be for some future week. The confusion thus caused is rivaled only by the hazard of creating a new point of difference between contesting parties of labor and management—which is precisely what this double overtime ruling does. Joseph P. Ryan, head of the International Longshoremen's Association whose members brought the original suit, has testified both before Congress and before the United States Supreme Court, and placed the union on record as opposed to the suits. He stated that he feared that granting overtime on overtime might wipe out "all the gains we have made for our men over a period of 25 years."

A further demonstration of the injustice worked by this ruling—the employers who have been most generous to their employees in negotiating agreements will be hit far harder than those who pay little and make few concessions for extra wages. The former will be hurt because they agreed to a shorter workweek with liberal provisions for contract overtime. Thus the average hourly wage which is the basis of any assessment against them will be at a higher figure and the 50 percent extra they will have to pay out correspondingly more.

I believe that the Congress has a direct and immediate responsibility to remedy this situation and end the menace it presents. Basically, the whole controversy arose from vague and indefinite phrasing of one of our own acts. It is in the nature of a windfall not expected by labor, and not contemplated or provided against by management. All that is needed for a simple and quick resolution of all the difficulties that have arisen is a statement from this body on what actually was meant by the term "regular rate of pay" as used in the Fair Labor Standards Act. We will, most of us, agree that this essential definition should have been included in the legislation in the first place. The Wage and Hour Administrator says the same in effect in his report to the Congress. But, because of an oversight, it was not included, I feel it is up to the Congress to insert it now.

The Goodwin bill, which has been offered for consideration, accomplishes this. The definition of the regular rate included in this bill is a workable one because 10 years of labor-management negotiating experience were evaluated in the writing of the bill. It should receive the immediate attention of the Congress and be speedily passed.

Time is essential. Many labor agreements come up for renegotiation within the next 2 months. The question of wages itself will be difficult enough without the addition of the overtime on overtime argument.

Passage of the Goodwin bill would settle the question once and for all. It would eliminate permanently a disturbing element of confusion and restore to the relationship between management and labor a stability which is now more sorely needed than ever before. In fact, clarifying legislation of this character will be necessary regardless of the manner in which the United States Supreme Court decides the issue.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODWIN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman's figures are astounding to me. That $6,000,000,000 will amount to more than both

the wheat and cotton crops of the entire United States for the last year—if my figures are correct.

Mr. GOODWIN. The gentleman is probably correct. I know his figures on economic statistics are usually sound.

Mr. RANKIN. If that is the case, the gentleman's statement is astounding. It ought to astound every sound-thinking American. I presume his figures are correct.

If every grain of wheat and every pound of cotton grown in this country last year had been sold at the prevailing prices, they would not have brought $6,000,000,000.

Mr. GOODWIN. Let me say to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi that the figures are, I believe, well authenticated.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. KING asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is recognized.

COLONIAL POSSESSIONS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to make a few general comments on matters pertaining to Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and some of our other possessions. Yesterday we witnessed in this Chamber a very beautiful commemoration of the peaceful relationship that has existed between Cuba and the United States during the past 50 years. I do not want to have that commemoration cause us to forget that there is still a Puerto Rico, that there is still a possession of ours known as the Virgin Islands.

It has been my high privilege to serve as a member of the Committee on Insular Affairs and Territories of this House for the past 14 years, during which time I have been a member of the Insular Affairs Committee or the Committee on Territories or the combined committee since the work has been consolidated. This has given me a chance to observe closely and extensively the attitude of the Congress of the United States toward the people who live in our Territories, such as Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and previously what is now known as the Republic of the Philippines while it was under the jurisdiction of the United States for some 45 or 48 years.

Speaking very frankly and bluntly, Mr. Speaker, I am not too well pleased with the way the Congress of the United States treats our people who live in the colonies and Territories. At the present time there is too much disposition on the part of the Congress to forget those who live under the American flag offshore and remember those who are subjects of foreign countries, foreign nationals, so to speak.

In recent days I have discussed some of these matters with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Appropriations Committee and since 12 o'clock noon today I have discussed with the Chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations some of the very vital matters pertaining to the welfare of our people in the Virgin Islands. We should always bear in mind that it has been the disposition of the Congress to place Puerto Rico in many instances in the same category as the Republic of Cuba. The Puerto Ricans are forced to purchase their goods from the United States under tariff protection. The Puerto Ricans sell their goods to the United States; thus the Puerto Ricans are subject to the high cost of living thereby imposed, when the Cubans, the Haitians, the San Dominicans are not thus subjected to those forces which are controlled by the Congress of the United States.

Many times when our departments of Government make deals involving the economy of Puerto Rico those deals are more or less hypothecated on the treatment we give the Cubans. You would think the Puerto Ricans were in the same class with the Cubans. It is not going too far to make the observation that sometimes Members of Congress will refer to "Puerto Rico, Cuba, and other foreign countries," practically classifying the Puerto Ricans as members of a foreign country.

In the light of our international relations today and what we are doing throughout the world in the way of spending money, shipping goods and so forth, you may say denying ourselves so that the other peoples of the world may have the goods we produce, I am of the opinion it will not be too well for the United States, certainly not so good for our subjects, to overlook our own children. I make these statements today on behalf of those loyal citizens of the United States who reside in the Virgin Islands, in Puerto Rico, in Hawaii, and in Alaska, who have been under the American flag all these years, but who still do not enjoy the full privileges of our citizenship. There is before the Congress at the present time a bill calling for statehood for Hawaii and statehood for Alaska.

I wish someone would give me a legitimate reason, a genuine reason why the Hawaiians, who have been under the American flag during all of these decades, are not now prepared for statehood, or why the people of Alaska, who have been under the American flag for some 80 years, are not prepared for statehood. If we have in mind that we can go into these other countries of the world, especially Japan and western Europe, and so influence those people—and specifically I refer to Germany and Japan—that they will conform to the philosophy and the ideals having to do with economics and politics and religion and economy such as we have in the United States, and do it within a reasonable time, then on what grounds do we contend that the people of Alaska and the people of Hawaii are not fit for statehood? Now, you can bring up some objections, of course, from the standpoint of racial preponderance, but will those objections sufficiently weigh in the scales? Those are matters that we should give extremely serious consideration to at the present time in the light of what we are doing in the other parts of the world.

The economy of Puerto Rico is substantially a sugar economy, and there is at the present time a fair chance that that economy will be tremendously interfered with by reason of the sugar policies of the United States. It is very difficult to imagine how you can treat Puerto Rico with respect to sugar on one level, and Michigan on another, and California on another, Colorado on another one, because the domestic sugar industry consists of continental sugarcane and sugar beets, Hawaiian sugarcane, Puerto Rican sugarcane, and Virgin Islands sugarcane. That is the domestic industry, and that industry must be considered as a whole, not in a manner which classifies Hawaii out on one limb and Puerto Rico out on another limb, and continental cane and beet industry on another limb, you might say.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Is it not true that we have some legislation that requires certain percentages of raw sugar to come into the United States from Puerto Rico instead of allowing them to refine it in Puerto Rico? Is there not a quota?

Mr. CRAWFORD. We have a marketing quota, you might say, a Federal law, which allocates to Puerto Rico the privilege of sending into the United States so much sugar, and then that law says that of that total tonnage no more than X tons may come in in refined form.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. How does anyone justify that?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, that is discrimination, of course, against Puerto Rico.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. And it has been going on for years.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It has been running on for years, of course. Those are matters which are highly significant to the economy of Puerto Rico.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the Delegate from Puerto Rico.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. I appreciate what the gentleman is saying concerning Puerto Rico, especially when in connection with the celebration held here yesterday. For 50 years Puerto Rico has been under the American flag as the result of the Spanish-American War.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. But there are quite a number of problems that do not seem to be settled yet. The gentleman from Michigan pointed to one of them, and that is that Puerto Rico, although within the United States tariff system, does not have the same access to the domestic market here that other areas have. The case of refined sugar is very important. Precisely because of the economy which Puerto Rico has had to develop during these 50 years, as a part of the economic system of the United States, sugar has become our mainstay.

We are under a production quota as the mainland areas are. That this be

so is not the point I am trying to make. The point I am trying to make is that within that production quota we are prevented from finishing the product industrially and we must sell raw sugar to be refined in the mainland, rather than being allowed to sell it as a finished, refined product. This means a loss to the island's economy of not less than $20,000,000 a year. This brings about a lower income for the people of the island, a lower standard of living, a lower level of education, a lower capacity for productivity, a lower purchasing power. It should be remembered that as we sell in the mainland, we buy in the mainland. If we are prevented, as we are prevented, from producing on an equal basis with the States, we are equally prevented from buying from the States. The end result can easily be a profound disturbance in the balance of trade between the island and the continent.

Just to give some figures, I shall use those included in an editorial which appeared only yesterday in the newspaper El Mundo, of San Juan.

In the year 1947 Puerto Rican merchandise shipped to the mainland was valued at $191,000,000. We purchased in the mainland $309,000,000. I cannot claim that if we refined our sugar, we would have solved this tremendous lack of balance of trade to the tune of $117,000,000. I very well know that industrialization should not stop with sugar and I may say that we are doing our utmost in order to industrialize the island in every possible direction. But I do say that twenty, twenty-five, or thirty million dollars which we could realize by simply being allowed to refine our sugar, would reduce this lack of trade balance in about 25 percent. It would be a real beginning in the effort to bring about a sounder, more satisfactory economic condition for the island.

As far as Puerto Rico is within the tariff system, as far as Puerto Rico is a member of the United States economic system, it is only fair that the rules of trade be applied to the island without discrimination. We have no other market than the mainland market. We are not free to engage in the development of foreign markets to which our economy is not geared, nor have we any desire to gear our economy to foreign markets in preference to the mainland market. That holds true as much concerning sales as concerning purchases. These economic discriminations are possible because of the fact that Puerto Rico remains in the undetermined position of a possession; that no definite policy of relationship between the island and the mainland seems to have been adopted and followed in the economic or political sense. At the end of 50 years it is understandable that the people of Puerto Rico may wish to arrive at such a position of relationship where equality both in a juridical and economical sense may exist, within which their decisions as free citizens may have due weight.

I must thank the gentleman from Michigan for bringing this matter at this point to the attention of Congress.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

OLEO VERSUS BUTTER EXPERIMENTS—WHY DOES NOT SOMEONE ANSWER THIS ONE WITH FACTS?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, while many learned men have declared that oleo is equal to butter, I wish to humbly state that this may be true, but no experiment conducted has ever proven this to be a fact. I fully realize that this may appear to be egotistical to many people. The statement that oleo equals butter is based on experiments with rats. One group of rats have been fed oleo and one group has been fed butter. Then the rats were examined and weighed. If the rats were of equal weight and health condition at the end of the experiment one could easily be misled into the wrong conclusion. Why do I say that? Because every experiment that I have ever heard of or read about showed that the rats had something else besides oleo or butter. What was used to implement the ration? Casein was used. What is casein? It is made from skim milk. Skim-milk powder has 1-percent butterfat. I maintain that a conclusion that oleo equals butter is not proven by this kind of an experiment regardless by whom it is conducted. Only one conclusion can fairly be made from such an experiment. That conclusion is that rats fed oleo with its 15.6 percent dairy products content will when fed another dairy product—casein—show equal health, and so forth as when fed only butterfat. If I am wrong, please put something in the record to disprove my contention.

I maintain that no experiment has ever shown a vegetable oil equal to butterfat. I maintain that an experiment based on taking a vegetable oil and implementing it with two dairy products does not prove what people have been led to believe it proved. For years I have tried to find someone that has evidence to prove my error in so believing. The phoney experiment carried out in the Chicago orphanages is so discreted that I shall omit a discussion of it.

With all the heat engendered in regard to the oleo-dairy controversy, I have tried to stick to facts. I have not been misled by any false claims or false propaganda. Although so many people appear to be allergic to the dairy industry, I hope they will not run short of one milk, and that is the milk of human kindness, and I will try to keep an adequate supply of this kind of milk on hand.

OLEO IMPORT DUTY, 22 CENTS PER POUND; BUTTER IMPORT DUTY, 7 CENTS PER POUND FOR FIRST 50,000,000 POUNDS OR FOR FREE

Mr. Speaker, much has been said about unfair taxation of oleomargarine. What are the facts? Let us check these up?

First. Oleo has one-fourth-cent tax on uncolored oleomargarine.

Butter has one-fourth-cent tax on reprocessed butter.

Second. Oleo has the protection of a 22-cent-per-pound import duty or tax.

Butter has the protection of 7 cents per pound for the first 50,000,000 pounds and 14 cents thereafter.

Third. Oleo has the protection of a 3-cent per pound internal or excise tax when made of imported oils.

Fourth. Oleo also has a tax of 10 cents per pound when colored, but 23 States with 60 to 75 percent of the population of the United States have laws prohibiting the sale of colored oleo. There is also a manufacturer's tax of $600 a year, a tax of $200 if uncolored on wholesalers, and a tax of $6 on uncolored a year on retailers. A total Federal tax of a little less than $6,000,000 was collected in the last fiscal year by the Unted States Department of the Treasury on the 700,000,000 pounds or 0.85 cent per pound.

Fifth. Oleo is subsidized more than the tax collected.

In addition I wish to call your attention to the following: The import tax on olemargarine is 22 cents per pound, and the import duty on dried skim milk is 1½ cents per pound although it contains 35.6 digestible animal protein. This import tax was reduced a few days ago. This is a byproduct of butter making. The import tax on casein was reduced to 2¾ cents per pound. The import tax on milk sugar or lactose is at this moment being reduced by 50 percent. There have been seven import tax reductions put in operation by the New Deal administrations on manufactured dairy products. Three of these were on cheese and four on butter and the byproducts of butter making.

This administration is so allergic to the dairy industry that even the old philosophy of the Democratic Party "taxes for revenue only" is being discarded.

Note the following official table. Over 90 percent of the butter imported last fiscal year came in without any import tax whatsoever. Under Executive order it came in free, but oleo was protected by a 22-cent-per-pound import tax.

Natural butter and butter spreads: Imports for consumption, fiscal year 1946–47 [1]

Month	Imports for consumption—natural butter	
	Quantity	Value
	Pounds	
July	[2] 848,085	$456,165
August	9,957	7,602
September	457	284
October	747	313
November	2,015	1,152
December	[2] 6,010,985	2,661,420
January	698	419
February	[2] 3,709,708	1,716,614
March	7,717	6,537
April	37,370	35,268
May	6	4
June	215	89
Total	10,627,960	4,885,867

[1] Preliminary.
[2] These entries were very largely free under Executive order.

Source: Official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

Please note that over 90 percent of the butter imports last fiscal year came in free under Executive order. I appreciated it was not a large volume and I appreciate the reason, but the fact still

remains that butter was imported without duty, and oleo had the 22 cents per pound protection and was not brought in free by Executive order.

Just exactly what do our oleo friends mean by putting on the cry-baby act by complaining about discriminatory taxes? If the dairy industry had anywhere near the tax protection that oleo enjoys, the dairy industry would feel complimented. This administration is so allergic to the dairy industry that the recent giving away of the market for the by-products of butter is just one more example.

MONTANA BUTTER HIGHEST IN VITAMIN A OF ANY STATE IN THE UNION—ALSO IS TRYING TO KEEP UP WITH THE VITAMINS

Mr. Speaker, we hear many weird tales about the wonders of oleo as publicized by the cotton lobby. Years ago, the oleomargarine people claimed that oleo was equal to butter. Experiments proved that this was not a fact, children ate it and had sore eyelids. Then the oleo people decided to fortify it with vitamin A. They then injected 9,000 international units of vitamin A, and then claimed it was as good as butter.

However, at Beltsville, Md., at the agricultural experiment station, this administration, which appears to be so allergic to dairy products, ran an experiment to find out how much vitamin A there was in butter. Remember now, the oleo people claimed that oleomargarine had as much vitamin A as butter when the oleo has the 9,000 units of vitamin A. Even their paid scientists said so. This butter experiment was conducted in 1942, 1943, and 1944. A summary of the results was based on:

First. The vitamin A potency of the creamery butter produced in the various States.

Second. The effect of commercial storage and handling on the vitamin A potency of butter.

Third. The vitamin A potency of butter sold on retail markets in the United States.

Results are now available which indicate the vitamin A potency of the butter produced in creameries in 14 States. These States make nearly 64 percent of the creamery butter produced in the United States, and their combined output undoubtedly may be considered representative of practically all the creamery butter produced in this country.

This experiment showed that there was a variation in vitamin A content in different States and the different regions, and in different seasons. However, Montana butter averaged 18,636 international units in winter butter and 22,100 international units in summer butter, or a yearly average of 21,014 international units.

The national average was 15,529 international units of vitamin A. When this experiment was made public, the oleomargarine people who had previously contended that oleo with no vitamin A was equal to butter, and who had previously contended that oleo with 9,000 international units of vitamin A was equal to butter, then adopted a program of injecting 15,000 international units of vitamin A and still claiming it was equal to butter.

Should anyone wish to harm Montana dairymen when they produce this high vitamin A butter?

The cotton lobby uses so much of the public funds for cotton programs that funds for too extensive dairy experiments have not been conducted. The unknown "x" in milk may still be discovered, but who knows if and when.

Wherever Mary Butter goes, her Lamb Oleo is sure to follow. Butter prices go down, oleo prices go down; butter prices go up, then oleo follows along up. The oleo prices are not evidently based on production costs, but on butter prices.

DO NOT DEPLETE THE SOIL FERTILITY BY SUPPORTING THE PROPAGANDA OF THE COTTON LOBBY AND OLEO MONOPOLY

Mr. Speaker, the following article is from the April 24, 1948, issue of the Midland Cooperative:

SAVE SOIL OR BECOME SERFS, SIMS TELLS SUPPLY MEETING

John W. Sims, general manager of the Ohio Farm Bureau Cooperative Association, Columbus, Ohio, warned at the farm supply section of Midland's annual meeting that unless action on soil-saving is taken immediately in the Midwest "our grandsons will see the United States a land of hunger, strife, and death."

"We in the United States have ruined more land in less time than any nation in history," he said. "We had very fertile soils to begin with, yet today one-fifth of our land has been ruined beyond repair and one-third of the remainder of our farm land is badly damaged. Yet we continue ruining our land at the rate of 500,000 acres a year."

We shall continue to have wars as long as we have hungry people in the world, Sims asserted.

The United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization has stated that by 1960 we should have 21 percent more cereals; 12 percent more sugar; 34 percent more fats; 80 percent more beans and peas; 16.3 percent more fruits and vegetables; 46 percent more meats; and 100 percent more milk.

"To fulfill the above requirement, there must be an enormous increase in yields. This hunger problem must be solved if we are to prevent wars. This problem of maintenance of soil fertility is far beyond being a farmer's problem—it is a national problem—yes, it is even a world problem."

Sims stated that the United States has always had an adequate supply of food available at a fair price. However, he warned that if the time ever comes when the people in this country are hungry, the Government will dictate how our farms should be handled. He said:

"Whether or not agricultural cooperatives were formed sufficiently soon or have or will progress sufficiently fast to save the farmers of our country from becoming a servile class of people, as has happened in so many older countries, is questionable."

When we realize that Chicago is the food and agricultural capital of the United States as well as the world, then we can appreciate the need, as shown by the above article, of conserving and preserving the fertility of our soil. Up to this time too much of the soil-conservation talk has been soil conversation. We have had an agricultural leadership in our United States Department of Agriculture that promotes, subsidizes, and fosters soil-depleting crops, and at the same time takes an antilivestock position, and has time after time demonstrated how allergic it was to butterfat in particular and dairying in general. There are millions of tons of phosphate, potash, and other fertilizer elements being sold from the farms of America each year.

When wheat has 18 cents per bushel fertilizer value, and when tobacco, soybean meal, and cottonseed meal have around $20 per ton fertilizer value, one can readily see how rapidly the soil fertility is being reduced. Over $75,000,000 worth of fertility was exported last year in the wheat shipments abroad.

Then we have those among us who have been misled into promoting oleo farming which means not only less milk, less beef and veal, but less fertility in our soils. We better be helping to strengthen the dairy industry. The oleo bill should not pass.

CONSUMERS CANNOT UNDERSTAND PRICES AND IT IS NOT SURPRISING

Mr. Speaker, the operations of the agricultural leadership of the present administration are difficult to support.

This agricultural leadership is antilivestock in its operations. It is allergic to butterfat as well. It has taken this position so long that it appears permanent.

First, we saw the goats of the Navajo Indians killed by the thousands. This deprived these Indians of a protective food. Now they have a high rate of disease and are hungry. The Appropriations Committee is now providing $1,000,000 so the Navajos can have food.

Then, we noted the lowering of the duty on livestock products. There have been at least seven reductions of duty on manufactured dairy products. This includes the reduction on cheese, dried skim milk, casein, and lactose, and three on butter. Not much evaporated milk has ever been imported. We shipped millions of pounds of butterfat as cheese, butter, and evaporated milk during the war. The Department is now asking for bids for 250,000 cases of evaporated milk for export. Other countries do not seem to be allergic to butterfat. While we are doing this there are two other activities taking place. One is the 7,000,000 pounds of dried skim milk provided for the national school-lunch program. The duty on this product has recently been lowered three-eighths of a cent a quart, which is inviting great imports of it and at the same time our Agricultural Department states that we have an oversupply of dried skim milk.

Is it surprising if we export by gifts the butterfat products and import more and more dried skim milk that butter prices bring public criticism?

With skim-milk imports, manufacturers of oleomargarine, filled milk, and other dairy substitutes are not dependent on the dairy men of America. A strong dairy position is needed in any country for an all around farm economy. Before the war there were more milk cattle in the United States than nonmilk cattle. The cattle numbers have already been reduced by six million. There are less milk cows on the farms of America than there were when the New Deal took over. When one realizes that over 40 percent of the beef and veal of our Nation is obtained from milk cattle, and when one realizes that we have not

been self-sufficient as to beef since the effects of the Democrat Underwood tariff went into effect in 1913, excepting during World Wars I and II, and when one realizes that the people of the United States are evidently apt to have less milk and dairy products in 1948 than any year in our history, then and only then is one cognizant of the damage that can come to American agriculture and American consumers when additional economic rugs are jerked out from under the dairymen of America. In 1948 the American people are evidently to have less per capita dairy products than ever before in the history of our country.

Before the war the milk from 42 out of every 100 milk cows found a market as butter. This has now been reduced to 25 cows out of every 100. The anti-livestock attitude of the Department of Agriculture is largely responsible for this fact. If the oleo bill cuts this number from 25 to 10 or 15, of course, that will mean less beef and veal and higher prices for the consumer. That will also mean less dried milk, less cottage cheese, less casein, less lactose. Of course, this has been taken care of by reducing the import duty on skim milk to three-eighths cent per quart. It surprises as well as pains me, to see people in high places, who must know this but who are afraid of the cotton lobby and the 26 oleomargarine manufacturers, who have a monopoly on the American market.

A high official of the United States Department of Agriculture may say, "Do not worry about oleo, just drink more milk." This sounds as if Mr. Luckman is back directing the Department of Agriculture. You cannot afford $1 per pound for butterfat in one form, but you can pay $2 per pound for the same butterfat in another form. Every man that milks a cow should make an earnest vow right now to withhold his support from any office seeker who is out to ruin the greatest system of agriculture ever developed in the United States or in the world.

If the consumers of America had a few more States like Wisconsin that would really produce milk at $3.52 per hundredweight or about 7 cents per quart instead of raising subsidized oil crops, they would not be doing so much complaining.

If the fertilizer, manpower, and land used to accumulate the 500,000,000 pounds of tobacco on hand, ample dairy products could be had. If the agricultural administration would cease subsidizing surpluses of nonfood crops like cotton and tobacco, and insist that they farm their farms more and the United States Treasury less, society would have much to gain.

The following monthly report of the Consolidated Badger Cooperative, of Shawano, Wis., gives indication of the apprehension of dairymen:

DAIRY SMATTERINGS, APRIL 1, 1948

(By Matt Wallrich)

APRIL FOOL'S DAY—WHO'S FOOLING WHO?

The dairy farmer will not be fooled again.

He got sucked in and worked over last year with a demand from the Secretary of Agriculture that he meet a goal. He met it for 6 months.

Reward: A program that drove the price of milk powder to 9 cents, cheese to 29 cents, and farm milk back to OPA levels.

It was a cute maneuver, but this year is an election year, and the farmer well knows that there are more votes in low food prices than in keeping faith with farmers.

Result: Since last July milk production has declined each month, as compared to the corresponding month the year preceding.

Midwest production: December, 10 percent under; January, 11 percent under; February, 11 percent under; March, 12 to 14 percent under. Based on production per dairy.

Cow population on Jan. 1 (total livestock number lowest since 1939)

1941:	
Cows 2 years and over	25,453,000
Heifers 1 to 2 years	5,676,000
1945:	
Cows 2 years and over	27,770,000
Heifers 1 to 2 years	6,307,000
1948:	
Cows 2 years and over	25,165,000
Heifers 1 to 2 years	5,685,000

United States human population

1940	131,675,000
1948	145,000,000

Baby crop in United States

1940	2,360,000
1946	3,260,000
1947	3,730,000

Per capita production, civilian population, United States

	Fluid and cream	Evaporated	Ice cream	Butter	Cheese
1929	356	12.0	10.0	17.4	4.6
1939	344	16.5	10.9	17.3	5.9
1945	433	16.9	13.9	10.8	5.9
1947	403	18.8	20.8	11.5	7.0

Our wherewithal

	Cold-storage holdings, March 1948	Annual production, 1947
Butter (pounds)	7,586,000	1,325,746,000
Cheddar (pounds)	95,100,000	955,842,000
Cream 40 percent (pounds)	6,114,000	
Evaporated (cases)	1,475,000	72,708,000

WE CANNOT WRITE THE PEACE WITH THE CUPBOARD BARE

Dairy production will not be restored to proper levels until farmers know the score.

Neither private nor cooperative operators will buck the Government on a storage deal.

So long as Government purchases can reject bona fide bids on open competitive bidding, and suggest that product will be accepted at a cent lower, just so long will farmers know that their only protection is in holding down production.

Imagine any other Government procurement agency rejecting bids, and telling the contractors, "Cut your labor 10 percent and we will let you bid again."

But it's all right to pluck the farmer.

If the Government doesn't need the product, isn't going to need the product, then tell the farmer in so many words: Don't use your billions of dollars of buying power to bludgeon small cooperatives and farmers, who have been taught to believe that USDA was created as an aid to farmers, just as the Department of Labor was created to fight for the workingman.

Government food buying (other than for stabilization) should be divorced from Agriculture; otherwise the buying should be on firm bid and acceptance basis, with the contracts going to the lowest bidder until the quantity needed is subscribed.

This week the acceptance of 104,000 pounds of powder (a measly two cars of distress merchandise) broke the market on a product with 700,000,000 pounds of annual production.

Next week they can nurse it down again, and then again, and again. Despite the supply-and-demand situation, with a $40,000,000,000 bank account, they can scare the market down to 9 or 10 cents again this year, and drag all other dairy markets with it.

More farmers will get disgusted and quit dairying. Then next fall, another worse bull market.

So, all I can say is:

"Please, Secretary Anderson, don't help us again this year, as you did last.

"Tell us how much you need, and when you need it, and we will do our level best to produce what you want to help you write the peace; but, if you can't pay the market price, well, bless you.

"It will be cheaper for us to set aside 5 percent of our total production and give it to you free of charge, rather than again break our prices 30 percent to show what a businesslike procurement agency you are operating."

Mr. Speaker, the Consolidated Badger Cooperative is one of the largest and most successful dairy cooperatives in the Nation and has made a great contribution for better dairy products and better marketing of dairy products. You will note the 58-percent increase in the baby crop and you will note the reduction in milk-cow numbers. In fact, our milk-cow numbers are less than they were 15 years ago when the New Deal took over. In 1948 the American people are to have the least milk and milk products to consume that they have ever had in the history of our country. The dairy industry is in enough trouble without injecting the oleo controversy into the picture.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 21, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1475. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting drafts of three proposed joint resolutions relating to the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1949; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1476. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of settlement of claims filed with this Department by Fresno and Visalia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1477. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to grant additional powers to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to be exercised in cases of emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1478. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a lien for moneys due hospitals for services rendered in cases caused by negligence or fault of others and providing for the recording and enforcing of such liens," approved June 30, 1939; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1479. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report and recommendation concerning the claim of the Madison Street Building Corp. against

the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1480. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Mystic River Bridge Authority, an instrumentality of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, an easement for the construction and operation of bridge approaches over and across lands comprising a part of the United States naval hospital, Chelsea, Mass.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1481. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide increased pensions for widows and children of deceased members and retired members of the Police Department and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4682. A bill to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act to increase the time within which claims under such act may be presented to Federal agencies or prosecuted in the United States district courts; with amendments (Rept. No. 1754). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 545. Resolution for consideration of S. 1641, an act to establish the Women's Army Corps in the Regular Army, to authorize the enlistment and appointment of women in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps and the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1755). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1756. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 46. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of Senate Report No. 986, on Labor-Management Relations; without amendment (Rept. No. 1757). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Concurrent Resolution 129. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint committee composed of members of the Senate and the House Public Lands Committee to make an investigation of our island possessions in the Pacific and trust territories, and report back recommendations for legislation providing for civil government; with amendments (Rept. No. 1758). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1298. An act to validate payments heretofore made by disbursing officers of the United States Government covering cost of shipment of household effects of civilian employees, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1763). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Tenth intermediate report pursuant to House Resolutions 90 and 185; without amendment (Rept. No. 1772). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 182. An act for the relief of Sgt. John H. Mott; without amendment (Rept. No. 1759). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 576. An act for the relief of Dan C. Rodgers; without amendment (Rept. No. 1760). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 981. An act for the relief of Carl W. Sundstrom; without amendment (Rept. No. 1761). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1164. An act for the relief of Doris D. Chrisman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1762). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1630. An act for the relief of Louis L. Williams, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1764). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1806. An act for the relief of Ensign Merton H. Peterson, United States Naval Reserve; without amendment (Rept. No. 1765). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1875. An act for the relief of the estate of Francis D. Shoemaker; without amendment (Rept. No. 1766). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 633. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Myrtle Hovde; without amendment (Rept. No. 1767). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2634. A bill for the relief of the Tampa Chapter No. 113, United Daughters of the Confederacy; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1768). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2688. A bill for the relief of Eva C. Netzley Ridley, William G. Stuff, Lois Stuff, and Harry E. Ridley; and the estates of Clyde C. Netzley and Sarah C. Stuff; without amendment (Rept. No. 1769). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3984. A bill for the relief of George Hampton; without amendment (Rept. No. 1770). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FOOTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6184. A bill for the relief of the East Coast Ship & Yacht Corp., of Noank, Conn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1771). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. R. 6273. A bill to provide for disposition of lands on the Cabazon, Augustine, and Torres-Martinez Indian Reservations; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 6274. A bill to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 6275. A bill to exempt from estate tax national service life insurance and United States Government life insurance, in certain cases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIZLEY:

H. R. 6276. A bill to reorganize and simplify the procurement, utilization, and disposal of Government property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 6277. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 6278. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, with respect to the naming of beneficiaries by persons retired prior to April 1, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 6279. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act in order to reduce the qualifying age for old-age and survivors insurance benefits to 62 and to increase the monthly retirement benefits payable to a minimum of $100; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 6280. A bill to amend the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act of 1934; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 6281. A bill to amend the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act of 1934; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 6282. A bill to enable certain former officers or employees of the United States separated from the service subsequent to January 23, 1942, to elect to forfeit their rights to civil-service retirement annuities and to obtain in lieu thereof returns of their contributions with interest; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 6283. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 6284. A bill to provide for the emergency operation of mines, plants, and facilities essential to the public health, safety, and welfare; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. J. Res. 378. Joint resolution to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. Con. Res. 185. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the High Cost of Housing; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States not to ratify any treaty or agreement with the Dominion of Canada or pass any legislation which may provide for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Guam Congress (through the Secretary of the Navy), memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States regarding establishment of a national cemetery on Guam; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 6285. A bill for the relief of Carl C. Ballard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIRWAN.

H. R. 6286. A bill for the relief of Francesca Cammarata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 6287. A bill for the relief of George Estaban Leal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1801. By Mr. ALBERT: Petition of Mrs. T. G. Johnson et al., of Ardmore, Okla., favoring a world federal government with limited powers adequate to maintain peace, and for the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 59, calling for Charter amendments to the UN to enact, interpret, and enforce world law to prevent war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1802. By Mr. DIRKSEN: Petition of Peoria Post, No. 2, Inc., the American Legion, Peoria, Ill., consisting of several thousand names, in support of H. R. 4482; to the Committee on House Administration.

1803. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition signed by V. J. Frink and 35 other citizens of Yamhill County, Oreg., endorsing a system of universal military training, as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1804. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Grace Burkhardt and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the endorsement of H. R. 4482, a bill to bar un-American parties from the election ballot; to the Committee on House Administration.

1805. Also, petition of Francine Finck and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition to universal military training and selective service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1806. Also, petition of Mrs. Jeanette Goldberg and others, of Cleveland, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the investigation of the conduct of the war-crimes trials before the United States military tribunals at Nuremberg, Germany, especially those relating to German industrial leaders such as I. G. Farbenindustrie and the Krupp steel combine; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 21, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, March 29, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Oscar F. Blackwelder, pastor of the Lutheran Church of the Reformation, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Father of all mankind, we bring before Thee the sufferings, the problems, the hopes of this earth. We pray for all who seek in private life and public office to work with Thee to complete this unfinished world and make it a place where the humblest and highest may work and live in peace and freedom.

We thank Thee for our country's call to world leadership. Wilt Thou increasingly raise up among us world leaders after Thy will in church and state.

O God, we pray Thee to grant Thy light, wisdom, and courage to each Member of this body. In the name of Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 20, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills and joint resolutions of the Senate:

S. 329. An act for the relief of Gentaro Takahashi;

S. 560. An act to prohibit the operation of gambling ships, and for other purposes;

S. 936. An act for the relief of Burnett A. Pyle;

S. 1021. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay salaries and expenses of the chairman, secretary, and clerk of the Fort Peck General Council, members of the Fort Peck Tribal Executive Board, and other committees appointed by said Fort Peck General Council, and official delegates of the Fort Peck Tribes;

S. 1263. An act for the relief of Fire District No. 1 of the Town of Colchester, Vt.;

S. 1304. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the organization of Minnesota as a Territory of the United States;

S. 1312. An act for the relief of Jeanette C. Jones and minor children;

S. 1468. An act providing for payment of $50 to each enrolled member of the Mescalero Apache Indian Tribe from funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States;

S. 1583. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Maryland, for the use of the University of Maryland, of the northern portion of a parcel of land previously constituting a part of the campus of the university and previously conveyed by the State of Maryland to the United States for the use of the Bureau of Mines;

S. 1696. An act to amend the act of August 13, 1940 (54 Stat. 784), so as to extend the jurisdiction of the United States District Court, Territory of Hawaii, over Canton and Enderbury Islands;

S. 2278. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in San Juan County, Utah, to the Southwest Indian Mission, Inc.;

S. J. Res. 189. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma; and

S. J. Res. 207. Joint resolution to provide for the commemoration of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the establishment of the Department of the Navy.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 608) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Growing Four Times, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 714. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Claude E. Milliken; and

S 2195. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1799) for the relief of Eva L. Dudley, Grace M. Collins, and Guy B. Slater.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 706. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Karl Frederick Kucker;

H. R. 838. An act for the relief of Frank J. Patzke, Archie Mitchell, J. L. Shoemaker, Einar Engen, and N. L. Gifford;

H. R. 851 An act for the relief of Adney W. Gray;

H. R. 926. An act for the relief of Dora Greenbaum (Brenner);

H. R. 1562. An act to increase temporarily the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States;

H. R. 2064. An act for the relief of Michael Palazotta;

H. R. 2193. An act for the relief of Robert E. Graham;

H. R. 2352. An act to provide for sale to the Crow Tribe of interests in the estates of deceased Crow Indian allottees;

H. R. 2359. An act to authorize the payment of a lump sum, in the amount of $100,000, to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y., as a contribution toward the cost of construction of a water-filtration plant, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2732. An act for the relief of Dennis Stanton;

H. R. 2785. An act for the relief of the New Amsterdam Casualty Co.;

H. R. 2897. An act for the relief of the Marden Construction Co., Inc.;

H. R. 2918. An act for the relief of the Sumner County Colored Fair Association;

H. R. 3006. An act for the relief of Laura Spinnichia;

H. R. 3114. An act for the relief of the estate of John Deiman;

H. R. 3358. An act for the relief of Dr. Timothy C. H. Liang and Dr. Esther Chang Liang;

H. R. 3578. An act to reduce in area the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge in Essex County, Mass., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3633. An act to amend section 203 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, designating certain public lands as available home lands;

H. R. 3635. An act to ratify sections 1 and 2 of Joint Resolution 7 enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawai' in its regular session of 1947;

H. R. 3680. An act to amend sections 207, 213, 215, 216, 220, 222, and 225 of title 2 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended;

H. R. 3785. An act to authorize the State of Minnesota to condemn lands owned by the United States in the county of Cass, State of Minnesota, for fish propagation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3954. An act to approve Act No. 74 of the Session Laws of 1947 of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act relating to revenue bonds of the Territory of Hawaii," and Act No. 95 of the Session Laws of 1947 of

the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act relating to Territorial and county public improvements and the financing thereof by the issuance of revenue bonds";

H. R. 3965. An act for the relief of John H. Schmitt and Mrs. Mildred Schmitt;

H. R. 4091. An act to ratify Act 237 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1947;

H. R. 4199. An act for the relief of George Haniotis;

H. R. 4201. An act to authorize payments to the public-school district or districts serving the Fort Peck project, Montana, for the education of dependents of persons engaged on that project;

H. R. 4381. An act for the relief of the Yellow Cab Transit Co., of Oklahoma City;

H. R. 4484. An act for the relief of Theodore Loetsch;

H. R. 4512. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land to the State of Oklahoma for the use and benefit of the Northeastern State College at Tahlequah, Okla.;

H. R. 4551. An act to provide for the addition of certain surplus Government lands to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area project, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4642. An act to provide for disposition and use of tribal funds of the Navajo Tribe of Indians;

H. R. 4804. An act to allow service credit for certain enlisted men of the Coast Guard who acted as policemen and guards at the Ivigtut Cryolite Mine, Greenland, during 1940 and 1941;

H. R. 4817. An act to amend the act of July 23, 1947 (61 Stat. 409) (Public Law No. 219, 80th Cong.);

H. R. 4892. An act to amend the act of July 23, 1947 (61 Stat. 409) (Public Law No. 219, 80th Cong.);

H. R. 4966. An act directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and lease certain houses, apartments, and lands in Boulder City, Nev.;

H. R. 5040. An act to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, to provide that claims under section 17 must be filed within 6 months to be allowable, to stop further accrual of such claims, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5155. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to have made by the Public Roads Administration and the National Park Service a joint reconnaissance survey of the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal between Great Falls, Md., and Cumberland, Md., and to report to the Congress upon the advisability and practicability of constructing thereon a parkway, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5173. An act to amend section 203 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, designating certain public lands as available home lands;

H. R. 5174. An act to authorize Commodity Credit Corporation to make adjustment payments to certain producers of raw cane sugar in Puerto Rico and Hawaii;

H. R. 5175. An act to confirm and ratify Act 205 of the Session Laws of 1947 of the Territory of Hawaii, relating to the issuance of public-improvement bonds;

H. R. 5244. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War II";

H. R. 5262. An act to authorize the sale of individual Indian lands acquired under the act of June 18, 1934, and under the act of June 26, 1936;

H. R. 5434. An act authorizing the Attorney General of the United States to recognize and to award to outstanding courageous young Americans a medal for heroism known as the Young American Medal for Bravery, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5553. An act to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended;

H. R. 5609. An act to authorize the survey of a proposed Mississippi River Parkway for the purpose of determining the feasibility of such a national parkway, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5651. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in South Dakota for municipal or public purposes;

H. R. 5669. An act to provide for adjustment of irrigation charges on the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5816. An act to amend the act of April 25, 1947, relating to the establishment of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5822. An act to establish the Saratoga National Historical Park, in the State of New York, from the lands that have been acquired by the Federal Government for that purpose pursuant to the act of June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 608), and for other purposes;

H. R. 5839. An act to authorize the conveyance to States or political subdivisions, of roads leading to certain historical areas administered by the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5870. An act to amend the act of May 16, 1946 (Public Law 383, 79th Cong.), as amended, to provide increased allowances for the escorts of repatriated war dead;

H. R. 6039. An act to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Army of one officer in the grade of general and to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Air Force of one officer in the grade of general, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6224. An act for the relief of John Watkins;

H. J. Res. 333. Joint resolution to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the termination of the war with Spain; and

H. J. Res. 354. Joint resolution to provide for the disposing of the Government irrigation experiment station at Bard, Calif., and the establishment in lieu thereof of a similar station at or near Brawley, Calif.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 1799) for the relief of Eva L. Dudley, Grace M. Collins, and Guy B. Slater, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

REPORT ON SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS OF CERTAIN CONTRACTORS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to Public Law 657, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, on the settlement of claims filed in cases where work, supplies, or services have been furnished to the Government under contracts during the war by the Fresno Dehydrating Co., of Fresno, Calif., amounting to $110,234.61, and the Visalia Dehydrating Co., of Visalia, Calif., amounting to $132,956.82, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL CEMETERY ON GUAM

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a resolution adopted by the 1948 session of the Guam Congress, favoring the establishment of a national cemetery on Guam, which, with the accompanying resolution, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Pennsylvania Society of Sons of the Revolution, Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the enactment of legislation providing universal military training, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

NATIONAL HOUSING

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state the parliamentary situation. Senate bill 866, the so-called national housing bill, is the unfinished business, and the immediate question before the Senate is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] to strike out title VI, relating to low-rent housing, as amended, in the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as amended.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia obtained the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I yield for statements by Senators and the transaction of routine business.

SITUATION IN POLAND

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, on April 2, 1948, at the Polish National Home in Paterson, N. J., a mass meeting was held in honor of Stanislau Mikolajczyk, former president of the Polish Peasant Party, and certain resolutions were adopted having to do with the present distressing situation in Poland, and expressing the sympathetic interest of our Polish-American citizens. I ask unanimous consent to present the resolutions for appropriate reference and request that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, the League of Polish Societies of the City of Paterson and the Paterson Chapter of the Polish-American Congress of New Jersey, urge the following resolution:

"Whereas we hold these truths to be self-evident that the people of Poland and the true Republic of Poland have become and are enslaved, engulfed, ensnarled, and enveloped within the clutches of the greatest threat to world peace, the cancerous scourge of communism and its influences emanating from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

"Whereas we hold these truths to be self-evident that the people of Poland and the true Republic of Poland are no longer a free, independent, and democratic nation; and

"Whereas we hold these truths to be self-evident that the people of Poland have suffered, sustained, and endured unjust miseries, tortures, starvation, oppression, and indignation, and that they have had their boundaries decimated and their religion desecrated; and

"Whereas we hold these truths to be self-evident that the country of Poland is the most martyred nation of Europe; and

"Whereas we hold these truths to be self-evident that millions of the people of Poland have become displaced persons, and have no home, no homeland, and very little hope of ever obtaining and sharing in the God-given right of freedom; and

"Whereas we hold these truths to be self-evident that the people of Poland and the true Republic of Poland are extending their hands of brotherhood to the people of the United States of America, and with fervent prayers upon their lips, and pleading tears of agony upon their faces, they are hoping and praying that we, the people of the United States of America, shall free them from the bondage of communism that shackles them within the iron curtain of communistic Russia; and

"Whereas we hold these truths to be self-evident that the guaranties as set forth in the Atlantic Charter, and in particular, 'the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live,' have been broken and violated; and

"Whereas we hold these truths to be self-evident that all God-fearing and God-loving people of the United States of America, including the more than 6,000,000 people of Polish ancestry, true and loyal American citizens, are deeply grieved over the tragic plight of the people of Poland: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved—

"1. We strongly urge the United States of America to maintain a firm stand in the present international crisis to prevent the further spread of communism which is the greatest threat to world peace;

"2. We strongly urge that the United States of America extend its every possible aid to the beleaguered people of Poland and to all other subjugated nations;

"3. We strongly urge the restoration of all guaranties as set forth in the Atlantic Charter.

"4. We condemn the loss of Poland's freedom and independence;

"5. We condemn the emasculation of her boundaries and her territorial rights;

"6. We condemn the quartering of Russian troops upon Polish soil

"7. We condemn the destruction and loss of free elections in the true democratic Republic of Poland;

"8. We urge that the solemn pledges made to Poland that she shall be a free and independent nation be fulfilled and sustained;

"9. We urge the immediate enactment of a bill which would admit displaced persons from Europe into the United States of America;

"10. We urge the enactment of a bill which would lower the postage rates upon all relief packages sent to countries in need of assistance, and that Poland be included among these countries;

"11. To the real Republic of Poland, the most martyred nation of all, we send our compassion and love. In silent prayer we bow our heads before Almighty God invoking His strength for her sustenance and fortitude in her hour of trial;

"12. To those representatives of our Government, to those members of the press and the radio, and to all champions of freedom, who are espousing the cause of right instead of might, we extend our deepest gratitude;

"It is these declarations that we make most sincerely, as fervent American citizens, having a filial love for Poland, and ever maintaining our love and loyalty to the United States of America, being aware of our own liberal heritage and believing most strongly in our American way of life, we hope and pray that the sacrifices that we have made shall not be in vain, that the people of Poland and of all other subjugated nations shall enjoy freedom, and a just and Godly peace for the spiritual progress and welfare of all the world; and be it further

"Resolved, That appropriate copies of this resolution be endorsed and mailed to President Harry S. Truman, Senators H. Alexander Smith and Albert Hawkes, Congressman Gordon Canfield, and to the press of this community."

Done at Paterson, N. J., this 2d day of April 1948.

THE LEAGUE OF POLISH SOCIETIES OF THE CITY OF PATERSON AND THE PATERSON CHAPTER OF THE POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS OF NEW JERSEY,

By ANTHONY R. SIERAKAWSKI, *President.*
CARROLL J. STARK,
Chairman, Resolution Committee.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF FREEDOM OF CUBA

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the Combined Veterans' Committee of Germantown, Pa., recently adopted a very suitable resolution relative to the fiftieth anniversary of the freedom of Cuba. I ask unanimous consent to present the resolution for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In regular meeting assembled the following resolution was properly proposed, seconded, and unanimously adopted by the Combined Veterans' Committee of Germantown, at Philadelphia, Pa., April 14, 1948:

"Whereas every citizen of the United States of America has the right and the duty to share in the maintenance and defense of his country and its institutions; and

"Whereas readiness for defense is sound proof of fidelity; and

"Whereas the veterans to whom this is addressed have long been acclaimed for their trustworthy American principles; and

"Whereas they sounded the original call forming this committee for the combined observance of Memorial Day; and

"Whereas it is founded in history that nations die out from the loss of their cherished customs: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That in this, its twenty-fifth year of remembrance of the honored war dead, the Combined Veterans' Committee of Germantown congratulates and commends for valiant service to their country; and for leadership and faithfulness on this committee, our comrades of Egbert Camp, United Spanish War Veterans, on the occasion of the celebration of their fiftieth anniversary, April 21, 1948; and be it further

"Resolved, That these resolutions be communicated to the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress; to the Governor of the Commonwealth; to the city council and to the mayor of the city of Philadelphia."

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 1062. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Christine West and Mrs. Jesse West; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1152).

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 2534. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Willis Mountain a patent in fee to certain land; and

S. 2535. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Ione Brandon Jensen a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 2536. A bill authorizing the establishment and operation of a memorial museum and shop at Spalding, Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 2537. A bill for the relief of Donald Olive Jack; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 2538. A bill for the relief of Maria Geertriude Mulders; and

S. 2539. A bill for the relief of James A. Stapleton, Ruth Burk, and Mildred Ovren, copartners, doing business under the name and style of Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2540. A bill for the relief of Victor Franz Pullwitt; and

S. 2541. A bill for the relief of Karl Ludwig Przibislawsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL HOUSING—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McCARTHY (for himself, Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming, and Mr. SPARKMAN) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 866) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective, and to provide for the coordinated execution of such policy through a National Housing Commission, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXTENSION OF BENEFITS OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT TO ALASKA RAILROAD EMPLOYEES—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2326) to repeal the Alaska Railroad Retirement Act of June 29, 1936, as amended, and to extend the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to officers and employees to whom such act of June 29, 1936, is applicable, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INCREASE IN RATE OF COMPENSATION OF HEADS AND ASSISTANT HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS — AMENDMENTS

Mr. BALDWIN (for himself and Mr. FERGUSON) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 1537) to increase the rate of compensation of heads and assistant heads of executive departments, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. GREEN submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1194) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to the liability of common carriers by motor vehicle, common carriers by water, and freight forwarders for payment of damages to persons injured by them through violations of such act, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GREEN submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2759) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide limitations on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by or against common carriers by motor vehicle, common carriers by water, and freight forwarders, which

were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS OF JAPANESE AND JAPANESE-AMERICANS FOR PROPERTY LOSSES

[Mr SMITH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Evacuation Claims—Justice Delayed," by Mike Masaoka, from the February issue of the Christian Register, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NEW PALESTINE PROPOSAL—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The New Palestine Proposal," from the New York Times of April 21, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMPILATION OF PENNSYLVANIA VETERANS LAWS

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a compilation of Pennsylvania veterans laws prepared by Harry C. Martin, department adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans, of Harrisburg, Pa., which appears in the Appendix.]

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is holding a hearing on the liquor advertising bill. There are about 200 people in the caucus room of the Senate Office Building, many of them from places outside Washington. I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee be permitted to continue its session this afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary considering Senate bill 156 be permitted to sit this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GERMAN ART TREASURES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently there has been discussion in the newspapers in relation to the German art treasures which have been on exhibit in Washington. It has been estimated that perhaps three or four hundred thousand people have seen these fine paintings.

The question has arisen as to whether or not the exhibit should go on tour in this country, to be shown at various places. General Clay has spoken decidedly on the subject, to the effect that it would be to the advantage of the United States to keep faith with the German Nation and return the paintings.

In this connection, I wish to have printed following my remarks a statement on the German art treasures which has been prepared, and which presents the issue clearly to the people.

I also ask that following the statement there be printed an article by Aline B. Loucheim from the New York Times.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON GERMAN ART TREASURES

The proposal has been made that the exhibition of German-owned art, now on view at the National Gallery, should be kept in America until there is a recognized and functioning German government which could assume responsibility for the pictures and until the danger of Russian seizure is past. It is further proposed that the pictures be sent on tour through the country and the admission fees be given to the United Nations Children's Emergency Fund.

I wish to comment on this proposal. I do not believe that a minor problem is involved. Upon the contrary, it presents us with a major problem in international morality and good will.

In the first place, the proposal is at variance with a long-standing policy of our Government. When, long ago, the Chinese Government was forced to pay an indemnity to the United States and to European nations for damages suffered during the Boxer Rebellion, we did not keep the money. Instead, we used the money to set up a scholarship fund for Chinese students studying in this country. Good will was never bought at a cheaper price. The Chinese were convinced that we were acting on the level, in a spirit of decency and fair play; and, since the rebellion was over and done with, no hard feelings were held. On the contrary, the good will in our act wiped the slate clean for a fresh start and we have ever since had the respect and reciprocal good will of the Chinese people. Incidents of this character have happened again and again in our history and we have always chosen the wise and honorable solution.

In the second place, we know too well from history what grudges and hard feelings have arisen from seizing art treasures as war booty. Such treasures have been war booty from the beginning of time and have been a source of acrimonious dispute. The museums of Europe are littered with paintings that the powers stole from one another during their endless wars. Bonaparte took the bronze horses from St. Mark's Cathedral in Venice and one of the first things done after the peace that followed Waterloo was to restore those memorials. One of the handiest clubs used to beat Bonaparte was to accuse him of being a common thief.

The Nazis were even more systematic thieves than Bonaparte and the whole continent was ransacked to get sculptures and paintings for the private collections of Hitler and Goering. Public opinion condemned this conduct in no uncertain terms. Why should we, even temporarily, keep these pictures and fall, even for a moment, under the shadow of suspicion?

In the third place, the administration never stopped talking during the late war about how we asked for nothing, not one penny. We said our aim was to destroy the forces of despotism and give humanity a chance. As the President and Mr. Churchill put it in their Atlantic Charter: "Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other." I submit that the words "or other" fully cover works of art.

I know perfectly well that the proposal doesn't mean that we keep the pictures permanently. I know perfectly well the proposal rests on a well-meaning belief that these art treasures should be kept safe for all humanity. I know the proposed tour of these pictures is for a worthy cause.

But how many Germans know it? General Clay publicly promised the German people that the paintings would be back in Germany by April. If we are committed by promise, then it is doubly essential that those pictures get back on time.

These pictures are a symbol of returning peace to the German people. They represent a start on the reconstruction of their country. It is not farfetched to say that the return of these pictures is as much a hope for a firm, peaceful future of the German people as is the economic rehabilitation of their devastated lands. Let us provide a wholesome contrast in international morality. While the Russians are removing all kinds of property from their zone in Germany, let us set an example by restoring to Germany the property which is an inspiration and source of pride to the German people. The return of these pictures would have a wider, settling effect on all Europe which is as much in need of spiritual sustenance as it is in need of bread.

The time to be magnanimous, the time to show our true character is when our victory and our strength enable us to bear down hard on others. We have possession of these art treasures. We have the strength to keep them as long as we wish. We can always find good and plausible reasons for keeping them. To do so on the grounds of protecting the pictures is a thin excuse in the light of present and future conditions. The German problem is not going to resolve itself into complete security for many years. On that account we could keep these pictures indefinitely.

But I submit that the measure of our national character is how we treat the vanquished when their fortune is in our hands. The good will we now show as victors will be all the greater because it is voluntary and not forced. And the measure of good will we shall draw to ourselves from the other nations as well as from the German people will be equally great, perhaps when we need it most.

We have on our hands two problems: One is putting Germany, or that part of it we control, to rights for the good of Europe. The other is building up a buttress against Russia. If we get those pictures back on time, we add one more clincher to our argument to the Germans that we are sincere in our aim to rebuild a peaceful Europe. Like our refusal to keep the Boxer Rebellion money, this is an honorable way to get good will. And, of course, quite apart from expediency, there is the question of common honesty. Here, as in other matters of life, honesty is still the best policy. We should restore these pictures at once to the German people.

[From the New York Times]

CLAY URGES RETURN OF ART TO GERMANY—FULBRIGHT REPLIES AT HEARING PAINTINGS WOULD BE UNSAFE THERE—QUESTION UNSETTLED

(By Aline B. Loucheim)

WASHINGTON, April 16.—After a 3-hour discussion before a Senate Armed Services Subcommittee, the question of when and how the German-owned pictures, now on exhibition at the National Gallery here, would be returned to Germany was still unsettled.

There was indication, however, that the pictures, which have been viewed by 709,663 persons since the opening here March 17, would remain on exhibit at the National Gallery beyond the scheduled closing on April 18.

The hearings were held on the Fulbright resolution, which provides that these paintings be sent on a National Museum tour and that the proceeds from an admission fee be given to the United Nations Children's Emergency Fund. It proposes that the paintings, which belong to the German people, be returned only when there is a diplomatically recognized government in Germany.

On the one hand, the Departments of Army and State argued strongly for the immediate return of the pictures. On the other, Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, and witnesses for the Metropolitan and other museums, a German Rhodes scholar, and William C. Bullitt, former American Ambassador to Moscow, spoke in favor of the Fulbright bill.

The argument of Under Secretary of the Army William H. Draper, Jr., and of Charles E. Saltzman, Assistant Secretary of State for Occupied Countries, was that Gen. Lucius D. Clay had given his word to the German people that the paintings would be returned in April and that any failure to keep his promise would impair the faith of the Germans in the

United States, "damage our prestige and position" and play into the hands of Communist propagandists.

General Clay was quoted as saying: "I do not know of anything that would convince the German people of our clear intent to hold our position in Europe more than would the return of these art objects."

Senator FULBRIGHT contended that conditions in Germany at this time did not guarantee the safety of these paintings, which we were pledged to hold in safekeeping.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, chairman of the subcommittee, suggested that the civil German governments in the American zone be asked to decide themselves whether they wished to have the paintings returned or to send them on tour and gain American dollars for Germany.

The Metropolitan Museum has requested that the collection of 202 masterpieces be shown in New York before they are shipped back.

PROPOSED REVISION OF ARMED SERVICES UNIFICATION ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, yesterday I made a speech in support of a complete revision of the military unification law and introduced a bill to accomplish that end.

I wish to say that I have been exceedingly gratified, the newspaper comments to the contrary notwithstanding, at the large number of Senators—I think the number exceeds 20—who have been kind enough to say to me that they agree with the major principles of my bill and agree that some such legislation needs to be passed.

I was not here when my very good friend, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. GURNEY], made his brief comment in regard to my speech. I wish to pay a very deserved compliment to him for his leadership on the Armed Services Committee and at the same time respectfully dissent from any suggestion from him that we may have to wait for 20 years to take all the kinks out of the present unification law. I do not believe the taxpayers of this country should be expected to wait a single year to bring about a practical integration of our armed services. I am satisfied that such an integration as provided for in my bill will save the taxpayers many millions of dollars. Those millions of dollars will continue to be wasted if the present law remains on the books. The people of our country have the right to look to the Armed Services Committee of the Senate to recommend the modification of the National Security Act of 1947 in this session of Congress because it is perfectly clear that experience under the act of 1947 has already shown that necessary economies cannot be worked out through that act in its present form. The armed services must be taught that we in the Congress mean it when we ask for an integrated military program. Any talk about trying to work out the kinks in this bill over a long period of years is not acceptable when viewed from the best interests of our national security or our free economy.

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, last fall the Senate Finance Committee appointed an advisory council to advise that committee on the subject of social security. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the names of the members of the council and brief biographies of them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The members of the advisory council are as follows:

Frank Bane, Chicago, Ill., executive director of the Council of State Governments. Mr. Bane was executive director of the Federal Social Security Board in the years 1935–38, and was previously director of public welfare for the States of Virginia and Tennessee and director of the American Public Welfare Association.

Dr. J. Douglas Brown, Princeton, N. J., dean of the faculty and director of the industrial relations section of the department of economics and social institutions, Princeton University. Dr. Brown was a member of an advisory council to the finance committee on social-security problems in the years 1937 and 1938. He has been a consulting economist to the Social Security Board since 1936 and chairman of the Federal Advisory Council on Employment Security.

Malcolm H. Bryan, Atlanta, Ga., vice-chairman of the board of the Trust Co. of Georgia. Mr. Bryan was first vice president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, Ga., during the period 1941 to 1946 and was a member of the American technical staff at the Bretton Woods Conference. Previously, for many years Mr. Bryan was professor of economics at the University of Georgia.

Nelson H. Cruikshank, director, social insurance activities, American Federation of Labor.

Miss Mary H. Donlon, New York, chairman of the New York State Workmen's Compensation Board, previously chairman of the New York State Industrial Board.

Adrien J. Falk, San Francisco, Calif., president of S & W Fine Foods, Inc. Mr. Falk is president of the San Francisco Board of Education, chairman of the Citizens' Postwar Planning Committee of San Francisco, member of the advisory council of the California State Employment Stabilization Commission and prominent in California civic and industrial affairs.

Marion B. Folsom, Rochester, N. Y., treasurer of the Eastman Kodak Co. Mr. Folsom served on the President's Advisory Council on Economic Security in 1934–35 and the Finance Committee's Advisory Council on Social Security in 1937–38. During the years 1944–47 he was director of staff for the Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning of the House of Representatives.

M. Albert Linton, Moorestown, N. J., president of the Provident Mutual Life Insurance Co. A member of the Finance Committee's Advisory Council on Social Security in 1937–38, Mr. Linton is a fellow of the American Institute of Actuaries and the Institute of Actuaries, London, and a former president of the Actuarial Society of America.

John Miller, Washington, D. C., assistant director of the National Planning Association, a private organization devoted to research in the fields of agriculture, business, and public administration.

Dr. William I. Myers, Ithaca, N. Y., dean of New York State College of Agriculture, Cornell University. Former Governor of the Farm Credit Administration and President of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, Dr. Myers' record of public service includes present membership on the President's Committee on Foreign Aid.

Emil Rieve, president of the Textile Workers' Union and vice president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Dr. Florence Sabin, Denver, Colo., scientist, for many years a member of the faculty of Johns Hopkins University, afterward a member and now member emeritus of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, past president of the American Society of Anatomists, author, and most recently chairman of the subcommittee on health of Colorado's postwar planning committee, a recipient of numerous awards for her achievements in the field of anatomical research.

Dr. Sumner H. Slichter, Cambridge, Mass., Lamont professor at Harvard University, formerly professor of business economics at Harvard, and previously on the faculties of Cornell and Princeton Universities. Dr. Slichter is Chairman of the Research Advisory Board of the Committee for Economic Development.

S. Abbot Smith, Weston, Mass., president of the Thomas Strahan Co.; president and director, Smaller Business of New England. Mr. Smith was a director of the Smaller War Plants Corporation during the war. He is a trustee of the Committee for Economic Development and a member of its subcommittee on the special problems of smaller business.

Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Charlottesville, Va., rector of the University of Virginia, former Secretary of State of the United States, Chairman of the Dumbarton Oaks Conversations on International Security and of the American delegation to the United Nations Conference on International Organization, San Francisco. Mr. Stettinius served on the Advisory Committee to the Council for National Defense, as Chairman of the Priorities Board, Lend-Lease Administrator, and in a number of other posts of high responsibility prior to his appointment as Secretary of State.

Delos Walker, New York, vice president of R. H. Macy & Co., Inc., trustee of the Institute of Public Administration, vice president and member of the board of the Regional Plan Association of New York, and formerly chairman of the board of the American Retail Federation.

Dr. Ernest Young, dean of the Graduate School of Purdue University, a former president of the American Farm Economic Association, now in Europe at an international agricultural conference.

Mr. Stettinius was designated chairman of the advisory council and Dr. Sumner H. Slichter as associate chairman.

Four members of the council, Mr. E. R. Stettinius, Dr. J. Douglas Brown, Mr. Marion B. Folsom, and Mr. M. Albert Linton were members of a previous council to advise the Senate Committee on Finance in social security matters appointed in 1937 jointly by that committee and the Social Security Board. A number of the recommendations of the 1937 council were adopted in the last major revision of the Social Security Act in 1939.

FIRST REPORT OF ADVISORY COUNCIL ON SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the Senate Finance Committee has now received the first report of the Advisory Council on Social Security embracing the matter of coverage. The report will be released today and will be available to Senators who may be interested.

Dr. Sumner H. Slichter, cochairman of the council, has prepared a question and answer explanation of the report. I ask unanimous consent that this may be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The Senate Finance Committee has heard an explanation of the report but has not as yet taken action on it. In this connection I may say that the initiative in the matter is in the House of Representatives and we cannot act until we receive a bill from the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Colorado is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

QUESTIONS ON THE REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON SOCIAL SECURITY ON OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE

1. What are the principal changes which the council has recommended in old-age and survivors insurance?

The council has made 22 recommendations for changes in old-age and survivors insurance. These recommendations fall in the main under four principal heads:

(1) Extending coverage—at present only three out of every five jobs are covered.

(2) Liberalizing eligibility requirements for older workers—at present only about 20 percent of those age 65 or over are either insured or receiving benefits.

(3) Liberalizing the benefits. At the end of 1947 retirement benefits averaged $25 a month for a single retired man, and $39 a month for a retired man and wife.

(4) Financing—what will be the cost of the proposals and what contribution rate should be charged?

2. Has the council agreed unanimously on its recommendations?

The council was unanimous on 20 of its 22 specific recommendations. Two members dissented from the recommendation that the coverage of traditionally tax-exempt institutions be compulsory. Several members believe that the present tax base and contribution base of $3,000 should be retained. Several others, while joining in the recommendation that the base be raised to $4,200, believe that this does not go far enough and that the increase should be to $4,800 instead of $4,200. Except on these two points the recommendations of the council are unanimous.

3. What changes does the council recommend in the benefit formula?

The council recommends that the primary benefit shall be 50 percent of the first $75 of the average monthly wage plus 15 percent of the remainder up to the maximum average monthly wage ($350 a month) that can be counted toward benefits.

The present benefit formula provides for a benefit amount equal to 40 percent of the first $50 of the average monthly wage, plus 10 percent of the remainder up to the maximum average monthly wage ($250 a month). One percent of this sum is added for each year in which the worker received $200 or more in wages in covered employment.

4. Has the council recommended any changes in the method of computing the average monthly wage on which the benefits are based?

To reduce the handicap of persons who would be newly covered under the council's recommendations, the council has proposed that for anyone who has six or more quarters of coverage after 1948, his average monthly wage may be based on either his wages and the time elapsing after 1936 or his wages and the time elapsing after 1948, whichever is more advantageous.

5. How much will the council's recommendations increase the average benefit?

Under the Council's recommendations the average benefit payments would more than double within a few years. Under the proposals, the average benefit for single retired men would rise from about $25 a month to about $55; the average for a man and wife would rise from about $39 to about $85 a month, and the average for a widow and two children from about $48 to about $110 a month.

6. Would the new benefit formula apply to persons who are now drawing benefits?

Yes. Present benefits would be computed according to the new formula for all months after the effective date of the amendments to the Social Security Act.

7. Why does the advisory council recommend dropping the present rule by which benefits are increased 1 percent for each year in which the wage earner receives $200 or more in wages in covered employments?

The benefit formula of the present program with the automatic increase of 1 percent for each year of coverage in effect postpones payment of the full rate of benefits for more than 40 years from the time the system began to operate. The council believes that adequate benefits should be paid immediately to retired beneficiaries and survivors of insured workers, but considers it unwise to commit the system to automatic increases in the benefit for each year of covered employment. By dropping the increment the council feels that it can recommend higher benefits now.

8. Has the council recommended increased protection for the survivors of insured employees who die?

Yes. The council recommends that survivors' benefits for children be paid at the rate of three-fourths of the primary insurance benefit for one child and one-half for each additional child within the limits permitted by the maximum provisions. The present act provides for children's benefits of one-half of the primary benefit in all cases. The council also recommends that the parents' benefits be increased from the present rate of one-half to three-fourths of the primary insurance benefit.

Under the present provisions the children in a family in which the mother as well as the father works receive benefits only on the death or retirement of the father. Because a working mother as well as the father is contributing to the income of the family, the council believes that a child's benefit should be payable when a mother who is currently insured dies or retires. A child, however, could not receive benefits on both its father's and its mother's wage record. A child would receive only the larger of the two benefits.

In addition, the council recommends payment of benefits to the aged, dependent husbands and widowers of women who were currently and fully insured when they retired or died.

9. Does the benefit formula proposed by the council favor low-wage earners?

Yes. A worker with an average monthly wage of $50 would receive a primary benefit of $25; a worker with an average monthly wage of $100, a primary benefit of $41.25; a worker with an average monthly wage of $200, a primary benefit of $56.25; a worker with an average monthly wage of $300, a primary benefit of $71.25. Thus, the worker with a $50 average wage receives in benefits half of his average wage, while the worker with a $300 average monthly wage receives in benefits less than one-fourth of his average wage.

10. Does the council make any other proposals for increasing benefits?

Yes. The council recommends that the present minimum primary benefit be raised from $10 to $20. It also recommends that the maximum benefits payable on one wage record should be three times the primary insurance benefit or 80 percent of the individual's average monthly wage, whichever is less, except that this limitation shall not reduce the total family benefit below $40.

The present law limits the total of all monthly benefits payable on the wage record of an individual to $85, twice the amount of the primary benefit, or 80 percent of the wage earner's average monthly wage, whichever amount is least. However, these last two provisions cannot reduce the total family benefit below $20 a month. The effect of the council's recommendations may be seen by an example. Under the present law, the family of a worker with an average monthly wage of $200 and 10 years of coverage can receive total benefits of $77, which is twice the primary benefit of $38.50. This limit applies because this amount is less than $85 or 80 percent of his average monthly wage. Under the council's proposal, maximum benefits payable to the family would be $160. This is 80 percent of the worker's average monthly wage, and is less than three times $56.25, which would be $168.75.

11. Do the recommendations of the council take into account the fact that wage levels and the cost of living have risen greatly since the last general review of the old-age and survivors' insurance program?

Yes. The liberalization of the formula recognizes this fact. In addition the council recommends that the wage base both for benefits and contributions be raised from $3,000 to $4,200 a year.

12. Since the cost of living has risen at least 60 percent since the $3,000 wage base for contributions and the computation of benefits was established and since wages have risen even more, why does the council recommend only an increase of 40 percent in the base for computing contributions and benefits?

The council took notice of the fact that after the rapid rise in prices during the First World War there was a subsequent fall. Consequently, many members of the council believe that it would be desirable to advance the base for computing contributions and benefits by less than the rise in prices and wages. If prices and wages continue to rise, the advisability of advancing the wage base still more can be explored.

13. What conditions of eligibility for benefits does the council recommend?

The council recommends that requirements for fully insured status should be one-quarter of coverage for every two calendar quarters elapsing after 1948 or after the quarter in which the individual attains the age of 21, whichever is later, and before the quarter in which he attains the age of 65 (60 in the case of women) or dies. A minimum of six quarters of coverage would be required and workers would be fully and permanently insured with 40 quarters of coverage.

14. Does the council recommend any reduction in the age of eligibility for old-age benefits?

Yes. The council recommends that the minimum age at which women may qualify for old-age benefits should be reduced from 65 to 60 years.

15. Do the council recommendations with respect to newly covered workers treat these workers as liberally as did the original Social Security Act in 1936?

Yes. The council recommends a new start in the eligibility requirements which will require the same qualifying period for an older worker now as was required for a person who was the same age when the system began operation. For example, all workers who will have attained age 62 before the middle of 1949 would be insured according to the council's recommendations with a minimum of six quarters of coverage, just as workers of the same age in 1937 could be insured with the same amount of coverage.

16. Will the council's recommendations help older people meet the eligibility requirements for benefits?

Yes. Several of the council's recommendations would help older people to qualify for benefits. Of particular importance is the recommendation for a new start which reduces the number of quarters of coverage (a quarter of coverage is a calendar quarter in which a worker is paid $50 in covered wages) required of older workers. The council's recommendation allows an individual to count all quarters of coverage earned at any time after 1936 toward fulfilling the requirement. The extensions of coverage which the council recommends will make it easier for all workers to meet the requirement of one quarter of coverage for each two calendar quarters elapsing after 1948 because practically all

work will count toward meeting the requirement.

17. What recommendations for extending coverage does the council make?

The council believes that the time has come to give old-age and survivors' insurance protection to virtually all gainfully employed persons. The council recommends extension of coverage immediately to the self-employed, who include about 6,000,000 business and professional people and 5,000,000 farmers; to about 3,500,000 agricultural workers; to about 2,500,000 household workers; to about 1,000,000 employees of nonprofit institutions; to about 1,400,000 members of the armed services; and by means of voluntary agreements between the States and the Federal Government, to about 4,000,000 employees of State and local governments.

In addition, the council recommends immediate extension of coverage to Federal employees (other than foreign nationals) not now covered by the civil-service retirement system. For the other 1,500,000 Federal employees and the 1,700,000 railroad workers it is recommended that coverage be extended after joint studies have been made by the Social Security Administration and the other two agencies concerned on the best way of revising the Civil Service Retirement Act and the Railroad Retirement Act to make them supplementary to the basic old-age and survivors' insurance.

18. Does the council recommend that any persons be excluded from coverage?

Yes. The council does not recommend extension of coverage to clergymen and members of religious orders.

19. What would be the total effect of the council's recommendations concerning coverage?

The council's recommendations would increase the number of persons covered at any one time from about 35,000,000 to about 59,000,000.

20. Does the council recommend that coverage be compulsory?

Yes; except in the case of employees of State and local governments. It is probably unconstitutional for the Federal Government to impose a tax on these governmental units, and therefore the council recommends that coverage should be extended to these employees through voluntary agreements between the States and the Federal Government.

21. In view of the fact that the Federal Government already has a civil-service retirement system, why does the advisory council recommend extension of old-age and survivors insurance to Federal employees?

The present civil-service retirement system fails to cover about 500,000 persons who are now working for the Government (including some foreign nationals for whom the council does not recommend coverage). These 500,000 represent nearly one-fourth of the total employees. Furthermore the present civil-service retirement system does not give retirement or survivorship protection to Federal employees with less than 5 years of service. About 40 percent of all persons entering Federal service remain less than 5 years. If Federal employment were covered, persons who move between Federal and private employment would have continuous protection.

22. In view of the fact that the Railroad Retirement Act provides retirement and survivorship protection for railroad workers, why does the council recommend extension of the old-age and survivors insurance to railroad employees?

There is a large movement in and out of railroad employment. For example, although railroad employment in 1946 averaged nearly 1,700,000, about 3,100,000 individuals had some railroad earnings during the year. Extension of old-age and survivors insurance to railroad employees would prevent anomalies and losses in protection that now may result from these shifts in employment. During the early years of the old-age and survivors insurance program some persons who work for only a few years in railroad employment would have less in combined protection under the railroad retirement plan and the old-age and survivors insurance than they would have had if they had been covered continuously by old-age and survivors insurance.

23. In recommending that Federal civil service and railroad workers be covered by old-age and survivors insurance, does the council contemplate that the present civil-service retirement plan and the railroad retirement plan would be duplicated?

No; the council believes that old-age and survivors insurance should give basic protection and that the civil-service retirement plan and the railroad retirement plan should give supplementary protection. The combined protection would be no less than workers receive under the civil-service retirement plan or the railroad retirement plan.

24. Is it practicable to combine old-age and survivors insurance with the civil-service emtirement plan, for Federal civil-service employees, and with the railroad retirement plan for railroad employees, as the council suggests?

The council believes that it is practicable. However, there are many technical problems which will have to be carefully worked out. Consequently, the council has recommended that the responsibility for recommending adjustments in the benefits and contributions of these special plans to make them supplementary to the basic protection afforded by old-age and survivors insurance should be delegated to the Civil Service Commission and the Railroad Retirement Board in collaboration with the Social Security Administration. The council recommends that these agencies be asked to work out the practical details and to make recommendations to the Congress.

25. If State and local governments are permitted to elect old-age and survivors insurance coverage for their employees, will not the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund be subject to an excessive drain?

It is true that any plan for voluntary coverage may involve a drain on the fund. This is so because under a voluntary plan only those groups are likely to elect coverage who have an opportunity to obtain exceptionally large benefits in return for their contribution. However, because of constitutional factors the only way in which coverage can be extended to State and local employees is through a voluntary plan. The council, therefore, recommends that, in this area of employment alone, coverage be extended on a voluntary basis and that special provisions be adopted to protect the trust fund.

For example, the council recommends that coverage of State and local employees be permitted only when elected for all employees within an occupational or departmental group. As further assurance that the coverage groups will contain a reasonably representative distribution of risks, coverage would be permitted only if one-fourth of the employees of each State or local Governmental unit were brought into the program. In the case of small local Government units of 100 or fewer employees, all would have to be covered.

26. How much will the old-age and survivors insurance program recommended by the council cost?

On the asumption that wages in the future are at the level of 1944–46, the program will cost from 4.9 to 7.3 percent of pay roll on a level premium basis. (The level premium rate is the rate which would support the system indefinitely if collected from the first year.) If wages increase, as may be expected with some confidence, the costs as a percentage of pay roll will be lower. Annual costs are much lower in the early years than at the time costs become relatively stable (about 2000). The costs for the year 1955, assuming the 1944–46 wage level, will be from 2.4 to 3.1 percent, but the cost for the year 2000 might be from 5.9 to 9.7 percent. The cost estimates have a wide range because of many uncertainties in long-range cost estimates.

27. Why is there uncertainty concerning the ultimate cost of the old-age and survivors insurance plan?

There are several items of cost which cannot be predicted with precision. For this reason the actuaries have made two sets of estimates—a set of low-cost estimates and a set of high-cost estimates.

The low-cost estimates assume a continuation of mortality at present levels. The high-cost estimates assume that mortality will decrease in the future—in other words, that people will live long enough to draw benefits for a larger number of years than at present.

Estimates of future cost must be based upon some assumption concerning the general level of employment. Naturally, the amount of employment in the community cannot be predicted with precision.

Estimates of cost also depend upon the level of wages. Experience shows that money wages rise over the long run. For example, in the hundred years from 1840 to 1940 there was, roughly, an eightfold increase in hourly earnings of workers outside of agriculture. No one knows what the rate of increase in the future will be.

Finally, there is considerable uncertainty concerning future retirement rates. There has been a tendency for the proportion of older workers engaged in gainful employments to decline.

In 1900, about 68 percent of male whites of 65 years or more were members of the labor force and engaged more or less steadily in employment; in 1940 this proportion had dropped to about 40 percent. The census has estimated that by 1960 only about 27 percent of male whites of 65 years or more will be members of the labor force. No one knows whether this estimate will prove to be too high or too low. The low-cost estimates assume that under a mature program about 45 percent of the eligible men aged 65–69 would get benefits, while for women aged 60–69 about 70 percent of those eligible would get benefits. (Eligible persons beyond age 70 would receive benefits regardless of work.) For the high-cost estimates it is assumed that about 60 percent of the men aged 65–69 and 80 percent of the women aged 60–69 will receive benefits.

28. Does the council recommend an increase in the rates of contribution?

Yes, the council recommends that the contribution schedule be increased from the present rate of 1 percent for employers and 1 percent for employees to 1½ percent for employers and 1½ percent for employees at the same time that benefits are liberalized.

29. Are not the old-age benefits proposed by the council quite inadequate? For example, under the council's proposals, a worker with an average monthly wage of $200 and a dependent wife would draw benefits of only $74.38, or 37.2 percent of his wage and a worker with a monthly wage of $350 and a dependent wife would draw benefits of only $118.12, or 33.7 precent of the monthly wage.

The council recognizes that the benefits which it proposes will need in many cases to be supplemented by individual savings and private pension plans. It believes that social insurance should provide basic protection but that it would not relieve individuals of responsibility for providing against old age and death.

30. Why does the council recommend that the rate of contribution shall be raised from 1 percent to 1½ percent for both employers and employees?

The present 1-percent rate has remained unchanged for more than 10 years. The longer it remains unchanged, the greater is the danger that the public will fail to appreciate that in the long run there must

be a close relationship between contributions and benefits. Consequently, the council believes that at the time benefits are increased and eligibility requirements are liberalized, the rate of contribution should be increased. Even with the increase in contributions which the council proposes the contributors would be paying but a fraction of the actuarial value of the benefits to which they are entitled.

31. If the benefits proposed by the advisory council will cost from 4.9 percent to 7.3 percent of pay rolls, why does the council recommend that the rate of contribution be increased only to a combined rate on employers and employees of only 3 percent?

Contributions of 3 percent of pay roll will probably be sufficient to meet the annual cost of old-age and survivors insurance for the next decade. Charging the full level premium cost of old-age and survivors insurance immediately would have the effect of building up a large reserve which would not be needed to meet costs in the near future and which would create some special problems.

32. Will the rate of contribution recommended by the council build up a huge reserve fund?

If the recommendations of the council are adopted, the old-age and survivors' insurance plan will continue to build up a surplus for a few years. It is not the purpose of the council's recommendations, however, to build up a large trust fund. The fact that the trust fund will continue to increase for a few years is merely an incidental result of the rates of benefit proposed and the immediate changes in the rate of contribution proposed. The increase in the trust fund will be moderate in amount and, in the view of the council, will not confront the Government with fiscal problems which will prove difficult to handle. The general view of the council is that the excess of income over outgo should be kept as low as is possible without impairment of public understanding that in the long run there must be a close relationship between benefits and contributions.

33. When will the recommendations of the council require another increase in the rate of contribution?

The precise answer to this question is impossible. The best estimate which the council has been able to obtain indicates that in about 8 to 10 years after the adoption of the council's recommendations it might be necessary to increase the contribution rates of employers and employees to 2 percent of pay roll in order to cover the disbursements at that time.

34. Does the advisory council recommend that the Government contribute to the cost of old-age and survivors' insurance?

Yes; the council believes that ultimately the Government should make a contribution and that the cost should fall in equal parts upon employees, employers, and the Government. The council does not believe that the contribution of the Government should begin until the contributions of employers and employees have each risen to 2 percent of pay roll and that this amount is no longer sufficient to meet the current costs of old-age and survivors' insurance.

35. Why does the council believe the Government ultimately should contribute part of the cost of old-age and survivors' insurance?

The council proposes that the full rate of benefits be paid to those who retire during the first two or three decades of operation. It would be unfair, however, to ask either the employers or the employees to finance the entire cost of the accrued liabilities represented by the policy of paying full-rate benefits at an early date. It is reasonable that such liabilities shall be borne by the community, at least in large part. It is particularly appropriate that the Government should be one of the contributors to the cost of social insurance since partly replacing public assistance with social insurance will give some relief to the general taxpayers who now have to finance the cost of public assistance.

36. During the last 8 years the rise in the price level has greatly diminished the purchasing power of old-age and survivors' benefits and thus has diminished the real protection afforded by the social security system. Is the council aware of the possibility that prices may continue to rise and that the protection given by old-age and survivors' insurance will continue to be diminished by rising prices?

The council has pointed out that if the protection afforded by the social security system is to be real, the purchasing power of benefits must not be destroyed by large increases in the price level, and that if the country is unable to prevent steep increases in price levels, benefits will have to be readjusted to preserve their purchasing power. The advisory council believes that a special obligation rests on the Government and all groups in the community to make sure that monetary policies, prices policies, and wage policies do not produce a large rise in prices. It is obvious that there must be a relationship in the long run between the rate at which output per man-hour rises, the rate at which wages rise, and the rate at which prices rise. If wages rise faster than output per man-hour, the difference will have to be made up by a rise in prices. For example, if output per man-hour rises about 3 percent a year and wages rise about 5 percent a year, one may expect prices to rise by about 2 percent a year. This seems like a small amount. Nevertheless, in the course of 10 years it would reduce the purchasing power of benefits by about 25 percent and in the course of 40 years it would reduce the purchasing power of benefits by more than one-half. The council ventures no predictions on the future course of output, wages, or prices. It does believe, however, that the community should regard itself as having the responsibility for seeing that the purchasing power of benefits is not impaired by a large increase in the price level.

37. What was the basis for the difference of opinion in the council with respect to the extension of coverage to nonprofit institutions?

All members of the council agreed that extension of old-age and survivors' insurance to the employees of nonprofit institutions is desirable. Since the contributions to old-age and survivors' insurance are taxes, two members of the council fear that compulsory coverage of nonprofit institutions would be a precedent for placing other taxes on religious, charitable, and educational organizations. These members favor allowing such organizations to come under the plan at their option. The rest of the council does not share this fear. The majority point out that the proposed tax is a special-purpose tax and that it would apply to pay rolls wherever found—whether in a business enterprise or a nonprofit organization. It might be compared to a tax on gasoline which a church or other nonprofit organization pays when it buys gasoline. Such organizations also pay many other taxes, such as those on telephone and telegraph messages.

38. What were the different views among council members with respect to raising the present tax base and contribution base from $3,000 to $4,200?

Several objections were made by some of the members to raising the present contribution and benefit base from $3,000 to $4,200. One objection was that this change would call for changes in many of the some 6,800 private pension plans covering 10,000,000 employees, which are now integrated with the present base. A second objection was that persons with average wages over $3,000 would receive larger increases in benefits than would those with average wages below $3,000. A third objection was that in the early years of the system the higher paid workers would not contribute enough in taxes to pay the cost of the increase in their benefits.

Other members of the council point out that since the tax base and benefit base of $3,000 was established, the cost of living has risen by 60 percent and wages have risen even more than that. If the tax base and benefit base of $3,000 was about right in 1936, a base of $4,800 would be indicated today. Hence an increase to only $4,200 is conservative. It is true that raising the benefit base to $4,200 would give a larger percentage increase in benefits to persons earning more than $3,000 than to persons earning less. The reason is the obvious one that under the present formula no wages above $3,000 affect the size of the benefits. If one were to accept this reason for not raising the benefit base, the country would be committed to permanent retention of the $3,000 limit no matter how high prices and wages might go. That would be an untenable position. As prices and wages rise, one must expect the benefit base and tax base to be changed to preserve the roughly original relation to the price level. This is one way of preventing a rise in the price level from undermining the purchasing power of benefits. As for contributions not equaling the value of benefits, that will be true in the early years of old-age and survivors' insurance for all classes of contributors It is less true of persons with incomes above $3,000 a year than of persons with lower incomes.

39. What is the Advisory Council on Social Security?

It is a body of 17 citizens from various walks of life appointed by the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate under authority of Senate Resolution 141 of July 23, 1947. The council has the duty of assisting the Senate committee in making an investigation of old-age and survivors' insurance and all other aspects of the existing social-security program. Its recommendations will be considered by the Senate in dealing with legislation relating to social security.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry of the able Senator from Colorado. I may say to him that I am particularly interested in the report which has been received. Quite recently I introduced a bill dealing with the subject of reducing the age for pensions from 65 years to 60 years, and providing for the payment of pensions to those who become unable to work through injury and disability. As I understand, the Senate Finance Committee is considering the subject. It is also now being considered by the House of Representatives. I understand the committee of the Senate is in a position to proceed upon the subject when the House acts.

Mr. MILLIKIN. We will be prepared to take up any bill which the House sends over to us, and we will have the benefit of the advice of the council to which I have referred.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is the Senator in a position to advise the Senator from West Virginia as to what steps have been taken in the House, and what progress has been made on this important subject?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It is my understanding that the House Ways and Means Committee has a subcommittee now actively engaged in studying the subject of social security, having in mind the possibility of introducing legislation on the subject.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is the Senator informed as to whether such legislation may be introduced at this session?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am not in a position to say whether it will be, although I am in a position to say that the subcommittee is actively engaged in its study of the subject.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 706. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Karl Frederick Kucker;

H. R. 838. An act for the relief of Frank J. Patzke, Archie Mitchell, J. L. Shoemaker, Einar Engen, and N. L. Gifford;

H. R. 851. An act for the relief of Adney W. Gray;

H. R. 926. An act for the relief of Dora Greenbaum (Brenner);

H. R. 2064. An act for the relief of Michael Palazotta;

H. R. 2193. An act for the relief of Robert E. Graham;

H. R. 2732. An act for the relief of Dennis Stanton;

H. R. 2785. An act for the relief of the New Amsterdam Casualty Co.;

H. R. 2897. An act for the relief of the Marden Construction Co., Inc.;

H. R. 2918. An act for the relief of the Sumner County Colored Fair Association;

H. R. 3006. An act for the relief of Laura Spinnichia;

H. R. 3114. An act for the relief of the estate of John Deiman;

H. R. 3358. An act for the relief of Dr. Timothy C. H. Liang and Dr. Esther Chang Liang;

H. R. 3965. An act for the relief of John H. Schmitt and Mrs. Mildred Schmitt;

H. R. 4199. An act for the relief of George Haniotis;

H. R. 4381. An act for the relief of the Yellow Cab Transit Co., of Oklahoma City;

H. R. 4484. An act for the relief of Theodore Loetsch;

H. R. 5040. An act to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, to provide that claims under section 17 must be filed within 6 months to be allowable, to stop further accrual of such claims, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5434. An act authorizing the Attorney General of the United States to recognize and to award to outstanding courageous young Americans a medal for heroism known as the Young American Medal for Bravery, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6224. An act for the relief of John Watkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1562. An act to increase temporarily the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States;

H. R. 2359. An act to authorize the payment of a lump sum, in the amount of $100,000, to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y., as a contribution toward the cost of construction of a water-filtration plant, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5870. An act to amend the act of May 16, 1946 (Public Law 383, 79th Cong.), as amended, to provide increased allowances for the escorts of repatriated war dead; and

H. R. 6039. An act to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Army of one officer in the grade of general and to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Air Force of one officer in the grade of general, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2352. An act to provide for sale to the Crow Tribe of interests in the estates of deceased Crow Indian allottees;

H. R. 3633. An act to amend section 203 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, designating certain public lands as available homelands;

H. R. 3635. An act to ratify sections 1 and 2 of Joint Resolution 7 enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in its regular session of 1947;

H. R. 3680. An act to amend sections 207, 213, 215, 216, 220, 222, and 225, of title 2 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended;

H. R. 3785. An act to authorize the State of Minnesota to condemn lands owned by the United States in the County of Cass, State of Minnesota, for fish propagation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3954. An act to approve act No. 74 of the Session Laws of 1947 of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act relating to revenue bonds of the Territory of Hawaii," and act No. 95 of the Session Laws of 1947 of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act relating to Territorial and county public improvements and the financing thereof by the issuance of revenue bonds";

H. R. 4091. An act to ratify Act 237 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1947;

H. R. 4201. An act to authorize payments to the public-school district or districts serving the Fort Peck project, Montana, for the education of dependents of persons engaged on that project;

H. R. 4512. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land to the State of Oklahoma for the use and benefit of the Northeastern State College at Tahlequah, Okla.;

H. R. 4551. An act to provide for the addition of certain surplus Government lands to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area project, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4642. An act to provide for disposition and use of tribal funds of the Navajo Tribe of Indians;

H. R. 4966. An act directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and lease certain houses, apartments, and lands in Boulder City, Nev.;

H. R. 5155. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to have made by the Public Roads Administration and the National Park Service a joint reconnaissance survey of the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal between Great Falls, Md., and Cumberland, Md., and to report to the Congress upon the advisability and practicability of constructing thereon a parkway, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5173. An act to amend section 203 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, designating certain public lands as available home lands;

H. R. 5175. An act to confirm and ratify Act 205 of the Session Laws of 1947 of the Territory of Hawaii, relating to the issuance of public-improvement bonds;

H. R. 5244. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War II";

H. R. 5262. An act to authorize the sale of individual Indian lands acquired under the act of June 18, 1934, and under the act of June 26, 1936;

H. R. 5609. An act to authorize the survey of a proposed Mississippi River parkway for the purpose of determining the feasibility of such a national parkway, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5651. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in South Dakota for municipal or public purposes;

H. R. 5669. An act to provide for adjustment of irrigation charges on the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5816. An act to amend the act of April 25, 1947, relating to the establishment of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5822. An act to establish the Saratoga National Historical Park, in the State of New York, from the lands that have been acquired by the Federal Government for that purpose pursuant to the act of June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 608), and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5839. An act to authorize the conveyance to States, or political subdivisions, of roads leading to certain historical areas administered by the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3578. An act to reduce in area the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge in Essex County, Mass., and for other purposes;

H. R. 4804. An act to allow service credit for certain enlisted men of the Coast Guard who acted as policemen and guards at the Ivigtut Cryolite Mine, Greenland, during 1940 and 1941;

H. R. 4817. An act to amend the act of July 23, 1947 (61 Stat. 409) (Public Law No. 219 of the 80th Cong.); and

H. R. 4892. An act to amend the act of July 23, 1947 (61 Stat. 409) (Public Law No. 219 of the 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 5174. An act to authorize Commodity Credit Corporation to make adjustment payments to certain producers of raw cane sugar in Puerto Rico and Hawaii; and

H. J. Res. 333. Joint resolution to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the termination of the War with Spain; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 5553. An act to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

H. J. Res. 354. Joint resolution to provide for the disposing of the Government irrigation experiment station at Bard, Calif., and the establishment in lieu thereof of a similar station at or near Brawley, Calif.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CARTER GLASS, OF VIRGINIA

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, our acting chaplain in a beautiful and lovely prayer has just asked that God, in this crisis, raise up world leaders among us. I rise to pay tribute to a world leader that God once gave us, who is no longer with us, but whose memory I hope will ever remain fresh in the minds and hearts of his former colleagues.

As the present occupant of the seat which the late Carter Glass occupied for more than a quarter of a century in the Senate of the United States, I approach with humbleness the task of eulogizing my illustrious predecessor.

I realize full well that I cannot add to or subtract from his place in the history of our Nation or the esteem and affection in which he was held by those who knew him. He was literally showered with honors while yet alive. By act of Congress a special coin bearing his likeness was issued by the United States Treasury. A plaque acknowledging his contribution to the establishment of the Federal Reserve System became a permanent part of the vestibule of the marble building which houses its Board of Governors. Portraits and busts by eminent artists were set up in various places to commemorate his work. A building at Harvard University bears his name. A chair of political science at Sweet Briar College was founded in his honor. Although his own formal education stopped at the age of thirteen, colleges and universities throughout the Nation honored him with degrees and medals and foreign governments added ribbons and citations.

But, it is not primarily in these material manifestations that the memory of Carter Glass lives on. It may be said of him as Pericles said of the young men of Athens:

So they gave their bodies to the commonwealth and received, each for his own memory, praise that will never die, and with it the grandest of all sepulchres, not that in which their mortal bones are laid, but a home in the minds of men, where their glory remains fresh to stir to speech or action as the occasion comes by. For the whole earth is the sepulchre of famous men; and their story is not graven only on stone over their native earth, but lives on far away, without visible symbol, woven into the stuff of other men's lives.

I shall not attempt to duplicate the work of biographers who have recorded the incidents of the life of Carter Glass covering the long period from his birth in Lynchburg, Va., on January 5, 1858, until his death here in Washington on April 21, 1946. I shall not attempt to measure the impact on him of such events as secession, the War Between the States, the tragic era of reconstruction, industrial expansion in the East and the building of railroads to the great empire of the West, the Spanish-American War, emergence of the United States as a world power, his associations with William Jennings Bryan and Woodrow Wilson, World War I, the depression, and the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt and, finally, World War II.

Nor shall I attempt to assess his own influence on events during his period of public service as a local official, State senator, member of his State's constitutional convention, Member of the House of Representatives, member of platform committees of party conventions, Secretary of the Treasury and finally, Member and president pro tempore of the United States Senate, while concurrently he wielded his influence as a newspaper publisher.

As our mutual friend, the Honorable Lindsay Almond, of Roanoke, Va., said at the convention which nominated me to succeed Carter Glass, his contribution—

Was not of the material, but of the immaterial, not of the flesh but of the spirit. It was his moral courage, his intellectual integrity, his absolute disregard of and contempt for the political consequences of the course of action upon which conscience and conviction had impelled him to embark that was his greatest contribution to his State and country.

As was well said in a resolution adopted by that convention:

His strength of character, honesty of purpose, nobility of soul, courage of conviction, forensic power, sanity of judgment, tenacity of principle, depth of ethical concept, political and personal integrity, devotion to duty, loyalty to friendship, love for his country, and unwavering fealty to his God, will ever stand as the bulwarks of his greatness, the vehicles of his accomplishment, and as a perpetual monument to his memory.

I might quote from Mr. Glass' own first speech as a Member of the House of Representatives, and say of him as he then said of his late colleague, Representative John F. Rixey, of the Eighth Virginia District:

Nobody better understood and no life has more surely conformed to, that philosophy which teaches that well-being of the soul depends only on what we are and that nobleness of character is nothing else but the love of good and the scorn of evil.

All of this, of course, would embarrass Carter Glass if he were alive today, since he once said:

I am genuinely embarrassed by being praised for such things as integrity, independence, and courage. I regard those as virtues of the common man. In all my life, day in and day out, I have never done anything but what I would expect and what would be expected of the average man of good sense and good character.

On this and many other occasions he exhibited a modesty that is an essential ingredient of the product we call "true greatness."

There was, for example, the letter he wrote in acknowledgment of the information that his brother, E. C. Glass, would be elected to the Virginia Board of Education, in which he said:

I frequently think of the inequalities of this life. This finds no better illustration than in the fact that Ned Glass, with infinitely more culture, learning and real ability than I, with vastly more real work to his credit, has given 40 years of his life to Virginia at a comparatively paltry wage, whereas the Commonwealth has loaded me with distinctions which he might more properly have received. The only compensation I can think of for such inequalities is the fact that my brother's work has been of a more enduring nature than mine and will be remembered by succeeding generations long alter I shall have been forgotten.

And no one can better appreciate than I that tribute to his brother because it was my happy privilege to attend for 6 years the public schools of Lynchburg which he headed.

This modesty about his own abilities doubtless contributed to the fact that in his case offices literally sought the man rather than the man the office.

He was drafted for a seat in the Virginia Senate, was virtually pushed by friends into the State constitutional convention, was first elected to the House of Representatives while hospitalized outside of his State, and after once being defeated for the United States Senate was appointed to this body and was returned thereafter throughout his lifetime without opposition within his party.

His political fights were for party and for principle and for candidates other than himself. The speeches by which he is best remembered were on behalf of suffrage reform in Virginia, national currency and banking reforms, sanity in national fiscal affairs, vigorous prosecution of wars, and integrity of the courts. The campaigns in which he spoke most emphatically were for the election of Woodrow Wilson, Alfred E. Smith, and Franklin Roosevelt as President and for Harry Byrd as Governor of Virginia.

But it never was through compromise with his conscience or surrender of convictions that he maintained his place in public life.

He was dubbed "The Unreconstructed Rebel" by Franklin Roosevelt after refusing the post of Secretary of the Treasury for a second time because he could not subscribe to the financial policies of the President. He adopted as his own the creed of Senator Lucius Q. C. Lamarr, of Mississippi, who in 1879 advised the Senate of his intention to cast his vote in defiance of instructions from the legislature of his State, explaining:

Even in this hour of their legislative displeasure and disapprobation I cannot vote as these resolutions direct. I cannot and will not shirk the responsibility which my position imposes. My duty, as I see it I will do, and I will vote against this bill. When this is done, my responsibility is ended. My reasons for my vote will be given to my people. Then it will be for them to determine if adherence to my honest convictions has disqualified me from representing them; whether a difference of opinion upon a difficult and complicated subject to which I have given patient, long-continued, conscientious study, to which I have brought entire honesty and singleness of purpose, and upon which I have spent whatever ability God has given me, is now to separate us.

In addition to citing these words from Senator Lamarr's speech, Carter Glass emphasized his own philosophy in the statement:

I have a distinct distaste for a modern-day phrase "public servant." To me it was never intended to mean abject subservience to the public will, however uninformed or misdirected. I prefer to think of a United States Senator as a representative of the sovereignty of his State and subject every moment of his service to the promptings of his conscience and the preservation of his own intellectual integrity. He has no moral right to sacrifice either to the clamor of the multitude or to the decree of "titled consequence" wherever it may be enthroned. Long ago I learned—indeed I did not have to learn; it is a self-evident proposition—that the public man who permits himself to pause long enough to inquire whether a thing is popular or unpopular, instead of seeking to know whether it is right or wrong, is not only useless, but dangerous to his country. He is a coward to begin with and a menace always.

Espousing such principles, Carter Glass stated his convictions in a forceful manner that was a joy to those who agreed with him and a terror to his opponents. The specific questions which he discussed are not before us today, but some of the same problems are involved and, at this critical time in our history, I think there is something more important for us to do than merely to recall the career of this former Virginian. It will help us to remember his political philosophy.

In World War I, when German submarines were sinking our unarmed merchant ships, he abhorred appeasement. In advocating the arming of our merchant marine he said:

I want the people of Virginia to know that I oppose any surrender, actually or implicitly, of any vital American right merely to propitiate a war-mad foreign nation, which already has strewn the seas with the dead bodies of helpless American victims. I want them to know that I have no absolution for such a crime; that I stand for full reparation and ample security, and am utterly opposed to the suggested interference of Congress with the diplomatic functions of the President.

I want them to know that I should despise myself for a vote cast here to warn American citizens that they must travel the free waters of the globe in merchant ships at their own peril, without their country's protection. I want them to know I would tear to tatters my commission as a Member

of the House of Representatives could I imagine that the people of Virginia would have to do a thing so repugnant to my sense of national honor and so at variance with my conception of national self-respect.

And there are some things worse than war. Virginia has homes that might be desolated and mothers who might be distressed and sons who might be sacrificed. But I pray God that the mothers and sons of Virginia who live appreciate their heritage from those who, "being dead, yet speaketh." Two of Virginia's boys are my own—stalwart, manly fellows, for either of whom I would die a thousand times—and I would have them hear me say, without a tremor, in the spirit which I hope animates their hearts, that I would rather be pursued through time and eternity by the pitiful apparition of their shattered forms than to see my country dishonored and its flag hauled down in disgrace.

On two great questions, the rights of the States and public spending, he took strongly the position of Mr. Jefferson, which some people would call conservative, but which he considered truly liberal, and he often denounced so-called liberals who were liberal only with other people's rights and other people's money.

He adhered strictly to the view that our Federal Government was a government of delegated powers, expressly stated in the Constitution, and that all others were reserved to the States. He was shocked when alive and would be inexpressibly more so today at the proposal to have the Federal Government assume control and regulation over all election laws and qualifications, public education, civil rights, and police protection in the States.

When he was Secretary of the Treasury, this is what he had to say about deficit financing and public spending, in his report to the Congress after the close of World War I, and I think these words are prophetic:

All sense of values seems to have departed from among us. The departments, bureaus, and boards, all inspired by a laudable enthusiasm for their work, but some by a less laudable instinct to magnify its importance, bombard the committees of Congress with projects, some more or less meritorious, some of no merit whatever, but all conceived in sublime indifference to the facts that the great business of Government is being run at a loss and that each one of these projects increases the deficit of the Government and consequently the burden to be thrown upon the great body of people, whether the deficit be met by increasing taxes or by floating additional loans. For no fallacy is more grotesque than the assumption that by issuing bonds or notes or certificates of indebtedness now we may pass on to future generations the burden of our own extravagance. The burden of these issues will have to be met today, not only in the interest and sinking-fund charges added to an already heavy load, but in the expansion of credit which is inevitable as a result of the issue of such securities, constituting as they do a prime basis for additional credit in the hands of the holders, whoever they may be. I shall not elaborate upon that point, but I want to say to you in all solemnity that a hundred million American people will pay for the extravagance of the Government, whether that extravagance finds its incidence in governmental waste or in the desire to accomplish real or fancied benefits for a portion of the community.

Let us now get back to bedrock. Let us remember that there can be no spending by the Government without paying by the Government, and that the Government cannot pay except out of the pockets of the people. Let us remember, too, that in the last analysis taxes and the cost of Government loans are borne by 100,000,000 people. The burden of taxation, the burden of credit expansion is inevitably shifted to the whole people of the United States. Some methods of finance are better than others. Some taxes are less readily adapted to being shifted from the backs of the people as a whole; but in the long run the burden of governmental waste and extravagance falls more heavily upon the poor than upon the well-to-do and more heavily upon the well-to-do than upon the rich. By graduated income taxes we tend to mitigate this consequence, but we cannot wholly avoid it. Let us not fail to remember that the Government of the United States is simply a name for the people of the United States and that all of the people of the United States will pay in inverse order to their ability for extravagances of the Government perpetrated in the interest of a portion of the people or a section of the country.

In a Senate speech in 1938, Carter Glass said:

Perhaps I am a relic of constitutional government—I am rather inclined to think I am. I entertain what may be the misguided notion that the Constitution of the United States as it existed in the time of Grover Cleveland is the same Constitution that exists today, and that if Mr. Cleveland—

Whose veto message Senator Glass had just read into the RECORD—

with his clear conception and courage, could find nothing in the Constitution then which authorized appropriations for special purposes and not for the general welfare, I cannot today find anything in the Constitution warranting such action.

He also said:

The people should keep in mind that the Constitution is a set of written rules designed to control the desires of public officials. The people should realize, fully, when public officials continually propose, or continually do, unconstitutional acts, or continually inveigh against the provisions of the Constitution, that these same public officials are really seeking the destruction of constitutional government in appeasement of their own desires. Such public officials do not wish to govern—they seek to rule.

We hear much of "privilege" and "privileged classes," but I should like to remind the people there is no class more privileged than those who occupy public office. Today, by breaking down constitutional barriers, public officials in many parts of the world have succeeded in extending their privileges, making them exclusive.

I pause here to say prophetic indeed is that statement of 10 years ago in regard to public officials under the guise of doing good things for the people acquiring the power to rule the people. Let us make no mistake, Mr. President, that could happen to us.

Carter Glass further said:

In their own safety, there is one privilege the people of the United States should keep for themselves. That is the privilege of final decisions, both as to legislation and administration, as well as the final decision as to who shall legislate and administer.

He also said:

This is what Daniel Webster meant when he said: "Nothing will ruin a country if the people themselves will undertake its safety; and nothing can save a country if they leave that safety in any hands but their own."

In his radio speech in 1937 attacking the proposal to pack the Supreme Court, Senator Glass said:

Why should we not proceed, as in honor we are bound to do, by first contriving legislation for social and economic security, painstakingly drafted by competent lawyers with a clear conception of the Constitutional prohibitions against invading the rights of business and individuals by a species of confiscation and by utter indifference for reserved powers of the States? Why should we not quit legislating by pious preambles and conform our enactments to the requirements of the Constitution and thus put upon notice the cabal of amateur experimenters that we will have no more of their trash? * * * If it then be found that we were mistaken in the expressed belief that the Constitution is ample to our purposes, let us do what we promised to do and appeal to the people to amend their supreme law. Let the impatient proponents of the pending scheme turn to the advice of George Washington in his famous Farewell Address, in which he admonished against disregarding "reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power," saying: "If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the Constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way in which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for, though this in one instance may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

In concluding the same speech, Senator Glass also quoted the statement of John Stuart Mill that—

A people may prefer a free government; but if from indolence, or carelessness, or cowardice or want of public spirit, they are unequal to the exertions necessary for preserving it; if they can be deluded by the artifices used to cheat them out of it; if by momentary discouragement, or temporary panic or a fit of enthusiasm for an individual, they can be induced to lay their liberties at the feet of even a great man, or trust him with powers which enable him to subvert their institutions—in all these cases they are more or less unfit for liberty.

But Carter Glass was as far from a die-hard conservative as any real statesman we have had since the Civil War. On the subject of the tariff, he was almost a free-trader, and he could never understand how his colleagues and friends, Senator Norris and Senator Borah, could consider themselves progressives and liberals and vote for high protective tariff schedules that "picked the pocket of every consumer for the benefit of a chosen few." On the subject of regulation of credit controls, the national banking system, and the stock market, he was not just fully abreast of the New Deal; he was far beyond it and in front of it. The Securities and Exchange Act, one of the really progressive pieces of legislation of the Franklin D. Roosevelt administrations, carried out belatedly recommendations that Carter Glass made to the Congress when he was Secretary of the Treasury. On the subject of public power, he stood on the battle line with the late Senators Norris, of Nebraska, and Walsh, of Montana, and with them fought the Power Trust tooth and nail, over Muscle Shoals, Grand Coulee, and the Tennessee Valley Authority.

After World War I, inflation reached its peak in the spring of 1920. As a member of the platform committee of the

Democratic convention of that year, Senator Glass prepared and secured the adoption of this plank:

> The * * * high cost of living can only be remedied by increased production, strict government economy, and a relentless pursuit of those who take advantage of postwar conditions.

Mr. President, I feel that his spirit is right here today. I feel that he is telling us today, "If you will economize in your Government expenditures, if all will join together to increase production, and if those who are chiseling and those who are cheating and those who are making unfair profits will be relentlessly pursued, we can meet the threat of inflation."

That is the reason, Mr. President, I have today invited the attention of the Senate not to what Carter Glass did, not so much to the honors which were conferred upon him, but to the fundamental principles for which he stood, which are as true today as they were when he spoke them, 10, 15, or 25 years ago.

He believed in public as well as personal frugality. As a boy he marked in one of his father's books these words from Jefferson's first inaugural speech:

> Economy in public expense, that labor may be lightly burdened;
>
> The payment of our debts and sacred preservation of the public faith;
>
> I am for a government rigorously frugal and simple, applying all the possible savings of the public revenue to the discharge of the national debt; and not the multiplication of officers and salaries merely to make partisans, and for increasing by every device, the public debt, on the principle of its being a public blessing.

Those words, uttered by Jefferson more than a hundred years ago, were marked by little Carter Glass in his father's book, before he ever dreamed he would have the privilege of administering the great financial agency of this Government, before he ever dreamed he would have the privilege of sitting in the greatest legislative body in the world and making a living reality those fundamental truths which he had imbibed in his boyhood, from his father's library in the city of Lynchburg.

Between the surrender of Lee at Appomattox and the destruction of Hitler's war machine in World War II, Carter Glass was able to say with Ulysses of old: "Many things have I seen, a part of which I was."

We see him first, a barefoot boy of five, standing solemnly and awe-strickenly on the bridge of the James River with his fellow townspeople on a beautiful May day in 1863 as the old packetboat *John Marshall* passes down the canal, carrying all the mortal remains in a flag-draped coffin on its deck of the great Stonewall Jackson, hero of Manassas, Chancellorsville, and the valley campaigns. We see him last, the great statesman, author, and defender of the Federal Reserve Act, Secretary of the Treasury, senior United States Senator from Virginia, and President pro tempore of this body, broken in health but not in spirit, awaiting the summons from his Maker to lay down the noble sword of his endeavors and come into the portals of everlasting peace. And as one who both loved and feared his Maker and through the stress and strain of critical years had demonstrated that a Christian life is not incompatible with a successful political career, he, at the time of passing, was able to say, in the dying words of Stonewall Jackson, "Let us cross over the river and rest in the shade of the trees."

NATIONAL HOUSING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 866) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective and to provide for the coordinated execution of such policy through a National Housing Commission, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] to strike out title VI, relating to low-rent housing, as amended, by the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as amended.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to add a few remarks to those made yesterday, in an effort to clarify the question before the Senate and to better inform Senators who did not happen to be on the floor yesterday.

As the result of what was to my mind a very illuminating debate, I feel that two outstanding and conclusive issues have been proved in support of the amendment which was submitted yesterday by the junior Senator from Washington, which proposes to strike out title VI, the public-housing section, offered as an amendment in the nature of a substitute for Senate bill 866.

The first point I have in mind, Mr. President, is that the most outstanding fact is that the public-housing section which my amendment would delete from the bill is not of an emergency character, as are most of the other sections of the so-called Flanders amendments. The senior Senator from Ohio yesterday told the Senate he doubts very much whether construction could be started on any of these public-housing projects before 1950.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. May I suggest, on the contrary, that except for the extension of title VI of the Housing Act, this is not an emergency bill; it is a long-range bill.

Mr. CAIN. That, if I may suggest to the Senator from Vermont, and if I understand correctly what he has just said, is exactly what I was endeavoring to state.

Mr. FLANDERS. In speaking of title VI I am not referring to title VI of the pending bill; I am speaking of title VI of the National Housing Act, which is the liberalized FHA.

Mr. CAIN. I was very obviously referring to title VI as it appears in the Flanders amendments, beginning, I think, on page 77; that having been the section which was debated at considerable length during the course of the session yesterday.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] explained to the Senate very clearly that it may be as many as 10 years before the 500,000 public-housing units in question could be constructed. It therefore appears to me that not one single line of the public-housing section which we are presently discussing will provide a single unit of housing today, when such housing is so sorely needed throughout the country. So far as I know, there is absolutely no provision for the control of the construction of such housing, except here in Washington, a fact which I think was rather clearly demonstrated yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. If we pause to reflect but a few moments on other provisions of the Flanders amendments we shall find that most of them are emergency and temporary legislation, intended to provide housing units immediately, when the country needs them most.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Would the Senator consider modifying his amendment to provide for separating the public-housing provision from other noncontroversial features of the bill, and then having the public-housing question become the pending question on a day certain, say a week from Monday? My reason for asking that is this: I intend to go along with the Senator, not that I oppose public housing; I favor the public-housing section as presently amended. I think it is a good, sensible section; but I think public housing should be separated from the remainder of the bill. If that is not done, I fear that both public housing and the other much needed housing legislation may be defeated.

As the Senator knows, the remainder of the bill undertakes to streamline and make workable all the previous housing legislation. As to voting for the Senator's amendment, I am sure many Senators will feel that in so doing they are voting against public housing. If the Senator would consider amending the amendment so as to separate public housing from the other provisions of the bill, the subject could be taken up on a day certain, possibly a week from next Monday, giving the committee time to perfect the housing section.

Mr. CAIN. It seems to me that the junior Senator from Washington differs from the junior Senator from Wisconsin only in degree. I think both of us feel, as we properly should, that the subject of public housing is one of the larger problems before the American public and before the Congress. I am thoroughly satisfied that we believe the subject is deserving of exhaustive research and debate by the Congress of the United States. The junior Senator from Wisconsin appears to think that the public-housing section which I seek to delete is of such a character that he could support it if it were discussed as a separate measure on the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; but in my opinion additional amendments are required. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] indicated yesterday that he agreed that it should be amended. I think it

should be amended to take from the Public Housing Administrator all the various functions which he never should have had under his jurisdiction. I think it needs further amendment, although even in its present form I would vote for it, now that it has been radically changed. Previously we started at the top of the low-income groups. Now we are starting at the bottom, where I think we should start. I believe it is a good section, but I should not want the Senate to take any action which would appear to preclude free consideration of the public-housing section. I might say that I think with additional amendments it should be adopted.

Mr. CAIN. It seems very clear to me that the junior Senator from Wisconsin is presently making a very worthwhile contribution, namely, that whether we vote on a public-housing measure within the confines of the bill presently before us, or whether we do so separately, the section must, before it is perfected, be amended, from the Senator's point of view and apparently from the point of view of the senior Senator from Ohio, in a number of particulars, which is only confirmatory of the fact that a sufficient amount of work has not been done on public housing to justify passing on the problem favorably at this time.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not want to misquote the senior Senator from Ohio. The only statement he made was in answer to a query of mine as to whether he would go along on an amendment to take away from the Public Housing Administrator certain functions which he now has and which I think he should not have. The senior Senator from Ohio indicated that he might go along. He said nothing except what he said on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. CAIN. I think there is no room for any difference of opinion.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to say to the Senator from Washington, in order to make it clear for those who are opposed to public housing and those who are in favor of it, that both groups would feel free to vote for the amendment if the Senator would consider including in it a provision that would keep the public-housing section separate. Then it could be the order of business on some day certain. I am very much concerned with passing a bill containing both public housing and all the other badly needed housing provisions. A good example of the view which is commonly held was found at the dinner table a little while ago, where I was talking with a Senator, who said, "If you take public housing out of the bill there is nothing left." That indicates the rather general feeling that the bill is a public-housing bill. I know that many Members of the House feel that we are debating nothing except a public-housing bill. We know that a very minor section of the bill deals with public housing.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], who represents a different school of thought, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and myself have now ironed out all of our major differences. There still remains a rather minor difference. Much as I dislike to admit it, I think possibly they are right. So if we can separate the two, I think we can pass housing legislation quickly, and I think it will go through the House quickly. We can then take up the question of public housing which I think is a very important problem.

Mr. CAIN. I find only one fault with the Senator's suggestion that the motion presently before the Senate be amended to provide for debate on a given date in the immediate future, taking up the subject of public housing for consideration as a separate subject. I think it would be unwise to limit the time within which we shall debate, if my motion should prevail, one of the most fundamental problems facing the country. I think it would be much better to leave to the leadership of this body the question of when we shall debate the subject.

Mr. McCARTHY. If we adopt the Senator's amendment, will the Senator go along with us in committee and on the floor, not in support of the housing bill, but in order to bring before the Senate a public-housing measure so that it can be debated and acted upon at this session?

Mr. CAIN. I should like, as an individual Senator, to do nothing more than that. I think we should separate public housing from all the aids and stimuli to private building and really determine what America's needs are and how they can best be met. Anyone who has taken the time, as most of us have, to read the RECORD of yesterday must realize that there is such an exaggerated difference of opinion among all the very serious and sincere advocates of public housing that perhaps we had better take more time to reconcile the differences before we take action.

Mr. McCARTHY. For the benefit of the record—I think I personally know what the Senator's belief is, but I think this concerns some of the other Senators—if the Senator's amendment should be adopted, even though he may vote against public housing, I hope he will not oppose bringing the question to the floor of the Senate so that it can be acted upon.

Mr. CAIN. I am by no means certain that I would oppose public housing after a full debate on the subject. I would oppose its inclusion in this bill, in which, in my considered opinion, it does not belong. I think I have stated very strongly to the Senator from Wisconsin that I shall be most happy, in fact, enthusiastic, to have an opportunity at the earliest reasonable time to participate on the floor of the Senate in a discussion of public housing.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will say to the Senator that with that assurance I shall go along with his amendment wholeheartedly. I think the present public-housing section is a good section. In my opinion it needs some amendment, but I believe it might be fatal to the entire bill to confuse the question of public housing with the other housing features of the bill. I believe that by throwing both of them into the same pot we will undoubtedly lose the whole cause of housing, and what happened last year and the year before will occur again, namely, a housing bill defeated because there is so much confusion in the minds not only of the legislators, but of the public as a whole. I know the Senator realizes that we are receiving a great flood of telegrams opposing or supporting the bill, which contains 101 valuable features, solely upon the basis of this one minor section in the bill dealing with public housing.

Mr. CAIN. I agree entirely with the Senator's fear that the entire housing bill may be held in jeopardy because of the confusion, if the public-housing section is retained in the bill, because it will be so generally misunderstood, and the subject is so highly confused that people who are desirous of supporting strong housing legislation are inclined to vote against it for fear they will be making a very serious and fundamental mistake.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I should like to make one comment. The Senator from Wisconsin said that if the housing bill shall be defeated it will be because it is linked with the public-housing program. The Senator is in error, in my opinion. If it is defeated, the primary cause of the defeat will be two of the most powerful lobbies that ever descended on the Congress, one the National Association of Real Estate Boards, the other the United States Savings and Loan Association, who have been doing their dirty work around the corridors of Congress and in the committee rooms for the last 4 years, endeavoring to hamstring and cut the heart out of the bill.

I should like to ask the Senator a simple question, and I hope he will not go into a long argument about it. Does the Senator believe in the principle of public housing?

Mr. McCARTHY. I heartily favor the bill as presently amended. I agree with the Senator that there is a lobby here that is not working well. But I may say that the so-called real-estate lobby has done more to convince me that public housing is needed than those who have been lobbying in favor of public housing.

Mr. TOBEY. That is fine, but if the Senator thinks it is needed, he is taking a very unusual course not to have it included in the bill. If the need exists, let the Senator take a positive stand and come along with us. The water is fine.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I held hearings from one end of the country to the other on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, and people came forward and wholeheartedly and vigorously opposed the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill because of one feature, the public-housing feature. They did not realize that there were some 10 other sections in the bill which had nothing to do with public housing. I know, to be frank, that if we combine public housing with the remainder of the badly needed legislation, there is going to be a great deal of opposition to the whole bill, solely because of the misunderstanding as to what public housing is.

Mr. TOBEY. There will be opposition, I know that full well, but a large part of the opposition will be based upon the

machinations of men, not based on reason, but on an excuse.

I shall not interrupt the Senator further at this time, but I shall have something to say later.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say, for the benefit of the Senator from New Hampshire, that I hope the Senator from Washington will amend his motion so as to provide that if the public-housing title is separated from the other provisions of the housing bill, then the public-housing section will be the order of business.

Mr. TOBEY. When?

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to fix a day certain. Perhaps we could agree on one, perhaps a week from Monday.

Mr. TOBEY. Will the Senator vote for the public-housing bill when it comes along?

Mr. McCARTHY. I not only intend to vote for it, but I shall support it.

Mr. TOBEY. Then why does not the Senator favor including all the subjects—the general housing shortage, public-housing delinquency, and the slum clearance cancer on the body politic—in one bill, a bill hammered on the anvil, in white heat, considered for 4 years under the leadership of the Senator from Ohio, and reduced to something tangible and constructive to meet all the problems? So far as a long-term program is concerned, the whole thing is a long-term program, helping to steer a course for betterment in housing in the United States. It is threefold. It should invite the Senator's confidence and his support. He is too good a man to try to defeat it here.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the Senator from New Hampshire and I agree almost wholly. My opposition to public housing has been on two grounds. First, that up until we amended the bill, it did not reach down to the very low-income group. The selective process of obtaining tenants I felt was based upon a question of how we could more easily administer rather than integrate the activity. I know the Senator agrees with me in that, and the Senator from Vermont agrees, and the Senator from Ohio likewise.

There is one other ground on which I have opposed public housing, that is, because of the bad administration of public housing. I do not think we can blame any one individual for that. It is the fault of the Congress largely. During the wartime, and subject to the war, we threw into public housing a great number of corporations, all with different assets, all with different bookkeeping systems, to such an extent that finally there was a somewhat unsavory mess.

Under the able direction of Mr. Foley that situation has been improved. For example, of the 66 bookkeeping deficiencies that were originally reported, all except 10 have been corrected, I think, 100 percent. The other 10 are being slowly corrected.

The Senator was not present a few days ago when I asked the Senator from Ohio about this matter. I should like to make one other amendment to the public-housing section, and then I think we would have a perfect public-housing bill, one that would take care of the very low-income group, where the need is greatest, and in no way interfere with private enterprise.

I should like to have an amendment in effect to make sure that never in the future would the Public Housing Administrator be given a great number of jobs because there was nowhere else to lodge them, but that he should handle the one and only job of taking care of the administration of public housing. For example, there is no reason why he should be burdened with the administration and disposal of the Greenbelt towns, there is no reason why he should be handling the disposal of war housing.

In that connection, I think Mr. Foley has taken a part of that work from the Housing Administrator. But if the motion of the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is defeated, I intend to vote for the housing bill. I think the public-housing section is in relatively good shape. I think that unless we pass the remainder of the housing bill we will have almost a complete stoppage of housing construction.

I heartily disagreed with the Senator who yesterday said the bill should be recommitted to the committee because we are drafting a bill on the floor of the Senate. We are not. It may have been confusing, but with the Flanders amendments amended as they have been up to date, I should have no objection at all to their being substituted for the 14 amendments which I submitted, because I believe they are almost identical, with a few minor changes.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I shall be very brief. I think my comment is germane.

In my judgment, the Senator from Wisconsin has just taken the heart out of his own opposition. He said that the bill had been materially improved, that the public-housing title had been materially improved, that the administrative provisions had been materially improved. But ergo, he says, the bill is not perfect. I wonder if the Senator ever heard the story of the prayer meeting when the minister sat up front and the people sat in the pews. The minister was talking about a divine character in human history, and asked if anyone had ever heard of a perfect man, and no one answered. But a little timid fellow in a back seat raised his hand. The minister said, "Have you ever seen a perfect man?" The little fellow rose and said, "No; I never did, but I heard about one." The minister said, "Who was it?" The reply was, "It was my wife's first husband." [Laughter.]

I submit that the Senator has taken the heart out of his opposition. He tells the Senate that the bill is improved. Ergo, do not seek perfection. Because it is better, put it to work. The Senator from Wisconsin, the Senator from Washington, and the Senator from New Hampshire, with our colleagues, under the Reorganization Act, will place the authority in the proper hands, and it will be up to them, having the control over the Housing Administrator, the like of which has never been seen before, to hold up his hands and do a good job. Come on.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President——

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I shall be delighted to yield, but I hope the Senator from New Hampshire can accommodate himself to my desire that he remain for a moment, and not duck out.

Mr. TOBEY. I shall remain.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the public-housing section is left in the bill, I sincerely hope we will pass it anyway. My opposition is not because of the modification of the bill. I think the bill is finally in such good shape that I could wholeheartedly go along with it. My principal objection was pointed up downstairs a few minutes ago, when I was sitting at the table in the Senate dining room with the Senator talking about the Cain motion. At that time the Senator said to me, "If the Senate adopts the Cain motion and strikes public housing from the bill there will, of course, be nothing left in the bill."

It points up to this, that the great mass of the public and legislators feel that we are merely dealing with a public-housing measure. I think we can pass that bill in the Senate as it is. I fear very much that what will happen will be what has happened before, which is that it will never be brought up for a vote in the House. I should like to have the suggestion of the Senator from New Hampshire on that point.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin says he does not think the bill will ever be brought up for a vote in the House. Let me give a word of warning. It is not permissible to criticize the other branch of Congress, and I am not going to do it. Nevertheless I belong to the Republican Party, and I wish to give a bit of advice to members of my party. We will have an election in this country in November, and the party conventions will be held before that time. May I give a little inside advice to my Republican Party? If our party wants to appeal to the rank and file of the great common people of the country by advocating something which is constructive and tangible, in my opinion we cannot present a better program for the betterment of the economy of the Nation and to improve industrial conditions than to pass legislation dealing with housing conditions in America, legislation which will encourage the building of housing, which will provide for slum clearance and for low-cost public housing. If we proclaim such a program to the American people we will receive their acclaim and reward.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I know that the Senator from New Hampshire has deep feelings and convictions about the whole bill before us. He feels—and I am not prepared to disagree with him—that there is and will be a continuing need for public housing. Let us assume by way of argument that the Senator from New Hampshire is correct. It does not necessarily follow that because he is correct and America should need public housing, a provision to cover public housing should be contained within the confines of a bill which is generally understood in many sections of the country

to be a stimulus to the building of houses. If we include this public-housing provision in the bill I think we are unintentionally misleading not only the people at large, but ourselves as well.

America expects houses to be built at this time, for we have a critical emergency housing problem. The best testimony we have comes from the sponsors and the advocates of the present provision covering public housing, in that they are the first to agree and admit that not a single house will be started under the provision, as I understand, before 1950. There is plenty of time.

The junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] and other Senators indicate that the measure has been materially improved. Of course it has been improved from what it was when attempts were first made to debate it. It seems to be logical to me that the bill can be further improved.

We did not have the information until yesterday as to the direction in which we are really going to go and in reference to the total number of public-housing units the country needs and ought to have. My only feeling, and that of those who support me in the motion which I made yesterday, is that the study of public housing, for one reason, because the bill in its present form, if adopted, will not add any new units of public housing at this time, is deserving of as much and as exhaustive consideration as the Senate of the United States can see fit to give it in its own right and in its own time. To include section VI within the provisions of a bill which is designed primarily to stimulate and create houses against our housing shortage, I think will place the whole measure in jeopardy. I wanted to make myself entirely clear to my good friend, the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from Washington always makes himself very clear to me and to all who listen to him. He is a lucid speaker, an intelligent speaker. I admire and respect him very much.

Touching upon his remarks respecting the Senator from New Hampshire, he points out that we will not get any action on public housing until 1949 or 1950. If that is so, it is a strong argument for taking the proposed action now. The longer we postpone taking this action, the longer it will be before there will be any public housing. That is not an argument in favor of putting off action by Congress. Come with me, Senators, to New York and see what has been done there in the way of public housing. Visit Hull House and see what is being done there. Visit other public-housing enterprises in the great cities of the country. Look them over and see what has been done. See how they are conducted. See the types of homes that have been constructed. See the improvements that have been made, and Senators will not want to wait, but will want to do it now.

The Senator speaks about the public-housing bill. For 4 years we have been considering public housing. We have been considering it up and down, back and forth, pro and con, here and there. The subject of public housing has been thoroughly elucidated by master minds of the Senate; such men as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who took a great leadership here; the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]; my friend the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. Their hearts have been in this thing. They have believed in it. They have lived and slept with it.

Mr. President, people are crying out for this thing. Before God, do not turn them down today in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, it seems to the junior Senator from Washington that by no means are those of us who support the motion endeavoring to turn down what are known as the little people who are in need of housing. I think it is well to say we want to separate and divorce the two subjects, so that we will do a better job on both subjects.

Again in referring to the matters which were so deeply gone into by many Senators yesterday, I am concerned to see, with reference to the Senator from New Hampshire, who feels as strongly as anybody on the basis of sympathy for those whom he seeks to help, that he cannot provide the Senate with the answers to the questions we all have a right to ask.

Referring for a moment to the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who spoke yesterday, he wanted to know where we are going from where we begin. I think that is a very reasonable request.

Referring to the words of the Senator from New Hampshire and to the other very distinguished and intelligent Senators who sponsor title VI within the bill, I suggest there was such a monumental difference of opinion among them as to where we are going that we should hesitate and pause before we start without sufficient knowledge of what the results are going to be.

As an individual I am not certain to what extent and to what degree America is in need of public housing. I think there are persons within our country who ought to be taken care of by the Federal Government. My own opinion is that they are fewer than most people think, but I believe we will be more satisfied as to what the facts really are if we can separate public housing from a bill within the confines of which it does not belong, and I would join with any group of Senators to accomplish that purpose at the earliest possible moment.

I should like to make one other point in connection with what I think is a germane subject concerning public housing. Some of us are concerned that control over the number of units which could be authorized by the public-housing title, title VI, to which we are addressing ourselves, is lodged entirely in Washington. We are not certain that it should not be lodged in Washington, but when we begin a monumental undertaking we must be absolutely positive from our point of view before we set up an administrative agency which is not as perfect as we think it can be made to be after future conversations.

The facts as they have developed from the debate have proved conclusively, to me anyway, that the figure 500,000 units was presumably picked almost from the air. So far as I know the figure 500,000 was not based on any factual study and actual need. Senators will recall that in my discussion yesterday with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] I pointed out the figures used by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who spoke of 6,000,000 units as being the number of substandard units throughout the country. The distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, has concluded, on the basis of what he assumed to be the facts, that there are presently in this country about 10,000,000. The senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] was very frank to say publicly that he did not know how many there were, but his best guess was that the figure would be approximately 2,000,000 units. So I think it important for us, as we vote either in support of or in opposition to the motion to strike the public-housing section from the bill, that we should be very conscious of one thing, which is that we are not, despite the limitations contained in a single piece of legislation, speaking of 500,000 units of public housing which will ultimately, over an amortized period of about 45 years, cost about $6,000,000,000.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to suggest that there is another approach besides that of the range from 500,000 to 10,000,000. By the way, the estimate of 10,000,000 comes from very questionable sources.

Mr. CAIN. Will the Senator permit me to ask a question?

Mr. FLANDERS. Let me complete this thought. The approach of the Senator from Ohio was that this rate of building was as fast as it was safe to go, and that the total of 500,000 called for in the bill was based upon a possible production of 1,000,000 houses a year, of which he said not more than 10 percent should be at any one time in public housing. So that is the basis for the 500,000, rather than it being based upon an unknown figure as to need.

Mr. CAIN. Yet I think it proper to say to the Senator from Vermont that that is not an answer to the question in the minds of most of us. We can now understand, since the Senator has so clearly stated it, where the figure of 500,000 comes from; but that is not an answer to the question as to how far we are going in the future, and how far we ought to go. The Senator from Vermont has just suggested that the figure of 10,000,000, which I find in the RECORD of yesterday, came from very questionable sources. Are those sources any more questionable than the sources from which any of the other figures have come? There are conclusions to the effect that there is need for 2,000,000, 6,000,000 or 10,000,000 units but no one has established the validity of the figures in a single instance.

Mr. FLANDERS. I am not able to verify my recollection at the moment, so I will give it merely as my recollection.

My recollection is that the figure of 10,000,000 came from a lobbying source hostile to public building. I am sorry that the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is not in the Chamber. When he returns I should like to interrogate him as to the source of the figures; but that is my recollection.

Mr. CAIN. It is my understanding that the junior Senator from Virginia will be here later and be available for questions.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I think perhaps the Senator from Washington is familiar with the general views of the Senator from Oregon with reference to the Federal Government going into business. The Senator from Oregon is opposed to it in every case unless there are most compelling reasons for it. However, it occurs to me that we are faced with a condition and not a theory with reference to the slum areas in the large cities of the United States. I have no knowledge as to the extent to which private enterprise has in the past attempted to deal with the problem of construction of substitute housing to take the place of housing in the slum areas in the cities of the United States. Does the Senator from Washington have only information on that subject? I ask the question because if there is any experience indicative of an answer to this problem in the field of private enterprise, I shall be opposed to title VI. But if on the other hand, we are faced with a situation in which private enterprise cannot, on the basis of the necessity for a profit for moneys invested, do the job, then it seems to me that there is no alternative but Federal subsidy.

Mr. CAIN. My own feeling is that the private builders of this country—and I refer to large investment houses, insurance companies, and so forth—are doing and will do a remarkable job in providing living accommodations for those possessed of incomes not on the bottom, but somewhat higher than that. I think it is perfectly safe to say, as one who wants to eliminate public housing from the bill at this time, that the private builder will probably not find it possible to accommodate the housing needs of those who will or should live in the low-rent accommodations provided under title VI. But I should like, if I may, to emphasize to the Senator from Oregon that we seek to divorce the public-housing provision from the other portions of the bill not necessarily because we oppose public housing—for a number of Senators who will presumably vote in favor of the pending motion are in favor of public housing—but because we are convinced that a better approach to the problem will result.

Mr. CORDON. What is that approach?

Mr. CAIN. It will be a compromise, if one can be reached on the basis of this particular title. We must bear in mind that for a considerable number of months not a single, solitary unit of public housing would result from the passage of the bill, even if the bill were actually passed through the House and Senate and signed by the President this afternoon.

Mr. CORDON. Under the provisions of the bill, cannot private enterprise, if it will, move into any area from which the slum dwellings have been cleared to make the area available for new construction, and invest its money with a substantial guaranty from the Government against loss?

Mr. CAIN. There is a very clear answer to the Senator's question within the bill. Title VI of the bill——

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to ask one question. I have been confused by the statement of the Senator from Oregon. Title VI of the bill does not deal with slum clearance. Title V of the bill is the title under which slum clearance appears. Title VI relates entirely to public housing.

Mr. CAIN. The motion made yesterday by the junior Senator from Washington sought to eliminate from the bill what is known as title VI.

Mr. GEORGE. But that does not refer to slum clearance.

Mr. CAIN. No. It refers to public housing. Title VI begins on page 77. The section to which the senior Senator from Oregon refers is found on page 61, under title V, headed "Slum clearance and urban redevelopment." The only thing to be taken from the bill if the motion prevails is the provision covering public housing, as opposed to slum clearance and urban redevelopment. The other sections are not touched at all.

Mr. CORDON. Is not the purpose of title VI to provide low-cost housing for those who now are forced to live in slums which will be cleared under title V?

Mr. CAIN. That is quite correct; and the slums must be cleared before there can be constructed in those areas houses in which people of extremely low incomes may live.

Mr. CORDON. Then my first question would appear to be pertinent. What is the Senator's view with reference to it? Let me rephrase the question. Under the terms of the bill as the Senator understands it, is there any requirement that the Government shall proceed with public housing in any case in which private enterprise is willing to proceed?

Mr. CAIN. No. The reverse is the case. As a matter of fact, the local community must establish the fact that private enterprise in that locality is not qualified and ready to do the job.

Mr. CORDON. Then I get down to the meat of the question. I am not one of those who can measure the necessity for relieving human misery in terms of dollars. I realize that we must have dollars to do it, but I think we must first determine what must be done and then decide what is the best way to do it. I am assuming now that conditions in the slum areas—and they are slum areas because they are congested with people who have none of the ordinary conveniences of living and no opportunity to do more than merely exist—are such that there is a necessity that something be done.

Mr. CAIN. In my considered opinion there most certainly is.

Mr. CORDON. Then, what can we do in lieu of what is proposed in this bill? If there is something that can be done by private enterprise and if there is any assurance about it, then I am opposed to title VI, I say to the Senator from Washington. But unless we can have that assurance, I shall be compelled to support that title.

Mr. CAIN. All of us are trying as best we can to provide an answer for that very natural inquiry. First, we know that slums exist in the United States. Second, we should like to rid the United States of those slums. Third, we must figure out the best way to do so. The United States is faced with many obligations, and in some instances perhaps we must discharge many of them at the same time.

But with respect to this proposed legislation, we are faced with a housing shortage. People all over the country say, "We want housing." We realize that by using money and men and materials we can have just so much housing at any one time.

One of the reasons why I hope to divorce this section or title from the remainder of the bill is that I hope that at this time nothing will be done to jeopardize meeting the primary emergency, namely, that of taking care of the housing shortage in the United States. If we wish to continue to build public housing units within a period of 2, 3, or 4 years, most experts say that we could build them during such a period only by preventing the construction by private builders of a corresponding number of houses.

In the second place, a number of us do not wish to be a party—and we say this very sincerely and very seriously—to misleading, even though unintentionally, the American people any more than we have to. What is this bill, Mr. President? It is called by some the T-E-W bill. It has been a matter of controversy all over the country for a long time. It would do two things. Most people think it will do either one thing or the other, but very few persons know that its intent and purpose is to do two things. One is to cure or alleviate the housing shortage in the United States, and the other is fundamentally and essentially an attempt to solve a welfare and social problem, namely, to provide houses for persons of low incomes.

As to the latter purpose, perhaps we should start on such a program; everyone is in agreement that there is a need which must be satisfied. But, Mr. President, once we start on a large-scale program of providing for the housing needs of persons of certain salary and income standards in the United States, where are we going to wind up? There has been a serious attempt to define the limits and to obtain an answer to that question on the floor of the Senate, but it simply has not been securable by anyone. Therefore, in the midst of misunderstandings and confusion, in this particular instance I wish to make clear to the Senator from Oregon that, so far as I know, there is no need for speed, particularly when speed might jeopardize the attainment of the other fine purpose of this bill, and that we can safely

divorce one from the other, and then have the Senate and the House of Representatives determine the issue of public housing per se, by itself.

Those are primarily the reasons, from my point of view, which I think are logical and important, as to why we should separate the two functions.

For example, not very long ago the Congress spent many hours and made real progress on the subject of national aid for education. On that subject no other divergent ideas were being presented. We said we had to grapple with it, and we knew, or thought we knew when we got through, where America was going in terms of Federal aid to education. Soon we shall be faced with exactly the same situation in terms of health. But why should not we do the same thing in respect to housing? Education and medicine and housing are social problems.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, is it the view of the Senator from Washington, then, that he opposes the inclusion of title VI on the ground that the problem sought to be met by it should be separated from the general housing problem and should be treated as a separate question? In other words, is the point simply one of procedure?

Mr. CAIN. From my point of view, it should be treated not only as a separate question, but as a social or welfare question, as opposed to a housing question. This country is in the midst of making up its mind as to what it wishes to do in terms of housing for persons of low incomes. That is not a housing problem. It is based on the number of dollars and the general surroundings and circumstances within which people of a certain stratum of life in our society live.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit me to ask a question?

Mr. CAIN. Yes; provided the Senator from Oregon does not wish to pursue his question any further.

Mr. CORDON. I may ask the indulgence of the Senator later.

Mr. KEM. This question is pertinent to something the Senator from Orgeon said. He spoke of the problems created by the large numbers of persons who live in congested areas in cities, and who do not have what he referred to, as I recall, as the conveniences of life.

In the State from which I come, we have congested areas in at least two cities, I am sorry to say; but we have thousands of persons who live elsewhere in our State and who do not have the conveniences of life to which the Senator has referred. Is it fair or proper for the Congress of the United States, representing all the people, to take the money collected from all the people and use it exclusively for the benefit of people who live in congested areas in cities, without the conveniences of life, and at the same time forget entirely the thousands of people who live in other areas and who are without exactly and identically the same conveniences?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, to permit me to answer the question?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. CORDON. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Missouri that in years long gone I have known personally what it means to live without what we now term the conveniences of life. I think I am fully familiar with that situation, and I think I have had a rather long experience in that field.

I submit that it is one thing to live on a primitive level in a place where at least God has given one space, and it is quite another thing to attempt to exist in a congestion that leaves to a family one or two rooms, with nothing more than floors, walls, and ceilings, and with room after room and floor after floor and block after block shoved together until the congestion becomes intolerable as a place for human beings to attempt the business of living and raising children. There is a difference.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, to permit me to ask a further question?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon whether in his opinion the difference creates a distinction which the Senate and the House of Representatives should observe in connection with appropriating the public money.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, if I may answer the question, I would say it does. There is a difference in degree and a difference in result that is manifest if one gives the matter even cursory consideration.

Mr. CAIN. I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon that I share his feelings in this connection. I do not take it that I am arguing about the merits. I would argue strenuously about the degree of help which such persons need and about how many of them there are and about what it will cost, not in terms of dollars, but in terms of balancing dollars which are used over a period of time for one purpose, as against another, so that simply in the realm of pure finance we would know what we were undertaking.

Let me urge again for the consideration of Senators that, at least from my point of view, it seems to me that by divorcing this section from the remainder of the bill, the result will be a better bill; and I further believe that during the ensuing time lag, no time in terms of units of public housing will be lost at all.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question and an observation?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. CORDON. I am intensely interested in determining how I should vote on this question, and at this moment I am still undecided.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield, to permit me to ask another question?

Mr. CAIN. I ask the Senator first to permit me to respond to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. The question is this: If we assume in the first instance that there is some obligation to do something about the congested slum areas, would it not be well to make a start to the extent at least of getting rid of some of these festering-sore centers, of eliminating the structures now located there which prevent any other housing construction thereon that might be habitable, and at least have some places within the urban areas where people may plan an orderly program, even though at a later time we may find it necessary to prohibit the further expenditure of Federal funds? Would it not be better for us to do something along that line now than simply, through major surgery, to attempt to eliminate entirely the public-housing provision and attempt to prevent the Government from going into this heavy expenditure? It probably will be a heavy expenditure.

Mr. CAIN. On the day of the passage of the bill——

Mr. CORDON. If I may conclude, would it not at least be better to start to do something, and then take our time? We would have a year, or perhaps 2 or 3 years, within which to determine whether we want to go beyond the simple clearing of the land and giving private enterprise an opportunity of functioning.

Mr. CAIN. It all depends upon the way we look at it. This bill, as I understand beyond the confines of title VI, does a great deal and will begin to do a great deal practically upon its enactment to accommodate the Senator's wishes.

I think that every Senator who is satisfied with the wording of title VI and is satisfied with the 500,000 houses in question, who does not care to concern himself with the lack of administrative cautions, when we ought to be cautious, on the basis of our experience with public housing in the past; every Senator who is not concerned with thinking about where the 500,000-unit program leads us; and any and every one who shares the Senator's conviction, as I do, that there are persons in our country needing assistance, should very freely and gladly and enthusiastically vote for the measure as it is presented before them. But those of us who are curious and who think they have a slight understanding of what great decisions mean in terms of the future, in the fields of health and education, and medicine, and all the rest, cannot support a concept which has not been fully considered from our point of view.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. If the Senator will excuse me for interrupting him, I should like to ask this question: Suppose public housing were provided in the congested area of the principal city of the Senator's State; suppose that were done on the theory that the situation from a social point of view was more acute than in any other city within his State; is there anything in the Senator's experience in public or private life leading him to believe that after the people living in that congested area were furnished modern up-to-date housing at public expense, the people of the second largest city in the Senator's State will not be at his doorstep with a similar request, and so on until all the cities of the State are taken care of? Furthermore, is there anything in the

Senator's public and private experience leading him to believe that people outside the cities will not be importuning the Congress for housing at public expense?

Mr. CAIN. A very interesting question, which has not been discussed on this floor, is precisely the one raised by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. THYE and Mr. ELLENDER addressed the Chair.

Mr. CAIN. If I may be permitted to conclude my reply to the Senator, I think, on the basis of my experience, that much of what he says is true. I think there is a need. We must satisfy a need. I am not clear about the size of the problem, but we ought to know in reaching a decision on what we shall do, that we are not going to place a house on one corner, in which a man possessed of so many dollars a year of income may live, while directly across the street from him, or next door, lives a man, making $7.50 a month more, who will raise the question or have it raised for him by those who represent him before future Members of Congress, "Since my cost of living has gone up, why can I not have what the Government has so freely given to somebody else?" But despite that, I think in that sense, in support of the position of the Senator from Oregon, we must reconcile the problems which will arise while we are satisfying the demands in the terms of what they actually turn out to be in the future, and not in the terms of a 5-year period, because once we go, we shall never come back.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. KEM. My question to the Senator is this: When he has once started the people of his State on his heady draught of housing at public expense, where are they going to stop? Where is he going to cut them off? What voters is he going to take care of, and what voters is he going to decline to recognize?

Mr. CAIN. I think I can give the Senator a fairly good answer. My answer is, I do not know where we are going beyond the 500,000 units included in a 5-year program, but I know we are going somewhere. In this debate many have gone 5 years and stopped, as though that were the end. That is another fundamental reason why I think it is imperatively important that we project our thinking not 5 years, but 10, 15, or 25 years ahead, for the reason that once the decision has been made the Congress ought to be in a position to utilize every medium of expression known to man, to inform the people of the country what public housing really means. If we do it too rapidly or too hurriedly or too carelessly, we shall have demands on us out of all proportion to what they ought to be.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I have listened to the debate on the question of public housing, slum clearance, and slum eradication, and at first I was of the opinion that I justly and conscientiously should be able to support the motion of the junior Senator from Washington. However, as the question has been debated and studied, I have tried to visualize slum areas in cities with which I am definitely acquainted, and it seems to me if we are going to be able to bring about slum eradication, there must be public housing going hand in hand with it.

Taking a slum area with which I am familiar, if by removing one or two blocks of that blighted area, or erasing it entirely and making of it a very nice public-housing unit, it would have the immediate effect of clearing and improving all the adjacent property, it would naturally follow that the investor, with his investment in those houses, would immediately find it profitable to improve the property, either because of improvements in the heart of the blighted area, or the public-housing unit which had been built therein. For that reason I shall support, and have always supported, public-housing projects which would erase a blighted area, because no investor will go into a blighted area and improve a property for the bare sake of improving it, knowing that all of the adjacent territory is nothing but a blighted or slum area.

So, as I listen to the debate, I want to say to the junior Senator from Washington that I cannot support his amendment for the reason that it would stymie slum clearance through the mere fact of tearing down homes without providing a place for the families who would be compelled to vacate the premises, except in either public housing or, in the event that houses should not be built, property as to which their means would not permit them to compete with tenants already occupying rented quarters. I say to the Senator that it seems to me the two propositions go hand in hand. We should have slum clearance because children who are compelled to live in slums or blighted areas are subjected to all the influences that breed juvenile delinquency. It is much better, in my opinion, that we spend money in improving living quarters and community conditions than to spend money in prosecutions of children and having them cared for in reformatories, training schools, or even penal institutions.

It is my conviction that blighted areas bring human problems which cost the taxpayers money, whether they are State or Federal problems. So we had better remove that which brings about all the heartaches which juvenile problems cause, rather than to spend time bickering over the question of whether we shall vote on the measure a week or 2 weeks or 2 months from today. It seems to me that it could all be embodied in one bill. We cannot have slum eradication and clearance without some sort of public-housing policy along with it.

I am sorry that I find myself changing my mind in the course of the debate.

Mr. CAIN. I have no quarrel with the Senator's position. I merely think he is wrong. I think the attainment of the objectives he has in mind will undeniably be reached by divorcing the public-housing section from the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have been trying to obtain the attention of my distinguished colleague from Washington for some time. He gave as one of his chief reasons for desiring to delete title VI from the bill that the subject of public housing needs further study.

Mr. CAIN. Among other reasons.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is one of the chief reasons, as I have just indicated. The Senator is aware of the fact that at least 6 reports from committees of the Congress have favorably recommended public housing. The House Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning; the Senate Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning; the Senate Banking and Currency Committee when the W-E-T bill was submitted to the Congress in 1946 and was passed by the Senate without a dissenting vote. It contained, in effect, practically the same provisions as are now included in the pending measure. Then the Senate Banking and Currency Committee reported the original Senate bill 866, known as the T-E-W bill, in March 1947. Then the Joint Committee on Housing reported favorably on the subject in 1948 and, again, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee reported the amendments which we are now considering.

Is it not a fact that the distinguished Senator was a member of the Joint Committee on Housing which made the study and which spent, I am informed, $100,000 in trying to discover the extent to which Congress should go towards alleviating housing shortages?

Mr. CAIN. Without knowing how much money the committee has thus far spent, the answer to the remainder of the Senator's inquiry is that I am a member of that committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Paragraph 14 of the Conclusions and Recommendations of the Final Report of the Joint Committee on Housing has this to say on the subject of Public Housing:

> Provision should be made for assistance to local communities under the United States Housing Act of 1937 for the provision over a period of the next 5 years of a maximum of 500,000 units of low-rent public housing for families of low income, with (1) additional safeguards written into the act to increase local responsibility, make sure that tenancy is restricted to low-income families, and avoid any competition with private housing; (2) preference to the families of veterans and servicemen for a period of 5 years; (3) revision of the applicable cost limitations, which have not been revised since the original act of 1937, so as to bring them in line with current housing costs; (4) shortening the period for the payment of annual contributions from 60 years to 40 years; (5) an increase of the rate of maximum Federal contribution by 1 percent per annum of development cost, which increase will be more than compensated for by the shortened period over which Federal contributions can be paid; (6) provision that, in the event of a major default by a local authority in its contractual obligations, the Public Housing Authority may take over a low-rent housing project until such default is cured, and may continue to pay annual contributions not in excess of the original amount contracted for; and (7) revision of the present $800,000,000 borrowing authorization of PHA to make it clear that amounts repaid are available for reloaning.

Is the Senator acquainted with the fact that the original bill which was reported in March of last year was not taken up soon after it was presented to the Senate, but that debate on it was deferred for the purpose of obtaining the views and recommendations of the Joint Committee of which the Senator was a member?

Mr. CAIN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The plan was then devised to permit the Committee on Banking and Currency to reinvestigate, as it were, the provisions of Senate bill 866 and try to make them conform as far as possible, with the recommendations of the joint committee. Is the Senator not acquainted with the fact that the public housing provision under title VI has been revised to comply with the recommendation of the joint committee?

Mr. CAIN. I am not only familiar with what my very good friend has said, but also with more things. I had forgotten that the bill to which the Senator referred, which was reported by the Banking and Currency Committee 2 years ago, was not debated after it had been seriously considered within the committee for a period running back several years, and that apparently, as the Senator has stated, debate was deferred subject to an investigation made by the joint housing committee of the Congress. I am further mindful of the fact that the 1947 bill to which the Senator has referred was reported by the committee, if I am not mistaken, by a vote of 7 to 6. It was not a unanimous report. The bill which is now before the Senate, if I am not mistaken, came out of the Banking and Currency Committee after the matter had been before the Congress and the people for 3 or 4 years. It was likewise reported by a vote not of 13 to 0 or 12 to 1 or 11 to 2, but by a vote of 7 to 6. I happened to be one of the 6 on both occasions. I do not construe my vote in opposition to supporting the bill to be a vote in opposition, substantially, to public housing as such. I think it is perfectly fair to say that I am sure Senators would like to participate in further debate on the subject of public housing.

Mr. ELLENDER. How did the Senator vote on the report made by the Joint Committee on Housing?

Mr. CAIN. If I am not mistaken, I did not sign in support of the report. I was in support of much of it, but I did not feel it advisable or wise to sign it.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. Gladly.

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the National Catholic Welfare Association has just issued a statement, and inasmuch as it contains some matters which are very pertinent to the discussion now proceeding, I should like to read from it. It is as follows:

The social action department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference urges the speedy enactment of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill (S. 866) as a partial solution to the national housing problem. This bill, which has been carefully worked out after exhaustive study and extended public hearings and which enjoys an unusual measure of bipartisan support, represents the very minimum which the public has a right to expect from the Federal legislature in the face of a national crisis which is playing havoc with the stability of family life in the United States.

The sponsors of the bill assume, and rightly so, that private enterprise has the primary function in providing decent housing for all of our citizens. But the sponsors are realists. They recognize that private enterprise, alone and unaided, is not and will not in the immediate future be in a position to solve the entire housing problem and that the Government therefore will serve the interests of social justice if it takes up the slack by supplementing the efforts of private builders.

The philosophy underlying the bill, then, is a wholesome philosophy and one which is in perfect harmony with American tradition—a tradition which calls upon the Government to intervene in economic and social life only to the extent that the Nation is faced with problems which individuals and private associations are unable to cope with successfully on their own initiative. The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is designed not to bypass or to undermine private enterprise, but rather, on the contrary, to protect it against the consequences of its own temporary inability to solve all of the complicated problems of the housing industry.

Particularly worthy of praise is the provision in the bill which would authorize the continuation of the present Federal low-cost housing program for low-income groups in the United States. This is not socialism, but rather the carrying out of a responsibility which the Government cannot in good conscience neglect or disregard. The bill also provides for the liberalizing of the loan provisions of existing Federal legislation in regard to housing for middle-income groups. It makes specific provision for cooperative housing, which again represents a wholesome trend in keeping with the finest of American traditions. It provides also for loans and grants to municipalities for slum clearance and city planning.

The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is not a panacea. If enacted, it will not automatically solve the entire housing problem. But it will at least authorize the Federal Government, in a spirit of wholesome cooperation with private enterprise and with local or municipal housing authorities, to hasten us toward a partial solution to the problem, and it will thereby serve to strengthen the American family, which is the basis and the fount of successful social living in a democracy.

We respectfully urge that the bill be enacted as speedily as possible.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Montana would give me his impression as to how many units of slum housing there are in America.

Mr. MURRAY. I could not give the Senator any definite figures, but I assume that the number is very great. Practically every city in the country has its problems of that character.

Mr. CAIN. My reason for asking the question is that we are here concerning ourselves with a provision that contemplates 500,000 units to be built over a period of 5 years, the ultimate cost to be $3,000,000,000. If that were all there was to it, probably everyone could come to terms in a hurry. But what is the ultimate load? I think that is a proper interrogation. We should be much better informed than we are at present. In the Senator's absence yesterday figures were cited running all the way from 2,000,00 units to 10,000,000 units, and everyone was willing to agree that they were only guesses, and not based on fact.

Mr. MURRAY. I assume the Senator is much better informed on that phase than am I, but I know that the program that is envisaged by the bill will make a tremendous contribution and will afford an opportunity at least to make a start on a program which is so desirable for the country.

Mr. CAIN. We quarrel mostly, then, because the Senator thinks it should be undertaken at this time within the confines of the pending bill, and I have done what I could to support a contrary point of view.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was just handed a statement which was prepared by the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency which attempts to answer the question which has been bothering the Senator from Washington, as to how many units of public housing we may be asked to provide for in the future. With the Senator's permission, I should like to read it.

Mr. CAIN. Please do. I think all Senators would like to hear it.

Mr. ELLENDER. This was intended to be read by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] but in his absence at the moment I shall read it. It is as follows:

There was a considerable amount of discussion on the floor yesterday. The statement was made that as many as 10,000,000 families might eventually need public housing.

Other estimates given were 6,000,000 and 2,000,000. The 10,000,000 figure is an entirely unsupported statement made in the form of a question and bearing no relation to any known statistical or economic fact. While it is impossible to give a precise estimate of the number of families who might eventually need public housing, it is quite feasible to estimate the range of possible need.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I cannot let that statement go unchallenged. We are getting a statement from the Administrator on housing. He says that the statement of a number up to 10,000,000 houses is not supported by the facts. What facts do we have?

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall give them to the Senator if he will be patient. The statement continues:

The Bureau of the Census currently estimates that there are 5,200,000 substandard urban housing units in the country. Obviously the need for public housing could not exceed this amount, since if all of these units were replaced there would be no families badly housed. However, a substantial proportion of these units are occupied by families who have sufficient income to provide themselves with standard housing if the construction of new houses is maintained at a sufficiently high level to overcome the current acute shortage and establish a more normal competitive market for housing.

The figures on family income also serve to indicate the outer limits of the need for public assistance to housing. According to the Census some 5,000,000 urban families of two or more persons have incomes of less than $2,000 per year.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the Senator ever before hear of this figure?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I am merely reading it——

Mr. WHERRY. Did the Senator ever hear of it before? It is a brand new figure.

Mr. ELLENDER. The figures are taken from the Bureau of the Census.

Mr. WHERRY. But did the Senator ever hear of it before?

Mr. ELLENDER. There was so much confusion on the floor of the Senate yesterday, Senators saying that there were 10,000,000 units, others saying 6,000,000, and others 2,000,000, that we are trying to clear up the position as far as possible.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is possibly as well informed on housing as any other Member of the Senate. He is one of the sponsors of the bill, and has done a great deal of work on it. I pay tribute to his ability, and especially his knowledge of housing. But we had a figure furnished us yesterday of two million, we had one of six million, we had one of ten million. Now there comes up a figure of five million, furnished by the Administrator of Housing, and I merely ask the Senator if he has ever heard of that figure before.

Mr. ELLENDER. No.

Mr. WHERRY. That is conclusive that there is confusion about the matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. As to this particular figure, no; but, as I have just stated, the figures are taken from the Bureau of the Census.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not deny that.

Mr. ELLENDER. And I am taking the time of the Senate today to resolve the confusion.

Mr. CAIN. Will the Senator permit me to ask a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. CAIN. I do not like to abuse the Senator's time on the floor, but I think the question of the Senator from Nebraska is a very significant and pregnant one. Yesterday we were actually reading out of the record, from which we got the figures of six million and ten million, and after months, apparently, of research and inquiry on this subject, on the very final day of the debate, the Administrator of Housing comes up with a figure we have never heard of before.

Mr. ELLENDER. I continue to read:

Many of these families live in areas in which construction costs are low enough to permit the purchase or rental of a home at such income level. On the other hand, there may be some families of larger size in high-cost areas for whom such an income is not sufficient to obtain decent housing.

The proportion of these families who may eventually need public housing is obviously dependent upon the costs and prices of housing produced by private enterprise. If private enterprise can produce an adequate volume of houses in the $4,000 price bracket in all parts of the country, we could cut this maximum estimate by nearly three million. One of the purposes of this bill is to provide aid to private efforts to achieve lower housing costs and prices, thereby reducing the number of families requiring other forms of aid.

The only recent effort by responsible economists to estimate the number of families who might require some form of assistance to obtain decent housing was made by the Twentieth Century Fund in its well known study "America's Needs and Resources" (pages 166–169). The Twentieth Century Fund estimated that over a 15-year period there might be a maximum of 3,600,000 families whose housing needs could not be met by private enterprise. This estimate is based upon the assumption that all substandard houses and slums are completely replaced during that 15-year period, and upon the assumption that we maintain a high level of prosperity during that period. Furthermore and most important, this estimate does not assume any cost reductions by private enterprise.

If we assume that the aids provided by this bill will make it possible for private enterprise to progressively reduce costs and prices, this maximum potential need of 3,600,000 could be substantially reduced. Furthermore, it does not appear to be probable that we will in fact clear all slums in a 15-year period, and this fact would defer much of the 3,600,000 estimate, which assumes that these units will be removed and therefore would have to be replaced.

Finally, it should be reemphasized that the size of the public housing job is dependent upon the progress of the private housing industry in reducing costs and prices. The task of providing decent housing for the American people is a long one. It will take at least 15 years, probably 25 or 30 years to achieve this goal. It would be economically unsound and practically impossible to try to do the job in a shorter time. But we must make a start. The longer we defer the job the worse it gets, the larger the slum areas become, the more numerous the substandard houses. This bill contemplates that we will make such a start now. The estimates presented indicate that the magnitude of the total job under unfavorable assumptions is not 10,000,000, not 6,000,000, but something probably less than 3,000,000. The bill provides aids of credit and research which are intended to further reduce that number. It is quite possible that by the time the present program is completed, five years hence, we will have achieved cost reductions and stopped the growth of slums so that no further extension or only very small ones will be needed.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I have answered, in line with my own concept, every question which has been raised during the course of the debate. I should like to say that I think this has been a fascinating exchange of ideas on one of the most confused subjects which faces the Nation. I sincerely trust that my motion to strike title VI from the bill will prevail, because I think the needs and requirements of public housing would be the better met and satisfied by giving separate consideration to a vitally important piece of social rather than housing legislation for the future.

EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROLS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill from the Senate (S. 2195) to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended, which were, on page 2 to strike out line 5 to 8 inclusive and insert:

(a) Any housing accommodations in hotels, as defined by this act, used exclusively for transient occupancy.

On page 2, line 11, to strike out "by conversion"; on page 2, line 12, after "1948", insert "by conversion of buildings or facilities or both not heretofore used for housing accommodations"; on page 2, after line 19, to insert:

SEC. 3. The prohibition against actions to recover possession of any housing accommodations set forth in section 5 (b) of the act approved December 2, 1941, entitled "District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act" shall not apply unless the tenant is actually occupying such housing accommodations as a home.

On page 2, line 20, strike out "Sec. 3." and insert "Sec. 4."; and on page 3, line 11, to strike out "Sec. 4" and insert "Sec. 5."

Mr. CAIN. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BUCK, Mr. CAIN, Mr. KEM, Mr. HOLLAND, and Mr. UMSTEAD conferees on the part of the Senate.

NATIONAL HOUSING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 866) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective and to provide for the coordinated execution of such policy through a National Housing Commission, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I had not intended to impose upon the time of the Senate in connection with the consideration of the pending motion, except for the fact that during the course of the debate yesterday the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] made what from my point of view was a very interesting, if not surprising, statement. He said:

I remember that there were those who then—

Referring to some time before—

charged that—this bill—was a communistic or socialistic bill. We hear no charge of that kind made at the present time.

Mr. President, lest silence be construed as lending consent, I feel constrained to raise my voice very briefly to say that that charge is made at the present time. I shall support the motion of the Senator from Washington to delete from the bill the public housing title. I shall do so because in my opinion public housing means socialized housing.

Mr. President, we hear it frequently said that there are two ways of life, two economic systems competing in the world today. The Russian system based on the Marxian principle of the abolition of private property and the means of production, and the American system, based on private property, free enterprise, and personal initiative.

A good many countries in western Europe are trying to combine the two. Our English friends have gone particularly far in that direction, and from all accounts the results have been far from happy. At any rate, those countries are now asking us to send them commodities and goods produced under the American system of free enteprise, because they cannot produce sufficient goods to meet

their own requirements and the demands of their own people.

We are told that the natural resources of Russia are the greatest of any country in Europe and perhaps of any country of the world, and yet we are also told by travelers who come back from Russia that Russia is the poorhouse of Europe.

Mr. President, I realize, as everyone must realize, that there is a housing problem in our country. I particularly sympathize with the position of the veteran who has returned from serving his country abroad, on all the seven seas, all over the world, and when he comes back, as has been eloquently said, he finds himself a stranger in the land of his birth, or as another individual has said, he goes from fox hole to fox hole. Mr. President, that situation is something which always follows war. I have a very poignant and acute personal recollection of the situation which followed World War I.

I am against the bill because I believe that the young men and women of America, including the veterans of America, will be better off in the long run under the American system of free enterprise than under any other system the wit of man has ever been able to devise. So, Mr. President, I propose on this vote and on similar votes to oppose what I regard as an invidious scuttling or attempt to scuttle the American system which has created and maintained in our country the highest standard of living the world has ever seen.

The trouble with the experiments in socialism, as was brought out in the excellent address by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], is that there is no logical way to stop them. Our English friends have found that out. They provide facilities and accommodations and conveniences for one group at the public expense, and immediately find another group waiting to be taken care of and demanding, Mr. President, equivalent and like attention.

There is one other feature to which I want to invite the attention of Senators. It is a fact they are well advised about, and that is, that in 1933 the expenses of the Federal Government were less than $4,000,000,000 a year. Today they are nearly $40,000,000,000 a year. The question I wish to raise with all the earnestness of which I am capable is this: How can we reduce the expenses of the Federal Government; how can we reestablish a solvent America, if we are constantly to open up new fields for Federal spending?

Only a week ago the Senate passed a bill which would launch the Government into an important new field of public spending. If that bill becomes a law the Federal Government will be launched into the field of general education, in which the sky is the limit. A week or so later we have a proposal to launch the Federal Government into the field of public housing, which field is wide open. The sky is the limit. If we take care of the people in the congested areas of cities at public expense, as is being urged, for the life of me I cannot see how we can deny attention and care and equal interest with respect to people in other sections of the United States.

It has been suggested that we lay down the rule that we are to bring to the American people the conveniences of life. I suppose by that is meant sanitary plumbing. If we are to undertake to install sanitary plumbing in all the housing of the United States, we shall certainly find ourselves with a budget far greater than $40,000,000,000 a year. I do not believe that we are justified in undertaking this housing project unless we do so with the conviction that, having once given the people a draught of such benefits, we must go all the way through. I believe that our experience will be similar to that of England. Conservatives like Winston Churchill joined with Mr. Lloyd George in starting the socialistic ball rolling. Now Mr. Churchill is very much concerned about it, as are many others. I cannot help but wonder if Senators with conservative backgrounds who are joining in this present effort will not live to rue the day.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield. I always enjoy colloquy with the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon joins in that pleasure.

I believe the Senator opened his remarks with the charge that the bill under consideration was both socialistic and communistic.

Mr. KEM. I said that it was socialistic. I do not believe that I used the term "communistic."

Mr. CORDON. I am glad that the Senator now eliminates the term "communistic."

Mr. KEM. I have examined the bill carefully. I have done my best to analyze it. I can reach no other conclusion than that it represents an experiment in socialism, as we understand that term.

Mr. CORDON. At least to the thinking of the Senator from Oregon, there are several analagous operations in which the Government is now engaged. One of them comes immediately to mind. I should like to request of the Senator from Missouri his view as to whether the present program of the Federal Government in the use of sundry measures of levee construction, dam construction, and otherwise, to control the floodwaters of the mighty Mississippi River and prevent terrific flood damage to the lush lowlands of the Senator's beautiful State of Missouri is, in the Senator's mind, an experiment in socialism.

Mr. KEM. I should say not. I should say that that is an effort to cope with the forces of nature. I may say for the information of the Senator that much of the best agricultural land in my State was reclaimed from the floodwaters of the Mississippi by private enterprise, by citizens who organized districts, issued bonds, and reclaimed the land for their own benefit.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon appreciates the fact that, as the Senator has indicated, the pioneers of the Mississippi Valley did a marvelous job of reclaiming the low-land areas along the Mississippi River. Private enterprise did it. The attention of the Senator is invited to the fact that a situation finally arose with which private enterprise could not cope. I refer to the problem of saving those reclaimed lands from flood damage. The Government then stepped in to do the job, a job which private enterprise as such could not do because of the necessity of continuity of operation, and so forth.

Title VI of the bill—and the Senator from Oregon is addressing himself only to that provision—provides that before any low-rental housing may be constructed and any Federal funds used for that purpose there must be a finding that there is need for that type of housing which cannot be met by private enterprise. In view of the fact that this type of need is one which seems to the Senator from Oregon to be exactly parallel to the need of the farmers in the Senator's own State for protection against floods, the analogy is so complete that one might well place this type of legislation in the same category with flood control.

Mr. KEM. I am glad that the Senator brought up the question of flood control, because it very well illustrates the difficulty which is intrinsic in a situation of this kind. In my State of Missouri we have, as I have stated, a considerable amount of land which has been reclaimed at the expense of the owners. They have built dikes; they have maintained them throughout the years; and by the sweat of their own brows they have paid for them. Those owners do not look with any great satisfaction on the Johnny-come-latelys who are waiting in our lobbies to obtain money from the Federal Government to do exactly the same thing. The situation is very complicated and difficult. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], who is an expert in that field, is seated in the Chamber. I do not attempt to say that I know all the answers; but I do undertake to say that under the present course of the Federal Government there are rank injustices not only to the people in the valleys, but to the people in the uplands who pay the taxes to reclaim the lands in the valleys.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Does the Senator favor the existing soil-conservation program and its benefits, and parity payments to farmers?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to have the Senator bring up that question. In my native county in Missouri, which is an agricultural country, the population has shrunk 24 percent during the past 7 years. There is no question that that has been largely due to the loss in fertility of the land. Let me say to the Senator that I am much more interested in fertilizer, lime, and conservation measures in the valley of the Mississippi and the Missouri than I am in the valleys of the Ganges, the Yangtze, the Oder, and the Rhine.

Mr. TOBEY. But that does not answer the question of the Senator from New Hampshire. I ask the Senator specifically, Does he favor the Soil Conservation Act and its benefits, and parity payments to farmers?

Mr. KEM. I favor intelligent, conservative, economical efforts to restore and maintain the fertility of the soil of the United States, upon which the prosperity and happiness of all of us depends.

If the Senator from New Hampshire is directing my attention to any specific act, I say to him that I am critical of certain provisions of existing legislation. I am critical of certain provisions of proposed legislation. I shall be glad to discuss both with him in detail at some appropriate time.

Mr. TOBEY. Has the Senator from Missouri voted, as a Member of the Senate, for appropriations to finance the Soil Conservation Act and parity payments to farmers?

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to vote for what I consider proper measures for that purpose.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from Missouri has voted for measures for that purpose; has he not?

Mr. KEM. Perhaps I have. I certainly should be glad to vote for them again.

Mr. TOBEY. Proceeding a little further with the analogy, which I think is fairly on all fours, the Senator in talking with the distinguished Senator from Oregon, I believe—I may be wrong—imputed to this housing program the title or the name or the kinship of socialism; did he not?

Mr. KEM. Exactly. I consider it an experiment in socialism.

Mr. TOBEY. Very well. Now I ask the Senator another question: If it is socialism for the Government to aid and abet people to have homes of their own, through Government loans, and the provisions of the housing bill and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, does the Senator from Missouri see very much difference between that and having the Federal Government use the taxpayers' money for parity payments and for soil conservation, and the liming of land, and so forth, so far as the question of socialism is concerned? What is the distinction in the Senator's mind?

Mr. KEM. I say to the Senator from New Hampshire that I think during the years of the New Deal, following the year 1933, the Federal Government went far in many directions along the line of socialism and toward the ultimate destruction of the American way of life.

For my part, I consider that at the last election the American people indicated in no uncertain terms that they had had enough, and that they wanted to turn back and wanted to reverse the trend. So I am hopeful that in voting on the pending legislation and on all similar provisions as they come before the Congress from time to time, this body will adhere to the expressed will of the people in that regard.

Mr. TOBEY. I should like to ask one more question, and then I shall sit down.

Mr. KEM. Let me say to the Senator that I am glad to have him ask questions. He is not wearing my patience, and I hope I am not wearing his.

Mr. TOBEY. I know that many are long suffering when I am on the floor. But what difference does the Senator see in his mind, in connection with the charge of socialism, as between a Congress that votes funds for soil conservation and parity payments and bailing out banks and insurance companies when they go to the wall in time of depression, and helping people get houses by means of Government aid? What is the difference so far as socialism is concerned?

Mr. KEM. I say to the Senator that some of the things he mentions, I consider very munificent and useful governmental activities. Some of them I would much rather see done on a State and local level, rather than to have them done by the Federal Government.

Before I sit down, I shall have something to say in regard to the question of whether private enterprise has had full opportunity to cope with the problem of slum clearance. But I wish to say to the Senator that in my judgment if it is finally determined that private enterprise cannot cope with the situation, I think it will be far better to have it dealt with on a State and local basis, rather than to have it dealt with by the Federal Government.

I shall tell the Senator very succinctly one reason why I think so. Today the Federal Government has an indebtedness of approximately $258,000,000,000. The best advised Members of this body are uncertain whether we are going to be able to bear the debt service required by that tremendous obligation.

As against that, the local subdivisions of government have a debt of approximately $2,500,000,000, and they have tax resources which reduce their total outstanding indebtedness to approximately $1,000,000,000. So it seems to me that if the Senator from New Hampshire is correct, and he may be in taking the position that public intervention is necessary in order to deal with this problem, then for my part I think it should be dealt with on a State and local level.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri apply that same logic to flood control and farm benefits and soil conservation?

Mr. KEM. If the Senator from New Hampshire is referring to the valley of the Mississippi and valley of the Missouri, of course, obviously that is an interstate problem; and if it has to be dealt with by public authority, it must be dealt with by the Federal Government. That matter was thoroughly threshed out a few days ago in connection with the Fulbright bill to extend the operations of the Bureau of Reclamation into the Mississippi Valley.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I shall close, if I may, if the Senator from Missouri will bear with me for a moment further, by quoting a statement of a great radical in this country, a statement which I find echoes in my heart. I hope it does in the Senator's and I hope it does in the hearts of my Republican colleagues; and I commend it to the convention at Philadelphia, which I hope will adopt this principle as a part of its platform framework in its proceedings during the coming June:

> We aim to set up in this country a human society, not an economic system. We aim for increased production and greater efficiency, but to the end that we may have happier home life in America.

Does the Senator from Missouri agree with that?

Mr. KEM. Yes; and I also——

Mr. TOBEY. Does the Senator from Missouri know who was the great radical who said that? That was Herbert Hoover. It is good enough for me.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, let me quote this to the Senator. Disraeli once said:

> I am a radical because I want to eradicate all which is bad, and I am a conservative because I want to conserve all which is good.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri thus takes Disraeli's words from his own lips, and says, in keeping with this statement, "I am a radical because I want to eradicate all which is bad," then I welcome him to the company of the apostles of slum clearance and public housing.

Mr. KEM. Yes, Mr. President, I wish to eradicate the bad and evil influence of socialism and communism and fascism and New Dealism and all the other pernicious "isms" which are infesting our land.

Mr. President, I do not wish to try the patience of the Senate, but I should like to say here that from my point of view the answer to the question whether private enterprise can adequately deal with the problems of slum clearance is by no means clear. We have heard much said to the effect that it has not done so in the past few years. Of course it has not done so. How could private enterprise do it, when in the first place we have been shipping great quantities of building materials abroad, both to Europe and elsewhere all over the world, thus creating shortages in the United States; and, in the second place—and this is more important—we have restricted private enterprise by literally hundreds of directives which have tied the hands of builders in many ways. So it seems to me we should be patient about this matter.

Today the Senator from New Hampshire referred to the wonderful housing developments which have been erected in the metropolitan area of New York City, and he invited the Members of the Senate to accompany him on a tour of inspection of those buildings. However, he neglected to say that those were built by private enterprise, under the free-enterprise system.

So I hope the Senate and the House of Representatives will not at this time launch the Federal Government on this untried, uncertain sea of Federal housing.

Mr. SPARKMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to say for the record that

on yesterday the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] asked me this question:

Are they to clear slums and erect houses where the slums had been?

My answer was:

The act is not specific on the subject.

I ask to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks section 10 (a) of the original Housing Act of 1937.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS IN ASSISTANCE OF LOW RENTALS

SEC. 10. (a) The Authority may make annual contributions to public-housing agencies to assist in achieving and maintaining the low-rent character of their housing projects. The annual contributions for any such project shall be fixed in uniform amounts, and shall be paid in such amounts over a fixed period of years. No part of such annual contributions by the Authority shall be made available for any project unless and until the State, city, county, or other political subdivision in which such project is situated shall contribute, in the form of cash or tax remissions, general or special, or tax exemptions, at least 20 percent of the annual contributions herein provided. The Authority shall embody the provisions for such annual contributions in a contract guaranteeing their payment over such fixed period: *Provided*, That no annual contributions shall be made, and the Authority shall enter into no contract guaranteeing any annual contribution in connection with the development of any low-rent-housing or slum-clearance project involving the construction of new dwelings unless, subsequent to the initiation of the project and within a period specified by the Authority, there has been or will be elimination by demolition, condemnation, and effective closing, or the compulsory repair or improvement of unsafe or insanitary dwellings situated in the locality or metropolitan area, substantially equal in number to the number of newly constructed dwellings provided by the project; except that such elimination may, in the discretion of the Authority, be deferred in any locality or metropolitan area where the shortage of decent, safe, or sanitary housing available to families of low income is so acute as to force dangerous overcrowding of such families.

Mr. ELLENDER. It will be noted that section 10 (a) of the act specifically requires that in connection with any project assisted under that act with Federal annual contributions, there must be eliminated in the locality or metropolitan area unsafe and insanitary dwellings substantially equal in number to the number of dwellings provided by the project. This requirement is a mandatory one, and cannot be waived by the public-housing agency, although, of course, compliance can be temporarily deferred, as during the war and at the present time, when the shortage of decent, safe, or sanitary housing available to families of low income is so acute as to force dangerous overcrowding of such families. I was, therefore, in error when I answered the query of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. What confused me at the moment the question was asked, was the fact that I was aware that some local authorities had not cleared slum units equal to the number of new units erected. I overlooked the provision of the law that compliance of slum elimination could be deferred.

The only statutory exception to this requirement—which is usually referred to as the "equivalent elimination" requirement—is in connection with the so-called Public 671 projects. These are the projects built with low-rent housing funds during the war for the purpose of housing workers in essential war industries during the war period. It is to be noted that despite this statutory exception, the public-housing agency has, as a matter of policy, generally required a commitment by the community to undertake equivalent elimination as soon as possible in connection with these Public 671 projects also.

Where the low-rent housing projects are constructed on slum housing sites, the equivalent elimination requirement is, of course, complied with, in whole or in basic part, by the elimination of the substandard dwellings on the site. Where, because of prohibitive land costs, or because the slum area is not appropriate for rebuilding for residential purposes, or for other appropriate reason, the project is built on a vacant site, the equivalent elimination requirement is complied with by the elimination of unsafe or insanitary dwellings on sites other than the project site. In such cases, the public-housing agency requires, as a condition precedent to any contract for annual contributions, that the city enter into a cooperation agreement with the local housing authority in which the city undertakes to exercise its police powers to eliminate unsafe or insanitary dwellings in the community substantially equal in number to the number of dwellings to be provided by the project. Thus, whether the project is constructed on a slum dwelling site, or on a vacant site, there is eliminated, in connection with every low-rent housing project assisted under the United States Housing Act, slum dwellings substantially equal in number to the number of dwellings provided by the project.

Because of the housing shortage during the war, which has become even more acute since the end of the war, there has naturally had to be some temporary deferment of compliance with the equivalent elimination requirement. But even so, the record of compliance to date has been an excellent one. In connection with the 117,000 low-rent housing units already constructed under the United States Housing Act, more than 106,000 unsafe or insanitary dwellings have already been eliminated. This comes to about 91 percent of the total required in connection with such projects. In addition, over 17,000 substandard dwelling units have been eliminated in connection with Public 671 projects, where the requirement was purely one of policy rather than one of Federal statute. In New Orleans, where 4,881 units have been constructed, there have been 4,013 equivalent eliminations, or about 80 percent.

While on the subject of elimination of slum dwellings, it is to be noted that the slum clearance and urban redevelopment program provided in title V of S. 866 points up very effectively the urgent need for an extension of the public low-rent housing program as provided in title VI of S. 866. One of the basic problems created in connection with any attempts or proposals to clear slums in the past is that the new dwellings put up or proposed to be put up on the slum sites after their clearance are necessarily beyond the means of the many low-rent families that had been living on the sites. It is true that these families may have been living in substandard housing, but at least they had some housing. As a matter of decent consideration, therefore, for the low-income families living in our slum areas, if we are to undertake a program of slum clearance and urban redevelopment—and we certainly should—we must make adequate provision for the low-income families who are living in such areas, and the simple, irrefutable facts are that this can be done only under the United States Housing Act program.

Mr. President, in connection with the consideration of S. 1592 in the Seventy-ninth Congress—the predecessor bill of S. 866, which was passed by the Senate by voice vote—I pointed out that there was never any doubt in the minds of the Senator from Ohio, the Senator from New York, or myself, or, for that matter, of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, that we could be saved a great deal of trouble and difficulty, and that we could considerably smooth the way for passage of a general housing bill if we would have eliminated the provision to meet the needs of our lowest-income families. But we could just not see—and we still cannot see—how, in all fairness, and how, as a matter of simple justice, we could recommend a program that would extend aid to all groups of our citizenry except the very one that needs aid the most. Nor could we see how we possibly could, as a matter of elemental honesty, recommend reliance on alternative aids recommended by opponents of public housing that could prove to be only a delusion and a mockery.

Likewise, we could not see how a modest provision for low-rent housing in a comprehensive housing bill could possibly be considered as inconsistent with private enterprise where, of the contemplated program of one and one-half million dwelling units a year, only 100,000 a year are to be provided over the next 5 years under the public-housing program, thus leaving over 92 percent of the grand total to be provided by private enterprise. In addition, by express provision in S. 866 the public-housing program is not only limited to the area which private enterprise cannot and does not serve, but there must be a gap of 20 percent left between the lowest income levels being served by private enterprise and the income levels being served by public housing. Moreover, the annual amount of housing which the bill contemplates that private enterprise should be encouraged to construct is about four times as much housing per year as private enterprise built on the average in the last 10 years before the war.

I sincerely hope that Senators will vote down the amendment to strike from the bill title VI which deals with public housing. The bill as a whole is well rounded and will go far toward providing decent homes for all segments of our society.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I want to do everything I can to bring this matter to an early vote. For that reason I am going to talk but a very few moments. I wish I had time to talk at length regarding the motion, because I think it strikes at the very heart of an adequate housing program. I want to make my position clear as being strongly in opposition to the motion that has been made by the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] to strike out title VI of the pending bill.

Mr. President, I have followed the arguments against this program all the way through. I am a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which has considered the legislation. I was also a member of the Joint Committee on Housing that studied the housing conditions in all parts of the country. Title VI, as carried in the bill, is in keeping with the recommendation of the Banking and Currency Committee and also the recommendation of the Joint Committee on Housing, which was made on the basis of exhaustive studies throughout the country.

I notice the argument has been made and is being made that there are only 500,000 units to be constructed within a period of 5 years, and that that is simply a scratching of the surface. Of course, that is true. It is realized that it does not eliminate slum housing, and it does not take care of all of those in the low-income group who must have help if they are to have decent places in which to live. But, Mr. President, my memory goes back to the time in 1937 when we passed the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. I was a Member of the House of Representatives at that time, and exactly the same argument was presented against that measure. I remember it was said that the amount of money we were providing would take care of an average of only one farm tenant purchase in each of the 3,000 counties of the United States. The argument was made that for this reason we ought to go into the program. However, we went into it, and I have noticed this: In the congressional district I represented for 10 years, there was in 1937 an average farm tenancy of 65 percent. Today that has dropped to about 40 percent. I do not mean that the Farm Tenant Purchase Act has been the sole cause, but it set in motion a program that has had that result. We may expect the same to be true if we make even a modest beginning on a housing program of this kind.

I believe the country wants and expects from Congress an adequate housing program. Practically all groups favor the regular FHA. Most of them are in favor of 90 percent insurance of loans for veterans' housing. Most of them are in favor of practically every feature of the pending bill, with the exception of this one feature of housing for families with low incomes.

We are making provision in the bill for those who can buy or build their own homes, and for those who can pay a proper rental. But, with respect to the one-third, or whatever the fraction may be, of our population that simply cannot provide enough rental for decent living accommodations, the only place we are taking care of them is in title VI which the pending motion would strike out of the bill. If that is done, it simply means that one great segment of our population will be given no relief whatever in regard to housing.

I do not believe we can have an adequate housing program without this provision. I wish I had time to review briefly the manner in which public-housing projects are set up. They are not imposed from Washington. One of them may not be set up unless authorized by the State legislature. Even then, it may not be established unless the city sets up a local board for such housing. The program is administered by local people. I wish Senators would think back to the local communities in their own cities, of the people who make up those boards. I wish I had time to review the matter.

Mr. President, I regret that I do not have time to talk further about the housing plan, but I am eager to bring the matter to a vote. Therefore I shall conclude with the few words I have spoken today, simply expressing the hope and urging that the Senate may vote down the pending motion, thereby making it possible for us to have a well-rounded and adequate housing program for all the people.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to associate myself wholeheartedly with the position taken by the Senator from Alabama in favor of the pending legislation and in opposition to elimination of the only provision in it that really does anything at all for the low-income groups of the United States.

I wish also to express my appreciation to the Senator from Alabama for his devotion to duty in abandoning his personal interest in Alabama in the midst of a campaign to come here and express himself and put himself on record in favor of this legislation. I congratulate him upon his compelling speech and upon his fine devotion to public service for which he is noted not only in the committee but here in the Senate. He has done so much to promote this legislation and to make certain that its benefits go to all classes of the American people.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am certainly indebted to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] to strike out title VI, as modified, from the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] as amended.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hill	O'Daniel
Ball	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Holland	Overton
Brewster	Ives	Pepper
Bricker	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Butler	Kem	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kilgore	Smith
Cain	Knowland	Sparkman
Capehart	Langer	Stennis
Capper	Lodge	Stewart
Chavez	Lucas	Taylor
Cordon	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McCarthy	Thye
Downey	McClellan	Tobey
Dworshak	McFarland	Tydings
Eastland	McGrath	Umstead
Ecton	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ellender	McMahon	Watkins
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	White
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young
Hatch	Murray	
Hayden	Myers	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] to strike out title VI of the Taft amendment, as amended. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). On this vote I am paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. If he were present and permitted to vote, the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], who is absent on official business, is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. If present and voting the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea," and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is unavoidably detained. If

present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are detained on official committee business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who is absent on public business, is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "nay," and the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—35

Bricker	Holland	O'Daniel
Butler	Jenner	Overton
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Cain	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Capehart	McCarthy	Stennis
Dworshak	McClellan	Stewart
Eastland	McFarland	Tydings
Ecton	McKellar	Umstead
George	Martin	Wherry
Gurney	Millikin	Wiley
Hickenlooper	Moore	Wilson
Hoey	O'Conor	

NAYS—49

Aiken	Hatch	Myers
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hill	Pepper
Barkley	Ives	Russell
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Bridges	Kilgore	Smith
Brooks	Knowland	Sparkman
Capper	Langer	Taylor
Chavez	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	Lucas	Thye
Donnell	McCarran	Tobey
Downey	McGrath	Vandenberg
Ellender	McMahon	Watkins
Ferguson	Magnuson	White
Flanders	Maybank	Young
Fulbright	Morse	
Green	Murray	

NOT VOTING—12

Buck	Hawkes	Taft
Bushfield	Malone	Thomas, Utah
Connally	Reed	Wagner
Cooper	Revercomb	Williams

So Mr. CAIN's motion to strike out title VI of the Taft amendment, as amended, was rejected.

MEMORIAL EXERCISES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the terms of Senate Resolution 212, the hour has arrived for holding memorial services for deceased Senators.

INVOCATION

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor, Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following invocation:

Almighty God, with a humble spirit and a contrite heart we call upon Thy great and holy name. In the life of each of us there are times when all our feelings seem to impose silence.

Grant that in this hour of sacred memory we may enter into a blessed communion with Thy Spirit, and the spirit of all upon whom Thou hast bestowed the glorious benediction, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of Thy Lord."

Hear us for the sake of the Christ, our Saviour. Amen.

Solo, There Is No Death—O'Hara—by Robert C. Nicholson, baritone, Wesley Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., accompanied on the piano by William Watkins, organist, New York Avenue Presbyterian Church.

THERE IS NO DEATH

I tell you they have not died,
They live and breathe with you,
They walk now here at your side,
They tell you things are true.
Why dream of poppied sod
When you can feel their breath,
When flower and soul and God
Know there is no death?

I tell you they have not died,
Their hands clasp yours and mine,
They are but glorified,
They have become divine.
They live, they know, they see!
They shout with every breath:
"All is eternal life;
"There is no death!"

SCRIPTURE READING

Dr. BRASKAMP. The Scripture readings are taken from the Old and New Testaments.

Psalm 85: "I will hear what God the Lord will say, for He will speak peace unto His people and to His saints."

Psalm 90: "Lord, Thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations.

"Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God.

"So teach us to number our days, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom."

Then from the New Testament these gracious words which were spoken by our blessed Lord:

John 14: "Let not your heart be troubled; ye believe in God, believe also in me.

"In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you.

"And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto Myself, that where I am there ye may be also.

"Peace I leave with you, My peace I give unto you; not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid."

In St. Paul's great chapter on the resurrection, the fifteenth of First Corinthians, we find these words:

"Now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept.

"For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead.

"For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.

"Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, for as much as ye know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord."

PRAYER BY DR. BRASKAMP

Most merciful and gracious God, the God of our fathers and of their succeeding generations, through Thy holy word Thou hast spoken and in our hearts Thy voice is heard.

Thou art the author and disposer of human life, from whom our spirits have come and unto whom they return.

We thank Thee for Thy servants who walked and worked with us for a little while upon this earth and who now are with Thee in heavenly blessedness, having received, as the reward of their faith and their fidelity, the salvation of their souls.

We rejoice that whatever was noble and beautiful in their life, in Thy sight and in our sight, abides forever. We bless Thee for the glorious testimony that they sought to serve their generation according to Thy holy will and were numbered among those who do justly, who love mercy, and who walk humbly with the Lord. We have not said "farewell" but only "good night," hoping on some blessed morn to meet and dwell with them in hallowed union in that land whose language is music and where joys are unceasing.

Grant unto the sorrowing and the lonely the consolation of Thy grace. May they yield themselves without murmur or complaint to the dispensations of Thy providence for Thou dost give and Thou dost take away, and blessed is Thy name forevermore. Help them to lay hold of the peace and the eternal companionship of the Christ.

We pray that Thou wilt continue to bless our Nation, our President, and all who hold positions of leadership and responsibility in the affairs of government. May we be a Nation whose God is the Lord. We are not asking Thee to deal with us in any preferential manner. We are not praying that Thou wilt make our beloved country a comfortable lotus land. May we be loyal partners with all who are laboring to build the kingdom of justice and righteousness, the social order in which there shall be peace and good will among men. Enable us to carry on in faith, in faithfulness, and in the fear of the Lord as we daily meet the problems and tasks which challenge the consecration of our noblest manhood.

To Thy name we ascribe all the praise. Amen.

ROLL OF DECEASED SENATORS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chief Clerk will call the roll of the Members of the Senate who have passed to the Great Beyond.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

JAMES GRAVES SCRUGHAM, a Senator from the State of Nevada, born January 19, 1880; graduated from the University of Kentucky, receiving bachelor and master degrees in engineering; Governor of Nevada, 1923–27; editor and publisher of the Nevada State Journal, 1927–32; served as State engineer, 1919–23; United States Army 1917–18; one of the incorporators of the American Legion, 1919; commander of the Nevada Department, American Legion, 1919; and national vice commander 1920–21; elected to the Seventy-third, Seventy-fourth, Seventy-fifth, Seventy-sixth, and Seventy-seventh Congresses; elected United States Senator November 3, 1942, to fill the unexpired term of the late Senator Key Pittman ending January 3, 1947. Died June 23, 1945.

HIRAM WARREN JOHNSON, a Senator from the State of California, born September 2, 1866; educated in the public schools of Sacramento and University of California; by profession, lawyer; elected Governor of California in 1910; reelected Governor in 1914; elected United States Senator in 1916, 1922, 1928, 1934, and 1940; died August 6, 1945.

JOHN THOMAS, a Senator from the State of Idaho; born January 4, 1874; engaged in livestock business; served as chairman of the Republican State Central Committee of Idaho for 4 years; was member of the Republican National Committee two terms; was appointed to the Senate June 30, 1928, and elected November 6, 1928, to succeed Senator Frank R. Gooding, deceased, for the term ending March 3, 1933; again appointed to the Senate January 27, 1940, to succeed Senator William E. Borah, deceased, to serve until the next general election, when he was elected to fill balance of Senator Borah's unexpired term ending January 3, 1943; reelected November 3, 1942, for the term ending January 3, 1949. Died November 10, 1945.

CARTER GLASS, a Senator from the State of Virginia; born January 4, 1858, printer; reporter; editor; publisher; student of private and public schools; member, board of visitors, University of Virginia, 1898–1906; member State senate, 1899–1903; delegate, State constitutional convention, 1901; Member, House of Representatives, Fifty-seventh to Sixty-fifth Congresses; Secretary of the Treasury in President Wilson's Cabinet; declined reappointment by President Franklin D. Roosevelt; Member of the United States Senate, under appointment and election from February 2, 1920; died May 28, 1946.

JOHN HOLLIS BANKHEAD 2D, a Senator from the State of Alabama; born, July 8, 1872; lawyer; graduate, University of Alabama, 1891, and Georgetown University, 1893; major, Alabama National Guard, 1901–3; member, State house of representatives, 1904–5; trustee, University of Alabama, 1917–19 and 1931–46; elected United States Senator, 1930, 1936, and 1942; died, June 12, 1946.

CHARLES OSCAR ANDREWS, a Senator from the State of Florida; born, March 7, 1877; soldier; lawyer; judge; attended South Florida Military Institute; graduate, State normal school, 1901, and University of Florida, 1907; captain, National Guard, Spanish-American War; secretary, State senate, 1905–7 and 1909–11; judge of the criminal court of record, Walton County, 1910–11; assistant attorney general, 1912–19; circuit judge, seventeenth judicial circuit, 1919–25; member, State house of representatives, 1927; city attorney, Orlando, 1926–29; State supreme court commissioner, 1929–32; elected United States Senator, 1936 and 1940; died, September 18, 1946.

JOSIAH WILLIAM BAILEY, a Senator from the State of North Carolina; born, September 14, 1873; editor; lawyer; attended Raleigh Academy; graduate, Wake Forest College, 1893; editor, Biblical Recorder, 1893–1907; member, State board of agriculture, 1896–1900; Presidential elector, 1908; collector of internal revenue, 1913–21; member, constitutional commission, 1915; trustee, University of North Carolina, 1930; elected United States Senator, 1930, 1936, and 1942; died, December 15, 1946.

THEODORE GILMORE BILBO, a Senator from the State of Mississippi; born, October 13, 1877; attended Peabody College at Nashville, Tenn.; Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.; and the University of Michigan, at Ann Arbor; lawyer and farmer; member of the State senate, 1908–12; served as Lieutenant Governor of Mississippi, 1912–16, and as Governor, 1916–20 and 1928–32; elected United States Senator, 1934, 1940, and 1946; died, August 21, 1947.

ADDRESS BY HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS, A SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, memorial services are traditional in America. There are many ways of conducting them. But this service is indeed unique.

We are honored to participate as representatives of the 48 States of the Union as we meet by our own resolve to pay tribute to the lives, the works, and the memory of our former associates and colleagues who have answered the roll call of eternity.

While we do this by our own motion, in a truer sense we do so under the influence of feelings in which the whole family of Americans unites with us.

While we pay our humble tribute to the revered memory of these former members, colleagues, and associates, as individuals we pay special tribute to their endeavors and their contributions to the preservation of our Republic and the advancement of human rights under our form of government.

Progress is not automatic; the world grows better because people wish that it should and because they take the right steps to make it better.

In this forum—this truly deliberative body—these men came representing their various States and constituencies to participate and play their full part in hammering out on the anvil of consultation and public debate the legislative enactments that would help steer our ship of state ever onward and forward to fulfill its destiny among the governments of the earth.

In this all important and arduous task they gave their all and at the end of their life's endeavor, standing at the top of the ladder, they handed on to us our great responsibility and stepped across the great divide.

By those who knew each of them intimately and well, no doubt an individual tribute could be paid that would live as a bit of romantic literature, but I was a junior in this honored body when most of them had passed on life's highway that stone which marked the highest point. They had climbed the heights and left petty superstitions far below, while on their foreheads fell the golden dawning of a grander day.

Coinciding with the glorious history of our beloved country is the history of the Senate of the United States. Each page of that history records the endeavor, accomplishments, and occasionally the death of an illustrious man. Each era has been both important and strenuous, but in my humble judgment no period in all our history has been more exacting and demanding of human energy than the short span of years in which these honored representatives of their respective States actually laid their lives on the altar of service to their State and Nation.

These men with their varying viewpoints, with their peculiar backgrounds of education, interests, and training, representing their particular political philosophies, made their magnificent individual contributions to the inspiration, courage, and strength of present day America.

These honored men carried into this forum their talents of determination representing the varying views that not only occasioned the birth of our beloved country, but guarantees its future existence not only as a free country for Americans, but the hope of the freedom-loving people of the entire world.

Throughout their lifetime, countless individuals were the beneficiaries of their works, and America is likewise the real beneficiary of their good deeds. On such an occasion, I labor only for words to do justice to your feelings and mine.

Words of any one individual are inadequate to fully express on an occasion of this kind the thoughts and emotions many may feel. Each of us in varying degrees learned to know and respect the individuals whose memory we honor today. With this fully in mind may it not be said that we, the members of the Senate of the United States who are assembled here today, cherish and honor the memory of our colleagues who have gone to meet their Maker.

They left us singly and in the sad succession appointed by the order of nature; but having lived, acted, and counseled with us, we honor them together today.

During their long careers of duty, forgetting the little that had divided them, and cherishing the great communion of service, they walked in honorable friendship the declining pathway of age.

No martial music, no blare of trumpets, no great parade, summoned these men either to their outstanding service or to their graves, but they were fighters just the same for the cause they represented. Each, in his own way, was a champion of the cause he believed best for his country.

We respect them for their undaunted courage, the energy and devotion with which they marched along the long rugged road of duty.

We miss them, but we know that while they no longer answer the roll call in this historic Chamber, they answer that longer roll call that contains the names of heroic men who served and died that America might be and continue to be a Government of free men devoted to liberty, to justice, and to God.

Solo, Beautiful Isle of Somewhere—Ferris—by Robert C. Nicholson, accompanied at the piano by William Watkins.

BEAUTIFUL ISLE OF SOMEWHERE

Somewhere the sun is shining,
Somewhere the songbirds dwell.
Hush then thy sad repining,
God lives and all is well.

Somewhere the day is longer,
Somewhere the task is done.
Somewhere the heart is stronger,
Somewhere the guerdon won.

Somewhere the load is lifted,
Close by an open gate.
Somewhere the clouds are rifted,
Somewhere the angels wait.

(Chorus)

Somewhere, somewhere, beautiful isle of somewhere.
Land of the true, where we live anew,
Beautiful isle of somewhere!

ADDRESS BY HON. CLYDE R. HOEY, A SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY].

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, life is real and likewise mystical. The high estate of man's creation makes him a little lower than the angels and gives him dominion over all other created and elemental things. He is the inheritor of all the past ages. From the dusty pages of antiquity the progress of man has been illuminating the processes of life

over the long centuries. Into the real life of today has been projected the mystical life of tomorrow. Immortality begins on earth. The struggle of man has been to build an enduring civilization here and to adorn it with the revealed and discovered truths of God. The search of man has been for truth, and in his quest for its attainment he has mastered much of the universe and made it subservient to his imperial will.

The majestic passages in the first chapter of Genesis describing the origin of man stamp him with the image of his Creator and crown him with honor and glory, and then the stately steppings of that graphic portrayal of his possibilities accord to him unquestioned dominion over the fowls of the air, the beasts of the field, and the fish of the sea, including all things passing through the paths of the sea. Man has marvelously attained this dominion and fulfilled this prophecy. He has gone deeper down into the sea than any fish has dared to go. He has soared higher into the air than the eagle, the king of birds, has been able to ascend—and he has gone into the stratosphere to join the celestial bodies as they float out through illimitable space.

Man speaks and his voice can be heard around the world, whereas the explosions of nature can be heard for only a few hundred miles, at best. The hurricane roars across the surface of the earth at 150 miles an hour, but man speeds along at 400 miles an hour and travels through space in a ship of his own creation at 800 to 1,000 miles an hour. Man measures the distance of the sun, moon, and stars, and counts and measures the circumference of the constellations in the sky. When Halley's comet skirts across our horizon at a terrific rate of speed, man calculates within a few seconds the time when that swift traveler will return after it has rambled through unexplored space along its charted course for 75 years.

Man has only recently split the atom and released the force and power of the universe. But the atom is not dangerous. Only man is dangerous.

But there is appointed a time for man to die. There is something majestic about death. Its very universality makes it a dreaded visitor in the homes of kings and subjects, presidents and citizens, rich and poor, white and colored, around the whole world. It levels all rank and makes a common denominator of all men. Sickness and death are not the tragedies of life; they are only the sadnesses. The age-old question propounded in the Book of Job, "If a man die, shall he live again," is affirmatively answered by the faith of man in immortality, and all nature shares that faith as it experiences a beautiful resurrection each springtime from the death of winter.

Edmund Burke said that civilization was a covenant between the dead, the living, and the unborn. What do we mean by civilization? It encompasses everything. The fields and farms, the factories and shops, the business houses and homes, the skyscrapers and humble cottages, the railroads, automobiles, and airplanes, the telephones, telegraph and radios, the churches, synagogues and cathedrals, the schools, colleges, and universities, the games, sports, and recreational centers, the graveyards, cemeteries, and mausoleums—all of these and more constitute American civilization.

Deep in the consciousness of our civilization is the stalwart figure of the early settler and pioneer who came to our shores seeking liberty and freedom, and who dared to visualize a land where a man could worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, and where none could molest or make him afraid. It also embraces the daring conception of a government where all power is lodged in the aggregate assembly of free men and women and where government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed. Our honored dead have given us this civilization, and our loved colleagues belonged to that immortal company of men and women who through the years labored intelligently and painstakingly to perfect this structure of a democracy that might endure and vouchsafe to us who live today, and to the unborn of tomorrow, the blessings of liberty and freedom and the benign influences of justice and rightousness in government and among men.

Civilization also encompasses the indescribably sacred picture of a mother bending over the bed of her offspring at eventide to hear it lisp the name of God in the simple prayer of childhood, "Now I lay me down to sleep."

The supreme sacrifice by which men die for their country and fellow men becomes a part of our civilization. In all wars, and particularly in the recent one, heroic souls have joined the immortals of earth in selfless death that liberty might endure and that peace might be possible. Only one illustration shall suffice. When one of our oil tankers was torpedoed in the Pacific and the commanding officer and his crew escaped the flaming boat, it appeared that the lifeboats were overloaded, whereupon the gallant lieutenant said, "We must leave the lifeboats for the injured," and immediately dived overboard into the surging sea, followed by 15 of his heroic men. Only 3 of them were ever seen again. They were swallowed up by the angry waves, and they had only the ocean for a sepulchre; but they left a trail of glory that time cannot efface.

At the same time a pharmacist mate administered tannic acid to the deep burns of the injured men to prevent their flesh from flecking off, and then visited another boat for the same purpose, and while swimming to a third boat became exhausted and went down, never to come up again; but there was the dew of immortality upon his brow and the radiance of heaven illuminating his watery grave.

Our illustrious colleagues in whose honor we assemble today belong in the category of those who served during those days of stress and crises, and they are among the casualties of war. They died gloriously in the service of their country. Eight of our comrades have passed away since the close of the war. They participated in the debates on the momentous issues determined in this greatest world forum of thought and action. They had a share in all of the history-making legislation enacted preceding and during the war years. They gave unstintingly of their time and efforts in behalf of our victory at arms and in furtherance of the cause of peace. We pause today to pay homage to their memories. Their colleagues who survive and still serve here will pay just tribute by the written word to them individually and thus preserve for posterity a record of their illustrious service and achievements. The youngest died in his 65th year and the oldest had passed his 88th milepost. Reasonably long life was vouchsafed to each of them ere the "silver cord was loosed or the golden bowl broken." In saluting their memory, I feel that they were able to join Byron in telling Death, that omnipotent tyrant, to his everlasting face that he possessed no sting, and in challenging the grave, his sleepless handmaiden, to dare proclaim a victory. May God rest their souls.

The high obligation of this hour remains with us who still live and serve here to preserve the heritage of our civilization for the benefit of those now living and for the unborn to follow after us. The days may be dark and the future clouded with many unhappy prospects; but if we are worthy of those who have gone before, we shall not falter in meeting the responsibilities of the times and underwriting the guaranties of liberty, freedom, and peace for the tomorrows.

These days call for high thinking, noble action, and unselfish dedication to the ideals of the Republic and to the spiritual verities which shall always be a source of strength and power in every crisis. It is well to remember that there has never been a night dark enough to put out the stars and that amid all the confusion, strife, and chaos extant in the earth, still this is my Father's world. Speaking of this atomic age, Walter Lippmann recently said, "Now the whole structure of our intellectual life must undergo a cleansing and reformation." Winston Churchill said about the same time, "Man must have a new heart." The great prophet Isaiah offered the solution more than 2,500 years ago when he wrote:

> They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength, they shall mount up with wings as eagles, they shall run and not be weary, they shall walk and not faint.

Everything is not gloom and pessimism. War is not inevitable, peace is not impossible. There is more of human sympathy than the world has known before, and divine compassion is as inexhaustible as the measure of God's love. America has opened wide her heart and delved deep into her treasure to relieve the suffering and want of the hungry and starving of the world—both friend and foe.

We have in a practical way voiced our concern for the devastated nations of earth, and we have known no race or clime. Our American ideals have found expression in the fullness of our generosity and the breadth of our sympathy at home and abroad. All faiths and creeds give expression in song and story to our conception of the universality of

the brotherhood of man and the Fatherhood of God.

It was a Catholic who wrote, Lead Kindly Light; it was a Baptist who wrote, "Amazing Grace, how sweet the sound, that saved a wretch like me"; it was a Presbyterian who wrote, "Rock of Ages, cleft for me, let me hide myself in thee"; it was Martin Luther, the founder of the Lutheran Church, who wrote, "A mighty fortress is our God, a bulwark never failing"; it was a Methodist who wrote, "Jesus, lover of my soul, let me to thy bosom fly, while the nearer waters roll, while the tempest still is high"; it was an Episcopalian, a follower of the Church of England, who wrote, "All hail the power of Jesus' name! Let angels prostrate fall; bring forth the royal diadem, and crown Him Lord of all"; it was a Jew who wrote:

The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want.
He maketh me to lie down in green pastures; he leadeth me beside the still waters.
He restoreth my soul: he leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for his name's sake.
Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil; for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff they comfort me.
Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies: thou anointest my head with oil; my cup runneth over.
Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life; and I will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever.

Thus speaking the universal language of mankind, voicing the hopes and the aspirations of the human heart.

"Our fathers' God, to thee,
Author of liberty,
To thee we sing:
Long may our land be bright
With freedom's holy light;
Protect us by Thy might,
Great God, our King."

TAPS

Sgt. Chris G. Stergiou, United States Marine Corps.

BENEDICTION

Dr. Braskamp pronounced the following benediction:

"The Lord bless you and keep you; the Lord make His face to shine upon you and be gracious unto you; the Lord lift upon you His countenance and give you peace." Amen.

ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the terms of Senate Resolution 212, as a further mark of respect to the memories of the deceased Senators, the Senate stands adjourned until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 22, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 21 (legislative day of March 29), 1948:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Russell B. Adams, of West Virginia, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1950.

IN THE NAVY

Capt. William M. Angas, CEC, United States Navy, for temporary and permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy.

Capt. Andrew G. Bisset, CEC, United States Navy, for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named permanent warrant officers, now serving in temporary commissioned ranks, to be permanent commissioned warrant officers in the Marine Corps, to rank with but after second lieutenants:

Philip J. Costello
Harry E. Detwiler
Hubert H. Dunlap
Roy L. Green
Roy E. Hagerdon
Edgar C. Hughes
John G. Johnson
John W. Mace
Clarence B. McKinstry
Edwin C. Reppenhagen
Percy W. Robbins
Charles Seiler
Reuben S. Stoner

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 21, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our blessed Father in Heaven, Thou who art the light of every heart that sees Thee and the life of every soul that loves Thee, keep us steadfast and daring in the things that we seek to do. Though pressed with thronging duties, we would never fail to honor our country with rectitude and personal integrity. We pray Thee to strengthen those who are weak and lift up the heads of those who are overburdened. Give us courage in all that is good, with aversion for all that is evil. As with clear vision and earnest purpose we stand looking into the future, make us ready for its duties and obligations, with a greater hunger for those virtues that will lift us to the highest plane of public service. For the sake of Thy dear Son our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate, having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 5052) "An act to exclude certain vendors of newspapers or magazines from certain provisions of the Social Security Act and Internal Revenue Code," returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, and passed by the House of Representatives on reconsideration of the same, it was

Resolved, That the said bill pass, two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative.

THE PALESTINE SITUATION

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday Warren Austin, our representative on the United Nations Council, said that the United States is willing to send troops to Palestine if other nations will join us. I want to call his attention, the President, and State Department to the fact that before such promises are made they should talk to the Congress of the United States. In the Seventy-ninth Congress we passed Public Law 264. It authorizes the President to make agreements with the Security Council for the purpose of furnishing armed forces to maintain peace and security, yet by that law he is specifically required to secure the approval of Congress by appropriate act or joint resolution. This is the second time, Mr. Speaker, I have called attention to this matter. I think we should keep on calling attention to it until we are sure that the representatives on the United Nations Council are aware of the law and comply with it. The use of armed forces in Palestine will lead to war, and there is no justification for it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERROW asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include certain articles.

Mr. McCOWEN (at the request of Mr. BREHM) was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WADSWORTH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post, issue of April 19, 1948, in relation to the women's status bill.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and any other special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DEVITT] may address the House today at the close of legislative business and any other special orders for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

WALTER REUTHER

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the vicious, behind-the-back

shotgun assault on the labor leader, Walter Reuther, last night was indeed shocking. Reuther has become the leader in the fight in the CIO–UAW against Communist leadership in that union. Reuther is in the vanguard of that labor fight to rid trade-unionism of communistic influence in the United States. He has been conducting a successful fight. While the police have not as yet captured the assailant nor uncovered the origin of the plot that was obviously aimed at Reuther's life, it would not be surprising, indeed, if it were disclosed to have had its origin among the Communist elements he has so vigorously opposed. This would not be inconsistent with the pattern of Communist activity throughout the world in its attempt to take over trade-unions by treachery, deceit, and even murder, if necessary. It would not be inconsistent, for example, with the high-handed retention of power by the leftist Communist group that for so many years dominated the Allis-Chalmers UAW–CIO local in my own city of Milwaukee, and which now has been broken.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

THE OIL SHORTAGE SITUATION

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, what are we going to do about the critical oil shortage in this country? It is steadily growing worse.

At the same time, Congress is being asked to increase our Air Force, and I am for that measure, designed to strengthen our defense.

But, what will happen if we run out of oil?

Yet, we now hear that under the ERP the United States are down for an export of 21,700,000 metric tons of petroleum products over the next 15 months. The cost in dollars and cents is $479,400,000. I trust the Appropriations Committee will look into the matter of financing.

Personally, I am much more worried about the effect of this export of American oil on our strategic and economic security. Why export American oil in the amount of $130,500,000 to oil-rich Britain? Why burden the bankrupt economy of the United Kingdom with dollar oil?

Or has the administration forgotten what the greatest English newspaper, the Daily Express, had to say about this American oil, under the ERP:

> Petroleum is an immense item under the plan. But all Britain's needs for motor spirit, lubricating oil, and all the other products of petroleum can be met in our own oil fields lying within the sterling area. There is no need whatever to maintain this disastrous dependence on dollar oil.

Mr. Speaker, England does not need dollar oil. In the interest of American security and for the welfare of the British people, I suggest that the Appropriations Committee immediately take steps to save this $130,500,000 worth of American oil.

We need that oil right here.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article of his which was published in the Liberty magazine entitled "Reds in Panama."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a recent radio broadcast.

Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House may sit this afternoon on the bill H. R. 6263 and related subjects, notwithstanding that the House may be in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

COMMEMORATION OF POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that 1 hour be set aside on Monday, May 3, following the conclusion of the regular business of the day, for the commemoration of Polish Constitution Day, and that the time may be equally divided between the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORSKI] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

FINANCING THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the amount of propaganda now coming to the offices of the members on the World Health Organization is just about as great as it was when we had ERP before us. I believe a lot of us have learned our lesson. I want to reply to those people in a manner that is proper and fitting.

The situation is that this country with its 140,000,000 people, is paying 49 percent of the cost of this world-wide organization where the other nations with their more than 2,000,000,000 of people are taking care of the other 51 percent. It is just out of proportion to our population and ability to pay.

I bring to your attention the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] on the World Health Organization. These are excerpts taken from an address he delivered before the Northern Tri-State Medical Association, at Findlay, Ohio, on April 13, 1948. The gentleman from Indiana makes certain statements that should be heeded by every Member of Congress and by the people of this country. Do not assume any more obligations than we can assume or any more world obligations, however worthy they may be.

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE FOREST A. HARNESS, REPUBLICAN, OF INDIANA, ON THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION, TAKEN FROM AN ADDRESS DELIVERED BY HIM BEFORE THE NORTHERN TRI-STATE MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, AT FINDLAY, OHIO, APRIL 13, 1948

There is now pending before the Congress legislation that would make the United States a member of the World Health Organization. This measure has been passed by the Senate, and approved by the House Foreign Affairs Committee. A few days ago, this bill came before the House Rules Committee, of which I am a member.

Twenty-four nations, including Russia, have indicated their willingness to join this World Health Organization. The announced purposes and objectives of the plan are entirely praiseworthy. Indeed, I am sure every right-thinking member of your profession endorses them. But experience proves that there is all the difference in the world between a theoretical ideal and its practical application, particularly at the hands of government bureaucracy. The record, as we (the Committee on Publicity and Propaganda) have disclosed it, proves that our medical bureaucracy as it is now constituted, is constantly carrying the ball for State health insurance—not merely here at home, but wherever it may exercise influence throughout the world. It is by no means impossible, therefore, that it would find a World Health Organization a very effective vehicle to promote the very program you are vigorously opposing here at home.

But there is still another consideration. This organization would cost us an initial investment of $3,000,000 for the first year. The cost undoubtedly would become bigger as time goes on. Now, $3,000,000 is not a tremendous sum as things are nowadays, but just stop and think for a moment. According to an official publication of the State Department, the United States has participated in, or is likely to be concerned in 216 international organizations, 38 of them concerned with social health problems.

The State Department's list includes such groups as the Inter-American Statistical Institute, the International Wheat Council, the Rubber Study Group, the Central Bureau of the International Map of the World on the Millionth Scale, the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees, the International Seed Testing Organization, and so on. And we foot most of the bill. Our contributions to the cost of these international organizations run as high as 70 percent, with all the other member nations splitting up the remaining 30 percent between them. Of the total cost of UNRRA, we paid out 72 percent. We have just created the European recovery program at the staggering cost, for the first year, of $6,000,000,000.

We simply must stop this trend somewhere. Certainly, we shall expect our Economic Cooperation Administration to contribute toward world health in a direct and effective way. We may properly ask, then, why we should underwrite another agency entirely independent and apart from the main program, which might obligate us to further

large expenditures, or commit us to an international policy which we will not endorse at home. Our committee deemed this a good place to stop and take stock. We feel it is time to determine how much further we can go in joining these international groups where we pay most of the cost. I do not mean to indicate this project has been finally killed, but I do feel we should give it a thorough examination before deciding definitely. It might be the meritorious features of the plan can be handled through some existing agency or group, at less cost.

JOSEPH P. KAMP

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement made by me before the Rules Committee yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to this matter which, in my opinion, deserves the serious consideration of every Member of the House.

It concerns the circumstances which prompted me to introduce House Resolution 495, which would rescind the citation for contempt of Congress against Joseph P. Kamp, vice chairman of the Constitutional Educational League. I call the attention of the Members especially to my reference to one James H. Sheldon, named by the Official Report of the Massachusetts Special Commission To Investigate the Activities of Communist, Fascist, Nazi, and Other Subversive Organizations, where on page 211 Sheldon is named as a "front" for the International Labor Defense which was branded as the "legal arm of the Communist Party" by former Attorney General Biddle. This man Sheldon misused the Anderson committee. My statement before the Rules Committee yesterday, April 20, is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, in recommending the adoption of this House Resolution 495, which I introduced, I want to make it clear that there is no question involved as to whether or not a subpena of a congressional committee should be obeyed.

There is no question as to whether Mr. Kamp was right or wrong in refusing to comply with the committee's demand for a list of contributors.

There is no question as to whether the House Committee on Campaign Expenditures of 1944 had the right to subpena the records of the Constitutional Educational League.

There is no question as to the disposition of this matter in the courts. The adoption of this resolution cannot affect the eventual outcome of the case in court one way or another.

The only question to be considered is simply one of justice and fair play.

This resolution is merely an attempt to rectify as much as possible what I believe to be an injustice which resulted from the fact that outsiders managed somehow to inject themselves into the affairs of the so-called Anderson House Committee on Campaign Expenditures, of which I was a member.

This resolution does not bring into question the integrity of the Anderson committee or any member thereof.

However, to ignore or condone the obvious skullduggery perpetrated by outsiders and their improper, if not illegal interference in the affairs of this committee, which I shall detail, would, in any opinion, tend to reflect on the integrity of the House of Representatives as a whole.

I was moved to sponsor this resolution largely because I believe it to be my duty as a Member of the House of Representatives to see to it that the powers entrusted to the Congress by the people shall not be abused at the instance of special interests of any kind or character.

This resolution is based upon the fact that false information, or at least what I believe to be false information about Mr. Kamp and his organization, was planted with the committee; that some thirty-odd paragraphs of his testimony were deleted from the printed record; that committee exhibits used during his hearings were removed from the committee's files and taken to New York by a person who had no connection with the committee and at least one of these exhibits has never been returned; and that all of these things were done without the knowledge or consent of the committee or any member thereof.

I am confident that if the members of the Anderson committee had been fully acquainted with the facts and circumstances surrounding these incidents at the time of the hearings or immediately thereafter, Mr. Kamp's testimony would have satisfied the committee. I am satisfied that no subpena would have been issued for his records. There would have been no default and no citation for contempt of Congress would have been voted.

I heard every word of Mr. Kamp's testimony and there was never any question in my mind that, either he or his organization had done anything other than to combat Communism wherever it was to be found. The fact that he had exposed Reds on the Government pay roll and Communist boring-from-within political parties did not seem to me to bring his work within the meaning of political activity which we were empowered to investigate.

Mr. Kamp's testimony satisfied me on that point and there was not one bit of evidence brought before the committee to show that he or his organization had engaged in any activity that could be construed as being political.

Some members of the committee may have been impressed, however, by the introduction of photostats of letters addressed to Mr. Kamp, which he immediately charged had been stolen from his office by an agent of what he termed "an un-American Gestapo."

One letter, on the stationery of the Republican National Committee, dated September 21, 1938—6 years before—(p. 265) stated that the writer was enthusiastic about a certain League newspaper edited by Mr. Kamp. Another letter dated July 10, 1943 (p. 261), more than a year before the hearings, stated that John J. Raskob was hugging to his bosom another of Mr. Kamp's publications. A third letter, from Channing Pollock, dated May 15, 1943 (p. 262)—a year and a half before the hearings—complimented Mr. Kamp for a swell job of writing and said he had brought it to the attention of Herbert Hoover.

Then an undated memorandum was offered in evidence (p. 263). The memorandum consisted of a list of individuals and organizations to whom copies of one of Mr. Kamp's booklets (published the previous year) should be sent.

Mr. Kamp testified: "I would like to make a comment on that. I should like to (p. 264) point out to the committee that although we make a suggestion here that this booklet be sent and that we want to send this booklet to people in twelve categories, there is no political organization of any kind included in the list. We suggest that our literature be sent to editors, special writers, veteran posts, women's organizations, fraternal organizations such as the Junior Order of United American Mechanics, Knights of Columbus, Elks; the heads of all patriotic organizations; the heads of all civic organizations, including chambers of commerce, junior chambers of commerce, boards of trade, together with luncheon clubs, Kiwanis and Rotary; the heads of local units of the A. F. of L. and independent unions; clergymen of all denominations; manufacturers, food processors, merchants, and businessmen and bank officials. Not a politician in the lot."

Significantly, however, this memorandum had written across it, the notation, "Used by Kamp solicitors for fund collection purposes as recently as 1944 (January)" (p. 266).

Mr. Kamp said: "I will comment on that. That is a lie. May I ask who put the note on there?"

Mr. SPARKMAN answered: "I will do the questioning. That note was put on for my own use."

This memorandum with what Mr. Kamp charged was a false notation and the other exhibits had been examined by the various members of the committee. It is possible that some members attached a political significance to the letters mentioning President Hoover and former Democratic Chairman John J. Raskob, plus the ancient laudatory letter from a worker at the Republican National Committee. Most certainly then, the notation "used by Kamp solicitors for fund collection purposes as recently as 1944 (January)" clearly implied their use for political purposes within the period in which the committee was authorized to investigate.

To me the purpose of the notation was only too obvious and since Mr. Sparkman was reluctant to name the person responsible for providing the information, I tried again a little later that morning to find out the source of these exhibits. I asked Mr. Murphy, a member of the committee, about a memorandum he was using. I asked him where it came from. He refused to answer.

During the Kamp hearings, Mr. ANDRESEN and I both asked about data in possession of other members of the committee and were refused information. Mr. ANDRESEN asked specifically if the committee had any evidence that Mr. Kamp or his organization had engaged in political activity.

I am certain that the committee members who refused to disclose information acted in good faith; that they felt justified in protecting their informant by keeping his name in confidence.

I am certain they did not know the real identity nor anything about the subversive background of this individual.

Had the members of the committee known then, as I know now, that this man was a Communist fronter and that he was acting for the American branch of an international propaganda organization which had been supported in part with Nazi funds, I feel certain there would have been a different outcome of the hearings in respect to the Constitutional Educational League and Mr. Kamp.

Had this information been in the hands of any member of the committee on the day the citation for contempt was being considered, I am positive the committee would not have voted to cite Mr. Kamp.

In a letter to Secretary Anderson, dated February 25, 1947 (which I now show you a signed copy of), Mr. Kamp charged that the exhibits used during his hearings had been turned over to one James H. Sheldon, of New York; that one document which he needed in connection with his trial in the District court was still in Sheldon's possession, and he requested Mr. Anderson to have the document returned to the committee's files so that it could be subpenaed.

In his reply to Kamp, Secretary Anderson disclaimed any personal dealings with Sheldon, but at the same time made admissions which convince me that Sheldon did supply these exhibits, that the missing exhibit was in his possession, and that Mr. Kamp was correct when he told us that the documents used by the committee had been stolen from his office.

I have here a photostat of Secretary Anderson's letter of March 4, 1947, and I want to read it to you.

Mr. Anderson wrote:

"DEAR MR. KAMP: I have your letter of February 25, which arrived in Washington while I was in California. I know nothing about the memo which you mention. As you know, I was not present during your first examination, and therefore was not familiar with the material presented to you. I have no authority to see that the memorandum is returned to the committee's files. I turned over to the Clerk of the House all the material which I had, including all exhibits. I was never satisfied that the office of the Clerk was being too careful of the material, but I could not be responsible for the way in which other people discharged their duties.

"Mr. Sheldon, of the so-called Anti-Nazi League, did come to Washington several times and did try to provide information for the committee. It became apparent to me that he was a person with a special interest, and I had to say to him that we could not permit him to try to run our work for us and could not have him telling us the subjects upon which we might cross-examine and question people. I know that he had an employee planted in the office of the Committee for Constitutional Government, and it was from that connection that I had an offer to have made available to me for a price all the financial records of that organization. Naturally, I did not attempt to pay that price, as we were trying to get only those things that might properly be developed by cross-examination of witnesses.

"If you are not able to get your document from the House committee I will try again to see if I can get the Clerk of the House to call upon Sheldon for it, but I do want you to realize that I have no authority in these matters when I am no longer chairman of the committee."

I have here a copy of the official report of the Massachusetts Special Commission To Investigate the Activities of Communistic, Fascist, Nazi, and other Subversive Organizations. On page 467 is a letter signed by James H. Sheldon inviting people to join with him in organizing the Boston chapter of the American League Against War and Fascism, the largest and most active of the Communist movements which was identified as a subversive Communist front by the Department of Justice.

On page 211 of this same report Sheldon is named as a front for the International Labor Defense which was branded as the legal arm of the Communist Party by former Attorney General Biddle.

I also have here two copies of the printed hearings of the Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures of 1944. By comparing them I have verified the fact that some thirty-odd paragraphs are missing from my own copy.

Mr. Kamp tells me that he has written to or talked with various members of the Anderson committee and that none of them know how these paragraphs came to be deleted or who is responsible. He further tells me that at his trial in 1946, the clerk of the Anderson committee testifying under oath said he knew nothing about these deletions.

I also have here a photostat of a letter from Secretary Anderson to Mr. Kamp, dated May 10, 1946, which reads as follows:

"I have your letter of May 2 in which you say that a part of your testimony before my committee has been deleted from the printed record of the hearings. As I was not present when you testified and didn't prepare the transcript of your testimony, I know little or nothing about the whole matter. Therefore, I am in no position to advise you as to who is responsible for the alleged deletion in the printed record."

Let me read for you just a few paragraphs of Mr. Kamp's testimony that are not in my copy of the printed hearings but which appear in the earlier copy sent to Mr. Kamp.

Mr. Kamp, after explaining that he was reluctant to give the names of contributors to the committee because they might get into the hands of the un-American gestapo and the smear bund, had this to say about Sheldon's chief investigator (p. 304): "Furthermore, one Dorothy Kahn Wurzburger Kalen, alias Dorothy Waring, alias Mary Gaffney, alias Charlotte Snowden Meade, a spy for the un-American gestapo who was 'Agent 89' on the McCormack-Dickstein staff, is the wife of a former German Army officer decorated with the Iron Cross and, more recently, a Japanese high commissioner and commercial representative for General Semenoff, whose military command in Manchukuo became part of the Japanese Army 1 week before Pearl Harbor."

Another deleted item read (p. 304): "We are not even sure that information given to this committee will not find its way into the hands of the Russian OGPU and the Japanese counterpart of the German Gestapo, since the un-American Gestapo has Communist connections and Communist Russia has a friendly compact with Japan."

Another paragraph deleted from my copy reads: "These charges are made under oath. I know that perjury is a major crime and calls for severe punishment. I repeat that every charge is true."

Another significant paragraph which is not in my copy declares: "The charges I have made should be a challenge to every Member of Congress. These charges call for a full-dress joint investigation by the House and Senate. When such an investigation is made, when the smear bund is exposed and discredited and the un-American Gestapo is rendered powerless to harass and invoke reprisals upon patriotic Americans, then, and then only, will it be judicious and desirable to make public the names of those who have cooperated in resisting their machinations to destroy our Republic."

I have checked with Mr. ANDRESEN and find that this part of Mr. Kamp's testimony is also missing from his copy.

I have not checked with the other members of the committee as to whether or not they have complete or deleted copies. That is immaterial.

I do not know whether any member read any testimony or not before voting to cite Mr. Kamp. That also is beside the point.

If this testimony was missing from the printed record of just one member of the committee and whether he had occasion to read the record or not, such testimony was nevertheless unavailable for consideration and a vote to cite for contempt under such circumstances, in my opinion, was improper, if not illegal.

I have used the words "not the legal act" advisedly in this resolution in order to emphasize the serious nature of the injustice that has been done.

As a lawyer I know what withholding evidence can mean in any court proceeding. Whether the information withheld in this case was pertinent or material is beside the point. The fact remains that information was withheld, and at least one material exhibit had been removed from the files and was not in the possession of the committee when the contempt citation was voted.

In cases where a person is convicted and it can be shown that there was abstraction or concealment of evidence, or that a witness was hidden or otherwise kept from testifying, courts quickly set aside the verdict. And a court will not go into the question as to whether or not the evidence or testimony was material to the issue.

It may be contended that the rules of law and evidence in a court of justice do not apply in a quasi-judicial proceeding, I believe they should.

However, the Anderson Committee, in this matter was, in effect, sitting as a jury to decide the fate of Mr. Kamp and to all intents and purposes (with only part of the evidence and part of the facts before it) found this man guilty of having defaulted and being in contempt.

Every scrap of evidence has to be available to a jury—that is the root of a fair trial. It should be no less so with us.

Because of the unusual and extraordinary circumstances involved in this situation, I feel that in order to be fair and just, the same rules as in a court—the same yardstick of justice—should apply especially when a man's and an organization's good names and future usefulness in public service are at stake.

Had the members of the Anderson committee known the identity and communistic background of the man who obviously gave this false information to the committee; had they known of the Red revolutionary activities of the man who stole the letters and memorandum foisted on the committee; and had they known the subversive and even criminal nature of the organization with which these men were connected and into whose possession these committee exhibits were about to be entrusted and that one of them would never be returned, I am certain that there would have been no occasion for any controversy between the committee and Mr. Kamp and, most certainly, there would have been no citation for contempt.

I want to say again, as I said in my opening remarks, passage of this resolution cannot affect the court action in this matter since a verdict has already been rendered in District Court of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Kamp has been found guilty and has been sentenced.

Of course, Mr. Kamp feels that if he had been able to show that outsiders, and particularly a Communist fronter planted false information with the committee, he would have been acquitted.

He was prevented from presenting such evidence at his first trial when the Clerk of the House was unable to comply with the subpena of the district court for the production of the document which had been removed from the committee's files and which Secretary Anderson has since tried unsuccessfully to have returned to the office of the clerk where it legally belongs. Hence, it was also unavailable to Mr. Kamp for his second trial.

Notwithstanding the guilty verdict, however, Mr. Kamp feels certain that the court of appeals will reverse the judgment in his case.

But, if he should be mistaken about his success on appeal, and if he should have to pay such a price for his fight against communism, then Mr. Kamp should go to jail with the knowledge that he has been vindicated in his charges made before the Anderson committee that subversive outsiders were using the committee for their own purposes.

He should go to jail with the satisfaction of knowing that the citation voted against him was not justified in the light of subsequent disclosures; that the record shows that the Anderson committee unwittingly allowed subversive forces to inject themselves into the affairs of the committee; and that the citation was voted at a time when the members of the committee did not have before them all the facts and evidence.

THE MAN OF THE YEAR

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday Justice T. Alan Goldsborough rendered a history-making decision. He proclaimed to the Nation and to the world that this is a "government of law and not of men"; that no man, even John L. Lewis, nor group of men, is superior and paramount to the sovereign laws of the United States. He announced and proclaimed to the world that no nation can stand by and see its laws violated and court orders disregarded without imperiling the authority by which it exists and the foundation on which it stands.

Justice Goldsborough breathed life into a "nod or a wink or a code" in which either may be used as a synonym of "strike." He applied the brakes on John L. Lewis' bid for anarchy and his defiance of the people of these United States and their Government and his disregard of the national welfare and safety of this Nation in both wartime and peacetime.

He held that this Nation's peace and security were endangered and imperiled when the court's order was ignored and willfully disregarded and that "law would have no meaning if men could evade its provisions and escape its penalties by substituting defiant trickery for compliance."

John L. Lewis has met his match in Justice T. Alan Goldsborough.

When men are picked for rendering outstanding preeminent public service, the name of Justice T. Alan Goldsborough should be placed at the top.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two separate articles.

Mr. WILSON of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials, one from the Dallas Morning News and one from the Dallas Times-Herald of Dallas, Tex.

Mr. COOPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include certain statements with respect to the accomplishments of the Habana Conference on the International Trade Organization.

Mr. KELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement by Paul A. Strachan, president, American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, before an examiner of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an address given by Commissioner John A. O'Donnell and in the other an address by Ambassador Girard.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $337.25, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

THE SENDING OF UNITED STATES TROOPS TO PALESTINE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the daily papers state that the United States has offered through its representative in the United Nations to send troops to Palestine. By whose authority, Mr. Speaker, is such a commitment made? Are not the people of America, through their duly elected representatives, to be consulted before we seek an opportunity to send our boys to die in foreign lands?

I know of no more direct road to war than to send our troops into foreign lands to impose or to deny a form of government on the people without their consent. I for one will have no part in such an undertaking, and I hereby now give notice that no one should rely on any alleged promise to send American troops for this purpose.

I believe in the defense of America and resistance to aggression. I will fight to defend freedom, but I will never kick down the back door of my neighbor's house simply to force my way into a shooting scrap.

TEXAS INDEPENDENCE

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call to the attention of the Members of the House that 112 years ago today Texas won her independence from Mexico. That battle was fought on San Jacinto soil, which I have the high honor and privilege of representing.

Today in Texas, in Houston and in San Jacinto, they are celebrating and I may say that the good old feeling that has existed for so many years between Texas and Mexico still exists today. The Mexicans are a great people; they are our friends and we are theirs.

As a part of the celebration, the great protector of the seas, the battleship *Texas*, is being permanently berthed at San Jacinto, while thousands of Texans cheer. Hon. Lloyd Gregory raised the funds to give her this lasting home.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

GIVE THE JEWS OF PALESTINE HALF A CHANCE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Ambassador Austin at the United Nations, I agree, had no right to make the gratuitous suggestion of sending American troops into the Holy Land.

The Jews do not ask for American troops to go into the Holy Land. They are well able to take care of themselves if given a reasonable chance. Fully fifty or sixty thousand American-Jewish war veterans would be perfectly willing to volunteer to go into the Holy Land in order to preserve intact the Jewish state which is and will continue to be, despite the double-talk of Warren Austin and despite the back-tracking on partition by the United States Government through mistaken notions of the administration presided over by President Truman.

All they want is a fair chance and the means to defend themselves. They wish to be furnished with arms, and that our arms embargo be lifted, and that the blockade around the coast of Palestine, maintained by Great Britain, be dissipated, so that arms can go into the Holy Land into the hands of the Jewish pioneers who are perfectly willing to defend the boundaries of Palestine, and their hearths and homes, and the lives of their loved ones. Arabs procure arms from Britain. Is it expected that the Jews meet Arab onslaughts with bare knuckles? These defenders of Israel are in Palestine as of right. They went there as the result of the Balfour Declaration and the mandate which specifically set aside Palestine to be a national homeland for the Jews. They would set up in Palestine a Jewish national commonwealth. They will defend to the death their homeland, their commonwealth. Our traditional American policy as exemplified by the two political platforms, by presidential proclamations issued by all the Presidents from Wilson down to and including President Truman; as exemplified by two congressional concurrent resolutions in part passed by this House advocated an independent Jewish democratic commonwealth. It is difficult to understand this betrayal by the administration. Partition follows this traditional American policy. The new scheme of Warren Austin, calling for the scuttling of partition traduces this traditional policy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER (at the request of Mr. JACKSON of Washington) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be much ado all over the country about this world health situation. I do not know any

reason why it does not have as much merit as the Food and Agriculture Organization which is also a part of the United Nations. But I just want to call your attention to the fact that if you are going to follow certain leadership, including our present Department of Agriculture, and the other people who are trying to pass this oleomargarine bill, you are going to have the American people in the same position the New Deal has put the Navajo Indians. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] called your attention to the fact that they killed all their goats down there in 1933 so that they did not have any protective food. Now the Indians have a high percentage of disease. The Appropriations Committee is now buying a million dollars' worth of goats for the Navajos so they can have protective foods. The fact is that the American people this year are going to have less per capita dairy products and less milk products to consume than ever before in the history of this country. They do not need to get this oleo bill in here to make it any worse. This is a recognized fact. There are three States in the Union—Minnesota, Iowa, and Wisconsin—which produced milk for around $3.50 a hundred last year. All these other chaps from these other States, that signed this discharge petition, the dairy farmers are receiving for their milk not $3.50 on an average, but up to 90 percent more, or up to $6.62 per hundredweight, and they come in here and want to put us out of business. I just say, go home and milk your own cows and quit trying to milk the United States Treasury and quit trying to ruin the dairy industry of the Midwest that is giving the Nation the cheapest milk in the United States and has been so doing for many many years.

The antilivestock attitude of this administration has reduced the sheep numbers by over one-third the past 5 years; hog numbers January 1, 1948, were 40 percent below the January 1, 1943, number; cattle numbers have been reduced 6,000,000 head; and milk-cow numbers are lower today than they were when the New Deal took over 15 years ago.

FORT SUMTER NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had on yesterday, whereby Senate Joint Resolution 94 was passed, be vacated, in order that I may offer a corrective amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have talked with the distinguished gentleman from California about this. It is my understanding that this resolution was originally passed by the Senate before the reorganization of the armed services and the phrase "Secretary of War" was used rather than the phrase "Secretary of the Army," and that that is the purpose of the request.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee is correct.

Mr. PRIEST. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to transfer, without consideration, to the Secretary of the Interior title to the site of the historic structure known as Fort Sumter, situated in Charleston Harbor, Charleston, S. C., together with such buildings and other improvements as are appurtenant to such site.

SEC. 2. The property acquired by the Secretary of the Interior under this joint resolution shall constitute the Fort Sumter National Monument and shall be a public national memorial commemorating historical events at or near Fort Sumter. The Director of the National Park Service under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior shall have the supervision, management, and control of such national monument, and shall maintain and preserve it for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of the United States, subject to the provisions of the act entitled "An act to establish a National Park Service and for other purposes," approved August 25, 1916, as amended.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WELCH: Page 1, line 3, strike out "Secretary of War" and insert in lieu thereof "Secretary of the Army."

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include newspaper articles.

OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker—

The moving finger writes; and, having writ,
Moves on; nor all your piety nor wit
Shall lure it back to cancel half a line,
Nor all you tears wash out one word of it.

The Members of this House have by 218 signatures brought the margarine bill to the floor of the House. Two hundred and eighteen Members cannot be wrong. The House has selected the leadership to guide in the fight between the dairy trusts and the consumers of margarine and the other spreads for bread. It is a question now of everybody being out of step but the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin. I think on Monday you will see what you will see.

RACING SHELLS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5933) to permit the temporary free importation of racing shells.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the duty on imported racing shells imposed by paragraph 412 of the Tariff Act of 1930 shall be suspended until January 1, 1949.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WOMEN'S ARMED SERVICES RESERVE BILL OF 1948

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 545 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1641) to establish the Women's Army Corps in the Regular Army, to authorize the enlistment and appointment of women in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps and the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], and yield myself such time as may seem requisite.

Mr. Speaker, the rule which is now brought before the House is one which, if adopted, will enable the House to give consideration in Committee of the Whole in the course of the usual procedure to the bill generally known as the WAC and WAVE bill.

It is not my purpose, Mr. Speaker, to address the House at length upon this measure. But first let me say that the rule is the normal, so-called open rule. After its adoption general debate will be limited to 2 hours. Then the bill will be read for amendments in the usual fashion. Just a word about the measure itself and perhaps its origin. I am sure a great many of you will remember the discussions which took place back in 1942 and 1943, while we were at war, with respect to the admission of women to the military services of the United States. I can remember very well at that time there were a good many cynical remarks made, some were very unkind remarks, with respect to the ability of women to

serve faithfully and efficiently in assisting the armed forces. However, the legislation went through—one bill for the establishment of what later became known as the Women's Army Corps, and known since then as the WAC; legislation establishing a similar corps known as the WAVES, and another group of women who joined in the Marine Corps.

These women, after they were organized in their respective groups, soon became exceedingly valuable. I can remember very well that at the time of the organization of these groups a good many people, some of them in the military services, expressed doubts as to whether they could really be useful. It took but a short time, however, for all the people in authority in the military services to realize that these women were doing an excellent job. They served in many, many capacities, none of them combatant, but in doing so they were of enormous assistance, especially at general headquarters and the several headquarters of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, in doing work which otherwise would have had to be done by men. Indeed, they were instrumental in releasing for more active and strenuous service, and perhaps combat service, thousands of men in the armed forces. They came through the war with great credit to themselves. They served most effectively. At the end of it every military officer with a sense of responsibility and with experience behind him commended them. Since then they have gone on, of course, in greatly decreased numbers, doing the same kind of work in time of peace. We now have come to a point when we must decide whether or not the services of women in the several branches shall be continued, and in what status. It is not my purpose at this time to describe the provisions of this bill. I may remind you, however, that while the bill itself is a Senate bill, having been sent to this body a good many weeks ago, the House Committee on Armed Services, in studying this question for months, has reported the Senate bill with a large number of amendments. Some of those amendments are fundamental in character, so that even the title of the Senate bill does not now describe accurately the purposes of this bill.

From all my observations of the military services and from all my conversations with many women attached to them or serving in them, I cannot say less than to urge the Members of the House to give their serious consideration to this bill and in the end approve it, because I believe it is a sound measure.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. The Senate bill, as I understand it, provided that the WAC and WAVES be made a part of the Regular Army. Is that correct?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is correct.

Mr. RAYBURN. The House bill, if I understand it, puts them in the Reserves?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It establishes them as a part of the reserve components of the several services. They may be called to active duty, just like a male member of the Reserves in the active services, and be given exactly the same treatment, whether they be officers in those women's organizations or enlisted women.

Mr. RAYBURN. Does the gentleman think that is a wiser provision?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do. I think for at least for some time to come, it would not be wise to inject these women into the Regular Army and the Regular Navy and the Regular Marine Corps. There are certain doubtful questions which arise in that connection, which the Committee on Armed Services studied with great interest. As I understand it, this bill proposes that they shall be members of the reserve components, and may be called to active duty, or if they are now on active duty, may be retained on active duty with their consent.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman is always very persuasive with me, but I think I will have to hear a little more argument on that point before I can go along with him.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. SHAFER. I may say the legislation before you continues the status quo of the women in the military services for 1 year, before they are placed in the Reserves. In that 1 year I think we will be able to consider the further status, relative to their association with the services, from that time on. However, it does continue for 1 year the status quo of these women in the military services, before they are placed in the Reserves.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. I suppose anyone who is in the Reserves would have had to serve in the Regular forces before they could be put in the Reserves. Am I wrong about that?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Having served during the war, they are eligible to be included in the Reserves.

Mrs. BOLTON. For the present, yes; but in the future?

Mr. WADSWORTH. In the future also. They may join the Reserves and then be called back to duty with their consent.

Mrs. BOLTON. On that basis, of course, they have nothing but a temporary status.

Mr. WADSWORTH. They have much more than a temporary status. Any member of the Reserves in the Armed Services has much more than a temporary status.

Mrs. BOLTON. The women would have just a relative position. They would not have a commissioned rank.

Mr. WADSWORTH. She would have a commissioned rank in the Reserves. There are thousands of Reserve officers, men, now serving on active duty, who make no complaint about their military status.

Mrs. BOLTON. They have all served in the Army?

Mr. WADSWORTH. These women have, too.

Mrs. BOLTON. For the moment, yes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Women coming along now who have not had wartime service could qualify and be admitted to the Reserves without previous service?

Mr. WADSWORTH. As I understand the provisions of this bill, they could. Of course, they would have to qualify.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Could the gentleman give us some of the objections to putting them into the Regular Army now?

Mr. WADSWORTH. In all frankness, I think the discussion of that should be indulged in by members of the committee who have made this study.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. I have read the testimony and it is my feeling that the heads of the services have testified they would like to have these women remain in the Regular service.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is my understanding, but that will be discussed by members of the Armed Services Committee.

Mrs. BOLTON. It seems to me that we should know why the Armed Services differ so definitely from the heads of the services.

Mr. WADSWORTH. You can get all that information in the general debate from members of the Armed Services Committee. It is not my function to describe in detail this bill and explain why a committee of the House of which I am not a member, has reached certain conclusions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], our former Speaker, does not need to worry very much as to the ladies being made part and parcel of our Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force in the very near future, although the provision giving them such status was stricken from the Senate bill. Knowing the Army and Navy as I do, and appreciating how the official personnel feel about increased expenditures, I know they will have the ladies in the regular armed services in no time at all.

The Speaker stated when he asked for order that this is an important piece of legislation and I agree with him that it is. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] who presented the rule gave some explanation of various provisions of the bill but not full details or how far-reaching it is; consequently I will give you a brief explanation of the provisions of the bill and what they authorize.

Title 1 authorizes the appointment of women in the Officers Reserve Corps and the enlistment of women in the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army. All laws applicable to present and former commissioned officers and present and former enlisted men and to their dependents and beneficiaries are applicable to present and former commissioned officers

and women of the Enlisted and Officers Reserve Corps.

Title 1 authorizes the President to appoint women in the Officers' Reserve Corps in grades from lieutenant colonel to second lieutenant. It further permits the appointment of any former Director of Women's Army Corps who served satisfactorily to be appointed to the grade of colonel in the Reserve Corps; also permits appointment of women specialists by the Secretary of the Army in such grades as he may prescribe. It also authorizes the President to form female members of Reserve components into such organizations and units as he may prescribe.

The bill extends the present Women's Army Corps for 1 year, which would otherwise expire July 1, 1948. This to permit orderly transition from the Women's Army Corps to the new Reserve status.

Title 2 amends the present law for women who served in the Naval Reserve and repeals certain sections and creates new authority for the appointment and enlistment of women in the Naval Reserve.

The present law provides for the appointment of women in the Naval Reserve only for duration of present war and for 6 months thereafter. New sections of this bill will permit appointment and enlistment of women without a termination date.

This title also permits appointment of women in the Marine Reserve Corps. It prohibits the assignment of women in the Naval Reserve to duty in aircraft while such aircraft are engaged in combat missions and limits assignment aboard naval vessels to hospital ships and naval transports.

Title 3—new title—authorizes enlistment and appointment of women in the Officers' and Enlisted Section of the Air Force Reserve. The President is authorized to commission women in the Air Force Reserve in the grades of lieutenant colonel to second lieutenant, inclusive.

Title 3 also provides for the appointment of any person formerly serving in the temporary grade of colonel in the Women's Army Corps to be appointed colonel in the Air Force Reserve. Assignment of women in Air Force Reserve to aircraft assigned to combat missions is prohibited.

I shall not take up further time in explaining the provisions of the bill but shall leave to the chairman and the members of the Committee on Armed Services the full explanation of its various provisions.

Mr. Speaker, I have endeavored to obtain information as to what the additional cost to the Government will be if the bill is enacted but have been unable to ascertain it and I doubt if anybody here knows or can state how many more millions this legislation will call for.

Personally, I am satisfied that the women have served the country well; but that was during the war. I feel now that the war is over—and I hope there is no danger of another war—that it will not be necessary to expand the women's branches of the armed services.

Day in and day out the Republicans criticize the Democratic administration, saying that we are spendthrifts, that we spend too much money, that we are reckless with Government expenditures; but notwithstanding that fact nearly every week you have one or two bills up here for consideration that call for an additional expenditure of millions of dollars. I wonder by reason of your reckless spending legislation how you will be able to explain to the country at the end of the fiscal year that instead of having a surplus we will find ourselves with an extremely large deficit running into the millions of dollars. I ask on whom will you put the blame for the expenditures and for the deficit that is bound to show at the end of the fiscal year?

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. May I say to the gentleman that the legislation we have before us now does not add 1 cent to what has already been appropriated. This has already been taken care of in the appropriations.

Mr. SABATH. Does the gentleman mean that the appropriations have already been made?

Mr. SHAFER. That is right.

Mr. SABATH. In advance for what this legislation covers?

Mr. SHAFER. This does not cost anything. It is already appropriated.

Mr. SABATH. You gentlemen possess a great deal of influence with the Appropriations Committee if you can get appropriations for legislation that have not even been considered by the House. That satisfies me that you are reckless with the expenditure of money, yet you charge the Democratic administration with being responsible for the wasteful expenditures, notwithstanding that you Republicans, who have control of both the House and Senate, yourselves appropriate these large sums.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. It is proposed by this bill to authorize and continue the use of women who are presently employed by the armed services as members of the WAVES and WAC. This merely proposes to give legal sanction to continuation of the use of women in the armed forces. They are being used now. So the continued use of them will not increase the over-all cost but it will give legal authority to continue their use. That is the purpose of this measure before us today.

Mr. SABATH. It also provides for advancement in grade.

Mr. BROOKS. That is the present law.

Mr. SABATH. And the gentleman says this will not cost any more money?

Mr. BROOKS. The present law provides for the same thing, I may say to the gentleman. It is the law we passed in 1942 and the gentleman supported it during the war.

Mr. SABATH. I admit that I supported this legislation which was enacted during the war, but the war is over. I shall support legislation now for anything that is actually necessary as I do not wish to oppose anything that may affect the dear ladies. However, I know something about our armed services and realize that the generals, the admirals, and the tops would hate to lose the services of any of the ladies under their command. They like them just as well as we do.

Mr. BROOKS. The Army employs some 6,000 of them at the present time.

Mr. SABATH. How many are there in all employed in the Army, the Navy, and the other departments?

Mr. BROOKS. I do not have the figures on that.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I may say to the distinguished member of the Rules Committee that all in all, in officers and enlisted personnel, Army, Navy, and Air Corps, there are about 8,000. Now, those are 8,000 jobs. If these women do not fill them as members of the WAC or WAVES, someone else will fill these jobs. There is no additional expense whatever involved, except if you let all these women go and bring in civil-service employees then you will be obligated to pay overtime.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman for his explanation. I hope he is right. He is chairman of the Committee on the Armed Forces and should know. However, I was under the impression that this bill provides for promotions and, therefore, would be bound to call for additional expenditures and, later on, if the extremely liberal benefits now accorded to the officers and men in the regular armed establishments are extended to the women joining the regular service, large appropriations will be required. Unlike the civil-service employees who pay income taxes, they will be exempt from paying such tax, with resultant loss in revenues. If there are 8,000 employed now and they are needed, that may be one thing. I know that they have qualified as splendid secretaries and stenographers and in some positions perform their work better than young men whose services can be utilized in other tasks. But nevertheless I am fearful that the tendency will be to still further expand the women's services and thereby increase our expenditures, and in view of the already alarming increase in cost of government from day to day I do not know how long we can continue to be such spendthrifts such as you gentlemen charge the administration, when you yourselves, as I said, continuously bring in bills and legislation that call for the expenditure of millions and millions of dollars. I repeat the question that so frequently is propounded by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, "Where will you get the money?"

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I wish to say that notwithstanding the statements of the proponents of this legislation that no cost is involved, you will find before

the year is over that the cost of putting this legislation into effect is bound to tremendously increase our expenditures. You are in power and have the votes and I am satisfied that the rule as well as the bill will pass.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Washington Post this morning an article over the purported signature of one Ferdinand Kuhn, Jr., relating to the hearings that are currently being conducted by the Deficiency Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations with respect to the European recovery program. I shall not discuss the source of the gentleman's information, but I think there is one statement in it that ought to be called to the attention of the Congress and the country now, because it is indicative of the campaign of misrepresentation that is going to be waged in an effort to club the members of this committee and the Congress into a very superficial, perhaps, examination of the estimates that have been presented to implement the European recovery program. As an indication of the start in that direction there appears this language, after a long discussion of what was supposed to be information contained in executive hearings of this committee:

> For the ERP hearings TABER had chosen a subcommittee about as critical as any that he could have found. Two of its members, Representative KARL STEFAN, Republican, Nebraska, and FRANCIS CASE, Republican, South Dakota, had fought ERP to the bitter end, and had voted against the authorization bill.

Then follows a description by name of the other members of the committee, with this statement:

> Many of these had voted for ERP with misgivings, and some expressed their dislike of the bill during the floor debate.

The evident purpose of that statement in the press was to give the public the impression that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations had set up a new special committee to conduct hearings on the appropriation estimates for the European recovery program, and that he had deliberately stacked this committee with people who were opposed to the program.

The truth of the situation is that every fair, and intelligent, and informed newspaperman, I am sure, knows that the Deficiency Committee of the Committee on Appropriations has been in existence ever since the beginning of the Eightieth Congress, and that no special committee was selected by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to conduct these hearings. The appropriation estimate came up from the executive department in the regular manner, and in the regular form that all estimates of this character are presented to the Committee on Appropriations.

The committee that is now conducting hearings on this appropriation estimate for the European recovery program is the identical deficiency committee that has conducted hearings in connection with all other European recovery programs and all supplemental and deficiency appropriation estimates, so it is very unkind and very unfair in the implications contained in this article to charge either directly or by indirection that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has selected a committee that is bound to not give this ERP program a searching investigation.

As far as I am concerned, I voted for ERP, but that does not mean that I as a member of that committee am going to accept without the most searching examination the estimates that have been presented. The committee itself and all of its members, I believe, intend to go into every single item in that program and examine it carefully and critically, if you please, in order that the domestic economy of the United States may be protected, which was the fundamental thesis written into the organic law passed by this Congress to provide for ERP, when it charged this committee with that responsibility. I can assure you that before these hearings are concluded the Congress and the American people will have the information they ought to have in order to appraise the ultimate effect of this entire program upon the economy of our own country. As far as I am concerned, I as one who voted for this program and am in sympathy with its objectives intend to see that in carrying it out, as far as I have it within my power, that program is not going to destroy the economic security and welfare of the United States of America.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1641) to establish the Women's Army Corps in the Regular Army, to authorize the enlistment and appointment of women in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps and the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1641, with Mr. CANFIELD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the bill before you is to authorize the enlistment and appointment of women in the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps.

This bill was reported to the House by a vote of 26 to 1 and reflects the opinion of the Armed Services Committee that women played a vital role in World War II and that their services may be necessary in the event of future war.

The committee was unanimous in its opinion that women can and do perform certain duties in the armed services as well or better than men. We do not wish to discontinue the services of women and therefore the committee has reported a bill to the House which will authorize their enlistment and appointment in the Reserve components of the various services. We have also extended the Women's Army Corps for an additional year and have amended the Naval Reserve Act so as to eliminate that part of the act which would have terminated women in the Naval Reserve at the end of the war, plus 6 months. In so doing we have assured the continuation of women in the services. As the bill is now written, there is no limit on the number of women that may join the Reserve components. The only limit on the number of women that may be voluntarily ordered to active duty for indefinite periods of time will be based entirely on the needs of the services. The services have repeatedly urged their need for women, and this legislation will permit them to utilize as many women as they desire.

We did not report the full Senate bill because the committee did not feel that this was the time to make women a permanent part of the services. There are many considerations involved in the problem of placing women in a permanent status in the services. It has never been tried for any prolonged period, and the committee felt that it would be better to place these women in a reserve status until women in a peacetime Army, Navy, and Air Force had been thoroughly tested. The argument has been made that this will not obtain the type of women desired by the services. We think that women who have a patriotic desire to serve their country will join the Reserve organizations as rapidly as they will join a permanent organization, just as have millions of men. Insofar as retirement benefits are concerned, as soon as H. R. 2744 becomes law, Reserves will also be eligible for retirement benefits. But not many will be affected according to General Eisenhower, for he testified:

> There will be few that will go through to their 30 years' service which entitles them to retirement. A few of the officers, yes, but they will certainly have earned their retirement by the time they get it. Ordinarily, the enlisted individual will come in and I believe after an enlistment or two enlistments, they will ordinarily—and thank heaven—they will get married.

And again—when questioned on costs—General Eisenhower testified:

> Of course, I see no additional expense. The only thing I can possibly see is the additional few, a very few, that will go through to their 30 years and on to retirement.

As I previously stated, there are many considerations involved in this question. When one considers the fact that over 100,000 Army officers applied for Regular commissions, many of whom had had excellent combat records, and were not accepted, one can understand why we look with reluctance at this time upon a proposition which would have permitted women to have been granted Regular commissions in the Army. This is also true in the Navy.

When all of the problems are considered, the happy solution seems to be to put the women in a reserve status for the present. In view of the present international tension, the pending selective service bill, and a 70-group air force, it would seem to be wiser at this time not to make a permanent change in the organizational structure of the services. Once enacted into law a permanent organization cannot be changed to any great extent.

The bill before you assures the continuation of women in the services, and permits the entire question of placing women in a permanent status to be carefully studied during a peacetime period.

Beyond that, may I say this assures that women in the armed services will continue for 1 year before they are placed in the reserve category. At least, it keeps what we have. It assures those women of one further year during which time any change can be made that the Congress desires to make.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Would the gentleman explain to the House the effect on the present status of the women, who are now serving in the armed services, if this bill were voted down?

Mr. SHAFER. Well, they would be through. We would not have women in the armed services.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true if this bill is enacted a member of the Reserves on active duty will enjoy the same benefits, not only from the standpoint of retirement but disability benefits also, as though they were in the Regular services.

Mr. SHAFER. That is true. They can serve any number of years they wish to serve and they can retire under the retirement bill that is now before the Senate and which passed the House heretofore.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Is it not true that unless we take some affirmative legislative action before July 1 the WAC will go out as a legally constituted organization?

Mr. SHAFER. Yes, that is true.

Mr. BROOKS. And the WAVES within 6 months after the termination of the war. So we have to do something.

Mr. SHAFER. I may say to the gentleman there was considerable opposition in committee to placing the WAC and WAVES and the others on a permanent status. One of the reasons why this bill, placing them in the Reserves, is on the floor, is because we want to save what we have got. There was a question of whether we could do it under the original bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. I believe the gentleman stated that they would either be placed in the Reserves or on a permanent status. Does not the gentleman mean the Reserves or a Regular status? I understand the Reserves is a permanent status; is it not?

Mr. SHAFER. Yes.

Mr. FLETCHER. So you are talking about either a Reserve status or a Regular status.

Mr. SHAFER. A Reserve status or a Regular status.

Mr. FLETCHER. But the Reserves is permanent?

Mr. SHAFER. Yes; that is right, or until such time as this legislation is amended.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER. I yield.

Mr. REES. Does the gentleman mean to say that these women who go into the armed forces under this legislation will be entitled to all of the provisions under what is known as the GI bill of rights?

Mr. SHAFER. I am talking about the retirement bill that was passed by the House some time ago and is now pending in the Senate. They will also come under the GI bill of rights.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. SHAFER. I yield myself one additional minute, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. REES. This bill provides that women may remain in the armed forces permanently. Is that not correct?

Mr. SHAFER. In the Reserve Corps, yes.

Mr. REES. Are they entitled, because they are in the Reserve Corps and by reason of their service in the Reserve Corps, to the benefits of the GI bill of rights?

Mr. SHAFER. Yes; those who had service during the war.

Mr. REES. And veterans' preferences?

Mr. SHAFER. Yes.

Mr. REES. They will have veterans' preference rights because they served in this corps?

Mr. SHAFER. Yes; if they are qualified veterans.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, this bill marks an epic in the development of our armed forces. For the first time during the period of peace we are authorizing organizations of women in our armed forces. It is true that they will come in under the terms of this bill as women reservists for periods of extended active duty but they will nonetheless be an important part of our armed forces. The bill before you seeks to form women's reserve organizations in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force. All organizations are more or less patterned along the same lines the Army would call into active service shortly after passage of this act some 13,500 women to be used as Wacs where needed in peacetime routine of the operation of this organization. It is proposed some 600 of these people will become commissioned officers and some 60 of them will be lieutenant colonels. It is proposed that the director of the organization shall have the temporary rank of full colonel. The enlisted personnel, consisting of some 12,900 persons will be distributed in the seven enlisted grades in corresponding proportion as in the male section of our Army. All in all, the same pay, allowances, and full benefits accruing to male members of the Organized Reserve are accorded members of the Women's Reserve Corps under this act.

The organization of the WAVES, women marines, and WAFS will be identical in all respects to that of the WACS. Where the law presently covering the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Air Force Reserves is not suitable to cover the women's sections of these services, special adaptation may be made for these purposes. We provide likewise that husbands of women in these services are not entitled to dependents' allowances unless proof of dependency is shown. No allowances are allowed children or other relatives unless actual support and dependency is clearly proved. All provisions of the statutes relating to our reservists are applicable to these people formed into Reserves of all the several services and the President is authorized to form any and all officer reserves, commissioned and enlisted Reserve Corps into such organizations and units as he may prescribe.

From every side come fine compliments regarding the magnificent work which the women of the service, Wacs, Waves, and women marines, and so forth, accomplished during the course of the war. They performed a magnificent service in most useful lines of endeavor and in many cases showing greater efficiency than the male section of the armed services. They worked with fidelity, courage, and loyalty during this extreme crisis in the life of this Nation and they are entitled to the gratitude of a grateful Nation. I do not believe I can improve upon the words used by General of the Armies, Dwight D. Eisenhower, before the Armed Services Committee when he stated:

> In tasks for which they are particularly suited Wacs are more valuable than men, and fewer of them are required to perform a given amount of work. As telephone operators, clerks, stenographers, and secretaries, as statisticians, interpreters of aerial photos, and as technicians in various types of hospital and other work their performance was and continues to be outstanding.
>
> In the disciplinary field they were, throughout the war, a model for the Army. Throughout 3 years' experience with them in Europe I cannot recall but one case among the Wacs that was serious enough to be brought to my personal attention. More than this, their influence throughout the whole command was good. Carefully supervised, presenting a picture of model deportment and neatness, their presence was always reflected around a headquarters in improved conduct on the part of all.

It is, therefore, the natural desire of the armed services that women units be retained. General Eisenhower, General Paul, and others indicate that a nucleus is needed from which expansion may occur in the event of another emergency. They all suggest that we adopt the principle that these units shall consist of not

more than 2 percent of the personnel of the Regular Establishment, and they feel that this 2 percent will form the nucleus from which further expansion may occur in the event it is necessary.

During the course of the war the WAC were expanded to a high point of 140,000 women. The WAVES and women marines had corresponding personnel.

The Senate bill which came to us provided that these women's organizations be integrated into the Regular Establishment. The Armed Services Committee of the House found a number of unsolved problems in reference to such a procedure and preferred to place these women in the Reserves, subject to call on extended active duty. The Wac or Wave receiving a call to extended active duty will know that her service for all intents and purposes may be just as permanent as though she were integrated into the armed services as a part of the Regular Establishment. She will know that her opportunities for promotion will be the same, and I know that her opportunities for retirement pay will be improved when the provisions of H. R. 2744, which this House unanimously approved, becomes law.

All of the witnesses testified that the huge majority of these women will never go through 30 years of service, which would entitle them to a retirement if they were members of the Regular Establishment. General Eisenhower stated the matter this way:

> There will be few that will go through to their 30 years' service which entitled them to retirement. A few of the officers, yes, but they will certainly have earned their retirement by the time they get it. Ordinarily, the enlisted individual will come in and I believe after an enlistment, or two enlistments, they will ordinarily—and thank God—they will get married.

Because of this fact, all of the service expect a larger turn-over in these organizations. The woman who serves 10 years, following which she leaves the service, if she were a member of the Regular Establishment, would have earned nothing tangible on a retirement. Under the terms of H. R. 2744 when it becomes law, she may leave the service after marriage and yet remain a part of the Reserve Establishment. The time she has consumed on active duty would be used as a credit by her in building on her retirement as a member of the Reserve Establishment and ultimately she would have the same retirement benefits which would be due male members of the Reserve Corps. In addition to this, the armed services could hope to have a large backlog of women reservists who might be available for active duty in the event of an emergency, and these well-trained people would provide the means of rapid expansion on a voluntary basis of the women units in the armed services.

In spite of suggestions regarding promotion, to my mind, in the event women are integrated into the Regular Establishment, their opportunities for promotion will not be correspondingly as great as male members of the Regular Establishment. This may be due to the fact that the highest permanent commissioned rank allotted to women under the recommendations of all of the armed services would be that of colonel. This means that a woman with training, education, and proficiency in service would meet a stone wall as far as promotion is concerned when she reached a grade of major or lieutenant colonel. The use of selection to retire forcibly those in the higher brackets in large numbers would hurt the morale of the service a great deal and under the program suggested no possibility of promoting those reaching the rank of lieutenant colonel is permitted. This bill as amended then gives to our armed forces a woman's Reserve organization. It makes it possible to continue the fine services of these young women which started during the course of World War II and the continuance of which is much to be desired. It makes it possible that all of our armed forces may call from the Reserve into active service women needed to fill specific positions when services are necessary. In line with the splendid work of handling clerical and stenographic office work, operating telephones, radios, switchboards, bookkeeping work, sales clerk and stock clerk, pharmacists and sanitary technician, and many other works of a similar character, they will be available. The Armed Services Committee reported this bill with only one opposing vote, and presents it to you as to what it believes presently to be the best method of handling this problem.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FLETCHER].

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise mainly for the purpose of clarification of S. 1641 as amended. As I read from title 3, section 301, subsection (c) it appears conclusive to me that the Secretary of the Air Force can set the qualifications of those he recommends for appointments for commissions. Therefore they need not necessarily to have been commissioned previously in the armed services to be qualified for a commission in the Air Force Reserve. I have reference to that great group of young women fliers known as the WASPS who did such a grand job during World War II. I have before me the report which accompanied H. R. 4219 in the Seventy-ninth Congress. It calls attention to the fact that there were over 500 women pilots engaged in flying all types of aircraft within the continental limits of the United States. I do not want to detract from the wonderful record made by other women in the armed services, but I do feel that the WASPS, the Women's Air Forces Service Pilots, are the unsung heroines of the last war in the respect that they were never made a part of the Regular armed services. An attempt was made when H. R. 4219 was brought on the floor during the Seventy-ninth Congress, but by a very narrow margin of 169 votes for and 189 votes against the bill, the WASPS were not allowed to become a part of the Regular service.

We spent over $12,000 in training these women in their flying courses. As a matter of fact, the United States Government has approximately $50,000 invested in each one of the splendid young women. They did a remarkable job but not without casualty. During the time they were piloting these airplanes as ferry pilots, 37 girls were killed. However, they were experts in their field; 150 girls ferried the B–26's, which, as you know, were one of the hottest planes the Air Force had, and there never was a single accident. The average age of these girls was 24 and they will be available for the Reserve for a number of years.

During the hearings it was pointed out that Gen. Henry H. Arnold appeared before the House committee and strongly recommended that they become part of the Regular service. Also the Honorable Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, stated in a letter that the War Department believed that presently qualified female pilots and necessary female administrative personnel should be commissioned in the Army of the United States without delay, and that provision should be made for additional appointments as the need arose.

In regard to this bill, S. 1641 as amended, before the House today, it seems to me to be clear that the WASPS who were flying under the direction of the Air Corps in a civilian status, and not in the Regular Air Corps, are to be allowed to join the Reserves. May I ask a member of the subcommittee if my understanding is correct, that there is nothing in this bill that would prohibit the Secretary of the Air Force from taking the WASPS into the Air Force Reserves?

Mr. SHORT. I think the gentleman is correct. There is nothing to prohibit the Secretary of the Air Force from appointing them.

Mr. FLETCHER. If they meet the qualifications of the Secretary of the Air Force, they could get into the Reserves?

Mr. SHORT. I think that is correct.

Mr. FLETCHER. I thank the gentleman for that clarifying statement. May I call the attention of the Members that the bill further provides in subsection (f) of section 301 that—

> The Secretary of the Air Force shall prescribe the military authority which any female person of the Air Force Reserve may exercise, and the kind of military duty to which such female persons may be assigned: *Provided*, That female persons of the Air Force shall not be assigned to aircraft while such aircraft are engaged in combat missions.

I think that clearly shows that it was the intention of the committee to include the WASPS in the Air Force Reserves.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, when the idea of putting women in the services was first brought to the attention of the old Committee on Military Affairs, I had a lot of reservations about adopting this as a policy in America. Of course, we had never done it before. However, many of us traveled throughout the world during the war years and saw these girls in many parts of the world performing duties that were hard and arduous, many

times in places that we probably thought they should not be. I never heard one of them complain of the duties they were asked to perform during all their years of service.

About a quarter of a million or more girls served in these services during the war as Waves, Wacs, Spars, and Wasps. Like the gentleman who just preceded me, I think the Wasps deserve recognition. They performed a very arduous and hard task in many parts of the world. Primarily, the reason I am supporting this legislation at the present time is that in a few weeks we will probably be asked to raise the number of personnel in our armed forces. I think we are all aware of the emergency that exists today with reference to the trained personnel which our armed services are trying to get along with to perform their duties and maintain a fighting force. During the war it required about 10 men back of the lines to support every fighting man. Today the Army is trying to get along with four men supporting one fighting man. It cannot be done and have an efficient Army. We hear accusations today that the armed forces of our country have become top-heavy and that it is entirely an administrative job. It is a big job. It is a job that we do not think about and appreciate here as we should. It is expending more money and is a larger organization than United States Steel or Sears, Roebuck and a half dozen other of the largest American concerns today. It simply cannot function unless we, as the constituted body and authority here, give to the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps what they need to perform their duties. I have before me a chart which was presented to us this morning in the Committee on Armed Services showing the strength as of today at 1,376,408 men. I also have a chart which shows what that force will be as of March of next year if the rate of enlistment gains and discharges continues as at present. We are considering legislation now which, in my opinion, can be helpful in this situation. From the best information that we can secure, there seems to be about 2 percent of the jobs in the Army which, it is estimated, will be filled by this group of people, whether in the Reserve status or permanent status.

Under the reserve bill as presented here today by the Committee on Armed Services, they have full authority to call in as many as they care to call in for service duty. I believe it would be helpful in this present hour. We are not assured as to whether or not this body and the Senate will adopt the legislation as requested by the armed forces and by the President, that is, the so-called draft measure. So in view of that fact I think we should not hesitate to adopt this legislation and put it into operation as quickly as possible. There is a group of people, of course, and I do not know how many, that we can get in on a volunteer basis. And there are others who will have to come back from the Reserve Corps. Not to permit them to serve their country in some capacity would be rather disastrous in my opinion in the present hour. I have a chart in my hand showing the manpower pool in the 19- to 25-year-old group. The total in that pool is 8,410,560. Those with prior service, in that pool, is 3,371,300, which would be exempt under the present legislation being considered.

The total who had no service because of physical defects is 1,489,500. The total number, nonfit veterans, is 1,181,800.

So you finally wind up in this pool with an army of single, nonveteran, nonfather status, of 1,362,000 people. That is the pool you will have to deal with if you get the so-called Regular Army, which they tell us they must have of around 700,000. We are going to have to supplement it in every possible way. So I hope this body will adopt this legislation today, because I feel it is necessary, and will be helpful in the present world situation. I offer for the RECORD figures I referred to that show definitely the personnel problem that is facing our armed forces.

Enlisted strength gains and losses July 1, 1947–Mar. 1, 1948

	Army	Navy	Air	Marines	Total		Army	Navy	Air	Marines	Total
Strength July 1, 1947	594,078	434,453	263,082	84,795	1,376,408	Strength Nov. 1, 1947	511,161	407,679	283,662	83,256	1,285,758
Gains, July	15,520	13,003	12,641	1,926	43,090	Gains, November	10,158	15,150	10,001	1,335	36,644
Reenlistments	(4,359)	(7,600)	(5,194)	(722)	(17,875)	Reenlistments	(5,458)	(10,220)	(3,579)	(705)	(19,962)
Other	(11,161)	(5,403)	(7,447)	(1,204)	(25,215)	Other	(4,700)	(4,930)	(6,422)	(630)	(16,682)
Losses	34,637	11,817	8,902	2,268	57,624	Losses	23,233	41,395	4,752	4,188	73,568
Strength Aug. 1, 1947	574,961	435,639	266,821	84,453	1,361,874	Strength Dec. 1, 1947	498,086	381,434	288,911	80,403	1,248,834
Gains, August	12,820	11,910	14,033	1,743	40,506	Gains, December	12,640	14,655	10,377	1,645	39,317
Reenlistments	(4,457)	(6,663)	(3,646)	(710)	(15,476)	Reenlistments	(6,222)	(10,324)	(3,720)	(917)	(21,183)
Other	(8,363)	(5,247)	(10,387)	(1,033)	(25,030)	Other	(6,418)	(4,331)	(6,657)	(728)	(18,134)
Losses	31,769	10,377	10,036	1,578	53,760	Losses	27,973	38,097	7,063	5,808	78,941
Strength Sept. 1, 1947	556,012	437,172	270,818	84,618	1,348,620	Strength Jan. 1, 1948	482,753	357,992	292,225	76,240	1,209,210
Gains, September	11,990	15,178	13,826	1,731	42,725	Gains, January	18,203	20,186	17,737	3,581	59,707
Reenlistments	(6,062)	(9,949)	(3,793)	(724)	(20,528)	Reenlistments	(7,995)	(10,361)	(5,160)	(1,769)	(25,285)
Other	(5,928)	(5,229)	(10,033)	(1,007)	(22,197)	Other	(10,208)	(9,825)	(12,577)	(1,812)	(34,422)
Losses	29,136	14,128	10,252	1,100	54,616	Losses	24,715	26,181	4,384	7,038	62,318
Strength Oct. 1, 1947	538,866	438,222	274,392	85,249	1,336,729	Strength Feb. 1, 1948	476,241	351,997	305,578	72,783	1,206,599
Gains, October	12,160	15,301	14,901	1,523	43,885	Gains, February	16,653	16,954	17,297	2,683	53,587
Reenlistments	(6,532)	(11,060)	(4,380)	(740)	(22,712)	Reenlistments	(7,654)	(8,349)	(4,208)	(1,167)	(21,378)
Other	(5,628)	(4,241)	(10,521)	(783)	(21,173)	Other	(8,999)	(8,605)	(13,089)	(1,516)	(32,209)
Losses	39,865	45,844	5,631	3,516	94,856	Losses	23,398	17,770	5,773	1,427	48,368
						Strength Mar. 1, 1948	469,496	351,181	317,102	74,039	1,211,818

Reenlistments includes all with prior service.

Armed forces estimated strength, gains, and losses with selective service, fiscal year 1949–fiscal year 1950

[All figures in thousands]

	Total			Army			Navy			Air			Marines		
	Total	Officers	Enlisted	Total	Officers	Enlisted	Total	Officers	Enlisted	Total	Officers	Enlisted	Total	Officers	Enlisted
Strength July 1, 1948	1,446	183	1,263	540	75	465	427	51	376	397	50	347	82	7	75
Gains, fiscal year 1949	950	57	893	557	31	526	133	2	131	222	23	199	38	1	37
Reenlistments, all prior service			(190)			(90)			(25)			(70)			(5)
Other			(703)			(436)			(106)			(129)			(32)
Losses, fiscal year 1949	554	19	535	260	10	250	100	2	98	166	6	160	28	1	27
Strength, July 1, 1949	1,842	221	1,621	837	96	741	460	51	409	453	67	386	92	7	85
Gains, fiscal year 1950	634	24	610	155	5	150	250	7	243	184	11	173	45	1	44
Reenlistments			(156)			(35)			(59)			(55)			(7)
Other			(454)			(115)			(184)			(118)			(37)
Losses	473	10	463	155	5	150	154	2	152	135	3	132	29		29
Strength, July 1, 1950	2,003	235	1,768	837	96	741	556	56	500	502	75	427	108	8	100

Navy and marines: Bureau of Personnel (Captain Monroe) x-7, 733
Air: Personnel and Administration Division (Major Jabbour) x-3, 082
Total and Army: Personnel and Administration Division (Mr. Bonis) x-3, 353

Estimated military availability, ages 19 through 25, as of Mar. 31, 1948

Present age	Total	Total with no prior service	Total who had no service because of physical defects	Total probably fit nonveteran	Estimated single nonfather nonveteran [1]
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
25	1,201,424	268,800	191,600	77,200	28,000
24	1,211,954	303,800	221,900	81,900	59,000
23	1,208,592	327,800	236,100	91,700	69,000
22	1,200,339	243,500	240,900	102,600	74,000
21	1,199,917	490,800	192,000	307,800	222,000
20	1,201,374	[2] 704,200	[3] 176,000	528,200	475,000
19	1,186,960	[2] 923,400	[3] 231,000	692,400	625,000
Total	8,410,560	3,371,300	1,489,500	1,881,800	1,352,000

[1] Census normal percentage of single men in each group.
[2] Estimate by Bureau of Census.
[3] Estimated 25 percent physically disqualified.

NOTE.—Except as noted below these figures are from figures in Age in Selective Service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] has expired.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I understand an amendment will be offered which will take the WAC, WAVES, and SPARS into the Regular Army instead of taking them in as Reserves. I shall wholeheartedly support that amendment. I believe it is not necessary for me to speak of my abiding faith in the armed forces today. The WAC, the WAVES, and the women marines are not an experiment. Their excellent record during the war, and the opinion of all of our military chiefs, without exception, are testimony to that statement.

The women who are still serving volunteered first to help this Nation in an emergency—then they volunteered to stay on during the trying days of demobilization when personnel needs were most critical. Now, when we are faced with another critical shortage and with the necessity of drafting young men to fill the needs still existing in the services, we are asking these same women to continue on active duty without the permanency and security that can be theirs only with Regular status.

First of all, I would like to read the names of large groups, national organizations, which have passed resolutions in favor of this bill, S. 1461, the bill to take them in as part of the integrated services. The following organizations have passed resolutions favoring the speedy enactment of S. 1461, the Women's Army Service Integration Act of 1947. I have copies of the resolutions which I will insert.

The following are copies of the resolutions:

AMERICAN LEGION

1. Following motion was unanimously adopted at meeting of the national legislative committee of the American Legion on April 26, 1947:

"That the American Legion support legislation which seeks to establish a permanent WAVE Corps in the Navy and a WAC in the Army."

2. Motion No. 4 was made by Lyle O. Armel (Kansas) and seconded by Hugh Askew (Oklahoma).

GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS

Following resolution was adopted at fifty-sixth convention of General Federation of Women's Clubs at New York convention, June 23–27, 1947:

"WAC INTEGRATION ACT OF 1947

"Whereas the experiences of World War II proved the military effectiveness of using the inherent skills and acquired training of women, and

"Whereas there is now pending before the Eightieth Congress of the United States a bill known as the WAC Integration Act of 1947 which provided for (a) the establishment of a voluntary corps of women, not to exceed 2 percent of the authorized strength of the Regular Army, and (b) the establishment of an Officers' Reserve Corps and an Enlisted Reserve Corps on the pattern already established for male Reserves: Therefore

"*Resolved*, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, June 27, endorses the principle involved in this proposed legislation and urges its early passage; and further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to appropriate Members of the Congress of the United States."

Above motion was amended to include integration of women in the Regular Navy.

NATIONAL SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Resolution adopted by Fifty-sixth Continental Congress, May 19–23, 1947:

"PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR THE INTEGRATION OF WOMEN IN THE REGULAR ARMY

"Whereas the experiences of the past two wars have definitely proved the value of the contributions of women to the military forces of the nations; and

"Whereas this organization is vitally concerned about all matters pertaining to the national defense; and

"Whereas the War Department has presented a legislative proposal to Congress providing for the establishment of the Women's Army Corps as an integral component of the Regular Army of Organized Reserve Corps.

"*Resolved*, That the Continental Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution meeting in the fifty-sixth convention endorse the proposed legislation providing for the integration of women in the Regular Army and urge the speedy enactment of such legislation."

NOTE.—In the current Fifty-seventh Continental Congress Convention of Daughters of the American Revolution, a resolution is now before the committee urging speedy enactment of legislation to include women in both the Regular services and Reserves.

WOMEN'S PATRIOTIC CONFERENCE

The following resolution was adopted at the Twenty-first Women's Patriotic Conference, January 24, 25, 26, 1947:

"2. Whereas women now predominate in numbers in the population of the United States and wield great economic power; and

"Whereas women must play an important part in future national defense, be prepared to take care of themselves in any national emergency, and assume responsibility for the functioning and security of our country; and

"Whereas the women who served in the armed forces set a highly satisfactory standard of work performed in administrative, technical, and clerical duties: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Twenty-first Women's Patriotic Conference strongly recommends to the Congress of the United States the passage of legislation retaining women permanently in the armed forces, as requested by the War and Navy Departments."

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN,
Washington, D. C., May 26, 1947.

The Honorable PAUL W. SHAFER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Organization and Mobilization, House Committee on Armed Services, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SHAFER: The American Association of University Women, through its legislative procedure, has endorsed H. R. 3054, the bill to establish the Women's Army Corps in the Regular Army, which is before your subcommittee for consideration.

The AAUW is a national educational association of 92,000 women college graduates, organized in 983 local branches in all States of the Union. At its national biennial convention held in Dallas, Tex., April 14–18, the association approved by overwhelming vote a legislative item or principle under which, members had been previously informed, the AAUW would expect to give its support to legislation to establish the Women's Army Corps as a small, permanent unit in the Army.

The association hopes that H. R. 3054 will soon be favorably reported; it will be glad of an opportunity to testify for the proposed legislation should hearings be held.

Respectfully yours,
(Mrs. P. A.) FRANCES VALIANT SPEEK,
Secretary to Committee on Legislative Program.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 26, 1947.*

The Honorable WALTER G. ANDREWS,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., an organization of 117,000 business and professional women, at its 1946 convention went on record as favoring the retention of the women's units as component branches of the military services.

Realizing that the women who volunteered for service cannot be retained indefinitely without some assurance of a permanent status, we urge that your committee give early and favorable consideration to enacting legislation which will permit integration and future planning for these women.

Both as a group earnestly interested and justifiably proud of the wartime record of servicewomen, among whom well over 1,000 were Federation members, and as a group deeply concerned over the necessity of an adequate basis for expansion of our military strength, in the event of an emergency, we are hopeful of the earliest possible action in this matter.

Thank you for the cooperation and courteous attention which you have always given to our views.

Respectfully yours,
HELEN G. IRWIN,
Legislation Chairman.

Whereas the Reserve Officers Association recognizes the contributions made by the Women's Army Corps during World War II and the present interim period and whereas this organization realizes that both the wartime and peacetime military establishments can be made more effective by the utilization of women and whereas the War Department has introduced to the Eightieth Congress a bill providing for the inclusion of women in the Regular Army and the ORC: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Reserve Officers Association endorse this proposed legislation and urge its early passage; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to appropriate Members of the Congress of the United States.

THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., May 12, 1947.

Mrs. OSWALD B. LORD,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MRS. LORD: During World War II it was my privilege to closely observe the work of the WACS and WAVES. Their fine spirit and deep interest in performing assigned duties was particularly commendable. In my opinion they represent a constructive influence that is necessary in peacetime military units. Accordingly, I hope everything possible will be done to pass the present bills before Congress and insure the continuance of their program.

Sincerely yours,
ELEANOR WILSON,
Assistant Director,
Army and Navy Department.

ASSOCIATION OF THE JUNIOR LEAGUES OF AMERICA, INC.,
New York, N. Y., May 16, 1947.

Mrs. OSWALD B. LORD,
New York, N. Y.

MY DEAR MRS. LORD: I should like the opportunity of telling you how very significant and important to the winning of the war was the work of the WAC and WAVES.

First in my position as director of civilian mobilization for New York State and then as executive secretary of the Association of the Junior Leagues of America, Inc., I had many opportunities to observe their efficiency, good humor, and generally excellent behavior. Also I learned from members of my family who were in the armed forces that they made significant contributions to the Medical Corps, the Army, and the Navy.

As I know you were instrumental all during the war in their recruitment and general efficiency, I would like to go on record, personally, as being in favor of their retention on a permanent basis. It would seem to me clearly indicated.

With kindest personal regards.

Very sincerely yours,
CLARICE H. L. PENNOCK
(Mrs. C. H. L. Pennock).

As you see it was strongly endorsed by the American Legion. It was endorsed by the General Federation of Women's Clubs; by the National Society, Daughters of American Revolution; American Patriotic Conference on National Defense; American Association of University Women; National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs; Reserve Officers Associations; National Council of YMCA; Association of Junior Leagues of America.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that only this morning I discussed the taking of women into the regular Navy with Admiral Denfeld, Chief of Naval Operations, and Admiral Radford, Deputy Chief of Operations. There has been some story going around that the officials of the Navy and the Army did not want the women taken into the Regular service. I have talked repeatedly with high-ranking officers of the armed services and they have stated most emphatically that they feel they would be much better off if women are taken in as part of the Regular service. They could function very much more efficiently in that way and they need them. Admiral Denfeld and Admiral Radford told me this morning again of how important it is that women be given permanent status. It seems to me also, in view of the great need of persons in the Army and Navy, that the women ought to be taken in as a part of the Regular armed services.

I consider that the proposed amendment is of the utmost importance to the present legislation. The bill as it stands, without the amendment, is not a satisfactory solution to the question before the House. We must vote on the issue of whether or not we shall continue to utilize women in the armed services. I maintain that if we do vote to continue the women's services we are obligated to provide for the most efficient possible utilization of womanpower. The present bill, calling for organizations of women Reserves only, does not achieve that end. There are sound reasons why the women's services should be incorporated into the Regular armed forces, with supporting Reserve components—as provided in the proposed amendment.

Leaders of all the armed forces have assured us that they can obtain the best available womanpower only by offering Regular status. Obviously they are right. No business or profession could secure the services of the highest caliber of working woman without offering some degree of permanence and security. Nor can the armed forces expect competent women to accept a situation where they can be called to duty when Congress thinks they are needed and released from service whenever Congress believes the services can get along without them.

One of the most important functions of the women's services in time of peace will be to serve as nuclei, ready for expansion in the event of emergency. The personnel of those skeleton staffs must be permanent. They must be the small group of women who will make lifetime careers of the Army, Navy, or Air Force. They will be the planners, the administrators. It will be their responsibility to bring into service and train other qualified women. Some of the latter may remain in service, it is true, for only two or three enlistments. Some will remain longer. Some women will join the Reserve organizations and be ready to serve their country in times of great emergency. But the nucleus of permanent people is the vital point. The rest of the structure will be built around them, varying in size with the needs of the times.

The members of the Regular, skeleton staff must be women who make careers of their jobs. The armed forces will compete with other businesses and professions to obtain the services of such women. Their competition will certainly be slight if they can offer no more than a Reserve status. Thus if we vote to give the services organizations of women Reserves, with no permanent components, we will be giving them a job to do without the proper facilities for doing it. They say they want women in the defense structure. They recommend the best way they know of to utilize those women. We are failing completely to cooperate with our military leaders if we ask them to utilize women in some other manner. It has been stated that women in the service will involve an additional expense to the Government. All studies made by the armed services have revealed exactly the opposite situation. The cost per person is less for women in the service than for men. The main reason for the difference lies in the fact that dependency allowances paid to men are greatly in excess of those paid to women. For example, a man may claim his wife and children as dependents; a woman may not claim her husband or children unless such person is in fact dependent upon her.

It has been alleged that a Reserve organization is just as good as a permanent organization of women. That is not so. In the first place, no one expects the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force to operate as a Reserve organization alone. All the forces use Reserves when necessary, and it is a splendid system. But in every case there is a permanent body of Regulars who devote themselves permanently to the business of preparedness. The women's components must be set up in the same way to achieve maximum efficiency.

And why should we expect women to volunteer for service in which they will do the same work for the same pay as male soldiers, but without the benefits to which the male soldiers are entitled? If we are going to use women in the armed forces, I believe we must go the whole way and offer them identical status and benefits as men. There is no provision now for retirement of enlisted personnel on active duty in a Reserve status. Even if pending legislation is enacted to provide retirement benefits for Reserve personnel, the reservist, man or woman, will not have the same benefits as a member of the Regular Army.

Nor is there any assurance at all that a reservist will be kept on duty for any given period. Any or all women reservists could be removed from active duty if appropriations were cut.

There is no question that a large Reserve organization should be included in our plans for women in the armed forces. Some portion of that Reserve should undoubtedly be on active duty at this time. But now or at any time the Reserve would not work without the backing of the Regular force. That Regular force must be a professional nucleus of women officers and noncommissioned officers. I insist that we can provide such a nucleus only by authorizing permanent forces of women to work along with our permanent forces of men.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, in supporting this legislation I wish to offer the observation that women are needed in the armed services of this Nation on a permanent basis.

Women are needed in the armed services of this Nation on a permanent basis, not only to form the nucleus of a corps for any possible future expansion, but also to handle the huge amount of work that it is doing right now.

Recruiting for the armed services has failed to provide the minimum strength authorized by Congress. Much of the work done by our military forces can best be done by women in uniform. And at this time we are confronted by the possibility that on the first of July the

Women's Army Corps will go out of existence under the terms of the current law.

Further than that—the armed services have no legal means of recruiting women who might volunteer their services to help do this work. To me, it seems the height of absurdity to hamstring our recruiting effort by forbidding enlistment of women—women who can handle many types of work necessary in the service much better than men. This source of personnel, which the services at present must ignore, could supply volunteers who could fill jobs in which many of the most acute shortages are found at present.

A Reserve system is a nice thing—a fine thing. But it is not quite the same thing as a permanent force of personnel actually in operation—actually at work upon critical jobs during a critical time.

I say, Yes—we should have a women's Reserve—by all means. But let us not forget that we would be in sad shape indeed if our entire armed forces were operated under the Reserve system. With the best system in the world, we could never be free of the waste and confusion, which would result if these Reserves were called into action in an emergency lacking a trained, operating force in being, around which it could group and expand.

It is during peacetime that we must take the steps to find out which aptitudes and skills, of all our citizens, can be best applied during an emergency. Integration into the Regular Services of a group of women will do much to further that type of study and will provide the personnel needed to carry out research in connection with it.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to divert attention from consideration of the objectives of the pending legislation and thorough consideration of the matter of the Women's Reserve units. But what we are talking about and thinking about in connection with this legislation fundamentally is the defense establishment of this country. I think we might take a moment at least to look at the general Reserve program, particularly of the Army, as it is presently operated. The situation which we find there today is most regrettable.

On April 1 I wrote to Secretary of the Army Royall requesting certain information with regard to the Army Reserve Corps. I inserted a copy of that letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 2, 1948. It appears at page 4072. I have still to receive a letter in answer to that communication.

Mr. Chairman, it is my belief that the Army today does not have a Reserve program. When they speak of their Reserve program, they are speaking about a mere concept which they have not put down in concrete form. I am constantly receiving word from Reserve commanders in my district and elsewhere to the effect that they are at an absolute loss to know just what is expected of them, what the Army expects to do with them, and that there is absolute mismanagement of the entire Army Reserve program. It has been poorly planned, there is lack of equipment, and it is being generally neglected.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I would like to point out that only within the last month has the Congress itself voted to give Reserves on inactive duty pay.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. We have had up a retirement bill for the Reservists. We considered it for a long time and it was a year and a half before action was taken on it. It has not been acted on yet by the Senate. If we can get some legislation through of that kind we can take care of the Reserves.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank the gentlemen for their contributions. The gentlemen are members of the committee handling this matter. I am not contending that Congress is without blame. But the Army itself should have some idea what it is going to do with the Reserve program that the Congress has provided for.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman will appreciate the fact that for better than a year at least 75 percent of the Reserve officers of the Army were in transit because they had no definite or permanent address. It was for that reason the Army could not promptly organize the officers into Reserve units. It is my opinion the Army should be given an opportunity to organize the Reserves and if Congress enacts the Reserve retirement bill I feel sure we will have a good Reserve Corps.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman believe we have a reasonable situation existing today, where a request is made of the Army for details of what it contemplates under the Reserve program, and the Army is unable in over 20 days to give that information to a Member of Congress? Or how does the gentleman explain the findings of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], who contacted all of the department presidents of the Reserve Officers Associations.

He found that 91 percent of the department presidents of the Reserve Officers Association "claimed that the difficulty with the Organized Reserve Corps of the Army and Air Services involved either a poorly conceived and executed Reserve program, insufficient Reserve units, both as to number and as to type, lack of proper facilities, or inadequate training equipment."

And that, gentlemen, is the situation as it exists, not just the day after the war ended, but almost 3 years after the war ended.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I wish to say that the gentleman from Wisconsin is speaking a lot of truth, and I am inclined to agree with him that our armed services have certainly not made a determined effort to fill up not only our Reserve, but our National Guard as well. But, because of the legislation we have recently passed giving inactive duty pay and also retirement, hereafter the Army will have no excuse whatever for any dereliction in the performance of its duty.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman. That is a point I wanted to make, but the gentleman from Missouri, as usual, makes it better.

As one who believes in the necessity of a Military Establishment based on a comparatively small regular armed force supported by a well-trained citizenry Reserve, I am most concerned in seeing to it that the Army establishes a sound and well-managed Reserve program. We do not have such a program in existence today. I can find no excuse for the present situation, and certainly there can be no excuse for the continuation of this condition in the future.

As an example of the lack of an intelligent Reserve program, I call attention to a letter which I received today from a Reserve officer in California:

APRIL 17, 1948.

Hon. J. W. BYRNES,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In the April 10, 1948, issue of the Army and Navy Register, I was very much interested in reading where you are making an investigation of the malfunctioning of the Army Reserve program. From the article I was not sure if you were including the Air Force in your investigation or not. It does seem that the activities of the Air Force Reserve program should be looked into as well as the Army.

I am a member of the Air Force Reserve, holding a commission as lieutenant colonel and have been in the Reserve continuously since November 1, 1918. As a result I have been able to observe the application of the Reserve program following two wars. The method of handling the Reserve activities are being bungled this time in practically the same manner as subsequent to World War I, only it seems to me to be worse this time.

During the recent war, I served nearly 7 years on active duty, being released at my own request last year. I was recommissioned in the Reserve in May of 1947 and was relieved from active duty in September. Upon returning to inactive status I received notification that I had been placed in the active Reserve; this one communication constitutes the sum total of correspondence of any kind that I have received. I have not, to my knowledge, been assigned to any unit or been advised of any matters of policy, in other words I might just as well not be in the Reserve forces.

I am not the only one in this respect, and I am sure that if some interest were shown in us and steps taken to organize units and provide training facilities, that an Organized Reserve could be built up that would be of material benefit to the country should the need arise.

If real steps were taken to train the Reserves and to keep them interested, I am sure that the response would be very encouraging and an energetic and virile force could be built up.

In closing, I want to say that I am glad you are taking such an interest in this matter and I hope you will be successful in improving the Reserve's activities.

Very truly yours,

———.

———, CALIF.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to express my conviction that we should speedily approve a bill to make women a part of the Regular and the Reserve forces of our Army, Navy, Air Force, and marines.

The civilian and the military heads of all of the services have, without exception, endorsed legislation to include women in their Regular and Reserve forces. They have not asked for an unlimited number of women; their request that not to exceed 2 percent of their authorized strengths be women is certainly not excessive. We should give the services the authority to use the numbers of women they have asked for.

At the present time the House Armed Services Committee is considering a draft bill. What basis will we have for drafting young men to take over jobs as typists, telephone operators, and hospital technicians if we have just failed to act upon service-sponsored legislation which would have permitted women to do many of these jobs? Let the draft fill up the shortages which men alone can fill—in our combat forces, on our planes, and on our combat ships—but let us not take a man away from farm, home, or school to train him to be a telephone operator. There are and always will be certain jobs in each service which women can do better than men. On what grounds, then, can we fail to permit the armed forces to have women in their Regular Establishments?

If we are going to keep women in the services, then we must offer the women the same status as we offer the men. The number of women will always be small as compared to the number of men in each service; those women should and must therefore be of the highest caliber. Only the security of Regular service will attract such women into the armed forces. I urge speedy enactment of the bill to authorize women in the Regular and in the Reserve forces of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marines. I am told the gentlewoman from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] will offer a correcting amendment which I trust will be accepted by the Committee.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I think it would be appropriate to place in the RECORD at this point, since the gentleman's remarks deal largely with personnel, the number in the respective women's components of the armed forces. The Army now has 722 officers on duty in the WAC, 6 warrant officers, and 4,342 enlisted personnel. The Air Force has 168 officers, 1 warrant officer, and 1,862 enlisted personnel. The Navy has 422 officers and 1,692 enlisted personnel. The Marine Corps has 8 officers and 171 enlisted personnel.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Of course, I am very happy to have the gentleman contribute the figures he has given, because they are undoubtedly based upon facts. However, under the legislative proposal we are presently considering, the status of the people to whom he has referred will be changed as respects approximately 40 percent of them.

Mr. BROOKS. The status of those in the Navy and the Marine Corps will not be changed. The status of the WAC will be changed from that of a permanent, integrated organization to that of a Reserve organization. The Navy and Marine Corps will not be changed, as they are Reserves at the present time. I join my friend from California in wanting to see proper legislation placed in the books that will fully protect the women who are contributing their services and their talents to the armed forces. A fight in the committee was made on an amendment for that purpose.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I do not want any misconception here because I am most appreciative of the efforts the committee has put forth to bring out a bill, but I do believe we should give the women we are inviting into our military functions the same participation we give our manpower, if we expect them to stay there and be happy about their service.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, the pending legislation authorizes the enlistment or appointment of women in the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps of our armed services.

When the original legislation was enacted into law back in July 1943, I admit I was not too enthusiastic about taking women into the armed services of our country. Perhaps it is because of an innate conservativeness or some southern chivalry or gallantry left in my soul that I never thought that women should have to fight a man's war. However, modern wars are fought for and by and in protection of total populations, and because of the excellent record made by the women in different branches of the armed services in the recent global conflict, I frankly confess that I have revised my thinking and changed my attitude.

General Eisenhower, General Bradley, and others have told us—and we had abundant opportunity during the war itself to witness it both at home and abroad—of the fine work accomplished by these women in the different branches of the service. We all know that there are many tasks and positions that a woman can occupy and perform much more efficiently and satisfactorily than can a man. That is the reason, I suppose, that most of the secretaries, stenographers, and clerks in our offices are women. They have a patience and a capacity for detail that the ordinary male citizen does not possess.

In addition, if we take in these women, that will release men for the heavier, more arduous combat duties during wartime. The present legislation which permits the enlistment and appointment of women in the Reserve forces is also amended by extending the present law for 1 year from July 1, 1948, when it would ordinarily expire, until July 1, 1949, in order to have a year of transition, changing them from the Regular to the Reserve component of our forces.

The bill also provides on page 29 that these women shall not be assigned to duty in aircraft while such aircraft are engaged in combat missions, nor shall they be assigned to duty on vessels of the Navy except hospital ships and naval transports. We have put in those safeguards which I think are wise. We do not want our women killed.

There are three different views that one can take of this bill. One group of people would simply let the act expire and do away with the WAC and the WAVES altogether. "Let us call an end to it." There is another group which would put them into the permanent Regular Establishment. Between those two extreme views, the Subcommittee and the full Committee on Armed Services reached a compromise whereby in the pending bill we do not abolish the Women's Reserve Corps in the different branches—we do not put them into the Regular Establishment—but we do put them in the Reserve components, giving them with minor exceptions all the benefits, rights, privileges, and emoluments that are given to male officers and former male officers in the Reserve Corps. I think equal treatment is meted out to men and women alike. Even if a husband is dependent upon his wife or the children are dependent on the mother, whether due to the father's death or otherwise, they themselves will receive the same rights and benefits as children of any male soldier. I think that the committee was convinced because of the critical situation at the present time that the best thing we could hope to accomplish was to reach a compromise, not by abolishing the Women's Corps altogether, not by putting them into the Regular Establishment, but by placing them in a Reserve where in case of emergency we would have a larger pool of women to call upon. I think the bill should pass as it has been reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation that we are now considering, although I have different views from the gentleman from Missouri. I want to join in paying tribute to the Wacs and Waves and marines who served so faithfully and gloriously during the war. These women performed duties far beyond what was expected of them when they entered the services. They proved that they could serve and serve well. They played a glorious part in the national defense of this country. At the time the legislation came from the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs, doubt was expressed as to whether it was proper. As the gentleman from Missouri has so ably explained we all know the part that they played. They overwhelmed us all, and added a moral influence to the Army higher than that which ever existed in our armed forces before. I do think that in the consideration of this bill more thought should be given to the

privilege of permitting these young ladies to make a career of the service; should they desire for the grand and glorious service they have rendered should we not do this—we are taking something away from them to which they are entitled, and which I personally think they have a right to expect.

However, I did not rise altogether to speak for the Marines, the WAC, and the WAVES. I rose to call your attention to another group of young women, 20,000 or more, who served so gloriously and so efficiently in the Coast Guard of this Nation.

There was the Coast Guard's Women's Reserve organization — SPARS — activated late 1942 and serving throughout the war. The Spars were used throughout the Coast Guard in all of the administrative offices, supplanting a major portion of the male enlisted personnel. In other types of duty, their activities embraced the field of operations, public information, communications, personnel procurement, training, military morale, medical, and finance and supply.

The organization contained women of wide experience throughout the business world, professional, and clerical workers. They brought with them an earnest desire to serve their country and attained a high standard of morale which was a definite asset to the Coast Guard.

There were 978 officers and 11,868 enlisted personnel in the Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard during the war, which in effect released an equal number of men for other essential continental and overseas service.

In the consideration of this act it is desirable to keep in mind the advisability of reactivating the Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard to have ready a trained nucleus for quick expansion when the need arises.

I understand in time of emergency, and you understand, that the Coast Guard is immediately called in to serve as an integral part of the Navy. Legislation at the approach of the last war, and in the future, I hope, pertaining to the Coast Guard will be left to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House. Immediately after the bill creating the WAVES and WAC was introduced, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House introduced a bill creating the SPARS. Those Spars served, as I have said, equally as well and faithfully and fulfilled all the duties assigned to them. I hope after the passage of this legislation, which I predict will pass, that the Merchant Marine Committee will be permitted to bring to the floor of the House a bill that will at least create in the Coast Guard a reserve for the women, so that they can be ready in case of future national emergencies, to join shoulders with the men in that grand agency of the Government, in that efficient arm of the national defense, to do their part in the future as they have done in the past.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Of course, the gentleman knows that in case of an emergency, if the SPARS are authorized they will become a part of the Navy and will enjoy all of the benefits of that service.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman misunderstood the point I am endeavoring to make—to permit the Coast Guard to retain reserves of women, similar to the WAVES, the WAC, and the Marine Corps, so that they can be ready to step in with the Coast Guard. As the Coast Guard joins the Navy, those Spars will join with the Coast Guard in the Navy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] has expired.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I want to join with every Member who has spoken before me in paying tribute to the women who served in the armed forces during the war period. I think we all acknowledge the fine, patriotic, loyal service they rendered to our country. They did serve with fidelity and courage. They are entitled to every bit of credit that may be extended them because of their service to our country.

I do feel also that there are many other thousands of women who served their country in the Government and outside the Government, who performed outstanding service during the war period, who are entitled to credit and commendation, but who will not receive it. There are thousands of women who were employed in our Government during the war period, who worked long hours and performed arduous duties, but have not and will not receive acknowledgment for their services. This is all understandable.

I take the floor at this time to ask a few questions with regard to the legislation before us. First, it is my contention that although it was most helpful to have women in the armed forces during the critical period of the war, it is not necessary that they join the armed forces during peacetime in order that they perform the duties required of them. Most of the women, so I am advised, during peacetime perform stenographic and clerical duties. It appears to me that women in classified civil service who qualify under competitive examinations should be entitled to perform those services. There may be a few exceptions to this proposal, but in nine cases out of ten, civil-service employees can do the work and do it just as well.

I find no fault with the continuation of the women now in the armed forces to have a year during which to make adjustments, but if those women are qualified to do the work—stenographic, clerical, or whatever it may be—then they should not hesitate to take the same positions in a civilian capacity under civil service.

Mr. Chairman, I am informed the bill presently considered places women in what is known as a Reserve capacity. No number is designated and there is nothing in the bill to indicate whether they will receive training under such program. It seems under this proposal they will be called upon to join what is known as Reserves and will be subject to call at the pleasure of those in charge of the armed forces.

To me this seems a little unfair to the women who join Reserve programs. In other words, they will not know if and when they may be called into service. As I understand the program, if the Army and the Navy want stenographers or typists, they can call Reserves to do the work, instead of calling women who are qualified under civil service. I see nothing in this bill to prevent them from doing it if they choose to do so. So I say there may be a few classifications where it would be helpful to have women in the armed forces to do certain specific work, but it is hardly fair to women in civil service to be replaced or to have jobs for which they are qualified taken by other women who happen to have joined the Reserves or are in the armed service.

I do want to ask a few questions with respect to this particular bill that is before us.

I think one member of the committee said there are approximately 8,000 now in service. Is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS. I put the exact list in the RECORD. I think it is more than that.

Mr. REES. But approximately 8,000.

Mr. BROOKS. Yes; something like that.

Mr. REES. Then I understand if this legislation is passed those 8,000 will be part of the Reserve components of the Army?

Mr. BROOKS. No; there will be 1 year's time in which that can be worked out.

Mr. REES. Are they to remain in service, perform their present duties continuously during that time?

Mr. BROOKS. It is intended to use the services of any who will voluntarily remain.

Mr. REES. One other question, how many women do you include under this bill? How many women do you expect to put in the Reserves under this legislation?

Mr. BROOKS. In the original bill passed by the Senate there was a restriction of 2 percent. Under the House version of the bill there is no limit.

Mr. REES. I understood there was some proposal to write in the figure "18,000"; but there is no limit under this legislation.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. If the gentleman will answer my question.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It will depend entirely upon the amount of money appropriated by Congress.

Mr. REES. Exactly; the more money appropriated the more women you can put in the armed forces. This is strange procedure. In other armed forces there is authorized strength, a limit to the number or maximum, but not in this legislation.

Mr. BROOKS. Let me call attention to the fact that we are today planning for a selective-service bill. If these women volunteer we may not have to draft so many men or take them in forcibly.

Mr. REES. Whether they come in forcibly or not is something else. I want to raise another question. I assume we are talking about a peacetime

proposal here. Nearly all women under this legislation perform the same services as those in civil service at the present time. They are stenographers and clerks and do work of that kind. A number of them are in personnel work.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. In just a moment.

My contention is that nearly all the services performed by these women we are going to put in uniform can be done by women in civil service and there is no reason for putting more than a comparative few in uniform. As I say, these women are clerks and stenographers. They do a type of work that can be done by women under civil service, especially during peacetime. There might be exceptions during an emergency but the situation during peacetime does not warrant putting women in uniform in order to do work of receptionists and secretaries and personnel directors.

Now I would like to ask another question.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. REES. In just a moment. I would like to ask another question about these women Reserves. Assuming they are in the Reserves, what are they going to do during the time before being called into active service? What are they going to do in the meantime, these 18,000 in the Reserves. Are they going into training? If so, what kind of training? Where?

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. Yes; I shall be glad to.

Mr. SHORT. They would do just exactly what male officers in the Reserves do.

Mr. REES. Now, just a moment; what is that? Do you mean military training? Where is the program? There is nothing outlined in this legislation concerning Reserve or any other kind of training.

Mr. SHORT. I want to answer the gentleman's question specifically.

Mr. REES. All right. A specific answer will be most helpful. How are they to be trained? Where? By whom? What kind of training?

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman is wrong in saying this is only for peacetime. This is for both peace and war.

Mr. REES. We are at peace now——

Mr. SHORT. Well, that is all right. This is for both peace and war. There would be no occasion for the legislation unless we considered the necessity for calling them into active service in case of war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman speaks of civil service. The gentleman should know that civil service does not fit into Army routine. Under civil service they come in at a certain time in the morning, sit at a desk and watch the clock waiting for quitting hour, then they jump up and go home whether their work is finished or not. They are not subject to the same discipline and hours of work as are the women in the WAC and the WAVES, especially in case of war.

Mr. REES. That may be true in case of war.

Mr. SHORT. Or in time of peace, either. They work down in the Pentagon now and in the Quartermaster Corps. In the armed services they cannot be governed by the same schedules of working hours used in the other Government departments.

Mr. REES. I may say to the gentleman from Missouri that I do not believe many of these people at the Pentagon are working overtime now during peacetime.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I would like to get an answer to my question. I want to know in what kind of service they will be employed while in the Reserves. The program should be explained.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I would like to answer the question the gentleman put a moment ago.

Mr. REES. No. I want an answer to this question. When these women join what we call the Reserves, they will join the Reserves, then what do they do? What specific training is outlined as it relates to the armed forces?

Mr. BROOKS. I will answer the question. If they are on a Reserve status, they will immediately be called into active duty for a certain period of time. They continue to work as they have been doing as an integral or component part of the Army or Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps.

Mr. REES. What I am asking is this: Here is a woman who works down here in a store, she joins the Reserves; does she continue to work in the store or what does she do? If she takes training for armed forces, what is that training?

Mr. BROOKS. She stays in the store like any other reservist would until she is called to active duty. When she is called to active duty, she has an active status. Then she will be put on full time as a reservist on active duty.

Mr. REES. She will be called a year or 2 years from now, as the case may be.

Mr. BROOKS. I suggest to the gentleman it is the same thing as the National Guard or the Reserve Officers Corps. The Reserve officer becomes a Reservist. He is not called to active duty unless he asks for service on extended active duty. When he is called, he puts in full time then in the service.

Mr. REES. That is the point I am making. She is not getting any training in the meantime until she is called. Men in the National Guard are taking training at specific intervals.

Mr. BROOKS. Until she is called.

Mr. REES. No training at all?

Mr. BROOKS. She will get some training.

Mr. REES. What training?

Mr. BROOKS. She will get training along the line of her occupation.

Mr. REES. By whom?

Mr. BROOKS. By the Reserve Corps.

Mr. REES. She will not get any training by the Army, will she, in the meantime?

Mr. BROOKS. If she is in the Army, she will.

Mr. REES. Let us continue talking about the same girl who is working down here, for instance in Hecht's store. She is a saleswoman. She is taken in the Reserves. What does she do to get training and in what respect?

Mr. BROOKS. Of course, it depends on the character of occupation she has when she is taken in the Reserves.

Mr. REES. Then how is she trained?

Mr. BROOKS. She is trained under rules and regulations set up by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of Air. He sets up rules and regulations, qualifications and requirements, just like those for the Officers Reserve Corps.

Mr. REES. She spends a certain length of time in certain training, but we do not know what kind of training.

Mr. BROOKS. As set forth by the respective Secretaries.

Mr. REES. One other question: In reference to these women in the Reserves, can they be called any time during peacetime to work as stenographers in the Pentagon?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes; when they give their consent. Only if they give their consent.

Mr. REES. They can be called at any time to go down to the War or Navy Department and get any kind of job they may be assigned to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. REES. Take women who are employed in stores, they can be called at any time that the Secretary calls them during peacetime; is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS. No. The gentleman is trying to put a strained construction on the law. They will be called in time of peace only when they agree voluntarily. The gentleman understands that. Whenever she wants to be called and she puts in an application for extended active duty, she may be called, surely. Is there anything wrong about calling when you want to be called?

Mr. REES. Take women who are em- certainly not. That is what I am trying to find out. I am trying to find out whether you are compelling her to go because she is in the Reserves?

Mr. BROOKS. There is no element of force in this Reserve legislation at all. The reservists are called when they want to be called into active service. It is not like the Selective Service Act or a bill that you may have before you perhaps in the next 10 days or 2 weeks. It is nothing like that. I honor the gentleman, his zeal for civil service, and glory in his effort to protect it at every turn.

Mr. REES. That is a different proposition. Unless these people are receiving training for some particular position in case of emergency I do not see what can be accomplished by the proposal. If you want people to do similar tasks as they are now doing, you already have them in the civil service. Again I pay all the tribute in the world to the splendid work women in uniform performed during wartime. But this is a peacetime proposal, as I understand it.

I believe we ought to limit the number. We ought to find out whether these people are to be compelled to enter the service and whether they will receive any

special training before they are called. I do not see anything in this bill in this respect, except naming them as reservists.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman feel it would be very much better to have the women on a permanent basis and then give them training? We should give them the opportunity so that they can be trained.

Mr. REES. I agree, if you are going to use them in the armed forces, they should be trained, but this is just Reserves with no training at all for service in the armed forces.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time. Other than asking permission to place in the RECORD a list of the type and character of jobs which these women in the women's component of the armed forces have performed in the past. I have nothing further to say. But I would like to ask permission to place this list in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

239 Army jobs (with specification serial numbers[1] that have been filled by Wacs,[2] 222 Army jobs that may be filled by Wacs

[The 17 jobs which have been deleted are Air Force only]

I. TECHNICAL AND PROFESSIONAL

I A—Medical or hospital technical:
- 067. Dental laboratory technician.
- 120. Meat or dairy inspector.
- 149. Pharmacist.
- 196. Sanitary technician.
- 264. X-ray technician.
- 303. Hospital orderly.
- 365. Optician.
- 409. Medical noncommissioned officer.
- 666. First-aid man.
- 673. Medical noncommissioned officer.
- 825. Medical supply, noncommissioned officer.
- 855. Dental technician.
- 858. Medical laboratory technician.
- 859. Pharmacy technician.
- 861. Surgical technician.
- 865. Veterinary pharmacist technician.

I B—Personnel:
- 262. Occupational rehabilitation counselor.
- 263. Psychiatric social worker.
- 275. Classification specialists.[3]
- 283. Athletic instructor.
- 289. Personnel consultant assistant.
- 290. Personnel technician.
- 298. Job analyst.
- 428. Psychological assistant.
- 659. Technical instructor.

I C—Public relations:
- 274. Public-relations man.
- 399. Reporter.
- 936. Canvasser, recruiting unit.

I D—Physical sciences:
- 160. Physics laboratory assistant.
- 292. Chemist.
- 411. Chemical laboratory assistant.
- 784. Weather observer.

I E—Photography:
- 016. Laboratory technician, V-mail and microfilm.
- 028. Blueprint or photostat operator.
- 017. Photolithographer.
- 134. Laboratory supervisor, motion picture.
- 137. Projectionist, motion picture.
- 152. Photographer.
- 153. Photographer, photoengraving.
- 154. Photographic darkroom man.
- 155. Photographer, portrait.
- 157. Phtographer, retouching artist.
- 158. Microfilm equipment repairman.
- 208. Film recorder, motion picture, sound.
- 402. Photographer, news.
- 890. Photo interpreter.
- 941. Camera technician.
- 944. Photographic-laboratory chief.
- 945. Photographic-laboratory technician.

I F—Drafting:
- 070. Draftsman.
- 071. Draftsman, mechanical.
- 076. Draftsman, topograhic.
- 109. Lithographic engraver.
- 227. Surveyor.
- 228. Instrumentman, surveying.
- 377. Tracer.
- 387. Cartographer.
- 416. Bookbinder.

I—Miscellaneous:
- 130. Animation artist.
- 267. Translator.
- 284. Actor.
- 296. Artist.
- 320. Interpreter.
- 386. Entertainer.
- 432. Bandsman, clarinet.
- 433. Bandsman, cornet or trumpet.
- 434. Bandsman, drum, bass.
- 436. Bandsman, euphonium or baritone.
- 437. Bandsman, flute or piccolo.
- 438. Bandsman, French horn.
- 439. Bandsman, saxophone.
- 440. Bandsman, trombone.
- 441. Bandsman, tuba.
- 442. Entertainment director.
- 803. Bugler.

II. RADIO AND ELECTRICAL

II G—Radio operation:
- 236. Telegraph operator.
- 514. Radar operator, designated set.
- 755. Radio operator, AGF.
- 766. Radio operator, high-speed.
- 776. Radio operator, low-speed.
- 777. Radio operator, fixed-station.

II H—Radio and electrical repair:
- 078. Electrician.
- 174. Radio repairman.
- 304. Electric-motor repairman.
- 338. Instrument repairman, electrical.
- 415. Transmission man, sound, electrician.
- 425. Tabulating-machine repairman.
- 648. Radio repairman, FM.
- 649. Radio repairman, fixed-station.
- 898. Radio inspector.

III. COMMUNICATIONS

III J—Telephone operation:
- 309. Telephone operator.
- 650. Telephone switchboard operator.

III—Miscellaneous:
- 231. Switchboard installer, Tp and Tg dial.
- 384. Installer, toll Tp and Tg.

IV. MECHANICAL AND TRADE

IV K—Gasoline motor and light machinery repair:
- 012. Electrician, automotive.
- 014. Mechanic, automotive wheel vehicle.
- 029. Boiler inspector.
- 040. Automobile body repairman.
- 078. Electrician.[4]
- 101. Engine lathe operator.
- 114. Machinist.
- 121. Utility repairman.

IV K—Gasoline motor and light machinery repair—Continued
- 138. Motorcycle repairman.
- 172. Automobile radiator man.
- 190. Riveter, pneumatic.
- 201. Sheet-metal worker.
- 255. Welder, electric arc.
- 256. Welder, combination.
- 257. Welder, acetylene.
- 319. Tractor, mechanic.
- 334. Welder, spot.
- 341. Shop-maintenance mechanic.
- 343. Burner, acetylene.
- 413. Motor inspector.
- 414. Carburetor specialist.
- 431. Machinist's helper.
- 511. Armorer.
- 535. Balloon-gas handler.
- 747. Army airplane and engine mechanic.
- 813. Motor transportation, noncommissioned officer.
- 903. Weapons mechanic, hand and shoulder.
- 912. Electrician, track and wheel vehicle.
- 928. Automotive equipment mechanic.

IV L—Instrument repair:
- 042. Camera repairman.
- 098. Instrument repairman, not electric.
- 282. Office-machine serviceman.

IV—Miscellaneous:
- 022. Beauty operator.
- 044. Canvas-cover repairman.
- 100. Structural-steel worker.
- 106. Linotype operator.
- 143. Painter, auto.
- 145. Painter, sign.
- 147. Parachute repairman.
- 168. Printer.
- 200. Sewing-machine operator.
- 203. Packing-case maker (cargo packer).
- 204. Shoe repairman.
- 234. Tailor.
- 248. Upholsterer.
- 317. Monotype operator.
- 458. Dog trainer.
- 550. Pigeoneer.
- 620. Parachute rigger and repairman.
- 629. Student.
- 651. Platoon sergeant.
- 677. Military policeman.
- 730. Provost sergeant.
- 809. Decontaminating equipment operator.

V. ADMINISTRATIVE AND OFFICE

V M—Clerical and general:
- 032. Chief clerk.
- 055. Clerk general (no typing).
- 056. Mail clerk.
- 128. Duplicating-machine clerk.
- 266. Dispatcher clerk (crew).
- 269. Cashier.
- 355. File clerk.
- 370. Proofreader.
- 391. Librarian.
- 457. Shop clerk.
- 502. Administrative, noncommissioned officer.
- 503. Liaison agent.
- 566. Duty noncom.
- 584. Sergeant major.
- 585. First sergeant.
- 667. Message center clerk.
- 674. Message center chief.
- 675. Messenger.
- 805. Cryptographic technician.
- 806. Code clerk.
- 807. Crytographer (code compiler).
- 808. Cryptanalyst.
- 818. Railway transportation, noncommissioned officer.
- 998. Administrative inspector.

V N—Clerical typing:
- 247. Typist.
- 272. Key punch machine operator.
- 368. Personnel clerk.
- 405. Clerk-typist.
- 501. Administrative and technical clerk.
- 534. Chaplain's assistant.
- 623. Financial typist clerk.
- 816. Personnel, noncommissioned officer.

[1] According to S. S. N.'s (specification serial numbers) as listed in War Department T/M 12-427, Military Occupation Classification for Enlisted Personnel, July 1, 1944.

[2] Of the more than 628 Army specialist jobs filled by enlisted men, 406 are noncombatant and may be filled by Wacs.

[3] For WAC units only.

[4] Also listed under II H—Radio and electrical repair.

V O—Statistical and financial:
212. Statistical clerk.
243. Geodetic computer.
268. Accountant.
350. Bookkeeper general.
390. Auditor.
622. Financial technical clerk.
624. Financial clerk.
V P—Stenography:
213. Stenographer.
V Q—Tabulating machine operator:
400. Tabulating machine operator.
V R—Teletypewriter operation:
237. Teletypewriter operator.
640. Teletypewriter switchboard operator.

VI. MOTOR VEHICLE DRIVERS

VI S—Driver (light automotive equipment):
244. Tractor driver (light).
316. Auto serviceman.
344. Chauffeur.
345. Truck driver, light.
357. Gas and oil man.
378. Motorcyclist.
410. Dispatcher, motor vehicle.
668. Truckmaster.
699. Ambulance driver.
929. Automotive equipment operator.

VII. FOOD

VII T—Cook or baker:
017. Baker.
037. Meat cutter.
060. Cook.
819. Commissary steward.
824. Mess sergeant.

VIII. SUPPLY AND STOCK

VIII U—Supply and stock:
186. Receiving or shipping checker.
193. Salvage inspector.
194. Salvage man.
195. Shipping clerk.
242. Toolroom keeper.
252. Foreman, warehouse.
323. Stock record clerk.
324. Stock clerk.
348. Parts clerk, automobile.
371. Purchasing agent or buyer.
373. Sales clerk.
374. Stock control clerk.
769. Chief storekeeper.
815. Ordnance, noncommissioned officer.
820. Subsistence, noncommissioned officer.
821. Supply, noncommissioned officer.
835. Supply clerk.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It might be well for the gentleman to point out that the Reserves will be identified with a unit, and those units will train, and they will receive training that will prepare them to fill billets that we assign them to in case they are assigned to active duty.

Mr. BROOKS. Yes. I do not think the type of training would necessarily be consonant with the training of the male components of the Army.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, if it is all we can get. But, if an amendment is offered to make the WAVES and the WAC and the SPARS and the marines a part of the permanent organization, I am for that, too.

Now, I have been pretty close to the personnel problem of the Navy, particularly during the war, and I can speak of the magnificent work that the WAVES and the SPARS and the marines have done during that particular period of time, because my work has been more closely associated with the Navy. I think these women are entitled to all the plaudits that we can possibly shower upon them.

I have been all over the mainland, out in the far reaches of the Pacific and the Atlantic, and across in the European areas. I have interrogated commanders of the different posts everywhere I have gone, and they have all been loud in their praise of the splendid and magnificent work that these women have done during the war period.

In these days, we are asked to resort to what we call selective service only because we cannot get sufficient male personnel to operate our facilities, to form our fighting battalions, and carry on the activities of every one of our defense agencies. It was proposed by the heads of all our military organizations that the Women's Corps be made part of the permanent organization, and it has been my feeling that we should follow in the footsteps of the Senate in the adoption of the bill making them part of the permanent organization. Whatever happened in the committee, I just do not know, and have never been able to find out. So we have the bill before us today to make the Women's Corps part of the Reserve forces of the United States.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am sure from my discussions with the gentleman in the past that he is in complete sympathy with the division of personnel application, meaning by that a certain percentage in the Regulars and a certain percentage in the Reserves.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is right. We are setting up the Women's Corps in the Reserve organization. They go on duty only when they are called and are paid only when they are called. Of course, we ought to set them up as a reserve organization in order to be ready for any emergency that may develop. On the other hand, I think we are making a great mistake in not making them part of the permanent organization, because we would be able to preserve an organization in the first instance that has rendered magnificent service down through the period of the wartime, whereas by the adoption of this bill we are in fact destroying the Women's Reserve Corps and are killing the incentive for women who are willing to give of their time and their lives as they look forward to the future, having security in mind, giving all of their services to the country where we feel they are needed; we feel they are needed because those in charge of our military organizations from the top down, those in command, speak eloquently of not only the services they have rendered but the need for these women in the permanent organizations of the country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is it not a fact that every military leader that appeared before our committee advocated that the women be permitted to enlist as part of the Regular Establishment?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is right.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is it not a further fact that General Bradley and General Paul stated that they presently had requests from their theater commanders overseas and in this country for more than 30,000 women?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Every commanding officer from the commanding general down, in both the Army and Navy, has pleaded for permanent legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How can the gentleman vote for a draft of 19-year-old boys to fill places that we refuse to let women voluntarily fill.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. It is going to be pretty difficult.

When you stop to think of the sacrifices these girls have made in the hospitals of the country and outside the boundaries of this country, you cannot help but have a kind word for the great job they have done during this war. I think they ought to become a part of the permanent organization.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The hearings reflect that Secretary Forrestal, General Eisenhower, General Bradley, General Vandenberg, Admiral Denfeld, and all the other expert witnesses we had were asked if they did not think we could get by on the Reserve proposal, and without exception those men vetoed the Reserve proposal and advocated taking these women into the Regular Establishment.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is right. I have not heard one bit of opposition from anybody in the Military Establishment to placing the Women's Corps in the permanent organization.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. Would the gentleman point out that unless this legislation is passed we will lose the services of the WAC on July 1 of this year?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Yes; we know that. That is why we have to accept this temporary legislation; but if such an amendment is offered on the floor to make them part of the permanent forces, I am going to support the permanent legislation. The Women's Reserve Corps goes out of existence altogether on July 1, and because it is going out of existence we have already lost thousands of our most competent women.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I think all of us will join the gentleman in the high praise and tribute he has paid to the women who served in our armed services. I will even say that I do not think our committee ever had two more intelligent and capable witnesses before it than Colonel Hobby and her successor, Mary Hallaren. I join with the gentleman in that, but

from a realistic point of view the gentleman must know that it would have been very difficult if not impossible ever to have gotten a rule to consider this measure had we put them into the Regular Establishment.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I do not know whether we could have gotten a rule or not.

Mr. SHORT. We had difficulty getting a rule to bring in this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We have it here now.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. We have no right to abrogate our right and authority on the floor of this House. If we believe they ought to become a part of the Regular organization, then we ought to have courage enough to come out on the floor of the House and be given an opportunity to speak our piece. That is the way I feel.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the gentleman will yield for a question, may I say that whatever realistic problems we might have had in getting this legislation to the floor of the House, we do have a rule now, and the fact is that an amendment is going to be offered which will carry out the recommendations of all of our military people and the House should adopt the amendment of the gentlewoman from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is right. Besides, the bill has already gone through the Senate and it is here today where it can be amended. That amendment, I understand, is going to be offered by the gentlewoman from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. I am for that amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If we leave the bill as it is written, then we very likely will not be able to get the personnel that we need in the Reserves.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is right, and we will destroy the whole organization.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] earlier in the day covered the situation perfectly. I can add very little to what he said. There are three groups of Members of the House who entertain a certain attitude toward this bill. First there are those who oppose women in the services. I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] in that connection that the situation is not unlike that in your own congressional offices. A great many Members of Congress like to have a woman secretary, and they prefer an enlightened woman secretary who knows the business of their district. The situation in that respect can be understood better when we realize that there are 8,000 of these women who are filling responsible positions in the departments. They receive some military indoctrination beforehand. If these 8,000 women do not serve to some extent, men must take their places. Even all civilian employees do not want to go to Germany, Japan, or some other outlandish base with the Air Force.

As to the difference of opinion between those who favor putting women into the Regular service and into the Reserves, those of us who favor the Reserves very strongly realize we are not changing the status of the women. They will have these benefits under the Retirement Act. I want to remind the proponents who favor putting women into the Regular service that during the past year or two Congress by its act increased the Regular commissions in the Army and Air Corps by only 25,000. One hundred and seventy thousand Reserve officers, many of whom fought in this war, applied for these 25,000 Regular Army commissions. Over 120,000 young male Reserve officers were denied commissions in the Regular services at the very time when you proponents who favor putting the women in the Regular service say that you will dish out so many Regular commissions to women in the face of the fact that these young men who fought during the war were denied those commissions.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. It makes no difference whether or not these officers have applied for commissions in the active service. The number of officers that can be commissioned depends on the strength of the service and the strength of our Women's Reserve Corps determines altogether the number of officers who are going to serve in the Women's Reserve Corps. It has no relation whatever to the number of applications of male officers for active duty in the Army or Navy or any other part of the military organization. They have nothing in common with each other. Therefore, the gentleman's argument falls flat.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

When a female officer in the Organized Reserve is called to active duty, that means that there will be one less male officer.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. But she will only be called to active duty when the personnel strength of the Women's Reserve Corps is large enough to justify her being called to active duty.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

Mr. CLASON. When this bill was before the committee for consideration, I refused to vote in favor of its adoption. That is, the House bill. I did so because I believe that these young women are entitled to make a service career out of the different branches of the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, just as much as the men are. To say that they shall serve voluntarily and for short periods of time is practically to deny them the right to serve at all, because no young person who is a good stenographer, nobody who has any capabilties, is going to take on a job that may last but 3 months or 6 months or 9 months, and with no opportunity for advancement. They have performed well in peace as well as in war. Persons who are generals—and I am not going to name them—persons who are members of the corps, the young women themselves, feel very badly about this House bill. They have told me so, just as they have told many of you. They called me on the telephone today. I feel that we ought to adopt the Smith amendment to the House bill and give the young women a permanent status in the Regular armed services.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] has expired.

All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1947."

TITLE I

ESTABLISHMENT OF WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS, REGULAR ARMY

SEC. 101. Effective the date of enactment of this title, there is established in the Regular Army a Women's Army Corps, which shall perform such services as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War.

SEC. 102. (a) The authorized commissioned, warrant, and enlisted strengths of the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army shall, from time to time, be determined by the Secretary of War, within the authorized commissioned, warrant, and enlisted strengths of the Regular Army, but shall not exceed 2 percent of such authorized Regular Army strengths, respectively.

(b) There is authorized a strength of 51,000 active list commissioned officers in the Regular Army, exclusive of the numbers authorized by law for the Army Nurse Corps, the Women's Medical Specialist Corps, professors of the United States Military Academy, and any numbers authorized by special provisions of law providing for officers in designated categories as additional numbers.

SEC. 103. (a) From the officers permanently commissioned in the Women's Army Corps, Regular Army, the Secretary of War shall select to serve during his pleasure, but normally not to exceed 4 years, one officer to be Director of the Women's Army Corps who shall be adviser to the Secretary of War on Women's Army Corps matters, and who, without vacation of her permanent grade, shall have the temporary rank, pay, and allowances of a colonel while so serving; one officer to be Deputy Director thereof, who if permanently commissioned in a lower grade shall, without vacation of her permanent grade, have the temporary rank, pay, and allowances of a lieutenant colonel while so serving; and from among officers of the Women's Army Corps (including Women's Army Corps officers of the Army of the United States or any component thereof serving on extended active duty) the Secretary of War shall select to serve during his pleasure such number of officers as he may determine necessary to fill positions designated by him in the administration and training of the Women's Army Corps, who, if permanently commissioned in a lower grade shall, without vacation of permanent grade, have the temporary rank, pay, and allowances of lieutenant colonel or major while so serving, as the Secretary of War may determine: *Provided*, That after July 1, 1952, such officers shall be selected from among commissioned officers in the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel or major, except the Director and Deputy Director who shall be selected from among officers in the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel: *And provided further*, That prior to July 1, 1952, the Secretary of War may extend that date one time

until such later date as he may select for that purpose but such later date shall not be later than July 1, 1956.

(b) Unless entitled to higher retired rank or pay under any provision of law, each such commissioned officer who shall have served for 4 years as Director or Deputy Director of such corps shall upon retirement be retired with the rank held by her while so serving, shall receive retired pay at the rate prescribed by law computed on the basis of the base and longevity pay which she would receive if serving on active duty with such rank, and if thereafter recalled to active service shall be recalled in such rank.

SEC. 104. (a) Commissioned officers of the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from female citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 21 years and who possess such qualifications as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War.

(b) Except as modified or otherwise provided by express provisions of law, original appointments of officers in the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army shall be made from among qualified female persons in the manner now or hereafter prescribed by law for appointment of male persons in the Regular Army except as may be necessary to adapt said provisions to the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army.

(c) Officers shall be permanently commissioned in the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army in grades from second lieutenant to lieutenant colonel, inclusive. The authorized number in permanent grade of lieutenant colonel shall be such as the Secretary of War shall from time to time determine but shall not exceed 10 percent of the total authorized commissioned strength of such corps.

(d) (1) During the interim between the date of enactment of this title and January 1, 1948, officers of the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army shall be promotion-list officers as contemplated in Public Law 281, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved December 28, 1945, as amended. Effective January 1, 1948, the names of all active-list commissioned officers of the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army shall be carried on a separate promotion list known as the Women's Army Corps promotion list and such officers shall be promotion-list officers as that term is defined under the laws then in effect. On January 1, 1948, the Women's Army Corps promotion list hereinabove described shall be established by entering thereon the names of the officers concerned without change in the order of their precedence on the promotion list contemplated in Public Law 281, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved December 28, as amended.

(2) Except as otherwise prescribed in this title or some other express provision of law, the respective provisions of law now existing or hereafter enacted relating (1) to the procurement, promotion, and elimination from the active list by retirement or discharge of "promotion list officers" and (2) to "promotion lists" as the terms "promotion list officers" and "promotion list" are from time to time defined by law, are hereby made applicable to the officers of the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army and to the Women's Army Corps promotion list, respectively.

(3) Effective January 1, 1948, and within the limitations prescribed in this title, the Secretary of War shall prescribe the authorized numbers in each of the several commissioned grades in the Women's Army Corps promotion list under the provisions of law applicable to promotion lists generally. Officers of the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army shall be permanently promoted to the grades of first lieutenant, captain, and major, as now or hereafter prescribed for promotion to such grades of promotion list officers as that term is from time to time defined by law, including any special provisions pertaining to promotion to fill initial requirements in such grades on or about July 1, 1948. Officers of the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army shall be promoted to and appointed in the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel in the Regular Army only when a vacancy exists in the number of lieutenant colonels authorized for the Women's Army Corps promotion list and such officers shall be appointed in that grade only when selected and recommended for that grade by a selection board under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War.

(4) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War any selection board convened to consider and recommend officers of the Women's Army Corps for promotion to any grade may contain officers of the Women's Army Corps holding permanent or temporary appointment in any grade above major.

(5) Officers of the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army shall be eliminated from the active list and retired or separated, as the case may be, under the provisions of law now or hereafter applicable to promotion-list officers generally, and they shall receive retired pay or severance pay, whichever is applicable, computed as provided under such law for promotion list officers generally: *Provided*, That any officer of the Women's Army Corps in the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be retained on the active list until that date which is 30 days after the date upon which 30 "years' service" is completed: *Provided further*, That any officer of the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army in the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel, who is serving in the temporary grade of colonel by virtue of occupying the position of Director of said corps, may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be retained on the active list while serving in such temporary grade: *Provided further*, That on and after June 30, 1953, each officer of the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army, heretofore or hereafter appointed in the permanent grade of major who is not retired or separated at an earlier date under other provisions of law, shall be eliminated from the active list on that date which is 30 days after the date upon which she completes 25 "years' service," unless she is appointed in the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel in the Regular Army before that date: *And provided further*, That the term "years' service" as used in this paragraph shall be construed to include the identical service defined by law to be included in that term under the law now or hereafter applicable to eliminations from the active list of promotion-list officers generally.

(e) The Secretary of War shall prescribe the military authority which commissioned officers of the Women's Army Corps may exercise, and the kind of military duty to which they may be assigned.

(f) The Secretary of War under the circumstances and in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President, may terminate the commission of any officer appointed in the Women's Army Corps.

SEC. 105. Under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, female citizens of the United States may be appointed in the Women's Army Corps, Regular Army, in the permanent grade of warrant officer (junior grade) and in the permanent grade of chief warrant officers under the provisions of law now or hereafter applicable to appointment of male persons in such permanent warrant officer grades in the Regular Army.

SEC. 106. (a) Original enlistments and reenlistments in the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army, from among female persons who posses such qualifications as the Secretary of War may prescribe, may be accepted under applicable provisions of law which govern original enlistments and reenlistments in the Regular Army of male persons except as may be necessary to adapt said provisions to the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army: *Provided*, That no person shall be enlisted in the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army who has not attained the age of 18 years: *And provided further*, That no person under the age of 21 years shall be enlisted in such corps without the written consent of her parents or guardian, if any.

(b) The Secretary of War, under such regulations as he may prescribe, may terminate the enlistment of any enlisted woman in the Women's Army Corps, and each person whose enlistment is so terminated shall be discharged from the Army.

SEC. 107. Except as otherwise specifically provided, all laws now or hereafter applicable to male commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Regular Army; to former male commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Regular Army, and to their dependents and beneficiaries, shall in like cases be applicable, respectfully, to commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted women of the Women's Army Corps, Regular Army, to former commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted women of the Women's Army Corps, Regular Army, and to their dependents and beneficiaries except as may be necessary to adapt said provisions to the Women's Army Corps: *Provided*, That the husbands of women officers and enlisted personnel of the Regular Army shall not be considered dependents unless they are in fact dependent on their wives for their chief support, and the children of such officers and enlisted personnel shall not be considered dependents unless their father is dead or they are in fact dependent on their mother for their chief support.

SEC. 108. Effective the date of enactment of this title, Public Law 281, Seventy-ninth Congress (approved Dec. 28, 1945; 59 Stat. 663), as amended (Public Law 670, 79th Cong., and Public Law 61, 80th Cong.), is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) Section 4 of said act is amended by changing the period at the end of said section to a colon and adding after said colon the following: "*Provided*, That female citizens of the United States may be appointed as officers of the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army under like conditions as those prescribed herein for appointment of male persons as officers in the Regular Army except that they may be appointed in the grades prescribed in section 5 of this act even though such grades be higher than those in which they served as officers in the Women's Army Corps of the Army of the United States."

(b) So much of section 5 of said act as reads "(a) Persons appointed in arms or services of the Regular Army, the officers of which are on the promotion list," is hereby amended to read: "(a) Persons appointed in arms or services of the Regular Army, the officers of which are on the promotion list, including persons appointed in the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army,".

SEC. 109. (a) Effective the date of enactment of this title, the appointment of women in the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army of the United States and the enlistment of women in the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army of the United States shall be authorized.

(b) Except as otherwise specifically provided, all laws now or hereafter applicable to male commissioned officers and former commissioned officers of the Officers' Reserve Corps, to enlisted men and former enlisted men of the Enlisted Reserve Corps, and to their dependents and beneficiaries, shall in

like cases be applicable, respectively, to female commissioned officers and former commissioned officers of the Officers' Reserve Corps, to enlisted women and former enlisted women of the Enlisted Reserve Corps, and to their dependents and beneficiaries, except as may be necessary to adapt said provisions to the Women's Army Corps in the Officers' and Enlisted Reserve Corps: *Provided*, That the husbands of women officers and enlisted personnel of any of the Reserve components of the Army of the United States shall not be considered dependents unless they are in fact dependent on their wives for their chief support, and the children of such personnel shall not be considered dependents unless their father is dead or they are in fact dependent on their mother for their chief support.

(c) Appointments of women in the Officers' Reserve Corps may be made by the President in grades from lieutenant colonel to second lieutenant, inclusive, from female citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 21 years and who possess such qualifications as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That any person who has served satisfactorily as the commanding officer (Director) of the Women's Army Corps established by act of July 1, 1943 (57 Stat. 371), or as the Director of the Women's Army Corps created by this title, may, if otherwise qualified, be appointed in such Reserve Corps in the grade of colonel: *And provided further*, That women specialists (such as scientists and technical experts) who possess such qualifications as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War may be initially appointed in the Officers' Reserve Corps in such grades as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War in accordance with regulations prescribed by him.

(d) Enlistments of women in the Enlisted Reserve Corps may be accepted under the provisions of law now or hereafter applicable to enlistments of male persons in the Enlisted Reserve Corps, under such regulations, in such grades or ratings, and for such periods of time as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War.

(e) The President may form any or all female members of the Officers' Reserve Corps and the Enlisted Reserve Corps into such organizations and units as he may prescribe.

TITLE II

ENLISTMENT AND APPOINTMENT OF WOMEN IN THE REGULAR NAVY AND MARINE CORPS AND THE NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS RESERVE

SEC. 201. All laws or parts of laws which now or hereafter authorize enlistments in the Regular Navy and which now or hereafter authorize appointments of commissioned and warrant officers in the Regular Navy shall, subject to the provisions of this title, be construed to include authority to enlist and appoint women in the Regular Navy: *Provided*, That no woman shall be enlisted in the Regular Navy or Naval Reserve who has not attained the age of 18 years: *And provided further*, That no woman under the age of 21 years shall be enlisted in the Regular Navy or Naval Reserve without the written consent of her parents or guardians, if any.

SEC. 202. The number of enlisted women on the active list of the Regular Navy at any one time shall not exceed 2 percent of the enlisted strength now or hereafter authorized for the active list of the Regular Navy. The number of commissioned and warrant women officers on the active list of the Regular Navy at any one time shall not exceed 10 percent of the authorized number of enlisted women of the Regular Navy.

SEC. 203. Women commissioned in the Regular Navy under the provisions of this title shall not have permanent commissioned grade or rank on the active list of the Regular Navy above that of commander. The number of women officers on the active list of the line of the Regular Navy in the permanent grades of commander and lieutenent commander shall not exceed 10 percent and 20 percent, respectively, of the number of women officers on the active list of the line of the Regular Navy above commissioned warrant grade at any one time. Computations to determine such numbers shall be made as of January 1 of each year. Upon determining such numbers, the Secretary of the Navy may further determine the number, which may be a lesser number, of women officers on the active list of the line of the Regular Navy which may serve in each of such grades and the numbers so further determined shall be held and considered as the authorized numbers until subsequent computations and determinations are made. No woman officer of the Regular Navy shall be reduced in grade or pay, or be separated from the active list, as the result of any such computation or determination.

SEC. 204. All original appointments of women to commissioned grade or rank in the Regular Navy above the grade of commissioned warrant officer, other than appointments effected pursuant to the act of April 18, 1946 (60 Stat. 92), as now or hereafter amended, shall be in the grade or rank of ensign or lieutenant (junior grade) at the discretion of the President. Such appointees shall be female citizens of the United States who on July 1 of the year in which appointed are over 21 and under 30 years of age. No person shall be appointed pursuant to this section until she shall have established her mental, moral, educational, professional, and physical qualifications to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Navy.

SEC. 205. From the women officers serving in the grade or rank of lieutenant commander or above, one woman officer may be detailed to duty in the Bureau of Naval Personnel as an assistant to the Chief of Naval Personnel. She shall have the rank of captain while so serving, and shall be entitled to pay and allowances as are now or may be hereafter prescribed by law for a captain of the Regular Navy, and her regular status as a commissioned officer in the Navy shall not be disturbed by reason of such detail.

SEC. 206. (a) Except as otherwise prescribed in this title, the respective provisions of law now existing or hereafter enacted relating to the promotion by selection of line officers of the Regular Navy not restricted in the performance of duty and to the advancement by selection of staff officers of the Regular Navy which are not inconsistent with the provisions of this title are hereby made applicable to women officers of the Regular Navy.

(b) A woman officer of the grade or rank of ensign in the Regular Navy shall be eligible for promotion or advancement to the grade or rank of lieutenant (junior grade) on the third anniversary of the date of rank stated in her appointment to the grade or rank of ensign.

(c) Selection boards for the recommendations of women officers of the Regular Navy for promotion in grade or for advancement in rank shall consist of nine officers of the line or appropriate staff corps of the Regular Navy. The Secretary of the Navy shall determine the composition of such boards.

(d) Women lieutenant commanders, lieutenants, and lieutenants (junior grade) of the line of the Regular Navy shall become eligible for consideration by a selection board for promotion to the next higher grade in the fiscal year on June 30 of which they will have completed 4, 4, and 3 years, respectively, of service in their grades and shall retain such eligibility until recommended for promotion in the approved report of a board on selection or until separated from the active list. In computing such service in grade, an officer appointed pursuant to the act of April 18, 1946 (60 Stat. 92), as now or hereafter amended, shall be credited in the grade to which so appointed with all active service from the date of rank stated in her appointment in that grade while an officer of the Naval Reserve, exclusive of service in such grade under a temporary appointment which, by its terms, was for a period of limited duration; in each other instance, service in grade shall be computed from the date of rank stated in the appointment to the grade concerned.

(e) Women officers of the staff corps of the Regular Navy shall have as their running mates women officers of the line of the Regular Navy who shall be assigned in the manner prescribed by law now existing or hereafter enacted relating to the assignment of running mates to male staff officers of the Regular Navy.

(f) A woman staff officer of the Regular Navy shall become eligible for consideration for recommendation for advancement to the next higher rank when the President approves the report of a line selection board in which the running mate of such staff officer or a woman line officer junior to such running mate is recommended for promotion to the next higher rank above that held by the staff officer.

(g) The recommendations of the selection boards in the cases of women officers of the line of the Regular Navy shall be based upon their comparative fitness for the duties to which they are assigned in the line of the Regular Navy.

(h) The recommendations of the selection boards in the cases of women officers of each of the respective staff corps of the Regular Navy shall be based upon their comparative fitness for the duties to which they are assigned in each of the respective staff corps of the Regular Navy.

(i) The number to be furnished the appropriate selection board in respect to the promotion of women officers of the line of the Regular Navy to the grades of commander and lieutenant commander shall be determined by the Secretary of the Navy as of the date of the convening of the board and shall be equal to the number of vacancies existing for such officers in the grade concerned plus the estimated number of such vacancies which will occur during the ensuing 12-month period and minus the number of such officers then on the promotion list.

(j) The number to be furnished the appropriate selection board in respect to the promotion of women line officers of the Regular Navy to the grade of lieutenant shall be determined by the Secretary of the Navy as of the date of the convening of the board and shall be equal to the number of women line officers of the Regular Navy of the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) who are eligible for consideration by such board. The board shall recommend such of the eligible officers who, in the opinion of at least two-thirds of the members of the boards, are qualified for promotion and shall so certify in its report. Women line officers recommended for promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the approved report of a board on selection shall become eligible for promotion to that grade on July 1 following the date of approval of the report of the board and, upon promotion, shall be entitled to the pay and allowances of the higher grade from the date of their eligibility for promotion.

(k) Each selection board appointed to recommend women staff officers of the Regular Navy for advancement to the rank of commander or lieutenant commander shall recommend for advancement to the rank concerned in the corps for which it was appointed such eligible officers, in number not to exceed the number furnished it by the Secretary of the Navy, who, in the opinion of at least two-thirds of the members of the board, are best fitted to assume the duties of the next higher rank. The number furnished the appropriate board for each such rank in each corps shall be a fraction of the number

of women officers in the next lower rank of the corps concerned who in that fiscal year first become eligible for consideration for recommendation for advancement to the next higher rank; the numerator of such fraction shall be a number equal to the total number of women line officers recommended for promotion to the rank concerned in the approved report of the immediately preceding line selection board; the denominator shall be a number equal to the number of women line officers eligible in the fiscal year concerned for consideration for recommendation for advancement to the rank concerned, exclusive of those previously passed over in selection for promotion to that rank and of those junior in lineal rank to the junior woman line officer recommended for promotion to that rank in the approved report of the immediately preceding line selection board; if the number so determined be a mixed number and the fraction thereof be one-half or greater, the fraction shall be regarded as a whole number; if such computation produces no whole number, the fraction shall be regarded as a whole number.

(l) Each selection board appointed to recommend women staff officers of the Regular Navy for advancement to the rank of lieutenant shall recommend such of the eligible officers who, in the opinion of at least two-thirds of the members of the board, are qualified for advancement.

(m) Upon promotion to the grade of commander or lieutenant commander, a woman officer of the line of the Regular Navy shall be entitled to the pay and allowances of such grade from the date of the occurrence of the vacancy to which she is promoted to fill.

(n) Each woman staff officer of the Regular Navy recommended for advancement in rank in the approved report of a board on selection shall become eligible for advancement to the rank for which recommended on the date that the line officer who is to be her running mate in such rank becomes eligible for promotion to that rank and, upon promotion, shall be entitled to the pay and allowances of the higher rank from the date upon which she becomes eligible for advancement thereto.

(o) Women officers of the line or staff corps of the Regular Navy shall not increase the authorized number of commissioned officers of the line or staff corps concerned nor shall women officers of the grades of chief pay clerk, pay clerk, and acting pay clerk increase the authorized number of officers of those grades. Women line officers of the Regular Navy above the grade of commissioned warrant officer shall be carried in their respective grades as in excess of the numbers otherwise authorized in those grades.

(p) The provisions of law now existing or hereafter enacted relating to the promotion of male warrant officers and to advancement to higher pay periods of male commissioned warrant officers shall apply in like manner to women warrant and commissioned warrant officers.

SEC. 207. (a) All provisions of law now existing or hereafter enacted relating to retired officers of the Regular Navy and to the retirement or separation from the active list of officers of the Regular Navy, except those provisions relating to the same subject matter provided for in the following subsections of this section, are hereby made applicable to women officers of the Regular Navy.

(b) Each woman officer of the grade or rank of commander in the Regular Navy, or a woman officer serving as an assistant to the Chief of Naval Personnel with the rank of captain, who attains the age of 55 years or completed 30 years' active commissioned service in the Regular Navy and the Naval Reserve, whichever is earlier, shall be retired by the President on the first day of the month following that in which she attains such age or completes such service, and except as otherwise provided by law, shall be placed on the retired list in the permanent rank held by her at the time of retirement: *Provided*, That a woman commander or lieutenant commander who serves as an assistant to the Chief of Naval Personnel with the rank of captain and who attains the age of 50 years while so serving may be retired by the President on the first day of the month following that in which she ceases to serve as such assistant to the Chief of Naval Personnel, and if so retired may be placed on the retired list in the rank authorized by subsection (d).

(c) Each woman officer of the Regular Navy who attains the age of 50 years while serving in the grade or rank of lieutenant commander or below shall be retired by the President on the 1st day of the month following that in which she attains such age, and, except as otherwise provided by law, shall be placed on the retired list in the permanent rank held by her at the time of retirement: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not apply to an officer of the grade or rank of lieutenant commander who is on a promotion list for the grade or rank of commander or to one while serving as an assistant to the Chief of Naval Personnel with the rank of captain.

(d) Any woman officer of the Regular Navy who may be retired for any reason while serving as an assistant to the Chief of Naval Personnel under section 205 of this title, or who subsequent to such service may be retired for any reason while serving in a lower rank, may, if she shall have served 2½ years or more as such assistant, be placed on the retired list, at the discretion of the President, in the rank held by her while serving as such assistant to the Chief of Naval Personnel: *Provided*, That the commissioned officer first detailed to duty in the Bureau of Naval Personnel as an assistant to the Chief of Naval Personnel, pursuant to this title, shall without limitation as to the time she shall serve in such capacity, upon retirement be retired with the rank held while so serving, and shall receive retired pay at the rate prescribed by law computed on the basis of the base and longevity pay she would have received if serving on active duty with such rank.

(e) Each woman officer of the Regular Navy who is placed on the retired list in her permanent rank pursuant to subsection (b) or (c) of this section shall receive retired pay at the rate of 2½ percent of the active duty pay to which entitled at the time of retirement, multiplied by the number of years for which entitled to credit in the computation of her active duty pay.

(f) Each woman officer of the Regular Navy retired because of physical disability incurred in line of duty shall, if placed on the retired list in a rank higher than her permanent rank, reecive retired pay equal to 75 percent of the active duty pay to which she would be entitled if serving, at the time of retirement, on active duty in the rank in which placed upon the retired list.

(g) Each woman officer of the Regular Navy retired for other than physical disability incurred in the line of duty shall, if placed on the retired list in a rank higher than her permanent rank, receive retired pay equal to 2½ percent of the active duty pay to which she would be entitled if serving, at the time of retirement, on active duty in the rank in which placed upon the retired list, multiplied by the number of years for which entitled to credit in the computation of her active duty pay, not to exceed a total of 75 percent of said active duty pay.

(h) In any instance in which retired pay is computed pursuant to subsection (e) and (g) of this section a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year in computing the number of years by which the rate of 2½ percent is multiplied.

(i) Women officers of the grade or rank of lieutenant commander in the Regular Navy whose names, on June 30 of the fiscal year in which they complete 20 years' active commissioned service in the Regular Navy and the Naval Reserve, are not then on a promotion list for advancement to the next higher grade or rank shall be placed on the retired list on that date.

(j) Women officers of the grades or ranks of lieutenant and lieutenant (junior grade) in the Regular Navy whose names on June 30 of the fiscal year in which they complete 13 and 7 years' active commissioned service, respectively, in the Regular Navy and the Naval Reserve are not then on a promotion list for advancement to the next higher grade or rank shall be honorably discharged from the Navy on that date with a lump-sum payment computed on the basis of 2 months active-duty pay at the time of their discharge for each year of commissioned service, but not to exceed a total of 2 years' pay: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this subsection a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year in computing the number of years commissioned service upon which to base such lump-sum payment.

(k) The retired pay of a woman officer of the Regular Navy who is commissioned in the Regular Navy pursuant to the act of April 18, 1946 (60 Stat. 92), as now or hereafter amended, shall not be less than 50 percent of her active-duty pay at the time of retirement.

SEC. 208. All provisions of law now existing or hereafter enacted relating to male personnel of the Navy, except those provisions relating to the same subject matter specifically provided for in this title, shall, where applicable, be construed to include women.

SEC. 209. The Secretary of the Navy may prescribe the quantity and kind of clothing and equipment which shall be furnished annually to enlisted women of the Regular Navy, including that required upon their first reporting for duty, and the amount of a cash allowance to be paid to such enlisted women in any case in which such clothing and equipment is not so furnished to them.

SEC. 210. The Secretary of the Navy may prescribe the manner in which women shall be trained and qualified for military duty in the Regular Navy, the military authority which they may exercise, and the kind of military duty to which they may be assigned.

SEC. 211. All provisions of law relating to pay, leave, money allowances for subsistence and rental of quarters, mileage and other travel allowances, or other allowances, benefits, or emoluments, of male personnel of the Regular Navy are hereby made applicable to women personnel of the Regular Navy: *Provided*, That the husbands of women officers and enlisted personnel of the Regular Navy shall not be considered dependents unless they are in fact dependent on their wives for their chief support, and the children of such officers and enlisted personnel shall not be considered dependents unless their father is dead or they are in fact dependent on their mother for their chief support.

SEC. 212. Title V of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (56 Stat. 730), as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out sections 501 to 508, inclusive, thereof, and substituting therefor the following:

"SEC. 501. Women may be enlisted or appointed in the Naval Reserve under the provisions of this Act, as now or hereafter amended, in such appropriate ratings, grades, or ranks as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy in the same manner and, except as otherwise provided in this title, under the same circumstances and conditions as men are enlisted or appointed in the Naval Reserve.

"SEC. 502. The Secretary of the Navy may prescribe the manner in which women enlisted or appointed in the Naval Reserve shall be trained and qualified for military duty, the military authority they may exercise, and the kind of military duty to which they may be assigned.

"SEC. 503. The provisions of this act, as now or hereafter amended, which relate to pay, leave, money allowances for subsistence and rental of quarters, mileage, and other travel allowances, or other allowances, benefits, or emoluments, for male personnel of the Naval Reserve, shall also apply to women personnel of the Naval Reserve: *Provided*, That the husbands of women personnel of the Naval Reserve shall not be considered dependents unless they are in fact dependent on their wives for their chief support, and the children of such personnel shall not be considered dependents unless their father is dead or they are in fact dependent on their mother for their chief support.

"SEC. 504. The Secretary of the Navy may prescribe the quantity and kind of clothing and equipment to be furnished annually to enlisted women of the Naval Reserve, including that required upon their first reporting for active duty, and he may prescribe the amount of cash allowance to be paid to such enlisted women in any case in which such clothing and equipment is not so furnished to them.

"SEC. 505. All members of the Women's Reserve enlisted or appointed under the act of July 30, 1942 (56 Stat. 730), as amended, are hereby transferred to the appropriate components of the Naval Reserve in the same temporary and permanent ratings, grades, or ranks, with the same effective dates and dates of precedence, which they held in the Women's Reserve on the effective date of this act, and such transfer shall be for the unexpired period of their current enlistments or appointments in the Women's Reserve."

SEC. 213. (a) Women may be enlisted or appointed in the Regular Marine Corps under the provisions of this title, and the provisions of this title (except as may be necessary to adapt said provisions to the Marine Corps) are hereby made applicable to women enlisted or appointed in the Regular Marine Corps in the same manner as such provisions apply to women enlisted or appointed in the Regular Navy.

(b) The number of enlisted women on the active list of the Regular Marine Corps at any one time shall not exceed 2 percent of the enlisted strength now or hereafter authorized for the active list of the Regular Marine Corps.

(c) The number of commissioned and warrant women officers on the active list of the Regular Marine Corps at any one time shall not exceed 10 percent of the authorized number of enlisted women of the Regular Marine Corps.

(d) From the women officers serving in the grade of major or above in the Marine Corps, one officer may be detailed to duty in the Personnel Department of the Marine Corps as an assistant to the Director of Personnel, Marine Corps. She shall have the rank of colonel while so serving, and shall be entitled to the pay and allowances as are now or may be hereafter prescribed by law for a colonel of the Regular Marine Corps, and her regular status as a commissioned officer in the Marine Corps shall not be disturbed by reason of such detail. The provisions of section 207 of this title shall apply in the same manner, and under the same relative conditions, to women officers of the Regular Marine Corps who have or shall have served as an assistant to the Director of Personnel of the Marine Corps.

SEC. 214. (a) The Secretary of the Navy, under the circumstances and in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President, may terminate the commission of any woman officer commissioned in the Regular Navy or Marine Corps pursuant to this title.

(b) The Secretary of the Navy, under such regulations as he may prescribe, may terminate the enlistment of any enlisted women in the Regular Navy or Marine Corps, and each such person whose enlistment is so terminated shall be discharged from the service.

SEC. 215. The provisions of this title shall not be construed to apply to women officers of the Navy Nurse Corps.

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the enlistment and appointment of women in the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 4, strike out the words "Integration Act of 1947" and insert in lieu thereof the words "Reserve Act of 1948."

On page 1, line 6, strike out the words "Establishment of Women's Army Corps, Regular Army", and insert in lieu thereof the word "Army."

On page 1, strike out all of lines 7 and 8.

Strike out all of pages 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10.

On page 11, strike out lines 1 to 15, inclusive.

On page 11, line 16, strike out the words "SEC. 109" and insert in lieu thereof the words "SEC. 101."

On page 12, lines 6 and 7, strike out the words "Women's Army Corps" and insert in lieu thereof the following "such female persons."

On page 12, line 20, strike out the word "War" and insert in lieu thereof the words "the Army."

On page 12, lines 23 and 24, strike out the words "or as the Director of the Women's Army Corps created by this title."

On page 13, line 4, strike out the word "War" and insert in lieu thereof the words "the Army."

On page 13, line 6, strike out the word "War" and insert in lieu thereof the words "the Army."

On page 13, line 13, strike out the word "War" and insert in lieu thereof the words "the Army."

On page 13, line 16, after the period add the following new section:

"SEC. 102. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2a of the act of July 25, 1947 (Public Law 239, 80th Cong.), neither (1) the act of July 1, 1943 (57 Stat. 371), nor (2) the act of September 22, 1941 (55 Stat. 728, ch. 414), as amended, insofar as it pertains to officers of the Women's Army Corps heretofore appointed thereunder, shall be repealed until that date which is 12 months after the date of enactment of this act."

On page 13, strike out lines 18, 19, and 20, and insert in lieu thereof the following "Navy and Marine Corps."

On page 13, strike out lines 21 to 25, inclusive.

Strike out all of pages 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27.

On page 28, strike out lines 1 and 2.

On page 28, line 3, strike out the words "SEC. 212", and insert in lieu thereof the words "SEC. 201."

On page 28, line 5, after the word "out", insert the words "the present caption and."

On page 28, immediately preceding the words "SEC. 501", insert the following: "Title V—Women in the Naval Reserve."

On page 28, lines 9 and 10, strike out the words "ratings, grades, or ranks" and insert in lieu thereof the words "ratings or grades."

On page 28, line 18, delete the period after the word "assigned" and insert in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That they shall not be assigned to duty in aircraft while such aircraft are engaged in combat missions nor shall they be assigned to duty on vessels of the Navy except hospital ships and naval transports."

On page 29, line 17, strike out the words "ratings, grades, or rank" and insert in lieu thereof the words "ratings or grades."

On page 29, line 19, strike out the word "this" and insert in lieu thereof the word "the."

On page 29, strike out lines 20, 21, and 22, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Women's Armed Services Reserve Act of 1948, and such transfer of enlisted personnel shall be for a period to be determined by the Secretary of the Navy."

On page 29, line 23, strike out the words "SEC. 213", and insert in lieu thereof the words "SEC. 202."

On page 29, line 24, strike out the word "Regular."

On page 29, line 24, after the word "Corps", add the word "Reserve."

On page 30, line 3, strike out the word "Regular."

On page 30, line 3, after the word "Corps", add the word "Reserve."

On page 30, line 4, strike out the words "Regular Navy" and insert in lieu thereof the words "Naval Reserve."

On page 30, strike out all of lines 5 to 25, inclusive.

On page 31, strike out lines 1 to 15, inclusive.

On page 31, immediately following line 15, add a new title as follows:

"TITLE III

"AIR FORCE

"SEC. 301. (a) Effective on the date of enactment of this title, the appointment and enlistment of women in the Officers' and Enlisted Section of the Air Force Reserve shall be authorized.

"(b) Except as otherwise specifically provided, all laws now applicable to male commissioned officers and former commissioned officers of the Officers' Reserve Corps, to enlisted men and former enlisted men of the Enlisted Reserve Corps, and to their dependents and beneficiaries, shall be applicable, respectively, to female commissioned officers and former commissioned officers, to enlisted women and former enlisted women, of the Air Force Reserve, and to their dependents and beneficiaries, except as may be necessary to adapt said provisions to such female persons: *Provided*, That the husbands of such female persons shall not be considered dependents unless they are in fact dependent on their wives for their chief support, and the children of such female persons shall not be considered dependents unless their father is dead or they are in fact dependent on their mother for their chief support.

"(c) Appointments of women to commissioned grade in the Air Force Reserve may be made by the President alone in grades from lieutenant colonel to second lieutenant, inclusive, from female citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 21 years and who possess such other qualifications as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force: *Provided*, That any person who has served satisfactorily in the temporary grade of colonel in the Women's Army Corps established by act of July 1, 1943 (57 Stat. 371), may, if otherwise qualified, be appointed in the grade of colonel in the Air Force Reserve.

"(d) Enlistments of women in the Air Force Reserve may be accepted under the provisions of law now applicable to enlistments of male persons in the Enlisted Reserve Corps, under such regulations, in such grades, or ratings, and for such periods of time as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force.

"(e) The President may form any or all such female persons of the Air Force Reserve into such organizations and units as he may prescribe.

"(f) The Secretary of the Air Force shall prescribe the military authority which any female person of the Air Force Reserve may exercise, and the kind of military duty to which such female persons may be assigned: *Provided*, That female persons of the Air Force shall not be assigned to aircraft while such aircraft are engaged in combat missions."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the enlistment and appointment of women in the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes."

Mr. SHAFER (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the further reading of the bill and the committee amendments, and I move the adoption of the committee amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER]?

There was no objection.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maine.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Strike out all after the enacting clause of Senate 1641 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That this act may be cited as the 'Women's Armed Services Reserve Act of 1948.'

"TITLE I"

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the amendment.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BROOKS. The Committee just voted a committee amendment which strikes out the amendment proposed by the gentlewoman from Maine, and which approves the House Armed Services Committee version of this bill. Now, is it in order to vote again on the Senate version of the bill, which has been stricken out by the House under those circumstances?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maine is different from the Senate version or the House bill.

Without objection, the further reading of the amendment will be dispensed with, and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There was no objection.

The amendment is as follows:

That this act may be cited as the "Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948."

TITLE I

ESTABLISHMENT OF WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS, REGULAR ARMY

SEC. 101. Effective the date of enactment of this title, there is established in the Regular Army a Women's Army Corps, which shall perform such services as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army.

SEC. 102. (a) The authorized commissioned, warrant, and enlisted strengths of the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army shall, from time to time, be determined by the Secretary of the Army, within the authorized commissioned, warrant, and enlisted strengths of the Regular Army, but shall not exceed 2 percent of such authorized Regular Army strengths, respectively.

(b) There is authorized a strength of 51,000 active-list commissioned officers in the Regular Army, exclusive of the numbers authorized by law for the Army Nurse Corps, the Women's Medical Specialist Corps, professors of the United States Military Academy, and any numbers authorized by special provisions of law providing for officers in designated categories as additional numbers.

SEC. 103. (a) From the officers permanently commissioned in the Women's Army Corps, Regular Army, the Secretary of the Army shall select to serve during his pleasure, but normally not to exceed 4 years, one officer to be Director of the Women's Army Corps who shall be adviser to the Secretary of the Army on Women's Army Corps matters, and who, without vacation of her permanent grade, shall have the temporary rank, pay, and allowances of a colonel while so serving; one officer to be Deputy Director thereof, who, if permanently commissioned in a lower grade, shall, without vacation of her permanent grade, have the temporary rank, pay, and allowances of a lieutenant colonel while so serving; and from among officers of the Women's Army Corps (including Women's Army Corps officers of the Army of the United States or any component thereof serving on extended active duty) the Secretary of the Army shall select to serve during his pleasure such number of officers as he may determine necessary to fill positions designated by him in the administration and training of the Women's Army Corps, who, if permanently commissioned in a lower grade, shall, without vacation of permanent grade, have the temporary rank, pay, and allowances of lieutenant colonel or major while so serving, as the Secretary of the Army may determine: *Provided*, That after July 1, 1952, such officers shall be selected from among commissioned officers in the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel or major, except the Director and Deputy Director, who shall be selected from among officers in the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel: *And provided further*, That prior to July 1, 1952, the Secretary of the Army may extend that date one time until such later date as he may select for that purpose, but such later date shall not be later than July 1, 1956.

(b) Unless entitled to higher retired rank or pay under any provision of law, each such commissioned officer who shall have served for 4 years as Director or Deputy Director of such corps shall, upon retirement, be retired with the rank held by her while so serving, shall receive retired pay at the rate prescribed by law computed on the basis of the base and longevity pay which she would receive if serving on active duty with such rank, and if thereafter recalled to active service shall be recalled in such rank.

SEC. 104. (a) Commissioned officers of the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from female citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 21 years and who possess such qualifications as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army.

(b) Except as modified or otherwise provided by express provisions of law, original appointments of officers in the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army shall be made from among qualified female persons in the manner now or hereafter prescribed by law for appointment of male persons in the Regular Army except as may be necessary to adapt said provisions to the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army.

(c) Officers shall be permanently commissioned in the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army in grades from second lieutenant to lieutenant colonel, inclusive. The authorized number in permanent grade of lieutenant colonel shall be such as the Secretary of the Army shall from time to time determine, but shall not exceed 10 percent of the total authorized commissioned strength of such corps.

(d) (1) During the interim between the date of enactment of this title and January 1, 1948, officers of the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army shall be promotion-list officers as contemplated in Public Law 281, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved December 28, 1945, as amended. Effective January 1, 1948, the names of all active-list commissioned officers of the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army shall be carried on a separate promotion list known as the Women's Army Corps promotion list and such officers shall be promotion-list officers as that term is defined under the laws then in effect. On January 1, 1948, the Women's Army Corps promotion list hereinabove described shall be established by entering thereon the names of the officers concerned without change in the order of their precedence on the promotion list contemplated in Public Law 281, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved December 28, as amended.

(2) Except as otherwise prescribed in this title or some other express provision of law, the respective provisions of law now existing or hereafter enacted relating (1) to the procurement, promotion, and elimination from the active list by retirement or discharge of "promotion-list officers" and (2) to "promotion lists" as the terms "promotion-list officers" and "promotion list" are from time to time defined by law, are hereby made applicable to the officers of the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army and to the Women's Army Corps promotion list, respectively.

(3) Effective January 1, 1948, and within the limitations prescribed in this title, the Secretary of the Army shall prescribe the authorized numbers in each of the several commissioned grades in the Women's Army Corps promotion list under the provisions of law applicable to promotion lists generally. Officers of the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army shall be permanently promoted to the grades of first lieutenant, captain, and major, as now or hereafter prescribed for promotion to such grades of promotion-list officers as that term is from time to time defined by law, including any special provisions pertaining to promotion to fill initial requirements in such grades on or about July 1, 1948. Officers of the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army shall be promoted to and appointed in the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel in the Regular Army only when a vacancy exists in the number of lieutenant colonels authorized for the Women's Army Corps promotion list and such officers shall be appointed in that grade only when selected and recommended for that grade by a selection board under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army.

(4) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army any selection board convened to consider and recommend officers of the Women's Army Corps for promotion to any grade may contain officers of the Women's Army Corps holding permanent or temporary appointment in any grade above major.

(5) Officers of the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army shall be eliminated from the active list and retired or separated, as the case may be, under the provisions of law now or hereafter applicable to promotion-list officers generally, and they shall receive retired pay or severance pay, whichever is applicable, computed as provided under such law for promotion-list officers generally: *Provided*, That any officer of the Women's Army Corps in the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Army, be retained on the active list until that date which is 30 days after the date upon which 30 "years' service" is completed: *Provided further*, That any officer of the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army in the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel, who is serving in the temporary grade of colonel by virtue of occupying the position of Director of said corps, may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Army, be retained on the active list while serving in such temporary grade: *Provided*

further, That on and after June 30, 1953, each officer of the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army, heretofore or hereafter appointed in the permanent grade of major who is not retired or separated at an earlier date under other provisions of law, shall be eliminated from the active list on that date which is 30 days after the date upon which she completes 25 "years' service," unless she is appointed in the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel in the Regular Army before that date: *And provided further*, That the term "years' service" as used in this paragraph shall be construed to include the identical service defined by law to be included in that term under the law now or hereafter applicable to eliminations from the active list of promotion-list officers generally.

(e) The Secretary of the Army shall prescribe the military authority which commissioned officers of the Women's Army Corps may exercise, and the kind of military duty to which they may be assigned.

(f) The Secretary of the Army under the circumstances and in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President, may terminate the commission of any officer appointed in the Women's Army Corps.

SEC. 105. Under such regulations as the Secretary of the Army may prescribe, female citizens of the United States may be appointed in the Women's Army Corps, Regular Army, in the permanent grade of warrant officer (junior grade) and in the permanent grade of chief warrant officer under the provisions of law now or hereafter applicable to appointment of male persons in such permanent warrant officer grades in the Regular Army.

SEC. 106. (a) Original enlistments and reenlistments in the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army, from among female persons who possess such qualifications as the Secretary of War may prescribe, may be accepted under applicable provisions of law which govern original enlistments and reenlistments in the Regular Army of male persons except as may be necessary to adapt said provisions to the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army: *Provided*, That no person shall be enlisted in the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army who has not attained the age of 18 years: *And provided further*, That no person under the age of 21 years shall be enlisted in such corps without the written consent of her parents or guardians, if any.

(b) The Secretary of the Army, under such regulations as he may prescribe, may terminate the enlistment of any enlisted woman in the Women's Army Corps, and each person whose enlistment is so terminated shall be discharged from the Army.

SEC. 107. Except as otherwise specifically provided, all laws now or hereafter applicable to male commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Regular Army; to former male commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Regular Army; and to their dependents and beneficiaries, shall in like cases be applicable, respectively, to commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted women of the Women's Army Corps, Regular Army, to former commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted women of the Women's Army Corps, Regular Army, and to their dependents and beneficiaries except as may be necessary to adapt said provisions to the Women's Army Corps: *Provided*, That the husbands of women officers and enlisted personnel of the Regular Army shall not be considered dependents unless they are in fact dependent on their wives for their chief support, and the children of such officers and enlisted personnel shall not be considered dependents unless their father is dead or they are in fact dependent on their mother for their chief support.

SEC. 108. Effective the date of enactment this title, Public Law 281, Seventy-ninth Congress (approved December 28, 1945; 59 Stat. 663), as amended (Public Law 670, 79th Cong., and Public Law 61, 80th Cong.), is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) Section 4 of said act is amended by changing the period at the end of said section to a colon and adding after said colon the following: "*Provided*, That female citizens of the United States may be appointed as officers of the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army under like conditions as those prescribed herein for appointment of male persons as officers in the Regular Army except that they may be appointed in the grades prescribed in section 5 of this act even though such grades be higher than those in which they served as officers in the Women's Army Corps of the Army of the United States."

(b) So much of section 5 of said act as reads "(a) Persons appointed in arms or services of the Regular Army, the officers of which are on the promotion list," is hereby amended to read: "(a) Persons appointed in arms or services of the Regular Army, the officers of which are on the promotion list, including persons appointed in the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army,".

SEC. 109. (a) Effective the date of enactment of this title, the appointment of women in the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army of the United States and the enlistment of women in the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army of the United States shall be authorized.

(b) Except as otherwise specifically provided, all laws now or hereafter applicable to male commissioned officers and former commissioned officers of the Officers' Reserve Corps, to enlisted men and former enlisted men of the Enlisted Reserve Corps, and to their dependents and beneficiaries, shall in like cases be applicable, respectively, to female commissioned officers and former commissioned officers of the Officers' Reserve Corps, to enlisted women and former enlisted women of the Enlisted Reserve Corps, and to their dependents and beneficiaries, except as may be necessary to adapt said provisions to the Women's Army Corps in the Officers' and Enlisted Reserve Corps: *Provided*, That the husbands of women officers and enlisted personnel of any of the Reserve components of the Army of the United States shall not be considered dependents unless they are in fact dependent on their wives for their chief support, and the children of such personnel shall not be considered dependents unless their father is dead or they are in fact dependent on their mother for their chief support.

(c) Appointments of women in the Officers' Reserve Corps may be made by the President in grades from lieutenant colonel to second lieutenant, inclusive, from female citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 21 years and who possess such qualifications as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army: *Provided*, That any person who has served satisfactorily as the commanding officer (Director) of the Women's Army Corps established by act of July 1, 1943 (57 Stat. 371), or as the Director of the Women's Army Corps created by this title, may, if otherwise qualified, be appointed in such Reserve Corps in the grade of Colonel: *And provided further*, That women specialists (such as scientists and technical experts) who possess such qualifications as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army may be initially appointed in the Officers' Reserve Corps in such grades as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army in accordance with regulations prescribed by him.

(d) Enlistments of women in the Enlisted Reserve Corps may be accepted under the provisions of law now or hereafter applicable to enlistments of male persons in the Enlisted Reserve Corps, under such regulations, in such grades or ratings, and for such periods of time as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army.

(e) The President may form any or all female members of the Officers' Reserve Corps and the Enlisted Reserve Corps into such organizations and units as he may prescribe.

SEC. 110. The provisions of this act shall be applicable to the Department of the Air Force: *Provided*, That all references therein to the Secretary of the Army, the Department of the Army, the Regular Army, the Organized Reserve Corps, the Officers Reserve Corps, the Enlisted Reserve Corps, and the Organized Reserves, shall be construed for the purposes of this act as referring to the Secretary of the Air Force, the Department of the Air Force, the Regular Air Force, the Air Force Reserve, the officers section of the Air Force Reserve, the enlisted section of the Air Force Reserve, and personnel of the Organized Reserves transferred to the Department of the Air Force, respectively.

TITLE II

ENLISTMENT AND APPOINTMENT OF WOMEN IN THE REGULAR NAVY AND MARINE CORPS AND THE NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS RESERVE

SEC. 201. All laws or parts of laws which now or hereafter authorize enlistments in the Regular Navy and which now or hereafter authorize appointments of commissioned and warrant officers in the Regular Navy shall, subject to the provisions of this title, be construed to include authority to enlist and appoint women in the Regular Navy: *Provided*, That no woman shall be enlisted in the Regular Navy or Naval Reserve who has not attained the age of 18 years: *And provided further*, That no woman under the age of 21 years shall be enlisted in the Regular Navy or Naval Reserve without the written consent of her parents or guardians, if any.

SEC. 202. The number of enlisted women on the active list of the Regular Navy at any one time shall not exceed 2 percent of the enlisted strength now or hereafter authorized for the active list of the Regular Navy. The number of commissioned and warrant women officers on the active list of the Regular Navy at any one time shall not exceed 10 percent of the authorized number of enlisted women of the Regular Navy.

SEC. 203. Women commissioned in the Regular Navy under the provisions of this title shall not have permanent commissioned grade or rank on the active list of the Regular Navy above that of commander. The number of women officers on the active list of the line of the Regular Navy in the permanent grades of commander and lieutenant commander shall not exceed 10 percent and 20 percent, respectively, of the number of women officers on the active list of the line of the Regular Navy above commissioned warrant grade at any one time. Computations to determine such numbers shall be made as of January 1 of each year. Upon determining such numbers, the Secretary of the Navy may further determine the number, which may be a lesser number, of women officers on the active list of the line of the Regular Navy which may serve in each of such grades and the numbers so further determined shall be held and considered as the authorized numbers until subsequent computations and determinations are made. No woman officer of the Regular Navy shall be reduced in grade or pay, or be separated from the active list, as the result of any such computation or determination.

SEC. 204. All original appointments of women to commissioned grade or rank in the Regular Navy above the grade of commissioned warrant officer, other than appointments effected pursuant to the act of April 18, 1946 (60 Stat. 92), as now or hereafter amended, shall be in the grade or rank of ensign or lieutenant (junior grade) at the discretion of the President. Such appointees shall be female citizens of the United States who on July 1 of the year in which appointed are over 21 and under 30 years of age. No person shall be appointed pursuant to this

section until she shall have established her mental, moral, educational, professional, and physical qualifications to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Navy.

SEC. 205. From the women officers serving in the grade or rank of lieutenant commander or above, one woman officer may be detailed to duty in the Bureau of Naval Personnel as an assistant to the Chief of Naval Personnel. She shall have the rank of captain while so serving, and shall be entitled to pay and allowances as are now or may be hereafter prescribed by law for a captain of the Regular Navy, and her regular status as a commissioned officer in the Navy shall not be disturbed by reason of such detail.

SEC. 206. (a) Except as otherwise prescribed in this title, the respective provisions of law now existing or hereafter enacted relating to the promotion by selection of line officers of the Regular Navy not restricted in the performance of duty and to the advancement by selection of staff officers of the Regular Navy which are not inconsistent with the provisions of this title are hereby made applicable to women officers of the Regular Navy.

(b) A woman officer of the grade or rank of ensign in the Regular Navy shall be eligible for promotion or advancement to the grade or rank of lieutenant (junior grade) on the third anniversary of the date of rank stated in her appointment to the grade or rank of ensign.

(c) Selection boards for the recommendation of women officers of the Regular Navy for promotion in grade or for advancement in rank shall consist of nine officers of the line or appropriate staff corps of the Regular Navy. The Secretary of the Navy shall determine the composition of such boards.

(d) Women lieutenant commanders, lieutenants, and lieutenants (junior grade) of the line of the Regular Navy shall become eligible for consideration by a selection board for promotion to the next higher grade in the fiscal year on June 30 of which they will have completed 4, 4, and 3 years, respectively, of service in their grades and shall retain such eligibility until recommended for promotion in the approved report of a board on selection or until separated from the active list. In computing such service in grade, an officer appointed pursuant to the act of April 18, 1946 (60 Stat. 92), as now or hereafter amended, shall be credited in the grade to which so appointed with all active service from the date of rank stated in her appointment in that grade while an officer of the Naval Reserve, exclusive of service in such grade under a temporary appointment which, by its terms, was for a period of limited duration; in each other instance, service in grade shall be computed from the date of rank stated in the appointment to the grade concerned.

(e) Women officers of the staff corps of the Regular Navy shall have as their running mates women officers of the line of the Regular Navy who shall be assigned in the manner prescribed by law now existing or hereafter enacted relating to the assignment of running mates to male staff officers of the Regular Navy.

(f) A woman staff officer of the Regular Navy shall become eligible for consideration for recommendation for advancement to the next higher rank when the President approves the report of a line selection board in which the running mate of such staff officer or a woman line officer junior to such running mate is recommended for promotion to the next higher rank above that held by the staff officer.

(g) The recommendations of the selection boards in the cases of women officers of the line of the Regular Navy shall be based upon their comparative fitness for the duties to which they are assigned in the line of the Regular Navy.

(h) The recommendations of the selection boards in the cases of women officers of each of the respective staff corps of the Regular Navy shall be based upon their comparative fitness for the duties to which they are assigned in each of the respective staff corps of the Regular Navy.

(i) The number to be furnished the appropriate selection board in respect to the promotion of women officers of the line of the Regular Navy to the grades of commander and lieutenant commander shall be determined by the Secretary of the Navy as of the date of the convening of the board and shall be equal to the number of vacancies existing for such officers in the grade concerned plus the estimated number of such vacancies which will occur during the ensuing 12-month period and minus the number of such officers then on the promotion list.

(j) The number to be furnished the appropriate selection board in respect to the promotion of women line officers of the Regular Navy to the grade of lieutenant shall be determined by the Secretary of the Navy as of the date of the convening of the board and shall be equal to the number of women line officers of the Regular Navy of the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) who are eligible for consideration by such board. The board shall recommend such of the eligible officers who, in the opinion of at least two-thirds of the members of the board, are qualified for promotion and shall so certify in its report. Women line officers recommended for promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the approved report of a board on selection shall become eligible for promotion to that grade on July 1 following the date of approval of the report of the board and, upon promotion, shall be entitled to the pay and allowances of the higher grade from the date of their eligibility for promotion.

(k) Each selection board appointed to recommend women staff officers of the Regular Navy for advancement to the rank of commander or lieutenant commander shall recommend for advancement to the rank concerned in the corps for which it was appointed such eligible officers, in number not to exceed the number furnished it by the Secretary of the Navy, who, in the opinion of at least two-thirds of the members of the board, are best fitted to assume the duties of the next higher rank. The number furnished the appropriate board for each such rank in each corps shall be a fraction of the number of women officers in the next lower rank of the corps concerned who in that fiscal year first become eligible for consideration for recommendation for advancement to the next higher rank; the numerator of such fraction shall be a number equal to the total number of women line officers recommended for promotion to the rank concerned in the approved report of the immediately preceding line selection board; the denominator shall be a number equal to the number of women line officers eligible in the fiscal year concerned for consideration for recommendation for advancement to the rank concerned, exclusive of those previously passed over in selection for promotion to that rank and of those junior in lineal rank to the junior woman line officer recommended for promotion to that rank in the approved report of the immediately preceding line selection board; if the number so determined be a mixed number and the fraction thereof be one-half or greater, the fraction shall be regarded as a whole number; if such computation produces no whole number, the fraction shall be regarded as a whole number.

(l) Each selection board appointed to recommend women staff officers of the Regular Navy for advancement to the rank of lieutenant shall recommend such of the eligible officers who, in the opinion of at least two-thirds of the members of the board, are qualified for advancement.

(m) Upon promotion to the grade of commander or lieutenant commander, a woman officer of the line of the Regular Navy shall be entitled to the pay and allowances of such grade from the date of the occurrence of the vacancy to which she is promoted to fill.

(n) Each woman staff officer of the Regular Navy recommended for advancement in rank in the approved report of a board on selection shall become eligible for advancement to the rank for which recommended on the date that the line officer who is to be her running mate in such rank becomes eligible for promotion to that rank and, upon promotion, shall be entitled to the pay and allowances of the higher rank from the date upon which she becomes eligible for advancement thereto.

(o) Women officers of the line or staff corps of the Regular Navy shall not increase the authorized number of commissioned officers of the line or staff corps concerned nor shall women officers of the grades of chief pay clerk, pay clerk, and acting pay clerk increase the authorized number of officers of those grades. Women line officers of the Regular Navy above the grade of commissioned warrant officer shall be carried in their respective grades as in excess of the numbers otherwise authorized in those grades.

(p) The provisions of law now existing or hereafter enacted relating to the promotion of male warrant officers and to advancement to higher pay periods of male commissioned warrant officers shall apply in like manner to women warrant and commissioned warrant officers.

SEC. 207. (a) All provisions of law now existing or hereafter enacted relating to retired officers of the Regular Navy and to the retirement or separation from the active list of officers of the Regular Navy, except those provisions relating to the same subject matter provided for in the following subsections of this section, are hereby made applicable to women officers of the Regular Navy.

(b) Each woman officer of the grade or rank of commander in the Regular Navy, or a woman officer serving as an assistant to the Chief of Naval Personnel with the rank of captain, who attains the age of 55 years or completed 30 years' active commissioned service in the Regular Navy and the Naval Reserve, whichever is earlier, shall be retired by the President on the first day of the month following that in which she attains such age or completes such service, and except as otherwise provided by law, shall be placed on the retired list in the permanent rank held by her at the time of retirement: *Provided*, That a woman commander or lieutenant commander who serves as an assistant to the Chief of Naval Personnel with the rank of captain and who attains the age of 50 years while so serving may be retired by the President on the first day of the month following that in which she ceases to serve as such assistant to the Chief of Naval Personnel, and if so retired may be placed on the retired list in the rank authorized by subsection (d).

(c) Each woman officer of the Regular Navy who attains the age of 50 years while serving in the grade or rank of lieutenant commander or below shall be retired by the President on the first day of the month following that in which she attains such age, and, except as otherwise provided by law, shall be placed on the retired list in the permanent rank held by her at the time of retirement: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not apply to an officer of the grade or rank of lieutenant commander who is on a promotion list for the grade or rank of commander or to one while serving as an assistant to the Chief of Naval Personnel with the rank of captain.

(d) Any women officer of the Regular Navy who may be retired for any reason while serving as an assistant to the Chief of Naval Personnel under section 205 of this title, or who subsequent to such service may be retired for any reason while serving in a lower rank, may, if she shall have served 2½ years or more as such assistant, be placed on

the retired list, at the discretion of the President, in the rank held by her while serving as such assistant to the Chief of Naval Personnel: *Provided*, That the commissioned officer first detailed to duty in the Bureau of Naval Personnel as an assistant to the Chief of Naval Personnel, pursuant to this title, shall without limitation as to the time she shall serve in such capacity, upon retirement be retired with the rank held while so serving, and shall receive retired pay at the rate prescribed by law computed on the basis of the base and longevity pay she would have received if serving on active duty with such rank.

(e) Each woman officer of the Regular Navy who is placed on the retired list in her permanent rank pursuant to subsection (b) or (c) of this section shall receive retired pay at the rate of 2½ percent of the active duty pay to which entitled at the time of retirement, multiplied by the number of years for which entitled to credit in the computation of her active-duty pay.

(f) Each woman officer of the Regular Navy retired because of physical disability incurred in line of duty shall, if placed on the retired list in a rank higher than her permanent rank, receive retired pay equal to 75 percent of the active-duty pay to which she would be entitled if serving, at the time of retirement, on active duty in the rank in which placed upon the retired list.

(g) Each woman officer of the Regular Navy retired for other than physical disability incurred in the line of duty shall, if placed on the retired list in a rank higher than her permanent rank, receive retired pay equal to 2½ percent of the active-duty pay to which she would be entitled if serving, at the time of retirement, on active duty in the rank in which placed upon the retired list, multiplied by the number of years for which entitled to credit in the computation of her active-duty pay, not to exceed a total of 75 percent of said active-duty pay.

(h) In any instance in which retired pay is computed pursuant to subsections (e) and (g) of this section, a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year in computing the number of years by which the rate of 2½ percent is multiplied.

(i) Women officers of the grade or rank of lieutenant commander in the Regular Navy whose names, on June 30 of the fiscal year in which they complete 20 years' active commissioned service in the Regular Navy and the Naval Reserve, are not then on a promotion list for advancement to the next higher grade or rank shall be placed on the retired list on that date.

(j) Women officers of the grades or ranks of lieutenant and lieutenant (junior grade) in the Regular Navy whose names on June 30 of the fiscal year in which they complete 13 and 7 years' active commissioned service, respectively, in the Regular Navy and the Naval Reserve are not then on a promotion list for advancement to the next higher grade or rank shall be honorably discharged from the Navy on that date with a lump-sum payment computed on the basis of 2 months' active-duty pay at the time of their discharge for each year of commissioned service, but not to exceed a total of 2 years' pay: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this subsection a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year in computing the number of years commissioned service upon which to base such lump-sum payment.

(k) The retired pay of a woman officer of the Regular Navy who is commissioned in the Regular Navy pursuant to the act of April 18, 1946 (60 Stat. 92), as now or hereafter amended, shall not be less than 50 percent of her active-duty pay at the time of retirement.

SEC. 208. All provisions of law now existing or hereafter enacted relating to male personnel of the Navy, except those provisions relating to the same subject matter specifically provided for in this title, shall, where applicable, be construed to include women.

SEC. 209. The Secretary of the Navy may prescribe the quantity and kind of clothing and equipment which shall be furnished annually to enlisted women of the Regular Navy, including that required upon their first reporting for duty, and the amount of a cash allowance to be paid to such enlisted women in any case in which such clothing and equipment is not so furnished to them.

SEC. 210. The Secretary of the Navy may prescribe the maner in which women shall be trained and qualified for military duty in the Regular Navy, the military authority which they may exercise, and the kind of military duty to which they may be assigned.

SEC. 211. All provisions of law relating to pay, leave, money allowances for subsistence and rental of quarters, mileage and other travel allowances, or other allowances, benefits, or emoluments, of male personnel of the Regular Navy are hereby made applicable to women personnel of the Regular Navy: *Provided*, That the husbands of women officers and enlisted personnel of the Regular Navy shall not be considered dependents unless they are in fact dependent on their wives for their chief support, and the children of such officers and enlisted personnel shall not be considered dependents unless their father is dead or they are in fact dependent on their mother for their chief support.

SEC. 212. Title V of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (56 Stat. 730), as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out sections 501 to 508, inclusive, thereof, and substituting therefor the following:

"SEC. 501. Women may be enlisted or appointed in the Naval Reserve under the provisions of this act, as now or hereafter amended, in such appropriate ratings, grades, or ranks as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy in the same manner and, except as otherwise provided in this title, under the same circumstances and conditions as men are enlisted or appointed in the Naval Reserve.

"SEC. 502. The Secretary of the Navy may prescribe the manner in which women enlisted or appointed in the Naval Reserve shall be trained and qualified for military duty, the military authority they may exercise, and the kind of military duty to which they may be assigned.

"SEC. 503. The provisions of this act, as now or hereafter amended, which relate to pay, leave, money allowances for subsistence and rental of quarters, mileage and other travel allowances, or other allowances, benefits, or emoluments, for male personnel of the Naval Reserve, shall also apply to women personnel of the Naval Reserve: *Provided*, That the husbands of women personnel of the Naval Reserve shall not be considered dependents unless they are in fact dependent on their wives for their chief support, and the children of such personnel shall not be considered dependents unless their father is dead or they are in fact dependent on their mother for their chief support.

"SEC. 504. The Secretary of the Navy may prescribe the quantity and kind of clothing and equipment to be furnished annually to enlisted women of the Naval Reserve, including that required upon their first reporting for active duty, and he may prescribe the amount of cash allowance to be paid to such enlisted women in any case in which such clothing and equipment is not so furnished to them.

"SEC. 505. All members of the Women's Reserve enlisted or appointed under the Act of July 30, 1942 (56 Stat. 730), as amended, are hereby transferred to the appropriate components of the Naval Reserve in the same temporary and permanent ratings, grades, or ranks, with the same effective date and dates of precedence, which they held in the Women's Reserve on the effective date of this act, and such transfer shall be for the unexpired period of their current enlistments or appointments in the Women's Reserve."

SEC. 213. (a) Women may be enlisted or appointed in the Regular Marine Corps under the provisions of this title, and the provisions of this title (except as may be necessary to adapt said provisions to the Marine Corps) are hereby made applicable to women enlisted or appointed in the Regular Marine Corps in the same manner as such provisions apply to women enlisted or appointed in the Regular Navy.

(b) The number of enlisted women on the active list of the Regular Marine Corps at any one time shall not exceed 2 percent of the enlisted strength now or hereafter authorized for the active list of the Regular Marine Corps.

(c) The number of commissioned and warrant women officers on the active list of the Regular Marine Corps at any one time shall not exceed 10 percent of the authorized number of enlisted women of the Regular Marine Corps.

(d) From the women officers serving in the grade of major or above in the Marine Corps, one officer may be detailed to duty in the personnel department of the Marine Corps as an assistant to the director of personnel, Marine Corps. She shall have the rank of colonel while so serving, and shall be entitled to the pay and allowances as are now or may be hereafter prescribed by law for a colonel of the regular Marine Corps, and her regular status as a commissioned officer in the Marine Corps shall not be disturbed by reason of such detail. The provisions of section 207 of this title shall apply in the same manner, and under the same relative conditions, to women officers of the Regular Marine Corps who have or shall have served as an assistant to the Director of Personnel of the Marine Corps.

SEC. 214. (a) The Secretary of the Navy, under the circumstances and in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President, may terminate the commission of any woman officer commissioned in the Regular Navy or Marine Corps pursuant to this title.

(b) The Secretary of the Navy, under such regulations as he may prescribe, may terminate the enlistment of any enlisted woman in the Regular Navy or Marine Corps, and each such person whose enlistment is so terminated shall be discharged from the service.

SEC. 215. The provisions of this title shall not be construed to apply to women officers of the Navy Nurse Corps.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Maine is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I asked to dispense with further reading of the amendment because this is very similar to the bill we have been discussing, except that we take the Senate bill and bring it up to date in accordance with the Unification Act which has been approved and made law since the Senate acted on the original bill.

This amendment merely proposes that the House adopt the Senate bill, which provides regular status as well as reserve status for women in our armed services.

I am not going to talk long about this amendment because the issue is very simple and very clear. The heads of our armed services have vigorously stated they have a permanent need for women in regular status in their Regular Establishments. The Senate granted their request. The House Armed Services Committee refused to grant the request and gives only a reserve status.

Either the Members of the House accept the statement of the military heads as to their needs, as the Senate did, or

they do not. Reserve status is temporary. At most it offers no career attraction that is necessary to obtain the desired caliber of women. It seems to me that quality is better than quantity.

A vote for this amendment is a vote for regular status for women in our armed services. A vote against the amendment is a vote against such regular status.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, when the proposition was brought up in the early days of the war to have a Women's Corps as an auxiliary to the Army and the Navy, it was brought before us in a draft measure. There was so much opposition to drafting women into the Army and Navy that a compromise bill was adopted which made them a volunteer part of the Army and Navy with voluntary enlistment.

The proposal before us in the form of this amendment, which is a Senate proposal, is to make the women a regular part of the Army. The minute you make the women a regular part of the Army then whenever a draft comes along you draft for the Army and you draft both the boys and the girls for the Army. I opposed that in the early part of the war. I am opposed to it now. I certainly would not want my daughter to be drafted into the Army against her will, and I certainly would not vote to make it possible to draft any other person's daughter into the Army against her will.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is rare that I take exception with my splendid colleagues on the left side of the aisle; in fact, in my 12 years service in this House this is but the fourth time I have taken the floor when I was not charged with the responsibility of a bill. But I feel that some Members have an erroneous conception, judging by the speeches of some of the Members present. In other words, for a long period of time we have told the great royalty of American humanity, to wit, its womanhood: "You have a right to free and equal opportunities." I would like to ask you today why are you turning around and walking back down the hill? Why do you not give to American womanhood her right of participation equal with that of man? If you accept her responsibility at the polls and solicit her support it would seem to me that the least you could do would be to give her a chance to participate in the emoluments and military service as she herself wants to participate.

There is nothing I know of in the Senate bill that would in any manner create a condition detrimental to the womanhood of the United States. I, as an individual, challenge the statement that I would not want my daughter or a female of my family to contribute her part to the continued welfare of our Nation, our form of government, and our way of life.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MITCHELL. Would the gentleman then advocate that we open the military establishments such as West Point and Annapolis for training our women?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would do that just as quick as I would for men. If we are going to use women they are entitled to the same participation and protection and to the same academic training as the men have.

Mr. MITCHELL. The gentleman feels that West Point and Annapolis should be made coeducational institutions?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I do not see any reason why they should not be. Since when have men got the right to claim all of the privileges of participation within our Government? Remember, it is the women who help send you and me up here; we cannot overlook that.

Mr. MITCHELL. May I say to the gentleman that my wife served in the Marine Corps during the last war.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have the greatest respect for the gentleman and his wife because she responded to her national responsibility.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. When the Women's Reserve Corps was called, the women in that corps had to have the same educational background as the men, then in addition to that a training that would qualify them for specific duties which they had to perform during the war.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish I could go all the way with what my colleague has said because in some instances the old established commands in the Army and Navy gave the women closer scrutiny for qualifications than they gave manpower because they did not want them in the services.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that this bill restricts the promotion of women above the rank of colonel. There is only one colonel. During the war we had in the WAC 140,000 women. The Director of the WAC was a woman. Does the gentleman agree with me in my position that any person who commands 140,000 people in the armed forces should have a greater rank than that of colonel? I made a fight to give the women in the Army components fair treatment in reference to appointments. Will the gentleman agree with that position?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I will not agree with any statement that the women of the United States are not as smart as you and I. My contention is that they have an equal right to demonstrate their mental ability and should not be circumscribed by any particular regulatory measures. I compliment the gentleman from Louisiana for endeavoring to give women their rights of rank.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. What justification is there for permitting women to go into Reserve components and not permitting them to go into the Regulars?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Of course, the gentleman from Texas is right, and any other concept is subterfuge or position that some people hide behind in order to avoid meeting the issue.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. If the base pay in the Army is $50 a month, would the gentleman expect that girls would go into the Army in peacetime at $50 a month to act as stenographers, for instance?

Mr. SHEPPARD. If the girls desired to do so, my answer would be "Yes." As a matter of fact, they have more applications pending than they know what to do with.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we can meet this issue today just as well as we can meet it a year from now. By the adoption of the House version of this bill, we are simply postponing making a decision as to whether we want to accept women in the permanent armed forces of the United States. Certainly they have demonstrated during the war period and in the months and years since the shooting war ended that there is a place for them in the armed forces, that they can do a job fully as well as any male soldier can do it, and in certain positions and categories, particularly in hospitals, they can do their job better than any man can do it for them.

Mr. Chairman, we should meet the issue today. Many of the women who are still serving in the WAC and WAVES have been serving for the past 2 years with a feeling of uncertainty, no knowledge as to when the thing would be eliminated, whether it will be extended or not. I talked to a young lady the other night here in Washington, a qualified member of the bar doing a very valuable piece of work with the Navy Department, and she told me she would like to make a career out of her service with the Navy. She said, "If they are going to postpone a permanent decision for another year—I am not getting any younger, I have to look out for my own security, and if this bill passes as the House committee recommends it, I am going to get out and affiliate with a law firm." Undoubtedly there are many other girls thinking along the same line because of this waiting to find out what decision the Congress is going to give, and I fear that a great many of the most valuable members of the women's corps will decide to get out of the service if we simply extend their service for another year and allow beyond that their continuance in the Reserve Corps.

As much as I favor the continuation and development of a strong Reserve Corps of women for both the Army and the Navy, I intend to follow the recommendations in this respect of the leaders of our armed forces, both the Army and

the Navy, on their testimony that these women are needed, and are needed permanently. I am not disturbed by the argument made by the gentleman from Illinois that by our action today some future Congress may take advantage of the situation and pass legislation drafting women. If that issue is ever faced by a future Congress, it will be known by them that women served during World War II and on what basis they served, and that Congress can solve its own problem. I hope that the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maine will be adopted, and that we can by so doing express not only our appreciation for the service that the women rendered during the war, but our faith in the service that they will render, and the strength that they will add to the armed forces of the United States in peacetimes.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. It has been stated by several Members here this afternoon that there is not one in our Military Establishment who wants to accept the bill as written, but that they demand that the women be placed in the permanent establishment. Now that simply is not true. As far as the high officers are concerned, and from major down to second lieutenant and an overwhelming majority of the enlisted men, they are against the corps. They want men. So, I think the committee has been very fair to arrive at this compromise, and many of us who will vote for the bill as reported, if this amendment is adopted will be forced to vote against it.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I am not criticizing the committee. All I can do is to follow the testimony presented in the hearings. In this case, when it is a matter of determining the policy of the armed service, I will follow the recommendations of the heads of the armed services rather than some rumor, what some second lieutenant or enlisted man may say about it.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

I can see no justifiable reason for discriminating between men and women in their privileges, opportunities, and duties to preserve and protect our country. As a matter of fact, in a great many instances, the women, who now outnumber the men, have a great deal more at stake than do we men. The women of our country now own 70 percent of the Nation's private wealth; they own 48 percent of all railroad stocks and they own 40 percent of all the homes in the United States. Our women are charged with the expenditure of the greater portion of our incomes. Women spend 75 percent of all money spent for clothing; they spend 67 percent of all money spent for consumer goods and 80 percent of all money spent for food. Were it not for the shrewd, keen, discriminating judgment of our women, we men who are struggling to provide money for the support of our families would have even greater difficulties than we now have.

There are many women who are ambitious to make military life their permanent careers. Unless the Smith amendment is adopted, and in the event the House bill becomes a law as written, women will not have the same opportunities as are accorded men.

Need I remind you of the words from the poet Rudyard Kipling who very well said, "The female of the species is more deadly than the male."

American women are not bystanders of war. They play a vital role in virtually every phase of its prosecution.

War has a curious way of speeding up all historical processes and pushing people and their societies much more rapidly into the future than they would ever move under normal peacetime processes.

For instance, it speeded up, even more rapidly in the last war, the revolution in the life of women. We forget that it is not only about 100 years since women were first admitted to any universities in America; that they obtained the franchise only after World War I; and that only during the Second World War were all restrictions on their possible activities lifted, with their admission into the last hitherto exclusively male occupation: the armed forces.

War is inevitably a revolutionary force in the life of women. There are those indeed who, like Max Lerner, go as far as to say that "when the classic work on the history of women comes to be written the biggest force of change in their lives will turn out to have been war." Whether or not so dramatic a generalization be accepted, there can be no question as to the dynamic effect of war in accentuating trends and accelerating changes in the life of women which otherwise would follow but slowly upon new phases of industrial organization or community need.

Not only in China but in India, the Latin-American countries, in Great Britain and Australia—everywhere—women have stepped over the threshold into a new era. Many have faced situations straining the utmost strength of mind and spirit—exile, internment, the misery of occupation, the slow starvation of their children.

To the extent that their nations have been involved in the war, women have suffered and toiled to meet the emergency.

Over the radio came the sensational announcement: Women are to replace men in every possible capacity in the Nation's industrial, operational, military, and defense fields.

In answer to the call came thousands of women—schoolgirls, store clerks, waitresses, housewives, domestics—ready to produce, to invent, to organize, to administrate—in short, to keep all the wheels of national life turning while all available manpower was drafted in the country's defense.

Could women run the country in the case of emergency? Could they take over the factories, railroads, farms, transport, communications, and civilian defense?

The answer to this question was given daily by the crews of competent women mechanics servicing bombers, by girl workers who handled thousands of rivets with speed and precision in the plants, by women swinging heavy picks and shovels on airdrome sites, by girl grease monkeys wielding monkey wrenches on auto and airplane engines. Women's technical, mechanical, and administrative aptitudes constituted one of the greatest surprises of the recent war. "Women lack strength—women lack experience—women lack traditions of craftsmanship"—such were the objections of men when they heard that women were to take over their jobs in the defense industries.

But it took only a few short months for girl workers in airplane factories to prove that they could keep up with the tempo of production set by men workers.

The legend of women's frailty has thus been exploded by the manifold activities in which women have distinguished themselves in war. A United States surgeon made an investigation to determine the comparative physical capacities of both men and women in industry—from the surgical point of view.

He discovered that women in railway trades were less subject to injury than men, due to the fact that they were more careful, possessed a superior quickness of action, and a keener perception. With regard to industrial accidents, fractures did not occur as readily, because women's bones are denser and more elastic. Women of middle age were less subject to heart strain and their blood vessels were in better condition than in men of the same age.

"Those girls aren't afraid to get their hands dirty," said the president of one great company employing thousands of women. "They aren't afraid to work. They put on overalls and tie up their hair or cut it off. And in 12 weeks they were making 900 different kinds of tools and making them well."

That comment was made to a group of newspaperwomen who toured American war plants from coast to coast, and reported on the part women were playing in producing war material.

In an aircraft plant on the Pacific Coast, the vice president showed them a fuselage assembly. "See that line?" he said. "First all-woman assembly line of a major part in the history of aircraft. Look at their fingers go."

Farther on he pointed to a hooded woman with a gas torch. "Hardest job in the place," he murmured. "Aluminum welding. All women doing it. Can't beat them."

A former school teacher in another aircraft plant figured out a new way to do a paint job. She saved 8 hours a plane. Women are naturally nimble with their fingers. Once they understand a job, they take to it like a duck to water.

Women who had never worked before found that their natural gift for using their hands was standing them in good stead. A woman down on her knees cutting a sheet of steel with a burner's torch uses the same keen eye required to stitch up a hem on a sewing machine. Ironing out the seams of a life belt uses the same abilities as ironing the family laundry. The woman who used to drive the kids to school ran tractors carrying materials in the biggest plants.

Training classes developed character, too, helping women to prove that they can work steady hours without fatigue or interruptions.

Between five and six million women were fighters in the late war. Their greater place in industry after the war was assured. They had earned it.

An official of a big rubber company went all the way with his enthusiasm. "It's the working women," he said, "who won this war."

Yes, and other women also "went to war," mothers and wives, sisters and sweethearts. And the battles they fought required no less courage than was demanded of the men on the battle lines. When we honor our heroes—our fighting men—let us not forget those who never heard a gun or saw a battleship, but who were just as truly heroic.

The gravest battle that ever was fought,
Shall I tell you where and when?
On the maps of the world you will find it not;
It was fought by the mothers of men.

Lt. Col. Mary Agnes Brown, top-ranking Wac in the southwest Pacific command, predicted recently that, if there is another war, women will be on an even footing with men. We all hope and pray that the proof of Colonel Brown's prediction will never be known, but you can put it down as a fact that the women have now made a permanent place for themselves in our military services. Congressman E. E. Cox, of Georgia, has even proposed a joint military academy to train young women as officers in the various services—a West Point for women. Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts, who sponsored the original WAC legislation, and is generally regarded as the godmother of the women's services, is certain that there will be a permanent training program.

The women have done almost everything except fight. During the last war at one marine base women took over the whole transportation set-up from keeping the records to overhauling and driving the cars and trucks. The accident rate went sharply down. At another base the male marines gasped when a truckload of dungaree-clad women drove in. But they gasped even harder when the women went efficiently to work installing a complete electrical system.

Women may do fine work in such fields as plumbing and truck driving, but there they are only pinchhitters for the men. What is more important is that the Army and Navy learned, as private business learned long ago, that there are fields in which men are only awkward, restless pinchhitters for women.

That is why 6,000 WACs were sent to England before the invasion—mostly for administrative and specialized work. It is why 87 percent of the enlisted personnel in Marine headquarters in Washington were women, why the Navy assigned more than 1,000 Waves to the postal service.

The fact that women up to now have had little to say about the management of the world's affairs—and, therefore, are not responsible for the conditions that led to the world upheaval, does not, however, preclude their grave responsibility for the future.

Women are in the majority in Europe, and also in the United States. In particular, the young business and professional women will be the shock troops of this onward march. They are the responsible and trained workers in the great army striving for better conditions in a better world.

The women of the United States have everything at stake in the world—their future, the future of their children, the future of their country. As an even better organized and informed phalanx of public opinion, they will be heard and they will have their way if theirs is the right, the unselfish, the progressive way.

Mr. Chairman, again I urge favorable action on the pending amendment so as to provide equal and unrestricted opportunities for the services of our women.

You need not be frightened by the suggestion made by the gentleman from Illinois that the adoption of this amendment would necessarily be followed, in the event selective service is revived, with the induction of women along with men. Special legislation would have to be passed dealing with that subject. The passing of this amendment by no means commits us to the drafting of women.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina, I think, has truthfully pointed out certain biological differences between the sexes. He says that the female is more deadly than the male. I agree to that. "Hell hath no fury like a woman scorned."

There are several aspects to this bill that I do not care to discuss here publicly. We discussed them in detail and rather intimately in our committee. Realizing those biological differences, we were told that 8 percent of all the women while they were in the service became pregnant. I do not cast aspersions. I tell facts. We were told that because of certain biological differences in the sexes when they reach the age of menopause or go through the change of life, with the physical disabilities or illnesses that result, the cost of the program would be stupendous if not prohibitive. Those are a few of the fundamental and essential facts, unpleasant as they might be, which we must as legislators wisely and soberly consider.

I repeat that if this proposed amendment offered by my very good friend, for whom I have the highest esteem and the greatest admiration, indeed, a little fond affection, and with whom I traveled so many thousands of miles in a plane over Europe and the Near East and north Africa—must as I would like to see her wishes granted and knowing that she is standing firmly by her sex, and I would not have much respect for her if she did not, I repeat, if the amendment is adopted, many of us who would like to save what we have will be constrained to vote against the bill. I hope the amendment will be defeated and that the bill as reported will be passed, because I do think it is in the interest of our national defense.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the argument of my good friend from Missouri in opposition to this amendment really amazes me, as it does every Member of this House. Said he, "If we only could discuss publicly on the floor of the House those things that we discussed behind closed doors." The intimation was that there would not be much support for this amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maine. Those are the old arguments that have been made down through centuries of time. I want to say again, as one who knows something about the character of the services rendered by women during the recent war, that those services were on the highest possible order.

If the services of these women were not essential in the military forces of the country, every high-ranking officer from General Eisenhower down would not support the bills that were before the committee. This bill has already gone through the other body. The adoption of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maine will make it permanent legislation. I believe the membership of the House is well enough acquainted with the womanhood of America, and particularly those who served with the armed forces, to know that they gave the best—they gave everything they had to the cause that we were fighting for. I believe it is just a little unfair to cast aspersions on their character and the type of service that they rendered in an effort to defeat this legislation. I trust that the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maine will be adopted.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The gentleman will also agree that the behavior record of the women on the basis of the records of the War Department is better than the record made for behavior by the males.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. It has always been stated when the question of morals of the women in the armed forces ever came up in the committee that the moral standards of women in the service forces of the country were at least on a par with those of women in the civilian population of the country. I believe that that is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the only thing I have to say in rebuttal is that the committee voted 26 to 1 to report the bill. It seems very strange and rather unusual that at this time there should be this opposition arising on the floor. The one vote in opposition was cast by proxy.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

May I ask the proponent of the amendment, the gentlewoman from Maine,

whether title III is included in the bill under the amendment offered by her?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. The bill will include the Air Force, which the gentleman is referring to in accordance with the Unification Act.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is title III?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. That is correct.

Mr. FLETCHER. I thank the gentlewoman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, on a division there were—ayes 42, noes 54.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. SHAFER and Mrs. SMITH of Maine to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 40, noes 66.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. SMITH of Maine: On page 34, after line 12, and before the word "amend" insert the following:

"SEC. 302. Except in time of war or declared national emergency, active duty assignment of women in the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps shall be limited strictly to the maintenance and organization of the cognizant Women's Reserve component: *Provided*, That any such active-duty period shall not exceed 2 years: *Provided further*, That the numbers of women Reservists on active duty at any time in each of the armed services shall not exceed 10 officers and 25 enlisted women."

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Chairman, from all my observations I learn that many of the bureaus in the Army, Navy, and Air Force are planning on using women permanently in various ways, especially in the Medical Bureau and in communications of the Navy.

This amendment merely proposes that active duty of women in the Reserves be limited to administering the Women's Reserve program, and for no other purpose. They either need these women permanently or they do not. It is not a question of filling regular jobs that the ordinary civil-service personnel could or would perform. It is the proposition of keeping a skeleton Women's Reserve organization only for expansion purposes in time of war or national emergency.

If these women are needed permanently, let us take them in the permanent organization; if they are not, let us set up the Women's Reserve in exactly the same way as the men's Reserve.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have great admiration for the gentlewoman from Maine who has just addressed us, both personally and officially, but it occurs to me that the position she now takes in reference to this amendment is exactly the reverse of that which she took in reference to the amendment which the Committee just voted down. The gentlewoman's other amendment would make the women's components of the armed forces permanent and would integrate them into the armed forces. This amendment would actually deny to these women the opportunity to serve save in a very limited and restricted capacity.

The House bill as reported by the committee gives the armed forces the right to call into the women's components of the armed forces the needed number of women to fill the jobs which they can properly fill, taking into consideration their training and their experience and their ability. It gives the armed forces the opportunity to call them for an unlimited time and give them a real chance to serve the Nation. It preserves to these women to a large extent the careers which they began during the course of the late World War. I think it is quite unfair to these women who served in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps to deny to them an opportunity to continue in some capacity. If we stand by the bill reported to the House, these women will then be called into active service as Reserves, will be given an opportunity to serve for an unlimited assignment, to continue with that type of work that they have been trained to do, and to render to the Nation the high type of service which they performed during the late conflict.

I hesitate, yes, Mr. Chairman, to take issue with the gentlewoman from Maine who offered this amendment, but in the interest of national defense, in the interest of those who have loyally served, I am opposed to the amendment and hope that we vote it down.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, a careful reading of the amendment would seem to indicate that were this amendment adopted it would represent a diametrically opposite point of view to that expressed by the gentlewoman from Maine when her previous amendment was offered and acted upon. I am sure that a very large majority of the 8,000 women now in the service would not approve of this amendment because it would limit the total number of officers and enlisted personnel to 10 and 25. In other words, this would simply establish an inadequate Reserve Corps for women and that is all there is to it.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the gentlewoman from Maine.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Is it not true that it is planned to use these women on active duty permanently and for indefinite and unlimited periods of time when actually the normal concept of the Reserve is inactive status—since Reservists are not accorded equal treatment with Regulars. In other words, you are using women just as you would Regulars without giving them Regular status and instead placing them under the misnomer of Reserve.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. We are not trying to set up an inactive Reserve. We are trying to provide a vehicle through which these many excellent women who are now in the service may continue in the service, if they so desire. I thought the gentlewoman from Maine was for that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand the amendment of the gentlewoman from Maine, she would clarify the status of women who are included under this proposed legislation. If women are in reserve, it should be determined whether they may be called at their own will or choice, or whether they are subject to the call of officials of the Department of Defense at any time they choose to call them. Furthermore, it should be determined whether the women under this legislation are to serve immediately, or only in event of emergency.

It is my contention that these women you are going to put in the armed services should know when they join the Reserve whether they are going to be called into service during wartime or called at the will of the Army or Navy officers. I think that is important. If this legislation is adopted I believe they ought to be called for emergency needs, if they are called at all. You should not call them in the armed forces because they are stenographers or typists or clerks. These women during peacetime can serve under the civil service rather than in the armed forces. I think the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maine should be adopted.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Roughly there are 8,000 in the service today. My information is a very large number of them wish to continue to serve, even as a part of the Reserve. I may say that they cannot be called to active duty without their consent.

Mr. REES. These 8,000 will serve anyway under the proposed legislation, at least for a year. The thing that concerns me most is that there may be wholesale employment of women by the armed services, under this legislation, that should be done under civil service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. SMITH of Maine) there were—ayes 21, noes 41.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POWELL:

Page 13, line 16, after the period insert: "There shall be no discrimination on account of race, color, religion, national origin in the appointment of officers, commissioned or warrant, or in original enlistments or reenlistments, or in the training or utilization of personnel selected under this act."

Page 31, line 16, after the period insert: "SEC. 216. There shall be no discrimination on account of race, color, religion, na-

tional origin in the appointment of officers, commissioned or warrant, or in original enlistments or reenlistments, or in the training or utilization of personnel selected under this act."

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment that I presented to the Armed Services Committee during the hearings on this bill. I would like to say in the beginning that it does not represent the type of amendment that I would offer personally. If I offered an amendment personally, it would be one aimed at complete elimination of segregation. This amendment is aimed at discrimination only. I am offering it on behalf of hundreds of Negro women who served in World War II in the WAC and other auxiliaries and who are now meeting with difficulty in reenlisting.

A member of our committee just said to me, "Did not Negro women serve in World War II in the auxiliary corps?" I said, "They did." He said, "So what is the need of this amendment now?" The answer is simply that if we had the same kind of attitude now that we had during World War II there would be no need for this amendment. It so happens that there is an atmosphere here in this House which is not the same atmosphere that we had during World War II. A year ago we had a bill before us to provide a permanent nurses' corps. At that time I pointed out that in the United States Navy alone there were 19,333 Negro men and only 1 Negro nurse. That was refuted on the floor. I make the same statement again today on the basis of facts furnished me this morning by the Office of the Secretary of the Navy. There is only one Negro nurse in the entire United States Navy and there are 19,333 men, and that nurse is Ensign Mary Devoe, assigned to the dispensary here in Washington, D. C. That is due to the fact that we did not write in the nurses' bill a year ago my provision that qualified Negro women would have a chance to serve their country as nurses.

This question is important, whether you realize it or not. It is so important that the Secretary of the Armed Forces is calling a conference Monday in his office with the Secretary of the Army, and the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Corps plus four outstanding Negro leaders, to discuss what can be done to see that the mistake we are making in this House will not carry over into the armed forces.

It is a mistake, my friends, to limit our Army and Navy so that 15,000,000 loyal American citizens do not have written into the law provisions that they can have a chance to serve their nation. That is all this amendment does. It does not aim at abolishing segregation. It merely says that here we are giving Negro women a chance to serve in the corps of our Army, Navy, Marine and Air Force. This they did in World War II, and, I have no doubt, they would be doing so now, had we the same attitude now as we had during the war. I leave this with you on your hearts. It is dear to us. It is an American problem. It is a problem whether democracy is going to be the first line of our defense. It is a problem not of abolishing segregation—I am talking to my friends from the South. It is not aimed at that. This amendment does not say "segregation." This amendment says "discrimination." Give Negro women a chance to serve. I would personally be in favor of a stronger amendment, but I am offering this on behalf of the Negro women who have served and want to serve now that we are about to set up a corps in our armed services. How long can you continue your blind way?

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot see a need for an amendment like this in the bill as drawn by the committee at the present time. We do not set up a permanent organization in the armed services under this bill; we put these women in reserve components, and we call them into service from time to time when they are needed, not in accordance with their racial characteristics, but rather in accordance with their ability. We have them in the Reserves all over this land, and when a position is vacant they are called in voluntarily, with their consent, to perform a duty in the armed forces of the Nation. There is no attempt to separate anyone who presently is in service and who desires to transfer to the Reserves. There is no attempt in this bill to segregate them or discriminate against anyone. The word "discrimination" is not used anywhere in this legislation. It is simply a method of preserving the services of those who have served the Nation during the last World War. It is likewise a method of placing in reserve and calling voluntarily to active duty those young women who have the ability, who have the training, who have the knowledge, and who have the characteristics needed by our services to perform a useful function. I submit that it is not a question there of discrimination but a question of national defense.

When I speak of national defense, it is something close to my heart. I do not like to hear people on the street and I do not like to hear Members of Congress continually refer to discrimination in our armed services. I would far rather hear them talk about saving this Nation and preserving the integrity of our Government and institutions and doing something forthright to raise the efficiency of our armed services which we present as a defense to a common enemy. I think the time is long since past when we have to prate about discrimination and things of that sort in the armed services. The time is here to get behind the armed services and give them the support they are entitled to receive from us in an hour of international crisis.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. This amendment would merely be tying the hands of the armed forces.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. POWELL) there were—ayes 12, noes 63.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CANFIELD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1641) to establish the Women's Army Corps in the Regular Army, to authorize the enlistment and appointment of women in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps and the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 545, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BROOKS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BROOKS moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Armed Services.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to authorize the enlistment and appointment of women in the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Times-Herald carries a headline today to the effect that ERP Administrator Hoffman calls the $5,300,000,000 not enough and serves notice that it may prove insufficient to cover the degree of recovery that is sought.

I voted for this plan but so far as I am concerned shall not vote another dollar,

particularly at this session of Congress, for this proposition until we have given consideration to some of the domestic problems affecting our own people.

I refer particularly to the subject of housing, which the joint committee of the House and Senate have investigated and reported to be one of the greatest problems confronting the Nation today.

I know that the housing problem is a vital one in the State of Connecticut and in my own Third Congressional District. The mayor of New Haven has recently petitioned the Governor of our State for a special session of the general assembly to authorize tax concessions to speed housing construction.

The Governor has rejected the plea of the mayor for a special session on the ground that, and I quote: "We will have to wait and see what Congress does on housing." The Governor says he is not adverse to calling a special session if one is necessary, but that, like everybody, he hopes for legislation on housing out of Washington in the near future.

There are several other so-called domestic matters in which our own people are vitally interested which in my opinion demand attention and are entitled to priority before we even begin to talk about further European commitments.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by the Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, AFL.

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial and a statement from a newspaper.

ON-THE-JOB TRAINING UNDER VETERANS' REGULATIONS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 1393, an act to increase the permitted rate of allowance and compensation for training on the job under Veterans' Regulation No. 1–A, as amended, and concur in the Senate amendments to the House amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by the House amendment insert the following:

"That paragraph 6 of part VIII of Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'6. While enrolled in and pursuing a course under this part (including an institutional on-farm training course) such person, upon application to the Administrator, shall be paid a subsistence allowance of $65 per month, if without a dependent or dependents, or $90 a month, if he has a dependent or dependents, including regular holidays and leave not exceeding 30 days in a calendar year: Except, That (1) While so enrolled and pursuing a course of full-time institutional training, such person shall be paid a subsistence allowance of $75 per month, if without a dependent or dependents, or $105 per month if he has one dependent or $120 per month if he has more than one dependent, and (2) while so enrolled and pursuing a course of part-time institutional training, including a course of institutional on-farm training, or other combination course, such person shall be paid, subject to the limitations of this paragraph, additional subsistence allowance in an amount bearing the same relation to the difference between the basic rates and the increased rates provided in (1) hereof as the institutional training part of such course bears to a course of full-time institutional training. Such person attending a course on a part-time basis, and such person receiving compensation for productive labor, whether performed as part of his apprentice or other training on the job at institutions, business or other establishments, or otherwise, shall be entitled to receive such lesser sums, if any, as subsistence or dependency allowances as may be determined by the Administrator: *Provided*, That in no event shall the rate of such allowance plus the compensation received exceed $210 per month for a veteran without a dependent, or $270 per month for a veteran with one dependent, or $290 for a veteran with two or more dependents: *Provided further*, That only so much of the compensation as is derived from productive labor based on the standard workweek for the particular trade or industry, exclusive of overtime, shall be considered in computing the rate of allowances payable under this paragraph.'

"SEC. 2. So much of paragraph 3 of part VII of Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, as precedes the first proviso, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'3. While pursuing training prescribed herein and for 2 months after his employability is determined, each veteran pursuing a course under this part, shall be paid a subsistence allowance of $65 per month, if without a dependent or dependents, or $90 per month, if he has a dependent or dependents: Except, That (1) each veteran pursuing a course of full-time institutional training under this part shall be paid a subsistence allowance of $75 per month, if without a dependent or dependents, or $105 per month, if he has one dependent, or $120 per month, if he has more than one dependent, and (2) each veteran enrolled in and pursuing a course of institutional on-farm training or other combination course, under this part shall be paid, subject to the limitations of this paragraph, additional subsistence allowance in an amount bearing the same relation to the difference between the basic rates and the increased rates provided in (1) hereof as the institutional training part of such course bears to a course of full-time institutional training.'

"SEC. 3. This act shall take effect on the 1st day of April 1948.

"Resolved, That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the above-entitled bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

"In lieu of the matter inserted by the House amendment insert the following: 'An act to provide additional subsistence allowances and to raise the ceilings on wages and allowances pertaining to certain veterans.'"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESERVE ACT OF 1948

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill S. 1641, an act to authorize the enlistment and appointment of women in the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes, with the amendments of the House thereto, insist on the House amendments and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SHAFER, SHORT, COLE of New York, BROOKS, and DURHAM.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRADLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he made before the Cosmos Club.

Mr. TALLE (at the request of Mr. VAN ZANDT) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter addressed to him by Mr. F. W. Hoffman, president of the Cudahy Packing Co.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILLIE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel.

Mr. LANE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Daily Evening Item of Lynn, Mass.

Mr. LANE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Dean K. Webster.

Mr. TEAGUE (at the request of Mr. COMBS) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was granted permission to extend the remarks she made earlier today and include certain resolutions passed by national organizations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an item from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include extraneous material.

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order previously granted to me to address the House for 30 minutes on Friday next be vacated.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DEVITT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

WE MUST CREATE A JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, it is my considered opinion that the most neglected and incompetent of our national security efforts is in the field of intelligence. We contemplate spending billions of dollars for building a 70-group air force. Legislation is in the hopper providing for a new selective-service law, and arguments are presented in favor of universal military training. The moth balls may soon be removed from our war vessels, and the marines are refurbishing their armor. Fifteen billion dollars will be spent in the next fiscal year for national defense, but in the most vital field of all, that of intelligence, we are woefully ill prepared both to prevent the recurrence of another great world war or to intelligently fight it in the event that we should become so engaged.

The intelligence fiasco at Bogota has only served to high light the condition of all of our intelligence services in the United States. The event in the Colombian capital may well be the motivating factor which will bring to the consciousness of the Congress and to the realization of the people of the country the need for a thorough study and the necessary revamping and strengthening of the intelligence agencies of the country.

In order to accomplish this purpose, I have today introduced a House concurrent resolution which sets up a joint committee on intelligence. Under this proposal, 18 Members, 9 from each of the Houses of Congress, will constitute the committee. It is charged with the responsibility of making a continuing study of the programs and activities of the Central Intelligence Agency and of the intelligence services of the Department of National Defense and the Department of State. It is required to evaluate the operations of those agencies and to review the progress achieved in the execution and administration of their programs.

The field of intelligence, insofar as it pertains to military operations, has not been fully utilized in modern American warfare, and as it serves as a preventive for future conflicts it has been almost entirely neglected. The responsibility of this committee will be to make a thorough study of our intelligence activities with the end in view of recommending an over-all program for their efficient future operation.

The members of the committee from the other body are three each from the Committees on Foreign Relations, Armed Services, and Judiciary. Three members each are taken from the comparable committees of the House.

There is no committee of Congress which can be said to have jurisdiction over the broad subject of intelligence. The Foreign Affairs and Foreign Relations Committees of the two bodies exercise legislative domain over foreign affairs and the Department of State, and, accordingly, have jurisdiction over the intelligence service of the State Department. The Armed Services Committees of the two bodies have supervision over the naval and military intelligence services of the armed forces. There is no comparable committee of the Congress which could be said to exercise jurisdiction over the recently created Central Intelligence Agency. The Judiciary Committees of the two Houses have a very broad jurisdiction, including that of the subject of espionage, and since these committees handle matters of a legal and judicial nature, it is provided that the Judiciary Committees of the two bodies should furnish the remaining one-third of the membership of the joint committee.

It is not the purpose of this resolution to deprive any committee of Congress of any of its traditional jurisdiction. It will be noted that this joint committee is not given legislative jurisdiction over any aspect of the United States intelligence services, and that it is provided that the committee shall give aid and assistance to the various standing committees of the Congress.

It will be recalled that the Legislative Reorganization Act of the Congress in section 133 (f) provided that the hearings of all committees of Congress are to be public except where by majority vote the committee decides to hold executive sessions for the purpose of marking up bills or for other similar purposes. Section 4 of the resolution I have introduced today specifically provides that this joint committee shall hold its hearings and conduct its business in private except where by majority vote the committee orders public hearings. This provision is necessary for obvious reasons. The field of intelligence is a secretive one and it would not be conducive to the best interests of this Nation for a committee of the Congress to hold public hearings on such a confidential subject as intelligence.

I said a while ago that our Government intelligence organizations in this country are woefully inefficient and incompetent. The existence of this condition is not necessarily attributable to the men in charge of these operations. The fault may lie deeper than that, to wit, in the lack of appreciation of the importance of intelligence to our military leaders, to the public generally, and, maybe it can be said, to the Members of Congress. Regardless of where the fault lies, it is our responsibility to do something about it. This resolution proposes to get us started on the road.

The shortcomings of the Central Intelligence Agency have been manifest, especially insofar as they relate to the correlation of their activities with those of the State Department.

I can testify from my own observations of the operations of the naval intelligence service that, during the war years at least, this agency did not come anywhere near serving the purpose for its being. I think the same thing can truthfully be said about the military intelligence service.

That the State Department's intelligence and security functions have not been efficiently and properly conducted is evidenced by a recent exclusive report, written by Mr. Gus Nordin, a Washington representative of the St. Paul Sunday Pioneer Press, in which it is reported that the text of a very important secret telegram prepared by the late President Roosevelt for transmission to Chungking, China, reached Moscow before the actual telegram left Washington in April 1945. Happenings such as this are recorded over and over again in the article to which I refer.

The public has recently become very conscious of the importance of atomic energy in the field of peace and war. We must reach a similar public awareness of the importance of intelligence in the field of peace and war. The Seventy-ninth Congress, recognizing the magnitude of the subject of atomic energy, created a joint committee of Congress to exercise a constant legislative jurisdiction over the subject. I urge that this Congress, recognizing the equal, or in some respects greater, importance of the subject of intelligence, take similar action by creating a joint committee on intelligence.

There is a great and wide field for the operation of this committee. We must study the correlation between our various intelligence services and determine the best course for their betterment. The Federal Bureau of Investigation now confines its activities to the continental limits of the United States so that with the Central Intelligence Agency and the various departmental intelligence services rests the sole responsibility for the collection, evaluation, and dissemination of information from foreign sources of vital importance to the security and welfare of this country. At a time when Russia is stretching its tentacles of power over much of the world, probably having the United States in mind as its ultimate objective, we must be constantly on our toes to detect in advance its antagonistic movements. The Communist gang in Moscow conducts its aggrandizement through subterfuge and chicanery. It operates through infiltration and cunning design. It is only through an efficient and well organized intelligence service that we will be able to anticipate and combat deceitful and stealthy conduct of this kind.

I have spoken informally with Admiral Hillenkoeter, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, of my intention to introduce this resolution today, and he has expressed his approbation of it. He told me that while he believes there is much merit to the independent position of his agency in the field of government, he feels somewhat at a loss for the lack of some specific committee of the Congress to whom he can turn for confidential guidance and counsel and to whom he can resort for needed changes in the legislative operations of his agency.

I urge that the Congress take immediate action to create a joint committee on intelligence so that we may proceed with dispatch to repairing this most neglected field of national defense.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVITT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I rise for the purpose of commending the gentleman from Minnesota for the very forceful suggestion he has made. It evidences great study and the rare abilities which I know the gentleman from Minnesota possesses.

Mr. DEVITT. I am very thankful to my colleague from New York for his fine commendation.

LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill relating to the Women's Army Corps bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1799. An act for the relief of Eva L. Dudley, Grace M. Collins, and Guy B. Slater; and

H. R. 4931. An act to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights."

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 20, 1948, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3703. An act to authorize transfer of surplus real property to the jurisdiction of the Department of Interior for consolidation of Federal holdings within areas administered by the National Park Service; and

H. R. 4326. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 22, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1482. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 in the amount of $650,000 for the legislative branch, Government Printing Office (H. Doc. No. 620); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1483. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 in the amount of $3,000,000 for the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation (H. Doc. No. 621); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1484. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the provisions of title VI of the Public Health Service Act relating to standards of maintenance and operation for hospitals receiving aid under that title; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. REES: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 5472. A bill to provide a temporary increase in the compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government and of the District of Columbia municipal government; with amendments (Rept. No. 1773). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REES: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 5667. A bill to provide additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the postal service; with amendments (Rept. No. 1774). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 6248. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1776). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McCULLOCH: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 127. A bill to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1777). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5992. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; without amendment (Rept. No. 1778). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5517. A bill for the relief of Edward Woolf; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1775). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 6288. A bill to provide for local taxation of real estate owned by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BUCK:

H. R. 6289. A bill to provide for the voluntary admission and treatment of mental patients at St. Elizabeths Hospital; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 6290. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Vermejo reclamation project, New Mexico; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 6291. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the town of Myton, Utah; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 6292. A bill to provide that civil-service examinations to test fitness for employment by the Panama Canal and the Panama Railroad Company in the Canal Zone shall be open only to persons who are citizens of or owe allegiance to the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 6293. A bill to amend the act of June 19, 1934, providing for the establishment of the National Archives, so as to provide that certain fees collected by the Archivist shall be available for disbursement in the interest of the National Archives; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 6294. A bill to establish a National War Memorial Auditorium Commission, to provide for construction and maintenance of a National War Memorial Auditorium, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 6295. A bill to provide increased pensions for widows and children of deceased members and retired members of the Police Department and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BEALL (by request):

H. R. 6296. A bill to grant additional powers to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to be exercised in cases of emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska (by request):

H. R. 6297. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a lien for moneys due hospitals for services rendered in cases caused by negligence or fault of others and providing for the recording and enforcing of such liens," approved June 30, 1939; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CLASON (by request):

H. R. 6298. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to provide full annuities at compensation of half salary or wages for persons who have completed 30 years of service and are 60 years of age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 6299. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 6300. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Mystic River Bridge Authority, an instrumentality of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, an easement for the construction and operation of bridge approaches over and across lands comprising a part of the United States naval hospital, Chelsea, Mass.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 6301. A bill to provide for retirement of the Government capital in the central and regional banks for cooperatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 6302. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, to permit the exercise of certain options on or before August 8, 1950; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 6303. A bill to cancel emergency crop, seed, and feed loans where the maker of such loans has been disabled or killed in action in World War II; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

H. J. Res. 379. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the Presidential inaugural ceremonies of 1949; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. J. Res. 380. Joint resolution authorizing the granting of permits to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. J. Res. 381. Joint resolution to provide for the quartering, in certain public buildings in the District of Columbia, of troops participating in the inaugural ceremonies

of 1949; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. J. Res. 382. Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar years 1948 and 1949; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DEVITT:

H. Con. Res. 186. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HALE:

H. Res. 546. Resolution requesting the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to review the report on York Harbor, Maine, submitted in House of Representatives Document No. 1088, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 6304. A bill for the relief of Claris U. Yeadon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 6305. A bill for the relief of the aliens Harry Owen White and his sister-in-law, Cecilia M. B. de Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 6306. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of John Rice Bruckman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of Kansas:

H. R. 6307. A bill for the relief of Mrs. E. M. Westenhaver; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 6308. A bill for the relief of Smith Distributing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 6309. A bill for the relief of Henry K. Kaminski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H. R. 6310. A bill for the relief of Rudolph Pavlinek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 6311. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to posthumously award the Congressional Medal of Honor to Marc C. Dauber; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1807. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Mrs. Fern Rose, chairman, Mrs. Goldie Namock, secretary, and 13 other members of the Friendly Circle Extension Club, Westport, S. Dak., urging favorable consideration of Federal-aid-to-education legislation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1808. By Mr. REES: Petition signed by E. L. Ganson and a number of other citizens of McPherson County, Kans., in opposition to universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1809. Also, petition signed by Daisy Grinsted and a number of other citizens of Sedgwick County, Kans., in opposition to universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1810. Also, petition signed by Harvey Peters and a number of other citizens of Marion County, Kans., in opposition to universal military training and reenactment of selective service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 22, 1948

Rev. Clarence W. Cranford, pastor of the Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

In these difficult days, our Father, when no problem seems simple any more and it is not easy to know what we should think and do, give us the wisdom to recognize what is right and the courage to carry it out when we see it. May we never lower our own ideals because there are those in the world who would challenge them. May no fear of others cause us to do that of which we would be ashamed. May we not deviate from our own code of honesty and justice because there are those in the world who recognize no such code. Instead, help us to believe that to choose the side of right is to be on the side of God, and that to be on the side of God is to be on the side that will win the victory over the forces of unrighteousness and oppression. We pray in Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 21, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1393) to increase the permitted rate of allowance and compensation for training on the job under Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1641) to establish the Women's Army Corps in the Regular Army, to authorize the enlistment and appointment of women in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps and the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes, with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SHAFER, Mr. SHORT, Mr. COLE of New York, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. DURHAM were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 94) to establish the Fort Sumter National Monument in the State of South Carolina, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5933) to permit the temporary free importation of racing shells, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 329. An act for the relief of Gentaro Takahashi;

S. 560. An act to prohibit the operation of gambling ships, and for other purposes;

S. 936. An act for the relief of Burnett A. Pyle;

S. 1021. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay salaries and expenses of the chairman, secretary, and clerk of the Fort Peck General Council, members of the Fort Peck Tribal Executive Board, and other committees appointed by said Fort Peck General Council, and official delegates of the Fort Peck Tribes;

S. 1263. An act for the relief of Fire District No. 1 of the town of Colchester, Vt.;

S. 1304. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the organization of Minnesota as a Territory of the United States;

S. 1312. An act for the relief of Jeanette C. Jones and minor children;

S. 1393. An act to provide additional subsistence allowances and to raise the ceilings on wages and allowances pertaining to certain veterans;

S. 1468. An act providing for payment of $50 to each enrolled member of the Mescalero Apache Indian Tribe from funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States;

S. 1583. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Maryland, for the use of the University of Maryland, of the northern portion of a parcel of land previously constituting a part of the campus of the university and previously conveyed by the State of Maryland to the United States for the use of the Bureau of Mines;

S. 1696. An act to amend the act of August 13, 1940 (54 Stat. 784), so as to extend the jurisdiction of the United States District Court, Territory of Hawaii, over Canton and Enderbury Islands;

S. 2278. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in San Juan County, Utah, to the Southwest Indian Mission, Inc.;

H. R. 4931. An act to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights";

S. J. Res. 189. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma; and

S. J. Res. 207. Joint resolution to provide for the commemoration of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the establishment of the Department of the Navy.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

INVESTMENT OF CERTAIN FUNDS IN OBLIGATIONS OF INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

A letter from the Chairman of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit investment of funds of insurance companies organized within the District of Columbia in obligations of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PENALTY MAIL MATTER

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to section 2 (b) of Public Law 364, approved June 28, 1944, a tabulation showing the number of envelopes, labels, and other penalty inscribed material

on hand and on order June 30, 1947; the number of pieces procured, the estimated mailings, and the estimated cost by departments and agencies for the period July 1 to December 31, 1947 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AUDIT REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION AND AFFILIATED COMPANIES—PETROLEUM RESERVES CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, volume 9 of the report on the audit of Reconstruction Finance Corporation and affiliated corporations, which deals exclusively with the activities of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

AUDIT REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION AND AFFILIATED COMPANIES—DISASTER LOAN CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, volume 10 of the report on the audit of Reconstruction Finance Corporation and affiliated corporations, which deals exclusively with the activities of the Disaster Loan Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT RELATING TO MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF HOSPITALS

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the provisions of title VI of the Public Health Service Act relating to standards of maintenance and operation for hospitals receiving aid under that title (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents in the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PROHIBITION AGAINST LIQUOR ADVERTISING

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD a list of 285 communities in the State of New York which have submitted petitions containing 5,725 signatures favoring the enactment of the so-called Capper bill, Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIVE THOUSAND SEVEN HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIVE SIGNERS FROM 285 COMMUNITIES OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK WHICH HAVE SUBMITTED PETITIONS IN SUPPORT OF THE CAPPER BILL (S. 265)

Adams, Addison, Akron, Alabama, Albany, Albion, Alexander, Alfred, Ames, Amsterdam, Appleton, Arkport, Attica, Auburn, Ava, Avon, Bainbridge, Baldwinsville, Ballston Spa, Barnerville, Barton, Basom, Batavia, Bath, Bay Shore, Bemus Point, Bergen, Berkshire, Binghamton, Bliss, Bolivar, Boonville, Branchport, Brewerton, Brockport, Brooklyn, Brownville, Buffalo, Burnt Hills, Byron, Caledonia, Cambridge, Canajoharie, Candor, Canisteo, Castle Creek, Cato, Cayuga, Cazenovia, Central Bridge, Chautauqua, Chemung, Cherry Valley, Chittenango, Circleville, Clarence, Clarence Center, Clinton Corners, Clyde, Cobleskill, Cohocton, Comstock, Copenhagen, Corfu, Corinth, Cornwall, Cortland, Cuba, Dale, De Ruyter, Dresden, Dundee, Durhamville, Eagle Bridge, Earlville, East Bethany, East Bloomfield, East Hampton, East Moriches, East Pembroke, Eastport, East Rochester, Eden, Ellicottville, Elmira, Endicott, Endwell, Esperance, Etna, Fayetteville, Ferndale, Fillmore, Fort Edward, Fort Johnson, Fort Plain, Frankfort, Freeville, Friendship, Fulton, Gainesville, Galway, Gasport, Geneseo, Geneva, Georgetown, Gerry, Glens Falls, Gouverneur, Grahamsville, Great Neck, Groton, Hagaman, Hague, Hamburg, Harrisville, Hauppauge, Hawthorne, Hempstead, Herkimer, Highland, Holcomb, Homer, Hornell, Horseheads, Houghton, Hudson Falls, Huntington, Hurleyville, Ilion, Islip, Ithaca, Jamaica, Jamesport, Jamestown, Jeffersonville, Johnsonburg, Johnson City, Johnstown, Kauneonga, Kenmore, Kingston, Lakawanna, Lacona, La Fargeville, Lakewood, Little Valley, Livingston, Livingston Manor, Lock Sheldrake, Lockport, Lockwood, Lowville, Lycoming, Lynbrook, Mannsville, Mayfield, Meadowbrook, Medina, Middleport, Middlesex, Milton, Mineola, Mohawk, Moira, Mooers, Mooers Forks, Morrisonville, Mount Morris, Nellliston, Newburgh, New City, Newfane, Newfield, New Hartford, New Paltz, New Rochelle, New York, Niagara Falls, North Chili, North Granville, North Java, Northport, Nyack, Oakfield, Ogdensburg, Olean, Oneida, Orangeburg, Orwell, Oswego, Otselic, Owego, Painted Post, Palmer, Pavilion, Penn Yan, Pierrepont Manor, Pitcher, Plattsburg, Pleasantville, Port Byron, Port Ewen, Poughkeepsie, Pulaski, Ransomville, Ravena, Red Creek, Remsen, Rensselaer, Rhinebeck, Richburg, Richford, Richland, Richville, Riverhead, Rochester, Rome, Round Lake, Ruhville, St. Johnsville, Salamanca, Salem, Salt Point, Sanborn, Sandy Creek, Saranac Lake, Saratoga Springs, Savona, Schenectady, Sharon Springs, Silver Springs, Sinclairville, Skaneateles, Slingerlands, Sloansville, Smiths Basin, Snyder, Southampton, South Hartford, South Otselic, South Westerlo, Spencerport, Sprakers, Spring Valley, Springville, Staatsburg, Stafford, Stanfordville, Staten Island, Stone Ridge, Sundown, Swan Lake, Syracuse, Tonawanda, Troy, Ulster Park, Union Center, Utica, Vails Gate, Valley Stream, Varysburg, Verona, Vestal, Victor, Wallace, Walton, Warsaw, Water Mill, Waterport, Watertown, Watervliet, Waverly, Wayland, West Chazy, Westford, West Leyden, West Oneonta, West Sayville, Whitehall, White Lake, White Plains, Woodbourne, Woodgate, Worcester, Wyoming.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. COOPER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 631. A bill for the relief of the Allied Aviation Corp.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1153).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 657. A bill to provide that service as a cadet, midshipman, or aviation cadet shall be credited for pay purposes, and that service as a cadet or midshipman shall be credited for retirement purposes, in the case of military and naval personnel; with amendments (Rept. No. 1154).

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1561. A bill to protect the National Security of the United States by permitting the summary termination of employment of civilian officers and employees of the Departments of State, War, and the Navy, and the Atomic Energy Commission, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1155).

By Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 4090. A bill to equalize retirement benefits among members of the Nurse Corps of the Army and the Navy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1156).

By Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 295. A bill to further amend the thirteenth paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1157).

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 4490. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to provide salvage facilities, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1158).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 1275. A bill to authorize the payment of certain claims for medical treatment of persons in the naval service; to repeal section 1586 of the Revised Statutes; and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1159).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 2033. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength," approved June 3, 1942 (56 Stat. 306); without amendment (Rept. No. 1160); and

S. 2034. A bill to increase the number of midshipmen allowed at the United States Naval Academy from the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1161).

By Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1599. A bill to prescribe the pay and allowances of aviation cadets in the Air Corps, Regular Army, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1162).

By Mr. BALDWIN, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1216. A bill to repeal that part of section 3 of the act of June 24, 1926 (44 Stat. 767), as amended, relating to the percentage, in time of peace, of enlisted personnel employed in aviation tactical units of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1163).

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 22, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 329. An act for the relief of Gentaro Takahashi;

S. 560. An act to prohibit the operation of gambling ships, and for other purposes;

S. 936. An act for the relief of Burnett A. Pyle;

S. 1021. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay salaries and expenses of the chairman, secretary, and clerk of the Fort Peck General Council, members of the Fort Peck Tribal Executive Board, and other committees appointed by said Fort Peck General Council, and official delegates of the Fort Peck Tribes;

S. 1263. An act for the relief of Fire District No. 1 of the Town of Colchester, Vt.;

S. 1304. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the organization of Minnesota as a Territory of the United States;

S. 1312. An act for the relief of Jeanette C. Jones and minor children;

S. 1393. An act to provide additional subsistence allowances and to raise the ceilings on wages and allowances pertaining to certain veterans;

S. 1468. An act providing for payment of $50 to each enrolled member of the Mescalero Apache Indian Tribe from funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States;

S. 1583. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Maryland for the use of the University of Maryland, of the northern portion of a parcel of land previously constituting a part of the campus of the university and previously conveyed by the State of Maryland to the United States for the use of the Bureau of Mines;

S. 1696. An act to amend the act of August 13, 1940 (54 Stat. 784), so as to extend the jurisdiction of the United States District Court, Territory of Hawaii, over Canton and Enderbury Islands;

S. 2278. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in San Juan County, Utah, to the Southwest Indian Mission, Inc.;

S. J. Res. 189. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma; and

S. J. Res. 207. Joint resolution to provide for the commemoration of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the establishment of the Department of the Navy.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Col. Kenneth David Nichols O17498, Army of the United States (professor, U. S. Military Academy), for temporary appointment as major general in the Army of the United States under the provisions of section 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947; such appointment to continue in force only for the duration of his assignment as Army member of the Military Liaison Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission and Chief of the Armed Forces Special Weapon Project;

Brig. Gen. Edward Allen Noyes, and sundry other officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Col. Hugh Chauncey Johnson, and sundry other officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States;

First Lt. James Gyde Owens, and sundry other officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States;

Ruth A Robinson, and sundry other persons for appointment in the Regular Army in the Army Nurse Corps and the Women's Medical Specialist Corps;

Col. Harry Dumont Offutt, and sundry other officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States;

Col. Frank Frederick Bell, and sundry other officers for appointment in the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army of the United States;

Inez I. Baum, and sundry other persons for appointment in the Regular Army in the Army Nurse Corps and the Women's Medical Specialist Corps;

Brig. Gen. Errol Henry Zistel, Ohio National Guard, for appointment as brigadier general in the National Guard of the United States of the Army of the United States;

First Lt. Kenneth McMillin Stewart, and sundry other officers for promotion in the United States Air Force;

Col. James Dennett McIntyre, and sundry other officers for temporary appointment in the Air Force of the United States;

Col. Emil Henry Molthan, and several other officers for appointment in the United States Air Force Reserve of the Air Force of the United States;

Rear Adm. Herbert C. Lassiter, Supply Corps, United States Navy, for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Supply Corps of the Navy;

John R. Behr, and sundry other officers for appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy;

James F. Berry, and sundry others for appointment or promotion in the Navy;

Admiral Charles M. Cooke, Jr., United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list of the Navy with the rank of admiral;

Vice Adm. John L. Hall, Jr., United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commandant of the Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Va.;

Rear Adm. Arthur D. Struble, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Operations);

Richard L. Alford, and sundry others for appointment or promotion in the Navy; and Walter E. Anderson, and sundry other permanent warrant officers, now serving in temporary commissioned ranks, to be permanent commissioned warrant officers in the Marine Corps.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 2542. A bill to authorize the construction, operation and maintenance of the Canton Reclamation project, Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER (for himself and Mr. AIKEN):

S. 2543. A bill to provide for retirement of the Government capital in the central and regional banks for cooperatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2544. A bill for the relief of Alexis Kivi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2545. A bill to provide pensions for disability and age under Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), part III, in the same amounts as now provided for veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

S. 2546. A bill to extend for 1 year the system of nurseries and nursery schools for day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 2547. A bill to amend section 3 of the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, as amended, relating to the placing of a certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third time zone; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming:

S. 2548. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, to permit the exercise of certain options on or before August 8, 1950; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. 2549. A bill to increase the lending authority of Export-Import Bank of Washington; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX RESERVATION TRUST PATENTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LANGER submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2315) to authorize the issuance of trust patents in lieu of land-use exchange assignments issued on the Cheyenne River Sioux Reservation prior to January 1, 1948, which were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed.

SURVEY OF PROPOSED MISSISSIPPI RIVER PARKWAY—AMENDMENTS

Mr. OVERTON submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5609) to authorize the survey of a proposed Mississippi River Parkway for the purpose of determining the feasibility of such a national parkway, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 5933) to permit the temporary free importation of racing shells was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

IMPAIRMENT OF NATIONAL SECURITY BY DISOBEDIENCE TO LAW

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from the previous day, Senate Resolution 217, officially notifying the Governor of the State of New York of certain testimony before the Committee on Armed Services, submitted April 1, 1948, by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

Does the Senator from Mississippi wish to have any disposition made of the resolution of which he is the author, which comes over from the previous day?

Mr. EASTLAND. Let it lie upon the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will continue to lie upon the table.

Morning business is closed.

THE INSIDE OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject The Inside of the United States Senate, delivered by Senator MARTIN, at the annual dinner of the Amen Corner, Pittsburgh, Pa., April 17, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR KEM

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of local government, delivered by Senator KEM, at the annual dinner of the Amen Corner in Pittsburgh, Pa., April 17, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN FOREIGN RELATIONS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LODGE

[Mr. OVERTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on American foreign relations delivered by Senator LODGE at the annual midcontinent business meeting of the Mississippi Valley World Trade Conference, in New Orleans, April 17, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXPORTATION OF TOBACCO TO GERMANY—STATEMENT BY SENATOR UMSTEAD

[Mr. UMSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the subject of exportation of tobacco to Germany, made by him before the Committee on Appropriations, on December 17, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATOR WILEY'S VIEWS ON THE AMERICAN FAMILY—ARTICLE FROM THE AMERICAN FAMILY

[Mr. SMITH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A United States Senator Looks at the American Family," from the magazine the American Family, for March 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Actions Versus Words" from the New York Times of April 22, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOW TO BEAT THE COMMUNISTS—ARTICLE BY WALTER P. REUTHER

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "How To Beat the Communists," written by Walter P. Reuther, and reprinted from Collier's for February 28, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, this afternoon in Carlisle, Pa., there is being celebrated the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the founding of Dickinson College, one of the outstanding church schools in Pennsylvania. I am anxious to attend the exercises, and I ask unanimous consent that I may be absent from the Senate this afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER asked and obtained consent to be absent from the session of the Senate for the remainder of today.

Mr. MORSE asked and obtained consent to be excused from attendance upon the Senate for the next few days on necessary business.

Mr. BALDWIN asked and obtained consent to be excused from attendance upon the session of the Senate Monday, April 26.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained consent for the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary considering House bill 3214 to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained consent for the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to sit during the session of the Senate today.

PERMISSION TO REPORT APPROPRIATION BILLS DURING RECESS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rule be waived and that the Appropriations Committee of the Senate be permitted to report, in any recess over the week end, the following appropriation bills: State, Justice, and Commerce; Labor and Federal Security; the civil functions of the War Department; and the first deficiency supplemental bill.

I also request permission that during the recess minority views on House bill 5524, the civil-functions bill, may be filed; that notices of motions to suspend the rule may be filed, and amendments submitted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

THE PALESTINE PROBLEM

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, there appears on the editorial page of this morning's New York Herald Tribune an editorial entitled "The Mandate of Events." It deals with the Palestine situation as it exists at the present time. I read the last paragraph of the editorial because it is most pertinent:

While the talk continues at Lake Success, the future is being indelibly etched by events. A Jewish state can no longer be prevented. UN trusteeship for Jerusalem, backed by whatever forces are necessary to maintain order and essential services, can no longer be avoided. The Arabs can no longer be dissuaded from war merely by words, hopes, or moral pressures. These are facts. They express the actual forces at work upon the ground; they are the materials with which statesmanship has to operate. Statesmanship cannot alter them by dreams of truces or trusteeships that have no basis in realities. What statesmanship can do is to recognize them and build on them concrete proposals that will so far as possible limit the bloodshed and hasten the achievement of practical equilibrium among the forces actually at work in that tortured country.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that this is a very factual and objective presentation of conditions as they are, and I think the editorial is well worth the careful consideration of all of us who are interested in this subject, as I know all of us are. I therefore ask unanimous consent that this editorial, which is comparatively brief, be inserted in the body of the RECORD at the the conclusion of these brief remarks of mine.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MANDATE OF EVENTS

The extraordinary, and profoundly dispiriting, contrast between the realities in Palestine and the arguments, illusions, and futilities at Lake Success drags itself along. While the United Nations committees wrangle in their vacuum of either statesmanship or courage, events in Palestine continue to shape a future daily assuming a greater and greater aspect of inevitability. The UN may talk trusteeship as against partition, but the Zionists have already formed the independent government which will have to take over (because there will be no alternative) on May 16 and make partition a fact. Yesterday the British were evacuating most of Haifa, and the Haganah troops were moving in, as they will have to move in on the heels of British withdrawal elsewhere. Even more significant is the report that a special administration is being formed for the Jews in Jerusalem distinct from the proposed Jewish state and responsible not to its government but to the World Zionist Organization.

Such an administration is again a recognition of facts—of the same facts which led the General Assembly, in its partition resolution of last year, to set Jerusalem aside from the proposed Jewish and Arab states, placing it under international control. Jerusalem and its holy places are an international heritage, while the proposed Jewish state, centered along the coast, neither can carry nor should be asked to carry the burden of protecting Jerusalem's Jewish community, cut off in the depths of Arab territory. The Jews of Jerusalem are thus confided not to the nascent Jewish state but to the World Zionist Organization, making possible their ultimate incorporation in the international control of some kind which is the only practicable answer to the problem of Jerusalem.

While the talk continues at Lake Success, the future is being indelibly etched by events. A Jewish state can no longer be prevented. UN trusteeship for Jerusalem, backed by whatever forces are necessary to maintain order and essential services, can no longer be avoided. The Arabs can no longer be dissuaded from war merely by words, hopes, or moral pressures. These are facts. They express the actual forces at work upon the ground; they are the materials with which statesmanship has to operate. Statesmanship cannot alter them by dreams of truces or trusteeships that have no basis in realities. What statesmanship can do is to recognize them and build on them concrete proposals that will so far as possible limit the bloodshed and hasten the achievement of practical equilibrium among the forces actually at work in that tortured country.

PROGRESS OF WORK OF THE COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT—STATEMENT BY HERBERT HOOVER

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement issued by former President Herbert Hoover, Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, which sets forth what to me is the very remarkable progress which the Commission is making. I think the statement will be of great interest and satisfaction to the Members of the Senate, who supported unanimously the resolution creating the Commission at the time it was before the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HERBERT HOOVER

Mr. Herbert Hoover, Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, the members of which are: Dean Acheson, former Under Secretary of State; Arthur S. Flemming, Civil Service Commissioner; James Forrestal, Secretary of Defense; George H. Mead, industrialist; Senator George D. Aiken; former Ambassador Joseph P. Kennedy; Senator John L. McClellan; Dr. James K. Pollock, of the University of Michigan; Congressman Clarence Brown; Congressman Carter Manasco; and James Rowe, Jr., former Administrative Assistant to the President, made the following statement today as to the progress of the work of the Commission:

"The Commission has secured the services of the National Bureau of Economic Research, for a study of Government statistical services. The study will be directed by Dr. Frederick C. Mills, and will include an examination and appraisal of the statistical agencies with regard to the scope and quality of their work and the effectiveness of their administration, with considerations of the problems of coordination, overlapping, or duplication of functions and gaps of coverage.

"Arrangement has also been made with the National Records Management Council, a nonprofit organization recently set up under the auspices of the Social Science Research Council, for a study of records management problems in the Federal Government to be

directed by the executive director of the council, Mr. Emmett J. Leahy, formerly of the National Archives, and Director of Records Administration, United States Navy, during the war. Dr. Wayne Grover, Acting Archivist of the United States; Robert H. Bahmer, Director of Records Management, Department of the Army; Herbert E. Angel, Director of Office Methods Branch, Department of the Navy; and Mr. Edward Wilber, of the Department of State, will serve as consultants in connection with the study.

"Pursuant to arrangements made by Col. Franklin D'Olier, formerly chairman of the Prudential Insurance Co., of Newark, and past president of the American Legion, who is heading up a study for the Commission on the Veterans' Administration, other than their hospital services, the Trundle Engineering Co. will report on certain services rendered by the Veterans' Administration and make recommendations in connection with them.

"In connection with the study which I am undertaking, in association with the Bureau of the Budget, and Mr. Don Price, of the Public Administration clearinghouse, on the Office of the Presidency and its relation to the departments and agencies, I have secured the assistance of Mr. H. Struve Hensel, formerly Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and Prof. John Millett, of Columbia University, for that phase of the study having to do with structural organization of the departments.

"Studies and reports upon the following executive functions have already been announced:

"Public works: Mr. Robert Moses.

"Veterans' affairs, other than hospitals: Col. Franklin D'Olier.

"Revolving funds, other than lending agencies: Maj. Gen. Arthur H. Carter.

"The post office: Robert Heller & Associates.

"Transportation: Brookings Institution.

"Public welfare: Brookings Institution.

"Foreign affairs: Messrs. Harvey Bundy and James Grafton Rogers, with Henry L. Stimson as adviser.

"Federal field offices: Klein & Saks.

"Relations of the Presidency to the executive branch: Herbert Hoover, with Don K. Price and the Bureau of the Budget.

"Regulatory agencies: Mr. Owen D. Young, ex-Senator Robert M. LaFollette, and Prof. Robert Bowie.

"Indian affairs: Mr. Charles J. Rhoads, Dr. John R. Nichols, Rev. Dr. Gilbert Darlington, and Prof. George Graham.

"Natural resources: Leslie A. Miller, Horace M. Albright, John J. Dempsey, Isaiah Bowman, Samuel Trask Dana, Donald H. McLaughlin, Gilbert F. White, and J. R. Mahoney, research assistant.

"Medical services of the Government (except those of the National Military Establishment): Mr. Tracy S. Voorhees (chairman), Dr. O. H. P. Pepper, Dr. Hugh Jackson Morgan, Dr. Allen O. Whipple, Dr. W. C. Menninger, Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, Dr. Frank R. Bradley, Dr. R. C. Buerki, Mr. Charles Rowley, Mr. Henry Isham, Dr. Paul R. Hawley, Dr. Michael DeBakey, and Rear Adm. Joel T. Boone, United States Navy.

"Personnel and civil service committee: John A. Stevenson (chairman), James P. Mitchell, George D. Stoddard, Rawleigh Warner, Alfred H. Williams, Lawrence Appley, Vannevar Bush, Alvin Dodd, Col. Franklin D'Olier, Alvin Eurich, Earl G. Harrison, Robert L. Johnson, David Lilienthal, Robert Ramspeck, Andrew Robertson, Senator Harry F. Byrd, and Leonard D. White, and Cresap, McCormick & Paget on research.

"Fiscal, budgeting, and accounting: John W. Hanes, chairman, with T. Coleman Andrews and A. E. Buck.

"Federal-State relationships: T. J. Coolidge (chairman), William Anderson, John Burton, Senator Harry F. Byrd, Gov. Frank Carlson, William L. Chenery, John W. Davis, former Gov. Charles A. Edison, Dean William I. Myers, Sinclair Weeks, and Frank Bane, research assistant.

"Agricultural activities: H. P. Rusk (chairman), D. Howard Doane, John Gaus, W. H. Martin, F. W. Peck, Chester Davis, Rhea Blake, W. A. Schoenfeld, and G. Harris Collingwood, research director.

"Lending agencies: Paul Grady, of Price, Waterhouse & Co., and the following committee of advisers: Paul Bestor, Donald D. Davis, Walter J. Cummings, Walter D. Fuller, George L. Harrison, Arnold B. Keller, Walter Lichtenstein, James H. McGraw, Jr., Sumner H. Slichter, and Allan Sproul.

"Federal supply: Russell Forbes, former commissioner of purchase of New York City, and the following committee of advisers: W. Z. Betts, Harry Erlicher, R. C. Haberkern, Carl Ilgenfritz, Thomas Jolly, George A. Renard, John Sanger, and Charles Smith."

EDWARD H. CRUMP

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I send to the desk an article about the Honorable Edward H. Crump, written by Mr. John White, and published in the Washington Times-Herald of this date, and I ask that it be published in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The article is an interesting, attractive, and scintillating tribute to Mr. Crump.

I have known Mr. Crump intimately for more than 50 years. No finer man lives. He is all Mr. White says about him, and a great deal more. He was mayor of Memphis for many years. He served in the House of Representatives for several terms, and is one the most successful businessmen in the country. He has made a great success in every undertaking.

Mr. Crump is an outstanding citizen and a great leader, and possesses one of the most attractive personalities I have ever known a man to have.

I thank Mr. White for this article, and commend it to the attention of all Senators and other good citizens.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DID YOU HAPPEN TO SEE BOSS CRUMP?

"Boss? Who said boss? I am no boss. I am no dictator. I am just an unassuming good citizen, working with and for the people. No, sir. Not a boss and not a politician. Just a good citizen. * * * And I have a captivating personality. I like people.

"You like people and they like you."

It is not hard to get Mr. Ed. H. Crump, good citizen of Memphis, Tenn., to talk. He is no longer a young man; he has lived a busy life, accomplishing and observing much; he is not loath to pass on some of his wisdom.

"I was born in Holly Springs, Miss., a town just big enough for its size; a town you can see for the trees; a town that provided 26 Civil War generals; a fine, fine town.

"My mother's family was from North Carolina, my father's people came from Virginia, and they met in Holly Springs.

"When I was a little boy I worked in a print shop, then in a grocery store. I boarded out debts.

"Remember that, how people boarded out debts? When they couldn't pay, one of the clerks from the store boarded at their house until the debt was cleared."

Boss—excuse it, please, Mr. Ed. Crump, good citizen—didn't stay in that grocery store long. He started running for public office. As a good citizen should.

And, as a good citizen often doesn't, he got elected.

Over and over again. To practically every public office in Tennessee, and particularly Memphis. Altogether, at the present moment, he has participated in 109 open elections.

And never lost a one.

No, sir. Never lost a one.

And Memphis has no graft, no vice, no organized gambling, no organized betting at the races * * *.

Mr. Crump loves the races, but he doesn't plan to make a fortune playing them, because:

You can beat a race, but you can't beat the races.

Furthermore, Memphis has the lowest tax rate of any large city in the country, and it is the best, finest, cleanest.

Yes, sir. I love old Memphis, on the head of the river.

Memphis sort of likes its boss. That is to say its Good Citizen Crump, too. You ask around town and you don't get many complaints.

No, sir. They never accuse me of graft or dishonesty. Only of being a dictator.

And I'm only an unassuming insurance man, with not 1 cent of business from city, county, or State; who likes Dante, Homer, Shakespeare, and the Bible—and people; who shakes for 3 hours before every trip to the dentist; who, like St. Paul, believes in worrying cheerfully, because there is no use worrying about what you can't help.

Not a boss. Just a good citizen. With a captivating personality.

JOHN WHITE.

THE ATTACK ON WALTER P. REUTHER

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, day before yesterday a dastardly attempt was made to take the life of one of the Nation's outstanding labor leaders, Walter Reuther, of Detroit. He still lies critically ill, and an anxious world hopes and prays for his recovery.

Organized labor has no more devoted exponent than Walter Reuther. While often people who do not think matters through are apt to stigmatize, with epithets and appellations, men who do not see as they do, I want to praise this man today, because of his outstanding and consistent record against the enemy of mankind, the enemy communism. Walter Reuther, as a stalwart and true American, has stood four-square against the inroads of communism.

As chairman of the CIO housing committee he has under date of April 20, 1948, sent me a telegram dealing with the pending bill, which I shall read into the RECORD, as follows:

As chairman of CIO's housing committee I urge you to vote for S. 866 as amended by the Flanders amendment. We hope you will also support the Russell-Young farm housing amendment, not only because we favor good housing for people on the farms, but also because labor has a major stake in farm welfare. In many areas farm housing is as bad as that in any city slum. A program of farm housing would provide a new vital market in which labor is vitally interested. This bill when enacted into law will be a strong gesture in this Congress for the welfare of millions of people in this country. Your voting for it will be proof of your interest in the well-being of our citizens.

WALTER P. REUTHER,
Chairman, CIO Housing Committee.

Today I offer my tribute to the man, and I express the wish and join in the hopes and prayers of millions of Americans, that God will spare his life, again to take his place in the cause in which he so truly believes.

NATIONAL HOUSING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 866) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective and to provide for the coordinated execution of such policy through a National Housing Commission, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as amended, striking out of the original bill all after line 3, on page 16, as amended, and inserting in lieu thereof other language.

Mr. FLANDERS obtained the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on Wednesday of last week the Senate accepted 14 amendments submitted by the junior Senator from Wisconsin. Since then we have been arguing at great length respecting the differences between the Taft-Flanders amendment and the McCarthy amendments, and we are happy to say that at this time we have agreed upon practically everything. There are no major differences. Either the amendments to the Taft-Flanders amendment have been accepted, or we have agreed to accept them.

For that reason, to avoid the confusion which might be incident to arguing the very lengthy McCarthy amendments as against the very lengthy Flanders amendment, and in view of the fact that there is now no substantial difference between the two, I ask unanimous consent that the Flanders-Taft amendment be substituted for the McCarthy amendments, and that the Flanders-Taft amendment then be open to further amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator repeat his request? It appears to be somewhat complicated.

Mr. McCARTHY. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to substitute the Flanders-Taft amendment, as amended, for the 14 McCarthy amendments that have been accepted, and that the Flanders-Taft amendment, when accepted, be then open to further amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Do I understand correctly that the Senator from Wisconsin is asking that the Taft amendment, including the 14 amendments to it which the Senator from Wisconsin offered——

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, so as to make myself clear, let me say that the Senator from Wisconsin offered 14 amendments which were accepted.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. However, while there were 14 amendments, there were only four major differences between those amendments and the Flanders-Taft amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. If they were accepted as part of the Taft amendment, were they amendments to the original bill?

Mr. McCARTHY. They were not accepted as a part of the Taft amendment. They were accepted as a substitute for the original bill, S. 866. There is now pending a motion by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to strike all the McCarthy amendments and substitute the Flanders-Taft amendment. My request is that, in view of the fact that the four major differences between the Flanders amendment and the McCarthy amendments have been ironed out, there is no longer any great difference between the two of us, certainly nothing of importance, as compared with the importance of the over-all bill. I believe, in order to avoid the confusion of asking the Senate to vote upon the very lengthy and complicated Flanders amendment as against the very lengthy and complicated 14 McCarthy amendments, that we now should substitute the Flanders-Taft amendment for the 14 McCarthy amendments, and that then the Taft amendment, as amended, be open to further amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does that mean that the 14 amendments which have been accepted would be offered again as a part of the Taft-Flanders amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As the Chair understands the situation, the result of the unanimous-consent request would be to wipe out the McCarthy amendments and to restore the issue to the Taft amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes. And the purpose for making that request is that now there is practically no difference between the McCarthy amendments and the Flanders-Taft amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana will state it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it not a fact that the Taft amendment is now open to amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then what is the necessity of the procedure suggested by my distinguished friend from Wisconsin?

Mr. McCARTHY. It is a procedure which I have discussed at some length with the proponents of the Taft amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that there probably is no necessity for the latter part of the request, but it simplifies the situation and makes it entirely clear in a parliamentary sense.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In order to make the situation clear in my own mind I desire to ask a question. This action in effect then is to vacate the prior action on the McCarthy amendments, and if that is done, and the so-called Taft-Flanders amendment is pending, it will be subject to further amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the Chair's understanding.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to say that I am not quite clear that I understand the parliamentary situation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair can well understand the Senator's perplexity, and he shares it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I submit to the Chair that we have had some unusually complex situations in consideration of the bill. The Senator from Wisconsin has asked unanimous consent to adopt the Taft-Flanders amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To substitute the Taft-Flanders amendment, and that it be open to amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I dislike to object to the request, but the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and the Senator from Georgia have an amendment to that amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. The action I propose be taken will not preclude that amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. It might make some difference as to how some Senators would vote on the Taft-Flanders amendment. I mean the vote on the amendment which we propose to offer might affect the votes of some Senators on the Taft-Flanders amendment. So I ask the Senator to withhold his request.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator from Georgia withhold his objection?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state to the Senator from Georgia that he has the option of offering his amendment either to the Taft amendment or to the original bill after the Taft amendment is taken care of.

Mr. RUSSELL. The original bill contains very largely the same subject matter as the amendment which will be proposed by the Senator from North Dakota and myself. I see nothing to be gained by this unusual unanimous-consent request. It might preclude some Members of the Senate from voting against the Flanders-Taft amendment, who might prefer the original bill. For that reason I ask the Senator from Wisconsin to withhold his request.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment so that I may explain the situation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly.

Mr. McCARTHY. Originally I was vigorously opposed to the Taft-Flanders amendment, because there were four principal differences between the McCarthy amendments and the Taft-Flanders amendment. We have agreed upon all except one, and we have compromised upon that. There is nothing presently in Senate bill 866 which at all resembles the Senator's amendment. That has all been stricken. Senate bill 866, as of now, contains nothing except the McCarthy amendments. The McCarthy amendments contain nothing comparable to the Senator's farm housing section. All I am doing is attempting to avoid the confusion which I think might result from asking the Senate to compare two very lengthy, complicated measures which are practically identical at this time, or will be practically identi-

cal after we accept the various amendments which have been agreed upon.

Mr. RUSSELL. May I ask the Senator from Wisconsin if his amendments struck from the original bill the provision for the program of rural housing?

Mr. McCARTHY. My amendments struck everything from the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill except the policy statement. So the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill as presently constituted is nothing more or less than the 14 McCarthy amendments.

In view of the fact that we have amended the Taft-Flanders amendment so that to all intents and purposes it is identical with the McCarthy amendments, I ask that we merely wipe out the McCarthy amendments and substitute the Flanders-Taft amendment. The Flanders-Taft amendment will then be open to further amendment, which will in no way preclude the Senator from offering his amendment on farm housing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. RUSSELL. I can see that the Senator might clarify the situation somewhat by eliminating his amendments; but I prefer that he do it by withdrawing them by unanimous consent, which would in nowise prejudice the right of the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Georgia to offer an amendment to the pending Taft-Flanders amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Chair may state his opinion, the vote by which the McCarthy amendments were adopted could be reconsidered, and they could be withdrawn.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It seems to the Chair that the same net result would be accomplished.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should much prefer to see that course followed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. However, that suggestion on the part of the Chair is gratuitous.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have made the same suggestion. It would not in any wise preclude the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Georgia from offering an amendment to the Taft-Flanders amendment which is pending.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, under the circumstances I withdraw my request. I shall make the request again, however, after the amendment of the Senator has been considered.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that would be the preferable course.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin withdraws his request. Does the Senator from Vermont yield further to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, unfortunately I was engaged in some desultory conversation. I should like to know the present parliamentary status.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin withdrew his request during the Senator's desultory conversation.

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall again make the same request, after the amendments have been fully perfected.

Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to call up at this time for immediate consideration two amendments.

The first amendment which I offer is, on page 18 of the Flanders amendment, in line 14, to strike out the figure "$4,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$4,500." This merely deals with the so-called title I, class 3, loans. The Flanders amendment has a figure of $4,000. The McCarthy amendment had a figure of $5,000. We have gone over this question in detail, and we feel that a figure of $4,500 will adequately cover the type of construction we intend to cover in this section. I understand that this amendment is acceptable to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I am glad to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin to the pending amendment, as amended.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and myself, I now offer an amendment dealing with housing for veterans with service-connected disabilities. This amendment is practically identical with a bill which we introduced last year. We are now offering it as an amendment. Last year the bill was recommitted to the committee by a vote of 40 to 37. We feel that we have met the principal objection of Senators who last year urged that the bill be recommitted.

This amendment would provide two things for veteran paraplegic cases, spinal cord injury cases who will be doomed to wheel chairs for the rest of their lives.

First, it will provide at Government expense plans for building special homes for paraplegics.

Second, it will provide that the Government will pay half the cost of a home costing up to $20,000, for veteran paraplegics. The remainder, of course, they will have to raise by an FHA or GI loan.

Last year the Senator from Ohio made the motion for recommittal. We have met his objections, to the extent that he is willing to accept this amendment for the benefit of paraplegics. The Senator from Vermont supported that provision last year. I understand that he is wholeheartedly in favor of the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will this amendment be by way of adding a new title to the bill?

Mr. McCARTHY. It will add title VIII to the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would that title in any way affect other titles in the bill?

Mr. McCARTHY. It would in no way affect any other section of the Flanders-Taft amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD without reading.

The amendment was, on page 93, after line 2 of the amendment proposed by Mr. TAFT, as amended, to insert the following:

TITLE VIII—HOUSING FOR VETERANS WITH SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES

SEC. 801. Section 1, title I, Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, approved March 20, 1933, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection known as subsection (g) and to read as follows:

"(g) Any person who served in the active military or naval service of the United States who is entitled to compensation under the provisions of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, for permanent and total service-connected disability due to spinal-cord disease or injury with paralysis of the legs and lower part of the body shall be entitled to assistance in acquiring a suitable housing unit with special fixtures or movable facilities made necessary by the nature of the person's disability, and necessary land therefor, subject to the provisions and limitations of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, part IX."

SEC. 802. Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new part to be known as part IX and to read as follows:

"PART IX

"1. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to assist any person (hereinafter referred to as 'veteran') who served in the active military or naval service of the United States, who is entitled to compensation under the provisions of this regulation for permanent and total service-connected disability due to spinal-cord disease or injury with paralysis of the legs and lower part of the body in acquiring a suitable housing unit with special fixtures or movable facilities made necessary by the nature of the veteran's disability, and necessary land therefor: *Provided*, That the regulations of the Administrator shall include, but not be limited to, provisions requiring findings that (a) it is medically feasible for such veteran to reside in the proposed housing unit and in the proposed locality; (b) the proposed housing unit bears a proper relation to the veteran's present and anticipated income and expenses; and (c) that the nature and condition of the proposed housing unit are such as to be suitable to the veterans' needs for dwelling purposes.

"2. The assistance authorized by paragraph 1 shall be limited in the case of any veteran to one housing unit, and necessary land therefor, and shall be afforded under one of the following plans, at the option of the veteran, but shall not exceed $10,000 in any one case—

"(a) where the veteran elects to construct a housing unit on land to be acquired by him, the Administrator shall pay not to exceed 50 percent of the total cost to the veteran of (1) the housing unit and (2) the necessary land upon which it is to be situated;

"(b) where the veteran elects to construct a housing unit on land acquired by him prior to application for assistance under this part, the Administrator shall pay not to exceed the smaller of the following sums: (1) 50 percent of the total cost to the veteran of the housing unit and the land necessary for such housing unit, or (2) 50 percent of the cost to the veteran of the housing unit plus the full amount of the unpaid balance, if any, of the cost to the veteran of the land necessary for such housing unit;

"(c) where the veteran elects to remodel a dwelling, which is not adapted to the requirements of his disability, acquired by him prior to application for assistance under this part, the Administrator shall pay not to exceed the total of (1) 50 percent of the cost

of the veteran of such remodeling, plus (2) the smaller of the following sums: (A) 50 percent of the cost to the veteran of such dwelling and the necessary land upon which it is situated, or (B) the full amount of the unpaid balance, if any, of the cost to the veteran of such dwelling and the necessary land upon which it is situated; and

"(d) where the veteran has acquired a suitable housing unit, the Administrator shall pay not to exceed the smaller of the following sums: (1) 50 percent of the cost to the veteran of such housing unit and the necessary land upon which it is situated, or (2) the full amount of the unpaid balance, if any, of the cost to the veteran of such housing unit and the necessary land upon which it is situated.

"3. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to furnish to veterans eligible for assistance under this part, without cost to the veterans, model plans and specifications of suitable housing units.

"4. Any person who accepts the benefits of this part shall not by reason thereof be denied the benefits of title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended.

"5. The Government of the United States shall have no liability in connection with any housing unit, or necessary land therefor, acquired under the provisions of this part."

SEC. 803. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

Renumber the succeeding title and the sections thereof.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I have the assurance of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] that he accepts this amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin to the pending amendment, as amended.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 93, line 6, in the Taft amendment as amended, it is proposed to strike out "Sec. 801" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 801 (a)."

On page 93, after line 12, it is proposed to insert a new subsection, as follows:

(b) Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, is amended by inserting "Federal Housing Administration;" immediately after the semicolon which follows "United States Housing Corporation": *Provided*, That as to the Federal Housing Administration, the audit required by section 105 of said act shall begin with the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1948, and the exception contained in section 301 (d) of said act shall be construed to refer to the cost of audits contracted for prior to July 1, 1948.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to extend the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act to the Federal Housing Administration. While this is not technically a corporation, this agency possesses many of the significant attributes of a corporation, and in nearly all major respects is treated as such by both the executive branch and the Congress. The enactment of the proposed provision would therefore help to secure a more uniform approach to the Government's business activities.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont to the Taft-Flanders amendment, as amended.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to yield to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] or the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] for them to present their amendment on farm housing.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, at this time I wish to call up the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and myself to Senate bill 866.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if there is to be a controversy over this amendment, I think a quorum should be present. The amendment is a rather important one.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I may say that the original idea in connection with the committee amendments was that there were one or two questionable points in the farm-housing provision. We have suggested in our amendments that a committee of Government officials be appointed to report on this subject on January 15.

I have stated to the two authors of the amendment that I would not lead any crusade against the amendment, but would leave it to the judgment of the Senate. However, if one particular section, which seems to me to be the most questionable section of the amendment, were deleted, I should be glad to support the amendment.

I am sorry to say that I do not have the particular section of the amendment before me. I think the Senator from North Dakota can tell us the section in question, as he has it marked. I believe it is the one which provides that any amount up to $2,000 may be applied to building a back porch, or an outhouse, or a chicken house, or what have you.

Mr. YOUNG. I think the Senator has reference to section 704, at the bottom of page 6 of our amendment.

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes; section 704. That is the one.

If the two proponents of the amendment are willing to eliminate that section, I shall gladly support their amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Chair correctly understand that the Senator from Georgia suggests the absence of a quorum?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Byrd	Ecton
Baldwin	Cain	Ellender
Ball	Capehart	Ferguson
Barkley	Capper	Flanders
Brewster	Chavez	Fulbright
Bricker	Cooper	George
Bridges	Cordon	Green
Brooks	Donnell	Gurney
Buck	Downey	Hatch
Bushfield	Dworshak	Hayden
Butler	Eastland	Hickenlooper
Hill	Magnuson	Smith
Hoey	Malone	Sparkman
Holland	Martin	Stennis
Ives	Maybank	Stewart
Jenner	Millikin	Taylor
Johnson, Colo.	Moore	Thomas, Okla.
Johnston, S. C.	Morse	Thomas, Utah
Kem	Murray	Thye
Kilgore	Myers	Tobey
Knowland	O'Conor	Tydings
Langer	O'Daniel	Umstead
Lodge	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
Lucas	Overton	Watkins
McCarran	Pepper	Wherry
McCarthy	Reed	White
McClellan	Revercomb	Wiley
McFarland	Robertson, Va.	Williams
McGrath	Robertson, Wyo	Wilson
McKellar	Russell	Young
McMahon	Saltonstall	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore Ninety-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] for himself and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point. The Chair thinks that for the information of the Senate perhaps a statement by the author would be more illuminating than for the clerk to read the long amendment.

The amendment submitted by Mr. YOUNG, for himself and Mr. RUSSELL, is to strike out in the amendment proposed by Mr. TAFT, line 3 on page 92 down to and including line 2 on page 93, being title VII, and insert the following:

TITLE VII—FARM HOUSING

ASSISTANCE BY THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

SEC. 701. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized, through such agency officers and employees as he may determine subject to the terms and conditions of this title, to extend financial assistance to owners of farms in the United States and in the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii and in Puerto Rico, to enable them to construct, improve, alter, repair, or replace dwellings and facilities incident to family living on their farms to provide them, their tenants, lessees, sharecroppers, and laborers with decent, safe, and sanitary living conditions as specified in this title.

(b) For the purposes of this title and the acts amended hereby, the term "farm" shall mean a parcel or parcels of land operated as a single unit which is used for the production of one or more agricultural commodities and which customarily produces such commodities for sale and for home use of a gross annual value of not less than $400. The Secretary shall promptly determine whether any parcel or parcels of land constitutes a farm for the purposes of this title whenever requested to do so by any interested Federal, State, or local public agency, and his determination shall be conclusive.

(c) In order to be eligible for the assistance authorized by paragraph (a), the applicant must show (1) that he is the owner of a farm which is without a decent, safe, and sanitary dwelling and related facilities adequate for himself and his family and necessary resident farm labor, or for the family of the operating tenant, lessee, or sharecropper; (2) that he is without sufficient re-

sources to provide the necessary housing on his own account; and (3) that he is unable to secure the credit necessary for such housing from other sources upon terms and conditions which he could reasonably be expected to fulfill.

LOANS FOR DWELLINGS ON ADEQUATE FARMS

SEC. 702. (a) If the Secretary determines that an applicant is eligible for assistance as provided in section 60 (c) and that the applicant has the ability to repay in full the sum to be loaned, with interest, giving due consideration to the income and earning capacity of the applicant and his family from the farm and other sources, and the maintenance of a reasonable standard of living for the owner and occupant of said farm, a loan may be made by the Secretary to said applicant for a period of not to exceed 33 years from the making of the loan with interest at a rate not to exceed 4 percent per annum on the unpaid balance of principal.

(b) The instruments under which the loan is made and the security given shall—

(1) provide for security upon the applicant's equity in the farm and such additional security or collateral, if any, as may be found necessary by the Secretary reasonably to assure repayment of the indebtedness;

(2) provide for the repayment of principal and interest in accordance with schedules and repayment plans prescribed by the Secretary;

(3) contain the agreement of the borrower that he will, at the request of the Secretary, proceed with diligence to refinance the balance of the indebtedness through cooperative or other responsible private credit sources whenever the Secretary determines, in the light of the borrower's circumstances, including his earning capacity and the income from the farm, that he is able to do so upon reasonable terms and conditions;

(4) be in such form and contain such covenants as the Secretary shall prescribe to secure the payment of the loan with interest, protect the security, and assure that the farm will be maintained in repair and that waste and exhaustion of the farm will be prevented.

LOANS FOR DWELLINGS ON POTENTIALLY ADEQUATE FARMS

SEC. 703. If the Secretary determines (a) that, because of the inadequacy of the income of an eligible applicant from the farm to be improved and from other sources, said applicant may not reasonably be expected to make annual repayments of principal and interest in an amount sufficient to repay the loan in full within the period of time prescribed by the Secretary as authorized in this title; (b) that the income of the applicant may be sufficiently increased within a period of not to exceed 10 years by improvement or enlargement of the farm or an adjustment of the farm practices or methods; and (c) that the applicant has adopted and may reasonably be expected to put into effect a plan of farm improvement, enlargement, or adjusted practices which, in the opinion of the Secretary, will increase the applicant's income from said farm within a period of not to exceed 10 years to the extent that the applicant may be expected thereafter to make annual repayments of principal and interest sufficient to repay the balance of the indebtedness less payments in cash and credits for the contributions to be made by the Secretary as hereinafter provided, the Secretary may make a loan in an amount necessary to provide adequate housing on said farm under the terms and conditions prescribed in section 702. In addition, the Secretary may agree with the borrower to make annual contributions in the form of credits on the borrower's indebtedness in an amount not to exceed the annual installment of interest and 50 percent of the principal payments accruing during any installment year, up to and including the tenth installment year, subject to the conditions that the borrower's income is, in fact, insufficient to enable the borrower to make payments in accordance with the plan or schedule prescribed by the Secretary and that the borrower pursues his plan of farm reorganization and improvement or enlargement with due diligence.

This agreement with respect to credits of principal and interest upon the borrower's indebtedness shall not be assignable nor accrue to the benefit of any third party without the written consent of the Secretary and the Secretary shall have the right, at his option, to cancel the agreement upon the sale of the farm or the execution or creation of any lien thereon subsequent to the lien given to the Secretary, or to refuse to release the lien given to the Secretary except upon payment in cash of the entire original principal plus accrued interest thereon less actual cash payments of principal and interest when the Secretary determines that the release of the lien would permit the benefits of this section to accrue to a person not eligible to receive such benefits.

OTHER SPECIAL LOANS AND GRANTS FOR MINOR IMPROVEMENTS TO FARM HOUSING

SEC. 704. In the event the Secretary determines that an eligible applicant cannot qualify for a loan under the provisions of sections 702 and 703 and that repairs or improvements should be made to a farm dwelling occupied by him or his tenants, lessees, sharecroppers, or laborers, in order to make such dwelling safe and sanitary and remove hazards to the health of the occupant, his family, or the community, the Secretary may make a grant, or a combined loan and grant, to the applicant to cover the cost of improvements or additions, such as repairing roofs, providing toilet facilities, providing a sanitary water supply, supplying screens, or making other similar repairs or improvements. No assistance shall be extended to any one individual under the provisions of this section in the form of a loan or grant or combination thereof in excess of $1,000 for any one unit or dwelling owned by such individual or in excess of $2,000 in the aggregate to any one such individual, and the grant portion with respect to any one unit or dwelling shall not exceed $500. Any portion of the sums advanced to the borrower treated as a loan shall be secured and be repayable in accordance with the principles and conditions set forth in this title. Sums made available by grant may be made subject to the conditions set out in this title for the protection of the Government with respect to contributions made on loans by the Secretary. In the case of such loan or grant with respect to a dwelling not occupied by the owner of the land, the Secretary may, as a condition precedent to the grant, require that the landowner enter into such stipulations and agreements with the Secretary and the occupants of the dwelling as will make it possible for the occupant to obtain the full benefits of the grant.

TECHNICAL SERVICES AND RESEARCH

SEC. 705. In addition to the financial assistance authorized in sections 701 to 704, inclusive, the Secretary is hereby authorized to furnish to all persons, without charge or at such charges as the Secretary may determine, technical services such as building plans, specifications, construction supervision and inspection, and advice and information regarding rural dwellings and other farm buildings. The Secretary and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator are authorized to cooperate in research and technical studies in the rural-housing field. In furnishing such services and information, the Secretary may utilize, through the Agricultural Extension Service, the facilities and services of State agencies and educational institutions.

PREFERENCE FOR VETERANS

SEC. 706. As between eligible applicants for assistance under this title, the Secretary shall give preference to veterans (defined for the purposes of this title to mean persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II).

LOCAL PUBLIC AGENCIES AND COMMITTEES TO ASSIST SECRETARY

SEC. 707. (a) Wherever a local public agency now exists or may be hereafter created which possesses authority to assist low-income persons and families outside of urban areas to obtain decent, safe, and sanitary housing and related facilities, the Secretary is authorized, and after agreement with such agency is directed, to utilize the facilities of such local public agency for the purpose of making the benefits of this title available to the eligible owners or operators situated upon farms (as defined in section 701) lying within the boundaries of said local public agency.

(b) Wherever the facilities of a local public agency are not utilized, the Secretary may utilize the services of any existing committee of farmers operating (pursuant to laws or regulations carried out by the Department of Agriculture) in the county or parish where the farm is located. In any county or parish where the facilities of a local public agency are not utilized and in which no existing satisfactory committee is available, the Secretary is authorized to appoint a committee composed of three persons residing in the county or parish. Each member of such committee shall be allowed compensation at the rate of $5 per day while engaged in the performance of duties under this title and, in addition, shall be allowed such amounts as the Secretary may prescribe for necessary traveling and subsistence expenses. One member of the committee shall be designated by the Secretary as chairman. The Secretary shall prescribe rules governing the procedure of local public agencies and committees utilized pursuant to this section, furnish forms and equipment necessary for the performance of their duties, and authorize and provide for the compensation of such clerical assistance as he deems may be required by any committee.

(c) The local public agency or committee utilized pursuant to this section shall examine applications of persons desiring to obtain the benefits of this title and shall submit recommendations to the Secretary with respect to each application as to whether the applicant is eligible to receive the benefits of this title, whether by reason of his character, ability, and experience, he is likely successfully to carry out undertakings required of him under a loan or grant under this title, and whether the farm with respect to which the application is made is of such character that there is a reasonable likelihood that the making of the loan or grant requested will carry out the purposes of this title. The local public agencies or committees shall also certify to the Secretary their opinions of the reasonable values of the farms. The local authorities and committees shall, in addition, perform such other duties under this title as the Secretary may require.

GENERAL POWERS OF SECRETARY

SEC. 708. (a) The Secretary, for the purposes of this title, shall have the power to determine and prescribe the standards of adequate farm housing, by farms or localities, taking into consideration, among other factors, the type of housing which will provide decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for the needs of the family using the housing, the type and character of the farming operations to be conducted, and the size and earning capacity of the land.

(b) The Secretary may require any recipient of a loan or grant to agree that the availability of housing constructed or improved with the proceeds of the loan or grant under this title shall not be a justification for directly or indirectly changing the terms or conditions of the lease or occupancy

agreement with the occupants of such housing to the latter's disadvantage without the approval of the Secretary.

SEC. 709. In carrying out the provisions of this title, the Secretary shall have the power to—

(a) make contracts for services and supplies without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, when the aggregate amount involved is less than $300;

(b) enter into subordination, subrogation, or other agreements satisfactory to the Secretary;

(c) compromise claims and obligations arising out of sections 702 to 705, inclusive, of this title and adjust and modify the terms of mortgages, leases, contracts, and agreements entered into as circumstances may require, including the release from personal liability, without payment of further consideration, of—

(1) borrowers who have transferred their farms to other approved applicants for loans who have agreed to assume the outstanding indebtedness to the Secretary under this title; and

(2) borrowers who have transferred their farms to other approved applicants for loans who have agreed to assume that portion of the outstanding indebtedness to the Secretary under this title which is equal to the earning capacity value of the farm at the time of the transfer, and borrowers whose farms have been acquired by the Secretary, in cases where the Secretary determines that the original borrowers have cooperated in good faith with the Secretary, have farmed in a workmanlike manner, used due diligence to maintain the security against loss, and otherwise fulfilled the covenants incident to their loans, to the best of their abilities;

(d) collect all claims and obligations arising out of or under any mortgage, lease, contract, or agreement entered into pursuant to this title and, if in his judgment necessary and advisable, to pursue the same to final collection in any court having jurisdiction: *Provided*, That the prosecution and defense of all litigation under this title shall be conducted under the supervision of the Attorney General and the legal representation shall be by the United States attorneys for the districts, respectively, in which such litigation may arise and by such other attorney or attorneys as may, under law, be designated by the Attorney General;

(e) bid for and purchase at any foreclosure or other sale or otherwise to acquire the property pledged or mortgaged to secure a loan or other indebtedness owing under this title, to accept title to any property so purchased or acquired, to operate or lease such property for such period as may be necessary or advisable, to protect the interest of the United States therein and to sell or otherwise dispose of the property so purchased or acquired by such terms and for such considerations as the Secretary shall determine to be reasonable and to make loans to provide adequate housing for the purchasers of such property;

(f) utilize with respect to indebtedness arising from loans and payments made under this title all the powers and authorities given to him under the act approved December 20, 1944, entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to compromise, adjust, or cancel certain indebtedness, and for other purposes" (58 Stat. 836), as such act now provides or may hereafter be amended;

(g) make such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

OBLIGATIONS AND APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 710. The Secretary may issue notes and other obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in such sums as the Congress may from time to time determine to make loans under this title but not in excess of $25,000,000 on or after the 1st day of July 1948, an additional $50,000,000 on or after the 1st day of July 1949, an additional $75,000,000 on or after the 1st day of July 1950, and an additional $100,000,000 on or after the 1st day of July 1951. The notes and other obligations issued by the Secretary shall be secured by the obligations of borrowers and the Secretary's commitments to make contributions under this title and shall be repaid from the payment of principal and interest on the obligations of the borrowers and from funds appropriated hereunder. The notes and other obligations issued by the Secretary shall be in such forms and denominations, shall have such maturities, and shall be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of the notes or obligations by the Secretary. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and other obligations of the Secretary of Agriculture issued hereunder and for such purpose is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such act are extended to include any purchases of such obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this section.

All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States.

SEC. 711. In connection with loans made pursuant to section 703, the Secretary is authorized, on or after July 1, 1948, to make commitments for contributions aggregating not more than $500,000 per annum, and to make additional commitments on or after July 1 of each of the years 1949, 1950, and 1951 which shall require aggregate contributions of not more than $1,000,000, $1,500,000, and $2,000,000 per annum, respectively.

SEC. 712. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary (a) such sums as may be necessary to permit payments on notes or other obligations issued by the Secretary under section 710 equal to (i) the aggregate of the contributions made by the Secretary in the form of credits on principal sums due on loans made pursuant to section 703 and (ii) the interest due on a similar sum represented by notes or other obligations issued by the Secretary; (b) an additional $1,000,000 for grants made pursuant to section 704 on or after July 1, 1948, which amount shall be increased by further amounts of $2,500,000, $4,000,000, and $5,000,000, on July 1 of each of the years 1949, 1950, and 1951, respectively; and (c) such further sums as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of sections 701 to 712, inclusive, of this title.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I shall have to object to the deletion of section 704, as proposed by the able Senator from Vermont. My reason for that, to start with, is that I am more concerned with the farm veterans' housing provisions of the bill than with any other feature of it. Farm veterans have had far less chance to take part in any veterans' legislation than any other group. There are few farm veterans taking advantage of college training. There are very few of them taking advantage of on-the-job training. When the farm veteran seeks to establish himself in the farming business, usually, because he was away during the war, he has to go to run-down buildings to find a place in which to live. This section would give farm veterans a chance to obtain Government funds to help repair those buildings and to modernize them to a certain extent. For that reason, I would have to oppose deletion of that section of the bill.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. I would say on the floor what I have said to the Senator from North Dakota personally, and what I have said to the Senator from Georgia personally, that I still think the committee plan of referring this question to a committee of the Cabinet for report on January 15 is the better way to handle this section, which I think has not had quite the thought put into it that certain other sections have had. I shall feel compelled to vote against this section. I shall not make any campaign against it, but shall leave it to the judgment of the Senate as to whether the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the Senator from Vermont. Mr. President, I had originally intended to make rather extended remarks on this amendment, but, in view of the sentiment expressed in the Senate in favor of the amendment, I do not think that is necessary. I should, however, like to speak briefly and to ask unanimous consent that the statement I had prepared be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, the national housing bill, in the form in which it is now before the Senate, carries a little bit for almost everybody, and for some it carries a great deal. Everybody shares to some extent, but the farmer shares least of all. Indeed, the present title VII, as it is proposed in the Flanders amendments to S. 866, calls for nothing but a survey and a report. Thus, farmers get barely a crumb from the housing table to be spread for the Nation in this bill.

Yet rural areas are by common consent the worst housed, the most neglected areas in America. As I have said, the present proposal is merely for another survey and another report. But the files of Congress, of the Library of Congress, and of the Department of Agriculture are full of reports on rural housing, dusty and unused, all telling the same story.

Several years ago an interbureau committee of the Department of Agriculture said, "Rural farm dwellings in general are inferior to those of urban families, and the homes of hired farm workers are even less adequate than those of farm operators. Under 1944 conditions of practically full employment, about 5,000,000 operator families were in need of housing on farms. Approximately 2,000,000 now occupy acceptable houses, and about 3,000,000 are in repairable and nonrepairable houses, approximately half in each class. Of this 3,000,000, about 2,000,000 are in position to finance acceptable housing, if appropriate housing credit can be made available to serve their needs, while about 1,000,000, even under 1944 conditions, had insufficient income to finance acceptable housing. About half of these 2,000,000 who can finance acceptable housing need to replace their dwellings, and about half of the million who cannot finance acceptable housing also need new homes."

That sums up the national situation in rural housing about as well as could be done if another year or more were wasted, not to mention the money of taxpayers, in another futile survey and report. We know now what needs to be done. All that remains is to go ahead and undertake a rural-housing program.

For that matter, almost exactly 2 years ago a committee of this body, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, said in its report on the national housing bill of that year, "The relative neglect of rural housing, despite the urgency of the problem in rural areas, has made it unthinkable that a comprehensive housing program should neglect the rural areas."

It remains unthinkable to me that the Senate will approve a bill avowedly embodying a national housing program but actually omitting entirely any program for dealing with the housing problems of farmers, in many ways the area of most acute need.

This is why the Senator from Georgia, Mr. RUSSELL, and myself have joined to propose the amendment now before the Senate. The amendment would provide a relatively modest rural-housing program, if its financial terms be compared with the dimensions of the remainder of the bill, but one which would be of substantial and important service in enabling farm people to improve their housing conditions.

Under the terms of this amendment the Department of Agriculture would be authorized to undertake a program involving no more than $25,000,000 for the first year, and rising by an additional $25,000,000 annually until it attained $100,000,000 in the year beginning July 1, 1951, these moneys to be available for the construction, repair, or improvement of dwellings and facilities on farms.

Section 701, as it is proposed in our amendment would allow such loans to be made only on condition that the applicant for the loan could show that improved housing was needed, that he was without the necessary resources to provide the housing himself, and that he was unable to obtain the required credit elsewhere upon terms and conditions which he could reasonably be expected to fulfill.

This program and the associated provisions of the amendment are carefully drawn, we believe, to take account of the very wide difference between the needs of farmers for housing credit and the needs of city dwellers. Too often, this difference is not realized, and too often well-meant efforts to improve rural housing have failed for this reason.

A prime necessity in rural housing credit is that it be, first, on a long-time, relatively low-interest basis, and, second, that it be related to the profitability of operation of the farm. The farm dwellings are in a sense a part of the farm plant, and this fact must be remembered. Thus, we have provided that the loans to be made will be for a maximum of 33 years and at an interest rate of 4 percent.

Three principal types of programs, aimed at meeting the three major kinds of housing problems in the country, are called for in the amendment. The first of these is simply for loans to provide dwellings on adequate farms, that is, farms of a size and character to warrant the reasonable assumption that the housing loan can be safely carried. The second is for loans to provide dwellings on farms not now regarded as adequate but classified as potentially adequate, that is, where there is a reasonable assumption for the belief that within 10 years the farm will have developed into an adequate farm. This is contained in section 703 in the amendment, and provides a plan for variable payments necessary to make such a program work. Finally, there is, in section 704, provision for a minor improvement program, including grants of up to $500, if necessary, designed to provide roof repairs, toilet facilities, sanitary water supply, screening, and similar greatly needed improvements. Such loans, or loans and grants, could not exceed $1,000 on any one dwelling, or $2,000 to any individual.

In very brief outline, this is the principal substance of the amendment. It contains, to my mind, adequate safeguards both for the Government and the individual, and opens up a field not now open to many private businesses who would benefit from such a new market as is here offered. At the same time, it is obvious that no private interests would suffer from the adoption of such a program, since even the credit is being provided to those who could not otherwise obtain it.

In conclusion, let me appeal to my fellow Senators to consider that agriculture, which should have a major claim upon them as custodians of the national welfare, has been sadly neglected by Congress in the past whenever such programs as these were being considered. Yet the farms are the principal seedbed of the Nation. From them come many more children, proportionately, than from the cities. We owe it to these children to help see to it that they grow up, not in rural slums, but in decent, healthy, and safe homes, homes of which any American could be proud. For that reason, if for no other, I hope the amendment may be adopted.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the amendment prepared by the Senator from Georgia and myself is identically, or almost identically, the same as the similar provision in the original housing bill. It gives high priority to veterans. In fact, of the meager amount of money provided in the amendment, I think every bit of it would go to veterans themselves.

Mr. President, during the time I have been in the Senate I have found that about the only way I was able to help the farm veterans was through the Farmers Home Administration. Veterans' loans, as a rule, do not apply to farm veterans and they have not been able to get the loans they need through the banks. As a result, the Farmers Home Administration, with its meager funds, is about the only place the farm veteran can go for financial assistance. It would seem to me unthinkable to pass the housing bill at this time and totally eliminate farm veterans from its help.

Mr. President, I do not think I have any more to add at this particular time, but I shall, perhaps, have more to say a little later.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to make a few very brief observations. I appreciate being associated with the Senator from North Dakota, who is a determined fighter for parity for our farm population, in presenting this amendment. I regret very much the Senator from Vermont is not greatly impressed with the importance of the amendment, because I assume that as one of the conferees on the part of the Senate he will have much to do with the fashioning of the final bill which will evolve in the course of the enactment of any housing legislation at this session. I hope the amendment will not see short shrift in the conference. In my opinion it is one of the most important features of the entire legislation, and that was the impression of the committee as evidenced by its original report. The report on the original housing bill, S. 866, contained substantially the provisions of this amendment, except this amendment, as stated by the Senator from North Dakota, gives high preference to veterans. I wish to read just a brief statement from the original committee report, at page 15:

> In the past, the magnitude of the urban-housing program has tended to divert attention from the problems of farm housing. The fact is that farm-housing conditions are relatively much worse than in our urban communities.

Mr. President, that is a fact that is known to every person who travels around the country. It was recognized by the committee in making this very modest provision for farm housing, when they reported the original bill, which provision was substantially the same as the one contained in the amendment submitted by the Senator from North Dakota and myself.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will yield, I should like to say that I have obtained certain very illuminating information, based upon the last census figures, showing the differences between urban and rural housing, at the present time, which I desire to read, as follows:

COMPARATIVE PERCENTAGES ON RURAL-FARM AND URBAN HOUSING

1. Dwellings which are overcrowded (more than 1½ persons per room):

	Percent
Rural-farm	16
Urban	6

2. Dwellings which have electric lighting:

	Percent
Rural-farm	32
Urban	96

3. Dwellings which have running water:

	Percent
Rural-farm	18
Urban	94

4. Dwellings which have mechanical refrigerators:

	Percent
Rural-farm	15
Urban	56

5. Dwellings which have private flush toilet:

	Percent
Rural-farm	11
Urban	83

6. Dwellings which have a private bath:

	Percent
Rural-farm	12
Urban	78

Source: Report of Department of Agriculture Interbureau Committee on Postwar Programs, as submitted to Senate Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, Jan. 17, 1945, and based on 1940 census figures.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for reading those figures. Farm housing, which is for the benefit of only 20 percent of the population, does not enlist the political pressures which are brought to bear when we are dealing with urban housing. Farm homes are on the average more substandard than homes in other areas of the Nation. The rural population does not have the same political effect and strength because the farmers are not as well organized as other groups. As a matter of fact, when a man goes down into the slum section of a city and sees some very deplorable living conditions, he immediately wants to do something

about it. When he goes out into the country and rides around he may see a little farmhouse and never realize its condition. It may be there are holes in the roof, under which it is necessary to put every pot and pan in the house to catch the rain when it leaks through the roof. There may be a hole in the wall through which a cat could be thrown. The plumbing may be 200 yards from the house, a long way out in the garden. But there may be a little vine growing up on the side. There may be two or three towheaded children playing in front of the door or perhaps two little pickaninnies. It does not occur to him ever to do anything about that. He merely says, "How picturesque that is" and then he drives off down the road, to carry on his campaign for slum clearance, where the people already have water in their homes, where they at least do not have leaky roofs. Deplorable as their condition may be, they are not nearly so bad off on the average as are those who live in farm homes.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will yield, I should like to suggest one addition to the discussion of the delinquencies in connection with farmhouses which have been listed by him, and that is that there is not only necessity of using water pots and pans but there is the necessity of moving the bed.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. On rainy days they have to move practically all the furniture. They do that every time it rains. That is the reason I do not understand why the Senator is opposed to this amendment. He is asking for a program of $7,000,000,000 for urban housing, but cannot approve the allowance of $25,000,000 for the first year to try to do something to relieve the housing conditions in the rural communities of the Nation.

I continue to read from the original report of the committee:

> Data furnished by the Department of Agriculture indicate that in 1944 only 2,000,000 of the 5,000,000 operator families on farms were occupying acceptable houses—

Forty percent of them had acceptable houses on the farms—

> and that half of the unsatisfactory houses were in such condition as to be classified as "nonreparable."

Conditions were so bad that the houses were nonreparable—

> Farm dwellings occupied by hired farm workers are, of course, substantially less adequate than those occupied by farm operators.

Then the committee made this statement in its report:

> It is unthinkable that a comprehensive housing program should neglect the needs of our ill-housed rural families.

In spite of this challenging statement in the committee's report, and the figures submitted by the Senator from North Dakota, it is now proposed to give urban populations housing programs, but in the case of rural populations merely to continue to investigate and study the farm-housing program. As a practical matter, it is an evident fact that farmers will not get any legislation at all regarding housing, no matter how much investigating and studying may be undertaken, unless they have the votes to enable such legislation to pass in the House and Senate. The suggestion to recommit the subject to further study and investigation is simply a method of slow death for any hope to do anything regarding the most deplorable housing conditions in the Nation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Was that report made by the same committee which is now proposing to strike out aid for rural communities?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. It made the report concerning the deplorable conditions obtaining, and then it did nothing about suggesting legislation to remedy the situation. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. Everyone loves the farmers until the time comes to do something for them, and then there is an effort to delay action and to merely investigate and make a further study, even after the committee has reported the deplorable conditions which exist on the farms and in rural communities.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not a fact that rural housing authorities were established in the late thirties and some developments were started, and that there has been all the investigation which is needed? The subject has been investigated since 1934, and in 1939 there was one little housing unit established in one small rural community in my State. Is not the same true of other Southern States?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am happy to have that statement by a distinguished member of the committee, who is more familiar with the details than I am. I do not like to see the farmer shunted aside and put in a position in which he will be unable to share the blessings of Federal legislation for housing aid.

Mr. MAYBANK. We have rural authorities established under State laws. All that is needed is legislation to provide special funds to be appropriated to the State agencies.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to have the Senator from South Carolina make it clear.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. If I correctly understand the situation, Mr. President, in the original bill which was formulated on this subject, there was intended to be a comprehensive treatment of the problem of inadequate housing in the rural areas. Provision was made for rural housing, but later on that part of the bill was eliminated and is not now even before the Senate. Without the amendment proposed by the able Senators from North Dakota and Georgia there will not be any effective dealing with the problem at all.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. The farmer is eliminated from any actual assistance in solving his housing problem, but Congress is to study him and investigate him, after reporting that his housing conditions are worse than are conditions in urban centers in which the bill is intended to apply.

Mr. PEPPER. I certainly want to commend the Senators from North Dakota and Georgia for initiating the amendment, and to give them assurance that they shall certainly get my vote when the time comes to pass upon the amendment. As one who was born in an inadequate rural home and has seen such homes all his life in the South where he has lived, I know the severity of the need. I know it would be the grossest injustice to the rural segments of our population if a bill which purports to be a comprehensive housing bill should fail to give some decency and adequacy of treatment to the subject of rural housing.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. We are merely undertaking to restore to the bill a provision written into it in the first instance, which is now proposed to be deleted, although it carries a very modest sum of money as compared with the staggering sums available for urban housing.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to add to the statement which is being made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia that aid is more needful for the farmers than for any other type of our citizens. The bill provides for a first mortgage, a secondary mortgage, and all other mortgages which city dwellers can obtain but which no rural person, living in communities where there are no fire departments, can obtain.

Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate that statement. I want to make one more brief observation, and then I shall have concluded.

Today veterans are leaving the farms in droves and moving into cities. There is no farm-housing program whatever of which they can avail themselves. They are adding to the difficulties of solving housing problems in the cities, because many veterans are moving into cities seeking to obtain a GI loan or an FHA loan to obtain housing for his wife and family after he has returned from the service. We should see that some modest amount is made available to aid the returning veteran in obtaining a livable home on the farm.

Mr. President, this country depends very largely, in these trying days of uncertainty and stress, when we are being assaulted by foreign ideologies and are being attacked by subversive movements, upon our rural population. We will do well to bear in mind the great strength which supports us from that source. They should not be shunted aside in every piece of legislation. We should see that the veteran has an opportunity to have a home on the farm, through the adoption of this amendment. It is a mere crumb from the table of the six or seven billion dollars provided for in the bill, but it at least shows that Congress recognizes that it has some responsibility

in connection with rural housing. It holds out a hope to the veteran on the farm, and to the nonveteran as well, that someday he may be able to share decent housing by building a home on the farm and share in the same benefits which are available to those who live in the city.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I commend the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from North Dakota for offering their amendment to the bill and for pointing up the real problem of farm housing. It is something we have never had in this country, and it is something we certainly need. I agree with the Senator that we cannot have a well-rounded housing program without including a provision for farm housing.

I was interested in what the Senator from Georgia was saying with reference to veterans obtaining farms and decent places in which to live, and my thoughts went back to an illustration I should like to present. Of course, the Senator has been interested all the way along in the Farm Tenant Purchase Act; and, by the way, under that act, as the Senator knows, whenever a farm was purchased, the purchaser got good housing with it, principally because there was an agency which was equipped and ready and willing to give technical advice and assistance in building the right kind of housing. Riding through the country where those tenant purchases have been made, I have noticed from time to time that one can almost pick them out in a community, because they have been properly planned, and under the provision proposed a great need will be met.

I started to use an illustration, if the Senator from Georgia will permit me to impose on his time. In 1944 I attended a ceremony in Alabama, along with the late Senator Bankhead, who was author of the Farm Tenant Purchase Act, when the first mortgage in all the United States to be paid off from the products of the farm itself was paid off and delivered. I remember the man and his family quite well. His name was Curtis Haraway.

Several months later I was in Europe, up near the front lines in Belgium, where I met a young man, who told me where he was from, a little community in Limestone County, Ala. His name was Haraway. I asked him if he was related to Curtis Haraway and he said, "Yes, he is my brother." I told him about the ceremony I had attended, during the time this boy had been over in Europe fighting. I said, "By the way, what are you going to do when you get out of the Army?" He said, "You know what I want to do? I want to go back home and get me a farm home as Curtis did."

Mr. President, that is a normal aspiration for every young man in the country, whether he is a veteran or nonveteran. Yet we know that their opportunities along that line have been greatly limited.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, Mr. President, such a man has no opportunity to get a loan from the pittance available to Farmers Home Administration unless he happens to be a share cropper or tenant farmer. That legislation does not help those who own a little land to get money to improve their homes so that they will have healthy and sanitary places in which to live.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is right; up to this point the bill would not provide a source of help to which the farmer could look. In other words, he has to be a farm tenant or farm worker, he cannot be a farm owner and hope to get decent housing with help from the Government.

In the hearings of the Joint Committee on Housing held in Birmingham, Representative ROBERT E. JONES, of Alabama, who, by the way, happens to be the Representative from my home district, testified before our committee. He had given a great deal of thought and attention to the need we are discussing, and he used some figures in the hearings which I should like to quote very briefly. He said:

> During the years of 1935 through 1938 the deterioration cost on farms in America was more than new construction in any 1 year of those 3 years.

Then he used these figures with reference to Alabama. I am quoting his words:

> We have in Alabama 234,000 farm-unit homes. Of that entire number of 234,000, there are 123,000 that have no toilet facilities, no screens, no lights, no electricity. They have nothing but the roof over their heads.

Representative RAINS, who is a member of the joint committee, said:

> You mean they are huts?

Representative JONES replied:

> I mean they are places that the health department of the city of Birmingham would more than likely condemn.

I think Representative JONES presented the picture very well, and it is a picture which applies largely throughout rural America. I certainly wish to add my endorsement to the amendment the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from North Dakota have sponsored.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will allow me, I should like to insert at this time a telegram which every Member of the Senate received from Walter P. Reuther, chairman of the CIO National Housing Committee, strongly urging the adoption of the amendment the Senators have offered. I should like to insert the telegram at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 20, 1948.*
>
> Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
> *United States Senate,*
> *Washington, D. C.:*
>
> As chairman of CIO'S housing committee I urge you to vote for S. 866 as amended by the Flanders amendment. We hope you will also support the Russell-Young farm housing amendment not only because we favor good housing for people on the farms but also because labor has a major stake in farm welfare. In many areas farm housing is bad as that in any city slum. A program of farm housing would provide a new vital market in which labor is vitally interested. This bill when enacted into law will be a strong gesture by this Congress for the welfare of millions of people in this country. Your voting for it will be proof of your interest in the well-being of our citizens.
>
> WALTER P. REUTHER,
> *Chairman, CIO National Housing Committee.*

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alabama for his contribution. I have practically concluded my remarks.

I wish to point out that the amendment is safeguarded in every possible way. It will have to be established that the borrower cannot secure the funds elsewhere upon terms and conditions with which he could reasonably be expected to comply, and that the loans have the same collateral security as in the case of city housing.

It is of tremendous importance that such an amendment be adopted, and I implore the Members of the Senate who will represent us upon the conference to make a real fight for this provision, and not stand by and see it killed without making an effort to be just to the 20 percent of our people who live on farms.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. This is the first opportunity I have had to look at the amendment, and I have been endeavoring to determine whether there is any limitation in the amendment on the amount of a loan which may be made to a farm resident. I have not been able to find it up to this time.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think there is any limitation in dollars and cents but there is a provision that the Secretary shall not lend more than he can reasonably expect to be paid from the farm on which the borrower may reside.

Mr. CORDON. I recognize that that appears in one place, and then I find in section 703 that the Secretary is given authority to speculate on what the farmer may be able to do on the farm within 10 years, or by adding another farm to it, going more or less into the realm of speculation. Then he may make grants of a portion of the value. It leaves me confused as to exactly what we are trying to do

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will turn to section 711, on page 15, he will find that the total amount available the first year under that section is only $500,000. It can be no more than an experiment, if we are to appropriate $500,000 for the whole United States. It is more or less of an experimental effort to do something about improving rural-housing conditions. Only half a million dollars is to be available in the first year, to be used in connection with section 703.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me——

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to invite attention to an editorial in the Wall Street Journal of Tuesday last in which this significant language is used:

> In its latest form the housing bill makes no provision for the farmers. The Senate Committee on Banking, in its report on the

bill, says that provision for the improvement of farm-housing conditions is essential but that further study of this division of the subject is desirable. The bill therefore instructs the Secretary of Agriculture and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to submit, early in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, a report on farm housing with recommendations.

If the Federal Government is to go into the business of providing housing at all, the farm population has a right to be considered. This order for a report, however, is a vivid reminder that public-improvement programs have a habit of growing far beyond the plans initially drawn for them. Federal housing could hardly be an exception to this rule.

If the financiers who patronize principally the Wall Street Journal recognize the justice of the amendment it is somewhat strange that the warm-hearted proponents of the measure cannot see that the farmers are entitled to equal treatment with slum dwellers in the large cities.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank my colleague for his splendid contribution.

Since the discussion began my hopes have been increased greatly that a real fight will be made in conference for the amendment. It is endorsed on the one hand by the Honorable Walter P. Reuther in a telegram read by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and on the other hand by the Wall Street Journal, and certainly with endorsements from those two extremes, from Mr. Reuther and from the Wall Street Journal it would be a great injustice if the amendment were finally omitted from the bill. I sincerely hope the Senate of the United States will not see such an injustice perpetrated.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I just want to have this thought made part of the RECORD. The Senator from Georgia said the amendment should be of significance to the conferees for the reason that it was not the Senate Banking and Currency Committee that requested the proposed action, but it was the Joint Housing Committee. I think the Senator from Vermont should know that the Joint Housing Committee of both Houses asked for this amendment. So far as I was concerned and so far as the other Members on the Democratic side were concerned, we thought sufficient study had been given to the matter, and that the amendment should be included, but in view of the close vote of seven to six it was delayed, because of the joint committee's hope that when we pass the bill it can also be passed through the House, and that the conferees will agree to it. So I just want the RECORD to show that the members of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, certainly on the Democratic side, believe that the amendment should have been in the original bill. I again want to take the opportunity of thanking the Senator from Georgia for bringing the amendment to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from South Carolina. I hope the Senate will not overlook the diligent efforts of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], who, in the first instance, is the prime author of the amendment. I am glad to be associated with him, and I hope that the amendment will come before us again, in whatever form the final draft of the housing bill may take.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Georgia for his kind remarks. His enthusiastic assistance and cosponsorship of this amendment has been of the greatest importance. Without this support on the part of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who always has the farmers' interests at heart, it probably would have been impossible to secure passage of this important provision so important to the farm veterans of America.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] for himself and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I shall read:

On page 9, in line 16, after "1935", insert "or of any of the village properties under the jurisdiction of the Tennessee Valley Authority."

Mr. President, the Tennessee Valley Authority has under its jurisdiction a number of residential properties. The House Appropriations Committee in 1947 recommended that the Tennessee Valley Authority dispose of a number of these villlage properties particularly the properties in Norris, Tenn., and the Wilson Dam villages located at Wilson, Ala.

The proposed amendment would simply make FHA insurance available to finance the sale of these properties in addition to the sale of the Greenbelt towns which is already covered by the amendment to section 610 of the National Housing Act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, in line 16, after "1935", it is proposed to insert "or of any of the village properties under the jurisdiction of the Tennessee Valley Authority."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I offer a further amendment, on page 20, after line 13, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 104. The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of section 500 (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: *"And provided further,* That the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may prescribe by regulation a higher maximum rate of interest than otherwise prescribed in this section for loans guaranteed under this title, but not exceeding 4½ percent per annum, if he finds that the loan market demands it."

Mr. President, developments in the money market generally, and in mortgage financing in particular, have indicated the definite possibility that veterans may not be able to continue to obtain financing for home purchase under the GI bill of rights at the maximum 4-percent rate of interest now prescribed by law. The purpose of this amendment, therefore, is to grant discretionary authority to the Veterans' Administrator to increase, but only with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, the maximum rate of interest on loans guaranteed or insured under the GI bill of rights from 4 percent per annum to 4½ percent per annum, if the mortgage market shall, in fact, demand such an increase in the future. In this respect it parallels a provision already in the committee amendments to S. 866 with respect to FHA insurance of home loans under its title VI program.

As in the case of the FHA provision, this proposed amendment is not intended to invite an increased interest rate on GI loans. On the contrary, it is not believed that an increase in the maximum rate of interest should be made at this time, and the intention is that the discretionary power provided in this new section should be used only as a last resort. Likewise, if an increase is required in certain areas only, it is intended that this power be exercised only in connection with such areas.

It is, however, desirable to provide necessary and moderate flexibility in the law should an increase in interest rates be absolutely required in order to attain the objectives of title III of the GI bill of rights.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to know to which title the amendment applies.

Mr. FLANDERS. It applies to FHA mortgages in general.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, there are two technical amendments which I desire to offer. One is perfecting amendment No. 1 to the committee amendments. The amendment is on page 82, in line 11, to strike out "(a)" following "Sec. 604."

This is necessary because on a motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], which was agreed to by the Senate, section 604 (b)—page 89, lines 13 to 25, inclusive, and page 90, lines 1 to 5, inclusive—was stricken.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont which he has already stated.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLANDERS. I now offer perfecting amendment No. 2 to the committee amendments on page 87, in line 18, to strike out the word "superseded" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "superseding."

This was a printing error.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I now move the adoption of the Taft amendment, as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the Taft amendment as amended.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to make the RECORD absolutely clear at this time so there will be no confusion in the minds of Senators or in the minds of those reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In view of the amendments to the Taft amendment which have been accepted, I think it now is, while not identical to the 14 amendments which the Senate accepted the other day, yet sufficiently parallel so that I have no objection whatever to substituting the Taft amendment for the 14 McCarthy amendments.

I might point out that there is only one remaining major difference, and that is on the question of a secondary market for title I, section 3 loans. I have gone over that with the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Ohio, and I think there is considerable merit to their objection to that particular provision.

Originally there was substantial difference respecting the size of the loan guaranty. The Flanders amendment contained a provision for $4,000; my amendment contained a provision for $5,000. We have gone into that question in some detail, and the Senator from Vermont and I agree that the figure $4,500, which is halfway between his figure and mine, is adequate to take care of that particular type of housing.

There is one provision in the Flanders-Taft amendment which was not in mine. I think it is an excellent provision. It provides for Federal loans to cover the disposal of the Greenbelt towns and the TVA towns. Other than that the amendments are now identical, so for that reason, Mr. President, rather than to call upon the Senate to vote upon the measure, I am going to ask unanimous consent that the Flanders-Taft amendment be substituted for the 14 McCarthy amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the Taft amendment as amended.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Taft amendment be substituted for the 14 McCarthy amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Agreement to the proposal which the Chair has submitted will achieve the result which the Senator seeks.

Mr. McCARTHY. I still would like to submit my unanimous-consent request. I have a reason for doing so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator please repeat his request?

Mr. McCARTHY. I ask unanimous consent to substitute the Flanders-Taft amendment for the 14 McCarthy amendments which were adopted the other day.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is not such a request out of order? The matter before the Senate now is the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as amended, to Senate 866. The McCarthy amendments have no standing, except as amendments to Senate 866, now under consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Any unanimous-consent request is in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall have to object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator to tell me why he objects?

Mr. ELLENDER. May I ask why the Senator is insisting on his request? As I have just stated, his amendments have no standing except as amendments to the pending measure. The effect of adopting the pending committee amendments as amended will wipe out the McCarthy amendments in any event, so that his request will accomplish nothing.

Mr. McCARTHY. It will accomplish a great deal. This morning I received at least 20 telegrams, half of them urging that the McCarthy amendments be accepted and the other half urging that the Taft-Flanders amendment be accepted. One reason why we have had no intelligent housing legislation passed through this body in the past 2 years is that the general public is thoroughly confused as to what we are trying to do. Many Members of the Senate and many Members of the House are thoroughly confused.

Originally there were some substantial, material differences between the amendments which I offered and the amendments offered by the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Vermont. The Senator from Vermont and I have spent a great deal of time going over those differences. We have finally agreed with respect to all of them, with one minor exception.

The Senator from Vermont has agreed to many of the things which I have wanted. I have agreed to some of the things which he has insisted upon. I should like to make it absolutely clear that there is now no major substantial difference between the Taft-Flanders amendments and the ones which were accepted by the Senate last week.

The Senator from Louisiana is asking that the Senate accept the Taft amendment. I am going a step further. I am saying that there is no dispute. I am asking that the Senate do by unanimous consent what the Senator wishes to do by a vote on the Taft amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Such a procedure is unique, to say the least. The Senator agrees there is no longer any controversy between him and the proponents of the pending committee amendments as amended. Then why not simply adopt the pending amendments, as amended? The Senator states that such a procedure will clear up the issues. I fear that if there is confusion, as he contends, his suggestion will add more confusion.

Mr. McCARTHY. I cannot conceive of the Senator objecting to my request that we do by unanimous consent what he wishes to do by voting on the Taft amendment. All he would do would be to create confusion in the minds of the public as to what is in this housing legislation.

We now have two sets of amendments before the Senate, one, the McCarthy amendments, and the other the Flanders-Taft amendments. I believe that the Flanders-Taft amendments now accomplish everything which I wanted to accomplish. I think they go a step further. I freely admit that as of now, the Flanders-Taft amendment is perfected in a better manner than my amendments were. For example, I heartily agree with what the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Ohio have done in extending loans in the case of the Greenbelt towns or TVA towns.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, at this point I should like to express my satisfaction with the cooperation which the Senator from Wisconsin has given in reaching the large measure of agreement which we have reached in connection with this legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection——

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, addressing myself to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, I think I know what is in his mind and the minds of other Senators. It is a natural question as to whether the confusion which the Senator from Wisconsin alleges exists in the minds of those in and outside the Capitol would be any less if we were to adopt these amendments by unanimous consent than if we were to follow the usual procedure of a vote. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. May I answer the Senator's question?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, what the Senate did several days ago was to agree to amendments to the original bill presented to the Senate on March 10, 1947. It is true, as the Senator from Wisconsin indicates, that the amendments which were agreed to by the Senate several days ago are in line with the amendments incorporated in the Taft amendment. I can see no point in the request made by the distinguished Senator. After all, what is before us now is Senate bill 866. The so-called Taft amendment, as amended, which is the pending amendment, really is in the nature of a substitute for what the Senate did with respect to Senate bill 866 in the past 2 or 3 days.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not a fact that even though unanimous consent were granted and the Taft amendment were substituted for the McCarthy amendments, there would still have to be a vote upon the Taft substitute as amended?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is entirely correct. The granting of the unanimous-consent request would not in the slightest degree change the general situation.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and the request is granted.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the committee amendment, which in effect has been superseded by the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as amended, will be disagreed to.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I have two perfecting amendments which are necessary.

The first is on page 1, line 5, to strike out "Title I"; and in line 7, to strike out "101" and insert in lieu thereof "2."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. FLANDERS. The second perfecting amendment is to strike out the last sentence of section 2, beginning on page 2, in line 23. That is necessary because the provisions of titles II and III relating to the establishment of the National Housing Commission have already been stricken from the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 866) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective, and for other purposes."

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to eliminate from the final bill excess commas, quotation marks, and other typographical errors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE WHEAT CARRY-OVER

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2158, Calendar 1137.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2158) to amend the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 and the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, so as to eliminate certain provisions of such acts requiring the retention of a specified carry-over of wheat in the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bricker	Butler
Baldwin	Bridges	Byrd
Ball	Brooks	Cain
Barkley	Buck	Capehart
Brewster	Bushfield	Capper
Chavez	Kilgore	Reed
Cooper	Knowland	Revercomb
Cordon	Langer	Robertson, Va.
Donnell	Lodge	Robertson, Wyo.
Downey	Lucas	Russell
Dworshak	McCarran	Saltonstall
Eastland	McCarthy	Smith
Ecton	McClellan	Sparkman
Ellender	McFarland	Stennis
Ferguson	McGrath	Stewart
Flanders	McKellar	Taylor
Fulbright	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
George	Magnuson	Thomas, Utah
Green	Malone	Thye
Gurney	Martin	Tobey
Hatch	Maybank	Tydings
Hayden	Millikin	Umstead
Hickenlooper	Moore	Vandenberg
Hill	Morse	Watkins
Hoey	Murray	Wherry
Holland	Myers	White
Ives	O'Conor	Wiley
Jenner	O'Daniel	Williams
Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Johnston, S. C.	Overton	Young
Kem	Pepper	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of Senate bill 2158.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I think it is not necessary to say very much on the pending bill. It seeks to repeal the 150,000,000-bushel carry-over provision inserted in interim-aid legislation last November. I fought the proposal at the time. I think it is unwise and unfair to this segment of American farm economy. It is the first time in the history of the United States that any such legislation has been passed. It is more effective in the control of wheat prices than was OPA itself, and more damaging in its results. While it controls the price of wheat and other commodities which are influenced by the price of wheat, it holds our wheat surplus in the United States and tends to build it up. All the reasons for the original request for this legislation in my opinion have now disappeared. Last November it looked as though we might have a poor winter wheat crop and that there might be a world shortage of wheat, but now the situation has entirely reversed itself.

Europe alone is expected to produce about 500,000,000 bushels more wheat this year than a year ago. Argentina has come through with a larger crop, and now our crop forecast is the second largest in history.

In a letter to the chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, the State Department stated that there is very dire need of additional food exports to a certain European country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I think it would be very dangerous at this particular time to remove the inventory control on wheat, in the form proposed by the Senator from North Dakota. At the time we passed the law, by which we restricted the Secretary of Agriculture from exporting below 150,000,000 bushels of wheat as of July 1, 1948. It was then felt to be necessary in order to maintain the security of this country that we always retain that much in the way of a stock pile. I fail to see any change in world conditions since that time to indicate that they have improved to the extent that we could lower the requirement of wheat needed here at home. For that reason I am going to send to the desk on behalf of myself and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] a substitute bill which would propose to reduce the carry-over to 140,000,000 bushels instead of outright repeal as proposed in S. 2158. I am reluctant even to reduce it by any amount at this time. However, I recognize that there has been some improvement in the crop situation since the time the first bill was passed, and I have made the concession to drop it to 140,000,000 bushels. Even that is lower than I like to go.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Delaware I appreciate his willingness to make a reduction, but the difference of 10,000,000 bushels I think would be of no material assistance to the farmers of the United States, or to the countries of Europe. A reduction of 10,000,000 bushels would not be worth while, but if the Senator would agree to reduce it to 100,000,000 bushels, I should be willing to accept that as a substitute.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I could not agree to that proposal. I feel that is entirely too low. Last year I think the carry-over on July 1, was about 100,000,000 bushels, if I remember right. But that is entirely too close to the bottom of the barrel. At that time we were faced with one of the largest wheat crops on record. According to the most recent agricultural report there will be a cut in last year's crop of nearly 200,000,000 bushels, and I feel it would be very dangerous to reduce the carry-over to 100,000,000 bushels as now proposed by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG. The European forecast is for about 500,000,000 bushels more. Argentina has, as I pointed out, come through with a larger crop by 60,000,000 bushels. Our wheat forecast is about the second largest in history, and with our greatly increased acreage and new methods of farming and new varieties of wheat and so on, there would be no chance whatever of producing less than our own needs. Last year's carry-over of wheat was actually about 83,000,000 bushels on July 1. To arbitrarily force a greater carry-over now, in the face of a new crop almost certain to be one of the largest in history, might be to legislate into being a tremendous surplus of wheat which would seriously depress wheat prices with consequences disastrous to our farmers. It should, in fairness and as a sound business matter, be eliminated.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I cannot see that an improvement in the European crop to the extent of 500,000,000 bushels would mean we were playing safe if we reduced our own carry-over at this time. Regardless of the favorable European wheat crop report we do not ever want to place the American people in the position of next year having to ask Europe for part of their wheat back.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. Apparently when this provision was adopted last year there was in prospect a shortage in the wheat crop, and it will be some time, as I understand, although I know nothing about wheat farming, before another crop is harvested. I am wondering if it is wise to

remove the restriction all at one time. I am wondering whether it would have any effect upon the market. One hundred and fifty million bushels of wheat are to be held as a surplus. What might be the effect of releasing that wheat?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In my opinion, unquestionably it would have an effect on the market to the extent that the market would rise considerably. In fact, I think it is best explained by what took place within a few days after the bill was first introduced. The markets went up to the limit on that particular day. When the bill was reported by the Committee on Agriculture, the markets again went up. So far as I am able to see, there is no question but that repeal today will cause a rise in the commodity markets.

Mr. BALDWIN. If the Senator will yield further, one point made by the proponents of the bill is that there is need of some of this wheat to take care of the emergency situation in Europe. I was wondering if it is desirable to remove this restriction eventually, if it would not be better to remove it piecemeal than to remove it all at once; and there appears to be a compromise by which the Senator from North Dakota says he would be willing, as I understand it, to accept 100,000,000 bushels. The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware calls for 140,000,000 bushels. I was wondering if there is not some middle ground that might be found on it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will say, if the Senator from North Dakota would agree to accept my substitute of 120,000,000 bushels, I would so amend it. I do this only because I would rather not gamble on my substitute bill being passed with the result there would be no restrictions left.

Mr. YOUNG. I would accept it with the understanding that my good friend, the poultryman from Delaware, and I, a wheat farmer, get together on our farming and cooperate. In that way, if the Senator would sell me a half interest in his poultry farm in Delaware on a slow note, perhaps we could agree——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the Senator from North Dakota owns most of the poultry farms in his State.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I will agree to the Senator's suggestion. I do not think it will have an ill effect on the market if the Commodity Credit Corporation buys its wheat in the orderly manner in which it should buy it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Chair correctly understand that the Senator from Delaware moves to amend the bill on page 3, line 4, by striking out "150,000,000 bushels" and substituting "120,000,000 bushels"?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, Mr. President. I am advised by the legislative counsel that it cannot be done that way, because the bill as it is now on the desk proposes an outright repeal of all those features. I have a substitute bill, which I should like the clerk to read, and which I have sent to the desk. It strikes out "120" and inserts "140." It is in the form of a substitute bill instead of an amendment to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill in its revised form, using "120" instead of "140."

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That section 11 (b) of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 is amended by striking out wherever it appears therein "one hundred and fifty million bushels" and inserting in lieu thereof "one hundred and twenty million bushels."

SEC. 2. The paragraph under the caption "Foreign Aid" in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, is amended—

(a) by striking out "one hundred and fifty million bushels" and inserting in lieu thereof "one hundred and twenty million bushels"; and

(b) by striking out "150,000,000 bushels" and inserting in lieu thereof "120,000,000 bushels."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2158) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend certain provisions of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 and the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, requiring the retention of a specified carry-over of wheat in the United States."

REVOLVING FUND FOR PURCHASE OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES AND RAW MATERIALS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1138, Senate bill 2376, to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2376) to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska to proceed with the consideration of Senate bill 2376.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2376) to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to loan to the Secretary of the Army, at such rates of interest as are necessary to provide full reimbursement to the Treasury, not to exceed in the aggregate outstanding at any time $150,000,000, to be used by the Secretary of the Army, or his duly authorized representatives, as a revolving fund for the purpose of (a) purchasing natural fibers (including cotton waste) produced in the United States, and such other materials, including starch, dyestuff, roller leather, and card clothing as may be used in processing and finishing such fibers; (b) transporting such fibers and other materials to occupied areas, making them available for processing, and having such fibers processed in such areas; (c) insuring such fibers and materials and the products obtained from such processing; and (d) selling products obtained from such processing. In the case of wool, mohair, or flax fiber, only those types and grades shall be purchased hereunder as the Secretary of Agriculture, in the light of supplies on hand in the United States designates as available for export; and stocks held by Commodity Credit Corporation of the types and grades so designated shall be purchased before other purchases are made of such types and grades. For the purpose of this act an occupied area shall be considered as any liberated or occupied area, which is at the time, occupied by United States forces or such an area occupied jointly with another power or powers when it is considered by the Secretary of the Army to be necessary or desirable to include such an area, in order to carry out United States objectives: *Provided*, That a treaty of peace shall not have been ratified and confirmed for such an area.

SEC. 2. Neither the Secretary, nor any duly authorized representative, shall use the fund created by this act for the purchase of any commodity unless, on the date of purchase of such commodity, it appears in his best judgment that within 15 months after such date—

(a) such commodity will be processed, or used in processing operations, in an occupied area; and

(b) so much of the products obtained from such processing will be sold under such terms and for such currencies as will be necessary to cover, in United States dollars, (1) all amounts expended from the fund in connection with such commodity plus (2) an appropriate portion of the interest payable to the Secretary of the Treasury on account of loans made pursuant to this act.

SEC. 3. The proceeds from the sale of products of commodities purchased with moneys from the fund, to the extent of the amounts specified in section 2, shall be returned to the fund.

SEC. 4. Annually after the date of enactment of this act the Secretary of the Army shall make a complete report with respect to the status of the fund. At such time as there shall no longer be any occupied area within the meaning of this act, or at such earlier time as the President or the Congress shall determine that the fund is no longer required for the purposes of this act, the unobligated balance of the fund shall be repaid to the Secretary of the Treasury; and the Secretary of the Army, as expeditiously as possible consistent with orderly liquidation, (a) shall cause to be sold so much of the commodities purchased with moneys from the fund and products thereof which are then on hand as may be necessary to obtain the amount of any balance then remaining owing to the Secretary of the Treasury on account of loans made pursuant to this act, and (b) shall repay such amount to the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 5. Fibers and other materials purchased for processing in any particular occupied area may, if a treaty of peace is ratified and confirmed with respect to such area prior to the processing of such commodities, be processed and sold, or sold, in such manner as the Secretary of the Army may deem to be in the best interest of the United States. If, after purchasing any such commodity with moneys from the fund, it shall appear to the Secretary of the Army that the product of such commodity cannot be sold for as much as the amounts specified in clauses (1) and (2) of section 2 of this act the Secretary of the Army may sell such

product for a lesser amount but, insofar as may be possible, no commodities shall be sold for less than the amounts specified in clauses (1) and (2) of section 2 of this act.

SEC. 6. So much of the commodities purchased with moneys from the fund for processing in any occupied area and so much of the products thereof as are not required to be sold, and so much of the proceeds obtained from the sale of any such commodities or products as is not required to be returned to the fund shall be used and disposed of by the Secretary of the Army, in such manner as he deems fit, for the benefit of the economy of such occupied area.

SEC. 7. In providing for the performance of any of the functions described in section 1 the Secretary of the Army shall to the maximum extent feasible utilize private channels of trade and is hereby authorized to make all necessary rules and regulations for the efficient implementation of the provisions of this act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the substitute, which is open to further amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] to explain the substitute bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the proposed substitute involves the elimination of hides from the original bill. The original bill provided for the appropriation of $150,000,000 as a revolving fund to be used for the purchase of wools, cotton, and hides for the occupied areas of Germany, Japan, and Korea. The Committee on Agriculture amended the bill, first, to provide for a loan directly from the Treasury of $150,000,000 in place of an appropriation, and then it eliminated hides from the operation of the revolving fund. That was done on the insistence of shoe manufacturers and those interested in that industry. I might state, Mr. President, that officials in charge of the Governments of Japan and Germany stated that a fund such as this would permit them to reestablish the industries in Japan and Germany and save $2 in appropriations next year for every dollar provided in this way now.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not a fact that by the operation of those industries in the past a net profit of $10,000,000 a month has been made and that the money has gone into the economy of Japan to reduce by that amount the money we have to appropriate?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes; that is correct. In the opinion of every expert who has been in those countries, unless we provide the raw materials to reestablish those industries we shall have to appropriate more money for years to come.

Mr. EASTLAND. We are presenting a bill which will actually save the Treasury several hundred million dollars.

Mr. YOUNG. I might add, Mr. President, that every dollar of the money is to be returned to the Treasury of the United States. It was the opinion of the committee that all of it would be returned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. BALL. Do I correctly understand that it would apply to Japan, Germany, Austria, and Korea?

Mr. YOUNG. Primarily to Japan.

Mr. EASTLAND. If the Senator will permit, it applies to all occupied areas. Its principal purpose is to acquire natural fibers, flax, cotton, wool, and mohair for Japan and Korea. Most of the money will be spent there.

Mr. BALL. Are we to purchase wool in the United States and ship it to Japan? I thought there was a shortage of wool.

Mr. EASTLAND. No. The Commodity Credit Corporation has a stock of approximately 200,000,000 pounds of low-grade wool, which is a drug on the market, and the Army will use that for Japanese industry.

Mr. YOUNG. The committee found that we were pretty well tied down to the purchase of surplus wool in the United States.

Mr. BALL. Where in the bill is the language which ties us down?

Mr. YOUNG. I think the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] can explain it.

Mr. AIKEN. On page 5, line 19, it is provided as follows:

In the case of wool, mohair, or flax fiber, only those types and grades shall be purchased hereunder as the Secretary of Agriculture, in the light of supplies on hand in the United States, designates as available for export, and stocks held by Commodity Credit Corporation of the types and grades so designated shall be purchased before other purchases are made of such types and grades.

That is to make sure that approximately 125,000,000 pounds of wool of a grade which our mills will not use today shall be disposed of before purchases of any other grades are made. It also makes sure that wool which is needed in this country to produce a finer type of textiles will not be sold out of the country, requiring this Nation to purchase wool back from Australia or some other country.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator will remember that the hearings show that the producers and manufacturers in the wool industry in this country favor the passage of this bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. In this country we use either very coarse wool or fine wool. There is a grade in between which our mills will not use, which the Japanese mills are adapted to use, and which the Japanese people and their customers in the East will accept.

Mr. BALL. As I understand, the textile industry in Japan primarily processes cotton. Cotton is not included in the list of fibers which shall be bought only when in surplus.

Mr. AIKEN. Cotton is always in surplus.

Mr. EASTLAND. The textile industry in Japan is not primarily a cotton industry. Japan has the second largest wool-manufacturing industry in the world, and the proof shows that that tremendous industry spins from 900,000 to 1,000,000 bales a year. They have only 5,000 bales on hand. This is the only source where they can secure the raw material to be used in operating that industry.

Mr. BALL. As I recall, however, one of the complaints of industry in the years just before the war was that Japan was flooding the markets of the world with cotton textiles.

Mr. EASTLAND. An agreement was worked out before the war between the American textile industry and the Japanese, which operated perfectly. So far as the cotton textile industry is concerned, the textile manufacturers of the United States have had a mission in Japan. They came back with the report that the passage of the bill now pending was absolutely essential, and the president of the American Cotton Textile Institute appeared before the committee urging the passage of the bill. He has made several trips to Washington, to my knowledge, working for its passage, the object being to take the Japanese people out of the pockets of the United States.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield further?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. BALL. It is planned to purchase some cotton under the program, I take it.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. BALL. Why not include cotton in line 19 in the list of fibers which shall be purchased only when the Secretary of Agriculture designates them as available for export? This is a kind of an ERP program for Japan, I take it, and there are tremendous quantities of cotton to be supplied to Europe under the European recovery program. I do not see why the same provision which we apply to wool, mohair, and flax fiber should not apply also to cotton.

Mr. EASTLAND. If the Senator from North Dakota will yield, I will explain that. It is because there is a shortage of those commodities. The United States is a deficit producer of those commodities, while we are a surplus producer of cotton. For that reason the provision in lines 19 to 24 was placed in the bill so that the Army would not be competing with the textile industry of this country for high-grade wool. The cotton textile industry took the position that there was plenty of cotton for itself and for supply to Europe and for the Japanese, and they urged the passage of the bill to permit the Army to go into the cotton market and buy what cotton it desired.

Mr. BALL. Does the Commodity Credit Corporation own any cotton?

Mr. EASTLAND. No.

Mr. BALL. As a matter of fact, then, if we should include cotton along with wool and flax fiber, it would have no effect on the operations under the bill, as the Senator envisages them.

Mr. EASTLAND. No; it would have no effect, but there is utterly no point in putting them in, for the reason that we have a surplus of cotton, and those in this country who consume cotton, our

textile industry, do not favor such a thing.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I wish to say, in regard to wool, that I agree entirely with what the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] stated. The stock pile which the Commodity Credit Corporation has at present consists largely of low-grade wool, with little or no sale in the United States. As the distinguished Senator pointed out, the United States consumes the fine wools and the very coarse wools produced in this country. Consequently this stock pile has increased, until today it is advisable to get rid of it in some way, by selling it if possible. The pending bill presents an opportunity to do just that, and we feel it very necessary that wool should be included in the bill, so that the present stock pile of wool may be put to use in Japan.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I might add that I understand that at the present time there is a surplus of mohair in this country, which our mills will not use, and that the mohair producers, I believe mostly in Texas, have asked for some relief in marketing their product. The bill would provide such assistance to them, and without cost to the United States, because everyone who testified said there was no question at all that the money would be repaid in full. We also provide that the Treasury shall be reimbursed in full for all interest charges.

We provided for a loan from the Treasury rather than a direct appropriation to the Army, for the reason that the Treasury would then have some supervision over the loan, and would see to it that it was paid back at the proper time.

I think we are as well protected as is possible, both as to the loan and as to the danger of exporting fibers which might be needed in this country, as well as insuring that surplus stocks held in this country which would otherwise be a loss would be disposed of first.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield further?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. BALL. Is the primary purpose of the bill to promote economic recovery chiefly in Japan and Korea, or to take off the market in the United States certain surpluses which have developed?

Mr. YOUNG. I think it would have a twofold effect, but the whole thought originated with our officials in Japan, who are endeavoring to get raw materials for Japan and some manufacturing industries going so the Japanese may be able to earn some money for themselves.

Mr. BALL. Then the object is to promote economic recovery in the occupied areas?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes.

Mr. BALL. What puzzles me is why we are asked to follow this kind of approach in the case of Japan and Korea, as contrasted with our procedure in the case of the occupied zones in Germany and Austria, which are covered under the European recovery program. This is a new approach, putting the Secretary of the Army in the textile business in Japan with a capital of $150,000,000. We have not followed that procedure in regard to any other industry in any other occupied country. What is the reason for this radically different approach to the problem of economic recovery in Japan as compared with the approach we followed in the case of Germany?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is not a radically different approach. We are not giving the Japanese anything. It might be a radically different approach in one aspect, but this program has been in effect for more than 2 years. Two years ago the Commodity Credit Corporation had large stocks of cotton on hand which it made available for spinning in Japan. That cotton was spun there, and the mills were operated, and, as I stated, a profit of $10,000,000 a month was realized, which went into the Japanese economy and reduced our cost of occupation by that much. The Commodity Credit Corporation was repaid all that was due it by virtue of that program, which has been very successful. The stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation, so far as cotton is concerned, are now exhausted.

No funds are appropriated to the Army for the acquisition of cotton. Without such a measure as this, the Army is faced with the prospect of shutting down the textile industry of Japan; and if it does so, then our costs of occupation will be increased by $10,000,000 or $15,000,000 a month. The Army is faced with that situation if it does not obtain credit for the supplying of raw materials to Japan.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield for another question?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I think it was Dr. Jacobs, of the Cotton Institute, who told me——

Mr. EASTLAND. Dr. Jacobs appeared as a representative of the manufacturers.

Mr. BALL. As I recall, he told me that in Japan there are now on hand stocks in warehouses, I believe he said, amounting to 5,000,000,000 yards of textiles which they are unable to sell. I wonder whether they are going to sell those textiles. If they cannot sell what is on hand, where are they going to sell what they will process out of the raw materials proposed to be obtained under the credits provided by the bill?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is a fair question, and I am glad the Senator from Minnesota asked it. Since Dr. Jacobs made that statement to the Senator, there has been a sale to Holland of $26,000,000 worth of textiles. That took care of a good part of the production. The Army has now established a system to dispose of its textiles. That system has been set up by one of the great textile men of the Nation, a man who was sales manager for the Cannon Mills. He is in charge of the project.

The Commodity Credit Corporation, the Army, those engaged in the cotton business, the cotton mills, all say that there is no doubt that there is a great need for textiles in the world, and that there will be no trouble in disposing of the textiles in question in the Far East. Engagements are being entered into at this time by which the textiles will be furnished to those who are engaged in the production of coconut oil, those who pick coconuts and prepare the copra.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to add a thought to what has heretofore been said. The Senator from Minnesota asked why we did this for Japan, and why we did not do it for the European recovery plan in Germany or France or other countries.

Mr. BALL. In Germany.

Mr. MAYBANK. Very well, in Germany. The thought is that Japan has always been a country which manufactured textiles, and that Japan exported those textiles. Germany was not a country which manufactured textiles. France, as the Senator well knows, borrowed from the International Bank certain funds for the purpose of obtaining cotton. But in Japan the manufacture of textiles has been an Army economy since the Army took charge. It has been an Army economy, but it has not been able to sell the goods which are produced in Japan to the Asiatic countries which are dependent on Japan for their goods.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator said they could not sell the goods. They have produced and sold textiles for over 2 years with a very satisfactory arrangement for all parties. The Commodity Credit Corporation has been repaid to the tune of several hundred million dollars for what it has advanced.

Mr. MAYBANK. I said the manufactured goods which the Senator from Mississippi spoke of as being on hand could not be disposed of in these countries without a revolving fund to be used to replace them. A large amount of cotton goods was sold the other day to the Dutch East Indies. Japan is a cotton-consuming nation and a cotton-exporting nation, insofar as the textiles are concerned. The Senator will agree to that statement, will he not?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I may say that I still cannot quite understand why, if they have been operating for 2 years, and have been making ten or fifteen million dollars a month on these textiles, and yet have this tremendous stock of textiles on hand which they cannot sell—and obviously the receipts from their sale could replenish their stock of raw material—we must, if there is a market for the textiles, put up $150,000,000 to buy raw materials for them.

Mr. EASTLAND. The stock of textiles is not there today. There has been a

sale consummated since the Senator received the information of which he spoke. In the next place, this money has gone into the Japanese economy. We had the choice in Congress of either putting up, I think it was approximately $300,000,000 in additional appropriations to add to the cost of occupation, or of taking these profits and plowing them back into the economy of the country and reducing the cost of occupation. The latter is what the Army has done.

Mr. BALL. The Senator tells me first that the textile industry has been making $10,000,000 or $15,000,000 a month profit.

Mr. EASTLAND. Ten million dollars.

Mr. BALL. Ten million dollars a month profit.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. BALL. That went back into the Japanese economy.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. BALL. And our Army was running the economy of Japan.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. BALL. And instead of setting aside at least part of that to buy raw materials to keep that industry going, they just plowed it all back, and now they wound up with no working fund for buying raw materials, and yet it is proposed to turn this $150,000,000 business over to the Secretary of the Army to operate.

Mr. EASTLAND. But credits have been furnished heretofore by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and they have been repaid. That has been the source of credit. The organization had some stocks of cotton. All those stocks are exhausted.

Mr. BALL. How much did that credit amount to; does the Senator know?

Mr. EASTLAND. Several hundred million dollars.

Mr. MAYBANK. The stock of cotton sold by the organization was a million bales, I may say.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement so as to clarify the situation in the minds of Senators. The trouble is that Japan normally, before the war, had about 10,000,000 spindles in the textile industry. Their business has been so built up during the last 2 years through Commodity Credit Corporation funds for the purchase of cotton that somewhat more than 1,000,000 spindles have now come back into use. It is contemplated that it is safe to allow Japan to do a business that will mean the use of two or three million spindles, or about 20 to 25 percent of her former textile industry, without doing any violence to the textile industry of Japan's former enemies.

This industry has been financed through the Commodity Credit Corporation up to date, but the Commodity Credit Corporation, in financing this recovery program, has required that the product be sold for dollars. That means that when the capacity of Japan herself to consume has been reached, and she has to sell to the Dutch East Indies and India, Burma, or China, she may have to take her pay in rubber or crocodile skins or diamonds, or whatever she can obtain from the countries to whom she sells. The countries must barter between themselves. The bill would require them to barter at a price sufficient to convert the product into dollars to pay back the United States in full.

In the case of Germany, all cotton sent there has been used fully for rehabilitation within the country. But Japan is obliged to export. She will use all the cotton goods she now has on hand within Japan over a period of several months, and can repay the United States in full, but if she sends the goods out of the country, if she exports any of the goods, or increases the number of spindles in use, she must sell for something besides dollars. That means we have got to provide another means of financing that recovery program other than through the Commodity Credit Corporation, and a logical method seemed to be a direct loan from the Treasury, because I am sure the Treasury will see that the money is repaid when it should be repaid.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from Vermont spoke of further credits from the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Commodity Credit Corporation refuses to extend further credit for the reason that as it says, its funds are trust funds——

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. To be used for agricultural support prices, and that when those funds are diverted for any other purpose they violate the intent of Congress and breach their trust, and therefore they desire to hold those funds for the support of agricultural commodities.

Mr. BALL. Let me get the Commodity Credit Corporation transaction straight in my own mind. As I understand, the Commodity Credit Corporation never extended loans. It never extended credit in that sense. At one time it had bought cotton in support of the price, and was holding the cotton. It sold the cotton to the Japanese textile industry on credit.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. BALL. Does the Senator know what the total of that credit was?

Mr. AIKEN. The total amount has been about $200,000,000, of which I think $108,000,000 has been repaid. The remainder is being repaid as rapidly as the goods can be disposed of. The Commodity Credit Corporation has really been purchasing cotton for the Army. It is the purchasing agent for the armed services. It has been using its money to the extent of $200,000,000 for this purpose, and more than half of it has been repaid up to the present time.

Mr. BALL. The practical effect of this situation is that for a couple of years the Commodity Credit Corporation has been extending credit which formed working capital for the Japanese textile industry. It has now reached the point where it can no longer do so under its charter. This is a proposal for a direct loan from the Treasury to the Secretary of the Army, to provide working capital to the Japanese textile industry.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. The reason is that it will permit Japan to sell outside the Japanese area cotton goods which she manufactures.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, for the past 2 years the Commodity Credit Corporation has used the cotton which it received under loans to finance these operations, to be refunded in dollars. That cotton is gone. There is no more cotton left under loan. It has all been shipped away. The proposed fund of $150,000,000 would make it possible for the Army to buy cotton to ship to Japan to be sold. As the Senator from Vermont ably stated, under that arrangement foreign currencies would be convertible into dollars. The Commodity Credit Corporation is not allowed to do that. Japanese cotton goods must now be sold in the sterling areas.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, we have two choices. The first is to pass this bill and make this credit available. The second is to shut down the textile industry of Japan. We must do one or the other. If that textile industry, which represents 65 percent of the entire industrial production of Japan today, is shut down, then we must appropriate millions of dollars through the Army.

Mr. BALL. Can the Senator tell me about what proportion of the working capital will be spent for cotton fiber, and what proportion for other fibers?

Mr. EASTLAND. That will depend upon the sale of the commodities. They are not going to buy any cotton until they can sell it.

Mr. BALL. What is the past history? What is the status of the industry in Japan? About what proportion of cotton is used?

Mr. EASTLAND. There is no past history as to wool, because the wool industry was destroyed during the war, and only a few spindles have been operated. Wool was acquired from Australia under a barter agreement. Now those factories have been renovated, and the Japanese are able to engage in the manufacture of wool in a modest way, just as they are able to engage in the manufacture of cotton today only in a modest way.

Mr. BALL. I take it from what the Senator says that the bulk of the working capital for the first year or two will go for the purchase of cotton.

Mr. EASTLAND. No; I did not say that at all.

Mr. BALL. The Senator stated that only a relatively few spindles were in operation so far as wool was concerned.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator misunderstood me. I said that there was no wool history, because those factories were destroyed by bombing during the war. They have now been repaired, and today the Japanese can spin wool in a modest way if they secure this credit, as they can spin cotton in a modest way.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I may be able to add a little information on the question. When representatives of the Army presented the question to the committee they explained the need of raw materials from the United States, in order to operate the woolen mills in the

same manner that the cotton mills are operated.

The other question which the committee considered at the time was the prospect that unless, to some extent, the economy of Japan was reestablished, we would have to continue to appropriate funds through the Army for the general recovery of Japan. In the event this $150,000,000 were made available, we would get the benefit through the purchase of cotton and wool in America, rather than having our money appropriated through the Army for assistance to the Japanese economy. In the latter event Japan would acquire not only wool, but cotton, elsewhere in the world. In reality, our dollars would be financing that business transaction. It seemed better business for us to make a loan which would enable the Japanese economy to purchase not only wool, but cotton, from us, and which would permit a speedier recovery of Japan and a lessening of the actual outright appropriations we would have to make to the Army in support of Japan.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] to section 2 (b) of the pending measure, reading as follows:

SEC. 2. Neither the Secretary nor any duly authorized representative, shall use the fund created by this act for the purchase of any commodity unless, on the date of purchase of such commodity, it appears in his best judgment that within 15 months after such date—

* * * * *

(b) so much of the products obtained from such processing will be sold under such terms and for such currencies as will be necessary to cover, in United States dollars, (1) all amounts expended from the fund in connection with such commodity plus (2) an appropriate portion of the interest payable to the Secretary of the Treasury on account of loans made pursuant to this act.

The purpose of that section, as will be noted, is to permit the sale of the commodities manufactured for such currencies which can later be converted into American dollars, so as to cover the amount expended for the purchase of raw materials. As the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] pointed out a few moments ago, what is causing difficulty in disposing of the goods now on hand in Japan is the fact that the commodities must be sold for dollars under the terms agreed upon with the Commodity Credit Corporation. Because of that situation, the sale of such commodities has been delayed. Such a situation will not prevail as to goods manufactured from raw materials acquired under the pending measure.

I am hopeful that the bill will pass without further delay.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill (S. 2376) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF SURPLUS PROPERTY ACT OF 1944

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2239, Calendar No. 895.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2239) to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Dakota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments with amendments.

Mr. FERGUSON obtained the floor.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia submits an amendment which cannot be considered until after the committee amendments are disposed of, unless the Senator's amendment is an amendment to a committee amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I think it proper to consider my amendment after the committee amendments have been disposed of.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will lie on the table.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the pending bill, which would amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting a new paragraph as follows:

"(3) Surplus property certified by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, as being suitable and needed for use in training and maintaining any civilian component of the armed forces under his jurisdiction may be disposed of to States, their political subdivisions or tax-supported instrumentalities, subject to such terms and conditions as the Administrator determines to be necessary to properly protect the interests of the United States. Such disposals shall be without monetary consideration: *Provided*, That the Government shall be reimbursed for such costs incident to the disposal of the property as the Administrator may deem proper, including the expense of removal of any machinery, equipment, or personal property not transferred as a part of such disposal."

The present law allows certain transfers from the War Assets Administration to governmental bodies for the purpose of health or educational facilities. It was discovered that civilian components of the Army could not qualify as such institutions. At the present time National Guard organizations in the respective States are in need of certain property. That is also true of the Reserve Corps. This bill would enable National Guard organizations or Reserve Corps organizations or civilian components of the Army to obtain property without necessarily paying the consideration which private agencies would be compelled to pay.

I think it is well to say that it is essential to build up the National Guard and the Reserve. It seems a waste of funds to require those agencies to purchase property for their needs when the Federal Government, which is later to use those facilities, has a surplus on hand.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendments will be stated.

The first amendment of the committee was, on page 1, in line 3, after the word "That", to strike out "paragraph (1) of."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 5, after the word "new", to strike out "section to be known as paragraph 13 (a) (3)", and insert "paragraph as follows":

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 7, after the word "property", to strike out "available and suitable", and insert "certified by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, as being suitable and needed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, in line 2, after the word "forces", to insert "under his jurisdiction."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments.

The bill is open to further amendment, and the amendment submitted by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, in line 12, after the word "disposal", it is proposed to insert "*Provided, however*, That the surplus lands in Mason County, W. Va., are hereby excepted from the operation of this act."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I think it appropriate to make a statement for the RECORD in regard to the amendment I have offered and which has just been read to the Senate.

A rather unusual situation exists in Mason County, W. Va., with respect to some surplus lands. I call attention to the fact that in the amendment the word "lands" is used, and no other kind of property there would be exempted.

During the war the Government purchased some 8,000 acres of land in that county, and there was erected a plant for the manufacture of explosives. It was known as the West Virginia Ordnance Works, and it was operated for the Government.

At the close of actual hostilities the War Department no longer needed the property and declared it surplus. Some of that property has been taken by the State, under its priority, and has been used as an experimental farming area. Another portion has been taken by the National Guard. I may say that I aided the National Guard all I could in helping it obtain a part of this property, and it now has the part that it desires.

There are some several thousand acres remaining. The people of the locality have been active in efforts to bring industrial plants into the area. Today there is high promise that that will be done. Transactions are under way which

will bring industrial plants into the Mason County section.

In order that that progress may not be interfered with, I have offered the amendment. I have talked with the author of the bill, and he has very kindly and considerately agreed to the amendment. But I felt I should make the explanation to the Senate and that I should further show, if I may, so that it may be understood, that there is no conflict in this case with the National Guard of my State. Therefore, I shall read from a letter from Gen. Charles R. Fox, adjutant general and head of the National Guard of West Virginia, under date of March 13, 1948, directed to me. He says:

I understand and appreciate your concern in the West Virginia Ordnance Works.

By that he means this ground—

But I assure you that even if the bill is passed we will not request any real estate at the West Virginia Ordnance Works which would interfere with the sale to an industry. I fully realize the need of additional employment in Mason County and will cooperate with you fully in your objectives.

I urge you to reconsider your objections to H. R. 2239 and to support its passage.

Mr. President, I wish to state that my sole concern is based upon the interests of the people of that county, who have conferred with me, and I wish to state that there is need for places of employment at that point.

Therefore, I ask that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, inasmuch as this amendment applies to only one county in the State of West Virginia, the Senator from Michigan sees no objection to the amendment. If adopted, it would not interfere with the general purpose of the bill, which is applicable to all the States of the Union.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there further amendments to be offered to the bill? If none, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

FEDERAL CHARTER FOR COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1322, providing a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation. The bill is Calendar No. 1064.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Dakota.

TEMPORARY RETENTION OF GERMAN PAINTINGS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on April 2, I introduced a bill providing for the temporary retention in this country of the German paintings now on exhibit at the National Gallery of Art.

This bill simply provides for their retention in this country until a government is recognized in Germany, and I believe that will be in conformity with the policy announced some 3 years ago by the President. The bill expressly recognizes the title of the Germans to these paintings. The principal purpose of the bill is to provide for the safety of the paintings until such a government is recognized. The bill also provides, purely as a permissive matter, that these paintings may be exhibited in this country under the supervision of the trustees of the National Gallery of Art.

A subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee held a hearing on this bill on April 16, under the chairmanship of the able Senator from Oregon. At the hearing, representatives of the Army, the State Department—represented by General Saltzman—the National Gallery, the Metropolitan Museum, the St. Louis Art Museum, the Art Digest, and several other groups appeared. It was an excellent hearing, and all present, except the representatives of the Army, favored the bill.

On April 13, before that hearing, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate wrote to the Secretary of the Army, the Honorable Kenneth C. Royall. I wish to read a part of that letter, to indicate its principal point. I need not burden the RECORD with all of the letter. This letter is signed by the chairman of the committee, and it reads in part as follows:

In view of the fact that the committee may not be able to reach a final decision previous to the termination of the present exhibition at the National Gallery of Art, and because of the great public interest shown in these paintings, it may be that you will wish to arrange for an extension of the present showing until such time as the committee can make its final decision on the matter.

Further, it is the committee's feeling that the present date set by the Army for the return of these pictures to Germany should be canceled, and that no substitute date should be announced until such time as the legislation has been finally acted upon.

I call particular attention, Mr. President, to the last paragraph of the letter which I have just read.

In response to that letter, on April 17, the Secretary of the Army addressed a letter to the Honorable CHAN GURNEY, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee. The letter is rather long, but the last paragraph relates to the point I wish to bring out. He says:

However, in response to your request and to give your committee opportunity for further consideration of this matter, I have asked the National Gallery to continue its exhibit for another week, after which I am firmly of the opinion that the pictures should be returned to Germany.

Mr. President, in view of the Nationwide interest in these paintings and the strong letter from the Chairman of the Committee requesting a delay by the Army in the return of the paintings to Germany, I am astonished at the reply which has been made by the Secretary of the Army. To my mind, this answer to a reasonable request by the Senate committee evidences a lack of respect for the Senate. The Army knows very well that the Senate cannot possibly reach a decision on this matter by next Monday. The Armed Services certainly have not been able to act very quickly in their own re-formation, and I am sure they do not believe that the Senate can act on this matter before next week.

This letter of the Army is, I fear, only typical of an arrogance which all too often characterizes the attitude of the military toward the democratic process and toward the Congress. Apparently the purpose of the Army is to foreclose action by the Congress in this matter. The reasons given by the Army, which apparently are those of General Clay, seem to me to pertain to matters which are not strictly within the purview of the Army. Such matters should be decided by the State Department or by the Congress. I might say the State Department ought to be consulted, and particularly that division of the State Department concerned with our public relations. I refer to the Assistant Secretary, Mr. George Allen. Throughout the dealing with these pictures, the Army has treated the matter as a restricted one, being very careful, until very recently, to keep from the public and from the press what their purpose was. I wish to quote from a hearing on March 4, conducted by a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, at which only one witness appeared; that is, the Army's witness, Colonel Riggs. The result of that hearing was that the chairman of the subcommittee agreed that the ownership of the paintings was settled by our agreement under the Hague convention concerning articles which may be considered loot or booty of war. In the hearing on March 4 there is one sentence, on page 7 of the transcript, which I think shows fairly clear what the attitude of the Army has been. I want to quote that sentence:

The basic reason for close guarding of the secret has been to prevent conjecture and debate in the press before the position of the Government could be entirely confirmed.

In other words, throughout the handling of the paintings up until the time of the exhibition, which was a little over a month ago, the Army very carefully kept from the public any notice of their plans or any announcement of them. That is one reason why we have had no opportunity to pass upon the subject or to consider it in the Senate.

The pictures have been in storage in the National Gallery of Art for 3 years, and during that period they were not permitted to be exhibited, although I am informed that such institutions as the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, had requested them. In view of that long sojourn in the museum, the unseemly haste with which they must move now, as the letter from the Secretary of the Army indicates, seems to me quite unreasonable, and I think the very least the Army can do is to give the Senate an opportunity to consider the matter and to pass upon it.

I am not so concerned today with what the ultimate decision of the Senate may be, as I am that the Senate may not be foreclosed from passing upon the ques-

tion. I think the least to be expected is that we shall have an opportunity to pass on it. If the committee decides that the paintings must be returned now, I shall be perfectly content with the decision. If, on the other hand, it decides that the matter should be presented to the Senate for decision, I certainly think that ought to be done, and that the Army ought not to foreclose that decision by shipping the paintings back to Germany before we have had an opportunity of passing upon the subject.

I submit to the Senate that this attitude of the Army, in its insistence upon sending these very valuable paintings back before there is an opportunity of passing upon the matter, is unwarranted and unjustified. I hope the Members of the Senate who have been interested in the matter—and I know many of them have been—will take time to consider the matter, and, if they can, give their advice to the Army on the subject. It is a peculiar situation because under the jurisdiction of the Army, which they acquired when they found these paintings in a salt mine in Germany, they seem to have the authority to do with them as they please, in the absence of an act by Congress.

The Army is not subject to criticism for having acquired the art treasures; that came about in the natural course of events in the war. But I think they are subject to criticism for apparently being unwilling to have the Congress consider the matter at all. I hope the Committee on the Armed Services will be able to proceed as rapidly as possible to a decision on this matter.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 2195) to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. O'HARA, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. ALLEN of California, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. ABERNETHY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 188) authorizing the Clerk of the House in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 5328) to amend paragraph 1803 (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, relating to firewood and other woods, to make certain corrections, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

FORT SUMTER NATIONAL MONUMENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 94) to establish the Fort Sumter National Monument in the State of North Carolina, which was, on page 1, line 3, to strike out "Secretary of War" and insert "Secretary of the Army."

Mr. BUTLER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. BREWSTER obtained the floor.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to defer yielding at this time.

Mr. MYERS. I may say to the Senator it would only take me a few moments.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act will expire in 2 months unless the Congress takes prompt action to extend this measure, which today—as it has been since its original enactment—is a keystone in our foreign policy and in our determination to achieve a decent world in which free nations can exist.

There is no doubt in my mind that we face the most bitter fight in the Congress in the enactment of the necessary legislation to continue this program. The opposition, I say flatly, is based almost entirely on misconception and distortion of fact. It is, however, exceedingly vocal and exceedingly well financed.

In 1946 an effort was made, which nearly succeeded, to sabotage this program and kill it. We managed to muster enough votes to keep it going. In 1947, the opposition renewed the drive to cripple or end reciprocal trade agreements, but, fortunately, the influence of the chairmen of two of our committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Finance, was sufficient to hold off the attack. As the time approaches for a decision this attack is getting under way again. The Senate cannot act on the matter until the House has acted. Influence must be brought to bear on the responsible leadership of the House for prompt action. The matter dare not be left to the last-minute rush and chaos of adjournment or recess prior to the Republican National Convention in June, but it should be settled now, as soon as possible, in an atmosphere of at least comparative calm such as we shall not have in the closing minutes or days of the session.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a telegram I received recently from a prominent and outstanding Philadelphian, Mr. William Batt, president of SKF Industries, Inc., and a valuable wartime Government production executive, who says that extension of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is of the most vital importance to the export and import trade of the United States.

I therefore ask that Mr. Batt's telegram be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *April 15, 1948.*

Hon. FRANCIS J. MYERS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The extension of the present reciprocal Trade Agreements Act seems to us to be of the most vital importance to the export-import trade of the United States. This company is keenly concerned that the Congress shall act affirmatively on this matter before the expiration date. Duties on our production have been cut each time but steadily increasing costs abroad give us no fear of any substantial importation that would seriously hurt us. We think the safety measures provided will insure against material damage to American industry. Hope you will support this program.

W. L. BATT.

FEDERAL CHARTER FOR COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I understand the pending question is on agreeing to the motion to take up Senate bill 1322, providing a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation. Two or three Members of the Senate have approached me, suggesting there has been an agreement not to vote on this bill until Monday. I reported the bill to the floor, and I understood I was to have charge of it. Nobody has approached me in regard to any agreement. I should like to inquire whether there is such an agreement, and, if so, when it was entered into, and what brought it about.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has no knowledge whatever of such an agreement. The question pending before the Senate is whether the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of the bill. Consideration of the motion has been temporarily suspended to make way for a privileged matter, the laying down of a message from the House of Representatives.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Chair. That had been my understanding.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Dakota to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1322. The Chair again recognizes the Senator from Maine.

CLARIFICATION OF PALESTINE SITUATION

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, it has seemed the appropriate time today to clarify the situation in the minds of the Senate and, I believe, of the country, as to the precise position which we occupy with regard to the problem of Palestine, which is now having attention at Lake Success. As a text for a possible discussion of the problem I wish to quote from the statement of our Ambassador at the United Nations, the Honorable Warren Austin, formerly a Member of this body, in the speech which he made before the United Nations General Assembly yesterday before the Political and Security Committee, dealing with the problem. I quote one paragraph of that statement, in which Mr. Austin said:

The United States has raised with certain other governments the question of joint responsibility for the security of a temporary

trusteeship. These discussions have thus far produced no tangible result. The United States is willing to undertake its share of responsibility for the provision of police forces which are required during a truce and a temporary trusteeship, along with other members who may be selected by the General Assembly and who are willing to carry out such a task in accordance with the will of the Assembly and with the provisions of the Charter.

That is the end of the quotation from the speech of our Ambassador.

In prior consideration of this subject it had been rather generally understood that the provision of police or military forces would require further implementation by action of the Congress. So there was considerable inquiry, when this statement appeared, as to whether there existed authority for the supplying of forces for such a purpose under existing law, and also whether such a procedure had been a matter of consultation with Members of the Senate, since, at the same time, from what appeared to be authoritative sources, there appeared reports in the public press yesterday and today that consultation regarding this matter had proceeded with certain Senators and Members of the other House. The matter is of such transcendent public importance that it would seem desirable to clarify the atmosphere and the understanding as to whether our procedure in connection with Palestine at the Security Council and the General Assembly in recent weeks had been a subject that had been considered by any competent Members of the Senate, and to what extent any discussion or understanding had been arrived at, and as to what extent they might in future affect the consideration of the matter by the Congress of the United States and the people.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Is it the Senator's understanding that Ambassador Austin is the one who made the statement regarding the overtures, or consultation, or whatever it was that is presumed to have occurred?

Mr. BREWSTER. This is a statement in the New York Times of Wednesday, April 21. On page 20 there is what purports to be an excerpt from the address of Ambassador Austin before the General Assembly Political and Security Committee yesterday.

Mr. IVES. I tried to listen as attentively as possible to the reading of the excerpt, but I did not gather from its reading that Ambassador Austin himself had made such overtures. He simply made the broad statement, did he not?

Mr. BREWSTER. The precise statement was as follows:

The United States has raised with certain other governments the question of joint responsibility for the security of a temporary trusteeship. These discussions have thus far produced no tangible result.

Then he says:

The United States is willing to undertake its share of responsibility for the provision of police forces which are required during a truce and a temporary trusteeship, along with other members who may be selected by the General Assembly and who are willing to carry out such a task in accordance with the provisions of the Charter.

I had understood from the newspapers that this had been a matter of consultation with some Members of the Senate.

Mr. IVES. That is what I wanted to have cleared up. That does not appear in the statement of Ambassador Austin. I read that also in the newspapers.

Mr. BREWSTER. It seems to me, and, I think, to other Members of this body, that whether there had been discussions of the matter with those who are primarily charged with the responsibility for advice to this body upon questions of foreign policy would be of very great interest and of much significance. I earlier mentioned the matter to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I believe that a statement of some character dealing with the subject, to indicate both to what extent consultations may have proceeded so far as the Senate is concerned and to what extent there might be authority for a commitment of this character, would be within the purview of the undertakings which I believe we entered into with the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. With the indulgence of the Senate, if the Senator from Michigan may speak from the chair, he considers the question entirely appropriate. The answer is that so far as the Senator from Michigan is concerned, while there have been occasional, casual conversations of one sort or another, and while the Secretary of State made a statement to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee one day in connection with a general discussion of foreign affairs, there has never been anything approximating, so far as the Senator from Michigan is concerned, what might be called a consultation on any phase of the subject. There have never been any concrete proposals submitted to him for his advice or approval, and there have been no relationships of that character whatsoever, either here or with the delegate in New York.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sure that that statement will be very gratefully received as contributing to a clarification of our understanding.

Would it be proper to inquire further as to whether the earlier position of this country last November, in supporting the so-called plan of partition with economic union, was a matter which required or received consultation?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It was not a matter of consultation, although the Senator from Michigan was clearly known to favor viable partition as the best basis of settlement. The Senator from Michigan would like to add to what he said, so that there may be no possible misunderstanding, that he has received mimeographed copies of addresses made by the Ambassador from the United States to the United Nations, but he scarcely considers that to be a consultation.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sure that would not be so considered. Is it a proper query—and I venture now into the realm of consultation as to the scope of the United Nations Charter—as to whether there is any question regarding the necessity of congressional action in order to supply police forces or military forces, so far as action under the United Nations is concerned? I am now distinguishing between action which might take place to protect American lives or property unilaterally under our authority, and the question of whether under the United Nations Charter there would be Executive authority for supplying police or military forces for any purpose under the United Nations without further congressional action.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Michigan is unable to answer the question conclusively, because it is in that borderland area of twilight zone Presidential authority which has been a subject of controversy for nearly 150 years.

As the Senator knows, there have been something like 125 occasions when the President of the United States has used the armed forces of the United States externally without consultation with Congress, under his general constitutional authority as Commander in Chief, which I assume relates to his responsibility for American life and property and national interest. Some of those instances have been challenged, although the President has substantial latitudes according to many constitutional lawyers. As I recall at the moment, in the matter of the use of the armed forces at Veracruz, President Wilson ultimately decided that he voluntarily would come to Congress and seek validation of the decisions he had made in that aspect.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it a fact that in that instance, while the Senate was debating the question of whether or not intervention should be authorized, directions did go to our Navy to take action at Veracruz? That is my recollection of the episode.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am not sufficiently familiar in my memory with the detailed record to answer categorically, and I would not want to answer otherwise.

Coming down, then, to the Senator's present question, I suppose we still confront the same old argument as to the latitudes within which the President can operate under his Presidential responsibility to protect American life and property and to protect the American interest under his responsibility as Commander in Chief. Beyond that I think he would require the consent of Congress to use the armed forces of the United States for any external purpose.

Mr. BREWSTER. To what extent was that question discussed or clarified in connection with the ratification of the United Nations Charter? It seems to me the matter did receive considerable attention, and I was under the impression—perhaps erroneously— that it was

generally considered that further congressional action would be taken to implement any provision for the use of force under the Charter.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator will recall that there is a section of the Charter in respect to the armed forces which has never been implemented.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is the section of the Charter which contemplated agreements between the member nations of the United Nations and the Security Council, identifying specific quotas of the armed forces which should be held available by each member nation for the ultimate use of the Security Council.

The Senator will recall that it was provided in the Charter that any such agreements, before they became effective, had to be approved by constitutional processes. Therefore, if there were any such force in existence, it would be the result of constitutionally approved agreements, so far as we were concerned.

As the Senator knows, the Security Council has never been able to come to an agreement on the subject because of the intransigeance of the Soviet Union and its satellites. Therefore, there is no such force. Therefore, there have been no such agreements. Therefore, there has been no constitutional action on the part of the American Congress in respect to the subject.

If there had been such constitutional action in respect to an armed American contingent identified for the use of the United Nations under the terms of the Charter, I think again an argument might be made that that particular force having been set aside, with the approval of Congress, for the use of the Security Council of the United Nations, the President could commit it without further congressional action. But that situation has not occurred, and I am reciting the matter solely in order to be responsive to the Senator's inquiry as to whether or not it was not contemplated that there might be some armed force available exclusively under the jurisdiction of the President of the United States. I think there was such a contemplation. Indeed, my recollection is, as I think further on the matter, that our own United Nations Participation Act spells out the authority of the President in respect to armed forces thus identified in a ratified agreement. But obviously there is none at the present time, because that particular machinery had never been set up, and no such agreement has ever been made.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is that possibly what Ambassador Austin referred to in the concluding line, "who are willing to carry out such a task in accordance with the will of the Assembly and with the provisions of the Charter"?

Under the statement of the Senator from Michigan, just made, the provisions of the Charter contemplating this United Nations police force did contemplate also the constitutional implementation of that force by the actions of the respective governments.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In the first instance——

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Leaving open the question whether, after it was constituted, there was not a fluxing power in the hands of the President either to act or not to act, depending upon the point of view, without further congressional action.

Mr. BREWSTER. But we do not need to consider crossing the second bridge, since we have not even approached the first bridge.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct, and that is what I am trying to make plain.

Mr. BREWSTER. So that the provisions of the Charter might well, within the contemplation of the Ambassador, mean that the question would have to be submitted to the Congress. I trust that is the construction; but perhaps we cannot be assured.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Obviously I would not undertake to state what was in the Ambassador's mind when he made the statement to which the Senator refers, because I have no information about it. Nor would I undertake to speak for the President or the State Department in respect to their attitudes in this matter, because I have had no consultations with them on this subject. I can simply say to the Senator that we are right where we started in this colloquy, so far as the Senator from Michigan is concerned.

There is a general constitutional power resident in the President of the United States as commander in chief which has been exercised a hundred or a hundred and twenty-five times in the last 150 years, to use the armed forces of the United States externally for the protection of American life and property and the national interest without the direct license and direction of the Congress of the United States. Therefore there is some such authority resident in the President of the United States. It is an authority, I repeat, which I think is without any specific boundaries. I think it is an authority which has always been the subject of more or less difference of opinion and controversy. I think it still rests in the twilight zone, and that is the only authority I know of touching the situation to which the Senator from Maine refers.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to incorporate certain statements in the RECORD at this point, following the statement made by the Senator from Michigan, for which I am very grateful, and I believe many other Members of the Congress, and the country, will welcome this statement as assisting in some degree to clarify the problem. I wish to quote from the statements of Sir Carl Berendsen, the representative of New Zealand, and Mr. Hood, the representative of Australia, on the somewhat anomolous situation with which we are confronted. I quote from the New York Times of Wednesday, April 21, in which issue it comments on the Palestine problem, and the decision last November to support partition, and the present somewhat anomalous situation that is presented. I quote now from the speech of Sir Carl Berendsen:

> The problem, I repeat, was susceptible of no perfect solution. But if there were in this room any who believed that the partition of Palestine could be accomplished peacefully and with good will on all sides and without enforcement, then I must say that that is a degree of naivete which did them little credit.

That is a comment, apparently, upon the position assumed by the representative of the United States, and it is a matter of profound regret when as thoughtful a student of affairs as Sir Carl Berendsen, representing New Zealand, speaking the sentiments of many of the countries of the world, is obliged to make such a statement. He said further:

> I say to you not only that these abominable incidents should have been foreseen and prevented, but that to put them forward as a reason for abandoning the decision arrived at after most careful and anxious consideration only a few months ago seems to the New Zealand delegation to be a most fantastic distortion of logical thought.

I say again it is regrettable when the action of this country must be characterized in such terms by as considered a statesman as Sir Carl Berendsen.

Mr. Hood, the Australian representative, followed in the discussion. He said:

> The resolution of November last can certainly not, to say the least, be lightly deferred. For our part, the Australian delegation cannot see why thought should be given to determine it at all except for reasons equally valid in justice and in objectivity, if they exist as those which shaped the decision of the last General Assembly.
>
> To the whole complex of facts comprised in the Palestine question, there has now been added, since last year, this further and momentous one—that the authority and credit of the United Nations is now committed in the sense of last year's resolution. This is not something with which we can afford to play fast and loose. For its own sake and for the sake of the interests of all members of the organization in other matters at issue internationally, it need not be said that to maintain and protect this authority and moral standing is of vital importance.
>
> The fighting and bloodshed which has occurred in Palestine this last year are deplorable, yet let it be recalled that the question of Palestine was deferred to the United Nations by the United Kingdom Government precisely because it had not been found possible to secure Jewish-Arab agreement. The disagreement between the two parties was therefore one of the main questions before the United Nations. It was well realized in the debates of last year that certain aspects of the partition plan would be resisted by one party or the other, and it was exactly for that reason that provision was made in the plan both for the establishment of Arab and Jewish militia forces in Palestine, and also for reference to the Security Council.
>
> In our view, all the circumstances referred to in the commission's report, so far as they come before this Assembly, should be considered from the standpoint of the maintenance of the Assembly resolution and not from that of hasty and ill-considered thoughts of its deferment or even reversal.

Mr. President, this raises the question of our policy. This is not perhaps the appropriate time nor is this possibly the forum for discussion of that subject, but in the light of all that has transpired and all that is implicit in the Palestine

problem, which we thought last November had been solved by the determination upon partition under the leadership of the United States, it is, I think, a matter of profound regret that this reversal of policy has occurred, which has been characterized by these representatives of two of the British Dominions, who are certainly not prejudiced regarding its consideration in such language as they have used.

The refusal also as to the embargo of arms and of men is a matter of considerable concern. Some time ago I pointed out the apparently very tenuous legal base upon which the existing embargo regulations had been issued, lacking a declaration by the President as to the authority for the act, under the citations which I placed in the RECORD at that time.

I called attention as long ago as December 1 last, immediately following the decision of the United Nations in the General Assembly, to the immediate necessity of recruiting a volunteer force which should be available for the United States in case there should be any call for a force to implement the decisions of the United Nations, either in Palestine or elsewhere.

It is, in my judgment, profoundly regrettable that no such force has been recruited. It is easily possible, within the limits of existing law, for the Executive to have taken action that there should be one of our divisions composed of men who had voluntarily given their service with the understanding that they might be used to implement the action of the United Nations.

So far as Palestine is concerned, there has been the voluntary effort of many thousands of our young men in America who have indicated their readiness to participate. Why no action of any character has been taken by the Executive to implement that voluntary effort is to me a matter of regret, particularly as historically this country came into being as the result of the voluntary aid of other lovers of liberty from other lands. Lafayette, Kosciusko, and Von Steuben are names still with which to conjure, the statues of whom are in Lafayette Square opposite the White House, bearing enduring testimony to the character of assistance which came to us in our great hour of need when our own Nation was experiencing the throes of birth.

More recently we remember the Lafayette Escadrille. We remember the thousands of young men who volunteered in the First World War before we were participants, who without let or hindrance went across the border and enlisted to help other nations that were in peril.

We remember the Flying Tigers of the more recent war who went over to China. We remember the shipment of arms and of munitions and of fighting planes in order to assist in the fight, and of men relieved from our own armed services in order to participate. All this has been the effort of an America which desired to help the cause of freedom everywhere.

The birth of a republic in Palestine has an authenticity which has never been possessed by any other people in the world who have bespoken their freedom by their own effort. When we declared our independence we did not have the sanction of a United Nations of the world in a resolution approved by two-thirds of them. Yet now, although the resolution was adopted by the overwhelming majority of all the nations composing the United Nations and of peoples of the world outside the Moslem countries, for the first time we see the inauguration of an embargo upon munitions, and upon the participation of our young men, in violation of the precedent of almost a century and a half, and with glittering exceptions to the rule which has always hitherto prevailed. This is the reason why there seems to be increasing concern over the policies which we are pursuing.

There is a very great desire on the part of the American people, in my judgment, for a clarification of a policy or for the justification of a reversal of a course which had seemed last November as the most practical solution of this long-studied problem. A solution was arrived at after 17 commissions had considered it, after the Anglo-American Commission had considered it, after the United Nations, composed of many countries, had considered it, and arrived at that decision as the most practical solution—partition with economic union.

Why we should now be thrown back to this chaos and confusion is a matter which must be answered at the judgment tables of the world.

I conclude with the statement of the Australian delegation:

> The Australian delegation at this Assembly will consider every proposal that may be brought forward on its merits. In doing so we shall form our opinion on what is just and in accordance with the principles of the Charter, and not on grounds, expressed or implied, of strategical expediency or of power politics and groupings outside the spirit and procedures of the United Nations. We will support, and hope to be supported by, all others who are similarly interested in cooperating to secure a fair settlement of this difficult problem and in upholding the authority of the United Nations.
>
> The Australian delegation reserves its right to introduce a resolution accordingly at the proper time.

Speaking in the presence of the one who, perhaps as much as any other single individual, was responsible for the fruition of this great dream of the centuries that the United Nations might really bring to pass this peace on earth, good will to men, I express the profound hope that there shall be no deviation from the broad, great principles laid down in the Charter and from a considered action which shall hold the authority and the respect of the United Nations among the peoples of the earth, and that this Government, above all others responsible so largely for its implementation, shall not now take a position which in all future time might result in discrediting the efforts which we shall make for a continuance of peace on earth, good will to men.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I of many who have been very much disturbed by the action of our country, through the United Nations organization, with respect to Palestine. It seems to me that anyone who is familiar with the tragic history of the Jewish people, especially in the past few years when four or five million of the six million European Jews have been butchered by nazism and fascism, would recognize the immense and unanswerable moral challenge of the Jewish people to the American Government and to the conscience of mankind for a just solution of the Palestine question.

The just solution of the Palestine question is simply that the Jewish people shall have an opportunity to fulfill the promise which was made to them by the Balfour Declaration, and which has been reiterated time after time by the Congress and the President as the policy of the American Government.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I invite attention to the declaration of this body in Senate Concurrent Resolution 44 on December 17, 1945, when we resolved—

> That the interest shown by the President in the solution of this problem is hereby commended and that the United States shall use its good offices with the mandatory power to the end that Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization and development, so that they may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine as the Jewish national home and, in association with all elements of the population, establish Palestine as a democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator from Maine for calling my attention to this latest expression of the Congress. That is substantially a repetition of an earlier declaration, going back as far as 1923 or 1924.

So, Mr. President, there is no doubt about what have been the promises of the American Government, the commitments of the American Congress, and the obligations of American Presidents for decades since World War I.

We thought this question was settled in the United Nations organization, where it should have been settled, and should be settled now. After long-drawn-out deliberations, after reports of committees numbering more than 20 over the past years since World War I, after the examination of the problem by representatives of various nations, it was finally resolved in the United Nations that there should be partition of Palestine. That was a solemn commitment arrived at by this international organization.

I do not know what caused the American Government to withdraw its support from that policy arrived at by the United Nations. I do not know who was responsible for the change of that policy, for the rescission of that commitment, and for the introduction of an entirely new approach to the problem in the United Nations. Now, instead of a United Nations policy in the partition of Palestine, we are urging in that organization the establishment of a trusteeship for Palestine.

Mr. President, if we have a trusteeship, what will be the significance of it? Will it assure that the Jews shall have the right of immigration into Palestine, as they are supposed to have enjoyed that right since the Balfour Declaration and since our early commitments in 1920? Does it mean that the Jewish people will have an opportunity to become a majority in the territory occupied by the Jews? Does it mean that this aggregation of people will have the right to call themselves a state, and to act as a state in the sisterhood of states of the world? Does it mean that the United Nations will protect the people of such an area against aggression from an outside source? If so, who will afford the protection? Where will the troops come from to afford security to those people against aggression from the states round about?

It seems to me that, if the proposal of the United States is adopted and a trusteeship for Palestine is established, it will afford not hope, but the blight of hope which every Jew and every sympathetic person has entertained since the Balfour Declaration. It means not the opening of the doors and gates of Palestine to Jewish immigration. It probably means that those doors will be closed, because the trusteeship will take in the whole of Palestine, which at the present time has a majority of Arab people.

It means that the United Nations will be powerless to protect the trusteeship which it assumes, if it has no international police force—and today it has none. We are not told by anyone of any prospect for establishing an international police force.

What, therefore, does that course offer but utter despair and hopelessness for the Jewish people, who have seen five million of their fellow Jews cut down in our own time in barbarity which not even Genghis Khan was able to approach. Those people will continue to live in concentration camps—although they are now called displaced-persons camps. There is hardly a family which was in existence in 1939 among all the Jewish population of Europe, which is now united.

What, therefore, should we do? I think we should have adhered to the partition commitment which was arrived at by the United Nations organization. I do not know of anything to justify a change in American policy. Evidently other nations have seen no reason to change the course which they followed in arriving at the partition decision. The initiative seems to have been confined entirely to the United States. Yet to my knowledge, Members of Congress are not told of any necessity for the complete and humiliating reversal of the United States policy upon this partition question.

Some have said, "If we had partition, there would be no international police force which would be able to protect the partitioned state and give them security against aggression from the outside." There would have been the same force, the same authority, the same power to protect that state against outside aggression which exists at the present time to protect any other state against outside aggression. They would have been no worse off, if no better off, than any other world state, until we create an international police force.

Mr. President, the implications from the partition of Palestine into a state which would have had cognizance by the nations of the world would have made a vast difference in the practical sense. The Jewish part of Palestine would have become a legal state. It would have assumed and would have had the right to exercise the functions exercised by other sovereign states in the world.

Mr. President, that would have meant that that area and those people would have had the same immunity from outside aggression which the people of any sovereign nation possess. That would also have meant that those people would have had the right to have called upon the other nations of the world not only for recognition but for the right to buy arms, the right to purchase the matériel with which to defend themselves, their homes, their state, their lives. And, Mr. President, they would have had the right to have invoked the moral obligation upon every member of the United Nations organization to lend them succor, to protect and maintain their security against outside invasion. Mr. President, if we then failed to protect that little state of Palestine against outside invasion and outside aggression, then the United Nations and every nation that stood callously by would give encouragement to a lawless world. I cannot believe that the United Nations membership, including our own country, would stand by and see a sovereign state set up by the United Nations organization ravished and ravaged by invading armies and by embittered foes.

Mr. President, that was one way by which that state might have acquired sovereignity, to have been established by the United Nations organization, the only world government that can speak for the family of nations at the present time. Once having done that, we should have adhered to the decision we made.

However, now that we have receded from that decision, if the United Nations is powerless to act, what can we do as the United States of America? I venture to suggest that in this case we can do just what we have done in other cases in which nations or peoples have appealed to our country on the basis of justice and right. That is to say, when those brave people declared that a provisional government did in fact exist in Palestine, when they called into being the natural right of man to independence and freedom—the same right we declared in our own immortal Declaration of Independence—when they constituted themselves before God and man an independent and a united people, and stated before the world that they were a de facto government, they had the same right to appeal to us for succor and for support and for full recognition that the American Colonies had, and exercised, to appeal to the family of nations for recognition after our own Declaration of Independence from the British crown.

Mr. President, if they declare a provisional, de facto government, if they appeal for recognition, if they ask for aid, then in justice and in good conscience it would seem to me proper that we extend such recognition and recognize as de jure the de facto state which they declare to exist. We have done that in many other instances, Mr. President, here in our own hemisphere, in respect to other nations. When we become satisfied that a people have the right to call themselves a state, it is recognized practice in international law for other sovereign states to recognize that new entity and receive it into the family of nations and states. That is what we could do as the United States of America, Mr. President. That is what I propose we do, if we are not going to find an effective way to solve this problem where it should be solved, and where it once was solved until we reversed ourselves, in the councils of the United Nations.

Mr. President, once we recognize the provisional government of Palestine, the Jewish people there will have a Jewish state, and then we shall have a right—and a duty—if they are threatened with invasion, to give them the privilege, at least, to purchase and to ship from our shores arms for their defense; and then we shall also have the right and the obligation to make loans to that government, to assist it in its struggle for survival against those who would destroy it.

Mr. President, I have no doubt but that, if the United States of America were to give unreserved recognition to such a government, other nations would follow our course, and if it were once recognized that the part of Palestine which has been set aside for the Jewish people was a sovereign state, aid would be forthcoming to them from the other nations and the peoples of the world. But as the matter stands at the present time, those who would destroy them have ample access to aid and to arms; but the Jewish people are being massacred, without even having the right to buy weapons with which to defend their lives and their families, their homes, and their ancient land.

Mr. President, once Palestine became a state, not only would the other individual states of the world have the right, if not the duty, to aid Palestine against aggression, but it would also become the duty of the Security Council of the United Nations organization to protect them, on the theory that their invasion might constitute a threat to the peace of the world. I base what I say now upon article 39 of the Charter of the United Nations, which reads as follows:

> The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with articles 41 and 42, to maintain or restore international peace and security.

Mr. President, there the duty is squarely put upon the Security Council to take measures which it deems proper to protect against threats to the peace, breach of the peace, or acts of aggression.

Article 30 says that the steps to be taken shall be taken in accordance with

articles 41 and 42. Here is article 41 of the Charter:

The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon the members of the United Nations to apply such measures. These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations.

Mr. President, in that article we find the power to apply sanctions. They do not have to employ force; they do not have to send armed might. If there be those who say that, if we set up this nation as a recognized sovereignty, we shall have to send American troops to protect and defend them, I say I believe that necessity would never arise; and I shall give my reasons for taking that position. First, I believe that their security could be protected by the action of the Security Council in applying measures other than the sending of armed might, if we acted in concert. Second, I believe that if the nations of the world once recognize the Jewish state, and if we make it possible for them to purchase arms and assure the delivery of those arms, I believe the Jewish people love their liberty to such an extent that they could be depended upon to protect it against any neighboring invader.

So, Mr. President, I say that, if we and other nations partition Palestine, through the United Nations, and set up the Palestinian state as a sovereignty, or if we as nations individually recognize the sovereignty of that nation, then we can, I believe, through the Charter of the United Nations, provide the means by which that state can be protected, without having a single American soldier called upon, either directly or indirectly, to go to its aid and defense.

Here is article 42 of the Charter of the United Nations:

Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of members of the United Nations.

Mr. President, we have been able to make demonstrations in the Mediterranean when we were interested in the security of Greece against some outside assault. We have been able to make naval demonstrations in the eastern Mediterranean when that was consistent with our policy to protect Turkey against some outside threat.

I wonder, Mr. President, whether we could not make some demonstration in the same Mediterranean Sea in order to protect the Jewish people, whose integrity and sovereignty we should legitimately have recognized, without the necessity of actually sending a soldier to fight a battle or to shoot a gun. So, Mr. President, it is not the way we lack; it is the will we lack to help Palestine. I do not make any suggestion unworthy of the integrity of our country or of its policy, Mr. President, but there are those who suggest that we have had a self interest that was more commanding upon our conscience than the pitiable appeal of the Jewish people for a homeland, than the sacred right of sanctuary against future brutality and butchery.

Mr. President, I like to feel that America really means what that symbol in New York Harbor suggests, to mankind, that we are the friend of the oppressed, that we will try to defend the persecuted, that we will stand bravely by the victims of aggression everywhere in the world. We have done that in other spheres; we have been extremely solicitous, Mr. President, to see that a certain power does not transgress upon other people, that they do not by force compel their ideology upon others. To that end we are spending billions of dollars, we are almost prepared to make up full-scale military commitments. We have been able and willing to make demonstrations by air and by sea, and to use every diplomatic and economic power that our great prestige put in our hands as a weapon. Why, Mr. President, are we so impotent to save the Jews from further destruction and to give them sanctuary in their ancient family homeland?

I say again, Mr. President, it is not the way we lack, it is the will we lack which has kept America impotent in the face of this problem, the greatest moral challenge of the day. I cannot understand, Mr. President, how we can continue to dishonor this moral claim upon our action. Surely those of us in this body who have looked upon, with horror, the concentration camps, the crematories, the places where the blood is still thick which spewed from their bodies when they were being butchered—the ashes which still contain their bones and the residue of their bodies; surely those who know, Mr. President, the hunger that the Jews of Europe have to secure a place where they feel there will not be another pogrom cannot deny that this is the supreme moral challenge being unanswered by our country today. The longer we put off the matter, the longer we delay the decision, the worse the situation gets.

I would say only this, Mr. President: I am totally unable to reconcile the fact that we were able to induce the British Government and the other beneficiaries of the Marshall plan in Europe to work in such magnificent harmony with us for a certain security for western Europe; yet, Mr. President, we seem so utterly incapable of bringing about any concerted action for the salvation of the Jews of Palestine. Great Britain, Mr. President, who, as announced by Mr. Paul Hoffman, Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration, is to receive the largest single amount of Marshall plan money of any nation, has told us that they are going to withdraw their forces in mid-May, and we seem so utterly incapable of persuading them to work in harmony with us even one step of the way in this matter of Palestine. I wonder, Mr. President, if we really have let the British people know how deeply our citizenry feels about this subject, and if we have let them know that we expect them to cooperate with us in this sphere as in the one closer to their own home, and that the Jews have got the same right to security that western Europe has. It makes no difference that the invasion comes from one source in one instance and from another, in another.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. I would ask the Senator from Florida, is it not true, that really and actually a state of warfare exists in Palestine with reference to the Jews?

Mr. PEPPER. There is no doubt of it. How can the nations of the world, our Government included, stand idly by and see armies concentrated and mobilized in the Middle East and gathered on the border of Palestine, and then invade the Palestine State, without some remonstrance or effective protest?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, the condition now existing in Palestine is affecting all Jews in that land. In other words, those Jews who went to Palestine a long time ago, settled, and bought homes, are suffering just as much as those against whom the opponents of the Palestine partition operate. Is that not true?

Mr. PEPPER. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. KILGORE. In other words, it is not merely a question of a fight against the partition of Palestine, it is a question of preservation of the lives of those Jews who went to Palestine, even saying the partition was not right, but it is a fight against those Jews who went to Palestine at a time when it was perfectly proper for them to do so, who bought their homes, who bought land, who settled down, and who had been living peaceably, trying to build up the country. Are the attacks not directed against them just as much as against anybody else, and are they not equally sufferers with anybody else?

Mr. PEPPER. Unmistakably so, unmistakably so.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I have not been able to hear the entire address by the Senator from Florida, which I regret. Has the Senator called attention to the extraordinary circumstances surrounding the so-called Transjordan Legion, which has been officered by British officers, some 30 of them, which is almost entirely supported by grants from the British Treasury, which grants were renewed within the past month with the grant of $8,000,000 a year to support the Transjordan Arab Legion under Emir Abdullah, the ruler of the Arabs of Transjordan, who are assisting in the policing and who are to be apparently associated in the carrying out of the insurrection against the decision of the United Nations?

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator from Maine for emphasizing that point.

Mr. President, the British record in Palestine will not be recorded as one of its noble areas of activity when the history of the whole matter is written. Mr.

President, the British Government undertook a mandate in Palestine with a solemn obligation. It gave that commitment to the League of Nations and, in a direct treaty, to the United States of America, as well.

Mr. President, the British Government, on the record, never did fulfill that obligation. To the contrary, in 1939, it issued what is called a white paper, which definitely limited the number of immigrants that might come into Palestine, and then closed the door, or slammed it, in the faces of the Jewish people.

Not only that, Mr. President, but Transjordan was a part of the mandate. The British Government separated Transjordan from the remainder of Palestine, made it into a sovereign, and, I think history and the facts will show, a puppet state, officered by British officers, if reports be true, supported and financed by British money and arms and protected by British power. In fact, spokesmen of the British Foreign Office have admitted to the press that Great Britain is furnishing arms to the Arabs.

The last step is that the Transjordan Army appears to be a part of the invading force now, so far as I know—and I assume it to be true—officered by British Army officers, armed with British equipment and guns, and certainly not acting contrary to British policy, so far as I have been able to see it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The fact that Transjordan was established as it has been established has made the Palestine question a very difficult one to solve. Had Transjordan not been established the solution of the question would have been much easier. There would not have been so much resistance. There would have been a give-and-take policy which would have worked out far better if that policy decision had not been made. As the Senator points out, and I agree, it was an unlawful disposition and an unlawful decision when Transjordan was established as a separate state.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator very much. It is unmistakably true that it was an unlawful decision and that it should never have occurred.

As I said a moment ago, Mr. President, I appreciate the fraternal spirit——

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I would not wish the Senator from Florida to leave any implication that the British Government was not supporting the Transjordan matters, because it has been officially announced that the British Government has been carrying on for a long time, as a matter of official record, and have renewed the treaty during the past month, obligating itself to pay $80,000,000 a year as a grant. Meanwhile Transjordan is an applicant for membership in the United Nations and is qualifying for membership by invading precincts of Palestine to enforce action against the decision of the United Nations.

Mr. PEPPER. And yet, on the record, the United States of America is helpless to restrain Transjordan. On the contrary, I believe we are advocating its admission to the United Nations organization, which means that we thereby ratify the illegal British action in separating Transjordan from Palestine and giving it recognition as a sovereign state among the family of nations.

Mr. President, I say I honor the fraternal relationships existing between this Nation and the British people. I have tried as long as I have been a Member of the Senate to help that great people in their hard struggles for democracy, and I still wish to see that citadel of democracy preserved intact as one of the glories of our present civilization. But I have never been able to understand why we are called upon to do so much for Britain and are unable to get Britain to do so little with us. I believe in a fraternal relationship that works both ways, Mr. President. We are committed in Palestine. It looks as if the British should be willing to bend their will and work with us in this humanitarian manner, since we are digging deeply into the pockets of the American people to save Europe from complete deterioration and destruction, including the isles of the United Kingdom. Yet, Mr. President, to me it seems strange that nations in western Europe whose very lives we are saving with our money and, indeed, all our might, show so little disposition to support us in a great humane appeal for the tortured people of Palestine.

Mr. President, in this great body I have always said that our policy must be one which is world-wide in scope. If we are to defend the victims of aggression in one part of the world we must do so wherever aggression occurs, if we are to be morally and politically consistent.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sure the Senator from Florida would not wish to be too critical of the nations of western Europe for not following our leadership, when it is so difficult to determine what has occurred. It seems to me that until we put our own house in order and pursue a consistent, responsible, and respectable policy we should not be very critical of either Great Britain or any other country.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, there is no doubt but what the leadership has fallen upon us and we shall have to discharge that obligation.

What I had in mind was the fact that the British have announced their departure from Palestine on May 15, apparently without the concurrence or consent of the United Nations, leaving the Jewish people, who now cannot get arms, to be butchered by their enemies. They will occupy until the very last the one port through which we might get aid in arms to the Jewish people of Palestine. If the British in their retreat cover the avenues through which aid might go, the inevitable effect will be the butchery of the Jewish people, and there will be a moral accountability on someone's escutcheon.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will not the responsibility for that bloodshed rest squarely on those who either have refused the shipment of arms under ample authority which exists or have refused entry of those arms to the people seeking simply the arms and the assistance to defend their very lives as well as the state which we contemplated was coming into being?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it will certainly rest upon those who have failed to take effective action to prevent that result.

So it seems to me we could go back to the decision that originated in the United Nations, namely, partition. We should find out what are the lawful borders of the Jewish land and mark them.

I pause, Mr. President, to make this observation. I am aware of the twenty-some-odd Russian vetoes in the Security Council, but in this particular case, I believe, it cannot be charged that it is Russian stubbornness or vetoes now preventing effective Security Council action. Let us at least put the decision up to the Security Council for an applicant for sanctions after the partition has established the Jewish state. Then, if anyone vetoes the action by the Security Council, all mankind will know who the obstructer is.

It just so happens, Mr. President—and what a lesson in cooperation it is between our two peoples—it happens in the partition decision that the two greatest powers in the world, the United States and the Soviet Union, were working together. How we wish that were true in every other troubled part of the world. They seemed to have worked together in good faith and with honest accord. What an example it is to both nations to try to find means by which we can work together, because in accord and honorable cooperation, dealing each with the other, we can make this a peaceful and prosperous world.

So I say, Mr. President, let us go back and reinstate the partition decision in the United Nations. Then let us carry through in the United Nations to the protection and preservation of that ancient people. In the alternative, if we do not do that, let us recognize, as we have a right to do, the de facto Jewish government in Palestine as a de jure government, and let all the blessings which result flow therefrom.

I believe, Mr. President, that if we will follow one or the other of those courses, we will set a grave and challenging example to the nations of the earth; indeed, the countries of mankind will at long last give not only security and sanctuary but a home to the wandering and persecuted Jews.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I have been wondering whether the Senator from Florida, in his able discussion, had intended to refer to the spectacle of the so-called Arab League, which is nothing but a vehicle of six Arab states which are all members of the United Nations, which have subsidized and used the Arab League as the vehicle through which to carry out this insurrection against the United Nations—a plain violation of the very provision of the Charter, and one which cannot be disregarded because of the

cloak with which they seek to enshroud their identity.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, there is no doubt that what the Senator from Maine says is correct. If the United Nations had made its decision for partition and stuck to it, had recognized the existence of the Jewish state, then if, as they threatened to do and did, the Arab states organized armed forces, if they brought those armed forces to bear across the border in Palestine, what could have been a ranker aggression or invasion than that? How is that to be distinguished from what happened when the Russians went over into Iran—and, I may add, got out after pressure was brought in the United Nations councils—or when any other nation goes across the border of another people? With the action of the United Nations in favor of partition, the Jewish state would have had the same right to existence and we would have had the same duty to defend it against aggression as we would have to do for every other state with regard to which we have that obligation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in connection with the debate on the floor this afternoon during which some of my colleagues in the Senate have discussed certain facets of the Palestine issue, I should like to ask unanimous consent to have published in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement which has been sent to me by the Jewish Agency dealing with the so-called American delegation proposal of the United Nations of a truce. I should like to have it made a part of the RECORD because I am not in a position to say whether or not the allegations set forth in the statement of the Jewish Agency are right or wrong. But I think the questions raised are ones which should be considered by our Government and an answer thereto provided.

The statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JEWISH AGENCY STATEMENT ON TRUCE PROPOSAL

The question of truce in Palestine was raised in the Security Council as part of a general proposal to set aside the plan adopted by the General Assembly for the future government of Palestine and to substitute for it an entirely different solution of the Palestine problem which the Jewish Agency found utterly unacceptable.

Actually, the resolution calling for a truce was adopted by the Security Council in conjunction with the decision to convene a special session of the Assembly for the purpose of undertaking the revision of the plan. Thus, the truce proposal in its very inception appeared to load the dice very heavily against Jewish interests.

Moreover, the wording of the resolution on truce, by referring merely to a truce between the Arab and Jewish communities of Palestine, ignored the major aspect of the present disturbed condition of the country, which is its invasion by armed forces from outside, organized by the governments of the neighboring Arab states, members of the United Nations and, in the case of Syria, member of the Security Council itself, and tolerated by the mandatory power.

The resolution of the Security Council called upon Arab and Jewish groups in Palestine to cease acts of violence. It addressed no admonition to the neighboring Arab states to discontinue the recruiting, training, and arming of military contingents in their territories for armed intervention in Palestine, and the actual sending of such forces across their frontiers into Palestine. According to reliable press reports, further large-scale incursions of armed units and further importation of war materials from the neighboring countries into Palestine took place only within the last 2 or 3 days as the first installment of a new wave of invasion.

Nevehtheless, the Jewish Agency declared itself willing to enter into a truce arrangement so that an end may be put to the bloodshed and destruction which is now ravaging the life of Palestine and claiming a mounting toll of victims. In its readiness to contribute its full share to the immediate restoration of peace in Palestine, the Jewish Agency was concerned to safeguard two main objectives:

First, that the truce should be an effective one and that it should not serve as a mere cover and protection for the preparation of further aggression. Secondly, that the conclusion and observance of the truce should not jeopardize legitimate long-term Jewish interests and should not prejudge the main issue which is now at stake.

Accordingly the executive of the Jewish Agency in Palestine on April 4, 1948, adopted the following resolution regarding the truce proposal:

"The Jewish Agency welcomes the efforts of the Security Council to produce a cessation of hostilities in Palestine and to prevent a continuation of bloodshed in the future. The Jews of Palestine were forced to defend themselves against a series of attacks launched against them by the Arabs since December 1, 1947. Responsibility for the situation in Palestine falls also upon the mandatory power, which, despite its duties and its public declarations, failed to preserve law and order, failed to prevent the invasion of Palestine by organized Arab guerrilla bands from neighboring states, provided arms to Arab states which have been sending these guerrilla bands into Palestine and suffered these foreign invaders to establish themselves in military camps in Palestine, to disrupt communications in various parts of the country, and to besiege the city of Jerusalem.

"The agency will gladly agree to a military truce which will put an effective and immediate end to all acts of violence, reestablish freedom of movement throughout the land on all roads and highways, restore free access to the holy places, withdraw all foreign troops and guerrillas, remove all units of the Transjordan Arab Legion to Transjordan, and prevent the incursion of such foreign forces and armed bands into Palestine in the future. To make such a truce effective, provision must be made for an international commission to supervise its execution. The Jewish Agency cannot rely in this respect upon the British authorities.

"It must be clearly understood that such a military truce shall not impede Jewish immigration and shall not affect preparations now in progress to assure essential public services, and for the establishment of an autonomous government in the area of the Jewish state immediately after the termination of the mandate on May 15."

This remains the attitude of the Jewish Agency.

The Jewish Agency was subsequently honored by an invitation from the distinguished President of the Security Council to attend a conference with a view to discussing the terms of the truce. There was only one brief formal meeting, attended by representatives of both the Arab Higher Committee and the Jewish Agency for Palestine, after which the President of the Security Council held a series of informal talks with the representatives of those two bodies separately. In reply to the President's question as to the conditions under which we would be prepared to conclude a truce, we defined our attitude in the following terms:

Had the aggression against the Jews been confined to the Arabs of Palestine, we would have been ready for a truce unconditionally. In actual fact, in that eventuality, the question of a formal truce and of negotiations in that regard need not have arisen at all, as it would have been enough for the Arabs to cease fire in order to produce an immediate cessation of all armed reaction against them on the part of the Jews. But the military situation in Palestine has been completely transformed by the invasion of the country from outside.

The very presence on the soil of Palestine of foreign armed forces is a permanent act of aggression against the Jews. Unless these forces are removed and further armed incursions prevented, the truce would be a godsend to the aggressor, for under its cover and without the fear of any interference on the part of the Jews, the Arab command would be able to bring up further reinforcements, to occupy points of vantage, to perfect its military organization and to be ready for renewed assault under much more advantageous conditions.

We, therefore, have to put forward, as essential conditions of the truce, that the armed units which were brought into Palestine from outside be withdrawn and that no further incursions should be tolerated. This is the summary of our position as explained by us to the President of the Council.

It would be observed that the two stipulations which we have made are purely military in character. They are intended to insure that the truce should be a real truce and not a sham. We have put forward no political conditions in connection with the truce. We gathered, however, from questions put to us by the President of the Security Council that political conditions had been put forward by the other side. These conditions we had to resist.

In the light of these general observations, I now propose, Mr. President, with your kind permission, to deal in some detail with the provisions regarding the truce included in the draft which was communicated to us yesterday and which now lies before the Security Council.

As a first general observation, I would point out that the scheme of the truce here outlined is founded on the assumption that the present mandatory administration in Palestine would discharge its functions under the mandate to preserve law and order. Quite apart from the question whether the present mandatory can be relied upon to do so in view of its recent record, it is clear that the truce arrangement proposed is thus by its very terms limited in its duration to the very short period which remains between now and May 15, on which date, according to the mandatory Government's decision which is announced to be irrevocable, the mandate is to be terminated. It is on this definite assumption that we now discuss the truce proposals.

I now address myself to the preamble of the draft resolution. Its third recital states "that the United Kingdom Government, so long as it remains the mandatory power, is responsible for the maintenance of peace and order in Palestine and should continue to take all steps to that end." We must, with all due respect to the Security Council, take exception not merely to the word "continue" which implies that the mandatory administration in Palestine has hitherto discharged its responsibilities in maintaining peace and order—this is most lamentably not the case—but to raise objection to the mandatory administration being given the sanction of the Security Council in advance for

whatever step it might deem fit to take in the field of security.

The recent record of the mandatory administration makes it impossible for us to repose any trust in it in that regard and we would regard it as nothing short of calamitous if in the light of that record it were thus formally assured of full international support for whatever, in its own wisdom, it might do or leave undone. We would, therefore, urge that the recital should be limited to the recognition of the fact that the mandatory power is responsible for the maintenance of peace and order while the mandate lasts, and that the remaining part of the recital after the word "Palestine" should be deleted.

In regard to subparagraph (A) of paragraph 1, I would observe that the requirement that all activities of a military or paramilitary nature should cease is far too wide to be practicable. It may be interpreted as involving the discontinuation of all normal defense arrangements without which the Jewish population of Palestine will be seized by a feeling of insecurity which will be inimical to any truce. The Jewish Agency would therefore propose that the clause should read "cease all acts of violence, terrorism, and sabotage."

A point of fundamental importance arises in connection with subparagraph (B), which contains the most important and welcome injunction against the bringing in to Palestine of armed bands or individuals from outside. With the injunction so formulated we are heartily in agreement, but what we cannot accept is that it should extended to include "individuals capable of bearing arms," as this would affect Jewish immigration. We cannot possibly agree that Jewish immigrants into Palestine, whatever their age group or physical condition, should be put on the same footing with those elements who are now being sent into Palestine in violation of its land frontiers with the deliberate purpose of upsetting the peace of the country and committing acts of aggression against the Jews and against the authority of the United Nations.

These people have not a vestige of any legal or political right to be in Palestine. They come there with the avowed object of breaking the law and disturbing the peace. By contrast, Jewish immigrants come to Palestine by virtue of an internationally recognized right. Palestine is their home in which they come to live. The equation of the two categories is untenable. We would urge that the words "capable of bearing arms" be deleted and that instead the wording should be "armed or entering Palestine with the deliberate purpose of taking part in the fighting."

Coming to subparagraph C, I would point out that as worded it goes much too far in a most sweeping manner and may be interpreted as imposing during the truce period a world embargo on the acquisition of arms for future Jewish defense, while leaving it free to Arab states to accumulate any quantities of arms they may be able to purchase for future fighting in Palestine. We, therefore, urge that the subparagraph should read "refrain from importing weapons and war materials" and that all reference to acquisition should be deleted.

A point of most far-reaching significance arises in connection with subparagraph (D). Here each party is called upon to refrain pending further consideration of the future government of Palestine by the General Assembly "from any political activity which might prejudice the rights, claims or positions" of either community.

The mere introduction of a political subject into the question of a military truce is liable to vitiate the issue. And we should urge that this whole subparagraph be deleted. Should its deletion not commend itself to the Council, we would urge that it be amended. To begin with, the term "political activity" seems inappropriate. It is too loose and might be taken to refer to any meeting, any public address, any article in the press, any resolution.

We would suggest to substitute the word "action" for the words "political activities." Further, the question of prejudicing claims does not arise at all. My claim can be prejudiced only if I myself renounce or compromise it. It cannot possibly be prejudiced by whatever the other party does. We suggest, therefore, that the word "claims" should come out altogether. But the main difficulty arises in connection with the word "rights."

The position as far as rights are concerned cannot be left in its present vague form, liable to be interpreted at will. The Arab community may claim as its right the spreading of its dominion over the whole of Palestine and the subjugation of the Jewish community. Can the Jews be expected to refrain from any action which might prejudice that alleged right which they categorically deny and whose exercise would affect the very roots of their existence.

An objective, internationally recognized, criterion is here imperative. We therefore suggest that the paragraph should be amended to read "refrain, etc., from any action which might prejudice the rights or position of either community under the mandate and the resolution of the General Assembly." It cannot be a moot point in an organ of the United Nations that pending further consideration of the future goverment of Palestine by the General Assembly, the existing resolution of the General Assembly stands and is fully valid.

With regard to subparagraph (E), I must state that the mandatory administration, by its own record and by what we would describe as its sins of omission and commission, about both of which enough has been said in our previous statements to the Security Council, has forfeited its title to Jewish cooperation.

Nevertheless, in the interest of preservation of life we would be prepared to cooperate with the various organs of the present Palestine government in certain spheres where we would regard cooperation as necessary and warranted, but there can be no question of our pledging general cooperation to the British administration of Palestine which has so manifestly disregarded and even acted contrary to its most basic responsibilities.

Subparagraph (F) seeks to secure the safety of the holy places. We submit that this is not enough. What has to be secured is also free access to all shrines and sanctuaries for those who have an established right to visit and worship at them. It is not enough, for instance, to lay down that the Wailing Wall might not be blown up. Free access to the Wailing Wall must be guaranteed for the Jews in accordance with the immemorial practice which has been internationally sanctioned.

I now come to paragraph 2. Despite the unquestionable default of the British mandatory administration in the maintenance of law and order and its particularly lamentable and most alarming failure to prevent the invasion of Palestine by armed forces from outside, this paragraph proposes to charge that administration with the duty of supervising the execution of the truce provisions. The Jewish Agency cannot possibly agree that the mandatory administration is impartial in the present conflict and can properly be entrusted in this highly responsible task which requires complete objectivity. If the draft is left in its present form and no authoritative United Nations organ is set up to supervise and insure the observance of the truce, we could consider that no adequate provision at all has been made in this record.

Paragraph 3 seeks to prevent further infiltration into Palestine of armed forces from outside. What I said in regard to the expression "capable of bearing arms" with reference to subparagraph (B) of paragraph 1 applies equally to the same phraseology in paragraph 3. The injunction itself against the mere entry into Palestine of armed bands, etc., does not go far enough.

We would urge that the governments of states neighboring to Palestine should be called upon to prohibit in their territories the recruitment and preparation of forces for eventual incursions into Palestine. Moreover, there is no reference in the paragraph, or anywhere else in the draft, to the fate of the foreign armed units already in Palestine. They all live in special camps, the location of which is common knowledge.

By omission, the draft resolution suffers them to remain where they are, or even to change their location and select better sites for their future activities. I have already stated that the mere presence of these bands on the soil of Palestine is regarded by the Jews as a permanent act of aggression. They are, indeed, a constant irritant and a perpetual source of danger. The absence of a clear provision to evacuate or at least to immobilize these bands forces the Jewish agency to reserve its position in this regard.

In conclusion, I would take the opportunity of emphasizing again that foreign invasion is the crux of the whole difficulty, and the fact that the mandatory government has allowed it to proceed unchecked mars its record more than anything else.

The Security Council has not so far deemed fit to place on record in clear and unequivocal terms the responsibility of either the Arab Governments or the Government of the United Kingdom for the present intolerable situation which has been created in and around Palestine by this continued process of invasion.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I would make this additional comment on this matter. It is my understanding, at least to date, that it is not the position of our Government that on the merits the decision for Palestine partition was unsound. Rather, as I interpreted the position of our Government, it is that an attempt at this time to enforce the partition would disturb the peace of the world; although I cannot ignore the fact that our failure to take any definite action one way or another seems also to be disturbing the peace of the world, in Palestine.

I also must take note of the fact that until we take a definite position one way or another on the merits of partition itself, international peace through international order by law, administered by the United Nations, is itself in jeopardy.

Although I am perfectly willing to await the position of our Government on the merits of the issue, if our Government proceeds expeditiously to consider the merits, I do want to point out that the position of our delegation to the United Nations leaves me somewhat puzzled and confused, because, that, too, is pregnant with many implications. If I understand that position correctly, it is to the effect that we will supply troops, to enforce trusteeship, provided certain other nations also provide troops. It seems to me what we are faced with is

the question of whether or not we are going to go forward with an international police force under the United Nations. I am very sure that the Palestinian issue is not the proper issue on which to raise the question as to whether or not the members of the United Nations really could go forward with the establishment of an international police force to be maintained not only in Palestine but elsewhere in the world where the peace is threatened.

There is one part of this statement put out by the Jewish Agency that at least seems to me to be one that is so plausible in nature that it calls for a clarification of America's position on it.

The point is that, after all, the conflict in Palestine today is not between the Jews of Palestine and the Arabs of Palestine, but between the Jews of Palestine and powerful Arab forces outside Palestine, who have been sent into Palestine. So that we have in effect a foreign army in Palestine, or in the Palestinian territory. I think that raises some very serious questions, Mr. President, as to the position that our delegation to the United Nations should take, even in regard to a trusteeship. I want the record to be perfectly clear that I am not purporting this afternoon to take a position on the merits of the position our delegation to the United Nations has taken on this question; but I do want the record to be perfectly clear that I think many other persons, in the Senate and in the Nation, share my puzzlement as to just what our position is. It is very difficult to find in our delegation's discussion of the Palestinian issue any consistent, logical case as to what our policy is toward Palestine. In the interest not only of the future of the United Nations, but in the interest of world peace, we should hasten our final decision as to our final policy in Palestine and make that decision so crystal clear that all parties concerned and all groups will know exactly where we stand on the merits of the issue.

FEDERAL CHARTER FOR THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I believe the pending business is Senate bill 1322, to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation; is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion was made by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] that the Senate proceed to consider that bill. Does the Senator from Vermont now wish to press the motion?

Mr. AIKEN. I do.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1322) to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, this is a bill to grant a charter to the Commodity Credit Corporation. It follows out the requirements of the so-called Byrd-Butler law, which requires all Federal corporations to proceed under Federal charters after July 1, 1948. The committee has amended the bill in several places. I shall not explain each amendment in detail unless some Senator desires me to do so.

In brief, the committee has made an effort more strictly to define the duties and authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and certain amendments are placed in the bill for that purpose.

The committee has also amended the bill so as to include the amount of guaranteed bank loans under the total authorization granted to the Commodity Credit Corporation. I think that Members of the Senate know that much of what the Commodity Credit Corporation has done has been through local banks, and that the loans so made should be included in the over-all limitations.

The committee also amended the bill to provide that any research work conducted by the Commodity Credit Corporation should relate to the servicing or disposal of commodities owned or controlled by the corporation, and should be conducted in collaboration with the research agencies of the Department of Agriculture. This is an effort to control the different agencies of government which are showing a tendency of late to set up full-fledged research departments of their own, without regard to similar research which may be conducted by other agencies of the Department of Agriculture.

The last amendment to which I shall call attention requires the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay to the United States Treasury a sum which will reimburse the Treasury in full for the interest on the money which the Commodity Credit Corporation may borrow from the Treasury.

There will be offered to the bill several other amendments, which I have discussed with the Senators who will offer them. I think we have worked out solutions to practically all of the proposed amendments. There may be one exception.

Unless there are some questions to be asked about the bill, I ask that the committee amendments be acted upon. I know of no objection to any of the committee amendments. Then we can take up the amendments which will be proposed by Members of the Senate.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I first wish to say that, in general, I am in thorough sympathy with the program of the Commodity Credit Corporation. It has served a good purpose. However, I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Vermont to the fact that it was found that private enterprise could serve just as well in the purchase of some commodities. Let us take coal, for instance. The tonnage of purchases of coal in this country to go to Europe is about the same as the tonnage of grain. Instead of handling the purchases through a Government corporation, the work has all been done through private enterprise, and it is the recommendation of the official who is handling the coal purchases that the same program be followed with respect to the grain purchases.

I realize that it is too late to amend the measure to any degree in that respect, but I should like to ask the Senator one question. Is it the purpose of the sponsors of the bill to make permanent the activities of the Government in business, or are they looking forward to the time when business can again be returned to private enterprise?

Mr. AIKEN. It is my understanding that an amendment will be proposed to the charter bill which will limit the length of time the charter will continue in operation to the same period which has been granted in the case of the RFC, which serves the banking and industrial interests of the United States just as the Commodity Credit Corporation was originally created to serve the agricultural interests.

I understand that coal referred to by the Senator has not been purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The armed services and other agencies which have designated the Commodity Credit Corporation the purchasing agency for grains and foodstuffs apparently have designated other agencies, or have bought direct such of their supplies as may have been needed for the European Recovery Program, for the people of the occupied areas, and for the armed services themselves. That is a matter which has been left to the armed services themselves, and is not written into the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter bill as being obligatory, although they are permitted to make purchases for other agencies of Government when they are required or requested to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments of the committee.

The amendments of the committee were on page 1, line 6, after the word "purpose" to strike out "of promoting the general welfare by stabilizing, supporting, and protecting farm income and prices, by assisting in the maintenance of balanced and adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, products thereof, foods, feeds, and fibers (hereinafter collectively referred to as agricultural commodities), and by facilitating the orderly distribution of" and insert "of stabilizing, supporting, and protecting farm income and prices, assisting in the maintenance of balanced and adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, products thereof, foods, feeds, and fibers (hereinafter collectively referred to as agricultural commodities), and facilitating the orderly distribution of."

On page 4, line 22, after the word "Corporation.", to insert:

The Corporation shall at all times reserve a sufficient amount of its authorized borrowing power under the act of March 8, 1938 (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 713a-4), which, together with other funds available to the Corporation, will enable it to purchase, in accordance with its contracts with lending agencies, notes, or other obligations evidencing loans made by such agencies under the Corporation's programs.

On page 5, after line 13, to strike out:

(m) May conduct researches, surveys, and investigations relating to the conduct of its business.

(n) Shall have such powers as may be necessary or appropriate for the exercise of

the powers specifically vested in the Corporation, and all such incidental powers as are customary in corporations generally.

And insert:

(m) Shall have such powers as may be necessary or appropriate for the exercise of the powers specifically vested in the Corporation, and all such incidental powers as are customary in corporations generally; but any research financed by the Corporation shall relate to the conservation or disposal of commodities owned or controlled by the Corporation and shall be conducted in collaboration with research agencies of the Department of Agriculture.

On page 7, after line 2, to strike out:

(g) To the extent specifically authorized by law, make payments with respect to, or purchases for resale at a loss of, agricultural commodities, for the purpose of maintaining the maximum prices established under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended.

(h) Carry out such other operations as the Congress may authorize or provide for.

And insert:

(g) Carry out such other operations as the Congress may specifically authorize or provide for.

On page 8, after line 3, to insert:

The Corporation shall pay interest to the United States Treasury on the amount of its capital stock, and on the amount of the obligations of the Corporation purchased by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to the act of March 8, 1938 (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 713a-4), at such rates as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be appropriate in view of the terms for which such amounts are made available to the Corporation.

On page 14, after line 20, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 19. Effective date: This act shall take effect on July 1, 1948.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act."

SEC. 2. Creation and purposes: For the purpose of stabilizing, supporting, and protecting farm income and prices, assisting in the maintenance of balanced and adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, products thereof, foods, feeds, and fibers (hereinafter collectively referred to as "agricultural commodities"), and facilitating the orderly distribution of agricultural commodities, there is hereby created a body corporate to be known as the Commodity Credit Corporation (hereinafter referred to as the "Corporation"), which shall be an agency and instrumentality of the United States, within the Department of Agriculture, subject to the general direction and control of the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary").

SEC. 3. Offices: The Corporation may establish offices in such place or places as it may deem necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business.

SEC. 4. General powers: The Corporation—

(a) Shall have accession in its corporate name.

(b) May adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed.

(c) May sue and be sued, but no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Corporation or its property. The district courts of the United States, including the district courts of the District of Columbia and of any Territory or possession, shall have exclusive original jurisdiction of all suits brought by or against the Corporation: *Provided*, That the Corporation may intervene in any court in any suit, action, or proceeding in which it has an interest. Any suit against the Corporation shall be brought in the District of Columbia, or in the district wherein the plaintiff resides or is engaged in business. No suit against the Corporation shall be allowed unless it shall have been brought within 2 years after the right accrued on which suit is brought. All suits against the Corporation shall be tried by the court without a jury. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the Federal Tort Claims Act (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.) shall be applicable to the Corporation.

(d) May adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its business may be conducted and the powers vested in it may be exercised.

(e) Shall have all the rights, privileges and immunities of the United States, including, but not limited to, the right to priority of payment with respect to debts due from insolvent, deceased, or bankrupt debtors, and immunity from the imposition of court costs, fees, and charges, from the allowance of interest on claims and judgments, and from State and local statutes of limitations on suits, actions, or proceedings. The Corporation may assert such rights, privileges, and immunities in any suit, action, or proceeding.

(f) Shall be entitled to the use of the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as the executive departments of the Federal Government.

(g) May enter into and carry out such contracts or agreements as it deems necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business. The Corporation may, whenever, it deems it necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business, consent to the modification of any term or condition of any contract or agreement of any kind to which it is a party. State and local regulatory laws or rules shall not be applicable with respect to contracts or agreements of the Corporation or the parties thereto to the extent that such contracts or agreements provide that such laws or rules shall not be applicable, or to the extent that such laws or rules are inconsistent with such contracts or agreements.

(h) May in any manner acquire, hold, and dispose of such real and personal property or any interest therein as it deems necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business.

(i) May borrow money subject to any provision of law applicable to the Corporation. The Corporation shall at all times reserve a sufficient amount of its authorized borrowing power under the act of March 8, 1938 (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 713a-4), which, together with other funds available to the Corporation, will enable it to purchase, in accordance with its contracts with lending agencies, notes, or other obligations evidencing loans made by such agencies under the Corporation's programs.

(j) Shall determine the character of and the necessity for its obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid.

(k) Shall have authority to make final and conclusive settlement and adjustment of any claims by or against the Corporation or the accounts of its fiscal officers.

(l) May make such loans and advances of its funds as it deems necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business.

(m) Shall have such powers as may be necessary or appropriate for the exercise of the powers specifically vested in the corporation, and all such incidental powers as are customary in corporations generally; but any research financed by the Corporation shall relate to the conservation or disposal of commodities owned or controlled by the Corporation and shall be conducted in collaboration with research agencies of the Department of Agriculture.

SEC. 5. Specific powers: In the fulfillment of its purposes and in carrying out its annual budget programs submitted to and approved by the Congress pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp V, 841), the Corporation is authorized to use its general powers only to—

(a) Support the prices of agricultural commodities through loans, purchases, payments, and other operations.

(b) Make available materials and facilities required in connection with the production and marketing of agricultural commodities.

(c) Procure agricultural commodities for sale to other Government agencies, foreign governments, and domestic, foreign, or international relief or rehabilitation agencies, and to meet domestic requirements.

(d) Remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities.

(e) Increase the domestic consumption of agricultural commodities by expanding or aiding in the expansion of domestic markets or by developing or aiding in the development of new and additional markets, marketing facilities, and uses for such commodities.

(f) Export or cause to be exported, or aid in the development of foreign markets for, agricultural commodities.

(g) Carry out such other operations as the Congress may specifically authorize or provide for.

SEC. 6. Existing statutes applicable to the Corporation: The Federal statutes applicable to Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall be applicable to the Corporation. Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall cease to be an agency of the United States as provided in section 7 (a) of the act of January 31, 1935, as amended (15 U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, 713 (a)).

SEC. 7. Capital stock: The Corporation shall have a capital stock of $100,000,000 which shall be subscribed by the United States. Such subscription shall be deemed to be fully paid by the transfer of assets to the Corporation pursuant to section 16 of this act. The Secretary is hereby authorized and directed to receive such stock and to exercise, on behalf of the United States, any and all rights of the United States arising out of the ownership of such stock. The Corporation shall pay interest to the United States Treasury on the amount of its capital stock, and on the amount of the obligations of the Corporation purchased by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to the act of March 8, 1938 (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 713a-4), at such rates as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be appropriate in view of the terms for which such amounts are made available to the Corporation.

SEC. 8. Funds: The Corporation is authorized to use in the conduct of its business all its funds and other assets, including capital and net earnings therefrom, and all funds and other assets which have been or may hereafter be transferred or allocated to, borrowed by, or otherwise acquired by it.

SEC. 9. Directors: The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a Board of Directors (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"), subject to the general direction and control of the Secretary who shall be a director and serve as Chairman of the Board. The Board shall consist of not less than 3 nor more than 11 persons employed in the Department of Agriculture who shall be appointed by and hold office at the pleasure of the Secretary. The directors so appointed shall receive no compensation for their services as directors. Nothing herein contained shall preclude any director from serving the Corporation in any other capacity and receiving compensation therefor.

SEC. 10. Personnel of Corporation: The Secretary shall appoint such officers and employees as may be necessary for the conduct of the business of the Corporation, define their authority and duties, delegate to them

such of the powers vested in the Corporation as he may determine, require that such of them as he may designate be bonded and fix the penalties therefor. The Corporation may pay the premium of any bond or bonds. With the exception of experts, appointments shall be made pursuant to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended (5 U. S. C., 1940 ed. 661).

SEC. 11. Cooperation with other governmental agencies: The Corporation may, with the consent of the agency concerned, accept and utilize, on a compensated or uncompensated basis, the officers, employees, services, facilities, and information of any agency of the Federal Government, including any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture, and of any State, the District of Columbia, any Territory or possession, or any political subdivision thereof. The Corporation may allot to any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture or transfer to such other agencies as it may request to assist it in the conduct of its business any of the funds available to it for administrative expenses. The personnel and facilities of the Corporation may, with the consent of the Corporation be utilized on a reimbursable basis by any agency of the Federal Government, including any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture, in the performance of any part or all of the functions of such agency.

SEC. 12. Utilization of associations and trade facilities: The Corporation may, in the conduct of its business, utilize on a contract or fee basis, committees or associations of producers, producer-owned and producer-controlled cooperative associations, and trade facilities.

SEC. 13. Records; annual report: The Corporation shall at all times maintain complete and accurate books of account and shall file annually with the Secretary a complete report as to the business of the Corporation, a copy of which shall be forwarded by the Secretary to the President for transmission to the Congress.

SEC. 14. Interest of Members of the Congress: The provisions of section 1 of the act of February 27, 1877, as amended (41 U. S. C., 1940 ed. 22), shall apply to all contracts or agreements of the Corporation, except contracts or agreements of a kind which the Corporation may enter into with farmers participating in a program of the Corporation.

SEC. 15. Crimes and offenses.—

FALSE STATEMENTS; OVERVALUATION OF SECURITIES

(a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Corporation, or for the purpose of obtaining for himself for another, money, property, or anything of value, under this act, or under any other act applicable to the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment by not more than 5 years, or both.

EMBEZZLEMENT, AND SO FORTH; FALSE ENTRIES; FRAUDULENT ISSUE OF OBLIGATIONS OF CORPORATION

(b) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Corporation or any of its programs, (i) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any money, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to the Corporation or pledged or otherwise entrusted to it; or (ii) with intent to defraud the Corporation, or any other body, politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Corporation, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of, or to, the Corporation, or draws any order, or issues, puts forth or assigns any note or other obligation or draft, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof; or (iii) with intent to defraud the Corporation, participates or shares in, or receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefits through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

LARCENY; CONVERSION OF PROPERTY

(c) Whoever shall willfully steal, conceal, remove, dispose of, or convert to his own use or to that of another any property owned or held by, or mortgaged or pledged to, the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT OFFENSE

(d) Whoever conspires with another to accomplish any of the acts made unlawful by the preceding provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to the same fine or imprisonment, or both, as is applicable in the case of conviction for doing such unlawful acts.

GENERAL STATUTES APPLICABLE

(e) All the general penal statutes relating to crimes and offenses against the United States shall apply with respect to the Corporation, its property, money, contracts and agreements, employees, and operations: *Provided*, That such general penal statutes shall not apply to the extent that they relate to crimes and offenses punishable under subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of this section: *Provided further*, That sections 114 and 115 of the act of March 4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C., 1940 ed. 204, 205) shall not apply to contracts or agreements of a kind which the Corporation may enter into with farmers participating in a program of the Corporation.

SEC. 16. Transfer of assets of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation: The assets, funds, property, and records of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, are hereby transferred to the Corporation. The rights, privileges, and powers, and the duties and liabilities of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, in respect to any contract, agreement, loan, account, or other obligation shall become the rights, privileges, and powers, and the duties and liabilities, respectively, of the Corporation. The enforceable claims of or against Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall become the claims of or against, and may be enforced by or against, the Corporation.

SEC. 17. Dissolution of Delaware corporation: The Secretary, representing the United States as the sole owner of the capital stock of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, is hereby authorized and directed to institute or cause to be instituted such proceedings as are required for the dissolution of said Corporation under the laws of the State of Delaware. The costs of such dissolution of said Corporation shall be borne by the Corporation.

SEC. 18. Corporation administrative accounts: In the event that the personnel or facilities of any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of or within the Department of Agriculture, including the Corporation, are utilized in the performance of functions, including those of the Corporation, for which separate funds are available, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed, upon the request of the Secretary, to establish one or more separate accounts into which there may be transferred, by advance payment or reimbursement, all or any part, as determined by the Secretary, of the funds available for administrative expenses in the performance of such functions. The funds so transferred shall be expended only for the purpose for which appropriated or made available.

SEC. 19. Effective date: This act shall take effect on July 1, 1948.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. On behalf of myself, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, line 13, after the words "fee basis", it is proposed to insert the words "privately owned and operated plants and facilities."

On page 10, line 15, it is proposed to strike out all after the word "and" and insert in lieu thereof "shall to the fullest extent practicable utilize existing trade channels for the marketing, sale, and distribution of such agricultural commodities."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have proposed this amendment to the bill, S. 1322, providing a Federal Charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation. Under section 12 of the bill as reported by the Committee emphasis is put only upon committees, associations of producers and producer-owned and producer-controlled cooperative associations in the utilization of facilities to conduct the business of the Corporation. I have prepared an amendment, which would not detract in any manner from the language now used in section 12, providing for the utilization of these facilities. I have, however, added additional language which would spell out in greater detail and with more emphasis that the Corporation shall, wherever feasible, utilize the facilities of private enterprise.

Those who believe in the free enterprise system will, I am certain, join with me in the adoption of this amendment.

I understand that the Senator from Vermont is willing to accept this amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, the amendment is in line with the method now being used by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Corporation seems to be operating as satisfactorily now as it has at any time in its existence, and I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that the two amendments to be offered by the Senator from Delaware are in line with the present practice of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Generally and consistently the Commodity Credit Corporation has followed the practices called for by the two amendments. But since the proposal now is the granting of a Federal charter over a period of years, the Corporation will be operating with rather extended and extensive powers, and it was deemed advisable that it be made abundantly clear in the act itself granting the charter, or chartering the Corporation, that the present practices were to be adhered to with respect to its commodity transactions.

I am pleased to cooperate with the Senator from Delaware. Both of us seem to have drawn amendments in substantially, though not identically, the same language.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not wish to discuss at any length the issue now before the Senate. I ask simply to have published in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement by H. E. Sanford, of Portland, Oreg., dealing with the problem. I think Mr. Sanford's statement commends itself to the consideration of the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF H. E. SANFORD, PORTLAND, OREG., BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

I appear before you as chairman of the National Grain Trade Council, an organization comprising all organized grain exchanges within the United States, plus six national grain and feed associations.

We come before this committee to present the views of the grain industry on H. R. 6214, cited as the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act. This bill seems improved in several respects as compared with the Senate bill, S. 1322, reported recently by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. There are a few points, however, upon which we would like to comment.

The basic foundation of our price policy for agriculture rests in the crop-loan and price-support programs. For these programs an instrument like Commodity Credit Corporation is needed. We prefer that the resulting activities in grain be handled by a corporate agency rather than by a governmental bureau. We should dislike to see these activities transferred away from the present experienced personnel to some other Government agency. For these reasons we favor the granting of a Federal charter to Commodity Credit Corporation.

We ask, however, that the proposed Federal charter be reasonably definite in its assignment of powers and authority to the Corporation. While the charter must be flexible enough to permit the Corporation to operate, it should by its terms limit the activities to the functions and objectives intended by Congress.

We ask the committee to bear in mind that it is dealing with a Corporation with a combined capital and borrowing power of nearly $5,000,000,000. Secretary Dodd has testified recently that the annual turnover has been between eight and nine billion dollars. This volume of business in itself constitutes a terrific bestowal of power. Increasing numbers of individuals and firms throughout the United States are dependent on the good will of Commodity Credit Corporation for a large part of their business existence. Satisfactory as the business may be, they fear the power of any single agency to grant them those favors or to take them away.

For these reasons we ask that certain safeguards be erected for the purpose of insuring adequate control of the Corporation by Congress. While it is true that this is only a charter, and that the authorities come specifically from other legislation, we remind the committee that these separate authorities are strewn through a maze of statutes, appropriation bills, directives, and executive orders dating back for many years. It is almost impossible to know what can or cannot be done. It is likely that somewhere in the statutes, justification can be found for almost any action.

The rewriting of this charter, we believe, provides Congress with a simple means of limiting the powers to those which Congress intends.

To assist in this, we have prepared a draft of a substitute bill to H. R. 6214. We hope this may be useful to your committee in comparing some of the provisions, and we offer it herewith as part of the record.

The substitute bill follows the more usual form for corporate charters in that the purposes and objects of the Corporation are set forth at the outset. This has proved more desirable than to have the various duties and powers scattered throughout the charter, where they may be ambiguous and are not readily determined without careful study.

I do not intend to take the committee's time discussing all the details of either bill, but will mention only the principal differences as follows:

1. We recommend that the Corporation shall have corporate succession only until July 1, 1950, rather than be granted a perpetual charter as provided in section 4 (a) of H. R. 6214.

Two compelling reasons favor this:

(a) The Agriculture Committees of both Houses are considering long-range agricultural legislation. This is so vast a problem that it seems possible no major change may be made this year. Secretary Anderson was asked at the hearing before the Senate Agriculture Committee on Monday last, to prepare stand-by legislation for use in case permanent legislation required further study. If Commodity Credit's charter is limited to 2 years, its authority may, in the interim, be tailored to fit the requirements of new legislation. If at the end of 2 years, it is still a necessary and satisfactory instrument, it will be a simple matter to extend its life.

(b) The act of July 7, 1947, Public Law 162, established a bipartisan Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch. This Commission is to study and investigate the present organization and methods of operation of all departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch and to determine what is necessary to limit expenditures; to eliminate duplication and overlapping of services, activities, and functions; and to consolidate, abolish, and define services, functions, and activities. Former President Hoover has been named Chairman of the Commission. Congressmen CLARENCE BROWN and MANASCO are members of the Commission. A committee has been appointed to study the organization of the Department of Agriculture. That committee has, it is our understanding, commenced its investigation. If Congress were, prior to receiving the recommendations of this special study group, to establish within the Department of Agriculture a corporate agency with perpetual existence and broad powers, the agency, so established, would stand as a huge Gibraltar about which recommended eliminations, consolidations, and cost-saving operations would need to flow. The accomplishment of recommended changes might be impossible.

As a matter of fact, Secretary Anderson used this same argument in testifying last Monday before the Senate Agriculture Committee on the suggested National Agricultural Council established in the proposed Agricultural Act of 1948. He said, "I would certainly raise the question as to whether we want to go into this general field before the report of the President's Commission on Organization which as you all know is now at work under the chairmanship of Mr. Herbert Hoover."

2. Section 4 (g), to the first sentence: "May enter into and carry out such contracts or agreements as it deems necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business," we would add, "to the extent authorized by law and as provided for in budgets submitted to Congress under the Government Corporation Control Act, and approved by Congress."

This paragraph should be further amended to permit the Corporation to consent to the modification of contracts or agreements, in their terms and conditions.

3. Section 4 (h): We urge that the Corporation be denied authority to acquire real property or any interest therein, or to acquire or lease warehouses, elevators, mills, gins, processing plants, railroads or other transportation facilities, barges, boats, or wharves; except that this shall not prevent the Corporation from contracting for the use of any of the foregoing in accordance with the usual customs of trade and commerce, or preventing the Corporation from renting or leasing office space.

Our reason for the above is obvious. All of those facilities are available in this country to handle the flow of grain and other commodities in commerce. We consider it a threat to business—and even to farmers—to give any governmental agency the power to acquire commercial facilities. Private individuals cannot compete with what amounts virtually to a $5,000,000,000 Government corporation, clothed with broad powers and not under any necessity of making a profit, and they should not be exposed to this risk.

4. Section 4 (1): This reads: "May make such loans and advances of its funds as it deems necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business."

We think this power is broader than is required for accomplishing the purposes and objectives of the Corporation and recommend that it be amended to read: "May make loans and advances of its funds on agricultural commodities to the extent authorized by law."

5. Section 5. Specific powers: We recommend that the opening paragraph be amended by inserting in line 12, after the word "purposes", the following language: "as specifically authorized by law."

6. Section 5 (a) might be broadened by reading: "Support the prices of agricultural commodities through loans, purchases, payments, guaranties, and purchase and guaranty agreements."

7. Section 5 (b): This reads: "Make available materials and facilities required in connection with the production and marketing of agricultural commodities."

We recommend the addition of the following language: "but nothing herein is to be construed as authority to acquire, own, rent, or lease real property or transportation facilities."

8. Section 5: We respectfuly urge that this section be amended by adding a new paragraph (h), or that a new section be added reading as follows:

"In the Corporation's purchasing and selling operations with respect to agricultural commodities (except sales to other Government agencies), and in the warehousing, transporting, processing, or handling of agricultural commodities, the Corporation shall utilize the usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of private trade and commerce."

We believe that this principle of government is in keeping with the thinking of the present Congress as indicated by the provision in section 112 (h) of the Foreign Assistance Act recently passed, as follows:

"In providing for the performance of any of the functions described in subsection (a) of section 111, the Administrator shall, to the maximum extent consistent with the accomplishment of the purposes of this title, utilize private channels of trade."

It is inconsistent, for example, that we, as a nation, should be preaching democracy and private enterprise throughout the world, while at the same time foreign buyers of wheat can procure supplies only from the United States Government.

Our export houses for many years have had their own offices or business connections in foreign countries. With a few minor exceptions of short duration, they have not been permitted to handle United States wheat exports for about 7 years. We do not believe it is the policy of this committee or of the Congress to expand or maintain the role of Government in business, or to bar private firms from their normal business for so long a period. This matter will be discussed in detail by witnesses for the exporters at a later date.

9. Section 8, capital stock, and section 9, funds. The substitute bill which we have offered includes the following provisions in its section 6 (e), which the committee might wish to consider:

"There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Treasury, to be paid over to the Corporation from time to time as may be necessary to cover losses of the Corporation, such sums as are estimated in advance for such purpose in the Corporation's budgets submitted in accordance with the Government Corporation Control Act and approved by the Congress."

In closing let me remind the committee that the original purpose of Commodity Credit Corporation was to protect farm income. The laws passed for this purpose give the Secretary of Agriculture the power to take all business away from private firms. We merely ask that you give it back to us.

Our industry today exists by the kindness of the administrative policy of Commodity Credit Corporation. When individuals and firms depend increasingly for their business upon a single powerful customer, they are in an exceedingly precarious position. There is a growing fear of offending the customer by any criticism or complaint. This is the basic philosophy behind the democratic objection to government in business. State trading carries with it such vast economic power that inevitably the time comes when private citizens are frightened into political submission; no longer do they dare to criticize or to raise their voices.

We believe this is the reason that Congress has started writing "private handling" clauses into legislation involving government in business. We respectfully petition the committee to provide this common safeguard in the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment B offered by the Senator from Delaware on behalf of himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. On behalf of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], and myself I offer amendment lettered "C" and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, beginning after the period in line 22, it is proposed to strike out down through line 4 on page 9, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

The Board shall consist of four members (in addition to the Secretary), who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Each appointed member of the Board shall hold office for a term of 4 years, except that (a) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (b) the terms of office of members first taking office after the date of enactment of this act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, one at the end of 1 year, one at the end of 2 years, one at the end of 3 years, and one at the end of 4 years, after the date of enactment of this act. In addition to their duties as members of the Board, such appointed members shall perform such other duties as may be prescribed by the Secretary. Each appointed member of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 per annum, except that any such member who holds another office or position in the Department of Agriculture the compensation for which exceeds such rate may elect to receive compensation at the rate provided for such other office or position in lieu of the compensation provided by this section.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, as an explanation of the reason why I think it is essential that we should confirm these members, I have prepared a brief review of the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the past 15 years, and I should like to present it at this time for the RECORD.

The Commodity Credit Corporation was incorporated under the laws of the State of Delaware on October 17, 1933, with capitalization of $3,000,000, subscribed for in the name of the United States Government by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration under the authorization of section 220 of the National Industrial Recovery Act. On April 10, 1936, the Corporation's capitalization was increased to $100,000,000, the additional $97,000,000 of the Corporation's stock being acquired by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the name of the United States Government. The act of March 8 1938 (52 Stat. 108) authorized the Corporation, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, to issue and have outstanding bonds, notes, debentures, and similar obligations in an aggregate amount not to exceed $500,000,000, fully guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States Government. The borrowing power of the Corporation was increased by successive amendments to the act of March 8, 1938, until now the Corporation is authorized to borrow $4,750,000,000 on the credit of the United States. On February 18, 1946, the Corporation was granted an additional $500,000,000 to be held as a reserve for postwar support of agriculture, bringing the total capitalization of this Corporation, exclusive of borrowing capacity, as of June 30, 1947, to $600,000,000.

In addition to this paid-in capitalization of $600,000,000, there has been appropriated to this Corporation between the years 1933 and 1946, inclusive, either as direct appropriations by Congress or cancellation of notes by the Treasury Department, $1,964,004,046.28.

As an additional source of capital, on August 24, 1935, under Public Law 320, Seventy-fourth Congress (49 Stat., p. 750), Congress authorized that 30 percent of the customs receipts should be turned over to the Secretary of Agriculture to be used to subsidize the export or domestic consumption of agricultural products. During the years 1936 to 1946, inclusive, the revenues derived from this source, known as section 32 funds, have amounted to $1,133,726,295. Thus, the combined total of the funds available for these programs equaled $3,697,730,341.28.

A review of the annual report of the Commodity Credit Corporation as of June 30, 1947, discloses that the Secretary of Agriculture, in the combined operations of these two funds, has sustained a loss between the years 1933 and 1946, inclusive, of $3,139,785,495 and that the Commodity Credit Corporation itself, as of that date, had a balance or a net worth of $557,944,847.

These combined losses are summarized by years in a table which I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE NO. 1.—*Statement of financial operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, including sec. 32 funds*

End of fiscal year	Capitalization (a)	Restoration of capital impairment by U. S. Treasury (b)	Sec. 32 funds (c)	Cumulative total capital (columns (a), (b) and (c)) (d)	Cumulative gain or loss (e)
1933	[1] $3,000,000	0	0	$3,000,000.00	0
1934	0	0	0	3,000,000.00	$730,367
1935	0	0	0	3,000,000.00	1,644,575
1936	[2] 97,000,000	0	$16,958,085	116,958,085.00	[3] 33,031,078
1937	0	0	15,451,587	132,409,672.00	[3] 55,092,520
1938	0	[4] $94,285,404.73	55,650,977	282,346,053.73	[3] 110,691,738
1939	0	[4] 119,599,918.05	81,326,615	483,272,586.78	[3] 190,982,641
1940	0	[5] 43,756,731.01	189,642,890	629,158,745.77	[3] 394,190,287
1941	0	[4] 1,637,445.51	219,365,779	850,161,970.28	[3] 647,254,409
1942	0	[5] 27,815,513.68	188,880,813	1,011,227,269.60	[3] 766,599,715
1943	0	0	93,368,302	1,104,595,571.60	[3] 964,603,919
1944	0	[4] 256,764,881.04	52,516,889	1,413,877,341.64	[3] 1,397,772,469
1945	0	[6] 921,456,561.00	58,377,445	2,393,711,347.64	[3] 2,290,994,088
1946	[7] 500,000,000	[6] 641,832,080.64	86,647,936	3,622,191,364.28	[3] 3,208,022,837
1947	0	0	75,538,977	3,697,730,341.28	[3] 3,079,834,799
Total	600,000,000	1,964,004,046.28	1,133,726,295	3,697,730,341.28	[3] 3,079,834,799
Reserve for postwar price support of agriculture					59,950,695
Total					[3] 3,139,785,494

Capitalization and appropriations	$3,697,730,341
Cumulative loss sustained, 1933 through 1947—sec. 32 funds and the Commodity Credit Corporation (column (e))	3,139,785,494
Net worth as of June 30, 1947	557,944,847

[1] Original capitalization. Subscribed by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Governor of Farm Credit Administration. The funds for such subscription were derived from the appropriation authorized by sec. 220 of the National Industrial Recovery Act (48 Stat. 210), and made by the Fourth Deficiency Act, fiscal year 1933 (48 Stat. 274).

[2] In accordance with the act of Apr. 10, 1936 (15 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 713a), the Corporation's capitalization was increased to $100,000,000, the additional $97,000,000 of the Corporation's stock being acquired by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

[3] Loss.

[4] Appropriation.

[5] Payment to U. S. Treasury.

[6] Restoration by note cancellation.

[7] Paid to the Corporation to be held as a reserve for postwar price support of agriculture in accordance with the act of Feb. 18, 1946 (60 Stat. 6).

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have two additional tables, the first of which shows a break-down by commodities and years of that portion of the loss which was sustained by the Commodity Credit Corporation itself, amounting to $1,831,498,139; the second shows a break-down as to commodities and the expenditures of section 32 funds during the same period. I ask unanimous consent that these tables be incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE NO. 2.—*Program results from Oct. 17, 1933, through June 30, 1947*

Program	Cumulative, Oct. 17, 1933, to June 30, 1941	Fiscal year ended June 30—						Cumulative, Oct. 17, 1933, to June 30, 1947
		1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	
Subsidy programs:								
Apple freight equalization				[1] $3,047,115	[1] $182,603			[1] $3,229,718
Beef production					[1] 5,000,156	[1] $33,204,163	$1,299,861	[1] 36,904,458
Barley for feed						[1] 6,994		[1] 6,994
Beans, dry edible				[1] 4,235,607	[1] 3,676,691	[1] 5,224,155	170,920	[1] 12,965,533
Cheese, Cheddar			[1] $11,437,554	[1] 26,101,634	[1] 18,472,810	[1] 11,674,918	52,132	[1] 67,634,784
Cocoa			[1] 100,903	[1] 1,036				[1] 101,939
Coffee			[1] 2,606,725	[1] 4,227,886	[1] 476,558	99,271	[1] 5,630	[1] 7,217,528
Corn ceiling price adjustment			[1] 359,755	[1] 1,166,751	[1] 9,252	79		[1] 1,535,679
Corn for alcohol [2]		[1] $1,600,000	[1] 2,800,000					[1] 4,400,000
Corn purchase and shelling				[1] 1,697,048	[1] 1,920,359	[1] 2,257		[1] 3,619,664
Corn importation					[1] 2,106,398	1,026		[1] 2,105,372
Dairy production				[1] 153,136,335	[1] 532,253,665	519,390,647	[1] 1,462,810	[1] 1,206,243,457
Flaxseed						[1] 503,374	109,670	[1] 393,704
Fruits for processing				[1] 18,811,060	[1] 23,579,833	[1] 32,036,548	[1] 341,455	[1] 74,768,896
Hay for dairymen				[1] 2,697,103	198,161			[1] 2,498,942
Milk, fluid			[1] 2,719,720	[1] 8,897,342	[1] 12,902,735	[1] 13,143,008	[1] 463,283	[1] 38,126,088
Millfeed price support			[1] 163,062	24,944				[1] 138,118
Oilseeds and products:								
Peanut butter				[1] 5,563,880	[1] 9,051,802	[1] 4,972,949	31,043	[1] 19,557,588
Peanuts				10,356,565	[1] 9,119,557	[1] 6,477,244	[1] 965,213	[1] 6,205,449
Shortening				[1] 391,808	[1] 1,007,560	[1] 522,588	5,672	[1] 1,916,284
Soybeans			[1] 5,153,893	[1] 15,978,998	[1] 43,413,901	[1] 34,781,641	316,406	[1] 99,012,027
Vegetable oils and meals			[1] 8,919,376	2,054,403	[1] 36,386	[1] 2,465		[1] 6,903,824
Pear freight equalization					[1] 142,237			[1] 142,237
Phosphate fertilizer					[1] 89,344			[1] 89,344
Pork purchase				[1] 330				[1] 330
Sheep and lamp production						[1] 41,427,240	[1] 1,810,912	[1] 43,238,152
Sugar			[1] 8,194,706	[1] 39,007,814	[1] 9,641,613	[1] 69,710,147	8,435,112	[1] 118,119,168
Vegetables for processing				[1] 20,938,233	[1] 14,476,131 [3]	[1] 63,093,441	12,138,179	[1] 86,369,626
Vegetables, frozen					[1] 498,283	[1] 7,996,688	4,834,755	[1] 3,660,216
Wheat for alcohol [2]		[1] 800,000	[1] 21,900,000					[1] 22,700,000
Wheat for feed		[1] 5,900,000	[1] 81,100,000	[1] 96,600,000	[1] 53,800,000	[1] 1,032,023	19,713	[1] 238,412,310
Total subsidy programs		[1] 8,300,000	[1] 145,455,694	[1] 390,064,068	[1] 741,659,713	[1] 845,102,114	22,364,160	[1] 2,108,217,429
Other programs:								
Ammonium nitrate					45,958	174,148	[1] 11,857	208,249
Barley		4,606	10,590	143,440	[1] 16,943	[1] 464,482	694,627	371,838
Beans and peas, dry edible				[1] 160,665	[1] 2,538	[1] 19,562	803	[1] 181,962
Castor beans			[1] 3,521		[1] 167,555	3,373		[1] 167,703
Corn	[1] $20,078,488	[1] 9,478,707	[1] 4,461,707	810,976	[1] 7,268,333	7,236,315	6,013,354	27,226,590
Cotton	[1] 27,401,798	63,334,939	25,525,792	27,373,731	22,940,882	79,152,962	46,536,525	237,463,033
Cotton, Puerto Rican					[1] 12,130	[1] 113,881	[1] 4,187	[1] 130,198
Cotton, American-Egyptian, Sea Island				[1] 156,121	151,153	[1] 533,605	37,023	[1] 501,550
Cotton, Egyptian					4,548,868	869,325	457,029	5,875,222
Cotton, export					[2] 951,507	31,798,547	[1] 19,225,915	[1] 53,975,969
Cotton, rubber barter		11,090,907		[1] 35,456				11,055,451
Cotton, burlap, and jute fabrics			2,769		3,586	[1] 47,959		[1] 41,604
Cotton, linters				1,283,411	158,344	150,796	237	1,592,788
Cotton, supply							24,628	24,628
Dairy animals			[1] 115,672	[1] 537,168	[1] 2,856	112	[1] 104	[1] 655,688
Eggs						[1] 224,002	423,602	199,600
Feed for Government facilities					460	[1] 1,283	1,284	461
Flax, fibers							[1] 122,636	[1] 122,636
Flaxseed			[1] 40	[1] 257	[1] 21,712	[1] 200	2,727	[1] 19,482
Foreign commodities			[1] 1,152,771	23,856,582	[1] 4,201,934	[2] 8,421,457	20,414,919	[2] 47,338,253
General commodities purchases							[4] 161,915,684	[4] 161,915,684
General supply							26,438,161	26,438,161
Grain bins				[1] 13,148,494	[1] 4,782,843	7,843,899	721,069	[1] 9,366,369
Grain sorghums			2,555	1,424	[1] 61,138	706,593	[1] 24,614	624,820
Hemp and milkweed floss				[1] 329,072	[1] 11,865,448	[1] 8,125,482	[1] 1,257,169	[1] 21,577,171
Hops	[1] 162,036	[1] 799,011			6,847			[1] 954,200
Idle farm machinery						16		16
Livestock procurement						22,186	92,821	115,007
Milk, dried							[1] 12,487	[1] 12,487
Molasses							23,674	23,674
Naval stores	[1] 4,435,579	27,014	430,747	3,962,806	1,084,011	493,283	[1] 460	1,561,822
Oats				26,512	[1] 9,212	[1] 740,224	532,030	1,289,554
Peanuts					[1] 386,055		727,481	341,426
Peanut equipment							[1] 376,110	[1] 376,110
Peanut seed notes							39,816	39,816
Pecans			[1] 3,751					[1] 3,751
Potatoes, white				[1] 3,467,589	[1] 12,958,355	[1] 8,771,278	[1] 60,091,288	[1] 85,288,510
Potatoes, sweet							95	95
Raisins		[1] 111,337			1,848			[1] 109,489
Rye	[1] 4,575	29,489	[1] 51,582	251,395	[1] 139,824	113,897	24,958	223,758
Seeds, miscellaneous			[1] 597,945	944	[1] 263,966	[1] 429,163	[1] 23,061	[1] 1,313,191
Sorgo			[1] 59,399	[1] 6,615				[1] 66,014
Soybeans							2,741,090	2,741,090
Soybean oil					31,179	[1] 10,406	67,494	88,267
Spruce logs, Alaska			[1] 22,522		[1] 2,368,961	270,255	[1] 21,865	[1] 2,143,093
Tobacco	[1] 2,107,589	[1] 12,099	[1] 96,895	7,395,210	2,349,554	1,617,865	596,186	9,742,232
Vegetables, canned						[1] 6,888	12,831	5,743
Wheat	[1] 6,199,460	5,089,029	28,505,494	[1] 28,412,822	[1] 16,947,002	23,157,655	17,517,267	22,710,161
Wheat, export					[1] 993,084	[1] 216,361	[1] 618	[1] 1,210,063
Women's land army						[1] 41,323		[1] 41,323
Wool	[1] 176			[1] 569,225	[1] 1,086,068	[1] 14,178,870	[1] 33,484,669	[1] 49,319,008
Unallocated						11,134	[1] 470,532	[1] 459,398
Total other programs	[1] 60,389,701	69,174,830	47,912,142	18,282,947	[1] 35,184,774	66,002,203	170,929,643	276,727,290
Total gains and losses from program operations	[1] 60,389,701	60,874,830	[1] 97,543,552	[1] 371,781,121	[1] 776,844,487	[1] 779,099,911	[1] 193,293,803	[1] 1,831,490,139

[1] Loss
[2] Estimated.
[3] Included gain of $794,100 reported by Office of Foreign Contract Settlement in 1946.
[4] Includes gain of $178,697,602 carried as Special Reserves—General Commodities Purchase Program as of June 30, 1946, and transferred to income in May of 1947.

TABLE NO. 3.—*Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities—expenditures by commodity groups and projects, fiscal years 1936–47*

	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946 [1]	1947 [1]	Total
Cotton:													
Stamp plan					$40,000	$2,725,000	$3,450,000						$6,215,000
Supplemental plan						17,802,000							17,802,000
Purchases	$3,331,325		$926,837	$1,347,039	13,563,350	26,902,710	1,346,020		$140				47,417,421
Export				17,335	35,636,762	6,180,713	6,363,091				$15,840,377	$33,370,968	97,409,246
Diversion	728,653	$6,836	133,829	530,057	232,290	398,518	1,078,933	$6,475,499	1,319,496	$273,764	3,264,724	1,688,645	16,131,244
Total	4,059,978	6,836	1,060,666	1,894,431	49,472,402	54,008,941	12,238,044	6,475,499	1,319,636	273,764	19,105,101	35,059,613	184,974,911
Dairy:													
Stamp plan				39,453	3,010,000	10,272,000	10,323,000	2,544,000					26,188,453
Purchases		368,386	5,876,612	38,932,498	14,060,014	2,472,891	15,187,386	1,265,537	3,610,624				81,773,948
Export				23,955	121,179								145,134
Diversion					693,027	2,110,829	3,869,232	6,573,436					13,246,524
Total		368,386	5,876,612	38,995,906	17,884,220	14,855,720	29,379,618	10,382,973	3,610,624				121,354,059
Fruits:													
Stamp plan				35,926	2,453,000	11,026,000	17,657,000	6,330,000					37,501,926
Purchases	2,182,843	6,110,183	16,739,000	10,910,314	22,757,863	21,741,880	12,216,226	5,509,079	1,242,780	3,069,212	787,496	28,295	103,295,171
Export		514	19,151	39,377	59,475								118,517
Diversion	256,438	179,525	571,894	866,182	286,759	232,938	93,898						2,487,634
Total	2,439,281	6,290,222	17,330,045	11,851,799	25,557,097	33,000,818	29,967,124	11,839,079	1,242,780	3,069,212	787,496	28,295	143,403,248
Grain:													
Stamp plan				12,670	2,916,000	13,800,000	21,896,000	10,939,000					49,563,670
Purchases	5,610,046	422,178	13,734,001	9,107,360	30,263,103	4,213,088	3,042,279	1,541,825	945				67,934,825
Export	154,261	231,112	78,961	9,116,007	11,115,141	4,465,971	4,217,037	6,656,673	1,313,993	4,154,712	3,740,075		45,243,943
Diversion					8,034								8,034
Total	5,764,307	653,290	13,812,962	18,236,037	44,302,278	22,479,059	29,155,316	19,137,498	1,314,938	4,154,712	3,740,075		162,750,472
Meats:													
Stamp plan					4,715,000	26,602,000	11,786,000						43,103,000
Purchases		107,229			20,969,768	4,123,363	2,435,175	440,000	367,194				28,442,729
Export					141,620								141,620
Total		107,229			25,826,388	30,725,363	14,221,175	440,000	367,194				71,687,349
Nuts:													
Purchases		139,682	180		206,827	311,605	977,393	1,450,014					3,085,701
Export	697,715	645,625	753,861	544,371	158,221								2,799,793
Diversion	898,023	759,053	3,113,295	653,876	1,742,938	8,895,202	1,315,709	279,837					17,657,933
Total	1,595,738	1,544,360	3,867,336	1,198,247	2,107,986	9,206,807	2,293,102	1,729,851					23,543,427
Poultry:													
Stamp plan				38,415	2,655,000	11,534,000	20,327,000	9,014,000					43,568,415
Purchases	198,604	2,136,766	1,726,868	532,134	12,834,520	3,213,263	5,650,967	2,881,850	5,883,402	3,072,033		10,700,000	48,830,407
Total	198,604	2,136,766	1,726,868	570,549	15,489,520	14,747,263	25,977,967	11,895,850	5,883,402	3,072,033		10,700,000	92,398,822
Tobacco:													
Export		3,881											3,881
Diversion	1,090,213	1,716,756	1,555,838	400,897			367,361	1,694,000	2,708,475				9,533,540
Total	1,090,213	1,720,637	1,555,838	400,897			367,361	1,694,000	2,708,475				9,537,421
Vegetables:													
Stamp plan				3,843	861,000	10,332,000	30,418,000	20,415,187					62,030,030
Purchases	1,707,599	1,365,684	6,632,906	5,429,351	2,769,886	12,496,852	4,609,489	1,268,944	3,688,430	2,961,179	6,732,268	20,613,935	70,276,523
Export											909,570	954,091	1,863,661
Diversion			1,309,768	33,164	54,577	1,895,744	366,956	213,932	2,715,394	233,489	857,708	4,714,231	12,394,963
Total	1,707,599	1,365,684	7,942,674	5,466,358	3,685,463	24,724,596	35,394,445	21,898,063	6,403,824	3,194,668	8,499,546	26,282,257	146,565,177
Miscellaneous:													
Purchases	6,517	983,970	570,928	1,089,743	758,072	8,896,903	3,503,456	626,453	239,269	19,599	66,614		16,761,524
Diversion	33,945	274,207	594,916	107,861	125,045	99,291	241,664						1,476,929
Total	40,462	1,258,177	1,165,844	1,197,604	883,117	8,996,194	3,745,120	626,453	239,269	19,599	66,614		18,238,453
School lunch [2]								975,334	25,777,837	41,067,410	50,474,990		118,295,571
Total	16,896,182	15,451,587	54,338,845	79,811,828	185,208,471	212,744,761	182,739,272	87,094,600	48,867,979	54,851,398	82,673,822	72,070,165	1,092,748,910

[1] Obligations.
[2] Cash payments only. Commodities purchased for school milk and lunch program shown under appropriate commodity head and not segregated as to distribution to school lunch or other authorized agencies.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Senate bill 1322, a bill to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation, which is now before the Senate, requires, in section 9, that "the Board of Directors shall consist of not less than 3 or more than 11 persons employed in the Department of Agriculture who shall be appointed by and hold office at the pleasure of the Secretary," in addition to the Secretary himself, who is designated to serve as Chairman of the Board.

I have prepared an amendment, a copy of which is on the desks of Senators. This amendment requires that in addition to the Secretary of Agriculture being designated as Chairman of the Board, the Board of Directors of the Corporation shall consist of four members who shall be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. It is my contention that the nominations of members of the Board of Directors of this Corporation, upon whom such broad powers of administration are being conferred by Congress, should require Senate confirmation. I particulary urge that we incorporate this requirement in the bill in view of the fact that it is proposed under this legislation to confer upon this unknown Board of Directors the power to borrow money and pledge the security of the United States Government itself in the amount of $4,750,000,000 in addition to transferring to their control the net worth of the Corporation, which in itself exceeds $500,000,000. There is nothing unusual in this procedure, since it is only a continuation of the same principles under which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and other Government corporations operate. The laws with respect to all of them require that the Board of Directors must be confirmed by the Senate.

Perhaps the paramount reason for requiring Senate confirmation in appointments of trust is that the President of the United States, in selecting men to occupy such positions, will have greater regard for their character and fitness than he would otherwise have if no Senate confirmation were required.

Since under the Reorganization Act which the Congress passed during the Seventy-ninth Congress all corporations of this character are required to be chartered by the Congress, I believe that it would be dangerous to establish a precedent here today by making an exception to the rule that members of Boards of Directors of Government corporations be required to be confirmed by the United States Senate.

Another reason why I would require confirmation by the Senate of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation is to prevent a recurrence of recent unpleasant developments. Senators will recall that a few months ago the Commodity Credit Corporation and other Government procurement agencies, through their haphazard buying methods, intentionally or otherwise, had been charged with manipulating our commodity markets. At that time it was difficult or impossible for the investigators to determine who in the Commodity Credit Corporation was responsible for the leaks on buying schedules which occurred or which official was charged with the responsibility of conducting their buying programs. My amendment would place a greater responsibility upon the President and upon the United States Senate to see to it that men of the highest character and ability are appointed to these offices. I know of no other way under the functions of our Government whereby we can insure that this will be done other than by the power of confirmation by the Senate, with instructions that these men must make an annual report to Congress of their operations.

Mr. President, I ask that this amendment be accepted.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware on behalf of himself and his colleagues leaves the way clear for the Board of the Commodity Credit Corporation to be chosen from among officials of the Department of Agriculture, although requiring them to be designated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. I do not believe that this will hamper the work of the Commodity Corporation. I believe that most, if not all, the members of the Board should be chosen from the Department of Agriculture, because the very nature of their work requires them to be familiar with practically all the work of the Department of Agriculture. Furthermore, members of the Board are under the direction of the Secretary, according to this amendment, at such times as they are not employed in Commodity Credit Corporation work. I see no seriously harmful effects upon the Commodity Credit Corporation work through the adoption of this amendment. However, I ask the Senator from Delaware if he would agree to a six-member Board besides the Secretary of Agriculture, rather than a four-member Board. The reason is that the Board members must be familiar with so many different branches of work. They must have full knowledge of the price-support program, of surpluses, and of shortages. They must know about the production goals which have been laid down. They must be familiar with the marketing quotas. They must deal with the school-lunch program. They must decide how to spend section 32 funds, and also must be familiar with both domestic and foreign requirements. It seems to me that a little larger Board than a four-member Board and the Secretary could perform these functions much better. I wonder if the Senator would be willing to modify his amendment to that extent. At the present time the Board consists of nine members, all officers or employees of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am not free to accept the suggestion of the Senator from Vermont, because some of the Senators who joined me in this amendment and who were most insistent that the Board consist of five members are not in the Chamber at this time. Therefore I could not agree to the modification of the amendment. The bill will have to go to the House. Perhaps some change could be made there. We could even let the bill go through with a five-member Board, and if we found that it did not work, the law could be amended later.

The Senator from Vermont raised this same question a short time ago. I asked the Library of Congress to check back and see how many members had been on the previous boards. While it is true that there are now nine members of the Board, it is also true that during 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944, and 1945 this Corporation operated with a membership of only five Directors. If the Board could operate with five members during that 6-year period, four of which were war years, when the Secretary of Agriculture had the power to enlarge the Board if he had seen fit, I do not see any reason why, in postwar years, the Board cannot operate with the same sized membership.

I should like to see the Senator from Vermont withhold his request and accept this amendment, which provides for a membership of four in addition to the Chairman, making a total of five, giving the Department of Agriculture the same number of directors with which the Board operated during the 6-year period mentioned. It is only recently that the membership has been raised to nine. I think we could at least try to operate on that basis.

Mr. AIKEN. The reason I made the suggestion was that I believe that the duties of the Commodity Credit Corporation are rather more diverse now, with the various relief programs in effect, than they were even during the war years.

I agree with the Senator that the Commodity Credit Corporation probably could function with either a five-man or a seven-man Board of Directors. However, realizing that this bill is likely to go to conference with the House of Representatives, I wish to make sure that the Senate provides for a sufficient number of Directors so that if the bill goes to conference and if the conferees on the part of the House insist upon having only three Directors, the Senate conferees will still have some grounds on which to reach a satisfactory agreement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if we in the Senate wish to have five members of the Board of Directors, I hardly see any necessity for providing for a greater number in the bill as we pass it, so that later we shall be able to split the difference with the House of Representatives. If we wish to have five Directors, I think we should provide for five. During the War, the Commodity Credit Corporation surely had more duties than it has now. If it could operate during the war period with five Directors, certainly there is no reason in the world why it cannot operate with five Directors today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont desire to offer an amendment to the modified amendment?

Mr. AIKEN. I think we should obtain the consensus of opinion of the Senators now present. Certainly I would not suggest the absence of a quorum or call for a yea-and-nay vote, but I move to modify the amendment by having it provide for six Directors, instead of four. I ask for a rising vote on that question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The appropriate terms of the amendment would also have to be changed in order to conform with the Senator's motion.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; I include in my motion any changes in the amendment which may be appropriate and necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Vermont for the further modification of amendment C of the Senator from Delaware. [Putting the question.]

The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. MORSE. I ask for a division.

On a division, the motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on agreeing to the modified amendment C, as offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there further amendments to be proposed?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, in line 18, after the word "name", it is proposed to insert "until June 30, 1960."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to state the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may the amendment be restated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be restated.

The Chief Clerk again read the amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, that amendment will be all right. As I understand it, it will extend the life of the corporation for 12 years, which will correspond to the length of life given the RFC in its charter.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is, instead of making the charter a perpetual one, as the pending bill now provides, to give the charter a life of 12 years, and to put it in the same class as the charter of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia for himself and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and myself, I offer the amendment which I now send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. Beginning with line 3 on page 6, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 11 on page 7, and insert the following:

SEC. 5. Limitations on authority: (a) The Corporation shall be limited in the exercise of the powers conferred upon it by this act to—

(1) Supporting the prices of agricultural commodities through loans, purchases, payments, and other operations.

(2) Making available materials and facilities required in connection with the production and marketing of agricultural commodities.

(3) Procuring agricultural commodities for sale to other Government agencies, foreign governments, and domestic, foreign, or international relief or rehabilitation agencies, and to meet domestic requirements.

(4) Removing and disposing of or aiding in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities.

(5) Increasing the domestic consumption of agricultural commodities by expanding or aiding in the expansion of domestic markets or by developing or aiding in the development of new and additional markets, marketing facilities, and uses for such commodities.

(6) Exporting or causing to be exported, or aiding in the development of foreign markets for, agricultural commodities.

(7) Carrying out such other operations as the Congress may specifically authorize or provide for.

(b) The Corporation shall not exercise any of the powers conferred upon it by this act to carry out any program unless such program is provided for in its annual budget program submitted to Congress pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to make it clear that this charter does not increase in any way the authority or power of the Commodity Credit Corporation and, furthermore, that it does not conflict with the provisions of the so-called Byrd-Butler Reorganization Act of the Corporation.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the amendment simply revises the language of the first paragraph of section 6, which specifically defines the powers of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The amendment is in line with what the committee intended. If there is doubt about the intent of the committee language in the first paragraph of section 6, the language proposed by the Senator from Virginia is acceptable to me, although I cannot speak for the full committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia for himself and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and myself, I offer the amendment which I now send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 14, it is proposed to strike out lines 7 to 20, inclusive; and in the committee amendment on page 14, in line 21, it is proposed to change the section number from 19 to 18.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this amendment would strike out section 18 on page 14. Section 18 permits the pooling of the administrative expenses of the Department of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation. I do not think a charter is any place in which to write legislation of that character. Furthermore, if that provision of the bill were adopted, it would deprive the Appropriations Committee of the power to allocate expenses as between the Department of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I cannot vote for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia. The purpose of section 18, as written into the bill, is to provide a certain degree of latitude for the Commodity Credit Corporation in handling its accounts. It would obviate the necessity of setting up different bookkeeping accounts for the particular hours of the day different men work on the affairs of the Commodity Credit Corporation or on the affairs of some division of the Department of Agriculture. I agree that the amendment, if adopted, probably would not terribly cripple the work of the Commodity Credit Corporation, unless at some future time there might be an interpretation by some other agency of the Government as to how these books should be set up and carried. If the amendment then were in force, it would deprive the Commodity Credit Corporation of the latitude it would need in carrying on its work to the best advantage. I do not say that that ever would happen or that the Commodity Credit Corporation ever would require such latitude in respect to carrying on its activities in such a way.

The Treasury Department has no objection to the provisions of the amendment.

As I have said, I cannot vote for the amendment; but I should like to have the Members of the Senate who are present at this time vote on the question of its adoption. On that question, I shall vote "no."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that section 18 is opposed by the General Accounting Office, which often does give the power to pool such expenses. In many instances the General Accounting Office has given that authority, and it has authority to approve it. But I do not think such power should be provided in this way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia for himself and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there further amendments to be proposed?

If there are no further amendments, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act."

SEC. 2. Creation and purposes: For the purpose of stabilizing, supporting, and protecting farm income and prices, assisting in the maintenance of balanced and adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, products thereof, foods, feeds, and fibers (hereinafter collectively referred to as "agricultural commodities"), and facilitating the orderly distribution of agricultural commodities, there is hereby created a body corporate to be known as the Commodity Credit Corporation (hereinafter referred to as the "Corporation"), which shall be an agency and instrumentality of the United States, within the Department of Agriculture, subject to the general direction and control of the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary").

SEC. 3. Offices: The Corporation may establish offices in such place or places as it may deem necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business.

SEC. 4. General powers: The Corporation—

(a) Shall have succession in its corporate name until June 30, 1960.

(b) May adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed.

(c) May sue and be sued, but no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Corporation or its property. The district courts of the United States, including the district court of the District of Columbia and of any Territory or possession, shall have exclusive original jurisdiction of all suits brought by or against the Corporation: *Provided*, That the Corporation may intervene in any court in any suit, action, or proceeding in which it has an interest. Any suit against the Corporation shall be brought in the District of Columbia, or in the district wherein the plaintiff resides or is engaged in business. No suit against the Corporation shall be allowed unless it shall have been brought within two years after the right accrued on which suit is brought. All suits against the Corporation shall be tried by the court without a jury. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Federal Tort Claims Act (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.) shall be applicable to the Corporation.

(d) May adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its business may be conducted and the powers vested in it may be exercised.

(e) Shall have all the rights, privileges and immunities of the United States, including, but not limited to, the right to priority of payment with respect to debts due from insolvent, deceased, or bankrupt debtors, and immunity from the imposition of court costs, fees, and charges, from the allowance of interest on claims and judgments, and from State and local statutes of limitations on suits, actions, or proceedings. The Corporation may assert such rights, privileges, and immunities in any suit, action, or proceeding.

(f) Shall be entitled to the use of the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as the executive departments of the Federal Government.

(g) May enter into and carry out such contracts or agreements as it deems necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business. The Corporation may, whenever it deems it necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business, consent to the modification of any term or condition of any contract or agreement of any kind to which it is a party. State and local regulatory laws or rules shall not be

applicable with respect to contracts or agreements of the Corporation or the parties thereto to the extent that such contracts or agreements provide that such laws or rules shall not be applicable, or to the extent that such laws or rules are inconsistent with such contracts or agreements.

(h) May in any manner acquire, hold, and dispose of such real and personal property or any interest therein as it deems necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business.

(i) May borrow money subject to any provision of law applicable to the Corporation. The Corporation shall at all times reserve a sufficient amount of its authorized borrowing power under the act of March 8, 1938 (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 713a–4), which, together with other funds available to the Corporation, will enable it to purchase, in accordance with its contracts with lending agencies, notes, or other obligations evidencing loans made by such agencies under the Corporation's programs.

(j) Shall determine the character of and the necessity for its obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid.

(k) Shall have authority to make final and conclusive settlement and adjustment of any claims by or against the Corporation or the accounts of its fiscal officers.

(l) May make such loans and advances of its funds as it deems necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business.

(m) Shall have such powers as may be necessary or appropriate for the exercise of the powers specifically vested in the Corporation, and all such incidental powers as are customary in corporations generally; but any research financed by the Corporation shall relate to the conservation or disposal of commodities owned or controlled by the Corporation and shall be conducted in collaboration with research agencies of the Department of Agriculture.

Beginning with line 3 on page 6, strike out all down to and including line 11 on page 7 and insert the following:

SEC. 5. Limitations on authority: (a) The Corporation shall be limited in the exercise of the powers conferred upon it by this act to—

(1) Supporting the prices of agricultural commodities through loans, purchases, payments, and other operations.

(2) Making available materials and facilities required in connection with the production and marketing of agricultural commodities.

(3) Procuring agricultural commodities for sale to other Government agencies, foreign governments, and domestic, foreign, or international relief or rehabilitation agencies, and to meet domestic requirements.

(4) Removing and disposing of or aiding in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities.

(5) Increasing the domestic consumption of agricultural commodities by expanding or aiding in the expansion of domestic markets or by developing or aiding in the development of new and additional markets, marketing facilities, and uses for such commodities.

(6) Exporting or causing to be exported, or aiding in the development of foreign markets for, agricultural commodities.

(7) Carrying out such other operations as the Congress may specifically authorize or provide for.

(b) The Corporation shall not exercise any of the powers conferred upon it by this act to carry out any program unless such program is provided for in its annual budget program submitted to Congress pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act.

SEC. 6. Existing statutes applicable to the Corporation: The Federal statutes applicable to Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall be applicable to the Corporation. Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall cease to be an agency of the United States as provided in section 7 (a) of the act of January 31, 1935, as amended (15 U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, 713 (a)).

SEC. 7. Capital stock: The Corporation shall have a capital stock of $100,000,000, which shall be subscribed by the United States. Such subscription shall be deemed to be fully paid by the transfer of assets to the Corporation pursuant to section 16 of this act. The Secretary is hereby authorized and directed to receive such stock and to exercise, on behalf of the United States, any and all rights of the United States arising out of the ownership of such stock. The Corporation shall pay interest to the United States Treasury on the amount of its capital stock, and on the amount of the obligations of the Corporation purchased by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to the act of March 8, 1938 (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 713a–4), at such rates as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be appropriate in view of the terms for which such amounts are made available to the Corporation.

SEC. 8. Funds: The Corporation is authorized to use in the conduct of its business all its funds and other assets, including capital and net earnings therefrom, and all funds and other assets which have been or may hereafter be transferred or allocated to, borrowed by, or otherwise acquired by it.

SEC. 9. Directors: The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a board of directors (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"), subject to the general direction and control of the Secretary who shall be a director and serve as Chairman of the Board. The Board shall consist of four members (in addition to the Secretary), who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Each appointed member of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 per annum and shall hold office for a term of 4 years, except that (a) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed, shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (b) the terms of office of members first taking office after the date of enactment of this act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, one at the end of 1 year, and one at the end of 2 years, one at the end of 3 years, and one at the end of 4 years, after the date of enactment of this act. In addition to their duties as members of the Board, such appointed members shall perform such other duties as may be prescribed by the Secretary. Each appointed member of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 per annum, except that any such member who holds another office or position under the Department of Agriculture the compensation for which exceeds such rate may elect to receive compensation at the rate provided for such other office or position in lieu of the compensation provided by this section.

SEC. 10. Personnel of Corporation: The Secretary shall appoint such officers and employees as may be necessary for the conduct of the business of the Corporation, define their authority and duties, delegate to them such of the powers vested in the Corporation as he may determine, require that such of them as he may designate be bonded and fix the penalties therefor. The Corporation may pay the premium of any bond or bonds. With the exception of experts, appointments shall be made pursuant to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended (5 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 661).

SEC. 11. Cooperation with other governmental agencies: The Corporation may, with the consent of the agency concerned, accept and utilize, on a compensated or uncompensated basis, the officers, employees, services, facilities, and information of any agency of the Federal Government, including any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture, and of any State, the District of Columbia, any Territory or possession, or any political subdivision thereof. The Corporation may allot to any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture or transfer to such other agencies as it may request to assist it in the conduct of its business any of the funds available to it for administrative expenses. The personnel and facilities of the Corporation may, with the consent of the Corporation, be utilized on a reimbursable basis by any agency of the Federal Government, including any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture, in the performance of any part or all of the functions of such agency.

SEC. 12. Utilization of associations and trade facilities: The Corporation may, in the conduct of its business, utilize on a contract or fee basis, privately owned and operated plants and facilities, committees or associations of producers, producer-owned and producer-controlled cooperative associations, shall to the fullest extent practicable utilize existing trade channels for the marketing, sale, and distribution of such agricultural commodities.

SEC. 13. Records; annual report: The Corporation shall at all times maintain complete and accurate books of account and shall file annually with the Secretary a complete report as to the business of the Corporation, a copy of which shall be forwarded by the Secretary to the President for transmission to the Congress.

SEC. 14. Interest of Members of the Congress: The provisions of section 1 of the act of February 27, 1877, as amended (41 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 22), shall apply to all contracts or agreements of the Corporation, except contracts or agreements of a kind which the Corporation may enter into with farmers participating in a program of the Corporation.

SEC. 15. Crimes and offenses—

FALSE STATEMENTS; OVERVALUATION OF SECURITIES

(a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Corporation, or for the purpose of obtaining for himself or another, money, property, or anything of value, under this act, or under any other act applicable to the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment by not more than 5 years, or both.

EMBEZZLEMENT, AND SO FORTH; FALSE ENTRIES; FRAUDULENT ISSUE OF OBLIGATIONS OF CORPORATION

(b) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Corporation or any of its programs, (i) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any money, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to the Corporation or pledged or otherwise entrusted to it; or (ii) with intent to defraud the Corporation, or any other body, politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Corporation, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of, or to, the Corporation, or draws any order, or issues, puts forth or assigns any note or other obligation or draft, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof; or (iii) with intent to defraud the Corporation, participates or shares in, or receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefits through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

LARCENY; CONVERSION OF PROPERTY

(c) Whoever shall willfully steal, conceal, remove, dispose of, or convert to his own use

or to that of another any property owned or held by, or mortgaged or pledged to, the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT OFFENSE

(d) Whoever conspires with another to accomplish any of the acts made unlawful by the preceding provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to the same fine or imprisonment, or both, as is applicable in the case of conviction for doing such unlawful acts.

GENERAL STATUTES APPLICABLE

(e) All the general penal statutes relating to crimes and offenses against the United States shall apply with respect to the Corporation, its property, money, contracts and agreements, employees, and operations: *Provided*, That such general penal statutes shall not apply to the extent that they relate to crimes and offenses punishable under subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of this section: *Provided further*, That sections 114 and 115 of the act of March 4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 204, 205) shall not apply to contracts or agreements of a kind which the Corporation may enter into with farmers participating in a program of the Corporation.

SEC. 16. Transfer of assets of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware Corporation: The assets, funds, property, and records of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, are hereby transferred to the Corporation. The rights, privileges, and powers, and the duties and liabilities of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, in respect to any contract, agreement, loan, account, or other obligation shall become the rights, privileges, and powers, and the duties and liabilities, respectively, of the Corporation. The enforceable claims of or against Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall become the claims of or against, and may be enforced by or against, the Corporation.

SEC. 17. Dissolution of Delaware corporation: The Secretary, representing the United States as the sole owner of the capital stock of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, is hereby authorized and directed to institute or cause to be instituted such proceedings as are required for the dissolution of said Corporation under the laws of the State of Delaware. The costs of such dissolution of said Corporation shall be borne by the Corporation..

SEC. 18. Effective date: This act shall take effect on July 1, 1948.

PATENT IN FEE TO GROWING FOUR TIMES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 608) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Growing Four Times, which was, in line 10, after "meridian" to insert "*Provided*, That when the land herein described is offered for sale, the Fort Peck Tribe or any Indian who is a member of said tribe shall have 90 days in which to execute preferential rights to purchase said tract at a price offered to the seller by a prospective buyer willing and able to purchase."

Mr. BUTLER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

PATENT IN FEE TO CLAUDE E. MILLIKEN

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 714) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Claude E. Milliken, which were, in line 11, to strike out "half, northwest half" and insert "half of the northwest quarter"; and in line 13, after "acres", to insert "*Provided*, That when the land herein described is offered for sale, the Crow Tribe or any Indian who is a member of said tribe shall have 90 days in which to execute preferential rights to purchase said tract at a price offered to the seller by a prospective buyer willing and able to purchase."

Mr. BUTLER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930 RELATING TO FIREWOOD AND OTHER WOODS—AUTHORIZATION TO MAKE CERTAIN CORRECTIONS IN ENROLLMENT OF BILL

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 188, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested to return to the House of Representatives the enrolled bill (H. R. 5328) to amend paragraph 1803 (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, relating to firewood and other woods; that if and when the said bill is returned by the President, the action of the Presiding Officers of the two Houses in signing the said bill be deemed to be rescinded; and that the Clerk of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed in the reenrollment of the said bill, to make the following correction, namely, strike out "handled bolts" and insert in lieu thereof "handle bolts."

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate concur in the concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

THE PRESIDENT'S CIVIL-RIGHTS PROGRAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the body of the RECORD the proceedings of a meeting on the question, "Are Civil Rights a Reality in America?" The proceedings consist for the most part of a transcript of an extemporaneous speech which I delivered at a Brotherhood meeting held in East Orange, N. J., February 20, 1948.

There being no objection, proceedings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PROGRAM ON CIVIL RIGHTS, HELD IN TEMPLE SHAREY TEFILO, EAST ORANGE, N. J., FEBRUARY 20, 1948

(Speech by Hon. WAYNE MORSE, United States Senator from Oregon. Chairman of meeting, Mr. George Stringfellow, vice president, Thomas A. Edison, Inc., West Orange, N. J.)

PROCEEDINGS

The meeting on civil rights convened at 9 o'clock p. m., February 20, 1948, in the Temple Sharey Tefilo, 57 Prospect Street, East Orange, N. J.; George E. Stringfellow, presiding.

Rabbi RANSON. I believe that we Jews and you Christians were doubly blessed in that we participated in this service in the spirit of brotherhood. A brotherhood program has been prepared for this evening, the nature of which you are all acquainted with.

The chairman of this program is Mr. George E. Stringfellow, a neighbor of ours, and the man who is a very good friend of many in this congregation this evening. It is with a great sense of personal honor that I present him because we have always known George Stringfellow as a man of God and we are happy to have him in our pulpit to be in charge of our program.

But if it has always seemed to us that he is a man of God, it has seemed to me even more so in the last 10 years during which time he has come increasingly to spend his life in the works of charity. He has been giving himself for the holy work of aiding crippled children and in the holy work of fighting that dread enemy of mankind which we call "cancer."

And so, George, this congregation is turned over to you as the chairman of our brotherhood program. [Applause.]

Chairman STRINGFELLOW. Thank you, Rabbi Ranson, distinguished guests, friends, and neighbors; I am delighted to have a part in this very inspiring meeting. It has been my privilege to work or to have worked with your distinguished rabbi for a great many years. I have come to believe that he means as much to us Christians as he means to you Jews. Sometimes I think a little more.

He is a great citizen and he makes a great contribution to the welfare of our community. I don't know how we would get along without him. No one ever has any trouble getting along with him.

I now have the pleasure of presenting the Honorable Spencer Miller, Jr., New Jersey chairman of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. The Honorable Spencer Miller. [Applause.]

And now, Mr. Donald Garachas, honorary chairman of this meeting last year. Most of you recall that last year's meeting was blizzarded out. We did a lot of work, and especially your honorary chairman, but we had such bad weather we wisely decided to postpone the meeting for a year. [Laughter.] The difference is that you have another chairman but the same speaker. [Laughter.]

I should now like to invite representatives of the following veterans' organizations to the pulpit: Mr. Robert Bain, he is ex-county vice commander of the American Legion; Mr. John Bill, national service officer for the Disabled American Veterans; Mr. Albert Friedman, commander of the Oranges and Maplewood Post of the American Veterans Committee; Mr. William Langer, secretary of the American Veterans Committee; Mr. Angus MacNutt, he is ex-county commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars; Mr. George Macallis—I hope that is correct—he is ex-county commander of the Jewish War Veterans; and Mr. George W. Millican, State commander of the Spanish American War Veterans.

Will you gentlemen please seat yourselves in the front of the pulpit?

If you are comfortably seated, and I trust that you are, we will now open this meeting by singing our national anthem.

(The national anthem was sung.)

Chairman STRINGFELLOW. We in this brotherhood movement are united without regard to personal kinship, rank, profession, or religious belief. We are animated by the desire to live together in harmony.

The need of such a movement as ours, such a movement as we represent here tonight, was never more acute than now. Our movement is designed to produce good will. While there are many deficits in the world today, the greatest deficit in my opinion is good will.

Our movement is designed, at least in a small measure, to underwrite that deficit. Most of us in the good-will movement believe that our civilization can escape suicide by returning to the practice of faith in God and in man.

Belief in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man is the basic foundation upon which the brotherhood movement has its origin. It is this belief that brings us together tonight in this house of worship.

If the spirit permeating the minds and hearts of those of us here assembled could be duplicated throughout the world, there would be no need to fear a third world war. In fact, there would be no wars or rumors of wars.

Tonight we are fortunate, I think extremely fortunate, in having with us as our speaker a philosopher, a man who is endowed with great wisdom and the rare ability to say what he wishes to say in such a manner as to create understanding of mutual problems and to suggest sound and reasonable solutions therefor.

He is a farmer, author, editor, authority on criminal law. During his 2 years as a member of the War Labor Board he wrote more than half of the Board's opinions. He is a member of two of the most important committees of the United States Senate and takes an active and vigorous part in the debate of important legislation before the Congress.

The conservatives in and out of Congress call him a reactionary or a radical. Henry Wallace, that darling of the Communists, has characterized our Speaker as a liberal who has gone reactionary. [Laughter.]

After you have listened to his nuggets of knowledge tonight, I suspect that you will conclude that WAYNE MORSE, junior United States Senator from Oregon, is neither a radical nor a reactionary. To me it is a rare privilege and a great honor to present to you now the junior United States Senator from the great State of Oregon, WAYNE MORSE. [Applause.]

Senator MORSE. Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and ladies and gentlemen, it is always a great pleasure to appear on the same program with George Stringfellow, but it is a great honor to be introduced by him. He is always very charitable, very kind, and inspires you to try to rise to the qualifications he lays down in his introduction. I mean it as no politician's flattery when I tell you that George Stringfellow is a great inspiration to me because I think he has demonstrated so clearly in his public service in the State of New Jersey that he is a great humanitarian. He recognizes that after all the subject of our discussion tonight is a subject that involves a problem that cuts across all groups in America because it is a common problem.

Because he is a humanitarian, a great patriot, a man who recognizes that if we are going to make this great system of ours based upon a constitutional government supported by a private-property economy work, then we must find the answers to the questions on civil rights that I seek to raise in my talk tonight.

It is because he is a humanitarian that I am always so happy to be associated with him in every movement that brings us together. I have been greatly impressed by the spiritual meeting tonight in which we all participated preceding this discussion of civil rights.

Certainly we not only have demonstrated here the universality of the spiritual basis of the brotherhood of man but I think we have also demonstrated democracy in action. People of all faiths are gathered here tonight to pay tribute to the importance of civil rights in maintaining a strong democracy.

It is important, it seems to me, that we approach the problem of civil rights from the standpoint of the spiritual basis of democracy. If you will reflect for a moment, you cannot escape the fact that democracy itself has a deep-rooted spiritual and religious base and our rights, our political rights, stem from those spiritual foundations.

On other occasions I have pointed out that the essence of democracy is to be found in the spiritual values on which are based our recognition of a free people of the dignity of the individual and all those inalienable human rights to which the people of our Nation dedicated themselves when both the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution were written. It is the spiritual values of democracy which distinguishes us from totalitarian nations which subordinated the rights of the individual to a materialistic philosophy.

At another time I said:

"I think there is a tendency on the part of the American people in these days to overlook the fact that it was our war as well as the war of Great Britain and the other allies. I think it is important for the American people to reflect anew on the fact that, except for the costly loss of life which we suffered, which, of course, cannot be evaluated in a material sense at all, the major burden of the war was borne by our allies insofar as destruction was concerned. We have no bombed cities. We have no vast areas of devastation. We suffered no such losses as were suffered in England, France, and other parts of war-torn Europe. We cannot in the eyes of history, evade those moral obligations—because they are very real. It seems to me it will not reflect well on the pages of history for us at this hour to take an overemphasized mercenary position, a dollar position, in relation to our moral obligations resulting from our participation in the war, irrespective of the importance of the Marshall plan to the establishment of our first line of economic defense in Europe, even if I did not believe it essential for that purpose.

"I should still argue for the plan on the basis that I think we should pass it in carrying out the moral obligations which we incurred in a war which was also ours. The American people cannot look on that war as a football game, and, now that it is over, sit around in America in what, after all, is an environment of reasonable material comfort, and talk about the plays of the war. There are moral obligations still to be paid by this country in connection with that war. There are many people who do not like to hear such language spoken these days. But I say it is essential to call attention to those obligations in view of the many comments made in regard to Great Britain and other war-torn countries. I have no hesitancy in saying, and I make no apologies for saying, that we have not yet fulfilled our moral obligations to Great Britain and the other allies that helped us fight the war.

"I also suggest that closely related to our moral obligations in connection with the war there are some great spiritual values of democracy which I think are being overlooked these days. I know that to talk about spiritual values makes it an intangible argument and I know that there is danger that an argument such as the one I am now making may be charged as being one which is placed on an emotional level. I offer it not as such; I offer it as an argument which supports a great truth, namely, that when we take away or fail to live up to the spiritual basis of democracy we lose democracy itself. When we look upon democracy only from the standpoint of materialism anl selfish economic values we have lost sight of the spirit of democracy. We can start with the spiritual values of the Declaration of Independence, we can trace them through the constitutional debates, the Constitution itself; we can follow them through the preamble of the United Nations Charter and the other sections of that Charter. What do we find? We find an unbroken thread of great spiritual values as the basis for the ideals of American democracy.

"Our form of government as contrasted with totalitarian systems of government, rests largely on the spiritual principle that we recognize the individual as the creature of a divine power; we recognize that, after all, Government should exist to serve the interests and the welfare of the individual. The primary purpose of a democracy such as ours is to promote the dignity and the welfare of the individual, to carry out the principle that the State truly is his servant and not his master. It is a spiritual value which represents a great universal religious truth the sacredness of the human individual as a child of God. This spiritual truth has no relationship to creed or dogma, but rather it rests on the fact that, after all, we are our brother's keeper. After all, basic in democracy is that great spiritual truth that we should do unto others as we would have them do unto us. I say that is a universal spiritual value which, through the ages, has crossed all religious lines and is not limited to Christianity itself. I say that in this hour the American people can well afford to consider, at least to some extent, our international obligations from the standpoint of the question, Are we carrying out an international policy which does justice to the spiritual values that form the basis of democracy itself?

"I say, most kindly, and I also say it most sincerely, that I think there are great forces at play in America today which are so motivated by a materialism, so driven by a money conception, so overpowered by selfish greed, that they are losing sight of the spiritual idealism of democracy itself. We had better bring the spiritual idealism of democracy into play in molding our international policies, or I think we shall lose our democracy itself."

If I were to select a text for my remarks I would turn to a passage we read in unison earlier tonight when we together rededicated ourselves to one of the basic principles of civil rights. We said, "Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart but thou shall love thy neighbor as thyself."

I attended another great meeting of democracy in action in Washington a few days ago where men of all faiths came together to do reverent honor to the memory of a great world citizen, Ghandi. I think it is quite appropriate that on an occasion such as this when we are to discuss the facets of civil rights, such as the dignity of the individual, personal freedom, the guaranty that we shall not be crushed under the heel of bigotry and intolerance, we at least pay passing appreciation to what I think, in my reading of Ghandi, is the epitomy of his belief in a Divine Being.

Yes, we people of many faiths here tonight can entertain our reservations, even our differences as to some of the concepts to be found in his notion of a Supreme Being, but in his discussion of God, I think there is a clear enunciation of a great universal principle, namely, a spiritual faith in the existence of a power greater than man.

Let me read just a paragraph or two out of a great writing of Ghandi's setting forth his views concerning God. He wrote: "To me God is truth and love; God is ethics and morality; God is fearlessness; God is the source of light and life, and yet He is above and beyond all these.

"God is conscience. He is even the atheism of the atheist. For in His boundless love God permits the atheist to live. He is the searcher of hearts. He transcends speech and reason. He knows us and our hearts better than we do ourselves. He does not take us at our words, for He knows that we often do not mean it, some knowingly and others unknowingly.

"God is personal to those who need His personal presence. He is embodied to those who need His touch. He is all things to all men. He is in us and yet above and beyond us. Man may banish the word 'God' in taking an oath, but he has no power to banish the thing itself."

Then Ghandi made a point which I think is so universal in its truth when he wrote: "Withal He is ever-forgiving, for He always gives us the chance to repent. He is the greatest democrat the world knows, for He leaves us unfettered to make our own choice between good and evil."

I think that is a rich statement on the universality of God, and I would use it as a premise for discussing our rights as the children of God. I would call your attention in answer to the question, "Are civil rights a reality?" that we need to take into account, the fact that we enjoy civil rights to a remarkable degree in America in spite of the great need for a complete granting of civil rights.

Civil rights in America are greater in quality and in quantity than in any other nation of the world, bar none, and there are many places in the world where they hardly exist at all to any degree whatsoever. Every totalitarian State knows not civil rights.

I have some liberal friends who are laboring under a great delusion and illusion that civil rights exist in Soviet Russia. The inescapable fact is that a communistic society is a police state because it is premised upon the proposition that the State is the master and not the servant of the people.

Democratic phrases do not make democracy. Propaganda about individual rights does not make democracy. Democracy lives only to the extent that practices of democracy are put to work—and in Soviet Russia there is no democracy.

I would have those in this country who in this critical period in our history are being so misguided in regard to Russian policies keep in mind the fact that in our dealings with her we are confronted by a police state. Yes; one that hides its denials of civil rights behind an iron curtain. Certainly as an American liberal, I take the position that we must seek to cooperate with Russia; we must exercise the greatest of patience in an endeavor to understand why Russia behaves as she does.

However, Russia too has obligations of cooperation resting on her. If she wants to demonstrate that she really believes in the principles of universal democracy based upon a recognition of the dignity of the individual and the civil rights of the person she need only lift the iron curtain as her first step at cooperation and let the light of international observation shed itself upon her doings.

But until she does, then I say to liberals, conservatives, and Americans all, our responsibility to those liberties and freedoms that we hold so dear under our form of government is to keep ourselves so strong that at all times of the day and the night we can demonstrate to Russia and all other nations our willingness and our ability and our determination to keep and enforce the peace.

I want to stress that point tonight because I think it has such a direct bearing upon the question "Are civil rights a reality in America?" As a liberal I want to caution you as to the difference between progress toward an ideal of making civil rights a reality in this country and an attempt at progress through a social avalanche. Some leftist groups in America would seek to bring about a social avalanche over the issue of civil rights in order to accomplish, not a protection of civil rights, but a state economy which once established will destroy civil rights.

I want to point out also that as good an example as anybody can give you as to the degree to which we have traveled down the road of putting into practice the civil rights set out in both the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution is this very meeting here tonight. This is civil rights put to practice. Thus I could give example after example showing that civil rights in America are to a very large degree in fact a reality.

But I am also conscious of the fact that in a great many respects they are not a reality. I am one who thinks it so important that we constantly carry on the fight for constant progress in this country on the issue of civil rights and attaining the full benefits of the freedom given to us by our form of government that I shall raise my voice from time to time in pointing out some of the ways and some of the incidents which show that we have not yet accomplished the goal of full civil rights for everyone in America.

In doing so, I want to base my remarks for the most part on what I think is the greatest document, as far as a discourse on civil rights is concerned, that has yet been written in our country. That is the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights entitled "To secure these rights," which was prepared under the direction of the chairman, Charles E. Wilson.

I know many of you have not read it but all of you must. I would have it as required reading in every high school and college of America because I think it marks out the problem. It raises the challenge, it points to the goal. Not one we are going to accomplish overnight, not one that we are going to accomplish in this session of Congress or the next or the next or the next, but certainly a goal toward which each session of Congress should take some very definite steps. I know how some of you may become impatient with that suggestion. I sit down and criticize the politicians, too. [Laughter.] I grow impatient, too.

I ask the question: "But if it is right to have a civil-rights legislative program why can't we do it now?" But don't forget democracy is also composed of people, people with a variety of points of view, great differences in social conditioning.

You know we liberals, we who deplore and resent intolerance and bigotry, must guard against being intolerant ourselves of those who are intolerant, because liberalism can turn itself into intolerance if one does not watch out. That can happen when liberalism seeks to follow a course of action which is impossible of accomplishment at the moment.

Hence, impatient as we are so frequently, we liberals have to answer the question: what can we accomplish at this point in advancing the cause of making civil rights a complete reality? In this great document of the President's Commisison on Civil Rights you will find on page 4 a few paragraphs which I would like to read:

"The central theme," says the report, "in our American heritage is the importance of the individual person. From the earliest moment of our history we have believed that every human being has an essential dignity and integrity which must be respected and safeguarded.

"Moreover, we believe that the welfare of the individual is the final goal of group life. Our American heritage further teaches that to be secure in the rights he wishes for himself, each man must be willing to respect the rights of other men.

"This is the conscious recognition of a basic moral principle: All men are created equal as well as free. Stemming from this principle is the obligation to build social institutions that will guarantee equality of opportunity to all men. Without this equality freedom becomes an illusion.

"Thus the only aristocracy that is consistent with the free way of life is an aristocracy of talent and achievement. The grounds on which our society accords respect, influence, or reward to each of its citizens must be limited to the quality of his personal character and of his social contribution."

I think that is such a beautiful preface to the committee's discussion of the four great freedoms or civil rights which it thinks we should seek to accomplish in a variety of ways of which the legislative process is one. Those four basic civil rights as set out by the committee are: The right to safety and security of the person, and, of course, the right that is encompassed in all the legal guaranties of civil rights under our Constitution and its judicial system.

Constantly we must maintain a vigilance in regard to that right. I am going to have a little something further to say about that in a moment but in passing let me point out that we must constantly be on guard to see to it that our courts, including the greatest court in the land, protect the right to safety and the security of the person.

It was because of what I sincerely believed was a great violation of that right by the United States Supreme Court in the Harris case that I addressed the American Bar Association criminal law section this year setting forth my views as to why I thought the Supreme Court in that decision failed to protect our right to freedom from illegal search and seizure.

So long as I am in the Senate of the United States I intend to work for legislation which will correct the great wrong I think was done by the court in the recent Harris case, unless the Court reverses itself. I care not how serious the emergency of the moment is, we cannot justify meeting a particular emergency by any illegal method, any police method, that violates the guaranty of our system of government of freedom from illegal search and seizure.

One cannot reconcile the decision in the Harris case with the great history of the courts of this country in protecting us from illegal search and seizure.

The second right, the right to citizenship and its privileges, is stressed by the Commission and I will comment on that in a moment.

Third, the right to freedom of conscience and expression; and fourth, the right to equality of opportunity.

Those four fundamental civil rights outline quite a legislative program if you will look at them from that angle for a moment.

I think we are making some progress on the legislative front. Certainly some States are making great progress. I am very happy to speak tonight on this subject in the State of New Jersey because I think you have pointed the way in your new constitution as to how we can guarantee civil rights and make them a reality to a greater extent than they exist in many other States.

You would be surprised at the number of letters I have received, not only from my home State but from many sections of this country, commenting upon the great decision that the Governor of this State made concerning the militia and the right to freedom from segregation as far as the New Jersey militia is concerned.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee of the United States Senate, I want, on this occasion, to express my compliments to the Governor of New Jersey because I think he performed a great public service when he drew the issue with the United States Department of the Army on the question of whether or not the Department of the Army, as a matter of Federal policy, would follow the course of withdrawing Federal funds from New Jersey because under your constitution you made civil rights in respect to segregation a reality.

I congratulate him and the people of the State for drawing that issue. It must be drawn in some other States. I am interested to see from my mail that many people in other States are asking that the issue be raised in respect to their militia, too.

I predict not the outcome of the controversy. I only point out that if nonsegregation is a sound principle of civil rights in New Jersey, then it is a principle which ought to be uniform in the armed services, State and National.

Let me say a word about the right to citizenship and its privileges in relation to legislation. That, of course, raises the question as to the elimination of barriers upon the

right to cast a Federal ballot. We have made great strides toward that reform.

There are a great many southern States that are entitled to sincere commendation for the steps which they have taken in recent years in removing the barriers to the great free franchise that ought to be enjoyed by every citizen irrespective of the color of his skin. There are still a few States that maintain the barriers.

I happen to be of the opinion as a lawyer that, under our Constitution, a duty rests upon the Federal Government, when the States maintain those barriers and refuse to remove them, to guarantee equality of citizenship privileges to all citizens of the country as far as Federal elections are concerned. That is why I am one of the sponsors of the anti-poll-tax law.

Do you know what some of the critics in my State say? (We don't have a poll tax in Oregon.) Those critics write and say, "Can't you keep out of just one fight? [Laughter.] Do you have to be in every one? What are you fighting about an anti-poll-tax bill for? Why don't you spend all your energy helping us with our western problems?"

My answer is: "I know of no proposal of any greater concern to the people of Oregon, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and every other State than a proposal which seeks to remove barriers that prevent people at the present time from exercising the freedom of franchise in this country. I say that because you cannot keep democracy secure unless the ballot box is free to all."

After all, I do not sit in the Senate of the United States as a Senator from Oregon for Oregon alone. That is not the type of Senate that the fathers of the Constitution set up in the Constitution. One has to read only the constitutional debates to understand that.

Under our system of representative government, the Members of the Senate come from their States for the Nation. There is quite a difference in that theory from the sectional attitude that has come to characterize public thinking in many sections of this country in regard to the responsibilities of a Member of the Senate.

We have to reinform ourselves, it seems to me in this country, as we are facing these great national issues which involve the whole country as to the responsibilities of the Members of the Senate of the United States to the welfare of the entire Nation.

Just last week—and I do not ask for agreement on the merits of this particular point or of this particular legislation that I am going to suggest as I have an idea that it is a very unpopular piece of legislation in New Jersey—I announced my support of the St. Lawrence seaway. Once I reach a conclusion on the facts as I see them, I do not hesitate to vote in accordance with those facts irrespective of sectional claims. Therefore on the St. Lawrence issue I addressed the Senate in about these words—"I have listened to this debate. I have come to the conclusion that on the merits, on the evidence that has been put into the record of this debate, the seaway should be built in the interests of transportation and in the interests of the maximum development of the power resources of the country.

"I want to comment on the speeches of Senators who have pointed out that the issue is not a matter of any sectional interest. Although the speakers have protested the sectional idea as they have given their speeches and have prefaced most of their speeches by assuring us that they speak out of no sectional interest, it is interesting to note that most of the speeches against the seaway have come from those sections of the country which feel they would suffer some economic loss to their harbors and their transportation systems if the seaway were built.

"But," I said, "I feel that those of us who have no sectional interest should rise on this occasion and vote for the national interest." That attitude, if you are going to be true to the job in the Senate, ought to be applied even to one's home State. I have done that on occasion and I know how difficult it is to do.

I know what political pressure means when one so votes but you cannot be true to your trust in the Senate on problems that do not affect your State and then be false to it out of a sectional motivation. A similar challenge goes to this whole question of civil rights.

Therefore, I make no apologies to anyone for my endorsement and sponsorship of the anti-poll-tax bill.

Let us move to the next civil-right issue, the right to freedom of conscience and expression. In my judgment, we have done pretty well on that. It seems to me for the most part that is a reality in America.

There are exceptions, and we must meet them incident by incident when there are transgressions upon the right of the freedom of speech. We must protect this right when hoods march again, as they will from time to time as hysteria sweeps the country. We must rise then to defend the civil right that is involved in this issue and protect it from intolerance and bigotry.

But I think we ought to be proud tonight that for the most part we have made freedom of speech a reality in America and for the most part freedom of worship, too. Here again there are those incidents, temporary in nature, in which there is a violation of these great civil rights. But man being what he is, we are never going to have perfection in the protection of these rights. We must, however, keep ourselves ready to rise to protect them whenever they are transgressed.

It is in the field of the right to equality of opportunity that I would address my major remarks as far as legislation is concerned because I think it is going to be in that field of civil rights in which the greatest battle is going to have to be fought in the next decade.

Yes, we have before the Senate now what has become known as an antidiscrimination bill. In the last session of Congress it was a fair employment practice bill, and that bill plus the President's message on civil rights is arousing a storm of intolerant reaction in America these days.

Now I want to say that I hope I shall always be nonpartisan enough never to welcome a political gain of my party on the basis of that gain being made because the opposition party is suffering from a split caused by a fight over civil rights. I do not welcome whatever gain the Republican Party is making these days over the split in the Democratic Party because some congressional representatives of some Southern States are threatening to take a walk from their party. I do not think that is healthy for American democracy.

Further may I say now, with some partisanship, that I have enough confidence in American republicanism to feel that we do not need that sort of a handicap in order to win. [Applause.] I do not want to win on the basis of that advantage because that victory will have some very empty values connected with it. It will only mean then that we will have to face the civil rights issue, too. I want my party to always stand for the principles of tolerance in opposition to bigotry and in opposition to discrimination based upon race, color, sex, or creed, just as the President of the United States is standing on that premise both in the civil-rights report and in that great message on civil rights which he sent to the Congress of the United States a few days ago. It was that message which gave rise to this tremendous political storm over civil rights.

As one Republican, I want to say here, as I have said elsewhere, I intend to support the hand of the President of the United States on this issue, be he Democrat or Republican. [Applause.]

Now there are those in this field of legislation, which deals with the subject of the equality of opportunity, who are making the mistake that I alluded to earlier in my remarks. They hope to accomplish a civil-rights program overnight. It cannot be done.

Oh, yes, there is a responsibility resting upon those of us who are making this fight for civil rights to do everything in our power to put the legislation through. But I would point out there are going to be compromises in that legislation. I shall vote against some of those compromises because I think many of them will be unnecessary. But I am going to vote for some of them because some of them will be necessary if we are to make progress in this field.

We got through the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare the other day, but only after a fight, the Ives bill, of which a good many of us are cosponsors. What happened in the committee?

I think you may be interested in a little look behind the scenes. Thorough hearings were held on that bill, a beautiful record was made, and the evidence, I think, is crystal clear. The hearings clearly support that section of this great report of the President's Committee on Equality of Opportunity.

But when we met in our final session to determine the question as to whether we should report the bill to the floor, with what were we confronted? First, a motion to recommit to the subcommittee. We defeated that by a majority out of a 13-man committee, as I recall, of 3 votes—and that is not many.

When you have a majority of only three votes in a committee on a motion such as that, I can assure you that you will have even greater trouble on the floor of the Senate because the men on the floor of the Senate are not going to be so well versed on the subject matter as the members of the committee. When you report out to the floor of the Senate, as it will be reported out, the closeness of the vote in committee, that fact is going to have very definite effects on the floor.

Then there was a motion made to revise the bill so as to eliminate any language whatsoever that would carry any enforcement provision. We squeezed through on that one, I think, with a majority of either two or three.

Then finally the motion to report the bill to the Senate was made; again by a small majority we carried that motion.

But do not be fooled about that. Getting the bill on the calendar gives you no assurance of a vote on the bill this session because many bills die on the calendar. Under the rules of the Senate you cannot get it up for a vote until you can get the leadership of the Senate to agree to make it the pending business on some occasion by motion.

So now our fight, before this session of Congress is over, is to make that bill at some time the pending business of the Senate. I am not too discouraged. I think it is very unfortunate in so many respects that this is a Presidential year. I say that because of the great issues that confront the Nation which should be considered at this session of Congress.

I think though that before the political conventions take place the parties may want to make a record on this bill, at least in one House of Congress. [Laughter.] I hope that I am not more pessimistic than subsequent events will justify.

We are going to be confronted, I think, with a historic debate on this matter of civil rights and we are going to be confronted again with a filibuster.

Let me say just a word by way of digression on the filibuster. I am opposed to them [laughter], that is right. Yes, it is true that I participated in one, and given the same

circumstances in the future I will participate in another as long as God gives me breath to talk on the floor of the Senate.

You say: What sort of a paradox of inconsistency is that position? There is nothing inconsistent about it at all. As the author of the antifilibuster resolution pending before the Senate of the United States I want to point out that it is important from the standpoint of protecting minority points of view in the Senate on any issue that ample time be guaranteed for full debate on the merits of a given issue. It is one thing to use time for debating the merits of the issue. It is another thing to use time in a filibuster to prevent an issue from ever coming to a vote. My filibuster on the Taft-Hartley veto message was necessary in order to secure sufficient time for a full consideration of the merits of the President's veto message. I was not seeking to prevent a vote from ever taking place on that message. I only sought to postpone the vote from Saturday afternoon to the following Monday afternoon in order to have sufficient time to discuss the veto message in detail.

In the resolution which I have introduced in the Senate I have provided for the protection of minority rights. If a motion to close debate is signed by 16 Senators and presented to the Senate it will bring before the full Senate the question of whether it is the sense of that body that the debate shall be brought to a close. If this question is decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of those voting, then the issue before the Senate shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

My resolution provides that each Senator shall be entitled to speak in his own right on the pending measure and its amendments and motions affecting it for 3 hours. I am willing to compromise on 2 hours if that is the wish of the majority. Any Senator is privileged to "farm out" his time in whole or in part if he does not wish to speak himself. With the date to vote fixed, definite, and certain, the usefulness of a filibuster ceases to exist.

That is very important to your civil rights because it is not safe in a representative government to permit to exist in your highest parliamentary body rules which permit a tyrannical majority to override the rights of a minority. That is what was attempted in the case of the Taft-Hartley debate.

We were not seeking to prevent a vote. We were seeking only to delay a vote until the merits of the case could be heard and the people could reply. It is quite a different thing.

But in the case of this legislation on civil rights we are going to be confronted with a filibuster. It is my intention to use it as an opportunity to raise anew the question of a resolution that will prevent filibusters in the Senate of the United States but, at the same time, give to the minority and to the people of the country adequate time to make their case on the merits.

Well, there are many other pieces of legislation dealing with civil rights that are pending. The Wagner-Morse bill on antilynching is one. That is another one that is causing the political revolt in various sections of the United States. But of course you cannot have equality of justice for all if you have people in various sections of the country living in fear when either rightly or falsely accused they may not get a fair trial before the law because of government by mob instead of government by law.

As long as that fear exists, and there is cause in support of it, then civil rights are not truly a reality in America. If time permitted I would comment on other legislation pending before the Senate.

I think I have spoken at sufficient length to illustrate to you that if we are going to be our brother's keeper, if we are going to recognize the spiritual basis of democracy, then we must make civil rights a reality in America. I think also we must live up to the lines in that great poem of Louis Untermeyer which I like to quote so often because from it I receive an inspiration and stimulation every time I read it as to the meaning of liberalism. I pass it on to you tonight.

We must live up to the principles of liberalism which, I think, Untermeyer so beautifully and richly penned when he said or wrote these words: "Ever insurgent let me be, make me more daring than devout; from sleek contentment keep me free, and fill me with a buoyant doubt.

"Open my eyes to visions girt with beauty, and with wonder lit. But let me always see the dirt, and all that spawn and die in it.

"Open my ears to music; let me thrill with spring's first flutes and drums. But never let me dare forget the bitter ballads of the slums.

"From compromise and things half done keep me with stern and stubborn pride, and when, at last, the fight is won, God keep me still unsatisfied." [Applause.]

Chairman STRINGFELLOW. Senator MORSE, your address is so profound, I would do nothing or say nothing to throw it out of focus except to thank you. [Applause.]

CIVIL-DISOBEDIENCE PROGRAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask to have published in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks certain correspondence which has passed between Mr. Walter White, secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and myself, and a letter which I have received from Mr. Grant Reynolds, who was one of the two witnesses before the Armed Services Committee, and who testified in support of the suggested civil-disobedience program.

In his letter, Mr. President, Mr. Reynolds shows that he has taken offense because I have expressed myself on the floor of the Senate in opposition to the proposed program for civil disobedience. He challenges me to a radio debate on the subject. I want also to have the RECORD include at this point a copy of my reply to Mr. Reynolds, which is to the effect that I do not propose to dignify, by way of a public debate, the position taken by men who are proposing a civil disobedience program. I am satisfied that such a program, in time of war, would constitute treason. Nor do I have any intention of giving Mr. Reynolds or his followers who in my opinion are guilty of a disservice to the welfare of our country, an opportunity to spread their propaganda by having a Member of the Senate indulge in public debate with them. Their course of action is not a course of action subject to debate, Mr. President. It would be in time of national emergency a course of action which should be prosecuted by all the processes of law under our Constitution. I repeat that their program in time of war would be treason. I do not propose to debate with one who proposes such an illegal course of action.

The correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE AGAINST JIM CROW IN MILITARY SERVICE AND TRAINING,
New York, N. Y., April 17, 1948.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I find very disturbing your comments of April 12 on the Senate floor in regard to the civil disobedience proposal—particularly your raising of the question of patriotism. I intend to answer the latter point on Monday morning in testimony before the House Armed Services Committee. As a person with a long and active NAACP background, I also disapprove strongly of your efforts to pressure a repudiation from Walter White under threat of resignation.

Because you are using your senatorial immunity to continue this running attack and because we as an organization do not have access to a free public sounding board to answer your remarks, I should like to propose a radio debate on a national hook-up at an early date.

Mr. Randolph is now in Texas and is not expected back in the East until about May 4. In his absence, if radio time should be made available, either I or some other representative of this organization would stand ready to discuss this on a broadcast. After his return, Mr. Randolph would be the logical person to debate with you, inasmuch as most of your comments are directed at him. Regardless of the person who would speak in opposition to you, I regard it as essential, in the interest of fair play, to have the opportunity to present our case to the public with the proper and accurate interpretation. Your Senate remarks have been on newscasts this week as far west as Los Angeles.

May I ask, therefore, that you use the prestige of your office to approach some appropriate radio forum or a national network in an effort to arrange such a program. I believe that public interest, among whites as well as Negroes, would be very great.

Very truly yours,

GRANT REYNOLDS,
National Chairman.

APRIL 22, 1948.

Mr. GRANT REYNOLDS,
National Chairman, Committee Against Jim Crow in Military Service and Training, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. REYNOLDS: I have received your letter of April 17, in which you suggest that I engage in a radio debate on your proposed plan for civil disobedience whereby you advocate that Negroes refuse to obey a draft law in time of national emergency unless your demand for nonsegregation in the Army is granted.

As you know, I favor granting complete civil rights to minority groups, including Negroes; and that covers the right to nonsegregation in the military forces. However, I completely disagree with and disapprove of your proposal to attempt to secure those rights through a program of civil disobedience. Further, I have no intention of dignifying such a proposal of civil disobedience, which amounts to an advocacy of treason, by engaging in a radio debate with the proponents of such an unpatriotic proposal.

Your proposal is not even a debatable subject, but rather it constitutes an advocacy of endangering the security of your Nation in time of national crisis. If such a crisis should arise, and if you attempt to put into effect such a program of civil disobedience, I think it would be imperative that a court test of the legality of your proposal under our Constitution be made as quickly as possible.

I believe I know you and Mr. Randolph well enough to know that you have no intention or desire to endanger the security of your country in time of national emergency, but that is exactly what you would do if you were successful in carrying out the type of conspiracy which is called for by your proposed program of civil disobedience. I pray that some way, somehow, you will come to realize before it is too late that the civil rights to which minority groups are entitled and which they are being denied in so many re-

spects today, cannot be attained by the approach you propose to make to this problem.

In my opinion, you are performing a great disservice to the cause of civil rights by following the course of action you are suggesting. As a Member of the United States Senate sworn to uphold the Constitution, and as one who advocates and who will continue to fight for a civil-rights legislative program, I want you to know that as long as you pursue your present ill-advised policy I shall continue to express my disapproval of your course of action.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,
New York N. Y., April 14, 1948.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In accordance with your telegram of April 7, I have waited to read the full discussion which you and Mr. Randolph had at the recent hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee with respect to racial segregation in the armed services. I have also read your speech on the subject of civil rights and civil disobedience in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 12.

Let me repeat with utmost sincerity that we do not feel that even so sympathetic and courageous a fighter for civil rights as yourself fully comprehends all that is involved in this question. Let me also repeat that the NAACP neither advocates nor believes in civil disobedience as an effective technique for solving the race problem here in America. We have not counseled Negroes to refuse to serve their country. But we would be less than honest and grossly derelict to the membership of the NAACP and to America itself if we did not say bluntly that the Negro is totally fed up with segregation in the armed services and will oppose in every legitimate and legal fashion such segregation.

Again I urge you and other Members of the Senate to put yourselves intellectually, as much as is humanly possible, in the position of the American Negro. Imagine being called upon by your country to fight, and die if need be, to preserve human freedom. Let me cite some of the experiences of Negroes when they either volunteered or were drafted.

They were separated on the basis of race at draft-induction centers. They rode Jim Crow trains to training camps in the South. Their barracks were in Negro locations when they trained with white troops. They had to buy at the Negro PX only. They were segregated in the "roost" in post theaters. At one camp in Tennessee, Negro commissioned officers with rank as high as major were ordered out of a post theater at the point of submachine guns because they sat in the section reserved for officers instead of the one for Negroes.

They were beaten, shot, and killed by white civilian bus drivers, county constables, and city police, and not one civilian was ever punished for such cold-blooded murder. Isaac Woodard had his eyes gouged by the chief of police of a South Carolina town 3 hours after he had been honorably discharged from the United States Army after 3 years of service, 18 months of which was service in the South Pacific.

Negro soldiers who dared protest in proper fashion through channels against abuse by prejudiced officers were court-martialed, which in part accounts for the allegedly higher crime rate which Senator RUSSELL inveigled General Eisenhower into admitting before the committee. I myself encountered as a war correspondent in both the European and Pacific theaters of war numerous instances of Negroes convicted in court martial for alleged offenses which, even if true, would not have brought official action had they been white. In one instance in Guam I served as defense counsel for 69 colored Navy personnel when they rebelled against being made the target of constant abuse, including the throwing of live hand grenades at them.

I, myself, saw numerous instances where segregated Negro units were used as escalators to promotion by young white officers while more experienced and better trained Negro officers remained in their same status.

But, over and above these galling injustices which are the inevitable product of segregation in a supposedly democratic Army and Navy, is the fact that the unnecessary and dangerous emphasis on racial separation broadens the chasm of antagonism between Negro and white Americans because the Army and Navy lack the courage to abolish segregation. This practice has caused the United States to be ridiculed throughout the world, particularly among the two-thirds of the people of the earth who are colored, at the gross negation of all of our protestations of democracy.

Negroes in the armed services and in civilian life loyally supported their Government during the late war because they believed that when the war was won America would keep at least some of its promises to make democracy more of a reality. And what is their reward? They see the rampaging Southern politicians threatening virtually everything up to and including mob violence to prevent any Federal action against mob violence, disfranchisement, and job discrimination. They see the overwhelming majority of Members of the Congress apparently cowed by the Southern bluster. In any event, few Members of the Congress have dared speak up for the clear-cut remedial measures of the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights.

The cheapest of politics is being played with even a minimum civil-rights program. It is openly reported that the Republicans are debating how little they can do on the civil-rights program and still attract Negro support. They are reported to favor an emasculated antilynching bill, overlooking the demand for abolition of the poll tax and freedom to secure jobs on merit through a Federal fair employment practice law, believing that the Negro vote can be purchased by passage of one emasculated bill. Even within recent weeks it has become manifest that the Republicans believe that the Southern revolt and the Wallace candidacy so assure a Republican victory that the party can be cavalier in its treatment of the Negro. On the other side of the wire there is little difference of attitude.

It is against this kind of background, Senator MORSE, that thoughtful and sincere leaders of American public opinion like yourself need desperately to weigh the present cynicism of Negroes and a good many other Americans with respect to civil rights and especially segregation in the armed services. It is profoundly to be hoped that sufficient courage can be mustered by the Government to do the simple thing which will make unnecessary and unthinkable any campaign of civil disobedience. This simple act is to wipe out segregation forthwith and to abolish the opportunism, prejudice, and cowardice with which this entire question has been shrouded for too long.

Ever sincerely,

WALTER WHITE,
Secretary.

APRIL 20, 1948.

Mr. WALTER WHITE,
Secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR WALTER: I appreciate very much receiving your fine letter of April 14. It certainly clarifies to my complete satisfaction your telegram of April 1.

It is understandable that one in your position is naturally inclined to assume that one in my position doesn't appreciate the serious significance of the failure of the Congress to date to adopt a civil-rights program giving to all groups in the country, including Negroes, full opportunity to enjoy the civil-rights guaranties under the Constitution which should be considered as much theirs as any other citizen's. However, I know there are many of us in the Congress who are doing everything that can be done within the true meaning of the definition of politics—as a science of the possible—to advance the cause of civil rights.

It is my intention to keep right on doing what can be done within the realm of possibility in trying to secure action on adequate civil-rights legislative proposals. Your disappointment in the decision of the Republican conference to restrict itself this year to antilynch legislation is no greater than mine. However, I am satisfied we were making considerable progress on a civil-rights program until the proposal for a civil-disobedience program was dropped into our midst as a bomb. That proposal gave some people in Congress a rationalization escape from standing up to be counted in favor of a civil-rights program, and there is no doubt about the fact that the civil-disobedience suggestion has greatly weakened the position of those of us in Congress who are sincerely trying to secure favorable consideration of civil-rights legislation.

I recognize that many Negroes do not appreciate that fact because I have talked to a good many of them during the last 2 weeks and they have indicated to me that they think those of us who are fighting for civil-rights legislation have in fact been strengthened in our position by the civil-disobedience proposal.

However, I can assure you, as I have assured them, that just the opposite is true. At the same time, I am satisfied that neither Randolph nor his supporters meant to produce that effect; and I am also convinced that Randolph has put into words the secret and subjective feelings of a great many Negroes who have become understandably embittered because of the cruelties and discriminations which have been heaped upon them.

Still that does not change the political situation confronting us in the Congress so far as civil rights legislation is concerned. Rather it makes the problem more difficult of solution.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA BRANCH,
Los Angeles, Calif., April 15, 1948.

Senator WAYNE B. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Last night's dispatches indicating that you are attempting to pressure Walter White into opposition to the proposal of Philip Randolph must come as a shock to all liberals of the country who have been counting on you as a real leader.

A sufficient time has elapsed since the hatred-creating days of the northern carpetbaggers so that pleas for gradualism in the settling of our race relationships have an exceedingly hollow sound. And, certainly, our Negro population could not be blamed if, after all these years of denial of their constitutional rights, they attempt to secure those rights by nonviolent civil disobedience.

As a Methodist minister for 40 years, I can only hope that if Congress passes a peacetime draft law, that our churches will follow in the same line. If we really believe that conscience, with its loyalty to God rather than to man, is an essential element in a democracy that is to endure, citizens may be compelled to use as unusual means to resist

the unmoral, undemocratic, and un-American program as the present administration has to put over its demand for universal military training and a peacetime draft. In spite of the police-state atmosphere which is reported prevalent in Washington, it still ought to be possible to see that following the failure to put over the militarization program, even by the use of Government funds and the best organized propaganda in our memory, the administration has now built up a synthetic war scare as the climax of a foreign policy which ought to have aroused far more opposition than has thus far developed in America.

My guess is that Philip Randolph's proposal, when understood in relation to the whole American and world situation, will receive surprising support over the country. I need not remind you that by this means Ghandi secured much more than rights guaranteed by our Constitution. It is the one answer to militarism.

Sincerely yours,

A. A. HEIST,
Director, Private Correspondence.

P. S.—I agree with the Nation editorial.

APRIL 22, 1948.

Mr. A. A. HEIST,
Director, Private Correspondence,
American Civil Liberties Union,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MR. HEIST: In response to your letter of April 14, I am sending you copies of the correspondence I have had with Walter White. Also enclosed are tear sheets from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 12 containing a speech I gave in the Senate on the civil disobedience proposal of Messrs. Randolph and Reynolds.

I am at a complete loss to understand your failure to recognize how ill-advised Randolph's proposal is, or to see how great a disservice a program of civil disobedience would be to attaining the goal of a sound civil rights legislative program.

Very truly yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

(Enclosure: Copy of April 6 telegram to Mr. White.)

APRIL 6, 1948.

Mr. WALTER WHITE,
National Association for the
Advancement of Colored People,
New York, N. Y.:

Appreciate your wire of April 1. However, I think you should read discussion which Randolph and I had at the hearing before you give any encouragement whatsoever to Randolph's proposal. I think you perform great disservice to those who are making as good a fight as we can for a sound civil-rights program if you give any encouragement to Randolph proposal. I agree with those parts of your wire which point out injustices which Negroes have been receiving in this country but I totally disagree with the other implications of your wire which I think give comfort to the Randolph approach to this problem. If you give any such encouragement to Randolph's point of view it will set back several years our fight for civil-rights program. Regards.

WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ON MONDAY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes on Monday next at noon it proceed to the consideration of unobjected-to bills on the Senate Calendar, commencing with Order No. 1155, House bill 4571, which is the point at which the Senate concluded the call of the calendar on the last occasion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the work of the Senate having apparently been completed for today, I move that the Senate stand in recess until Monday next at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, April 26, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 22, 1948:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be the United States Special Representative in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Charles Sawyer, of Ohio, to be Secretary of Commerce.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 4th day of June 1948:

Paul F. Abel
William Abromitis, Jr.
Richard C. Adams
Augustine A. Albanese
Thomas E. Alexander
Benjamin G. Allen
Hoyt E. Allen
Robert C. Allen
Walter L. Alt
Gordon A. Anderson
Roy C. Anderson
William S. MacL. Arnold
Edward M. Axtell, Jr.
William R. Ayers
Robert P. Barber
William H. Barnes III
Russell Bartmes, Jr.
William H. Barton, Jr.
William R. Bartow
Jack Baruch
George M. Bates
Richard W. Bates
Joseph R. Bavle
David A. Beadling
Richard L. Beatty
Jerry T. Becker
Donald R. Behrens
Harry E. Belflower, Jr.
Gregory McC. Bell, Jr.
Herbert P. Benton III
Levon Berberian, Jr.
Floyd E. Bergeaux
Robert E. Berggren
Benjamin W. Bevis
Oral J. Bilderback
Patrick P. Billingsley
Walter T. Blakney
Floyd H. Blizard
Richard V. Bodmer
Louis J. Boland
Philip H. Bolger
Eugene S. Bowers
Franklin L. Bowersox
Claiborne S. Bradley
Charles R. Braley, Jr.
Ralph W. Brown, Jr.
James S. Brunson
Paul G. Bryant
Douglas G. Buchanan
Beaumont M. Buck
Robert G. Buechler
Norwood W. Bullington, Jr.
Ronald S. Burton
James E. Callahan, Jr.
James H. H. Carrington
Charles C. Carter, Jr.
Ernest C. Castle
Nicholas A. Castruccio
John D. Caylor
William D. Chandler 3d
Edwin MacM. Chapline
Roger A. Chapman
Thomas P. Cheesman
Robert S. Chew, Jr.
Matthew A. Chiara
Michael L. Childress
William T. Chipman, Jr.
Robert G. Claitor
Wyndham S. Clark, Jr.
Richard J. Clas
John D. Clithero
Richard A. Cochran
James N. Comerford
Jack H. Conable
Robert C. Conolly II
Albert E. Conord
Charles P. Coulter
Jack Cowden
Howard S. Crosby
James S. Crosby, Jr.
John R. Crumpton, Jr.
Thomas W. Cuddy
Daniel W. Cullivan
Bradley L. Daley
Bennie V. Damberg
James E. Davenport, Jr.
John M. Davis
John DeGoede
Daniel T. Deibler
Leonard V. Delling
Dean D. DeWitt
George W. Dittmann
William D. Dittmar
Claude E. Dorris
Laurens Dorsey
Benjamin S. Dowd, Jr.
Norman L. Duncan
Robert D. Duncan
Richard T. Duncan, Jr.
James W. Dupree, Jr.
William F. Easterlin, Jr.
Rex C. Eaton, Jr.
Dewey A. Ellis, Jr.
Gordon R. Engel
Leland F. Estes
John Evasovich
John L. Everngam, Jr.
Emil M. Eyler
William R. Fisher, Jr.
Edward B. Fleming
John A. Fletcher II
Francis C. Fogarty
Donald D. Foulds
Andrew L. Frahler
Ian N. Fraser
Edward Frothingham, Jr.
Wallace S. Gabriel
Stanton B. Garner
Herbert K. Gates, Jr.
Sidney W. Gaylord, Jr.
George E. Goodwin
Hugh H. Goodwin, Jr.
Ralph T. Goodwin, Jr.
Raymond I. Gornik
Jack L. Gracey
Morris R. Grady
Warren C. Graham, Jr.
Frederick H. Gralow
Ernest J. Gray
Harold Gurman
Donald B. Hall
Norman L. Halladay
Albert B. Hallman
David R. Hamlin
Robert W. Hanby, Jr.
Kevin Hanlon
Harley S. Harris, Jr.
Wade H. Harris
David L. Hartshorn
Charles E. Hathaway
Douglas B. Hatmaker
Stanley R. Hawe
Edward B. Hebden II
Leonard M. Hendrix
Albert G. Henry, Jr.
John D. Herlihy, Jr.
Lawrence C. Hernandez, Jr.
Charles W. Hines
William R. Hintz
Richard B. Hodson
Hugh S. Holder
Tennyson J. Hull III
Harvey R. Humphrey
Robert D. Huntington, Jr.
David A. Hurt, Jr.
Karl H. Huss, Jr.
William G. Ikard II
James M. Ivey, Jr.
Frederick D. Jackson, Jr.
John W. James
Alan L. Jansen
Leonard A. Jay, Jr.
John L. Jensen, Jr.
Francis C. Johnson
Henry B. Johnson
William E. Johnston
Harry L. Jones
William A. Kanakanui, Jr.
Jack C. Kays
William H. Keen
Kenneth Kelty
Robert E. Kenyon
Harry N. Key, Jr.
Thomas F. Kilduff, Jr.
Robert E. King
Burton H. Kleinman
Herbert S. Kline
John W. Klinefelter
Edward L. Korb
Seymour L. Kunin
Frederick R. Lafferty, Jr.
Arthur Landis, Jr.
Charles M. Lane
Charles H. Langton
William J. Laubendorfer
Jason P. Law
Paul D. Lawler
Hugh O. Lea
Robert L. Lee, Jr.
William W. Lee, Jr.
Edgar S. Levy, Jr.
William W. Lewis, Jr.
Aubrey L. Loeffler
Hubert B. Loheed
John R. Lowdenslager
Robert B. Lyle
Arthur L. Markel
Marvin D. Marsh
George W. Marshall
Paul V. Martenson
Thomas E. Matia
Frank E. Matthews
Elmer A. McCallum, Jr.
William L. McClure
John K. McConeghy, Jr.
John W. McCord
Milton C. McFarland
Robert S. McGihon
Andrew McIntyre
Donald A. McIver
Russell R. McKechnie
Marvin "M" McKinley, Jr.
Edward F. McLaughlin, Jr.
John R. McMahon, Jr.
Robert H. Meenan
Robert E. Melhorn
James I. Mellencamp
Murray Menkes
Charles Mertz, 3d
Edward W. Meyers
Howard B. Moore
James R. Moore, Jr.
Roderick B. Moore
Sumner K. Moore
William V. Moore
Donald R. Morris
Eugene C. Moss
Peter R. Moureau
Leonard W. Mulbry
James E. Myrick
Robert R. Neely, Jr.
Frederick L. Nelson
Richard E. Nicholson
Eugene J. Noblet
Dan R. Nolen
Robert P. Nottingham
Thomas H. Nugent, Jr.
John L. Oberrieder
Mark J. O'Friel
Robert W. O'Reilly
Frank W. Orr, Jr.
Edward J. Ortlieb
Gerald L. Palmer, Jr.
Benjamin H. Pester
John D. Peterson
James E. Peterson, Jr.
William C. Pierson
Ray C. Pittman
Alonzo M. Poteet, Jr.
Delton B. Pruner
Robert O. Pyle, Jr.
Paul L. Quinn
Charles E. Ransom, Jr.
Hugh B. Rardin
Walter L. Rees
Harvey E. Rennacker
Earl F. Resch
Edwin C. Rice
Ward P. Riggins, Jr.
Guy W. Riggs
Knight M. Robbins
Harold L. Robiner
Rufo W. Robinson
Edward B. Rogers, Jr.
Joseph P. Rogers, Jr.
William A. Rogers, Jr.
Donald S. Ross
Ernest H. Ross, Jr.
Terry A. Ross
Andrew T. Roulston
Richard B. Rubenstein
John A. Russell
William F. Sallada

William G. Sawyer	Boone C. Taylor
Albert R. Schofield, Jr.	Karl R. Thiele
	Albert J. Thompson
Robert A. Schultz	David R. Thornhill
Robert E. Schwoeffermann	Frank S. Tiernan
	Herbert N. Townsend
Richard U. Scott	Kenneth M. Treadwell
Robert H. Searle	Howard A. True
Ruell A. Searson	John C. Tsiknas
Henry T. Settle, Jr.	Robert W. Van Kirk, Jr.
Charles A. Sheehan	
Peter N. Sherrill	Carlos C. Villarreal
Jack N. Sherwood	John E. Vinsel
Albert F. Shimmel	Quentin W. Wagenfield
Richard E. Shimshak	
Jack R. Silvey	Robert E. Wainwright
William N. Small	Daniel P. Walchko
Harold F. Smith, Jr.	James F. Ward II
Robert C. Smith, Jr.	William Wegner
Nicholas W. Smusyn	Elbert N. Wells
Thomas C. Spalding	James K. Welsh, Jr.
Wilburn A. Speer, Jr.	Richard O. Wheeler
Richard H. Sprince	John F. White, Jr.
Richard J. Springe	Joseph P. White
Edward F. Stacy	Warren P. White
Thomas E. Stanley	Charles A. Whitmore, Jr.
Don R. Stephens	
Charles G. Strahley	Gilbert Wilkes III
Hart R. Stringfellow, Jr.	Stanwix M. Williams
	Joseph A. Wilson
Richard Struyk	Thomas B. Wilson, Jr.
Robert T. Styer	Thomas Woods II
George H. Sullivan, Jr	David L. Wright
Edward P. Supancic	George S. Wright
Francis J. Suttill, Jr.	Robert E. Wurlitzer
Joseph P. Tagliente	Ellis M. Zacharias, Jr.
Robert McE. Tatum	Jack P. Zimmerman

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy from the 4th day of June 1948:

Edmund S. Armstrong	Dudley Holstein
William H. Borchert	Howard N. Kay
William G. Brendle	William N. Langone
John W. Bruner	Charles L. Lewis
Donald H. Corson, Jr.	Harold B. Lipschutz
James A. Cox	Edward A. McManus
William F. Doddy	Kennedy Niland
Kenneth W. Dunwody, Jr.	James H. Smeds
	David M. Smith
William H. Evans, Jr.	Edgar N. Smith
John P. Gaffigan	Morris M. Smith
Robert L. Ghormley, Jr.	Charles L. Suit III
	Robert C. Vance
Lewis E. Gleason	Kenneth B. Webster
Richard I. Henderson	Marvin A. Weir

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy from the 4th day of June 1948:

Robert G. Carroll	Charles B. Hogan
James C. Day, Jr.	Robert S. Lee, Jr.
Sydney W. Dunn, Jr.	George A. Leighton, Jr.
Richard M. Fluss	Henry Remsen
George L. Hoffman	Colonel J. Shook, Jr.

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Robert W. Corey, June 4, 1948.
Robert J. Cutler, June 4, 1948.
Raymond R. Demrick, June 4, 1948.
James H. Foxgrover, June 4, 1948.
Robert J. Harlow, June 4, 1948
Romeo D. Hinkston, June 4, 1948.
Leslie C. Hofto, June 4, 1948.
Frederick W. Holler, Jr., June 4, 1948.
James P. Kilgariff, June 4, 1948.
Justus A. Mueller, June 4, 1948.
Franklin C. Paschal, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Clyde A. Reaves, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Harlan C. Snyder, June 4, 1948.
Thomas C. Trafzer, June 4, 1948.

Philip A. Amidon (Naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy from the 4th day of June 1948.

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

Ray W. Foreaker, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Charles W. Gulick, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Nicholas F. Troug, June 4, 1948.

Francis W. Day (Naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, in lieu of ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy as previously nominated, to correct spelling of name.

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Betty J. Alexander	Charlotte R. Pierce
Virginia M. Cardillo	Gloria V. Rapp
Josephine A. Franks	Dorothy M. Riotte
Lois W. Gass	Anita J. Smith
Mary E. Hagan	Mary F. Sullivan
Lois C. McCuller	Bernice Szostak

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

COMMANDER

Greydon G. Boyd

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Donald G. MacKinnon

LIEUTENANT

Arvin T. Henderson

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Kenneth S. Axelsen	Ernest F. Wallner, Jr.
John J. Carroll	James H. Watts, Jr.
Donald E. Lloyd	John H. Young
Wallace S. Sekul	

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

COMMANDERS

James R. Justice
Niels H. Martin

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Norman D. Himes

LIEUTENANTS

Wallace S. Andrews	George E. Dudley
Hewitt J. Beauvais, Jr.	Martin R. Hamilton
Joseph J. Bonello	

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Anthony P. Giammusso	James A. Mitchell
	Daniel M. Roach
Walter J. Krumbeck	

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 22, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Albert E. Kirk, superintendent of the Methodist Churches of the Independence district, Kansas, offered the following prayer:

O God, our gracious Heavenly Father, we stand reverently lifting our thoughts to Thee, the source of all good. Our earnest prayer this morning is that goodness, righteousness may more and more prevail in the earth. To that end Thou hast ordained government among men as an agency of righteousness and "an avenger to execute punishment upon him that doeth evil," and hast declared that rulers, if they be not usurpers, are "ministers of Thine for good to all the people." We thank Thee this morning for government, "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," and we pray that it may not perish from the earth.

Grant each Member of this great legislative body, this House of Representatives of our Nation, to realize the honor and greatness of his position, and in that consciousness to find strength and courage for his arduous work.

Help all of us as American citizens intelligently to love our country, to honor and uphold our leaders, and to supply that righteousness that exalteth a nation, that righteousness that is the lifeblood of effective government.

"America, America, God mend thine every flaw,
Confirm Thy soul in self-control, Thy liberty in law."

Thy kingdom, O God, is "righteousness, peace, and joy": "righteousness," the foundation of peace—help us further to establish righteousness; "peace" built upon righteousness, the foundation of joy, of human well-being—help us further to achieve peace and human well-being.

Our prayer is "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth"—hear this, our prayer, and help us daily to help Thee to answer it. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2195) entitled "An act to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BUCK, Mr. CAIN, Mr. KEM, Mr. HOLLAND, and Mr. UMSTEAD to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

JAMES WOLFENDEN AND ROLAND KINZER

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Republican delegation of Pennsylvania is honored today by having again with us two men who served long and faithfully in this House. I refer to the Honorable James Wolfenden, of Upper Darby, and the Honorable Roland Kinzer, of Lancaster. When we came here 10 years ago these two men were among the leaders and mentors of this House. They were both instrumental in seeing that the present Speaker was named the minority leader at that time. I know that all the older Members share with us today the pleasure and satisfaction we have in greeting these two men who have contributed so much to the honor of not only the great State of Pennsylvania but this Nation as well.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am very glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. I join with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] in the nice things that he has said about these two gentlemen from Pennsylvania. In my service here, I do not believe I have ever served with anyone for whom I have had greater affection or higher regard than the two gentlemen from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank our distinguished majority leader for his gracious remarks.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. Gladly.

Mr. RANKIN. I wish to say for our side of the House that no two Members who ever served in Congress, at least since I have been here, enjoyed more of the respect and confidence and affection of the Members, regardless of party, than did the two distinguished gentlemen from Pennsylvania, Mr. Wolfenden and Mr. Kinzer.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi.

ARBOR DAY—A NEBRASKA GIFT

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the world knows that the institution of Arbor Day is one of Nebraska's many outstanding gifts to this Nation.

A Nebraskan—J. Sterling Morton, who later became the third United States Secretary of Agriculture—was the man who gave Arbor Day its name, a name now admired and respected by 145,000,000 Americans. The State Legislature of Nebraska, in a resolution approved on January 4, 1872, was the first legislature of any State in this country to give its unanimous stamp of acceptance to the one day of the year dedicated to the progressive purpose of planting trees. Nebraska attained another "first" by being the initial State to hold Arbor Day observances on April 10, 1872.

It is significant to note that Nebraska's gift to the Nation has not been a mere flash in the pan, something which was of a temporary nature, to be abandoned when enthusiasms cooled. It is a matter of record that approximately 350,000,000 trees and shrubs were set out by Nebraskans—in Nebraska—during the 12 years between April 10, 1872, and April 10, 1884. There has not been a single year since the origin of Arbor Day when Nebraska children and grown-ups turned away from this commendable tradition.

My greatest inspiration from Arbor Day has been that it was, and is, an all-American event. Farmer and townsman, railroader and merchant, men and women, old and young—everyone turns out, fired with a single purpose, to make the day a success. Civic organizations encourage it. Agricultural societies get behind it. Schools foster it. Churches back it.

In Nebraska, Arbor Day is truly people's day.

Our countrymen know all this. We Nebraskans are proud to have them know it.

But, in spite of this widespread knowledge of Nebraska's gift day, there are still some facts about it that are not generally known. These facts belong to our American heritage as much as those which are already common property.

Let us dare to look back. Let us pay tribute now, not only to the Nebraskan father of Arbor Day but to the unheralded and unsung Nebraskans who were the grandfathers and great-grandfathers of this enduring tribute to the soil.

Indians were the first Nebraskans. Growth, planting, was the very core of their existence. The legend of Mondamin, a permanent star on the horizon of American literature, was made famous by the poet, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, in his epic work Hiawatha. Every school child knows the story of Mondamin. Yet, it never loses its force with each retelling. You remember it, how the strange warrior youth challenged Hiawatha to a battle to the death. Mondamin made only one condition: that if he should die, Hiawatha was to bury him, tend his grave, and keep it green. The result is equally familiar to all of you. Mondamin did die. Hiawatha kept his pledge. And out of Mondamin's well-tended grave came the first stalk of corn, a vital contribution to the Indians and to all who came after the Indians.

That legend had a place of respect in Indian folk lore long before the first white man staked his claim on Nebraska's fertile prairies.

The early Nebraska Indians planted to live. Their descendants, real and spiritual, live to plant. Each passing generation of Nebraskans, in an unbroken line since before recorded history—by planting—have added to the productiveness of our land.

In this respect it must be recalled that Omaha's first settler was a planter. Manuel Lisa came up the Missouri River on a raft, only 3 years after Jefferson had purchased the Louisiana Territory. We know that he originally intended to be a fur trader. He actually turned out to be a farmer. He had brought lima beans, potatoes, turnips, squash, and young trees. He came to plant these things for his own food. He remained to show the Indians how to plant and what to plant.

Manuel Lisa was only one among the many. Great as he was, J. Sterling Morton, father of Arbor Day, was also one among the many. You will look in vain on history's pages for the names and records of the real "unknown soldiers" of the army of agriculture. These heroes of hardship lived and served, planted and passed on. Others enjoyed the fruits of their labors. They were content that this should be so. Indian and white, they have vanished from Nebraska soil. But the work they have done will never perish. It will endure as long as fertile Nebraska endures.

The white pine sent to me by Sterling Morton, Jr., and which I planted on the Capitol Grounds, is a monument to Arbor Day and for the men and women and children whose devotion, understanding, and sacrifice has given such a powerful meaning to this observance. Little people, who in the ultimate analysis are the only great people, have literally watered this tree with their blood, sweat, and tears to make possible the continuing growth of the State of Nebraska.

With this knowledge before us, the meaning of our State motto, "Equality before the law," becomes all the more clear. All of us are equal before the law of nature.

We are all as humble as those first planters of Nebraska. We are all as great as those who gave Arbor Day from Nebraska to the Nation.

That is the message of Arbor Day, 1948.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POTTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio broadcast.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some editorials.

STEEL SHORTAGES PLAGUE NATION

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks and include two news items and a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege yesterday to attend a conference sponsored by the Office of Industry Cooperation, in the Department of Commerce, between representatives of the steel jobbing industry, the steel warehousemen, and representatives of Government, including the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives.

At the conference the steel warehousemen pointed out that their stocks were low, that the demand was high, and that average orders are for quantities less than 1 ton.

The steel warehouses and the wholesale hardware firms of the Nation who supply more than 10,000 items of steel to the farmers and smaller business firms of America have a real problem on their hands.

For many years these distributors have been getting about 19 percent of our total steel production. And they in turn have been servicing millions of users, who, by virtue of their small purchases, could not be economically served direct by the great steel mills.

Since VJ-day, there has been a marked increase in the domestic demand for steels of all kinds. More steel is needed to rehabilitate railway rolling stocks. More steel is needed in the petroleum industry to expand capacities to meet the highest demand in history.

Mr. Speaker, in the face of this greatly increased domestic demand, there has also arisen a greater demand for steel exports.

And so our steel producers and distributors are confronted with the problem of trying to take care of our domestic needs, and at the same time supplying steel for export purchasers.

Under the European recovery program, as first presented to the Congress, the 16 European nations asked for a total of $441,000,000 in steel and steel-making materials during 1948. This together with the demands of other nations not in the European recovery program, makes the export demand approximately 10 percent of our total steel production.

Our Office of International Trade only yesterday announced that the steel export quotas for the second quarter of 1948 had been reduced 2 percent from the

January-March period, to a total of 846,000 tons. Now, over and above this 846,000 tons allocated for export, the Office of International Trade announces that 125,000 short tons of tin plate has also been allocated for export during the second quarter of 1948. Thus more than 971,000 tons of steel and tin plate will leave our country at a time when many firms, large and small, are laying off employees and curtailing production because of serious shortages right here at home.

Last Friday, General Motors Corp. announced they would have to close several of their foundries, their machine and metal stamping shops for at least a week on account of the interruption in their steel supplies due to the work stoppage in the coal mines. K. T. Keller, president of Chrysler, told his stockholders only yesterday that his firm would have to reduce their output of automobiles because the work stoppage in the coal fields had seriously affected their supply of steel, pig iron, and coke.

Mr. Speaker, our present steel capacity is estimated to be around 93,000,000 tons per year. The steel companies are presently adding 5,000,000 tons of new capacity. But this new capacity, will not be sufficient to supply the domestic demand and take care of all the export demand at the same time.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, our committee suggested to the conference, that consideration be given to our domestic demand first of all, and that an additional 2 to 3 percent of our production be allocated to the warehouses and distributors, so that the hardship cases might be given a modicum of relief at once. The chief use of this additional percentage should be to users in the category of requirement of 100 tons per year. This class user is too small to obtain mill orders and too large to be supplied ordinarily by steel warehouses.

It will be a tragedy, indeed, Mr. Speaker, and a travesty on justice, if our taxpayers, who are going to provide the funds for the European recovery program, are to have their needs come secondary to the needs of people in other lands.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend to each of the Members of this House a study of section 112 (a) of the act of April 3, 1948, known as the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, which provides:

> The Administrator shall provide for the procurement in the United States of commodities under this title in such a way as to (1) minimize the drain upon the resources of the United States and the impact of such procurement upon the domestic economy, and (2) avoid impairing the fulfillment of vital needs of the people of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that steel is a vital need of the people of the United States, and that further large exports of steel and steel products will immeasurably damage the domestic economy, and serve as a drain upon our resources.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSIONER CLIFFORD DURR

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I place here in the RECORD an Associated Press description of a statement made yesterday by the distinguished American journalist, Frank C. Waldrop, on a ruling made by the Federal Communications Commission. Mr. Waldrop, long a recognized authority on matters pertaining to free speech in our Nation, I feel, speaks for all of those Americans who are concerned over any attempt to abridge the right of expression here in America. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that his objections to the Federal Communications Commission ruling should be made a part of the permanent RECORD:

> The Federal Communications Commission yesterday heard itself called "the principal enemy of free speech now operating within the Government of the United States."
>
> Frank C. Waldrop, Washington Times-Herald editorial writer, applied the description in an appearance before the Commission to protest the 7-year-old FCC ban against radio stations "editorializing" on public questions.
>
> Waldrop asked for revocation of the ban and "a general correction of past policies" relating to supervision of broadcasting.
>
> "The law did not appoint you America's nursemaid, school ma'am, or censor," Waldrop said.
>
> The no-editorializing rule was as staunchly championed by Norman Matthews, chairman of the UAW-CIO international radio committee.
>
> He said the wording of the ban itself—"a truly free radio cannot be used to advocate the cause of the licensee"—stated the case for retention.
>
> Matthews contended that both the letter and the spirit of the rule is frequently violated by radio stations. He said that "the licensing of broadcasters to editorialize will be a move toward a monopoly of opinion channels in the country."
>
> FCC yesterday concluded a series of public hearings on the question of amending or revoking the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I noted in today's paper two news items of particular interest. One was that Mrs. Virginia Foster Durr, the wife of Federal Communications Commissioner Clifford Durr, had accepted the chairmanship of the Northern Virginia Committee for Henry Wallace. The second item listed Commissioner Durr as being scheduled to call upon President Truman at the White House this morning. I feel that I express the fervent hope of 95 percent of the American people that Commissioner Durr tendered his resignation to the President of the United States.

EMERGENCY RENT CONTROL, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2195) to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended, with House amendments, insist on the amendments of the House, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. O'HARA, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. ALLEN of California, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. ABERNETHY.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]?

There was no objection.

OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to announce that Governor Driscoll, of the great State of New Jersey, at 11 o'clock today signed a bill which will permit the houewives of New Jersey to buy oleomargarine, colored, free from State restrictions.

This bill went through the assembly of the great State of New Jersey 63 to 3, and through the State senate 16 to 0. My compliments to the great State of New Jersey.

I hope coming events are casting their shadows before.

SEVENTY-GROUP AIR FORCE

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, according to the morning press, the administration is still opposed to the achievement and maintenance of the 70-group air force program and is offering a compromise. This attitude is amazing in view of the fact that even with 70 groups of planes the United States will not possess air supremacy but will only have the basis on which to build air supremacy.

The House last week displayed admirable foresight and leadership in voting overwhelmingly the funds to begin the construction of the 70-group program. I hope that we will unfalteringly insist upon the position we have taken.

This administration must be told what we want for planes and not asked. The Congress should inform the administration and the armed services that the United States must have air supremacy. All the money necessary to give the United States the mightiest Air Force in the world should be appropriated and then having done this the Congress should demand that the armed services efficiently and effectively move to an early and full realization of the proposed goal. I hope the Congress will disregard this latest administration proposal for a compromise on our air strength and emphatically insist that the 70-group plane

program for the Air Force be realized at the earliest possible moment.

OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if I were the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MITCHELL] I would not rejoice too much over the fact that all the homes in New Jersey are going to have colored oleomargarine right soon, because I have in my possession an Associated Press report saying that an oleo factory blew up the other day injuring 26 people. I do not know what they were making it out of. But it must have been high powered. God help the people of Jersey if they get that kind of stuff.

REPORTS FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight, Friday, April 23, to file reports on H. R. 5808, H. R. 6071, H. R. 6087, H. R. 6203, H. R. 6209, and S. 2409.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SIMPSON]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NODAR asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post.

CONGRESSIONAL VISIT TO NEW YORK CITY

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, a number of Members of the House and their wives are going to make a visit a week from this week end to New York City. We desire very much to have them in New York City. As a matter of fact, one of the places they will visit is Radio City. I am particularly anxious that democracy come to Radio City in the persons of this delegation. I say that because of that same place you will find Russian propaganda, which is attempting to influence the minds of our students in the public schools. In that area you will find that pamphlets are distributed to the school children with pictures of Stalin on them, and a return postage-paid envelope also distributed, from which they can get further information from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics so-called Information Bulletin, but actually propaganda.

I am sure that the propaganda which the congressional group will find up there emanating from Communist sources will have as much effect on our delegation as water rolling off a duck's back.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POTTS. I yield.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. While they are in Radio City I wish they would take a peek at the world's tallest building, built from Indiana limestone.

Mr. POTTS. And we take great pride in it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a paper entitled "Southern California's Future in the Colorado River."

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a short article.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

CONFUSION REGARDING THE MARSHALL PLAN

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, today in the New York Herald Tribune there is an article written by Elmo Roper concerning a survey made by Time magazine with respect to the Marshall plan. The last paragraph of this article by Mr. Roper states that the people have shown more statesmanship than Congress has in its debate upon the subject. But the article starts off by saying that the public is confused about the Marshall plan. That is proved by an analysis in Time magazine's report, which shows that 15 percent of the people never heard of the plan, 46 percent are either unfavorable or have not had enough information to make a decision, and only 39 percent are generally favorable to the plan. It shows also that out of 13 questions only 3 went over 50 percent in affirmative answers. In reply to one question, 70 percent thought the people in the European countries who were sick and hungry were getting the relief directly, and 51 percent who believed it was going to secure us allies in the event of war. Sixty-two percent thought that the plan will make Europe self-supporting. Forty-six percent felt that the plan will promote American prosperity, and but 40 percent said it will make prices at home higher. I say they are confused; but in view of the fact that Congress passed the Marshall plan by a vote of 4 to 1, I think Mr. Roper must be more confused than Congress, because that body was not uncertain in its action. I believe the Appropriations Committee will show statesmanship in deciding how much money is going to be sent over there on this relief plan. We must depend upon that reliable committee to keep the expenditures within the reach of the American people. We desire to be charitable, but we are hardly going to be an example to the nations of Europe if we spend our money wildly, and demonstrate to the people of those countries that the peoples' representatives here act in appropriating their money without their knowledge, their consent, or without giving them any information with respect to the subject matter. We can hardly recommend our form of government to those nations when we fail to follow the mandates of our own Constitution. I repeat what I have said before, "Let us be just to our own people before we are too generous to others."

FEDERAL FINANCES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I was very much astonished, looking at the RECORD today, to find that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] yesterday asked "Where are you going to get the money?" and especially after I find that this Nation is now in debt $252,000,000,000. If he had thought of that before the debt was so large—I mean all the Democrats should have voted for economy in Government.

I have received a letter from Mr. Duck, vice president of the Lee Rubber & Tire Corp., in which he says:

> We are only kidding ourselves if we think we can cut taxes by $4,800,000,000, and make it stick, without at the same time putting the brakes on spending.
>
> Some clearly defined evidence that our Republican Congress intends to cut expenditures and that they are going to start cutting soon is important if you hope to regain public confidence for the party.

I want to say that since the Democrats have awakened to the realization that they have created this great debt, we should take advantage of their desire to help cut down expenses. I hope now they vote for some economy in Government. The Republican organization ought to study every bill that comes up and demand greater care and economy if we are going to keep this country solvent. Many bills are on their road into this Chamber, every one should have the utmost scrutiny, they may be worthy. We must ask ourselves the questions, Can the country stand any more obligations? Can we run the country in debt any further? If not, vote them down until we can consider them. We must be wise and economize.

UNCOLORED OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, 5 weeks ago, during the week of March 8, the Committee on Agriculture held hearings on margarine taxes. I very much regret that printed records of these hearings are not yet available.

I imagine that all Members received the April 20 margarine letter from Cudahy Packing Co. extolling the desirability of uncolored margarine. I today wired the president of that company as follows:

Referring your margarine letter 20th, please consult with sales manager and wire me effect on your margarine sales of failing to include coloring matter in each package.

If I am favored with a reply you will hear about it on Monday or Tuesday.

THE COMMUNIST LINE IN EUROPE

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the decisive defeat of the Communists in Italy is the most significant victory of American foreign policy since the conclusion of World War II. It represents a major achievement for the new realism in the State Department which holds the key to peace. The westward march of communism has been halted for the moment.

As a result of the victory for democracy, it is not impossible or improbable that the ever-devious Communist party line will now suddenly make a complete about face, and we might soon hear expressions from Moscow advocating cooperation with the western democracies. The expression of yesterday by the Italian Communist leader is a straw in the wind. The 1948 American apostle of holy Soviet Russia, Mr. Henry Wallace, might very well be "Browderized," which would certainly cause no grief in America.

Americans must be on guard against such a change of policy. It is at last seeping through the minds of the Kremlin that America is determined to assist free men everywhere; that we are going ahead with our program of reestablishing our military strength on land, on the sea, and in the air. We must not be lulled into a new sleep. If the change in party line comes and we hear words of sweetness from the inner sanctum of the Soviets, let us not be again deceived. Let us realize that this is only another tack and another brand of Soviet intrigue, but it could happen, and it may happen. Have any of you forgotten the issue of the Daily Worker which in its inner pages gave reports on the imperialistic war, and on page 1 called for an American expeditionary force to immediately go to the aid of Soviet Russia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech by former Commander Raymond M. Bottom, of the city of Newport News on the port of Hampton Roads, Va. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $159.75, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include two editorials and in the other to include an address by Norman Burns, of the Department of State, before the Rhode Island World Affairs Week.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include newspaper excerpts.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two newspaper editorials and one newspaper article.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to include in the remarks which he expects to make today on House Resolution 562 certain extraneous material.

GOVERNMENT ECONOMY

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has properly called attention to the excessive appropriations and spending that have recently been sanctioned by the Congress. However, it does occur to me that his remarks should be principally addressed to his colleagues on the Republican side. Thus far this session five appropriation bills have been passed but the reductions under the budget estimates have amounted to a mere 2 percent. Meanwhile, the Republican majority are bringing in bills every other day, other than regular appropriation bills, calling for the expenditures of large sums of money which will cost the taxpayers millions and millions of dollars.

I called attention to this situation yesterday and I repeated the gentleman's question: "Where are you going to get the money?" Now, I feel that something should be done to limit expenditures and to stop the reckless spending of Government funds. Day in and day out you Republicans charge that the administration is careless in its spending, but the fact is that you have a majority in both the House and Senate and are in position to reduce expenditures, yet you endeavor to make the people believe that you are not responsible for these large monetary outlays. Despite your promises to economize and reduce expenditures, you have failed absolutely to do so.

Mr. RICH. I objected to the Democrats spending money and I object to the Republicans spending money just the same.

Mr. SABATH. But, again, I state: You Republicans have a majority and can stop reckless spending, but you have not seen fit to do it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders hertofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders hertofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an article appearing in the Lynn (Mass.) Telegram-News, and in the other to include a resolution adopted by the Executive Governor's Council of Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HULL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain letters.

THE ITALIAN ELECTION

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, all Americans, all the liberty-loving people of the world, rejoice over the outcome of the recent elections in Italy.

In the results of that plebiscite that great people announce in no uncertain terms to an anxiously awaiting world that they have taken their stand on the side of liberty and justice, and turned their back upon all forms of soul-withering totalitarianism, including that which today holds Red Russia in chains.

And in the achievement of that glorious result great credit must go to our fellow American citizens of Italian descent. The avalanche of mail that they dispatched to their Old World friends and relatives, bespeaking their faith in our democratic institutions, did much to turn the tide in favor of the enlightened system of human relations which has been so long our cherished possession.

All honor to our fellow citizens of Italian descent. Their service to the cause of liberty, justice, and human dignity cannot be overestimated.

TREASONABLE PROPAGANDA

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we have seen a good deal in the press lately about the Negro, A. Philip Randolph, head of the pullman porters union, advising the Negroes of this country to resist military service.

We are still at war. Peace has not been declared. This Negro, Randolph, would be committing a criminal offense if we were not at war, but under the circumstances he is perpetrating treason. If we had the right kind of an Attorney General, he would find himself in jail before the sun goes down.

He is following the Communist line of stirring up trouble among the Negroes of this country. I see that one Negro bishop down in the Southern States has taken it upon himself to advise the Negroes against it—saying that Randolph is merely trying to lead them into trouble. I say Randolph is simply following the Communist line, and every one of the rest of them that takes that kind of an attitude and advocates resistance to this Government is perpetrating treason, and the Attorney General ought to do his duty and prosecute them at once.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

ANTI-MILITARY-SERVICE PROPAGANDA

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with what the gentleman from Mississippi has just said with reference to these highfaluting race hate agitators and troublemakers who are attempting to stir up resistance among the Negroes to the draft by demanding that they refuse to serve their country, I want to read to you section 4 of the Criminal Code:

> Whoever incites, sets on foot, assists, or engages in any rebellion or insurrection against the authority of the United States or the laws thereof, or gives aid and comfort thereto, shall be imprisoned not more than 10 years or fined not more than $10,000, or both; and shall, moreover, be incapable of holding any office under the United States.

Mr. Speaker, there is, I believe, the Attorney General's authority, and I want to suggest to him that he take his nose out of the internal affairs of Mississippi and South Carolina long enough to take care of putting these real traitors where they belong.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PHILLIPS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Dr. Norborg.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute in order to announce the program for next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the discharge petition on H. R. 2345, the bill dealing with taxes on oleomargarine, having been signed by the required number of Members under the discharge rule probably will be called on Monday next. By reason of certain circumstances a number of Members have asked me to try to postpone the consideration of this matter. I have explored that possibility but have been informed that objection would be made to any effort to postpone it, so of course, it would be useless to make that effort. As far as I know now, therefore, it will be called up on next Monday.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Is it hoped that that measure will be finished on Monday?

Mr. HALLECK. From what I have heard, I do not know. I would seriously question that it could be finished on Monday. I understand the concern in the gentleman's mind, since I know that next Tuesday is the day fixed for the primaries in the great State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. Necessarily the Members from Pennsylvania want to be home to participate in those primary elections on that day. That is one of the considerations that I think motivated many of the Members who asked me to try to make some arrangement to postpone the consideration of the bill. Of course, if the consideration of the bill is not concluded on Monday, under the rules it would carry over on Tuesday.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Is it not quite true that under circumstances similar to this, as a matter of precedent, where a committee is discharged it is generally the rule that there is an agreement between both sides that some debate is required, and the chances are the consideration of the bill might continue not only until Tuesday but until Wednesday?

Mr. HALLECK. I cannot say what may be done in that regard; I do not know.

Monday is also District day. I understand from the Committee on the District of Columbia that there are a number of matters that should be disposed of, if at all possible. Also, if a rule is granted, it is hoped that we can call up for disposition on Tuesday the bill (H. R. 5963) to authorize the construction of a courthouse to accommodate the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

On Wednesday it is hoped that the supplemental Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill will be ready for consideration. In connection with that, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the rules of the House it may be in order to call up that appropriation bill for consideration on Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent that the call of the committees in order on Calendar Wednesday next may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. On Thursday we will continue the consideration of that appropriation bill, if it is not previously concluded. It is hoped that on Thursday we may call up, if a rule is granted on it, the bill (H. R. 5992) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

It is also hoped that the legislative appropriation bill may be reported by the Committee on Appropriations next week. If it is so reported, we should like to call it up on Friday and dispose of it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we are about to consider one of the most important cases that has ever come before the Congress. I think the Members ought to be here to hear the discussion. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 46]

Abbitt	Domengeaux	Kearns
Andrews, Ala.	Dondero	Kefauver
Battle	Dorn	Kennedy
Beall	Eaton	Keogh
Bell	Elliott	Kilburn
Bloom	Fogarty	Larcade
Bolton	Gallagher	Ludlow
Boykin	Gavin	Lusk
Buckley	Gillette	Lyle
Bulwinkle	Gossett	Lynch
Byrne, N. Y.	Grant, Ala.	McCormack
Chadwick	Harless, Ariz.	McCowen
Chapman	Harrison	Macy
Clark	Hart	Manasco
Clippinger	Hartley	Mansfield
Cole, Kans.	Hendricks	Mathews
Cole, N. Y.	Hobbs	Meade, Md.
Colmer	Hoeven	Miller, Calif.
Cotton	Jackson, Calif.	Monroney
Courtney	Jarman	Morgan
Crosser	Javits	Multer
Dawson, Ill.	Jenison	Mundt
Delaney	Jenkins, Ohio	Norrell
Dingell	Jenkins, Pa.	Norton
Dirksen	Johnson, Okla.	O'Hara
Dolliver	Kearney	O'Konski

Pace	Regan	Smith, Wis.
Pfeifer	Rizley	Stratton
Phillips, Tenn.	Rogers, Mass.	Taylor
Plumley	Sarbacher	Towe
Powell	Scoblick	West
Price, Fla.	Scott, Hardie	Worley
Rains	Sikes	
Redden	Simpson, Pa.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 329 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SUNDSTROM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll.

Mr. RICHARDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Columbia Record.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permisison to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, to include in one an editorial and in the other an article by Anne O'Hare McCormick.

EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I brought to the attention of the House the disturbing fact that, in spite of our well-known critical oil shortage, we are about to let the ERP export from this country 2,700,000 metric tons of petroleum products of the value of $500,000,000.

Today I want to point out that the outstanding study on the Economic Situation and Prospects of Europe, released on March 30, by the UN Economic Commission for Europe, points out that the 16 participating ERP countries expect by 1951 to double their oil consumption of 1938—in fact, the increase in the case of some countries is more than threefold as compared with 1938 consumption.

These UN economic experts who really know the problems of European economy warn that the huge ERP oil program will actually make Europe depend forever upon dollar oil. In this manner it seems to me that generous and dangerous American oil deliveries by way of the ERP program will prove to be a means by which this country not only will rob itself of her strategic oil but will forever burden and break European economy and trade with dollar countries—in fact, within a period of from 6 to 8 years, demands on the oil account alone will call for at least $4,000,000,000. This is not the way to recovery.

DR. EDWARD U. CONDON

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I call up House Resolution 522 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Commerce is hereby directed to transmit forthwith to the House of Representatives the full text of a letter dated May 15, 1947, written by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and addressed to W. Averell Harriman, Secretary of Commerce, relating to Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, in making allotments of time in the consideration of this resolution, I grant the time on the basis of debate, and for no other purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has reported House Resolution 522 favorably, without a dissenting vote, with one member voting "Present."

The committee recognizes that the resolution creates an issue of extreme importance as between the executive and legislative branches of our Government. The committee has accordingly given very careful consideration to the matter. Furthermore, the committee has prepared and filed a voluminous report to the end that the membership may have the fullest information on every phase of the issue.

The resolution as reported by the committee directs the Secretary of Commerce to transmit forthwith to the House of Representatives the full text of a letter dated May 15, 1947, written by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and addressed to W. Averell Harriman, Secretary of Commerce, relating to Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards.

The necessity of adopting the present procedure, by resolution of the House, arises from the fact that the Secretary of Commerce has refused to submit the letter to the Committee on Un-American Activities. This action was taken by the Secretary of Commerce even though a subpena had been issued to produce the same. Members of the Committee on Un-American Activities testified that the letter was desired for the benefit of their committee in its study and inquiry concerning un-American and subversive activities, and to determine what legislation should be adopted to curtail or eliminate all activities that are contrary to our Government and subversive to its best interests.

The Secretary of Commerce in his letter of March 4, 1948, addressed to Hon. J. PARNELL THOMAS, chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities, takes the position, based on an opinion of the Attorney General that—

Under traditional concepts of the separation of powers and responsibilities of the executive and legislative branches of our Government, the executive branch is not, as a matter of law, required to furnish information of this kind to a congressional committee, but on the contrary has the duty to exercise its own judgment in determining whether the furnishing of the information would be in the public interest.

The Secretary then proceeds to say at a later point in his letter to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS]:

I have, after careful consideration reached the conclusion that the release of the documents and information called for in this case would, in fact, be prejudicial to the public interest.

Such a reply on a matter of this kind is not only surprising, but, in my opinion, rather startling.

On April 9, 1948, as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, being the committee to which House Resolution 522 had been referred, I addressed a letter to the Honorable Tom Clark, Attorney General of the United States, informing him that the committee expected to consider House Resolution 522 on April 13. I also stated in my letter to him that if he wished to submit a brief expressing his views with respect to the resolution, the committee would be pleased to receive it. Mr. Peyton Ford, Assistant to the Attorney General, replied by letter of April 12, in which he recommended that House Resolution 522 be not favorably reported, for reason stated therein. The letter in full has been made a part of the committee report. It expressed the view that the refusal of the Secretary of Commerce to produce the letter and other documents was "in keeping with the well-established principle that it is in the public interest to maintain on a confidential basis reports rendered by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other investigative agencies of the executive branch of the Government."

On March 13, 1948, President Truman in dealing with this matter and others of a similar character, issued a directive in the form of a memorandum to all officers and employees of the executive branch of the Government, reading as follows:

MEMORANDUM TO ALL OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

The efficient and just administration of the employee loyalty program, under Executive Order No. 9835 of March 21, 1947, requires that reports, records, and files relative to the program be preserved in strict confidence. This is necessary in the interest of our national security and welfare, to preserve the confidential character and sources of information furnished, and to protect Government personnel against the dissemination of unfounded or disproved allegations. It is necessary also in order to insure the fair and just disposition of loyalty cases.

For these reasons, and in accordance with the long-established policy that reports rendered by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other investigative agencies of the executive branch are to be regarded as confidential, all reports, records, and files relative to the loyalty of employees or prospective employees (including reports of such investigative agencies), shall be maintained in confidence, and shall not be transmitted or disclosed except as required in the efficient conduct of business.

Any subpena or demand or request for information, reports, or files of the nature described, received from sources other than those persons in the executive branch of the Government who are entitled thereto by reason of their official duties, shall be respectfully declined, on the basis of this directive, and the subpena or demand or other request shall be referred to the Office of the President for such response as the President may determine to be in the public interest in the particular case. There shall be no relaxation of the provisions of this directive except with my express authority.

This directive shall be published in the Federal Register.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The communications in the form of letters to which I have already referred, refusing to make available the letter of J. Edgar Hoover relating to Dr. Condon and the broad scope of the President's directive of March 13, 1948, freezing all such information, indicate the adoption in the executive branch of the Government of a policy of denying to the legislative branch of the Government information which it is essential for the legislative branch to have in order to discharge its functions in relation to the safeguarding of the national security.

In order that the House may readily see the importance and the necessity of the Committee on Un-American Activities having the benefit of the entire contents of the letter written by J. Edgar Hoover to Secretary of Commerce Harriman, I wish to read to the House that small portion of the letter which has been obtained by the Committee through one of its investigators. It is as follows:

The files of the Bureau reflect that Dr. Edward U. Condon has been in contact as late as 1947 with an individual alleged by a self-confessed Soviet espionage agent, to have engaged in espionage activities with the Russians in Washington, D. C., from 1941 to 1944.

Mr. and Mrs. Condon associated with several individuals connected with the Polish Embassy in Washington, D. C. Among those are Mrs. Joseph Winiewicz, wife of the Polish Ambassador, Virginia Woerk, a clerk employee of the Polish Embassy, Helen M. Harris, secretary of the Polish Embassy, and Ignace Zlotowski, former counselor of the Polish Embassy and presently a Polish delegate to the United States.

Helen Harris is identified as a former secretary to the American-Soviet Science Society during the time it was known as science committee of the National American Soviet Friendship Society. She went to work for the Polish Embassy in the fall of 1946.

Zlotowski is identified as a nuclear scientist who studied under Jolit Curie, known member of the Communist Party. He was ex-secretary of the American-Soviet Society. It is known that in February 1947 Zlotowski purchased 270 books on atomic energy which had been published by the Department of Commerce.

It is also known that Mr. and Mrs. Condon were in contact with several other persons closely associated with this alleged Soviet espionage agent. It is also reliably reported that, in March 1947, Zlotowski offered the use of the Polish diplomatic pouch to scientific groups as a means of transmitting scientific material outside the United States, dissemination of which had to be restricted because of security reasons by military authorities.

Zlotowski was in contact with Anatole Cromov, first secretary of the Soviet Embassy, who has since returned to Russia. Condon applied for passport June 4, 1946, to Russia, which was issued but was later canceled by the Army.

As further background to the information contained in the letter of J. Edgar Hoover, and which makes it highly necessary for the Committee on Un-American Activities to have possession of the full contents of the letter, is the allegation that Dr. Condon has made a number of speeches indicating an interest in Russia, one of which was made on the occasion of the Fifth Annual Science Institute on March 5, 1946, in Washington, D. C., from which I quote. Condon, speaking of Russia, said:

We must welcome their scientists to our laboratories, as they have welcomed us to theirs, and extend the base of scientific cooperation with this great people. Of course, we must behave this way toward the scientists of all nations. I only mention Russia because she is right now the target of attack by those irresponsibles who think she would be a suitable adversary in the next world war.

In the same address Condon made the statement:

We must regain for all scientists that freedom from military domination if science is to be used for peaceful ends.

Condon's belief in the free exchange of information among world scientists is indicated by the following quotation from his article, Is War Research Science? which appeared in the Saturday Review of Literature of January 15, 1945:

The restoration of freedom to science is one of the elements in the civilization we have been fighting for—freedom from secrecy and freedom from national barriers.

The facts contained in the portion of the letter of J. Edgar Hoover that I have read, together with the statements of Dr. Condon in his speech and article also referred to, are sufficient, in my judgment, to create an obligation upon the part of the Committee on Un-American Activities to pursue the inquiry concerning Dr. Condon to a conclusion. The action of the Secretary of Commerce in refusing to give to the committee the full text of the letter of J. Edgar Hoover concerning Dr. Condon handicaps and prevents the committee in making this inquiry as fully as the importance of the matter requires. It is my further opinion that this refusal upon the part of the Secretary of Commerce is unjustified and contrary to the public interest.

The claim that is made by the Secretary of Commerce, and supported by the opinion of the Attorney General, "that under traditional concepts of the separation of powers and responsibilities of the executive and legislative branches of our Government, the executive branch is not, as a matter of law, required to furnish information of this kind to a congressional committee," and so forth, is without foundation in law. To the contrary, it may be said that there is no provision of the Constitution, nor any law of the United States that precludes the giving of such information as is here requested, by an executive department to the Congress or one of its duly appointed committees, in the furtherance of its legislative functions, nor is there any division between the executive and legislative branches of our Government provided for in the Constitution that prevents, precludes, or contemplates the refusal of any executive department to give necessary information to the legislative branch of the Government.

The constitutional authority of any congressional committee to demand or require information deemed essential to the legislative process is found in an early act of Congress of May 3, 1798 (1 Stat. 554, ch. XXXVI), which reads:

CHAP. XXXVI. An Act To Authorize Certain Officers and Other Persons To Administer Oaths

SECTION 1. *Be it enacted, etc.*, That the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, a chairman of a committee of the whole, or a chairman of a select committee of either House, shall be empowered to administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses, in any case under their examination.

SEC. 2. *And be it further enacted*, That if any person shall willfully, absolutely, and falsely swear or affirm, touching any matter or thing material to the point in question, whereto he or she shall be thus examined, every person so offending, and being thereof duly convicted, shall be subjected to the pains, penalties, and disabilities which by law are prescribed for the punishment of the crime of wilful and corrupt perjury.

Approved, May 3, 1798.

It is also important to note that the protection and the enforcement of these attributes of the power to legislate are the subject matter of Revised Statute 102 (U. S. C. 2: 192), which applies to every person. This provision reads:

Every person who having been summoned as a witness by the authority of either House of Congress to give testimony or to produce papers upon any matter under inquiry before either House, or any joint committee established by a joint or concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, or any committee of either House of Congress, willfully makes default, or who, having appeared, refuses to answer any question pertinent to the question under inquiry, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of not more than $1,000 nor less than $100 and imprisonment in a common jail for not less than 1 month nor more than 12 months.

In these days when communism is working by devious methods to advance its ideology, in this and other countries, using secret agents, and practicing all the tricks inherent in a well-organized espionage system operating throughout the world, it is incumbent upon the Congress to leave no stone unturned in its effort to ferret out every subversive agency and every person affiliated with any such activity. Whether Dr. Condon is disloyal, a security risk, indiscreet, or innocent is not the issue before the House today. The only issue, and it is an important one, is whether Congress in the due performance of its functions of legislation can require the executive branch to submit to the duly authorized committees of Congress information that is necessary to properly and fully perform the duties assigned to the Congress and its committees.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, con-

cluded his speech by citing paragraphs of an old law which applies to individuals and not to executive departments. I cannot see how it could be interpreted to apply to a department and therefore feel that the proposed legislation is purely for political effect to create embarrassment for a public servant who has served the Nation well and in a manner as very few persons in responsible places have been able to do.

I have received many letters and resolutions from scientists throughout the United States, all of whom I know are patriotic, sincere, honest and law abiding. These gentlemen state positively that they have known Dr. Condon favorably for many years and vouch for his patriotism and loyalty. Besides, I feel that the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Harriman, who happens to be a Republican, is just as patriotic and has the interest of the country at heart in this respect as any member of any committee of the Congress. I do not agree with Mr. Harriman on some matters, but in any event he is of good American stock and patriotic. I know that if there were anything in the letter that is sought by the committee that was against the interests of our country, he would gladly furnish it notwithstanding the fact that what we are proposing to do today has not been done for 175 years.

We have been able to get along nicely during that period with the executive and even with the judicial branch of our Government, although we might have differed and the judiciary may have sometimes ruled that our action was not in accordance with the Constitution; nevertheless, the founding fathers established these three branches of government, and I think it is unfair at this time to deviate from the precedents and interfere with the long-established rights and powers to obtain evidence by this method—evidence that the President, Secretary of Commerce, and the Attorney General say is not consistent to furnish in accordance with the best policy of the Government.

I may say, however, Mr. Speaker, that if there is anything in the letter to show that Condon is unpatriotic, I feel that he would have been separated from the important position that he holds. I wish to say that I would oppose with all the power at my command any individual or any organization whose activities would endanger the interests of our country. But from the evidence that I have been able to obtain from outstanding and patriotic persons who have worked and associated with Dr. Condon and who have known him for many years, I am compelled to believe that he is a loyal, patriotic American and is deserving of the privileges and rights of any other citizen of our land.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. Does not the distinguished gentleman from Illinois believe that the best answer to any charges against Dr. Condon would be found in the letter, and I ask the gentleman a further question: I do not know whether Dr. Condon is guilty or not of the charges being made against him. But I want to give him a fair trial, and I think in justice to Dr. Condon he himself should ask that the letter be released.

Mr. SABATH. If I am not mistaken, the doctor has asked for a hearing before the committee. I agree with the gentleman he is entitled to a fair trial, just as any other man, but can he obtain a fair hearing from the committee that has conducted some of its hearings unfairly?

Mr. HÉBERT. I disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. SABATH. I regret that I cannot yield to the gentleman any further.

Mr. HÉBERT. Obviously, the gentleman will not yield any further.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman knows that I have served for many years. I was instrumental in passing the first resolution as well as the second one to investigate any and all un-American activities. Consequently, I am interested in the work of the committee, but have at all times insisted on fair play and that the investigation be carried on whether it applied to un-American or Fascist activities.

Mr. Speaker, I fully realize that this resolution will pass and notwithstanding that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] appeared before the Committee on Rules for a rule on his resolution, House Joint Resolution 342, which is more comprehensive than the resolution before us in that it would require all agencies of the Government to open their files or to submit any evidence requested by any committees of the House or Senate, I feel that if we are to deviate from our established policies at this time, we should give consideration to the resolution of the gentleman from Michigan, not that I approve of it, but that it should have received prior consideration.

I repeat, I am satisfied that notwithstanding the denials that have been made, this matter is being taken up purely for political purposes. It is amazing to me that no one in opposition to this resolution was permitted to appear before the Comimttee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Such denial of hearing opponents to a measure is unfair and unjustifiable and, saying the least, is a lopsided procedure. The gentlemen urging this legislation ignore the fact that the Constitution provides for the duties and functions of the executive, judicial, and legislative branches of our Government. Each branch with its definite powers and rights should suffer no interference at the hands of any other branch of the Government. This constitutional direction the proponents of this legislation today are ignoring, despite the weight of opinions of the Supreme Court that tend to uphold the powers and rights of the executive branch against infringement by the legislative branch. However, despite these Supreme Court precedents, I know that every Republican will vote for the passage of this resolution which, as I stated, was reported without giving any opponents the opportunity of being heard.

Mr. Speaker, under the permission given me, I shall not encumber the RECORD with some of the letters which I have received, but shall insert a résumé of the Condon case which appeared in the New York Times of March 7, 1948, giving a history of the happenings in the matter since July 11, 1946, when an unidentified person communicated with the congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to check the Federal Bureau of Investigation's record of Dr. Condon, as follcws:

CASE OF DR. CONDON

Dr. Edward U. Condon, 46, is a physicist who has made several fundamental contributions to nuclear physics. He was associated with the Manhattan district project, which developed the atomic bomb. He later was a scientific adviser to the Senate committee that created the United States Atomic Energy Commission. In 1945 he was appointed by the Secretary of Commerce, Henry A. Wallace, to be Director of the National Bureau of Standards, a Federal agency for scientific research. Last week a House Subcommittee on Un-American Activities called Dr. Condon "one of the weakest links in our atomic security."

This was the background of the allegation:

July 11, 1946: An unidentified man, described as a person who formerly held a security position in the Manhattan district project, wrote the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy suggesting that the committee have a look at the Federal Bureau of Investigation's record of Dr. Condon (the FBI had made a routine security investigation). Representative J. PARNELL THOMAS, head of the Un-American Activities Committee, was then a member of the joint committee.

March 23 and 25, 1947: Two articles appeared in a Washington newspaper—said to be "leaks" from the Thomas committee—accusing Dr. Condon of disloyalty.

April 8, 1947: At the request of Dr. Condon, the Loyalty Board of the Department of Commerce started to investigate him.

June 1947: Two magazine articles by Representative THOMAS contained brief references to Dr. Condon, saying, in effect, that he was a man to be watched.

July 9, 1947: Dr. Condon wrote to Mr. THOMAS offering to appear before his committee and answer any questions.

August 15, 1947: A subcommittee of the Thomas committee started its investigation of Dr. Condon.

February 24, 1948: The loyalty board of the Department of Commerce cleared Dr. Condon of any suspicion of disloyalty to the Government.

Last week the affair reached a climax. On Monday the Thomas committee issued a blast at Dr. Condon and demanded that Secretary Harriman either dismiss the scientist or set forth reasons for keeping him.

GIST OF THE CHARGES

The Thomas charges against Dr. Condon add up to this: Dr. Condon has associated with individuals suspected of disloyalty to the United States, including persons connected with the Polish Embassy in Washington; the FBI report of Dr. Condon states that he "has been in contact as late as 1947 with an individual alleged * * * to have engaged in espionage activities with the Russians in Washington"; Dr. Condon in 1945 tried to get a passport for Russia and was not permitted to leave this country.

In a statement in his defense, Dr. Condon said: "If it is true that I am one of the weakest links in atomic security that is very gratifying and the country can feel absolutely safe." Leading scientists supported him. It was pointed out that Mr. THOMAS had omitted a sentence in the FBI report which stated that there was no evidence that Dr. Condon's contact involved anything illegal or disloyal. It was also pointed out that Dr. Condon had tried to get a passport for Russia in order to attend an international scientific celebration in Leningrad, and that

Dr. James B. Conant, president of Harvard University, and other top-ranking scientists were also refused permission to attend the Russian ceremony.

On Wednesday the Thomas committee subpenaed the Commerce Department's investigation records of Dr. Condon. On Thursday Secretary Harriman refused to honor the subpena on the grounds that publication of the files would be "prejudicial to the public interest."

Mr. Speaker, I also insert an article appearing in the Christian Science Monitor of today which I feel will be enlightening to the membership and to the country, entitled "A Hearing for Dr. Condon—When?" as follows:

A HEARING FOR DR. CONDON—WHEN?

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—On March 1 the House Un-American Activities Committee, under the chairmanship of Representative J. PARNELL THOMAS, Republican, of New Jersey, charged that Dr. Edward U. Condon, a well-known natural scientist and Director of the United States Bureau of Standards, consorted with persons suspected of being Soviet espionage agents. He was declared to be, accordingly, "one of the weakest links in our atomic security."

Dr. Condon asked for, and was promised, a hearing to answer this charge. In his own behalf, he declared that his duties required him to keep in touch with natural scientists of other nations so as to know what new discoveries are being made abroad, even if some of these foreign representatives happen to be Soviet agents without his knowledge.

The date for the Condon hearing was originally set for today (April 21) by the Thomas committee. It was called off, however, and no other date has been set.

Attacks on Dr. Condon have been made on the floor of the House by members of the Thomas committee. A court test of the validity of these charges (if Dr. Condon so desired) is precluded, because Members of Congress are privileged while speaking on the floor from the operation of the law of libel.

A number of noted natural scientists have protested the treatment of Dr. Condon. They ask that the facts be sifted one way or the other, and protest a situation as unfair where a man's reputation can be attacked without an opportunity to be heard or to reply.

The American Mathematical Society in annual convention at Philadelphia in a resolution for its 3,700 members expressed grave concern over the committee's actions. It called for rules of committee procedure that would guarantee to Americans just treatment by their Government.

A statement has been drawn up by 45 teachers in 27 law schools in all sections of the country, urging improved committee procedure and attacking the treatment of Dr. Condon. Among the signers of the statement are the deans of seven law schools: Harvard, University of Nebraska, Indiana University, University of Pennsylvania, University of Chicago, University of Oklahoma, and University of Iowa. "The committee's proceedings lead to proclamations of guilt, rather than to generalized corrective proposals," the statement declares. The professors propose six basic rights of a citizen before a congressional committee:

The right fully to receive and to answer charges; to call witnesses; to have the aid and advice of counsel; to be permitted cross-examination of witnesses making derogatory statements; and to have the case determined on the basis of the material presented at the hearing.

* * * * *

In the meantime, the chairman of a House subcommittee on executive expenditures under Representative GEORGE H. BENDER, Republican, of Ohio, has announced that, so far as his small body goes, he intends to follow a set of prescribed rules to give witnesses a fair hearing. These rules include most of those urged by the professors above.

The fast-moving Thomas committee has meanwhile sidestepped the April 21 hearing previously scheduled for Dr. Condon's reply, in order to develop a new angle.

The loyalty of a couple of million Government workers from top to bottom is now being checked by FBI examination, subject to review by respective department loyalty boards. The Thomas committee demands that the particular FBI check on Dr. Condon be turned over to it. The executive branch of the Government declares that these checks are confidential (a) because publication would disclose sources of FBI information; (b) because material included is often hearsay, from critics or enemies of those investigated; and (c) the information is not final or definitive.

Secretary of Commerce Averell Harriman refuses to set the precedent of turning over the Condon file, acting under orders of President Truman.

Tomorrow, April 22, the House of Representatives is scheduled to approve a resolution demanding that Mr. Harriman produce the file. The Senate will then be called upon to approve it. Dr. Condon must wait to defend himself till later against charges already made. While the issue of the file disclosure is still unsettled, courts in the past have sided with the Executive against the legislature in similar show-downs over documents.

Mr. Speaker, several letters have been read from informants without the giving of their names, some of them allegedly having worked with Dr. Condon. I pause to question whether it is not possible that these letters were inspired by persons who were jealous of Dr. Condon.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I do not know Dr. Condon personally, but I am appreciative of his straightforwardness in immediately asking to be heard. Unfortunately, the hearing has been delayed, and in the meantime he has been assailed and were he not a man of such high standing, the allegation of such charges might have ruined him. It is my belief that in all matters that the accused is entitled to the benefit of any doubt and that, in this instance, Dr. Condon is entitled to a fair and unbiased hearing. So why should not the committee have waited before pressing this legislation until the opportunity of a hearing had been afforded him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, in considering this resolution the House must first recognize the fact that today we are not voting on any question as to whether or not Dr. Condon is guilty of any improper conduct. That is not the issue here at all. What Congress is seeking is further information to determine what its legislative policy should be; and whether what, if anything, Congress should do in trying to secure this information which has been denied it by the executive department.

The Committee on Un-American Activities has been presented with information which justifies, in my judgment, a further inquiry as to the facts. This House could not afford to stop at this point. It should properly seek to get further information. I regret that Dr. Condon himself, as the holder of a very important commission of our Government, is not here insisting on this further information and offering a full revelation on which to demand a complete exoneration. If innocent, he could well afford to take that position.

Here we have knowledge that there is a letter written by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, the head of a responsible agency of this Government, which is supposed to reflect, from some standpoint, on Dr. Condon. Without knowing what the information is, the Committee on Un-American Activities has properly requested that it be furnished this letter. So if we stop at this point, the Congress is liable to be subjected to the inference it is covering up or acceding to the concealment of facts it should know. I do not think that, with due regard to interest of the Nation at this time, Congress should be put in that position.

Let us look briefly as to what is probably the law in this case. From memoranda furnished by the legislative counsel to the committee, I cite just a few sentences that may help to clarify the situation.

One proposition is this:

That the scope of a congressional investigation is as broad as the legislative purpose requires.

From that standpoint this is a matter within the jurisdiction of Congress. Again:

That the subpena of a duly authorized investigatory committee of Congress is no more restricted than that of a grand jury.

Again:

That the right of a legislative body to demand and receive, from the executive branch, information and papers which it deems pertinent to the legislative process is established.

That the President and the executive officers have vigorously defended against such asserted right on the basis of the fundamental doctrine of separation of powers of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Federal Government.

That the Congress has merely asserted its right to obtain information without attempting to enforce it.

That the Congress has never attempted to invoke against executive officers the law which provides that every person who, having been summoned by either House to give testimony or to produce papers upon a matter under inquiry, willfully makes default, is criminally liable.

Now, Congress is not here invoking a criminal penalty. Here we have a right to ask for this information. Even if it be conceded that the executive department has the power to refuse, and does so, that is its responsibility. Its power to refuse a request of Congress does not detract from the power of Congress to request such information. There is no law that forbids the Executive from granting such a request. At the least, the Executive has discretionary power to grant such a request.

As an authority cited by the Legislative Counsel states:

When Congress suspects, for good and sufficient reason, that irregularities are taking place in a department, it is its duty and privilege under the Constitution to investigate as means to other action.

So in this case, if it be assumed that we have no right to compel the executive department to give this information, nevertheless there is no doubt about the authority of Congress to request it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include certain extraneous material, which I have heretofore obtained permission to do when the House was in session.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to object to it being inserted at this point. I think it ought to go in the Appendix or later on in the RECORD.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have obtained permission heretofore, by unanimous consent, to do so.

Mr. RANKIN. Not for this purpose.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes; for this purpose, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman has already obtained permission in the House, there is no necessity for him again obtaining permission to do so.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the question involved here, Members of the House, is not so much Dr. Condon as it is the authority of the President of the United States. The President has instructed the Secretary of Commerce not to release a certain letter. The Congress by this action now is going to say that that letter must be released, regardless of the President's position.

I have served on the Comimttee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for 12 years. This is the first time during that whole 12 years that I have seen a resolution or bill come up for consideration before that committee where only the proponents were heard. That sounds strange, but it is true. The full morning before the committee was taken up by the proponents. The Members of the Committee on Un-American Activities appeared and testified. Before the vote was taken by the committee I requested that the letter from the Attorney General be read; that its contents be made known to the members of the committee. Now, heretofore that has always been done. That is done in every committee all the time. When I made the request that the letter be read it was denied. It would have taken about 10 minutes to read the report of the Attorney General and that, mind you, is the report of the President of the United States or, rather, it is a report in defense of the President's position.

The report of the Attorney General of the United States was not read and that happened in the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. That is the first time I have ever seen anything like that happen.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADOWSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WOLVERTON. May I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that everybody in the committee, unless I have to except the gentleman, knew that the Attorney General had rendered an opinion contrary to the resolution, and I read the conclusion of the Attorney General to that effect to the committee. The opinion was there for the gentleman to read it in full if he wished to. In order to be fair to the gentleman, I made it a part of this report so that everybody could see it.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I believe that is the only reason it is a part of the report, probably because I raised the issue in the committee. I still say that I asked to have that letter read. I am a member of that committee and I had the right to have that letter read. The motion was made to move the previous question and debate was discontinued, and the resolution was reported out. I say again, and I repeat, that that is not proper committee procedure.

Let me read from the letter from the Attorney General of the United States to the committee. Certainly everybody should read it. It is too bad that this letter was not considered by the committee, that its arguments were not considered in coming to a decision on this resolution.

The resolution would direct the Secretary of Commerce to transmit to the House "the full text of a letter dated May 15, 1947, written by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and addressed to W. Averell Harriman, Secretary of Commerce, relating to Dr. Edward U. Condon."

The Secretary of Commerce has previously declined to make available to the House Committee on Un-American Activities the contents of confidential files relating to the loyalty investigation conducted by that Department with regard to Dr. Condon. This refusal was in keeping with the well-established principle that it is in the public interest to maintain on a confidential basis reports rendered by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other investigative agencies of the executive branch of the Government.

The right of the Executive to maintain such reports on a confidential basis has long been recognized as his constitutional prerogative. The sound considerations of policy which support the assertion of this prerogative have been well stated many times. There is attached hereto a copy of an opinion rendered by Attorney General Jackson on April 30, 1941, addressed to the chairman of the House Committee on Naval Affairs. In that opinion, Attorney General Jackson took the position, with the approval and at the direction of the President, that records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation are confidential documents of the executive branch and that congressional or public access to such records would not be in the public interest. The opinion points out that this view accords with the conclusion reached by a line of predecessors in the office of the Attorney General and with the position taken by the President from time to time since Washington's administration. It further points out that exercise of this discretion in the executive branch has been upheld and respected by the judiciary. For the sound reasons which support this position, taken by the executive branch since the founding of the Republic, I refer you particularly to pages 2 and 3 of Attorney General Jackson's opinion. Pursuant to this well-established policy, the President on March 13, 1948, directed all officers and employees in the executive branch of the Government to maintain in confidence all reports, records, and files relative to the loyalty of employees, including the reports of such investigative agencies as the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Compliance with House Resolution 522 would require a member of the President's Cabinet, the Secretary of Commerce, to violate the President's directive in this regard. If there is anything well established under our tripartite system of government, it is that members of the President's Cabinet, although appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, are responsible to the President (*Myers* v. *United States*, 272 U. S. 52). Agreement by the House to the resolution would, therefore, raise serious questions of a constitutional nature. The resolution would constitute legislative interference with an important executive function of the President, namely, the supervision of those officers of the Government who are responsible to him. As stated by William Howard Taft in his book, Our Chief Magistrate and His Powers, 1916, at page 129:

"The President is required by the Constitution from time to time to give to Congress information on the state of the Union and to recommend for its consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient, but this does not enable Congress or either House of Congress to elicit from him confidential information which he has acquired for the purpose of enabling him to discharge his constitutional duties, if he does not deem the disclosure of such information prudent or in the public interest."

There is attached hereto a memorandum which points to the provisions in the Constitution and to the Supreme Court decisions which bear upon this subject and which reveals the unconstitutionality of the proposal embodied in House Resolution 522.

A brief reference to historical precedents relating to resolutions similar to House Resolution 522 will be helpful. In January 1807 the House of Representatives passed a resolution that the President of the United States be requested to lay before the House information in his possession, except such as he may deem should not be disclosed in the public interest, touching any illegal combination of private individuals against the peace and safety of the Union. The Burr conspiracy was then stirring the country. Jefferson had made it the subject of a special message to the Congress. Jefferson's reply to the resolution was in the form of a message to the House and Senate wherein he pointed out that he had received a mass of data, most of which had been obtained without the sanction of an oath so as to constitute formal and legal evidence, which he could not, without divulging private confidences and exposing names furnished confidentially to the Government, divulge to the House. (Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. 1, p. 412, January 22, 1807.)

Similarly, in 1843, a resolution of the House of Representatives called upon the Secretary of War to communicate to the House the reports made to the War Department by Lieutenant Colonel Hitchcock relative to the affairs of the Cherokee Indians, together with all information communicated by him concerning the frauds which he had been charged to investigate. The Secretary of War advised the House that he could not communicate information which Colonel Hitchcock had obtained in confidence, because it would be grossly unjust to the persons who had given the information. The House, however, claimed the right to demand from the Executive and heads of departments such information as may be in their possession relating to subjects of deliberations of the House. President Tyler, in a message dated January 31, 1843, said in part:

"And although information comes through a proper channel to an executive officer, it may often be of a character to forbid its being made public. The officer charged with a confidential inquiry, and who reports its result under the pledge of confidence which his appointment implies, ought not to be exposed individually to the resentment of those whose conduct may be impugned by

the information he collects. The knowledge that such is to be the consequence will inevitably prevent the performance of duties of that character, and thus the Government will be deprived of an important means of investigating the conduct of its agents." (Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. 4, pp. 221–223.)

The reports of Colonel Hitchcock concerning the delegates of the Cherokee nation were not communicated by President Tyler to the House. The reasons given by the President for the failure to send the papers and documents referred to were that suggestions, anticipated projects, views dealing with the personal character of persons, would not be of aid to Congress in legislation, and their publication would be unfair and unjust to a Federal official and inconsistent with the public interest.

Our first President, in his Farewell Address, cautioned against the dangers resulting from the encroachment by one branch of the government upon the other. He wrote:

"It is important, likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those entrusted with its administration to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism." (Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. I, p. 219.)

In view of the foregoing considerations, this Department recommends that House Resolution 522 be not favorably reported.

The Department of Justice has not had the opportunity to submit this report to the Bureau of the Budget.

Yours sincerely,

PEYTON FORD,
The Assistant to the Attorney General.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARENDS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, that does not include the insertion of extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

THE HOOVER LETTER AND HOUSE RESOLUTION 522

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment briefly on certain aspects of House Resolution 522, which requests the Secretary of Commerce to transmit to the House a letter dated May 15, 1947, written by J. Edgar Hoover and addressed to the Secretary of Commerce relating to Dr. E. U. Condon.

The House may remember that this letter was quoted in part in the report of the special subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities on March 1, 1948, attacking Dr. Condon. I analyzed the letter as well as the entire report on March 9, 1948, on the floor of the House. At this time I wish to point out merely that the tactics of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, which the New York Times characterizes as "punishment by publicity," are being continued in this matter of House Resolution 522. The public, in reading of this request, must wonder why the letter is not turned over.

In general the public is not aware of the significance of the constitutional division of powers between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government. This division is a good one, but, of course, disagreements are inevitable at times. House Resolution 522 is symptomatic of the disputes that arise in such a system.

However, the general public, in view of the previous tactics of the House Committee on Un-American Activities with respect to Dr. Condon, may wonder whether there is not an effort to conceal information. To this I say that the question of either revealing or not revealing the letter is immaterial. This question is purely a matter of administrative policy.

I know that Dr. Condon personally would be happy to see to it that the House Committee on Un-American Activities had every bit of information possible, for he has nothing to conceal. He has repeatedly volunteered to appear, cooperate, and testify. As long ago as last July, he wrote letters to every member of this committee offering his services and aid. Since then, he has even called on the committee in its own chambers, reiterating his offer. So far, nothing has been done. Even the hearing which had, at long last, been announced for April 21, 1948, has now been postponed.

What is really significant about House Resolution 522 is its background. Since the committee published a part of this letter in its report of March 1, 1948, I would like to know how the committee got the letter. For it is evident that the committee did manage to get this letter in some form or another. Where did it get the letter? Does the committee have a spy in the FBI or the Department of Commerce? And does this spy steal confidential documents regularly for the committee? Furthermore, since the committee has had the letter, why this fuss over getting it again? Is the committee trying to fool this House and the public?

The House and the Nation may recall that after the release of the report of March 1, 1948, in which the Hoover letter was quoted, it turned out that an important sentence favorable to Dr. Condon was omitted. Then a few days later, it developed according to a newspaper article in the Washington Post that the committee had also added a paragraph of their own to the Hoover letter. Thus, an important document, according to the committee, was tampered with by the committee. Now the committee wants the letter, they say. In view of the above facts with respect to their tampering with the letter, what are we to conclude?

Part of the letter was published by the committee as the Hoover letter. Then two instances of tampering with the evidence were revealed. Now the letter is requested through a House resolution. Well, either the committee had the letter or it did not. If it had—as is apparent—the letter, then why this resolution?

Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted I shall insert in the Appendix a letter from the Attorney General's office to the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Mr. WOLVERTON, an opinion on the constitutional aspects of the Committee on Un-American Activities request for the FBI letter, and a list of constitutional objections to House Resolution 522.

I regret that I have been unable to obtain time to properly explore and debate this subject. In my opinion Dr. Condon has no objection to the release of this letter. It has become a bone of contention between the executive and the legislative branch of our Government. The resolution may pass the House and the Senate but the Supreme Court will never, in my opinion, force the presentation of the FBI report in question.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, my thought on this resolution is that the Congress of the United States is entitled to all the information it can get when an investigation with reference to the security of this Nation is involved. This resolution only calls for one letter written by J. Edgar Hoover to the Department of Commerce of the United States. Two departments created by the Congress are involved. Any information that they hold, irrespective of the merits of this controversy, should certainly be given to the Committee on Un-American Activities. They are doing a job for the security of this country. It is fair to Dr. Condon, it is fair to the Congress, and it is fair to the people of the United States that the truth be known. If Dr. Condon is not a "security risk," then that fact should be proven, and if information is in the Department of Commerce, the Secretary ought to be made to furnish it. Let me point out to the membership of the House that Dr. Condon at this time occupies the most important position in our Government, insofar as dealing with the security of this Government is concerned.

The report read as follows:

The National Bureau of Standards, which acts as custodian of the Nation's basic scientific standards, is one of the most important national defense research organizations in the United States. It is engaged in projects at the present time concerning atomic energy, radar, proximity fuzes, instrument-landing systems, jet fuels, and other vital and secret projects that affect the security of our Nation. The Director of this agency has access to confidential records and information sought by virtually every foreign espionage agent in the United States.

Should the Congress be denied this information? Should a committee created by the Congress—the Committee on Un-American Activities—be denied this information at a time when we are in danger of war? That is what we are in. You know, when we are in a war, all these constitutional liberties and prerogatives that we enjoy as individuals are suspended, even the right of habeas corpus. The right of habeas corpus can be taken away from us in time of war. This investigation is just as important to the people of this country and the Congress as any other measure that has ever come before the House of Representatives be-

cause of the security involved. Irrespective of the merits of the controversy, I hope the House will adopt this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON].

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, I think my distinguished colleague from the State of California [Mr. LEA] put his finger on this problem very neatly in his 3 minutes. I am going to address myself to that particular point.

There are Members of the House who may disagree on the merits of the Condon case itself. You may have different viewpoints as to whether or not Dr. Condon is or is not loyal. You may have different viewpoints as to whether or not his alleged associations do or do not constitute a security risk. You may have different viewpoints on whether or not the procedures of the Committee on Un-American Activities, in presenting the Condon case, have or have not been fair to Dr. Condon. These are not the issues before us, however.

I wish to address myself, as did the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], to the narrow but very important issue before us, of this particular FBI letter. Referring to the letter, I want to summarize briefly the facts concerning it, most of which appear in the report, but an elaboration of which will, I believe, be of interest to the Members.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. Will the gentleman point out, if he has knowledge on which to base it, whether or not in his opinion the disclosure of all the contents of this letter would in any way endanger the security of the country? That is troubling a great many Members.

Mr. NIXON. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that point, because I intend to discuss it in my remarks, specifically.

In the first place, this letter was the basis for a report by a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities which was issued on March 1.

Certain paragraphs of the letter which had been obtained by a committee investigator were quoted in the report. The quoted portion referred to various associations of Dr. Condon with alleged foreign agents and the committee report concluded that these associations constituted a security risk in view of Dr. Condon's access to secret information.

On March 3, the letter again became a subject of discussion as the result of an article which appeared in the Washington Post. It is important to refer to this article because it fills out the story.

I quote from the article of March 3:

> Two persons who saw the letter, and are known to be reliable, told the Washington Post last night that they were struck by the omission in the subcommittee's quoting of the letter of a certain sentence.

The following day, on the 4th of March, another article appeared in the Washington Post which stated:

> The exact text of the missing statement was secured by the Washington Post last night.

The newspaper article, in other words, quoted directly from a letter which the executive department refused to turn over to a congressional committee.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Can the gentleman, as a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities, who has given much time and thought to this question, tell this House whether or not the statement just read, together with the statement in the report issued by your committee, contains the full text of the letter in question?

Mr. NIXON. That is exactly the point. The gentleman has asked whether these quotations constitute the full and exact text of the letter. We do not know. That is what we are trying to find out. We do not know whether the version of the letter quoted in the committee report is correct, or whether the version quoted in the newspaper is correct, because we, apparently unlike the newspaper reporter involved, cannot get the text of the letter.

But this point should be emphasized to the House. Confusion has resulted by reason of the fact that portions of this letter were included in the committee report which apparently cast an unfavorable reflection upon Dr. Condon, while other portions have been quoted in the newspapers which create the inference that Dr. Condon is completely innocent, insofar as these particular associations are concerned. In order to clear up this confusion, in order to clear the air, it is essential that the whole letter come out.

I wish to point out that there are only two copies of this letter, one in the FBI and one in the Department of Commerce. Certainly no one will contend that the FBI made the letter available to newspaper reporters. The only other place from which it could have come was the Department of Commerce. We heard before our committee, in executive session, every available employee of the Department of Commerce who was supposed to have seen the letter. Every one of them refused to divulge the contents of the letter in any respect to a committee of Congress, and yet we find that portions of the letter are apparently made available to a newspaper reporter and are used to discredit the committee's report.

Now, I am not criticizing the reporter for getting the information. That is his job. But I do say that when the time comes that the executive department feels that a particular letter is so confidential that it cannot be disclosed in executive session to a committee of Congress but that its contents can be bandied about among newspaper reporters, it is certainly high time that the Congress did something about that situation and got the information to which it was entitled.

I am now going to address myself to a second issue which is very important. The point has been made that the President of the United States has issued an order that none of this information can be released to the Congress and that therefore the Congress has no right to question the judgment of the President in making that decision.

I say that that proposition cannot stand from a constitutional standpoint or on the basis of the merits for this very good reason: That would mean that the President could have arbitrarily issued an Executive order in the Meyers case, the Teapot Dome case, or any other case denying the Congress of the United States information it needed to conduct an investigation of the executive department and the Congress would have no right to question his decision.

Any such order of the President can be questioned by the Congress as to whether or not that order is justified on the merits. So, looking at the order and noting the reasons which the President gave for denying this information to the Congress, let me read:

> It is necessary in the interest of our national security and welfare, to preserve the confidential character and sources of information furnished, and to protect Government personnel against the dissemination of unfounded or disproved allegations.

This is from the memorandum of the President of March 13.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from California one additional minute.

Mr. NIXON. In the brief time remaining to me I want to apply these two criteria to the Condon letter. First, the order says we must not disclose confidential sources of information. As a matter of fact, this letter does not disclose confidential sources of information, and I make this statement on the basis of the testimony of Mr. Towne, secretary of the Commerce Department Loyalty Review Board, before our committee. Let me quote from that testimony:

> Mr. STRIPLING. * * * I contend that there are no names disclosed in Mr. Hoover's letter.
>
> Mr. TOWNE. If Mr. Harriman's letter is limited to the letter of May 15, a thing of which I was not aware. I think it would be accurate to say that the FBI file, however, does contain the names of people, however, who are identified by name.

From this statement it seems apparent that there are no sources of information in the letter. There may be in the complete FBI file which is not covered by this resolution.

The second point, just as important, upon which the President based his secrecy order is that we must protect Government personnel against the dissemination of unfounded or disproved allegations. This point constitutes one of the strongest arguments for making the letter public rather than for keeping it secret. Because as a result of the portions of the letter which have already been released allegations have been made which reflect upon Dr. Condon. Some sources say that the letter in fact clears him of these charges. In the interest of a complete airing of all the facts and of dispelling these unfounded allegations, if they are that, it is essential that the entire content of the letter be released to the Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I was not on the subcommittee that originally heard this case, but the question here is whether or not the Congress of the United States is going to permit a bureaucrat to draw an iron curtain between it and people on the Federal pay roll.

We can have a Bogota in this country, we can have a Pearl Harbor in this country. Five atomic bombs dropped at the proper place would paralyze this eastern seaboard and probably paralyze the country. That question is involved in this investigation. If the Secretary of Commerce wanted to be fair he could have brought that letter and submitted it to the committee in executive session, and every member of the committee would have treated it as such.

This man Condon is in a position in which he could be impeached for certain offenses. He has been confirmed by the Senate. Suppose we were impeaching Dr. Condon; then, could the Department of Commerce say: "You cannot have this information"?

When the Committee on Appropriations gets ready to make appropriations for a department can the Secretary of the department say that the committee cannot have information concerning the loyalty of men on the Federal pay roll in that department?

I call your attention to the following provision of the law:

TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, CHAPTER 10. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

SEC. 604. Annual and special reports: The Secretary of Commerce shall annually, at the close of each fiscal year, make a report in writing to Congress, giving an account of all moneys received and disbursed by him and his Department in fostering, promoting, and developing the foreign and domestic commerce, the mining, manufacturing, shipping, and fishery industries, and the transportation facilities, of the United States, and making such recommendations as he shall deem necessary for the effective performance of the duties and purposes of the Department. He shall also from time to time make such special investigations and reports as he may be required to do by the President, or by either House of Congress, or which he himself may deem necessary and urgent. (February 14, 1903, ch. 552, sec. 8, 32 Stat. 829.)

Mr. Speaker, we have come to a showdown. Mr. Harriman has been nominated to handle the billions of dollars which you voted the other day for ERP. Do you want to put a man in charge of that who will defy the Congress before he starts? Are you going to be denied the right to investigate the loyalty of his subordinates who are to handle the money you are appropriating out of the pockets of your taxpayers? Are you going to be denied the right to see whether or not it goes to Russia or Russian satellite nations?

Mr. Speaker, this is a challenge to the Congress of the United States. This Government, according to the decisions of the Supreme Court, consists of the President, the Senate, and the House of Representatives. These are our prerogatives, and I submit it is our duty to demand that this letter and this file be submitted to the proper committee of the Congress.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman for a brief question.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. If we pass this resolution, will the constitutionality of it be subject to a test before the courts?

Mr. RANKIN. No; I do not think so. I hope the resolution is passed unanimously.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I shall emphatically support the pending resolution. The purposes of it have been thoroughly discussed by those who have preceded me upon the floor today. I should like to point out, however, one thing which has not been touched upon.

The committee report which you have before you outlines in detail how the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Harriman, has refused to help us fight communism in the United States. He has refused by failure to cooperate with the House Committee on Un-American Activities in its request that the Secretary provide the committee with the letter from his files, written by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, about the subversive connections of Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards. He has rejected a similar request from the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He has even refused to testify on the matter. He has refused to permit the letter to be brought in under subpena. He thus shields this appointee of his predecessor, Henry Wallace. This is also the same man who, as Secretary of Commerce, has refused to quit granting export licenses for war potentials being shipped to Soviet Russia. His constant appeasement of communism and refusal to cooperate with Congress in getting the Reds off our Federal Government pay roll, is a matter of public record.

Now, on yesterday, his refusal to resist communism at home has been rewarded by the President who names him our roving ambassador at a salary of $25,000 per year, to resist communism abroad. I hope he does a better job at it abroad than he has done at home.

Certain apologists for this way of doing things have hailed this appointment of Secretary Harriman, to supervise the expenditure of billions of dollars of our tax money under the Marshall plan, as a great thing. Maybe the appointment of this Wall Street millionaire and bewildered liberal, in view of his past performances which I have outlined, is a great thing. But, it is not a great thing for the United States of America, and for the people who would like to see consistency in our foreign policy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to say anything in reference to this matter. I suppose I am going to be swept along with the crowd today. But I do want to give one warning, and that is when the reports of the Federal Bureau of Investigation become public property in general, that Bureau, as far as its usefulness in detecting crime is concerned, will about pass out. There is no such thing as detecting. You know, it is a wonderful thing to read detective stories, but people hunting out crime do not just pick the criminals out of the air. They have got to have confidential information from somebody on the inside of the crowd they are trying to catch.

If we start exposing reports and names of people generally who give this information to that agency of the Government, I fear we are going to very seriously cripple this whole thing.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say one other thing. I have known Averell Harriman a long time. He is a gentleman, he is a man of great ability, he is a patriot, and I do hate to see the gentleman from Missouri try to drag his name down like he did a while ago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce [Mr. LEA], and our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], have laid the issue squarely before you. It is not a question of loyalty or disloyalty of Dr. Condon. It is a question of whether or not the various departments of the executive branch of Government are going to be permitted to withhold essential information from regularly constituted committees of Congress.

I regret very much that my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] had to bring the political situation into this discussion when he remarked that the resolution under consideration was a political matter. For the enlightenment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] I wish to state that this resolution was reported out of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce unanimously, Democrats and Republicans voting for it.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that is not quite true. It was not reported out unanimously.

Mr. BUSBEY. Who voted against it?

Mr. SADOWSKI. I voted "present" and I gave my reason for it, that only one side of this issue had been presented before the committee. Only the proponents were heard, and those in opposition, and the representatives of the President of the United States, were not heard before the committee.

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield no further.

Inasmuch as there was not a single vote against the resolution, I still say it was reported unanimously; therefore it certainly cannot be considered a political matter.

I have a very serious charge to make this afternoon. The various departments of our Government have requested many reports on individuals from the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and it is because they have drawn an iron curtain around or put the lid on these reports that the Committee on Un-American Activities and other agencies of the legislative branch of this Government have been prevented from exposing the fact that the administration is still coddling and protecting known Communists in our Government. If you do not adopt this resolution we are not going to get these Communists out of our Government. I think as the duly elected Representatives of our districts we have a responsibility to our people. Everybody is crying about the Communists here, abroad, and everywhere, from the President of the United States on down. But the Communists remain. If we are sincere, let us back the committee up on this resolution and let us make this document available. I think we ought to make a lot more documents available to committees of Congress. On March 22, 1947, the President, by directive order, set up the so-called Federal Loyalty Board, and we appropriated millions and millions of dollars in order that the Loyalty Board might get the Communists, fellow travelers, subversives, and those who are security risks out of our Federal Government. I charge on the floor of the House today that this Loyalty Board, for which we appropriated millions of dollars, has not processed its first loyalty case in over 1 year of operation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a complete and satisfactory answer to the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], our distinguished former Speaker. Of course, if everyone knew what the FBI was doing, it might just as well go out of business, and if everyone in the departments is to know what the FBI is doing, then they will have to go out of business. I can see no reason why, if this information is given to the department, it should not also be given to the Congress.

Another thing, why should not the Congress have the authority to know what those agencies, which it creates and supports, are doing? Is the creature greater than the creator? And, again, the committee in this case, if I understand it correctly, did not ask for the source of the information. And that is an answer to the gentleman's objection. And, once more. Dr. Condon is not on trial here, nor is he being persecuted by the Department of Justice nor by the FBI, and this resolution, if it is adopted, will only aid the Congress, or more accurately, its committee, to learn whether he is or is not loyal. The only question is whether the House is to have the information which will aid it in legislation—help it learn whether new or different legislation is needed to protect the national security.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I yield for a question.

Mr. HALE. Will the gentleman explain whether the passage of this resolution would not automatically make the letter public to the entire world? That is what I should like to know.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Yes; it would.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Un-American Activities at its organization meeting in January 1946 set down for itself an eight-point program. That program included, among other things, an investigation and exposé of Communists in the moving-picture industry, an investigation and exposé of Communists in the labor unions, an investigation and expose of Communists in our atomic energy set-up and an investigation and exposé of Communists in the Government.

From that time on our investigators have proceeded with their investigations in pursuance of this program. In the course of their investigation they crossed the path of Dr. Edward U. Condon.

One of the first times that Dr. Condon's name was called to the attention of our investigators was in a letter addressed to a Member of Congress. Part of that letter is quoted in the report of the Subcommittee on National Security of the Committee on Un-American Activities and I want to read a part of the letter. The person who wrote it is presently employed in the Atomic Energy Commission, and who has held a high position in the Atomic Energy Commission, said this in a leter to a Member of Congress:

> Attached is a very hurried attempt which may be of some help. Unfortunately, the ——— group has loaded me down in preparation for Friday's meeting.

Remember, this is a high person in the Atomic Energy Commission, one who advocated civilian control of atomic energy. He said:

> May I suggest that you demand Dr. Condon's record of the FBI. It would be enlightening.

Another time the paths of our investigators crossed the path of Dr. Condon was a letter given to our committee by a former Member of Congress, a former prominent member of the minority side. This was a letter written by Samuel Gelfan, who was writing for the membership committee of the American-Soviet Science Society, which the Committee on Un-American Activities has claimed right along is affiliated with the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., of New York City. This letter by Mr. Gelfan has this to say, and it is addressed to a person in the National Bureau of Standards, United States Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C. :

> DEAR ———: It has been suggested by Dr. Condon, who is a member of our executive committee, that you might be interested in the activities of our society and membership in same.
>
> We are, therefore, enclosing a brief statement concerning the objectives and activity of our organization, and under separate cover are also mailing you a copy of our last bulletin.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> SAMUEL GELFAN,
> *For the Membership Committee.*

We claim that the American-Soviet Science Society is affiliated with the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

The Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Tom Clark, stated that the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., is a Communist-front organization, but it has been denied and repeatedly denied that there was any connection between those two organizations, even though we stated that they have the same telephone number in New York and the same address in New York, and just the other day we found a little more definite proof which was in the form of a check. I have before me a photostatic copy of a check signed by an employee of the Bureau of Standards turning over his $3 dues to the American-Soviet Science Society in response to the Gelfan letter. The check is endorsed on the back by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., even though it was made payable to the American-Soviet Science Society. If that is not definite proof that this organization is affiliated with a Communist-front organization, and that they are all one and the same, then I would just like to know what is.

Here is another thing our committee ran into which bears upon the case of Dr. Condon and whether or not he constitutes a security risk as Director of the Bureau of Standards. It is a letter written by Dr. Condon himself to Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer. The date of Dr. Condon's letter is April 26, 1943. It was sent from Los Alamos, Santa Fe, N. Mex. Dr. Condon had this to say to Dr. Oppenheimer after he spent 1 month in Los Alamos Atomic Energy Plant when he then severed his association with the atomic bomb project. Dr. Condon said this:

> The thing which upset me most—
>
> Referring to Los Alamos—
>
> is the extraordinary close security policy. I do not feel qualified to question the wisdom of this since I am totally unaware of the extent of enemy espionage and sabotage activities. I only want to say that in my case I found that the extreme concern with security was morbidly depressing—especially the discussion about censoring mail and telephone calls, the possible militarization and complete isolation of the personnel from the outside world. I know that before long all such concerns would make me be so depressed as to be of little if any value. I think a great many of the other people are apt to be this way otherwise I wouldn't mention it.

Members of the House, that is the security attitude of the man that we are dealing with here today and who occupies the highly strategic position as Director of the National Bureau of Standards.

Mr. Speaker, what we are doing today is insisting upon a prerogative which the legislative branch of this Government has always had. This letter which Mr.

Hoover wrote to Mr. Harriman, I have been reliably informed, does not disclose the names of any confidential informants, or does it violate any confidences. This letter has become an important exhibit in our forthcoming hearing on Dr. Condon, and the Congress is entitled to the full text of this letter.

The files of the Committee on Un-American Activities, which were set up in 1939 by the authority of this House, today comprises the principal source of information on subversive influences in the United States. Personally, I feel that it is a great tribute to the foresight and alertness of the legislative branch of the Government that it took the precautionary measures of establishing a committee which would check upon the subversive influences in the United States at a time when the executive branch of the Government and the people were not too concerned with this threat.

During the 10 years since the committee was first created, we have amassed thousands of documents and records which have been of invaluable assistance to the various agencies of our Government charged with the security of the United States. The documents and records are irreplaceable. Our files have always been open to the agencies of the executive branch of the Government. Even though in the past 5 years there have been over 12,000 agents and representatives of the executive branch of the Government call at the committee for information on subversive individuals or organizations, never has there been an instance in which our committee has declined to cooperate or furnish information to those agents, and I doubt if the membership of the House is aware of the extent to which our files are being used today and every day by the agencies of the executive branch of the Government. As an indication, I should like to cite one typical day, April 13, 1948. On that day, six different agents of the United States Civil Service Commission worked in our files on a project calling for a check of over 2,000 names. On the same day, three FBI agents were working on a project of checking 337 names. Four agents from the Central Intelligence of the Army were working checking 924 names; one agent from the Treasury Department, checking 15 names. One agent from the State Department checking 58 names. One agent from the Secret Service checking two names. One agent from the Naval Gun Factory checking one name. Thus it goes every day. An agency of this House opens its complete files to the executive branch of the Government and yet in contrast we have the executive branch of the Government openly defying the legislative branch of the Government in refusing to furnish the House of Representatives with a document which pertains directly to the security of the United States.

I feel that you agree with me that we must assert our prerogative and demand this important letter which has been denied the Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK). The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 302, nays 29, not voting 98, as follows:

[Roll No. 47]

YEAS—302

Abernethy	Elston	LeFevre
Allen, Calif.	Engel, Mich.	Lemke
Allen, Ill.	Engle, Calif.	Lesinski
Allen, La.	Evins	Lewis
Andersen H. Carl	Fallon	Lichtenwalter
	Fellows	Lodge
Anderson, Calif.	Fenton	Love
Andresen, August H.	Fisher	Lucas
	Fletcher	Lyle
Andrews, N. Y.	Foote	McConnell
Angell	Fuller	McCulloch
Arends	Gamble	McDonough
Arnold	Garmatz	McDowell
Auchincloss	Gary	McGarvey
Bakewell	Gathings	McGregor
Banta	Gearhart	McMahon
Barden	Gillie	McMillan, S. C.
Barrett	Goff	McMillen, Ill.
Bates, Ky.	Goodwin	Mack
Bates, Mass.	Gordon	MacKinnon
Beall	Gore	Mahon
Beckworth	Gorski	Maloney
Bender	Graham	Martin, Iowa
Bennett, Mich.	Granger	Mason
Bennett, Mo.	Grant, Ind.	Meade, Ky.
Bishop	Gregory	Merrow
Blackney	Griffiths	Meyer
Bland	Gross	Michener
Boggs, Del.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Miller, Conn.
Boggs, La.	Gwynne, Iowa	Miller, Md.
Bolton	Hagen	Miller, Nebr.
Bonner	Hale	Mills
Bradley	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mitchell
Bramblett		Monroney
Brehm	Hall, Leonard W.	Morris
Brooks		Morrison
Brophy	Halleck	Morton
Brown, Ga.	Hand	Murray, Tenn.
Brown, Ohio	Hardy	Murray, Wis.
Bryson	Harness, Ind.	Nicholson
Buck	Harris	Nixon
Buffett	Hart	Nodar
Burke	Harvey	Norblad
Burleson	Havenner	O'Brien
Busbey	Hays	O'Konski
Butler	Hébert	O'Toole
Byrnes, Wis.	Hedrick	Owens
Camp	Heffernan	Passman
Canfield	Herter	Patman
Cannon	Heselton	Patterson
Carson	Hess	Peden
Case, N. J.	Hill	Peterson
Case, S. Dak.	Hinshaw	Philbin
Chapman	Hoffman	Phillips, Calif.
Chelf	Holmes	Pickett
Chenoweth	Hope	Ploeser
Chiperfield	Hull	Plumley
Church	Jackson, Wash.	Poage
Clason	Jennings	Potter
Clevenger	Jensen	Potts
Coffin	Johnson, Calif.	Poulson
Combs	Johnson, Ill.	Preston
Cooper	Johnson, Ind.	Priest
Corbett	Johnson, Tex.	Ramey
Coudert	Jones, Ala.	Rankin
Cox	Jones, N. C.	Rayburn
Cravens	Jones, Wash.	Reed, Ill.
Crawford	Jonkman	Reed, N. Y.
Crow	Judd	Rees
Cunningham	Kean	Reeves
Curtis	Keating	Rich
Dague	Kee	Richards
Davis, Ga.	Keefe	Riehlman
Davis, Tenn.	Kerr	Riley
Davis, Wis.	Kersten, Wis.	Rivers
Dawson, Utah	Kilday	Robertson
Deane	King	Rockwell
Devitt	Kunkel	Rogers, Fla.
Donohue	Landis	Rohrbough
Doughton	Lane	Rooney
Durham	Lanham	Ross
Ellis	Latham	Russell
Ellsworth	Lea	St. George
Elsaesser	LeCompte	Sanborn
Sasscer	Stefan	Vorys
Schwabe, Mo.	Stevenson	Vursell
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Stigler	Wadsworth
	Stockman	Walter
Scrivner	Sundstrom	Weichel
Seely-Brown	Taber	Welch
Shafer	Talle	Wheeler
Sheppard	Teague	Whitten
Short	Thomas, N. J.	Whittington
Simpson, Ill.	Thomas, Tex.	Wigglesworth
Simpson, Pa.	Thompson	Wilson, Ind.
Smathers	Tibbott	Wilson, Tex.
Smith, Kans.	Tollefson	Winstead
Smith, Maine	Trimble	Wolcott
Smith, Ohio	Twyman	Wolverton
Smith, Va.	Vail	Wood
Snyder	Van Zandt	Woodruff
Spence	Vinson	Youngblood
Stanley		

NAYS—29

Albert	Feighan	Kirwan
Blatnik	Fernandez	Klein
Bloom	Fogarty	Madden
Buchanan	Forand	Marcantonio
Carroll	Fulton	Powell
Celler	Holifield	Price, Ill.
Clark	Huber	Sabath
Cooley	Isacson	Sadowski
Douglas	Karsten, Mo.	Somers
Eberharter	Kelley	

NOT VOTING—98

Abbitt	Gossett	Meade, Md.
Andrews, Ala.	Grant, Ala.	Miller, Calif.
Battle	Harless, Ariz.	Morgan
Bell	Harrison	Muhlenberg
Boykin	Hartley	Multer
Buckley	Hendricks	Mundt
Bulwinkle	Hobbs	Murdock
Byrne, N. Y.	Hoeven	Norrell
Chadwick	Horan	Norton
Clippinger	Jackson, Calif.	O'Hara
Cole, Kans.	Jarman	Pace
Cole, Mo.	Javits	Pfeifer
Cole, N. Y.	Jenison	Phillips, Tenn.
Colmer	Jenkins, Ohio	Price, Fla.
Cotton	Jenkins, Pa.	Rains
Courtney	Johnson, Okla.	Redden
Crosser	Kearney	Regan
Dawson, Ill.	Kearns	Rizley
Delaney	Kefauver	Rogers, Mass.
D'Ewart	Kennedy	Sadlak
Dingell	Keogh	Sarbacher
Dirksen	Kilburn	Schwabe, Okla.
Dolliver	Knutson	Scoblick
Domengeaux	Larcade	Scott, Hardie
Dondero	Ludlow	Sikes
Dorn	Lusk	Smith, Wis.
Eaton	Lynch	Stratton
Elliott	McCormack	Taylor
Flannagan	McCowen	Towe
Folger	Macy	West
Gallagher	Manasco	Williams
Gavin	Mansfield	Worley
Gillette	Mathews	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Domengeaux for, with Mrs. Norton against.

Mr. Jenkins of Ohio for, with Mr. McCormack against.

Mr. Redden for, with Mr. Multer against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Dingell against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Cole of Missouri with Mrs. Lusk.

Mr. Schwabe of Oklahoma with Mr. Buckley.

Mr. Sadlak with Mr. Dorn.

Mr. Gavin with Mr. Kefauver.

Mr. Eaton with Mr. Battle.

Mr. Muhlenberg with Mr. Delaney.

Mr. Macy with Mr. Pace.

Mr. Towe with Mr. Pfeiffer.

Mr. Taylor with Mr. Gossett.

Mr. Cole of New York with Mr. Colmer.

Mr. Sarbacher with Mr. Byrne of New York.

Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Lynch.

Mr. Hardie Scott with Mr. Rains.

Mr. Kilburn with Mr. Regan.

Mr. Chadwick with Mr. Harrison.

Mr. Mathews with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.

Mr. Dondero with Mr. Andrews of Alabama.

Mr. D'Ewart with Mr. Harless of Arizona.
Mr. Cotton with Mr. Kennedy.
Mr. McCowen with Mr. Worley.
Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Miller of California.
Mr. Jackson of California with Mr. Williams.
Mr. Dolliver with Mr. Manasco.
Mr. Mundt with Mr. Boykin.
Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Courtney.
Mr. Rizley with Mr. Mansfield.
Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts with Mr. Folger.
Mr. Cole of Kansas with Mr. Hobbs.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Morgan.
Mr. Gillette with Mr. Jarman.
Mr. Jenison with Mr. Hendricks.
Mr. Hoeven with Mr. Price of Florida.
Mr. Horan with Mr. Larcade.
Mr. Knutson with Mr. Grant of Alabama.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. West.
Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Norrell.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

FIREWOOD

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 188.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested to return to the House of Representatives the enrolled bill (H. R. 5328) to amend paragraph 1803 (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, relating to firewood and other woods; that if and when the said bill is returned by the President, the action of the presiding officers of the two Houses in signing the said bill be deemed to be rescinded; and that the Clerk of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed in the reenrollment of the said bill, to make the following correction, namely, strike out "handled bolts" and insert in lieu thereof "handle bolts."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DEVITT (at the request of Mr. SEELY-BROWN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include some newspaper articles.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in each to include extraneous material.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, during the roll call on the Condon resolution, I was called away from the Chamber. I would like the RECORD to show that if I had not been called away and had been present and voting, I would have voted "yea."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H. R. 6263, the Commodity Credit Corporation Act, and S. 2225, the Federal Credit Union Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

OLEOMARGARINE LEGISLATION

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include editorials, tables, and other matters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time to make a few pertinent observations on the controversy which will be discussed on the floor of the House on Monday, and that is oleomargarine legislation. I have developed certain facts with reference to this controversy which I think will be helpful to the membership of the House in arriving at a conclusion. I hope to have more to say on the subject when the motion to discharge the committee comes up for consideration on Monday and also in connection with the so-called Rivers bill, which will be the order of business in the event the Committee on Agriculture is discharged from further consideration of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the attempt to repeal the Federal taxes on oleomargarine is an irresponsible attack on our basic farm economy, the results of which no man can foresee. Reduced to its simplest terms, the South wants increased markets and increased prices for its cottonseed oil. It believes that the oleomargarine market promises to offer those increases. To foster the oleo market, then, the South is willing to encourage the practice of fraud and deceit against the consumer by allowing the oleo manufacturers to color their product in imitation of butter.

It hopes thus to insure increased consumption of oleo which can only come from its large-scale substitution for butter in eating places, in institutions, and in the public market place. American housewives are being used as a front by the cotton South and the oleomargarine manufacturers to increase prices on cottonseed oil and profits on oleo.

The National Cotton Council has contributed more than $10,000 to the National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, which, in turn, has sponsored the activities of the American Soybean Association toward that end. In addition, southern interests have brought pressure to bear on 218 Members of this House, many of them from the South, to petition discharge of the Rivers bill from the House Committee on Agriculture and to bring it to the floor of the House for a vote.

MONEY TALKS

For the year ending last November the oleomargarine industry, as represented by 26 major manufacturers, spent $6,000,000 to advertise their product to consumers, according to Time magazine. The gist of this advertising was that oleo is as good as butter, that it is entitled to be colored yellow in imitation of butter, and that only "horse and buggy" legislation prevents it from being sold in this form. Not unnaturally, the impact of these millions of dollars of advertising revenue was reflected by columns of favorable news and editorial comment in return.

The so-called powerful butter lobby has spent not a penny on national advertisements in reply, for the simple reason that not even 1,250,000 dairy farmers have that kind of money to spend. The sole dissenting voice has been raised within the oleo industry itself by Mr. Fred Hoffman, president of the Cudahy Packing Co., the fourth largest manufacturer of oleomargarine, who this week stated:

> If any hurt has come to the oleomargarine industry, it has been self-inflicted. During the past several decades the industry has encouraged, rather than discouraged, the consumer to take the time and trouble to color her oleomargarine yellow. All of the industry's advertisements have encouraged this practice.
>
> Had the industry, on the other hand, spent its millions of advertising dollars encouraging the consumer to serve her oleomargarine white, she would be accustomed to using it that way today.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention at this point to some of the activities of the oleomargarine industry, and what they have been doing throughout the country to sell an erroneous idea to the people of the United States.

I have no quarrel with oleo. I want that strictly understood. The people of this country can buy and eat and use all the oleo they want to. All I am interested in, and I am sure I speak the sentiments of all dairy farmers when I say that all we require is that oleo be sold for what it is, and not as an imitator of butter.

Yellow is the color that we are fighting over in this issue. The oleomargarine industry stated they must have the color yellow in order to promote and increase the sale of their product. So all of the literature and information and advertisment that has gone out has been in a yellow color to induce the housewives to demand yellow-colored oleo.

For instance, here is a little piece of advertising. It raises this question: "Why do you bother to color your own margarine?"

Here is another one: "Ask to have your margarine colored yellow."

In other words, the propaganda has been all along the line of encouraging the housewives or to sell the housewives the

idea that they should have yellow-colored oleomargarine.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Suppose what you suggest and contemplate became true: As far as the State of Vermont is concerned, under our law, which prohibits the manufacture or sale of yellow-colored oleomargarine, of what benefit would it be to any consumer in Vermont?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I intend to discuss that a little later, but I will say the gentleman is correct. Even though we would repeal all the Federal laws, yellow oleomargaine could not be manufactured and sold in the State of Vermont, and 22 other States, because the State law prohibits the sale of that commodity.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I just want the gentleman to assist me in making a suggestion to an answer I should give to a letter which was written to me, in which the writer asked:

> It is my understanding that there are forces afoot that will take up the difference between the amount repealed in the tax and the present price and that they will probably raise the price eventually after the tax is off.

Has the gentleman any information on that?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has taken a very strong position on that and I understand he intends to offer an amendment to prohibit oleomargarine manufacturers from increasing the price in the event this law is repealed. I know the gentleman has that in mind; but let me call the gentleman's attention to what is going on. Yellow-colored oleomargarine is sold in certain States where there is no State law against it, but there is a 10-cent Federal tax wherever colored margarine is sold. Indiana happens to be one of those States. White oleo in Indiana is sold at around 37 to 40 cents a pound. The yellow-colored oleo on April 15 at Terre Haute, Ind., was sold at 59 cents a pound. Here is the package in which it was purchased; here is the sales slip. It was 19 cents a pound more than the price of white oleo.

The gentleman can therefore feel sure that in the event we repeal this law as proposed by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], oleomargarine manufacturers will take care of that and will sell yellow-colored oleo for all the traffic will bear; and that, in most instances, will be more than 10 cents above the white oleo.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Then it is the gentleman's opinion that, if the tax is taken off, oleo will be sold at an increased price.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is no question about that. In the gentleman's State, the great State of New York, the people could not buy yellow-colored oleomargarine if they wanted to, because the State law prohibits the manufacture and sale of yellow oleomargarine.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is not much of the support for this bill on the theory that it is a consumers' bill, a bill to protect the housewives? If it were believed that the price would go up, support for the bill would disappear, would it not?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is no question but what this legislation is not intended to protect housewives. The sponsors of the legislation have paid lip service to the low-income people of this country; but this is an economic fight, as I have already said.

I will just read a brief statement from the New York Times. It states that with reference to the petition on the Speaker's desk, which was sponsored by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]:

> Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, Democrat of South Carolina, who has been trying for 8 years to obtain repeal of the margarine tax in the interest of the cottonseed-oil industry has already a discharge petition on the Speaker's desk.

So it is an economic fight, wherein the cotton South is trying to increase the price and sale of cottonseed oil, and this group has been joined by the manufacturers of oleo who want to make more profits, all of this is to the detriment of American dairy farmers.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. I have heard of people grabbing at straws many a time——

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yielded to the gentleman for a question, not a speech. I will be glad for him to ask a question.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. In the State of Pennsylvania there is a law prohibiting the sale of colored oleomargarine. These men who paraded down the aisle to put their names on this discharge petition now have the responsibility on their shoulders to see that their States repeal their own tax laws against the sale of oleo.

Again, why is it that in the past 14 years the Democrats, when they had the votes, when they had absolute control of the Congress, did not pass this law? Why are they suddenly so solicitous about its repeal when for 14 years they could have done it without any opposition. Where were they then?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad the gentleman asked that question because I have served on the Committee on Agriculture during most of the time the Democrats were in control. Why did they not take it up, the gentleman asks?

Mr. GROSS. Votes. That is the answer.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Of course. They wanted the votes of the northern Democratic farmers. They did not dare to do it. And now they want the votes of the solid South for Truman.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am sorry; I cannot yield.

Mr. RIVERS. I certainly appreciate the gentleman's fairness. That certainly exemplifies just about how much he has. And I want to congratulate the gentleman too on his great courage, because he is loaded with it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have always admired the gentleman for his astuteness, and for his ability as a statesman and a parliamentarian, and particularly for the protection that he is now trying to afford to the cottonseed growers.

Mr. RIVERS. I certainly appreciate the gentleman's courage because he is loaded with it, or he is packed with it, I should say.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I certainly appreciate the gentleman's sentiments.

Mr. RIVERS. I wish I had the gentleman on my team.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would like to have the gentleman stay because I am sure he will be interested in what I have to say.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina who is now leaving the floor to stay here because in the few minutes I have I want to show the kind of leadership we are supposed to have from the great State of South Carolina. I would like to have him present.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman for that purpose because I would like to have him present also.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. What I would like to know is do we have a direct tax on oleomargarine?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. A direct tax?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The tax in States where the State law prohibits the sale of oleomargarine is ¼ cent per pound, which is absorbed by the manufacturers.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I wonder if the gentleman will discuss the question of the use of coconut oil in the manufacture of oleomargarine and what effect it is going to have on the farmers who raise soybeans and cottonseed which is presently being used to manufacture oleo? The only reason they are not using coconut oil is because it has not been imported due to the war.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. What will happen to these farmers who presently

grow soybeans when the coconut oil begins to flow in at a low price?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. When coconut oil flows in and the price comes down, which it will, then the gentleman will find that the oleomargarine manufacturers of this country will go to making their product out of coconut oil rather than the domestic oils. Have no fear about that, because these oleomargarine manufacturers are not dumbbells. They are in the business to make money. They claim, probably rightly so, that they can make just as good margarine or oleomargarine out of coconut oil as they can out of the domestic cottonseed oil.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BUCK. When the coconut oil starts coming in and the price of margarine comes down, that will benefit the housewife; will it not?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes; I think the gentleman is right, and we want the housewife to have it. But let her have it for what it is, not as an imitator of butter.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. When that coconut oil begins flowing does not the gentleman think that the oleomargarine manufacturer will seek the protection of a tax to keep it out?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think they may try to do that. If he does not, then producers of cottonseed oil and soybean oil will do so.

Mr. GROSS. They want to take it off now, but they will want it on then.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I may say to the gentleman that under the recent reciprocal trade agreements that have been approved, we are going on a free-trade basis in the United States under the lowest tariff in the history of our times, so that when the countries of the world get back into production again they will not only be shipping in oleo but other commodities.

Mr. GROSS. That is true. I had forgotten about that.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to show how clever this oleo lobby has been, and I compliment them on the wonderful public-relations job they have done in putting over their idea and using the American housewives as a front for them. We did not have any of them appear before the committee. But we insisted that one of them come before the committee and he did so reluctantly.

What did they do to put this over? They went out and hired one of the best public relation advertising firms in the country? Who were they? They were good friends of ours—Selfridge & Lee, who handled the Republican advertising in 1944 in the Presidential campaign. It is a good firm. They did a splendid job and they received good money for it. The National Cotton Council that represents the cotton growers of the South contributed $10,000 before the first of the year to the oleo lobby so that they could go ahead and put on this campaign. I have here a long list of large expenditures to build up the public relations part and sell the idea to the American housewife so that she would get busy and write to Members of Congress.

This was an organized campaign and it was cleverly arranged. They sent out secret instructions to the merchants and to the distributors and manufacturers of oleo. I want to read a few paragraphs to show how they proposed to organize this campaign on Congress, particularly the House of Representatives.

It was a clever idea. We should use some of those same tactics politically for ourselves and our political party. Here is what they said. Here are the instructions followed in the oleo campaign. Let me read it:

A RESOURCES ROUND-UP

(Confidential)

NEED

In order to mobilize each and every available resource for the best possible effort for success in revising the Federal margarine law, we request full information on the kind and amount of assistance each of the margarine manufacturers is ready to give.

Please be specific—attach as many pages as necessary to give full information.

THIS IS URGENT—PLEASE REPLY PROMPTLY

All requests for cooperation on the part of your personnel will be cleared through the addressee of this memorandum, unless certain companies desire and authorize us to work direct with their people in the field and give their field people authority to work with us. (We do not favor this, since we believe better results will follow if requests reach your people via their principals.)

1. A list of all home office and field personnel, by name and address, available to:

(a) Contact women's clubs, especially to promote club interest via agenda reprints.

(b) Contact editors.

(c) Develop letters, etc., to Congressmen and Senators, when desired.

(d) Organize any other type of support at the local level. Also, please be certain to mention friendly contacts outside your home area, which we may follow up.

(e) To organize and bring a delegation to Washington at the critical time to urge their own Congressmen to work and vote for passage of our measure.

2. List any (a) State or (b) congressional district for which your company, or your branches, or your jobbers, could take the responsibility of educating the congressional delegation, or any member thereof, in obtaining their, or his, support.

3. A list of the names and addresses of the heads of local civic, religious, charitable, fraternal, consumer, business, or other groups, in your home office territory, or in territory served by your branches, known to be friendly to margarine, whom you could contact for us, or whom we could contact direct, to distribute literature, write letters, organize public opinion at homes. Please indicate whether contact should be through you or direct by us.

4. When the times comes, can you promote our bill?

	Yes	No
(a) In your advertising	☐	☐
In your radio programs	☐	☐
By the distribution of leaflets to the grocers	☐	☐

If "Yes," please show amount of:

(1) Space available in column inches, or number of words, and list of publications available.

(2) Amount of time or number of words you can use on the air and a list of radio stations you use.

(3) Approximate quantity of leaflets you could use, based on grocer contacts made by your representatives.

5. A list of supplier contacts which you wish us to contact. All should be sold on giving margarine a hand now, since all who sell to margarine manufacturers have a justifiable pocketbook interest in the future of margarine. Publications and radio stations carrying margarine advertising are an important part of this group.

6. A list of the names of any members of your organization, or of any organization retained by your firm, who work on public relations and publicity for you, who will be available to attend a meeting on promotional publicity, in New York early in December, and to assist on this part of the job during the campaign. On December 4, we expect to set the date for this meeting.

7. A list of any other cooperation of facilities you can offer, which you think will contribute to the success of this undertaking.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to show the advertisements that appeared in Life magazine. Two of these advertisements appeared in Life magazine. One firm, Leo Burnett & Co., Inc., of Chicago, was paid $50,153.47 just to prepare this advertisement and another one that appeared in Life magazine. So they have done a real, thorough job, and we, as men in public life, subject to the will of the people, can well take a lesson from this lobby as to the magnificent job they have done. I, of course, compliment the Republican Advertising Agency in New York. The Cotton Council and the Oleo Institute did a clever piece of work when they employed this firm.

OLEO PROPAGANDA MISLEADING

The oleomargarine manufacturers have further misled the consumer to believe that she pays a Federal tax of 10 cents a pound on their product. The plain truth is that the Federal tax on uncolored oleomargarine amounts to only one-fourth of 1 cent a pound, which is absorbed by the processor. No housewife pays the additional Federal tax of 10 cents a pound unless she buys her oleomargarine already colored. Most consumers avoid this tax by coloring their own oleo, a procedure which takes only 2 minutes, according to the manufacturers' own advertisements. No housewife pays the 10-cent tax if she buys plain white oleo, as millions do.

Oleomargarine propaganda does not mention that 23 States prohibit the sale of the colored product altogether, and that repeal of the Federal taxes would not affect States' rights in this matter. These States, however, have heavy concentrations of industrial population and are targets for the 26 big oleomargarine manufacturers who produce and distribute the bulk of this product.

As the oleomargarine lobby itself says, "So long as Federal restrictions upon the manufacture and sale of margarine are continued in effect State restrictive laws are more difficult to remove."

Repeal of Federal taxes on oleo, therefore, may be considered as a deliberate first step in this direction in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Delaware, Pennsylvania, New York, Maryland,

Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, and California.

Data showing States in which State laws restrict or prohibit the sale of yellow-colored oleomargarine, as of April 1, 1948:

STATES THAT PROHIBIT OR RESTRICT THE MANUFACTURE OR SALE OF COLORED OLEOMARGARINE

COLORED OLEO SALE PROHIBITED

California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Vermont, Washington, and Wisconsin.

COLORED OLEO SALE RESTRICTED

Maryland, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Wyoming.

MANUFACTURE OF COLORED OLEO PROHIBITED OR RESTRICTED

California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Vermont, Washington, and Wisconsin.

Now, a lot of information has gone into various States, such as Illinois, Ohio, and New York, trying to make the housewives believe that they are paying a 10-cent tax at the present time. That is false. They have circulated this erroneous information to those people in an effort to try and mislead them so that they will become aroused to the point of bringing pressure upon Congress to have this so-called punitive tax law repealed. The tax is a quarter of a cent a pound on white margarine, which is sold in these 23 States, where more than two-thirds of the population resides.

MISLEADING PROPAGANDA AS TO COLOR

The oleomargarine manufacturers are further guilty of leading the public to believe that their product is naturally yellow in color. They infer that Federal restrictions force the removal of this color by bleaching, and that the housewife is unfairly required to restore it. Butter, they say, is colored with the same dyes with which oleo is colored; and restraints on their use of the yellow color is unjustified discrimination.

The facts are that it is impossible to make a naturally yellow oleomargarine out of domestic oils. The Armour Research Foundation of the Illinois Institute of Technology revealed this week the results of scientific tests in this respect. When cottonseed oils are turned into fat they become gray. When soybean oils are turned into fat they become green. They are then bleached not because of the Federal laws, but to remove undesirable odors, flavors, and colors.

Laboratory analyses of hydrogenated soybean or cottonseed oils, the domestic oils generally utilized in commercial production of oleomargarine, indicate that regardless of whatever other qualities oleo may or may not have, it does not in the least resemble natural butter in its original state as far as color is concerned.

Moreover, when color is added to butter it is for purposes of uniformity and not with the idea of making butter look like something which it is not. Would the oleo manufacturers want to color their product yellow if butter was naturally pink? Certainly not.

OLEOMARGARINE IS A SYNTHETIC PRODUCT

We must remember that oleomargarine is a contrived product of uncertain ancestry. It can be and has been made of fish oil, animal fats, tallow, waste packing-house byproducts, and vegetable oils both domestic and imported. To say that oleo is the nutritional equivalent of butter is to say that horsemeat is the nutritional equivalent of prime roast beef. The statement may be technically true, but it is morally dubious.

In any case the processing of oleo requires the deodorizing of some oils, the removal of unpleasant off-tastes from others, and bleaching to give a uniform base for the addition of color. Diacetyl must be added to imitate butter's taste. Vitamin A, which is extracted from shark livers, must be added to imitate butter's nutrition. Milk must be added to oleo to imitate butter's texture. The use of yellow would be the final step toward fraud and deceit by imitating butter's color.

The consumer is entitled to get what she pays for. The dairy farmer is entitled to the quality market he works for. When an imitation of butter invades the butter market, both consumer and farmer suffer. Somewhere this parade of imitations must stop, and the time to stop it is now.

OLEO TAXES ARE NOT DISCRIMINATORY

For 62 years we have had Federal excise taxes on oleomargarine to pay for policing its manufacture and distribution. Nearly 30,000 persons were picked up by the Bureau of Internal Revenue in one 15-year period for selling oleomargarine as butter at butter prices. The Federal tax is the only way to maintain jurisdiction, police the continued sale of oleo, and protect the public welfare.

These taxes harm no one, least of all the oleomargarine manufacturer, since production of oleo has more than doubled since 1941. Oleo manufacturers have proved themselves well able to absorb this tax. Every other food store in the land now stocks and sells oleo, so it cannot be said that oleo distribution suffers from the tax.

Butter production, on the other hand, has been consistently discouraged since the outbreak of World War II. Wartime price ceilings penalized butter manufacture in favor of other dairy products, and great quantities of milk went overseas in other forms. Butter production fell from 1,900,000,000 to 1,300,000,000 pounds during the war, and has not yet recovered. Like the Germans, we were told to choose between guns and butter, and, in a sense, that is still the choice which confronts us.

DANGER TO BUTTER PRODUCTION

The unrestricted sale, now, of yellow oleomargarine in imitation of butter might well be the final crippling blow to our native dairy industry. For instance, statistics show that 65,000,000 meals are served daily in public eating places. The unrestricted sale of colored oleo would allow restaurant keepers to substitute it for butter. Their patrons would be paying for butter and eating oleo. Hospitals and other public institutions state openly that they want the right to serve colored oleo in place of butter without the knowledge of their patients. The public markets where butter is sold in bulk would not be immune to fraud and deceit, since its yellow color is the only way by which butter may be identified at sight. None of these deceptions come under the Pure Food and Drug Act, which operates only in interstate commerce. Within the border of each individual State any form of fraud and deception could be practiced in substituting colored oleo for butter, once Federal taxes and State restrictions were repealed.

The repeal of the Federal taxes on yellow oleomargarine, then, would lay the consumer open to substitution on every hand. The markets would be wide open to adulterations and imitations of every kind. The outlets for butter as a quality product would be destroyed—and that is exactly what the oleomargarine manufacturers want. They want not part of the market for spreads used on bread, nor most of that market, but all of the market. Their corporate greed, backed by the ravening interests of the cotton South, is insatiable.

DAIRY HERDS ENDANGERED

If the drive to repeal the Federal taxes on oleo succeeds, what will be the effect on the dairy farmers? The lost butter market will be felt first by the 1,250,000 farmers who sell farm-separated cream, most of whom only milk from 3 to 6 cows. These farmers and their families depend upon some 5,000 creameries for almost their only weekly cash income.

In June, during the flush season, cows produce 50 percent more milk than in November while consumption remains the same. This surplus must go into butter, which can be stored longer and more readily than any other manufactured dairy product. Without butter outlets the small dairy farmers will have no alternative but to reduce their herds, with far-reaching results.

If Federal oleo taxes are repealed, I estimate that the reduction of dairy herds within the next 3 years will amount to not less than 2,500,000 head of cattle. This drop in the available milk supply will be severely felt in urban centers which absorb the surplus from our milk sheds, and will affect the very consumers to whom the oleo manufacturers now appeal. Any possibility of savings from the oleo taxes will be reflected many times over in the consumer's increased milk bill.

With increased population and increased demands for milk, the reduction in dairy herds would produce milk shortages. Higher prices for milk would be inevitable. Higher prices for meat would be equally inevitable, since 40 percent of our meat supply comes from dairy herds. If this vicious trend were continued, we could easily be reduced from our traditional American meat and milk products diet to a subsistence diet of grain and synthetic foods, as is much of

Europe today. Filled milk, filled cheese, and other filled dairy products using cottonseed oil would follow as a matter of course. How would your family like that?

Our modern soil-conservation practices would be equally crippled, since sound soil conservation goes hand in hand with dairy farming. Nourishment would no longer be returned to the soil in the form of fertilizer, as on every dairy farm at present. Legumes such as alfalfa, which build the soil rather than destroy it, would no longer be required for nonexistent dairy herds. The soil would be ruined rather than replenished, to the disadvantage of our children and our children's children.

A shift in production to soybean and other soil-depleting crops would be unavoidable. This, in turn, would mean larger appropriations from Congress to meet our increasing soil-conservation needs and to match the job once taken over without subsidy by our Nation's dairy farmers. The end would be disastrous for farmers and city folk alike, and would endanger the very existence of our country.

DAIRY FARMERS ARE NOT PROFITEERS

Although a vital part of our economy, dairy farming is not particularly profitable. In central New York it ranks only ninth in returns per hour for labor. In southern Wisconsin it ranks eighth. By contrast, the southern plains cotton farms are fourth among profitable agricultural operations.

Yet dairy farming is the backbone of diversified modern agriculture. Manufactured dairy products are a necessary outlet for milk which cannot be sold in bottles, and butter continues to be the product upon which the dairy farmer relies for tax money when the bottom falls out of other markets. It is a product which both farmer and consumer must be able to count upon—a quality product which is both a food and a flavor.

Dairy farmers are not seeking to deprive anyone of oleo. If the housewife wants oleo she should be able to buy it, and modern packing permits her to color it easily, quickly, and without waste. But, except for Federal tax, there is no way of controlling the manufacture and sale of oleo. No other control plan has been suggested.

OLEO PRICES WOULD GO UP, NOT DOWN

Oleomargarine, colored yellow in imitation of butter, has sold right here in Washington, D. C., for as much as 12 cents to 18 cents a pound more than plain white oleo, on the same day. Last week, in Terre Haute, Ind., oleo colored yellow in imitation of butter sold for as much as 29 cents per pound more than plain white oleo. The Federal tax on colored oleo is still 10 cents a pound. What accounts for the difference? Only one thing—the consumer is being stuck for this extra profit.

If all restrictions are removed from the sale of colored oleo it will replace white oleo entirely in the market. With no white oleomargarine to compete in keeping the price down, colored oleo will tend to follow butter prices even more closely than at present. What will then happen to the cost of "the poor man's spread?"

The price of oleo has no apparent relation to the cost of its ingredients, or to the basic Federal tax. The cost of adding vitamin A to oleo is more than three times the amount of the tax. The cost for advertising the leading brands of oleomargarine normally runs from 4 to 7 times the amount of the tax. The industry's profits on oleomargarine are currently running 8 to 12 times the amount of the tax.

Butter production shows no such profits as these, but it remains a vital part of our farm economy. From the consumers' standpoint, the laws give protection against fraud and misrepresentation in the substitution of colored oleomargarine in place of butter. The oleo manufacturers will tell you that there is no other parallel in our laws of one food product being protected against another food product. The answer is that no other type of merchandise affords even a close parallel for comparison.

The monetary incentive to sell colored oleo at the price of and in the guise of butter is absolutely unique. With the quantities of butter sold so huge and the price spread between oleo and butter so great, there would be tremendous incentive for substitution and fraud if the laws were repealed. No proof should be needed for such an obvious fact, but if proof is needed we have only to examine the long history of fraud in oleo sales as revealed in the records of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

I hold that there has been no important change in the production and sale of oleo nor in the relationship of oleomargarine to other competitive products such as cheese, shortenings, lard, and butter—particularly butter—to cause the Congress at this juncture to make any change whatsoever in the Federal statutes. These bills have been introduced at a time when both national and international conditions are in a state of uncertainty and change. Precipitate action at this time by the Congress in weakening or repealing these laws would undoubtedly result in great damage to the dairy farmers of the country and increase the cost of oleomargarine to consumers.

A change in Federal law would have more far-reaching effects than might first be assumed, because it would change the relationship of some of the more important fats and oils and require adjustments to be made all along the line, the full extent of which cannot readily be foreseen. For example, no one can foresee at this time just what the ultimate effect upon the soybean producers may be if the market in soybean meal is substantially reduced as a result of the repeal of the oleomargarine laws.

Soybean growers get two and a half times as much income from soybean meal sold for dairy cattle feed as they get from soybean oil sold for oleo. Cotton planters get half again as much for their cottonseed meal sold for dairy cattle feed as they get for cottonseed oil sold for oleo.

Without an outlet for the soybean meal it may prove difficult for the soybean producers to compete against imported oils. Such effects as these, in turn, require compensating adjustments and changes further down the line. On the other hand, maintenance of the status quo cannot in the least injure the manufacturers of oleo, their handlers, or the producers of oleaginous products from which certain oils, notably cottonseed and soybean oil, are extracted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If there is no objection on the part of Members having special orders, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN] has led the fight against the passage of this iniquitous legislation. I wonder if the gentleman has noticed the letter from the Cudahy Packing Co. who, themselves, by the way, are among the large oleo manufacturers in America, the fourth largest, I believe. These people, Mr. Speaker, have made this statement, and I wish the gentleman from Minnesota would quote from that particular letter.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad to do so at the gentleman's suggestion:

> Twenty-five percent of our dairy farmers depend largely upon the sale of cream for butter manufacture to maintain their dairy cows. If the oleomargarine laws were repealed, over a million of this type of farmer would, in our opinion, be forced to sell most of his cows. The permanent reduction in this segment of our cattle population would affect not only our supply of milk and cream but also our supply of meat.
>
> Inasmuch as butter traditionally has served as the outlet for all surplus supplies of milk after all other milk products (including bottled milk, ice cream, evaporated milk, dried milk, and cheese) have been supplied with their requirements, it is quite apparent that any action adversely affecting butter could create chaotic conditions in the supply and cost to the consumer of all other dairy products. It might well be that in the event that the price of butter were unduly depressed, bringing about substantially reduced production of milk in the over-all in this country, the price of bottled milk and all manufactured dairy products would at times be increased substantially to the consumer.
>
> Butter alone is entitled to the yellow color because it alone is always naturally yellow—in varying shades thereof. It is morally entitled to make the claim: "Yellow is the 'trade-mark' of butter." Oleomargarine, on the other hand, if processed from vegetable oils from American farms (as it is largely today) cannot be made a natural yellow. These oils are bleached not because of the Federal laws, but because it is necessary to remove undesirable colors. There has been a great deal of misinformation and misleading propaganda put out on this subject and the record should be set straight.

My time is about to expire, but on Monday I hope to have additional opportunity to further discuss what effect the Rivers bill, or similar legislation will have upon the economy of our country. I am honestly convinced that the passage of the proposed legislation will bring serious dislocation to American agriculture, and in the end work great hardship for consumers in this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK). The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

OLEOMARGARINE AND CUSTER'S LAST STAND FOR THE DAIRY INDUSTRY

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, long before this oleo bill was ever introduced there was much apprehension in the dairy world as to exactly what was happening. This administration through the many years of its more abundant life, started out by killing off all the goats, even going into the reservation of the Navajo Indians, with the result that the people on that reservation did not have protective food and now the Appropriations Committee has to give them $1,000,000 to go out and buy goats.

If you do not want to go way back to the days of killing the little pigs and burying cattle while people were starving just take the last 5-year period. Once more I will call your attention to the antilivestock attitude of this administration. During the last 5 years you have seen over one-third, in fact, more than one-third, 37 percent to be exact, of the sheep of this country go over the hill. On January 1 of this year we had 40 percent fewer hogs than we had 5 years ago, and 6,000,000 fewer cattle. Mr. Luckman was selected to kill the chickens off last year, but the poultry men of the Nation soon saw that his program did not make sense and didn't kill them off. Now we have this effort to hang up the carcass of the poor old dairy cows in the coolers of the packing houses of this nation. This will have more serious consequences than killing the pigs ever had. We have fewer milch cows on the farms of our country than we had 15 years ago when the New Deal took over. Next year, the American people are faced with less milk and less dairy products than ever before in the history of this country. That is how serious this situation is before oleo ever gets into the picture. With 58 percent more babies and with an increase of millions in our national population it is high time someone does some forward thinking.

It is a sad day when in this great country the membership of this Chamber has to discharge its Committee on Agriculture from the consideration of important Agricultural legislation. This is but one more example of the desire to crush the American farmer. In the Washington milk shed they are even being threatened with jail sentences. It is also a sad day when we have to make a step backward and accept the leadership—and get this one—the leadership of a State which in 1947 could not or did not pay its farm labor more than an average of 28 cents an hour. In one of the States of this Nation the farm labor is paid 91 cents an hour—the State of Washington. Mr. Henry Wallace—and I am sorry his supporters are not here—has a dollar an hour in his campaign promises, as a minimum wage.

You will note that in the Midwest in the three States of Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin where one-fourth the milk of the Nation is produced, the hourly wage is 70 cents per hour, 68 cents per hour, and 61 cents per hour, respectively.

My colleagues, do you wish an economy based on 28 cents per hour? Do you wish to promote a type of economy in the United States where one-third of the people cannot read or write? Do you wish to promote an economy that gives a 33⅓ percent draft rejection for health and educational reasons?

If that is your purpose do not follow the leadership of the agriculturally conscious Members of this Congress who are in favor of a farm hourly return that gives the American farm people an American standard of living. I would like to know just how many supporters of Mr. Wallace would want labor to get only 28 cents an hour, even on the farm. What is the use of talking about a minimum wage or a new minimum wage bill when the 28-cents-per-hour leadership is to discharge the Agriculture Committee? I will put this information in the RECORD if anyone has any doubt about the different States. I insert it at this point:

Annual average wage per day without board, 1939 and 1947

	Estimated daily rate		Converted to hourly rate [1]	
	1939	1947	1939	1947
Alabama	$0.90	$3.15	$0.09	$0.32
Arizona	2.07	6.00	.21	.60
Arkansas	1.04	3.85	.10	.38
California	2.82	8.10	.28	.81
Colorado	2.06	6.60	.21	.66
Connecticut	2.88	6.30	.29	.63
Delware	1.94	6.10	.19	.61
Florida	1.25	4.35	.12	.44
Georgia	.90	3.20	.09	.32
Idaho	2.44	7.90	.24	.79
Illinois	2.19	5.90	.22	.59
Indiana	1.92	5.50	.19	.55
Iowa	2.23	7.00	.22	.70
Kansas	1.90	6.90	.19	.69
Kentucky	1.28	3.85	.13	.38
Louisiana	1.07	3.25	.11	.32
Maine	2.25	6.40	.22	.64
Maryland	1.86	5.70	.19	.57
Massachusetts	2.82	6.50	.28	.65
Michigan	2.19	6.40	.22	.64
Minnesota	2.31	6.80	.23	.68
Mississippi	.95	3.30	.10	.33
Missouri	1.43	4.75	.14	.48
Montana	2.58	7.30	.26	.73
Nebraska	1.84	7.10	.18	.71
Nevada	2.42	6.30	.24	.63
New Hampshire	2.93	6.40	.29	.64
New Jersey	2.47	6.50	.25	.65
New Mexico	1.67	5.30	.17	.53
New York	2.30	6.50	.23	.65
North Carolina	1.18	4.05	.12	.40
North Dakota	2.00	8.20	.20	.82
Ohio	2.10	5.50	.21	.55
Oklahoma	1.44	5.10	.14	.51
Oregon	2.41	8.00	.24	.80
Pennsylvania	2.24	5.50	.22	.55
Rhode Island	2.90	6.30	.29	.63
South Carolina	.82	2.85	.08	.28
South Dakota	1.97	7.50	.20	.75
Tennessee	1.03	3.20	.10	.32
Texas	1.28	4.70	.13	.47
Utah	2.55	6.30	.26	.63
Vermont	2.43	6.70	.24	.67
Virginia	1.44	4.35	.14	.44
Washington	2.63	9.10	.26	.91
West Virginia	1.48	3.85	.15	.38
Wisconsin	1.98	6.10	.20	.61
Wyoming	2.28	7.20	.23	.72

[1] Average daily rates were converted to hourly rates assuming a uniform 10-hour day. This assumption is not completely valid since average time worked per day varies between States and is also probably a little less in 1947 than in 1939. No estimate of the annual length o work day for hired farm workers is available.

Prepared by Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Oh, there are a lot of States that are interested in a minimum wage. They say, "We want a minimum wage, but we want to eat off the minimum wage based on the new agricultural leadership of 28 cents an hour."

We have had a lot of that leadership and the more leadership we have of that kind the less the people of this country have to eat. Why, the President gets on the radio and tells us how serious the situation is from the consumers' standpoint. He is right but I often wonder why he does not do something about it. We are not going to have food for the people of this country unless somebody produces it, and the antilivestock attitude of this administration is not going to furnish it to them. They have demonstrated many times how allergic they are to dairy products in general and butterfat in particular. I think it is about time someone would want to check up on them.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. If the farmers of this country went on strike as many of the unions have, I fear many of our labor racketeers would go hungry.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would like to say a word about labor. I wish to say a good word for John Lewis because he deserves this expression. He is the whipping boy, but no one can charge by any of the statements that John Lewis has made that he wants to keep the American farmer from getting a decent price for his product and from having a decent price for their product. That is one thing you cannot lay onto John Lewis and I have followed his position for the last 25 years.

We are now faced with this new agricultural leadership with 28 cents per hour as in South Carolina.

Meat animals last year yielded a return of $9,900,000,000.

Dairy products, $4,059,000,000.

Poultry and eggs, $2,900,000,000.

Corn, $1,200,000,000.

Wheat, $2,500,000,000.

Rice, which is one of the great basic commodities under the New Deal, only $165,000,000.

Just think about a $165,000,000 crop as a basic commodity, when a $9,900,000,000 meat crop and a $4,059,000,000 milk crop and a $2,900,000,000 poultry crop is not classed as basic. The same can be said of peanuts and tobacco for that matter.

Cotton, $2,000,000,000.

Tobacco, $1,001,000,000.

Peanuts, $213,000,000.

Are we going to have an antilivestock program going on forever and forever before someone calls a halt to it? We should call a halt before it is too late. That is the question to be decided. At this point I include the farm returns by States in 1947 and also the returns for certain agricultural products and crops:

Cash receipts from farm marketings, by States, 1947

[In thousands of dollars]

State:	Amount
Alabama	380,001
Arizona	182,574
Arkansas	490,001
California	2,144,538
Colorado	516,654
Connecticut	145,570
Delaware	81,598
Florida	354,377
Georgia	492,081
Idaho	359,880
Illinois	1,869,729
Indiana	1,079,751
Iowa	2,368,962
Kansas	1,266,671
Kentucky	579,258
Louisiana	309,133
Maine	171,686
Maryland	233,231
Massachusetts	193,772
Michigan	719,484
Minnesota	1,335,556
Mississippi	473,439
Missouri	1,080,676
Montana	397,350
Nebraska	1,125,518
Nevada	40,944
New Hampshire	59,448
New Jersey	278,822
New Mexico	181,939
New York	822,582
North Carolina	743,951
North Dakota	736,927
Ohio	1,052,485
Oklahoma	695,005
Oregon	376,350
Pennsylvania	767,172
Rhode Island	21,930
South Carolina	302,582
South Dakota	671,099
Tennessee	485,938
Texas	1,974,575
Utah	151,949
Vermont	109,443
Virginia	413,471
Washington	611,455
West Virginia	125,156
Wisconsin	1,051,210
Wyoming	148,821
Total	30,174,744

Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Apr. 19, 19, 1948.

Wisconsin has been pushed down already from sixth place to eleventh place in farm-marketing returns in 1947. Some unthinking people of Wisconsin even wish to drive the farm income still further downward. The special-privilege crops, subsidized and pampered with legislative acts, enjoy the benefits.

Cash receipts from specified commodities, United States, 1947

Commodity:	Amount (in millions of dollars)
Meat animals	9,911
Dairy products	4,059
Poultry and eggs	2,903
Corn	1,248
Wheat	2,588
Rice	165
Cotton (lint and seed)	2,139
Tobacco	1,001
Peanuts	213

Bureau of Agricultural Economics, April 19, 1948.

This is not a butter-oleomargarine controversy. This is a controversy as to the system of agriculture we are going to have in America. Are we going to have a system of a landed aristocracy where the people work at slave wages, carrying on generation after generation, or do you believe in the American farm way where the people of this country can have family-sized farms and own a little piece of America themselves? I am not going to engage in the business of dividing anybody's land up, but, in my opinion, the time has come for the people of this country to recognize the fact that the great bulk of the people who want to live on our land are entitled to own some land and to farm it the American way—like real Americans. They are entitled to an American wage. This minimum-wage proposition does not only apply in New York City, it does not only apply in Philadelphia, it does not only apply in Los Angeles; it should apply to every citizen of America who labors, regardless of whether he is laboring in the factory or he happens to be laboring on a farm.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Is it not true that the dairy industry is the largest industry in dollar value in this country? It is bigger than oil, steel, or any other.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. There is no argument about that. The table I inserted showed over a $4,000,000,000 marketing of milk, and the dairy industry also furnishes between 40 and 50 percent of the beef and veal of the Nation in addition.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BUCK. Would the gentleman favor a minimum wage on farms?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes. The gentleman does not catch me on that. I do favor a minimum wage and I will tell the gentleman why, too. If you had a minimum wage on the farm we would not have so many of these rich fellows getting farms so that it will help out on their income tax even though they may hire their labor for 28 cents per hour or less. If they can hire a man for nothing, the man who works his own land does not get anything either. That fact is evident.

I am personally willing to support legislation that will give the man on the farm equal wage and hour support, the same protective legislation that you give any other group of labor in the country. And, I am getting awfully tired of having our friends in the cities, who say that they have to have $2 an hour, want the peasants to produce it for them, under the new agricultural leadership, by a rate of 28 cents an hour labor.

Mr. BUCK. What about a 40-hour week on the farm?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Forty hour? The cows cannot wait on Saturday and Sunday, so I cannot really do that. But, there is a comparable minimum wage in this dairymen picture, too. If we pass any more minimum wages around here, we better take into consideration the people that work the land and produce the food and fiber of this Nation, and if we do not, I am sure that a lot of these people on the farms will kind of go out of existence. Still more millions will migrate to the cities for more per hour and less hours per day. There is a limit as to how far this can be carried on.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, one of the proponents of this legislation recently wrote a letter asking why you cannot sell milk, instead of at 10 or 13 cents a glass, for a nickel, like they do Coca-Cola. It seems that the proponents of this legislation thought you could get the milk out of a stream like you could Coca-Cola.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman. My distinguished friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] gave me permission to insert his letter to Mr. W. A. McDonald, of Flint, Mich., and Mr. McDonald's answer thereto. It contains consideration of the Coca-Cola-dairy values, and I recommend it to my colleague from Pennsylvania. I will insert the letters at this point:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 5, 1948.

Hon. W. A. MCDONALD,
McDonald Cooperative Dairy Co.,
Flint, Mich.

DEAR MR. MCDONALD: In your letter of the 2d you enclosed a resolution which I think indicates the complete lack of understanding on the part of the average milk producer of the relative importance of the various markets. If the processors would make the same effort to sell fluid milk to the public at a fair price that the soft-drink companies have made, I believe there would be very few farmers who would want to sell milk for the production of butter. Our country should consume much more fluid milk, and it could do so with benefit to the public and profit to the dairy farmer, but instead of developing this market the milk processors seem determined to charge the public all the tariff and to pay the milk producer as little as possible.

You cannot build a great industry on the basis of high unit costs. You have got to get prices down so that all of the public can consume. A few weeks ago I went to the great milk-producing State of Wisconsin. I paid 13 cents for a glass of milk in a restaurant. This is not the way to get the most money for the farmer. At 10 cents a glass the restaurant operator can make 100 percent profit and still pay a wholesale price for that milk that should return twice as much to the farmer as that same farmer would get if the milk were sold for butter which would retail at $1 a pound.

The milk producers of America would do well to employ some of the salesmen who have made Coca-Cola great. These people put out a cheap drink, and they meet all competition even competition that undersells them, that uses a similar name and an almost identical color. They have, however, sold the American people on the idea that they furnished a dependable quality product at a fair price. If the milk producers of America could but do the same thing, they could make far more than they could ever make selling milk for butter, and they could improve the whole standard of American nutrition. I think it is about time that instead of trying to hide behind a legislative monopoly, that the milk producers applied some modern business principles to their own industry. Maybe they need to kick out some of their present leadership and get somebody who has the vision of a Henry Ford.

Yours very sincerely,
W. R. POAGE,
Congressman, Eleventh Texas District.

McDONALD COOPERATIVE DAIRY CO.,
Flint, Mich., April 20, 1948.

Hon. W. R. POAGE,
Congressman, House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POAGE: Your letter of April 5 is amazing. I am reproducing it, together with my reply, for other Members of Congress. I think they should know that a member of the Committee on Agriculture has such a provincial viewpoint and so little knowledge of business and agricultural economics, particularly how and when a cow gives milk, and the production cost in relation to selling price.

I agree with you—Americans should consume more fluid milk, but apparently you do not know that they already lead the world in this respect, and that the milk distribution function is performed in this country more efficiently than anywhere else in the world.

You are unhappy that you paid 13 cents for 8 ounces of milk in a restaurant in Wisconsin. It is unlikely that the restaurant paid over 4½ cents for this milk. Did you price a bottle of Coca-Cola or a highball in this restaurant? In some restaurants there is no more comparison between the wholesale price of a commodity and the charge to the customer than there is between the ingredient cost in a bottle of Coca-Cola, which is infinitesimal, and the charge to the purchaser.

While you were visiting in Wisconsin, did you notice what a Garden of Eden this dairy-producing State is compared with the millions of acres of cotton land that has been eroded and rendered utterly worthless by that type of agriculture? Certainly a member of the Committee on Agriculture should not have missed this telling argument in favor of butter versus cottonseed oleo.

I understand that Coca-Cola is approximately 10.7 percent solids, mostly sugar at three-tenths of 1 cent per 6-ounce bottle. Add two-tenths of 1 cent for gas and flavor, making ½-cent total. Coke at 5 cents is six times the retail mark-up of the dairy industry. You can buy Coke for 26⅔ cents a quart if you go after it and carry it yourself. This is approximately 1½ times the price of a quart of milk delivered on your doorstep in Flint, rain or shine, snow or ice. Do you know the relative food value of a quart of milk and a quart of Coca-Cola?

From the standpoint of low-cost service, the Coca-Cola Co. and even the United States postal service, has much to learn from the milk industry. The net income of the Coca-Cola Co. has been about 20 percent of sales in the last 7 years, which is approximately 6 times that of the fluid-milk industry. It is hard to tell from your letter whether you are complaining about the mark-up in the milk industry, or whether you are recommending that it be multiplied by 6.

You point out that Coca-Cola meets competition that undersells them. True, but their product is identified by their container when the consumer gets it, and that is just the point that butter people are making on the oleo question. Oleo, colored and flavored and fortified and preserved with benzoate of soda, cannot be distinguished from butter in a restaurant. The consumer and manufacturer are entitled to protection against substitution.

Oleo bears another resemblance to Coca-Cola in its low ingredient cost in that the Texas cotton farmer selling cottonseed oil for oleo gets only 31 cents out of the consumer's dollar, whereas the milk producer selling cream for butter gets approximately 80 cents.

Apparently when you advocate that the 33.4 percent of milk used in butter should be added to the 35 percent of total milk production distributed in fluid milk in the cities and villages, you do not understand that this is not possible for several reasons.

1. You can't make people drink twice as much milk.

2. Farms producing butterfat for butter are not located near consuming population.

3. God arranged for cows to produce twice as much milk in May and June as they produce in November and December, but He did not make human beings so that they would drink twice as much.

In other words, in order for the dairy industry to exist there must be a concentrated form in which dairy products may be preserved from the flush to the scarce season, and this form must have a ready market. Powder and butter answer this description.

Has the oleo lobby, with its abundantly financed campaign, given you the answers to these questions?

1. If it is good to substitute vegetable fats for butterfat in the spread for bread, should it also be substituted in ice cream, cheese, and evaporated milk?

2. If you destroy the market for the butterfat portion of the milk, how do you get the solids-not-fat, since the cow produces fat and solids together?

3. If we allow oleo to drive butter out, what will happen to soil fertility?

4. Where will you get the 40 percent of beef now coming from dairy cattle?

5. Since there is little relationship between the cost of ingredients and the selling price of oleo, what will prevent the sale of colored oleo for very little less than the cost of butter? (Witness the history of vegetable fats and lard, and the consequent higher price on the meat portion of pork.)

6. How to prevent fraud in the sale of colored oleo as butter?

7. How to maintain American stamina on a Hindu diet resulting from legislating the dairy business and 40 percent of the beef business out of existence?

8. If imitation butter is desirable, why not encourage all other imitation and deception—for instance, horse meat for beef?

9. Were the legislation proposed by the oleo lobby adopted and the enormous population depending on milk production pauperized, what would you then do for or with these millions of people?

10. When you have abolished the dairy industry what becomes of the market for soybean oil meal and cottonseed meal used for feeding milk cows? In 1946 cotton farmers received $21,000,000 from oleomargarine manufacturers for cottonseed oil, but received $31,000,000 from dairy farmers who fed cottonseed meal. In the same year soybean growers received $23,000,000 from oleo manufacturers, and $55,000,000 for soybean products fed to dairy cattle. To turn these feed producers into oleo boosters is certainly clever fifth column work.

11. Why have oleo prices advanced much more above prewar levels than butter prices? Why does the price of oleo follow the price of butter instead of the cost of oleo ingredients?

This letter does not cover this most important subject adequately. Additional information will gladly be supplied. Your comparison of milk with Cola-Cola is a bad blunder. It shows an utter lack of sound understanding or comprehension of agriculture in general and milk economics in particular. The reasons you advance for permitting oleo to masquerade as butter are certainly fallacious.

I believe that the proposals of the oleo lobby would wreck the dairy industry and the economic security of the millions of farmers and workers depending on it. Notwithstanding this fact, demonstrate to me that the proposals of oleo would actually benefit our whole country and all its people, and I will not oppose it.

I am convinced the facts are not on the side of the oleo lobby, and that their arguments are not basically and economically sound, even though advanced plausibly.

Yours very truly,

W. A. McDONALD.

I just want to say this: I have been through this oleo-versus-the-people argument. I have not been angry at anyone; neither have I tried to be unduly unkind. If anyone is angry at me, because I cannot let this unjustified attack on the dairy industry go unchallenged, I feel only sorrow for him. I have no scars on me, and I hope I have not given anyone else any scars. I have not said anything that I will take back or retract. Not one word. I believe they are taking the American housewives for a ride in this matter. They will find out if they pass this bill that they will pay and pay and pay more for the privilege of buying margarine. Every ounce of every pound of oil in oleo is subsidized. The subsidy is between 1 and 10 cents per pound. The first thing you will do will be to destroy the whole dairy industry, and the second is, they are subscribing to a system of American agriculture, based on the philosophy, if you please, in 1947, of 28 cents an hour for labor. I hope you will not pass this bill. It is a backward step. I hope you will not prefer the 28-cents-per-hour formula of South Carolina for the American wage of Washington. If you do, I just hope that every time you take a mouthful of that oleomargarine—you may be getting $2.50 an hour or $40 a day—but remember this, that the fellow that raises this oleomargarine under the new leadership of the gentleman from South Carolina will get only 28 cents an hour. In 1939, the seventh year of the more abundant life, the South Carolina hourly wage was 8 cents per hour. I ask, "Did it taste good to you in 1939 when agricultural labor in South Carolina received 8 cents an hour?" I ask, "Will it taste good to you in 1948 with 28 cents per hour for labor?"

This is Custer's last stand so far as the dairy industry is concerned. You have the choice. You either accept the agricultural leadership of our colleague, the gentleman from Kansas, CLIFF HOPE, the whole Agricultural Committee, or you accept the new agricultural leadership of our distinguished colleague from South Carolina, MENDEL RIVERS.

Your decision is not only about oleo and butter. Your decision will have untold effect upon the future of American agriculture.

You will decide whether you want the American farmer to live like an American, own a piece of America, educate his family as an American family should be educated. You will also decide whether or not you wish to take a backward step. You will decide whether you want to follow the pathway of an agricultural aristocracy, where the big landowner controls the land and where the worker of the land seldom has a chance to own a small piece of it. My colleagues, that is the over-all issue, and do not be misled by the oleo-butter con-

troversy that is just an excuse and not a reason for the legislation. If your conscience is your guide you should not discard the Agricultural Committee for a 28-cents-per-hour agricultural leadership.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

WHY WERE THE CONDON HEARINGS POSTPONED?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, April 14, 1948, the House Committee on Un-American Activities announced a postponement of the hearings by Dr. E. U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards, scheduled for April 21, 1948. This was the matter which was so urgent that a special subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, in a report ostensibly to the full committee but actually to the press for obvious publicity purposes, characterized in that March 1, 1948, report as "of such importance that it demands immediate attention."

This matter, "of such importance that it demands immediate attention," has, in fact, been cooling its heels in the committee for over a year. Twenty-three days after the March 1, 1948, report, the committee announced hearings for April 21. Then on April 24 came the announcement of the postponement. Just how urgent is this matter that demands immediate attention?

The announcement of the hearings on March 24, 1948, coincided with the issuance of a subpena to Dr. Condon, an ironic and needless gesture in view of the fact that as long ago as last July 1947 Dr. Condon wrote the committee, offering to appear and to cooperate, and even went so far as to call on the committee in its chambers this last March, repeating his offer.

Yet all we have are what the New York Times calls punishment by publicity—attacks, reports, leaks, announcements to the press, released in sensational and theatrical fashion. Why all this fanfare?

Is it because the only purpose of the committee is to smear Dr. Condon and other distinguished scientists? Is it because the committee prefers a one-sided punishment-by-publicity campaign in order to prevent Dr. Condon from having his day in court? Is it because Dr. Condon has received tremendous backing from scientists and citizens throughout the Nation? Is it because the editorials and columns throughout the press have been uniformly critical of the tactics of the committee, and the committee is hoping that the Nation will forget? Is it because Dr. Condon has retained one of the leading law firms of the Nation and because this firm has requested certain minimal rights for this honored and revered scientist? Is it because the committee does not want to grant him these rights—granted by the Constitution to every common chicken thief—and does not want to establish a precedent of the granting of such rights?

The letter addressed to the House Committee on Un-American Activities by the legal firm, Arnold, Fortas & Porter, is an important document. Their analysis of the issues implicit in the Condon case strikes at the very real dangers to the Nation in these troubled times. Their request for certain minimal rights for Dr. Condon is warranted: those rights are and must be the inalienable rights of every citizen if democracy is to survive anywhere in this world.

The letter reads:

ARNOLD, FORTAS & PORTER,
Washington, D. C., March 29, 1948.

The CHAIRMAN, THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. E. U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards, and other distinguished scientists of national reputation have consulted us with respect to hearings which your committee has scheduled for April 21. We have been asked to advise them concerning the procedure which your committee will follow.

The issues involved in the Condon case are such that the procedure which you adopt at this hearing is a matter of great national importance. Unless safeguards are imposed, Dr. Condon's hearing could become a forum for rumors, innuendo, and unsubstantiated charges which would prejudice Dr. Condon and jeopardize the critical program of secret scientific work in this country. Scientists cannot function under the threat of public scandal and of unjustified charges against which they cannot defend themselves. The security, morale, and, to some extent, the continued utility to the Nation of all men of science engaged in Government work depend on the fairness of your hearing procedures in this case.

The seriousness and alarm with which American scientists regard the committee's previous procedure is evidenced by a testimonial dinner arranged by a group of scientists for the purpose of showing their confidence in Dr. Condon and their profound disapproval of the methods pursued by the committee. The sponsors of that dinner constitute a Who's Who of distinguished American scientists, including nine Nobel prize winners. A copy of the letter of invitation, which includes the list of sponsors, is enclosed for your information.

The basis of the danger which these scientists fear inheres in the methods which your committee has pursued in an effort to uncover so-called un-American activities. These methods involve denial of the rights of confrontation and cross-examination and the concealment of sources of the committee's information. Necessarily this sort of procedure encourages irresponsible and baseless statements and accusations, based on suspicion, gossip, and even willful invention. Deliberate malice, recklessness, and bias on the part of the informants are protected. False information may be deliberately planted with impunity and a virtual guaranty that its falsity will not be exposed. Both the committee and the public can be misled.

Nothing is received in evidence, considered, or published that is favorable to the accused. Only one side of the story is permitted to be stated or considered, and that is the side which is prejudicial and derogatory to the accused. Even this one side of the story is apt to be highly colored, emotionalized, and distorted. The net effect is strikingly reminiscent of the infamous purge trials which the Communists themselves have conducted in the Soviet Union.

The danger from unsubstantiated charges and intentionally distorted evidence is illustrated by the report concerning Dr. Condon which a subcommittee of your committee published on March 1, without any prior hearing. This report contained a purported quotation from a letter written by J. Edgar Hoover. According to statements in the press, language was inserted in that quotation which was not found in the original letter. Other language exonerating Dr. Condon was deliberately omitted. A spokesman for your committee has publicly conceded that some committee investigator was responsible for this tampering.

The motives for false and distorted evidence in proceedings before your committee are many and apparent. Some informant may be paying off a grudge. An overzealous investigator may be more concerned for publicity than accuracy. What motivated the spurious addition to the Hoover letter we do not know. We assume, of course, that you and your colleagues of the committee were unaware of it. But this episode demonstrates the reality and seriousness of the danger created by the disregard of ordinary procedural safeguards. No scientist or any other citizen is safe against this kind of slander. In this particular instance the source was known and the deception could be checked and exposed. But when anonymous sources are relied upon and there is no opportunity for confrontation or cross-examination, there is no protection against false evidence or malicious distortion.

There is another real source of danger that your committee should not ignore. It is in the interest of the Communist Party to hamper scientific work in the United States. Nothing could be more effective for the Communist cause than false documents planted with the committee by Communist agents in the hope that their publication will impair the reputation of some indispensable scientist and make his services unavailable to this country. The opportunity to use your committee for that purpose is apparent.

The effect of the publication of your accusations against Dr. Condon, and of the inflammatory and reckless manner in which that was done, may be devastating to the national interest. There is abundant evidence that it has impaired the security and peace of mind of practically all of the leading scientists who are now employed on atomic bomb, radar, and related projects of fundamental importance to our security. Your actions must inevitably cause scientists to hesitate to accept work in these fields; and they will doubtless tempt scientists now employed in these activities to seek other work of less national importance where their reputations will not be exposed to irresponsible attack, and their civil rights will be safe.

In fact, we respectfully suggest that the practices of your committee may be retarding the scientific research which is the most vital part of our defense program.

The number of scientists qualified for the exacting work required on many crucial projects is small. The need for their services at this critical point in history is great. Hitler drove out of Germany the very men qualified to discover the atomic bomb. Among them were Albert Einstein, Leo Szilard, James Franck, Hans A. Bethe, Otto Stern, and others, who came to this country and made possible our development of the atomic bomb. Mussolini drove Enrico Fermi out of Italy. Dr. Fermi is now one of our most distinguished atomic scientists. The Communists persecuted George Gamow, and forced him to flee the Soviet Union. Dr. Gamow is now one of our great nuclear physicists.

These men and many others, including outstanding native American scientists like Dr. Condon, now have reason to wonder whether they will be allowed to work in this country, free from molestation.

Nothing can serve the ends of communism today better than the intimidation of American scientific personnel through such tactics as your committee has followed in the Condon case to date. This committee must avoid becoming an unconscious instrument of Communist purposes.

We, therefore, respectfuly suggest that the commitee exercise extreme care in proceedings involving this country's critically important scientific program and, further, that you avoid the possibility that your activities might aid and abet the very forces you seek to combat; namely, communism and the apparent effort of its agents to create disunity and confusion in this Nation.

We know of no way in which the necessary precautions can be made effective except by objective investigations, fairly conducted, and hearings in which the truth is ascertained by men of impartial minds proceeding in accordance with traditional and tested American methods. We urge that the national interest, as well as the interests of the scientists whom we represent, requires that the Committee should follow this simple prescription.

Accordingly, for the reasons stated above, we request the committee to advise us with respect to the following procedural questions which we believe represent minimal procedural rights:

1. Will the distinguished scientists who are fully qualified concerning the subject matter of your hearing be allowed to testify?

2. Will Dr. Condon be permitted to present, in factual and dispassionate form, answers to the accusations made against him? This would include the opportunity by Dr. Condon either to read a statement or to respond to questions addressed to him by his own counsel, and, further, to present such evidence and witnesses relevant to a consideration of your previous statements and such other issues as may be involved. Any witnesses that Dr. Condon might present will, of course, be available to the committee and its counsel for cross-examination.

3. Will the committee afford Dr. Condon an opportunity to cross-examine any witnesses whose testimony may be considered or made public by the committee?

4. If the committee proposes to adduce charges or accusations relating to Dr. Condon, in addition to those in the report which was made and published without hearing, will the committee advise Dr. Condon of the details of such accusations in advance of the hearing so that he may prepare the material and have present at the hearing witnesses necessary to meet such charges? Will the committee advise Dr. Condon or his counsel, in advance of the hearing, of the names of the witnesses who will be called, so that preparations for the hearing may be made?

We assure you, on behalf of ourselves and Dr. Condon, that if these fundamental procedural rights are accorded, the hearing, so far as we are concerned, will be conducted with dispatch and within the scope of the issues. Dr. Condon requested an opportunity to be heard before your commitee by letter dated July 9, 1947. This privilege was denied to him and 8 months later a derogatory report, since discredited and even disavowed in part by the chairman of the committee, was issued by a subcommittee which had held no hearings.

Dr. Condon is now and always has been eager for a public proceeding at which he may furnish any information concerning himself that may be desired. Even the publication of your report before you had even heard Dr. Condon himself has not altered his desire for an opportunity to appear before your committee or any other forum, although we have directed to his attention the obvious fact that your subcommittee has already pronounced a judgment in its published report and that in the absence of adherence to ordinary rules of procedure, the hearing can serve no purpose except a belated attempt to support a judgment already pronounced in an ex parte proceeding.

Nevertheless, the issues involved in this case are so grave that we respectfully suggest that in the hearings concerning Dr. Condon, your committee should follow the traditional and tested judicial methods of ascertaining facts and grant the minimal procedural rights we have requested on behalf of Dr. Condon and some of his distinguished colleagues of science, all of whom desire to preserve an atmosphere in which they can conscientiously dedicate their talents to their country's welfare.

We shall appreciate a reply to this letter at your earliest convenience.

Very truly yours,

THURMAN ARNOLD.
ABE FORTAS.
PAUL A. PORTER.

So far, the committee has not deigned to reply, inscrutable and ineffable.

The problem of congressional committee procedures is a grave and growing one. I do not question that Congress must have broad powers to conduct investigations: actually, I know of no one who questions this right and this need. It is in the method of conducting such investigations that the fault lies, and those committees that have exceeded the bounds of fair play and fair procedures are the very ones that jeopardize the rights and privileges and the reputation of the Congress. Recognition of this travesty on the constitutional rights of individuals has grown, among the citizens, businessmen, publishers, the press, and Members of the Congress. Thus, the Senator from Illinois has introduced Concurrent Resolution 44 in recent months. Prior to that, on December 4, 1947, I introduced H. R. 4641, to prescribe the procedures of investigating committees of the Congress and to protect the rights of parties under investigation by such committees. This bill provides:

Be it enacted, etc., That it is hereby declared to be the purpose and policy of the Congress that all legislative committees and subcommittees shall conduct their proceedings with the utmost fairness to all who may be affected by them and shall make every effort to avoid the abuse of their proceedings as a forum for the making of charges detrimental to the persons involved, which are not supported by convincing evidence. To this end the following specific regulations are prescribed.

SEC. 2. (a) All witnesses at hearings of the committees, whether public or private, shall have the right to have the aid and assistance of counsel and such other assistance as may be necessary to protection of their rights and to a full and fair presentation of the matter under investigation.

(b) Every witness who testifies in a hearing shall have a right at the conclusion of his testimony either to make an oral statement or at his option to file a sworn statement which shall be made part of the record of such hearing, but such oral or written statement shall be relevant to the subject of the hearing.

(c) If a committee, or any member thereof, shall make public any report furnished to it by its staff or others, or if any witness shall make, by oral testimony or documentary evidence, any statement reflecting adversely upon the character or reputation of any other person (including governmental officials or employees) the committee shall either at once strike such material from the record or shall grant to the person referred to an opportunity to cross-examine the persons responsible for the report or making the statement, and to present countervailing evidence. Such cross-examination and evidence shall be relevant to the interests of the individual who is involved, and may be subject to such reasonable limits of time and duration as the committee may impose. In addition, the persons concerned shall have the right, but unless subpœned shall have no obligation to file with the committee any denial, defense, or explanation they may see fit and they shall have the right to testify in person.

SEC. 3. The Congress hereby reaffirms the right and the duty of the press to comment on the activities of the Congress and individual Congressmen, whether favorably or adversely, and declares that it is contrary to this fundamental principle of a free society for editors, publishers, and reporters to be called into question before any committee of Congress unless it is deemed essential by a full committee to the conduct of a legislative inquiry. And it is further declared to be the policy of the Congress that, except at his own request, no reporter, editor, or publisher shall be called to testify before a committee to be questioned concerning any publication by him, unless upon vote of a majority of the committee or subcommittee before whom he is called to testify: *Provided*, That no such person shall be called before any committee or subcommittee having less than five members.

Certainly some such measure is appropriate and necessary. The investigatory powers of the Congress are in no way invaded by such a measure. On the other hand, the constitutional rights of citizens are protected. No one who believes in and respects the Constitution can maintain that the rights granted to individuals in such a bill are either unimportant or unnecessary. If we expect the Nation to believe that Congress is an upholder of the Constitution and that Congress intends to preserve and maintain both the spirit and the letter of the Constitution—instead of merely paying hypocritical lip service to it—it is high time that we established democratic procedures for the conduct of our committees.

As far as I know, all of the rest of the committees of the House extend to their witnesses the customary minimal protective procedures. This bill, H. R. 4641, would have no effect on their procedures. It would have an effect on the procedures of the Committee on Un-American Activities and would force them to grant to witnesses certain basic protections which are vital to democratic processes. It would give American citizens the right to defend themselves against assassination of character by any individual member of a congressional committee.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

A MOTHBALL AIR FORCE—THE 66-GROUP AIR FORCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that makes democracy so much better than other forms of Government is that in a democracy we have freedom of speech. Here in America there is, or there should be, no muzzling. Here in America we may speak the truth as we see it. We will preserve that freedom only so long as we exercise it and stand up and call deception, sham, and delusion what it is.

Headlines in the morning papers from coast to coast tell our citizens that the

Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense have agreed on a 66-group air force. It is said that in reaching this decision General Bradley assured the Air Force that two light-bomber groups and two troop-carrier groups would not be required this year in support of ground operations. Therefore, it is implied that the 70-group program passed by this body by a vote of 343 to 3 only last Thursday could be reduced by these 4 groups. That has been accepted by the Secretary of Defense and his military advisers.

WHAT KIND OF 66 GROUPS?

Mr. Speaker, it is better not to enjoy freedom of speech at all than to sit silently and see it used as a vehicle for deluding and misleading the Congress and the people. The Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense apparently did agree on a 66-group air force for 1949. What kind of 66 groups? What every Member should know, and what every citizen should know, is that the 66-group proposal is not 66 modern groups as contemplated by the House, but 66 moth-ball groups; 66 World War II groups; 66 T-model groups, not jet-model groups.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Does the gentleman tell us this proposal is to use old planes, old models?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I said to the House a moment ago that this is a 66-moth-ball-group program. The proposal made in another body yesterday contemplated canceling out every dime of the $822,000,000, completely vitiating the action of the House last Thursday when we, by a vote of 343 to 3, added the Taber amendment. They now go into the moth balls and pick out some old planes that have been wrapped up and stored, wheel them out of the warehouse and roll them in to fill up 66 groups. They then say to the country: "You want 70 groups. We are reasonably prudent men. We give you 66."

Mr. POAGE. It seems to me that is a most astonishing statement in view of the fact that we have already been told, and I think very correctly, that an air force that is only second to somebody else's air force is not worth anything. Is it not true that an air force to offer us any protection at all must be superior and have the latest planes? If we were to equip our Air Force with the kind of planes Orville Wright flew at Kitty Hawk, it would not be worth much more than knights and coats of armor, would it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. And the Orville Wright-Kitty Hawk deal may be just exactly what we are getting now. We are not placing an order for new modern planes for a 66-group air force. The gentleman—the intelligent, constructive Member he is—knows that and anticipates me. If he will permit me to continue, I will point out some of the things he just questioned me about.

Mr. POAGE. I will be glad for you to go on, but I want to enter my protest against any program that will tie us to old models. We must have the best models in the world.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no doubt but that the 342 other gentlemen who joined the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] the other day will follow him again once they realize what a delusion, a sham, and a snare this 66-group proposition is.

MILITARY CONSIDERATIONS DICTATE 70 GROUPS

I now quote from the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Forrestal, in his statement before the commitee in the other body on yesterday, in which he said that the unanimous report of the Joint Chiefs of Staff was "based solely on military considerations."

It is the opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that the administration should advocate a balanced Military Establishment commensurate with the 70-group air program for the Air Force.

That was the statement the Secretary made only yesterday—that is, "the administration should."

Further, Secretary Forrestal stated:

As a military matter—

And I stress "military"—

the wisdom of this step cannot be questioned—

The Secretary refers to the 70-group step—

provided, of course, that the planes which are purchased are of sufficiently advanced type that we do not end up with a large supply of obsolete or obsolescent equipment.

Secretary Forrestal continued:

The Joint Chiefs of Staff, in their memorandum of April 14 to me, are unanimously on record on this subject.

Unanimously for what? Unanimously in favor of a 70-group program. This House, too, is almost unanimously on record for a 70-group modern air force.

NO MILITARY CONSIDERATION REDUCED 70 GROUPS TO 66

So, Mr. Speaker, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, presumably our greatest military leaders, invested with a responsibility for protecting this country and its security, have made it abundantly clear that "based solely on military considerations" a 70-group program is the program needed. It must not have been a military consideration that reduced this 70-group modern air force to a 66-group moth-ball air force. The combined voice of our military leaders says the administration should advocate a 70-group program. Because of military considerations, they say, the "administration should"—and we ought to capitalize that "should."

Why in the name of heaven, if our leaders believe we should have 70 groups, do they not recommend 70 groups?

PULL CLOAK OF DECEPTION AND SHAM FROM 66-GROUP PROPOSAL

Instead, the substitute proposed is a 66-group program. Let us examine that substitute. Let us this afternoon pull the cloak of deception and sham off the body of this 66-group proposal presented to the committee yesterday.

The first thing this proposal does is vitiate the action taken by the House of Representatives by a vote of 343 to 3, and eliminates—or proposes to eliminate—every dollar of the $822,000,000 that was added on the floor of this House last Thursday. So, No. 1, it eliminates $822,000,000. It says "not one dollar for these planes; not one dollar for the designs to go on the drawing board to produce the planes" that we may need in 1950 and 1951, and maybe earlier.

TAKES MODERN JETS OFF OF ORDER

The second thing this proposal does is take out of moth balls World War II planes—and I call this to the attention of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]—take these World War II planes that have been wrapped up and take off-of-order the modern jets that our air strategists think they must have. So, we pull out of the warehouse old planes, and we cancel the plans for the new ones. That is the second thing.

The third thing it does is to give the Army average personnel for the fiscal year 1948 of 695,700. That is the Army—the land army. I do not begrudge a single man you give the Army. We are sitting here with nine divisions. The other great power has 170 well-trained, seasoned divisions plus an additional 90 in its satellite countries. But, this proposal of yesterday gives the Army 695,700. That is the average personnel for the year. The Navy and the Marines are given 528,000, and the Air Force, our first line of defense, comes out last with 416,000. That is the third thing: It lines up the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, in that order.

Now, what is the fourth thing it does? It gives to the Navy $5,018,700,000. It gives to the Army $4,260,600,000. It gives to the Air Force $4,227,700,000. That is a total of $13,507,000,000. The Navy gets the big share, followed by the Army. The Air Force brings up the rear, not only in dollars but in men.

It should be remembered that it takes just as much Army and just as much Navy to handle a 70-group modern force as it does to handle a 70-group "moth-ball" force.

A committee of the other body was told on yesterday that there are "other considerations." But if you confine this thing solely to military considerations, every military man in the country—from General Eisenhower down—says the minimum air force this country should have to protect its security in peacetime is 70 groups.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at the conclusion of my remarks some quotations by General Eisenhower, Secretary Patterson, and other eminent military people on the subject I am discussing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr HALLECK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I wish to compliment the gentleman on this splendid presentation. The gentleman referred to the recommendation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I should like the gentleman to insert, if he will, at this point, who compose the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

How many of them are connected with the Navy, how many with the Army, and how many with the Air Force?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am not a military strategist and I am not an authority on the individuals and the background of each man on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I do respect them. I like to follow their suggestions. For that reason, I want to make it clear that their recommendations made to the Finletter Commission, the President's own commission, were for a 70-group air force. Now again the Joint Chiefs of Staff say that solely, from a military standpoint, we will need 70 groups. But getting back to the gentleman's question, I understand that Admiral Leahy, Chief of Staff to the President, participates in those meetings, together with General Bradley, of the Army; Admiral Denfeld, Chief of Naval Operations, for the Navy; and General Spaatz, of the Air Force.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Is it not true that Secretary of Defense Forrestal continues to talk about a balanced force all the time? What are we trying to balance this force with? Are we trying to balance our naval strength in this country with other navies of the world? Are we trying to balance our Air Force with other air forces of the world? Or is it a fact that the Air Force has not had fair representation on the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

ADDS UP: THREE NONAIRMEN TO ONE AIRMAN

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Admittedly Admiral Leahy is a great Navy man. Admittedly General Bradley is one of our greatest Army leaders. Admittedly Admiral Denfeld is familiar with the Navy's needs. If the gentleman wants to do a little arithmetic, it adds up to three nonairmen to one airman.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman has made a splendid explanation of what this means and the tragedy that is in store for our country if we follow this backward-looking advice. I wonder if the gentleman will go a little further—he may plan to, and I hope he will—and give a little further explanation as to just why there should be any other than military considerations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am going into that very fully.

Mr. POAGE. Right now the gentleman has shown us that the military men say that from the military standpoint there should be 70 air groups. He has also shown us and we all know that the House of Representatives, which I assume speaks the political and the economic views of the people of America, has determined that from that standpoint, the civilian standpoint, there should be 70 groups. Consequently, why should there be anyone who should question the judgment of this House on the civil side and the judgment of the Chiefs of Staff on the military side?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish that the gentleman were correct, but our founding fathers in their wisdom decided there should be another body in the legislative establishment, and they also provided that legislation passed by this establishment should have the approval of the President of the United States. Rumors prevail in the lobbies and the cloakrooms and the committee halls that the President of the United States would veto legislation that sought to provide the 70-group program.

AMERICA DOES NOT INTEND TO ACCEPT SECOND-RATE AIR FORCE

I am not informed. I am unwilling to accept such gossip. But I do say that in the light of the action taken by this body last week in voting 343 to 3, if similar action is taken in the other body, whatever may be done down at the other end of the Avenue will be comparatively unimportant. It will be unimportant because we will have established in this country the program for a 70-group force. We will have sent a message to all the world that the people of America do not intend to sit silently by and accept as a first line of defense a second-rate air force.

We have discussed the military considerations, and we are all agreed on the military considerations.

WHAT ARE THOSE OTHER CONSIDERATIONS?

But a committee of the Senate on yesterday was told that there are other considerations. The proposal to draft our young men moves speedily through our Armed Services Committee in the House. No one has suggested that other considerations should prevent the Government from taking these young men out of their homes, place them in training camps and start them to drill and to march. While we are passing legislation affecting human beings out of our committee, the Senate committee is told by the leaders of our defense departments that other considerations make it inadvisable to provide this country with a 70-group force. What are those considerations, Mr. Speaker? I quote from the very able Secretary of Defense, Mr. Forrestal. The other considerations listed in the Senate hearings yesterday are:

> The impact of the cost of the program on our national economy.
>
> In the interest of our national solvency.

If we do not have a 70-group air force, we may have no solvency at all.

Continuing with Mr. Forrestal's words:

> And in the interest of avoiding allocations—

That means allocating steel, power, oil, and aluminum—

> rationing, price controls, and a host of other restrictions. Then we should proceed in such a manner that will get the most national security for each dollar we spend.

WE ARE WILLING TO PAY COSTS OF SECURITY

Mr. Speaker, there are those who believe a 70-group force is the minimum for national security. There are those who love security more than they hate the cost involved. There are those who think that we can buy security and are willing to pay for it even if the cost should be allocations and restrictions. There are those who believe that if we refuse to put planes on order now as approved by the House, if we refuse to modernize and give this country an air force of 70 groups, that there may be no security for our flesh or for our dollars.

I am one of those.

It is passing strange that the same concern for "the impact of the cost of the program on the national economy" as related to selective service and universal military training was not expressed until the Congress asked, by the action of this House, the industry of this Nation to start making equipment to provide for these men. It is unthinkable that we should mouth about "allocations" and "a host of other restrictions" when we talk of equipment for the men but should remain silent when we apply those controls, those allocations, those hosts of restrictions, those drafts, if you please, upon human lives.

NOT A NEW ROAD WE ARE ASKED TO TRAVEL

This is not a new road that we are being asked to travel. It is the same road the eloquent Churchill pled with England, the great home of freedom, to follow in the early thirties. When his plea was rejected, when the members of Parliament turned him down, they deceived Hitler into thinking democratic nations would not provide for an adequate common defense.

Churchill, speaking in the House of Commons on July 7, 1935—13 short years ago—said:

> We are admittedly the fifth air power. I dread the day when the means of threatening the hearts of the British Empire should pass into the hands of the present rulers of Germany.

To the little band of you House Members who are gathered here listening to me today I think we might well echo those words:

> I dread the day when the means of threatening the hearts of America should pass into the hands of others.

And just as certainly as I stand before you today, air supremacy is passing into the hands of others.

FAMILIAR PHRASES ECHO IN WASHINGTON TODAY

Mr. Churchill in his memoirs writes of his attempts to awaken his nation to the need for stronger air power. His voice was not heard. His words went unheeded. It was said then, "We must have balance." Those familiar phrases echo through Washington today. But this is what Mr. Churchill says now, in looking back to World War II, of his nation's failure to maintain its grasp on air supremacy:

> Had we acted even with reasonable prudence and healthy energy it might never have come to pass.

Prime Minister Baldwin, commenting on the prospects for security, gave England the same assurance then that we are getting now; assurance based on "other considerations."

When you go back to your district, you may be asked: "Why did you not vote for the 70-group air force?" If you start to give them this "balance blah," I hope some young man who was out in the Pacific in the early days crying, "Too little and too late" will remind you that the Joint Chiefs of Staff months ago told the Finletter Commission that we should have a minimum of 70 air groups.

GENERAL EISENHOWER FAVORED 70 GROUPS

General Eisenhower has said to this Nation, not once but time and time again, that we should have 70 groups. He is a land general, an Army man—not an air man. He said on July 10, 1946:

Now we have reached one concentration which we think is fixed. We cannot see any change in the foreseeable future where our Air Force will go below 70 groups.

The great Secretary of War, Robert Patterson, expressing belief that a 70-group force "would be a minimum," said, "but of course the question depends upon what types of planes the organization of the 70 groups is equipped with. If they are going to be equipped with planes that are relics of World War II they will not be any good."

And then yesterday, based on military considerations, not considering having to allocate things, the JCS still say we should have 70 groups, and yet there is recommended only 66 mothball groups.

Prime Minister Baldwin, too, made the tragic mistake some of our great able men are making today and that we almost made here in 1939.

Mr. Baldwin was called upon to acknowledge his mistake, only 3 months after it was made. He told Commons:

Where I was wrong was in my estimate of the future. There I was completely wrong. We were completely misled on that subject.

And there are present-day Baldwins who are wrong in their estimate of the future. Some who echo his words 13 years later are completely wrong.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In just a moment. Let me finish. Then if I have time I shall be glad to yield.

MAY HEAR SAME WORDS HERE

Mr. Speaker, the admission of Mr. Baldwin to Mr. Churchill 3 months too late, may be repeated to this body 3 months from now. We need not repeat and recount to this body the price England paid and we ultimately may pay in blood and dollars with interest if we make that dreadful mistake.

Today in this country there are those who press to increase the authorized strength of our manpower, and I applaud them. I only wish they could be as enthusiastic in their demands to provide that manpower with what the joint chiefs say "as a military matter the wisdom of this step cannot be questioned."

I need not dwell on what transpired in the House in 1939 when 150 Members of this body stood opposed to increasing the size of our Air Force by 2,290 planes. I read the debates the other day. There are some sections of those debates of 1939 that could be substituted almost word for word for arguments heard here within recent days. In 1939, some Members stood here opposing the appropriation for 2,290 planes, trying to whittle it down to 1,007 planes. Thank God, when the roll was called, 217 other Members foresaw our urgent need and cast their votes for a larger air force and smothered that group.

EITHER FOR 70 GROUPS OR NOT

We are either for the 70-group program or we are not. I am one of those who believe that all legislation is a result of compromise. Although I would reluctantly agree to 66 modern groups in order to insure unity in the Congress and with the military, my face would blush with shame if I would be a party to accepting the 66-group proposal offered. That proposal vitiates the action of the House, completely eliminating the $822,000,000 and insuring nothing more than a second-rate air force for this country. Gen. Ira Eaker put it better than I can when he said, "A second best air force is like a second best poker hand."

Incidentally, I assume we are to conclude that the Secretary of Defense's presentation before the Senate committee was agreed upon by the Secretary for Air and all the Joint Chiefs of Staff, including General Spaatz. It is regrettable that those of us who believe in air power did not hear from Symington and Spaatz. Where were they? Why did they not speak out? Since when have their voices been stilled? What hope do the men who pilot the planes have if these men have retired voluntarily from the scene?

I pray that this Nation may not suffer as a result of its delinquency and its fear of controls as the people of London suffered from failure to provide a great air force after rejecting Churchill's pleas to increase air power.

WE MAY SUFFER MORE

But unless we stop, look, and listen, we may suffer more. If the other body swallows in toto the adroit and well-presented program it received yesterday, our people will not have the security I think they are entitled to have. The men we draft into our Air Force will not have the planes they may need on that fateful day of decision in 1951 or 1952. Remember, not a single plane used in World War II was even on the drawing board before Pearl Harbor.

GO OVER THIS WITH FINE-TOOTH COMB

I pray that this House will curry this 66-group proposal with a fine-tooth comb. I believe that the "too much, too soon" addicts will not prevail when the final roll is called. The recent bitter experiences that caused our boys to shout "Too little—too late" from the Pacific islands should not be forgotten.

"NATION NEVER IN GREATER PERIL"

Do you want a 66-group program that is not fully modernized? Do you want to file away the plane designs now on the drafting boards? Do you want to accept compromise in this hour when General Eaker, among many others, warns:

This Nation was never in greater peril.

If you do, sit by and peacefully let them shove this 66-group proposal down your throat. If you do not, speak out and support the action of this House less than a week ago in providing $822,000,000 additional for plane procurement. Then you again will hear our boys saying we have enough, and we have it on time.

AMERICAN PEOPLE WILL SUPPORT 70 GROUPS

This Congress will have the support and approval of the American people only provided we furnish our people with the protection and the security that a 70-group air force—and a 70-group air force alone—can give us.

Peace cannot be stored in mothballs and left safely untended. Peace demands a constant vigil. Let us not dare toss away this hard-earned peace by entrusting its protection to a stop-gap air force drawn from the mothballs of the past.

The quotations referred to above are as follows:

Gen. George C. Marshall, October 1943:

I think maintenance of a sizable ground expeditionary force properly impracticable except on basis of allotments of fillers after 6 months. Having air power will be the quickest remedy.

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower before subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, and the Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, on S. 2343, a bill to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and other purposes, on June 27, 1946:

Specifically, in the Army, we have calculated that we will need no fewer than 70 air groups which imposes a strength of about 400,000 upon us. We can never maintain an Air Force with fewer than 400,000 men.

* * * * *

I have gone over the troop dispositions that we must maintain at present, and the dispositions that I think we should keep permanently, and until there is a definite trend showing a growing confidence in the United Nations I believe that the 70-group program is about as low as we can go.

Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, speech at Air University, Maxwell Field, Ala., April 8, 1947:

The military has always been accused of being narrow-minded, reactionary, stubborn, slow to change, bound by ritual, and the reason that it has always irritated us to hear these charges is because there has usually been an element of truth in them.

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Chief of Staff, United States Army, before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, Eightieth Congress, first session, on H. R. 3678, a bill making appropriations for the military establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, on June 28, 1947:

When I urge you to maintain a modern, effective air force my mind is literally filled with examples of the bleak fate of those who failed to provide air superiority during the past war. I am sure that the importance of the air arm has been overwhelmingly demonstrated to all. We are talking about our first line of defense, gentlemen, our first line of defense against attack which might be brought to our homes and families. With all the emphasis at my command, I urge you to keep that first line strong, modern, and ready.

Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, speech before the Air Force Association, Columbus, Ohio, September 15, 1947:

Against such threat, our first defense is air defense. But no real security resides in a second-best air force. Either ours shall be equal to any test a possible aggressor might impose or, under attack, it will quickly cease to be.

Today American air power is assurance against the terror that another Luftwaffe, whatever its name or flag, would strike in men's hearts. If we are prudent and foresighted, and design our forces to match our world position, no possible aggressor can repeat the Nazi strategy of fear.

James Forrestal, Secretary of Defense, before Armed Services Committee, March 25, 1948:

We need a strong air force, capable of striking sustained blows far beyond the peripheral bases which we now hold; an air force capable of the air defense of our homeland and our protective bases and capable of seeking out and destroying an enemy that might impose war. Such an air force requires more aircraft and more manpower than we have today in readiness to meet the lightning war of tomorrow.

Hon. Robert P. Patterson, Secretary of War, before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, Eightieth Congress, first session, on H. R. 3678, a bill making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, on June 24, 1947:

The ability to oppose quickly with military force wherever the interest of the United States requires such action is an indispensable requisite for peace and stability in these difficult times. For this purpose, the War Department looks to the air as their first-line force. If our relatively small Air Force is to carry this heavy responsibility, it must be kept modern.

* * * * *

I maintain that we need an Air Force well trained and ready to fight. Do not jeopardize it.

Hon. Kenneth C. Royall, Secretary of the Army, before the Senate Armed Services Committee, March 25, 1948:

The principal initial offensive weapon of any present or future war will be air power. The principal defensive weapons will be antiaircraft, interceptive air power, antisubmarine defense, and means of repelling airborne or submarine-borne forces, and of protecting our atomic and other vital installations and—as far as possible—our cities against sabotage, and of preserving order in the event of an attack against them.

Since air power would be vital for offense and defense, it is important that we should promptly make certain that we have undisputed air superiority in the world, just as it is important that we retain our present undisputed sea superiority. We should have, as soon as possible, planes of such speed and armament—and in sufficient numbers—that in the event of a war in the years ahead we could launch from our own shores effective—and sufficiently frequent—round-trip attacks on any enemy points in the world which military strategy dictates. To accomplish these purposes we must have an adequate aircraft program, and we should start it now. For planes cannot be improved or built in a day—or in a year. Every type of plane we used in World War II, including the B–29, was planned before Pearl Harbor.

Hon. Kenneth C. Royall, Secretary of the Army, before President's Air Policy Commission, December 2, 1947:

The importance of air power to the defense of this country is hard to overestimate. It is certainly our first line of defense in the event of any war and any attack upon the United States. Unless there are considerable changes in the present concepts and methods of warfare, it would be an important factor in the waging of any world-wide war.

Therefore, I think it essential for the defense of this country that there be an Air Force in being, which is adequate to deal with the possibility of a surprise or sudden attack upon the United States, sufficient to seize and hold foreign territories and to attack enemy territories.

In response to a question from the chairman as to whether or not Secretary Royall was satisfied with Air Force plans, Secretary Royall stated:

Their plans are satisfactory, and their plans for the future are satisfactory if they can get what they want.

Gordon Gray, Assistant Secretary of the Army, address before the Lions Club and other civic and veterans' organizations, Portland, Maine, April 6, 1948:

We need air power second to none in the world. We need a full-strength, well-trained, well-equipped Army and Navy * * * and we need all three of these service branches backed up by the National Guard and efficient reserve organizations.

And, most important, we need these things in being—not on paper or in the blueprint stage or based on push-button theory—but actual equipment, trained men, all up to date and ready to move immediately if attack should come.

Gen. Carl Spaatz, before subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, on the Military Establishment appropriation bill for 1947, on May 20, 1946:

Needs for current tasks must be balanced against the necessity for economy. An air force of 70 combat groups, backed by a pool of personnel and organizations in the Air National Guard and the Air Reserve, is the minimum force we believe adequate.

Maj. Gen. Edward M. Powers, Assistant Chief of Air Staff, before subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, on the Military Establishment appropriation bill for 1947, on May 20, 1946:

Seventy groups is a carefully computed irreducible minimum number of tactical units required to carry out the Air Forces' over-all mission.

Gen. Jacob L. Devers, commanding general, Army Ground Forces, address before the District of Columbia convention, American Legion, August 2, 1946:

General Eisenhower has estimated that we will send an army of 850,000, divided about equally between ground forces and air forces.

Gen. Curtiss LeMay, April 11, 1947:

We must have well-thought-out, properly integrated programs for land, sea, and air forces-in-being and in potential. Programs for land and sea forces have been developed and are most intelligently presented by members of those forces. The Air Force program has been developed and approved by land, sea, and air leaders; it is not a pipe dream of ambitious air generals. That program includes:

1. An adequate program of air research and development, coordinated with similar programs for land and sea.

2. A healthy, readily expansible aviation industry.

3. A properly balanced, operationally ready, strategically deployed, 70-combat-group air force-in-being, equipped with superior weapons.

4. A readily available, 1,500,000-man air-force-in-potential * * *.

What can we say about the 70-combat-group air-force-in-being? The 70-combat-group air-force-in-being, in the considered opinion of the War Department—not Air Force alone—is, not was, the absolute minimum air force consistent with national security.

Lt. Gen. C. P. Hall, director of organization and training, War Department General Staff, before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, Eightieth Congress, first session, on H. R. 3678, a bill making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, on June 25, 1947:

It is the opinion of the War Department that we must have a strong Air Force in being, capable of successfully meeting an attack of an aggressor and of taking immediate retaliatory action. A reduction in officers will necessarily restrict the operation of our already reduced strategic and tactical Air Forces plan for 1948, and the build-up to our 70-group program, which we consider essential for national defense, will be greatly retarded.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEICHEL (at the request of Mr. GRANT of Indiana) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

TRADE CONCESSIONS TO CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from the State Department, also excerpts from a proclamation issued by the President and excerpts from the general agreement on tariffs and trade negotiated at Geneva last fall.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the announcement that the President is giving the trade concessions, which were negotiated at the Geneva Conference, to the Communist-controlled Government of Czechoslovakia will be a great shock to the American people. There is absolutely no way to reconcile that action with the European recovery plan with its billions of dollars taken from the American taxpayers for the avowed purpose of strengthening the economic structures of those western European nations who are outside of the iron curtain.

On the one hand we propose to spend an initial outlay of $5,300,000,000 for the economic rejuvenation of western Europe and to contain communism behind the iron curtain, and now our Chief Exec-

utive has broken through the iron curtain to provide trade advantages to this satellite Government, so that through an increased trade they may acquire more American dollars. It is probably the most inconsistent and indefensible action ever taken by our Government. Either communism is a threat or it is not. If it is, then today's action by this Government should never have been taken. If it is not, then the American people and their representatives in Congress have been sold a bill of goods in the form of the Marshall plan.

Following is a letter from the State Department, delivered to me today, in which the State Department attempts to justify its action. The letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 22, 1948.

The Honorable ROBERT A. GRANT,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. GRANT: I have reference to your recent conversations with various officers of the Department regarding the signature by Czechoslovakia of the Protocol of Provisional Application of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and the implications of this action for the United States in the light of the events surrounding the governmental changes of last February in Czechoslovakia. This matter has been given the most careful study both within the Department of State and in meetings of the President's Cabinet.

The President today has decided to issue a proclamation putting into effect the provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade with respect to Czechoslovakia, thereby implementing an obligation entered into by this Government more than 5 months ago, on October 30, 1947, when the general agreement was concluded at Geneva, and prior to the Communist coup of February 1948. Since Czechoslovakia has now placed the general agreement in effect with respect to the United States and the other contracting parties, this country as well as the other contracting parties is obligated to apply the agreement to Czechoslovakia. This Government's attitude toward the events of last February in Czechoslovakia has not changed from that indicated in the joint statement of February 26, 1948 by the Secretary of State of this Government and by the Foreign Ministers of the Governments of the United Kingdom and France. These events, however, do not directly affect the legal status of the reciprocal obligations under the general agreement.

The general agreement is a comprehensive trade agreement among 23 countries. It is part of a world-wide program, sponsored by the United Nations and actively participated in by the United States, designed to reduce trade barriers and to restore international trade to an orderly and stable basis. It is clearly to the interest of such a program to include the fullest possible participation by any countries which are willing to undertake the necessary obligations.

Concern has been expressed by a number of persons that making effective the general agreement as between the United States and Czechoslovakia will give undue assistance, without receiving adequate reciprocal advantage in return, to a country subject to the influence of the Soviet Union, while depriving the American economy of the goods which are necessary to maintain our defensive strength. I would like to emphasize, in particular, that should Czechoslovakia or any other contracting party fail to fulfill the obligations of the agreement or adopt any policy which impairs or nullifies the tariff concessions, the application by the United States to that country of such obligations or concessions under the agreement as may be appropriate in the circumstances may be suspended. In addition, if, as a result of unforeseen circumstances, any of the concessions extended in the agreement should result in such increased imports from Czechoslovakia as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers in this country the United States is free to withdraw or modify the concessions to the extent necessary to prevent or remedy the injury.

In addition to this safeguard with respect to imports, the United States also exercises export controls to protect the American economy generally, to promote the objectives of foreign policy, and to safeguard national security. Since March 1, 1948, no shipments to European destinations, including Czechoslovakia, can be made without appropriate license. These export controls prevent shipment of goods contrary to the national interests of the United States.

There is enclosed a statement being issued to the press today which contains some of the considerations discussed in this letter and outlines the pertinent facts relating to the reciprocal concessions included in the general agreement on the part of the United States and Czechoslovakia. It should be noted that the entry into force of these concessions granted by the United States on products of special interest to Czechoslovakia will also benefit certain other countries which signed the general agreement in Geneva and which are participating in the European recovery program.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES E. BOHLEN,
Counselor
(For the Acting Secretary of State).

By way of justification and defense the State Department points to the so-called escape clause which could be invoked if injury to American industry should follow. If that escape clause is not applied better than it has been during the past, then it means absolutely nothing at all.

The State Department insists that "this country as well as the other contracting parties is obligated to apply the agreement to Czechoslovakia."

If that statement is true, then the simplest words in the English language have lost their meaning.

Article 27 of the general agreement expressly provides that "any contracting party shall at any time be free to withhold or to withdraw in whole or in part any concession in respect of which such contracting party determines that it was initially negotiated with a government which has not become, or has ceased to be, a contracting party." The difference between the government of Jan Masaryk and the Communists who took over that government is the difference between day and night. The American people will want to know why article 27 of the general agreement was not relied upon in this situation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ARNOLD (at the request of Mr. LEONARD W. HALL) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement in reference to the Taft-Hartley Act.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS ON THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN ECONOMIC COOPERATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which was read:

APRIL 13, 1948.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to provisions of Public Law 472, Eightieth Congress, I have this date appointed the following Members to represent the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation: Hon. JOHN M. VORYS, Ohio; Hon. JAMES G. FULTON, Pennsylvania; Hon. SOL BLOOM, New York.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES A. EATON,
Chairman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, which was read:

APRIL 22, 1948.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In conformity with section 124 of Public Law 472, Eightieth Congress, I have this date appointed the following Members to represent the Committee on Appropriations on the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation: JOHN TABER, New York; CLARENCE CANNON, Missouri.

Very truly yours,
JOHN TABER,
Chairman.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HOEVEN (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), on account of death in family.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 329. An act for the relief of Gentaro Takahashi;

S. 560. An act to prohibit the operation of gambling ships, and for other purposes;

S. 936. An act for the relief of Burnett A. Pyle;

S. 1021. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay salaries and expenses of the chairman, secretary, and clerk of the Fort Peck General Council, members of the Fort Peck Tribal Executive Board, and other committees appointed by said Fort Peck General Council, and official delegates of the Fort Peck Tribes;

S. 1263. An act for the relief of Fire District No. 1 of the town of Colchester, Vt.;

S. 1304. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the organization of Minnesota as a Territory of the United States;

S. 1312. An act for the relief of Jeanette C. Jones and minor children;

S. 1393. An act to provide additional subsistence allowances and to raise the ceilings on wages and allowances pertaining to certain veterans;

S. 1468. An act providing for payment of $50 to each enrolled member of the Mescalero Apache Indian Tribe from funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States;

S. 1583. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Maryland, for the use of the University of Maryland, of the northern portion of a parcel of land previously

constituting a part of the campus of the university and previously conveyed by the State of Maryland to the United States for the use of the Bureau of Mines;

S. 1696. An act to amend the act of August 13, 1940 (54 Stat. 784), so as to extend the jurisdiction of the United States District Court, Territory of Hawaii, over Canton and Enderbury Islands;

S. 2278. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in San Jose County, Utah, to the Southwest Indian Mission, Inc.;

S. J. Res. 189. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma; and

S. J. Res. 207. Joint resolution to provide for the commemoration of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the establishment of the Department of the Navy.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1799. An act for relief of Eva L. Dudley, Grace M. Collins, and Guy B. Slater; and

H. R. 4931. An act to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 26, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred, as follows:

1485. A letter from the Archivist of the United States transmitting lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

1486. A letter from the Postmaster General transmitting a statement showing the number of envelopes, labels, and other penalty inscribed material on hand and on order June 30, 1947; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1487. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting volume 9 of the report on the audit of Reconstruction Finance Corporation and affiliated corporations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 622); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1488. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting volume 10 of the report on the audit of Reconstruction Finance Corporation and affiliated corporations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 623); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1489. A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and the National Bank Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 1985. An act to amend the act entitled "Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act," approved July 19, 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 1779). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3731. A bill authorizing modifications in the repayment contracts with the lower Yellowstone irrigation district No. 1 and the lower Yellowstone irrigation district No. 2; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1780). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 5153. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of an experiment station in the Appalachian region for research on the production, refining, transportation, and use of petroleum and natural gas; without amendment (Rept. No. 1781). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 5587. A bill to add certain lands to the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1782). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 5901. A bill to provide for the distribution among the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming of the receipts of the Colorado River development fund for use in the fiscal years 1949 to 1955, inclusive, on a basis which is as nearly equal as practicable and to make available other funds for the investigation and construction of projects in any of the States of the Colorado River Basin in addition to appropriations for said purposes from the Colorado River development fund; without amendment (Rept. No. 1783). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6056. A bill to amend an act of Congress approved February 9, 1881, which granted a right-of-way for railroad purposes through certain lands of the United States in Richmond County, N. Y.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1784). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6067. A bill authorizing the execution of an amendatory repayment contract with the Northport irrigation district, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1785). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6091. A bill to withdraw certain land as available land within the meaning of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920 (42 Stat. 108), as amended, and to restore it to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1786). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6071. A bill to provide for the treatment of sexual psychopaths in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1787). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 6263. A bill to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1790). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 2225. An act to transfer administration of the Federal Credit Union Act to the Federal Security Agency; without amendment (Rept. No. 1791). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6203. A bill to incorporate the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington a corporation sole; without amendment (Rept. No. 1788). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6209. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Protestant Episcopal Cathedral Foundation of the District of Columbia," approved January 6, 1893, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1789). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 6312. A bill to provide for the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by farmers for the purpose of soil and water conservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. R. 6313. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Canton reclamation project, Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 6314. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to provide for the deduction from gross income of losses incurred upon the sale or exchange of residences; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 6315. A bill to provide for the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by farmers for the purpose of soil and water conservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois (by request):

H. R. 6316. A bill to amend the Life Insurance Act to make available group life insurance to employees of members of trade associations; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HARNESS of Indiana:

H. R. 6317. A bill to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and to repeal section 2402 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. R. 6318. A bill to amend section 3 of the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, as amended, relating to the placing of a certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third time zone; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 6319. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide that individuals who have completed at least 35 years of service may retire on a full annuity, without regard to age; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 6320. A bill to provide for wildlife restoration through the use of unobligated

balance in the special fund known as the Federal aid to wildlife restoration fund and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 6321. A bill to provide for the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by farmers for the purpose of soil and water conservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 6322. A bill to authorize the construction of access roads necessary to the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 6323. A bill to provide additional compensation for employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 6324. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to conduct an investigation and study of the feasibility and desirability of adopting the plan, known as the West Virginia plan, for the construction and financing of low-cost housing facilities for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. Con. Res. 187. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the executive branch of the United States Government recognize the Hebrew Republic of Palestine and extend certain aid thereto; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARNESS of Indiana:

H. Res. 547. Resolution requesting the President of the United States not to proclaim rates of duty listed in schedule XX of the general agreement on tariffs and trade signed at Geneva, Switzerland, on October 30, 1947, with the country of Czechoslovakia; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 6325. A bill for the relief of John Thompson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 6326. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to bestow the Silver Star upon Michael J. Quinn; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H. R. 6327. A bill to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Samuel O. Burdette; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 6328. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Public Buildings to lease to the Temple Methodist Church, a nonprofit corporation, of San Francisco, Calif., that portion of the federally owned building known as 100 McAllister Street, San Francisco, Calif., which was previously occupied by the Temple Methodist Church; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 6329. A bill for the relief of the Olympic Hotel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (by request):

H. R. 6330. A bill for the relief of Aurelio Espada Alvarez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 6331. A bill for the relief of José Antonio Elias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 6332. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Public Buildings to lease to the Temple Methodist Church, a nonprofit corporation, of San Francisco, Calif., that portion of the federally owned building known as 100 McAllister Street, San Francisco, Calif., which was previously occupied by the Temple Methodist Church; to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1811. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Ray C. Herschlec, Mobridge, S. Dak., and 25 others, urging enactment of H. R. 5759, to increase the retirement of beneficiaries under the Railroad Retirement Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1812. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolutions adopted at a mass meeting in Paterson, N. J., April 2, 1948, honoring Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former president of the Polish Peasant Party, calling for aid to the beleaguered people of Poland and other subjugated nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1813. By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN: Petition of the United States Army and Navy Retired Association, of San Juan, P. R., urging approval of H. R. 5043; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1814. Also, petition of Puerto Rican veterans, urging support of the universal military training program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1815. Also, petition of the International Longshoremen's Association of Mayagüez, P. R., urging support of H. R. 5739 and H. R. 5653; to the Commitee on Education and Labor.

1816. By Mr. TAYLOR: Petition of Avis Fleischer and 16 other residents of Troy, N. Y., in opposition to univeral military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1817. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Kenneth W. Bellows, Elgin, Ill., consisting of 40 signatures, in support of H. R. 5213; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1818. Also, petition of Paul H. Traub, Elgin, Ill., consisting of 43 signatures, in support of H. R. 5213; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1819. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Walter Marlow, Brooklyn, N. Y., and others petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the amputee bill, which would provide automobiles at no expense to veteran amputees; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1820. Also, petition of the board of managers and members of the Pennsylvania Society of Sons of the American Revolution petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of universal military training; to the Committee on the Armed Services.

1821. Also, petition of Mrs. B. W. Kellogg, St. Cloud, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1822. Also, petition of William Chandler, Orlovista, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1823. Also, petition of T. M. Nuzum, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1824. Also, petition of T. S. Kinney, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1825. Also, petition of Orlando Townsend Club, No. 2, Orlando, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1826. Also, petition of John A. Davies, Orlovista, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1827. Also, petition of Miss Maggie Ellis, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1828. Also, petition of Miss Gertrude Hoschma, Geneva, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1829. Also, petition of the City Council of the City of Chicago, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting removal of restrictions on evictions of excess-income families residing in permanent housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1830. Also, petition of Ray Jerome Gross, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the preservation and general welfare of the Nation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 26, 1948

(Legislative day of Thursday, April 22, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

It is not our brothers or our friends, but it is we, O Lord, who are standing in the need of prayer. Much as we would like to see this great company engaged in fervent supplication, we remember that Thou hast promised: "If any two are agreed, I will do it."

Let us not be staggered by statistics but rather by the implications of the prayers here uttered by a few. When they really move us, they can move our Nation. Let us not be the stumbling-blocks. We ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 22, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 24, 1948, the President had approved and signed the following act:

S. 2038. An act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its

reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 608. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Growing Four Times;

S. 714. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Claude E. Milliken;

H. R. 5328. An act to amend paragraph 1803 (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, relating to firewood and other woods; and

S. J. Res. 94. Joint resolution to establish the Fort Sumter National Monument in the State of South Carolina.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of the Senate, immediately upon the convening of the Senate the calendar is to be called for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection, beginning with Order No. 1155, House bill 4571. Senators can be recognized after the first bill is called. The clerk will state the first order of business on the calendar.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Murray
Ball	Gurney	Myers
Barkley	Hatch	O'Connor
Brewster	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Bricker	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Brooks	Hoey	Reed
Buck	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Jenner	Russell
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Capper	Kem	Stennis
Chavez	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	Knowland	Thomas, Utah
Cooper	Langer	Thye
Cordon	Lucas	Tobey
Donnell	McCarthy	Tydings
Downey	McClellan	Vandenberg
Dworshak	McFarland	Watkins
Eastland	McGrath	Wherry
Ecton	McKellar	White
Ellender	McMahon	Wiley
Ferguson	Malone	Williams
Fulbright	Maybank	Wilson
George	Millikin	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE FILED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 22d instant,

The following reports of the Committee on Appropriations were submitted on April 23, 1948:

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 5524. A bill making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1167).

By Mr. BALL, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 5607. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1166).

By Mr. KNOWLAND, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 5728. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1165).

By Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 6055. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1164).

MINORITY VIEWS SUBMITTED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 22d instant,

Mr. BRIDGES, on April 23, 1948, submitted the views of the minority of the Committee on Appropriations on the bill (H. R. 5524) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which were ordered to be printed as part 2 of Report No. 1167.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE FILED DURING RECESS—AMENDMENTS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 22d instant,

Mr. GURNEY, on April 23, 1948, submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 5524) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: Page 10, line 7, after the word "dam" and before the period, insert the following: *Provided further*, That the authority contained in section 6 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 approved July 24, 1946 (Public, 526), is hereby extended to include the projects known as Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak., Pine Flat Reservoir, Calif., Isabella Reservoir, Calif., and Folsom Reservoir, Calif."

Mr. GURNEY also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 5524, making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 22d instant,

Mr. BALL, on April 23, 1948, submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 5607) making appropriations for Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page —, line —, after the figures "$1,844,000" insert: "*Provided*, That the compensation of secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges (exclusive of any additional compensation under the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 and any other acts of similar purport subsequently enacted) shall be fixed by the Director of the Administrative Office without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that the salary of a secretary shall conform with that of the main (CAF–4), senior (CAF–5), or principal (CAF–6) clerical grade, or assistant (CAF–7), or associate (CAF–8) administrative grade, as the appointing judge shall determine, and the salary of a law clerk shall conform with that of the junior (P–1), assistant (P–2), associate (P–3), full (P–4), or senior (P–5) professional grade, as the appointing judge shall determine, subject to review by the judicial council of the circuit if requested by the Director, such determination by the judge otherwise to be final: *Provided further*, That (exclusive of any additional compensation under the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 and any other acts of similar purport subsequently enacted) the aggregate salaries paid to secretaries and law clerks appointed by one judge shall not exceed $6,500 per annum, except in the case of the senior circuit judge of each circuit and senior district judge of each district having five or more district judges, in which case the aggregate salaries shall not exceed $7,500."

Mr. BALL also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 5607, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (S. Doc. No. 150)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Department of Agriculture, amounting to $1,079,610, in the form of amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

STATUE OF GEN. JOSE GERVASIO ARTIGAS

A letter from Charles E. Bohlen, counselor for the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Gen. Jose Gervasio Artigas, and for other purposes (with

an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

CANCELLATION OF DRAINAGE CHARGES AGAINST CERTAIN LANDS WITHIN UINTAH INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT, UTAH

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copy of an order of October 15, 1943, canceling, subject to approval by Congress, the sum of $23,090.62 expended for drainage works to serve non-Indian-owned land under the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah; together with a draft of proposed legislation to cancel drainage charges against certain lands within the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following petitions, which were referred as indicated.

A resolution adopted by the city council of Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for removal of restrictions on evictions of excess-income families residing in public housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of Kern County (Calif.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1988, to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Claire B. Geller, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 984, to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; ordered to lie on the table.

PROHIBITIONS AGAINST LIQUOR ADVERTISING—PETITIONS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference six petitions which I have received from Mrs. Grant Baker, 14 Terrace Park, Louisville, Ky., director of Christian citizenship of the south-end union of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of that city, endorsing Senate bill 265, "To prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes. These petitions are signed by numerous residents of Louisville, including members of the South Louisville Christian Church, the Larchmont Church of God, the Oakdale Methodist Church, and the Victory Memorial Baptist Church.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the petitions will be received and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

GENERAL EDWARD LAWRENCE LOGAN AIRPORT—RESOLUTION OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the executive council, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relating to the General Edward Lawrence Logan Airport.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, APRIL 14, 1948

Whereas the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has invested approximately $50,000,000 in the General Edward Lawrence Logan Airport, which is operating at an annual deficiency of about $75,000 and should, as promptly as possible, be placed on a self-supporting basis; and

Whereas to accomplish this purpose the department of public works, which is the operating agency, has been directed by act of the legislature to establish a schedule of charges at the airport on items including the sale of gasoline or other aviation fuels, oils, or other articles and supplies; and

Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Administration has allocated $600,000 from Federal funds to Logan Airport under the terms of the Federal Airport Act, which amount is urgently needed to assist in meeting the cost of large expenditures required to complete the development of the airport, but has refused to allow the Commonwealth to receive said sum unless the Commonwealth binds itself for 20 years not to impose any fee on supplies delivered at the airport for operation of aircraft other than a charge for the cost of services rendered by the airport in connection therewith; and

Whereas such interference by the Civil Aeronautics Administration in the operation by the Commonwealth of Logan Airport as the price of receiving Federal funds, which represent only a small fraction of the money paid by citizens of the Commonwealth to the Federal Government, is without congressional warrant, would require violation of the Massachusetts statutes and would seriously interfere with, if not make impossible, the operation of the airport on a self-supporting basis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the executive council unanimously opposes such unwarranted interference by a Federal administrative agency; and be it further

Resolved, That each Member of the Massachusetts delegation to the Congress of the United States be sent a copy of this resolution and be required to take immediate action to protect the Commonwealth from such abuse of authority by the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 26, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 608. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Growing Four Times;

S. 714. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Charles E. Milliken; and

S. J. Res. 94. Joint resolution to establish the Fort Sumter National Monument in the State of South Carolina.

PERMISSION TO REPORT CONVENTION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rule be waived and that the Committee on Foreign Relations be permitted to report during the recess a claims convention with Norway.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be the United States special representative in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

NOMINATION OF W. AVERELL HARRIMAN

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would like to give notice to the Senate that in the course of the day he will request an executive session to consider the nomination of W. Averell Harriman to be Ambassador to the European recovery group.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JENNER:

S. 2550. A bill for the relief of William H. Howe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 2551. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mrs. Pearl Scott Loukes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ECTON (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

S. 2552. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 2553. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Mystic River Bridge Authority, an instrumentality of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, an easement for the construction and operation of bridge approaches over and across lands comprising a part of the United States Naval Hospital, Chelsea, Mass.; and

S. 2554. A bill to promote the common defense by providing for the retention and maintenance of a national reserve of industrial productive capacity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 2555. A bill for the relief of Azy Ajderian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 2556. A bill for the relief of Alexy W. Katyll and Ioana Katyll; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2557. A bill for the relief of William Adam Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2558. A bill for the relief of William A. Davis; and

S. 2559. A bill to extend the benefits of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to increase the efficiency of the Air Corps," approved June 16, 1936, as amended, to certain former officers in the Army Air Forces who were erroneously commissioned in the Army of the United States rather than in the Air Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 2560. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Public Buildings to lease to the Temple Methodist Church, a nonprofit corporation, of San Francisco, Calif., that portion of the federally owned building known as 100 McAllister Street, San Francisco, Calif., which was previously occupied by the Temple

Methodist Church; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 2561. A bill to provide for the admission of Mrs. Julia Balint to the United States as a nonquota immigrant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. J. Res. 210. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the golden anniversary of the consolidation of the boroughs of Manhattan, Bronx, Brooklyn, Queens, and Richmond, which boroughs now comprise New York City; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING—AMENDMENT RELATING TO UTILIZATION OF INDUSTRY IN REARMAMENT PROGRAM

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit an amendment I shall propose to Senate bill 651, to provide for the national security of the Nation by requiring that all qualified young men undergo a period of training.

I shall propose the same amendment to any selective-service bill which may reach the floor of the Senate ahead of the universal military training bill. The amendment provides for the utilization of the industry of the United States in the rearmament program. I request unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment submitted by Mr. RUSSELL, was received, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. RUSSELL to the bill (S. 651) to provide for the national security of the Nation by requiring that all qualified young men undergo a period of training, viz: At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

"UTILIZATION OF INDUSTRY

"SEC. 21. (a) Whenever the President determines that it is in the interest of the national security for the Government to obtain prompt delivery of any articles or materials the procurement of which has been authorized by the Congress, he is authorized, through the head of any Government agency, to place with any person operating a plant, mine, or other facility capable of producing such articles or materials an order for such quantity of such articles or materials as the President deems appropriate. Any person with whom an order is placed pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be advised that such order is placed pursuant to the provisions of this section.

"(b) It shall be the duty of any person with whom an order is placed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a), (1) to give such order such precedence with respect to all other orders (Government or private) theretofore or thereafter placed with such person as the President may prescribe, and (2) to fill such order within the period of time prescribed by the President or as soon thereafter as possible.

"(c) In case any person with whom an order is placed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) refuses or fails—

"(1) to give such order such precedence with respect to all other orders (Government or private) theretofore or thereafter placed with such person as the President may have prescribed;

"(2) to fill such order within the period of time prescribed by the President or as soon thereafter as possible as determined by the President;

"(3) to produce the kind or quality of articles or materials ordered; or

"(4) to furnish the quantity, kind, and quality of articles or materials ordered at a reasonable price as determined by the President;

the President is authorized to take immediate possession of any plant, mine, or other facility of such person and to operate it, through any Government agency, for the production of such articles or materials as may be required by the Government. The President is authorized to direct the Secretary of Defense to furnish any assistance by the National Military Establishment, or any personnel thereof, which may be required in the operation of any plant, mine, or other facility of which possession is taken.

"(d) Fair and just compensation shall be paid by the United States (1) for any articles or materials furnished pursuant to an order placed under subsection (a), or (2) as rental for any plant, mine, or other facility of which possession is taken under subsection (c).

"(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to render inapplicable to any plant, mine, or facility of which possession is taken pursuant to subsection (c) any State or Federal laws concerning the health, safety, security, or employment standards of employees.

"(f) Any person, or any officer of any person as defined in this section, who willfully fails or refuses to carry out any duty imposed upon him by subsection (b) of this section shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 3 years, or by a fine of not more than $50,000, or by both such imprisonment and fine.

"(g) (1) As used in this section—

"(A) The term 'person' means any individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or other form of business organization.

"(B) The term 'Government agency' means any department, agency, independent establishment, or corporation in the executive branch of the United States Government.

"(2) For the purposes of this section, a plant, mine, or other facility shall be deemed capable of producing any articles or materials if it is then producing or furnishing such articles or materials or if the President determines that it can be readily converted to the production or furnishing of such articles or materials."

NOTICE OF HEARING BY SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE ON NOMINATION OF EDWARD ALLEN TAMM

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, notice is hereby given that on Wednesday, April 28, 1948, at 9:30 a. m., there will begin, in room 424, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C., further public hearing with respect to the nomination of Edward Allen Tamm, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, which subcommittee is composed of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL].

THOMAS JEFFERSON—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at Columbia University, New York City, April 21, 1948, at a meeting to honor Prof. Dumas Malone, author of the book Jefferson, the Virginian, which appears in the Appendix.]

MONEY AND HOW TO FINANCE THE MARSHALL PLAN—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject Money and How To Finance the Marshall Plan, delivered by him April 20, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

JEFFERSON STILL LIVES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BARKLEY

[Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Jefferson Still Lives," delivered by Senator BARKLEY on April 25, 1948, at Cape Henry, Va., on the three hundred and forty-first anniversary of the landing of English settlers at that point in 1607, which appears in the Appendix.]

JAMES GRAVES SCRUGHAM

[Mr. McCARRAN, in accordance with the terms of Senate Resolution 212, agreed to April 1, 1948, submitted a statement prepared by him on the life, character, and public service of James Graves Scrugham, late a Senator from the State of Nevada, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPUBLICAN PARTY RISKS DEFICIT FINANCING—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Republican Party Risks Deficit Financing," issued by him on April 26, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROBLEMS OF INDEPENDENT BANKERS—ADDRESS BY L. B. McBRIDE

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by L. B. McBride at a dinner held by the executive council of the Independent Bankers' Association at the Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C., February 24, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT THE WORLD WANTS MOST—ADDRESS BY DR. RALPH W. SOCKMAN

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "What the World Wants Most," delivered by Dr. Ralph W. Sockman on April 11, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ALLEGED DISCLOSURE OF RADAR SECRETS—REPLY BY DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY TO DREW PEARSON

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum issued on April 21, 1948, by the Department of the Army replying to allegations by Drew Pearson of disclosure of radar secrets, which appears in the Appendix.]

VIEWS OF SENATOR MORSE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a newspaper editorial describing a speech delivered by Senator MORSE, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEETING OF COMMITTEES DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be permitted to sit and hold hearings on the armed services appropriation bill during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations on the China and Italian treaties may meet this afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. JENNER asked and obtained permission for the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will proceed to call the bills on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 1155.

ESTATE OF CARL R. NALL

The bill (H. R. 4571) for the relief of the estate of Carl R. Nall was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES B. WALSH

The bill (S. 1281) for the relief of James B. Walsh was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $21,899.67, to James B. Walsh, an individual doing business as M. J. Walsh & Sons, of Holyoke, Mass., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for work performed in connection with the construction of defense housing project Mass-19023, at Springfield, Mass., in January and February 1942: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF JAMES HAROLD NESBITT, A MINOR

The bill (H. R. 334) for the relief of the legal guardian of James Harold Nesbitt, a minor, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES C. SMITH AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 4399) for the relief of James C. Smith, Stephen A. Bodkin, Charles A. Marlin, Andrew J. Perlik, and Albert N. James was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JUDICIAL SALARIES IN HAWAII

The bill (S. 1052) to fix the salaries of certain justices and judges of the Territory of Hawaii was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following salaries shall be paid to the several justices and judges hereinafter mentioned, namely:

To the chief justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, $15,500 per year and to each of the associate justices thereof, $15,000 per year.

To each of the judges of the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii, $12,500.

SEC. 2. All of said salaries shall be paid in equal monthly installments.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect on the first day of the first month next following its approval.

JESSE L. PURDY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3550) for the relief of Jesse L. Purdy, which has been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$55.47" and insert "$41.12."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

SYLVESTER T. STARLING

The bill (H. R. 344) for the relief of Sylvester T. Starling was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MARGARET LEE NOVICK AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 1747) for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Lee Novick and others was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JACK O'DONNELL GRAVES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1206) for the relief of Jack O'Donnell Graves, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$460.62" and insert "$453.76", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Jack O'Donnell Graves, formerly a captain, Signal Corps, Army of the United States (ASN O1633899), the sum of $453.76, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for mileage for travel performed by him by private conveyance from Fort Dix, N. J., to Nevada City, Calif., and return pursuant to Army orders dated July 16, 1946, which orders were revoked without his knowledge after his departure from Fort Dix, N. J.: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH W. BEYER

The bill (H. R. 2399) for the relief of Joseph W. Beyer was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 191) giving the consent of Congress to the compact on regional education entered into between the Southern States at Tallahassee, Fla., on February 8, 1948, was announced as next in order.

Mr. IVES. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

BOUNDARY COMPACT BETWEEN MICHIGAN, MINNESOTA, AND WISCONSIN

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 206) consenting to an interstate boundary compact by and between the States of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the following interstate boundary compact by and between the State of Michigan, the State of Minnesota, and the State of Wisconsin:

"A COMPACT

"Entered into by and between the State of Michigan, the State of Minnesota, and the State of Wisconsin, states signatory hereto.

"The contracting states solemnly agree:

"1. That the boundary between the State of Michigan and the State of Wisconsin in the center of Lake Michigan be and it hereby is finally fixed and established as the line marked A–B–C–D–E–F–G on the map, Exhibit A, annexed hereto, which line is more particularly described as follows:

"Starting at Point A, a point equidistant from either shore on the line which is the eastward continuation of the boundary line between Wisconsin and Illinois or latitude 42°29'37" North;

"Thence to Point B, a point equidistant from either shore on the line drawn through the Port Washington Fog Signal and Storm Signal and the White Lake Storm Signal, on a true azimuth of 354°12'00" a distance of 61.55 statute miles;

"Thence to Point C, a point equidistant from either shore on a line drawn through the Sheboygan Coast Guard Storm Signal, Fog Signal, Radio Beacon, and Little Sable Point Light, on a true azimuth of 03°01'15", a distance of 22.18 statute miles;

"Thence to Point D, a point equidistant from either shore on a line drawn through the Twin River Point Light and Fog Signal and Big Sable Fog and Light Signal, on a true azimuth of 10°04'30", a distance of 30.33 statute miles;

"Thence to Point E, a point equidistant from either shore on a line from Bailey's Harbor Inland Light and Point Betsie Fog Signal, Radio Beacon, and Distance Finding Station, on a true azimuth of 17°09'55", a distance of 54.20 statute miles;

"Thence to Point F, a point equidistant from either shore on a line drawn through the Pilot Island Light and Fog Signal and Sleeping Bear Point Light, on a true azimuth of 33°29'10", a distance of 17.24 statute miles;

"Thence to Point G, the point determined by the United States Supreme Court decree of March 12, 1936, which is a point 45,600 meters from the center of Rock Island Passage on a bearing of South 60° East, on a true azimuth of 49°34'10", a distance of 15.66 statute miles.

"The latitude and longitude of the named control points is as follows:

"Point A—Latitude 42°29'37", longitude 87°01'15".

"Point B—Latitude 43°22'50", Longitude 87°08'50".

"Point C—Latitude 43°42'00", Longitude 87°07'20".

"Point D—Latitude 44°07'55", Longitude 87°00'45".

"Point E—Latitude 44°52'50", Longitude 86°41'10".

"Point F—Latitude 45°05'20", Longitude 86°29'30".

"Point G—Latitude 45°14'10", Longitude 86°14'55".

"2. That the western boundary of the State of Michigan in the waters of Lake Superior and the eastern boundary in the waters of Lake Superior of the State of Minnesota and Wisconsin be and it hereby is finally fixed and established as the line marked M–N on the map, Exhibit B, annexed hereto, which line is more particularly described as follows:

"Starting at Point M, the point where the line through the middle of the main channel of the Montreal River enters Lake Superior,

"Thence in a direct line to Point N, the point where a line drawn through the most easterly point of Pigeon Point and the most southerly point of Pine Point intersects the international boundary, on a true azimuth of 23°27'24" and a distance of 108.86 statute miles.

"The latitude and longitude of the named control points is:

"Point M—Latitude 46°34'05", Longitude 90°25'05".

"Point N—Latitude 48°00'50", Longitude 89°29'00".

"3. That the boundary between the State of Minnesota and the State of Wisconsin in the center of Lake Superior be and it hereby is finally fixed and established as the line marked A–B–C–D on the map, Exhibit B, annexed hereto, which line is more particularly described as follows:

"Starting at Point A, which is the midpoint on the line M–N described in paragraph 2, supra;

"Thence to Point B, the midpoint in a direct line between the mouth of Cross River, Minnesota, and the Lighthouse on Outer Island in Wisconsin, on a true azimuth of 272°17'10", a distance of 33.15 statute miles;

"Thence to Point C, the midpoint in a direct line between the Lighthouse on shore at Two Harbors, Minnesota, and the light on the lakeward end of the Government east pier at Port Wing, Wisconsin, on a true azimuth of 235°27'40", a distance of 49.60 statute miles;

"Thence to Point D, the midpoint in a direct line at right angles to the central axis of the Superior entry between the tops of the eastern ends of the pierheads at the lakeward ends of the United States Government breakwaters at the Superior entry to Duluth Superior Harbor, on a true azimuth of 239°50'20", a distance of 26.43 statute miles.

"The latitude and longitude of the named control points is as follows:

"Point A—Latitude 47°17'30", Longitude 89°50'00".

"Point B—Latitude 47°18'35", Longitude 90°39'15".

"Point C—Latitude 46°54'10", Longitude 91°31'25".

"Point D—Latitude 46°42'39.875", Longitude 92°00'24.571".

"4. All azimuths are measured clockwise from true north.

"5. That this compact shall become operative immediately upon its ratification by any state as between it and the other state or states so ratifying. Ratification shall be made by act of the legislature of the ratifying state.

"6. That immediately upon ratification of this compact by all three states, each state will appoint two members to a Joint Survey Commission to survey and mark the boundaries defined in this compact by establishing and perpetuating monuments at the reference points on shore by means of which the control points of said boundaries are located. The expense of marking the Lake Michigan Boundary shall be borne jointly by the states of Michigan and Wisconsin; the expense of marking the boundary line described in paragraph 2 above shall be borne equally by the states of Minnesota, Michigan, and Wisconsin. The expense of marking the Lake Superior boundary between Minnesota and Wisconsin shall be borne jointly by the states of Minnesota and Wisconsin.

"STATE OF MICHIGAN

"EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT

"In witness whereof:

"I, Kim Sigler, Governor of the State of Michigan, by virtue of the power vested in me as such Governor, and pursuant to the provisions of act No. 267, of the public acts of 1947, approved June 27, 1947, which ratifies paragraphs 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6 of the foregoing compact, have hereunto set my hand for and on behalf of the State of Michigan and have caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Michigan.

"Done at the city of Lansing, in the State of Michigan, this 3d day of February, in the year of our Lord, 1948.

"[SEAL] (S) KIM SIGLER,
"(S) F. W. ALGERE,
"Secretary of State.

"STATE OF MINNESOTA

"EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT

"In witness whereof:

"I, Luther W. Youngdahl, Governor of the State of Minnesota, by virtue of the power vested in me as such Governor and pursuant to the provisions of chapter 589, Laws of Minnesota for the year 1947, approved April 26, 1947, which ratifies the foregoing compact, have hereunto set my hand for and on behalf of the State of Minnesota, and have caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Minnesota.

"Done at the city of St. Paul, in the State of Minnesota, this 30th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1947.

"[SEAL] (S) LUTHER W. YOUNGDAHL,
"Governor.
"(S) MIKE HOHN,
"Secretary of State.

"STATE OF WISCONSIN

"EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT

"In witness whereof:

"I, Oscar Rennebohm, Acting Governor of the State of Wisconsin, by virtue of the power vested in me as such Acting Governor, and pursuant to the provisions of chapter 222, Laws of Wisconsin for the year 1947, approved June 12, 1947, which ratifies the foregoing compact, have hereunto set my hand for and on behalf of the State of Wisconsin and have cause to be affixed the great seal of the State of Wisconsin.

"Done at the city of Madison in the State of Wisconsin, this 22d day of December, in the year of our Lord 1947.

"[SEAL] (S) OSCAR RENNEBOHM,
"Acting Governor.
"(S) ROBERT C. ZIMMERMAN,
"Assistant Secretary of State."

SEC. 2. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to impair or in any manner affect any right of the United States.

RECIPROCAL EXEMPTION OF FOREIGN AIRCRAFT EARNINGS—BILL PASSED OVER TEMPORARILY

The bill (H. R. 5448) to amend sections 212 (b) and 231 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana asks for an explanation of the bill. The bill was reported from the Committee on Finance by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Finance should make explanation of the bill. He is expected to be present momentarily. I ask that the bill be passed over temporarily.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over until the completion of the call of the calendar.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 5275) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of limestone to be used in the manufacture of fertilizer was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

ESTATE OF ANTHONY D. CHAMBERLAIN

The bill (H. R. 761) for the relief of the estate of Anthony D. Chamberlain, deceased, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DUDLEY TARVER

The bill (H. R. 762) for the relief of Dudley Tarver was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DARWIN SLUMP

The bill (H. R. 2728) for the relief of Darwin Slump was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BESSIE B. BLACKNALL

The bill (H. R. 3113) for the relief of Bessie B. Blacknall was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. AND MRS. RUSSELL COULTER

The bill (H. R. 3328) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Russell Coulter was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LIZZIE REYNOLDS, ADMINISTRATRIX

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 550) for the relief of Lizzie Reynolds, administratrix of the estate of Grace Reynolds, deceased, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$6,000" and insert "$5,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATION OF THE UNITED STATES IN UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

The bill (S. 2518) to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska asks for an explanation of the bill. With the indulgence of the Senate, the Chair will make the explanation from the Chair.

This is a bill to increase the official representation of the United States at the seat of the United Nations. At the present time the official representation consists of one ambassador and a deputy. The work has so heavily increased that it is impossible for one ambassa-

dor and his deputy, particularly if one of them happens to be ill, to carry the responsibility involved. The bill would add one additional deputy and would also authorize the deputizing of any other Government official who has been confirmed by the Senate, to act in a special capacity.

The bill also places the salary and emoluments of the first American representative, the Chief Ambassador, Mr. Austin, on the basis of class 1 ambassadorial rank.

The bill is unanimously reported from the committee and is seriously essential for the sake of our adequate representation.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 be amended to read:

"SEC. 2. (a) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a respresentative of the United States and a deputy representative to the United Nations who shall have the rank and status of ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary and shall hold office at the pleasure of the President. The representative shall receive compensation at the rate of $25,000 per annum and the deputy representative shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 per annum. Such representative and deputy representative shall represent the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations and may serve ex officio as United States representative on any organ, commission, or body of the United Nations, other than specialized agencies of the United Nations, and shall perform such other functions in connection with the participation of the United States in the United Nations as the President may from time to time direct.

"(b) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint an additional deputy representative of the United States in the Security Council who shall receive annual compensation of $12,000, and shall hold office at the pleasure of the President. Such deputy representative shall represent the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations in the event of the absence or disability of the representative or deputy representative of the United States to the United Nations.

"(c) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall designate from time to time to attend a specified session or specified sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations not to exceed five representatives of the United States and such number of alternates as he may determine consistent with the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. One of the representatives shall be designated as the senior representative. Such representatives and alternates shall each be entitled to receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum for such period as the President may specify, except that no Member of the Senate or House of Representatives or officer of the United States who is designated under this subsection as a representative of the United States or as an alternate to attend any specified session or specified sessions of the General Assembly shall be entitled to receive such compensation.

"(d) The President may also appoint from time to time such other persons as he may deem necessary to represent the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations at such salaries, not to exceed $12,000 each per annum, as he shall determine, but the representative of the United States in the Economic and Social Council and in the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations shall be appointed only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, except that the President may, without the advice and consent of the Senate, designate any officer of the United States to act, without additional compensation, as the representative of the United States in either such council (A) at any specified session thereof where the position is vacant or in the absence or disability of the regular representative, or (B) in connection with a specified subject matter at any specified session of either such Council in lieu of the regular representative. The President may designate any officer of the Department of State, whose appointment is subject to confirmation by the Senate, to act, without additional compensation, for temporary periods as the representative of the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations in the absence or disability of the representative and deputy representatives appointed under section 2 (a) and (b) or in lieu of such representatives in connection with a specified subject matter. The advice and consent of the Senate shall be required for the appointment by the President of the representative of the United States in any commission that may be formed by the United Nations with respect to atomic energy or in any other commission of the United Nations to which the United States is entitled to appoint a representative.

"(e) Nothing contained in this section shall preclude the President or the Secretary of State, at the direction of the President, from representing the United States at any meeting or session of any organ or agency of the United Nations.

"SEC. 3. The representatives provided for in section 2 hereof, when representing the United States in the respective organs and agencies of the United Nations, shall, at all times, act in accordance with the instructions of the President transmitted by the Secretary of State unless other means of transmission is directed by the President, and such representatives shall, in accordance with such instructions, cast any and all votes under the Charter of the United Nations.

"SEC. 4. The President shall, from time to time as occasion may require, but not less than once each year, make reports to the Congress of the activities of the United Nations and of the participation of the United States therein. He shall make special current reports on decisions of the Security Council to take enforcement measures under the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, and on the participation therein under his instructions, of the representative of the United States.

"SEC. 5. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, whenever the United States is called upon by the Security Council to apply measures which said Council has decided, pursuant to article 41 of said Charter, are to be employed to give effect to its decisions under said Charter, the President may, to the extent necessary to apply such measures, through any agency which he may designate, and under such orders, rules, and regulations as may be prescribed by him, investigate, regulate, or prohibit, in whole or in part, economic relations or rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication between any foreign country or any national thereof or any person therein and the United States or any person subject to the jurisdiction thereof, or involving any property subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

"(b) Any person who willfully violates or evades or attempts to violate or evade any order, rule, or regulation issued by the President pursuant to paragraph (a) of this section shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $10,000 or, if a natural person, be imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both; and the officer, director, or agent of any corporation who knowingly participates in such violation or evasion shall be punished by a like fine, imprisonment, or both, and any property, funds, securities, papers, or other articles or documents, or any vessel, together with her tackle, apparel, furniture, and equipment, or vehicle, concerned in such violation shall be forfeited to the United States.

"SEC. 6. The President is authorized to negotiate a special agreement or agreements with the Security Council which shall be subject to the approval of the Congress by appropriate act or joint resolution, providing for the numbers and types of armed forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of facilities and assistance, including rights of passage, to be made available to the Security Council on its call for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security in accordance with article 43 of said Charter. The President shall not be deemed to require the authorization of the Congress to make available to the Security Council on its call in order to take action under article 42 of said Charter and pursuant to such special agreement or agreements the armed forces, facilities, or assistance provided for therein: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as an authorization to the President by the Congress to make available to the Security Council for such purpose armed forces, facilities, or assistance in addition to the forces, facilities, and assistance provided for in such special agreement or agreements.

"SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Department of State, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the United Nations as apportioned by the General Assembly in accordance with article 17 of the Charter, and for all necessary salaries and expenses of the representatives provided for in section 2 hereof, and of their appropriate staffs, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; travel expenses without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended, and without regard to the rates of per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence expenses under the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended, and section 10 of the act of March 3, 1933, as amended, and under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, travel expenses of families and transportation of effects of United States representatives and other personnel in going to and returning from their post of duty, allowance for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, as authorized by the act approved June 26, 1930 (5 U. S. C. 118a); cost of living allowances for personnel stationed abroad under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe; communication services; stenographic reporting, translating, and other services, by contract; hire of passenger motor vehicles and other local transportation; rent of offices; printing and binding, without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); official entertainment and representation; the lease or rental (for periods not exceeding 10 years) of living quarters for the use of the representative of the United States to the United Nations, the cost of installation and use of telephones in the same manner as telephone service is provided for use of the Foreign Service pursuant to the act of August 23, 1912, as amended (31 U. S. C. 679), and the allotment of funds, similar to the allotment authorized by section 902 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, for unusual expenses incident to the operation and maintenance

of such living quarters, to be accounted for in accordance with section 903 of said act; and such other expenses as may be authorized by the Secretary of State; all without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U. S. C. 5)."

ESTATE OF T. L. MORRIS

The bill (H. R. 1667) for the relief of the estate of T. L. Morris was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

H. C. BIERING

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1308) for the relief of H. C. Biering, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

The first amendment was, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out the word "acting" and insert "for his own account and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 1, line 8, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$11,212.05" and insert "$7,057.96."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 1, line 10, after the name "Biering", to strike out "against the United States arising out of losses of interest, by reasons of the erroneous issuance of the Alien Property Custodian on October 11, 1943, of vesting order No. 2392, which resulted in the seizure of $67,066.55 from H. C. Biering, acting as attorney in fact" and insert "and said E. A. M. Biering against the United States for expenses necessarily incurred in contesting the erroneous issuance by the Alien Property Custodian on October 11, 1943, of vesting order No. 2392, which resulted in the seizure of $67,066.55 from said H. C. Biering, acting as attorney in fact for said E. A. M. Biering, and in securing the return of the sum so seized."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EMANCIPATION OF CERTAIN INDIANS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1113) to emancipate United States Indians in certain cases, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That any Indian who is a citizen of the United States and who wishes to be freed of the disabilities and limitations specially applicable to Indians may, upon reaching the age of 21, apply to any naturalization court for the area in which he resides for a "decree or judgment of competency." The court shall set a hearing date not less than 30 days nor more than 60 days from the day it receives the application; and under regulations adopted by the court notify the head of the local, county, or parish governmental unit; the local welfare department of State, county, and city government; the superintendent of the applicant's tribe; and the head of the tribal council or other governing body, if a member of a tribe, or the Commissioner of Indian Affairs; and any other persons the court considers appropriate.

SEC. 2. At the hearing the court shall examine the applicant and may require the persons who appear before the court to give testimony in the matter of the applicant's competency to the court in determining the applicant's competency. The United States attorney of the district and the attorney for the county or parish in which such court is situated shall be given an opportunity to appear at such hearing and to participate in the examination of the applicant and other witnesses. In determining competency, the court shall consider significant factors bearing upon the applicant's moral and intellectual qualifications and his ability to manage his own affairs. If the court finds the applicant competent, it shall issue a "decree or judgment of competency," freeing him of all disabilities and limitations specially applicable to Indians; and the recipient shall no longer be entitled to share any of the benefits or gratuitous service extended to Indians as such by the United States, except as to such services as are required under the provisions of this act. In the event the court denies a "decree or judgment of competency," the applicant may file a new application 1 year following the date of denial. Upon the entry of a decree or judgment of competency to any applicant, such applicant shall file a certified copy thereof with the Secretary of the Interior, who shall maintain such copy as a public record.

The form of a decree or judgment of competency under this act shall be substantially as follows:

"DECREE OF COMPETENCY

"Whereas _____, a member of
(name of applicant)
the _____ Tribe of Indians, has made
(name of tribe)
application to the _____ for
(designation of court)
a decree of competency under the provisions of the act of Congress approved _____
_____:
(date of enactment)

"Now, therefore, this court, upon consideration of such application and the evidence submitted in support thereof, finds and hereby declares the said _____ to be
(name of applicant)
fully competent and capable of transacting _____ own business and caring for
(his or her)
_____ own individual affairs.
(his or her)

"Done in open court this _____ day of _____.

"_____
(Name of judge)

"Attest: _____."
(Clerk of court)

SEC. 3. When presented with a "decree or judgment of competency," the Secretary of the Interior shall within 90 days give the applicant full ownership and control of the money and property held in trust for him as an individual Indian by the Secretary; issuing, in the case of land, appropriate patents in fee, provided the Secretary may make such provisions as he deems necessary to insure repayment of money loaned to the applicant by the Federal Government or by the tribe: *Provided*, That where the Secretary finds that with respect to inherited interests in lands held jointly or in common with other heirs by reason of the number of such heirs or size of such interest that it is impracticable to divide same according to their inherited interests, he shall sell the interest or interests of the individual Indian applicant who has been adjudged competent and pay to him or her the net proceeds of such sale.

SEC. 4. After receiving a "decree or judgment of competency," the applicant, if a member of a tribe, shall continue on the tribal rolls as a member of the tribe. Any Indian who has been adjudged competent as herein provided shall in no manner be deprived of his or her tribal rights or treaty benefits; and in no way shall he or she be alienated from any benefits or payments of funds which may accrue to the tribe, band, group, or ward of the Federal Government through settlement of claims as provided in section 12, Public Law 726, approved August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1049). In case of the death of any member, his or her share shall descend to the heirs in accordance with the inheritance laws of the State wherein the tribe is located.

SEC. 5. Any Indian born after the date of the enactment of this act, who is a citizen of the United States, and any child of parents, either of whom has been issued "a decree or judgment of competency" shall, upon reaching the age of 21 years, be free of all disabilities and limitations specially applicable to Indians.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BUTLER subsequently said: Mr. President, before proceeding with the next bill, I should like to revert to Calendar 1178, House bill 1113, which was passed. I have now been advised that the Bureau wishes another week to study the bill, and I suggest that it go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the vote by which House bill 1113 was passed is reconsidered, and the bill will be returned to the calendar.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4725) to confer jurisdiction on the several States over offenses committed by or against Indians on Indian reservations was announced as next in order.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, with respect to House bill 4725, Calendar 1179; Senate bill 1686, Calendar 1180; and Senate bill 1687, Calendar 1181, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] has asked permission to look into the bills, and I ask that they go over for that reason.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be passed over.

The bills passed over are as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4725) to confer jurisdiction on the several States over offenses committed by or against Indians on Indian reservations.

A bill (S. 1686) to provide for the settlement of certain obligations of the United States to the Indians of New York.

A bill (S. 1687) to confer jurisdiction on the courts of the State of New York with respect to civil actions between Indians or to which Indians are parties.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN INDIAN LANDS TO BROCKTON SCHOOL DISTRICT, MONTANA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1933) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to School District 55, Roosevelt County, Mont., which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "convey", insert "with the consent of the executive board of the Fork Peck Tribe"; and on page 2, line 8, after the name "United States", to insert "in trust for the Fort Peck Tribe", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey with the consent of the executive board of the Fort Peck Tribe by quitclaim deed to School District 55, Roosevelt County, Mont., the following-described lands located

in Brockton, Roosevelt County, Mont.: Lots 3 through 14 of block 16; lots 1 through 4 of block 9; and lots 13 through 16 of block 9.

SEC. 2. The lands authorized to be conveyed by this act shall be used by the grantee for school purposes, including the use as a site for housing furnished to Indian families during the school term. The conveyance of such lands shall contain the express condition that if the grantee shall fail or cease to use such lands for such purposes, or shall alienate or attempt to alienate such lands, title thereto shall revert to the United States, in trust for the Fort Peck Tribe.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the typographical error on page 1, line 4, in the spelling of the word "convey" will be corrected.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ISSUANCE OF PATENT IN FEE TO JOHN F. COMPTON

The bill (S. 1941) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to John F. Compton, formerly John Crazy Bull, a patent in fee to certain land was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to John F. Compton, formerly John Crazy Bull, Rosebud Sioux allottee, a patent in fee to the southeast quarter of section 32, township 36 north, range 26 west, sixth principal meridian, South Dakota, containing one hundred and sixty acres.

LOANS TO CERTAIN INDIANS

The bill (H. R. 2622) to authorize loans for Indians and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MISSISSIPPI CENTRAL RAILROAD CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3089) for the relief of Mississippi Central Railroad Co., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 8, after the word "for", to insert "payment made in settlement and satisfaction of liability to which said Mississippi Central Railroad Co. was subjected by."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2385) to promote the progress of science to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare to secure the national defense and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

MINING OF POTASH ON THE PUBLIC DOMAIN

The bill (S. 1050) to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the mining of potash on the public domain," approved February 7, 1927, so as to provide for the disposition of the rentals and royalties from leases issued or renewed under the act entitled "An act to authorize exploration for and disposition of potassium," approved October 2, 1917, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the act entitled "An act to promote the mining of potash on the public domain," approved February 7, 1927, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence:

"All money received from royalties and rentals from any lease issued or renewed under the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to authorize exploration for and disposition of potassium,' approved October 2, 1917, shall be paid into, reserved, and appropriated as follows: 52½ percent to the reclamation fund, 10 percent to the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, and 37½ percent shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury, after the expiration of each fiscal year, to the State within the boundaries of which the leased lands or deposits are or were located, such money to be used by such State or subdivision thereof for the construction and maintenance of public roads or for the support of schools or other public educational institutions, as the legislature of the State may direct."

TITLE TO CERTAIN LANDS IN JEFFERSON COUNTY, ILL.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 242) to confirm title in fee simple in Joshua Britton to certain lands in Jefferson County, Ill., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALE AND LEASE OF CERTAIN LANDS AND BUILDINGS IN BOULDER CITY, NEV.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1448) directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and lease certain houses, apartments, and lands in Boulder City, Nev., which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "house" to insert "including the furniture, fixtures, and appurtenances"; on page 1, line 7, after the word "the", to insert "lessee"; on page 1, line 8, after the word "house", to strike out "at" and insert "for a period of at least 90 days prior to"; and on page 3, line 4, after the word "Act", to strike out "(not including such proceeds as may be attributable to the lease of lands upon which such houses and apartments may be situated) shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts" and insert "shall be deposited in the Treasury and credited to the Colorado River Dam fund established by section 2 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057)", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to sell each house, including the furniture, fixtures, and appurtenances, acquired from the Defense Homes Corporation and situated on land in Boulder City, Nev., to the lessee occupant thereof, if such occupant (1) occupied the house for a period of at least 90 days prior to the time it was acquired from the Defense Homes Corporation and occupies it at the time of sale, (2) is at the time of sale an employee of the United States Government or person regularly employed or conducting a business or profession in Boulder City, and (3) desires to purchase the house and to lease the land upon which it is situated. The offer of sale to any such occupant shall be made within 180 days after enactment of this act and the sale shall be completed within a reasonable time after such offer. The sale price shall not exceed the amount at which the house was carried on the books of the Defense Homes Corporation at the date of transfer to the Secretary. The sale contract and documents of title shall contain (1) a provision prohibiting resale within 3 years at a price exceeding the price paid the Secretary and (2) a provision prohibiting resale on any terms during such period unless resale on such terms shall first have been offered to, and refused by, the Secretary. The Secretary is authorized and directed to lease the lot on which each house so sold is situated to the purchaser of such house in accordance with the provisions set out under the heading "Boulder Canyon Project" in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1941 (54 Stat. 406, 437).

The Secretary is authorized to lease all apartments acquired from Defense Homes Corporation and all houses so acquired and not sold pursuant to this act, together with the lands upon which situated, upon such terms and conditions as he may see fit in accordance with existing law.

All proceeds from the sale and lease of houses and apartments by the Secretary pursuant to this act shall be deposited in the Treasury and credited to the Colorado River Dam fund established by section 2 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057).

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO CITY OF PIERRE, S. DAK.

The bill (S. 1925) to convey certain land to the city of Pierre, S. Dak., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey to the city of Pierre, S. Dak., all of the rights, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described as all of blocks 1, 2, 3, and 4, Yaple's addition to the town, now city of Pierre, and lots 5 to 12 of block 23 and all of block 34, Ash's second addition to the town, now city of Pierre, S. Dak.

MRS. CHRISTINE WEST AND MRS. JESSE WEST

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1062) for the relief of Mrs. Christine West and Mrs. Jesse West, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the name "Montana", to strike out "in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States, the sum of $2,500, representing the fair value of her house which was razed in 1939 by enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps, Indian Division, of the Fort Peck Agency, in connection with a project for the restoration of grazing ranges on submarginal lands, and (2) Mrs. Jesse West, of Wolf Point, Mont., in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States, the sum of $300, representing the fair value of certain buildings, owned by her late deceased husband, which were seized and removed in 1939 by such enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps in connection with such project" and insert "the sum of $1,000 representing compensation for her outstanding right, title and interest in 340 acres of land and all improvements thereon, tract 215B, Roosevelt County,

State of Montana, adverse to the title of the United States under deed from Christ Christofferson dated on December 2, 1936, recorded in the land records of the said county on December 12, 1936, in volume 62 on page 190, and for any and all damages to a dwelling formerly located thereon, which was destroyed by enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps in 1939, upon submission of evidence satisfactory to the Attorney General of a right, title or interest adverse to the record title of the United States, and, upon delivery of a quitclaim deed conveying such right, title or interest to the United States, together with a release to the United States of any and all claims for damages resulting from the possession or use of the land by the United States prior to the transfer of title, and (2) to Mrs. Jesse West, of Wolf Point, Mont., in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States, the sum of $250, representing the fair value of certain buildings owned by her late deceased husband, upon proof of title, right or interest by Christine West to the lands on which they were situated when seized and destroyed in 1939 by enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to (1) Mrs. Christine West, of Poplar, Mont., the sum of $1,000 representing compensation for her outstanding right, title, and interest in 340 acres of land and all improvements thereon, tract 215B, Roosevelt County, State of Montana, adverse to the title of the United States under deed from Christ Christofferson dated on December 2, 1936, recorded in the land records of the said county on December 12, 1936, in volume 62 on page 190, and for any and all damages to a dwelling formerly located thereon, which was destroyed by enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps in 1939, upon submission of evidence satisfactory to the Attorney General of a right, title, or interest adverse to the record title of the United States, and, upon delivery of a quitclaim deed conveying such right, title, or interest to the United States, together with a release to the United States of any and all claims for damages resulting from the possession or use of the land by the United States prior to the transfer of title; and

(2) to Mrs. Jesse West, of Wolf Point, Mont., in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States, the sum of $250, representing the fair value of certain buildings owned by her late deceased husband, upon proof of title, right, or interest by Christine West to the lands on which they were situated when seized and destroyed in 1939 by enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALLIED AVIATION CORP.—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 631) for the relief of the Allied Aviation Corp. was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator who made the objection withhold it for a moment?

Mr. LANGER. I shall be glad to withhold it temporarily.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to say that the process leading up to the bill which is now before the Senate arises out of a war contract. In order that the committee of the Senate which considered the matter might not have any conflict in testimony, the Navy Department, through its general counsel, and the claimant agreed on a set of facts. In other words, there is no dispute about the facts involved in this claim. When the facts were submitted to the committee, the committee unanimously agreed that the claim was just. The Navy entered into that conclusion. So there is no dispute either on the part of the Navy or the claimant as to what the facts are or as to the justice of the claim. The Senator from Kentucky can correct me if I make any misstatements in that respect. He was chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator explain the amendment?

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall be glad to do so. When the facts were presented to the committee, the committee not only reached the conclusion that the amount as carried in the bill as it passed the House was fair, but that the claimant was entitled to more money than the amount which had been allowed on the former consideration.

Mr. HATCH. Had that set of facts been submitted to the House of Representatives?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think as complete a set of facts had been submitted to the House of Representatives. I am not sure about this statement, but my recollection is that the complete set of facts was submitted to the Senate, but not a complete set of facts was submitted to the House.

I hope the Senator from North Dakota will not object, in view of the fact that now the Government is in complete accord with the facts as presented by the claimant, and the claim seems to be approved by all the parties concerned.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, it is with the deepest regret that I am forced to object to the present consideration of the bill, the reason for my doing so being that I am a member of the Judiciary Committee, which had this matter under consideration, but unfortunately I could not attend a certain meeting of the committee, because I was busy on the work of the Committee on Civil Service.

But I shall be glad to look into this bill, so as to be prepared to agree to its consideration at the next call of the calendar.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is perfectly satsfactory. I did not know the Senator had not had an opportunity to look into the bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I should like to state, for the benefit of the Senator from North Dakota, that the statement the Senator from Maryland has made with respect to the consideration of this bill by the subcommittee is a correct statement, and at the proper time I shall elaborate on it for the guidance of the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been made, the bill will be passed over.

The clerk will state the next measure on the calendar.

CREDIT FOR SERVICE AS CADET, MIDSHIPMAN, OR AVIATION CADET

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 657) to provide that service as a cadet, midshipman, or aviation cadet shall be credited for pay purposes, and that service as a cadet or midshipman shall be credited for retirement purposes, in the case of military and naval personnel, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 3A of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) Insert after the word "appointments" in line 6 of the said section as it appears in section 1 of the act of September 7, 1944 (58 Stat. 729), the words "as cadets, as midshipmen, as aviation or flying cadets, or".

(b) Insert after the words "Regular Army Reserve," in line 8 of the said section as it appears in section 1 of the act of September 7, 1944 (58 Stat. 729), the words "the Officers' Reserve Corps, the Medical Reserve Corps of the Army,".

(c) Strike out the period at the end of the first sentence of the said section, substitute a comma therefore, and insert after the comma the following: "and for all periods of service as a contract surgeon serving full time.".

SEC. 2. The amendment to section 3A of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, made by this act, shall be applicable to the active-duty pay and to the retired, retirement, or retainer pay of all persons heretofore or hereafter separated from the active list, whose pay is affected by that section, but the service authorized to be credited therein for pay purposes shall not be credited for purposes of establishing eligibility for voluntary retirement.

SEC. 3. This act shall be applicable to personnel of the Air Force of the United States to the same extent as applicable to personnel of the other armed forces of the United States.

SEC. 4. This act shall become effective on the first day of the first month following its enactment, and no back pay for any period prior thereto shall accrue by reason of its enactment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to authorize crediting of service as a cadet, mid-

shipman, or aviation cadet for pay purposes, and for other purposes."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1561) to protect the national security of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Let the bill go over.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over, under objection.

RETIREMENT BENEFITS, NURSE CORPS OF THE ARMY AND THE NAVY

The bill (H. R. 4090) to equalize retirement benefits among members of the Nurse Corps of the Army and the Navy, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INDUSTRIAL AND OTHER SCHOOLS FOR ARMY ENLISTED MEN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 295) to further amend the thirteenth paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That the thirteenth paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C., Supp. V, 535), is further amended to read as follows:

"The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to detail personnel of the Army of the United States, without regard to component, as students at such technical, professional, and other civilian educational institutions, or as students, observers, or investigators at such industrial plants, hospitals, and other places as shall be best suited to enable such personnel to acquire knowledge or experience in the specialties in which it is deemed necessary that such personnel shall perfect themselves, and any officer or warrant officer who receives such instruction shall, immediately upon termination thereof, be ordered to active duty for a period at least equal to the duration of his period of instruction but not greater than 4 years, except that where the duration of such training is 90 days or less, such subsequent active duty may be at the discretion of the Secretary of the Army: *Provided*, That no member of the National Guard or the Organized Reserve Corps shall be detailed as a student, observer, or investigator pursuant to the provisions of this act nor be ordered to active duty as herein provided except with his own consent, and, in the case of a member of the National Guard of the United States, with the approval of the governor or other appropriate authority of the State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, whichever is concerned: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Army may require that an enlisted man, prior to his detail pursuant to the provisions of this paragraph, shall be discharged and reenlisted in his component for a period of not less than 3 years; and the total length of detail of an enlisted man pursuant to the provisions of this paragraph shall not exceed 50 percent of his enlistment period: *And provided further*, That at no time shall more than 8 percent of the authorized commissioned officer strength, 8 percent of the authorized warrant officer strength, or 2 percent of the authorized enlisted strength of the Regular Army, or more than 8 percent of the actual commissioned officer strength, 8 percent of the actual warrant officer strength, or 2 percent of the actual enlisted strength of all Reserve components of the Army (including in the computation of the actual strength of each such class of Reserve personnel persons in active or inactive duty status), be detailed as students pursuant to the provisions of this paragraph."

SEC. 2. All expenditures incident to the detail of personnel as students at such technical, professional, and other civilian educational institutions, or as students, observers, or investigators at such industrial plants, hospitals, and other places, as provided herein, shall be paid from any appropriated Department of the Army funds.

SEC. 3. The provisions of the foregoing section shall be equally applicable to the Department of the Air Force: *Provided*, That all reference therein to the Secretary of the Army, the Department of the Army, the Regular Army, the National Guard of the United States, and the Army of the United States shall, insofar as they apply to the Department of the Air Force, be construed for the purpose of this section as referring to the Secretary of the Air Force, the Department of the Air Force, the United States Air Force, the Air National Guard, and the Air Force of the United States, respectively.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes, under the rule.

Mr. GURNEY. I am sure I shall not us that much time.

This bill authorizes the sending of enlisted men of the three services to industrial schools.

Mr. AIKEN. Is that all the bill does?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. There is no objection to that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NAVAL SALVAGE FACILITIES

The bill (H. R. 4490) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to provide salvage facilities, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. AIKEN. May we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, at the present time on the east coast and the west coast there are insufficient salvage facilities for offshore ship protection and ship salvage.

This bill would permit the Navy to use up to $3,000,000 to help finance salvage companies, to enable them to carry on offshore salvage operations, particularly on the west coast. At first there were objections from some persons on the west coast. The objections have been satisfied, and I believe the bill now is entirely agreeable to all the salvage companies that are equipped for deep-sea salvage operations on both the east coast and the west coast.

If a bill of this character is not enacted so as to help the Navy, we may well lose some our very valuable ships because of the inability to salvage them if anything happens to them while they are at sea.

Mr. AIKEN. This bill provides, does it not, for giving the companies $3,000,000 to enlarge their salvage facilities?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The bill authorizes the Navy to put up to $3,000,000 into salvage operations. The Navy hopes to get it back in the form of successful salvage operations. The bill does not permit the use of more than $3,000,000 for this purpose.

This character of work was done all during the war, and it is necessary to carry it on now. The enactment of this bill is necessary because of the lack of profit in the carrying on of this business by private contractors.

I believe there is no objection to the bill in its present form. All companies that are engaged in these operations are agreeable to the bill as it is now constituted.

Mr. AIKEN. Three million dollars is a rather small sum for the Navy to ask permission to give away, it seems to me, in comparison with what the Navy has been giving away. Perhaps the smallness of the sum arouses my suspicions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MEDICAL TREATMENT OF PERSONS IN THE NAVAL SERVICE

The bill (H. R. 1275) to authorize the payment of certain claims for medical treatment of persons in the naval service; to repeal section 1586 of the Revised Statutes; and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INCREASE IN NUMBER OF MIDSHIPMEN FROM THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 2034) to increase the number of midshipmen allowed at the United States Naval Academy from the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. May we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BYRD. The bill applies to the District of Columbia, and it increases the number of midshipmen from the District of Columbia at the Naval Academy from 5 to 15, in proportion to the increase given to the States which have relatively the same population as the District of Columbia. The increase is made on the basis of that allowed for the State of Vermont, which has approximately the same population as the District of Columbia. The bill simply permits District of Columbia representation to that extent at the Naval Academy.

The following bill on the calendar does the same thing with respect to the Military Academy.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to inquire who makes the appointments from the District of Columbia.

Mr. BYRD. The appointments are made on the basis of an examination, by the Commissioners.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. I notice that the following bill, calendar 404, Senate bill 2033, provides for an increase in the number of cadets from the District of Columbia at the United States Military Academy. Is the increase provided in Senate bill 2034 in the same proportion as the increase provided in Senate bill 2033?

Mr. BYRD. Yes. In Senate bill 2033 the number is increased from 6 to 12, which is in the same proportion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2034) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to increase the number of midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy," approved December 20, 1917 (40 Stat. 430), as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out the words "and five for the District of Columbia" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "and fifteen for the District of Columbia."

SEC. 2. The increase in appointments provided in this act shall be accomplished by the appointment of not more than five during each of the years 1948 and 1949.

INCREASE IN NUMBER OF CADETS FROM THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AT THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The bill (S. 2033) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength," approved June 3, 1942 (56 Stat. 306), was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the principle of this bill is the same as that of the preceding bill. In this case the bill applies to the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy. It increases the number of cadets allotted to the District of Columbia, and does so on the basis of providing equality with States having relatively the same population as that of the District of Columbia.

Mr. LANGER. How many cadets will be permitted to be appointed from the District of Columbia, if the bill is passed?

Mr. BYRD. The bill provides for an increase in the number of cadets coming from the District of Columbia from 6 to 12.

Mr. LANGER. If the population of the District of Columbia decreases, will the number of cadets be decreased?

Mr. BYRD. The point is that at the present time the number of cadets coming from the District of Columbia is on a different ratio to population, as compared with the number of cadets coming from the States. The bill will make the ratio for the District of Columbia, as compared to its population, the same as that with respect to the States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength," approved June 3, 1942 (56 Stat. 306), be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out the word "six" preceding the words "District of Columbia" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "twelve."

PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF AVIATION CADETS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1599) to prescribe the pay and allowances of aviation cadets in the Air Corps, Regular Army, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments, on page 1, in line 9, after the words "Secretary of", to strike out "War" and insert "the Air Force"; and on page 2, in line 6, after the words "Secretary of", to strike out "War" and insert "the Air Force"; in line 12, after the words "Secretary of", to strike out "War" and insert "the Air Force"; and in line 18, after the words "of the", to strike out "Army" and insert "Air Force", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act of June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 239), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. The base pay of an aviation cadet shall be the same as that now or hereafter provided by law for a cadet undergoing instruction at the United States Military Academy. In addition, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force, aviation cadets shall receive an increase of 50 percent of their base pay when, as a part of their course of instruction, they are required to participate regularly and frequently in aerial flights, and pursuant to such requirement they do participate in regular and frequent aerial flights. Aviation cadets shall be paid, in addition, a money allowance for subsistence at such rates as the Secretary of the Air Force may prescribe and shall, while undergoing training, be furnished quarters, medical care, and hospitalization and shall be issued uniforms, clothing, and equipment at Government expense. No aviation cadet shall be entitled to receive longevity pay. While traveling under orders, they shall, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Air Force may prescribe, receive transportation and reimbursement for necessary expenses incurred which are incident to such travel, or cash in lieu thereof. When traveling by air under competent orders, they shall receive the same allowances for traveling expenses as are now or may hereafter be authorized by law for officers of the Air Force."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to prescribe the pay and allowances of aviation cadets in the United States Air Force, and for other purposes."

ENLISTED PERSONNEL IN AVIATION TACTICAL UNITS

The bill (S. 1216) to repeal that part of section 3 of the act of June 24, 1926 (44 Stat. 767), as amended, relating to the percentage, in time of peace, of enlisted personnel employed in aviation tactical units of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the statute which this bill seeks to repeal was enacted in 1926 during the period of expansion of the Army and Navy Air Force components. Since the statute applies only in times of peace, the provisions have not been in effect since 1939. During the war years, with few exceptions, most combat pilots were commissioned officers. Both the Department of the Navy and the Department of the Air Force indicate that it is impractical to train sufficient enlisted pilots to meet the requirement that 20 percent of pilots in aviation tactical units shall be enlisted pilots. The pending bill would repeal the provision of law that in peacetime enlisted men should compose 20 percent of the pilot strength of the Army and Navy Air Forces. The plan followed now of course is to send the enlisted men to officers' candidate schools, and as soon as they graduate and become pilots, to give them officers' commissions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That paragraph 8 of section 3 of the act of June 24, 1926 (44 Stat. 767), as amended by the act of June 30, 1932 (ch. 326, 47 Stat. 451), and so much of section 13a of the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 166), as amended by the act of July 2, 1926 (44 Stat. 781) reading "On and after July 1, 1929, and in time of peace, not less than 20 percent of the total number of pilots employed in tactical units of the Air Corps shall be enlisted men, except when the Secretary of War shall determine that it is impractical to secure that number of enlisted pilots.", are hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. Nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting the status of enlisted personnel of the armed services, including the Reserve components thereof, designated as aviation or enlisted pilots or engaged in training relating to or leading to such designation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to repeal that part of section 3 of the act of June 24, 1926 (44 Stat. 767), as amended, and that part of section 13a of the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 166), as amended by the act of July 2, 1926 (44 Stat. 781), relating to the percentage, in time of peace, of enlisted personnel employed in aviation tactical units of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, and for other purposes."

RECIPROCAL EXEMPTION OF FOREIGN AIRCRAFT EARNINGS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next four bills on the calendar are appropriation bills, which will be passed over.

The clerk will state the bill which was passed over until the completion of the call of the calendar, namely, Order No. 1167, House bill 5448. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from Colorado to this bill, which will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5448) to amend sections 212 (b) and 231 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] wanted an explanation of the bill. I have discussed the matter with the Senator, and he has authorized me to say that he withdraws his objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5448) to amend sections 212 (b) and 231 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, on page 3, line 2, to strike out "1947" and insert "1945".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

JURISDICTION OF PUBLIC LANDS IN OREGON

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, on a previous occasion when Calendar 1144, Senate bill 580, was called, objection was made by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. For the information of the Senate, the clerk will read the bill by its title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 580) relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. I have discussed the matter with him. The objection had been made at the request of one of the departments to enable it to make certain representations. I am now advised by the senior Senator from Utah that adequate time for that purpose has elapsed, and that the Senator has no further objection to the passage of the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, my attention has just been called to something in connection with the bill, and I should like a few moments in order that I may look into it. I will confer with the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over for the time being.

AMERICAN INDIAN DAY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on a previous occasion I objected to calendar No. 183, Senate bill 309, on the ground that the measure was in my opinion only an idle gesture toward the Indians of America. In reality, I was using that expression, not in any spirit of contempt, but to express my deep sense that the Government is under a genuine obligation to the Indians. I know, Mr. President, that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is very much interested in the passage of this particular bill. I do not see how it can do any harm, and it might conceivably do some good. I think my own purpose has been served. Therefore, Mr. President, I wish to withdraw the objections I made previously. I am now willing that the bill be considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered at this time?

Mr. HATCH. I do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 309) designating American Indian Day, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "requested" and to insert "authorized", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the fourth Saturday in September of each year is hereby designated and shall hereafter be known as American Indian Day.

SEC. 2. The President is authorized to issue a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all governmental buildings on such day and inviting the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies as a memorial to the aborigines of this Nation and their contributions to the establishment and maintenance of this Nation.

SEC. 3. The President is also requested to communicate this declaration, by proclamation or otherwise, to the governors of the several States, and request them to take such action as they may deem advisable in order to bring about observance of such day.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FORT SUMTER—A NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, on March 31, 1947, I introduced a bill which would establish Fort Sumter as a national monument in South Carolina. The bill was reported favorably by the committee, and on July 16, 1947, it was passed by the Senate.

Last week the House of Representatives passed Senate Joint Resolution 94 authorizing the Department of the Army to transfer Fort Sumter, without consideration, to the Director of the National Park Service under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior.

I wish to take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation to all, both in the Senate and in the House, for their support in passing this resolution. It will mean much, not only to the people of South Carolina but to all the people of our country who may some day have the privilege of paying a visit to this historic spot.

An article appeared yesterday in newspapers all over the country telling something of the story of Fort Sumter. I ask that this article be incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this time.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORT SUMTER

(By A. Lee Parsons)

A historic site has been saved from a fate worse than Yankee cannon fire. Such valiant names as Beauregard, Wigfall, Rhett, Pringle, Ashley, and numerous others will now be forever enshrined in the great national monument now assured at Fort Sumter.

Any South Carolina school child, at no more provocation than the drop of a magnolia, will instantly recall that Fort Sumter is a big chunk of brick and masonry located on a minute spit of sand commanding the entrance into Charleston Harbor. It was against these walls, the child will remind you, that Confederate cannon fire was directed during the dark morning hours of April 12, 1861. That first hurtling arc of sparks across Charleston Harbor was preceded by a flash of fire and smoke from James Island and followed by a rending report from Fort Sumter. The long-smoldering fuse had burned down to dry powder. The first shot of the War Between the States had been fired.

Up until this week Fort Sumter was on a Department of the Army list to be declared surplus property. But there were proud South Carolinians who had other ideas. United States Senator BURNET RHETT MAYBANK, himself bearing the name of one of the illustrious defenders of Fort Sumter, had long been an advocate of a national shrine at the old fort. He had introduced a bill in the Senate which would establish Fort Sumter as a national monument to be administered by the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior. That bill was passed by the Senate last year. When it went to the House of Representatives it immediately received the whole-hearted support of the first district's Congressman L. MENDEL RIVERS. This week the bill passed the House and with the President's approval Fort Sumter was saved from the ignominious shame of being declared surplus property.

Fort Sumter has a distinguished history. Standing out, as it does, in the entrance of Charleston Harbor, it was a lonely citadel for Maj. Robert Anderson's garrison of Union forces when he moved from Fort Moultrie, on Sullivan's Island, to Fort Sumter where he believed he would be in a better position for defense in the event of hostilities. He made the move on the night of December 26, 1860, following passage of the Ordinance of Secession by South Carolina.

President Buchanan, whose term of office would expire on March 4, 1861, avoided the momentous decision of whether to recall Anderson or send an expedition to reinforce him at the risk of provoking war. The isssue was met by Abraham Lincoln who, immediately upon assuming office, dispatched a fleet to relieve the fort.

President Lincoln probably had not reckoned with the Confederate government's new commander of military forces at Charleston. Perhaps he did not know that President Davis had elected a direct descendant of Jacques Toutant-Beauregard and Francois Marie Chevalier de Reggio. General Pierre Gustave Toutant Beauregard, hero of Chapultepec, Cerro Gordo and Vera Cruz, and late commander of the Military Academy at West Point, was a gentleman, a diplomat and certainly a soldier by heritage, training and deed.

With President Lincoln's relief-carrying-fleet expected at any moment, General Beauregard offered Major Anderson an opportunity to evacuate the fort. The offer was not accepted, and at 4:30 on the morning of April 12, 1861, the Confederate batteries on James Island opened fire on Fort Sumter. On April 13, after a bombardment of 34 hours, Anderson surrendered, and the War Between the States had begun.

The announcement of Congressional and Presidential approval of the transfer of Fort Sumter to the Department of the Interior brought smiles to a soft spot in the hearts of Senator MAYBANK and Congressman RIVERS and to all men who have a tender feeling for the historic fort.

Losing no time, the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior called Senator MAYBANK and informed him that their representatives would visit Charleston within the next few days to make an inspection of Fort Sumter. The Department is already setting the machinery in motion for putting its technical staffs to work on the elements of a master plan for the long-term preservation of the fort and for its exhibition and interpretation to the tens of thousands of Americans who will undoubtedly visit it when opened to the public.

Although unable to commit themselves to a definite plan at this time, officials of the Department of the Interior report that this new national monument will be recreated from original maps of the old fort. Guide and interpretation services will be provided. Comfort stations will be built. Transportation arrangements will be made for getting visitors out to the island.

The unbowed pride of the confederacy, the grand old fort which never surrendered under the Confederate flag, stands ready to rise now to even greater heights in the eyes of men who will come across miles and miles of plains, mountains, and oceans to visit her in her glorious new role as a national shrine.

WOMEN'S CORPS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1641) to establish the Women's Army Corps in the Regular Army, to authorize the enlistment and appointment of women in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps and the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes, together with a message from the House insisting upon its amendments and requesting a conference with the Senate thereon:

On page 1, line 4, to strike out "Integration Act of 1947" and insert "Reserve Act of 1948."

On page 1, strike out all after line 5 over to and including line 15 on page 11.

On page 11, after line 15, insert:

"ARMY"

On page 11, line 16, strike out "109" and insert "101."

On page 12, lines 6 and 7, to strike out "Women's Army Corps" and insert "such female persons."

On page 12, line 20, to strike out "War" and insert "the Army."

On page 12, line 23, strike out all after "371)," down to and including "title", in line 24.

On page 13, line 4, to strike out "War" and insert "the Army."

On page 13, line 6, to strike out "War" and insert "the Army."

On page 13, line 13, strike out "War" and insert "the Army."

On page 13, after line 16, insert:

"SEC. 102. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2a of the act of July 25, 1947 (Public Law 239, 80th Cong.), neither (1) the act of July 1, 1943 (57 Stat. 371), nor (2) the act of September 22, 1941 (55 Stat. 728, ch. 414), as amended, insofar as it pertains to officers of the Women's Army Corps heretofore appointed thereunder, shall be repealed until that date which is 12 months after the date of enactment of this act."

On page 13, to strike out all after line 17 over to and including line 2 on page 28.

On page 28, after line 2, insert:

"NAVY AND MARINE CORPS"

On page 28, line 3, strike out "212" and insert "201."

On page 28, line 5, after the word "out", to insert "the present caption and."

On page 28, after line 6, insert:

"TITLE V

"WOMEN IN THE NAVAL RESERVE"

On page 28, lines 9 and 10, to strike out "ratings, grades, or ranks" and insert "ratings or grades."

On page 28, line 18, after "assigned" insert "*Provided*, That they shall not be assigned to duty in aircraft while such aircraft are engaged in combat missions nor shall they be assigned to duty on vessels of the Navy except hospital ships and naval transports."

On page 29, line 17, to strike out "ratings, grades, or ranks" and insert "ratings or grades."

On page 29, line 19, strike out all after "of" down to and including "Reserve" in line 22, and insert "the Women's Armed Services Reserve Act of 1948, and such transfer of enlisted personnel shall be for a period to be determined by the Secretary of the Navy."

On page 29, line 23, to strike out "213" and insert "202."

On page 29, line 24, to strike out "Regular."

On page 29, line 24, after "Corps" insert "Reserve."

On page 30 line 3, to strike out "Regular."

On page 30, line 3, after "Corps" insert "Reserve."

On page 30, line 4, to strike out "Regular Navy" and insert "Naval Reserve."

On page 30, strike out lines 5 to 25 inclusive, and lines 1 to 15 inclusive on page 31, and insert:

"TITLE III

"AIR FORCE

"SEC. 301. (a) Effective on the date of enactment of this title, the appointment and enlistment of women in the Officers' and Enlisted Section of the Air Force Reserve shall be authorized.

"(b) Except as otherwise specifically provided, all laws now applicable to male commissioned officers and former commissioned officers of the Officers' Reserve Corps, to enlisted men and former enlisted men of the Enlisted Reserve Corps, and to their dependents and beneficiaries, shall be applicable respectively, to female commissioned officers and former commissioned officers, to enlisted women and former enlisted women, of the Air Force Reserve, and to their dependents and beneficiaries, except as may be necessary to adapt said provisions to such female persons: *Provided*, That the husbands of such female persons shall not be considered dependents unless they are in fact dependent on their wives for their chief support, and the children of such female persons shall not be considered dependents unless their father is dead or they are in fact dependent on their mothers for their chief support.

"(c) Appointments of women to commissioned grade in the Air Force Reserve may be made by the President alone in grades from lieutenant colonel to second lieutenant, inclusive, from female citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 21 years and who possess such other qualifications as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force: *Provided*, That any person who has served satisfactorily in the temporary grade of colonel in the Women's Army Corps established by act of July 1, 1943 (57 Stat. 371), may, if otherwise qualified, be appointed in the grade of colonel in the Air Force Reserve.

"(d) Enlistments of women in the Air Force Reserve may be accepted under the provisions of law now applicable to enlistments of male persons in the Enlisted Reserve Corps, under such regulations, in such grades, or ratings, and for such periods of time as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force.

"(e) The President may form any or all such female persons of the Air Force Reserve into such organizations and units as he may prescribe.

"(f) The Secretary of the Air Force shall prescribe the military authority which any female person in the Air Force Reserve may exercise, and the kind of military duty to which such female persons may be assigned: *Provided*, That female persons of the Air Force shall not be assigned to aircraft while such aircraft are engaged in combat missions."

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to authorize the enlistment and appointment of women in the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes."

Mr. GURNEY. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House; agree to the conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. HILL conferees on the part of the Senate.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I inquire what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate has completed the call of the calendar under the order of the Senate. There is nothing officially before the Senate at the moment.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1210, House bill 6055.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6055) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1079, House bill 3433.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there is already a motion pending to proceed to the consideration of House bill 6055.

Mr. BUCK. I withdraw my request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is a motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6055.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6055) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

REGULATION OF INSURANCE RATES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and

that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1080, House bill 3998.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1080, House bill 3998? The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3998) to provide for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this goes back to the old bills on the calendar.

Mr. CAIN. That is quite correct.

Mr. WHERRY. The understanding was, when the unanimous-consent order was made last Thursday, that the calendar would be called for the consideration of unobjected-to bills, commencing with order No. 1155. I have no objection to the consideration of House bill 3998, because it is a District of Columbia bill, but I want to make it plain that if we go back beyond the unanimous-consent agreement there might be Senators who would like to be heard and will not have an opportunity to be heard. I shall not object in this particular case, because I think the bill is probably not of particular interest to a great many Senators, but I do feel that we should keep faith with the unanimous-consent order passed last Thursday.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska is entitled to a reason for the consideration of this bill. It is my understanding that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] objected to consideration of the bill on the last call of the calendar, for the reason that the junior Senator from Washington, who had represented him within the committee was absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3998) to provide for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the problem covered by House bill 3998 arises by reason of a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States on June 5, 1944, in the case of *United States* v. *Southeastern Underwriters Association, et al.* (322 U. S. 533, 88 L. ed. 1440), which held that the business of insurance was commerce, and that when it was conducted across State lines it became interstate commerce, and, therefore, subject to the Sherman Antitrust Act. Following the decision, Congress, by Public Law 15, provided a moratorium, giving the right to the several States to enact local regulations or to become subject to the antitrust laws. This moratorium will expire on June 30, 1948.

In a word, the purpose of the bill is to provide for the regulation of insurance rates in the District of Columbia. It is not intended that it shall become a model for any other State. Its passage has been strongly recommended by the Commissioners and by the Insurance Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments reported by the committee will be stated.

The first amendment was, in section 2, page 2, line 22, after the word "reinsurance", to insert "other than joint reinsurance to the extent provided in this act,".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 2, after the word "title", to insert the word "insurance."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendments were, in section 3, on page 3, line 19, after the word "by", to strike out "insurers" and insert "companies"; on page 4, line 3, after the word "upon", to insert the word "the"; in line 4, after the word "experience", to strike out "purpose of insurance"; in line 6, after the words "reasonable considerations", to insert "attributable to such risks"; in line 13, after the words "contract of", to strike out "insurers" and insert "companies"; in line 15, after the word "by", to strike out "insurers" and insert "companies"; in line 17, after the word "may", to strike out "be made" and to insert "become"; at the beginning of line 18, to insert "upon filing"; in line 23, after the word "Act", insert "Rates for contracts or policies described in the last sentence of subsection (c) of section 4 of this act may become effective when made and filing thereof shall be made promptly thereafter"; and on page 5, after line 2, to insert:

(g) No company, agent, or broker shall make, issue, or deliver, or knowingly permit the making, issuance, or delivery of any policy of insurance within the scope of this act contrary to pertinent filings which are in effect for the company as provided in this act, except that upon the written application of the insured stating his reasons therefor, filed with and approved by the Superintendent, a rate in excess of that provided by a filing otherwise applicable may be used on any specific risk.

The amendments were agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 2, to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

(g) No company, agent, or broker shall make, issue, or deliver, or knowingly permit the making, issuance, or delivery of any policy of insurance within the scope of this act contrary to pertinent filings which are in effect for the company as provided in this act, except that upon the written application of the insured stating his reasons therefor, filed with and approved by the Superintendent, a rate in excess of that provided by a filing otherwise applicable may be used on any specific risk.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 13, to strike out "January 1, 1948" and insert "July 1, 1948."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 2, after the words "are not", to strike out "being made."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 1, after the word "policy", to insert "other than one of workmen's compensation or automobile liability insurance," and on line 3, after the words "authority, or", to insert "a contract or policy of any type."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 17, after the word "more", to strike out "admitted insurers" and insert "companies."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 20, after the word "No", to strike "insurer" and insert "company."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 2, after the words "furnishing to", to strike out "admitted insurers" and insert "companies."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, when permission was asked for the consideration of the bill, the request referred to Calendar No. 1079, and the bill now being amended is Calendar No. 1080, House bill 3998.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The request was subsequently altered. The Senator from Delaware was in error in his original request and subsequently changed the request to apply to Calendar No. 1080.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. LANGER. I notice the bill proposes to provide a complete system of insurance regulations for the District of Columbia.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator is precisely correct.

Mr. LANGER. Does it provide regulations similar to those in the States?

Mr. CAIN. It differs in degree from what is done in various States. There is no uniform procedure being followed in the several States under Public Law 15.

Mr. LANGER. Has the insurance commissioner in the State of Washington the right and authority to fix the rates, as he is being given authority in the pending bill?

Mr. CAIN. Public Law 15 gave the States throughout the land the authority and right to regulate rates as they thought proper.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 6, after the words "fleet of", to strike out "insurers" and insert "companies."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 14, to strike out:

(e) as any other type of group, association, or organization, for such purposes, other than those heretofore described in this section, as the Superintendent may, after investigation, approve as being in the interest of the insuring public of the District.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 24, after the words "organization of",

to strike out "insurers" and insert "companies."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 10, after the word "No", to strike out "such."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 21, after the words "Furnished by", to strike out "Insurers" and insert "Companies," and on line 23, after the word "every", to strike out "insurer" and insert "company."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 4, after the word "every", to strike out "insurer" and insert "company"; on line 9, after the words "request to", to strike out "review" and insert "revise"; on line 11, after the words "organization or", to strike out "insurer" and insert "company"; on line 15, after the words "or such", to strike out "insurer" and insert "company"; on line 20, before the word "may", to strike out "insurer" and insert "company."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 14, after the word "act" and the period, to insert "The expense of such examination shall be paid by the company or rating organization examined. In lieu of such examination the Superintendent may, in his discretion, accept a report of examination made by any other insurance supervisory authority."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 2, after the words "organization of", to strike out "insurers" and insert "companies."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 4, to strike out:

The Superintendent shall have no authority at any hearing to compel the attendance of witnesses or to require adherence to formal rules of pleading or evidence. At the request of a party or parties in interest at any hearing, he shall administer oath and shall make a record of the hearing, and upon request of such party or parties he shall make and certify a transcript of the record, the cost of such record and transcript to be paid by the party or parties requesting same.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 12, to insert a new subsection as follows:

(d) The Superintendent may designate one or more rating organizations or other agencies to assist him in gathering statistical data and in making such compilations thereof as may be necessary for the proper administration of this act. Such compilations shall be made available, subject to reasonable rules promulgated by the Superintendent, to companies and rating organizations.

The Superintendent shall have no authority at any hearing to compel the attendance of witnesses and he shall not be required to adhere to formal rules of pleading or evidence. At the request of a party or parties in interest made prior to any hearing, he shall administer oaths to witnesses and shall permit such party or parties, at the cost and expense of one who so requests, to have made a record of the hearing, which record upon request of such party or parties the Superintendent shall certify.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 17, line 6, after the word "shall", to strike out "take effect October 1, 1947" and insert "become effective 30 days after approval."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington explain what is meant by lines 10, 11, and 12 on page 9, which provide:

No group, association, or organization shall engage in any unfair or unreasonable practice in the conduct of its business.

Is there a definition anywhere in the bill of what is an "unfair or unreasonable practice"?

Mr. CAIN. Not so far as I know. I dare say the insurance commissioner of the District of Columbia would be guided by the rules and regulations and directives which have been in operation in the past in defining what is or is not unfair competition or an unreasonable practice. The term is not otherwise defined in the bill, to my knowledge.

I should like to say to the Senator from North Dakota that this particular provision was among the other provisions very carefully examined by the Insurance Commissioner of the District of Columbia, whom Congress holds responsible, and it had his strong support and approval.

Mr. LANGER. What bothers me about the bill is whether the insurance companies can get together and fix prices they are to charge for all the different forms of insurance which are listed. I should like to know about that aspect.

Mr. CAIN. Their ability to do so is subject to review by the Commissioner and approval by him, and in that sense the operation would be no different in the District of Columbia, which is construed to be a State, than in any of the 48 States.

Mr. LANGER. Has the Senator before him the public law he mentioned a moment ago?

Mr. CAIN. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. I wonder if I might see it?

Mr. CAIN. I am glad to hand it to the Senator. The reason why we are pressing for action is that Public Law 15 will expire on the 30th day of June this year.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this bill was taken up unexpectedly, and I had no opportunity to look into it. I should like to have just a moment. I may ask the Senator from Washington whether it sets aside the Sherman Antitrust Act.

Mr. CAIN. I refer the Senator to section 3, subdivision (b), of the law, reading as follows:

Nothing contained in this act shall render the said Sherman Act inapplicable to any agreement to boycott, coerce, or intimidate, or act of boycott, coercion, or intimidation.

If the bill now before the Senate, or a similar measure, shall not be passed by June 30, 1948, the Sherman Antitrust Act and other Federal regulations will apply as to business being done within the District of Columbia, because the District is construed to be a State.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the distinguished Senator very much.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 3998) was read the third time and passed.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6055) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

Mr. BRIDGES. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Legislative branch," on page 2, after line 1, to insert:

SENATE

Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper: For an amount necessary ($3,150) to pay the basic salaries from May 1 to June 30, 1948, inclusive, of the following positions: Clerks—one at $2,500; one at $2,400; four at $1,980 each; one at $1,950: *Provided*, That one position of clerk in folding room at $1,740 per annum be abolished after April 30, 1948; in all, $3,150; and the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1948 hereby is amended accordingly.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 11, to insert:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation: For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation, as authorized by Public Law 472, Eightieth Congress, including per diem and subsistence expenses without regard to the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, approved June 3, 1926, as amended, $20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 18, to insert:

Furniture and repairs: For an additional amount for materials for furniture and repairs of same, exclusive of labor, and for the purchase of furniture, $2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 21, to insert:

Stationery: For an additional allowance for stationery of $200 for each Senator and the President of the Senate, for the second session of the Eightieth Congress, $19,400, to remain available until December 31, 1948.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 3, to insert:

For stationery for committees and offices of the Senate, $2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "House of Representatives," on page 3, after line 3, to insert:

For payment to Adah H. Zimmerman, widow of Orville Zimmerman, late a Representative from the State of Missouri, $12,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 5, to insert:

TEMPORARY CONGRESSIONAL AVIATION POLICY BOARD

For an additional amount for salaries and expenses of the Temporary Congressional Aviation Policy Board created by the act to establish a National Aviation Council, and for other purposes (Public Law 287, 80th Cong.), to be available until June 30, 1948, and to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers approved by the Chairman, $5,000: *Provided*, That expenditures hereunder shall be made in accordance with the laws applicable to inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Independent Offices—Federal Security Agency," on page 7, after line 22, to insert:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Public-health services, Philippine Islands: The maximum price limitations on the purchase of passenger motor vehicles established by or pursuant to section 202 of the act of May 3, 1945 (59 Stat. 106, 131), or section 5 (c) (1) of the act of July 16, 1914, as amended (5 U. S. C. 78), shall not be construed to be applicable to passenger motor vehicles purchased in the Philippine Islands, during the calendar year 1946, by the Public Health Service for public-health work in such islands.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 7, to insert:

OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Such sums as may be necessary are hereby appropriated for making for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1949 payments to States in accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended (29 U. S. C., ch. 4): *Provided*, That the obligations incurred and expenditures made for such purpose under the authority of this paragraph shall be charged to the appropriation therefor in the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1949: *Provided further*, That the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall not exceed the amount paid to the States for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1948 in accordance with such Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Social Security Administration," on page 8, after line 21, to insert:

Grants to States for unemployment compensation administration: For an additional amount for "Grants to States for unemployment compensation administration," $1,850,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 2, after the word "seamen", to strike out "$840,000" and insert "$1,100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Works Agency", on page 9, after line 8, to insert:

PUBLIC BUILDINGS ADMINISTRATION

Plans for elimination of structural and fire hazards, Executive Mansion: For preparation of plans for the elimination of structural and fire hazards in the Executive Mansion, including a survey of the structural condition of the building; the preparation of drawings and specifications for replacement of the existing wooden second-floor structure by a fire-resistant type of construction and for the installation of equipment, devices, and means for modernization of the building; and the making of a report to the Congress of the scope and estimated cost of work required to execute such plans; $50,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 3, to insert:

HOUSING EXPEDITER

Salaries and expenses, Office of the Housing Expediter (Housing and Rent Act of 1948): For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1948 (Public Law 464, approved March 30, 1948), $2,000,000; and the unexpended balances of the appropriations "Salaries and expenses, Office of the Housing Expediter," in the Government Corporation's Appropriation Act, 1948, and "Salaries and expenses, Office of Rent Control," in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, are hereby consolidated with and made a part of this appropriation, the total thereof to be disbursed and accounted for as one fund which shall be available for all of the objects and purposes of said appropriations (except as such purposes may be limited by the Housing and Rent Act of 1948 or other law), and for a health-service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150): *Provided*, That the provision of the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Office of the Housing Expediter," in the Government Corporation's Appropriation Act, 1948, making $1,908,000 available exclusively for terminal leave, is hereby repealed: *Provided further*, That the limitation under the head "Salaries and expenses, Office of Rent Control," in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, on the amount available for deposit in the Treasury for penalty mail is increased from "$175,000" to "$245,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 3, to insert:

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Arbitration and emergency boards: For an additional amount for "Arbitration and emergency boards," $48,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 6, to insert:

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

Salaries and expenses: The limitation under this head in the National Mediation Board Appropriation Act, 1948, on the amount available for compensation and expenses of referees, is increased from "$65,000" to "$75,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 11, to insert:

THE TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Salaries and expenses: The limitation imposed by section 105 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1948, on the amount available for travel expenses under this head, is increased from "$20,000" to "$24,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "District of Columbia," on page 14, after line 6, to insert:

REGULATORY AGENCIES

Office of Administrator of Rent Control: For an additional amount for "Office of Administrator of Rent Control," $10,210.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Guard," on page 14, line 16, after "National Guard", to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$17,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Commerce—Office of the Secretary," on page 15, after line 5, to insert:

Printing and binding: For an additional amount for "Printing and binding," $39,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 17, after "Bureau of the Budget);", to strike out "$750,000 of which" and insert "$375,000: *Provided*, That the authorization granted the Secretary of Commerce in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, with respect to utilization of funds for export controls and for allocation and inventory controls or voluntary agreements relating thereto, is extended from March 31 to June 30, 1948: *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available herein not to exceed $300,000"; in line 24, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$225,000" and insert "$300,000"; on page 16, line 2, after the word "and", to strike out "of which," and in line 3, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$15,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 16, to insert:

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1948, for the furnishing of emergency medical services to employees in Alaska and other areas outside the United States on a reimbursable basis, the appropriations for "Salaries and expenses" of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, "Salaries and expenses" of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and "Salaries and expenses" of the Weather Bureau, shall be available in an amount not to exceed $10,000 during the fiscal year 1948 for furnishing such services without charge when authorized or approved by the Secretary of Commerce.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of the Interior—Bonneville Power Administration," on page 17, line 15, after the word "system", to strike out "$625,000" and insert "$665,000"; and in line 24, after the word "to", to strike out "$2,600,000" and insert "$2,640,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Land Management," on page 18, after line 21, to insert:

Management, protection, and disposal of public lands: The limitation under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1948, on the amount available for the administration of district land offices, is increased from "$310,000" to "$325,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Indian Affairs," on page 19, line 21, after the numerals "1949", to insert "of which amount not to exceed $100,000 shall be available for loans to the Navajo and Hopi Tribes, members or association of members thereof for the purchase of milk animals."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Reclamation—Construction," on page 21, after line 8, to insert:

GENERAL FUND, CONSTRUCTION

General fund, construction: For additional amounts for continuation of construction of

the following projects, to remain available until expended, and to be subject to such limitations and restrictions as may be applicable to appropriations for such purposes in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1948, or other law, as follows:

Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado;

Central Valley project, California, irrigation facilities, $1,274,281.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Colorado River Dam Fund," on page 22, after line 7, to insert:

Boulder Canyon project: For payment to the Boulder City School District in accordance with the provisions of S. 1985, $39,000, payable from the Colorado River Dam fund.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 15, to insert:

BUREAU OF MINES

Synthetic liquid fuels: For an additional amount for "Synthetic liquid fuels," $4,000,000, to remain available until expended, for the payment of obligations incurred under the contract authorization under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1946.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Park Service," on page 23, line 2, after the word "for", to insert "fighting forest fires."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Justice—Legal Activities and General Administration," on page 24, after line 13, to insert:

Fees of witnesses: The limitation under this head in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1948, on the amount available for such compensation and expenses of witnesses or informants as may be authorized or approved by the Attorney General or his administrative assistant is increased from "$25,000" to "$50,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Labor," on page 25, after line 2, to insert:

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

General administration: For an additional amount for "general administration," $40,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 5, to insert:

Grants to States for public employment offices: For an additional amount for "Grants to States for public employment offices," $2,560,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Military Establishment—Department of the Army—Civil Functions—Government and Relief in Occupied Areas," on page 26, line 18, after the figures "$143,000,000", to insert "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Pay of the Army, 1948"."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Department of the Navy—Naval Establishment — Naval Home, Philadelphia, Pa.," on page 27, line 18, after the name "Pennsylvania", to strike out "$3,800" and insert "$9,100."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Post Office Department—Field Service, Post Office Department—Office of the First Assistant Postmaster General," on page 29, line 5, after the figures "$1,000,000", to insert "to be derived by transfer from the appropriations 'Clerks, first- and second-class post offices, 1947,' $300,000, and 'City delivery carriers, 1947,' $700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Second Assistant Postmaster General," on page 29, line 17, after the word "service", to strike out "$765,000" and insert "$665,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 23, after the figures "$224,500", to insert "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Railway Mail Service, 1947'."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 3, after the figures "$42,000", to insert "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Powerboat service, 1946'."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Third Assistant Postmaster General," on page 30, line 23, after the word "old", to strike out "$321,000" and insert "$300,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General," on page 31, line 10, after the word "supplies", to strike out "$305,200" and insert "$89,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public buildings, maintenance and operation," on page 31, line 14, after the figures "$465,000", to insert "of which $100,000 is to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Operating force, public buildings, 1948'."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of State—international obligations and activities," on page 32, line 9, after "January 27, 1948)", to insert "and to administer the program authorized by section 32 (b) (2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (50 U. S. C., App. 1641 (b))"; on page 33, line 21, after the word "That", to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$1,600,000"; in line 23, after "Revised Statutes", to insert "for transfer to the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army"; on page 34, line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$570,000" and insert "$100,000"; and in line 18, after the word "That", to strike out "$60,000" and insert "$100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Treasury Department—Fiscal Service—Bureau of Accounts," on page 36, after line 3, to insert:

Refund of moneys erroneously received and covered: For an additional amount for "Refund of moneys erroneously received and covered," $300,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Refunds under Renegotiation Act, 1948."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 10, after the word "claims", to strike out "$700,000" and insert "$1,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Refunds under Renegotiation Act, 1948'."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of the Public Debt," on page 36, line 16, after the figures "$361,000," to insert "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Administering the Public Debt, 1948.' "

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 17, to insert:

BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

Collecting the revenue from customs: Funds appropriated under this head for the fiscal year 1948 are hereby made available for the payment to bridge, tunnel, and ferry companies, of claims for refund of reimbursements of extra compensation for customs officers and employees for inspectional services in connection with traffic over highways, toll bridges, toll tunnels, or ferries, as required by section 2 of the act of June 3, 1944 (19 U. S. C. 1451a).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, after line 2, to insert:

Refunds and draw-backs: For an additional amount, for "Refunds and drawbacks," $4,500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, after line 4, to insert:

BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Salaries and expenses: The limitation under this head in the Treasury Department Appropriation Act, 1948, on the amount available for printing and binding, is increased from "$2,530,000" to "$2,670,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, after line 9, to insert:

Refunding internal revenue collections: For an additional amount for "Refunding internal revenue collections," $568,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

FICTITIOUS "ECONOMY" CUT RESTORED

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from New Hampshire with respect to the appropriation on page 37, line 12, $568,000,000 for refunding internal revenue collections. Does this amount cover the budget which was before the House for $300,000,000, as well as the supplemental budget?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; it takes in everything. As the Senator from Wyoming knows, we wrote off about $268,000,000, but we decided that inasmuch as we were considering the subject of refunds we would clear the whole item up at the present time, because those funds are drawing interest at 6 percent. So in order to run up the obligation of the country to the least degree we inserted the full amount.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So it was the desire of the committee to make certain that the Treasury shall have on hand the full sum with which to refund these overpaid taxes?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from New Hampshire will recall that a year ago a cut of some $800,000,000 was made in this item. At that time the Senator from Wyoming and some others pointed out that it would only mean the payment

of 6 percent interest upon refunds that were not paid. Now we are obviating that difficulty, are we not?

Mr. BRIDGES. We are.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And we are making an appropriation for the $800,000,000 that was cut out last year, and an additional estimate of $568,000,000? Is that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; $268,000,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Well, including the $300,000,000 which was before the House?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Wiggins, which appears at pages 316 and 317 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate on the first deficiency appropriation bill for 1948.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 16, 1948.

HON. JOHN TABER,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. TABER: Under date of April 14 the President transmitted a supplemental estimate of $268,000,000 for refunding internal-revenue collections in the fiscal year 1948. This is in addition to the amount of $300,000,000 requested in the supplemental estimate submitted under date of January 22, 1948, but which has not been acted upon. Therefore, the total amount which should be appropriated for the fiscal year 1948 for refunding internal-revenue collections is $2,299,000,000. As of this date only $1,731,000,000 has been made available, leaving a balance of $568,000,000 to be appropriated.

As of yesterday, April 15, 1948, the total refunds scheduled to the disburing officers for payment aggregated $1,758,279,324, or $27,279,324 in excess of the total available for refunds. Since there is a period of approximately 10 days between the scheduling operations and the preparation of the checks by the disbursing officers the actual exhaustion of the funds previously appropriated will not occur until on or about May 1. Unless the additional funds of $568,000,000 are made available on or before May 1 the refunding operations will be brought to a close, leaving 2 months of this fiscal year remaining in which no refunds will be made and in which interest on $568,000,000 will accumulate unnecessarily.

More important than the interest element is the fact that close to 10,000,000 taxpayers, primarily in the low-income groups, from whom tax has been withheld from their wages in excess of the tax which they owe, will be deprived of their refunds during this period.

I am sure that you will agree that this is a contingency that should be avoided if it is at all possible to do so.

In view of these circumstances, I feel it my duty to urge that you give early consideration to the supplemental appropriation request referred to herein.

I am today addressing a similar letter to Senator STYLES BRIDGES, chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

A. L. M. WIGGINS,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask for the printing of this letter in order that it may be quite clear that, at last, even though with some reluctance we are doing what President Truman has recommended through his budget messages and the so-called economy cut of last year has been completely restored.

The pay-as-you-go tax law of several years ago with its provision for advance estimates by taxpayers of their tax liability and its provision for tax withholding by employers from the wages and salaries of employees made huge tax refunds absolutely essential.

In his budget message to the first session of this Congress, President Truman asked for an appropriation of $2,031,000,000 to make these refunds during the fiscal year 1948. The Republican leadership insisted on reducing this appropriation by $800,000,000 for the purpose of economy; so last year in the law approved July 1, 1947, we appropriated one billion two hundred and thirty-one million. At the time I said this was a wholly fictitious cut which would have to be restored.

In House Joint Resolution 355, approved March 31, 1948, we restored $500,000,000 of the cut and now we have restored the other $300,000,000 and provided $268,000,000 additional. This we have done all because without the appropriation we would have to pay 6-percent interest, as the Senator from New Hampshire properly says, on the refunds which were not made. Thus the postponement of the payment of our $800,000,000 obligation which we decreed last year served no purpose except to allow certain Members to claim that they had reduced Government spending.

Mr. BRIDGES. At this point, Mr. President, in view of the fact that the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee [Mr. MILLIKIN] is present in the Senate, I might say that the Appropriations Committee instructed me to bring to the attention of the Finance Committee and to the Senate the desirability of reviewing the payment of 6 percent interest on overpayments to the Treasury so far as tax refunds are concerned. We recognize the fact that there is a penalty of 6 percent on underpayments, or on the payments that have not been made. That is, however, more or less in the relation of a penalty. There is a feeling that today, with money bearing only 1 or 2 percent interest, an opportunity which many persons may be taking advantage of is to overpay their tax, and thus have the United States as their debtor, and receive 6 percent interest on the amount overpaid. While we make no specific recommendations, we would appreciate it if the Finance Committee would review the subject with the possibility of taking some action.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am sure that the Finance Committee will appreciate the suggestion and the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee, and the chairman of the Finance Committee will charge himself with bringing the matter to the attention of that committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I inquire whether the report to which the Senator from New Hampshire has just referred in his colloquy with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], chairman of the Finance Committee, has been printed?

Mr. BRIDGES. No. We took the action in the committee as a whole in asking that the matter be called to the attention of the Finance Committee. There is no printed report.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am referring to the report that was prepared by the staff of the joint tax committee. There was a report which was prepared, as I understand, by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, dealing with this very subject.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not know. It was not printed so far as we are concerned.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I feel that it ought to be printed. However, that question can be deferred for future consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Engraving and Printing", on page 37, line 15, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$1,650,000" and insert "$1,250,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Administering the Public Debt, 1948.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Secret Service Division," on page 37, line 23, after the figures "$10,800", to insert "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Salaries and expenses, guard force, Treasury Department, 1948.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Claims for Damages, Judgments, and Audited Claims," on page 38, line 9, after the word "in" to insert "Senate Document No. 132, and", and in line 11, after "Eightieth Congress", to strike out "$14,221,369.83" and insert "$16,047,956.34."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—Reduction in Appropriation—Department of the Army—Military Functions," on page 39, line 17, after "Pay of the Army", to strike out "$175,300,000" and insert "$32,300,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6055) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BRIDGES. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair

appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. MCKELLAR, and Mr. HAYDEN conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MYERS subsequently said: Mr. President, the Senate Appropriations Committee, at my request, has restored the full budget amount of $9,100 for the United States Naval Home at Philadelphia to the first deficiency appropriation bill. The House had reduced this item to $3,800, a cut of $5,300.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as part of the proceedings on that bill, my statement to the Appropriations Committee explaining the need for this modest sum.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 15, 1948.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FRANCIS J. MYERS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, SUBMITTED TO DEFICIENCY SUBCOMMITTEE OF SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE IN REGARD TO DEFICIENCY REQUEST FOR THE NAVAL HOME AT PHILADELPHIA IN H. R. 6055, THE FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL FOR THE 1948 FISCAL YEAR

It may be somewhat incongruous for me to make an issue over a sum of $5,300 in a bill which totaled $324,107,782.50 when it passed the House April 1, particularly since the bill involves many thousands of persons and a variety of Government agencies and functions, whereas the item of $5,300 which I am asking be added to the fund for the Naval Home at Philadelphia affects just a handful of old sailors. Nevertheless, I am impelled to call this item to the attention of this busy and overworked subcommittee because it involves the honor of the United States.

The fact that the item is small, therefore, takes nothing from its importance.

The Naval Home at Philadelphia is one of the oldest establishments of the Federal Government. It grew out of the prize, or bounty act of March 2, 1799, which provided that any surplus in the funds from the sale of prizes of war remaining after the payment of pensions to Navy personnel shall be applied, as Congress may direct, toward provisions for the comfort of disabled officers, seamen, and mariners.

The home was subsequently established in 1811. Up to 1936 it was maintained and supported entirely out of this prize money which accumulated from the early wars up to the Spanish-American War. During much of this period, the Naval Home was maintained merely from the interest, or part of it, on this prize funds, which amounted to something like $15,000,000 at the time it was captured into the Treasury.

Since that fund was taken over by the Treasury, the Naval Home has had to depend upon annual appropriations from Congress. The Congress, I might add, has not been overly generous. Last year, for instance, it cut the budget request for the Naval Home for the current fiscal year by nearly $28,000. That forced the dismissal of many full-time employees and also reduced considerably the number of beneficiaries of the home who could earn modest wages of perhaps $200 or $300 a year by working around the home.

The home cut its staff as fast as it felt it could safely do so, but it soon became obvious, as a result of a required increase in the per diem wages of employees, handed down by a wage board, that it would need additional funds. Rather than reduce their force temporarily, pending a deficiency appropriation, the officials of the home proceeded to make what cuts they could in operation—and the only things they could cut were the rations of the men.

As a result, the tobacco ration was eliminated, I understand, last October. Next, the milk rations were cut out for all the men except those who required milk under doctors' orders.

Subsequently, the Navy went before the House Appropriations Committee to seek a deficiency appropriation of $9,100, which would pay the increased per diem wages for the employees for the rest of the year and release funds now being used for that purpose to be used, instead, for the restoration of the milk and tobacco rations, and to meet increases in food costs.

The House, however, with no explanation, allowed only $3,800. No one seems to know the reason for the cut. It may be the Navy failed to make clear to the House committee exactly how the money was to be used, or it may be that the House believed the $9,100 was to cover a much longer period and that the smaller amount was all that was needed for the remainder of this fiscal year. The Navy says that would not be the case. Admiral Randall Jacobs, the Governor of the Naval Home, discussed this matter with me recently and he is completely in the dark as to the reason for the cut.

If this cut is maintained, I am informed that the milk ration may have to be cut out entirely, meat may be served no oftener than about once a week, and further reductions would be necessary among employees. This would be most cruel and undeserving treatment, I believe, for old sailors who had looked to the home for shelter and protection and fair treatment in their declining years.

Most of them have no other place to go.

Although the population of the home is small, being less than 300, the home has lived and continued all these years as an important morale builder for the older men still on active service who know it is there, should they ever need its shelter.

In reducing the item from $9,100 to $3,800, the House committee provided that the smaller amount shall be transferred from the item of "Officer candidate training, 1948." I am satisfied this transfer procedure is proper and I am further assured there is ample room in the above item for the transfer of the full budget amount of $9,100, and so I ask that the full amount be granted.

How the Congress of the United States can, in any conscience, deny milk to disabled and decrepit old sailors, deny them tobacco, cut them down to an occasional taste of meat, and still consider that we are doing right by these old fellows, is something of which I cannot conceive.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 5728, Calendar 1209, the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5728) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, Members of the Senate have before them the committee report on this appropriation bill, which deals with the Labor and Federal security functions of the Government. The amount of the bill as passed by the House was $905,405,250. The amount of the decrease recommended by the Senate committee to the Senate is $14,653,810, or a total amount, as reported to the Senate, of $890,751,440. This is under the estimates for 1949 by $40,787,729, and is under the 1948 appropriations by $21,206,357.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Department of Labor, Office of the Secretary," on page 2, line 5, after the word "Secretary," to strike out "and for the performance of the functions vested in the Secretary by title I of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (Public Law 101, approved June 23, 1947)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 18, after "District of Columbia", to strike out $1,000,000" and insert "$1,031,555."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 20, after the word "industrial", to strike out "health and"; in line 22, after the word "industry", to insert "and for the performance of the functions vested in the Secretary by title I of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (Public Law 101, approved June 23, 1947), and the functions under the Fair Labor Standards Act transferred under and pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1946 pertaining to research, formulation of standards, and youth employment problems," and on page 3, line 9, after the word "Secretary", to strike out "$200,000" and insert "$450,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 13, after "(39 U. S. C. 321d)", to strike out "$105,000" and insert "$130,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 13, to insert:

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights: For expenses necessary to render assistance in connection with the exercise of reemployment rights of veterans under section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C., App. 308), the Service Extension Act of 1941, as amended, the Army Reserve and Retired Personnel Service Law of 1940, as amended, and, under the act of June 23, 1943, as amended (50 U. S. C., App. 1472), of persons who have performed service in the merchant marine, including personal services in the District of Columbia, $415,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Labor Statistics", on page 4, line 14, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$4,250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Women's Bureau," on page 4, line 20, after the word "exhibits," to strike out "$274,200" and insert "$326,735."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Wage and Hour Division," on page 5, line 3, after the words "for the" to insert "enforcement", and in line 11, after the word "Secretary", to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$4,887,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Federal Security Agency—Bureau of Employees' Compensation," on page 7, line 1, before the word "for" to strike out "$36,000" and insert $41,000", and in line 2, after the word "Appeals", to strike out "$1,371,200" and insert "$1,400,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subsead "Office of Education," on page 13, line 11, after the word "same", to strike out "$1,796,700" and insert "$2,000,000", and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to st ike out the comma and "of which not less than $487,400 shall be available for the Division of Vocational Education as authorized."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Vocational Rehabilitation," on page 14, line 25, after the numerals "1950", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall not exceed the amount paid to the States for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1949."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 10, after the word "films", to strike out "$622,700" and insert "$675,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Health Service," on page 18, line 7, after the word "amended", to strike out "$60,000,000" and insert "$40,000,000", and in line 10, after the words "basis of", to strike out $75,000,000 and insert "$65,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—National Labor Relations Board," on page 29, line 5, after "(28 U. S. C. 921);", to strike out "$7,200,000" and insert "$9,400,000", and in line 10, after the numerals "1949", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That no part of the funds appropriated in this title shall be available to organize or assist in organizing agricultural laborers or used in connection with investigations, hearings, directives, or orders concerning bargaining units composed of agricultural laborers as referred to in section 2 (3) of the act of July 5, 1935 (49 Stat. 459), and as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (Public Law 101, approved June 23, 1947), and as defined in section 3 (f) of the act of June 25, 1948 (52 Stat. 1060)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title VI—Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service," on page 33, line 19, after "(28 U. S. C. 921);", to strike out "$2,540,000" and insert "$2,940,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 2, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$150,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title VII—Reductions in Appropriations—Federal Security Agency," on page 35, line 14, after the word "Agency", to strike out "$15,000" and insert "$10,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 5728) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from California how the appropriations in this bill, in the aggregate, compare with the bill as it passed the House?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Apparently the Senator was not in the Chamber when I made the explanation. The amount of the appropriations as the bill has now passed the Senate, and as recommended by the Committee on Appropriations, is $14,653,810 less than the amount of the bill as it came over from the House of Representatives.

Mr. KEM. I congratulate the Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BALL, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCKELLAR, and Mr. RUSSELL conferees on the part of the Senate.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, ETC., APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 5607, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5607) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Department of State—Department Service," on page 3, line 9, after the word "State", to strike out "$17,168,000" and insert "$21,101,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 19, after the word "for", to strike out "$532,000" and insert "$582,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 2, to insert:

North Atlantic fisheries: For necessary expenses of surveys, discussions, and other activities incident to the participation of the United States in an international agreement relating to conservation of the North Atlantic fisheries, including personal services in the District of Columbia; temporary employment of persons without regard to civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the furtherance of the purpose hereof, $30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Foreign Service," on page 6, line 18, after the word "amended", to strike out "$42,500,000" and insert "$44,665,830", and in line 25, after the word "Revised", to strike out "Statutes" and insert "Statutes,".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 16, after "(22 U. S. C. 1131)", to strike out "$7,000,000" and insert "$7,301,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 20, after "(22 U. S. C. 1131)", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 3, after the word "for", to strike out "$170,000" and insert "$175,485."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 20, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$9,250,000" and insert "$10,250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "International Activities," on page 9, line 11, after "(22 U. S. C. 276, 276a", to insert a semicolon and "Public Law 409, approved February 6, 1948)", and in line 12, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$30,000, of which $15,000 or so much thereof as may be necessary, to assist in meeting the expenses of the American group, shall be disbursed on vouchers to be approved by the President and the executive secretary of the American group."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 18, to insert:

Caribbean Commission (Public Law 431, approved March 4, 1948), $135,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 4, to strike out:

Inter-American Economic and Social Council (57 Stat. 159), $21,810.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, at the beginning of line 15, to strike out "Pan American" and insert "Pan-American", and at the beginning of line 17, to strike out "$347,143" and insert "$1,536,352."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 19, to insert:

South Pacific Commission (Public Law 403, approved January 28, 1948), $20,000;.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 7, after the words "In all", to strike out "$23,208,863" and insert "$24,541,262."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 16, after the word "and", to insert "without regard to the rates of per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence expenses under", and in line 24, after "(44 U. S. C. 111)", to strike out "not to exceed $75,000 for entertainment and representation allowances as authorized by section 901 (3) of the act of August 13, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 1131); $3,600,000" and insert "$4,000,000, of which not to exceed a total of $100,000 may be expended for representation allowances as authorized by section 901 (3) of the act of August 13, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 1131) and for entertainment."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 17, after the word "Revised", to strike out "Statutes" and insert "Statutes,".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 6, after the word "be", to strike out "necessary" and insert "necessary,".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 18, to strike out:

International information and educational activities: For expenses necessary to enable the Department of State to carry out international information and educational activities as authorized by the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, approved January 27, 1948), including personal services in the District of Columbia; employment, without regard to the civil service and classification laws, of persons on a temporary basis (not to exceed $50,000) and aliens within the United States; salaries, expenses, and allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C. 801–1158), except title VII and title VIII; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with activities provided for under this appropriation (not to exceed $6,000); rental of tie lines and teletype equipment; printing and binding, including printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); purchase, rental, operation, and maintenance of printing and binding machines, equipment, and devices abroad; ice, and drinking water for office purposes; acquisition production, and free distribution of information materials for use in connection with the operation, independently or through individuals, including aliens, or public or private agencies (foreign or domestic), and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, of information and educational activities outside of the continental United States, including the purchase of radio time (except that funds herein appropriated shall not be used to purchase more than 75 percent of the effective daily broadcasting time from any person or corporation holding an international short-wave broadcasting license from the Federal Communications Commission without the consent of such licensee), and the maintenance and operation of facilities for radio transmission and reception; purchase and presentation of various objects of a cultural nature suitable for presentation (through diplomatic and consular offices) to foreign governments, schools, or other cultural or patriotic organizations, and the purchase, rental, distribution, and operation of motion-picture projection equipment and supplies, including rental of halls, hire of motion-picture projector operators, and all other necessary services by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; $28,000,000, of which not to exceed $2,500,000 may be transferred to the appropriations "Salaries and expenses, Department of State" "Printing and binding, Department of State", "Salaries and expenses, Foreign Service", "Living and quarters allowances, Foreign Service", and "Printing and binding, Foreign Service", under this title: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 665), the Department of State is authorized in making contracts for the use of the international short-wave radio stations and facilities, to agree on behalf of the United States to indemnify the owners and operators of said radio stations and facilities from such funds as may be hereafter appropriated for the purpose against loss or damage on account of injury to persons or property arising from such use of said radio stations and facilities: *Provided further*, That in the acquisition of leasehold interests (which may be for one or more years) payments may be made in advance for the entire term or any part thereof: *Provided further*, That $4,400,000 of this appropriation shall be available exclusively for the purchase, construction, and improvement of buildings and facilities and the purchase and installation of necessary equipment for radio transmission and reception, including the acquisition of land and interest in land (by purchase, lease, rental, or otherwise) necessary therefor, all without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated herein shall be available for payment to private organizations abroad in pursuance of contracts entered into for the processing and distribution of motion-picture films.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

International information and educational activities: For expenses necessary to enable the Department of State to carry out international information and educational activities as authorized by the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, approved January 27, 1948), and to administer the program authorized by section 32 (b) (2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (50 U. S. C. app. 1641 (b)), including personal services in the District of Columbia; employment, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, of persons on a temporary basis (not to exceed $50,000) and aliens within the United States; salaries, expenses, and allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C. 801–1158), except title VII and title VIII; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with activities provided for under this appropriation (not to exceed $6,000); printing and binding; hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); radio activities and acquisition and production of motion pictures and visual materials and purchase or rental of technical equipment and facilities therefor, narration and script-writing, by contract or otherwise, acquisition of printed materials, purchase of objects for presentation to foreign governments, schools, or organizations, and information and educational activities outside the continental United States, all without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; $27,000,000, of which not to exceed $2,600,000 may be transferred to other appropriations of the Department of State: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 665), the Department of State is authorized in making contracts for the use of the international short-wave radio stations and facilities, to agree on behalf of the United States to indemnify the owners and operators of said radio stations and facilities from such funds as may be hereafter appropriated for the purpose against loss or damage on account of injury to persons or property arising from such use of said radio stations and facilities: *Provided further*, That in the acquisition of lease-hold interests payments may be made in advance for the entire term or any part thereof: *Provided further*, That $2,400,000 of this appropriation shall be available, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes for transfer to the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, exclusively for the purchase, construction, and improvement of buildings and facilities, purchase and installation of necessary equipment for radio transmission and reception, and the acquisition of land and interest in land outside the continental United States by purchase, lease, rental, or otherwise, without regard to section 355 of the Revised Statutes, but title to any land so acquired shall be approved by the Secretary of State; and, in addition, the Corps of Engineers is hereby authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes specified in this proviso, and under the same conditions, in an amount not to exceed $2,000,000: *Provided further*, That funds herein appropriated shall not be used to purchase more than 75 percent of the effective daily broadcasting time from any person or corporation holding an international short-wave broadcasting license from the Federal Communications Commission without the consent of such licensee: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated herein shall be available for payment to private organizations abroad in pursuance of contracts entered into for the processing and distribution of motion-picture films.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$10,000", and on page 28, line 6, after the word "boats", to strike out "$3,900,000" and insert "$4,250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 1, after the words "provisions of", to strike out "title" and insert "titles."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Department of Justice—Legal Activities and General Administration," on page 34, line 22, after "For the Tax Division", to strike out "$800,000" and insert "$875,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$200,000" and insert "$100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, in line 24, after the word "bailiffs", to strike out "criers."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair suggests to the Senator from Minnesota that the word "and", after the word "bailiffs", should also be stricken out.

Mr. BALL. Yes; the "and" should also be stricken out, and I offer that change as an amendment to the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "immigration and Naturalization Service," on page 42, line 22, after the word "thereto", to insert "and for all necessary expenses incident to the maintenance, care, detention, surveillance, parole, and transportation of alien enemies and their wives and dependent children, including transportation and other expenses in the return of such persons to place of bona fide residence or to such other place as may be authorized by the Attorney General;" and on page 43, line 3, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "$26,900,000" and insert "$27,150,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—Department of Commerce—Office of the Secretary," on page 49, line 11, after "(not exceeding $1,000)", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert $1,050,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 19, after "(44, U. S. C. 111, 220)", to strike out "$1,100,000" and insert "$1,200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, after line 19, to insert:

Technical and scientific services: For necessary expenses in the performance of activities and services relating to the collection, compilation, and dissemination of technological information as an aid to business in the development of foreign and domestic commerce, including personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $10,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and not to exceed $20,000 for printing and binding, $200,000, of which $8,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses" under the Office of the Secretary: *Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized, upon request of any public or private organization or individual, to reproduce by appropriate process, independently or through any other agency of the Government, any scientific or technical report, document, or descriptive material, foreign or domestic, which has been released for public dissemination, and to sell such reproductions at a price not less than the estimated total cost of reproducing and disseminating same as may be determined by the Secretary, the moneys received from such sale to be deposited in a special account in the Treasury, such account to be available for reimbursing any appropriation which may have borne the expense of such reproduction and dissemination and making refunds to organizations and individuals when entitled thereto.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of the Census," on page 51, line 24, after the word "paper", to strike out "$3,889,000" and insert "$5,623,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, line 15, after the word "paper", to strike out "$635,000" and insert "$785,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Civil Aeronautics Administration," on page 53, line 9, after the word "witnesses," to insert "examination of estimates of appropriations in the field;" and in line 24, after the word "towers", to strike out "*Provided further*, That the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as successor to Defense Plant Corporation and acting by and through the War Assets Administrator, is authorized and directed to transfer to the United States and jurisdiction of the Federal Works Agency (Public Buildings Administration) without charge a tract of land and the improvements thereon at Los Angeles, Calif., covered by lease dated January 1, 1947, between the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and surplus to the needs of the Corporation" and in lieu thereof to insert the following "*Provided further*, That the War Assets Administrator, acting for and on behalf of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, is authorized and directed to transfer to the United States without reimbursement or transfer of funds, legal title to a certain tract of land and improvements thereon at Los Angeles, Calif., covered by lease dated January 1, 1947, between the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and heretofore designated by that Corporation on Plancor 890 and declared surplus to the needs of that Corporation, and to transfer such property to the control and jurisdiction of the Federal Works Agency (Public Buildings Administration): *Provided further*."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 15, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$10,099,000" and insert "$10,211,660."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, line 2, after the word "exceeding", to strike out "$34,392,000" and insert "$37,000,000"; in the same line, after the word "which", to strike out "$33,892,000" and insert "$36,500,000"; and in line 19, after the word "appropriation", to strike out the colon and "*Provided further*, That no part of the appropriation herein made shall be expended on the development of Fort Worth International Airport in Tarrant County, Tex."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Civil Aeronautics Board", on page 59, line 14, after the words "per annum", to insert "and the salaries of the other members of the Board shall be at the rate of $11,500 per annum."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce", on page 61, line 21, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a), to strike out "$5,300,000" and insert "$4,500,000"; and on page 62, line 2, after the word "appropriated", to strike out the colon and "*Provided further*, That $25,000 shall be available exclusively to carry out a study of hard fibers and hard fiber products."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, line 11, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$2,204,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Patent Office", on page 62, line 25, after the word "photolithography", to strike out "$8,000,000" and insert "$8,350,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, line 5, after the word "binding", to strike out "$1,750,000" and insert "$1,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Bureau of Standards," on page 65, line 7, after the word "data," to strike out "$3,900,000" and insert "$4,339,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Weather Bureau," on page 66, line 20, after the word "stations," to strike out "$21,880,000" and insert "$22,380,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General Provisions—Department of Commerce," in section 302, on page 68, line 13, after the word "available," to insert "in an amount not to exceed $10,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title IV—The Judiciary—Other Federal Courts—Miscellaneous Items of Expenses," on page 75, after line 23, to insert:

Salaries of criers: For salaries of criers as authorized by the act of December 7, 1944 (28 U. S. C. 9), and the acts of March 3, 1911, and March 3, 1891, as amended (28 U. S. C. 224 and 547), $468,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 25, after the word "for," to strike out "$1,775,000" and insert "$1,844,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, line 12, after the word "clerk," to strike out "$577,000" and insert "$607,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I offer on behalf of the committee and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 76, in line 25, after the figures "$1,844,000", it is proposed to insert "*Provided*, That the compensation of secretaries and law

clerks of circuit and district judges (exclusive of any additional compensation under the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 and any other acts of similar purport subsequently enacted) shall be fixed by the Director of the Administrative Office without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that the salary of a secretary shall conform with that of the main (CAF–4), senior (CAF–5), or principal (CAF–6) clerical grade, or assistant (CAF–7), or associate (CAF–8) administrative grade, as the appointing judge shall determine, and the salary of a law clerk shall conform with that of the junior (P–1), assistant (P–2), associate (P–3), full (P–4), or senior (P–5) professional grade, as the appointing judge shall determine, subject to review by the judicial council of the circuit if requested by the Director, such determination by the judge otherwise to be final: *Provided further,* That (exclusive of any additional compensation under the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 and any other acts of similar purport subsequently enacted) the aggregate salaries paid to secretaries and law clerks appointed by one judge shall not exceed $6,500 per annum, except in the case of the senior circuit judge of each circuit and senior district judge of each district having five or more district judges, in which case the aggregate salaries shall not exceed $7,500."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Minnesota in behalf of the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. May we have an explanation of the amendment?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, this provision has been in the bill for several years. It was stricken out by the House of Representatives this year. It permits the fixing of the salaries of secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges in accordance with a formula developed by the Conference of Senior Circuit Judges. In accordance with the amendment, the salaries of such law clerks and secretaries of long service will be somewhat in excess of the salaries permitted by the Classification Act. I may say that in the codification of the Federal judicial procedures, now pending in the Judiciary Committee, this provision is included in that code, which already has passed the House, and that is why the House did not include this provision in the appropriation bill. But in case that code is not enacted at this session, we want this appropriation bill to include this amendment, so as to permit the secretaries and law clerk of circuit and district judges to be paid in accordance with the pay schedules which they themselves have permitted. Funds in the amount of $65,000 are included in the bill, in order to permit this to be done.

If this amendment is not adopted, it will mean substantial pay cuts for such secretaries and law clerks who have been with their judges for a number of years, and probably it will mean that the judges will not longer be able to have the benefit of their services.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota in behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, in printing the bill, one word was omitted on page 42. I offer an amendment to correct that omission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 42, line 20, after the semicolon, it is proposed to insert the word "and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota whether the appropriations contemplate substantial reductions in the pay rolls of the four departments.

Mr. BALL. I do not believe there will be any reduction in the Department of Justice for which the appropriation remains about the same as last year. There will be some reductions in the Department of Commerce, but none in the Judiciary. There will be some increase in the Department of State, particularly for the Office of Information.

Mr. KEM. There is a widespread feeling in the country that pay rolls in many of the Government departments, including some of those dealt with in the pending bill, are entirely beyond reason, that they have swollen and grown beyond any reason. I ask the Senator if the committee studying the situation confirmed that as a fact, or determined otherwise?

Mr. BALL. I may say to the Senator that the subcommittee is pretty well satisfied with respect to the Department of Justice. It is one department which did not increase its employment very much during the war. Although some additional work was assigned to the Department the increase in employment was relatively minor. The Department of State of course has expanded tremendously. As a matter of fact, the committee had to increase the amount of the appropriation by nearly $12,500,000 above the amount allowed by the House, principally by reason of the increase in the State Department's budget, which the House had cut. Although the Budget estimates for the departmental and foreign services were less than for the current fiscal year, the House had cut the budget estimates about $6,500,000. Both the subcommittee and the full committee felt we simply could not justify reducing the appropriation for the Department of State. That would have forced a layoff of about 800 employees in Washington and 700 or 800 in the field, or abroad. In view of the critical international situation, the committee did not feel it could justify that kind of reduction at the present time, although I think probably a majority of the subcommittee feels that the administrative organization in the Department of State in Washington is wasteful and that probably there is considerable duplication of effort, simply because geographical desks are set up for various regions and countries in order to discharge four different functions connected with intelligence, political affairs, economic affairs, and the information program. I think the subcommittee feels that the duplication of geographical desks, in many cases dealing with very similar subjects, could be eliminated or at least considerably reduced, but the committee did not feel that it could at this time force a reduction of that kind on the Department by a drastic cut in funds.

Mr. KEM. Was the attention of the committee directed to the situation in the Department of Commerce?

Mr. BALL. Yes. The House cut the Department of Commerce, particularly the Census Bureau, in connection with current census statistics. The major increase for the Department of Commerce is in that Bureau. We granted, as I recall, about a third of the requested restoration. The House, for example, completely eliminated the appropriation for the collection of Government statistics. We did not feel that could be justified, though I am inclined to agree with the Senator that in many of the statistical agencies of which, to my knowledge, there are three major ones, there is considerable duplication, and considerable expense could be saved through better coordination in the gathering of statistics for the Government.

Mr. KEM. I am sure the Senator is cognizant of the fact that in the 1946 campaign a great deal was said about reducing Government pay rolls. When the Eightieth Congress convened, it was widely thought that substantial reductions would be made. I should like to ask the Senator if he thinks all has been done in that respect that should be done, and if the pending bill represents a determined and courageous effort to reduce pay rolls in the departments affected.

Mr. BALL. I may say to the Senator that last year, particularly in the Department of Commerce, there was an over-all reduction of from 20 to 30 percent. I think there could be a further reduction in many of the departments, but it is very difficult for a congressional committee to make the reductions intelligently without better cooperation by the departments themselves. For example, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, which, incidentally, did not appeal the reductions made by the House, spends at least $100,000,000 a year. To study its expenditures in detail and decide intelligently where reductions can be made would usually take more time than a subcommittee of Congress can devote to one particular bureau, and there are 30 or 40 such bureaus covered by the bill.

I think that as the years roll along we can concentrate each year on one particular bureau and perhaps make a thorough study. I think we did a very thorough job last year. I will admit we did not dig into the bureaus as deeply this year as we did in 1947, but as I say I do not think we have provided for any great expansion of employment in any of them. There is a reduction in the Department of Commerce, there is no reduction of expansion in the Department of Justice, there is some in the State Department, as I say, and in the new Office of Information.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator another question, addressing it to him as a member of the Appropriations Committee generally, rather than as chairman of a particular subcommittee. Why is it that when appropriation bills come from the House to the Senate, we so often find it necessary or advisable to increase the amount allowed by the House?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Missouri, I think the explanation is simply that a tradition has developed to the effect that the House handles the bills initially, and the House usually makes about as drastic a cut as it thinks any bureau can stand. In actual practice, the function of the Senate Appropriations Committee is like that of an appeal board, in passing upon reductions made by the House. It is only within the past 2 years that there has been any effort on the part of the Senate Committee on Appropriations to go into the departmental requests and items, regardless of House action, and to make reductions in items beyond what the House has made, even when the department or bureau was not appealing; but in general the function of the Senate and of the Senate Appropriations Committee in handling the bills is that of an appellate tribunal, passing upon reductions made by the House.

Mr. KEM. Why is it that it cannot work the other way? Why cannot the interests of the public and of the taxpayer be considered by the Senate when acting in the capacity of a reviewing authority? We have just passed on the bill for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related agencies. My recollection is that at the last session the appropriation was reduced by the Senate. I was very much encouraged to learn today that it has again been reduced by the Senate. I do not mean to make invidious comparisons; I am merely seeking information, but why is it that a committee can, in two successive sessions, put on that kind of performance, whereas so many of the other subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations, as the Senator says, act as a reviewing authority, with the idea of determining how the appropriations may consistently be increased?

Mr. BALL. I think we decreased some items in the bill. I happen to be a member of the subcommittee which handled the labor and security bill. Last year we increased a great many items, but we came out with a net decrease, because we reduced grants to States for unemployment compensation. This reduction comes about largely because we reduced the cash appropriation to pay for contract authorizations already granted in the amount of $60,000,000. We reduced the figure from $60,000,000 cash to $40,000,00 cash, because we were convinced they would not need the cash during the coming fiscal year. Eventually they will need it. It is a reduction only in the next fiscal year. So that while the reduction in the next fiscal year is real, it is a situation which does not obtain as to every bill.

Mr. KEM. I notice that the net result of the bill is to increase the aggregate amount provided by the House by approximately $12,000,000. Is most of that amount for additional pay-roll expense?

Mr. BALL. Most of it is to keep the pay rolls at or somewhat below existing levels, particularly for the State Department. Except in international broadcasting, there are no pay rolls increased above existing levels.

Mr. KEM. Where does the increase come in, then?

Mr. BALL. The House reduced the funds for the State Department, I believe, approximately $6,500,000 below the budget estimates. The Senate committee could not find any justification at this time, facing the situation which we face in international affairs, for reducing the funds for the Foreign Service of the State Department.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 5607) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show that I voted against the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The RECORD will so show.

Mr. BALL. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. BALL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCKELLAR, and Mr. TYDINGS conferees on the part of the Senate.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I ask unanimous consent that the Appropriations Committee be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 428) to provide for an increase in the combined amounts of retired pay for services as a commissioned officer and compensation from a civilian position with the Government which may be received by individuals and that the bill be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made, and the bill will be referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, pursuant to notice previously given by the Chair, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of executive business.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

W. AVERELL HARRIMAN

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will report the nomination of Mr. W. Averell Harriman.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of W. Averell Harriman to be United States Special Representative in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like the RECORD to show that I voted against the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Harriman.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The RECORD will so show.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will proceed to state the nominations.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Air Force.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Air Force nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Navy nominations are confirmed en bloc.

MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Marine Corps nominations are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate will return to the consideration of legislative business.

EFFORTS TO UNDERMINE THE FREE PRESS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to take a few moments to discuss what I consider one of the most flagrant and vicious attempts to undermine the free press of this country that I have come across for many years. This attempt was made in two ways. One was out-and-out bribery of American newspaper cartoonists. The second was a despicable set of lies, addressed to the editors of this country, regarding the National Health Assembly, which meets in Washington May 1 to May 4, 1948.

The culprit is the so-called National Physicians Committee—a notorious and disgraceful lobby managed by a few highly paid public relations men who, through misrepresentation, annually extort hundreds of thousands of dollars from physicians and drug houses. In the past, this organization has been repeatedly guilty of using the vicious Hitler-Stalin tactic of the great lie—for example in labeling as communistic legislation endorsed by two Presidents of the United States and sponsored by six Members of the United States Senate, four of whom are also members of that church which is perhaps communism's greatest enemy. Despite the fact that it was dealing with matters literally involving life and death, the National Physicians Committee has spent over a million dollars in appeals to fear and hate, but not a nickel on appeals to reason.

Now, to the everlasting shame of thousands of honest and conscientious doctors throughout the country, this depraved group, in their names, has reached a new low and is attempting to bribe the cartoonists of America and thereby to buy the editorial opinions of the Nation's press.

It is to the everlasting credit of Editor and Publisher, perhaps the leading magazine in the field of practical and effective journalism, that it accepted the National Physicians Committee's full-page advertisement of a fake prize contest, through which the bribe was offered, and then ran an editorial which denounced the advertisement as an attempt at bribery, which called on the American society of newspaper editors for a revision of the canons of journalism to make such trickery impossible in the future.

I have here a copy of the full-page advertisement I referred to. It was published in the February 28 issue, Editor and Publisher. It is signed by the National Physicians Committee of Chicago, Ill.

The advertisement announces the offer of 14 cash awards to newspaper cartoonists for the most effective portrayal "of the meaning and implications of political distribution of health-care services in the United States."

The top prize is $1,000, and eight other awards range from $500 to $100.

Despite the obscure phrasing of the basis of these awards, the purpose is obvious. What the committee is looking for—and what it will distribute the prize money for—is published cartoons attacking the principle of national health insurance.

To make this purpose crystal clear, so there will be no possible misunderstanding, the advertisement reprints a sample cartoon, published some years ago by J. M. Darling, otherwise known as "Ding."

This cartoon shows Congress in the guise of an unattractive old biddy pouring out a dose of medicine to be administered to the poor long-suffering public. The medicine is labeled "Socialized Medicine—$3,000,000,000 a Bottle." The frightened Mr. Public is being held tightly in the grasp of a gentleman labeled "Political Quack." In the foreground is another gentleman, labeled "Medical Science" who is depicted as having been bound and gagged—in other words, helpless to prevent the outrage. And in the background is a group of mourners gathered around the coffin of an admittedly able citizen, now presumably deceased, labeled "Free enterprise."

At the top of the cartoon is the caption, "It is all mixed and ready to swallow."

I have no quarrel with Mr. Darling or with his right to present his own views through his syndicated cartoon strip. From a purely objective viewpoint I can even admire the skill with which he managed to compress into one picture all the prejudices and fears of those vested interests which are arrayed against this proposed legislation.

What I do object to is this outrageous and cynical attempt, on the part of the National Physicians' Committee, to bribe the cartoonists of America into helping them spread their propaganda. No matter what opinion any member of this honorable body may hold as to the merits of the legislation involved, I know that each of my colleagues will join me in condemning this vicious, underhanded attempt to buy the free editorial-cartoon expression of the newspapers of this country.

Do not make any mistake. In spite of the risk of possible flare-backs which such a campaign of chicanery may engender, this method of poisoning the wells of public opinion is extraordinarily and insidiously clever. No self-respecting newspaper cartoonist would countenance an outright effort to offer him a bribe. He would reject indignantly any attempt to slip him, say, $50 for putting across a cartoon angled to meet the requirements of some special interest. But a prize contest is, psychologically, something else again. On the surface it is all open and aboveboard. By the terms of the conditions, he could even submit a cartoon in favor of so-called socialized medicine—that is, if he were naive enough to believe that such an entry would be given a moment's consideration.

I say it may seem open and aboveboard. But the real catch in this contest—now get this—is the requirement that the cartoon, to be entered, must first have been published in some newspaper or syndicate feature. The committee makes sure that the cartoon achieves its normal circulation before it is even judged.

There is probably many a hard-pressed cartoonist, sitting hunched over his drawing board, trying to dig out an idea for tomorrow's paper, who might grasp at this ready-prepared subject as a means of meeting a deadline. Moreover, like lots of the rest of us, he might well be worried over money. Who could not use an extra thousand—or even an extra hundred?

This latest and most outrageous attempt to exert undue influence on public opinion focuses attention once again on this highly questionable National Physicians' Committee. The full name of this group is the National Physicians' Committee for the Extension of Medical Services. It describes itself as a "nonpolitical, nonprofit organization for maintaining ethical and scientific standards and extending medical services to all the people."

It calls itself "nonpolitical," yet is registered under the Lobbying Act. It calls itself "nonprofit," but the three laymen running it profit to the tune of ten to fourteen thousand dollars a year salaries, plus apparently unlimited expense accounts. It calls itself a "physicians committee," but its list of contributors of $500 or more submitted under the Lobbying Act sets forth the names of some 14 drug manufacturers, but does not include that of a single physician. It says its purpose is to extend medical services to all the people, but its record shows over a million dollars spent in opposing health legislation, and not a penny spent or an action taken which extended medical care to anyone.

From behind all this pious verbiage emerges the blunt fact that the committee is the political lobbying and propaganda bureau of the American Medical Association—and that its chief purpose today is the blocking of any legislation aimed at the extension of medical services under a system of national health insurance.

Over the past 6 years this committee has admittedly spent over a million dollars in its propaganda efforts to accomplish this end. It has flooded the country with more than 25,000,000 pamphlets and circulars distributed through every conceivable channel, including over-the-counter hand-outs in the large drugstore chains. It has arranged for the publication of more than 3,000 full-page advertisements in various newspapers throughout the country. It has swamped newspapers and other periodicals with everything from carefully angled news stories to pretendedly forthright, carefully written editorials which an editor is free to run as an expression of his own views. It has made wide use of the radio, direct-mail solicitation, education, and every other known technique of public relations, including the direct lobbying of United States Senators and Representatives here in Washington.

This cartoon-prize award stunt is merely the latest example of the committee's consummate skill in publicity methods. It is apparently a forerunner of the campaign which has been scheduled for this year and for which, I am informed, the committee is planning to spend some $600,000—or double the amount spent in 1947.

Some of this money is undoubtedly contributed by physicians who perhaps believe that the inauguration of a system of national health insurance will damage their own pocketbooks. But tens of thousands of dollars, by the admission of the committee itself, have been contributed by the great pharmaceutical manufacturers and other interests allied to the drug and medical fields.

I cannot believe that these manufacturers are opposed to a health-insurance program which would make medical care available to many more people than can now afford it. After all, even from a purely selfish point of view, these men must realize that more people getting more medical care means more drugs

sold. One is forced to wonder whether it can be the power of the politicians of organized medicine to endorse or withhold endorsement of drug products which accounts for these contributions by reputable manufacturers to so odious an outfit.

This National Physicians' Committee was organized originally to take over the publicity and propaganda activities of the American Medical Association at a time when it was feared that such activities might undermine the tax-exempt status of the parent organization. Many reputable doctors—members of the AMA—have protested the right of this committee to assume these functions. They charge it with being an irresponsible clique which, by its ruthless and scurrilous attacks on all proponents of national-health insurance, is putting not only the AMA but all honest medical practitioners in bad odor with the American people.

The basic line of attack of this propaganda is quite simple. It is to smear the whole project as socialized medicine, relying on the effect of that horrendous word "socialism" to scare ordinary minded citizens away. Not content with this snide attack, they are now labeling the proposal out-and-out communistic. Riding the wave of our present international difficulties, they are working the "Red menace" for all it is worth.

National health insurance, they tell us, is a project conceived by the Kremlin and fostered by Communist Reds and fellow travelers in this country for the sole purpose of inserting an entering wedge for the overthrow of our democratic system of government. Any person who supports the project is pro-Stalin and anti-American. Any person who opposes it is a stanch defender of private enterprise and the American way of life.

I do not have to state my own profound conviction about democracy and the American way of life to resent this cheap, mendacious appeal to emotionalism and insult to the intelligence of the American public.

I have no present intention of discussing the merits of the bill, as such. I recognize that there exist many honest differences of opinion as to the advisability of enacting such legislation. But while I am on the subject, I should like to draw attention to the smear attack now being unleashed by this same national physicians committee against the projected National Health Assembly which is to meet here in Washington on May 1.

This National Health Assembly, as Senators all know, has been called by the Federal Security Administrator, Oscar R. Ewing. The purpose of the assembly is to develop a concrete plan for increasing the health safeguards of this Nation over the next 10 years. It will be attended by some 700 to 800 representatives of public and private organizations and agencies concerned with various phases of the Nation's health. Its executive committee comprises leaders in the several fields involved, including a number of eminent physicians and other outstanding leaders in the health field.

There is no one in touch with the many pressing problems of public health in this country who does not recognize the vital necessity of making an expert appraisal of our needs and of laying down a concrete program of action.

Among these are:

The problem of sanitation—of improved water supply and sewerage systems for our towns, cities, and rural areas.

The necessity for more hospitals and medical centers to serve the needs of our population.

The lack of adequate personnel in our public-health services, and the crying need to train thousands more doctors, dentists, nurses, laboratory technicians.

The problem of what to do about the startling fact that 8,000,000 Americans are today suffering from some form of mental or nervous illness.

The always present problem of school health and the need of expanding regular health examinations, medical treatment, and physical education services for the benefit of our children.

Then there are the vocational rehabilitation services, the maternal and child-health services, the services for crippled children, and many other problems.

These are among the major topics for discussion which appear on the agenda which has been drawn up for the assembly. By common consent they are noncontroversial matters, that is to say, they involve areas of activity which most responsible physicians and public-spirited citizens agree should be further explored.

Certainly, to the health and well-being of the 145,000,000 American men, women, and children they are matters of the greatest importance, and any honest attempt, by a responsible group of citizens, to meet the challenge of these problems should be given every encouragement and support.

But what do our friends the National Physicians' Committee say to all this? In a canned editorial, for distribution among newspaper editors all over the country, they lash out at it as a politically inspired move on the part of the President—engineered by what they describe as his extreme leftist advisers—to strengthen his position in the 1948 campaign. Ignoring the clearly stated intent of the assembly, they insinuate that its only objective is to push forward the administration's program of so-called socialized medicine. To their bigoted and narrow minds it can have no other purpose.

As proof of their contention, they point out that both President Truman and Federal Security Administrator Ewing are on record in favor of national health insurance. They charge the Federal Security Administration, which is sponsoring the assembly, as being, in its study division the "nerve center of socialized medicine propaganda for the entire world." And they interject downright lies—or at least totally misleading statements—concerning the experience of Great Britain in implementing a similar system.

I do not have to point out that the findings arrived at on this controversial subject of national health insurance by the study division of the FSA were based on hard, laborious and objective research—and that, despite attack, they have been substantially accepted not only by many prominent physicians, but by such representative leaders as Bernard Baruch, Bishop Francis J. McConnell, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, and Gerard Swope.

By dragging the red herring of Socialist-inspired—or Communist inspired—national health insurance across the trail of this assembly, the National Physicians' Committee reveal themselves as opposed to any rational attempt to improve the Nation's health so long as this attempt is sponsored by the Government. Their cry of free enterprise, as it involves their own profession, is employed to scotch every effort toward liberal reform.

Because of its immoderate activities, this committee has been called one of the most reactionary elements in our entire national economy—and with its powerful propaganda and lobbying machine, one of the most dangerous.

I think that has now been clearly demonstrated. But in order to destroy any possibility that Senators on the other side of the aisle might think my remarks tinged with partisanship, let me quote another characterization of the National Physicians' Committee:

> The National Physicians' Committee has supplied the medical profession and the public with sheer buncombe * * * its publications are misleading * * * it is an inimical force working against the medical profession from within.

Those statements were made, Mr. President, not by a proponent of national health insurance, but by Dr. Shearon, the expert on medical care matters employed by the Republican National Committee.

I hope the people of this country, together with all newspaper editors and radio commentators, will appraise the national health assembly, convening May 1, for what it actually is—and not what these reactionary elements claim it to be.

I hope they will appreciate that it is not called merely to put its seal of approval on a program already determined by the Government, but that it is a meeting of recognized authorities in the field of medical and health services—few of whom have any political ax to grind—and that the sole purpose of these authorities is to lay out a practical and comprehensive program for improving this Nation's health, over the next 10 years, based on their own individual knowledge and experience.

I think it is highly to the credit of this administration that it has sponsored the calling of this assembly. I think it has been wise in its decision to allow whatever program is formulated to be developed from the grass roots for the grass roots of this country, by those who are closest to the actual situation.

I repeat, Mr. President, I think it is to the everlasting shame of thousands of honest, conscientious, social-minded doctors throughout the land that they permit this vicious so-called National Physicians' Committee to continue its activities—and to create the impression that the medical profession of this Nation is opposed to any progress in the domain of this country's public health.

In closing, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the three excerpts from the magazine Editor and Publisher which I hereby submit, together with an article by Lowell Mellett from the Wash-

ington Star, be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Editor and Publisher of February 28, 1948]

ANNOUNCING CASH AWARDS FOR CARTOONISTS—FOURTEEN IMPORTANT AWARDS

Over a period of years, it has been our privilege to reprint many cartoons portraying artists' appraisal of the political distribution of medical care in the United States. One of these cartoons appears in this announcement.

Any cartoonist regularly employed by any newspaper or magazine of general distribution or by any syndicated service is eligible to submit exhibits to be judged for the awards.

First award	$1,000
Second award	500
Third award	250
Fourth award	200
Fifth award	150
Sixth to ninth awards (each)	100

BASIS OF AWARDS

Judging will be based solely on originality and effective portrayal of the meaning and implications of political distribution of health-care services in the United States.

FOLLOWING ARE THE RULES

1. Entrants must submit 10 copies of publication in which the cartoon has been published, with a letter of formal application approved by his publisher.

2. Full permission must be granted by publisher to reprint the cartoon submitted.

3. Six copies of engravers' proofs of original illustration must be provided.

4. The period of this effort will be March 1 to May 31, 1948. Wherever editorial deadline is prior to April 1, artists may submit advance proofs of publication with statement from publisher that the cartoon is to be published on a specific date.

5. All exhibits submitted must be postmarked before midnight, May 31, 1948, and must be mailed or delivered to twenty-first floor, Lincoln Tower Building, Chicago, Ill. Entrants may submit as many published cartoons as they desire.

6. Judges will comprise a group of nationally known publishers and editors. Decision of judges will be final. In case of ties, duplicate awards will be made. No individual cartoonist shall be eligible for more than one award.

7. In addition to cash awards listed above, an appropriate parchment scroll, award of merit, will be given to each winner.

WRITE FOR FACTUAL DATA

Write today for free package of supplemental data which already have been published by leading periodicals with the objective of preserving in the United States our system of freedom of enterprise to the end that doctors of medicine may retain, in the public interest, their personal independence, their individual and collective integrity and effectiveness.

Your understanding of purpose is sought and cooperation is welcomed in the belief that joint efforts may result in the attainment of these objectives.

We shall be happy to send you additional brochures, articles, and reports of general information which will be helpful to you.

NATIONAL PHYSICIANS' COMMITTEE
FOR THE EXTENSION OF MEDICAL SERVICE
CHICAGO, ILL.

A nonpolitical, nonprofit organization for maintaining ethical and scientific standards and extending medical service to all the people.

[From Editor and Publisher of March 6, 1948]

QUESTIONABLE CONTEST

The National Physicians' Committee for the Extension of Medical Service, an organization opposed to the Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill, and other like measures, is offering $3,000 in prizes to newspapers and magazine cartoonists for their "portrayal of the meaning and implications of 'political distribution of health care services in the United States.'" An ad announcing this contest with $1,000 first prize appeared in Editor and Publisher last week.

Completely ignoring the political viewpoint of this committee, which it is not our function to criticize or evaluate, let us analyze the contest.

First, the rules make it clear that no cartoon will qualify for 1 of the 14 cash awards unless it takes a position against the proposed bill. A "Ding" Darling cartoon, printed in the ad lampooning "Socialized Medicine," serves as a guide.

Second, proof of publication is required to enter the "contest."

The contest rules leave no doubt that this is a subtle bribe to cartoonists to support or oppose certain political beliefs (according to how you look at it) and to obtain general circulation for those beliefs in newspapers and magazines. In other words, large cash rewards are offered to cartoonists for doing a propaganda job in behalf of the physicians' committee.

We classify this contest with those photography contests which require cameramen to portray certain products in their published photos—cigars, coffee, etc.—in order to qualify for an award. They are all a threat to independent thinking, objective and unbiased reporting and comment in newspapers.

They offer rewards for doing a slanted job in newspapers and magazines. And it will be difficult for any cartoonist or his editor to deny the charges of critics that they were bribed by the $1,000 first prize into supporting the viewpoint of the physicians' committee, even though their opinion may have been arrived at independently.

The American Society of Newspaper Editors, and all editors' groups, should take a firm stand against such contests. The Canons of Journalism should be amended to require that all newspapermen ignore the cash rewards offered in so-called contests in which qualification is based on getting mention of a product or one side of a controversial political subject into the paper.

[From Editor and Publisher of March 13, 1943]

A VICIOUS ATTEMPT TO BRIBE THE PRESS

To the EDITOR:

Now comes the National Physicians' Committee for the Extension of Medical Service with an attempt to bribe the American press by offering $2,200 in prize money to newspaper cartoonists, as revealed in an advertisement on page 27 of Editor and Publisher for February 28. What an insult. Does this selfish group think American cartoonists can be bought—and for such a paltry list of prizes?

This is the boldest, most insidious, most vicious attempt to infiltrate selfish ideas into the American press that has occurred in recent years.

The committee offers cartoonists a "free package" of supplemental data which will furnish ideas. And look what they expect to get for 2,200 bucks; "ten copies of the publication in which the cartoon has been published with a letter of formal application approved by the publisher" * * * "full permission must be granted by the publisher to reprint the cartoon submitted." Here the committee reveals its purpose—to have original cartoons opposing socialized medicine published extensively in American newspapers.

The advertisement referred to was illustrated by a cartoon by J. N. Darling, titled "It's All Mixed and Ready to Swallow," showing Congress in the character of mother pouring from a bottle labeled "Socialized Medicine, three billion a bottle" into a gigantic spoon for administration to a pitiful little figure labeled "Public," held on the floor by a "Political Quack" while "Medical Science" lies in the foreground, bound and gagged. In the background a group of mourners weep over the bier of "Free Enterprise."

No one questions the right of Mr. Darling to draw this cartoon if it expresses his convictions, nor the right of a newspaper to publish it for the same reason. No one questions the right of the committee to argue its side of this great issue in paid advertisements and such other means as may be available to it. Everyone who understands the purpose of a free press in a democracy will deny the right of the committee thus to attempt to corrupt the press.

I don't believe there is a single newspaper cartoonist anywhere in the United States who will fall for this sordid scheme. On the contrary, I believe it will stir the resentment of every cartoonist, editor, and newspaper worker, and I hope the American newspapers will expose this attempt to subvert their true functions.

Criticisms of American newspapers have been numerous and loudly vocal in recent years. This is an opportunity for American newspapers to show that sometimes when a newspaper slips up, the original blame belongs to some selfish institution or group. The public should know the terrific pressures by pressure groups upon every editorial staff every day in the year and here is a concrete example.

RALPH L. CROSMAN,
Director, College of Journalism,
University of Colorado.
BOULDER, COLO.

[From Editor and Publisher of March 20, 1943]

TO EDITORS FROM DOCTORS

We congratulate Editor and Publisher for its forthright editorial in the March 6 issue condemning the contest announced by the National Physicians' Committee in its full-page advertisement which had appeared in Editor and Publisher a week earlier. This advertisement offered $3,000 in prizes to newspaper cartoonists for portrayal of the meaning and implications of political distribution of health-care services in the United States.

The editorial stated clearly the unethical character of the advertisement thus: "The 'contest' rules leave no doubt that this is a subtle bribe to cartoonists to support or oppose certain political beliefs (according to how you look at it), and to obtain general circulation for those beliefs in newspapers and magazines. In other words, large cash awards are offered to cartoonists for doing a propaganda job in behalf of the physicians' committee. * * * They (such contests) are all a threat to independent thinking, objective and unbiased reporting and comment in newspapers. They offer rewards for doing a slanted job in newspapers and magazines."

Some readers may have been surprised at this attempt by the National Physicians' Committee to pervert journalism. Unfortunately we were not surprised. We were ashamed. We as physicians have long been ashamed of the National Physicians' Committee, because it has conducted a propaganda campaign with disregard for facts and a readiness to employ odious labels in place of reasoned argument.

The name, National Physicians' Committee, may cause many laymen to assume that it speaks for all members of the medical profession. This is emphatically not so. Many physicians are opposed to the aims and purposes of the National Physicians' Committee, and many more are ashamed of the methods it constantly uses.

The committee has misrepresented the national health legislation which it opposes. In the official record of the Senate hearings in 1946, for example (December 1, 1945, pp. 963–963), seven of the committee's statements regarding the bill were shown to be

false by comparing them with the summary of the bill published in the Journal of the American Medical Association. The American Medical Association opposed the bill, but printed a factual analysis of it.

The committee has sent to all physicians of the country—and we believe also to many newspapers and periodicals—statements to the effect that the national health-insurance legislation grows out of collectivist doctrine and emanates from Moscow, despite the fact that the principle of this legislation is supported by such Americans as the President of the United States, Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, and the officers of the committee for the Nation's Health named below.

We are informed that the National Physicians' Committee has for some time made a practice of distributing canned editorials on a national scale. Some newspapers have published these opinions as their own. Now the National Physicians' Committee proposes the cartoon contest which has been so justly condemned. We are glad that Editor and Publisher calls upon the men in the profession of journalism to take a firm stand against such contests. We hope that in the future the literary products of the National Physicians' Committee, whether submitted as editorials, news, or advertisements, will be given close scrutiny as to their factual and ethical basis.

We physicians, as members of a scientific profession, want to see this subject of medical care handled in a scientific spirit and according to ethical principles which the best men in our profession and in yours have the privilege to cherish.

Thomas Addis, M. D., San Francisco; Ernst P. Boas, M. D., New York; Allan M. Butler, M. D., Boston; Paul B. Cornely, M. D., Washington; Katharine Dodd, M. D., Cincinnati; Channing Frothingham, M. D., Boston; Harry Goldblatt, M. D., Los Angeles; John V. Lawrence, M. D., St. Louis; Hyman Morrison, M. D., Boston; John P. Peters, M. D., New Haven; Henry B. Richardson, M. D., New York; Harry Saltzstein, M. D., Detroit; Max Seham, M. D., Minneapolis; Edward L. Young, M. D., Boston.

(This advertisement is paid for by the Committee for the Nation's Health, 1709 Broadway, New York, a nonpartisan organization supporting national health insurance. Chairman, Channing Frothingham, M. D., honorary vice chairmen, Jonathan Daniels, Russell Davenport, William Green, Bishop Francis J. McConnell, Philip Murray, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, David Sarnoff, Gerard Swope. Directors, Thomas Addis, M. D., Barry Bingham, Ernst P. Boas, M. D., Morris Llewellyn Cooke, John J. Corson, Mrs. Gardner Cowles, Michael M. Davis, Albert W. Dent, Abe Fortas, Channing Frothingham, M. D., Mary Dublin Keyserling, Carl C. Lang, Mrs. Albert D. Lasker, John V. Lawrence, M. D., Dorothy Norman, Emil Rieve, Anna M. Rosenberg, V. Henry Rothschild 2d, R. M. Walls, D. D. S., Matthew Woll.)

[From the Washington Star of March 30, 1948]

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION'S ATTEMPT TO INFLUENCE CARTOONISTS

(By Lowell Mellett)

Something very interesting has been happening recently in the newspaper world and the public should be told about it. The newspapers have been too modest for the most part to do the telling, so here goes:

There appears in the February 28 issue of Editor and Publisher, trade journal of the newspaper business, a page advertisement submitted by the National Physicians' Committee for the extension of medical service. The committee describes itself further as a nonpolitical, nonprofit organization for maintaining ethical and scientific standards and extending medical service to all the people. Take particular note of the word "ethical," for this story has to do with ethics.

The advertisement is directed at newspaper cartoonists. It offers prizes ranging from $1,000 down to $100 for cartoons on the subject of socialized medicine. To be eligible for the contest the cartoons, of course, must appear in the newspapers for which the cartoonists work.

"Write for factual data," says the ad. "Write today for free package of supplemental data which already have been published by leading periodicals with the objective of:

"Preserving in the United States our system of freedom of enterprise to the end that—

"Doctors of medicine may retain, in the public interest, their personal independence, their individual and collective integrity and effectiveness.

"We shall be happy to send you additional brochures, articles, and reports of general information which will be helpful to you."

Only average intelligence is required to recognize this contest for what it is—a bald attempt to buy the support of America's cartoonists for the American Medical Association's fight against national health insurance. (The National Physicians' Committee is the propaganda arm of AMA.) Editor and Publisher, having at least average intelligence, followed through in its next issue with an editorial in which it said:

"The contest rules leave no doubt that this is a subtle bribe to cartoonists to support or oppose certain political beliefs and to obtain general circulation for those beliefs in newspapers and magazines. In other words, large cash awards are offered to cartoonists for doing a propaganda job in behalf of the Physicians' Committee. * * *

"They offer rewards for doing a slanted job in newspapers and magazines. And it will be difficult for any cartoonist or his editor to deny charges of critics that they were bribed by the $1,000 first prize into supporting the viewpoint of the Physicians' Committee, even though their opinion may have been arrived at independently."

That was the first evidence of a clash between journalistic ethics and the ethics of the American Medical Association—which are not exactly the same thing as medical ethics.

Other evidence was given by angry editorials in a few newspapers, although most newspapers have preferred to remain silent, not wishing to call attention to the fact that the AMA considers it possible to bribe editors and cartoonists. The best evidence perhaps was given by a cartoonist, Roy Justus of the Minneapolis Star. He drew a cartoon but it was not what the doctors ordered. It was designed to burn the pants off the so-called Physicians' Committee. His paper printed it.

A few more incidents of this kind may cause the decent doctors of this country, meaning the majority, to take a serious look at what the AMA has been doing in their name.

RECESS TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next. What business the Senate will consider at that time will be determined then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Wednesday, April 28, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 26 (legislative day of April 22), 1948:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John M. Steeves, of the District of Columbia, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 3, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

John M. Echols, of Illinois.

William Koren, Jr., of New Jersey.

GOVERNOR OF THE PANAMA CANAL

Brig. Gen. Francis K. Newcomer, United States Army, for appointment as Governor of the Panama Canal, provided for by the Panama Canal Act, approved August 24, 1912, vice Maj. Gen. Joseph C. Mehaffey, United States Army.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARKANSAS

James Vernon Huntley, Judsonia, Ark., in place of A. E. Nelson, resigned.

Horace M. Grogan, Mabelvale, Ark., in place of C. H. King, resigned.

CALIFORNIA

Fenton E. Watson, Mira Loma, Calif., in place of C. E. Faulhaber, resigned.

Jared W. Moore, Modesto, Calif., in place of A. A. Fields, resigned.

COLORADO

Dorothy F. Mullen, Bayfield, Colo., in place of L. E. Landreth, resigned.

FLORIDA

Donald E. McDermott, Boca Raton, Fla., in place of F. A. Clement, resigned.

Lois A. Brown, Immokalee, Fla., in place of H. P. Herbert, resigned.

Evangeline W. Shuler, Indian River City, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Edith Z. Petrey, Valparaiso, Fla., in place of M. L. Woodmansee, retired.

ILLINOIS

John C. McKinstra, Freeport, Ill., in place of F. H. Gibler, resigned.

George M. Farrell, Marseilles, Ill., in place of J. A. Maier, resigned.

INDIANA

Joseph C. Renie, Sharpsville, Ind., in place of C. W. Cottingham, resigned.

IOWA

James T. Kisgen, Carroll, Iowa, in place of J. F. Rettenmaier, deceased.

Elton O. Brill, Kamrar, Iowa, in place of M. J. Torrence, transferred.

KANSAS

Harold D. Vernon, Goff, Kans., in place of E. H. Huerter, transferred.

Charles W. Parker, Highland, Kans., in place of W. D. Gilmore, resigned.

Una V. Shoemaker, Perry, Kans., in place of Guietta Stark, deceased.

LOUISIANA

Virginia C. Kent, Tangipahoa, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MASSACHUSETTS

John A. Marshall, Worcester, Mass., in place of J. T. Sheehan, retired.

MINNESOTA

Orville L. Bahl, Holloway, Minn., in place of L. M. Smith, resigned.

Reuel J. Jacobson, Lutsen, Minn., in place of J. C. Bally, resigned.

Leo L. Panneck, Taunton, Minn., in place of R. A. Panneck, transferred.

MONTANA

Alice Hedges, Antelope, Mont., in place of E. O. Sorvick, retired.

Winnie M. Rife, Roy, Mont., in place of W. L. Marsh, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Joseph E. Stout, Pittstown, N. J., in place of W. T. Snyder, transferred.

Ralph T. Hodge, South Vineland, N. J., in place of Ethel Light, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA

John Lynn Jones, Clarkton, N. C., in place of L. A. Smith, resigned.

NORTH DAKOTA

Ben Ramsland, Almont, N. Dak., in place of Otis Malone, retired.

OHIO

Gail I. Lauer, Prospect, Ohio, in place of C. B. Dix, resigned.

PUERTO RICO

Roberto Ortiz Colon, Vega Baja, P. R., in place of V. C. Aviles, transferred.

SOUTH CAROLINA

David M. Peden, Gray Court, S. C., in place of C. W. Reeves, deceased.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Dayton C. Sebade, Wall, S. Dak., in place of L. T. Dartt, resigned.

WASHINGTON

Ronald M. Hinton, Parkwater, Wash., in place of M. G. Rosauer, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 26 (legislative day of April 22), 1948:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

UNITED STATES SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE IN EUROPE

W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be the United States special representative in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Col. Kenneth David Nichols, O17498, Army of the United States, for temporary appointment as major general in the Army of the United States under the provisions of section 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947; such appointment to continue in force only for the duration of his assignment as Army member of the Military Liaison Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission and Chief of the Armed Forces Special Weapon Project.

To be brigadier generals, Medical Corps

Harry Dumont Offutt
Gouverneur Vincent Emerson
Dean Flewellyn Winn
Frederick Arthur Blesse
George William Rice
John Morris Hargreaves
Leonard Dudley Heaton
Silas Beach Hays
Crawford Fountain Sams
Harry George Armstrong

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 510 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion. (Date of rank will be the date of appointment.)

To be colonels

Hugh Chauncey Johnson
John Owen Colonna
Charles Calvin Higgins
George Craig Stewart
Louis Peter Leone
Robert Leroy Dulaney
James Clarke Carter
Henry Granville Fisher
Ralph Mundon Neal
Edwin Britian Howard
John Paul Evans
William Harold Schaffer
Allen Dwight Raymond, Jr.
×Harold Rathbun Turner
Glenn Castle Wilhide
Wayne Latta Barker
Russell Vivian Perry
Herbert Spencer Jordan
Dresden James Cragun
Thomas Robinson
William Rush Blakely
Carl Eugene Anderson
William Douglass Paschall
Frederick Mott Thompson
Voris Hamilton Connor
Staten Eugene Rall
Don Emerson Carleton
Kenneth Lafayette Johnson
Paul Green Kendall
Ralph Waldo Russell
DeWitt Ballard

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

To be first lieutenants

James Gyde Owens
Alfred Karl Ganschow
William Henry Hamilton
Daniel Vance, Jr.
John Walter Patrick, Jr.
George Washington Connell, Jr.
Lawrence Lionel Golston
Darrell Roland Rumpf
John Maurice Van Dyke
Joseph Bordeaux Garrett
Carl Edgar Glenn
Walter William Von Tongeln
Alexander Serge Mikhalevsky
Richard Milo Lyman
Douglas Henry Carter
Albert Ellmore Lockhart
Ralph Herschel Alexander
James Wells Startt
William Haskell Allison
Michael John Burke

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947:

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Flora Elasibeth Manahan
Imogene LaVerne Stites
Iva Rene Miller
Margaret Ann Rowland
Sara Elizabeth Garvin
Frances Louise Beauchamp
Mary Elizabeth Rosser
Olga Angelina Zanella
Pearl Ruth Jonah
Catherine Shanley McBride

To be first lieutenants, Women's Medical Specialist Corps

Amelia Dorothy Amizich

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, with dates of rank to be as established under the provisions of the aforementioned title:

To be major generals, Medical Corps

Edward Allen Noyes
James Albertus Bethea

To be brigadier generals, Medical Corps

Edgar Erskine Hume
Frank Lamont Cole
Paul Henry Streit
Raymond Osborne Dart
George Ellis Armstrong

To be brigadier generals, Dental Corps

Oscar Peter Snyder
George Robert Kennebeck

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY IN THE ARMY NURSE CORPS AND THE WOMEN'S MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS IN THE GRADE SPECIFIED

To be captains

Ruth A. Robinson, WMSC (OT).
Helen R. Sheehan, WMSC (OT).
Eleanor J. Westfall, WMSC (PT), M433.
Beatrice Whitcomb, WMSC (PT), M2526.
Margaret E. Whitehurst, WMSC (PT), M534.

To be first lieutenants

Rubye W. Archer, ANC, N724114.
Erma L. Baldwin, ANC, N788894.
Mary F. Beck, WMSC (OT).
Margaret E. Bellue, ANC, N735053.
Anna B. Berterman, ANC, N773398.
Goldie L. Bodson, ANC, N761282.
Irene C. Bofenkamp, ANC, N732184.
Phyllis A. Boland, ANC, N772328.
Stephanie M. Borgia, ANC, N796547.
Dorothy P. Briggs, ANC, N744326.
Edna M. Browning, ANC, N761389.
Beth Campbell, WMSC (Diet.), R637.
Elizabeth M. A. Campbell, ANC, N790092.
Mercedes A. Castille, ANC, N734154.
Louise P. Cavagnaro, ANC, N783964.
Delia F. Caylor, ANC, N727405.
Evelyn M. Churchill, WMSC (Diet.), R1083.
Christine Coletti, ANC, N742800.
Freda M. Cornell, ANC, N769363.
Helen E. Cundiff, ANC, N735135.
Olga Dorosh, ANC, N724074.
Marguerite G. Duggan, ANC, N721367.
Clara M. Duley, ANC, N736153.
Elizabeth M. Dunsmore, ANC, N732477.
Virginia D. Earpe, ANC, N768096.
Dorcas E. Easterling, ANC, N734007.
June Egbert, ANC, N785604.
Marjorie B. Erdmann, ANC, N731819.
Marian Eskeldson, ANC, N776284.
Edith H. Fowler, ANC, N755476.
Elizabeth Fowler, WMSC (PT), M2650.
Clara E. Franks, ANC, N768914.
Genevieve D. Guitrau, ANC, N779279.
Thelma A. Harman, WMSC (Diet.), R957.
Helen J. Hash, ANC, N769344.
Jean M. Hawkins, WMSC (Diet.), R799.
Florence D. Hedrick, ANC, N765065.
Thelma M. Horgen, ANC, N783544.
Maebelle Hosterman, ANC, N762298.
Dorothy J. Huelsman, ANC, N764463.
Beatrice E. Johnson, ANC, N742326.
Elizabeth A. Jones, ANC, N753564.
Nettie B. Jones, WMSC (PT), M2664.
Margaret A. Kabana, ANC, N725078.
Mary P. Kent, ANC, N743081.
Nancy C. Kermott, ANC, N776636.
Julia A. King, ANC, N787630.
Dorothea M. Lawlor, ANC, N756293.
Dorothy M. Lear, ANC, N760804.
Laura B. Little, ANC, N779377.
Anna L. Loftus, WMSC (OT).
Verta R. Long, ANC, N726855.
Inez T. Lott, ANC, N788100.
Ruth S. McBurnie, ANC, N783630.
Elizabeth C. Mahoney, ANC, N774018.
Ellen C. Miller, WMSC (Diet.), R2189.
Elizabeth M. Nachod, WMSC (OT).
Evelyn J. Niles, ANC, N765166.
Mary L. O'Brien, ANC, N736465.
Catherine J. D. O'Connor, ANC, N779981.
Elizabeth J. Orr, ANC, N794663.
Marion J. Pace, ANC, N735777.
Margaret E. Pettibone, ANC, N785510.
Carolyn B. Rahm, ANC, N787910.
Virginia H. Ramage, ANC, N779246.
Rosalie M. Requist, ANC, N744241.
Nina M. Romeo, ANC, N721095.
Paula A. Schaefer, ANC, N790228.
Laura B. Schild, ANC, N789215.
Geneva F. Sims, ANC, N729992.
Eleanor M. Slade, ANC, N753147.
Marjorie E. Sodt, ANC, N795537.
Lucile Standley, ANC, N763651.
Dora F. L. Sullivan, ANC, N703917.
Katherine F. Taliercio, ANC, N757533.
Sara A. Tapp, ANC, N764812.
Mary C. Tkacik, ANC, N725709.

Mary L. Todd, ANC, N734185.
Mary E. Vaughan, ANC, N723564.
Sara A. Walb, ANC, N742442.
Wilma L. West, WMSC (OT).
Daisy D. Williams, ANC, N737787.
Dorothy A. Wolfe, ANC, N730872.
Lurline V. Zuerner, ANC, N783276.

To be second lieutenants

Mary K. Berteling, WMSC (OT).
Lottie V. Blanton, WMSC (OT),
Josephine M. Burt, WMSC (PT), M2729.
Virginia D. Coffin, WMSC (OT).
Clara C. Copeland, ANC, N765654.
Elsie L. Deming, WMSC (OT).
Patricia A. Donaldson, ANC, N799398.
Theresa M. Ferrazzoli, WMSC (PT), M2717.
Helen L. Gabler, WMSC (OT).
Lucy J. Kahmann, WMSC (OT).
Mary C. Lachette, ANC, N800010.
Miriam J. Partridge, WMSC (PT), M2805.
Betty L. Reichert, WMSC (PT), M2707.
Susanna Schramm, WMSC (OT).
Mary E. Thelen, ANC, N786940.
Hildegard V. Wenstrom, WMSC (PT), M2752.
Joan M. Wissing, ANC, N802136.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY IN THE ARMY NURSE CORPS AND THE WOMEN'S MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS IN THE GRADE SPECIFIED

To be captains

Inez I. Baum, WMSC (PT), M443.
Olga S. Heard, WMSC (Diet.), R75.

To be first lieutenants

Phyllis D. Barsh, ANC, N773722.
Roberta Broyles, ANC, N790616.
Catharine A. Burgmeier, ANC, N779920.
Kathleen R. Creech, WMSC (Diet.), R648.
Evelyn C. Ekstrom, ANC, N754110.
Virginia M. Elder, ANC, N723862.
Ruth M. Engel, ANC, N778098.
Juanita E. Fannin, ANC, N768913.
Lu Gomez, ANC, N788919.
Lulu J. Hartman, ANC, N768377.
Mona O. Hetland, ANC, N777355.
Elizabeth A. Hughes, ANC, N745171.
Esther M. Knoedler, ANC, N732206.
Jean M. Lang, ANC, N721159.
Edna H. Livaudais, WMSC (PT), M1232.
Helen Logan, ANC, N787308.
Frances A. Lusas, ANC, N751622.
Rose M. MacKellar, WMSC (Diet.), R190.
Ethel S. Madden, ANC, N785083.
Ann Markey, ANC, N731072.
Alice M. McDowell, ANC, N768192.
Agnes L. Miller, ANC, N727259.
Alyce G. Milne, WMSC (OT).
Nadine A. Neisig, ANC, N772760.
Rita M. Pfeiffer, ANC, N773595.
Edna L. Phariss, ANC, N732558.
Mary E. Pierce, ANC, N728765.
Olie B. Reed, ANC, N724951.
Margaret J. Rice, ANC, N759617.
Helen A. Rydzewski, ANC, N755886.
Edythe B. Sanborn, ANC, N752594.
Catherine E. Sanford, ANC, N723466.
Dorothy F. Shaw, ANC, N783003.
Barbara M. Short, ANC, N775527.
Carol V. Smith, ANC, N775342.
Virginia L. Smith, ANCV, N773897.
Betty J. Snyder, WMSC (PT), M2496.
Doris M. Vance, ANC, N732635.
Tannie E. Westmoreland, ANC, N764987.
Mary W. Wilborne, ANC, N759122.

To be second lieutenants

Gloria F. Coradi, ANC, N754740.
Frances A. Foley, ANC, N792054.
Marjorie A. Mell, WMSC (OT).
Miriam A. Schulz, ANC, N796722.
Gisela M. Zernick, ANC, N800184.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be brigadier generals

Frank Frederick Bell
Robert Charles Dean
Whitfield Jack
Ralph Hendricks McKee
Ralph Albert Palladino
Herbert Harold Vreeland, Jr.
Arthur Pope Watson

HONORARY RESERVE

To be major general

Walter Perry Story

APPOINTMENT IN NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be brigadier general of the line, to date from December 7, 1947

Errol Henry Zistel

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

PROMOTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 502 AND 508 OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

To be first lieutenants

Kenneth McMillin Stewart
Emil John Schutt
Robert Andrew Blair
Ralph Lee Hicks
Shirley Leon Foreman
Robert Thomas Higdon
Edward Joseph Conway
Theodore Phillip Martin
Daniel Joseph Sheehan, Jr.
Alvin Willard Banner
Nelton Ronald Wilson
Milburn Grant Apt
Jack Cox, Jr.
Andrew Jules Chapman
Paul Enos Rova
Robert Francis Kaltenbacher
Billy Gordon Moseley
Jack Victor Allen
Paul Arnold Roney
Philip Reed Vaughn
Douglas John Howard
Robert Ewing Gay
Robert James Pierce
Donald Graham May
William Boyd, Jr.
Robert Rufus French
Albert Edwin Ninde
Elmer Roy Smith
Harlan Eugene Ball
William Alfred Swanson
Lawrence Oscar Thomas
James Millard Davis
Delbert Volney Berg, Jr.
Richard Gene Twyman
Stephen Phillip Walter
Jesse Charles Bush, Jr.
Rufus Winfrey Scott
Dewey Roger Laney
James Edward Leonhard
Leo Cayetano Baca
David Both Van Pelt
William Stanley McGregor
William Richard Werb
Paul Quillian Holloway
Donald Oscar Beck
Leo Dee Putt
Marvin Walter Miller
Don Byron McEntire
John Richard Francis
David Sylvester Melluish
Montie Thompson, Jr.
Robert Joseph Kalina
Ray Barton
Carl Bryan Fountain
Donald William Payne
Joseph Robert Clark
Donald Wilbert Akers
Bushnell Nelson Welch
Edward Charles Whalen
Theodore Leonard Monasee
Charles Arthur Monasee
Gerald Vern Kehrli
Frederick John Reitman, Jr.
Von Harold Dixon
Gerald Francis Fitzgerald

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE AIR FORCE OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major generals

James Dennett McIntyre
Arthur William Vanaman
Bryant LeMaire Boatner
Frank Fort Everest
Truman Hempel Landon

To be brigadier generals

Robert Chapin Candee
Rosenham Beam
Hugh Whitt
Joseph Vincent de Paul Dillon
Roscoe Charles Wilson
Paul Thomas Cullen
Oliver Stanton Picher
Ralph Powell Swofford, Jr.
William Dole Eckert

APPOINTMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE OF THE UNITED STATES

To be brigadier generals

Emil Henry Molthan
Lacey Van Buren Murrow
Robert Armstrong Nagle

IN THE NAVY

Admiral Charles M. Cooke, Jr., United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list of the Navy with the rank of admiral.

Vice Adm. John L. Hall, Jr., United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commandant of the Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Va.

Rear Adm. Arthur D. Struble, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Operations).

Rear Adm. Herbert C. Lassiter, Supply Corps, United States Navy, for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Supply Corps of the Navy.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the grades hereinafter stated:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

John R. Behr

LIEUTENANTS

Jack F. Buescher
William D. Reed

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

David E. Ward

ENSIGNS

Joseph J. August
Charles A. Sueur

The following-named (civilian-college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

James F. Berry	John R. Huston
William H. Cope	Robert C. Kessler
William A. Cull	Vincent E. Lowery
Calvin J. Curts	Andrew M. Margileth
Donald R. Davis	Philip W. Mayo
Donald J. Dochen	Jack W. Millar
Byron T. Eberly	Stephen R. Mills, Jr.
Wayne L. Erdbrink	James E. McClenathan
John W. Flynn	Richmond T. Prehn
Carl N. Haggard	Donald W. Spicer
Robert McA. Hamill	Donald E. Upp
Walter R. Holland	Joseph L. Whatley
Hal T. Hurn	Henry E. Wolfe, Jr.

John W. Eastlack (civilian-college graduate) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy.

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Margaret T. Barrow	Vila L. Knuth
Joanna S. Bubp	Andrea Lago
Jane F. Buettner	Veronica A. Lesho
Theresa M. Canjuga	Rita T. Maciag
Beverly A. Coey	Mary M. Murray
Mary M. Deak	Muriel H. Riley
Dorothy M. Frison	Janina J. Rupert
Rita A. Gervais	Shirley E. Sauvage
Betty L. Gregorio	Anna Skaleski
Rosemary L. Gunn	Margaret J. Stewart
Olga Hitchak	Mae B. Stumm
"E" M. Hohmann	Lillian R. Wojnarowski

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT

Ralph L. Eslick

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Theodore R. Hunley

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy, to rank from June 4, 1948:

Richard L. Alford	Francis J. Kovalcik
Carl B. Austin	Warren W. Lord
Fred W. Baldwin	Albert F. Lovata
John A. Bayers	Robert B. McKay
Francis E. Brooks	Albert C. MacDonald
Dudley A. Buck	Thomas P. Marks
Francis J. Corrigan	Thomas D. Nabors, Jr
John A. Duffy	Leonard H. Nettnin
Frederick L. Eareckson Jr.	Paul W. Nicholson
	Jerry A. Pacilio
John L. Fogle	Hugh W. Rose
Thomas F. Hahn	Francis J. Roth
Charles R. Hannum	Aimo M. Saari
Charles Z. Hanus	Herbert J. Shields
Elwin R. Harris	Ralph R. Speicher, Jr.
James E. Henry	Douglas DeL. Swift
William W. Holm	Dillan W. Taff
Roy A. Howard, Jr.	James P. Trinity, Jr.
Harry E. Hunt	James W. Walker, Jr.
Harry C. Judy, Jr.	Richard M. Znaniecki
Robert G. Keller	

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, to rank from June 4, 1948:

Herbert E. Reichert
Charles E. P. Schappacher
James E. Weibel

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

Domenico N. Bibbo	William T. Peckham
Charles W. Calhoun	Robert R. Raber
Frank W. Day	Jack M. Thornburgh
Herbert R. Foster	Dexter M. Welton
Robert F. Harsch	Robert L. Winkler
Steven K. Kauffman	

Delmar W. Ruthig (civilian-college graduate) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy.

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Margaret LaR. Boyer	Sonia Loir
Helen S. Crowell	Mae O. Lovin
Helen J. Francis	Owedia M. Searcy
Betty E. Jenkinson	Dorothy D. Stoddard
Virginia M. Jennings	

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

George Donabedian
Wilson G. Scanlon
Edward H. Taylor

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

John P. Colmore
Verne K. Harvey, Jr.
Charles E. Rogers

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Philip B. Dalton

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS

Elizabeth V. Butenas	Wordie Isbell
Bertha E. Harris	Carol E. Sawyer

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Anne J. Chelf	Gertrude W. Killebrew
Marion M. Dooley	Mildred M. Lankenau
Carolyn L. Falconi	Alva B. Pelkington
Mary M. Hogan	Helen K. Quay
Dolores M. Iacone	Phyllis A. Scungio

ENSIGNS

Elizabeth M. Simpson
Dorothy M. Troyan
Irene M. Walters

IN THE MARINE CORPS

To be permanent commissioned warrant officers in the Marine Corps, to rank with but after second lieutenants

Walter E. Anderson	Gordon L. Rea
Hubert G. Bozarth	Frederick M. Steinhauser
Zadik Collier	
Frederick Dykstra	Clyde H. Webster
John R. Gray	Clarence S. Wick
Leon E. Matthews	

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 26, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, Thou who hast led Thy children through fire and cloud in ages past, today lead us through the maze of questions that are before us. We pray for a strong, uncontaminated citizenship, free from every subversive element. Shed Thy might upon the perplexing problems and sweep aside all discord which is harmful to the public welfare. Make large our conception of duty and unite us as never before, binding us with the spirit of a loyal determination to preserve the blessed ways of American life. For the sake of our country, we pray Thee to strengthen our wills for every good work; for vacillation, give us steadiness; for ignorance, give us understanding, meeting storm with calm, adversity with fortitude, and defeat with faith. In the name of Jesus our Saviour. Amen.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the Journal.

Mr. BUCK. A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withhold his point of order until after the Journal is read?

Mr. BUCK. I regret that I must insist on my point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withhold his point of order so that the Chair may swear in a new Member?

Mr. BUCK. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

APRIL 24, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: A certificate of election in due form of law showing the election of Hon. JOHN ALBERT WHITAKER as a Representative-elect to the Eightieth Congress from the Second Congressional District of the State of Kentucky, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Hon. Earle C. Clements, is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. WHITAKER appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 48]

Andrews, Ala.	Hall,	Miller, Calif.
Andrews, N. Y.	Edwin Arthur	Morgan
Battle	Harless, Ariz.	Mundt
Bell	Harrison	Norton
Bland	Hart	O'Toole
Bloom	Hartley	Patterson
Bolton	Hedrick	Pfeifer
Boykin	Heffernan	Powell
Buckley	Hendricks	Price, Fla.
Carroll	Jackson, Calif.	Rains
Celler	Jarman	Rich
Clason	Jenkins, Ohio	Rizley
Clippinger	Jenkins, Pa.	Scoblick
Colmer	Johnson, Okla.	Shafer
Coudert	Jones, N. C.	Sikes
Courtney	Kearney	Simpson, Pa.
Dague	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Dawson, Ill.	Kilday	Smith, Ohio
Delaney	Lusk	Stratton
Dingell	McCormack	Sundstrom
Fenton	McCowen	Taylor
Gallagher	McDowell	Thomas, N. J.
Gavin	Macy	Trimble
Gillette	Madden	Wadsworth
Gore	Manasco	Walter
Graham	Mansfield	West
Grant, Ala.	Meyer	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 351 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 22, 1948, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2239. An act to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 188. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Clerk of the House, in the enrollment of the bill H. R. 5328, to make certain corrections.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 866. An act to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective, and for other purposes;

S. 1322. An act to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation;

S. 2158. An act to amend the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 and the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, so as to eliminate certain provisions of such acts requiring the re-

tention of a specified carry-over of wheat in the United States; and

S. 2376. An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 608. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Growing Four Times;

S. 714. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Claude E. Milliken; and

S. J. Res. 94. Joint resolution to establish the Fort Sumter National Monument in the State of South Carolina.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Justice.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Post Office Department.
5. Housing and Home Finance Agency.
6. National Archives.
7. Veterans' Administration.

KENNEWICK DIVISION OF THE YAKIMA PROJECT, WASHINGTON

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 550, Rept. No. 1797), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4954) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance, under Federal reclamation laws, of the Kennewick division of the Yakima project, Washington. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continued not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Lands, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTHOUSE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 549, Rept. No. 1796), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5963) to authorize the construction of a courthouse to accommodate the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SUBMERGED LANDS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 548, Rept. No. 1795), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5992) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the motion to discharge the Committee on Agriculture from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2245) to repeal the tax on oleomargarine.

The SPEAKER. Did the gentleman sign the petition?

Mr. RIVERS. I did, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina is entitled to 10 minutes.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask to be recognized in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RIVERS. The proponents of the motion have 10 minutes and the opponents have 10 minutes, and the proponents have the right to close the debate?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has stated the situation accurately. He has the right to close debate.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, the proposition before us at this moment is very plain. It is simply, Shall the House Committee on Agriculture be discharged from the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2245?

It will be alleged here that to discharge the committee is an attack on the committee system, but, Mr. Speaker, it is the very opposite. The discharge petition method is part of the committee system. It was designed as a great reform. It was designed, if you please, as the safety valve that permits the Congress and the public to bring measures before this body for consideration and a vote when a committee fails to function.

In this particular instance, the need of the discharge method was extraordinary because the committee not alone voted not to bring to this floor any of the pending bills but voted further not even to consider any legislation which might hereafter be introduced during this session. Therefore, with the public demand that this measure be debated and voted on, I certainly urge upon my colleagues that the committee be discharged and that the majority of this House have the right to function as they properly should.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, if this proposed measure were not so serious it would be ridiculous. Just think of it. Folks cannot eat oleo unless it is colored to imitate butter, so that they can deceive themselves. Just think of it. If it were not for the fact that long-established practice has permitted this thing to be done under this tax, it would be before the Federal Trade Commission, in my opinion, as an unfair practice, trying to color the product for sale to make it look like butter. If this tax is repealed, the oleo manufacturers will find a way to raise the price corresponding to the cut in the tax. At the present time, with the packages that they put the thing out in, if they want to color it to suit themselves so that they can deceive themselves at their own tables, they can do so by putting a little pellet inside the package so that they do not even have to dirty their hands with it. It seems to me that this whole operation is silly. Why should we want to deceive ourselves? I cannot see it. This tax was put on because it was regarded as an unfair trade practice, and, as I understand it, it was put on before the law providing against unfair trade practices was passed and before the Federal Trade Commission was established.

I hope that the Congress will not try to help the people deceive themselves that this is butter. Why would they care whether it was colored yellow or green or black or white?

One other thing that has aroused my interest in this matter is that linseed oil is used to make paints. I was told this

morning by the Department of Agriculture that linseed oil is one of the main ingredients of some types of oleo. I do not know whether that is something you ought to consider here or not, but it is a very interesting thing. I hope we will not go ahead and deceive ourselves and try to deceive the public into believing that something is butter which is not butter and thus destroy the opportunity that our dairy industry has to supply the people with that kind of table food which we have known for so long as butter.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER].

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, the measure now before the House, namely the motion to discharge the Agricultural Committee from further consideration of the Rivers' margarine bill, should receive the overwhelming support of the Members.

There never has been any real justification for the present legal discrimination against the sale and use of margarine. Without any doubt whatsoever, the law discriminating against the sale of margarine was enacted as a result of the activities of those who had a desire to provide special privilege for the sale of another commodity, namely, butter.

There is no misrepresentation whatsoever in connection with the sale of margarine. I have always been, and still am, a strong advocate of requiring the truth to be told about the fabric or substance of any commodities sold to the public. I have no desire to see the margarine manufacturers given any advantage in the matter of labeling their goods. I am entirely willing and desirous of having them required to label or mark as clearly as possible the name of their product on the package in which it is sold to the public. I have not heard of any of the margarine producers or dealers who object to doing this. They are perfectly willing to have their product marked for what it is—margarine. That being true, what possible reason can be advanced for the attempt to prevent a free sale of a wholesome food to the public in competition with other food of a similar nature? It is said, however, that it could be sold in the restaurants without label or mark to distinguish it from butter. I patronize restaurants very often, and I never yet have seen margarine sold in such a way as to be mistaken for butter. Even, however, if I may have been an exception, I certainly would have no objection, and I have heard no supporter of the margarine cause object to having a legal requirement to the effect that a statement should be placed on the tables in the restaurants that margarine is being served.

They cry, however, that margarine is given an orange color and that makes it look like butter. The fact of the matter is that when I was a boy at home in school, all the butter that was sold in the village practically, was colored. The butter produced by the farmers was always a very pale-colored substance, and most of the sellers saw to it that coloring was added to make it more attractive. Even if there were any merit to this contention, however, I know of no one who would object seriously to seeing that coloring had been added to other things in the production of margarine.

There is simply no real excuse for this injustice that has been perpetrated on the American people for decades past. Experts on food chemistry will tell you that first-class margarine is equally, if not more, nutritious than first-class butter. Certainly from a sanitary standpoint, there is greater likelihood of margarine, which is purely a vegetable product, being more sanitary than butter would be, in view of the fact that butter is derived from milk which comes from the body of the animal and would vary from the sanitary standpoint as the health of the cow might vary.

No; this is an illustration of a thing that was common in old England before the days when the Parliament had become an institution of any power. A special privilege, such as has been enjoyed by the butter producers in the United States, was granted in a little different way in the time of Elizabeth, but nevertheless had the same effect, namely to give those selling a certain product a price and profit which would not have been possible without the restriction made possible by law. Parliament, in the early reign of Queen Elizabeth, had been a subordinate institution, in fact, almost a powerless body, but there was a constant growth in the resentment against the injustices which were inflicted upon the English people because of the power exercised by the absolute monarchy uncontrolled by a representative body.

To illustrate the extent to which such special privilege, such exclusive monopolies to deal in commodities which were the necessaries of life, prevailed, let me quote to you the following from Taswell-Langmead's English Constitutional History at 394 and the following:

> It was in the Parliament of 1601 that the opposition, which had, during 40 years, been silently gathering and husbanding strength, fought its first great battle and won its first victory. The conflict arose concerning the enormous abuse of monopolies. Under cover of the loosely defined prerogative possessed or assumed by the Crown of regulating all matters relating to commerce, the Queen had taken upon herself to make lavish grants to her courtiers, or patents to deal exclusively in a multitude of articles, mostly common necessaries of life. Coal, leather, salt, oil, vinegar, starch, iron, lead, yarn, glass, and many other commodities were in consequence only to be obtained at ruinous prices. The grievance was first mooted in Parliament in 1571 by a Mr. Bell; but he was at once summoned before the council, and returned to the House "with such an amazed countenance, that it daunted all the rest." After the lapse of 26 years the Commons ventured, in 1597, to present an address to the Queen on the same subject, to which she replied, through the Lord Keeper, that she "hoped her dutiful and loving subjects would not take away her prerogative, which is the choicest flower in her garden, and the principal head pearl in her crown diadem; but would rather leave that to her disposition, promising to examine all patents and to abide the touchstone of the law." In spite of these fair words, the abuse, far from being abated, rose to a still greater height. So numerous were the articles subject to monopoly that when the list of them was read over in the House in 1601 an indignant Member exclaimed, "Is not bread amongst them? Nay, if no remedy is found for these, bread will be there before the next Parliament." A bill for the explanation of the common law in certain cases of letters patent was introduced by Mr. Laurence Hyde, and was debated with unprecedented warmth for 4 days. The ministers and courtiers, who endeavored to support the prerogative, were overborne by a torrent of indignant and menacing eloquence. The populace openly cursed the monopolies, and declared that the prerogative should not be suffered to touch the old liberties of England. Seeing that resistance was no longer politic, or even possible, Elizabeth, with admirable tact, sent a message to the House that, understanding that divers patents which she had granted had been grievous to her subjects, some should be presently repealed, some superseded, and none put in execution, but such as should first have a trial, according to the law, for the good of the people. Robert Cecil, the secretary, added the more direct assurance that all existing patents should be revoked, and no others granted for the future. Overjoyed at their victory, the Commons waited upon the Queen with an address of thanks, to which she replied in an affectionate and even apologetic tone: "Never since I was a Queen," she told them, "did I put my pen to any grant but upon pretext and semblance made to me, that it was both good and beneficial to the subjects in general though a private profit to some of my ancient servants who had deserved well. * * * Never thought was cherished in my heart that tended not to my people's good."

What was done by Queen Elizabeth as evidenced by the foregoing quotation was possible because of her power as an absolute monarch. As chief executive without the check by any power, she was able to grant favors to her friends, as shown in the quotation just given, whereas the present-day monopoly in regard to the sale of butter was granted by the legislative body so as to prevent competition by another food of a similar character. Both are equally vicious, both result in the same kind of harm to the people, who should be able to buy food in a freely competitive market, instead of being compelled to pay high prices to the sellers of a product which has been given a special privilege by law, and thereby enables them to get an extortionate price.

The Rivers bill should be passed by unanimous vote as a matter of justice. Let us make sure that our vote will be so overwhelmingly in favor of the pending bill that no attempt will ever be made to grant by such vicious legislation a monopoly to anyone in the sale of food.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I have always felt that the discharge rule is one which should be used under only the most unusual circumstances. There may be times if a committee arbitrarily refuses to consider a bill when it might be proper to use the discharge rule, and Members might be justified in signing a discharge petition. I personally have not signed a discharge petition for a great many years. In fact, I have only signed one during the more than 20 years that I have been in Congress, and that was many years ago.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I am glad to yield briefly to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. The time to sign a discharge petition is when it is backed here by a well-organized lobby?

Mr. HOPE. Well, certainly in this case the discharge petition was backed by such a lobby. I do not believe anyone would care to controvert that statement.

In this particular case the committee held hearings early in the session. There was no effort to delay the matter. The committee gave the proponents of the legislation exactly the time they asked for. They asked for a week's hearings. They got a week's hearings. I do not believe anyone will say that they did not get a fair hearing. In fact, many of the proponents of the legislation have told me that they did get a fair hearing.

The committee considered the legislation in executive session, carefully. Most of the members were present during all the time of the hearings. In fact, I think we had almost a full committee present during the entire time the hearings were in progress. In the course of those hearings the evidence disclosed that about two-thirds of the people of the United States at the time lived in territory where the manufacture and sale of colored oleomargarine is absolutely prohibited, and that most of the remainder of the people of the United States lived in States which imposed some restrictions upon the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. How many States in the Union have laws prohibiting the sale of colored oleomargarine?

Mr. HOPE. At the time of the hearings there were 23 States. I understand that since that time 2 States have either repealed or modified their laws.

Those States, in the main, are States with large population, so that almost two-thirds of the entire population of the country reside in them. Now, the committee felt that since this was a very controversial question, and since any action which this Congress might take at this time would be absolutely without effect in States in which lived two-thirds of the population of the Nation, that the matter was one which should have some further consideration. At the time the committee took action in tabling the measures that were before it, the Chairman was instructed to appoint a subcommittee to give further consideration to this question and to report before the expiration of this Congress. That committee has been appointed and it has been working on this subject matter.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Then, following the observation of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT], the information was that the committee had not taken action, and to proceed in this manner would indicate that any time the committee did not take the action that somebody wanted they should sign a discharge petition. That would naturally be the situation that would follow here. The committee has, as the gentleman has said, already considered it. It did take committee action, as the gentleman has well stated.

Mr. HOPE. Yes; and in the same connection let the gentleman from Kansas state that, while the form of resolution adopted might give the implication that the committee could not give further consideration to this question during this session, I am advised by the Parliamentarian that the committee could not bind itself not to take up future legislation. Therefore, there is nothing that the committee did which in any way would have prevented the committee from considering any later bills which might have been submitted to the committee during this session.

Now, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. I wish very briefly to say that I agree with the chairman that the hearings were very fairly conducted, but was it not the intention of the resolution passed by the gentleman's committee that it would end the possibility of legislation on this matter for this session?

Mr. HOPE. I think that the form of the resolution was such that it would indicate that the committee thought it was concluding its consideration for this session, but, as I have said, that would not and could not have precluded the committee from giving consideration to new bills which might have been introduced.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. On that point is it not a fact that the committee could have taken it up at any time by unanimous consent?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; it could have taken it up by unanimous consent or it could have taken up any bill on oleomargarine which might have been introduced at a later date in the same manner that it would take up any bill that might be referred to the committee.

Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances that seem to exist in this situation, it does not seem to me that any case has been made for the discharge of the committee. The committee held hearings—timely hearings; it gave full and fair consideration to the question. It seems to me that no case has been made out for discharging the committee, and I submit that the committee should not be discharged on this vote.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, this discharge petition would not be before this House today had the dairy lobby not tricked the Congress some 60 years ago. The trick was to write into the Rules of the House a provision that all margarine tax legislation must be referred to the Committee on Agriculture. That lobby knew full well that no Committee on Agriculture, despite the contrary interest of the American housewife, would ever favorably report a bill to remove taxation on margarine. Their prediction was more than fair.

I draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that not a single Republican affixed his name to this discharge petition until after the Committee on Agriculture had failed to act—until after that committee had done its utmost to close the door on margarine tax relief for the balance of this session. It was only then that Republicans, in the interest of American consumers, joined their colleagues from across the aisle in bringing this measure before the House today.

The first and critical step in the elimination of these unconscionable taxes is to vote "aye" on the pending motion.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I want to agree with everything that my chairman, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], had to say with reference to what happened in our committee. He is a splendid gentleman and as fair as a man can be. But I would also like to call the attention of the House to certain other actions of the committee.

A motion was made at the conclusion of the hearing to table all bills, not only the bills that were pending but all bills that might thereafter be introduced during this session of Congress. That motion was carried. The object of the motion was to kill all bills for this session of Congress, and then in order to make it certain that the Committee on Agriculture could not consider margarine legislation further this year, in order to cinch the matter, a motion was made to reconsider the vote and a further motion was made to table the motion to reconsider. The latter motion prevailed. The committee therefore endeavored, whether it succeeded or not, it endeavored to tie the hands of the House Committee on Agriculture absolutely for the remainder of this session of Congress no matter what margarine bill might be introduced and no matter how meritorious it might be.

Every consumer in this country is interested in this legislation, people throughout the length and breadth of this land, consumers, veterans' organizations, labor, women's organizations—they favor this bill. This is the only opportunity you will have to vote on it. In view of the committee action, you will have no other opportunity. Now is the time. I think the committee ought to be discharged.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield one and one-half minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MITCHELL].

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take issue at this time with my very dear and beloved friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], who seems to hold to the idea that butter has a monopoly on the color "yellow." Why they do not have to pay a tax to color butter yellow 12 months of the year is more than I can understand when the oleomargarine people have to pay a tax for that privilege.

Another very good friend of mine, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED],

made the statement that a powerful and well paid lobby is responsible for this discharge petition. There was a powerful lobby, yes, indeed, the most powerful that has ever been witnessed in this Congress in the years it has been in session. That lobby was composed of the American housewives. The American press, the American radio, and every magazine in the country recognizes this tax is a travesty on the rights of the American housewife. Yes, a lobby, Mr. REED, but not a paid lobby. Every Member of this House can verify that by the mail he has received from independent sources—labor, the housewife, the civic clubs, every interest in the country. They want this tax removed. It is an unfair tax.

Mr. Speaker, I beg of you to vote "yea" when it comes to voting on the pending motion.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, nearly 40 years ago I introduced two bills in the House to repeal or reduce what I considered an unfair tax on oleomargarine, then commonly referred to as "butterine," which was imposed on the country by the dairy interests. Since the introduction of these bills I have endeavored to bring about the repeal of the tax. The matter of the repeal or adjustment of the tax has lain dormant for many years, but when butter rose to the price of a dollar a pound a demand from the housewives from nearly all sections of the country was made for the repeal of what they termed an unfair and unjust tax on this food item daily consumed by their families. Several repeal bills were introduced and referred to the Committee on Agriculture composed of nearly all Representatives having agricultural interests who failed to report a bill out, whereupon the gentleman from South Carolina filed a petition to discharge the committee from further consideration of H. R. 2245 and with the signing of the petition by 218 Members the bill is now before us for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I concede that there are 22 States in which the dairy interests have succeeded in enacting legislation imposing restrictions on the sale and manufacture of oleomargarine, but two wrongs do not make a right. I am indeed gratified that the House is finally acting to remove this unjust 10-cent tax. In this connection, I wish to say that the continuous rise in the cost of living, embracing an increase on practically every food item, will bring about a similar universal demand for legislation for the return of price controls and rationing.

The statement has been made by several opponents of the bill that it may be expected that the oleomargarine manufacturers will immediately raise their prices. They might do so but my warning is that they had better be careful because the people will not stand for it and may demand that we put a price ceiling on oleomargarine products and other foodstuffs and commodities as well. I say this especially in view of the fact that the vested interests have taken charge of the situation, because it was believed if they were given the right of voluntary action in controlling and reducing prices, prices would have at least been held in check, but despite this voluntary action prices are still increasing and it is only a question of a short time when we will be obliged to act to protect the public from these avaricious combines who, instead of voluntarily reducing prices, are continuing to raise them until today it is impossible for families of low income to even exist.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] lays great stress as to the coloring of oleomargarine. Is it not a fact that 90 percent of the butter is colored and do the butter processors pay any tax on it, so why should those who cannot afford to pay $1 a pound for butter be forced to pay a 10-cent tax on the wholesome oleomargarine substitute?

I observed a few of my Republican colleagues appeared surprised and seemed to doubt my statement that I introduced several measures nearly 40 years ago on this subject legislation. To remove any doubt in their minds, I hope tomorrow I will be given an opportunity to submit positive proof of my efforts years ago to bring about the repeal of this unjustifiable and unwarranted tax on butter substitutes.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I have been a Member of this body for 22 years. I represent a district in the heart of a very large city. I will compare my voting record during that time on legislation favorable to the farmers of this country with any Member of Congress representing a rural district.

I shall vote to discharge the committee and I will vote for the bill to repeal the discriminatory tax on margarine. It is the duty of Congress to do everything within its power to reduce the cost of living. Mr. Speaker, immediately following the decision of the committee to discontinue hearings on the bill to repeal the tax on margarine, butter took a jump of as high as 8 cents a pound in certain sections of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks an editorial printed in the San Francisco Chronicle under date of April 23, 1948, entitled "The Margarine Tax":

THE MARGARINE TAX

By all signs, the House will vote at last to repeal the discriminatory tax on margarine, and repeal prospects in the Senate have sharply looked up with Senator TAFT'S announcement that he favors it.

For all the years it has been kept on the books the tax has been entirely wrong in principle. On the pretext that artificial coloring is employed, margarine makers and dealers have been forced to distribute under special taxation calculated artificially to keep the price of margarine so near that of butter as to discourage consumption. The pretext has no validity, for many foods are artificially colored without being penalized, and butter is often among them. The law amounted in principle to Government subsidy of one American industry against its competition for no reason except pressure of a powerful lobby.

Of recent years, realistic considerations have also come to the fore. Many families are feeling the pinch of high prices, and these are often families most in need of additional fat in their diets. It has therefore become a matter of national health, as well as principle, that the Government no longer be a party to this inequity.

Congress should close out a bad practice which has endured too long.

TAXES ON OLEO COMPARED WITH TAXES ON TEA

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the people have resented from our earliest colonial history any direct taxes on their food budget. The wrath of the wives of America today is comparable with the resentment of those hardy colonists who boarded the ships in Boston Harbor and tossed overboard the tea taxed by the British. The taxation of one food for the benefit of a competing food product is equally intolerable. No wonder the women of the country are angry. Not only does the tax on oleo contribute to the higher cost of this spread for the poor man's bread, but millions of hours and tons of good food must be wasted in tribute to the dairy trusts.

Good oleomargarine is the nutritional equivalent of good butter, yet we tax the one and not the other. This is as bad as taxing lamb chops because they are not chemically identical with beefsteak. The dairy spokesmen reply that the tax is necessary to prevent oleo from being sold fraudulently as butter. Of course, they fail to remind us that other products are protected from fraudulent competition without the assessment of tax under the Federal trade and food and drug laws. Why butterfat should feel that it has a monopoly on the color yellow has always been difficult for me to understand. In fact, color is actually added to butter in wintertime to preserve the yellow tint.

The Dairy Trust argues that it would be destroyed if this tax is repealed. The truth is that butter production now results in an oversupply of skim milk, which is largely wasted. If the production of oleomargarine should result in reduced production of butter, there would be available a larger supply of whole milk, which would add to the health of the Nation's children. Moreover, any competition that shakes the price of butter from its $1 a pound pedestal would certainly be most welcome to those consumers who have long ago stricken that item from the family budget.

It is high time that this Congress stopped using the Federal taxing power for the private benefit of the dairy industry and against the best interests of the consuming public, as well as the competing producers of oleomargarine. The power to tax, notwithstanding the judicial statement to the contrary, is indeed the power to destroy when so used.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I am going to vote for H. R. 2245 because I believe the taxes on oleomargarine should be repealed and that this issue should be settled now. I was among those who signed the discharge petition, in order to get this legislation to the floor of the House. American housewives are demanding that these taxes be eliminated and they are right in their demand. They have been patient, but there comes

a time when patience is no longer a virtue.

I have the greatest regard for the dairy industry and I wish to see it prosper. The issue now involved, however, is greater than any industry. It concerns matters of convenience and economy affecting every American home. I do not think we should be penalized for wishing to use oleomargarine. It is commonly recognized as a wholesome, appetizing food product and is much in demand.

Great efforts have been put forth by the butter interests to block this legislation. Now we have the opportunity to have the issue settled on its merits, an opportunity which has been long sought. I believe that sentiment is in favor of this bill and that the House will adopt it.

The Federal taxes on oleomargarine were first enacted by Congress in 1886. All this time, consumers have had to pay these levies and certainly they should be relieved of this burden. I am sure from the communications I have received that the general sentiment in my congressional district is in favor of repeal.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote to discharge the Committee on Agriculture from the further consideration of H. R. 2245, to repeal the tax on oleomargarine. It is my uniform policy not to sign petitions for discharge, but on account of the fact that this and similar bills were bottled up in the Committee on Agriculture with such a stronghold that neither this bill nor any similar bill would be reported, I made an exception and signed the petition for discharge.

The taxes and the occupational taxes, both wholesale and retail, on margarine, have always been without justification. With the existing high cost of living, and especially in view of the inability to produce or to obtain butter when and as needed, the tax is utterly indefensible. I shall not only vote to discharge the committee, but I shall gladly support at any and every opportunity the repeal of this discriminatory tax which I have always opposed.

The tax constitutes the only discrimination in favor of one edible product against another, or in favor of one agricultural product and against another agricultural product. The tax is therefore not only unfair, but it is un-American.

Whatever may have been the prevailing view when the taxes were first levied, the fact is that margarine is now regarded by physicians, hospitals, and consumers generally as a wholesome and nutritious food.

The public is and will be protected from impurities, as both butter and margarine will be supervised under the Federal Pure Food and Drug Act, which requires proper labeling of all food products.

The tax is not only unfair, but the administration of the tax is worse than discriminatory. The restrictions are such that many of the smaller wholesalers and many of the smaller retailers do not handle margarine. The consumers, therefore, are deprived of margarine. The repeal of the tax will carry with it the repeal of the regulations, and will thus make margarine available not only to the consumers in the big cities, but to consumers in the small cities, towns, villages, and countryside.

I have no quarrel with dairy farmers. I do not believe that the repeal of the antimargarine taxes will fundamentally injure the dairy farmers. Something has been said about the tariff on long-staple cotton. There are quotas not only on the importations of cotton, but on other agricultural products. For more than a half a century the antimargarine taxes discriminated against cotton. There are 1,600,000 cotton farms in the 18 States that produce cotton, but substantially 42 percent of the margarine is now manufactured from soybeans, and the soybean crop, especially in the Midwest, in the past 10 years has increased so that it is now valued at $700,000,000 annually. Cottonseed oil is still used in 47 percent of the margarine production.

When food is high, and in justice to the American consumer, and particularly to the American housewife, the tax should be promptly repealed. There is no valid reason for the continuance of the tax. It is utterly unfair to millions of housewives to require them to mix the yellow coloring with the white margarine. The repeal of this iniquitous tax is long overdue.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, as one of the signers of discharge petition No. 7 which today brings H. R. 2245 before the House for consideration, I wish to say that while I always endeavor to follow all of the committees of the House, and while I extend to every member of any committee the privilege of exercising his good judgment on any question, as I do to all others on any matter, in this particular case the interests of the majority of my constituents were not best served by withholding the opportunity of enacting this bill, and therefore, I was compelled to assist in bringing this bill to the floor for action.

Mr. Speaker, while I have full respect for the chairman and all of the members of the Committee on Agriculture, I cannot agree with their position in this matter as it is manifestly to the interest of my constituents and my district that I support this bill, and since more than a majority of the Members of the House have indicated their approval of the bill, it is a foregone conclusion that the same will be passed by a comfortable majority.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine. Therefore, I am for discharging the Committee on Agriculture in view of the action of the committee adopting a resolution to table all proposals that would repeal this discriminatory tax.

I signed the discharge petition for which I make no apology. This is not an unusual procedure. In fact it is democracy in its truest form, as carrying out the will of the majority. There is no precedent by such as action as the discharge method of bringing legislation before this House when desired by a majority of the membership, which has been used innumerable times.

The esteemed gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, makes an appeal that his committee should not be discharged of this legislation because of the action of his committee in consideration of the great number of bills pending on this subject. I realize fully the seriousness with which the gentleman makes such an appeal, but in my opinion it fails insofar as the merits of this issue are concerned.

The gentleman has stated the action of his committee. To be sure rather extensive hearings were held on the various bills to repeal what I think is a wholly unjustified tax. To be sure his committee has considered these proposals in executive session. The gentleman admits that his committee adopted a resolution to table any and all such proposals during this session of Congress.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, such action of that committee thwarted the will of the majority of this House and justifies this discharge. Furthermore, this petition was not laid on the Speaker's desk until after the Committee on Agriculture had taken such action. Neither I nor any other Member of this Congress attempted to take such action until a few members on the Committee on Agriculture had said by their action that we will not permit the House to consider this matter of so much importance to the American people. Therefore, in my opinion the argument of the fine gentleman from Kansas should be wholly ineffective.

The vote to occur, Mr. Speaker, is whether or not this House will discharge the Committee on Agriculture. It is not my purpose at this time to enter into the argument as to the merits or demerits of the tax issue on oleomargarine. I do wish to say that I am supporting the repeal of such taxes, and I signed the petition because I believe such a tax is wholly indefensible. It has the effect of a monopoly, to which the American people do not subscribe. It is discriminatory and designed especially to protect the dairy interest in their monopoly, and to force continued high prices for their butter on the consuming public. Check with your grocery store anywhere throughout the country and see how much the price of butter has increased in the last 2 years. Certainly some normal increase was justified, but when there is a shortage of any commodity the slack is usually taken up by the increase in price.

This is not a new issue. It dates as far back as 1886 when the first tax on oleomargarine was provided. That was not sufficient and a complete schedule of rates as now exists was provided in 1902. Let us see what the rate is in determining the justification.

Uncolored oleomargarine is subject to a tax of one-fourth cent per pound. Colored oleomargarine has a tax of 10 cents per pound. We wonder why the one-fourth cent per pound on uncolored oleo? Perhaps it was to try to cover up the real intention of the tax. Imported oleomargarine, regardless of color, is taxed at the rate of 15 cents per pound.

As a further inhibition to the use of oleo, manufacturers have a tax of $600, wholesalers are required to pay a tax of $480 on colored oleomargarine and $200

even to distribute uncolored products. Then comes the retailers who are required to pay an annual tax of $48 for colored oleo and $6 for uncolored.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this vote to discharge the committee should prevail, giving this House the privilege and opportunity of considering such unfair practices on a commodity so vitally needed by the consuming public. It is the democratic way. It is fair. It is right.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, it simply burns me up to have a fine, outstanding gentleman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], attribute fraud to oleomargarine because of the use of coloring, when butter does the same thing whenever need becomes apparent. He charges that oleomargarine does it to imitate butter. Of course, both add coloring to give their product a color it does not have, and both are tarred with the same stick. This practice is common to each product, and to many other sales aids.

Why, then, this holier-than-thou attitude?

Another distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] would have us believe that his tongue is not in his cheek when he argues that the House Committee on Agriculture has ever given, or ever means to give, the repeal of the taxes on oleomargarine any real consideration. On this issue opinions are fixed—on both sides. Like the justice of the peace, hearings may be held, but the decision is always written in advance—for every practical purpose. We might as well entrust a rabbit with a cabbage leaf and expect him not to eat it.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to limit my personal remarks regarding the repeal of the margarine taxes to say that the present taxes on colored margarine are discrimnatory and place an unnecessary financial burden on the American families who do not care to color the margarine at home. I wish to read a letter from Dr. Jessie Whitacre, chairman of the Texas State Nutrition Council, College Station, Tex., who has very ably presented the facts concerning the repeal of the tax on margarine:

TEXAS STATE NUTRITION COUNCIL,
College Station, Tex., April 22, 1948.

Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. TEAGUE: My varied interest in oleomargarine as a food prompts me to send this message to you as Representative from my district, No. 6, of Texas.

First let me tell you that I am immensely pleased to find your name among those who signed the discharge petition referring to the Rivers bill (H. R. 2245). Next, let me urge you not to fail to be present in the House on April 26, and vote for the Rivers bill then. Do give every possible support to this bill.

My interests in oleomargarine may be briefly stated as follows:

1. As a consumer, I am grateful that research and industry have made available such an excellent food as is oleomargarine with added vitamins. For many years I have used vitamin-fortified oleomargarine for cooking, but from the time butter reached 75 cents a pound here, I have used only fortified oleomargarine on the table.

2. As a homemaker, knowing that vitamin-fortified oleomargarine and butter may be used alternately in food preparation, and for serving too when oleomargarine is colored, I resent having to pay the 10 cents tax per pound for the colored product. When I buy the white oleomargarine and add the color myself, I must pay an extra price in time and energy and have a less attractive product so far as shape is concerned, than if the manufacturer does the coloring and molding.

3. As a nutritionist, I know that no research or demonstration yet conducted, has produced any evidence that vitamin-fortified oleomargarine is inferior to butter nutritionally. The one outstanding difference between the two fats is in price. In five of our local stores today, the price of butter ranges from 90 cents to $1.10 per pound; white oleomargarine from 34 to 49 cents, colored oleomargarine from 49 to 55 cents. It is therefore, irrational from an economic viewpoint to consider oleomargarine with vitamins added and butter competitive products. The choice for consumers in the lower-income classes is not between oleomargarine and butter, but between oleomargarine and no spread for their bread.

4. As an educator, I am obliged to state the facts concerning the relative merits of oleomargarine and butter whenever the occasion arises.

5. As chairman of the Texas State Nutrition Council, I have an interest in the matter beyond my own personal feelings and professional views. This council's objectives are to induce Texans to want optimum nutrition, and to help them to achieve it. The removal of the taxes from the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine will assist the council in its objectives.

6. As a taxpayer, I object to the taxes on oleomargarine on several counts.

(a) The price of vitamin-fortified oleomargarine is higher than it need be not merely because of the direct influence of the taxes on its manufacture and sale but also because in order to comply with the law, the natural color of soybean and cotton seed oils used in making oleomargarine must be removed before these oils can be incorporated into the fat.

(b) The revenue derived from this tax source is comparatively small. For many years the cost to administer the tax laws was greater than the revenue derived.

(c) Most important of any aspect, it seems to me, is the precedent set in this case. Do not the taxes against oleomargarine constitute the only case on record where one industry has been responsible for penalizing by taxation the product made by another industry? One fairly shudders to think of the situation which might arise if other industries would follow the precedent of antagonism of the butter industry against the oleomargarine industry. Suppose the cotton interests were able to bring about the taxing of synthetic fibers. Suppose the producers of any of the materials used in building houses were to bring about the taxation of any of the other materials. We could have a situation very oppressive upon certain ones of our industries.

Too long the manufacturers, sellers, and consumers of oleomargarine have been oppressed by taxes against oleomargarine. I beg you to do all in your power to have those taxes repealed.

Sincerely yours,

JESSIE WHITACRE,
Chairman, Texas State Nutrition Council.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks on the rule discharged in the House Agriculture Committee for further consideration of H. R. 2245, I wish to point out that the only basis for the tax originally was to protect butter. Before signing the petition to bring H. R. 2245 to the floor for consideration, I read the testimony before the Agricultural Committee and in none of it did I find any real basis for the tax.

I am a member of a family which has operated a dairy farm for several generations and I grew up with the idea that there was substantial justification for the tax on oleomargarine but in all of the thought and study I have given to this matter I can find no economic reason in the national interest or any moral justification for the tax. I know of no other instance wherein a food or a product is taxed for the benefit of another food or product. To levy such a tax on margarine violates the very principles on which our free-enterprise system is based.

It is against the law to represent margarine as butter and the removal of this tax will in no way affect the regulations concerning margarine as set forth in the Federal Pure Food and Drug Act. If it can be proven there is a definite need for strengthening the Federal Trade Act and/or the Federal Pure Food and Drug Act in connection with the sale of margarine, I will most certainly be for that.

The present tax on margarine takes money out of the housewife's pocket for the purpose of protecting another food. With prices continuing their steady rise, a tax of this nature is eminently unfair.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to myself.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to enter into any argument now because every Member of this House has his mind made up on how he is going to vote. There is no question in my mind but what everyone knows how they are going to vote. Now is the time to vote.

I want to clear up one thing, however. It has been charged here that linseed oil is used in the manufacture of margarine. I would like to correct that error without getting into an argument. I call this to your particular attention: The component parts of margarine are corn oil, cottonseed oil, peanut oil, soybean oil, and a considerable amount of dairy products. There is no place in this Nation, and I challenge anybody to say this is not true, where linseed oil is used in the manufacture of margarine. Linseed oil is a flaxseed oil. There is no such thing as the use of linseed oil for the manufacture of margarine in this country. Maybe that is done in other places in the world but not in America.

Mr. Speaker, this is an American product. The American people want this tax repealed. Let us vote on it. Let us get this thing over and take care of the people who eat this spread because they desire to do so. It is good for them, it is good for you, it is good for me; let us give it to them immediately.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

The question is, Shall the Committee on Agriculture be discharged from further consideration of the bill H. R. 2245?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 235, nays 121, answered "present" 2, not voting 72, as follows:

[Roll No. 49]

YEAS—235

Abbitt	Fulton	Muhlenberg
Abernethy	Gamble	Multer
Albert	Garmatz	Murdock
Allen, Calif.	Gary	Murray, Tenn.
Allen, La.	Gathings	Nicholson
Anderson, Calif.	Goodwin	Nixon
Angell	Gordon	Nodar
Auchincloss	Gorski	Norrell
Bakewell	Gossett	O'Brien
Barden	Grant, Ind.	O'Toole
Bates, Mass.	Gregory	Owens
Beall	Hale	Pace
Beckworth	Hall,	Passman
Bender	Leonard W.	Patman
Bennett, Mich.	Hand	Peden
Bland	Hardy	Peterson
Blatnik	Harris	Philbin
Boggs, Del.	Havenner	Pickett
Boggs, La.	Hays	Ploeser
Bonner	Hébert	Poage
Bradley	Herter	Potter
Brooks	Heselton	Potts
Brown, Ga.	Hess	Poulson
Bryson	Hinshaw	Preston
Buchanan	Hobbs	Price, Ill.
Buck	Holifield	Priest
Bulwinkle	Huber	Ramey
Burleson	Isacson	Rankin
Busbey	Javits	Rayburn
Byrne, N. Y.	Jennings	Redden
Camp	Johnson, Tex.	Reeves
Canfield	Jones, Ala.	Regan
Carroll	Jones, Wash.	Richards
Case, N. J.	Judd	Riley
Chadwick	Karsten, Mo.	Rivers
Chapman	Kean	Rogers, Fla.
Chelf	Keating	Rohrbough
Church	Kee	Rooney
Cole, Kans.	Kelley	Ross
Combs	Kennedy	Sabath
Cooley	Keogh	Sadlak
Cooper	Kerr	Sadowski
Corbett	King	Sarbacher
Coudert	Kirwan	Sasscer
Courtney	Klein	Scott, Hardie
Cox	Kunkel	Scott,
Cravens	Lane	Hugh D., Jr.
Crosser	Lanham	Seely-Brown
Crow	Larcade	Sheppard
Davis, Ga.	Latham	Smathers
Davis, Tenn.	LeFevre	Snyder
Dawson, Ill.	Lesinski	Somers
Deane	Lichtenwalter	Spence
Delaney	Lodge	Stanley
Devitt	Love	Stigler
Dingell	Lucas	Teague
Dirksen	Ludlow	Thomas, Tex.
Domengeaux	Lyle	Thompson
Donohue	Lynch	Tibbott
Dorn	McConnell	Tollefson
Doughton	McDonough	Towe
Douglas	McGarvey	Twyman
Durham	McMahon	Vail
Eaton	McMillan, S. C.	Van Zandt
Eberharter	McMillen, Ill.	Vinson
Elsaesser	Mahon	Vorys
Elston	Maloney	Welch
Engle, Calif.	Marcantonio	Wheeler
Fallon	Mathews	Whitaker
Feighan	Meade, Ky.	Whitten
Fellows	Meade, Md.	Whittington
Fernandez	Merrow	Wigglesworth
Fisher	Miller, Conn.	Williams
Flannagan	Mills	Wilson, Tex.
Fletcher	Mitchell	Winstead
Fogarty	Monroney	Wolverton
Folger	Morris	Wood
Foote	Morrison	Worley
Forand	Morton	Youngblood

NAYS—121

Allen, Ill.	Brophy	Crawford
Andersen, H. Carl	Brown, Ohio	Cunningham
	Buffett	Curtis
Andresen, August H.	Burke	Davis, Wis.
	Butler	D'Ewart
Arends	Byrnes, Wis.	Dolliver
Arnold	Cannon	Dondero
Banta	Carson	Elliott
Barrett	Case, S. Dak.	Ellis
Bates, Ky.	Chenoweth	Ellsworth
Bennett, Mo.	Clark	Engel, Mich.
Bishop	Clevenger	Evins
Blackney	Cole, Mo.	Fuller
Bramblett	Cole, N. Y.	Gearhart
Brehm	Cotton	Gillie
Goff	Keefe	Rees
Granger	Kersten, Wis.	Riehlman
Griffiths	Kilburn	Robertson
Gross	Knutson	Rockwell
Gwinn, N. Y.	Landis	Rogers, Mass.
Gwynne, Iowa	Lea	Russell
Hagen	LeCompte	St. George
Hall,	Lemke	Sanborn
Edwin Arthur	Lewis	Schwabe, Mo.
Halleck	McCulloch	Schwabe, Okla.
Harness, Ind.	McGregor	Scrivner
Harvey	Mack	Shafer
Hill	MacKinnon	Short
Hoeven	Martin, Iowa	Simpson, Ill.
Hoffman	Mason	Smith, Kans.
Holmes	Michener	Smith, Va.
Hope	Miller, Md.	Smith, Wis.
Horan	Miller, Nebr.	Stefan
Hull	Murray, Wis.	Stevenson
Jackson, Wash.	Norblad	Stockman
Jenison	O'Hara	Talle
Jensen	O'Konski	Vursell
Johnson, Calif.	Phillips, Calif.	Weichel
Johnson, Ill.	Phillips, Tenn.	Wilson, Ind.
Johnson, Ind.	Plumley	Wolcott
Jonkman	Reed, Ill.	
Kearns	Reed, N. Y.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Coffin Taber

NOT VOTING—72

Andrews, Ala.	Hart	Morgan
Andrews, N. Y.	Hartley	Mundt
Battle	Hedrick	Norton
Bell	Heffernan	Patterson
Bloom	Hendricks	Pfeifer
Bolton	Jackson, Calif.	Powell
Boykin	Jarman	Price, Fla.
Buckley	Jenkins, Ohio	Rains
Celler	Jenkins, Pa.	Rich
Chiperfield	Johnson, Okla.	Rizley
Clason	Jones, N. C.	Scoblick
Clippinger	Kearney	Sikes
Colmer	Kefauver	Simpson, Pa.
Dague	Kilday	Smith, Maine
Dawson, Utah	Lusk	Smith, Ohio
Fenton	McCormack	Stratton
Gallagher	McCowen	Sundstrom
Gavin	McDowell	Taylor
Gillette	Macy	Thomas, N. J.
Gore	Madden	Trimble
Graham	Manasco	Wadsworth
Grant, Ala.	Mansfield	Walter
Harless, Ariz.	Meyer	West
Harrison	Miller, Calif.	Woodruff

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Wadsworth for, with Mr. Taber against.
Mr. Clason for, with Mr. Clague against.
Mr. Madden for, with Mr. Mundt against.
Mr. Coffin for, with Mr. Woodruff against.
Mr. Sundstrom for, with Mr. Meyer against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Gavin with Mr. Kilday.
Mrs. Bolton with Mr. Hedrick.
Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Walter.
Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Mansfield.
Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Jenkins of Ohio with Mr. Colmer.
Mr. Fenton with Mr. McCormack.
Mr. Gillette with Mr. Bloom.
Mr. Graham with Mr. Kefauver.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Pfeifer.
Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Rains.
Mr. Rich with Mr. Price of Florida.
Mr. Patterson with Mr. Gore.
Mr. Dawson of Utah with Mr. Battle.
Mr. Gallagher with Mrs. Norton.
Mr. Macy with Mr. Jones of North Carolina.
Mr. Jackson of California with Mr. Boykin.
Mr. Kearney with Mr. Sikes.
Mrs. Smith of Maine with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Rizley with Mr. Trimble.
Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Miller of California.
Mr. Chiperfield with Mr. Morgan.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Harrison.
Mr. McCowen with Mr. Hart.
Mr. McDonough with Mr. Andrews of Alabama.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Jarman.
Mr. Clippinger with Mrs. Lusk.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Heffernan.
Mr. Andrews of New York with Mr. Grant of Alabama.

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair on this motion with the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. WOODRUFF, who is unavoidably absent. If he were here, he would vote "no." I therefore withdraw my vote of "aye," and vote "present."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I voted "no" on this bill. I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York, Mr. WADSWORTH. If he were present, he would vote "aye." I therefore withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. Without interfering with the rights of the gentleman from South Carolina to move to go into the Committee of the Whole, the Chair will entertain consent requests for extensions of remarks only.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of taxation of co-ops and to include therewith an editorial on the same subject.

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

NO HELP TO UNFRIENDLY NATIONS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, before passing the foreign-aid bill, amounting to $6,098,000,000, Congress provided every possible safeguard to prevent any part of this money, or goods purchased with it, from falling into the hands of unfriendly nations.

My Speaker, my attention has been called to a recent sale by the War Assets Administration, held in the city of San Francisco, consisting of locomotives and other heavy machinery, to agents representing foreign countries.

It is the bounden duty of Congress to prevent commodities of any kind finally falling into the hands of any unfriendly nation. It is inconsistent to spend days here safeguarding appropriations for foreign aid and at the same time leave the door open for matériel of this kind to fall into the hands of unfriendly countries.

Mr. Speaker, we had our lesson. We should remember that we sold the Japanese the material to build and the gasoline to run the airplanes used by them in their cowardly attack on Pearl Harbor.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BARRETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Southern California's Future and the Colorado River." I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $195.25, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a synopsis of the Maryland veterans laws.

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial and in the other resolutions.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial written by Mr. L. F. Reid, a newspaperman of Renville, Minn., relative to the request by our various bureaus of Government for free advertisement in small country newspapers.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement of the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article about the cattle industry in Hawaii.

Mr. HULL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include letters.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution unanimously adopted by the Combined Veterans Committee of Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa., in tribute to Egbert Camp, United Spanish War Veterans.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include excerpts.

Mr. BRADLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he made recently before the spring conference, Middle Atlantic region, Propeller Club of the United States.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter addressed by him to Mr. F. W. Hoffman, president of the Cudahy Packing Co.

Mr. HÉBERT (at the request of Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech he recently made.

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two letters.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Shreveport Times.

Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include two editorials.

Mr. LYNCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by Mr. C. Tyler Wood, deputy to the assistant secretary for Economic Affairs.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject Reciprocal Trade Program Benefits All The People and include two editorials.

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an excerpt from a letter and an editorial.

Mr. MONRONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. STIGLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement he made before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for Civil Functions of the War Department.

Mr. LUDLOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. STIGLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject Assisting American Agriculture in Oklahoma.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he will make in the Committee of the Whole and include certain pertinent extracts.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour on the high cost of living.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be excused for 2 hours to go shopping for America's housewives, as I feel it is quite as important for the Members of Congress to know what is going on in the grocery stores of America as in the munitions plants of America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2245) to repeal the tax on oleomargarine; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 3 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2245, with Mr. ARENDS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POTTS].

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Chairman, the matter before us is whether we shall eliminate the highly repressive taxes on colored margarine and give to the consumers of America the rights to which they are entitled from a free, competitive market.

Now what are those taxes?

First. Six hundred dollars a year on manufacturers of margarine.

Second. Four hundred and eighty dollars a year on wholesalers of colored margarine.

Third. Forty-eight dollars a year on retailers of colored margarine.

Fourth. Ten cents a pound on the purchaser of colored margarine.

Oh, yes; the housewife can have uncolored margarine without most of these taxes, and then she can color it herself with all the difficulty and labor coloring it entails, as housewives who use margarine will very graphically attest to. And she will color it, too; of that there is no doubt, because it then

takes on a palatable appearance, and she will buy it, especially in these times of $1 butter, and of that there is no doubt either. So that the net result is a tax placed on the product, the sole purpose of which is, and from its inception has been, to attempt to discourage housewives from purchasing it.

Nobody denies that the remission of these taxes will boost the sales of margarine, although I believe to a lesser degree than the opponents of the pending legislation would have us believe, and that since it is a substitute for butter, there will be a consequent falling off in the sale of the latter. It is quite understandable therefore that the dairy interests should become apprehensive and that they should redouble their efforts to save a subsidy they have enjoyed for many decades, paid for by the housewives of America.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. POTTS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman know that the oil in every ounce of every pound of oleo made in the United States is subsidized at between 1 and 10 cents a pound?

Mr. POTTS. I am only concerned about the subsidy as it affects the manufacture of butter, that you have a free, competitive market except that this is a limitation on that free competitive market in America. There is no more reason for that than for putting a tax on salad spreads, because they are a competitor of mayonnaise.

It is safe to say, this legislation would not have come to the floor of this House by petition to discharge if margarine taxes were the prerogative of the revenue-raising committee of the House, namely, the Ways and Means Committee. That the taxes on margarine are not truly for revenue-raising purposes is evident from the fact that the Ways and Means Committee does not have jurisdiction over them but rather the Committee on Agriculture. So long as the latter committee has jurisdiction over margarine taxes it can be reasonably expected that margarine taxes will be forever imposed not for tax-raising purposes, because it is not a tax-raising committee, but to give to the dairy interests of the country an unfair advantage having no place in a free-enterprise America.

There is no more sense in putting taxes on margarine because people use it as a substitute for butter than there is in putting a tax on salad spreads because they are competitive with mayonnaise, nor as it might have been in days of yore in putting a tax on leather shoes to keep people wearing wooden sabots.

Progress, whether it be manifest in a superior product or in cheaper cost, should not be held up if we agree on the premise, and I take it we do, that our living standards are higher in this country because we have a freer economy than any other country. The present taxes on margarine are a limitation on that free economy.

I have great confidence in the ingenuity of the dairy farmer to devise other and perhaps better uses and outlets for his milk. Butter is not his only one. Progress begets progress.

It is sometimes contended that butter is entitled to use the color yellow to the exclusion of margarine. That is sheer nonsense and the proof of that is that the housewife may color it herself and the wholesaler and retailer may sell it colored and the housewife may buy it colored upon the payment of a tax—not to the dairy interests, as you would suppose it would be if butter had such a preemptive right, but rather to the Government.

It is said that the tax is imposed to raise revenue to prevent fraud in the marketing of margarine as butter. But that theory is falacious. There is no more basis for saddling the margarine consumers of America with the operating cost of a Government agency charged with the prevention of fraud than there would be in parceling out the cost of such agency in exposing fraud in the sale of hybrid shoes as leather shoes, or in the sale of "blue sky" securities.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. This is a very important issue, and I see very few Democrats on the floor to hear this discussion. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and two Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Chairman, if my neighbor's house is burglarized, the crime has been committed against the entire citizenry, and I, as one, must contribute through my taxes to the cost of apprehension and punishment of the criminal, even though my own house may never be burglarized. That is sound policy and cannot be disputed.

It follows, therefore, that the cost of preventing fraud in any manner should be borne by the people as a whole.

Put whatever penalties are necessary on the fraudulent sale of margarine as butter; make all reasonable requirements as to wording on packages; but do not saddle solely the consumers of margarine with a cost that is properly that of the whole populace. Do not give a subsidy any longer to the dairy interests at the expense of America's housewives.

Mr. Chairman, this is a nonpartisan measure. The Members on both sides of the aisle from the dairy country have represented their interests well. Their constituents should long remember them for their untiring efforts in preserving the subsidy for so long a time. Now the consumer should have his rightful day.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER].

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, you ask me of the state of the Nation, Mr. Hennessey. It is a sad state indeed. The biggest political hoax in many a moon has made strange bedfellows, the likes of which this House has seldom seen.

Oleo can be naturally colored yellow, somebody told them, and with that they fall into each other's arms.

They have buttered their bread, Mr. Hennessey, and now let them lie in it.

And who do we find sharing the same pillow, Mr. Hennessey? The Cotton South and the CIO; both hoping to remove the Federal taxes on oleomargarine colored yellow in imitation of butter.

Oleo will be cheaper, the CIO murmurs sleepily. But what does the Cotton South dream, Mr. Hennessey? The Cotton South dreams that yellow oleo will bring better prices for cottonseed oil; though how cottonseed oil can go up if the oleo price goes down no man can tell.

Then there is Harry and Henry Wallace cuddled up in another corner. Harry wants the votes of the workingman, and Hank wants whatever the Communists want, so they both plump for yellow oleo and never mind the farmer, Mr. Hennessey.

The Consumers' League is snuggled close to the 26 big Wall Street corporations that make oleomargarine, and all because the big corporations and Eleanor say it is a shame for the ladies to have to take 2 minutes from My Day to color their own oleo.

Every left-wing cartoonist in the country has crawled under last year's $6,000,000 advertising blanket cast over the scene by four oleo manufacturers. And whom do we find under the blanket, Mr. Hennessey, but the conservative publishers who have closed their columns to the nonadvertising farmers. If it is yellow oleo their city readers want, it is yellow oleo they should have.

Life magazine has hold of a $200,000 corner of that advertising, Mr. Hennessey, and if the same blanket covers the unwashed Daily Worker, who is Mr. Luce to complain?

But, Mr. Hennessey, wait until we hear from the 5,000,000 farm families left out in the cold.

And, remember this, if we raise big, strapping babies in the United States of America someone is going to produce milk. If we kill off all the cows, I give you one guess, Mr. Hennessey, filled milk will not do it.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me at all times there is a middle ground upon which we can all meet. That goes for the agricultural producer of farm crops, as well as the labor organizations in the great cities.

It is contended by those who desire to remove the tax on oleomargarine that the housewives should have the right to buy yellow oleomargarine without the 10-cents-per-pound tax.

It is likewise contended by the opponents that if oleomargarine is permitted to be colored yellow and sold without a payment of a 10-cents-per-pound tax that yellow oleomargarine will be passed off to the public and served as butter.

Let us be frank and admit that there is merit in both those contentions. The objective of both groups, if they are honest and sincere in their contentions, is to benefit and protect the consumer. The oleomargarine forces would achieve this objective by coloring oleomargarine yellow. The butter forces would accomplish their objective and protect against fraud and deception by having

oleomargarine any color other than yellow so that the product could readily be recognized as oleomargarine.

I am not speaking for either group, but I am speaking for the housewives. The bill I have offered, or will offer, as a substitute will give each group substantially what it seeks and at the same time it will also let the housewife have yellow oleomargarine without the 10-cents-per-pound tax and without having to spend hours in the kitchen coloring the product herself. It will also drastically reduce the taxes on wholesalers and retailers.

The gentleman from New Hampshire, Congressman NORRIS COTTON, has cooperated with me in working out the amendment which I will place in the RECORD at this point. We both feel that here is a plan we can all support. Now we can, under this amendment, always distinguish oleomargarine from butter.

I am going to offer a bill as an substitute for the bill proposed by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], whom I love and have known ever since I have been in this House. I will give you a chance to learn something about this amendment as I proceed. I am going to propose in my amendment that we take the tax off of oleomargarine. That should please the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Amendment in the nature of substitute offered by Mr. HILL:

Strike out everything after the enacting clause and substitute the following:

"That chapter 16, subchapter A, section 2301 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the tax on oleomargarine) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(1) Upon oleomargarine which shall be manufactured and sold, or removed for consumption or use, there shall be assessed and collected a tax at the rate of one-fourth of 1 cent per pound; except that such tax shall be at the rate of 10 cents per pound in the case of oleomargarine which is yellow in color: *Provided*, That such tax on oleomargarine which is yellow in color shall be at the rate of one-fourth of 1 cent per pound if such oleomargarine is manufactured, prepared, molded, shaped, packaged, sold, and distributed so that—

"'a. The net weight of the contents of the retail package shall not exceed 1 pound;

"'b. The contents of each package is divided into four equal parts; and

"'c. Each part of the contents of such package is manufactured, prepared, molded, and shaped in such manner so as to have three sides (exclusive of the ends) so that each part will be triangular in shape, or to be in such other form or shape as the Secretary of the Treasury may approve. The Secretary of the Treasury shall not approve any other method of preparing, molding, or shaping of oleomargarine unless he is fully satisfied that the article after all labels have been removed and after it has been cut into patties for use on the table can readily be recognized by the general public as oleomargarine and clearly distinguished from butter.'

"SEC. 2. Chapter 16, subchapter A, section 2302 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after the phrase 'determined as provided in paragraph 2 of section 2301 (a),' the following 'or who shall change or attempt to change the mold or shape or other identifying characteristics of yellow oleomargarine with the intent of defeating the purposes of this act.'

"SEC. 3. Chapter 16, subchapter A, section 2308 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by inserting after the word 'law' where it last appears in that section the following: ', or who knowingly changes or attempts to change the form or shape or other identifying characteristics of yellow oleomargarine on which a tax at the rate of 10 cents per pound has not been paid with the intent of defeating the purposes of this act.'

"SEC. 4. Chapter 27, subchapter A, part I, section 3200 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after the word 'oleomargarine' the following ', except hospitals which merely color oleomargarine to be served to patients or hospital employees.'

"SEC. 5. Chapter 27, subchapter A, part I, section 3200 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by striking out the figures '$200' and insert in lieu thereof '$50.'

"SEC. 6. Chapter 27, subchapter A, part I, section 3200 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by striking out the figure '$6' and insert in lieu thereof '$1.'

"SEC. 7. This act shall take effect on July 1, 1948."

EXPLANATION OF THE HILL AMENDMENT

Section 1: This section will reduce the tax on yellow oleomargarine from 10 cents a pound to one-fourth of 1 cent per pound if the yellow oleomargarine is prepared so that it will be cylindrical or triangular in shape instead of in a square or rectangular form. The effect of this will be to let the housewife have yellow oleomargarine at the same price as white oleomargarine but will also give a person who desires to buy butter an opportunity to get butter and not oleomargarine because the shape of the yellow oleomargarine will clearly identify it as oleomargarine and distinguish it from butter. This section provides flexibility so that it may be in some other shape other than round or triangular if the Secretary of the Treasury is fully satisfied that the article after all labels have been removed and after it has been cut into patties for use on the table can be readily recognized by the general public as oleomargarine.

Section 2: This section merely inserts a provision which will make any person who attempts to change the mold or shape of yellow oleomargarine and otherwise destroy its identifying characteristics subject to the full tax as a manufacturer.

Section 3: Section 3 of the bill makes a similar change in the penal provisions of the present Internal Revenue Code so that they will be applicable if a person changes the form or shape of the yellow oleomargarine on which the tax of 10 cents per pound has not been paid in order to defeat the purposes of the act.

Section 4: This section exempts hospitals from the definition of a manufacturer and permits hospitals, which merely color oleomargarine, to serve to patients or hospital employees without payment of a manufacturers tax.

Section 5: This section reduces the tax on wholesalers who handle yellow oleomargarine packaged in the manner provided in section 1 from $480 per year to $50 per year.

Section 6: This section reduces the tax on retailers who handle only yellow oleomargarine prepared and packaged in the manner authorized under section 1 of this act from $48 a year to $2 per year.

Section 7: Section 9 makes the act effective on July 1, 1948. This is the date on which new license fees will have to be paid.

I repeat:

The contents of each package is divided into four equal parts. Each part of the contents of such package is manufactured, prepared, molded, shaped, in such manner as to have—

Now, get this—

three sides exclusive of the ends so that each part shall be triangular in shape or to be in such other form as the Secretary of the Treasury shall order.

The Secretary of the Treasury shall have the power of approval.

Now let us see what we would have. Here is a package of oleo.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman who loves me yield?

Mr. HILL. In just a moment. I do not love the gentleman that much. Now, here is what I was going to tell the gentleman——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. HILL. As you look at this package——

Mr. RIVERS. Now will my affectionate friend yield?

Mr. HILL. As you look at this package you will find that it is perfectly solid. There is therefore no reason in the world why some type of machine could not easily be made to divide the package into four equal parts and make them triangular in shape. Then they could be cut up into patties and served and there would be no way in the world to confuse it with butter. Color it as yellow as you want.

You can do the same with a pound of butter. Here is a pound cut into four equal parts. There is no use saying it will not work. My desire is to protect the public and if my friend from South Carolina does not want to sell oleo as a substitute for butter he will vote for this amendment.

I now yield to the gentleman from South Carolina, whom I love with all my heart.

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman with the heart that bleeds so profusely for the people, did he offer that amendment in the committee?

Mr. HILL. It would have been offered, I may say to the gentleman, if this petition discharging the committee had not been signed.

Mr. RIVERS. Did the gentleman ever offer any such amendment in the committee?

Mr. HILL. I would have offered this if it had not been that the matter was taken away from the committee. I may say to the gentleman that I was made chairman of a committee to report on this matter.

Mr. RIVERS. When to report back?

Mr. HILL. I do not quite understand the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. What did your committee propose to report?

Mr. HILL. Tomorrow morning if it had not been for the petition. We were all ready to go. We had this bill drawn up.

Mr. RIVERS. I dislike to argue with the gentleman but you know very well you all passed a motion to defer anything regarding oleo until the next session of Congress.

Mr. HILL. Let me say to the gentleman that I was one of those who said we should consider this further. My friends on the committee will stand up and tell you that I was one of the members who stood up and said we should give further consideration to this matter. There is one sitting at the gentleman's right

hand now who will tell you if you ask him.

Mr. RIVERS. It looks to me as though the gentleman was outweighed.

Mr. HILL. I shall ask permission to have this bill printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of today.

There is no reason why it should not be accepted. The pound of oleo can be easily shaped in this triangular form, four pieces to the pound and with this peculiar shape the oleo people would not be perpetrating a fraud upon anyone.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WORLEY. I merely wish to say that I am glad to support the statement made by the gentleman that he tried to get some floor action on all of these bills.

Mr. HILL. And I will say to the gentleman from Texas that I believe that statement and I believe we can do this. I do not think it will be any trouble at all. The oleo shaped in this form can be as yellow as anyone wants it to be or it can be any color, yellow, black, green, or red. Automobiles are not all the same color and no one would want them to be. Why, you know what your wife would say if you went to buy a new car and could get only one color?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. As soon as I have made this one statement: I have nothing to cover up, nothing to shield on this matter. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman has proposed a very interesting thing. Right now the gentleman takes the position that butter is much better than oleo; does he not?

Mr. HILL. I take no restrictive position.

Mr. ABERNETHY. But the gentleman does now?

Mr. HILL. If I can secure sufficient time I will answer all the questions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCGARVEY].

Mr. MCGARVEY. Mr. Chairman, as you all know, on Tuesday, March 20, the members of the House Committee on Agriculture, shelved 19 bills which had been introduced to either repeal or drastically reduce the Federal taxes on colored oleomargarine. The reasons for the committee's high-handed action in this instance are best known only to themselves. It is significant that the members of the committee all represent agricultural districts. Not one member, representing an industrial or city district, was permitted by vote to voice his approval of the bills. Since the people living in such districts comprise the main body of consumers of oleomargarine, and not the people in the farming districts, it can hardly be said that the proposed legislation received the impartial consideration to which it is entitled in a country which functions under a representative form of government.

I am proud that I am one of the signers of the discharge petition to bring the oleomargarine repeal bill to the floor of the House in order that it might be voted on in the American way. This way is directly opposed to the manner in which the oleomargarine repeal bills were roughly pigeonholed with no explanation or reasons given. I represent a large thickly populated city district where some of the leading industrial plants of the country are located, and where the housewives have written me daily regarding the outrageous measure which the committee members have proposed in lieu of H. R. 2245. Yes; I call it outrageous and Sovietlike tactics, and I will not stand idly by.

I should now be home in my district campaigning, as tomorrow is primary election day in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, but to me the repeal of the taxes on oleomargarine is so vitally important that I am here today to fight for the repeal. I want every Member of this House to know my feelings and to know that I shall vote for H. R. 2245, and vote against any attempt to forestall or compromise the issue.

The members of the committee have even gone so far as to stoop to giving a ballyhoo circus performance by sending down to Washington charts from the dairy and creamery States of the Union in an attempt to win the Members of the House to their viewpoint. This is a sickening and nauseating performance to go through when the main issue is to relieve the American housewife of the burden of the unfair and unjust Federal taxes on a product which she wants and needs.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, the farmers are not the only people who will feel the effects if the present Federal tax on oleomargarine is removed. The consumers are due for a drubbing they do not expect.

In the first place, why do the oleomargarine manufacturers want to color their so-called superior product yellow? What is unappetizing about white? As a farmer's wife very accurately pointed out, "What is distasteful or unappetizing about the white color of an angel-food cake?"

The questionable genealogy of oleomargarine was concisely covered here recently when a great friend of the American farmer, the gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, said:

> We must remember that oleomargarine is a contrived product of uncertain ancestry. It can be and has been made of fish oil, animal fats, tallow, waste packing-house by-products, and vegetable oils, both domestic and imported. To say that oleo is the nutritional equivalent of butter is to say that horse meat is the nutritional equivalent of prime roast beef. The statement may be technically true, but it is morally dubious.
>
> In any case, the processing of oleo requires the deodorizing of some oils, the removal of unpleasant off-tastes from others, and bleaching to give a uniform base for the addition of color. Diacetyl must be added to imitate butter's taste. Vitamin A, which is extracted from shark livers, must be added to imitate butter's nutrition. Milk must be added to oleo to imitate butter's texture. The use of yellow would be the final step toward fraud and deceit by imitating butter's color.

If the existing Federal legislation is repealed, the price of oleomargarine will go up. The consumers will suffer. At the present time, most of the oleomargarine that is sold is uncolored. When and if the law is changed so that this oleomargarine appears entirely like butter, the consumers will pay and pay plenty. It has been shown by the debate on this subject that colored oleomargarine is sold in Indiana for as much as 29 cents per pound more than the white oleomargarine. The Federal tax is only 10 cents a pound. The consumer is required to enrich the handful of manufacturers who control the oleomargarine industry to the tune of 19 cents a pound because their product is colored. If there is to be no white oleomargarine to compete in keeping the price down, colored oleomargarine will tend to follow butter prices even more closely than at present.

Another interesting thing that has been brought out since this controversy has risen is that in one 15-year period 30,000 persons were picked up by the Bureau of Internal Revenue for selling oleomargarine as butter at butter prices. The present Federal tax of one-fourth of a cent a pound on white oleomargarine is money well spent by the consumers because it guarantees the policing of the manufacturers and distributors of oleomargarine. A repeal of the existing Federal law would be most unfair to both farmers and consumers.

The farmer knows what repeal would do to him. During the days of drouth and crop failure in Nebraska and in surrounding States, the regular cream check was the thing that enabled hundreds of thousands of farmers to keep going. It was these checks that made it possible for the retail merchant and business and professional men in our cities and towns to stay open for business.

The consumer would do well to inquire more fully into the reason for the present law, to study the probable effects of its repeal, and to realize that oleo and butter cannot and never should be put into competition with each other.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I do not suppose that anything that may be said in this argument will influence a single vote, especially when the mental attitude of many of the Members is that reflected by the gentleman from Pennsylvania who just preceded me. He very properly has indicated his great interest in this matter to the extent of staying here in Washington to fight for the repeal of what he calls "iniquitous taxes" in behalf of his constituents who are going to vote tomorrow in the primaries in Pennsylvania. The assumption is that by the repeal of this law he is going to get oodles of oleomargarine at a very cheap price for those who are crying and craving for oleomargarine in his district. Now, that sort of an argument to me is typical of the type and character of arguments that I have heard around here since this matter has been before the Congress for discussion. Why not discuss this thing on the basis of some sane, simple facts?

I had two constituents come to my office this morning, fine, splendid people. They were apparently very much exercised because of the propaganda that has gone out in this oleomargarine fight. They felt that there was just one thing to do, give us this tax repeal, in order that the housewife may be able to buy colored oleomargarine and not have to color it herself and be able to buy it at a cheap price.

Now, what are the facts? I explained the situation to them carefully, and without emotional appeal, and when they left my office both of them, highly intelligent people, said, "Why, we never understood that at all. We are going to leave this to your judgment."

What is the situation in Wisconsin, along with 21 other States? They absolutely prohibit the sale of colored oleomargarine. You can color it all you want to out in these other States, but you cannot sell colored oleomargarine at all in Wisconsin or some 21 or 22 other States in this Union. What difference does the tax make then? What difference does it make to the housewife in my State if you repeal this tax that is on the Federal statute books? What benefit is she going to get out of this situation? How are these housewives, that the gentleman who just left the floor pleaded in behalf of, going to get any benefit by the repeal when the sale of colored oleomargarine is absolutely prohibited? A lot of people do not seem to know that. I said to one of these good ladies in my office, "Do you buy oleomargarine?" She said, "Yes." I said, 'You do not have to color it when you use it in cooking, do you?" She said, "No, I do not." I said, "How much Federal tax do you pay on uncolored oleomargarine?" Why, she did not know. I said, "You only pay one-fourth of a cent a pound on uncolored oleomargarine; that is all." I said, "How much oleomargarine do you use in a year?" Why, she was amazed to find out that she would not spend 20 cents a year tax in the use of uncolored oleomargarine. Now, I said, "You cannot buy colored oleomargarine in Wisconsin, and you cannot buy it in these other 22 States." What do they do? They put a little pellet in the package and you can color it yourself, if you want to. She does not really have to. She uses it without coloring, and she only pays about 20 cents a year for the entire family, the quarter of 1 cent a pound.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. Just a moment. You fellows have been talking around here for the last 2 or 3 months on this thing and have been talking "malarkey" to a lot of people about this thing. Now, the fact of the situation is just simply this: I want the people in my district to be able to buy oleomargarine, and they can buy all the oleomargarine they want as long as it is not colored, and pay just one-quarter of a cent a pound tax. Why have the oleomargarine people not gone out into the States and made their appeal to the State legislatures where it would count? Why have they propagandized oleomargarine all over this country and made the American housewife believe that if you repeal this law they are going to get a cheap food spread?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. It seems to me that you have not given the American housewife the facts about this situation. You have led her to believe by this expenditure of millions of dollars for propaganda that if you just repeal this Federal tax everything is going to be lovely and she will get all the oleomargarine that she needs.

Now, let us see. I looked into a Giant Food Market store this morning. They can sell colored oleomargarine in the District of Columbia by paying the Federal tax of 10 cents per pound. What was colored oleomargarine selling for on the store shelves here in the District of Columbia this morning? Fifty-five cents a pound. What was uncolored oleomargarine selling for? Forty-one cents a pound. That is a differential of 14 cents, and the total tax is only 10 cents. The oleo manufacturers have added 14 cents to the base price of uncolored margarine and have raised it to 55 cents a pound. What assurance has the housewife that the price of oleo will be reduced? None at all. Those were the prices cited in the food stores here in Washington this morning. Past experience indicates that if we take this little tax off, the price of oleomargarine will follow the price of butter. You people who are committing that fraud upon the American housewife will wake up if and when this legislation ever becomes law to see that if there is any fraud committed it is a fraud that has led the American housewife to believe that by the repeal of this legislation you are going to get a cheap table spread for the American housewife.

I will tell you what will happen. They are using soybean oil and cottonseed oil now, and the appeal is made that that is American agriculture. You take this tax off and you will see them using imported copra oil that they can buy for a fraction of what it costs to manufacture their product out of soybean oil and cottonseed oil. You will see that there will be no reduction in price. The price of oleomargarine will follow the historic price of butter all along the line.

Let me tell you something. You are going to find that the housewife is going to ask some question on this thing when she understands it. She does not understand the situation today. All she knows is that she has to color her oleomargarine unless she pays 10 cents tax in those States that permit colored oleomargarine to be sold at all. She knows that in my State the State law prohibits the sale of colored oleomargarine. She knows that anything that we do here is not going to change the situation there. Why do you not go out and spend your millions of dollars in the 23 States of the Union that do not permit the sale of colored oleomargarine, and repeal those laws and give some real benefit to the American housewife, instead of kidding them as you are kidding them with this proposed legislation?

Mr. Chairman, in my remaining time I shall try to present some basic facts that should be understood by all before this bill becomes law.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The efforts of chemists to produce a substance compounded of low-priced fats and oils and having the color, flavor, melting point, and other characteristics of butter made from cow's milk came to partial fruition in France in 1870. A French chemist invented a process "to obtain butter. Note the objective "to obtain butter." The financial rewards possible in the manufacture of a butter imitation that could be produced cheaply and sold without restriction in the butter market soon brought the product to the United States. By 1880 the fraud of passing oleomargarine as butter was so prevalent that the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland enacted legislation to protect the consuming public from the racketeers who were pawning yellow oleo as being butter. In the same year the Congress passed legislation to protect the consumers in the District of Columbia. In 1886 the Congress recognized that the fraud had become so flagrant that control by States was ineffective and enacted the first national oleomargarine act. In signing the legislation, President Cleveland stated:

> I am convinced that the taxes which (this legislation) creates cannot possibly destroy the open and legitimate manufacture and sale of the thing upon which it is levied. If this article has the merit which its friends claim for it, and the people of the land, with full knowledge of its real character, desire to purchase and use it, the taxes exacted by this bill will permit a fair profit to both manufacturer and dealer. If the existence of the commodity taxed and the profits of its manufacture and sale depend upon disposing of it to the people for something else which it deceitfully imitates, the entire enterprise is a fraud and not an industry; and if it cannot endure the exhibition of its real character which will be effected by the inspection, supervision, and stamping which this bill directs, the sooner it is destroyed the better, in the interests of fair dealing.

The act of 1886 neglected to say anything about the color of oleo so that the deception continued and the States were obliged to pass corrective legislation. By 1902 a total of 32 States including South Carolina—home State of the gentleman who authored this discharge petition—had passed anticolor oleo laws. During the same year the Congress passed the Grout bill which introduced the principle of a tax graduated according to color. The uncolored product was subject to a manufacturing tax of one-fourth of a cent a pound, while oleo artificially colored in semblance of butter was taxed 10 cents a pound.

1931 LAW ASSIGNED YELLOW TO BUTTER

So anxious were the oleo people to cash in on the historic trade-mark of yellow butter that they soon discovered a loophole by mixing palm oil in the oleo concoction, thereby imparting a naturally yellow color while escaping the 10-cents-per-pound Federal tax. They also experimented with a mixture of cottonseed oil and sulfur to produce the yellow color and evade the tax. This led to the enactment of H. R. 15934 in 1931 which specifically assigned yellow to the rightful product—butter—and said that if

oleo is colored to resemble butter it is subject to the 10 cents' tax.

TAX GIVES INTERNAL REVENUE DEPARTMENT SUPERVISION

With this legislation on the statute books the Bureau of Internal Revenue has been able to maintain effective enforcement.. The consuming public has been protected. The oleo industry has not been destroyed and those who want to eat oleo can have it for about half the price of butter. Yet we are confronted with this fight, sponsored by those who would throw overboard all the experience of nearly 70 years in dealing with this problem. A fight backed by those who want to again allow oleo to take the color of butter without restriction and reopen the door to the temptation of the fraudulent sales that made this legislation necessary.

I am not suggesting that the big and reputable oleomargarine manufacturers are interested in deliberately misrepresenting their product to the public. In fact I am certain they would suffer the greatest damage if this effort to repeal the oleomargarine law is successful.

The only thing that is holding the unscrupulous in check and preventing the bootleg conditions that prevailed in the industry in its early days is this oleo tax law which in my judgment protects the producer as well as the consumer.

It is the tax-collecting feature of this law that places its enforcement within the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The Bureau, with its trained staff, charged with the collection of taxes on oleomargarine, would be relieved of any further responsibility in connection with this product, if you repeal this tax.

It has been suggested that oleo control can be left to the Pure Food and Drug Act. This is not true as this act covers only shipments in interstate commerce.

COURT CASES INVOLVING FRAUDULENT SALES OF OLEO

With all of its skill in this field the Bureau has found that there are always sharks ready to take a chance in this field because of the terrific possibilities for big profits. I can cite you many court cases taken from the Internal Revenue Department records.

There was the case of Albert Haddad, who sold himself to a reputable Illinois oleo manufacturer as a New York-New England distributor. He got the white oleo and colored it on his pig farm at Stoneham near Boston—as much as 5 tons a day. He reported fake oleo sales to Boston bakeries hoping to outsmart the Internal Revenue agents. With labels describing the product as "creamery butter" he flooded Boston with 375,000 pounds at double white-oleo prices. He was well on the way to a fortune when a New England housewife reported her suspicions to health authorities and the product was found to be oleomargarine.

In another case Harry F. Griggs was a respectable appearing dealer of oleo in Baltimore. Revenue agents noticed that the quantity of white oleo Griggs reported he had sold did not always check with the amounts the agents believed he had sold. They investigated the warehouse and store he operated in his basement and found he was coloring the white oleo and selling it to small groceries, restaurants, and housewives as butter. Griggs was convicted of failing to pay the manufacturers' tax and paid a fine of $3,500. Within 2 years of Griggs' conviction John Seeger and two Washington, D. C., men were convicted of evading Federal taxes on 162,951 pounds of oleo sold as butter to hotels and cafes along the Baltimore-Washington Pike and in the city of Washington itself.

I have a book full of similar cases. They prove that if crooks will defy the Bureau of Internal Revenue for the lure of profits in victimizing the public, what would the situation be if there was no agency of the Government continuously on the job to restrain racketeers, to help make sure that when the housewife pays for butter she really gets butter. I am convinced that our oleo laws are sound and operate in the best interests of the public.

OLEO TAX IS NOT BURDENSOME

Much has been said in this debate about the oleo tax being burdensome. All taxes are burdensome unless the taxpayer gets value for his tax dollar. In the case of oleo the tax is one-quarter of a cent a pound. The license fees paid by the retailer and wholesaler and manufacturer are also small. Applying the total of all these taxes to a family that consumes 3 pounds of oleo a week (156 pounds a year), the total amount of taxes does not exceed 40 cents a year, less than 1 cent a week. Is that too much for the protection of the health of the family, to see that the oleo that is purchased is sanitary and not something mixed in a washing machine in some racketeer's basement?

OLEO RETAIL PRICES, WASHINGTON, D. C.

It is contended that killing the oleo taxes will lower the price to the consumer. I have just demonstrated that if the housewife buys uncolored oleo the cost of the tax is less than a penny a week per family. But this is not the tax that the supporters of this repeal bill want to kill. They want to eliminate the 10-cent tax that applies when the manufacturer colors his product to imitate butter. If this tax is killed virtually all oleo will be placed on the market in the color of butter. Theoretically, if the tax is eliminated the consumer will be able to buy colored oleo for 10 cents a pounds less than he does today. But let us look in at a Giant store here in Washington and see if this is the case. On March 29 these stores advertised uncolored oleo at 35 and 37 cents per pound; colored oleo at 55 cents a pound. In Evansville, Ind., on April 20, the Bazley Market sold Durkees' white oleo for 41 cents a pound, Durkees' yellow oleo at 53 cents a pound; in Terre Haute, Ind., on the same day, white oleo sold for 32 cents a pound, colored oleo at 59 cents.

If this tax law is repealed oleo manufacturers will be free to boost prices as they please. They will add a fancy price, no doubt, for coloring the oleo. The thrifty housewife who today buys white oleo at from 32 cents to 37 cents and colors it herself will find only colored oleo on the grocery shelves at considerably higher prices. Will that help cut down the family grocery bill?

REMOVAL OF OLEO TAX WILL NOT REDUCE BUTTER PRICES

It is claimed that the price of butter is too high and that taking the tax off oleo will bring down the price of butter. The facts are that oleo has advanced in price the same percentage as butter since the end of the war. This has occurred in spite of the fact that the oils which constitute the body of oleomargarine have not increased, but have decreased, in price since the end of the war. In view of this oleomargarine price picture, have consumers any assurance that the oleo interests will reduce consumer prices to the extent that Federal excise taxes might be eliminated or reduced?

OLEO CORPORATIONS MAKING SUBSTANTIAL PROFITS

Could this situation be reflected in the following table showing the net incomes of a few of the major oleo corporations in 1945 and in 1947:

	1945	1947
Glidden Co. (California)	$2,347,644	$12,757,984
Armour & Co. (Chicago)	9,172,538	22,950,269
Best Foods, Inc. (California)	2,515,648	5,288,095
Swift & Co. (Chicago)	12,303,807	22,334,977
Wilson & Co. (Chicago)	5,036,602	15,448,823
Standard Brands, Inc. (Indiana)	9,576,464	[1] 13,947,960
Capital City Products Co. (Ohio)	251,072	1,702,378

[1] 1946.

Butter is one of our basic foods and through the ages has been identified by its natural yellow color. It is the identifying trade-mark that rightfully belongs to butter. The claim that oleo has as much right as butter to the color yellow is false. Oleo in this country is produced from the oils of cottonseed and soybeans. The real reason why these oils must be bleached is that when cottonseed oils are turned into fat they become gray; and when soybean oils are turnd into fat they become green. To have a uniform color the oleo manufacturers must bleach out the gray and green colors. It is impossible to produce a natural yellow oleomargarine from domestic oils.

Butter is always yellow, although at some seasons of the year it is less yellow than at others. When color is added to butter it is for the sake of uniformity, not for the purpose of making it look like some other product.

YELLOW COLOR IS BUTTER "TRADE-MARK"

There have long been recognized ethical standards restricting imitations. For example Brookshire cheese is too close to Swift & Co.'s Brookfield trade-mark to be permitted. An automobile manufacturer was prevented from using a certain shape of radiator because it too closely resembled the Packard design.

Why of all the colors in the spectrum do the oleomargarine people select the yellow color of butter? Why have the manufacturers of oleo made every effort to duplicate the body and texture and melting point of butter. They have added vitamins in an effort to approximate the vitamin content of butter. The flavor of butter may also be added legally to oleomargarine so as to make identification almost impossible. With all this imitation permitted, there remains the

feeling that consumers should be protected by a color identification so that it would not be necessary to call on technical laboratory tests to determine whether it is butter or oleo. Some say that if people cannot tell the difference between butter and yellow margarine what harm is done? The point is that people are entitled to know what they are paying for—beef, not horsemeat; butter, not oleo. Labels on cartons are not enough. Most consumers get part or all of their butter—or oleo after it has left the containers—in individual servings or in bulk from grocers. It is an easy matter, also, to switch a pound of yellow something or other into an empty butter carton. Federal food and drug laws cannot protect the public in intrastate shipments and sales.

OLEO SHOULD HAVE DISTINCTIVE COLOR OF ITS OWN

By means of a costly advertising campaign the oleo people have convinced the average housewife that oleomargarine is as nutritious and healthful as butter. If that is true why do the oleo interests insist upon copying what they contend is an inferior product. Why should they not insist upon a distinctive color of their own. Peanut butter sells under its own characteristic brown color and its own typical flavor. Even though peanut butter uses the term "butter," there is no controversy because there is no consumer deception.

Advocates of this oleo tax repealer have gone so far in this debate as to make the charge that butter and milk products spread undulant fever. I do not know how many housewives they have convinced of this libel. But as a result of this false propaganda the oleo supporters may have built up a large following of people who do not want to eat butter, who may fear that it is a carrier of undulant fever. Why are not these people then entitled to some protection so that they will know that they are being served oleo instead of butter when they eat in a hotel or restaurant. If oleo had its own distinctive color they could be sure they are not eating butter.

To show you what I mean I have arranged a display of oleo colored in various hues any one of which could be selected as oleo's trade-mark. I have also arranged a display of ice cream in the many fascinating colors in which this tasty product is manufactured. You have no aversion to eating pistachio ice cream although it comes in a bright green color. Why not produce oleo in some similar color. The 10-cent Federal tax would not then apply. There would be no necessity for repealing the oleo-tax laws which I have pointed out are really a protection for the consuming public.

Aside from this angle of protection for the consumer there is a still more serious aspect to this matter in the impact the repeal of these laws would have upon our national economy.

During the war we heard much of the slogan "Guns or butter." Our New Deal managers placed the production of war weapons in opposition to the production of butter and inevitably butter became a war casualty. Creamery butter production dropped from better than 1,800,000,000 pounds before the war to a low of 1,168,000,000 pounds in 1946. When the wartime food-rationing program was set up butter was placed at a conspicuous disadvantage in the order of preference given milk and dairy products. At the same time margarine was given a distinct advantage with respect to other fats and oils commodities. The margarine industry was allowed to use fats and oils at a rate which permitted an output higher than in the prewar years. Exported margarine was exempted from quota restrictions. As a result, margarine production in the period 1943–45 averaged 600,000,000 pounds, 250,000,000 pounds above prewar output. The impetus margarine production received during the war is still carrying it forward. It now exceeds the monthly output of butter. In comparison with margarine, butter is relatively expensive to produce. The cost of butter includes a large element of labor, as well as raw materials in the form of fodder and grain. Margarine, a machine product, costs little to produce.

Butter production has not recovered from casualties it sustained during the war period, and it may take some time for it to regain its normal per-capita production even under the most encouraging circumstances. Repeal of the oleo legislation will not make that road easy. In fact, repeal of the Federal laws and repeal of the color restrictions might result in the oleo manufacturers reaching their first goal, namely, a billion pounds of oleomargarine. It is quite easy to foreglimpse what would result should oleomargarine consumption reach that gigantic figure while creamery butter is trying to climb back from its low production of a billion three hundred million pounds to the almost 1,900,000 pounds which it had reached in prewar days.

Oleo manufacturers claim that their product does not hurt the dairy industry, but the records show that when oleomargarine consumption goes up the consumption of butter declines. This advance of oleo into the butter market is being made without any appreciable advantage to the American farmer in spite of widespread propaganda to the contrary.

FARMERS NOT BENEFITED BY OLEO INDUSTRY

During 1946 the American farmer received $25,322,896,000 in cash income from the products of his farm, of which he could attribute $39,376,000 or less than two-tenths of 1 percent to the portion of his farm products utilized in the manufacture of oleomargarine. Of this latter amount $16,759,000 went for cottonseed oil and $18,603,000 went into soybean oil. At the moment the American margarine industry is using domestic cottonseed and soybean oil but there is no assurance that the industry will not again turn to foreign oils which in normal times are much cheaper than domestic oils. Before the war the principal ingredient of margarine was coconut oil imported from the Philippines and other far eastern countries. That supply was shut off by the conflict, but coconut oil is beginning to show up again in the import statistics. During 1948 approximately 20,000,000 pounds of coconut oil was used in the making of margarine for the American market. Significantly this oil was used almost exclusively in the manufacture of factory colored oleo. Copra products are coming back by leaps and bounds in the East Indies and Philippines. What the score will be for 1948 I will not venture a guess, but I think the southern cotton growers and those who dabble in soybeans should take careful note of the trend. Disaster nearly struck the soybean and cottonseed oil industry early in 1947 when the coconut oil began arriving in quantities from the Philippines. Domestic vegetable oils were at a high point but the arrival of the foreign oils sent the entire price structure down to prewar levels. Only vastly increased Government buying for export saved the industries involved from crippling losses.

OLEO WILL NOT HELP SOUTHERN COTTON

I have observed that many of my southern colleagues have signed this discharge petition apparently in the belief that expansion of the oleo industry would help the southern cotton industry. The records reveal that dairying and other competing interests are tremendously more important as sources of cash income to southern farmers than oleomargarine. For instance cash income to farmers in the State of Carolina, represented by my good friend, the Honorable Mr. RIVERS, in 1940 amounted to $1,090,000 from oleomargarine and $19,294,000 from sources injured by oleomargarine. In the 10 cotton States cash income in that year from oleo was $17,539,000 compared with $478,803,000 from sources injured by oleo. It is unfortunate that some farmers in these States have been led to believe that more oleo would improve their economic status.

While less than two-tenths of 1 percent of farm income is traceable to oleomargarine, dairy products gave him a cash income of $4,116,930,000 in 1946. Normally in the United States 45 to 59 percent of all milk which is processed is made into butter. If butter production is drastically reduced, it would mean a decrease in total milk production. Milk is a seasonal product with substantial surpluses accumulating during the flush season. It is at this period of surplus milk that the bulk of the butter is made and stored away for consumption during the lean period. To assure consumers of an adequate supply of fluid milk in the lean season the dairyman must maintain a herd of greater size than he would need at the flush season. If he cannot convert the surplus milk into butter during the flush period he will have only one recourse and that is to cut down the size of his herd. The Department of Agriculture statistics show that he has been compelled to reduce the number of milk cows on his farms steadily since 1945 and today has fewer animals than he had in 1934. If this trend continues the shortages of fluid milk in the dry periods will grow progressively worse. Shortages in fluid milk supply are usually reflected in higher prices to the consumer.

There is another serious aspect to this picture relating to the conservation of our valuable soil, the soil that gives America the highest standard of living in the world. Check the older countries and you will find that countries which

place great stress on their dairy herds such as Denmark, Switzerland, Holland, Sweden are the only ones in Europe whose people at present receive an adequate diet. The others, such as Italy, India, China, and many others which have tried to get along without this basic industry are suffering from inadequate diet and are dependent on our generosity to keep them alive. This condition is due in large part to the fallacy of some countries in thinking that they can crop their lands, leave it open to wind and water erosion year after year. This policy has lost for them forever that valuable top soil so necessary to the growth of vegetation. The dairy industry is the only type of farming that goes with a sound soil-conservation program. From that standpoint alone it is to the interests of all America to see that this great industry is not destroyed.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, the Atlanta Constitution carried a statement sometime ago that the CIO Political Action Committee had voted to establish political headquarters in two congressional districts in the State of Georgia to defeat Representative JAMES C. DAVIS, of Clarkston, and myself, it being stated that Judge DAVIS and I are looked upon with great disfavor by the CIO Political Action Committee. In this connection it might be noted that on the last blacklist issued by CIO Political Action Committee my rating was given at zero minus.

Since this announcement was made the CIO Political Action Committee has been planting its agents in Georgia, particularly in the second and fifth congressional districts preparatory to the initiation of an aggressive campaign against Judge DAVIS and myself.

This is not the first time, Mr. Chairman, that the CIO Political Action Committee has opposed me for Congress. Mr. Sidney Hillman testified before the House Campaign Expenditures Committee that in the 1944 primary the CIO contributed $4,500 to my opponent in that election, but I happen to know that this was but a small part of what they spent to defeat me. They had scurrilous literature printed outside the State and shipped in in bales and distributed by a host of agents that were sent in from other States.

Mr. Chairman, the Special House Committee on Un-American Activities investigated the CIO's National Citizens Political Action Committee and made some interesting discoveries.

The NCPAC was organized so that the CIO–PAC could carry on political activities which it was prevented by law from financing.

Sidney Hillman was chairman of both CIO-PAC and NCPAC. Both organizations had the same treasurer. Both organizations operated out of the same headquarters at 205 East Forty-second Street, New York.

The set-up of NCPAC was as follows:

NATIONAL CITIZENS POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE OFFICERS

Sidney Hillman, chairman; James G. Patton, vice chairman; Freda Kirchway, vice chairman; R. J. Thomas, treasurer; James H. McGill, comptroller; Clark Foreman, secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Verda White Barnes, Elmer A. Benson, Van A. Bittner, Clark Foreman, Sidney Hillman, Freda Kirchway, James Loeb, Lucy Randolph Mason, James H. McGill, Philip Murray, James G. Patton, Gifford Pinchot, R. J. Thomas, Dr. Robert C. Weaver, A. F. Whitney.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Adamic, Louis, author, Milford, N. J.

Alexander, Dr. Will W., vice president, Julius Rosenwald Fund, North Carolina.

Anderson, Mary, former director, Women's Bureau, Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.

Anderson, Mrs. Sherwood, New York City.

Baldwin, C. B., assistant chairman, Congress of Industrial Organizations Political Action Committee, New York City.

Balokovic, Zlatko, president, United Committee of South Slavic Americans, New York.

Barnes, Verda White, director, Women's Division, Congress of Industrial Organzations' Political Action Committee, New York.

Bauer, Catherine, author, California.

Benet, William Rose, poet, New York.

Benson, Elmer A., ex-Governor, Minnesota.

Bethune, Mary McLoed, Daytona Beach, Fla.

Biggert, Mrs. Robert, Winnetka, Ill.

Bittner, Van A., United Steelworkers of America, Washington, D. C.

Blaine, Mrs. Emmons, Chicago, Ill.

Bliven, Bruce, editor, New Republic, New York.

Boas, Dr. Ernest P., New York City.

Bowie, Dr. W. Russell, professor, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

Bremer, Otto, banker, St. Paul, Minn.

Bunzick, Zarko M., president, Serbian Vidovdas Congress, Akron, Ohio.

Burke, J. Frank, Pasadena, Calif.

Butkovich, John D., president, Croatian Fraternal Union, Pennsylvania.

Carey, James B., secretary-treasurer, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Clyde, Mrs. Ethel, Huntington, Long Island.

Connelly, Marc, Los Angeles, Calif.

Cooke, Morris Llewellyn, consulting engineer, Philadelphia, Pa.

Coolidge, Albert Sprague, professor, Harvard University, Massachusetts.

Corrothers, Rev. S. L., president, National Nonpartisan Colored Ministers' Association of the United States of America, Westbury, Long Island.

Curran, Joseph, president, National Maritime Union of America, New York.

Dalrymple, Sherman H., president, United Rubber Workers of America, Ohio.

Davis, Dr. Michael M., editor, Medical Care, New York.

Dombrowski, Dr. James A., executive secretary, Southern Conference for Human Welfare, Tennessee.

Dunjee, Roscoe, editor and publisher of the Black Dispatch, Oklahoma.

DuPoint, Ethel, writer, Kentucky.

DuPont, Zara, Cambridge, Mass.

Durr, Mrs. Clifford, vice chairman, National Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax, Virginia.

Eliot, Thomas H., attorney, Cambridge, Mass.

Embree, Edwin R., president, Julius Rosenwald Fund, Illinois.

Epstein, Henry, attorney, New York City.

Fitzgerald, Albert J., president, United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, New York.

Foreman, Clark, president, Southern Conference for Human Welfare.

Frazier, Dr. E. Franklin, professor of sociology, Howard University, Washington, D. C.

Galbraith, John Kenneth, editorial department, Fortune magazine.

Gimbel, Elinor, committee for the care of young children in wartime, New York City.

Green, John, president, Marine & Shipbuilding Workers of America, New Jersey.

Gutknecht, Judge John, municipal court, Chicago.

Harburg, E. Y., motion-picture director, Hollywood.

Hastie, Judge William, dean, Howard University Law School, Washington.

Hays, Mortimer, attorney, New York City.

Haywood, Allan S., administrator, Federal Workers of America, Washington.

Hecht, Ben, writer, California.

Hewes, L. I., Jr., National Council on Race Relations, Palo Alto, Calif.

Hillman, Sidney, president, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

Hollander, Sidney, manufacturer, Maryland.

Hughes, Langston, poet, New York.

Imbrie, James, banker, Trenton, N. J.

Kenyon, Judge Dorothy, New York City.

Kingdon, Dr. Frank, author, New York.

Kirchwey, Freda, publisher, the Nation, New York.

Krzychi, Leo, president, American Slav Congress.

Kulikowski, Adam, publisher, Opportunity, Virginia.

Lange, Oscar, professor, University of Chicago.

Lapp, John, independent labor conciliator, Chicago.

Lecron, James, assistant to Henry A. Wallace, as Secretary of Agriculture, Berkeley, Calif.

Lee, Canada, actor, New York City.

Lerner, Max, author, editor, PM, New York City.

Lewis, Alfred Baker, Greenwich, Conn., president, Trade Union Accident and Health Association.

Lewis, John Frederick, president, Art Alliance, Philadelphia, Pa.

Lewis, William Draper, Philadelphia, Pa.

Lochard, Dr. Metz T., editor, Chicago Defender, Chicago, Ill.

Loeb, James, secretary, Union for Democratic Action, New York.

Luyten, Dr. W. J., professor of astronomy, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.
Mason, Lucy Randolph, Atlanta, Ga.
Maurer, Dr. Wesley, school of journalism, University of Michigan.
McAllister, Mrs. Thomas F., former director, women's division, National Democratic Party, Grand Rapids, Mich.
McConnell, Bishop Francis J., New York City.
McCulloch, Frank, director, Mullenbach Institute, Chicago, Ill.
McDonald, David J., secretary-treasurer, United Steelworkers of America, Pennsylvania.
McGill, James H., McGill Manufacturing Co., Valparaiso, Ind.
McMahon, Francis, professor, University of Chicago.
McWilliams, Carey, attorney and writer, Los Angeles, Calif.
Motherwell, Hiram, author, New York.
Murray, Philip, president, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D. C.
Mulzac, Hugh, captain, United States merchant marine, Jamaica, Long Island.
Neilson, William A., educator, Falls Village, Conn.
Niebuhr, Dr. Reinhold, Union Theological Seminary, New York.
Norris, Hon. George W., Nebraska.
Osowski, Dr. W. T., president, American Slav Congress, Michigan.
Patton, James G., president, National Farmers Union, Colorado.
Perry, Jennings, editor, Nashville Tennesseean, Tennessee.
Pinchot, Cornelia Bryce, Washington, D. C.
Pinchot, Gifford, Milford, Pa.
Platek, V. X., president, National Slovak Society, Pennsylvania.
Pope, Dr. Liston, Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Conn.
Popper, Martin, executive secretary, National Lawyers Guild.
Porter, Katherine Ann, writer, New York.
Poynter, Nelson, publisher, St. Petersburg Times, Florida.
Quilici, Judge George L., municipal court, Chicago.
Ratica, Peter, president, United Russian Orthodox Brotherhood of America, Pennsylvania.
Reid, Dr. Ira, associate director, Southern Regional Council, Atlanta, Ga.
Reynolds, J. Louis, Reynolds Metal Co., Virginia.
Ricker, A. W., editor, Farm Union Herald, St. Paul, Minn.
Rieve, Emil, president, Textile Workers Union of America, New York.
Robeson, Paul, actor, New York.
Robinson, Edward G., Hollywood, Calif.
Robinson, Mrs. Edward G., Hollywood, Calif.
Robinson, Reid, president, United Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers of America, Colorado.
Rosenblum, Frank, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, New York.
Rosenthal, Morris S., Stein-Hall & Co., Inc., New York.
Ross, Mrs. J. D., Seattle, Wash.
Ryan, H. Frank, managing editor, Courier-Post, Camden, N. J.
Sackett, Sheldon F., editor, Coos Bay Times, Marshfield, Oreg.
Schlesinger, Arthur M., professor of history, Harvard University.
Schuman, Frederick L., professor of international relations, Williams College, Massachusetts.
Schwartz, C. K., attorney, Chicago, Ill.
Seiferheld, David S., president, N. Erlanger Blumgart & Co., New York City.
Smathers, Hon., William H., New Jersey.
Smith, Lillian, editor, South Today and author Strange Fruit, Georgia.
Smith, S. Stephenson, Eugene, Oreg.
Soule, George, associate editor, New Republic, New York City.
Speir, Mercedes Powell, president, Richmond Consumers Cooperative, Richmond, Va.
Steele, Julian D., president, Boston branch, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Boston, Mass.
Sweezey, Alan, professor of economics, Williams College, Massachusetts.
Stone, Maurice L., business executive, New York.
Thomas, R. J., president, United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America, Detroit.
Tilly, Mrs. M. E., jurisdictional secretary of Christian social relations, of the Southeastern Jurisdiction of the Women's Society for Christian Service, Methodist Church, Georgia.
Tobias, Dr. Channing H., member of Joint Army and Navy Committee on Welfare and Recreation and Mayor's Committee on Unity, New York City.
Townsend, Willard, president, United Transport Service Employees of America, Chicago, Ill.
Van Kleeck, Mary, Russell Sage Foundation, New York City.
Walsh, J. Raymond, director of research, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Political Action Committee, New York.
Waring, P. Alston, farmer-author, New Hope, Pa.
Weaver, Dr. Robert C., Mayor's Committee on Racial Relations, Chicago.
Welles, Orson, Hollywood, Calif.
Wesley, Carter, publisher, Houston Informer, Texas.
Wheelwright, Mrs. Ellen Du Pont, Wilmington, Del.
Whitney, A. F., president, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, Ohio.
Williams, Aubrey, National Farmers Union, Washington, D. C.
Wilson, Mrs. Luke I., Bethesda, Md.
Wise, James Waterman, author, radio commentator, New York.
Wright, R. R., Jr. (Bishop), executive secretary, Negro Fraternal Council of Churches in America, Ohio.
Young, P. B., publisher, Norfolk Journal and Guide, Virginia.
Zeman, Stephen, Jr., president, Slovak Evangelical Union, Pennsylvania.
Zmrhal, Prof. Jaroslav J., president, Czechoslovak National Council, Illinois.

This list contains 141 names. Checking the 141 on this list of the National Citizens Political Action Committee against the 25 organizations the Attorney General has characterized as subversive and Communist, we find 82 of the 141 have been affiliated with one or more of these 25 subversive organizations, which organizations include the following:

American Council on Soviet Relations.
American League for Peace and Democracy.
American League Against War and Fascism.
American Peace Mobilization.
American Youth Congress.
Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder—from the Atlanta Federal Penitentiary.
Communist Party.
Congress of American Revolutionary Writers.
Daily Worker.
Emergency Peace Mobilization.
Freiheit.
International Labor Defense.
International Publishers.
International Workers Order.
League of American Writers.
Michigan Civil Rights Federation.
National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners.
National Committee for Peoples Rights.
National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.
National Negro Congress.
New Masses.
United States Congress Against War.
Washington Bookshop.
Washington Committee for Democratic Action.
Workers Alliance.

The National Citizens Political Action Committee, to all intents and purposes was the right arm of the CIO Political Action Committee, not only was loaded with avowed Communists and fellow travelers, but even contained the name of the naturalized American citizen, Dr. Oscar Lange, a professor at the University of Chicago who, upon the formation of the United Nations, renounced his American citizenship to become Ambassador representing Poland at the United Nations and is listed as such on page 85 of the delegations to the United Nations at Lake Success in the January-February 1948 issue of the list of such delegations.

There is not a Member of this body who does not know that Oscar Lange could not have been appointed as Ambassador representing Poland without the consent of the Soviet Union and without complete and unswerving adherence to the Communist Party line.

Langston Hughes, the Negro poet, was also a member of the National Citizens Political Action Committee. His works have been published and widely distributed by the Communist Party. A fair sample of his subversive and un-American poetry published for the eighth convention of the Communist Party, United States of America, entitled "The Worker's Song," reads as follows:

ONE MORE S IN THE U. S. A.

Put one more S in the U. S. A.
To make it Soviet.
One more S in the U. S. A.
Oh, we'll live to see it yet.
When the land belongs to the farmers
And the factories belong to the workingmen,
The U. S. A., when we take control,
Will be the U. S. S. A. then.

Now, across the water in Russia
They have the big U. S. S. R.,
The Fatherland of the Soviets,
But that is mighty far
From New York, or Texas, or California, too,
So listen, fellow workers, this is what we have to do:

Put one more S in the U. S. A.

(Repeat chorus.)

But we can't win out by just talking,
So let us take things in our hand.
Then down and 'way with the bosses' sway—
Hail, Communist land!
So stand up in battle and wave our flag on high,
And shout out, fellow workers, our new slogan to the sky.

(Repeat chorus.)

But we can't join hands strong together
So long as whites are lynching black.
So black and white in one union fight
And get on the right track.
By Texas, or Georgia, or Alabama led,
Come together, fellow workers—black and white can all be red!

(Repeat chorus.)

Another of Langston Hughes' poems reads as follows:

Good bye, Christ Jesus,
Lord, God, Jehovah;
Beat it on the way from here;
Make way for a new guy with no religion at all,
A real guy named "Marx Communist, Lenin Peasant, Stalin Worker, me"—
I said "Me." Go on ahead now. You are getting
In the way of things, Lord—
And step on the gas, Christ.
Move, and don't be so slow about moving.
The world is mine from now on.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the membership of the House to some factual information which is a matter of record concerning the organization of the CIO Political Action Committee.

The CIO Political Action Committee was organized by the CIO executive board on July 7, 1943, and was composed of the president of the CIO, the secretary-treasurer of the CIO, 9 vice presidents of the CIO, and 38 other leaders of the CIO unions. Out of the 49 executive board members of the CIO, the following had notorious Communist records: Lewis Alan Berne, Donald Henderson, Joseph P. Selly, Julius Emspak, Grant W. Oakes, Eleanor Nelson, Joseph F. Jurich, Ben Gold, Morris Muster, Harry R. Bridges, Ferdinand C. Smith, Lewis Merrill, Abram Flaxer, Michael J. Quill, Joseph Curran, Reid Robinson, E. F. Burke, Frank R. McGrath.

Among those who were notorious for their Communist-front affiliations and who obtained seats at the national CIO convention in Philadelphia in 1943 as representatives of CIO industrial councils, were the following avowed Communists: Meyer Adelman, Harold Christoffel, Philip M. Connelly, Arthur Daronatsy, Len de Caux, James Drury, Fullerton Fuller, Sander Genius, Bjorne Halling, Mel J. Heinritz, J. F. Jurich, Saul Mills, Luverne Noon, Lee Pressman, George Wilson.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the membership of this House is fully aware that Harold Christoffel, who led the traitorous Allis-Chalmers strike during the critical war period, is now under sentence of 6 years in the penitentiary for perjury he committed before a committee of the House, in denying under oath that he was a Communist.

It is well known that the CIO-PAC and its affiliated and cooperating organizations have spent millions of dollars in past elections in trying to defeat Members of Congress who voted in the traditional American way, and that Members of Congress have been subjected to vicious attacks, smears, and libels by the CIO in heated campaigns; and it is well known that these enormous CIO funds have been recklessly and illegally used, and are being used today in an attempt to defeat Members of Congress who have insisted on voting in the best interest of the whole American people.

In some cases in the past they have succeeded in purging honest and conscientious servants of the people, but by far they have not succeeded in getting their endorsed mouthpieces into either the House or Senate.

Recently, Mr. Chairman, I obtained information concerning the director of the CIO Political Action Committee, who succeeded the late Sidney Hillman as the master mind of that organization. I am speaking of Mr. Jack Kroll, of Oaks and Burnett Streets, Cincinnati, Ohio.

I know that the Members of this House and the American people will be interested to know that Mr. Kroll was born in London, England, June 10, 1885; that he came to the United States in 1898, and that although he has been in this country for 50 years, he has never even applied for citizenship. Jack Kroll is actually registered with the Department of Justice as an alien, being so registered in 1946.

Mr. Kroll became associated with Sidney Hillman in 1910 and was continuously associated with him until Mr. Hillman's death in 1946. But, even though Mr. Hillman continued to espouse an alien ideology, he actually was a naturalized citizen.

Think of it, my colleagues, here is an alien, the head of a great political organization with millions of followers and with millions of dollars in funds, out to defeat Members of Congress and endeavoring by every means to try to influence American citizens in their votes and to persuade them to accept candidates who are completely subservient to the CIO and who, in many cases, are followers of the Communist Party line.

Last year, soon after Congress passed the Taft-Hartley Labor Act, Mr. Kroll's CIO-PAC published a "voting guide"—a "blacklist" of Congressmen—naming 340 Members of the House and 28 of the 32 Senators coming up for reelection this year, charging that they "voted against the people" and demanding their defeat.

The Communist-led CIO unions have since added the names of 104 Representatives and Senators who had been CIO approved until they voted aid to Greece and Turkey to save those countries from communism. This means that out of 477 Members of Congress up for reelection, only 5 meet with full CIO approval.

Such contemptible affrontery is to be expected from an organization which places an alien in charge of its political activities in American elections.

Although Mr. Kroll has never taken the trouble to apply for American citizenship, he certainly has taken advantage of loopholes in the American election system, because I am advised that he has had the audacity to vote many times in Chicago and Cincinnati, where he now lives.

Mr. Kroll will probably try, unsuccessfully I am sure, to get some of his alien ideas into the Democratic platform and he will attempt to make his influence felt in the selection of the nominees of the Democratic Party in the coming elections.

I say this because, right now, Jack Kroll is an unopposed candidate for delegate at large from Ohio to the Democratic National Convention to be held in Philadelphia on July 12.

Any man who has made his living here; has enjoyed the protection of our laws; has availed himself of the privileges afforded under our system of government, and has deliberately maintained an alien status for 50 years, is most certainly not an American.

I, for one, resent the intrusion of such a person into the American political scene. And every right-thinking American will also resent and reject the gratuitous advices of this alien and his CIO Political Action Committee.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TWYMAN].

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is unnecessary to devote much time or talk to the discussion about this legislation which will remove the punitive tax on oleomargarine. It is my feeling that most of the Members have already made up their minds as to how they intend to vote. This present punitive tax is outdated and whatever situation which may have justified its having been levied in the first place no longer exists. Margarine is a proper food and has achieved its place and should be permitted to have the standing which it deserves. You will hear a great deal about the violations and the dire things which will result from the elimination of the tax on oleomargarine. I think we can forget that. If there are to be any violations, they would result whether there is a tax or not. There is still ample provision for penalizing any violators. The criminal element if they desire to substitute oleomargarine for butter can do that just as well whether there is a tax or not. As a matter of fact, there is a greater incentive for them to violate with a tax than there is without. Recently you saw what happened with reference to the price of butter. When it looked as if the House committee on Agriculture might act favorably on one of the bills under consideration having to do with the tax on oleomargarine, butter prices fell. When the committee shelved the legislation, butter prices rose 6 cents or more a pound immediately.

Removing the punitive tax from oleomargarine is not going to be detrimental to butter or the producers of butter. If there should ever need to be a tax on oleomargarine, butter, or any other commodity, it seems to me that that should be determined by the Ways and Means Committee. That is the committee

which usually determines what taxes are proper and the amounts. However, as I have already said, there are enough votes in this body to pass this bill. We have enough information to act and I intend to vote to remove the Federal taxes from oleomargarine.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, this Congress has been subjected to a high-powered and highly financed lobby by the oleomargarine interests. They have resorted to everything from legitimate arguments to highly fanciful and emotional statements having no basis in either logic or fact. In all events, it seems clear that the oleomargarine trust feels justified in spending vast sums of money in an effort to eliminate the tax upon colored margarine so that innocent consumers can be more readily deceived into accepting and using oleo instead of the more wholesome and nutritious product of butter.

Mr. Chairman, it has always seemed to me extremely strange that the oleo trust should be so insistent upon trying to secure the tax-free privilege of coloring their synthetic compound a shade of yellow to most closely resemble butter if their oleo product were the delectable and wholesome product which they say it is. It should be apparent to any objective observer that the only reason the oleo trust wants to color its product yellow is to make it look like butter since people generally prefer butter as a spread upon their food. That being the case there can be no valid objection to the maintenance of a tax upon such a coloration process since it seems only right and fair that the oleo trust should not be permitted to traffic and profit upon the virtues of butter by imitating its color without paying something in the nature of a royalty, or a "patent fee" or an "imitator's license" or a copyright privilege for endeavoring to disguise its product so it looks as much like butter as possible in color, shape, and size. Certainly if the oleo trust finds it necessary to pawn off its product as butter by coloring it yellow, it should in simple justice pay the small tax now imposed for being allowed to continue to practice that deception.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing distasteful or repugnant about nutritious and wholesome food which happens to be white in color. Vanilla ice cream is the most popular of frozen foods and it is white in color; angel food cake appeals to the taste of kings and emperors as well as men in every walk of life and it is white in color; nobody ever heard of coloring mashed potatoes yellow in order to induce people to eat them and wheat bread remains the staff of life without resorting to any disguise against its pure white color. Why is oleo colored yellow, Mr. Chairman? Simply to make it look like butter and simply because consumers prefer butter to oleo. That being the case, I think this legislation should be defeated and the tax on colored oleo retained since it helps protect the consumer against deception and adulteration and since it aids butter makers in their long fight to raise and maintain the standards of their product against unfair competition and against fraudulent imitation.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the action of the House today on this legislation is not only uncalled for, but entirely ridiculous. It is economically wrong. It is wrong from every angle. The producers of oleomargarine have made tremendous profits during the war and established the greatest lobby that has ever come to Washington and out of that was born this resistance to the action of the committee. The committee did what all the other committees of the House do. We studied this legislation and knew what was best for all concerned. For years I was taught that if you were not familiar with a piece of legislation, you could always justify your action by following the recommendations of the committee. But here a few Members side-stepped that and put a petition on the desk. Certain Members of the House rushed down the aisle in their greed to get votes in this election and signed that petition to discharge the committee. This action will have far-reaching effects. I do not know what oleomargarine is made out of, but I do know that they say it is made out of peanut oil, cottonseed oil, and soybean oil. Maybe some other things are in it. But I have here an Associated Press report saying that an oleomargarine chemical factory blew up and killed 28 persons and damaged 18 buildings. Now there may be some high-powered stuff in it—God only knows. But I do know that certain members of the committee recently wanted to go into an oleomargarine plant to see just what was there and how they were operating, and they were denied that right. I do not know whether it was because there were certain things going in, but here I have a little bottle full of worms taken out of cottonseed. If I took them in my hand and squeezed them, juice would run out of my hand. That goes into cottonseed oil.

Last fall when the Committee on Agriculture went down through the South, we rode 400 miles in a single day. It was during the time when the cotton was spoiling in the fields and the peanuts were rotting in the shocks because the weather was wet. We rode 400 miles, but we did not see a farmer out trying to save his crops, although it was a nice, clear, windy day. At the same time farmers were complaining about their crops rotting in the field. I could not understand; it was not Sunday, they were not in church. The reason was they did not care.

Those crops were subsidized. Those crops had price supports and were insured by the Government. Those are the crops that go into the manufacture of oleomargarine. The reason they were not in the field was not because they were in church. When I mentioned that in Rocky Mount, N. C., that we did not see a single farmer out saving his crops, they said, "Of course not; it is Saturday." Saturday, hell. On that Saturday every dairy farmer in America was cleaning his cows, his barns, producing good dairy products, checking the milk from every teat from every cow, getting it out on time so that we would have wholesome dairy products. That was every dairy farmer in America, when those farmers in the South would not work because it was Saturday. The dairy farmers not only did it on Saturday, but they did it on Sunday, on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, when those farmers down South, who had their crops insured, who were the recipients of all the New Deal hand-outs during the years, did not care whether they harvested their crops or not, because they were insured; they had price supports, so that today the Commodity Credit Corporation is loaded with peanuts and cotton and tobacco, that they had to force them into the ERP to get them off their hands. That is why there is a billion dollars' worth of tobacco going into ERP.

Recently Commodity Credit Corporation sold $3,000,000 worth of peanuts to a Philadelphia broker on agreement to take them back if he could not make money on them.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I do not yield. I do not have time to yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I just wanted to inform the gentleman——

Mr. GROSS. Sit down. I have the floor. I do not yield.

This thing is wrong from an economic standpoint. This assault on the dairy industry, which has been the greatest mainstay to soil conservation and improved farming in America, is today getting a body blow. We have now 2,000,000 less cows than we had 2 years ago. That has its reflection in our milk supplies. That has its reflection in all of our dairy supplies, in our meat supplies, and in our veal supplies. Yesterday, the St. Louis manufacturers put shoes up 10 cents a pair wholesale because of the rising cost of cowhides; not steer hides or bull hides, but cow hides. This bill reflects itself in every budget in every home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] has expired.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MITCHELL].

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I have been very interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS], and about the uncleanness and worms in the cottonseed oil, and so forth. I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania is too honest to make any misstatement. I think he has been rather misinformed or that he has overlooked that the soya bean and cottonseed oil that ultimately goes into the manufacture of oleomargarine, together with the skimmed milk, has been put through a refining process, so that all the available decomposition is of course removed. That is a fact.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. I am not going to yield at this time. I do not intend to yield until I get through.

I have here, as a matter of comparison, which I will insert in the RECORD, a state-

ment from the Department of Agriculture, the Pure Food and Drugs Section, for the years from 1930 to 1947. There were prosecutions pertaining to butter for filth, decomposition, and/or productions under insanitary conditions amounting to 705.

In those same years, 1930 to 1947, the seizures in oleomargarine for filth or decomposition amounted to just two. I think it would be well for the Members of the House to peruse this RECORD tomorrow, where it gives everything in detail.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. I will not yield at this time.

Further, I will read from the Federal Security Agency Bulletin, Food and Drug Administration, simply to show what this adulteration under filth and decomposition means—these 705 cases in that period of time as against 2.

Nature of the charge: Adulteration, section 402 A–3, the article consisted in whole or in part of a filthy substance, by reason of the presence of insects, insect parts, insect fragments, setae, rodent hair—that is rat hair—hair similar to rat hair, hair similar to cat hair; moth scales, nondescript dirt.

The article had been prepared, packed, and held under insanitary conditions, whereby it might have become contaminated with filth.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. Where do you find all that stuff?

Mr. MITCHELL. This is in the record of the Federal Security Agency.

Mr. RIVERS. But what kind of product do you find that in?

Mr. MITCHELL. That is butter, my friend.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania was asking about the farmers of the South and of my great State, where we raise a lot of soybeans; and, incidentally, for your information, 9 of the 11 counties in my district are dairy counties. When he was speaking about the farmers who neglected their fields and the farmers that he is acquainted with who were so busily, industriously cleaning up their creameries, I wonder if he impressed the House with the fact that he has visited so many creameries that he can conscientiously testify to the fact in the face of the documentary evidence I have produced here which is irrefutable because there are legal cases, there are many of them here, and I will refer you to pages 92, 93, 94, and 95 of the Federal Security Agency notices of judgment under the Federal Pure Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. I will not yield at this time.

I think rather than take salad oils that are derivatives of our farm products, soybeans, cottonseed, peanuts, and what have you, I think perhaps the butter people might think along in terms of refining the butter before they put it on the market; in fact, from all of the evidence I have, it is time we recognized that if what the gentleman said is true, that every jar of mayonnaise and every jar of salad oil on the grocery shelves of America would be contaminated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEVENSON].

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I think it should appear at this point in the RECORD that our distinguished colleague from Indiana is speaking of what happened during the present administration. With the present administration, no one would expect any prosecution of the cottonseed lobby, but would expect a great deal of prosecution so far as the dairy industry was concerned.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, to those who would defraud the American public by serving colored oleomargine for good, pure, unadulterated butter, I ask the question: "Would you favor the sale and serving of horse meat in public eating places without informing the people what they were getting?" If it is a fraud to sell horse meat to the public without telling the customer what he is getting, it is fraud to serve oleo to the public disguised as pure butter.

Why do the manufacturers of oleo want to color their product? They know the people prefer butter because of its sunshine color, because butter is made from unadulterated cream. Butter tastes good because it takes 4 pints of cream to make a pound of butter. Butter by nature is our symbol of good living.

There is no foreign oil in butter, no cottonseed oil, no coconut oil, no soybean oil. Butter is made from pure cream churned to a golden nugget. Butter does not have to be artificially impregnated with vitamins; it does not have to be adulterated to look like something it is not. Oleo manufacturers know oleo would not be bought or served on the table by the American housewife if it was put on the market in its original dirty-white color. You have heard the expression "tattle-tale gray." That is the real color of margarine. "Oleo" Members of Congress know their baby could not be pawned off on the housewife if they tried to dispose of it in its natural color. Because they want oleo to displace butter as a spread for bread, they want to adulterate it and color it to look like the golden globules of butterfat that gather when pure cream is churned into pure butter. They try to make oleo taste like butter, so they adulterate it with foreign oils to imitate the creamy flavor of pure butter. Butter by nature contains vitamin A, vitamin D, vitamin E, and the other natural food elements that combine to make butter one of nature's masterpieces. Soybean and cottonseed oil and foreign coconut oil from which oleo is made do not contain vitamins nor anything else that is tasty or palatable, so the oleo boys have to adulterate their oleo in an attempt to make it taste and look and smell like butter. My premise is: If you want to pawn off an adulterated imitation on the American public, why not let the people know they are getting an adulterated imitation. Why make it possible for these imitators to deceive and defraud the people by selling them an adulterated imitation of golden delicious butter at a price far beyond its value, and thus make it possible for the Oleo Trust to sacrifice a basic American industry on the altar of unconscionable profits, fraud, and deceit?

More than 65,000,000 meals are served to the public in public eating places in the United States every day. What a wonderful harvest for the Oleo Trust. What a market for the oleo interests to pawn off their adulterated imitation of butter at butter prices—an imitation that costs but a fraction of the cost of butter. This would afford the Oleo Trust the opportunity of disposing millions of pounds of oleo to the public, who would think they were getting butter. Billions of dollars of unconscionable profits for the Oleo Trust. No wonder they are spending millions in their oleo campaign.

The attempt of the oleo interests to destroy the dairy industry is not new. It started in Paris in 1872 and in the United States 2 years later. Neither is the regulation of the sale of oleo and taxation of this imitation of butter new. In all parts of the world the manufacture and sale of oleo have been subject to regulation and taxation of one form or another. In our neighbor state of Canada the use of oleo is completely prohibited. Wherever oleo has been sold in all parts of the world, it has been artificially made to look like butter and to defraud the public by passing it off for butter.

Oleo is usually made by mixing a vegetable fat, such as cottonseed oil, soybean oil, or coconut oil, with some skim milk and certain chemicals, and fortifying it with artificial vitamins by the addition of fish-liver-oil concentrates.

To the farmers of the Southern States and to any other person who believes that oleo manufacture is a good thing for the farmers of this country, I want to make it clear that less than two-tenths of 1 percent of the total cash income from the products of the farm is received from farm products utilized in the manufacture of oleo. That does not bear out the statement made by the oleo interests that oleomargarine manufacture is a boon to our farm populace.

Inasmuch as cottonseed oil is the basic ingredient of oleo, the southern farmer is told that oleo manufacture is an important source of income for him. But the facts show that all the cottonseed oil used in oleo manufacture accounted for only about one-half of 1 percent of the cash income of the cotton farmer. An increase of a mere five one-hundredths of 1 percent per pound for cotton lint alone would have meant more to cotton farmers than all the cottonseed oil used in the manufacture of oleo. The cotton farmer receives approximately four times as much cash income from cottonseed oil used in vegetable shortening and

from cottonseed byproducts sold as dairy feed as he receives from the entire oleo business. If the dairy industry is destroyed by the oleo interests, as is their aim, the loss to southern farmers from the sale of byproducts of cottonseed as dairy feed would offset many times their income from the sale of cottonseed oil for oleo manufacture.

The representatives from the cotton districts of the South should contemplate these facts before they vote to sacrifice the dairy industry on the altar of the Oleo Trust.

In a report of the Federal Trade Commission it was revealed that about 60 percent of the average annual production of crude cottonseed oil was handled by only three corporations—Procter & Gamble, Wesson Oil & Snowdrift, and Swift & Co. The sphere of control of these large corporations extends from the local cotton gin to the final processor and manufacturer, where the refined cottonseed oil is actually used. By the time the refiner, the broker, wholesaler, the crusher, and ginner have all taken their percentage of profits, the amount left for the cottonseed farmer is very small; in fact, almost imperceptible.

The total cash income to farmers in the Cotton Belt in 1946 was a little more than five billions. Of this huge sum only about seventeen and one-half millions was or could be credited to the sale of farm products used in the manufacture of oleo. Thus it is a fact that only one-third of 1 percent of the cotton farmers' cash income can be traced to oleomargarine.

For every $100 the average cotton farmer or farmer in the Cotton Belt receives from his farm, he can credit only about $34 cents to oleomargarine. But he does receive $8 out of every $100, on the average, from the sale of his dairy products. In other words, the average farmer in the Cotton Belt actually receives 24 times as much today from the sale of his dairy products as he receives from the sale of cottonseed oil and other ingredients of oleomargarine. Let the representatives of the cotton States give these facts to their cotton farmers. Thus the agruments of the oleo interests and their representatives are completely debunked.

In fact, in the most specialized cotton States, the dairy industry is much more important as a source of cash income to the farmers than is the manufacture of oleo. That may be a revelation to some of the Representatives from the Southern States. In Mississippi where practically every farmer raises cotton, the cash farm income from dairy products in 1946 was nine times as great as the cash farm income credited to oleo manufacture. Here are the figures from the United States Department of Agriculture and from the United States Department of Commerce, that speak for themselves, proving that the total farm income from oleo manufacture is but a small fraction of the income derived from the sale of dairy products and other farm products, the sale of which is hurt by the manufacture of oleo, in Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North and South Carolina, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas:

Important cotton State	Cash income to farmers in 1940	
	From oleomargarine	From sources injured by oleomargarine [1]
Alabama	$1,919,000	$30,956,000
Arkansas	2,263,000	36,891,000
Georgia	1,815,000	35,949,000
Louisiana	765,000	22,277,000
Mississippi	3,035,000	39,908,000
North Carolina	1,244,000	37,909,000
Oklahoma	639,000	63,802,000
South Carolina	1,090,000	19,294,000
Tennessee	888,000	65,766,000
Texas	3,881,000	126,051,000
Total, 10 cotton States	17,539,000	478,803,000

[1] Cash farm income from dairy products, lard, vegetable shortening, cottonseed meal, and soybean meal sold for dairy feed.

It is unfortunate that some farmers in these States have been led to believe that more oleomagarine would improve their economic status. If oleomargarine were eliminated from the market the increase in cash income from these competing products, notably dairy products, would be substantially greater than the insignificant income that can be attributed to oleomargarine.

In the State of South Carolina, the home of my distinguished friend and colleague, the Honorable MENDEL RIVERS, who is the protagonist of oleo in this fight, the cash income to farmers in his State in 1946 from the sale of oleo products totaled only $1,090,000 while the sale of cottonseed meal as a dairy feed brought his farmers $1,823,000; the sale of lard brought his farmers $2,492,000; vegetable shortening brought them $2,627,000; and the sale of other dairy products brought those farmers in South Carolina $11,253,000. Amazing as it may appear, the cotton farmers of South Carolina received $12,325,000 from the sale of butter and dairy products alone, which is $11,235,000 more than the total they received from the sale of all their oleo products in South Carolina. In fact, the amount received from the sale of all oleo products from the farms of South Carolina, the home of my distinguished colleague, is only about 5 percent of their total farm income.

The farmers of Alabama and Arkansas receive more from the sale of butter alone produced on their farms than they receive from all the products that go into the manufacture of oleomargarine. These figures should be revealing to the representatives of the cotton belt districts of the South who appear to be the leaders in this oleo fight against the dairy cow.

Now let me speak to the representatives of the farmers who produce soybean oil. In 1946 less than 14 percent, less than one-seventh, of the total soybean oil production was used in the manufacture of oleo. Most soybeans are grown in Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, and Ohio.

Like cottonseed oil, soybean oil is used in vegetable shortening and is interchangeable with many other edible fats and oils. Thus the price of soybean oil is dependent on the supply and demand of all fats and oils, and follows closely the price of cottonseed oil. The farmers of the leading soybean States are also heavy producers of dairy and hog products. Here are the figures from the United States Department of Agriculture and the Department of Commerce showing that the farmers from Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, and Ohio get less than 2 percent out of oleo products as compared with their income from butter and other dairy products, soybeans used as dairy feed, lard, and vegetable shortening:

	Cash farm income in 1946
Butter	$186,355,000
Other dairy products	462,733,000
Lard	217,125,000
Vegetable shortening	62,678,000
Soybeans sold as dairy feed	39,209,000
Total	968,100,000
Total from oleomargarine	16,571,000

As indicated here farmers in these States receive 58 times as much from sources adversely affected by oleomargarine as they do from all the farm products used in its manufacture. In fact, a reduction of 3 percent in the cash income from dairy products alone would completely eliminate their entire income from oleomargarine.

It will also be revealing to my distinguished colleague from the Hoosier State, the Honorable EDWARD MITCHELL, the gentleman who is the antagonist of the dairy farmer, that the dairy farmers of the good State of Indiana in 1946 received from the sale of butter alone over eighteen millions, whereas they received less than three millions from the sale of their oleo products and from other competing interests to the dairy industry. Does the gentleman from Indiana realize that his farmers are receiving approximately 50 times as much money from the dairy cow as they receive from the sale of soybean oleo products and margarine?

Faced with these facts, does he still want to destroy the dairy industry in his State? Does he still insist on sacrificing the dairy industry on the altar of oleomargarine?

During 1946 the cash income that farmers throughout the United States received from the sale of farm products used in the manufacture of oleomargarine, as compared to the total farm income from all other products, shows that only 1.12 percent of the total income from cotton and cottonseed was derived from the sale of oleo products and only 5 percent from soybeans; and an infinitesimal percentage from other farm products as is shown from the following figures received from the United States Department of Agriculture and the Department of Commerce:

Source of cash income	Cash income to farmers in 1946		Percent from oleomargarine
	From products sold by farmers	From portion used in oleomargarine	
Cotton and cottonseed	$1,495,814,000	$16,759,000	1.12
Soybeans	371,501,000	18,603,000	5.01
Cattle and calves	3,715,226,000	707,000	.019
Dairy products	4,116,930,000	817,000	.020
Hogs	2,971,829,000	342,000	.012
Peanuts	152,222,000	1,470,000	.097
Corn	746,473,000	678,000	.091
Total	13,569,995,000	39,376,000	2.902

Even a casual observation of these data reveals that farmers are not depending upon oleomargarine as an outlet for their farm products.

The above facts and figures should be carefully studied and contemplated by the representatives in this Congress who are putting on the fight for the oleo interests.

Most of the oleo interests or oleomargarine producers are in Illinois, California, Ohio, and New Jersey. There were 47 plants licensed to produce oleo in 1947. These plants were owned by 25 corporations, four of which were the Big Four meat-packing companies. The bulk of oleomargarine is produced in the United States by five or six large corporations.

With oleomargarine selling at 28.3 cents a pound, the farmer received only 8.86 cents, which represents a differential of almost 20 cents a pound between what the farmer gets for the ingredients that go into a pound of oleo and the price the Oleo Trust gets from the consumer. Do you think for one moment that the Oleo Trust will knock off 10 cents a pound on colored oleo if the Federal tax of 10 cents a pound on colored oleo is repealed by this Congress. You are very naive if you believe the Oleo Trust is that charitable. If the Federal tax on colored oleo is repealed the price of colored oleo may go up considerably in every State where the sale of colored oleo is not prohibited.

A lot of propaganda has been flooding the country to the effect that you are paying 10 cents a pound more for oleo now than you would pay if the Federal taxes are repealed. This propaganda is very misleading to the housewives. There is a Federal tax of only a quarter of a cent a pound on uncolored oleo, which is absorbed by most dealers and manufacturers. This should make no difference in the cost of uncolored oleo to the consumer. There are 22 States, including the States of Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, and Illinois, that prohibit the sale of colored oleo within their borders, to protect the people from the fraud and deceit of having colored oleo served to the public as imitation, adulterated butter. The Armour Research Foundation of the Illinois Institute of Technology has revealed that through scientific experiments and tests cottonseed oils turn gray in color when made into oleo, and soybean oils turn a greenish color when made into oleo. Oleo must first be bleached to remove those colors. The oleo manufacturers desire to imitate the golden color of butter, so they deceive the consuming public by coloring their product to look like butter, which they aim to displace as a spread for bread. Whatever the Congress does in this fight will not lower the price of oleo in States where its sale is prohibited, as is the case in Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, and Illinois.

If oleo does displace butter as a spread it will mean practically the destruction of the dairy industry. Every dairy cow and every dairy herd that is thereby destroyed means less milk, less cream, less butterfat, and less beef, less veal, and less hides and leather for the American public. There is no question but that there will be a scarcity of milk, cream, butter, a scarcity of meats and meat products, and a scarcity of hides and leather with the destruction of the dairy industry. Every dairy cow and every calf that is removed from the dairy picture means an increasing scarcity of dairy products, a scarcity of meats and meat products, and a scarcity of hides and leather products. This will result in higher prices for milk, cream, and butter, higher prices for meats and meat products, and higher prices for shoes and leather products just as surely as night follows the day. As you know, 40 percent of our meat supply in this country comes from our dairy herds.

Instead of getting oleo for less, the consuming public will pay a higher price for oleomargarine. With a continuous decrease in the number of dairy cows and dairy herds in the country, it is absolutely a foregone conclusion that butter and dairy products will go higher in price because of the ever-continuing scarcity of dairy products. And so the consumer is bound to meet with disappointment, if he thinks the repeal of the Federal tax on uncolored or colored oleo will bring about lower prices, either in the cost of oleo or milk or butter, or in the cost of meats or meat products, or in shoes or leather products. All these products are bound to increase in cost to the consumer. And the Oleo Trust will fill their pockets with huge profits. Is it any wonder the Oleo Trust is spending so much money in this fight for oleo against the dairy cow?

The gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, pointed out to us last week in an address before the House that colored oleo has sold in our National Capital for as much as 12 to 18 cents a pound more than uncolored oleo on the same day. He also pointed out that in Terre Haute, Ind., colored oleo sold for as much as 29 cents a pound more than uncolored oleo. Surely this is proof sufficient to indicate what will happen in every State where colored oleo is not prohibited, if the tax on colored oleo is repealed.

In every State where the sale of colored oleo is not prohibited, the price of oleo will follow the price of butter. With no competition from uncolored oleo to keep the price down, the consuming public will pay more and more for oleo until there will be practically no difference between the cost price of colored adulterated oleo and pure golden delicious butter. The consuming public will thus pay huge and unconscionable profits and tribute to the Oleo Trust. Right now the profit of the Oleo Trust on every pound of oleo amounts to many times the amount of the Federal tax. They could sell oleo to the public for much less than the current price, and still make huge profits.

The facts and figures I have given to you thus prove that a repeal of the Federal tax on oleomargarine will not only do a great injustice to the dairy farmers of the entire United States, but it will do great harm to the consuming public, to the man and woman with a family, because of the increased prices that will follow in the cost of oleo, butter, in milk and dairy products, and in the cost of meats, meat products, leather, leather products, and shoes.

To prove to every Member of Congress how seriously harmful the production of oleomargarine is to the farmers and the consuming public of this country, I attach the following tables for your examination and study:

Cash income received by farmers from oleomargarine and competing interests in 1946

CASH INCOME TO FARMERS FROM SOURCES ADVERSELY AFFECTED BY OLEOMARGARINE

State	Butter [1]	Other dairy products [2]	Lard [3]	Vegetable shortening [4]	Cottonseed feed sold as dairy feed [5]	Soybean feed sold as dairy feed [5]	Total competing interests	Cash income to farmers from oleo [6]	Cash income from competing interests per dollar from oleo
Alabama	$2,117,000	$18,945,000	$3,226,000	$4,621,000	$1,972,000	$75,000	$30,956,000	$1,919,000	$16
Arizona	199,000	9,088,000	156,000	644,000	318,000		10,405,000	263,000	40
Arkansas	3,340,000	20,686,000	3,275,000	5,666,000	2,034,000	890,000	36,891,000	2,263,000	16
California	8,935,000	224,910,000	3,953,000	1,938,000	730,000		240,466,000	873,000	275
Colorado	7,843,000	18,399,000	1,834,000	245,000			28,321,000	29,000	977
Connecticut	41,000	32,068,000	241,000	10,000			32,360,000	1,000	32,360
Delaware	51,000	7,297,000	132,000	146,000		68,000	7,694,000	38,000	202
Florida	189,000	24,449,000	2,221,000	222,000	27,000		27,108,000	64,000	424
Georgia	2,655,000	22,712,000	4,335,000	4,503,000	1,718,000	26,000	35,949,000	1,815,000	20
Idaho	8,830,000	28,467,000	1,544,000	99,000			38,940,000	10,000	3,894
Illinois	30,889,000	144,837,000	52,912,000	29,481,000	6,000	18,353,000	276,478,000	7,958,000	35
Indiana	18,118,000	109,598,000	37,858,000	10,953,000		5,714,000	182,241,000	2,881,000	63
Iowa	111,648,000	46,414,000	99,024,000	14,797,000		9,889,000	281,772,000	3,722,000	76
Kansas	24,083,000	46,857,000	10,423,000	1,445,000		845,000	83,653,000	344,000	243
Kentucky	10,327,000	41,742,000	6,070,000	533,000	24,000	153,000	58,849,000	122,000	482
Louisiana	431,000	16,020,000	2,595,000	1,844,000	1,285,000	102,000	22,277,000	765,000	29
Maine	2,121,000	21,571,000	270,000	16,000			23,978,000	1,000	23,978
Maryland	1,651,000	47,306,000	1,388,000	177,000		100,000	50,622,000	65,000	779
Massachusetts	364,000	38,255,000	575,000	12,000			39,206,000	1,000	39,206
Michigan	26,252,000	163,419,000	7,684,000	969,000		339,000	198,663,000	244,000	814
Minnesota	95,768,000	144,123,000	33,340,000	2,962,000		1,039,000	277,232,000	702,000	395

Footnotes at end of table.

Cash income received by farmers from oleomargarine and competing interests in 1946—Continued

State	Butter [1]	Other dairy products [2]	Lard [3]	Vegetable shortening [4]	Cottonseed feed sold as dairy feed [5]	Soybean feed sold as dairy feed [5]	Total competing interests	Cash income to farmers from oleo [6]	Cash income from competing interests per dollar from oleo
Mississippi	$1,734,000	$25,179,000	$1,648,000	$7,008,000	$4,077,000	$262,000	$39,908,000	$3,035,000	$13
Missouri	30,695,000	90,011,000	27,267,000	4,975,000	808,000	2,707,000	156,463,000	1,363,000	115
Montana	4,921,000	11,062,000	1,473,000	238,000			17,694,000	23,000	769
Nebraska	39,285,000	13,640,000	23,581,000	839,000		101,000	77,446,000	194,000	399
Nevada	345,000	2,829,000	121,000	39,000			3,334,000	4,000	834
New Hampshire	231,000	13,971,000	89,000	8,000			14,299,000	1,000	14,299
New Jersey	100,000	51,796,000	823,000	70,000		25,000	52,814,000	109,000	485
New Mexico	648,000	7,142,000	407,000	618,000	264,000		9,079,000	235,000	39
New York	9,089,000	306,772,000	1,349,000	147,000		12,000	317,369,000	15,000	21,158
North Carolina	2,812,000	26,762,000	2,968,000	3,417,000	1,522,000	428,000	37,909,000	1,244,000	30
North Dakota	25,612,000	14,096,000	4,617,000	240,000		8,000	44,573,000	27,000	1,651
Ohio	25,700,000	161,884,000	27,331,000	7,447,000		5,253,000	227,615,000	2,010,000	113
Oklahoma	18,189,000	37,175,000	5,360,000	1,718,000	1,349,000	11,000	63,802,000	639,000	100
Oregon	9,189,000	36,914,000	1,860,000	120,000			48,083,000	12,000	4,007
Pennsylvania	7,544,000	209,337,000	4,292,000	236,000		78,000	221,487,000	47,000	4,712
Rhode Island	4,000	6,087,000	56,000	1,000			6,148,000	(7,000)	42,993
South Carolina	1,072,000	11,253,000	2,627,000	2,492,000	1,823,000	27,000	19,294,000	1,090,000	18
South Dakota	18,551,000	13,487,000	14,560,000	459,000		39,000	47,096,000	81,000	581
Tennessee	7,107,000	49,958,000	5,144,000	2,199,000	1,088,000	270,000	65,766,000	887,000	74
Texas	11,772,000	91,610,000	7,350,000	9,299,000	6,017,000	3,000	126,051,000	3,881,000	32
Utah	2,150,000	17,947,000	656,000	60,000			20,813,000	6,000	3,469
Vermont	1,388,000	58,005,000	134,000	19,000			59,546,000	2,000	29,773
Virginia	5,252,000	44,390,000	3,206,000	966,000	63,000	204,000	54,081,000	278,000	195
Washington	8,908,000	63,220,000	1,575,000	91,000			73,794,000	9,000	8,199
West Virginia	1,832,000	18,441,000	885,000	64,000		3,000	21,225,000	8,000	2,653
Wisconsin	46,639,000	461,954,000	16,739,000	547,000		142,000	526,021,000	86,000	6,117
Wyoming	1,390,000	6,278,000	473,000	112,000			8,253,000	11,000	750
Total, United States	638,011,000	3,078,363,000	429,647,000	124,712,000	26,127,000	47,164,000	4,344,024,000	39,377,000	110

[1] Cash income from farm butter sold plus butterfat in creamery butter times price received by farmers per pound of butterfat for cream sold at wholesale.
[2] Cash income from all dairy products less income from butter.
[3] Estimated at 14.46 percent of cash income from hogs.
[4] Estimated amount of farm cash income which could be properly attributed to ingredients used in shortening.
[5] Estimated amount of cash income which could be properly attributed to soybean and cottonseed products sold for dairy feed.
[6] Estimated amount of farm cash income which could be properly attributed to ingredients used in oleomargarine.

NOTE.—The method used in making these detailed calculations was informally approved by various disinterested experts in the U. S. Department of Agriculture. Some of the figures shown here are based, in part, upon preliminary data and are therefore subject to slight revision.

The following fact knocks out the argument that existing Federal laws are restricting the production of oleomargarine. During the last half of 1947 production of oleo had increased to the rate of 800,000,000 pounds per year. In February the production of oleo had reached the rate of 1,000,000,000 pounds per year.

How many people pay the 10-cent tax on oleomargarine? Not very many. During the last half of 1947, for example, only 4 percent of the tax-paid oleomargarine was colored. Only 4 percent was therefore subject to the 10-cents-per-pound tax.

FACTORS AFFECTING THE CURRENT DAIRY SITUATION

1. More customers for dairy products in our rapidly increasing population.

2. Consumption per capita at much higher rates.

3. Fewer cows to meet this increased demand.

The Secretary of Agriculture has set a goal of 120,000,000,000 pounds of milk for 1948. Already production has fallen so far below our needs that it is unlikely that we will meet that goal this year. In February per capita milk production per day was only 1.80 pounds, the lowest point reached in 10 years.

FEWER DAIRY COWS

Here are the facts on the reduced number of dairy cows being milked this year:

Cows and heifers 2 years old and over kept for milk in the United States:

1937–46 average	25,973,000
Jan. 1, 1947	26,098,000
Jan. 1, 1948	25,165,000

This means a loss of 3.6 percent or 933,000 cows in our herds in the last year.

Heifers 1 and 2 years old kept for milk cows:

1937–46 average	5,645,000
Jan. 1, 1947	5,602,000
Jan. 1, 1948	5,685,000

Heifer calves under 1 year kept for milk cows:

1937–46 average	6,317,000
Jan. 1, 1947	6,768,000
Jan. 1, 1948	6,485,000

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNGBLOOD].

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Chairman, we are confronted at this time with an all important issue in which both those pro and con may be overconcerned. Fear, apprehension, and perhaps just a bit of prejudice has entered into this dispute. I have resentment or malice toward none. After having been here almost two full sessions, I have many friends on both sides of the aisle, of that I am sure.

I come before you to make a plea in behalf of the men and women who toil in the factories and the shops. I ask you to help them so that they can eke an existence from their earnings. This bill to repeal taxes on oleo will not only help them to help themselves but will benefit the Nation as a whole as well.

With the advancements made in the science of chemistry new fields are opening each day for more and varied uses for farm products. Let us dwell awhile upon the fact that the United States Government has paid out countless millions of dollars to the American farmers in the last decade or so in the form of subsidies to continue the present unbalanced program. If we are not to stop this practice, we may be driven to subsidize the urban population by such methods as granting them more pay and thereby further contributing to the devaluation of the American dollar. In my opinion, all such subsidies are just another form of governmental control and bring more clearly before our eyes the specter of the Hammer and Sickle. Let us all work together in an effort to protect all of our people from the repercussions of such a program.

I have talked to many Members of the House who agree that these taxes on oleomargarine are discriminatory and unjust. However, these same men do not feel that they can vote for the removal of these taxes in view of their constituents' strong objections to such an action. I say to these Representatives that you will regret it if you continue to express opposition to this bill because when you hurt some of the citizens of the United States you must of necessity hurt the entire public. For example, in the farm districts of my own State of Michigan, which is a good model for other parts of the dairy country, small grocers in those very same districts stock oleo on their shelves. I ask at this time, who are the consumers of this product, if it is not the farmer?

With this information in mind, I do not come before the House to debate the benefits of this legislation but to plead in behalf of those poor unfortunates who are helpless to help themselves and in behalf of the farmers who will be helped by the passing of this bill. Again, I feel that we should do everything possible to help these people.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute for the purpose of answering certain questions to be asked by the majority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to ask the gentleman, in view of the fact that numerous inquiries have been coming to me, what he proposes to do about the further consideration of this measure, and when it will be concluded? I understand there has been an arrangement

entered into between the minority leader and the majority leader to have the Committee rise this afternoon at 4 or 4:30 in order to take up some very important District matters.

Mr. RIVERS. That is right.

Mr. HALLECK. Now then, beyond that, is it the intention of the gentleman to call this measure up tomorrow, or call it up on Wednesday?

Mr. RIVERS. It is not our intention to call this matter up again until Wednesday as the result of an agreement entered into between all parties affected. I want to make it plain at this time, because some of the Members have to catch trains and fill other commitments, and we want to give them an opportunity to do that.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to make this further suggestion, if the gentleman will yield further, that it was anticipated to call up for consideration tomorrow the bill dealing with the authorization for the construction of a courthouse here in the District of Columbia. Later in the week it had been expected that we would call up the so-called tidelands bill. I would like to announce to the membership that if the courthouse matter is disposed of early tomorrow, I would like very much to finish with, at least, general debate on the tidelands bill in order that later on in the week, if we could not conclude it tomorrow, we would be able to reach it and dispose of it.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. On this tidelands bill, the understanding was that it was not coming up until Thursday because some of the Members who are very much interested in it could not be here. The author of the bill has a primary tomorrow. It was programed for Thursday. I also want to ask this question: A bill being considered by virtue of a discharge petition is the order of business until finished?

Mr. RIVERS. That is right.

Mr. MICHENER. And if other business intervenes, then I ask, Does not the bill lose its special privilege so that it could be objected to if called up at some future time? No agreement between the leaders can keep alive a special privilege unless it be by unanimous consent?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. It is not a question of agreement. The so-called oleomargarine bill is the pending business until disposed of. The gentleman in charge of the bill is not under compulsion to move on any specific date after it comes up for consideration to go into the Committee of the Whole, and the gentleman from South Carolina has just announced that he does not intend to make that motion again until Wednesday.

Mr. MICHENER. Does the gentleman feel that the person who controls a discharge petition can control the business for the rest of the session and bring up the bill as unfinished business if, when, where, and how he may see fit?

Mr. RAYBURN. Not at all.

Mr. MICHENER. I say that that is not the rule. It is not logical and it cannot be done.

Mr. RAYBURN. All I say to the gentleman is that anyone could move tomorrow that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the oleomargarine bill, but as far as we who are vitally interested in it are concerned, we are going to try to vote that motion down if it is made.

Mr. RIVERS. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan that this has not been arbitrary, this has been done because Members have asked me to do it and I have tried to cooperate. I am paid to stay here 365 days a year, and I can be here tomorrow or any other day. I am just trying to help the Members from the gentleman's side and my side who cannot be here tomorrow. I am willing to vote now, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will yield further, as has been pointed out, the matter that is now pending is the unfinished business, and its continuing consideration will depend upon the action of the House. As the gentleman has pointed out, this suggestion has been made and, as far as I know, will be followed. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan that my suggestion regarding the beginning of the consideration of the tidelands bill tomorrow was made at this time in order that we might learn whether or not there are any reasons why that should not be done. As the gentleman has pointed out, it was programed for Thursday. This situation that has developed will necessarily interfere in some degree with the continuing prosecution of the program for the week. I made the suggestion only with the idea that we might make some progress, and I will be glad to confer with the gentleman about it.

Mr. MICHENER. The author of the bill has a primary tomorrow and will not be here.

Mr. HALLECK. Then, of course, the bill cannot go on tomorrow.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Is there any difference in the program as outlined in the notice as far as the courthouse bill is concerned, which comes under our committee?

Mr. HALLECK. No; that bill will be on for consideration tomorrow.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ].

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, one of the basic issues involved in this legislation is the propriety and desirability of using the tax laws to affect the relative position of competing industries. In the case of oleomargarine, the taxing power is used as a punitive measure against one industry, to advance the interest of another. In the process, the public is deterred from the free exercise of its consumer preferences. Competing industries are deprived of the full benefit of the free-enterprise system, which conflicts with the public interest and should be avoided. These taxes unnecessarily burden consumers far in excess of the amount paid in taxes.

Every group has a right to enjoy a free market for its products. The consuming public should be given the right to buy the products it wants. Margarine should be placed in the same legal status as butter or any other wholesome food product. It would still be subject to all pure food laws and subject to the same laws against misrepresentation of its character or content that apply to butter or any other food.

Health authorities have pointed out that the food value of oleomargarine is equal to that of butter. While the vitamin A content is about the same, oleomargarine contains larger quantities of vitamin E than does butter. Oleomargarine is just as easily digested as is butter. The National Research Council states, and I quote:

> The present available scientific evidence indicates that when fortified margarine is used in place of butter as a source of fat in a mixed diet, no nutritional differences can be observed.

If lower-priced fats are more generally available for human consumption, there undoubtedly will be a tendency to use them more freely than when an extremely expensive fat, such as butter, must be purchased. Therefore, the removal of the restrictions on margarine would encourage a greater use of margarine in cooking and on the table, which, in turn, would probably result in a further improvement in nutritional status of the average individual.

Those families that can afford to use butter will continue to do so. But those families who have had to reduce their consumption of fats because of the cost of butter and margarine would be enabled to increase their use of fat through the purchase of margarine, when the price is lowered by removal of taxes.

Because of my interest in doing everything possible to reduce the cost of living, I signed the discharge petition several months ago to bring this legislation before the House, having been the fourteenth Member to sign the petition. The cost of food is the largest single item in the budget of the working people and I urge the Members to vote for H. R. 2245, to reduce the cost of this valuable food product by the removal of the unjust and discriminatory tax.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, the general purpose of this legislation is to lower the cost of living, if possible, and of course we are all for that, but there are other things than butter prices that need correction. May I remind my good friend from South Carolina that we now have an import limitation of 29,000 bales on short-staple cotton, and 91,000 bales on longer cotton fiber, a year. That is not very much on a production basis of

11,000,000 bales, which is the estimate for this year. I can think of no other agricultural product that is protected by an embargo. I find that textiles have gone up just the same as has butter and to the same degree. The price of cotton textiles has increased about 300 percent since 1939. I want you cotton Members to listen to this because we are going to do something about it if the oleo tax is repealed. In that event we are going to do away with the quota, and it is my good fortune to be the chairman of the committee that can do it. The commodity index shows that the price of cotton textiles was 57 in 1939. In 1948 it is 168.9, an increase of about 300 percent. I find that on the New York Cotton Exchange, short-staple cotton is being quoted at 38.14 cents a pound. Sheeting and shirting and all the other things in the manufacture of which cotton is used have also increased 300 percent. It is not fair to differentiate between the cotton grower and the butter producer. But if you folks are prepared to go ahead and carry out your program, we are going to do something about cotton a little later on.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. I remember that you did not make any threats when we voted with you to override the President's veto so that we could reduce taxes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, but you did not vote that way out of love for me or my party. You voted that way because your constituents demanded it of you. Deny it if you can.

Mr. RIVERS. I am voting for the American people now, too, and no threat that you can make can deter me in my action.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman cannot kid me.

Mr. RIVERS. I would not try to kid you, and neither can you kid me.

Mr. KNUTSON. No, the gentleman knows better than to try to kid me. He did not vote to reduce taxes because he wanted to vote with Republicans.

Mr. RIVERS. You do not remember the days when you came around asking us to help you. You remember that, do you not?

Mr. KNUTSON. I recall the gentleman coming to me of his own volition and telling me he was for tax reduction. His intelligence on that occasion did him credit.

Mr. RIVERS. You cannot remember those days, can you?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield any further.

I appreciate the gentleman's help, and I hope that the gentleman will not take a position that will prevent our cooperation in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further; I only have 5 minutes.

Mr. RIVERS. I yield the gentleman two more minutes in order to ask him a question.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is not enough time, because the gentleman would use it all himself.

Mr. RIVERS. Then I do not yield the gentleman any time.

Mr. KNUTSON. The duty on cotton 1⅛ inch or longer is 3½ cents a pound, and the current price is 42 cents. Can the gentleman justify that high price? Can anyone justify it? I am not saying that butter is not too high, but so is nearly everything else.

As for you poor misguided creatures who pulled the chestnuts out of the fire for the southern minority, I cannot understand you at all. You did what the New Dealers shied away from for 16 long years, and a few of you actually seem to be proud of your blindness.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two more minutes to make a further statement along that line.

Mr. KNUTSON. I wish I had time to pay my compliments to the Republicans who signed the discharge rule in the way I really should like.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman another minute.

Mr. KNUTSON. New Deal Congresses had 16 years in which to take up oleo tax repeal, but it was too hot for them, so a group of Republicans obligingly does it for them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. And the gentleman from South Carolina gave me two, which makes five.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. No; I cannot yield further.

I want you Members from the cotton-raising sections to just look ahead a little bit. Just as sure as you pass this tax repeal, we are going to bring down the price of wearing apparel into the manufacture of which cotton enters and just as surely are we going to remove all quotas on cotton imports. When we have to compete with the oleomargarine manufacturer who wants to put the dairyman out of business, I will say, as was said by some of the dictators over in Europe some years ago, "If you pull us down, by the eternal, we will pull you down with us." Think it over.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill which would relieve millions of American people, particularly the housewives, of this unjust and un-American tax on margarine.

It seems to me that this provision in the law which allows those of us who can afford butter which has been colored artificially by the producers without any penalty, and which, on the other hand, requires those who use margarine to pay a penalty if they desire to purchase it colored by the producer, certainly is discriminatory and violates the basic principles of democracy.

Nowhere in American economic life is there a more unfair violation of the economic spirit of the Nation than is presented by the cynical set of taxes which besets oleomargarine, and I feel strongly that this represents a national principle not in keeping with our democratic way of life.

Butter itself is artificially colored 8 months a year. That fact need not even be printed on the butter package. To color margarine requires a $600 Federal license plus a tax of 10 cents a pound. For millions of low-income families, butter today is too costly and they do without it. Anything that can be done to lower the cost of living and help these families, and to save taxes, should be done rather than the creation of new taxes and new controls. Even our Government during the war urged the eating of margarine and there is no reason why this cheaper food should not be available to our people, without tax.

During the past few weeks I have received a great many communications from my constituents, stressing the need for the repeal of this tax. It is my duty, as their representative in Congress, to protect them against legislation which will tax them unjustly. In behalf of them, I am proud to be among those who signed the discharge petition in order that this legislation be brought to the floor of the House today for action and shall vote to abolish this unfair tax on oleomargarine for the welfare of our country.

We are constantly seeking every possible means to ease the burden of the high cost of living, and yet these unjustified taxes and fees continue to swell the price of a basic commodity. I firmly believe anyone who is interested in benefiting the American public will vote for prompt passage of this bill.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, in the few short years of my service in this House, I can think of no subject which has caused oratory to flow so freely as this subject of margarine taxes. As the oratory has flowed and sounded good in the ears of its enumerators, it has fed on itself, carried on of its own momentum to erroneous conclusions which are as fantastic as they are unrealistic.

The remarks of the very able gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] delivered in this House last Thursday afternoon well illustrate my point. I have always regarded, and I presently regard, the gentleman from Minnesota as one of the ablest Members of this House. But just listen to what he told us on Thursday. The removal of the tax on margarine will eliminate the production of butter. Elimination of butter production will cause the disappearance of the dairy cow. Disappearance of the dairy cow means that our children and our children's children will go without milk. Worse yet, the exit of the dairy cow will mean neither direct fertilizer for our fields nor nitrogen-fixing crops erstwhile used to feed those cows. Our soil will lose its fertility; the lush fields of America will be ruined.

Ladies and gentlemen, it just is not so. Let us get down to cold facts and weigh the pros and cons of this margarine tax without flights of fancy. Let us canvass who is harmed by the tax; who, if anyone, is benefited by the tax.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I decline to yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN] is not on the floor.

Mr. BUCK. I regret that he is not here. I saw him here just a few minutes ago.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield until I have finished my statement.

Let us get down to cold facts and weigh the pros and cons of this margarine tax, without flights of fancy.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BUCK. Does the tax benefit the public revenue? No. The yield is picayunish. The Treasury Department itself testified before the recent hearing of the Committee on Agriculture and advocated the tax's elimination.

Does the tax benefit the dairy farmer? No. Despited the tax, margarine sales have increased more than eightfold in the 61 years of the tax's existence. Meanwhile, butter prices have recently reached the highest points in history and butter is still selling in my community in excess of $1 per pound.

Does the tax benefit the cotton planter? Obvously no.

Does the tax benefit the soy farmer? Obviously no.

Does the tax benefit the housewife margarine user? Obviously no.

Whom then does the tax benefit? It benefits no one. Therefore it is a bad tax. Therefore the tax should be eliminated. Therefore the House of Representatives should vote to discharge the Committee on Agriculture from further consideration of this measure.

Let us now proceed further, Mr. Chairman, and explore whom the tax harms, if anyone. Mr. Speaker, it does not harm the rich. Dollar-a-pound butter is too small an item in the rich man's budget.

It does not harm the well-to-do who employ a servant. The latter is assigned the messy, time-consuming job of coloring the margarine.

Whom then does the tax harm? Mr. Chairman, it harms the great preponderance of American housewives who do their own work—who must take time they can ill-afford from their 14- to 16-hour day to add the color which they and their families want but which has been denied them by the dairy lobby. Think of next fall, gentlemen of Congress. Think of housewives in every congressional district in the Nation. Will they be thanking their Congressman for the boon of added leisure? Or will they be damning their Congressman with every stroke of their margarine spoon? Think hard, gentlemen, think hard.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as you have noted, we have refrained from making any charges here reflecting on any section of this country. Sectionalism in my part of the world is dead. I can only speak for that part.

This oleo tax is certainly not sectional. The biggest city in the whole world is New York City and they are vitally interested in this tax. The high cost of living knows no section or no city and this tax affects everybody in this country.

I do not regard this as a tax, I refer to this as a ransom. I have consistently referred to this so-called oleo tax as a ransom and as a tribute to certain interests in this country.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I do not yield.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to a farmer?

Mr. RIVERS. I do not yield.

Now I want to say this to the gentleman. Modern margarine is composed of of soy oil, of cotton oil, peanut oil, and of corn oil—remember that, they grow corn in every State of the Union—and a sizable quantity of milk goes into oleo, too. Let me tell you how much milk was used in oleo last year: 116,242,000 gallons or pounds, whichever unit they use.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I do not yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RIVERS. No, I do not yield; I just do not yield, that is all.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, not for a correction?

Mr. RIVERS. The Members apparently do not understand me; I just do not yield.

It was unfortunate.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I decline to yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RIVERS. For how long?

Mr. Chairman, I yield a half a minute to the gentleman from Iowa. I love old BEN; I guess I have got to yield to him.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows, of course, that I have gone along with the folks from the South on a lot of things they have wanted. The gentleman knows that, does he not?

Mr. RIVERS. If the gentlem n says so, I agree with him.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows that, does he not?

Mr. RIVERS. All right, certainly; and I have gone along with the gentleman, too.

Mr. JENSEN. All right; now, this strikes directly, this bill strikes directly at the heart of the economy of the Dairy and Farm Belt of America. That is what it does.

Mr. RIVERS. I disagree with the gentleman. This is a consumers' bill.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman has a perfect right to disagree with me, but he knows as well as I do that our economy to a great degree is built around the old milk cow; and he knows also that this bill if made law is going to be a direct detriment to the old milk cow and what she means to America.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further. I just do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield to anybody. How can I make a speech when my friends take all my time?

Mr. MITCHELL. Will not the gentleman yield that I may correct the statement made by the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. JENSEN. If the gentleman yields to him to correct me then I must ask him to yield to me to correct the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I just do not yield to anybody else.

Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate when the chairman of a great committee makes threats. I am not here to vilify anybody. I have the utmost confidence and faith in the fairness of the membership of the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives is the finest jury in the world, made up of the most intelligent men and women of either branch of our Congress or of any parliamentary body in the world, and I say that without reservation. The gentleman from Minnesota is not the only one who has made threats; another distinguished gentleman has made threats against the South. This is not a southern bill, Mr. Chairman; this is an all-American bill. When these gentlemen make threats of what they are going to do, I will leave our cause in the hands of the rest of the membership of the committee. I just do not believe they will support him. I regret that a man in a responsible position would make a statement like that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned, I am willing to let the House vote on this issue, I am willing to abide by the vote and I will cast no aspersions upon any Member regardless of his color, his class, his party label, or the section from which he comes. I will be perfectly satisfied with your verdict.

Mr. Chairman, there is a great section of our country where the glaciers deposited top soil of which there is no better in the world, out in the great sections of Illinois, Indiana, and that part of the world. That is where soybeans are grown. The soybean oil which is placed in oleomargarine approximates the amount of cotton oil placed therein, of which there is no better in the world. Those two components make up a great proportion of the composition of margarine.

Now, let me say something about margarine. We have had abundant testimony before all of the committees of the House, in 1-minute extensions of remarks and in every conceivable way by which people could have exposed and debated this proposition. But margarine is a healthful food. Dr. Anton Carlson testified before the Committee on Armed Services to that effect on proposed legislation introduced by myself and the gentleman from Indiana. We have shown beyond peradventure of doubt or beyond

the pale of skepticism the healthful ingredients of this product. It is loaded with vitamins and it is good for children and growing people.

Mr. Chairman, we are not alleging that butter is not good, or the number of cases in which there have been prosecutions in reference to butter. This is not presented on the demerits of butter or anything found therein. This is presented on the basis of American fairness, on the basis of taxing one edible product grown on the farms of this Nation on behalf of another. That is not fair. In effect, that is taking property without due process of law, and in direct contravention of the amendments of the Constitution, and you know it.

When I was with the Department of Justice and I first argued these cases about the police power of the Federal Government and the States, I saw that terrific discrepancy and unfair venture on the part of the Congress. I then resolved I would use what ability I possessed to some day make these two products competitive with one another in accordance with the basic American theory of supply and demand and competition.

I am glad to say that by a 2 to 1 vote the House is going into this matter today. The AMVETS testified before the Committee on Agriculture—that great organization composed of veterans of World War II—that the American housewives in 1947 spent twelve or thirteen thousand years mixing margarine. I want to relieve them of that 12,000 years' labor.

Something else was shown beyond peradventure of doubt which nobody can question. Because of the tax on oleomargarine, and regardless of how infinitesimal the tax may be that is imposed as a tribute on oleomargarine, it is not sold in the small grocery stores. Consequently the people who cannot afford the luxury of butter cannot buy it. It can only be bought in the big cities where they pay for it through their nose, and you know it.

I have no complaint, Mr. Chairman, about States like Wisconsin that prohibit the sale of colored margarine. That comes under the heading of States rights and I will defend you with my all as long as I live on that proposition. If the States do not want it, that comes under the heading of their business. I will not complain about that. But when the Federal Government through its strong arm of taxation tells your people and mine what they can have, when they can have it, and what price they shall pay, I say that somebody has got to raise his voice and I will raise my feeble voice.

It does not sound good, but believe you me that it is honest and it is sincere. I say to you that this tax is un-American. I say to you that it is unfair. I say to you that as far as the House of Representatives is concerned, regardless of the wailing of those who say this thing is unkind, I am sure, based on your characteristic and historic fairness, that you will remove this tax so far as we are concerned and let the other body assume its own responsibility. The people of this country have their eyes glued on us today. Do not let us fail them.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I think the RECORD should show that the distinguished new agricultural leader of the Nation, my good friend, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], made a misstatement when he told of how many million pounds of milk were used in oleomargarine. That is not a factual statement and I want it to appear in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, one of the greatest hoaxes ever perpetrated before the American public, the American press, and the Congress of the United States was executed to build up the present case for repeal of the oleomargarine laws.

The hoax had its origin back in 1943 when Mr. Arthur G. Hopkins, an oleomargarine manufacturer from Sherman, Tex., representing the National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, an organization made up of 20 large oleo corporations, appeared before the House Committee on Agriculture.

He stated:

> Margarine can be made yellow without the addition of any artificial color.

And later upon questioning from members of the committee he stated clearly and without equivocation that margarine could and would be made a natural yellow color from cottonseed and soybean oils if it were not for the fact that these oils had to be bleached because of present Federal regulations.

The next year, in 1944, Mr. Hopkins appeared before the committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the United States Senate. At this hearing, Mr. Hopkins presented an elaborate array of samples and charts purported to prove beyond a shadow of doubt that margarine made from cottonseed and soybean oils which have not been bleached produces a natural golden color.

After these statements were made they were picked up by the journalists of our country and repeated during the ensuing years all across our land without ever being modified or revoked by any member of the oleomargarine industry.

Fortune magazine, in November 1944, ran an article which purported to be a studious and unbiased analysis of the butter-oleomargarine problem. That magazine stated in an article entitled "Will Butter Win the Peace" that some cottonseed and soybean oils can produce a yellow margarine.

In the Reader's Digest of May 1947, page 29, there appeared the following statement:

> On the other hand, all margarine made from soybean oil naturally would have a yellowish color. Under the punitive tax law, however, this natural color of the oil must be bleached out and the resultant fat left an artificial white.

The Chicago Tribune, in an editorial dated January 20, 1948, stated:

> The strange thing about this is that oleo made from cottonseed or soybean oil is naturally yellow and must be bleached to avoid the tax.

Similar statements even found their way into our farm journals. For example, in Pathfinder for February appeared the following:

> Soybean oil gives margarine a naturally yellow color without using chemical dyes, but to avoid the 10-cent color tax, this oleo must be bleached.

In the Farm Journal for March 1948, appeared this statement:

> Margarine makers say butter has no monopoly on the yellow color; that margarine oils must be bleached to eliminate a naturally yellow color.

What is the truth, and wherein lies the hoax and deceit that have been practiced in connection with this butter and oleomargarine controversy? The hoax and the deceit lie in the fact that these statements are plain, unadulterated misrepresentation.

At the hearings held by your Agricultural Committee last month, the truth finally came to the surface. It was demonstrated before the committee that, when cottonseed oil is manufactured into margarine without bleaching, the resultant color is a dirty white and not a light golden color. When soybean oil is manufactured into margarine without bleaching the resultant color is green and not a light golden color.

These facts have been recently publicly corroborated by one of the outstanding independent research laboratories in the country, the Armour Foundation of the Illinois Institute of Technology.

Carrying the hoax still further, the Margarine Manufacturers Association, through their official representative, stated before congressional committees that the only reason the oleomargarine industry bleaches their oils is because of the presence of Federal laws. This is a second deliberate falsification of the truth and an enlargement of the original deceit.

The plain, unadulterated truth in this respect is that the oleomargarine industry would have to bleach their oils even if there were no oleo tax laws on the books. The oleo manufacturers are forced to bleach these oils to remove undesirable odors, flavors, and colors, like dirty white and green.

Regardless of the other merits of this controversy, we should be fully cognizant and the American people should be made fully aware and the American press should be completely informed of the false colors under which the oleomargarine industry has presented its case.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, 26 oleomargarine corporations who produce nearly all of that product sold in the United States, who want the law changed so that they can sell yellow oleo to imitate butter, have taken advantage of the present high cost of butter and all other products under the guise of reducing the cost of living in an attempt to repeal the present tax on oleomargarine.

In building up their campaign for repeal, the oleo and cottonseed-oil lobby employed one of the outstanding adver-

tising agencies in New York City to direct a Nation-wide advertising campaign. During the year closing November last, they spent in this advertising campaign $6,000,000, according to a report of Time magazine. The gist of their advertising campaign was that oleo is as good as butter and is entitled to be sold yellow in color in imitation of butter. Naturally, this amount of money spent in the advertising columns of newspapers brought about a lot of favorable editorial support, as many newspapers often express their appreciation of paid advertising with favorable news and editorial comment in return.

The 1,250,000 dairy farmers who were working long hours to produce milk and butter spent no money to counteract the efforts of these 26 corporations. Much of their propaganda as a result of the millions spent has not given or disclosed the true facts to the people as to this situation.

This is a fight for greater profits led by the comparative few oleo manufacturers in the country, and by the cotton lobby of the South. It is a fight for more money and bigger profits on the part of both of them. It is not a sincere effort to reduce the cost of living, and certainly is not in the interest of the health of the millions of our children, the people generally, and is not in the interest of the general welfare of the Nation.

For this reason I feel it my duty and solemn obligation in the interest of the people I represent and in the interest of the economy of the Nation to oppose this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, for many years the law of the State of Illinois and 22 other States has prohibited the sale of yellow oleomargarine. If we were to pass this law, yellow oleomargarine, as an imitation for butter, could not be sold in the State of Illinois. There must be considerable merit in maintaining the law as it is, otherwise those representatives of the people in Illinois, who serve closest to them, would not continue the law in force to prohibit the sale of yellow oleo.

Anyone can now buy oleo in its natural white color throughout Illinois and the Nation without paying the 10 cents per pound tax. The tax is only one-fourth cent per pound and is paid by the manufacturer.

This oleo fight, led largely by the cotton lobby of the South and the oleo manufacturers who want to sell the growing children and the people of Illinois and the Nation, renovated oil instead of nature's pure wholesome butter, I repeat, is a fight for greater profits and more money. It all hinges on color. Here is one reason they want the right to color their white oleo and sell it in the yellow color imitating butter. There are 65 million meals each day served to people in restaurants and public eating places. None of these millions of people would have any protection and neither would the Federal Government, as to whether or not they were serving oleo and charging the higher butter prices for it. If this law permits them to color oleo in imitation of butter, they can go freely into the manufacture of ice cream, cheese, and other butter products. I do not believe the American people want to repeal this law and throw the butter, ice cream, and cheese business of this country wide open to many unscrupulous people who would sell these synthetic products at any price they can get.

Mr. Chairman, last week you could buy in Terre Haute, Ind., yellow oleo cut in quarters to imitate butter in a carton which said country fresh, flavored with butter, with the picture of a dairy farm on the carton. While oleo costs 32 cents there, this package was selling at 59 cents. After adding the 10-cent tax for the yellow color there was still an overcharge to the consumer of 17 cents.

There is little question, if oleo is allowed to compete with butter in color as the repeal of this law would permit, that the price of oleo will be raised by the manufacturers, guaranteeing them millions of dollars that otherwise would be saved to the consumers who are now buying oleo, if the Federal law is kept on our statute books unchanged.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, under the present law, the tax in Illinois to the consumer is nothing. It takes only a few minutes' time to color their oleo, if they desire to do so. I know this is quite a little chore, but let me point out that thousands of housewives on the farms also find it quite a chore to wash and clean the hand separators after the night milking is done, so they will be fresh and sanitary to receive the morning milk, many times before daylight the next morning.

In considering this bill we must take into account what is best for the farmer, the purchasing power of his family, and the fertility of the soil. Then we must take into consideration the product the consumer gets, its nutrition value, whether you want your small and growing children to have a sufficient supply of wholesome milk, ice cream, and cheese products, or whether you want to substitute for milk and milk products a mixture of cottonseed oil with a small amount of soybean oil and other oils, with a small amount of skim milk added, together with coloring matter, producing an imitation butter.

Mr. Chairman, if these oleomargarine corporations and the cottonseed interests of the South are able to put over this legislation, I predict that it will strike such a blow against the dairy interests that the dairy herds, already too low, will be reduced by 2,500,000 head within the next 3 years. The loss of the butter market will be felt first by 1,250,000 small farmers who sell farm separated cream, most of them only milking three to six cows.

This proposal to repeal the tax if adopted, will change very largely the whole course of agriculture in the Northern States. It will finally bring disaster to the dairy business, which employs more people and produces more farm income than any other segment of agriculture.

The Government, recognizing the food value of milk and dairy products through the years past, has spent millions of dollars through State College Agriculture Extension Service for the expansion and improvement of dairying. During the past year there was spent on dairy extension work alone $900,000. The passage of this legislation reverses our course. The effect of this legislation is to begin to undermine and destroy the fine results of the Government's past efforts.

When you vote for this bill, you vote to restrict the future opportunity of 1,750,000 boys and girls doing 4–H Club farm work. You vote to restrict the opportunity of these future farmers of America. There are 101,606 farm girls alone enrolled in dairy cattle activities. We need to encourage the boys and girls to stay on the farms. This bill, if enacted, will discourage them.

These farmers and their families for a market depend upon 5,000 creameries. This cream is a considerable part of their weekly cash income. They are not a part of any oleo corporation or lobby. They are just plain, hard-working, small farmers who work long hours, month after month to produce a little milk and cream, and many other farm products that the people in the villages and cities must have.

If this bill is passed, it will strike such a blow in reducing the dairy herds and the supply of milk that the demand for the scarce amount of milk will be so great the price of milk will go up to where the very consumers who are signing petitions to Congressmen urging us to make this mistake, will be paying far more for milk than they will save on a few pounds of oleo. If this thing happens it can well affect the health and growth of millions of children here in America. It is a terrible price to consider paying to allow the oleo people and the cottonseed-oil people to imitate the yellow color of butter in order that they can make more millions for the comparatively few of them who are interested in this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, this administration and the Congress has insisted on giving away billions of dollars in food to European countries through the Marshall plan. If this legislation passes there will be less food for the American people and less food to ship abroad.

Mr. Chairman, we depend upon our farmers for all of the food we consume. We must have a sound and prosperous agriculture because it is the cornerstone of our economic prosperity. Agriculture employs more people and is the biggest single business in the Nation. How can we expect sufficient agricultural products to keep prices reasonable if you endanger 20 percent of the farmers' production income. Twenty percent of the total income of agriculture in the Nation is derived from dairy products.

THIS LEGISLATION MEANS LESS MEAT

The Department of Agriculture gave out a statement a few weeks ago that it would take 10 years before dairy herds were built back up to the number necessary. There are 2,600,000 less dairy cows in the Nation today than there were in 1945. There are 21,000,000 less sheep and lambs in this Nation today than in 1942. There are 38,000,000 less hogs today than there were in 1944. That is the reason meat is so high at this time. Now by this legislation you will start the reduction of dairy cattle which means the reduction of milk, butter, and cheese. Through the sale of veal calves, heifers,

and older dairy cattle comes approximately 35 percent of the present beef supply of the Nation, hence this legislation will add to the shortage of meat. It is well to read this paragraph again so that you may better understand the terrible price the people and the economy of this Nation will have to pay if this legislation is enacted.

With less cattle to slaughter each year it will not only mean less beef which will cause prices to go higher, but it will mean less hides, fats, oils, and tallow. Less hides will mean an increase in the cost of shoes, leather goods of all kinds including luggage. The women of this Nation who have been deceived by this $6,000,000 advertising campaign into writing the Congressmen in the hope of saving a few minutes' time in coloring oleo, or in the hope of saving a couple of dollars a year in the price of oleo, will find that they will be caused to spend five times as much as they save, when they buy purses, luggage, shoes, milk and, yes, oleo at higher prices.

The oleo manufacturers, as soon as they are given the use of the yellow color to imitate butter, will doubtless raise their prices and get all the traffic will bear.

Mr. Chairman, turning our thoughts to Illinois, may I point out that the hundreds of thousands of dairy farmers, most of them marketing cream from only a few cows each week, received, last year in Illinois, a cash income of $175,726,000. The oleo manufacturers only bought soybean oil in the amount of $7,958,000. On the other hand these dairy farmers purchased Illinois soybean feeds from the soybean industries alone in the amount of $18,353,000—more than twice the amount sold to the oleo manufacturers.

These figures show that the market the soybean farmers should want to protect is the dairy farmers, their best customers.

Mr. Chairman, may I sum up this argument by saying to those who have been deceived by the advertising propaganda campaign put out in favor of oleo, that they give consideration to the following:

The present Federal law protects you and the public so that you know what you are buying. The present tax helps to hold down the price of white natural oleo which will go up if it is taken off. The present Federal law costs you practically nothing in taxes. If it is taken off no one will know what they are buying, and the general public will be cheated out of millions of dollars annually by unscrupulous persons who will sell oleo at regular butter prices. By reducing the dairy herds, butter will go higher and oleo prices will likewise be raised. Milk, by reduction of dairy herds, will go higher which prices will be reflected in bottled milk, ice cream, and dairy products. Leather of all kinds will go higher because of the reduction of the number of hides. Beef will go higher because about 35 percent of the beef of the Nation now comes from the dairy herds.

Mr. Chairman, the consideration of this bill leads me to refer to the Navajo Indians. The New Deal, several years ago, when the policy was to kill off livestock, reduced the goat herds of the Navajo Indians and restricted their pasture lands to the point where starvation overtook them and the Congress recently voted to give them several million dollars for immediate aid in food products. Now the Government is buying a million goats for the Navajo Indians in order that they may have goat milk and goat meat.

This legislation will start the dairy cow down the same trail. More carcasses of dairy cows will go into the coolers of the meat processors of the Nation during the next few years if this legislation passes, than ever before. That will mean less heifers and steer calves annually to help out in the meat supply of the Nation. It will mean less milk as well.

I will not be a party to striking such a blow against the biggest segment of agriculture in the Nation. I will not vote for what I sincerely believe, to be against the interest of every man, woman, and child in America and against the entire economy of this Nation. As a member of the Farm Bureau for 25 years and from my experience in farming and agriculture I think I know the danger of this legislation to all the people.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress votes millions of dollars each year out of the Federal Treasury for soil conservation. The Congress realizes, with the great increase of population and our commitments to the world that during the war our soil has been depleted. I am sure you Members of Congress who have driven through any dairy section know from first hand that no farm crop puts back through the byproducts of dairying as much fertilizer on the soil as do the dairy farmers. No group of farmers grow as much legumes and alfalfa and rotate crops preserving the soil equal to the dairy farmers. When you reduce dairying in this Nation you take away the necessity of growing legume crops, greatly depleting the soil.

Nothing is of greater importance than preserving the fertility of the soil to feed the expanding population throughout the years to come here in America. Dairying is the backbone of diversified modern agriculture. During flush milk production the manufacture of butter is a necessary outlet for surplus milk which cannot be sold in bottles. Butter continues to be the product upon which the dairy farmer largely relies.

It is a product which both farmers and consumers must be able to count upon in the future. This bill should be defeated in the interest, not only of agriculture, but in the interest of the consumers and the entire economy of the Nation.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to pay tribute to those men who have fought so nobly, I should say, to get this bill out of committee.

I would like to compliment all of you; particularly the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MITCHELL] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]. It was my pleasure to be in Mr. RIVERS' district last week, and the people down there are behind him in this fight. I might say that the people all over South Carolina and all over this country are against this iniquitous, abominable ransom, as the gentleman from South Carolina calls it. They are behind him in this fight. We in South Carolina hope that this tax will be repealed.

I was very much interested in the rantings and ravings of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] whom I like, and also the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], whom I also like. I would like to say that this is a forward step today, I believe, toward the ultimate achievement of the true opportunity system. The gentleman from Pennsylvania mentioned South Carolina, Georgia, and North Carolina, and spoke of the farmers down there. I would like to say that their income is much lower than that of the farmers of Pennsylvania. They are struggling to raise cotton. They have a right to expect a fair opportunity under the American system. I do not believe that this tax is fair. It is undemocratic. It is un-American, and discriminatory on the farmers of the South and throughout the country.

I would like to say also that I am against sectionalism. I am against the injection of sectionalism into this debate.

Mr. GROSS. If you fellows down there would not label dairy products as filthy, your people might be eating it and be better off.

Mr. DORN. I would like to say we are not labeling dairy products as filthy products.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, your Mr. RIVERS and your Mr. POAGE, and the whole gang of them, have labeled these things as unfit for human consumption. We could not even find people using milk and butter down there.

Mr. DORN. I do not yield further, Mr. Chairman.

The gentleman's observations about our use of milk and butter disqualifies him further as a witness about conditions in the South. My people use dairy products and the dairy industry is growing. The gentleman has injected sectionalism into this debate. I stand on the merits of this bill. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] made no such statements. They are both gentlemen and believe in conducting debate on a high plane. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] has handled this side admirably.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Would the gentleman be in favor of removing the quarter-of-a-cent tax on reprocessed butter?

Mr. DORN. I am not committing myself on that. We are arguing the tax on oleomargarine. If the gentleman is in favor of something like that, he is privileged to bring it up. They will not hold it up in the Committee on Agriculture like some of your members attempted to hold up this oleomargarine bill, and thus keep the bill from coming

before this democratic body and letting it be acted upon.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. But there was one member of your own party. The gentleman should not blame us for all of it.

Mr. DORN. The gentleman is correct. Such important legislation should always be nonpartisan. The members of both parties, who would seek to hold this bill in committee, I criticize. There is nothing wrong with letting the membership of this House vote on any bill, any legislation, pro or con. I compliment my colleague the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] on the wonderful job he has done in bringing this bill, in the democratic, American way, before this Committee to be considered.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DORN. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Did you ever question why he did not do it when the Democrats were in power, all these years?

Mr. DORN. Well, they raised the question a while ago about the New Deal spending money in the South. Your State, a two-party State, received more New Deal money than South Carolina.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Oh, no.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I am disturbed by the trend of the argument today on the vital matter of taxation of oleomargarine. There can be only one approach to this problem. All other argument is superfluous. Let us answer this question today: Is our dairy industry worth protecting?

There can be only one answer to this question—an emphatic "Yes." Our action today must result in beating down this attempt to repeal all Federal taxes on oleomargarine, or else we will be legislating the destruction of one of the Nation's most important industries, the dairy industry.

This has been labeled a butter-oleo fight. Herein lies the basic error in thinking which has resulted in bringing this matter up for consideration today. It is not a contest between butter and oleo; it is not a contest between the soybean or cotton farmer and the dairy farmer. It is a fight vital to every citizen of the Nation; and it is a fight between the entire public and the margarine interests.

By a clever, well-financed propaganda campaign, the oleo industry has been successful in injecting false issues into its campaign to repeal existing taxes, and has enlisted a wide popular support. I urge you to put aside all preconceived notions, for I assure you many of them are false. Let us examine the question rationally, without emotion or prejudice, then vote accordingly, in the best interests of the Nation.

Because I come from a butter-producing State — North Dakota ranks seventh in the Nation—you will say that I cannot objectively outline the issues today. Because I come from a butter-producing State, I am acquainted with this problem, and have attempted to understand it, and my conviction is not one recently acquired, but represents a long intimacy with the problem. I assure you I have at all times attempted to think objectively on this matter.

MARGARINE'S ARGUMENTS

First, let us examine the arguments, and evaluate them, of the proponents of tax repeal.

They contend that oleo can compare with butter in every respect. While I shall never believe this, I answer them by saying, "So what?" Even if it is the equal of butter, it should not be permitted to imitate butter. Horse meat may be the equal of beef, but our people are entitled to know when they are being sold horse meat. The argument is not whether butter and oleo are on or near a par in nutritive and food value; the question is, Should we protect our dairy industry?

The proponents of tax repeal cry "special-privilege tax," "subsidy," and "restraint of trade." Even if their cry is right, it is evading the basic question. Should we protect our dairy industry? We have tariff to protect industry; they are special-privilege taxes. We subsidize many farm products, including cotton and soybeans, I am told. We regulate many industries for the good of the Nation; regulation constitutes restraint of trade. But if these things are justified, then the cry is a cry of "wolf," and is merely designed to arouse emotion.

Now the oleo people tell us that if we take this tax off their product it will reduce the cost of butter and the cost of margarine. This is pure, unadulterated propaganda. How can removal of a tax on margarine reduce the cost of butter? They are not competing today because of the wide variance in price between butter and oleo. Further, the cost of butter is not high compared to other prices of products made from milk and butterfat. The price the farmer receives for butterfat sold the creameries to make butter is much lower than the price the same farmer would receive if he should sell this same butterfat to evaporators, cheese factories, or as fluid milk. When you consider that it takes an hour of labor to produce a pound of butter, including all the steps involved, from caring for livestock, through transportation to the creamery, and transportation to the market, we wonder how butter can sell for less than a dollar a pound. Compared to the butterfat content of fluid milk at 20 cents a quart, it is an excellent buy. No; taking the tax off oleo will not reduce the cost of producing butter nor the price the consumer will have to pay.

The tax on uncolored oleo is a quarter of a cent per pound, a reasonable license fee. Remove this tax and how much will it reduce the cost of oleo to the consumer? Not more than a quarter of a cent a pound.

The housewife has been hoodwinked into believing that the 10-cent tax on colored margarine is being paid by her. Nobody is paying for it unless the oleo is colored when she buys it. The most taking this color tax off could do would be to give the housewife colored oleo at the same price she pays for uncolored oleo today. But I am not too confident that the greedy margarine interests will be so kind as to hold the price down, if they can get the privilege of making their product appear like butter.

But, they argue, take off the 10 cents tax on colored margarine, then we can save the housewife hours of work. Let us examine this follow-up and alternate argument used when it is obvious that the propaganda is not falling for the reduce-the-cost-of-living fallacy which has been sold to the public, including many Congressmen. In the first place, the majority of housewives of the Nation use more uncolored margarine for cooking than they do for table spread, and I am confident they will admit that they do not care whether the margarine is white or yeollow for cooking purposes. This explodes the time-saving theory in half. Now to dispose of this argument as it applies to table spread. If the housewife insists upon oleo's being yellow—why not green or sky-blue, or palatable pink—there is no law against margarine manufacturers coloring oleo any color except yellow—true she has to color it. But the very fact that this law exists is the only protection that the housewife has in knowing whether she is buying butter or buying oleo. The Pure Food and Drug people have no authority, except over interstate traffic, to regulate and prevent the sale of margarine as butter. The housewife may have to color some of her margarine for the table, but at least she knows that when she buys butter, it is butter and is not a colored substitute sold to her fraudulently.

The housewife has been sold on this proposition thinking that the elimination of this 10-cent tax on oleo will reduce the cost of margarine 10 cents and also give her the product in yellow form. She has not been informed—she has been misinformed. The cost will not be lowered more than one-quarter of a cent per pound, for that is all the tax she is paying today on uncolored margarine.

If this margarine is such a great product, why do not the oleo manufacturers pay the 10-cent tax? It would still sell for half the price of butter. This cost-of-living and color argument is so shallow that it is hard to understand how so many well-informed people could entertain it for a moment. We might fool a few housewives today who have read the oleo ads and propaganda, but we will encounter their wrath on the morrow when they find out just what we did accomplish if we are so foolhardy as to remove this necessary protective tax.

The color argument is simply a camouflage, a colored and false argument which has led us today to the precarious position of threatening one of our greatest industries, and the welfare of the Nation. The basic question is this: Is the dairy industry worth our continued support, or should we render it a knock-out blow?

EFFECT OF TAX REPEAL

Is our dairy industry worthy of protection? This is the question to be

answered and you cannot answer it unless you understand the following facts.

The dairy industry, not alone butter, but cheese, milk, and all other phases of it, will suffer if we take this protective tax off oleo. People think milk is good for them. And they are right. But knock butter off the market and what will happen to the milk industry?

A cow gives milk in different quantities at different times of the year. Humans want a set amount of milk throughout the year. How can we satisfy the demands of humans, with the erratic milk production of cows? Only if we have a surplus of cows in seasons of high production can we have enough milk in seasons of low production. Say one cow provides enough milk for your family part of the year, but two cows are required during the low-milk season. You have to keep two cows or go without enough milk during the latter season. What will you do with the extra milk from the extra cow during the high milk-production seasons? That will be the problem facing the fluid-milk industry if you push butter off the market. Butter is the perfect outlet for extra milk in seasons of high production, for it provides a concentrated form of butterfat which can be safely stored in seasons of high production for consumption during seasons of low milk production. It is a part of the dairy cycle. Will you maintain, at present feed prices, an extra dairy cow half of the year when you have no outlet for that extra butterfat? You will not, and you do not expect the industry to. Dairy herds will naturally decrease to the point to meet set human consumption during the high productive period of the herd. The price of milk will skyrocket in times of low production. Who, then, will complain loudest? The housewife, the mother of children, your consuming public, they will demand a subsidy for dairy herds. The Government will be buying butterfat, because the butter market will be gone. The housewife will not thank you for voting to destroy the dairy industry today.

Consider the dairy industry from another important standpoint to the entire Nation. Diversified farming is important to the welfare of the people of North Dakota, as it is important to any agricultural community. The dairy industry provides this opportunity for diversified farming. In bad crop years the farm population, one-fifth of the Nation's population, the majority of whom have at least a few dairy cows, will need to depend largely upon dairy herds to manage to eke out an existence.

Not only is it important from this standpoint, but the fertilizer problem is solved to a large extent through the use of dairy herds in North Dakota. The maintenance of livestock on our farms is essential to restore organic matter to the soil. Without a market for butter the dairy industry in North Dakota would cease to exist, and this soil-conservation practice would soon be discontinued. This is true throughout the Nation and is not limited to my State.

The dairy industry is more important as a means of revenue to the farmers of every State than will be the sale of vegetable oils to margarine manufacturers even if they triple or quadruple their sales, completely pushing the use of butter from the market. Every Congressman should seriously consider this fact. In fact, the dairy farmer is a better source of outlet for soybean and cotton byproducts than the oleo industry will ever be, a better source of revenue. Action destroying the dairy industry will prove short-sighted, indeed.

I urge that every Congressman read and study the letter I received from the Cudahy Packing Co., which is one of the Nation's largest producers of margarine. This letter appears on page A2415 of the Appendix of the RECORD. Here is one margarine producer who has stuck to facts, who recognizes the threat to the dairy industry and sees the folly of the action contemplated today. As a margarine producer Cudahy has every reason to join the propaganda campaign of the other producers who have precipitated this crisis today. Do not take my word for this, read the story as written by Mr. F. W. Hoffman, president of the Cudahy Packing Co., of Chicago, Ill. It is truly revealing, and certainly without prejudice.

Remember the issue before you today is: Should we protect our dairy industry? If you give this your honest evaluation today, I am certain you will agree, our dairy industry is worth protecting. It will be a tremendous mistake to repeal present taxes, and I urge with all the strength at my command that Congress defeat the bill now being considered and avoid the calamity of seriously crippling our important dairy industry.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE].

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman I am opposed to the Rivers bill. So far as I can see, it will accomplish very little good for anyone and will do very positive harm to certain groups and to the country as a whole. In spite of the great propaganda to the contrary, the repeal of the law providing a 10-cent tax on colored oleomargarine will accomplish very little for the consumer. In the first place, it is the general opinion that the repeal of the tax will be followed by an increase in the price of oleomargarine substantially equivalent to the tax.

In the second place, some 23 States now have laws either prohibiting the sale or manufacture of colored oleomargarine or putting very drastic restrictions on the sale or manufacture. Those State laws will, of course, not be affected by any action taken in this Congress.

Any benefit that the repeal of the tax would bring to the cotton States would be lost when competition begins in earnest with certain foreign oils. The cottonseed people cannot compete with these imported oils on any basis favorable to cottonseed.

Of course, the Rivers bill would be very injurious to the dairy sections of the country for reasons which have been so well outlined thus far in this debate. The principal objection to the Rivers bill, however, it seems to me, is its effect on our soil-conservation program. We all agree that the conservation of our soil is a necessary program in this country. Every year we appropriate substantial sums to carry out that objective. The dairy industry contributes largely to the conservation of the soil. If for no other reason, that is sufficient justification for the legislation now on the statute books designed to protect the dairy industry.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, when I first approached the butter-versus-oleomargarine issue several months ago, my first inclination was to vote for the repeal of the oleomargarine tax and get this long-standing sore out of the way.

But, as time has passed and as I have studied this issue most carefully, reading literally everything that I could get my hands on concerning the fight, I have learned many startling facts that give me an entirely different attitude about which side I shall take. On the surface, this seems like a very simple issue, but the more you learn of it, the more you see that what seems to be true in regard to the oleo situation really is not the truth at all.

For example, I had been led to believe that the tax on a pound of oleomargarine, purchased at the store by a housewife, was 10 cents—that it really was an important item in the cost of living. The fact is, this tax is only one-fourth of a cent a pound. Even more important than this is the fact that no oleomargarine manufacturer has come forward to state unequivocally, so far as I know, that he will not raise the price of oleo if the tax is repealed. In other words, we might be voting the oleo manufacturer more profits without helping a single housewife who purchases oleo.

The more I studied this issue, the more I learned about our dairy industry. And, the more I learn about the importance of our dairy industry in the scheme of our agricultural and industrial life, particularly in the North and in the great Middle West, the more I see that any tinkering with the present Federal laws regarding oleo could prove disastrous to the dairy farmer and the whole dairy industry. If the results of such action were sure to stop there, and the measure seemed to be in the public interest, I still might be persuaded to vote for oleo repeal. But the truth is, Mr. Chairman, we have no assurance that the results of our action here might not have even more far-reaching consequences in our closely knit economy.

As you know, the business interests in the typical little city and town, throughout the North and the Middle West in particular, are dependent upon the cash income of the farmers who live in the rural areas. If the income of these farmers—and most of them are dairy farmers, in one way or another—is cut, then business in town suffers proportionately. We cannot divide the interests of the city man from those of his rural neighbor. So, if the dairy farmer is injured, the city folks will be injured.

Personally, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe this issue is nearly as important to the average consumer or even to the cotton farmer as certain pressure groups, through a whipped-up and expensive propaganda campaign, have tried to make it seem. Actually, the average housewife would not save 25 cents a year if this tax were removed from oleo by the Federal Government, but to hear

some of them talk, you would think the average family would save hundreds of dollars annually. Twenty-five cents a year. That is what this thing could mean to an average family, if the mother were to buy no other kind of spread except oleo. That is a very little bit of savings to kick up such a storm about, even if the savings were to come about. But as I have stated before, not a single consumer can guarantee me, or anyone else, that the oleo manufacturers will not raise the price of their product so that they can get that additional two bits every year. And when you put it on that basis, you begin to see why these oleo manufacturers have put up so many millions of dollars to take this tax off.

Let me make it clear, Mr. Chairman, that not all oleomargarine manufacturers support this bill to repeal the so-called burdensome tax of one-fourth of 1 penny a pound.

I have here a letter from Mr. F. W. Hoffman, president of the Cudahy Packing Co., which manufactures and sells both oleo and butter in great quantities. He states the case against repeal of the oleo tax clearly and concisely. I quote his letter:

THE CUDAHY PACKING CO.,
Chicago, April 20, 1948.

Hon. PAUL W. SHAFER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Our company is engaged not only in the business of slaughtering, processing, and selling meat and meat products but also in the production and sale of butter and oleomargarine. We are, in fact, one of the largest manufacturers of margarine in the United States today. Our interest in the controversy over the present oleomargarine laws is therefore not one sided. We stated in a communication to Congressman ANTON J. JOHNSON of Illinois, several weeks ago that we are not asking for repeal of any of the present laws relating to the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine. In our opinion, looking at the laws from the standpoint of the welfare of all segments of our economy, no change need be made. In order that you may know the reasons for our position we shall set them forth. They are as follows:

1. The present laws are not unfair or unjust.

(a) The dairy farmer is entitled to the protection of these laws. They protect his market for butterfat against unfair competition from an imitation product. Any businessman is entitled to protection against imitation of his manufactured merchandise.

(b) The consumer is not hurt by these laws. The tax of one-fourth cent per pound on oleomargarine not colored yellow is small. The license fees which must be paid by the retailer, wholesaler, and the manufacturer are also small when passed on to the consumer, as they undoubtedly are. Applying the total of all these taxes to a family that consumes 3 pounds of oleomargarine per week, every week of the year (156 pounds per year), the total amount of taxes does not exceed 40 cents per year—less than 1 cent per week.

By comparison, the cost of adding vitamin A to oleomargarine is more than three times the amount of the tax, and the cost of advertising the leading brands of oleomargarine normally runs from four to seven times the amount of the tax.

There is no reason why oleomargarine cannot be served white, which is its natural manufactured color, but if the consumer desires to color it, modern packaging enables her to do so without waste of time or product.

Nor have the present laws had any detrimental effect on our national diet or nutrition. Our per capita consumption of fats has increased steadily during the past several decades, rising from 39 pounds in 1912 to 51 pounds in 1941. It declined slightly during the war, but since then has been rising again.

When all elements are carefully considered it can be stated with fairness that these margarine laws have helped the consumer rather than hurt him. Among other things, we can thank these laws for placing the oleomargarine industry on its good behavior, and prompting it to use American-produced oils and to improve its product to a point where it approximates the palatability and nutritional equivalency of butter.

(c) The oleomargarine industry has not been hurt by these laws. Over the past several decades sales have been on a gradually ascending curve. If any hurt has come to the oleomargarine industry it has been self-inflicted. During the past several decades the industry has encouraged rather than discouraged the consumer to take the time and trouble to color her oleomargarine yellow. All of the industry's advertisements have encouraged this practice. Had the industry, on the other hand, spent its millions of advertising dollars encouraging the consumer to serve oleomargarine white, she would probably have become accustomed to using it that way today.

Other industries in food, drugs, clothing, and shelter have gotten us to change our living habits without resorting to a complete imitation of competing articles and the oleomargarine industry could and should do the same without imitating the color of butter.

(d) Our general economy would be seriously affected by a change in these laws. The uncertain benefits that might accrue to cotton and soybean farmers are so insignificant compared with the certain disastrous effects that would be produced for dairymen by reducing the tax on yellow oleomargarine that we should all pause and examine carefully the implications of these laws before tampering with them. In 1946, only two-tenths of 1 percent of farm income was attributable to oleomargarine. On the other hand, farm income from dairy products was over a hundred times farm income from items attributable to oleomargarine. Even if farm income attributable to oleomargarine were doubled or trebled, it would be small—less than 1 percent. Even for farmers who raised only cotton, but 1.45 percent of their cash farm income in 1946 came from cottonseed oil used in oleomargarine. In the 10 leading cotton States, income to farmers from dairy products was 27 times as great as income from oleomargarine in the same year.

Farmers in certain States now raise soybeans. Taking this segment of the farming industry alone, but 5 percent of the income they enjoyed from soybeans came from oleomargarine in 1946.

To sum up, actually oleomargarine is not an important outlet for any farm product.

The following is an interesting extract from the booklet entitled "Oleomargarine and the Farmer," recently published by the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation:

"During 1946, American consumers spent over $2,000,000,000 for the primary edible fats—butter, lard, vegetable shortening, and oleomargarine. Out of this $2,000,000,000 of consumers' money, the American farmer received over 60 percent, or $1,231,747,000, which was divided as follows:

	Cash farm income in 1946
Butter	$638,011,000
Lard	429,647,000
Vegetable shortening	124,712,000
Oleomargarine	39,377,000
Total	1,231,747,000

"Historical facts prove beyond a doubt that the quantity or poundage of fats used by the average American consumer stays about the same from year to year. Fluctuation occurs in the per capita consumption of the individual fats but an increase in the consumption of one fat generally results in an offsetting decline in another."

Twenty-five percent of our dairy farmers depend largely upon the sale of cream for butter manufacture to maintain their dairy cows. If the oleomargarine laws were repealed, over a million of this type of farmer would, in our opinion, be forced to sell most of his cows. The permanent reduction in this segment of our cattle population would affect not only our supply of milk and cream but also our supply of meat.

Inasmuch as butter traditionally has served as the outlet for all surplus supplies of milk after all other milk products (including bottled milk, ice cream, evaporated milk, dried milk, and cheese) have been supplied with their requirements, it is quite apparent that any action adversely affecting butter could create chaotic conditions in the supply and cost to the consumer of all other dairy products. It might well be that in the event that the price of butter were unduly depressed, bringing about substantially reduced production of milk in the over-all in this country, the price of bottled milk and all manufactured dairy products would at times be increased substantially to the consumer.

2. Butter alone is entitled to the yellow color because it alone is always naturally yellow, in varying shades thereof. It is morally entitled to make the claim: "Yellow is the 'trade-mark' of butter," Oleomargarine, on the other hand, if processed from vegetable oils from American farms (as it is largely today) cannot be made a natural yellow. These oils are bleached, not because of the Federal laws, but because it is necessary to remove undesirable colors. There has been a great deal of misinformation and misleading propaganda put out on this subject, and the record should be set straight.

3. The present 10-cent tax on the sale of yellow oleomargarine reduces the incentive for fraud and assists the Federal authorities in detecting the presence of any considerable quantities that might be palmed off as butter. The monetary incentive to sell yellow oleomargarine at the price of and in the guise of butter is unique in our economy. No other kind of product affords a parallel for comparison. With the quantities of butter sold being so huge and the price spread between butter and oleomargarine so wide, the incentive for fraud is unparalleled. Fraud would undoubtedly be practiced if the present laws were repealed. The frauds which existed when the sale of oleomargarine in this country was unregulated demonstrate this. Oleomargarine being more palatable and nutritious today, deception would be easier.

We should like to make clear at this point that in our opinion the regulatory tax on the retailer is scarcely necessary to effect proper regulation. It could well be removed.

4. Wherever large and healthy farm economies are in existence throughout the world, oleomargarine is under some form of government restriction and regulation. This is true of practically all of the countries of western Europe. In Canada its threat to a healthy economy is considered so serious that the sale of oleomargarine is completely prohibited. It is only during periods of high prices like the present that Canada ever seriously considers modification of its extreme position on oleomargarine.

5. It has been claimed that present oleomargarine laws are a misuse of the Federal taxing power. Actually only by levying Federal taxes can the Federal Government effectively watch the sale of oleomargarine. The

pure food and drug laws are helpless in this regard because they have no jurisdiction over intrastate traffic. However, the Revenue Department can and does enforce the present laws.

We hope that you will study the considerations involved in this butter-oleomargarine controversy and that your decision will not be based upon the exigencies or pressures of the moment, which are transitory.

Sincerely,

F. W. HOFFMAN,
President, the Cudahy Packing Co.

Also, Mr. Chairman, as we know, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] hit the nail on the head the other day when he declared:

This is not a butter-oleomargarine controversy. This is a controversy as to the system of agriculture we are going to have in America. Are we going to have a system of landed aristocracy, where the people work at slave wages, carrying on generation after generation, or do you believe in the American farm, where the people of this country can have family-sized farms and own a little piece of America themselves? I am not going to engage in the business of dividing anybody's land up, but, in my opinion, the time has come for the people of this country to recognize the fact that the great bulk of the people who want to live on our land have a right to own some land and farm it the American way—like real Americans.

We all know of the system of agriculture which prevails in the section from whence this proposal comes—the cotton country. A lot of the agriculture people even in those States do not want to see dairying destroyed and Coca-Cola take the place of milk and oleomargarine take the place of butter.

I cannot make my stand against this legislation too strong, Mr. Chairman, after reading and hearing the facts which I have read and heard in the past several weeks. To me the case is crystal clear, and there is only one way for me to vote—that is, against repeal of this tax. To do otherwise would be to injure in a very real way every farmer in my district and, indirectly, every businessman and consumer in my district. The farmers, busy with their work, particularly in this spring season, have a right to know that I and my colleagues are here to represent them and to stand firm against the oleomargarine manufacturers, with millions to spend to put on a high-pressure campaign. That is why this proposal has advanced as far as it has—because a few oleo manufacturers had millions to spend to convince consumer groups through a sustained advertising campaign that this tax ought to be repealed. The dairy farmers, who, altogether, represent much more wealth and much greater value to this country, are not as well organized as these few oleo manufacturers; but we who know of the value of the dairy industry should stand firm. The righteousness of our stand will become apparent as time passes, and our farmers will know without a doubt the Congressmen who really have the interests of all the people at heart.

I call on my colleagues who have gone astray and those who have indicated a weakness in favor of this oleo-tax repeal to think again and to ponder the long-time results of their action. If they will think this thing through, I am sure they will come to the same stout rejection of the idea as I have.

We cannot be for our American farmer and against him at the same time. We have to take a stand. This is the issue which is vital to the farmers and I am proud to be counted among those who are on his side.

Mr. Chairman, there are many, many reasons why this Congress should vote down this oleo-tax repeal, in addition to those cited by Mr. Hoffman, the president of the Cudahy Packing Co. Many of these reasons are contained in a letter from Mr. W. A. McDonald, president of the McDonald Cooperative Dairy Co., of Flint, Mich., which many of you have received. I challenge supporters of this bill to answer Mr. McDonald's 11 pertinent questions, which I quote:

1. If oleo is good to substitute vegetable fats for butterfat in the spread for bread, should it also be substituted in ice cream, cheese, and evaporated milk?

2. If you destroy the market for the butterfat portion of the milk, how do you get the solids-not-fat, since the cow produces fat and solids together?

3. If we allow oleo to drive butter out, what will happen to soil fertility?

4. Where will you get the 40 percent of beef now coming from dairy cattle?

5. Since there is little relationship between the cost of ingredients and the selling price of oleo, what will prevent the sale of colored oleo for very little less than the cost of butter? (Witness the history of vegetable fats and lard, and the consequent higher price on the meat portion of pork.)

6. How to prevent fraud in the sale of colored oleo as butter?

7. How to maintain American stamina on a Hindu diet resulting from legislating the dairy business and 40 percent of the beef business out of existence?

8. If imitation butter is desirable, why not encourage all other imitation and deception—for instance, horse meat for beef?

9. Were the legislation proposed by the oleo lobby adopted and the enormous population depending on milk production pauperized, what would you then do for or with these millions of people?

10. When you have abolished the dairy industry what becomes of the market for soybeans, oil meal, and cottonseed meal used for feeding milk cows? In 1946 cotton farmers received $21,000,000 from oleomargarine manufacturers for cottonseed oil, but received $31,000,000 from dairy farmers who fed cottonseed meal. In the same year soybean growers received $23,000,000 from oleo manufacturers, and $55,000,000 for soybean products fed to dairy cattle. To turn these feed producers into oleo boosters is certainly clever fifth-column work.

11. Why have oleo prices advanced much more above prewar levels than butter prices? Why does the price of oleo follow the price of butter instead of the cost of oleo ingredients?

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I sincerely believe repeal of the oleomargarine tax which will permit colored oleo to be marketed as butter will destroy the dairy industry and the economic security of millions of farmers and workers dependent on it. It is certain to create shortages with the result that we will see increasingly higher prices at grocery stores and meat markets in the coming months.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I am unalterably opposed to the Rivers bill. If it passes—as it is indicated it will—this will be a black day for the people of the dairy industry, who must work 365 days out of the year in the great dairy industry.

I am against the bill because in my opinion it will accomplish little good and will do certain and substantial harm to the great dairy industry.

I prophesy that the repeal of the law which provides a 10-cent tax on colored margarine will do little for the consumer. It is the general consensus of opinion that repeal of the tax will be followed by increase of the price of oleomargarine; thus the consuming public will be paying the bill.

I have always endeavored to not be provincial in my thinking. The dairy industry is a great industry. It is not necessarily confined to any one particular section of the country. Any votes in favor of this legislation will be either upon a sectional basis or upon a basis that it will be of aid to the consumers. Both of these reasons are short-sighted and in some respects entirely erroneous.

Any presumed benefit that the repeal of this tax might bring to the States producing cottonseed will be affected by the importation of cheap oils.

It is further to be recognized that in certainly most of the States—more than 20 in number—which now have laws prohibiting the sale or manufacture of colored margarine or imposing restrictions on the sale or manufacture, such State laws will of course not be changed or affected by the action taken by this Congress.

The consuming public are entitled to protection. Let those who want to eat oleo eat it in the natural state or color it after it is purchased. For the purpose of protection of the public from deception, the present tax should be continued.

To repeal the law would be not only a severe blow to the dairy industry but it would be a removal of the protection which should be maintained for the consuming public.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose, during the few minutes which I have at my disposal, to try to show the House just what the passage of this legislation would mean to the average dairy farmer who produces butter in southwestern Minnesota. The Seventh Congressional District of Minnesota is the largest butter producer of the nine districts in our State. Because of the fact that we are approximately 200 miles from any large city, we farmers in that district cannot sell our milk as whole milk. We put it through a cream separator and skim it and then take the cream to our local village, where our cooperative creamery manufactures butter out of it and ships this butter by the carload to the eastern markets of the United States. On the farms, we

utilize the rest of the milk—the skim milk—as feed for hogs and calves.

Our dairy economy is different from that of the farmers in the dairy business within operating radius of the large milk sheds such as those in the Twin Cities, Chicago, and New York. In those milksheds the entire production of milk is shipped to the cities, and nothing is left to use on the farms. The price paid these people for their whole milk depends, of course, upon the butterfat content of that milk, and the money obtained for this whole milk is considerably higher than we receive in southwestern Minnesota for our butter and its by-product, skim milk.

The dairies near the large cities cannot afford to feed dairy calves and grow and develop them for future service as producing cows. In our territory, we can do so and we do furnish the areas near the cities with replacement stock for the cows that are disposed of.

I am trying to show you how the passage of this legislation will dislocate the dairy economy. First of all, it will tend to lower the price on butter, and if that is done it will mean that those farmers on the dairy farms who produce butter in my district will just simply sell their herds on the block—perhaps keeping one or two cows for their home use. My farmers cannot afford—when labor is costing $150 per month plus board and room—and when feed prices are as high as they are—to produce butter at a price under what they are receiving today.

Members of the House, there is no worse drudgery on a farm than in milking dairy cows 14 times a week—we have to have some reasonable profit therefrom if farmers are to continue milking cows. Through the war years, I have watched four of my nearest neighbors become disgusted and sell out their dairy herds simply because the OPA decided that 71 cents a pound for butterfat was a fair payment for their production. I urged the foreman on my farm to keep our dairy herd although we did cut it in half in size because of the fact that we were actually losing money during the war years on our butter production. When OPA was discontinued, the price of butterfat shot up immediately to approximately $1 a pound where it should have been all through the war if production meant anything whatsoever and was desirable. The butterfat sold from my farm during January brought $1 a pound—while that sold in February brought 94 cents a pound. These prices are not at all out of line when you consider the fact that good alfalfa hay is worth at least $15 a ton—oats sell for over $1 a bushel and the care which these cows must have is paid for at the rate of approximately $200 a month when board and room is taken into consideration. Nor when you consider that the average workingman today spends a smaller proportion of his wages on food than he did in 1939.

If Congress today discourages further—through the passage of this legislation—the production of dairy products throughout the United States—it will have an immediate and inevitable result. Farmers—like myself—in southwestern Minnesota—will immediately begin to ask ourselves—why should we continue the drudgery of milking cows if we are faced—in the near future—with uncontrolled and ruthless competition from a low-cost product sold in almost complete imitation of butter. It will be easy for my farmers to reach a decision—when they consider the present high prices of meat—and they will decide to go out of the dairy business entirely. The 16 dairy heifers which are on my farm and which my foreman is developing for the future expansion of the herd, will bring a very good price for beef on the markets in South St. Paul. We can sell the milk cows as they become dry later in the season and by fall there will be no dairy herd on that farm and the production of butter and other dairy products will go down just that much. Multiply this occurrence by 200,000 or 300,000 and you can readily see what the effect of the passage of this legislation will mean to the dairy industry of the United States. The children of America will either drink higher-priced milk in the future or do without it entirely.

May I call to your attention the fact that it is not necessary for us in southwestern Minnesota to maintain dairy herds to produce butter and also to produce the heifer calves which will be needed for replacements in the larger dairies near the cities where children get the whole milk to drink that they must have to thrive on. We can go into other lines of endeavor on our farms and this coming fall and winter I would be able to dispense with the services of one of the two men we always keep on the farm to maintain a good dairy herd, if this legislation passes and the price of butter is drastically reduced.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion let me reiterate that the passage of this legislation would not be in the best interests of the United States. Passage of this legislation would reduce the supply of meat in our Nation. It would reduce the supply of whole milk and all dairy products.

I will close with a reference to a statement made by Dr. Charles Mayo, of the renowned Mayo Clinic. For years Dr. Mayo stressed the vital need our Nation has for sufficient whole milk to insure the proper development of the children of America—our country's greatest asset.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not true as these herds go away and pastures are plowed up and soybeans are grown that the soybean is the greatest drainer of soil we have? I have never seen a good crop of soybeans. Has the gentleman?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I have seen many good crops of soybeans but have never produced any myself, so I cannot speak as to the effects of growing soybeans upon the fertility of our soil. I do know, however, that Minnesota needs the dairy cow and that the South needs millions of good cattle. Yet, here we find Representatives from the great South, who should be here fighting to bring more dairy cattle into their South, so that their children down there, who today lack sufficient vitamins, could have all the milk they want to drink. I repeat, we see these same Representatives attempting to pass this legislation. Yes, they will pass it. I know they will pass it, but I do not think the other body, upon reflection, is going to be foolish enough to pass any such legislation as this when they hear from the people of America; when they hear, for instance, evidence to the effect that the dairy cow eventually is going to go out of business, and that eventually the people in the great milk sheds, such as Washington, D. C., will go without sufficient milk. Unfair competition from oleo will eventually take away so many of our dairy herds that scarcities of milk and butter will inevitably ensue.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Is it not true that the State of Minnesota last year produced milk for $3.43 a hundred, the cheapest of any milk that was produced in the United States, and that these people who are chasing up here signing that petition come from States that are getting from one to two dollars more for their milk than the farmers in Wisconsin or Minnesota?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It is a fact that the workingman today is paying a lesser percentage of what he earns for his food, including butter, than he did in 1939, and those are the statistics brought out by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending bill to repeal taxes on oleomargarine. This bill is brought to the floor by a discharge petition placed upon the Speaker's desk by the gentleman from South Carolina, that champion of the New Deal and of cottonseed oil [Mr. RIVERS] from the historic cotton district, once represented by John C. Calhoun. Two hundred and eighteen Members of the House, a majority, have signed this petition. The signers for the most part are from the cotton-growing areas of the South or from big cities. The House Committee on Agriculture, after exhaustive hearings on the subject, refused to report this bill. It thus comes before the House without the benefit of a committee report. Of course, this subject is not entirely unknown to the membership. But, by way of background, it may be appropriate, however, to state just what these taxes are. I will also summarize, as I have heard them here, the arguments for and against the bill and would like to make special reference to the harmful effect it will have on the Sixth Missouri Congressional District which I represent.

Present Federal oleomargarine laws provide for a quarter cent per pound tax

on the uncolored product and a 10-cent-per-pound tax on the colored. They also provide for occupational taxes of $600 a year on manufacturers; $480 on wholesalers and $48 on retailers of colored and uncolored oleo. On wholesalers of only uncolored oleo the taxes are $200 per year. The retailer of uncolored oleo pays a tax of $6 per year. People who must pay these taxes demand that they be repealed. They are joined by a vast horde of housewives who object to the bother of coloring their oleo. The claim is not made that repeal of the taxes would lower the cost of oleo. The oleo industry has been careful not to go on record about that.

In the last half of the nineteenth century, Napoleon III of France, offered a prize to anyone who could develop a substitute for butter that would be practical commercially. As a result of this offer, a French chemist developed a product he called margarine. It made its debut in Paris in 1872. Two years later it was introduced in the United States.

The use of oleomargarine has spread into various parts of the world, but everywhere its manufacture and sale have been subject to regulation of one type or another. In Canada, its use is completely prohibited. In those countries permitting its use, the people and their public officials have found it necessary to exercise some degree of control over this product. The need for such regulation was occasioned by the fact that oleo was artificially made to look like butter and it became a common practice to pass off oleo for butter. Public sentiment against misuse of this artificial food reached such proportions that by 1886 Congress had enacted its first Federal oleo legislation and 24 States and the District of Columbia had established laws governing the sale of this butter substitute. Today, 44 States have such laws.

For 74 years the oleo and butter interests have battled bitterly for the vast, rich market in bread spreads. As fast as the oleo makers improved their product or made any encroaching move toward the butter stronghold, the dairymen counterattacked. Their powerful State, regional, and national associations enlisted the support of legislators, who, in turn, threw up legalistic road blocks to thwart oleo. Caught in the middle of this struggle is the frustrated housewife, thwarted from buying ready-colored oleo. And, in 17 States, public institutions cannot even serve the stuff, colored or not. Eying her family budget, the housewife must choose between paying up to a dollar a pound for butter or half as much for oleo. With the cost of living going up, oleo interests, backed by a $6,000,000 advertising campaign in 1947, managed by the Nation's top public relations and advertising firms, have the butter crowd "on the ropes." The House will probably repeal the oleo taxes. The Senate's action in the matter is hard to forecast.

One of the arguments made by the oleo people is that oleo is made from farm products, soybeans and cottonseed, and therefore anything that helps oleo should help the farmers.

The butter or dairy interests reply that only two-tenths of 1 percent of farm income is traceable to oleomargarine and cite Census and Department of Agriculture reports to prove it.

The dairy interests also advance a host of other arguments. Some of these are:

First. Trivial benefits that might be derived from repeal of oleo taxes would be far outweighed by the damage to our agricultural economy and consumers' interests. Proof that the laws are not restrictive to the oleomargarine industry is the fact, they claim, that since 1941 oleo sales have more than doubled; retail outlets have increased 64 percent. These are figures of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. As for consumers' interests, no one pays the 10-cent tax unless oleo is purchased yellow. The old contention that the home coloring of oleo is tedious and wasteful no longer holds water for modern packaging in plastic bags enables a housewife who wants yellow oleo to color it easily, quickly, and without waste.

Second. Repeal of the laws would open the doors to fraud on the consuming public.

Third. Oleomargarine is not entitled to the color yellow, which is butter's historic trade-mark.

Fourth. Repeal of the oleo laws would set the precedent for other imitation foods.

Of all these arguments, and others which could be mentioned, I imagine that the one of greatest importance to the Sixth Missouri Congressional District pertains to what effect repeal of oleo taxes would have on the dairy industry.

The Missouri Resources and Development Commission, an agency of our State government, has published a booklet entitled "Milk." This booklet says that there are 154,000 dairy cows in the 11 counties of the Sixth District.

They are divided by counties as follows:

	Dairy cows
Barton County	10,000
Bates County	14,000
Cass County	18,000
Cedar County	8,000
Greene County	30,000
Henry County	10,000
Johnson County	12,000
Polk County	16,000
Pettis County	12,000
St. Clair County	10,000
Vernon County	14,000
Total dairy cows in Sixth Missouri District	154,000

This official publication of the Missouri State government says further, on page 16, and I quote:

Within a radius of 75 miles of Springfield there is a daily milk production of 3,500,000 to 5,000,000 pounds, making this area the greatest milk-producing area of comparable size in the United States. Milk production and manufacture of millions of pounds of milk products annually has made the dairy industry the most important agricultural industry in southwest Missouri. Greene County, of which Springfield is the county seat, registers more Jersey cattle with the national purebred office than any other county in the United States. Thousands of purebred and high-grade Holstein and Guernsey cows also help to make up a large dairy-cow population. The area has 52 modern milk-products plants. There are 3 evaporated-milk plants, 2 dry-milk plants, 11 creameries, 22 cheese factories, 5 milk plants, 9 ice-cream plants, 2 whey-drying plants, and 2 process-cheese factories. One dairy plant at Springfield has processed over a million pounds of milk daily. It is the largest of its kind.

During the war the dairy industry of southwest Missouri contributed mightily to victory. Missouri is the eighth State in the Nation as a dairy State, with 1,148,000 dairy cows. Southwest Missouri alone had a cash income of $37,422,000 from dairy products last year, according to A. G. Anderson, assistant director of agricultural development for the Frisco. Milk production of the southwest Missouri area would fill an 80-car train of oil tank cars every day. Southwest Missouri's 14 creameries produce 15,000,000 pounds of butter, or 25 percent of the State total.

Now, as to the importance of dairying in the 11 counties of the Sixth District, which runs from southwest Missouri, north to Kansas City and central Missouri, official Government reports, from the Census and Department of Agriculture, state that dairying provides the cash income on nearly 18,000 farms of the Sixth District. In addition, there are 26 milk manufacturing plants in the district producing butter, cheese, and other manufactured dairy products, whose operations create income for residents of the district. More than half of the dairy farms sell farm-separated cream, which is used almost exclusively for butter making. The 17,936 farms that sold dairy products in 1944, in my district, realized a cash income of nearly $12,000,000. The economic significance of dairying here is reflected not merely in the incomes of the dairy farmers, but also of milk haulers, plant employees, office and sales forces, and feed and equipment dealers. Where would the merchants and grocers be without the many millions of dollars spent from dairies' profits in the district? There is no oleo at all produced in the district. Farmer interest in oleo is represented by soybean growers in the district. Soybeans were grown on 1,233 farms in 1944, the last year on which figures are available. The value of the harvested crop, which included a substantial proportion fed to dairy cows, was $629,513. This was only 5.3 percent as large as the value of sales of dairy products. Studies show that the value of soybean oil used in oleomargarine represents only about 5 percent of the total farm value of soybeans, Nationwide.

The effect which elimination of taxes on colored oleo would have on various groups in the sixth district, can be estimated roughly. Assuming per capita consumption of butter and oleo equal to the United States average for 1947, and using 1947 prices, the cost of these table fats would have been $3,210,000 in this district. If oleo were freely colored, it would have been no cheaper than the uncolored oleo which consumers actually bought. Not even oleo makers claim otherwise. Butter, on the other hand, would have had to be sold at a lower price. A 5-percent reduction in dairy prices is conservative. Ignoring the fact that a 5-percent drop to consumers would result in a somewhat larger percentage drop to farmers, the change would cost the sixth district dairy farmers about

$600,000 or $470,000 more than the amount by which the cost to the sixth district consumers would have been lowered.

In the position which I occupy, I have learned to appreciate and respect the importance of agriculture to the economic well-being of my district. The farm population, according to the last census, is almost half the population of the district. All of the towns in the district are dependent in whole or part on farm prosperity for their very existence. Dairy farming is the principal type of farming in the district. Of the 29,667 farms in the district, 25,866 produce dairy products, with 17,936 devoted to dairying, and selling such products. The total value of these products sold in the district is, I repeat, $11,826,268 annually. That is the bigest farm industry in the district, and its profits are plowed back into the district.

In contrast, I repeat, only 1,233 district farms grow soybeans. Their sales value is $629,513 annually, or 5.3 percent as large as the value of sales of dairy products.

Yes; butter is high. What the farmer has to buy is high, too. Feed is high. The drouth and foreign exports have seen to that. But, I am one representative who knows that the economic "bread" of his district is spread with butter and not oleo, which is to say that the well-being and prosperity of my district is dependent on the welfare of the dairy farmer, and I am on his side. To be otherwise would be to betray not only the majority interests but the best interests of my district. No vote of mine will destroy or impair the biggest supports in the foundation on which that district and the happiness of its people is built. That is a frank and honest statement on a controversial subject. With all due respect to the friends of oleo, which is a good product, I must say, look elsewhere for your champion. The welfare of the sixth district is not for trade for a few pennies tax per pound and a few minutes of oleo mixing time. Not if it is up to me to trade it. I will not sell out a $12,000,000 farmer-built industry in my district for 600,000 pieces of silver.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose at this time to discuss some of the testimony that was adduced before the Committee on Agriculture.

A member of the United States Wholesale Grocers Association testified that in a poll of distributors many said they did not handle margarine—even though it enjoyed a position of preference to butter, in many cases—because of first, the taxes; second, the high license fees; and third—I will quote from his testimony here—"the bother, worry, and expense of making out monthly reports."

One member of the association reported that it cost him $100 a month just to fill out the required Government forms.

It was brought out that another wholesaler discontinued selling margarine because of the fact that small retailers back away from handling it for the reason that the Federal Government puts into them the mortal fear of not abiding by the regulations and of fines for possible infractions.

Let us see what the Government requires of wholesale distributors who have the courage to handle margarine. The regulations on wholesalers set forth 7 specifications of record keeping, 11 specifications for handling monthly reports and more than 9 penalties of fines and imprisonment for various violations. The regulations occupy six printed pages of an Internal Revenue Bureau pamphlet.

As one harassed wholesaler put it, you might think the wholesaler was handling a poisonous drug or lethal concoction or was trying to dispose of dynamite, TNT or atomic bombs or was on the point of being lured into some form of supplying a black market or smuggling. Was anything ever more ridiculous and outlandish?

Now, let us take a look at the retailer who offers his customers oleomargarine.

The independent retail grocers of the country favor the repeal of these taxes on oleomargarine. In their opinion, it is tax persecution.

In 1947, 270,000 grocers paid a license to sell margarine in their stores. To many thousands of these dealers, a saving of $6—of the amount of the Federal tax on sales of uncolored margarine—represents the net profit on about $200 in sales. In other words, in order to pay the tax alone, a retail merchant must first sell $200 worth of margarine.

In addition—and this is the most important aspect that we have to consider here—the tax operates in such a manner as to prevent thousands of retailers from selling margarine at all. This situation, therefore, denies millions of consumers who cannot afford to pay the high prices for butter an opportunity of purchasing the more reasonably priced margarine.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that the grocers who cannot afford the tax and cannot afford the office assistance which is required to fill out the forms are not located in the neighborhoods of the well-to-do consumer. The majority of these grocery stores are located in the poorer neighborhoods, the neighborhoods of the laboring man and woman, the neighborhoods where the saving of 1 cent on a food item is a matter of grave importance.

The license fees for the retail grocers impose still another inequity. The small, independent merchant pays the same tax and license fee as the large chain store. While to a chain grocer doing a large volume of business, the fee of $6 or $48 may be a mere trifle, to the corner grocery store, it means much as he struggles against overwhelming competition.

As I have said, the burden of paying the license fee is not the only expense and hardship for the retailer. There is also the mystic and maddening maze of highly technical regulations and requirements which he must follow.

First of all, the retailers must file a special tax return on his magarine transactions; then he must be sure to display conspicuously his tax stamp or pay a fine of $10. If one of his partners die or withdraws or additional partners are taken into the firm or if he changes his name or relocates his place of business—(whew, gentlemen, is there ever any end?) he must remember to file another form with the collector or pay a penalty.

Not only does he have to do all of that, but this unique law, this daisy of a duty, requires still more: listen to this: If a customer enters his store and buys over 10 pounds of margarine and the grocer fails to have the customer make payment in at least two separate transactions the grocer will, under the regulations, be classified as a wholesaler and required to pay $200 or a license, plus a penalty for failure to file a return.

Why, an innocent mistake like this, it has been testified, would cost the small grocer his profits for many months.

Let me give you just one more aspect of this ridiculous tax. He must be sure at all times that all sales of margarine are conducted and completed in his place of business. Thus, we have been told by one retailer, that his delivery boy cannot deliver a pound of margarine at the home of Mrs. Jones unless she included this item in her grocery order. The grocery boy may have the margarine in his truck, but he cannot sell it to Mrs. Jones—because the transaction must be under the roof of the grocery store.

I hold that under no conceivable circumstances of justice and equity can we any longer countenance these outrageous margarine taxes, taxes which penalize the storekeeper and the consuming public.

It almost defies the imagination to realize how many years we have been forced to tolerate these taxes on a major food product. Has there ever been such an example of gross inattention on the part of our democratic Government to the fundamental needs of so many of its citizens as this penalty which is imposed on a nutritious and wholesome food? Has there ever been such a glaring instance of the power and influence of one industry to strangle a competing industry?

I ask you today to consider these Federal taxes on margarine, particularly colored margarine, from two points of view: First, I want you to look at these taxes from the angle of business discrimination which the law is permitting within the framework of our highly cherished system of free enterprise. Then I hope you will consider these tax laws from the standpoint of their utter ridiculousness and stupidity.

Your attention at all time, I trust, will be directed toward the injustices these taxes play upon the consuming public, particularly that segment where every penny counts when it comes to setting a health-giving table.

Now let me touch briefly on the unhealthy discrimination in business competition which these tax laws permit. In the hearing on the pending measure before the House Committee on Agriculture, Mr. Archibald L. M. Wiggins, the distinguished Under Secretary of the Treasury, revealed some startling conclusions which the Treasury Department holds regarding the margarine taxes.

Said Mr. Wiggins—and I quote:

The legislative history of these taxes and the considerations advanced in their defense during their long history indicate that their purpose is to buttress the competitive position of the dairy industry by discouraging the consumption of a substitute commodity.

It could not be conveyed in better words. Is that the sort of statement that upholders of the system of free enterprise can take with equinamity?

But let me further quote from the testimony of the Under Secretary. Mr. Wiggins declared before the committee—I am quoting his testimony:

The basic issue raised by the oleomargarine taxes—

He said—

is the propriety and desirability of using the tax laws to affect the relative position of competing industries, both of which use domestic agriculture raw materials. In the case of oleomargarine—

And I am still quoting Mr. Wiggins—

the taxing power is used as a punitive measure against one industry to advance the interests of another. In the process, the public is deterred from the free exercise of its consumer preferences. It is the view of the Treasury Department—

Mr. Wiggins continued—

that the use of the taxing power to distort the normal development of competing industries and to deprive them of the full benefit of the free enterprise system conflicts with the public interest, and in the absence of compelling consideration, should be avoided.

While I am dealing with the testimony from the Treasury Department, I should also like to add an additional thought: It is the view of the Treasury Department, that the tax burden alone reflects only part of the cost of these taxes to the consumers. In other words, aside from running up the price of oleomargarine, a fundamental burden, the tax, by preventing most merchants from carrying the product, therefore forces a consumer to pay, say, 90 cents a pound for butter when the housewife may prefer to buy 41-cents-a-pound margarine.

The present situation has resulted in all but one out of every hundred grocers from stocking colored margarine. And under the prevailing conditions only one merchant out of fifty has the courage and the resources to stock uncolored margarine.

There are, to be sure, numerous other logical and water-tight arguments which could be brought out to show the discriminatory and unjust nature of these taxes, but, for the moment, I believe views of the Treasury Department—the agency which has the duty of collecting the taxes—will suffice. Before passing on, I want to remind you that these oleomargarine taxes, which the dairy interests would have you retain have, in the words of the Treasury Department, little revenue significance.

The taxation on margarine dates originally from 1886 and the present schedule of rates, from 1902. Speaking of modernizing tax laws, perhaps we had better start with these taxes which have remained unchanged for nearly half a century.

I trust that this legislation will be enacted.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, if we will hark back just a few years we will remember, as I was reminded by a farmer from my district today, Mr. Wayne Anderson, of Stanton, Iowa, who is here in the interest of good farming and good government, that the substitutes for lard were first put on the market at a lower price than real lard. But the price of those substitutes are now higher than lard. That is what is going to happen if this bill goes through. The price of this substitute for butter is lower than lard now, but when the fellows who are concocting and processing and marketing this artificial butter get through, in a few years it will be higher than butter, because they will propagandize it to the end that they will finally get a lot of American people believing that real butter is unhealthy and bad stuff. To listen to some of the propaganda going out over the air today, that is about what we can expect.

Sooner or later this thing will be taken care of in this way: We in Iowa and the farm States, especially the hog States, and dairy States have the real McCoy. We produce butter and we have the real pure lard, and we have the other things that are the real McCoy. We do not have to mix a lot of junk together and squirt it full of a lot of stuff to make it marketable. So this is what we will do if this bill goes through, and it may be well if this bill does go through because this is what we will do without a question of a doubt. We will take about 30 percent good butter, good, pure cow's butter, we will take about 70 percent good, pure hog's lard, and we will put some good, rich juicy bacon juice in it to give it just a little extra flavor, and rich, creamy, appetizing color, and we will outsell oleomargarine by about 10 cents a pound.

How can we do that? Well, here it is, 30 percent of 85 cents, the average butter price, is 25½ cents, and 70 percent of 30 cents, the price of lard, is 21 cents. Add those together and you have 46½ cents. It will be better and in far greater demand than any of this concocted stuff you folks are trying to wish off on the American housewife. It will be real food, not a substitute. So you are not going to outfox the hog farmer and the dairy farmer and the corn farmer for one minute. If you think you are, you have another guess coming. If you will remember back in 1932, a candidate for the Presidency of the United States—and he was elected—said that our old tried-and-true system of government was wrong—too expensive. He said it was costing 25 percent too much. So he concocted a substitute for the American people. You know what happened. The minute the New Deal spending outfit got in with their artificial program and their substitutes for our time-tested American way of doing things, the price of government went up, up, up. That is what happens when you substitute and when you try something artificial. Certainly this Government today is just a substitute for the real thing, just as oleo is for butter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MITCHELL].

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the impassioned pleas for the dairy farmers of this great country. I have heard Members of the House say that the dairy farmers will no longer be in existence if this tax or these restrictions are removed from the manufacture, sale, or consumption of margarine. I will go back to 1886 when the first restrictions were placed on the sale of margarine, and then I will bring you back to 1902 and 1903 when the dairy lobby successfully imposed upon the housewives of America the extra 10-cent tax on colored margarine and additional restrictions on wholesalers, retailers, and so forth. In 1902 and 1903, the dairy lobby told the committees of the House in charge at that time that unless these taxes were imposed upon this margarine product, it would be a very short time before the dairy farmers of this country would be out of business and bankrupt. At that time the people of this great country consumed almost 70,000,000 pounds of oleomargarine. That was in 1902 and 1903. Butter was selling at that time for 23 cents a pound. Forty-five years have gone by since the butter lobby was successful in selling that bill of goods. What do we have now? The consumers of oleomargarine have consumed as of last year 750,000,000 pounds of margarine or 10 times that amount which was consumed in 1902 and 1903. The price of butter has gone from 23 cents a pound to a dollar a pound. The dairy farmers of the United States of America have enjoyed the greatest income that they have ever enjoyed in the history of this great country of ours. I maintain that that proves conclusively that in spite of these taxes the margarine industry has gone ahead, multiplied by 10 times. The butter industry has not suffered, the price of butter going up three times. The income of the dairy farmer has not suffered, in spite of these taxes. The only person who has suffered because of the imposition of these taxes is the American housewife. The tax has not hurt the margarine business; it has not helped the dairy farmer; it will not hurt the dairy farmer by its removal. It will not aid the margarine business any more if it is removed. It will aid the housewife in getting rid of one more pain in the neck. It is about time we took it off.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MITCHELL] has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE].

ERSATZ BUTTER

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, during the war years the people of the State of Iowa produced 10 percent of our Nation's food supply. That is a lot of production. One of the reasons why the people of my State were able to achieve this remarkable record is the fact that for more than

100 years they had developed a fine balance between dairying on the one hand and corn-hog production, stock feeding, and poultry raising on the other. The proposal before us is designed to throw a monkey wrench into our farm-production set-up and destroy this fine balance.

The Federal margarine taxes have helped us to protect our dairy farmers against unethical competition and the consuming public against fraud and deception. It is a matter of genuine regret to me that today it is proposed that this protection be repealed. The principal argument that has been advanced for this proposed action is based on the fallacious assumption that it would materially reduce the cost of living. As a matter of fact, the present tax of one-fourth cent per pound on uncolored margarine plus the license fees would not cost the average family as much as a penny a week if margarine were substituted exclusively for butter on the American table. And color may be added to this product by the purchaser easily, quickly, and at no cost, if desired.

Mr. Chairman, I do not object especially to the removal of the tax on uncolored margarine. I do, however, strenuously oppose the removal of the tax on butter-colored margarine. Margarine is now retailed in the image of butter. The package simulates butter as to shape, weight, and size. The wrapping is similar. It is alleged that the vitamins known to be present in butter have been added in approximately the same amount to margarine by artificial methods, and the flavor of butter has been imitated. All that remains to make the deception complete is the adoption of the butter color. It is pertinent to note that the natural color of butter is yellow and that the natural color of margarine made from cottonseed oil or soybean oil is not yellow. Surely it is not unreasonable for the dairy industry to protest the sale of butter substitutes that march under false colors.

Approximately one-quarter of the milk which is processed in this country is normally made into butter. Consequently, any action that affects the demand for butter affects the entire dairy industry. Should the demand for butter be curtailed, the production of milk unquestionably would be reduced. In this connection, I should like to point out that Iowa is the leading butter-producing State. Much of the butter is produced from cream separated on thousands of farms throughout the State. The skimmed milk which remains after the cream is separated makes a nourishing feed for hogs, calves, and chickens—the quantity of the skimmed milk on the average farm being too small to make it practical to collect for human consumption. Thus the production of butter is closely related to the production of hogs, cattle, and poultry; and a decrease in butter production will result in a decrease in meat and poultry production, with corresponding price increases all along the line. Furthermore, our agriculture would undergo a transformation. The trend would be to reduce dairy and livestock farming and to increase crop farming. And it is all too obvious what effect the resulting loss of natural fertilizer would have on soil fertility and soil conservation.

Mr. Chairman, on April 1 the Fairmont Foods Co., of Omaha, Nebr., issued the following memorandum to its stockholders:

FAIRMONT FOODS CO.,
Omaha, Nebr., April 1, 1948.

To All Fairmont Stockholders:

A great deal has found its way into print recently regarding Federal taxes on oleomargarine and the relative merits of that product and butter. As we have had several requests for information concerning these matters, we have concluded to furnish to all stockholders such facts as will give a basic understanding of the issues involved in the attempts being made by the manufacturers of oleomargarine to have the taxes removed.

Most of the claims of the oleomargarine manufacturers are along the lines of yellow color, taxes, and nutrition. As the famous Al Smith used to say, "Let's look at the record."

Yellow is the natural color of butter. In the spring and summer all butter has a pronounced yellow color. There is no color added and it is impossible to reduce that color. The color gradually becomes a lighter yellow toward the fall and winter seasons, so for the sake of uniformity the creameries add just a slight amount of color during those seasons. This has Government approval and is legalized by an act of Congress.

Oleomargarine manufacturers say that they want the yellow color because it is an appetizing color. But, there are other appetizing colors, such as chocolate brown, strawberry red, mint green, and so forth. The manufacturers could use any other color except yellow without having to pay the 10-cent tax. Why do you suppose they want yellow? Would they want to color oleomargarine yellow if the natural color of butter were pink?

Many spreads are used on bread in their natural color. Cream cheese is white, peanut butter is a nut brown, and jams and jellies vary in color.

The agitation for yellow oleomargarine springs from the manufacturers and not from the customers or the Government. The consumer who buys it and uses it knows that it is oleomargarine regardless of whether it is white or some other color. Color does not make it taste different.

Food and drug regulations are designed to prevent the manufacture and substitution of one food product to resemble another. Oleomargarine is sold in packages of the same weight, size, shape, inner-wrapper, and paraffined carton as butter. The manufacturers have added flavoring to the margarine. With the entire field of flavors to choose from, they have picked butter flavor. They have added artificial vitamins; not all vitamins but just the ones found in butter and in approximately the same amount. If they wanted to make a more healthful product, why not add all the vitamins? Next, if they add butter color, the deception would be complete.

There have been many frauds due to yellow colored oleomargarine. At various times, FBI, Internal Revenue, Food and Drug, State and city officials have had to cope with big-time racketeers, as well as small fry, in oleomargarine frauds in various parts of the country. Convictions and imprisonments are a matter of court records. In 1916 the Treasury officially reported, "Since 1902, more than 200,000,000 pounds of colored oleomargarine have been manufactured and fraudulently sold. * * * It is believed that a great portion of this product reached the consumers as butter."

Just a few weeks ago a man went into a restaurant in Tulsa, Okla., to get a meal. On the menu were listed the following: Cakes and butter, toast and butter, buttered peas.

When they were served, the spread looked like oleomargarine, so he asked the head waiter whether they had any butter and the waiter said, "No, we do not have any butter in the place."

The 10-cent tax is only on yellow oleomargarine. No other color would be taxed 10 cents. The tax goes to the Government and helps pay for policing and discouraging of such fraud. Tax repeal would let down the bars.

Oleomargarine has a proper place in our economy. People who want it should have it. But like any other merchandise, from beans to Ford automobiles, it should be sold on its own merit.

Uncolored oleomargarine or margarine colored any color except yellow is taxed only one-fourth cent per pound. Certainly that is not discriminatory. Many things people use every day are taxed much higher and there is no complaint.

Oleomargarine is advertised as the poor man's spread. If so, its price should be in proportion to the cost of its ingredients and not in proportion to the price of butter. Professor Thomsen, of the University of Wisconsin has kept a record of the wholesale prices in Chicago for butter and margarine, and also the approximate cost of the raw materials used in margarine. The figures show that the price of margarine tends to follow the price of butter. In 1942, Professor Thomsen's figures showed that since 1929 the price of margarine has been from 32 to 70 percent the price of butter, but the wholesale price of margarine had been from 40 to 350 percent over the cost of the ingredients. During the same period the selling price of butter, even when selling at depression prices, was never 20 percent over the ingredient cost and was usually less than 10 percent over the ingredient cost.

The manufacturers claim that oleomargarine is nutritionally equal to butter. Vitamin A is now added to oleomargarine in about the same quantities as found in butter.

Recently, another valuable element in butter has been discovered which promotes growth. This is contained in butterfat and is not found in oleomargarine or vegetable oils. It makes butter much better for children than oleomargarine would be.

Butter comes from milk, the food which nature provides to nourish the young and give them a start in life. It is a question if scientists will ever learn all there is to know about it. It cannot be proved that oleomargarine is nutritionally equal to butter. Therefore, such claims should not be made for it.

Aside from the relative merits of butter and oleomargarine, it should be borne in mind that butter has a pronounced influence on employment in this country. The raising of feed and the caring for cows, the transportation of the cream to the creameries, the manufacture of the butter, the making of the containers in which it is packed, the shipping to market, and the hauling to the stores—all furnish jobs for a lot of people. Butter is made in thousands of creameries scattered throughout the land, whereas oleomargarine is made in a relatively few factories.

Oleomargarine is not as good as butter, and the manufacturers should not be allowed to color it in imitation of butter without paying the 10-cent tax. That does not compel the consumer to pay 10 cents more, for he can get the uncolored product on which there is no 10-cent tax.

D. K. HOWE,
Vice President.

A copy of this memorandum was brought to the attention of one of Iowa's outstanding educators, Dr. Samuel N. Stevens, president, Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa. Dr. Stevens was so im-

pressed with it that he dispatched the following letter to the Fairmont Foods Co.:

GRINNELL COLLEGE,
Grinnell, Iowa, April 13, 1948.

Mr. D. K. HOWE,
Vice President, Fairmont Foods Co.,
Omaha, Nebr.

DEAR MR. HOWE: I have just read with great interest your memorandum to the Fairmont stockholders concerning oleomargarine. I think it is the most intelligent discussion of this matter which I have read. I would like for each member of my faculty and some of my friends to have copies of this. I wonder if you would be willing to send me a hundred copies for distribution.

I want you to know that I have communicated with our Senators and Congressmen from Iowa telling them that I hope they will not yield to the pressure of this oleomargarine group and thereby expose the people in this country to another period of fraud in regard to the sale of this commodity. Most people have never thought critically about this matter. Your memorandum gives them a basis for thinking about it.

Warm personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL N. STEVENS,
President.

Incidentally, Grinnell College boasts one of the oldest and foremost departments of home economics in the Nation, and it follows that the president of that great institution speaks on subjects relating to food with considerable knowledge and authority.

It is significant, Mr. Chairman, that in about half of the States our dairy farmers and the consuming public are protected against the sale of colored imitations of butter. In my State, Iowa, the applicable statutes are as follows:

CODE OF IOWA (1946) SECTION 1-194.13

SEC. 190.6. Coloring not permitted. No imitation butter or imitation cheese shall be colored with any substance and no such imitation product shall be made by mixing animal fats, vegetable oils, or other substances for the purpose or with the effect of imparting to the mixture the color of yellow butter or cheese. (Ch. 97, sec. 2518; chs. 24, 27, 31, 35, 39, sec. 3063.)

SEC. 191.3. Placard where imitation sold: Every person owning or in charge of any place where food or drink is sold who uses or serves therein imitation butter or cheese, as in this title defined, shall display at all times opposite each table or place of service a placard for each such imitation with the words "Imitation ——— served here," without other matter, printed in black roman letters not less than 3 inches in height and 2 inches in width, on a white card 12 by 22 inches in dimension. The blank after the word "Imitation" in the above form shall be filled with the name of the product imitated. (Ch. 97, sec. 2517; chs. 24, 27, 31, 35, 39, sec. 3069.)

SEC. 192.32. Oleomargarine not used in State institutions: Oleomargarine, butterine, or other products made in the imitation or semblance of natural butter produced from milk or cream or both, shall not be used as a food in the college for the blind, the school for the deaf, or any State institution under the management of the board of control. (Chs. 27, 31, 35, sec. 3043-a1; ch. 39, sec. 3043.1.)

Tax

SEC. 194.1. Amount of tax imposed: There is hereby imposed, levied, and assessed, an inspection fee and excise tax of 5 cents upon each pound of oleomargarine sold, offered, or exposed for sale, or given or delivered to a consumer, said fee and tax to be paid to the Secretary of Agriculture prior to any such sale, gift, or delivery. (Chs. 31, 35, sec. 3100-d1; ch. 39, sec. 3100-07.)

SEC. 194.3. Stamps affixed before disposal: Before any such package or carton is broken or is offered or exposed for safe, gift or distribution to a consumer, there shall be securely affixed thereto, a suitable stamp or stamps denoting the fee thereon.

SEC. 149.9. Stamping by manufacturer: The payment of the inspection fee and tax and the stamping and cancellation of any carton or package of oleomargarine by the manufacturer or importer of any oleomargarine, shall exempt all other persons from the requirements of this chapter, relative to the stamping of, and cancellation of stamps on cartons and packages of oleomargarine.

Mr. Chairman, the laws of Iowa and of other progressive States will continue to prohibit the sale of butter-colored substitutes regardless of any action the Congress may take. But, in all fairness, the Federal Government should continue to tax these products. This is little enough protection for the dairy farmer and the housewife.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, as one who comes from a deep Southern State, I am compelled to reply to the remarks made a short while ago. It is most regrettable that some of my colleagues have seen fit to threaten the farmers of that section of the country, who already have the lowest income of any people in the United States, with further poverty.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. No; I do not yield. The gentleman cannot contribute anything, so I do not yield to him.

Mr. GROSS. I might say——

Mr. ABERNETHY. I do not yield to the gentleman, Mr. Chairman. I hope I have made myself clear. I regret very much that I cannot yield to him.

I repeat, it is regrettable that some of my colleagues have seen fit to threaten a certain group of people—one of the lowest income groups in the country—with further poverty. Think of it; with further poverty only because they plead for a fair market; not an advantage, but a fair market for their products. If 75 or 80 years ago there had been a little UNRRA, ERP, or something similar passed in our direction, maybe we would not have been left so impoverished; nevertheless, none was forthcoming, although this Congress now sends billions to its former enemies in Europe while a South, bled white, got nothing but carpetbaggers, and now is threatened with impoverishment. But I am not too concerned. I have the greatest confidence in Members of the House of Representatives as a whole for fair play. May the day never come when we will have to go home to our people and tell them that sitting in Washington, representing 143,000,000 people, is a jury which will not give them a fair trial. I just do not believe that situation exists in the House of Representatives, or that it will ever exist, but should I ever come to the conclusion that it does, then I do not want to sit longer in this body. I will be ready to take up and go home; not only ready to leave the House of Representatives but ready to leave the country—and so will you.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Much has been said about who favors and who opposes repeal of the margarine taxes.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. No.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman is not resigning, is he?

Mr. ABERNETHY. No; I am not resigning, neither am I declaring war on any section of the country as has been done several times here today.

Who favors removal of the taxes? Let us call the roll and see.

The consumers, generally, throughout America favor removal of the taxes. Do you represent any of them?

The Retail Grocers' Association of the United States favors removal of the taxes.

The Wholesale Grocers' Association of the United States favors removal of the taxes. I would like for some of you to keep score as I go along.

The housewives of the United States favor removal of the taxes; and the husbands, who by some of the wives are forced to mix the margarine, also favor removal of the taxes. If you check your mail you will find that that is true.

The hospitals of the United States, which are forced to pay a $600 manufacturers' tax if they use colored margarine, favor removal of the taxes.

The restaurants and dining rooms of the United States favor removal of the taxes.

The labor organizations of the United States, all of them, favor removal of the taxes.

The women's organizations of the United States favor removal of the taxes. I do not remember a single one appearing before our committee in favor of their retention.

One of the veterans' organizations appeared before our committee and favored removal of the taxes. None appeared in opposition.

The American Association of Small Business appeared before the Agriculture Committee and favored removal of the taxes.

The people who use butter only were polled by the Atlantic Monthly and they favored removal of the margarine tax. The people who use margarine only were polled by the Atlantic Monthly and they favored removal of the taxes. The farmers of the country were polled by the Atlantic Monthly and the Gallup poll and a majority of them favored removal of the taxes.

The press of the country favors removal of the taxes.

The radio and radio commentators favor removal of the taxes.

Well, who does that leave favoring retention of the taxes? Only the Cudahy Packing Co. Why do they favor the retention?

The answer is that until a few months ago Cudahy had a monopoly on a new mixing package invented by a man named Peters. Through this monopoly Cudahy leaped from one of the lowest of 26 margarine manufacturers to either

third of fourth position. In the letter which Cudahy recently distributed among you, they said not one word about their monopoly or their contract with Peters. Oh, no; they said nothing about that but they sent a witness before our committee from whom the facts were evoked. I charge that Cudahy's position is entirely a selfish one and they are in a class by themselves as no other margarine manufacturer to my knowledge opposes this legislation.

Oh, yes; I was about to forget Mr. Peters. He, too, appeared before our committee and favored retention. Of course this only means a matter of near on to a million dollars each year for him, for once the taxes are repealed and manufacturers are permitted to manufacture colored margarine, then his little capsule will not be worth 15 cents. I do not blame him. Certainly not. But the facts are that a majority of the people of this land in each and every group favor removal of the taxes. Everyone is out of step but the Cudahy Packing Co. and Mr. Peters.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, let us keep the record straight. Let us find out just what all this oleomargarine fuss is about. The truth is that a few large manufacturers of oleo wish to deceive the public. They wish to steal the trademark of butter. They wish to color their oleomargarine the same color as butter so that the unsuspecting public may be fooled, and fed oleo in place of butter.

Of course, these manufacturers have succeeded in fooling people and arousing a false emotional sentiment. They spent thousands in advertising. However, the time has arrived that Members of Congress help shape a legitimate and honest public opinion, rather than blindly accept and follow false propaganda.

I am sure that a majority on this floor will not permit themselves to be stampeded into becoming an accomplice in the perpetration of a fraud. There is only one reason why some of the manufacturers of oleo want to steal the trademark of butter, and that is to perpetrate a fraud upon the public. They want to color their product yellow so that the consuming public will not know the difference between it and butter.

The natural color of oleo, if made from soya beans, is brown—if made from cotton seed it is green, unless infested with sufficient pink boll weevil worms, and then it may become pinkish. I have no objection to oleo provided it is offered in its natural color, or any other color except the trade-mark of butter—yellow. If anyone wishes to deceive themselves, and do not like the color white, let them have brown, green or pink oleo, or any other color, but let this Congress not become an accomplice to a fraud—to deception.

I am confident that if a majority of the members of this House permit themselves to be stampeded into assisting a few manufacturers to perpetrate deception upon an unsuspecting public, that the Senate will not follow in their steps. You will then find yourselves in the embarrassing position of explaining your vote when the truth becomes known, and remember that the truth will out.

May I also call the attention of the Members of this House, and the public to the fact that we must not be foolish enough to cut off our noses to spite our faces. It has been incorrectly stated that the farmer gets 76 cents out of every dollar you pay for butter. That is not true.

The farmer pays for the raising of the calf until it becomes a cow. He pays for the parent stock producing the calf. He feeds and houses the calf until it becomes a cow. Then, he pays for the labor and the feed to produce the milk that produces the butter. The same cow also produces the calf that produces the veal cutlets and veal roasts you so much desire. The same cow also produces the milk that you drink, as well as the butter you eat.

It is a balanced economy, and the farmer and his family get less for providing you with this balanced economy than you who work in the cities and towns. Why should you now, because of a false hysteria created by paid advertisements, permit yourselves to be fooled and to destroy this economy upon which you and your families depend?

No, we must not become the victims of false hysteria. Some leading manufacturers of oleomargarine have sense enough to know that this kind of legislation is dangerous, and may even spell disaster for oleomargarine.

Here is the position of the Cudahy Packing Co., one of the largest manufacturers of oleomargarine. This company feels that from the standpoint of the welfare of all segments of our economy, no change need be made. It feels that the present laws are not unfair or unjust, and that the dairy farmer is entitled to the protection of these laws against unfair competition, and imitation products. This, the same as any businessman is entitled to protection against imitations of his manufactured products.

The Cudahy Co. feels that the one-fourth cent per pound on oleo not colored yellow is too small to make a fuss about, and is necessary for protection. It also feels that the license fees, paid by the retailer, wholesaler, and manufacturer, are small because they are passed on to the consumer, and amount to less than 40 cents per year to the consumer—less than 1 cent a week.

This company feels that other industries in food, drugs, clothing and shelter have gotten us to change our living habits without resorting to imitations of competing articles, and that the oleomargarine industry could and should do the same without imitating the color, or stealing the trade-mark of butter.

This company shows that the benefits that might accrue to cotton and soyabeans farmers are so insignificant, compared with the certain disastrous effects that would be produced for dairymen by reducing the tax on yellow oleomargarine, that we should pause and examine carefully the implications of these laws before tampering with them.

It shows that these margarine laws have helped the consumer rather than hurt him, and that it has placed the oleomargarine industry on its good behavior, and that, because of these laws, the margarine industry has been compelled to improve and produce a palatable and nutritious product dressed up in snow white.

It is the contention of the Cudahy Co. that the oleomargarine industry has not been hurt by these laws. Over the past several decades sales have been on a gradually ascending curve. If any hurt has come to the oleomargarine industry it has been self-inflicted. During the past several decades the industry has encouraged rather than discouraged the consumer to take the time and trouble to color her oleomargarine yellow. All of the industry's advertisements have encouraged this practice. Had the industry, on the other hand, spent its millions of advertising dollars encouraging the consumer to serve oleomargarine white, she would probably have become accustomed to using it that way today.

APRIL 22, 1948.

Hon. W. LEMKE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Why are oleomargarine manufacturers so insistent upon demanding that they be given the unrestricted right to color their product yellow?

They say it's because custom has made the consumer expect the spread upon her bread to be colored yellow. But what created that custom? Butter, of course; yellow butter. And so the oleomargarine manufacturer, himself, admits that he wants to foist his product upon the American people in the guise of something that it is not.

The consumer readily accepts the purple of grape jelly, the rich red of current jelly, and the gold of orange marmalade as a spread upon her bread, just as she accepts the green of mint sauce for her lamb roast, and finds nothing objectionable in the greenish tinge of applesauce.

The foods upon our tables are of every color and hue—from the deep red color of meat to the white stalk of celery. And none does the housewife find objectionable. There is, then, solid background for almost any color that the oleo manufacturer may care to use (and which the dairy industry has no objection to his using—tax-free), but he insists that only one color will serve his purpose: the color of the product he is trying to imitate.

Our neighbors to the north prohibit the manufacture of oleomargarine; we ask only that the tax on yellow margarine be continued. Do not retard the growth of agriculture in our great Midwest and Northwest by voting for repeal of the tax.

Sincerely,
WISCONSIN BUTTERMAKERS ASSOCIATION,
R. V. EIRSCHELE, *President.*

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ARENDS). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the Committee will rise at 4 o'clock. It is also my understanding of the rules that this Committee should meet tomorrow in order to have continuous consideration of the pending legislation.

I would like to have a ruling of the Chair as to whether or not the rules provide that a day may intervene so that this legislation may be taken up on Wednesday.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say that is a matter for the Speaker of the House and the House itself to determine. It is not something within the jurisdiction of the Chair to decide.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, those of us who propose the repeal of the punitive taxes and regulations now levied and imposed on the manufacture, distribution, and sale of margarine do not ask special favors for any product of the American farm, and I do not believe that any group in this country has any right to deny a food produced by another group a right to openly and honestly compete for the consumers' patronage. And that, Mr. Chairman, is the heart of the present controversy.

Those of us who ask the repeal of these discriminatory taxes and license fees believe in free enterprise, and we believe that every group has the same right to enjoy a free market for its products. We believe in the freedom of the consuming public to buy the product they want. We believe that Government exceeds its proper function when it tells the housewife that if she desires to buy yellow margarine that she must pay a penalty to the Government, but that if she is willing to pay twice as much for a pound of butter artificially colored with the same yellow coloring that her Government will assess no penalty.

The effect of such a policy is nothing more than to license the butter manufacturers to collect from the consumer the penalty which the Government imposes upon a competitor's product. That is, this was the effect when the consumer could get butter. But, to aggravate an inexcusable piece of favoritism, the original beneficiaries of this tax-created quasi monopoly have smugly accepted all of the benefits of Government favoritism with no recognition of any responsibility toward the public to even supply the needed table spread. This utter disregard for the needs of the public is readily shown by the failure of the butter industry to supply the butter the public needs. In 1901, the last year the American people were free to buy colored margarine, they consumed 19.9 pounds of butter per capita and 1.6 pounds of margarine. In 1902, the first year of the tax against colored margarine, the consumption of margarine fell off to nine-tenths of a pound per person, but either the demand or the supply of butter also fell off, because in 1902 we consumed only 17.5 pounds of butter.

Certainly no butter producer profited by this attack on margarine. As a matter of fact, butter producers never have gained anything from the dog-in-the-manger attitude, and I propose to show conclusively that it has been exactly that—a dog-in-the-manger attitude—which has helped no one, but which has lowered the whole standard of American living, especially the living standards of those least able to pay the exorbitant prices charged for tax-protected butter in the retail stores of the great cities.

In 1901 the American people enjoyed 21.5 pounds of spread per capita. Never since this punitive tax was placed on yellow margarine by the butter interests has there been so much spread. Never has there been so much butter available. Last year the American people were able to buy only 11.2 pounds of butter per capita—less than 60 percent of what they were using when the butter interests secured this legislative quasi monopoly. Is that fair play? Is that free enterprise? Do we not recognize that where public utilities are given monopolies or partial monopolies that in turn they owe the public a duty to supply the public needs and at reasonable prices? Certainly the butter industry has shamefully failed to supply the public need. On the other hand, margarine, laboring under the handicap of the most vicious and undemocratic punitive taxes ever levied against a wholesome food product in our country, has increased its production from 1.6 pounds per capita in 1901 to approximately 5 pounds last year.

And what about price? What has the butter industry done to carry out its obligations as a governmentally favored quasi monopoly? Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that I do not believe in price controls in peacetime, and surely I would not complain of any price the butter people saw fit to establish in a free competitive economy, but since they have seen fit to take themselves out of such a free competitive economy, and to invoke the strong arm of the Federal Government in behalf of their monopolistic position, they must, in good conscience, be willing to assume some degree of public responsibility in return. I think I have shown that they have either failed terribly in their duty to provide the public with an adequate supply of butter, or worse, they have used their governmental protection to deliberately reduce the supply of butter in an effort to increase their profits at the expense of the very American citizens who gave them their favored position. Surely no one will contend that present prices of butter are such as to encourage the widespread use of the product. Actually, what is happening is that the distributors are letting their greed destroy the long-time interests of the dairy farmer, just as governmentally favored groups always do.

The very next day after the majority of the Agriculture Committee voted not to consider any repeal of the taxes on margarine, the price of butter went up 8 cents, and the next day it advanced another 5 cents right here in Washington. After this spectacular evidence that the butter processors were committed to a policy of charging the consumer all the traffic would bear, I undertook to find out just what benefits the producer, the man who milks the cows, received from this gouge of the consuming public. I called five of the leading processing dairies of Washington. These were all wholesale establishments who buy milk from the farmer. I asked how much they had increased the price they paid for milk. Not one claimed to have increased their payments to farmers by a single cent. No, my friends, it is not the actual farmer who profits by this monopoly.

In the long run, the farmer makes far more out of the sale of fluid milk than he does out of the sale of butter. The Nation gets far more nutritional value out of fluid milk. We do not produce nearly enough fluid milk to meet our minimum needs. Only high retail prices prevent the consumption of far more fluid milk in this country to the mutual benefit of the dairy farmer and the consumer. Who is today sabotaging the increase in the use of fluid milk? Surely the farmer does not receive too much, but clearly the public is often charged too much. I have recently returned from the great milk-producing State of Wisconsin, where on my trip I paid 20 cents for a glass of milk on the railroad diner. Of course, people rather expect to be gouged on dining cars, but when I had to pay 13 cents per glass in a restaurant, I wondered if the same people who have reduced America's butter supply in order to gouge the consumers might not be now applying the same tactics to the dairy farmers who have so long supplied the farmer interest which these distributors have claimed to represent. My suggestion to my dairy farmers is to cut loose from a distribution system that is based on the monopolistic principles of scarcity and prices as high as the traffic will stand and join up with the more modern and more successful principle of abundance at fair prices.

Coca-Cola has done a better job of selling its product in competition with Pepsi-Cola, and a whole host of other drinks that look and taste like it, without any special tax on its competitors, than the butter monopoly has in expanding any market for the dairy farmers. If I were a dairy farmer, I believe I would be looking for some new leadership, and maybe that is what the dairy farmers of Wisconsin have decided who recently asked for repeal of their State's almost prohibitive taxes against margarine.

We ask no advantage for margarine. We are willing to provide strict penalties for any fraud or deception. We agree that anyone who tries to sell margarine as butter should be punished just as we believe that anyone who tries to sell cotton as wool should be punished, but just as we are unwilling to tax all cotton cloth just because someone might at some time try to pass it off as wool, so we are unwilling to impose a tax on a wholesome food product because there are dishonest people in the world. On the contrary, we say, "Punish the dishonest dealer, not the innocent public."

I am not going to impose on your time to rehash the old arguments of the relative food value of butter and margarine. Today every informed person knows that there is no significant difference on this score. Margarine is required to state the fact that it contains artificial color if it does. Butter is not required to disclose the presence of artificial coloring. As far as I know, it is the only food product which can use artificial color without revealing that fact.

I do not want to take your time with a discussion of the question of the relative purity of the two products. Suffice it to say that while the propaganda package of the butter industry contains a second edition of a booklet entitled "Colored Oleo Sold as Butter," this book recites the history of only six such cases and conveniently forgets to state the pe-

riod of years covered. Evidently it goes back a number of years, but I have seen the record of seizures of both margarine and of butter by the United States Food and Drug Administration for the past 17 years. Since 1930 there have been only 32 seizures of margarine. Only two of these involved filth. During the same time there were 2,910 seizures of butter, and 652 of these involved filth. Last year there were 127 seizures of butter and not one of margarine. Who does it look like should be policed?

Now, there is just one more feature of this question of monopoly that I want to discuss. That relates to the remarkable attitude of the Cudahy Packing Co., which company holds a license for the use of a bag or container for margarine which the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation states makes it "actually fun" to mix coloring into margarine. Of course, the sincerity of this organization might be open to question. If they sincerely believe their statement that it is actually fun to mix coloring into margarine by the use of the Cudahy Packing Co. bag, why do not they put the coloring in a pill and sell it to the public along with their winter white butter rather than to mix it before offering it to the public? There is no law or tax to prevent it. Why do they deny to their butter customers the "actual fun" which they say Cudahy Packing Co. offers with margarine?

To go a little further, on April 22, 1948, Mr. Charles W. Holman, secretary of this association, addressed a communication to every Member of this House in which he states:

> As for the contention that the housewife is entitled to yellow oleo—she may certainly have it if she wants it. Modern packaging permits her to color it easily, quickly, and without waste.

I submit that the experiences of most of the 31,000,000 American families who use margarine is not in keeping with Mr. Holman's statement.

Actually, all of this free advertising that the butter people have given to the patented package used by Cudahy Packing Co. is rather easy to understand when we recall that Cudahy has within recent years bought the franchise to use this package and with it the company has had a change of heart in regard to colored margarine. The entire value of Cudahy's franchise and of Mr. Leo Peters' patent depend on the maintenance of the present tax prohibiting manufacture of colored margarine.

Today only a few margarine manufacturers are licensed to use Mr. Peters' bag—Cudahy is the only really large producer. If the manufacturers of margarine were allowed to color their product before it was distributed, Cudahy would have to meet competition on price and quality and Mr. Peters would have an absolutely worthless patent. I think it may, therefore, be understood why Mr. Peters is so ready to make almost any sacrifice to prevent coloring of margarine at the factory, and why Mr. Hoffman, president of the Cudahy Packing Co. has gone to such lengths to urge each Member of this House to retain these taxes. Mr. Peters and Mr. Hoffman are but the lesser leeches who suck the livelihood of the American consumers under protection of the larger monopoly which the butter interests have so long enjoyed. What could be more natural than for the beneficiaries of legislative favoritism to get together.

Mr. Chairman, America is a big land. It is a land of opportunity, but it is not big enough to grant any group a monopoly or a partial monopoly on any of the essentials of ordinary living.

If you want the butter industry to be regulated as a public utility; if you think it is entitled to a monopoly, you should be frank enough to say to this body that you look upon the butter industry as a public utility and that you will accept the responsibilities of public utilities that go with the privileges and quasimonopoly position which it has enjoyed for nearly 50 years.

It has failed to accept those responsibilities. It is giving the public only about 60 percent of the butter that the public was getting before the passage of these restrictive laws against margarine.

It has not kept faith with the butter producers of America because it has reduced their market. It has taken away from the dairymen themselves the opportunity to sell to the American people 19.6 pounds of butter as they were selling before these laws against colored margarine were passed.

There has never been a year since the passage of these laws that the dairy people of America have sold as much butter per capita as they sold before the laws. They have not increased the production of butter. They have not helped the dairy producer.

They have not put any money into the pockets of the man who milks the cows. They have enabled a monopoly, a monopoly established and maintained by the laws of this Nation, to milk the dairy farmers at the expense of the dairy farmers and at the expense of the consuming public. They have done it with utter disregard for the rights of millions of other American farmers, many more, who produce cottonseed and who produce soybean oil. They have said to those people that even though you have a wholesome product and the American people want to buy it, still it will be taxed.

I only ask that we wipe out monopoly and favoritism. Let the people of America decide for themselves what spread they want on their tables and how they want it colored.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, the discharge of the Committee on Agriculture from further consideration of the bill to repeal oleo taxes is one of the few instances in the history of Congress when such a step has been taken. The basis of the discharge was a petition signed by 152 Democrats and 66 Republicans, a bipartisan combination formed to swell the profits of the vegetable oil interests to the damage and destruction of the butter trade of the Northwest.

The tactics of this bipartisan combination are further in evidence by the limited time allowed for debate upon the bill for the repeal of all oleomargarine taxes introduced by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]. These laws for the protection of the dairy industry were enacted nearly 60 years ago, and with but slight amendment have continued in force until the present day. No other form of protection for the dairy farmer has been suggested, much less advanced. Now that the success and the consequent exuberance of the proponents of this movement are so firmly fixed, even the representatives from dairy districts will have but limited opportunity to enter their protests. Backed by the same bipartisan combination, the bill may pass.

For months the propaganda financed by the vegetable oil monopolies and their associated industries has been carried on. People have been led to believe by extensive advertising that they are being taxed unjustly, while the fact is that of the more than 600,000,000 pounds of all oleo made in this country last year, less than 18,000,000 pounds were taxed the 10 cents per pound on colored oleo. Only 18,000,000 pounds were sold. If this scheme works out, as its promoters hope that it will, it will only be a little time until oleo will have an increased price in the markets. For the month of February this year, oleo production totaled 80,418,000 pounds or 12,668,000 pounds over February of last year. Butter production had fallen off by 20,000,000 pounds in a single year to 77,545,000 pounds. It is the ambition and the purpose of those fostering this legislation to continue the increase in oleo production, and that decrease in the butter made from the farms of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, and other Northwestern States.

It is alleged that over 40 percent of all the oleo made in this country is produced in plants owned by a British cartel, which has monopolistic control over the palm oil, coconut oil, and other vegetable oils of the world. Fortune magazine is authority for these facts. Some few cotton planters may imagine that this measure will serve their interests by an increased price on cottonseed oil. Peanut growers of the South may think that they will profit in the peanut-oil markets. Both have been especially favored by a recent enactment of Congress providing for the purchase of vegetable oils, among others, for shipment to foreign lands. Included in the first shipment will be 40,000 tons of peanut oil, and 10,000 tons of cottonseed oil. But the vegetable-oil dealers of our own country will discover that within the course of a few months, if not in a few weeks, foreign oils produced, owned, and controlled by the vegetable-oil monopolies, will commence to flow into our ports. Possibly even now reciprocal trade manipulators may be sitting behind closed doors preparing for such importations, and listening to the same lobbyists whose voices have been so potent in the attack on the butter industry.

Millions of dollars have been spent on advertising and propaganda, and many householders have been led to believe that they are paying a tax of 10 cents a pound on oleomargarine, when as a matter of fact, a very small portion of oleo has been sold in colored form. The purpose of this law is to permit colored oleo, possibly made from palm oil, coconut oil, babassu oil, and so forth, to be sold in competition with butter, and to be

actually sold as butter. It was that unfair competition, the selling of oleo as butter, which led to the enactment of the original law. The oleo manufacturers want to make their product yellow in order to imitate butter, and take over the table-spread market in America. The consumers will not gain, but the farmers will lose.

The dairy people of Wisconsin are strongly aroused by this bipartisan attack on their great butter industry. There are nearly 600 cooperative creameries in Wisconsin. Those cooperatives have the fear that their creameries will soon follow the 600 cheese factories which have been closed in the past few years by monopolistic competition, and be forced out of business.

The demand of the consumers which has been whipped up by the powerful propaganda and advertising of the oleo interests will then find another side of the picture that has been painted. Practically all of the dried skim-milk powder comes from the sections of the West which produce butter. It is made from the dried-milk solids after the cream has been removed from the whole milk. Dried skim-milk powder has become an important factor for household use as well as for industrial purposes. Last year over 700,000,000 pounds of powdered skim milk was sold. The Department of Agriculture claims that at this time there is such a scarcity of dry-milk powder that they are unable to fill the demand for it. If the dairy farmers lose because of this legislation, they will naturally reduce their dairy herds. In doing so, we shall lose not only their production, but also we shall lose in the meat supply which comes from the annual sale of calves which forms a big part of our meat supply. The householder is going to find in many ways that this measure is more destructive to his household than is stated in any of the talks heard here.

There will be amendments offered to this measure, none of which should be adopted. It is a straight-out issue of the protection of the farmers and the dairymen as against the profits of the margarine makers. The public pays a tax of only one-quarter cent on uncolored oleo. Nobody objects to the people buying and eating oleo if they prefer it. The tax is a mere incident so far as uncolored oleo is concerned, as no consumer feels the burden. It is only when oleo is colored an imitation of butter that objection is raised.

I have received hundreds of communications of protest from the dairy people of Wisconsin relative to the repeal of oleo taxes. It is impossible to include all of the protests in my remarks. I shall, however, under permission previously granted, insert in the RECORD communications from the Pigeon Falls Cooperative Creamery, Pigeon Falls, Wis., representing 352 patrons; the Twenty-fourth District Cooperative Association, Wis.; the Wisconsin Buttermakers Association, which is a large organization; also that of the Wisconsin Restaurant Association, protesting that the passage of such a measure as this will put honest hotel and restaurant proprietors in competition with those who will use oleo instead of butter on the tables of their establishments. Also a letter from John D. Wuethrich of the John Wuethrich Creamery Co., Greenwood, Wis., expressing the alarm of the independent creameries over the dangers involved in permitting oleo to come into the markets and permitted to be sold as butter. These are only a few of the hundreds of protests I have received, and other members of the Wisconsin delegation have likewise been flooded with protests from their constituents over this proposed legislation.

Over 2,000,000 farm boys from the great dairy districts of the Northwest are veterans of the late war. While their fathers were laboring from 70 to 80 hours a week on the farms to respond to the demands of the Government for increased production, those young men were serving in the fox holes and trenches of the battlefields in all parts of the world. Only 3 years ago the endeavors of those dairy farmers were highly commended by the Government, and here in Congress, for the great and severe endeavors they were making. Now in less than 3 years of the close of the war these farmers and their veteran sons are being attacked by the selfish interests of one of the world's greatest cartels and monopolies. It is unfair, and it is unjust to all the people, as well as to the farmers involved.

PIGEON FALLS COOPERATIVE CREAMERY,
Pigeon Falls, Wis., April 20, 1948.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The board of directors of the Pigeon Falls Cooperative Creamery, representing 352 patrons, are opposed to a law permitting the addition of yellow coloring to oleomargarine. Oleomargarine must be regulated by law and sold on its own merits but not as an imitation of butter.

CLARENCE KAAS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

LAND O' LAKES CREAMERIES,
TWENTY-FOURTH DISTRICT,
COOOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
April 15, 1948.

HON. MERLIN HULL,
Congressman, State of Wisconsin:

The Twenty-fourth District Cooperative Association of Galesville, Wis. is comprised of 12 large cooperative creameries who are members of Land O' Lakes Creameries, Inc., having a total patron membership of 2,500 farmers. They manufactured a total of seven and one-half million pounds of butter for the year 1947 and are very much concerned in regard to the present oleomargarine tax bill that is being now presented to the Congressmen and Senators in Washington.

We urge you as our Representative from the State of Wisconsin to do all you can with the other Members of both the House and Senate to protect the dairy industry against the coloring of oleomargarine tax free.

We believe as dairymen that the soybean raisers and the cotton people benefit far more by the use of their products to the dairy farmers than they would be permitting the oleomargarine manufacturing people to get their influence to repeal the coloring of oleomargarine-tax law.

We further feel that once oleomargarine can be colored that it would be a greater benefit to the oleomargarine manufacturers to forget about the soybean farmer and cotton farmer and use as much of the coconut oils from the islands to be put on our market in competition with butter.

We know how you stand in the great dairy State of Wisconsin, but we want you to urge your coworkers in the Senate and House to protect the interest of the dairy farmer. This resolution was adopted by the entire district board and operators present at a meeting held on April 13, 1948, at Cochrane, Wis.

A. G. BENJAMIN,
Secretary, Twenty-fourth District Cooperative Association.

WISCONSIN BUTTERMAKERS ASSOCIATION,
Chippewa Falls, Wis., April 22, 1948.

HON. M. HULL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Why are oleomargarine manufacturers so insistent upon demanding that they be given the unrestricted right to color their product yellow?

They say it's because custom has made the consumer expect the spread upon her bread to be colored yellow. But what created that custom? Butter, of course; yellow butter. And so the oleomargarine manufacturer himself admits that he wants to foist his product upon the American people in the guise of something that it is not.

The consumer readily accepts the purple of grape jelly, the rich red of currant jelly, and the gold of orange marmalade as a spread upon her bread, just as she accepts the green of mint sauce for her lamb roast, and finds nothing objectionable in the greenish tinge of applesauce.

The foods upon our tables are of every color and hue—from the deep red color of meat to the white stalk of celery. And none does the housewife find objectionable. There is, then, solid background for almost any color that the oleo manufacturer may care to use (and which the dairy industry has no objection to his using, tax free), but he insists that only one color will serve his purpose—the color of the product he is trying to imitate.

Our neighbors to the north prohibit the manufacture of oleomargarine—we ask only that the tax on yellow margarine be continued. Do not retard the growth of agriculture in our great Midwest and Northwest by voting for repeal of the tax.

WISCONSIN BUTTERMAKERS ASSOCIATION,
R. V. EIRSCHELE, *President.*

RESTAURANT ASSOCIATION PROTESTS

Resolution on oleomargarine

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States legislation to repeal the tax on oleomargarine which, if adopted, would have the effect of reducing the price of oleomargarine to below that of butter and be a temptation to serve oleomargarine in restaurants; and

Whereas experience in the food-service industry in Wisconsin has established that the public will be opposed to the serving of oleomargarine in public eating places; and

Whereas the proposed measure will have an unfavorable effect upon the dairy industry in the State of Wisconsin and upon the State economy as a whole by reason thereof: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the association opposes the repeal of such tax; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be furnished to all of the Wisconsin Senators and Representatives in Washington.

WISCONSIN RESTAURANT ASSOCIATION.

A LETTER TO SECRETARY ANDERSON

ARCADIA, WIS., *April 5, 1948.*

Secretary of Agriculture CLINTON ANDERSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: There is considerable pressure being used to take off the oleo tax.

For the past 15 years your Department has been interested in soil conservation. Never-

theless, at the rate we are losing our topsoil we can only last another 50 years or so. Now, why can't your Department put more emphasis on saving our topsoil than they are?

We are all very much stirred up about some foreign people absorbing us. Well, why should we have the use of this great fertile land when we do not take more interest in caring for it? After the topsoil is gone the farmer and city man alike will be in the same boat. Then, after it is too late we will cry: "O God, save us." It is a blessing the Almighty gave us this last resort—the Garden of Eden to care for. But, oh, what a miserable job man has made of it. He has commercialized the world where God meant for man to care for it. Without contradiction, I believe we will all admit that.

Dairying is the best conservation that can be practiced. Therefore, why do we, and by "we" I mean all city people as well, want an oleomargarine product; a product that will spell ruination to our country? By raising soybeans to produce the oil for oleo, we loosen our soil and it becomes an easy prey to rain and wind. You may say that education will remedy this among the producers, but by the time you educate the producer to do this, the soil will be gone. Why can't your Department put out some literature that our dairy Congressmen can use to show Congressmen from other parts of our country that this is a wrong way to use our soils?

Furthermore, the oleo people are encroaching upon butter's natural color. Is there not protection to this encroachment? Also, they say that vitamins can be added to oleo which will make oleo equal to butter in value. Maybe after 25 years this can be proven but then it will be too late.

For sake of argument we will say the dairy factories will go to manufacturing oleo instead of butter. We may do it. Would it be healthy for our Nation in more ways than one?

I wish you would do something along these lines.

A-G COOPERATIVE CREAMERY,
A. C. SCHULTZ.

JOHN WUETHRICH CREAMERY CO.,
Greenwood, Wis., March 6, 1948.

The Honorable MERLIN HULL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HULL: We are very much concerned over this matter of oleomargarine, and we know that you are very active in the fight for butter. We wish you well in your efforts.

We in the dairy business are particularly concerned because if this oleomargarine consumption keeps on increasing, eventually it is going to raise "cain" with our whole dairy economy. You know the story as well as I or perhaps better. They are trying to imitate butter in every sense of the word. The color factor is about the only protection we have had, and if oleo is so good, why then don't they make it a distinctive color of its own, say black or purple, and not try to pull a fraud on the American public by making them think in many instances that they are getting butter—particularly in restaurants and hospitals as well as other places.

I quote the following information from a letter that Professor Thomson from the University of Wisconsin sent us:

"Now as to some of the special nutritional constituents: Butter contains on an average 15,000 international units of vitamin A. It varies from about 12,000 to 18,000. Since about two-thirds of the butter is produced during the summer months, it is natural to assume that it will approach the 18,000 figure for the above percentage of butter. Summer butter contains vitamin E in an amount equal to that found in green vegetables for the same weight. It seems that the vitamin E protects the vitamin A from destruction. For this reason the vitamin A with which oleomargarine is fortified has a tendency to be destroyed almost 50 percent when oleomargarine is stored for periods of 5 months or longer. Even though the oils from which oleomargarine is made contain appreciable quantities of vitamin E, this vitamin is destroyed in the process known as hydrogenation when oleomargarine is manufactured.

"More recently it has been shown that summer butter contains a growth-promoting substance which is distinct from the known fat soluble vitamins and the essential fatty acids. The new factor has been identified as vaccenic acid. Vaccenic acid appears to be present only in fats of animal origin. Butter has been found superior to other animal fats which have been tested. Oleomargarine apparently contains no vaccenic acid.

"Apparently there is still another growth-promoting nutrient present in butter. It apparently is in the nonfat or curd portion. The vegetable oils from which oleomargarine is made do not contain this substance, but I presume it might be added along with the skim milk which oleomargarine manufacturers use. Butterfat has been shown to exert a favorable influence on vitamin producing intestinal flora of animals. A similar favorable effect was not found in the case of the vegetable oils which have been tested."

Of course, we realize the main thing that is causing the present disturbance is the high price of butter and the customer acceptance of it. If butter were plentiful, the fight would be easier. Now, with the present high cost, they try to bring out that the customer is being penalized by using oleomargarine. There is no product that returns as much of the customers' dollar to the farmer as butter. Oleomargarine is decidedly a big profit item for the manufacturer and he is doing a swell job of making the customer think these taxes are hurting him. When cheaper oils and fats are available, they will be imported, and the soybean and cottonseed growers will not enjoy the favorable position they hold today.

It was indeed discouraging last night to pick up the Life magazine and see them come out flatly in favor of repealing the tax presently on oleomargarine.

The growth factor particularly in small children is very important and nothing supplies these elements as they are put up in the form of butter.

We hope that these taxes will not be removed and the customer hoodwinked into thinking he is getting something he is not. If a fellow wants to buy this over a counter as oleomargarine, that is his own privilege, but when he is sick in a hospital or eating out, he should know what he is getting.

We believe the dairy people will have to put forth every effort to show the consumer why he should use only butter.

Yours truly,
JOHN WUETHRICH CREAMERY CO.
JOHN D. WUETHRICH.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. ARENDS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2245) to repeal the tax on oleomargarine, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAYBURN. Since this is the pending business, suppose the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] determines not to move tomorrow that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the pending bill; would that jeopardize his chances of making that motion on Wednesday?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard on the parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, my only purpose in saying anything now is that we are establishing a precedent here that is most important. I think it is clear that the House can do almost anything by unanimous consent, but I am just as convinced that a special privilege created by a special rule like the discharge rule, is entirely different from a privilege under the general rules attaching, for instance, to appropriation bills. It is my thought that when this discharge rule was written, as amended, the rule was specific in providing that when by discharge petition the ordinary procedure of the House was changed and interfered with, and the House voted to discharge the committee, those in favor of considering the legislation affected by the discharge petition, may immediately—and I stress the word immediately—bring the matter before the House, and the House shall immediately proceed to a conclusion of the consideration, and if the conclusion is not reached on the first day, then this legislation shall be the unfinished business until it is completed.

I am wondering whether, as a matter of reason and logic and parliamentary procedure, if other business intervenes, that special discharge rule privilege is not lost. If that were not true, the bill could be put over in the discretion of those who were responsible for the petition and who had changed the rules of the House temporarily. If the bill can be called up Wednesday instead of the following day, as unfinished, then it can be called up Thursday, or the next Thursday, or the last day before the session ended, and this bill would have a special privilege the rest of the session, conditioned only upon the general rules of the House affecting privileges like those of appropriation bills and bills from the Committee on Ways and Means.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that my only interest in this matter is as to the precedent.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is interested in the valued comments of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan. Of course, the Chair is unaware of the intent or purpose back of the rule when it was first formulated. All he has to guide him is the rule itself as it appears before him in print. The Chair agrees with the gentleman from Michigan that the House can immediately consider the legislation after the motion to discharge the committee is agreed to, but the rule states "and if unfinished before adjournment of the day on which it is called up,

it shall remain the unfinished business until it is fully disposed of."

That provision does not state definitely that the bill must come up on the following day, but that it shall remain the unfinished business. The gentleman's point that the bill could be postponed indefinitely of course is correct, in a sense, but after all the rules are based on common sense, and no one would anticipate that the side that procured enough signatures to a discharge petition to bring a bill before the House would filibuster their own bill.

While the rule perhaps is not quite as definite as it might be, it is the opinion of the Chair that the consideration of the bill could go over until Wednesday if the proponents of the bill do not call it up on tomorrow, and that it would be in order on Wednesday as the unfinished business.

The Chair believes that unless the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] or someone on his side of the issue, calls it up on tomorrow, it can be called up on Wednesday and will be the unfinished business on that day. The Chair also wishes to state that he will not recognize anyone on the affirmative side of this matter unless the gentleman from South Carolina is absent. It is not necessary to call it up on tomorrow and it can be called up on Wednesday, at which time it will be the unfinished business.

The Chair will also remind Members that it is always within the control of the majority of the House to determine what should be done.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Must it be called up by unanimous consent on Wednesday?

The SPEAKER. No. It remains the unfinished business and can be called up by the gentleman from South Carolina or someone delegated by his side to do so.

Mr. GROSS. Then I might add further, since the Speaker mentioned a filibuster, I think I sat in on a conversation where this filibuster was well planned and it is being worked out just fine for the Wednesday meeting.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GROSS. No. It is just a comment.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I am informed by the Public Printer that the extension exceeds the regular amount allowed. Notwithstanding, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Carl H. Wilken, an economic analyst, before the Senate Committee on Agriculture on Friday, April 23.

LOAN TO UNITED NATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF PERMANENT HEADQUARTERS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have today introduced a bill to authorize the loan of $65,000,000 to the United Nations for the construction of a permanent headquarters on the site contributed by the city of New York and John D. Rockefeller, Jr., along the East River in the Borough of Manhattan. The loan is repayable in annual installments commencing with June 1, 1951, over a period of 32 years, the average installments being $2,500,000 a year. This loan will become the obligation of the members of the United Nations through their responsibility to meet the regular budget of the United Nations of which the annual installments will become a part. The bill recalls that the Congress of the United States by House Concurrent Resolution 75, adopted in December 1945, invited the United Nations to settle here, and that largely inspired by our leadership the United Nations was conceived of as the necessary postwar machinery for peace.

The occasion of the introduction of this bill properly raises two major policy questions: Do we want the United Nations? Do we want it in the United States?

It is entirely appropriate that the legislation should be made a vehicle for the discussion of these two questions. Assuming that they are answered in the affirmative, there should be no objection to the bill itself which provides for a suitable permanent home of the United Nations in the world's greatest port where, by democratic expression of the members of the United Nations themselves, its headquarters have been located. It deals also with intolerable conditions of inadequacy of space which I found to exist by personal inspection of UN's temporary headquarters at Lake Success.

For myself, I want the UN and I want it here. All of us in considering the world's machinery for peace always make the comparison with the League of Nations which failed to preserve the peace. But the United States did not belong to the League. It does belong to the UN. The United Nations, mankind's best hope for peace, should not be interred before it has a chance to live.

Our people believe the UN to be our best hope for peace, and we must make it good or confess our inability to lead the world in the way in which our prestige, our resources, and the character of our people require.

It is my hope that this bill could be made the occasion for considering how best to implement the UN and to make it more effective. The situation which the United Nations has been unable to resolve in Palestine and Greece, the frustration which it has encountered in Korea, Trieste, Indonesia, and Spain, as well as its inability to deal with the problem of respect for treaty obligations in the Soviet satellite countries and in occupied Germany make certain shortcomings all the more apparent.

We may recall at this time that it was the United States which itself insisted on the veto. There is now considerable sentiment in the United States for removing the veto power of the permanent members of the Securtiy Council, in order to bring about the creation of an adequate security force so that the UN may not be impotent to enforce its determinations, and so that the international control of atomic weapons should be made possible. There is sentiment also for giving up the veto power when it comes to action to punish aggressors, but whether our people want as yet to give other powers the ability to commit them to war is an open question.

There are some matters in our presently complex world in which national may have to give way to international sovereignty. There seems to be a disposition in the United States to make a start along these lines. We should not permit this start to be thwarted by the veto power in the UN Charter. This sentiment may lead to consideration of international regulation free of the veto, of international communications, international aspects of health and agriculture, and international law. The subject bill may afford an opportunity to crystallize ways and means by which the gradually maturing concept of international government in certain spheres may be effectively initiated.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include a short letter from the Buttermakers' Association of Wisconsin.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Dr. Elmer G. Peterson.

Mr. TALLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made today and include certain material.

DR. EDWARD U. CONDON

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a communication which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

APRIL 24, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: In obedience to its provision, the Clerk transmitted to the Secretary of Commerce on April 23, 1948, an attested copy of House Resolution No. 522 of the Eightieth Congress.

The letter of the Acting Secretary of Commerce, dated April 23, 1948, in response to said resolution, addressed to the Clerk and received in his office at 11:25 o'clock a. m., on April 24, 1948, is transmitted herewith for the information of the House.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the letter from the Secretary.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, April 23, 1948.

Hon. JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDREWS: I refer to your communication of today transmitting an attested copy of House Resolution 522, the receipt of which I have already acknowledged. My action in response to the resolution is governed by the President's directive of March 13, 1948, which provides as follows:

"The efficient and just administration of the employee loyalty program, under Executive Order No. 9835 of March 21, 1947, requires that reports, records, and files relative to the program be preserved in strict confidence. This is necessary in the interest of our national security and welfare, to preserve the confidential character and sources of information furnished, and to protect Government personnel against the dissemination of unfounded or disproved allegations. It is necessary also in order to insure the fair and just disposition of loyalty cases.

"For these reasons, and in accordance with the long-established policy that reports rendered by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other investigative agencies of the executive branch are to be regarded as confidential, all reports, records, and files relative to the loyalty of employees or prospective employees (including reports of such investigative agencies) shall be maintained in confidence and shall not be transmitted or disclosed except as required in the efficient conduct of business.

"Any subpena or demand or request for information, reports, or files of the nature described, received from sources other than those persons in the executive branch of the Government who are entitled thereto by reason of their official duties, shall be respectfully declined, on the basis of this directive, and the subpena or demand or other request shall be referred to the Office of the President for such response as the President may determine to be in the public interest in the particular case. There shall be no relaxation of the provisions of this directive except with my express authority."

The letter referred to in the resolution is part of the Loyalty Board files of the Department, and I must, therefore, respectfully decline to transmit the document to the House of Representatives. In further compliance with the directive, I am referring the matter to the President.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM C. FOSTER,
Acting Secretary of Commerce.

The communication from the Acting Secretary of Commerce was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

SUBPENA DUCES TECUM

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 23, 1948.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIRS: From the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, I have received 11 subpenas duces tecum, directed to me as Clerk of the House of Representatives, to appear before said court on the 26th day of April 1948 at 10 o'clock a. m., as a witness in the case of the *United States* v. *Dalton Trumbo* (No. 1353–47 Criminal Docket), and to bring with me certain and sundry papers therein described in the files of the House of Representatives.

Your attention and that of the House is respectfully invited to a resolution of the House adopted in the Forty-sixth Congress, first session (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 680), upon the recommendation of the Committee on the Judiciary as follows:

"*Resolved*, That no officer or employee of the House of Representatives has the right, either voluntarily or in obedience to a subpena duces tecum, to produce any document, paper, or book belonging to the files of the House before any court or officer, nor to furnish any copy of any testimony given or paper filed in any investigation before the House or any of its committees, or of any paper belonging to the files of the House, except such as may be authorized by statute to be copied and such as the House itself may have made public, to be taken without the consent of the House first obtained."

And to a resolution adopted by the House in the Forty-ninth Congress, first session (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1295), from which the following is quoted:

"*Resolved*, That by the privilege of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate or process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission.

"That when it appears by the order of a court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer for the promotion of justice, this House will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House."

These resolutions result from the issuance of subpena duces tecum upon the Clerk of the House to produce certain original papers in the files of the House.

Permission to remove from their place of file or from the custody of the Clerk, any papers, was denied by the House but court afforded facilities to make certain copies of papers to be secured from the House. This seems to be the uniform procedure in the case of subpenas duces tecum served upon the Clerk of the House of Representatives to produce original papers from the files of the House.

The subpenas in question are herewith attached, and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

Very respectfully yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* DALTON TRUMBO, NO. 1353–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday the 26th day of April 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A, attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 22d day of April, A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and David Carliner, attorneys for Dalton Trumbo.

Schedule A

1. Stenographic transcript of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee of the same from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, at which the definition or content of phrases, or any portion of the phrases, "un-American propaganda activities," and/or "subversive and un-American propaganda * * * (which) attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution," were considered or acted upon, or on which any action was taken by the committee in connection with the scope of its authority and powers, or in connection with any constitutional limitations thereon.

2. All press releases issued by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or its chairman or its members from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, dealing with the definition or content of phrases, or any portion of the phrases, "un-American propaganda activities," and/or "subversive and un-American propaganda * * * (which) attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution."

3. All reports of the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, including but not limited to:

Author	Date	House Report Nos.	Congress	Session
Wood	Mar. 28, 1946	1829	79th	2d.
Do		1936	do	Do.
Do	May 10, 1946	1936	do	Do.
Adamson	May 29, 1946. Report to Wood. Citations by official Government agencies and private organizations regarding the character of organizations named.			
Wood	June 26, 1946	2233	79th	Do.
Do	June 26, 1946. Corliss Lamont	2354	do	Do.
Do	July 31, 1946, George Marshall	2707	do	Do.
Do	July 31, 1946, Richard Morford	2708	do	Do.
Do		2742	do	Do.

4. Transcripts of all hearings, public and executive, held by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, including but not limited to the following volumes and subjects:

1945: Executive hearings that were released by the committee December 15, 1944;

September 20, 1939–April 19, 1943; volumes 1 through 7.

1946: September 26–October 19, 1945, Communist Party; June 20–27, 1945, OPA; January 30, 1945, G. L. K. Smith; April 4, 1946, E. B. Jarg (JAFRC).

5. All reports of investigators for the committee issued by the committee from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947.

6. All releases and statements issued by, or on behalf of, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and/or stenographic transcripts of meetings of the committee from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, relating to or discussing the investigation of organizations, groups, or individuals which disseminate propaganda or influence or attempt to influence public opinion.

7. The records of names of all organizations and groups compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, which are allegedly subversive or un-American.

8. The records of names of all individuals compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, which are alleged subversive or un-American.

9. For the period from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, all correspondence and memoranda from and to the committee, or from and to individual members of the committee, or from and to members of the committee staff relating to findings by the committee or to material in the committee files concerning the names of organizations, groups, or individuals in the files of the committee.

10. Copies of letter sent by KARL E. MUNDT, member of the committee, to Gov. Thomas E. Bailey, of Mississippi, and approximately 99 others on or about January 20, 1945, relating to a suitable and working criterion to determine what does and what does not comprise un-American propaganda activity, together with the data and material mailed therewith and all replies received thereto, and all further correspondence with the same individuals in connection therewith and such additional correspondence received from other individuals and/or organizations pertaining to the establishment of the working criterion above set forth as to the definition of the term un-American and/or subversive; all stenographic transcripts of meetings of the committee and all its members and other memoranda relating to the said letter.

11. Copies of all letters sent by or on behalf of the committee or by any members thereof to the Brookings Institution between January 3, 1945, and April 15, 1945, relating to a working criterion for determining what constitutes un-American propaganda activity, or relating to an analysis of letters received purporting to define un-American propaganda; together with all letters received from the Brookings Institution in connection therewith.

12. The report or memorandum submitted to the committee by the Brookings Institution between January 3, 1945 and April 15, 1945, relating to or entitled "Suggested Standards for Determining Un-American Activities," and all stenographic transcripts of meetings of the committee and all its minutes and other memoranda relating to the said report or memorandum.

13. Memorandum of six paragraphs sent to the committee or to KARL E. MUNDT, committee member, by the American Civil Liberties Union during February 1945, relating to Un-American activities, and letter accompanying same.

14. Minutes and transcripts of meetings and executive sessions, not limited to but including, committee action on or about February 21, 1945, relating to a request to the Brookings Institution to analyze the replies to MUNDT's letter of January 20, 1945, concerning the working criterion of what comprises an Un-American propaganda activity, and to suggest standards for determining un-American propaganda activities.

15. Copy of letter sent by the counsel for the Committee on Un-American Activities to the National Committee to Combat Anti-Semitism in which it was stated that the said National Committee to Combat Anti-Semitism is engaged in solicitation of money for the purpose of controlling the thoughts of American citizens, and all correspondence, minutes, and other records in relation thereto, said letter being referred to in CRA, March 1, 1946, at page 1120.

16. Copy of letter sent by counsel for the Committee on Un-American Activities to the Veterans Against Discrimination in which letter it was noted that the Veterans Against Discrimination had referred to democracy several times and in which it was called to the attention of the Veterans Against Discrimination that the United States is a Republic and not a democracy, which letter was referred to in CRA, January 29, 1946, at page 740, and all correspondence, minutes, and other records in relation thereto.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* DALTON TRUMBO, NO. 1353–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday, the 26th day of April 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness the honorable chief justice of said court, the 22d day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY H. HULL,
Clerk.
MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenney and David Carliner attorneys for Dalton Trumbo.

Schedule A

1. Stenographic transcript of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee of the same since October 20, 1947, at which the definition or content of phrases, or any portion of the phrases, "un-American propaganda activities," and/or "subversive and un-American propaganda * * * (which) attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution," were considered or acted upon, or on which any action was taken by the committee in connection with any constitutional limitations thereon.

2. All press releases issued by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or its chairman or its members since October 20, 1947, dealing with the definition or content of phrases, or any portion of the phrases, "un-American propaganda activities," and/or "subversive and un-American propaganda * * * (which) attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution."

3. All reports of the House Committee on Un-American Activities since October 20, 1947.

4. Transcripts of all hearings, public and executive, held by the House Committee on Un-American Activities since October 20, 1947, including but not limited to the following volumes and subjects:

1948: September 24–26, 1947, October 20–30, 1947, Hans Eisler, Hollywood.

5. All reports of investigators for the committee issued by the committee since October 20, 1947.

6. All releases and statements issued by, or on behalf of, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and/or stenographic transcripts of meetings of the committee since October 20, 1947, relating to or discussing the investigation of organizations, groups, or individuals which disseminate propaganda or influence or attempt to influence public opinion.

7. The records of names of all organizations and groups compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities since October 20, 1947, which are allegedly subversive or un-American.

8. The records of names of all individuals compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities since October 20, 1947, which are alleged subversive or un-American.

9. For the period since October 20, 1947, to date, all correspondence and memoranda from and to the committee, or from and to individual members of the committee, or from and to members of the committee staff relating to findings by the committee or to material in the committee files concerning the names of organizations, groups, or individuals in the files of the committee.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* DALTON TRUMBO, NO. 1353–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday, the 26th day of April, 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 22d day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and David Carliner, attorneys for Dalton Trumbo.

Schedule A

1. Minutes of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, between May 26, 1938, and January 1, 1945, at which investigation of the motion-picture industry was considered, referred to, acted upon, or authorized.

2. Memoranda and Reports of Investigators for the Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee thereof, concerning the motion-picture industry from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945.

3. Transcripts of any testimony taken with relation to the motion-picture industry during the period from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945.

4. All the releases and statements issued by or on behalf of the House Committee on Un-American Activities whether to the press or otherwise between May 26, 1938, and January 1, 1945, which referred to or discussed the motion-picture industry, and particularly regarding the alleged Communist infiltration in the motion-picture industry.

5. Copies of any letters, reports, or other communications from any person or groups of persons or organizations to the House Committee on Un-American Activities from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, concerning the motion-picture industry.

6. Copies of all letters, correspondence, or other communications from the House Committee on Un-American Activities to any persons, group, or individuals between May 26, 1938, and January 1, 1945, concerning the motion-picture industry.

7. Copies of all reports made to the House Committee on Un-American Activities by

any of its investigators and particularly its investigators H. A. Smith and A. B. Leckie, concerning the interviews had by the said investigators with the motion-picture producers in Hollywood, Calif., during the period May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945.

8. Transcripts of committee meetings in executive session held from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, at which the committee considered and/or acted upon matters relating to the motion-picture industry.

9. All correspondence and communications between representatives of the motion-picture industry and the House Committee on Un-American Activities from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945.

10. All correspondence and communications between the Motion Picture Alliance and/or any of its representatives and the House Committee on Un-American Activities from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* DALTON TRUMBO, NO. 1353–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday the 26th day of April 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 22d day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk*,
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and David Carliner attorneys for Dalton Trumbo.

Schedule A

1. Minutes of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, between January 1, 1945, and January 1, 1947, at which investigation of the motion-picture industry was considered, referred to, acted upon, or authorized.

2. Memoranda and reports of investigators for the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, concerning the motion-picture industry from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947.

3. Transcripts of any testimony taken with relation to the motion-picture industry during the period from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947.

4. All the releases and statements issued by or on behalf of the House Committee on Un-American Activities whether to the press or otherwise between January 1, 1945, and January 1, 1947, which referred to or discussed the motion-picture industry, and particularly regarding the alleged Communist infiltration in the motion-picture industry.

5. Copies of any letters, reports, or other communications from any person or groups of persons or organizations to the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, concerning the motion-picture industry.

6. Copies of all letters, correspondence, or other communications from the House Committee on Un-American Activities to any persons, groups, or individuals between January 1, 1945, and January 1, 1947, concerning the motion-picture industry.

7. Copies of all reports made to the House Committee on Un-American Activities by any of its investigators and particularly its investigators H. A. Smith and A. B. Leckie, concerning the interviews had by the said investigators with the motion-picture producers in Hollywood, Calif., during the period January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947.

8. Transcripts of committee meetings in executive session held from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, at which the committee considered, and/or acted upon matters relating to the motion-picture industry.

9. All correspondence and communications between representatives of the motion-picture industry and the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947.

10. All correspondence and communications between the Motion Picture Alliance and/or any of its representatives and the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* DALTON TRUMBO, NO. 1353–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday, the 26th day of April 1948, at 10 a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 22d day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and David Carliner, attorneys for Dalton Trumbo.

Schedule A

1. Minutes of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, between October 30, 1947 to date, at which investigation of the motion-picture industry was considered, referred to, acted upon, or authorized.

2. Memoranda and reports of investigators for the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, concerning the motion picture industry from October 30, 1947 to date.

3. Transcripts of any testimony taken with relation to the motion-picture industry during the period from October 30, 1947 to date.

4. All the releases and statements issued by or on behalf of the House Committee on Un-American Activities whether to the press or otherwise between October 30, 1947 to date, which referred to or discussed the motion-picture industry, and particularly regarding the alleged Communist infiltration in the motion-picture industry.

5. Copies of any letters, reports, or other communications from any person or groups of persons or organizations to the House Committee on Un-American Activities from October 30, 1947 to date, concerning the motion-picture industry.

6. Copies of all letters, correspondence, or other communications from the House Committee on Un-American Activities to any persons, groups, or individuals between October 30, 1947, to date concerning the motion-picture industry.

7. Copies of all reports made to the House Committee on Un-American Activities by any of its investigators and particularly its investigators, H. A. Smith and A. B. Leckie, concerning the interviews had by the said investigators with the motion-picture producers in Hollywood, Calif., during the period October 30, 1947, to date.

8. Transcripts of committee meetings in executive session held from October 30, 1947, to date, at which the committee considered, and/or acted upon matters relating to the motion-picture industry.

9. All correspondence and communications between representatives of the motion-picture industry and the House Committee on Un-American Activities from October 30, 1947, to date.

10. All correspondence and communications between the Motion Picture Alliance and/or any of its representatives and the House Committee on Un-American Activities from October 30, 1947, to date.

11. Transcripts of hearings held by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from October 20 through October 30, 1947, concerning the motion-picture industry and all exhibits and applications and motions of counsel for all witnesses who appeared before the said committee at the said hearings.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* DALTON TRUMBO, NO. 1353–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday the 26th day of April, 1948, at 10 a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 22d day of April, A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and David Carliner, attorney, for Dalton Trumbo.

Schedule A

1. Minutes of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, between January 1, 1947, and October 20, 1947, at which investigation of the motion-picture industry was considered, referred to, acted upon, or authorized.

2. Memoranda and reports of investigators for the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, concerning the motion picture industry from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947.

3. Transcripts of any testimony taken with relation to the motion-picture industry during the period from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947.

4. All the releases and statements issued by or on behalf of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, whether to the press or otherwise, between January 1, 1947, and October 20, 1947, which referred to or discussed the motion-picture industry, and particularly regarding the alleged Communist infiltration in the motion-picture industry.

5. Copies of any letters, reports, or other communications from any person or groups of persons or organizations to the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947, concerning the motion-picture industry.

6. Copies of all letters, correspondence, or other communications from the House Committee on Un-American Activities to any persons, groups, or individuals between January 1, 1947, and October 20, 1947, concerning the motion-picture industry.

7. Copies of all reports made to the House Committee on Un-American Activities by any of its investigators and particularly its investigators H. A. Smith and A. B. Leckie, concerning the interviews had by the said investigators with the motion-picture producers in Hollywood, Calif., during the period January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947.

8. Transcripts of committee meetings in executive session held from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947, at which the committee

considered, and/or acted upon matters relating to the motion-picture industry.

9. All correspondence and communications between representatives of the motion-picture industry and the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947.

10. All correspondence and communications between the Motion Picture Alliance and/or any of its representatives and the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947.

11. Transcripts of the hearings held by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or a subcommittee thereof, in Los Angeles, Calif., concerning the motion-picture industry on of about May 1947, including specifically the testimony of Louis B. Mayer and all other executives in the motion-picture industry.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES v. DALTON TRUMBO, NO. 1353–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday the 26th day of April 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 22d day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk*,
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and David Carliner, attorneys for Dalton Trumbo.

Schedule A

1. Stenographic transcript of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommitte of the same from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, at which the definition or content of phrases, or any portion of the phrases, "un-American propaganda activities," and/or "subversive and un-American propaganda * * * (which) attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution," were considered or acted upon, or on which any action was taken by the committee in connection with the scope of its authority and powers, or in connection with any constitutional limitations thereon.

2. All press releases issued by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or its chairman or its members from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, dealing with the definition or content of phrases, or any portion of the phrases, "un-American propaganda activities," and/or "subversive and un-American propaganda * * * (which) attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution."

3. All reports of the House Committee on Un-American Activities from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, including but not limited to:

Author	Date	House Report Nos.	Congress	Session
Dies		2	76th	1st.
Starnes	Jan. 3, 1940	1476	do	3d.
Dies	Apr. 8, 1940. Contempt—Albert Blumberg	1937	do	Do.
Do	Mar. 29, 1940. Contempt—James H. Dolsen	1900	do	Do.
Do	Apr. 8, 1940. Contempt—Philip Frankfeld	1936	do	Do.
Do	Apr. 8, 1940. Contempt—Thomas F. P. O'Dea	1938	do	Do.
Do	Apr. 2, 1940. Contempt—George Powers	1904	do	Do.
Starnes (pt. I)	June 25, 1942	2277	77th	2d.
Voorhis (pt. II)	July 7, 1942	2277	do	Do.
Do	Sept. 3, 1942. Report of FBI, House Doc. 833		do	Do.
Dies	Jan. 2, 1943	2748	do	Do.
Costello	Sept. 30, 1943	717	78th	1st.
Dies	Peace Now	1161	do	2d.
Do	CIO-PAC	1311	do	Do.

Report of a subcommittee of the committee to the full committee publicized on October 30, 1944, relating to a reinvestigation of PAC and an investigation of the National Citizens PAC.

4. Transcripts of all hearings, public and executive, held by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, including but not limited to the following volumes and subjects:

1938: August 12–23, 1938, September 15–17, volume 1; September 28–October 6, October 11–13, volume 2; October 17–22, October 24–November 21, volume 3.

1939: November 19–December 14, volume 4; December 15, supplement to volume 4; May 18–June 1, 1939, volume 5; August 16–29, volume 6; September 5–27, volumes 7 and 8.

1940: September 28–October 14, volume 9; October 16–28, volume 10; October 28–December 3, volume 11; February 7–April 4, 1940, volume 12.

1941: April 11–May 21, volume 13; August 29, 1940–August 11, 1941, volume 14.

1943: June 8–July 7, 1943, volume 15.

1944: November 29–December 20, volume 16; September 27–October 5, 1944, volume 17.

5. All reports of investigators for the committee issued by the committee from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, including a report published in 1938 by investigator for the committee, Edward E. Sullivan, containing a statement, "Evidence tends to show that all phases of radical and Communist activities are rampant among the studios of Hollywood, and, although well known, is a matter which movie moguls desire to keep from the public."

6. All releases and statements issued by, or on behalf of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and/or stenographic transcripts of meetings of the committee from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, relating to or discussing the investigation of organizations, groups, or individuals which disseminate propaganda or influence or attempt to influence public opinion.

7. The records of names of all organizations and groups compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, which are allegedly subversive or un-American.

8. The records of names of all individuals compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, which are alleged subversive or un-American.

9. For the period from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, all correspondence and memoranda from and to the committee, or from and to individual members of the committee, or from and to members of the committee staff relating to findings by the committee or to material in the committee files concerning the names of organizations, groups, or individuals in the files of the committee.

10. Transcripts of all meetings held by individual committee members and specifically including transcripts of a meeting held by Congressman J. PARNELL THOMAS with officials of the State of New Jersey published by the committee in 1939 or 1940.

11. Copy of letter sent by counsel for the Committee on Un-American Activities to Drew Pearson in which letter a demand was made for an explanation of the phrase "make democracy work," which letter is referred to in C. R. A., February 11, 1946, at page 1257, and all correspondence, minutes, and other records in relation thereto.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES v. DALTON TRUMBO, NO. 1353–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday, the 26th day of April, 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 22d day of April, A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk*,
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk,

Robert W. Kenny and David Carliner, attorneys for Dalton Trumbo.

Schedule A

1. Minutes and memoranda of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee thereof between January 1, 1945, and January 1, 1947, at which investigation of Dalton Trumbo was considered, referred to, or acted upon or authorized.

2. All releases and statements issued by or on behalf of the House Committee on Un-American Activities whether to the press or otherwise from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, which referred to or discussed Dalton Trumbo.

3. All publications, documents, statements, or communciations relating to Dalton Trumbo and submitted to the House Committee on Un-American Activities between January 1, 1945, and January 1, 1947.

4. Transcripts of committee meetings or executive sessions from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, at which the committee considered and/or discussed the said Dalton Trumbo.

5. All reports, communications, and correspondence and memoranda relating to the investigation of the said Dalton Trumbo by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES v. DALTON TRUMBO, NO. 1353–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday, the 26th day of April, 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 22d day of April, A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and David Carliner, attorneys for Dalton Trumbo.

Schedule A

1. Minutes and memoranda of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee thereof between May 26, 1938, and January 1, 1945, at which investigation of Dalton Trumbo was considered, referred to, or acted upon or authorized.

2. All releases and statements issued by or on behalf of the House Committee on Un-American Activities whether to the press or otherwise from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, which referred to or discussed Dalton Trumbo.

3. All publications, documents, statements, or communications relating to Dalton Trumbo and submitted to the House Committee on Un-American Activities between May 26, 1938, and January 1, 1945.

4. Transcripts of committee meetings or executive sessions from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, at which the committee considered and/or discussed the said Dalton Trumbo.

5. All reports, communications, and correspondence and memoranda relating to the investigation of the said Dalton Trumbo by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* DALTON TRUMBO, NO. 1353–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday the 26th day of April, 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 22d of April, A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and David Carliner, attorneys for Dalton Trumbo.

Schedule A

1. Minutes and memoranda of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee thereof between January 1, 1947, and October 30, 1947, at which investigation of Dalton Trumbo was considered, referred to, or acted upon or authorized.

2. All releases and statements issued by or on behalf of the House Committee on Un-American Activities whether to the press or otherwise from January 1, 1947, to October 30, 1947, which referred to or discussed Dalton Trumbo.

3. All publications, documents, statements, or communications relating to Dalton Trumbo and submitted to the House Committee on Un-American Activities between January 1, 1947, and October 30, 1947.

4. Transcripts of committee meetings or executive sessions fom January 1, 1947, to October 30, 1947, at which the committee considered and/or discussed the said Dalton Trumbo.

5. All reports, communications, and correspondence and memoranda relating to the investigation of the said Dalton Trumbo by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* DALTON TRUMBO, NO. 1353–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday the 26th day of April, 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 22d day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and David Carliner attorneys for Dalton Trumbo.

Schedule A

1. Stenographic transcript of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee of the same from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947, at which the definition or content of phrases, or any portion of the phrases "un-American propaganda activities," and/or "subversive and un-American propaganda * * * (which) attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution," were considered or acted upon, or on which any action was taken by the committee in connection with the scope of its authority and powers, or in connection with any constitutional limitations thereon.

2. All press releases issued by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or its chairman or its members from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947, dealing with the definition or content of phrases, or any portion of the phrases, "un-American propaganda activities," and/or "subversive and un-American propaganda * * * (which) attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution."

3. All reports of the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947, including but not limited to:

Author	Date	House Report Nos.	Congress	Session
Thomas	AYD	271	80th	1st.
Do	CP	209	do	Do.
Do	The Communist Party of the United States as an agent of a foreign power.		do	Do.
Do	Southern Conference	592	do	Do.
Do	Civil Rights Congress	1115	do	Do.

4. Transcripts of all hearings, public and executive, held by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947, including but not limited to the following volumes and subjects:

1947: November 22, 1946 (revised 1947), Budenz; February 6, 1947, Eisler; bills to outlaw CP, March 24–28, 1947; April 9, 1947, Eugene Dennis; July 7, 1947, Walter S. Steele; February 27, July 23–25, 1947, Communists in Labor Unions; July 22, 1947, Kravchenko.

5. All reports of investigators for the committee issued by the committee from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947.

6. All releases and statements issued by, or on behalf of, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and/or stenographic transcripts of meetings of the committee from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947, relating to or discussing the investigation of organizations, groups, or individuals which disseminate propaganda or influence or attempt to influence public opinion.

7. The records of names of all organizations and groups compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947, which are allegedly "subversive" or "un-American."

8. The records of names of all individuals compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1947 to October 20, 1947, which are alleged "subversive" or "un-American."

9. For the period from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947, all correspondence and memoranda from and to the committee, or from and to individual members of the committee, or from and to members of the commitee staff relating to findings by the committee or to material in the committee files concerning the names of organizations, groups, or individuals in the files of the committee.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

PERMANENT BASIS FOR NURSERIES AND NURSERY SCHOOLS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 5808) to continue on a permanent basis a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to authorize and direct the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia to establish and operate in the public schools and other suitable locations a system of nurseries and nursery schools for day care of school-age and under-school-age children, and for other purposes", approved July 16, 1946, as amended, is amended by striking out "and until June 30, 1948, and no longer."

SEC. 2. Section 4 of such act of July 16, 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for each fiscal year thereafter, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 1, after the word "longer", insert "and inserting 'and until June 30, 1949'."

Page 2, line 6, after the figure "1949" strike out "and for each fiscal year thereafter."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word in order to interrogate the chairman of the District of Columbia Committee on this day nursery. Has the gentleman gone into this matter carefully enough to draw the bill in such form that people who are able to take care of their own children will have to pay for that care.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. I may say to the gentleman from Nebraska that this is on a fee basis in the case of everybody who can afford it.

Mr. STEFAN. Based on a net income of how much? The gentleman will recall the people whose combined earnings were as much as $10,000 or $12,000 a year have had their children taken care of by this organization, whereas there are a lot of widows whose salaries are very, very low who cannot get their children in at all. What do you do about that?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That has been carefully corrected. I think the average income here is $1,840 in the case of families running from one and two in some cases to as many as five in others.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman knows there were some who were earning as much as $10,000 a year combined earnings who had their children in these day-care schools, whereas widows earning very meager salaries were unable to get their children in at all.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is exactly so. I gave attention to that some time ago. Those faults have been corrected.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman for the information.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the amended title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to continue a system of nurseries and nursing schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children of the District of Columbia."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the amended title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 2 in the amended title which follows line 10, strike out the words "nurseries and nursing."

The amendment was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to continue a system of schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children of the District of Columbia."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL FOUNDATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6209) to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Protestant Episcopal Cathedral Foundation of the District of Columbia," approved January 6, 1893, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Protestant Episcopal Cathedral Foundation of the District of Columbia," approved January 6, 1893, as amended, is hereby amended with respect to the number of trustees authorized therein and the method of providing for a quorum of such trustees, by adding at the end of the first section the following paragraph:

"The present board of trustees of said corporation is hereby authorized to choose additional trustees, so that the board shall hereafter consist of such number of trustees as the board may from time to time determine, not exceeding a total of 30, which board as hereafter constituted shall succeed to and exercise all of the powers heretofore granted to the board as heretofore constituted, subject to all of the provisions and limitations in such act, as amended, and shall be authorized to fill any vacancies which may occur and to prescribe, by bylaws, such number as shall constitute a quorum to do business."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA], whose subcommittee handled this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to permit the Protestant Episcopal Cathedral Foundation, which was incorporated a number of years ago, to increase the number of trustees to 30. This will allow the corporation to facilitate and assist the formation of subcommittees and provide better supervision of the foundation's activities, which have grown and increased considerably in the 50 years that have elapsed.

Mr. Speaker, I may say that I know of no objection of any kind to this bill.

I move the previous question on the bill.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO INCORPORATE THE ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF WASHINGTON A CORPORATION SOLE

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6203) to incorporate the Roman Catholic archbishop of Washington a corporation sole, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Patrick A. O'Boyle, Roman Catholic archbishop of Washington, and his successors in office, in accordance with the discipline and government of the Roman Catholic Church, hereby is created and declared to be a corporation sole.

SEC. 2. The corporation—

A. shall have perpetual succession;

B. may contract in the same manner and to the same extent as a natural person and may sue and be sued;

C. may have and use a corporate seal and may alter and change the same at pleasure;

D. may acquire real and personal property by purchase, devise, bequest, gift, or otherwise, and hold, own, use, lease, assign, convey, or otherwise dispose of the same in like manner and to the same extent as a natural person;

E. may borrow money, issue notes or other negotiable paper, and secure the money borrowed by mortgage or by deed of trust on said real or personal property or any part thereof;

F. and may perform such other acts in the furtherance of the objects and purposes of the corporation that are not inconsistent with the Constitution of the United States or the law in force in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. The objects and purposes of the corporation shall be religious, charitable, and educational.

SEC. 4. In the event that a vacancy should occur in said archbishopric and an administrator shall be elected or appointed in accordance with the discipline and government of the Roman Catholic Church, such administrator shall, until the installation of a successor archbishop, be authorized to do and perform all acts which the corporation is authorized to do and perform. The election and appointment of such administrator shall be evidenced by a certificate signed by the chancelor of the Archdiocese of Washington, duly acknowledged and filed with the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed as changing any law relating to taxation or exemption from taxation of any real or personal property.

SEC. 6. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to vest the same powers in the recently established archdiocese of Washington as those vested in the archbishop of Baltimore.

Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA: On page 2, line 24, strike out the word "and" following the word "election" and insert in lieu thereof the word "or."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE ACT TO PROVIDE REVENUE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 2409) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 16, 1947, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph lettered (h) of section 4 of title I of article I of the act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 16, 1947, is amended by striking out the period at the end of the paragraph, inserting a colon, and the following: *"Provided, however,* That the words 'trade or business' shall not include, for the purposes of this article, sales of tangible personal property whereby title to such property passes within or without the District, by a corporation or unincorporated business which does not physically have or maintain an office, warehouse, or other place of business in the District, and which has no officer, agent, or representative having an office or other place of business in the District, during the taxable year. For purposes of this proviso, the words 'agent' or 'representative' shall not include any independent broker engaged independently in regularly soliciting orders in the District for sellers and who holds himself out as such."

SEC. 2. Section 1 of title X of article I of said act is amended by striking out the period at the end of the section, inserting a colon, and the following: *"Provided further,* That income derived from the sale of tangible personal property by a corporation or unincorporated business not carrying on or engaging in trade or business within the District as defined in title I of this article shall not be considered as income from sources within the District for purposes of this article."

SEC. 3. Section 4 of title XIV of article I of said act is repealed.

SEC. 4. The amendments made by this act shall apply to the taxable year or part thereof beginning on the 1st day of January 1948, and to succeeding taxable years.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That paragraph lettered (h) of section 4 of title I of article I of the act entitled 'An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved July 16, 1947, is amended by striking out the period at the end of the paragraph, inserting a colon, and the following: *'Provided, however,* That the words "trade or business" shall not include, for the purposes of this article—

"'(1) Sales of tangible personal property whereby title to such property passes within or without the District, by a corporation or unincorporated business which does not physically have or maintain an office, warehouse, or other place of business in the District, and which has no officer, agent, or representative having an office or other place of business in the District, during the taxable year; or

"'(2) Sales of tangible personal property by a corporation or unincorporated business which does not maintain an office or other place of business in the District and which has no office, agent, or representative in the District except for the sole purpose of doing business with the United States, but such corporations and unincorporated businesses shall be subject to the licensing provisions in title XIV of this article.

" 'For purposes of this proviso, the words "agent" or "representative" shall not include any independent broker engaged independently in regularly soliciting orders in the District for sellers and who holds himself out as such.'

"SEC. 2. Section 1 of title X of article I of said act is amended by striking out the period at the end of the section, inserting a colon, and the following: *'Provided further,* That income derived from the sale of tangible personal property by a corporation or unincorporated business not carrying on or engaging in trade or business within the District as defined in title I of this article shall not be considered as income from sources within the District for purposes of this article, with the exception of income from sales to the United States not excluded from gross income as provided in title III, section 2 (b) (13) of this article.'

"SEC. 3. Paragraph lettered (b) of section 2 of title III of article I of said act is amended by adding thereto the following subparagraph:

"'(13) Income derived from the sale of tangible personal property to the United States by corporations and unincorporated businesses having their principal places of business located outside the District, which property is delivered from places outside the District for use outside the District: *Provided, however,* That the taxpayer shall furnish to the Assessor a statement in writing of the amount of gross sales so made and, if required by the Assessor, a list of the names of the agencies of the United States through which such property was sold.'

"SEC. 4. Section 4 of title XIV of article I of said act is repealed.

"SEC. 5. The amendments made by this act shall apply to the taxable year or part thereof beginning on the 1st day of January 1948, and to succeeding taxable years."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, in the Revenue Act of 1947 as it applies to the District of Columbia some confusion has arisen concerning the taxation on income from sales in the District of Columbia by outside firms that maintain no representation here. The same question arose in connection with sales of the Federal Government, notably the Navy operating through an independent broker.

It was agreed that ought to be clarified, which is the purpose of the pending bill. It has the concurrence of the Commissioners, the Corporation Counsel's office and the unanimous report of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TREATMENT OF SEXUAL PSYCHOPATHS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6071) to provide for the treatment of sexual psychopaths in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent for its consideration in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I

INDECENT EXPOSURE

SEC. 101. Section 9 of the act of July 29, 1892, entitled "An act for the preservation of the public peace and the protection of property within the District of Columbia," as amended (D. C. Code, 1940 ed., sec. 22–1112), is hereby amended by inserting "(a)" before "That it shall not be lawful" and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Any person or persons who shall make any obscene or indecent exposure of his or her person or their persons, as described in subsection (a), knowing he or she or they are in the presence of a child under the age of 16 years, shall be punished by imprisonment of not more than 6 months, or fined in amount not to exceed $500."

IMMORALITY—INVITING FOR PURPOSE OF, PROHIBITED

SEC. 102. The first section of the act of August 15, 1935, entitled "An act for the suppression of prostitution in the District of Columbia" (D. C. Code, 1940 ed., sec. 22–2701) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That it shall not be lawful for any person to invite, entice, persuade, or to address for the purpose of inviting, enticing, or persuading any person or persons 16 years of age or over, in or upon any avenue, street, road, highway, open space, alley, public square, enclosure, public building or other public place, store, shop, or reservation or at any public gathering or assembly in the District of Columbia, to accompany, go with, or follow him or her to his or her residence, or to any other house or building, enclosure, or other place, for the purpose of prostitution, or any other immoral or lewd purpose, under a penalty of not more than $100 or imprisonment for not more than 90 days, or both. And it shall not be lawful for any person to invite, entice, or persuade, or address for the purpose of inviting, enticing, or persuading any such person or persons from any door, window, porch, or portico of any house or building to enter any house, or go with, accompany, or follow him or her to any place whatever, for the purpose of prostitution, or any other immoral or lewd purpose, under the like penalties herein provided for the same conduct in the streets, avenues, roads, highways, or alleys, public squares, open spaces, enclosures, public buildings or other public places, stores, shops, or reservations or at any public gatherings or assemblies."

INDECENT ACTS—CHILDREN

SEC. 103. (a) Any person who shall take, or attempt to take any immoral, improper, or indecent liberties with any child of either sex, under the age of 16 years, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, or gratifying the lust or passions of sexual desires, either of such person or of such child, or of both such person and such child, or who shall commit, or attempt to commit, any lewd or lascivious act upon or with the body, or any part or member thereof, of such child, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, or gratifying the lust or passions or sexual desires, either of such person or of such child, or of both such person and such child shall be imprisoned in a penitentiary, not more than 10 years.

(b) Any such person who shall, in the District of Columbia, take any such child or shall entice, allure, or persuade any such child, to any place whatever for the purpose either of taking any such immoral, improper, or indecent liberties with such child, with said intent or of committing any such lewd, or lascivious act upon or with the body, or any part or member thereof, of such child with said intent, shall be imprisoned in the penitentiary not more than 5 years.

(c) Consent by a child to any act or conduct prescribed by subsection (a) or (b) shall not be a defense, nor shall lack of knowledge of the child's age be a defense.

(d) The provisions of this section shall not apply to the offenses covered by section 104 of this act or by section 808 of the act of March 3, 1901, entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," as amended and supplemented (D. C. Code, 1940 ed., sec. 22–2801).

SODOMY

SEC. 104. (a) Every person who shall be convicted of taking into his or her mouth or anus the sexual organ of any other person or animal, or who shall be convicted of placing his or her sexual organ in the mouth or anus of any other person or animal, or who shall be convicted of committing any other unnatural or perverted sexual act with any

other person or animal, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or be imprisoned for a period not exceeding 10 years. Any person convicted under this section of committing such act with a person under the age of 16 years shall be fined not more than $1,000 or be imprisoned for a period not exceeding 20 years. And in any indictment for the commission of any of the acts, hereby declared to be offenses, it shall not be necessary to set forth the particular unnatural or perverted sexual practice with the commission of which the defendant may be charged, nor to set forth the particular manner in which said unnatural or perverted sexual practice was committed, but it shall be sufficient if the indictment set forth that the defendant committed a certain unnatural and perverted sexual practice with a person or animal, as the case may be.

(b) Any penetration, however slight, is sufficient to complete the crime specified in this section. Proof of emission shall not be necessary.

TITLE II

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 201. For the purpose of this title—

(1) The term "sexual psychopath" means a person, not insane, who by a course of repeated misconduct in sexual matters has evidenced such lack of power to control his sexual impulses as to be dangerous to other persons because he is likely to attack or otherwise inflict injury, loss, pain, or other evil on the objects of his desire.

(2) The term "court" means the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, the criminal branch of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, or the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, as the case may be.

(3) The term "patient" means a person with respect to whom there has been filed with the clerk of any court a statement in writing setting forth facts tending to show that such person is a sexual psychopath.

(4) The term "criminal proceeding" means a proceeding in any court against a person for a criminal offense, and includes all stages of such a proceeding from (A) the time the person is indicted, charged by an information, or charged with an offense in the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, to (B) the entry of judgment, or, if the person is granted probation, the completion of the period of probation.

FILING OF STATEMENT

SEC. 202. (a) Whenever it shall appear to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia that any person within the District of Columbia, other than a defendant in a criminal proceeding is a sexual psychopath, such attorney may file with the clerk of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia a statement in writing setting forth the facts tending to show that such person is a sexual psychopath.

(b) Whenever it shall appear to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia that any defendant in any criminal proceeding prosecuted by such attorney or any of his assistants is a sexual psychopath, such attorney may file with the clerk of the court in which such proceeding is pending a statement in writing setting forth the facts tending to show that such defendant is a sexual psychopath.

(c) Whenever it shall appear to any court that any defendant in any criminal proceeding pending in such court is a sexual psychopath, the court may, if it deems such procedure advisable, direct the officer prosecuting the defendant to file with the clerk of such court a statement in writing setting forth the facts tending to show that such defendant is a sexual psychopath.

(d) Any statement filed in a criminal proceeding pursuant to subsection (b) or (c) may be filed only (1) before trial, (2) after conviction or plea of guilty but before sentencing, or (3) after conviction or plea of guilty but before the completion of probation.

(e) This section shall not apply to an individual in a criminal proceeding who is charged with rape or assault with intent to rape.

RIGHT TO COUNSEL

SEC. 203. A patient shall have the right to have the assistance of counsel at every stage of the proceeding under this title. Before the court appoints psychiatrists pursuant to section 204 it shall advise the patient of his right to counsel and shall assign counsel to represent him unless the patient is able to obtain counsel or elects to proceed without counsel.

EXAMINATION BY PSYCHIATRISTS

SEC. 204. (a) When a statement has been filed with the clerk of any court pursuant to section 202, such court shall appoint two qualified psychiatrists to make a personal examination of the patient. The patient shall be required to answer questions asked by the psychiatrists under penalty of contempt of court. Each psychiatrist shall file a written report of the examination, which shall include a statement of his conclusion as to whether the patient is a sexual psychopath.

(b) The counsel for the patient shall have the right to inspect the reports of the examination of the patient. No such report and no evidence resulting from the personal examination of the patient shall be admissible against him in any judicial proceeding except the proceeding under this title to determine whether the patient is a sexual psychopath.

WHEN HEARING IS REQUIRED

SEC. 205. If in their reports filed pursuant to section 204, both psychiatrists state that the patient is a sexual psychopath, or if both state that they are unable to reach any conclusion by reason of the partial or complete refusal of the patient to submit to thorough examination, or if one states that the patient is a sexual psychopath and the other states that he is unable to reach any conclusion by reason of the partial or complete refusal of the patient to submit to thorough examination, then the court shall conduct a hearing in the manner provided in section 206 to determine whether the patient is a sexual psychopath. If, on the basis of the reports filed, the court is not required to conduct such a hearing, the court shall enter an order dismissing the proceeding under this title to determine whether the patient is a sexual psychopath.

HEARING; COMMITMENT TO ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

SEC. 206. Upon evidence introduced at a hearing held for that purpose the court shall determine whether or not the patient is a sexual psychopath. Such hearing shall be conducted without a jury unless, before such hearing and within 15 days after the date on which the second report is filed pursuant to section 204, a jury is demanded by the patient or by the officer filing the statement. The rules of evidence applicable in judicial proceedings in the court shall be applicable to hearings pursuant to this section; but, notwithstanding any such rule, evidence of conviction of any number of crimes the commission of which tend to show that the patient is a sexual psychopath and of the punishment inflicted therefor shall be admissible at any such hearing. The patient shall be entitled to an appeal as in other cases. If the patient is determined to be a sexual psychopath, the court shall commit him to St. Elizabeths Hospital to be confined there until released in accordance with section 207.

PAROLE; DISCHARGE

SEC. 207. Any person committed under this title may be released from confinement when the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital finds that he has sufficiently recovered so as to not be dangerous to other persons, provided if the person to be released be one charged with crime or undergoing sentence therefor, the Superintendent of the hospital shall give notice thereof to the judge of the criminal court and deliver him to the court in obedience to proper precept.

STAY OF CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS

SEC. 208. Any statement filed in a criminal proceeding pursuant to subsection (b) or (c) of section 202 shall stay such criminal proceeding until whichever of the following first occurs:

(1) The proceeding under this title to determine whether the patient is a sexual psychopath is dismissed pursuant to section 205 or withdrawn;

(2) It is determined pursuant to section 206 that the patient is not a sexual psychopath; or

(3) The patient is discharged from St. Elizabeths hospital pursuant to section 207.

CRIMINAL LAW UNCHANGED

SEC. 209. Nothing in this title shall alter in any respect the tests of mental capacity applied in criminal prosecutions under the laws of the District of Columbia.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 7, line 2, insert comma after word "proceeding."

Page 9, line 1, strike "the" and insert "a."

Page 10, line 5, strike "tend" and insert "tends."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Nebraska, chairman of the subcommittee that handled this very important matter, would like to be heard.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to strengthen the laws of the District of Columbia relating to sex offenses and the treatment of persons charged with sex crimes. The present laws of the District of Columbia do not seem adequate to handle sex crimes against children.

This matter of sex crimes was considered very thoroughly in the committee which held rather searching hearings and consulted with the district attorney's office, the Corporation Counsel's office and psychiatrists. We feel this bill is a step in the right direction to set up legislative authority for handling some of the sex crimes that occur within the District of Columbia.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. Will the gentleman tell me just what the penalty is now? What was the penalty and what is the penalty now?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, on page 2 of the report will be found the penalties for the different types of sex offenses. There is no provision in the code as it now exists for certain of these crimes. This increases the penalty for crimes against children. It about doubles those penalties.

In the main portion of the bill there is set up the treatment of chronic sex offenders.

I may say that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACKINNON] assisted us in the writing of this bill. Minnesota has a bill that has stood the court tests of the Minnesota Supreme Court and the United States Supreme Court and a similar definition was written in this bill for the treatment of chronic sex offenders.

They are committed to psychiatric hospitals for their protection. We have thrown around it all of the ordinary safeguards.

Mr. CHELF. When it is found that a person is a sexual pervert and he ought to be confined, is there a penalty, and, if so, what is the penalty? What is the final punishment?

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, title II of this bill does not deal with offenses of that character at all, except in extremely aggravated situations. In title I of the bill there are some provisions dealing with what may be classed as sex crimes. Title I strengthens the law with respect to such cases, provides for increased penalties, for presently specified offenses, and adds additional offenses and penalties therefor for breaches of public decorum that have not previously been covered by District statutes.

Title II of the bill is not aimed at the ordinary sexual pervert, nor is it limited to perverts. It is aimed at persons who are a dangerous menace to society and who by a repeated course of conduct have evidenced that they are a dangerous menace to society, because by a repeated course of misconduct in sexual matters they have demonstrated such lack of power to control their sexual impulses as to be dangerous to other persons because they are likely to attack or otherwise inflict injury, loss, pain, or other evil on the objects of their desire.

Title II does not provide for any criminal penalty. It provides that such persons shall be considered as sick persons, and they are to be handled in that way rather than as criminals.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The purpose of this bill is, of course, is to multiply the approach a little bit, and instead of calling him a criminal he is referred to as a patient, and if it is established that he is a sexual psychopath, then he will be sent to St. Elizabeths and treated by a qualified psychiatrist. It treats with a social problem that is evident everywhere in the country.

Mr. CHELF. I am very much in favor of the bill. I just wanted a little clarification.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is that all the protection the people of Washington may expect as in the case of the fellow who took a little 9-year-old girl and asked the direction, and he said he was lost?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, indeed. Some sections in this bill implement and fortify the criminal statute of the District of Columbia, and the rest of them are, of course, still in effect. But, this deals with a certain kind of case.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does it strengthen the protection or weaken it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It strengthens it very much.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGULATING THE PRACTICE OF OPTOMETRY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6087) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia" and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia," approved May 28, 1924, is amended to read as follows:

"That (a) the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia is hereby declared to affect the public health and safety and to be subject to regulation and control in the public interest. Optometry is hereby declared to be a profession and it is further declared to be a matter of public interest and concern that the optometric profession merit and receive the confidence of the public and that only qualified optometrists be permitted to practice optometry in the District of Columbia. All provisions of this act relating to the practice of optometry shall be construed in accordance with this declaration of policy.

"(b) As used in this act, the term 'optometry' means the science and art devoted to the examination of the human eye; to the analysis of ocular functions; or to the prescribing, providing, furnishing, adapting, and employing of lenses, prisms, contact lenses, ocular exercises, visual training, orthoptics, and all preventive or corrective optometric methods for the aid, correction, or relief of the human eye; and the term 'optometrist' means a person who practices optometry, or any part thereof, as defined in this subsection."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person in the District of Columbia to engage in the practice of optometry or represent himself to be a practitioner of optometry, or attempt to determine by an examination of the eyes the kind of eyeglasses required by any person, or represent himself to be a licensed optometrist when not so licensed, or to represent himself as capable of examining the eyes of any person for the purpose of fitting glasses, excepting those hereinafter exempted, unless he shall have fulfilled the requirements and complied with the conditions of this act and shall have obtained a license from the District of Columbia Board of Optometry, created by this act; nor shall it be lawful for any person in the District of Columbia to represent that he is a lawful holder of a license as provided by this act when in fact he is not such lawful holder, or to impersonate any licensed practitioner of optometry, or shall fail to register the certificate as provided in section 13.

"(b) It shall be unlawful in the District of Columbia for any person to include in an advertisement offering to furnish to the public professional services relating to the examination of the human eye; or in an advertisement relating to the analysis of ocular functions; or in an advertisement relating to the prescribing, providing, furnishing, adapting, and employing of lenses, prisms, contact lenses, ocular exercises, visual training, orthoptics, and all preventive or corrective optometric methods for the aid, correction, or relief of the human eye; or in an advertisement relating to the furnishing to the public of spectacles, eyeglasses, lenses, mountings, or similar prosthetic devices, whether such advertisement is made by print, radio, letter, display or any other means: (1) the fee for such professional services, or any reference to such fee; (2) prices of such prosthetic devices, or any reference to such prices; (3) the terms of credit or payment for such professional services or prosthetic devices, or any reference to such terms; (4) an offer of such professional services or prosthetic devices at a discount, as a gift, or free of charge, or any reference to such an offer; or (5) a guaranty of satisfaction of such profession services or prosthetic devices, or any reference to such a guaranty.

"(c) It shall be unlawful in the District of Columbia for any persons to sell, dispense, or supply to any person an ophthalmic lens which is not of first quality, unless prior thereto such person is informed that such lens is substandard. For the purpose of this subsection, a substandard lens is defined as any ophthalmic lens which according to trade usages is not of first quality.

"(d) Any persons violating any of the provisions of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction for the first offense shall be fined not more than $500, and upon conviction for any subsequent offense shall be fined not less than $500 nor more than $1,000 or be imprisoned in the District jail not less than 3 months nor more than 1 year, or both, in the discretion of the court."

SEC. 3. Section 5 of such law is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. The Board shall have authority and it shall be its duty to make necessary regulations which shall include restrictions prohibiting advertising by means of large signs, of large displays, of glaring light signs, or of displays or signs containing as a part thereof the representation of the human eye or any part thereof, and acts of unprofessional conduct by optometrists. All such bylaws and regulations shall, before they become effective, be approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia."

SEC. 4. Section 11 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 11. Any person over the age of 21 years, of good moral character, who has had a preliminary education equivalent to a 4 years' high-school course of instruction acceptable to the Board (which shall be determined either by examination or by certificate as to work done in an approved institution), and who is a graduate of a school or college of optometry in good standing (as determined by the Board and which maintains a course in optometry of not less than 4 years), shall be entitled to take the standard examination. Such standard examination shall consist of test in—

"(a) practical optics;

"(b) theoretical optometry;

"(c) anatomy and physiology and such pathology as may be applied to optometry;

"(d) practical optometry;

"(e) theoretic and physiologic optics."

SEC. 5. Section 16 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 16. (a) The Board may, in its discretion, after a hearing as provided in section 17, refuse to grant a license to any applicant for any of the following reasons:

"(1) That the applicant has been convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude.

"(2) That the applicant is a habitual user of narcotics or any other drugs which impair the intellect and judgment to such an extent as to incapacitate the applicant for the duties of an optometrist.

"(b) The Board may, in its discretion, after a hearing as provided in section 17, cancel, revoke, or suspend the operation of any license by it granted for any of the following reasons:

"(1) That such license was procured through fraud or misrepresentation.

"(2) That the holder thereof has been a habitual user of narcotics or any other drugs which impair the intellect and judgment to such an extent as to incapacitate the holder for the duties of an optometrist.

"(3) That the holder thereof has been convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude.

"(4) That the holder thereof has been guilty of advertising professional superiority or the performance of professional services in a superior manner; advertising prices for

professional services; advertising contrary to regulations prescribed by the Board of Optometry in accordance with section 5 of this act; employing or making use of solicitors or free publicity press agents, directly or indirectly, or advertising any free optometric service or free examination; or advertising to guarantee optometric services.

"(5) That the holder thereof is guilty of unprofessional conduct as prescribed by regulations of the Board of Optometry in accordance with section 5 of this act.

"(6) That the holder thereof has been convicted of an offense in violation of section 2 of this act.

"(7) That such person has been guilty of practicing optometry while suffering from an infectious or otherwise contagious disease.

"(8) That the holder thereof has been guilty of using the title 'Doctor' or 'Dr.' as a prefix to his name without using the word 'Optometrist' as a suffix to his name."

SEC. 6. Section 17 of this act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 17. Any person who is the holder of a license or who is an applicant for a license against whom any charges are preferred shall be furnished by the Board with a copy of the complaint and shall have a hearing before the Board at which hearing he may be represented by counsel. At such hearing witnesses may be examined for and against the accused respecting such charges; the Board shall thereupon pass upon such charges. An appeal may be taken from the decision of the Board to the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia."

SEC. 7. Section 20 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 20. The provisions of this act, except the provisions of subsections (b), (c), and (d) of section 2, shall not apply—

"(a) to physicians and surgeons practicing under authority or license issued under the laws of the District of Columbia for the practice of medicine and surgery;

"(b) to persons selling spectacles and/or eyeglasses and who do not attempt either directly or indirectly to adapt them to the eye, and who do not practice or profess the practice of optometry."

With the following committee amendments:

Beginning at line 10, page 3, strike through line 7 on page 4.

Page 4, line 8, strike "(c)" and insert "(b)."

Page 4, line 11, change period to comma and insert "and designate the particulars in which it is substandard."

Page 4, line 12, after the word "is", insert "one which has been sold by the manufacturer as substandard, or."

Page 4, line 15, strike "(d)" and insert "(c)."

Page 8, line 14, strike ", and (d)."

Page 8, line 14, strike comma between "(b)" and "(c)" and insert "and."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, may I simply observe that in connection with this optometry bill, while there has been a great deal of controversy about it, it has moved into all sections of the country. The revised bill which is now before the House was finally introduced and considerable work was done on it by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] and his subcommittee. Other parts of the controversy have been met by amendment, together with amendments presently pending on the desk and printed in the report accompanying the bill.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments, which are pending at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. DIRKSEN:

On page 7, line 5, strike after the word "of", "ad" and all of lines 6 and 7, including the words "for professional services" and the semicolon in line 8.

Place a period after the word "act" in line 10, page 7.

Strike out the balance of line 10 after the word "act" and all of lines 11, 12, and 13 on page 7.

Page 8, line 18, strike out all of paragraph (a) down to and including line 20 and insert: "(a) Persons licensed to practice medicine or osteopathy in the District of Columbia."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EMERGENCY RENT ACT

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2195) to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2195) to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendments numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"(a) Any housing accommodations in hotels, which accommodations are used exclusively for transient occupancy, that is for living quarters for nonresidents upon a short-time basis;"

And the House agrees to the same.

GREGORY MCMAHON,
JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
OREN HARRIS,
T. G. ABERNETHY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

C. D. BUCK,
HARRY P. CAIN,
JAMES P. KEM,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2195) to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: The Senate bill decontrolled "any housing accommodations in hotels, which accommodations are used predominantly for transient occupancy, that is, for living quarters for nonresidents upon a short-time basis." The House amendment inserted a provision, in lieu of the Senate provision, decontrolling "any housing accommodations in hotels, as defined by this Act, used exclusively for transient occupancy." The Senate recedes with an amendment adopting the House provision that the accommodations must be used exclusively for transient occupancy, but using the language of the Senate bill with the word "predominantly" changed to "exclusively."

Amendments Nos. 2 and 3: Under the Senate bill additional housing accommodations created by conversion after March 31, 1948, were decontrolled. These amendments would limit the application of the provision to conversion of buildings or facilities or both not heretofore used for housing accommodations. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 4: This amendment inserted a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 3. The prohibition against actions to recover possession of any housing accommodations set forth in section 5 (b) of the Act approved December 2, 1941, entitled 'District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act' shall not apply unless the tenant is actually occupying such housing accommodations as a home."

There was no corresponding provision in the Senate bill. The House recedes. It was the feeling of the conferees that the legal considerations involved in this amendment might better be considered in a separate legislative proposal.

Amendments Nos. 5 and 6: These amendments make changes in section numbers and in conformity with the action of the conferees on amendment No. 4 the House recedes.

JOS. P. O'HARA,
GREGORY MCMAHON,
JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
OREN HARRIS,
T. G. ABERNETHY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (S. 2195) to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the conference report.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is really no difference between the House and the Senate on this matter. There were some amendments, but they were only for the purpose of clarification.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURAL CEREMONIES, 1949

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have three House joint resolutions that relate to the preparation for the inaugural ceremonies in January 1949. These are the customary joint resolutions that are passed every 4 years, and there is no controversy about them.

First, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 379) to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the Presidential inaugural ceremonies in 1949.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That $37,100, or so much thereof as may be necessary, payable in like manner as other appropriations for the expenses of the District of Columbia, is hereby authorized to be appropriated to enable the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to maintain public order and protect life and property in said District of Columbia from January 15 to January 26, 1949, both inclusive, including the employment of personal services, payment of allowances, traveling expenses, hire and means of transportation, cost of removing and relocating streetcar-loading platforms; for the construction, rent, maintenance, and expenses incident to the operation of temporary public comfort stations, first-aid stations, and information booths, during the period aforesaid, and other incidental expenses in the discretion of the Commissioners. Said Commissioners are hereby authorized and directed to make all reasonable regulations necessary to secure such preservation of public order and protection of life and property, and to make special regulations respecting the standing, movements, and operating of vehicles of whatever character or kind during said period; and to grant, under such conditions as they may impose, special licenses to peddlers and vendors to sell goods, wares, and merchandise on the streets, avenues, and sidewalks in the District of Columbia, and to charge for such privilege such fees as they may deem proper.

SEC. 2. Such regulations and licenses shall be in force 1 week prior to said inauguration, during said inauguration, and 1 week subsequent thereto, and shall be published in one or more of the daily newspapers published in the District of Columbia and in such other manner as the Commissioners may deem best to acquaint the public with the same; and no penalty prescribed for the violation of any such regulations shall be enforced until 5 days after such publication. Any person violating any of such regulations shall be liable for each such offense to a fine of not to exceed $100 in the municipal court for the District of Columbia, and in default of payment thereof to imprisonment in the workhouse of said District for not longer than 60 days.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 380) authorizing the granting of permits to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1949, and for other purposes, and further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, and such other officers of the District of Columbia and the United States as control any public lands in the District of Columbia, are hereby authorized to grant permits, under such restrictions as they may deem necessary, to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies to be appointed with the approval of the President-elect for the use of any reservations or other public spaces in the District of Columbia under their control on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1949: *Provided*, That in their opinion no serious or permanent injuries will be thereby inflicted upon such reservations or public spaces or statuary thereon; and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may designate for such and other purposes, on the occasion aforesaid, such streets, avenues, and sidewalks in said District of Columbia under their control as they may deem proper and necessary: *Provided, however*, That all stands or platforms that may be erected on the public space, as aforesaid, including such as may be erected in connection with the display of fireworks, shall be under the said supervision of the said inaugural committee, and no stand shall be built on the sidewalk, street, parks, and public grounds of the District of Columbia, not including the area on the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue directly in front of the White House, except such as are approved by the inaugural committee, the director of inspection of the District of Columbia, and the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency: *And provided further*, That the reservations or public spaces occupied by the stands or other structures shall, after the inauguration, be promptly restored to their condition before such occupation, and that the inaugural committee shall indemnify the appropriate agency of the Government for any damages of any kind whatsoever upon such reservations or spaces by reason of such use.

SEC. 2. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to permit the committee on illumination of the inaugural committee for said inaugural ceremonies to stretch suitable overhead conductors, with sufficient supports wherever necessary, for the purpose of connecting with the present supply of light for the purpose of effecting the said illumination: *Provided*, That if it shall be necessary to erect wires for illuminating or other purposes over any park or reservation in the District of Columbia, the work of erection and removal of said wires shall be under the supervision of the official in charge of said park or reservation: *Provided further*, That the said conductors shall not be used for conveying electrical currents after January 24, 1949, and shall with their supports, be fully and entirely removed from the streets and avenues of the said District of Columbia on or before January 31, 1949: *Provided further*, That the stretching and removing of the said wires shall be under the supervision of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or such other officials as may have jurisdiction in the premises, who shall see that the provisions of this joint resolution are enforced, that all needful precautions are taken for the protection of the public, and that the pavement of any street, avenue, or alley disturbed is replaced in as good condition as before entering upon the work herein authorized: *And provided further*, That no expense or damage on account of or due to the stretching, operation, or removal of the said temporary overhead conductors shall be incurred by the United States or the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Defense be, and he is hereby, authorized to loan to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies such hospital tents, smaller tents, camp appliances, ensigns, flags, signal numbers, etc., belonging to the Government of the United States (except battle flags), that are not now in use and may be suitable and proper for decoration, and which may, in their judgment, be spared without detriment to the public service, such flags to be used in connection with said ceremonies by said committee under such regulations and restrictions as may be prescribed by the said Secretary in decorating the fronts of public buildings and other places on the line of march between the Capitol and the Executive Mansion, and the interior of the reception hall: *Provided*, That the loan of the said hospital tents, smaller tents, camp appliances, ensigns, flags, signal numbers, etc., to the said committee shall not take place prior to the 11th of January, and they shall be returned by the 25th day of January 1949: *Provided further*, That the said committee shall indemnify the said Government for any loss or damage to such flags not necessarily incident to such use. That the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized to loan to the inaugural committee for the purpose of caring for the sick, injured, and infirm on the occasion of said inauguration such hospital tents and camp appliances, and other necessaries, hospital furniture, and utensils of all descriptions, ambulances, drivers, stretchers, and Red Cross flags and poles belonging to the Government of the United States as in his judgment may be spared and are not in use by the Government at the time of the inauguration: *And provided further*, That the inaugural committee shall indemnify the Government for any loss or damage to such hospital tents and appliances, as aforesaid, not necessarily incident to such use.

SEC. 4. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency be, and they are hereby, authorized to permit telegraph, telephone, radio-broadcasting and television companies to extend overhead wires to such points along the line of parade as shall be deemed by the chief marshal convenient for use in connection with the parade and other inaugural purposes, the said wires to be taken down within 10 days after the conclusion of the ceremonies.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 381) to provide for the quartering, in certain public buildings in the District of Columbia, of troops participating in the inaugural ceremonies of 1949, and ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Illinois failed to advise the House that the three joint resolutions which we are now discussing have been unanimously approved by his committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency or head of any executive department or establishment is authorized to allocate such space in any public building under his care and supervision as he deems necessary for the purposes of quartering troops participating in the inaugural ceremonies to be held on January 20, 1949,

but such use shall not continue after January 22, 1949. Authority granted by this joint resolution may be exercised notwithstanding the provisions of the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, approved April 28, 1902, prohibiting the use of public buildings in connection with inaugural ceremonies.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsidered was laid on the table.

DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1481) to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District, and further ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There will be an opportunity for discussion of the bill under this procedure.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. If there is going to be discussion on the matter, I withdraw my objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. STEFAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Minnesota mean he is opposed to the bill?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am definitely opposed to it.

Mr. STEFAN. Some more of us are opposed to it. I wonder if the gentleman does not want to object, to keep the bill off the floor entirely.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia is authorized to advance the standard time applicable to the District 1 hour for a period of each year commencing not earlier than the last Sunday of April and ending not later than the last Sunday of September. Any such time established by the Commissioners under authority of this act shall, during the period of the year for which it is applicable, to be the standard time for the District of Columbia.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN:
Line 5, strike out "a" and insert "the."
Line 5, strike out "of each year."
Line 6, after "April" insert "1948."
Line 7, after "September" insert "1948."
Line 9, strike out "of the year."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, first let me express my appreciation to my good friend from Minnesota for not pressing his objection. It is a rather difficult matter. This daylight-saving bill passed the Senate of the United States on April 6, 1948, by a very substantial vote of about 3 to 1. It came before our committee and was reported out by the subcommittee and we have had some difficulty, as you may well understand, in trying to get the bill up for immediate action. I tried to call it up by unanimous consent some days ago. Now comes District Day, but by the supervention of a discharge petition, it appeared that it might be possible that we would not have any District Day at all. I am grateful to the leadership and the House that they have managed to find some time to dispose of this District business.

First, let me say that we have tried in every way possible to save the time and energy of Members of the House. I know the difficulty of getting around to District legislation, and as a matter of fact, we have only taken one District Day a month. There is one occasion this year when we only had a single District Day in 6 weeks. We have rather tried to package the bills, and then bring them to you all at once. Sometimes, of course, difficulties ensue.

The daylight-saving bill should have been called up before because in most—I should say not most—sections, but a very substantial portion of the country they went on daylight-saving time as of yesterday. This bill does nothing more than confer upon the District Commissioners, the executive heads of the District of Columbia, the authority to impose daylight-saving time if they see fit to do so. In that respect it is patterned upon the bill that we presented and had passed last year. The Commissioners held hearings, and rather extensive hearings, and then on the basis of their findings, decreed daylight saving in accordance with the way it obtains in all other sections of the country.

As I say, it passed last year in the House by a vote of 218 to 145. It passed in the other body last year by a vote of 56 to 17, and passed in the other body this year by a vote of 46 to 17. It is only for 1 year. It does not make it permanent. We hope if favorable action finally obtains on the District Reorganization Act, that it will then become a matter to be taken care of under the general authority delegated to the executive head and heads of the District of Columbia, and will not come on as an annual problem for Congress to dispose.

I think there are three reasons why the House ought to act favorably upon this matter. The first is that others have daylight saving and we ought to conform insofar as possible in order to eliminate and avoid unnecessary confusion. We find confusion on radio schedules, trains, bank clearances, and on the stock market, and many, many other places. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAMBLE] said to me today, he came down from New York in 5 minutes for the very good reason that there was a disparity of 1 hour in time. New York is on daylight-saving time, and the District of Columbia is not.

When I say that other localities have it, that goes for Chicago, Philadelphia, St. Louis, Cleveland, New York, Baltimore, Annapolis, and most of the other metropolitan centers of the country. Because of the interdependence of business and the interrelationship of communications, the District of Columbia ought to conform since others do have daylight-saving time. Already I think it is a fair estimate to say that it applies to more than 50,000,000 people in this country where they are resident at the present time.

Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Illinois, California, Maryland, and Nevada, almost in their entirety, now have daylight-saving time. In addition, Tennessee, Michigan, West Virginia, Ohio, Missouri, Indiana, and Virginia have daylight saving in part. Those are contiguous areas and the confusion that has already manifested itself here springs from the fact that they have daylight saving and we do not. So the first reason is that others have it and the time in the District of Columbia should conform.

The second reason is that the District of Columbia wants it. There have been innumerable polls here, and when daylight saving was concluded last fall, they took a poll in Maryland, Virginia, and in the District of Columbia. I am not unmindful of the fact that there are certain trades and crafts and there are certain people in Government who object. Of course, the proposal was never born which, after examination, did not call for some objection. But in the main it can be said that nearly 70 percent of the people in the contiguous counties in Virginia and Maryland are willing to conform and are going to conform if we have daylight saving in the District of Columbia, and they are anxious to have it.

I think it is a safe estimate that about 70 percent of the people who have been polled are in favor of daylight saving. I have a long list of organizations, 30 or 40 in number, that I will not bother to put into the RECORD, but all of them, very prominent, are heartily in favor after the experience of last fall.

So the first reason is that others have it and it applies to fifty or more million people. The second reason why we should approve it is that the District of Columbia, through its people want it. The third reason is that they ought to have it.

A great contention was made on this floor last year that by virtue of the vagaries of time between our home constituencies and the District of Columbia the people back home could not get Members on the telephone when they wanted them. The fact of the matter is that Congress may adjourn some time in June. Then there is July, August, and September until the 29th day of September when that argument would not apply at all.

So would we be fair in penalizing the people who must remain here in the hot scorching season of the year when we have gone perhaps to cooler spots and to a little relaxation? They want it and for that reason they should have it.

Radio programs when remaining on the same time here that they have always been on are compelled to make transcriptions today. Last night they had transcriptions on the radio. Confusion and expense is involved. I said

there was confusion insofar as the markets are concerned because the markets close earlier in New York and Chicago than they do here.

The other night the former president of the District Bankers' Association said there would be considerable confusion on bank clearances because of the hour of difference where time is such an element.

That is the story. Others have it. The District of Columbia wants it as manifested by the polls and I think they should have it. I do not believe that because of considerations that obtain back home in Illinois or Missouri or Minnesota or California we should deny to them the right to have daylight saving.

This confers upon the Commissioners the authority to do it if they so see fit. That is in the spirit of a little home rule for the people who otherwise are voteless and without any representation except through the Congress.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I realize the hour is late, but I have always opposed daylight saving time and I shall continue to do so.

In the first place, I am sure my good friend from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] would agree with me that I have had no part in the delay which may have existed between the passage of the bill in the Senate and its being brought here for consideration, but I still say I feel very strongly that the greatest illusion, the greatest delusion I have ever met in my legislative experience is the theory of daylight saving time. In the first place, if the city of Philadelphia or the city of New York or the city of Chicago wants to go on daylight saving time, that is their business, but I say to you everything we do here in the city of Washington in a legislative way—and it is illustrative of the home-rule bill—affects the people of the country. Personally, I know our people are confused by the additional hour of daylight saving time that ensued last year.

While we are speaking of daylight saving time, you know we had it for 3½ years during the war. In 1945, this House and the Senate, without a dissenting vote, repealed daylight-saving time that existed during the war. Then, last year they came in with a bill for the Congress to authorize daylight saving in the District of Columbia. That bill was defeated last year. They finally came back with a nice little bill that authorized the District Commissioners to give them daylight saving time, and that bill was passed. That was sort of going up the hill and going down again.

The drive for daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia is not one which is agreed to by all people. While some of the organizations, it is true, have endorsed it, I do not know how many that represents in actual voice in either approval or disapproval, but certainly I want to say to you, in fairness to the people who have taken this matter up with me, that it is not in complete agreement. For example, I have a letter from the District Federation of Women's Clubs, signed by Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, in which she says this:

> I write to inform you that the District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs having a membership of approximately 6,000, in 1947 went on record as opposing the principle of daylight saving for the District of Columbia, unless daylight saving was made uniform throughout the United States.

Then she states this, which I think is highly important:

> It seems to us that daylight saving for one isolated locality means great confusion and annoyance in traveling. At best daylight saving is an artificial expedient for young people to give them more time for outdoor exercise. It is not desirable for mothers with young children, or for housekeepers, who must serve the evening meal and put their offspring to bed in the heat of the day. It is extremely hard on farming people, adding an extra hour of work to their already crowded lives. So if we have to endure this artificial arrangement, to please the pleasure of loving youth of the country, it seems to us it ought to be as painless as possible by making it universal, as was done during the war.

Let me read to you a little item that was in the Star here a while ago from a doctor in Philadelphia. He states:

> Daylight-saving time is a menace to the health of school children.

This was a statement made by Dr. John P. Turner, a member of the Philadelphia Board of Education. He goes on to say:

> Students are getting only 6 or 7 hours' sleep and great numbers are suffering from nervous reaction because of daylight saving. Instead of getting up at 7 o'clock, our children are getting up at six after staying up late because you just can't make a child go to bed when the sun is still up.

While some people may think it gives them greater time to play golf or more time in the garden, what it is doing is cheating the rest of the people of this city who want to sleep in the cool of the morning out of that additional hour of sleep.

There has been a great deal of hysteria about daylight saving in the District of Columbia. I know the elements behind the movement for daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia. They are not considering that after all Washington is the Nation's Capital, not operated for just the few people who may live in the metropolitan area of Washington, but a city that should be representative of what affects all of the people in the country.

Mr. Speaker, I am against this bill. I think it is a delusion, I repeat, because it does none of the things that it is supposed to do and does a great many things that are a nuisance and menace to the health of the people of the city of Washington.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'HARA) there were—ayes 41; noes 21.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 204, nays 92, not voting 134, as follows:

[Roll No. 50]

YEAS—204

Abernethy	Goodwin	Nixon
Albert	Gordon	Nodar
Allen, Calif.	Gossett	O'Brien
Allen, Ill.	Grant, Ind.	O'Toole
Anderson, Calif.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Owens
Angell	Hagen	Pace
Auchincloss	Hale	Patman
Bakewell	Hall,	Patterson
Banta	Edwin Arthur	Peden
Bates, Mass.	Hall,	Peterson
Beall	Leonard W.	Philbin
Bennett, Mich.	Halleck	Phillips, Tenn.
Blackney	Hand	Ploeser
Blatnik	Hardy	Plumley
Boggs, Del.	Harness, Ind.	Poage
Boggs, La.	Harvey	Potts
Bradley	Hays	Poulson
Bramblett	Hébert	Powell
Brehm	Herter	Preston
Bryson	Heselton	Price, Ill.
Buck	Holmes	Ramey
Burke	Hope	Rayburn
Burleson	Horan	Reed, Ill.
Busbey	Huber	Reeves
Butler	Isacson	Regan
Byrne, N. Y.	Jenison	Riehlman
Byrnes, Wis.	Johnson, Calif.	Rivers
Canfield	Jonkman	Robertson
Carroll	Karsten, Mo.	Rogers, Fla.
Carson	Kean	Rogers, Mass.
Case, N. J.	Keating	Rohrbough
Chapman	Kee	Rooney
Chelf	Keefe	Russell
Church	Kennedy	Sadlak
Coffin	Keogh	Sadowski
Cole, Kans.	Kersten, Wis.	St. George
Combs	Kilburn	Sanborn
Corbett	Klein	Sarbacher
Cotton	Landis	Sasscer
Crosser	Lane	Scott,
Crow	Latham	Hugh D., Jr.
Davis, Wis.	LeFevre	Seely-Brown
Dawson, Utah	Lesinski	Smathers
Deane	Lodge	Smith, Wis.
Devitt	Love	Snyder
Dirksen	Lucas	Spence
Domengeaux	Lyle	Stigler
Dondero	McDonough	Stockman
Donohue	McGregor	Teague
Doughton	McMahon	Thompson
Douglas	McMillen, Ill.	Tibbott
Durham	MacKinnon	Tollefson
Ellsworth	Macy	Towe
Elsaesser	Madden	Twyman
Engel, Mich.	Mahon	Vail
Engle, Calif.	Marcantonio	Van Zandt
Feighan	Mathews	Vursell
Fernandez	Meade, Ky.	Weichel
Fisher	Meade, Md.	Welch
Flannagan	Merrow	Whittington
Fletcher	Michener	Wigglesworth
Fogarty	Mills	Wilson, Ind.
Folger	Mitchell	Wilson, Tex.
Foote	Morrison	Winstead
Forand	Morton	Wolcott
Gamble	Muhlenberg	Wolverton
Gearhart	Multer	Woodruff
Gillie	Murdock	Worley
Goff	Nicholson	Youngblood

NAYS—92

Abbitt	Cole, Mo.	Hobbs
Allen, La.	Cole, N. Y.	Hoeven
Andersen,	Cooley	Hull
H. Carl	Cooper	Jackson, Wash.
Arnold	Courtney	Jensen
Barden	Cox	Johnson, Ill.
Bates, Ky.	Crawford	Johnson, Tex.
Beckworth	Cunningham	King
Bennett, Mo.	Curtis	Knutson
Bishop	Davis, Ga.	Larcade
Brooks	Dolliver	LeCompte
Brophy	Dorn	Lemke
Brown, Ga.	Gary	Lewis
Brown, Ohio	Granger	Lusk
Bulwinkle	Gregory	McCulloch
Camp	Griffiths	McMillan, S. C.
Cannon	Gross	Mack
Case, S. Dak.	Gwynne, Iowa	Martin, Iowa
Chenoweth	Harris	Miller, Md.
Clark	Havenner	Miller, Nebr.

Morris	Redden	Simpson, Ill.
Mundt	Reed, N. Y.	Smith, Kans.
Murray, Tenn.	Rees	Smith, Va.
Murray, Wis.	Richards	Stefan
Norblad	Riley	Stevenson
O'Hara	Rockwell	Talle
O'Konski	Sabath	Vorys
Passman	Schwabe, Mo.	Wheeler
Phillips, Calif.	Schwabe, Okla.	Whitten
Pickett	Short	Williams
Rankin	Sikes	Wood

NOT VOTING—134

Andresen, August H.	Gathings	McCormack
Andrews, Ala.	Gavin	McCowen
Andrews, N. Y.	Gillette	McDowell
Arends	Gore	McGarvey
Barrett	Gorski	Maloney
Battle	Graham	Manasco
Bell	Grant, Ala.	Mansfield
Bender	Harless, Ariz.	Mason
Bland	Harrison	Meyer
Bloom	Hart	Miller, Calif.
Bolton	Hartley	Miller, Conn.
Bonner	Hedrick	Monroney
Boykin	Heffernan	Morgan
Buchanan	Hendricks	Norrell
Buckley	Hess	Norton
Buffett	Hill	Pfeifer
Celler	Hinshaw	Potter
Chadwick	Hoffman	Price, Fla.
Chiperfield	Holifield	Priest
Clason	Jackson, Calif.	Rains
Clevenger	Jarman	Rich
Clippinger	Javits	Rizley
Colmer	Jenkins, Ohio	Ross
Coudert	Jenkins, Pa.	Scoblick
Cravens	Jennings	Scott, Hardie
Dague	Johnson, Ind.	Scrivner
Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Okla.	Shafer
Dawson, Ill.	Jones, Ala.	Sheppard
Delaney	Jones, N. C.	Simpson, Pa.
D'Ewart	Jones, Wash.	Smith, Maine
Dingell	Judd	Smith, Ohio
Eaton	Kearney	Somers
Eberharter	Kearns	Stanley
Elliott	Kefauver	Stratton
Ellis	Kelley	Sundstrom
Elston	Kerr	Taber
Evins	Kilday	Taylor
Fallon	Kirwan	Thomas, N. J.
Fellows	Kunkel	Thomas, Tex.
Fenton	Lanham	Trimble
Fuller	Lea	Vinson
Fulton	Lichtenwalter	Wadsworth
Gallagher	Ludlow	Walter
Garmatz	Lynch	West
	McConnell	Whitaker

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Sundstrom with Mr. Eberharter.
Mr. Taber with Mr. Kilday.
Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Kelley.
Mr. Judd with Mr. Hedrick.
Mr. Kearns with Mr. Walter.
Mr. Gavin with Mr. Pfeifer.
Mr. Fenton with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Maloney with Mrs. Norton.
Mr. Hardie Scott with Mr. Kefauver.
Mr. Hoffman with Mr. McCormack.
Mr. Arends with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Chadwick with Mr. Battle.
Mr. Clason with Mr. Price of Florida.
Mr. Lichtenwalter with Mr. Jones of North Carolina.
Mr. Kunkel with Mr. Boykin.
Mr. Dague with Mr. Mansfield.
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Colmer.
Mrs. Bolton with Mr. Bloom.
Mr. McConnell with Mr. Garmatz.
Mr. Meyer with Mr. Morgan.
Mr. Miller of Connecticut with Mr. Trimble.
Mr. Wadsworth with Mr. West.
Mrs. Smith of Maine with Mr. Priest.
Mr. Jenkins of Ohio with Mr. Rains.
Mr. McGarvey with Mr. Miller of California.
Mr. Gillette with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. D'Ewart with Mr. Andrews of Alabama.
Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Jarman.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Bonner.
Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Jones of Alabama.
Mr. Rich with Mr. Hart.
Mr. Hess with Mr. Gorski.
Mr. Andrews of New York with Mr. Fallon.
Mr. Eaton with Mr. Evins.
Mr. Fulton with Mr. Dingell.
Mr. Graham with Mr. Lynch.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Delaney.
Mr. Shafer with Mr. Lea.
Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Kirwan.
Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Lanham.
Mr. Jackson of California with Mr. Thomas of Texas.
Mr. Hinshaw with Mr. Holifield.
Mr. August H. Andresen with Mr. Heffernan.
Mr. Elston, with Mr. Harrison.
Mr. Chiperfield with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. Buffett with Mr. Gore.
Mr. McCowen with Mr. Kerr.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Stanley.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a telegram.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech by Mr. Lane Webber.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include as a part of the remarks a table on ERP, an editorial from the Daily Express, London, of January 15, 1948, an article from the Economist of September 13, 1947, and also an editorial from the Economist of July 12, 1947.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution from the East Chicago (Ind.) Chapter of the American Christian Palestine Committee.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances and include newspaper excerpts.

Mr. LYLE (at the request of Mr. HAYS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. RICH (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for 3 days, on account of death in family.

To Mr. KEARNEY (at the request of Mr. REED of New York), until further notice, on account of illness.

To Mrs. NORTON (at the request of Mr. RAYBURN), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. ALBERT, for Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of this week, on account of official business.

To Mr. SMITH of Ohio, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. TRIMBLE, for 3 days, on account of illness in family.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 866. An act to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2158. An act to amend the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 and the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, so as to eliminate certain provisions of such Acts requiring the retention of a specified carry-over of wheat in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 2376. An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 5328. An act to amend paragraph 1803 (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, relating to firewood and other woods.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 608. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Growing Four Times;

S. 714. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Claude E. Milliken; and

S. J. Res. 94. Joint resolution to establish the Fort Sumter National Monument in the State of South Carolina.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 27, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from

the Speaker's table and referred, as follows:

1490. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 in the amount of $750,000 for the Department of the Interior (H. Doc. No. 624); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1491. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to cancel drainage charges against certain lands within the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1492. A letter from Charles E. Bohlen, Counselor, for the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Gen. Jose Gervasio Artigas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

1493. A letter from the assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 334 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1156–1157; 8 U. S. C. 734); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1494. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1495. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of its newly issued Typical Electric Bills, Residential, Commercial, and Industrial Services, Cities of 50,000 Population and More, January 1, 1948; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 2409. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 16, 1947; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1792). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 5808. A bill to continue on a permanent basis a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 1793). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6087. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia"; with amendments (Rept. No. 1794). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 548. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 5992, a bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; without amendment (Rept. No. 1795). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 549. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 5963, a bill to authorize the construction of a courthouse to accommodate the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1796). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 550. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 4954, a bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance, under Federal reclamation laws, of the Kennewick division of the Yakima project, Washington; without amendment (Rept. No. 1797). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JONES of Washington: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 1608. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Postmaster General to contract for certain powerboat service in Alaska, and for other purposes," approved August 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 1338); with an amendment (Rept. No. 1798). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WEICHEL: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 1132. An act to amend section 40 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (39 Stat. 728), as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1809). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POTTS: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 1896. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1944, so as to provide annuities for certain remarried widows; without amendment (Rept. No. 1810). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURKE: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 5144. A bill providing for the conveyance of the Bear Lake Fish Cultural Station to the Fish and Game Commission of the State of Utah; without amendment (Rept. No. 1811). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DIRKSEN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1481. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District; with amendments (Rept. No. 1813). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DIRKSEN: Committee on the District of Columbia. House Joint Resolution 379. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the Presidential inaugural ceremonies of 1949; without amendment (Rept. No. 1814). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DIRKSEN: Committee on the District of Columbia. House Joint Resolution 380. Joint resolution authorizing the granting of permits to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1949, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1815). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DIRKSEN: Committee on the District of Columbia. House Joint Resolution 381. Joint resolution to provide for the quartering, in certain public buildings in the District of Columbia, of troops participating in the inaugural ceremonies of 1949; without amendment (Rept. No. 1816). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REES: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 1493. An act to amend section 19 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 387), and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1817). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TWYMAN: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. House Joint Resolution 371. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the golden anniversary of the consolidation of the Boroughs of Manhattan, Bronx, Brooklyn, Queens, and Richmond, which boroughs now comprise New York City; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1818). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 5053. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Philadelphia National Historical Park and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1819). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 810. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of John E. Parker, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1799). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 929. A bill for the relief of Ernest L. Godfrey; with amendments (Rept. No. 1800). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1642. A bill for the relief of Miss Rosella M. Kostenbader; without amendment (Rept. No. 1801). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FOOTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2246. A bill for the relief of Carl E. Lawson and Fireman's Fund Indemnity Co.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1802). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2325. A bill for the relief of Mamie L. Hurley; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1803). Referred to the Committe of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2898. A bill for the relief of Doris Marie Richard; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1804). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3500. A bill for the relief of Lester L. Elder; with amendments (Rept. No. 1805). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5449. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lucille Davidson; with amendments (Rept. No. 1806). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6251. A bill for the relief of Hans Kraney and Clare Felton Kraney; without amendment (Rept. No. 1807). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 744. A bill for the relief of Sylvia M. Misetich; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1808). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 6333. A bill to facilitate the deportation of aliens from the United States, to provide for the supervision and detention pending eventual deportation of aliens whose deportation cannot be readily effectuated because of reasons beyond the control of the

United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 6334. A bill to authorize the use of oleomargarine by the armed forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 6335. A bill providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BRADLEY:

H. R. 6336. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to lease to the Continental Southern Corp. the subsurface of the land on which is situated the United States post office at Long Beach, Calif., for the purpose of removing oil and other hydrocarbon substances therefrom; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 6337. A bill to amend the Social Security Act of 1935; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 6338. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 6339. A bill to amend the provisions of title VI of the Public Health Service Act relating to standards of maintenance and operation for hospitals receiving aid under that title; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOODRUFF:

H. R. 6340. A bill to provide for the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by farmers for the purpose of soil and water conservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 6341. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 6342. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force to proceed with construction at military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 6343. A bill to grant military leave with pay to substitute employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. J. Res. 383. Joint resolution designating the first Tuesday of March of each year as National Teachers Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAND:

H. J. Res. 384. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the International Industrial Exposition, Inc., Atlantic City, N. J., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. J. Res. 385. Joint resolution to provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. J. Res. 386. Joint resolution to authorize the President, following appropriation of the necessary funds of the Congress, to bring into effect on the part of the United States the loan agreement of the United States of America and the United Nations signed at Lake Success, N. Y., March 23, 1948; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. J. Res. 387. Joint resolution to authorize $100,000 to provide adequate protection from flooding of the Susquehanna River in the Conklin-Kirkwood, N. Y., area; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. Con. Res. 189. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the final report of the Select Committee on Foreign Aid, and authorizing the printing of 5,000 additional copies thereof; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADLEY:

H. R. 6344. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. A. C. Lupcho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROPHY:

H. R. 6345. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Irmgard Erfurt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDY:

H. R. 6346. A bill for the relief of the estate of Jennie Gayle, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 6347. A bill for the relief of Huynh Ngoc Ho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 6348. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria N. Laborde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

H. R. 6349. A bill for the relief of Osmore H. Morgan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 6350. A bill for the relief of Angelina Gonzales y Soto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 6351. A bill for the relief of S2c Joseph T. Sypko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON (by request):

H. R. 6352. A bill for the relief of Reno E. Stitely; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. R. 6353. A bill for the relief of Ion Stanescu and Catherina Stanescu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. R. 6354. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lelia E. Colvin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1831. By Mr. BROOKS: Petition of Ben E. Neal, Sr., of Shreveport, La., on behalf of Mrs. Clara L. Fetterhoff, Shreveport, La., widow of Sgt. Paul H. Fetterhoff, ASN33233021; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1832. By the SPEAKER: Petition of J. C. Michael, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1833. Also, petition of H. M. Barnhart, Mount Dora, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1834. Also, petition of W. S. Lincoln, Zephyrhills, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1835. Also, petition of T. S. Kinney, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1836. Also, petition of Mrs. L. H. Anglemyer, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1837. Also, petition of the Gippe sisters, Montevideo, Minn., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution urging defeat of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1838. Also, petition of the Board of Aldermen of the city of Chelsea, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Wagner-Taft-Ellender housing bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1839. Also, petition of Hughes R. Hilliard, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1840. Also, petition of the Best Foods, Inc., Cambridge, Mass., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the right to yellow margarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 27, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our eternal light, breathe Thy gracious power upon us and calm us with thought that reveals the way of wisdom. Purge us of all vanity and grant us a newer and clearer vision of the things we should do. Take from our lives intemperance and indulgence and fill every heart with fidelity to our Republic. As we consider our heritage, lift our heads and lead us to proclaim boldly those great moral and spiritual imperatives which give honor and vitality to a people. In our Redeemer's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On April 17, 1948:

H. R. 358. An act for the relief of Hilario A. Goitia;

H. R. 387. An act for the relief of Hayato Harris Ozawa;

H. R. 420. An act for the relief of Esther Ringel;

H. R. 421. An act for the relief of Betty Isabel Schunke;

H. R. 560. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Wilhemina Piper Enz;

H. R 899. An act for the relief of Mrs. Keum Nyu Park;

H. R. 990. An act for the relief of William B. Moore;

H. R. 1859. An act for the relief of Philip Lee Sjoerdt Huizenga;

H. R. 1912. An act for the relief of John A. Dilboy;

H. R. 1927. An act for the relief of Margaret Katherine Hume;

H. R. 2213. An act for the relief of A. J. Sprouffske;

H. R 2250. An act for the relief of Mrs. Daisy A. T. Jaegers;

H. R. 2303. An act for the relief of Mitsu M. Kobayashi, who is the wife of Edward T. Kobayashi, a citizen of the United States;

H. R 2425. An act for the relief of August Dane Tetuaeraro;

H. R. 2427. An act for the relief of Jose Cabral Lorenzo;

H. R. 2557. An act for the relief of Mable Gladys Viducich;

H. R. 3039. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marian D. McC. Plein;

H. R. 3263. An act for the relief of Tech. Sgt. Tsuyoshi Matsumoto;

H. R. 3387. An act for the relief of Bruce Bros. Grain Co.;

H. R. 3569. An act to authorize the construction of a chapel and a library at the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y., and to authorize the acceptance of private contributions to assist in defraying the cost of construction thereof;

H. R. 3849. An act for the relief of Domingo Gandarias;

H. R. 3968. An act for the relief of Olive Irene Milloglav; and

H. R. 4403. An act for the relief of Ladislao Vaida, Elena Vaida, and Stefano Vaida.

On April 20, 1948:

H. R. 3300. An act for the relief of Martin A. King;

H. R. 4572. An act to amend section 7 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, to provide for learners' permits, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4636. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing arts to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929, as amended;

H. R. 4649. An act to provide that compensation of members of the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board of the District of Columbia shall be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended;

H. R. 4739. An act to amend paragraph 1629 of the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to provide for the free importation of exposed X-ray film;

H. R. 5214. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5387. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Department of the Treasury who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions and whose claims for such losses have been considered and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury upon the recommendations of a Treasury claim board.

On April 21, 1948:

H. R. 927. An act for the relief of the estate of Mary D. Briggs, deceased;

H. R. 2633. An act for the relief of Claude T. Thomas, legal guardian of Elizabeth Ann Mervine, a minor, and the estates of Mary L. Poole, deceased, and Hazel S. Thomas, deceased;

H. R. 2645. An act to provide that appointments of United States commissioners for the Isle Royale, Hawaii, Mammoth Cave, and Olympic National Parks shall be made by the United States district courts without the recommendation and approval of the Secretary of the Interior;

H. R. 4118. An act to confirm title in fee simple in Thomas Loflin to certain lands in Rankin County, Miss.;

H. R. 3484. An act to transfer the Remount Service from the Department of the Army to the Department of Agriculture; and

H. R. 4326. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

On April 24, 1948:

H. R. 3703. An act to authorize transfer of surplus real property to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior for consolidation of Federal holdings within areas administered by the National Park Service.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 334. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of James Harold Nesbitt, a minor;

H. R. 344. An act for the relief of Sylvester T. Starling;

H. R. 761. An act for the relief of the estate of Anthony D. Chamberlain, deceased;

H. R. 762. An act for the relief of Dudley Tarver;

H. R. 1275. An act to authorize the payment of certain claims for medical treatment of persons in the naval service; to repeal section 1586 of the Revised Statutes; and for other purposes;

H. R. 1667. An act for the relief of the estate of T. L. Morris;

H. R. 1747. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Lee Novick and others;

H. R. 2399. An act for the relief of Joseph W. Beyer;

H. R. 2622. An act to authorize loans for Indians, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2728. An act for the relief of Darwin Slump;

H. R. 3113. An act for the relief of Bessie B. Blacknall;

H. R. 3328. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Russell Coulter;

H. R. 4090. An act to equalize retirement benefits among members of the Nurse Corps of the Army and the Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4399. An act for the relief of James C. Smith, Stephen A. Bodkin, Charles A. Marlin, Andrew J. Perlik, and Albert N. James;

H. R. 4490. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to provide salvage facilities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4571. An act for the relief of the estate of Carl R. Nall; and

H. J. Res. 242. Joint resolution to confirm title in fee simple in Joshua Britton to certain lands in Jefferson County, Ill.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 550. An act for the relief of Lizzie Reynolds, administratrix of the estate of Grace Reynolds, deceased;

H. R. 1308. An act for the relief of H. C. Biering;

H. R. 3089. An act for the relief of Mississippi Central Railroad Co.;

H. R. 3550. An act for the relief of Jesse L. Purdy;

H. R. 3998. An act to provide for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5448. An act to amend sections 212 (b) and 231 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 295. An act to further amend the thirteenth paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended;

S. 309. An act designating American Indian Day;

S. 657. An act to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to authorize crediting of service as a cadet, midshipman, or aviation cadet for pay purposes, and for other purposes;

S. 1050. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the mining of potash on the public domain," approved February 7, 1927, so as to provide for the disposition of the rentals and royalties from leases issued or renewed under the act entitled "An act to authorize exploration for and disposition of potassium," approved October 2, 1917;

S. 1052. An act to fix the salaries of certain justices and judges of the Territory of Hawaii;

S. 1062. An act for the relief of Mrs. Christine West and Mrs. Jesse West;

S. 1206. An act for the relief of Jack O'Donnell Graves;

S. 1216. An act to repeal that part of section 3 of the act of June 24, 1926 (44 Stat. 767), as amended, and that part of section 13a of the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 166), as amended by the act of July 2, 1926 (44 Stat. 781), relating to the percentage, in time of peace, of enlisted personnel employed in aviation tactical units of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, and for other purposes;

S. 1281. An act for the relief of James B. Walsh;

S. 1599. An act to prescribe the pay and allowance of aviation cadets in the United States Air Force, and for other purposes;

S. 1925. An act to convey certain land to the city of Pierre, S. Dak.;

S. 1933. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to school district 55, Roosevelt County, Mont.;

S. 1941. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to John F. Compton, formerly John Crazy Bull, a patent in fee to certain land;

S. 2033. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength," approved June 3, 1942 (56 Stat. 306);

S. 2034. An act to increase the number of midshipmen allowed at the United States Naval Academy from the District of Columbia;

S. 2518. An act to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization; and

S. J. Res. 206. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate boundary compact by and between the States of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6055. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. MCKELLAR, and Mr. HAYDEN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5728. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal

Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BALL, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCKELLAR, and Mr. RUSSELL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5607. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BALL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCKELLAR, and Mr. TYDINGS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SWEDISH PIONEERS COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, on the 30th of March the President exercised his veto on House Joint Resolution 251. This measure would have authorized the issuance of a special stamp commemorating the one hundredth anniversary of the coming of the Swedish pioneers to the Middle West. In doing this, I feel that the President was ill-advised. By taking such action, he has disappointed a large number of American citizens of Swedish ancestry and has disappointed Swedes abroad. This was to have been a 5-cent stamp primarily for foreign postage. It would have corresponded with a series of stamps authorized by the Swedish Government to be used in correspondence between the two countries. We all know that this would have been a fine good-will gesture.

Furthermore, contrary to the general understanding, there is a real profit to the Post Office Department by reason of the issuance of commemorative stamps. So many are purchased and not used as postage. The Second Assistant Postmaster General appeared before our committee and agreed that the commemorative stamp business was very profitable.

In a day or so, House Joint Resolution 251 will be called up again. It is hoped that we can obtain a sufficient number of votes to enact this worth-while legislation.

SUPPLEMENTAL LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file its report on the supplemental Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN reserved all points of order on the bill.

SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 551, Rept. No. 1820), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 334, giving the consent of Congress to the compact on regional education entered into between the Southern States at Tallahassee, Fla., on February 8, 1948. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Sumner Welles.

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances and include in one a statement made by the attorney general of the State of North Dakota before the Judiciary Subcommittee of the United States Senate, and in the other a statement by Dr. Jonathan A. Munro, of the Agricultural College, before the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations of the United States Senate.

A STAMP COMMEMORATING THE ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF SETTLEMENT BY SWEDISH PIONEERS SHOULD BE APPROVED

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TWYMAN] in directing attention to the message of the President returning to this House, without approval, House Joint Resolution 251, of which my colleague and a member of my committee is the author. The House, in my opinion, should support the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TWYMAN] in his request that the House override the veto of the President. In fact, I do not believe the President had an opportunity to have all the facts, otherwise he would not, in my judgment, veto the resolution.

It is the purpose of this joint resolution to authorize a stamp commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the coming of the Swedish pioneers to the Middle West. After the message from the President was received the Post Office and Civil Service Committee took under consideration the views expressed in the message. The committee instructed me to bring to the attention of the House that the committee is still of the unanimous opinion that on occasion Congress should be able to determine some historical events which should be commemorated through means of a commemorative stamp and that the committee is still of the opinion that the commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the great Swedish pioneers to America, and who have contributed so much in the building of the great Middle West, is of sufficient importance and merit to warrant the issuance of a commemorative stamp.

Since both the House and the Senate unanimously passed this resolution providing for such commemorative stamp, the committee feels that the Congress should again express its approval of this stamp so that issuance will be authorized and directed.

The President premises his disapproval of the stamp on the possible lack of facilities in the Bureau of Printing and Engraving. I have today ascertained from the Bureau of Printing and Engraving that they are in position to produce at least five additional commemorative stamps over and above those presently on order from the Postmaster General.

In the past 10 years the Postmaster General has personally approved 108 commemorative stamps, and none have been authorized by action of Congress. It would just seem to me that now, when the Congress did go on record unanimously to approve this stamp, that we ought to sustain our own position and our own judgment in this instance and go on record affirmatively for the issuance of such stamp. Incidently, this is one piece of legislation that does not cost the Government anything. In fact it yields a profit to the Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, if the membership of this House could have a chance to review the list of commemorative stamps issued by the Post Office Department in the past 10 years, I dare say that you will find very few that are more worthy of consideration than a stamp to commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of the coming of the Swedish pioneers to the Middle West and who contributed so much in the building of a better and finer America. The resolution of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TWYMAN] should be approved.

STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to believe that the State Department

can blunder the way it does without deliberately trying to do so.

At a time when American taxpayers are being soaked for hundreds of millions to be poured into Germany, supposedly to combat communism there, the State Department here auctions off the property of the German Embassy and thus creates almost ideal propaganda for the Communists to use with the Germans.

So far as I know there is no precedent in history for auctioning the furnishings of a defeated country.

This blunder comes right on top of action by the State Department in keeping the Hoffman ERP staff in the dark over the schedule of hand-out shipments to Europe. As the Marshall plan outpourings begin to move in volume, the least that can be done is to keep the whole story on top of the table.

Secret diplomacy lost World Wars I and II. Secret tactics now in spending the Marshall-plan billions would compound the failure. The Truman-Marshall-Vandenberg policy of propping up Socialist rulers everywhere is juvenile enough at its best. Its failure will be guaranteed if State Department methods of secrecy and conniving become its modus operandi.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAIL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make in Committee of the Whole this afternoon and include extraneous matter.

Mr. COLE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on Federal aid to education from the St. Joseph News-Press entitled "Missouri Would Lose."

MORE WINE FOR BRITAIN

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, some of my constituents have wanted to know whether or not wine is included in the list of commodities being furnished under the European recovery program. Before answering their letters I called our Committee on Foreign Affairs and was informed very definitely that wines are not on the list being supplied to the participating countries. Last week the committee sent a mimeographed statement to all Members of the House. This statement says these wine questions arose apparently from a misunderstanding of the Paris CEEC report and that "wine imports will not be financed by the European recovery-program funds." This statement is true.

While we are supplying bread, coal, and tobacco, we are not supplying any wine. However, Mr. Bevin has been quite candid with us. In his Paris report—volume II, page 106—he tells us that in each of the 4 years before the war, the United Kingdom imported an average of 750,000 hectoliters of wine. With the help of our British loan the United Kingdom wine imports for this fiscal year are estimated at 990,000 hectoliters. Next year with the help of ERP money the United Kingdom hopes to import 830,000 hectoliters or some 80,000 more hectoliters than they imported during the 4 years preceding the war when American taxpayers were not paying for her necessities. Now, Mr. Speaker, while it is true that we may not be directly furnishing wine to participating countries, it cannot be denied that by furnishing such necessities as food, clothing, and machinery, we are permitting these countries to use their own funds for larger quantities of wine. The ECA will permit Britishers to imbibe more wine than they did in prewar days. Mr. Speaker, do you think it just that Americans should be asked to deny themselves many things in order that a socialized England can drink more wine? I do not.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two newspaper articles.

THE TAFT-ELLENDER-WAGNER BILL, S. 866

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, revise and extend my remarks and include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, whether or not we shall have a comprehensive national housing program this session in answer to the overwhelming demand of our people generally, and especially of veterans, is now squarely up to the House. At a time when the United States is taking the leadership for world reconstruction and when our youth may be called on for new sacrifices in the interests of the Nation, it is only fitting that their needs in a critical housing shortage should be recognized and met. History gives us ground for grave concern. A bill, similar to the modernized Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill which just passed in the other body, passed the Senate in the Seventy-ninth Congress but died in the House as it was not reported out of committee. The Banking and Currency Committee now announces hearings to begin next week; so far so good. Members interested in this legislation will have an opportunity at the hearings to demonstrate their support by testifying or filing a statement with the committee.

But we must not have a repetition of 1946. Veterans have expressed themselves decisively through the National Veterans' Housing Conference held here in Washington on March 1, 1948. Members of the House have expressed themselves through their signatures on discharge petition No. 6 for the bill. The majority report of the Joint Committee on Housing has already supported the most controversial features of the bill after full public investigation—low rent federally assisted housing, slum clearance, and urban redevelopment—and the other body has not only included these in the bill, but has also restored the rural housing title. Amendments to bring the House bill in line with the bill passed in the other body will be proposed if it must be brought up on the discharge petition. But I sincerely hope that a renewed effort to get signatures on the discharge petition, especially among those of the 204 veterans in the House who have not yet signed, will be made unnecessary by seasonable committee action, and that we shall not have a repetition of the oleo situation on housing.

There is appended hereto the principal resolution adopted by 1,350 official delegates from posts and chapters of the following national veterans' organizations recognized by the National Veterans' Housing Conference held in Washington, D. C., February 29 and March 1, 1948: Veterans of Foreign Wars, Catholic War Veterans, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, American Veterans of World War II, Disabled American Veterans, American Veterans Committee, Marine Corps League, the Italian American War Veterans, American Prisoners of War, the Army-Navy Union. Also in attendance at this conference were delegates from many American Legion posts, who were also recognized by the conference, mayors of leading cities, representatives of municipal housing authorities, of trades unions, welfare organizations, and other civic groups.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE NATIONAL VETERANS' HOUSING CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 1, 1948

Resolution 1

T-E-W bill

Whereas the housing shortage has become critically aggravated by World War II;

Whereas the impact of this shortage is falling on all groups of Americans, but especially on veterans and their families;

Whereas although the quantity of homes now being built is at a high rate, too many, due either to exorbitant sales prices or rentals, are beyond the financial reach of most veterans;

Whereas there exists a special problem for the families in the lowest income brackets for whom decent housing cannot be provided without direct Government aid;

Whereas all possible aids should be extended by the Federal Government to private enterprise to help provide housing for moderate income families at sales prices within the $6,000 range for single family dwellings, and rentals within the $50 per month per unit range;

Whereas financial aid is needed to help municipalities remove the expensive, health-destroying, socially undesirable slums in our cities; and

Whereas the accumulated evidence shows a present need for a program of rural housing as well as rural nonfarm housing: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Veterans Housing Conference, assembled at Washington, D. C., February 29 and March 1, 1948—

1. That the Federal Government should adopt at this Eightieth session of Congress a national housing policy and program to provide within 10 years for American families generally a decent place in which to live.

2. That such a policy should be contained in a single piece of comprehensive housing

legislation, so that all phases of the problem, housing and slum clearance, public and private, rural and urban, may be dealt with in a unified, integrated, and coordinated manner.

3. That the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill (S. 866 and H. R. 2523), containing the framework for putting into effect such a national housing policy and program should be enacted immediately.

4. That Members of the House of Representatives are urged to sign immediately discharge petition No. 6 of the Eightieth Congress, and that failure of Members of the House to sign discharge petition No. 6 can be regarded by the conference as opposition to the bill.

Following is letter of endorsement of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, second largest veterans' organization in the United States:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., April 15, 1948.

To All Members of the House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is an urgent appeal for your signature on discharge petition No. 6, which will relieve the House Committee on Banking and Currency from further responsibility for H. R. 2523, the House companion bill to the T-E-W bill.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars 1947 National Encampment unanimously endorsed the T-E-W bill with certain amendments which closely coincide with those recently proposed by Senator FLANDERS and approved by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. For this reason we are asking your assistance and cooperation to insure the passage of this long-range housing bill during the present session of Congress.

Many of our departments and posts have requested information as to whether or not their representatives in the House have signed discharge petition No. 6. If you have already done so, or intend to do so in the near future, please advise this office accordingly so that we might relay this information to our membership.

We sincerely hope that you will indicate favorably your desire to assist in the furtherance of this important legislative objective of the Veterans of Foreign Wars by signing discharge petition No. 6.

Respectfully yours,
OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Director.

Following is letter from a private housing project developed under New York's Urban Redevelopment Companies Act, showing the enormous housing shortage with 100,000 requests for 8,755 apartments, the majority from veterans of World War II:

STUYVESANT TOWN CORP.,
New York, N. Y., March 17, 1948.

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have your letter of March 10, 1948, concerning request for application No. 39201, filed by Mr. Joseph A. Mandato.

We regret that we cannot make any commitments in advance, before the various buildings are made available to us by the contractor. So far we have rented only 8 buildings out of the final number of 35, and as other buildings become ready for occupancy, those who can be accommodated will be notified.

While we assure you that Mr. Mandato's request will receive our full and sympathetic consideration, we think you should know that we have received more than 100,000 requests for only 8,755 apartments. The majority of these requests are from veterans of World War II. Under the circumstances, we feel it would be a disservice for us to offer him any encouragement, and we must suggest that he should not relax his efforts to find accommodation elsewhere.

Very truly yours,
C. H. HUEBNER,
Resident Manager.

Following is an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of Thursday, April 22, 1948, on the same subject. The endorsement by this editorial of the public housing title of the bill is extremely important in view of the charges made that this title is socialistic:

THE SENATE VOTES ON HOUSING

The Senate's debate on housing turned, as forecast, on the public housing provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Yesterday the Senate refused to be fooled by Senator CAIN'S red herring, an attempt to limit public housing to families on relief. This would have turned public housing projects into veritable almshouses, in contradiction of every sound principle of public welfare and public housing. The Senate did well to repudiate it.

We hope this foreshadows today a prompt approval of the bill, including the public housing sections, and its early acceptance by the House. Without public housing the bill can hardly pretend to be either comprehensive or long range. The amendments that have now been made appear to have removed every reasonable objection, even those raised by the dogged Senator MCCARTHY.

A national housing policy that is likely to pull the Nation out of its chronic housing shortage has at last been formulated and spelled out. It is a delicate compromise among many contending forces. It should be implemented, not emasculated.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERROW asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. DEVITT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech entitled "Patriotism, Its Duty and Value," by the Most Reverend John Ireland, notwithstanding the fact that the cost of said speech is $213.

OLEOMARGARINE VERSUS THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as long as this battle is oleo versus the people, I am satisfied. I do not want to be personal about this anyway. For that reason I will not use the names of the corporations who are making this oleo—I will just give them numbers. However, I assure you that I have the names and addresses from the Congressional Library in case you could wish to check them.

First, I call attention to the fact that last year, 14 of the largest dairy corporations in the United States made $4,000,000 less than they did the year before. However, I am glad they kept this battle of oleo versus the people on the basis of the housewife, because they are in a very bad position when they talk about the profits of oleo manufacturers. These oleo people that are making two to seven times the profits of 1940 surely do not need your sympathy.

Do you not feel sorry for this company which in 1940 could make only $1,727,000 but last year made $12,757,000?

Do you not feel sorry for No. 2, which made $801,000 in 1940, and last year made $5,288,000?

Do you not feel sorry for No. 3 corporation which made $242,000 in 1940, and in 1947 made $1,700,000?

Then I know you will have to put some onions in your eyes to draw the tears on this one—No. 4—which corporation was $48,000 in the red in 1940, but in 1946 they were able to make $190,000.

I am not opposed to people or corporations making profits, because I know it takes money to run the Government. I do want you to be sure to keep this oleo-versus-the-people argument on the basis of the good housewife. However, she may wake up on election day if the price of oleo goes up 10 or 15 cents, and you will have a hard time to explain to her how that happened. But I do not want you to shed any tears for the oleo manufacturers. They seem to be getting along very satisfactorily. If they are making three times as much oleo and up to seven times the net profits they did in 1940, I do not see why they have been so eager to obtain legislation that gives them still more favorable legislative consideration when they now have more legislative protection than is provided the dairy people. They surely appear to be very difficult to please legislatively.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

INCREASED PAY FOR POSTAL WORKERS

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in Mr. Pearson's column in the Washington Post, I was quoted as having made the statement at the Republican caucus that I was opposed to any raise for postal employees. Whoever gave Mr. Pearson that information ought to be more careful in checking his facts, because everyone present knows that I made no statement which, by any stretch of the imagination, could be so construed. At that time I very definitely stated, as I have on numerous occasions, that I favored a salary increase for postal employees, commensurate with the increase of the cost of living.

A GOVERNMENT OF LAWS OR MEN?

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 min-

ute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Secretary of Commerce refused to transmit the Condon letter in response to House Resolution 522. He declined to do so by virtue of an order issued by the President notwithstanding the fact that a law adopted by Congress and signed by the President requires the Secretary of Commerce to make such reports "as he may be required to do by either House of Congress." This raises the question as to whether we in the United States have a government of laws or a government of individuals. It raises the question as to whether a Presidential order is of greater validity than the law of the land.

When the Pauley matter was up and the executive department was attempting to shield Pauley, I pointed out to the House that we were letting ourselves in for a lot of future trouble by bowing to the demand of the executive department that a joint resolution was necessary to open up public records to public scrutiny. Now we are up to the same point in the Condon matter only now the executive department goes a step further and refuses to produce the material even with a resolution. We have subpenaed, we have resolved, we have appeared personally, and we are met at each turn of the road by claims of secrecy. They say it is not in the public interest—but the public interest in our form of government is supposedly determined by laws and not by men.

A claimed independence of the executive branch is the ground for refusal. But is the independence of the legislative branch and its capability for acquiring the facts upon which to legislate to be destroyed by the establishment of a superexecutive branch that refuses to open up its records of public business on public servants to public scrutiny by the elected legislative representatives of the people. Under our Constitution the independence of each branch was never intended to exempt it from the exercise of the constitutional functions of the other branches. The Constitution provides for a separation of powers into three main branches and no branch is immune from the exercise of the constitutional powers vested in the other branches. The exercise of such assigned powers does not interfere with the constitutional independence of any branch. Was the independence of the judiciary destroyed when the legislative branch impeached a Federal judge? Was the independence of the Congress destroyed when the executive department 2 years ago prosecuted and convicted one of its committee chairmen? Was the independence of Congress destroyed 2 weeks ago when the House pursuant to a court subpena made available certain records of the Committee on Un-American Activities, or yesterday when a Member was permitted to testify in court? Was the independence of the executive branch destroyed when Congress investigated certain oil leases on naval reserves made by the executive branch and uncovered by the Teapot Dome scandal? Is the independence of the executive department destroyed when Congress appropriates money for the executive branch, when the President vetoes a bill or the courts find a law or department action to be unconstitutional or invalid? Is the President's independence destroyed by the fact that his appointments must be confirmed and his treaties ratified? The answer to each of these questions is clearly "No." And the independence given to the executive branch by the Constitution will not be destroyed or even impaired by complying with the law and making the Condon letter available so all may see. Under our form of government no single department is absolutely independent. Ours is a government of checks and balances and each branch must yield to the constitutional powers of the other departments in their assigned fields. The failure of the Secretary of Commerce, who is a creature of congressional statute and not a constitutional officer, to make the Condon letter available to Congress constitutes, in my opinion, a violation of the law under which his department is organized. His action is a contempt of Congress. For the contempt he has committed this House may, under the rule laid down by the Supreme Court in Jurney against McCracken, bring him before the bar of the House and sentence him. If that is done on motion for a writ of habeas corpus we will have decided by the courts whether the public interest is to be what some official says it is or what the statutory law says it is. If ours is still a government of laws, the law will prevail.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in each to include an editorial.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of the foot-and-mouth disease.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL SENT TO CONFERENCE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6055) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate; and that the Chair appoint conferees.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, ENGEL of Michigan, STEFAN, CASE of South Dakota, KEEFE, CANNON, KERR, and MAHON.

MEMORIAL DAY AT GETTYSBURG

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, Gettysburg, Pa. is in my district and is America's greatest national shrine. It has been a regularly established custom to have an annual memorial service on Memorial Day in that cemetery, and the speeches are made from the same rostrum from which Abraham Lincoln made his famous address. It has been my privilege and pleasure to preside at these ceremonies during the 8 years I have represented that district and during that time I have secured the speakers from year to year, and I have had the great and the near-great.

This year on Memorial Day we will have no other and no less a person to deliver the principal address than the Honorable Speaker of this House, the man who might be your next President. We are going to have a great day. We have never had less than 10,000 people there on that occasion and we look for a great many more this year.

The page boys of the House are going by chartered busses.

Those Members of Congress who have never had the pleasure of visiting Gettysburg I know will want to be there. The ceremony will be broadcast over a national hook-up and there will be 2,000 little boys and girls strewing flowers over the graves of the old Union veterans. It is a ceremony that is long-established and never changes. It is a ceremony of such beauty and patriotism that it brings tears to your eyes. Those of you who have been there before will want to come again for this occasion.

I shall announce this program occasionally between now and then for I am sure you will want to attend this national memorial service held in the National Cemetery at Gettysburg, on Memorial Day, Monday, May 31, at 2 o'clock p. m.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN, DREW PEARSON, AND THE FBI

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, hardly a week passes that Drew Pearson does not make some vicious lying attack on me. In Sunday's paper he said that I was threatening to impeach President Truman with reference to the Condon case.

I made no such threats.

Much as I disagree with him on his blunders on the so-called civil-rights program, there is one thing on which President Truman and I agree: neither of us would believe Drew Pearson on oath.

As to the Condon case, we are going to use every legitimate means to secure the FBI's letter concerning Dr. Condon.

I have also introduced a bill to make the FBI an independent agency. If you will sign petition number 15 now on the clerks desk and help bring this bill out

and pass it, J. Edgar Hoover will uncover enough to drive every Red from the Federal pay roll and put a stop to this insidious movement that is going on to undermine this country.

I hope every one of you will sign that petition today. Let us make the FBI an independent agency so that it may reach throughout the earth and keep us informed as to what is going on.

Then we can prevent another Pearl Harbor, or another Bogota.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PASSMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter he received from the Chamber of Commerce of Monroe, La.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. LYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in two to include editorials and in the other a newspaper article.

Mr. TABER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

THE PALESTINE SITUATION

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the situation in the Middle East and in Palestine is daily becoming more alarming. I am very fearful that within 3 weeks we are going to have reports from that area of unnecessary bloodshed, as well as the sacrifice of many lives, including women and children, both Jewish and Arabian.

Mr. Speaker, mistakes have been made somewhere along the line. This is the first test of any importance that the United Nations has had. There has been up to date too much fumbling with the situation. It is time for the United States Government to take the lead in adopting a firm policy immediately so that there will be no more unnecessary bloodshed.

The policy of appeasement in this controversy is the wrong policy. As I said previously, the failure of the United Nations and the failure of the United States to properly lead in the situation is going to cause us many sorrows and heart pangs in the way of loss of life and bloodshed which will undoubtedly occur unless a firm stand is taken immediately in the Middle East and in Palestine. The United States should desist in its worthless efforts to impose a trusteeship upon all of Palestine. The Arabs have defiantly stated that they will never accept a permanent trusteeship. This defiance is a violation of the obligations taken by the Arab states in joining the United Nations. In threatening to invade, and in actually invading Palestine with its armed forces, the Arab states are engaging in a war of aggression against a neighboring country. This also is an undeniable violation of their commitments to the United Nations. Furthermore, by embargoing the shipment of arms for distribution by the United Nations Commission to the Jewish people for defense purposes only, the State Department is making it that much easier for aggressor nations to wage an unjustifiable attack. Decisive action must be taken now or we will later regret the horrible sacrifices and bloodshed which will inevitably occur.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

THE LATE JAMES V. McCLINTIC

Mr. PEDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEDEN. Mr. Speaker, for 20 years, James V. McClintic represented the Seventh Congressional District of Oklahoma in Congress. In this capacity he served not only the people of Oklahoma, but his country in the most capable, sincere, and honorable manner.

The news of his death on April 22 brought a sense of real loss to all who knew him. It marked the passing of a good man, a loyal public servant, a true pioneer, and a lover of his fellow Americans. His long tenure of service in this House is evidence of the faithful way in which he represented the people of western Oklahoma.

James McClintic was born in Robertson County, Tex., on September 8, 1878. Two years later his parents moved to Groesbeck, Limestone County, Tex., where Jim attended the public schools. Later, he completed his formal education at the Add-Ran University, Waco, Tex. Jim accepted a position with a wholesale drygoods company at St. Louis, Mo., and continued in such employment until he moved to the Oklahoma Territory in 1902.

Even as a youth, Jim McClintic was interested in Oklahoma Territory, and he early determined to make his home there. He participated in the great land drawing at El Reno when Oklahoma Territory was opened for settlement, but his luck was not so good in obtaining a homestead when the lottery was held. He was not content to abandon his interest in this new land and, in later years, he told of his determination to make his home there in these words:

> The impression gained on this first trip was so fastened on me that it was not possible to resist the temptation to go to Oklahoma Territory and cast my lot with those who were willing to suffer the hardships of a new country in order to begin life anew. Therefore, I bought a ticket to the last station on the Frisco Railroad, which was Snyder, Okla., and for over 30 years I have been proud to call this my home.

He had the pioneer spirit which is the true heritage of those born in the great Southwest. He had the willingness to work, the desire to help open new frontiers, and the tenacity of spirit to follow his vision. He grew up with and became a part of the great State of Oklahoma.

In 1908, Jim McClintic was appointed clerk of the town of Snyder, Okla., and, from this date to his death, his life was devoted to public service. He later served as a member of the Oklahoma House of Representatives, the Oklahoma State Senate; and, in 1914, when the Seventh Congressional District was organized, he was elected as a Democrat to the Sixty-fourth Congress. He served continuously until 1934. Soon thereafter, he was appointed executive secretary to Gov. E. W. Marland, of Oklahoma, and held this position until he was appointed assistant traffic director for the District of Columbia in 1939. Later, he was selected as special assistant to the Secretary of the Interior. During World War II, he became the congressional liaison officer for the War Department before retiring on VE-day.

In paying tribute to Jim McClintic, it is well to recall his important work as a Member of this body. His outstanding abilities earned him assignments on the Naval Affairs Committee and, later, on the Ways and Means Committee. If Jim McClintic were still in the House today, he would certainly be foremost among those demanding a strong air force for the defense of this country. He was an early advocate for placing the Air Force on an equal status with the Army and Navy. He recognized the potential value of air power for preparedness and national defense, and bent every effort to secure an adequate air force for the United States. In a typical speech in 1934, he commented upon the growing air-mindedness of the American people and stated:

> The major percentage of our citizens feels and knows that the air offers more possibilities for future development than anything else and that time is not far distant until planes will be circling the globe; then nations will lay aside all types of obsolete weapons of offense and defense and unless we have the newest and most up-to-date instrumentalities that can be provided by mankind, we cannot hope to carry on in a successful way.

Jim McClintic's death is a real loss to Oklahoma and particularly to southwestern Oklahoma—a place that he loved so much. His death is a loss to the Nation, for he was a loyal American who had a sense of duty and responsibility and always worked for the best interest of this country. He was a good Democrat, and was loved by both Democrats and Republicans alike. His friendly smile, warm handshake and understanding manner will be missed by all who knew him. His death is significant in that it marks the passing of another of those individuals who put friendship and loyalty to country above everything else.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEDEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I would like to pay a word of tribute in connection with the beautiful sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. PEDEN] regarding the services of Jim McClintic while he was a Member of this House.

Mr. McClintic was a member of the Committee on Ways and Means for a number of years while I had the honor to be its chairman, and there were bonds of friendship between us until the day of his death. I regarded him as one of the most useful, diligent, capable, and outstanding members of that committee. He attended sessions regularly. He was always courteous and kind, and he made a great contribution to the work of our committee while he was a member. When he left the House I regarded his leaving as a distinct loss, not only to the House and the country, but to the Committee on Ways and Means. I regarded him from the point of ability as the equal of any man who served on that committee while I had the honor of being its chairman. I extend my deepest sympathy to the bereaved family on the loss they, the committee, the Congress, and the country have sustained.

Mr. PEDEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. It was my privilege to serve as a Member of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Ways and Means with our distinguished friend, Hon. James McClintic. I believe the gentleman from Oklahoma will bear me out that the very day before his death I was asking him about Jim McClintic and how he was getting along. I join with the gentleman from Oklahoma and my distinguished former chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in paying deserved tribute to this outstanding patriot and statesman, who rendered such distinguished service to his district, State, and Nation.

Mr. PEDEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. It was my privilege to serve with Jim McClintic in this House for 14 years. Thomas Jefferson once said there were three questions to ask of an applicant for public office: Is he honest, is he qualified, is he faithful? Jim McClintic measured up to that standard.

There is another qualification that our distinguished friend, Jack Garner, pointed out to me when I first came to Congress. He said that the one qualification most needed in this House was moral courage. I have never known a man to possess moral courage to a higher degree than that manifested by Jim McClintic under the most trying conditions.

I join with the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma and my other colleagues in expressing my sorrow at his untimely passing away, and my sympathy for his bereaved family.

Mr. PEDEN. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, although I did not have the privilege of serving in this great body with Jim McClintic, I have known him as a friend for a long time. Jim McClintic represented the great southwestern part of the State of Oklahoma, the Seventh Congressional District, but his record and achievements were not limited to that section. He was known everywhere, and the love of Oklahomans for him extended throughout the length and breadth of our State. I join with my colleagues in expressing my own sorrow over his untimely passing and in extending my deepest sympathy to his loved ones.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEDEN. I yield.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, Jim McClintic possessed two outstanding virtues or characteristics among others. He was a very loyal type of person, and he had the personality, the desire, and the faculty of scattering a lot of sunshine as he went through life. Someone has very aptly said:

If a bit of sunshine hits you after passing of a cloud,
If a fit of laughter gets you, and your spine is feeling proud,
Don't forget to up and fling it at some soul who's feeling blue,
For the minute that you fling it, it's a boomerang to you.

Jim McClintic lived the philosophy expressed in that thought as well as most any person I ever met, and he did scatter a lot of sunshine as he walked through the highways and byways of life. That sunshine came back to him and played upon his personality so that it was always a pleasure to be in his presence, because he had that exuberance and feeling of fellowship and warmth about him which made you want to be with him. I liked him very much. I did not have the opportunity of associating with him intimately all through life. He was an older man than I. I knew him when I was just a kid and he was a Congressman, but I always had a great deal of respect for him. He served our good State from the Seventh District of Oklahoma, as our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. PEDEN] has said, for 25 years. He always kept those two characteristics for which he was so well known and for which he was so well liked by the people who knew him. Yes, he was loyal; he was a Democrat in politics. He was loyal to his party even when it was hard sledding to be loyal. He was loyal to his district; he was loyal to the great State of Oklahoma; he was loyal to our great Nation that we all love. He served with distinction and honor in the Congress and on the various committees. I join wholeheartedly with my colleagues in expressing my sympathy for his bereaved loved ones and in extending these few words of tribute to this man who has been the last one to go of our former colleagues. All of us who knew him will suffer a personal loss. Our Nation has suffered a loss in the passing of Jim McClintic who served the Seventh District of Oklahoma so well for so many years.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEDEN. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, the remarks with reference to Jim McClintic by the gentleman from Oklahoma, who has just taken his seat, were very appropriate. Jim McClintic was one of the friendliest men I have ever known. There was no dross about his friendliness. He was capable of being a friend. I do not think there have been many men with whom I have served in this body who had more friendship in them and who deserved more than Jim McClintic. He truly served his day and generation in fine fashion. I join his colleagues in expressing sorrow at his passing and extending my deepest sympathy to his bereaved loved ones.

LICENSING OF MARINE RADIOTELEGRAPH OPERATORS

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1036) entitled "An act to provide for the licensing of marine radiotelegraph operators as ship radio officers, and for other purposes," with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 5, line 9, strike out "July 1, 1948" and insert "April 1, 1949."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEW COURTHOUSE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, in a few moments the House will consider H. R. 5963, a bill reported unanimously from the Committee on Public Works, which would authorize the construction of a courthouse in the District of Columbia.

I regret that, due to the necessity of being in the Deficiency Committee this afternoon, I will not have an opportunity to address myself to this bill. I do want to say that I was privileged to hear the testimony of the distinguished jurists who appeared before the Deficiency Committee in support of this program. They made what appeared to me to be a conclusive case.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I would consider it to be a privilege indeed to implement this legislation, should it pass this Congress, to

assure for the District of Columbia needed space and facilities in the handling of the court business of the District of Columbia which at the present time, in my humble opinion, is a tragic shame and disgrace to our Nation's Capital.

I hope that this bill will be passed promptly by unanimous action of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

CONTESTED ELECTION—MANKIN AGAINST DAVIS OF GEORGIA

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I desire to call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 552) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the election contest of Helen Douglas Mankin, contestant against JAMES C. DAVIS, contestee, Fifth Congressional District of Georgia, be dismissed and that the said JAMES C. DAVIS is entitled to his seat as a Representative of said district and State.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may read the report.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the report, as follows:

The Committee on House Administration, to which was referred Resolution 552, make the following report relative to the above-mentioned election-contest case.

All papers and documents in the above-mentioned election case have been fully examined, including the notice of intention to contest, the answer, and exhibits attached thereto, the briefs of the parties and the minutes of the hearings and a full hearing was given to the parties in person and by counsel on March 16 and 17, 1948. Upon consideration of all proceedings, it is respectfully submitted that the afore-mentioned contest be dismissed as lacking in merit.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, this is the contest of Mrs. Mankin against the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] and was heard by a subcommittee of the Committee on House Administration, composed of seven members. After lengthy hearings, the subcommittee brought in a unanimous report confirming Judge DAVIS in his seat as a Member of this House. I think it should be said that in Georgia the election laws are somewhat different from the election laws of any other State, and I believe that anyone who carefully studies the situation in Georgia with respect to this contest will have to reach the conclusion that JUDGE DAVIS is entitled to his seat, unless you want to set aside the election laws of Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, there is another resolution, inasmuch as two contests were filed against Judge DAVIS. I presume it will be proper to call up the second resolution immediately upon the consideration of this one.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. GAMBLE. This contest was filed and the report shows the election was held in accordance with the election laws, plus the Democratic election laws.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Under the election laws of Georgia the county unit system is employed under certain circumstances and was in use in this primary election. It appears reasonably certain that Judge DAVIS was the nominee of his party under the county unit system and in due course was elected in November as such nominee to Congress from the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia. Unless you want to set aside that county unit system, I think we will have to conclude on both sides of the aisle that the resolution should be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, unless there are further remarks, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION CONTEST—LOWE AGAINST DAVIS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 553), relative to the contested election case of Lowe against Davis, Fifth Congressional District of Georgia (Rept. No. 1823), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the election contest of Wyman C. Lowe, contestant, against JAMES C. DAVIS, contestee, Fifth Congressional District of Georgia, be dismissed and that the said JAMES C. DAVIS is entitled to his seat as a Representative of said District and State.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—RETURNING H. R. 5328

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the House of Representatives:

In compliance with the request contained in the resolution of the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring therein), I return herewith H. R. 5328, "An act to amend paragraph 1803 (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, relating to firewood and other woods."

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 26, 1948.*

BERT HARRINGTON, JR.—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. 626)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith without my approval the enrolled bill H. R. 388, "for the relief of Bert Harrington, Jr."

The bill would authorize the payment of the sum of $5,305 to Bert Harrington, Jr., of Burbank, Calif., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the infringement of personal liberty, loss of compensation, damage to business, and personal expenses which resulted from his arrest on February 1, 1946, and subsequent imprisonment in San Pedro, Calif., on the high seas, and in Manila, P. I., such arrest and imprisonment being made on the criminal charge of misappropriations of Government property, although the charge was subsequently dismissed.

According to a letter from the Judge Advocate General of the Navy, dated June 6, 1947, which is contained in the report accompanying the bill (S. Rept. No. 1103, 80th Cong.), it appears that Bert Harrington, Jr., was honorably discharged on November 2, 1945, as a chief boatswain's mate, United States Naval Reserve, at the personnel separation center, Bremerton, Wash. On January 8, 1946, the commander of the Philippine Sea Frontier informed the Navy Department that three enlisted men received the sum of $3,000 for Government property sold to a civilian, one of whom was reported to be Harrington. The commander of the Philippine Sea Frontier requested that Harrington be returned to that command for trial by general court martial. On January 17, 1946, the Navy Department advised the commander of the Philippine Sea Frontier that Harrington had been discharged on November 2, 1945, and requested information as to whether the case came within article 14, Articles for the Government of the Navy (R. S. 1624), and whether the circumstances warranted Harrington's arrest and return to the Philippine Sea Frontier. On January 20, 1946, the commander of the Philippine Sea Frontier advised the Navy Department that Harrington and two other enlisted men repaired a Japanese PT boat with United States property; that these men used the boat in the battalion boat pool; and that on inactivation of the battalion they sold the boat to a Chinese for $3,000 and executed a bill of sale therefor. The commander of the Philippine Sea Frontier recommended Harrington's arrest and return to the Philippine Sea Frontier for trial.

On January 21, 1946, the Navy Department directed that Harrington be arrested by naval guard and returned in a prisoner status to the commander of the Philippine Sea Frontier for trial. Navy Department records show that Harrington was arrested by the Los Angeles, Calif., Navy shore patrol on February 1, 1946, and was delivered to the receiving station, Terminal Island, Calif., on the same date for further transfer to the commander of the Philippine Sea Frontier on March 26, 1946.

After Harrington's arrival in the Philippine sea frontier, the convening authority, in view of the unavailability of requested defense witnesses, elected to nolle prosequi the charges and specifications preferred against Harrington. Harrington was therefore returned to the United States by Government air transportation, departing on May 22, 1946. He arrived in the United States on May 24, 1946, and reported to the receiving ship, San Francisco, Calif., on that date for release. The Judge Advocate General of the Navy concludes his letter by recommending against the enactment of the bill.

The facts involved in this case fall far short of justification for the granting

of the relief proposed by this measure. Although the beneficiary of this measure was inconvenienced and may have suffered a loss of compensation and damage to his business as a result of his arrest and return to Manila to face the charges then pending against him, it appears that there was justification for the action taken by the Navy authorities under the circumstances. Had the witnesses been available, he would no doubt have been tried and he might have been convicted of the charges. Arrest and detention are oftentimes followed by discharge without trial. The Congress has authorized suit for damages in the Court of Claims by persons erroneously convicted and imprisoned (18 U. S. C. 729) but such right was carefully limited. Until the right to compensation for damages sustained by persons erroneously convicted and imprisoned is extended to persons who have been arrested but subsequently released without trial, to compensate an individual by a private relief measure of this character would be highly discriminatory.

Accordingly, I am unable to lend my approval to the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 27, 1948.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal and the message and bill referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpenaed to appear before the District Court of the United States in and for the Eastern District of Louisiana, to give testimony on May 3, 1948, at 10 a. m., in the case of the United States of America against William T. Burton, et al. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this summons without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I, therefore, submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

(Issued for Messrs. Ellis, Ellis & Oancaster, 836-839 Canal Building, New Orleans, La., attorneys for defendant)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, TO THE MARSHAL OF THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA, TO EXECUTE AND RETURN

To Hon. HENRY LARCADE,
United States Congressman,
1413 New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to be and appear before a district court of the United States in and for the Eastern District of Louisiana, to be holden at the city of New Orleans, on the 3d day of May 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., then and there to testify the truth, according to your knowledge in the matter of *United States of America* v. *William T. Burton, et al.*, and herein fail not, under penalty of $250.

Witness, the Honorable Wayne G. Borah, judge of the said court, at the city of New Orleans, this 21st day of April, in the year of our Lord 1948, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and seventy-second year.

A. DALIAM O'BRIEN, Jr.,
Clerk.

By H. W. NIEHUES,
Deputy Clerk.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged resolution (H. Res. 556) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas Representative HENRY LARCADE, a Member of this House, has been served with a subpena to appear as a witness before the District Court of the United States in and for the Eastern District of Louisiana to testify at 10 o'clock a. m. on the 3d day of May 1948, in the case of the *United States of America* v. *William T. Burton et al.;* and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify but by the order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Representative HENRY LARCADE is authorized to appear in response to the subpena of the District Court of the United States in and for the Eastern District of Louisiana on Monday, May 3, 1948, in the case of the *United States of America* v. *William T. Burton et al.;* and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena of the said court.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

CONSTRUCTION OF COURTHOUSE FOR UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 549 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5963) to authorize the construction of a courthouse to accommodate the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides consideration for H. R. 5963, a bill to authorize the construction of a courthouse to accommodate the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

This legislation is required to alleviate the deplorable inadequacy of the present Federal court facilities in the District of Columbia.

The present District Courthouse, for example, was built in 1823 as a city hall, and converted for use as a courthouse in 1916. Since 1916, the continuous increase of court business has necessitated the use of an additional eight buildings by the courts. Some of these buildings are owned and partially occupied by the District of Columbia courts, while in other instances the Federal courts have rented space in privately owned buildings. Now many of you members—like myself—are lawyers—and you can appreciate the confusion and wasted time and effort that is bound to result from having the courts and its agencies located in nine different buildings.

This situation also presents a very real danger to the public safety. In criminal cases, it is often necessary to escort prisoners to two or three different buildings—thereby increasing the danger of their escape.

But even in view of the conditions I have just mentioned, I doubt that the Public Works Committee would have recommended a new courthouse for the District now if the buildings presently occupied by the court were sufficient to meet the needs. But they are not.

There is no space to house the court reporters, and no space for a court library. There are insufficient waiting rooms for jurors, who are sometimes forced to loiter about the halls between trials. Toilet and washroom facilities for witnesses and jurors are also inadequate. And the agencies of the court are so cramped for working space that they cannot operate with maximum efficiency.

The conditions I have just mentioned were pointed out by members of the Public Works Committee last year after they had made a personal inspection of the courts.

The Rules Committee was particularly interested in the effect the proposed construction would have on private housing—whether it might take a good deal of building material which might otherwise find its way into homes for veterans. We were assured that it would not. The material to be used in the proposed court building, in most instances, could not be used in home construction.

I have weighed the arguments for and against this bill carefully, and I believe that the best interests of our Federal judicial system lie in the passage of the bill, and I urge every Member to vote in favor of it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, there is very little that I can add to the remarks made in explanation of the bill that this resolution makes in order. I have been informed, as was my colleague, the chairman of the committee, that this courthouse is absolutely necessary, and consequently I favor the adoption of the rule and the passage of the bill. But, Mr. Speaker, I feel that we should also act favorably upon the pending housing bill before the Committee on Banking and Currency. No one can deny the great need for housing. I think it is outrageous that thousands and thousands of the veterans who served the Nation are unable to find quarters in which to live. True, this courthouse construction will not start until a year and a half from the date of the enactment of this bill, nevertheless, we have passed many bills in this House that will require the use of a great deal of material that should be used for housing. I urge the Members to insist that the housing bill that is pending and that has been pending for nearly 3 years receive favorable consideration without further delay. As to whether or not we can force the committee to report the bill, I do not know, but in view of the expressions on the part of most of you gentlemen, if the committee will not act favorably and report the bill I shall file a petition to discharge it from the further consideration of the measure, so that we can obtain action as we did on the oleomargarine bill here yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, were it not for the fact that I am so vitally interested in obtaining housing for veterans and the people, I would have pressed for the passage of my bill (H. R. 4423) providing for the construction of a Federal office building in Chicago to provide office space for the branch, regional, and district offices of various departments and agencies now located in over 100 buildings in Chicago at a rental cost of over $4,000,000 to the Government.

I believe that a building to provide office accommodations for all the different Government agencies, including courtrooms for the United States courts, could be erected at a cost of about $35,000,000, or even less, which would save the Government from $3,000,000 to $3,500,000 in rentals a year. The Federal building in Chicago has been occupied to capacity for over 20 years, and a new building in which all Government offices and the United States courts could be concentrated would mean a real savings to the Government, would expedite Government business, and provide better service to the public. However, in view of the very serious housing shortage which has made it almost impossible for veterans to obtain homes, I have withheld pressing for the passage of the bill, but shall do so as soon as housing materials become available and the veterans are able to purchase homes.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the pending rule and bill scarcely need any belaboring, but perhaps for the purpose of the RECORD and posterity the record should be made.

In a little town in Virginia not very far from Washington there was born the fifth President of the United States. His name was James Monroe. James Monroe became President of the United States, and in 1823 he announced his very celebrated doctrine that we have known ever since as the Monroe Doctrine.

It was in that same year that they built a city hall in the Nation's Capital, and that city hall built in 1823 was renovized in 1916, just before World War I, and constitutes the main court facility for the Nation's Capital. In addition to that facility, the court by virtue of increased business now occupies eight additional buildings.

I have said before that the strength of the law is respect, and the basis of respect is dignity. When there is no dignity about what we are pleased to speak of as the temple of justice, you sometimes wonder why you get a diminished amount of respect for the law.

It is rather difficult for me to conceive the number of people who have identity with the court system in the District of Columbia, and who must be subjected to the facilities we have here now who can come away with a sense of deep respect. When a case is completed in the court facilities today and all the argument has been made to the jury, sometimes 3 or 4 hours elapse before they can find a jury room. An interesting lot of things can happen from the time argument is concluded until the jury begins its deliberations. We have in Washington today mixed juries, and there are no facilities to speak of for mixed juries. Often they must be sent home, even in the case of issues of national import for, after all, this is the equivalent of a Federal and a State jurisdiction, and it is necessary that the departments of the Government rely upon our court facilities here.

You have such celebrated defendants in court as Benedict Meyers, officer of the United States Army, John L. Lewis, Hollywood writers, and a great many other people. Such cases are rather common. The facilities should be dignified and such as comport with the importance of the cases that are tried there. Sometimes jurors have to be sent home. They have to wait before argument is closed. Ofttimes jurymen must loiter in the halls of the courtrooms here—a strange proceeding if you please, and certainly not in conformance with our estimate of the traditions of justice in this country. It is interesting to find that prisoners have to be brought from one building to another, and in the case of those who have records for viciousness, it would be the easiest thing in the world to have a prison break take place here in Washington by those defendants who are distinct and definite menaces to society. We have three assistant district attorneys attached to the court. All of them must operate and prepare their cases in a single room. We have six domestic relations commissioners who deal with those delicate domestic relations between mother and child, husband and wife. Yet those six commissioners must occupy a single room. So you can imagine all of them dealing with those intimacies of family life that have brought them within the jurisdiction of the court, and you can imagine those intimacies being revealed there in a single room where others can hear them. Manifestly that is not in conformance with our sense of justice and propriety and our desire to keep private those intimacies of family life which ofttimes find their way into the courts of domestic relations. One of the most amazing things in connection with our court facilities here is that witnesses often get lost. They are notified to appear at a certain building to testify at a trial and perhaps are not given a very good description of the building. They land in some other building and sit there hour after hour. Meanwhile the participants in the trial, plaintiff and defendant and counsel for both plaintiff and defendant wonder where their witnesses are. After a while somebody is sent out, if there is enough personnel to do that, and finally they find a lost witness sitting patiently in some other courtroom not knowing where to go and waiting for justice to be done and for him to be called. To me it is really astonishing. Judge Laws told me that for some time there have been inadequate conferences between himself and his associate justices for the very good reason that there is no chamber where such conferences can be held. And, mind you, that is in the Nation's Capital.

Gentlemen, you know that in your own community the real center of the judicial and moral forces of the community is the courtroom. That is why people in county seats in all the constituencies of the United States are always anxious to have a fine, impressive courthouse. They want something that will comport with the dignity and the size of the town, something that will make a deep impression upon the people and augment and enhance respect for law and for those who sit in judgment on their fellow men and who administer the law. So over the years we have been appropriating money for fine court facilities so that courthouses of adequate dignity might be available, because, after all, the palace of justice is a hallowed place. But can it be hallowed if there is not that kind of dignity that comports with our estimate of justice? Let me close by making one reference to something that happened in the Congress when we began to appropriate money for military cantonments in World War II. In those first appropriation bills there appeared sufficient funds to provide special separate and well-designed chapels for every Army cantonment, both here and abroad. I became very much interested in that matter because of a letter which I received from a former Catholic chaplain from Puerto Rico who related some of his experiences of World War I. Having been a soldier who started at Camp Custer at Battle Creek, in the State of my esteemed friend, the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], I was interested because I had lived through that experience. He said in his letter that they had to use the recreation facilities in camp for religious services the next morning, but on Saturday night

those centers were always used for boxing bouts, for motion-picture shows, and that sort of thing. Everybody smoked. Cigarette stubs and cigar stubs were littered on the floor. So, early on Sunday morning, before religious services could be held, the chaplain had to go and sweep up the place, open all the windows, and get in a little fresh air, so that some unrepentant sinner who had not gone to bed the night before would not fall asleep in church.

So he had to give it a little touch, you know, to make it habitable. He set this out, and I thought what a strange thing. Out of my own experience I knew it was true. So we met that challenge, because you can look at those cantonments everywhere in the world and there were fine little chapels, so beautifully maintained, used exclusively for religious worship. It imparted a dignity that reached away down into the recesses of the soul, and accounted, in large measure, for so many, many men in uniform who went to church during World War II, because there was some appeal, some attraction, and there was a dignity that was in conformity with the glory of the Lord, and there was atmosphere. We did it. So, if we are going to have that atmosphere, that respect, and that dignity in the temple of justice, most notably here in the Nation's Capital, the Capital of the greatest citadel of liberty that remains on the face of the earth, we must do this. How necessary it is that this job be done, that this rule be passed, and that this bill be passed without a single dissenting vote.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5963) to authorize the construction of a courthouse to accommodate the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5963, with Mr. SEELY-BROWN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] for 30 minutes, and will recognize the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] for 30 minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, after listening to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] there is very little that can be said in regard to this bill.

This bill comes to the floor of the House with the unanimous approval of the Committee on Public Works.

I am well aware that there is no Member of this House who has not been pressured, or to whom appeals have not been made for a public building in their respective congressional districts, perhaps a courthouse, a post office, a customshouse, or some other Federal building. I hope that no Member of the House will get the impression that this is the beginning of an extended building program in the United States.

Your Committee on Public Works believes we are trying to meet what we consider an intolerable condition in the District of Columbia. The administration of justice has been seriously handicapped for want of space to administer it.

As the gentleman from Illinois so well said a few minutes ago, the present courthouse was built in 1823 and was used for a city hall. In 1916 it was changed to a courthouse. At that time room was provided for 6 judges and a few governmental agencies. At the present time the District has 12 judges and 17 public agencies yet they must transact their business with the same facilities furnished nearly 32 years ago.

There is no controversy as to the site, there is no controversy as to the price, there is no controversy or disagreement as to the type of building which is proposed to be erected if this bill becomes law and the courthouse is authorized. We all know that the courthouse is to be built on Constitution Avenue just opposite the Standard Service Center. The site which is now owned by the District of Columbia is to be used. The price for it has been determined to be $2,420,000.

The Congress has already voted and appropriated some $370,000 for the drafting of plans and specifications for the building, and the amount which the courthouse is estimated to cost as stated in the bill is $18,665,000. The District of Columbia will pay half, or 50 percent, that half to be repaid to the Government of the United States over a period of 25 years.

I could go on in detail and give many reasons why this courthouse is necessary. Some of us on the Committee on Public Works who are present this afternoon, together with myself, visited the court building a year ago in order to see firsthand the conditions under which cases are being tried and justice is being administered.

I again repeat, the conditions which we saw were deplorable and I think adversely affected the fair and decent administration of justice here in the Nation's Capital.

This is one of the most important jurisdictions in all the land, for here reside the Cabinet officers, and other high officials of the Government; and here are initiated or instituted many of the famous and important cases of the United States, many of them well known to every Member of this House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one additional minute.

In spite of all that, the District of Columbia is sadly in need of necessary space in which these cases may be heard and justice done.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. HUBER. I wish to compliment the gentleman and his committee for bringing out this legislation. Several years ago I had opportunity as a member of that committee to visit the courthouse and see for myself the deplorable conditions which exist. I am sure that if every Member of the House had had the opportunity to visit that building, we would have had this legislation long ago.

Mr. DONDERO. I appreciate the gentleman's statement and his contribution, because what he says is absolutely true.

Mr. Chairman, I do not care to take the time of the Committee further, except to say that free government is under attack all over the world, our own Government included. Anything which in any way depreciates or detracts from the administration of justice under such free government among peoples reflects upon the system of government which we have heralded to the world. This bill, therefore, is brought to the House in the hope that we can provide proper facilities for the administration of justice under the last great free government on the face of this earth. We all hope that it will serve the purpose of supporting that type of liberty, of freedom and government founded upon justice and equity to all citizens, high and low, rich and poor, humble and great alike.

The bill provides that the Federal Works Administrator is authorized to construct, equip, and furnish a courthouse to accommodate the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, the planning and site acquisition of which were authorized by Public Law 80, Eightieth Congress, approved May 29, 1947.

The limit of cost for the entire project is $18,665,000, including architectural, engineering, and administrative expenses. This sum includes the credit of $2,420,000 granted the District of Columbia under Public Law 80, Eightieth Congress, as compensation for the site and $370,000 for plans and specifications appropriated under Public Law 271, Eightieth Congress, approved July 30, 1947.

The United States and the District of Columbia are to share equally in the cost, the District of Columbia to repay the United States, over a period of 25 years, 50 percent of the cost of the entire project upon completion, less the credit of $2,420,000 granted the District as compensation for the site, payment to be made in equal installments beginning with the July 1 next following the date of completion of the project.

The operation, maintenance, and repair of the completed building will be under the control of the Public Buildings Administration in the Federal Works Agency, and the allocation of space therein will be vested in the chief justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the Chief Justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. The

cost of operation, maintenance, and repair of the completed project will be divided equally between the United States and the District of Columbia.

JURISDICTION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS—FROM TESTIMONY OF CHIEF JUSTICE LAWS

Inasmuch as under the Constitution Congress is the sovereign power in the District of Columbia, we combine in our courts the jurisdiction which ordinarily is vested in the Federal Courts in the States with the jurisdiction ordinarily vested in the superior State courts. This means that in our courts we have the most diversified class of cases of any court in the United States. The importance of our court is great. Since the Cabinet officers and other Government officials are situated in Washington, they are served with process here and the major litigation which they are engaged in to a large extent is tried here. It is not rare that we have major problems arising in other jurisdictions which are decided by our District courts. For example I can recall a mandamus case against the Secretary of the Interior, involving fishing rights in Puget Sound; suits against the Secretary of the Interior growing out of his guardianship of Indians throughout the various States; suits against the Secretary of the Treasury growing out of moneys about to be paid on transactions occurring in different States.

The Attorney General finds it convenient to initiate many of his most important Government cases, both civil and criminal in the District of Columbia. Seldom a week passes, indeed a few days pass, when some major Government case or cases is not being heard in our court. Within the past 2 years, we have had many major criminal cases with which I am sure you are familiar. Last year we had, as a new reporter put it, for the first time in any court, three front-page criminal cases on trial at one time. They were the May-Garsson case, the Kenneth Romney case, and the case of Carl A. Marzani. Other cases we have tried lately are the Joseph P. Kamp, the Benjamin Fields, and the Edward K. Barsky with 15 codefendants. These involved charges of refusal to testify before Congress.

PRESENT HOUSING INADEQUATE

Present building was constructed in 1823 as a city hall. It was converted for use as a courthouse in 1916 to house six judges and a few agencies. Since then the business has increased so that we now have 12 judges and 17 agencies. At present we occupy nine buildings in all. Nine judges have their offices and courtrooms in the old building, and three, including the chief justice, are located in the Municipal Court-Criminal Division Building, owned by the District. These buildings are about one-half block apart and separated by E Street. Valuable records of the clerk's office are stored in the basement of the Juvenile Court Building. The Commission on Mental Health occupies quarters in the new Municipal Center Building. Other officials are housed in the Century Building at 412 Fifth Street, in the Bank of Commerce and Savings Building at Seventh and E Streets, in the Department of Justice Building at Ninth and Pennsylvania Avenue, in the Tower Building at Fourteenth and K Streets. We have no space to house the court reporters and no space for a court library.

With the judges and the agencies thus scattered, a tremendous problem confronts the chief justice. It is customary for him to hear cases from 9:30 or 10 a. m. to 4:30 or 5 p. m. The result has been that sometimes many weeks have passed that he has not been able to see, much less confer with, the other judges, and sometimes months pass without his being able to maintain contacts with some of the important agencies of the court.

The District government has permitted them to use, without payment, three courtrooms in the Municipal Court-Criminal Division Building. Recently it became necessary to relinquish one of these rooms.

SERIOUS PROBLEM IN HANDLING PRISONERS

There are three buildings between which prisoners have to be conducted, with no protection except being handcuffed together or to deputy marshals. When criminal cases are being tried in the Municipal Criminal Court Division Building, it is necessary for the United States marshal to bring the prisoners from a cell block in the District Courthouse, through an open yard, and across the public street.

CONFUSION CAUSED BY LACK OF SPACE

Witnesses report to the District Building, and they must be sent or taken to the building in which the trial is held. Despite careful efforts, they are continually being lost, delaying proceeding with cases until they are found.

NO ADEQUATE SPACE FOR JURORS

The same problem arises with respect to jurors. Jurors in criminal cases are assigned to a specific court. However, if a first-degree murder or other capital case is being tried, or if a judge tries three or four cases in 1 day, it is often necessary to borrow jurors from one of the other courts. Time and again jurors have lost their way and delayed the trial of a case.

Jurors have to loiter standing up in the corridors because of lack of space in the waiting rooms.

There is a shortage of rooms for the use of jurors when actually deliberating on a case.

Two of our courtrooms in the courthouse are so small that they do not contain a box for jurors.

There is no room available for two special grand juries when it is necessary to appoint a second one.

AGENCIES UNABLE TO WORK WITH MAXIMUM EFFICIENCY

The United States attorney's office is so crowded that he has two assistants in every room and three in some. These assistants must interview witnesses and otherwise prepare their cases for trial—cases which often are of vital importance to the Government. When one assistant is talking with witnesses, the other who shares his office is forced to take his witnesses elsewhere and on occasions to a file room.

There is no place for witnesses to wait while in the United States attorney's office, so they must stand or sit in the corridor or on the steps.

The same situation obtains in the office of the probation officer, in the office of the domestic relations commissioner, and in the office of the assignment commissioner.

INCREASING VOLUME OF CASES

In 1945, 8,288 civil and criminal cases were commenced. In 1946 the number was 10,086, an increase of 21.69 percent. In 1947 the number was 9,830, an increase over 1945 of 18.61 percent.

Divorce cases commenced in 1945, 2,696; in 1946, 3,893, and in 1947, 3,060. Increase in 1946 over 1945, 1,197; increase in 1947 over 1945, 364.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, for some time it has been generally agreed that there is need for a courthouse for the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and for the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. This matter was brought to the attention of the Congress previously and on May 29, 1947, an act was passed authorizing the acquisition of a site, the appointment of a committee to supervise the plans and authorizing conveyance of property owned by the District of Columbia as a site for the courthouse building. The Architect of the Capitol was authorized to employ the necessary personal and other services in providing for the plans.

The bill under consideration provides for construction of a courthouse at a cost not to exceed $18,665,000, including architectural, engineering, and administrative expenses. This amount includes the value of land conveyed by the District of Columbia to the United States in the amount of $2,420,000.

Under the said act of May 29, 1947, providing for plans in the supplemental deficiency appropriation bill of July 30, 1947, Congress appropriated $370,000 for the preparation of plans and provided that those plans and the exercise of the powers under the act of May 29, 1947, should thereafter be exercised by the Commissioner of Public Buildings.

The District of Columbia is to share one-half the cost of this building, to be repaid in 10 annual installments without interest. The cost of the operation of the building is to be divided between the Government and the District of Columbia as are the costs of maintenance and repairs.

As I indicated, it is generally agreed that the need for this courthouse really constitutes an emergency. I was among the members of the Committee on Public Works who, with Chief Justice Laws, inspected the existing courtrooms, court buildings, and the court facilities. They are quite inadequate. The largest courtroom is the criminal courtroom. That auditorium, as I recall, is around 60 feet square, yet some of the most celebrated trials in recent years have been conducted by the district court for the District of Columbia. You will recall a number of trials that attracted the attention of the entire country in the last few years were conducted in the District of Columbia.

The need for additional court facilities is evident.

It is well to keep in mind this building will cost, with the ground, probably twice as much, or substantially twice, as the magnificent Supreme Court Building. I make the comparison to show the increase in the cost of construction. The amount authorized here, of course, is to be appropriated and I personally trust that the appropriations will be so made as to provide for the needed facilities, and at the same time protect the Public Treasury. There is need for public works in many parts of the country. There are crowded conditions in other courts, but, personally, I have advocated that a program of public works be delayed, certainly for the present, until the costs of labor and materials have been stabilized. It is very difficult to obtain steel and very difficult to obtain other building materials, and the labor supply has not been stabilized. So that while I favor the authorization, I trust that the Appropriations Committee will safeguard the interest of the District and the Government by making appropriations for the prosecution of the work so that the materials may be obtained at reasonable prices and that labor may be obtained at reasonable costs.

In the tour of inspection made by the Public Works Committee I was impressed by the crowded conditions, particularly by the crowded conditions of the jury rooms and the crowded conditions of the courtrooms. There is more space for the average justice of the peace court in many parts of the country than there is for the District courts in the existing facilities in the District of Columbia. The crowded condition for the handling of prisoners and the method of handling, with opportunity for escape, impressed me. I do not think I have ever seen a prison that was more crowded. Prisoners of all ages were placed in the same cell. The prison problem necessitates and cries out for improvement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Then there is confusion in the court buildings. The aisles in some cases were filled with files and with witnesses, to say nothing at all of the prospective jurors. The whole atmosphere of the existing court facilities was such that I do not believe any reasonable man could conclude otherwise than that the situation is an emergency and that Congress should make provision even in the period of high costs for the construction of the courthouse as soon as it can be reasonably built. The agencies of the District, as has been indicated, are inadequately provided for and are as a result, unable to transact with efficiency their usual business.

The number of cases tried has materially increased; consequently the number of litigants has greatly increased. Washington has increased in population vastly in the last 5 to 10 years. The trial of cases to which the Government is a party has multiplied with the expanding multiplication of the functions of the Government. I might mention, among others, the trial of cases that Congress is responsible for. I have in mind the citing of those for contempt for refusing to answer questions of the Committee on Un-American Activities. So, all in all, Mr. Chairman, as has been stated by the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works, this bill comes before the House with the unanimous approval of the committee, and I trust that it will be unanimously passed by the House.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 5963 authorizes construction of a courthouse to accommodate the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. The planning and site acquisition for this court building were authorized by Public Law 80 of the Eightieth Congress, approved May 29, 1947, which established $2,420,000 as a credit for the District of Columbia.

The land was originally purchased, some 20 years ago, for $1,770,000 and the $2,420,000 represents the agreed and appraised value of this site by the District of Columbia and the United States Government appraisers, or the fair value of the land at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, some weeks ago, members of the Committee on Public Works made a very thorough inspection of the buildings now being used by the courts above named. We found conditions deplorable and definitely impairing the quality and functions of the court. Every foot of space is utilized and the crowded conditions, most assuredly, deprive officials and their subordinates the opportunity to efficiently perform their duties.

The District courthouse was constructed as a city hall in 1823. It was rebuilt in 1916 to house six judges. In 1938 it housed 12 judges and now there are 17 agencies connected with this court. Three judges are in a separate building because there is no room for them in the courthouse, and there are nine different buildings now used by the court. Under this bill, they would be housed in one building. I believe we all realize how difficult it is to administer the work of the court and keep abreast of work under such conditions.

Attention is called to the fact that it has been necessary to move to the basement many important records in order that space could be made available for personnel. A survey reveals that conference rooms for attorneys, and waiting rooms for jurors and witnesses, are so small that they cannot accommodate the various actual requirements of the hundreds who enter the building each day. As a result of these conditions, the corridors and courtrooms are overcrowded.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question, if every Member of Congress would take time to visit the court, that he will agree that the construction of this building is absolutely necessary, that this is a real emergency, and that the efficient administration of justice is seriously affected by these deplorable conditions.

This court is one of the outstanding courts of our Nation, as a very unusual situation exists here. Because Congress is the sovereign in the District of Columbia, jurisdiction of the courts is combined, and jurisdiction which ordinarily is vested in the Federal courts in the States is combined with jurisdiction vested in the superior State courts. This calls attention to the fact that this court has the most diversified class of cases of any court in the United States.

The importance of the work is added to the fact that Cabinet officers and other Government officials, all situated in Washington, are served with process here in the District of Columbia, and the major litigation in which they are engaged is tried here. Important antitrust legislation which is brought here involves companies throughout the entire United States. There is now pending an antitrust case involving 160 major oil companies. These companies are represented by 160 or more attorneys and they have assistants. There is no place to hold that court in the greatest Capital of the world.

Mr. Chairman, this building is a dire necessity, a real emergency exists, and I respectfully urge that this bill be passed at once.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. On both the bill providing for the drawing up of plans and specifications, passed in May 1947, and the pending bill, the Committee on Public Works and the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds conducted hearings, and those hearings are available to any Members who may desire to read them.

Mr. McGREGOR. The gentleman is absolutely correct. He refers to the legislation relative to the authorization for the drafting of the plans and specifications. Hearings were held on that bill, which passed in this Congress and is now known as Public Law 80. Extensive hearings were held on both the pending bill and the legislation to which the gentleman has referred.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In support of the statement that the committee gave careful consideration to the bill under consideration, it is fair to say that the bill originally introduced was amended so as to protect the amount that might be expended and protect the expenditures and contributions of the Government by eliminating the escalator clause.

Mr. McGREGOR. The gentleman is correct. The bill originally introduced we thought possibly did not protect the public funds, so the bill before us has been amended so that the cost of construction cannot exceed the amount described in the legislation.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MUHLENBERG], a member of the committee.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, there is one point that I think should be called to the attention of the House today—the total cost of the project. Under the existing bill the cost of the entire project is marked as $18,665,000. There has been some discussion time and again as to why the building should cost that amount of money. Actually, that is for

the total project. When you deduct the $2,420,000 for the land, there is left a total of $16,247,000 which includes, roughly, about 10 percent for architectural and engineering fees. This leaves a net for the building of about $15,000,000. But even with the $15,000,000 total, comparison should not be made with the Supreme Court building, because the number of cubic feet in this building is very substantially in excess of that in the Supreme Court Building. The building is simple in design, but large in cubage, and it cannot be made much smaller without seriously crippling its activities.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUHLENBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I wish to pay my personal respects to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, who is a very gifted architect, and whose services were very valuable in the consideration of this bill.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. I thank the gentleman very much. In turn, may I say that as an architect on the committee I have observed with very great respect and admiration the conduct of the whole discussion on the project, both by our very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], and by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR], chairman of the Subcommittee on Buildings and Grounds, who first called up the bill, held extensive hearings, and guided the discussion into a constructive proposal in accord with the facts and needs.

I think there is not very much else to say other than that, in my opinion as a practicing architect, the building is estimated sensibly and the plans are quite well developed. You will note that there is a definite limit in cost, and should the bids be in excess of the total appropriation the plans will be modified in accordance. The working drawings and specifications will not be completed for another 6 or 8 months, but I think that if the bill is passed we can be assured that, granted reasonable bids, the construction can actually be started within a period of 6 months.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUHLENBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Whatever may be said about comparison with the Supreme Court Building, that comparison was made to emphasize the increase in the costs since the Supreme Court Building was constructed. The fact remains that this structure has been under consideration, and, practically, the cost has increased every time an estimate has been made for the last 5 or 6 years, on account of the increase in the cost of materials and labor.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. The gentleman from Mississippi is absolutely correct. Costs have increased a great deal, probably about 75 percent since that time. I believe, however, that the estimates of costs on this job by the Architect and the Federal Works Agency is consistent and in accord with today's practices.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], a member of the committee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, the founding fathers of our country very wisely provided at the time of the drafting of the Constitution for a separate branch of government in the establishment of the judicial system. The medium through which this judicial system functions for the benefit of the people is the courts. The courts cannot properly do their work unless they have proper tools. One of the most important tools is a proper building to house the court in. The testimony before the Committee on Public Works and the Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was very persuasive and conclusive that the present facilities in the way of buildings in the District of Columbia are wholly inadequate for the administration of justice at the present time as it was intended to be administered by the framers of the Constitution. If the branch of the Government known as the judicial branch were to fall, we would have anarchy and lose our form of government. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it is essential that we have appropriate and suitable buildings for those who administer justice in our land so that they can properly do their work. I very much favor the passage of the bill and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized to construct, equip, and furnish the building for the use of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, the planning and site acquisition of which were authorized by the act of May 29, 1947 (Public Law 80, 80th Cong.), under a total limit of cost for the entire project of $18,665,000, including architectural, engineering, and administrative expenses (which limit of cost also includes the credit of $2,420,000 granted the District of Columbia as compensation for the site of the project by said act of May 29, 1947, and the $370,000 for plans and specifications heretofore appropriated under Public Law 271, 80th Cong., approved July 30, 1947): *Provided*, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall repay to the United States, over a period of 25 years, 50 percent of the cost of the entire project upon completion, less the credit of $2,420,000 granted the District of Columbia as compensation for the site of the project of said act of May 29, 1947, in equal annual installments, beginning with the July 1 next following the date of completion of the project: *Provided further*, That the cost of operation, maintenance, and repair of the completed project shall be divided equally between the United States of America and the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. The operation, maintenance, and repair of the completed building shall be under the control of the Public Buildings Administration, in the Federal Works Agency, and the allocation of space therein shall be vested in the chief justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the chief justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think this bill aptly illustrates a point that is somewhat before the public today. We are here appropriating money for the judicial branch. We are telling them where they can build a courthouse and how much they can spend for it. This was requested by the judicial branch, and they submitted facts in support of their request. In reply Congress did not say that it was improper for the judicial branch to make this request. Instead, the Congress recognized the needs of the judiciary and Congress, now acting as the legislative branch, is exercising its constitutional powers that the judiciary might exercise the constitutional powers it possesses. Now, the point I make is that such action by the Congress in appropriating or the judiciary in accepting does not involve any surrender of independence by the judicial branch, for we are exercising the powers which the Constitution assigns to the Congress to support this particular branch of the Government by appropriations. I think that is of particular importance. I think it should be pointed out at this particular time, because the claim is in effect being made that when the exercise of the constitutional powers of the legislative branch of our Government involves the executive branch, that the constitutional grant of power to the Congress cannot be exercised. Such claim would destroy our system of checks and balances and either establish one branch that was superior to the others or set up a no-man's land in each branch where the other branches would be powerless to exercise their constitutionally assigned functions. Such fields of inoperative areas for constitutional powers was never intended by the Constitution.

Apropos of the fact that our Constitution provides for three separate interdependent branches and not three independent departments, I want to observe that when the powers assigned to any constitutional branch are exercised by the branch to which they are assigned, such exercise does not interfere with the constitutional independence of any other branch. To illustrate: Is the independence of the judiciary destroyed when the legislative branch impeaches a Federal judge? Was the independence of the Congress destroyed when the executive branch 2 years ago prosecuted and convicted one of its committee chairmen? Was the independence of Congress destroyed 2 weeks ago when the House, pursuant to a judicial subpena, made available certain records of the Committee on Un-American Activities, or on yesterday, when a Member was released so as to testify in court?

TEAPOT DOME

Was the independence of the executive branch destroyed when the Congress investigated certain oil leases of naval reserves made by the executive branch, and thereby uncovered the Teapot Dome scandal?

Is the independence of the executive department destroyed when the Congress

appropriates money for the executive branch, when the President vetoes a bill or the Court finds a law or departmental action to be unconstitutional or invalid, or the General Accounting Office refuses to approve a voucher?

Is the President's independence destroyed by the fact that his appointments must be confirmed and the treaties he negotiates must be ratified?

The answer to each of these questions is clearly "no." And the independence given to the executive branch in the exercise of executive powers by the Constitution will not be destroyed or even impaired by the proper officials of the Commerce Department complying with the law and making the Condon letter available so all may see. I have no knowledge of the contents of this letter, but I believe the best interests of Dr. Condon, the Commerce Department, Congress, and the public would be promoted by making the truth available. Under our form of government no single department is absolutely independent. Ours is a Government of checks and balances, and each branch must yield to the constitutional powers of the other departments in their assigned fields. The failure of the Secretary of Commerce, who is a creature of congressional statute and not a constitutional officer, to make the Condon letter available to Congress obstructs Congress in the performance of its legislative duties, and, in my opinion, constitutes a violation of the law under which his department is organized. His action is a contempt of Congress, since Congress has been held to possess the power of investigation as auxiliary to the constitutional power to legislate (*McGrain* v. *Daugherty* (273 U. S. 135)). For such contempt the Supreme Court in *Jurney* v. *McCracken* (294 U. S. 125) held that a private citizen may be brought before the bar of Congress and sentenced. The right would seem to be ever clearer where a governmental employee is concerned. If that is done on a motion for a writ of habeas corpus, we will have decided by the courts whether the public interest is to be what some official says it is or what the law of the land states it to be. If ours is still a government of laws and not men, the law which was enacted by Congress and signed by the President and which provides that the Secretary of Commerce shall make such reports as he may be required to do by either House of Congress will be declared to establish what is in the public interest, and the matter will not be left to private individual determination. However, even apart from this statutory bulwark for the position of the House in this matter, the Secretary of Commerce is subject to the subpena powers and violates his office when he refuses to comply therewith. My sole interest in this matter is to be watchful of the constitutional powers vested in this Congress, the protection of which I consider the best guaranty of liberty and the other constitutional and natural rights of men.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SEELY-BROWN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5963) to authorize the construction of a courthouse to accommodate the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 549, he reported the same back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WE CAN DESTROY OURSELVES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, two of the ways by which we can render the future of the United States of America insecure are these: We can fail to adequately prepare to defend ourselves against foreign aggression or, under the guise of national preparedness, we can waste our national resources by improper and misdirected so-called preparedness measures, to such an extent that, even though not threatened by a foreign foe, we will collapse through weakness or because of internal strife growing out of scarcities and high prices—inflation—or discontent and rebellion against price fixing, rationing, and dictatorial methods made necessary by a foreign policy which weakens us.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

There is no indication that the Congress will fail to appropriate adequate funds to build up all branches of our armed forces. Recent appropriations indicate that the Congress will give, not only all that is necessary to insure an adequate national defense, if the money be wisely spent, but that it may go so far beyond what is necessary as to unduly burden the taxpayers.

MISDIRECTED NEW DEAL BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY

Our real danger lies, not in the failure to understand the need for adequate armed forces in this country or in the failure to provide the money for that promptly, but rather in an unsound New Deal bipartisan foreign policy which would impose upon our people a burden which would not only prevent an adequate defense here at home, but which would be such a drain upon our national resources that ultimately our own weakness would destroy us. There is an old saying that it is folly to let the contents of a barrel out through the bunghole instead of the spigot. Our foreign policy does not bother with the bunghole—it just knocks in the head of the barrel.

Let us consider the second possibility. Natural resources, the ability of a people to produce, are not unlimited. Unfortunately, those two facts have been ignored by those who have formulated and directed our foreign policy. To date, no accurate or adequate inventory of our national resources or of our ability to produce has been given to us by the administration.

Every wise individual contemplating an undertaking first determines what he has, what he can obtain, before undertaking an enterprise. A farmer starting off on his tractor to plow sees to it that he has at least enough gasoline to get to the field. A fisherman or a hunter, before starting out, gets himself some fishing tackle, a gun, and ammunition. But the administration, attempting to buy friendship and peace throughout the world, makes no accounting of our ability to do or pay. It goes blindly on its way, giving here, there, and everywhere; interfering in, or attempting to direct, the affairs and policy of every nation with which it deals, without considering its ability to meet its commitments and, at the same time, preserve the freedom, the prosperity, and the happiness of the people here at home.

To distract attention from its own failures and from what it is doing and from the policy which, after 10 years, involved us in a world war, and now has nothing better to offer us than compulsory universal military training, conscription of our men and women in peacetime, and an ever-increasing public debt, with added taxation, additional scarcities, and more regimentation, the administration once more starts its propaganda machine at work, charging all who oppose its ruinous policies with being not only unkind, greedy, uncharitable but lacking in patriotism, just because they will not swallow without protest the bitter dose prepared by its medicine men.

THE FACTS

Not only has the administration refused to make an inventory of what we have or what we can do or to tell us the ultimate figure on what is needed to carry out its policy, but it cravenly keeps repeating that we are in danger of aggression from a foreign foe, and it fails to tell you what has already been spent in its fruitless effort to purchase friendship abroad.

I asked Legislative Service to get me the facts, not guesses, and here are the figures on what the United States of America has done since July 1, 1940, and prior to October 1, 1947, in extending aid to foreign countries.

SECTION I

Did anyone ever tell you that in that period of time the United States of America aided foreign countries to the tune of $73,233,890,070? Of that sum, $68,774,364,498 had actually been disbursed by September 30, 1947.

This figure includes the total of several funds which had not been disbursed in their entirety in the period in question, but break-downs of the funds are not available. This total includes all loans by the various United States Government agencies which are authorized to extend lines of credits to foreign entities, property credits, advances in the form of trade goods or cash to be repaid by the delivery of goods, relief in the form of congressional authorizations, outlays in accordance with official international obligations, and expenditures for war on behalf of other governments, notably lend-lease. Of this total, $1,759,462,338 of loans, property credits, and advances remained unutilized on Sep-

tember 30, 1947. Of the grants for relief and rehabilitation, the bulk of the Greek-Turkish aid had not been spent by September 30, 1947. The American contribution to the International Bank—$3,175,000,000—consists of $219,215,000 and non-interest-bearing, nonnegotiable demand notes of $415,785,000 actually paid into the bank. The remainder, $2,540,000,000, remains subject to call only when required to meet the obligations of the bank; in other words, it is a contingent liability only. This $2,540,000,000 should be deducted from the total disbursements for the above-mentioned reasons.

Loans represent cash credits which must be repaid in cash. Property credits are credits other than cash which have been extended to foreign countries in the disposal of surplus property, ships, final disposition of lend-lease goods in pipe lines, and transactions in settlements of the residues of relief supplies. Repayments are expected in the form of cash, strategic materials or services. Advances are in goods or cash and repayment is expected in materials or services.

Under relief and rehabilitation no summaries of utilization or disbursement are given, with the exception of a separate break-down for lend-lease, since some of the material is still classified and in other cases final accounting has not been given.

SECTION II.—*Summary statements of loans, property credits, advances, relief and rehabilitation grants and other authorizations to foreign countries by the U. S. Government, July 1, 1940, to Sept. 30, 1947*

LOANS

	July 1, 1940, to Dec. 11, 1941	Dec. 12, 1941, to Sept. 30, 1947
1. Export-Import Bank	$164,501,298.84	$1,875,185,252.16
2. Reconstruction Finance Corporation (proper)		465,000,000.00
3. Office of Defense Supplies (RFC)		19,608,519.00
4. U. S. Commercial Company (RFC)		2,620,196.00
5. State Department		248,032.00
6. Treasury Department		3,350,000,000.00
Total loans to Sept. 30, 1947	164,501,298.84	5,712,661,999.16

PROPERTY CREDITS

1. Maritime Commission	$157,559,480
2. Office of Rubber Reserve (RFC)	1,964,773
3. Office of Foreign Liquidation Commissioner (State)	945,889,763
4. Lend-lease fiscal operations (Treasury)	1,366,684,881
5. U. S. Army	20,000,000
Total property credits to Sept. 30, 1947	2,492,098,897

ADVANCES

1. Agriculture Department	$712,200,101
2. Office of Defense Supplies (RFC)	49,741,693
3. Office of Metals Reserve (RFC)	117,090,443
4. Office of Rubber Reserve (RFC)	10,214,789
5. U. S. Commercial Company (RFC)	53,803,250
6. State Department	281,021
7. Treasury Department	60,000,000
Total advances to Sept. 30, 1947	1,003,331,297

SECTION II.—*Summary statements of loans, property credits, advances, relief and rehabilitation grants and other authorizations to foreign countries by the U. S. Government, July 1, 1940, to Sept. 30, 1947*—Continued

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

1. UNNRA	$2,700,000,000
2. Post-UNNRA (general relief bill)	332,000,000
3. International Refugee Organization	71,073,900
4. International Child Emergency Fund	15,000,000
5. Italian relief by U. S. Army (pre-UNNRA)	135,000,000
6. Philippine war damage grants	631,000,000
7. U. S. Army and Navy relief	2,200,000,000
8. Congressional aid to China	120,000,000
9. Aid to American Republics	20,000,000
10. Greek-Turkish aid	400,000,000
Total relief to Sept. 30, 1947	6,624,073,900

OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

1. Lend-lease, till Sept. 2, 1945	$48,172,697,106
2. Lend-lease grants, post VJ-day	1,220,000,000
3. International Bank	3,175,000,000
4. International Monetary Fund	2,750,000,000
Total other authorizations to Sept. 30, 1947	55,317,697,106

RECAPITULATION

Loans (July 1, 1940, to Dec. 11, 1941)	$164,501,299
Loans (Dec. 12, 1941, to Sept. 30, 1947)	5,712,661,999
Property credits	2,492,098,897
Advances	1,003,331,297
Relief and rehabilitation	6,624,073,900
Other authorizations	[1] 52,777,697,106
Total disbursements	68,774,364,498

[1] $2,540,000,000, a contingent liability of the United States in the World Bank, has been deducted from this item.

SECTION III—*Loans, property credits, and advances to foreign countries by the United States Government, July 1, 1940, to Sept. 30, 1947*

	July 1, 1940, to Dec. 11, 1941, loans	Dec. 12, 1941, to Sept. 30, 1947			
		Loans	Property credits	Advances	Total
LATIN AMERICA					
Argentina	$120,000.00	$270,000.00		$3,990	$273,990.00
Bolivia		18,485,301.85		5,954,296	24,439,597.85
Brazil	10,184,686.42	103,878,804.52	$16,178,139	2,018,885	122,075,828.52
Chile	5,633,493.26	30,557,299.06		27,655,862	58,213,161.06
Colombia	9,781,556.09	24,853,830.43	798,080	1,530,497	27,182,407.43
Costa Rica	1,173,728.67	6,034,999.71		574,282	6,609,281.71
Cuba	11,000,000.00	17,689,999.64		699,687,413	717,377,412.64
Dominican Republic	804,181.69	2,470,750.31			2,470,750.31
Ecuador	392,456.80	6,986,755.01	257,133	539,330	7,783,218.01
Guatemala				35,532	35,532.00
Haiti	2,300,000.00	5,815,000.00			5,815,000.00
Honduras		1,000,000.00	757		1,000,757.00
Mexico		67,547,066.80		33,648,705	101,195,771.80
Nicaragua	1,950,000.00	2,115,000.00		276,383	2,391,383.00
Panama	2,050,000.00	287,704.00		22,898	310,602.00
Paraguay	1,580,000.00	3,910,000.00			3,910,000.00
Peru		376,506.00	5,260,658	1,671,830	7,308,994.00
Salvador		1,476,000.00			1,476,000.00
Uruguay		12,003,253.00	331,720	281,021	12,615,994.00
Venezuela	398,178.35	5,332,899.65		753,623	6,086,522.65
Unclassified	5,831,579.64	8,257,098.01	102,915,274		111,172,372.01
Special exporter	363,803.44				
Total, Latin America	53,563,664.36	319,357,267.99	125,241,761	774,654,547	1,219,753,575.99
ASIA					
Bahrein		17,047,675.00			17,047,575.00
China	70,331,884.19	76,345,505.82	133,329,716	7,456,304	217,131,525.82
Iran			12,999,341		12,999,341.00
Iraq			889,350		889,350.00
Japan			9,999,074		9,999,704.00
Korea			15,159,381		15,159,381.00
Lebanon			2,036,649		2,036,649.00
Philippines		70,000,000.00	5,983,384	10,133,716	86,117,100.00
Saudi Arabia		8,000,000.00	2,000,000		10,000,000.00
Siam			5,152,963		5,152,963.00
Turkey		774,120.00	8,662,744		9,436,864.00
Total, Asia	70,331,884.19	172,167,200.82	196,212,602	17,590,020	385,969,822.82
EUROPE					
Austria			2,643,916		2,643,916.00
Belgium		100,000,000.00	48,800,000		148,800,000.00
British Commonwealth, United Kingdom		3,740,000,000.00	650,000,000		4,390,000,000.00
Australia			7,000,000	886	7,000,886.00
British East Africa			81,668		81,668.00
British Guiana				1,690	1,690.00
British Honduras		481,755.00		322,503	804,258.00
Burma			5,000,000		5,000,000.00
Canada	25,000,000.00	5,670,000.00		83,442,253	89,112,253.00

SECTION III.—*Loans, property credits, and advances to foreign countries by the United States Government, July 1, 1940, to Sept. 30, 1947*—Continued

	July 1, 1940, to Dec. 11, 1941, loans	Dec. 12, 1941, to Sept. 30, 1947			
		Loans	Property credits	Advances	Total
EUROPE—continued					
India			$10,000,000	$2,015	$10,002,015.00
New Zealand			4,387,899		4,387,899.00
Newfoundland and Labrador		$2,100,000.00			2,100,000.00
Nigeria				68,117	68,117.00
Northern Rhodesia				5,862,585	5,862,585.00
Sierra Leone				492,966	492,966.00
Southern Rhodesia				25,443	25,443.00
Trinidad and Tobago				1,690	1,690.00
Union of South Africa			1,412,250	2,074,117	3,486,367.00
Czechoslovakia		21,982,939.37	7,760,537		29,743,476.37
Denmark		15,000,000.00	208,726		15,208,726.00
Finland	$15,074,390.45	61,850,626.07	15,385,658		77,236,284.07
France		1,014,000,000.00	702,142,684		1,716,142,684.00
Algeria				2,023,188	2,023,188.00
Greece		7,100,000.00	82,196,554		89,296,554.00
Hungary			16,660,741		16,660,741.00
Iceland	200,000.00				
Italy		27,012,532.32	219,725,950		246,738,482.32
Netherlands		202,998,460.00	63,033,590		266,032,050.00
Netherlands Indies			69,378,737	2,405,683	71,784,420.00
Surinam				3,000,000	3,000,000.00
Norway		5,000,000.00	14,458,611		19,458,611.00
Poland		14,108,309.42	30,010,012		44,118,321.42
Portugal	215,961.96				
Angola		65,000.00		764,405	829,405.00
Mozambique				753,500	753,500.00
Spain	115,842.07			103,996	103,996.00
U. S. S. R.			198,779,452	109,741,693	308,521,145.00
Total	40,605,750.29	5,217,369,622.18	2,149,066,985	211,086,730	7,577,523,337.18
AFRICA					
Egypt			9,345,528		9,345,528.00
Ethiopia		1,050,000.00	426,762		1,476,762.00
Liberia			11,305,259		11,305,259.00
Total, Africa		1,050,000.00	21,077,549		22,127,549.00
MISCELLANEOUS					
Special importer and exporter credits		3,050,825.00			3,050,825.00

SECTION IV—LEND-LEASE AID

While the following summarization of lend-lease expenditure does not agree in total with the total given by the Clearing Office for Foreign Transactions, it is felt that the individual country totals will be useful in determining the approximate proportions of lend-lease aid received by individual countries. The totals vary as follows:

Clearing Office for Foreign Transactions

Lend-lease, till Sept. 2, 1945	$48,172,697,106.00
Lend-lease, post VJ-day	1,220,000,000.00
Total grants	49,392,697,106.00
U. S. Treasury Department lend-lease fiscal operations (Sept. 30, 1947)	48,411,064,886.04

Statement of lend-lease aid by country cumulative through Sept. 30, 1947

American Republics:	
Bolivia	$5,523,017.51
Brazil	357,006,600.90
Chile	21,603,647.58
Colombia	8,264,954.63
Costa Rica	156,330.15
Cuba	6,550,610.38
Dominican Republic	1,617,315.60
Ecuador	7,794,178.09
Guatemala	2,640,634.08
Haiti	1,423,147.25
Honduras	368,364.24
Mexico	39,237,773.98
Nicaragua	887,199.28
Panama	667.33
Paraguay	1,956,128.55
Peru	18,925,731.36
Salvador	878,275.90
Uruguay	7,129,488.01
Venezuela	4,523,680.08
Total, American republics	486,487,745.20
Europe:	
Belgium	$157,664,578.04
British Empire	31,289,165,451.24
Czechoslovakia	641,839.17
France and possessions	3,266,675,257.99
Greece	81,521,726.17
Iceland	4,371,496.03
Netherlands and possessions	246,141,546.98
Norway	47,000,522.22
Poland	12,475,376.00
U. S. S. R.	11,075,653,115.01
Yugoslavia	32,192,067.91
Total, Europe	46,213,502,976.76
Asia:	
China	1,623,101,405.63
Iran	5,303,624.18
Iraq	891,469.57
Saudi Arabia	19,004,414.23
Turkey	42,871,845.85
Total, Asia	1,691,172,759.46
Africa:	
Egypt	2,320,943.43
Ethiopia	5,251,480.09
Liberia	12,328,981.10
Total, Africa	19,901,404.62

RECAPITULATION

American Republics	486,487,745.20
Europe	46,213,502,976.76
Asia	1,691,172,759.46
Africa	19,901,404.62
Total	48,411,064,886.04

Source: U. S. Treasury Department. Report on Lend-Lease Fiscal Operations, Sept. 30, 1947, pp. 6–9.

The foregoing figures do not include more recent plans to further tap the resources of our country, to add to your tax burden, plans which will inevitably result in depriving the American people of many things they need, compelling them to pay higher prices for what is available. Our commitments to foreign governments from the last day of September 1947, to the last day of December 1947, were as follows:

Oct. 1 to Dec. 31, 1947:	
Loans	$311,846,939
Property credits	73,075,387
Advances	2,401,095
Relief and rehabilitation (estimate)	286,926,100
Lend-lease	63,000,000
Total	737,249,521

Nor is that the whole story. Since December 31, 1947, up to and including the Marshall plan, we find that your Government has agreed to extend aid to other nations to the following extent:

Jan. 1 to Mar. 31, 1948:	
British loan	$300,000,000
Export-Import Bank	168,600,241
War Assets Administration (line of credit)	7,000,000
Bulk sales of surplus property:	
Germany	184,000,000
Greece	25,000,000
Austria	2,500,000
Property credits	22,300,000
Loan to United Nations for headquarters (not to exceed)	65,000,000
Total	774,400,241

And do not forget the Marshall plan—1-year period—$5,300,000,000.

So, if you will add the foregoing: July 1, 1940, to October 1, 1947, $73,233,890,070; October 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, $737,249,521; January 1, 1948, to

March 31, 1948, $774,400,241; the Marshall plan, $5,300,000,000; you will get a total of $80,045,539,832.

But do not think that that is the end of the story, for already Paul Hoffman, Presidential appointed administrator of the Marshall plan, otherwise known as ERP, has quite frankly told you and the Congress that the money made available for the Marshall plan was not enough, so prepare to dig deeper in your pocket, if you have one left, for there is apparently no end to the day-dreaming of the New Deal bipartisan foreign policy. It will not only get your shirt, your pants, your socks, and your shoes, but you will be lucky if, in the end, it leaves you enough to eat, wear, and a roof over your head, if you happen to have one now.

Nor is the foregoing all this international New Deal bipartisan foreign policy has cost you or will cost you. More important than your dollars is the happiness, the welfare, and the lives of your kin.

From the office of the Secretary of Defense, I received the following figures:

(a) Deaths from battle casualties in World War II:

Army and Air Force:	
Killed in action	175,407
Died of wounds	26,706
Died as prisoners of war	11,332
Reported dead or missing	23,604
	237,049
Navy and Marine Corps:	
Killed in action	51,724
Died of wounds	2,551
Died as prisoners of war	1,404
Reported dead or missing	536
	56,215
Grand total	293,264

(The U. S. War Department reports a total of 313,000 dead as the result of the war and 12,744 as missing.)

The above figures of the Army and Air Force are for the period through June 30, 1946, whereas the figures for the Navy and Marine Corps are for the period through December 31, 1946.

(b) Amputations:

Army and Air Force:	
Single	13,844
Multiple	1,068
	14,912
Navy and Marine Corps:	
Single	2,169
Multiple	39
	2,208
Grand total	17,120

(c) Blindness:

Army and Air Force (estimated)	1,500
Navy and Marine Corps	1,200
Total	2,700

The above Army and Air Force figures cover those totally or partially blinded in both eyes. The Navy and Marine Corps figures, so far as studies are completed, indicate that 141 out of the 1,200 were bilaterally blinded.

(d) Totally disabled:

As of June 30, 1947, there were 90,768 men and women receiving compensation for total disability in World War II. This figure is part of a total of 1,728,516 men and women receiving compensation for disability of some kind.

The services had no accurate figures of the above category and they were obtained from the Veterans' Administration.

(e) Hospitalized for 30 days or more:

Army and Air Force	2,836,000
Navy and Marine Corps	896,000
Total	3,732,000

The Army and Air Force total is from all causes, 375,000 of which were due to battle. The Navy and Marine Corps figure is the result of a sampling of the 1,877,282 patients admitted to naval hospitals during the war. As a result of the sampling, it is estimated that the 896,000 were confined for more than 30 days.

We certainly would be most ungrateful if we did not take care of those who fought, not only for themselves, their loved ones, their homes, and their country, but for the rest of us.

To aid the veterans, the Congress passed Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, sometimes known as the GI bill of rights. That bill provided for three major benefits—education and training, loans, and readjustment allowance. The actual costs under that bill and the estimated cost for 1948 are as follows:

	Fiscal year 1946, actual	Fiscal year 1947, actual	Fiscal year 1948, estimated
Education and training:			
Tuition, supplies, counseling, etc.	$31,765,045	$567,558,316	$856,919,824
Subsistence allowance	310,102,485	1,550,432,792	1,674,934,464
Total, education and training	341,867,530	2,117,991,108	2,531,854,288
Loan guaranty	5,229,180	75,492,597	78,827,000
Readjustment allowances	977,396,632	1,443,257,175	663,625,000
Total	1,324,493,342	3,636,740,880	3,274,306,288

If you happen to be interested in the cost of World Wars I and II, as given by the Library of Congress, take a look at these figures:

World War I:	
Military costs	$31,000,000,000
Interest on war debt	16,600,000,000
Pensions, care of veterans	26,400,000,000
Total (as of June 30, 1945)	74,000,000,000
World War II:	
Military costs	341,000,000,000
Interest on war debt	22,800,000,000
Pensions, care of veterans	19,400,000,000
Total (estimated as of June 30, 1948)	383,000,000,000

My final question is, just how much more can we give away, just how many wars can we fight before the security of our Nation is destroyed?

From the foregoing figures we now know that other than the sums expended in carrying on World War II, we have made available, or have committed ourselves to make available, for foreign aid, in part in an effort to buy peace, since July 1, 1940, up to and including March 31, 1948—including the Marshall plan—a total of $80,045,539,832, and the share of each man, woman, and child, whether he be in a hospital, jail, or asylum, is $552.49.

Please remember that the above does not include the sums mentioned as the cost of World War I and World War II, the latter item alone being estimated, as of June 30, 1948, by reliable authorities, as being $383,000,000,000.

The point is this: How long can our people carry that kind of an ever-increasing burden before the load sinks us—for us ends our freedom? How many wars can we fight before we follow the path of every nation which, with pride in its accomplishments under the ambition of its leaders to conquer the then-known world, faded out of the world picture? Are we to follow a path which all too often has shown the rise of a nation to military power always followed by its decay, its end as a nation?

To date, after more than 10 years of submission to its demands, what has the bipartisan foreign policy given us? What now confronts us? A demand for more money, for socialistic schemes, for national defense—which we must have—for additional billions to be given to foreign governments to be there spent by politicians greedy for power.

Most serious of all, a demand that we adopt universal compulsory military training, and in peacetime, draft into the armed forces the young women and the young men of our land.

My assertion is that, inasmuch as by their fruits ye shall know them, we root up and destroy the remnants of the New Deal which now direct the policies of our Government—restore that Government to the people, where its policies will be formulated and directed by the people's representatives.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. ISACSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LESINSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he made over Station WWJ, Detroit.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on Friday, April 30, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF SECTIONS 212 (B) AND 231 (D) OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5448) entitled "An act to amend sections 212 (b) and 231 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code" with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 3, line 2, strike out "1947" and insert "1945."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. POTTS, for Thursday and Friday, April 29 and 30, 1948, on account of death of a relative.

To Mr. HOBBS, for 10 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today, on account of official business.

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

COLORADO OFFICIALS WORKING FOR ARIZONA IN CALIFORNIA-ARIZONA WATER CONTROVERSY

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am speaking today to the people of four States: Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and New Mexico. They are, principally, the upper-basin States of the great Colorado River watershed. The State of Arizona has an insignficant sliver of land in this upper basin, but what I will say here will fall on deaf ears in Arizona, because those ears have long been closed by untruthful propaganda. It is important, however, to remember that this sliver of land of Arizona's, in the upper basin, gives Arizona a doorway to matters which properly should not be her concern.

As the Congress well knows by this time, there is a bitter controversy over claims to the waters of the Colorado River—the economic lifeline of the southwestern United States. I shall not now go into the phases of this controversy. I shall merely state that it has been going on for more than a quarter of a century, and that it rests on the fact that California, Nevada, and Arizona—the States of the lower basin—interpret differently a series of documents and statutes known as the law of the river.

I am speaking now to the people of the upper-basin States chiefly about one man. He is Judge Clifford H. Stone.

As a matter of brief background, it is necessary to state that Arizona has set out to gouge from California water that was awarded to my State years ago under Federal contracts. Arizona wants California's water because Arizona has a scheme to build a fantastic irrigation project to cost more than a billion dollars. Arizona cannot pay for this project, and the only way it can be paid for is to take the water from California and at the same time make California pay for the project by purchasing the hydroelectric power produced.

That is Arizona's scheme. California and Nevada have proposed that the entire controversy be placed before the Supreme Court, and have introduced legislation for this purpose. But Arizona is fighting this legislation. Her legal position is untenable, and she fears to go before the Supreme Court.

Now this is a peculiar situation. For one of the staunchest promoters of the Arizona project is Judge Clifford H. Stone. But Judge Stone is not from Arizona. He is from Colorado, and California has no controversy with Colorado. Judge Stone is director of the Colorado Water Conservation Board, and as such he speaks for all water matters of the State.

Why is Judge Stone, who is paid by the State of Colorado, a leading supporter of Arizona's plans? Arizona and Colorado are in different divisions of the river. While the people of Colorado pay Judge Stone, he is off in Washington and elsewhere fighting for another State whose water interests are not common with those of his own State.

Judge Stone is also a vice president of the National Reclamation Association, and chairman of its legislative committee. I might point out that the other two members of this legislative committee are J. Hubbard Moeur, of Arizona, an unqualified proponent of the fantastic Central Arizona project; and E. W. Rising, of Washington, D. C., and Idaho. Thus, you have a three-man legislative board of a national association dominated by two men seeking to win approval of a project that would saddle a billion-dollar debt on the Government, and which could only be built by taking water that legally belongs to California. Representing Idaho, Mr. Rising has no official interest in the central Arizona project. But why has Judge Stone an official interest? He represents the State of Colorado, yet is spending a large part of his time working in the interest of another State.

Judge Stone also is active in the National Water Conservation Conference, which was organized to unify all water interests in the Nation.

Now, Judge Stone receives a modest salary from the State of Colorado, somewhere in the neighborhood of $6,000 annually.

But I wish to point out to you gentlemen—and I am sure that many of you have met Judge Stone—that he spends a large part of each year here in Washington.

The past year he has been excessively busy promoting the central Arizona project. Who pays for all this travel? Who pays his lobbying expenses while he is away from his Colorado State job? Presumably the State of Colorado pays them—the people of Colorado pay for a man to lobby for another State with which they have no common water interest.

And here I might ask: Has Judge Stone registered as a lobbyist for the central Arizona project?

There are serious reasons why the people of the upper basin States should weigh carefully this situation, and I shall bring them out. Their own future in power and reclamation development may be adversely affected.

In July 1947, Judge Stone testified for the central Arizona project bill—for Arizona. He announced that he was appearing with the knowledge and consent of Governor Knous, of Colorado, even though he was a witness for Arizona.

Why was he a witness for Arizona? His State of Colorado could not benefit from the Arizona project. But it could, in years to come, be seriously injured by the Arizona project. Why, as a State official of Colorado, was Judge Stone fighting California? California and Colorado have no quarrel.

The Colorado River compact forever divided the waters of the river between the upper and lower basins. Colorado and Arizona are not in the same river divisions. Why, then, was Judge Stone a witness for Arizona—a lower-basin State? One reason is that Judge Stone hates the State of California, which has no quarrel with any upper-basin State and has no intention of interfering in upper-basin water agreements. California is for strict enforcement of the Colorado River compact, and California's only quarrel is with Arizona, in the lower basin.

Judge Stone has a complex. He has a consuming desire to dominate the water affairs of the entire basin, both upper and lower. His bitterness and activities against California are based on the fact that he has been unable to dominate California as he dominates in upper-basin States.

Judge Stone has a close working relationship with Charles A. Carson—a most bitter enemy of California—and Carson is special counsel on Colorado River matters for Arizona.

Now, I mentioned that Arizona has an insignificant sliver of land in the upper basin. But this gives Arizona a great privilege. It is the privilege to be heard in upper-basin affairs—to participate in upper-basin compacts. This influence is nothing short of perilous to upper-basin plans for the future.

The upper-basin States, with Arizona and Judge Stone participating, are striving to draft a compact among themselves for division of the upper waters of the Colorado River. Before any developments can be undertaken in the upper basin a compact must be signed. But Arizona has virtually no interest in the upper basin, and the central Arizona project, which Judge Stone is promoting, is entirely in the lower basin.

The liaison between Judge Stone and Carson goes back prior to the days of the Mexican Water Treaty, when Arizona sided with upper basin States. Now Carson represents Arizona's trivial interest in the upper basin—a comparatively small amount of land—and Carson is chairman of the Upper Basin Committee for

drafting definitions of compact terms. This fact is important to the people of the upper basin. It means that Arizona's interpretation of the master Colorado River compact will be forced into the upper-basin compact, once it is written. And this will be binding on the upper-basin States.

In this light, it would be well for the upper-basin States to consider most thoughtfully the different theories of depletion and consumptive use of water. Arizona—for which Judge Stone is plumping, along with Carson—is well versed in the matters of depletion and consumptive use, and has very peculiar ideas along these lines. The ideas, of course, are all in favor of Arizona, and against other States.

Arizona is proposing to build a gigantic new project. And an Arizona man, working with a Colorado man, is defining definitions. Arizona's interpretation of the master compact will bind upper basin States, and might seriously injure them.

California and Nevada are vigorously attempting to have the lower-basin controversy placed before the Supreme Court. Now, when this is done, suppose the Supreme Court rules for California. This will mean that Arizona's interpretations are null and void, yet those interpretations—especially as to the depletion theory of the use of water—will be around the necks of the upper-basin States.

Judge Stone, of Colorado, remember, is campaigning for Arizona.

Now, once more, suppose the central Arizona project was built and water for it was taken through a $300,000,000 aqueduct for several years. What is going to happen to the upper-basin States if the Supreme Court rules that California is right in the lower-basin controversy? That would mean there would be no water for the $300,000,000 aqueduct of the project.

Is the Federal Government going to let the gigantic central Arizona project dry up? After investing $300,000,000 in an aqueduct 242 miles long, serving 200,000 acres, is the Federal Government going to say: Oh, well, the upper-basin States need this water, so we will let the central Arizona project go?

The good people of the upper-basin States had better think twice about this. What will happen under such circumstances? Will water for the central Arizona project be taken away from the upper-basin States?

The upper-basin States would do well to see that the lower-basin controversy is settled first.

I believe I know what Judge Stone is shooting at. He is using the money he gets from his own State and elsewhere to promote himself for a big Federal job. He has tried for such a job before. He tried to be Under Secretary of the Interior Department and Commissioner of Reclamation. Now, I understand his ambition has gone up—he wants to be Secretary of the Interior. To aid his cause, he is keeping his hand in every water matter that he can.

I have not mentioned yet another cohort of Judge Stone. That is Royce J. Tipton, a consulting engineer of the Colorado State Water Conservation Board, and for many years active in Colorado water matters.

Tipton was a negotiator for the State Department on the Mexican water treaty.

Now, here is another peculiar thing. Tipton testified in the Mexican treaty hearing purportedly for the upper basin. He wanted, he said, to protect the upper basin.

But last July, Tipton testified for the central Arizona project—which can do nothing else in the long run but take water from the upper basin. Of course, there was a mitigating circumstance in regard to Tipton's testimony for the Arizona project. He was paid a thousand dollars by Arizona to testify. Tipton registered as a lobbyist, and this is on the record.

Tipton is working furiously now—with Judge Stone—and I would like to know if his expert opinion changes with the fees he receives.

So, we have another Colorado official working for a lower-basin project, and being paid for it. Two Colorado officials spending their time and Colorado's money fighting California, with whom Colorado has no quarrel. And they are promoting a project that might well seriously imperil water development in the upper-basin States. I ask you, are the people of the upper-basin States aware of these things?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McGREGOR). Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] is recognized for 30 minutes.

ATOMIC-ENERGY PROGRAM

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, in April 5 years ago, a laboratory for research leading to the development of an atomic bomb was opened at Los Alamos in New Mexico. The results of that research, as we well know, were blazoned as new but terrifying pages in world history when, on August 6 and 8, 1945, atomic bombs were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, respectively. Science had succeeded in placing at the disposal of mankind control over a vast new range of natural phenomena, the destructive potentialities of which have thus far overshadowed their use in a manner beneficial to mankind. Even today, almost 3 years after the world first learned of atomic energy from the dramatic use of atomic bombs, there are countless persons not fully aware of this new development other than in its fearful military employment. It is essential, however, for us to know that atomic energy also has a human side which optimistically offers a much better material world in which to live.

Today, a reexamination of much of the atomic-energy program will show us the direction in which we are moving and should help us to gage the impact of this vast new enterprise upon future civilization. It should provide us with a better insight to the problems and to the hopes for the future of those closely associated with this project.

The introduction of S. 1359 by Senator BRIEN MCMAHON exactly 1 month after the destruction of Hiroshima was the first of a series of measures offered in the Senate in 1945 which sought to meet the unprecedented problem posed by this new scientific giant. On October 3, 1945, President Truman sent a message to Congress stressing the need for legislation establishing a national policy for atomic-energy control "to assure its use for peaceful ends and for the safety of the Nation." The present Atomic Energy Act, Public Law 585, Seventy-ninth Congress, is the result of the acute awareness of Congress that atomic energy must be controlled by our Government to serve the paramount interests of the people of this Nation. The approval of that act, on August 1, 1946, placed the control of atomic energy in the civilian hands of the Atomic Energy Commission and was an historic milestone along a road leading not only to continued research on the military applications of nuclear science, but leading also to research promising ultimately a better life for all the people of the world.

It is quite apparent from a reading of the Atomic Energy Act that Congress had human welfare in mind, for that act directs the Commission "to make arrangements for the conduct of research and development activities relating to utilization of fissionable and radioactive materials for medical, biological, health, or military purposes and processes entailed in the production of such materials for all other purposes, including industrial uses."

When the Atomic Energy Commission was established by Executive order on December 31, 1946, it took over the personnel and facilities of the Manhattan Engineer District of the War Department. One of the important responsibilities in the atomic-energy program then and now is research and the facilities which were transferred to the Commission are, for the most part, engaged in programs of development, production, and testing. There are five principal laboratories in the Atomic Energy Commission's schematic, and three of these have been established as national laboratories to provide a common ground for cooperation in research and training between our educational institutions and the United States Government. The principal laboratories under direction of the Atomic Energy Commission and located at different parts of the country are as follows:

First. The Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tenn., is part of a 59,000-acre reservation comprising a number of production and research units, all of which are operated by Carbide & Carbon Chemicals Corp. under contract with the Government. This laboratory also is responsible for production of nearly all of the radioisotopes now being distributed by the Atomic Energy Commission.

Second. The 45,000-acre Los Alamos, N. Mex., laboratory is principally for research on the military applications of atomic energy. The University of California is the contract operator at Los Alamos.

Third. The Argonne National Laboratory, at Chicago, Ill., is a metallurgical research facility, administratively operated under Commission guidance by the University of Chicago. Twenty-nine midwestern universities and research institutions are represented on the Argonne Laboratory Board of Governors.

Fourth. The Brookhaven National Laboratory, Long Island, N. Y., is a general atomic research center operated by Associated Universities, Inc., which represents nine eastern universities in collaboration with other regional colleges and universities.

Fifth. The Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory, Schenectady, N. Y., is a $15,000,000 installation now under construction and which will be operated by General Electric Co. as a research center for power development.

Other major centers which are part of the Commission's network and which are engaged in atomic-energy research are:

The Hanford Works at Pasco, Wash., operated by General Electric Co.;

The Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, Ohio;

Columbia University, New York, N. Y.;

Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa;

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.;

Radiation Laboratory, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; and

United States Bureau of Standards, here in Washington.

Fifty-two universities and colleges throughout the country now participate in the atomic-energy program through organizations which they have set up to provide cooperative training for their students in atomic-energy installations. The Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies is composed of 14 southeastern educational institutions and is headed by Dr. Frank P. Graham, president of the University of North Carolina. Twenty-nine midwestern universities and research institutions make up the Institute of Nuclear Studies associated with the Argonne National Laboratory in Chicago. Associated Universities, Inc., is a nonprofit organization of 9 universities which operates the Brookhaven National Laboratory, in collaboration with other regional colleges and universities. The University of California and other western educational institutions also cooperate with the Government in these research programs.

Such programs of cooperation between our Government and our Nation's educational institutions are wise, for only through such cooperation can we hope to provide the scientific manpower in the future which is capable of keeping us in the forefront of nuclear developments. Congress was able to foresee the need for private assistance in such a manner on the part of the Commission, for in the very first section of the Atomic Energy Act it directed that "A program of assisting and fostering private research and development to encourage maximum scientific progress" and "a program of federally conducted research and development to assure the Government of adequate scientific and technical accomplishments" are prime responsibilities of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Recently the Atomic Energy Commission announced the establishment of fellowship programs for training in the physical sciences basic to atomic-energy development and also for training in biology and medicine. To support the physical sciences training program, the Commission has allocated an initial sum of $1,500,000. To carry out the first year of the program in medicine and biology, it has budgeted approximately $1,000,000. Administration of both programs is to be under the supervision of the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences. To provide more trained scientific personnel in these fields was a paramount factor governing the size and scope of the programs. In addition to the present need for trained workers in the atomic-energy field, there is also a great need for a reservoir in the general population of persons adequately trained in the scientific problems connected with this field.

Facilities to provide training for holders of atomic-energy fellowships in biology and medicine have been established in six States. In North Carolina, the University of North Carolina, Wake Forest College, Duke University, and the North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering are cooperating in the program. Institutions in New York, Texas, Colorado, California, and Oregon are also participating in the training program.

Last month, the Commission made known its program in support of cancer research which will cost approximately $3,000,000. The basic objective of the plan is the development of the use of radioactive materials in studies of the nature of cancer, its diagnosis, and its treatment. The main points of the program of assistance are: Provision of radioisotopes for cancer research and treatment by qualified United States medical and research workers; support of selected cancer-research projects carried on by hospitals and universities in various parts of the country; the establishment of cancer-research facilities, including hospital space, at four Commission laboratories; and support of research related to cancer carried on by the Committee on Atomic Casualties of the National Research Council.

A cooperative research program by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Agriculture also has been inaugurated for the study of the influence of radioactive materials on growth of plant crops. This study program is intended to cover phases of agricultural research not covered in the more than 200 current studies financed and operated by the Department of Agriculture and State agricultural experiment stations.

Probably the outstanding basic research tools resulting from the development of atomic energy are radioactive isotopes. These are common elements which have been exposed to radiation in chain-reacting piles and, by virtue of this, their presence can be traced in many chemical processes. The program for the production and distribution of these beneficial radioactive elements set up by the Manhattan District has been carried forward with such increased activity in the past 2 years that today over 100 varieties of these materials are being produced at Oak Ridge, Tenn. Shipments of radioactive elements have been made to scientific and research institutions throughout the world for use in fundamental biological research in disease control and for basic industrial research.

It is significant to note that before the development of the chain-reacting pile, most artificially produced radioisotopes were made in cyclotrons. The cyclotron method, however, is slow and extremely costly. For instance, it costs approximately $1,000,000 and requires at least a year to produce a small quantity—a millicurie—of carbon 14 in a cyclotron. The same quantity can be produced in the chain-reacting pile at Oak Ridge for $50.

The advantage of the radioisotope lies in the fact that a minute quantity can be followed through complicated chemical metabolic and biologic processes because their radiations tag them. They are tagged for as long as their radioactivity lasts. Present developments indicate that the greatest promise of beneficial results from atomic energy is in the use of such radioactive tracers, and scientists today are utilizing them in countless ways as both research and diagnostic tools.

During the past year, many medical institutions have availed themselves of the opportunity to obtain radioactive isotopes at low cost from the Atomic Energy Commission and this field, no doubt, offers the greatest hope as a result of study with these elements. At the University of Washington, radioactive materials are being used with effectiveness for investigating the mechanism by which drugs exert therapeutic action.

The Memorial Hospital in New York is engaged in an intensive program of research, employing these materials in the study and treatment of cancer. Cancer of the thyroid is being vigorously attacked by these workers. Vanderbilt University researchers have found radio gold exceedingly useful as a means of treating patients with chronic forms of lymphoma and Hodgkin's disease.

In Los Angeles, at the Cedars of Lebanon Hospital, radiophosphorus has been used during the past year to compare the circulation of normal hearts afflicted with coronary occlusion. Doctors there have been successful in tagging red blood cells with this radioactive material so that the extent of circulation can be quantitatively measured. They have demonstrated conclusively that large numbers of accessory channels exist to bring nourishment to the heart muscles when the need arises due to coronary occlusion.

Only recently, Western Reserve University in Cleveland announced that radioactive iodine from Oak Ridge has cured or definitely improved 12 of 18

toxic goiter patients. In the Washington University School of Medicine in St. Louis, radioactive iron has been used in anemia cases to determine the important fact of how rapidly iron entering the body as food is adapted as a constituent of red-blood-cell production. Radioiron tagged atoms can be introduced into the body and the exact path they follow and the time they emerge as blood constituents can be determined. This is obviously not a cure for anemia but it is one more vital fact added to scientific knowledge of the disease. It is well to remember that this fact and many others have been learned through the use of radioactive materials produced as byproducts of atomic energy.

Out at Bethesda, the Public Health Service is using tagged penicillin with radioactive sulfur to follow its progress through the body. These tests are expected to show specifically how penicillin reacts with blood elements to counteract the toxic effects of germ invaders.

Today, medical scientists are able to conduct research of which they had vainly dreamed for years before the development of isotopes on a large scale. The usefulness of these tracer elements is limited only by the imaginations of the men who use them. According to Dr. E. V. Cowdry, director of the Barnard Free Skin and Cancer Hospital in St. Louis, who more than a year ago received the first shipment of a pile-produced isotope from Oak Ridge, the distribution of these materials has signaled a clear path for undertaking studies that had long been dreamed of but had remained unborn until tracer material became generally available.

The use of radioactive materials has not been limited to medical research. In biological and agricultural studies, these elements have proven as important as in the study of medicine. Agricultural experimental stations are using them to study the growth and development of plants. They are being used to study the action of fertilizer and various agents on the growth of many crops and they are being used in animal studies. Scientists have been successful in tagging the virus of tobacco mosaic disease, an achievement which opens the way for tagging and studying other viruses such as influenza, the common cold, and infantile paralysis.

A hitherto unsuspected fact of plant life has been demonstrated through the use of radioactive carbon atoms produced at Oak Ridge and sent to Honolulu for research purposes. It was discovered there that sugar formed in one leaf of a large sugarcane plant during 1 hour in the sun was distributed to all parts of an 11-foot stalk within 3 days. In the Ohio Experiment Station, radioactive phosphorus and chlorine are being used to determine just how growing corn plants take up those materials, how they dispose of them, and what effects varying amounts have on their growth. Workers at the University of Florida are investigating the effects of small amounts of minerals, especially cobalt and copper, on the growth of pastures and on grazing cattle. Other universities are conducting experiments with radioactive materials to study the food habits of insects, with the idea of producing cheaper and better poisons for use against destructive pests. The Department of Agriculture is using radioactive fertilizers to determine the rate and extent plants utilize them.

A Geiger counter, an instrument for measuring radioactivity, is used to check the progress of radioactive fertilizer materials through the plants. By taking cuttings from the plants at various times, experimenters are able to determine just how much of the radioactive fertilizer is taken up and to what part of the plant it goes. Radioisotopes also have become important as research tools in industry. Today, in petroleum engineering, in chemical engineering, in metallurgy, in synthetic rubber, in pharmaceutical investigations, in radiography, and in industrial hygiene, radioactive materials occupy a very important place.

In order to determine what happens to metal during friction and wear, steel has been made radioactive in the Oak Ridge pile for experiments on dry and lubricated friction phenomena. Just last week the results of a test involving mixing radioactive sulfur into 12 tons of coal and studying its behavior conclusively showed that the sulfur processed in the coke in either of its forms and that steel companies are no better off with one kind of coal than another.

Since the beginning of the isotope-distribution program, the Atomic Energy Commission has shipped these materials to more than three-fourths of the States, the District of Columbia, and the Territory of Hawaii. The countries of Australia, Argentina, Peru, the United Kingdom, Denmark, Canada, Italy, and Sweden have purchased a total of 44 shipments from the Commission under a foreign distribution program. Many other countries have made arrangements to obtain these materials and their orders are now being processed by the Commission.

In addition to the distribution of radioisotopes, the Atomic Energy Commission is giving direct aid in many fields of biological and medical research. It is conducting a health physics program which is of utmost importance to protect workers' health and to reduce any extreme costs which may be imposed by excessive margins of safety. So that it may know what protective measures are most effective, how radiation affects the body, and what methods of diagnosis and treatment are most satisfactory, the Commission has physicians, biologists, and chemists at work constantly. As a result of this continuing study, it has successfully developed new instruments for detecting radiations of several different degrees of penetrating power and it has developed improved techniques which indicate significant advances in an understanding of the problems involved in atomic-energy research and development.

The development of atomic energy as a source of power is a phase of research that is being pursued with vigor. When we shall have commercially available power from nuclear fuels is a moot question. There have been many diverse expressions of opinion on the subject. Estimates of the time necessary to complete this project have ranged from 2 or 3 years to fully 50 years, and there are very nearly as many different opinions as there are people expressing them.

The chain-reacting piles at atomic-energy installations have demonstrated that nuclear fuel is effectively harnessed and this controlled release of atomic energy is therefore a matter of great importance today. The extremely low rate at which atomic fuel is consumed is one of the permanent advantages of nuclear power. The small amount of uranium necessary for pile-produced energy as compared with coal or other common fuels for producing equal amounts of heat are important factors to areas where transportation is a limitation.

It must be borne in mind when we envisage atomic energy as the means of operating our power plants that the unfavorable factors involved also must be weighed. The need for heavy protective shielding means that at first atomic power will probably be used only in large units where proper engineering and safety supervision can be easily maintained, and until we become more familiar with radiological hazards, atomic power plants can be operated only by personnel properly trained in radiation health supervision.

At the present time, engineering studies of the possibilities for using nuclear fuels as power sources are in progress at Oak Ridge and such possibilities will be the primary research problem of the Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory.

In a recent paper describing the scientific and engineering problems involved in the production of power from nuclear fuels, the General Advisory Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission reported that it is hardly probable that any considerable portion of the world's power supply will be derived from nuclear fuels before the expiration of 20 years. Even though today we get heat from the piles at Oak Ridge and other installations, it is heat involved with intense and deadly radioactivity. For that reason, we must be content, for the present, with the byproducts of such plants which are today being used as tools of research throughout the scientific world. The view that we shall eventually have a source of power in atomic-energy fuels is, however, an encouraging one. The problem will be solved but it will require years of experimentation in the fields of chemistry, metallurgy, and mechanics, of utterly new techniques, and when it is finally announced that we have developed this means of power, we can rest assured that it will be useful and safe for large segments of industry.

A program to stimulate the production of domestic uranium is now in operation and it offers private enterprise an opportunity to participate in the Nation's atomic-energy industry on its own initiative and with a profit incentive. The Commission plans to expand and con-

tinue its own exploration, development, and research relative to raw materials used in the atomic-energy program.

In order to secure the most effective administration of the Atomic Energy Act, the Congress, in setting up the Atomic Energy Commission, authorized the establishment of advisory boards to advise and make recommendations to the Commission on legislation, policies, administration, research, and other matters. There are at present four permanent advisory boards and five temporary advisory boards which have been appointed under this proviso to carry out the intentions of Congress. The permanent boards are an Advisory Committee on Biology and Medicine, an Advisory Committee for Exploration and Mining, an Advisory Committee for Isotope Distribution, and a Patent Advisory Panel. The temporary groups are an Advisory Board on Contractual Relationships, an Industrial Advisory Group, a Medical Board of Review, a Safety and Industrial Health Advisory Board, and a Committee on Scientific Personnel. The membership of these boards is made up of outstanding men in their respective fields and the advice they give and the reports they submit are of inestimable value to the Government in its long-range atomic-energy program.

There also are two permanent committees which were established by the terms of the Atomic Energy Act. One is the General Advisory Committee for advice on technical and scientific matters relating to materials, production, and research, and development. The other permanent group is the Military Liaison Committee consisting of representatives of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Atomic-energy installations are unique in that there is no precedent for their construction. They require the building of unusual types of equipment which are not available from commercial sources. They require also the services of skilled scientific engineers as well as the services of regular construction workers. In building our present plants, it is necessary at times to experiment in order to arrive finally at a goal which will serve the ends of the development program satisfactorily. It is not an easy task. Rather it is one which requires unusual skill, foresight, and patience. As long as we have atomic energy—and no doubt we always shall—new developments will require new construction and if we have the ambition to keep our country in the foreground in this field, we must be aware of this fact.

The dissemination of public and technical information concerning atomic energy has progressed very rapidly during the past year. The Commission is continually declassifying, through analysis, such material as no longer needs be classified as confidential. Declassification makes the information available for public use. At the present time there are 120 scientists and engineers serving as reviewers of classified material. During 1947 these reviewers recommended the declassification for public use of some 1,000 documents concerned with atomic energy. A number of these declassified documents have appeared in scientific journals and they have also been made available to the public through the Office of Technical Services of the United States Department of Commerce.

The dissemination of such information is in keeping with the wishes of the Congress, for it recognized in the Atomic Energy Act that "the dissemination of scientific and technical information relating to atomic energy should be permitted and encouraged so as to provide the free exchange of ideas and criticisms which is essential to scientific progress."

Congress has determined that it should be continuously informed concerning progress in this field. With that in mind, it established, by law, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy which is charged with making continuing studies of the activities of the Commission and of problems relating to the development, use, and control of atomic energy.

Since the joint committee was organized, it has been fully aware of its responsibilities and the "vast significance to the people of the United States and the world" of the problems created by this great scientific development. Consultations and executive hearings are frequently held by the committee with members of the Atomic Energy Commission and other departments and agencies of the Government that have varying degrees of responsibility in the program. Most of the committee members have undertaken inspection trips to the major atomic-energy installations in order to have first-hand acquaintance with the production requirements and problems involved in the development of atomic energy.

It is an unfortunate necessity that the greater part of our atomic-research program has instruments of destruction as its goal but such is the case in this unsettled world. At Los Alamos we are engaged in research leading toward the development and production of new and improved atomic weapons. At Eniwetok a laboratory has been established as a proving ground for routine experiments and tests of atomic weapons, but work at both these areas is cloaked in highest secrecy.

As I have said, the development of atomic weapons is an unfortunate necessity. We, as a Nation, have no desire ever to use the fruits of our weapon research but by keeping ourselves in a preeminent position through such development, it is less likely that we shall have to use them.

The history of our interest in the international control of atomic energy is an open book for all the world to see. We have offered the results of our efforts through the United Nations in exchange for a world-wide guaranty that atomic energy will be henceforth utilized only for peacetime pursuits. Naturally, our plan requires that all nations agree to inspection and control by a supreme agency, but there are some who cannot or will not surrender enough of their sovereignty to put such a plan into effect. We have never lost hope that a solution can be arrived at whereby the only use ever to be made of this scientific power will be peaceful. We have been patient in listening to a variety of other suggestions for international control but none of them embody the guaranties we require before releasing our secret to the world. Because of this, we must continue our weapons research until such time as workable international control is adopted in good faith by all nations. We must see to it that our efforts never falter nor deviate from the intention of Congress which declared the paramount objective in the development of atomic energy shall, at all times, be the assurance of "the common defense and security" and "promoting world peace."

I am quite sure you will be interested in this cylinder of pure uranium I have in my hand. It weighs approximately 2½ pounds, but it is more pure uranium than any man ever had seen prior to 6 years ago. It is not a rare mineral, but until that time, its use was not considered important. Today, it is important because we now know that within it is the secret of destruction or the secret of construction, depending on how it is used. It is up to us and the rest of the world to make the decision as to its use. If it is to be a destructive use, we shall see and know chaos on a scale never before imagined by man. If it is to be for the benefit of mankind, then we should pursue that use with unrelenting energy.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the Labor-Federal Security supplemental appropriation bill, 1949.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ANOTHER ANGLE OF THE ANTILIVESTOCK, PRO-OLEO CONTROVERSY OF OLEO VERSUS THE PEOPLE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, section 32 of the AAA Act provided that 30 percent of the custom receipts or duties on imports was and is to be set aside for disposing of surpluses and for finding new uses for agricultural products. The imports into our country are largely agricultural and our exports are largely nonagricultural. Of the agricultural imports a large percentage is livestock products. The total imports of around $450,000,000 for 1 year include around $150,000,000 wool imports alone. In other words, a blank check for $149,000,000 has been provided the Secretary of Agriculture for the present year to dispose of commodities largely as he

wishes. This is in addition to the $70,000,000 blank check provided in the sugar bill. For what have, and what are, these funds being used? Some of the allocations are so ridiculous that one has difficulty in believing them.

According to the United States Department of Agriculture, the 30 percent of the customs receipts was $149,000,000 this present year. Of this $149,000,000 the allocations were: National school lunch, $65,000,000; for section 32, disposal and purchase program, $44,000,000; ECA—ERP—provided that certain amount of these funds be used, and according to the United States Department of Agriculture, this amount was $40,000,000. This made a total of $149,000,000.

Among the projects has been the new use for cotton. One feature has been the subsidizing of cotton for insulation purposes. The total amount used is about $6,000,000 to a dozen corporations, but the break-down by amounts of subsidy to each corporation is "confidential information," and so stamped. It always appears rather incongruous to me to have the information about the subsidy paid each farmer available, but the subsidy to corporations held as "confidential." In other words, the taxpayer is not even entitled to know who gets his tax dollar, even though he may be paying Federal taxes on a $600 annual income.

Section 32 funds used for purchasing food for the school-lunch program are a total of $14,500,000 as the Department of Agriculture spokesman states that $50,000,000 of the $65,000,000 school-lunch program is allocated to the States.

The following are the purchases for the school-lunch program:

Tomatoes	$3,000,000
Dried skim milk	1,265,000
Cheese	3,000,000
Tomato juice	1,120,000
Concentrated orange juice	3,500,000
Peanut butter	2,600,000
All other (fish)	15,000
Total	14,500,000

You will note the $1,265,000 for dried skim milk. Then compare it with the other items and use your own judgment. I have tried for months, years for that matter, to unravel some of the facts in regard to these section 32 funds.

My contention has been and is, first, that these funds are looked upon as easy to spend because the fund is derived by a formula that provides the money without direct appropriations from the Treasury. I noted that the President asked for a direct appropriation for the project rather than to continue to use section 32 funds. Whether the reason for this position was because it would be a better business practice to follow that procedure, or whether due to the dozen or more reductions in duties on the imports of livestock products that have been put into effect and thus reducing the amount of customs receipts and section 32 funds, I have no method of determining.

Second. These funds are being used for unwise and unwarranted purposes. Funds for the administration of the marketing agreements, including milk marketing, should either be provided by the beneficiary of the agreements or by direct appropriations. There is surely no reason for using these section 32 funds for this purpose.

Third. You will note that millions upon millions are used to subsidize nonlivestock and soil-depleting crops, although the funds are obtained largely by livestock and livestock products, as previously shown in the wool imports.

Fourth. Over $9,000,000 of these funds secured largely from livestock imports has in the past been used to grind up tobacco and subsidize it as fertilizer and insecticide. This is one more example of incongruity in the New Deal agricultural set-up. Invite livestock imports, take 30 percent of the custom receipts, spend over $9,000,000 to make fertilizer and insecticide, and then talk loud and long about a soil-conservation program. You will also note that it is contemplated to use $4,400,000 of these funds this year for disposal of tobacco. Is it surprising that the consumers of America are complaining about food prices?

Fifth. Let us take a look at cotton, which has under the New Deal some 25 or more legislative acts to bolster it up until it has more subsidies than the British have traditions. In a letter from Mr. N. E. Dodd, Acting Secretary of Agriculture, on April 20, I find the following:

> In addition, the Commodity Credit Corporation incurred a loss of $19,225,915 on cotton exported in accordance with the provisions of its commodity export program.
>
> Under the section 32 program, there was a net expenditure of $32,805,869 for cotton export and a net expenditure of $1,688,112 for cotton diversion.

Here we have another example of a very unwise agricultural program. The New Deal, which has now killed off 37 percent of the sheep and cut the duty by 50 percent for most livestock products, or all it could under the law, turns around and uses the funds secured thereby to subsidize cotton for export, cotton for paper, cotton for insulation. In fact, this cotton subsidy is taking place when cotton is above the support level, and when the cotton price is above parity even.

Frankly, does this make sense to you? Does it make sense to encourage the importation of livestock products and talk about soil conservation, and then turn around and oversubsidize the exports of soil-depleting crops? In plain English that is just plain "screwy."

Sixth. Look at the use of these funds for the other soil-depleting crops and compare them with the use of funds for soil-conservation crops and products associated with conservation of the soil.

Seventh. Also, note that the milk for the school-lunch program is skim milk. No doubt about skim milk being a good food, although children surely should have an ample supply of vitamin A. This skim milk is not fortified with vitamin A. We are spending millions to obtain nutritional facts. Why not make use of what little we know about them now?

If one follows the use of these funds over the years, and even at this time one is compelled to see in it just one more example of the many examples whereby the present administration is antilivestock in its approach at every turn in the agricultural economic road. The expenditure of these funds also gives one more example of how allergic this administration is to dairying in general and butterfat in particular. Huge shipments of butterfat are made to our friends across the sea. They are not allergic to butterfat. They prefer evaporated milk to skim milk. They prefer, or at least they purchased, our top beef cattle when the meat cost them 50 cents per pound and they could have purchased defatted milk at 10 cents per pound, although it had 35.6 percent digestible protein in it, which is twice what the meat contains.

Eighth. This administration has not only killed the goats for the Navajos, it has reduced the sheep by 37 percent in the past 5 years; there are 40 percent less hogs on the farms than 5 years ago; the cattle numbers have been reduced by 6,000,000; milk cow numbers are smaller than they were 15 years ago when the New Deal took over. The duties on imports of livestock and livestock products have been reduced a dozen times while this administration was erecting more trade barriers than ever before in the history of our country for cotton and other soil-depleting crops. They replaced tariffs with embargoes. They placed an embargo on the imports of many of the soil-depleting crops. They cannot lower the duties on livestock products much more. A few days ago the Geneva boys reduced the duty on defatted milk to 1½ cents a pound, which is three-eighths of 1 cent per quart.

The American farmer still has one hope. He cannot be compelled—that is, not yet—to follow the crackpot schemes as promoted by Mr. Luckman. If the poultrymen had followed his advice, eggs would have been a dollar a dozen today, yes, more scarce than the teeth of the hens Mr. Luckman had channeled for execution.

The hope of the American farmer is now largely based on two factors. One is the continuation of the Steagall amendment and the second is a Secretary of Agriculture that will follow the spirit of the Steagall amendment. The President is soon to appoint a new Secretary of Agriculture, and it is hoped the selection will be a secretary for agriculture as well as a Secretary of Agriculture.

Another example of what is in the minds of the groups that are so anxious to increase the imports of livestock and livestock products by lowering the duty on them, and then secure section 32 funds, is provided by the letter of April 16 of the Farm Commissioners Council, 220 Raleigh Hotel. They point out that the proposed world wheat agreement is to provide that section 32 funds be provided to export wheat, another soil-depleting crop that has 18 cents per bushel fertilizer value.

Must the livestock industry forever be subjected to these unfair and senseless approaches?

OTHER SECTION 32 FUNDS SHOWING THE APPROVED PROGRAM AND OBLIGATIONS INCURRED FROM THE $44,000,000 APPROPRIATED DIRECTLY FOR PURCHASES OUTSIDE THE SCHOOL-LUNCH-PROGRAM APPROPRIATION OF $65,000,000 AND THE $40,000,000-ERA ECA FUNDS

The official table is as follows:

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities approved programs and obligations by commodities, July 1, 1947, to Mar. 31, 1948

Approved programs	Amount of approved programs, Mar. 31 1948	Obligations incurred— July 1, 1947, to Mar. 31, 1948	Obligations incurred— During March
PURCHASES FOR DIRECT DISTRIBUTION			
Apple, fresh	$2,445,000	$625,234	$625,234
Pear, fresh	393,750	211,272	57
Dried fruit	4,850,000	3,641,738	417,726
Dried fig	1,220,000	987,260	−4,795
Grapefruit juice, canned	3,500,000	2,590,395	2,590,395
Irish potato	9,500,000	4,547,305	631,721
Sweetpotato	1,500,000	791,068	34,644
General vegetable	1,125,000	123,074	1,558
Tree nuts	1,280,000	834,900	34,900
Egg	5,000,000	695,675	43,439
Prior year transportation costs	157	157	
Total	30,813,907	15,048,078	5,174,87
EXPORTATION			
Cotton	2,000,000	1,963,728	260,243
DIVERSION			
Cotton:			
Insulation	1,000,000	813,625	
Paper	200,000	190,000	190,000
Pear, fresh	135,000	22,892	22,892
Irish potato	1,000,000	389,060	389,060
Total	2,335,000	1,415,577	601,952
Administration of marketing agreements and orders	700,000	454,875	52,500
Other administrative expenses	1,060,000	842,274	31,178
Total	1,760,000	1,297,149	83,678
Grand total	36,908,907	19,724,532	6,120,752

Then we come to the $40,000,000 of these section 32 funds that were or are to be used by ECA or ERP. This is as follows:

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities, commodity allocations, and obligations by commodities, fiscal year 1948

PROGRAM AND COMMODITY

	Commodity allocation as of Apr. 15, 1948
Purchases for direct distribution:	
Apple, fresh	$2,445,000
Pear, fresh	393,750
Apple, peach, prune, raisin, dried	6,350,000
Dried fig	1,220,000
Grapefrut juice, canned	3,500,000
Irish potato	10,000,000
Sweetpotato	1,250,000
General vegetable	875,000
Tree nuts	1,280,000
Egg	11,750,000
Prior year costs	157
Total	39,063,907
Exportation:	
Cotton	$2,600,000
Dried fruit	7,500,000
Eggs	7,116,093
Flax	600,000
Hemp	600,000
Tobacco	4,400,000
Total	22,816,093
Diversion:	
Cotton insulation	1,000,000
Cotton paper	200,000
Pear, fresh	135,000
Irish potato	4,000,000
Total	5,335,000
Administration of marketing agreements and orders	700,000
Other administrative expenses	1,460,000
Total	2,160,000
Allotments and transfers	450,000
Total allocated	69,825,000
Total funds available	84,023,929
Unallocated funds [1]	14,198,929

[1] Reserved for other possible requirements under the Economic Cooperation Administration.

WHY IS IT THAT CONSUMERS PAY MORE AND THE FARMERS RECEIVE LESS FOR THEIR PRODUCTS? HOW ABOUT MILK AND PORK?

Mr. Speaker, it is a well-known fact that milk in the United States increased 9 percent in price in 1947 over 1946. Yet see how the consumer is being squeezed. In many of the eastern cities milk would be 12 cents per quart if the farmer gave the milk to the distributor.

Let us take a look at pork prices in the butcher shops. In many places these prices have reached a high. But what has happened to the producer of pork?

The following statistics were received from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture, on April 20, 1948:

Hog prices at Chicago based on weighted average

Week ending:	*Price per 100 pounds*
1947	
Feb. 8	$24.16
Mar. 8	28.16
Apr. 5	25.63
1948	
Feb. 7	24.86
Mar. 6	22.18
Apr. 3	20.28
Apr. 10	20.18
Apr. 17	20.29

Do you note that hogs were 27 percent higher in Chicago on March 8, 1947, than on March 6, 1948, and 39 percent higher than on April 10, 1948? Do you also note that these hog prices are not much above the support level? Yet the consumer is expected to pay an all-time high, regardless of what the producers receive.

Fourteen of the largest dairy companies in the United States showed net profits of over $4,000,000 less in 1947 than they had in 1946, while most of the other big industries showed enormous increases in net profits.

For example, the manufacturers of cotton goods showed an increase of $61,000,000. The big corporations handling petroleum products showed an increase of over $400,000,000 net profits. The 13 large manufacturers of agricultural implements showed an increase from $45,000,000 net income in 1946 to $96,000,000 net income in 1947, or an increase of $41,000,000. The electrical-equipment people, probably from our distinguished colleague's home—Mr. CORBETT, of Pittsburgh—showed an increase in net profits from one hundred and thirteen million in 1946 to two hundred and seventy-two million in 1947. The 28 automobile and truck companies showed an increase in net profits from $121,000,000 in 1946 to $450,000,000 in 1947. It seems that the handlers of dairy products are just about the only corporations in the United States that showed less net income in 1947 than in 1946, and yet we have Members from industrial districts that want to further rip the largest segment of American agriculture.

The average milk price for 1947 increased only 2 percent over 1946 in the State of Wisconsin, and in 1947 the Wisconsin average milk price was 17 percent below the national average. In the State of Minnesota the average milk price for 1947 increased only 1 cent per hundredweight over 1946, and the 1947 average milk price in Minnesota was almost 19 percent below the national average.

LARD VERSUS OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable research work done in connection with lard. It is now deodorized the same as vegetable oils are deodorized. This deodorized lard is tasteless. No doubt butter-tasting acids could be added to make it taste like butter and vitamin A could be added.

A pound of lard with 4,080 calories purchased at 23 cents gives the consumer 177 calories for 1 cent.

A pound of oleomargarine with 3,325 calories purchased at 39 cents gives the consumer 85 calories for 1 cent. This is less than one-half as many calories per cent or per dollar in purchasing oleo as when lard is purchased.

With the antilivestock and the procotton attitude of the present administration, one would not expect much support for research work about the food value of these two products. But this is the picture:

DID YOU KNOW THAT EVERY POUND OF OIL IN OLEOMARGARINE IS SUBSIDIZED?—IS THIS SUBSIDY 1 CENT OR 10 CENTS PER POUND?—WHO KNOWS?

Mr. Speaker, every pound of oleomargarine produced is subsidized by the Federal Treasury. While old bossie standing on the hillside stands on her own four feet, her products are compelled to compete with federally subsidized oils used in oleomargarine. Although the oleomargarine manufacturers are producing three times as much oleo as before the war and making two to five times the profits as during the war, they are now banded together to try to ruin the dairy industry, the greatest and largest agricultural industry of our Nation.

The following found on page 76 of the hearings before the Agricultural Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee is an indication of one of the many, many subsidies that are being

paid by the Federal Treasury on oil-producing crops:

Crops:	Jan. 1 to June 30, 1947
Cotton, upland	$10,986,182.14
Peanuts	664,367.11
Cotton, American Egyptian	14,797.73
Soybeans	435,210.93

The above are some of the losses that have taken place in the past few months.

Every drop of oil in every pound of oleo is subsidized out of the Federal Treasury. The dairy cow stands on her own four feet, but her products are compelled to compete with a federally subsidized imitation and not a substitute.

DORIS FLEESON STATES, "FARMERS HAVE ELEPHANTS' MEMORIES"

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk about what the housewife was going to do at the ballot box next November 2 in regard to the position that Congressmen might take on the oleomargarine legislation. To begin with, this is a reflection on the intelligence of the American housewife. What position will the signers of this discharge petition be in on November 2 if by chance this bill should become law and then the price of oleomargarine is 10 or 15 cents higher than it is at the present time? Will the housewife then feel that she has been misled and used as an agent to mislead her Congressman in this question? Or will she think that the Congressman should have had the facts before he voted and that he should have voted to protect her pocketbook against the higher prices that she will have to pay if this bill becomes law? The price of oils has already advanced, but of course the price of oleomargarine has not advanced in proportion—why? Because 26 corporations have a monopoly on oleomargarine and it would be very unwise for them to raise the price of oleo until at least the bill has been considered in the legislative Halls of this Congress.

In this connection I might call your attention to another situation that has been brought out by Doris Fleeson in a recent column, the heading is "The farmers remember." She states that farmers have elephants' memories. This might be well to think about as of November 2, 1948. Farmers are not subjected to high-pressure propaganda measures. They are not apt to even write many letters, but I am sure that Doris Fleeson is right in her analysis, and I wish to support her contentions because the farmers do have very, very, very good memories. They have ways of knowing who their friends are, and who are just making believe they are their friends, but who also forget at the crucial time. Their American way of protest is not by making a vocal protest, but by voting to support people that do not two-time or double-cross them.

TAKE HEED WHILE THERE IS STILL TIME; DO NOT DENY MILK TO SOME MOTHER'S BABY

Mr. Speaker, the April 22, 1948, report of the United States Department of Agriculture on storage stocks of evaporated milk shows the following:

Stocks of evaporated milk reported quarterly by wholesale grocers

Quarter ending—	Number of firms	Evaporated milk	
		Thousands of pounds	Days' supply [1]
Mar. 31, 1947	607	31,663	26
June 30, 1947	581	35,689	27
Sept. 30, 1947	563	42,294	32
Dec. 31, 1947 [2]	569	32,530	26
Mar. 31, 1948	564	28,957	21

[1] Approximately 85 percent of the firms reporting estimated the number of days their stocks would last at prevailing rate of sales. The number of "days' supply" represent the weighted average of those estimates.

[2] Revised to include late reports.

Remember that millions of babies are raised on evaporated milk, and remember the 58-percent increase in the baby numbers. Note that on March 31, 1948 there was only a 21-day supply held by the wholesale grocers of our country. The manufacturers usually have about a 30-day supply in storage in addition. Is it surprising that the 250,000 cases for foreign shipment are being acquired so carefully?

The dairy industry is in enough difficulty without getting into the oleo-versus-the-people controversy.

WHAT STATES ARE PRODUCING DAIRY PRODUCTS AT THE LOWEST PRICES?—WHY THEN THE EFFORT TO WEAKEN THE DAIRY INDUSTRY OF THIS SECTION OF THE UNITED STATES WITH THE OLEO BILL?

Mr. Speaker, I include the official 1947 returns to farms for milk at this point:

Milk, wholesale: Annual average price per 100 pounds received by farmers in 1947, by States

Alabama	$5.37
Arizona	4.93
Arkansas	4.50
California	4.39
Colorado	4.44
Connecticut	5.65
Delaware	4.83
Florida	6.62
Georgia	5.57
Idaho	3.59
Illinois	3.92
Indiana	4.25
Iowa	3.82
Kansas	3.91
Kentucky	4.12
Louisiana	5.71
Maine	4.67
Maryland	5.28
Massachusetts	5.44
Michigan	4.27
Minnesota	3.43
Mississippi	4.63
Missouri	4.08
Montana	3.87
Nebraska	3.93
Nevada	3.88
New Hampshire	5.26
New Jersey	5.37
New Mexico	5.65
New York	4.54
North Carolina	5.15
North Dakota	3.77
Ohio	4.36
Oklahoma	4.23
Oregon	4.69
Pennsylvania	4.80
Rhode Island	5.66
South Carolina	5.46
South Dakota	3.98
Texas	5.44
Tennessee	4.64
Utah	3.94
Vermont	$4.87
Virginia	5.10
Washington	4.57
West Virginia	4.77
Wisconsin	3.52
Wyoming	3.85
United States average	4.24

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

What do these figures indicate? Iowa, Wisconsin, and Minnesota produce one-fourth of the milk of the Nation. Milk in these States in 1947 gave the farmer in Iowa a return of $3.82 per 100 pounds, Wisconsin a return of $3.52 per 100 pounds, and Minnesota a return of $3.43 per 100 pounds. You will note that farmers in some of the other States received from 70 to 90 percent more than the farmers of Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Iowa.

Then why, I ask, do you people of other States take action to lower and injure the milk prices of the farmers of these three States in particular and of the dairy farmers of our country in general?

Remember that the per capita consumption of milk and dairy products in the United States will in 1948, the fifteenth year of the "more abundant life," be the smallest in the history of our country. Remember there are less milk cows on the farms of the United States than there were 15 years ago, when the "more abundant life" came into being. Remember that this oleo bill is just one act on the part of this antilivestock administration, which has demonstrated time after time how allergic it is to butterfat and dairy products.

This oleo bill means higher fluid milk prices; it means that the consumer, if he can still find it in the market place, will pay more for beef and veal; it means that milk cattle numbers will be further reduced and cause higher prices for hides and shoes; and, finally, it means a body blow to soil conservation and soil-fertility conservation of our soils. All the housewife will have out of the passage of this bill will be an opportunity to pay more for oleomargarine. She may find this out by election day, too.

The average price of American cheese for 1947 was 36.04 cents per pound. This cheese has 23 percent protein and is the poor man's meat. The farmer should not be held responsible for prices. The United States Department of Agriculture has much responsibility as to prices, whether high or low.

ANTILIVESTOCK ATTITUDE OF PRESENT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Speaker, the following shows the results of the antilivestock attitude of our present Agricultural Department:

Rank of Wisconsin among other States in cash receipts for farm marketing

1941	Sixth.
1942	Seventh.
1943	Do.
1944	Sixth.
1945	Seventh.
1946	Sixth.
1947	Eleventh.[1]

[1] Preliminary.

Income for dairy products in the United States increased 9 percent in 1947 whereas other commodities increased 25 percent.

The present Secretary of Agriculture, not for agriculture, has refused to even announce a support price for milk and dairy products, even though the House has passed a bill requiring him to do so.

The Department of Agriculture put a 10-cent per pound support price under defatted or dried skim milk when the OPA even allowed it to sell for 14½ cents per pound.

The Secretary of Agriculture found plenty of time and plenty of money to spend on nonlivestock crops and even subsidized cotton both domestically and in foreign trade when cotton was above parity in price.

President Truman is soon to appoint a new Secretary of Agriculture. I hope he finds one that cannot only read the Steagall amendment, but one that is not so allergic to dairy products in general and manufactured dairy products in particular. I hope he finds one that does tell the American people not to eat butterfat in one form at $1 per pound, but eat it most generously at $2 per pound.

When the Government wants a dairy product like dried skim where the support price of 10 cents per pound is not over one-half what the support should be, the Agricultural Department does not accept the offerings but has nerve enough to tell the manufacturers of this product if they will reduce the price of the offerings they will consider the offering.

The 1947 price that farmers received in Wisconsin over 1946 was 2 percent, and the increase in price in Minnesota of 1947 over 1946 was less than 1 cent per hundredweight.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 295. An act to further amend the thirteenth paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 309. An act designating American Indian Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 657. An act to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to authorize crediting of service as a cadet, midshipman, or aviation cadet for pay purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1206. An act for the relief of Jack O'Donnell Graves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1050. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the mining of potash on the public domain," approved February 7, 1927, so as to provide for the disposition of the rentals and royalties from leases issued or renewed under the act entitled "An act to authorize exploration for and disposition of potassium," approved October 2, 1917; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 1052. An act to fix the salaries of certain justices and judges of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1062. An act for the relief of Mrs. Christine West and Mrs. Jesse West; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1216. An act to repeal that part of section 3 of the act of June 24, 1926 (44 Stat. 767), as amended, and that part of section 13a of the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 166), as amended by the act of July 2, 1926 (44 Stat. 781), relating to the percentage, in time of peace, of enlisted personnel employed in aviation tactical units of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Armed Services.

S. 1287. An act for the relief of James B. Walsh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1599. An act to prescribe the pay and allowance of aviation cadets in the United States Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1925. An act to convey certain land to the city of Pierre, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 1933. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to School District 55, Roosevelt County, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 1941. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to John F. Compton, formerly John Crazy Bull, a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 2033. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength," approved June 3, 1942 (56 Stat. 306); to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2034 An act to increase the number of midshipmen allowed at the United States Naval Academy from the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2518. An act to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. J. Res. 206. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate boundary compact by and between the States of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 334. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of James Harold Nesbitt, a minor;

H. R. 344. An act for the relief of Sylvester T. Starling;

H. R. 761. An act for the relief of the estate of Anthony D. Chamberlain, deceased;

H. R. 762. An act for the relief of Dudley Tarver;

H. R. 1275. An act to authorize the payment of certain claims for medical treatment of persons in the naval service; to repeal section 1586 of the Revised Statutes; and for other purposes;

H. R. 1667. An act for the relief of the estate of T. L. Morris;

H. R. 1747. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Lee Novick and others;

H. R. 2399. An act for the relief of Joseph W. Beyer;

H. R. 2622. An act to authorize loans for Indians, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2728. An act for the relief of Darwin Slump;

H. R. 3113. An act for the relief of Bessie B. Blacknall;

H. R. 3328. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Russell Coulter;

H. R. 4090. An act to equalize retirement benefits among members of the Nurse Corps of the Army and the Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4399. An act for the relief of James C. Smith, Stephen A. Bodkin, Charles A. Marlin, Andrew J. Perlik, and Albert N. James;

H. R. 4571. An act for the relief of the estate of Carl N. Nall; and

H. J. Res. 242. Joint resolution to confirm title in fee simple in Joshua Britton to certain lands in Jefferson County, Ill.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 28, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1496. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting his refusal to transmit to the House of Representatives the letter relating to Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards, dated May 15, 1947, written by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and addressed to W. Averell Harriman, Secretary of Commerce (H. Doc. No. 625); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

1497. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Commonwealth of Virginia a right-of-way for public-highway purposes in certain lands at Pungo, Va.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1498. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the request of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics for authority to undertake certain projects for the development of class 4 and larger airports which, in his opinion, should be undertaken during the fiscal year 1949; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1499. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Dorrance Ulvin, former certifying officer, and for the relief of Guy F. Allen, former Chief Disbursing Officer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 551. Resolution providing for consideration of House Joint Resolution 334, joint resolution giving the consent of Congress to the compact on regional education entered into between the Southern States at Tallahassee, Fla., on February 8, 1948; without amendment (Rept. No. 1820). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KEEFE: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 6355. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1821). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 552. Resolution relative to the contested-election case of Mankin against Davis, Fifth Congressional District of Georgia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1822). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 553. Resolution relative to the contested-election case of Lowe against Davis, Fifth Congressional District of Georgia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1823). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 559. Resolution waiving points of order against the bill H. R. 6355, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1824). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 6355. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 6356. A bill to permit refund or credit to brewers of taxes paid on beer lost or wasted in bottling operations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6357. A bill to extend the loan benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to certain widows of veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 6358. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a free bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Del Rio, Tex.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 6359. A bill to encourage the construction of rental dwellings by allowing building costs to be deducted, for income-tax purposes, over a period of 60 months; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 6360. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law title 14 of the United States Code entitled "Coast Guard"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. R. 6361. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to permit disabled employees to receive annuities irrespective of any earnings in service for hire or in self-employment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEVENSON:

H. R. 6362. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, with respect to clerks in air-mail field railway post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. J. Res. 388. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation for construction of buildings and facilities in or near the University of Alaska for research in Arctic health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. Con. Res. 190. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that there should be a bipartisan platform on foreign policy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. Res. 554. Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document and the printing of additional copies of the High Cost of Housing; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. Res. 555. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the Eightieth Congress, Long-Range Agricultural Policy; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. Res. 557. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Document No. 146; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 558. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Document No. 149, Eightieth Congress, second session; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 6363. A bill for the relief of Commander John Lester Wilfong, United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 6364. A bill for the relief of the Quality Coal Mining Co., Pikeville, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6365. A bill for the relief of J. M. Arthur; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1841. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition of various students of Westmar College, Le Mars, Iowa, relative to endorsement of House Concurrent Resolutions 59 and 68 and Senate Concurrent Resolution 24; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1842. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of Wisconsin Restaurant Association, Milwaukee, Wis., opposing repeal of tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1843. By Mr. WELCH: Resolution No. 7402, passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, endorsing the Pillar Point breakwater project and memorializing Congress to enact legislation authorizing the construction of said project; to the Committee on Public Works.

1844. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. Thelma E. Roby, St. Cloud, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1845. Also, petition of Miss Myrtle Wells, St. Cloud, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 28, 1948

(Legislative day of Thursday, April 22, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rabbi Herman Eliot Snyder, Sinai Temple, Springfield, Mass., offered the following prayer:

We pray unto our God who instilled His spirit in all humanity. Thou didst teach us the common brotherhood of man. Thou didst reveal Thyself as the emancipator of the enslaved. Thou didst instruct us to worship Thee in acts of loving kindness and justice.

We pray that our beloved Nation may be preserved as a citadel of righteousness, as the protagonist of justice, and as a constant example of human kindness and mercy. We pray that we may be instruments of Thy will in establishing Thy kingdom on earth, to the end that people everywhere may live in peace and security without fear of the tomorrows to come.

Protect Thou and inspire the guardians of our liberties and freedom, that the generations to come may bless their vision and devotion. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. SALTONSTALL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 26, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

On April 26, 1948:

S. J. Res. 207. Joint resolution to provide for the commemoration of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the establishment of the Department of the Navy.

On April 27, 1948:

S. 329. An act for the relief of Gentaro Takahashi;

S. 936. An act for the relief of Burnett A. Pyle;

S. 1583. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Maryland, for the use of the University of Maryland, of the northern portion of a parcel of land previously constituting a part of the campus of the university and previously conveyed by the State of Maryland to the United States for the use of the Bureau of Mines; and

S. 560. An act to prohibit the operation of gambling ships, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1481) to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District, with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2409) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, approved July 16, 1947," with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2195) to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6055)

making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. ENGEL of Michigan, Mr. STEFAN, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. KEEFE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. KERR, and Mr. MAHON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1036. An act to provide for the licensing of marine radiotelegraph operators as ship radio officers, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5448. An act to amend sections 212 (b) and 231 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 5808. An act to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children of the District of Columbia;

H. R. 5963. An act to authorize the construction of a courthouse to accommodate the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6071. An act to provide for the treatment of sexual psychopaths in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6087. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia";

H. R. 6203. An act to incorporate the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington a corporation sole;

H. R. 6209. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Protestant Episcopal Cathedral Foundation of the District of Columbia," approved January 6, 1893, as amended;

H. J. Res. 379. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the Presidential inaugural ceremonies of 1949;

H. J. Res. 380. Joint resolution authorizing the granting of permits to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1949, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 381. Joint resolution to provide for the quartering, in certain public buildings in the District of Columbia, of troops participating in the inaugural ceremonies of 1949.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 334. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of James Harold Nesbitt, a minor;

H. R. 344. An act for the relief of Sylvester T. Starling;

H. R. 761. An act for the relief of the estate of Anthony D. Chamberlain, deceased;

H. R. 762. An act for the relief of Dudley Tarver;

H. R. 1275. An act to authorize the payment of certain claims for medical treatment of persons in the naval service; to repeal section 1586 of the Revised Statutes; and for other purposes;

H. R. 1667. An act for the relief of the estate of T. L. Morris;

H. R. 1747. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Lee Novick and others;

H. R. 2399. An act for the relief of Joseph W. Beyer;

H. R. 2622. An act to authorize loans for Indians, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2728. An act for the relief of Darwin Slump;

H. R. 3113. An act for the relief of Bessie B. Blacknall;

H. R. 3328. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Russell Coulter;

H. R. 4090. An act to equalize retirement benefits among members of the Nurse Corps of the Army and the Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4399. An act for the relief of James C. Smith, Stephen A. Bodkin, Charles A. Marlin, Andrew J. Perlik, and Albert N. James;

H. R. 4571. An act for the relief of the estate of Carl N. Nall; and

H. J. Res. 242. Joint resolution to confirm title in fee simple in Joshua Britton to certain lands in Jefferson County, Ill.

COMMEMORATION OF CUBAN INDEPENDENCE—MESSAGE FROM PRESIDENT OF CUBAN SENATE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a cablegram from the President of the Senate of the Republic of Cuba regarding the recent ceremonies commemorating the war for Cuba's freedom. The President pro tempore undertakes to say for the American Congress, in response to these cordial greetings, that the message is greatly appreciated and that we fully reciprocate every wish for the permanent maintenance of our happy relationships with the Government and people of the Republic of Cuba. The message from the President of the Cuban Senate will be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The cablegram is as follows:

HABANA, *April 19, 1948.*

His Excellency the PRESIDENT OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C.:

In commemorating today the historic agreement of the joint resolution as action of the Cuban Spanish-American War which laid down full sovereignty democratic principles and ideals for Cuba, this action firmly binding together our peoples and nations, permit me to send you cordial greetings and to express fervent wish for the permanent union of our peoples in such noble ideals.

Dr. MIGUEL A. SUAREZ FERNANDEZ,
President of the Senate.

TRIBUTE TO GEN. U. S. GRANT BY SENATE SESSION

Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained permission for the Committee on the Judiciary considering the nomination of Edward Allen Tamm to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. CAIN asked and obtained permission for the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate to sit during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

TRIBUTE TO GEN. U. S. GRANT BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday it was my privilege to speak to a group of patriotic Americans gathered at the foot of Capitol Hill around the monument erected to the memory of Ulysses S. Grant.

In our fast-moving life many times we find ourselves so living in the present that we lose some of the values of the past. The life of Ulysses S. Grant is an odyssey in the history of America. He had one of those great qualities so needed in the present, bulldog tenacity. When he stuck his teeth into something, he hung on to it. Knowing he was right he persevered to the end, and to him and to Lincoln we owe the fact that we are a united people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed following my remarks the tribute I paid yesterday to Gen. Ulysses S. Grant.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE ALEXANDER WILEY, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM WISCONSIN, AT THE MEMORIAL EXERCISES AT THE ULYSSES S. GRANT STATUE, SPONSORED BY CUSHING CAMP, NO. 30, SONS OF UNION VETERANS OF THE CIVIL WAR, DEPARTMENT OF MARYLAND, AND ALLIED ORGANIZATIONS, APRIL 27, 1948

A 1948 TRIBUTE TO GEN. U. S. GRANT

Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War and Allied Organizations, it is a distinct honor to address you today in relation to the life of Gen. Ulysses S. Grant, and its inspiring meaning to us of this generation.

Of this distinguished soldier, a poet, Thomas Bailey Aldrich, wrote:

"Great captain, glorious in our wars—
No mead of praise we hold from him;
About his brow we wreathe the stars
The coming ages shall not dim."

BIOGRAPHY OF GRANT

General Grant's life might be called an American Odyssey. He was born in Ohio in 1822, appointed to West Point in 1839, and graduated therefrom in 1844, ranking twenty-first in a class of 39. In 1845, he went with his regiment with General Taylor to Mexico and took part in a number of battles, was transferred to General Scott's army and participated in the storming of Chapultepec. He came out of the Mexican War as a captain. Throughout this service, he displayed courage and gallantry. He remained in the service until 1854, when he resigned his commission, and in 1860 he became a clerk in his father's little store in Galena, Ill. At that time, he was earning about $800 a year and was regarded as a broken and disappointed man.

Then came war. He responded to the call of arms in 1861, and was commissioned colonel of the Twenty-first Illinois Regiment. We are all acquainted with the rest of the story in a general way. Early in 1862 General Halleck entrusted him with the command of the force to clear the lower reaches of the Cumberland and Tennessee. He captured Fort Donaldson and 15,000 Confederates. When Halleck went to Washington, Grant took command of the forces in the West, and Vicksburg fell before his onslaught.

But he didn't always have success. He had, however, "what it takes," when success does not always follow one's effort. He possessed iron determination and energy, the qualities for which Lincoln was looking in his generals. In November 1863, after a great 3-day battle at Chattanooga, he crushed the Confederates. Then Lincoln said: "Come to Washington," and Grant was placed at the head of all of the Union forces. Then followed the "On to Richmond" campaign.

THE SUPREME BATTLE

One of the great men of this country opposed Grant, and Grant knew there was

but one way to win, and that was by attrition of Lee's forces. It was costly in lives. Some 72,000 men fell, but it was Grant's same determination, his bulldog tenacity, that won through. "I propose to fight it out on this line if it takes all summer," expressed Grant's philosophy. Truly we can say of him, he brought the great struggle to an end. He was the savior of the Union.

Thomas Bailey Aldrich wrote further of Grant:

"The Cloud-sent man! Was it not he
That from the hand of adverse fate:
Snatched the white flower of victory?
He spoke no word, but saved the State."

There were other generals more brilliant, but it is doubtful whether any other man could have done the job. His was a singleness of purpose and a relentless vigor in the execution of purpose. He was equal to the emergency. Truly he was a great war captain. His energy rose higher with each obstacle and yes, he had what it takes—clear judgment to distinguish the essentials from the minor issues in war.

At Appomattox he met his old friend, Gen. Robert E. Lee. Grant laid down the terms of peace which gave to the Confederates their sidearms and, yes, their horses with which to plow their fields. Then, he sent them back home—not to concentration camp.

GRANT'S POSTWAR ROLE

After the assassination of Lincoln, Andrew Johnson wanted to deal severely with the Confederate leaders, it being understood that indictments for treason were to be brought against General Lee and others. Again, General Grant stepped forward. He said that the United States Government was bound by the terms that he had accorded to Lee and his army at Appomattox. He even went so far as to threaten to resign his commission if the President disregarded his protest. Truly, here again it was the energetic action on General Grant's part that saved the United States from a foul stain upon its escutcheon.

GRANT AS PRESIDENT

He became President—the choice of a free people. During his term as President, the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution was adopted, providing that suffrage throughout the United States should not be restricted on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. The most important event in foreign policy during his administration was the Treaty of Washington with Great Britain, whereby the Alabama claims and others were referred to arbitration. During his second term, there were those in high places who favored debasing the currency, and a bill was introduced to effectuate that purpose. President Grant promptly vetoed the same. This showed again his courage and statesmanship.

We all know that during Grant's term of office, there was a great deal of corruption in high places. It was difficult for General Grant with his simplicity of nature, to believe that persons to whom he had given his friendship could be so unworthy. His childlike faith led him to trust folks, and after he went out of office, he joined up with a banking firm, investing all his property there. But he paid no attention to the management. He confided in others, and again he was "taken in." Two of his partners perpetrated systematic and gigantic frauds. This left Grant penniless. Then, though ill, he began his personal memoirs, and he labored on until he died. His body now reposes in the monument at Riverside Drive in New York overlooking the Hudson.

U. S. GRANT'S WORTHY TRAITS

Grant had many admirable and loving traits. He possessed a trustful simplicity. He abounded in kindness and generosity. He had a high sense of justice. He was a noble and lovable personality, well fit to be remembered as one of the heroes of a great Nation.

What can we learn from his life?

1. He loved America, her institutions, and to preserve them he had that bulldog tenacity that is needed in a great cause.

2. He was honest, kind, and generous.

3. While in his personal affairs, he was too trusting, and, as a result, was "taken in," he was able as the head of the Union armies to evaluate the paramount needs of the Nation in meeting the emergency. He didn't let the minor issues interfere with his ability to appreciate to the full the important material needs and manpower necessary to accomplish victory.

Today, as we look out upon a troubled world, we have to apply these qualities. We must not make molehills into mountains, nor mountain issues into molehills. Whatever challenge we have to meet, we have got to meet it head on, the Grant way, sensing to the full the needs as they really exist.

Today we are one people. There is neither North, nor South, nor East nor West. There is a unity of heart and soul in 48 free and equal States, a unity many times tested in the fiery crucible of war and in times of crisis while at peace.

It was Lincoln who saw that this man could do the job, and it was this man who, collaborating with Lincoln, preserved the Union. Grant was truly the product of America. He was the descendant of Matthew Grant, a Scotchman, who settled in Dorchester, Mass., in 1630. Over two centuries of the warp and the woof of America went into the fiber of this man's being.

Courage, bulldog tenacity, love of country, loyalty to friends—these were the qualities of Ulysses Simpson Grant.

Another American President, William McKinley, said of Grant:

"The iron shackles which Lincoln declared should be loosed from the limbs and souls of the black slaves, Grant, with his matchless Army, melted and destroyed in the burning glories of the war."

CONCLUSION

America looks with pride to the deeds and creed of "Unconditional Surrender" Grant—a great soldier who was adequate to a great occasion. May it be said of us, that we in peace as in war, we, the citizens of a free Republic, were adequate to our challenges as U. S. Grant was adequate to his.

EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROL IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on Senate bill 2195, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The conference report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the conference report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2195) to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendments numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"(a) Any housing accommodations in hotels, which accommodations are used exclusively for transient occupancy, that is, for living quarters for nonresidents upon a short-time basis;".

And the House agree to the same.

C. D. BUCK,
HARRY P. CAIN,
JAMES P. KEM,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.
JOS. P. O'HARA,
GREGORY MCMAHON,
JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.,
OREN HARRIS,
T. G. ABERNETHY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report. It is merely a report of agreement between the House and the Senate concerning the extension for a year of rent control within the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME IN THE DISTRICT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1481) to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District, which were, in line 5, to strike out "a" and insert "the"; in the same line, to strike out "of each year"; in line 6, after "April" to insert "1948"; in line 7, after "September" to insert "1948"; and in line 9, to strike out "of the year."

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House. Senators will no doubt recall that in recent days the Senate passed a measure authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to have or not to have daylight saving within the District of Columbia for an uncertain number of years in the future. When the bill went to the House it was determined by the House that that authority should be restricted to a single year. Despite the fact that the proponents of the bill in the Senate find it obviously necessary to differ from the position taken by the House, it is our opinion that to do other than concur in the amendment of the House would be to hold in jeopardy the wish of a majority of the citizens of the District of Columbia that there be daylight saving in force in this community during the next year. For that reason I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CORPORATION OR BUSINESS TAX

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington wish to have a further message from the House of Representatives laid down regarding the revenue act for the District of Columbia?

Mr. CAIN. May the junior Senator from Washington inquire whether it is legislation covering the proposed courthouse in the District of Columbia?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is an amendment of the House to Senate bill 2409.

Mr. CAIN. To the District of Columbia franchise tax bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. CAIN. I would very much appreciate its being laid down.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2409) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 16, 1947, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That paragraph lettered (h) of section 4 of title I of article I of the act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 16, 1947, is amended by striking out the period at the end of the paragraph, inserting a colon, and the following: "*Provided, however,* That the words 'trade or business' shall not include, for the purposes of this article—

"(1) Sales of tangible personal property whereby title to such property passes within or without the District, by a corporation or unincorporated business which does not physically have or maintain an office, warehouse, or other place of business in the District, and which has no officer, agent, or representative having an office or other place of business in the District, during the taxable year; or

"(2) Sales of tangible personal property by a corporation or unincorporated business which does not maintain an office or other place of business in the District and which has no office, agent, or representative in the District except for the sole purpose of doing business with the United States, but such corporations and unincorporated businesses shall be subject to the licensing provisions in title XIV of this article.

"For purposes of this proviso, the words 'agent' or 'representative' shall not include any independent broker engaged independently in regularly soliciting orders in the District for sellers and who holds himself out as such."

SEC. 2. Section 1 of title X of article I of said act is amended by striking out the period at the end of the section, inserting a colon, and the following: "*Provided further,* That income derived from the sale of tangible personal property by a corporation or unincorporated business not carrying on or engaging in trade or business within the District as defined in title I of this article shall not be considered as income from sources within the District for purposes of this article, with the exception of income from sales to the United States not excluded from gross income as provided in title III, section 2 (b) (13) of this article."

SEC. 3. Paragraph lettered (b) of section 2 of title III of article I of said act is amended by adding thereto the following subparagraph:

"(13) Income derived from the sale of tangible personal property to the United States by corporations and unincorporated businesses having their principal places of business located outside the District, which property is delivered from places outside the District for use outside the District: *Provided, however,* That the taxpayer shall furnish to the Assessor a statement in writing of the amount of gross sales so made and, if required by the Assessor, a list of the names of the agencies of the United States through which such property was sold."

SEC. 4. Section 4 of title XIV of article I of said act is repealed.

SEC. 5. The amendments made by this act shall apply to the taxable year or part thereof beginning on the 1st day of January 1948, and to succeeding taxable years.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House. It is merely a clarification of a provision regarding the franchise tax presently utilized in the District of Columbia. It exempts from taxation those out-of-the-District corporations and companies doing business within the District of Columbia in a casual manner. Companies whose head offices are beyond and outside the confines of the District of Columbia and do not have branch offices in the District of Columbia are not to be subject in the future to the franchise tax.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator know of any objection on the part of any Member of the Senate to the action which the Senator proposes the Senate take at this time?

Mr. CAIN. I know of no single objection within the Senate. The matter having been thoroughly considered by the District of Columbia Committees both of the House and the Senate and more thoroughly considered by the House, I take it that there are no objections to the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR TRUST TERRITORY OF PACIFIC ISLANDS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide a civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION ON NATURAL GAS INVESTIGATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, its report on Natural Gas Investigation (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

DEVELOPMENT AND IMPROVEMENT OF CERTAIN AIRPORTS (S. DOC. NO. 151)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a request of the Acting Administrator of Civil Aeronautics for authority to undertake certain projects for the development of class 4 and larger airports during the fiscal year 1949, which, with the accompanying papers, will be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter just laid before the Senate together with the accompanying papers be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A letter from W. Walter Williams, president of American Association for the United Nations, of Seattle, Wash., embodying a resolution adopted at a meeting in Seattle, Wash., under the auspices of that association, northwest headquarters, relating to Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter from Bernard S. Rogard, honorary secretary, American Chamber of Commerce of Tientsin, China, transmitting a memorandum adopted by that organization, relating to treatment of American civilians who suffered internment or imprisonment in China at the hands of the Japanese military authorities (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from Mrs. Richard G. de Buda, of Oneonta, N. Y., suggesting ways and means to check communistic expansion and prevention of war; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the board of aldermen of the city of Chelsea, Mass., favoring the prompt enactment of the so-called Wagner-Taft-Ellender housing bill; ordered to lie on the table.

A petition of sundry citizens of the State of California, praying for the enactment of legislation providing an increase of $800 in salaries of postal employees; ordered to lie on the table.

A letter from Frances Lopinsky, of Washington, D. C., transmitting a petition of citizens of the United States, being residents of southeastern Alaska, praying for the enactment of legislation to abolish the Tongass National Forest in southeastern Alaska (with an accompanying paper); ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CAIN, from the Committee on Public Works:

S. 2284. A bill to authorize the construction of a courthouse to accommodate the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1172); and

H. R. 4068. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to construct a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1171).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 2281. A bill to provide for an air parcel-post service, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1169).

By Mr. MALONE, from the Committee on Public Works:

S. 1025. A bill to authorize public improvements at Nome, Alaska; with amendments (Rept. No. 1173); and

S. 2262. A bill granting the consent of Congress to Carolina Power & Light Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in the Lumber River; without amendment (Rept. No. 1174).

WAGE RATES FOR EMPLOYEES IN NAVY YARDS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I ask unanimous consent to report, with amendments, the bill (S. 2285) relating to the fixing of wage rates for employees in navy yards,

and I submit a report (No. 1170) thereon, to which I call the attention of the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

EVALUATION OF EFFECT OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (REPT. NO. 1175)

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I ask unanimous consent to submit a report on the evaluation of the effect of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and printed.

EXTENSION OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I ask unanimous consent to report an original bill to provide for a temporary extension of title VI of the National Housing Act, as amended, and I submit a report (No. 1168) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 2565) to provide for a temporary extension of title VI of the National Housing Act, as amended, was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], I ask unanimous consent to report favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 215, submitted by Mr. VANDENBERG on March 25, 1948, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and I request its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eightieth Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purpose, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

JOINT COMMITTEE TO ARRANGE FOR THE INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT-ELECT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably Senate Concurrent Resolution 48, submitted by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] on April 7, 1948, and I request its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That a joint committee consisting of three Senators and three Representatives, to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, is authorized to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect of the United States on the 20th day of January 1949.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT NO. 950, RELATING TO INVESTIGATION OF IMMIGRATION SYSTEM

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably Senate Resolution 220, submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], on April 6, 1948, and I request its immediate consideration. I may say for the record that there has been an estimate of the cost of printing in the amount of $319.41.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed 2,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 950, current session, submitted pursuant to Senate Resolution 137, a resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to make an investigation of the immigration system, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary and 1,000 copies for the use of the Senate document room.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably Senate Resolution 224, submitted by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] on April 19, 1948, and I request its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eightieth Congress, $5,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purpose, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE FACTUAL ANALYSIS ENTITLED "HOUSING IN AMERICA"

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably House Concurrent Resolution 182, and I request its immediate consideration. I may state that the estimated cost of printing the first 1,000 copies is $543.49; each additional 1,000 copies, $153.60; and for the total estimated number of copies, $2,693.89.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed as a House document, and that there be printed 15,000 additional copies of the factual analysis on housing prepared for the Joint Committee on Housing, entitled "Housing in America," for the use of the said joint committee.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS ON INVESTIGATION OF NATIONAL RESOURCES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably Senate Concurrent Resolution 51, submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] on April 20, 1948, and I request its immediate consideration. I would say for the RECORD that the estimated cost of printing these additional copies will be in the neighborhood of $1,400.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That 1,000 additional copies of the hearings held before the Committee on Public Lands on Investigation of National Resources on May 15, 16, and 20, 1947, be printed for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a report for the month of March 1948, from the chairman of a certain committee, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.) relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
April 13, 1948.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of March 1948, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Leona V. MacKinnon, 1443 Spring Road NW.; Social Security Administration, Federal Security Agency; annual salary, $5,905.20.

Fedele F. Fauri, 3227 Northampton Street NW.; Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress; annual salary, $9,975.

Martha D. Ring, 3510 Morrison Street NW.; Division of Public Health Methods, Federal Security Agency; annual salary, $6,623.40.

E. D. MILLIKIN,
Chairman.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 2562. A bill to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans of World War I and World II with service-connected disabilities who have dependents; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 2563. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Mrs. Fannie Cordier a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. 2564. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and the National Bank Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(Mr. TOBEY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported an original bill (S. 2565) to provide for a temporary extension of title VI of the National Housing Act, as amended, which was ordered to be placed on the Calendar.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2566. A bill providing for investigations and experiments into problems relative to

maintaining productive meadows at high altitudes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BUTLER (by request):

S. 2567. A bill to provide for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2568. A bill to provide that civil-service examinations to test fitness for employment by the Panama Canal and the Panama Railroad Company in the Canal Zone shall be open only to persons who are citizens of or owe allegiance to the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2569. A bill to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence, to make immigration quotas available to Asiatic and Pacific peoples, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 2570. A bill to extend the time within which suit may be filed under the Federal Tort Claims Act on the claim of Luis Birriel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 2571. A bill to authorize the protection of life and property, water conservation, and the comprehensive reclamation of land in the Middle Rio Grande Valley in New Mexico, by flood control, irrigation, sediment detention, drainage, and other activities; to provide for the financial rehabilitation of the Middle Rio Grande conservancy district; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

S. 2572. A bill for the acquisition of additional land adjoining the Federal building in Idaho Falls, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 2573. A bill for the acquisition of additional land adjoining the Federal building in Idaho Falls, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 2574. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the Boise Barracks Military Reservation, Boise, Idaho, to Boise City, Idaho, excepting certain parts thereof heretofore set aside for governmental purposes of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. THYE, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. IVES, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. HOEY, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia, and Mr. O'CONOR):

S. 2575. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2576. A bill for reimbursement of the Hawaiian Dredging Co., Ltd.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED:

S. 2577. A bill to amend section 303 (e) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. THYE, and Mr. LANGER):

S. 2578. A bill to provide an appropriation for the reconstruction and repair of roads and other public facilities in the States of North Dakota and Minnesota which were destroyed or damaged by recent floods; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 2579. A bill to provide for the transfer of War Housing Project No. Fla–VN–8342 to the city of Sebring, Fla.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MCKELLAR:

S. 2580. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey a certain tract of land in the State of Tennessee to the city of Johnson City; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MCMAHON (by request):

S. 2581. A bill for the relief of Dr. Elias Stavropoulos, his wife Stravrola Stravropoulos, and their minor daughter, Tina Stavropoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MALONE (for himself and Mr. BUTLER) introduced Senate bill 2582, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCCARRAN:

S. 2583. A bill to permit the sale of gold within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, including Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REGISTRATION AND PROTECTION OF CERTAIN TRADE-MARKS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HAWKES submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1919) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of international conventions, and for other purposes," approved July 5, 1946, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles, and referred or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 5808. An act to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children of the District of Columbia;

H. R. 6071. An act to provide for the treatment of sexual psychopaths in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6087. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 6203. An act to incorporate the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington a corporation sole;

H. R. 6209. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Protestant Episcopal Cathedral Foundation of the District of Columbia," approved January 6, 1893, as amended;

H. J. Res. 379. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the Presidential inaugural ceremonies of 1949;

H. J. Res. 380. Joint resolution authorizing the granting of permits to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1949, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 381. Joint resolution to provide for the quartering, in certain public buildings in the District of Columbia, of troops participating in the inaugural ceremonies of 1949; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 5963. An act to authorize the construction of a courthouse to accommodate the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY—EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY SENATOR BREWSTER

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a portion of an address delivered by him before the Harvard Law School Forum, at Cambridge, Mass., on April 23, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL SERVICES—ADDRESS BY TRYGVE LIE

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Mr. Trygve Lie, Secretary General of the United Nations, at the Roosevelt memorial services at Hyde Park, N. Y., April 12, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

AN ECONOMIC ISSUE FOR THE REPUBLICANS—ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

[Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "An Economic Issue for the Republicans," written by Arthur Krock and published in the New York Times of April 27, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES AS DEFENSE AGAINST COMMUNISM

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Central Issue," published in the New York Times of April 25, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] I send to the desk a notice and request that it be read.

The Chief Clerk read the notice, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
April 28, 1948.

To the Senate:

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the act approved May 17, 1928, I hereby appoint Senators HOMER FERGUSON and THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN to represent the Senate Appropriations Committee on the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy for the year beginning January 1, 1948.

STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Appropriations.

INTERPRETATION OF FEDERAL STATUTES BY THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, from time to time it appears necessary, in the interest of the public welfare, to examine into the interpretation by Federal bureaus of statutes which provide that rules and regulations may be made for carrying out the purposes of certain acts. I refer particularly to the recent attempts of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, to read into such general laws its right to extend the powers specifically granted; and also, in some instances, to nullify certain policies and directives of the Congress. These incidents would not be of serious import were it not for the fact that the end result is something alien to our past experiences to such a degree that the intent and purpose of this Bureau may well be subject to question.

In the Seventy-ninth Congress I was a member of the Irrigation and Reclamation Committee which held hearings on a bill to establish a Missouri Valley Authority. Hearings on this bill were held over a 10-day period in September 1945. The committee submitted a report after a great deal of consideration of the testimony, and we recommended that the bill, S. 555, do not pass.

Many Senators recall this bill. Let me outline briefly what it proposed. First,

to create a Federal corporation to be controlled by three directors appointed by the President. Second, to prepare a plan for unified development of the Missouri Valley region within 2 years after enactment of the bill. Third, to construct or operate any project or conduct any activity entrusted to it. Fourth, to enter upon privately owned lands for the purpose of improving and developing such lands. Fifth, to acquire by purchase, lease, or condemnation real or personal property or any interests therein. Sixth, to institute a program of planned economy. Seventh, the corporation would not be subject to provisions of general law governing proceedings in eminent domain.

All these provisions were said to be necessary for the continued development of the resources of the Missouri River Basin. The committee believed that a statement made by a witness against the bill accurately reflected its scope:

> It amounts to creating a third level of government, neither Federal or State, and never contemplated by our Constitution.

We concluded that there were in existence adequate, comprehensive plans for the development of the basin resources, consisting of lands, water, and minerals. Most of these plans were authorized under existing law to accomplish, in cooperation with the several States affected, an orderly procedure in the interest of the welfare of the people. The committee concluded further that the bill would provide means for the expansion of governmental powers through a Federal corporation, since it proposed the creation of an instrument of Government with questionable and irresponsible powers affecting the social, cultural, and economic welfare of the people, and over which they would have little or no control. Local autonomy was not assured in this bill, but, on the contrary, the creation of the Missouri Valley Authority would amount to the welding of economic and political powers resulting in nothing short of autocracy.

In particular, it was attempted by the sponsors of this authority bill to supersede the laws of the Western States which over the course of many years have established rights to the uses of their waters. The testimony showed that about 85 percent of present irrigation development in the Western States has been achieved by private enterprise under which rights in water have been acquired under existing State laws. Reclamation laws at the outset required that the Secretary of the Interior proceed in conformity with State water laws. More than 40 years after the Reclamation Act of 1902 was enacted, the Congress reaffirmed its position respecting the observance of local laws in connection with the waters of the West in section 1 of the Flood Control and Rivers and Harbors Acts of 1944 and 1945 respectively.

The authority bill, nonetheless, would circumvent this policy of the Congress since it provided that nothing in the act "shall limit the authority of the corporation to acquire by purchase, lease, condemnation or donation real or personal property or any interest therein."

In the West, a water right is a property right. I want to emphasize this point.

Early this year I had occasion to review a proposed contract between the Secretary of the Interior and an irrigation district in my State which was made for the sole purpose of supplying stored water to about 20,000 acres of land now irrigated and about 20,000 acres of new land which had not been irrigated, and to provide terms for repayment of construction costs by the users of water within the district. This district is within the Missouri River Basin. The contract, if consummated, would give the Bureau of Reclamation more power over the land and water resources of a 60,000-acre region in southwestern Nebraska than the Congress has ever heretofore considered desirable in our democratic Nation. Do not be misled into believing that this is merely a local affair. It is an attempt to initiate in Nebraska a pattern of administration to be used in the 17 Western States wherever and whenever the Bureau of Reclamation can develop the opportunity. According to a letter from the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation to Chairman WELCH of the House Committee on Public Lands, the contract is particularly devised to permit the Department of the Interior to control the agriculture of the valley of the Missouri River and of the Central Valley of California.

Let me outline briefly what this pattern contract provides:

First. The Secretary of the Interior becomes the appropriator of the water supplies in that he is empowered to take over, in the name of the United States, all existing irrigation works. He limits the project diversions to such waters as only he may determine are required. He denies the lands benefited vested rights in the water supply. He supplants the officers of the State in the administration of the water supply.

The Secretary of the Interior thereby violates plain directives of the Congress to comply with the water laws of the State; he violates also the laws adopted by the State for the protection of the property rights of its citizens, and for the orderly administration of its water resources; and he violates the spirit and intent of the decisions of the Supreme Court.

Second. Under the provisions of this contract the Secretary of the Interior assumes full control of the crops the farmer may produce.

Third. The Secretary, under this contract, assumes full control of land-improvement work now covered by functions of the Department of Agriculture through the Soil Conservation Service, and the aids, such as advice and financial assistance from this Service, would no longer be available. The contract violates the soil-conservation laws of the State of Nebraska.

Fourth. The contract provides for the appraisal and valuation of all the irrigable lands of the irrigation district, while reclamation law applies the appraisal and valuation only to excess lands. In this district I doubt the excess lands exceed 5 percent. However, the Secretary proposes that the district set up an abstract and land-title office for about 1,000 ownerships and to maintain these records on an up-to-date basis monthly.

Fifth. The Secretary, under the terms of the contract, controls the employees of the district inasmuch as he requires that the manager or superintendent be at all times satisfactory to him, and that, if he is not satisfactory, the contract may be considered breached. When any breach of the contract occurs, at the election of the Secretary he will immediately take over the care, operation, and maintenance of the district.

Sixth. The contract is not a specific and definite agreement between the parties, for a provision is included at the end of the document which says that the Secretary reserves the right to make rules and regulations and to add to or modify them, to supply details of administration, and the district shall agree to observe such rules, regulations, and directives.

Seventh. There is in this contract no single statement which gives recognition to the rights of the directors of the district or to their duties as prescribed in the statutes of Nebraska. The few references to the directors are confined to their availability for consultation by representatives of the Secretary.

It is apparent that the present policy of the Bureau of Reclamation is to achieve bureaucratic autonomy by means of contracts. When inquiry is made of the reasons behind the procedure, there is always available some Bureau official who can talk at great length about the Bureau's duty to safeguard the interests of the United States. When one asks the authority for the inclusions of the many restrictions upon the individual rights of the water users—the landowners, the producers of the crops—these proponents of bureaucracy point to section 10 of the Reclamation Act of 1902. Let me quote this section:

> SEC. 10. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to perform any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper for the purpose of carrying the provisions of this act into full force and effect.

The purpose of the act of 1902 is stated in section 1. It is to provide for the construction and maintenance of irrigation works for the storage, diversion, and development of waters for the reclamation of arid and semiarid lands in the Western States. If the Congress and the people had construed section 10 literally, there would, of course, have been no occasion to add further provisions to reclamation laws. But, the fact is that the Congress did not intend to delegate legislative powers by this section. On the contrary, a great body of reclamation law has since been enacted. Congress has never altered the purpose of Federal reclamation. Many construction fea-

tures which we have authorized, and those we hereafter may authorize, include flood control and navigation benefits, and may produce commercial electric power; nevertheless, their basic purpose is the reclamation of arid lands.

In attaining this basic objective, I do not propose that this or any Federal bureau shall be permitted to increase its control over the private properties of our people, their land values, their vested water rights, and their individual freedom respecting land use and occupancy, on the grounds that they borrow money from the Federal Government. I shall consider seriously the repeal of section 10 of the act of 1902. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee is now reviewing other provisions of reclamation law which the Bureau of Reclamation interprets, so as to require it to submit this kind of contract to water users in the West.

Manifestly, Department of Interior officials are now engaged in an effort to establish the equivalent of a valley authority by means of contracts that enable the Department to control the land and water resources in the West. It is all too plain that although we stopped the valley-authority type of totalitarian government when we reported adversely on the proposed Missouri Valley Authority Act, we still have the same ideology emerging in the operations of some of the bureaus of this Department. The time has come to listen to the wishes of the people. The time is here for an independent review of such policies as I have described, which would ignore the laws of States and take away individual rights, long enjoyed in our country. It is plainly the duty of Congress to protect the citizen whose property rights are threatened as I have herein outlined. The Nebraska contract to which I have referred has been returned to the Bureau of Reclamation for further consideration and a complete rewriting.

INSPECTION TOUR OF NAVAL BASE AT NORFOLK, VA.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, on Saturday, April 24, it was my pleasure to take a group, including the distinguished minority leader of the Senate, on an informal inspection tour of the largest naval base in the world at Norfolk, Va. It was an impressive and reassuring trip and I regret that circumstances prevented a larger number of the Members of this body from participating.

In view of criticism which has been voiced of what sometimes has appeared to be a lack of coordination among the branches of our armed services, I was particularly pleased to observe the spirit in evidence at the Armed Forces Staff College where officers of the Army, Air Force, and Navy are being trained in the procedures of combined operations and the use of newly developed weapons.

For the information of those Members of the Senate who did not have this experience, I ask leave to insert in the RECORD a summary account of what we saw on our trip.

There being no objection, the summary account was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On our arrival in the Hampton Roads area we first were given an air view of the military installations, the deep water ports, the great privately operated shipyards of Newport News and Norfolk and other activities in the area which play an important role in our national defense system.

After landing at the Norfolk Naval Air Station, our first stop was made at the parade grounds where Capt. Dan McGurl, United States Navy, commanding officer, receiving station, was holding a routine inspection of receiving station personnel which consisted of approximately 700 officers and men plus a detachment of Waves. As the congressional party disembarked from the buses they informally inspected these people who were drawn up on parade.

We then proceeded to Admiral Ainsworth's office and received a detailed account of the activities in the Fifth Naval District, stressing those in the Norfolk area. This included the amphibious annexes at Little Creek, the naval shipyard in Portsmouth, and antiaircraft and test center at Dam Neck, and air fields and other naval installations. Questions were asked by the congressional party of the admiral, who went into matters as thoroughly as time permitted. He invited attention to the fact that there were approximately 10,000 officers and men at present on duty in the naval base area and that the civilian rolls amounted to about 28,000 employees with a total pay roll of around $8,200,000 monthly.

The party then again embarked in the bus and proceeded to Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet headquarters, where we were driven through the grounds and the various buildings pointed out with an explanation of the activities in each one.

Upon finishing this portion of the tour we proceeded to the Armed Forces Staff College where we were met by Rear Adm. F. P. Old, USN, present commanding officer of the college in the absence of Lieut. Gen. Delos C. Emmons, United States Army. Here an interesting lecture was given by Brig. Gen. C. D. Eddleman, United States Army, upon the mission, function, and objects of the college. Inspection was also made of classrooms and seminar rooms. This college was commissioned on February 3, 1947, with Lieut. Gen. Delos C. Emmons, United States Army, as the Commandant. It trains officers of the Army, Air Force, and Navy in joint operations procedures. Thus far three classes consisting of 150 officers, equally divided among the three services, have been graduated. The course of instruction is 5 months and during the course outstanding authorities in fields of science and tactics appear as guest speakers. Students are taught the characteristics, organization, and employment of Army, Naval, and Air Force, and the relation of these forces to each other. Joint staff techniques and procedure and the trends of new weapons and developments and their effects on joint operations are also a part of the course.

A visit was then made to Subgroup Three of the Norfolk group, Atlantic Reserve Fleet. This consists of 17 ships, a tonnage of 85,345; personnel, 15 officers, 190 men; barracks ship, escort carrier *Mission Bay*.

Prior to World War II, plans called for reserve ships to be placed in active service in from 30 to 90 days. However, when the chips were down, destroyers averaged 7 months for activation, submarines 9 months. After the conclusion of World War II, to avoid post-World War I mistakes, the Navy Department conducted protracted studies which resulted in the organization of the present Reserve Fleets, for which new techniques for preservation were developed. The ships are completely equipped (less ammunition, provisions, and certain combustibles), and maintained in a condition which will insure minimum delay in placing them back in active condition. To accomplish this, the ships have been made water- and weathertight; dehumidification machinery has been installed to keep the relative humidity within the ship at or below 30 percent; external equipment has been packaged or preserved by paint or rust-prevention compounds. Subgroup personnel provide security, maintain preservation, and provide activation instruction teams to reactivate the ships and train mobilized personnel.

Logistic support is furnished by the Fifth Naval District Command. This includes berthing area and pier maintenance; public utility services to each subgroup; all supply, pay, and medical services; transportation equipment, and the very important welfare and recreation facilities and funds. Approximately 20 percent of the ships are overhauled at the naval shipyard each year, to the end that each ship shall have an overhaul every 5 years.

From the Reserve Fleet a visit was made to the Naval Supply Center where Rear Adm. T. E. Hipp, (SC), USN, after explaining the functions of his command, escorted our party to the roof of building 143 where a fine view of the entire base was obtained. Buildings, ships and other interesting objects were pointed out to the party.

From the naval supply center the party proceeded to the assembly and repair department of the naval air station where the party was met by Capt. G. A. Dussault, USN, commanding officer, United States Naval Air Station and Capt. L. M. Grant, USN, assembly and repair officer. A tour of this activity upon a small tractor-train was conducted by Captain Grant.

Following this inspection of the Naval installations our party boarded the Army engineer's boat *Falcon* and spent some time on a water inspection tour on which we were shown features of the harbors including the important southern branch of the Elizabeth River with its adjacent shipyards, loading piers and industrial plants.

Before returning to Washington on the next day, our party attended ceremonies at the cross on Cape Henry which marks the spot where the colonists first landed before establishing at Jamestown, Va., the first permanent white settlement in America. Inspiring speeches were delivered by Attorney General of the United States, the Honorable Tom Clark, and Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY. Senator BARKLEY's speech was inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD on Monday, April 26.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Sanford M. Rosenthal for appointment as medical director in the regular corps of the Public Health Service.

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

J. Edwin McKee, to be postmaster at Fort Worth, Tex., in place of H. D. Young, deceased.

By Mr. WHERRY (for Mr. BROOKS) from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

John J. Deviny, of the District of Columbia, to be Public Printer.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive G, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, a convention between the United States and Norway signed at Washington on March 28, 1940, providing for the disposition of the claims of Christoffer Hannevig and of George R. Jones (Ex. Rept. No. 5).

HOUSING EXPEDITER—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably the nomination of Tighe E. Woods, of Illinois, to be Housing Expediter, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate. The committee voted unanimously yesterday morning to report this nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

TREATY PASSED OVER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Executive H (79th Cong., 1st sess.), the agreement on petroleum between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, signed in London on September 24, 1945, will be passed over.

The clerk will state the next business on the Executive Calendar.

PROTOCOL EXTENDING THE INTER-AMERICAN COFFEE AGREEMENT

The Senate, as in the Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the Protocol, Executive A (80th Cong., 2d sess.), a protocol for the extension for 1 year from October 1, 1947, subject to certain conditions, of the inter-American coffee agreement signed in Washington on November 28, 1940. The Protocol, which was signed on September 11–November 1, 1947, was read the second time, as follows:

PROTOCOL FOR THE EXTENSION OF THE INTER-AMERICAN COFFEE AGREEMENT FOR ONE YEAR FROM OCTOBER 1, 1947

WHEREAS an Inter-American Coffee Agreement (hereinafter referred to as "the Agreement") was signed in Washington on November 28, 1940:

AND WHEREAS by a Protocol signed in Washington April 15, 1941, the Agreement was brought into force on April 16, 1941, in respect of the Governments on behalf of which the Protocol was signed on April 15, 1941:

AND WHEREAS Article XXIV of the said Agreement provides that it should continue in force until October 1, 1943:

AND WHEREAS by unanimous consent the Governments signatory to the Agreement twice extended the said Agreement unchanged for one-year periods, these extensions being duly attested by two certified and signed Declarations passed by the Inter-American Coffee Board on May 12, 1943 and July 25, 1944, respectively, which were duly deposited in the Pan American Union on June 11, 1943, and September 11, 1944, respectively, in accordance with the provisions of Article XXIV of the Agreement:

AND WHEREAS by a Protocol signed and deposited with the Pan American Union under date of October 1, 1945, the said Agreement was extended for one year from October 1, 1945, with certain changes recommended by the Inter-American Coffee Board.

AND WHEREAS by a Protocol signed and deposited with the Pan American Union under date of October 1, 1946, the said Agreement was extended for one year from October 1, 1946, subject to certain conditions recommended by the Inter-American Coffee Board.

NOW, THEREFORE, in support of a recommendation made by the Inter-American Coffee Board on September 11, 1947, the Governments signatory to the present Protocol, considering that it is feasible, pending further efforts toward completion of international and inter-American arrangements for dealing with commodity problems, that the Agreement should be prolonged for one additional year, subject to the conditions stated below, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE 1

Subject to the provisions of Article 2 hereof, the Agreement shall continue in force between the Governments signatory to the present Protocol for a period of one year from October 1, 1947.

ARTICLE 2

During the period specified in Article 1 above, the Governments signatory to the present Protocol agree that the provisions of Articles I through and including VIII of the Agreement shall be inoperative.

ARTICLE 3

(a) During the period specified in Article 1 above, the Inter-American Coffee Board shall undertake to complete by April 1, 1948, its recommendations for the consideration of the governments now participating in the Agreement and of other governments that might be interested in participating in an understanding regarding the type of cooperation, whether inter-American or other international, that appears most likely to contribute to the development of sound and prosperous conditions in international trade in coffee equitable for both consumers and producers.

(b) Such recommendations shall be in accordance with general principles of commodity policy which are embodied in the Chapter on Inter-governmental Commodity Arrangements drafted in the First Session of the Preparatory Committee on the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment or which may be embodied in the Charter for an International Trade Organization if such Charter is concluded prior to the submission of such recommendations by the Board.

(c) The Inter-American Coffee Board shall undertake to make arrangements prior to October 1, 1948 for the transfer of its functions, assets and records to an appropriate inter-American or other international organization.

ARTICLE 4

The present Protocol shall be open for signature at the Pan American Union from September 11, 1947 until November 1, 1947, provided, however, that all signatures shall be deemed to have been affixed under date of October 1, 1947, and the Protocol shall be considered as having entered into force on that date with respect to the governments on behalf of which it is signed.

In witness whereof the undersigned, being duly authorized thereto by their respective Governments, have signed the present Protocol.

Done at the City of Washington in the English, Spanish, Portuguese and French languages. The original instrument in each language shall be deposited in the Pan American Union which shall furnish certified copies to the Governments signatory to this Protocol.

CARLOS MARTINS PEREIRA E SOUZA
Brazil
ANDRÉS URIBE C.
Colombia
J. RAPHAEL OREAMUNO
Costa Rica
GMO. BELT
Cuba
JULIO ORTEGA
Dominican Republic
C. J. AROSEMENA
Ecuador
CARLOS A. SIRI
El Salvador
ENRIQUE LÓPEZ HERRARTE
Guatemala
JOSEPH D. CHARLES
Haiti
JULIÁN R. CÁCERES
Honduras
V. SANCHEZ GAVITO JR.
Mexico
GUILLERMO SEVILLA SACASA
Nicaragua
C. ALZAMORA
Peru
WILLARD L. THORP
Subject to Ratification
United States of America
M. A. FALCÓN-BRICEÑO
Venezuela

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, this coffee agreement should be extended in order to give the signatory governments an opportunity to consider whether continued international consultation on problems relating to coffee is desirable, and, if so, what form it should take. The agreement has no important substantive effect, because the conditions which caused the creation of the agreement in the first place no longer exist; and, of course, it will have no effect whatever on the cost of living in America. The argument for extending it is that it provides machinery which will be useful to us in our relations with the coffee-producing countries.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire from the Senator from Massachusetts how long this coffee agreement has been in existence with the South American countries?

Mr. LODGE. The coffee agreement has been in existence since November 28, 1940, and it has been extended every year since then.

Mr. LUCAS. It has been extended in each instance for 1 year?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand further that there is an international board which is now studying the coffee situation with a view of ultimately making the determination as to whether or not the board shall be continued?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; and I think I can say that the United States representative on the board has indicated that the United States is not prepared to have the agreement extended or to continue to participate in an autonomous regional board of this type. So extension of the agreement beyond this term is not considered likely. However, we do wish to

extend it once more in order to make the transition.

Mr. LUCAS. Can the Senator tell me if the world supply of coffee is in excess of demand at this moment?

Mr. LODGE. The most recent studies indicate that for the next few years the world supply will be slightly in excess of demand.

Mr. LUCAS. Are there quota agreements involved in this protocol?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; there are quotas involved under this protocol, but the protocol provides that the quotas shall be inoperative during the life of the protocol.

Mr. LUCAS. Was the protocol unanimously reported by the committee?

Mr. LODGE. The protocol was unanimously reported from the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The protocol is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the protocol will be reported to the Senate.

The protocol was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive A, Eightieth Congress, second session, a protocol for the extension for 1 year from October 1, 1947, subject to certain conditions, of the Inter-American Coffee Agreement signed in Washington on November 28, 1940. The protocol was signed September 11–November 1, 1947.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification is agreed to, and the protocol is ratified.

PROTOCOL PROLONGING THE INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT REGARDING THE REGULATION OF PRODUCTION AND MARKETING OF SUGAR

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeding to consider the protocol, Executive C, Eightieth Congress, second session, a protocol prolonging, for 1 year after August 31, 1947, the international agreement regarding the regulation of production and marketing of sugar, signed at London on May 6, 1937. The protocol, which was signed at London on August 29, 1947, was read the second time, as follows:

C. TEXT OF THE PROTOCOL

Whereas an International Agreement regarding the Regulation of the Production and Marketing of Sugar (hereinafter referred to as "the Agreement") was signed in London on the 6th May, 1937;

And whereas by a Protocol signed in London on the 22nd July, 1942, the Agreement was regarded as having come into force on the 1st September, 1937, in respect of the Governments signatory of the Protocol;

And whereas it was provided in the said Protocol that the Agreement should continue in force between the said Governments for a period of two years after the 31st August, 1942;

And whereas by further Protocols signed in London on the 31st August, 1944, the 31st August, 1945, and the 30th August, 1946, it was agreed that, subject to the provisions of Article 2 of the said Protocols, the Agreement should continue in force between the Governments signatory thereof for periods of one year terminating on the 31st August, 1945, the 31st August, 1946, and the 31st August, 1947, respectively;

Now, therefore, the Governments signatory of the present Protocol, considering that it is expedient that the Agreement should be prolonged for a further term as between themselves, subject, in view of the present situation, to the conditions stated below, have agreed as follows:—

ARTICLE 1

Subject to the provisions of Article 2 hereof, the Agreement shall continue in force between the Governments signatory of this Protocol for a period of one year after the 31st August, 1947.

ARTICLE 2

During the period specified in Article 1 above the provisions of Chapters III, IV and V of the Agreement shall be inoperative.

ARTICLE 3

1. The Governments signatory of the present Protocol recognise that revision of the Agreement is necessary and should be undertaken as soon as the time appears opportune. Discussion of any such revision should take the existing Agreement as the starting point.

2. For the purposes of such revision due account shall be taken of any general principles of commodity policy embodied in any agreements which may be concluded under the auspices of the United Nations.

ARTICLE 4

Before the conclusion of the period of one year specified in Article 1, the contracting Governments, if the steps contemplated in Article 3 have not been taken, will discuss the question of a further renewal of the Agreement.

ARTICLE 5

The present Protocol shall bear the date the 29th August, 1947, and shall remain open for signature until the 30th September, 1947; provided however that any signatures appended after the 30th August, 1947, shall be deemed to have effect as from that date.

In witness whereof the undersigned being duly authorised thereto by their respective Governments have signed the present Protocol.

Done in London on the 29th day of August, 1947, in a single copy which shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and of which certified copies shall be furnished to the signatory Governments.

For the Government of the Union of South Africa:

G. HEATON NICHOLLS.

For the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia:

JOHN A. BEASLEY.

For the Government of Belgium:

G. WALRAVENS.

For the Government of Brazil:

MONIZ DE ARAGÃO.

For the Government of Cuba:

MIGUEL ANTONIO RIVA.

For the Government of Czechoslovakia:

B. G. KRATOCHVIL.

For the Government of the Dominican Republic:

EMILIO ZELLER.

For the Government of the French Republic:

J. C. H. DE SAILLY.

For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

T. G. JENKINS.

For the Government of Hayti:

STEPHEN ALEXIS.

For the Government of the Netherlands:

A. BENTINCK.

For the Government of Peru:

FERNANDO BERCKEMEYER.

For the Government of the Republic of the Philippines:

J. M. ELIZALDE.

For the Government of Poland:

A. SZEMINSKI.

For the Government of Portugal:

MIGUEL D'ALMEIDA PILE.

For the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

For the Government of the United States of America:

L. W. DOUGLAS.
Subject to ratification.

For the Government of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia:

Dr. FRANC KOS.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, this protocol was unanimously reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations. It is advocated not because of any immediate usefulness of the agreement—because under the terms of the present protocol it is largely inoperative—but because a sugar surplus is anticipated within the near future, and it is believed that the present agreement may be a useful point of departure in working out future methods of cooperative action on an international basis to keep the sugar industry in a healthy condition. This protocol has no effect whatever on the American cost of living. It simply seeks to perpetuate for another year the international machinery which has served a good purpose, and it is believed that it could serve a useful purpose in the future.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The protocol is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the protocol will be reported to the Senate.

The protocol was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive C, Eightieth Congress, second session, a protocol dated in London August 29, 1947, prolonging for 1 year after August 31, 1947, the international agreement regarding the regulation of production and marketing of sugar, signed at London on May 6, 1937.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification is agreed to, and the protocol is ratified.

NOMINATIONS TO ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, on yesterday I released a statement relating to the nomination of David Lilienthal and the other incumbent members of the Atomic Energy Commission. I have stated a position in this statement, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed immediately following these remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I had hoped that when President Truman submitted nominees for the Atomic Energy

Commission that confirmation of these nominees would be considered by the Senate in strict conformity to existing law.

Now there are disturbing reports that efforts will be made to amend the law to provide for 1-year appointments only for all five members of the Commission.

In my opinion, such a procedure would seriously injure the continuity of the atomic energy project and completely dissipate the spirit of nonpartisanship which is so essential to its success.

If the 1-year plan is adopted this means in effect that the composition of the Commission must wait upon the results of next fall's Presidential elections. I am sure that the American public will look upon any such move with alarm and dismay. Is this to happen every 4 years?

The members of the Commission were appointed originally without regard to partisan considerations. A majority are Republicans. The present nominations should be considered on the same high plane.

If the test of political fitness is to apply to members of the Commission, why should not the same test apply to employees of the Commission? There are no politics in engineering and science. It is as unthinkable to apply the test of political fitness to members of the Atomic Energy Commission as it would be to apply the test in the selection of a Chief of Staff for the Army or a Chief of Operations for the Navy.

There is no such thing as a Republican chief of staff or a Democratic chief of staff. Where the national security is at stake, partisan considerations must give away. This rule must be applied with rigid severity in selecting the membership of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The present Commission has had direction of the atomic energy project since late in 1946. It has had to build from the ground up an organization to administer one of the most complex operations in the history of Government. The Commission has been compelled to chart new courses, to feel its way by the age-old process of trial and error. It has had very little precedent to guide its decisions.

In the over-all picture, I think the present Commission has performed a splendid public service during the trial period provided for in the existing law. It has been tried and not found wanting.

Under normal procedure, the Senate would investigate the work of the Commission during this trial period before acting on the present nominations. If there is valid reason for delay, this should be demonstrated at appropriate committee hearings.

Instead of pursuing this course, the suggestion is now made that the terms of the Commissioners should be reduced to 1 year without any review of their work whatsoever. If the Senate is not justified in confirming these nominees for longer terms, it certainly is not justified in confirming them for another year.

The present Commissioners have had approximately 1 year and a half of invaluable experience in atomic problems. If new Commissioners are selected to replace them, then this experience will be largely lost. A delay in this kind in a matter so vital to national security is unthinkable.

We are discussing the very cornerstone of our national security. Delay in establishing the Commission on a permanent basis inevitably means reckless trifling with the national defense. There is no place for politics in atomic energy. If partisanship creeps in, it will destroy confidence and shock the conscience of the American public. I shall vigorously oppose any effort to weaken or dismember the present act.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I move that the Senate now resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF FINAL REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of a report of the Senate War Investigating Committee. I send the resolution to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed 7,000 additional copies of the report (Rept. No. 440, pt. 6, current session) of the special committee of the Senate authorized and directed to make a study and investigation of the operation of the war program, of which 5,000 copies shall be for the use of the special committee, 1,000 for the use of the Senate document room, and 1,000 for the use of the House document room.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me ask the able Senator from Maine whether this is the final report of the War Investigating Committee.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes; this is the final report. I am filing the remaining interim reports today, immediately. I wish to present that matter to the Senate, but first I wish to have the Senate agree to this resolution, which calls for the printing of additional copies of the final report.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, let me inquire about the interim report which the Senator is filing. Is it a unanimous agreement on the part of the committee?

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator refer to the report on industrial mobilization?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes; it is a unanimous report.

Mr. LUCAS. Is that also true of the report on the Arabian-American Oil Co.?

Mr. BREWSTER. It is.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 226) was considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—INDUSTRIAL MOBILIZATION FOR WAR (PT. 4 OF REPT. NO. 440)

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I wish to refer, first, to the industrial mobilization report, which I am filing today under the extension of authority, dealing with the whole broad question of the fruits of the studies of the Senate Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program during the 6 years of its existence. Much of the work to which the report refers was done under the chairmanship of my distinguished predecessors, the former Senator from Missouri, Mr. Truman; the former Senator from New York, Mr. Mead, and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. It was deemed that the problem of industrial mobilization in time of war and in time of crisis is perhaps one of the most challenging problems before our country at this time, as we hear the discussion of possible further war, and that unless we learn the lessons of the two world wars and apply them in connection with any future crisis, we shall have violated our great obligation to the people of the United States. It was very evident throughout our studies that in the Second World War we repeated, step by step, every error we made in the First World War. Mr. Bernard Baruch, who during the First World War was in charge of industrial mobilization, and studied the problem in all the interim, and thereafter was very actively observant of all the conditions in the recent war, testified before our committee that the failure to implement the industrial mobilization plan developed during the interim between the two world wars resulted in the loss of thousands of lives and billions of dollars.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from Maine has well pointed out that in the recent world war we made the same mistakes we made in the First World War; in other words, that we had not learned much in the interim. Confirming that, I point out that the eminent French statesman Briand very effectively stated:

The only lesson that we learn from experience is that we learn nothing from experience.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, that was never more forcefully illustrated than in the somewhat feeble and fumbling steps by which we undertook to mobilize in the last World War.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GURNEY. As the Senator knows, the administration has presented a bill which is its answer to the problem of handling the industrial plants which presently are owned by the Federal Government.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. GURNEY. Would the Senator from Maine object to having the bill presented by the administration printed at this point in the RECORD? If that is done, the whole story, in apple-pie order, will be available in the RECORD.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think it would be extremely helpful, as illustrating the steps the executive branch of the Government is now trying to take in applying these lessons and to indicate the complete cooperation between the legislative branch and the executive branch of our Government.

Mr. GURNEY. I thought it would be well to have the whole story right here while the Senator from Maine is making his report.

I wish also to say that our committee will go into this problem just as soon as we possibly can do so, consistent with the other legislative matters presently before the committee.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will it be agreeable to the Senator from South Dakota to have the bill printed at the conclusion of my very brief discussion of industrial mobilization? I shall finish that in a few moments.

Mr. GURNEY. That will be entirely satisfactory. I refer to Senate bill 2554.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill referred to by the Senator from South Dakota will be printed at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Maine, as an exhibit. (See exhibit A.)

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the matter of industrial mobilization is at the very foundation of modern war, which is of a total character.

Prior to the First World War, industrial mobilization mattered very little. Yet all the studies made in the interim—those under Secretary Baker, Secretary Johnson, who was Acting Secretary, Secretary Hurley, and with the assistance of Bernard Baruch, and under the industrial mobilization plan which was developed and available, and the additional studies of Mr. Stettinius, as chairman of a special board appointed by the President to study the matter—come to the same conclusion as to the basic necessity of fixing responsibility and of having a very simple and direct organization. Yet as a result of the very tentative way in which we faced the crisis prior to Pearl Harbor, and even after Pearl Harbor, for the ensuing year, our committee was extremely careful not to undertake to fix responsibility as between the executive and the legislative departments, because there was ample responsibility and fault on both sides in this failure, and so the committee took no steps. We expressly brushed that aside as being a meaningless controversy about the past. There was failure on the part of the Congress, there was, as we feel, failure on the part of the Executive. Whether either could have done better without the cooperation and assistance of the other we thought was not useful for our committee to consider; but we were very clear and very unanimous that in the shadow of the great crisis through which we have just passed, and as the shadows apparently begin to deepen in the future on the eastern horizon, there should be recognition by all concerned in the Congress and also in the executive department of the imperative necessity of carefully concerting our plans so that if a future crisis should arise we would not be in the utterly hopeless position in which we found ourselves when the President of the United States in 1941, at the time of the attack on Pearl Harbor and in the months preceding it, as the crisis intensified, was obliged to turn to an utterly outmoded statute of 1916, which embodied none of the lessons of the First World War and none of the lessons of the 20 years' study in between, as the only means by which he could even bring about a vestige of mobilization.

That involved the creation of a seven-man advisory committee, comprising four members of the Cabinet and three others, to advise and consult, with the result that for the next year we went along with the advisory boards and groups. We finally constituted a four-man board, with two members of the Cabinet and the late Mr. Knudson, who has just passed on, and Mr. Sidney Hillman, who tried more or less vainly for the next year to concentrate and mobilize, until finally, after these efforts for a year, we concentrated power in one man under the War Production Board, Mr. Donald Nelson.

As the result I think of the understandable good nature of Mr. Nelson, and of his desire if possible to cooperate with all the various agencies, Mr. Nelson did not move as promptly and forcefully as we can now see would have been wise, to concentrate the responsibility, and we soon found ourselves with a half dozen different agencies with conflicting powers. We had the Secretary of War coming to the Congress in bitter conflict with the head of the War Production Board; we had the czar of the various plants and productions; we had the Petroleum Board. We had various agencies, and nowhere, short of the President of the United States, was it possible to fix the lines of authority. The Secretary of Defense, Mr. Forrestal, with the assistance of the War Munitions Board and the National Resources Board, created under the legislation enacted since the close of the war, is seeking very earnestly now to prepare an industrial mobilization plan, which will be nothing other than the total mobilization of our resources, and which will be absolutely vital in the event of further difficulty. I hope and expect that the appropriate committees of the Congress, when, as, and if legislation authorizing this plan is presented, will give to it the prompt and serious consideration which all the studies of the Special War Investigating Committee—and I am sure I speak the thought of every Member who has served on that committee throughout the six preceding years—indicate this subject warrants.

We are, therefore, filing this industrial mobilization report today, with recommendations which are the fruits of hearing, during the past year, Mr. Baruch, Secretary Forrestal, and about nine various other authorities in this field, with the hope that it may contribute something to counteract the sad lesson that we learn nothing from history.

So much for the industrial mobilization report.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Of course, I have not had an opportunity to read the report on industrial mobilization, but I am greatly intrigued by it, and I desire to know whether there will be an effort made to eliminate the element of excessive profits in time of great national emergency. We recall that during World War II the Government drafted the young men of our Nation to serve in uniform, with complete disregard for any dislocations of income which might have accrued to the individuals involved. I am wondering whether this entire mobilization plan of industry envisions comparable treatment for industry, so that dollars will be called upon to render the same kind of service to the country as manpower. Can the Senator from Maine give me some information along that line?

Mr. BREWSTER. We went very carefully into the matter of profits. We have compiled an immense amount of material regarding it, which illustrates very well what the Senator from Idaho has commented on. We came to the conclusion, far beyond universal military training, that if we should ever have another war—which God forbid—universal service must be the matter most seriously considered. That was the considered conclusion of the committee, and in the final item of our conclusions and report it is stated that very careful consideration must be given to that subject, which will automatically go to the root of much of the problem of excessive profits, because it would take care of profiting by individuals so far as their salaries are concerned.

The other phase involving the profits of corporations and of property is one we studied a great deal, and I think we reported on it in connection with the Renegotiation Act, to which I may refer the Senator. During the war the idea was adopted of permitting 10 percent on each turn-over. On an original investment of $1,000,000, there might be a hundred turn-overs, with the result that a corporation would receive total profits of $10,000,000 on an investment of $1,000,000. I have never believed that was either right or necessary or fair. I cannot speak for the committee, because we simply pointed out the facts, but I think it is obvious that when a formula of approximately 10 percent on the turn-over is adopted, in the event of a great war, the inequities which result are astounding. We found cases in which as much as 400 or 500 percent on the investment was realized by companies under this rule. I do not believe that is necessary or fair. The Senator from Maine hopes personally that very careful study will be given to that matter, for so far as the broader question is concerned, the figures are simply fantastic. The First World War left us with a debt of $26,000,000,000; the Second World War, with a debt of $260,000,000,000, which is 10 times greater. If we should be projected into the third world war of which apparently we talk so blithely today, and the same ratio should prevail, increasing the debt 10 times, we would be left with a national debt of $2,600,000,000,000—that may be the first time the word has been uttered on this floor—$2,600,000,000,000. I think anyone who pauses to contemplate that figure will recognize at once it would mean the end not only of private property but of the system of free enterprise under which we operate.

While we might be fighting the war against a totalitarian power, we would inevitably end up with a completely totalitarian regime, because, in my judgment, we never could pay the enormous debt except by wiping out the currency, as many countries in Europe have been compelled to do. It was the contemplation of those figures which gave us pause.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Maine will probably recall that because of profiteering in the First World War there was, in the years immediately following the armistice in 1918, agitation in this country to outlaw war by eliminating profiteering. The American Legion adopted as one of its essential programs so-called universal service, whereby the burdens would be equitably placed upon industry, capital, and business, as well as upon manpower; but in the subsequent years little, if any, progress was made toward the enactment of that program. Because of the failure of the American Legion to secure the overwhelming support of public sentiment for that specific program, we found ourselves, prior to World War II, in a situation which recognized that manpower must serve this great republic in a time of emergency, but that business, industry, and dollars would be permitted to profiteer, and there would be no demand for universal service.

As the Senator from Maine has pointed out, when procurement contracts were awarded throughout World War II, not only were normal peacetime profits demanded by industry in preparing the United States for national defense, but fantastic and exorbitant profits were made by industry throughout the critical years of the early forties. As I recall, Mr. Lindsay Warren, the Comptroller General, appeared before a certain House committee and pointed out that because of the haphazard procurement methods then in vogue the United States Government had expended probably $50,000,000,000 in excess of legitimate amounts for procurement contracts.

So, Mr. President, I am happy to know that the committee of which the Senator from Maine is chairman recognizes, as we face the chaotic world situation, that if and when we are compelled to call upon the young men of this country to serve unselfishly and loyally, it is only fair that we call upon business, industry, and the dollar resources of the Nation to render the same type of unselfish service.

Mr. BREWSTER. I very much appreciate the comments of the Senator from Idaho. I think we can realize, from the nature of the figures, that every individual in America, in the event of another crisis, must respond to the call for universal service. I can see no reason why dollars and property should not similarly respond. They, too, should serve for the duration of the emergency, without asking for exorbitant profits. We take our young men and do not ask them whether they want to go. They go, and they take what the Government gives them. Certainly, capital must expect similarly to respond.

I would comment on only one statement made by the Senator from Idaho. I think he referred to the failure of the American Legion to sell the idea of universal service. I would say it was a failure on the part of the American people to understand all the implications of that great program which the American Legion proposed. Although the Legion campaigned very vigorously in behalf of the program, it was unable to succeed. In our report and recommendation it is our hope that the American Legion and all other patriotic agencies may recognize the significance of the situation and revive the crusade before the lessons of the war shall be forgotten, so that we may place on the statute books legislation which will need only congressional or Executive action incidentally to put it into effect. It is easy to say that we should wait until the crisis comes and then legislate. But some of us may not be here. Perhaps those who have learned the lesson will not be here. Perhaps a new administration will be in power, and there will be new Members of the Senate and of the House. So they will go through the same weary round experienced in the First and Second World Wars. There will be a repetition of the same procedure unless we now put on the statute books legislation designed to implement the program, leaving simply for determination the time when it shall be put into effect either by congressional resolution or by Executive action, as may be deemed wise.

I might say that we found one of the most fruitful sources of profits was the elimination from the Renegotiation Act of the production of raw materials, which meant that petroleum, for instance, was not subject to renegotiation, and it was in the petroleum field that some of the most enormous profits accrued.

EXHIBIT A

S. 2554

A bill to promote the common defense by providing for the retention and maintenance of a national reserve of industrial productive capacity, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 1. In enacting this act, it is the intent of Congress to provide a comprehensive and continuous program for the future safety and for the defense of the United States by providing adequate measures whereby an essential nucleus of Government-owned industrial plants and a national reserve of machine tools and industrial manufacturing equipment may be assured for immediate use to supply the needs of the armed forces in time of national emergency or in anticipation thereof; it is the purpose of this act to eliminate or reduce to the maximum extent possible, consistent with the needs of industry for peacetime production, the delays experienced in World War II in converting from a peacetime production economy to one geared to the full prosecution of a global war.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. (a) The term "national industrial reserve," as used herein, means that excess industrial property which has been or may hereafter be sold, leased, or otherwise disposed of, subject to a national security clause, and that excess industrial property which not having been sold, leased, or otherwise disposed of, subject to a national security clause, shall be transferred to the Federal Works Agency under section 4 hereof.

(b) The term "excess industrial property," as used herein, means any industrial plant (including structures on land owned by or leased to the United States, substantially equipped with machinery, tools, and equipment) which is capable of economic operation as a separate and independent industrial unit and which is not an integral part of an installation of a private contractor, and any machine tool and any industrial manufacturing equipment which is under the control of any executive department or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government including any wholly owned Government corporation and which is not required for its immediate needs and responsibilities as determined by the head thereof.

(c) The term "national security clause," as used herein, means those terms, conditions, restrictions, and reservations, heretofore formulated or as may be formulated under section 3 (2) hereof for insertion in instruments of sale or lease of property, determined in accordance with section 3 (1) to be a part of the national industrial reserve, which will guarantee the availability of such property for the purposes of national defense at any time when availability thereof for such purposes is deemed necessary by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 3. To effectuate the policy set forth in section 1 of this act the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized and directed to—

(1) determine which excess-industrial properties should become a part of the national industrial reserve under the provisions of this act;

(2) formulate a national security clause, as defined in section 2 (c) hereof and vary or modify the same from time to time in such manner as best to attain the objectives of this act, having due regard to securing advantageous terms to the Government in the disposal of excess industrial property;

(3) consent to the relinquishment or waiver of all or any part of any national security clause in specific cases when necessary to permit the disposition of particular excess industrial property when it is determined that the retention of the productive capacity of any such excess industrial property is no longer essential to the national security or that the retention of a lesser interest than that originally required will adequately fulfill the purposes of this act: *Provided,* That nothing in this subsection (3) shall require the modification or waiver of any part of any such national security clause when such clause is deemed necessary by the Secretary of Defense to effectuate the purposes of this act; and

(4) designate what excess industrial property shall be disposed of subject to the provisions of the national security clause.

SEC. 4. (a) In the event that any agency charged with the disposal of excess industrial property, after making every practicable effort so to do, is unable to dispose of any excess industrial plant because of the national security clause it shall notify the Secretary of Defense, indicating such modifications in the national security clause, if any, which in its judgment would make possible disposal of the plant. The Secretary of Defense shall consider and agree to any and all such proposed modifications as in his judgment would be consistent with the purposes of this act. If, however, such clause is not modified or the requirements thereof waived pursuant to section 3 (3), or if modified, such plant cannot then be disposed of under such modified clause, the Munitions Board shall direct that such plant be transferred to the Federal Works Agency, and such transfer shall be without reimbursement or transfer of funds.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, any agency charged with the disposal of excess machine tools and industrial manufacturing equipment shall transfer custody of such machine tools and equipment as may be designated by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to section 3 hereof to the Federal Works Agency, without reimbursement, for storage and maintenance.

SEC. 5. Subject to provisions of section 6 hereof, the Federal Works Agency is hereby authorized and directed to accept the transfer to it of such excess industrial property as is directed to be transferred to it under section 4 hereof and to utilize, maintain, protect,

repair, restore, renovate, lease, or dispose of such property. Notwithstanding section 321 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412; U. S. C., title 40, sec. 303 (b)), any lease may provide for the renovation, maintenance, protection, repair, and restoration by the lessee, of the property leased, or of the entire unit or installation when a substantial part thereof is leased, as part or all of the consideration for the lease of such property.

SEC. 6. The Secretary of Defense, with respect to property in the national industrial reserve, is authorized when he deems such action to be in the interest of national security—

(1) to establish general policies for the care, maintenance, utilization, recording, and security of such property transferred to the Federal Works Agency pursuant to section 4 hereof; and

(2) to direct the transfer without reimbursement by the Federal Works Agency of any of such property to other Government agencies with the consent of such agencies; and

(3) to direct the leasing by the Federal Works Agency of any of such property to designated lessees; and

(4) to authorize the disposition by the Federal Works Agency of any of such property by sale or otherwise when in the opinion of the Secretary of Defense such property may be disposed of subject to or free of the national security clause provided for in section 4 hereof; and

(5) to authorize and regulate the lending of any such property to nonprofit educational institutions and training schools.

SEC. 7. The Federal Works Agency shall after the date upon which transfer is directed pursuant to section 4 hereof provide for the transportation, handling, care, storage, protection, maintenance, utilization, repair, restoration, renovation, leasing, and disposition ernment-owned property.

SEC. 8. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed as authorizing the acquisition of any property for the national industrial reserve except from excess or surplus Government-owned property.

SEC. 9. The Secretary of Defense shall appoint a National Industrial Reserve Review Committee, which shall consist of not exceeding 15 persons to be appointed from civilian life who are by training and experience familiar with various fields of American industry, including shipbuilding, aircraft manufacture, machine tools, and arms and armament production. The members of such committee shall serve for such term or terms as the Secretary of Defense may specify and shall meet at such times as may be specified by the Secretary of Defense to consult with and advise the National Military Establishment. Each member of such committee shall be entitled to compensation in the amount of $50 for each day, or part of day, he shall be in attendance at any regular called meeting of the committee, together with reimbursement for all travel expenses incident to such attendance: *Provided*, That nothing contained in sections 41, 109, and 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 93, 198, and 203); in Revised Statutes, section 190 (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 99); in section 19 (a) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 (Public Law 395, 78th Cong.); or in any other provision of Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States, shall apply to such persons solely by reason of their appointment to and membership on such committee.

SEC. 10. It shall be the duty of the Committee appointed under section 9 hereof to review not less often than once each year the justification for the retention of property in the national industrial reserve established hereunder and (i) to recommend to the Secretary of Defense the disposition of any such property which in the opinion of the committee would no longer be of sufficient strategic value to warrant its further retention for the production of war material in the event of a national emergency; (ii) to recommend to the Secretary of Defense standards of maintenance for the property held in the national industrial reserve; (iii) to review and recommend to the Secretary of Defense the disposal of that property which in the opinion of the committee could and should be devoted to commercial use in the civilian economy; and (iv) to advise the Secretary of Defense with respect to such activities under this act as he may request.

SEC. 11. The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress on April 1 of each year a report detailing the action taken by it hereunder and containing such other pertinent information on the status of the national industrial reserve as will enable the Congress to evaluate its administration and the needs for amendments and related legislation.

SEC. 12. Section 5 of the act approved August 5, 1947 (ch. 493, 61 Stat. 774), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 13. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Office of the Secretary of Defense and to the Federal Works Administration, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as the Congress may, from time to time, determine to be necessary to enable the Secretary of Defense and the Federal Works Agency to carry out their respective functions under the act.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks and presentation of the report regarding industrial mobilization, two editorials, one from the New York Times of April 28, 1948, entitled "The Price of Security," and the other from the New York Herald Tribune of April 26, 1948, entitled "Forethought or Disaster."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of April 28, 1948]

THE PRICE OF SECURITY

Two world wars and sundry other national emergencies through the years should have demonstrated to us that limited and halfway measures are not good enough to win the one or meet the other. Eventually we have come up with the right answers, but never until after a period of improvisation and wasted time that has exacted a high cost in blood and sweat and tears. Faced now with a real crisis in making peace, maintaining world order, and insuring national security, there seems to be a tendency among some again to believe that we can wait upon events or to hope that there is some magic formula of limited cost and effort that will insure our safety.

Fortunately, there seems to be, both in the administration and in Congress, a conviction to profit from the lessons of the past and to do now the planning and the preparation that should forestall disaster or at least mitigate its consequences. The latest report of the Special War Investigating Committee of the Senate, calling for a plan of total mobilization in event of threat of another war, and the request of the National Munitions Board for legislative authority to maintain 146 wartime plants now marked for sale as surplus, are evidence of this attitude. We believe that the American people and Congress will recognize the essential fairness of the first proposal and the necessity of both.

The United States is better prepared now to meet a national or world emergency than it was in 1939. The National Security Act of 1947, which unified the armed services, also set up two important peacetime planning boards we did not have when Hitler marched into Poland—the Munitions Board, which is in the Defense Establishment under Secretary Forrestal, and the National Security Resources Board, which is an independent agency under the President. The former corresponds to the wartime War Production Board, headed by Donald Nelson, and the latter to the Office of Director of War Mobilization, whose successive heads were Mr. Byrnes, Mr. Vinson, and Mr. Snyder. The effectiveness of both, however, will depend on the degree of cooperation they receive from Congress and the people in making their plans and putting them into effect, step by step. The request for the placing of wartime plants in reserve is one of the first tests.

What is said here and what is said in the special Senate committee's report has been said again and again by many others: There is no easy road to national security. An Air Force of 70 groups, or even 170 groups, is not an answer in itself. Our armed forces are but the blade of our sword of defense. A haft also is required, if it is to be wielded effectively. That is what a plan of total mobilization in a national emergency would provide. That is what is needed now. That is what is in preparation. That is what should be quickly translated into legislative action as its various parts are formulated.

Certainly a strong military establishment is needed. That means an Air Force large enough to blunt the spearhead of an attack and retaliate in force. National security also demands a Navy strong enough to keep open the lines of supply to advance bases. It demands an Army strong enough to contain an air-borne attack on this country, large enough to maintain order and reorganize disaster areas. It demands the maintenance of strong reserve forces and preliminary training of them. It demands more than that. It demands a country ready to mobilize its full economic might as well as its military strength.

A reputation of weakness, of unpreparedness, is no deterrent to war, as we have learned to our sorrow. We know no better way to make the point than to use the words of Bernard Baruch when he was urging before the special Senate committee the formulation of a plan for total mobilization. "The direction toward which we must move is clear," he said. "I hope that our efforts, as heretofore, will not fade out into good intentions not expressed in wise and determined action." Let us not walk so close to the forest that we see only the trees.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 26, 1948]

FORETHOUGHT OR DISASTER

There was a time when the United States was satisfied to intrust its security in peace to a relatively tiny segment of the national economy—to a small investment in manpower, tax money, and industrial resources. This was simple to administer and the burden it imposed upon the American community was easy to bear—while peace endured. Improvisation was relied upon to meet the demands of actual warfare. This system, or lack of system, proved increasingly costly when put to the test of a great international emergency, and has been abandoned as a national policy. National security is now generally recognized as resting upon a large Military Establishment, plus a complex variety of economic measures which make heavy continuous demands upon the wealth and skill of the country.

A framework exists, in the National Security Act of 1947, for integration of the

manifold factors of national defense into an efficient structure. The public and Congress have been debating the purely military aspects of the defense organization—the numbers of planes and men required and the best method of procuring them. On the economic side, there has been a good deal of spade work in the direction of exploring national resources, and some concrete programs, such as the stock piling of critical materials, the development of atomic energy and the use of economic power in international relations, have actually been launched. But the economy of defense, on the scale demanded by present conditions, does not yet possess the legislative and administrative machinery which has been given the military. It is being organized principally on an advisory basis through the National Security Resources Board.

It is no criticism of the work of the N. S. R. B. to say that this is not enough. The board itself, as its deputy director, Gen. Clinton F. Robinson, pointed out the other day, has been working on drafts of legislation for economic mobilization in case of war. But public and congressional discussion of these matters cannot begin too soon, nor should some form of economic organization of national defense be delayed until the competition of the various defense programs for goods and men—in an economy which is straining to meet civilian demands—has produced chaos.

The Senate Special War Investigating Committee, summing up its experience with the failures of World War II, has issued a report urging strongly and cogently that plans be laid now for full economic mobilization in case of war, the stages by which it should be achieved, the creation of reserves of trained men for its administration and the like. The committee points out that in World War II, the lessons of World War I were ignored. The generation which has paid, and must continue to pay for that mistake, cannot repeat it. The growth of military power must be accompanied by economic planning—certainly to the extent of voluntary allocation of scarce materials and services, with standby controls should an emergency arise. Forethought now can save the Nation from what at best will be waste and confusion 6 months hence, and what at worst could be sheer disaster.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM ON ARABIAN OIL

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I now desire to address myself to the investigation which was made of the so-called Arabian Oil Co., the report of which we are filing with the Senate today, together with the final report of the investigating committee. The final report is primarily a summary of the various reports filed and an accounting of the work of the committee, its methods, and its functions, with the idea that it will be useful as a historical chronicle of the activities of the committee during the war.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks there be printed a summary of the report of the special committee investigating the national defense program on the Arabian-American Oil Co. I shall refer to it in my discussion, but I should like to have this summary printed at the conclusion of my remarks, as a summary of the report, for the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, more than a year ago the attention of the committee was called to the situation in the so-called Middle East petroleum reserve. We have been hearing a great deal regarding the Middle East and its petroleum during the past year, where it is estimated there may be reserves to the extent of 30,000,000,000 barrels of petroleum, which is about 50 percent more than the present demonstrated reserves in this entire country, according to the current estimates. There are, further, speculative estimates, I would say, of rather competent authorities that the entire petroleum reserves of the Middle East, covering Arabia, Iran, Iraq, and the general Persian Gulf area, may be as much as 100,000,000,000 barrels. Apparently the gulf between the three continents, Asia, Africa, and Europe, contains the greatest known petroleum reserve at the present time.

The British, with their customary celerity and ingenuity, moved in first. Approximately 25 years ago Winston Churchill and his associates in the Admiralty, knowing of the significance of petroleum in the future for the British Navy, through the British Government, took over a 51 percent interest in the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., which controlled the reserve, and erected a large refinery at the head of the Persian Gulf from which much of the petroleum supplies of the British Navy have since been obtained. The British allowed the private interests which controlled 49 percent to carry on in private enterprise with full scope, providing only that the British Navy and the British Government should always have primary consideration.

There has never been any record published regarding what the British Navy pays for oil. There is a rather general feeling that it is certainly a very low price. The figure which has been commonly discussed is 40 cents a barrel. Whether that is correct I do not know, and I do not know anyone outside the British Government who can speak authoritatively on the subject. At any rate, Winston Churchill, with great vision, provided for that more than 25 years ago, and the great wisdom and foresight of the arrangement have been demonstrated ever since. The Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. continues to exploit the reserves of the Iranian region.

Meanwhile the Iraq Petroleum Co., in which American companies have a 23 percent interest, were also developing vast reserves around the Tigris and Euphrates, at the head of the Persian Gulf. Moreover, there was the so-called "red line" agreement, which forbade the Standard Oil of New Jersey and the Socony Vacuum from developing any further resources in the general region covered by the so-called "red line" agreement, which was, roughly, the line of the old Turkish Empire, which was broken up after the First World War, without permitting the others to participate.

When the Standard Oil of New Jersey and the Socony Vacuum a year ago from this time bought a 40 percent interest in the Arabian oil reserves in Arabia, challenge was immediately made by Mr. Gulbenkian, the Armenian, who is a British subject with a 5 percent interest in the Iranian Petroleum Co., as to the legality of the arrangement.

The Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey merely said that they understood from competent attorneys and authorities that the "red line" agreement had been voided by the incidents of the war and the French participation, and therefore that they were no longer bound by it.

A legal suit to determine their rights is now pending in the courts of the United Kingdom. What the issue of that suit will be we do not know, but it has a very pertinent bearing on our own problem, since the contract of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey and Socony Vacuum for the acquisition of 40 percent interest in the Arabian-American Oil Co., which was formerly owned 100 percent by the Standard Oil Co. of California and the Texas Co., in equal shares, was announced last March. The sale of that 40 percent interest was for $102,000,000, a very interesting figure, because it represented approximately from 50 to 100 percent more than the previous oil companies had invested in the enterprise. In other words, they sold a 40 percent interest in the enterprise for substantially a greater sum than they had invested in the project. So they still retained a 60 percent interest, and at the same time had their money back to the tune of $102,000,000.

Two days after the announcement of that sale the Truman doctrine was announced concerning Greece and Turkey, which was the first Executive determination that we were moving into the Middle East in a big way.

When Mr. Rodgers, president of the Texas Co., was before the committee, I asked him regarding this matter, as to whether he realized, when he made the arrangement, that the United States was going to move into the Middle East. I wish to read what he said. It is very interesting, particularly the emphasis he placed on it. The chairman asked this question of Mr. Rodgers, president of the Texas Oil Co., or the Texas Co., as it is called:

> Was it entirely coincidental that the arrangement which you were discussing under which you sold a 40 percent interest here for $102,000,000, in what is certainly a very good business venture at this time, went through the same month that President Truman declared the policy for Greece and Turkey, as being spheres of interest in which we would take a most active part?

Mr. Rodgers answered—and I may say that he answered with a vehemence which I thought was extremely revealing, using more emphasis than he did in any other portion of his testimony. He said:

> Absolutely coincidental. And we—
>
> Speaking of the Texas Co.—
>
> were amazed the following day, or 2 days afterward, when we heard about it. If I had known about it, I think we would have probably held up, as far as we were concerned.

That, to me, is most impressive testimony as to the significance of the policy which we adopted in the Middle East. Without challenging the wisdom of this policy, I wish to make clear the tremendous significance which Mr. Rodgers

of the Texas Co. assigned to this event, saying that if he had known of it, he would not have been inclined to sell a 40 percent interest to the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey and the Socony Vacuum for $102,000,000. That, I think, is interesting evidence as to the significance of petroleum in the evolution of our economic life.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Did the Senator take any steps to ask the other parties to the transaction whether they knew about the adoption of the Truman doctrine?

Mr. BREWSTER. We did not have the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey before us, because they are still not an owner of any interest in this concern. They are simply the potential purchasers. They have a contract of purchase. I will, however, read what Mr. Rodgers said about it. So far as he knew, they did not know this. I do not know whether I am a trifle less naive than Mr. Rodgers, but knowing the history of the very active interest of the oil companies in problems in the Middle East, I myself was perhaps at least suspicious that the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey may have known of this; but I have no evidence to support that other than surmise.

The chairman of the committee commented:

> The CHAIRMAN. That is the most interesting bit of testimony you have given here. Do you suspect that your Standard of New Jersey friends were equally interested?
>
> Mr. RODGERS. I certainly do.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. Well, that is very interesting.
>
> Mr. RODGERS. I have heard that they were amazed when they read about it.

That is all the evidence we have before us as to the matter. I want to be completely just to all the interests involved.

At any rate, it was a profoundly significant fact. I do not at all mean to intimate that it was the sole reason for our moving into the Middle East. It may have been one of the incidental, purely coincidental, facts, but it did have a profound significance so far as the Standard Oil of New Jersey was concerned, and when the Aramco interests first came to Washington in order to sell the United States Government on the idea of taking more active interest in the Arabian oil field, they infiltrated our Government with a technique which was extremely intriguing, putting men from these various oil companies into various key positions in our State Department and into the oil picture, where, at any rate, they would be fully informed regarding the evolution of our oil policy, and be able perhaps to exert a very considerable influence upon its evolution.

There were a couple of significant illustrations, one of them the case of Mr. Max Thornburg, who had been the former head of the oil company in Dhahran, who came to the State Department. Dr. Herbert Feis, who was in charge as a special assistant in the State Department on petroleum matters, found Mr. Max Thornburg on his committee surveying the oil problem, and some months later discovered to his amazement as he testified, that Mr. Thornburg at the same time was receiving a salary of $27,500 a year from the very oil company concerning whose policies and activities we were deliberating within our Government.

Mr. Feis simply said that as soon as he discovered that, having had no knowledge of it before, he immediately decided to eliminate Mr. Thornburg.

But he had been functioning there for some time, and very illuminating letters were received, in the correspondence of Mr. Thornburg to his former associates, as to the policies regarding petroleum, as to the fact that while he had not been particularly consulted heretofore, the time had now arrived when they were beginning to ask him about these oil problems, and he would soon be in a much better position to know what was going on and be able to keep them advised as to developments.

The other illustration was Mr. James Terry Duce, the present American president of the Aramco Co., functioning in the Middle East. His is a name very easy to remember, because it is spelled "D-u-c-e." He was here in the Oil Administration for a year or two assisting in the formation of our policy at the very time when those same interests were trying with all the power and influence at their command to persuade the United States Government to contribute to the stabilization of their concessions in Arabia, because ibn-Saud, who was in charge there as the absolute ruler of that land without limitation or restriction of any kind, was becoming exceedingly uneasy. The matter has worked out very well, because we finally did move in. We finally made the grants they desired. But it began with the proposal, by the direction of these oil companies, the Standard of California and the Texas Co., to the President of the United States in 1941, that if we would take an interest in the Arabian picture they would sell us all the oil we desired at 40 cents a barrel. That was on April 16, 1941, when Mr. James A. Moffett, who was then president of the subsidiary company involved, at the direction of his company, submitted this proposal to the President, following a talk which Mr. Moffett had with the President, who asked him to submit a memorandum.

It is interesting to note that the original of this letter was never found. It was sent to the President, transmitted by him to the Navy Department, and subsequently, a year or so later, the White House called on the Navy Department and asked them to return all documents dealing with this matter. The files were entirely cleared, although the officer in charge said it was very unusual, when the Navy Department had filed a report to the President on a matter, that some copies of the document would not be retained in the files. After the letter was sent back to the White House it disappeared without a trace. We followed it to Hyde Park. We followed it around to various departments. Finally we located a copy in the State Department which apparently had been inadvertently overlooked. What the significance of this was I shall not say. I simply recite the facts.

This was brought to our attention by Mr. Moffett, who is now engaged in litigation with the oil companies concerned, undoubtedly as an effort on his part designed to embarrass his former associates; but the authenticity of the proposal has not been challenged.

So we have clearly established at that point the proposal by the oil companies that they would be happy to make available to us many million barrels of these petroleum reserves if the United States Government would advance to the King of Saudi Arabia $6,000,000 annually for the next 5 years. That was the proposal. That was calculated to appease the King of Saudi Arabia so that he would not cancel the concession.

It was decided, after careful deliberation, that we were not in a position to do that, as at that time Saudi Arabia was not eligible for lend-lease. It was decided that we had no legal authority to buy future oil reserves in the ground, and accordingly no action was taken on this proposal. But the representations and the discussions which went on during the next 6 months culminated in a letter from Mr. Harry Hopkins to Mr. Jesse Jones, advising him that the President now considered that it would be desirable to take care of ibn-Saud, and would Mr. Jesse Jones kindly talk with the British and suggest that they should take the proper steps to do so. We at that time were making advances to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars, and eventually billions of dollars, to the British under lend-lease, and Mr. Jones was to suggest that it would be desirable that the British take care of ibn-Saud, as at that time it was still recognized that Arabia was in the British sphere of influence. This letter which is found in our report, written by Mr. Hopkins on June 14, 1941, was written 2 months after the original letter. It said:

> The President is anxious to find a way to do something about this matter. I am enclosing confidential correspondence from the White House so you can see what goes on.

Mr. Jones replied that there appeared to be no legal way to do this. I quote now from Mr. Jones' letter of July 22, 1941, to Mr. Hopkins:

> There appears no legal way that we can help the King so, with the approval of the President, I suggested to Lord Halifax and Sir Frederick Phillips, also Mr. Neville Butler—

He, I believe, at the time, was a minister here—

> that they arrange to continue taking care of the King.

Mr. Jones then wrote on August 11, 1941, to Mr. Moffett regarding this proposal, and I read from his letter of October 9, 1941:

> DEAR MR. MOFFETT: With further reference to your request that aid be provided by our Government for King ibn-Saud, through an advance of several million dollars, beg to advise I am informed that funds cannot be advanced to the King under the Lend-Lease Act, and no Government agency has the authority to provide the King with funds.
>
> I discussed the matter with the President and the Secretary of State. They were both sympathetic with the King's needs and regretted that our Government was not in a

position to make a loan, or an advance on oil royalties that may accrue to him through leases held by your company at some future date.

At the instance of the President and the Secretary I suggested to the British Ambassador that Britain consider providing King ibn-Saud with such funds as in its opinion were necessary to meet his requirements.

The oil companies interested might, if they wanted to do so, work out some arrangement between the British Government and the King.

This arrangement developed, and during the ensuing 3 or 4 years there was advanced to King ibn-Saud, either by the British at our suggestion, coming, as we assume, largely from the accrual of funds under lend-lease or, subsequently, directly by our Government beginning in 1943, the sum of approximately $90,000,000, which was the amount we invested in Arabia certainly for military results which were not visible to the naked eye, but with the very gratifying result that King ibn-Saud remained quiescent so far as the oil concessions were concerned.

The proposal of 1941 was that we could have what oil we wanted at 40 cents a barrel. On February 8, 1943, the Government was again approached, this time by Mr. Rodgers, president of the Texas Co., who submitted, after some conversations here, a formal proposal to the Petroleum Administrator for War, Mr. Ickes, with a memorandum attached, which will be found on page 11 of the report, in which the importunities were renewed that we should advance money to the King of Saudi Arabia and take an interest in these oil reserves. The specific proposal in item 3 of this proposal was:

Furthermore, the California-Arabian Standard Oil Co. would be willing for a certain period of time to give the United States Government an option on a specified number of barrels of crude or the equivalent products thereof at an agreed-upon percentage of the going price in the world markets for such crude oil or products at the time the United States Government elected to take delivery.

That looked to the future, but meanwhile they also proposed:

Were this done—

That is, were our advances made—

California-Arabian Standard Oil Co. would be willing to set aside as a reserve for the United States an amount of oil having an equivalent value at a rate to be agreed upon. Such oil or the equivalent amount of oil products could be made available to the United States Government at prices well under world prices and reflecting only the production costs, including royalty, plus manufacturing costs in the case of products, plus a nominal profit.

That was the proposal. It was in two phases. One was that we take over the British advances. The British absolutely refused to turn over to us information as to the advances which they had made in the two preceding years, under lend-lease, or any evidences of liability to the Government or any interest therein. The second phase was that from February 1943 on, we should make advances directly to King ibn-Saud, and that we should be repaid by receiving oil at production cost plus a nominal profit.

Immediately following that Mr. Ickes submitted this question to the President. On February 16, 1943, as he testified, he submitted this proposal to the President, and on February 18, 10 days after this proposal was received, and 2 days after the President conferred with the Petroleum Administrator for War, the President issued the following directive to the Lend-Lease Administrator:

DEAR MR. STETTINIUS: For purpose of implementing the authority conferred upon you as Lend-Lease Administrator, by Executive Order No. 8926, dated October 28, 1941, and in order to enable you to arrange for lend-lease aid to the Government of Saudi Arabia, I hereby find that the defense of Saudi Arabia is vital to the defense of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Was that addressed to Edward Stettinius, who later became Secretary of State?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct. At that time I think he was administering the Lend-Lease Authority.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I have just entered the Chamber. I judge the Senator from Maine is discussing the Middle East oil report.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. To what page is the Senator referring?

Mr. BREWSTER. The bottom of page 12 and the top of page 13. I was quoting the letter making the project eligible for lend-lease.

With that action of the President, which followed 10 days after the proposal of Mr. Rodgers, the United States Government had carried out substantial compliance with what the Arabian-American oil companies desired. In other words, we had decided from that moment to do what they desired, namely, that during the period of the war we would make these advances to ibn-Saud, since the oil companies were not in a position to carry further their investments in this area under the precarious conditions incident to the war; and we were to receive in return compensation by purchasing this oil, in whatever amounts might be required to repay us, at cost plus a nominal profit. This is certainly as near to a contract as it would be possible to achieve. It was a proposal, and by accepting the proposal we carried out substantial compliance.

We learned later in our investigation that the actual cost of production of this oil—and this is the testimony of the qualified representatives of the companies themselves—in the case of Bahrein, where certain concessions were located, was 10 cents a barrel. In the case of Arabia it was 20 cents a barrel plus, in the first instance, a royalty of 15 cents to the Sheik of Bahrein, which made a total cost of 25 cents a barrel; and in the case of Arabia, a royalty of 21 cents, which made a total cost of 41 cents a barrel—I believe 40.6 is the correct figure. There was a letter which indicated a somewhat lower cost, with royalty, of 36 cents; but Mr. Duce on the stand indicated that the cost would actually be a little higher.

So if this proposal had been implemented by the companies doing what they offered to do—and the United States Government substantially complied with their proposal by making ibn-Saud eligible for lend-lease, and by contributing from that time on, in addition to the previous advances by the British directly and indirectly, approximately $90,000,000 to ibn-Saud during the 5 years of the war—we would have been able to buy this oil when our need was greatest at 40 cents a barrel in one case and 25 cents a barrel in the other.

Now we move on. This is the scene: The American Government is now embarked upon this great enterprise, and we finally reach the point where we can get the oil which was needed 2 years later. Meanwhile the oil companies had represented that they needed a refinery in the Arabian area to take care of the production of the oil. During the course of the war, when we were at our wits end for material, authority was issued by the Priorities Board for the construction of a large refinery in Arabia to take care of the production of the oil. This is found in the report on page 54, in the minutes of the meetings of the committees of the Government concerned with our various petroleum problems. I quote from the bottom of page 54, this being a report regarding the Saudi Arabian and Bahrein projects:

Mr. Snodgrass explained that this project application had been approved by WPB and issued on February 21.

That was 1944.

It was assigned AA-1 preference rating on materials up to $45,000,000 and given builder's serial No. 119033. Engineering details are well along and initial orders are expected to be released to the contractors within the next few days.

There we were, in the middle of the war, in February 1944, when materials were very critical, providing the materials for a $45,000,000 refinery in Arabia; and yet earlier we had this proposal: "If you will only help us out in Arabia you can have all the oil you need at 40 cents a barrel." I now read from the end of the report, on page 55:

Mr. Falck asked the completion date of the Saudi Arabian project, and Mr. Snodgrass explained it was divided into two parts, stage 1 being scheduled for completion the latter part of May 1945 and stage 2 scheduled for completion the latter part of July 1945.

We were approaching the end of the war. We were ready for the Japanese invasion. Petroleum supplies were tighter than ever. We desperately needed the oil from the Persian Gulf. It was now accessible to the Japanese theater. So in May, June, and July, 1945, we went to the oil companies and told them, "We want the oil."

What was the reply? The reply was, "We will sell you this oil at $1.05 a barrel. Take it or leave it."

We had the evidence of the naval officers negotiating this purchase—incidentally, naval officers who apparently had no knowledge of the earlier proposal

of 1943, as a result of lack of coordination within the departments—that they desperately tried to obtain the oil at what they considered a more reasonable price, and they utterly failed. They testified that after weeks of delay, with the pressure from our military authorities constantly increasing, they were obliged to sign on the dotted line and pay $1.05 in order to get the oil which we so desperately needed.

What were the facts? The oil companies had offered the oil to us in 1941 at 40 cents a barrel. They had offered it to us in 1943 at cost plus a nominal profit, which, as I have shown, would have been approximately 40 cents. We had made the refinery available to them, to be finished in its two parts in May and July 1945, which would indicate some foresight, and some prospect that we might need the oil, because we never would have provided for the refinery unless it had been thought that it would assist us in the prosecution of the war. Yet when the time came, when we went seeking the oil with our backs to the wall, we were calmly told by the oil companies that we could have it at their price, which happened to be exactly comparable with the price of oil in the Gulf of Mexico at that time. We were told that we could have it at that price or go without. That in my judgment is one of the most atrocious pictures presented in the prosecution of the war.

There was undoubtedly a failure of proper coordination within our Government in this situation. That is what we of the committee have addressed ourselves to in the industrial mobilization report. If the directions and authority issued to the Petroleum Administration for War, under Mr. Ickes, had been properly implemented and if the various departments had coordinated their programs, then the proposal of 1941 and the proposal of 1943 would have been fully known to the competent procurement authorities and they would have had a very much better case with which to proceed.

But what did we find? When we came to the justification for this price, we asked the Navy how they finally agreed upon it. They gave us a full account of their expostulations and the pressure from above to get the oil. That pressure was cited by the young negotiating officer as justification, although they pointed out that they were fully aware that that was an excessive price.

It is interesting to note that this very oil was first rejected by the Navy because of its quality, but it is now the chief source of supply of oil for our Navy. So the rejection at that time apparently was not on sound grounds. Prior to Pearl Harbor oil from this source was sold to the Japanese for 70 cents a barrel. At the time when we were negotiating for it in 1945 it was being sold for the account of the French Government at 85 cents a barrel, which happened to be the figure the Petroleum Administration for War determined was possibly a fair price, not taking into account the earlier discussion of cost. Yet in that crisis for our country, when we were faced with the absolute necessity of procuring oil, the United States was obliged to pay $1.05 a barrel for the oil. If we had obtained, at the 40-cents-a-barrel price, the supplies covered by that contract, that would have made a difference of approximately from $30,000,000 to $35,000,000 under that contract alone. In other words, instead of paying $65,000,000 or $70,000,000, we would have paid approximately $30,000,000 for the supplies of oil we received. That may seem to be a mere bagatelle, in comparison with the total expenditures for war, but its significance should not be lost sight of, since it is shown that in the closing days of the war, the price of Persian Gulf oil was established on a basis comparable to the price of oil from the Gulf of Mexico. That was the end they had in view, namely, that oil which cost but 20 cents a barrel to produce should be sold at a price comparable with that of oil produced in the Gulf of Mexico, costing approximately $1.05 a barrel.

We tried in vain to find out what was the price paid by the British Navy, in order to determine whether the charge on reverse lend-lease to our Government was comparable with the British price. That was for oil supplies flowing from the Abadan refinery of the Anglo-Arabian Oil Co. We received one report to the effect that they thought the figure was 81 cents a barrel. Two weeks later we got another report from the Navy stating that they really did not know. We never have been able to establish what were the precise charges on reverse lend-lease.

But so far as my knowledge goes, we made freely available the information regarding the costs to our country and our charges in connection with lend-lease operations. We discussed those at some length when President Truman, then Senator Truman, was chairman of our committee, and discussed them in connection with the oil supplies furnished to Britain for the prosecution of the war. We discussed the oil we made available to them, some of which they later delivered back to us under reverse lend-lease, and we discussed the price we charged and the price they charged, which we believed at that time, and it was reported in many instances to be, most excessive. But we have never been able to find out, and I do not know whether we shall ever know, how the price paid by the United States under reverse lend-lease for Persian Gulf oil for our Navy and our Air Force compared with the price paid by the British Navy, I believe it is a figure to which we are entitled at some point in our fiscal relationships with Great Britain, in which I am sure we have been a very generous creditor.

Now we find this prospect and we find that this contract was made. What was said in justification of it? Let me refer here to questions asked by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH]:

Senator HATCH. I have not been able to attend all of these hearings, but the picture you have drawn this morning is not a very pleasant one. I want to know whether I understand the situation correctly, that the contractors submitted their bid of $1.05, their offer to the Government, they refused to give you any information whatever as to costs; realizing the urgency of the situation, the great need for oil, they said in effect "either pay us this price, take it or leave it." In other words, was that their attitude?

Mr. BODENSCHATZ. Yes; I think they referred us to their arguments to the Petroleum Administration for War, where as far as they were concerned, while the Petroleum Administration for War did not accept $1.02 at the well, the contractor argued that they were getting the benefit of that particular $1.02 price that they had requested at the well.

Senator HATCH. They made no offer of compromise or deviation from their original price whatever.

Mr. BODENSCHATZ. No, sir.

Senator HATCH. They said, "Take this or nothing."

Mr. BODENSCHATZ. There was no compromise, no deviation.

Mr. President, in my judgment that is an amazing picture of corporate greed when our country was in its most bitter need. That shows that when the corporations reached that point, they were forgetting everything behind their proposal, they were forgetting their statement, in effect, "if you will only save us in Arabia, you can have the oil at 40 cents a barrel, at a normal profit." But when the time of our need arrived, those companies said not one word about that.

There is a further interesting commentary. In the Navy justification for this price, we found that, as justification, the Navy negotiators depended chiefly upon the representation to our negotiators by the oil companies that they must ask for 20 cents a barrel more at that time—20 cents in addition to the price of 85 cents a barrel, under the former discussion with Mr. Ickes, thus amounting to a total of $1.05 a barrel—because the royalty had been doubled. That appears in the Navy justification of the price. That was the report of the Navy negotiator in his written justification. We asked about that. To our amazement, we discovered that there had been no such increase in royalty, and that the statement in the Navy negotiator's report was absolutely false. We never have been able to determine where the responsibility for that false statement lies. We do not now find out about that. There was a dispute. There were two Navy negotiators involved and there were two oil company representatives involved. They disagree as to what was said. All we know is that the Navy negotiator used that as the chief basis for justifying the 20 cents a barrel increase. However, that statement was entirely erroneous.

So the committee in its report concludes:

7. The committee is of the opinion that if the statement contained in the official Navy justification for the purchase of oil at $1.05 a barrel is true, that the oil companies represented to the Navy that they had doubled their royalty payment from 21 to 42 cents a barrel, then the Government clearly was defrauded because the royalty payments were not doubled.

We go on to say:

8. However, if the statement is false, and the oil companies did not represent to the Navy that their royalty payments were double, tnen, it is obvious that the Government overpaid at least 21 cents a barrel, aggregating losses of millions of dollars.

Mr. President, that is the considered opinion of the committee. But there is something much more profound in this

situation than the mere matter of whether the United States paid $35,000,000 too much on this oil contract. Mr. Forrestal, the Secretary of Defense, was before the committee. He was Under Secretary of the Navy, I believe, at the time of the original procurement proposals. In his statement he agreed with us that a policy regarding these Arabian oil reserves should be formulated. There were enormous reserves under American control, in which our Government had certainly a very great equity, because it was chiefly if not solely a result of our $90,000,000 grants to ibn-Saud that the concessions of the company for 60 years were preserved; so that it occupies a unique situation. He agreed that some arrangement ought to be worked out.

Following the 1943 proposal, after the President had issued orders for the lend-lease grants to be made, along in the spring, the Oil Advisory Committee in the State and other Departments concerned recommended to the President, four Cabinet officers signing the recommendation, that we should undertake to acquire an interest in these reserves. A copy of the report by the Cabinet officers is here. Following that, in the closing days of June 1943, the Petroleum Reserves Corporation was formed, with instructions to proceed to acquire an interest in the reserves. Mr. Ickes took this up with the oil companies and testified at some length to the very great difficulties he had encountered in securing satisfactory talks. At first it was contemplated they should secure a 100-percent interest. That did not seem to work out, so they lowered it to 60 percent, to 51 percent, and finally to 40 percent. Mr. Rodgers testified he thought they had worked out an arrangement by which Mr. Ickes would acquire a 40-percent interest, but suddenly all the discussions were terminated, and Mr. Ickes said there was considerable difficulty in dealing with them. But only last week, in respect to a request which we filed last January when the committee was still carrying on its investigation, we secured a letter, dated January 5, 1944, from Secretary Hull to Mr. Ickes, which is of very considerable significance, in terminating any attempts to acquire an interest in the Arabian reserves. Secretary Hull sent this letter to Mr. Ickes, telling him very definitely—and I quote from the closing paragraph, which appears in the report, on page 47—

> Accordingly, the Department is of the firm opinion, with which I believe you will agree in view of the above-mentioned considerations, that negotiations of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation—

That was the Government corporation—

> with the California Arabian Standard Oil Co. and with the Gulf Oil Co., for the purpose of arranging participation by this Government in those companies or their foreign reserves, should be held in abeyance, and that no similar negotiations should be undertaken with any other company at this time.

This was a result of discussions going on with the British as to future arrangements in this general area.

There is one rather curious thing about the photostat, which I hold in my hand, and which came from the Department on last Monday. The bottom of the photostat had been very carefully clipped off, and Cordell Hull's name had been inserted, in pen and ink. This naturally aroused some curiosity, because it is a rather unusual arrangement. Yesterday we secured a transcript of the remainder of the letter, which was not forwarded to us by the State Department, containing a perfect maze of hieroglyphics, which I hold in my hand, showing the various initials and dates and other things which appeared thereon. What the significance of those various initials, and so on is, remains to be determined by whatever competent committee shall subsequently find any interest in this matter. It is, in the judgment of the committee, a matter of interest and concern to know as to the occasion for the formulation of this recommendation, which terminated any attempt of the American Government to acquire an interest in these reserves, at the same time we were discussing with Britain an arrangement by which all concessions in the Middle East should be frozen as they were, which has ultimated in the Anglo-American oil agreement now before the Senate for consideration, under which it is stipulated that we mutually agree to protect each other in the concessions of the other in any parts of the world, and see to it that no one pirates on the concessions. In other words, this arrangement with the British, if it should be confirmed, would amount to a freezing of the situation in the Middle East, where Britain and the United States would mutually agree to protect each other's concessions. Such an arrangement would practically guarantee, so long as Britain and America are able to defend them at least, their mutual interests there, covering the approximately 100,000,000,000 barrels of petroleum supposed to exist underneath that soil, and it would be a matter of very great value to the companies concerned.

It is very interesting to note that, assuming the British interests are equal to ours, the British Government would have a 51-percent interest in all the profits, while our Government would have no interest whatever. But Mr. Duce, the president of Iranco, labored to discuss at some length the taxes they pay to our Government. He had a good deal to say about that in his earlier evidence. Said he, "We are an American company, paying American taxes, and so we should be entitled to all the fruits of our free enterprise." He intimated that this had contributed to the $90,000,000 our Government had invested over there. We were subsequently somewhat amazed to discover in the course of the investigation that these companies in their operations in the Middle East during the last decade had accumulated profits of $117,000,000 on an investment of $1,000,000. They testified at the time that they had paid no taxes whatever on those profits, as they had put them in a Bahama corporation and a Canadian corporation, which paid taxes of no kind.

Subsequently they advised us, and we incorporate this in the report, that certain taxes had been paid. I want to be entirely just to them. It was indicated that they had paid I believe what they alleged to be $1,000,000 to our Government and $1,800,000 to some other government, or a total of $2,800,000. That, however, is a very nominal return for the investment which the United States Government had made in this affair, representing approximately 1 percent received by our Government on the $117,000,000 profit realized on an investment of $1,000,000. So far as the record shows, they could go on indefinitely with this arrangement.

I was accordingly instructed by the committee to report the situation to the Treasury, to see whether or not this was entirely within the law.

There is filed with the report my letter to the Secretary of the Treasury, with instructions of the committee to deal with the situation which we found, and going on to point out its implications so far as we were concerned. The Secretary of the Treasury replied, and his letter is on file here, indicating that we probably could not reach those profits under any existing law, and suggesting that the matter was receiving very careful study. We subsequently reported it also to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and their reply, at great length, is also filed for the information of the Senate and of the Congress. This reply is exceedingly interesting, because in the closing portion of the reply of the joint committee, on page 46, they point out the following:

> Justice Holmes said: "Taxes are the price we pay for civilization." Should a corporation which has no operations in the United States and thus obtains none of the service or benefits which domestic enterprises enjoy pay the same taxes as a domestic enterprise?

I can well understand the import of that question and certain equities which it presents; but I desire to point out that in this particular case we have invested $90,000,000 which resulted in preserving their concession. They certainly are in a different category from that of any other corporation doing business abroad. I trust that the appropriate committees of the House and Senate dealing with taxation will continue to give exceedingly careful study to the situation, because I wish to point out to the Senate what is now in prospect.

Assuming that the reserves continue to be exploited, with such development as can be anticipated, with profits which would be indicative of $1 to $1.50 a barrel, if the estimate of 30,000,000,000 barrels be correct, it would mean a profit of approximately $30,000,000,000 for the concern. Mr. Ickes testified that he could see very little evidence of competition in the Persian Gulf area, so far as oil was concerned; that the entire emphasis of our policy seemed to be toward a consortium with the British and other interests by which the reserves would be developed to the very great advantage of those who control them.

If the entire reserves be taken into account, if they consist of 100,000,000,000

barrels, there would be $100,000,000,000 in profit.

I say this because I think Congress and the country should realize what is involved. It was testified that we did not expect any of the oil to come to the United States. Their policy in that regard has already been demonstrated as fallacious this very spring, as result of the great oil shortages in this country which were apparently not anticipated by our people during the earlier months, although it was pointed out in the discussions in the Petroleum Board 3 years ago that this very situation would come to pass; that there would be a great shortage of petroleum products. It was said that if the people knew about it they would be very much alarmed.

As a result of the shortages the Arabian oil has begun to flow into the American market, on the eastern seaboard. Meanwhile much, if not all, of the petroleum for Europe will come from the Middle East. Under the Marshall plan it is proposed that the oil consumption of Europe be increased by 250 percent. We are to develop refining and consuming facilities to increase oil consumption by Europe by 250 percent, which means that we are apparently contemplating the transformation of the coal economy of Europe more and more to an oil economy, according to the supply of petroleum. The result is that whether we buy oil for our Navy and our Air Force in Arabia, as we are now doing, or whether the oil goes to Europe, in the next 4 years the American people, directly or indirectly, will have to pay the bill, and whether the profits are $1,000,000,000, $5,000,000,000, or $10,000,000,000, they will be a direct result of the assistance which our Government gave to the oil companies in their hour of need.

Mr. Charles E. Hughes, the distinguished counsel for the oil companies, stated before a committee that we are dealing at arm's length. I do not think the oil companies are in a position to come to the United States Government, in the light of what I have recited, and say to the American people and to the American Government, "You shall have no special consideration of any character." I hope, as a result of the investigation and report and of the continuing interest of everyone concerned with the procurement of petroleum and its impact upon our economy, we shall see that those companies are properly brought to book.

With regard to price, those companies could, if they so desired, ruin every oil producer in this country. They can lay their oil down in New York at half the price which the American producer is receiving today and for which he can perhaps produce it under future conditions. They possess the absolute power of life and death over our entire petroleum economy. They can either take their profits in the billions of dollars or wipe out the American oil industry if they prefer. Such a power is not lightly to be regarded. But assuming that they charge what the traffic will bear, and that they simply bring in oil to supply whatever shortages there may be in this country, and take their profits on it, in the event they have a determining voice in the price received for the oil, up or down, they have the power at any time, as transportation facilities grow adequate, to change their policy.

Accordingly, so far as my own thought is concerned—and I now express my opinion as distinguished from that of the committee, because the committee did not go this far—one of the approaches which should be most seriously considered is the development of tax legislation which will reach a situation of this character and do justice to the oil companies involved and to whatever reward they are entitled to for their enterprise, their ingenuity, and their investment, but at the same time do justice to the people of the United States who have an equitable interest in the situation which, in my judgment, should no longer be disregarded, so that those companies may not come to us in the future, whether we need the oil for our Navy, our people, or for the starving people of Europe, and tell us that we must pay whatever price they exact.

Mr. Forrestal testified before the committee that the oil companies might undertake to raise the price of $1.05 which had continued ever since 1945. The oil companies appeared before us and boasted of their generosity to our people, when they said, "We have let you have this oil at $1.05. Even though the Gulf of Mexico oil has gone up a dollar or more in price, we are still selling our oil to you at the same price."

It was pointed out that we had no assurance as to how long that situation would continue. I recited that their attitude throughout the past 2 years might be the result of feeling they were still in a somewhat precarious condition. I recited the old saw that "When the devil was sick the devil a saint would be, but when the devil was well, the devil a saint was he."

Mr. Forrestal replied to that, stating that in this instance, if they tried to raise the price, they would find they had the Navy Department to deal with, and that was a very serious "devil." He went on to say that if they tried to raise the price they would meet with very firm opposition on the part of the Department.

I am sorry to report that Mr. Forrestal's opposition has been in vain, because in this very month the Navy Department was compelled to renew its contract for Arabian oil at a very great increase in price. The oil companies made a proposal which was far out of line with the previous arrangement. After very considerable discussion and, I hope, very firm opposition, the Navy was still obliged to renew the contract for the last quarter of this year at a price of $1.48 a barrel, which is 43 cents above the previously prevailing price. That amounts to an additional sum over the existing price of approximately $5,500,000, at the 40-cent price which our committee has always believed was a fair figure, or approximately $2,000,000 above the previously prevailing price. Where the price will go from here no one knows, but it is evident that the Secretary of Defense was utterly unable further to protect the interests of our Government by continuation.

In the report of the contract which has been made, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, John W. Kenny, in announcing the contract, stated:

> It is highly gratifying to the Navy Department to have immediate availability of a ready source of high-quality oil.

That is an interesting comment, because originally the Navy rejected the oil on the ground that it was not proper quality. They now characterize it as a high-quality oil, and I think that is correct. He continued:

> Easily accessible to fleet needs, especially during a period of short supplies of gasoline and oil at home.

He proceeds to comment on the advantage of getting all the petroleum they can from the Middle East because of shortages, and he gives the price of $1.48, which is 43 cents above the previously prevailing one. Then Secretary Kenny pointed out that new contract prices to be paid by the Navy were comparable with United States gulf prices for comparable products.

That is a significant item. In other words, they have now achieved their further goal of establishing Persian Gulf oil—which includes oil used by our British, Dutch, and other friends—on a basis comparable with the prices at the Gulf of Mexico, the result being that our Navy and our people and Europe will pay that price from this time on, with the results I have pointed out.

There is a further interesting item. I have spoken of the taxation aspect, which I trust will receive serious study, as I believe it is feasible to reach this situation by that avenue without in any way disturbing our American petroleum economy. In other words, if we approach it from that angle, we then cut the unholy profits which they are making as a result of this enterprise without impairment of the position of the American petroleum industry. If we should take the other course and attempt to lower the prices, which, of course, would be very attractive to those who live in the State of Maine, where we have no petroleum, it would necessarily have a profound effect upon our own petroleum economy. So I feel the approach through the tax avenue is perhaps the most practical approach.

But we have one other suggestion, namely, regarding the question whether or not the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey and the Socony-Vacuum may acquire a 40-percent interest without infringing upon the existing decrees of courts regarding the dissolution, which forbade certain transactions so far as they were concerned.

The committee voted to call this matter to the attention of the Department of Justice. The letter which we sent to the Department of Justice is in the record, calling the attention of the Attorney General to the fact that the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey and the Socony-Vacuum acquired a 40-percent interest in this foreign petroleum reserve. The reply is a simple acknowledgment. This letter was sent some months ago. Further evidence has since developed,

which apparently also has some significance. An account of this recent transaction was sent to one of the New York newspapers by its local correspondent, and I should like to put this entire account in the RECORD, if I may have unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, April 20.—The Navy on April 12 signed a contract with Cal-Tex Oil Products Co. for the delivery of 6,000,000 barrels of Navy special fuel oil, 2,250,000 barrels of Navy Diesel fuel oil, and 1,000,000 barrels of motor gasoline, officials announced today.

All oil is for delivery in the last 6 months of 1948 from Persian Gulf sources.

Assumption is that 60 percent of this oil will come from the Saudi-Arabian production of the Arabian American Oil Co. Cal-Tex has been the marketing agent for Aramco since January 1, 1947, under an agreement by which the latter company agrees to take 60 percent of Aramco's oil.

Navy officials stated that negotiations are under way for the purchase of an additional 3,000,000 barrels of Navy special fuel oil, 1,400,000 barrels of Navy Diesel fuel oil, and 500,000 barrels of motor gasoline from other companies participating in production from Persian Gulf sources.

Supposition is that most of the remainder will come from the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. and Standard Oil Co. on a 3 to 1 basis. This, however, cannot be verified, although such offerings on this basis are considered possible because the two companies have agreed to participate in the remaining 40 percent of Aramco's outlet on that basis.

Under Secretary of the Navy W. John Kenney, in announcing the contract, stated:

"It is highly gratifying to the Navy Department to have immediate availability of a ready-source of high-quality oil, easily accessible to fleet needs, especially during a period of short supplies of gasoline and oil at home.

"The procurement of the maximum amount of petroleum products from Persian Gulf sources for military use renders direct assistance to the national economy of the United States by releasing equivalent quantities of United States produced petroleum products for civilians."

The new contract provides for 3,000,000 barrels of Navy special fuel oil at $1.75 a barrel for the first quarter of fiscal 1949 and 3,000,000 barrels at $1.48 for the second quarter.

Navy Diesel fuel oil of 1,425,000 barrels at $1.805 a barrel and 1,425,000 barrels at $2.11 a barrel are to be purchased for the same two periods.

Cal-Tex's contract with the Navy which ends in June 1948, calls for $1.05 a barrel for Navy special. This amount has been paid to Cal-Tex for Aramco oil since the first contract was negotiated, effective January 1, 1947.

Secretary Kenny pointed out today that new contract prices to be paid by the Navy are comparable with United States Gulf prices for comparable products of $2.63 a barrel for Navy special fuel oil; and $3.5175 a barrel for Navy Diesel fuel.

The contract for motor gas was executed at no change from existing prices.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I wish to quote from the article. After reciting the contract for the oil, the article stated:

Assumption is that 60 percent of this oil will come from the Saudi Arabian Production of the Arabian American Oil Co., Cal-Tex—

Which is the company that has made these profits—

Cal-Tex has been the marketing agent for Aramco since January 1, 1947, under an agreement by which the latter company agrees to take 60 percent of Aramco's oil.

Cal-Tex is the Standard Oil of California and Texas Co. So they are to take 60 percent of this Arabian oil. The statement proceeds:

Navy officials stated that negotiations are under way for the purchase of an additional 3,000,000 barrels of Navy special fuel oil, 1,400,000 barrels of Navy Diesel fuel oil, and 500,000 barrels of motor gasoline from other companies participating in production from Persian Gulf sources.

Supposition is that most of the remainder will come from the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. and Standard Oil Co. on a 3 to 1 basis. This, however, cannot be verified, although such offerings on this basis are considered possible because the two companies have agreed to participate in the remaining 40 percent of Aramco's outlet on that basis.

The significance of that statement—if it is correct, and I simply have the report of surmises—is that it is the precise distribution of Arabian-American oil which would be contemplated by the contract made a year ago last March by the Standard of California and the Texas Co. with the Standard of New Jersey and Socony-Vacuum. In other words, the interest now is 60 percent in the two original companies, 40 percent in the Standard Oil of New Jersey and Socony Vacuum. The interest of the two new companies is 30 and 10 percent. So that if this surmise should be correct, it would mean that for all practical purposes they were dividing the production of these fields in the exact ratio which would be contemplated if the contract of March 1947 had been actually carried into effect. Whether or not that is warranted will have to remain for future investigation and determination. It is further additional evidence, to be carefully considered by the Department of Justice, as to whether or not the impact of these agreements and these sales upon our domestic as well as foreign supplies of oil does not indicate at least the wisdom of submitting the arrangement to the courts for their consideration and determination as to whether or not it is in violation of the consent decree hitherto entered. In two instances decrees of that sort have been entered. In other words, when any question of this sort has arisen, which might have a very profound impact upon our entire petroleum position in this country, it has been submitted to the court by the Attorney General, and he has asked the court, after a full exposure of all the circumstances, whether or not the arrangement contemplated would be in violation of the decree hitherto entered. In this case all that has been done, according to the evidence of Mr. Rodgers, president of the Texas Co., was the submission of the proposal to the Attorney General, without an answer of any kind. He has neither said it was all right nor wrong. Nor has it been presented to any court. I trust that as the Department of Justice investigation proceeds, it may decide that in the interest of a sound solution of this matter this case may be submitted to the proper court for determination of the question whether or not this arrangement is calculated ultimately to have a very serious effect upon the petroleum problem of our own country, which is one of the No. 1 problems in peace or war.

Mr. President, there is one other item I should like to have included. In this morning's New York Herald Tribune I find a very interesting item dated April 27, from Denver, Colo., where Mr. James Terry Duce, vice president of the Arabian-American Oil Co., is represented as stating as follows:

Every American is benefited by the Arabian oil development, James Terry Duce, vice president of Arabian-American Oil Co., declared today in an address to the American Association of Petroleum Geologists.

Arabian-American, he pointed out, is a United States company, organized in Delaware, and thus is a trustee to the American people. It pays 38 percent of its net income, many millions of dollars annually, to the United States Government.

One in my office who followed all this matter very easily and very closely, brought this item to me and said, "Why, that statement must be absolutely false." It is not false; it is true, although it might seem to be in entire conflict with what I have said here regarding the $117,000,000 in profits on which 1 percent was paid. The statement is entirely correct. But what Mr. Duce apparently failed to tell the American Association of Geologists was that through the medium of his foreign subsidiaries $117,000,000 of profits hitherto, and heaven knows how many in the current period, are being entirely diverted from any feasible taxation at the present time or in the indefinite future, until Mr. Duce decides to bring those profits home to the United States to the parent company. He can go on investing those profits abroad, he can go on exploiting them, he can go on accumulating profits until he decides that the tax structure of the United States is such as is agreeable to him. In the meantime, having got rid of the 90-percent taxes of the war period, having got rid of the excess-profits taxes, having got rid of other taxes which he may levy, until Mr. Duce decides that the tax schedule of this country has reached a sufficiently low point that in the exercise of his baronial powers he is willing to bring the money home and let it be taxed, and he does so, we are helpless, unless we enact some law.

Meanwhile I think Mr. Duce might be well advised to be a little more frank with the people of the United States. I am sure that the responsible journals of the United States will be interested to clarify, for the benefit of the American people, exactly how much credit can be attached to his remarks at this very significant time, when, I am sure, Mr. Duce, through his means of information, is quite aware that under the extension agreement our committee report must be filed by tomorrow night. So Mr. Duce, returning from his former empire in Arabia, arrives in Denver, Colo., to tell the world he is paying 38 percent of his net income, but utterly failing to declare that most of his in-

come is in a pocket which the American people at the present time cannot touch.

Mr. President, I call attention to one other pertinent and interesting item. Just how much significance should be attached to this item only the future can tell, but the United Nations are very much interested now in the affairs of Palestine. We hear a great deal about Palestine and the ideological and the other conflicts there. Whether or not petroleum is more significant than Palestine in the difficulties of the Middle East only the future can tell, but in the minutes of the meeting of the Special Committee on Petroleum held away back in 1943 we find this interesting and significant item, which I read from the committee report on page 54:

No drilling has been done in Palestine and a small amount has been done in Syria. There are, however, untested structures of some promise in those countries.

The British Government has exercised its power in that area to grant concessions for a pipe line within the past month, as their powers are obviously expiring. How much more has been done in the matter of granting oil concessions in Palestine only the future can disclose, when the American people, and the people of all the world, can finally ascertain the facts. But it is very interesting that as far back as 1943 our Government was advised that "There are untested structures of some promise" concerning petroleum in Palestine.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to file not only the industrial mobilization report at this time, and the oil report, but also the final report of the committee, which constitutes a summary of its activities through the past 5 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I think that concludes my presentation of this matter. The reports will be filed with the Secretary of the Senate today, including the final report of the committee, and will conclude its labors extending over this period of years.

Subsequently,

Mr. BREWSTER, from the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, submitted the following reports:

Industrial Mobilization for War (pt. 4 of Rept. No. 440);

Navy Purchases of Middle East Oil (pt. 5 of Rept. No. 440); and

Final Report of Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program (pt. 6 of Rept. No. 440).

EXHIBIT B

SUMMARY OF REPORT OF THE SENATE WAR INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE ON THE ARABIAN AMERICAN OIL CO.

The expenditures by the United States Government for the petroleum products necessary to oil the war machine was a major item in the cost of the war. Early in 1947 the committee received information that the Navy had paid excessive prices for petroleum products to companies holding concessions in Saudi Arabia and the island of Bahrein in the Persian Gulf.

The concessions in Saudi Arabia are held and operated by the Arabian American Oil Co., a Delaware corporation, now known as Aramco. The Bahrein Petroleum Co., Ltd., a Canadian corporation owns and operates a concession on the small island of Bahrein. These two corporations are owned equally by the Standard Oil Co. of California and the Texas Oil Co. In March 1947 a conditional contract of purchase of Aramco stock was entered into by Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey and Socony Vacuum Oil Co. for the acquisition of 30 percent and 10 percent interest, repectively, in Aramco for the consideration of $102,000,000.

Because of a steady reduction in revenue, the King of Saudi Arabia approached the Arabian American Oil Co. in the fall of 1940 for financial aid. Negotiations followed between company representatives and those of the King, at the end of which the company committed itself to an advance of $3,000,000. Relations meanwhile between the companies and the King became strained and the company resolved that the best way out would be to approach the United States Government to find ways and means to come to the aid of the King of Saudi Arabia.

Mr. James Moffett, a personal friend of President Roosevelt, was assigned to discuss the matter with the President. He submitted to him a memorandum proposing a loan to the King to be later amortized by deliveries of quantities of oil and oil products.

In part, the memorandum said:

"If the United States Government will advance to the King of Saudi Arabia $6,000,000 annually for the next 5 years, the Calarabian Standard Oil Co. will agree to deliver to the United States Government for account of the King: 1,800,000 gallons of gasoline at 3½ cents; 2,660,000 barrels of Diesel oil at 75 cents; 3,400,000 barrels of fuel oil at 40 cents, totaling approximately $6,000,000 worth of petroleum annually."

Because of absence of authority to enter into such deals, the proposal was not accepted. Nevertheless, the companies continued to press the issue of aid to Saudi Arabia. They applied to the United States Government for a grant of lend-lease aid to Saudi Arabia to relieve themselves of the burden of supplying the King with $6,000,000 annually.

While the Moffett proposal could not be implemented at this time, the United States Government was sufficiently interested in the stability of the King of Saudi Arabia to arrange for indirect aid through the British, which ultimately cost the United States $51,000,000 in return for which the companies offered to sell to the United States fuel oil at 40 cents a barrel, Diesel oil at 75 cents, and gasoline at 3½ cents a gallon. While the negotiations were not conducted on a formal basis, good faith was implicit in their dealings.

Through the continued intervention of and pressure brought to bear by the companies, President Roosevelt on February 18, 1943, issued a directive by which Saudi Arabia was to receive lend-lease.

Meanwhile, the Government of the United States considered various means to safeguard future oil sources in Saudi Arabia. Among the possibilities were the acquisition of stock in Aramco, options on oil in the ground, and the construction and control of pipe lines and refineries. For this purpose the Petroleum Reserve Corporation was formed and Secretary Harold Ickes was delegated to negotiate for the stock control of the company in the interest of the national defense. The negotiations were unsuccessful and Secretary Ickes attributed the reluctance of the oil companies to part with their stock to the fact that by this time Rommell had been chased out of north Africa and they felt secure in their concession.

By the end of 1947, United States financial assistance to the King of Saudi Arabia totaled $99,469,000, $72,469,000 of which is classified as probably nonrecoverable and $27,000,000 of which is considered probably recoverable.

When the time came for the United States Navy to negotiate a contract for oil, Aramco placed its bid for a price far in excess of the original proposal. It demanded and later received the price of $1.05 for crude oil. Testimony before the committee brought out the fact that Navy procurement officers considered the price excessive and that the pressing need for fuel compelled them to accept the company's terms.

The Navy Department during its negotiations for the purchase of oil from Aramco received information from PAW that their experts considered the price of $1.05 as excessive. Testimony also brought out the fact that the company had offered as justification for this price the suggestion that the company knew it would eventually have to increase the 21-cents royalty to the King to 42 cents. So far the royalty has not been increased.

The total sum paid by the United States Navy in excess of the figures in the Moffett proposal amounts to $38,505,578.11.

Recently the Navy signed a new contract with Aramco at an increase in price despite the fact that Defense Secretary Forrestal in his testimony before the committee on January 29, 1948, stated that "I think they realize that any attempt to increase that price would meet with very severe opposition."

The new contract covering purchases for July through December 1948 of 6,000,000 barrels Navy special fuel oil and 2,850,000 barrels of Navy Diesel fuel oil works out as follows:

Navy special fuel oil:	
3,000,000 barrels at $1.175 per barrel (actual contract for third quarter 1948)	$3,525,000
3,000,000 barrels at $1.48 per barrel (actual contract for fourth quarter 1948)	4,440,000
Total	7,965,000
6,000,000 barrels at 40 cents per barrel (had the price been 40 cents a barrel)	2,400,000
6,000,000 barrels at $1.05 per barrel (current to June 30, 1948, f. o. b. Ras Tanura Bahrein)	6,300,000
Navy Diesel fuel oil:	
1,425,000 barrels at $1.805 per barrel (actual contract for third quarter 1948)	2,572,125
1,425,000 barrels at $2.11 per barrel (actual contract for fourth quarter 1948)	3,006,750
Total	5,578,875
2,850,000 barrels at $1.68 per barrel (current to June 30, 1948, f. o. b. Ras Tanura/Bahrein $1.68 bbl.)	4,788,000
2,850,000 barrels at 75 cents per barrel (current to June 30, 1948, f. o. b. Ras Tanura/Bahrein 75 cents bbl.)	2,137,500

In the light of testimony heard, the committee concludes:

1. The United States Government extended direct and indirect lend-lease and other assistance to the Saudi Arabian Government in excess of $99,000,000, of which only approximately $27,000,000 is likely to be recovered.

2. These advances of direct and indirect lend-lease and other assistance to the Saudi Arabian Government were initiated for the most part by the Arabian American Oil Co., its affiliates, and parent companies, for two reasons: First, in 1941, to relieve themselves of the onerous burden of supplying large funds to meet the budgetary requirements of Saudi Arabia; and second, in 1943, direct United States lend-lease was requested by the company to eliminate the danger of its concessions and earnings falling under the financial control of the United Kingdom.

3. To induce the grant of aid to the Saudi Arabian Government, the Arabian American Oil Co. offered to sell to the United States under a proposal to the President dated April 16, 1941, at prices based on fuel oil at 40 cents per barrel. Under another proposal made February 8, 1943, as a further inducement to the United States to extend direct lend-lease to Saudi Arabia, the company offered to set aside reserves and to sell its petroleum products "at prices well under world prices" or at "cost plus a nominal profit."

4. The committee is of the opinion that the various governmental agencies and departments did not implement the companies' proposals as a direct result of their failure to abide by the letter and spirit of Executive Order No. 9276 which was formulated to coordinate and centralize all oil procurement in the office of the Petroleum Administrator for War.

5. When the United States Government needed Middle East oil because of its eastern hemispheric war demands, notwithstanding these prior proposals, the companies offered the Navy fuel oil there at $1.05 a barrel on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. The Navy was forced to buy that oil on these terms. The committee is of the opinion that the oil companies were under a moral if not a legal obligation to disclose to the naval procurement officers their previous proposals for the sale of oil submitted to the President. These oil companies exploited the Government by exacting high prices for their products despite the high expenditures and assistance granted for them to Saudi Arabia at the companies' behest to protect and preserve the companies' concessions.

6. The committee is of the opinion that in paying $1.05 a barrel, the United States Government was overcharged between thirty and thirty-eight million dollars on sales made to the Navy by Aramco and its affiliates, between January 1, 1942, and June 30, 1947, by payment of prices higher than those the oil companies had a right to insist on in the light of their previous dealings with the United States.

7. The committee believes that the Navy Department wholly failed to exercise its wartime procurement authority in not obtaining production cost figures for this Arabian oil, and in awarding contracts to Aramco and its affiliates there at prices which the Navy representatives admitted were excessive.

8. The committee is of the opinion that if the statement contained in the official Navy justification for the purchase of oil at $1.05 a barrel is true, that the oil companies represented to the Navy that they had doubled their royalty payment from 21 to 42 cents a barrel, then the United States Government clearly was defrauded because the royalty payments were not doubled.

9. However, if the statement is false, and the oil companies did not represent to the Navy that their royalty payments were double, then it is obvious that the Government overpaid at least 21 cents a barrel, aggregating overcharges of millions of dollars.

10. Naval procurement of oil from Aramco will continue for an indefinite period. It is impossible to ascertain the final over-all costs of these overcharges and the total loss to the Government by its failure to have implemented the Moffett and Rodgers proposals.

11. The committee recommends that greater care be exercised by the various governmental departments and agencies, where industrial experts are employed, to make certain such experts are disqualified from handling matters or determining policy which affects the interest of the companies with which they are or were affiliated.

12. The committee recommends that all Government agencies concerned with the procurement of petroleum should be more closely coordinated, and further recommends the establishment by Congress of a board authorized to manage, control, and coordinate national petroleum problems for all Government departments, bureaus, and agencies, both military and civilian.

13. The committee recommends that the subject of tax avoidance by the formation of foreign subsidiary companies of United States corporations should receive consideration by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation for such study and legislative correction as may seem proper.

14. The committee recommends that a continuing investigation of national petroleum affairs be authorized for either a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives or for one committee of the Senate and one committee of the House.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina obtained the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I have listened to the entire report made by the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. I think the committee has done a remarkably fine job which should be appreciated by every good citizen of the United States. I believe the report presented thoroughly answers the criticisms appearing in newspapers, which have, in my judgment, been most unfair to the distinguished chairman of the committee, particularly during the past 12 or 13 months.

Certainly, Mr. President, every honest citizen of this country must hang his head in shame when he realizes what those in control of our Government in the years the Senator from Maine has described, 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944, and 1945, left undone to protect the interests of the common people of the United States.

Mr. President, I noticed that during the time the distinguished Senator from Maine spoke at no time were there more than four members of the opposition party, not more than four Democrats, on the floor of the Senate. I think I can readily understand why there were not more of them present. That was because of the fact that it was announced that the report was to be made today.

I can only say, Mr. President, that if during the years I have mentioned my party had been in control of the affairs of the United States as the Democratic Party was, and had acted as some of the men who were in the Cabinet acted, and even as a couple of renegade Republicans acted, I would hang my head in shame.

I want to pay tribute also to the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. Every Senator upon the floor knows that the junior Senator from Michigan is a fearless servant of the people. They know that as a member of the committee he digs to the very bottom of affairs and drags out evidence. The evidence he has adduced shows, in my opinion, Mr. President, that if some men are not in the penitentiary, and from the report I gather they are not, then most certainly they ought to be. Not only that, Mr. President, but the men who have put over this oil deal, those very men who have called upon American boys to go into foreign lands to protect their interests, in my judgment, are traitors to America, and they ought to surrender their citizenship or have it taken away from them. Mr. President, at a time in our Nation when the lives of millions of our people were at stake, indeed when the very life of the country was at stake, we find the situation where the interests of the American people were not properly protected.

Mr. President, this committee has done a magnificent job. It so happened that I voted for the continuation of the committee. Every vote that could be obtained was necessary in order to continue it. I say that it has justified its existence; and if it had spent 100 times more than it has spent, it would have been money very well invested by the American people.

Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Maine how many copies of the report which he has submitted have been printed?

Mr. BREWSTER. I think only the usual number at this time; but I believe there may well be need for additional copies.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire report be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE REPORT NO. 440, PART 5, INVESTIGATION OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

(Mr. BREWSTER, from the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, submitted the following additional report pursuant to S. Res. 71, 77th Cong.; S. Res. 6, 78th Cong.; S. Res. 55, 79th Cong.; and S. Res. 46, 80th Cong.)

ARABIAN AMERICAN OIL CO.

Introduction

Since its inception the committee has had a vital interest in strategic supplies and materials essential to national defense. Its interest has been not only in the procurement of such supplies but also in their procurement at the lowest possible cost to the Government. It is the opinion of the committee that before our national defense program can be improved, it is necessary to consider and study our past experience as a guide in future planning.

The expenditures by our Government for the petroleum products necessary to oil the war machine was a major item in the cost of the war. Early in 1947 the committee received information that the Navy had paid excessive prices for petroleum products to companies holding concessions in Saudi Arabia and the island of Bahrein in the Persian Gulf. (See appendix I.)

The concessions in Saudi Arabia are held and operated by the Arabian American Oil Co., a Deleware corporation hereinafter referred to as Aramco. The Bahrein Petroleum Co., Ltd., a Canadian corporation, owns and operates a concession on the small island of Bahrein. These two corporations are owned equally by the Texas Co. and Standard Oil Co. of California. In March 1947 a conditional contract of purchase of Aramco stock was entered into by the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey and Socony Vacuum Oil Co. for the acquisition of 30 percent and 10 percent interest, respectively, in Aramco for the consideration of $102,000,000. (See appendix II.) The Bahrein Petroleum Co., Ltd., wholly owns a marketing subsidiary of Bahaman origin, California-Texas Oil Co., Ltd., known as Cal-Tex.

The Standard Oil Co. of California obtained concessions in Saudi Arabia from King Abdul Aziz ibn-Saud in 1933. Encompassing an area of 162,000,000 acres, approximately as large as the States of California and Oregon

combined, it has been estimated that these concessions contain reserves of from 4,000,000,000 to 20,000,000,000 barrels of oil.

It may be well to note that the entire Middle East oil resources in Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Qatar and the island of Bahrein are estimated to have over two-fifths of the proven oil reserves of the world and to contain what James Terry Duce, vice president of Aramco testified are believed by some authorities to contain a total of 100,000,000,000 barrels.

There are two Saudi Arabian concessions, one running to 1993 and the other to 1999. The California-Arabian Standard Oil Co., whose name was changed to Arabian-American Oil Co., in 1943, was formed by Standard Oil Co. of California as a subsidiary to operate this concession. The first well was drilled in 1935 and a year later the Texas Co. became a joint owner upon the purchase of 50 percent of the capital stock of Aramco. Production of crude oil in commercial quantities started in 1938 at which time King ibn-Saud began to receive his royalty of approximately 21 cents per barrel in accordance with the terms of the concession agreement.

Prior to World War II the needs of the kingdom had been met principally by revenues from the annual pilgrimages of the Moslems to their holy cities of Mecca and Medina which lay within the realm of King ibn-Saud, augmented by small royalties from the oil companies and advances from the British Government. After the outbreak of World War II the pilgrimage became almost nonexistent because of transportation difficulties and revenue from that source dropped to virtually nothing. The King, faced with the problem of providing for his subjects, turned to the American companies holding the oil concessions and sought financial relief.

The oil company was not producing sufficient oil to meet the financial demands of the King from current royalties. It then was forced to make advances on royalty payments amounting to several million dollars by 1941 when the King announced that his annual budget would be in the vicinity of $10,000,000. The United Kingdom was furnishing approximately the equivalent of four million and the King demanded that the American oil interests advance the balance. Reluctant to make further contributions from their own treasuries, the officials of the companies conceived the idea of inducing the United States Government to make the necessary financial advances, offering in return the oil of Saudi Arabia as possible military or naval reserves in the Middle East.

The Moffett offer of 1941

In the fall of 1940 it was evident that King Ibn Saud faced a financial crisis as a result of the loss of revenue from the pilgrimages. At this time Mr. Fred A. Davies, president of Aramco, together with other company representatives, went to Saudi Arabia to enter into discussions with the Minister of Finance in an effort to arrive at some financial understanding with the King. During the years 1933 to April 1, 1941, Aramco had advanced the King $6,800,000 in excess of its obligations and the payments were becoming burdensome. In addition the companies were now faced with demands for greater advances.

Several months of negotiations transpired between the King, his representatives and Aramco officials, during which time cables between the home office and Arabian office of the company showed that the relations between Aramco and the King were becoming strained. The King was adamant in his demands for an additional $6,000,000. The months of conferences culminated in an exchange of letters of agreement between the Saudi Arabian Minister of Finance and Mr. Fred A. Davies, president of Aramco, under dates of January 18, 1941 (exhibit 2580) and January 19, 1941 (exhibit 2581). The companies' representatives committed themselves to an advance of $3,000,000 and the representatives undertook to have their companies increase its loan to $6,000,000, as is hereinafter set forth in the letter of January 18, 1941 (exhibit 2580), from the Minister of Finance to the president of Aramco:

"Second. The amount of the loan for the year 1941 which the Company has definitely authorized you to agree to is three million American dollars—however, you personally have undertaken to return to America with Mr. Hamilton and, jointly, to endeavor, with all earnestness and diligence, to increase the said loan and to raise it to the figure of $6,000,000.

"We have no doubt at all that your efforts will be crowned with success in increasing the loan to the final figure, i. e., $6,000,000 for the year 1941 and, accordingly, we are figuring our budget for this year on $6,000,000 as explained to you on several occasions."

The company took the position not expressed to the King that the international situation did not justify any substantial additional investment of their own capital.

Representatives of the Standard Oil Co. of California, the Texas Co., and the subsidiaries, Aramco, Bahrein, and Cal-Tex, held conferences in New York in April 1941 to consider ways and means of interesting our Government in making advances to the Saudi Arabian Government, either through the Lend-Lease Act or other means. It was decided that Mr. James A. Moffett, an officer in two of the affiliates, Bahrein and Cal-Tex, would present the subject on behalf of Aramco and the parent companies to the President of the United States.

Accordingly, Moffett, a former Federal Housing Administrator and a personal friend of President Roosevelt, discussed the matter with the President in Washington on April 9, 1941. He showed the President a memorandum briefing the history of the company, the concession, and the King's financial plight, and containing a proposal. Under date of April 16, 1941, the President received a letter signed by Moffett, enclosing a memorandum and proposal which is hereinafter referred to as the Moffett offer. This original letter was sought by the committee from the files of the former President in the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, Hyde Park, N. Y. The files at the library indicated that such a letter was received by President Roosevelt and subsequently forwarded to the State Department. The Department of State was then requested to search its files and they located a copy of a letter dated April 16, 1941, to the late President, with the notation "(original signed by J. A. Moffett)." A photostatic copy of this letter was forwarded to the committee together with the memorandum found in the White House papers. The memorandum and the letter are set forth below.

APRIL 16, 1941.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Referring to the interview which you so kindy granted me on Wednesday, April 9, and in line with your request, I am attaching hereto a memorandum covering the existing situation in Saudi Arabia. Also a proposal which we hope will be acceptable as a means of providing funds for the Saudi Arabian Government.

Our representatives have had numerous conferences with the King. His financial situation is desperate. The British Government has advanced him £400,000 and he is endeavoring to have this increased to £900,000. His budget requirement is conservatively estimated at $10,000,000.

You referred to the four Danish tank steamers which might be utilized to transport finished petroleum products. If the United States Government will advance to the King of Saudi Arabia $6,000,000 annually for the next 5 years, the Calarabian Standard Oil Co. will agree to deliver to the United States Government, for account of the King:

	F. o. b. ship Persian Gulf (cents)
1,800,000 bbls. of gasoline, at	3½
2,660,000 bbls. of Diesel oil, at	75
3,400,000 bbls. of fuel oil, at	40

totaling approximately $6,000,000 worth of petroleum products annually.

The King's normal revenue (from pilgrimage and customs) has practically disappeared. His expenses have very materially increased, not only on account of the war, but due to the drought this past year, so that he has been forced to feed two or three hundred thousand of his subjects.

I sincerely trust that some way may be found under existing legislation to provide King Ibn-Saud financial assistance, which he so urgently needs in order to maintain his government in a stable condition. We believe that unless this is done, and soon, this independent kingdom, and perhaps with it the entire Arab world, will be thrown into chaos.

Your very sincerely,
(Original signed by J. A. Moffett.)

[Exhibit 2539]

"MEMORANDUM, APRIL 16, 1941

"King ibn-Saud, of Saudi Arabia, formerly depended largely on the revenue from the pilgrimage and customs duties to finance his government. Due to the war, this revenue has been reduced to a negligible amount.

"The only economic resources of any substantial value of Saudi Arabia are its oil resources, the development of which has been seriously interfered with on account of the war.

"The King has privately expressed himself, and we believe sincerely, as strongly pro-Ally. No other man in the Arab countries, nor among Moslems the world over, commands prestige equal to his. In order to feed and maintain control of his people, which is essential to maintain his prestige in the Arab world elsewhere and to prepare, even in a moderate way, for equipping his own soldiers for service, he estimates that he will require $10,000,000 per annum until the emergency has passed and he recently demanded that the California Arabian Standard Oil Co. supply him with $6,000,000 during the year 1941. In addition to this, the British have promised him 400,000 pounds sterling during 1941, which he hopes to increase to 900,000 pounds.

"Based on the best information which we have been able to obtain, it is our opinion that the King's estimate of $10,000,000 for this year is moderate and close to a minimum figure for essential expenditures.

"The California Arabian Standard Oil Co. owns an oil concession in Arabia consisting of approximately 162,000,000 acres, and embracing all the probable oil territory of the country. This area is approximately equal in size to the States of California and Oregon. The original concession was acquired in 1933 and runs to 1993; the remaining area was acquired in 1939 and runs until 1999. The company is of American nationality and 50 percent is owned by the Standard Oil Co. of California, and 50 percent by the Texas Corp. These two companies between them have approximately 160,000 American stockholders.

"The development work commenced in 1933 and to date the company has discovered on three structures an estimated 750,000,000 barrels of crude-oil reserves and there are many other structures of considerable promise on this concession. The Calarabian Standard Oil Co. has so far spent approximately $27,500,000 on this development. In addition, the company has advanced to the King against future royalties $6,800,000. It has now come to a point where it is impossible for the company to continue the growing burden and responsibility of financing

an independent country, particularly under present abnormal conditions. However, the King is desperate. He has told us that unless necessary financial assistance is immediately forthcoming, he has grave fears for the stability of his country.

"PROPOSAL

"1. We propose that the United States Government purchase from the Saudi Arabia Government finished petroleum products to the value of $6,000,000 annually for a period of 5 years.

"2. The company will contract with the King to produce, manufacture, and load such products for his account at a Persian Gulf port.

"3. The King will waive royalty on an amount of crude oil corresponding at current royalty rate to $6,000,000.

"4. The products taken under this arrangement, except that taken for use by the United States Navy or other United States Government purposes within the area, would have to be moved outside an area approximately defined as follows: Egypt, the east coast of Africa, South Africa, Australasia, India, the Straits Settlements, China, Japan, and possibly the Philippines.

"5. We suggest that for the purpose of determining the quantity of products due under this arrangement an agreement be reached as to the prices of certain products to be supplied over an agreed period.

"6. We suggest that our State Department approach the British not only to increase the amount of money which the British have been advancing to the King, amounting to 400,000 pounds sterling per year, but also to request the British to continue to make such advances in sufficient amount, which, added to those made by the United States Government, plus any other revenue received by the King, will total approximately $10,000,000 per year.

"Any British advances should be on a political and military basis and should not involve their getting any oil from this concession, the British at the present time being well supplied from Iran, Iraq, and Bahrein, etc."

The oil companies claim that the letter of April 16, 1941, which was prepared by them for Moffett to send President Roosevelt differed from the photostatic copy received by the committee from President Truman, in that the second sentence, third paragraph, stated:

"We feel confident that we can work out with the King an arrangement whereby he will deliver through us the following quantities of petroleum products and at the prices mentioned * * *" in place and instead of "the Calarabian Standard Oil Co. will agree to deliver to the United States Government, for account of the King."

However, W. S. S. Rodgers agreed that the companies' proposals differed from Moffett's proposal only in method, not in principle. Rodgers testified:

"The proposal was for a three-cornered arrangement between the United States, the Saudi Arabian Government and Aramco. The United States was to purchase the petroleum products from the Saudi Arabian Government—paragraph 1. The company was to contract with the King to produce, manufacture, and load such products for his account."

In essence the offer was that if the United States Government were to advance $6,000,000 annually to the King of Saudi Arabia, Aramco and the King of Saudi Arabia would deliver $6,000,000 worth of petroleum products f. a. s. Persian Gulf at the following prices: Gasoline at 3½ cents per gallon; Diesel oil at 75 cents per barrel; fuel oil at 40 cents per barrel.

It appears that copies of the Moffett letter with enclosures were forwarded to the Secretary of State, Hull, and the Secretary of Navy, Knox. Moffett discussed the proposal with the Secretary of Navy. He first suggested that the Navy purchase finished products for normal day-to-day requirements. However, this was not feasible since the Navy had contractual commitments for petroleum in this area with the Dutch East Indian fields. Moffett then suggested that a naval oil reserve be set aside; but the Secretary of the Navy stated that appropriations were not available for such purchase. It appears that the views of Secretary Knox in the matter undoubtedly were affected by the adverse recommendations contained in a study of May 17, 1941, prepared at his request by Rear Adm. H. A. Stuart, USN, in charge of naval petroleum reserves. The adverse recommendations were based on the high paraffinicity and a relative high sulfur content of the Saudi Arabian oil, stating, in part, "purely from an operating standpoint this fuel could be used but again its use is highly inadvisable in naval vessels on account of its high sulfur content, 3.9 percent." It should be noted that despite this report of May 17, 1941, the Navy purchased Arabian oil and used large quantities with apparent success in 1945 and succeeding years. In explanation, the Navy Department forwarded a paper to this committee entitled "Discussions of Quality of Arabian Oil," dated June 12, 1947, wherein the following conclusions were made:

"(1) The method of production since 1945 has been different and produces products different from those which Admiral Stuart envisaged * * *.

"(2) It is probable that the crude oil currently being processed has a somewhat lower sulfur content than that which would have been processed in 1941.

"Admiral Stuart did state, incorrectly, that sulfur content of fuel oil was in 1941 limited to 1.0 percent, and hence the Arabian fuel oil which ran at 3.9 percent would therefore be unacceptable."

The position taken by the Navy that it could not use the oil did not abate the companies' efforts to obtain funds from the United States Government for the King of Saudi Arabia. In May 1941 Moffett and Rodgers, president of the Texas Corp., met with Jesse H. Jones, Secretary of Commerce and Federal Loan Administrator, to discuss direct financial assistance for King ibn-Saud and left with him an opinion by the attorneys for the company which set forth detailed legal reasons why aid could be proffered Saudi Arabia under the newly approved Lend-Lease Act.

Following the conference with Jesse Jones, Moffett again went to the White House and talked with Messrs. Stephen Early and Harry L. Hopkins, aides to the President. On June 14, 1941, Mr. Hopkins sent a personal and confidential letter on White House stationery to Mr. Jones, stating:

"The President is anxious to find a way to do something about this matter. I am enclosing confidential correspondence from the White House so you can see what goes on."

The Federal Loan Administrator, Mr. Jesse H. Jones, replied July 22, 1941, saying in part:

"There appears no legal way that we can help the King, so, with the approval of the President, I suggested to Lord Halifax and Sir Frederick Phillips, also Mr. Neville Butler, that they arrange to continue taking care of the King."

Jesse Jones apprised Moffett by letter dated August 11, 1941, that it was "clearly the responsibility of the British to furnish the King with aid," and on October 9, 1941, Jones forwarded the following letter to Moffett:

"DEAR MR. MOFFETT: With further reference to your request that aid be provided by our Government for King ibn-Saud, through an advance of several million dollars, beg to advise I am informed that funds cannot be advanced to the King under the Lend-Lease Act, and no Government agency has the authority to provide the King with funds.

"I discussed the matter with the President and the Secretary of State. They were both sympathetic with the King's needs and regretted that our Government was not in a position to make a loan, or an advance on oil royalties that may accrue to him through leases held by your company at some future date.

"At the instance of the President and the Secretary I suggested to the British Ambassador that Britain consider providing King ibn-Saud with such funds as in its opinion were necessary to meet his requirements.

"The oil companies interested might, if they wanted to do so, work out some arrangement between the British Government and the King."

Rodgers testified that while he was not certain, he thought they had asked for a copy of this letter from the Federal Loan Administrator in order to show it to King ibn-Saud since they "didn't want the British to run away with all of the credit on this thing."

While the grant of indirect United States aid through the British was not precisely the method of aid desired by the companies, the testimony of Mr. Moffett during the hearings is significant in this respect:

"The CHAIRMAN. Following this, were the advances which were made by the British Government to King ibn-Saud over the period of the next few months and years, which kept him quiet; is that right?

"Mr. MOFFETT. That is true, as far as I know; yes, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. So that the British Government were making advances in connection with funds we were advancing them, although it was illegal for our Government at that time to make any advances of this character?

"Mr. MOFFETT. But this, to my mind, seemed an unusually happy solution to the situation. Because it was a collateral loan, and I knew Mr. Jones pretty well, and I talked to him a good deal about the loan and the type of collateral he was getting. And it seemed to me that from every standpoint, from the commercial standpoint, it did not involve our Government in the Palestine and Trans-Jordan situation, and the King was going to get his money, when he needed it, and that would keep him quiet in India, and the whole thing was such that everybody was happy.

"The CHAIRMAN. This accomplished what you and the oil companies were after, in keeping ibn-Saud quiet from his agitation for more money, so it could not at that time be advanced?

"Mr. MOFFETT. Yes, sir."

At an appearance before another Senate committee while discussing the letter of October 9, 1941, from Hon. Jesse H. Jones, Mr. W. S. S. Rodgers, chairman of the board of the Texas Co., expressed the following view:

"Question. Are we to conclude from that that these advances have been made by England since that date and have been done at the suggestion of the Government of the United States?

"Mr. RODGERS. Yes, sir."

The record indicates that the furnishing of aid to King ibn-Saud was achieved through indirect American lend-lease, although the method was not in full accord with the Moffett original proposals.

Fred A. Davies, present vice president of Aramco, testified:

"We felt all through here that the money that the Saudi Arabian Government was receiving from the British was in effect money that we had passed over to the British."

The story of the Moffett proposal would be incomplete without examination into the Saudi Arabian end of the negotiations. Without the knowledge of King ibn-Saud, Aramco, taking the initiative, sought to obtain a lend-lease grant for Saudi Arabia from United States to relieve themselves of the burden of supplying the King with funds. When King

ibn-Saud learned of this action he expressed his anger to the company representatives. A cable, exhibit 2571, dated April 19, 1941, to Davies from the Aramco field office in Saudi Arabia, states:

"Message stated that F. A. Davies had promised to endeavor to persuade company itself to increase loan offered to figure of $6,000,000, and that placing faith in that promise, Government had closed all other doors to financial assistance which at that time had been open to it. Message continued that King knew that he could borrow money from United States Government if he so wished; and that if he did so wish, he would do so directly, and not through company, and that, furthermore, in that case he would not restrict himself to requesting such inadequate sum. Message suggested company itself borrow money from United States Government in case it needed financial help in order to keep its promise to him and concluded stating he would not only expect but insist upon company keeping its promise to him."

The King evidently wished to deal directly with the United States Government as is indicated from excerpts of a cable dated April 21, 1941, marked "Exhibit 2572," sent to F. A. Davies by Aramco Field Office in Saudi Arabia:

"Last night King telegraphed his answer to Feisal and dispatched cable to Saudi Arab Legation at Egypt requesting them to advise new American Minister to proceed to Jedda by plane as soon as possible. * * *

"In view of imminent arrival of American Minister and discussions likely to be held between him and Prince Feisal hope to receive soon advice as to any developments in Washington."

The oil companies were reluctant to have the head of the Saudi Arabian Government consult with the designated representative of the United States Government and showed concern over the possibility of such a meeting. A cable dated April 23, 1941, marked "Exhibit 2574," to Davies from Aramco field office contains the following excerpt:

"By Egyptian Legation as well as by Saudi Arab Government I have been informed that American Minister to Egypt definite plans to fly to Jedda. Would appreciate any information you can develop in this connection."

That Aramco was able to control the situation and had great persuasive powers with the State Department, cannot be doubted. Exhibit 2576 dated April 30, 1941, set forth in full states:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *April 30, 1941.*

Ohliger.
Calkhobar.
San Franciscoradio.

PC 277 Lenahan (companies representative) Kirk (United States Minister at Cairo) has been instructed not to leave Cairo for Jedda without first cabling Washington for any special instructions. No such cable yet received.

DAVIES.

The companies' manipulation in the State Department continued; they sought to serve as an intermediary in the dealings between the United States Government and the Saudi Arabian Government in order that they should derive the benefits of any advances made by the United States to the King of Saudi Arabia. This is clearly set forth in cable dated October 8, 1941, to Davies, marked "Exhibit 2606" in the record:

"[Coded]

"(Via Calkhobar)

"DJEDDAH, *October 8, 1941.*
Received S. F. October 8, 1941.

"DAVIES,
"200 Bush St., S. F.:

"305. Informed by director of mines that about 8 or 9 weeks ago King sent messenger by motor car to American Minister at Cairo requesting financial assistance from United States Government that messenger was kept waiting in Cairo for 7 weeks and that he is now on his return to Riyadh with reply traveling via Baghdad. Director of mines states that he knew nothing about matter until informed by Minister of Finance in Taif few days ago. He says he thinks King hoping to get $10,000,000. If messenger's departure from Riyadh reported correctly, do not understand why no intimation given to W. J. Lenahan and cannot guarantee accuracy of report, but suggest that you immediately check with Washington if possible as would be most embarrassing if Government learns result of your Washington negotiations before I do, particularly if final decision unfavorable."

The oil companies claimed the indirect lend-lease of United States money through Britain as their accomplishment as may be seen from the following cables, exhibit 2612, dated 10/28/41, Davies to Aramco Field Office:

"SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *October 28, 1941.*

"Ohliger.
"Calkhobar.

"Pc. 321. Lebkicher. Our 311. Direct United States financial assistance not available now, although may be possible reopen question later. However, President has formally expressed to British Ambassador through Jesse Jones his desire that British supply King with necessary funds. It is based on fact that although United States cannot advance funds directly to Saudi Arabia under existing legislation it is assisting British very materially and does wish Saudi Arabia to receive assistance required. Above information may be passed on informally to Saudi Arabian Government if you think advisable."

Exhibit 2615 states:

"Cable No. 312. Lebkicher to Davies, October 31: Re your 321, gratified with results."

Exhibit 2618 states:

"[Coded]

"(Via Calkhobar)

"DJEDDAH, *November 7, 1941.*
"Received S. F. November 7, 1941.

"DAVIES,
"200 Bush St., S. F.:

"Pc 316 Have had meetings during the past few days with Emir Feisal, Minister of Finance, and Yasseen. All have been so extremely cordial that I feel confident planned high-pressure campaign for additional money this year has been averted by logic of our position, our firmness, and your success Washington, also by Director of Mines convincing others that any further attempts on us useless and that they should be very grateful for help company has given. Believe they are grateful and that Government relations now on very sound friendly basis."

The oil companies applied to the United States Government for a grant of lend-lease aid to the King of Saudi Arabia without his knowledge and consent. They did so to relieve themselves of the onerous burden of supplying him with $6,000,000 a year to meet his budgetary deficiencies caused by the loss of his usual sources of revenue.

The United States Government effectively arranged for aid to the King of Saudi Arabia indirectly through the British, which ultimately cost the United States the sum of $51,000,000.

In return for the indirect lend-lease aid to Saudi Arabia and relief of the oil companies from the pressure of the King's demands for additional loans, the oil companies offered to arrange to sell fuel oil to the United States at 40 cents a barrel; Diesel oil at 75 cents a barrel; and gasoline at 3½ cents a gallon.

The negotiations were not conducted on a formal basis by either the oil companies or the United States Government. Good faith was implicit in their dealings. The Government had every right to expect the oil companies to honor their moral, if not their legal, obligation and to supply oil at the prices fixed in their proposals.

In fact, substantially everything the companies asked the United States Government to do was done by their own admission. The performance differed only in method. The results sought by the oil companies were accomplished. Despite this fact the oil companies did not fulfill their part—furnishing oil at 40 cents a barrel. They received all the benefits and in return ignored their promises.

The Rodgers proposal

The financial needs of King Ibn Saud during 1941 and 1942 were substantially met by advances from the British Government. By the end of 1942 Great Britain assumed a position of increased importance in Saudi Arabia because of the financial advances being made to the King with money obtained from the United States. The situation reached a point where it appeared that Great Britain would become intrenched as the financial adviser and backer of the Saudi Arabian Government.

This state of affairs alarmed the oil companies, and in January and February of 1943, their representatives came to Washington to ask the United States Government to change the aid from indirect to direct lend-lease to Saudi Arabia. Rodgers and H. D. Collier, chairman of the board of the Standard Oil Co. of California, made appointments with Harold L. Ickes, Frank Knox, Henry L. Stimson, Secretaries of the Interior, Navy, and War, respectively, and Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State, and James V. Forrestal, Under Secretary of the Navy, to enlist their support in a campaign for direct lend-lease aid to Saudi Arabia in lieu of indirect aid via the British.

Secretary Ickes, Rodgers, and Collier held a conference in the office of the Secretary on February 5, 1943. Mr. Ickes testified that he told these gentlemen to get some facts to him right away so that the matter could be brought to the President's attention.

On February 8, 1943, Mr. W. S. S. Rodgers addressed Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, the following letter:

"Referring to the discussion between yourself and Messrs. Ralph K. Davies and H. D. Collier and myself, in Washington last week, relative to Saudi Arabia:

"It is our suggestion that you try to arrange a meeting with Secretary Knox and Secretary Stimson and with Under Secretary James V. Forrestal and Under Secretary Robert P. Patterson for some time during the middle of this week. Mr. H. D. Collier and I will be in Washington and will be available for the meeting at any time from about Wednesday noon until the end of the week.

"In order that you and those mentioned above will have an understanding of this Saudi Arabian situation and what we have in mind, I am enclosing herewith a brief memorandum on the subject. Probably you will wish to send copies of this memorandum to Secretary Knox and Secretary Stimson as a matter of convenience to them, and I am attaching a few extra copies of it for your use in the event that you wish to do this.

"We would appreciate it very much if you can arrange this meeting and will communicate with us as to the time."

A copy of the memorandum referred to in Mr. Rodger's letter of February 8, 1943, follows:

"Memorandum: California-Arabian Standard Oil Co., a company jointly owned by the Standard Oil Co. of California and the Texas Co., holds in Saudi Arabia an oil concession embracing approximately 250,000 square miles—an area approximately equal

in size to the States of California and Oregon. This concession was granted by King Ibn Saud to American interests after keen competition and pressure from the nationals and governments of the major powers of Europe—the King at that time having clearly expressed his preference for dealing with Americans.

"To date drilling on three of the many structures in this area has resulted in discovery of three major oil fields from one of which oil is being currently shipped. Operations on a fourth structure are now starting. The extent of Saudi Arabian reserves will not be known at all accurately until much additional drilling is done. It is known, however, that they are measured in billions of barrels and are of the same order of magnitude as the great reserves of Iran and Iraq.

"The importance of this vast reserve of American-controlled petroleum becomes increasingly apparent as demands on production within the United States point more and more to a decrease in our national reserves and an increase in national consumption. Maximum efficient production from all domestic wells will soon be insufficient to meet this country's expanding consumption and exports. Additions to United States reserves during the past several years have been far short of those required to maintain either current or future production.

"In addition to carrying on its exploration work, California-Arabian Standard Oil Co. has endeavored to relieve the wartime financial problems of the Saudi Arabian Government by advancing large sums against future royalties—the Government's debt to the company today being approximately $10,000,000. These advances have offset in part the King's loss of revenue from such customary sources as the annual pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina. California-Arabian Standard Oil Co.'s financial asistance has not been adequate to meet all of the financial requirements of the Government. However, it has been impossible for this company in this period to further finance the needs of the Saudi Arabian Government due to the limitations of its own revenue.

"To further the cause of the United Nations in strategically located Saudi Arabia and in the Moslem world, as a whole, the British Government has in the past 2 or 3 years made substantial advances to the Saudi Arabian Government in cash and supplies. Such British assistance, made possible by the aid which the British Government has been receiving from the United States Government, now totals in excess of $20,000,000.

"In lieu of continuing these cash advances, the British Government is now insisting that Saudi Arabian financial requirements be met by an internal note issue backed by a British bank and controlled by the British Currency Control Board—the practice followed in British or British-controlled territory.

"Concern is felt over the rapidly increasing British economic influence in Saudi Arabia because of the bearing it may have on the continuation of purely American enterprise there after the war.

"Direct aid from the United States Government to the Saudi Arabian Government instead of indirect aid through the British as at present would check this tendency and give some assurance that the reserve of oil in Saudi Arabia will remain under control of Americans; and consequently remain available to American economy and to American naval and military forces of the future. The Middle East oil reserve is without question the world's greatest oil reserve—and including Russia may well produce as much oil as the remainder of the world. The American participation in that reserve is as follows:

Country	American participation	English participation
	Percent	*Percent*
Iran	None	100
Iraq	23¾	[1] 52½
Qatar	23¾	[1] 52½
Kuwait	50	50
Saudi Arabia	100	None

[1] 76¼ percent if French share included.

"One manner in which direct aid might be extended to the Saudi Arabian Government by the United States Government is through the machinery of lend-lease, as follows:

"1. The British Government's present creditor position could be transferred to the United States by crediting to the British Government's lend-lease debt to the United States the amount now owed by the Saudi Arabian Government to the British Government. Were this done California-Arabian Standard Oil Co. would be willing to set aside as a reserve for the United States an amount of oil having an equivalent value at a rate to be agreed upon. Such oil or the equivalent amount of oil products could be made available to the United States Government at prices well under world prices and reflecting only the production costs, including royalty, plus manufacturing costs in the case of products, plus a nominal profit.

"2. To assure the United States Government of additional reserves and also the recovery of at least part of additional lend-lease aid to Saudi Arabia, California-Arabian Standard Oil Co. would be willing to set aside additional oil under a similar agreement to the above.

"3. Furthermore, the California-Arabian Standard Oil Co. would be willing for a certain period of time to give the United States Government an option on a specified number of barrels of crude or the equivalent products thereof at an agreed-upon percentage of the going price in the world markets for such crude oil or products at the time the United States Government elected to take delivery.

"These are suggestions that we are making for a starting point in carrying forward further discussions.

"Thus Saudi Arabia would receive the help needed directly from the United States Government instead of indirectly as at present. United States prestige would be enhanced and the United States armed forces assured of a 100-percent-owned reserve of great magnitude in a neutral country in a portion of the world where it does not have such reserve, and at prices less than such oil could be purchased elsewhere even if available.

"Construction of refinery and pipe-line facilities now being studied by various United States Government agencies would further strengthen as well as increase the flexibility of such an arrangement."

Testimony before the committee and the diary of Mr. Ickes show that on February 16, 1943, the subject was discussed with the President, who was very much interested and "his mind at once moved to the conclusion on the analogy of not only Great Britain, but of other European governments, that our economy and our own ability to fend for ourselves in time of war would be greatly increased if we had an interest in this big oil pool, and so we moved in right away to try to acquire some interest."

On February 18, 1943, 2 days after the President conferred with the Secretary of the Interior and Petroleum Administrator for War, he issued the following directive to the Lend-Lease Administrator:

"DEAR MR. STETTINIUS: For purpose of implementing the authority conferred upon you as Lend-Lease Administrator, by Executive Order No. 8926, dated October 28, 1941, and in order to enable you to arrange for lend-lease aid to the Government of Saudi Arabia, I hereby find that the defense of Saudi Arabia is vital to the defense of the United States.

"Sincerely yours,

"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT."

The United States Government, by the letter above quoted, had at last taken the action long sought by the Saudi Arabian oil interests. This Government was not in a position to accept the benefits of Mr. Rodgers' proposal because the United States did not have immediate need for the oil at that time.

Various means designed to enable the United States Government to safeguard future oil sources in Saudi Arabia were considered and discussed; among the possibilities were the acquisitions of stock of Aramco, options on oil in the ground in the Saudi Arabian fields, the construction and control of pipe lines and refineries.

The United States had a precedent for the purchase of the stock control of Aramco. Winston Churchill, former Prime Minister of England, had as long ago as 1913 bought control of the Anglo-Iranian Co., which held large concessions in the Persian Gulf area. He was motivated by the desire to protect and secure future oil supply cheaply for the British Navy. The United States Government was now in a position to secure the same advantage.

The methods of accepting the companies' proposals were discussed by Secretary Knox, Secretary Ickes, State Department officials, and Mr. Jesse Jones of the RFC. After a conference, the Petroleum Reserve Corporation was formed and Secretary Ickes was delegated to negotiate for the stock control of the company in the interest of national defense and the economic needs of the Nation. The negotiations were unsuccessful.

With regard to the attempts to purchase all or part of the stock of Aramco, Secretary Ickes testified that he encountered resistance on the part of the oil companies to the sale of their stock. He stated that first the Standard Oil Co. of California went through the motions of agreeing to terms, then the Texas Co. would hold out, they would then reverse their positions—Texas Co. would agree and Standard Oil of California would hold out. Secretary Ickes attributed the reluctance of the oil companies to part with their stock to the fact that by this time Rommel had been chased out of north Africa and they felt secure in their concession, and more disposed to thumb their nose at us.

Rodgers admitted to objection on the part of the companies to the sale of their stock in Aramco. This attitude reached a point where they resorted to other means to discourage stock acquisition by the Government, and Secretary Ickes testified:

"They came up here to the Hill and built a fire under us on the theory that this was an attempt on the part of the Government to take over a private business enterprise, which, of course, was against the American tradition, as they put it, and perhaps was. But this was more than a business enterprise. This involved the defense and safety of the country, and I felt that if there ever should be an exception, it would be proper in that case and that we ought to have some oil reserves. The best way to have those reserves was to have a participating share in this company."

In connection with the unsuccessful negotiations for the purchase of Aramco's stock, James F. Byrnes, then head of the Office of War Mobilization, sent the following note to

the President on January 25, 1944, calling attention to the companies' attitude:

"Memorandum for the President on Mid-East oil: In the hope that it may contribute to a clearer understanding of the above proposal, I submit the following: Last June Secretary Knox and Secretary Ickes asked me to request officials of the State Department and the War Department to meet them to consider the Mid-East oil situation. As a result of the conference, I requested Jesse Jones to establish a Petroleum Reserves Corporation before the power of RFC to create corporations expired June 30, 1943. It was agreed we would press for the construction of a refinery. WPB was asked to allot materials, which was done shortly thereafter. I understand that thereafter at a meeting held in your office, it was agreed between the agencies that Secretary Ickes should negotiate with the Standard and the Texas companies to purchase a majority of the stock of the corporation owned by these two companies, which corporation has the Saudi Arabian oil concession.

"Secretary Ickes was unable to purchase the stock at a fair price. He was right in refusing because the companies tried to drive a hard bargain."

The negotiations for the acquisition of Aramco by the United States Government thus ended unsuccessfully and were never resumed. Because of the lack of integration in the executive departments with respect to petroleum, the proposals held out by the companies for setting up oil reserves (par. 2, Rodgers proposal) can option to purchase at well under world prices, or at an agreed-upon percentage of such prices (par. 3, Rodgers proposal) were completely lost sight of by the different governmental agencies and further action was never taken.

The oil companies had come to the United States Government for a grant of financial assistance and once again succeeded in getting what they wanted. Direct lend-lease by the United States was made available to the King in large amounts. The danger of British control over the finances of Saudi Arabia and the consequent danger to Aramco's concessions and earnings were removed by this action of the United States Government.

However, Aramco has taken the position that the conditions precedent to the Rodgers proposal were not complied with by the United States and therefore impliedly the oil companies owed no obligation to the Government. They contend that their proposal was conditioned on the United States transferring to itself the British Government's present creditor position by crediting to the British Government's lend-lease debt to the United States, the amount now owed by the Saudi Arabian Government to the British Government. This contention in the committee's opinion carried little weight. If the United States had credited the United Kingdom with the amount of its advances to Saudi Arabia the responsibility of the companies would have increased considerably. They would have been required to match the amount of advances with low-price oil in a corresponding amount.

The money advanced by British lend-lease has been admitted by the oil companies to be United States money. There have been no attempts made to collect this money. The oil companies took credit for obtaining the indirect United States aid through British lend-lease and represented to the King of Saudi Arabia that this was their accomplishment.

But more to the point is the fact that the companies overlook that they specified in the proposal that this was * * * one manner on which direct aid might be extended to the Saudi Arabian Government by the United States * * *, and they overlook the second and third paragraphs of this proposal.

Under paragraph 2 of February 8, 1943, proposal, the companies in consideration for the extension of this direct aid to Saudi Arabia, offered to set aside a reserve in oil to be made available to the United States Government, at prices well under world prices and reflecting only production costs, including royalty, plus manufacturing costs in the case of products, plus a nominal profit.

Paragraph 3 Rodgers proposal of February 8, 1943 (provided as further inducement for the United States to grant direct lend-lease) the companies offered an option at a percentage of the going prices, to be agreed upon, in the world markets for crude oil at the time the United States Government elected to take delivery.

At the committee hearing the oil companies also took the position that the offer by Rodgers to the Government was not the reason why the United States supplied Saudi Arabia with direct lend-lease aid. The committee feels that this point is not well taken. The fact is that the oil companies made a proposal to their Government in time of war, representing that if it were met the Government in turn could expect to buy oil from them at cost plus a reasonable profit. The Government did comply substantially by providing direct lend-lease aid to Saudi Arabia. As will be shown later, the companies failed to supply oil to their Government at cost plus a reasonable profit when the need for the oil arose. They refused to supply oil to the United States except on their own terms even though the urgency of the need for oil was extreme.

Pipe-line negotiations

The history of the negotiations would be incomplete without a brief discussion of the pipe-line negotiations. The Petroleum Reserves Corporation negotiated a draft contract in January and February 1944, with the California Arabian Standard Oil Co. and with the Gulf Oil Corp. (which held a half interest in the oil resources of the adjacent sheikdom of Kuwait) which contract called for governmental financing of a $165,000,000 pipe line from Arabia and Kuwait to the Mediterranean. The Government financial interest in the line was to be amortized over a period of 25 years and additionally the Government was to receive an option to purchase up to 1,000,000,000 barrels of oil from Saudi Arabia at a discount of 25 percent off the prevailing price for crude oil.

This proposal met with immediate and articulate opposition from almost all segments of the American oil industry which regarded the Government financial participation as constituting the opening wedge of Government penetration into oil industry operations. The project was subsequently withdrawn.

United States Government financial assistance to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Financial Assistance

The United States Government, partly in an effort to aid Aramco and preserve its concessions, implemented the general resources of the British from time to time by lend-lease and other assistance. This included the RFC loan of 1941 out of which the Federal Loan Administrator, at the request of President Roosevelt, suggested to responsible British officials that they should take care of the King of Saudi Arabia.

Between 1940 and 1943 the British Government provided financial assistance to the Government of Saudi Arabia in the neighborhood of $40,000,000. All British aid was an outright grant, with no provision for repayment of either interest or principal.

As shown above, in 1943 the representatives of the Arabian Oil Co. successfully sought the financial assistance of this Government for direct lend-lease to avoid the danger of possible British financial control of Arabia.

After the President's determination in February 1943 of Saudi Arabia's eligibility for direct lend-lease, this Government entered into a joint program with the British in providing the necessary assistance to maintain political and economic stability in Saudi Arabia. Arrangements were made with the British to meet Saudi Arabian requirements on a basis of the best source of supply, with equal participation as to dollar values between the British and the United States.

The financial assistance received by the Government of Saudi Arabia under this arrangement by the United States and United Kingdom during the period 1940–47 is summarized as follows:

Probably nonrecoverable	
British grants sterling equivalent of approximate	$51,000,000
United States credit lend-lease:	
Joint United States-United Kingdom aid; United States share	11,000,000
1945 supplemental United States aid	3,000,000
1945 United States-United Kingdom military aid; United States share	3,000,000
Transportation costs on silver, approximate	136,000
Silver lost at sea	733,000
Total United States lend-lease aid, approximate	17,869,000
Airports constructed at Dhahran and Laqua after VJ-day, approximate	3,600,000
Total probably nonrecoverable, approximate	72,469,000
Probably recoverable	
United States lend-lease silver bullion	15,000,000
United States Export-Import Bank credit	10,000,000
United States surplus property credit	2,000,000
Total probably recoverable	27,000,000
Total probably nonrecoverable and probably recoverable	99,469,000

A brief explanation of the above items follows:

United States-United Kingdom joint aid: This amount of approximately $11,000,000 consisted of the United States share of the joint-aid program up to VJ-day. Important items supplied were cereals, sugar, cotton piece goods, and transport equipment.

1945 supplemental United States aid: When lend-lease was terminated on August 17, 1945, the directive did not apply to certain excepted countries, including Saudi Arabia, which had minimum requirements for aid over and above the amount of the joint-aid program. Accordingly, the United States lend-leased about $3,000,000 worth of goods in addition to those contemplated by the joint-aid program.

1945 United States-United Kingdom military aid; United States share: In 1944 it was agreed by the United States and British armed forces that it was desirable to provide certain military items for the purpose of safeguarding internal security of Saudi Arabia. Armaments, munitions, vehicles, and other military goods of about $3,000,000 worth were delivered under military lend-lease. "Internal security" has interesting overtones.

Transportation costs on silver: 5,167,000 ounces of silver bullion for minting of 15,000,000 rial coins were lend-leased to the

Government of Saudi Arabia from United States Treasury stocks of free silver. This item covers transportation costs of inland and ocean freight for movement of this bullion to Saudi Arabia.

Silver lost at sea: Silver in an amount of 1,031,250 ounces was lost at sea while en route to Saudi Arabia. Since this silver had not been physically delivered to Saudi Arabian Government, American authorities considered it inappropriate to require that Government to undertake an obligation to return in kind the additional silver required to replace that lost. Accordingly, the cost of the lost silver was charged to the general Saudi Arabian lend-lease account.

Airports Constructed at Dhahran and Laqua After VJ-day

Little more than a year prior to VJ-day the War Department concluded that a substantial military necessity existed for acquisition and development on a United States military airfield at Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, for use in the redeployment of troops to and from the Far East. There was considerable delay in making preliminary engineering surveys due to British opposition on the ground that no military necessity for the airfield existed. In the late spring of 1945 the objections by the British were resolved. Equipment and personnel for construction began to assemble at the site about the 1st of August 1945. On August 15, 1945, just 1 day after VJ-day, Army engineers took occupancy of land granted by the King that was located 3½ miles from the Aramco settlement of Dhahran near the Persian Gulf.

It became apparent to the War Department that the military usefulness of the Dhahran airfield might not exist at the time of its completion. There also arose doubt as to the legality of constructing the field with War Department funds following the close of the Japanese war. In September 1945 the President in a memorandum to the Acting Secretary of State approved the completion of the construction of the Dhahran airfield, and its auxiliary facilities, by the War Department at its own expense provided, among other reasons, that the Congress either approve for this purpose the use of War Department funds already appropriated, or that the Congress make an additional appropriation therefor. The War Department obtained congressional approval for the use of the funds already appropriated and completed the installation in the early summer of 1946. One of the reasons advanced for the construction of the airfield was the determination under the Potsdam agreement to withdraw our troops from Iran before January 1, 1946. It is to be noted, however, that the airfield was not completed until long after this date. Effective troop repatriation was completed before the field was in a condition to accommodate even the smallest transport planes. Testimony at the committee hearings revealed that Aramco is the principal beneficiary of this field. Between August 15, 1945, and March 1946 there was expended in the neighborhood of three and one-half million dollars for a fully equipped modern airfield that could accommodate the largest type of aircraft. The United States Government under the terms of the concession may operate this base for a period of 3 years after the cessation of hostilities against Japan at which time the land and all improvements thereon will revert to the King.

At Laqua, approximately half-way between Dhahran and Cairo, Egypt, an emergency landing field was built at a cost slightly less than $200,000. This installation became the property of the Saudi Arabian Government in early 1946.

United States Lend-Lease Silver Bullion

Paper money has never been acceptable to the Sunni Moslems of Saudi Arabia, who are strict observers of the religious tenets set forth in the Koran, including the requirement that goods and services shall be acquired only in exchange for other goods and services of equivalent intrinsic value. The King and Aramco needed coins to finance governmental expenditures and salaries of the Arab employees.

Approximately 22,350,000 ounces of silver bullion were provided the Saudi Arabian Government, of which it is obligated to return about 21,320,000 ounces. This bullion was used in the manufacture of royal coins. The coins were minted by the United States Mint, the expense of minting and shipping about one-third of the coins ($136,000) and the cost of silver lost at sea (about $700,000) being charged to the general lend-lease account of the Saudi Arabian Government, with the costs of minting and shipping the remainder paid in cash by the Government of Saudi Arabia.

United States Export-Import Bank Credit

On April 12, 1945, the Export-Import Bank authorized a line of credit, not to exceed $5,000,000, for Saudi Arabia. Before any definite arrangements were reached regarding products eligible for financing, this authorization was superseded by the bank's action of January 3, 1946, which authorized a line of credit not to exceed $25,000,000 in favor of Saudi Arabia for acquisition and transportation of United States materials, equipment, and services for use in development projects in Saudi Arabia in the amount of $5,000,000. There was also $20,000,000 for acquisition and transportation of other United States products and services. On August 9, 1946, the credit of $10,000,000 was established out of the afore-mentioned authorization of $25,000,000 by agreement concluded between the kingdom and the bank to cover the following items: Cereals and grains; sugar; textiles; agricultural tools and machinery and supplies; automotive equipment; medical, sanitarium, and hospital equipment and supplies; and transportation and incidental costs. Out of this $10,000,000 credit which had been established, there has been disbursed approximately $7,000,000.

King ibn-Saud is said to be of the opinion that a railway from the Persian Gulf (Dammam) to the capital, Riyadh, would furnish the soundest type of transportation. The Minister of Finance requested the bank to give this project their immediate consideration. The bank stated in reply that it would be prepared to permit the utilization of a portion of its existing credit to Saudi Arabia for financing such a study. The bank pointed out that any financing extended by it toward the construction of a railroad would be within the limits of the $15,000,000 not yet contracted for out of the $25,000,000 authorized in 1946.

United States Surplus-Property Credit

On May 25, 1946, an agreement was signed with the Kingdom extending a line of credit in the amount of $2,000,000 for the purchase of United States surplus property, calling for repayment in dollars in five annual installments, commencing June 1, 1947, and terminating June 1, 1951. By early 1947, $1,567,603.68 of this line of credit had been obligated, and all but about $100,000 of this amount was delivered to Saudi Arabia. Principal categories of material sold include aircraft machinery and apparatus, construction machinery, aircraft and spares, motor vehicles, textiles, rubber products, tools, and utensils. The largest single sale was of surplus equipment at the Dhahran Airport for material whose procurement cost was about $2,600,000, sold for about $800,000.

Lend-Lease Settlement

Official reports state when the matter of extending lend-lease aid to Saudi Arabia was considered it was felt that special circumstances existed which should affect the nature of the final settlement. These circumstances included the Saudi Arabian contribution to the United Nations cause, the strategic location of the country, and the numerous benefits inherent to the United States in maintaining a free and independent Government of Saudi Arabia. The Saudi Arabian Government has interpreted the absence of a settlement agreement as meaning the United States would not ask repayment for such aid. In view of these considerations, no stipulations as regards final settlement have ever been made.

The Foreign Economic Administration did not require Saudi Arabia to enter into an agreement to pay for the value of goods supplied after VJ-day, in view of the circumstances which led to lend-lease aid and by direction of the President and the Secretary of State. Goods requisitioned prior to VJ-day were delivered thereafter, both items included in the joint-aid program and items included in the supplementary lend-lease aid operations.

The United States Government through lend-lease and other means has furnished the major portion of over $99,000,000 given to the Saudi Arabian Government. Of this sizable sum only $27,000,000 is classified as probably recoverable; the balance of over $72,000,000 is considered as probably nonrecoverable.

Purchase of Saudi Arabian oil from Aramco by the Navy Department

The initial procurement of crude oil from Aramco by the Navy Department was made in July 1945 for delivery to the French Government under lend-lease. The Navy had been assigned procurement responsibility for petroleum products within the terms of the Lend-Lease Act. It was recognized that the terms of the first contract with a new vendor could (and did) have a far-reaching effect on future dealings with the seller as it would serve as a precedent.

The officer in charge of the Purchase Section, Fuel and Lubricants Division, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, Commander A. A. MacKrille, United States Naval Reserve, received a requisition from the Requirements Section of his Division to purchase crude oil from Aramco. Realizing the importance of a first purchase from the designated vendor, MacKrille's subordinate officers conducted investigations within Government agencies to learn whether the quoted price of $1.05 per barrel, f. a. s. Persian Gulf, was reasonable. MacKrille testified that his staff depended principally on files from the Petroleum Administration for War as it was considered that PAW had excellent cost experts.

The records obtained from the files of PAW disclosed that this agency had previously refused to accept an evaluation of Arabian crude based on the prices of West Texas Permian crudes which are said to be similar in character to the Arabian crude. PAW made an exhaustive analysis of the costs of Arabian crude in connection with the construction of a refinery financed mainly by the United States Government for 100-octane aviation gasoline on the Island of Bahrein and rejected the price quoted by Bahrein of $1.02 per barrel. They stated that a price less than 84 cents a barrel for the Arabian crude, f. a. s. Bahrein was justifiable.

A quotation from the report on the subject of value of the crude oil follows:

"We have refused to accept this evaluation of Arabian crude because it appears to us that its comparative value with reference to domestic crude is not a proper criterion and because the prewar sales of Arabian crude * * * were at prices considerably lower than $1.02 per barrel. Specifically we understand that the company owning the Arabian crude had a contract with a Japanese firm calling for the sale of a large volume of this crude at 86 cents per barrel f. a. s. the Arabian coast. We further understand that this contract was canceled by the Japanese as a result of pressure exerted on Dutch East Indian sources of crude oil and as a result of these factors two cargoes

were shipped to the Japanese at a price of 70 cents per barrel f. a. s. the Arabian coast. We do not believe that these latter sales (or certain other small sales which we understand were made for shipment to Mediterranean ports) represent a fair index to the market value of the Arabian crude but we have taken the position that this crude oil should not be evaluated at a price higher than the 86-cents-per-barrel figure contained in the large-scale contract referred to above. We believe this position is justified despite a number of factors which have been pointed out by Bahrein Petroleum Co. indicating that even this 86-cents-per-barrel price does not provide any index of present market value."

The PAW report was considered by the Navy negotiators and was attached to their so-called justification of purchase of crude oil for $1.05 per barrel.

Finally after about 5 weeks of negotiation the Navy agreed to pay exactly what the company asked, namely $1.05 a barrel for crude oil. A written justification for paying this high price was filed in the records of the Navy. One pertinent part of this justification reads as follows:

"This group (representatives of the oil companies) stated that they considered the original pricing of crude oil for 100-octane aviation gasoline for the Defense Supplies Corporation 'that is January 1943' a reasonable and adequate justification for contractor's quotations to Navy, particularly since current royalties to the King of Arabia are now totaling approximately 42 cents per barrel, as compared to the former 21 cents per barrel applicable during the period of negotiations of the DSC contract. In addition, it was reported considerable pressure is being placed on Arabian American to further increase such royalty."

This 21-cent increase was the difference between 84 cents per barrel price fixed as a reasonable price by PAW and the final price in the contract of $1.05. The officials of the oil companies have denied making the representation of an increase in royalty. However, Commander MacKrille, who had conferred with the officers of the oil companies, stated that Mr. Denham, manager of sales for Aramco, told him that the royalty paid to the King might be doubled and that the company was under pressure by the Arabian Government to increase the royalty. The testimony before the committee revealed that there had been no increase in royalty payments. Therefore, the written justification, an official record of the Navy, for an increased price was based on incorrect facts. Accordingly, the point that was stressed mainly in the justification for the increase in price based on an increase in royalty was entirely without foundation.

The matter of possible misrepresentation has been brought to the attention of the Attorney General for investigation by the Navy Department in a letter dated November 12, 1947.

Commander MacKrille also testified that on several occasions he had asked for cost data from the manager of sales for Aramco. He was told that information was not available and that it would be impossible to furnish accurate figures of cost data since the costs of doing business in Arabia were so indefinite.

Mr. James Terry Duce, vice president of Aramco, testified that cost data were compiled monthly for distribution in the director's data book. He stated that at the time of entering into the first Navy contract the cost of production of crude oil was 40.6 cents per barrel. The testimony of Duce directly contradicts the statements alleged to have been made to Commander MacKrille on this subject by Mr. H. G. Denham, sales representative of Aramco.

The negotiating officers on behalf of the Navy testified that the period of negotiation for this purchase extended an unusually long time. They were compelled finally to agree to the original price offered, $1.05 per barrel, solely because of the urgent need for the oil. The following discussion is pertinent:

"Senator HATCH. I have not been able to attend all of these hearings, but the picture you have drawn this morning is not a very pleasant one. I want to know whether I understand the situation correctly, that the contractors submitted their bid of $1.05, their offer to the Government; they refused to give you any information whatever as to costs; realizing the urgency of the situation, the great need for oil, they said in effect 'either pay us this price, take it or leave it.' In other words, was that their attitude?

"Mr. BODENSCHATZ. Yes; I think they referred us to their arguments with the Petroleum Administration for War, where as far as they were concerned, while the Petroleum Administration for War did not accept $1.02 at the well, the contractor argued that they were getting the benefit of that particular $1.02 price that they had requested at the well.

"Senator HATCH. They made no offer of compromise or deviation from their original price whatever?

"Mr. BODENSCHATZ. No, sir.

"Senator HATCH. They said, 'Take this or nothing.'

"Mr. BODENSCHATZ. There was no compromise, no deviation."

Commander MacKrille stated he was reluctant to make this contract since he felt the price quoted was too high and that several times he went back to a superior officer and asked him if there were not some other way to obtain crude oil. He was told it was absolutely impossible, that the oil was needed and he had to take it. While testifying on the matter of costs and allowable profit he agreed that if the companies had disclosed to him their costs he would have refused to pay $1.05 per barrel.

It should be borne in mind that this contract was not for fuel for the fighting forces but crude oil for France via lend-lease. Shortly after this contract Aramco entered into a contract with the Provisional Government of the French Republic for this same crude oil at 95 cents per barrel and subsequently contracted with Société Générale des Huiles de Pétrole for crude at 90 cents per barrel which price remained constant thereafter according to records filed with the committee by Aramco. In addition, one cargo was sold in December 1946, to Administración Nacional de Combustibles Alcohol y Portland, Montevideo, Uruguay, at an approximate price of $1 per barrel, f. o. b. Ras Tanura.

At the same time Aramco was selling Ancap at $1 per barrel in December 1946, it entered into another contract with the Navy for UNRRA at $1.17 to $1.23 per barrel. In explanation the vice president of Aramco testified that the deliveries to France and Uruguay and Japan at lower prices were experimental or spot cargoes that the company wanted to get into the market. The pertinent testimony follows:

"Senator BREWSTER. The curious part of that is that the first sale to the United States Navy for that very period was for France, and was delivered to France, so that your product was being distributed in France by the United States Navy at $1.05 they were paying, and the day before you concluded that contract, you made a contract with the French for 90 cents.

"Mr. DUCE. Right.

"Senator BREWSTER. Is that the record?

"Mr. DUCE. That is the record.

"Senator BREWSTER. How do you reconcile that with the desire to get your product used in France. You were getting a million dollars worth of your product used in France, paid for by the United States Government under lend-lease at $1.05 at the very same time, the day before, you were selling the French for 90 cents.

"Now, Mr. Duce, how do you explain treating your Government, to whom you certainly owe so much in just that way, we have heard a good deal about the most-favored nation?

"Mr. DUCE. Senator, we simply went out to get that business in France, and that is the figure we had to quote to get it.

"Senator BREWSTER. You did not have to quote that figure to get the United States Navy business.

"Mr. DUCE. We quoted a figure to the United States Navy and they took it.

"Senator BREWSTER. Did you tell the Navy in argument about the price that these negotiations had been going on for 4 to 6 weeks, did you tell them that you were going to sell the Franch at 90 cents?

"Mr. DUCE. I do not recall, Senator.

* * * * *

"Mr. DUCE. And I said, Senator, that was an experimental cargo we wanted to get into that market.

"Senator BREWSTER. This is another one of those spot cargoes; everybody in the world seemed to be getting the benefit of the spot-cargo business except the Government, who had put $80,000,000 in to preserve your enterprise, and were being charged these prices which resulted in the profits in 1945 which we have discussed here recently.

"Now do you think you were giving your Government a good break on those situations?

"Mr. DUCE. I think we have always given the Government a good break, Senator.

"Senator BREWSTER. I accept your answer. We have now the Japs at 70 cents, France at 85 to 90 cents, at the same time you are selling $1.05, and now we have Uruguay buying from you at $1, while you are selling your Government at $1.17 to $1.23. That is a record that we have developed here."

With particular reference to the UNRRA contracts Duce testified these were awarded as a result of competitive bidding. This is an erroneous statement. These contracts indicate on their face that they were negotiated under authority of the First War Powers Act, which implemented by Executive Order 9001 waived the requirements of competitive bidding contemplated under section 3709, Revised Statutes.

After the signing of this first contract with Aramco for crude oil, petroleum products were in critical short supply. By the fall of 1945, the Navy was in great need of fuel oil special and Diesel fuel. At that time it was necessary to expedite the vast troop movements throughout the world and especially in the South Pacific theater of operations.

The new, large and modern refinery built by Aramco as Ras Tanura, Saudi Arabia, was completed in October 1945 and went "on stream," i. e. processing crude oil into finished products. In September 1945 Duce went to see Rear Adm. Horace D. Nuber, U. S. N., Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts. He informed the admiral that his company would like to enter into a contract with the Navy for refined products. A contract was entered into on September 13, 1945, at the minimum United States Gulf coast prices for products of similar grade in tanker lots. These prices were as follows: 80 octane motor gasoline at 6½ cents per gallon, fuel oil special at $1.05 per barrel and Diesel oil at $1.68 per barrel.

It was agreed by the Navy representatives that the first contract for $1.05 for crude was largely determinative in the fixing of these prices. In its first sale of refined products, as in the sale of crude oil, Aramco did not furnish these products at the prices quoted in the Moffett offer of 1941 nor at "prices well below world prices" as set forth in the 1943 Rodgers proposal. In fact the prices were much higher than those the sister corporation, Cal-Tex, had charged in prior years. The latter corporation furnished from

Bahrein's refinery fuel oil special for 85 cents per barrel and Diesel oil at $1.25 per barrel from May 1942 to July 1944 and had supplied the Diesel fuel between March and July of 1945 at $1.57½ per barrel.

Cal-Tex was solely a marketing agent and had been in that part of the world for some time. Aramco, a virtual newcomer to the marketing field, on its first major transaction with the Navy, established the United States Gulf coast price for the Persian Gulf area. This action by Aramco had a marked effect. Cal-Tex in its next Navy contract commencing October 1, 1945, closed at prices identical with the price established by Aramco 2½ weeks before with very little question because of the precedent established by the first Aramco contract.

The testimony indicated clearly that the Navy officers were far from diligent in seeking cost records from Aramco. Millions of dollars might have been saved the taxpayers had the Navy insisted on or demanded the cost figures prior to execution of the contract for $1.05 per barrel of crude oil. This failure to establish the bottom price for that commodity and it has remained as a basing price since in all other procurements from the Arabian oil fields.

The Navy Department, during its negotiations for the purchase of oil from Aramco, received information from PAW as to the costs of production of Arabian crude oil and their experts' findings that $1.05 for crude oil in the Arabian area was excessive. Had the Office of Petroleum Administrator for War been consulted or advised that the Navy was being charged $1.05 for this crude oil, he would certainly have taken advantage of the terms of the Moffett offer and the Rodgers proposal as a strong bargaining weapon.

Computations of current figures furnished by the oil companies indicate that in the period of January 1, 1942 to June 30, 1947, Caltex received the sum of $31,946,689.86 from the United States Navy. If the companies had charged the price fixed in the Moffett proposal the Government would have paid only $13,793,098.17, which could have resulted in a saving of $18,153,591.69 to the United States.

Similarly during the period of August 1, 1945, to April 6, 1947, Aramco received the sum of $37,523,478.73 from the United States Navy. Had the company charged the prices fixed in the Moffett proposal the Government would have paid only $17,171,492.31, thus the current figures indicate that Aramco overcharged the United States Government $20,351,986.42.

The total sum paid by the United States Navy in excess of the figures in the Moffett proposal amounts to $38,505,578.11.

When the time came to furnish the United States with oil, the companies' promises were completely forgotten; the oil companies were out to get the best price they could, and instead of honoring their obligations insisted on a price of $1.05 a barrel and not 40 cents a barrel. They disregarded their proposal of February 8, 1943, which promised "a price well under the world prices and reflecting only the production costs, including royalty, plus manufacturing costs, plus a nominal profit."

Accepting the cost figure of 40.6 cents fixed by the vice president of Aramco as the true cost, Aramco profited in excess of 64 cents a barrel on each barrel sold to the United States on the price of $1.05 a barrel charged to the Navy.

A highly revealing document read in evidence shows that the company officials were concerned over the extremely large profits as a result of these Government contracts. In part it reads as follows:

"Reflecting upon the possibility that with contracts now in force, continuing throughout the year, we may have considerable net, suggest you give some thought to a policy of allocating all possible charges against 1946 income.

"We might be in an embarrassing position with some people with whom we have contracts should our net be excessively high. I am recalling present position in Venezuela as result of large earnings of Creole. Also possible effect in Washington.

"J. T. DUCE."

The Government agencies concerned gave considerable assistance to Aramco; the extent to which it went is best shown in a memorandum to the President of the United States from the Director of the Office of War Mobilization, Hon. James F. Byrnes, under date of October 15, 1943, when he stated:

"4. Under lend-lease we have contributed to the British Empire up to July 1, 1943, American petroleum products to the value of $466,000,000 and from American-controlled foreign reserves to the value of $120,000,000. Current lend-lease petroleum expenditures for the use of the British is running at the rate of $60,000,000 per month.

"5. Previously it had been suggested that the British repay in kind our contribution of petroleum products to England and the British colonies, made under lend-lease. Such an arrangement could seriously injure American concessions and interests in Saudi Arabia because this arrangement would practically destroy any market for these latter products and our concessions in that area can only be maintained through use of the reserves."

The oil companies have shown a singular lack of good faith, an avaricious desire for enormous profits, while at the same time they constantly sought the cloak of United States protection and financial assistance to preserve their vast concessions.

Despite the protestations of Rodgers and Duce that they were concerned with holding down the prices of products to the Navy, the oil companies have again advanced prices for Navy requirements at a time of the highest receipts in their history. Products that are now sold to the Navy for $1.05 and $1.68 per barrel will advance to $1.175 and $1.805 per barrel respectively on July 1, 1948, with further advances from $1.175 to $1.48 per barrel and from $1.805 to $2.11 per barrel effective October 1, 1948. (See Appendix IV.)

Avoidance of tax payments through wholly owned foreign subsidiary corporations of United States companies

The representatives of the oil companies made a special effort to impress the committee with the allegation that the parent companies, Standard Oil of California and the Texas Co., paid large amounts in United States taxes.

During the course of the hearings, however, it developed that their subsidiary, Bahrein (Canadian corporation) had accumulated profits and surplus of over $91,000,000 in the course of 15 years on a capital stock of only $100,000. This company, according to the record had paid no taxes to the United States or even to Canada.

The other subsidiary, Cal-Tex (a Bahama corporation), wholly owned by Bahrein, claimed that in the course of 10 years from 1936 to 1946 it had paid the United States Government $1,000,000 in taxes. The payment of this tax must be examined in the light of its financial history. The testimony of its officers shows that it accumulated over $25,000,000 during these years on a capital stock of $1,000,000. Thus the joint earnings of both Cal-Tex and Bahrein has totaled $117,000,000 on a total joint capital stock of only $1,000,000. As much as 90 percent of the earnings of $117,000,000 would have been paid into the United States Treasury by way of taxes had these corporations been subject to United States corporate taxes.

The chairman of the committee has commented on this issue as follows:

"That is what interests us here. It is a liberal education on how corporations organized under foreign flags yet seek the shelter of the American flag, and were constantly coming here seeking the United States to take an interest in and to protect your investment over there. Meanwhile through the device of these two corporations over $100,000,000 of your earnings were escaping entirely taxation in the United States.

"I am sure that the American people will be very much interested to acquire an increasing knowledge of methods by which these things are carried on, and particularly when you found it necessary in 1945, when we were still at war, to raise the price to the American Navy over the price you had been previously charging."

The committee communicated with the Treasury Department on November 21, 1947, calling attention to this unusual tax situation and a reply was received, dated January 15, 1948, which advised that these corporations are not subject to United States tax. (See appendix III.) The Treasury Department further stated that it is at present making a study of the entire problem of taxation of American business abroad but that it is not at this time in a position to make specific legislative recommendations.

The committee is of the opinion that this situation presents a loophole in our tax law. The committee transmitted this matter to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation for such action as they might deem proper. The views of that committee are stated in its reply of March 4, 1948. (Appendix V.)

Oil companies' officials in Government positions

Our Government during the last war required and greatly benefited by the service of the ablest men in industry. Many such men served this country with distinction, and at great personal sacrifice to their fortunes and health. However, at times such personnel by reason of past association, training, and habit are susceptible of allowing their past background or thoughts of future benefits to color their official actions. In rare cases there have been a few who designedly sought key positions in Government service so that they could control situations for selfish interests.

The following persons are mentioned who were affiliated with the Government and who also were connected with the companies involved. The record disclosed that many of the persons who testified before the committee held positions in the Government and were also identified with the oil companies involved in this investigation: James Terry Duce, vice president of Aramco since 1940, and formerly associated with its parent company, the Texas Co., for 25 years, was at one time Director of the Foreign Division of the Petroleum Administration. D. E. Bodenschatz, assistant manager of the export department of the General Petroleum Products of Los Angeles, Calif., a subsidiary of Socony-Vacuum, was the naval officer who wrote the justification for the purchase of Aramco crude oil at $1.05 a barrel. J. J. Walsh, one of the naval procurement officers who worked on the Aramco contracts is now associated with Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. Admiral Andrew Carter, recently president of the Overseas Tank Ship Co., a Texas company and local subsidiary, was formerly executive officer of the Army-Navy Petroleum Board. Ralph K. Davies, formerly an officer of the Standard Oil Co. of California, was formerly the Deputy Petroleum Administrator for War. Max Thornburg, a vice president of Bahrein Petroleum Co., Lt., was Special Assistant to the Under Secretary of State.

Although Mr. Ralph K. Davies received remuneration from his company during his Government service, he made a full disclosure of this fact to all concerned and dis-

qualified himself from all negotiations involving this company. In fact, there is evidence to suggest that he lost his position in his company by his uncompromising attitude toward the oil companies on behalf of the interest of the Government.

On the other hand, Dr. Herbert Feis, economic adviser to the State Department from 1931 to 1943, testified that although he had participated in the appointment of Max Thornburg, he was unaware of the fact that Thornburg was receiving compensation of any significance from the oil companies during his Government service. Certain letters introduced in the record indicated that Thornburg continued his interest in his oil company while in the Government service. There were obtained photostatic copies of certain letters found in the files of the involved oil companies from the records of an action now pending in a Federal district court. These letters between Mr. Reginald C. Stoner, an official of the Standard Oil Co. of California, and Thornburg indicate that some of his interests in his official Government position were concerned with his company. Mr. Thornburg's letter to Mr. Stoner is as follows:

SEPTEMBER 29, 1941.

DEAR REG: I have been expecting to hear that Fred Davies and Bill Lenahan were in town—but no word yet. I presume that Roy is in Jedda—and that just about now he is wishing he were somewhere else. I would appreciate knowing when Fred and Bill will be here—if they are coming.

Karl Twitchell has been quite active here furthering his agricultural mission to Arabia. I think it will go over all right—if the King wants it. Henry Field (Donovan's Middle East expert—or one of them) suggested to Twitchell the other day (in my presence) that it might be well to have him—Twitchell—sent over to Arabia as a special representative from the President to learn how we can help the King—for example, by giving him food and other supplies. This came up as a result of a remark of my own—that Paul Alling (Near East—State Department) had suggested that if we couldn't send money we might send supplies. I then hastened to say that if it came to that—Davies already had a pretty good list of supplies that the King could use—so I saw no real necessity for sending a man over to ask what he needed.

Field has just called me on the phone and said that he had, nevertheless, put it up to Donovan and that Donavan thought it might be a smart thing to do. I am to meet Field this afternoon about 6:30 and talk again about it. Meanwhile I have discussed it with Paul Alling—who is rather upset with the idea of another "outside" emissary talking with the King.

Twitchell's intentions are good—and he is very straightforward about everything he does—such as giving everyone copies of his letters—but I don't see any good coming out of getting another man into our part of the picture. And, of course, his interests are not ours.

Alling feels that the oil atmosphere didn't help our plans any—particularly now—and that if this angle of it died out the plan might have possibilities on a purely political basis. Jim's recent conversations here were referred back to the Near East Division who replied that inasmuch as their former action had been dictated by so and so they did not feel free to express any further views. Whether Welles or J. J. will choose to go back up on it remains to be seen.

My own view is that the approach of large-scale operations in the Near East will—in the reasonably near future—provide ample ground for the matter of our support to be raised through purely political channels—for example via Kirk in Cairo. I know that he strongly favors such support, quite apart from oil-company interests. Then, when Kirk's request hits this Department—in the Near East Division, which also strongly supports the idea of backing Ibn-Saud—it would be passed through various other divisions which have a say in matters of this kind and then start on up the line.

It may be that the best we can do is supply material and not money. There is a hitch here, however, as Arabia has now been classified as ineligible for lend-lease. While this was done to stop the money deal it also effectually blocks the supply deal—but I have an idea that this could be got around, if all that is involved is sending food, piece goods, auto parts, and so forth.

Another small thing we might do is see that the Saudis know that a definite share of the money they are getting from the British is made possible through lend-lease and by special arrangements by the President. You may know that broadcasts in Arabic go out regularly from here—several every day—and it would be simple (I think) to work this in.

When Fred gets here I would like to review the whole thing with him—if you wish, that is. Meanwhile I am doing nothing officially on the case. I thought best to stay out of it, unless I was really needed, because an oil man is sort of branded around here. However, an hour ago, Paul Alling (now Acting Chief of Near East) asked me if they could now start using me on their oil problems—and I said "Yes"—so I presume I shall be better posted from now on.

The Mexican case has been very active for the past month. I was asked to come in on that one—but I think they wished later that they had left me out. I am quite sure that they feel I am not plugging for any particular advantage for the oil companies, but my own views concerning the importance of setting a sound example in this case differ widely from their own. The present program is considerably better than it was a month ago, but it is still bad. However, they can't possibly switch over to a new basis all of a sudden after spending so long polishing up one set of ideas. Judge Feuille has probably given you a report on the meeting the other day with Farish & Armstrong. If Tom doesn't start a fight, I think it will have a chance of working around to a pretty good settlement yet. When will I have a chance to talk about it with you?

Yours,

MAX.

The reply to this letter is quoted:

OCTOBER 2, 1941.

Mr. M. W. THORNBURG,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MAX: I was glad to receive your letter of September 29 regarding what is going on around Washington with reference to Arabia. It looks as though we have been barking up the wrong tree for several months, but now, since J. J. is talking with Welles, maybe we can get something done through political channels, as you mention, especially if the situation gets bad from a military standpoint in the direction of Arabia.

I have talked your letter over with Fred and I think that he is planning to call you up in a few days to get your reaction then as to just when he should start back to Washington. Lenahan probably will not be here until the 15th of this month—maybe later—as he is held up in Manila. As you know, Lloyd Hamilton is in the British Columbia Co. now, so I don't suppose he will be available.

I agree with you that there is no use for Twitchell to go to talk to the King as an American envoy.

As to the Mexican situation, the Jersey have had several meetings with the Shell and Judge Feuille and all the attorneys, and, as you say, the plan still looks bad, and I have an idea it will be rejected. On the other hand, it is impossible to say at this time whether it can be worked out.

I think the principle upon which the Jersey are working, i. e., that they do not wish to surrender their rights and allow Mexico to confiscate their lands with only a token payment, is sound and should be followed. Of course, we have such a small interest that Mexico could easily settle with us; however, I do not know at this time whether or not we will go that route. Mr. Collier is going to New York and also to Washington. You probably will see him and get his first-hand ideas as to whether or not we will continue to ride along with the Jersey and Shell on the general policy.

I will be in my office all next week; and if you could call me collect from where you can talk, I will be glad to get any ideas you may have on Mexico at that time.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely,

_____.

Thornburg represented the State Department on an interdepartmental committee which was engaged in discussions concerning, among other things, the purchase of Aramco stock control and the exercise of other methods of accepting the proposals made by Rodgers. Dr. Feis, the other State Department member of the interdepartmental committee, testified that it was not until this committee had commenced to function that he discovered that Thornburg was receiving compensation from the oil companies. He testified that, upon learning that:

"We said: 'This committee can no longer handle Middle Eastern oil affairs.' We gave up and immediately brought about the organization of a new committee. * * * On that committee, of course, Thornburg was absent."

At the time of the hearings before the Senate committee, Mr. Thornburg was abroad and could not testify; a cable was addressed to him by the committee to which he replied asserting that he had disqualified himself from Mideast affairs. He took the position that the correspondence between himself and Reginald Stoner was unrelated to any State Department affairs in which he was concerned and that the ideas expressed in the correspondence were obviously in the public interest.

The fact that the Government must be represented in procurement matters by people with former business and industry connections is inevitable in war. It is also inevitable that when these men leave the employment of the Government a large number return to their former employment. These facts should be considered, nevertheless, in the light of the evidence adduced at the hearings; namely, that the Government was forced to do business on the terms proffered by the oil companies without consideration or suggestion of any equities on behalf of the Government or disclosure of prior offers to supply products at lower prices. Stated in another way the fact that in time of war the Government must be represented by men from the oil companies places an added burden on the companies to deal fairly and openly with their Government.

Confusion and absence of coordination with respect to petroleum

The failure of the Government to implement the Moffett and Rodgers proposals after the expenditure of millions of dollars in Saudi Arabia evidences a lack of responsibility and control over petroleum matters in the executive departments of the Government. The committee believes the resulting confusion merits the earnest consideration of Congress. Previously (p. 24) it was pointed out that the committee was not successful in locating the original Moffett letter and proposal. In fact, great difficulty was experienced in tracing all the pertinent documents through the various governmental departments and agencies which took part in these transactions. During the course of the investigation it was learned that the Moffett letter and proposal had been in the files of the Navy Department. However, when they

were sought from the Department it was discovered that the papers were no longer there, having been forwarded to the White House with the following letter:

MAY 18, 1944.

Miss DOROTHY BRADY,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MISS BRADY: In accordance with our telephone conversation of this morning, I am attaching hereto the correspondence which we discussed.

I have had a search made of the Department's files and this seems to be all that remains in our files of this subject.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. DILLON,
Major, USMC.

(Subject: Financial Aid to Arabia (King Saud). Enclosures: Memo April 16, 1941 (Secretary of State); memo for President May 20, 1941, from Secretary of the Navy; memo for Secretary of the Navy May 17, 1941, from Secretary of the Navy; letter to Miss Marguerite LeHand, White House, May 23, 1941, from John F. O'Keefe, Special Assistant to the Secretary. Enclosure (a).)

The Navy Department was not successful in finding the original letter nor did it retain file copies of the material which was transmitted to the White House. The inference is clear that this affair was an unusual situation since the Navy had rendered an opinion on the use of Saudi Arabian oil yet the files of the Department were devoid of essential material or any copies. The following colloquy attests this fact:

"Senator FERGUSON. May I just inquire there, was it customary that when the President would send over for papers, that you would send the file and not make copies and keep copies in your file, so that the Navy files would be complete?

"Captain WOOD. I do not know what the custom was at that time.

"Senator FERGUSON. Could you find out for our record what it was?

"Captain WOOD. I will endeavor to, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. What is the present practice in situations of that sort?

"Captain WOOD. Well, I know in my own office I would make copies.

"The CHAIRMAN. If you were supplying some material, you would have a copy so that you would know what your letter was about?

"Captain WOOD. I would. I can only say about this, it must be remembered that in 1941 the Navy Department was a very busy place.

"Senator FERGUSON. This is not 1941, this is 1944.

"Captain WOOD. It was still a very busy place. It is highly possible on an urgent telephone call from the White House, those papers would have been sent up with the idea that they would be sent back.

"Senator FERGUSON. Does this indicate it was a telephone call from the White House?

"Captain WOOD. I think it says that. It says: 'My dear Miss Brady: In accordance with our telephone conversation of this morning.' I might also say that that '17 May 44' fits in at the time that this whole subject came to light, over the proposed pipe line.

"The CHAIRMAN. And the question of further purchases or sales of the Arabian oil to the Government?

"Captain WOOD. Yes; that was related.

"The CHAIRMAN. That is one of the items in it, so that if this matter were concerned with price and quantities in 1941, it might have a significance as bearing on 1944?

"Captain WOOD. Yes, sir; I think so."

The committee fared no better when the letter was sought from the files of the former President in the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library at Hyde Park, N. Y. President Truman furnished the committee with a photostat of a copy of the letter and proposal which he obtained from the Department of State. The disposition of the original Moffett letter and proposal and its present whereabouts remains an enigma and the committee is at a loss to determine the responsibility for the failure to act on the proposal.

The Rodgers proposal of February 8, 1943, shared a somewhat similar fate. After the terms of the same were taken up with the President it was filed by the Petroleum Administrator for War and no consideration of importance was given it until the hearings before this committee. The Secretary of the Interior submitted the original of the Rodgers letter and proposal in response to a committee subpena, directing him to produce "a letter with memorandum addressed to the Petroleum Administrator for War under date of February 8, 1943, by Mr. W. S. S. Rodgers, of the Texas Co., and all other records in relation thereto."

Apparently no other records in relation to this proposal were contained in the files of the defunct Petroleum Administration for War since there were none furnished by the Secretary.

The Petroleum Administrator for War, Hon. Harold L. Ickes, discussed the Rodgers proposal with the President 1 week after its receipt. No action was ever taken by his agency to accept the terms of the letter. The Petroleum Administrator for War had no intimation that the Navy was negotiating the purchase of oil from Aramco, the sponsoring company of both the Moffett and Rodgers proposals. Had the history of the Moffett offer or the Rodgers offer been known to the Navy negotiators they would not have been compelled to deal with the oil companies on a basis of "take it at our price or you do not get the oil," with resultant loss of millions of dollars to the Government.

The committee feels that the interests of the Government were not protected adequately. The requests of the oil companies for financial assistance were granted beyond their demands. The United States sent about $99,000,000 into Saudi Arabia and the oil companies were relieved of the monetary demands being made upon them by the King. Neither the State Department, which was involved in the early lend-lease proposal; the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which likewise participated, who were consulted on the proposals, took any adequate steps to protect the rights of the Government.

The committee is of the opinion that this situation came about as a result of the failure of the military and naval petroleum procurement officials to abide by the mandate of the President in Executive Order No. 9276, December 2, 1942. This order created the Petroleum Administrator for War "in order to coordinate and centralize the war policies and actions of the Government relating to petroleum for the successful prosecution of the war and for other essential purposes."

This directive provides the highest echelon in petroleum affairs but its workings insofar as the armed forces are concerned are best described in the words of the Petroleum Administrator for War, Hon. Harold L. Ickes, as he testified at the hearings:

"Mr. ICKES. I would like to interject at that point, as illustrative of that situation, that there were times when we wanted to know our own oil situation with respect to the Army and Navy, and we would have to get it from the British.

"They would tell us. We could not get it from the Army or Navy."

Such lack of coordination and cooperation resulted in great waste of funds and impaired the progress of national defense.

The importance of petroleum to the national welfare, in the opinion of the committee, warrants the establishment by Congress of a board authorized to deal exclusively with all matters pertaining to petroleum. The committee believes that such a board should be set up to manage, control, and coordinate national petroleum problems for all Government departments and agencies, military and civilian. It should be empowered to secure the assistance of an industry advisory group and to employ personnel familiar with petroleum problems in order that the confusion and inefficiency that existed during the past world conflict should not reoccur.

For similar reasons the committee is of the opinion that either one committee of the Senate and one committee of the House of Representatives or a joint committee of the two should be authorized to deal with national matters concerning petroleum.

The committee believes that appropriate and equitable arrangements should be consolidated to secure an interest by our Government in these vast reserves which are so utterly important in time of war. The Secretary of National Defense, Hon. James V. Forrestal, shares this belief as expressed before the committee in these words:

"I think that speaking purely from the standpoint of national defense, that there should be some arrangement worked out. I think it would require a lot of thought, because you will encounter, as we did before, the question of American governmental investment in the Middle East oil with all of the implications of imperialism to which we might be subjected, the reluctance of other nations to deal with a government. Nevertheless, having recited all of those questions of doubt, I think there can be some method arrived at by which we can have access in times of emergency for the armed forces and that is what I am speaking of now."

Conclusions

1. The United States Government extended direct and indirect lend-lease and other assistance to the Saudi Arabian Government in excess of $99,000,000, of which only approximately $27,000,000 is likely to be recovered.

2. These advances of direct and indirect lend-lease and other assistance to the Saudi Arabian Government were initiated for the most part by the Arabian-American Oil Co., its affiliates, and parent companies, for two reasons: First, in 1941, to relieve themselves of the onerous burden of supplying large funds to meet the budgetary requirements of Saudi Arabia; and second, in 1943 direct United States lend-lease was requested by the company to eliminate the danger of its concessions and earnings falling under the financial control of the United Kingdom.

3. To induce the grant of aid to the Saudi Arabian Government, the Arabian-American Oil Co. offered to sell to the United States under a proposal to the President dated April 16, 1941, at prices based on fuel oil at 40 cents per barrel. Under another proposal made February 8, 1943, as a further inducement to the United States to extend direct lend-lease to Saudi Arabia, the company offered to set aside reserves and to sell its petroleum products at prices well under world prices or at cost plus a nominal profit.

4. When the United States Government needed oil because of its war demands, notwithstanding these prior proposals, the companies offered the Navy fuel oil at $1.05 a barrel on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. The Navy was forced to buy the oil on these terms. The committee is of the opinion that the oil companies were under a moral if not a legal obligation to disclose to the naval procurement officers their previous proposals for the sale of oil submitted to the President. The oil companies exploited the Government by exacting high prices for their products despite the high expenditures and assistance granted to Saudi Arabia at the companies' behest to protect and preserve the companies' concessions.

5. The committee is of the opinion that in paying $1.05 a barrel, the United States Government was overcharged between thirty and

thirty-eight million dollars on sales made to the Navy by Aramco and its affiliates, between January 1, 1942, and June 30, 1947, by payment of prices higher than those the oil companies had a right to insist on in the light of their previous dealings with the United States.

6. The committee believes that the Navy Department wholly failed to exercise its wartime procurement authority in not obtaining production cost figures for the Arabian oil fields and in awarding contracts to Aramco and its affiliates at prices which the Navy representatives admitted were excessive.

7. The committee is of the opinion that if the statement contained in the official Navy justification for the purchase of oil at $1.05 a barrel is true, that the oil companies represented to the Navy that they had doubled their royalty payment from 21 to 42 cents a barrel, then the Government clearly was defrauded because the royalty payments were not doubled.

8. However, if the statement is false, and the oil companies did not represent to the Navy that their royalty payments were double, then it is obvious that the Government overpaid at least 21 cents a barrel, aggregating losses of millions of dollars.

9. Naval procurement of oil from Aramco will continue for an indefinite period. It is impossible to ascertain the final over-all costs of these overcharges and the total loss to the Government by its failure to have implemented the Moffett and Rodgers proposals. From the standpoint of national defense the Arabian reserves are of very dubious value. Most military opinion agrees on the probability of the destruction or capture of the Arabian oil fields by the enemy in the event of any crisis.[1]

10. The committee is of the opinion that when companies sell to the United States Government, especially during the war, the doctrine of "caveat emptor" should not apply. Companies must be required to deal openly and fairly with the Government. In cases where companies fail to do this and a loss results to the Government a remedy should be provided to permit recovery.

11. The committee recommends that greater care be exercised by the various governmental departments and agencies where industrial experts are employed to make certain such experts are disqualified from handling matters or determining policy which affects the interest of the companies with which they are or were affiliated.

12. The committee recommends that all Government agencies concerned with the procurement of petroleum products should be more closely coordinated. A proper Federal agency should be established to administer all Government problems concerned with petroleum, both civilian and military. Any agency, however, to be successful must, because of the complex and varied nature of the oil industry, both domestic and foreign, have a strong and competent industry advisory group working in closest cooperation. Only by such a combination can proper results be accomplished.

13. The committee recommends that the subject of tax avoidance by the formation of foreign subsidiary companies of United States corporations should receive consideration by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation for such study and possible legislative correction as may seem proper.

14. The committee recommends that a continuing investigation of national petroleum affairs be authorized for either a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives or for one committee of the Senate and one committee of the House.[2]

15. It is the opinion of the committee that the matter of the purchase of a 40-percent interest in Aramco by the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey and Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. with its possible effect of lessening competition in the United States markets should receive the utmost consideration of the Attorney General and any petroleum board or congressional committee that may have jurisdiction.

[1] An excellent railroad and truck line were built by American enterprise and generosity from the Soviet border to the head of the Persian Gulf during the recent war and are readily available for an invasion in force.

No comparable facilities are available from the Mediterranean.

[2] The committee has turned over its records with reference to minerals, fuel, and the strategic and critical minerals and materials to the National Resources Economic Committee, a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. At the present time the latter committee is conducting an investigation on national petroleum affairs and it was felt that certain records of the War Investigating Committee would be helpful to those investigations.

APPENDIX I

[Map—not printed.]

APPENDIX II

THE CONTRACTS BETWEEN STANDARD OIL CO. OF CALIFORNIA, THE TEXAS CO. AND STANDARD OIL CO. OF NEW JERSEY, AND SOCONY-VACUUM OIL CO. FOR THE PURCHASE OF ARAMCO STOCK

Standard Oil of California and the Texas Co. entered into a conditional purchase contract with the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey and the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. whereby the latter two companies acquired the right to purchase 40-percent interest in Aramco for the sum of $102,000,000.

The view taken by Mr. Rodgers on President Truman's doctrine on aid to Turkey and Greece concerning the 40-percent participation by Socony-Vacuum and Standard of New Jersey is expressed in this testimony:

"The CHAIRMAN. Was it entirely coincidental that the arrangement which you were discussing, under which you sold a 40-percent interest here for $102,000,000, in what is certainly a very good business venture at this time, went through the same month that President Truman declared the policy for Greece and Turkey, as being spheres of interest in which we would take a most active part?

"Mr. RODGERS. Absolutely coincidental. And we were amazed the following day, or 2 days afterward, when we heard about it. If I had known about it, I think we would have probably held up, as far as we were concerned.

"The CHAIRMAN. That is the most interesting bit of testimony you have given here. Do you suspect that your Standard of New Jersey friends were equally interested?

"Mr. RODGERS. I certainly do.

"The CHAIRMAN. Well, that is very interesting.

"Mr. RODGERS. I have heard that they were amazed when they read about it."

The committee raised the question whether or not this contract is in restraint of trade and competition in violation of the antitrust laws and the Webb-Pomerene Act. Mr. Rodgers, chairman of the board of Texas Co., testified that the oil companies gave consideration to the fact that the contract might have a bearing in the competitive problems of sale and import of oil to the east coast of the United States. He testified that the contracts were made available to the interested Government agencies, and that while the Attorney General did not specifically approve the arrangements made, he has not voiced any objection.

"Mr. RODGERS. I didn't go to see the Attorney General. Colonel Kline, president of the Texas Co., and several of the lawyers from the other companies, as I recall, called on the Attorney General. Now I can only give you my impressions.

"I think they left a memorandum of what we were proposing to do and I don't think they asked any—I am sure they did not ask any approvals—and I also understand they got no objections.

"The CHAIRMAN. I read from the latest decision, which was case No. 2091, just to call it to your attention, where problems of that character are involved and at that time, this committee had conducted investigations which to some degree were associated with this action.

"The directors and all persons acting under them are restrained and enjoined from curtailing, the restricting, limiting, shutting back, or refraining from directly or indirectly the export from, the import into, or the production within the United States or any of its Territories, of any petroleum or petroleum products.

"That is something which I am sure we should be interested in having the opinion of the Attorney General, and I assume that the company has taken steps to get that cleared before they went, and perhaps it may be a matter still under discussion.

"Mr. RODGERS. I can't comment on that. I don't know anything about it, but this thing is going to increase competition very materially, in my opinion.

"The CHAIRMAN. I certainly hope so, and we need a lot of it because we are short of oil and the only point is whether that arrangement is calculated to increase or decrease the bringing of oil products into this country and that, of course, is a matter for very wide consideration."

No oil was exported from the Saudi Arabian fields to the east coast of the United States in commercial quantities despite the fact that a serious shortage of oil existed on the east coast of the United States in the winter of 1947–48. Mr. Rodgers testified that Arabian oil would have the effect of preventing the siphoning of oil from this hemisphere to Europe, and he further stated that Aramco did not intend to ship its oil to the United States, and he stated, "* * * I do not expect that oil to come in here. I expect that it will replace South American oil."

According to prevailing prices (approximately $3 per barrel for fuel oil and $3.27 for crude oil in New York harbor) Aramco could have delivered its products in New York at well under these prices and still have made a substantial profit.

The testimony before the committee indicates that the cost of production of oil shipside, Saudi Arabia, was 40.6 cents per barrel inclusive of royalty of 21 cents and in Bahrein 10 cents per barrel plus 15 cents royalty for an aggregate cost of 25 cents per barrel. The actual cost of transportation between Persian Gulf and United States east coast ports has been estimated by the War Shipping Administration to be 92 cents per barrel (exhibit 2640). The oil company estimates of total transportation costs have varied from $1.27 to $1.70 per barrel (exhibit 2579). Accepting the $1.27 transportation cost as the median and adding 40.6 cents cost of oil at shipside, Persian Gulf, it appears that oil could have been delivered to the United States east coast at a cost of $1.67½ per barrel. Allowing a profit of 100 percent on the cost of the oil, it could have been sold commerically on the east coast for approximately $2.10 per barrel compared to the present price of $3 to $3.27 per barrel. (Bahrein deliveries could have been made at less than $2 per barrel.)

It is a well known fact that Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. and Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey are large producers and distributors of petroleum products on the United States east coast. The failure of Aramco to ship oil to the United States east coast no doubt contributed to the shortage of Atlantic coast

supplies during the winter of 1947–48. Such shipments of oil obviously would have competed with oil produced and distributed through the regular channels of Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. and Standard of New Jersey. It follows that the importation of Arabian oil to compete with Western Hemisphere oil marketed by these companies would have a great impact on its markets. The contract to purchase of 40 percent of Aramco stock by these companies manifestly enables these east coast distributors to exercise a measure of control over shipments of Arabian oil to the United States. Such stock purchase and its subsequent effect on the United States competitive markets must be considered in the light of the provisions of the Webb-Pomerene Act contained in title 15, section 63 of United States Code annotated, which provides:

"63. Acquisition of stock of export trade corporation. Nothing contained in section 18 of this title shall be construed to forbid the acquisition or ownership by any corporation of the whole or any part of the stock or other capital of any corporation organized solely for the purpose of engaging in export trade, unless the effect of such acquisition or ownership may be to restrain trade or substantially lessen competition within the United States." (April 10, 1918, c. 50, 3, 40 Stat. 517.)

It is interesting to note that since the question was raised by this committee at its hearing as to the possibility of antitrust violations resulting from the purchase of Aramco stock by Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. and Standard Oil of New Jersey, an article has appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on March 9, 1948, which stated:

"MIDDLE EAST OIL TO REACH UNITED STATES AROUND APRIL 1—JERSEY STANDARD TO BRING IN 15,000 BARRELS DAILY FOR EAST COAST REFINERIES

"First cargoes of Middle East oil under Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey's recently formulated program for increasing crude petroleum supplies for its east coast refineries are scheduled to reach American ports around April 1 it was learned yesterday.

"Standard's initial plans are to bring in an average of 15,000 barrels of oil daily from Persian Gulf sources. This may be stepped up to a point where such imports for 1948 will average 15,000 a day, although there have been no receipts in the first quarter, it is said.

"The Jersey company has two sources of supply in the Middle East—Bahrein Island and Saudi Arabia—through its association with Arabian-American Oil Co. and Iran, under a purchase agreement with Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., Ltd. The latter, however, is to become effective with the completion by Anglo-Iranian and Jersey of a jointly financed and operated pipe line of larger capacity than Anglo-Iranian's present line.

"Current shipments from the Persian Gulf are being made in tankers just chartered from the United States Maritime Commission. Ships of Jersey's own extensive fleet are expected to be used in later shipments.

"The chartered tank ships are scheduled to sail March 15, 18, and 27 with the initial cargoes of about 125,000 barrels each. The voyage to east coast American ports requires about 16 days for these modern fast carriers."

The influence of the purchase of an interest in Aramco by the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey and Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. on the announced decision of Aramco to confine itself principally to European markets, and its consequent effect of lessening competition in the United States markets, presents a serious question. The policy of Aramco to confine its oil shipments to Europe and the Eastern Hemisphere was justified by the company on the ground that its supply of oil to Europe would have the effect of stopping the siphoning of oil from this hemisphere to the Eastern Hemisphere and that the end result would have been beneficial to the United States. It now appears that their decision to confine themselves to the European markets has undergone a change and Arabian oil will be brought into the United States. The quantity of Arabian oil to be imported in the future and the impact of such imports on the competitive market in the United States are under the control of the owners of Aramco. This control of Arabian oil importation by competitive interests is a matter of deep concern to the committee.

The committee thinks that this matter requires closer examination and study. It was referred to the Attorney General by unanimous action of the committee in a letter of November 6, 1947, a copy of which is attached hereto:

NOVEMBER 6, 1947.

Hon. TOM CLARK,
United States Attorney General,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: In the course of an investigation of oil purchases by the United States Navy during and immediately following the war the Special Senate Committee Investigating Defense Expenditures developed certain evidence bearing on the production potential and the cost and distribution of oil resources in Arabia controlled by American oil companies and potentially available in this country to assist in meeting our petroleum problem.

The evidence indicated that during the war, coincidentally with very strong representations by certain American oil companies concerned, $80,000 in American lend-lease funds were made available to King Ibn-Saud of Saudi Arabia and that those contributions were a very material factor in preserving the oil concession which these American oil companies had obtained in Saudi Arabia running for a period of 60 years when these concessions were being threatened with possible cancellation as a result of conditions then prevailing.

The evidence of the oil officials indicates a possible reserve of 20,000,000,000 barrels of oil in Arabia under this concession as part of a possible 100,000,000,000 barrel reserve in the Middle East and Persian Gulf area outside of the Soviet Union.

There seems every reason to expect that the coal economy of Europe will gradually be converted to an oil economy as indicated in the so-called Marshall plan submitted by the European nations which contemplates an immediate increase in petroleum consumption of approximately 250 percent over 1938.

The evidence before our committee indicated cost of production of crude oil in these American concessions in the Persian Gulf at 25 cents a barrel in one case including a royalty of 15 cents a barrel to the local ruler and of 40.6 cents in another case including a royalty of 21 cents to the local ruler.

Plans are now under way to step up production to 550,000 barrels a day. In March of this year, coincidentally with the announcement of the Truman Doctrine regarding Greece and Turkey with its necessary implication of the national interests of the United States being vitally involved in the Middle East area, the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey and the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. announced the prospective acquisition of a 40 percent interest in the Arabian oil reserves entirely controlled heretofore by the Standard Oil Co. of California and the Texas Co. in equal parts.

The impact of these various developments upon the competitive situation along our Atlantic seaboard in this period of oil shortages, growing ever more serious, seems a matter appropriate for consideration by your office and under the instructions of the committee I am accordingly submitting it for your consideration.

The evidence before our committee indicates that this Arabian oil under American control could be laid down in New York harbor for approximately one-half the current price and might contribute very materially to easing the growing shortage of petroleum in the eastern United States as well as contributing to the relief of the consumers in the matter of price.

While it might be argued that the oil companies concerned are now free to produce and distribute this oil as they see fit in world markets with sole consideration of the interests of their own stockholders it seems clear that these concessions, which on their own figures may represent a value of $10,000,000,000, were preserved for them to a large extent as a result of the lend-lease contribution of $80,000,000 during the war to stabilize this area and to appease Ibn-Saud and are now primarily dependent upon American protection for their continued conservation.

The oil companies concerned make much of the fact that they are at present charging the United States Navy for its essential fuel supplies less than the comparable Gulf of Mexico prices for similar products. There is at present no indication nor assurance as to how long this benevolent attitude will continue.

The committee is at present concerned with the fact that this same oil was earlier offered to our Navy at 40 cents a barrel and was sold to the Japanese prior to Pearl Harbor at 70 cents a barrel and that a price of $1.05 a barrel was fixed for this oil after the German surrender and 3 weeks before the termination of the Japanese war under circumstances that indicate considerable pressure to fix the Persian Gulf oil price on a comparable basis with the Gulf of Mexico at a time when our Government was in great need. This price of $1.05 represented an increase of 21 cents a barrel over a price of 85 cents a barrel that had previously been determined by the United States Petroleum Administration for War.

This same oil was being sold to France for 85 cents a barrel at the very time the United States Navy was being forced to pay $1.05 a barrel.

The evidence before our committee indicated that it was expected that in the future this Arabian oil would be used in Europe and the Far East rather than in the United States in order to avoid the cross hauls that otherwise might result from the present exports of 600,000 barrels in oil from the United States to countries outside the Western Hemisphere.

Whether or not the interest of the United States in the handling of these oil reserves and their possible impact on world peace will receive primary consideration seems open to some doubt in view of the evidence before our committee that the protestations of the company representatives that this operation was an American enterprise paying American taxes had a somewhat hollow ring when it was disclosed that on an investment of $100,000, one of the subsidiaries, a Canadian corporation, had made profits of $92,186,107.11 in recent years on which no taxes of any character to any government have ever been paid and another subsidiary, a Bahama corporation, on an investment of $1,000,000,[3] had made profits of $25,387,673.44 on which similarly no taxes had ever been paid to the United States or any foreign government.

[3] The information set forth in the above letter was based on the testimony given at the committee hearings. Information furnished subsequent to the date of this letter states that the records of Caltex show that it has paid to the United States Government in income taxes during the period from July 1, 1936, through December 31, 1946, over $1,000,000 and that to other governments Caltex has paid over the same period more than $1,800,000.

Under all these circumstances it seemed appropriate to bring this situation to your attention for whatever exploration and action you felt might be warranted under existing law, decisions, and decrees with a view to assuring that the interests of the United States and its citizens would receive appropriate protection.

Very truly yours,

OWEN BREWSTER,
United States Senator, Chairman,
Senate War Investigating Committee.

APPENDIX III

NOVEMBER 21, 1947.

Hon. JOHN W. SNYDER,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In the course of an investigation of the purchase of petroleum products by the United States Navy, the Senate Committee Investigating Defense Expenditures developed evidence indicating a somewhat unusual tax situation which the committee felt should be brought to your attention.

It appears that the Standard Oil Co. of California and the Texas Co. have been the co-owners in equal parts for the past decade of extremely valuable oil concessions in the Persian Gulf area.

The representatives of these oil companies, before our committee, stressed the American character of the enterprise and its significance to the United States, particularly from the tax angle.

The committee was accordingly somewhat surprised to discover that much of the operation had been carried on through the medium of two wholly owned subsidiaries in which profits of $117,000,000 had been accumulated in recent years without payment of tax of any character to the United States or to any foreign government.

One of these subsidiaries was the Bahrein Petroleum Co., a Canadian corporation, in which an original investment of $100,000 now shows profits of $92,186,107.11. The other corporation was the California-Texas Oil Co. (Caltex), a Bahama corporation, in which an original investment of $1,000,000 now showed profits of $25,387,673.44, on which similarly no taxes of any kind had ever been paid to the United States or to any foreign government.

To what extent there are similar situations of this character affecting the tax position of American corporations operating abroad would seem to be a matter that might well invite exploration.

I should appreciate being advised whether or not this situation is one with which the Treasury is familiar and what statistics are available as to the extent of this practice, and whether or not under existing law there is any possibility of reaching profits of this character, and also whether the Treasury has ever given consideration to any legislation dealing with a situation of this kind.

The committee instructed me to bring this matter to your attention.

OWEN BREWSTER,
United States Senator, Chairman.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 15, 1948.

Hon. OWEN BREWSTER,
Chairman, Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your letter dated November 21, 1947, calling attention to evidence indicating an unusual tax situation which was developed as a result of an investigation by your committee of the purchase of petroleum products by the United States Navy.

It is stated in your letter that the Standard Oil Co. of California and the Texas Co. have been the co-owners in equal parts for the past decade of extremely valuable oil concessions in the Persian Gulf area. Operations have been carried on through the medium of two wholly owned subsidiaries in which profits of $117,000,000 have been accumulated in recent years without payment of tax of any character to the United States or to any foreign government. One of these subsidiaries was the Bahrein Petroleum Co., a Canadian corporation, in which an original investment of $100,000 now showed profits of $92,186,107.11. The other corporation was the California-Texas Oil Co. (Caltex), a Bahama corporation, in which an original investment of $1,000,000 now showed profits of $25,387,673.44, on which similarly no taxes of any kind had ever been paid to the United States or to any foreign government.

You request advice as to whether or not this situation is one with which the Treasury is familiar and what statistics are available as to the extent of this practice and whether or not under existing law there is any possibility of reaching profits of this character and also whether the Treasury has ever given consideration to any legislation dealing with a situation of this kind.

You are informed that this situation is one in respect to which the Treasury Department is thoroughly familiar. For years domestic American corporations have carried on operations in foreign countries through the medium of corporations organized in such countries. While this practice may have been motivated in some cases, particularly in recent years, by tax considerations it is believed to have been brought about originally by the fact that competitive advantages in a foreign country are often obtained through the use of an organization incorporated therein. As a matter of fact, this Department has been informed that many foreign countries have adopted policies which make it more desirable for American companies to do business in those countries through organizations incorporated therein. It may be noted that such foreign corporations have been established not only by the larger domestic companies, such as General Motors, Ford, Otis Elevator, American Radiator, and Goodyear Rubber, but also by many of the smaller United States corporations and, in many cases, directly by individuals. No statistics have been compiled by this office concerning the extent to which such American-owned foreign companies accumulate profits abroad, but attention is invited to the fact that the Department of Commerce in connection with its studies of the balance of international payments makes annual estimates of reinvested earnings of foreign subsidiaries of American corporations.

With respect to your inquiry as to whether there is any possibility of reaching profits of this character, you are informed that under the present law a foreign subsidiary not engaged in trade or business within the United States and not having fixed or determinable periodical gains and income from United States sources is not subject to United States tax. (Sec. 231 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code.) A tax is imposed, subject to a foreign-tax credit, at the time the foreign subsidiary pays a dividend to the domestic parent corporation. A tax is also imposed when the domestic parent corporation sells the stock of the foreign subsidiary at a profit or liquidates the foreign subsidiary.

It may be of interest to you to compare the tax treatment of foreign subsidiaries with that accorded domestic corporations under the present income-tax laws. In general, domestic corporations are subject to the Federal income tax on all of their income, both from sources within and from sources without the United States. This general rule is subject to several exceptions with limited applicability. Domestic corporations operating in any Territorial possessions and meeting certain conditions are exempted by section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code from that portion of their income derived from sources outside the United States. Corporations which qualify as China Trade Act corporations are granted an exemption under sections 261 to 265 of the Code from Federal income tax on income arising in China to the extent allocable to stockholders who are residents in China, the United States, or its possessions, or who are United States or Chinese citizens wherever resident. American corporations doing business in the Western Hemisphere were exempted under the Revenue Act of 1942 from corporate surtax under sections 15 (b) and 109 of the Code. To qualify for this exemption, a domestic corporation must derive at least 95 percent of its gross income from foreign sources in the Western Hemisphere and must derive at least 90 percent of its gross income from the active conduct of a trade or business. All domestic corporations are allowed a foreign tax credit under the provisions of section 131 of the Code for income taxes paid to foreign countries on income derived from foreign sources.

The Treasury Department is at present making a study of the entire problem of taxation of American business abroad but is not in a position at this time to make any specific legislative recommendations. Aside from the question whether the taxation of the type of profits you mention would be desirable, it may be noted that legislation to accomplish that result would encounter some important technical and administrative difficulties. Thus, a tax might be imposed but the amount due might in many cases be difficult to determine inasmuch as the books and records of the corporation would be located in the foreign countries. Again, even were a tax liability computed and asserted, it is not possible for this Government under the present state of international relations to levy upon those assets of a foreign corporation which are located abroad. International arrangements may eventually be worked out whereby this can be done, but the general adoption of such arrangements does not appear to lie within the immediate future.

Very truly yours,

A. L. M. WIGGINS,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

APPENDIX IV

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS,
Washington, D. C.

Memorandum of interview.
Date: April 14, 1948.
Time: 11:15.
Place: Office of Capt. E. L. Woodyard, room 2131, Main Navy.
Subject: Procurement of petroleum products from Persian Gulf sources.
Present Capt. E. L. Woodyard, JAG; Commander C. G. Drescher, Fuel Division, BuSandA; Mr. Fred Coughlin, Assistant Counsel, Senate War Investigating committee.

1. The following questions were asked by Mr. Fred Coughlin, assistant counsel, Senate War Investigating Committee, and the answers given by Commander C. G. Drescher, Fuel Division, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts:

(1) Question: When did negotiations start for these new purchases? (Caltex contract July 1–December 31, 1948).

Answer: The Navy originally requested a contract covering the full calendar year of 1948 but agreement was reached last fall only for the period ending June 30, 1948. Direct negotiations for the last 6 months of 1948 commenced in February 1948.

(2) Question: What are the estimated quantities?

Answer: The estimated quantities per month are: Navy special fuel oil, 1,000,000 barrels; Navy Diesel fuel oil, 475,000 barrels; motor gasoline, 167,000 barrels.

(3) Question: These negotiations were with Caltex Oil Co., and who represented these companies?

Answer: Initially, when the negotiations commenced in February, Mr. Herron, chairman of the board.

(4) Question: Was he succeeded by anyone else?

Answer: Yes. Other officials of Caltex accompanied him to the several conferences. Later, a conference was held with Mr. Collier, chairman of the board, Standard Oil Co. of California, and Mr. Rodgers, chairman of the board of the Texas Co.

(5) Question: What was their first quotation on Navy special fuel oil?

Answer: The original offer, made on February 16, 1948, is as follows:

(A) NAVY SPECIAL FUEL OIL

The price to be the low of the price quoted in Platt's Oilgram, 10 days before loading, under the heading: "Gulf Coast, Cargoes, Domestic and Export, All Ports, Heavy Fuels, Cargoes, Bunker C Fuel," less a discount of 40 percent with the further provision that in no event shall the price paid by Navy exceed $1.85 per barrel and further, regardless of the above provision, at no time shall the price payable by the Navy be lower than 95 cents per barrel.

(B) NAVY DIESEL FUEL OIL

The price to be the low of the price quoted in Platt's Oilgram 10 days before loading under the heading: "Gulf Coast, Cargoes, Domestic and Export, All Ports, Diesel and Gas Oils, 53–57 Diesel Index," less 40 percent with the further provision that in no event shall the price payable by the Navy exceed $2.48 per barrel and, regardless of the above provision, at no time shall the price payable by the Navy be less than $1.58 per barrel. The price per barrel shall be calculated by multiplying the quoted price per gallon by 42.

(C) MOTOR FUEL M—72 OCTANE—CLASS A

The price to be the low of the price quoted in Platt's Oilgram, 10 days before loading, under the heading: "Gulf coast—Cargoes, domestic and export, all ports—Motor gasoline, leaded—70–72 octane."

(6) Question: Were subsequent reductions effected?

Answer: Through negotiation a contract was executed for the period July 1 to December 31, 1948, on the following terms:

Navy special fuel oil, July 1 to September 30, 1948, 3,000,000 barrels at $1.175 per barrel.

Navy special fuel oil, October 1 to December 31, 1948, 3,000,000 barrels at $1.48 per barrel.

Navy Diesel fuel oil, July 1 to September 30, 1948, 1,425,000 barrels at $1.805 per barrel.

Navy Diesel fuel oil, October 1 to December 31, 1948, 1,425,000 barrels at $2.11 per barrel.

(7) Question: Is that now a binding contract, fully approved?

Answer: That is an approved and executed contract.

(8) Question: Were there subsequent reductions in these quotations?

Answer: Yes; the contract prices indicate a substantial reduction from the original offer.

(9) Question: This document [indicating contract papers with Caltex effected April 12] indicates the prices, July 1, 1948, through September 30, 1948, $1.805 per barrel, increasing to $2.11 per barrel on October 1, 1948, through December 31, 1948, for Navy Diesel fuel oil. Now with respect to 70–72 motor gas, has any contract been executed?

Answer: Yes; an extension of the existing contract for motor gasoline has been executed increasing the quantity in the amount of 1,000,000 barrels for delivery during the period July 1 to December 31, 1948. There is no change in the price provision of the extension of the motor gasoline contract.

(10) Question: Would you give me the present price, that is, the prices in effect at this time on Navy special fuel oil and Navy Diesel fuel oil?

Answer: The current contract prices f. o. b. Ras Tanura/Bahrein extending to June 30, 1948, is $1.05 per barrel for Navy special fuel oil and $1.68 for Navy Diesel fuel oil.

(11) Question: Were the reductions in the prices effected through resistance on the part of the Navy Department?

Answer: Yes. The Navy did not accept the original terms and conditions offered and continued the negotiations with the senior officials of not only Caltex Oil Products Co. but invited the chairmen of the boards of the two parent companies to Washington to discuss the terms and conditions.

(12) Question: Did Messrs. Rodgers and Collyer come here?

Answer: Yes, they did.

(13) Question: What information was given by Mr. Andrews to Mr. Rodgers?

Answer: Mr. Andrews advised Mr. Rodgers, of the Senate War Investigating Committee, of the current status of negotiations with Caltex and the Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) by telephone on April 9, 1948.

(14) Question: When were the contracts with Caltex closed or made firm?

Answer: It was accepted on the part of the Navy by signature of the contracting officer on April 12, 1948.

(15) Is this information available to the press if they desire it?

Answer: Yes; if they request it.

C. G. DRESCHER.

APPENDIX V

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION,
Washington, March 4, 1948.

Hon. OWEN BREWSTER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BREWSTER: This is with reference to your letter of February 3, enclosing copies of your letter to the Secretary of the Treasury and the reply of the Under Secretary, dealing with the unusual situation of the Bahrein Petroleum Co., Ltd., and the California Texas Oil Co., Ltd., familiarly knowns as Bahrein and Caltex.

Bahrein is a corporation organized under the laws of the Dominion of Canada. Its stock is also owned one-half by the Standard Oil Co. of California and one-half by the Texas Co. For some 18 years it has been obtaining petroleum from a concession in the island of Bahrein, in the Persian Gulf. Bahrein is a protectorate of Great Britain, and a requirement of the concession was that the corporation be a British corporation. It has operated exclusively outside the United States, none of its sales being made in this country. At the end of 1946 its books showed an original capital investment of $100,000, "paid-in capital surplus" of $28,191,709.13, and earned surplus and surplus reserves of $63,994,397.98. It has never paid any income taxes on that income to the United States or Canada, nor has it paid a dividend to its United States stockholder corporations.

Caltex was organized in 1936 under the laws of the Bahama Islands as a marketing subsidiary of Bahrein, its stock being owned by that corporation. It has marketed the products of Bahrein in many countries in Asia, Africa, and Europe. Although it sold considerable quantities of petroleum products to the United States Navy, deliveries were made in the Persian Gulf or elsewhere outside the United States. No sales were ever made in the United States. As of December 31, 1946, its books showed an original capital investment of $1,000,000, paid-in capital surplus of $8,195,144.33, and earned surplus and surplus reserves of $17,230,911. It has never paid any income taxes to the United States on those earnings. The Bahama Islands does not have a corporation income tax; but if it did, Caltex would probably not have been liable for such tax. It has never paid a dividend to Bahrein, its parent company.

The tax situation with respect to these corporations is different from that of the Arabian American Oil Co., a corporation whose stock was also, until recently, owned one-half by Standard Oil Co. of California and one-half by the Texas Co. It is, however, a domestic corporation, organized under the laws of Delaware. For some years it has been engaged in developing petroleum from concessions in Saudi Arabia. Its income is entirely from that source, and it has made no sales of oil in this country, although it has sold considerable quantities of petroleum products to the United States Navy, deliveries being made abroad. It has paid the normal income taxes on its income to the United States; for 1946 it paid a tax of $9,260,000 on an income of about $23,000,000. Although it pays royalties for oil, it has paid no taxes to Saudi Arabia or any other foreign country.

It may seem strange that although each of these three corporations conducted all its operations and derived all of its income outside the United States, one paid substantial income taxes to the United States, while the other two did not. This difference of treatment is clearly based on the provisions of present law, which follow the principles that have been incorporated in all our modern income-tax laws since the passage of the sixteenth amendment in 1913.

Section 231 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code says: "In the case of a foreign corporation gross income includes only the gross income from sources within the United States." The Revenue Act of 1918 (section 233 (b)) and all subsequent revenue acts said the same thing in the same words, while the Revenue Act of 1913, with respect to a foreign corporation, imposed a tax only on the amount of net income accruing from business transacted and capital invested within the United States Section 3797 of the Internal Revenue Code defines a foreign corporation as one which is not domestic, and a domestic corporation as one created or organized in the United States or under the law of the United States or of any State or Territory. These definitions are similar in effect to those of section 1, part IV of the Revenue Act of 1918, which defined a foreign corporation as one created or organized outside the United States, a domestic corporation as one created or organized in the United States, and to the 1913 act which referred to corporations organized, authorized, or existing under the laws of any foreign country.

With respect to a corporation organized under the laws of a foreign country, therefore, the law is, and has always been, clear that no tax is imposed on its income from sources without the United States, since such income is not included within the categories of gross income or net income upon which the tax is imposed. Since Bahrein and Caltex have derived all their income from the production or purchase of petroleum products outside the United States and the sale of such products outside the United States no United States tax has ever been imposed on their incomes.

In general, however, the United States imposes its income taxes on all the net income, from whatever source, received by a domestic corporation. There are some exceptions to this rule, in the case of income from sources within possessions of the United States (sec. 251), and in the case of China Trade Act corporations (sec. 262); also, only the corporation normal tax and not the surtax is imposed on Western Hemisphere trade corporations, which derive 95 percent of their gross income from sources within the Western Hemisphere but without the United States (secs. 15 (b) and 109), and the excess-profits tax was not imposed on domestic corporations which derived 95 percent of their gross income from sources without the United States (sec. 727 (g)). These exceptions (ex-

cept the excess-profits tax exemption) do not apply in the case of Aramco, so the income of that corporation, although earned abroad, is and has been subject to the corporation normal tax and surtax.

The United States is not unique in exempting the foreign income of a foreign corporation. Detailed information about the laws of all the countries of the world is, of course, hard to obtain, but we know of no country which imposes a tax on a foreign corporation which does not derive any of its income from sources within that country.

Moreover, contrary to the United States practice, most countries except the United States do not tax the income of their own citizens or domestic corporations which is earned abroad. Canada, for example, exempts from its income tax (sec. 4 (k)) "the income of incorporated companies * * * whose business operations are of an industrial, mining, commercial, public utility or public service nature, and are carried on entirely outside Canada, either directly or through subsidiary or affiliated companies, and whose assets * * * are situate entirely outside of Canada." For that reason Bahrein has paid no Canadian taxes on its income. Great Britain does not tax the income of a British corporation earned abroad, if the operations are managed and controlled abroad, except for amounts remitted to the home organization. The Union of South Africa does not tax the foreign income of a domestic corporation. France, Italy, and many South American countries similarly exempt the foreign income of a domestic enterprise, while Belgium imposes only a relatively small tax on such income.

Instead of exempting the income of a domestic corporation from foreign sources, the United States allows as a credit against the United States tax any foreign income tax paid on such income to the extent that the foreign tax does not exceed the United States tax on that income (sec. 131). Since Aramco paid no taxes to Saudi Arabia it did not receive any foreign-tax credit. But domestic corporations which derive income from sources in Great Britain and other countries which have higher rates do not pay any United States tax on such income because the foreign-tax credit is equal to the United States tax.

It should be noted that, while foreign subsidiaries of United States corporations do not pay income taxes to this country when income derived from foreign sources is earned, such income does not, unless it is subsequently offset by losses, ultimately escape United States tax. For dividends received by the United States parents corporation from such foreign subsidiaries constitute income of the United States parent corporation, fully subject to our corporation taxes, except for a credit for foreign taxes paid by the subsidiary with respect to the income from which such dividends were paid. When Bahrein transmits its accumulated earnings to the parent companies as dividends the parent companies will pay full income taxes on the amounts received. Similarly, when Caltex transmits its accumulated earnings to Bahrein, and Bahrein passes them on to the parent companies, the amounts received by the parent corporations will be fully taxed. It is true that, so far, each of these corporations has needed all its earnings for development and expansion, so that no dividends have as yet been paid. But, since the only purpose of creating a foreign subsidiary is to produce earnings to be ultimately available to the parent corporation and its stockholders, it may be assumed that eventually the United States will obtain taxes from these enterprises equivalent (except for possible differences in rates) to those which would have been received currently if the subsidiaries had been domestic corporations.

There are, of course, numerous advantages to such corporations, and corresponding disadvantages to the Government, from the postponement of tax payments. The interest factor—the value of the use of money over a long period—is itself of considerable importance. And it cannot be denied that under some circumstances, the tax burden can be materially reduced if the foreign subsidiary fails to pay dividends to its domestic parent during periods of high tax rates and pays them at subsequent periods of lower rates. Whether, and to what extent, Bahrein and Caltex failed to transmit earnings and profits to their domestic parent corporations for the purpose of avoiding or reducing taxes, and whether, and to what extent, this failure to transmit funds was due to legitimate need for the earnings in their foreign fields of operation are questions which are not easy to answer.

Whether, in general, the conduct by an American enterprise of its foreign operations through foreign subsidiaries rather than through domestic subsidiaries or mere branches of the parent corporation of itself involves tax avoidance would depend, probably, on the point of view. It can be argued that American enterprises, wherever and however conducted, should be subject to the same tax burdens; that income from foreign sources should be taxed as is income from domestic sources. As Mr. Wiggins' letter points out, however, even if that were deemed desirable, there are grave doubts as to whether it would be practicable in the case of foreign subsidiaries. If the books and records were kept abroad and all assets retained abroad, it would be difficult, perhaps impossible, to ascertain the amount of the taxable income or to enforce collection of the tax, since foreign corporations are not subject to our laws and our enforcement officers would have no jurisdiction.

On the other hand, it has been argued by many persons that this Government should not tax, or should tax at materially reduced rates, income derived from foreign sources, whether such income is earned by a foreign subsidiary of an American corporation, by a domestically organized subsidiary operating wholly abroad, or by a foreign branch of a domestic corporation. As previously stated, this would be in conformity with the practice of many of the other great nations of the world.

In any consideration of such questions it would of course be pertinent to consider the whole field of American enterprise abroad. In your letter to the Secretary of the Treasury you asked what statistics are available? The Treasury Department has recently published its Census of American-Owned Assets in Foreign Countries, which embodies the results of its investigation made as the result of the war emergency. All citizens of the United States wherever resident, organizations established or doing business in this country and all foreign citizens resident in this country were required to file reports (Form TFR–500) of their holdings in foreign countries over $10,000 as of May 31, 1943. The data so obtained give the best available picture of the extent and scope of American operations abroad.

From the statements and tabulations in this publication it appears that on May 31, 1943, United States corporations, individuals, estates, and trusts controlled (through ownership by one person or an affiliated group of 25 percent or more of the voting stock) assets of $5,096,000,000 in 10,536 foreign corporations (pp. 32, 73). Of this total United States corporations controlled assets of $4,575,000,000 (p. 24). In addition to these foreign corporations there were 600 corporations organized under United States laws but operating abroad and controlled by parent United States corporations, with foreign assets of $1,057,000,000 (p. 28) and foreign branches, unincorporated, of United States corporations with assets abroad of $806,000,000. The total foreign assets of $6,438,000,000, involving 8,220 organizations abroad (p. 48), were owned or controlled by 2,680 United States corporations, but 70 percent of the total assets was owned or controlled by 100 corporate groups composed of 385 United States enterprises (pp. 29, 75). On the basis of assets owned or controlled, therefore, it would seem that about 71 percent of the operations of United States corporations abroad are conducted by means of corporations organized under the laws of foreign countries, 16 percent by domestic subsidiaries, and 13 percent by unincorporated branches of United States corporations. These assets were located in, or owned by corporations organized under the laws of, some 98 foreign countries or possessions in all the continents (pp. 72–73).

The question of the proper taxation of the income which corporations organized or controlled in the United States derive from operations abroad is one which involves many and conflicting considerations and presents many problems. Not only are the interests of American enterprises abroad substantial and extensive, as is shown by the data given above, but there is a very great diversification in types of business organization, nature of operation, degree of local taxation, and degree of competition with enterprises of the foreign countries in which operations are conducted and enterprises of other foreign countries in those countries.

It has been argued, with considerable justification, that the present tax law, which produces different results with different types of corporate organizations, and in different geographical areas of operation, should be superseded by an integrated and equitable policy which would apply uniformly and equally in all cases where corporations derive, directly or indirectly, income from foreign sources. But, though we may recognize that as a desirable goal, practicable methods of reaching that goal are by no means easy to devise. A tax policy which might be deemed necessary and desirable for an American enterprise facing strong competition in a foreign country from enterprises organized and controlled in that country and enterprises organized and controlled in other foreign countries might not be necessary or desirable for an American enterprise enjoying a favored monopoly position in a foreign country. Important questions of national policy are involved—should direct investment and operation in foreign countries be encouraged, should the production and sale of goods abroad, or the production in the United States and sale abroad, or the production abroad and sale in the United States, be encouraged generally, or with respect to special products or types of operation or with respect to certain countries or geographical areas? Justice Holmes said: "Taxes are the price we pay for civilization." Should a corporation which has no operations in the United States and thus obtains none of the services and benefits which domestic enterprises enjoy pay the same taxes as a domestic enterprise? Or, if a few foreign enterprises receive special aids from the United States Government because of their American organization or control, should all enterprises operating abroad pay substantial taxes because of the benefits obtained by the few? How shall the conflicting tax claims of the country of origin and the country where operations are conducted be reconciled—if the foreign country imposes a heavy tax, shall this country be content with no tax; or if the foreign country imposes no tax, shall the United States collect a full tax though collecting none from a similar enterprise operating in a different country?

Suggestions for general or special revision of the tax laws relating to income from foreign sources have been made by various organizations and individuals. Technicians on the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and technicians in the Treasury Department, are studying such suggestions and the questions indicated above.

Conclusions have not yet been reached, but it is hoped that in the not-too-distant future analyses of the considerations and problems involved and some useful suggestions will be available.

Sincerely yours,

COLIN F. STAM,
Chief of Staff.

APPENDIX VI

The Honorable HAROLD L. ICKES,
President, Petroleum Reserves Corporation.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I refer to the negotiations which the Petroleum Reserves Corporation recently undertook with the California Arabian Standard Oil Co., for direct governmental participation in, or control of, that company's oil holdings in Saudi Arabia, and to similar negotiations which were initiated with the Gulf Oil Co. relative to the latter's holdings in Kuwait.

It is understood that the above-mentioned negotiations have been based on the view that this Government should participate in companies holding foreign oil resources in order to protect the American interest in those resources and assure this country supplies in emergencies.

As you know, we are planning to undertake exploratory conversations with the British Government on questions of mutual interest regarding Middle Eastern oil. Our intention is to determine the possibility of achieving close cooperation between the United States and British Governments in developing oil in the Middle Eastern area, and the manner in which such cooperation would be effectuated. Hence, the purpose of the conversations is to insure that this country will have access to supplies of Middle Eastern oil to meet peacetime as well as security needs. At the same time, of course, the conversations will seek to assure that supplies of Middle Eastern oil will also be available, in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter, to meet the similar needs of other friendly countries. Thus the broad objectives of the proposed conversations with the British Government included the purpose intended to be accomplished by the Petroleum Reserves Corporation negotiations with the California Arabian Standard Oil Co. and the Gulf Oil Co.

However, the Department believes that, until the outlines of our conversations with the British Government take shape, it is not possible to determine whether direct participation of this Government in petroleum companies holding foreign oil reserves will prove consistent with the steps we may wish to take to attain our objective. In fact, there is a danger that such an arrangement made now between this Government and the oil companies holding reserves in the middle eastern area might even adversely affect the course we may decide upon as a result of the conversations. Moreover, the question of the needs for assuring foreign oil reserves for security reasons must take into account the larger question of the character of the postwar security system growing out of the Moscow agreements.

Accordingly, the Department is of the firm opinion, with which I believe you will agree in view of the above-mentioned consideration, that negotiations of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation with the California Arabian Standard Oil Co. and with the Gulf Oil Co., for the purpose of arranging participation by this Government in those companies or their foreign reserves, should be held in abeyance, and that no similar negotiations should be undertaken with any other company at this time. If developments growing out of the forthcoming conversations with the British Government should indicate that negotiations of the afore-mentioned nature should be again considered or that some alternative course might be advantageously examined as being within the scope of operations of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation, the Department, of course, will be glad to discuss the subject through its representative on the Board of Directors of the Corporation.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

MINUTES OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PETROLEUM, JUNE 15, 1943

Participants: Mr. Herbert Feis, Adviser on International Economic Affairs, State Department, chairman; the Honorable William C. Bullitt, Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Navy; Brig. Gen. Boykin C. Wright, Director of International Administration, War Department; Mr. J. Terry Duce, Director of Foreign Division, Petroleum Administration for War; Mr. Paul Alling, Chief, Near Eastern Division, State Department; Mr. James C. Sappington, Office of Petroleum Adviser, State Department; Mr. Howard Trueblood, Office of Adviser on International Economic Affairs, State Department.

The chairman opened the first meeting of the Special Committee on Petroleum by reviewing briefly the scope of its activities indicating that he intended to place himself in the hands of the committee wtih regard to the order and development of the work, although he would endeavor to select and indicate what projects the committee might undertake. The scope and size of the staff organization would be decided as the work went along. As to the status of the committee, Mr. Freis said that the President had requested the Secretary of State to establish an appropriate organization to report back to him on plans and proposals in the sphere of national petroleum policy. The committee should, consequently, consider every question in the petroleum field which relates to the defense and permanent welfare of the United States and which was not connected with any immediate development for military purposes.

Mr. Feis thereupon proposed several projects and suggestions for the attention of the committee.

1. He recommended that prompt attention be paid to the presentation and identification of those oil-bearing areas of the world not already held by any oil interests or included in existing concessions. It was his thought that a summary report might be prepared indicating where United States interests might be directed. He assumed in this connection that a new agency of this Government—the Petroleum Reserve Corporation—would be created to implement such policy as might be developed. Mr. Duce indicated that PAW had done a considerable amount of work in connection with the determination of the prospective oil-bearing areas and a map had been prepared which would provide a useful base on which to start such a report. Mr. Feis consequently suggested that, and it was agreed to by the committee, Mr. Duce would head a small subcommittee to handle this project.

2. It was next proposed that a factual survey be made of existing petroleum legislation and other regulations covering the rules and rights to exploit petroleum resources throughout the world. He pointed out that a certain amount of work on such a factual survey was under way both in the Department and in PAW.

3. Mr. Feis further suggested that the committee consider how best the United States can deal with the Middle Eastern area in order (a) to safeguard the reserve position, (b) to make for the most effective development of the reserves, (c) to assure the availability of such resources to all countries on satisfactory terms. As one means of approaching this problem, he raised the question of the feasibility of an over-all agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom covering the whole area. Secondly, assuming that a new agency (Petroleum Reserve Corporation) will be created, it was suggested that consideration should be given to determining what oil-bearing areas in the Middle East are presently not subject to concession.

This suggestion prompted some discussion of the complexities of the Middle East oil set-up, including the general question of the influence of the "red-line agreement." Briefly, the so-called red-line area embraces the territory formerly occupied by the old Turkish Empire. The members of the group holding concessions in this area, including AIOC, Shell, a French group, and an American group (Standard Oil of New Jersey and Socony-Vacuum) each of which owns 23¾ percent of the Iraq Petroleum Co. (the remaining 5 percent being owned by Gulbenkian, a British citizen), have agreed that no one of them would take any other concessions within the so-called red-line area unless it were shared by the entire group. The red-line agreement consequently restricts the operating freedom of the American companies concerned in the Middle Eastern field.

4. As his final suggestion, the chairman referred to the fact that one of the great obstacles to the acquisition and maintenance of adequate oil resources for the United States is the tendency of the foreign governments to nationalize oil properties. As one means of dealing with this problem, the chairman suggested the possibility of a new series of bilateral agreements with other governments offering reciprocal oil exploration and development agreements. In connection with this proposal it was pointed out that our own oil reserves were being rapidly depleted and that if the public were aware of this fact, any attempt to conclude a reciprocal agreement of the type described would be vigorously opposed. It was admitted that the proposal was possibly impractical but nevertheless needed examining, particularly since the suggestion was apt to be made at some later date through other channels. Furthermore, it might be argued that this method of approach was one of giving practical expression to the raw-materials provisions of the Atlantic Charter. Consequently, the committee agreed that the appropriate division of the Department of State should be asked to turn out a memorandum on the subject.

During the course of the discussion on the four proposals and suggestions made by the chairman, Mr. Bullitt, referred to the urgency of the Saudi Arabian question and expressed the opinion that action looking toward the acquisition of United States concessions in this area and the establishment of strategically located refineries should not be delayed pending an examination of our entire middle-eastern oil policy. With regard to the refinery question, Mr. Feis took the position that this was war business outside the scope of the committee. So far as the general question of Saudi Arabia was concerned, it was the sense of the discussion that despite its immediate importance, there was no reason to assume that examination of the entire middle-eastern question would in any way delay appropriate action.

After some further general discussion it was agreed that what was needed was a general report on oil-producing areas or oil-bearing areas to show:

(1) Oil-bearing areas not under concession at the present time, and

(2) Oil-bearing areas where there existed the possibility of making some arrangements for the extension or acquisition of control by the United States. It was the feeling of the group that the real problem over the longer term was to conserve the dwindling United States reserve and draw on, to the greatest extent possible, resources outside the United States.

The next meeting of the committee was set for 2:30 p. m., June 18, in Mr. Feis' office.

HERBERT FEIS,
Chairman, Special Committee on Petroleum.

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PETROLEUM, TUESDAY, JULY 27, 1943, 2:30 P. M.

The following attended the meeting:

State Department: Mr. Herbert Feis, chairman; Mr. Alger Hiss, Mr. J. C. Sappington.

Navy Department: Commodore A. F. Carter.

War Department: Brig. Gen. Boykin C. Wright.

Petroleum Administration for War: Mr. C. S. Snodgrass, Mr. E. L. De Golyer.

There was general agreement that the committee's existence springs from the long-range postwar need to assure adequate oil supplies at reasonable price. This raises the question as to the policy we should follow and the steps we should take to attain that objective. It was agreed that we could take action in the following fields:

A. Facilitate the entry into the United States of foreign oil by reducing import restrictions. With respect to the tariff and quota sphere, it was felt, that the committee could set down some of the major elements involved but should not recommend specification since it is not equipped to do so, whereas the Commercial Policy Division of the Department in due course would undertake the necessary study of specific action as a part of its regular activity and program.

Encourage through financial and other appropriate governmental assistance the development of foreign oil supplies. Foreign development might even be directly undertaken by the Government in some instances. In this sphere there is the question of the desirability and feasibility of an international agreement or agreements which would prevent export barriers on oil. Regarding this question, it was stated that the export restrictions which might face the endeavors of this country to obtain petroleum in the postwar period might be imposed for such reasons as revenue, the desire to hold resources, or for bargaining purposes. An international agreement of the character in mind would involve also the question of whether this country would agree not to restrict oil exports under conditions of a need for all domestic oil obtainable.

It was also recognized that the manipulation of price and cartel arrangements for the division of markets could well constitute substantial obstacles in the way of desired development and distribution of oil to importing markets.

It was suggested that the State Department examine whether this country could secure by agreement oil exploration or development rights as quid pro quo from countries to which we are supplying substantial quantities of critical materials and equipment. In this connection the committee considered the fact that this country has obtained in trade agreements from many of the countries which would be concerned most-favored-nation commitments with respect to export restriction, which commitments probably would be entirely adequate from our point of view in regard to any export prohibitions that might be placed on oil supplies.

It was believed that the great importance of the Near East area in the world oil picture points to the need for a United Kingdom-United States agreement on petroleum. Since it was felt that Britain will endeavor insofar as possible to maintain her oil position in the Near East, there was some thought that the first step should be the formulation for action of proposals whereby this Government, by arrangements with Saudi Arabia and possibly other countries in the Near East, could improve our position on oil vis-a-vis Britain prior to the negotiation of an agreement with that country.

In the light of the foregoing, agreement was reached on the following future program:

1. In view of the importance of price and cartel arrangements to the development and distribution of oil, it was felt that the PAW should be asked to make a study of the way in which imports of crude petroleum and petroleum products into the United States might be affected by price agreements or company marketing arrangements. It was also felt that this study should cover arrangements affecting the price of oil in foreign markets.

2. It was agreed that the State Department representatives would endeavor to identify other studies which should be undertaken and outline the character of such studies to the committee at a subsequent meeting with an indication as to which agency should be requested to undertake them.

3. It was agreed that the chairman at the next meeting would outline possible terms of an agreement between this country and Britain on oil in the Near East.

JUNE 26, 1943.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As an outcome of discussion held in the Office of Justice Byrnes, representatives of State, Navy, War, and Interior Departments met to consider the situation presented by our prospective shortage of domestic petroleum reserves and the consequent imperative need to assure adequate foreign reserves, and the best means of proceeding to that end. They, in addition, gave particular attention to the situation in Saudi Arabia. They have agreed upon a signed report which we are transmitting to you. We concur and support this report. You will note that if one of its main recommendations is to be put into effect, that is, the creation of the Petroleum Reserve Corporation, it would be most desirable that this action be taken before July 1.

Faithfully yours,

CORDELL HULL,
Secretary of State,
HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War,
JAMES V. FORRESTAL,
Acting Secretary of the Navy,
HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

RECOMMENDATIONS AS TO PETROLEUM RESERVES

Meetings of representatives of the State, War, Navy, and Interior Departments took place on June 17, 19, 21, and 24, 1943, in the office of the Under Secretary of War in an effort to reconcile the views of the several Departments on the subject of the acquisition of petroleum reserves outside of the continental limits of the United States for both wartime and postwar needs. Besides Judge Patterson, there were present at some or all of these conferences Dr. Feis of the State Department, General Wright and Colonel Covell of the War Department, Mr. Bullitt and Captain Carter of the Navy Department, and Mr. Fortas of the Interior Department.

Introductory

The factual background, and the military, economic, and diplomatic considerations which render the problem both important and urgent, are adequately set forth in the memorandum from the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the President dated June 8, 1943, and in the memorandum to the President from the Secretary of State dated June 14, 1943, and accordingly will not be repeated here.

At the meeting presided over by Mr. Justice Byrnes in the east offices of the White House on June 12, 1943, at which Mr. Stimson, Mr. Knox, Mr. Ickes, Dr. Feis, and General Wright were present, the gravest concern was expressed over the rapidly dwindling domestic reserves of petroleum and recognition was given to the urgent necessity of the acquisition of foreign petroleum reserves by this Government at the earliest practicable time. Specifically, all concurred that it was necessary (a) prior to July 1, 1943, to form a corporation for the general purpose of acquiring foreign oil reserves, and (b) immediately to initiate steps looking to the acquisition of an interest in the highly important Saudi Arabian fields. There were left for further study by the interested Departments and later recommendation to Mr. Justice Byrnes, questions having to do with the directorate and the control of the proposed corporation as well as questions relating to the type of interests or ownership to be acquired in the Saudi Arabian reserves and the method of paying for such acquisition.

Recommendations

The undersigned representatives of the State, War, Navy, and Interior Departments agree that the following proposals shall be submitted to the four Secretaries and, if approved by them, shall be presented to Mr. Justice Byrnes as the unanimous recommendations of the four interested Departments:

1. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation will be requested to organize a corporation to be known as the Petroleum Reserves Corporation, or by some similar name, which will be authorized to acquire interests or ownership in petroleum reserves outside the continental limits of the United States, and to finance, retain, develop, exploit, or lease such reserves.

2. The Board of Directors of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation will consist of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy, and Secretary of the Interior.

3. In order that the activities of the Corporation in acquiring foreign oil reserves shall be in accord with American foreign policy, the following principles shall be observed in conduct of the Corporation's affairs:

(a) The Corporation shall not embark on any major projects or undertakings without receiving the prior approval of the Secretary of State;

(b) All major negotiations with foreign governments shall be conducted through the appropriate missions of the State Department or else under its supervision.

4. The interest to be acquired by our Government in the Saudi Arabian oil reserves shall be the ownership of 100 percent of the stock of the corporation now owning the oil concessions. The corporation which now owns the oil concessions is the California Arabian Standard Oil Co., a Delaware corporation, and its stock is understood to be owned 50 percent by the Standard Oil Co. of California and 50 percent by the Texas Corp.

In view of the inherent uncertainty as to the quantity of oil which can be obtained from these or any similar oil fields, it is proposed that payment for the stock of the California Arabian Standard Oil Co. shall be made by providing that (a) the present owners shall receive a proportion or percentage of the oil to be produced to be paid in kind or at the option of our Government in United States currency, and (b) that such owners shall receive a payment, either in money or in oil, computed upon the basis of reimbursing them for the net expenditures made by them to date in connection with the concession. The percentage or proportion of oil to be received by the present owners should be the minimum amount which under the circumstances it is fair to accord them.

In the event the Petroleum Reserves Corporation shall determine that it is advisable to enter into an operating and management contract covering all or part of the Saudi Arabian oil fields, the two American corporations now owning the concessions may be afforded an opportunity to operate and manage the oil fields in question pursuant to a contract containing such terms and conditions as shall be stipulated by the Petroleum Reserves Corporation (or by its subsidiary the California Arabian Standard Oil Co.) including appropriate provisions placing in the Petroleum Reserves Corporation, or the California Arabian Standard Oil Co., the right to

exercise control over the rate of production, the development of oil structures, and the sale or other disposition of all oil produced from such fields.

5. Matters connected with the construction of an oil refinery for the Saudi Arabian fields are primarily questions of military policy and as such should be determined by the Army and Navy Petroleum Board. In no event should the consideration of problems as to the acquisition of these oil reserves or the formation of the proposed corporation be permitted to cause delay in carrying out any program for oil refinery construction in Saudi Arabia and elsewhere determined to be advisable by the military services. Instead it is suggested that such programs of refinery construction go forward without delay and that questions as to ultimate financing and ownership be reserved for future determination.

6. After definite determination has been made as to the program to be pursued, it is suggested that Mr. Byrnes, on a confidential basis, should inform certain Members of the Congress of this program and should endeavor to obtain their informal approval in advance of the initiation of negotiations with the two American companies now owning the concession.

7. Thereafter, at the earliest practicable time, negotiations are to be commenced with the president of the Standard Oil Co. of California and the president of the Texas corporation in an effort to arrive at tentative agreements along with lines herein set out. The representative of the United States Government in these negotiations will be selected by the four Secretaries and the undersigned will submit recommendations for that purpose.

8. Promptly after exploring the matter with the two American companies, an official of the United States Government shall be dispatched to Saudi Arabia to confer with Mr. Kirk and the United States Minister-resident in Saudi Arabia as to the arrangements herein proposed and to obtain their views as to what, if any, conferences or discussions with ibn-Saud are required in connection therewith.

9. While the undersigned concur in recommending that the interest to be acquired in the Saudi Arabian fields should be represented by the ownership of stock as outlined above in paragraph 4, they desire to present for the consideration of the Secretaries the following alternative method of obtaining an interest in these oil fields:

In lieu of any stock acquisition a contract would be entered into by the Petroleum Reserves Corporation and the California Arabian Corp. (without altering or affecting the existing concessions) which, among other things, would provide:

(a) That a substantial sum of money should be advanced by the Petroleum Reserves Corporation upon the signing of the contract and further sums should be advanced thereafter in agreed installments. Such payments would insure that advance royalties and other obligations due ibn-Saud or the Saudi Arabian Government would be duly met and that exploration and development of the fields would proceed in the manner to be specified in the agreement. The California Arabian Corp. would be obligated to repay all amounts so advanced and the time schedule for making such repayments would bear a relation to the amount of oil produced upon each specific producing structure, over and above an agreed minimum;

(b) That in order to maintain a reserve of oil in the ground in the amount to be specified in the agreement, the California Arabian Co. would agree that it would not withdraw for its own purposes more than a specified percentage of the total estimated reserves in the entire group of fields or more than a specified percentage of the estimated amount of oil in each individual structure brought into production. The estimates as to such reserves would be fixed as promptly as may be by agreement between representatives of the California Arabian Co. and of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation and provision would be made for revisions from time to time of such estimates as development by drilling proceeded;

(c) That the Petroleum Reserves Corporation would be entitled to call for the production and delivery of the reserved oil at such rates and at such times as it deemed advisable. Payment for the oil so produced and delivered would be made on a cost-basis formula to be set forth in the contract.

10. The undersigned desire also to direct attention, in the briefest manner possible, to the various considerations which in their conferences have been advanced as possible advantages and disadvantages of each of these alternatives.

The stock-acquisition method

Suggested Advantages

(a) That this is a simple, straightforward, and readily understandable method and for that reason is easier to defend from domestic attack.

(b) That to the fullest extent practicable this method separates the interests of the Government from those of the private companies and thus makes it difficult to criticize the arrangement on the ground that it is the utilization of Government funds for private benefit.

(c) That the war need is urgent and immediate and in addition a critical peacetime shortage impends; that this method places complete control over these reserves in the hands of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation for both war and peacetime needs and thus attains fully the desired objectives.

(d) That the only cash payment would be the reimbursement of amounts actually expended and substantial revenues would presumably flow into the United States Treasury from the outset.

(e) That the oil produced could be offered on equal terms to all companies and in addition, if deemed advisable, the right to manage and operate the several structures could be granted to the oil companies making the best competitive bids.

Suggested Disadvantages

(a) That the stock-acquisition method may have undesirable international repercussions, and specifically may cause concern on the part of the United Kingdom and the U. S. S. R. and may strengthen the tendency of certain Latin American countries to proceed further along the road of oil nationalization.

(b) That it may be contended that this method will put the Government in the oil business on a huge scale and by reason thereof a bitter domestic attack may result.

(c) That the desired ends can be attained, at least in large part, without embarking on such an uncharted course.

The contract method

Suggested Advantages

(a) That from the standpoint of international relations the contract method would not be so apt to create concern or serve as an incentive to the nationalization of oil resources.

(b) That from the domestic standpoint there would be less force to the contention that the Government was entering the oil business.

Suggested Disadvantages

(a) That there would be the danger that such an arrangement, no matter how scrupulously and fully it sought to protect the interests of the Government, would be misconstrued and would be unfairly criticized as the use of the resources and prestige, and perhaps even of the armed forces of our Government to provide profit for private capital.

(b) That since it is impossible to determine with accuracy the amount of oil in the ground it would be difficult to make certain that the reserves would not be exhausted and the Government left with little oil despite large profits to the companies.

(c) That if the Government is to enter the picture at all, the Government, and not the private companies, should have control over the development and production of oil and over its sale and distribution in the international market;

(d) That the Government would be in the vulnerable position of a coadventurer or junior business partner with large oil companies which have international tie-ups and which in their activities outside the United States, operate under quota and cartel systems.

The foregoing is respectfully submitted by the undersigned:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
DR. HERBERT FEIS.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
BOYKIN C. WRIGHT,
COL. W. E. R. COVELL.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
WILLIAM BULLITT,
CAPTAIN CARTER.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR,
ABE FORTAS.

The meeting was convened with Mr. Davies, Deputy Petroleum Administrator, as chairman.

The minutes of the meeting of January 27 were approved.

Report on the Middle East Petroleum Mission

Mr. Snodgrass was asked to report on the Middle East Petroleum Mission, headed by Dr. E. DeGolyer. He read a preliminary report which was submitted by the Mission, using as illustration two maps, one showing concessions in that area and the other a general refinery and pipe-line map.

Mr. Snodgrass described the terrain and geological structure of the oil fields in the Middle East, pointing out high lights in the Iraq, Iran, and Saudi Arabian fields.

Mr. Snodgrass mentioned as a point of interest that the distance from the Bahrein field, the southernmost of the producing fields, to Kirkuk, the northernmost of the fields in the Middle East, is almost 850 miles, while the distance from Kirkuk to Baku, the center of the Russian oil industry, is less than 450 miles.

No drilling has been done in Palestine and a small amount has been done in Syria. There are, however, untested structures of some promise in both countries.

In any consideration of the mission's report, it should be recognized (a) that the object of the mission's work was solely that of technical review of the reserves and prospects of the area under consideration, and (b) that the conclusions expressed therein are strictly those of the mission. Appreciation was expressed to the various oil companies who were helpful in showing the fields and for the information regarding the fields and prospective areas.

The report states that the center of gravity of world oil production is shifting from the Gulf-Caribbean area to the Middle East—Persian Gulf area—and is likely to continue to shift.

The report also states that in discussing the reserves of this area it is extremely difficult to find a common denominator by which to express them. Preliminary estimates show reserves proved by developed fields and indicated by fields discovered but not yet fully explored of about 9,000,000,000 barrels in Kuwait now shut in; approximately 6,000,000,000 to 7,000,000,000 barrels in Iran; 5,000,000,000 barrels in Iraq; 4,000,000,000 to 5,000,000,000 barrels in Saudi Arabia; and 1,000,000,000 barrels in Qatar.

The report points out that obviously any attempt to appraise the unexplored areas in this region must be highly speculative. In

their opinion, however, in any attempted rating of such values, Iran and Saudi Arabia must vie for first place and Iraq ranks a close third. Qatar and Kuwait, with relatively small areas, have far more limited possibilities. Too little is known of the value of other areas to justify an attempt to rate them.

Report on Bolivian and Argentine situation

Mr. Townsend, in the absence of Mr. Sappington, stated there was nothing new to report to date; that the situation was uncertain and that no action is being taken by the State Department until the situation is clarified.

Saudi Arabian and Bahrein refinery projects

Mr. Snodgrass was asked to report on the Saudi-Arabian (Nejma) refinery project, and explained that the status of the project was substantially as previously reported. The refinery is designed to charge 50,000 barrels a day of Arabian crude with no aviation gasoline facilities at present, but so designed as to permit installation of such facilities if needed in future. The pipe line from the Damman field to the Nejma refinery site at Ras Tanura is adequate to supply comfortably the crude needed for this refinery. It is to produce about 18,000 barrels a day of 80-octane, 8,500 barrels a day of Diesel oil, and about 16,000 to 17,000 barrels a day of Navy special fuel oil, at a total cost estimated at $40,000,000 to be financed entirely by the Arabian-American Oil Co. Mr. Snodgrass explained that this project application had been approved by WPB and issued on February 21. It was assigned AA-1 preference rating on materials up to $45,000,000 and given Builder's Serial No. 119033. Engineering details are well along and initial orders are expected to be released to the contractors within the next few days.

Mr. Snodgrass pointed out that the Bahrein 100-octane plant might be delayed, primarily because of the delay in transportation of men. He explained that this was a constant problem in meeting completion dates, and asked the cooperation of those present in helping to expedite the transportation of the necessary manpower. Upon inquiry from the chairman as to who was responsible for the transportation of these men, Mr. Snodgrass indicated that it was the Air Transport Command. Lieutenant Milbrath stated he would be glad to take the matter up with the Air Transport Command.

Action: Mr. Davies requested that Mr. Snodgrass write the appropriate party in regard to the matter and see what could be done to correct the situation.

Mr. Falck asked the completion date of the Saudi Arabian project, and Mr. Snodgrass explained it was divided into two parts, stage 1 being scheduled for completion the latter part of May 1945 and stage 2 scheduled for completion the latter part of July 1945.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to say further that whatever committee may have charge of formulating tax laws or any other laws, which in the judgment of the Senate may be proper, I hope will consult the junior Senator from Maine time and time again. This report shows the great knowledge which he has acquired as a result of his investigation. I hope that other members of the committee who may be designated by the distinguished Senator from Maine may also be called into consultation.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from North Dakota has said. The Finance Committee will deal with questions of taxation in this body, and the Ways and Means Committee in the House. The question of the application of the Sherman Act and the Webb-Pomerene Act dealing with foreign corporations, I believe, will be a matter within the purview of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is a member. I believe the Senator from North Dakota is also a member. So whether or not the Department of Justice, as it considers this question, may finally determine that it is a matter which should be brought to the courts, would be a very appropriate subject for the Committee on the Judiciary eventually to inquire into. I trust that the committee, if it shares the sentiments of the Senator from North Dakota—as I am sure it does—will pursue this subject in connection with the evolution and application of legislation.

The Senator made some reference to defense. There has been much talk about the use of Arabian oil in case of difficulty. It has been repeatedly suggested and intimated that Arabian oil would be vital for our security in the event of trouble. It has been so indicated even by military authorities. We inquired very particularly into that aspect, both in our committee and in the aviation committee. I know that I inquired of the military authorities whether or not, if we had difficulty with a certain country immediately to the north of the Middle East, these oil installations would be destroyed. The general replied, "Oh, no; they would not destroy them. They would simply capture them."

In connection with the strategic situation, I find that our Government has built a very excellent railroad from the head of the Persian Gulf to the Caspian Sea, a distance of 700 miles, as well as an excellent truck road down which any forces from the north could readily flow. There is no comparable road from the Mediterranean to the East over the 1,000-mile line from Palestine to Arabia. So for all practical purposes, if there is serious contemplation that we may have trouble with a government in northern Europe, all the installations which we are putting in, and all the developments we are carrying on, would simply serve their purpose in the event of trouble, and would be utterly useless so far as our defense is concerned. I think that point should be very definitely borne in mind. I believe that represents the opinion of practically all the military and air authorities. Meanwhile, so long as peace continues, the enterprise will be very profitable for those who control it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article dealing with Middle East oil, appearing in the New York Herald Tribune of March 14, 1948.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIDDLE EAST OIL NOW PROCESSED AND MARKETED HERE BY SOCONY

(By J. D. Tompkins)

Use of Middle East oil to supplement domestic supplies has become a reality. Several cargoes from the Persian Gulf oil fields have been processed at a large east coast refinery during the last 4 months. The resulting products, principally gasoline and home-heating oils, have been marketed through regular channels in New York and New England.

The beginning of the Middle East oil movement westward is modest, but more than 21,000,000 gallons of products have already been distributed. The general belief has been held that shipments from Arabia must await completion of the Trans-Arabian pipe line project in 1950 or 1951. First imports, however, were initiated by Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. early in the winter. Chartered tankers, plying from the Persian Gulf through Suez were utilized. The oil was routed to the company's Paulsboro, N. J., refinery.

Socony's step to obtain an early supply of Arabian oil was in line with its effort, and that of the industry, to tap every available source of crude to mitigate home shortages. The primary motive, however, was to test fully the foreign oil in normal refinery practice in this country.

COST FACTORS STUDIED

With complete information on the chemistry and characteristics of the oil in its possession, the company sought to obviate manufacturing or other problems which might arise when Middle East oil imports assume greater volume. Cost factors in comparison with domestic and Caribbean crudes also came under study in these initial imports.

To date, Socony has brought in four cargoes of Middle East oil over the 8,500-mile route from the Persian Gulf source. The total oil involved was 502,688 barrels, of which 390,688 barrels were from the Saudi Arabian fields and 112,000 from Kuwait wells.

Scientists and technicians at the Paulsboro refinery have been concerned primarily with the Arabian oil, purchased from Arabian-American Oil Co. That is, of course, because Socony has contracted to purchase a 10-percent interest in Aramco, now jointly owned by Standard Oil Co. of California and Texas Co. At the same time, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey will obtain a 40-percent interest in the Arabian company.

The Aramco crude, by American standards, has a high sulfur content, averaging 1.35 percent. Some refinery experts have predicted that because of corrosion problems involved in cracking such oil, major equipment changes would be necessary.

TROUBLES READILY SOLVED

The Socony experts have found that this will not be the case. All the oil received from the Middle East was processed in a thermafor catalytic cracking unit. One of the men who supervised and analyzed the processing of the Middle East oil at Paulsboro found only minor difficulties. These, he said, were readily solved.

No trouble was encountered with sulfur in the light fractions, such as gasoline, kerosene, and the gas oils. An increased amount of caustics for "scrubbing" the end gas products largely eliminated the corrosive hydrogen sulfide generated by disintegration of sulfur in the cracking process.

This expert expressed the opinion that relatively minor replacements and adjustments will serve in most refineries for runs of the Arabian crude. He explained that while some Texas crudes with one-half to three-fourths of 1 percent sulfur content, described as "sour crudes," are hard on equipment, the higher-in-sulfur Aramco crude presents less threat of corrosion because of the manner in which the sulfur is distributed. No difficulty, for example, was encountered within the gasoline-kerosene boiling ranges.

The Socony expert's view is that any increase in the rate of corrosion can be dealt with effectively by replacement of carbon steel with alloy steels or clad metals in cracking equipment sections not already so protected, more particularly those dealing with propane and BB, or butane-butylene, gases.

These adjustments and replacements, he said, were not indicated as expensive, nor would they involve more than negligible loss of operating time. Blending of the imported crudes with low-sulfur domestic or Caribbean crudes would also simplify cracking problems.

The Aramco crude processed at Paulsboro ranged between 34° and 36° gravity. Seasonal considerations caused the refiner to emphasize fuel oil rather than gasoline production.

PRODUCT DISTRIBUTION SHOWN

Product distribution was approximately as follows: Gasolines, 45 percent; distillate oils, 25 percent; bunker and residual fuel oils, 23 percent; bottled gas, propane, 4 percent; and BB, or butane-butylene gas, 3½ percent.

The percentages given do not reflect liquid fuel use from dry gas, which could add a further 2½ percent. The indicated over-all 103 percent of products from a barrel of crude represents the increase in bulk resulting from refinement of petroleum.

Premium and house-brand gasolines produced from the Aramco oil were comparable in quality and in sulfur-free characteristics with motor fuel from the best domestic or Caribbean crudes, it was said. Other products also were fully comparable.

Pilot-plant tests on the Aramco oil for the production of lubricants are being conducted by Socony's research specialists and laboratory technicians preparatory to full-scale runs in stills. High-quality lubricating oils are said to have been produced from the Aramco medium in its Persian Gulf refineries.

Socony has so far been unable to determine the cost of Middle East crude delivered to its east coast refineries. Industry estimates recently have suggested that it will cost no more, and perhaps less, than Gulf coast or Venezuelan oil, providing company-owned tankers are used. The present shipments are in tankers chartered from the United States Maritime Commission.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the name of Edward R. Stettinius was mentioned in connection with this subject. He was the great administrator. He was formerly Secretary of State. I invite attention to an article published in the Chicago Daily Tribune of April 26, 1948. It reads as follows:

LIBERIA TRADE VENTURE HEADED BY STETTINIUS—TELLS OF POSSIBILITIES IN MINERALS, LUMBER

NEW YORK, April 25.—Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., former Secretary of State who heads an American group interested in the development of Liberia, has announced that agreements had been reached with Liberian President William V. S. Tubman on the program to be carried out in that African country.

He is not dealing with a king who got $90,000,000. He is now dealing with the President of Liberia.

He said that first steps to be carried out by the Liberia company, organized by the group last year with initial capital of $1,000,000, will be the exploitation of known mineral, lumber, and agricultural resources.

I invite attention to the report made by the distinguished junior Senator from Maine, which shows that the company which made a profit of $117,000,000 in Arabia also had a capital of $1,000,000.

"African resources have barely been scratched for the benefit of a world short of food and raw materials," Stettinius told reporters after a survey of Liberia.

TELLS OF IRON-ORE DEPOSITS

"We intend to develop one of the world's greatest deposits of iron ore contained in a 30,000,000-ton mountain lying in Liberia 40 miles off the coast. The country has 27,000,000,000 board-feet of timber that the world needs. Peanuts grow wild virtually without cultivation and with other crops should be a vast source of fats and oils."

The agreements gave the Liberia company first rights in the development of these resources, other metals, petroleum, and housing and other facilities in the country.

The distinguished Senator from Maine told us a moment ago about petroleum in Arabia, and the fields which are thought to exist in Palestine. Now the same Mr. Stettinius is in Liberia grabbing up the petroleum there.

He said that members of his group would contribute additional funds as needed, and that no public financing is contemplated.

"British, French, and United States companies already established in various fields will be invited to participate in the program," said Stettinius, who is chairman of the company. "Four American companies are already surveying timber prospects in Liberia, and an American steel firm is interested in exploiting the vast iron-ore deposit," he said.

Edward Stettinius's father was of the House of Morgan, and Stettinius himself is or was an official of the United States Steel Corp.

NO MARSHALL PLAN TIE

Questioned on the point of advantage accruing to his and other firms through the Marshall plan for European recovery, Stettinius asserted "there is no connection between this development and the Marshall plan, and I don't see how we could benefit." It was recalled that a British firm developing a huge peanut plantation elsewhere in Africa expected Marshall plan aid.

The Liberian Government holds 25 percent of the company's stock and will receive that proportion of company dividends when and if paid, Stettinius said.

In other words, the company takes 75 percent and leaves 25 percent for the poor blacks, the 2,000,000 common people of Liberia. I mention this because I believe that the general plan in Liberia, to rob the common people of that country is on a par with the plan to rob the people of Arabia, who have lived there for centuries, of their oil, by the despicable, contemptible method which has been so well described by the Senator from Maine.

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAX

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I desire to make a few remarks at this time concerning the oleomargarine tax.

I have never understood that there is any good reason for placing the tax on margarine. My belief that the tax should be repealed is based on the following reasons: First, the butter interests claim that colored oleomargarine should be taxed. To meet that argument, I should like to call attention to the fact that both margarine and butter are products of American farms. Both margarine and butter contain 3,300 calories per pound. Both margarine and butter contain 80 percent fat by volume. I find that margarine also has from 1 to 1½ percent skim-milk solids, and I find that butter has the same. Three percent of margarine is salt, and 3 percent of butter is salt. Sixteen percent of butter is moisture and 16 percent of margarine is moisture. Then why should there be a difference when it comes to taxing either of them?

At the present time I find that margarine is a constant source of 15,000 units of vitamin A per pound, except that 2 percent of margarine sold still contains only 9,000 units of vitamin A per pound. However, butter is variable in that respect, containing from 500 to 2,000 units of vitamin A per pound, depending on the season and what the cows have been eating. Most butter contains much less than 15,000 units of vitamin A per pound.

As to color, margarine is colored. Butter is colored 8 months of the year. But when it comes to taxation, we find that margarine, if colored at the factory, is heavily taxed; the manufacturer must pay $600 a year; the wholesaler must pay $480 a year; the retailer must pay $48 a year; and the housewife must pay a tax of 10 cents a pound.

The Federal antimargarine laws have been in existence since 1886. During the 62 years that have passed since their first enactment, scores of bills have been introduced to bring about their repeal or drastic modification. But the record shows that not once has the Senate held a clear-cut vote on the issue.

Three times since 1886 amendments have been offered to attach a margarine-tax-repeal provision to the general revenue bill. Such amendments were offered in 1917, 1944, and on March 18, 1948. But, by the very nature of this procedure, it has been impossible to secure a clear-cut, decisive debate or vote on the question of whether the antimargarine laws should be repealed; the issue has been colored by the question whether it was proper to attach such a rider to the revenue measure. Those of us who recall the March 18 debate, when the Fulbright and Maybank amendments were defeated, will remember that the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and a number of other Senators stated that they were opposed to the margarine repeal amendments not necessarily on their merits but because they did not believe they had a proper place in the income-tax measure.

On the other hand, it is perfectly clear that those who, on all these occasions, have attempted to place margarine-tax-repeal amendments on the general revenue bills have done so because there seemed no other way in which to secure any kind of Senate vote on the issue.

However, since March 18, the situation has changed radically. The House Agriculture Committee, which for 62 years had tabled all bills attempting to repeal the Federal antimargarine laws, and which had voted earlier in March to table all margarine bills until the end of this session, now has been discharged from further consideration of House bill 2245, a bill introduced by Representative RIVERS, of South Carolina, to repeal the antimargarine laws. A majority of the House—235 Members from both parties—have voted to have the House of Representatives take up House bill 2245. At this very moment that bill is being discussed on the floor of the House. It would not surprise me if, before I finish my brief remarks on this subject, we were to receive word that the bill has been passed by the House—something which has not been done in all the past 62 years of effort to repeal these tax laws.

This bipartisan effort in the House was in response to tremendous public endorsement of margarine-tax repeal, as evidenced by many thousands of letters and editorials from the great majority of publications in almost every State in the Union. As a result, it appears probable—in view of the fact that the formal motion to discharge the House Agriculture Committee from further consideration of the bill was approved by a vote of 235 to 121 on April 26—that the Rivers bill to repeal the Federal antimargarine laws will be passed by the House, probably today.

The action taken by the House is especially encouraging to those of us who have long urged the abolition of these discriminatory, unjust, and outmoded antimaragarine statutes. Not only does it indicate that a majority of the Members of the House favor a change in the antimargarine laws, but it offers, at long last, an opportunity for the Senate to vote on the matter.

My purpose today is to urge the Senate, and especially those Members on the Finance Committee who will, I believe, have an opportunity to consider the Rivers bill, to see to it—whatever their personal preference may be on the margarine question—that at the very least the Senate is given an opportunity for a clear-cut discussion and vote on the question of repealing the antimargarine laws.

We have never had, as I have already pointed out, such an opportunity before. I think we are entitled to that opportunity. I think the farmers of this country, in 44 of our 48 States, who grow the ingredients of margarine, are entitled to it. And I believe we owe it to the consumers of this country to let the Senate express itself on this matter.

I hope, of course, that if, as seems probable, the House passes the Rivers bill, the Finance Committee will report the measure favorably to this body. I think the case for margarine tax repeal is overwhelming. I know of no other current issue on which there is so much to be said for one side and so little for the other. I know of no law on our statute books which so unjustly discriminates against one American product in favor of another; against one group of American farmers in favor of another; and against one healthful food essential to the nutrition of many of our low-income people in favor of another healthful food which, because of its price, is now available in quantity only to our high-income groups.

I am especially hopeful that the cause of margarine tax repeal will be made a bipartisan one in this body as it was in the House, that the Republican leadership will join with the Democratic leadership in support of repeal. This should never have been a party issue. The farmers who grow the ingredients of margarine are both Republican and Democrat. The growers, as I stated, live both in Republican-dominated States, and in Democratic-dominated States, both in the North and in the South. The grocers who sell it, the consumers who buy it, the housewives who are compelled, in effect, to mix the color into it, are both Republicans and Democrats, and the Federal antimargarine laws discriminate against them all without regard to party affiliation.

I am confident, if the Senate is permitted to discuss the question of margarine-tax repeal without the intrusion of the other issues which have always been present in past efforts to repeal these laws, that the outcome will be decisively in favor of repeal.

The fact that this body, by identical votes of 45 to 33, decided against the Fulbright and Maybank margarine-tax-repeal amendments to the income-tax bill is immaterial. That was not a vote on the merits of margarine-tax repeal alone; it was also a vote on the wisdom of incorporating in an income-tax measure an amendment to repeal excise taxes. I am confident that a number of Senators who opposed the Fulbright and Maybank amendments are in favor of repeal of the Federal antimargarine laws. I believe that this will be abundantly established when, and if, the Senate is permitted to vote on the question.

It is interesting, in this connection, to recall the fate of the McClellan bill to incorporate the principle of community property in the income-tax measure during the first session of the Eightieth Congress. The McClellan amendment was defeated. One of the contentions which brought about that defeat was that it should have been incorporated in the bill itself and not offered as an amendment from the floor because, it was said, it would revise the whole taxing schedule. Later, however, in the present session of Congress, the principle of community property was overwhelmingly approved when it was incorporated in the body of the bill reported by the committee. I hope, and believe, that margarine-tax repeal will have the same success when it comes to us to be decided on its merits alone.

I have long championed repeal of these oppressive, undemocratic laws. In March 1947 I introduced a bill (S. 985) for the purpose. At the time I requested an opinion from the Department of the Government charged with the collection of the Federal taxes and license fees and the enforcement of the many burdensome restrictions placed on margarine. I wrote to the Under Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. A. M. Wiggins, to ascertain whether it was the view of the Treasury Department that these laws were needed or desirable. I should like to quote from his reply:

> The revenue derived from oleomargarine taxes is not substantial and the revenue aspects of S. 985 are therefore inconsequential. Viewed as revenue-producing measures, this Department is opposed to excise taxes on basic food articles. Moreover, the existing taxes discriminate against a particular food, oleomargarine which is yellow in color. For these reasons the Department is in favor of the enactment of S. 985.

Later, Mr. Wiggins appeared before the House Agriculture Committee, in March of this year, and urged the repeal of the existing Federal taxes and other punitive restrictions on margarine.

It seems probable that the decision in the House and in the Senate Finance Committee, if the House approves the margarine-tax repeal measure, will largely turn on the color question. The crux of this whole controversy, it seems to me, is the contention of the butter proponents that butter has some unique right to the use of the color yellow and that margarine, if it uses that color, should be required to pay an impost of 10 cents a pound. This extraordinary claim, which has been accepted in our Federal statutes since 1902, is unique. No other food, no other American product has ever before claimed a monopoly on color.

The butter argument runs like this: The natural color of butter is yellow; artificial coloring is added to butter, but only to enhance this so-called natural color, not for the purposes of deception. The natural color of margarine is white, and yellow coloring is added only to make it look like butter and thus to deceive the public. Thus speak the butter champions.

Let us examine this argument carefully. In the first place, if the butter argument is correct, then margarine producers should be prohibited from using yellow at all, since yellow margarine presumably deceives the public. Outright prohibition of yellow margarine, not a 10-cent tax on it, would be the logical solution.

But, of course, the butter argument on color is a most flimsy one. Yellow is the natural color of butter only part of the time. Butter's color varies from white to pale yellow to deep yellow. There has even been butter, the famous old Goshen butter of Pennsylvania, which had a reddish hue. Sometimes, depending upon the breed of the cow and its feed, butter is as white as the most thoroughly bleached margarine.

Notice that I said "bleached margarine." For one of the ironies of our tax on yellow margarine is that the natural yellow color of margarine has to be bleached from it or the product is subject to the 10-cents-per-pound Federal tax.

The reason, of course, that margarine manufacturers want to color their product yellow is the same as the reason that creameries add yellow coloring to butter—to meet consumer preferences.

Butter is the only product which claims a preemptive right to any color. Lard could claim a right to white to the exclusion of the vegetable cooking compounds. Cotton could try to prevent rayon and other synthetic fibers from using the colors which cotton used before its competitors came upon the market.

After all, the essence of competition is imitation in one form or another. If we tax one product because it resembles another and because it is used for the same purposes, we will destroy our competitive system. The butter people say that the tax on yellow margarine is necessary to prevent fraud. Since the pure food and drug laws are considered sufficient to prevent fraud in the case of other food products, it obviously is absurd to say they will not prevent fraud in the case of margarine.

Of course, no law was ever written which could not be violated.

Speaking of violations, I find that from 1933 to June 1947, margarine was seized by authorities only 21 times, but at no time was it seized because of filth, contamination, or adulteration. From 1933 to 1947 butter was seized by authorities 2,292 times because of filth, contamination, and other materials being added.

Even though we should repeal the law, protection could be enforced with ease, for this reason:

Repeal of the Federal antimargarine laws would leave strong legislative safeguards against fraud. The Federal pure-food laws, pure-food laws in 47 of the 48 States, and criminal statutes in every State against fraud and misrepresentation, would still be in effect. The penalty for violation of these laws is severe and is considered to protect the consumer in the case of other food products. If given a test, they will prove adequate in the case of margarine.

Fraud can be committed under the present laws with a high return to the lawbreaker, since there is a difference of approximately 40 to 50 cents a pound in the price of butter and margarine. The 10-cent tax on yellow margarine is not a strong deterrent under the circumstances, since the margin of profit for a violator still would be comparatively great.

To indicate how extensive the protection against fraud would be if the Federal tax regulations on margarine were repealed, I call the Senate's attention to Federal Pure Food and Drug Act provisions. The United States Code Annotated, titles 20–21, 1942, paragraph 331, reads:

(a) The introduction or delivery for introduction into interstate commerce of any food, drug, device, or cosmetic that is adulterated or misbranded.

(b) The adulteration or misbranding of any food, drug, device, or cosmetic in interstate commerce.

(c) The receipt in interstate commerce of any food, drug, device, or cosmetic that is adulterated or misbranded, and the delivery or proffered delivery thereof for pay or otherwise.

The penalty for violation is found in paragraph 333, as follows:

Any person who violates any of the provisions of section 331 shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall on conviction thereof be subject to imprisonment for not more than 1 year or a fine of not more than $1,000, or both such imprisonment and fine; but if the violation is committed after a conviction of such person under this section has become final, such person shall be subject to imprisonment for not more than 3 years or a fine of not more than $10,000, or both such imprisonment and fine.

Article 343 states:

A food shall be deemed to be misbranded:

(a) If its labeling is false or misleading in any particular.

(b) If it is offered for sale under the name of another food.

(c) If it is an imitation of another food, unless its label bears, in type of uniform size and prominence, the word "imitation" and, immediately thereafter, the name of the food imitated.

I do not believe that any American industry has a right to the discriminatory protection against another that has been given butter over margarine. But, leaving aside the question whether such discrimination is just or wise, let us meet the dairy argument on its own grounds. They defend the antimargarine laws because they say they are needed for the protection of dairy farmers.

Have they protected dairy farmers? More specifically, have they protected the farmers who depend upon butter for their livelihood? Let us examine the record.

During the past 50 years, under the protection of the antimargarine laws, butter has been reduced from a major factor in the dairy industry to a decidedly minor one. In 1901, the year preceding the passage by Congress of the most restrictive of the antimargarine laws—the 10-cent tax on every pound of yellow margarine—per capita consumption of butter was 19.9 pounds. In 1947, it was only 11.2 pounds.

In the 10 years between 1936 and 1946, total butter production, including both creamery and farm manufacture, declined from 2,131,000,000 pounds to 1,501,000,000 pounds. This is a reduction of approximately 29 percent. During the same 10 years, total milk production, for all purposes including butter, increased from 102,410,000,000 pounds in 1936 to 120,276,000,000 pounds in 1946. So we see that while there was more milk available for butter manufacture, the percentage of this milk made into butter during these 10 years decreased approximately one-fifth.

The disappearance of more than 600,000,000 pounds of butter from the market during these 10 years is especially significant because prices for butter fat rose fairly steadily. As a matter of fact, farmers received $548,000,000 from the sale of butterfat at inflated 1946 prices compared to $420,000,000 from the sale of a much larger amount in 1936. But, whereas in 1936 this income from butter was 29.5 percent of the total dairy income; in 1946, it amounted to only 14.7 percent. These facts indicate the chief reason for reduced butter production: It has been much more profitable generally for dairy farmers to sell their product as fluid milk and for whole milk purposes than to sell it for butter manufacture.

The war—to use the favorite rationalization of the butter apologists for this decline—undoubtedly had some effect on butter production, but they were not all disadvantageous to butter. From June 1943 until October 1945, butter producers received 5 cents a pound subsidy.

Moreover, this excuse fails to explain why butter production for the first 7 weeks of 1948—nearly 2 years after the removal of wartime restrictions—is more than 15 percent less than for 1947.

But it is not margarine that is driving butter out of the market. Margarine has not occupied that portion of the market vacated by butter which would have occurred if this were the big reason for the drop in butter consumption.

In 1946 margarine per capita consumption was 3.8 pounds, one of the highest on record, yet this represented an increase of only eight-tenths of 1 pound per capita since 1936. During this 10-year stretch butter consumption dropped 5.9 pounds.

The public, on an average, bought about 6 pounds less butter per capita in 1946 than in 1936, but this definite nutritional gap was not filled with a corresponding increase in margarine purchases.

Surely we cannot say that if margarine had been unrestricted, if it had had free access to the market place, more of the gap, or all of it, would not have been filled, to the definite nutritional gain of the American people. For no one today challenges the healthful qualities of margarine.

But even if this happy situation had transpired, it could not be said that margarine drove butter from the market. It is evident that butter has taken itself out of the market. The cost of producing butter is high by comparison with the more profitable uses of milk. Butter must be sold at a comparatively high price to meet the cost of production. These are the reasons for dollar butter and the loss by the butter industry of approximately 40 percent of the market which it had 10 years ago.

This, then, is what has happened to butter and to the income of farmers who depend upon butter for their livelihood under the alleged protection of the Federal antimargarine laws.

But repeatedly the butter lobby has claimed that if the Federal taxes on margarine were repealed it would disrupt the whole dairy industry and have other adverse effects on the national economy and health apparently in this way.

Margarine would become distinctly competitive with butter, forcing butter prices, which largely control the prices of dairy products, to fall to low levels. Milk prices would likewise fall. This would result in curtailment of the production of milk. The dairy farmer would reduce his herds of dairy cattle, losing considerable income, and perhaps many dairy farmers would be driven out of the dairy business. This would also force a shift from livestock toward field crops, which would result in soil erosion. National nutrition would also suffer, as a result of the decline in milk production.

Assuming, however, that butter prices would be forced down competitively by expanded margarine production, there is no reason why this should affect the price of other dairy products. It is true that in many sections of the country the price of fluid milk is set by formula and depends in part upon butter prices. But there is no necessity for this. It is the result of a situation that once existed—when butter production was greater and more profitable as compared with the sale of milk for other purposes—but that no longer exists today. Butter today is a dwindling industry. Its production has fallen fairly steadily for 10 years. It is the least profitable of all the milk outlets. There is no reason why some other milk product should not become the industry's price stabilizer. Many dairy farmers realize this and complain of the continuance of butter as a price fixer for the industry. The report in September 1947, of the Boston Milkshed Pricing Committee, which was composed of a number of outstanding dairy economists, recommended the abandonment of the

butter formula for setting fluid milk prices in the Boston market.

It seems clear today that butter is no longer a desirable price stabilizer for milk products.

Moreover, butter is not the most satisfactory outlet for so-called seasonal surpluses of milk—or depression surpluses; the new dried whole milk industry and the greater expanded evaporated and condensed milk and ice cream industries offer more profitable outlets for so-called surpluses of fluid milk.

No evidence is given that repeal would result in the curtailment of milk production, and little can be found, because the more butter produced the less fluid milk is available; and the less butter, the more fluid milk. The reduction of butter production and the increase in fluid milk and whole milk use means more income for the dairy industry as a whole.

Since the milk which did not go into butter would go into fluid and whole milk channels, there would be no need for reducing the number of dairy cattle.

If a decline in milk production occurred, national nutrition would suffer. But an expansion of fluid milk production would be the more likely consequence—if margarine competition were sufficient to effect a decline in butter production, and that is a large "if." The diversion of milk from butter to fluid and whole milk uses is actually to the nutritional interest since these outlets, unlike butter, utilize all the nutrients of milk.

The other reasons which have been given over the years to justify this discriminatory, un-American legislation are merely rationalizations for this real purpose of protection—which, as we have seen, does not protect. Most of them are so patently false today that they deserve little consideration by serious-minded men. However, because they have been repeated so often, I think we must discuss them briefly.

It is claimed that margarine has not been demonstrated to be the equivalent of butter in human nutrition.

Whatever validity this claim once may have had, it has none today. The United States Department of Agriculture, the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, the Red Cross, the American Public Health Association, the Food and Nutrition Board of the National Research Council, the New York Academy of Medicine and numerous other scientific groups, and individual doctors, chemists, biophysicists, nutritionists, and other scientists have testified that margarine is as healthful as butter. And many of them have pointed out that in some ways it is superior to butter.

An extensive test on 255 children, recently completed by Drs. Leichenger, Eisenberg, and Carlson of the University of Illinois College of Medicine, department of pediatrics, completely disproves previous claims that butter had a mysterious health property lacking in margarine. By every criterion of health, the children whose diet included margarine instead of butter were as healthy or healthier than the children who ate only butter as table and cooking fat. Blood count, gain in weight and height, and general health were all measured.

The conclusion of the doctors was as follows:

> Growing children experience normal growth, in height and weight, when their diets contain only fortified margarine as table fat, as shown by comparison with children fed on similar diets with butter as a source of table fat.

I do not need to tell the Senate in detail about the interest which the cotton farmers and the soybean farmers have in this issue. The cotton producers have been discriminated against for years and this discrimination has cost them millions upon millions of dollars. In market value cottonseed oil is more important than the three other products of cottonseed, meal, linters and hulls combined. Ordinarily, oil provides more than 55 percent of the market value of all four products, and for the first 9 months of 1947, margarine alone took 32.5 percent of all the cottonseed oil consumed in this country and was the biggest single use for the oil.

The price of cottonseed, from which the sharecroppers and other small cotton producers get the bulk of their spendable income, depends primarly on the price of oil. It is all too obvious that the Federal and State restrictions which restrict the use of cottonseed oil are a drop upon price. This matter is of vital importance to the South and the entire Cotton Belt.

Similarly, it is of vital importance to the soybean areas which, incidentally center in the Middle West. Almost as much soybean oil as cottonseed oil is used in the production of margarine and the story is similar to the story of cottonseed.

It also is of vital importance to the consumers of the country and to the housewives who waste time and food in coloring margarine. One can buy margarine a little cheaper if he colors it himself. He can save 10 cents. Is not that ridiculous? A man can buy margarine uncolored, take it home, and let his wife have the trouble of coloring it, to save 10 cents.

Finally, a vital principle is involved, one which transcends any of the other factors which I have mentioned. There is no reason to discriminate against margarine in favor of butter. This wrong is an ancient one, and we should wait no longer to rectify it.

I repeat, therefore, that I hope the Senate Finance Committee will permit this issue to come before us in such a way that Senators may express themselves directly upon it. If we do that, and if the facts are known, I have no fear of the result in this body.

According to the information which I have received, the bill which is now in the House of Representatives will soon be before the Senate. The amendments are now being discussed in the House. I hope that before this day's work is finished in the House of Representatives the bill will be passed and sent to the Senate.

FOREIGN TRADE AUTHORITY

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, through the legislation which I am now proposing a flexible import fee would be substituted for the fixed tariffs on imports, to be administered by a reorganized Tariff Commission called the Foreign Trade Authority, a bipartisan body composed of six members.

Imports would be encouraged and liberalized through such an import fee periodically adjusted to the differential of cost of production of any specific article or product in this Nation and in the chief competitive country.

The work of the Foreign Trade Authority would be conducted on principles described in the bill itself as in the case of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Federal Trade Commission in their respective fields.

The market for foreign goods would be definitely established in this country through the proposed legislation, on the basis of an equal wage living standard, and our economic structure would be protected while we were assisting the 56 lower-wage standards of living nations to improve their standards and living conditions.

The legislation would leave to every country in the world the power of self-determination with respect to its own wage-living standards, but would provide a definite incentive for the other 56 member nations of the United Nations to raise their wage-standard of living, since they would immediately be given credit for such advance through a corresponding reduction of the import fee; and when any nation reached our own wage-standard of living, free and unrestricted trade would be the immediate and automatic result.

The legislation moreover removes the controversial tariff question and foreign trade manipulation from the traditional arena of log-rolling and lobbies through the establishment of machinery and practices operating on principles which are definitely set down in the proposed legislation, and which are not subject to Executive orders or to the judgment of a bureau official.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following the bill an explanation and a digest of the provisions of the proposed legislation.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2582) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MALONE (for himself and Mr. BUTLER), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is declared to be the policy of the Congress—

(a) to facilitate and encourage the importation into the United States of foreign goods and products in quantities sufficient to supplement the needs of the various branches of American industry and agriculture;

(b) to foster and provide for the export of the products of American industry and agriculture in quantities sufficient to pay for the needed imports;

(c) to develop and promote a well-balanced, integrated, and diversified production within the United States so as to maintain a sound national economy and a high level of employment in industry and agriculture;

(d) To provide necessary flexibility of import duties thereby making possible appropriate adjustments in response to changing economic conditions;

(e) To assure the accomplishment of these objectives by returning to the United States the control over American import duties now subject to international agreements.

RESTATEMENT OF EXISTING IMPORT DUTIES

SEC. 2. Title I, paragraphs 1 to 1559, inclusive, of the Tariff Act of 1930 are hereby amended by repealing the classifications and rates therein contained and substituting therefor the classifications and rates obtaining and in effect on June 12, 1948, by reason of proclamations of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or otherwise.

FORMATION OF FOREIGN TRADE AUTHORITY

SEC. 3. Title III, part II, section 330, of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"PART II—FOREIGN TRADE AUTHORITY

"SEC. 330. Organization of the Foreign Trade Authority.

"(a) MEMBERSHIP.—The United States Tariff Commission shall be reorganized and reconstituted as the Foreign Trade Authority (hereinafter referred to as the 'Authority') to be composed of six directors to be hereafter appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The original directors of the authority shall be the same persons now serving as Commissioners of the United States Tariff Commission, each such person to serve as a director of the Authority until the date when his term of office as a Commissioner of the United States Tariff Commission would have expired. Thereafter the term of office of any successor to any such director shall expire 6 years from the date of the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed except that a director appointed to fill a vacancy occurring for any reason other than the expiration of a term as herein provided shall be appointed only for the remainder of the term which his predecessor would otherwise have served. Directors shall be eligible for appointment to succeed themselves if otherwise qualified therefor. No person shall be eligible for appointment as a director unless he is a citizen of the United States, and, in the judgment of the President, is possessed of qualifications requisite for developing expert knowledge of tariff problems and efficiency in administering the provisions of this act. Not more than three of the directors shall be members of the same political party, and in making appointments members of different political parties shall be appointed alternately as nearly as may be practicable.

"(b) Chairman, Vice Chairman, and salary: The President shall annually designate one of the directors as Chairman and one as Vice Chairman of the Authority. The Vice Chairman shall act as Chairman in case of absence or disability of the Chairman. A majority of the directors in office shall constitute a quorum, but the Authority may function notwithstanding vacancies. Each director shall receive a salary of $12,000 a year. No director shall actively engage in any business, vocation, or employment other than that of serving as a director."

APPOINTMENT OF SECRETARY

SEC. 4. Title III, part II, section 331 (a), of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) Personnel: The Authority shall appoint a secretary who shall receive a salary of $9,000 per year, and the Authority is hereby empowered to employ and fix the compensations of such special experts, examiners, clerks, and other employees of the Authority as it may find necessary for the proper performance of its duties."

ADMINISTRATION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS

SEC. 5. Title III, part II, of the Tariff Act of 1930 is amended by adding at the end of section 331 the following new section:

"SEC. 331A. ADMINISTRATION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS

"(a) All powers vested in, delegated to, or otherwise properly exercisable by the President or any other officer or agency of the United States in respect to the foreign trade agreements entered into pursuant to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 are hereby transferred to, and shall be exercisable by, the Authority, including, but not limited to, the right to invoke the various escape clauses, reservations, and options therein contained, and to exercise on behalf of the United States any rights or privileges therein provided for the protection of the interests of the United States.

"(b) The Authority is hereby authorized and directed—

"(1) to terminate as of the next earliest date therein provided, and in accordance with the terms thereof, all the foreign trade agreements entered into by the United States pursuant to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930;

"(2) to prescribe, upon termination of any foreign trade agreement, that the import duties established therein, shall remain the same as existed prior to such termination, and such import duties shall not thereafter be increased or reduced except in accordance with the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, by this act."

PERIODIC ADJUSTMENT OF IMPORT DUTIES

SEC. 6. Title III, part II, section 336, of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"PERIODIC ADJUSTMENT OF IMPORT DUTIES

"SEC. 336. (a) The Authority is authorized and directed, from time to time, and subject to the limitations hereinafter provided, to prescribe and establish import duties which will, within equitable limits, provide for fair and reasonable competition between domestic articles and like or similar foreign articles. A foreign article shall be considered as providing fair and reasonable competition to producers of a like or similar article if the authority finds as a fact that the landed duty paid price of the foreign article is a fair price and is not substantially below the price, including a reasonable profit, at which like or similar articles can be offered to consumers of the same class by a domestic producer: *Provided, however,* That no such import duties shall be established contrary to the provisions of any foreign trade agreement in effect pursuant to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

"(b) In determining whether the landed duty paid price of a foreign article is, and may continue to be, a fair price under subdivision (a) of this section, the Authority shall take into consideration, insofar as it finds it practicable—

"(1) The lowest landed duty paid price of the article from any foreign country offering substantial competition;

"(2) Any change that may occur or may reasonably be expected in the exchange rate of any country either by reason of devaluation or because of a serious unbalance of international payments;

"(3) The policy of any foreign country designed substantially to increase exports to the United States by selling at unreasonably low and uneconomic prices to secure additional dollar credits;

"(4) Increases or decreases of domestic production and of imports on the basis of both unit volume of articles produced and articles imported, and the respective percentages of each;

"(5) The probable extent and duration of changes in production costs and practices;

"(6) The degree to which normal cost relationships may be affected by grants, subsidies, excises, or other taxes, or otherwise, in the country of origin; and factors either in the United States or in other foreign countries which appear likely to affect production costs and competitive relationships.

"(c) Decreases or increases in import duties designed to provide for fair and reasonable competition between foreign and domestic articles may be made by the Authority either upon its own motion or upon application of any person or group showing adequate and proper interest in the import duties in question: *Provided, however,* That no change in any import duty shall be ordered by the Authority until after it shall have first conducted a full investigation and presented tentative proposals followed by a public hearing at which interested parties have an opportunity to be heard.

"(d) The Authority, in setting import duties so as to establish fair and reasonable competition as herein provided, may, in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, prescribe specific duties or ad valorem rates of duty upon the foreign value or export value as defined in sections 402 (c) and 402 (d) of the Tariff Act of 1930 or upon the United States value as defined in section 402 (e) of said act.

"(e) In order to carry out the purposes of this act, the Authority is authorized to transfer any article from the dutiable list to the free list, or from the free list to the dutiable list.

"(f) Any increase or decrease in import duties ordered by the Authority shall become effective 90 days after such order is announced: *Provided,* That any such order is first submitted to Congress by the Authority and is not disapproved, in whole or in part, by concurrent resolution of Congress within 60 days thereafter.

"(g) No order shall be announced by the Authority under this section which increases existing import duties on foreign articles if the Authority finds as a fact that the domestic industry operates, or the domestic article is produced, in a wasteful, inefficient, or extravagant manner.

"(h) The Authority, in the manner provided for in subdivision (c) and (f) in this section, may impose quantitative limits on the importation of any foreign article, in such amounts, and for such periods, as it finds necessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this Act: *Provided, however,* That no such quantitative limit shall be imposed contrary to the provisions of any foreign trade agreement in effect pursuant to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

"(i) For the purpose of this section—

"(1) the term 'domestic article' means an article wholly or in part the growth or product of the United States; and the term 'foreign article' means an article wholly or in part the growth or product of a foreign country;

"(2) the term 'United States' includes the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia;

"(3) the term 'foreign country' means any empire, country, dominion, colony, or protectorate, or any subdivision or subdivisions thereof (other than the United States and its possessions);

"(4) The term 'landed duty paid price' means the price of any foreign article after payment of the applicable customs or import duties and other necessary charges, as represented by the acquisition cost to an importing consumer, dealer, retailer, or manufacturer, or the offering price to a consumer, dealer, retailer, or manufacturer, if imported by an agent.

"(j) The Authority is authorized to make all needful rules and regulations for carrying out its functions under the provisions of this section.

"(k) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary for the entry and declaration of foreign articles with respect to which a change in basis of value has been made under the provisions of subdivision (d) of this section, and for the form of invoice required at time of entry."

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 337

SEC. 7. Title III, part II, section 337, of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended, as follows:

(a) Subdivision (a) thereof by striking out the word "President" and substituting therefor the word "Authority."

(b) Subdivision (b) thereof is hereby repealed.

(c) Subdivision (d) thereof is hereby repealed.

(d) Subdivision (e) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(e) EXCLUSION OF ARTICLES FROM ENTRY.—Whenever the existence of any such unfair method or act shall be established to the satisfaction of the Authority, it shall direct that the articles concerned in such unfair methods or acts, imported by any person violating the provisions of this act, shall be excluded from entry into the United States, and upon information of such action by the Authority, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, through the proper officers, refuse such entry."

(e) Subdivision (f) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) ENTRY UNDER BOND.—Whenever the Authority has reason to believe that any article is offered or sought to be offered for entry into the United States in violation of this section, but has not information sufficient to satisfy it thereof, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, upon its request in writing, forbid entry thereof until such investigation as the Authority may deem necessary shall be completed; except that such articles shall be entitled to entry under bond prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury."

(f) Subdivision (g) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(g) CONTINUANCE OF EXCLUSION.—Any refusal of entry under this section shall continue in effect until the Authority shall find and advise the Secretary of the Treasury that the conditions which led to such refusal of entry no longer exist."

CONTINUANCE OF PERSONNEL, FUNDS, ACTIONS, AND SO FORTH

SEC. 8. Section 339 of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 339. Effect of enactment.

"(a) All personnel, property, records, balance of appropriations, allocations, and other funds available (or to be made available) to the United States Tariff Commission shall be transferred to the Authority for use in connection with the exercise of its functions; and such transfer shall not operate to change the status of the officers and employees transferred from the Commission to the Authority. No investigation or other proceeding pending before the Commission at such time shall abate by reason of such transfer but shall continue under the provisions of this act.

"(b) Wherever in the Tariff Act of 1930, or in any other law, the terms 'United States Tariff Commission' or 'Commission' occur, such terms shall be construed to mean the 'Foreign Trade Authority' and the 'Authority,' respectively."

REAPPLICATION OF SECTION 516 (B)

SEC. 9. Section 17, subsection (c), of the act of June 25, 1938, chapter 679, is hereby repealed.

STATISTICAL ENUMERATION

SEC. 10. Title IV, part III, section 484 (e), of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(e) STATISTICAL ENUMERATION.—The Chairman of the Foreign Trade Authority is authorized and directed to establish from time to time, after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce, a statistical enumeration of imported articles in such detail as he may consider necessary and desirable to effectuate the purposes of this act. As a part of each entry there shall be attached thereto or included therein an accurate statement giving details required for such statistical enumeration. The Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized and directed to make such reasonable and proper digests from, and compilations of, such statistical data as the Chairman requests. In the event of a disagreement between the Chairman and the Secretary of Commerce, as to the reasonable and proper nature of any request the matter shall be referred to the President whose decision shall be final."

REVISED TEXT OF TARIFF ACT

SEC. 11. The Authority, as soon as practicable, shall prepare and cause to be printed as a public document available for public distribution a complete revised text of the Tariff Act of 1930 as amended.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 12. This act shall take effect as of June 13, 1948.

The explanation and digest of the provisions of the proposed bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A bill to revise the Tariff Act of 1930 may be described as follows:

Section 1 states the purposes of the amendment. They are:

(a) To facilitate importations to supplement the needs of industry and agriculture;

(b) To foster the export of products sufficient to pay for needed imports;

(c) To develop within the United States a balanced, integrated and diversified production so as to maintain a sound economy and high level of employment;

(d) To provide flexibility of import duties, thereby making possible adjustments in response to changing economic conditions; and

(e) To return to the United States the control over import duties now subject to international agreements in order to accomplish the above purposes.

Section 2 provides for writing into the tariff act all import duties now actually in effect by reason of trade agreements or otherwise (see also sec. 5 relating to existing trade agreements).

Section 3 and section 4 reconstitute the United States Tariff Commission as the new Foreign Trade Authority with additional powers and responsibilities as set out in section 5 and section 6 below.

Section 5 vests in the Foreign Trade Authority power and responsibility to administer trade agreements already in effect, or which might come into effect prior to June 13, 1948. It also directs the Authority to cancel (as of the earliest date possible) all existing agreements without, however, making changes in the import duties established by those agreements.

Section 6 delegates to the Authority the responsibility for administering a system of flexible import duties and the right to prescribe changes in import duties to provide fair and reasonable competition between domestic articles and like or similar foreign articles. Factors bearing upon the reasonableness of competition are set forth.

In prescribing such changes in import duties the Authority is not limited as to the percentage of change and is permitted to add articles to or remove articles from the free list, and to establish specific duties or ad valorem duties based either upon foreign value or upon United States value.

Changes in import duties can be made only:

1. After investigation, issuance of tentative proposals and public hearings thereon,

2. Effective in not less than 90 days after promulgation and only if not disapproved by concurrent resolution of Congress within 60 days.

Subject to the same limitations the Authority is delegated power to impose quantitative restrictions on imports when necessary to effectuate the purposes of the act.

Section 7 contains technical amendments concerning unfair practices in import trade occasioned by the transfer to the Authority of obligations hitherto residing in the President in reference to action in the event of such unfair practices.

Section 8 provides for transfer of personnel, property, funds, etc., from the United States Tariff Commission to the new foreign trade authority and continues proceedings now before the Commission without abatement.

Section 9 repeals part of the act of June 25, 1938 which made section 516 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 inoperative as respects any article subject to a trade agreement. The effect of this repeal is to again permit action if it is believed an article is incorrectly classified. This relates to classification rather than to the adequacy of the import duty assessed.

Section 10 gives the Chairman of the Foreign Trade Authority the power to request necessary statistical reports, after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce.

Section 11 directs the Authority to prepare a complete text of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

Section 12 prescribes the effective date as June 13, 1948, the day after the expiration of the so-called trade agreements amendment (sec. 350).

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in 1934 Congress gave to the President the power to conclude trade agreements with foreign countries by which both they and ourselves were to reduce tariffs and other so-called trade barriers. Four times Congress has renewed this delegation of authority over United States import duties. For 14 years the State Department, to use its own phrase, has been "horse trading" with foreign nations for a reduction of tariffs. The 14 years culminated in the negotiations at Geneva last summer, when, in on orgy of tariff cutting, most of our already low rates were slashed still further.

What have we gotten from all this "horse trading"? Today United States tariffs are lower than they have been for 100 years, while the tariffs and trade restrictions imposed by foreign countries are now more extensive than they were when the program got under way in 1934. It is not my intention to criticize foreign countries. In most cases it was sheer economic necessity which forced them to withdraw concessions to which they had agreed, or to nullify the concessions by the imposition of quotas, embargoes, currency manipulations and other devices.

Only a very rich nation can stand up under a division of her markets.

The United States has not withdrawn the concessions which it made, and stands today in the position of having severely restricted or traded outright many of its industries, with very little to show in return.

We are bound to these low rates by international agreements, the most important of which cannot be terminated

short of 3 years, and will continue indefinitely thereafter unless terminated after the 3-year term has expired. A new approach to the problem is clearly necessary. The bill which I am introducing provides that new approach. A similar bill will today be introduced in the House (H. R. 6379).

Many of my colleagues have supported the trade agreements program in the past because it was the only proposal which provided a method whereby tariff duties which were too high could be corrected without throwing the entire schedule of tariff rates open for general congressional debate. It is important that any new system provide a means whereby there can be prompt individual adjustment of tariff rates which get out of line, without resorting to a general periodic rewriting of the entire tariff by Congress. This the bill does.

The other prime objective of the bill is to remove the determination of the United States tariff rates from the arena of international agreements, which have often been referred to by the proponents of such measures as horse trading. Horse-trading methods of any kind, which are, in fact, dealing with the wage-standard of living of this Nation built up over a period of 140 years through the blood and sweat of millions of American citizens, is far from the best method of approach to a sound national policy for a great nation.

The second reason for recapturing control of our own import fees lies in the necessity for a high degree of flexibility, which is impossible if changes must be made through international agreement. The tariff structure of the United States has become rigidified by reason of the many trade agreements executed by the State Department. This has not yet caused any particular embarrassment, because of the abnormal trade conditions of the past few years, war conditions, subsidies, and gift-loans to foreign nations which can be used to purchase our own products. However, it is inevitable that future conditions will change with considerable rapidity, and to a hitherto unexperienced extent. We must be ready to meet such conditions. True flexibility of our import fees is essential to our national economic welfare.

To provide for a truly flexible import fee which can be made responsive to rapidly changing conditions, two steps have been incorporated in the bill. First, an agency to administer a flexible import fee under a delegation of authority from Congress according to definite principles embodied in the bill itself. And second, the removal of the United States import fees from the scope of international agreements.

As to the first, the bill provides for the reorganization and reconstituting of the Tariff Commission as the "Foreign Trade Authority" to administer a truly flexible import fee under delegated authority from Congress.

The delegation of authority is in some respects broader than that provided in the former trade-agreements amendment. It is provided that tariff rates may be lowered or raised without any percentage limitation and that articles may be added to or removed from the free list. The trade-agreements program limits reductions and allows no additions to the free list.

As to the second, the bill provides that all trade agreements executed under the trade agreements amendment (sec. 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930) shall be canceled as of the earliest date provided in the agreements themselves. In canceling the agreements, the United States tariff rates therein provided are to be incorporated as the official existing rates in the Tariff Act and are to be changed only when and if necessary as provided in the provisions set forth for the administration of the flexible import-fee system. In other words, we cancel our agreements but we do not cancel the reduced tariff rates to which we have agreed. Nobody knows whether these new reduced rates are adequate or not; we should leave them where they are for the present and change them, either downward or upward, only as future conditions dictate. This leaves foreign countries to do as they please—which they have pretty much done anyway—but indicates that we ourselves intend to stay put unless and until we find it necessary to change.

The Foreign Trade Authority provided for in the bill is directed to establish rates which will "provide for fair and reasonable competition between domestic articles and like or similar foreign articles." The bill sets forth guides and criteria for determining what represents fair and reasonable competition. Under such a system, if the standard of living and the level of costs abroad increase, our import fee would be correspondingly reduced; if foreign nations exploit their labor and dump low priced products in the United States, our rates would be increased.

The bill stipulates that no import fees can be increased if the authority "finds as a fact that the domestic industry operates, or the domestic article is produced in a wasteful, inefficient or extravagant manner." And to protect against the possibility of any ill-advised action the bill provides that a change promulgated by the authority may be disapproved by concurrent resolution of Congress within 60 days after submission.

The bill will accomplish all of the legitimate aims of any of the supporters of the trade agreements amendment. It will prevent the continuation of unduly high tariffs, but in their reduction will protect American industry, agriculture, and mining against mistakes frozen by long-term agreements, and import fees which do not conform to the differential of the cost of production. It will give far more encouragement to foreign producers by assuring them that United States import duties are to remain at a fair competitive level and will encourage foreign countries to increase their living standards without having to face the probability of being frozen out of our markets as a result of their higher costs. It will stabilize foreign trade by providing a yardstick of fair and reasonable competition instead of fixed tariffs, or of haphazard rates set by a bargaining system where each side seeks to gain unsuspected advantages. The bill removes from Congress the responsibility for studying and deliberating over the thousands of individual tariff rates, but retains for Congress the right to disapprove by concurrent resolution any unwise use which might conceivably be made of this delegated authority.

The bill provides machinery for adjusting import fees both up and down, whereas the effect of the trade agreements amendment has been only successive reductions, a process which obviously cannot continue indefinitely.

The thing which the bill does not do is to permit any Government official or agency to freeze United States import fees by international agreement and prevent us from making changes and corrections except at the risk of being criticized for withdrawing from a covenant made and accepted in good faith. This is the only point to which the more ardent "global planners" can take exception. But this feature is one of the bill's most important virtues. The one way in which we can protect our own economy and continue to seek fair play abroad is to be in a position promptly to revise our import fees when occasion demands. Conditions today call for flexibility in our import fees structure, not for rigidity made almost complete by international commitments. This does not mean that we should be any the less sympathetic to the problems of foreign nations, but merely that we consider such problems as they arise and that we consider them on their merits and make the decision ourselves on principle by law and not subject to Executive order or to the judgment of a bureau official. This is far different from the trade-agreements system where we commit ourselves in advance without knowledge of what the commitment may mean under changed conditions in the future.

The bill has been carefully drafted to cover the operation of current commitments and to provide for the problems of administration. It provides that so long as any existing trade agreements remain in force, the Foreign Trade Authority will have responsibility for administering the escape provisions and for taking such other action as is appropriate in accordance with the provisions of the agreements themselves. It provides that the authority can prescribe changes in rates only after full study, public announcement of the proposed new rates, and hearings thereon. Such a system is impossible under the "horse trading" technique of the trade-agreements program where all intentions have to be kept secret lest the other horse trader get wind of what we might be willing to do.

The proposed legislation establishes a definite basis for a liberalized foreign trade with the other 56 member nations of the United Nations, and encourages our associate nations to raise their wage-standard of living without fear of penalizing their exports to this country.

The bill, by defining the general principles of fair and reasonable competition, makes it possible to quickly adjust tariffs to compensate for the effect of changes in exchange rates, for foreign subsidy payments, dumping, and other practices which might affect normal competitive price relationships. Because the effect of such devices can be

so promptly offset, the enactment of the bill will go far to discourage foreign nations in the use of these devices which have, in the past, caused considerable dislocation of normal international trade.

The bill, in short, provides for every stated objective of the trade agreements program on an even more liberal basis than the limited-rate changes which are possible under that program, but it does so without tying the hands of the United States in such a way as to prevent us from making changes in our rates except upon the advice and consent of our competitors abroad.

The bill represents a constructive, positive program to handle the problems of foreign trade and to take our tariff structure out of the political arena—both national and international. It should receive enthusiastic support from the members of both parties.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be permitted to hold hearings during the remainder of the session of the Senate this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consent is granted.

AUTHORIZATION FOR PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS DURING RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President pro tempore be authorized to sign the following enrolled bills during the recess of the Senate:

S. 1481. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District;

S. 2195. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941; and

S. 2409. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, approved July 16, 1947."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I may state it is the intention now, subject to approval by the Senate, that when the Senate recesses today, it shall be until Friday noon. I call the attention of Senators to the fact that today a bill was reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, relating to an extension of another 30 days, I think, of the so-called National Housing Act. The bill refers to loans under title VI. It will undoubtedly be called for consideration next Friday, since, I understand, the present 30-day extension will expire on that day.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the bill propose to increase the fund for insurance purposes?

Mr. WHERRY. I am not sure what it does. I simply wanted to call attention to the fact that the bill had been reported, and that, in view of the fact that the present law terminates next Friday, all Senators who are interested in the extension of the act, either for 30 days or on any other basis, should be present. Senators may differ as to the amount of money involved.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Can the acting majority leader advise the Senate what legislation the majority proposes to bring up next week?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to state to the distinguished Senator that it is the intention now to bring up on Monday the Army civil-functions appropriation bill, about which there is considerable controversy. Minority views have been or will be filed, and consideration of the bill will no doubt take considerable time on Monday, perhaps all afternoon.

It is the hope of those interested that, after Monday, the armed-services legislation, or some phase of it, may be considered at an early date.

I think, in view of the minority views, a full afternoon's debate will be necessary Monday on the Army civil-functions appropriation bill, following which, if legislation is reported by the Armed Services Committee, that certainly should be given priority.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Nebraska for the information.

RECESS TO FRIDAY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if there is nothing further to come before the Senate today, I move that the Senate recess until Friday noon next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, April 30, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 28 (legislative day of April 22), 1948:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Thomas C. Wasson, of New Jersey, a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and consul general at Jerusalem, Palestine, and Transjordan, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Truce Commission for Palestine which was established by resolution of the Security Council of the United Nations April 23, 1948.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Robert L. Shivers, of Honolulu, Hawaii, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 32, with headquarters at Honolulu, Hawaii. (Reappointment.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 28, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast committed unto us the solemn trust of free government, grant unto our Nation the blessing of harmony and concord, making us one in heart, in mind, and in purpose.

Be with our President, our Speaker, and the Congress. As leaders may they be exemplars of the great virtues, guarded by Thy holy influence in doing the right. In these days of striving, help us so to acquit ourselves that we shall give no evidence of indifference. By the crises that press upon us, by the future that awaits us, by the hopes which cast their beams across our fears, and by the thought of Him who died to make man free, do Thou enable us to choose the divine way of justice and humanity. In Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

REPEALING TAX ON OLEOMARGARINE

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is consideration of the bill (H. R. 2245) to repeal the tax on oleomargarine.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2245) to repeal the tax on oleomargarine.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2245, with Mr. ARENDS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-nine Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 51]

Albert	Gallagher	Miller, Calif.
Andrews, Ala.	Gillette	Monroney
Battle	Granger	Morgan
Bell	Grant, Ala.	Norrell
Bennett, Mo.	Grant, Ind.	Norton
Blatnik	Harless, Ariz.	Pfeifer
Bloom	Harrison	Phillips, Tenn.
Boggs, Del.	Hartley	Ploeser
Boykin	Hedrick	Price, Fla.
Buckley	Hendricks	Rains
Carroll	Hobbs	Rich
Carson	Jackson, Calif.	Rizley
Celler	Jarman	Rooney
Chenoweth	Jenkins, Ohio	Schwabe, Mo.
Cole, Mo.	Jennings	Scoblick
Colmer	Johnson, Okla.	Simpson, Pa.
Cooley	Kearney	Smith, Maine
Cox	Kearns	Smith, Ohio
Cravens	Kefauver	Taylor
Crow	Kilday	Teague
Dawson, Ill.	Lemke	Thomas, N. J.
Dingell	Lesinski	Vursell
Douglas	McCowen	Wadsworth
Durham	Manasco	West
Ellis	Mansfield	
Fisher	Meade, Ky.	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ARENDS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2245, and finding itself without a quorum, had directed the roll to be called, when 354 Members responded to

their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the 5 minutes I yielded to myself previously and now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, as a dairy farmer from the great State of Pennsylvania and having been for a long time associated—in fact, having been associated all my life—with the industry and having won recognition in that field as a producer of dairy products and a breeder of good cows, I feel wounded today, not because the tax is going to be removed from oleomargarine—no; to me that is the insignificant part of this battle that is raging around here which has been so well lobbied and so well paid for on all sides—I feel wounded because of the fact we have been working so hard and so long to produce and have produced in this country the best supply of dairy products that have ever been marketed any place in the whole world all these years and have brought such products up to standards that are unsurpassed.

I am sorry that certain Members from the cotton area have seen fit for the last month to come into the well of this House from day to day and make malicious, vicious, small, and trifling assaults and attacks on our dairy products by saying they were not fit for human consumption; that they contained all manner of disease; to the extent that their own people are refusing to use them, and to the extent that their own people, knowing the make-up of oleomargarine, are refusing to use it, too. That is why, in certain sections of the South, when the Committee on Agriculture visited down there, even in some of the best hotels we could not be served with either oleomargarine or butter. There were some fine dinners given us in certain sections of the South, where many of their people were guests. I observed that milk was served in bottles, and not one of their guests tasted milk, while every member of the group from a dairy section drank his milk.

They have built up a prejudice against dairy products by their vicious attacks. It seems to me that those good farmers down there—and I know there are many of them in the South, and I know there are some good dairymen down there—I have made up my mind about one thing, and that is if they keep sending certain men back here to Congress who have maligned them as they have, who have maligned their product as they have, then I might vote for the Federal aid for education bill, because something will have to be done in certain sections of the South.

The dairy industry has not been subsidized like the crops are subsidized from which oleomargarine is made. The dairy farmers suffer from that subsidy in the fact that peanut feeds, soybean feeds, and cottonseed feeds have been pegged up in price by the Government. Peanuts have been taken from $40 to $200 per ton. They have been priced off the market just as some other commodities. Due to price and supports and subsidies, dairy feeds are today selling at more than $100 per ton. They have likewise increased production to the point where the Government is burdened with tremendous surpluses, which are proving costly to the taxpayers. It is politically unwise in the fact that this pressure has come from the South.

You Democrats were in the saddle for 14 long years and could have removed this tax, but with you it was a hot potato. You feared the farm votes. Now the Republicans were suckers enough to have the baby dumped in their laps. It has not been popular in the very fact that Stassen carried Pennsylvania yesterday, after having made the declaration that he was for the tax, which ought to make some faces red who trotted down this aisle to sign this petition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] has expired.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, this is not the first time that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] has attacked the people of the Southern States.

Some time ago he wanted to send somebody down there to improve our looks. I suggested then that if the people of Pennsylvania were going to send a missionary for that purpose, the chances were that the last one they would pick for that purpose would be the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS.]

Now he wants to send somebody down there to improve our intelligence. I submit that if the State of Pennsylvania wants to send anybody to the South to improve the intelligence of the people of that great section of the country, the last missionary they would pick for that purpose would be the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly.

Mr. GROSS. I assure you I can do your State a lot of good.

Mr. RANKIN. I can think of no contribution the gentleman could possibly make to the looks, the intelligence, or the welfare of the people of Mississippi.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, it is impossible for me to vote to repeal the Federal laws and taxes which regulate the sale of oleomargarine. The reason I oppose the elimination of this tax is because the dairy farmers and the American farmers who milk cows will be seriously affected by this far-reaching piece of legislation. In my opinion, this is a threat that reaches right down into the farm home and into the business of every farming community in our land. This legislation can easily result in the uncontrolled, ruthless competition of a low-cost synthetic product sold in almost complete imitation of butter. I fear that it will hurt butter prices and reflect its damage through the entire dairy industry. I fear that there will be fewer farmers who can be able to stay in the milk business, and what hurts the farmer who milks the cow and what hurts agriculture in general will hurt business in all of our farming communities.

The propaganda to repeal the oleo laws is backed by a powerful lobby which apparently is supplied with and which has spent millions of dollars. I fear our housewives have been hoodwinked by this unfair publicity campaign into believing they are paying exorbitant "spite prices" as a tribute to dairy farmers.

I predict higher and not lower prices for synthetic and imitation butter in the not distant future if this bill is passed. I predict less use of soybean oil, cottonseed oil, and other American-produced oils in the manufacture of future oleomargarine. It is my firm belief that what the synthetic butter trust is planning for the future is to flood our country with cheaply produced foreign oils, such as coconut oil, which will go into the manufacture of future margarine.

This bill is merely the vehicle by which the floodgates for this foreign-produced oil will be opened and the American market which belonged to the American farmer will be destroyed.

The oleo taxes are not burdensome but they are absolutely necessary for the enforcement of the present laws. There can be no compromise on this oleomargarine legislation. The reasons are simple. They have been pointed out many times by the cooperative milk producers of our country. Here are five very important reasons why these taxes are needed to protect the American farmer:

First. No enforcement of oleo regulations can be effective without the taxation powers which have been enacted by the Congress.

Second. To enforce this legislation the tax upon yellow oleomargarine must be high enough to differentiate it from the uncolored product.

Third. Existing legislation enacted in 1902 has minimized and will continue to minimize the sale of yellow oleomargarine sold as butter.

Fourth. The occupational tax paid by handlers of oleomargarine may be large or small, or be collected annually or on a perpetual basis. But it is essential as the basis of enforcing penalties for violations under the Federal act.

Fifth. No Federal law prohibiting the sale of yellow oleomargarine would be effective because such a law could not reach within State borders unless it were enforced by a Federal tax.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

REPEAL LONG SOUGHT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, when the original resolution was before the

House, I stated that years ago I advocated the repeal of this oleomargarine tax on the poor who could not afford to buy butter. I could not, however, at that time give the dates I introduced the bills, and some of the younger Members thought I made this statement for the purpose of getting a little credit. Just by chance I happened to locate the two bills that I introduced on the subject. For the benefit of those Members—because the older Members know I never say anything unless I can substantiate it—I wish to state that on April 23, 1910, I introduced H. R. 24881, a bill to eliminate the tax on butterine, and to regulate and provide supervision over the oleomargarine manufacturers. It was not for the sole purpose of reducing the tax, because I had no more interest in the butterine manufacturers, who were to be benefited, than I had for the farm bloc and the combination that brought about the adoption of the unfair, unjustifiable, and unwarranted oleomargarine tax.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may embody the bill in my remarks, because it was a very constructive bill and drafted with great care. I was a younger man then and could devote more time to preparing and drafting bills than time permits me to do now.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. I was unable to obtain favorable action on the bill that year. However, 2 years later, on January 20, 1912, I introduced another bill, H. R. 18427, to eliminate the tax on butterine and oleomargarine and also providing for stringent regulations on the manufacturers of this product so that the poor people would be able to obtain a wholesome butterine at prices they could afford to pay. Of course, that was 36 years ago, and many of you naturally do not recall that proposed legislation. Under the leave given me, I shall also include this bill in my remarks.

ONE-DOLLAR-A-POUND BUTTER AROUSED HOUSEWIVES

Many repeal bills have been introduced since, but because of conditions and the two world wars we were unsuccessful in obtaining the passage of any of them. However, when butter finally reached the price of a dollar a pound last year, housewives became so aroused that we finally succeeded in getting 218 signatures to the discharge petition to eliminate the tax on oleomargarine. Personally, I feel that we should not eliminate the regulations governing the manufacture of oleomargarine.

LOBBY CHARGE

During the debate I heard many gentlemen on the Republican side charge that the signing of the discharge petition was brought about by the propaganda and activities of a powerful lobby. I agree that the people have been aroused and that there is a great general demand for the passage of this legislation. Although I have always criticized and opposed lobbies, I realize and recognize that there are exceptions to every rule. This is why I have never attacked or assailed the lobbies who are working in the interest of the people; and I hope that in the future the people will wake up and take an interest in legislation for their benefit that sometimes reaches the floor.

This type of lobby, as I stated, is working for the good of the people and is not a lobby of the vested interests who are here day in and day out urging, advocating, and influencing legislation for their own selfish avaricious gains.

STATES MUST REPEAL TAX

I realize that there are some States, including my own State of Illinois, where the dairy interests have been able, through their influential lobbies in Springfield, to pass legislation taxing and restricting the sale of oleomargarine, but I am hopeful that the good people of Illinois will this time elect a Democratic governor who will bring about the repeal of this unfair tax against those who, as I said before, cannot pay a dollar a pound for butter and therefore are obliged to buy a substitute.

PROTECTION FOR CONSUMERS

Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding that I favor the repeal of the oleomargarine tax, I am also in favor of protecting the American people from being imposed upon. Consequently, I shall vote for the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS], which amendment is similar or in substance the same as one of the provisions contained in each of the bills which I introduced in 1910 and 1912 which proposed to protect consumers in their purchases and users in being served oleomargarine instead of butter.

As to the manufacturers raising the price on oleomargarine, no doubt that will be their aim, because the biggest manufacturers are the packers and two or three other industries not connected with the packing interests. But I warn them that if they try to raise the price of oleomargarine, if this legislation is finally enacted into law, I shall immediately demand an investigation of the unwarranted increase or high prices of their many byproducts.

Yes; we have joined with the southern gentlemen because they have shown an inclination to legislate in the right direction and I hope that this is the beginning and that we can cooperate in the future in the interest of the people and the consumers. However, if these southern gentlemen fail they cannot expect the gentlemen of the North to cooperate and aid them in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I shall reintroduce the bill, H. R. 18427, which I introduced 36 years ago, which carries constructive provisions that will properly regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine and provide protection to the consumers. I hope that in the future the dairies that have been making tremendous profits from the manufacture and sale of butter will also be regulated and that the people will be able to get a cheaper substitute in the form of oleomargarine.

In conclusion, I insert the bills which I introduced in 1910 and 1912 on the subject of this legislation, as follows:

H. R. 24881

(In the House of Representatives, April 23, 1910, Mr. SABATH introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed)

A bill to change the name of oleomargarine to butterine and to change the rate of tax on butterine and renovated butter; to protect the consumers, dealers, and manufacturers of all kinds of cream butter, butterine, and renovated butter against fraud; and to afford the Bureau of Internal Revenue more efficient means for the detection of fraud and the collection of revenue

Be it enacted, etc., That every manufacturer or producer or wholesale dealer in materials and ingredients, as provided for in section 2 of this act, engaged in trade or commerce in the District of Columbia, or in any Territory of the United States, or between any Territory and another, or between any Territory or Territories and any State or States or the District of Columbia, or with foreign nations, or between the District of Columbia and any State or States or foreign nations, shall be liable to the provisions of this act.

SEC. 2. That for the purposes of this act certain manufactured substances, certain extracts, and certain mixtures with cream butter or with milk, heretofore known as "oleomargarine," "oleo," "oleomargarine oil," "butterine," "lardine," "suine and neutral," "lard extracts," "tallow extracts," "tallow," "beef fat," "suet," "lard," "lard oil," "vegetable oil," "intestinal fat," and "offal fat," including all compounds or mixtures of what heretofore has been known as "oleomargarine," "oleo," "oleomargarine oil," "butterine," "lardine," "suine and neutral," "lard extracts," "tallow extracts," "tallow," "beef fat," "suet," "lard," "lard oil," "vegetable oil," "intestinal fat," and "offal fat," with or without coloring matter, made in imitation or semblance of cream butter, or whether so made or not, if sold or offered for sale or intended to be sold or offered for sale as cream butter or as a substitute for cream butter, shall be known and designated as "butterine."

SEC. 3. That for the purposes of this act the words "cream butter" shall be understood to mean the food product usually known as cream butter and which is made exclusively from milk, cream, or both, with or without common salt, and with or without additional coloring matter, chemical or other, and does not contain more than 16 percent of moisture.

SEC. 4. That "renovated butter" is hereby defined to mean cream butter which has been subjected to any process by which it is melted, clarified, or refined, and made to resemble genuine and fresh cream butter, as defined by this act.

SEC. 5. That "renovated butter" is hereby defined to mean a grade of butter produced by mixing, reworking, rechurning in milk or cream, refining, or in any way producing a uniform, purified, or improved product from different lots or parcels of melted and unmelted butter or butterfat, in which any acid, alkali, chemical, or any substance of whatsoever nature is introduced or used for the purpose or with the effect of deodorizing or removing therefrom rancidity, or any cream butter or butterfat with which there is mixed any substance foreign to cream butter as herein defined, with intent or effect of cheapening in cost the product of any butter in the manufacture or manipulation of which any process or material is used with intent or effect of causing the absorption of abnormal quantities of water, milk, or cream.

SEC. 6. That special taxes are imposed as follows:

Manufacturers of cream butter, butterine, and renovated butter shall pay $50 per annum: *Provided*, That all persons who make cream butter only from the milk of cows pastured upon land owned or rented and farmed by them shall be exempt from the provisions of this act. Whoever manufactures cream butter, butterine, or renovated butter for sale shall be deemed a manufacturer of cream butter, butterine, or renovated butter.

Wholesale dealers in cream butter, butterine, or renovated butter shall pay $25 per annum. Whoever sells or offers for sale cream butter, butterine, or renovated butter in the original manufacturers' packages, or in quantities of more than 10 pounds at one time, shall be deemed a wholesale dealer in cream butter, butterine, or renovated butter. But any manufacturer of cream butter, butterine, or renovated butter, who has given the required bond and paid the required special tax and who sells only cream butter, butterine, or renovated butter of his own production, at the place of manufacture, in the original package to which the tax-paid stamps are affixed, shall not be required to pay special tax as a wholesale dealer in cream butter, butterine, or renovated butter on account of such sales.

Retail dealers shall pay $6 per annum. Whoever sells cream butter, butterine, or renovated butter in quantities not exceeding 10 pounds shall be regarded a retail dealer in cream butter, butterine, or renovated butter.

SEC. 7. That every manufacturer of cream butter, butterine, or renovated butter shall file with the collector of internal revenue for the district in which his manufactory is located such bonds, notices, and inventories, shall keep such books and render such returns in relation to his business, shall put up such signs and affix such number to his factory, and conduct his business as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may by regulations require.

Every manufacturer of cream butter, butterine, and renovated butter shall enter daily in a book, in such form as may be prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, the quantity and quality of materials or ingredients used for the production of cream butter, butterine, and renovated butter, and number of packages and pounds of cream butter, butterine, and renovated butter sold or removed, and the name and place of business or residence of each person to whom sold or consigned. Every wholesale dealer in cream butter, butterine, and renovated butter shall enter, on the day when received, in a book, in such form as may be prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, the number of packages and pounds of cream butter, butterine, and renovated butter received, and number of packages and pounds of cream butter, butterine, and renovated butter disposed of on the day when sold or removed, and the name and place of business or residence of each person, firm, or corporation to whom sold or consigned; but the bond required of such manufacturer shall be approved by the collector of internal revenue and be in a penal sum of not less than $500, and shall be increased from time to time in proportion to the quantity of production or manufacture, and additional sureties required, at the discretion of the collector or under instructions of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. And the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, is hereby authorized to detail, from the force now allowed by law, the necessary agents, deputies, or other officers for assignment at the various manufactories where cream butter, butterine, and renovated butter are produced, and whose duty shall be the ascertainment of the quantity of materials and manufactured product, supervision over the affixing and cancellation of stamps, and the enforcement of the law and regulations made thereunder as the commissioner may from time to time direct.

SEC. 8. That all cream butter, butterine, and renovated butter shall be put up by manufacturers in their manufactories in bricks, prints, or rolls of one-half, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 10 pounds, and in no larger or smaller subdivisions, which bricks, prints, or rolls shall be pressed by the manufacturer in the manufactory in a mold or form in such manner as to conspicuously indent the cream butter, butterine, or renovated butter to a depth of not less than one-eighth of 1 inch, on the surface thereof, with the words "Cream butter," "Butterine," or "Renovated butter," respectively, in letters one-fourth of an inch square. Such bricks, prints, or rolls may be first wrapped or incased in thin paper, marked or branded as herein prescribed, and shall then be wrapped or incased in other wrappers with the words "Cream butter," "Butterine," or "Renovated butter" printed or branded thereon in block letters, which shall be three-fourths inch square, and such wrappers shall also bear the name of the manufacturer, together with the label required by this act; and these bricks, prints, or rolls shall then be packed by the manufacturer thereof in wooden or other packages, each containing not less than 10 pounds, which shall likewise be marked or branded as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prescribe; and the internal-revenue stamp or stamps shall be so affixed to the one-half-, 1-, 2-, 3-, 4-, 5-, and 10-pound bricks, prints, or rolls as to seal the wrapper thereof so that such wrapper or coverings may not be opened without destroying the stamp affixed thereto; and all sales made by the manufacturers of cream butter, butterine, or renovated butter, and wholesale dealers in cream butter, butterine, and renovated butter shall be in the original manufacturers' packages of not less than 10 pounds: *Provided*, That cream butter, butterine, and renovated butter for export may be put up in tin or wooden packages of any style, shape, or material and containing any quantity up to and including 112 pounds.

Retail dealers in cream butter, butterine, and renovated butter shall sell only the manufacturers' one-half-, 1-, 2-, 3-, 4-, 5-, and 10-pound bricks, prints, or rolls, to which the tax-paid stamps are affixed, and in quantities not exceeding 10 pounds at one time. Whoever sells or offers for sale or delivers or offers to deliver any cream butter, butterine, or renovated butter in any other form than in the package above described, or who packs in any package any cream butter, butterine, or renovated butter in any manner contrary to law, or who sells or offers for sale as cream butter any butterine or renovated butter, or who falsely brands any package or affixes any stamp on any package denoting a less amount of tax than that required by law, shall be fined for each offense not more than $200, or be imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both.

SEC. 9. That every manufacturer of cream butter, butterine, and renovated butter shall securely affix, by printing or by pasting on each stamped package containing cream butter, butterine, or renovated butter manufactured by him, a label, on which shall appear, besides the number of the manufactory and the district and State in which it is situated, these words:

"NOTICE.—That the manufacturer of the cream butter, butterine, or renovated butter herein has complied with all the requirements of the law."

Every manufacturer of cream butter, butterine, or renovated butter who neglects to provide such a label for any package containing cream butter, butterine, or renovated butter, made by him or sold or removed for sale by or for him, and every person who removes any such label from any such packages shall be fined $50 for every package in respect to which such offense is committed.

SEC. 10. That upon cream butter, butterine, and renovated butter that shall be manufactured and sold or removed for consumption or use, there shall be assessed and collected a tax of one-fourth cent per pound, to be paid by the manufacturer thereof, and every fractional part of a pound in a package shall be taxed as a pound. The tax levied by this section shall be represented by suitable and special stamps denoting the weight and character of the article, and all the provisions of the existing laws governing engraving, issuing, sale, affixing, cancellation, accounting, effacement, and destruction of stamps provided for internal revenue are, so far as applicable, hereby made to apply to the stamps provided for by this act: *Provided*, That cream butter made by persons exempt from the provisions of this act, as hereinabove set forth, shall become subject to tax when it has become the property of dealers, and and in that event such dealers shall affix the stamps thereon.

SEC. 11. That this act shall apply to all cream butter, butterine, and renovated butter imported from foreign countries, and the collector of internal revenue shall prescribe rules and regulations as to the manner of stamping, repacking, and withdrawing all of such imported cream butter, butterine, or renovated butter; and the owner or importer of such cream butter, butterine, or renovated butter shall be liable to all the penal provisions of this act prescribed for the manufacturers of cream butter, butterine, and renovated butter produced in the United States. Whenever it is necessary to take any cream butter, butterine, or renovated butter to any place other than the public stores of the United States for the purpose of affixing and canceling such stamps, the collector of customs of the port where such cream butter, butterine, or renovated butter is entered shall designate a bonded warehouse to which it shall be taken, under the control of such customs officer as such collector may direct; and every officer of customs who permits any such cream butter, butterine, or renovated butter to pass out of his custody or control without compliance by the owner or importer thereof with the provisions of this section relating thereto shall be fined not more than $500 or be imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both. Whoever sells or offers for sale any imported cream butter, butterine, or renovated butter purporting or claimed to be imported, not put up in packages and stamped as provided by this act, shall be fined not more than $500 or be imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both.

SEC. 12. That all packages of cream butter, butterine, and renovated butter, subject to tax under this act, which may be found without stamps or marks as hereby provided, shall be confiscated by the United States. Whoever willfully removes or defaces any of the stamps, marks, or brands on packages containing cream butter, butterine, or renovated butter taxed as provided herein, or reuses such stamps, shall for each such offense be fined not more than $500 or be imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both.

SEC. 13. That cream butter, butterine, and renovated butter may be removed from the place of manufacture for export to a foreign country without payment of tax or affixing stamps thereto under such regulations and the filing of such bonds and other security as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may prescribe. Every person who

shall export cream butter, butterine, or renovated butter shall brand upon every package containing such article the words "Cream butter," "Butterine," or "Renovated butter," or their respective equivalent descriptive word in the language of the country to which exportation is to be made, in plain roman letters not less than one-half of an inch square: *Provided*, That cream butter, butterine, or renovated butter manufactured for export to any foreign country may be put up in rolls, prints, or solid, in packages of 10, 25, 40, 60, and 100 pounds each.

SEC. 14. That whenever any person engaged in the carrying on of the business of manufacturing cream butter, butterine, or renovated butter, defrauds or attempts to defraud the United States of the tax on the cream butter, butterine, or renovated butter, produced by him, or any part thereof, his manufactory shall be confiscated and all manufacturing apparatus used by him and all cream butter, butterine, or renovated butter and all other material for the production of cream butter, butterine, or renovated butter found in the factory and on the factory premises or owned by him, and shall be fined not more than $1,000 or be imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both.

SEC. 15. That manufacturers of and wholesale dealers in cream butter, butterine, and renovated butter shall keep such books and render such returns in relation to the business conducted by them as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may by regulation require, and such books shall be open at all times to the inspection of any internal-revenue officer or agent. Whoever fails to keep such books or render such returns in relation to the business as required by the regulations of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, or makes a false entry in such books or returns, shall, for each offense, be fined not more than $500 or be imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both.

SEC. 16. That the provision of existing laws relating to internal revenue, so far as applicable, are hereby made to extend to and include and apply to the taxes imposed by this act, and to substances upon which and the persons upon whom they are imposed. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may make all needful regulations for carrying into effect the provisions of this act.

SEC. 17. That the act of Aug. 2, 1886 (24 Stat. L., p. 209), and the act of Oct. 1, 1890 (26 Stat. L., p. 621), and the act of May 9, 1902 (32 Stat. L., p. 194), be, and the same hereby are, repealed.

SEC. 18. That this act shall take effect upon the 1st day of December 1910.

H. R. 18427

(In the House of Representatives, Jan. 20, 1912, Mr. SABATH introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed)

A bill to change the name of oleomargarine to butterine, and to change the rate of tax on butterine and renovated butter; to protect the consumers, dealers, and manufacturers of all kinds of butterine and renovated butter against fraud; and to afford the Bureau of Internal Revenue more efficient means for the detection of fraud and the collection of the revenue

Be it enacted, etc., That every manufacturer or producer or wholesale dealer in materials and ingredients, as provided for in section 2 of this act, engaged in trade or commerce in the District of Columbia, or in any Territory of the United States, or between any Territory and another, or between any Territory or Territories and any State or States or the District of Columbia, or with foreign nations, or between the District of Columbia and any State or States or foreign nations, shall be liable to the provisions of this act.

SEC. 2. That for the purposes of this act certain manufactured substances, certain extracts, and certain mixtures with cream butter or with milk, heretofore known as "oleomargarine," "oleo," "oleomargarine oil," "butterine," "lardine," "suine and neutral," "lard extracts," "tallow extracts," "tallow," "beef fat," "suet," "lard," "lard oil," "vegetable oil," "intestinal fat," and "offal fat," including all compounds or mixtures of what heretofore has been known as "oleomargarine," "oleo," "oleomargarine oil," "butterine," "lardine," "suine and neutral," "lard extracts," "tallow extracts," "tallow," "beef fat," "suet," "lard," "lard oil," "vegetable oil," "intestinal fat," and "offal fat," with or without coloring matter, made in imitation or semblance of cream butter, or whether so made or not, if offered for sale or intended to be sold or offered for sale as a substitute for cream butter, shall be known and designated as "butterine."

SEC. 3. That "renovated butter" is hereby defined to mean cream butter which has been subjected to any process by which it is melted, clarified, or refined, and made to resemble genuine and fresh cream butter, or a grade of butter produced by mixing, reworking, rechurning in milk or cream, refining, or in any way producing a uniform, purified, or improved product from different lots or parcels of melted and unmelted butter or butterfat, in which any acid, alkali, chemical, or any substance of whatsoever nature is introduced or used for the purpose or with the effect of deodorizing or removing therefrom rancidity, or any cream butter or butterfat with which there is mixed any substance foreign to cream butter as herein defined, with intent or effect of cheapening in cost the product of any butter in the manufacture or manipulation of which any process or material is used with intent or effect of causing the absorption of abnormal quantities of water, milk, or cream.

SEC. 4. That special taxes are imposed as follows:

Manufacturers of butterine and renovated butter shall pay $100 per annum, and whoever manufactures butterine or renovated butter for sale shall be deemed a manufacturer of butterine or renovated butter.

Wholesale dealers in butterine or renovated butter shall pay $25 per annum. Whoever sells or offers for sale butterine or renovated butter in the original manufacturers' packages, or in quantities of more than 25 pounds at one time, shall be deemed a wholesale dealer in butterine or renovated butter. But any manufacturer of butterine or renovated butter, who has given the required bond and paid the required special tax and who sells only butterine or renovated butter of his own production, at the place of manufacture, in the original package to which the tax-paid stamps are affixed, shall not be required to pay special tax as a wholesale dealer in butterine or renovated butter on account of such sales.

Retail dealers shall pay $6 per annum. Whoever sells butterine or renovated butter in quantities not exceeding 25 pounds shall be regarded a retail dealer in butterine or renovated butter.

SEC. 5. That every manufacturer of butterine or renovated butter shall file with the collector of internal revenue for the district in which his manufactory is located such bonds, notices, and inventories, shall keep such books and render such returns in relation to his business, shall put up such signs and affix such number to his factory, and conduct his business as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may by regulations require.

Every manufacturer of butterine and renovated butter shall enter daily in a book, in such form as may be prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, the quantity and quality of materials or ingredients used for the production of butterine and renovated butter, and number of packages and pounds of butterine and renovated butter sold or removed, and the name and place of business or residence of each person to whom sold or consigned. Every wholesale dealer in butterine and renovated butter shall enter, on the day when received, in a book, in such form as may be prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, the number of packages and pounds of butterine and renovated butter received, and number of packages and pounds of butterine and renovated butter disposed of on the day when sold or removed, and the name and place of business or residence of each person, firm, or corporation to whom sold or consigned; but the bond required of such manufacturer shall be approved by the collector of internal revenue and be in a penal sum of not less than $1,000, and shall be increased from time to time in proportion to the quantity of production or manufacture, and additional sureties required, at the discretion of the collector or under instructions of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. And the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, is hereby authorized to detail, from the force now allowed by law, the necessary agents, deputies, or other officers for assignment at the various manufactories where butterine and renovated butter are produced, and whose duty shall be the ascertainment of the quantity of materials and manufactured product, supervision over the affixing and cancellation of stamps, and the enforcement of the law and regulations made thereunder as the Commissioner may from time to time direct.

SEC. 6. That all butterine and renovated butter shall be put up by manufacturers in their manufactories in bricks, prints, or rolls of one-half, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 10 pounds, and in no larger or smaller subdivisions, which bricks, prints, or rolls shall be pressed by the manufacturer in the manufactory in a mold or form in such manner as to conspicuously indent the butterine or renovated butter to a depth of not less than one-eighth of 1 inch, on the surface thereof, with the words "Butterine" or "Renovated butter," respectively, in letters one-fourth of an inch square. Such bricks, prints, or rolls may be first wrapped or incased in thin paper, marked or branded as herein prescribed, and shall then be wrapped or incased in other wrappers with the words "Butterine" or "Renovated butter" printed or branded thereon in block letters, which shall be three-fourths inch square, and such wrappers shall also bear the name of the manufacturer, together with the label required by this act; and these bricks, prints, or rolls shall then be packed by the manufacturer thereof in wooden or other packages, each containing not less than 10 pounds, which shall likewise be marked or branded as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prescribe; and the internal-revenue stamp or stamps shall be so affixed to the one-half, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 10 pound bricks, prints, or rolls as to seal the wrapper thereof so that such wrappers or coverings may not be opened without destroying the stamp affixed thereto; and all sales made by the manufacturers of butterine or renovated butter, and wholesale dealers in butterine and renovated butter shall be in the original manufacturers' packages of not less than 10 pounds: *Provided*, That butterine and renovated butter for export may be put up in tin or wooden packages of any style, shape, or material and containing any quantity up to and including 112 pounds.

Retail dealers in butterine and renovated butter shall sell only the manufacturers' one-half, 1-, 2-, 3-, 4-, 5-, and 10-pound bricks, pints, or rolls, to which the tax-paid

stamps are affixed, and in quantities not exceeding 10 pounds at one time. Whoever sells or offers for sale or delivers or offers to deliver any butterine or renovated butter in any other form than in the package above described, or who packs in any package any butterine or renovated butter in any manner contrary to law, or who falsely brands any package or affixes any stamp on any package denoting a less amount of tax than that required by law, shall be fined for each offense not more than $200, or be imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both.

SEC. 7. That every manufacturer of butterine and renovated butter shall securely affix, by printing or by pasting on each stamped package containing butterine or renovated butter manufactured by him, a label, on which shall appear, besides the number of the manufactory and the district and State in which it is situated, these words:

"NOTICE.—That the manufacturer of the butterine or renovated butter herein has complied with all the requirements of the law."

Every manufacturer of butterine or renovated butter who neglects to provide such a label for any package containing butterine or renovated butter, made by him or sold or removed for sale by or for him, and every person who removes any such label from any such packages shall be fined $50 for every package in respect to which such offense is committed.

SEC. 8. That upon butterine and renovated butter that shall be manufactured and sold or removed for consumption or use there shall be assessed and collected a tax of 1 cent per pound, to be paid by the manufacturer thereof, and every fractional part of a pound in a package shall be taxed as a pound. The tax levied by this section shall be represented by suitable and special stamps denoting the weight and character of the article, and all the provisions of the existing laws governing engraving, issuing, sale, affixing, cancellation, accounting, effacement, and destruction of stamps provided for internal revenue are, so far as applicable, hereby made to apply to the stamps provided for by this act.

SEC. 9. That this act shall apply to all butterine and renovated butter imported from foreign countries, and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall prescribe rules and regulations as to the manner of stamping, repacking, and withdrawing all of such imported butterine or renovated butter; and the owner or importer of such butterine or renovated butter shall be liable to all the penal provisions of this act prescribed for the manufacturers of butterine and renovated butter produced in the United States. Whenever it is necessary to take any butterine or renovated butter to any place other than the public stores of the United States for the purpose of affixing and canceling such stamps, the collector of customs of the port where such butterine or renovated butter is entered shall designate a bonded warehouse to which it shall be taken, under the control of such customs officer as such collector may direct; and every officer of customs who permits any such butterine or renovated butter to pass out of his custody or control without compliance by the owner or importer thereof with the provisions of this section relating thereto shall be fined not more than $2,000 or be imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both. Whoever sells or offers for sale any imported butterine, or renovated butter purporting or claimed to be imported, not put up in packages and stamped as provided by this act, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or be imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

SEC. 10. That all packages of butterine and renovated butter subject to tax under this act, which may be found without stamps or marks as hereby provided, shall be confiscated by the United States. Whoever willfully removes or defaces any of the stamps, marks, or brands on packages containing butterine or renovated butter taxed as provided herein, or reuses such stamps, shall for each such offense be fined not more than $500 or be imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both.

SEC. 11. That butterine and renovated butter may be removed from the place of manufacture for export to a foreign country without payment of tax or affixing stamps thereto under such regulations and the filing of such bonds and other security as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may prescribe. Every person who shall export butterine or renovated butter shall brand upon every package containing such article the words "Butterine," or "Renovated butter," or their respective equivalent descriptive word in the language of the country to which exportation is to be made, in plain roman letters not less than one-half of an inch square: *Provided*, That butterine or renovated butter manufactured for export to any foreign country may be put up in rolls, prints, or solid, in packages of 10, 25, 40, 60, and 100 pounds each.

SEC. 12. That whenever any person engaged in the carrying on of the business of manufacturing butterine or renovated butter, defrauds or attempts to defraud the United States of the tax on the butterine or renovated butter produced by him, or any part thereof, his manufactory shall be confiscated and all manufacturing apparatus used by him and all butterine or renovated butter and all other material for the production of butterine or renovated butter found in the factory and on the factory premises or owned by him, and shall be fined not more than $1,000 or be imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both.

SEC. 13. That manufacturers of and wholesale dealers in butterine and renovated butter shall keep such books and render such returns in relation to the business conducted by them as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may by regulation require, and such books shall be open at all times to the inspection of any internal revenue officer or agent. Whoever fails to keep such books or render such returns in relation to the business as required by the regulations of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, or makes a false entry in such books or returns, shall, for each offense, be fined not more than $1,000 or be imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

SEC. 14. That the provision of existing laws relating to internal revenue, so far as applicable, are hereby made to extend to and include and apply to the taxes imposed by this act, and to substances upon which and the persons upon whom they are imposed. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may make all needful regulations for carrying into effect the provisions of this act.

SEC. 15. That the act of August 2, 1886 (24 Stat. L., p. 209), and the act of October 1, 1890 (26 Stat. L., p. 621), and the act of May 9, 1902 (32 Stat. L., p. 194), be, and the same hereby are, repealed.

SEC. 16. That this act shall take effect upon the 1st day of December 1912.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I am not interested in improving the looks of my southern friends. They look pretty good to me, by and large. I am not even interested in lifting the level of intelligence of my southern friends because they average up pretty well with the level of intelligence of the people of the Nation as a whole. I am not interested in improving the American attitude of my southern friends because I like their attitude on American questions.

But this oleomargarine question has been a tug of war between the cotton States and the dairy States for lo these many years and it has been an even tug of war and a friendly tug of war. Of late years, however, the soybean interests have come into the picture and made it a little bit more uneven as a tug of war. Of course, when a tug of war is a little more uneven it gets a little bit hotter and we get a little bit peeved sometimes.

Well, I am not even peeved, but I do know this, that regardless of the repeal of this tax, all the poor people in Chicago that the gentleman from Chicago spoke about will not be benefited by its repeal, because the State of Illinois has a State law which says that you cannot manufacture nor you cannot even sell colored oleomargarine in Illinois. So the repeal of this tax will not help those people at all.

Now then, I have had letters, telegrams, and petitions sent to me asking me to support the repeal of this tax, and I have answered every single one of them by saying, "You are starting at the wrong end. You get the Illinois State law repealed forbidding the manufacture and sale of colored oleomargarine, and then I can consider removing the Federal tax, but until you do that the repeal of this tax will not help you." I understand there are some 23 States that have such laws. So, if this tug of war is going to get severe, I may have to part company from my southern friends on many of their pet programs that I have supported, if they insist upon this measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I admire the vigorous fight that the dairy State representatives have made to defeat this bill. I think, however, they would agree that it is utterly impossible for a group having economic interests to take an objective view on a question of this kind and that would apply to us all. Without any feeling I want to comment on what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] has said, implying a threat against the cotton producers of the South.

I began to take an interest in this fight in 1937 when Oscar Johnston called a meeting to consider the handicap that the producers of oleomargarine were under by reason of these artificial restrictions. We began that fight in 1937, and for years we pursued it. We got exactly nowhere. I supported it vigorously because, believe me, I thought it was right. And finally, as this fight has come to a successful fruition, it is apparent that it is because it is fundamentally right, and not just because cotton-seed interests are behind it. Now, if the gentleman has retaliation in mind, then he must punish the consumers because until this became something more than a producers' fight no progress toward repeal was made. I hope that we can have an atmosphere of understanding and good will instead of one of bitter differences.

An important economic development is taking place. The dairy industry is growing in the South, and you of the dairy section are going to have a new group on your side. That explains the vote of my good friend, the gentleman-man from Tennessee, JOE EVINS, and perhaps of others who have voted with you. There is a growing dairy industry in many parts of the South, and I am interested in it, not only because of the economic aspects which will strengthen us but for social implications, which are also valuable. There are 175,000 sturdy dairy farmers in Wisconsin alone. They are Republicans, most of them, I assume, and, while we do not vote alike, I appreciate their contribution to the preservation of a rural culture that I think is vital to this Nation.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I want the record to show that Mr. Johnston is a big cotton farmer, and no doubt he has had thousands upon hundreds of thousands of dollars out of the United States Treasury. He is promoting a system of agriculture in America based on large landholdings, where the renter works somebody else's land. In this Wisconsin, of which the gentleman speaks, we have an agricultural economy based on the fact that a man that lives on a piece of land can live as an American and educate his children as Americans, and live as an American is supposed to live.

Mr. HAYS. With that I agree, although, of course, there is not time to treat the question the gentleman has raised of the problems of large and small holdings. I think the gentleman knows where I stand on that question. I am a friend of the small farmer. I think there is room enough in American agriculture for the big farmer, too. We have some differences we must iron out. Would the gentleman agree with me that the development of the dairy industry in the South is a wholesome development from the standpoint of American agriculture?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. There is no doubt about it. My predecessor did not want you to have any cows down South, but no one has ever heard me try to keep you from having them.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman has been generous and fair at all times.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARNOLD].

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, something over a month ago your Committee on Agriculture heard testimony relating to some 17 bills, all designed to repeal or reduce the Federal tax on the manufacture of colored oleomargarine, a commercial substitute for butter, which has vegetable oil as its principal ingredient.

These hearings were conducted in the traditional manner of standing committees of the House of Representatives. The members of that committee have been selected by the House in order that we, a small group, should be the experts for the House on matters affecting agriculture. Perhaps all of us are not the experts we should be on agriculture. I should like to point out, however, that throughout my service on that committee we have always attempted to work out our problems in an unimpassioned and unbiased manner. The record of the committee, both under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Kansas indicates we have been as successful in maintaining this professional, rather than emotional or political, attitude as any committee of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I mention the qualifications of this committee, not to boast or brag, but to point out that the decision to place this oleomargarine question before a subcommittee for thorough and considered study was based on our professional attitude, rather than the influence of highly colored arguments from either the butter or the margarine lobby.

Unfortunately the emotional arguments—the argument of lower prices, which are ephemeral at best—seem to have been more powerful to 217 of our colleagues than the sober decisions of your committee on agriculture. I use the figure "217" because one of the signers of the discharge petition, the late distinguished gentleman from Missouri, has since passed away.

Why did we of the Agriculture Committee believe that there should be more study? Principally because we felt that an honest effort should be made to sift emotion from fact, and then to determine what effect, if any, continuation or repeal of these taxes would have on the whole agriculture picture.

Let us consider the chief promargarine argument of lower prices. Let us assume for the moment that what proponents of repeal legislation claim—that lower prices for margarine will result in lower prices for butter—is correct.

Obviously if repeal of this tax on margarine brings the price of butter down to that of its substitute, there will no longer be much butter made. It will mean the gradual diminution of our dairy herds in many parts of the country. Normally I would say to any industry, agricultural or otherwise, if you can't keep pace it's just too bad. But we have to have a dairy industry. Even today the dairy industry is called upon for top production to meet our domestic and foreign requirements. I am not telling you that repeal will mean the end of the dairy industry, but there is no question, if you accept the promargarine arguments, that it would be curtailed and curtailed sharply. The average 1942–44 dairy-cow population in my district was 143,100 milkers. Areas of higher cost of production might in time be entirely without dairy herds. That would mean the concentration of the dairy industry in the Middle West, perhaps. It would be a move away from the goal of having every section of our Nation as nearly self-sufficient as possible.

That is a facet of this problem which needs further study.

I do not think, however, that lower prices for margarine would mean correspondingly lower prices for butter. Margarine is a substitute for butter. It currently sells for about half the price of butter. Colored margarine, packaged in the same manner as creamery butter, costs but a few cents more than uncolored margarine. The difference in price probably is worth that much to a housewife who does not wish to go to the trouble of coloring margarine. The price of butter, on the other hand, is determined by cost of production, not on the basis of competition with its substitute. Changing this law will not reduce the cost of production. It is true that the unfortunate coincidence of the increase in butter at Chicago markets when the committee decided to refer this legislation for further study lent weight to this argument, but, at best, that situation was only a coincidence, and there is, of course, the rumor that margarine interests deliberately went in to that market to drive the price upward. I do not accept that rumor as fact, in the absence of an investigation, but it is something which could have happened.

Assume once again, Mr. Chairman, that repeal of this legislation will reduce the price of butter to such a point that it will no longer be feasible to make it; that margarine becomes the accepted spread for bread. Thus, we are tearing down one vital industry and giving prosperity to cotton and peanut growers. Cotton is an important crop. But margarine from cottonseed oil is but a by-product and not the principal reason for growing cotton. Moreover, the encouragement of planting more cotton in the South will again seriously dislocate our agriculture. Cotton, as we all know, is rough on soil. Its constant growth poses serious erosion problems. Southern farm land has in many areas been drained of its vitality by constant cotton crops. Within the past 10 years or so, however, great strides have been taken to rehabilitate southern cotton land. A plant—kudzu—has been developed which in a few years will rebuild soil, and while it is growing it holds the soil in place, prevents its washing down gullies and rivers. Farmers, however, whether in the South or the North, cannot be asked to grow a crop which has no specific economic value. Kudzu cannot be eaten. But it is a fine cattle feed; cattle who are turned out to graze produce more and richer milk. Hence, in the South dairy farming has been increasing in recent years. I cannot understand why my southern colleagues are in here today asking us to repeal these taxes on the grounds that it will further increase their cotton growing, which, in turn, is going to completely ruin the soils of their homelands, and, at the same time, hinting that repeal will retard and perhaps ruin an industry which is the one thing so far known that will permit rehabilitation of the land without impoverishing their farmers and depleting the Federal Treasury.

This question, Mr. Chairman, has many ramifications. It is oversimplification to say we must do this in order to strike a blow for the consumer. We must think of the consumers of tomorrow and the farming of tomorrow. Before we act hastily and emotionally, we must find the answer to all these long-range problems.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may

desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, two groups are primarily interested in this butter-oleomargarine controversy. Human nature being what it is, each group can be accused of being selfish. The farmers and the dairymen, who have always produced the butter of the Nation, feel that they have priority rights in this field and should be permitted to continue in the future as they have in the past. On the other hand, the manufacturers of oleomargarine want to increase their market and produce more of their product for the express purpose of increasing their dividends. Now I do not criticize either industry because both are just like all the rest of the people—they want to make money.

This is a fight between the ins and the outs. The American people have learned through experience the value of dairy products, especially butter, in the household diet. From childhood we have all been told that milk is not only nourishing but essential if the children are to grow and develop physically. We have been educated and know from experience that butter is nutritious, and the family doctor has convinced us that both butter and milk should be a part of the family daily diet. Vitamin pills are helpful, but they do not take the place of milk.

Now the trouble comes because originally oleomargarine did not contain the vitamins and health-giving qualities possessed by butter. It was an entirely different mixture than it is today. The scientists and the chemists have mixed ingredients a little different here, and done a little bleaching there, and inserted some vitamins somewhere else along the line, and as a result claim that they have a synthetic product almost equaling butter in nutrition value. One of the big troubles, however, is that while this substitute may contain the vitamins and the calories, yet it naturally is of a dirty gray color unless it is bleached white. Then if it is bleached white, it does not fulfill its purpose as a visional substitute because it does not look like butter; therefore, the manufacturers of oleomargarine want all restrictive laws removed giving them carte blanche authority to make oleomargarine look like butter, taste like butter, and smell like butter, to such an extent that the consumer cannot tell the difference between real butter and this concocted mixture called oleomargarine. In short, this whole fight boils down to the one word "color."

Years ago when the manufacturers of oleomargarine were attempting to perfect a mixture that would resemble butter, even though it did not possess the health-giving qualities of butter, the Congress and the State legislatures, in an endeavor to protect the consumer and the public against fraud and deception, placed certain limitations on the sale of oleomargarine. The purpose was to make sure that the housewife and the consumer knew the difference between butter and this substitute. These protective laws took different forms. In some cases public eating places were compelled to post signs in conspicuous places advising the people that oleomargarine was being served instead of butter. In other instances public institutions, like hospitals, orphanages, sanitariums, homes for the aged and the blind, as well as all public-supported institutions, were prohibited from feeding the sick, the children, and the incarcerated oleomargarine in place of butter. These public institutions were so protected on the theory that oleomargarine was not as wholesome as butter.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, in 23 States the legislatures have enacted laws making it absolutely unlawful to manufacture or sell olemargarine colored yellow to imitate butter. At this hour it is unlawful to either manufacture or sell oleomargarine colored yellow in 21 of the States. As I am informed, in many of the remainder of the 48 States there are some State laws restricting or controlling the sale of oleomargarine. Now this did not happen overnight. These laws are the fruition of the deliberate judgment of the representatives of the people in these several States. They are time-tested and it has been, and is, within the power of every State to remove these limitations and restrictions if the people in the States so desire.

This debate has made it clear that Members coming from cotton and vegetable oil producing States want to remove all legislation that interferes with the use of their products to the fullest extent. On the other hand, those Members representing large dairy producing districts are just as interested in maintaining a market for the products of their farms. Then the consumer has a stake in the controversy between these two economically interested groups.

Now it is self-evident that if a pound of cottonseed oil from the cotton-producing States or a pound of coconut oil imported into this country is permitted to be placed on the market so that the purchaser cannot tell the difference between a pound of butter and a pound of oleo, somebody is going to be deceived. Is this fair competition? If oleo is in all respects the equal of butter, why should it not stand on its own merits? Why should it be doctored and colored in imitation of real butter?

In my experience in Washington I have never witnessed a better financed and more efficient lobby than that operating in the last few months on the part of oleo manufacturers. I am not criticizing this lobby because it has been efficient and, so far as I know, it has been entirely honorable. It is out to sell its wares and it has done a good job of salesmanship. The radio, the magazines, and the press have all been effectively used under the direction and leadership of one of the outstanding advertising agencies of the country. The strategy of this advertising firm has been to have the housewife appear as the front for the oleo manufacturers. The hearings before the Committee on Agriculture make this clear beyond all doubt. Again I am not criticizing, but we must recognize the facts as they are, and realize where the steam and the pressure for this legislation are generated.

It has been suggested here that the dairy farmers should start an advertising campaign similar to that conducted by Coca-Cola and induce the people to consume more milk and thereby give the vegetable-oil and the coconut-oil producers the butter market. Some of these people forget that you cannot make people drink twice as much milk. Most farmers producing butterfat for butter are not located near consuming populations. Cows produce twice as much milk in May and June as they produce in November and December, but human beings cannot consume in the same proportion. There must be some way of preserving the surplus milk in May and June if there is to be enough fluid milk in November and December.

Mr. Chairman, in my home city there is located the Michigan Milk Producers Co., which maintains a creamery. In order that there may be adequate fluid milk for the people of Detroit and other large consuming centers in the area, there is a surplus of this fluid milk in May and June, and it is manufactured into butter. If this were not possible, the fluid milk would cost the consumer much more money. This song and dance of the oleo manufacturers just does not make sense from a practical standpoint.

Mr. Chairman, there is room and a place in our economy for the cottonseed-oil industry, the vegetable-oil industry, and the dairy industry. None of these should be deliberately and knowingly killed economically or otherwise. To some extent they are interdependent. For instance, in 1946 the cotton farmers received $21,000,000 from oleomargarine manufacturers for cottonseed oil, but during the same year the same farmers received $31,000,000 from dairy farmers who fed cottonseed meal to their cattle; also soybean growers received $23,000,000 from oleo manufacturers, while they received $55,000,000 for soybean products fed to dairy cattle. Again you must not forget that the dairy industry furnishes 40 percent of the beef meat supply of the country.

Many small farmers especially cannot continue with their farm projects without the monthly milk, cream, or butter check.

I wish some of our cotton friends, together with some of our big-city friends, could drive with me through the agricultural part of the congressional district which I have the honor to represent here. Wherever there is a dairy operated continuously, there is little soil depletion. The fertility of the cotton South in many sections is largely gone, and the Congress is appropriating money each year for soil conservation. In the dairy sections the conditions are not comparable.

The farmer, regardless of his specialty, has been comparatively prosperous in recent years. This has been war prosperity caused to some degree by Government spending. We all know that these conditions cannot continue. If disaster is to be avoided, agriculture must not be destroyed. In these circumstances, it would be most unwise to strike a death blow to any branch of industry at the moment.

Yes, it is true that the Committee on Agriculture, after hearings and deliberation, did not feel it wise to remove this restriction on oleomargarine without further study. I stress the fact that a subcommittee is now giving consideration

to the whole oleomargarine-butter color problem. This study will shortly be followed by a report. I do not believe the action provided in this oleomargarine bill should be taken until this final study is concluded.

I want the people of Michigan, and especially the housewives who have been asked to write to their Congressmen, to definitely understand that if this tax is removed it will not in any way assist the consumer in Michigan to buy colored oleomargarine. It will still be lawful to sell oleo in any color excepting yellow. Many of those who have written to me from the district have been led to believe that Congress can eliminate the necessity of the housewife coloring her own oleomargarine. This just is not true and the only possible benefits that could come to consumers in Michigan, if the pending bill were to become a law, would be the removal of the one-fourth of a cent a pound tax on uncolored oleo. Everybody knows that this tax is now absorbed by the manufacturer, and that the consumer does not pay it as a tax.

I have given much thought and consideration to this whole matter and, for the reasons which I have stated, I am constrained to believe that the best interests, not only of the dairy industry and the consumers but of the country at large, require the defeat of this bill at this time. I am not so naive, however, as to overlook the effect of the commercial propaganda and a general misconception on the part of many people. If pressure groups ever accomplished anything, this bill will be passed in the House, but that does not mean that it will become law.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to myself.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest and concern to the debate on this important legislation. It occurs to me that many people throughout the country and probably some of my colleagues here in the House have been misled as to the real purpose and intent of the bill. It has been said that this legislation is proposed in the name of the consumer, to bring about lower costs of food and cheaper food to the consumers of this country, particularly the low-income groups. That is so far from the truth that it is hard to conceive that anybody would pay any attention to such an argument, because the facts are that throughout the United States the people can now buy oleomargarine for what it is and pay a tax of only one-fourth of a cent a pound on it, not 10 cents a pound, as most people have been led to believe. The tax is a quarter of a cent a pound, fixed by Federal law, on oleomargarine. I am satisfied that the manufacture of the oleo absorbs that quarter of a cent so that the consumer does not pay any of it.

The fight is an economic issue. It is not to bring lower food prices to the people, it is an economic issue where, as has been so well stated here by several Members, one branch of American agriculture is seeking to increase and expand the sale of its products at the expense of another group. There is no question about that. When some people here plead for the low-income groups, those low-income groups are only being used as a front to carry on an economic fight for the benefit of one group in this country. The issue is very plain and should be made clear to everyone, and that is color—the color yellow. The oleomargarine industry and the National Cotton Council, which represents the southern cotton States, want to have oleomargarine colored yellow to make it look like butter so as to increase their sales and to increase the use and price of cottonseed oil. Fifty-three percent of the fat in oleomargarine is from cottonseed. There is some soybean oil, some peanut oil, and some corn oil. But cottonseed oil is the main ingredient in oleomargarine. The price of cottonseed oil yesterday was around 27 cents a pound. Oleomargarine is sold all the way from 32 cents to 41 cents a pound in its white color. It has been said here that if we would remove this tax of 10 cents a pound on yellow-colored oleomargarine the people would be able to get a cheaper product, to wit, oleomargarine colored yellow. Well, let us see what they are doing right here in Washington today. I have here last Thursday's Evening Star which quotes Southern Gold yellow-colored oleo sold at 55 cents a pound, and if you buy it in its natural state you can get it for 40 cents a pound. So in addition to charging the 10 cents tax, they are adding another nickel so that people are paying more for the yellow-colored oleo than the tax itself.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Does not the Washington Post of this morning in an editorial point out that all they are doing if we pass this so-called Rivers bill is to give the American people a chance to pay more money for oleomargarine?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes. Again I tell you, gentlemen, that when I read that editorial, I was very much surprised at the admission the editor of the Post made when he said that this legislation would not help very much because there were 22 States in the country, where two-thirds of the population reside, where the people would not be able to buy this yellow-colored oleo even though we repeal the so-called yellow-color margarine tax.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CORBETT. On this particular argument about the price differential there has never been any consideration on the floor of the House with reference to the fact that there is a $600 manufacturers' tax, a $480 wholesalers' tax, and a $48 retail tax.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I believe I know what the gentleman has in mind, and I shall be glad to answer the question. Yes, the tax on manufacturers is $600. But who pays it? There are twenty-six multi-million-dollar food-processing concerns in this country, and the $600 does not mean even a drop in the bucket to them. The same thing applies to the wholesalers and the tax applying to the retailer does not mean anything.

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. MacKINNON. The truth of the matter is that the manufacturers' tax is imposed both on the person manufacturing the colored oleomargarine and the uncolored oleomargarine, and that should not reflect in any difference in price between the two commodities other than to the extent of the 10-cent tax.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is correct. Furthermore, if you will look at the figures of the profits made by these different concerns, you will find that the manufacturer gets around 4 cents or more profit on a pound of oleomargarine That is true for the wholesaler and retailer.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman tell us why it is that England does not want to buy any oleomargarine which is made in the United States?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I did not think that question was going to be brought up here, but I can point out that we have been trying to sell some oleomargarine to England under the Marshall plan—or I should say, not sell it but give it to England. In a communication from a reliable agency dealing for the British, I find the following paragraph which I will read from their letter. It says:

> Should the Marshall plan materialize lard will be imported in quantity, but licenses to import oleomargarine will not be granted, as American margarine chemical contents does not come up to the necessary standards for the British Ministry of Health.

I do not know why they should object to the oleomargarine they make in this country, but certainly they do not want our oleomargarine. They want butter. Of course, under the Marshall plan, we will ship them butter if we have any left, instead of sending them oleomargarine.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Why is it, if this oleomargarine is so pure as it is advertised, that it is impossible to make inspections of the plants? Why is that? I only tried to get in one and I could not get into that one.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is probably because of the secret process that they might have. I am not familiar with that. I have not tried to get into any of them.

Let me say in conclusion, my opposition to the pending legislation is honest and sincere. I try to take a long-range viewpoint for American agriculture. I am interested in all segments of agriculture. I want them to succeed and prosper because I know what it means to the general welfare of our country. We who come from the dairy sections feel that legislation sponsored by the national

cotton council and the oleomargarine industry is going to seriously threaten our dairy areas. We produce a surplus of milk, and should this bill which is before us be passed, I am convinced that our dairy farmers throughout the Middle West will be forced to reduce their dairy herds, which will mean that the price of milk and the price of meat will go up to the consumers. The dairy farms of the United States furnish approximately 40 percent of the meat for the country. We will also have a very severe retarding in soil-conservation practices in the United States. Dairying and soil conservation go together. I say to you, those of you who are interested in providing abundant food for the American people, who are interested in the general welfare, should vote against the pending bill and join us in defeating it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, in this long and acrimonious debate I have listened attentively and have not until now opened my mouth. This is not because I am not interested in the subject, for I have given this controversy the best study of which I am capable. On the production side, my constituents appear about equally divided, for my State has a substantial dairy industry and also an expanding cotton production. It is unnecessary to say that both types of producers have contacted me in regard to my vote on this issue, but none have contacted me so much or so firmly as the consumers in this pending matter.

This debate has grown intense and bitter. I find it necessary to discount much that has been said here during the last few days regarding the impurities and the unwholesome ingredients of that food product in the controversy which is opposed. I do know that our pure food laws are not perfect and their administration lacks much of perfection, but I think the proper solution would be a tightening of inspection and enforcement of law. In spite of our progress since 1906, we have not gone far enough in the direction of protecting the public health. Perhaps the dairy industry has fallen short, especially in the recent years during the war, but I can see how the oleo producers might also harm the public health without proper laws and strict enforcement concerning its composition.

I know the over-all benefits of the dairy industry in the total picture of American agriculture. If I had to choose between them I should choose dairy agriculture rather than cotton agriculture, but I do not think such a choice necessary. I believe both types can be integrated to the benefit of our American economy. I do not believe the passage of this tax repeal bill will destroy our dairy industry as I have heard claimed during this debate. That is one argument I am discounting heavily.

In casting a vote on this measure I am thinking of the consumer interest more than that of the producers. Therefore, I want to take the first step toward making a wholesome food available for the modern family of small income. In keeping with that, I shall vote for any amendment that seems to guarantee the protection of the public health and prevention of fraud on the consuming public by preventing a substitute being sold as butter. I want both of these wholesome foods to be sold and purchased on their merits in a competitive market without the benefit of monopolistic legal support. I am confident that amendments to bring such about will be offered and I shall be alert to support such amendments if they really accomplish this purpose.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I followed with great interest the debate on the pending legislation. It seems to me that the basic problem involved has been obscured by acrimonious and emotional charges on the part of both proponents and opponents. We have been told that margarine is full of worms and, therefore, unfit for human consumption; we have been told that butter is a filthy product and a carrier of tuberculosis and other disease germs. If the housewives of America give any credence to the arguments advanced during this debate, most of us will eat apple butter the rest of our lives. The facts are that both butter and oleomargarine are healthy, nutritious, and palatable food products. In my opinion, the quality of both products has been unfairly and unjustly attacked here on the floor of the House.

There can be no doubt that the great consuming public in its quest for a cheaper and more convenient table spread is advocating the repeal of the taxes on oleomargarine. This same consuming public is very conscious of the important part that the dairy industry plays in the over-all economy and prosperity of this country. The factory worker cannot hope to be prosperous unless this Nation enjoys a high farm income. The producer of dairy products is the very backbone of our farm economy.

Now what will happen to the dairy business if this tax is repealed? Experts in my own district tell me that it will result in a reduction of 20 cents per hundred in the price that the farmer receives for his milk. This may or may not prove to be the case. If it does, it merely indicates that butter plays too much of a part in the formula by which milk prices, f. o. b. the farm, are computed. I understand that butter accounts for only about one-seventh of the end retail value of dairy products. Yet, in most milksheds, the price of butter is the major controlling factor in the price that the farmer receives for his whole fluid milk. In my own district in Louisville, Ky., we have three alternate formulas for computing the price of milk and the milk producers in my section are attempting to develop a fourth alternative which gives more expression to the price of cheese. I sincerely trust that they will be successful in this effort. I am told that in the city of Boston an experiment is under way which takes into consideration many factors in arriving at the farm price for milk. Included among these factors are the cost of feed, the cost of farm labor, and even department-store sales. This is an interesting experiment and may well prove to be of great benefit not only to the dairy producers but to our over-all economy. For years, butter has been regarded as the gold standard in the whole dairy business. This, it seems to me, accounts for the great apprehension of the milk producers over the repeal of this tax. This apprehension can be eliminated or substantially relieved if the base is broadened and if the price of butter receives only its proportionate importance in arriving at the farm price for whole-fluid milk.

Many years ago, the horse was, perhaps, the most important animal in the economy of this Nation. The horse provided most of our transportation and farm power. When the President of the United States addressed the Congress, he drove from the White House to Capitol Hill in a horse-drawn carriage. The doctor answered the calls of the sick in a horse-drawn buggy. The tub of butter was delivered to the grocery store by a horse-drawn dray. Members of Congress traveled from their districts to Washington in horse-drawn stagecoaches. The farmer used horses or mules for most of his plowing, cultivating, harvesting, and transportation requirements. Today mechanized power has almost completely replaced the horse and this has not resulted in a backward step in the economy of this country. In fact, we now refer to those days before our economic awakening as the horse-and-buggy days.

Human progress is full of examples of substitution. When a product or a machine or a method is developed which does any job or satisfies any human need at a cheaper price or more efficiently, it succeeds and takes its rightful place in the economy and lives of the people. That is the basic problem involved in the legislation before us. The repeal of the margarine taxes is inevitable either at this session of Congress or some future session. I am confident that the repeal of these taxes will not mark the end of prosperity in the dairy industry. Many people will always eat butter. The potential demand for other dairy products is enormous. The per capita consumption of cheese in this country is far below that in most European nations. It can be greatly stimulated and developed. I voted for the motion to discharge this bill from the committee and I shall vote for its passage. I also recognize a responsibility to our producer of dairy products. The dairymen must not be the victim of an archaic and artificial pricing basis. If legislation is necessary to protect the dairy producer, it is our responsibility to pass it. In my opinion, this whole question has been exaggerated and I am afraid that many people have been very much misled as to the facts by the bitter campaign which has been waged on both sides of the subject.

Mr. ELSAESSER. Mr. Chairman, I favor repeal of the punitive taxes and

regulations now levied and imposed upon the manufacture, distribution, and sale of colored oleomargarine. I firmly believe that no one group is entitled to favoritism, such as we have in the dairy industry, whereby another group producing a food item is penalized by governmental taxes from openly and honestly competing for consumer patronage.

Special privileges, such as this, are un-American. Our Government should not interfere in a free choice by imposing a tax that is in effect a penalty. Today the housewife must pay 10 cents per pound more for yellow margarine, but if she buys yellow butter she does not have to pay 10 cents more.

Existing laws make it possible for the Government to impose a license fee of $600, plus a tax of 10 cents per pound on colored margarine. Regulations require that the manufacturer, jobber, wholesaler, and retailer engaged in the sale of margarine, all file lengthy reports and data with the Federal Government. These penalties and requirements are imposed to benefit a certain group at the expense of our lower-income families. The Treasury has made a recommendation that this tax be abolished because the revenue therefrom has been so small.

I ask for no special privileges for margarine. Strict penalties should be imposed for any fraud or deception by manufacturers. Also stiff penalties should be invoked where a margarine product is offered as butter.

Butter manufacturers are permitted to color their product 8 months of each year, and they do not have to print the fact that color has been added on their packages. Why is this discrimination permitted? The public expects butter to be yellow in color, and the manufacturers of butter comply with their desires. In the case of margarine, the manufacturers can comply with the public's desire only if an additional Federal tax of 10 cents per pound is imposed.

I believe it is the duty of Congress to pass legislation which will remove this tax and reduce the price of a food item which many millions of our citizens purchase.

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Chairman, the high cost of living is one of the vital issues of the hour. Congressional committees have devoted much time to investigating its causes. It has been well stated that living costs generally may be brought down by reduction in income taxes, reduction in governmental expenses, and the revamping of the fiscal policies of the Nation. However, this is a long-range program and will take some time before the people of this country will realize benefit from it. Action is needed immediately to give relief to the people of the country from excessive costs of living and I know of no better way of bringing down the cost than to cut down the cost of individual items that go to make up the family table and are found on the grocery list of the average American family today.

The idea that a particular commodity which now finds itself on the tables of the majority of the people of the country must be taxed by the Federal Government 10 cents per pound in the event that coloring is added to it, and that the wholesaler and the retailer must get a permit in order to sell it, is to my mind unreasonable. It is the only food product that I know of in the United States that is directly taxed in such a manner.

In January last, I introduced H. R. 4930, a bill similar to the one now under consideration. I did so not as the representative of the oleomargarine interests or any lobby, but at the request of a resident who is an average American citizen residing in my congressional district. Since then I have received hundreds of letters, post cards, and telegrams from housewives and organizations protesting against this tax, and only three letters in favor of its continuance.

I have endeavored to approach this matter in a calm and deliberate manner, looking only to the merits of the situation. I do not charge anyone who is opposed to it with ulterior motives, and I do not believe anyone who is in favor of it should have his motives impugned or the charge made that he is a walking delegate for the margarine interests. As I understand it, after reading the RECORD and statements of those who defend this tax, it is not levied for revenue purposes primarily, but for the prevention of an alleged fraud and deception, to wit: To prevent the sale of oleomargarine as butter. The fallacy of this argument is that by the payment to the Federal Government of 10 cents, the sale of colored margarine is permitted. Therefore, if the position of the opponents is correct, the Government is in the very awkward position of saying to the people of the country that deception may be practiced provided one pays 10 cents for the privilege of doing it.

But what fraud and deception is practiced? So far as the sale of margarine as butter in stores is concerned, that can never take place if the customer is in full possession of faculties, for the package is plainly marked and in addition, any housewife knows the difference when she pays the price. So far as being able to go to a restaurant, hotel, or tourist house and having oleomargarine foisted upon a patron as butter is concerned, a great many States in the Union have statutes, and I know this is true in my own State, providing that these establishments must display a sign in plain sight of all guests sitting at tables, announcing the fact that oleomargarine is being served in the event they are doing so. Furthermore, it would seem that those advancing this argument are in a very weak position for they seem to assume that the ordinary individual today cannot tell the difference in taste between oleomargarine and butter, and according to the American Medical Association, margarine can be substituted for butter in the ordinary diet without any nutritional disadvantage.

This tax harms a great preponderance of the American housewives who do their own work, do not have servants and who work 14 to 16 hours a day, and who are obliged to add coloring which they and their families want, but which has been denied them unless they pay 10 cents to the Federal Government for this privilege. It affects organizations who operate on a rather restricted budget. The executive director of the Bristol Boys Club Association of Bristol, Conn., which operates a summer camp for boys from low-income families and in reaching this class of boys it is necessary to keep fees as low as possible. The director states he wishes to run the camp at the lowest possible figure but with the present day cost of food, he is obliged to trim all corners possible. He states they desire to serve good nourishing food, but with butter $1 a pound this item is out of the question, and therefore, the serving of margarine is the answer to his problem.

As far as color is concerned, no one group should have a monopoly on any color. The Hartford Daily Courant of Hartford, Conn., in commenting on this, states as follows:

> A further paradox is the fact that much margarine is naturally a light yellow color, but must be bleached before it can be sold. Butter, on the other hand, is colorless most of the year, and is artificially colored.

So it seems that the butter industry colors its butter yellow. Therefore, why should the manufacturers of oleomargarine be criticized for doing the same thing?

We hear a lot about the "sacred cow." Heretofore, that terminology has been used only in connection with the official plane of the President. Frankly speaking, I could never understand why a plane should be named after one of the slowest moving animals of the country. I regret that it is not possible for butter to be produced today at a figure that the average housewife can afford to pay. Maybe she would rather have it, but she cannot afford it and it is a lamentable fact, too, that when butter is $1 a pound, that the farmer still gets a very small part of it. The elimination of this tax will in no way affect the price that the farmers of this country are receiving and will continue to receive for their products. These are the days of keen competition in all fields of endeavor. I have the greatest respect for the farmer. In fact, I have always lived on a farm or in a farming community and during my career, I probably milked as many cows as any Member of this House. My congressional district has several towns in it where farming is engaged in and milk production carried on. I had sent to me by the Shore Line Times, a weekly publication which circulates through and in the vicinity of these towns in my district, and in it I find an editorial which is more vociferous in its support of the passage of this legislation than some of the editorials I read in the newspapers published in the great State of Wisconsin. The Shore Line Times states in part:

> Keep the penalty severe and the inspection keen to prevent the sale of margarine for butter, but let the efficient Food and Drug Act cover any such deceptive labeling rather than give any one group a patent on the color yellow, as is now in effect being done.

I realize that the passage of this legislation may not be beneficial to the people residing in the States of the Union where the sale of margarine is prohibited by local laws and regulations. This is no reason why the present proposed Federal legislation should not be enacted.

The abolition of this tax will affect millions of people in the Nation. It is unjust, unfair, and discriminatory, and I have been unable to find any legal or moral justification for its continuance. These are days of nondiscrimination.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield just for a short observation?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have in my possession an invitation to any Member of Congress who wishes to visit either the Best Foods margarine plant or the Kraft cheese margarine plant or any other margarine plant.

Mr. BARDEN. I had not intended saying anything about this legislation but I am a little disturbed over the trend that the debate has assumed. I think it might be well for every Member of this House to reflect for a moment and remember the time when all agriculture was on its knees and all agriculture was in distress, and the people of America pretty soon found themselves in the same situation.

Now, the same kind of people grow the beans and the peas and the other grains that produce the oils for margarine, that produce the milk; they are the same kind of farmers, they are the same kind of Americans. Why should we try to pit one against the other for the benefit of none?

We can bring it a little closer to the House. The same kind of Members and the same kind of Americans are indulging in this debate, some on one side and some on the other. Some are following their conscientious convictions about this matter and are conscientiously of the opinion that the tax should be removed. Others are equally conscientious and are doing all they can representing their constituency in trying to keep it from being removed. Why can we not be fair on each side and brush out these insinuations and remarks that have been flying back and forth?

All of us in this House know that the Pure Food and Drug Act is an active statute on the statute books today; and all of us know that butter is as nearly pure as it can be made, and the Pure Food and Drug Act requires it. All of us know that oleomargarine is just as pure as modern production methods can make it, and must comply with the Pure Food and Drug Act. I like both of them, as far as that is concerned, and use both of them, but prefer butter. I was not very much impressed with the paragraph read by the gentleman from Minnesota from a British official saying that they would not permit any oleo to be shipped over there when we are giving it to them. While the people of my constituency have to eat oleo—some of them eat it by choice, others eat it when they cannot get butter—I am not much inclined to want to force my folks to eat it in order that the British may have the cream and butter. That does not impress me one bit and I hope that that British official is not speaking the sentiments of the British people or the British Government.

I have both dairy farmers and farmers who grow cotton, beans and corn as well as some farmers who produce cotton, beans, corn, and dairy products on the same farm.

The beans and cottonseed are crushed, the oil pressed out, the oil is used in oleo. The cottonseed meal, bean meal, and other byproducts are used to feed the dairy cattle to produce milk and butter. Now the question presents itself of where we should begin taxing and where should it end? Of course the consumer does not like the tax, and in so far as it would affect the price or demand for cottonseed, beans, and so forth, the producing farmer would not like it.

I do not feel that my dairy farmers would want to harm or hinder their neighbors across the road any more than the cotton, bean and corn farmer would want to harm or hinder his neighbor, the dairy farmer.

I think there is an element of justice and fair play involved and as long as I see it in this light, I shall not be one to drive a wedge between the dairy farmer and any other group of farmers. I believe it is so necessary at this time for them to stand together in order to strengthen our great agricultural industry, and encourage private enterprise rather than discourage it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

How much time will that leave me?

The CHAIRMAN. That will leave the gentleman 1 minute.

Mr. RIVERS. That is all I want.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I think it is unfortunate that the debate on this bill developed as it did on Monday. I wish it were possible under the rules to ask to expunge the whole record of debate that we have had on oleomargarine. I sat throughout Monday and so far today wishing that some of the opponents of the bill would explain to me just how the repeal of this tax is going to wreck the dairy industry. I have not heard any argument on that during the debate.

I was particularly impressed by the remarks of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] and it seemed to me his remarks went to the whole meat of this argument. The gentleman from Minnesota contended that the repeal of this tax would force down the price of butter and would thereby create a hardship on the dairy industry.

The gentleman from Minnesota explained from his point of view the effect it would have on the dairy industry and I was greatly impressed by his argument. I wish we had more along that line.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I firmly believe what I said, that the direct result of this legislation will be to force down the price of butter and it will force out of business butter producers such as myself.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I gave very serious consideration to the gentleman's remarks, and, as I said, I wish the whole debate had been on that level. This is not the place here to discuss the purity of oleomargarine or butter. I have a great many dairy farmers in my district, and I have talked to many of them, and they tell me they are not concerned about this tax. The tax is not important as a revenue producer. They want the tax continued so as to continue Federal control over the sale of oleo and so that we may have Federal enforcement against those who try to substitute oleomargarine for butter. As long as that Federal control is continued the dairy farmers I talked to in my district are satisfied.

Mr. Chairman, if this bill passes Federal control will be continued. We have the Pure Food and Drug Administration of the Federal Government which over the years has given us a good administration. It is one of the finest agencies of the Federal Government insofar as cooperation with the States is concerned. I talked with representatives of that department yesterday. I asked them, "Will repeal of this tax make your task more difficult? Is there any more reason why you cannot police the oleomargarine situation the same as you do other food and drug products?" They said, "Absolutely not."

When this tax was placed on oleomargarine we did not have the Pure Food and Drug Act on the books that we have today. We have just amended that act in the House, which bill is over in the Senate now and will be passed in a few days. That bill was based on a Supreme Court decision. In that act we say that Federal control of any commodity moving in interstate commerce shall follow through to the ultimate consumer, so that a pure food and drug inspector can seize oleomargarine at a grocery store, in a restaurant or anywhere he may find it. There is ample punishment provided in the law for those who would substitute oleomargarine for butter. We also have the False Labeling Act.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I join with the gentleman in the statement that probably oleomargarine may be as pure as butter. It is a matter of choice. The overflow of a septic tank, they tell us, may be as pure as spring water, but I should prefer the spring water.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Well, I have been at places where I would take the septic tank water.

Mr. Chairman, there are many people who either by choice or necessity buy oleomargarine and I do not think we should make it more expensive for them. It has been said that this will not make any difference in the State of Connecticut or 20 other States because the State law prohibits the sale of colored margarine. But that is not my responsibility. If the consumers of Connecticut are as insistent with the members of the Connecticut Legislature as they have been with the Connecticut delegation in Congress, I dare say the next session of

the legislature will consider that matter. That is their responsibility, however. I am trying to live up to my responsibility today. If I can protect the consumers of my State without working a serious hardship on the dairy farmers, I feel that is my duty and that is the road I should follow.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. Would not the gentleman agree that the argument that because there are still some States that prohibit the sale of margarines is weak against eliminating this tax? I do. State laws are not our responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 2301 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the tax on oleomargarine) is repealed.

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the day following the date of the enactment of this act.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HILL as a substitute: Strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute the following:

"That chapter 16, subchapter A, section 2301 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the tax on oleomargarine) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(1) Upon oleomargarine which shall be manufactured and sold, or removed for consumption or use, there shall be assessed and collected a tax at the rate of one-fourth of 1 cent per pound; except that such tax shall be at the rate of 10 cents per pound in the case of oleomargarine which is yellow in color: *Provided*, That such tax on oleomargarine which is yellow in color shall be at the rate of one-fourth of 1 cent per pound if such oleomargarine is manufactured, prepared, molded, shaped, packaged, sold, and distributed so that—

"'a. The net weight of the contents of the retail package shall not exceed 1 pound;

"'b. The contents of each package is divided into four equal parts; and

"'c. Each part of the contents of such package is manufactured, prepared, molded, and shaped in such manner so as to have three sides (exclusive of the ends) so that each part will be triangular in shape, or to be in such other form or shape as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may approve. The Secretary of the Treasury shall not approve any other method of preparing, molding, or shaping of oleomargarine unless he is fully satisfied that the article after all labels have been removed and after it has been cut into patties for use on the table can readily be recognized by the general public as oleomargarine and clearly distinguished from butter.'

"SEC. 2. Chapter 16, subchapter A, section 2302 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after the phrase 'determined as provided in paragraph 2 of section 2301 (a),' the following 'or who shall change or attempt to change the mold or shape or other identifying characteristics of yellow oleomargarine on which a tax at the rate of 10 cents per pound has not been paid with the intent, or with the effect, of defeating the purposes of this act.'

"SEC. 3. Chapter 16, subchapter A, section 2308 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by inserting after the word 'law' where it last appears in that section the following: ', or who knowingly changes the form or shape or other identifying characteristics of yellow oleomargarine on which a tax at the rate of 10 cents per pound has not been paid with the intent, or with the effect, of defeating the purposes of this act,'.

"SEC. 4. Chapter 27, subchapter A, part I, section 3200 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after the word 'oleomargarine' the following ', except hospitals which merely color oleomargarine to be served to patients or hospital employees,'.

"SEC. 5. Chapter 27, subchapter A, part I, section 3200 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by striking out the figure '$200' and insert in lieu thereof '$50.'

"SEC. 6. Chapter 27, subchapter A, part I, section 3200 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by striking out the figure '$6' and insert in lieu thereof '$1.'

"SEC. 7. This act shall take effect on July 1, 1948."

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I shall take my time principally on the first section. What we had in mind, in all seriousness, was to get away from the—shall I say—eternal battle that has been going on concerning the coloring of oleomargarine and changing it over to resemble butter. In this bill, if you will notice, we have provided that it must be made only in triangular form, and there is no reason why a manufacturer cannot cut it into a triangular form just as easy as he can cut it into a square or rectangular form.

Then the bill also provides that this form shall follow the oleomargarine to the table, to the little patty that housewives serve on the plate. It catches the hotels and the restaurants. Certainly no one supporting this legislation wants oleo sold in the place of butter, or as an imitation. This is the thing that has caused our thinking on this matter to turn to this form, to discover if possible a way to keep the identity of oleo until it is consumed by the ultimate consumer, so when you went into an eating house, a hotel, a restaurant, or a cafe, you would know, if they served you a triangular piece of spread—I will avoid the use of the word "butter"—that that would be oleomargarine, and that would identify it until it had been consumed.

In this bill we go a step further than that. I might say to my colleagues that we have worked long and hard on this amendment. We have not been in the councils of the butter trust, as some like to call it. Neither have we been taken into the hearts of those who wish to have oleo sold if they can sell more cottonseed oil or more of the other products that go into oleo. What we were trying to do is to be honest and fair and just. Of course, we were hopeful that the gentleman in charge of the bill would accept this amendment.

We go one step further and say to you something like this, and I shall read from the amendment:

Each part will be triangular in shape, or to be in such other form or shape as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may approve. The Secretary of the Treasury shall not approve any other method of preparing, molding, or shaping of oleomargarine—

And so on, unless it maintains the identity of the oleo.

I ask any fair-minded person in this room wherein that statement has in it any fault. We are not trying to keep the housewife from having oleo, we are not trying to keep her from having colored oleo, yellow if she wishes. If it is the wish of this House to take all the taxes off, I would be the last person to find any fault. My good friend from Connecticut knows well that, if he thinks that is what he wants, and that is the desire of this House, I would be the last one to say that the housewife had to pay, shall I call it, a nuisance tax.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Would the gentleman be willing to accept an amendment to his amendment that would strike out the tax provisions, because frankly I may say in all fairness that I think it is wrong to tax a wholesome food product. As I understand, the gentleman would keep a tax of a fourth of a cent and the taxes on the manufacturers and distributors. Those taxes on the distributors, as I see it, are more unfair if possible than even the 10-cent tax, because only one store in a hundred in the United States today sells colored oleomargarine. They cannot do it because of the taxes. Would the gentleman be willing to strike out the tax provisions of his amendment?

Mr. HILL. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that as far as I am personally concerned I cannot find any substantial ground upon which I could place my argument in support of any kind of a tax on any kind of food, but we must be certain that we can still police this matter, the same as we do under our Food and Drug Act. Take for instance the candy that is manufactured in this country, hundreds and hundreds of tons of it annually. We do not permit the manufacturer of candy to put into it materials that are harmful to children.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. CORBETT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman seems to be making an effort to work out a fair proposition. I know he is trying to work out something fair. Would the gentleman then, in an effort simply to be fair about this thing, recognize that the only danger he is trying to avoid is in connection with the possibility that in a public eating place somebody might be served margarine when he thought it was butter?

The gentleman recognizes, I take it, that the margarine that is now sold in packages which are by law labeled oleomargarine and which is sold to the housewife does not confuse her, no matter what might be the shape of the oleomargarine. It has been pointed out that

the margarine manufacturers cannot change their machinery overnight. I wonder if the gentleman would be willing to confine this special-shape requirement to public eating places and let the housewife buy her margarine in any color regardless of the shape it is in. You cannot fool anybody in the kitchen, and you certainly are not going to fool the family that bought it in the package which says oleomargarine on it. You are only trying to strike at about the less than 10 percent that may be sold in public eating places. Would the gentleman be willing to confine his requirements to public eating places and take off the tax? Although I admit that they must have some kind of regulation but it is not necessary to have all these taxes. Would the gentleman be willing to do those two things?

Mr. HILL. The gentleman, of course, puts me in this position—I have not had time to analyze that type of amendment. But I would say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], you are putting your finger on the element that was mentioned a while ago and that has not been kept uppermost in this debate. What you and I are trying to do is to meet on common ground.

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. HILL. I had called to my attention this morning by a housewife that she bought oleo in quarter pound cubes, and they were wrapped in paper and that quarter-pound package had the name oleo plainly written on it.

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. HILL. I have no objection to a sale like that so far as I am concerned, but there are thousands of hotels, restaurants, and cafes in this country that must take that paper wrapping off and when they bring it out on a plate to the dining room there is no way to identify it. I do not see why the oleo manufacturers should object to the plan that you yourself mentioned.

Mr. POAGE. If you will require the public eating places to either post a notice that they are serving oleomargarine or to serve it in a triangular form when they serve it, would not regulation of public eating places serve the gentleman's purpose? I realize you may have to have a license fee in order to secure the desired regulation of public eating places, but you do not have to put that license fee on the grocer who sells oleomargarine to the housewife in order to cure the evil that you are trying to cure. All that I am trying to say is let us not place a burden on 90 percent of the people in order to cure a possible danger at another point. I am willing to try to go along with you and cure the evil that you are trying to cure, but would you not be willing to try to work out a proposal which would apply only to the public eating places?

Mr. HILL. I certainly would. May I go one step further and say that this is a demonstration here on the floor of the House of what may happen and what does happen when you try to bring out legislation by means of a discharge petition. I am positive if our committee could have had some more time, we could have worked out this proposition, and we could have come to some common ground of agreement, which I am sure every Member of the House wants to reach.

I yield to my chairman the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman from Texas has asked the gentleman from Colorado if he would object to an amendment which would remove all taxes. I did not understand the gentleman from Colorado to commit himself on that, but the gentleman realizes, I am sure, that if an amendment to the gentleman's amendment were adopted which would take off all the taxes, that the remaining language would not be germane to this bill. As I understand it, the proposal will be offered that all taxes except the tax on the manufacturer be eliminated. While I would prefer the amendment in the form that the gentleman has suggested, it seems to me that we might very well consider a proposal to take all taxes off except those on the manufacturer because that would still leave the Bureau of Internal Revenue with jurisdiction of the matter and would make it possible, I think, to enforce the legislation which the gentleman has in mind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in the 2 years I have been a Member of this body I have rarely taken time on this floor. I take this time today because I am a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture, of which the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] is chairman, created for the purpose of seeking a solution to this long-time problem which has been the subject of so much controversy.

I have collaborated with the gentleman from Colorado, as have other members of the subcommittee, in the preparation of this substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I was interested to read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the story of the original debates on this problem, back in 1886, 62 years ago. The same arguments were made; the same expediencies were suggested. I was interested to read the recriminations between various sections and States of the country, and compared with that, what has been said here this last week has been very mild indeed. Even then it was suggested that we should have oleomargarine colored green or bright pink. Even then it was suggested that a tax would be unfair to the American consumer.

I am a member of the committee which voted to postpone consideration of this matter until we could work out a solution. I have stated frankly that I believe that the tax is fundamentally wrong, and the wrong approach to the problem.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is a member of the subcommittee named by our chairman to study this problem. I was wondering whether or not that subcommittee had considered the amendment now under consideration.

Mr. COTTON. The subcommittee, as far as any formal consideration is concerned, has not met and considered the matter. Due to unforeseen circumstances, the time was so short that we have only been able to try to work it out, and it is presented purely as the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. COOLEY. Is the gentleman supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. COTTON. I certainly am, and if it is adopted I shall vote for the bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I hope that this House will give careful consideration to this substitute bill. I hope the Members from all sections and on both sides of this controversy will give this proposition very careful consideration, because it is a constructive proposition that might do much to heal this sore which has lasted for these 62 years.

The substitute, which causes the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine in a triangular form within the package, clearly distinguishes the product from butter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, if everybody is going to ask for an extension of time we will never finish the bill. I shall have to interpose an objection from now on to extensions of time beyond the 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire that he may proceed for one additional minute?

There was no objection.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, the Hill substitute, if adopted, will benefit and protect the dairy industry in that it enables them to have their product clearly recognizable and distinguished from all other similar products. Enlightened and progressive dairy farmers have told me that they recognize the unsoundness of the tax but that all they want or expect is to be able to merchandise their own butter, to advertise it, and to sell it, and to have the public know their product.

The Hill substitute will benefit the proponents of this bill and the oleo industry. It is quite apparent that the proponents of the bill have sufficient votes here today to pass the bill in its present form but the bill must pass the other body and, before it can affect the major portion of the population of the United States, State legislatures must take action. I believe they are much more likely to repeal the restrictions and prohibitions of the State laws if this substitute is passed instead of the original bill.

The Hill substitute will benefit the entire country and all its agriculture, for it is a logical and constructive solution of a problem that has been agitating this Congress and the country for 62 years.

I cannot vote for the bill in its present form. I would like to vote for it because it abolishes the manufacturers' and dealers' fees, and they should be abolished. I would like to vote for it because it removes the tax which I believe to be unsound, but I cannot vote for it unless it

is safeguarded by a method clearly distinguishing butter from margarine.

The present bill will not save the housewives from coloring the margarine in many States in this Union, including my own. The present bill, in my opinion, will not provide lower-priced yellow margarine even in the States that now permit the sale of it. All that the margarine manufacturer and dealer has to do is to sell it at a lower price than butter. That they are now doing and paying 10 cents per pound to the Government. If this 10-cent tax is removed, the price of margarine will not drop more than a few weeks or months because, like any other business, it will be sold at only a reasonable margin below its great competitor.

The consumers of this country have been deceived by a clever national publicity campaign into believing that they will profit from this bill. They can profit very little from it and, in its present form, they can suffer greatly because of the blow it will strike at the livestock and milk industry of the Nation.

I cannot vote for this bill because it does so little for so few.

I can and will vote for the substitute if it is adopted because it will benefit and protect both the farmer and the consumer.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am certain that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] has offered this amendment in all sincerity and good faith; but I am just as sure that he has not taken into consideration the complications that this amendment would cause should it be adopted.

In the first place, from a practical standpoint, the consumer would be prevented from obtaining margarine due to the fact that it would require a period of years to design and build the necessary machinery to comply with the provisions of this amendment. I seriously doubt such machinery could be designed and built in less than 3 to 5 years due to the critical shortage of steel at the present time.

During that time, of course, the margarine manufacturers would be obligated to close their plants, laying off their employees and depriving the farmer of his outlet for oil and skim milk which is used in the manufacture of margarine.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman accept this amendment if we put it off for 9 months?

Mr. MITCHELL. If the gentleman will let me finish my statement first, then I will discuss this matter with him.

I respect the desire of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] to protect the consumer who eats in restaurants, hotels, and other public eating places. In my years of experience in the food business I have quite naturally had occasion to do business with and become personally acquainted with thousands of hotel and restaurant owners and managers all over the country; and while I feel that there is possibly a small percentage of these people who would deliberately defraud their customers, the public, I am sure that this percentage is infinitesimal and that the great majority of American businessmen and women operating our restaurants and hotels throughout the country are people of integrity and honesty. I do not think that there is a Member of this House who does not feel precisely the same way I do about their own constituency who happen to be in the restaurant and hotel business.

Of course, in every walk of life we find cheats. The substitution of margarine for butter is not the only substitution which takes place in the eating establishments of the unscrupulous operator. Ground sirloin steak oftentimes is substituted for by hamburger; maple sirup is substituted for by cane or corn sirup artificially flavored; Roquefort cheese dressing in most cases today is made with a substitute called blue cheese—which I personally consider superior to the imported Roquefort. This fine blue cheese is generally made in the great States of Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, and Iowa. I could go on, but I feel that the Members of this House understand the situation without my doing so.

The protection that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] desires to give the consumer who eats in hotels and restaurants can be afforded in a different manner, one which would not have the harmful effects I have previously outlined. In fact, it is already being done. In 41 States there are laws providing that if margarine is used or served, such fact must be stated on the menu, on a placard on the wall, or on the dish itself. So the job is approximately 85 percent completed already.

Furthermore, the average housewife has a small specially shaped dish in which she keeps her quarter-pound sticks of margarine or butter, and if this amendment were to pass, the housewife—the consumer of margarine—would, by necessity, be forced to get rid of her little spread dish and then go out and buy, if she could obtain it, a specially shaped dish to hold the margarine cut in accordance with the provisions of this amendment.

I ask that this amendment be voted down.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, it is now proposed that since it is certain that the tax shackles on margarine are about to be taken off, that the opponents of margarine offer us some shackles that are not quite as onerous. Mr. Chairman, this whole debate illustrates just exactly why the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives should not have abdicated its authority and closed down committee consideration of these margarine bills. Consequently, for the remainder of this day in this debate I am am going to urge that the House pass the bill as perfected and send it over to the Senate for committee consideration. The gentleman who just left the floor was fair in his approach, pointing out that he will allow time for retooling. He did not say much about how the additional cost would be compensated and why increased manufacturing costs would not increase the price. However, how can we consider matters of the economic complexity of an amendment like this here on the floor? I am urging that this amendment and all similar amendments be turned down here and that the bill be sent over to the Senate where it can have committee consideration, which was refused in the House committee.

Again, however, in taking up this problem of trying to prevent fraud by changing the form, how easy it would be for the individual inclined to fraud to simply melt the product slightly and re-form it and establish it as something else. Secondly, imagine the Congress of the United States starting to legislate on the form of manufactured products. They will be coming in here with a bill after a bit saying that the cotton skirts should be short and the rayon skirts should have the "new look." Are we now going into the business of legislating the shape of manufactured products? This proposal, to me, is simply ill-considered.

Furthermore, if butter is the quality product, why do they not do what every other quality product manufacturer does and put their label and trade-mark on it to protect them and enjoy the protection of the copyright laws? Why should they penalize this product and say it has to take this form or some particular, peculiar shape?

The producers of butter have every right to mark their butter in any way they please, and they will be protected against imitation. Therefore, I believe that if there is going to be anything done in the way of distinguishing one product from another, which I believe in, we should utilize the copyright laws just as we should utilize the pure-food laws to bring about the necessary controls.

Finally, if there is going to be fraud and substitution, why is it going to increase so much just because a 10-percent tax is taken off? The differential now is 40 to 50 cents. Why is not fraud apparent at this time? Why is the repeal of a 10-cent tax going to change the American manufacturers, the hotels, restaurants, and storekeepers, into a bunch of crooks?

Mr. Chairman, I urge on this committee that they defeat this amendment and all other amendments similar to it, and send this bill over to the Senate committee, where it can have fair consideration of any and all proposals.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: On page 1, line 4, strike out the period and insert the following: "insofar as it relates to oleomargarine sold in round or circular pats or prints."

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HILL. Is that an amendment to the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. This is a perfecting amendment to the text of the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I am going to read the first two lines of the bill and then I shall read it with my amendment added, so

that it can be perfectly plain to everyone just what this does. The bill starts out:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 2301 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the tax on oleomargarine) is repealed.

With my amendment it would read—

is repealed insofar as it relates to oleomargarine sold in round or circular pats or prints.

I think that is all that is necessary here to accomplish the purpose that has been sought by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado, which is, to make it perfectly plain that when oleomargarine is sold it is known as oleomargarine.

My amendment is considerably simpler than the amendment the gentleman from Colorado has offered, but if it should not be adopted I would certainly vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado. I am not arguing against his amendment. The purpose is fine. I would point out, however, that there is a definite reason for using the round or circular form to identify oleomargarine rather than a triangle.

Two triangles pressed together at the hypotenuse of the triangle will make either a rectangle or a square. On the other hand, a circle is always a circle; if changed, it ceases to be a circle. Round is always round. The language of the amendment would apply whether the oleomargarine is sold in an original pound pat or in a small circular patty when delivered to the customer in the restaurant. A circle must always be round; it cannot become anything else and remain round.

How did I happen to think of a circle? Because I was trying to think of something that would suggest the word "oleo," and "O" is the predominant characteristic of the word "oleomargarine." The circular pat will suggest the "O" of oleomargarine. It does not require any lettering.

This idea would become effective as soon as the changeover was made in the form in which it was packaged by any particular producer. It does not require any date. It is self-enacting. As soon as the producer of oleomargarine sells his product in circular or round form, the color tax is off as far as he is concerned, and that is all there is to it. At whatever level the product is sold, whether in a restaurant or by the wholesaler or by the retailer, the round or circular form would say, in effect, "This is oleomargarine."

This amendment would eliminate the idea of fraud. It would permit the color if color is what you want. It avoids all of that argument about price and color, but it does protect the consumer against fraud. It puts everyone on notice indisputably that roundness may mean oleomargarine, and every person will then know what he or she is buying or getting.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman's amendment, as I understood it, does not say what size these round prints of oleomargarine must be. Can the manufacturer make them as big as a barrel or as big as a basket? If they can be made as big as a barrel or anywhere in between those two sizes, then your restaurant keeper or anyone else can cut them into any shape that they want to and make it square.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No; the circular roundness would apply wherever it is sold to the consumer. It would have to be round clear down to the last cut or the last drop, which of course would be round. It would be round at the restaurant level. It would be round at the retail level, and it would be round at the wholesale level.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman's amendment does not say that.

Mr. BREHM. It might also indicate the direction in which the House apparently is traveling on this issue—circles.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Would your amendment permit triangular shapes or would it all be required to be round?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. My amendment simply says that if oleomargarine is sold in round or circular shape then the tax for coloring does not have to be paid. That would apply to a restaurant or wherever it was sold. A stick of oleo would be round, not square; when sliced it would be in disks like a "tootsie" roll.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I might also say that it would take a very short time to get the machinery ready.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes; the gentleman is correct; it would take a very short time to get into operation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be defeated. I have had long experience in the packing of dairy products. The objection to round milk bottles was that a lot of space was wasted. The thing that has made the square paper container popular in the packaging of milk is that they can be packed tight. Thus a lot of expense and space is saved in packing and shipping. Therefore that amendment should be defeated.

The Hill amendment should be accepted.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I would simply observe that most candy is round or cylindrical whether it is stick candy or gum drops.

Mr. GROSS. That does not enter into the problem of packing in the same way that butter or milk is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, the Hill amendment should be adopted. Certainly the dairy industry is entitled to that recognition, and the housewife is entitled to the protection that that amendment would give her. If you want the best example of the extremity to which the dairy interests have gone in their efforts to supply good products, just drive out through the Washington milkshed and look at these farms. You will see a big barn that was built 30 or 40 years ago, which cost maybe $10,000. You will see it there standing vacant because sanitary regulations have been enforced, and the farmer had to build another $10,000 barn maybe right next to the old one. There he has to milk his cows. The old barn generally houses the feed. Maybe the silo is over there, too. In this new barn he could have his milk house, but regulations forbid. So he has had to build a milk house costing probably $3,000, 50 feet away from the barn. He must carry each cow's milk as it is milked to the milk house and there strain it and put it in the cooler. The farmer has gone a long way to supply a good product and a healthy commodity. He has put his milk checks back into the preparation of a still better product all through the years. The two barns and milk house in many cases represent the worth of the farm. The farmer has put his dairy income back into the building of new buildings, which is made necessary by these new regulations. Certainly he is entitled to a little recognition so that when his product goes on the market the housewife is protected and knows she is getting butter when she asks for butter. The industry should be recognized to that extent, too.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think there is some significance in the fact that everyone who has spoken in favor of this substitute voted against discharging the Committee on Agriculture from consideration of the oleomargarine taxes. I therefore have some question as to the solicitude of those gentlemen for the housewives who want colored margarine.

Of course, the July dating of the substitute would mean there would be no tax-free colored margarine for a year or 2 years pending manufacture of the very elaborate machinery necessary to package margarine in triangular shapes.

Of course, the worst feature of the substitute is the fact that it would raise the cost of margarine to the consumer. Many of us are favoring this legislation from the consumer angle. We want to keep the price of margarine low. Anything which would increase the price is therefore disadvantageous.

Now coming down to this question of the shape of the product, in order to protect the consumer against fraud, no law has ever required that a suit of clothes must carry a patch because it is not all wool. No law has ever required a pair of nylon stockings to carry a stripe because they are not all silk. Why were such requirements unnecessary? Because our misbranding laws are entirely adequate to protect consumers.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I prefer to finish my statement and then I will be happy to yield.

Of course, this special shape is not a protection. I understand that about half of all margarine and butter is used in the kitchen. If we are to carry this proposed protection all the way we would have to pass a law that eggs fried in margarine would have to reach the table in triangular shape; possibly we could go a little further and say that any cookie of which margarine is a component part could not be sold unless it is triangular in shape. Gentlemen, the substitute makes no more sense.

I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think that Coca-Cola people would be agreeable to having Pepsi-Cola sold in a bottle of that shape?

Mr. BUCK. That bottle is a registered trade-mark. It is an entirely different situation.

Mr. GROSS. But you were talking about going into a clothing store to buy a suit of clothes and looking for a label to see whether it is labeled all wool or shoddy or whatever it is.

Mr. BUCK. In the same way, when you buy a package of margarine it is marked "margarine." When you buy a suit of clothes you need not wear a label on the outside of the suit to set forth that it contains something other than wool.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Does the gentleman think the consumers of this country must have all of these designs and shapes to let them know what they are buying? They know the product they are buying when they call for it.

Mr. BUCK. They certainly do.

Mr. COOPER. They are not so easily deceived as some might seem to indicate.

Mr. BUCK. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to something that has not been touched on with reference to these amendments. There are a few who have expressed themselves in favor of the amendments, assuming I presume that the amendments would be acceptable to the dairy industry. If they are not acceptable to the dairy industry, then I am confident they would not be acceptable to you who support them.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield briefly.

Mr. HOPE. I think everybody in the House has a letter from representatives of the dairy industry saying that they will not accept any amendments. They do not want any amendments.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is right.

Mr. HOPE. As far as I am concerned I have no idea whether the dairy industry will accept this amendment or not.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman has anticipated me.

In a general letter on April 22 the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, which incidentally represents more dairy farmers than any other association in the country had this to say:

> Can there be a compromise on the pending oleomargarine legislation? The answer is "No."

And they print the word "No" in capital letters.

I hope this satisfies you that the milk producers are not accepting the amendments. They definitely say that no amendment is acceptable.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, does not the gentleman think it is up to this House to decide what legislation shall be passed rather than that some outside organization should dictate to it?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I agree with the gentleman, but I want to go further. These amendments should have been submitted to the Committee on Agriculture. It is now too late. The door has been locked. Certainly our committee should have asked the margarine people to appear and be heard as to whether or not they could gear their machinery to comply with the regulations required by the amendments.

The purpose of these amendments is to prevent fraud. Ninety percent of the margarine is sold in packages which go into homes marked "Margarine." There can be no fraud there. None at all. So in your effort to prevent fraud which is possible in only 10 percent of the sales, you would apply the preventive measures to the other 90 percent wherein fraud is impossible. This is not the positive maner in which we should go about it.

If the butter people who contend that their product is so much better than margarine would only mark their own product that would be the positive means of safeguarding butter's alleged superiority over margarine and prohibit fraud. The Bayer aspirin people do not ask that their competitors be required to put a sign on their aspirin. Bayer is so proud of its product that they emboss the word "Bayer" across the face of each tablet. If the butter people want their product identified, if they want it held up to the world as the best product why do they not so label it, rather than insist that their competitors label their product to the effect that it is not butter? Why do they simply not emboss on every pound, on every mold or patty of butter the legend "This is butter, accept only the genuine?" That is the usual method exercised by various and sundry competitive products in this country. But here we have the butter people advocating a negative method, a back-door method, while all other competitive products exercise the positive method, that is, they mark and identify their own products and are glad to do it.

The amendments should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could not arrive at some agreement as to time?

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes, the last two reserved to the committee.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If the motion prevails and the substitute adopted does it mean that it will preclude further amendment to the adopted substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Then, Mr. Chairman, the further parliamentary inquiry: Would that eliminate all opportunity to offer amendments to the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman states the situation correctly.

The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RIVERS) there were—ayes 91, noes 101.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the plain implications of this proposed legislation do not bother me at all. My farmers make butter. When they choose, they sell it to the city folks who have sufficient money and who desire to buy it at the present so-called high price, and in turn the farmers, when they desire, buy oleo because they are thrifty. So you see I am in the clear. I cannot please all—can only vote for the legislation I think to be of greatest benefit to the people as a whole.

I am somewhat amazed at the attitude taken by some of my Republican friends. I do not want to be critical, I do not want to scold, I do not want to find fault, but I do reserve the right to call the attention of my good friends on the Republican side of the aisle to the fact that for years through protective tariffs we have protected and subsidized industries in the cities from which they come. We pay tribute through a tariff for every shirt we wear, for every coat, every pair of pants, and every pair of shoes we wear to the industrialists in the manufacturing cities. Now, when it is proposed to continue protection to the farmers you turn on us and say that the dairy farmers shall be discriminated against in favor of the industries of the South.

I understood when this debate started those who favored repeal of the tax on oleo were on a sort of a holy crusade for the benefit of the housewife and her family. My friend who introduced this resolution sings us such a sweet song and plays such good music that he has some ninety-odd Republicans on his petition. He was speaking in favor of the consumer. His heart was bleeding, his tears were flowing for the consumers, for the housewife. He could not say anything except for the consumers. I have been under the suspicion, however, as the debate went along that he and some of his supporters—and it is their right and privilege—have been talking not so much in favor of the consumers as in favor of

the cottonseed-oil interests and the interests of the producers of other ingredients that go into oleo and principally in favor of the oleo manufacturers.

Why do I reach that conclusion? I reach it because of their opposition to the so-called Hill amendment and because of their opposition to the Case amendment. They are not content with—I will not say stealing—permitting the oleomargarine people to take the butter market, which has been built up by the dairy interests, through the use of coloring—and a good, wholesome product; they are not content with that—turning that market over to the oleo boys—but when we offer a proposition which will prevent fraud, which they say they want to prevent, by prescribing the shape of the marketed article, then they say "No." Which leads us where? To the conclusion that they are not primarily nor wholeheartedly interested and only in favor of preventing fraud, but they are interested in creating a market for the things that the South has to sell, and they are interested in protecting and increasing the profits of the oleo interests. Now, as I say, I do not know whether they know what they are doing or not, but that is just exactly what the debate discloses they are doing.

I close by saying to my Republican friends from the great industrial districts, it is all very right for you to listen to these lobbyists now, to these southern gentlemen who are talking and voting for their own industries, who are making a drive for your industries, but you will need some of these votes from the Middle West when the time comes for the November election, and you will need support from the rural communities in order to protect your constituents. I will say this to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MITCHELL], who is on his feet: You have been in a position of saying, "Let the States do this, that, and the other." Why do you not let the States pass on the question of tax and color? The answer is, No; in one instance they want the Federal law, not the State law. They want Federal law when it serves their purpose, the purpose of the oleo manufacturers, and they do not want it when it would protect the dairy interests.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I really did not intend to have anything to say about this legislation, because you have thoroughly, I think, discharged me from any responsibility for this bill. I am not going to do anything to injure it or improve it. I have tried to find out whether this was an economic question or whether it was a political question. I admit that I have a stack of telegrams and letters a foot high in favor of this legislation, and very few opposed to it, this makes it a political consideration with me. I am evidently flying in the face of considerable opposition, but I think this supposed uprising has been created by the expenditure of millions and millions of dollars by the oleo interests. I do not believe any Member of this House is influenced from that angle at all, but I do say that these people who have been trying to sell this fraud upon the American people have gone out to the grass roots and have deliberately engineered all the petitions for the passage of this legislation.

My colleagues on this side, I cannot understand your attitude. You have sat here for 16 years, with anywhere from 5 to 10 majority on the Agricultural Committee, and you have never raised this question before. I know that it may have been because our committee has been stacked with membership that has been located in the sphere of the solid South. There never has been a time since I have been here when there has been a single solitary Member on the Democratic side out of the influence of the South, west of the Mississippi River, except myself and one other, and none north of the Border States.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Did the gentleman make the statement that the House Committee on Agriculture had not raised this question in the last 16 years? If so, I should like to remind the gentleman that in 1943 I had a bill before that committee and we had 62 witnesses in behalf of the bill, and not a single witness was called in opposition, yet we were denied the privilege at that time of ever discussing the matter on its merits.

Mr. GRANGER. Yes, I know that, and you simply considered the oleo question too hot to handle. That was the trouble.

Mr. COOLEY. No. The thing about it was that the opponents of the bill looked at us and said, "We have got the votes, boys; call the roll." They did not even call a single witness to testify in opposition to it.

Mr. GRANGER. I do not complain at all because some Members are trying to find out new ways and new uses for cotton. I do not object to that at all. But I do think there is no reason why any Member of this House who neither has cotton nor has an oleo production plant in his State or in his district should desert one of the basic industries upon which our economy is built, and that is the dairy industry. Why should I, in spite of what the consumers in my district say, promote an industry on the Atlantic seaboard when the only thing it can do to me, if it does anything at all, is to destroy that basic industry? I am just not going to do it, and I do not care what the political consequences are. I have to maintain and keep those industries that pay the county taxes, that build the roads and operate the schools.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Case amendment.

There have been some very unkind things said during this debate in the few days this bill has been before the House. The debate has dropped to a low standard. I know many of us regret some of the things that have been said. The basic thing is that this is a fight between butter and an imitation whose producers have practiced deception all through their program. They have deceived the public and the housewife by making her believe, when it is absolutely not a fact, and the press has been filled with stories of this deception, that oleo is a natural yellow color. This is not true. You cannot make an edible or marketable product from domestic oils and have a natural color.

However, this is a new low in unfairness by the margarine people. I am going to quote an excerpt from the New York Herald Tribune of April 23. It is bad enough to let this fight go on between oleo and butter, but when margarine goes in competition with a house of worship on Sunday mornings at the hour of worship, 11 o'clock, that is a new low.

> Free for all—free margarine is being handed out at church time Sunday. The first 3,000 women to visit the Museum of Science and Industry at 30 Rockefeller Plaza opening at 11 a. m. will receive a pound of margarine donated by members of the National Margarine Association. Inside the museum door will be waiting a poster several feet in height. Won't you sign your name here along with the plea for colored margarine, without the restricting taxes? The poster with the petitioners' names will be air-expressed to Washington to speak its piece Monday when the Rivers bill for the repeal of Federal antimargarine restrictions comes to the floor of the House for vote.
>
> This is the first time in 63 years that pro-margarine legislation has come to a vote, giving consumers a chance for action on the tax question. Here's your chance, ladies, to throw a little weight on the matter. And free margarine is yours for the bother, that is if you are one of the first 3,000 Sunday visitors through the museum doors.

That is put on in competition with the Sunday hour of worship at 11 o'clock a. m.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, frankly I did not intend to have anything to say during this debate, but my colleague, the gentleman from Utah, stated to the House that this was a hot potato which the Democrats were unwilling to embrace during the long time that we were in charge of the House. The fact is that we did have in 1943 several bills pending before our committee, one which I had introduced myself. I know that we examined 62 witnesses who came from all parts of the United States and when we had finished the hearings some gentlemen on the committee suggested to the chairman, who at that time was a Democrat, that the opposition had the necessary votes to defeat the pending measures and that they did not want to put the opposition to the tremendous inconvenience and expense of coming all the way to Washington to testify concerning the merits of the proposition then under consideration. Consequently he asked to have the roll called and they did defeat the pending measure. My recollection is that the vote was about 13 to 14. The very distinguished and beloved friend of mine from Utah was then a member of the committee, and he along with one other Democrat voted with the Republicans and the measures were defeated. They defeated them by tabling further consideration of the bills. At this session of Congress my recollection is that there were 19 bills pending before our committee. This time

the opponents were not quite so sure about their position. They were not so certain about it, so they did call the opponents. I am frank to say, and I agree with my chairman, that the hearings were full and complete, and so far as I know, entirely satisfactory. After we had finished the discussion and consideration of the bills on the merits, instead of taking a vote they dodged the issue. I was the one who said, "Now is the time to stand up and be counted and say whether we are for or against this proposition." But, no, the motion prevailed, and the bills were tabled. I want to say to the Congress and the country that not a single one of those 19 bills has ever been read in the committee room. They were not read and they were not considered. They were tabled. After they were tabled, in an effort to build a storm cellar, somebody on the committee moved that the chairman be authorized to appoint a subcommittee to further study and consider the matter which had just been fully explored by witnesses from all over the country who had testified on both sides of the proposition.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. If you were so sincere then, why did you not drag a petition out here and do just what you have done now?

Mr. COOLEY. Frankly, the gentleman knows that I did not put this petition on the desk. In fact, I was very reluctant to sign the petition. I signed it, I think, as the 213th Member. I do not believe in petitions any more than the rest of you. I had never signed one before in my life and I am not going to let this be a precedent. When I signed it, I felt I was doing the right thing because the country has not had an opportunity to consider this matter for about 62 years. It seems to me that the Congress has the intelligence and the fortitude necessary to consider all issues regardless of whether they are hot or cold.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Of course.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If you think the Congress has that, did you think they lacked it during the 10 years you were in control?

Mr. COOLEY. I want to say this to my friend, it is not here now by a petition signed by Democrats alone. It was brought here by intelligent Republicans who were not willing to duck the issue because of political cowardice.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Right you are.

Mr. COOLEY. They brought the issue out in the open and now we have it before us and now is the time to stand up and be counted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to have the opportunity of following my distinguished colleague the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], who is credited with being the man responsible for bringing this legislation out of committee by the petition method. That information has gone all over the country. I want to commend him for his denial of responsibility for it, because I think the responsibility belongs to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], who is always willing to share his glories with the gentleman from North Carolina. But I think the gentleman ought to correct the RECORD so that the country would know, and particularly the women of this country would know that the gentleman did not have very much to do with it, because his signature was No. 213 on the list, and because he was so reluctant to discharge his own Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to agree with the gentleman. The gentleman knows I have never attempted to claim any credit whatever for bringing this bill to the floor, other than placing my name on the petition. I am willing to give full credit to my distinguished friend from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I know the gentleman is a busy man and I will take him at his word; but I would like to ask him and his colleagues on the Democratic side what did you do in 1933 and 1934 when you had a large majority in Congress? Did you bring this oleomargarine legislation up, when you could have put it through as a piece of must legislation? Oh, no. You did not touch it. What did you do in 1935 and 1936? Did you bring it before the Committee on Agriculture for a hearing? Did you ever even introduce a bill? Oh, no. Why? The first thing you wanted was to get the vote of the dairy farmers of the Northern States. Of course, that is what you wanted. It was a hot potato and you did not touch it. You were more interested in politics than you were in the welfare of the housewives of this country, and in 1940 you dropped the subject of oleo in the interest of the third-term candidate and political expediency.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. What did you do in 1937 and 1938? You did not touch it then. And in one of those Congresses we only had 89 Republicans here while you had the balance of the 435. Still you did not touch it. It was a hot potato and you were more interested in playing politics and in trying to get the votes of the farmers of the Northern States than you were in giving relief to the housewives for whom you plead today.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Surely.

Mr. COOLEY. Has there ever been a time during all those years when we had enough votes on the committee to bring that bill out?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Oh, you had enough votes on the floor of the House to bring out petition after petition, but from the top of your leadership down, for the first time in the history of some of your States, this is the first time you voted to discharge one of the responsible committees of the Congress.

Now I do not want to be critical of my good friend from North Carolina nor do I want to be critical of any of the other Members, because you have a right to do as you please and to think as you please and to vote as you please. You have the votes to pass this bill, I concede it to you. If you want to harm the dairy industry of the United States that is something for you to decide.

We work very much in harmony in the Committee on Agriculture. We even went so far back in the thirties that we let the gentleman from North Carolina write the complete ticket for the tobacco industry of the United States. Yes, we did; and he will not deny it. He certainly did a splendid job, and he is still functioning in the interests of the tobacco industry. One of the master strokes that he attempted and succeeded within the past 6 or 7 months was to include nearly a billion dollars worth of tobacco in the Marshall program to be given to the various countries of Europe not as a necessity, but something to satisfy a habit. And all at the expense of the American taxpayers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to talk on this legislation until I received a letter from one of the creameries in my State after they had endeavored to have a national magazine print their answer to an article criticizing their stand on this issue. The Challenge Cream and Butter Association sent a letter to Life magazine. The magazine refused to print the letter even though they had made what I think was an unfair statement. I was asked to have the letter from the Challenge Cream and Butter Association of my State placed in the RECORD, and this I will do.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that in my congressional district I have both cotton and dairy industries. My district produces more cotton than the rest of California together and one of the counties in my district set a record for more cotton than any other county in the United States. We produce it in large quantities. There are areas in my district where the cotton yield is from five to six bales per acre and the average is more than one bale per acre wherever planted.

I do not believe we are approaching this legislation in the right way. Here you have two great industries that should be partners. One reason why cottonseed is so scarce today is not because it is being used in the production of oleo, but because cottonseed is being fed to dairy and beef cattle. That is the reason cottonseed is so high priced at the present time. It is one of the concentrates that is used to produce more butter, milk, and dairy products in my State, and I think

in every State where these products are produced. There is a time of the year when not so much milk is consumed and they manufacture butter and place it in storage until it is needed.

We all know that butter is one of the finest things produced. Man eats it from childhood. I did not hear of oleo being rationed during the war period, but everybody was scrambling for butter, and I have sat at the table in the House restaurant downstairs and heard Members at my table and at adjoining tables complain about the difficulty they had in getting sufficient butter. Mr. Chairman, we have an industry we should protect, and I am very fearful that the legislation we are about to adopt will, through the years, prove to be injurious to the dairy business. After all, by protecting the dairy industry we are preserving the welfare of the people on the whole because there is no substitute for milk and its byproducts. The dairy industry provides steady employment the year around in contrast to the seasonal employment of about every other form of agricultural endeavor.

The dairy cows are on the farm from one year until the next to be taxed, while the bales of cotton are moved before tax assessment time, and therefore the greater part of the tax is borne by the dairy farmer. I have supported legislation time and again for the cotton farmers and will again, but I believe this is unfair to the dairy farmer, and so I will vote against it.

How many of you Members of the House here have gotten up at 2 o'clock in the morning and milked a string of cows by hand, then have taken your milk to the creamery and returned in the afternoon at which time you would have to go through the whole performance again, finishing your work at 8 or 9 o'clock at night? I have had to do that. The first money I ever made was from milking cows. I have milked as many as 35 cows by hand, not just 1 day but every day year after year. I know something about both of the products that we are talking about.

In my congressional district we produce cotton fiber and cottonseed oil.

Mr. Chairman, the letter to which I referred earlier in my remarks follows:

MARCH 17, 1948.

The EDITOR, LIFE MAGAZINE,
Time and Life Building, New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: It was with considerable regret that we read your editorial contained in Life magazine of March 8 wherein you took definite sides on an issue on which apparently you were not too well informed. You and many others apparently have been misled to the effect that if the 10-cent tax on butter-colored oleo were repealed that this would permit a reduction in price to consumers of oleo. About the only thing that would result would be that the same oleo, now produced, would be colored to imitate butter at no reduction in price to consumers, from that now being paid for uncolored oleo. Consumers today can buy all the oleo they choose and certainly the addition of coloring would not reduce the price to the consumer.

Food is a most important item in the world economy today, and anything that would be done that would threaten to reduce the production of such an important food item as dairy products, certainly does not appear to be good business at this particular time. Yet this could happen, if oleo, masquerading as butter, were to an even greater extent replace butter.

It has been argued that milk production should only be sufficient to take care of fresh milk and cream demands, evaporated milk, cheese, etc., yet with milk production very seasonable, actually a surplus is necessary to be produced in the spring months, if sufficient production is to be available in the fall months. This is particularly true with respect to fluid milk, as it is impossible to store fresh milk in the spring to have sufficient available as fresh milk in the fall and winter. Butter, therefore, acts as a reservoir, and the price obtained by the farmer for butter to a great extent determines the price of fluid milk. If he must obtain a sizable reduced income for his surplus then it would probably follow that he must receive more for his milk used as fluid milk if he is to continue in production, or the other alternative, reduce his production so that he has little or no surplus in the spring, in which event there would be a definite shortage of fluid milk in the fall and winter, in this latter instance, where demand would exceed supply, it is quite probable a consumer of fluid milk would have to pay a greater price for their fluid milk.

There are numerous arguments that could be added, which you no doubt are conversant with by this time.

It is regrettable that a magazine like Life would take sides on an issue of this type involving not only the very economy of all the dairy farmers in this country, but one that could be very disturbing to the food situation throughout the world.

Very truly yours,

CHALLENGE CREAM AND BUTTER ASSOCIATION,
L. E. EVANS, *General Manager.*

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to the eloquence of this debate. So far it seems to me that we have gone far afield from the actual point.

First of all, if this legislation is passed without amendment, we will be going back on the idea of protection that has always been one of the basic foundations of our economy and one of the reasons for our high standard of living. It is perfectly obvious to those who come from dairy districts that the dairy industry needs and requires protection at the present time.

I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House to something that I read just the other day in a local paper. It is entitled "Oleo Leads Butter," and is as follows:

OLEO LEADS BUTTER

More oleo than butter was produced in the United States in February, Government figures showed today. Oleo production totaled 80,418,176 pounds for the month, an increase of 12,668,098 pounds over February 1947. Butter production was estimated at 77,145,000 pounds, a decrease of about 20,000,000 pounds from February 1947.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe anyone in this House wants to see the dairy industry in this country crippled and ruined. On the other hand, after listening to the protagonists of oleomargarine, it seems to me that that product should be held up to the world for what it is and that there is only one color which describes it—virgin white. After all, if it is so good, why does it have to adopt another color? If it is so perfect, why does it need all this assistance? You are paying only half for it right now. What more do you want?

The thing the dairy farmer in this country today is up against is high prices and high wages. Cows are feminine, and like all things feminine, it takes a lot of hard work if you want to keep them. You cannot do without them, and they do not like cheap competition. So, I repeat, the dairy farmer is up against it.

Surely there is nothing unfair or unusual in continuing the taxes as they have been, and, as has been so well pointed out, as they have been for the last 60 years or more.

The relative nutritional value of oleomargarine and butter has no bearing on the repeal of the oleo statutes. Even if oleomargarine were identical in nutritional value with butter, the repeal of the laws would set a dangerous precedent. Such actions would establish the philosophy that an imitation food product achieves full legal legitimacy if it is nutritionally equivalent to the product it imitates. The floodgates would be down to a whole category of simulated dairy products such as filled cheese, filled ice cream, and filled milk. Our standards of food products would be undermined. Imitations and substitutions would take over our food industries.

Other imitations of butter are taxed now. Adulterated butter—which, like oleo, is an imitation of good butter—carries the same per pound tax and the same manufacturer's, wholesaler's, and retailer's occupational taxes as does colored oleo. Renovated or process butter carries the same per pound tax as uncolored oleo. There is no reason why an exception should be made for oleomargarine.

Oleomargarine already has been given competitive privileges which are denied butter. It may be "fortified" with vitamins, flavored with butter flavor, and preserved with benzoate of soda. None of these—nor any other extraneous substances—may be added to butter.

Uncontrolled and ruthless competition of a low-cost product in almost identical imitation of butter would hurt butter prices and drive many farmers out of dairying. Unfortunately those who say "Let the consumers drink milk" do not have the answer to this dilemma.

To have enough milk to meet fluid demands in the slack season requires more than enough milk in the flush season. Some of this excess must go into butter. Without a butter outlet farmers would cut their herds to the point where there would be insufficient fluid milk in the slack season. Cattle numbers would continue to decline. In the final analysis the question is whether America is to continue its meat and milk products diet, or revert largely to a grain and field crop subsistence.

The gentleman from Colorado's amendment seems to me eminently satisfactory to the dairy farmers because by a simple device it makes it impossible for oleo to pass itself off as butter. That is what we want to prevent, no more, no less. Surely in all fairness no one can object to the truth. If oleo is so good, so pure, so healthful as all the eloquent speeches made on this floor attest,

why not proclaim it to the world? All we ask is that oleo be known as oleo and butter as butter.

CONSUMERS WILL BE HURT BY OLEO LEGISLATION

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, much has been said about fraud on the consumer but also involved as a reason for this law is the prevention of unfair competition and the implications of unfair competition in this field have greater effect on a larger segment of our population than is true with respect to any other article that I know of. The problems presented by imitation butter are unique in the field as to character and degree and are not suitably handled by any Federal law on the statute books. This bill has been sold to many of the public on the strength of the fact that it would aid the consumer by reducing the cost of living. Propaganda to this effect has been circulated primarily in the city areas of our Nation and that concerns me directly because approximately one-half of those who live in the district I represent live within the boundary of the city of Minneapolis and each of those in this group as well as many others in the district I represent would naturally be interested in legislation that would cut the cost of living. This situation has caused me to carefully investigate the claims that have been made with respect to this measure to see if they will actually be realized if the bill before us is enacted into law. I am sorry to relate that I find the claims that are made in this direction are deceitful and untrue and that we have before us in this legislation nothing that would aid any consumer in my State and nothing that would aid 90 percent of the consumers of oleomargarine in America. For this reason it is clear to me that this legislation should be opposed if for no other reason than the fact that it is not honest legislation.

I have before me the editorial which appeared in this morning's Washington Post. This paper has supported the legislation in question, but they have suddenly awakened to the fact that the claim that it would benefit the majority of consumers is false. This editorial states:

> It should not be forgotten that abolition of the 10 cents per pound Federal tax on oleomargarine will confer no benefits whatever on the great majority of the consumers.

The reason this legislation will confer no benefits whatever upon the great majority of consumers is that 90 percent of the oleomargarine that is consumed in the country is not subject to the 10-cent tax. The editorial further goes on to state:

> Moreover, in this period of scarcity and obviously high butter prices there is a real danger that elimination of the 10-cent Federal tax on colored oleomargarine may not have the desired effect of reducing margarine prices even in the areas where it can be freely sold. For, as noted in the course of the House debate, margarine producers would probably sell the colored product exclusively if relieved from payment of the extra tax on it, and it might well be that they would take advantage of the opportunity to boost the price above those previously charged for the uncolored products.

My study of the matter has convinced me that the situation the Washington Post refers to is sure to arise and that this legislation will increase the price of oleomargarine to 90 percent of the consumers and not decrease it.

In support of this, the editorial further notes:

> As the present spread between prices of the colored and uncolored products in some places, Washington, for instance, exceeds the amount of the 10-cent tax, the danger is by no means imaginary.

Of course it is not imaginary, it is actual, tested, and proven, and this bill will raise the price of oleomargarine to 90 percent of the oleomargarine users in America as sure as the sun will rise tomorrow. Is that what you want to do? That is what will be done and that is what the oleomargarine lobby wants to do and that is the reason they have spent over $6,000,000 in their advertising campaign in support of this legislation.

OLEO LOBBY SPENDS MILLIONS

Is there any person so naive in this House as to believe that the oleomargarine lobby has spent in the last year $6,000,000 in advertising to drum up support for a law so they can sell their product at less profit to themselves than they presently enjoy? It is as plain as day that they are motivated by increased profits and these will only be obtained by selling their product to the consumer at a higher price.

There is an additional aspect of this legislation which has been touched upon briefly but which needs elaboration. Permitting the deceitful imitation of butter will interfere with the butter market and hence the market the farmer enjoys for his butterfat. Since butter is the end product of milk when the market for butterfat is removed or seriously interfered with, the farmer will be forced to increase the price of his milk to the consumer if he is to make ends meet. The price of meat would also be increased because dairy operations would be decreased and thus the amount of beef and veal which presently comes as a result of dairy operations would be cut down at the livestock markets. At the present time 42 percent of our beef and veal comes from dairy operations.

BILL WOULD INCREASE PRICES

So the net result of this legislation in the long run will be to increase the price of oleomargarine to the majority of consumers, to increase the price of milk, to increase the price of meat, and if that result is a benefit to the consumers I fail to see it. The only people in America who would benefit from this legislation would be the oleomargarine manufacturers and they would do so at the expense of the consumers and to the detriment of the dairy farmer's honest market.

TAX ISSUE A SHAM

In this legislation the tax issue is only a sham since the tax is not paid in 90 percent of the cases. The only issue is whether or not they are going to permit the oleomargarine manufacturers to artificially color oleomargarine to imitate butter. I can well appreciate that people from various districts might be influenced in the decision they make on this point by what they consider to be best for their own individual district, but in my position I am forced to decide this on the basis of what is fair and right because I have both groups, and it is my conclusion, and I urge it strongly on the House, that to permit the artificial coloring of oleomargarine and to permit the sale of oleomargarine under such circumstances that it cannot be distinguished from creamery butter is a fraud on the purchaser and is unfair competition which the farmers of this Nation should not be required to face. It reminds me pretty much of Henry Wallace running around the country saying he is just the same as Roosevelt. You know and I know that is not true. He is far from the real McCoy and oleomargarine is far from the real McCoy and people have a right to know the difference.

OLEO NOT EQUIVALENT OF BUTTER

In my study on this matter I have gone back to the debate which occurred in Congress over 9 days in 1886. The claim was made then as it is made today that oleomargarine was just as good as butter. We know today that statement was untrue and false because we have found, through scientific research, things today which we did not know in 1886 about the nutritional qualities of various foods. So if any person were to sell oleomargarine in the form in which it was prepared in 1886 today and claim that it was just as good as butter he could be sued and convicted of fraud. The same would be true of oleo as made in 1920. The only reason they could not be sued and convicted in 1886 or 1920 was because they were not able to prove it because they did not have the scientific knowledge. Now, today, we have exactly the same claim made—that oleo is just as good as butter, but what they really mean is that it is as much like butter as they are able to make it. I venture to predict that as scientific knowledge develops in the nutritional field, we will find that oleomargarine being sold today is also deficient in supplying equal nutritional value with butter just the same as it was in 1886 and 1920, although some improvement has undoubtedly been made in this field. I think it is a fraud of the worst sort to permit oleomargarine to be palmed off on the public under such claims just because a lack of scientific knowledges makes it impossible to prove the fraud. I believe it is essential that this Congress, if we are going to protect the public interest, prohibit this deceitful imitation of butter. It seems to me that the reasons advanced by President Grover Cleveland when he signed this legislation are equally sound today. At that time the President of the United States said:

> If the existence of the commodity taxed, and the profits of its manufacture and sale, depend upon disposing of it to the people for something which it deceitfully imitates, the entire enterprise is a fraud and not an industry.

PROMOTE SOIL CONSERVATION

We should encourage balanced agriculture instead of discouraging it and

while you and I might think soil conservation is quite new, this was one of the original reasons advanced by the committee in 1886 for adopting this legislation. I quote from the report on H. R. 8328, Forty-ninth Congress, first session, which was the oleo bill. Report No. 2028, dated April 28, 1886, signed by Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Agriculture, that—

> The dairy interest is a necessity to all other branches of agriculture as it is the cheapest and most reliable means of producing or continuing the conditions of soil necessary to the production of crops of grain and grass.

That is even more true today and more true in the South than in the North, because cotton raising has depleted the fertility of the soil.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] have offered us a choice of solutions of the situation that exists before the House at the present time. Either amendment would provide a means of identification other than a little printed placard which the restaurant keeper hangs back of the coat rack or back of the coffee urn, where, if you want to hunt around the restaurant, you may be able to find it. This is a simple and understandable proposal that oleo, if it is oleo, be of one shape upon the restaurant plate and butter be of another shape, irrespective of the color, which, Mr. Chairman, as you know, is the only argument before the Congress. If a proposal were made here to take away the taxes but not permit oleo to color its product yellow, there would be the same opposition from the manufacturers who today support this bill.

I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHNSON] must have referred to the same thing I have in my hand, regarding the statement in a radio broadcast by Mr. Lyle Van, in which he says:

> Just to remind you that Sunday is National Margarine Day, and here in New York it will be observed at the Museum of Science and Industry at Radio City. As I have told you, the first 3,000 women who attend will each be presented with a pound of colored margarine. There'll be a margarine-mixing contest between housewives and glamour-girl models—and, if you please, I'm to be one of the judges. The proceeds of the day-long program benefit the American Cancer Society.

Then I would add briefly that everyone who received a pound of margarine must have signed a petition to Congress asking them to take off this tax.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Was that contest open to Members of Congress?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I am afraid not. We are not glamour girls or housewives—with the exception of the gentlewoman from New York.

The argument has been advanced here by some of the opponents of the amendment that it will take years to make the needed changes in the machinery. I took it upon myself to call up and find out just how long it would take. It will take no time at all to change the cutting machinery because it would be a wire-cutting process and the change in shape could be made in a couple of weeks, and it might take 2 or 3 months to get the wrapping machinery changed. It is a very simple solution, and I hope the amendment will be supported.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. MITCHELL. Where does the gentleman get this information?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. From the manufacturers of the machinery.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is wonderful.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. From listening to the arguments of some of the proponents of the bill, I get the impression that it would be an operation at least similar to converting from peace to war by American industry. It would not take that long, would it?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Not that long.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. What would the gentleman suggest that the poor people of this country eat in the interim?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. They would continue eating what they are now eating. They seem to be eating all the oleo that is manufactured and all the butter that is manufactured. I do not think that this bill is going to do anything but raise the price of both oleo and butter to the consumers.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, during the time that I have had the privilege of serving as a Member of Congress, I have never felt that sectionalism or provincialism should enter into the decision of any question that comes up in the Congress. I have repeatedly found myself on the same side as some of my colleagues from the South in problems affecting cotton and tobacco, for example. I have tried to adjust my thinking and decide how I should vote on the basis of what is best for the people of this country as a whole. Our distinguished colleague from Utah [Mr. GRANGER], who spoke a few minutes ago, said that there were perhaps only two questions involved, one political and the other economic, in this question. I should like to suggest to the Members that there is still another problem involved which is of equal importance to us in this question, and that is the question of health. If any of you have sat on committees having to do with health laws such as the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, you realize the importance of the present tax so far as the regulation of this business is concerned. Without the help that this tax affords, the enforcement machinery of the Government is going to be very seriously impaired. At the present time I am informed that there are 26 companies manufacturing oleomargarine. I say to you, as a statement coming from those whose duty it is to enforce the laws of the country, that if there were no tax at all on colored or uncolored margarine, oleomargarine will be made in every back alley in this country.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I cannot yield now. I should like first to complete my statement.

I hope the gentleman is not offended at that, because it is a fact in my book, and it will be a fact if you take this tax off. The mushrooming of these small companies which will be making poorly refined and adulterated oleomargarine in order to cash in on this new market which will be created if you pass the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina will be enormous. So I say to you while you are considering this problem, you also should consider it from the viewpoint of health as well as the other problems which may actuate you in coming to some conclusion.

If you do not believe what I say, I suggest that you consult with your Federal Bureau of Internal Revenue, particularly the Miscellaneous Tax Division, and ask them if that statement which I have just made to you is not the viewpoint of that department of the Government.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I had understood that the Internal Revenue Bureau representatives had appeared at these hearings in favor of removing the tax.

Mr. O'HARA. I do not so understand, but it makes little difference to me whether they did or not.

Mr. KEATING. Is there any parallel for this method of regulating health—the imposition of a tax in this way?

Mr. O'HARA. Let me say to my friend it has certainly aided enforcement and protection from the health viewpoint of the manufacturing end of oleomargarine and the ingredients which go into it.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Is it not a fact that the packers must pay the inspection cost of their meat before they can ship it in interstate commerce at the present time?

Mr. O'HARA. Certainly that is true.

Mr. KEATING. But it is not called a tax, however? It is not in the nature of a tax? It is simply an inspection fee.

Mr. O'HARA. Well, I do not care what you call it.

Mr. KEATING. The purpose of taxes is to raise revenue.

Mr. O'HARA. This is the first year of operation.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Do we not also have a quarter of a cent a pound tax on reprocessed butter and nobody seems to be anxious to get rid of that, not even the butter people.

Mr. O'HARA. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 10 minutes.

Mr. RIVERS. What about amendments thereto?

Mr. HOPE. No. If this amendment should be adopted, then no further amendments would be in order.

Mr. RIVERS. What about the Case amendment?

Mr. HOPE. As I understand the Case amendment, it is not an amendment to the Hill amendment. It is a perfecting amendment to the bill itself.

Mr. RAYBURN. Is the gentleman asking unanimous consent that debate close on the two pending amendments in 10 minutes?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; that is my request, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the fact that the amendment which I offered is a perfecting amendment to the bill, the Hill substitute may be voted upon first and my amendment second.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. POTTS] for 1 minute.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important that we look back at the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] and see what it does. It does nothing to the present tax set-up, except make a switch. All these inequities which are in the present law are maintained under the first amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

The switch which has been made is that now oleomargarine may be colored yellow, but in substitution for that it is required to take on a legislatively imposed shape. Remember that the tax which has been put on oleomargarine is not a revenue-raising tax, it is a tax alleged to be placed there to prevent fraud. It is one of the few times, if not the only time, when specific consumers rather than the general public are taxed for enforcing laws against the fraudulent sale of a product.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. GOFF] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, I have been very much interested but have had nothing to say. I happen to be a member of the House Committee on Agriculture which has been discharged, and I do not happen to own any dairy cows and am not a farmer. I sat for over a week in the hearings and listened to all the testimony and it was my conclusion that the reason this law should not be repealed is that we should protect butter from what can be called nothing else but a synthetic or imitation product. I appeal to my good friends over here to not put the butter industry out of business. That is what I think we will do if we permit the sale of yellow margarine without some way of identifying margarine from butter. It does not hurt me a bit to say that the manufacturer of margarine has to put it up in a special shape. He can afford to do it. I will tell you this, the only way the farmer can save himself if you do not adopt this amendment is to make such molds himself for his own product. The farmer will have to pay that expense or go out of business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the housewives of America have been sold a bill of goods and the American dairy farmer has been "sold down the river" on the floor of the House, here, today. An expensive, yes, a very expensive, advertising campaign has misled a large segment of the American people, and from the sound of things here, a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives, as well.

You who have appeared here in the well of the House as self-righteous champions of the American housewife will reap the whirlwind of their wrath when they find out the truth about the false leadership which has been given on this issue—when they find out they have, in return for the small benefit of being spared the work—and, oh, how arduous that labor has been pictured here in this Chamber—of massaging a cellophane bag a couple of times a week, they will have been misled into opening the door to grievous abuses; attrition of our national supply of animal fats, deterioration of the American livestock industry, and depletion of our soil resources.

How can the cost to any consumer be lessened by the removal of a tax when that tax is now being evaded simply by refraining from coloring oleomargarine yellow? Certainly a tax which is not being paid cannot increase the cost of a product to which that tax might otherwise apply.

The fundamental question here is whether or not two fats of vastly different origin are now being permitted to compete fairly and whether they would be permitted to compete fairly if we adopted the bill before the House today.

Under the existing laws the manufacturers of oleomargarine have over a period of years, and with the obvious purpose of imitation, been able to develop the ersatz butter which duplicates the real product in body, in texture, in melting point. They have impregnated it with vitamin A to duplicate real butter; they have added butter flavor to increase the prospects of delusion of the consuming public. In addition, they have been permitted to add preservatives to their product, which is not permitted with butter. The question then arises, if it feels the same, reacts the same, tastes the same, and has approximately the same vitamin content, if it is practically as good as butter, what is the difference? Why not let the people be fooled—they would not be any worse off because of it. That is the kind of argument we have been faced with, and are faced with here today, and it exhibits a brash lack of decency and concern for the right of the American to know what he is eating.

When a man buys a steak in a restaurant he has the right to know whether it is beef or horse meat, even though by a process of seasoning and smothering it with onions a clever cook may be able to disguise the difference. Not too many years ago we heard about the establishment of a plant down in Florida for the canning of rattlesnake meat. They told us it tasted like chicken, was just as nutritious, and more tender. Yet, certainly a man has a right to know whether he is eating chicken or rattlesnake meat.

The nutritional factors of this argument are probably not as important as they once were. By the clever, artificial means which I have described above, perhaps there is not too much difference. We do know, for one thing however, that butter does contain substantial quantities of vitamin E, which is important for human reproduction and the prevention and treatment of certain disease, and that a like content of vitamin E has not been developed for oleomargarine. Without belaboring this nutritional point, I do want to quote from a recent issue of the American Medical Association Journal:

> Since the nutritional factors have not all been identified, and since butter contains numerous additional fatty acids of unknown nutritional value, the consuming public has a right to demand that the practice of identifying oleomargarine and butter, so that anyone can differentiate between them, should be continued.

It is a plain fact that without this existing method, the method of Federal taxation, our Government would be severely handicapped in attempting to preserve this right of the American people to be able to differentiate between butter and oleomargarine.

Nor should the long-range adverse effect of our agricultural economy be overlooked. There is no substitute for the maintenance of a livestock economy when it comes to retaining and developing soil fertility. A great many of the dairymen in the great dairy area which I represent are primarily fluid-milk producers, but they realize that almost half of our total milk production is used for butter and that unfair competition for the butter market will have a serious effect on the livestock industry and on the stability of milk production and dairy markets.

Nor ought we overlook the fact that nearly half of our leather and nearly half of the beef consumed in this country come from the source of butter production—the dairy cow.

On the floor of the House here today some of you who are horse traders—you certainly are not cow traders—are going to trade a substantial part of an industry, which in the production of butter receives 62 percent of the consumer's dollar, for a very minor part of the cotton and soybean industries, whose farmers get, respectively, only one-half of 1 percent and 5 percent of their income from the production of oleomargarine.

The conflict here is between millions of individual dairy farmers and 29 or 30 profit-hungry manufacturers of oleomargarine. The housewives of this Nation and you who are voting for this bill today have been drawn into this conflict as the pawns of these few seekers of oleomargarine profits.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the intense partisans on both sides of this issue, it seems to me at times this debate has gone wide of the mark. The question before us does not concern the relative merits of butter or margarine, nor the question of which one is the cleaner or more wholesome, nor whether the butter or margarine lobby has spent more money to advance its interests, nor any of the other side-alley contentions which have been advanced on both sides of this issue.

The sole question it seems to me is: Is the continuance of this tax on margarine justified as a revenue-raising measure?

At the present time the manufacturer pays a tax of one-fourth of a cent a pound on white margarine and 10 cents a pound on yellow margarine, which is, of course, passed on to the wholesaler, from him to the retailer and from the latter to the consumer. This bill proposes the repeal of this tax.

In addition, the manufacturer of margarine pays a special tax of $600, the wholesaler of yellow margarine $480 and of white margarine $200, and the retail dealer in yellow margarine $48 and white margarine $6. It is proposed that these levies be repealed except for those now imposed upon the wholesalers and retailers of white margarine.

These laws were enacted in 1886 when margarine was first introduced as a food on the American table. The historian relates that efforts were made to palm off this new product as butter, which led to the enactment of punitive measures, which it was thought would discourage this practice. In other words, this tax was not conceived originally as part of a plan for raising necessary revenues to run the Government. It was rather designed as a protection to the dairy industry. With commendable frankness the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY], when he addressed the House on February 3, as appears at page 1032 of the RECORD, replied to an inquiry of mine by conceding that the purpose of the tax today is for the protection of the dairy industry.

In that respect this tax is an anomaly. There is no other industry which enjoys the advantage of having a tax imposed upon its competitor. It is not by such a method that this country has attained material progress unparalleled in all history. What would be the present status of our automobile industry, for instance, if on the advent of this new mode of transportation the harnessmakers, the livery-stable keepers, and breeders of horses had combined to influence the Congress to impose a punitive Federal tax upon the automobile manufacturer or dealer? Or what if the railroad interests had successfully sought like measures when airplane transportation was in its infancy?

This tax is unique. It stems from a motive alien to that which should inspire tax legislation. The only purpose, the only justification for taxation upon any group or classification of our citizens is to produce revenue. Yet we are told that the total revenue produced by this tax is inconsequential in the over-all revenue picture. Representatives of the Treasury Department, indeed, appeared in opposition to the continuance of the tax. In all of the debate scarcely a word has been uttered by the opponents of this measure about the loss of revenue to the Government and the seriousness of the effect of repeal on the public coffers.

This tax is an artificial restraint upon free competition. It causes a discriminatory price rise in a product not primarily used by those who have the pocketbook to afford such discriminatory treatment, but rather by those of middle and lower incomes who find the greatest difficulty in meeting their grocery bills.

Butter is $1 a pound. The $40-a-week man must work an hour to earn a single pound of butter. Millions of people in this country, therefore, simply cannot afford the luxury of eating butter.

Margarine is a wholesome and nutritious product which can be used in place of butter and purchased at about half the price. When we add a tax of 10 cents on each pound of margarine, as well as levy a ransom on the manufacturer, wholesaler, and retailer, which will eventually fall on the consumer, it impresses me that we are exacting a tribute, unwarranted and unjust, from those citizens whose economic status renders them least able to meet discriminatory charges. We are in effect levying a consumer's sales tax, not a luxury, not, indeed, across the board, but upon a single staple item of food. Such action seems to me an abdication of our duty to legislate, not for a special group, but in the interest of all the people.

The legislation now on our books had its genesis, as I pointed out, in the fact that margarine was being misrepresented as butter. That condition no longer exists. Margarine today is distributed under that name. Indeed there are those who prefer margarine to butter. There is no longer reason, therefore, for attempting to represent it as butter.

Butter is composed of fats which contain more fatty acids of the saturated variety than does margarine. For this reason butter tends to become rancid more readily than does margarine.

Two vitamin-like substances essential in the human diet are linoleic and linolenic acids. When absent or low in the diet, an intractable eczema involving the skin may result. Margarine is rich both in linoleic and linolenic acids, while butter contains very little.

The vitamin E content of these two fats is important. One hundred grams of butter contain approximately 2.4 milligrams of vitamin E. One hundred grams of margarine contain about 54 milligrams of vitamin E. Thus, 1 pound of butter yields 11.5 units of vitamin E; while in 1 pound of margarine there is available 259 units of E. The average American eats during a 24-hour day from 1 to 2 ounces or from 30 to 60 grams of either of these fats. From the butter he would obtain 0.72 milligram to 1.08 milligrams of E; while from the margarine he would get from 16.20 milligrams to 24.30 milligrams. In short, margarine is 22 times richer in the essential vitamin E than is butter. In other words, to obtain as much vitamin E as is found in the daily portion of margarine, 1 to 2 ounces, one would have to eat from 22 to 44 ounces of butter.

The effect of vitamin E on the human body is not yet clearly established. Its importance to many of the lower animals has been clearly proven and reasoning from studies on experimental animals it is fair to assume that it is necessary in the human diet. Moreover, certain diseased conditions are relieved by its administration. Its clinical use at the present moment is a matter of scientific controversy and study. Based on a study of experimental animals, a normal human being should have a daily food intake of 30 milligrams of vitamin E.

A prominent physician of my congressional district, Dr. John R. Williams, has recently completed a careful analysis of the diets of more than 200 individuals from all walks of life, some of them normal controls, others affected with diabetes and cardiovascular disease. Upwards of 300 observations were made on these diets. The results are extremely suggestive. Approximately 80 percent of this group have a daily intake of 20 milligrams of vitamin E—normal 30 milligrams—and 50 percent have less than 11 milligrams. An analysis of the blood made on 100 of these individuals disclosed that in 28 percent of these the blood level was lower than the accepted normal; while the majority approximated the minimum normal. Limited as this study is in numbers, it is one of the few which have been made. It may be confidently said that the majority of the American people today are living on a substandard vitamin E diet. Vitamin E, while a fat-soluble vitamin, is found but sparingly in animal fats. Its chief source are the oils of plants and the coverings of grains, fruits, and vegetables. Whole wheat preparations and vegetable oils are the richest sources. Cotton-seed, peanut, soybean, and corn and wheat germ oils contain large amounts from 20 to 50 times that found in animal fats. Whole wheat bread and cereals, margarine, salad oils, carrots, beets, green leafy vegetables, and eggs are the foods which will afford a normal intake of vitamin E.

The vast majority of the American people, all walks of life included, do not have an adequate vitamin E dietary content. The same is undoubtedly true of most animals used as sources of food. Food processing and soil deficiencies are the probable explanations. Margarine is a pure, healthful food product rich in vitamin E and other essential dietary factors. Its wide use, therefore, should be encouraged in every possible way. To restrict or curtail its use by legislation certainly is not in the best interest of the national health or economy.

Undoubtedly an equally strong case can be made out for butter, which contains many of the ingredients embraced

within a well-rounded diet. The point is that each food can and should stand on its own merits divorced from the artificial crutch of an indefensible tax.

Furthermore, it is a violation of law to represent margarine as butter under the Federal Pure Food and Drug Act. If that act needs strengthening in order to achieve its purpose of preventing a fraud on the public, that is the method which we should pursue to prevent imposition. It is perhaps pertinent to point out that artificially colored margarine must be so designated—a restriction not imposed on artificially colored butter.

This tax punishes not the margarine industry, but the public. It represents an unmoral and uneconomic use of the taxing power. While favoring a single industry, it is indicative of a principle which, if applied in reverse to raise the price of products consumed by the dairy farmer, would artificially raise his cost of living to a degree out of all proportion to any loss which he might conceivably suffer from the elimination of this levy.

In a recent survey conducted among readers of the Atlantic Monthly magazine, who certainly would for the most part fall in the upper income brackets, 89 percent answered in the negative the question: "Do you think it is in the public interest to supply public revenue through special taxes on the manufacture and distribution of margarine?" Only 5 percent answered in the affirmative, with 6 percent of no opinion. Such a question put to a fair cross-section of all the people would, of course, reveal an even higher percentage opposed to the continued imposition of this levy on the manufacture and distribution of a single food product.

To continue this tax would, therefore, be to act contrary to the wishes of an overwhelming majority of our citizens in the interests of a tiny minority.

The dairy industry is an essential part of our economy. We should not consciously take a step to do it an irreparable injury. On the other hand, neither should we grant it a favoritism of an unjustified indirect subsidy unless we are prepared to accord equal treatment to the producers of any and all other farm products which find a place on the American table. In the long run such a policy would materially injure, not help, the American farmer. More and more every day he is coming to the realization of the soundness of that fundamental principle. The consumers of the country, most of all the tightly budgeted housewives, are raising their voices in protest against any price rises which are the result of artificial stimulation by legislative action.

By the enactment of this measure we will end a 60-year old anachronism. No argument has been advanced for the continuance of this tax which commends itself to my conception of responsible legislation. Our duty to repeal it is clear.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. The gentleman stresses the point that the tax should not be continued as a revenue-raising measure. I want to tell the gentleman that I think he has stated the entire problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, on my first appearance in the well of the House today I want to say one thing and say it plainly. We are confronted with two things today. If you want to remove the yoke from the neck of the housewives of this Nation and take away the red tape they are burdened with now, vote against the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment does one thing. It just cuts the heart out of the bill, that is all it does. If you want to cut the heart out of this bill, support the pending amendment. That is all you have to do.

Mr. Chairman, the Hill amendment leaves the tax in effect, it still leaves the cumbersome bookkeeping in effect; it straddles the manufacturer, the wholesaler, and the rest of them alike with this additional cost. Where will you get enforcement?

Mr. Chairman, this is not a revenue-raising measure. The Treasury itself does not want it. The Treasury testified against it. Now you have your opportunity to vote to remove these taxes or you have your opportunity to vote to retain them. The Hill amendment, I repeat, cuts the heart out of our bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I should like to have the attention of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL]. I know the gentleman is trying to work out a fair proposition. He has worked diligently to secure a workable program for several weeks. It seems to me it is fundamental that the one thing that must be done here is to protect any one from deception in public eating places. There is no deception in the sale of butter or margarine to the housewife.

Would the gentleman from Colorado accept the substitute for his amendment which I have discussed with him, striking out all of the taxes except a one-dollar license fee on all public eating places which sell margarine and also requiring them to advise the public of that fact either by printing the fact on the menu or by the use of the triangular form suggested by the gentleman? If the gentleman will accept it, I will offer it as a substitute and I believe we can agree.

Mr. HILL. I may say to the gentleman from Texas that I have great regard for him. I would be willing to do this: Let us refer this bill back to the Committee on Agriculture and have it considered further.

Mr. POAGE. No. I cannot agree to that. If the gentleman will accept my substitute, I will join with him. I think I have offered a fair proposition. I think the gentleman himself has already agreed that what I propose is fair and that it will prevent any possibility of any deception in the only case where deception can occur. If the gentleman will accept it, I am sure the overwhelming majority can agree. I think the overwhelming majority of this House believes, as I do, that all the nuisance taxes and dealers' license fees should be removed. The gentleman's amendment would not remove them.

I think the great majority of this House believes, as I do, that we should punish any effort to deceive the public. The substitute I propose surely goes just as far in that direction as the gentleman's amendment but my proposal involves a minimum of expense and special forms. The gentleman's amendment would admittedly delay the effective date of this reform for many months and probably years. I hope the gentleman will accept the following proposed amendment:

H. R. 2245 is hereby amended so as to add thereto section 3, reading as follows:

"SEC. 3. The Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended so as to add thereto a new section, numbered 3200, reading as follows:

"'(a) Operators of public eating establishments: Every person who operates a public eating establishment in which yellow oleomargarine is served shall pay a special tax of $1, and, in accordance with such regulations as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, shall prescribe, shall display a printed statement in prominent type that oleomargarine is being served or in the alternative shall serve such oleomargarine only in patties which are triangular in shape. For the purpose of this subsection, the term "public eating establishment" shall not include such an establishment having less than 25 patrons per day.

"'(b) Every person who operates a public eating establishment and who is subject to the provisions of subsection (a) above who serves oleomargarine without having complied with the provisions of said subsection (a) shall, besides being liable to the payment of said special tax, be fined not less than $100 nor more than $1,000 for each and every offense.

"'(c) The provisions of this section shall take effect on July 1, 1948.'"

In an effort to show that we are as anxious as is the gentleman to prevent fraud, I will say that if the gentleman will accept this proposed amendment as a substitute for his pending amendment, I will support his.

Mr. HILL. Let us have a vote on my amendment first.

Mr. POAGE. I am sorry we are unable to agree on a fair proposal. I know the gentleman is trying to be fair, but I am sure he realizes that we cannot agree to let him try to keep a large part of the objectionable provisions of the present law and at the same time agree that if he fails that we will then let him accept what we all recognize is a fair proposal. Since the gentleman refuses a compromise, I must oppose his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. FLETCHER].

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, I am against the present taxes and coloring restrictions on oleomargarine because they are unfair and un-American and also because they amount to a tremendous inconvenience and added cost to the housewife.

Personally, I do not happen to like the taste of oleomargarine, but I am ready to fight for the right of anyone who wants to buy oleo without being penalized for choosing it.

We hear statements made as to the dire consequences to dairymen if this bill passes. I am convinced that the dairymen of my congressional district are too smart to be fooled by such propaganda. Charges and countercharges have been made; but when you brush aside the propaganda of both sides, you still find that by a vote of 235 to 121 this House voted to discharge from the committee the Rivers bill and give it a thorough hearing before this body.

Eighteen Members of the House offered similar bills and a number of us on both sides of the aisle introduced identical bills to the Rivers bill. I mention this only to prove the nonpartisan support which is apparent in this movement. It is an indication of the power of the voice of the long-suffering consumer and homemaker.

Recent scientific tests given by the University of Illinois College of Medicine proved that oleomargarine is just as healthful and nutritious as butter. They studied 267 children in two groups, one of which ate margarine and the other butter.

There was no appreciable difference in the health, growth, and weight of the members of the two groups. The margarine group consisted of 160 orphans or children from broken homes. They were given margarine on bread, in vegetables, in pastry, and in fried foods. The margarine used was derived from vegetable oils and contained no animal fat.

The butter group consisted of 107 children in another charitable institution 10 miles away. Butter was used for everything that margarine was used for in the other group, and one spread was just as healthful and nutritious as the other.

Opponents of this bill have suggested that oleomargarine be colored green or red so as not to fool people that it is genuine butter. If the opponents wanted to be consistent, they would insist that all subsitutes be colored differently than the genuine article. For instance, why not have a Federal law that light cream, moving in interstate commerce, must be colored green to assure that unscrupulous restaurants will not palm it off as heavy cream? And in that event, how should we deal with rayon and nylon in order to distinguish them from silk?

With grade A butter again selling in Washington at $1 a pound as of Monday, I believe this Congress must do everything possible to reduce the cost of living. If oleomargarine is relieved of its penalty taxes, I believe it could be sold for about one-third the price of butter.

These penalty taxes, first devised back in 1866 certainly cannot be justified today. The coloring restrictions which make the housewife spend many needless hours in the kitchen to satisfy the greed of special butter interests should no longer be tolerated. I am convinced that removal of these taxes and coloring restrictions will do no harm to the butter industry. But, as one of my constituents asks, "Why not let butter stand up in competition with oleomargarine? After all, nobody worried much about the horse when the automobile became popular."

I strongly urge this Congress to allow the will of the people to prevail by voting for this bill which would allow the American consumer a free choice of healthful products according to his tastes and his pocketbook.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest all afternoon and in a spirit of fair play I think I should have an opportunity to present my case. I have listened to discussions on cottonseed oil, soybean oil and coconut oil. I come from the great State of Pennsylvania and I thought I might take this minute to talk about Pennsylvania grade crude oil. Pennsylvania crude oil is the finest lubricant that is produced today. It is superrefined. We have sold to the world the fact that there is no oil which compares with Pennsylvania-grade crude oil.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McDOWELL. I might remind the gentleman that over in my country they make a Monongahela rye whiskey, which is somewhat of a lubricant, too.

Mr. GAVIN. Time will not permit me to enter into a discussion with my good friend of that particular matter. Although we in Pennsylvania produce but one and nineteen-one-hundredths of the over all production of 5,085,000 barrels daily, we do from Pennsylvania-grade crude produce approximately 10 percent of all lubricants. I suggest to the membership to use Pennsylvania grade crude oil.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HILL) there were—ayes 83, noes 114.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the Case amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be again read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CASE of South Dakota) there were—ayes 87, noes 119.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the bill be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The remainder of the bill is as follows:

SEC. 2. Effective July 1, 1947, part I of subchapter A of chapter 27 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the occupational tax on manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers of oleomargarine) is repealed. Beginning with the day after the date of the enactment of this act and until July 1, 1947, wholesale dealers in oleomargarine who vend no other oleomargarine except that upon which a tax of one-fourth of 1 cent per pound would have been imposed by section 2301 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code if such section had not been repealed shall pay the lower tax prescribed in section 3200 (b) (1) of such code. Beginning with the day after the date of the enactment of this act and until July 1, 1947, retail dealers in oleomargarine who vend no other oleomargarine except that upon which a tax of one-fourth of 1 cent per pound would have been imposed by section 2301 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code if such section had not been repealed shall pay the lower tax prescribed in section 3200 (c) of such code.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN as a substitute: Strike out all language after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That all sections of the Internal Revenue Code relating to taxes on oleomargarine and the manufacture, distribution, handling, and sale of oleomargarine and the taxing or licensing of persons engaged in the manufacture, distribution, handling, and sale thereof, are hereby and herewith repealed.

"SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby assessed and levied upon oleomargarine which shall be manufactured and sold, or removed for consumption or use, a tax at the rate of one-fourth of 1 cent per pound: *Provided*, That no oleomargarine shall be manufactured or sold which is yellow in color.

"(b) The tax levied by subsection (a) shall be paid by the manufacturer.

"SEC. 3. (a) For the purposes of this act oleomargarine shall be defined as certain manufactured substances, certain extracts, and certain mixtures and compounds, including such mixtures and compounds with butter, and such mixtures and compounds shall be known and designated as 'oleomargarine,' namely: All substances known prior to August 2, 1886, as oleomargarine, oleo, oleomargarine oil, butterine, lardine, suine, and neutral; all mixtures and compounds of oleomargarine, oleo, oleomargarine oil, butterine, lardine, suine, and neutral; all lard extracts and tallow extracts, and all mixtures and compounds of tallow, beef fat, suet lard, lard oil, fish oil or fish fat, vegetable oil, anatto, and other coloring matter, intestinal fat, and offal fat; if (1) made in imitation or semblance of butter or (2) calculated or intended to be sold as butter or for butter or (3) churned, emulsified or mixed in cream, milk, or other liquid, and containing moisture in excess of 1 percent or common salt. This section shall not apply to puff-pastry, shortenings, churned or emulsified in milk or cream, and having a melting point of 118° F. or more, nor to any of the following containing condiments and spices: Salad dressings, mayonnaise dressings, or mayonnaise products, nor to liquid emulsions, pharmaceutical preparations, oil meals, liquid preservatives, illuminating oils, cleansing compounds, or flavoring compounds.

"(b) For the purposes of this act, oleomargarine held to be yellow in color when it has a tint or shade containing more than 1⅞ degrees of yellow, or of yellow and red collectively, but with an excess of yellow over red, measured in the terms of the Lovi-

bond tintometer scale or its equivalent. Such measurements shall be made under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, and such regulations shall provide that the measurements shall be applied in such manner and under such conditions as will, in the opinion of the Commissioner, insure as nearly as practicable that the result of the measurement will show the color of the oleomargarine under the conditions under which it is customarily offered for sale to the consumer.

"SEC. 4. This act shall become effective July 1, 1948."

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment brings the issue clearly before the Committee. The proposal repeals all license fees, manufacturers' taxes, wholesalers' occupational license fees, and the retailers' tax, and leaves only a quarter-of-a-cent-a-pound tax on oleomargarine sold, to be collected from the manufacturer. It prohibits the sale of yellow-colored margarine. In other words, the proposal permits the sale of oleomargarine in its white form and prohibits the sale of yellow-colored margarine. It removes the tax on the retailer and the wholesaler, for whom some of the Members have been pleading as not being able to raise enough money to pay the $6 tax.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Does it provide anyone to do the mixing for them?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Maybe the gentleman from Mississippi could furnish someone to do the mixing for them.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to take this time to offer this amendment, which I anticipate the gentleman from South Carolina will oppose and have voted down, because I intend to offer this as a motion to recommit and there will not be an opportunity then to explain it. Therefore, I have taken this time to let the Members know what the motion to recommit will be and give an explanation of it. The amendment removes all of the taxes on the manufacturer, the wholesaler, and the retailer, and leaves a quarter of a cent excise tax to be charged to the manufacturer of the oleomargarine that is sold in its white form. It lets the housewives get the oleomargarine tax-free, and lets the retailer sell it without any taxes.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my amendment is adopted.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we know that when my distinguished friend from Minnesota offers a substitute it is not for the good of the bill. I am going to beware of the Greeks bearing gifts. This amendment cuts what is left of the heart out of the bill. You know that. The distinguished gentleman from Minnesota in the committee moved that all things in the universe akin to margarine be tabled for the rest of the session. You know good and well that if you ever sent another bill back to that committee it would be as dead as Job's turkey. Let us vote and kill the amendment, and get on with the business of the people.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN) there were—ayes 72, noes 129.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RIVERS: Strike out the figure "1947" wherever it appears and insert in each case the figure "1948."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: Strike out section 2 of the bill and insert the following new sections:

"SEC. 2. Effective July 1, 1948, section 3200 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 3200. Each manufacturer of, wholesale dealer in, retail dealer in, or vendor of oleomargarine shall pay a special tax of $1 per year.'

"SEC. 3. Section 2305 of the Internal Revenue Code shall be renumbered section 2315, and the following new section 2305 shall read as follows:

" 'SEC. 2305. Vendors.

" '(a) Definition. Every person, except a manufacturer, wholesale dealer, or retail dealer, who sells, vends, serves, or furnishes oleomargarine for the use and consumption of others, except his own family, where such other persons directly or indirectly pays for such oleomargarine through direct or indirect charges for food or meals, shall be held to be a vendor of oleomargarine.

" '(b) Notice of Requirements. Every vendor of oleomargarine shall, in addition to the requirements of State or local law, give the following notice to persons to whom he may serve or furnish such oleomargarine:

" '(1) In case meals are served at tables, or at counters, or on trays, a sign having not less than two display panels, upon each of which shall be printed in plain gothic letters of not less than 20-point type, the words "oleomargarine served here" shall be displayed on each table, counter, or tray.'

"SEC. 4. Subsection (j) of section 2308 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

" 'If any manufacturer of oleomargarine, any dealer or vendor therein, or any importer or exporter thereof shall knowingly or willfully omit, neglect, or refuse to do, or cause to be done, any of the things required by law in the carrying on or conducting of his business or shall do anything by this subchapter or chapter 27 prohibited, if there be no specific penalty or punishment imposed by any other provisions of this subchapter or chapter 27 for the neglecting, omitting, or refusing to do, or for doing or causing to be done, the things required or prohibited, he shall pay a penalty of not less than $50 nor more than $1,000.' "

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a regulatory amendment to protect the public from fraud and deception, particularly people who eat their meals in public eating places, people who are patients in hospitals, or in any other institution where they pay for their meals, directly or indirectly.

There are 65,000,000 purchased meals served in the United States every day. Sixty-five million meals served in this country every day at some public eating place for which people pay. Those people are entitled to protection. We have evidence before our committee from representatives of the Restaurant Association that in the event the Rivers bill becomes law and oleomargarine is sold in yellow form, 75 percent of the restaurant owners will serve oleomargarine instead of butter without telling their customers what they give them.

We also had before our committee a representative of the American Hospital Association, who stated that they wanted to serve yellow colored oleomargarine without letting their patients know what they were eating. I particularly asked the question if they would object to having notice given to the patient that he was eating oleomargarine. They said they did not think that was necessary and that the patients should be required to eat what they furnished them.

I believe when people come into a restaurant, whether they pay 50 cents for a meal or $4 for a meal and they expect to get butter, they should be advised that they are being served oleomargarine instead of butter, because they are paying the butter price, and should be able to secure butter. At least, they should be able to find out what they are eating.

So my amendment provides that a little sign in black letters be placed on the tray or on the table, or displayed on the counter whenever oleomargarine is served. I eliminate the license and occupational tax or license fees, or rather reduce them, so that the manufacturer will pay $1, the wholesalers will pay $1 a year, and the retailer will pay a dollar a year—a mere nominal license charge in order to get jurisdiction over the handling and serving of oleomargarine in restaurants and other eating places, including hospitals.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman accept an amendment which would provide that a sign be placed on the door that could be read from the outside, saying "Oleomargarine is served here"?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That might be a very good amendment, I will say to my colleague, but I am trying to offer a constructive amendment to protect the public.

Mr. JENSEN. Would not the gentleman say that was constructive, because the people would not even go into the restaurant?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, that is true, but I think my amendment should be accepted because of the proponents of this legislation are sincere and are interested in protecting the public from fraud and deception, they should not have any objection to a little card being placed on the tray or the counter saying that oleomargarine was served there.

I would like to have the gentleman offer his proposal as a separate amendment, because I think in the interest of trying to protect a piece of legislation that will serve the public and protect the public from fraud and deceit we should adopt the amendment I have offered in its present form. The public is entitled to some protection. In the case

of the housewives who serve it at home they go to the store and buy packages labeled "oleomargarine;" but what protection do you have, sir, when you go to a restaurant, sit down to a table and order a $2 or a $4 meal? What protection do you have to know that you are being served butter instead of oleomargarine? Naturally, you want butter. You pay for it. In the interest of protecting the public, this amendment should be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 6 minutes, the last 2 to be reserved to myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MITCHELL] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, now I have heard everything, I think. The next thing the gentleman will ask will be that every proprietor of a restaurant or hotel stand on his head three times a day to show that he is serving margarine.

The burden of the argument is that the public shall be protected against the restaurants of this country practicing fraud and deceit. Is that the gentleman's opinion of the honesty of restaurant proprietors, hotel managers, and the innkeepers? I cannot believe so. I cannot go along with anyone who says that 75 percent of the people who keep restaurants and operate the hotels in this country are crooks. They are not in my district and they are not in any part of the country where I have traveled.

Mr. GOFF. How many hundreds of pounds of oleomargarine did the gentleman sell to restaurants last year?

Mr. MITCHELL. That is a fine question. How many sacks of potatoes did the gentleman's folks grow in Idaho last year? That remark is about as smart as the amendment just offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

The gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I think the champions of the housewives of America and the newspapers of the country which have accepted great full-page advertisements from the oleo interests should tell the American people the truth, that the advocates of this legislation, if this bill passes, are going to have to tell them eventually; it is that even though this bill is enacted, two-thirds of the people of the country are not going to enjoy any benefits. This is so because for some reason or other the people in many States in the Union have sent people to represent them in their local legislatures which have passed laws prohibiting the sale of colored oleomargarine in their State.

This amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota will do just exactly what I have said all the time. We have no objection to the American people buying all the oleomargarine they want to; but buy it for what it is. It is still oleomargarine after it is colored.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment, if adopted, would be to put 60,000,000 people of this country under the strong arm of the Gestapo. I voted against OPA. This would be another OPA. I thought the gentleman from Minnesota believed in States' rights, but on this amendment I am going to save him in spite of himself.

Let us vote!

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN) there were—ayes 64, noes 117.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARVEY: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That (a), subject to the exception stated in section 3 of this act, section 2301 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the tax on oleomargarine) is repealed.

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date following the date of the enactment of this act.

"SEC. 2. Subject to the exception stated in section 3 of this act, part I of subchapter A of chapter 27 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the occupational tax on manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers of oleomargarine) is repealed effective July 1, 1948. Beginning with the day after the date of the enactment of this act and until July 1, 1948, wholesale dealers in oleomargarine who vend no other oleomargarine except that upon which a tax of one-fourth of 1 cent per pound would have been imposed by section 2301 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code if such section had not been repealed shall pay the lower tax prescribed in section 3200 (b) (1) of such code. Beginning with the day after the date of the enactment of this act and until July 1, 1948, retail dealers in oleomargarine who vend no other oleomargarine except that upon which a tax of one-fourth of 1 cent per pound would have been imposed by section 2301 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code if such section had not been repealed shall pay the lower tax prescribed in section 3200 (c) of such code.

"SEC. 3. Section 1 and section 2 of this act shall not be deemed to repeal section 2301 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the tax on oleomargarine), or part I of subchapter A of chapter 27 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the occupational tax on manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers of oleomargarine) in the case of oleomargarine which contains any fat or oil ingredient other than cottonseed oil, peanut oil, corn oil, soybean oil, oleo oil from cattle, oleo stock from cattle, oleo stearine from cattle, neutral lard from hogs, beef fat, or milk fat. Any fat or oil added to oleomargarine in a quantity not exceeding 1 percent of the weight of the finished oleomargarine, solely for the purpose of imparting vitamins to such oleomargarine, shall not be held to be a fat or oil ingredient for the purpose of this section."

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I am going to be brief, therefore I hope I may have the attention of the Members. I am a farmer, I am a farmer from the Middle West, the great State of Indiana.

I did not sign the discharge petition. I might add that I have consistently refused to sign all discharge petitions. It is with some regret that I have observed that this controversial issue was assumed, or we have been led to assume, to be a political one. I think that this bill will pass. Having no animosities on the subject, I can speak with freedom, for I count it a privilege to be able to make this bill do the thing we would have it do. I might also say that my farming interests include both dairying and soy beans, so that the result of this bill is not going to be a question of personal profits so far as I personally am concerned.

This substitute bill simply does three things: One of them has already been corrected by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] in which he changed the effective date from July 1, 1947 to July 1, 1948. Secondly, and this is the most important item, in my opinion, it protects all domestic oils by a 10-cent per pound tariff against foreign oils. A product that is made, in other words, from domestic oils, will be tax exempt. Oleo that is made from foreign oils will be subject to this 10-cent tax.

I might say in conclusion that it does repeal the taxes so far as wholesalers, retailers and manufacturers are concerned. So, for all practical purposes the only thing that this substitute bill does is to impose the 10-cent tax on oleo made from foreign oils.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not like to get into any trouble with anybody, and if I have to, I would prefer to get into trouble with the fellows on the Democratic side. I have tried to go through this whole thing calmly, and I have not taken any time on the bill. I regret I feel I should oppose this amendment. This amendment just shows how unwise it is for us to try to legislate on this piece of legislation on the floor of the House.

Now, stop and analyze what the gentleman from Indiana is proposing to do. Yes, the gentleman from South Carolina, the new agricultural leader, can laugh if he wants to, but it is no laughing matter to my State that produces one-eighth of the milk of the whole United States. Nor to Minnesota and Iowa, who with Wisconsin produce over one-fourth of the milk of the Nation. Wisconsin is compelled to help furnish the finances to fill the little tin cups that South Carolina brings up to Washington to get funds from the United States Treasury. Stop and analyze what is in this bill today, in this substitute that was offered. Analyze it. We are asked to revert a step backward from the direction we have been taking. They want to go back and they think they will pick up some votes by appealing for votes on the basis of protecting domestically produced oils. The protection they now have is practically an embargo. The facts are that the soybean boys—and I am glad they

are north of the Mason-Dixon line—have watched these other cotton, tobacco, and peanut boys reach their hands into the Federal Treasury that they now want to get into it, too. They want embargoes like the tobacco, cotton, and peanut groups now have. Let us stop and analyze this situation. There is a 3-cent internal tax, or excise tax, or processing tax now on any imported oils used in the manufacture of oleomargarine. Now, remember that one. There is a 3-cent duty on soybean oil coming into the United States, and there is a 22-cent duty on oleo coming into the United States. Now, I wish you would just analyze that situation and compare it with the duty on imports of dairy products.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. What effect will this amendment have upon the price of oleomargarine?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The Rivers bill will give the 26 oleo manufacturers another chance to up the price which everyone knows they are going to do. First, I object to the amendment because it is absolutely contrary to the approach of better world understanding. I voted for the FAO. It is a part of the UN. Do you wish to pass an amendment like this that is just contrary to the very spirit of the FAO and the UN? Do you wish to take a step backward and build another fence up around the vegetable oils? I would oppose this amendment even if it was not in this oleo bill. The domestic vegetable oils now have much more legislative protection than do animal fats for that matter. But I repeat the first objection is that this amendment is contrary to the spirit of the times, is contrary to the objective of having more harmonious world relationships. The second objection is because the American vegetable oil now has more than ample legislative protection. There is a 5 cents per pound internal processing tax unless it is imported from our own possessions or the Philippines when it is 3 cents per pound. There is a 3 cents per pound duty on imports of soybean oil, and even a 1 cent per pound duty on the soybeans. There is a 22-cent duty on oleo imports. One duty is 15 cents per pound, and one is 7 cents per pound. The import duty on butter is 7 cents per pound for the first 50,000,000 pounds imported.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to my chairman, the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. With reference to the pending amendment, the gentleman will recall that the officials of the American Soybean Association wrote all the Members of Congress and suggested they sign the petition for the Rivers bill. Does the gentleman think we ought to let them have the Rivers bill, instead of giving them the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes, let them have it if they want, but let us not make it worse. I presume the Members will do as they want about that. I oppose the Rivers bill and I oppose this amendment. Neither one should pass. I wish to call your attention once more to the fact that there is no use talking about the FAO and then bringing in this kind of amendment and adopting it. You might just as well forget that. This would give additional special privilege to these oils. They have plenty of special privileges now. You heard my friend from California. He is so against taxes, but did you hear him or anyone else ask that the tax of one-quarter of a cent a pound be taken off reprocessed butter? No, they want to take it off oleo. Both one-fourth cent per pound taxes on oleo and reprocessed are on for the same purpose. Neither should be repealed. They should pay for their own inspections.

If they do not close debate, I will give you a chance to show who is interested in the housewives of the country and who wants to save them sixty to eighty million dollars a year or more and who just want to talk about it.

I also call your attention to the fact that up in Pennsylvania yesterday the dairymen must have voted too. Mr. Stassen's attitude toward this oleo tax did not seem to have done him any harm in the cities either. In other words, Mr. Stassen, like everyone else that lives in a dairy section, knows that these vegetable oils now have a legislative advantage over animal fats. He does not need to worry about the cotton lobby.

Still some want to have more legislative special privilege and bring in an amendment that really says, "Just fix us up, help us build a higher fence for us. We do not care what happens to the rest of you. We have 22 cents duty on the imports of oleo and 7 cents on butter on a quota basis." Remember last year under Executive order they brought in over 90 percent of the butter without any duty on it whatsoever.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY. May I ask the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin if he is conducting a political campaign or campaigning against oleo?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will say to my distinguished colleague from Indiana that I am always carrying on a campaign based on equity, fairness, and justice for all segments of America alike. The gentleman has not been here very long or he would not ask the question. All the time I have been on the Committee on Agriculture, and he can check it up and ask any man on the Democrat side, I have never taken any position on agriculture that was sectional, or done anything to hurt any crop in any part of the United States, but I do not intend to subscribe to a program to let the Indiana boys come in and get special privileges for themselves nor help anyone else get special privilege legislation.

If $7,000,000 had not been jingling around in the air, this bill would not even be here on the floor today.

I only ask that the rural people of my district and my State have equal consideration with other States and districts, and as discouraging as it may be, I expect to keep right on that pathway every minute of every hour of every day and every year that I have the honor to represent the people of the Seventh Wisconsin District.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 4 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MITCHELL].

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my good friend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY], but I do so only because I introduced a bill to provide precisely the same thing the gentleman's amendment does, and it came out in the committee hearings that there are certain reciprocal trade agreements this proposal might run foul of and contrary to I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana might well be put into separate legislation at a later date, and I would be willing to go along with it then, but I am afraid it will foul up this bill. I am afraid of any amendment that will raise any doubt that this bill will pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin has spoken against this amendment. I agree with him that it will be in conflict with our agreement with the Philippines. It will absolutely abrogate every agreement we have with the Philippines, and it will interfere with the reciprocal trade agreements. This is much too involved for us even to think about at this time, so I am against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin: Add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 3. Section 2470 of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby repealed."

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will take off the 3-cent-a-pound internal-revenue tax on vegetable oils. So that there will not be any misunderstanding about what this does, we will find out in a few minutes who has been kidding the housewives of this country and who wants to be their friend. This is the way we are going to find out. The Rivers bill will cause the housewives of this country to be bushed out of millions upon millions of dollars. We can do something for them today since I now offer an amendment to save them at least sixty to eighty million dollars this next year. It will save them more millions than I indicated no doubt.

The Rivers bill may cost them hundreds of millions of dollars. Yesterday

I showed the House where these oleo corporations were making from two to seven times their 1940 profits. The Rivers bill should give the oleo manufacturers an opportunity to make from 2 to 20 times their normal profits. Remember the 14 largest dairy corporations in the United States made four millions less net profit in 1947 than in 1946.

Today cottonseed oil is 31 cents a pound. Soybean oil is 27.75 cents a pound, and coconut oil 24½ cents a pound. Before our committee it seems that many people who are allergic to cottonseed oil thought that coconut oil is the very best vegetable oil with which to make oleomargarine. It is more like animal fat. By passing this amendment we will help the housewife. I am sure there are many people interested in the housewife. They should support this amendment. I do not know how anyone can help but support this amendment if he is really and sincerely interested in the housewife. We are going to save the housewives of this country at least from $60,000,000 to $80,000,000 a year. Remember this amendment is being offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, the leading dairy State in the Union. You can now see that all we are asking for is this opportunity to demonstrate to you and to the housewives that we wish to do something about the food problem and not just talk about it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman explain just what the tax is on existing oils? I am not familiar with that.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Before GV, that is before Geneva, when the State Department boys went around like a lot of puffed-up turkey gobblers in the springtime, and men who never were elected to anything by anybody reduced the duty on the importation of soybean oil from 3½ cents to 3 cents and the duty on soybeans, which was 2 cents, to 1 cent, and lowered the duty on all oils from 2 cents to 1 cent. But this amendment takes 3-cent per pound excise or internal tax off the imported oil used for the manufacture of oleo.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to our distinguished former Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman made some remarks a while ago and said that he was going to offer something that was "it." Is the gentleman sincerely for the amendment that he has now offered?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. May I say to our distinguished former Speaker that this is the tenth year that I have been a Member of this body with him. Up to this moment I have never taken a position on the floor of the House that I was not willing to defend. I would not do so at this time if I was not sincere in offering this amendment.

Mr. RAYBURN. I know the gentleman is always sincere.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Just stop and think. I am not doing anything against anybody. Why, I could not get the dairy industry protected the way that some of these special interests are protected with special-privilege legislation. This administration has lowered the duty on every dairy product as much as the law will allow them to be lowered. They have gone so far as to lower the duty on milk sugar. It is tiring to hear the chanting about oleo taxes when the dairy industry has more taxes to face than oleo ever did. Now here is a chance to save the housewives of America at least $60,000,000 to $80,000,000 a year. Who wants to save the housewives of America that much money? Who wants to be their friends? I know that I do, and we will soon see what the rest of you want to do. Will you support this amendment to help the American housewife or will you vote for the Rivers bill as that will cost the American housewife untold millions of dollars?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

The question was taken; and in a division (demanded by Mr. RIVERS) there were—ayes 105, noes 97.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin and Mr. RIVERS to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 124, noes 127.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin: Add a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 4. Chapter 16, subchapter (a), section 2306 of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby repealed."

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, nobody knows what section 2306 of the Internal Revenue Code is.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will explain it in a minute.

Mr. RIVERS. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the point of order comes too late. gentleman from South Carolina was not recognized and the first statement of the gentleman from South Carolina was not that he made a point of order or that he reserved a point of order, but he started debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina was on his feet at the time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The point of order I make is——

The regular order was demanded.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The regular order is my point of order; and the point of order is that the gentleman from South Carolina was on his feet addressing the gentleman from Wisconsin. The gentleman from Wisconsin permitted him to speak. His first statement was not a point of order nor a reservation of a point of order, but it was debate on the amendment. The RECORD will so show.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota has correctly stated the situation. The gentleman from South Carolina did not start by making a point of order but by interrogating the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The point of order raised by the gentleman from South Dakota is sustained and the point of order of the gentleman from South Carolina is overruled, as coming too late.

Mr. RIVERS. Begging the Chair's pardon, I have not addressed the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has overruled the gentleman's point of order.

The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Just to keep the record straight, I suppose that this amendment, like that of the gentleman from Indiana, is subject to a point of order.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The Chair ruled that the point of order was not made in time. The gentleman's amendment, therefore, is in order.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. We will not get into a fight about that. What I would like to say to you is that with all this $7,000,000 jingling in the ears of the public through the newspapers and over the radio, I just wonder if there is a little fairness, justice, and equity still left. This is the worst bomb shell to hit our party that has occurred since the Willkie blitzkrieg struck the 1940 national Republican convention in Philadelphia. Surprising how lightning can strike in the same place, and have similar origin; is it not?

We have been through 15 years of an antilivestock program down here in the Department of Agriculture. We have seen them kill off 37 percent of the sheep, for instance. If your grandchildren want to see any of them now they will soon have to go to the zoo. We have seen cattle numbers reduced by 6,000,000 head. We have seen milk cow numbers reduced to a number below the numbers in the United States 15 years ago. We are to have the smallest per capita consumption of milk in the United States in 1948 we have ever had since records were kept.

What has happened? Why have we been doing that? While this antilivestock attitude has been the order of the day they have been erecting more trade barriers than have ever before been erected in the history of our country. The most vicious one of course is the one that is now supported by the gentleman from North Carolina, the one that prohibits giving anyone else in the world a handful of tobacco seed. Just think that one over.

Mr. Chairman, there is a 22-cent duty on oleomargarine coming into the United States. There is 7 cents on butter for the first 50,000,000 pounds. What my amendment will do is to take off 15 cents.

It will put oleo and butter on an equal basis so far as imports are concerned.

I repeat, all I am trying to do is to take off the 15-cent duty and put oleo on an equal basis with butter. I claim that is a fair position for anyone to take and I can defend it any time, anywhere, any place, because there is 7 cents left on oleo coming in the United States. Over 90 percent of the butter imported last year came in here without any duty whatever because it came in under an Executive order.

All I am asking here today in fairness is to give the dairy people of this country so far as duties are concerned just fair consideration. Leave it at 7 cents per pound the same as it is on the 50,000,000 pounds of butter.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. This will also help the housewife?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. My chairman is so right. We came within two or three votes here of doing that on my other amendment. There were 123 of us who really wanted to help the housewife. The professed friends of the housewife demonstrated they were not really interested in the housewife. They were evidently more interested in the 26 corporations that made 2 to 7 times as much profit in 1947 as in 1940, and who no doubt will make from 2 to 20 times as much profit next year if and when the Rivers bill becomes law. I wish we could have a roll call on that because we could tell the housewives then for sure who their friends are here. If we had a roll call we would know who were the friends of the housewife and who were friends of the oleo corporations for sure. This amendment, then, is just another way of helping the housewife. This amendment just places oleo and butter on a somewhat equal basis. This is pretty close to the end of the debate and I have not gotten into trouble yet.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. A vote on this amendment will determine whether you are for the oleo manufacturer or for the oleo housewife?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The gentleman is right.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Many are asking the question: Who are we going to protect, the oleo manufacturer or the housewife?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. We will be helping the housewife and we will be giving oleo and butter somewhere near equal import-duty consideration.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman explain what tax this takes off?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The tax that was put on the year before I was born, of 15 cents a pound.

Mr. KEATING. On what product is that tax placed?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. On oleomargarine there is a 15-cent tax. There is a 7-cent import duty or tax on butter for the first 50,000,000 pounds. This is to give oleo and butter the same legislative protection so far as imports are concerned.

Mr. KEATING. And it should result in lowering the price of oleo?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. It could accomplish that end. All I want to have is a fair consideration for the dairy industry of this country. I want them to have equal protection so far as imports are concerned.

Mr. KEATING. The passage of the gentleman's amendment should reduce the cost of oleo, should it not?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. It should have that effect, but whether it will or not I do not know. The 26 oleo corporations have a monopoly on the American market and I would not hazard a guess as to what they might do, except to admit that they will make all the profit they can when they can.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COMBS. We now have two import duties on oleo and butter.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes; two on oleo totaling 22 cents. There are two on butter, 7 cents per pound up to the first 50,000,000 pounds and then 14 cents per pound.

Mr. COMBS. Seven cents and fourteen cents on one and fifteen cents on the other?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. COMBS. We have a 7-cent duty on butter?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes; 7 cents on the first 50,000,000 pounds imported.

Mr. COMBS. The gentleman's amendment would take off the 15-cent advantage that oleo now has over butter, so far as imports are concerned?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The gentleman is right, up to the quota of 50,000,000 pounds, when the duty on butter becomes 14 cents per pound.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, to begin with the amendment is subject to a point of order. We have no jurisdiction here over the Ways and Means Committee. This amendment affects section 2306 of the Code providing a 15 cents a pound tax and a 7 cents a pound tax. The gentleman himself admitted it was subject to a point of order and not germane to this bill. We are getting far afield.

Mr. Chairman, we do not want to sit here and be lulled into a sense of false security by these gentlemen. You better beware of these Greeks bearing gifts. We almost got caught napping a while ago. This amendment does just like the rest of them. It just cuts the heart out of the bill. If you boys want to embark on a surgery program, follow the gentleman and you will put it over.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COMBS. The gentleman does not contend, does he, that taking that extra import duty off of oleomargarine will make oleomargarine cheaper in competition with butter?

Mr. RIVERS. Of course, I do not agree with any such thing as that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RIVERS) there were—ayes 116, noes 126.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COMBS:

Page 1, line 3, after "(a)", insert "except as provided in section 3."

Page 1, line 8, after "1947", insert "except as provided in section 3."

Page 2, after line 14, insert the following:

"SEC. 3. Notwithstanding sections 1 and 2, section 2301 of the Internal Revenue Code and part I of subchapter A of chapter 27 of the Internal Revenue Code shall remain in full force and effect with respect to oleomargarine which is colored yellow unless such oleomargarine is manufactured, prepared, molded, shaped, packaged, sold, and distributed so that the Secretary of the Treasury is fully satisfied that the article after all labels have been removed and after it has been cut into patties for use on the table can readily be recognized by the general public as oleomargarine and duly distinguished from butter."

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, I trust that I shall not have to take the full 5 minutes allotted me. The amendment I am offering is what I believe to be the correct approach to producing an honest situation in the sale of colored oleomargarine. I think it is evident that since oleomargarine so accurately duplicates the taste of butter, that when you permit it to be colored as butter it becomes easy to palm it off on people as butter. This is unfair to the consuming public and it is unfair to the dairy industry.

The approach to dealing with that question that I have offered is this: We would leave the Rivers bill as it is insofar as it repeals all taxes and regulations on manufacturers, sellers, handlers, and dispensers of oleomargarine, whether it is colored or not, provided—and I have sought to leave this to the Treasury instead of trying to devise here on the floor how to do it—that the Secretary of the Treasury shall see to it that those who sell oleomargarine colored yellow shall so manufacture, distribute, and dispense it that those who purchase it, whether on the table in a public eating place or in a grocery store, will know what they are getting. As to that, it

will leave in full force and effect every present regulatory law. All that any manufacturer, merchant, or other dispenser of colored oleomargarine will have to do to exempt himself from all taxes and regulations is simply to be honest with the American people and with the American dairy farmers; that is all.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COMBS. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The effect of the gentleman's amendment will just be that as long as they pay a tax they can call it butter and so deceive the public. They pay the tax for the privilege of doing that.

Mr. COMBS. No; that is not the effect at all. It would not permit colored margarine to deceive the people simply by paying a tax. My amendment would leave in full force and effect every law now on the statute book which prevents such deception. What it does do is to relieve manufacturers and dispensers of oleomargarine, either colored or not, free from all taxes and restrictions so long as they deal honestly with the American people by selling it for what it is. But I repeat it would leave the punitory laws in effect only as against those who sought to deceive and defraud the public. I cannot see how any honest man can possibly object to that.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That is it. They would pay a tax for the privilege of doing that.

Mr. COMBS. No; that is not correct. They would incur a tax, possibly, as part of the penalty for such fraud, but it would in no wise relieve them from those provisions of the existing laws which forbid it. There would be no change whatever in existing law. If it protects now, it would still protect against unfair competition with the American dairy farmer and tend to insure as much as the law now insures that we get what we pay for. And in addition it would add such further protection to the American consumer as the Treasury might from time to time prescribe to insure honesty and fairness in the sale of oleomargarine. Personally, I do not want oleomargarine palmed off on me when I buy butter, and I do not think other people would want to have it.

It seems to me that this amendment proposes to enforce the principle of simple, common honesty. I have sought to leave it to the Treasury to devise the means of enforcement. This bill will go to the Senate, where opportunity will be granted, of course, for the Treasury officials and others to come in and study this provision and make it more practical in its workings, perhaps.

My point is that if we want to be fair we should now establish the principle of requiring those who would imitate the product of our farms to be honest in their imitation in selling it to the people. What I want to see is fair competition, and then we will make progress. The American dairy farmer can meet his competition if you will give him a decent chance to do it, because the American people prefer their butter when they can get it at reasonable prices. But if you permit the dairy industry to be seriously injured by unfair and dishonest competition, you will be in the condition that the great industrial area where I live was in 3 or 4 years ago when the dairy industry, seriously crippled and a number of dairies closed out, was unable to furnish an adequate supply of milk for our people. There were times when more than one carload of powdered milk in a month was brought in to manufacture "reconstructed" milk. Such scarcity of milk not only causes such an inferior product to be sold but it puts the price up unreasonably. If we are to have an adequate milk supply in the section where I live, or any other great industrial area, dairy farming must be sufficiently extensive and productive so that there will be a surplus of milk during the fall and winter season when smaller quantities of it are used for such things as ice cream. Consequently, butter and cheese making during those slack seasons is absolutely essential to tide dairy farmers over that period and provide a stable and prosperous industry that can supply milk when needed at reasonable prices. If there are those who think they are going to get cheaper milk and butter by permitting the dairy industry to be seriously injured by unfair oleomargarine competition they are sadly mistaken.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COMBS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. I am wondering whether or not the statute which defines butter as that which is made exclusively from milk and cream does not take care of the proposition.

Mr. COMBS. I think this amendment is needed. We must all admit that we are working here under difficulties, with a complicated law. I think we can safely adopt this amendment and be perfectly fair and honest.

In conclusion let me say simply this. I want to see the American consumer get his oleomargarine, either colored or not, free of punitory taxes. I want to see the grocer be able to sell it without unnecessary, hampering regulations. If you adopt this amendment I will be glad to support the bill. But the Rivers bill provides no protection at all for the American consumer and the American dairy and I simply cannot support the bill in its present form. From my viewpoint, were I to do so, I would be acting contrary to the best interest of the dairy farmers and consumers alike. Again I repeat I hope you will adopt this amendment and I believe that many of us could then support the bill who otherwise cannot.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas by his own admission, at least that is my understanding of it, means that if you want to serve this as butter and pay the tax, it would be perfectly all right. That would knock the argument of my friends from Wisconsin into a cocked hat. That is a terrible thing. We have laws on the statutes books now dealing with fair trade practices. The Federal Trade Commission handles that. That pure food and drug laws are abundant and perfectly plain on this subject. This would really give us the works. I am terribly afraid of this amendment. Let us vote it down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COMBS) there were ayes 90, noes 132.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the measure under consideration has far-reaching effects upon the people of my State, particularly the farmers of the State of Oklahoma.

The latest figures obtained from the Department of Agriculture show that there are 164,790 farms in the State of Oklahoma. One hundred and forty thousand three hundred and nineteen of these farms report cows milked. In other words, 90 percent of our Oklahoma farmers are interested directly in and are immediately affected by this legislation.

It is primarily a question of my considering the interests of 90 percent of the farmers of the State of Oklahoma or the some 26 margarine manufacturers who have been conducting a huge and expensive advertising campaign. I always prefer to befriend those who cannot protect themselves, rather than to look after the interests of those who are able to protect their interests and who are so aggressive in the expenditure of large sums of money to influence legislation. I have cast my lot with 90 percent of the farmers of Oklahoma rather than with the large manufacturers of margarine.

The products of the farm are our basic commodities. Civilization depends more upon the production which results from labor on the farm, and particularly from food production, than from any other type of human activity. Food is the first essential and milk is perhaps the most universally needed item of food. From birth to the grave, we must have milk if our civilization is to survive.

In addition to the producers of milk we have 102 dairy-products processing plants in the State of Oklahoma. Fifty-two of these produce butter. Many of them produce ice cream. Some produce cheese, and so forth. Generally speaking, they are typical small business enterprises, whether owned by farmer cooperatives or private investors. These plants employ many hundreds of people, whose future pay rolls will be determined to a greater or less extent by the way we vote on this measure.

One very important, although indirect and more remote, effect the passage of this bill will have upon our farmers and upon our people generally should be considered. I refer to the decrease in our milk-cow population of Oklahoma. In 1944 we had 920,000 milk cows in Oklahoma. Today the figure stands around

765,000 or less. If this bill passes, our milk-cow population will almost surely decline greatly. Likewise, it will decline Nation-wide. Everyone familiar with the over-all picture must realize that butter is the balance wheel of our dairy economics. A large percentage of the people living on farms in this country depend upon the sale of milk, cream, or butter as almost their only regular periodical cash income. It takes care of the family necessities. It puts shoes on the children's feet and clothing on their backs, and it also furnishes the table at home, that all-important food for the children—milk, butter, and the use of these items in cooking. The milch cow feeds our children and pays off the farm mortgage. If this bill passes and the milk cow moves off the farm, the family simply will not have this highly desirable food and will not have the money with which to purchase a colored substitute.

Soil conservation has been too long neglected. Soil rebuilding and conservation are absolutely essential if we are to continue to feed our own people and assist in feeding the peoples of other lands. The source of the best soil enrichment and fertilization will leave the farm with the sale of the cow. No commercial fertilizer has ever equaled that which is afforded by the keeping of milk cows on a farm. Again, while the cow is on the farm the fertilizer is immediately available, but if the farmer has to buy commercial fertilizer he likely will not have the money or will not expend the money for that purpose until the soil is so impoverished that it will not produce any further.

A large percentage of our meat—I refer to beef—comes from the dairy cattle, rather than from the beef types of cattle. This is such an important factor that it cannot be overlooked during these times of meat shortages. If this bill passes it means less meat, and particularly less beef on our tables, and it means higher prices for all kinds of meat.

The cotton growers will not benefit by the passage of the bill to the extent that they have made the people believe they will benefit. The dairy farmer in Oklahoma today pays twice as much for cotton seed and soybean meals which are sold as dairy feed, as the value of the two oils sold for margarine. Similar situations exist in other States.

One more consideration of vital importance. In some 23 States, there are heavy taxes on margarine. Before this modest Federal tax removal would benefit the consumers by offering margarine at a slightly less cost than is being paid today, the State legislatures of the 23 States would have to remove their taxes on margarine.

Some important amendments will be offered. If this bill is to pass, it should not be passed in its present form, but some of these amendments should be adopted. Otherwise, the adoption of this measure, in its present form will do great injustice to the farmers of my State, and of every other State which has any considerable dairying business. It will tend to the further impoverishment of our soil, lessen our quantity of available beef, result in higher prices for all meats and will be of no material benefit to anyone, except the margarine producers, the big packers, and other big corporations engaged in the manufacture and sale of margarine. Then we will have substitutes instead of the genuine article. Then we will kid ourselves by coloring the substitute. Why not be realistic. If the various brands of margarine are pure and wholesome as a food, let us have them unadulterated and in their natural color, rather than permitting the manufacturers to deceive the public by giving them the same color as butter.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot arrive at some agreement to close debate.

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto and all substitutes close in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: Add the following new section at the end of the bill:

"No cottonseed oil shall be used in the manufacture or production of oleomargarine unless such cottonseed oil shall have been produced from cottonseed grown in areas certified to be free from pink boll weevil worm infestation."

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is not germane. It is a frivolous amendment and has nothing to do with the measure itself. It relates to the production of raw material and has nothing to do with this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GROSS. Definitely, Mr. Chairman.

I contend it is entirely germane since it is going to deal with what goes into oleomargarine.

We dairy farmers of America have spent millions of dollars and years and years of hard work to produce the best product we can.

The other day I heard people spitting around when they talked about worms in cottonseed oil, saying that they did not want to eat it any more. I want by my amendment to clear that up and make oleomargarine a clean product, an appetizing product, a product that everybody will want to eat.

Mr. BREHM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Does the gentleman believe that the boll weevil worm is "germ-main" to oleomargarine?

Mr. GROSS. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman address himself to the point of order?

Mr. GROSS. I am, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not confining his remarks to the point of order.

Mr. GROSS. My amendment will safeguard the public.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the gentleman accept an amendment——

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I will not yield.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

Mr. GROSS. My amendment will save the public in this respect, that it will not permit——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The pending bill deals with the removal of a tax on oleomargarine, whereas the gentleman's amendment deals with the question of content.

The point of order is sustained.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, could we not remove the worm at the same time?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to be recognized for 2½ minutes of the time remaining?

Mr. GROSS. No, Mr. Chairman.

I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I had no other object in mind—and I hope you will accept me seriously in this matter—I had nothing in mind except to safeguard the public health. As I said a moment ago, we have gone to such great extremes in the protection of dairy products in this country that every cow whose milk goes to the market has got a clean bill of health; and yet you come along here and make oleomargarine out of oils from areas that are infested with pests, the worms of which live in the cottonseed. I am referring to the pink boll cotton worm. Now, when this seed is crushed, these worms are crushed too. Believe me, and I have a bottle of them here in my pocket.

My amendment would do nothing but protect the public health. It would put a good taste in the mouth of a lot of people, so much so that it would increase the sale of oleo. It will not penalize any other area.

There are a few sections, a few counties in Texas and two or three in Oklahoma, where we have spent millions of dollars of public money to get rid of this pest. Just as soon as they get rid of it and have clean cottonseed meal, then this prohibition automatically goes off and they can crush their cottonseed, and we can use cottonseed meal from wherever it comes. It seems strange to me that the only oleomargarine plant that I know of would not permit the public in the plant. Our Hershey chocolate company and all of the large meat packers and processors invite the public to inspect their plants, and conduct tours through their establishments, and have thus greatly expanded the sale of their

products. It certainly affects human food, for cottonseed meal crushed in the area where this pest infestation occurs is fed to cows whose milk goes into the market and into the manufacture of butter and the oil goes into oleomargarine. Since that is the fact, it is important.

Another thing, let me say to the people from the South, we want you to put a clean product on the market. We are interested in public health. We want them to have a good market. We want them to put out a product that is appetizing, something that will have them licking their lips like they used to over butter before you spread stories calling butter a filthy product, such as we heard earlier in this debate.

Take me seriously. Pass this amendment. It will raise the quality of your product. It will help clean up the infested areas and do a great deal to help the advancement of public health. I plead earnestly with you fellows from down there. I hope you do not want to put something on the market that is inferior. This amendment would really do something for the consumers of oleo in the country.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I have refused to pay any attention to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS], and I am not going to now, for anyone who knows anything about the subject knows that no boll weevil ever gets into the seed because the seed is not formed at the time the boll weevil is active. I have just been laughing at him like everybody else who knows anything about it. You know good and well that there are no boll weevils in this when it is cottonseed oil. It is so absurd that the proposition hardly needs answer and, of course, I am not going to pay any attention to it except to recommend that we put it where it belongs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SABATH. May I inquire how much time has been used in speaking against the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? I think about 2 minutes have been used and there are 5 minutes permitted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina had 5 minutes, but he yielded the floor, so all debate in opposition to the motion has concluded.

The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS].

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, it is perhaps fitting that the present Democratic administration should have put its stamp of approval on the legislation now before us removing the dairy farmer's last Federal protection against complete imitation of butter—his principal source of cash income.

As my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, REID MURRAY, has frequently and tellingly pointed out, the present Department of Agriculture has repeatedly demonstrated its allergy to the dairy farmer and his products. It is fitting that this crowning blow to the stability of the dairy industry should receive the tacit approval of that Department. It is entirely in keeping with its antidairying sentiment.

Mr. Chairman, we should not be here today seeking to destroy the dairy industry. We should be strengthening it. Yet this legislation is nothing more nor less than a crippling blow to an agricultural industry without which this Nation could not long remain strong and prosperous. I hope today to be able to explain to you the nature and significance of that crippling blow.

What is the basic purpose of this legislation? You can argue all day; you can toss figures hither and yon, but this elemental fact remains: The purpose of this legislation is to increase the sales of an imitative product by legitimatizing its imitation.

What would be the basic effect of the passage of this legislation? It can have only one basic effect. The repeal of the Federal tax on oleo colored yellow in imitation of butter can only lead to the greatly increased consumption of the imitative product itself—oleo.

We would not be here today if this were not so. The vast sums of money being spent to force through this legislation are not being spent for any altruistic purpose. They are being spent by a hard-headed group of manufacturers—manufacturers who seek to benefit from this legislation—the manufacturers of oleo. They know they will benefit from this repealer because they know that it will greatly increase the sales of an imitative product which they can produce at a fraction of the cost of the genuine article. The fact that oleo sales will greatly increase with the removal of all restrictions upon its manufacture in complete imitation of butter has never been denied—nor can it be—by any proponent of this repealing legislation.

Thus, one fact can be stipulated at the outset. We are discussing legislation designed to increase greatly the sale of oleo. What will be the effects of greatly increasing the sales of oleo—the great imitator?

The first effect is so evident that it can also be stipulated almost automatically. Greatly increased sales of oleo will cause greatly reduced sales of the genuine product—butter. Proof of this is a matter of historical record. Since 1912, statistics shows that everytime oleomargarine consumption goes up, butter consumption declines. During the past 36 years, the per capita consumption of oleo has been under 2 pounds in 9 years and 3 pounds or over for 11 years. When it was under 2 pounds, per capita consumption of butter averaged 17.3 pounds. When it was 3 pounds or over per capita, butter consumption fell to 13.6 pounds.

Two basic facts thus are established. This legislation means, first, increased consumption of the imitator, oleo; and, second, decreased consumption of that which it imitates—butter.

Now, let us translate those facts into their effect upon both producer and consumer in this complex economy of ours.

The most important effect of this shift in the usage of basic fats will be higher milk prices and higher meat prices for the housewife.

It can easily be seen why this is so.

While the consumption of milk is fairly level, its production is not. It is highly seasonal. During the flush summer season, the dairy cow produces 50 percent more milk than in the fall and winter months. During the flush season, milk production greatly exceeds consumption. The surplus must go into storable products, principally into butter. Butter manufacture, in other words, provides an outlet for the farmers' surplus milk after all other outlets are satisfied. This fact is important not only because of the seasonal production of milk, but because some of our greatest dairy States such as Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, and South Dakota are distant from the city market for fluid milk. In these States, butter is the only outlet for a major share of the milk produced.

What happens when we dangerously lower the consumption of this major market for surplus milk—as is proposed in the pending legislation?

If his surplus milk cannot find its way into butter manufacture because consumption has drastically dropped, the farmer has only two alternatives. He can dump his previous, high-cost, surplus milk down the drain, or he can reduce his production of milk to the level of demand. He will naturally choose the latter course. He can reduce his production in only one way. That way is by culling his herd of dairy cattle. The inevitable effect of this legislation will unquestionably be a drastic reduction in the number of milk cows in the Nation.

Proof of this can also be found in the record.

The production and consumption of oleo during the war received tremendous impetus from the restrictions placed upon butter and from the preferences given to the fats and oils used in oleomargarine, and is still being carried forward by that impetus.

Butter production fell from 1.8 billion pounds in 1944 to 1.6 billion pounds in 1947, a loss of 200,000,000 pounds. During the same period oleo production increased 150,000,000 pounds.

What effect has this shift had on the size of our dairy herds? In the United States the number of cows and heifers 2 years old and over kept for milk decreased from 27,700,000 to 25,165,000. That is the over-all loss of 2,500,000 milch cows for all 48 States.

But, even more significant is what happened to dairy herds in the West North

Central States, that great butter-producing region west of the Mississippi, which includes Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas. It is in this region that over 60 percent of our butter is produced.

While oleo sales were supplanting the sale of butter from 1944 to 1947, what happened to the dairy herds in these great States?

The tragic fact is that the number of milk cows fell from 7,183,000 to 5,848,000, or a total loss of 1,335,000 cows and heifers. In other words, 52 percent of the 2,500,000 decline in milk-cow population took place in a seven-State area which produces 60 percent of our butter and which contains only 25 percent of our milk-cow population.

This, to me, is almost conclusive proof of the insidious effect of increased oleo consumption at the expense of butter.

I think it is firmly established, then, that a decline in butter consumption can only mean a decline in the number of our milk cows, and a decline, therefore, in the total production of milk.

But, can we afford a decline in the total production of milk?

Our population has increased to 145,000,000 people. Our marriage rate has increased from 1,400,000 per year before the war to 1,900,000 in 1947. There were 3,900,000 babies born in 1947, an all-time record. Per capita consumption of milk products other than butter is at a record all-time high. We will probably produce less milk this year than the demand.

Yet, we are here today considering legislation which can only have the effect, as I have demonstrated, of lowering the number of milch cows and the production of milk.

The answer can only be a milk shortage—sharp and continuing. The answer can only be higher prices to the consumer for milk—and since 40 percent of our beef comes from dairy herds—less meat and higher prices for it.

That is the real issue in this controversy. It is an economic issue. It is for us to decide whether we shall benefit the few manufacturers of oleo by sacrificing one of the most stable elements in our agricultural economy and by imposing higher prices for basic foods upon the unsuspecting housewife. I cannot see how this House, in its wisdom, could consent to such a tragic error.

There are other issues, too.

Shall we pass this repealing legislation, and thus, give full legitimacy to an imitative product? If we consent to the unrestricted production of imitation butter, cannot the same principle be applied to any product which is capable of complete, on-the-surface, imitation of the genuine thing? I shudder to think of the unrestricted production of filled milk, filled ice cream, filled cheese, each of which can be manufactured by the same method as olemargarine.

Shall we pass this legislation—and, by striking at dairying, strike hard at the type of farming that is closely associated with sound solid conservation practices?

Shall we pass this repealing legislation, and give aid and comfort to the 26 margarine manufacturers and financial ruin to the 3,000,000 small butter producers? It is amusing to see our Democratic friends profess undying love for the cooperative movement in this Nation with one breath, and with the next, sponsor this vicious legislation which strikes at the heart of the strongest and most progressive cooperatives of all—the dairy cooperatives. In Wisconsin, Michigan, and Iowa, over 80 percent of the butter is produced in cooperative creameries controlled by dairy farmers living and working on family-sized farms. Ask them what this legislation means to them.

These are the fundamental issues, Mr. Chairman, in this controversy. It is these fundamental issues which we must weigh in the balance when we consider the removal of a tax which does not add one cent to the cost of oleo, in its natural color, white, and whose only sinister effect is to inconvenience the housewife if she wants her oleo yellow and does not take advantage of modern packaging of the imitative product.

In the best interests of the whole population, of farmer and housewife alike, this legislation, Mr. Chairman, should be soundly defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in these closing moments of the debate to congratulate the committee and the House on its activity this afternoon and to point out that in this vote to repeal the margarine tax, which I am sure will be carried, we will be eliminating a tax which is repugnant to the whole free enterprise system. I urge that we send this bill to the Senate with a resounding majority.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the pending legislation in its present form. In my opinion, it is not fair to either the farmer or the consumer.

I represent one of the richest dairy sections in the United States. However, I also represent a large urban area. Arguments have been made here today that their interests are conflicting in this fight on the repeal of the taxes on oleomargarine. I vigorously disagree with that viewpoint.

The removal of all taxes on oleomargarine and granting oleo manufacturers complete freedom to sell their product, colored or uncolored, as imitation butter would be just as harmful and unfair to city consumers as to farmer producers.

Let us first take the dairy farmer. The dairy farmers know that if they are denied protection for their industry against unfair competition by colored oleo, they will suffer financial loss. They also know from experience before and since the passage of the Federal tax law on oleo that the consumer will be gypped by unscrupulous dealers selling colored oleo as butter—at butter prices.

The dairy farmer has an investment to protect, an investment in equipment, in experience, in cattle, and in outlets for his products—many of them cooperatively owned and cooperatively managed. Altogether there are some 4,500,000 dairy farmers, of whom 1,250,000 absolutely depend upon 4,000 local creamieries for almost their only regular cash income. In this sense the dairy farmer is a small-business man and, like all small-business men, he is entitled to protection from powerful interests competing unfairly with his goods and services.

One of the dairy farmers' leading products is butter. It is a recognized high-quality product for which, presently, the demand exceeds the supply. Traditionally our American producers of everything from bicycles to bedspreads have been entitled to protection against those who duplicate their products in inferior materials and palm off the result on the American people to their own profit. Such a procedure is unfair to manufacturer and consumer alike, and it does no good to say that this thing would not occur in the case of colored oleomargarine, because it would occur. It has occurred.

Let us all remember this: Butter is the cornerstone of the dairy farmer's economic structure. To have enough milk to meet fluid demands in the slack season requires an excess of milk in the flush season. Much of this surplus must go into butter production. If butter could not be produced profitably, farmers would naturally have to reduce their herds, and the consequent shortage of milk in the slack season would be aggravated and tend to raise fluid-milk prices. Contrast this body blow to our basic dairy industry with the rather inconsequential effects any tax removal will have on the total sale of soybean and cottonseed oil. Oleo represents less than 3 percent of cash farm income.

Finally, let us not forget that anyone who has given even casual study to the soil-conservation and fertility problem in our country knows the valuable contribution made by the dairy cow. Are we to aggravate still further a situation which is already critical in the face of a continuing world food shortage? Are we the most prodigal nation in the world with our land resources, to deplete them even further?

Now let us study the effects of this proposed move on the consuming public.

First, oleo prices are not based on production costs but on a historical competitive ratio with butter. Traditionally, oleo has sold for about half butter costs. Is any Member here today so naive as to believe that if these taxes are removed the saving will go to the consumer? Uncolored oleo will probably go off the market, and only colored oleo will be sold. There will obviously be an increased demand for oleo which will boost the price more than any tax saving. The consumer will not save, and the United States Treasury will lose, but the oleo manufacturer will increase his already exorbitant profit.

In Atlanta, Ga., last week uncolored oleo sold for 30 cents. Oleo already colored yellow sold for 50 cents a pound, or 20 cents more. The Federal tax on colored oleo is only 10 cents. What excuses that other dime of profit on colored oleo, if it is not the undeclared attempt to deceive others?

In Terre Haute, Ind., the price for uncolored oleo last week was 32 cents a pound. The price for the same product already colored yellow was 59 cents, or an increase of 27 cents. The Federal tax on colored oleomargarine, as I remind this House again, is only 10 cents. To make it abundantly clear that this is just what is happening, a grocery store in Kansas City, Mo., last week displayed a card above a box containing oleo. The card read:

Colored oleo—looks and tastes like real butter.

The price for the colored oleo was 55 cents a pound, 20 cents more than the uncolored product despite the fact that the Federal tax is only 10 cents.

It is this sort of deception which the dairy farmer hates and fears. Its effect on his market can only be disastrous, despite the fact that it is a kind of competition which we do not favor in this country. Losing his market to a better product at a better price is one thing. Losing his market to an inferior product at a price which follows the cost of butter, rather than the cost of its ingredients in manufacture, is quite another thing entirely. No Member of this House would approve that kind of competition in his own business or the business of his friends. No small dairy farmer can long endure that kind of competition and continue to make a living.

With no white oleomargarine to be had, what becomes of the competitive price in the oleo field? If there is no white oleo available, there will be nothing to compete with colored oleo from below. The only price factor which the oleo manufacturers will have to keep in mind will then be the price of butter. So long as they stay below the price of butter, they will be able to sell unlimited quantities of their product. Oleo prices, as I have said, bear no relationship to the cost of their ingredients. They are geared to butter prices and nothing but butter prices, a clear indication that oleomargarine is an imitation product engaged in following the leader rather than developing its own field.

The probable effect of widespread oleo sales on the dairy industry has already been pointed out to this House. It cannot be said often enough that the dairy farmer will suffer, and that when the dairy industry is reduced our whole standard of living goes down with it. Without butter outlets the dairy farmer cannot maintain his milk supply in slack seasons. We have lost 11 percent of our dairy cattle since 1945, as a direct result of this constant harassment of the dairy farmer. It has been predicted that we will lose another 2,500,000 head of dairy cattle in the next 3 years if the Federal taxes on oleomargarine are repealed.

We already face a severe meat shortage before this year is over. Forty percent of our meat production comes from the dairy industry. If farmers cannot dairy farm profitably, obviously they will slaughter their stock. Over the long run, who here will predict what astronomical prices meat will soar to under these circumstances? Will the housewife be grateful to the Congress that has brought this intolerable situation into being? I do not believe she will and I urge you gentlemen to consider this thoughtfully before voting on this matter today.

The oleo interests are right in saying that Federal restrictions on their product are unique. But the incentives to fraud and deception in the manufacture and sale of their product are also unique. The tremendous quantities involved, the price differential between oleo and butter, and the ease with which deception can be practiced are powerful temptations. The end result of unrestricted sale of oleo, however, can only be a reduction of our meat and dairy resources and an increase in meat and milk prices to the consumer.

In conclusion, let me say this: If you are determined to disrupt our agricultural economy by this action; if you do insist on removing these so-called discriminatory taxes, then at least do this one thing—prohibit the sale of margarine colored to simulate butter. Protect the housewife against those few unscrupulous dealers who would pawn off on her a poor substitute at butter prices. If she chooses to buy oleomargarine, that is her privilege; but if she wants butter, it is our duty to see she gets butter.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be granted permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

THE IMPORTANCE OF MILK

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, in the controversy over the repeal of Federal taxes on oleomargarine, not enough attention has been paid to the preference of the American consumer. There is no doubt that the American consumer prefers to use butter wherever possible.

The American Dairy Association recently conducted a test with 7,850 patrons of a cafeteria to determine the percentage of choice. At 2 cents a pat for butter as against 1 cent a pat for oleo, 93 percent of the cafeteria patrons chose butter. At 1 cent a pat for butter as against free uncolored oleo, 98 percent chose butter. In the armed forces commissaries, where servicemen's wives spent their own money for household food, butter outsells oleo 5 to 1.

Yet our highest per capita consumption of butter was 18.5 pounds in 1926. By contrast, butter consumption in New Zealand between 1930 and 1940 averaged from 40 to 47 pounds of butter per capita. In Australia and Canada it was over 30 pounds for the same period, and in the United Kingdom from 20 to 25 pounds per capita.

Is the famed American standard of living to be less than that of the New Zealanders? Are we to keep on having less butter than Australia and Canada? Butter production is still staggering under wartime demands upon our dairy industry. Today our American consumption of butter is only 11.2 pounds per capita.

How has this situation come about? Governmental regulations and restrictions on the dairy industry, and indeed on all our livestock industries, have penalized their output since we first began plowing under little pigs. The OPA followed. The trend still continues. Our dairy-cow population has shrunk 11 percent since 1945.

Milk production is down from last year and the trend has not yet been checked. The decline seems to be at its worst in the butter-producing parts of our country. It began when butter was discriminated against by Government order during the war, and the present scarcity and high prices of butter are natural results.

If the butter industry is now to be further injured by loss of part of its milk to yellow oleomargarine this trend will be accentuated. We will find milk even less plentiful in the milk sheds around our industrial centers. Higher prices for milk will follow as a matter of course, due to the relationship between fluid milk production and butter production.

If the butter market is affected by colored oleo sales, there will, of course, be a temporary surplus of milk. Those who say, "What of it? Let the consumers drink more milk," do not have the answer. That milk surplus will exist only for the length of time necessary to dispose of the dairy herds. The farmer cannot afford to keep enough cows to insure an even flow of milk unless he has a butter outlet for his surplus.

If we are to have enough milk in the slack season, the dairy farmer must milk more cows than he needs in the flush season. This situation arises from the fact that cows give more milk in June than they give in November, while consumption remains the same. As long as butter absorbs the surplus milk, the dairy industry is able to maintain a balanced output. Without butter outlets, however, farmers would cut their herds to the point where there would be too little milk in winter and the price of milk would go up. In California, this would be serious because we have a great increase of population and milk is already in short supply.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN] has estimated that, if we removed Federal restrictions from the sale of colored oleomargarine, our dairy herds will suffer a further reduction of not less than 2,500,000 head in the next 3 years, some farmers would go out of dairying altogether, losing what they have invested in their dairy equipment and cooperative creameries. The consumer's milk bill would be increased by more than the possible saving in oleomargarine, as consumer's cost would also be increased indirectly by increased costs of meat and leather products.

Other farmers, faced with the loss of their butter market, might sell milk in other dairy markets. There are 1,250,000 farmers who rely on farm-separated cream for almost their only source of cash income. The economic impact of a change in distribution methods would be widespread and profound. No matter from what direction we approach this problem, the inevitable result promises to be less milk at a time when our increasing population requires more.

We are faced with the philosophy that an imitation food product is legitimate and acceptable provided it is somewhat the nutritional equivalent of the product it imitates. This philosophy opens the way to substitutions for milk, for cheese, and for ice cream. We foresee a day when the consumer will no longer get what she pays for, but will be confronted with synthetic products in place of natural butter, milk, and manufactured dairy products to which she is accustomed. That day is near at hand.

Today oleomargarine is outselling butter for the first time in our country's history. December and January figures show that 128,000,000 pounds of oleo were sold in the Nation's stores compared with 108,000,000 pounds of butter. A few years ago oleo enjoyed a distribution of only 50 percent. Now it has 80 percent distribution.

Of the combined sales of spreads for bread, oleomargarine formerly accounted for only 19 percent. Today it has risen to 54 percent of the combined market. Oleo production has more than doubled since 1941.

It would appear from these figures that the oleomargarine industry is doing rather well. The present Federal taxes on the sale and distribution of oleomargarine have not hurt the 26 big manufacturers that account for the bulk of this product. These taxes have not restricted the dealers in oleo, and they certainly do not hurt the consumers. The Federal tax on uncolored oleo is only one-fourth of 1 cent per pound, and amounts to only a few pennies for each consumer in the course of a year. No housewife pays the 10-cent tax if she buys her oleo white and mixes the color herself, as millions do.

There is more at stake in this controversy than the welfare of 26 big corporations. There is more at stake than the convenience of the housewife. There is more at stake than a few pennies of Federal tax per pound on colored oleomargarine. What we risk in the repeal of the Federal taxes on oleo is a milk supply for us and for our children, the food supply for our friends overseas, and the successful existence of our Nation's dairy industry. This matter is of vital interest to 4,500,000 farm families, of whom 1,250,000 depend upon butter, as I have stated, for almost their only source of regular cash income. The farmer, as a small-business man, is entitled to protection against the inroads of an imitation product. The consumer is entitled to protection against imitation. The color requirements affecting oleo are among the means of affording that protection.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, upon three occasions this afternoon I voted to remove the tax on colored oleomargarine. I did so because I wanted the housewives to have a cheaper colored spread if they so desired.

However, I followed this course only when the proposed amendments were coupled with the provision that manufacturers of colored oleomargarine would so package their product that it would be readily identified as oleomargarine and not mistaken for butter. This would have protected consumers from getting oleomargarine under the guise of butter.

I also voted for amendments which would have protected those eating in public restaurants from being served oleomargarine instead of butter without their knowledge.

Since the final form of the bill did not provide this protection to the public I voted against it.

In my judgment the provisions of the bill as passed are against the best interests of the farmers producing butter, and provide unfair competition to this dairy product which is so essential to the welfare of this country.

I am fearful those in Illinois who believe this legislation will be beneficial to them have been misled because there is a State statute which prohibits the manufacture and sale of colored oleomargarine in the State of Illinois. Until this State statute is repealed this legislation will have no effect in Illinois.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. ARENDS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2245) to repeal the tax on oleomargarine, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin moves to recommit H. R. 2245 to the Committee on Agriculture with instructions to report it back forthwith with the following amendment: Add a new section to the bill which reads as follows:

"SEC. 3. Section 2470 of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby repealed."

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RIVERS. The proposed motion is not germane to the bill. It seeks to amend a provision of law with which this bill does not deal.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am sure it is germane, Mr. Speaker. I know of no other law which covers the tax on the principal ingredients of oleomargarine.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is the same amendment that was voted on in the Committee of the Whole. No point of order was raised at that time against the amendment, and a vote was taken. The substance of the amendment deals with a part of the ingredients of oleomargarine, a very desirable ingredient, they say. I feel that the amendment is germane, and had a point of order been raised in the Committee of the Whole and sustained, it might have been different. It was germane in the committee and acted on, and it should be held to be germane now.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. The only thing I desire to say, Mr. Speaker, is that if this motion is germane, then you might offer a motion to repeal all of the income-tax laws now on the statute books.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair would hold that the bill under consideration is one which deals solely with oleomargarine. The instructions contained in the motion to recommit deal with a part of the general revenue laws and other substances which do not include oleomargarine. Therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN moves to recommit the bill H. R. 2245 to the Committee on Agriculture with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Strike out all language after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That all sections of the Internal Revenue Code relating to taxes on oleomargarine and the manufacture, distribution, handling, and sale of oleomargarine and the taxing or licensing of persons engaged in the manufacture, distribution, handling, and sale thereof, are hereby and herewith repealed.

"SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby assessed and levied upon oleomargarine which shall be manufactured and sold, or removed for consumption or use, a tax at the rate of one-fourth of 1 cent per pound: *Provided*, That no oleomargarine shall be manufactured or sold which is yellow in color.

"(b) The tax levied by subsection (a) shall be paid by the manufacturer.

"SEC. 3. (a) For the purposes of this act oleomargarine shall be defined as certain manufactured substances, certain extracts,

and certain mixtures and compounds, including such mixtures and compounds with butter, and such mixtures and compounds shall be known and designated as "oleomargarine," namely, all substances known prior to August 2, 1886, as oleomargarine, oleo, oleomargarine oil, butterine, lardine, suine, and neutral; all mixtures and compounds of oleomargarine, oleo, oleomargarine oil, butterine, lardine, suine, and neutral; all lard extracts and tallow extracts; and all mixtures and compounds of tallow, beef fat, suet, lard, lard oil, fish oil or fish fat, vegetable oil, annatto, and other coloring matter, intestinal fat, and offal fat—if (1) made in imitation or semblance of butter, or (2) calculated or intended to be sold as butter or for butter, or (3) churned, emulsified, or mixed in cream, milk, or other liquid, and containing moisture in excess of 1 percent or common salt. This section shall not apply to puff pastry, shortenings—churned or emulsified in milk or cream and having a melting point of 118 degrees Fahrenheit or more, nor to any of the following containing condiments and spices—salad dressings, mayonnaise dressings or mayonnaise products, nor to liquid emulsions, pharmaceutical preparations, oil meals, liquid preservatives, illuminating oils, cleansing compounds, or flavoring compounds.

"(b) For the purposes of this act, oleomargarine held to be yellow in color when it has a tint or shade containing more than 1.6 degrees of yellow, or of yellow and red collectively, but with an excess of yellow over red, measured in the terms of the Lovibond tintometer scale or its equivalent. Such measurements shall be made under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, and such regulations shall provide that the measurements shall be applied in such manner and under such conditions as will, in the opinion of the Commissioner, insure as nearly as practicable that the result of the measurement will show the color of the oleomargarine under the conditions under which it is customarily offered for sale to the consumer.

"SEC. 4. This act shall become effective July 1, 1948.

"SEC. 5. No oleomargarine shall be offered for sale in the United States that is from farms infected by pink boll worms."

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under the rules of the House only one motion to recommit is permitted. That motion was made. This is a second motion to recommit, and I think a second motion to recommit is not in order.

The SPEAKER. No motion to recommit has been considered by the House, because the motion to recommit previously offered was ruled out of order. The Chair holds that the pending motion to recommit is the only proper one before the House.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN) there were—ayes 98, noes 212.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 260, nays 106, answered "present" 1, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 52]

YEAS—260

Abbitt	Gordon	Murdock
Abernethy	Gore	Murray, Tenn.
Allen, Calif.	Gorski	Nicholson
Allen, La.	Gossett	Nixon
Anderson, Calif.	Graham	Nodar
Andrews, N. Y.	Gregory	Norrell
Angell	Gwinn, N. Y.	O'Brien
Arends	Hale	O'Toole
Auchincloss	Hall,	Owens
Bakewell	Edwin Arthur	Pace
Barden	Hall,	Passman
Bates, Ky.	Leonard W.	Patman
Bates, Mass.	Hand	Patterson
Beall	Hardy	Peden
Beckworth	Harness, Ind.	Peterson
Bender	Harris	Pfeifer
Bennett, Mich.	Harvey	Philbin
Bland	Havenner	Pickett
Boggs, La.	Hays	Poage
Bolton	Hébert	Potter
Bonner	Heffernan	Potts
Bradley	Herter	Poulson
Bramblett	Heselton	Powell
Brooks	Hess	Preston
Brown, Ga.	Hinshaw	Price, Ill.
Bryson	Holifield	Priest
Buchanan	Huber	Ramey
Buck	Isacson	Rankin
Bulwinkle	Javits	Rayburn
Burke	Jenkins, Pa.	Redden
Burleson	Johnson, Ind.	Reeves
Busbey	Johnson, Tex.	Regan
Butler	Jones, Ala.	Richards
Byrne, N. Y.	Jones, N. C.	Riehlman
Camp	Jones, Wash.	Riley
Canfield	Judd	Rivers
Carroll	Karsten, Mo.	Rogers, Fla.
Case, N. J.	Kean	Rogers, Mass.
Chadwick	Keating	Rohrbough
Chapman	Kee	Rooney
Church	Kelley	Ross
Clason	Kennedy	Russell
Clippinger	Keogh	Sabath
Coffin	Kerr	Sadlak
Cole, Kans.	King	Sadowski
Cooley	Kirwan	Sarbacher
Cooper	Klein	Sasscer
Corbett	Kunkel	Scott, Hardie
Coudert	Landis	Scott,
Courtney	Lane	Hugh D., Jr.
Cravens	Lanham	Scrivner
Crosser	Larcade	Seely-Brown
Crow	Latham	Sheppard
Davis, Ga.	LeFevre	Sikes
Davis, Tenn.	Lewis	Smathers
Dawson, Ill.	Lichtenwalter	Snyder
Deane	Lodge	Somers
Delaney	Love	Spence
Devitt	Lucas	Stanley
Dingell	Ludlow	Stigler
Domengeaux	Lusk	Sundstrom
Donohue	Lyle	Teague
Dorn	Lynch	Thomas, Tex.
Doughton	McConnell	Thompson
Douglas	McCormack	Tibbott
Eaton	McDonough	Tollefson
Eberharter	McDowell	Towe
Elsaesser	McGarvey	Twyman
Elston	McGregor	Vail
Engle, Calif.	McMahon	Van Zandt
Fallon	McMillan, S. C.	Vinson
Feighan	McMillen, Ill.	Vorys
Fellows	Madden	Wadsworth
Fenton	Mahon	Walter
Fernandez	Maloney	Welch
Fisher	Marcantonio	Wheeler
Flannagan	Mathews	Whitaker
Fletcher	Meade, Md.	Whitten
Fogarty	Merrow	Whittington
Foote	Meyer	Wigglesworth
Forand	Miller, Conn.	Williams
Fulton	Mills	Wilson, Tex.
Gamble	Mitchell	Winstead
Garmatz	Morris	Wolverton
Gary	Morrison	Wood
Gathings	Morton	Worley
Gavin	Muhlenberg	Youngblood
Goodwin	Multer	

NAYS—106

Allen, Ill.	Andresen,	Banta
Andersen,	August H.	Barrett
H. Carl	Arnold	Bishop
Blackney	Griffiths	Miller, Nebr.
Blatnik	Gross	Mundt
Brehm	Gwynne, Iowa	Murray, Wis.
Brown, Ohio	Hagen	Norblad
Buffett	Halleck	O'Hara
Byrnes, Wis.	Hart	O'Konski
Cannon	Hill	Phillips, Calif.
Case, S. Dak.	Hoeven	Plumley
Chelf	Hoffman	Reed, Ill.
Chiperfield	Holmes	Rees
Clark	Hope	Robertson
Clevenger	Horan	Rockwell
Cole, N. Y.	Hull	St. George
Combs	Jackson, Wash.	Sanborn
Cotton	Jenison	Schwabe, Okla.
Crawford	Jensen	Shafer
Cunningham	Johnson, Calif.	Short
Curtis	Johnson, Ill.	Simpson, Ill.
Dague	Jonkman	Simpson, Pa.
Davis, Wis.	Keefe	Smith, Kans.
D'Ewart	Kersten, Wis.	Smith, Va.
Dolliver	Kilburn	Smith, Wis.
Dondero	Knutson	Stefan
Elliott	Lea	Stevenson
Ellsworth	LeCompte	Stockman
Engel, Mich.	Lemke	Taber
Evins	McCulloch	Talle
Folger	Mack	Trimble
Fuller	MacKinnon	Vursell
Gearhart	Martin, Iowa	Weichel
Gillie	Mason	Wilson, Ind.
Goff	Michener	Wolcott
Granger	Miller, Md.	Woodruff

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Reed, N. Y.

NOT VOTING—63

Albert	Gillette	Manasco
Andrews, Ala.	Grant, Ala.	Mansfield
Battle	Grant, Ind.	Meade, Ky.
Bell	Harless, Ariz.	Miller, Calif.
Bennett, Mo.	Harrison	Monroney
Bloom	Hartley	Morgan
Boggs, Del.	Hedrick	Norton
Boykin	Hendricks	Phillips, Tenn.
Brophy	Hobbs	Ploeser
Buckley	Jackson, Calif.	Price, Fla.
Carson	Jarman	Rains
Celler	Jenkins, Ohio	Rich
Chenoweth	Jennings	Rizley
Cole, Mo.	Johnson, Okla.	Schwabe, Mo.
Colmer	Kearney	Scoblick
Cox	Kearns	Smith, Maine
Dawson, Utah	Kefauver	Smith, Ohio
Dirksen	Kilday	Stratton
Durham	Lesinski	Taylor
Ellis	McCowen	Thomas, N. J.
Gallagher	Macy	West

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Jennings for, with Mr. Reed of New York against.

Mr. Kearns for, with Mr. Chenoweth against.

Mrs. Smith of Maine for, with Mr. Gillette against.

Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. Schwabe of Missouri against.

Mr. Grant of Indiana for, with Mr. Bennett of Missouri against.

Mr. Kilday for, with Mr. Brophy against.

Mr. Hedrick for, with Mr. Carson against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. McCowen with Mr. Mansfield.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Durham.

Mr. Cole of Missouri with Mr. Cox.

Mr. Jackson of California with Mrs. Norton.

Mr. Rich with Mr. Boykin.

Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Battle.

Mr. Stratton with Mr. Celler.

Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Price of Florida.

Mr. Jenkins of Ohio with Mr. Harrison.

Mr. Hartley with Mr. Hobbs.

Mr. Ellis with Mr. Kefauver.

Mr. Meade of Kentucky with Mr. Albert.

Mr. Rizley with Mr. Morgan.

Mr. Kearney with Mr. Miller of California.

Mr. Dirksen with Mr. Colmer.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1481. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District; and

S. 2409. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 16, 1947.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2195) entitled "An act to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended."

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DEVITT (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. TABER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6055) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpenaed to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia to give testimony on April 29, 1948, at 10 a. m., in the case of the United States against Dalton Trumbo, which is a congressional-contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this summons without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I, therefore, submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* DALTON TRUMBO, DEFENDENT, NO. 1353–47, CRIMINAL DOCKET

The President of the United States to Congressman ADOLPH SABATH, of Illinois, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Thursday, the 29th day of April 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 27th day of April, A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*

By ELIZABETH M. KOWALSKI, *Deputy Clerk.*

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 560) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas Representative ADOLPH SABATH, a Member of this House, has been served with a subpena to appear as a witness before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify at 10 a. m., on the 29th day of April 1948, in the case of the *United States* v. *Dalton Trumbo*, criminal docket No. 1353–47; and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify, but by order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Representative ADOLPH SABATH is authorized to appear in response to the subpena of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia at such time as when the House is not sitting in session; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena of said court.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House and ask that a subpena with which I have been served be read by the Clerk.

Mr. Speaker, I have been subpenaed to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify on Thursday, April 29, 1948, at 10 a. m., in the case of the United States against Dalton Trumbo, which is a congressional contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I therefore submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

The Clerk read as follows:

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

THE UNITED STATES *v.* DALTON TRUMBO, NO. 1353–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to Hon. JOHN MCDOWELL, Old House Office Building:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Thursday, April 29, 1948, at 9:45 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the United States, and bring with you copy of subpena served upon Dalton Trumbo and other related papers and telegrams, and not depart the court without leave of the court or district attorney.

Witness, the Honorable Bolitha J. Laws, chief justice of said court this 28th day of April, A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*

By CHARLES J. RUMSEY, *Deputy Clerk.*

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 561) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas Representative JOHN MCDOWELL, a Member of this House, has been served with a subpena duces tecum to appear as a witness before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia to testify at 10 a. m. on the 29th day of April 1948, in the case of the *United States* v. *Dalton Trumbo*, criminal docket No. 1352–47; and

Whereas by the privileges of the House, no Member is authorized to appear and testify but by order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, that Representative JOHN MCDOWELL is authorized to appear in response to the subpena duces tecum of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia on Thursday, April 29, 1948, in the case of the *United States* v. *Dalton Trumbo*; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena of the said court.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpenaed to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia to give testimony on April 29, 1948, at 9:45 a. m., in the case of the United States against Dalton Trumbo, which is a congressional contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House I am unable to comply with this summons without the consent of the House, the priviliges of the House being involved. I therefore submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

The Clerk read as follows:

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

THE UNITED STATES *v.* DALTON TRUMBO, NO. 1353–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to Hon. RICHARD B. VAIL, room 320, Old House Office Building:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Thursday, April 29, 1948, at 9:45 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the United States, and not depart the court without leave of the court or district attorney.

Witness, the Honorable Bolitha J. Laws, chief justice of said court, this 28th day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*

By CHARLES J. RUMSEY, *Deputy Clerk.*

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 562) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas Representative RICHARD B. VAIL, a Member of this House, has been served with a subpena to appear as a witness before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify at 9:45 a. m., on the 29th day of April 1948, in the case of the *United States* v. *Dalton Trumbo* (criminal docket No. 1353–47); and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify, but by order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Representative RICHARD B. VAIL is authorized to appear in response to the subpena of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia at such time as when the House is not sitting in session; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena of said court.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

Mr. MERROW asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Mrs. Nelson Clausen.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a eulogy to William S. Knudsen.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the business of the day and any other special orders, I may address the House for 3 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, April 29, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and other special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON H. R. 5852

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Un-American Activities may have until midnight Friday in which to file a report on the bill H. R. 5852.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON H. R. 3748

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] may file a supplemental report on H. R. 3748.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN TRADE AUTHORITY

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day two distinguished Members of the other body, the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] and the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] introduced jointly in that body a bill which, if adopted by the Congress, would create a United States Foreign Trade Authority.

Since the measure would, if adopted, affect the revenues of the Nation and must, therefore, be first approved in this body, I have been asked by those two distinguished colleagues of ours to introduce the bill, at their request, in the House of Representatives.

As I am not familiar with the full implications of the legislation, I want to make it crystal clear to the membership of this body, and to the country, that I am not, in introducing the legislation by request extending to the principles contained in the measure my unqualified approval, at least not until I know much more about it than I do now. But I am convinced after hastily reading the text of the measure that the proposal merits and should have the careful consideration of the Congress and the country. I await their reactions with interest.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include two additional articles.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on foreign relief costs and the high prices at home and attach thereto an article.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix on the subject of oleomargarine, the farmer's point of view, and include therein a letter.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial on Even the Pilgrims Learned.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Eamon de Valera made in New York. I am advised by the Acting Public Printer that it exceeds the statutory length and will cost $248.50. Notwithstanding the additional cost I ask that the matter may be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE asked and was granted permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and to include therein a proposed amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks and include a letter written to the chairman of the Texas Railroad Commission and his reply thereto.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include certain sections from the Draft Act of 1916 and the Draft Act of 1940.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of today's business I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in four separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I made earlier today in the Committee of the Whole a letter from the Challenge Butter Co. to a publication known as the Life magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include certain excerpts from the remarks of the Secretary of State before the Chamber of Commerce in annual session yesterday, and also an editorial on the same.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech recently made by him.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on the vote on passage of the oleo bill I had a pair with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS]. I voted "no." If the gentleman from Tennessee were here he would have voted "aye." I therefore withdraw my vote and vote "present."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BROPHY (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), indefinitely, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDOWELL). Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include at the end of my remarks—

First. President's 10-point program, together with some of my own remarks.

Second. Memorandum to the President by the Council of Economic Advisors, covering first quarter of 1948, together with some of my remarks.

Third. Excerpts from statement of Chairman Eccles of the Federal Reserve Board before Joint Committee on the Economic Report, November 25, 1947.

Fourth. Excerpts from Mr. Eccles' statement of April 13, 1948, before Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

Fifth. Excerpts from two monthly Letters on Economic Conditions and Government Finance issued by the National City Bank of New York of November 1947 and April 1948.

Sixth. Article by Richard L. Neuberger entitled "The Battle of the Family Budget" in the New York Times of January 11, 1948.

Seventh. And an article from Current Business Week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

COST OF LIVING, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, I was by unanimous consent granted official leave to go shopping for America's housewife because it is quite as important for the Members of this body to know what is going on in the grocery stores of America as in our munitions plants.

I now wish to report my findings, and have brought with me in this market basket, the results of my study.

Mr. Speaker, whether or not this Congress is making sound economic policies depends on whether the housewife is able to obtain what she needs in this basket without going into debt and mortgaging the economic future of her family.

Can the housewife today balance her own budget?

This is the major issue. It is not a partisan one.

Are all Republicans so rich that they can afford a 25-percent increase in the cost of living?

I do not believe it.

Are all Republican tenants so rich they can afford to have their rent doubled?

I do not believe it.

Do all Republicans approve of pursuing reckless economic policies which invite economic collapse?

I do not believe it.

Economic collapse would cost us the confidence of people all over the world in our system of free enterprise. Do all Republicans dare that risk in this hour?

I do not believe it.

The Russians have predicted economic collapse for the United States, and are banking on such a development. But if there were no people in Russia tomorrow, communism would still be a challenge to democracy and would still seek its gains among the ruins of economic collapse.

Are all Republicans unaware of this?

I do not believe it.

Surely, all clear-thinking people are aware that economic collapse would mean that we could no longer give leadership to other nations in their struggle for freedom.

A sound and stable American economy is essential if we ourselves are not to promote the spread of communism and if we are to maintain and preserve free democratic processes in the world.

A year ago I made a similar report to this House on the status of the American housewife's grocery basket.

I come again today with the same basket but with different price marks. The reason why the price of this basket of groceries is greater than it was a year ago is the business of this House.

It would be easy to speak at great length about the Republican opposition in the House to price control—about the reasons why the cost of living has risen; why the budgets of most housewives in the United States are out of balance. But the world situation today is so acute and the problem of inflation is so much a part of the chance for world peace that partisan politics has no more place in our discussion of this critical issue than it would in answering a four-alarm fire.

In view of the facts that I have in this basket and of our common knowledge of what the world will lose if this Congress adjourns without having reenacted the control measures necessary to halt inflation here and around the world, I plead, Mr. Speaker, for the statesmanship that is needed.

I plead that the majority forget that we have a Republican Congress and a Democratic President who has asked for the reenactment of measures necessary to secure a stable economy.

I plead that we face the economic facts in this basket with an open mind.

PRICES IN THE "BETTER TOMORROW"

Mr. Speaker, a little over a year ago I reported to the House on what had happened to the cost of living in the first year of decontrol when we were asked to let prices seek their natural level in the open market. Remember the decontrol that the NAM promised would bring goods for everybody at prices they could afford to pay and a better tomorrow?

I reported on the NAM's "better tomorrow" last year and found it far short of the promises made. We were told then that the NAM "tomorrow" had not had enough time to dawn. Well, now we have given them another year, and where are prices?

They have changed again, Mr. Speaker, and again for the worse. The enemies of price control and rent control in June 1946, and ever since—even in the face of the steadily mounting cost of living—must in the name of common sense reconsider their opposition.

As the elections draw closer, prudence should dictate the protection of all the people, regardless of the pressures from the special interests.

The sudden action on Capitol Hill—on the north slope—in the field of housing may be a good omen. I pray that it is—for the people's sake—for they must have relief.

The market basket of groceries that I brought onto the floor of the House last year contained essential items in the everyday life of our people. Today I bring the same evidences of economic facts with which every housewife in America is daily confronted—bread, milk, flour, eggs, fats, meat, soap.

These items were again purchased in the shadow of the Capitol—at the lowest-priced chain store in Washington.

I reported last year that in the 9 months between June 1946, when price control was done to death, and March 1947, the prices of these basic items had increased 50 percent. After 9 months of NAM-sponsored decontrol the housewife had to pay $15 for the same amount of food she could get for $10 under OPA.

Let us see what another year of the NAM's "better tomorrow" has brought. The same items I used as exhibit A last year in the same lowest-priced grocery store I find now—April 26, 1948—cost $16.23 instead of the $15.02 of a year ago, and the $10.08 of predecontrol 1946. And this despite the headlined temporary price dip in some foods in February of this year.

Mr. Speaker, for the convenience of the Members I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD the comparative price table for 19 specific grocery commodities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Food prices since OPA

Commodity	OPA [1]	Last year [2]	Today [3]		
			Lowest-priced store	Medium-priced store	De luxe store
10 pounds of flour (Pillsbury)	[4] $0.78	$0.87	$0.89	$0.89	$0.95
1 pound of butter (Land O'Lakes)	.65	.82	.93	.99	.93
2 quarts Lucerne milk	[4] .29	.34	.38	.40	.40
1 dozen eggs (cream crop)	.53	.69	.65	.69	.73
2 pounds of Sunsweet dried prunes	.32	.54	.38	.50	.54
3 pounds of round steak	1.35	2.07	2.76	2.94	2.67
2 pounds of pork chops	.76	1.46	1.66	1.58	1.80
1 pound of Swift Premium bacon	.42	.79	.75	.77	.85
3 pounds of Crisco	.68	1.27	1.23	1.35	1.25
1 quart Wesson oil	.58	.90	.90	.98	.95
2 pounds Maxwell House coffee	.66	.98	1.06	1.20	1.14
1 pound of sausage (pork links)	[4] .45	.49	.59	.69	.89
2 pounds of stew beef (boneless)	[4] .70	1.18	1.46	1.58	1.38
3 cans of string beans (Briar cut)	.39	.60	.57	.57	.78
3 cans of peas (Sugarbelle)	.45	.55	.59	.38	.84
2 loaves of Wrights bread	[4] .22	.20	.24	.28	.28
1 pound of Sunnybank margarine	.18	.43	.40	.47	.45
2 pounds of soda crackers	[4] .42	.50	.52	.54	.58
1½ pounds of Oxydol soap chips	[4] .25	.34	.36	.37	.39
Total	10.08	15.02	16.23	17.17	17.80

[1] OPA or BLS prices, June 1946, of selected commodities in lowest-priced stores in Washington.
[2] Prices, Mar. 12, 1947, of same brands in same store, 9 months after end of OPA.
[3] Prices, Apr. 26, 1948, for same or similar commodities, 22 months after end of OPA.
[4] BLS prices.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. These are the items in the housewife's basket that I priced a year ago and priced again yesterday. I want to just show you here what the difference is.

Here was a pound of butter. Under OPA it cost you 65 cents. Last year it cost you 82 cents, and it cost 93 cents today in the lowest-priced store in Washington.

Two quarts of Lucerne milk cost 29 cents under OPA, 34 cents last year, and 38 cents today.

A dozen eggs cost 53 cents under OPA, 69 cents last year, and 65 cents today. That is a seasonal drop, Mr. Speaker.

Three pounds of round steak cost $1.35 under OPA, $2.07 last year, and $2.76 today.

Two pounds of Maxwell House coffee cost 60 cents under OPA, 98 cents last year, and $1.06 today in the cheapest-priced store in Washington.

Two loaves of Wrights bread cost 22 cents under OPA, 20 cents last year and 24 cents this year.

Margarine. We have been talking a lot about it today. Everybody thinks they have done so much for the housewife in passing this bill. I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that we have done practically nothing for the housewife. If the Members think they have changed the facts represented in this basket, they are greatly mistaken. If the effort put forth to pass the margarine bill was expended as a sop to the housewife, the Members have another guess coming.

Well, let us take margarine, the cheapest margarine. There are different grades of margarine you know. The cheapest grade of margarine cost 18 cents under OPA, and 40 cents today in the cheapest priced store.

But suppose a housewife does not live near one of the cheapest priced stores? With the shortage of housing a family lives wherever they can find a roof. If you live near a high-priced store, if you are buying flour, then maybe you do not pay 89 cents for 10 pounds of flour, you pay 95 cents. Maybe you do not pay $2.76 for 3 pounds of round steak, but you pay $2.94; and so it goes.

Mr. Speaker, I hope I can have this chart set up outside for the convenience of the Members, so that they can study these figures next week.

The increase in these basic household food items which every housewife must have, is now not 50 percent as it was a year ago, but 61 percent over the prices charged when price control was killed—an increase of 11 percent in the last year.

In no case, despite all the promises of the opponents of price control, is the price of any of these basic articles lower than the June 1946 prices. In all cases, prices have gone up tremendously—in some cases, over 200 percent since 1946.

This list does not contain luxuries, but the essential items in every family's grocery budget—bread, milk, flour, eggs, fats, soap, and meat—and I mean so-called cheap cuts of meat.

I am talking about ground round steak—hamburger; sausage—greasy; and pork chops—mostly fat. I am not talking about lamb chops, steak, roast beef, and leg of lamb.

These typical American dishes are today prohibitive for most American families.

Remember that the Bureau of the Census showed that in 1946 two out of every three nonfarm families had total family incomes of less than $3,500 a year, and two out of every five less than $2,500 a year.

Round steak at 92 cents a pound, lamb chops at 98 cents a pound, roast beef at 85 cents a pound, leg of lamb at almost $5 a leg are not on the grocery list of these American families.

Under OPA our economy permitted the average family to buy chicken on Sunday and roast beef on Thursday. The low income family had as much opportunity to buy the better cuts of meat as the high income family. As a matter of fact, more opportunity, because they generally have more children and therefore had more points.

During the war, whether or not the housewife could buy beef depended upon how she apportioned her points. Now it depends upon whether or not she has enough money—and she has not.

THE FEBRUARY DROP WAS A DROP IN THE BUCKET

In mid-February, after the so-called drop, food prices were still 12 percent above February of a year ago. I think that my analysis of comparative food prices which was made on April 26 shows clearly that the much acclaimed drop has evaporated from the poor parched consumer's bucket.

For instance, let us take the much heralded drop in butter. It went from 99 cents to 87 cents—still 20 cents higher than under price control in April 1946, and still 5 cents higher than when I spoke to you last year.

But even this respite was short lived. The price of butter climbed right back up. It is today 93 cents a pound.

This means that for the majority of the families of America butter is prohibitive.

Round steak, in the temporary sag, dropped from 85 cents to 69 cents, but today has already shot past its high mark to 92 cents a pound, and the price is still going up.

Not only did the drop not amount to anything for the grocery basket but the Council of Economic Advisers to the President tells us that all other items in the housewife's budget rose.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point a comparison of changes in consumers' price index from January 15, 1947, to January 15, 1948, and from March 15, 1947, to March 15, 1948.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. This tabulation is as follows:

[1935-39=100]

	Jan. 15, 1947	Jan. 15, 1948	Mar. 15, 1947	Mar. 15, 1948
Food	183.8	209.7	189.5	202.3
Clothing	179.0	192.1	184.3	196.3
Rent	108.8	115.9	109.0	116.3
Fuel, etc.	117.3	129.5	117.6	130.3
All items	153.3	168.8	156.3	166.9

The much-advertised dip, therefore, amounted to only 1 percent of the total Consumers' Price Index and I have already shown that this 1 percent has since largely disappeared.

I have been told by one grocer in a medium-priced store that temporary drops in some items mean nothing. He said, "Don't be fooled, lady, by these little price drops here and there. In the over-all picture of the grocery business, prices have gone right along and are continuing to go up. I know, because people are buying less. We haven't seen the end of it yet, either. Every invoice has higher prices than the last one."

Yesterday in the grocery store when I went shopping a woman came in and said, "What are you doing, advertising this store?" I said, "No; I am from the Hill. I am trying to persuade the Members of Congress to do something about prices." She said, "Oh, that's hopeless. They won't do anything about prices. Just tell them for me that we are having to eat less."

Mr. Speaker, the February thaw in prices was only a warm spell in the middle of a freezing winter. It was a big help to those who have been telling us for nearly 2 years that prices will soon come down.

But for the housewife it was not worth two thin pennies out of a dollar bill. It was big news in the headlines, but you cannot eat headlines.

Mr. Speaker, last year I did not report on two large areas of food expenditures for most families—baby foods, and fruits and vegetables.

PRICES FOR BABY FOODS

Three and one-half million babies were born in 1946 and four million in 1947—that is one million more babies born than in any year before 1946. We all know that, despite the difficulties of housing, veterans are still getting married and having children.

The Nation's requirement for baby food today is therefore over 30 percent greater than it was when price control was killed. And last week all baby foods—canned milk, canned foods, Pablum—the things for which one cannot make substitutions—had gone up, in some cases, almost 50 percent in the last 22 months.

In the cheapest priced store in Washington canned milk that used to be 9 cents is now 15 cents; canned baby vegetables that used to be three for 20 cents are now three for 29 cents—when they are on special sale; Pablum that used to be 15 cents is now at least 21 cents, sometimes higher. Ivory soap, a very necessary part of a baby's equipment, that used to sell for 9 or 10 cents a cake, now sells for 18 cents.

Mr. Speaker, behind these price increases in baby foods is the serious threat of malnutrition for a whole generation of our children. In terms of our national welfare we cannot afford these high prices.

FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

Fruits and vegetables take a large part of the family food budget. A few examples will show how desperate the situation is growing for the manager of the family budget.

Ordinary potatoes, the poor man's staple, now sell for 6 cents a pound. Under OPA they were approximately 4 cents a pound.

Under OPA, onions were about 5 cents per pound. A year ago they were even as low as 3 pounds for 10 cents. Last week they were 23 cents a pound.

Bananas were 11 cents a pound under OPA. Now bananas are anywhere from 15 to 20 cents a pound. Yes, we have no bananas for the average child.

Even in California where so much of the fruits and vegetables are grown, many families have given up eating the fresh varieties, because 35 cents for a bunch of celery and 10 cents for a single lemon are just too much.

The fact that decent cuts of meat have been priced out of the housewife's basket does not begin to tell the whole story, Mr. Speaker. Fruits and vegetables are being priced out, too. This last year wholesale prices of fruits and vegetables (both canned and fresh) have gone up even faster than meats. Wholesale prices of fruits and vegetables have gone up almost twice as fast as meat prices in the past year. Since Congress killed price control, fruits and vegetables in the corner grocery have gone up 16 percent.

THE WHOLE COST OF LIVING

Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out before, food prices are not the only source of increases in the cost of living. I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD a very illuminating table that appeared in the March 6, 1948, issue of Business Week under an article entitled "What's Happening to the Cost of Living?"

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

What's happening to the cost of living

[1935-39=100]

	Food	Clothing	Rent	Gas and electricity	Other fuels and ice	House furnishings	Miscellaneous	Total cost of living
August 1939	93.5	100.3	104.3	99.0	96.3	100.6	100.4	98.6
January 1941	97.8	100.7	105.0	97.4	104.2	101.1	101.9	100.8
January 1942	116.2	116.1	108.4	96.7	111.8	118.2	108.5	112.0
January 1943	133.0	126.0	108.0	96.8	117.5	123.8	113.2	120.7
January 1944	136.1	134.7	108.1	96.0	122.7	128.3	118.4	124.2
January 1945	137.3	143.0	108.3	95.5	123.6	146.6	123.3	127.1
January 1946	141.0	149.7	108.3	93.8	127.2	148.8	125.4	129.9
January 1947	183.8	179.0	108.8	91.9	132.1	179.1	137.1	153.3
February	182.3	181.5	108.9	92.2	142.3	180.8	137.4	153.2
March	189.5	184.3	109.0	92.2	142.5	182.3	138.2	156.3
April	188.0	184.9	109.0	92.5	143.8	182.5	139.2	156.2
May	187.6	185.0	109.2	92.4	142.4	181.9	139.0	156.0
June	190.5	185.7	109.2	91.7	143.0	182.6	139.1	157.1
July	193.1	184.7	110.0	91.7	146.6	184.3	139.5	158.4
August	196.5	185.9	111.2	92.0	154.8	184.2	139.8	160.3
September	203.5	187.6	113.6	92.1	156.3	187.5	140.8	163.8
October	201.6	189.0	114.9	92.2	157.4	187.8	141.8	163.8
November	202.7	190.2	115.2	92.5	160.5	188.9	143.0	164.9
December	206.9	191.2	115.4	92.6	162.0	191.4	144.4	167.0
January 1948	209.7	192.1	115.9	93.1	165.6	192.3	146.4	168.8

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. What about the rise in the price of clothing which is disgraceful? What about coal and fuel oil and kerosene that is the only thing that the poor people can get and pay for to heat their homes during the winter months? Those are some additional things that have gone up in price as a result of the unjustifiable removal of price controls while the emergency is still on which, during the last 2 years has cost the American consuming public $50,000,000,000.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The gentleman from Massachusetts is, as usual, correct in his statement.

Clothing, in January 1946, according to the consumer price index in the table which I have just included in the RECORD, stood at 149.7. In January 1948 it stood at 192.1.

Would the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts like to have the price index on fuels? On January 1946 they stood at 127.2. In January 1948 they stood at 165.6. And so it goes. The table is in the RECORD for the Members to study.

These figures of Business Week show in carefully prepared statistics what every housewife knows—that the cost of living had reached a record high in January 1948.

When you get through with all the talk in the headlines about price dips, you find that the total cost for food, clothing, rent, fuel, and all the other necessities was still over 25 percent higher than in 1946 when Congress killed price controls. You have to have $5 in your pocketbook to buy what $4 bought in June of the year before last.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have here today some advertisements showing what food was in 1939, what it was under OPA and what it is now in 1948.

Let us take one item from these charts. I am going to have them put up outside if I may, so that the Members may study them.

Let us take a leg of lamb, which is not included in my budget because the price is prohibitive. A good grade of lamb was 21 cents a pound in 1939. In 1946, under OPA—7 years later—of which 5 years were war years, lamb was selling for 39 cents a pound—a rise of only 18 cents. But thanks to OPA it was held there all through those years. But remember the 18-cent rise occurred mostly before OPA was enacted. That was the reason for OPA—Congress saw prices getting out of line. We ought to have sense enough now when we see prices going through the ceiling to do something about it.

The same thing that is true of a leg of lamb is true of most everything else—rib lamb chops, bacon, roast beef—anything you want to mention.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I go from the staff of life to the backbone of our economy—from bread to steel.

STEEL PRICES AND PROFITS

Last week, Mr. Speaker, we witnessed another amazing attempt to give the people headlines instead of help. The United States Steel Corp. announced a price reduction. It was the headline of the day. In my opinion, it was the headline to end all headlines.

United States Steel said it will reduce its prices in May by $25,000,000 annually. That sounds like big money. But the United Steelworkers round out the story when they tell us that, since November 1946—just 17 months ago—United States Steel has raised its prices by a total of $340,000,000 annually.

You see, Mr. Speaker, that still leaves the Nation paying to the giant steel corporation $315,000,000 more for a year's output than it paid before Congress killed price control.

As a matter of fact, the price reduction announced by United States Steel amounts to about 1¼ percent on its annual sales of over $2,000,000,000. The reduction which it now promises to give us is $3,000,000 smaller than the price gouge of $28,000,000 it imposed on us just a few weeks ago.

It could not be, could it, Mr. Speaker, that the steel corporation was engaged in collective bargaining when it hatched these headlines about a price reduction?

It could not be, could it, Mr. Speaker, that when the steel corporation has achieved its purpose in collective bargaining it will reverse the price reductions which it promises to make next month? What I mean, Mr. Speaker, is, Will it love us in September as it loves us in May?

If we in this country have not the courage and the common sense to fight inflation with what it takes, at least let us not go "headline happy." The corporation's workers cannot trade these headlines for cash. Their wives cannot use these headlines to pay grocery bills or buy clothes for the kids, or pay the landlord. The NAM and their fellow travelers are getting us nowhere fast, except to the poorhouse, with money piling up in fewer and fewer hands.

Mr. Speaker, remember the NAM promised us, "If we could just get rid of price control, we would get the goods we want at prices we could afford to pay."

Mr. Speaker, maybe the Members of Congress can afford to pay over 25 percent more to live in the over-all picture and 41 percent more for food than they did 2 years ago. We got a wage adjustment after a brief negotiation between ourselves and our consciences.

THE ROAD TO RELIEF

But what about the head of a family who does not have enough dollars to meet the gap? What then? I shall tell you what happens and what is happening to him:

First. His buying power shrinks.

Second. He draws on his savings, cashing his war bonds.

Third. He goes into debt, putting a mortgage on his family's future income, because his present income is not enough to meet his family's day-to-day needs.

Fourth. The last ugly turn in the road brings him to relief.

Are we reaching that turn in the road, Mr. Speaker? Let us spell it out and see.

BUYING POWER

Personal incomes in this country, after taxes, in late 1947 were running around $184,000,000,000 a year. This huge sum was $30,000,000,000 greater than the spendable income people had in the second quarter of 1946, before price control was killed off.

But it was not greater in purchasing power. It was smaller. The 25-percent rise in the cost of living since June 1946 changed that $30,000,000,000 increase in personal incomes into a $7,000,000,000 drop in buying power.

THE DEVALUATION OF THE DOLLAR

And here I hope to have the undivided attention of the Members of the majority party, which has always boasted of being an advocate of sound money ever since McKinley defeated William Jennings Bryan.

A dollar today is not the same dollar it was yesterday. Who knows what it will be tomorrow?

The value of the dollar—in terms of 1935–39, equals 100—decreased 14 percent measured by wholesale prices, 8 percent measured by consumers' prices, 10 percent as measured by retail food prices, and at least 13 percent when measured by prices received by the farmer.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point a table showing what has happened to the purchasing power of the dollar since the death of OPA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

(The table referred to follows:)

Purchasing power of the dollar

[1935-39=100]

	December 1946	December 1947	Percentage decrease
Wholesale prices	57.1	49.3	14
Consumers' prices	65.2	59.9	8
Retail food prices	53.7	48.3	10
Prices received by farmers	40.3	35.3	13

Source: Survey of Current Business, annual review number, February, 1948, p. S-5. U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Domestic Commerce.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. And on the question of publicity, we pick up newspapers and if somebody commits a murder we see headlines, but there will be very few headlines featuring the great speech the gentlewoman from California is now making unless I am sadly mistaken.

It is amazing to me that the press of this country—and I say this impersonally but nonetheless firmly—are not through their pages and the radio leading a crusade in the interest of the consumer, demanding that Congress do something before this session is over.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his contribution. He is a champion of the people.

THE PEOPLE'S SAVINGS

As the people's buying power dropped, their savings shrank. While their spendable incomes in dollars were rising, and the buying power of their incomes was falling, the amount which people could save dropped sharply. Personal savings in 1947 were 33 percent smaller than in 1946.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point a table showing what happened to people's savings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Consumer expenditures and savings—disposable personal income (after taxes)

[Billions of dollars]

	1946	Percent	1947	Percent
Disposable personal income	158.4	100.0	175.3	100.0
Personal consumer expenditures	143.7	90.7	164.4	93.8
Personal savings	14.7	9.3	10.9	6.2

Consumer expenditures increased from 90.7 percent to 93.8 percent.

Personal savings decreased from 9.3 percent to 6.2 percent.

Sources: 1946 figures from National Income, supplement to Survey of Current Business, July 1947, p. 19. 1947 figures from Survey of Current Business, annual review number, February 1948, p. 10. U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. This little table with only three lines, Mr. President, is a signpost that points the way to doom, depression, and collapse.

Many people have not been able to save at all. They are going into debt. Consumers of the United States have now put themselves into hock to banks, stores, and loan companies for a total of $13,000,000,000. This breaks the previous high-water mark of 1946 by $3,000,000,000. It is almost double the crushing burden of debt which in 1929 pulled the plug on the purchasing power of the people and toppled us into depression.

At the rate we are going, in 2 more years we will all be in hock. The continuous large increase in consumer debt which has been made necessary by uncontrolled inflation in itself is a weakness which sooner or later will be one of the basic factors in bringing on a depression.

I ask again, Mr. Speaker, are we about to take that last ugly turn in the road? Have we, in fact, already turned it?

In the midst of the glowing accounts of prosperity which we hear it may seem in bad taste, indelicate, of me to speak of relief. I am sorry if that is so, but I cannot refrain from telling you that from December 1946 to December 1947 the amount spent for public assistance increased 16 percent. In the last month of 1946 the cost of public assistance was $114,000,000. In December 1947 its cost was $132,000,000. This is at the rate of over a billion and a half a year.

"Over the hill to the poorhouse" with the NAM and the GOP.

Is this the slogan the Republicans want to be labeled with for the next 20 years? I do not think so.

This is the picture of what has happened to the American people, their incomes, and their savings since Congress killed price control. Inflation has cut the buying power of their income and forced them further and further into debt.

WAGES AND PROFITS

This, if you please, Mr. Speaker, has happened in spite of the fact that labor was forced by circumstances to fight for and win two rounds of wage increases. In spite of their wage increases, the American workers' families have less real money to spend than they had before.

Oh, I know, Mr. Speaker, the NAM tells us that labor brought this upon itself. It tells us that wages caused these higher prices. I have heard—we have all heard—over and over again the story of the spiral which makes labor the guilty party.

Let me call your attention to the fact that on top of the increased wages which the corporations have paid to their workers they have added a very great increase in profits for themselves.

In the latter part of 1946, following the first round wage increase, profits of all corporations were running over seven billions, after taxes, larger than in 1945. In other words, after paying more in wages, corporations added to their prices enough to come out with an annual rate of sixteen billion profits, after taxes, for themselves compared with nine billions in 1945.

This was repeated with the second round of wage increases of 1947. Again the corporations soaked the consumers and came out with another $2,000,000,000 addition to their profits, after taxes, for a total of $18,000,000,000 at the end of 1947.

Nineteen hundred and forty-five profits were $9,000,000,000. Nineteen hundred and forty-six profits were $16,000,000,000, and in 1947 profits were $18,000,000,000, after taxes.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. That seems to be an ironic answer that has been given the President in his plea for a voluntary, sensible adjustment of prices downward, does it not?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. It certainly does.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Could the gentlewoman tell us something about the efforts that were made to hold the line on prices in the Republican-sponsored bill which was passed last December and which it was promised would do something?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I refer to that a little later. It has not accomplished any-

thing, as the gentleman can see from prices of the food in the housewife's basket.

Between the wages which corporations pay their workers and the prices which they make us consumers pay are the profits which they keep for themselves. On each of these two occasions they made the wage increase very profitable to themselves. In fact, they made a substantial profit on every dollar workers won from them in higher wages.

In fact, corporations are now earning 90 percent more after taxes than in the banner year of 1945—the last year of the war. Meanwhile, inflation has reduced the standard of living of wage earners by roughly 20 percent. The weekly wage of the average factory worker today is $52.51. To regain 1945 living standards, this weekly wage would have to be $62.41. Some businessmen—angered by the restrictions of OPA—called it un-American. They prefer to ration the poor through higher prices. Families are having to make drastic cuts in their standard of living to make ends meet.

RENTS

During the past year the ordinary consumer has also had the burden of meeting the Republican rent increases. After the passage of the infamous Republican Rent Decontrol Act of 1947, rents increased in the first 4 months five times more than they did all through the five difficult war years of price control from 1942 to 1947.

And what did the Eightieth Congress do this year in the face of this appalling fact, Mr. Speaker? It smugly passed another decontrol bill—the Republican Housing and Rent Act of 1948, which threatens the consumer with further inroads on his rent dollar.

Thus the Eightieth Congress made another of its many contributions to inflation and to the free enterprise of the real-estate lobby.

There has been a lot of talk, Mr. Speaker, among some sections of the business world about consumer resistance, what to do about it, how to break it down and thus begin a more rapid flow of goods.

Let us take this phrase of consumer resistance out of the gobbledegook of the false friends of private enterprise.

Consumer resistance means nothing more than no money to buy anything but the bare essentials. Consumer resistance is not voluntary. It is involuntary. He has no choice.

It is not, Mr. Speaker, a matter of consumer resistance, but of his dollar's nonexistence.

That is not hard to understand, is it? Perhaps, it will be clearer in November.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to save democracy and free enterprise here at home, and win the peace, we have to begin to look at the total picture and the needs of all the people.

To this end I have sought to give you figures on the effects of the current inflation on the wages of the factory worker, on prices of food and other necessities of life, consumer savings, and the purchasing power of the dollar. Thus have I sketched the general background. It is not possible to take up in detail the effects of these conditions on each profession and occupation but I suggest that we look at two examples that are very close to home.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Federal employees, for whose salaries we are directly responsible, have been particularly squeezed in the wringer of inflation. In addition to being abused from early morning to late at night, spied on, smeared, terrified, and belittled, they have not enough to live on. Despite slight increases in their basic wage scale in 1945 and 1946, given them in the last Congress, their salaries buy less now than they did in 1946. Even after the last general salary increase in July 1946, 60 percent of all Federal workers still received less than $2,600 a year, and many of them less than $2,000—which is $1,200 less than the minimum budget of a family of four. This budget is based on the BLS study, which is lower than the Heller budget of the University of California.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The welfare of those receiving social-security benefits is also directly up to us.

Inflation strikes most brutally those families who are already at the marginal subsistence levels. We have come to regard the social-security benefits payable to workers and their dependents covered by old-age and survivors insurance as a bulwark against economic disaster. Yet the maximum primary insurance benefit today for a retired worker over 65 is $46 a month.

The average benefit for a retired male worker alone is around $25 a month. A widow of an employee covered by social security with several children can today receive no more than $85 a month. The average for a widow and two children is less than $50 a month. These benefit scales were fixed in 1939. Living costs have risen well over 60 percent since then. What mockery social security must be to the pitiful recipients of these pittances. Yet every day increasing NAM high prices take away another slice of bread from these hungry mouths.

I have a letter from an elderly lady which I ask to include in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker. It is a heartbreaking letter on how she fares on her $60 a month in California. Of course $60 a month in California is higher than most old-age people receive in many parts of the country. She is forced to spend $30 for rent and then with the rest of her money she tries to eke out her existence. If she is sick she is out of luck, because she has not the money for a doctor. I ask to include that as part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD AGREES

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, the facts and figures I have given you show us clearly where we are headed. A very interesting independent survey of the current financial position and plans of consumers, made for the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board in July 1947 by the University of Michigan shows that the people are already aware of these facts and figures. The conclusions of that survey were published in the Federal Reserve Bulletin for October 1947 and are in its usual objective style.

You will see, Mr Speaker, from these excerpts the reason for consumer resistance.

Mainly because of the rise in the cost of living, the proportion of spending units—

Spending units, Mr. Speaker, are people—

that felt they were worse off financially than a year ago was larger in July than earlier in the year.

That is what the facts and figures I have presented should also make clear to this House.

In other words, the people felt they were worse off now than they were a year ago. There is no use in trying to kid the people. No amount of campaign oratory will convince them that they are better off than they were a year ago.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. On the question of kidding or being fooled, the people were fooled in 1946 by the National Association of Manufacturers, and the Republican Party, with the exception of a few progressives that exist in that party, by the appeal that if they got rid of the OPA, within 60 days there would be plenty of meat and plenty of everything else at lower prices than under OPA. Now, the people were fooled in 1946. The promises have not been kept, and it is costing the American consumers, as I said, $50,000,000,000 more than it would have cost if OPA price ceilings were continued or if the authority in law had been continued for effective price control. The people are not to blame for being fooled in 1946, because they believed the promises that were made, but the same thing is going on now. They are trying to fool the people again, in 1948, because there is another election. If the people are fooled a second time, then they are to blame themselves. It is a pitiful thing to see what this tragic deception upon the people in 1946 has brought about. Although I have my doubts, I hope the people in 1948 will have learned their lesson and not be fooled again.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his contribution.

The Federal Reserve Board goes on in its report to say:

These spending units—

People, Mr. Speaker—

which were most numerous in the lower income groups, were somewhat less optimistic than others were about future economic developments.

That means, Mr. Speaker, the American people have little confidence that this Congress will do anything to help them.

Responses to questions concerning current expenditures indicated that rising prices in relation to incomes were compelling many spending units—

And remember these are people, Mr. Speaker—

to make important adjustments in personal and family budgets.

The Federal Reserve Board study thus tells us that the low-income groups are going broke and going into debt and, what is more, that they do not have any confidence that Congress is going to do anything about it. This means, if I may be pardoned for pointing to the farm Members of the House, Mr. Speaker, that people are being forced to curtail their purchases of food and fiber—the products of American farms.

Data from a recent survey show a significant shift since the beginning of the year in consumers' price expectations. At the end of July 1947 approximately one-third of all spending units—

People, Mr. Speaker—

expected higher prices in the next 12 months as compared to about one-tenth of all spending units—

Again people, Mr. Speaker—

in the first quarter of the year.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, people have given up hope that they can expect any relief from the Eightieth Congress.

During the first 7 months of 1947, as in 1946, sizable numbers of spending units—

And once again I remind you that these are people, Mr. Speaker—

reported net withdrawals from their liquid asset holdings; i. e., United States Government securities and checking and savings accounts in banks. * * * The primary purpose for which liquid assets were withdrawn was again to meet general living expenses, particularly in the case of spending units—

Remember? People, Mr. Speaker—

in lower income groups.

Taking it out of Federal Reserve, Mr. Speaker, and putting it in plain American, people are eating up their savings and going broke.

We are willing to appropriate billions of dollars to stop communism elsewhere, but we do nothing to stop the conditions which will breed it here. There is apparently no willingness to stop the rising cost of living and bring it down to the point where $1 will buy 100 cents worth of consumers' goods, and not 60 cents worth, as it does now.

Family life will face a crisis if this disastrous inflation continues. Anxiety and strain over the problem of how to make ends meet; over where to find a place to live, with houses being sold from under renters who cannot afford to pay the exorbitant prices asked; over illness unattended because doctors cannot be paid, cannot be safely overlooked. It is this kind of strain that drives people to all sorts of panaceas, including communism.

The first line of defense in a democracy is a people well-fed, well-housed, and well-clothed.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, I placed my market basket and its problems squarely in the lap of the Republican Party where it belonged, but the record of the past year has proved that the American housewife's market basket has not fared well there.

Not only has the majority failed to forward any measure of its own to combat inflation, but it has placed measure after measure proposed by the President or introduced by Members of this body in the dungeons of its committees where they never see the light of day.

I, myself, have sought, time after time, to present measures that would aid in the fight against inflation. Among these are:

H. R. 1750—1947—a bill to continue a sound rent-control program.

House Resolution 236—1947—a resolution to discharge from its committee dungeon the long-range housing bill.

H. R. 4726—1948—the only noninflationary tax bill to provide a democratic cost-of-living credit straight across the board for every Federal taxpayer compensated by the reimposition of the excess-profits tax.

H. R. 5823—1948—a bill to continue a sound rent-control program.

WE NEED A COMPREHENSIVE ATTACK ON INFLATION

To date I have not introduced a price-control bill believing that such a bill should and would come in face of steadily mounting prices from the majority side of the House.

What has the Republican leadership in this Congress done to protect the housewife's budget?

It presented and passed in the Congress three programs.

First. Hatched up and passed in the special session a voluntary allocation bill. I am not going to waste any time on that. The Democrats were never for it and the Republicans have probably forgotten about it. If they have not, everybody else has. Indeed, no one ever took it seriously in the first place.

Second. Passed a second rent bill to further decontrol rents and therefore increase the cost of living.

Third. Passed a tax bill which provided an increase in the take-home pay, after taxes, for those with an income of $3,000 of 3.2 percent; for those with an income of $25,000 an increase of 18.5 percent; for those with an income of $250,000 an increase of 58.4 percent. It was a tax bill that in every respect was inflationary.

Mr. Speaker, excuses, party slogans, trumped-up charges, whipping boys, accusations are not going to be accepted by the housewives of America, whether they be Democratic or Republican. They want action.

It is late—yes, but it will never be earlier.

The housewife cannot feed her family on speeches and declarations of Americanism. She knows that this Congress has done nothing to protect her budget. She knows that this Congress has done nothing to halt rising prices. Every day she is reminded of this fact when she pays the grocery clerk for the food in her basket.

Congress must get at the root of the problem. I am therefore introducing this afternoon an anti-inflation, price-control, and allocation measure. It has already been introduced on the other side of the Capitol and is the only bill which has been introduced to date which faces squarely the facts as represented in this basket. It provides an answer to the lessons we have learned from the market basket.

I warn this Congress that it had better pay attention to these lessons. The market basket is a yardstick of the effectiveness of the economic measure we take in this Congress. There is an atomic bomb in this basket, which if allowed to go off can lose for us the peace man must have.

I say again, take heed of the recent warnings of President Truman, his Council of Economic Advisors and Marriner Eccles of the new waves of inflation that this basket will soon reflect. If we are going to avoid another and final spiral that will throw us into economic collapse, some measure such as this proposal that I now introduce must be passed before we adjourn for the conventions.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. There ought to be a political atom bomb in that basket so that the people would recognize what in plain language, was pulled off on them in 1946 so that in 1948 they will return to the Congress a progressive party with progressive leadership which can only be done by electing the Democratic Party.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The bill I am introducing would provide an immediate price freeze at the January level of this year. It covers everything.

Luxury items and those items not in short supply can be taken out from under price control as the situation warrants.

It would go behind present prices and break some of the production bottlenecks which result in shortages and higher prices.

THE NEED FOR ALLOCATION POWERS

It would provide an orderly system of allocation of scarce materials so that the productive machinery of the United States can get out of its present tangle in which basic industries are unable fully to produce for lack of necessary materials.

It would provide for the allocating of steel, aluminum, lead, copper, and other vital materials just as we today control the use of tin, in order to insure maximum production where it counts. We must expand our basic industries. We must produce more, as well as hold down the prices of the things we produce if we are to lick inflation.

Our current fuel shortage, which is the most serious threat to our production, is due primarily to the lack of equipment for oil and gas wells, the lack of transportation facilities, such as pipe-line pipe and hopper cars, and the lack of power-generating equipment. These shortages are threatening all of our basic industries and our European recovery program.

The vital fuel bottleneck cannot be broken unless steel is available for these purposes. We have been told this clearly, again and again, in connection with the hearings on the European recovery program. The Krug, Nourse, and Harriman reports clearly indicated that the

allocation of steel would be needed. And in the special session the President himself made it clear that these powers to allocate scarce materials must be available if we are to maintain our own production and to provide the goods needed abroad.

The West has a power shortage which cannot be broken unless steel is available for generators and turbines.

Detroit has a natural-gas shortage. Its plants were shut down last winter for over 2 weeks and 200,000 people were thrown out of work. This will happen next winter and the winter after that unless pipe made of steel is available to bring fuel to these plants.

We must assure our industry the materials it needs to maintain a high level of production and employment. Allocation of materials is necessary if essential production abroad is to be assured.

CREDIT CONTROL AND STABILIZATION

The bill I am introducing will also place a necessary restraint on inflationary expansion of bank credit. These provisions are identical with the measures proposed by the Federal Reserve Board last November.

The bill also provides for an economic stabilization coordinator and an anti-inflationary advisory board with representatives of business management, labor, and agriculture serving on it.

PRICE ROLL-BACKS AND WAGES

This bill does not restore the balance between wages, prices, and profits which today are hopelessly out of line.

It does not provide a roll-back in prices.

This bill does not provide for freezing wages. These are still to be determined by collective bargaining.

I should like to say at this point that were Congress willing to roll back prices so as to restore the balance which existed between wages, prices, and profits in the middle of June 1946, before price controls were effectively terminated, I would support a provision for the control of wages as well as prices in this emergency.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If we are to judge the future by the past I seriously doubt that this Congress will take action on the legislation that the gentlewoman is introducing. We are hopeful, however, that the American people will send progressive Members to the new Congress who will help us to prevent ruinous and runaway inflation. If the people do that I think it will be the result largely of the courageous and able fight that Members like the gentlewoman from California have made in an attempt to keep the little people of America from being ruined by inflation.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I have been sitting in the gallery listening to the lady make her speech today. It is one of the finest speeches that has ever been delivered on this floor. It is well documented with facts which she has brought out and put into her speech from authoritative sources. Her speech is a challenge to the people who believe in laissez faire, the people who say, "Just turn the business interests of this country loose and they will furnish the people everything they want at cheaper prices." She has proved beyond question that that political and economic philosophy is fallacious. It is untrue. It is a cruel hoax on the people of America. I want to compliment the gentlewoman on the weeks of preparation which I know she has undergone to prepare this speech and to collect the facts and data which she has presented. I think it is a challenge to the Republican Party, and I would like to hear their most able Members answer the challenge which she has given them today, which proves beyond any doubt that they are responsible for the high cost of the articles which are necessary for human life, and for the inflation which is now enveloping our country and which is threatening our economic existence and which is a factor which will prevent us from arming and defending our country, because you cannot defend a country nor defend the health of the people of the country with inflation as we have it today.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I thank the gentleman from California. Instead of inviting the Republican leaders to answer this speech, I would much rather they acted to control inflation. I pray for open minds on this vital question on both sides of the aisle. Everyone is caught in this inflationary spiral. It is not partisan. I can see nothing but chaos and disaster if we pursue our present course.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think we all join the gentlewoman in the hope that there will be this open mind, but we also hope that the people of America will arouse themselves to a realization of what has been done to them, and that there will be an aroused public opinion that will be very influential in creating that open mind because, without that, I am afraid there is going to be a closed mind.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I agree with the gentleman. I am hoping that we will have a strong expression of public opinion on this matter so that we can in the months that remain between now and November do something to bring a balance between prices, profits, and wages.

Is it hopeless to introduce a price-control bill at this late date? Is it hopeless to expect that this Republican-led Congress will now take steps that they have steadfastly opposed?

Mr. Speaker, there are 6 months left before November. Are the Republicans in this Congress prepared to meet America's housewife at the polls, having left unsolved the economic problems represented in this basket?

Is the Republican housewife indifferent to the shortcomings of Congress as they are reflected in this basket?

I do not believe it.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress, in its farsightedness and understanding, has passed the ERP bill.

This Congress has just voted for an expanded Air Force.

Mr. Speaker, unless we initiate the necessary controls, our ERP program and our contemplated defense program, are going to increase our inflation until we go bust. In that process the people of America are going to be forced to accept a lower standard of living month by month and year by year. Is that what this Congress wants? I do not believe it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from California be permitted, with the consent of the others who have special orders, to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I have a special order, and so does the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], but I should like the gentlewoman to yield to me during these 10 minutes to ask her a question, and possibly also a question of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FOLGER. I do not intend to use my time tonight.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I do not need that much time. I have only one more thing to say. Then I will be glad to yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from California may proceed for 10 additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. I do not, of course, choose to ask a question or make any statement for our side, there being but two or three Republicans present, but the Republican Party has been directly assailed.

The gentlewoman has asked for open minds. As I say, I am not speaking for the leadership. There are just two or three of us here and we are not authorized to make any statement; but I may say to the gentlewoman that there is not any question but what there will be open minds. Let me, however, in all friendliness remind the gentlewoman that one can do anything with words. Words are dangerous. Even Holy Writ in the third chapter of James reminds us that we can control horses with just a little bit, that we can control a ship with just a little rope and rudder, but that the tongue of man no one can tame, especially when it may be motivated by emotionalism or it may be hate. I hope these unusual words are not applicable to the gentleman from Massachusetts, I know they are not to him and I do not believe they are to the gentlewoman from California; but the gentlewoman asks us for open minds.

Why ask us for open minds and assail us with barbed words?

The gentlewoman said: "Over the hill to the poorhouse with the NAM," or something like that; I do not remember. I do not know that I know what that means. "And the GOP." I know what that means, for I am a member of the GOP. I wish to remind the gentlewoman from California that Will Carleton, who wrote Over the Hill to the Poorhouse,

passed on long before Communists and world terrorists or even more than mild iconoclasts came on the scene. I regret that the gentlewoman makes this approach.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. May I interrupt to answer the gentleman at this point?

Mr. RAMEY. Certainly.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I said that I was sure—the gentleman remembers my speech?

Mr. RAMEY. That is right.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. That the Republican-led Congress at this moment would not want that label attached to them.

Mr. RAMEY. They are the gentlewoman's words, all right.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I said I am sure they would not want that label attached to them.

I think that was a fair statement.

We cannot get a price-control bill through this Congress unless the leadership, which happens to be Republican at the moment, sponsors such legislation, do you see?

Now, then, I am saying that if we have a depression then the responsibility for not having reimposed controls must of necessity be lodged at the door of Republican leadership because the Republicans are in the majority. A Democratic President has long since asked for controls. I am not trying to be partisan. In my opinion, the American people are in a desperate situation. I have tried to gage my whole speech in such a way as to free it from a partisan approach. But the gentleman is on the majority side.

Mr. RAMEY. We concede the gentlewoman's words were cunning.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. No; not cunning. I have been very forthright.

Mr. RAMEY. Nobody could debate with the gentlewoman on words.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I have great respect for the gentleman and I admire him for his support of many good measures in this Congress. But I am not spinning words—I am presenting basic economic facts. These prices speak for themselves. I am not opposing anything or anybody in the Congress. I am bringing the facts before you hoping that Congress will act. The gentleman is on the majority side. The Republicans are effective when they want to be and I have great admiration for their effectiveness. I ask them to step out now and be the people's champion, even if it means increasing the number of Members on the other side of the aisle after November.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is most unfortunate for the Republican Party and for the House that our friend from Ohio is not in leadership in his party because certainly no remarks I made, and I am sure this is true of the gentlewoman from California and her remarks, by the remotest inference would apply to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY]. The gentleman we all recognize is one who has an open mind not only on this subject but on other matters. He has a deep, fine, rich philosophy which addresses itself to all Members and commands their respect and attention. So far as the gentleman from Ohio is concerned, I know the gentlewoman from California as well as myself and my Democratic colleagues on the floor are exceedingly distressed that he has to defend the Republican Party because on this question he has long since recognized the weakness of his party and he has evidenced that by his votes.

So in connection with the observations we have made, we particularly exclude our friend from Ohio from any of them. I particularly exclude him. He comes among that small but very limited and courageous group of Republicans who have approached this question with an open mind and voted for the people's interest.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts. May I say one thing more to the gentleman from Ohio. I would like to remove the issue of inflation from partisan politics. I think something can be said on both sides of the aisle in connection with the final votes that were taken to kill OPA. However, the record shows that the Republican side of the House has been largely in opposition to price control from the beginning. But aside from all that, rising prices are going to blow us high, wide, and handsome unless we do something to check them. People want action—not recriminations. The Republicans have the majority. It is up to them to do something about it. It is as simple as that. If they will act to check inflation they will gain great popularity in November. Now, you cannot say that is partisan on my part, is it?

EXHIBIT A—THE PRESIDENT'S 10-POINT PROGRAM

On November 17, 1947, the President in his message to Congress presented a 10-point program, the effectuation of which he felt was necessary for the economic well-being of our own country and of the world. The President was particularly concerned about the march of inflation from which a catastrophic depression may result. So far, this Eightieth Congress has given heed to only 3 of those 10 points, and in all cases a half-hearted manner.

With respect to his first point—the restoration of consumer credit controls—the other body of this Congress long ago took some action, but to date this body has taken no action, nor is any contemplated by the committee responsible.

With respect to his third point—to extend and strengthen export controls, two bits of legislation have been acted upon; one to remove price criteria from export controls, which I consider unsound, and the second to extend the President's authority only until May 31, 1948, which is short-sighted since the matter will have to be taken up again.

With respect to his eight point—to extend and strengthen rent control, this Congress passed a rent-control bill, if you want to call it that. But I think the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee labeled it much more aptly when he called it the second decontrol bill.

If we really want to lick inflation now, I think this Congress might do well to study these 10 points again. Perhaps some decent legislation to prevent a depression may yet come out of the Eightieth Congress.

For that reason I am including them as an exhibit at this point:

PRESIDENT'S 10-POINT PROGRAM

First. To restore consumer credit controls and to restrain the creation of inflationary bank credit.

Second. To authorize the regulation of speculative trading on the commodity exchanges.

Third. To extend and strengthen export controls.

Fourth. To extend authority to allocate transportation facilities and equipment.

Fifth. To authorize measures which will induce the marketing of livestock and poultry at weights and grades that represent the most efficient utilization of grain.

Sixth. To enable the Department of Agriculture to expand its program of encouraging conservation practices in this country and to authorize measures designed to increase the production of foods in foreign countries.

Seventh. To authorize allocation and inventory control of scarce commodities which basically affect the cost of living or industrial production.

Eighth. To extend and strengthen rent control.

Ninth. To authorize consumer rationing on products in short supply which basically affect the cost of living.

Tenth. To authorize price ceilings on products in short supply which basically affect the cost of living or industrial production, and to authorize such wage ceilings as are essential to maintain the necessary price ceilings.

EXHIBIT B—MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT BY THE COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

The Council of Economic Advisers to the President presented a memorandum to him recently covering the state of our economy for the first quarter of 1948.

That document is intensely interesting to me. Not only does it give a very current picture of the trend of inflation, of the steel price rise and the third-round of wage increases, of the defense plan and the European recovery plan, but its recommendations for fiscal and material controls are timely and should be considered seriously by this body if we are to avoid economic collapse.

The full memorandum is included below:

MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT FROM THE COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

The President's Economic Report of January 14, 1948, stressed continued inflationary tendencies as the prime danger to be combated in early 1948. It recommended maintenance of the existing level of taxation and the tightening of credit controls as restraints upon the general price level, and extension of rent control, and initiation of allocation of materials as specific devices for meeting the inflationary dangers. It recommended stand-by controls of prices and wages, to be invoked if crop conditions during 1948, the actual impact of the European recovery program as authorized by the Congress, or other economic developments should bring particular inflationary situations to a critical level.

These recommendations were made in contemplation of a foreign-aid program approximating the $6,000,000,000 program enacted by the Congress for the fiscal year 1949.

After the passage of 3 months, we should now examine and evaluate certain impor-

tant new factors that have entered or old factors that have changed since January and, on this basis, consider what new or modified policies are now called for.

THE COMMODITY PRICE BREAK AND OTHER ANTI-INFLATIONARY FACTORS

One important new factor developed early in the quarter in the form of a sharp break in prices of agricultural products, particularly grains and livestock. The strong inflationary push given to the general price and wage situation during 1947 had, among other things, reflected a condition of poor crop yields in much of the world. In the first half of December 1947, reports of crop conditions both at home and abroad became more favorable, and the January report of the grain carry-over was larger than had been expected. This betterment of the food outlook was reflected in considerable fluctuation in agricultural prices, which culminated in a sharp break in late January. From a low about the middle of February there have been several short periods of recovery, but with these prices in the main making a plateau formation somewhat above the bottom point of the dip.

In many quarters, the agricultural price break was hailed as the end of inflation. Some even thought it was the beginning of a recessionary movement which would spread throughout the economy. As the Council then reported, however, there were clearly discernible factors which would make such a general movement extremely unlikely. Agricultural prices were not being forced down by any surplus of farm products either at home or abroad, and they were not falling into a vacuum. They were declining toward the support levels provided by existing agricultural legislation. Cereals and meats were unlikely to test those levels in the face of the fact that at least moderate scarcity of food would exist in the markets of the world during the closing months of this crop-year even if conditions for the 1948 crop should develop very favorably.

It was most fortunate for our people that this first open break in the inflationary movement occurred at the one place where it would induce no chain reaction in the shape of reduced production and of loss of employment throughout industry. The decline in agricultural prices did not have any direct effect upon production and employment, and when the grain markets had become fairly well stabilized before the end of February, we could feel confident that the economy as a whole had been distinctly benefited. While the break had not created any specific recessionary developments, it had induced a desirable degree of caution in the business world.

In contrast to the break in agricultural prices, there was no important reduction of industrial prices during the first quarter. The weekly wholesale price index of goods other than farm and food products, which had been rising at a steady rate for full 6 months, dropped only one-half of 1 percent in February to a level which it has since maintained without appreciable variation.

During the first quarter, reports of consumer resistance became increasingly prevalent and indications that competitive conditions were returning, or would return over wider areas as the year progressed, carried an intimation that the economy was approaching a topping-out area in which the forces of inflation would be abating. This was reflected in a growing sentiment in commercial and industrial circles that the honeymoon is over, the bloom is off the peach, it's time to put our house in order, we've got really to sell the public, not just book orders, and the like. Of course, this trend of thought and action has been most marked in soft goods and light manufacturing. It did not hit automobiles, heavy industry, or basic materials, such as coal, petroleum, and steel. Even these industries, however, showed a sobering sense that their turn would come in a future which was constantly drawing nearer.

THE STEEL PRICE RISE AND THIRD-ROUND SPIRAL

In contrast to the favorable economic factors which characterized the opening months of 1948, the last few weeks have witnessed developments which have given new impetus to the price-wage spiral of inflation and threaten seriously to retard production and to impair the real purchasing power of consumers.

The first of these developments was the mark-up of prices of semifinished steel on February 13 as the climax of a creeping advance in various steel prices that had been going on during January and early February. This advance in prices of a commodity so basic as steel threatened compensating price advances in a wide range of steel-using industries. This would aggravate the general inflationary tendency or, encountering the consumer resistance which we have already mentioned, might lead to an impasse and curtailment of production. The furor of public criticism of this move, the prompt investigation by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, and reports on the subject by the Departments of Justice and Commerce and the Council of Economic Advisers served to check the spread of price increases to finished steel. But the steel wage settlement was yet to be made, and the whole situation was thrown into confusion by the stoppage of coal production on March 15.

Up to this time, the so-called third round of wage adjustments had progressed without extensive work stoppages and with advances of wage rates mostly limited to a range of 5 to 15 cents an hour. They did not conform to a pattern but rather to the peculiar situations of the various companies and in the main were not at once reflected in proportional or larger price advances. There seemed to be some ground for hoping that labor and management would compose their differences without strikes and that wage adjustments would in the main be held within limits that would not require further price increases. Such an outcome would demonstrate our ability to use voluntary bargaining methods toward the containment of inflationary forces.

The high cost of living still exerts an upward pressure on wages. Thus far the consumers' price index has failed to reflect the commodities break which occurred in February. This may represent only the customary time lag. But in view of the recent stabilization of commodity prices, and the additional buoyancy which has been injected by the defense plan, there is certainly no assurance that the consumer price index will go down, and for such important items as meat and rent, there is strong reason why it may go up. In the case of meat, it is estimated that the supply this fall may be 10 percent below the supply last year. In the case of rent, the housing shortage is still acute and rent control has been loosened by a succession of legislative steps. The high cost of living still persists as an important element in the wage negotiations that are ahead. And significant industrial leaders have expressed in no uncertain terms their prediction or determination that any substantial wage increases would be followed immediately by further price increases.

Stoppage of work in the bituminous coal mines on March 15 did not grow out of a demand for higher wages, but it had the effect of immediately aggravating shortage of material at a point basic to our whole industrial system. Even if settled at an early date, it will result in the loss of many thousands of tons of steel and postpone the time when the supply of automobiles and other items fabricated from steel will catch up with demand.

THE DEFENSE PLAN

Against this reminder of the continuing narrow margin of supply at the very basis of our industrial system, the President on March 17 addressed the Congress on the seriousness of the international situation and launched a defense plan. On April 2, the Congress completed passage of the European recovery plan and on the same day removed approximately $5,000,000,000 from Government revenues through its tax-reduction act and added this amount to civilian spending power.

These developments must be evaluated against the background of an economy of relatively little slack in employment or productive capacity, of high prices still strongly colored by inflationary forces, and of a precarious balance between prospective Federal revenues and projected scale of expenditures. In such circumstances the inflationary threat might easily be aggravated, and substantial increases in the demand for certain goods might quickly initiate new price advances.

In our analysis of this inflationary problem, we shall assume that the coal strike will be settled within a relatively short time. The loss of coal production in a strike of even a month would entail the serious disruption of railroad transportation, steel production, and other industrial output. Therefore, the restoration of fuel production constitutes our foremost domestic problem since indefinite continuation of the coal strike would bring industrial paralysis.

On this assumption of an early settlement of the coal strike, it is our belief that the European recovery plan and the defense plan as now proposed should not generate inflationary pressures which at this time require resort to over-all controls of the war-economy type. We believe that the safeguarding measures included in the President's 10-point program in November and reiterated in January should be promptly enacted and somewhat extended but that this will leave free competitive enterprise to operate through most of the business world.

We are aware of course that the international situation with which the President must deal is most uncertain and that the defense plan now proposed may soon prove to be inadequate. We feel, however, that our analysis and recommendations should be limited strictly to the program as announced and as evaluated by the business community. This involves something of a psychological factor but, as already stated, does not as yet, as we read the signs, involve general speculative anticipation of future expansion of the program. Everywhere in the business world, there are heard words of caution, but we recognize that that condition might change suddenly.

The European recovery plan and the defense plan need to be considered together because they entail similar economic consequences. Both will entail withdrawal of goods from American consumers without a corresponding curtailment of purchasing power in their hands.

Appraisal of the combined impact of these two plans may be undertaken by an examination, first, of their general impact upon the economy, and, second, of their impact upon specific situations of shortage. Viewing first the general impact, we concluded in our October foreign-aid report that the export surplus in 1948 under an aid program of the size then contemplated would not inject a new inflationary influence because it would not exceed the export surplus already felt in 1947. As finally adopted, the European recovery plan will involve an export surplus in 1948 at least $2,000,000,000 below the level that the October report contemplated and found to be safe. This leaves room for the safe absorption of a defense program of considerable magnitude. The defense program, as now formulated, implies a $3,000,000,000 to $4,000,000,000 commitment

for the fiscal year 1949. In the President's letter of April 1, transmitting an additional budget request, there was outlined a program involving additional expenditures for the armed services of only $1,700,000,000 in fiscal 1949. Of this amount, not more than half will represent actual payments to the public in 1948, and only a part of this will represent a demand for additional goods. Thus, in terms of its general impact upon the economy, the defense plan would seem to be something the country could readily take in its stride.

With increasing appreciation of these facts, the tendency for business to react to the defense program in terms of an incipient new boom has abated, and there has been an increasing disposition to assess the plan as an offset to softening tendencies which might be developing during 1948 rather than as a further stimulus to an already strongly inflationary situation.

But while a $3,000,000,000-to-$4,000,000,000 program may not seem disturbing to a $240,000,000,000 economy when viewed generally, the conclusion is different when we turn to its specific impact upon particular production and market situations. Just as in the case of the European recovery program, to which it is now added, the real issues as to whether additional economic controls are needed grows out of the concentration of both programs on certain classes of goods and areas of production where shortages have been most severe and persistent. These areas include products of farm origin, particularly livestock products and textiles, steel and other metals, and the sources of power and heat, including coal, petroleum, gas, and electricity.

While we do not yet have specific information as to the size and timing of these particular demands, we have already, in evaluating the impact of ERP, urged the adoption of allocation policies which, if carried out, will help to hold the prices of these goods from unduly rising and prevent demoralization of productive operations. The same prudent measures will help to offset the inflationary effect of the expedited stockpiling program for which the President has requested $375,000,000.

One factor which has entered the picture since the time of our foreign-aid report is the addition of about $5,000,000,000 to the purchasing power of consumers through the reduction in taxes. This adds to inflationary pressures an important force and virtually eliminates the one important weapon controlled by the Government with which to combat inflation—a substantial Government surplus. Yet we believe that this untoward development can also be neutralized if the other features of the President's anti-inflation policy are adopted.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Of the policies and programs of the Government which we believe will fairly well restrain inflation if labor peace is maintained and the defense program is not greatly expanded, the first three will operate through influencing the entire economy, the others are directed at points of specific pressure.

Fiscal controls:

The imprudent reduction in taxes increases the need and by the means ends the opportunity for helpful fiscal policies. New taxes should be demanded in proportion to (or even in anticipation of) all subsequent increases of defense expenditures which are not clearly offset by practicable reductions of Government expenditures in other directions. Reduction of public expenditures should be made wherever possible.

Credit controls: So long as inflationary danger continues, the central banking system should use its powers to restrain the creation of buying power through bank loans. The imperative need to protect the Government bond market prevents the use of the traditional method of limiting the expansion of bank credit by raising discount rates, but something can be accomplished by increasing reserve requirements, and authority should be granted to take this action. If we avoid a Government deficit and prevent the expansion of bank credit, we can still avoid a destructive general or monetary inflation, even though there might be a considerable rise in particular prices.

Consumer credit, also, should be restricted. The President's warning that there would be imprudent, competitive easing of credit terms when control was dropped has been fully vindicated.

Savings bond campaign: The completion of the extensive preparations for the Nationwide campaign to sell savings bonds fortunately comes at the most appropriate time to give maximum effect to the anti-inflationary value of consumers' savings. Saving by consumers is the only anti-inflationary measure which is pleasant. It is also one of the most effective of such measures. No effort should be spared in pressing to the fullest advantage the fine enthusiasm which has been built up in the great army assembled for this campaign.

Materials controls: Since we start the defense effort not from a position of industrial and commercial slack as in 1939 but from one of activity so high that significant material shortages already exist, we believe that ordinary prudence requires that increased attention be given to perfecting a system of allocations, priorities, and export and domestic-use limitations which would build up adequate stock piles and safeguard production under the defense plan against bottlenecks and break-downs. Present and prospective shortages in food, textile, metal, and fuel or power items already referred to make it necessary that allocation and related control measures be promptly enacted and selectively applied.

Some controls have already been found necessary during the formative stages of the European recovery program. These should be articulated with or merged into the defense-control system. We believe also that voluntary effort in the formulation of the materials-control plan and in its enforcement should be utilized to the fullest extent possible. The authority to impose controls should not be limited to establishing priority of use. That simply makes the competition all the warmer for the balance of the supply. There must be power to make it unlawful to use controlled materials in unnecessary projects, or to use controlled materials beyond the permitted quantity in authorized but limited projects.

Price-wage control and rationing: There has not yet appeared need to impose either price control or rationing, other than in the case of a few materials, as discussed above. The prospects for an adequate meat supply are so poor, however, and there is so much uncertainty about the general food situation that the President should have authority to make ready a price and rationing system and to put it into effect selectively as conditions require. Where price controls are imposed there should be a prohibition of such wage increases as would break through the price ceiling, except for certain necessary equitable adjustments and except for such wage increases as might be necessary to recruit people from the defense program in the absence of manpower controls.

Distribution of labor: The number of men involved in the contemplated increase in the armed forces and in the expanded industrial operations incident thereto will not exceed the expected increase in the labor force in 1948. The labor market is tight, however, and the frictional difficulties in the way of any accurate distribution of labor will lead to many local shortages. These can be minimized by making better use of the United States Employment Service.

To this end, we believe that the national office of the United States Employment Service would have to be enlarged and strengthened. The Employment Service should undertake to develop a smoothly functioning program of (a) priority referral in local offices, and (b) comprehensive interarea recruitment. We should make sure that the Selective Service Act and regulations are so drafted and administered as to give suitable deferment to individuals and groups who are especially needed in the defense program. Procurement agencies likewise should exercise care to see that contracts are placed in looser labor market areas and, so far as possible, withheld from tight labor markets. Efforts should also be made to prevent labor piracy or unrestrained intraindustry hiring.

In general our position is that manpower control should be of an indirect rather than direct sort.

IN CONCLUSION

At this early stage of the defense plan, two points should be clearly recognized and made plain to the public:

1. We are in a peace economy, not a war economy. The maintenance of an armed force is as much a part of the peacetime system as is the maintenance of a police force by States, counties, and cities, or the employment of railroad detectives and factory guards. The last 2 years have given us a fuller measure of the productivity of our resources when aggressively used. We were not staggering under the load of $11,000,000,000 for our protective forces, and the rise in this item to $14,000,000,000 or $15,000,000,000 will not swamp our economy nor require us to pass from free enterprise to regimentation. Some rather systematic and vigorous discipline, however, must be exercised to redirect our economic effort so as to meet the new goal in an orderly and economical manner.

2. Every citizen must recognize that further diversions of productive effort to military uses inevitably involves some sacrifice of civilian types of consumption. It is our particular application of the old alternative of guns or butter.

Our people had—and we believe quite properly—looked forward to a postwar period in which larger numbers of people would achieve higher standards of living than had ever been realized before. Those hopes are not nullified by the defense program. But they must be in some measure postponed or for the present revised downward. During this period, if any group insists that its income shall be advanced in proportion to every advance in prices or that it shall be in a position to pay up to whatever level is needed to bid its accustomed amount of goods away from other users, it is in effect demanding that it be exempted from sharing in the common burden of protecting our country. These economic facts of life should be proclaimed along with every step in working out the practical details of the defense program.

EXHIBIT C—STATEMENTS OF MARRINER S. ECCLES FOR THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

Last November, Chairman Eccles, of the Federal Reserve Board, presented testimony before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. In it is stated very clearly the causes of the current inflation problem and the methods of controlling it. In particular, he explained in detail the special reserve requirement plan proposed by the Federal Reserve Board as a method of restricting the banks' expansion of credit. That plan is given below:

1. The plan would have about the same effect in limiting credit expansion as an increase in primary reserve requirements, which was proposed as the third alternative in the 1945 annual report. It would enable the banks to retain the same volume of

earning assets that they now hold, whereas an increase in basic reserve requirements would make it necessary for them to reduce earning assets, with adverse effects upon the earnings position of banks.

2. The ratio of potential credit expansion on a given increase in reserves would be narrowed to the extent that the special reserve was required. At the maximum requirement proposed, it would be lowered from 6 to 1 to nearly 2½ to 1.

3. It would bring about an increase in interest rates on private debt and would increase earnings of the banks from this source where rates on loans are comparatively low. It would accomplish this purpose, moreover, without increasing the interest cost on the public debt or permitting unstable prices in the Government securities market. The plan, in effect, would divorce the market for private debt from the market for Government securities.

4. The plan would not rely on higher interest rates to restrain private borrowing, but to the extent higher interest rates restrain such borrowing, the proposal would make use of the interest rate mechanism. Hence, the cost of restraining credit would be borne by private borrowers who are incurring additional debt, and not by the Government which is reducing its debt.

5. The main effect of the plan would be to reduce the availability of bank credit. This would be accomplished by putting the restraint on the lenders, that is, the banks. They would be less willing to sell Government securities in order to expand credit because the amount of such liquid assets as they held as secondary reserves could be greatly reduced by the requirement. Such an authority, even without action being taken by the Reserve authorities, would have a very restraining influence.

6. The plan would restore use of the customary instruments of Reserve influence on bank-credit expansion, namely, discount rates and open-market operations. Support of these instruments by the special reserve requirement would enable the Federal Reserve to make it more difficult and costly for banks to borrow Federal Reserve funds.

7. No alterations in the banking structure, in the authority of the supervisors, in customary methods of bank operations, or in established interbank relationships would be introduced as a result of imposing the requirement.

8. The banks would be left by the plan with sufficient latitude to meet essential needs of the economy for credit, and the public would be assured of a high degree of liquidity and safety for the banking system.

On April 13, 1948, Mr. Eccles again appeared before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report to speak for the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board on the monetary and credit situation as it had developed during the intervening 4 months. The statement is concerned particularly with the impact on our economy of military and relief expenditures. Below are excerpts from this testimony:

SITUATION NOW AND IN 1940

The Board believes that any realistic appraisal of the economic outlook from the standpoint of monetary and credit policy must take account of the underlying facts of the international situation. During the war there was no doubt about the ultimate victory. The country looked forward confidently to an era of stability and peace following the hostilities. Nearly 3 years after the end of fighting, however, we seem to be farther away from these goals than ever. Our national debt still exceeds two hundred and fifty billions, or more than five times the prewar total. Federal budgets have never fallen under thirty-seven billions a year and we are confronted now with the prospect of an expanding debt and budgets. During the war we expected the peace to bring an end to these enormous drains on our resources.

Today there is no end point in sight. Threatening as the inflationary potential was at the end of the war, it is worse today. When we embarked upon the defense program in 1940 we had a tremendous slack in the labor force, with nearly twelve millions fewer employed then than now. We had surpluses of most raw materials, of unused industrial capacity, of housing, of foodstuffs, and of countless other things. The impact of our heavy armament expenditures was not inflationary so long as the total demand on our resources did not exceed capacity. It rapidly became inflationary as civilian purchasing power created by the expenditures began to exceed the available supplies of goods and services.

We held the excess purchasing power fairly well in check while the war was on. We have now seen the consequences of premature removal of the harness of wartime controls. Even the one remaining anti-inflationary force, that is, a large budgetary surplus used to reduce our money supply, is no longer in prospect.

OVER-ALL POLICY ALTERNATIVES

On the basis of present trends, we believe that the country, sooner or later, has to choose between three broad alternatives.

First, we can continue on the present course of providing essential foreign aid and of carrying out a military program on a scale of, as yet, undetermined size and cost, while at the same time we have no effective checks on the free play of economic forces. This is the certain road, if followed long enough, to a ruinous inflation. Surely no one would seriously contend that we can go on adding more and more pressure in the boiler of inflation without an ultimate explosion. Those who view us with a hostile eye no doubt hope that we will wreck our economy on the shoals of inflation. It would be a cheap way to defeat us.

Secondly, the country could be subjected to a full harness of direct economic controls—for example, allocations, construction permits, rationing, price and wage controls, as well as taxation at higher levels. Without such a harness, amounting to a regimentation of the economy in peacetime, there is no such protection against inflationary dangers that may lie ahead. They cannot be successfully combated by any single means or on any single front. There is no power that the Board now possesses or that the Congress could give us in the monetary and credit field that would be adequately effective by itself.

Beyond that, we must ask ourselves whether the public would be willing in peacetime to submit to the sacrifices and rigid restraints of a wartime economy. If our preparedness program calls for a military draft upon our young men, should it not call also for control of the profits arising from that program?

We may well ask for how many years must we maintain enormous and probably expanding military expenditures. The question is, how long, to what end, and at what consequences to our economy? We do not have the inexhaustible supplies of manpower and resources to support indefinitely, with no end point in sight, programs of the magnitude which we now are shouldering or contemplating. We cannot go on year after year bearing these crushing costs without jeopardizing what we seek to save. If we were confident of the early establishment of peace, we could tolerate a tightly controlled economy. We believe that the time element is the very essence of this grave problem.

Our Nation sought neither territory nor reparations in either World War. We seek neither now. We ask only for the earliest possible establishment of the foundations for enduring peace. To that end, our third and best course may be to choose a combination of alternatives; that is to say, acceptance of such controls as may become necessary to prevent inflation at home while abroad we lay at the earliest possible moment the foundations for peace. Surely an informed public would be ready to accept even burdensome controls and taxation if convinced they are essential to safeguard our economy against a ruinous inflation, and that there is an early end point in sight which will enable us to maintain our system and our institutions in a peaceful world.

* * * * *

So far as the monetary and credit field is concerned, we have tried to make clear that action on these fronts alone cannot guarantee stability. Nevertheless, we believe that the Reserve System should be armed with requisite powers, first to increase basic reserve requirements of all commercial banks and, later on, if the situation requires it, to provide that all such banks hold an additional special reserve. Both of these would be protective measures. The first could be used to offset gold acquisitions and purchases of Government securities by the Federal Reserve, and thereby restrict continued expansion of our already excessive money supply. The second would be essential in case banks embark upon an inflationary credit expansion through the sale of Government securities to the Federal Reserve or to assist the Government in case of large-scale deficit financing.

We believe it is the part of prudence to recognize clearly that the underlying cause of the continuing inflationary dangers arises from the disappointment of our great hopes for the early establishment of world peace. Surely we must summon all our human and material resources needed to assure that peace. If necessary to protect our economy at home so that we shall not lose by inflation what we seek most of all to save, we should be willing and prepared to reimpose to whatever extent the situation demands a harness of controls, including higher levels of taxation. Nobody wants such regimentation but in the hard choices before us it is infinitely preferable to economic chaos and possible collapse of our system, to which all freemen look for deliverance from the evils of war and misery that feed on economic distress.

We are aware that the questions of policy designed to achieve the cardinal purpose of assuring an enduring world peace are outside the domain of those charged with responsibilities in the monetary and credit field, but we feel that such responsibilities have to be exercised in the light of the burdens which the economy must bear. The earliest attainable settlement of the issues that now stand in the way of lasting peace offers the best hope for the preservation of our institutions and our freedoms. Meanwhile, they must not be jeopardized either by uncontrolled inflation or long-continued regimentation at home.

EXHIBIT D—CORPORATE EARNINGS IN 1947

The April 1948 monthly letter of the National City Bank of New York on economic conditions and Government finance carried an interesting table of corporate earnings in 1947. Below is the table, together with an excerpt from the article of which it is a part:

CORPORATE EARNINGS IN 1947

Annual reports for 1947, now issued by a majority of all corporations publishing financial statements, reflect the substantial increase over 1946 which occurred in total dollar sales and aggregate net earnings, and which is characteristic of inflation. Both figures are higher than in any previous year.

Net income of leading corporations for the years 1946 and 1947

Net income is shown as reported—after depreciation, interest, taxes, and other charges and reserves, but before dividends. Net worth includes book value of outstanding preferred and common stock and surplus account at beginning of each year.

[In thousands of dollars]

Industrial groups	Number of companies	Net income after taxes		Percent change [1]	Net worth, Jan. 1 [2]		Percent return	
		1946	1947		1946	1947	1946	1947
Baking	21	56,975	57,523	+1.0	274,948	284,576	20.7	20.2
Dairy products	14	64,736	60,364	−6.8	344,280	392,467	18.8	15.4
Meat packing	20	69,368	83,928	+21.0	662,051	697,450	10.5	12.0
Sugar	24	37,753	79,952	(+)	395,662	429,035	9.5	18.6
Other food products	66	187,566	245,477	+30.9	1,052,214	1,173,576	17.8	20.9
Soft drinks	15	39,405	49,066	+24.5	196,894	217,338	20.0	22.6
Brewing	30	20,861	26,683	+27.9	89,956	104,148	23.2	25.6
Distilling	12	161,635	139,065	−14.0	388,424	522,484	41.6	26.6
Tobacco products	22	98,458	115,035	+16.8	863,858	897,217	11.4	12.8
Cotton goods	42	101,717	162,190	+59.5	381,607	448,804	26.7	36.1
Silk and rayon	16	59,579	90,326	+51.6	281,995	346,320	21.1	26.1
Woolen goods	8	34,131	31,282	−8.3	137,763	147,242	24.8	21.2
Hosiery, knitted goods	19	22,626	22,556	−0.3	77,084	96,213	29.4	23.4
Other textile products	43	92,263	137,092	+48.6	462,004	527,766	20.0	26.0
Clothing and apparel	30	34,739	34,768	+0.1	146,074	173,295	23.8	20.1
Leather tanning	10	5,519	11,290	(+)	50,205	53,282	11.0	21.2
Shoes, leather products	23	27,071	37,534	+38.7	211,452	232,017	12.8	16.2
Tires, rubber products	26	135,727	122,154	−10.0	662,784	760,470	20.5	16.1
Lumber	21	23,066	42,458	+84.1	109,128	132,925	21.1	31.9
Furniture, wood products	15	10,412	18,958	+82.1	106,745	115,114	9.8	16.5
Pulp and paper products	74	144,282	267,176	+85.2	1,010,471	1,179,824	14.3	22.6
Printing and publishing	28	35,606	42,548	+19.5	187,160	199,767	19.0	21.3
Chemical products	60	320,672	398,813	+24.4	2,160,524	2,321,855	14.8	17.2
Drugs, soap, etc	29	126,139	126,460	+0.3	520,744	614,783	24.2	20.6
Paint and varnish	17	36,842	54,856	+48.9	269,714	288,241	13.7	19.0
Petroleum products	40	769,556	1,215,947	+58.0	7,174,266	7,712,538	10.7	15.8
Cement	25	19,539	24,193	+23.8	191,827	198,469	10.2	12.2
Glass products	12	53,719	68,046	+26.7	362,208	390,331	14.8	17.4
Other stone, clay products	41	63,622	92,790	+45.8	465,222	524,652	13.7	17.7
Iron and steel	50	271,008	425,552	+57.0	3,659,481	3,780,331	7.4	11.3
Agricultural implements	13	45,695	96,249	(+)	797,152	866,294	5.7	11.1
Building, heating, plumbing equipment	67	58,398	108,109	+85.1	508,038	570,388	11.5	19.0
Electrical equipment and radio	74	113,861	272,222	(+)	1,270,385	1,412,386	9.0	19.3
Hardware and tools	50	36,101	55,025	+52.4	272,967	291,326	13.2	18.9
Household equipment	39	45,354	83,620	+84.4	210,177	243,617	21.6	34.3
Machinery	151	99,655	180,331	+81.0	980,721	1,075,775	10.2	16.8
Office equipment	21	56,426	91,753	+62.6	293,525	338,083	19.2	27.1
Nonferrous metals	30	[3] 133,158	[3] 283,341	(+)	1,963,856	2,018,206	6.8	14.0
Other metal products	83	77,783	135,155	+73.8	822,007	877,075	9.5	15.4
Autos and trucks	28	121,307	450,942	(+)	1,983,117	2,172,379	6.1	20.8
Automobile parts	63	40,691	125,722	(+)	442,305	534,474	9.2	23.5
Railway equipment	25	47,260	61,821	+30.8	561,659	588,944	8.4	10.5
Aircraft and parts	24	19,596	[4] 16,625	(−)	406,539	452,134	4.8	----------
Shipbuilding	5	10,220	9,876	−3.4	66,894	74,103	15.3	13.3
Miscellaneous manufacturing	45	81,778	95,352	+16.6	529,324	584,602	15.4	16.3
Total manufacturing	1,571	4,111,875	6,316,975	+53.6	34,005,411	37,062,316	12.1	17.0
Coal mining	24	37,316	[3] 62,424	+67.3	494,109	506,929	7.6	12.3
Metal mining	26	[3] 25,029	[3] 46,227	+84.7	389,894	402,345	6.4	11.5
Oil and gas	41	[3] 35,316	[3] 69,983	+98.2	293,947	351,980	12.1	19.9
Other mining, quarrying	12	[3] 23,870	[3] 30,344	+27.1	118,165	123,759	20.2	24.5
Total mining, quarrying	103	[3] 121,531	[3] 208,978	+72.0	1,295,115	1,385,013	9.4	15.1
Chain stores—food	16	46,643	47,501	+1.8	239,386	269,422	19.5	17.6
Chain stores—other	58	213,030	201,030	−5.6	927,012	1,069,901	23.0	18.8
Department stores	44	133,325	116,649	−12.5	669,551	795,766	19.9	14.7
Mail order	5	148,494	165,169	+11.2	621,297	782,985	23.9	21.1
Miscellaneous and wholesale	54	82,964	85,483	+3.0	392,925	450,351	21.1	19.0
Total trade	177	624,456	615,832	−1.4	2,850,171	3,368,425	21.9	18.3
Class 1 railroads	133	287,139	460,200	+60.3	12,665,923	12,715,977	2.3	3.6
Traction and bus	26	13,253	3,000	−77.4	281,602	287,902	4.7	1.0
Shipping	13	28,211	32,213	+14.2	234,584	250,517	12.0	12.9
Air transport	12	[4] 2,694	[4] 11,835	----------	70,377	70,123	----------	----------
Miscellaneous transportation	47	15,849	20,251	+27.8	207,217	214,204	7.6	9.5
Total transportation	231	341,758	503,829	+47.4	13,459,703	13,538,723	2.5	3.7
Electric power, gas, etc. [5]	186	565,150	586,466	+3.8	6,418,734	6,504,968	8.8	9.0
Telephone and telegraph [5]	54	217,310	185,590	−14.6	3,132,321	3,205,333	6.9	5.8
Total public utilities	240	782,460	772,056	−1.3	9,551,055	9,710,301	8.2	8.0
Amusements	17	134,166	109,494	−18.4	600,209	686,880	22.4	15.9
Restaurant and hotel	43	22,604	24,600	+8.8	144,901	158,254	15.6	15.5
Other business services	29	18,062	21,715	+20.2	128,988	137,650	14.0	15.8
Construction	17	9,432	12,623	+33.8	77,711	85,960	12.1	14.7
Total amusements, services, etc	106	184,264	168,432	−8.6	951,809	1,068,744	19.4	15.8
Commercial banks [6]	274	385,974	378,132	−2.0	4,536,040	4,816,632	8.5	7.9
Fire and casualty insurance [6]	83	20,701	44,626	(+)	1,608,120	1,452,401	1.3	3.1
Investment companies [6]	154	135,638	147,741	+8.9	2,397,883	2,447,223	5.7	6.0
Sales finance companies	58	29,140	56,232	+93.0	508,793	534,124	5.7	10.5
Real estate companies	105	11,903	15,205	+27.7	135,188	143,273	8.8	10.6
Total finance	674	583,356	641,936	+10.0	9,186,024	9,393,653	6.4	6.8
Grand total	3,102	6,749,700	9,228,038	+36.7	71,299,288	75,527,175	9.5	12.2

[1] Increases or decreases of over 100 percent not computed.
[2] Net worth is based upon balance-sheet book values of assets, which may differ widely from actual present-day values.
[3] Before depletion charges in some cases.
[4] Deficit.
[5] Due to the large proportion of capital investment in the form of funded debt, rate of return on total property investment would be lower than that shown on net worth only.
[6] Figures represent in most cases operating earnings only, and do not include profits or losses on investments.

EXHIBIT E—THE BATTLE OF THE FAMILY BUDGET

The following article, by Richard L. Neuberger, in the January 11, 1948, issue of the New York Times tells a dramatic story of one family's struggle to make ends meet, on a fixed income, in the face of the rapidly rising cost of living:

A 6-cent spurt in the price of hamburger a few weeks ago was particularly unwelcome to Martha Andrews. Martha is a 28-year-old housewife with a husband, Ted, aged 34, and three small children—Ted, Jr., aged 8; Jane, 2; and Robert, 7 months. While Ted was off fighting in Europe with General Patton's Third Army his mouth watered for Martha's baked hams and veal roasts. However, meat loaf, hamburger patties, and spaghetti with meat balls have become the regular diet in the wartime housing unit in which the Andrews live, and that is why the rise in the cost of hamburger from 42 to 48 cents a pound at the corner butcher shop did such damage to Martha's budget.

The Andrews are an average American family. Ted earns $250 a month pumping gasoline at an independent service station and garage 4 or 5 miles east of Portland, on U S 30, along the timbered shores of the Columbia River. This is $75 more than he earned at the same work before he went to war in 1942. Of the three children, two were born after Ted returned from the Army with a medical discharge early in 1945.

For a time the rising cost of living merely inconvenienced the Andrews. Now it has passed far beyond the casual stage. Ted is not sure what the family would do if it had a serious illness. A small legacy left by Martha's parents is down to $350 and that is their only reserve. Half a dozen series E war bonds were cashed to pay for Christmas presents.

The Andrews take some comfort from the fact that practically all their friends seem to be in a similar predicament. Martha is certain of that from her conversations with other housewives who live in the housing project which was occupied by Henry J. Kaiser's shipyard workers during the war. She also gets letters from her married sister in Spokane, and Ted hears occasionally from men with whom he served in the Army.

All these sources indicate to the Andrews that their experience is by no means unique in this period of the highest prices in American history. Indeed, Martha says, "I suppose there must be millions of families all the way across the United States in just exactly the same boat. If they can keep afloat, I guess we can, but it's getting harder all the time."

How have the Andrews made out thus far? What fate do they think 1948 holds for their strained and battered budget?

It is easy to tell where the money goes today. The two chief items are food and rent. Forty-four percent of the monthly income, or $110, goes for food; rent, including light, heat, and water, is $49.50. And the remaining $90.50 of Ted's salary seems to disappear like a snowman in the noonday sun. Ted insisted on having a telephone installed when the new baby was on the way; this costs $2.75 for a four-party line. He spends $16.50 a month to carry his GI life insurance policy. The family has no car and transportation for Ted to and from work comes to $9. They budget $15 a month for medical care and prescriptions and the total is nearly always spent.

All of this comes to over $200 and still some big items must be taken care of. So far as clothing is concerned, Martha improvises all she can. Jane is very much a little girl but she wears slickers, "Dr. Dentons," and overalls which her brother Ted, Jr., long ago outgrew. Martha paid $20 to a crippled friend with sewing skill to make an old coat into a trim suit, complete with the "new look." Ted wore his GI shoes to work until the uppers split away from the composition soles, and then had to count out $15.50 for a new pair which would withstand grease and gravel.

With five $500 deductions, including his own, Ted Andrews' income taxes are small. He pays $42 a year to the Federal Government and $6 to the State of Oregon. Ted says he has no complaint about taxes, but he and his wife resent the high prices that keep them from saving. "After a few dentist's bills and other odds and ends," says Ted, "we don't even have enough left when the month is over to pay for a week's summer vacation 75 miles away at the beach."

Martha allocates $25 for food each week. Last week she spent $24.89, in this way:

Meat	$7.00
Milk (9 quarts)	2.07
Cheese	1.00
Eggs (3 dozen)	2.13
Bread (7 loaves at 1½ pounds each)	1.47
Staples (sugar, coffee, flour, etc.)	2.25
Fruit (canned and fresh)	3.00
Vegetables (canned and fresh)	3.00
Margarine (3 pounds)	1.32
Baby food (canned)	.72
One quart ice cream	.43
Ted's contribution to coffee-and-soup fund at garage	.50

Before the war, with less money, Martha was able to serve leg of lamb or even prime ribs for Sunday dinner and some kind of meat or fish the other six nights. Now she buys roasts only occasionally, and on at least two evenings a week the principal course consists mainly of rice, macaroni, or noodles. Many months ago Ted cut out the irregular indulgence of a hot lunch at the diner across the highway from the garage. He and the other workers bring sandwiches and make coffee or heat canned soup over a hotplate.

Only on Sundays does Martha serve ice cream to her family. Otherwise they finish the principal meal with fresh fruit from the grocery store or peaches canned at home. At breakfast only the children get the juice of fresh oranges; the parents drink canned juice, which is cheaper. Eggs are the great luxury all enjoy; it was to enable Ted to start for work with two fried eggs under his belt that, nearly a year ago, the Andrews gave up butter. The one time that Martha entertained the other wives in the housing unit she served a big golden omelet and homemade applesauce.

Martha says all the culinary skill taught her by her mother has vanished in the onrush of inflationary food prices.

"I used to be famous for meat loaf," she tells me. "Everyone raved about it. The recipe was my mother's. But now I have to fill the meat loaf so full of bread cumbs or rice to stretch the hamburger that it has no resemblance to the original. Thanksgiving Day also upset some notions which had lasted since childhood. Even on the farm turkey was a delicacy—yet Ted and I treated ourselves to a Thanksgiving turkey because it turned out to be only a few cents more a pound than hamburger."

She is indignant at warnings from the Government not to waste food. "How many families do they think are able to waste any food at these prices?" she asks, her dark eyes flashing. "That Thanksgiving turkey lasted us a whole week. We had it roasted, warmed over, served in cold slices, creamed and made into hash, croquets and soup. I don't believe I threw out enough of that turkey to fill a coin purse."

High prices have forced on the Andrews many economies. They get books at the public library instead of buying them at a bookstore. Except when a jovial customer has thrust a pack in his direction, Ted has not smoked a cigarette since the end of 1946. A pipe satisfies his taste for tobacco. Martha puts up her own jams, jellies, fruits, and vegetables. She and other housewives in the Vanport housing project even buy jars and lids in big quantities to get them cheaper. During the summer months Ted, a six-footer who was star tackle in high-school football, often spends a Sunday helping cultivate a nearby truck garden along the Columbia bottomlands. Then he comes home laden with heads of cauliflower, bags of peas and ears of golden corn.

Martha cuts the children's hair, washes her own, and gets a permanent but once a year, and then at a beauty-school price. Ted postpones his haircuts as long as he can; when he finally does get one, it is from a beginner at a local barber college for 40 cents instead of at a commercial shop for $1.

The high cost of hamburger and bread long ago ruled movies out of the Andrews budget. However, Ted discovered that by joining the Portland auxiliary police force he could get into shows free, and occasionally he sends Martha to a movie which he tells her is really colossal, while he stays at home with the children. He and Martha can't go together because they can't afford a baby sitter. Teen-aged youngsters in the neighborhood want 50 cents an hour.

In his spare moments at the garage Ted works with the two mechanics. Within the next 9 or 10 months he expects to be tuning up motors and straightening out bent fenders. Then his salary will jump to $300, or perhaps even $350. However, he believes the increase will do him no good unless somehow prices are brought into line. The worst of it is, says Ted, is feeling that he is on a treadmill. "At these prices," he says, "you can't build or buy a house, you can't get an automobile, you can't save for a vacation, you can't even put away some money for your children's education. That's the worst of the whole thing. We're just standing still. We can't get ahead of the game. Prices eat up every cent I earn."

The Andrews are resentful of economic conditions in general but their resentment is channeled in no particular direction. They didn't like it when in September their rent was raised $7 a month. The units of their housing development are of flimsy construction and the squeak of boards in the apartment next door is clearly audible in the Andrews home. But their special interests do not shape their whole philosophy. A member of the auto mechanics union, Ted believes organized labor made it tough on the white-collar fellow by getting pay boosts the white-collar fellow had to help pay for, without any assistance from a union of his own. Ted also thinks business profits are too high and that the rich man is getting richer.

Ted and Martha are registered as Republicans, principally because they were brought up in rural Oregon, which is predominantly Republican. Ted worked on a farm until he and Martha, the daughter of a German-born wheat rancher, were married in 1938. They moved to Portland a few months later and Ted greased cars while Martha was a member of a championship girls' swimming team.

The Andrews voted a straight Republican ticket in November 1946. They admit they are disappointed, for they thought even then that prices had risen far higher than they should. "We hoped the Republican Congress would bring down the cost of living," says Martha. "Instead, prices are worse now than they were at the time of the election—much worse. I don't know how we will vote this year, but I'm sure it will be for the party we think will do the most to end these fearful prices."

There doesn't seem to them to be anything they can do directly. "I thought at first that

buyers' strikes might be the answer to high prices," says Ted. "That was all right when it came to automobiles, radio sets, new refrigerators, and even shoes and clothes. But you can't save on food when you have three little children. I believe I'd buy my children milk with the last dollar in my jeans, even if it was 43 cents a quart instead of the 23 it is now."

Ted and his wife have strangely conflicting fears. On the one hand, they fear that inflation may get further out of bounds, that prices will go higher. Ted predicts that his next raise will simply keep him where he is now. Yet, the Andrews also fear a deflation, the possibilities of a crash. "If we have another big depression, where will I be?" Ted asks.

When they express these fears, Ted is grim and his wife somber. Yet, on the whole, the Andrews are not a gloomy or melancholy family; in fact, they are quite the contrary. The three children are chubby and cheerful. The parents likewise are in excellent health. Martha, straight and trim, still can flash 100 yards through the water in 66 seconds. And Ted, when he takes a rusty set of clubs and rides on the trolley to a public golf course, can negotiate 18 holes in the low eighties.

Ted had hoped to study civil engineering at Oregon State College, but the $90 a month of the GI bill of rights was not enough to feed five mouths at 1946 prices, let alone those of 1948. Ted overcame that disappointment, and now he takes solace in the belief that some day he will be an expert auto mechanic.

Despite their fears, Ted and his wife are hopeful that both the luxuries and necessities of life will again be available at prices which make sense and that the adjustment will come before the country suffers permanent economic damage.

EXHIBIT F—BUSINESS OUTLOOK

[From Business Week of April 17, 1948]

Inflation danger can grow early in 1949. Arms spending will be stepped up to the maximum rates permitted by appropriations. The deficit spending won't be large in the first 1949 quarter. Though if business is still booming, as seems likely, the March 15 tax date will see the Treasury temporarily rolling in dough. But relations with Russia, not tax receipts, hold the inflation key. If it is necessary to spend more and more on arms or if we start lend-leasing armaments to Europe, then early 1949 may be the time to start dusting off the old price and production controls.

EXHIBIT G—LETTER FROM A $60-A-MONTH PENSIONER

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *November 1, 1947.*

Representative HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DOUGLAS: As one of your constituents, I am writing to inquire, if you cannot use your influence, when the House convenes in November, toward calling the attention of your colleagues to our domestic problems as well as that of the foreign?

No one feels more sorry than I, for those that are suffering from hunger abroad, as an aftermath of the war, but how about your countrymen at home, who are practically in the same boat?

There are millions like I am who have lost everything from a monetary standpoint, and are dependent upon the pension, which in our State is $60 a month (and I am very grateful to God for same), but it is hardly adequate to cope with the exorbitant rentals asked for furnished rooms in conjunction with the spiral costs of all food commodities.

Eggs, poultry, in conjunction with bread and cake, is reaching an all-time high. A year ago bread was 10 cents a loaf, now it is 18 cents; doughnuts 15 cents for half dozen in a box, now 25 cents, and when you buy them at the bakers, they are 26 cents for a half dozen; evaporated milk, formerly 2 cans (tall) for 15 cents, now 25 cents; oleomargarine 25 cents, now 35 and 45 cents, and so on. Vegetables all out of proportion, as well as fruit, especially citrus.

It is very hard for one, alone in the world with no other source of income than what I have just stipulated, to exist, let alone live. We are advised to eat less, what a travesty, because at prices as they are we cannot even buy it.

I am paying $6.50 a week rent, in a second-rate hotel (no homes for the aged where they can spend the eventide of their life in peace and tranquility). This practically amounts to half of my pension; then I try to exist for 32 days on the balance, because on account of the large number of those receiving the pension, it is usually the 2d of month, and sometimes the 3d or 4th (if there is a holiday) before we receive same.

It is to be deplored the Congress cannot have the amendment to the Social Sercurity Act brought before them for debate, and if feasible, passed upon during this special session to alleviate the suffering of some of their constituents that voted them in office to represent us, because after all, there is an old adage that it would do well to remember: "Charity begins at home."

Hoping that I have not appealed to you in vain, and that you will use your influence, to bring this matter before the House by calling their attention to the deplorable economic condition of affairs (at home) and perhaps they will endeavor to ameliorate this present state of affairs as in my estimation it would not be a bad idea to put our own house in order in conjunction with those of foreign nations.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. ——— ———.

SPECIAL ORDER TRANSFERRED

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I had for today be transferred to next Tuesday, May 4, 1948.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Mexico [Mrs. Lusk] may be permitted to address the House tomorrow for 1 hour after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] is recognized for 3 minutes.

WORLD PEACE AND CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLES

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, the League of Nations failed miserably. Today its modern counterpart, the United Nations, is vastly less effective than we hoped for a few years ago when we took the leadership in creating it. Some will say flatly that it is bankrupt; for practical purposes, defunct. What is behind this dismal lack of success in organizing world peace?

Every student of the problem will at once come up with numerous and important answers to this question. But one factor to which we have not given enough attention is simply that God Almighty was not invited to the conclaves. The principles of Christian brotherhood were not present in the day-to-day operation of these agencies for world peace. Symptomatic of this condition is the fact that, in contrast to our own Congress, neither the League nor the UN opened its meetings with prayer.

Of course, these international bodies can only reflect, through their representatives, the spiritual values of the peoples and of the rulers they represent. If the citizens in a self-governing country, or the rulers in a dictatorship, are not imbued with the principles of Christianity, these international organizations cannot rise to a higher spiritual level than the sources of their being. If "everyone now makes God in His own image," as one of my fellow Congressmen asserts—if he has no higher standard of conduct than mere conformance to what the laws of the community require to keep him out of trouble—there will be serious consequences for the individual, the Nation, and the world. For peace does not originate at the high level of diplomatic relations between nations and then flow down to the people of the world. Peace, based on Christian principle, must first exist among individuals and then—and only then—will it permeate to the level of international relations of sovereign nation-states. Fortunately, today in this country we are witnessing something of a resurgence in dedication to Christianity on the part of increasing numbers of our people.

But, you will say, we are faced with hard facts and stubborn conditions today in the international sphere. There are grave questions of national policy to which belief in Christianity, important as it is, does not give the complete answers. You will say, it does not tell us how best to determine the control of atomic energy, the nature and extent of the European recovery program, the size of our armed forces, our policies in the Middle East. True, the Bible alone cannot be expected to give us the specific answers we must have in our day to day decisions affecting international peace. Nonetheless, the more the individual realizes that we all belong to a Brotherhood of Man under the Fatherhood of God which demands a continual striving to improve the ethical standards of our conduct, and the more these feelings are translated into our international activities as a Nation, the greater are the probabilities of peace.

This Christian attitude of which I speak does not mean for a minute that we, as a Nation, should not take an intelligent and realistic view of world events. It does not necessarily mean that we should not improve and husband our military strength, that we should not be firm in our dealings with Russia; or that we should not aid democratic countries abroad. It does mean that in taking such action on these problems as

our best reasoned intelligence dictates, we do it not in the spirit of vindictiveness, in the spirit of swaggering self-importance or of mere lust for power, but that we leave the door open to better relations around the world by leaving our attitudes and our decisions with some of the humility, some of the brotherhood, and some of the hope for sweet reasonableness in others that Christ exemplified. You will recall that when a group of men came to President Lincoln and said, "Mr. Lincoln, the Lord is on our side," he replied in words which should be remembered now, "I am not concerned about that; are we on God's side?" We must not forget, with Lincoln that the principles of Christianity stand higher than a mere partisan struggles in which the worship of God can be made a mockery.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

AIR CARGO

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I asked for 10 minutes in which to address this House in protest against the kicking around which this Government has given to many of my fellow veterans of World War II, who are engaged, or rather trying to engage, in the business of carrying cargo by air.

I will begin, Mr. Speaker, by pointing out that the United States Government has an extremely strong interest in encouraging the development of a fleet of freight planes. The Secretary of the Navy has testified before the Armed Services Committee of the Senate that the Russians now have more than 250 operating submarines—which is five times the submarine fleet with which the Germans started World War II. And these subs are far more dangerous and far harder to locate than were those which baffled our Navy and Air Force for such a long time in World War II.

We therefore can no longer place our sole reliance upon ocean vessels. We must be able to fly over the enemy navy. Furthermore, if there is any truth in what General Eisenhower has told us—that the next war will be won or lost in the first 60 days—then we certainly cannot rely upon supply lines which move at only 16 knots. We must have supply lines capable of keeping up with the 70 Air Force groups voted by this House last week. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I submit that this Government has a very strong interest in building up a fleet of cargo planes without any further delay.

However, when we look at our present commercial air transport fleet, we are confronted with a very sad case of unpreparedness. The air lines which have been given certificates by the Civil Aeronautics Board possess and operate only about 60 freight planes, of which only about 20 are really capable of crossing the ocean. However, quite a group of veterans of World War II, when the war ended—and I remind this House that VJ-day occurred more than 2½ years ago—returned home with a desire to apply to our peacetime commerce those talents which they had acquired in war: the ability to fly an airplane and the familiarity with moving large quantities of freight by air. Many of these veterans, with their own money and that of their friends and relatives, bought surplus cargo planes from the Government, formed companies, started in business, and applied to the Civil Aeronautics Board for certificates of convenience and necessity to operate regularly and in a big way.

The shameful thing, Mr. Speaker, is that during the last 2½ years not a single one of these veterans air freight lines has been granted a certificate by the Civil Aeronautics Board. Lacking a certificate, these veterans have been permitted to operate only under adverse and restrictive conditions and have found it difficult to borrow money from private banks. Many of them have been forced into bankruptcy, a fact over which the president of one large certificated passenger line gloated in a recent testimony before the Civil Aeronautics Board:

> Not long ago, I believe, you could read in the paper that there were somewhere close to 100 companies engaged in that (air freight) type of service, and that has now diminished to a handful.

The Civil Aeronautics Board has not only been shamefully slow in handling the applications of these freight companies—the very type of company which this country needs for national defense—but they have failed to remove the obstacles which have been put in the way of these veterans.

Last fall the big certificated passenger air lines filed freight rates as low as 13 cents a ton-mile, which the CAB permitted to go into effect over the protest of the independent freight carriers. After another cut and another protest the CAB finally ordered an investigation, which is still pending. The veterans have charged that these new tariffs were designed solely to undercut them, and since the new rates were way below cost, they were apparently designed to crush and eliminate the remaining veterans who started this new air-freight business.

The President has recently appointed a new Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and one new member, and a third new member is slated to come before the Senate for confirmation. While the new Board has just made a tentative decision in the Air-Freight Rate case, it is yet too early to tell whether or not it will bring much relief to the veterans who are suffering from the rate war. We can only hope that in the future the Board will be considerably more enlightened on the subject of air cargo than it has been in the past.

We are all familiar, Mr. Speaker, with the tactics of big companies in certain fields other than air transportation, in starting a rate war for the purpose of crushing small competitors who do not have sufficient financial resources to last out such a rate war. The basic unfairness of this situation is high-lighted by another recent development.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. During the past few years air transportation has increased tremendously, has it not?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I read in the newspapers within the last day or two that the air freight business of Pan American had increased from $12,000,000 in 1 year to well over $30,000,000. This type of business is still in its infancy. Air freight deals principally with light articles and perishables, and it is going to develop into broader fields, of course. That is a healthy sign. However, as the business increases and the number of these independents decreases, the air freight business will become more and more monopolistic.

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes. The fact is that the Big Five air lines have gotten most of their income from passenger service, while the veterans have attempted to concentrate on freight, which would be a valuable asset to national defense. However, they have been pushed out by the rate war which the big companies have started, with the hope on the part of the big companies, I suppose, that when the rate war is over they can go back to their passenger service and get the following assistance. I think this is most unforunate.

Only last week, Mr. Speaker, enormous subsidies in the form of mail pay were granted by the CAB to the certified lines. This move, Mr. Speaker, amounts to the Government using the taxpayers' money to finance those who are trying to crush the veterans' air-freight lines—at the very time when, for defense purposes, we should be encouraging them all we can. And it is certainly odd, Mr. Speaker, that the CAB is establishing air-mail rates for the Big Five air lines, which they call service rates, which are five times the rates they have approved for cargo.

These veterans' air-freight lines have among them some 125 freight planes, and it is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the able operators among them should be given certificates by the Government as quickly as possible, so that these freight planes may be added to the fleet we so badly need for national security. They will do all right in business; in fact, until this rate war was permitted last fall, these veterans' air-freight lines were operating in the black, which is more than can be said for nearly all the big passenger lines. These veterans' air-freight lines have carried more traffic than the certificated lines. They have done it entirely on their own, and without any subsidy from the Government. It is my firm belief that they fill an important need in the interstate and foreign commerce of this country.

These veterans desire fair play, and I announce at this time, Mr. Speaker, that when the appropriation bills for the payment of air-mail subsidies and any other legislation affecting them reaches the floor of this House, I am going to see that they get fair play.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1036. An act to provide for the licensing of marine radio-telegraph operators as ship radio officers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4490. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to provide salvage facilities, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5448. An act to amend section 212 (b) and 231 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1481. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District; and

S. 2195. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 26, 1948 present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5328. An act to amend paragraph 1803 (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, relating to firewood and other woods.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 29, 1948, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1500. A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution approving an agreement relating to the resolution of conflicting claims to German enemy assets and authorizing the President to enter into the agreement or other agreements similar in character with certain countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1501. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide a civil government for the trust territory of the Pacific islands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1502. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a voluntary plan covering the allocation of steel and pig iron for the construction of domestic railway freight cars and the repair of railroad rolling stock; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1503. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting reports on the natural-gas investigation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1504. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 24, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Mississippi River below Cape Girardeau with respect to west Tennessee tributaries, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on April 26, 1944, and other congressional authorizations (H. Doc. No. 627); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1505. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 2, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of report on Clinton River, Mich., with a view to providing flood protection on Red Run, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives, adopted on May 2, 1946 (H. Doc. No 628); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1826. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 6341. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1827). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 6342. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force to proceed with construction at military installations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1828). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. S. 418. An act to provide for water pollution control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1829). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EATON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 1605. An act to provide for the payment of a sum not to exceed $12,000,000 to the Swiss Government as partial compensation for damage inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights, and authorizing appropriations therefor; with amendments (Rept. No. 1831). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REES: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 4917. A bill to provide further benefits for certain employees of the United States who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for probational civil-service appointments by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States, and who, due to service-connected disabilities, are unable to perform the duties of the positions for which examinations were taken; without amendment (Rept. No. 1832). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. House Report No. 1068 (pt. II). Supplemental report to accompany H. R. 3748. A bill to provide additional compensation to widows and other dependents of certain veterans. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5546. A bill for the relief of Harry Tansey; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1825). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 6366. A bill to permit the sale of gold within the United States, its Territories and possessions, including Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 6367. A bill to conserve water and power for irrigation and related purposes and to conserve petroleum used in power generation and to direct the construction, operation, and maintenance of transmission lines interconnecting Federal power systems of the Bonneville Power Administration and the Bureau of Reclamation in the Pacific Northwest and northern and central California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

H. R. 6368. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the dedication of the Palomar Mountain Observatory; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 6369. A bill to incorporate the National Guard Auxiliary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 6370. A bill to provide for the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by farmers for the purpose of soil and water conservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. R. 6371. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the Boise Barracks Military Reservation, Boise, Idaho, to Boise City, Idaho, excepting certain parts thereof heretofore set aside for governmental purposes of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 6372. A bill for the acquisition of additional land adjoining the Federal building in Idaho Falls, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 6373. A bill to limit and restrict the ownership and use of radio broadcast stations in chain or network broadcast service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 6374. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 6375. A bill to provide for the temporary free importation of lead; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 6376. A bill to cancel drainage charges against certain lands within the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 6377. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Commonwealth of Virginia a right-of-way for public-highway purposes in certain lands at Pungo, Va.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 6378. A bill to provide for the refund of certain interest paid by veterans on loans secured by adjusted-service certificates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEARHART (by request):

H. R. 6379. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6380. A bill to increase the amount of articles acquired abroad by residents of the United States which may be brought into the country free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. R. 6381. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 6382. A bill to provide a coordinated anti-inflation program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. J. Res. 389. Joint resolution to amend Public Law 472, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. J. Res. 390. Joint resolution to authorize the erection of a marker to commemorate the poem The Blue and the Gray and the event which inspired its composition; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 6383. A bill for the relief of Jacob Reder and Erna Marcelina Frenkel Reder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROPHY:

H. R. 6384. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose Katchios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 6385. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy M. Evans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1846. By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of E. F. Freytag and 33 other residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity, in support of legislation to reduce postage on packages mailed to European countries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1847. By Mr. PATMAN: Petition of Mrs. George P. Grout and 45 other members of the Bogata, Tex., Methodist Church, protesting against the inclusion of tobacco and American wine as a part of the aid to the peoples of Europe under the European recovery program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1848. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Max Kloen, Roslyn Heights, Long Island, N. Y., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the grant of the reissue of United States Letters Patent No. 1,815,303; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1849. Also, petition of Miss Rosa Lee Smith, Jacksonville, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1850. Also, petition of the chairman, Citizens Protective League, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to permitting the entry of German nationals into this country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 29, 1948

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Spirit of God, Thou who givest liberally to all men, whisper into our souls the secret of obedience to Thy holy will. We pray Thee to give us that repose of mind which believes that all things work together for good to them that love the Lord. We thank Thee that we can live by deeds and thoughts, rather than by years marked on the dial of time. No matter if the veiling fog shuts out the stars, we praise Thee that above all abide the immortal words sounding in the recesses of the soul: Peace, be still; it is I, be not afraid. In the Master's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 182. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document the factual analysis on housing entitled "Housing in America" for the use of the Joint Committee on Housing.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution authorizing the appointment of a joint committee to arrange for the inauguration of the President-elect of the United States on January 20, 1949; and

S. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the hearings on investigation of national resources for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

FOOD PRICES

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TWYMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a Member of this body made an appeal for the return to controls because food prices have gone up. Nothing new was learned. We all know that food prices have gone up, but they have not gone up simply because there are no controls. I wish to quote from an article by George Thiem, staff farm writer of the Chicago Daily News. He says, and I quote:

There is no mystery about high food prices.

The United States has been pumping food and resources to foreign countries at a rate never equaled in the history of the world.

People are putting 17 percent more food per capita under their belts than in the prewar period.

And until lately consumers spent their money for food because there wasn't much else in the stores to buy.

University of Wisconsin economists came up with these explanations after digging into the causes of current price levels.

The experts put the finger on grain prices as the culprit in the whole upward spiral.

EXPORTS BIG FACTOR

Heavy wheat and corn exports built a fire under the grain market, causing repeated explosions at the Chicago Board of Trade.

Higher grain raised flour and bread prices. The cost of a ham, pork loin, and standing rib roast went up because high-priced corn was used to make them.

Singling out United States exports in 1946, the Wisconsin men said: "The export level was twice as high as the 1920 peak after World War I. It was five times as heavy as in 1938 and nearly 10 times as great as in the depression of 1933. These exports are largely Government promoted."

HIGHER PRICES, HIGHER PAY

Continuing the analysis: "Food prices bring demands for higher wages. Higher wages increase the price of most manufactured goods and the price of all services."

Unlike other war periods, this time agricultural products rose faster than nonfarm goods and reached higher peaks. Nonagricultural prices have not reached the peaks of other wars.

But the heyday of the farm boom is past, the economists conclude. The farmer's net in 1948 will be less than that of last year. His prices are falling, but his costs will stay up.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TWYMAN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. We want to put controls on our exports. That will keep prices down here if we do it right.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and in one to include an editorial.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from today's Tribune.

Mr. COUDERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances.

Mr. SNYDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

GREAT BRITAIN AND PALESTINE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I had intended to confine my modest efforts this week to housing, but events will not permit that.

Mr. Speaker, the eyes of the world this week will be focused on Great Britain. Will Great Britain take counsel of statesmanship or will Great Britain take counsel of the chagrin and resentment of her Bevins and cause the Arab legion of the Kingdom of Transjordan, trained, led, financed, and organized by Great Britain, to administer the final "stab in the back" to the Jews in Palestine and to the United Nations? The whole world this week will watch to see the result.

I believe—and I think I have a right to believe—that the people of Great Britain, like the people of the United States, feel that the United Nations is mankind's last best hope for peace. The United Nations needs to be supported, not undermined, in the Palestine situation. Great Britain can show that she means what she says about supporting and strengthening the United Nations now.

Heretofore it has been much too easy to slough over Britain's derelictions in not cooperating with respect to Palestine with the United Nations Palestine Commission. We have been asked to overlook her callous supply of arms to the Arab states, openly backing the Arab invaders in Palestine, due to claimed "treaty arrangements," while our arms embargo was applied vigorously to the Jewish defense forces. We have been asked to overlook allegations of damaging restrictions and discriminations by British forces respecting these Jewish forces. But now the issue is clear. In not staying the hands of the organized Arab armies, which we now see to mean the Arab legion of Transjordan, led, financed, organized, and directed by Great Britain, in a plan to invade Palestine, she will show her real intentions. I sincerely hope that even at this late date Great Britain will be true to her tradition of justice and will cooperate with the United Nations.

The world this week will see what it shall see.

I append hereto an editorial on this subject from today's Washington Post:

ABDULLAH'S POSITION

Whether Emir Abdullah, of Transjordania, is or is not moving into Palestine, there is little doubt in our minds that he holds the key to Jew-Arab understanding, and that the British hold the key to Emir Abdullah.

Hitherto, however, the great powers since last November have been engaged in pushing the Emir into the arms of the Arab League. This league has been widely touted by some of our diplomats as well as our military, as a formidable combination capable of proclaiming and leading a jehad, or holy war. The plain fact is that it is a loose body, in great part of British creation, composed of hardly reconcilable elements. Abdullah cannot forget that King ibn-Saud of Saudi Arabia robbed his family of their rightful kingdom, their native Hejaz. He likewise is at dagger's drawn with the man who is running the Arab Higher Committee in Palestine, namely, the Mufti. Both of them are doing everything in their power, by intrigue and otherwise, to bring about Abdullah's downfall. The notion that he would open his kingdom to forces belonging to his enemies is too fantastic to be entertained. Yet Transjordan, which is the main territory abutting upon Palestine, would have to be used in any large-scale invasion.

It is clear in the nature of things that Abdullah must be scared that his own kingdom might invite partition by his enemies if he goes into all-out collision with the Palestine Jews. His dilemma is extreme. Strong action by the United Nations might have spared him from it, but, looked at from Transjordan, and, indeed, from the whole of the Middle East, the United Nations must now seem even more pallid than the Arab League. And the United States, which he doesn't know but from which he longs for recognition, cannot give him any confidence as to its reliability. The fact is as apparent here as it is there that America has been dazzled by bogeys created by romantic Arabophiles, some of them members of our Foreign Service, who showed their loyalty by kicking through the American goal as soon as the Assembly and the United States had backed the Sundstrom report in favor of partition.

Abdullah, however, does know the British. His kingdom is the only one in the Middle East that is tied body and soul to the British. The only one of the rulers who does not subsist on oil royalties, he is kept going by a direct subsidy from the British, and the British, moreover, run his army, second-best in the Middle East to the Jewish Haganah. That army is the Arab Legion, 25,000 strong. At present part of it is being borrowed by the British administration in Palestine as police. The Jewish Agency charges that the forces are being used to allow positions, as, for instance, the airport at Lydda, to fall into Palestine Arab hands. Be this as it may, the Arab Legion without the British and Abdullah himself without the British would be in a parlous condition.

Whether the British can now use their influence over Abdullah in behalf of peace with justice is problematical. That they have lost touch with realities and are taking counsel of their fears was indicated in the collapse of what an authoritative English news letter calls their treaty mania with the Arabs. The incredible Foreign Secretary Bevin actually refused to tell a critical House of Commons yesterday whether the British would continue to finance, arm, and officer Abdullah's legion in the event of invasion of Palestine. Abdullah must feel in a cleft stick as a result of the imbroglio about Palestine. All that has happened since last November has, indeed, put a premium on intransigence in the Middle East, both among the Arabs and among the Jews. Good will alone will never produce results in Arab lands subject to Pasha control. Force is needed to back good will, resolve as well as paper must clothe resolutions. Mr. Churchill made this plain during the 1937 debate on the Peel scheme of partition. In an advertisement in the Washington Post yesterday the Committee for Justice and Peace in the Holy Land asks Americans to support the plans of their Government, because partition has been shown to be unworkable. Nothing in the Holy Land has yet been shown to be unworkable except irresolution.

THE GEOMETRY OF OLEO

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, during yesterday's debate on the oleomargarine bill certain thoughts occurred to me which I was about to put into the RECORD when debate on the Case substitute to the Hill amendment was closed by the action of the House. I should like, if I may, Mr. Speaker, to make these observations now, for I think they are still pertinent.

I have observed, Mr. Speaker, when I have accompanied Mrs. Jenkins on her shopping trips, in the manner of most husbands, that oleomargarine is generally sold in square packages. The Hill amendment would have required that it be sold in triangular packages. Now, as I recall my geometry, according to the famous Pythagorean theorem, the square on the hypotenuse of a right-angle triangle is equivalent to the sum of the squares on the other two legs. There is, therefore, as one can easily see, a very definite relationship between squares and triangles. There is, however, so far as my recollection goes, which, with the passage of the years, might, however, well be faulty, no such definite relationship between squares and triangles, on the one hand, and circles, which formed the substance of the Case substitute, on the other hand. I was, therefore, opposed to the Case substitute as not germane to the subject and voted against it.

With respect to the Hill amendment, while the relationship of which I spoke exists, I could see no good reason for substituting the constituent triangles for the square of which they were but a component part. It is a complete work of supererogation. Consequently, I was opposed to the Hill amendment.

My final observation is that I wonder what Euclid and Archimedes would have thought of yesterday's debate. I am inclined to think that they would be greatly surprised to observe the lengths to which their studies have progressed. But then, of course, "progress"—and I place that word in quotation marks—is the hallmark of this modern age and is what distinguishes us from the arrogant, opinionated, and unlearned beasts.

TAXES IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, we people of New York are proud of our State. We are particularly proud that it has been a leader throughout the decades in the enactment of progressive laws and in the administration thereof in a manner which has brought good government. Our nonpolitical school system is a model for the country. Our courts, manned by well-paid judges, enjoy undisputed pres-

tige. Our civil service, based on measured merit, is free of political interference. Our workmen's compensation laws pioneered similar laws elsewhere and grant maximum protection to our people.

In no branch of State government, as a matter of fact, is the State of New York deficient.

Such fine government costs money. The people of the State of New York have been willing to tax themselves heavily to supply the revenue which our brand of government requires. I append herewith a tabulation of these taxes and rates:

Type of revenue	Measure of tax	Rate of tax [1]
Personal income tax	Net income; nonresidents, net income derived in State	2 to 7 percent. Net capital gains, 1 to 3½ percent. Exemptions: Single person, $1,000; married, $2,500. Each dependent, $400. Tax reduced 25 percent for income of calendar years 1941 to 1944; 50 percent reduction for income of calendar years 1945, 1946 to 1947.
Business taxes:		
Corporation tax (art. 9):		
Sec. 181. Foreign corporations	Capital stock employed in State during first year of business and any increase thereafter.	1/5 of 1 percent of par value, or if no designated value, 6 cents per share. Minimum tax, $10.
Sec. 182. Real estate	Gross assets employed or situated in State during preceding year and dividends as apportioned.	¼ of 1 mill on $1 of assets. Minimum tax, $10. 2 percent on dividends as additional tax.
Sec. 183. Transportation and transmission.	Capital stock within State during preceding year	Dependent on dividends but not less than 1 mill on $1. Minimum tax, $10.
Sec. 184. Transportation and transmission, additional.	Gross earnings in State	5/10 of 1 percent.
Sec. 185. Agricultural cooperatives	Capital stock within State during preceding year	Dependent on dividends but not less than 1 mill on $1. Minimum tax, $10.
Sec. 186. Water, gas, electric, steam, lighting and power.	Gross earnings in State. Also dividends in excess of 4 percent on paid-up capital in State.	5/10 of 1 percent of gross earnings and 3 percent of dividends in excess of 4 percent. Minimum tax, $25.
Sec. 187. Insurance premiums	Gross direct premiums less return premiums thereon on risks located or resident in State.	1 to 2 percent but non-United States fire and marine, 5/10 of 1 percent.
Utilities tax (gross receipts)	Gross income or gross operating income (as defined) as the case	2 percent.
Corporation franchise tax (art. 9a)	Entire net income or other applicable measure	4½ percent. Minimum tax not less than (1) $25, (2) 1 mil on $1 of capital or (3) 4½ percent of 30 percent of income plus certain salaries.
Organization of corporations	Authorized capital stock	1/50 of 1 percent of par value, or if no designated value, 5 cents per share. Minimum tax, $10.
Unincorporated business tax	Net income within State	3 percent.
Bank tax	Net income for calendar year	4½ percent. Minimum tax $10 but not less than 1 mil on $1 of apportioned issued capital stock.
	Net income	4½ percent.
Insurance premium tax	Gross direct premiums, less return premiums thereon on risks located or resident in the State.	1 to 2 percent depending on type of insurance and on place of incorporation.
	Underwriting profit on business in State	5 percent.
Excises on consumption:		
Motor-vehicle tax	Weight, seating and carrying capacity	Passenger: 50 cents per hundredweight and 75 cents per hundredweight over 3,500 pounds. Commercial: Light delivery cars, $12; trucks, 80 cents per hundredweight. All other: Various.
	Flat rate	3-year chauffeur, $5; operator, $2; renewals: Chauffeur, $4; operator, $1.50. 1 year chauffeur, $3; operator, $1; renewals: chauffeur, $2; operator, 50 cents.
Motor-fuel tax	Sale of motor fuel within State	4 cents per gallon.
Alcoholic-beverage tax	Sales of beer, wine, and liquor within State	Per gallon: Cider, 1½ cents; beer, 3½ cents; still wine, 10 cents; carbonated wine, 20 cents; sparkling wine, 40 cents; liquor with not more than 24 percent alcohol, 50 cents; liquor, $1.50.
Alcoholic beverage control licenses	Nature of business and size of locality	Varying schedule, $1 to $7,500.
Cigarette tax	Sale of cigarettes within State	1 cent for each 10 cigarettes or fraction thereof.
Taxes on transfers and exchanges:		
Inheritance and estate tax	Residents, net estate; nonresidents, so much of net estate as consists of real and tangible personal property in State.	1 to 20 percent.
Stock transfer tax	Shares of stock	Sales, 1 to 4 cents per share. Other transfers, 2 cents.
Pari-mutuels tax	Pari-mutuel betting pool	In first zone, 6 percent of total pari-mutuel pool plus 60 percent of breaks, as defined. In second zone, 5 percent and 50 percent. Harness races, 5 percent and 50 percent.
Other taxes:		
Racing tax	Price of admission tickets sold or disposed of	15 percent.
Motion picture tax	Length of film	$3 per 1,000 feet or fraction thereof for orginal film, $2 for copies.
Boxing exhibitions tax	Total gross receipts	5 percent.

[1] Excluded from this chart are the collections earmarked for the war bonus account as, follows:

	1947–48, estimated	1948–49, estimated	Rate
Personal income tax	$2,500,000	$31,000,000	10 percent of normal tax.
Cigarette tax	2,500,000	16,750,000	Additional ½ cent for each 10 cigarettes or fraction thereof.

In addition to taxing ourselves as per the above, the people of the State of New York, in 1947, paid 19.8 of all the Federal Government's internal revenue collections.

In view of such participation in the cost of the Federal Government, and in view of the extent to which we tax ourselves for our State government, is it not fair for the people of the State of New York to say to the people of other States, "Tax yourselves as extensively as we tax ourselves, and at corresponding rates, before you come to the Federal Government for Federal aid that will add to the tax burden we already carry"?

ONE VERSUS THE MANY AND OLEO VERSUS THE PEOPLE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear about the progress of the great State of New York. But as far as I am concerned, it was rather surprising to me yesterday to see so many people put down in black and white that they felt they had more information than their State legislatures, their assemblymen, senators and governors, all the people of their State. It is difficult to believe New York can make these forward steps with the approval of Washington. Being a modest soul, I hope I never get myself in the position of knowing more than the Governor, the State legislature, and all the people of my State. I would not want the people of my district or my State to think that I knew more than they did. This superduper attitude is a foreign approach and not the American way. As long as they have State laws on oleo or any other legislation, I would want to give them the consideration they deserve and not give the impression that I knew more than all the people of my State and its representatives know.

This is a hang-over from the New Deal. All the knowledge emanates from Washington, as though the people were not capable of thinking for themselves. They must be imbued with the feeling that States' rights deserve little recognition and that Washington has all the answers.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

AN ENGLISHMAN'S OPINION OF THE MARSHALL PLAN

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House will be interested in knowing that the Liberal Party in England recently adopted a resolution deploring the "measures taken by the Government for the compulsory direction of labor and the continuation in peacetime of conscripted military service."

At the same time Guy Naylor, chairman of the Association of Liberal Trade-Unionists, said:

> We are at this moment living on the charity of Americans. Everyone diverted from production has to be supported by the United States.

This English labor leader explained that this being so, American taxpayers were in reality paying the way of every man in an English uniform, conscript or volunteer. He even went so far as to call British soldiers American mercenaries.

Mr. Speaker, it is becoming more and more evident every day that many distinguished Englishmen realize that the so-called Marshall plan is merely underwriting their socialism. As Mr. Churchill recently said:

> All this money which comes to us has to be earned by a mass of ordinary people in America who voluntarily deny themselves many things.

Mr. Churchill told his countrymen:

> We should be proud once again when we are earning our own living and paying our own way.

Americans, no less than Englishmen, can be proud once again when they pay their own way and are no longer dependent on socialistic subsidies from funds which should be used to increase productive capacity of America and the entire world. Let us hope the advice of these distinguished Englishmen will be heeded and that there will be a world-wide movement for men once again to stand on their own feet. Only then can we have a peaceful prosperity.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on the subject of reciprocal trade agreements which appeared in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette April 27, 1948.

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Indianapolis News.

PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the press I learn that Candidate Stassen and some of the Washington papers' editorials find fault because Senator TAFT intimated that the Republican Senate would not confirm Mr. Lilienthal and perhaps some other appointments of the President. Now, I would like to ask Mr. Stassen and the Washington press, too, for that matter, and all others of like mind, what is the use of having two parties, a two-party system, and then have a party which expects to win the next election, as the Republican Party does—and the Democrats, I think, concede that—what is the purpose in confirming all of those appointments and letting the New Dealers continue in power during the next 4 years? The purpose of an election is to afford the people an opportunity to change the makers and administrators of law. For a party which expects to direct the Government during the next 4 years to freeze into office the opposition is just the height of a silly, absurd policy that does not even make good sense politically. Now, when the Democrats won—and they were in power for 15 or 16 years—they gave the offices to members of their political faith. And that is all right with me. I go along with that old Democrat, Jackson, I think it was, who said, "to the victor belongs the spoils." There is no use in trying to improve conditions unless we kick all of these boys out down there; not a bit. I am wondering whether Mr. Stassen intends to retain all the New Deal bureaucrats who have misdirected us so long.

INFLATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised at the remarks made by my very distinguished friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

One fellow said the other day that "the New Deal Democrats and ERP Republicans are going to wreck this country yet."

But, I want to refer to the address made a few minutes ago about inflation. If you want to do so, you can curb this inflation, but so far nothing has been done.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, is the gentleman looking at me?

Mr. RANKIN. No; I am just looking over the gentleman's head.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is fine.

Mr. RANKIN. With my mind's eye, I was looking at candidates Taft and Stassen and Dewey and the chairmen of the Committee on Banking and Currency of both the House and the Senate and wondering why they neglect this vital issue.

Prices in a free economy are controlled by two things: The volume of the Nation's currency and the velocity of its circulation. The circulating medium has been spiraling from less than $5,000,000,000 in the early thirties to $28,110,000,000 on January 31. Unless the Congress of the United States takes back the power given it by the Constitution to "coin money and regulate the value thereof" and takes away from these private banks, these Federal Reserve banks, the right to inflate our currency, they are likely to wreck this country. I have pointed this out time and time again. It is the most serious problem that now confronts the American people.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Who passed all these laws? The New Deal Democrats. They are responsible for it, and we are going to clean them out.

Mr. RANKIN. You are in charge now, and you have not done a thing about it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; we did. We took the tax off oleo yesterday.

Mr. RANKIN. That is as near as you have come yet to solving the question of curbing inflation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

INFLATION

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the gentleman's explanation of inflation. He probably is correct. I have a simple one. Inflation is nothing more than more money than goods, and the cure is to have more goods than money. It is simple, but it rings true.

Now, in connection with inflation, yesterday I received a phone call from a farmer in western Nebraska saying that they were short of oil and gasoline, to carry on their farming operations. That condition is going to get worse in this country, and one reason for it is that we are shipping out of this country tremendous amounts of oil under the so-called ERP. You just cannot ship it out of the country and have it here at the same time. You folks from New England who were crying that you were cold last winter may be colder this winter, because the amount of oil shipped out of this country is far in excess of what the country can stand, and consequently the

supply is insufficient to meet our own needs.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The shipping of this material abroad is going to cause a further inflation of the currency. Now, mark that. Inflation is going to increase, and those prices to the American consumers are going to increase.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Coming back to my definition of inflation. It is more money than goods, and the cure is to have more goods than money. Factories are running at capacity. There is full employment in this country. When our citizens try to buy the goods they need and find that under ERP these goods have been shipped out of the country, it all means inflation and a dislocation of our own economy.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6055) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6055) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 12, 40, 42, 50, and 54.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, and 68, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"TEMPORARY CONGRESSIONAL AVIATION POLICY BOARD

"For an additional amount for salaries and expenses for completion of the work of the Temporary Congressional Aviation Policy Board created by the Act to establish a National Aviation Council, and for other purposes (Public Law 287, Eightieth Congress), to be available until June 30, 1948, and to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers approved by the Chairman, $5,000: *Provided*, That expenditures hereunder shall be made in accordance with the laws applicable to inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

"Such sums as may be necessary (not exceeding $4,500,000) are hereby appropriated for making for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1949 payments to States in accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended (29 U. S. C., ch. 4): *Provided*, That the obligations incurred and expenditures made for such purpose under the authority of this paragraph shall be charged to the appropriation therefor in the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1949: *Provided further*, That the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall not exceed the amount paid to the States for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1948 in accordance with such Vocational Rehabilitation Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$970,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$20,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$262,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 22, 30, and 34.

STYLES BRIDGES,
CHAN GURNEY,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE H. MAHON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6055) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS

Amendments Nos. 1 to 7, inclusive, relate to miscellaneous items for the Senate and involve additional appropriations of $47,550, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8 appropriates $12,500 for the widow of a deceased Representative, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9 appropriates $5,000 for the Temporary Congressional Aviation Policy Board, as proposed by the Senate, with an amendment added to provide for the completion of the work of the Board concurrent with the expiration date of this appropriation, June 30, 1948.

Amendment No. 10 waives a limitation for the Public Health Service in connection with the purchase of motor vehicles in the Philippine Islands, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11 authorizes the advance to States from the 1949 appropriation of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, as proposed by the Senate, but limits the amount that may be advanced to the sum of $4,500,000.

Amendment No. 12 strikes out the proposal of the Senate to appropriate $1,850,000 for grants to States for unemployment compensation administration.

Amendment No. 13 appropriates $970,000 for reconversion unemployment benefits for seamen instead of $840,000 as proposed by the House and $1,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14, relating to the Public Buildings Administration, appropriates $50,000 for preparation of plans to eliminate structural and fire hazards in the Executive Mansion, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15, relating to the Office of the Housing Expediter, appropriates $2,000,000 to carry out the functions of Public Law 464, approved March 30, 1948, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16, relating to the National Mediation Board, appropriates $48,800, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17, relating to the National Railroad Adjustment Board, increases a limitation from $65,000 to $75,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18, relating to the Tax Court of the United States, increases a salary limitation from $20,000 to $24,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19, relating to the District of Columbia, appropriates $10,210 for the Office of Administrator of Rent Control, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20, relating to the District of Columbia, appropriates $17,500 for the National Guard, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $20,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 21, relating to the Department of Commerce, appropriates $20,000 for printing and binding instead of $39,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22 reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 23, relating to the Department of Commerce, transfers $262,500 to the Bureau of Customs for enforcement of the export-control program instead of $225,000 as proposed by the House and $300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24 corrects language.

Amendment No. 25 provides for the transfer of $15,000 to "Printing and binding" of the Department of Commerce as proposed by the Senate instead of $20,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 26, relating to the Department of Commerce, allows $10,000 to be used for emergency medical services in Alaska, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27, relating to the Bonneville Power Administration, appropriates $665,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $625,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 28, relating to the Bonneville Power Administration, increases a limitation by $140,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $100,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 29 increases a limitation in the Bureau of Land Management of the

Interior Department from $310,000 to $325,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30 reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 31 inserts language providing for general funds, construction, in the Bureau of Reclamation, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32, relating to the Bureau of Reclamation, appropriates $3,000,000 for the Colorado-Big Thompson project, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 33, relating to the Bureau of Reclamation, appropriates $1,000,000 for the Central Valley project instead of $1,274,281, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 34 reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 35, relating to the Bureau of Mines, appropriates $4,000,000 to liquidate contract authorizations, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36, relating to the National Park Service, inserts language to provide for fighting forest fires in Acadia National Park, Maine, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37, relating to the Department of Justice, increases limitation on fees of witnesses from $25,000 to $50,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 38 and 39, relating to the United States Employment Service, appropriates $40,800 for general administration, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40 strikes out the proposal of the Senate to appropriate $2,560,000 for additional grants to States for public employment offices.

Amendment No. 41, relating to the Department of the Army, provides for the transfer of $143,000,000 for government and relief in occupied areas from the appropriation "Pay of the Army, 1948," as proposed by the Senate, instead of a direct appropriation of a similar amount as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 42, relating to the Department of the Navy, appropriates $3,800 for the Naval Home, as proposed by the House, instead of $9,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43, relating to the Post Office Department, "Compensation to postmasters," provides for the transfer of $1,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of a direct appropriation as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 44, relating to the Post Office Department, appropriates $665,000 for "Star-route service," as proposed by the Senate, instead of $765,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 45, relating to the Post Office Department, "Star-route and air-mail service, Alaska," provides for a transfer of $224,500, as proposed by the Senate, instead of a direct appropriation as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 46, relating to the Post Office Department, "Star-route and air-mail service, Alaska, 1946," provides for a transfer as proposed by the Senate instead of a direct appropriation as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 47, relating to the Post Office Department, appropriates $300,000 for unpaid money orders more than 1 year old, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $321,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 48, relating to the Post Office Department, appropriates $89,000 for transportation of equipment and supplies, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $305,200 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 49, relating to the Post Office Department, provides for the transfer of $100,000 for "Operating supplies, public buildings," as proposed by the Senate, instead of a direct appropriation as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 50 strikes out the proposal of the Senate relating to the Department of State, international obligations and activities, for administration of the program authorized by section 32 (b) (2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended.

Amendment No. 51, relating to the Department of State, international obligations and activities, provides that $1,600,000 shall be available without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 52, relating to the same subject as amendment No. 51, provides that the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army shall handle certain construction work abroad for the Department of State.

Amendment No. 53, relating to the Department of State, allows not to exceed $100,000 for certain moving expenses, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $570,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 54, relating to the Department of State, provides that $60,000 shall be available for activities authorized by titles II, III, and IV of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as proposed by the House, instead of $100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 55, relating to the Treasury Department, Bureau of Accounts, provides $300,000 for refunds, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 56, relating to the Treasury Department, Bureau of Accounts, provides for $1,000,000 for "Payment of certified claims" to be derived by transfer as proposed by the Senate instead of direct appropriation of $700,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 57, relating to the Treasury Department, Bureau of the Public Debt, provides for the transfer of $361,000 for "Distinctive paper for United States currency" as proposed by the Senate instead of a direct appropriation as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 58, 59, and 60, relating to the Treasury Department, Bureau of Customs, provide for refunds in the amount of $4,500,000 and for the use of certain collections for reimbursements, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 61 and 62, relating to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, provide an increase in the limitation on printing and binding in the amount of $140,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 63, relating to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, appropriates $568,000,000 for "Refunding internal revenue collections," as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 64, relating to the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, provides for the transfer of $1,250,000 for "Salaries and expenses," as proposed by the Senate, instead of a direct appropriation of $1,650,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 65, relating to the Secret Service Division, provides for the transfer of $10,700 to reimburse the District of Columbia as proposed by the Senate instead of a direct appropriation of the same amount as proposed by the House.

TITLE II—CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, JUDGMENTS, AND AUDITED CLAIMS

Amendments Nos. 66 and 67 provide for the payment of claims, etc., as set forth in Senate Document No. 132, as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE III—REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATIONS

Amendment No. 68, relating to the Department of the Army, reduces the rescission for "Pay of the Army" to $32,300,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $175,300,000 as proposed by the House.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The managers on the part of the House have authorized the following motions with respect to amendments in disagreement:

Amendment No. 22, relating to voluntary agreements and export controls under the Department of Commerce, that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out and inserted by the said amendment insert "$225,000: *Provided*, That the authorization granted the Secretary of Commerce in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, with respect to utilization of funds for export controls and for allocation and inventory controls or voluntary agreements relating thereto, is extended from March 31 to June 30, 1948: *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available herein".

Amendment No. 30, relating to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, provides that not to exceed $100,000 shall be available for loans to the Navajo and Hopi Tribes in connection with the emergency work program, as proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 34, relating to the Department of the Interior, Boulder Canyon project, provides for the payment of $39,000 from the Colorado River Dam fund to the Boulder City School District, as proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the House move to recede and concur.

JOHN TABER,
RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE H. MAHON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 22: On page 15, line 17, strike out "$750,000 of which" and insert the following: "$375,000: *Provided*, That the authorization granted the Secretary of Commerce in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, with respect to utilization of funds for export controls and for allocation and inventory controls or voluntary agreements relating thereto, is extended from March 31 to June 30, 1948: *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available herein."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 22 and concur in the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out and inserted by the said amendment insert "$225,000: *Provided*, That the authorization granted the Secretary of Commerce in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, with respect to utilization of funds for export controls and for allocation and inventory controls or voluntary agreements relating thereto, is extended from March 31 to June 30, 1948: *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available herein."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 30: Page 19, line 21, insert the following: "of which amount not to exceed $100,000 shall be available for loans to the Navajo and Hopi Tribes, members or association of members thereof for the purchase of milk animals."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 34, on page 22, line 9, insert "Boulder Canyon Project: For payment to the Boulder City School District in accordance with the provisions of S. 1985, $39,000, payable from the Colorado River Dam fund."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, 1949

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 559 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6355) making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill or any provisions contained therein are hereby waived.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and now yield to myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution waives points of order against H. R. 6355, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949. Of course, it is understood by Members of the House that ordinary appropriation bills do not require a rule. The rule was requested in this instance because in the appropriation bill there is a provision consolidating in the Federal Security Agency the employment services which are presently in the Labor Department and the Unemployment Compensation Service, which is now in the Federal Security Agency. That being a legislative provision, it was necessary for the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations to request this rule. This provision in the appropriation bill, if adopted by the Congress, will save approximately $21,000,000 a year. You will recall that just recently, under the Presidential Reorganization Act for 1948, the Chief Executive proposed the consolidation of both these agencies in the Labor Department. The Congress rejected that reorganization plan.

In the Federal Security Agency there is an organization, the Bureau of Employment Security, which has been administering the unemployment compensation. If these services are consolidated, as this appropriation bill proposes, you not only save this sum of money but you get more efficiency.

These services have all been consolidated by the States at the State level, with the exception of the State of Idaho, and they are now in the process of consolidating these services in that State. So it is an economic saving to have them consolidated in the same way at the Federal level.

I feel that the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], and the members of his subcommittee should be commended for doing what I think is a splendid job in reducing the Budget estimates of the Federal Security Administration. I had the pleasure and the honor, at his invitation, to appear before his committee and testify concerning certain activities that my Committee on Publicity and Propaganda has reported to the Congress. I am convinced, as a result of the investigation which we made, that the Federal Security Administrator, particularly the Bureau of Research and Statistics, have unlawfully diverted Federal funds for publicity and propaganda activities. It is most gratifying, therefore, that the committee has reduced the Budget estimate for that Bureau from $229,830 to a round figure of $100,000.

They have made an over-all saving in the Social Security Board of $1,377,000.

If the work of my committee exposing the propaganda and publicity activities of this agency has resulted in the Appropriations Committee cutting off $129,830 from this one bureau, then I think my committee has rendered a great service not only to the country but to the Congress, and especially to this Appropriations Committee.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. Where is that cut of $129,000?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. According to the report, I understand that the Budget estimate for the Bureau of Research and Statistics was $220,830. The Committee reduced that figure to $100,000.

As I have already mentioned, one of the best things in this bill is this legislative provision which makes this rule necessary, by consolidating these two agencies, the Employment Service and the Unemployment Compensation Service, in the Federal Security Agency.

I hope the Congress will overwhelmingly support the committee in this action.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of confidence in the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. I believe that his intentions are honorable and that he actually aims to effect a saving to the Government. Whether it does or not I do not know.

A rule was granted upon this bill the same day that it was reported by the Committee on Appropriations. The Committee on Rules did not have before it a printed numbered copy of the bill, just the committee print, and voted for the rule without a quorum being present.

The points of order that are waived against the provisions of the bill apply to legislative provisions of the bill pertaining to the transfer of the United States Employment Service from the Department of Labor to the Federal Security Agency, and to section 109 of the bill which prohibits the payments of salaries to employees who are members of an organization whose officers have not complied with the requirements of the Labor-Management Relations Act—Taft-Hartley Act—and those committed to striking against the Government. Both these provisions incorporated in the appropriation bill are clearly in violation of the rules of the House in that the Committee on Appropriations is improperly invading the legislative field.

This arrogation will come to plague the House, giving, as it does, the right to the Committee on Appropriations to legislate. Not that I hold any brief for Communists or sanction the employment of any persons who strike against the Government or advocate its overthrow, but I object to the usurpation of the powers of a legislative committee by a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations and the full committee.

I have served notice that I will oppose such methods in legislating in apropriation bills and all I can do now is to call attention to the inclusion of legislative matter in an appropriation bill before us. You have a majority, you have the power and, yes, you are flaunting that power and you do as you please. In acting in this manner, I wish to assure you that if I had been present when the Rules Committee gave this rule, it would not have been done without a quorum being present. I serve notice now that no rules will be granted by the Committee on Rules, especially on appropriation bills carrying legislative provisions, without a quorum being present, except where there is a unanimous report from a legislative committee.

What I am opposed to is this—and I think the House should know—the Appropriations Committee again arrogates legislative jurisdiction of this House. I am sorry that we have not the report of some of the gentlemen who made the investigation of this matter.

I did not know, really, that this matter would come up this morning. Furthermore, I have been under the weather more or less, and there are so many things that I have not been able really properly to familiarize myself with, particularly the real purpose that lies behind this effort.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for just a question? I agree with the gentleman that he has been ill and has been overworked, and I think on these matters the gentleman owes it to himself to take a rest here at Bethesda or one of these sanatoria. I think the gentleman is overworking all the time.

Mr. SABATH. I think I will be obliged to do so. I am here against the orders of my physician, but I feel that I owe the duty to the House and the country to be here and call attention from time to time to unfair legislation and unfair action taken that is manifestly unwarranted, and deprives the legislative committees

of their prerogatives under the rules of the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, I know; if the gentleman is not able——

Mr. SABATH. I am trying to do as well as I can, as the gentleman will see. As I say, unfortunately I do not have all the facts before me, but I am going to rely on the members of the committee who possess, in my opinion, greater knowledge of the matter than I do; and I always try to safeguard and protect the rights and privileges of legislative committees, and I feel that I should call attention to what this resolution seeks to do. I will read it; it is short; it will take only half a minute. It says:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6355) making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill or any provisions contained therein are hereby waived.

Under that resolution, as I have stated, all points of order are waived. The Appropriations Committee can bring in almost anything without having any jurisdiction in the matter, according to this procedure. That is what I complain against. My efforts during a long tenure in the House have been to safeguard and protect the membership of this House so they would not be deprived of their rights, and at the same time protect and safeguard the rights of the committees who have the duty of reporting legislation after thorough and careful consideration. I do not know how much time has been given to this matter of merging the United States Employment Service and the Unemployment Compensation Service in the Federal Security Agency; but I do know it is contrary to the provisions of the President's reorganization plan and will reduce the Department of Labor in usefulness.

Personally, I suspect that this merger is not for the best interest of the country. It may save money; yes; and I am for saving every dollar that we can. It is the duty of the Members of the House, it is the duty of the Congress, to save every dollar possible and practice economy, but, notwithstanding all of the assurances and promises of economy that you gentlemen have made since you became a majority in the House, instead of saving money you have expended larger sums than necessary and much larger sums than were ever expended by the Democrats when they were in control of the House.

I know that the gentleman from Rhode Island will make it clear that the Appropriations Committee is again assuming a jurisdiction it does not possess under the rules of the House. I repeat, I do not think the Appropriations Committee should deprive the regularly constituted legislative committees of their rights and duty. Later I hope to have a little time, while the bill is being considered, to point out the underlying unfairness of this matter and the reasons why this merger is to be made. I do not think the object is to save the $139,000. In fact, I do not think there will be any saving. I have very often heard you gentlemen of the majority pledge yourselves to save money, but, unfortunately, every week you bring in additional bills for unnecessary appropriations. How you will be able to justify your statement that you are going to save money, so far as the taxpayers are concerned, I do not know. Of course, you are very skillful, you are even very astute, and you know how to try to mislead the American people, but I am of the opinion that the American people now realize that they were misled in 1946, and I hope they will not be misled again in 1948.

The American people know that under the New Deal the country prospered. Everyone was a beneficiary of its wise and far-reaching efforts. The Nation never before was so prosperous, and the people know this was unmistakably due to New Deal legislation.

Mr. Speaker, saving money is very proper if you do it without injuriously affecting the departments that are actually doing an honest work or trying to do so and if it promotes efficiency in the Government.

Mr. Speaker, for the reasons I have given I am obliged to oppose the adoption of this very unfair rule. However, I repeat, I realize that you of the majority have the votes and you will pass it notwithstanding its unfairness, the same as has been done heretofore. I regret, however, that you fail to recognize the needs and the rights of the people and the membership of the legislative committees.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago the people and press of this country were humiliated and indignant upon learning of the condition of the Navajo and Hopi Indians. I am today introducing a resolution creating a select committee, to be appointed by the Speaker, to conduct a thorough investigation of the condition of all of the Indians of the United States and Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, the terrible distress existing among some of our Indian tribes was forcefully brought to the attention of the present Congress by H. R. 4627, which I introduced. This bill was a temporary measure to bring stop-gap relief to the Navajo and Hopi Indians. Hearings were held on the reservation by a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands. The committee subsequently unanimously reported the bill to the House. It was passed and became law. An appropriation was then authorized to take care of the most urgent needs during the past winter and for coming months.

In the treaty of 1868 with the Navajo Indians the United States Government set aside 16,500,000 acres of land, much of which is the very poorest land in the West. There were less than 9,000 Navajo Indians when this treaty was signed. At that time they could eke out a meager existence by hunting wild game and raising cattle and sheep. Now, however, their population has increased to over 60,000 and is increasing at the rate of 1,200 yearly. The overcrowding on their barren land has reduced their average family income to less than $400 a year. The infant mortality rate has continually increased until it is now 318 per 1,000, or seven times greater than for the entire United States. There are no field doctors or nurses, only one school nurse and one full-time dentist attending these sixty-odd-thousand Americans.

The same tragic story can be told concerning education. With some 24,000 children of school age, only 8,000 have had any schooling whatever, and their average is less than 3 years. This means that 16,000 Indian children, wards of the United States Government, receive no school facilities, no educational opportunities to help them help themselves. Only 12 percent of the Navajo Indians included in the selective-service records of 1943 could speak English.

What is true with respect to the Navajo and Hopi Indians, is probably true with reference to other American Indians on other reservations. This tragic condition cannot continue. Its seriousness requires immediate action. The whole problem of American Indians must be thoroughly investigated. It is a humanitarian task of the first order of importance, and it must be promptly solved. It must be solved by planning a long-range program that will make the Indians in both continental United States and Alaska economically self-sufficient, that will give them an education qualifying them to meet the needs of the times, and the understanding of health and hygiene that will eliminate the extremely high mortality rate of both infants and young children.

The present disgraceful conditions cannot be permitted to continue. It is not only a blot upon the entire Government, but it is a costly perpetuation of a tragic situation. Some $59,000,000 has been asked for appropriation during the coming year to administer the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Educate these Indians, give them an opportunity to break away from the tribal conditions of a century ago and make their way in the world, and they will make as fine a class of American citizens as any we now have. They are humans, even as you and I, and they must be treated as humans.

I have also introduced House Resolution 564, which appropriates a meager $50,000 to make this investigation, report, and recommendation to Congress. The Committee on Public Lands has already saved far more than twice this amount in money it could have expended under the provisions of the Congressional Reorganization Act. This small sum, used wisely, can bring effective savings to the American people of millions of dollars and can make self-supporting citizens of our Indian population.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, since I have been a Member of this body, for the last 8 years, I have always opposed legislation on an appropriation bill. I could never see the need of a subcommittee on appropriations going to the Committee on Rules and getting a rule to bring up a bill to appropriate money. In this bill we have taken away from

the legislative committee of this House, which has to do with the consolidation of the USES and Unemployment Compensation, that responsibility and have taken upon ourselves as a committee on appropriations the right to legislate in this body. To me that is not right. It is not easy to legislate, and I do not think there is any need for an appropriation committee to have to resort to the Committee on Rules to get that protection to bring up this bill after holding all the hearings that we have held.

The main point of contention in this rule is that we have taken it upon ourselves to transfer out of the Labor Department the Employment Services which were inaugurated in the Labor Department in 1918 during the First World War and continued in the Labor Department until 1939. Because of the passage of the Wagner-Peyser Act in 1933, it then became a definite function in the Labor Department. I have never heard any criticism in this body or throughout the country as to how the Labor Department has handled the Employment Services. During the last war they were placed in the Federal Security Administration, they were placed under the War Manpower Commission, and they were finally put back into the Department of Labor, where I sincerely believe they belong. The President early this year sent his first reorganization plan to this body. It was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the executive departments, headed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] is also a member of that committee.

This reorganization plan was to the effect that it would consolidate the USES and the Unemployment Compensation Commission into the Department of Labor. It would leave the USES in the Labor Department as it is now and take the UC out of the Federal Security Administration and transfer that agency into the Department of Labor, where I have always believed the two belong. But what happened to that reorganization plan? This committee came on the floor only about 6 or 8 weeks ago and turned down the reorganization plan of the President to consolidate these two agencies. The reason they used in general debate on this floor when they turned it down was that last year this Congress appropriated $750,000 to establish the so-called Hoover Commission to reorganize the executive branch of this Government. So this committee said at that time, only 6 or 8 weeks ago, "What is the rush? Why should the President ask that these two agencies be consolidated in the Labor Department? We have already a Commission that we are spending $750,000 on that is to report to the next Congress, in January of 1949. Why should we do anything in this body to effect such a reorganization when this Commission is working toward that end and will report to the Congress in January of 1949?"

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The gentleman knows, of course, that the transfer of the Unemployment Service to the Labor Department was done by Executive order under the War Powers Act, and when that act expires it will automatically go back to the Federal Security Administration.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Why is it not an advantage to send it over there now and save this $21,000,000-plus every year?

Mr. FOGARTY. The same argument that I used can be used just as well in answer to the gentleman from Indiana.

On February 25 on this floor the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], a member of this committee, said in regard to the President's reorganization plan:

> We have already appropriated $750,000 for the Hoover Commission to make an over-all study of the executive branch. It will include, of course, this particular question—

The same question that is before the House at this time.

> Inasmuch as the committee is divided and the House is divided, it seems to us on the committee that the sensible procedure is to wait until next January, at which time we will have before us the findings of the Commission composed of very able and distinguished students of government. No harm will be done in the next 10 months by failure to transfer these two agencies now to the Department of Labor.

If that statement was good in February of this year, it should be good now, and it applies to this very same question.

The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], said on that same day on the floor of this House:

> It seems a little absurd to suggest at this time that we should have piecemeal reorganization plans for the executive department.
>
> It seems no more than the use of common sense to suggest that we wait and get the results of this expenditure of what may be from $750,000 to $1,750,000 by a nonpartisan, fully qualified commission made up of men who have had experience along the lines of reorganization.

So he opposed the reorganization plan on that day.

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SNYDER] also a member of that committee, said on the same day:

> The reason I think we should pass the resolution before the committee is because last year this Congress provided for the appointment of a Commission and provided funds for the use of that Commission in making a comprehensive and complete study of the organization of the executive branches of the Government.
>
> It seems to me that it is wisdom to delay our action until we have a report from this Commission.

That was the argument used to defeat the reorganization plan of the President to take the Unemployment Compensation Commission out of the Social Security Administration and move it over and consolidate it with the USES in the Department of Labor. So what do we do on this committee? After a legislative committee of the Congress had gone into this thoroughly and after it had been turned down following due consideration—and it was turned down in this body and sent over to the Senate—the very same arguments used in this body were used in the other body to defeat the reorganization plan of the President in consolidating these two agencies. Almost the very same language was used there as was used here to defeat this program. So we come along now and we are saying in effect that even though this legislative committee had studied the reorganization plan, what they did and what they said did not mean anything back in February of this year. We believe that we know more about the reorganization of the Government than they do. Here we are as a Committee on Appropriations attempting to reorganize the executive arms of the Federal Government. It is a field we have no business in. It is the work and duty of a legislative committee. It has nothing to do with us as an Appropriation Committee. Although I know there is no chance of this rule being voted down—I know it will pass—I am opposed to it on the ground that it is definitely legislation on an appropriation bill.

Then toward the end of the bill we add another item. I read from the report:

> For a number of years the appropriations bills have each carried a provision denying the use of funds to pay salaries or wages of any employee who engages in a strike against the Government, who advocates the overthrow of the Government by force or violence, or is a member of an organization that advocates the right to strike against the Government or the overthrow of the Government by force or violence. The committee has amended this provision to include a prohibition against the payment of salaries or wages to any employee who is a member of a labor organization the officers of which have not filed the affidavit required by subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act as amended by the Taft-Hartley Act. That section denies the services of the National Labor Relations Board to any labor organization whose officers have failed to file an affidavit stating "that he is not a member of the Communist Party or affiliated with such party, and that he does not believe in, and is not a member of or supports any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods."

The sum and substance of that provision in this appropriation bill is, of course, aimed at one labor organization in our Government, the UPWA, which I agree with my chairman is headed by an out-and-out Communist. I agree with my chairman, as I think the vast majority of this body does, that we do not want any Communists holding Government jobs in this country. I think we all agree to that, but I do not like this way of legislating. It is another method of legislating under a limitation on an appropriation bill.

There were no hearings held on this provision. It was never discussed in the hearings that we held on this bill. It came to us when we marked up the bill that morning. It was something I never heard of before. It came out of a clear sky. No one has had an opportunity to appear before the committee to state his views either for or against such a provision in this bill. I just do not think that is a good way to legislate. If we

are going to throw things like that into appropriation bills, without giving the people who are interested on one side or the other an opportunity of going there and expressing their views, I think it is about time something should be done about it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has again expired.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I have no further requests for time right now.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this rule and shall vote against its adoption.

Again we have an instance where the Appropriations Committee of this House is spending its time not to look into the money figures in an appropriations bill, but to legislate. In this bill carrying appropriations for the Federal Security Agency which will be considered immediately after the decision upon this resolution, the Committee has spent its time on the legislation and reorganization of these bureaus rather than upon the amount of money that might properly be saved to the taxpayers. As part of the Republican mad rush of senseless economy since the Eightieth Congress convened in January 1947 there has been a reduction from the budget estimates on this bill of 1¾ percent. The total bill amounts to almost a billion dollars. Again the vaunted predictions of the Republican members of the Committee on Appropriations and other gentlemen on the other side of the aisle have come to nothing, because we find that the President's budget estimate in this instance have been so nearly correct and proper that they have been able to reduce the bill only to the extent of 1¾ percent of the amount of funds requested in the budget estimates. It would have saved everyone's time if they had given blanket approval to those budget estimates, and we would now have a better bill.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I take this time now on the rule only in order that the record may be kept straight at this point in the RECORD.

With respect to the remarks just made by my distinguished friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], he has expressed some glee over the fact that the committee has not been able to effect more substantial savings than we have made. The fact of the matter is, which he ought to tell this Congress and tell the people of the Nation, that in the bill which is pending before us, if you will look at the report you will see it carries a total of $797,000,000 in mandatory grants to the States for the payment of old-age and survivors' insurance and similar items, over which this committee has no control whatsoever. So when the gentleman uses his little figure of 1¾ percent, he applies the saving to the entire grant program. He knows and everybody knows that has a grain of sense—and I know he has many grains of sense—the argument is preposterous and absurd, and utterly and completely misleading.

The facts are that on that portion of the bill on which we had an opportunity to make reductions in the public interest we had exposed to us appropriation items amounting to $170,000,000, and we have lopped off from those requested appropriations $20,623,000, a far cry from one-and-a-fraction percent reduction. So far as I am concerned, I am not interested in just wielding a broadax in an attempt to strike out reductions of appropriations and I insist that it be done with some degree of intelligence, but I think it is only fair that the facts be presented to the American people and that Members of Congress should not stand up here, rub their hands, and gleefully claim that the Republican Party has not reduced the budget by more than one-and-a-fraction percent.

I ask the gentleman from New York or any other gentleman on the Democratic side: Do you expect us to wipe out the old-age and survivors insurance grants?

Do you expect us to wipe out the grants under the Social Security Act that are administered by the Children's Bureau and the Bureau of Public Assistance?

Of course you do not; and neither do we. Then why are you standing here and criticizing the Congress because it is compelled under mandatory law to make these appropriations to the tune of $797,000,000?

Just one further thing about this rule: My good friend the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has spent a lot of time on that phase of the situation. I will not take the time on this rule to explain to you the necessity on this side, but I want you to know, Mr. Speaker, that if I ever was in earnest and ever presented to this Congress a proposal which was based upon logic, common sense, and decency, and the result of a tremendous expenditure of hard work and time, you have it before you in this bill today.

Let me tell you something: This Subcommittee on Appropriations could not possibly have brought you a bill, in my humble opinion, due to the reorganization in the Federal Security Agency that was contemplated by the Administrator himself and bring about a complete integration of the program which they themselves want unless we brought into the Federal Security Agency this employment agency now resting in the Labor Department. That agency is going to go into the Security Agency under existing law.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. All we are doing is accelerating the time and we are compelled to do it in order to meet the intricacies that are involved in the total reorganization program that has been taking place in the Federal Security Agency and which has the full and complete approval both of the head of the Social Security Administration, Mr. Altmeyer, and the head of the Employment Service, Mr. Goodwin. When I asked the specific question: Should these two services be put together and consolidated? the answer was "Yes." Where should they be consolidated? In the Federal Security Agency.

They say we are legislating. It is true we are, but I want to say to my distinguished friend from Rhode Island that this committee has not legislated blindly in this matter and in usurpation of the rights of the legislative committee. I will say to him that the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], was fully advised and consulted with respect to this proposal, as was the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], the author of the proposed reorganization resolution under which the Hoover committee is operating. They were called into conference on this when the whole thing was suggested, and the suggested consolidation meets with their complete approval.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. Did the gentleman say that Mr. Goodwin made the statement that he thought the USES should be consolidated and put into the Federal Security Administration?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes. I made exactly that statement.

Mr. FOGARTY. Is it in the record?

Mr. KEEFE. I do not know whether the gentleman attended the hearings or not, but I asked the question and he gave that categorical answer. I asked the same question, as the gentleman will remember, of Mr. Altmeyer and after a good deal of fumbling around I forced him to make a categorical answer.

THE SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding that there is no quorum present I shall not make the point of order that a a quorum is not present, nor shall I ask for a roll call on this rule because it would merely take up time.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to state that he appoints as Speaker pro tempore for the balance of the week the Honorable CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill S. 2287, the RFC Extension Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he will make in the Committee of the Whole and include extraneous matter.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, 1949

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6355) making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; and, pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue for not to exceed 2 hours, 1 hour to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and 1 hour by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, one of my colleagues objects to limiting it to 2 hours. He suggests 3 hours, with the proviso that if we can get through sooner than that we do so.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the experience in connection with this bill in the past has been that we have not even consumed the 2 hours. It seems to me that is a very liberal amount, in view of the fact that one of the principal arguments that might be made has already been made by the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island in the consideration of the rule. I have no desire to limit debate, but I feel 2 hours is a very liberal amount of time, in view of the limited character of the proposals in this bill.

Mr. ROONEY. I would be inclined to agree with the gentleman, but, having been in the hospital during most of the time the hearings went on during the past couple of months, I have to rely on the judgment of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], who feels that 2 hours is too short a time.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have a request for 20 minutes I may inform the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman has requested 20 minutes?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Yes; so that 1 hour on each side would not be enough.

Mr. KEEFE. I have frequently requested 20 minutes time to speak on a proposal and have been given 3 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman make it 2½ hours?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to that and will modify the unanimous-consent request to 2½ hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6355, with Mr. GRAHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is entitled "The Supplemental Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1949." Now, ordinarily the amounts carried in this bill would have been a part of the regular supply bill for the Federal Security Agency and the Labor Department, which we passed some weeks ago, and which has recently been passed by the Senate. The reason that this comes in as a supplemental supply bill is because certain unavoidable circumstances existed at the time we reported the other bill. You will recall that at the time the other bill was under consideration by the subcommittee, the President's reorganization plan was pending before the Congress. The budget estimates that came up from the President were made in contemplation of the fact that the Employment Services would remain in the Labor Department, and that there might be transferred to the Labor Department out of the Federal Agency the Bureau of Employment Security, which presently is a part of the Social Security Administration.

Because we could not tell what would happen to that reorganization plan, we decided that the part of wisdom required us to await action by the Congress in determining whether or not they would effect the consolidation of these two services of the Labor Department or leave them separate as they are. So, we withdrew that appropriation entirely from the first bill. Then next, when the Federal Security Agency officials came before the committee to testify in support of the budget recommendations for the various elements of the Federal Security Agency, we found that Mr. Ewing, now Federal Security Administrator, was putting into effect very vast and wide reorganization programs within the Agency itself which made the budget estimates which had been prepared many months in advance completely outmoded and completely out of date and without any specific reference to the Federal Security Agency as it would be if the reorganization within the Agency was completed according to the plans of the Administrator. So, we decided that we would take out of the first bill all of the appropriation estimates for the Federal Security Administrator's office and the Social Security Administration and leave that for further consideration until the reorganization within the Agency was completed.

In addition to that, we had a program submitted to implement the National Mental Health Act, and when the testimony was presented before the committee it was apparent that a very inadequate showing was made in justification of the budgeted recommendation. Now, the committee was interested in seeing to it that a program was set up in implementation of the National Mental Health Act that would be a very effective program, so we took that appropriation out of the other bill and delayed it for further consideration until we could have full and complete hearings on the program that was to be initiated under the Mental Health Act.

The same is true of the dental health program. We have had long and extensive hearings on both the mental health and the dental health programs since that time.

So we bring this bill here containing these appropriations estimates.

In addition, during the hearings there was brought to the attention of the committee by Governor Gruening, of Alaska, and by the public-health officer of the Territory and by the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] a very, very important story and a very devastating and pathetic story, may I say, as to public health in Alaska. They were down here in an effort to get budget approval immediately for very critically needed services in the Territory of Alaska. The committee, responsive to the needs of the people of this country at all times, decided that we would not wait to go through the normal processes of having the Bureau of the Budget pass upon this question, and we had a long hearing before the subcommittee, which completely convinced us that it was absolutely necessary that we take immediate steps to provide funds for the United States Public Health Service in order that they might initiate a public-health program in Alaska to supplement the public-health services conducted by the Territory itself. So you will find that we have set up a fund here of about $750,000, which is very much less than the amount they asked for, but we permitted expenditure of that fund upon an 8-month basis so that they could immediately go to work and set up a program of public health in Alaska. In the meantime, when the next Congress reconvenes, we can inspect the program that they have set up and determine how much further we want to implement that program in Alaska.

The committee was unanimous upon this program on both sides. The committee was unanimous upon the public health program. I want to say to my colleagues and say to the country at large that I think the Congress is doing one of the greatest things that has ever been done in the promotion of public health in this country when we implement the efforts that are being made to attack this devastating problem of the increase in mental illness that is taking place in this country. The evidence that was brought before the committee by the distinguished men of the profession throughout the country clearly indicates that we have fallen behind in this country in dealing with this problem of mental illness and mental frustrations that are so directly responsible for the crime and so directly responsible for the juvenile delinquency that is costing us such an appalling sum here in this country, to say nothing of the maintenance of the domiciliary care of the 655,000 mental patients that are compelled to stay in public-supported mental institutions, and to say nothing of the 62 percent of the medical cases of the Veterans' Administration that are in the psychotic class and need

psychiatric care and treatment. It is an appalling situation, and we propose to do something about it. We propose to encourage throughout this country the teaching of psychiatry and the training of psychiatric personnel and clinicians so that we may be able to service the institutions of the country that are so deficient, because they simply do not have the trained personnel.

Think of it, out of the total number of about 137,000 trained physicians in this country only 3 percent have any training whatsoever basically in the field of psychiatry. Right today there are 3,000 beds in veterans hospitals that ought to be occupied by psychotic cases which they cannot fill because they do not have any doctors or nurses or technicians to treat them.

I have been advised that their programs call for the building of facilities for 15,000 more beds. Why provide these beds and hospital facilities unless we are able to provide the personnel to adequately service them? This proposed mental-health program is one of distinguished character, in my opinion, which is going to make a monumental contribution in a number of respects. We are going to give aid and help to medical institutions in this country in teaching in the field of mental health. We are going to grant fellowships to students and practitioners of medicine who will go into the field of psychiatry. The reason they have not been attracted heretofore has been that under the grant programs you say to a young man, "Won't you please specialize in the field of mental illness?" and he says, "Yes; I have that disposition to do that." So they grant him a fellowship for 1 year, and he does not know from one year's end to the next whether Congress will continue the appropriation to enable him to complete his course. That has been one of the contributing factors in tearing down the personnel and one of the blocks in this road that we must travel if we are to provide the necessary personnel to equip our country to deal with the menace of mental illness.

This committee has done something unusual and yet which has been asked for for years and years and years. While we have provided large funds to implement the National Mental Health Act in the form of grants, community facilities, and other facilities as well as education, we have done something more than that—we have provided for forward financing under contract obligation that will permit the Public Health Service in the administration of these funds to say to one of these young men or women who sees fit to go into the field of psychiatry and mental health, "We will assure you that if you go into this, you will be taken care of and that this grant or scholarship will continue through the years so that you will be enabled to complete your course." We have provided that under a contract authorization which will become effective next year. Thus, under the advice of the best people in the United States, we hope that ultimately we may attract to the field of mental health and psychiatry trained personnel who are so absolutely necessary if we are going to fight this ever-growing menace to the mental health and security of our country. Along with that goes the great program of research which will be carried on in research institutions in this country to be coordinated at this great hospital that you have provided at Bethesda, a major portion of which, if not all, will be devoted to cancer, heart disease, and mental health.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to be a Member of a Congress that has had the foresight and vision and which has, with almost complete unanimity of purpose, approached this program of public health with the determination that we are going to wipe out the disease that has devastated humanity by finding the causes of it in the best way that we can.

Mr. Chairman, I compliment the members of the professions who have given their full and complete support to this program and hundreds of whom are willing to take refresher courses and training in order that they may be available to deal with this menace of mental illness.

We make provision in this bill for the extension of the dental-health program in order to give to the people of America, and especially to the children of America, the benefits that are to be derived from the topical application of sodium fluoride to the teeth.

We did not establish as extended a program as had been contemplated by Dr. Knutson when he first appeared, but we have reorganized and reoriented the program along the lines that have the complete support of the dental societies of America and the complete support of the State medical organizations in the several States.

We are providing funds in this bill for about 50 mobile units to be organized by the Dental Health Section of the Public Health Service, that will go into every State in this Union, and out into the rural areas; and under the direction of the State Public Health Services and the grass roots dental organizations, the Parent Teachers Associations, and so on, bring to them the techniques that may ultimately result when this program goes forward, the prevention of at least 60 percent of the tooth decay in children.

I am for the program. I think it is a great step forward. I look forward to the time when through research and the efforts to put this thing into the hands of the people of America, tooth decay in children may become a thing of the past.

Now, I have discussed these three aspects of the bill, mental health, dental health, and aid for the people of Alaska in setting up a health program there.

Do you know that in Alaska, which is a strategic and critical part of our military defense, I was shocked and amazed at the report of a committee of five doctors of the American Medical Association that went to Alaska to make a survey and study, to find for example that in Alaska, our people, our country, under our domain and our direction—people are dying at the rate of 343 per 100,000 from tuberculosis, while the average in America is only 43 per 100,000. When you get the figures on venereal disease and the incidence of syphilis in Alaska as given to us by the territorial health officer and the gentlemen who made a very thorough survey, it is simply devastating in character. We propose to do something about that. They are our people, and if we are going to send our boys, our soldiers into Alaska to serve the country, we want the health conditions in Alaska such that they will not be exposed to the terrible situation that exists there today. I know the Congress will support us unanimously in our efforts in that regard.

I told you something about the Federal Security Agency and the proposed consolidation that is involved with the United States Employment Service. Let me discuss that a little more fully. I do not have time. If I took the entire hour there would not be enough time to adequately discuss that program. The members of my committee and myself have spent untold weeks on this proposition. Personally I have never worked so hard and so long on anything in my life as I have to try to bring this thing about. Now what is the situation? The Federal Employment Services in this country, under Federal-State relationship, were established under the Wagner-Peyser Act in 1933. The Wagner-Peyser-Act is the only law on the statute books that gives justification and authority for the establishment of the federally supported employment service. It does not provide for complete and full support, because it provides for a State-Federal system, in which there are matching funds to be put up by the States and the Federal Government. That was in 1933. In 1936 you passed the Social Security Act and you set up a program of unemployment compensation. You allowed the collection of a tax of 3 percent to provide funds to implement the unemployment compensation and you provided that three-tenths of 1 percent of the funds collected from industry, should be set aside to provide for the administration of the funds and carry on the administration in the States of this unemployment compensation. That fund has grown to tremendous proportions, something over $800,000,000 in excess of the amount of money needed to pay the administration expenses of unemployment compensation, which have been derived out of that three-tenths of 1 percent tax. What happened? The old Social Security Board said in order to administer the provisions of the unemployment compensation law we have to have some agency that will provide job exposure to the person who comes into the office of the Unemployment Compensation Commission asking for unemployment compensation. So they by regulation of the Social Security Board designated the Employment Service in the country as the agency that would make the job exposure, and thus they brought together the Unemployment Compensation Agency and the Employment Agency working hand in hand, one offering people payment of unemployment compensation based upon the applicant's subjecting himself to a job exposure to be provided by the Employment Service.

What happened? In 1939 the reorganization plan of that date transferred the Employment Service over to the Federal Security Agency from the Labor Department, and after the federalization of

the Employment Service when Mr. Roosevelt got the governors of the various States to turn those services over to the Federal Government and they federalized the employment service, they were transferred to and became part of the War Manpower Commission which was headed by Mr. McNutt, the War Manpower Commissioner, who was also Federal Security Administrator and by that Executive Order 9117 dated December 17, 1941, acting under the temporary authority of title I of the First War Powers Act, the President transferred the employment service over to the Labor Department, and under the provisions of that Executive Order the USES will go back to the Federal Security Agency from which it came just as soon as there is a finding that the war is over. The President by his executive order sought to transfer the Bureau of Employment Security which in effect is the unemployment compensation arm of the Federal Security Agency, and put it over in the Labor Department. Congress rejected that by an overwhelming vote.

When the committee came to the consideration of this problem we found Bob Goodwin's organization, the USES, down here in the Labor Department, the Bureau of Employment Security controlling unemployment compensation over in the Federal Security Agency, and out in the States where the work is done and where the money is spent, where the compensation is paid, those services have been integrated under one director and under one agency in every State of the Union except Idaho, and they will accomplish it very shortly, as the director from Idaho told me in my office day before yesterday. We have this very funny situation: Two agencies in Washington allocating Federal money, one for the administration of the employment offices in the States, the other for the administration of unemployment compensation in the States, the States being required to submit two budgets to Washington, one budget for the employment service submitted to the Labor Department, and one budget submitted to the Federal Security Agency for the Bureau of Employment Security, unemployment compensation, each with their conflicting, duplicating, and overlapping staffs, the USES with its budget-appraisal group, its State technical-services group, its economic group, and its auditing group; the Federal Security Agency in the Bureau of Employment Security with its auditing group, with its budgeting group, with its States financing-service division, and all duplicating, all overlapping services which everybody concedes ought to be brought together as the States have brought them together in order to avoid duplications and to try and save some money. So what did we do? We called these people in. There is not a soul in the world that I know of who says that these services should not be consolidated. Everybody admits that. The Congress has said: "We do not want that consolidated in the Department of Labor." The Congress has spoken very clearly on the matter. The law says they will be consolidated in the Federal Security Agency 6 months after it is found the war is over.

What do we do? We simply carry out the express will of the Congress of the United States and carry out the express will of Mr. Goodwin and everybody connected with it who says the Employment Service is being destroyed and interfered with and that the morale of the people in that department is being broken up because they do not know from day to day, from week to week or from month to month where they are going to be. So in the interest of doing a good job we did this.

I could have gone along. That would have been the easy way out. I, as chairman of the committee, could have gone along and said: "Take these budget estimates, submit the bill to the Congress," and let it go at that. But, Mr. Chairman, I have never worked that way in my life and I do not propose to work that way here. I have chosen to take the hard course. It has been a tough job to bring about this reorganization with all the technical services that are involved and to get them properly integrated.

What have we done? We have had all this testimony before the committee and you can read it in the hearings. The Bureau of Employment Security is a division of the Social Security Administration. Up here sits the Federal Security Administrator. Down here is the Social Security Administrator, and under him the Bureau of Employment Security, old-age survivors insurance, and the assistance to States—three over-all functions. The Bureau of Employment Security handles unemployment compensation.

Mr. Altmeyer wanted us to take the USES, the Employment Service, transfer it to his bureau and make the consolidation there, providing for a whole superstructure of supernumeraries below him and between him and the Federal Security Administrator.

We decided to do just one clear job that anybody can understand. When this appropriation is carried through, as I believe it will be, the Federal Security Agency will be administered by an administrator—that is Mr. Oscar Ewing. Direct line of authority will go down to the Social Security Administrator. Next to that the Chief of the Children's Bureau, next to that the Pure Food and Drug Administration, next to that the Office of Education, next to that the Public Health Service, and next to that the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. All of these bureaus will be on a straight line, each with its bureau chief directly responsible to the Federal Security Administrator and each with its subdivisions handled by division chiefs in the proper line of set-up, with direct line of authority going to the Federal Security Administrator.

What do we propose to do? We take the USES and put it over in the Federal Security Agency. We take the Bureau of Employment Security out of the Social Security Administration and we create one more bureau over there, putting these two agencies together as divisions of the Bureau of Employment Security, with one bureau chief, with a subagent or chief of the UC, as one division, and with the head of the Employment Service in the other division.

What do we accomplish by that? We wipe out all of the duplication of technical services, we wipe out all of this duplication of auditing, all of this duplication of high-salaried people engaged in budgeting and accounting, and we bring the whole thing together at one place just as has been done in the States. When we make an allocation of funds to the States then we make one allocation for both UC and the Unemployment Service. One budget comes up from the States and one budget examination here in Washington.

In doing this we have wiped out the 12 regional offices of the USES. That is what they do not like. They have these fat $10,000 jobs out in the field and some fat $8,000 and $9,000 jobs out there. We have done away with 12 of those regional offices. We have done away with the separate regional offices of the Social Security Administration and we propose to establish 1 regional office, the regional office of the Federal Security Agency, with 1 regional director to whom will be delegated responsibility in the field from the Federal Security Administrator here in Washington. In that office there will be suitable representatives just exactly on the same plane as we have effected the reorganization here. There will be some people devoted to technical services in the States in the field of unemployment compensation, others in another division dealing with USES, but we will do away with all this multitudinous overhead that is involved in the present system, and if I stay here long enough and can have my way about it—and I know I am supported by the overwhelming majority of the people in the Federal Security Agency—we will have 1 Federal Security Agency Administrator, with 1 set of field offices, and we will not have a multitude of field offices for the Public Health Service, the Children's Bureau, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, or the Office of Pure Food and Drugs. They will be brought together in 1 field office where the citizens of the United States who want to do business with the Federal Security Agency can go and there be advised as to what the program is.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I say that I believe the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is more responsible than any other one man in Congress for what is being done toward promoting research in mental health, cancer, and such diseases that threatens the future of the people of America.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman for the remarks which he has made. I, of course, cannot take the time to go into all the details, and you would not expect me to do that. If you will read the report, which is a very wonderful report prepared by my distinguished clerk, Mr. Paul Wilson, with the very able assistance of Mr. George Harvey, you will find there one of the finest contributions that I think has ever been made to an appropriation bill for enlightenment and illumination as to the details of this proposal. While I am on that subject, may

I say to you, my friends, that I have served now nearly 9 years on the Committee on Appropriations and had the opportunity to serve with three great clerks. The first one, Marc Sheild, the second one, John Pugh, and the third one, George Harvey. George has done a masterful job as the chief clerk of the Committee on Appropriations, and he has done an overwhelming job in connection with the tremendous amount of work that has been necessary to orient and bring this bill before the Congress. I want to pay a personal tribute to him, and I want to say that following right along with him in the very distinguished character of a great clerk of the Committee on Appropriations is my young friend, Paul Wilson, who has done a great job. Those people know neither hours of labor nor anything else except fidelity to the job they are doing. Nights, Sundays, Saturdays, holidays, all those days mean nothing to them, and were it not for them, the Congress never would be able to get these appropriations, and especially this one, in the form in which it is.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to add my tribute for the wonderful work I know they are doing. That has been true in connection with matters I have taken up with the gentleman's committee.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, under this consolidation what will happen to the Veterans' Employment Service?

Mr. KEEFE. I was coming to that. Of course, the gentlewoman is always interested in matters affecting veterans.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Just as the gentleman is.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes. If you will read the hearings, you will see that we have conducted long sessions. It is a rather anomalous situation, the whole veterans' employment matter. It is being given consideration now by the Board which we set up under title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act in 1944. I had General Gray before the committee, and General Hershey. Unfortunately the other member of that committee, Mr. Schwellenbach, has been ill. We have been trying to see if we cannot work out a program that the Congress intended should be worked out, so that we could provide a decent, workable, fine service to the veterans of this country in the matter of securing employment.

I am fearful that the thing is not working out. I am also fearful that this board that we set up to declare over-all policies in the matter of the veterans' employment service is not functioning, is not having any meetings, and is not laying down any policies, and is not taking the direct interest in the veterans' placement program that I think the board itself should take. I believe, under the stimulus the committee gave to General Gray when he was before it—and he was kind enough to sit there a whole afternoon in connection with this matter—they are going to go to work.

We have left the appropriation at the budget estimate. The organization follows right along with the USES, this part of it. It will be transferred with the USES as an integral part of the USES, and with separate identity in the new division of the Bureau of Employment Security. We have seen to it in the report and in the actions which we have taken that the Veterans' Employment Service and the Employment Service generally shall not lose its identity and be subordinated to the unemployment-compensation group.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Then you will give them a chance to grow? I have found them very effective. I have seen them work in California, Massachusetts, and elsewhere. If they have further assistance and cooperation, they will do much more.

Mr. KEEFE. All I can say to the gentlewoman is that the committee has repeatedly and repeatedly and repeatedly tried to implement the expressed attitude of the Congress of the United States. Legislation is needed to clarify the conflicting situation that now exists, in order to make clear in the law that these assistants that are out in the field have legislative authority behind their actions. It is rather in a nebulous condition as far as I am able to determine at the present time. The committee has called the attention of the Congress and its legislative committee time and again to the need for legislation to deal with that situation, and nothing has been done. I am repeating it again today and hope that some member of the proper legislative committee that has charge of this legislation will go to work and bring in some amendments to the fundamental law that will make clear just exactly what the situation should be in the matter of the Veterans' Employment Service.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I should like to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman and the other members of the deficiency committee for bringing in an additional $3,000,000 for the Veterans' Administration in connection with other work. It was a very great thing the gentleman did.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. May I remind the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] that I have always fully supported such items in this bill as mental health, dental health, social security, health in Alaska, and other such appropriations. You miss the point that I made a while ago. We hear so much talk on the other side of the aisle about what you are saving the American taxpayer. The point I made was that the President's budget estimates were correct. They were certainly correct in this instance because as far as a saving for the taxpayers is concerned, the cut amounts to only 1¾ percent in a bill carrying appropriations of almost $1,000,000,000. We are tired of the talk we hear about New Deal laws. Why, your Republican Party has been in control of the House of Representatives and the Senate for the past year and a half. What have you done about those laws if they are all wrong?

Mr. KEEFE. That is the usual argument that I expect to hear from an ardent New Dealer. I do not get irritated or cross any more when the gentleman makes his usual needling arguments which do not have very much effect on anybody who has any brains or intelligence and can understand the facts of a matter. If the gentleman wanted to be fair he would know that this is a supplemental estimate and that the major portion of the appropriations has already been reported. Just consider the other parts of the bill. Laughing out of the other side of his mouth, I have heard the gentleman from Rhode Island and the gentleman from Brooklyn [Mr. ROONEY] charge up and down the platforms of their respective States saying that I have been responsible for killing the Labor Department by taking away all its funds, or as I have heard them say on the floor of the House that we have made just puny little cuts and hardly pared anything from Government expenses. It seems to me that a sort of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde complex gets possession of my two good friends. They talk out of one side of their mouths one day to one class of people and out of the other side of their mouths some other day to another class of people. So far as I am concerned, I have stated my position clearly. I am going to cut every dollar out of these appropriations that we can cut and which will not interfere with the necessary services to the people of this country.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. Did I understand the gentleman to say that he heard I was going up and down Rhode Island accusing him?

Mr. KEEFE. Perhaps I had better withdraw that. I do not know that the gentleman ever did. I do not want to say that. I do not think the gentleman would do that because when he talks to his own people he perhaps tells them the facts, and I think that he would praise the gentleman from Wisconsin rather than say anything about him. I think what he says on the floor of the House here is just for the consumption of the Congress. I would not say that he had been too critical of me at any time. We got along pretty well this year, didn't we?

Mr. FOGARTY. We got along fairly well.

Mr. ROONEY. I am happy to say so.

Mr. KEEFE. I am happy to say so. I am sorry the gentleman was ill. He was ill this year and could not be at all the meetings of the committee. I was very seriously ill last year, but still I was able to be at those meetings. I know that the gentleman could not be there, but I had to be at those meetings. The Members who saw me on the floor of the House when the bill was reported last year will recall that some of them wondered how I was going to be able

to stand up and carry through until we finished with the bill, but I did. I am glad that I did because I know something about this bill—I have attended all the hearings on the bill and conducted the hearings on it. I know what is in the bill. It is unfortunate that the gentleman from New York was not there; of course, he could not be there—and therefore it is not to be expected that he would know very much of the facts or the background of this bill.

I would like to say one word about this terrible action of the committee, that was referred to by my good friend from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], when the committee inserted this language in the general provisions of the bill:

> General limitations: No part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who is a member of a labor organization, the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

I want to say that in my humble opinion I do not believe that either of my good friends from the minority side of our committee, down in their hearts object to that provision. I can not believe that they do. Knowing them as I do and their utter hatred and revulsion against the communistic penetration of labor unions, I cannot realize that they would. But I realize, of course, that the Communist outfit has now brought to the floor of the House and will bring to the floor by its official spokesman in the House, a brief that is intended and designed to show that the action of the committee is unconstitutional and every other thing.

Well, I have given some consideration to that, and I hope that my good friend from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] will have an opportunity to speak on it. I want him to have the fullest opportunity to expound the philosophy which he expounded down here at the Willard Hotel before a group of Communists, near-Communists, and fellow travelers the other day when, under the inspiration of a bunch of Communist leaders, they got themselves together, after sending out three-hundred-odd telegrams, and the reports are that they had 48 in attendance, they got themselves organized to fight the efforts of Congress to deal with the menace of communism. I want the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] to have full time to say anything he wants to.

I might say I have read the brief. I know he did not prepare it. I know where it comes from. I know the source of it. I have a copy of it, and I have read it. I am not at all impressed by it.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I would like to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that it is very rare that I find occasion to agree with him, but on this particular occasion and with regard to the principle of this rider, I am in 100-percent accord. There is only one purpose at which it is aimed, and that is to get rid of Communists in the Government service, and you can be assured of my support 100 percent in ridding Communists out of Government agencies.

Mr. KEEFE. That is awfully nice of you to say that. I know that is the way you feel about it. You could not feel any other way. I do regret that part of the statement you made that you seldom agree with me, because on the major aspects of this legislation as we have presented it year after year, we have been in complete agreement. On all the great parts of this program, to which you have contributed, for the building up of the Public Health Service, social security, and grants of various nature, we have found ourselves in complete agreement. So that the divergencies and disagreements are not so great except when one party rises to throw a crack at some Republican on the other side.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman would not say we agreed on everything last year, would he?

Mr. KEEFE. Oh, I think we did. You made a lot of talk as usual, but I noticed you voted pretty much the other way. I noticed that when the bill passed, it passed practically unanimously. That is the way it always is. We make a lot of noise on the floor, something for home consumption and all that sort of thing, that makes an appeal to our labor-union bosses in certain parts of the country, and they love to know that they have their people on the floor who are speaking and rising up in their behalf. But I am glad to see that the gentleman has arisen to the occasion of realization that here is a problem that affects not only Republicans and Democrats, but affects every American, and I am glad to see that we are on common ground in fighting this communistic penetration.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] will speak with his usual vehemence and apparent knowledge of the subject, that I suspect that most of his knowledge has been put into his hands by the astute managers of this communistic outfit.

I say what I am saying advisedly, and I regret it. I like MARC personally, but I utterly and completely despise his associations and his associates. I think it is high time that the American people and this Congress began to do something about it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield; yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. May I state to the gentleman, and to get it straight once and for all, that irrespective of how the gentleman may feel about my associations I prefer to be judged by what I say and what I do.

Mr. KEEFE. I am judging the gentleman not only by the associations he keeps but—let me tell a little story.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. May I complete my statement? Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; I shall be glad to.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am very proud that I am espousing the cause of these public workers.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CHURCH. I do this in order to give the chairman of the subcommittee a chance to reply to the gentleman. Will the gentleman be cut off any time shortly?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I used?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin has used 51 minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KEEFE. I think the gentleman will have plenty of time.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes; I will answer the gentleman in my own time.

Mr. KEEFE. All right; you answer me in your own time.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. But in the meantime I want to state that the agreement between gentlemen on the Republican side and the gentlemen on the Democratic side again proves that there is only one party in this country and that we need a new political party.

Mr. KEEFE. You see, usually clever! I remember some years ago when I was trying to earn money enough to go through school, the State of Wisconsin passed a law providing that if a country school would install a heating and ventilating system they would be subsidized out of the State treasury. I thought here was a chance for me to make some money by going out to the school districts in the territory where I resided and selling some of this heating and ventilating equipment. I thought it would be a simple thing, so I, young fellow, went out trying to get school boards together. I finally did get one school board together in a village across the lake from where I lived. They sat there with stony faces when I made my presentation and I asked:

"Well, gentlemen, does not this appeal?"

And one of the old fellows spoke up and said: "Oh, ve had a fellow around here couple years ago that sold us a chart and he said if only ve bought his chart ve could get rid of the teacher, they could teach themselves from the chart. Ve bought it and it turned out that he vas a crook."

Well, I asked, "Do I look like a crook?"

"Vell," he said, "You can't tell vot kind birds you got under de fedders."

And I asked: "Do my feathers look good to you?"

"Vell," he says, "I got to look under de fedders just a leetle beet, because you know ven you get crooks you find that birds of a fedder if you look deep enough always go mit."

His interpretation of "birds of a feather flock together."

That old philosophy has always stuck with me, and I am glad as a Republican and a member of the Republican Party that no charge has ever been leveled that we have harbored, given aid or comfort to, or assisted in any way, the despicable communistic conspiracy which exists throughout the world, and I know also in that behalf there are on the minority side almost with rare exception men and women who have similar beliefs. So far

as this Congress is concerned and so far as this country is concerned, the fight is on, Mr. MARCANTONIO.

You are carrying the fight for the other crowd and we intend to carry the fight for America and intend to carry out the pledges that we have made that we are going to protect this country wherever and whenever we can against the domination and sabotage of those who would destroy this country.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman might inquire into the record and background of the opponent that I had in the 1946 elections, a member of the American Labor Party who was endorsed by your Republican organization of Kings County in New York City and in New York State, even after I publicly called attention to what he stood for.

Mr. KEEFE. I cannot inquire into that, because the politics of New York City and Brooklyn has always been an enigma to me.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I would like to make a statement to the gentleman from Wisconsin before he leaves.

Mr. KEEFE. I am not going to leave. I am right here.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am glad you are here, physically anyway. May I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] that his opponent was not trying to overthrow the Government of the United States. He was simply trying to overthrow the gentleman from Brooklyn [Mr. ROONEY]. The two have not as yet become synonymous under our constitutional system.

Mr. KEEFE. Did you want me to hear that?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes. It might do you some good, I hope.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor and Federal Security appropriations has explained in pretty general terms just what this bill that we have before us this afternoon embodies. We are not in agreement on several portions of it. When the rule was under consideration I gave my reasons then why I thought the Subcommittee on Appropriations is taking over year after year more of the duties of the legislative committees of this House. When they find themselves in a position where they have to go to the Rules Committee to get protection in order to bring their bill on the floor of the House for consideration, it has come to the point of ineffective government, in my opinion.

Mr. Chairman, we have appropriation-wise taken the USES, the United States Employment Service, out of the Department of Labor and have put it in the Federal Security Administration.

The chairman of the committee was perfectly right when he gave a lot of deserving praise to the clerk of the full committee, George Harvey, and our very efficient clerk of the subcommittee, Paul Wilson, because as I remember it, on the last day of the hearings on this bill I do not believe any of us on the Appropriations Committee knew where we were or what we were going to do or how we were going to write this particular bill.

I have read the bill three times now, and I still cannot get clear in my own mind as to just what has happened to some of the functions of USES, the UC, the Social Security Administration, and the Federal Security Administration itself. I know about where the cuts are, but with all these transfers back and forth under the Federal Security Administration it is very difficult for anyone of you to take up the report or the bill, or after reading the hearings, if you have had an opportunity to read them, and know just what is what at the present time.

The chairman has stated that this transfer would take effect anyway 6 months after the hostilities of this last war have been terminated. All he wants to do is to accelerate that action just a little bit. But, at the same time he is saying in effect that the committee, headed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], when it had the reorganization plan of the President up last February, did not know what it was doing and "We know how to do it better." If we are going to go along these lines from now on, you might just as well abolish all the legislative committees of this House and let all the subcommittees on appropriations do the legislating on all bills where we appropriate money, because that is just what is happening now in this Congress. I do not believe by this action today that you have any faith in the Hoover Commission that is working now to reorganize the executive branches of this Government. But here we take right out from underneath that commission something that they are working on and are supposed to report on to us in the next Congress in January 1949.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. It so happens that I am a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and one of the reasons advanced for the failure of the committee to approve the plan of the President was that the Hoover Commission was working on it. The argument at that time was, "What is the hurry? What is the hurry?"

Mr. FOGARTY. When the rule was under consideration earlier today I gave as my principal argument against the rule quotations from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 25, 1948, when they opposed the reorganization plan, by giving that very same reason. Also every Senator in the other body that spoke against this plan gave that as the same reason. That was the reason only last February. That was the argument that they used then. Now, how can we expect a duly constituted legislative committee of this body, which has taken definite action on a matter of this kind, to take a turn-about-face only 2 months after they have spoken on a piece of legislation such as this?

Now, we have done more than consolidate USES and the UC and the Federal Security Administration. We have cut the grants-in-aid to the States by $22,650,000. What rhyme or reason or justification has been given for these cuts? When we had those who are responsible for these departments before our committee, they did not recommend any of these cuts. When the State representatives were before our committee there was no talk of cutting the grants to these States while they were testifying before our committee. But, after they had gone along and worked for 2 or 3 months in getting up the budget and presenting it to our committee, after full and complete hearings, they sit down for about an hour and say, "I guess we will lop off about $22,000,000 for these grants-in-aid to the States." Is that a good way to legislate? The chairman has just said a short time ago that he does not like to legislate that way by just knocking off lump sums. But time and again that is just exactly what has been done by this committee, and we are cutting not in a proportionate way the UC funds and the unemployment funds. No. We are cutting 30 percent of the funds for the United States Employment Services and cutting the unemployment-compensation fund by only 10 percent.

These two functions of the Government are closely related. We know that we have to make these payments out of the unemployment-compensation fund. That is unemployment insurance. When a man is out of a job he is entitled to that money because he has paid into that fund. At the same time, we contend that the USES is just as important to the economy of this Government, and more important to the trust fund that we have established at the present time in unemployment compensation, because it is the duty of the USES when a man is unemployed to find a job for him and put him to work. That has been the program they have followed out. They do not want the man drawing unemployment-compensation benefits. They want to get that man in a position where he is earning his own way and not collecting these payments. That is why it is absolutely necessary to keep the employment services strong today to keep the men working.

One of the arguments used by the majority of this committee in making these cuts was, "Why, employment in this country is the highest in the history of this country." Certainly it is. It has good reason to be high. At the same time we have the highest labor turn-over in the history of the country at the present time. That is the reason we need a strong employment service now.

What else does the committee write into this bill? When we are talking about the appropriation for USES, we have four hundred-some-odd-thousand dollars for the Farm Placement Bureau, but we specifically state in our report that this money that is set apart for the placement of farm workers shall not be touched by those in control of the USES.

We set apart the appropriation for the Veterans' Employment Service and say that the USES, Mr. Goodwin and his officers, cannot touch one dime of it. Yet the $22,650,000 that we have cut will be taken out of the services that are being rendered to the people of every State in the country at the present time. It is not affecting one section of the country, it is affecting every section of the country.

We had this first portion of the bill before us in March of this year. I said at that time that a year ago this subcommittee cut the appropriations for the Labor Department 44 percent. There is not another subcommittee on Appropriations in this House that has wielded the ax so fluently as this committee has against the Labor Department. Why that discrimination? This year when we had the appropriations before us we still cut the budget request of this year by 25 percent. We even went above the 44 percent of last year and cut 20 percent additional off what they had to work with in 1948. But when the Farm Placement Service comes along in this appropriation bill, is that touched or reduced accordingly, percentagewise, in the over-all reduction of the bill? Oh, no.

They are well protected as they have been right down the line in every agricultural section of this country. We had one little insignificant thing in the appropriation bill this year for the library in the Labor Department, an increase of about five persons in the library of the Labor Department. We only have about 20 people in one of the finest libraries in the country. They are running way behind in their work. They have one of the ablest librarians of any library in the entire country. But could we get one dime for one additional employee for the Labor Department library? No. But the library in the Department of Agriculture has about 200 employees. They are well taken care of again. Now we come along following the same old pattern that has been followed for 5 or 6 years in the appropriation for the Labor Department. We find in this bill that we are further weakening and taking everything away from the Labor Department by taking the United States Employment Service out of the Labor Department and putting it in with the UC in the Federal Security Administration. I think there is something else behind this. I think there is perhaps a good reason for building the Federal Security Administration up into one of the biggest and strongest agencies in the Government. We are raising the salary of the Federal Security Administrator, Mr. Ewing, from $12,000 to $15,000. In other words, we are making a Cabinet position out of the Federal Security Administration. What business have we, as a Committee on Appropriations, to set up someone of Cabinet rank in the Federal Security Administration? It looks to me that if this pattern continues and this program continues as it has continued for the last 3 or 4 years, the intent might be to build the Federal Security Administration up to a point where it will be recognized as being of Cabinet rank. Then the move will be to do away with the Labor Department and have it as a division of the Government under the Federal Security Administration.

I honestly think that is what might happen in the next 3 or 4 years if we keep on going as we are. The Republican leadership of the House should be proud of the program that they are following because it was one of their great Presidents who in 1913 established the Labor Department in this country when there were not half as many employed in industry as there are today. Now we have the largest number of employed people in the history of our country, and we find this committee cutting down year in and year out the functions that come under the Labor Department. It seems that every time the word "labor" is mentioned that is a good place to cut because it is popular to condemn labor and take away the rights and privileges of labor in some sections of the country. My good friend, the chairman of my committee, told you in his opening statement that we are giving the Veterans' Employment Service everything that they asked for. He is entirely right—we are giving them everything they ask for after a fashion. But what did this committee do a year ago? We want to make sure that the veterans get every bit of service that this Congress can render to them, but what was the argument a year ago when this same appropriation bill was before the House? We did not pay much attention then to the needs of the veterans, Mrs. ROGERS, when we cut the Veterans' Employment Service a year ago by about 40 percent. We did not take into consideration the needs of the veterans this year in this subcommittee, when along last March by another bit of legislation on this bill we decided to wipe out the Veterans' Reemployment Rights Division in the Department of Labor. When they requested some $400,000, this committee wiped out that division that was handling the affairs of the veterans of this country by eliminating the entire amount. That is the way the House passed the bill on March 8.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Is it not a fact that this bill carries the exact budget estimate submitted for the Veterans' Employment Service?

Mr. FOGARTY. I said that. I said we are giving them exactly what they asked for, but we cut them about 40 percent a year ago.

Mr. KEEFE. You are complaining about what the Congress did last year?

Mr. FOGARTY. I am just reminding the Congress of your friendship to the veterans a year ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. As the gentleman knows, I am not a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I was very much interested in having adequate appropriations, as the gentleman knows, for the veterans' reemployment service. I would like to ask the assistance of the gentleman in securing the passage of an amendment to the GI bill of rights which is generally considered to be really the only veterans' bill which we have before the Congress. We will have it before the Congress shortly for action. That will provide for low rental houses and apartment houses for the veterans. I know the gentleman will help secure the passage of that bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. There will be no question about that.

But when we start talking about talking out of one side of your mouth one day and the other side of your mouth the next day, when you look at the record, we are talking about giving the veterans something now—but this is an election year. A year ago when we on the Democratic side offered an amendment to restore that cut in the bill it was turned down by a two to one vote in this House by the Republican majority. Earlier this year when we had up a bill for the veterans' reemployment rights the Republican majority eliminated the entire division having to do with the reemployment rights of the veterans of this country. If that is not talking out of one side of your mouth one day and the other side the next day I do not know what talking out of both sides of your mouth at the same time means.

I have always been an advocate of the United States Employment Service. I have always believed that it should be in the Department of Labor. It originated in the Department of Labor back in the year 1918 and was continuously there until 1939. When the Wagner-Peyser Act was passed in 1933 it was then a part of the Labor Department. The chairman of our committee in his talk today explained how it was back and forth, through Executive orders and otherwise, first Federal Security Agency, the War Manpower Commission, and finally put back into the Department of Labor a year or two ago. I think if I remember correctly, the chairman of our committee was reported as saying in the RECORD somewhere along the line at that time: "It is about time it was put back in the Department of Labor. That is where it belongs." It seems to me I read that in the hearings a year or two ago.

There is a close tie-up of the Employment Service with the functions of the Department of Labor, much closer than any other department of our Government. The employment services are tied up with almost every division in the Department of Labor. They are tied up to a certain extent with the Wage and Hour Division. That is tied up to a certain extent to the Apprenticeship Training Division in the Department of Labor. They are tied up to a certain extent with the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor. They are tied up to a certain extent to the Division of Labor Standards in the Department of Labor. We have a labor force now of over 60,000,000 people employed in this country. We have a Labor Department to give

service to the working classes of this country, and practically 95 or 96 percent of those 60,000,000 employees have something to do with either unemployment compensation or USES.

Mr. Chairman, I disagree entirely with the report of the committee on establishing the USES in the Office of the Federal Security Administration. I do not believe, however, there will be much opportunity of having any consideration given to splitting this up and leaving it as it is today, but I do hope when it gets over into the other body that they will leave it as it is if they do not consolidate unemployment compensation along with the USES in the Department of Labor. I have been trying to find in this report where some of these cuts are, but it is quite difficult. In the office of the Social Security Administrator, Mr. Altmeyer, they have cut out practically all of the money for the publications and review division and the national service of the Social Security Administration.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. May I direct the gentleman's attention to page 23 of the report? He says he is unable to understand the cuts, transfers, and so on. If he will turn to page 23 he will observe that there is a table which shows the break-down in detail right to the very dollar; and following that each one of those proposed transfers and cuts is discussed in detail in a separate paragraph. If the gentleman would take time to read the report of the committee of which he is a member, I am sure he would be able to understand exactly what the cuts are and what they are related to.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I have read this report four times now. Perhaps I am not as bright as the gentleman is. I realize that he is an authority on the Labor Department and the Federal Security Administration. I do not take one thing away from the gentleman because I know he thoroughly understands the operation of every division in that department of the Government. I have been on this committee only 2 years. All this is new to me and sometimes it takes me a little longer to get it through my head as to just what happens.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I will say to the gentleman that I tried to explain my statement. It is technical. It is difficult. It is difficult and technical for anybody, and it is just hard, consistent work that will permit anybody to understand it because of the complexity and detail of all these set-ups in the Federal Security Agency and especially the Social Security Administration, but we have tried to make it as clear as the A B C's in the table and the following explanations. I am sure the gentleman is fully competent to understand it, and I am sure that he does and will if he just reads that statement. It will show the transfers and the cuts and everything else clearly.

Mr. FOGARTY. I will be willing to wager, Mr. Chairman, that when this bill has passed this House not over 15 Members who vote for it will know what is in the bill or in the report.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin, chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, if he will permit me, whether or not the Research and Statistics Division of the Social Security Administration has been cut 50 percent.

Mr. FOGARTY. It has been cut more than 50 percent.

Mr. KEEFE. I can give that to the gentleman. The Bureau of Research and Statistics had 54 positions and asked for an appropriation of $229,830. It has been cut $129,830.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It has been cut then more than 50 percent.

Mr. KEEFE. It has been cut to $100,000.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It has been cut practically 50 percent.

Mr. KEEFE. A little less than 50 percent.

Mr. FOGARTY. More than 50 percent.

Mr. KEEFE. It is cut $129,000, which leaves $100,000.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Is it not a fact that the Research and Statistics Division is to a large extent the nerve center of the whole operation of the Social Security Service? It is absolutely necessary to keep up this Bureau of Research and Statistics in order that the Congress may be properly advised as to what type of coverage to extend and how much greater benefits shall be granted, as proclaimed by both parties?

Mr. KEEFE. Is the gentleman asking me a question?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Yes; I am asking the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. If the gentleman will yield to me for this one answer, I will appreciate it. Is it a fact that this division that has been cut is the actual nerve center of the whole operation of the Social Security Administration?

Mr. KEEFE. I will say to the gentleman he is simply reiterating the contention that has frequently been made by the flock of jobholders who find security in this particular division of the Social Security Administration. To categorically answer the gentleman's question, my answer is no.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am glad that the gentleman is frank about it, and I am glad to have him on record.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, when we come to the Office of the Social Security Administrator, the committee allowed all but $211.

The Coordinating and Procedural Division, which has to do with supervision and control, has been eliminated entirely without one thing in the hearings about whether it was necessary or not. The committee has taken this action by saying, "Well, that is one place we can cut. We will eliminate that division entirely."

In the Personnel and Business Management Section the estimate embraced 128 positions. The agency suggested a transfer of 29 and has also proposed to transfer 15 positions to the Office of Administrator, 14 to the Social Security Library, and 1 to handle personnel replacement and recruitment work for the Administrator's office.

The Publications and Review Division, and Information Service, I think are very necessary. I have asked for information and I make inquiries of the Social Security Administration time and time again in the course of a year. What did we do on its budget? They asked for a total of $109,997, or 24 positions for these 2 units. What did we give them? We gave them $20,000. Why in the world they left in the measly $20,000 I do not know, because it takes away all of the services they are giving now to Members of Congress, to employers, and to employees all over the country. With the whole social-security program now in the process of being revalued, probably enlarged and taking in more scope than it does at the present time, there is more need for a division like this than ever before in the Social Security Administration. But do they pay any attention to that? No. Here is an easy way of knocking off $100,000, so that is what they did. In the Training Division there was a small item of $16,445. I think maybe three or four positions that are necessary in an establishment that has 12,000 employees. Is it not good business management to have three or four men who can train these employees in technical services and otherwise? But the committee did not see fit to even include that small sum of $16,000 for three or four men in that branch.

In the Bureau of Research and Statistics they cut them almost 60 percent. They reduced the budget estimate from $229,800 to $100,000. I am not talking, Mr. Chairman, because some of these employees have come to me and because they are losing their jobs. I would not know 10 men down in that whole Division of Social Security or Federal Security Administration, outside of the times I have met them before the committee when they were up here for their budget requests. But it does not seem like good business management, with an agency that is responsible perhaps for $2,000,000,000 that they handle in a year, to be cutting down their administrative expenses in such a manner.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has again expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself four additional minutes.

On the dental-health program that I know my chairman is very much interested in, I think he would personally have favored the full budget request. I am sorry that the committee did not see fit to give the full budget request on this dental-health program. The full budget request was for some three million-odd dollars, and we allowed a flat sum of $1,000,000, as the chairman has stated, to provide 50 mobile units to put on these demonstrations in training personnel. The original request, I think, was for $1,500,000 to train hygienists to apply

these sodium fluoride treatments to the children's teeth. I think we should have granted that amount. In the new budget request they asked for some $161,000 for publicity programs. This is something new, I think we all wanted to give it to every child in this country. We are all working toward that end. But, there is a small item of $161,000 to publicize this discovery, which is the greatest discovery ever made in the care of dental health; the first time in the history of dental care that we have come up with something that will prevent the decay of teeth in children by 50 percent. We only allow the small item of $161,000 to publicize this throughout the country. I hope that the committee will allow the full amount.

In the mental-health program we have given them everything they have asked for and more. They have been well taken care of. There was one thing I mentioned in my earlier talk on USES and the UC funds.

One of the arguments used for reducing this budget was that we now have the highest employment in the history of the country, so why do we need to spend so much money? Costs are going up and up and up, and where are they going to stop? What we should tell the Congress is that the Administrator of this program, the USES, came in and asked for an additional amount of money this year because he has additional responsibilities the Congress wants him to perform. At the same time he asked for an additional amount, the budget estimate came up with some 540 employees less than he had in 1948. The reason for the request is the additional responsibilities that Congress has asked him to assume, and the raise in salaries in all the States in the Union. They have been giving these raises and there is nothing we can do about it. There is no question in my mind that the employees deserve those raises. In view of all this, the committee has taken the over-all action just across the board, and said to the States men, to this States group, to every State in the Union, "Your organization promised us economy in 1947 and 1948, when you said that if this program was returned to the States you would cut costs. Now we are going to make you prove it or eat your own words."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, the action of the Appropriations Committee in decimating the staff of the Commissioner for Social Security is in complete accord with other actions of this Congress in weakening social security. This House has already passed one bill to deprive employee news vendors of social-security coverage, as well as another bill—House Joint Resolution 296—which would take away the protection of some 750,000 workers and their families granted by a Democratic Congress back in 1935. Still other legislation is pending to repeal benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act.

Of course, there is more than one way to skin a cat. The majority now strike at the nerve centers of the social-security system cutting by nearly 60 percent the Research and Statistics Division in Social Security. This is the office that supplies the committees of Congress with facts and figures on which to legislate. These people have years of experience in the detailed operations of social security. By approving the cuts recommended and proposed in the pending measure, we are going to deprive the Congress of the services of indispensable personnel.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to congratulate and thank the chairman the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and members of the committee for reporting a special item of $700,000 for health work in Alaska. It is needed and badly needed, and had it not been for the fine cooperation of the committee, there would have been no possibility of starting this health program in the Territory this year.

Alaska, by its peculiar position on the globe, has become the crossroads of aerial world trade routes and more recently the strategic military significance of Alaska has suddenly been appreciated. The late Gen. Billy Mitchell, prophet of American air power, declared, "He who holds Alaska will hold the world." Alaska is now being referred to as the left flank in the defense of the North American Continent and when we carefully analyze the statement of Secretary Symington that from bases in Alaska and Labrador, Asia and Europe could be bombed, we know that this land is a very precious possession. In order to make Alaska a bulwark of defense, rapid development is essential. There is already significant migration and by people who desire to make it their permanent home. There are others who are needed by the thousands for the great defense activities and as has been recently announced, the Department of Defense has indicated that more intensive training will take place in Alaska for the purpose of conducting arctic warfare.

It hardly seems necessary to mention the importance in preparing for a rapidly developing country that adequate basic health services must be made available. This includes a complete public-health program, adequate hospital facilities, sufficient qualified phyisicians and other trained personnel to do the work and the establishment of facilities to conduct Arctic scientific investigations.

At this point I should like to bring to your attention some of the conditions that exist in Alaska that this appropriation will set about correcting. Our territorial officials and Department of Health have done as much as has been possible for them to do to attack these problems. Definite progress and success can be demonstrated but the task is of such tremendous proportions that it is not possible for them to control completely the spread of communicable diseases and give adequate health protection. Indeed, conditions are so serious that it becomes necessary to refer to it as an emergency. This emergency situation is developed by reason of the fact that there are such tremendous developments taking place and contemplated in the immediate future for Alaska that we cannot stand by idly and permit health conditions to continue as they are. It is conceivable that Alaska—a country which is one-fifth the area of the United States and perfectly capable of having a population of several millions—could through gradual and normal expansion meet these problems. But, in view of the fact that many thousands of people are needed there soon it is highly essential that basic public-health protection, which we offer to the American citizens in continental United States, be made available now for the Americans who are migrating to Alaska to make it truly a bastion of defense.

What are some of these serious conditions that have been neglected and what does this appropriation propose to do to correct them?

TUBERCULOSIS IS SCOURGE

Tuberculosis is correctly referred to as the scourge of Alaska.

One out of every five deaths in Alaska is caused by tuberculosis. Many of these are children who die from meningitis which their tuberculous mothers gave them. The over-all death rate from tuberculosis in the United States in 1946 was 40.1 per 100,000 population while in Alaska it was 359.1.

The incidence is even higher among the Native peoples—Eskimos, Indians, and Aleuts. That death rate is 16 times the average tuberculosis death rate in the United States. Even among nonnative groups the rate is twice that of the United States and this is not counting the many white patients who have moved out of Alaska to receive treatment too late. There are hundreds of known cases of bone tuberculosis, many of which have already caused permanent crippling conditions in children.

IT IS PREVENTABLE

The horrible tragedy is that tuberculosis is a communicable disease. It must be transmitted from person to person, mother to child, sister to sister, and so forth, and because of this even a nontuberculous family can become infected when an open active case moves in to live with them. This spread is particularly serious among native people who live in small, substandard, poorly ventilated houses. Alaska's weather dictates this congested living, since the cost of heating small houses is kept down. So it does not take long for an entire household to contract tuberculosis when someone living there brings it home. A native mother has said, "Only 5 of my 15 babies living; others all die TB." And that is readily understood when the husband has bilateral far-advanced tuberculosis with cavitation and now is dying right in that home. The tragedy is that this family would not have had TB if someone else had not transmitted it to the father in the first place—quite innocently to be sure.

THERE IS HOPE

Can this chain of infection be broken? Yes; it is possible and Alaskans are pledged to do just that. They know it can and must be done for the good of their country. Today Alaskans are traveling much more. They come from remote villages by boat and train, but

chiefly by plane, to centers of population where there is a doctor. Before, they were doomed to die in lonely villages without any medical aid. Increased travel, however, brings about a greater intermingling of people and it must be remembered tuberculosis is no respecter of race.

ALASKANS ACT

Alaskans, in 1946, at an extraordinary session of the Territorial legislature, passed an all-inclusive Tuberculosis Control Act and appropriated $250,000 to carry out the purposes of the act. This, for Alaska, was a large sum, for it was one-tenth of its entire annual appropriation for government services of all types. An intensive program of case-finding through mass chest X-ray surveys was established. Today over 40 percent of the population has been X-rayed. What has been found is appalling. In one village on the Aleutian chain 20 percent of the population has active tuberculosis. This is not an unusual percentage, either. In State-side surveys one could expect to find about a 1-percent incidence in those examined.

Statistics were studied and a central case register started. Alaskans believed in its program and again appropriated nearly a quarter of a million dollars for 1947 and 1948 to continue the fight against tuberculosis.

WE CANNOT DO IT ALONE

But Alaska cannot do the job alone. The task is too great. Case-finding, care, and hospitalization cost tremendous sums for this is a disease that necessitates long-term hospitalization. The United States Public Health Service is helping through grants-in-aid of about $114,000 annually, assignment of full-time personnel and consultation services. However, the real need from the Federal Government is the construction of sanatoria—1,000 beds are needed—for the 4,000 cases of known tuberculosis, and sufficient funds to care for the patients who are Federal beneficiaries. More aid on the part of the Federal Government must be forthcoming now if this scourge is to be controlled. A health department field physician, returning to an area surveyed last year reported:

> We were very depressed when we went to Tetlin to hear of the people who died last winter. You should have seen the look on John Andrews' face when he told us that two of his children had died and all he hears is talk, talk, talk; no doctor, no hospital. Give these people another 10 years and we won't have to worry about Tetlin. I so hope the beds and funds will come soon. Will they?

This bill proposes to intensify the case-finding and related control activities. It will give increased home nursing service to patients with TB until such time as enough sanatorium beds are made available. It will be possible to establish a BCG vaccination program. This is a method of vaccination against tuberculosis. This is an approach to the problem that will bring long-term results and will be instituted at once under the provisions of the appropriation now before you.

ALARMING SITUATION

It hardly seems necessary to emphasize the importance in a defense area, as Alaska is rapidly becoming, for the adequate control of the spread of venereal diseases. It must be stated very flatly that the venereal diseases are on the increase in Alaska and are not being controlled. Their spread has been rapid since the beginning of defense activities started in 1940. These diseases are not only on the increase in large towns but are spreading to small communities where there was no evidence of them before. The spread is of immediate concern to us all for the seeding of previously uninfected vicinities with gonorrhea with its genital, urinary, and eye complications in areas without a physician's services leads not only to invalidism in adults but touches the children at birth. The ravages of syphilis are spreading and bringing death to many infants born to infected parents and crippling adults during their years of usefulness. From an economic standpoint a diseased populace is a burden to society. There should be no excuse for delay in controlling venereal disease before its ravages have reached too far. Curbing venereal disease now will save countless lives and dollars in the future. All of us know the serious aspects of and time lost from venereal diseases among the many troops and defense workers. It is regrettable to have to admit that with the funds available and the personnel now in Alaska, the venereal diseases cannot be controlled. The program contemplated under this appropriation is simply one of getting enough personnel to go into the areas in which venereal disease exists, and is spreading, control it by immediate and effective treatment using recognized rapid treatment methods. It will also establish and intensify educational programs and bring about effective enforcement of laws and regulations so that the spread of venereal diseases can be controlled effectively on a permanent basis.

NEED FOR SANITATION

Alaska is faced with basic insanitation. There are very few water supplies that are adequate to meet the demands placed upon them by reason of an ever-increasing population. Many communities do not have what can be referred to as safe water supplies. Sewage disposal, garbage collection, and general and environmental sanitation of restaurants, food-handling establishments, and so forth, must be improved and in many instances instituted. Conditions peculiar to the Arctic such as permafrost, which is a condition where the ground freezes down to an undertermined depth with only a surface crust thawing out each summer, needs scientific investigation. The usual processes of purification and bacterial action do not exist in the Arctic. The need for improving basic sanitation to make a community livable hardly needs to be stressed further. This program will make it possible to employ an adequate number of well-trained and qualified sanitary engineers and sanitarians. They must make the necessary investigations in order to be in a position to give reliable information and advice. They will serve as consultants to engineers but of most importance they will participate in direct service in the many communities that have not heretofore received any assistance whatsoever. Through these engineers and sanitarians water which is now deemed impure will be made safe. Sewage sytems that are inadequate and overloaded will have qualified engineers investigate and make recommendations for corrections.

It is gratifying to me to note that our health officials have included in this emergency appropriation a considerable item to begin immediately field investigations along scientific lines as they relate to health. It is difficult to state categorically that these basic scientific investigations are of more or less importance than the direct services which I have referred to above. We Americans have long known the importance of research and careful studies to get at the basic causes for disease and I cannot emphasize too strongly how urgently this type of work is needed in Alaska.

FAR BEHIND RUSSIA

I fear that we have already delayed too long. We knew before World War II that Russia was making great progress in scientific investigations, research, experimentation, in Siberia—which you know is only 54 miles across the Bering Sea from Alaska—but nowhere in the United States of America or Alaska are the simplest academic scientific facts known about conditions as they exist in the arctic and how they affect all of the various aspects of health. It is a known fact that during World War II the Army began such investigations but under the stress and urgency of war conditions these research studies were of little value. I know that now such studies are being instituted by the Army and the Navy on a rather small scale and the tragedy is that they are being conducted with inadequate facilities.

This has been brought to my attention so effectively in recent weeks that I introduced a resolution into this House on April 27 which will authorize the construction of adequate research laboratories in the arctic which will make it possible for the United States Public Health Service and the military forces to conduct studies that they deem urgent and essential in order that we will have some basic information about the Arctic where we regrettably fear many thousands of American citizens may someday be stationed.

As I have stated above, I am pleased that this appropriation will make it possible for field investigations to be started at once without waiting until the construction is completed of an Artic Institute of Health.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the Committee to the language on line 5, page 17, of the bill. That is to be read in connection with the first sentence of section 9. There we find the following:

> No part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person—

Then go over to page 17 and continue—

> who is a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with

the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

Subsection (h) of section 9 as amended referred to in this language is the section of the Taft-Hartley law which provides that officers of unions must file non-Communist affidavits, non-Communist affiliation oaths; and the penalty for not filing such affidavits is the deprivation of National Labor Relations Board rights of the members of those unions.

This language goes way beyond the Taft-Hartley law; it singles out the Government employees. Under the Taft-Hartley law, the member of such union is deprived of the right to avail himself of the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act as amended. The proviso in this bill deprives the Government employee of his job.

Let us examine this proviso without hysteria. It applies to the United Public Workers of America. It applies also to the ITU members, the people who are employed in the Government Printing Office, and it applies to several other organizations whose members are employed by the Government. While it is true that this proviso is restricted just to this appropriation bill, it is no secret that this proviso will be attached to every other appropriation bill, and if I am wrong in that respect I ask the chairman of the subcommittee to correct me. So this proviso will apply to every Government employee who belongs to a labor organization whose officials have not filed these non-Communist affidavits; and while the Taft-Hartley law deprives labor of the benefits of rights under the National Labor Relations law, this language deprives Government employees of their jobs.

Let us analyze the situation further. If a minority of such a union should vote in favor of having their officers file such affidavits but will not withdraw from the union because of the benefits that have accrued to them through years of membership in such union, those members will be punished, they will be deprived of their jobs. Let us go a step further. If that question of the filing of non-Communist affidavits is not a matter for the membership to pass upon, still the members of that union will be deprived of their jobs under this language. The proponents of this language will say, of course, "Why do these members not leave the union?" There is a good reason for their not leaving the union. First, there is the fundamental right of Americans to belong to any union of their choice, the right of the Government employees to belong to any union of their choice, guaranteed in the La Follette Act of 1912, which I hold here in my hand and which I make a part of my remarks:

UNITED STATES CODE ANNOTATED, TITLE 5

Chapter 12, section 652: Removals from classified civil service only for cause. No person in classified civil service of the United States shall be removed therefrom except for such cause as will promote the efficiency of said service and for reasons given in writing, and the person whose removal is sought shall have notice of the same and of any charges preferred against him, and be furnished with a copy thereof, and also be allowed a reasonable time for personally answering the same in writing; and affidavits in support thereof, but no examination of witnesses nor any trial or hearing shall be required except in the discretion of the officer making the removal; and copies of charges, notice of hearing, answer, reasons for removal, and of the order of removal shall be made a part of the records of the proper department or office, as shall also the reasons for reduction in rank or compensation; and copies of the same shall be furnished to the person affected upon request, and the Civil Service Commission also shall, upon request, be furnished copies of the same. Membership in any society, association, club, or other form of organization of postal employees not affiliated with any outside organization imposing an obligation or duty upon them to engage in any strike, or proposing to assist them in any strike, against the United States, having for its objects, among other things, improvements in the condition of labor of its members, including hours of labor and compensation therefor and leave of absence, by any person or groups of persons in said postal service, or the presenting by any such person or groups or (of) persons of any grievance or grievances to the Congress or any Member thereof shall not constitute or be cause for reduction in rank or compensation or removal of such person or groups of persons from said service. The right of persons employed in the civil service of the United States, either individually or collectively, to petition Congress, or any Member thereof, or to furnish information to either House of Congress, or to any committee or member thereof, shall not be denied or interfered with. (Aug. 24, 1912, ch. 389, 6, 37 Stat. 55.)

Second, there is the economic reason. Members have accrued benefits which have come to them as the result of years of membership in a union. Now you ask them to make a choice of either losing their jobs or losing the benefits that have been accrued.

That is what Government workers will be up against with this language being written into this bill. May I say that the language was written into the bill without a hearing before the committee. Before the subcommittee itself no hearing was held. Before the full committee no hearing was held.

The gentleman from Wisconsin seeks to sell this to the Congress by an old, ancient technique, the technique of raising the Red bogey. This language, he says, is aimed at removing Communists from the Government. I have heard the gentleman sing that song here so often it is becoming very stale. What would he say, for instance, if the coal mines were being operated by the Government? Would he say that John L. Lewis is a Communist? Does he say that the ITU is communistic? The leaders of both of these labor organizations have not signed the oath. Further, what about the first amendment to the Constitution? What about the Bill of Rights?

The purpose of this language is to impose upon Government employees a superrestriction way beyond that which was written in the Taft-Hartley law. But, of course, the gentleman from Wisconsin having a bad case has to wave the "red herring" to sell this vicious antilabor provision.

I now deal for a moment with one or two of the extraneous matters which the gentleman from Wisconsin injected in order to confuse the real issue. You know, when I was a young boy I used to read an old cartoon of Hawkshaw, the detective. Old Hawkshaw would go around and go through an awful lot of motions, when right under his nose in the very first portion of the cartoon the mystery was solved, only he could not see it. Hawkshaw, after going through a lot of motions and carrying on through a page of cartoons, would finally solve the mystery. He would at last see something that had been right under his nose all the time.

The gentleman from Wisconsin got up here today and tried to make you believe he was investigating a great mystery. He said, "I have on my desk there a memorandum on the constitutionality of this law. I know who prepared it. The gentleman from New York distributed it, but he did not write it. I know who prepared it." What a secret, what a Hawkshaw, what a detective. When I distributed copies of this brief yesterday I stated that it had been prepared by the United Public Workers of America. He is leading you to believe here that it was a great subversive activity, a great conspiratorial secret that he was uncovering, something which I proclaim loudly and proudly.

The gentleman from Wisconsin goes to extremes in his attempt to sell this antilabor law to this Congress by raising the old communistic bogey. It is a bogey that has developed into quite a racket. You know, I sometimes wonder what would happen to some of the gentlemen of this House if all the Communists should die tomorrow morning. A lot of gentlemen in this House would find themselves at a loss. They would have to find themselves a new racket, otherwise they would be forced to stand up before their constituents and explain their failure to do anything on housing, their failure to do anything on veterans' legislation, the damage they have done to labor, their failure to bring down the cost of living, what they have been doing to civil rights and the peace of the American people. The Red bogey has been the most convenient vehicle for legislative deception.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, this Communist bogey is raised time and time again to conceal the inactivity of Members here on behalf of the people and to conceal their activity on behalf of the intrenched interests in these United States.

The gentleman from Wisconsin by his diatribe on communism would make you believe that he is the protector of America; this self-assumed monopoly on patriotism which was displayed here this morning by him should be recalled in the light of his similar past performances. You new Members were not here in 1943. You should have heard his speech on the Dodd-Watson-Lovett cases here. You should have heard his speech on section 504 of that deficiency appropriation bill that we had here in 1943. It is basically the same speech as the one he delivered here this morning. The same self-righteousness and flag-waving oratory.

Mark Twain tells of a steamboat on the old Mississippi River that had a

6-inch whistle and a 2-inch boiler, and every time the whistle blew the boat stopped, and that boat huffed and puffed and huffed and puffed to get along. The gentleman from Wisconsin reminds me of the huffing and puffing of this 6-inch whistle and 2-inch boiler boat. He huffed and puffed here in 1943 when he gave us the same speech that he gave you today, and remember we have before us identically the same situation today.

Now, my idea of Americanism is to support the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. And I say that when the Supreme Court has handed down law on this question, it comes in my opinion close to subversivism to try to enact in this Congress that which the Supreme Court of the United States said you could not do; that which the Supreme Court said was a violation of the Constitution; that which the Supreme Court declared to be violation of the Bill of Rights. The deliberate attempt to do that is, in my considered judgment, far, far from Americanism and close, close, close to Fascist subversiveness.

In the Dodd-Watson-Lovett case we had a similar provision as we have here. There we mentioned three individuals and we said that no part of the appropriation was to be paid to them in the form of a salary. Now I want to read from the opinion of the Court in United States against Lovett. The gentleman from Wisconsin made this Congress go through with that proposition by the same speech that he made here. Yes; I remember the gentleman's speech.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman compliments me when he says I made the Congress go through. I think the gentleman will recall that the present Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Clinton Anderson, made the speech with respect to Mr. Dodd. Does the gentleman recall that?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes, of course.

Mr. KEEFE. And it was a Democratic committee that reported this action here to this Congress. The gentleman has gone a long way to charge that the gentleman from Wisconsin forced that thing through.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Oh, how the gentleman loves to dodge.

Mr. KEEFE. No; I do not dodge.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman is a champion dodger this afternoon. He wins the prize. The gentleman made a speech advocating the adoption of section 304, did he not?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Did he not?

Mr. KEEFE. Certainly.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Now the gentleman wants to say, "Teacher, I did not do it; the Democrats did it."

Mr. KEEFE. Oh, no. I made a speech for it, definitely.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman made a speech for it, did he not?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Certainly; and he used identically the same language. He huffed and puffed just like that steamboat did. He used the same language, and he blew up this big anti-Communist balloon and he carried it on the floor of this House, and when it got to the Supreme Court they put a pin in that balloon and it burst right in his face.

Now, I want to read from the Court's language and I want the membership of this House to follow what the Supreme Court said on this proposition strongly advocated by the gentleman from Wisconsin who today is trying to dodge his share of the responsibility which caused that disgraceful action on the part of the Congress and which was subsequently rejected by the Supreme Court of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. May I have some time to read this Supreme Court decision?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Follow this language. Supreme Court Justice Black, in his opinion for the Court in the Dodd-Watson-Lovett case in discussing section 304, which the gentleman from Wisconsin helped to put over in this House, said as follows:

> We hold that section 304 falls precisely within the category of congressional actions which the Constitution barred by providing that "No bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed." In *Cummings* v. *Missouri* (4 Wall 277, 323), this Court said, "A bill of attainder is a legislative act which inflicts punishment without a judicial trial. If the punishment be less than death, the act is termed a bill of pains and penalties. Within the meaning of the Constitution, bills of attainder include bills of pains and penalties."
>
> The Cummings decision involved a provision of the Missouri Reconstruction Constitution which required persons to take an oath of loyalty as a prerequisite to practicing a profession. Cummings, a Catholic priest, was convicted for teaching and preaching as a minister without taking the oath. The oath required an applicant to affirm that he had never given aid or comfort to persons engaged in hostility to the United States and had never "been a member of, or connected with, any order, society, or organization, inimical to the Government of the United States." In an illuminating opinion which gave the historical background of the constitutional prohibition against bills of attainder, this Court invalidated the Missouri constitutional provision both because it constituted a bill of attainder and because it had an ex post facto operation. On the same day the Cummings case was decided, the Court, in *Ex parte Garland* (4 Wall. 333), also held invalid on the same grounds an act of Congress which required attorneys practicing before this Court to take a similar oath. Neither of these cases has ever been overruled. They stand for the proposition that legislative acts, no matter what their form, that apply either to named individuals—

Now, get this—

> or to easily ascertainable members of a group in such a way as to inflict punishment on them without a judicial trial are bills of attainder prohibited by the Constitution. Adherence to this principle requires invalidation of section 304. We do adhere to it.

This is Americanism, Mr. KEEFE, and not huffing and puffing in the old anti-Communist balloon.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to say just a word or two, in a general way, with respect to the pending bill, making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year 1949, which was reported by my Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

It will be recalled that when we reported the regular Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill we deferred action on certain items until we had opportunity to inquire into them in greater detail. At the time the regular appropriation bill was presented to the House the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 for 1948 was pending for consideration. Not knowing what the final action would be on the reorganization plan, whether the United States Employment Service and the Bureau of Employment Security were to be administered by the Labor Department or the Federal Security Agency, we were not in a position to act intelligently on the budgetary estimates.

We have since acted on the reorganization plan. With the adoption of the resolution rejecting the proposal, the United States Employment Service will automatically revert to the Federal Security Agency from the Labor Department 6 months after the official end of the war is declared. That action having been taken, the committee is thus able to make the appropriation on a sound basis as recommended in the pending bill. It having been determined by the Congress that the Federal Security Agency, and not the Labor Department, should have charge of the Employment Service and the Bureau of Employment Security, the pending bill provides for the consolidation of these two operations without further delay.

I do not intend to rehash the arguments as to whether these particular functions should be administered by the Federal Security Agency or the Labor Department. That question has been decided by the Congress. It having been decided that the Federal Security Agency should administer both the Employment Service and the Bureau of Employment Security, it behooves us to see that this is done at the earliest possible date and that funds be appropriated on a basis that will best realize an effective and economical operation.

Anyone who has examined the hearings before our committee cannot but be impressed with the detailed care taken by the committee in an examination of this specific matter. We have talked and talked about the duplications, and the resulting waste, in the organizational set-up of the Federal Government. We have frequently assured our constituents that we would act to eliminate the duplications and overlappings. Insofar as the related functions of employment service and unemployment compensation are concerned, we have by this bill fulfilled that pledge to the people.

The bill proposes the consolidation of the United States Employment Service and the present Bureau of Employment Security into a single bureau. To carry out these two programs, which are clearly related, the bill makes a single appropriation of $123,000,000, instead of two separate appropriations to two separate

agencies of the Government. This is $22,650,000 below the budget estimates.

During the course of the debate on the bill we will doubtless hear the usual cry that by this reduction in the budget estimates we are crippling these services. That is the argument that is advanced on practically every economy proposal, and that is why it is so difficult to achieve economy in government. Those who have their pet projects or pet governmental activities are always opposed to any reduction in the operations in which they are especially interested.

But the reduction proposed by this bill in no way will interfere with the proper and effective carrying out of the programs. When we returned the employment offices to the States, about 2 years ago, we were told that the system could be more economically operated by the States. And there is every reason to believe that it should be. Notwithstanding, the appropriations for the service have been on the increase. It just does not make sense for the Federal appropriations for a function to increase when, at the same time, the activities of the Federal Government in a particular field are intended to be purely supervisory.

Moreover, our committee cannot understand why such large appropriations should be requested for the Employment Service when we are at an all-time high in employment. The situation confronting us today is certainly not the same as confronted us during the depression. And, certainly, there are no immediate prospects, at least not for the coming fiscal year, for any decrease in employment.

Here again is an illustration of how bureaucracy grows and grows like a cancerous disease. The purpose of the Employment Service is to assist employees in securing jobs for which they are qualified and to assist employers in securing the people to fill the jobs they have available. In short, it is to bring the job and the man together. I recognize it has its value even in times of full employment, as the labor market is never static; but I shall never be convinced that there is the need for this type of service on a larger scale today than during a period of unemployment. Yet the Bureau continues to grow and its officials continue to present reasons for "bigger and better" appropriations, so to speak.

I am sure that if the Members take the time to go through the hearings of our committee on the various items in connection with this bill they will be impressed with the thoroughness with which we explored each and every one. You will note from the tables embodied in the committee report that some of the items were increased over the budget estimates. I mention this simply as an indication that our attitude has not been to reduce summarily and arbitrarily every budget recommendation. When a particular expenditure could be fully justified, the committee recommended it, but where an expenditure did not appear to have justification, we did not hesitate to reduce it. That is the only way to achieve economy.

Eliminating the large item of $797,000,000 as grants to States for public assistance, which represents a specific amount that the Federal Government is obliged to appropriate under existing law, our committee has been able to realize a reduction of approximately 10 percent below the budget estimates. And, I say again, we have done this without in the slightest degree interfering with any essential activity or in any way hindering the programs involved.

The expenditures of the Government have long been a matter of great concern to me. They are a matter of great concern to the people we represent. I frankly have not been entirely satisfied with what we have been able to accomplish thus far for achieving economy. As I view it, there is too much of a disposition on the part of the individual Members and on the part of the committees who are interested in certain specific matters to look only at their particular interests without regard to the national picture as a whole. As I have said many times, the question is not so much the merits of some one program, but rather its relative merits. It is not whether a program has any value, but rather what its value is in relation to all the other programs. It is easy to spend, but it is difficult to economize. I sincerely urge that in our consideration of this, and the other appropriation bills that will be reported, that the Members will not look at it as just another bill but that they will try to view each bill and each item in relation to the budget as a whole. It must be borne in mind that $100,000 for this item or that may in itself appear of no consequence, considering the billions spent each year by the Federal Government, but the national budget contains hundreds of items, and when one adds a little here and a little there, which has a certain appeal, when the end result is reached we have spent many millions that could have been saved.

I should like to say, before concluding, a special word with respect to the provision in this bill which denies the use of the money appropriated to pay the salary of any person who is a member of a labor organization the officers of which do not file affidavits to the effect that he is not a member of, or affiliated with, the Communist Party. Inasmuch as organizations of Government employees are generally not subject to the Taft-Hartley Act, these organization officers have not filed such affidavits as required by that act. The provision in this bill simply requires that they meet that requirement, as every other organization under the Taft-Hartley Act is required to do.

It does not seem to me that there should be any objection whatever to this provision, and I am confident that it will be welcome by the rank and file of Government employees who belong to labor organizations. There is no place in the Government for anyone who does not believe in our system of government, and I cannot see where anyone who works for the Federal Government, or who is connected with any organization of Government employees, should even for a moment hesitate to swear that he is not a Communist. The provision in this bill is part of our efforts to drive the Communists out of the Federal service and to drive them out of the labor unions. This provision helps the average working man as the provision in the Taft-Hartley Act has served to help the average working man.

As to be expected, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] has directed his attack to the provision in this bill which would have the effect of ousting from the labor union of the Federal employees all officials who are Communists. In making this attack, he has followed the usual party line. He speaks glibly of freedom and the Constitution of the United States.

The gentleman advances the argument that this provision is unconstitutional, but he offers no settled principle of law in substantiation. It is a well-settled rule of constitutional law that when Congress confers an unusual right or privilege or benefit, it can stipulate what requirements must be met to enjoy such privileges or benefits. And that is precisely the principle we have followed under the Taft-Hartley Act and the provision of this bill. We are simply saying that if a labor union is to enjoy the protection and advantages of the Taft-Hartley law, the officials of the union must first file an affidavit that they are not Communists. In this bill we are saying that if the employees of a labor union are to enjoy the high privilege of working for the Federal Government, they must first require the officials of their labor union to file such affidavits.

The gentleman has stated that this provision in the bill brands employees as disloyal solely because of membership in a labor organization. The provision brands no one as disloyal. It denies no one the right to belong to a labor organization. It simply requires that a Federal employee divorce himself from affiliation with Communists who hide behind the Constitution while at the same time work to destroy it. The Federal employee may belong to a labor organization, but he may not belong to a labor organization that is ruled by Communists and at the same time work for the Federal Government.

The question is very simple and there should be no doubt as to the constitutionality of this provision. It surely is not too much to ask that the Federal employees take the same steps for ridding their organization of communism as is required of other labor organizations. No one who believes in America and is loyal to America should for a moment object to swearing under oath to his loyalty. Anyone who does object certainly should have no place on the Federal pay roll.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ISACSON].

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Chairman, today is April 29, 1948.

There are 17 days left to May 15.

Seventeen days left before the combined armies of Transjordan and Egypt and the other Arab states burst their

way into Palestine as a devastating pestilence.

Seventeen days left of life for the 600,000 Jews of Palestine before they are wiped out in the most horrible of all pogroms.

Seventeen days left of life for us in this country. For if the Jews in Palestine die, we die with them.

Our honor dies.

Our hopes for peace on earth die.

Our spiritual essence—our very souls die.

There is no longer the time for pleading.

There is no longer the time for petition, for entreaty, for supplication.

There is no longer the time for words.

Only the most immediate action can yet prevent this tragic slaughter.

I am, therefore, today moving to discharge the Committee on Foreign Affairs from further consideration of House Joint Resolution 343, which provides:

First. The Government of the United States shall give wholehearted support to the partition decision, and the representatives of the United States in the Security Council shall immediately propose and support all measures designed to implement this decision speedily and effectively, including the establishment of an international United Nations police force and the arming of local miiltia in Jewish Palestine for self-protection;

Second. The President of the United States shall amend the Executive order declaring an embargo on arms shipments to the near eastern countries so as to permit shipments of arms for the self-protection of Jewish Palestine; and

Third. The Government of the United States shall call upon Great Britain, which is currently the beneficiary of great economic and military aid from the United States, to end its noncooperation with and sabotage of the Palestine-partition decision.

May I urge that the Members of this House cast aside political differences and unite behind this expression of the legislative branch of our great Government so that the executive branch may yet return to the path of partition, the path of justice, honor, and peace—justice for the Jewish people of Palestine; honor for the word of the American Government; and peace for the peoples of all the nations of the world.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am appalled at the cut in the appropriation recommended for the United States Employment Service and the unemployment compensation programs. It is impossible from the report of the Committee to arrive at any accurate conclusion as to which functions are intended to be annihilated because of the tortuous bookkeeping that has been employed. Certain areas of activity, specifically the Veterans' Employment Service and the Farm Placement Service have been exempted from any cut. This has been done with a disregard of the fact that these services are an integral part of the total Employment Service activity and are in a large measure dependent upon the maintenance of a high level of performance of functions not specifically included in the budget requests made for these two services. In other words, it is impossible to render an effective service to veterans and to the workers and employers in the field of agriculture if you emasculate the rest of the program upon which these services depend.

At the present time the country is confronted with one of the most difficult manpower needs for scheduled increased production. The European recovery program has committed a significant part of our facilities and manpower resources. To this must be added significant expansion in military production and the manpower needs for handling 9,000,000 more acres of agricultural production than were harvested last year.

The public employment service is the only Nation-wide agency we have that is specifically responsible for dealing with our manifold employment problems. It is of vital importance, not only in connection with European recovery commitments but to the rebuilding of our national security through accelerated aircraft production, ship building, and other necessary military production. Only through the employment service can we facilitate the movement of workers to the plants that are engaged in vitally important production without disrupting other important nonmilitary production. We cannot be certain that the budget request which was presented to the Congress if granted in full would be adequate to meet the obligations that these recent developments have placed upon the public employment service system. The cut in the budget here proposed, without any increase in the work load that is now being placed upon the employment service would seriously impair the rendering of the service that is needed.

It would be difficult to estimate the damage that will be wrought or to enumerate the different segments of the Service now furnished that will be annihilated.

When we come to the section on appropriations for grants to the States we encounter confusion. Worse than that, we encounter a repudiation of the position recently taken by both Houses of Congress which have declared that special emphasis should be given to positive action of securing jobs for workers rather than keeping them on unemployment-compensation benefits. And yet the committee report provides for an appropriation of $65,000,000 to meet the administrative costs of paying unemployment-compensation benefits and only $58,000,000 for the positive functions of finding suitable employment for workers in the labor force.

It was pointed out in the hearings of the subcommittee that the States estimated to maintain the Service without any impairment would require $85,000,000. The increase in the cost of living and salary adjustments necessary to keep the Employment Service salaries in the States in line with other salaries paid to State employees accounted for the largest portion of this increase in cost. And yet, the administration requested only $72,000,000 for grants to States in hopes that some of the increased salary costs could be absorbed through more economical and efficient State administration. In the face of these facts, however, the committee comes along and makes another $14,000,000 cut in the amount to be granted to the States.

Let us face the facts squarely, whatever the politics involved in such a recommendation. It certainly does not constitute economy. We all know this will show up on the books as a net saving but we must realize that this alleged saving will be offset many times in the increased amounts of benefits being paid to unemployed workers because the Public Employment Service will be reduced to a point where it is unable to promptly find employment for such workers even though suitable employment opportunities may be available. Of course, the amount paid out of the State trust fund for unemployment-compensation benefits never shows up in an appropriation measure.

The recommendations of the committee should be rejected and the full amount of the request for these Services restored.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time, 11 minutes, to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, if it be true that consistency is a virtue of small minds, and if inconsistency should be a characteristic of great minds, then I would have to congratulate the gentlemen who are handling this appropriation bill, H. R. 6355, and responsible for the construction of pages 7 and 8, on possessing the most gigantic and overpowered intellects it has ever been my privilege to encounter.

Not only are we asked to legislate on a matter of the greatest importance—the location of the United States Employment Service—as a casual incident in appropriating funds for that Service and for certain activities of the Federal Security Agency, but we are at the same time asked to repudiate and tear up the recommendation of the majority of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department, that we freeze in our tracks and do nothing about reorganization until the Hoover commission shall have made its report next January on the operation of the executive department.

I extend my sympathy to the gentleman from Michigan who is the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department. He and other members of the committee were helpless only a few weeks ago and giving us reasons why we should not approve the

President's Reorganization Plan No. 1, which would have transferred the Bureau of Employment Security from the Federal Security Agency to the United States Department of Labor where it would have been coordinated with the United States Employment Service. In effect, the burden of their argument was this: Let us not do anything about reorganization until Herbert Hoover comes up with the report of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

I quote from the majority report disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1, which this House approved and endorsed on February 25, when it voted to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1:

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1948 SHOULD NOT BE ADOPTED AT THIS TIME

Whatever may be the merits of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1948, this is not the time for its adoption.

Public Law 162, Eightieth Congress, first session, approved July 7, 1947, established a Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. That act created a Commission composed of 12 members. Four were appointed by the President, four by the President pro tempore of the Senate, and four by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Two of the members of the Commission came from the executive branch, two from the Senate, two from the House of Representatives. An equal number were appointed from private life.

The present membership of that Commission is as follows: Herbert Hoover, Chairman; Dean C. Acheson, Vice Chairman; James Forrestal, Secretary of Defense; Arthur S. Flemming, Civil Service Commission; George H. Mead, Dayton, Ohio; George D. Aiken, Senator from Vermont; John L. McClellan, Senator from Arkansas; James K. Pollock, Ann Arbor, Mich.; Joseph P. Kennedy, Hyannis Port, Mass.; Clarence J. Brown, Representative from Ohio; Carter Manasco, Representative from Alabama; James H. Rowe, Washington, D. C.; Francis P. Brassor, Washington, D. C., Secretary to the Commission; Lawrence Richey, Washington, D. C., special assistant to the Chairman.

The Commission is required to make a report of its findings and recommendations to the Congress within 10 days after the Eighty-first Congress is convened and organized.

To enable the Commission to "study and investigate the present organization and methods of operation of all departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government, to determine what changes therein are necessary in their opinion to accomplish the purposes set forth in section 1 of this act" the Congress in the first instance appropriated, for its use, $750,000.

The ability and the character of the membership of the Commission, and the funds available to it, should be and are a guaranty that it can and it will present to the Eighty-first Congress an over-all plan designed to give economy by (1) limiting expenditures, (2) eliminating duplication and overlapping, (3) consolidating services, activities, and functions, (4) abolishing unnecessary services, activities, and functions, and (5) defining and limiting executive functions, services, and activities, without impairing the efficiency of public service.

Because the Department of Labor was created to and must, of necessity, be an advocate of labor, and because a nonpartisan commission, on which the public, the executive departments, and the legislative departments are adequately and competently represented, is now engaged in spending almost a million dollars in a study involving the same subject outlined in Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1948, that plan should be rejected. The Congress should await the report of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

CLARE E. HOFFMAN, Chairman; GEORGE H. BENDER; ROBERT F. RICH; HENRY J. LATHAM; JAMES W. WADSWORTH; FOREST A. HARNESS; CLARENCE J. BROWN; ROSS RIZLEY; J. EDGAR CHENOWETH; FRED E. BUSBEY; MELVIN C. SNYDER; J. CALEB BOGGS; R. WALTER RIEHLMAN; RALPH HARVEY; J. FRANK WILSON.

Now let me quote the clear and unmistakable words of the gentleman from Michigan who is the chairman of the Committee on Executive Expenditures, made February 25, and appearing on page 1708 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Congress created a Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. . . . the Commission, as you will note, is nonpartisan and it would be difficult to find a group more competent and unbiased. The Congress gave that Commission which will report shortly after the next Congress convenes, $750,000 for a study of the National Government. . . . so to me it seems a little absurd to suggest at this time that we should have piecemeal reorganization plans for the executive department. . . . It is also true that the adoption of piecemeal organization might well interfere with an overall coordinated plan of organization. If we adopt this or other suggested reorganization plan. . . . we may in the end after the Commission's report is in find ourselves disposed to scrap these plans and adopt the plans recommended by the Commission. It seems no more than the use of common sense to suggest that we wait and get the results of this expenditure of what may be from $750,000 to $1,750,000 by a nonpartisan, fully qualified Commission made up of men who have had experience along the lines of reorganization.

If the gentleman from Michigan now votes for this transfer, I warn that he is running the risk of having his former peerless leader, Herbert Hoover, run out on him and make him look as foolish as he feared the Congress would look if it went ahead with Reorganization Plan No. 1 while the great engineer was bending his mighty brain to his study of the operations of the executive branch.

Let me read the counsel of caution, delay, and inaction given on the same occasion by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SNYDER], also a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

The reason I think we should pass the resolution—

To kill Reorganization Plan No. 1—

before the committee is because last year this Congress provided for the appointment of a Commission and provided funds for the use of that Commission in making a comprehensive and complete study of the organization of the executive branches of the Government, with the object of recommending to Congress improvements, the consolidation of functions, and the elimination of duplication. That Commission is now in the midst of its work and is to report to the Congress by next January. The Commission, no doubt, will make a study and include in its recommendations the same matter as is contained in the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1. It seems to me that it is wisdom to delay our action until we have a report from this Commission.

According to the statement of Secretary Schwellenbach, the present set-up is functioning in a satisfactory manner and there is no immedaite need of disturbing the existing set-up until we receive a report from the Commission.

Further, laboring what was then obvious to the majority of the committee, and which today seems to be conveniently forgotten, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] had this to say:

We have already appropriated $750,000 for the Hoover commission to make an over-all study of the executive branch. It will include, of course, this particular question. Inasmuch as the committee is divided, it seemed to us on the committee that the sensible procedure is to wait until next January, at which time we will have before us the findings of the Commission, composed of very able and distinguished students of government. No harm will be done in the next 10 months by failure to transfer these two agencies now to the Department of Labor; therefore, it seems to me the part of wisdom is to vote for the pending concurrent resolution and to take no action upon any controversial reorganization plan until we have the report of ex-President Hoover and his commission.

Mr. Chairman, the Members who signed that report now have to eat their words if they vote for the provision of this H. R. 6355 arbitrarily transferring the United States Employment Service from the Department of Labor to the Federal Security Agency.

Let me read the final sentence of their report again:

The Congress should await the report of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

If the House now votes for the recommended transfer, it is at the same time bypassing the Hoover commission which was so highly recommended by the majority report on Reorganization Plan No. 1. We will be saying in effect that the Commission which, to quote the majority report, "is now engaged in spending almost a million dollars in studying the same subjects" shall today be ignored.

A vote for this transfer is a vote of no confidence in the recommendation of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department. It is a repudiation of that committee's recommendation.

It is a vote of disrespect to the Hoover commission, to which the Committee on Executive Expenditures, and later the majority of the House made many genuflections in the debate and vote on Reorganization Plan No. 1.

In view of the apparent readiness of the members of the majority of the Committee on Executive Expenditures to eat their empassioned words, I think we and the country, particularly the employers and wage earners who will be so greatly affected by the transfer, are entitled to wonder just how sincere the majority was in using the hallowed name of Herbert Hoover to defeat the proposal to locate both the United States Employment Service and the Bureau of Employment Security which handles unemployment compensation matters at the Federal level in the United States Department of Labor, where it belongs. I think we are fairly entitled to conclude that the majority is willing to use any stick—even Herbert Hoover—to beat the dog with—the dog, in the majority view being

the Department of Labor that has been so systematically kicked around by the Republican Party.

This, I believe, is the true explanation of the inconsistency exhibited by the master minds of the Republican majority.

Before passing to the substantive issue, namely, the importance of this proposed transfer and its effects upon the welfare of wage earners and service to employers, may I, Mr. Chairman, briefly pay my respects to the well-oiled efficiency of the machine that is operating here today. We who are about to be chewed up in that machinery, along with the United States Employment Service and the wage earners of the Nation, may at least be allowed to admire the thoroughness and speed with which the machine is doing its work.

It will make interesting and instructive material for use in the coming political campaign.

Let me recapitulate: At high noon on April 27, yesterday, the House Appropriations Committee unveiled H. R. 6355 and the accompanying report proposing to strip the already stripped-down Labor Department of its largest remaining action agency, the United States Employment Service.

A few hours later the House Rules Committee met and, in a twinkling of an eye, granted H. R. 6355 a rule waiving all points of order, thereby armorplating the bill against objections that it carries substantive legislation in an appropriation measure, thereby flagrantly violating due process in legislation, we are today being asked to vote on this proposal without hearings, without due consideration, without having afforded interested agencies and parties an opportunity to appear for or against the proposal. This, Mr. Chairman, is not a fair trial; it borders on the procedure of a well-conducted lynching party, in which the verdict has been written before the proceedings begin.

Also on the afternoon of April 27, the House Rules Committee obtained permission to have until last midnight to file its report on H. R. 6355.

The Rules Committee report, the report of the House Appropriations Committee, and the bill itself are before us today for the first time and I would be surprised if anyone other than the gentleman from Wisconsin who is in charge of the proceedings for the majority knows everything that is contained in these documents.

The majority machine has also arranged for H. R. 6355 to be taken up today immediately after the oleo decision, perhaps because it thought that the ways would be better greased for smooth and speedy passage.

I have a feeling, Mr. Chairman, that there is such a thing as being just too clever, too smart, too efficient. The machine rule such as is being exerted here on this bill is going to be recognized and resented by the American people, just as it has been recognized, resented, and broken up in times past.

The intent to do a job on the employment service, on the Department of Labor, on wage earners and on employers who rely upon the services of the Employment Service and the Bureau of Employment Security is pretty well spelled out, I think, by the committee's recommendation with respect to the appropriation for the United States Employment Service for 1949. The committe would cut by 20 percent the amounts to be granted to States for the operation of State employment service other than for farm placement and veteran's placement activities. The committee would make a 30-percent cut in joint administrative expenses of the Employment Service and unemployment compensation.

Any effort to achieve economy is laudable, but reductions of this magnitude can mean only that such economy can be achieved at the expense of eliminating essential activities below the needs for serving our national economy and national-defense programs. There must be no reduction in the one facility which the country has to properly mobilize manpower for our national-defense program. In periods of high employment such as we presently have, the problem of mobilizing additional manpower is much more difficult and costly to operate. We cannot at this time afford to slash the appropriation for Employment Service activities. In fact, there should be no reduction in facilities of the employment service in the light of a 40-percent cut of actual operating expenses of last year, and in light of developing international conditions, and in the light of production commitments we have already made in the promotion of world peace.

Mr. Chairman, let me warn the House that we are running through warning lights that have been plainly set up. On April 9, the Council of Economic Advisers in its quarterly report, had the following to say about the need for an expanded and improved United States Employment Service to meet the manpower needs that are bearing down upon us:

> The number of men involved in the contemplated increase in the armed forces and in the expanded industrial operations incident thereto will not exceed the expected increase in the labor force in 1948. The labor market is tight, however, and the frictional difficulties in the way of any accurate distribution of labor will lead to many local shortages. These can be minimized by making better use of the United States Employment Service.
>
> To this end, we believe that the national office of the United States Employment Service would have to be enlarged and strengthened. The Employment Service should undertake to develop a smoothly functioning program of (a) priority referral in local offices, and (b) comprehensive interarea recruitment.

We of the minority are going to see to it that those who vote for this transfer of the United States Employment Service and for these reckless cuts in funds for that Service and for other functions of the Federal Security Agency will have to live with and defend that vote in the months and years to come.

A vote for this transfer and these cuts is a vote for confusion, for inefficient spending of public funds, for depriving both wage earners and employers of a vital service, for putting obstacles in the way of our manpower needs for maximum production to meet our ECA-ERP commitments and the increased defense requirements and productions that are now plainly in sight. Speaking deliberately and after full consideration, Mr. Chairman, I say that a vote for the transfer and these cuts are a vote against the national welfare; and considering the crisis that is upon us, it is a vote against the national security.

So that the record may be made and so that we may all have a chance to stand up and be counted on this very grave issue, I now offer an amendment to strike out from H. R. 6355 the proposed transfer of the USES to the Federal Security Agency. This amendment I now send to the desk with the request that we proceed to a roll-call vote thereon.

Well, I do not know how to characterize that, but to characterize it as inconsistency is to express myself in a mild and most tolerant manner. I will confine myself to being mild and tolerant on this occasion.

I wonder how the Members feel with the knowledge that only 6 weeks ago or thereabouts they went up the hill and voted against reorganization during this session, and now my friend from Wisconsin is asking them to go down the hill and vote for a reorganization involving the very two agencies that you acted upon before, with the exception that in the President's plan they were organized into the Department of Labor and under this plan they are consolidated into Federal Security.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. With pleasure to my friend to explain his inconsistency.

Mr. KEEFE. Would the gentleman like me to explain what he conceives to be an inconsistency?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman could not do that.

Mr. KEEFE. All right.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. Let me ask the gentleman this very simple question: The gentleman has spoken about the profound and convincing argument that was made. Did that argument influence the gentleman, and did he vote for or against the President's reorganization plan?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts said that that argument was made and was one that Members might well consider as a proper argument.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman voted for it, did he not?

Mr. McCORMACK. What is that?

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman voted for the President's reorganization plan?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, I did. But one thing is certain, the gentleman is not consistent. The gentleman voted against Reorganization Plan No. 1. The gentleman voted against reorganization. The argument was made in the report of the majority of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments that no organization should take place before the report of the Hoover Commission. That is the substance of it at any rate. Now, my friend from Wisconsin, with all of the autocracy of the Appropriations Committee, because my friend is a mild, tolerant gentleman, comes in

and takes away not only the first jurisdiction of the proper standing committee of the House, but he is against the very argument made by his own members of the Committee on Expenditures.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. In making this great research that the gentleman is evidencing on this subject did he happen to run across the speech which I made on the President's program If he did, he will see that I urged exactly the same thing that I am submitting to the Congress today.

Mr. McCORMACK. Did the gentleman vote for President Truman's reorganization plan?

Mr. KEEFE. I did not.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; of course not.

Mr. KEEFE. Of course I did not, and I have been consistent all the way through.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is very sensitive.

Mr. KEEFE. No; I am not.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is the easiest man in the world to get his sensitiveness aroused.

Mr. KEEFE. No. I am in charge of this bill and I take all of the darts the gentleman can throw and I laugh and smile at them.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman is going to do a cold-blooded job, sit down and do not try to explain it away. You cannot explain away the fact that the Committee on Expenditures recommended to the Republican-controlled House that President Truman's reorganization plan should not go through, that we should wait until ex-President Hoover's commission has made its report, The gentleman from Wisconsin is violating that and brings in a reorganization in an appropriations bill. Is there any question about that?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman is the Democratic whip of this House, is he not?

Mr. McCORMACK. I think it is fair for the gentleman to assume that I am the Democratic whip, and I was formerly majority leader.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman should not say a lot of things that he does not believe in himself.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Wisconsin has a most unhappy faculty, which is easily detected, of accusing every other Member, when his feelings are disturbed, of being guilty of the very things he is guilty of himself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the amendments to restore the cuts made in the appropriations for the United States Employment Service and the Social Security Administration.

The bill reported out by the committee will emasculate the social-security program. It is part and parcel of the program of the Republican high command to scuttle every progressive piece of social legislation designed to help the little fellow.

There are two ways to emasculate legislation. The Republicans are trying both ways at the same time.

The first way is to amend, repeal, and undermine the legislation directly. House Joint Resolution 296, reported out by the Republican majority of the Ways and Means Committee which the Republican majority in this House passed on February 27 and sent to the Senate will exclude some 500,000 to 750,000 persons from social-security protection. This bill backed by the Republicans will mean the loss of insurance protection for thousands of persons. It will mean that many persons who have already paid their insurance premiums will lose insurance coverage. This is the Republican plan for social security—to exclude more people from the protection of the law. For those who want to know more about this outright brazen attack by the Republicans on our social-security law I refer them to the article by Thomas L. Stokes in his syndicated article on House Joint Resolution 296 which appeared on March 24 in the Washington Daily News.

Here is what Mr. Stokes said:

> The joint resolution sponsored by Representative BERTRAND W. GEARHART, Republican, of California, is designed to circumvent and nullify a Supreme Court decision of nearly a year ago which interpreted the Social Security Act so that coverage would be extended to many persons hitherto classified as independent contractors and not eligible.
>
> The joint resolution is the result of agitation and pressure from interests that would have to pay social-security taxes under the Supreme Court decision, including insurance companies and sweat-shop operators who contract out homework of various sorts. They got busy to exempt themselves from the decision.
>
> This puts the Republican House leadership in a strange position. In its 1944 platform it pledged extension of existing old-age insurance and unemployment insurance systems to all employees not already covered. It has done nothing thus far to keep this pledge but by this measure, to the contrary, it tries to deprive those rightfully entitled to coverage, mostly persons in the white-collar class who do not have the protection of labor unions.

The second way the Republicans are trying to emasculate social security is through the appropriation bill we are considering here today. Last year they cut social-security appropriations This year they are cutting even deeper. This year they are trying to cut the heart out of the program.

Now everyone here today knows that you cannot administer a law effectively unless you have the money and personnel to do the job right. Social security is a big business. The Social Security Administration administers the largest insurance business in the world. The benefits paid out for old-age and survivors insurance next year will be over $600,000,000; the Federal grants for unemployment insurance and public assistance over $900,000,000. These two items total $1,500,000,000. In addition the Social Security Administration supervises another $1,500,000,000 being expended by the States for unemployment insurance and public assistance—a grand total of $3,000,000,000. Yet the bill reported out by the committee cuts the research funds in Social Security from $229,000 to $100,000, or over 55 percent. The bill cuts $129,000 in this item. Yet everyone knows that you need research and statistics to help improve the present program—to work out ways and means to cover more people, and to improve the law in other ways. Every single person here at some time or other has asked for information and statistics from the Social Security Administration. Yet the appropriation bill cuts this function in half. The result will be less information and help to us and to the people of the country; less knowledge, less light on the need for improving the social-security law, less help to the aged, the blind, to widows, orphans, and the disabled.

That is the effect of this Republican-sponsored bill. That is the intent and the result.

What the committee report appears to say on page 26 is that the changes to be anticipated in the social-security program are of such a limited character that no real issues or questions for study are going to arise. That is a dangerous point of view—and, I trust, a mistaken assumption. Our social-security program is well-established, in the sense that it represents a good beginning. But it is not a completed program. Congress should long before this have given serious consideration to expanding the coverage of old-age and survivors' insurance, to adding disability benefits, to improving the basis for Federal financial aid in public assistance, and to many other improvements in the program. I refuse to believe that we are going to continue much longer the shameful neglect of the welfare of millions of our citizens which our failure to take action on social security represents.

The Social Security Administration has assembled facts and made studies which support recommendations for expansion and improvement of the program. But surely no one believes that when Congress turns seriously to study the program, it will not have a multitude of new questions to be answered, alternative proposals which must be analyzed and evaluated, new demands for information. Directly or indirectly we will turn to the Social Security Administration for much of that information. If the committee bill is adopted, Members of Congress will have only themselves to thank when they find that the information and the assistance they call for cannot be provided.

The Bureau of Research and Statistics has today only 50 employees, including clerical and administrative as well as professional staff. The committee bill would provide for a total staff of about 20. The present staff is hardly large enough to do more than keep up with the most pressing current demands for statistical information. It can only do that in fields where it can draw on

past studies and previous research. Any agency which has no margin to do basic and developmental research on new and emerging problems is headed toward senility. We cannot afford to have the Social Security Administration thinking about the social-security problems of today and tomorrow in terms of the facts and ideas of last year.

While Congress has turned its attention away from social security, labor and management have been struggling with problems of security for workers and their families outside the social-security system. Much of the pressure for employee benefit plans in collective bargaining results from the inadequacies of our social-security program. I suspect, however, that employee-benefit plans to supplement social security are here to stay. What rules the Congress should lay down for such plans—and what should be the relation of such plans to the basic social-security program are policy questions of increasing significance. We have a right to expect the Social Security Administration to make the studies necessary to any intelligent discussion of these questions. As a result of the budget cuts of last year, the Bureau of Research and Statistics was obliged to abandon plans for systematic studies that would have provided some information merely on the number of employee benefit plans now in existence and the types of provisions which are most commonly found in them. The Bureau has made a few case studies of individual plans, but that is all the present staff can do. And I am talking about the present staff, not about the Bureau's resources after the more than 50-percent cut imposed by this bill.

Another problem about which we, the Congress, should be demanding more rather than less information and study is improvements in the method of financing social-security programs, particularly the problem of additional Federal financial aid for the low-income States. Certainly the Social Security Administration has done research on this problem in the past, but the circumstances of 1948 and 1949 are not the circumstances of 1939 and 1940. Until we have solved the problem of making it possible for all States to provide adequate assistance to needy persons, I want to know that research and study has not stopped.

You cannot find out the answers to these and many other questions without having some people to study the problem. Every businessman knows the value of spending sufficient sums on research to improve his product, or reduce costs. Why should not the United States Government be willing to do the same thing?

The bill also cuts the informational work of the Social Security Administration by 70 percent. This cut means that the people who pay into social security will not be able to get a prompt reply to their letters. It will mean the public will get less and less information on their rights to benefits. It means that many insurance beneficiaries—widows, orphans, and dependent parents—will lose millions of dollars in benefits because there will not be an adequate informational service to tell them about their rights.

The appropriation bill cuts the appropriations for the Commissioner for Social Security in total about 20 percent. Then it transfers about another 75 percent out of his immediate control. The result is to leave the Commissioner for Social Security with only about 5 or 6 percent of the amount of money he has today. The result is a stab in the back of social security. It makes it almost impossible to run an efficient and coordinated social-security program.

The Republican record on social security is clear.

And, although they have been in power nearly 2 years, they have only produced three pieces of legislation of social security:

First. They froze the social-security contributions last year.

Second. They excluded adult news vendors from the social-security program a few days ago.

Third. They recently passed a bill in the House, House Joint Resolution 296, to exclude 500,000 to 750,000 people from social security.

This is the Republican record on social security. Now they want to add a fourth item to their list—the scuttling of the appropriations.

Everyone who votes today to support the bill as reported out by the gentleman from Wisconsin is voting against true social security. A vote for the bill is a vote against social security. A vote to restore the cuts is a vote for social security.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, the proposed appropriation for the Children's Bureau shows a cut of about $139,000 below the budget estimate. It is claimed that this cut will materially affect essential work for children especially in respect to health problems, and other serious physical impediments, and that it will cut down on funds for travel, essential if the Children's Bureau is to do its job, and for essential research.

Under leave to extend my remarks obtained in the House this morning, there follows a statement analyzing the details of these points by the American Parents Committee, a membership non-profit public service association working for better conditions for children locally and nationally, the chairman of which is Mr. George J. Hecht, of New York, publisher of the Parents' magazine:

THE AMERICAN PARENTS COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C.

Memorandum to J. K. JAVITS, Member of Congress.
From American Parents Committee.
Re proposed 1949 appropriation for United States Children's Bureau.

The proposed appropriation for the United States Children's Bureau, part of the Federal Security Agency, is only $1,385,000. This is $69,265 less than the present year's appropriation, which, in turn, was less than the previous year's.

This appropriation does not include the maternal and child health and welfare grants in aid to the States, which the Children's Bureau administers under the Social Security Act, and for which sums are fixed in law.

Also rejected was the Bureau's request for an additional $96,000 needed to administer and supervise more effectively the child health and welfare grants to the States, and which would have restored some services lopped off by last year's budget cut in both field and departmental offices of the Bureau.

The Children's Bureau is the only Federal agency that is developing new programs for children with rheumatic fever, cerebral palsy, hearing defects, and other crippling conditions. The need for an adequate budget is obvious when you consider that heart afflictions due to rheumatic fever kill five times as many children of school age as infantile paralysis, whooping cough, diphtheria, scarlet fever, measles, and meningitis combined. Programs for the care of rheumatic-fever patients is only one of the Bureau's vital functions that will be affected by this appropriation cut.

Also turned down was a requested $41,000 restoration of traveling expenses for the Bureau's staff, which sum was removed from the appropriation this year and is sorely needed because the Bureau has only 8 regional offices to serve 52 States and Territories. This year for example, the Denver regional office, serving six Rocky Mountain States, has only one medical consultant and one medical social worker. With such limited staff to cover such an area surely necessitates adequate travel expense.

Although the Appropriations Committee in its report states that it desires the Bureau's over-all appropriation to be held "to approximately the current-year level," by denying funds for necessary within-grade salary advancements, which therefore must be met from other funds, the committee has obliged a contraction of the Bureau's services.

The proposed 1949 appropriation turns down the Bureau's request for $51,000, which would have provided a national clearing house for research in child life. This would have meant a service to scientists unobtainable elsewhere in the country that has long been requested by the Bureau by top-ranking authorities in this field.

The Children's Bureau budget is far too small in any case. This is most obvious when you compare it with other programs of the Federal Government that are spending many times as much on behalf of the health and welfare of cattle and hogs than it does on children.

GEORGE J. HECHT,
Chairman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, if, as it appears, the reduction in the appropriation for the Commissioner for Social Security from $3,131,165 to $221,000 suggests the dismemberment of the presently unified social-security program, I am unalterably opposed to it. This proposal raises a basic question as to whether we are going to have a coordinated and balanced development of social security in this country or whether each of the programs under social security will operate with little regard for the needs of the others.

This is the appropriation which provides funds for the Office of the Commissioner for Social Security and covers activities which are common to all four of the social-security programs: Old-age and survivors insurance, public assistance, unemployment compensation, and the health and welfare programs of the Children's Bureau. These activities were organized along present lines to assure

coordination in the administration of the present social-security programs and in the development of new ones as well as to avoid duplication and unnecessary expense. It would be a great mistake to go along with the crippling of this office through the elimination of its component service and control offices which enabled it to function effectively. In addition to the Commissioner's immediate office, this appropriation provides funds for such necessary and continuing activities as the review of the work plans, objectives, and accomplishments of the four program bureaus, the analysis of various proposals for financing social security, the evaluation of proposals for changes in the social security system and in addition for assuring that adequate factual information is made available to employer, employees, and the public regarding the rights and obligations under social security. Unless this latter function is performed adequately the administrative costs of administering the programs are greatly increased through inaccurate reporting of wages by employers, through increased difficulty in the adjudication of claims, and through the issuance of duplicate account number cards which are lost by employees through careless handling. The total of $221,000 provided for all of the activities encompassed by the Commissioner's office is entirely inadequate. Since it is so obvious that these functions must continue so long as there is social-security legislation to be administered. I ask reconsideration of the proposal.

MAJOR FEATURES OF 1949 APPROPRIATIONS BILL FOR THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION (H. R. 6355, H. REPT. NO. 1821)

This bill makes such drastic cuts in the Federal administrative funds for social-security administration as to undermine the effectiveness of the present social-security program and the possibility of its expansion as recommended in the 1944 platforms of both Democratic and Republican Parties. The over-all cut amounts to $78,335,000 in a program whose administrative budget was relatively small in any case.[1]

The most serious cuts and their implications are summarized as follows:

The Commissioner's office was cut as follows:

Budget estimate	$3,131,165
Committee recommendation	221,000
Reduction, 93 percent	2,910,165

When the Social Security Board was abolished under Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1946, all its functions were centered in the office of the Commissioner of Social Security (Mr. Arthur Altmeyer). Obviously his office is the nerve center of the program insofar as over-all direction of the program is concerned, and particularly with respect to policy and planning functions. This has the effect of eliminating many of these functions and throwing others back to the Bureau level, thus eliminating the possibility of any coordinated approach to the problem of human need and any real integration of function.

Informational service cut:

Budget estimate	$109,997
Committee recommendation	30,000
Reduction	79,997

[1] The total cost in 1948 of the Federal administration of the three social-security programs is 1.8 percent of the total benefit payments.

Informational service is an integral part of program operation in social security since it is essential that people be informed of their rights under the program and how to secure them. Already there are many complaints that people lose the benefit rights to which they are entitled by their own contribution because of failure to make application at the right time.

Bureau of Research and Statistics:

Budget estimate	$229,830
Committee recommendation	100,000
Reduction	129,830

This reduction is most serious in its implications for future development of the social-security program, since it means that the administration cannot carry on the technical work of research which must precede and accompany any changes in policy and program. Members of Congress and its committees are themselves largely dependent on this Bureau for the factual material on which their own decisions are based. Social security is a highly technical field involving complicated relationships between contributions, benefit payments, wage levels, Federal-State fiscal problems for which specialized research is absolutely basic.

Employment service and unemployment compensation:

Combined budget recommendation for grants to States	$145,650,000
Combined committee recommendation	123,000,000
Reduction	22,650,000
Combined administrative budget	6,398,671
Combined committee recommendation	5,312,000
Reduction	1,086,671

The House voted against the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 to combine these two functions in the Labor Department. Now the House Appropriations Committee recommends their combination in a new Bureau of Employment Security outside the Social Security Administration with a drastically reduced budget as indicated above.

ELIZABETH WICKENDEN.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered as read and that it be open to amendment at any point thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 5, line 12, strike out "$123,000,000" and insert "$145,650,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, the original budget request for the United States Employment Service and the Unemployment Compensation Commission was $145,650,000. This is the largest single reduction in the entire bill. It is a reduction of $22,650,000, coming at a time when I know that a majority of the committee realized that we have the highest employment in the country, and at the same time we have the highest turn-over of labor in the history of the country. The needed request for an increase over the budget last year is due mainly to the increased responsibilities that they have because Congress has given them the increased responsibilities and because of the salary raises that have been granted in practically all the States in the past year. Now, that is something that we cannot do much about. Here we say on one hand that we want a good, strong United States Employment Service; we want to make sure that the farmers in the Midwest and the South and the far West are taken care of by this farm placement service, and we specify particularly in the bill and the report that the $400,000 set aside for farm placement service is not to be touched one cent.

At the same time this $22,000,000 will have to be absorbed without any of that percentage being taken away from the Farm Placement Service.

It is all right to say that we want a strong Employment Service, but you are attempting to do in this appropriation just what you did to the Office of Price Administration. I heard so many times that some form of price control was needed, but what happened in the Appropriations Committee? They came here year after year with reduced budgets in an effort to make it unworkable, and they succeeded, until some parts of the OPA became the laughing stock of the country. One of the main reasons they did become the laughing stock of the country was the action of the Appropriations Committee in not giving them the necessary money to work with. The same thing can happen here. These people who are responsible for the administration of these two necessary divisions of government come in with their budget requests and justify their requests. Then who are we to say they can get along with $22,650,000 less?

Mr. Chairman, my amendment just restores the original budget amount requested by the USES and the Unemployment Compensation Commission.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island would increase the amount provided in this bill for the combined UC and Employment Office services by approximately $23,000,000. I tried to explain to the Members of the House, whether successfully or not I do not know, that the very saving the gentleman seeks to put back into this bill is made possible by virtue of the reorganization program this bill accomplishes. If his amendment were to be adopted it would just throw a monkey wrench into the whole reorganization program and would be giving them so much money they just simply would not know what to do with it.

As a matter of fact, under the program we have in mind this is what would happen. They have one State budget with one fund allocated to the States. If they run short of funds on the UC side then they can use the funds and personnel from the employment side. If the case load of Employment Service goes up and the unemployment goes down, it can use the unemployment compensation group over in the Employment Service, thus

having fluidity of operation which is not present today.

The director of the Arkansas administration spoke to me just a few moments ago. He has a deficit in his UC funds but he has a surplus in the Employment Service funds that were allocated to them. As things stand, he has to come up here and ask for a deficiency for his UC funds when he has plenty of funds over on the other side in the Employment Services that he could use if he were given the opportunity to do so.

We have provided complete flexibility in the utilization of these funds and the services under this bill. If you vote this amendment you are just completely destroying everything the committee has sought to do to provide some economy and some flexibility in the operations of this great system.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, the President has failed to act. The reason is obvious. Eighty-one thousand CIO strikers who have partially tied up 50 meat-packing plants throughout the Nation are still committing flagrant acts of violence. They battle in large numbers with the police in Chicago. One striker seeking to stop a truck loses his life. One policeman was shot in Chicago and others injured. A general free-for-all battle between the police and hundreds of strikers in Kansas City is reported in the press.

Farmers who have to hold and feed grain to cattle, hogs, and livestock longer than necessary are losing millions of dollars. Millions of bushels of grain wasted in feeding livestock ready for the market which cannot be shipped because of the strikes.

The American Federation of Labor working in the same plants accepted the company's offer for a 9-cent raise. The radical leaders of the CIO, doubtless many of them Communists or fellow travelers, in the same plants have been carrying on this strike for over a month.

Under the Taft-Hartley law the President sent his fact-finding committee to investigate. They reported back to the President weeks ago in substance that the wage increase offered by the packers was sufficient for a settlement of the strike. Had the President then asked the Attorney General to enforce the Taft-Hartley Act by requesting an injunction, the strike would have been settled within 24 hours. The President, in failing to act, has encouraged the CIO officials to continue the strike.

The big packers in Chicago have been called to Washington this week by officials of the National Labor Relations Board in an effort to effect a settlement. Of course, this delay and the calling of these packers into Washington must be carrying out the policy of the President.

It is interesting to observe that the CIO political officials throughout the Nation are the shock-troop leaders in support of the President for reelection.

Can it be that instead of vigorously enforcing the Taft-Hartley Act in the interest of all the people of the Nation that he is influenced not to do so by reason of political consideration?

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, on page 27 of the committee report, which deals with salaries for the Office of the Federal Security Administrator, the statement is made that the recommended reduction includes $74,000 for the executive assistants in each of the 11 regional offices, which the committee believes could very well be dispensed with.

Mr. Chairman, I do not pretend to be familiar with all of the executive assistants in the 11 regional offices, but I do happen to be familiar with the situation in San Francisco. May I say that if there were a deliberately planned attempt to wreck the efficiency of that office it could not be put into effect in a more efficient manner than by this provision, because the executive assistant out there is one of the most competent persons I know in the whole Government service. Her appointment was in no sense political. As a matter of fact, she was in this office long before I came to the Congress the first time. I happen to know that she carries a major share of the responsibility for the administration of that regional office on her shoulders and has made a most creditable record.

I regret extremely to see this provision in the bill, Mr. Chairman, and I hope it will be stricken out by the vote of the House.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask a question which I think will be answered to my entire satisfaction by the chairman of the subcommittee. As will be recalled, it has been my purpose to inquire as to each appropriation bill whether there are any funds available for the purpose of installing new oil-burner equipment or to convert from coal to oil in Government installations. It may seem inappropriate to raise this question at the present time of the year, but I want to quote from a memorandum I received this week from a well-qualified source:

> Although the petroleum supply and demand has shown improvement in the past weeks, we are by no means out of the woods. It is possible that the Nation will experience gasoline shortage this summer, particularly in the Middle West. Moreover, local shortages of fuel oils may again plague the eastern seaboard and the North Central States next winter. Supply and demand are so nearly equal that the nature of future events depends almost entirely upon a number of factors not susceptible of precise evaluation at this time—the weather, labor disturbances, the availability of steel, military requirements, disasters such as Texas City, the extent of increases in demand, and, of great importance, the degree of public conservation.

Having that in mind, I was not able to find any indication whatever in the terms of the bill itself or in the committee report that the committee intends that one cent of these funds should be used for either of those two purposes. However, I thought it might be helpful, if the chairman agrees with that interpretation of the bill and report, to have him say so at this stage of the debate.

Mr. KEEFE. I may say to the gentleman that a reading of the report and the bill itself clearly indicates that there are no expenditures provided in this bill for any of the purposes he is talking about. I daresay that the bill carries funds to pay for all the old-age and survivors' insurance. If you are going to restrict the beneficiaries of old-age and survivors' insurance against the purchase of oil burners, it may be that the gentleman would want to put some limitation in this bill, I do not know, but, so far as this bill is concerned and so far as I know, there is not a dollar, a dime, or a penny involved in it for any of the purposes that the gentleman has been fighting for so long and so well.

Mr. HESELTON. I thank the gentleman. My principal interest is that the Government in its buildings, either owned or leased, should understand that under no stretch of imagination or construction can undertake new installations of oil-burner equipment or convert from coal to oil-burning equipment. The statement made by the chairman makes that crystal clear.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY:
>
> On page 17, line 5, after the word "violence", strike out all of lines 5, 6, 7, and 8, down to and including "1947" on line 9.
>
> Strike out all of lines 19, 20, 21, and 22, down to and including "1947" on line 23.
>
> On page 18, line 5, after the word "violence", strike out all of lines 5, 6, 7, and 8, down to and including "1947" on line 9.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, this strikes out the language that was added as a last-minute measure in the mark-up of this bill. I think, as everyone knows, that it was directed at one labor organization that has Government employees in its organization. When this was first suggested to me, when we were about to adjourn our mark-up that day on this bill, I did not know just what to do about it because of its various implications, and I said at that time that I would vote against the committee in marking up this particular item in the bill. When this report of the subcommittee was before the full committee a few days ago I told the full committee at that time that I was against it, and there was still some doubt in my mind as to whether it was decent legislation or not.

I am convinced, after giving it considerable thought, that it is very bad legislation on an appropriation bill. We did not hold any hearings at all on this item of the bill. There was no witness called one way or the other. It was just a directive that was given to the subcommittee the last minute and told to add or tack on to this bill, and that is how we got it.

Now, this goes a lot further than just to get the leaders of the UPWA Union. It affects every union that has to do with Government employees. Why it even goes so far as this, and I would like to

just give a personal explanation now. I have been a union man since 1930. I am paying now $48 a year dues in the union that I belong to. If I did not come back to Congress next year and got a job in some agency of our Government this legislation would force me to give up 18 years of paying dues into my international labor organization or quit my own job that I have in that particular department. Is there anything fair about that?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. May I inquire what union the gentleman belongs to?

Mr. FOGARTY. The Bricklayers International Union.

Mr. KEEFE. Have the officers of that union signed the affidavit?

Mr. FOGARTY. They have.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, then, the gentleman would not be bothered at all. It would not injure the gentleman at all. The gentleman used a very bad illustration.

Mr. FOGARTY. I am just giving that as an illustration of what could happen. Take the typographical union, or maybe some one who may have been a coal miner back 25 years ago and holds a dues-carrying card in the coal miners union. If he has a job in the Government today he has to give up his union or his job; there is no question about that. But, take the union I belong to, if they had not signed the affidavit, I would be affected by it. That means I would have to give up 18 years of annual dues that I have paid in at the rate of $48 a year. We have sick benefits that our families rely on. We have death benefits that we have been paying into for years. Is that a fair way to treat someone in a case like that? Going maybe a step further, what would happen if the Government took over the coal mines in this country, when the leaders of the coal miners union have not signed this affidavit? What would happen then? Who do you think would dig the coal if legislation like this is tacked onto an appropriation bill?

No; it goes much further than what has been maintained here this afternoon. I hope the amendment will be carried because of the unjust provisions to so many people that we do not know anything about, who will be affected by the provision. We did not have any information before the committee or in the record as to how many people in the Government employ would be affected by such a situation as I have explained to you. In order to be fair to them, if not to anybody else, I hope the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. Was not this amendment thoroughly discussed by the members of the subcommittee?

Mr. KEEFE. It was.

Mr. CHURCH. We considered it and talked about it often.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say that utter candor and frankness compels me to say that I have no pride of authorship of the proposal in this bill. Certain CIO unions have sent telegrams to Members of Congress asking them to vote down the Keefe rider simply because I happen to be chairman of the committee. This provision in the bill, which we thoroughly analyzed, is a sound provision, in line exactly with the provisions that have been carried in appropriation bills for a number of years.

I call the attention of the Members to the fact that nothing that is done in this life can be done with complete finality. I recall that I learned when I was a student in law school that there were some 386 hypotheses that could be indulged in in the drafting of a will. After 30 years of the practice of law, I have found I would be sitting there for the rest of my life drawing one will if I listened to all the conceivable situations that you might possibly think of and conceive of in human relations that just do not exist.

The gentleman has told about his situation. He was a member of the bricklayers' union before he came to Congress. He used that example unfortunately because it is not a good illustration at all. The officers of the bricklayers' union have signed the non-Communist affidavit. Nothing in this provision would affect his situation at all. There may be a situation, however, where such a question might arise. I am willing to concede that. I am willing to concede that you might find one or two isolated cases in the Government service where perhaps somebody had been a member of a union the officers of which had refused to comply, for reasons best known to themselves, with the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law. I am satisfied that if such a situation does develop—and I make this statement on the floor of the House now—I would be perfectly willing in connection with the discussion of this matter in the conference with the other body to see to it that if there is any such reasonable possibility as that, although we have not been able to find it in our discussions of the provision, there might be some other language included that would take care of just exactly that situation.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question with regard to my position. I have been a member of the typographical union since 1913. I have been an active dues-paying member. If what the gentleman from Rhode Island says is true, I might have to resign from Congress or surrender my card in the typographical union, and I propose to do no such thing.

Mr. KEEFE. I would not ask the gentleman to do that, and there is nothing in this asking you to resign your seat in Congress—not at all. That is just typical of the flimsy arguments that are being made. I cannot yield further to the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, because he is not making any worth-while contribution to our thought on this subject. The gentleman does not understand apparently what is in the bill.

Mr. DINGELL. I am trying to.

Mr. KEEFE. I am telling you that there is nothing here that would affect you at all. You are not an employee of the Government.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman understand one thing—that the typographical union president and the officers of the International Typographical Union have not taken the pledge. They have not signed non-Communist affidavits.

Mr. KEEFE. They have not signed the non-Communist affidavits as required.

Mr. DINGELL. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. They have not signed the non-Communist affidavits as required by the Taft-Hartley law. Do you know the reason why they have not signed them, principally those who are affected in the Government Printing Office? I will tell you why——

Mr. DINGELL. Because they are not Communists.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further. Let us make this clear. The reason these Government unions have not signed the affidavits according to the Taft-Hartley law is that they are not required to do so. They do not use the services of the NLRB, and they do not use the Mediation Conciliation Service. Their salaries are fixed by the Congress. That is all there is to the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. The fact of the matter is that we have talked with some of the officers of these other Government unions, and they are perfectly willing to sign such an affidavit. It comes in pretty poor conscience, it seems to me, for a man who is the head of a union like the International Typographical Union to say, "I am no Communist. I despise communism. I will not have anything to do with them, and I will not have one in my organization, but I refuse to sign this particular affidavit." I am just as certain as I am standing here that you will not run into any such difficulty at all. But what this will do is to say to Mr. Abraham Flaxner and his associates running this organization, which is absolutely Communist-dominated, that is the UPWA, "Either fish or cut bait." That is all there is to it, because there are plenty of good organizations of Government workers in this country who are perfectly willing to sign a non-Communist affidavit. It seems to me the time has come when we say to these people, "It is true that you are making your contribution to support Flaxner and his crowd out of the pay that the Government gives you. Now it is up to you, Mr. Government Employee, to say to Mr. Flaxner and to Miss Nelson, 'We are not going to contribute

funds to you Communists to carry on your activities.'" That is all there is to this situation and you can raise all these other bug-a-boos from morning till night. That is all there really is in this situation. That is what it is intended to strike at.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. The chairman of the committee says that is the only thing in it. He knows that is not so. He knows, as you yourself know, that if you carry a card, if you take a Government job, you have to give up your card or give up your job. There is no question about it.

Mr. DINGELL. If the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] will indulge me a moment, I will be glad to yield to him later.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman from Wisconsin realizes that the way we operate on the House side, so far as the Committee on Appropriations is concerned, gives very little opportunity for any of us to come before the committee and find out much of what is happening. As a matter of fact, you have such a closed corporation that members of one of your own subcommittees cannot very well barge in on another subcommittee. Your own members are barred from taking part. Therefore, frequently one hand does not know what the other hand has been doing. I have a right, as a Member of Congress here in the Committee of the Whole, to ask questions and to determine for myself what course to follow. That is all I am trying to do.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield right at that point? I want the gentleman to ask questions and I want to give him the information.

Mr. DINGELL. You were loath to answer the questions when I tried to clarify the fact that because the president of the International Typographical Union did not sign the non-Communist affidavit, my position either as a Member of Congress or a member of the typographical union was at stake.

Mr. KEEFE. Does not the gentleman think he would, under these circumstances?

Mr. DINGELL. Well, suppose you engineered such a thing as I was led to believe by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] had occurred in the committee, do you not think I have a right to know, and if such a condition did exist would I not have a right to vote against a pernicious action of that kind?

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Did the gentleman charge and put words into the mouth of the gentleman from Rhode Island, that something pernicious and iniquitous did occur in the committee?

Mr. DINGELL. I would say it would be iniquitous and pernicious and worse than that if what he said was correct.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, what do you charge him with saying?

Mr. DINGELL. I am not charging him with anything. He said that my standing as a member of the typographical union was at stake in what you accomplished in the committee.

Mr. KEEFE. What did he say?

Mr. DINGELL. Did you not hear him say so?

Mr. KEEFE. I do not think he said any such thing. I think you are putting words in his mouth.

Mr. DINGELL. I am not trying to put any words into his mouth. I am trying to put his words into your head. I have listened to your lectures here on the floor altogether too long.

Mr. KEEFE. You have not listened to very many.

Mr. DINGELL. I never got anything out of them. As far as the membership of this House is concerned and as far as the membership of the typographical union is concerned, they are no more Communists than the gentleman from Wisconsin, and they should be protected in their rights as citizens of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] has expired.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I believe I understand the provisions of this clause in question. If I am in error, I hope the chairman of the committee or someone will correct me.

If I read this provision right, it says in substance that if a Government employee belongs to a union and the officers of that union do not comply with the requirements of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, that that person will be penalized by losing his job because of what somebody else does or, rather, fails to do.

Now, suppose that a man, a member of a union involved, were begging his officer to sign and he would not sign. Suppose half of them in the union were doing it, or even 95 percent were doing it, and suppose everybody knew the officer involved was not a Communist, but just a stubborn man, and suppose that, being a stubborn man, he stood on what he claimed was his American rights, and for that reason just refused to sign the required affidavit. To penalize all of these men because they belonged to that union and could not force this man to sign the affidavit in question is, to my mind, going far afield from our duties here. You know there is such a thing as our doing a serious injustice under the cloak of patriotism. I think all of us love this country. I know that I do.

I take it that all of us want this Government to prosper and to be protected, but I take it also that all of us want to be fair to individuals and not to penalize people for something they cannot help. That is what we would be doing if this provision is left in the bill. It clearly is unfair as it stands, and this provision in question, is, in my judgment, also unconstitutional.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman spoke about there being just a few. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MORRIS. I beg the gentleman's pardon?

Mr. CHURCH. Does the gentleman believe that if this provision of the bill is adopted, and if Mr. Flaxner remains in his position as head of his union—and he is considered a Communist—if he continues there, does not the gentleman believe the employees would insist on his getting out? He is even less than a "few."

Mr. MORRIS. That is right. The gentleman has asked me a question. I will try to answer it. I do not know who the gentleman is talking about. I have never received any telegram——

Mr. CHURCH. I am talking about Flaxner.

Mr. MORRIS. I do not know anything about Flaxner. I have received telegrams from no one. I have no information on the matter except my own study of it. All I am doing is just standing up here as a Congressman and an American citizen trying to be fair to people generally and help make fair laws.

Mr. CHURCH. If the gentleman——

Mr. MORRIS. Now, wait! Let me speak for just a minute and I will try to answer the gentleman's question, and the gentleman has raised a very intelligent question, one that bears on the debate.

It takes time to remove a person from office, and the person might come in with a mandamus suit, injunction or other court action to prevent his removal from an office in the union. It might be 6 months' time or a year, it might even be several years before they could get him out, and the innocent Government employee's family would starve or at least suffer while they were trying to get him out.

I say that guilt is a personal thing. You cannot make me guilty because of something you did; that is not American, that is not right. If somebody fails to follow the law or if somebody else is guilty, that corruption of blood should not be worked upon my head; and if I am guilty you should not be called guilty because I am. That is all there is to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think the gentleman has given a very fair explanation of just what can happen in this legislation and how far it can go; but it goes a lot further than that. We have one or two Members of Congress who at one time in their younger days worked in coal mines and who still carry a card. Is it not fair to assume that there are other men who worked in coal mines who have Government positions today and who still hold cards in the miners' union? This legislation would parcel them out even though they had been paying into the union for 15 or 25 years.

Mr. MORRIS. Certainly it would have that effect, there is no question about that.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad to hear the gentleman make this explanation of this particular section of the bill. He presents the point very clearly that this is the old principle of guilt by association.

Mr. MORRIS. That is right.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. A principle which was outlawed at Runnymede when they made King John sign the Magna Carta.

Mr. MORRIS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. In answer to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], a few minutes ago, I tried to simplify this question. The issue is simply this: the Federal employee may belong to a labor union, but he may not belong to a labor organization that is ruled by Communists and at the same time work for the Federal Government.

The gentleman from Oklahoma mentioned the time element awhile ago, that it might take 6 months or such under present law to do certain things, but this bill will shorten the time within which we can get rid of the Flaxners and other Communists who are giving trouble to our loyal American workers today.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further.

In getting rid of communism, let us do it the right way, let us do it the American way, let us do it the fair way. Let us not trespass on the rights of innocent people in doing it. It is not necessary.

I want it distinctly understood that I do not impugn the motives of the chairman of the subcommittee; I do not impugn the motives of any man here. I think you gentlemen are trying to do what is right. I am not saying you are willfully doing anything wrong. I do not mean that at all. I have respect for your committee, and I will go along with you gentlemen when I think you are right. But I am saying to you that I am going to oppose you or anybody else in the Halls of this Congress who I think is deviating from the true path that I believe ought to be followed. I am going to fight for the protection of the liberties and just rights of the people of the United States to the very best of my ability.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this provision in the bill is intended to get rid of the Communists and the "pinks" who are employees of the Federal Government, a movement which is long overdue. There is no use getting up any blood pressure about this situation because the Congress is ready to do it and it is ready to do it now. The motion of the gentleman from Rhode Island is not going to prevail. This House is not going to strike out that clause. So let us get down to some practical aspects of the situation because I see considerable merit in the suggestion of the gentleman from Rhode Island. I can see how we will unwittingly do some injustice if we adopt this language as it is.

As I understand the situation, a person might have been at some time a member of a labor organization and still hold a card and carry that card and be entitled to certain benefits out of the union, but at the same time he may be employed by the Government and in no way associated with the management of the union. Under this provision as I read it he would lose his Government job. That is not what we are intending to do at all. We do not intend to do an injustice to anybody, I am sure, by this provision.

Mr. Chairman, I have a suggestion that I think will heal this situation. On page 17, line 5, where we refer to "an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence or who is a member of any labor organization the officers of which have never complied," and so forth, I suggest that at the end of line 5, after "labor organization" we say "of Government employees." I think that will get at the root of what we are trying to do; that is, these labor organizations of the Federal Government that are affiliated with an organization which refuses to comply with the law. They must divorce themselves from that union that is subversive or they must suffer the penalty of separation from Government service.

There is an old saying down in the country where I come from that if you lie down with the dogs you are going to get up with fleas. If they want to associate with an organization that refuses to comply with the law, and it is "pink" or communistic, then let them get out of the Government service. If they are bona fide, good American citizens, and do not want to be associated with that organization, then they can divorce themselves from an organization that is subversive.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I will say to the distinguished gentleman that the committee has given that question very careful consideration, but I call the gentleman's attention to this fact that if we use the language which he has suggested, we are perhaps eliminating the very union that we seek to get out, because this Flaxner union, which has been condemned by the minority as well as the majority as being Communist led and inspired, is a union that covers not only Federal Government workers, but covers State employees, municipal employees, and county employees. Therefore, you see, if we exempt them and make it apply to Government employees, we would be letting them out.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Well, if a local union of Federal employees wants to associate with that kind of company, and they want to keep themselves mixed up with Communists or subversives, or organizations of that character, then they must suffer the penalty.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, if you simply use the language, "any labor organization of government employees" would not that cover a union that had State, local, and Federal employees? You would not have to say, "Federal Government."

Mr. KEEFE. Of course, if the gentleman will yield, we considered that very carefully and came to the conclusion that we were legislating for the Federal Government, and by implication and construction it would apply only to Federal employees.

Mr. GARY. How about "public employees?"

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; but this union has employees in the State, Federal locals, and everything else.

Mr. GARY. Suppose we use the words "public employees?"

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I would say to my friend, as I indicated in my statement on the floor, that I quite agree with what he has said. It is not entirely free from the possibility of some inequities that you might think of. But, the suggestion has been made, and I wonder what the gentleman from Virginia would think of this, that after the provision just as it is, this language were to be inserted:

Provided, That notwithstanding the provisions hereof an employee may continue his membership in any organization if the cancellation of such membership would result in loss of insurance or other like benefits, the rights to which existed prior to January 1, 1938.

Now, that would cover the situation and cover every case that has been talked about here and would not destroy the entire provisions of this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think that is better than what we have. At the same time, I think we ought to be pretty careful to see that these folks that want to mix up with these Communist groups, get out.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, would the words "public employees" carry out the idea that the gentleman has in mind?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I had reference solely to Federal employees.

Mr. GARY. Since this other question has arisen, if we make it "public employees" which would cover both Federal, State, and local employees, would not that take care of the situation and remove the objection which the committee has?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That would be agreeable to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on

this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Wisconsin, I am very much concerned about the language employed to meet the objectives in mind. If the officers of the union to which the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] belongs refused to sign the affidavit, and he was an employee of any agency of the Government, under this provision, unless he resigned from the union or joined some other union the officials of whom sign, he would lose his job. The same applies to any other employee.

The gentleman from Oklahoma made a powerful argument that under this provision, a Federal employee is found guilty and sentenced because of the action or nonaction of some other person. I remember an old saying that is pretty well embedded in Anglo-Saxon law, that it is far better that 99 guilty persons escape than that one innocent person suffer. That is one of the foundations of Anglo-Saxon law and our way of life. That is a way of describing the fundamentals in which we believe.

This provision is very far reaching, and it disturbs me very, very much. It seems to me that including the words "public employees" after the word "union" would enable the conferees to give it further consideration and it would confer on them broad jurisdiction when the matter goes to conference.

Further, if the gentleman from Wisconsin and the majority of the subcommittee had in mind a particular union to which Federal employees belonged, why could they not have written into the bill language relating to a member of the union who is a Federal employee, but who became a member of a union subsequent to becoming a Federal employee. Certainly, if a man is a member of a union for 25, 20, 15, or 10 years and then becomes an employee of the Federal Government, and desires to continue in the union, no matter what his reason is, sick benefits, or death benefits, or because of his love of and pride in his union, we should not by our action disturb him when he has not done anything himself.

To me, this is deep. I have fought communism. I am the author of the only real legislation aimed at communism, passed by Congress in years, the Foreign Agent Propaganda Act, the McCormack Act. My committee recommended making it a crime for any person knowingly or willfully to advocate the overthrow of the Government by force and violence. It took me 3 years to get that legislation through, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] ably helped me. My committee also recommended giving the Army and the Navy the power to control subversive activities in camp or aboard ship, a power that was sadly lacking before the special committee of which I was chairman years ago made our recommendations.

I have my opinion about this, but I do not want my constitutional rights invaded. I have to protect the other fellow's constitutional rights to protect my own. In this case, in order to get at a particular group we might jeopardize the rights that individuals possess under the Constitution, which we should do everything we can to preserve and protect. That is what concerns me. I hope the gentleman from Wisconsin will put in this provision the words "public employees." That phrase is broader than "Government employees." When the committee goes to conference, the members will then have something to work on, and it will remove from our minds the great doubt which so many of us honestly entertain. If this provision of the bill is passed the way it is at present, many Members, even while voting to retain it, will feel seriously disturbed that such a provision should pass the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, there are certain propositions that have been overlooked here in the debate on this amendment. The first is that the constitutionality of the provision requiring officers of unions to sign the so-called non-Communist affidavits has not been settled. That provision is now before the courts of the land. It is being tested there. Its constitutionality is being challenged on the basis of its violation of the first amendment. What if we adopt the language in this bill then the Supreme Court rules that that provision of the Taft-Hartley Act is unconstitutional? Where would this Congress be? That is one proposition.

The second constitutional proposition is that I do not see how you are going to escape the decision in United States against Lovett. I read from it during the general debate. Some of you were not here at that time, and I want to reemphasize what this decision stated. It said, discussing one case particularly, the Cummings case, involving also the taking of an oath:

> The oath required an applicant to affirm that he had never given aid or comfort to persons engaged in hostility to the United States and had never been a member of, or connected with, any order, society, or organization, inimical to the Government of the United States.

That was thrown out as unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States. In referring to that decision, and a similar decision in another case, here is what the Supreme Court of the United States said in the Lovett-Dodd-Watson case. It said:

> They stand for the proposition that legislative acts, no matter what their form, that apply either to named individuals—

As in the Lovett-Dodd-Watson case—and now get this—

> or to easily ascertainable members of a group in such a way as to inflict punishment on them without a judicial trial are bills of attainder prohibited by the Constitution. Adherence to this principle requires invalidation of section 304.

That was the section we passed here in 1943, and the Court further says:

> We, too, adhere to it.

Now to go one step further. I direct my remarks to the people who voted against the Taft-Hartley law. Labor leaders are challenging the non-Communist oath proposition on a strictly labor basis. John L. Lewis has not signed. Philip Murray has not signed, and many other prominent leaders of the labor movement who are by no stretch of the imagination members of the Communist Party have refused to sign that affidavit for very valid prolabor reasons. They believe it their duty to refuse to sign those affidavits. They consider that section in the Taft-Hartley Act repugnant to the Bill of Rights and strictly antilabor in character. I agree with their contention. For this added reason I support the amendment.

I now include herein a brief prepared by the United Public Workers, CIO:

UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF PROPOSED RIDER WITHHOLDING SALARIES FROM FEDERAL EMPLOYEES WHO ARE MEMBERS OF CERTAIN UNIONS

I

Preliminary statement

There has been proposed to the House Appropriations Committee that a rider be attached to various appropriation measures withholding salary payments to all employees who are members of a labor organization the officers of which have failed to submit to the affidavit filing requirements of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The Appropriations Committee is being asked to initiate a drastic program in connection with the rights of Federal personnel without holding hearings, without airing the program in full, and without giving those affected by the proposed rider an adequate opportunity to present their viewpoint. Such a procedure is inherent in the practice of legislating through appropriations riders. The proposed rider, however, is more objectionable than any which has ever been submitted to the Appropriations Committee. There has never been a rider proposed for adoption by the Appropriations Committee, and, indeed, there has never been any legislative proposal so fundamentally in conflict with our constitutional guarantees and so totally subversive of the American way of life.

Nature and Scope of the Proposed Rider

The proposed rider is unconstitutional on its face. Here are a few of the injuries which the rider imposes upon Federal employees:

1. It destroys the constitutional right of freedom of association for the great mass of innocent hard-working Federal employees. It cuts off from the Federal pay roll, and, in effect, brands as disloyal, employees not on the basis of any disloyal act but solely because of membership in a labor organization.

2. It denies to Federal employees even a pretense of a hearing. The drastic stigma of disloyalty is to be attached to our Federal personnel without any hearing whatsoever. In thus denying a hearing, the proposed rider violates the constitutional guarantees of due process of law.

3. The proposed rider by forcing the Federal employee to choose between his job and his union destroys his free right to join a union, a right guaranteed by the Lloyd-La Follette Act, as well as his right to freedom of thought, a right guaranteed by the Constitution.

4. The proposed rider is not only unconstitutional but drastically amends or repeals

(a) the Lloyd-La Follette Act; (b) the Taft-Hartley Act.

II

1. The proposed rider destroys the constitutional right of freedom of association for the great mass of innocent, hard-working Federal employees.

If there is one principle which is fundamental to our democratic society it is that guilt is personal and may not be imputed because of an individual's membership in a particular group. This is especially true where, as here, the group involved is a labor organization, the formation of which is protected by the constitutional guaranty of freedom of association.

In cutting off from the pay roll individuals on the basis of membership in a labor organization the rider is in direct conflict with the Constitution as construed both by the Supreme Court and the Attorney General.

2. The proposed rider denies to Federal employees even a pretense of a hearing.

It should be borne in mind that the Federal employees who are adversely affected by the proposed rider are not even guaranteed a semblance of a hearing.

The President's loyalty order has been widely criticized because it denies a full hearing to Government employees charged with disloyalty. It has been pointed out that the lack of opportunity afforded by that order for full cross-examination and an opportunity to confront the accuser denies to the accused employee adequate procedural protection.

Under the proposed rider there are no safeguards whatsoever. An individual is afforded no hearing at all in order to give him an opportunity to defend his loyalty. His membership in a labor organization becomes the basis of a conclusive presumption that he is disloyal. There can be no question that such a denial of procedural protection to an employee violates the fundamental safeguards of our Constitution. The fact that the individual's loyalty is involved makes imperative his fully procedural protection. There can be no question that the result of the rider will be, in effect, to deny employment in the Federal Government because of alleged doubts as to an individual's loyalty. The consequences of the rider will be to deny an individual employment in his chosen vocation and to cast doubts upon his loyalty to his country. This is a penalty of a criminal character (see *U. S.* v. *Lovett* (323 U. S. 303)), and to deny an individual a hearing in the face of such serious consequences is to make a mockery of our Constitution.

Finally, it should be borne in mind that among the guaranties of the Lloyd-La Follette Act of August 24, 1912 (5 U. S. C. 652, 37 Stat. 555) is the requirement that every employee receives a written statement of the grounds of his dismissal and be afforded an opportunity to reply. The purpose of this statute was to prevent precisely what this proposed rider would do, namely, deny employees the right of freedom of expression, and to prevent arbitrary dismissals.

3. The proposed rider by forcing the Federal employee to choose between his job and his union destroys the free right of the Federal employee to join a union—a right guaranteed by the Lloyd-La Follette Act—as well as his right to freedom of thought—a right guaranteed by the Constitution.

The Lloyd-La Follette Act guarantees to Federal employees the right to join an employees' organization or union for the purpose of seeking betterment of conditions of employment and to petition Congress for the redress of grievances.

This statute was designed to lift from Federal employees the so-called gag rules which prescribed dismissal as a penalty for union activity and which converted Federal employees into second-class citizens. This act, which may be termed the "magna carta" of the Federal employee, made it clear that Federal employees were to be placed on the same footing with all other American citizens (48 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 5080), and to express the view of Congress that an American citizen when he enters the civil service should not by that act lose his right as an American citizen (48 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 5207).

This rider completely eliminates all of the protections of the Lloyd-La Follette Act. The right of a Federal employee to join a union is now to depend upon a strict form of political censorship under which a union is condemned by congressional fiat. Moreover, by imposing a political test upon Federal unions Congress has interfered with the rights of Federal employees to freedom of political expression in a manner which is plainly inconsistent with the Constitution. It is now well-established that Congress is subject to the limitations of the Constitution in dealing with Federal employees and that the American constitutional system as well as the requirements of the Lloyd-La Follette Act prevent treating Federal employees as second-class citizens. In addition, our entire civil-service system and years of bitter experience in evolving intelligent personnel practices have taught us that the most serious danger to the morale and effectiveness of the Federal establishment is arbitrary dismissal. This rider would elevate the arbitrary dismissal to a new standard of respectability and overnight destroy the protections of Federal employees so vital to an effective civil service.

4. The proposed rider is not only unconstitutional but drastically amends or repeals (a) the Lloyd-La Follette Act and (b) the Taft-Hartley Act.

The proposed rider makes a shambles of the Lloyd-La Follette Act with its protection of Federal employees' self-organization, of the right to a hearing as a protection against arbitrary dismissals and of the right to freedom of political expression.

In addition, the rider enlarges the scope of the Taft-Hartley Act. Under that act, labor organizations may not enjoy the benefits of Federal administrative machinery when their officers fail to submit to the filing requirements contained in the act.

These filing requirements are now under constitutional attack on the ground that they interfere with freedom of thought and freedom of assembly. A case involving this attack is now pending before the Supreme Court.

This proposed rider greatly enlarges the filing requirements so as to deny an individual employment because an officer of a labor organization which he belongs to has failed to comply with such requirements. This proposed rider can only be characterized as a "ripper" bill which is designed to force thousands of employees to abandon a union which they have freely chosen upon threat of economic sanctions.

If there is one principle which is established in our constitutional system, it is that congressional conceptions of trade-union or political orthodoxy may not be forced upon American citizens.

As the Supreme Court has ruled in *Board of Education* v. *Barnette* (319 U. S. 624):

"If there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation, it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, this shows the difficulty that is encountered whenever an honest effort is made to deal with this problem. The argument is bitter, emotional, sometimes picayunish. We sometimes, too, forget the objective that we have in mind, and that is to remove from the control of labor organizations in the country those who are dedicated to the cause of communism. That is what this amendment proposes to do. Where did the opposition to this spearhead from? It spearheaded originally from that very union—Abraham Flaxner's and Eleanor Nelson's union. They are a constituent part of the CIO. So they enlist the sympathy of the parent organization and then the barrage of telegrams starts. It may be that you can conceive, as I said before, of some situation that might arise where an injustice might be done. But it is mighty strange to me that the president or any other officer of any great union would say to the members of his union, "I refuse to sign this non-Communist affidavit, and as a result you lose your job." That just is not going to be the case, and no Government worker is going to lose his job who ought not to lose his job—I can tell you that because there are plenty of organizations of workers that are officered by people who are Americans and all any person has to do—all any person has to do who belongs to Flaxner's organization is to resign and get out of that union and join one of the other unions that is officered by Americans. That is what we hope to accomplish.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 28, noes 108.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, after examining H. R. 6355, which proposes to transfer the United States Employment Service from the United States Department of Labor to the Federal Security Agency, to cut its funds and to cut other FSA funds by from 20 percent to 30 percent on top of 40 percent cuts made last year, I have a feeling that the controlling majority in this House is writing legislative policy with an egg beater—not just one egg beater, but several egg beaters—and that the cakes that are going to come out of the oven for the American people will not be appetizing, edible, or digestible.

Too many cooks are using too many egg beaters to write contradictory policy, and this House, driven like a 20-mule team with blinders, is pulling the contradictory policies through to enactment and delivery to the American people.

I have confidence that the American people will quickly find out what has been done to their welfare and security in action such as we are about to take today with respect to H. R. 6355. When they do, I believe that such actions will be repudiated and reversed.

Mr. Chairman, I sat for days in the hearings conducted by the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on Reorganization Plan No. 1. Nothing human was alien to that hearing. We considered not only the

proposed transfer of the Bureau of Employment Security to the Department of Labor and its coordination with the United States Employment Service, but the details of the GSI strike and even the possibility of a 5-day week on dairy farms.

Over and over again we heard the arguments that there should be no reorganization until the sage of Palo Alto, Mr. Herbert Hoover, and his Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, had labored and brought forth, sometime next January 1949, a report and recommendations. Those who were opposed to Reorganization Plan No. 1, which would have put these two interrelated services together in the Department of Labor where they belong, clung for dear life to Mr. Hoover and his commission as an excuse for doing nothing.

This excuse became the theme song of the majority in its report to the House. The House adopted it.

Until noon Tuesday, April 27, when the Appropriations Committee threw it in the ash can, the stand-still agreement until the Hoover report was made had been the official majority policy.

Now we have a new policy, in direct conflict with the old policy. The gentleman from Wisconsin is writing this week's policy, superseding the previous policy, promulgated by the gentleman from Michigan.

I await with interest the formulation and unveiling of next week's policy. If the members of the majority do not run out of egg beaters, we may have a choice collection, including that fearful and wonderful reversal of the old "balance the budget and retire the national debt" policy that was imposed on the country when the recent tax cut was adopted in a fit of election-year jitters.

Mr. Chairman, in essence, this is simply another attack upon the United States Department of Labor and indirectly upon the welfare of the wage earners of this Nation. Labor knows what is happening, labor knew last year when the Labor Department budget was cut 40 percent. Labor knew last February and March, when we turned down the President's sensible Reorganization Plan No. 1. Labor recognizes this maneuver for what it is—class legislation against the wage earners at the same time that the Congress is appropriating substantial funds for adequate services to farmers and businessmen, provided those services are located in agencies other than the Department of Labor.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 17, line 5, after the word "organization", insert "of public employees."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I shall not consume the 5 minutes because I have already explained the purport of this amendment.

I think this amendment will in some degree help to avoid the injustices that have been suggested by the gentleman from Rhode Island, and the purpose of this amendment is so to arrange the situation that an organization of Federal employees who belong to a union whose officers refuse to sign this affidavit of non-communism will either have to give up their Government job or divorce themselves from that union. That seems to be a pretty fair proposition from our standpoint. They can stay in the union if they want to but if they do they give up their Government job; or they can keep their Government job and divorce themselves from the union whose officers refuse to say that they do not belong to the Communist Party.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. In just a minute.

I have been studying the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Wisconsin, the distinguished chairman of the committee, and I am afraid that under that amendment which states that a person who has financial benefits coming from a union may still remain in the Government notwithstanding the fact that his officers refuse to sign the anti-Communist affidavit. It seems to me that the worst Communist in the country, if he had a card and had certain benefits coming to him could remain under that amendment a Federal employee; and that is not what you want and not what I want.

I do not say that this amendment is going to accomplish wholly the purpose and I am offering it in the hopes that it will be adopted and then the gentleman from Wisconsin, with whose purposes I am in full accord, can work something out in conference.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Is it not a fact that under the gentleman's amendment the employees of the Government Printing Office who are members of the ITU, whose officers have not signed the affidavit, that those employees of the Government Printing Office would be compelled either to leave the job or disassociate themselves from their union?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is just exactly what I mean. I am here to defend the honest, straightforward, good American citizens who are in Government jobs; but I warn them to stop affiliating and associating with these Communists. I am saying to give them their option. If they want to associate with Communists, if they want to belong to an organization whose officers refuse to say that they will support the Constitution and laws of this country, then let them do so but get them out of the Government service. If they want to stay in the Government service let them get away from such a union.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I am glad the gentleman sees fit to bring his amendment out into the public. The gentleman used the phrase "public employees." I believe the gentleman, unintentionally, of course, adds to confusion by his amendment. What is the meaning of the gentleman's phrase "public employees"? The gentleman brings his amendment here out into the public. The word "public" is rather indefinite, broad, and confusing. The bill as it is written is clear.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Is the gentleman asking me a question?

Mr. CHURCH. I am both asking the gentleman a question and trying to tell him, briefly, that I am afraid that his amendment confuses the situation. I do not believe the phrase, "public employees," is very clear.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Maybe the situation is confused, maybe the gentleman from Illinois is confused. I cannot judge which one is confused; perhaps we are all a little confused about this. I confess that I am not satisfied that my amendment is going to cure the situation but I think it will help, and I am sure that the gentleman from Wisconsin, if this amendment is adopted, will try in conference to work out language that will protect the Government and at the same time protect honest employees.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the 5 minutes allotted to me but I wish to call the attention of the membership to this situation. I think the distinguished gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman who is now addressing you and the members of the Committee, have in mind the attainment of a single objective. The thing that has always brought about these things was the activities of certain individuals. Everyone here knows this fellow Flaxner and Nelson have communistic records a mile long and they are being supported in the carrying on of their communistic activities by the clique that is paid from the Government pay roll. We appropriate money for them.

But they go farther than that. They organize these GSI employees. I think there are perhaps two or three thousand of them. Now, those GSI employees, the workers in these cafeterias around town, are not Government employees, they are not public employees. Out over the country Flaxner has sucked into his union county employees, State employees, municipal employees, and a lot of employees that do not fall into any such category.

Mr. Chairman, if this is limited as suggested by the gentleman from Virginia in its application to membership in unions of public employees, you will immediately jump right square into the question: Is Flaxner's union a union of Government employees or not? Certainly the best you could say for it is that he has only a partial number of public employees. Only a small number of the employees of these unions fall in such a category.

I wish what the Congress would do is limit the language as the committee has written it in this bill after very long and serious consideration. Let us work this situation out in conference with the Senate when the bill goes to conference. I have already indicated on the floor of the House in response to questioning of the gentleman from Massachusetts and others that as chairman of this committee, and I know I bespeak the interest

and will of the subcommittee, I will see to it that in conference when we get to it every one of these situations will be taken into consideration and if we have failed to canvass all of them heretofore they will be canvassed, because we do not want to hurt a person who is in the position of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] or the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], or any other person who is a good American, yet through force of circumstances is a Government employee and is desirous of keeping his membership in a union, the officers of which have not seen fit to sign the non-Communist affidavit under the Taft-Hartley law.

I would prefer to have this language worked out in conference with the Senate rather than to take a chance on the haphazard inclusion of language here which, if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia were adopted, would completely nullify the objective we have in mind, which is to get at Flaxner and his crowd.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee has said that our committee gave this long and serious consideration. The first I ever heard of it was when we had finished marking up the bill. I had never heard of it before. It has never been discussed except on that day. It was not discussed in the committee hearings that I attended. I do not blame him for getting a bit confused, but it is his own fault.

Here we have another example of the Appropriations Committee attempting to legislate, the same as we had in the forepart of the bill in combining the USES and turning it into the Federal Security Administration. In this instance we have another attempt by the Committee on Appropriations to take over the work of a proper legislative committee of this House. It is no wonder things are confused when you legislate in that way.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Virginia) there were—ayes 21, noes 91.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 2, line 8, strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,161,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, this is the part of the bill that has to do with the dental health program that we are initiating this year. I think it is of such importance and of such benefit to the youth of this country that we should do everything we possibly can to see to it that the various organizations of parent-teachers throughout the country, and every other group affiliated with and working for the children of the country, should be given an opportunity of knowing just what this program is and to take the best advantage of it.

The inclusion of this $161,000 is for publicity that the budget asked for, something which I think is needed, and it is not asking too much of this Congress for such a worth-while program.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say this, that the language that the gentleman from Rhode Island has offered proposes to add about $161,000 to the dental health program. It was not a budgeted item. It came up in an informal budget submitted by the Public Health Service at the request of the committee after the regular budget item was submitted.

I have already discussed this in general debate. The committee felt that we had treated this subject very, very fairly. If I had my own personal way I perhaps would have given more money than was given. The committee, however, in its judgment, worked out what the officers of the National Dental Association have declared to be a fine program. The very program that we worked out with 50 mobile units going throughout this country to set up this program in the States is the greatest publicity that could possibly be given to this program.

I ask that the amendment be voted down.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I took no time in general debate on this measure. At this point I should like to speak for a few minutes on this bill. I am heartily in favor of the pending amendment which is designed to accelerate the dental-health program among the youth of our country. After all, the amount of money requested is very small indeed, yet it should contribute tremendously to the health of the youth of the country and good health is one of our greatest national asssets. This program is approved by the American Dental Association.

I think the subcommittee is due much credit for the exhaustive hearings which were conducted on the subject of mental health. Mental illness is costing this Nation hundreds of millions of dollars per year. Unfortunately however, the committee after conducting exhaustive hearings, reduced by $500,000 funds requested for research and training in the field of mental illness. In my opinion this was short-sighted economy and I wish to express my disapproval of the action taken. The Nation is suffering greatly from its lack of information and research in the field of mental illness.

I must say that I am in hearty accord with the provision of the bill which seeks to outlaw communism. I also favor the provision of the bill which places the United States Employment Service in the Federal Security Agency.

I think some very worth-while economies have been achieved and I favor them.

Mr. Chairman, I should hate to see the social-security program crippled. The Bureau of Old Age and Survivors Insurance is rapidly growing by reason of the large coverage among our citizens in all the States. I think the committee made a mistake in reducing funds which are necessary for the proper administration of the social-security program.

Reverting again to the pending amendment for the dental-health program, I wish to emphasize the importance of the program and urge passage of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendment thereto do now close.

Mr. FOGARTY. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto do now close.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will not press the motion, because if he does, I shall be compelled to make the point of order that a quorum is not present. I think some of the Members are entitled to a few minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman threaten to make the point of order that a quorum is not present?

Mr. SABATH. I said I would be obliged to if the gentleman insisted on his motion.

Mr. KEEFE. We have a quorum here.

Mr. SABATH. No; I do not think we have 100 Members here.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman want to talk on the bill?

Mr. SABATH. No.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman know of anybody else who does?

Mr. SABATH. There are two gentlemen who have amendments and they should not be foreclosed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point or order that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-two Members are present, a quorum.

Does the gentleman from Wisconsin desire to move now to close debate?

Mr. KEEFE. I withdraw that motion, Mr. Chairman, and ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I have four amendments on the desk. They all pertain to the office of the Social Security Administrator. The amendments are all in single sums, but I ask unanimous consent that they may all be read, and I shall speak in general terms on them.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. FOGARTY:

On page 12, line 15, strike out "$166,000" and insert "$216,836."

On page 12, line 15, strike out "$166,000" and insert "$246,000."

On page 12, line 15, strike out "$166,000" and insert "$182,445."

On page 12, line 15, strike out "$166,000" and insert "$295,830."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, all of the amendments that have just been read pertain to cuts that have been made in the Office of the Social Security Administrator. I think everyone in this country today wants a good social-security program. Both parties are committed to it. It should be a nonpartisan effort by Congress to make sure that this program is made stronger rather than weaker, as this committee is doing in taking away necessary personnel the Social Security Administrator has at the present time. I think almost all of us agree that we want to extend social security into other fields. We all realize that the unions and industry now are entering into agreements on pensions and social-welfare funds throughout the country.

In all of these programs I have attempted to increase the appropriation for the Office of the Administrator. The Office of the Administrator asked for $3,131,000. They transferred out of his office $2,352,000, and left him the whole sum of $221,000 to run one of the biggest business corporations in the world with not enough personnel to take care of it. The personnel and business manager part of it has been cut in half. The Coordinating and Procedures Division, one of the most essential divisions of the social-security program, has been completely eliminated by this committee. The Training Division, the smallest division in the Social Security Administration which only has an appropriation of $16,400 and employing about four men to take care of an agency which employs 12,000 people, is being wiped out in its entirety.

The Publications and Review Division and Information Service were practically eliminated. Almost all of the service divisions in the social-security program have been eliminated. Whom does that affect and how does it affect them? I know that many Members of Congress get requests from women whose husbands have died who do not know what this set-up is all about. Sometimes they have to wait 2, 3, or 4 years before they start collecting the benefits for which their husbands have paid. Because of the elimination of services of this kind, we are denying persons benefits and service which we all say we want to guarantee to the people who are covered by the social-security program at the present time. The Bureau of Research and Statistics has been cut almost 60 percent. That is one of the most vital divisions in the entire social security set-up. I know the argument made by the majority of the committee was, "Why, this has been established for a long time. Why do we need any research facilities at all now?" Almost every Member of Congress goes to an office like this several times a year for information and statistics of the Social Security Administration. We are not giving them enough help to answer the inquiries they get from Congress in the next year in the administration of the social-security program as it has been reported by this committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, all that I can say in answer to the argument by the gentleman from Rhode Island is that it is unfortunate that he does not understand the situation. The Social Security Administration, of which Mr. Altmeyer is the head, administers the old-age and survivors' insurance program. We are giving them more money than they had last year to administer that great program which is a great part of the social-security set-up. I explained in my statement this morning what we had done. It comes with poor grace, it seems to me, to now argue in the face of a lack of information as to what the situation is in reality, that we are stripping the Social Security Administration of its ability to even answer a letter from a Member of Congress. The old-age and survivor's insurance program is not going to be touched at all. We have done away with a lot of surplus big money deadwood that is down there in the Social Security Administration that is carrying on a job that you do not want carried on. You may rest assured when you examine the break-down on page 23 of the report and the explanation that goes with it, that we have not acted blindly but we have acted in the public interest.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The amendments were rejected.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman from Rhode Island offered four amendments to be considered en bloc, as I understood. Therefore, as I understand it, the vote just taken applies to the rejection of all four amendments. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. The Committee has just voted on all four amendments.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOLIFIELD: On page 8, line 10, after the word "act" strike out the period and insert ": and the sum of $10,000 is hereby appropriated to be made available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the procurement and upkeep of barn pigeons to be domiciled in such quarters as may be vacated by agencies herein transferred from the Department of Labor, the Secretary of Agriculture to be responsible for disposing of marketable pigeons in such manner as will not interfere with free enterprise operating in the normal channels of trade."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment that it is not germane and not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California desire to be heard?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GRAHAM). The Chair rules that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill and therefore not germane. The Chair sustains the point of order.

ANOTHER REPUBLICAN ATTACK ON SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, this bill is not merely an appropriation measure. It is really another in the series of Republican attempts in the Eightieth Congress to hamstring social security—the most far-reaching social legislation ever enacted in the history of this country. Regardless of the protestations to the contrary, the Republican record against social security is altogether too clear. As the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] recently pointed out on the floor of the House, the entire Republican membership of the Committee on Ways and Means in 1935, when this legislation was enacted by a Democratic Congress, filed a minority report protesting that the old-age and survivors' insurance titles of the act were unconstitutional and expressing doubt whether the unemployment-insurance provisions would result in a general national benefit at that time. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], the present chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, filed supplemental views in which he contended that the social-security taxes would increase unemployment and retard recovery, and, Mr. Speaker, believe it or not, but the gentleman from Minnesota would have vested the program for economic security in the Veterans' Administration instead of establishing the Social Security Board.

Mr. Chairman, slowly the Republican opposition to social security declined to the point that in 1944 the party was pledged to extension of old-age and unemployment insurance to all employees not now covered. Yet, what is the record of the Republican Eightieth Congress? First, to take away the coverage of news vendors. Second, the House has voted to remove from social-security protection some three-quarters of a million workers and their families engaged in industrial home work and outside selling activities. Third, legislation to repeal sickness and maternity benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act is now pending on the House Calendar.

Of equal or greater significance is the action of the Appropriations Committee regarding the office of Commissioner for Social Security and the Bureau of Employment Security. The Bureau of Research and Statistics is at one and the same time the brain, the heart, and the nerve center of the social-security program. This office conducts the basic studies necessary to analyze the existing coverage of social security and the deficiencies or mistakes that may become apparent at operating levels. It supplies the committees of Congress with information upon which to legislate and to appraise the need for expansion of social-security coverage. To reduce this research staff from 50 to 20 employees can be justified only upon the assumption that a Republican Congress either is not going to enact any progressive social-security legislation or that they want to legislate in an uninformed vacuum.

I understand that the Division of Research and Statistics has been quite active in providing information to employers and unions on health and welfare funds. A reduction in appropriations from $229,000 to $100,000 will impair this service at a time when in the Detroit area this subject is one of the very live labor management issues. One unnecessary

strike over an employees' health and welfare fund that might have been avoided had objective actuarial information been supplied by the Division of Research and Statistics will cost many times over to the Government and to the country the amount of the saving effected by the Appropriations Committee.

The 70-percent reduction in the appropriations for Publications and Review Division and Information Service is equally unwise. Of what good is it to extract a social-security tax from employers and employees, only to have the workers and their dependents, the aged, and the orphans lose their right to benefits because they have not been informed as to the method of application for such benefits or even as to their eligibility for benefits. That would most certainly be the result if this reduction is approved.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this bill makes the very important mistake of removing from the jurisdiction of the Commissioner of Social Security the activities of the Bureau of Employment Security. Unemployment insurance is an integral part of the social-security structure. Yet, effective coordination between the unemployment-insurance activities and the old-age and survivors' insurance program will be greatly handicapped by this action. As a member of the Committee on Ways and Means I have carefully studied the objections of various State unemployment administrators to the supervision exercised by the Commissioner of Social Security, and I am frank to say that I believe the problem of unemployment is one that can be solved only at the national level and that it is imperative that we keep our entire social-security operational agencies as closely coordinated as possible. A certain amount of bureaucracy in the greatest insurance office in the world is to be expected, but we should not contribute to irresponsibility and inefficiency through bad legislation by an appropriation committee.

Mr. Chairman, I have supported the amendments to rectify the damage proposed by the bill reported by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. HALLECK having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. GRAHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6355) making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MAHON. In its present form, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman qualifies.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, do not the rules of the House provide that the person offering a notion to recommit must be unqualifiedly opposed to the bill? Do they not provide that if there is a Member who is unqualifiedly opposed the Chair must give preference to such Member as against a Member who is qualifiedly opposed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from Texas opposed to the bill?

Mr. MAHON. I am opposed to the bill in its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question properly is: Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MAHON. I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the bill H. R. 6355 be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 2, line 8, strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,100,000."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present and object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and sixty-three Members are present, not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 272, nays 35, not voting 123, as follows:

[Roll No. 53]

YEAS—272

Abernethy	Bates, Ky.	Brown, Ga.
Allen, Calif.	Bates, Mass.	Brown, Ohio
Allen, La.	Beall	Bryson
Andersen, H. Carl	Beckworth	Buck
Anderson, Calif.	Bennett, Mich.	Buffett
Andresen, August H.	Bishop	Bulwinkle
Angell	Blackney	Burke
Arends	Boggs, La.	Burleson
Arnold	Bolton	Butler
Auchincloss	Bonner	Byrnes, Wis.
Banta	Bradley	Camp
Barrett	Bramblett	Cannon
	Brehm	Case, N. J.
	Brooks	Chadwick
Chapman	Holmes	Poage
Chelf	Horan	Potter
Chiperfield	Hull	Poulson
Church	Jenison	Preston
Clark	Jensen	Priest
Clason	Johnson, Calif.	Ramey
Clevenger	Johnson, Ill.	Rankin
Coffin	Johnson, Tex.	Rayburn
Cole, Kans.	Jones, Ala.	Reed, Ill.
Cole, N. Y.	Jones, N. C.	Reed, N. Y.
Combs	Jonkman	Rees
Cooley	Judd	Reeves
Cooper	Kean	Regan
Cotton	Kearns	Rich
Cox	Keating	Richards
Cravens	Kee	Riehlman
Crawford	Keefe	Riley
Crow	Kersten, Wis.	Rogers, Fla.
Cunningham	Knutson	Rogers, Mass.
Curtis	Kunkel	Rohrbough
Davis, Ga.	Landis	Rooney
Davis, Tenn.	Lanham	Ross
Davis, Wis.	Larcade	Russell
Dawson, Utah	Latham	Sadlak
Deane	Lea	St. George
D'Ewart	LeCompte	Sanborn
Dolliver	LeFevre	Sarbacher
Domengeaux	Lewis	Sasscer
Dondero	Lodge	Schwabe, Okla.
Doughton	Love	Scott, Hardie
Elliott	Lucas	Scrivner
Ellis	Lusk	Seely-Brown
Ellsworth	Lyle	Shafer
Elsaesser	McConnell	Short
Elston	McCulloch	Simpson, Ill.
Engel, Mich.	McDonough	Smathers
Evins	McDowell	Smith, Kans.
Fellows	McGarvey	Smith, Va
Fenton	McGregor	Smith, Wis.
Fernandez	McMahon	Snyder
Fisher	McMillan, S. C.	Spence
Flannagan	McMillen, Ill.	Stanley
Fletcher	Mack	Stefan
Folger	MacKinnon	Stevenson
Foote	Macy	Stigler
Fuller	Maloney	Stockman
Fulton	Martin, Iowa	Sundstrom
Gamble	Mathews	Taber
Gary	Merrow	Talle
Gathings	Meyer	Teague
Gavin	Michener	Thomas, Tex.
Gearhart	Miller, Conn.	Thompson
Gillie	Miller, Md.	Tibbott
Goff	Miller, Nebr.	Tollefson
Goodwin	Mills	Towe
Gore	Morrison	Trimble
Gossett	Morton	Twyman
Graham	Muhlenberg	Vail
Granger	Mundt	Vorys
Gregory	Murdock	Vursell
Gwynne, Iowa	Murray, Tenn.	Wadsworth
Hagen	Murray, Wis.	Walter
Hale	Nicholson	Weichel
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Nixon	Welch
Hall, Leonard W.	Nodar	Wheeler
Halleck	Norblad	Whitaker
Hand	O'Hara	Whitten
Hardy	O'Konski	Whittington
Harness, Ind.	Owens	Wigglesworth
Harris	Pace	Williams
Harvey	Passman	Wilson, Tex.
Hays	Patterson	Winstead
Hébert	Peden	Wolcott
Heselton	Peterson	Wolverton
Hinshaw	Philbin	Wood
Hoeven	Phillips, Calif.	Woodruff
	Pickett	Worley
	Plumley	Youngblood

NAYS—35

Blatnik	Holifield	McCormack
Buchanan	Huber	Madden
Carroll	Isacson	Mahon
Dawson, Ill.	Jackson, Wash.	Marcantonio
Delaney	Karsten, Mo.	Morris
Dingell	Kelley	O'Brien
Donohue	Kennedy	O'Toole
Feighan	King	Powell
Fogarty	Kirwan	Price, Ill.
Gordon	Klein	Sabath
Hart	Lane	Sadowski
Havenner	Ludlow	

NOT VOTING—123

Abbitt	Boykin	Coudert
Albert	Brophy	Courtney
Allen, Ill.	Buckley	Crosser
Andrews, Ala.	Busbey	Dague
Andrews, N. Y.	Byrne, N. Y.	Devitt
Bakewell	Canfield	Dirksen
Barden	Carson	Dorn
Battle	Case, S. Dak.	Douglas
Bell	Celler	Durham
Bender	Chenoweth	Eaton
Bennett, Mo.	Clippinger	Eberharter
Bland	Cole, Mo.	Engle, Calif.
Bloom	Colmer	Fallon
Boggs, Del.	Corbett	Forand

Gallagher	Johnson, Okla.	Ploeser
Garmatz	Jones, Wash.	Potts
Gillette	Kearney	Price, Fla.
Gorski	Kefauver	Rains
Grant, Ala.	Keogh	Redden
Grant, Ind.	Kerr	Rivers
Griffiths	Kilburn	Rizley
Gross	Kilday	Robertson
Gwinn, N. Y.	Lemke	Rockwell
Harless, Ariz.	Lesinski	Schwabe, Mo.
Harrison	Lichtenwalter	Scoblick
Hartley	Lynch	Scott,
Hedrick	McCowen	Hugh D., Jr.
Heffernan	Manasco	Sheppard
Hendricks	Mansfield	Sikes
Herter	Mason	Simpson, Pa.
Hess	Meade, Ky.	Smith, Maine
Hill	Meade, Md.	Smith, Ohio
Hobbs	Miller, Calif.	Somers
Hoffman	Mitchell	Stratton
Hope	Monroney	Taylor
Jackson, Calif.	Morgan	Thomas, N. J.
Jarman	Multer	Van Zandt
Javits	Norrell	Vinson
Jenkins, Ohio	Norton	West
Jenkins, Pa.	Patman	Wilson, Ind.
Jennings	Pfeifer	
Johnson, Ind.	Phillips, Tenn.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Van Zandt with Mr. Eberharter.
Mr. Allen of Illinois with Mr. Garmatz.
Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Fallon.
Mr. Bakewell with Mr. Meade of Maryland.
Mr. Canfield with Mr. Keogh.
Mr. Cole of Missouri with Mr. Multer.
Mrs. Smith of Maine with Mrs. Douglas.
Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Kefauver.
Mr. Schwabe of Missouri with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Rockwell with Mr. Pfeifer.
Mr. Jackson of California with Mr. Lesinski.
Mr. Andrews of New York with Mr. Kilday.
Mr. Eaton with Mr. Lynch.
Mr. Griffiths with Mrs. Norton.
Mr. Gwinn of New York with Mr. Morgan.
Mr. McCowen with Mr. Price of Florida.
Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Redden.
Mr. Bender with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. Brophy with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.
Mr. Dague with Mr. Battle.
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Albert.
Mr. Kilburn with Mr. Engle of California.
Mr. Lichtenwalter with Mr. Dorn.
Mr. Hess with Mr. Colmer.
Mr. Carson with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Dirksen with Mr. Miller of California.
Mr. Bennett of Missouri with Mr. Crosser.
Mr. Busbey with Mr. Forand.
Mr. Jenkins of Ohio with Mr. Harless of Arizona.
Mr. Grant of Indiana with Mr. Jarman.
Mr. Gross with Mr. Harrison.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Abbitt.
Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Hedrick.
Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., with Mr. Rains.
Mr. Meade of Kentucky with Mr. Sikes.
Mr. Gillette with Mr. Heffernan.
Mr. Corbett with Mr. Gorski.
Mr. Chenoweth with Mr. Rivers.
Mr. Boggs of Delaware with Mr. Hobbs.
Mr. Hoffman with Mr. Patman.
Mr. Jennings with Mr. Monroney.
Mr. Ploeser with Mr. Hendricks.
Mr. Johnson of Indiana with Mr. Norrell.
Mr. Jones of Washington with Mr. Manasco.
Mr. Kearney with Mr. Somers.
Mr. Rizley with Mr. Mansfield.
Mr. Case of South Dakota with Mr. Boykin.
Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. Andrews of Alabama.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Durham.
Mr. Devitt with Mr. West.

Mr. FOGARTY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DELANEY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BUCHANAN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DONOHUE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. LUDLOW changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAHON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Ansonia Evening Sentinel.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut (at the request of Mr. SEELY-BROWN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article entitled "Sacrifices on the Altar of the Oleo Trust."

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, extending an invitation to a very fine performance on the steps of the Capitol tomorrow morning.

Mr. DEVITT (at the request of Mr. BRADLEY) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech by Senator VANDENBERG.

Mr. COX asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and to include therein a beautiful tribute to Mother.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a compilation of veterans' rights granted by laws of the State of North Carolina.

Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in order to pay tribute to the memory of the late President of the Philippine Islands, Manuel Roxas.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and insert certain quotations.

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by Archibald Alexander.

Mr. POWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. COOLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech delivered in the city of Washington last evening by the Honorable Joe L. Blythe, of North Carolina.

Mr. MCMILLAN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and in each to include an editorial.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and to include therein a brief on the constitutionality of certain language in the bill prepared for me by the United Public Workers of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN (at the request of Mr. MARCANTONIO) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

ESTABLISHMENT OF WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS IN THE REGULAR ARMY, ETC.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker pro tempore be authorized to appoint two additional conferees on the bill (S. 1641) to establish the Women's Army Corps in the Regular Army, to authorize the enlistment and appointment of women in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps and the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and, without objection, appoints the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will notify the Senate thereof.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, which was read:

APRIL 29, 1948.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, I have received 11 subpenas duces tecum, directed to me as Clerk of the House of Representatives, to appear before said court on the 3d day of May 1948 at 10 o'clock a. m., as a witness in the case of the *United States* v. *Albert Maltz* (No. 1354–47, criminal docket), and to bring with me certain and sundry papers therein described in the files of the House of Representatives.

Your attention and that of the House is respectfully invited to a resolution of the House adopted in the Forty-sixth Congress, first session (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 680), upon the recommendation of the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

"Resolved, That no officer or employee of the House of Representatives has the right, either voluntarily or in obedience to a subpena duces tecum, to produce any document, paper, or book belonging to the files of the House before any court or officer, nor to furnish any copy of any testimony or paper filed in any investigation before the House or any

of its committees, or of any paper belonging to the files of the House, except such as may be authorized by statute to be copied, or of any paper belonging to the files of the House, before any court officer, nor to furnish any copy of any testimony given or paper filed in any investigation before the House or any of its committees, or of any paper belonging to the files of the House, except such as may be authorized by statute to be copied and such as the House itself may have made public, to be taken without the consent of the House first obtained."

And a resolution adopted by the House in the Forty-ninth Congress, first session (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1295), from which the following is quoted:

"*Resolved*, That by the privilege of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate or process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission.

"That when it appears by the order of a court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer for the promotion of justice, this House will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House."

These resolutions result from the issuance of subpena duces tecum upon the Clerk of the House to produce certain original papers in the files of the House.

Permission to remove from their place of file or from the custody of the Clerk, any papers, was denied by the House, but court afforded facilities to make certain copies of papers to be secured from the House. This seems to be the uniform procedure in the case of subpena duces tecum served upon the Clerk of the House of Representatives to produce original papers from the files of the House.

The subpenas in question are herewith attached, and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

Very respectfully yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* ALBERT MALTZ, NO. 1354–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday the 3d day of May, 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 28th day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and Charles H. Houston, attorneys for Albert Maltz.

Schedule A

1. Minutes of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, between May 26, 1938, and January 1, 1945, at which investigation of the motion picture industry was considered, referred to, acted upon, or authorized.

2. Memoranda and reports of investigators for the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, concerning the motion picture industry from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945.

3. Transcripts of any testimony taken with relation to the motion picture industry during the period from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945.

4. All the releases and statements issued by or on behalf of the House Committee on Un-American Activities whether to the press or otherwise between May 26, 1938, and January 1, 1945, which referred to or discussed the motion picture industry, and particularly regarding the alleged Communist infiltration in the motion picture industry.

5. Copies of any letters, reports, or other communications from any person or groups of persons or organizations to the House Committee on Un-American Activities from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, concerning the motion picture industry.

6. Copies of all letters, correspondence, or other communications from the House Committee on Un-American Activities to any person, groups, or individuals between May 26, 1938, and January 1, 1945, concerning the motion picture industry.

7. Copies of all reports made to the House Committee on Un-American Activities by any of its investigators and particularly its investigators, H. A. Smith and A. B. Leckie, concerning the interviews had by the said investigators with the motion-picture producers in Hollywood, Calif., during the period May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945.

8. Transcripts of committee meetings in executive session held from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, at which the committee considered, and/or acted upon matters relating to the motion-picture industry.

9. All correspondence and communications between representatives of the motion-picture industry and the House Committee on Un-American Activities from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945.

10. All correspondence and communications between the Motion Picture Alliance and/or any of its representatives and the House Committee on Un-American Activities from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* ALBERT MALTZ, NO. 1354–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday the 3d day of May 1948, at 10 a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness the honorable chief justice of said court, the 28th day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and Charles H. Houston, attorneys for Albert Maltz.

Schedule A

1. Stenographic transcript of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee of the same since October 20, 1947, at which the definition or content of phrases, or any portion of the phrases, "un-American propaganda activities," and/or "subversive and un-American propaganda * * * (which) attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution," were considered or acted upon, or on which any action was taken by the committee in connection with the scope of its authority and powers, or in connection with any constitutional limitations thereon.

2. All press releases issued by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or its chairman or its members since October 20, 1947, dealing with the definition or content of phrases, or any portion of the phrases, "un-American propaganda activities," and/or "subversive and un-American propaganda * * * (which) attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution."

3. All reports of the House Committee on Un-American Activities since October 20, 1947.

4. Transcripts of all hearings, public and executive, held by the House Committee on Un-American Activities since October 20, 1947, including but not limited to the following volumes and subjects:

1948: September 24–26, 1947, October 20–30, 1947, Hanns Eisler, Hollywood.

5. All reports of investigators for the committee issued by the committee since October 20, 1947.

6. All releases and statements issued by, or on behalf of, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and/or stenographic transcripts of meetings of the committee since October 20, 1947, relating to or discussing the investigation of organizations, groups, or individuals which disseminate propaganda or influence or attempt to influence public opinion.

7. The records of names of all organizations and groups compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities since October 20, 1947, which are alleged "subversive" or "un-American."

8. The records of names of all individuals compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities since October 20, 1947, which are alleged "subversive" or "un-American."

9. For the period since October 20, 1947, to date, all correspondence and memoranda from and to the committee, or from and to individual members of the committee, or from and to members of the committee staff relating to findings by the committee or to material in the committee files concerning the names of organizations, groups, or individuals in the files of the committee.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* ALBERT MALTZ, NO. 1354–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday the 3d day of May 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 28th day of April A. D. 1938.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and Charles H. Houston, attorneys for Albert Maltz.

Schedule A

1. Stenographic transcript of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee of the same from January 1 to October 20, 1947, at which the definition or content of phrases, or any portion of the phrases "un-American propaganda activities," and/or "subversive and un-American propaganda * * * (which) attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution," were considered or acted upon, or on which any action was taken by the committee in connection with the scope of

its authority and powers, or in connection with any constitutional limitations thereon.

2. All press releases issued by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or its chairman or its members from January 1 to October 20, 1947, dealing with the definition or content of phrases, or any portion of the phrases, "un-American propaganda activities," and/or "subversive and un-American propaganda * * * (which) attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution."

3. All reports of the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1 to October 20, 1947, including but not limited to:

Author	Title	House Report No.	Congress	Session
Thomas	AYD	271	80th	1st.
Do	Communist Party	209	do	Do.
Do	The Communist Party of the United States as an Agent of a Foreign Power.			
Do	Southern Conference	592	80th	Do.
Do	Civil Rights Congress	1115	do	Do.

4. Transcripts of all hearings, public and executive, held by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947, including but not limited to the following volumes and subjects:

1947:

November 22, 1946 (revised 1947), Budenz.

February 6, 1947, Eisler.

Bills to outlaw CP March 24–28, 1947, April 9, 1947, Eugene Dennis.

July 7, 1947, Walter S. Steele.

February 27, July 23–25, 1947, Communism in Labor Unions.

July 22, 1947, Kravchenko.

5. All reports of investigators for the committee issued by the committee from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947.

6. All releases and statements issued by, or on behalf of, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and/or stenographic transcripts of meetings of the committee from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947, relating to or discussing the investigation of organizations, groups, or individuals which disseminate propaganda or influence or attempt to influence public opinion.

7. The records of names of all organizations and groups compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947, which are allegedly subversive or un-American.

8. The records of names of all individuals compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947, which are alleged subversive or un-American.

9. For the period from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947, all correspondence and memoranda from and to the committee, or from and to individual members of the committee, or from and to members of the committee staff relating to findings by the committee or to material in the committee files concerning the names of organizations, groups, or individuals in the files of the committee.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

THE UNITED STATES v. ALBERT MALTZ, NO. 1354–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.

You are hereby commanded to attend the said Court on Monday the 3d day of May 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 28th day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and Charles H. Houston, attorneys for Albert Maltz.

Schedule A

1. Stenographic transcript of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee of the same from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, at which the definition or content of phrases, or any portion of the phrases, "un-American propaganda activities," and/or "subversive and un-American propaganda * * * (which) attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution," were considered or acted upon, or on which any action was taken by the committee in connection with the scope of its authority and powers, or in connection with any constitutional limitations hereon.

2. All press releases issued by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or its chairman or its members from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, dealing with the definition or content of phrases, or any portion of the phrases, "un-American propaganda activities," and/or "subversive and un-American propaganda * * * (which) attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution."

3. All reports of the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, including but not limited to:

Author	Date	House Report No.	Congress	Session
Wood	Mar. 28, 1946	1829	79th	2d.
Do		1936	do	Do.
Do	May 10, 1946	1936	do	Do.
Adamson	May 29, 1946. Report to Wood. Citations by official Government agencies and private organizations regarding the character of organizations named.			
Wood		2233	do	Do.
Do	June 26, 1946. Corliss Lamont	2354	do	Do.
Do	July 31, 1946. George Marshall	2707	do	Do.
Do	July 31, 1946. Richard Morford	2708	do	Do.
Do		2742	do	Do.

4. Transcripts of all hearings, public and executive, held by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, including but not limited to the following volumes and subjects:

1945: Executive hearings that were released by the committee December 15, 1944. September 20, 1939–April 19, 1943. Volumes 1 through 7.

1946:

September 26–October 19, 1945, Communist Party.

June 20, 27, 1945, OPA.

January 30, 1945, G. L. K. Smith.

April 4, 1946, E. B. Jarg (JAFRC).

5. All reports of investigators for the committee issued by the committee from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947.

6. All releases and statements issued by, or on behalf of, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and/or stenographic transcripts of meetings of the committee from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, relating to or discussing the investigation of organizations, groups, or individuals which disseminate propaganda or influence or attempt to influence public opinion.

7. The records of names of all organizations and groups compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, which are allegedly subversive or un-American.

8. The records of names of all individuals compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, which are alleged subversive or un-American.

9. For the period from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, all correspondence and memoranda from and to the committee, or from and to individual members of the committee, or from and to members of the committee staff relating to findings by the committee or to material in the committee files concerning the names of organizations, groups, or individuals in the files of the committee.

10. Copies of letter sent by KARL E. MUNDT, member of the committee, to Gov. Thomas E. Bailey, of Mississippi, and approximately 99 others on or about January 20, 1945, relating to a suitable and working criterion to determine what does and what does not comprise un-American propaganda activity, together with the data and material mailed therewith and all replies received thereto, and all further correspondence with the same individuals in connection therewith and such additional correspondence received from other individuals and/or organizations pertaining to the establishment of the working criterion above set forth as to the definition of the terms un-American and/or subversive; all stenographic transcripts of meetings of the committee and all its members and other memoranda relating to the said letter.

11. Copies of all letters sent by or on behalf of the committee or by any members thereof to the Brookings Institution between January 3, 1945, and April 15, 1945, relating to a working criterion for determining what constitutes un-American propaganda activity, or relating to an analysis of letters received purporting to define un-American propaganda; together with all letters received from the Brookings Institution in connection therewith.

12. The report or memorandum submitted to the committee by the Brookings Institution between January 3, 1945 and April 15, 1945, relating to or entitled, "Suggested Standards for Determining Un-American Activities," and all stenographic transcripts of meetings of the committee and all its minutes and other memoranda relating to the said report or memorandum.

13. Memorandum of six paragraphs sent to the committee or to Karl E. Mundt, committee member, by the American Civil Lib-

erties Union during February 1945, relating to un-American activities, and letter accompanying same.

14. Minutes and transcripts of meetings and executive sessions, not limited to but including, committee action on or about February 21, 1945, relating to a request to the Brookings Institution to analyze the replies to Mundt's letter of January 20, 1945 concerning the working criterion of what comprises an un-American propaganda activity, and to suggest standards for determining un-American propaganda activities.

15. Copy of letter sent by the counsel for the Committee on Un-American Activities to the National Committee to Combat Anti-Semitism in which it was stated that the said National Committee to Combat Anti-Semitism "is engaged in solicitation of money for the purpose of controlling the thoughts of American citizens," and all correspondence, minutes and other records in relation thereto, said letter being referred to in CRA, March 1, 1946, at page 1120.

16. Copy of letter sent by counsel for the Committee on Un-American Activities to the Veterans Against Discrimination in which letter it was noted that the Veterans Against Discrimination had referred to democracy several times and in which it was called to the attention of the Veterans Against Discrimination that the United States is a Republic and not a Democracy, which letter was referred to in CRA (January 29, 1946, at page 740, and all, correspondence, minutes and other records in relation thereto.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* ALBERT MALTZ, NO. 1354–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday the 3d day of May 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 28th day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and Charles H. Houston, attorneys for Albert Maltz.

Schedule A

1. Stenographic transcript of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee of the same from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, at which the definition or content of phrases, or any portion of the phrases, "un-American propaganda activities," and/or "subversive and un-American propaganda * * * (which) attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution," were considered or acted upon, or on which any action was taken by the committee in connection with the scope of its authority and powers, or in connection with any constitutional limitations thereon.

2. All press releases issued by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or its chairman or its members from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, dealing with the definition or content of phrases, or any portion of the phrases, "un-American propaganda activities," and/or "subversive and un-American propaganda * * * (which) attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution."

3. All reports of the House Committee on Un-American Activities from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, including but not limited to:

Author	Date	House Report No.	Congress	Session
Dies		2	76th	1st.
Starnes	Jan. 3, 1940	1476	do	3d.
Dies	Apr. 8, 1940. Contempt, Albert Blumberg	1937	do	Do.
Do	Mar. 29, 1940. Contempt, James H. Dolsen	1900	do	Do.
Do	Apr. 8, 1940. Contempt, Philip Frankfeld	1936	do	Do.
Do	Apr. 8, 1940. Contempt, Thomas F. P. O'Dea	1938	do	Do.
Do	Apr. 2, 1940. Contempt, George Powers	1904	do	Do.
Do	Jan. 3, 1941	1	77th	1st.
Starnes (pt. I)	June 25, 1942	2277	do	2d.
Voorhis (pt. II)	July 7, 1942	2277	do	Do.
	Sept. 3, 1942. Report of FBI (H. Doc. 833)		do	Do.
Dies	Jan. 2, 1943	2748	do	Do.
Costello	Sept. 30, 1943	717	78th	1st.
Dies	Peace Now	1161	do	2d.
Do	CIO-PAC	1311	do	Do.

Report of a subcommittee of the committee to the full committee publicized on Oct. 30, 1944, relating to a re-investigation of PAC and an investigation of the National Citizens PAC.

4. Transcripts of all hearings, public and executives, held by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, including but not limited to the following volumes and subjects:

1938: August 12–23, 1938, September 15–17, volume 1.
September 28–October 6, October 11–13, volume 2.
October 17–22, October 24–November 21, volume 3.
1939: November 19–December 14, volume 4.
December 15, supplement to volume 4.
May 18–June 1, 1939, volume 5.
August 16–29, volume 6.
September 5–27, volumes 7 and 8.
1940: September 28–October 14, volume 9.
October 16–28, volume 10.
October 28–December 3, volume 11.
February 7–April 4, 1940, volume 12.
1941: April 11–May 21, volume 13.
August 29, 1940–August 11, 1941, volume 14.
1943: June 8–July 7, 1943, volume 15.
1944: November 29–December 20, volume 16.
September 27–October 5, 1944, volume 17.

5. All reports of investigators for the committee issued by the committee from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, including a report published in 1938 by investigator for the committee, Edward E. Sullivan, containing a statement, "Evidence tends to show that all phases of radical and Communist activities are rampant among the studios of Hollywood and, although well known, is a matter which movie moguls desire to keep from the public."

6. All releases and statements issued by, or on behalf of, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and/or stenographic transcripts of meetings of the committee from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, relating to or discussing the investigation of organizations, groups, or individuals which disseminate propaganda or influence or attempt to influence public opinion.

7. The records of names of all organizations and groups compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, which are allegedly "subversive" or un-American.

8. The records of names of all individuals compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, which are alleged "subversive" or un-American.

9. For the period from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, all correspondence and memoranda from and to the committee, or from and to individual members of the committee, or from and to members of the committee staff relating to findings by the committee or to material in the committee files concerning the names of organizations, groups, or individuals in the files of the committee.

10. Transcripts of all meetings held by individual committee members and specifically including transcripts of a meeting held by Congressman J. PARNELL THOMAS with officials of the State of New Jersey published by the committee in 1939 or 1940.

11. Copy of letter sent by counsel for the Committee on Un-American Activities to Drew Pearson in which letter a demand was made for an explanation of the phrase "make democracy work," which letter is referred to in C. R. A., February 11, 1946, at page 1257, and all correspondence, minutes, and other records in relation thereto.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* ALBERT MALTZ, NO. 1354–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday, the 3d day of May 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 28th day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and Charles H. Houston, attorneys for Albert Maltz.

Schedule A

1. Minutes and memoranda of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee thereof between January 1 and October 30, 1947, at which investigation of Albert Maltz was considered, referred to, or acted upon or authorized.

2. All releases and statements issued by or on behalf of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, whether to the press or otherwise, from January 1 to October 30, 1947, which referred to or discussed Albert Maltz.

3. All publications, documents, statements, or communications relating to Albert Maltz and submitted to the House Committee on Un-American Activities between January and October 30, 1947.

4. Transcripts of committee meetings or executive sessions from January 1 to October 30, 1947, at which the committee considered and/or discussed the said Albert Maltz.

5. All reports, communications, and correspondence and memoranda relating to the investigation of the said Albert Maltz by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1 to October 30, 1947.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* ALBERT MALTZ, NO. 1354–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday the 3d day of May, 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 28th day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and Charles H. Houston, attorneys for Albert Maltz.

Schedule A

1. Minutes and memoranda of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee thereof between January 1, 1945 and January 1, 1947 at which investigation of Albert Maltz was considered, referred to, or acted upon or authorized.

2. All releases and statements issued by or on behalf of the House Committee on Un-American Activities whether to the press or otherwise from January 1, 1945 to January 1, 1947 which referred to or discussed Albert Maltz.

3. All publications, documents, statements, or communications relating to Albert Maltz and submitted to the House Committee on Un-American Activities between January 1, 1945, and January 1, 1947.

4. Transcripts of committee meetings or executive sessions from January 1, 1943 to January 1, 1947 at which the committee considered and/or discussed the said Albert Maltz.

5. All reports, communications and correspondence, and memoranda relating to the investigation of the said Albert Maltz by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1945 to January 1, 1947.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* ALBERT MALTZ, NO. 1354–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday the 3d day of May 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable Chief Justice of said court, the 28th day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenney and Charles H. Houston, attorneys for Albert Maltz.

Schedule A

1. Minutes and memoranda of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee thereof between May 26, 1938, and January 1, 1945, at which investigation of Albert Maltz was considered, referred to or acted upon or authorized.

2. All releases and statements issued by or on behalf of the House Committee on Un-American Activities whether to the press or otherwise from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, which referred to or discussed Albert Maltz.

3. All publications, documents, statements, or communications relating to Albert Maltz, and submitted to the House Committee on Un-American Activities between May 26, 1938, and January 1, 1945.

4. Transcripts of committee meetings or executive sesisons from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, at which the committee considered and/or discussed the said Albert Maltz.

5. All reports, communications, and correspondence and memoranda relating to the investigation of the said Albert Maltz by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from May 26, 1938 to January 1, 1945.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* ALBERT MALTZ, NO. 1354–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said Court on Monday the 3d day of May, 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 28th day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and Charles H. Houston, attorneys for Albert Maltz.

Schedule A

1. Minutes of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, from October 30, 1947, to date, at which investigation of the motion-picture industry was considered, referred to, acted upon, or authorized.

2. Memoranda and reports of investigators for the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, concerning the motion-picture industry from October 30, 1947, to date.

3. Transcripts of any testimony taken with relation to the motion-picture industry during the period from October 30, 1947, to date.

4. All the releases and statements issued by or on behalf of the House Committee on Un-American Activities whether to the press or otherwise from October 30, 1947, to date, which referred to or discussed the motion-picture industry, and particularly regarding the alleged Communist infiltration in the motion-picture industry.

5. Copies of any letters, reports, or other communications from any person or groups of persons or organizations to the House Committee on Un-American Activities from October 30, 1947, to date, concerning the motion-picture industry.

6. Copies of all letters, correspondence, or other communications from the House Committee on Un-American Activities to any persons, groups, or individuals from October 30, 1947, to date, concerning the motion-picture industry.

7. Copies of all reports made to the House Committee on Un-American Activities by any of its investigators and particularly its investigators H. A. Smith and A. B. Leckie, concerning the interviews had by the said investigators with the motion-picture producers in Hollywood, Calif., during the period October 30, 1947, to date.

8. Transcripts of committee meetings in executive session held from October 30, 1947, to date, at which the committee considered, and/or acted upon matters relating to the motion-picture industry.

9. All the correspondence and communications between representatives of the motion-picture industry and the House Committee on Un-American Activities from October 30, 1947, to date.

10. All correspondence and communications between the Motion Picture Alliance and/or any of its representatives and the House Committee on Un-American Activities from October 30, 1947, to date.

11. Transcripts of hearings held by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from October 20 through October 30, 1947, concerning the motion-picture industry, and all exhibits and applications and motions of counsel for all witnesses who appeared before the said committee at the said hearings.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* ALBERT MALTZ, NO. 1354–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday, the 3d day of May 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 28th day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and Charles H. Houston, attorneys for Albert Maltz.

Schedule A

1. Minutes of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, between January 1 and October 30, 1947, at which investigation of the motion-picture industry was considered, referred to, acted upon, or authorized.

2. Memoranda and reports of investigators for the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, concerning the motion picture industry from January 1 to October 30, 1947.

3. Transcripts of any testimony taken with relation to the motion-picture industry during the period from January 1 to October 30, 1947.

4. All the releases and statements issued by or on behalf of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, whether to the press or otherwise, between January 1 and October 30, 1947, which referred to or discussed the motion-picture industry, and particularly regarding the alleged Communist infiltration in the motion-picture industry.

5. Copies of any letters, reports, or other communications from any person or groups of persons or organizations to the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1 to October 30, 1947, concerning the motion-picture industry.

6. Copies of all letters, correspondence, or other communications from the House Committee on Un-American Activities to any persons, groups, or individuals between January 1 and October 30, 1947, concerning the motion-picture industry.

7. Copies of all reports made to the House Committee on Un-American Activities by any of its investigators, and particularly its investigators H. A. Smith and A. B. Leckie, concerning the interviews had by the said investigators with the motion-picture producers in Hollywood, Calif., during the period January 1 to October 30, 1947.

8. Transcripts of committee meetings in executive session held from January 1 to October 30, 1947, at which the committee considered and/or acted upon matters relating to the motion-picture industry.

9. All correspondence and communications between representatives of the motion-picture industry and the House Committee on

Un-American Activities from January 1 to October 30, 1947.

10. All correspondence and communications between the Motion-Picture Alliance and/or any of its representatives and the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1 to October 30, 1947.

11. Transcripts of the hearings held by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or a subcommittee thereof in Los Angeles, Calif., concerning the motion-picture industry on or about May 1947, including specifically the testimony of Louis B. Mayer and all other executives in the motion-picture industry.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* ALBERT MALTZ, NO. 1354–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday the 3d day of May 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A, attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness the honorable chief justice of said court, the 28th day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and Charles H. Houston, attorneys for Albert Maltz.

Schedule A

1. Minutes of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, between January 1, 1945, and January 1, 1947, at which investigation of the motion-picture industry was considered, referred to, acted upon, or authorized.

2. Memoranda and reports of investigators for the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, concerning the motion-picture industry from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947.

3. Transcripts of any testimony taken with relation to the motion-picture industry during the period from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947.

4. All the releases and statements issued by or on behalf of the House Committee on Un-American Activities whether to the press or otherwise between January 1, 1945, and January 1, 1947, which referred to or discussed the motion-picture industry, and particularly regarding the alleged Communist infiltration in the motion-picture industry.

5. Copies of any letters, reports, or other communications from any person or groups of persons or organizations to the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1945 to January 1, 1947, concerning the motion-picture industry.

6. Copies of all letters, correspondence, or other communications from the House Committee on Un-American Activities to any persons, groups, or individuals between January 1, 1945, and January 1, 1947, concerning the motion-picture industry.

7. Copies of all reports made to the House Committee on Un-American Activities by any of its investigators and particularly its investigators, H. A. Smith and A. B. Leckie, concerning the interviews had by the said investigators with the motion-picture producers in Hollywood, Calif., during the period January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947.

8. Transcripts of committee meetings in executive session held from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, at which the committee considered and/or acted upon matters relating to the motion-picture industry.

9. All correspondence and communications between representatives of the motion-picture industry and the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947.

10. All correspondence and communications between the Motion Picture Alliance and/or any of its representatives and the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] is recognized for 30 minutes.

NAVAL AVIATION—UNITED STATES AIR SUPREMACY

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, in the summer and fall of 1945, I had an opportunity to travel extensively in western Europe, the Balkans, the Near East, and India. Since this trip I have constantly urged that the United States achieve and maintain air supremacy. In the fall of 1947, as a member of a Foreign Affairs Subcommittee, I again visited western Europe and the countries in the Near East. On this occasion I became more thoroughly convinced than ever that the United States must immediately construct an all-powerful, invincible air armada if the peace of the world is to be maintained.

In an effort to emphasize the compelling necessity of air supremacy, I have made several speeches on this subject in the House. I have introduced appropriation bills providing funds for increasing our air strength and have continually emphasized and reemphasized how essential United States air supremacy is to the survival of our country and to the establishment of an enduring peace.

SEVENTY GROUPS

Great and increasing emphasis has been placed, and rightly so, on the 70-group program of the Air Force. The 70-group program about which there is so much discussion includes, as summarized by General Spaatz, 6,689 aircraft, also 3,212 for the Air National Guard and 2,360 for the Air Reserve. This totals 12,441 planes. In addition, a reserve of 8,100 planes is necessary. This constitutes a grand total of 20,541 planes.

On Thursday, April 15, the House of Representatives, by the overwhelming vote of 343 to 3, appropriated money to begin the construction of the 70-group Air Force. By this action the House rebuffed the administration, which had persistently favored appropriations for only 55 groups. The administration has now proposed 66 groups.

The total appropriation allotted to the Air Force in the House bill passed on April 15 is $2,295,100,000. Two hundred and fifty million dollars of this is for the liquidation of previously made obligations. Therefore, new funds including cash and authorizations for the placing of plane contracts amount to $2,045,100,000. Originally the bill called for $865,000,000 to be used for contracts. The House amended this by adding to it $822,000,000. Also the time for making such contracts was extended from June 30, 1949, to June 30, 1950. The vote on the amendment was 115 to 0. The decision of the House to begin the construction of a 70-group air force and to increase the strength of the naval air arm is one of the most important steps we have yet taken toward the attainment of a lasting peace.

I hope Congress will disregard the proposal made by the Administration to strike a compromise of 66 groups and emphatically insist that the 70-group plane program for the Air Force be realized at the earliest possible moment. The attitude of compromise is amazing in view of the fact that even with 70 groups of planes the United States will not possess air supremacy but will only have the basis on which to build air supremacy.

NAVAL AVIATION ESSENTIAL TO AIR SUPREMACY

In discussing air power, we have failed to depict the importance of the naval air arm as a necessary prerequisite to the achievement of air supremacy. While the Air Force was laying plans for the minimum peacetime air protection of the United States, which resulted in the proposed 70-group program, the Navy simultaneously developed a program of naval aviation which it deemed essential to carry out its missions. The Navy plan for aviation calls for a force of approximately 14,500 planes. In considering naval aviation the term 14,500-plane Navy is used. This is employed because the various components of the Navy must be expanded if we are to have the necessary support for the 14,500 planes.

Unfortunately the program for naval aviation has not been described as clearly, and the requirements for naval aviation are not as familiar to the country as the requirements for the 70-group air force. It must be borne in mind, however, that the plane program for the Navy is as important to ultimate achievement of air supremacy as the 70-group program. Without an efficient striking naval air arm, we cannot hope to attain complete control of the air. A 14,500-plane Navy has been approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the same basis as the 70-group program for the Air Force. Just as the 70-group program of 20,541 planes constitutes the number of aircraft to give the irreducible minimum air protection by the Air Force, so the 14,500-plane Navy will give the irreducible minimum air protection by the naval air arm. A total of 35,000 planes is all too small a number for the protection of the United States.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is that the number the Naval Air Force asked for, or is it the number of planes that the Secretary of National Defense asked for?

Mr. MERROW. Approximately 14,500 planes is the number the Navy asked for to enable them to carry out their air mission. This program was developed by the Navy at the same time as the Air Force made plans for the 70 groups.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is that all that the Naval Air Force asked for?

Mr. MERROW. That is all, as I understand it, they are calling for at the moment.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am delighted that the gentleman has

brought up this point, because it has not been stressed enough. As the gentleman knows, when unification went through, the Navy for a long time was not allowed to present its case.

Mr. MERROW. I do not think that the case for the Naval Air Force has been properly presented, and that is why I am speaking about it today.

The Air Force is asking for 12,441 planes with a reserve of 8,100, making a total of about 20,541 planes. The Navy is asking for approximately 14,500 planes. This should be carefully considered. The 14,500-plane Navy is as important in achieving air supremacy as the 70-group program.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman is making a great contribution as always. He never fails to make an extensive study of any subject about which he talks. Is it not important to have the Naval air forces and carriers so that they can strike at distant points without returning to their bases in the United States for refueling?

Mr. MERROW. This is indeed most essential in achieving control of the air. I thank the gentlewoman for her kind and constructive words.

NAVAL PROGRAM ACCELERATED

Originally the Navy planned to realize its program of a 14,500-plane Navy over a period of 6 years. It was estimated that in 1954 the cost of such a Navy including aviation would level off to approximately $8,000,000,000 a year. The appropriations until then were to be on a sliding scale.

Since the submission of the original naval budget for 1949, the world picture has become much worse. In view of the increasing international tension, the Navy has decided to bring into actual readiness for operation the 14,500-plane Navy as soon as possible rather than wait for a period of years for this achievement. It has been decided that beginning in July 1948, the Navy will build up to a 14,500-plane inventory to be completed by July 1, 1949. In order to do so it is necessary to take out of storage 3,000 obsolescent aircraft. The Navy has the original structure and most of the personnel to implement a 14,500-plane Navy next year. It is imperative, however, to replace obsolescent aircraft with modern planes. Since this change in planning has become essential because of Soviet aggression, increased international tension, the general deterioration of world relations, and the necessity of national security, Congress, if it views realistically the disturbing international picture, must increase immediately the appropriations for the Navy. More money must be provided than was authorized in the bill which the House passed on April 15.

MONEY VOTED FOR THE NAVY

In the bill acted upon by the House on April 15, the money allotted to the Navy amounted to $903,000,000. One hundred fifty million dollars of this is assigned for liquidation of obligations already consummated. Seven hundred fifty-three million dollars in new funds were provided for contractual authorizations for planes and equipment. In other words, $753,000,000 is for the procurement or the buying of new planes. This amount of money is insufficient and much more should be made immediately available for procurement if the Navy is to realize a modern up-to-date 14,500-plane program. True, an inventory of 14,500 planes can be realized but a large number will be obsolete.

NEW AIRCRAFT REQUIREMENTS

The financial requirements for new aircraft have greatly increased as a result of more complete and detailed cost break-downs. The original estimates for the development of a 14,500-plane Navy were far too low. More realistic schedules have been prepared for the annual deliveries necessary if the Navy is to achieve its program.

For the fiscal year 1949, 1,200 planes are to be delivered. This money for all but 60 of these planes, was authorized in the 1948 budget. In the budget estimates for the fiscal year 1949, provision was made for 1,050 planes to be delivered in 1950. The 1949 appropriation estimates as approved by the House of Representatives on the 15th of April contain $753,000,000 for the procurement of 1,535 new aircraft in 1949 with deliveries in 1950. Even this is insufficient.

Authorizations for procurement and delivery of planes should be increased, as follows:

Authorization:	
1949	3,002
1950	3,810
1951	3,597
1952	3,028
Delivery:	
1949	0
1950	3,002
1951	3,810
1952	3,597
1953	3,028

It is obvious that the average procurement should be a little above 3,300 planes a year if we are to replace the naval aircraft which become obsolete in 5 years. The naval planes should be replaced every 5 years, and it follows that in order to do this we must manufacture and deliver over 3,300 naval planes annually.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR PROCUREMENT

In order to bring into existence the procurement program that I have outlined, much more money must be allotted for this purpose. Funds for the procurement or the purchase of required planes during the four fiscal years to which I have referred in the above tables is estimated as follows:

1949	$1,351,074,000
1950	1,691,831,000
1951	1,965,387,000
1952	1,601,857,000

If the 14,500-plane Navy is to be achieved and implemented, it will be necessary to increase the 1949 budget procurement figures to the amount I have given for 1949, which is $1,351,074,000. This is an increase of $598,074,000 above the $753,000,000 recently approved by the House. In other words, the House should have voted approximately an additional $600,000,000 for naval procurement alone if we are to have a 14,500-plane Navy. By doing this, the aircraft procurement would be increased by 1,467 or a total of 3,002.

NAVAL EXPANSION

It must be emphasized that the figures I have given are only for naval aircraft procurement. In addition, the entire Navy must be built up commensurate with the Air Force and naval aviation. We cannot expect to bring our full air power to bear on an overseas enemy by operating only from bases on the Western Hemisphere.

If full striking power is to be developed, many combatant elements of the Air Force plus supporting marine and Army forces must be transported to overseas bases. The accomplishment of this broad task requires strong Navy, marine, and amphibious components. Therefore, expansion of air power without a commensurate expansion of the necessary Navy surface and subsurface units would not permit the Navy to conduct its assigned missions.

It is impossible to consider the naval air arm apart from the Navy itself. To bring a 14,500-plane Navy into being will require an increase in appropriations for the entire Navy extending over a period of years. The whole Navy must be expanded if we are to have the support necessary for the 14,500 planes. I want to make it perfectly clear that the increase in procurement funds must be followed by an increase in funds for other components of the Navy.

Naval aviation looking to the accomplishment of its future missions as a vital part of air power as well as sea power has drafted a program of expansion. This program is designed to assure only the minimum requirements for the security of the United States. It involves reserves as well as active squadrons.

During this period of expansion, the program calls for increasing the total operating aircraft of the Navy from 7,850 to 10,700 planes or an increase of 36 percent. Of this total 2,700 will be naval and Marine Corps Reserve as against 2,050 currently available.

Ready combatant units account directly for 2,100 of the total increase of 2,850 operating planes. Combatant ready carrier air groups, marine amphibious support, and seaplane squadrons will be jumped from 2,300 to 4,400. Of these, 1,100 will be manned by reserves.

There are two reasons for the increase in combatant units: First, expansion of the immediately available forces to meet minimum emergency needs; and second, to provide replacement units not now available to permit naval aviation to engage in continuous actions despite losses and fatigue.

Of the 10,700 operating planes, about 56 percent will be of carrier, fighter, and attack types; 8 percent, long-range type; 25 percent, training; and 11 percent, utility transport and helicopter types. In addition to the operating planes, 3,800 in overhaul or repair status and logistic pools and pipe lines will make the total inventory of 14,500 modern aircraft.

The Navy's plan is a tenfold program. It provides for the needs of four separate fleet combat forces, each with its own unique functional mission. It provides also for six major categories of supporting activities whose growth must parallel

that of the combat forces. In view of this, it is easy to understand why the whole Navy must be considered in the true picture of naval aviation. This gives us the reason for calling it a 14,500-plane Navy. All the elements must be built up, and therefore it is necessary not only to vote the funds for procurement of planes but to vote the funds necessary to expand the entire Navy. Following is a brief outline of the various elements in the 14,500-plane Navy:

COMBAT FORCES

First. Attack carrier forces: Expansion is planned for the present force of 11 medium and large carriers, with only 13 operating air groups and 1,430 planes in both oceans, to a force of 16 attack carriers with 32 air groups and 2,500 fighter and attack planes ready for combat.

These carriers will be the primary weapon of naval air power against an enemy air force and its supporting bases and industries. By 1952, faster, longer-ranged fighters and attack planes able to carry all types of weapons will form a substantial part of this force. One new large carrier is planned for completion as a part of this program. The other four additional operating carriers required will come from the laid-up fleet.

The provision of two air groups per carrier is necessary to keep four task groups, with more than 1,000 planes, continuously in action. The present lack of spare groups allows no replacement for losses or fatigue. Eight of the 32 planned air groups will be manned by combat-ready Reserves.

Second. Marine amphibious support aviation: Fleet Marine force squadrons are scheduled to increase from 23, with 490 planes to 40, with 850 planes. These squadrons operate from escort carriers or advance bases, as required, to support acquisition of beachheads and air bases abroad. Six escort carriers will be operated regularly in peacetime. Others can be obtained quickly from the inactive fleet in an emergency. One-fifth of these marine planes will be manned by combat-ready Reserves.

Third. Submarine killer carriers: Expansion is urgently required from the present grossly inadequate force of 3 escort carriers, 3 air groups, and less than 100 planes, to 8 light and escort carriers, 24 air groups, and 530 planes. These figures emphasize how necessary it is to expand the entire Navy. These units will operate with surface-killer vessels to hunt down and destroy submarines. In view of the rapidity with which Russia is constructing a submarine fleet, we must reactivate more submarine-killer carriers with the requisite number of planes if we are to possess adequate protection. The 5 additional operating carriers operating in peacetime are available from the moth-ball fleet. One-third of the air groups will be in the combat-ready Reserve.

Fourth. Land-based sea-patrol aircraft: The program calls for expansion from 34 seaplane and landplane patrol squadrons, with 300 planes, to 52 squadrons, including 12 from the combat-ready Reserve, with 520 planes. In addition, 16 blimps must be maintained in fleet-patrol squadrons. These forces will cooperate with surface vessels in sea patrol and convoy escort in all oceans and in hunting submarines. These peacetime bases extend from Guam to Hawaii, Alaska to Panama, Newfoundland to Florida, Bermuda to Trinidad.

SUPPORT ELEMENTS

First. Pilot training: We need to increase the number of Navy and Marine aviators. Training of new pilots is barely sufficient to maintain the regular services at their present strength. It provides no excess to replace pilots leaving the Reserve or to expand the totals on duty. We must increase pilot training, and this will require 2,000 aircraft in the Naval Air Training Command, compared to the present 1,050. A high rate of utilization of aircraft under an expanded program, plus changes in training methods, will permit training output to be increased more than the number of airplanes to be required.

Second. Reserve training: Because a substantial part of the present Reserve squadron organization will be converted to a combat-ready status, comparable with Regular Navy and Marine Corps combatant units, a decrease from 2,050 to 1,600 is planned in aircraft assigned to remaining Reserve training units.

Third. Research and development: Naval aviation will maintain and expand research, developmental, experimental, test, electronics and other equipment, and guided missiles. To these activities 550 aircraft will be continued to be assigned.

Fourth. Fleet support: An increase from 1,150 to 1,380 in aircraft operated by the combat training, utility, air transport, rescue and service activities of Fleet and Fleet Marine Force aviation, is required to maintain the expanded combat forces in a state of full combat readiness.

Fifth. Bases and logistic support: Expansion will be required in the base facilities needed to support the increased volume of fleet combat, training and service activities, to supply these activities, and to maintain, overhaul and modify their aircraft and equipment.

The present 55 domestic and 24 extra-continental air stations in operation are scheduled for increase to 74 and 25 respectively.

Sixth. Production of airplanes and equipment: To support the program for expansion after full strength is attained, an annual production of 3,300 airplanes, with a total air-frame weight of about 25,000,000 pounds will be required. Of this, 76 percent of the planes will be of combat types.

SUPPORTING TABLES FOR THE BREAK-DOWN OF THE 14,500-PLANE NAVY

The figures which follow are divisions into operating units and by types of the Navy's plan of the 14,500 planes required to make it possible for the Navy to carry out its assigned mission.

The requirement of 14,500 aircraft has been approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff for the Navy on the same basis as the 70-group plan of the Air Force. The Navy now has operating 5,793 planes and an inventory of about 11,000.

Break-down by operating units and by types

Total USN operating	8,015
Total USNR operating	2,672
Grand total operating	10,687
Logistic support	3,787
Total planes HTA	14,474
Total lighter-than-air	32

Break-down by operating units

NAVY

	Groups	Aircraft
USN:		
Attack carrier air groups	24	1,860
ASW carrier air groups	16	352
Total	40	2,212
USNR:		
Attack carrier air groups	8	632
ASW carrier air groups	8	176
Total	16	808
Total carrier air groups	56	3,020
Patrol squadrons, USN	40	400
Patrol squadrons, USNR	12	120
Total patrol squadrons	52	520
Marine Corps:		
Carrier groups (amphibious) USMC	6	144
Air groups (support) USMC	27	540
Total	33	684
Air groups (support) USMCR	7	168
Total Marine Corps	40	852

Break-down by types

COMBAT

Fighters	5,990
Attack	1,972
Patrol (heavy land)	292
Patrol (medium land)	306
Patrol (medium sea)	193
Patrol (amphibian)	65
Total combat	6,818

NONCOMBAT

Transport, heavy land	171
Transport, medium land	321
Utility, multi-engined	492
Utility, single-engined	119
Training, multi-engined	694
Training, single-engined	1,883
Helicopters, observation	189
Total noncombat	3,869
Total operating aircraft, heavier-than-air	10,687
Logistic support (in transit, overhaul, etc.)	3,787
Total heavier-than-air craft	14,474
Total lighter-than-air craft	32

FOURTEEN THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED PROGRAM DOES NOT INCLUDE A RESERVE POOL

It is considered that a reserve pool of aircraft is of little value unless trained flight and maintenance groups are available on very short notice to operate these aircraft. It is reasonable to expect that a high attrition of aircraft in the early stages of war will be accompanied by a high attrition in flight groups. Time will not be available to train additional necessary groups or to manufacture required additional aircraft. The Navy considers that the personnel and aircraft of the ready Naval Reserve will provide best these necessary replacements in the

early stages of a war and at the same time permit as much economy as possible in peacetime. It is felt by the Navy that the funds necessary to modernize an aircraft pool would be better spent in keeping a smaller number actually operating.

CONTROL OF THE AIR

I wish to state as forcibly as I know how that if we are to achieve United States air supremacy, we must have an air force equal to any air force or combination of air forces in the world. If we are to develop air power so that our voice can be heard and our will respected in the sections of the planet where there are American interests, then it is necessary to bring into being immediately the 70-group air force program and the 14,500-plane Navy.

Since in the event of another conflict, the first attack will come from the air, it necessarily follows that the defense must originate from the air. In all probability Navy planes will strike first because they are on carriers which are mobile and can be brought within close proximity to any shore. When we have appropriated sufficient funds to provide 20,451 planes for the Air Force and to create a 14,500-plane Navy, we will have a striking force of approximately 35,000 planes. This is only the minimum air protection for the United States. It is not air supremacy. Should we be attacked, vast and immediate expansion would be necessary. With the 70-group program and the 14,500 plane Navy, we would have the basis on which to build air supremacy. We would have the starting point for winning the next war.

It is unfortunate that the administration does not exercise the foresight and the vision to comprehend the fact that overwhelming air power is our first line of defense. Major emphasis should be placed not on the Army, not on the Navy as such, but on achievement and maintenance of air supremacy through the Air Force and naval aviation. It is also unfortunate that the administration does not act without fear or favor according to the true spirit of unification and save billions of dollars by effecting a thoroughgoing unification of the armed services. Too often, thinking about national defense is in terms of the past and not in terms of what the exigencies of the future may present. It is regrettable that the administration opposes the immediate achievement of overwhelming air power. It is also regrettable that the Congress does not with complete dispatch and unanimity vote all the funds necessary for laying the secure foundation for the achievement of complete United States air supremacy.

I must repeat again what I have so often stated, that all the funds required to keep us the strongest military Nation on this planet should be unhesitatingly appropriated by the Congress; and then having done this, the Congress should insist that the armed services efficiently and effectively move to an early and full realization of this proposed goal. Congress has an opportunity for leadership. We have the power to appropriate the funds. It is within our province to give directions to the Department of National Defense and to insist that this Department reach air supremacy. Were we to do this and were we to insist upon complete unification, the bickering, the uncertainty, and indecision would terminate. Congress controls the appropriations and Congress can lay down any principle it wishes. If we insist on air supremacy, the Department of National Defense must deliver.

I have no objection to talking about a balanced program. I hope we can achieve it someday. It would be an excellent thing if we were living in a balanced world, but such is not the case. We must be realistic. First things must be placed first. Air power, overwhelming and invincible, must be created at all costs. A strong and all-powerful United States is the surest guaranty for the perpetuation of a society of free nations. By adopting and acting upon the principle of sufficient preparedness, by the appropriation of funds to carry out this purpose, and by insisting that the armed services achieve complete air supremacy we will be able to win the long-protracted struggle in which we are engaged for the achievement of an enduring peace.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the hearings on investigation of national resources for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; to the Committee on House Administration.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2409. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; approved July 16, 1947.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 30, 1948, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1506. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Chairman, the Textile Foundation, transmitting the Annual Report of the Textile Foundation, for the fiscal year ending December 31, 1947, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3194. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1833). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 6113. A bill to transfer certain land in Langlade County, Wis., to the United States Forest Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 1834). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 6301. A bill to provide for retirement of the Government capital in the central and regional banks for cooperatives, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1835). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 2287. An act to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1836). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

H. R. 6386. A bill to provide an appropriation for the reconstruction and repair of roads and other public facilities in the States of North Dakota and Minnesota which were destroyed or damaged by recent floods; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 6387. A bill to authorize Federal cooperation in the acquisition and preservation by the State of California of the south Calaveras grove of big trees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 6388. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 6389. A bill to authorize Federal cooperation in the acquisition and preservation by the State of California of the south Calaveras grove of big trees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 6390. A bill to establish within the Department of the Interior an Office of National Minerals Resources, Production, and Conservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 6391. A bill to amend section 3224 (2) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R 6392. A bill to permit the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to sell a certain war-housing project to the Housing Authority of the city of Las Vegas, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUTLER:

H. R. 6393. A bill to authorize the acquisition of an ice cutter to relieve ice-bound traffic on Lake Erie; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 6394. A bill to amend section 731 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 6395. A bill to authorize the construction of access roads necessary to the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 6396. A bill to authorize for a limited period of time the admission of displaced persons into the United States for permanent residence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA (by request):

H. R. 6397. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. J. Res. 391. Joint resolution to provide a civil government for the trust territory of the Pacific islands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. Res. 563. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the Indians of the United States and Alaska; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 564. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 563, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. Res. 565. Resolution authorizing funds for study of plans for rehabilitation of Capitol Power Plant; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOOTE:

H. R. 6398. A bill for the relief of R. Wallace & Sons Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 6399. A bill for the relief of Frank O. Ward; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1851. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of the National Guard and Naval Militia Association of the State of New York, urging the Congress to adopt a Selective Service Act that provides an exemption from draft of any member in good standing of the National Guard and Organized Naval Reserve in the several States until the adoption of a Universal Military Training Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1852. By Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Petition of Wirt H. Ferguson, in regard to the United Nations organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1853. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the members of the Southern Wholesale Hardware Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts' explanation of the proposal for a federal union of the civil-liberty democracies as set forth in Clarence K. Streit's book Union Now and his booklet Federal Union of the Free; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 30, 1948

(Legislative day of Thursday, April 22, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God of grace and God of glory, when we resent having so many choices to make, may we remember that good character is the habit of choosing right from wrong.

Help us as a nation to see that our strongest defense lies back in home and school and church where is built the character that gives free people the power to win their freedom and to hold it. May we never forget that it is only under God that this Nation or any nation can be free.

And when we have learned well this lesson, then shall we have for export more than money, even the faith and idealism for which all who love liberty will be willing to live. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 28, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED DURING RECESS

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of April 28, 1948,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore signed on April 29, 1948, the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 1481. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District; and

S. 2195. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on April 29, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1481. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District; and

S. 2195. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

On April 28, 1948:

S. 1021. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay salaries and expenses of the chairman, secretary, and clerk of the Fort Peck General Council, members of the Fort Peck Tribal Executive Board, and other committees appointed by said Fort Peck General Council, and official delegates of the Fort Peck Tribes;

S. 2278. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in San Juan County, Utah, to the Southwest Indian Mission, Inc.; and

S. J. Res. 94. Joint resolution to establish the Fort Sumter National Monument in the State of South Carolina.

On April 29, 1948:

S. 1481. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District;

S. 1696. An act to amend the act of August 13, 1940 (54 Stat. 784), so as to extend the jurisdiction of the United States District Court, Territory of Hawaii, over Canton and Enderbury Islands; and

S. 2195. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended.

On April 30, 1948:

S. 1468. An act providing for payment of $50 to each enrolled member of the Mescalero Apache Indian Tribe from funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that Mr. ANDREWS of New York and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas had been appointed additional managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1641) to establish the Women's Army Corps in the Regular Army, to authorize the enlistment and appointment of women in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps and the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6055) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 30 and 34 to the bill and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22 to the bill and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bill, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6355. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 2409. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 16, 1947;

H. R. 1036. An act to provide for the licensing of marine radiotelegraph operators as ship radio officers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4490. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to provide salvage facilities, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5448. An act to amend sections 212 (b) and 231 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask permission of the Senate that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] be excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON FOREIGN SURPLUS DISPOSAL OPERATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the ninth report of the Department of State on the disposal of United States surplus property in foreign areas, together with a report from the Foreign Liquidation Commissioner concerning the administration of title II of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 107 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DORRANCE ULVIN AND GUY F. ALLEN

A letter from the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Dorrance Ulvin, former certifying officer, and for the relief of Guy F. Allen, former Chief Disbursing Officer (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A petition of the Citizens' Protective League, Inc., New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation creating a department or agency to arrange for bringing to this country free of charge and for the term of 1 year 1,000,000 starving German children to be fed and employed on farms under United States inspection; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A petition of the Citizens' Protective League, Inc., New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to permit the entry into this country of German nationals from eastern Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Austria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A petition of members of the Insular Association for Protection and Defense of the Old Aged People in Puerto Rico, being American citizens, Tierra, P. R., praying for the enactment of legislation to include Puerto Rico in the National Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

DISPLACED PERSONS — RESOLUTION OF BEAVER COUNTY (PA.) BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I recently received from the Beaver County Bar Association of Pennsylvania a photostatic copy of a resolution which that association adopted on April 1, 1948, wherein the association earnestly recommends to the Congress the passage of the Stratton bill, House bill 2910, relating to displaced persons. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas, since the end of World War II, there remain in detention camps in various places in the British and American occupied zones of Europe some 800,000 people officially classed as displaced persons; and

Whereas these people represent various nationalities and religions and cannot be repatriated to their former homelands largely because of their active opposition to totalitarian government which now makes their return dangerous; and

Whereas at the Potsdam meeting of the Allied Powers, our Government joined with its allies in encouraging resistance against Nazi totalitarianism and in announcing its assurance that those who resisted would not be forced to repatriate at the risk of religious or political persecution in the event of Allied victory, which assurances undoubtedly enticed these people into the active resistance which now makes them displaced persons; and

Whereas the United States Government now is required to spend millions of dollars annually to maintain and support these people in idleness, with their skills and productive abilities wasted, while labor shortages exist in many fields and localities in this country: Now be it

Resolved, and it is hereby resolved by the Beaver County Bar Association, in meeting duly assembled, That—

1. The Government and people of the United States of America are morally obligated by our assurances given at Potsdam, as well as on humanitarian grounds and in the interest of world peace, to admit a fair share of the said displaced persons to residence in the United States of America.

2. Large numbers of the displaced persons have skills which would enable them to be absorbed readily into our economy, thereby returning them to productivity, enabling them to become self-supporting and saving our Government large sums of money now spent in supporting them in idleness.

3. One of the greatest traditions of America is the furnishing of asylum to the oppressed and the persecuted.

4. The Stratton bill, designated as H. R. 2910, supported in congressional committee hearings by the testimony of such outstanding citizens as the Honorable Owen J. Roberts and Dean Earl G. Harrison, most nearly meets the requirements of the situation.

Wherefore this association earnestly recommends to the Congress of the United States the passage of the Stratton bill, H. R. 2910, as promptly as possible and directs that this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this meeting and copies thereof sent to our representatives in the Congress and Senate of the United States.

J. FRANK KELKER,
MYRON E. ROWLEY,
JOHN N. SAWYER,
Chairman.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CAIN, from the Committee on Public Works:

H. R. 3219. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator or officials of the Federal Works Agency duly authorized by him to appoint special policemen for duty upon Federal property under the jurisdiction of the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1176).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 668. A bill for the relief of certain Indonesian aliens; with amendments (Rept. No. 1177);

S. 2060. A bill for the relief of Edward Wikner Percival; with amendments (Rept. No. 1178);

H. R. 338. A bill for the relief of Amin Bin Rejab; without amendment (Rept. No. 1179);

H. R. 817. A bill for the relief of Andres Quinones and Letty Perez; without amendment (Rept. No. 1180);

H. R. 831. A bill for the relief of George Chan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1181);

H. R. 1022. A bill for the relief of Peter Bednar, Francisca Bednar, Peter Walter Bednar, and William Joseph Bednar; without amendment (Rept. No. 1182);

H. R. 1724. A bill to legalize the admission to the United States of Sarah Jane Sanford Pansa; without amendment (Rept. No. 1183);

H. R. 1749. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of Johannes or John, Julia, Michael, William, or Anna Kostiuk; without amendment (Rept. No. 1184);

H. R. 2418. A bill for the relief of Luz Martin; without amendment (Rept. No. 1185);

H. R. 3224. A bill for the relief of Frank and Maria Durante; without amendment (Rept. No. 1186);

H. R. 3608. A bill for the relief of Cristeta La-Madrid Angeles; without amendment (Rept. No. 1187);

H. R. 3740. A bill for the relief of Andrew Osiecimski Czapski; without amendment (Rept. No. 1188);

H. R. 3787. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Smorczewska; without amendment (Rept. No. 1189);

H. R. 3824. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cletus E. Todd (formerly Laura Estelle Ritter); without amendment (Rept. No. 1190);

H. R. 3880. A bill for the relief of Ludwig Pohoryles; without amendment (Rept. No. 1191);

H. R. 4050. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Moke Tcharoutcheff, Lucie Batistine Tcharoutcheff, Raymonde Tcharoutcheff, and Robert Tcharoutcheff; without amendment (Rept. No. 1192);

H. R. 4130. A bill for the relief of Dennis (Dionesio) Fernandez; without amendment (Rept. No. 1193); and

H. R. 4631. A bill for the relief of Antonio Villani; without amendment (Rept. No. 1194).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 2584. A bill to incorporate the National PT Veterans Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 2585. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Preston L. Watson as administrator of the goods and chattels, rights, and credits which were of Robert A. Watson, deceased;

S. 2586. A bill for the relief of Georgias Gianniotes; and

S. 2587. A bill for the relief of Francesca Camarata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 2588. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants and scholarships for medical education and grants for dental, nursing, and public health education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado):

S. 2589. A bill to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF FINAL REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a concurrent resolution. I send to the desk the reconsideration of the action by which the Senate on Wednesday last agreed to Senate Resolution 226. Through inadvertance a Senate resolution was submitted instead of a concurrent resolution, as is necessary. The resolution adopted provided for the printing of additional copies of the final report of the Senate War Investigating Committee. As I have

said, a concurrent resolution should have been submitted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine that the action of the Senate in agreeing to Senate Resolution 226 be rescinded, and that the Senate resolution be indefinitely postponed? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

The Senator from Maine asks for the immediate consideration of a concurrent resolution, which the clerk will read.

The clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 52), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 7,000 additional copies of the report (Rept. No. 440, pt. 6, current session) of the special committee of the Senate authorized and directed to make a study and investigation of the operation of the war program, of which 5,000 copies shall be for the use of the special committee, 1,000 for the use of the Senate document room, and 1,000 for the use of the House document room.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE REPORT NO. 949, ENTITLED "NATIONAL AVIATION POLICY"

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit a concurrent resolution, and I request its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 53) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 5,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 949, current session, entitled "National Aviation Policy," for the use of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6355) making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

INSURANCE AND THE ANTITRUST LAWS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Insurance and the Antitrust Laws," delivered by him before the luncheon session of the annual meeting of the United States Chamber of Commerce on April 28, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CAUSES AND CURE OF COMMUNISM—ARTICLE BY CHESTER BOWLES

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "We Need a Program for as Well as Against," written by Chester Bowles, and published in the New York Times magazine of April 18, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHY THE ARMY'S CIVIL-FUNCTIONS BILL SHOULD BE RECOMMITTED

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was most interested in the minority views filed by the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee [Mr. BRIDGES], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] in opposition to the version of the Army's civil-functions bill which was reported from the Senate Appropriations Committee. The substance of the minority views is that $200,000,000 should be lopped off the $708,000,000 provided in the full committee draft of the bill.

Not being a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I cannot presume to pass in great detail upon the merit of this or that project in the bill. I have, however, already called attention to the fact that the $708,000,000 which would be appropriated would actually constitute a 41-percent increase over current levels of spending, or a total of $206,000,000 more than current levels.

It seems absolutely fantastic that we should be embarking on spending one-fifth of a billion dollars more for river and harbor and flood-control work in a year in which we have already voted $6,000,000,000 for foreign aid, and in which we will vote untold billions of dollars more for national defense. It seems fantastic that we can vote all this money, yet could not vote to authorize a loan of approximately $400,000,000 for the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway.

It is my understanding, based upon expert analysis by various individuals who have studied this appropriation bill very closely, that the bill contains a considerable number of nonessential projects which could be very well deferred. I am not referring to absolutely essential work that must be done on flood control, maintenance, and repair, but I am referring to those projects which will simply eat into the scarce supply of existing construction materials, and which will further complicate the housing shortage, as well as the shortage of all the other items which are so desperately needed in these critical times.

I believe that the Republican Party was elected on the basis of championing Government economy rather than Government extravagance. This civil-functions bill, I believe, therefore, is a testing ground for the determination of whether we mean what we say, or whether we are to outspend the highest expenditures of peacetime ever thus far made.

Earlier in the Eightieth Congress, the Senate unfortunately decided to recommit the St. Lawrence seaway resolution, which, as I have said, provided for a loan of approximately around $400,000,000 for the construction of that great self-liquidating power and navigation project over a 6-year period, and today there comes over the wire the information that Governor Dewey, of New York, has, on behalf of the State of New York, instituted negotiations with the Canadian Government for the construction of this great project. The undisputed evidence, as indicated on the floor of the Senate during the debate, was to the effect that if one branch of the construction were undertaken without the other, the cost would be increased. I know that certain segments and certain groups were overwhelmed by the power of the railroad lobby and others. Now that we are facing a great world crisis, I am of the opinion that some who voted down the project will rue their vote.

Now we are confronted with a bill which would mean the expenditure of $708,000,000, much of which would apparently go down the drain forever. It is my understanding that the expenses which would be authorized under this civil-functions bill would merely inaugurate a vast number of projects which would involve far higher appropriations in later years. Every thinker along economic lines has said that these projects, even the most worthy of them, should be postponed, in view of the great international crisis we are facing, and the great drain they would mean upon the economic strength of this country.

I believe that the American people have a right to expect that all nonessential projects shall be curtailed until such time as they may actually be needed in a public works program when the Government fiscal situation will permit of such a program.

For this reason, I must take my stand with the minority of the Senate Appropriations Committee in urging that, if it is at all possible, the Army civil-functions bill be recommitted to the Senate Appropriations Committee, where every attempt should be made to reduce the expenditures contemplated under it.

FOR AN INTERNATIONAL ARMY—EDITORIAL FROM THE PORTLAND (MAINE) EXRESS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "For an International Army," published in the Portland, Maine, Express of April 15, 1948. I hope the editorial will be particularly read in the next few days by the members of the Committee on Armed Services.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR AN INTERNATIONAL ARMY

Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., of Massachusetts, makes the sensible suggestion that a lot of currently unemployed young men in European countries this side of the iron curtain might well be recruited into the United States Army overseas.

Such an opportunity undoubtedly would appeal to many a young European with time on his hands and little present opportunity to make ends meet. It is hardly necessary to add that it would help this country considerably in meeting its military manpower problems.

Dorothy Thompson would go a long step further with this idea. She says the thing to do is to recruit an "international army to supplement the national forces of the law-abiding, * * * an international peace force with standards of American pay and American maintenance, with compulsory 5 years' service, and the possibility of eventually retiring with a pension. * * *

"Russians would desert to join such a force. Men would crawl across borders to join it. * * * Offer American citizenship to any European who will serve in an American legion for 5 years, and you will have millions of recruits, and for every category of service."

Well, why not?

Miss Thompson continues:

"Here is a country which millions want to join, want to serve, merely in return for being part of it. That mere fact is a lever to turn the world * * *."

That's one way to build the international police force the world dreamed about, at the war's end, when the United Nation's Charter was being written. Since UN could not, or would not, sponsor such an army, let America be the organizing force. That could be a weapon for peace.

SHORTAGE OF DOCTORS — EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, those of us who are opposed to state medicine in America, and who believe that health insurance is a sound method through which the American people can afford to pay the high costs of modern medical care, will be greatly interested in an editorial entitled "Doctor Shortage" which appeared in the Washington Star of April 20.

In this editorial, Dr. Richard J. Williams, of Cumberland, Md., pleads for a new leadership in organized medicine which will really reflect the interests of America's general practitioners—its family doctors—rather than those of the few specialists who, he claims, are exercising a dominant influence in medical politics.

I, too, sincerely wish that organized medicine would develop a leadership and a spirit of cooperation which would work with us in an honest effort to develop a mutually satisfactory program which would assure medical care to all at budgetable prices within the reach of all, and with guaranteed freedom of medical practice and protection of the high quality of medical care which is available. It is most important that the medical profession should cooperate in an effort to solve this problem in the interest and welfare of our country.

To this end, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial referred to be set forth in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHORTAGE OF DOCTORS

News reports of the recent comments by two Maryland physicians—Dr. Charles S. Maxson of the University of Maryland faculty and Dr. Richard J. Williams, of Cumberland—are somewhat confusing. Both men seem to agree, however, that doctors themselves are helping to bring closer the day when this country will adopt some form of socialized medicine.

Dr. Maxson was reported to have said in Baltimore that a public which finds it difficult to obtain physicians may lean toward socialized medicine. He was quoted as going on to say that doctors of today "take their week ends and their evenings. Some refuse to make any night visits and make it impossible to get a telephone connection with them in the evening."

Dr. Williams took this as being a slap at general practitioners, and retorted sharply that the few doctors in his community who do general medicine are overworked and keep on the go day and night. He blamed organized medicine for the shortage of general practitioners, asserting that the profession encourages young men to specialize because of the high fees to be obtained. Calling for a "grass roots revolt against such incompetent leadership," Dr. Williams added that "unless you men at the top very speedily mend your ways and stop trying to shift the responsibility onto the shoulders of the few of us who are doing general medicine, then the public will rise up and give us State medicine whether we like it or not."

The layman is not in a position to know, and is not going to be too greatly concerned, with the rights and wrongs of the clash between these two physicians. He is very much concerned, however, with the scarcity of general practitioners, especially in rural areas; the apparently increasing trend toward specialization at the expense of general practice, and the high costs of modern medical care. If something is not done to bring more adequate medical facilities within the financial reach of the average person the public is going to insist upon and bring about some kind of State intervention.

THE RECIPROCAL-TRADE-AGREEMENTS PROGRAM—ARTICLE BY NEAL STANFORD

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the entire Congress—for on this matter the Senate cannot act until the House has acted—to an article in the Christian Science Monitor on April 22 by Neal Stanford entitled "Keystone in American Foreign Policy." It concerns, of course, the reciprocal-trade-agreements program and the necessity for extending the present act before its scheduled termination, June 12—so very, very soon.

I spoke on this matter a few days ago in the Senate, urging those Senators who have influence with the leadership in the other body to impress that leadership with the need for prompt action. I voiced a few of the many doubts and fears which assail me over the future of reciprocal trade, in view of the well-organized, well-financed campaign against the program.

Mr. Stanford makes the very convincing point that if the Congress fails to renew the Trade Act it will put itself in the anomalous position of pressing upon other nations—through the European recovery program and its insistence on the reduction of trade barriers among the various participating nations—a course which this country would be rejecting for itself. Mr. Stanford warns, as I did here the other day, of the danger of lip-service support for reciprocal trade when coupled with back-door efforts to cripple the act, and he outlines some of the directions these efforts may take.

There is one point in the article I desire particularly to emphasize, which is that all the responsible polls seem to indicate that a substantial majority of the American people endorse reciprocal trade. The percentage of Republicans approving it is about as high as the percentage of Democrats. Thus—although this program is identified with Democratic administrations, was the dream and the achievement of Cordell Hull, a great Democrat, and was largely implemented by the support of Democrats in the Congress—it is not a partisan issue with the voters who, despite their party affiliations, approve it and endorse it and support it. Opposition to it, then, on a partisan basis would be a repudiation, this article makes clear, of grass-roots sentiment.

Mr. President, I am confident that the Members of the Senate who are generally regarded as spokesmen for their respective parties on foreign policy will do their determined best to get this measure through in the interest of the American people and of world peace. But the bill must first come to the Senate from the other side of the Capitol.

If there is any among us who has the persuasive powers, the influence, and the ability to speed up action on the other side, I pray, Mr. President, that such Senators will make use of that happy gift to get the reciprocal-trade bill over here before the last-minute chaos of recess or adjournment before the political conventions.

In the meantime, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Stanford's article be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, it was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEYSTONE IN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

(By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON.—Circle June 12 on your calendars.

Unless Congress renews the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act by that date, this keystone in American foreign policy expires.

To the administration, the Trade Agreements Act epitomizes American leadership in the world.

During the 14 years since it was passed, it has become a symbol to the rest of the world of America's willingness to cooperate economically in the world.

That cooperation has been expressed not only in bilateral agreements under this act. It was apparent in the creation of the World Bank and Monetary Fund in 1945. It was recently evident in passage of ERP.

Last fall, it was made clear at Geneva when 23 nations, doing 75 percent of the world's trade, made mutual tariff concessions on billions of dollars' worth of trade. It was obvious at Havana, this March, in the creation of the International Trade Organization that would extend America's reciprocal trade-agreements program.

It can be said that the administration is genuinely worried over the possibility of getting the act extended another 3 years. Its concern stems from the fact that the Republicans now control Congress, and it has been the Republicans who in the past have led the opposition to this approach to international cooperation.

The act has been renewed four times. In three of the four instances, a majority of the Republicans in Congress have opposed the program. The only time the Republicans, as a body, approved, the record shows, was during the war and when the act was extended for 2 rather than 3 years.

There seems reason, then, for the administration's alarm and concern.

Should Congress fail to renew the Trade Agreements Act, it would put itself in the anomalous position of pressing on others what it is unprepared to do itself. For in the ERP legislation, written by this Congress, there is a clause requiring the 16 participating countries to "cooperate to reduce barriers to trade among themselves and with other countries." As one administration official put it, does Congress not intend to practice what it preaches?

Actually, the administration's fears are not so much that Congress will let the trade-agreements program go by default, as that the Hill will load such crippling amendments on it as to make it useless.

There are three approaches the opposition in Congress is expected to take to draw the teeth from the present act.

First is to require some measure of comparative production costs in tariff negotiations that would doom agreement. For there is no recognized standard for measuring costs, the factors and conditions varying so greatly from country to country.

Second is to insist that each agreement get congressional approval, thus scaring off all interested. Now, with the Executive given the power to write agreements on its own, foreign powers do not face the prospect of having months of negotiation vetoed by a suspicious Congress.

Third, Congress may suggest renewal of the act—but for a single year, rather than the normal three.

Or it could be a combination of these three approaches that would characterize Republican stratagem.

According to Gallup polls, a substantial majority of the American people favor extension of the Trade Agreements Act. And, interestingly enough, practically as many of those who indicated they were Republicans approved the program as did their Democratic brethren.

The GOP leadership, then, that would repeal this program appears somewhat less than representative of grass-roots sentiment. For that reason, as much as any, perhaps, the Administration expects the opposition to try to hamstring the act with amendments rather than permit it to expire. Its enemies would like the fruits of defeat without the blame for surrender.

Fortunately, the administration is working to break down some of this congressional opposition to the trade program. It is working quietly and under cover to convince doubting Congressmen of the act's merit. Primarily, it hopes to impress on all and sundry that failure to renew, or renewal with crippling amendments, would be looked on abroad as surrender of American leadership in this field.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Otto T. Ault, of Tennessee, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Tennessee, vice James B. Frazier.

By Mr. WHITE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Charles Sawyer, of Ohio, to be Secretary of Commerce;

Harrington Wimberly, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission, for the term expiring June 22, 1953;

Russell B. Adams, of West Virginia, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1950;

Delos Wilson Rentzel, of Virginia, to the position of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics; and

Irving Louis Apgar II and sundry other cadets to be ensigns in the Coast Guard.

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate Executive F, Eighteth Congress, second session, the international wheat agreement, which was open for signature in Washington from March 6, 1948, until April 1, 1948, and was signed during that period by representatives of this Government and the governments of 35 other countries. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the agreement; and, without objection, the message from the President, together with the agreement, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The message and agreement are as follows:

EXECUTIVE F, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith, in certified form, the International Wheat Agreement, in the English and French languages, which was open for signature in Washington from March 6, 1948 until April 1, 1948 and was signed, during that period, by representatives of this Government and the governments of 35 other countries.

The purpose of the Agreement, described in greater detail in the enclosed report of the Secretary of State and letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, is to provide supplies of wheat to importing countries and to assure markets to exporting countries at equitable and stable prices.

In view of the fact that the Agreement requires formal acceptance by the signatory governments by July 1, 1948, I urge that the Senate give the Agreement the earliest possible consideration.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 30, 1948.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture; (3) certified copy of International Wheat Agreement.)

APRIL 29, 1948.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

The undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to ratification, if his judgment approve thereof, a certified copy of the International Wheat Agreement which was open for signature in Washington from March 6, 1948 until April 1, 1948 and was signed, during that period, by representatives of the Government of the United States of America and representatives of the Governments of 35 other countries.

The Agreement is the result of approximately fifteen years of negotiation in an effort to conclude an agreement providing a framework within which there might be stabilized the greatest possible portion of the international wheat trade. Negotiations reached a successful conclusion at the Special Session of the International Wheat Council held in Washington from January 28, 1948 until March 6, 1948.

The objectives of the Agreement, as set forth in Article I thereof, are "to assure supplies of wheat to importing countries and to assure markets to exporting countries at equitable and stable prices." In general the Agreement is in the nature of a multilateral contract requiring member exporting countries to supply designated quantities of wheat to member importing countries, when requested to do so by those importing countries, at the maximum prices established in the Agreement and, conversely, requiring member importing countries to purchase designated quantities of wheat from member exporting countries, when requested to do so by those exporting countries, at the minimum prices established in the Agreement. The market which the Agreement assures to United States producers of wheat should eliminate to a great extent the serious disadvantages to those producers which are the result of bilateral contracts between other exporting countries and certain of the importing countries signatory to the Agreement. The number and coverage of such bilateral contracts, moreover, undoubtedly would have been increased if the Agreement had not been negotiated.

It is believed that in addition to assuring markets, at guaranteed prices, to exporting countries for a substantial portion of the exportable wheat production of those countries, thus encouraging the maintenance of production during the current cereals shortage, the Agreement will have the effect, by assuring importing countries of designated quantities of wheat at specified prices, of encouraging those countries whose cost of wheat production is relatively high to meet a larger part of their requirements with imported wheat and, accordingly, to plan their agricultural production with a view to increased diversification of crops and employment of land resources to greater advantage.

The Agreement, in accordance with the provisions of Article XXII thereof, is to remain in force for a five-year period. Provision is made in Article XXII for recommendations by the International Wheat Council with respect to renewal of the Agreement upon the expiration of the five-year period.

The more important substantive provisions of the Agreement are contained in Articles I to IX, inclusive, Articles X to XXII, inclusive, deal with administrative and procedural matters. The Agreement is explained in greater detail in the enclosed article-by-article summary. Also transmitted herewith is a letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture which sets forth the views of the Department of Agriculture with respect to the Agreement.

In the course of the negotiation it was found necessary, in order that the Agreement might be in effect during the next wheat-marketing year, to provide, in Article XX, that instruments of acceptance of the Agreement be deposited no later than July 1, 1948, by all Governments except those of importing countries which are prevented by a recess of their respective legislatures from accepting the Agreement by that date. In order to bring the Agreement into force on the part of the United States it is necessary, therefore, that the United States instrument of acceptance be deposited by July 1, 1948. Accordingly it is recommended that the Senate be requested to give consideration to the Agreement at the earliest opportunity.

Respectfully submitted.

G. C. MARSHALL.

(Enclosure: Summary of Agreement.)

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS

Article I sets forth the objectives of the Agreement, i. e., the assurance of wheat supplies to importing countries and wheat markets to exporting countries at equitable and stable prices.

Article II relates to the rights and obligations of importing and exporting countries and establishes, in Annexes I and II, respectively, the purchases which each contracting importing country, and the sales which each contracting exporting country, guarantees to make.

Article III provides that the contracting countries shall supply to the International

Wheat Council, established by Article XI, with respect to imports and purchases for import, and exports and sales for export, of wheat, the information which is necessary for the maintenance by the Council of records required in the administration of the Agreement.

Article IV, relating to enforcement of rights, establishes the procedure to be followed by the contracting countries in requesting fulfillment of obligations, namely, that any importing country which at any time finds difficulty in making its guaranteed purchases at the maximum price may, through the Council, call upon the exporting countries to supply wheat at the maximum price up to the amount that the exporting countries have guaranteed to supply the importing country in question and that any exporting country which at any time finds difficulty in making its guaranteed sales at the minimum price may, through the Council, call upon the importing countries to purchase wheat at the minimum price up to the amount that the importing countries have guaranteed to purchase from the exporting country in question.

Article V, concerning adjustment of obligations, provides for the reporting to the Council by a country which fears that it may be prevented by circumstances from fulfilling its obligations under the Agreement; for a finding by the Council as to whether that country's representations in this connection are well-founded; and, if so, for an adjustment in the obligations in question, through the voluntary assumption of those obligations by other contracting countries, if this is possible, and, if it is not, through a reduction by the Council, on a pro rata basis, of the quantities in the appropriate annex to Article II.

Article VI establishes the following minimum and maximum prices for the duration of the Agreement for No. 1 Manitoba Northern wheat in store at Fort William or Port Arthur:

	Minimum	Maximum
1948–49	$1.50	$2.00
1949–50	1.40	2.00
1950–51	1.30	2.00
1951–52	1.20	2.00
1952–53	1.10	2.00

The Article provides further that during the last three years of the five-year period during which the Agreement is to remain in force the price range may be narrowed, within the minimum and maximum limits, by the Council by a two-thirds majority of the votes held by the exporting and importing countries voting separately.

There are established in Article VI formulas for determining the price equivalents for No. 1 Manitoba Northern wheat in store in Vancouver, f. a. q. wheat f. o. b. Australia, No. 1 Hard Winter wheat f. o. b. Gulf/Atlantic ports of the United States, and No. 1 Soft White/No. 1 Hard Winter wheat f. o. b. Pacific ports of the United States. Article VI provides also that the Executive Committee, in consultation with the Standing Technical Advisory Committee on Price Equivalents, established by Article XV, may determine the price equivalents for other descriptions of wheat.

Article VII authorizes the Council, upon request by a member country, to use its good offices in facilitating transactions in wheat in amounts in addition to those provided for elsewhere in the Agreement.

Article VIII authorizes any exporting country to export wheat at special prices for use in nutritional programs that are approved by the Food and Agriculture Organization, provided the wheat is exported under conditions that are approved by the Council, it being understood that the Council will not give its approval unless it is satisfied that the full commercial demand of the importing countries will be met throughout the period in question at not more than the minimum price.

Article IX provides that the minimum stockholdings of the exporting countries shall be as follows, subject to the proviso that stocks may be permitted to fall below these figures if the Council decides that this is necessary in order to provide the quantity of wheat needed to meet either the domestic requirements of the exporting countries or the import requirements of the importing countries:

Australia: 25,000,000 of bushels (excluding farm stocks).

Canada: 70,000,000 of bushels (excluding farm stocks).

United States: 170,000,000 of bushels (including farm stocks).

This Article further places an obligation upon exporting and importing countries to operate price-stabilization reserves up to 10 percent of their guaranteed export and import quantities, respectively.

Article X sets forth the areas to which the Agreement applies with respect to each contracting country.

Article XI establishes an International Wheat Council, provides that each contracting government shall be a member thereof, and makes provision for such administrative matters as frequency of meetings, election of officers, and rules of procedure.

Article XII provides for the distribution among importing and exporting countries of votes in the Council on the basis of the quantities of wheat which those countries have guaranteed to purchase or sell under the Agreement.

Article XIII requires the Council to perform the duties assigned to it under the Agreement and confers on the Council such powers in addition to those expressly conferred upon it as may be necessary to achieve its effective operation and to realize its objectives. Article XIII provides also for the settlement by the Council of any dispute arising out of the interpretation of the Agreement or regarding an alleged breach of its provisions.

Article XIV requires the Council to elect annually an Executive Committee which is to be responsible to and work under its general direction and on which representatives of the exporting and importing countries, respectively, shall have the same number of votes.

Article XV requires the Council to establish a Standing Technical Advisory Committee on Price Equivalents to advise the Council or the Executive Committee regarding the establishment or revision of price equivalent.

Article XVI provides that expenses necessary for the administration of the Agreement (except those incident to national representation on the Council, the Executive Committee, and the Standing Technical Advisory Committee on Price Equivalents) shall be met by annual contributions by contracting governments, such contributions to be proportionate to the number of votes held by those governments.

Article XVII provides that the Agreement shall prevail over any provisions inconsistent therewith which may be contained in any other agreement previously concluded between any of the contracting governments, provided that any two contracting governments which may be parties to an agreement, entered into before March 1, 1947, for the purchase and sale of wheat, shall supply full particulars of transactions under such agreement so that the quantities, irrespective of prices involved, may be recorded by the Council and be counted toward the fulfillment of obligations of importing and exporting countries.

Article XVIII requires the Council to make whatever arrangements are required to ensure cooperation with the appropriate organs of the United Nations and its specialized agencies.

Article XIX defines the words and expressions which are used in the Agreement in a technical or specialized sense.

Article XX provides that the Agreement shall remain open for signature until April 1, 1948; that it shall be subject to formal acceptance by the signatory governments; and that Articles X to XXII, inclusive, shall come into force on July 1, 1948 and Articles I to IX, inclusive, shall come into force on August 1, 1948, between the governments which have deposited their instruments of acceptance by July 1, 1948, provided that any such government may, at the opening of the first session of the Council, which is to be convened in Washington early in July 1948, effect its withdrawal by notification to the Government of the United States of America if in the opinion of such government the guaranteed purchases or guaranteed sales of the countries whose governments have formally accepted the Agreement are insufficient to ensure its successful operation.

Article XXI provides that any government may accede to the Agreement by unanimous vote of the Council and upon such conditions as the Council may lay down.

Article XXII provides that the Agreement shall remain in force until July 31, 1953; that the Council, not later than July 31, 1952, shall communicate to the contracting governments its recommendations regarding renewal of the Agreement; that the Council may recommend an amendment to the Agreement by a simple majority of the votes held by the exporting countries and by a simple majority of the votes held by the importing countries; that such an amendment shall become effective upon its acceptance by importing countries which hold a simple majority of the votes of the importing countries (including the Government of the United Kingdom) and by acceptance by the Governments of Australia, Canada, and the United States; that any government not accepting the amendment may withdraw from the Agreement at the end of the current crop year; and that any contracting government which considers its national security endangered by the outbreak of hostilities may withdraw from the Agreement upon the expiry of 30 days' written notice to the Council.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, April 22, 1948.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The proposed International Wheat Agreement, which you plan to submit to the Senate for approval, is of far-reaching significance to our national economy. It is a unique document—combining the advantages of a commercial contract and of a multilateral agreement between governments. As such, it provides a concrete, practical approach not only to international economic cooperation, but also to the achievement of our long-range domestic agricultural policy. It is with the mutual interests of both the Departments of State and Agriculture in mind, therefore, that I take this opportunity of presenting formally to you the views of this Department in the matter.

The basic objective of our long-term domestic agricultural policy is that of organized, sustained, and realistic abundance. Opportunities offered by the proposed agreement, for expanded trade in wheat through international cooperation, hold excellent promise for meeting this objective for a basic agricultural commodity, and avoiding the need for restrictive measures.

The 1945 census of agriculture reported over 1,200,000 farms growing significant quantities of wheat. There is a substantial number of wheat growers in practically every State in the Union. Production of wheat in the United States during each of the past four seasons has exceeded 1,000,000,000 bushels, and current indications point to another large crop in 1948. Our farm economy is now geared to this high level of wheat production. We have reached this production through the response of the American farmer to the need for increased food production during World War II, and to meet the critical postwar world food shortage. Improved seed and new varieties, increased mechanization, and generally improved farming practices, have also helped our wheat growers to reach this goal of organized and realistic abundance. But the problem posed by the production level achieved in this effort involves ways and means of gaining our further objective of sustained abundance.

The problem is particularly significant in the large specialized areas of the Pacific Northwest and the Great Plains. In these areas, crop shifts are limited and full employment of agricultural resources involves production of considerable quantities of wheat in excess of normal domestic needs. Measured in terms of acreage, the United States has at present several million acres producing wheat for export or for non-food uses other than feed and seed. The impact of this acreage holds in large measure the key to the well-being of American agriculture. Markets which the proposed agreement helps to assure, however, would absorb this excess and would minimize the need for considering costly restrictions on the production of wheat in the United States for several years to come.

Our stake in the world wheat market is important. The average annual value of United States exports of wheat and flour during the past 25 years exceeds $200,000,000 or nearly 14 percent of the total value of exports of agricultural products during that period. We all remember the effects of economic developments in many of our formerly important foreign markets for wheat during the decade of the thirties. It was during this period that a natural tendency towards self-sufficiency developed in many of the principal importing countries of Europe by increasing domestic production of bread grains. This development was accompanied, in turn, by increasing trade barriers and restrictions that resulted in the loss of a large part of our foreign trade in wheat. It is essential that a constructive alternative be provided, if a return to those chaotic conditions is to be avoided in the future. With the European recovery program providing the impetus for economic recovery in Europe during the emergency period, and with the proposed agreement implementing the more permanent multilateral approach to world trade envisioned by the International Trade Organization, by assuring supplies of wheat to importing countries at stable prices, I am confident that such an alternative is now available.

In view of the foregoing, the Department of Agriculture strongly recommends Senate approval of the agreement.

Sincerely yours,

N. E. DODD,
Acting Secretary.

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

(Preamble)

The Governments on whose behalf this Agreement has been signed,

Recognizing that there is now a serious shortage of wheat, and that later there may be a serious surplus;

Believing that the high prices resulting from the present shortage and the low prices which would result from a future surplus are harmful to their interests, whether they are producers or consumers of wheat; and

Concluding therefore that their interests, and the general interest of all countries in economic expansion, require that they should cooperate to bring order into the international wheat market,

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

Objectives

The objectives of this Agreement are to assure supplies of wheat to importing countries and to assure markets to exporting countries at equitable and stable prices.

ARTICLE II

Rights and obligations of importing and exporting countries

1. The quantity of wheat prescribed in Annex I to this Article for each importing country shall be called that country's "guaranteed purchases" and shall represent the quantity of wheat which the International Wheat Council established by Article XI:

(a) may, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 2 of Article IV, require that country to purchase at the minimum prices specified in or determined under the provisions of Article VI for shipment during the current crop-year from the exporting countries; or

(b) may, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 1 of Article IV, require the exporting countries to sell to that country at the maximum prices specified in or determined under the provisions of Article VI for shipment during the current crop-year.

2. The quantity of wheat prescribed in Annex II to this Article for each exporting country shall be called that country's "guaranteed sales" and shall represent the quantity of wheat which the Council:

(a) may, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 1 of Article IV, require that country to sell at the maximum prices specified in or determined under the provisions of Article VI for shipment during the current crop-year to the importing countries; or

(b) may, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 2 of Article IV, require the importing countries to purchase from that country at the minimum prices specified in or determined under the provisions of Article VI for shipment during the current crop-year.

3. In the event of any country listed in Annex 1 of Article II (a) not signing or (b) not formally accepting or (c) withdrawing from or (d) being declared in default of this Agreement, the guaranteed purchases of such country shall be redistributed by the Council to those importing countries which desire to guarantee additional purchases. The redistribution to such countries shall be pro rata to their existing guaranteed purchases, unless the Council should otherwise decide by a simple majority of the exporting and importing countries voting separately. Should the additional purchases which contracting importing countries desire to guarantee be less than the guaranteed purchases of the countries referred to in (a), (b), (c), and (d) above, the Council shall reduce pro rata the figures in Annex II to Article II by the amount necessary to make the total of them equal to the total of the figures in Annex I to Article II.

4. The Council may at any meeting approve an increase in any figure or figures in either Annex if an equal increase is simultaneously made in a figure or figures for the same crop-year or crop-years in the other Annex, provided that the representatives of the exporting and importing countries whose figures may thereby be changed concur.

ANNEX I TO ARTICLE II

Guaranteed purchases

[Thousands of metric tons [1]]

	August-July					Approximate equivalent in thousands of bushels
	1948–49	1949–50	1950–51	1951–52	1952–53	
Afghanistan	20	20	20	20	20	735
Austria	510	510	510	510	510	18,739
Belgium	650	650	650	650	650	23,883
Brazil	525	525	525	525	525	19,290
China	400	400	400	400	400	14,697
Colombia	60	60	60	60	60	2,205
Cuba	225	225	225	225	225	8,267
Czechoslovakia	30	30	30	30	30	1,102
Denmark	40	40	40	40	40	1,470
Dominican Republic	20	20	20	20	20	735
Ecuador	30	30	30	30	30	1,102
Egypt	190	190	190	190	190	6,981
French Union and Saar	975	975	975	975	975	35,824
Greece	510	510	510	510	510	18,739
Guatemala	10	10	10	10	10	367
India	750	750	750	750	750	27,557
Ireland	360	360	360	360	360	13,227
Italy	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	36,743
Lebanon	75	75	75	75	75	2,756
Liberia	1	1	1	1	1	37
Mexico	200	200	200	200	200	7,349
Netherlands	835	835	835	835	835	30,680
New Zealand	150	150	150	150	150	5,511
Norway	205	205	205	205	205	7,532
Peru	110	110	110	110	110	4,042
Philippines	170	170	170	170	170	6,246
Poland	30	30	30	30	30	1,102
Portugal	120	120	120	120	120	4,409
South Africa	175	175	175	175	175	6,430
Sweden	75	75	75	75	75	2,756
Switzerland	200	200	200	200	200	7,349
United Kingdom	4,897	4,897	4,897	4,897	4,897	179,930
Venezuela	60	60	60	60	60	2,205
Total (33 countries)	13,608	13,608	13,608	13,608	13,608	499,997

[1] Without prejudice to the preference of any country for imported flour of any extraction rate, all imports of wheat flour registered by the Council as part of the guaranteed purchases shall, unless the Council should otherwise determine, be computed at 72 metric tons of flour to 100 metric tons of wheat.

ANNEX II TO ARTICLE II

Guaranteed sales

[Thousands of metric tons [1]]

	August-July					Millions of bushels
	1948–49	1949–50	1950–51	1951–52	1952–53	
Australia	2,313	2,313	2,313	2,313	2,313	85
Canada	6,260	6,260	6,260	6,260	6,260	230
United States of America [2]	5,035	5,035	5,035	5,035	5,035	185
Total	13,608	13,608	13,608	13,608	13,608	500

[1] Including wheat flour in terms of wheat, computed at 72 metric tons of flour to 100 metric tons of wheat, unless otherwise determined by the Council.

[2] In the event of the provisions of par. 1 of art V, being invoked by reason of a short crop, it will be recognized that these guaranteed sales do not include the minimum requirements of wheat of any occupied area for which the United States of America has, or may assume, supply responsibility, and that the necessity of meeting these requirements will be one of the factors considered in determining the ability of the United States of America to deliver its guaranteed sales under this agreement.

ARTICLE III

Reports to the Council

1. The Council shall keep a record of those transactions in wheat which are part of the guaranteed quantities in Annexes I and II to Article II. The difference between the guaranteed quantity of each country and the

total of the quantities so recorded with respect to that country by the Council shall be called the "unfilled guaranteed quantity" of that country.

2. The Council shall record as part of the guaranteed quantity of the importing and the exporting country concerned any transaction, or part of a transaction, in wheat between a contracting exporting and a contracting importing country:

(a) if it is at a price not higher than the maximum nor lower than the minimum specified in or determined under the provisions of Article VI; and

(b) if it has resulted, or in the opinion of the Council will result, in the shipment from the exporting country during the current crop-year of the wheat contracted for; and

(c) if the unfilled guaranteed quantities of the exporting and the importing countries concerned are not less than the transaction or part of the transaction referred to.

In reporting their transactions in wheat to the Council under this Article, the importing and exporting countries may be required by the Council to specify the amounts included in the buying and selling prices to cover carrying charges and marketing costs.

3. The Council shall also record as part of the guaranteed quantities of the exporting and importing countries concerned those transactions which are carried out in accordance with the provisions of Article IV.

4. If the exporting and the importing countries concerned in a particular transaction in wheat flour inform the Council that they are agreed that the price of such wheat-flour is consistent with the provisions of Article VI, the transaction shall be recorded by the Council as part of the guaranteed quantities of those countries if the other conditions laid down in this Article are fulfilled. In the event of the exporting and importing countries concerned being unable to agree that the price of such wheat-flour is consistent with the provisions of Article VI, they shall so inform the Council which shall decide the issue. Should the Council decide that the price of such wheat flour is consistent with the provisions of Article VI, its wheat equivalent shall be recorded against the guaranteed sales and the guaranteed purchases of the exporting and importing countries concerned. Should the Council decide that the price of such wheat flour is inconsistent with the provisions of Article VI, its wheat equivalent shall not be so recorded.

5. In order to safeguard the rights of exporting countries under the guarantees of purchases and the rights of importing countries under the guarantees of sales, the Council shall determine the factors to be taken into account in devising its records, which shall ensure:

(a) that the registration of transactions is made in the same chronological order as they are reported to the Council; and

(b) that upon the fulfillment of any exporting country's rights by the registration of the total of the purchases guaranteed to it and upon the fulfillment of any importing country's rights by the registration of the total of the sales guaranteed to it, any further purchases or sales by such countries shall not be entered in the record referred to in paragraph 1 of this Article.

Upon the fulfillment of the rights referred to in (b) above the Secretary of the Council shall immediately notify all contracting exporting and importing countries, so that they may be informed of the position and consider its effect on contemplated transactions.

6. The importing and exporting countries shall report to the Council such information as it may request regarding imports and purchases for import of wheat into their territories and exports and sales for export of wheat from their territories.

7. The Council shall prescribe the records which shall be kept of the transactions reported in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 6 of this Article.

8. The Council shall also prescribe the manner in which any wheat purchased by a contracting importing country from a contracting exporting country which is later resold to another contracting importing country may, by agreement of the contracting importing countries concerned, be recorded against the obligations and rights of the contracting importing country to which the wheat is finally resold.

9. The Council shall prescribe the degree of tolerance which shall be permitted exporting and importing countries in fulfilling their obligations.

10. The Council shall circulate to each member country a monthly statement compiled from the records kept in accordance with the provisions of this article and may, from time to time, publish such information as it deems fit.

11. Each contracting Government shall supply, within the time prescribed by the Council, such other information as the Council may, from time to time, request in connection with the administration of this agreement.

ARTICLE IV

Enforcement of rights

1. Any importing country which at any time finds difficulty in purchasing its guaranteed quantity at the maximum price specified in or determined under the provisions of article VI may request the Council's help in securing the desired supplies. Within 3 days of the receipt of such a request the Secretary of the Council shall notify those exporting countries which have unfilled guaranteed quantities of the amount of the unfilled guaranteed quantity of the importing country which has requested the Council's help and invite them to offer wheat at the maximum prices specified in or determined under the provisions of Article VI. If within 14 days of such notification the whole of its guaranteed quantity, or such part thereof as in the opinion of the Council is reasonable at the time the application is made, has not been offered, the Council, having regard to all the circumstances which the exporting and the importing countries may wish to submit for consideration, shall as soon as possible, and in any event within 7 days, indicate the quantities of wheat and/or wheat flour which it is appropriate for each or any of the exporting countries to sell, and the country or countries so indicated shall within 30 days of the Council's decision make the quantities so indicated available at prices consistent with the maximum prices specified in or determined under the provisions of article VI. In the event of disagreement between the exporting and importing countries concerned on the relation of the price of the wheat flour in question to the maximum prices of wheat specified in or determined under the provisions of article VI the matter shall be referred to the Council for decision.

2. Any exporting country which at any time finds difficulty in selling its guaranteed quantity at the minimum price specified in or determined under the provisions of Article VI may request the Council's help in making the desired sales. Within three days of the receipt of such a request the Secretary of the Council shall notify those importing countries which have unfilled guaranteed quantities of the amount of the unfilled guaranteed quantity of the exporting country which has requested the Council's help and invite them to purchase wheat at the minimum prices specified in or determined under the provisions of Article VI. If within fourteen days of such notification the whole of its guaranteed quantity, or such part thereof as in the opinion of the Council is reasonable at the time the application is made, has not been purchased, the Council, having regard to all the circumstances which the exporting and the importing countries may wish to submit for consideration, shall as soon as possible, and in any event within seven days, indicate the quantities of wheat and/or wheat flour which it is appropriate for each or any of the importing countries to purchase, and the country or countries so indicated shall within thirty days of the Council's decision purchase for shipment the quantities so indicated at prices consistent with the minimum prices specified in or determined under the provisions of Article VI. In the event of disagreement between the exporting and importing countries concerned on the relation of the price of the wheat flour in question to the minimum prices of wheat specified in or determined under the provisions of Article VI the matter shall be referred to the Council for decision.

3. Unless otherwise agreed between the countries concerned, contracting exporting and importing countries shall carry out their obligations under this Agreement with respect to guaranteed sales and purchases on the same conditions regarding the currency in which payment is made as prevail generally between the countries concerned at the time the guaranteed purchases and sales are being arranged. Should an exporting and an importing country between which no transactions have hitherto taken place fail to agree on the currency in which payment should be made, the Council shall decide the issue.

ARTICLE V

Adjustment of obligations

1. Any contracting Government which fears that it may be prevented by circumstances, such as a short crop in the case of an exporting country or such as the necessity to safeguard its balance of payments or monetary reserves in the case of an importing country, from carrying out its obligations and other responsibilities under this Agreement shall report the matter to the Council.

2. Where the above provisions with respect to the balance of payments and monetary reserves are invoked the Council shall seek and take into account, together with all relevant facts, the opinion of the International Monetary Fund as to the existence and the extent of the necessity referred to in paragraph 1 of this Article.

3. The Council shall discuss the circumstances referred to in paragraph 1 above with the country concerned and if the Council finds that such country's representations are well founded it shall so rule, and if no other mutually acceptable remedy can be found the Council shall, in the first instance, if the reporting country is an importing country, invite the other importing countries, and, if the reporting country is an exporting country, invite the other exporting countries, to assume the obligations which cannot be fulfilled. If the difficulty cannot be solved in this way, the Council shall invite the exporting countries, if the reporting country is an importing country, or the importing countries, if the reporting country is an exporting country, to consider whether any one or more of them can assist the reporting country to fulfill its obligations or, failing that, accept a reduction in its or their guaranteed quantities for the current crop-year corresponding to the obligations which cannot be fulfilled.

4. If the reporting country cannot be assisted by the procedure set out in paragraph 3 of this Article and it is apparent to the Council that it will not carry out its obligations, the following procedure shall be adopted. If the reporting country is an exporting country, the Council shall forthwith reduce the total of the guaranteed purchases in Annex I to Article II for the current crop-year to an amount equal to the total of the guaranteed sales which will remain in Annex II to Article II for the current crop-year after account has been taken of the prospective failure of one of the exporting countries to

carry out its obligations. If the reporting country is an importing country, the Council shall reduce the total of the guaranteed sales in Annex II to Article II for the current crop-year to an amount equal to the total of the guaranteed purchases which will remain in Annex I to Article II for the current crop-year after account has been taken of the prospective failure of one of the importing countries to carry out its obligations. In adjusting individual quantities in Annex II to Article II for this purpose each figure in the Annex shall be reduced by the same proportion, unless the exporting countries concerned agree otherwise.

5. If the Council finds that the reporting country's representations are well founded, that country shall not be deemed to have committed a breach of this Agreement whether it is relieved of its obligations by the procedure set out in paragraph 3 of this Article or recourse is had to the procedure set out in paragraph 4 of this Article. If the Council finds that the reporting country's representations are not well founded it shall so advise that country and request it to carry out its obligations. Should any contracting Government subsequently allege that the country concerned has not carried out its obligations the Council shall apply the procedure prescribed in paragraph 3 of Article XIII.

6. If, in order to meet a critical need which has arisen or threatens to arise, a contracting Government should appeal to the Council for assistance in obtaining supplies of wheat in addition to its guaranteed quantity, the Council may, by two-thirds of the votes held by the Governments of importing countries and by two-thirds of the votes held by the Governments of exporting countries, reduce the guaranteed import quantities of the other contracting importing countries for the current crop-year, on a pro rata basis, by an amount sufficient to provide the quantity of wheat which the Council determines to be necessary to relieve the emergency created by the critical need, provided that the Council agrees that such emergency cannot be met in any other manner.

ARTICLE VI

Prices

1. The basic minimum and maximum prices for the duration of this Agreement shall be:

	Minimum	Maximum
1948–49	$1.50	$2
1949–50	1.40	2
1950–51	1.30	2
1951–52	1.20	2
1952–53	1.10	2

Canadian currency per bushel at the parity for the Canadian dollar, determined for the purposes of the International Monetary Fund as at February 1, 1948, for No. 1 Manitoba Northern wheat in store Fort William/Port Arthur. The basic minimum and maximum prices, and the equivalents thereof hereafter referred to, shall exclude such carrying charges and marketing costs as may be agreed between the buyer and the seller.

2. At sessions of the Council to be held not later than July 1950, July 1951, and July 1952 respectively, the Council may by a two-thirds majority of the votes held by the exporting and importing countries voting separately determine minimum and maximum prices for the crop-years 1950/51, 1951/52, and 1952/53 respectively, the minimum price so determined not to be lower than the minimum price and the maximum price so determined not to exceed the maximum price for the crop-year in question specified in paragraph 1 of this Article. Minimum and maximum prices so determined shall be effective for the crop-year in question and shall supersede the prices specified for that crop-year in paragraph 1 of this Article. In determining minimum and maximum prices in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph the Council shall examine all the factors and circumstances which it may consider relevant. In the event of the Council not determining minimum and maximum prices for any one of the crop-years 1950/51, 1951/52, and 1952/53 the minimum and maximum prices for such crop-year specified in paragraph 1 of this Article shall remain in force.

3. The equivalent maximum prices for bulk wheat for:

(a) No. 1 Manitoba Northern wheat in store Vancouver shall be the maximum prices for No. 1 Manitoba Northern wheat in store Fort William/Port Arthur specified in paragraph 1 or determined under the provisions of paragraph 2 of this Article;

(b) f. a. q. wheat f. o. b. Australia shall be whichever is the lower of:

(i) the maximum prices for No. 1 Manitoba Northern wheat in store Fort William/Port Arthur specified in paragraph 1 or determined under the provisions of paragraph 2 of this Article converted into the currency of Australia at the prevailing rate of exchange; or

(ii) the prices f. o. b. Australia equivalent to the c. i. f. prices in the country of destination of the maximum prices of No. 1 Manitoba Northern wheat in store Fort William/Port Arthur specified in paragraph 1 or determined under the provisions of paragraph 2 of this Article, computed by using currently prevailing transportation costs and exchange rates, and in those importing countries where a quality differential is recognized by making such allowance for difference in quality as may be mutually agreed by the importing and exporting countries concerned;

(c) No. 1 Hard Winter wheat f. o. b. Gulf/Atlantic ports of the United States of America shall be the prices equivalent to the c. i. f. prices in the country of destination of the maximum prices of No. 1 Manitoba Northern Wheat in store Fort William/Port Arthur specified in paragraph 1 or determined under the provisions of paragraph 2 of this Article, computed by using currently prevailing transportation costs and exchange rates and by making such allowance for difference in quality as may be mutually agreed by the importing and exporting countries concerned; and

(d) No. 1 Soft White/No. 1 Hard Winter wheat f. o. b. Pacific ports of the United States of America shall be the maximum prices for No. 1 Manitoba Northern wheat in store Fort William/Port Arthur specified in paragraph 1 or determined under the provisions of paragraph 2 of this Article converted into the currency of the United States of America at the prevailing rate of exchange, making such allowance for difference in quality as may be mutually agreed by the importing and exporting countries concerned.

4. The equivalent minimum prices for bulk wheat for:

(a) No. 1 Manitoba Northern wheat in store Vancouver;

(b) f. a. q. wheat f. o. b. Australia;

(c) No. 1 Hard Winter wheat f. o. b. Gulf/Atlantic ports of the United States of America; and

(d) No. 1 Soft White/No. 1 Hard Winter wheat f. o. b. Pacific ports of the United States of America shall be: the prices in store Vancouver, f. o. b. Australia, f. o. b. United States of America Gulf/Atlantic ports or f. o. b. United States of America Pacific ports equivalent to the c. i. f. prices in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of the minimum prices of No. 1 Manitoba Northern wheat in store Fort William/Port Arthur specified in paragraph 1 or determined under the provisions of paragraph 2 of this Article, computed by using currently prevailing transportation costs and exchange rates, and in those importing countries where a quality differential is recognized by making such allowance for difference in quality as may be mutually agreed by the importing and exporting countries concerned.

5. The Executive Committee, elected in accordance with the provisions of Article XIV, may in consultation with the Standing Technical Advisory Committee on Price Equivalents, established in accordance with the provisions of Article XV, at any date subsequent to August 1, 1948, designate any description of wheat other than those specified in paragraphs 3 and 4 above and determine the minimum and maximum price equivalents thereof, provided that in the case of any other description of wheat, where the price equivalents have not yet been determined, the minimum and maximum prices for the time being shall be derived from the minimum and maximum prices of the description of wheat specified in this Article or subsequently designated by the Executive Comittee, in consultation with the Standing Technical Advisory Committee on Price Equivalents, which is most closely comparable to such other description, by the addition of an appropriate premium or by the deduction of an appropriate discount.

6. The Executive Committee if at any time it considers, or if it receives representations from any contracting Government, that the prices established under the provisions of paragraphs 3 and 4 of this Article, or any prices determined under the provisions of paragraph 5 of this Article are no longer, in the light of current transportation or exchange rates or market premiums or discounts, fair equivalents of the prices specified in paragraph 1 or determined under the provisions of paragraph 5 of this Article may, in consultation with the Standing Technical Advisory Committee on Price Equivalents, adjust them accordingly.

7. The Executive Committee, in consultation with the Standing Technical Advisory Committee on Price Equivalents, shall determine the appropriate premium or discount in the event of a dispute arising regarding any description of wheat specified in paragraphs 3 and 4 or established under the provisions of paragraphs 5 and 6 of this Article.

8. All decisions of the Executive Committee under the provisions of paragraphs 5, 6, and 7 of this Article shall be binding on all contracting Governments, provided that any contracting Government which considers that any such decision is disadvantageous to it may ask that a session of the Council be convened to review that decision.

9. In order to encourage and expedite the conclusion of transactions in wheat between exporting and importing countries at prices mutually acceptable in the light of all current circumstances, the contracting Governments, while reserving to themselves complete liberty of action in the determination and administration of their internal agricultural and price policies, undertake not to operate those policies in such a way as to impede the free movement of prices between the maximum price and the minimum price in respect of transactions in wheat into which the contracting Governments are prepared to enter. Should any contracting Government consider that it is suffering hardship as the result of action contrary to this undertaking by another contracting Government, it may draw the attention of the Council to the matter and the Council shall inquire into and make a report on the complaint.

ARTICLE VII

Additional purchases or sales

Should the assistance of the Council be requested by (a) any contracting importing

country desiring to make purchases in addition to its guaranteed purchases or (b) any contracting exporting country desiring to make sales in addition to its guaranteed sales, the Council may, having regard to all the circumstances of the case, use its good offices in assisting such country to make such additional purchases from contracting exporting countries or such additional sales to contracting importing countries.

ARTICLE VIII

Sales for nutritional programs

Any exporting country may export wheat at special prices in such quantities and for such periods and under such conditions as may be approved by the Council, but the Council shall not give its approval unless it is satisfied that the full commercial demand of the importing countries will be met throughout the period in question at not more than the current minimum price specified in or determined under the provisions of Article VI. Such exports of wheat shall be utilized in nutritional programs approved by the Food and Agriculture Organization. The rights and obligations of the contracting Governments under the other provisions of this Agreement shall not be modified by virtue of such exports at special prices.

ARTICLE IX

Stocks

1. The exporting countries shall ensure that stocks of old wheat held at the end of their respective crop-years (excluding price stabilization reserves) are not less than the quantities specified in the Annex to this Article; provided that such stocks may be permitted to fall below the minimum so specified if the Council decides that this is necessary in order to provide the quantity of wheat needed to meet either the domestic requirements of the exporting countries or the import requirements of the importing countries.

2. The contracting exporting countries and those contracting importing countries which are not recognized by the Council as predominantly importers of flour shall operate price stabilization reserves up to ten percent of their respective guaranteed quantities for each crop-year specified in the Annexes to Article II, subject to the following conditions:

(a) the total of the price stabilization reserves operated by the exporting countries shall so far as possible be equal to the total of the price stabilization reserves operated by the importing countries, unless the Council, in order to meet special circumstances of any particular exporting or importing country, should otherwise decide;

(b) price stabilization reserves shall be accumulated first by the contracting exporting countries;

(c) contracting importing countries shall be required to fill their price stabilization reserves only upon the request of those contracting exporting countries which have filled their price stabilization reserves; when so required any contracting importing country shall purchase at free-market prices from those contracting exporting countries which have filled their price stabilization reserves an amount of wheat, in addition to its guaranteed purchases, not greater than one-tenth of the guaranteed quantity prescribed for that country in Annex I to Article II;

(d) subject to the provisions of (b) and (c) above, contracting exporting and contracting importing countries shall accumulate price stabilization reserves as soon and so long as free-market prices are below the lowest basic minimum price prescribed in paragraph 1 of Article VI; and

(e) contracting exporting and contracting importing countries shall sell or utilize their price stabilization reserves as soon and so long as free-market prices are above the basic maximum price prescribed in paragraph 1 of Article VI.

Annex to article IX

Country:	*Millions of bushels*
Australia	* 25
Canada	* 70
United States of America	** 170

* Excluding farm stocks.
** Including farm stocks.

ARTICLE X

Territorial application

The rights and obligations under this Agreement shall apply to:

The Kingdom of Afghanistan.

The Commonwealth of Australia, Papua, the Mandated Territory of New Guinea, Nauru, and Ocean Island.

The Republic of Austria.

The Kingdom of Belgium.

The Republic of the United States of Brazil.

Canada, including the Customs territory thereof.

The Republic of China.

The Republic of Colombia.

The Republic of Cuba.

The Czechoslovak Republic.

Denmark, including Greenland.

The Dominican Republic.

The Republic of Ecuador.

The Kingdom of Egypt.

France, territories under France's responsibility (French Equatorial Africa—conventional Basin of the Congo and other territories, French West Africa, Cameroun under French Mandate, French Somali Coast and Dependencies, French Establishments in India, French Establishments of Oceania, French Establishments of the Condominium of the New Hebrides, Gaudeloupe and Dependencies, French Guiana, Indo-China, Madagascar and Dependencies, Morocco—French Zone, Martinique, New Caledonia and Dependencies, Reunion, Saint-Pierre and Miquelon, Togo under French Mandate, and Tunisia) and Saar.

Greece.

Guatemala.

India.

Ireland: Customs territory administered by the Government of Ireland.

The Customs territory of the Italian Republic.

The Republic of Lebanon.

Liberia.

Mexico.

The Kingdom of the Netherlands.

New Zealand, its Island Territories, and Western Samoa.

The Kingdom of Norway.

The Republic of Peru.

Poland.

The Republic of the Philippines.

Continental Portugal and its Overseas Territories.

Sweden.

Switzerland, and the Principality of Liechtenstein.

The Union of South Africa and the Mandated Territory of South West Africa.

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Ceylon, Newfoundland, Southern Rhodesia, Aden, Bahamas, Barbados, Bastutoland, Protectorate of Bechuanaland, Bermuda, British Guiana, British Honduras, Protectorate of British Solomon Islands, British Somaliland, Brunel, Cayman Islands, Cyprus, Falkland Islands and South Georgia, Fiji, Gambia, Gibraltar, Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony, Gold Coast, Hong Kong, Jamaica, Kenya Colony, Leeward Islands, Federation of Malaya, Malta, Mauritius, British Establishments of the Condominium of the New Hybrides, Nigeria, North Borneo, Protectorate of Northern Rhodesia, Protectorate of Nyasaland, St. Helena, Ascension, Tristan da Cunha, Sarawak, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore Colony, Protectorate of Somaliland, Swaziland, Mandated Territory of Tanganyika, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Turks and Caicos Islands, Protectorate of Uganda, Windward Islands, Protectorate of Zanzibar, Sheikdom of Bahrein, Sheikdom of Kuwait, Sheikdom of Muscat, and Shiekdom of the Trucial Coast, and, while under British Military administration, Cyrenaica, Tripolitania, and Eritrea.

United States of America, including the Customs territory thereof.

Venezuela.

ARTICLE XI

The Council

1. An International Wheat Council is hereby established. Each contracting Government shall be a member of the Council and may appoint one Delegate and one Alternate, who may be accompanied by such Advisers as it deems necessary. The Food and Agriculture Organization and the International Trade Organization may each nominate to the Council one nonvoting representative. The Interim Coordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements, established by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, may during its existence nominate to the Council one nonvoting representative.

2. The Government of any country which the Council recognizes as an irregular exporter or an irregular importer may become a nonvoting member of the Council provided that it accepts the obligations prescribed in paragraph 6 of Article III and agrees to pay the membership fee determined by the Council. The government of any such country may become a voting member of the Council under the provisions of Article XXI.

3. Each contracting Government undertakes to accept as binding all decisions of the Council under the provisions of this Agreement.

4. The Council shall elect each year, in conformity with its rules of procedure, a Chairman and a Vice-Chairman. The Chairman shall have no vote.

5. The Council shall appoint a Secretary and such staff as it considers necessary and shall determine their remuneration and duties. In selecting them and in fixing the terms and conditions of their employment, the Council shall have regard to the practice of the specialized agencies of the United Nations.

6. The Council shall meet at least once during each half of each crop-year and at such other times as the Chairman may determine.

7. The Chairman shall convene a Session of the Council if so requested by (a) the Executive Committee; or (b) the Delegates of five contracting Governments; or (c) the Delegate or Delegates of any Government or Governments holding ten percent of the total votes; or (d) the Delegate of any country presenting a request in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 8 of Article VI.

8. The presence of Delegates with a simple majority of the votes held by the exporting countries and a simple majority of the votes held by the importing countries shall be necessary to constitute a quorum at any meeting.

9. The Council shall have legal capacity in the territory of each contracting Government to contract and to acquire and dispose of property, in so far as is necessary in discharging its functions under this Agreement.

10. The Council shall select in July 1948 its temporary seat. The Council shall select, so soon as it deems the time propitious, its permanent seat after consultation with the appropriate organs and agencies of the United Nations. In selecting the temporary and permanent seats of the Council each Delegate shall have one vote.

11. The Council shall establish its rules of procedure.

ARTICLE XII

Voting in the Council

1. The Delegates of the importing countries shall hold 1,000 votes, which shall be distributed between them in the proportions which the guaranteed purchases of the coun-

tries have to the total of the guaranteed purchases. The Delegates of the exporting countries shall also hold 1,000 votes, which shall be distributed between them in the proportions which the guaranteed sales of the countries have to the total of the guaranteed sales. Each Delegate shall have at least one vote and there shall be no fractional votes.

2. When a country accedes to this Agreement under the provisions of Article XXI, or the guaranteed purchases or sales of any country are increased in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 4 of Article II, the Council shall redistribute the votes in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 1 of this Article.

3. In the event of the withdrawal of a country under the provisions of Article XXII, or the suspension under the provisions of paragraph 5 of Article XVI of the voting rights of a country, the Council shall redistribute the votes in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 1 of this Article.

4. Except where otherwise specified in this Agreement, decisions of the Council shall be by a simple majority of the votes cast.

ARTICLE XIII

The powers and functions of the Council

1. The Council shall perform the duties assigned to it under this Agreement and shall have such powers in addition to those expressly conferred on it thereunder as may be necessary to achieve its effective operation and to realize its objectives.

2. The Council shall not, except by unanimity of the votes cast, delegate the exercise of any of its powers or functions. The Council may at any time revoke such delegation by a simple majority vote.

3. Any dispute arising out of the interpretation of this Agreement, or regarding an alleged breach of its provisions, shall be referred to the Council. The Council may appoint a committee to ascertain and report on the facts of such dispute. The Council shall, on the evidence before it, including the findings of any committee so appointed, give a ruling on the dispute but no contracting Government shall be found to have committed a breach of this Agreement except by a simple majority of the votes held by the exporting countries and a simple majority of the votes held by the importing countries.

4. The Council, after consultation with the Secretary of the Wheat Advisory Committee established under the Final Act of the Conference of Wheat Exporting and Importing Countries held in August 1933 and with the International Wheat Council established under the Memorandum of Agreement approved in June 1942 and amended in June 1946, may take over all assets and liabilities of those bodies.

5. The Council shall publish an annual report.

ARTICLE XIV

The Executive Committee

The Council shall, in accordance with its rules of procedure, elect annually an Executive Committee which shall be responsible to and work under the general direction of the Council. The representatives of exporting and importing countries, respectively, on the Committee shall have the same number of votes.

ARTICLE XV

The Standing Technical Advisory Committee on Price Equivalents

The Council shall establish a Standing Technical Advisory Committee on Price Equivalents consisting of representatives of the Governments of Australia, Canada, the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and representatives of at least two other importing countries. The Committee shall advise the Council or the Executive Committee on the matters set out in paragraphs 5, 6, and 7 of Article VI and on such other questions as the Council or the Executive Committee may refer to it. The Chairman of the Committee shall be appointed by the Council.

ARTICLE XVI

Finance

1. The expenses of Delegations to the Council, of the members of the Executive Committee, and of the members of the Standing Technical Advisory Committee on Price Equivalents shall be met by their respective Governments. All other expenses necessary for the administration of this Agreement, including those of the Secretariat, shall be met by annual contributions from the contracting Governments. The contribution of each Government for each crop-year shall be proportionate to the number of votes held by its Delegate when the budget for that crop-year is settled.

2. At its first Session, the Council shall approve its budget for the crop-year ending July 31, 1949 and assess the contribution to be paid by each contracting Government.

3. The Council shall at its first Session during the second half of each crop-year approve its budget for the following crop-year and assess the contribution to be paid by each contracting Government for that crop-year.

4. The initial contribution of any Government acceding to this Agreement after the first Session of the Council shall be assessed proportionately to the number of votes held by its Delegate and to the number of full months between its accession and the beginning of the first crop-year for which it is assessed under the provisions of paragraph 3 of this Article, but the assessments already made upon other Governments shall not be altered for the current crop-year.

5. Each contracting Government shall pay to the Secretary of the Council its full contribution within six months of its assessment. Any contracting Government failing to pay its contribution within one year of its assessment shall forfeit its voting rights until its contribution is paid, but shall not be deprived of its other rights nor relieved of its obligations under this Agreement. The Council shall redistribute, under the provisions of Article XII, the votes of any country which has forfeited its voting rights.

6. The Council shall publish an audited statement of all its receipts and expenditures during each crop-year.

7. Each contracting Government shall give consideration to granting to the funds of the Council and to the salaries paid by the Council to its staff, treatment in its territory no less favorable than that granted by it to the funds of, and salaries paid by, other intergovernmental bodies of comparable status.

8. In the event of the termination of this Agreement, the Council shall provide for the settlement of its liabilities and the disposal of its assets.

ARTICLE XVII

Relation to other agreements

So long as this Agreement remains in force, it shall prevail over any provisions inconsistent therewith which may be contained in any other agreement previously concluded between any of the contracting Governments, provided that should any two contracting Governments be parties to an agreement, entered into prior to March 1, 1947, for the purchase and sale of wheat, the Governments concerned shall supply full particulars of transactions under such agreement so that the quantities, irrespective of prices involved, shall be recorded in the register of transactions maintained by the Council in accordance with the provisions of Article III and so count toward the fulfillment of obligations of importing countries and obligations of exporting countries.

ARTICLE XVIII

Cooperation with Intergovernmental Organizations

1. The Council shall make whatever arrangements are required to ensure cooperation with the appropriate organs of the United Nations and its specialized agencies.

2. If the Council finds that any terms of this Agreement are materially inconsistent with such requirements as the United Nations through its appropriate organs and specialized agencies may establish regarding intergovernmental commodity agreements, such inconsistency shall be deemed to be a circumstance affecting adversely the operation of this Agreement and the procedure prescribed in paragraphs 3, 4, and 5 of Article XXII shall be applied.

ARTICLE XIX

Definitions

For the purposes of this Agreement:

1. "Bushel" means sixty pounds avoirdupois.

2. "Carrying charges" means the costs incurred for storage, interest, and insurance in holding wheat.

3. "C. i. f." means cost, insurance, and freight.

4. "Crop-year" means the period from August 1 to July 31, except that in Article IX it means in respect of Australia the period from December 1 to November 30 and in respect of the United States of America the period from July 1 to June 30.

5. "Exporting country" means, as the context may require, either a Government which has accepted this Agreement as the Government of an exporting country or that country itself.

6. "F. a. q." means fair average quality.

7. "F. o. b." means free on board.

8. "Free-market prices" means the prices at which transactions other than those relating to guaranteed purchases or sales take place between contracting exporting and contracting importing countries.

9. "Importing country" means, as the context may require, either a Government which has accepted this Agreement as the Government of an importing country or that country itself.

10. "International Trade Organization" means the specialized agency contemplated by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment or any interim body which that Conference may form to act on its behalf pending the definitive establishment of the International Trade Organization.

11. "Marketing costs" means all usual charges incurred in procurement, marketing, chartering, and forwarding.

12. "Old wheat" means wheat harvested more than two months prior to the beginning of the current crop-year of the exporting concerned.

13. "Stocks" means in Australia, Canada, and the United States of America the total of the stocks of old wheat held at the end of their respective crop-years in all elevators, warehouses, and mills and in transit or at railroad sidings; such "stocks" also include in the case of the United States of America stocks held on farms and in the case of Canada stocks of wheat of Canadian origin held in bond in the United States of America.

14. "Wheat", except in Articles VI and IX, includes wheat-flour. Seventy-two metric tons of wheat-flour shall be deemed to be equivalent to one hundred metric tons of wheat in all calculations relating to guaranteed purchases or sales, unless otherwise determined by the Council.

ARTICLE XX

Signature, acceptance, and entry into force

1. This Agreement shall be open for signature in Washington and shall remain open for signature until April 1, 1948 by the Governments of the countries listed in Annexes

I and II to Article II. The original of this Agreement shall be deposited with the Government of the United States of America, which shall transmit certified copies of it to each signatory and acceding Government.

2. This Agreement shall be subject to formal acceptance by the signatory Governments. Instruments of acceptance shall be deposited with the Government of the United States of America by July 1, 1948; provided, however, that an additional period shall be allowed by the Council for the deposit of instruments of acceptance on behalf of those importing countries which are prevented by a recess of their respective legislatures from accepting this Agreement by July 1, 1948. Instruments of acceptance shall become effective on the date of their deposit. The Government of the United States of America shall notify the Governments listed in Annexes I and II to Article II of the Governments which have signed this Agreement and of the Governments which have deposited instruments of acceptance.

3. Articles X to XXII inclusive of this Agreement shall come into force on July 1, 1948, and Articles I to IX inclusive shall come into force on August 1, 1948, between the Governments which have deposited their instruments of acceptance by July 1, 1948, provided that any such Government may, at the opening of the first Session of the International Wheat Council, established by Article XI of this Agreement, which Session shall be convened in Washington early in July 1948 by the Government of the United States of America, effect its withdrawal by notification to the Government of the United States of America if in the opinion of any such Government the guaranteed purchases or guaranteed sales of the countries whose Governments have formally accepted this Agreement are insufficient to ensure its successful operation. With respect to Governments which deposit their instruments of acceptance after July 1, 1948, the Agreement shall enter into force on the date of such deposit, provided that in no case shall Articles I to IX inclusive be deemed to have entered into force before August 1, 1948, as a result of such deposit.

ARTICLE XXI

Accession

Subject to unanimity of the votes cast, any Government may accede to this Agreement upon such conditions as the Council may lay down. Such accession shall be effected by the notification thereof by the Government concerned to the Government of the United States of America, which Government shall notify the signatory and acceding Governments of each such accession and of the date of the receipt thereof.

ARTICLE XXII

Duration, amendment, withdrawal, and termination

1. This Agreement shall remain in force until July 31, 1953.

2. The Council shall, not later than July 31, 1952, communicate to the contracting Governments its recommendations regarding the renewal of this Agreement.

3. If at any time circumstances arise which, in the opinion of the Council, affect or threaten to affect adversely the operation of this Agreement, the Council may by a simple majority of the votes held by the Governments of the exporting countries and by a simple majority of the votes held by the Governments of the importing countries recommend an amendment of this Agreement to the contracting Governments.

4. The Council may fix a time limit within which each contracting Government shall notify the Council whether or not it accepts the amendment. The amendment shall become effective upon its acceptance by (a) importing countries which hold a simple majority of the votes of the importing countries, including the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and (b) the Governments of Australia, Canada, and the United States of America.

5. Any contracting Government which has not notified the Council of its acceptance of the amendment by the date on which it becomes effective may, after giving such notice as the Council may require in each case, withdraw from this agreement at the end of the current crop-year, but shall not thereby be released from any obligations under this agreement not discharged by the end of that crop-year.

6. Any contracting Government which considers its national security endangered by the outbreak of hostilities may withdraw from this Agreement upon the expiry of thirty days' written notice to the Council. In the event of such a withdrawal, the Council may recommend an amendment of this agreement in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 3 of this Article.

In witness whereof the undersigned duly authorized representatives of the respective Governments have signed this Agreement on the dates appearing opposite their signatures.

Opened for signature in Washington, on March 6, 1948, in the English and French languages, each of which shall be authentic.

For Afghanistan:
ABDUL-HAI AZIZ.
March 29, 1948.
For Australia:
NORMAN MAKIN.
March 19, 1948.
For Austria:
L. KLEINWAECHTER.
March 29, 1948.
For Belgium:
SILVERCRUYS.
March 18, 1948.
For Brazil:
CARLOS MARTINS PEREIRA E SOUSA.
March 30, 1948.
For Canada:
CHARLES F. WILSON.
March 6, 1948.
For China:
V K WELLINGTON KOO.
March 6, 1948.
For Colombia (subject to ratification):
E GALLEGO.
March 6, 1948.
For Cuba:
GMO BELT.
Marzo 25, 1948.
For Czechoslovakia:
JOSEF HANČ.
March 30, 1948.
For Denmark:
S. SORENSEN.
March 6, 1948.
For the Dominican Republic:
EMILIO ZELLER.
March 30, 1948.
For Ecuador:
A DILLON.
March 31, 1948.
For Egypt:
LOUTFY MANSOUR.
March 6, 1948.
For the French Union and Saar:
H BONNET.
mars 30, 1948.
For Greece:
CONSTANTINE CARANICAS.
March 6, 1948.
For Guatemala:
Y GONZÁLEZ ARÉVALO.
March 31, 1948.
For India:
JAMSHED VESUGAR.
March 6, 1948.
R. L. GUPTA.
March 6, 1948.
For Ireland:
TIMOTHY O'CONNELL.
March 6, 1948.
For Italy:
ALBERTO TARCHIANI.
March 29, 1948.
For Lebanon:
EMILE MATTAR.
March 6, 1948.
For Liberia:
R. S. S. BRIGHT.
March 6, 1948.
For Mexico:
A OCHOA M.
Marzo 29, 1948.
For the Netherlands:
E. N. VAN KLEFFENS.
March 6, 1948.
For New Zealand:
R. W. MARSHALL.
March 24, 1948.
For Norway:
W. MUNTHE MORGENSTIERNE.
March 23, 1948.
For Peru:
P. J. M. LARRAÑAGA.
March 6, 1948.
For the Republic of the Philippines:
NARCISO RAMOS.
March 19, 1948.
M F OCCEÑA.
March 30, 1948.
For Poland:
J. WINIEWICZ.
March 31, 1948.
For Portugal:
ANTONIO FERREIRA D'ALMEIDA.
March 6, 1948.
For Sweden:
A AMINOFF.
March 30, 1948.
For Switzerland:
W. SCHILLING.
March 25, 1948.
For the Union of South Africa:
H. T. ANDREWS.
March 26, 1948.
For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
HERBERT BROADLEY.
March 6, 1948.
For the United States of America:
NORRIS E. DODD.
March 6, 1948.
LESLIE A. WHEELER.
March 6, 1948.
For Venezuela:
GONZALO CARNEVALI.
March 30, 1948.

SALE AND LEASE OF REAL PROPERTY IN BOULDER CITY, NEV.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on April 26 the Senate passed Senate bill 1448, Calendar No. 1189. A duplicate bill, with the exception of two words, has been passed by the House. It is my purpose to ask that the House bill be passed by the Senate. It will be necessary to make two small amendments in it. First I ask that the vote by which the Senate bill was passed be reconsidered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the vote by which Senate bill 1488 was passed is reconsidered.

Mr. BUTLER. I now ask that the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of House bill 4966.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BUTLER. I now ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4966.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4966) directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and lease certain houses, apartments, and lands in Boulder City, Nev.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I offer two amendments to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 10, after the word "occupied", it is proposed to strike out "the" and insert "a."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 11, after the word "occupies", it is proposed to strike out "one" and insert "it."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 1448 will be indefinitely postponed.

TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF TITLE VI OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT, AS AMENDED

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, according to the announcement made last Wednesday that the business of the Senate today would be the consideration of Calendar No. 1212, Senate bill 2565, to provide for a temporary extension of title VI of the National Housing Act, as amended, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2565.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the motion is not in order because the bill has not laid over for a legislative day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ferguson	McCarthy
Ball	Fulbright	McClellan
Brewster	Green	McFarland
Bridges	Gurney	McGrath
Brooks	Hatch	McKellar
Buck	Hayden	McMahon
Butler	Hickenlooper	Malone
Cain	Hoey	Martin
Capper	Holland	Maybank
Chavez	Ives	Moore
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Myers
Downey	Kilgore	O'Conor
Dworshak	Knowland	O'Daniel
Eastland	Langer	O'Mahoney
Ecton	Lodge	Overton
Ellender	Lucas	Pepper
Reed	Thye	Wiley
Robertson, Wyo.	Tydings	Williams
Russell	Vandenberg	Wilson
Saltonstall	Watkins	Young
Stennis	Wherry	
Thomas, Utah	White	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] is absent on official State business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, again I shall ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1212, Senate bill 2565.

Mr. FULBRIGHT and Mr. TYDINGS rose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if there are going to be objections, I should like to have them withheld for just a moment. First, I should like to explain to the Senate that the existing law expires today; by tonight it will be ineffective unless it is extended. Title VI of the National Housing Act provides for loans under the Housing Act. Twice it has been extended because those who believed in it felt it should be extended, in the hope that they could do something more with it. There have been 30-day extensions. The proponents of the measure have been the ones who have asked for that.

I was asked to bring up this bill today, and on Wednesday I made announcement that it would be the order of business for today. Certainly if the extensions which have already been made have been worthy ones and have been needed in the past, all the arguments used for making them should apply to making a further extension at this time.

I have no hard and fast feelings about the matter, and I do not know yet what arguments will be presented in favor of making a further extension for 30 days or for a year or for any other time. I do not know what those arguments are. All I am saying is that at least the Republican leadership is charged with not letting this act expire tonight without making an effort to continue or extend it. Because of that fact we have set the bill down for consideration today.

I should like very much to have the Senate proceed to consider the proposed legislation, because the announcement has been made, and it is the only proposed legislation which it was announced would be before the Senate today, so far as I know, although other measures could be considered either by unanimous consent or by motion, if the Senate so desires. But if we are to have a program and if we are to consider proposed legislation, the Senate must proceed in an orderly fashion.

So I appeal to the Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle to permit Senate bill 2565 to be considered at this time. After it is taken up, Senators, of course, can do as they please regarding it.

Mr. President, I have great affection and admiration for the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and I hope he will comply with my request. Certainly if there is anything that Senators wish to present or have considered in connection with the bill or if there is any debate in which they wish to engage, they can do so after the bill is before the Senate. They can debate the bill today or on Monday or all next week, if that is desired. But it seems to me that the Senate must follow some program. This bill seemed to be an emergency measure, in view of the fact that the act expires tonight; and certainly we should take some action in regard to extending it.

So, Mr. President, once again I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2565, Calendar No. 1212.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say I thought I made clear to the Senator from Nebraska why I objected. In objecting, I was performing a task which I had been requested to perform by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], who, as is well known, has been one of the leading spirits in connection with the housing legislation. He practically rewrote the bill which was passed by the Senate.

I am frank to say that I did not go into all his reasons for making that request of me. I did not know that there was this dead line which would require that the Senate proceed with the bill at this time. The Senator from Vermont requested that I object to the consideration of the bill today because he would have to be out of town today. He is out of town today; he is not now present. He will return next week. I thought there

would be no question in regard to a request for a postponement. I am frank to say that I am not prepared to argue on the merits as to whether the bill should be brought up at this time. But I am obligated to object. I did object because of that request, and I have to make the point of order. Unfortunately, I have no way of getting in touch with the Senator from Vermont at this time, or else I might be able to straighten out the matter. But, Mr. President, under the circumstances I can do nothing else but object. Therefore, I object.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me say that I appreciate the fact that the Senator from Arkansas has accepted the responsibility of making the objection, and he has to keep his word.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I had no idea that this situation would arise.

Mr. WHERRY. But if matters have reached a point where some Member of the Senate can prevent the carrying out of a necessary program in the Senate merely by objecting to the proposed consideration of an emergency measure, especially after it has been announced that that measure would be taken up, it will simply be impossible to have such necessary matters considered by the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I may say to the Senator it is a very common practice for Members on both sides to request the whip to object, in their absence. That happens every day.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, that is true relative to measures which have not been before the Senate and are not on the regular calendar. I agree with the decision of the Chair sustaining the point of order. I have not appealed from the ruling. But I feel this is emergency legislation, and announcement was made last Wednesday concerning its consideration today. Those who have asked that objection be made had conferred with me, and I had told them I would move to take up the bill. They knew that when they left. I say the legislation is important; the act terminates today, and we are charged with responsibility.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. Will the Senator from Arkansas tell me, if he can, whether the Senator from Vermont explained to the Senator from Arkansas that title VI, which Senate bill 2565 proposes to extend, actually expires as of midnight today?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As I said in the beginning, I did not realize the situation and how important action on the bill appears to be. I thought it could be delayed until next week, without difficulty, so I did not inquire into it. But the Senator from Vermont did intimate that it has some bearing upon the fate of the housing bill itself. I assumed, having knowledge of the Senator's great interest in that bill, that he knew, and that he had good reason for his request. It seemed to me at the time to be a very common ordinary thing to do. I did not pin him down; I made no point of it.

I, for other reasons, have made an investigation. I know that many Senators are absent from the Senate today. I therefore thought it would be very easy to have the bill put over, so I did not inquire of the Senator from Vermont, I am frank to say. I regret now that I did not. I had no personal interest in the matter but I feel committed to make the point. That is really my position. I do not know what all the reasons of the Senator from Vermont may be for making the request, but I surmise he thinks the bill has a bearing upon the housing bill which the Senate passed. I assumed that to be so.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield for a brief statement?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CAIN. Quite naturally, I hesitate to read or say anything on the floor in the absence of any Member to whom the remarks I am about to quote refer, but I think few more important problems, either of policy or of need, have come before the Senate for a very long time. In support of my contention, I desire to read a brief excerpt, for the benefit and knowledge of each Senator upon the floor, which excerpt comes from a meeting of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, of which the Senator from Arkansas and the junior Senator from Washington as well as the Senator from Vermont are members.

The excerpt concerns itself with a problem in which those of us who do not want title VI to expire are tremendously interested. I shall quote only one page:

Senator TOBEY—

As we all know, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Senator TOBEY. Now Senator FLANDERS has an important matter to present.

Senator FLANDERS. This concerns the question of the extension of title VI. As you remember, we extended it for 2 months, and JESS WOLCOTT wanted it for 1 month. The 1 month expires April 30. This is the middle of the building season, and it ought to be extended another 30 days. It is in the nature at this late date of emergency legislation. I wonder if it would be possible for this committee to vote to put in a second bill with the same wording as the resolution that was passed giving authority to have it introduced tomorrow and ask for unanimous consent to have it passed and sent over to the House.

Senator BRICKER. Pending the passage of permanent legislation.

Senator FLANDERS. That is correct. There would be about $250,000,000 required.

Senator BUCK. I move the adoption of the Senator's resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. You have heard the motion. As many as are in favor say "aye"; those opposed, "no." It is carried.

Mr. President, that is an excerpt from the minutes of an executive session of the Banking and Currency Committee held on Tuesday, April 27, 1948.

That motion carried, and as a result, a definite, positive request was made to have the matter of title VI presented to the Senate, not on Friday, April 30, but on Wednesday, April 28. It is because of the direction of the committee, of which the distinguished Senator from Vermont is a member, that we who want to see title VI extended find it difficult to understand why there could or should be any possible objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 2565.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I merely want to say I have no personal objection to this extent: It does not occur to me that the bill could not be passed on Monday, achieving all that would be possible if it were passed today. Many emergency acts have been passed over. Appropriation bills have been passed over, when entire departments have been without money. There are many such illustrations, yet the Government goes on. It did not occur to me to be vital that the bill be passed today. I am not opposed to the extension of title VI, as such, but there are considerations which appear to be sufficiently important in the mind of the Senator from Vermont. He, as I say, together with the Senator from Ohio, has taken the lead in connection with the subject of housing legislation. I naturally assumed he had good reasons for making the request, and I also assumed the Republican leadership would have a certain regard for his request. That is all there is to it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to ask a question, now that he has made the objection in good faith, would there be any objection to the junior Senator from Nebraska moving the consideration of the bill?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agreed to make the point of order, as a part of the agreement. If the Senator from Nebraska could contact the Senator from Vermont, I should have no objection at all.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. I merely rise to raise the question, which I think has already been made clear. As I understand, what the Senator from Vermont objects to is the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2565), to extend for 30 days one of the titles in the bill (S. 866) which the Senate passed a week ago or more. In Senate bill 866, the entire title was extended for one year, as I recall.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. IVES. I cannot comprehend why the Senator from Arkansas should object to extending something in the bill for 30 days. I seem to recall that he supported the bill, in which was included the extension for 1 year.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement since the chairman of the committee is also absent. As a member of the committee I approved the short extension which has been mentioned by the Sena-

tor from Washington. But I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska a question, which he may not be able to answer. In the event the 30-day extension measure is brought up, is there any assurance to those of us who voted for the housing legislation that the bill may not be amended?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as I explained in the beginning, I do not know anything about what might happen to the bill in the event it is brought up. What I am interested in, and what I am trying to tell Senators, is simply this: It was announced last Wednesday that the bill would be called up for consideration today. It is necessary that the Senate follow an orderly procedure. I think my good friend from South Carolina will agree with me that I have not sought to bring up the bill without notice. All Members of the Senate knew that it was to be brought up for consideration. To wait until the last minute and then offer an objection to the consideration of a measure designed to extend a law, which, if not extended, would terminate the loaning facilities of the Housing Act, at midnight today, certainly is, I think, unfortunate. Whether the present law will be extended for 30 days or for 1 year, of course I do not know. The Senator from South Carolina has been here longer than I have. I am not here representing the proponents or the opponents of the measure. I am asking the Senator's support and also the support of the Senator from Arkansas. In view of the fact that it was announced that the bill would be called up for consideration, we should be permitted to take up the measure. We can debate it all of next week, if necessary; but certainly it should be brought up today. That is the responsibility of the leadership, because the Act will expire tonight. I do not wish to be responsible for letting it die without making an effort to have it extended.

Mr. MAYBANK. I want again to say to the distinguished Senator that I do not think there is any great objection to agreeing to an additional 30-day extension, as was done previously; but to bring the bill up in the absence of the chairman of the subcommittee, who asked that action be postponed, appears to me to be rather unusual.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think it is unnecessary to continue the debate. Either we will bring the bill up or we will not. I think the point of order was well made. It is a fact that this particular piece of legislation has not been on the calendar a full legislative day, althought it was reported last Wednesday, and it was announced that it would be brought up today. I did not anticipate that there would be objection. But since there has been objection made, and since the distinguished Senator has said that if I move to take it up he will make a point of order—and of course the point of order would be sustained—I feel that my responsibility to continue this effort is greater than any other step in procedure. So I now move——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if it be in order, I wonder if the Senator from Washington could tell the Senate whether it is proposed to provide for an extension for 1 year.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I am delighted; in fact, I am enthusiastic over being given an opportunity to state publicly the position of the junior Senator from Washington. The position was explained to the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee on Wednesday of this week that it would be more proper and effective to extend the loan provisions of title VI for the period of a year rather than for a period of 30 days. I said, in response to a question by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] on Wednesday, that if he wanted to secure today unanimous consent to consider the measure, I would propose that suggestion to the Senate through the medium of an amendment, and that I hoped very strongly that it would be agreed to. I do not know how many other Senators will agree with what seems to me to be the soundness of my position, but I think it is wholly and completely less than fair not to have an immediate discussion of the issue involved, because if we do not we shall have failed to keep faith with the builders of the country, for reasons which have not yet come out publicly on the floor of the Senate, by not taking action on a piece of legislation passed by the Senate 30 days ago and which expires at midnight tonight.

Mr. President, I should like to say one more thing to the Senator from Arkansas, for the benefit of other Senators. The Banking and Currency Committee held a meeting on Tuesday of this week, during which, as I have related, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] asked authority from the committee to ask the next day for unanimous consent to consider the measure. He hoped to have passed the bill extending title VI and have it go to the House. It so happened that the junior Senator from Washington was not in attendance at that meeting. The next morning, Wednesday, April 28, at approximately 10 minutes after the Senate convened at noon, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, whom I hold, as he knows, in very high regard, came to me and said, as accurately as I can remember, and I think exactly, this:

HARRY, I shall ask for a unanimous-consent request to consider title VI on which the committee agreed yesterday when you were not present, to extend for a period of 30 days its operation.

The Senator from New Hampshire then said: "Is that all right with you?"

I said, "Mr. Chairman, no." He said, "Why?" I responded that I wanted to raise several questions. I went so far as to tell him what those questions were. I said, "Mr. TOBEY, I am in opposition to extending for 30 days this legislation when we can do a better job through extending it for a year. I want to make that conviction clear to my colleagues in the Senate."

His response was: "Harry, I thought that Senator FLANDERS would handle this matter, but he is not well and has asked me to handle it for him."

That is the end of the conversation. It could not have been more than quarter after or 20 minutes after 12. Had the instruction been given by the committee and been approved, and had action been taken on Wednesday of this week, the act would have been in the hands of the President for signature and there would have been no controversy to the consternation of the builders of America.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I desire to make my position perfectly clear, in view of the remarks of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] as to the merits of the extension. I am in favor of it. The recent observation of the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] has clarified the differences involved. I am guessing that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] believes that an extension of the act for a year, as the Senator from Washington intends to request through an amendment, would be prejudicial to the housing bill which was passed. I should like to suggest that by unanimous consent the Senate pass an extension for 30 days, and debate a year's extension when the chairman of the subcommittee is present.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn, to meet at 1:12 p. m.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his motion for the purpose of permitting me to introduce a bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is not debatable. The motion made by the Senator from Nebraska is that the Senate adjourn until 1:12 p. m.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Is a quorum call in order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks so.

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Holland	O'Mahoney
Ball	Ives	Overton
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	Reed
Brooks	Kilgore	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Knowland	Russell
Cain	Langer	Saltonstall
Chavez	Lodge	Stennis
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McClellan	Thye
Downey	McFarland	Tydings
Eastland	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ecton	McMahon	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Fulbright	Martin	White
Green	Maybank	Wiley
Gurney	Moore	Williams
Hatch	Murray	Wilson
Hayden	Myers	Young
Hickenlooper	O'Conor	
Hoey	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] that the Senate adjourn until 1 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.

Mr. MAYBANK. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is absent on account of illness.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] is absent on official State business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is unavoidably detained. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are detained on official committee business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] are absent on official business at Government departments.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 17, as follows:

YEAS—44

Aiken	Holland	Robertson, Wyo.
Ball	Ives	Russell
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Bridges	Knowland	Stennis
Brooks	Langer	Thye
Buck	Lodge	Tydings
Cain	McClellan	Vandenberg
Cordon	McFarland	Watkins
Downey	Malone	Wherry
Eastland	Martin	White
Ecton	Moore	Wiley
Ferguson	O'Conor	Williams
Gurney	O'Daniel	Wilson
Hickenlooper	Overton	Young
Hoey	Reed	

NAYS—17

Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Murray
Connally	Kilgore	Myers
Fulbright	Lucas	O'Mahoney
Green	McKellar	Pepper
Hatch	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	Maybank	

NOT VOTING—35

Baldwin	Flanders	Revercomb
Barkley	George	Robertson, Va.
Bricker	Hawkes	Smith
Bushfield	Hill	Sparkman
Butler	Jenner	Stewart
Byrd	Kem	Taft
Capehart	McCarran	Taylor
Capper	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McGrath	Tobey
Donnell	Magnuson	Umstead
Dworshak	Millikin	Wagner
Ellender	Morse	

So Mr. WHERRY's motion was agreed to, and at 1 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m. the Senate adjourned until 1 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m. the same day.

AFTER ADJOURNMENT

(Legislative day of Friday, April 30, 1948)

The Senate met at 1 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m., under the order previously made.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, when trouble comes, we know that we need Thee and then are not ashamed to seek Thy help. May we have the humility and the wisdom to accept Thy help when we seem to need it least, for in that time of confidence we are most likely to blunder.

Keep us all this day. We ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, is the Journal of the previous session to be approved?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unfortunately, the Journal is not yet ready for approval.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON WAR CONTRACT TERMINATIONS AND SETTLEMENTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fifteenth quarterly report on war-contract terminations and settlements for the period January 1 to March 31, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ALLOCATION OF STEEL AND PIG IRON

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of steel and pig iron for the construction of domestic railway freight cars and the repair of railroad rolling stock, and copies of the request for compliance therewith which the Secretary of Commerce has issued to various steel companies, pig-iron producers, contract car builders, railroads and private-car lines, and component parts manufacturers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1703. A bill for the relief of Lorraine Burns Mullen; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1195);

H. R. 345. A bill for the relief of Ollie McNeill and Ester B. McNeill; without amendment (Rept. No. 1196);

H. R. 1392. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Charlotte E. Harvey; without amendment (Rept. No. 1197);

H. R. 1653. A bill for the relief of Edward W. Bigger; without amendment (Rept. No. 1198);

H. R. 1878. A bill to amend the immigration laws to deny admission to the United States of persons who may be coming here for the purpose of engaging in activities which will endanger the public safety of the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 1199);

H. R. 1953. A bill for the relief of John F. Reeves; without amendment (Rept. No. 1200);

H. R. 1975. A bill to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917 and subsection (a) of section 338 of the Nationality Act of 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 1201);

H. R. 2000. A bill for the relief of Jeffersonville flood-control district, Jeffersonville, Ind., a municipal corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1202);

H. R. 3189. A bill for the relief of Joe Parry, a minor; without amendment (Rept. No. 1203);

H. R. 3566. A bill to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1204);

H. R. 4129. A bill for the relief of Jerline Floyd Givens and the legal guardian of William Earl Searight, a minor; without amendment (Rept. No. 1205);

H. R. 5137. A bill to amend the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1206); and

H. R. 5193. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; with amendments (Rept. No. 1207).

By Mr. FERGUSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; with amendments (Rept. No. 1208).

By Mr. BREWSTER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 3. A bill to provide for the training of air-traffic control-tower operators; without amendment (Rept. No. 1209);

S. 2451. A bill to encourage the development of an international air-transportation system adapted to the needs of the foreign commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1210); and

H. R. 4892. A bill to amend the act of July 23, 1947 (61 Stat. 409) (Public Law No. 219 of the 80th Cong.); without amendment (Rept. No. 1211).

By Mr. REED, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 2216. A bill to amend section 205 of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to joint boards; without amendment (Rept. No. 1212);

S. 2426. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 1213);

H. R. 2759. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide limitations on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by or against common carriers by motor vehicle, common carriers by water, and freight forwarders; without amendment (Rept. No. 1214); and

H. R. 3350. A bill relating to the rules for the prevention of collisions on certain inland waters of the United States and on the western rivers, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1215).

By Mr. REED (for Mr. CAPEHART), from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 1979. A bill directing the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to undertake certain studies of the soft-shell clam in Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Maine; with amendments (Rept. No. 1216);

H. R. 107. A bill for the acquisition and maintenance of wildlife management and control areas in the State of California, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1217);

H. R. 3505. A bill authorizing an appropriation for investigating and rehabilitating the oyster beds damaged or destroyed by the intrusion of fresh water and the blockage of natural passages west of the Mississippi River in the vicinity of Lake Mechant and Bayou Severin, Terrebonne Parish, La., and by the opening of the Bonnet Carre spillway, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1218);

H. R. 3510. A bill to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in the Territory of Alaska; with amendments (Rept. No. 1219);

H. R. 4018. A bill authorizing the transfer of certain real property for wildlife, or other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1220); and

H. R. 4071. A bill to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1221).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

H. R. 4236. A bill to amend the Civil Service Act to remove certain discrimination with respect to the appointment of persons having any physical handicap to positions in the classified civil service; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1222).

By Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 6226. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1223).

ELIMINATION OF POLL TAX IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers, and I submit a report (No. 1225) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. BROOKS. I ask unanimous consent that the report be not printed until the minority views are filed, and that it then be printed with the majority report, which is to be filed not later than Tuesday, May 4.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 30, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2409) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2590. A bill to amend title X of the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to provide for the encouragement and stimulation of aid to the blind recipients to become wholly or partially self-supporting; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CAIN (by request):

S. 2591. A bill to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Gen. Jose Gervasio Artigas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

MRS. MAUD M. WRIGHT AND MRS. MAXINE MILLS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original resolution providing for reference to the Court of Claims House bill 1226 and Senate bill 1585, for the relief of Mrs. Maud M. Wright and Mrs. Maxine Mills, and I submit a report (No. 1224) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 227) was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the bills H. R. 1226 and S. 1585, for the relief of Mrs. Maud M. Wright and Mrs. Maxine Mills, with the accompanying papers, are hereby referred to the Court of Claims in pursuance of section 151 of the Judicial Code (28 U. S. C., sec. 257), for such action as the court may take in accordance therewith.

EXTENSION OF TERMS OF OFFICE OF MEMBERS OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, earlier today I introduced for appropriate reference a bill providing for amendment to the Atomic Energy Act, changing the date of the expiration of the present terms of members of the Atomic Energy Commission from August 1, next, until June 1950. I say that for the information of the Members of the Senate. At a later date I shall undertake to give to the Senate the reasons and justification for the bill.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE REPORTS AND MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, recently when a majority of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program filed a report on the Hughes investigation, time was given the minority until today to file minority views. Unfortunately because of the stress of work in the Senate, those of us who desire to file an expression of our views have not had an opportunity to get together and agree upon just what we should submit. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that we may have until May 15 to file such views.

In connection with the same request, I ask that a like period of time be given the majority of the committee to file, either as a committee or as individuals, any further expression of views they may desire to submit.

In the same request I ask that the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] be given permission to file minority views on the industrial mobilization report from the same committee, and that he be allowed the same period of time.

Further, I ask that the majority of the committee be given time to file views on the industrial mobilization bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the multilateral request of the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if the Chair will withhold submitting the request, I wish the able Senator from New Mexico would include in his request with respect to the report on industrial mobilization any Members who may wish to file views, because others besides the Senator from Florida might wish to join in the minority views.

Mr. HATCH. I so amend my request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

WHICH PARTY IN 1948?—ADDRESS BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Which Party in 1948?" delivered by Senator O'MAHONEY at the Harvard Law School Forum, Cambridge, Mass., April 23, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE BUILDERS OF THE BOMB—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Builders of the Bomb," published in the New York Times of April 30, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONFIRMATION OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION NOMINEES — LETTER FROM J. H. RUSH

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from J. H. Rush, secretary-treasurer, Federation of American Scientists, relating to confirmation of Atomic Energy Commission nominees, published in the New York Times, which appears in the Appendix.]

JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Jefferson-Jackson Day address delivered by Senator MAGNUSON at Phoenix, Ariz., on February 19, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

RHODE ISLAND'S VETERAN LAWS

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an outline of Rhode Island's laws affecting veterans, their dependents, and organizations, compiled by John P. Riley, department adjutant, Disabled American Veterans, Providence, R. I., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MINIMUM WAGE—ARTICLE BY LOWELL MELLETT

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Senate Committee Ponders How Much To Increase Minimum Wage," by Lowell Mellett, from the Washington Star of April 20, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDUCATIONAL CRISIS—EDITORIAL FROM THE DAILY ATHENAEUM

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Educational Crisis," published in the Daily Athenaeum, the West Virginia University student newspaper, which appears in the Appendix.]

A VETERAN'S THANKS FOR TRAINING RECEIVED UNDER THE GI VOCATIONAL TRAINING BILL

[Mr. BUCK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from

M. Robert Felton, of Wilmington, Del., expressing his appreciation for training received by him under the GI vocational bill, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRIZE-WINNING SCIENCE STUDENTS HAVE MELTING-POT PARENTAGE—ARTICLE BY SCIENCE SERVICE

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Prize Winning Science Students Have Melting-Pot Parentage," by Science Service, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED OFFERING OF KAISER-FRAZER CORP. STOCK—LETTERS FROM SENATOR TOBEY AND KAISER-FRAZER CORP.

[Mr. AIKEN, on behalf of Mr. TOBEY, asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed by Senator TOBEY to Robert K. McConnaughey, Acting Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, and a letter from the Kaiser-Frazer Corp., regarding the proposed offering of Kaiser-Frazer Corp. stock, which appear in the Appendix.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF TITLE VI OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT, AS AMENDED

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2565, Calendar No. 1212, to provide for a temporary extension of title VI of the National Housing Act, as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2565, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2565) to provide for a temporary extension of title VI of the National Housing Act, as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2565) to provide for a temporary extension of title VI of the National Housing Act, as amended.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 603 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended—

(1) by striking out "$5,350,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$5,600,000,000";

(2) by striking out "April 30, 1948" in each place where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "May 31, 1948."

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Perhaps the Senator from Washington would be willing to have the amendment printed in the RECORD at this point, and explain its contents to the Senate, in lieu of the full reading of the amendment.

Mr. CAIN. That is completely and entirely acceptable, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. CAIN's amendment is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended, as follows:

"'TITLE VI AMENDMENTS

"'(a) Section 603 (a) is amended—

"'(1) by striking out "$5,350,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$5,950,000,000 except that with the approval of the President such aggregate amount may be increased to not to exceed $6,950,000,000";

"'(2) by striking out "April 30, 1948" in each place where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "March 31, 1949";

"'(3) by striking out the period and adding a comma and the following: "and that, of the total authorization provided in this subsection, not less than $800,000,000 shall be made available for the insurance of mortgages on rental properties under section 608, and not less than $200,000,000 shall be made available for the insurance of mortgages on multifamily dwellings under section 603, on which commitments for insurance are issued subsequent to March 31, 1948."

"'(b) Section 603 (b) (5) is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may prescribe by regulation a higher maximum rate of interest, not exceeding 4½ percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time, if he finds that the mortgage market demands it."

"'(c) Section 608 (b) (3) (B) is amended by striking out the semicolon and the word "and" at the end of the first proviso and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: *"And provided further,* That the principal obligation of the mortgage shall not, in any event, exceed 90 percent of the Administrator's estimate of the replacement cost of the property or project on the basis of the costs prevailing on December 31, 1947, for properties or projects of comparable quality in the locality where such property or project is to be located; and."

"'(d) (1) Section 608 (b) (3) (C) is amended by striking out "$1,500 per room" and inserting in lieu thereof "$8,100 per family unit";

"'(2) Section 608 (b) (3) (C) is amended by striking out the colon and the proviso and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

"'(e) Section 609 is amended—

"'(a) By striking out all of paragraph (1) of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'"(1) The manufacturer shall establish that binding purchase contracts have been executed satisfactory to the Administrator providing for the purchase and delivery of the houses to be manufactured, which contracts shall provide for the payment of the purchase price at such time as may be agreed to by the parties thereto, but, in no event, shall the purchase price be payable on a date in excess of 30 days after the date of delivery of such houses, unless not less than 20 percent of such purchase price is paid on or before the date of delivery and the lender has accepted and discounted, or has agreed to accept and discount, pursuant to subsection (i) of this section a promissory note or notes, executed by the purchaser, representing the unpaid portion of such purchase price, in which event such unpaid portion of the purchase price may be payable on a date not in excess of 180 days from the date of delivery of such houses."

"'(b) By striking out the first and second sentences of paragraph (4) of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'"The loan shall involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed 90 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the necessary current cost, exclusive of profit, of manufacturing the houses, which are the subject of such purchase contracts assigned to secure the loan, less any sums paid by the purchaser under said purchase contracts prior to the assignment thereof. The loan shall be secured by an assignment of the aforesaid purchase contracts and of all sums payable thereunder on or after the date of such assignment, with the right in the assignee to proceed against such security in case of default as provided in the assignment, which assignment shall be in such form and contain such terms and conditions, as may be prescribed by the Administrator; and the Administrator may require such other agreements and undertakings to further secure the loan as he may determine, including the right, in case of default or at any time necessary to protect the lender, to compel delivery to the lender of any houses then owned and in the possession of the borrower."

"'(c) By adding at the end of subsection (f) the following new sentence: "The provisions of section 603 (d) shall also be applicable to loans insured under this section and the reference in said section 603 (d) to a mortgage shall be construed to include a loan or loans with respect to which a contract of insurance is issued pursuant to this section."

"'(d) By adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'" (i) (1) In addition to the insurance of the principal loan to finance the manufacture of housing, as provided in this section, and in order to provide short-term financing in the sale of houses to be delivered pursuant to the purchase contract or contracts assigned as security for such principal loan, the Administrator is authorized, under such terms and conditions and subject to such limitations as he may prescribe, to insure the lender against any losses it may sustain resulting from the acceptance and discount of a promissory note or notes executed by a purchaser of any such houses representing an unpaid portion of the purchase price of any such houses. No such promissory note or notes accepted and discounted by the lender pursuant to this subsection shall involve a principal obligation in excess of 80 percent of the purchase price of the manufactured house or houses; have a maturity in excess of 180 days from the date of the note or bear interest in excess of 4 percent per annum; nor may the principal amount of such promissory notes, with respect to any individual principal loan, outstanding and unpaid at any one time, exceed in the aggregate an amount prescribed by the Administrator.

"'"(2) The Administrator is authorized to include in any contract of insurance executed by him with respect to the insurance of a loan to finance the manufacture of houses, provisions to effectuate the insurance against any such losses under this subsection.

"'"(3) The failure of the purchaser to make any payment due under or provided to be paid by the terms of any note or notes executed by the purchaser and accepted and discounted by the lender under the provisions of this subsection, shall be considered as a default under this subsection, and if such default continues for a period of 30 days, the lender shall be entitled to receive the benefits of the insurance, as provided in subsection (d) of this section except that debentures issued pursuant to this subsection shall have a face value equal to the unpaid principal balance of the loan plus interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum from the date of default to the date the application is filed for the insurance benefits.

"'"(4) Debentures issued with respect to the insurance granted under this subsection shall be issued in accordance with the provisions of section 604 (d) except that such debentures shall be dated as of the date application is filed for the insurance benefits and shall bear interest from such date.

"'"(5) The Administrator is authorized to fix a premium charge for the insurance granted under this subsection, in addition to the premium charge authorized under subsection (h) of this section. Such

premium charge shall not exceed an amount equivalent to 1 percent of the original principal of such promissory note or notes and shall be paid at such time and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Administrator."

"'(f) Section 610 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'"The Administrator is further authorized to insure or to make commitments to insure in accordance with the provisions of this section any mortgage executed in connection with the sale by the Government, or any agency or official thereof, of any of the so-called Greenbelt towns, or parts thereof, including projects, or parts thereof, known as Greenhills, Ohio, Greenbelt, Md., and Greendale, Wis., developed under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, or of any of the village properties under the jurisdiction of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and any mortgage executed in connection with the first resale, within 2 years from the date of its acquisition from the Government of any portion of a project or property which is the security for a mortgage insured pursuant to the provisions of this section."

"'(g) Title VI is amended by adding after section 610 the following new section:

"'"SEC. 611. (a) In addition to mortgages insured under other sections of this title, and in order to assist and encourage the application of cost-reduction techniques through large-scale modernized site construction of housing and the erection of houses produced by modern industrial processes, the Administrator is authorized to insure mortgages (including advances on such mortgages during construction) which are eligible for insurance as hereinafter provided.

"'"(b) To be eligible for insurance under this section, a mortgage shall—

"'"(1) have been made to and be held by a mortgagee approved by the Administrator as responsible and able to service the mortgage properly;

"'"(2) cover property, held by a mortgagor approved by the Administrator, upon which there is to be constructed or erected dwelling units for not less than 25 families consisting of a group of single-family or 2-family dwellings approved by the Administrator for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction: *Provided*, That during the course of construction there may be located upon the mortgaged property a plant for the fabrication or storage of such dwellings or sections or parts thereof, and the Administrator may consent to the removal or release of such plant from the lien of the mortgage upon such terms and conditions as he may approve;

"'"(3) involve a principal obligation in an amount—

"'"(A) not to exceed 90 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the completed property or project, exclusive of any plant of the character described in paragraph (2) of this subsection located thereon; and

"'"(B) not to exceed a sum computed on the individual dwellings comprising the total project, as follows:

"'"(i) $8,100 or 90 percent of the valuation, whichever is less, with respect to each single-family dwelling; and

"'"(ii) $12,500 or 90 percent of the valuation, whichever is less, with respect to each two-family dwelling.

"'"With respect to the insurance of advances during construction, the Administrator is authorized to approve advances by the mortgagee to cover the cost of materials delivered upon the mortgaged property and labor performed in the fabrication or erection thereof;

"'"(4) provide for complete amortization by periodic payments within such term as the Administrator shall prescribe and shall bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance) at not to exceed 4 percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time: *Provided*, That the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may prescribe by regulation a higher maximum rate of interest, not exceeding 4½ percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time, if he finds that the mortgage market demands it. The Administrator may consent to the release of a part or parts of the mortgaged property from the lien of the mortgage upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe and the mortgage may provide for such release.

"'"(c) Preference or priority of opportunity in the occupancy of the mortgaged property for veterans of World War II and their immediate families and for hardship cases as defined by the Administrator shall be provided under such regulations and procedures as may be prescribed by the Administrator.

"'"(d) The provisions of subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) of section 608 shall be applicable to mortgages insured under this section."

"'TITLE II AMENDMENTS

"'(h) Section 203 (b) (2) (B) is amended by striking out "$5,400" and inserting in lieu thereof "$6,300."

"'(i) Section 203 (b) (2) (C) is amended—

"'(1) by striking out "$8,600" and inserting in lieu thereof "$9,500";

"'(2) by striking out "$6,000" in each place where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$7,000";

"'(3) by striking out "$10,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$11,000".

"'(j) Section 203 (b) is amended by striking out in paragraph numbered (3) the following: "of the character described in paragraph (2) (B) of this subsection" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "on property approved for insurance prior to the beginning of construction".

"'(k) Section 203 (b) is amended as follows:

"'(1) By striking out the period at the end of paragraph (2) (C), inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the word "'or", and adding the following new paragraph:

"'"(D) not to exceed $6,000 and not to exceed 90 percent of the appraised value, as of the date the mortgage is accepted for insurance (or 95 percent if, in the determination of the Administrator, insurance of mortgages involving a principal obligation in such amount under this paragraph would not reasonably be expected to contribute to substantial increases in costs and prices of housing facilities for families of moderate income), of a property, urban, suburban, or rural, upon which there is located a dwelling designed principally for a single-family residence the construction of which is begun after March 31, 1949, and which is approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction: *Provided*, That the Administrator may by regulation provide that the principal obligation of any mortgage eligible for insurance under this paragraph shall be fixed at a lesser amount than $6,000 where he finds that for any section of the country or at any time a lower-cost dwelling for families of lower income is feasible without sacrifice of sound standards of construction, design, and livability: *And provided further*, That with respect to mortgages insured under this paragraph the mortgagor shall be the owner and occupant of the property at the time of the insurance and shall have paid on account of the property at least 10 percent (or 5 percent, in the case of a 95 percent mortgage insured pursuant to this paragraph (D)) of the appraised value in cash or its equivalent, or shall be the builder constructing the dwelling in which case the principal obligation shall not exceed 85 percent of the appraised value of the property."

"'(2) By striking out the period at the end of paragraph numbered (3), and adding a comma and the following: "or not to exceed 30 years in the case of a mortgage insured under paragraph (2) (D) of this subsection."

"'(3) By striking out the period at the end of paragraph No. (5) and adding a comma and the following: "or not to exceed 4 percent per annum in the case of a mortgage insured under paragraph (2) (D) of this subsection."

"'(l) (1) Section 203 (c) is amended (1) by striking out in the last sentence the words "section or section 210" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "title"; and (2) by striking out in said sentence (i) the words "under this section", and (ii) the following: "and a mortgage on the same property is accepted for insurance at the time of such payment,".

"'(2) Section 603 (c) is amended by striking out in the next to the last sentence the following: "and a mortgage on the same property is accepted for insurance at the time of such payment,".

"'(m) Section 204 (a) is amended—

"'(1) by striking out, in the last sentence, the following: "prior to July 1, 1944,";

"'(2) by inserting between the first and second provisos in the last sentence the following: "*And provided further*, That with respect to mortgages which are accepted for insurance under section 203 (b) (2) (D) or under the second proviso of section 207 (c) (2) of this act, there may be included in the debentures issued by the Administrator on account of the cost of foreclosure (or of acquiring the property by other means) actually paid by the mortgagee and approved by the Administrator an amount, not in excess of two-thirds of such cost or $75 whichever is the greater:".

"'(n) (1) Section 207 (b) is amended by amending paragraph No. (1) to read as follows:

"'"(1) Federal or State instrumentalities municipal corporate instrumentalities of one or more States, or limited dividend or redevelopment or housing corporations restricted by Federal or State laws or regulations of State banking or insurance departments as to rents, charges, capital structure, rate of return, or methods of operation; or."

"'(2) Section 207 (c) is amended by amending the first sentence to read as follows:

"'"(c) To be eligible for insurance under this section a mortgage on any property or project shall involve a principal obligation in an amount—

"'"(1) not to exceed $5,000,000, or, if executed by a mortgagor coming within the provisions of paragraph No. (b) (1) of this section, not to exceed $50,000,000;

"'"(2) not to exceed 80 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the property or project when the proposed improvements are completed, including the land; the proposed physical improvements; utilities within the boundaries of the property or project; architects' fees; taxes and interest accruing during construction; and other miscellaneous charges incident to construction and approved by the Administrator: *Provided*, That, except with respect to a mortgage executed by a mortgagor coming within the provisions of paragraph No. (b) (1) of this section, such mortgage shall not exceed the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the cost of the completed physical improvements on the property or project, exclusive of public utilities and streets and organization and legal expenses; and

"'"(3) not to exceed $8,100 per family unit for such part of such property or project as may be attributable to dwelling use."

"'(o) (1) Section 207 (h) is amended by striking out, in paragraph No. (1), the

words "paid to the mortgagor of such property," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "retained by the Administrator and credited to the Housing Insurance Fund."

"'(2) Section 204 (f) is amended by inserting in clause No. (1), immediately preceding the semicolon, the following: "if the mortgage was insured under section 203 and shall be retained by the Administrator and credited to the Housing Insurance Fund if the mortgage was insured under section 207."

"'TITLE I AMENDMENTS

"'(p) Section 2 is amended:

"'(1) by striking out "$165,000,000" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "$175,000,000";

"'(2) by striking out "$3,000" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "$4,500";

"'(3) by striking out the first proviso in the first sentence of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: *"Provided*, That insurance may be granted to any such financial institution with respect to any obligation not in excess of $10,000 and having a maturity not in excess of 7 years and 32 days representing any such loan, advance of credit, or purchase made by it if such loan, advance of credit, or purchase is made for the purpose of financing the alteration, repair, improvement, or conversion of an existing structure used or to be used as a hotel, apartment house, dwelling for two or more families, hospital, orphanage, college, or school:".

"'(4) by striking out the last sentence of subsection (b).

"'SEC. 2. In order to aid housing production, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to make loans to and purchase the obligations of any business enterprise for the purpose of providing financial assistance for the production of prefabricated houses or prefabricated housing components, or for large-scale modernized site construction. Such loans or purchases shall be made under such terms and conditions and with such maturities as the Corporation may determine: *Provided*, That to the extent that the proceeds of such loans or purchases are used for the purchase of equipment, plant, or machinery the principal obligation shall not exceed 75 percent of the purchase price of such equipment, plant, or machinery: *And provided further*, That the total amount of commitments for loans made and obligations purchased under this section shall not exceed $50,000,000 outstanding at any one time, and no financial assistance shall be extended under this section unless it is not otherwise available on reasonable terms.

"'SEC. 3. The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting immediately after section 510 thereof the following new section:

"'"INCONTESTABILITY

"'"SEC. 511. Any evidence of guaranty or insurance issued by the Administrator shall be conclusive evidence of the eligibility of the loan for guaranty or insurance under the provisions of this title and of the amount of such guaranty or insurance, except that nothing in this section shall preclude the Administrator from establishing, as against the original lender, defenses based on fraud or material misrepresentation, and except that the Administrator shall not, by reason of anything contained in this section, be barred from establishing, by regulations in force at the date of such issuance or disbursement, whichever is the earlier, partial defenses to the amount payable on the guaranty or insurance."

"'SEC. 4. The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of section 500 (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: *"And provided further*, That the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe by regulation a higher maximum rate of interest than otherwise prescribed in this section for loans guaranteed under this title, but not exceeding 4½ percent per annum if he finds that the loan market demands it."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended."

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, as every Senator knows, the National Housing Act has had included within it a provision which has been known as title VI. Title VI loans have covered in the past, as they are covering today, multiple unit construction. The passage of a bill similar to this some several weeks ago resulted in stimulating the building of housing by private builders for the benefit of persons without homes, and with particular benefit to veterans.

Title VI of the National Housing Act was to have expired on March 31, 1948. The Banking and Currency Committee held hearings on the desirability of continuing the loan privileges, which had been desirable for the building industry. As a result of those considerations the Senate passed a bill which extended the privileges of title V of the National Housing Act for a period of 30 days, beginning on the day following the expiration of title VI and continuing until midnight, April 30, 1948.

The Senate now concerns itself with the desirability of reextending the loan privileges of title VI for yet another 30 days. What the junior Senator from Washington has done has been to send to the desk an amendment which in fact only constitutes an action which the Senate itself took on April 22, 1948. Senate bill 2565, as introduced under the name of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] provides for an extension of title VI privileges for 30 days in the amount of $250,000,000. The amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Washington is in fact title I in its entirety of Senate bill 866, which the Senate passed on the 22d day of April, which immediately thereafter went to the House of Representatives, and on which hearings will be held beginning the first of next week.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I am trying to ascertain what the situation is. As I understand, title VI of the National Housing Act expires tonight.

Mr. CAIN. At midnight tonight.

Mr. PEPPER. The bill now pending proposes to extend title VI for 30 days.

Mr. CAIN. That is precisely correct.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator from Washington has proposed an amendment to the bill to extend title VI for 1 year.

Mr. CAIN. For 1 year, in the amount of $1,600,000,000, as agreed to in the bill so recently passed by the Senate, Senate bill 866.

Mr. PEPPER. A few days ago the Senate passed the bill known as the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, and sent it to the House. That bill provided a rather comprehensive approach to the entire subject of housing, including public housing, sometimes called slum clearance, containing provisions for rural housing insisted upon by the Senate, and containing provisions for Federal housing under the Federal Housing Administration, and perhaps other aspects of housing. As I understand, that bill also carried a year's extension for title VI. Is that correct?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will further yield, some of us are anxious to further the entire housing program. We are for all of it. We think it is very essential in the public interest. We are told that if we pass a piecemeal bill such as this, although we are for it, the practical effect will probably be to retard consideration by the Congress and the enactment into law of the comprehensive housing program known as the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. I wonder if the Senator will be good enough to comment upon that fear which many of us seriously entertain.

Mr. CAIN. I shall comment on the point which the distinguished Senator from Florida has just made, to the extent that I can.

We hear rumors in Congress on every conceivable subject. Among such rumors there is one to the effect that there are serious opponents in the House of Representatives of what is known as public housing. Feeling strongly on that subject, those Members will undoubtedly do everything they can to defeat the passage of the legislation, because they do not believe in it. But I see no necessary relationship between the extension of title VI as a separate measure, for very good, sound reasons, and the entirety of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill to which the Senator has so ably referred.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will further yield, following the same line of inquiry, if the bill, which the Senator from Washington now proposes to amend, were enacted, title VI would be extended for 30 days, and the operation of that very salutary provision of the housing law might be continued. Is it not also probable that during that 30-day period, with the consciousness that we are drawing relatively near the end of the session, progress might be made upon the comprehensive bill, namely, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, by our sister body; and would we not stand a chance of having the entire subject perhaps more effectively dealt with than if we began to pass measures piecemeal to deal with segments of the subject for as long as a year, as the amendment of the able Senator from Washington proposes to do?

Mr. CAIN. If there were no sound reason for having separate legislation on the subject of title VI, I would agree with the distinguished Senator from Florida. However, I shall attempt—I hope briefly—to prove that there is cause for the Senate to pursue the course called for by the amendment which has just been sent to the desk.

I think it has become singularly clear during the very brief debate we have already had on this subject that those who today oppose a consideration of the problem, those who voted against bringing the measure up at this time, are exceedingly concerned because of a deep-seated fear that to remove the privileges of title VI from Senate bill 866 would place the remaining large portions of

that bill in jeopardy. I cannot say for certain, by any means, that that will happen, but I like to think that even those who thus far have opposed consideration of the proposal to amend the bill which is now before the Senate by including title I of Senate bill 866 will find it possible to study on its merits what I hope to say from now on.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. IVES. I gather from what the Senator from Washington has said regarding the fate of Senate bill 866, to which he has been referring, that there is some chance that the passage of that bill will be jeopardized by the approval at this time of the 1-year extension of title VI of the National Housing Act, which the Senator from Washington now proposes in his amendment. Would the Senator from Washington go so far as to admit that perhaps that would very likely be the fate of Senate bill 866 if a 1-year extension is granted in this instance?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the Senator from New York pays me an exceedingly high compliment in assuming that I can judge, first, what the House committee will do and, second, what the entire House of Representatives will do. I do not think it would be reasonable for me to make an assumption regarding a matter about which I actually know nothing.

Mr. IVES. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. IVES. The junior Senator from New York merely raises the question because he realizes that the Senator from Washington is far more familiar with the situation as it pertains to this bill than is the junior Senator from New York, and the junior Senator from New York thought that perchance the distinguished Senator from Washington might have some definite ideas with respect thereto.

However, I realize that no one can anticipate what our sister body of the Congress will do in this connection; but it seems to me that this is a direct attempt to sabotage Senate bill 866. I would never go so far as to charge the distinguished Senator from Washington with an attempt to sabotage anything of the kind, but history rather comes to my mind in this instance, and I recall very well that he himself endeavored to take the public-housing provision out of Senate bill 866; and he did not approve, I seem to remember, of Senate bill 866 as it now stands. He recognizes very thoroughly that this particular portion of Senate bill 866 is most necessary and that, if the remainder of Senate bill 866 goes by the board, the country may be able to get along, even though not too well.

So, Mr. President, in the face of the evidence we have before us and in the face of the record, the junior Senator from New York is most suspicious in connection with the motion now being made by the distinguished Senator from Washington, although the junior Senator from New York desires to inform the distinguished Senator from Washington that he has an absolute and complete respect for the integrity of the distinguished Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I prefer to respond first to the junior Senator from New York, if the Senator from South Carolina will permit me to do so.

With reference to the feeling the junior Senator from New York has and his confidence in the integrity of the junior Senator from Washington, I am most grateful, particularly because the distinguished junior Senator from New York and I have been and will continue to be the very best of good friends.

I hope to allay some of the suspicions of the junior Senator from New York concerning the motives which lie behind the amendment I have submitted. The Senator from New York remembers most correctly that the junior Senator from Washington attempted to have deleted from Senate bill 866 its title which covered public housing. But the Senator from New York overlooks the reasons which were stated by me at the time when I sought to have that action taken.

I wish to say to the Senator from New York that I thought then, and I most certainly continue to believe now, that the subject of public housing is a subject and a problem in itself, and that it ought to stand and must stand on its own feet; and if as a result of an examination of it as a single and particular question, it is found not to be deserving of passage by the Congress, I, for one, think it would be deserving of its fate.

Today I seek for other reasons—reasons which at least are my own—to benefit the people of the United States, to benefit the builders of the United States, and to do what little I can to help in doing a competent job within the instrumentalities provided by the Senate. Question normally and naturally is raised as to why we wish to have an extension of 1 year made, when the bill before us calls for an extension of 30 days. I think I stated that title I of Senate bill 866 calls exactly for what the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Washington calls, and for what it is intended to accomplish.

I have related some history because I think the pending legislation has some historical importance. I have before me the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 24, 1948, which concerns itself with the debate on the first 30-day extension. Today we are concerning ourselves with doing again what we did then so rapidly and so hastily and for what appeared to be reasonable reasons, as set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

On that date, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] inquired of the President pro tempore whether the Senator from Vermont would yield. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] said, "I yield to the Senator from Ohio."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CAIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. A short time ago the distinguished Senator from Washington said that any Senators who voted against having the Senate take up this bill at this time no doubt were fearful that perhaps this was the so-called heart of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

Mr. CAIN. No; the Senator from Washington said he thought those who were opposed to a consideration of this measure today were fearful that the public housing bill would fail of passage in the House of Representatives if title VI were removed.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to say that is exactly what I fear. As has been stated, the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are not present today.

Title VI of the 1946 act expired on March 31, and it was not renewed until May, although in March I used my every effort to prevent its expiring. But no great damage was done by that lapse in 1946. The conferees on the part of the House and the conferees on the part of the Senate worked hard to have the renewal made, and no great harm was done by the delay. So I anticipate that no great harm will be done if there is a delay of the matter today. I may say that, as is well known, in the absence of title VI the necessary funds could be obtained from title II.

I wish to say that the Senator from Washington is eminently correct in his expression of fears, and I myself am fearful that those fears are justified, and that what is feared may develop into a reality.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the Senator is particularly anxious to have title VI extended; is he not?

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course I am anxious to have it extended for a period of 30 days.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from South Carolina wishes to have it extended by tonight; does he not?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes, I wish to have it extended for 30 days, but not for 1 year. An extension for 1 year will seriously impair the prospects of passage of the bill now before the House of Representatives, in my opinion.

Mr. CAIN. Today the Senate will decide whether to grant an extension for 30 days or for 1 year or for a portion thereof.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator will admit, will he not, that although in the committee an extension for 1 year was discussed, nevertheless the positive action taken by the committee was for an extension of 30 days?

Mr. CAIN. Indeed I do recall that.

Mr. MAYBANK. So an attempt is being made at this time to circumvent that action, and to have the Senate make an extension for 1 year, although the chairman of the committee is not now present and the Senator from Vermont, one of those who have been particularly interested in the subject, is not now present, and although in the past, in connection with title VI of the 1946 act, a lapse of time which occurred between the expiration of that act and its renewal or extension caused no particular harm.

Mr. CAIN. I have anything but a desire to be discourteous to anyone, either here or anywhere else, but the absence of the two Senators to whom the Senator from South Carolina refers cannot, from my considered point of view, be

important on this issue. I endeavored to say, in the presence of the Senator from South Carolina, I think, this morning, that the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency evidenced to me his desire on Wednesday morning to bring the matter to an issue. In the face of several very friendly but significant questions, the Senator has found it necessary, for reasons best known to himself, to be absent from the session of the Senate today. We are discussing, as I hope the Senator from South Carolina will agree, a matter of national importance.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I heard what the Senator said. I repeat, the question was not voted on in committee, except with respect to the 30-day extension. A similar situation existed in 1946, when the act had expired. There was a lapse of 1 month, yet no great damage was done.

Mr. CAIN. If I may add a further word at this point, I have been happy to admit that so far as I know no consideration was given in the committee in recent days to a proposal to extend title VI for a year. The extension which was agreed to by those members of the committee who were present at the time, was an extension for 30 days only.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. CAIN. However, I emphasize the fact that the committee by its own action last Tuesday directed those whom it charged with bringing the matter to a conclusion, to proceed to do so on Wednesday, 2 days ago. The one statement, from my point of view, offsets the other.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has mentioned the absence of the Senator from New Hampshire, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. The Senator has also stated that the committee frequently discussed extending title VI for a period of 30 days. If I may inquire, did the Senator from New Hampshire know the Senator from Washington intended to bring up the pending amendment?

Mr. CAIN. Today?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. CAIN. He did not know I was going to bring it up today, but he knew I intended to bring it up on Wednesday, when he asked me, if the proposed legislation was acceptable to me.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, is it correct to say that on Wednesday, the Senator from New Hampshire, who is today absent, knew that if the legislation were brought up on Wednesday, the Senator from Washington intended to propose an amendment?

Mr. CAIN. On Wednesday, I would say, or on any other day.

Mr. LUCAS. That is, an amendment to extend it for 1 year?

Mr. CAIN. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me ask the Senator the further question, in line with the inquiry by the Senator from New York a moment ago. May I ask the Senator whether he believes that, if the amendment is agreed to extending public housing title VI for 1 year, it will be of assistance in the matter of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill which is now in the House of Representatives?

Mr. CAIN. I most certainly do not.

Mr. LUCAS. That is what I thought. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MYERS. I listened to the colloquy between the Senator from New York and the Senator from Washington. I understood the Senator from Washington in his reply to a question by the Senator from New York who inquired whether the Senator from Washington knew what action the House of Representatives might take on the housing bill, in the event the pending amendment was agreed to, to say he did not know, and could not, of course, speak for the House committee.

Mr. CAIN. Yes.

Mr. MYERS. In view of what happened a little earlier today, might I suggest that the Senate again recess or adjourn for 10 or 15 minutes, and that the Senator from Washington confer with the chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, who is present in the Senate Chamber. It may be the Senator from Washington could then advise the Senate better as to what the action of the House committee would be.

Mr. CAIN. As the junior Senator from Washington understands the situation, each Member of the Senate is a free agent. I am today concerning myself primarily and completely, if possible, with the reasons for extending title IV for a year, instead of for 30 days. I hold no brief whatever for the proposition, nor do I think it reasonable to assume, that the deletion of title VI from one bill, in order to put it into effect today, has of necessity an adverse effect on other legislation, which legislation in my opinion is deserving of no consideration, if it is not strong enough to stand on its own feet as a separate measure.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. I understand the Senator's point, but I wanted to suggest, since the Senator from Washington was unable to answer the question propounded by the Senator from New York, that if the Senator adopted my suggestion, he might very well be able to report back to the Senate the opinion of the House Committee on Banking and Currency with regard to the effect which the acceptance of this amendment might have on the housing bill now in the House committee. We could adjourn or recess for a few moments. My good and very able friend, the chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, is in the Senate Chamber. The Senator from Washington could confer with him and then report back to the Senate and give the Senate a definite and unequivocal answer to the question propounded previously by the Senator from New York.

Mr. CAIN. It would seem reasonable for me to suggest to my very good friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania, that he is apparently curious about the answer to the question that was propounded to me. If the Member of the House, to whom the Senator from Pennsylvania refers, is in the Senate Chamber, although I do not happen to have seen him myself, I see no necessity for considering either an adjournment or a recess. I would encourage the Senator from Pennsylvania to endeavor to obtain an answer to his own question. I think it has no bearing on what those of us who believe in extending title VI for 1 year are endeavoring to do.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. I think it has, of course, a real bearing, because I understood the Senator from Washington, a moment ago, in his reply to the question propounded by the Senator from Illinois, to say in effect that the adoption of the pending amendment extending title VI for 1 year would have a real and profound effect upon the legislation now in the House of Representatives, namely, the housing bill.

Mr. CAIN. I think that is a fair position. The bill before the House, if deleted, by its title I would be a different bill from what it would be without the deletion of title I, which necessarily would either accelerate or minimize interest in that legislation.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Pennsylvania would not expect me to predict what is actually going to happen to legislation over which the Senate has no control.

Mr. MYERS. I think I would; I would expect the Senator to be able to give a fair answer to that. But may be infer that there is in the Senator's mind no doubt that if title VI is extended for one year, there will be much less likelihood of the housing bill being passed by the House?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator has asked the question a great many times. To the best of my ability, I would answer by saying I think there would be less chance of passage of certain of the remaining portions of Senate bill S. 866, though, as I have tried to indicate, that is not my concern at the moment in connection with the pending question.

Mr. MYERS. I understand.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, it would seem very fair and reasonably important to begin now, and it will not take very long, to endeavor to justify the amendment which has been sent to the desk, calling for an extension of 1 year rather than for 30 days. When the proposal to extend title VI for 30 days first came to the floor of the Senate, certain Senators took exception to that method of doing business. They explained their reasons therefor, and I merely want the RECORD to be very clear on it. I feel justified in going back to the RECORD made at that time, because from my point of view we are attempting to do something carelessly within 30 days after we said our justification for a 30-day extension was that we wanted to be very careful and precise and thorough in our approach to title VI, having regard to the future.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] having asked the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] to yield, on the basis of the latter's request for a unanimous-consent agreement to consider a 30-day extension, said, referring to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Mr. TAFT. Does the committee have a House bill continuing title VI?

Mr. FLANDERS. It has a House bill continuing title VI, which, on hasty examination—

Hasty examination—

seems to be a good bill, but there is no possibility of our committee giving it consideration within the deadline.

The colloquy took place on the 24th of March.

The Senator from Ohio said:

The deadline is the 31st of March, is it not?

The Senator from Vermont replied:

The 31st of March.

Mr. TAFT. I have no objection.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I understand that the House bill, which the Senator says appears to be a good bill, had only 1 day of hearings, and was passed very quickly by a unanimous-consent vote. Is that correct?

The Senator from Vermont replied:

That is what I have heard.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] said—and I think it is reasonably important—

If that be so, I am very strongly opposed to taking hasty steps and foregoing consideration for the House proposal. I am not at all in favor of extending for 60 days the provisions of the present act. If there be any possibility of having a hearing—and there are some 4 or 5 days within which hearings could be held—it seems to me we owe to the House the courtesy of considering the bill which it has passed. If it be agreeable to the Senate, it will become law and we shall have accomplished something, instead of trying to push the proposed legislation ahead for another 60 days without knowing very much about it.

The Senator from Vermont replied as follows:

I would say to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey that the calendar of the Banking and Currency Committee is such that it is impossible to give the amount of consideration we should give to the bill in the time remaining before the act expires.

The Senator from Vermont continued:

Mr. President, my suggestion is for the purpose of avoiding haste. I wonder if, from that point of view, the Senator from New Jersey would withdraw his objection.

The Senator from New Jersey saw fit not to withdraw his objection, but in the colloquy the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] had this to say:

Mr. President, I am of the opinion that the request which the Senator from Vermont has made meets exactly the objection which has been made. We are simply proposing to extend the provision of the law for 60 days in order that we may be able to go into the matter more thoroughly, rather than to take up the bill which the House has so quickly passed. The power runs out on March 31, and we are simply asking for a 60-day extension in order to have time to study the whole problem more thoroughly.

As a result of Senate action, authorization for an extension of 30 rather than 60 days was granted. It seemed at that time to be the consensus of opinion among the Members of the Senate that 30 days would give the Banking and Currency Committee sufficient time within which carefully and thoughtfully to consider the House bill and take the necessary action with reference to it. There was an assertion made by a considerable number of Senators that we should not, if it could be possibly avoided, pass legislation on important or any other topics for 30-day periods when we had the ability to pass more permanent legislation.

In the course of the past 30 days the Banking and Currency Committee has given some casual consideration to the bill which the House passed, House bill 5854. I have been told by the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] that he had made the suggestion to the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee that both a 30-day extension request and the House bill approved by the Banking and Currency Committee would be reported favorably to the floor. For reasons unknown to me, no official and formal action within the committee has at any time been taken on the House bill which has been before the committee for consideration for a period of approximately 6 weeks. We are now faced with a question of pure policy. Do we want to do again what we have on previous occasions said we did not want to do, namely, pass a measure extending for 30 days existing legislation when, at the same time and coinciding with our action, we have, through title I of Senate bill 866, decreed that title VI, providing loans to the extent of $1,600,000,000, should be continued for the next year? All it means, it seems to me, is that we shall be doing unnecessarily what will obviously be done through the passage of the title I portion of Senate bill 866 by the House at some undeterminable date in the future.

I think I am but one of a number of Senators who feel it is improper for the Senate not to give the builders and purchasers of buildings the consideration to which we have already determined they are entitled under the provisions of Senate bill 866, in which we have said to builders everywhere: "You can so plan your coming operations as to know that loans will be extended against any risks for a period of a year, and $1,600,000,000 has been made available for that purpose."

Where are we as of this moment? Every Senator's office and every Representative's office is and has been for the past few days receiving telephone calls inquiring, "What will Congress do about extending title VI? Will Congress act, or will it not?"

If we take action on Senate bill 2565 as unamended, if there is no likelihood of passing that measure tonight—and there seems to be no likelihood of it—we are saying as of tomorrow morning that "for the next 30 days you can plan your operations for the future, but we can give you no strong, sturdy assurance that you shall be protected through loan extensions after that time, or in any particular form."

I think it should be said particularly for the record that I have had occasion during the course of the past few days to talk to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. MARTIN; the majority leader, Mr. HALLECK; and the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, Mr. WOLCOTT, regarding this problem. They, individually and collectively, have authorized me to say that, first, they believe in an extension of title VI for a period of 1 year; secondly, that they will do everything they can this afternoon, and they think they will be successful, to have Senate bill 2565 passed by the House, as amended by the Senate if the amendment recently offered by the junior Senator from Washington shall prevail. It could be done rather easily in this way: We have before us Senate bill 2565 to which an amendment has been offered. If the amendment prevails, and if the bill as amended passes, it will be proper, under the circumstances of today, to ask that the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate be discharged from the further consideration of House bill 5854, following which, if the discharge shall be granted, it will be possible to call up House bill 5854 and so amend it as to include within that bill the entire provision of title I of Senate bill 866, which the Senate, by a strong vote, passed on the 22d day of April 1948.

Mr. President, I think very little more of a constructive character can be said on this subject, because a number of Senators will make their decision on the basis of whether or not they think, as they themselves have stated, that the public housing provisions of S. 866 will be imperiled if title I of that bill shall be removed. I think no Senator will, nor could he safely deny that it would be much better for the American people and the American builder if we would do for the latter this afternoon and tonight what we have in a piece of legislation which has not yet been considered by the House of Representatives told him we were going to do at some date in the future. I think the passage of Senate bill 2565, as amended, by including the title VI provisions included within Senate bill 866, would be a further stimulus to the building of homes, and that we would find people generally grateful and appreciative of the action being taken in their interest by their Congress.

There can be no single ground of justification for not extending title VI for a year, except, first—and I admit it is a very large consideration, and that this again is the fear—that to do something which is undeniably logical will hold in peril the consummation of a desire for public housing believed in by a number of Senators within this body. If they feel so strongly as not to do what I think is the more logical thing because they are likely, from their point of view, to lose a chance of establishing a furtherance of public housing, I necessarily could not quarrel with their vote, though as an individual I could deny the logic which resulted in that vote.

To recapitulate in just a word, an amendment has been offered to S. 2565 which seeks to continue for a period of a year, and in the amount of $1,600,000,000, the loan privileges of title VI, which will expire tonight at midnight in the absence of legislative action. No one in this Chamber can quarrel either

with the period in question or the amount of money, because, after a long, thoroughgoing debate, the Senate itself agreed to those particular terms.

The difference between the amendment and the bill as it is before the Senate is the difference between 30 days and $250,000,000 and 1 year and $1,600,000,000.

I do not want to be misunderstood in what I have related covering my conversations with the distinguished Members of the House of Representatives. As I have indicated, they have suggested that their bill, if amended, would be accepted by the House some time during this day without request for a conference and could be sent to the President. They necessarily have given me no assurance, nor could they, that if we pass a bill today, either amended or without amendment, which had not previously been before the House of Representatives the bill would not be objected to, or that it would be passed by the House in time to go to the President tonight.

In my considered opinion, if a reasonable, logical way to meet the deadline which the proponents of the amendment seek to meet can be found, we should necessarily pass the legislation.

One word further. I hope the amendment will prevail as proposed; but if it does not, for the very clearest reasons in the world, I shall, with no tinge of possible regret, vote for the bill as reported to the Senate on Wednesday last by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Washington whether his amendment was proposed to the committee and acted upon by the committee before Senate bill 2565 was reported to the Senate.

Mr. CAIN. The only way in which I can answer that is to say that the committee has had before it for about 5 weeks a House bill which in substance is exactly what my amendment is, extending the term for a period of a year, and containing an amount, roughly, of $1,600,000,000. The committee did not have before it the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. AIKEN. May I ask whether the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] were aware that the Senator from Washington was going to offer this amendment today?

Mr. CAIN. Not in the exact form, perhaps, in which it is offered, but the Senator from New Hampshire took the matter up with me on Wednesday, and I told him, in answer to his suggestion that he was going to press for passage of the legislation, that I, being in favor of a 1-year extension, would do what I could on the floor of the Senate to make that certain.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CAIN. I have had no conversations with the Senator from Vermont.

SENATOR TAFT AND THE REPUBLICAN RECORD

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, sometimes we hear from our good friends on the other side of the aisle the statement that should President Truman for any reason not be nominated at the coming Democratic convention, it would be a repudiation of the leadership of the party, and therefore the party would say, in effect, that it repudiated its record over the last 4 years.

Mr. President, we Democrats are quite accustomed to having internal differences. I cannot remember many periods during which we have had what might be called party unity. There is always a large segment of the Democratic Party which seems to be in disagreement on some particular proposal. That is more or less a constant characteristic of the Democratic Party. But what I cannot understand is the position of our good friends on the other side of the aisle when the same philosophy is turned around and applied to them, for the record that the Republican Party has made for the last 2 years in this body, and pretty much in both bodies, has been due primarily to the leadership of Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio. He is the man who has sponsored most of the controversial legislation which has passed this body. He has on this side of the aisle, although we are not of the same political complexion, many great admirers, for I have never seen a man in my service in Congress with more industry than the Senator from Ohio has shown in the 2 years he has been largely in control of the legislation coming before this body.

Nor are there any of the elements of the political demagogue in the Senator from Ohio. I have a very high regard for his mental integrity and for his willingness to buck the stream for what he believes to be best for the country. But what I cannot understand is that if this record which we hear so much about, and which we will hear more about from time to time, which is largely the record made under the leadership of the Senator from Ohio, and a great deal of which carries his personal imprint, is to be the basis for changing parties in the White House and for a continuance of Republican control in the Congress, how in the name of goodness the Senator from Ohio can be repudiated on the one hand and the record which he alone more than any other Republican in Congress has made can be upheld upon the other.

The most controversial act, or at least one of the most controversial acts, to be discussed in the next election is the Taft-Hartley Labor Act, which bears the name of the great Senator from Ohio. Certainly if this act, which will be given as one of the reasons why the Republican Party should be placed in control of at least two branches of the Government, the executive and the legislative, is to be used as an argument for the placing of the Republican Party in control of those two branches of government, then why repudiate the man whose courage and industry and ability put it on the statute books? Yet I understand that has been done in several States. It was not done in Wisconsin, but it was in Nebraska, I believe, and now I understand the great leader of the Republican Party is actually being attacked in his own home State of Ohio—the man who made this great record upon which Mr. Stassen hopes to run, upon which Mr. Warren hopes to run, upon which Mr. Dewey hopes to run, upon which General MacArthur perhaps hopes to run. The record made by ROBERT A. TAFT, which is to be used as the great reason why the Republican Party is to be returned to power in the coming election, is to be repudiated in the national convention by, perchance, the nomination of someone who had little or no part in the making of the record.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Is the Senator satisfied that these distinguished gentlemen are seeking to reap where the Senator from Ohio has sown?

Mr. TYDINGS. It looks as if the Senator from Ohio has to do pretty much of the work, run the corporation, conduct the business, accumulate the surplus, and the nonworking stockholders come in and receive all the dividends. [Laughter.]

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I want to apologize to my able friend from Maryland, because I came into the Senate Chamber after he had begun his address, and as a result may not have realized its entire significance. I do not know whether my able colleague is now proposing to nominate the candidate for the Republican Party on the floor of the Senate, or whether perhaps some of the southern Democrats, not feeling at home in their own party, are now moving over into ours?

Mr. TYDINGS. It looks to me as if nearly all the Republicans are feeling out of place in their party because they are all repudiating, in one State after another, the man who has made the record for them here in the Senate during the past 2 years.

Here is the Taft-Hartley Labor Act, one of the great issues in this campaign. One of the things for which a large segment of the Republican Party has been contending for years is that the Wagner Labor Act should be amended, and the Senator from Ohio, with his usual industry, with his integrity, and with his conviction, threw his personality into the breach and drove the Taft-Hartley Act through Congress. Yet, having made this great effort, when the time comes to pin the decoration of service well performed on the breast of the leading Republican, we find BOB TAFT is not called forward, but a man who had nothing to do with it is preferred in one State, several men who had nothing to do with it are preferred in another State, and the Senator from Ohio, who made

this record, receives no consideration whatsoever.

Take the tax reduction bill, which is another one of the keystones in the arch of the Republican record. BOB TAFT is on the Finance Committee. Except for the chairman, the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], BOB TAFT had more to do, in my opinion, with the writing of the tax reduction bill than any other Republican or Democrat in this Chamber.

Mr. President, after he put over the Taft-Hartley Act and the tax-reduction measure, which almost bears his name, one would think the Republican Party would be walking toward him with open arms, for I cannot imagine two things that most Republicans who contribute to the campaign fund would rather see done than have the Wagner Labor Act amended, on the one hand, and have tax reduction, on the other hand. That is two home runs out of one time at bat almost. Yet when this great man, who has made this record, comes before the voters of the different States he runs second or third or fourth. And even now he has to fight to carry his home State.

Then, too, it is said that there is another great issue to which the party on the other side of the aisle will point, and that is the new housing program, the W-E-T bill, the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill. Again we find the name of this great industrious Republican Senator tacked onto this bill as another part of the record. Yet in spite of that, the man who is making the record, who is going to save the necks, if they are saved, of more men at the other end of the Capitol and in this body in the next election, than all the other candidates put together, for whatever issues they have, BOB TAFT has made for them, is being repudiated in every State of the Union. Republicans are repudiating the man who has stood in this Chamber and worked until he has commanded the admiration of every Senator in this body regardless of party for his integrity. We all recognize his political integrity. It is second to that of no other man in either branch of Congress. Yet having made that record, the man who made the record is to be repudiated by the mass of Republican voters over the country, if what has happened up to this time is a criterion. Talk about Harry Truman being repudiated by his own party. At least Harry has a few States.

We come to another great reform—education. Again the name of BOB TAFT is attached to that bill. He is a man who has met all comers head-on. He stood on this floor and fought to give greater educational benefits to those who have not had educational privileges. If it had not been for the Senator from Ohio, that bill would not have got as far out as the closet in the room of the committee which deals with educational matters. That will be one of the things that will be pointed to. Again, it bears the label of the great Ohio Republican, ROBERT A. TAFT; and yet he is likely to be repudiated in his own State, or at least some parts of it, for all those who are going to take the credit for this record, which is more the work of ROBERT A. TAFT than of any other Republican in the country, are trying to take every vote they can away from him. It is necessary for a Democratic Senator to rise on the floor of the Senate and tell the truth about the record on which the Republicans are going before the country next November. All the Senators on the other side of the aisle are going to take credit for this record. Who made it? BOB TAFT made more of it than any 10 other men in the Republican Party in either branch of the Congress.

I am becoming worried. When you go into the field of Federal housing and the field of public education, you are getting over into the New Deal field. I thought you gentlemen hated this bureaucracy, this New Deal with all its thousands of employees who were like locusts eating up the substance of the taxpayers. But, praise be, you are not in power a single year before you come forward with two bills, on housing and education, which between them embrace, in one way or another, $8,000,000,000. There is your New Deal. Good gracious. The present administration has been called a spend-thrift administration. Only yesterday a billion dollars more than Truman wanted was voted by the Republican-controlled Appropriations Committee. Truman tried to save a billion dollars, and you gentlemen came along with an extra billion dollars.

You have a salary-increase bill which will cost about one and a half billion dollars more. I am advised that that is to go through—this being election year—before we return home in late June. You have a $200,000,000 veterans' increase bill, which I am also informed must go through. When we add all those together, unless there is a great deal more prosperity than is now apparent, you are going to wind up with a deficit, and before long you fellows will have to go before the country as the deficit-spending party, because every man here who is honest knows that without a record-breaking prosperity, with the expenditures we now have you will have to restore the taxes which you reduced this election year, or you will have a deficit in the Treasury.

But that is all incidental. I have seen you getting more and more over on the New Deal side with the Federal Housing bill and with the Federal Education bill. I thought Roosevelt was the man who stood for such things as that. You fellows raised cain while he was doing it; and you have not been under the tent more than 10 minutes before you are riding the camel of Federal beneficence out through the main door, with more things, and on a bigger scale than Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the New Deal prophet, ever conceived of in his wildest dreams. He had to get ready for a war. He had a depression on his hands; but you are doing this in the midst of the most prosperous year the country has ever had. You are spending money like water, with everyone working. That is an entirely different situation from spending money when people are hungry and jobless, and banks are closed.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. What the Senator says bears out the statement in the New York Times of April 23, 1948, under the caption "Taft says Stassen seems New Dealer." This dispatch is from Steubenville, Ohio. The Senator from Ohio said:

> I have rather been amused by Mr. Stassen's claim here that the general sentiment is that he wants the support of the people because he is more liberal than I am. So far as I am concerned, my policies are exactly those of the Republican majority in Congress.

I thought the Senator would be interested in that statement.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Illinois knows, every other Member of this body knows, and every member of the press gallery knows, that the man who has had most to do with making the record of the Republican Party since it has been in control of both Houses of Congress for the past 2 years has been the senior Senator from Ohio, Robert A. Taft. That statement involves no disrespect to any one at all. His industry challenges the admiration of all of us on both sides of the aisle. Even his bitterest enemy would be glad to say that he is not a demagogue. He has an intellectual integrity—whether one agrees with his political philosophy or not—that is exceptional in high public office or low public office.

He is the man who has made the record. As I say, he will do more to save the necks of Senators and Representatives of the Republican party on the stump next fall than any other 25 Republicans in America put together. But, lo and behold, that poor devil who has carried water to the elephant until he has nearly broken his right arm must go back on the hustings in Ohio and fight for the handful of Ohio delegates.

I am not against Mr. Truman. I am taking no position for the time being. But Republicans have been saying that if we do not put up Mr. Truman we shall repudiate the leadership of our party. Good Lord! You are repudiating yours in homeopathic doses from Maine to California.

I feel sorry—and I say this with no irony—for BOB TAFT. I have watched him work. He is a real worker. I have watched him take socks on both sides of the political jaw because of the measures which he has espoused, and I have seen him fight and put them through, for the most part, one after another. I have seen him exhibit some vision, which has caused me occasionally to look at him twice, because it seemed to me that he was getting out of the conservative pasture and straying over into New Deal acreage. But even so, his record is the record of the Republican Party—to whatever extent the Republican Party has a record—and yet that hard-working, industrious man, with such great political integrity, must go back on the stump in Ohio and try to defend his own bailiwick from the encroachments of someone who had nothing to do with the record made here in the past 2 years.

I do not know how you gentlemen can meet in Philadelphia and nominate anyone except Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, for he, more than any other man in this Congress, has made the record for the Republican Party. You ought to be proud of it and take it at its face value and sell it to the country, and not repudiate the man who has carried you up and given you a glimpse of the Promised Land.

REHABILITATION OF CERTAIN WORKS OF FORT SUMNER IRRIGATION DISTRICT, NEW MEXICO—MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on the 14th of January the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] entered a motion to reconsider the votes by which House bill 3834 had passed the Senate. That was a bill to authorize a project for rehabilitation of certain works of the Fort Sumner irrigation district in New Mexico. Since that time, the motion has been pending and is now pending, undisposed of.

It had been my hope that the Senator from Texas would withdraw his motion and would let the measure go to the President for signature. As yet, the Senator from Texas has not seen fit to do so. I may say here that I have informed the Senator from Texas of what I propose to do today. I regret that he is not now on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, time is passing. If any action is to be taken on this bill or on this motion at this session of the Congress, it must be taken shortly. I cannot sit here and allow this measure, which is of such supreme importance to a very small district in my State, to die with the close of this session of the Congress without making every effort to have the matter finally determined and passed on.

Therefore, I now give notice to the leadership on both sides of the aisle that at the earliest possible moment I shall ask that this motion be heard and considered by the Senate. I assure the Senate that it will not take a great while to consider the motion. I think probably an hour's debate on each side should finally dispose of it. But the matter is of such importance that I must give this notice, and I trust that the leadership will provide an early opportunity to consider and dispose of the motion to reconsider.

THE PACKING-HOUSE WORKERS STRIKE

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, out of order I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution and request its appropriate reference. The resolution is not long, and I desire to read it into the RECORD, and then to follow the reading of it with some remarks explaining the resolution and the purpose I have in presenting it.

The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas 80,000 packing-house workers represented by the United Packinghouse Workers of America, are in their seventh week of a strike against the Big Four meat packing companies—namely, Armour, Swift, Cudahy, and Wilson—to secure what they deem to be a decent living wage for themselves and their families; and

Whereas the packers refused and the union accepted a proposal by the Federal Mediation Board and the Conciliation Service to arbitrate this wage dispute; and

Whereas the packers have refused point blank to consider the union's further suggestion that a joint study be made by the union and the packers as to the economic needs of the workers; and

Whereas the collective-bargaining processes between the contending parties have broken down completely; and

Whereas the even flow of livestock to market has been disrupted by the strike at a serious financial loss to the livestock industry and the consuming public generally; and

Whereas legislative agencies did settle the recent coal miners' dispute by direct action: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare examine the facts surrounding this controversy, and, if they find that a stalemate exists, they demand that the packing companies and the United Packinghouse Workers submit their differences for arbitration to an impartial agency whose findings would be binding upon both parties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG in the chair). Without objection, the resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 228) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, for the past 7 weeks, in their struggle for a decent living wage, these 80,000 packing-house workers have been striking. In my opinion, they had, and have, much justification for taking such arbitrary action.

From the very outset of their wage negotiations these workers have been faced with blunt refusals by the packers to seriously consider their needs or to seek a peaceful means by which to settle their dispute.

It is to the everlasting credit of these workers, who are represented by the United Packinghouse Workers of America, that they sought every possible avenue to avoid taking strike action and later, when the strike got under way, to terminate their walk-out through continued negotiations or to submit to impartial arbitration.

The packing companies, on the other hand, consistently have refused to seriously engage in collective bargaining with the union or to consider the proposal by the Government that the union and the packers arbitrate the dispute. It is in the light of these considerations that I am firmly convinced that the packers are more concerned with smashing the union of their employees than they are with reaching a fair and equitable settlement.

Mr. President, I desire to read at this time a short editorial written by Bruce Gustin, and published in the Denver Post of April 26 of this year. It is in regard to the rioting which took place in Kansas City, Kans., and which was instigated by the police force itself. The editorial reads as follows:

President Truman acted with commendable vigor to end the coal strike. He should employ the same policy to stop the meat strike. Certainly a walk-out of packing-house workers, with all the violence which has resulted, imperils the national health and safety. So far as economic damage is concerned, the coal strike was more serious than the meat strike. But the latter has been productive of more violence.

The Federal Government has an unusual responsibility in this meat strike. It has a normal duty to prevent interruptions of interstate commerce. Because the Federal Government has encouraged and promoted and favored the development of labor unions, it has an obligation to protect the public against their excesses.

Kansas City, Kans. police made a disgraceful spectacle of themselves last Friday. Breaking up a picket line which had been interfering with office employees of a packing plant was within their province. But when they invaded CIO headquarters and "cleaned it out" they went beyond the bounds of reason and lawful authority. No matter what their provocation, their resort to hoodlumism and savagery cannot be condoned. In goading police officers with insults, strikers were asking for trouble. But the skull-cracking tactics employed in Kansas City, Kans., are not the only nor the proper police method for dealing with such a situation.

Mr. Bruce Gustin is an editor whom I have followed for a great many years. He does not have too much sympathy with the labor element; in fact he has very little sympathy with strikers, and on most occasions he really "gives them the business." But in this editorial he is protesting against what the police in Kansas City, Kans., did. After breaking up the picket lines, which action, according to Mr. Gustin, perhaps was proper, the police then went to the union hall, where those men were accustomed to assemble, and there the police did their skull cracking, and they made no distinction between the sexes. Women who were in that hall, a place where they had every right to be, were dealt with severely and many of them had to go to the hospital. The constitutional rights of assembly were interfered with on that occasion.

In the course of their meetings with the companies and with responsible Government officials, the union has either offered or indicated its willingness to use eight different approaches which would have made this disastrous strike unnecessary or, if once started, would have resulted in its quick termination. All those suggestions were summarily rejected by the companies.

The eight offers are:

First. An acceptance of a proposal by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service to arbitrate the dispute. The union expressed its willingness to accept an impartial judgment as to whether its request for an increase of 29 cents an hour was fair and equitable or whether the companies' offer of 9 cents or some intermediate amount in between was justified.

Second. The union reduced its wage proposals from 29 cents to 19 cents, which proves its conciliatory attitude.

Third. The union offered to withdraw its wage proposals and to make a contract which would guarantee to all employees in each week they worked a minimum of the average wage which the companies claimed their employees were earning.

Fourth. The union offered to engage in a joint study with the companies in an effort to determine the economic needs of the packinghouse workers, and agreed to be bound by the findings of that study.

Fifth. The union accepted the proposal by the Federal Mediation Service that an attempt be made to negotiate a

settlement of the current dispute and to extend the contract beyond its present reopening date of August 11, 1948.

Sixth. The union advised the companies that it would agree to take a secret ballot as to the willingness of the employees to accept the 9 cents offer, on the condition that the companies would be willing to negotiate above that amount if the offer were rejected.

Seventh. The union proposed that the board of inquiry appointed by the President to investigate the facts of the meat-packing strike, be converted into a private arbitration tribunal.

Eighth. The union accepted a suggestion by Mr. E. Howard Hill, president of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation, that a tripartite board arbitrate the dispute.

The eight proposals, I submit, give ample proof of the union's sincere efforts to work out a peaceful settlement. This labor organization, while never losing sight of distressing economic needs of its members, in my opinion, has attempted to discharge its full responsibility to the general public, and particularly the farmers.

The United Packinghouse Workers are deeply cognizant of the effects the strike has upon the livestock raisers and feeders of the Nation. Two weeks prior to calling the strike, the union, through the press, radio, and widely circulated pamphlets, advised the farmers as to the strike date, cautioning them that they should adjust their shipments to prevent possible loss.

The packing companies, on the other hand, have not shown similar consideration for the farmers and feeders. As a result, many farmers have suffered heavy losses when they shipped their livestock to packing plants which were shut down. One disastrous incident occurred on the week end of April 17–18, when particularly flamboyant claims were made by the struck companies that their plants would open on the Monday of that week. Livestock shipments to the packing centers were heavy, and when it was found that the plants were unable to operate, the farmers suffered serious losses. Prices for hogs on that day dropped from $1 to $10 a hundredweight on that market.

A significant development in this strike is the growing support the union is receiving from heretofore neutral farm organizations. In response to a suggestion from Mr. E. Howard Hill, president of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation, the union has declared that it is willing to submit its dispute to arbitration by a three-man board, one to be selected by the companies, one by the union, and the third to be selected by these representatives. This proposal was flatly turned down by the packing companies.

From my home State of Colorado and other areas with extensive feeding operations there is a rising demand for arbitration. The traditional allegation that farmers are inherently hostile to the wage struggles of urban workers is dramatically denied by the response of individual farmers and farm group leaders for impartial action to be taken in this prolonged and costly dispute. The union has announced its willingness; it is now up to the packers to show their good faith.

The packing-house workers' fight for improved wages has great merit. Although they are employed in one of the most profitable industries in this country, their wage scale is relatively low. More than two-thirds of the workers receive $1.10 an hour or less. One-third of all the workers receive $1.02 an hour or less. On the basis of yearly earnings the packing-house workers in the past year received an average total of $2,180. Many of the workers received substantially less.

This yearly average is $700, or 25 percent, less than the city worker's family budget, prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, needed by a family with one child in order to meet the minimum living requirements. Many of the packing-house workers have families with more than one child and their economic distress is therefore greater than the average.

It is this concern for the welfare of the packing-house worker's family on which the union based its proposal for 29 cents an hour wage increase. In view of the needs of the workers and the ability of companies to pay this increase, the union's request is a modest one. The 29-cent amount was calculated as necessary to bring wage rates of at least one-third of the packing-house workers up to budget minimums of the BLS study for a family with one child. According to the budget, a family with one child needs an income of $1.39 an hour in order to meet the minimum requirements. Twenty-nine cents added to the $1.10 rate of the upper third of packing-house workers would bring their income into the range of this requirement.

The attitude of the meat-packing companies toward the men and women who by their labor made these profits possible was well demonstrated at the recent fact-finding hearings conducted by the President's board of inquiry. At these hearings, representatives of the companies repeatedly told the board that they cannot be concerned with the budgetary problems of the workers.

The board thought otherwise. Their report to the President stated:

> Summing up the union's case, a budget approach to wage determination is not invalid or unprecedented. The union could properly offer it for consideration as a criterion for resolving this dispute. If all questions of policy in the application of the budget were resolved in favor of the union, an increase of more than 29 cents could be justified. Making other determinations of policy, less favorable but arguable, an increase of more than 9 cents but less than 29 cents would be justified.

Elsewhere in the report, the board noted the widespread recognition of the budgetary principle enunciated in 1920 in the award and recommendations of the Bituminous Coal Commission, that "every industry must support its workers in accordance with the American standard of living."

> In the present dispute—

The board continued—

> the United Packing House Workers of America has selected the city worker's family budget as its immediate goal in seeking to achieve an "American standard of living."

Immediately after receiving the report, the President directed the union and the companies to resume negotiations on the basis of findings by the board. The board's report for all practical purposes was, to the companies, merely a scrap of paper. They refused to enter into any discussion with the union which would amount to collective bargaining.

This is a fight for a living wage. The union has sufficient confidence in its position that it is willing to submit to an impartial judgment which would be final and binding. The companies have refused to arbitrate, negotiate, or in any way bring about a just and quick settlement, and so the strike continues.

I believe that Congress should examine the motives and purposes of the four large packing companies in maintaining a condition which brought about this strike. Furthermore, I believe we should examine the reasons behind the persistent refusal by the packers to settle this dispute, either through direct negotiations and collective bargaining, or mediation, or perchance, through arbitration.

This conflict has brought about serious economic loss to the farmers, the meat-packing companies, the packing-house workers, and the consumers.

It is for these reasons that I have today offered this resolution. I believe the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare can settle this strike now.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Small Business Committee of the Senate be permitted to meet during this afternoon's session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, permission is granted.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Holland	Myers
Ball	Ives	O'Conor
Bridges	Knowland	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Lucas	Stennis
Cain	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McKellar	Thye
Ecton	Martin	Vandenberg
Ellender	Maybank	Wiley
Ferguson	Moore	
Gurney	Murray	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Twenty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. CORDON, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HOEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. REED, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WHITE, and Mr. YOUNG answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Forty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is not present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay Mr. MCCARTHY and Mr. O'DANIEL entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Is a motion to adjourn until Monday at 12 o'clock in order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is not, in the absence of a quorum.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Chair rule that a motion to adjourn is not in order in the absence of a quorum? My understanding of the rule is that the only motion in order when there is not a quorum is a motion to adjourn.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois inquired whether a motion to adjourn until Monday was in order in the absence of a quorum. A motion to adjourn is in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not catch the words "until Monday"; but I knew that a motion to adjourn was in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, another parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. When would the Senate reconvene if the Senator from Illinois made a motion to adjourn and it was carried?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Did the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] answer to his name on the first call of the roll?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will have to take the position that that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Chair for his ruling. I think we will have to get the leader back here before we can obtain a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Debate is not in order.

After further delay, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. HATCH, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. WATKINS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF TITLE VI OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2565) to provide for a temporary extension of title VI of the National Housing Act, as amended.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I have just received from the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], who is absent on official business, a brief message which I shall read:

> I request postponement of action on the amendment to extend title VI for 1 year until Monday, May 3, because we have already passed legislation extending title VI in S. 866.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the House of Representatives is keenly conscious that title VI of the National Housing Act expires as of midnight tonight; and as I understand, the House is standing by in the hope that it will have an opportunity before this day is over to consider and take action on any action taken by the Senate concerning the extension of title VI.

I am most hopeful that the Senate will be able to resolve the prevailing difference and send to the House of Representatives before we recess this afternoon or tonight, either the Senate bill which is now before us, Senate bill 2565, as it was reported to the Senate, or as the junior Senator from Washington has proposed to amend it.

The intention of the junior Senator from Washington and those who are in support of his point of view is that of materially assisting the construction industry by making it possible, through extending the loan privileges for a year, as opposed to 30 days, for that industry to plan its future operations.

We can all realize that the amazingly fine achievements of the building construction industry for the first 3 months of this year should be continued for another year, without the resulting doubt, confusion, uncertainty, and consternation which, from my considered point of view is certain to result if we say to it again what we said only one short month ago—"We will let you plan your future on a 30-day basis, following which we are not completely certain what is going to happen."

It is for that material reason alone that I am most hopeful that the pending amendment, which in fact is but title I in its entirety of a bill which was favorably acted upon by the Senate on April 22, will prevail. It seems to me that those who oppose the adoption of this amendment do so for only one reason—at least no other reason has been advanced. No Senator has said, and I do not believe that any Senator could successfully contend, that an extension of 30 days is preferable to an extension of a year. Nor has it been claimed that a figure of $250,000,000 of loan guaranties provided for under a 30-day extension proposal is nearly as adequate and as reasonable as the $1,600,000,000 of loan guaranties provided for in my amendment.

No man is entitled to take exception to another man's point of view. It seems to me, however, very clear and positive that Senators who oppose this amendment do so for only one reason; and they have stated it very clearly. They are of the opinion that if title I of Senate bill 866 is eliminated, there is a very strong likelihood—and these words are theirs and not mine—that title VI of Senate bill 866 will not prevail in the House of Representatives. I have seen no direct relationship between the extension of the loan guaranties and the beginning of a true program of public housing in this country. I can speak only for myself. I say that if their fears were to be realized the fate of public housing as such, if it were given a fair judgment on its merits, would be no more severe than it deserved. if the remainder of Senate bill 866 is as good as its proponents thought it was at the time it was passed by a considerable majority in the Senate, I do not see how that character of good legislation could be imperiled, injured, or defeated per se merely because from within the bill we have taken out a proposed loan guaranty extension of a year in order to satisfy the needs of the American building construction industry.

Mr. President, I trust that my amendment will prevail.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I take exception to the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Washington that, given a choice between a 30-day extension and a 1-year extension, everyone would appear to be in favor of the 1-year extension. That was my understanding of the statement of the Senator from Washington.

I think there is a great deal of difference in this particular instance between the proposal of the Senator from Washington and the proposal submitted by the committee in the form of the bill before us. The difference has already been pointed out, and was indicated by the distinguished Senator from Washington in the remarks which he has just concluded. The difference lies in the fate of Senate bill 866. I may be mistaken; but in my judgment if we grant an extension of 1 year as proposed in the amendment before us, Senate bill 866 will not be passed by the Congress at this session. I think that difference in itself is altogether sufficient to justify opposition to the Senator's proposal.

On the other hand, a 30-day extension, as proposed in the bill which was reported from the committee, should be ample to meet the situation with which we are immediately confronted. In that period of 30 days final determination can be had with respect to an extension of 1 year, as is now proposed by the Senator from Washington, or with regard to the approval of Senate bill 866.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from New York a question, if I may. If I correctly understood him, he stated that he was frightened less by the prospect of title I of Senate bill 866, which includes the guaranties about which we are speaking, be-

ing eliminated from the bill, and that the resulting action would have a negative effect on the omnibus housing bill. Is that correct?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I did not say anything about being frightened. I am not at all frightened about this situation. All I did point out was that I personally feel very strongly—and I assume there are other Members of the Senate in addition to myself who feel this way—judging by the vote which was had on Senate bill 866 and on the amendment offered to that bill by the distinguished Senator from Washington—that Senate bill 866 should be passed by this Congress; and I think the acceptance of the amendment which the Senator from Washington proposes, which, as I understand, constitutes title I of Senate bill 866, would definitely have the effect of jeopardizing the enactment of all that would then remain of Senate bill 866. But I am not frightened about it.

Mr. CAIN. Does the Senator from New York think that the maintenance of title I in Senate bill 866 will be a guarantee that the bill in its present form will be passed by the Congress?

Mr. IVES. In answer to that question, I shall have to refer to the Senator's earlier remarks, when he himself said that he is never able to anticipate what may occur in our sister body of the Congress. As the Senator knows, no one here can answer as to that. But I believe very definitely that with title I intact in Senate bill 866, and not adopted separately as the Senator from Washington now proposes, the chances of favorable action on Senate bill 866 are much greater.

Mr. CAIN. What the Senator from New York has said, as I have understood him, is that if title I is eliminated, we can judge what the action of the House of Representatives will be, but that if title I remains where it is, we have not very much reason to hope for the passage of that bill.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, in this particular instance I think we are beginning to quibble. I think the important point of this matter is that the 30-day extension proposed by this bill, which has been reported by the committee, is sufficient to take care of the situation, and the 1-year extension proposed by the amendment submitted by the Senator from Washington is absolutely unnecessary at this time. There is time enough to consider that matter a month from now, if the situation with which we are confronted in the present instance arises then. There is no emergency at this time requiring an immediate 1-year extension. The only emergency with which we are confronted now is an extension in itself, and that matter is covered by the 30-day extension bill now before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, proposed by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

Mr. CAIN and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

Mr. MYERS, Mr. MURRAY, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

THE EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, while we have been devoting much time this afternoon——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania has the floor.

Mr. MYERS. I yield the floor to the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana cannot obtain the floor in that manner.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have in my own right been seeking the floor for some time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana will be recognized in his own right when he addresses the Chair, but it is not proper for him to obtain the floor from another Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the Senator from Pennsylvania was yielding for a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A Senator can yield for a question during the course of his speech, of course; but under the rules, one Senator cannot yield the floor to another Senator. If a Senator desires to obtain the floor, he should address the Chair.

Mr. LUCAS. However, on innumerable occasions no objection has been made to the practice of having one Senator yield to other Senators to permit them to make speeches. That has been done time after time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is doing the best he can to prevent such a practice.

Mr. LUCAS. The Chair has done a remarkably fine job in that respect. Nevertheless, on many occasions no objection has been made to such a practice on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MURRAY. As I started to say, Mr. President, although we have been devoting much time today to a consideration of the record of Republican leadership in the Congress, I should like to inquire whether the Republican leaders in this body intend to go forward with and carry out the purpose and intent of the Employment Act of 1946. It seems to me that if such a course had been followed, we would have been spared the difficulties with which we are confronted this afternoon on the floor of the Senate.

I raise this question as one of the authors and sponsors of the Employment Act, a statute based squarely upon the constitutional principle that the executive branch and the legislative branch of our Government should work cooperatively toward advancing the welfare of our people.

Under this act, the President has certain functions to perform, and the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report, established for the sole purpose of providing leadership within Congress on matters of economic policy, has other functions to perform. Both are expected to work together in developing a national policy for maintaining employment, production, and purchasing power within the framework of our private-enterprise economy.

Mr. President, our Chief Executive has carried out his responsibilities under the act. He has carried out the letter of the law. He has carried out the spirit of the law.

But the Joint Committee on the Economic Report has failed to perform its task. It has failed to comply with the letter of the law. It has failed to comply with the spirit of the law.

Let us look briefly at what the act requires and what the President and the joint committee have done.

Under the Employment Act of 1946, the President is expected to present to Congress at the beginning of each regular session an economic report. This report is to analyze the current state of the American economy, establish economic goals for the future with respect to employment, production, and purchasing power, and set forth a comprehensive economic program for achieving these goals. From time to time the President is to submit supplementary reports to the Congress.

The President has discharged this mandate completely. Three economic reports have already been transmitted to the Congress: The first in January 1947, a midyear report in July 1947, and the third in January 1948. Each of these documents has been widely hailed through the country—particularly the economic report of January 1948. Conservatives and liberals, businessmen, and labor leaders, farm leaders, and economists, all have agreed that the President's Economic Report of 1948 reached a new high level in the analysis and presentation to the Congress of the basic economic facts upon which America's future must be built.

Under the Employment Act of 1946, the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report was expected to take the President's program, study it, analyze it, debate it, hold public hearings on it, and then bring forth its own report. The joint committee was not expected to place a rubber stamp of approval upon the President's recommendations. It was expected to accept the proposals it regarded as sound, reject those it regarded as unsound, and modify those it felt should be changed. The important principle was that the joint committee should provide leadership in Congress in order to bring together into a consistent pattern the diverse activities of the individual legislative committees dealing with economic matters. The purpose was to provide a framework within which the leaders of Congress, if they differed with the viewpoint of the President, would be expected to state openly and publicly the reason for their differences and propose alternatives of their own.

But what has the joint congressional committee done? Let us look at the record.

In January 1947, the President's First Economic Report was transmitted to the Congress. It was referred to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. But

the joint committee held no public hearings on it, and failed to develop its findings and recommendations upon each of the main recommendations by the President, as required under the act. By February 1, when the law required the joint committee to bring forth its report, the Congress received merely a brief pro forma statement from the joint committee stating that the committee had not been able to develop its conclusions on the President's program. One of the reasons given was the fact that there had been insufficient time for the committee to organize its professional staff.

In July 1947, the midyear Economic Report of the President was transmitted to the Congress and referred to the joint committee. No hearings were held on this midyear report, and no findings or recommendations were forthcoming from the joint committee.

During the first weeks of 1948 it was my hope that the joint committee would at last carry out its assigned responsibilities under the Employment Act. On January 14 of this year I made the following statement:

> The President's Economic Report is the most important economic document ever to be laid before the Congress. Carrying out the intent of the Employment Act, the report analyzes the present condition of our economy, sets goals for the future and outlines the broad principles of a program designed to meet these goals.
>
> The American people will anxiously await the action of the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report in carrying out its functions under this act. Last year the joint committee failed to hold public hearings on the President's Economic Report. Still more important, it failed to formulate its own conclusions on the President's major recommendations, as it was required to do under the act.
>
> It is my sincere hope that this year the joint committee will hold public hearings on the President's Economic Report, instead of tucking it away in a filing cabinet, and then bring forth its own conclusions on the President's analysis of the economy and each of his recommendations for future action.

In January 1948 it was evident that the joint committee had the services of a competent professional staff, and it was generally expected that this year the committee would comply with the provisions of the act. In fact, when it became evident that the joint committee was not able to bring forth a report by February 1 as required by law, the joint committee itself supported a joint resolution extending the statutory date for the committee's report from February 1 to March 1. This joint resolution was approved by both Houses of the Congress and was signed by the President. The Employment Act was thereby officially amended and all those who were looking to the joint committee for leadership sat back and waited until March 1.

But when March 1 came nothing happened. The joint committee failed to meet the new statutory date contained in the joint resolution that the committee itself had proposed.

Another month went by. Yet on April 1 the Congress had still not yet received the long delayed report from the joint committee.

Mr. President, it is now almost the end of April and we are still waiting. The Congress is waiting to see what kind of economic leadership can be obtained from the committee it has established to exercise economic leadership. The country is waiting to see whether the leadership of Congress intends to cooperate with the President in fighting inflation today and preventing depression tomorrow. The President is waiting to see what position the leaders of Congress will take upon his economic program for maximum employment, production, and purchasing power—and I can assure you the Chief Executive of the United States would rather see the joint committee take a position criticizing some of his recommendations than see the joint committee take no position at all.

Mr. President, the passage of the Employment Act of 1946 was a long step forward toward enabling the Federal Government to meet its responsibilities in preventing the disastrous booms and busts that threaten our private-enterprise economy. Mr. Walter Lippmann, the noted commentator, has described the Employment Act of 1946—in the Washington Post of December 26, 1946—as "one of the most significant enacted by Congress in this century." The distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] in an article in the autumn 1947 issue of the Public Administration Review, has described the Employment Act of 1946 as "the most significant administrative implementation to the formulation of public policy since establishment of the Federal budget system a quarter of a century earlier." The act has also been hailed by such sober commentators on the national scene as the editors of Kiplinger magazine. Let me quote from a special Kiplinger magazine report entitled "Can We Prevent Depressions?"

> The Employment Act of 1946 is not a labor measure. It is not a law involving salvation by government. It is a measure designed to insure the American economic system of a long and healthy life.

But this legislation is hardly worth the paper it is written upon if the Joint Economic Committee continues to ignore its responsibilities. The act can be meaningful only if its procedures are complied with. It can help us prevent future depressions only if the Joint Committee on the Economic Report carries out the mandate that has been given it.

Mr. President, the time is already late. Almost 2 months have gone by since March 1, the day the joint committee was required to report under the joint resolution which was adopted at its suggestion. There have been many important economic developments since the January Economic Report of the President: The break in commodity prices; the increase in steel prices some weeks back, and just recently the announcement of a decrease in steel prices; the enactment of the European recovery program; the passage of a tax-reduction act. A first quarterly report, drafted by the President's Council of Economic Advisers for the purpose of bringing up to date the analysis of the economy contained in the President's Economic Report of January, was released by the White House on April 9 and made available to the joint committee.

In view of these developments, Mr. President, it seems to me that the Joint Committee on the Economic Report should be expected to submit to Congress a committee report covering not only the January Economic Report of the President but also analyzing economic developments since that time, with particular reference to the April 9 report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

It is my earnest hope that this action will be taken without further delay.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained consent to be excused from attendance upon the Senate for the remainder of today's session.

SOUTHERN STATES COMPACT ON REGIONAL EDUCATION—SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask the attention of Senators. I am about to make a request for a unanimous-consent agreement, and I should like to have the subject matter of it well understood by the other Members of the Senate.

On February 25 there was introduced by 28 Senators a joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 191, which is a resolution approving or giving the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by 15 Southern States relating to regional education. That resolution was referred to the Judiciary Committee. The favorable report of the committee was received something more than 2 weeks ago, and the measure has been on the calendar since then.

I had hoped to have the joint resolution considered today, but it now appears that in the absence of so many Senators, and because of the fact that the pending business is taking considerable time for disposal, action today will not be possible. I have been advised by the Conference of Southern Governors that the program for the survey of education in the South, which must precede the doing of anything substantial under the compact, is ready to proceed. It will be financed in part by the General Education Board, which is the Rockefeller Foundation, in part by the Carnegie Foundation, and in part by the Southern States themselves. They cannot move forward in the matter, which is of great importance to all the South, until Congress has passed upon and given its consent to the compact.

Mr. President, I ask that the Senate give unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 191 be made the special order of business next Thursday, May 6, at 12 o'clock noon. The reason for deferring it so long, Mr. President, is that both Senators from Alabama, who are interested in the matter, and the two Senators from Florida must necessarily be in their respective States at the primary elections to be held on Tuesday next and will not return until some time Wednesday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to state to the distinguished Senator from Florida that it is my understanding he has conferred with the chairman of the steering committee and that the time will be put down at which the bill will be considered. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. No. I have not. I asked the chairman of the steering committee 3 weeks ago to bring the matter up. He told me that he had simply forgotten to do so. Then I asked the temporary chairman, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], to bring it up, but he has gone away without doing so. It occurs to me that since the 15 States concerned request prompt consideration by the Senate of this proposed legislation of importance to them, my request is a reasonable one, and I hope it will be granted.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall not object to the request of the Senator, but I want to state that if the matter is placed upon the legislative calendar as of that date, if there is proposed legislation before the Senate, such as might be in the form of an appropriation bill or some other bill which needs to be taken up because of emergency or because of the issues involved, I hope the Senator from Florida will agree temporarily to set aside the bill in which he is interested and consider such matters as I have suggested.

Mr. HOLLAND. I will say to the acting majority leader that in the case of measures such as the proposed military preparedness bill which we are expecting, or appropriation bills, or any other bills of general importance, I shall of course agree to set aside for the time being consideration of our measure, assuming that it shall not lose its place on the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF TITLE VI OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2565) to provide for a temporary extension of title VI of the National Housing Act, as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate long upon this matter. As I understand, the Committee on Banking and Currency reported unanimously, with the exception of the Senator from Washington, a resolution requesting that title I or title VI, whichever we are discussing, be extended for 30 days instead of for 1 year. That was almost the unanimous action of the committee. Senators who are not members of the committee and who are not entirely familiar with this type of legislation should give some consideration to the report of the committee.

I undertake to say that the Members of the Senate who were present on April 21 and voted upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington at that time were aware of the fact that it sought to strike out title VI of Senate bill 866, and those who voted not to strike out that title are justified today in voting against an amendment to extend the title for 1 year. Had the amendment of the Senator from Washington been agreed to on April 21, and title VI of Senate bill 866 had been stricken from the bill, the Senator from Washington would not be here today seeking to extend that title for another year instead of for 30 days.

The Senator from Washington has been very frank and very candid regarding the entire matter. There is no doubt that if the amendment shall be agreed to it will be a severe blow to Senate bill 866, which looks at housing from a broader viewpoint, from the longer-range standpoint of the country as a whole, than it is viewed by the present law, or would be viewed if the law should continue for a year and should remain the only law on the statute books in relation to housing.

I especially remind those Senators who are interested in rural housing that an amendment on that question offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] was adopted and made a part of Senate bill 866. If the public-housing bill shall not become law, certainly the amendment offered by those two distinguished Senators will have no effect upon the rural sections of the country so far as obtaining proper housing is concerned.

I am satisfied that if the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington is agreed to, we can kiss good bye to any housing such as the Senate provided for last week in Senate bill 866. It will be the end of it. That is exactly what the Senator from Washington wants. He stood on the floor of the Senate for days in debate, which he had a right to do. I know his philosophy. I do not object to it, if that is the way he feels about it. But he is still endeavoring to sabotage the public-housing bill which was passed last week by the Senate after a vote of 49 to 35 against his amendment to strike title VI from the public-housing bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I rose to ask the Senator what the vote was upon the amendment submitted by the Senator from Washington. The Senator says it was 49 against the Senator's amendment. How many votes were there in favor of it?

Mr. LUCAS. The yeas were 35 and the nays were 49. Twelve Senators did not vote.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So it was rather a decisive majority, I will say to my able friend. In other words, there were 84 votes cast upon the issue, and it was felt to be such a decisive expression of the will of the Senate that there was then no roll-call vote upon the passage of the bill itself. Is that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I now also point out, if the Senator will indulge me, that at the present moment there are scarcely 49 Senators present. Already this afternoon the Senate had to wait for more than a half hour because of the absence of many Senators on official business and otherwise. So that if the pending amendment were to be agreed to it would, in effect, be a complete repudiation of the action of the Senate taken upon this important legislation within 10 days.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct, if I understand the purport of the amendment offered last week, to strike out title VI. The amendment now offered extends the time for 1 year on title VI. That is the very reason why it is being brought up at this time. It is one of the reasons why I think the majority party should permit this bill to go over until Monday, in view of the fact that there are so few Senators in the Chamber this afternoon. I do not know why the chairman of the committee is not present, but there are three members of the committee who know more about this legislation and are in a better position to answer the Senator from Washington than any other Members of the Senate. Yet they are not present. Perhaps they should be here. I am not complaining about that. Those Senators are probably unavoidably detained on business, or are sick, or there is something else which detains them, but it seems to me, in common courtesy to the chairman of the committee and the other Members on the other side of the aisle, the majority should allow the bill to go over.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. IVES. In view of the observations the distinguished Senator from Illinois is now making, I point out that the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent on official business and cannot possibly be present today. He has already sent a message, which I have read to the Senate, requesting that action on the particular amendment now being discussed, offered by the distinguished Senator from Washington, be delayed until next Monday.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from New York for that interesting observation. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is unavoidably absent this afternoon, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is unavoidably absent.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I may say that I was detained, but I am now in the Chamber.

Mr. LUCAS. I regret not having observed that the Senator from Louisiana had entered the Chamber, but in the earlier part of the debate the Senator was absent. With the full realization that he was one of the authors of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, and the realization of his peculiar knowledge about the housing problems, which it takes one a long, long time to familiarize himself with, we were looking for him when the Senator from Washington offered the amendment to extend the time 1 year.

I repeat what I said before, I cannot understand why the majority are so insistent upon passing the bill today. They say the time limit is midnight. There

are on the statute books a thousand and one laws which were extended by bills which were retroactive, and in this instance the bill could go over until Monday and could be made retroactive, and no one would be hurt. No one is going to lose his job here in Washington. Of course, Republicans would not be much interested in that, anyway; if some did lose their jobs it would be all right with them. But there is some reason why the majority want to vote on the bill this afternoon, and I wonder if it is because of the absence of so many Republicans who are vitally interested in it.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Illinois is probably conscious of the fact—I hope he is—that the Committee on Banking and Currency, by direction to its chairman and to the Senator from Vermont, wanted the bill now before the Senate to be disposed of on Wednesday of this week. Is the Senator conscious of that action taken by the Committee on Banking and Currency?

Mr. LUCAS. I am conscious of many things happening around here.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I think the Senator from Washington will agree with me that the Committee on Banking and Currency wanted action taken looking to a 30-day extension, but had no vote on the 1-year extension. So far as I am concerned, as I said earlier in the debate, I should be glad to vote for a 30-day extension at any time.

Mr. CAIN. If I am permitted to respond to the Senator from South Carolina in just a word——

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. CAIN. The Committee on Banking and Currency directed that the bill be called up before the Senate on Wednesday of this week. The chairman of the committee came to me, as I related this morning, and said, "I am about to take the action which I was instructed to take by the committee as of yesterday." He asked me, as an individual Senator, and as a member of his committee, if the action intended was acceptable to me. I said, "No," and I told him why, and that I would make an effort to get an extension of a year instead of 30 days. The chairman of the committee thought about my response to his position. Presumably he is still thinking about it, because some time later he went to the then acting floor leader, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and said, "I have changed my mind. As to the bill I wanted to ask unanimous consent to bring before the Senate today, I no longer want to take that action." The Senator from New Hampshire left the floor of the Senate, and to my knowledge has not as yet returned. I think that as soon as that happened it made all of us free agents to endeavor to debate a proposal which we think represents a very sound position.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I have not been on the floor of the Senate all through the debate, and I do not know whether the Senator from Illinois can answer my question or not. If not, perhaps some other member of the committee will. I desire to know whether or not the particular amendment extending the time for 1 year was submitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and what action the committee took on this exact amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. It is my understanding—and the Senator from Washington will correct me if I am wrong—it was not submitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency for a vote.

Mr. HATCH. The committee did not consider it?

Mr. LUCAS. The committee did not consider it.

Mr. CAIN. If I may add a word, I think the committee considered the 1-year extension idea in two different ways. It has included the 1-year extension in what is known as title I of the housing bill which the Senate passed a short time ago. The committee did that.

Mr. HATCH. I mean separately, as now proposed in the amendment offered.

Mr. CAIN. No.

Mr. HATCH. It was never presented to the committee in that light?

Mr. CAIN. It most certainly was not.

Mr. HATCH. And the committee has never had a chance to pass on this amendment?

Mr. CAIN. What the Senator from Washington has proposed is that a provision, namely, title I, approved not only by the Committee on Banking and Currency but by the Senate as well, be put into force and effect tonight, rather than delayed until the House takes some action on Senate bill 866.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator is well aware that singling out one feature such as this and submitting it as a separate proposal is altogether different from considering an entire bill, as we did the other day, and what I wanted to know was whether or not the Committee on Banking and Currency had ever had this proposal submitted to it as a separate proposition, and if the committee had ever acted on it in that form.

Mr. CAIN. The answer to the question is "No."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the suggestion?

Mr. LUCAS. I withhold the suggestion.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Illinois has made one suggestion which disturbs me very much. I personally do not care much whether we pass a 30-day extension or a 1-year extension, but unless the Senate today extends title VI, with authority, it will completely disrupt the housing program. This is the time of year when all the builders are making their plans for the year. Unless we extend the act for 30 days or 1 year, some young men, including veterans, will be unable to buy or rent homes this year. So I urge the Senator from Illinois not to attempt to get the Senate to adjourn before we obtain action on a 30-day or a 1-year extension.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has in mind builders having all their contracts in readiness and having to stop proceedings if we do not pass this bill by midnight tonight. Nothing is going to stop. The bill is going to be passed within the next 2 or 3 days, it will be made retroactive, and no one will be damaged.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I could not quite hear what the distinguished Senator from Illinois said a moment ago. He may have said what I am going to inquire about. It is my impression, however, that the present Housing Act has elapsed at least twice heretofore. Is that not correct?

Mr. LUCAS. I am not quite sure about that.

Mr. IVES. I am sure that it has lapsed at least twice.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator for his contribution. Of course if it has lapsed twice heretofore no one was hurt very much, and no one can be hurt very much if it should lapse again. I have known of laws relating to governmental agencies which have lapsed for a period of months and then have been passed and their provisions made retroactive. Those employed by the particular agencies proceeded with their work because they knew that sooner or later legislation respecting them would be passed.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I desire to ask the Senator from Illinois a question, and if he cannot answer it, I should like to have the Senator from Washington answer it. I have been informed that the House has already passed a bill extending title VI for 1 year, as a separate measure, and that the bill has been before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee for some time, and that the Banking and Currency Committee has not seen fit to act upon it. Is that correct?

Mr. CAIN. In part the Senator's statement is correct. I am delighted that the Senator from New Mexico raised the question. The bill to which he refers came from the House, if I am not mistaken, on the 23d day of March. It was referred, if I am not mistaken, to a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which reported to the Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency that the bill should be reported to the calendar.

Mr. HATCH. That is, the subcommittee did?

Mr. CAIN. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. But the Committee on Banking and Currency itself has never acted on that bill which has already been passed by the House?

Mr. CAIN. I was told by the chairman of the subcommittee, the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], that he made his proposal on behalf of the subcommittee to the chairman of the full committee, who said that, "Until such time as Senate bill 866 is finally resolved we will report no bill for a year's extension to the calendar."

Mr. HATCH. Then I take it that it is at least the feeling of the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, supported perhaps by a majority of that committee, that no action should be taken separately extending the time for 1 year until the other bill has finally been acted upon one way or the other?

Mr. CAIN. All I know in that connection is that the full committee has seen fit, either by action or lack of action, not to report the House bill to the calendar.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Myers
Ball	Hatch	O'Conor
Brewster	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Bridges	Hoey	Overton
Cain	Holland	Saltonstall
Capper	Ives	Stennis
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Thye
Cordon	Knowland	Vandenberg
Dworshak	McClellan	Watkins
Ecton	McFarland	Wherry
Ferguson	Martin	Wiley
Fulbright	Maybank	
Green	Moore	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Thirty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCKELLAR, and Mr. O'MAHONEY answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Forty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is not present.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I desire to know whether the Sergeant at Arms is present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that the Chair cannot entertain parliamentary inquiries until a quorum is developed.

After a little delay, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. REED entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Forty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I have just received a communication from the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. As all of us know, he is unavoidably detained and cannot be here on this occasion. His communication reads as follows:

I request postponement of action on the amendment to extend title VI for 1 year, until Monday, May 3, because we have already passed legislation extending title VI in S. 866.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, as the debate on this amendment has continued, I have been reminded somewhat of the Hitler conquest of Europe. I can remember that first he took a little piece of the Rhineland, and then he took a little piece of Austria, and then he wanted the Sudetenland; until, bit by bit, Hitler gobbled up nearly all of Europe. That is somewhat similar to the fight on this bill, Mr. President.

Yesterday, I understand, the House Banking and Currency Committee reported a bill covering one feature of the housing bill which passed the Senate last week. It reported a bill providing for a separate secondary market for GI mortgages. Almost every Member of the Congress is in favor of that feature of the housing bill. So the House very shrewdly said, "Let us pass that as a separate bill," and it was reported yesterday by the House Banking and Currency Committee.

Today, for some reason which seems to be rather mysterious and rather strange, an amendment is offered to a very simple bill, one merely to extend title VI. Every Member of Congress is in favor of title VI. I do not think there would be one vote against title VI. That feature is incorporated in the general housing bill. But when the proposal is made in the Senate to extend title VI for 30 days, to which the subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am not a member, agreed, suddenly an amendment is proposed to extend it for 1 year. Rather strangely, Mr. President, the House of Representatives is now in recess, waiting patiently until the Senate acts on this 1-year-extension amendment. I do not doubt that there is an agreement that the House will accept that 1-year extension; and, as Hitler gobbled up Europe piece by piece, so will they take bit by bit from the housing bill which has been passed by the Senate, and leave only the public-housing feature.

The debate this afternoon—and it has been an earnest and a vigorous debate, although there have been several quorum calls purposely designed to postpone until Monday the debate or the vote on this bill—is a debate on public housing.

I thought we had debated that question in the Senate a week or two ago when we passed the public housing bill, at which time the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], who is now offering an amendment to extend title VI for 1 year, offered an amendment to strike the public-housing feature from the bill. His amendment was defeated by a vote of 49 to 35. Let me read the names of the Senators who voted against the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington to strike out of the housing bill the public-housing feature. In voting "nay" the following Senators thereby voted for public housing: AIKEN, BALDWIN, BALL, BARKLEY, BREWSTER, BRIDGES, BROOKS, CAPPER, CHAVEZ, CORDON, DONNELL, DOWNEY, ELLENDER, FERGUSON, FLANDERS, FULBRIGHT, GREEN, HATCH, HAYDEN, HILL, IVES, JOHNSON of Colorado, KILGORE, KNOWLAND, LANGER, LODGE, LUCAS, MCCARRAN, MCGRATH, MCMAHON, MAGNUSON, MAYBANK, MORSE, MURRAY, MYERS, O'MAHONEY, PEPPER, RUSSELL, SALTONSTALL, SMITH, SPARKMAN, TAYLOR, THOMAS of Oklahoma, THYE, TOBEY, VANDENBERG, WATKINS, WHITE, YOUNG.

By that vote, Mr. President, those Senators put their imprimatur on public housing. We are now endeavoring by the pending amendment to go through a back door for the purpose of destroying the public-housing feature which is in the housing bill as passed by the Senate.

Let us be out in the open, Mr. President. We all know that if the amendment submitted by the Senator from Washington to extend title VI for 1 year were to prevail this afternoon, the House would immediately reconvene; it would agree to the amendment, and public housing for this session would be dead. That is the issue, Mr. President, and I certainly hope Senators who voted for public housing a week or so ago realize and know that that is the issue in the present debate.

Why the hurry, Mr. President? Why the discourtesy to members of the majority party? Why the discourtesy to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], one of the authors of the housing bill, who is now in Ohio fighting for his political life?

I shall not refer to the remarks made today by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], but this again is an indication of how the majority party in the Congress feels toward their leader in the Congress, the Senator from Ohio, who is at least the leader on matters affecting the home front, and on domestic affairs.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MYERS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Was the Senator present when the junior Senator from New York a moment ago read a message from the Senator from Ohio, requesting the majority party to take the lead in postponing action upon the pending measure until next Monday?

Mr. MYERS. No, I did not hear the message read, but I am very happy to have the Senator call my attention to it.

Mr. LUCAS. I was sure the Senator did not hear the message read. The Senator from Ohio, the real leader of the majority party in the United States Senate, who is in Ohio campaigning for the Presidency, sends a message to the junior Senator from New York, merely asking that the majority party postpone action on the pending question.

Think of it. Notwithstanding the plea made by the distinguished Senator from Ohio to his colleagues on the Republican side, they still continue to debate the matter, and refuse to permit a postponement until Monday, when it could be voted upon at 2 or 3 o'clock.

Does anyone believe that if the Senator from Ohio had won the primary in Wisconsin, or if he had won the primary in Nebraska, some Senators on the other side of the aisle would not be eager to secure compliance with his request? The Senator from Ohio is still in the running. [Laughter.] I think the refusal by his colleagues is one of the most discourteous things I have ever seen happen in the United States Senate. The leader goes out of town on important business, and a majority on his side of the aisle simply turns aside from the request and brushes it away as though it were a messenger boy who had conveyed a message of that kind. Yet, as the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] said today, upon the shoulders of the Senator from Ohio has rested for the last 2 years the primary responsibility of carrying forward the program of the Republican Party in the Senate and throughout the country. But, one day out of town, two days out of town, and he makes a request. The request is unheeded; nobody pays any attention to it. Mr. President, I hope that Senators on the other side of the aisle will show a bit of fairness, a bit of deference to the Senator from Ohio in connection with the request he made. The request is not unreasonable, it is not unusual. The pending measure is not a matter of life and death. To say it must be passed by midnight is poppycock. That is not at all the case.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who also is unavoidably absent today, were to send a plea from Oklahoma or California or wherever he might be, that the Senate take no action upon a certain measure until he returned on Monday, and if we were in the majority, ah, we would honor a request of that kind. We would honor a request of that kind, Mr. President, and I think perhaps the Senators on the other side of the aisle will honor the request the Senator from Ohio has made. I cannot imagine my good friend from Nebraska, who is so close to the Senator from Ohio, refusing to honor his request.

Mr. CAIN and Mr. WHERRY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MYERS. I note the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] has been standing for several moments. I shall first yield to him, and then to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I have necessarily been interested in what the Senator from Illinois has just said, relating to something about which most of us know. A message from the Senator from Ohio was read to the Senate a few moments ago by the junior Senator from New York. The message expressed a wish on the part of the Senator from Ohio that consideration of the pending question be deferred until a particular hour on Monday. A few moments after the receipt of that message, the acting majority leader [Mr. WHERRY]—whether as a result of receiving the message, I do not know—came to the junior Senator from Washington and asked whether he would agree to a unanimous-consent request to set an hour—I think 4 o'clock—on Monday for continuing the debate.

I said I certainly would not do so at the moment; that it would cause me to compromise every conviction I had on the particular subject, and that for a period of time I wanted to think it over. That is not a denial by the Republican side of a request of the Senator from Ohio. It amounts to a denial of a request by a particular individual—myself; and I very much doubt that there are many Senators in the Chamber who have a greater affection or respect for the Senator from Ohio than I have. I simply think that on this particular occasion his judgment is wrong, and for the time being I am not inclined to agree to a request which I think should not be made.

A few minutes ago the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] read a list of the Senators who, on a particular motion, several weeks ago voted in the negative. Forty-nine Senators voted against the motion and 35 voted in support of it. For several hours I have not been able to see why the amendment, which we all understand and with which we are all familiar, should not be voted upon in order that we may thus determine how many Senators are for it and how many are against it. If it is agreed to, it is the wish of the Senate; if it is rejected, it is the wish of the Senate. But whether we adopt it or reject it, the House of Representatives, awaiting action by the Senate—and, in my opinion, they are deserving of action on our part—would have an opportunity to act and to continue title VI before its expiration hour at 12 o'clock tonight.

Mr. MYERS. We are more considerate of the leaders on the other side of the aisle than is the Senator from Washington. We want the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], who reported the housing bill, to be present; we want the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee [Mr. TOBEY] to be present, and we want the authors of the bill to be present. We are more considerate of the Republican leaders than are many Members on the other side of the aisle. That is the only reason we are endeavoring to postpone debate until next Monday.

Mr. CAIN. In this instance I think the Senator has a perfect right to be critical of me, but he must not criticize others who cannot act in any other way than they are now acting in the absence of an individual Senator's willingness to go along with a unanimous-consent request, and hold them responsible for any unwillingness to accede to the wish of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MYERS. I asked the Senator earlier in the afternoon to confer with a Member of the House who was here and who is chairman of one of the House committees. I now suggest that the Senator from Washington confer with my good friend, the majority leader of the House, who is at present on the Senate floor. I am sure he would agree that the matter should be postponed until Monday so that the Members of the House may go home and not have to wait until a late hour in the afternoon to vote on the amendment. Why not get together with the majority leader of the House, who is my good friend with whom I served in that body? I am sure the Senator can arrange a time to vote and to send the matter over to the House of Representatives on Monday.

Mr. CAIN. It happens that I am in position to answer both question. When the Senator suggested that I determine from Representative WOLCOTT what the vote on Senate bill 866 might be in the House if title I were deleted from it I thought it was an improper suggestion for the Senator to make. I thought the Senator should secure the answer to his own question. But later on I talked with Mr. WOLCOTT, and I recall that he said there would be no attempt on his part or on the part of the leadership of the House to prevent a vote by the House on the only subject which is of concern to those who oppose the amendment, namely, public housing; that it would be open, and there would be no closed door. If the Banking and Currency Committee of the House sees fit—I do not know what its action will be—to eliminate the public-housing provision from Senate bill 866, there will be no attempt on the part of the leadership to prevent any individual Representative from offering an amendment to replace it in the bill. If the contrary be true, if the bill in its present form is reported by the Banking and Currency Committee to the floor, there will be no attempt to prevent the offering of an amendment which will restrict public housing.

Secondly, I want to say to the very distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania that a few minutes ago I had an opportunity to chat for a brief time with the gentleman from Indiana, Representative HALLECK, the majority leader of the House, and, in answer to the question which the Senator has posed to me, he suggested, if it is proper to say so on the floor, in answer to the Senator's query, that he thought it would be a fine thing for the country if the Senate should take action and if the House also should take action before the existing law expires at midnight tonight.

Mr. MYERS. Did the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee predict that Senate bill 866 would be reported by his committee without the public-housing feature being in the bill?

Mr. CAIN. He made no prediction, for I asked him no question in that respect.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] has been seeking recognition, and I will yield to him.

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I call up the conference report on House bill 6055 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The conference report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6055) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 12, 40, 42, 50, and 54.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, and 68, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"TEMPORARY CONGRESSIONAL AVIATION POLICY BOARD

"For an additional amount for salaries and expenses for completion of the work of the Temporary Congressional Aviation Policy Board created by the Act to establish a National Aviation Council, and for other purposes (Public Law 287, Eightieth Congress), to be available until June 30, 1948, and to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers approved by the Chairman, $5,000: *Provided*, That expenditures hereunder shall be made in accordance with the laws applicable to inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

"Such sums as may be necessary (not exceeding $4,500,000) are hereby appropriated for making for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1949 payments to States in accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended (29 U. S. C., ch. 4): *Provided*, That the obligations incurred and expenditures made for such purpose under the authority of this paragraph shall be charged to the appropriation therefor in the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1949: *Provided further*, That the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall not exceed the amount paid to the States for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1948 in accordance with such Vocational Rehabilitation Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$970,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$20,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$262,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 22, 30, and 34.

STYLES BRIDGES,
CHAN GURNEY,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE H. MAHON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to know whether the conferees of the House agreed with the conferees of the Senate. I should like to have a report on what happened in the conference.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senate would be concerned with only two amendments, which were eliminated from the bill. The amendments were inserted by the Senate Appropriations Committee, and agreed to by the Senate, providing $1,850,000 for the State unemployment compensation agencies, and $2,560,000 for grants to States for public employment offices. On those items the Senate conferees maintained their stand, but were unable to reach an agreement with the House. Representative KEEFE, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Labor and Federal Security and a member of the conference, took the leadership in the House group, stating that those particular divisions would be combined in the new Labor-Federal Security bill. For that reason, he did not believe these funds were needed. The conferees could reach no agreement. Finally, the understanding was reached that there soon would be another deficiency bill and that if, on the checking by our staff with the various State unemployment agencies and the State unemployment departments, the need still existed for funds, we would again insert the items in the next deficiency bill and urge their adoption.

I think those are the only two points as to which there is any question.

Mr. LUCAS. Do I correctly understand that if we adopt the conference report there will be no money whatsoever to carry on the unemployment-compensation feature?

Mr. BRIDGES. The amounts requested will not be included.

Mr. LUCAS. What will happen until Representative KEEFE can get around to the Labor-Federal Security bill and until an investigation can be made?

Mr. BRIDGES. They will have to get along with what they have in the various States.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, when the money runs out, that will be the end of it?

Mr. BRIDGES. That would be the end of it.

Mr. LUCAS. Is this a quick way to liquidate those agencies? Is that what the attempt is?

Mr. BRIDGES. No. I would say to the Senator from Illinois that the Senator from New Hampshire was very sincere. I thought our case was justified. I sponsored the items and the Senate included them, but we ran into disagreement in conference with the House. It seemed that the only way to get the report adopted and effect a compromise measure was to serve notice that in the next deficiency bill we would include the items again and insist on them.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire merely to emphasize the fact as I understand it, that the Senate Committee on Appropriations, when it put this appropriation in the bill, at the suggestion of the Senator from New Hampshire, was satisfied that the employment offices in the States were in need of this sum without any question.

Mr. BRIDGES. It was.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That was the opinion of the committee, as I understood. Am I correct in my understanding now that the position of the House rather was that the money was not needed?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; plus the explanation that they were going to propose a new set-up for the coming year. They felt that these sums were not needed on the same basis as if the two divisions were to be continued for the coming year as they had been in the past.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator imply by that statement that the plan in the House is to change the existing legislation?

Mr. BRIDGES. I would assume so; yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That, of course, raises a very serious question. The advice which comes to me with respect to this amendment is that unless this appropriation is allowed, and allowed very soon, the employment offices in a number of States will be required to close. So it poses a very serious issue, whether, because a member of the House conference suggests that there will be a change in legislation, we shall therefore deny the funds which the Senate committee thought were absolutely essential.

May I not ask the Senator, therefore, if in these circumstances it would not be desirable to have the Senate now reject this report, so that the Senate conferees could take it back to discuss it again with the House conferees?

Mr. BRIDGES. I was in favor of both items, the Committee on Appropriations was in favor of both items, and the Senate was in favor of both items. We went forward in good faith. We argued for their retention until it became apparent that we could not get an agreement unless we yielded on these items; so the only compromise I could see was that of putting the items in the next deficiency bill if the need still existed.

Having moved the adoption of the conference report, I do not intend to recommend that it be rejected. But if the Senate in its wisdom does not care to accept it, I shall accept that decision.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator has told us that his compromise agreement is not that this fund shall be provided in another bill, but that if legislation is not changed, then some other sum perhaps may be provided.

Mr. BRIDGES. No; I think the Senator misunderstood me. My statement was that I still felt that insofar as I was concerned, and insofar as I then knew, the funds were needed, but that if the Senate adopted the conference report we would recheck as to the needs, and if the facts as developed on the recheck were as I thought them to be, we would certainly insist on the items in the next deficiency bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In other words, the Senator has put himself in the position of saying to the House conferees, as he now says to the Senate, that he sees no evidence to change his mind as to the necessity for this appropriation, and that if such evidence is not presented he will, upon the basis of the evidence which we have already had, seek to restore this appropriation in the next appropriation bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator wish to have us understand that if it is handled in that way it will be in time to prevent cutting off the services in the States?

Mr. BRIDGES. It would be done before the current Congress adjourned. I do not know when the next deficiency bill will come along, but I should guess it would be sometime in May.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I merely wish to point out the importance of returning the report to the conference, so far as the State of Michigan is concerned. In the State of Michigan during April the service has been operated at the rate of $450,000 a month. At the present time the State has about $424,000, which would be less than enough to carry on the operations for a month at the present rate.

In Michigan we face this situation: Several strike votes have been taken, and if the strikes take place, employees in other plants which are geared to the main industry will be out of employment, and, therefore, great difficulty will be encountered if money is not received within a period of 30 days.

I think the State of Michigan has done everything it can to conserve the money which has been allotted to it, namely, $1,750,000. There was a serious gas shortage in the State, as a consequence of which 3 weeks of employment were lost in the city of Detroit, which placed a great burden on the administration of the act in Michigan. The State has even gone to the point of asking the employers to help to fill out certain blanks and applications so that money could be saved. The service operated at the rate of $536,000 in January, and it was able to cut the amount down to $450,000 in the month of April.

Mr. President, I feel that under the circumstances we actually face a shutting down of the Employment Compensation Commission and the work it has to do in Michigan. I do not feel we can take the chance of waiting until May or June for another deficiency bill in order that we may keep the service going.

As I understand, when people are thrown out of work, they immediately make applications. Although the law does not provide for compensation for the first week, it does provide compensation for the second week, and if the applications are not cleared and properly processed, the employees do not receive their compensation.

I was talking with Lansing today, and found that there is an item of $100,000 for rent and overhead expenses in the operation of this activity. I was informed that they might transfer some funds, but under no circumstances could they transfer more than $100,000.

In the circumstances, Michigan faces, within a little more than a month, I should say even less than a month, the shutting down of this facility, and I intend to move that the Senate disagree to the report, and request a further conference with the House. I think this situation should be forcefully presented to the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A motion to disagree would not be in order. The same purpose would be accomplished by voting down the conference report.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to say to my distinguished friend from New Hampshire that the report rather shocks me, because, since the able Senator from New Hampshire was in charge of the appropriation, and was the author of these amendments, it seemed to me that there was nothing more any Senator could do or should do in attempting to protect his State, because I was sure the Senator from New Hampshire would come back to the Senate with a report embodying what the Committee on Appropriations had inserted in the bill.

What the Senator from Michigan has said presents a picture typical, perhaps, of a great number of States throughout the Nation. I am not sure what the condition is in the State of Illinois in respect to funds. It seems to me that the report is of such importance that we ought to delay action on it until Monday, at least, so that in the interim Members of the Senate may have an opportunity to investigate the situation existing in respect to their own States, and further investigate the problem as a whole, and then take action on Monday, when probably 75 or 80 Members may be present, instead of a bare quorum. The measure is one which is of tremendous importance to every State of the Union. I hope the Senator from New Hampshire will not urge immediate action on his motion, but permit the report to go over until Monday and deal with the matter at that time.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I merely want to point out that acceptance of the report will have a rather devastating effect on the State of New York in the two services involved. It would mean that beginning with May 15, or the day after, 900 employees would have to be dropped in the State of New York. This would come at a time of big rush in the recruitment services, and it would not only be demoralizing there but would be almost paralyzing.

Mr. President, far be it from me ever to want to see a conference report rejected for any personal reason, but knowing what I do about the situation, knowing not only how the measure would affect New York, but how it would affect Ohio and New Jersey, two States which are affected even more harmfully than New York, it seems to me action on the report should not be postponed. I think we ought to have immediate consideration of the report, and that the report should be rejected. I say that with all due respect to my good friend the Senator from New Hampshire, who, I happen to know, is in no way, shape, or manner to blame for the present situation.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope that the report will not be adopted.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. What was done with respect to the amendment dealing with the Naval Home in Philadelphia?

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senate conferees receded from that amendment.

Mr. MYERS. The Naval Home in Philadelphia is really the home for old tars, old salts, some of them indigent, and some injured. They asked for a deficiency, Mr. President, of $9,100. The House gave them $3,800. The matter came to the Senate, and the Senate provided the full $9,100 asked for. In conference the Senate conferees have receded on that item. Do you know what that means, Mr. President? Those poor old fellows will be deprived of their tobacco, they will get milk only now and then, and perhaps meat once a week.

Mr. President, why should the Senate recede on this item? It means a saving of less than $6,000; yet the Senate conferees receded. I certainly think that is one amendment on which they could have held fast. $6,000 is involved, and those poor old fellows in the Naval Home in Philadelphia are going to be penalized. They are not only going to have their tobacco taken from them, but will receive less milk and less meat. I certainly wish to join with some of my other colleagues in urging that the report be rejected, and that the bill again go to conference.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, let me say that in a deficiency bill which contains many, many items there are always some which are in disagreement between the House and the Senate. The only way in which a conference report is finally agreed to is by means of give and take. In no instance do the Senate conferees yield easily. Senators who have been on conference committees know

what is involved. In order to agree upon a report it is necessary for the conferees on both sides to yield here and there. I am not at all satisfied at times with the results obtained in conference, and I regret that we sometimes are obliged to yield. But it is a case of reaching agreement on appropriations in order that the various branches of government may be enabled to function. Therefore in a conference, if the representatives of one House demand everything passed by that House, and the representatives of the other House demanded everything passed by their House we would reach a stalemate and nothing would be accomplished. As I stated, it is a matter of give and take. Some Senators may believe that there is a mistake in judgment on the part of House conferees or Senate conferees respecting certain items, but whatever is done is in good faith.

Mr. President, insofar as I am concerned I do not believe that postponement of the report until Monday or any other day will do any good. If the Senate would like to insist further upon its amendments I shall have no personal feeling in the matter.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I wish to express the hope that the Senate will reject the conference report, and send the bill back for further conference. None of us are altogether familiar with the situation, but I was informed this morning that not only my own State but several other States will be obliged to close their unemployment compensation offices very early, probably before another deficiency bill can be passed, if the action taken by the conferees is agreed to. In that situation it will cause the abandonment of all the organizations in States affected. That will be a most wasteful procedure, aside from the injury done to the service generally. I do not know what will be required, but knowing that the Senator from New Hampshire will do his best to correct the situation, why not let the measure go back to conference, and there try to provide for funds to carry over for a period of 60 or 90 days, while the new plan is worked out, so there will be no interruption in the service. Can that not be done?

Mr. BRIDGES. The funds would be sufficient only for the next 2 months, until June 30. As I have said previously, I have no personal feelings in the matter. If the Senate desires to send the measure back for further conference, and insists on amendments which the Senate has approved, and which I personally supported, or if the Senate desires to send it back with instructions, certainly I do not want to delay the matter. I urged the adoption of the report and I may say that I feel that no good can be accomplished by postponing action. Whatever we do should be done this afternoon.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. As the Senator from New Hampshire knows, there is an item in the bill providing $1,600,000 for the deepening of St. Lucie Canal in Florida. While I do not want to put the needs or the necessities of my own State ahead of those of any other State, I do desire to call to the attention of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee and to all other Senators the fact that here is a vital matter, which must be acted upon, for it may mean life or death next fall. This is the first phase of the flood-control program to try to avert a disaster next fall similar to that of last fall, which caused approximately $59,000,000 in damages, according to the report of the Corps of Engineers. Plans and specifications are all ready. The engineers are ready to start their advertisements for bids, just as soon as the measure is passed. I have no objection at all to a rejection of the report if it will be accompanied by speedy action, followed within 2 or 3 days, by another report. But, Mr. President, I feel that we should recall that in a deficiency measure of this kind there are of necessity matters upon which action cannot be delayed, and I know that no Member of the Senate would want to cause additional delay in carrying on the project I have mentioned.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say to the Senator from Florida, that he is one of the fortunate individuals whose particular appropriation is in the bill. Therefore he is not in the position of some other Senators who are interested in items on which the Senate conferees were forced to yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire that the conference report be agreed to.

The report was rejected.

Mr. BRIDGES. I move that the Senate further insist upon its amendments, request a further conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint as conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference the same conferees as were previously appointed, with the addition of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BALL, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. RUSSELL conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 6055, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
April 29, 1948.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 30 and 34 to the bill (H. R. 6055) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out and inserted by the said amendment insert: "$225,000: *Provided*, That the authorization granted the Secretary of Commerce in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, with respect to utilization of funds for export controls and for allocation and inventory controls or voluntary agreements relating thereto, is extended from March 31 to June 30, 1948: *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available herein."

Mr. BRIDGES. I move that the Senate agree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22.

The motion was agreed to.

TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF TITLE VI OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2565) to provide for a temporary extension of title VI of the National Housing Act, as amended.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the hour is now about 5:30. We have been debating the Cain amendment for most of the afternoon, although we have branched off to other subjects. In view of the support from the other side of the aisle, it seems that the only thing we could do this afternoon would be to nominate the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] for President. [Laughter.] For that reason, after debating this question since noon, I feel that I should propound a unanimous-consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, May 3, 1948, at 2 o'clock p. m., the Senate vote without further debate on the pending amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the time from 12 o'clock until 2 o'clock p. m. to be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the amendment, and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] or some other Senator designated by him if he is unable to serve.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] if he believes that would be a satisfactory arrangement so far as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is concerned. The Senator from Ohio testified before the committee; and I shall object to the request of the Senator from Nebraska if there is any objection on the part of the Senator from Ohio or the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity to communite with the Senator from Ohio since receiving the message which was read a little while ago. The message was actually received. It was not a phony message. It did arrive, and it is absolutely accurate. In line with the message which the Senator from Ohio sent requesting that action on the proposed amendment be delayed until next Monday, I am sure that the hour suggested by the Senator from Nebraska would undoubtedly be satisfactory under those conditions. The same thing applies so far as the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is concerned. I have not heard from them; but I believe that is all any of us should request.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York has no objection, I do not object.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I had hoped that the Senate would be able to resolve the pending question during the course of this night. I continue to be aware, as I have been all day, that title VI of the National Housing Act expires at midnight tonight. That calls for action before midnight.

I wish to make it very clear that we ought to take some action. Apparently a sufficient number of Senators to prevent action have no intention of doing anything tonight. I wish to make myself very clear on that particular subject. I think the pending amendment is a reasonable one from my point of view. It has been exposed to close scrutiny and debate all day. I wish I could think of some way by which the question could be brought to a positive conclusion.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish only to repeat what I stated earlier today. In March 1946 the same law expired. Thanks to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, I was one of the conferees at that time. We could not get the House to agree. The law was inoperative for some time before we finally reached an agreement. A hiatus of 1 or 2 days makes no difference. The law expired in March 1946 and was not in effect until May 27. Forty-eight hours makes no difference. The Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Vermont and other Senators who supported the measure should be present.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I have a very simple answer in reply to the question just raised by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]. If he really wants action on this subject tonight, I am sure that it can be obtained by unanimous consent if he will withdraw the amendment which he has offered and allow the Senate to pass the bill providing for a 30-day extension. I am sure that that would meet with no objection whatever.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to respond to the junior Senator from New York by saying that there are two different points of view concerning an important problem. How can either of us know whether or not the amendment would prevail?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I should like to point out, in reply to the observation of the Senator from Washington, that he has emphasized that action must be taken.

Mr. CAIN. It ought to be.

Mr. IVES. That is a little change in phraseology. The Senator stated that action must be taken.

Mr. CAIN. From my point of view it must.

Mr. IVES. The junior Senator from New York is merely trying to point out the process by which action can be taken, and by which this debate and controversy can be ended. If the situation is so serious as the junior Senator from Washington would have us believe—and I have every reason to think that the junior Senator from Washington himself thoroughly believes that it is that serious—he should withdraw the amendment which he has offered and allow the Senate to vote on the bill as reported by the committee, providing for a 30-day extension.

Mr. CAIN. All the junior Senator from Washington and other Senators who believe in his position have been asking all day is that the Senate vote on the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Washington. If that is defeated, the bill will be open for passage or rejection, in accordance with the wish of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. CAIN. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MAYBANK. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I feel that every effort has been made to bring this issue to a successful conclusion. Apparently the will is that there shall not be a vote on this issue tonight if it can be prevented. I shall not quarrel with that viewpoint. However, we have had a long session. It is now 5:30. If it meets with the approval of the Senate I shall move that the Senate, as in executive session, consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, and then take a recess until Monday.

Mr. MAYBANK. Upon that motion being agreed to, I shall withdraw the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand, the unfinished business would be the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, the Senate will shortly take a recess. The names of many leaders on the opposite side have been mentioned. When the deficiency bill goes back for further conference, I hope the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] will remember my old sailors in Philadelphia and try to do something for them.

CONSIDERATION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, that the Senate proceed to consider nominations on the Executive Calendar as printed for Friday, April 30, 1948.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

HOUSING EXPEDITER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Tighe E. Woods to be Housing Expediter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC PRINTER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John J. Deviny to be Public Printer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Sanford M. Rosenthal to be Medical Director in the Public Health Service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of J. Edwin McKee to be postmaster at Fort Worth, Tex.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the nominations confirmed by the Senate today.

CONVENTION DISPPOSING OF CLAIMS BETWEEN NORWAY AND THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Before the consideration of the Executive Calendar is concluded, the Chair, with the indulgence of the Senate, desires to call attention to No. 18 on the Executive Calendar, being Executive G of the Seventy-ninth Congress, first session. It is merely a conclusion of a method of arbitration of claims between Norway and the United States, claims which have been lingering for many, many years, in connection with shipping in World War I. This convention is simply a method of arranging for arbitration in one instance, and an agreement on our part to permit the Government of Norway to submit all the claims to our Court of Claims.

The able Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] was absent from his seat when the Chair undertook to make this explanation. He is in charge of the convention, and the Chair now recognizes him.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I am sure the President pro tempore has stated the proposition better than I could have. I think the Senate should act upon this convention tonight.

The Senate, as in committee of the whole, proceeded to consider the Convention, Executive G (79th Cong., 1st sess.), a convention between the United States of America and Norway, signed at Washington on March 28, 1940, providing for the disposition of a claim of the Government of Norway against the Government of the United States on behalf of Christoffer Hannevig, a Norwegian subject, and a claim of the Government of the United States against the Government of Norway on behalf of the late George R. Jones, an American citizen, which was read the second time, as follows:

CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND NORWAY SIGNED MARCH 28, 1940

Whereas the Government of Norway has made claim against the Government of the United States of America on account of

damages alleged to have been sustained by Christoffer Hannevig as the result of acts of the Government of the United States of America, the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, their officers and agents, in relation to certain properties in the United States of America in which he claims to have had an interest, the validity of which claim is denied by the Government of the United States of America.

Whereas the Government of the United States of America has made claim against the Government of Norway on account of alleged denial of justice by the courts of that country in connection with certain litigation involving the rights and interests of the George R. Jones Company, or the late George R. Jones, the validity of which claim is denied by the Government of Norway.

Whereas the President of the United States of America and His Majesty the King of Norway, desirous of reaching an amicable agreement for the disposition of such claims and of concluding a convention for that purpose, have named as their plenipotentiaries, that is to say:

The President of the United States of America:

Cordell Hull, Secretary of State of the United States of America; and

His Majesty the King of Norway:

Wilhelm Munthe Morgenstierne, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Norway to the United States of America;

Who, having communicated to each other their respective full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following articles:

ARTICLE I

First. Within one year from the date of the exchange of ratifications of this convention, the Agent for the Government of Norway shall present to the Agent for the Government of the United States of America a Memorial or a statement of claim in which shall be set forth in a clear, categorical and full manner:

(a) the precise items of alleged loss or damage composing the claim on behalf of Christoffer Hannevig as they are finally conceived to be by the Government of Norway, indicating definitely the amount of each separate item thereof;

(b) the facts alleged in support of each such item of the claim;

(c) the principles of law upon which each item of the claim is alleged to rest.

Such Memorial shall be accompanied by all the evidence upon which all items of the claim are made to rest, it being clearly understood that no further evidence may be submitted in support of the claim, either during the stage hereinafter provided for its diplomatic consideration or during its possible adjudication, except such rebuttal evidence as is referred to hereinafter.

Second. Within one year from the date of the receipt by the Agent for the Government of the United States of America of the Memorial of the Government of Norway, he shall present to the Agent for the latter an Answer to the Memorial, in which shall be set out in a similarly clear, categorical and full manner:

(a) the defenses of the Government of the United States of America to each item of the claim;

(b) the facts upon which such defenses rest;

(c) the principles of law relied upon in each instance.

To such Answer there shall be attached all of the evidence upon which the defense of the case shall be made to rest and no further evidence shall be filed in defense, either during the stage of diplomatic consideration or during a possible adjudication of the claim, except such rebuttal evidence as is referred to hereinafter.

Third. Within six months from the date of the receipt of the Answer of the Government of the United States of America, the Agent for the Government of Norway may, if he so desires, file a Reply to such Answer. In such Reply the Government of Norway, without being allowed to augment or change any of the bases of the claim as stated in its Memorial, may explain such alleged bases in the light of the evidence filed with the Answer.

There may be filed with the Reply only such evidence as is strictly in rebuttal to evidence filed with the Answer and as does not present any new bases of claim. Any such evidence filed which is not strictly in rebuttal to the evidence filed with the Answer shall be entirely disregarded in deciding the case.

Fourth. Within six months from the date of the receipt of the Reply of the Government of Norway, the Agent for the Government of the United States of America may, if he so desires, file a Counter-Reply, which Counter-Reply shall be strictly limited to answering contentions advanced in the Reply.

There may be filed with the Counter-Reply only such evidence as is strictly in rebuttal to evidence filed with the Reply. Any such evidence filed which is not strictly in rebuttal to the evidence filed with the Reply shall be entirely disregarded in deciding the case. It is understood that no evidence may thereafter be submitted in support of or in defense of the claim, either during the period of its diplomatic consideration or during its possible adjudication.

Fifth. Within six months from the date of the receipt of the Counter-Reply of the Government of the United States of America, the Agent for the Government of Norway shall file with the Agent for the Government of the United States of America a legal Brief in which the Claimant Government shall set forth with clarity and fullness all its contentions with respect to the factual bases of the claim as already developed and the law applicable thereto.

Sixth. Within six months from the date of the receipt of the Brief of the Government of Norway, the Agent for the Government of the United States of America shall file with the Agent for the Government of Norway a Reply Brief in which the Respondent Government shall set forth with clarity and fullness all its contentions with respect to the factual defenses of the claim and the law applicable thereto.

It is declared to be the purpose of this Article to require a full, systematic and fair development of all the facts and law of the case for consideration by the two Governments and, if necessary, by the tribunal or tribunals.

ARTICLE II

In the event that the two Governments shall be unable to agree upon a disposition of the claim, or any portions thereof, within the six months next succeeding the filing of the Reply Brief of the Government of the United States of America, the pleadings thus exchanged shall be referred to the Court of Claims of the United States of America for a decision on the claim or any such unsettled portions thereof, it being clearly understood, however, that in no event shall the issues of the case, either factual or legal, or the contentions of either party, as submitted to diplomatic discussion, be changed in character, or the written record above described augmented in any manner in the event that the claim shall be so referred to the Court of Claims for adjudication.

It is understood that the provisions for possible reference of the case to the Court of Claims, and for possible appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States of America, as provided in Article V hereof, are subject to authorization by the Congress of the United States of America.

ARTICLE III

The issues to be decided by the Court of Claims shall be those formulated by the pleadings exchanged pursuant to Article I of this convention, or such of those issues as shall not have been previously settled by agreement of the two Governments.

The Court of Claims shall decide such issues in conformity with applicable law, including international law, and shall state fully the reasons for its decision.

ARTICLE IV

As soon as possible after the receipt of the above-mentioned pleadings by the Court of Claims, the Court shall convene for the purpose of hearing such oral arguments by Agents or Counsel or both for each Government as the respective Agents thereof shall desire to present. The conduct of the oral proceedings shall otherwise be under the control of the Court.

ARTICLE V

Within three months following the date of the decision of the Court of Claims (in the event the case shall be referred to the Court for adjudication), either or both Governments may petition the Supreme Court of the United States of America to review the decision and such review shall comprehend either the factual or the legal bases of the case, or both, as may be requested in the petition or petitions.

ARTICLE VI

In the absence of such a petition to the Supreme Court the decision of the Court of Claims shall be accepted by both Governments as a final and binding disposition of the case. In the event of such a petition to the Supreme Court its decision shall be accepted by the two Governments as a final disposition of the case.

ARTICLE VII

In the event that an award is finally rendered in favor of the Government of Norway, no part thereof shall be paid or credited to that Government for any purpose whatsoever until the claims of creditors of Christoffer Hannevig and of his various American corporations shall have been settled by an agreement between the two Governments.

ARTICLE VIII

The language of the pleadings and of the oral proceedings shall be English. Any evidence submitted in any language other than English shall be accompanied by a full and correct translation thereof into the English language.

ARTICLE IX

The two Governments agree that the claim of the Government of the United States of America against the Government of Norway on behalf of the George R. Jones Company, the late George R. Jones, or his heirs, successors or assigns shall be developed for consideration in the following manner:

(a) the pleading shall be limited to four in number, namely, a Memorial, an Answer, a Brief, and a Reply Brief, and they shall be prepared in the same manner, and filed within the same time limits as the corresponding pleadings provided for in Article I of this convention:

(b) all evidence in support of and in defense of the claim shall be filed with the Memorial and with the Answer in the manner prescribed in Article I, and no further evidence shall be filed except that such evidence may be filed with the Brief as is strictly in rebuttal to that filed with the Answer.

ARTICLE X

If the two Governments shall be unable to agree upon the settlement of the Jones case within the six months next succeeding the date upon which the Reply Brief shall have been filed in that case, the pleadings shall be

referred by means of a joint communication of the two Agents, to a sole Arbitrator for decision. The Arbitrator, who shall be neither Norway nor the United States of agreed upon by the two Governments, shall be a jurist of high reputation, well versed in international law, and shall be a national of America.

In the event of the inability of the two Governments to agree upon an Arbitrator within two months from the termination of the period last above mentioned, such Arbitrator shall be selected by His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland and the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India.

The place of arbitration of the Jones case (in the event that arbitration becomes necessary) shall not be within the territorial jurisdiction of either of the contracting parties.

In the matter of the conduct of oral proceedings, the Arbitrator shall be bound by the principles of Article IV of this convention. The decision of the Arbitrator, which shall be rendered within three months from the conclusion of oral proceedings, shall be accepted by the two Governments as a final and conclusive disposition of the Jones case.

ARTICLE XI

Each Government shall pay all expenses incident to the preparation and presentation of its own side of each case. All joint expenses, including the honorarium for the Arbitrator, shall be borne by the two Governments in equal proportions.

ARTICLE XII

The periods of time mentioned in Articles I and IX of this convention may be extended by mutual agreement of the two Governments.

ARTICLE XIII

This convention shall be ratified by the High Contracting Parties and shall take effect immediately upon the exchange of ratifications which shall take place at Washington as soon as possible.

In witness whereof, the respective plenipotentiaries have signed this convention and have hereunto affixed their seals.

Done in duplicate at Washington, this twenty-eighth day of March, 1940.

[SEAL] CORDELL HULL
[SEAL] W. MUNTHE MORGENSTIERNE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The convention is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the convention will be reported to the Senate.

The convention was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive G, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, a convention between the United States of America and Norway, signed at Washington on March 28, 1940, providing for the disposition of a claim of the Government of Norway against the Government of the United States on behalf of Christoffer Hannevig, a Norwegian subject, and a claim of the Government of the United States against the Government of Norway on behalf of the late George R. Jones, an American citizen.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators concurring therein, the resolution of ratification is agreed to, and the convention is ratified.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate take a recess until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.), under the order previously entered, the Senate took a recess until Monday, May 3, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 30 (legislative day of April 22), 1948:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Ely E. Palmer, of Rhode Island, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Afghanistan, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Afghanistan.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

J. Skelly Wright, of Louisiana, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Louisiana, vice Hon. Herbert W. Christenberry, resigned.

George L. Grobe, of New York, to be United States attorney for the western district of New York. (Mr. Grobe is now serving under an appointment which expired October 1, 1947.)

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be dietitian (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance:

Fonda L. Dickson

To be senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance:

John L. Lewis, Jr.	Alvin L. Cain
Ralph Alperin	William W. Richards
William Weingarten	Walter J. Lear
Holman R. Wherritt	John P. Risley
Stanley H. Moulton	Vaso L. Purlia
Edgar A. Swartz	Milo O. Blade

To be assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance:

Paul Fremont-Smith	Robert F. Wettingfeld
David L. Rodgers	Sidney Shindell
Robert M. Faine	Raymond W. Hermann
Laurence Finberg	William H. Baker
Carlyle F. Stout	Harry R. H. Nicholas III
John P. Utz	Sol Altschul
Charles O. Metzmaker	Keith H. Frankhauser
Arthur D. Fisher	Edward B. Lehmann
David H. Solomon	Ralph S. Paffenbarger, Jr.
Norman G. Hepper	
James V. Woodworth	John W. Cashman
Leonard J. Ganser	Robert A. Sammons
Charles M. Gillikin	Alan F. Thometz
Daniel M. Enerson	Lewis W. Moore
Arthur S. Keats	Delmo A. Paris
Wendell L. Pierce	

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

To be first lieutenants

First Lt. John Edward Lineberger, AO50377, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 1, 1948.

First Lt. Rudolph Junior Schweizer, AO56527, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force) with rank from May 1, 1948.

First Lt. William Claude Weldon, Jr., AO56528, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 2, 1948.

Second Lt. M. L. Buchanan, AO56530, United States Air Force, with rank from May 3, 1948.

×Second Lt. Clayton Darrell Mode, AO38456, United States Air Force, with rank from May 3, 1948.

First Lt. Bryan Roscoe Jolley, AO56529, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 3, 1948.

First Lt. Walter Brooks Badger, AO56533, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 4, 1948.

Capt. Frank Mann, Jr., AO50378, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 4, 1948.

Capt. Floyd Harrison Trogdon, AO50381, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 7, 1948.

First Lt. John William Trezise, AO50382, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 8, 1948.

First Lt. Clarence James Douglas, Jr., AO56534, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 9, 1948.

First Lt. Jewel Neal Craft, AO56536, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 10, 1948.

First Lt. Walter Scott Crum, AO50383, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 11, 1948.

Second Lt. John Malcolm Netterblad, AO50384, United States Air Force, with rank from May 11, 1948.

First Lt. Joseph Michael Kristoff, AO56538, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 12, 1948.

×First Lt. James Fred Gruben, AO50387, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 13, 1948.

Second Lt. John Joseph Burgmeier, AO50388, United States Air Force, with rank from May 13, 1948.

First Lt. Harold Wendell Petree, AO56539, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 13, 1948.

First Lt. John Boyd Flaig, AO50390, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 14, 1948.

First Lt. Donald Eugene Dano, AO50391, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 16, 1948.

Capt. Ellis Leroy Fisher, AO38461, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 17, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Allen Novotny, AO56541, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 17, 1948.

First Lt. LeRoy Perry Hansen, AO41333, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 18, 1948.

First Lt. Russell Lamar Lewis, AO56542, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 18, 1948.

First Lt. William Everett Davis, Jr., AO41332, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 18, 1948.

First Lt. William Daniel Johnston, Jr., AO50393, Air Force of the United States

(second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 18, 1948.

First Lt. Frederick Warburton Joy, Jr., AO50394, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 18, 1948.

First Lt. Philip James Crossman, AO56544, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 19, 1948.

First Lt. Andrew Raymond Reeves, Jr., AO38462, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 20, 1948.

Capt. Robert Charles Tomlinson, AO38464, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 21, 1948.

First Lt. Nils Nelson, AO56545, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 21, 1948.

Second Lt. Robert Dale Miller, AO38465, United States Air Force, with rank from May 23, 1948.

First Lt. Spencer Crosby Savage, AO56546, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 23, 1948.

×First Lt. Francis Harold Potter, AO38466, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 23, 1948.

×First Lt. Cullen Bryant Morgan, AO38467, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 23, 1948.

×First Lt. Alma Lord Potter, AO50399, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 23, 1948.

×First Lt. Jerry William Tom, AO38468, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 23, 1948.

First Lt. Benjamin Wilder Coolidge, AO56547, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 23, 1948.

First Lt. Hoyt Cecil Bethell, AO56548, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 23, 1948.

×First Lt. James Russell Lowell, AO38469, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 23, 1948.

Second Lt. Smith Lorenzo Von Fossen, AO56552, United States Air Force, with rank from May 23, 1948.

Second Lt. Marlin Clyde Howard, AO56549, United States Air Force, with rank from May 23, 1948.

First Lt. Martin Luther Stutts, AO38470, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 23, 1948.

First Lt. Kenneth Omar Wofford, AO56550, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 23, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Herbert Proctor, AO56553, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 23, 1948.

Second Lt. Robert Marion Denny, AO56555, United States Air Force, with rank from May 23, 1948.

First Lt. William Orville Lighty, AO56556, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 23, 1948.

Second Lt. Robert Wendell Dodson, AO56551, United States Air Force, with rank from May 23, 1948.

First Lt. Vernon Alfred Lindvig, AO56557, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 24, 1948.

First Lt. Keith Gordon Robison, AO56558, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 25, 1948.

First Lt. Donald Raymond Butterfield, AO56559, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 26, 1948.

First Lt. Lyle Albin Wykert, AO50404, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 30, 1948.

First Lt. Douglas James Nelson, AO50405, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 30, 1948.

First Lt. Hewitt Eldridge Lovelace, Jr., AO50406, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 31, 1948.

First Lt. James Stuart Schofield, AO56561, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from May 31, 1948.

Regular Army and Regular Air Force

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army and Regular Air Force of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Army, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

REGULAR ARMY

Albert N. Abelson
Eugene K. Andreasen
John F. Archer
Edward J. Arlinghaus
Thomas Y. Awalt
Guy A. Baber, Jr.
Andrew W. Baird
George M. Barrack, Jr.
Sam L. Barth
Rutland D. Beard, Jr.
Donald J. Beckwith
Richard A. Benefield
Robert B. Bernstorf
George W. Bickerstaff
George H. Bickley
Colon R. Britt, Jr.
William E. Brockmeier
Joseph W. Brouillette, Jr.
Bobby C. Bush
Thomas E. Cantrell
Marco J. Caraccia
Robert E. Carlson
Murray L. Carroll
Esper K. Chandler
William W. Chandler
John W. Chism
Byron R. Clark
William P. Clay
Ray W. Coffey
Samuel N. Cohen
Charles C. Collins
William I. Compton
James Corey
George L. Cross
Harrison P. Crowell
Victor R. Cullens
William J. Cummings
Charles T. deLorimier
Albert P. Dempsey, Jr.
Clinton A. Drury, Jr.
Eugene M. Dutchak
Charles W. Edwards
Earl E. Emerson, Jr.
Irving Feldman
Robert J. Fiscella
Thomas C. Fischer
Harley B. Fisk, Jr.
James R. Flannery
Joe A. Font
Edward F. Foster
Reinhart C. Gauerke
Owen J. Giblin
Warren A. Gilbert, Jr.
John P. Gilman
George W. Gordon
Douglas M. Graham
Edward Greer
Sidney C. Guthrie
M. B. Guyton
Spencer V. Halgren
Elton F. Hammond, Jr.
Albert H. Hanger
Clifton S. Harris, Jr.
Walter R. Harrison, Jr.
Thomas J. Heller
Benjamin C. Hilliard
Charles B. Hinson
William R. Huff
Harold Hutcherson
Clarence H. Jackson
James A. Jeffers
William F. Jester
Charles M. Johnson
Ivor R. Jones
Edward S. Karon
Roy D. Kaylor
Oliver T. Kelly
Clayton A. Kemp
Ernest L. Kerley
John H. Klein, Jr.
Joseph Knight
Irvin S. Kramer
Donald K. Kuehl
George S. Kukuchek
John E. Lambert
Robert D. Lambourne
Delbert E. Lane
Arthur L. Laughry
Francis Lebaron
Henry H. Lentz
Francis E. Lougee
Jose H. Lowry
Benjamin E. Lumpkin, Jr.
John R. Manning
James S. Martin
William R. Massey
Wesley J. Matson
William D. McLean
Homer C. McNamara, Jr.
Donald C. Mead, Jr.
James O. Melton
Robert W. Merchant
Carl J. Merck
Francis Meredith, Jr.
Malachi M. Mills.
Guy E. Mitchell, Jr.
Robert D. Monical
Victor O. Morris
John E. Mulhern
Harry F. Mumma
Robert A. Munford
Paul E. Myers
Norman J. Newman
John M. Nolan
Edward H. O'Donnell
Carlo J. Ortenzi
Robert L. Patterson
Trevor J. Perry
Galen W. Pike
Harvey D. Piper
Martin L. Pitts, Jr.
David D. Powell
Leonard L. Preston
Robert M. Quinlan
William R. Ramsey
John M. Reardon
James B. Reed
Rolfe Robertson
William B. Roth
James J. Rubash
Louis G. Sandkaut
Tommy F. Satterfield
Henry A. Schenk
Robert C. Schindling
Robert G. Schmitt
Paul E. Schwab
Robert D. Sheppard, Jr.
Thomas P. Shiely
Cyril Sidun
Orvis H. Skolos
Forest J. Smith, Jr.
Melvin Smith
John E. Steinke
Lorenzo E. Stephenson
John W. Stevenson
Julian R. Story
Robert P. Story
Donald L. Synolds
Hunter G. Taft.
Jerrol E. Taylor
Mack Taylor, Jr.
William M. Taylor
Richard H. Timmins
George R. Truex, Jr.
Blaine E. Twitchell
Jack C. Utley
Clifton F. Vincent
Louis H. Wagner
John E. Walden II
Andrew J. Waldrop
Joseph L. Walker, Jr.
Paul A. Watkins
Robert W. Webb
James S. Weeks
John M. Welch
Hal D. White
Charles Wiersch
Robert T. Wilkerson
Theodore C. Williams, Jr.
Charles L. Worley, Jr.
Charles S. Wylie
Walter E. Yerkes

REGULAR AIR FORCE

Avan T. Adams
Robert L. Adams
Carl W. Ballard
Melvin R. Bandle
Lester Banks
Herbert B. Barentine
Arnold G. Barker, Jr.
Harold L. Bellairs
Donal D. Bloodgood
John H. Bost
Manuel Bracete, Jr.
Ray B. Bressler, Jr.
Paul L. Briand, Jr.
Pat D. Brinson
Charles Buhman, Jr.
Richard W. Burkholder
Warren F. Chrisman
George H. Christena
William N. Cornett
George A. Crane, Jr.
Benjamin B. Davis
Victor M. Davis, Jr.
William E. Donlon, Jr.
Lawrence A. Doyle
Rudolph W. Ebacher
Shirley J. Eby
William H. Field
Harrell D. Foitik
Richard Foster
Carl R. Frear, Jr.
Joseph E. Hammond
Raymon W. Harlow
Robert L. Harrison
Gerald L. Hendryx, Jr.
William A. Hofacker
Clarence T. Jane
Robert P. Keller
Ulysses S. Knotts, Jr.
Robert L. Lieberman
John H. Lomax
Howard B. Long, Jr.
Frank C. Longwell
Owen L. Lovan
Brice E. Lytle
Edward A. Malone, Jr.
Robert E. McGee
John A. Middleton III
Clay H. Miller, Jr.
Robert B. Monier
Earl M. Monroe
William W. Mullally
James W. Newberry
Alan H. Noyes
William H. O'Bryan, Jr.
Robert H. Papy, Jr.
Michael N. Parker
Virgil F. Perkins, Jr.
Lennox I. Petree
Laverne W. Poland
Donald A. Preble
Charles A. Rodenberger
Wesley K. Sasaki
Robert A. Schlapper
Bennett E. Smith
James A. Snell
Marlowe B. Sorge
Maynard D. Stewart
Francis R. Stokes
Stanley L. Sturgill
Phillip R. Tatnall
Jacques K. Tetrick
John C. Thompson
William J. Thorpe
Richard R. Tibbetts
William A. Toombs, Jr.
James S. Tucker
Paul J. Vican
Joe E. Webb
Frank R. Williams
Harry L. Wytock
Joe E. Zollinger

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 30, 1948.

Housing Expediter

Tighe E. Woods to be Housing Expediter.

Public Printer

John J. Deviny to be Public Printer.

Public Health Service

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR CORPS

Sanford M. Rosenthal to be medical director (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel), effective date of acceptance.

Postmaster

TEXAS

J. Edwin McKee, Fort Worth.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, APRIL 30, 1948

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Be Thou our peace, O Lord, the peace that makes the yoke easy and the burden light; the peace which prepares for toil, stimulates action, and inspires fellowship in a common purpose. Help us to live the life of the spirit, conscious that no duty is too simple, no position too humble to show forth the grandeur of Thy trust in us. No act can be better than the servants of the Ship of State striving in every redemptive effort. O bless our entire citizenship, that our people may rest and abide under just laws, wisely administered; in the bond of unity, grant us light where there is twilight and purge away the weakness of prejudice and error. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

HON. JOHN TABER

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to protest an attack against our hard-working, conscientious colleague, JOHN TABER. The Washington Post in its April 29 editorial, Hands Off, Mr. TABER, has, in fact, affronted not only Mr. TABER but also the entire Appropriations Committee and House of Representatives.

The Post seems to have forgotten that part of the Constitution which says "no money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law." Mr. TABER and his committee are specifically charged with the duty of scrutinizing and passing on the expenditure of every taxpayer's dollar. He is performing a very patriotic duty, and for editors to be perturbed at the fact that Mr. TABER manifests an interest in ECA is an unwarranted affront to the entire Congress.

The Washington Post seems to feel that Mr. Hoffman's preliminary guesses should be treated by the Congress as Mr. Hitler's suggestions were ratified by the Reichstag. I know my distinguished colleague will pay no attention to the Washington Post. We all are relying on him and his committee for a real examination of the fantastic guesses made by the State Department, which, as the Post says, "Mr. Hoffman has not even had time to check and revise."

The Washington Post would apparently like us to give the wealth of our citizenry to the Socialists of Europe without raising any serious question as to how the money will be spent and what results can be reasonably expected. American citizens everywhere should thank God for JOHN TABER, who, with his committee, is giving this program the only sound scrutiny it has ever received.

HANDS OFF, MR. TABER

The interest manifested by Chairman TABER of the House Appropriations Committee in Administrator Hoffman's plans for allocation of ECA funds is decidedly perturbing. In the first place, any estimates of the amounts required by the participating countries are at present in the nature of preliminary informed guesses. Mr. Hoffman has not even had time to check and revise those estimates. Secondly, premature announcements of decisions subject to change raise hopes that may be disappointed and are likely to bring protests from participating countries that think they are entitled to a larger slice of the common fund.

But these are minor irritations after all; the major danger suggested by Mr. TABER'S probing activities is the possibility that he will use the information placed at his disposal to work out some plan of his own for distributing ECA funds, or attach conditions to their utilization that would tie the hands of the Administrator and impair the effectiveness of the recovery program. In view of Mr. TABER'S habit of incorporating policy-making legislation in appropriations measures, there is good cause for anxiety regarding his intentions.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a talk made by her before the Daughters of the American Revolution.

Mr. FLETCHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the February issue of Home Builders' Monthly, the official publication of the Home Builders' Association of Metropolitan Washington.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by George S. Benson, president of Harding College at Searcy, Ark., on Federal aid to education. He is one of the soundest men I know of in this country, and I would like for people to read his article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

LEND-LEASE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I notice in this morning's paper that the President of the United States is going to send us a message next week on lend-lease. The article is as follows:

TRUMAN TO URGE NEW LEND-LEASE UNDER AID PLAN

WASHINGTON, April 29.—President Truman will ask Congress in a special message next week for limited shipments of American arms to the 16 Marshall-plan nations, informed sources reported tonight.

He will ask Congress to endorse a limited program of lend-lease shipments for countries now participating in the European recovery program, including the five powers which recently signed a "western union" mutual defense pact, it was said.

Lend-lease is what we had in this country during the last World War. It is going to give practically everything we have in this country to foreign countries. I want to say to you, as a leader of the Republican Party, and to the Republicans and to the Democrats of the House, that if we do not stop trying to take care of all the nations in all the world and simply tend to our own business and look after America, we had better just adjourn and go home, because I tell you that you are only sticking your nose out now into everybody's business all over the world, and you cannot do that. We do not have enough to take care of the people of America and look after our country. It just burns me up to think that you are going to go on with that sort of thing. It is about time to stop it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial by Ralph McGill in the Atlanta Constitution.

Mr. TEAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material in three instances.

Mr. GOSSETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address he made last week.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix.

DOMESTIC PROBLEMS

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, when the war ended and the country was in a high state of optimism for peace, Congress and the Nation hoped that at long last we could settle ourselves into a normal routine and take a look at our domestic problems. There were many problems concerned purely with domestic matters; some of these problems had been increased manyfold because of the war.

Uppermost on the list of matters needing the serious study of the Congress were the problems of the farmers of this country. We were very happy here in Congress and I am sure the farmers were also relieved that legislation had been provided which assured them an adequate price-support program during the war and for 2 years after the termination of the war emergency.

In order to make it possible for the farmers to do the tremendous job which they did during the war, the Congress wisely had provided agriculture legislation which has supported the price of farm commodities at 90 percent of par-

ity and 92½ percent of parity for cotton. This support program ends on December 31 of this year, making it necessary to pass legislation at once to assure fair prices for farm products.

But much has happened since the days of victory. And it is very wise that farmers have had the protection of emergency farm legislation. Today, in this brief space, I should like to discuss two aspects of the agriculture picture which are of paramount importance. First, the soil-conservation program, and, second, the long-range farm program and price supports.

The House could not vote adequate funds under House rules, to provide for a real and successful program for conservation of the soil. Whereas the American farmer needs for this purpose Government assistance in the minimum amount of $300,000,000, funds in the amount of only $150,000,000 had been authorized last year for this purpose for the calendar year of 1948. At that time, an effort was made in vain to wipe out soil-conservation benefits all together.

Every Member of the Arkansas delegation in Congress fought this provision and asked that the authorization of $300,000,000 be restored.

But there is still hope that the meager and inadequate authorization of funds can be increased. I should like to explain, however, that it will be impossible to increase this appropriation in the House at this time. Under the rules of the House, no funds in excess of the authorization can be appropriated. However, there is still the Senate, where such a rule does not prevail.

Therefore, the entire Arkansas delegation is taking our fight for more funds to back the farmer in his struggle against soil erosion directly to our friends in the United States Senate. If our friends in that body are successful in increasing the funds for this purpose over the amount set aside by the House—and I am happy to say that I believe such will be the case—the House then will be privileged to vote on compromise legislation. When this happens, as I believe it will, we can hope that the sum of $150,000,000 for soil conservation can be increased. How much more, I cannot, of course, predict. That is the situation as it now stands. I speak frankly on this issue because it is vital to the farmers of the entire Nation. I have never ceased to fight for more money for soil conservation. I am also endeavoring—along with other friends of the farmer in Congress—to wipe out the ridiculous limitation on soil payments. There is no earthly reason why a farmer should be forced to limit his conservation practices if we do the job of conserving the soil. The result of such a limitation would be that farmers and their tenants will not come into the program at all.

This situation is one of the most flagrant examples of false economy.

On the issue of a long-range farm program, the House Committee on Agriculture decided not to pass such a proposal at this time. Instead, the committee, of which I am privileged to serve, has recently voted to extend for a year and 6 months the support price program at 90 percent of parity. This bill should be before the House soon.

We did this for the reason that we felt that these unsettled times is not the proper time to draw up a long-range program which would commit the farmer for years to come, regardless of the world situation.

I believe this course was right. How do we know at this moment what the world situation will be a year from now? The Amercan farmer knows well that his welfare is tghtly knit with the international economic situation. After the war, it appeared we were in for a period of peace and stability, but the events of the past 6 months alone have shown us that this is not the case. The American farmer has an important stake in the Marshall plan. How can we make long-range plans for the farmer until we know of the outcome of the operation of this measure? Having been mobilized for war and having performed a magnificent job, the American farmer—in all fairness—should not be tied to a program at this time when he is being asked to continue to produce more food and fiber in order to assure the peace.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMPSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Hon. Marley O. Hudson, formerly judge of the World Court.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a very interesting editorial which appeared in an Italian language newspaper in New York.

PATRICK J. CONNELLY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on the last day of this month, one of the most distinguished careers in the history of the Postal Service will be officially terminated with the retirement of Patrick J. Connelly after nearly 52 years of faithful and meritorious service in the Boston postal district.

In relinquishing the postmastership of the city of Boston, "Pat" Connelly, as he is affectionately known to his multitude of friends, leaves behind him a record of achievement which stands as its own tribute, not only to his sterling character, but to the merit system which operates so effectively within the Post Office Department.

Beginning with his initial appointment from the civil-service rolls as a substitute clerk in November 1896, he steadily progressed by well merited promotions to positions of increasing responsibility which culminated in his appointment as postmaster on April 16, 1943.

Throughout that span of years, recognition came to him from within and without the service. And it is in that one word, "service," wherein will be discovered the reason for such recognition, because it more aptly characterizes his predominant quality than any other.

From the very beginning, he conceived his public career as an opportunity to devote his organizational and executive talents to the service of his country, his community, his fellow workers, and the great department in which he labored.

After appointment as a regular clerk in 1897, he successively became supervisor of clerks and carriers, superintendent of the Uphams corner branch office, assistant superintendent of mails, assistant postmaster in charge of finance, and finally postmaster of the entire Boston postal area.

In each successive capacity, through his supervisory and administrative abilities, he effected marked improvements in personnel management, internal administration, public relations, and mail distribution.

At the same time, every worth-while community and civic project elicited his whole-hearted sympathy and cooperation. His activities on behalf of such organizations as the Dorchester Board of Trade, the American Red Cross, the Children's Safety League, the various Boston relief and and emergency campaigns, the chambers of commerce, the community chest, and the Boy Scouts of America, and in religious and charitable activities, have evidenced his public-spirited concern for his fellow citizens, as well as his willingness to give generously of his time and efforts for social welfare and public benefit.

Throughout his long career, he has left the imprint of his character upon the organization he has so faithfully served and upon the community he has loved so well. All who know him regret his retirement from public life—but rejoice that the wisdom of his years and the sagacity of his counsel will still be available to his State, his community, and his beloved city.

With his entry into a period of well-deserved rest from the responsibilities of public office, his host of friends and well wishers sincerely join in the one tribute and accolade which will honor him most and please him best: "Well done thou good and faithful servant."

SALE OF BRITISH AIRCRAFT ENGINES TO THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of newspaper comment lately about the shipment by Britain of plane parts to Soviet Russia. In the interest of our national security, I think we should speak very frankly and openly about it. I would like to comment on it at this time in order to explain the facts.

The total number of airplane engines so far sold by Britain to Russia since 1946 is 55. All of these planes are on the "open list," which means that they were almost obsolete and available to any country which wanted to buy them.

The delivery of almost all of the 55 planes to Soviet Russia was completed by November 1947, with the remainder delivered in January of 1948.

The sale of 40 more aircraft engines to Russia occasionally referred to in the press has not been authorized and any statement to the contrary is incorrect. These are so-called Derwent and Nene engines, also on the "open list."

There was a verbal promise made by Sir Stafford Cripps to a Soviet purchasing mission that Soviet Russia could purchase six jet aircraft, three meteors, and three vampires, both again on the "open list," but no order has so far been placed. The Soviet Union has been told that in any case delivery could not take place until at least 15 months from the date of the order. So that at the present time the delivery of these aircraft engines will be 15 months from the date of the order, which yet is to be entered by Soviet Russia.

In addition to that, Great Britain has applied the principle of reciprocity to the sale of aerial engines and aircraft to the Soviet Union, which requires Russia to allow Britain to inspect their aircraft factories and make similar purchases of some of their later models. This reciprocity principle appears unlikely to be accepted by the Soviet so that the sale of the 40 Derwent and Nene engines and of the 6 jet aircraft is now unlikely to be authorized. As a matter of fact, in Britain airplane engine manufacturers are no longer permitted to sell engines or aircraft without specific authority from the Government. So that there are controls being placed in Britain upon the sale of these engines to Russia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in two instances and to include extraneous material.

CONTROL AND USE OF CERTAIN TIDELANDS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 548 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5992) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

I yield myself 1 minute at this time.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution which you have just heard read gives the House 2 hours to deliberate on the question that is now before you relative to the tideland controversy that has been before various committees of the House during the last several years.

I am sure that after listening to the debate which will take place within the next 2 hours you will determine what action you take on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a resolution from the Senate of the State of California and other resolutions from my district.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take a great deal of time, I merely would show why my home town, the City of Long Beach, the place most immediately affected by this so-called tidelands decision wants this rule brought to the floor for discussion.

The first grant of tidelands by the State of California was made in 1851—think of it, almost 100 years ago—and it has stood without dispute until 1937.

In 1936 oil was discovered in the uplands around Long Beach, fairly close to the harbor. The city made no move to develop that oil at that time.

In 1937, to our great surprise, the Federal Government made claim to ownership of submerged lands which are now called the "tidelands" but more properly might be referred to as the marginal sea area.

And now let us go back to 1933. I read an excerpt from a letter written by the Secretary of the Interior to one of the residents of Long Beach, Dr. Olin Proctor, who was then endeavoring to get a grant of undersea lands. The Secretary of the Interior at that time quoted the following excerpt from the decision of the Supreme Court—*Hardin* v. *Jordan* (140 U. S. 371):

"With regard to grants of the Government for lands bordering on tidewater, it has been distinctly settled that they only extend to high-water mark, and that the title to the shore and lands under water in front of the lands so granted inures to the State within which they are situated, if a State has been organized and established there. Such title to the shore and lands under water is regarded as incidental to the sovereignty of the State—a portion of the royalties belonging thereto and held in trust for the public purposes of navigation and fishery—and cannot be retained or granted out to individuals by the United States."

The foregoing is a statement of the settled law, and therefore no rights can be granted to you either under the leasing act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), or under any other public land law to the bed of the Pacific Ocean either within or without the 3-mile limit. Title to the soil under the ocean within the 3-mile limit is in the State of California, and the land may not be appropriated except by authority of the State.

There, Mr. Speaker, is a definite statement by the Secretary of the Interior in 1933, yet, in 1937, for some reason unknown to the rest of us he suddenly changed his opinion and made claims to submerged lands. When we investigated this is what we found. Just look at this map which I have before you. Here is the harbor of Long Beach—every single inch of it smeared up and blanketed with claims which have been filed with the Federal Government for the underwater areas. Just look at the size and number of these marked areas. These are claims. It is all very confusing. This presents something like the old question—which came first, the chicken or the egg? I do not know whether all these claims came first or whether the Government's decision to claim this territory came first. I do not know whether the Government's decision is incidental to these claims having been filed or whether these claims are incidental to the Government having decided to claim the land; but, there they are and if this tidelands bill should not prevail, if this Congress should allow the Supreme Court's decision to stand, what do you suppose is going to happen? Do you suppose the Government is going to retain permanent title to this submerged area? Or do you think, as I do, that all of these people who have filed are promptly going to begin litigation, and then come to Congress to get special bills passed to make these claims valid? It is just a difference between tweedledee and tweedledum as far as the Government's interests are concerned. If the State of California does not take the oil out, or the city of Long Beach does not take it out, for the use of the people, I venture to say that these present unauthorized claimants will get it in the long run.

Two of the biggest claims, held by the Robert E. Lee Jordan outfit, were filed in 1937. They are still actively prosecuting them and trying to get them approved by the Department of the Interior. I do not know how many of these 90 claims may have been denied. I do not know if any of them have been denied. I do know that many are still being prosecuted.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this rule be adopted.

I am pleased to publish in the Appendix of the RECORD several resolutions from the State of California and from governmental units within the Eighteenth Congressional District.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SABATH. I yield myself as much time as I desire.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my views on this bill very clearly. It aims to nullify a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. It is an effort to pass again a bill that was vetoed by the President last year, which veto was sustained by this House.

The money that has been spent and appropriated unwisely by those on the other side of the aisle in the last 1½ years is exceedingly large. The Republicans promised the people to conserve, practice economy, and save every-

thing that properly could be saved for the taxpayers of America. But instead of reducing the expenditures as you have promised, you are increasing them. In fact, since you came into power you have voted not only millions but billions above what was expended under the Democratic administration that you loved to attack and assail as great spenders. During the Democratic administration we were at war and most of these great expenditures and appropriations were made to conduct and win the war. But the war has been over for 3 years and for the last year and a half since you have been in power, you have appropriated recklessly and have given away unnecessarily not only millions but billions of dollars.

In that connection I refer to the statement that appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 27, pages 4910 and 4911. You have appropriated nearly $20,000,000,000 for Great Britain, Germany, Italy, France, China, and even to despicable Japan; and you are continuing to appropriate hundreds of millions more for so-called national defense. I myself am ready and willing to vote for any amount necessary for actual and necessary national defense, but the money that has already been appropriated was due to a hysteria created by the military gentlemen and the Wall Street representatives, some of whom are in our State Department. Today, regardless of the ruling of the Supreme Court and the President's veto, you are going to pass this bill which will give away more millions upon millions of dollars' worth of property, including indispensable oil.

When history is written on this matter it will be like the infamous Teapot Dome incident of some years back. The gentleman from California has stated that California has the title to this land. Here are the indisputable facts. Even the great, resourceful lobbies for this proposed legislation have been unable to disprove these facts.

In 1848 the land in question in the California case was ceded by Mexico to the United States. This territory so ceded included the islands offshore to the west of California's coast line. Mind you, the land was ceded to the United States and not to the State of California because there was no such State in 1848.

California was admitted to the Union in 1850 and at the time it possessed no land, but, by virtue of the enabling act, became a sovereign political State upon its admission.

The Congress by legislative act provided that the new State of California should be granted 500,000 acres of land within the boundaries which California set for itself; but there was a restriction that the State could not select that land before it had been surveyed by the Federal Government. Further, it was provided that the land should be selected by the State legislature. The record shows that it was not until 1865 that the State of California made any selection of any of the 500,000 acres. The important point is that proprietorship in land was not an essential element of State sovereignty and did not prevent the State from functioning as a sovereign State.

Next, the State of California did not select any tide, submerged, or upland waters as a part of the Government's donation of 500,000 acres; because only by selection after survey could title be acquired. At no time did the State of California select any of these lands in question.

Under the Constitution Congress alone has the power to dispose of the land of the Government. As the Congress has not divested the title of the United States in the tidal, or submerged lands, or inland waters, by any specific act, title still remains in the United States Government.

Again it seems certain beyond reasonable doubt that the State of California did not acquire title to the tide, submerged lands, and inland waters, by virtue of any law covering the disposition of real property of the United States.

It has been shown that the title to the tide, submerged lands, and inland waters still remains in the Government and that by the act of 1851 the Congress appropriated these lands and made them a part of the public domain. The questions of the alleged rights of California in them have been definitely settled, and the decisions of the Supreme Court does not in any way infringe upon her sovereignty with respect to the land in suit or the inland waters which were purposely omitted from the action.

As I have said, the act under which the State of California was granted 500,000 acres of land included the restriction that the selections could only be made after the territory had been surveyed. There has not been any such survey up to this good hour. Therefore the State of California could not possibly have any claim to these lands.

Moreover the courts have granted the United States injunctive relief against trespassers on the land in question, and, of course, no injunction or restraining order will issue to enjoin trespassers unless the applicant shows ownership of the property concerned.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I am always happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There is oil under this land; is that right?

Mr. SABATH. There is a lot of oil there.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman favor giving it to Palestine?

Mr. SABATH. Sir?

Mr. HOFFMAN. This oil.

Mr. SABATH. No; I do not want this oil for Palestine or for any other purpose other than for our own national welfare. If the gentleman is in favor of it, I am not. I am for America's interest first and all the time.

We are spending billions and billions of dollars to conserve oil in Arabia that we never can get in case of war. Billions are being expended, even endangering the peace of the world, because we want to protect a few oil companies, British as well as American. By this proposed action we would give away land that contains many, many times as much oil—land situated right within a stone's throw of one of our great naval establishments in the United States, as well as other tidewater lands.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave given me, I insert an article appearing in today's PM, bearing on a speech made by a Member of the other body with respect to Saudi Arabian oil purchased by the Navy Department, which, I am sure, will be of interest to the membership in that it shows the tie-up of American oil companies with foreign oil interests, as follows:

BREWSTER RAKES OIL FIRMS IN SENATE—PRICES TO UNITED STATES NAVY FOR SAUDI ARABIAN OIL ARE TERMED "OUTRAGEOUS"

(By Alexander H. Uhl)

WASHINGTON.—Senator OWEN D. BREWSTER (Republican, Maine) in a 2-hour speech in the Senate, yesterday made a slashing attack on the American oil companies which control the oil of Saudi Arabia, terming as "outrageous" the prices they are demanding and getting from the United States Navy.

"The oil companies," his Committee on the National Defense Program reported, "have shown a singular lack of good faith, an avaricious desire for enormous profits, while at the same time they sought the cloak of United States protection and financial assistance to preserve their vast concessions."

Declaring sarcastically that the Justice Department had not shown much zeal in checking into the revelations made by his committee, BREWSTER, asked that the Senate Finance Committee look into the tax position of the Arabian-American Oil Co. and its subsidiaries, and that the Judiciary Committee look into the recent sale of 40 percent of Aramco holdings to the Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) and the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.

HOW ABOUT OLD DECREE?

He wants to know whether this sale was in contravention of the decree dissolving the original Standard Oil Co.

The committee report was one of the strongest attacks on a major American industrial concern that has come out in a long time.

It is a 55-page document that traces the history of the Saudi Arabian oil concessions:

The role played by Aramco in developing the concessions.

The benefit which Aramco derived from American lend-lease aid to King ibn-Saud.

An early Aramco offer to sell oil to the United States Navy at 40 cents a barrel, later negotiated to give Aramco $1.05 cents a barrel.

The latest Aramco contract with the Navy by which the price has been jacked up to $1.48 a barrel effective October 1 of this year.

OIL IN PALESTINE?

One highly important revelation BREWSTER made in his Senate speech was that there was a strong likelihood of oil being eventually discovered in Palestine. He cited a report of a United States Middle East petroleum mission in 1943 which read:

"No drilling has been done in Palestine and a small amount has been done in Syria. There are, however, untested structures of some promise in both countries."

It is highly doubtful if anything can come out of the early offer of the company to the Government to sell oil to the Navy at 40 cents a barrel. That offer never was taken up.

So far as these early negotiations are concerned, the committee says that as late as 1943 "the company offered to set aside reserves and to sell its petroleum products 'at prices well under world prices' or at 'cost plus a nominal profit.'"

TAKE IT OR LEAVE IT

Yet, when it came to making a deal later, "the companies offered the Navy fuel oil at $1.05 on a take-it-or-leave-it basis."

Commenting on this deal, the committee said:

"The oil companies exploited the Government by exacting high prices for their products, despite the high expenditures and assistance granted to Saudi Arabia at the companies' behest to protect and preserve the companies' concessions.

"The committee is of the opinion," the report continues, "that in paying $1.05 a barrel, the United States Government was overcharged between thirty and thirty-eight million dollars on sales made to the Navy by Aramco and its affiliates between January 1, 1942, and June 30, 1947, by payment of prices higher than those the oil companies had a right to insist on in the light of their previous dealings with the United States."

CRITICIZES NAVY

The Navy comes in for sharp criticism, the report stating:

"The testimony indicated clearly that the Navy officers were far from diligent in seeking cost records from Aramco. Millions of dollars might have been saved the taxpayers had the Navy insisted on or demanded the cost figures * * *."

In connection with the negotiations between the oil companies and the Navy, the committee reported that the Navy justification for the $1.05 price included a statement that ibn-Saud had doubled his royalties from 21 cents to 42 cents a barrel.

This was not correct, and the committee concludes that if such a statement was made, "then the committee concludes that the Government clearly was defrauded."

TAX POLICIES

One highly important phase of the investigation dealt with the tax policies of Aramco and its affiliates. The committee declared that Bahrein, a subsidiary of Standard (Calif.) and Standard (Tex.), founders of Aramco, was a Canadian corporation and had accumulated profits and surplus of over $91,000,000 in the course of 15 years on a capital stock of only $100,000.

"The company, according to the record," the committee said, "had paid no taxes to the United States or even to Canada." Another subsidiary, Cal.-Tex., which acts as sales agent, is a Bahama corporation and paid $1,000,000 in taxes to the United States in the course of 10 years.

BREWSTER during the investigation said:

"It is a liberal education on how corporations organized under foreign flags yet seek the shelter of the American flag."

TAX DODGING

In its conclusions, the committee recommended "that the subject of tax avoidance by the formation of foreign subsidiary companies of United States corporations should receive consideration by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation for such study and possible legislative correction as may seem proper."

The committee also made some tart observations on the appearance of oil men in the Government service during the war, listing half a dozen who came from oil companies or went back to oil companies after the war was over. It said that while this might be inevitable because of the need of specially trained men, it placed an "added burden on the companies to deal fairly and openly with the Government."

GOVERNMENT INTEREST

During the early days of Aramco, efforts were made to obtain an interest in the Saudi Arabian oil fields for the United States of America. These were abandoned when the oil companies and Members of Congress expressed objections on the grounds that this meant the entry of the Government into a field of private enterprise. The Brewster committee again came back to this issue, declaring:

"The committee believes that appropriate and equitable arrangements should be consolidated to secure an interest by our Government in these vast reserves which are so utterly important in time of war."

I think it is unfortunate that this great lobby that has been working here for many years to secure this legislation was finally able to mislead many Members of this House in favoring this proposed legislation. Unfortunately, because of the propaganda that has been carried on, many of you seem to believe that a great injustice is being done to California by the United States not ceding these rich oil lands to that State and other States. If California itself, or the State of Texas, or any of these other States affected for that matter, would derive the benefit and the wealth, I would not complain so much; but this tremendous wealth will go to the oil companies who have no unselfish interest in the welfare of our country, but who have an interest solely in accumulating greater wealth, more oil, more power and greater control and influence over the United States.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield for a question.

Mr. WALTER. Is the gentleman from Illinois intimating that the State of California would not have the best interests of the people at heart when they dispose of the use of these lands?

Mr. SABATH. Again I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for the interrogation as it gives me the opportunity to call attention to a matter that I otherwise would have omitted. Notwithstanding the attacks and the criticisms against the Federal Government, I think the interests of the American people have been protected especially in the last 14 or 15 years, under a Democratic administration, and it was not so easy for the vested and special interests to obtain legislation that they were heretofore able to obtain. Unfortunately there are very few State legislatures that are able to thoroughly cope with the great influence and great power that is utilized from time to time, demanding and urging special legislation for the oil interests and other vested interests. Unfortunately the masses have very few men or very few organizations that can come before these legislative bodies and urge that such special legislation for the vested interests and for the combines, should not pass. Consequently I fear that the rights and interests of the people would be protected to a greater degree by the Federal Government than they would be by any individual State, regardless of what State it might be. I know the history with respect to legislation in many States. I know that formerly first the railroad companies and then other interests would come along and control the legislation of those bodies.

Fortunately we have been able, to some extent at least, in the last 15 years, to protect and preserve the rights and interests of our country. I feel that these oils will be needed in peacetimes as well as during war, although I hope to God there will be no war for many, many years, because we have hardly begun to bring our dead boys back; and still there are some of those gentlemen interested in oil that would like to involve us in another war. That should not happen.

It would be the greatest crime against humanity, because we know what the last war was. I know the great majority of the American people, certainly the masses, are pleading and praying against war. It is only the few war profiteers and some of the military gentlemen, most of whose sons are found in swivel chairs and not at the front that are talking war, war, war. Let us try to bring about peace, peace for which the American people, especially parents and relatives, are praying and pleading.

Instead of talking war, preparing for war, and spending millions upon millions in preparation for war, why can we not spend a little of this money to actually promote peace? I feel that if we would spend $1 out of every hundred that we are appropriating to strengthen the United Nations, it would be expended for a better cause. It is my fervent hope that these militaristic gentlemen and those they influence in our State Department will not succeed in destroying or weakening the United Nations as they did the League of Nations.

The power and influence that this militaristic group is permitted to exercise is indeed amazing. This group has already expended millions to protect the English and a few American oil companies in Saudi Arabia under the pretense, as I have said, that we may need these oils in the future. The War Department has, against the best interests of America, supplied these companies and shipped to Arabia hundreds upon hundreds of tons of steel pipe and other materials in short supply here. At the same time the War Department has refused our domestic oil companies the needed supplies for the increased production of oil; it has denied our neighboring republic, Mexico, small quantities of the steel that would enable it to rehabilitate and increase its oil production, as was pointed out so clearly and forcefully by the gentlemen from New Mexico, Senator CHAVEZ, a few weeks ago.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that the majority of the gentlemen here are anxious to get away. Some of you have important engagements and others extremely important trips, including one to Kentucky, which I doubt will be beneficial. It seems to me I am a lone voice in the wilderness trying to offset the bewildering mass of misinformation that has been fed to the Members and the country by the powerful and resourceful lobby. Mr. Speaker, I wish I could more strongly impress upon the membership that it should desist from appropriating and giving away these many millions to which I have called attention. I repeat that in the last year and a half, since you Republicans came into power, we have voted away and authorized to be given away hundreds of millions, yes, billions not only for food but for war materials in many instances of nations that have attempted willfully and shame-

fully to destroy us of our standing as the citadel of the democratic form of government. It is beyond my understanding why we should supply these millions to Germany and her late satellites to reconstruct themselves so that they will be in position in a few years to start world war III, which is their aim. This also applies to the tremendous sums of money that we have given to Great Britain and the other nations, notwithstanding our great indebtedness, which is greater than the combined wealth of all these nations. I ask how long we can continue in this reckless course.

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding all of these foreign appropriations, I understand our military gentry is urging more money and arms for the European nations and partly, I presume, to aid Great Britain to fight the Jews in Palestine. I wonder how much of this war material and money will go to Germany in addition to that already given as I have observed in today's press that the Nazis are active in the Reich again. Surely it cannot be that it is intended that the moneys we have appropriated is to be used in furnishing arms and war material to Germany, notwithstanding the statement appearing in PM that General Clay is cognizant of the activities of the Nazis. For the information of the House and the country, I insert the article, which reads as follows:

CLAY SAYS NAZIS ARE ACTIVE IN REICH AGAIN

FRANKFURT.—United States military governor, Gen. Lucius D. Clay, predicts that Germany's surviving Nazis will try a strong political come-back.

He indicated at a press conference they might be supported by Germans fearing a Communist dictatorship.

Clay said Russia's anti-Allied campaign in Berlin did not foreshadow immediate war, and that he was "not worried about war tomorrow or for the next day."

Clay's remarks on the possible resurgence of nazism came less than 12 hours after United States and British deputy commandants charged the Russians in the four-power Kommandantur with permitting Nazis to rise again in their zone under the guise of National Democrats.

ELECTION FRAUD IN UNITED STATES AREA SUSPECTED

Associated Press reports that United States and German officials suspect a fraud in the Wiesbaden city election helped the National Democratic Party win unexpected successes there. Dr. James R. Newman, United States military governor of the State of Hesse, says the party is supported by ex-Nazis; party leaders deny this.

The officials said it appeared that the Wiesbaden election board issued ballots to thousands of persons forbidden to vote because of their Nazi sympathies. The party won 25 percent of the vote last week end and 15 out of the 60 seats in the Wiesbaden City Council.

(German officials said they are investigating other cities where the party gained strength, and that the elections might be voided if fraud is discovered.)

RUSSIA TO SEND GRAIN TO ITS ZONE

The official Soviet Army organ, Taegliche Rundschau, meanwhile reported that Russia has promised small emergency shipments of grain, fodder, and fertilizer to make up shortages in the Russian zone. It was believed the first time Russia will send food into Germany.

The announcement came as thousands of workers in the Ruhr, in the British zone, threatened to strike because of food shortages. Scattered walk-outs already have started.

In Berlin, 1½ miles of the downtown subway will be shut down tonight because Soviet authorities have seized German construction equipment in their zone, United States headquarters announced.

Confiscated equipment belonging to 17 German firms with main offices in the United States and British zones was valued at $850,000. All the firms affected were bankrupted by the Russians' action, the announcement said.

Mr. Speaker, I also insert at this point a United Press report that United States arms are to be furnished the western European bloc, as follows:

TRUMAN TO ASK UNITED STATES ARMS FOR WESTERN BLOC

WASHINGTON.—President Truman will ask Congress in a special message next week for limited shipments of American arms to the 16 Marshall plan nations, informed sources reported.

He will ask Congress to indorse a limited program of lend-lease shipments for countries now participating in the European recovery program, including the five powers who recently signed a "western union" mutual defense pact, it was said.

Contents of the message are a closely guarded administration secret, and its provisions are known to only a few top level officials.

It is expected to be sent to Congress Monday or Tuesday.

First reports were that the program, described as military insurance for the huge ERP investment, would pledge American guns, planes, and tanks for the "western union" of Britain, France, Belgium, Luxemburg and the Netherlands.

But authoritative sources said later that other ERP countries would be included.

TRUMAN'S PLEDGE

One proposal under consideration would permit diversion of ERP funds from peacetime to arms purposes and authorize recipient countries to use raw materials for arms as well as for economic reconstruction.

The broadened program, it was said, would be accompanied by a pledge from Truman for a more specific military program for the five "western union" countries as soon as they establish a general staff and draw up their needs.

This additional program probably would not be sent to Congress until next year.

Meanwhile, it was revealed that the State and Defense Departments recently sent the House Foreign Affairs Committee a bill providing for military aid to all the ERP nations.

This measure may be withdrawn for revision under the new program.

WHY PLAN WAS MOVED UP

It was made clear that the White House is speeding up the plan mainly because Congress plans to adjourn about June 15 for the national political conventions, and not because of any new developments on the international scene.

If Congress quits as scheduled, it will have 6 weeks to act on the request. The Administration was reported as convinced that any delay would make action this year almost impossible.

The program would fulfill President Trumans pledge—made on the day on which the pact was signed at Brussels—of American support for the mutual-defense alliance. At that time Truman told Congress:

"I am confident that the United States will, by appropriate means, extend to the free nations the support which the situation requires. I am sure that the determination of the free countries of Europe to protect themselves will be matched by an equal determination on our part to help them do so."

Defense ministers of the five European nations are schedule to meet in London today.

Mr. Speaker, for years the Republicans have been criticizing the New Deal for allegedly spending recklessly and, as I have said, they pledge and promise that they would practice economy and eliminate the vast expenditures. Unfortunately, as the RECORD will show and I am sorry I have not the figures—how many millions they have recklessly appropriated above estimates and for propositions not recommended by the administration or the departments.

Why, the New Deal did not commence to spend this amount of money, and what it did spend it necessarily spent to feed deserving and willing people who were in enforced idleness when the Democratic administration and President Roosevelt came into power. They were hungry and had no place to live. Money was spent for that purpose, but you are spending it for Wall Street and the war bosses.

I realize how busy you all are and that you cannot give these important matters the consideration that they deserve, but some day in the near future I hope that you will consider and think of the responsibility we owe to our country. It is about time that we stop giving away the taxpayers' money, which it will require 100 years for us to repay, yes, that our great-grandchildren will be obliged to pay.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain articles and letters with regard to this matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Under the leave granted to me, I include excerpts from an article by a gentleman whom I believe to be better informed on the subject of this legislation than any other man in the United States, namely, our former Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Harold L. Ickes, as follows:

MAN TO MAN

By Harold L. Ickes

Lucullan feasts, free of cost, and much else besides, are in prospect for Members of Congress from now until the close of the session. The California Legislature has appropriated $43,500 "to carry forward California's fight for its tidelands," according to a United Press dispatch from Sacramento under date of March 23.

Of this total it was announced unblushingly that $25,000 would go for "lunches and entertainment" for Congressmen. Assemblyman John W. Evans, of Los Angeles was quoted as saying, "This money is to pay lunch checks for congressmen from midwestern States."

So even if congressmen—and there are some—outside of California should propose to betray the interests of their own constituents, by voting the tidelands to California, they should coyly hang back. If they make it appear that they are in doubt, the more the "lunches and entertainment" that will be theirs. The California Legislature is wise enough to know that "the surest plan to please a man is through his

appetite." And here are $25,000 worth of "lunches and entertainment."

* * * * *

No more scandalous proceeding in connection with this whole malodorous affair could be imagined. Nor is it to be supposed for a minute that this appropriation of $43,500 by a cynical State legislature will be all that will be made available if the jaded appetites of the Senators and Representatives require more stimulation. There are always the oil interests, and they are more generous and finished spenders than any lobbyist representing a State could hope to be. For if this proposed steal of property belonging to all of the people of the United States, can wiggle its oily way through the Congress, the benefits to the oil industry would far exceed those to the State of California.

Moreover, money spent by the oil interests would not cost them anything. The bill would be paid by the people of the United States, whose property it is proposed to filch by bills now in both Houses of Congress. Any money spent by any oil company or its lobbyists would be charged on the books as an expense of doing business and deducted on its next income-tax return.

This noisome scandal has gone far enough. The cynical proposal of California is nothing less than that it should be allowed to take over hundreds of millions of barrels of valuable crude oil that belongs to all of the people of the United States. It is difficult to understand how any Member of Congress could even think of participating in such a notorious affair. Even some of the Congressmen elected from California will find it difficult to support this bill without holding their noses.

* * * * *

There should be a roll call on this legislation in both Houses, so that the people may know just how many Members there are who will succumb to the quality, amount, and degree of the lunches and entertainment that the oleaginous Legislature of California is willing to provide. Secrecy should not be allowed to protect those who will support an oil-besmeared bill designed to take money out of the pockets of every non-Californian in order to bail out the poor oil companies and the equally indigent State of California. If the late Albert B. Fall were still a Senator from New Mexico, he might have been expected to support such a bill.

Mr. Speaker, I also insert a short editorial appearing in the February 13, 1948, issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, entitled "Attempt To Rig Congress." It bears on the lobby activities of the committee for constitutional government in behalf of this proposed legislation and is enlightening as to the facts in support of the Supreme Court decision. The article follows:

ATTEMPT TO RIG CONGRESS

A propaganda campaign is being waged to fake a popular demand for giving up the national interest in tidelands oil. Its promoters hope by this synthetic whipped-up clamor to stampede Congress into adopting a bill quitclaiming the United States Government's right in favor of the separate States.

The outfit that is stirring up the phony agitation for quitclaim legislation is the committee for constitutional government. This is the outfit which Representative PATMAN, of Texas, 4 years ago called one of the most powerful, one of the most effective, most wealthy lobbies, and also the most sordid and sinister lobby that has ever been organized in the history of the United States.

This is the outfit which, in the same year in which Representative Patman spoke, decided to withhold its list of contributors from a House campaign expenditures committee on the grounds that it was not engaged in politics and therefore did not come within the committee's purview.

The Committee for Constitutional Government has been in politics from the word "go" and in the tidelands controversy it is attempting to rig Congress in as cynical and highly organized a way as any stock manipulator ever rigged the market.

The quitclaim lobby hitherto has been supported by the California oil companies which profited from exploitation of tidelands oil under State leases. It lost last year when the Supreme Court decided that the Federal Government possesses paramount rights to the oil reserves in the California tidelands.

The Supreme Court, not the Congress, is the proper agency to decide whether the paramount interest in the tidelands oil reserves of other States is State or Federal.

The States were admitted to the Union under specified conditions, and the conditions were not uniform. In the case of each coastal State, the question whether the State or the Federal Government owns the tidelands oil reserves is a subject for judicial construction.

Apparently the lobbyists think the States do not possess the rights which they assert they have, or they would not be in such a fever to have Congress enact legislation about it. Congress will need to keep its head, and a good way to do it will be to make a clinical examination of the lobbyists who are trying to befuddle it.

Marquis Childs, in an article appearing in the Los Angeles News of February 26, 1948, says that to justify any policy anywhere in these times, you have only to say: "Oil." He contends that if the national need for oil reserves is anything like as urgent as our military planners say, then the first duty is to conserve what is left of our vast resources. I am including excerpts from Mr. Childs' article which I am sure will be of interest to the membership and to the country, as follows:

MARQUIS CHILDS

WASHINGTON.—To justify any policy anywhere in these times, you have only to say: "Oil." It is the magic password that explains action in the farthest corners of the globe.

The American public is told that with our dwindling supplies of oil it would be impossible for us to fight another major war. Our security is at stake. Therefore Greece, therefore Palestine, therefore Saudi Arabia.

Against this background of extra special urgency, a remarkable proposal is before Congress with the likelihood that it will be adopted. Under this proposal, Congress would hand over for immediate exploitation the largest single reserve of oil in this country.

Stripped of the oratory, that would be the net effect of the bill to give the States title to oil-rich lands under coastal waters. It would nullify a decision of the United States Supreme Court holding such lands belong to the Federal Government.

The issue is dressed up with the old battle cry of States' rights. A parade of governors and other officials representing 44 States have come before a joint Senate-House committee considering the measure. They talk about undermining the Bill of Rights and jeopardizing all that the States have done in developing harbors and fisheries.

The administration has a counterproposal. This would permit the development of tidelands oil under careful Federal supervision, with prime consideration given the Navy's needs. Most of the revenue from the oil would go to the States.

* * * * *

Since then, the protest has taken on a larger scope. Many of the witnesses are undoubtedly sincere when they talk about States' rights. But they should understand how costly States' rights can be when this doctrine cuts across the imperative need to fix a national policy.

If the national need for oil reserves is anything like as urgent as our military planners say, then the first duty is to conserve what is left of our once vast resources. This may mean reduced profits for a few oil companies. It may mean temporarily reduced revenues for the tideland States. But oil reserves are a lot more secure a mile off the coast of California than they are in the Arabian desert 5,000 miles away.

Members of the congressional committee should read a just-published book that has already stirred controversy. It is A National Policy for the Oil Industry, by Eugene V. Rostow of the Yale University Law School. Published by Yale University Press, the book was prepared with the help of a committee of Yale experts in economics and political science.

Rostow shows that present methods of exploitation of American oil fields are wasteful. State conservation laws and compacts do not enforce the best conservation methods.

The author recommends a Federal law under which each oilfield would be operated as a unit. Only in that way, he says, can serious waste be stopped. Under proration for individual companies in each field today, there is shocking waste.

A Federal law might seem to indicate the need for elaborate Federal regulation. Rostow would avoid that by restoring competition. He points to a recent Supreme Court decision by Justice Harold Burton, in the American Tobacco Co. case, which opens a new way to enforcement of the antitrust laws against great combines.

"The companies grew big," Rostow writes, "as the whole history of the industry testifies, in order to gain the profits of monopoly position. Integration is not a means of achieving economies in production, nor does it result in such economies. It is the basic means of achieving and maintaining monopolistic control over price."

* * * * *

Keeping title to the tidelands oil in the Federal Government is one simple, immediate way of protecting our own oil reserves. From there the Government should move to a far-reaching conservation policy.

Mr. Speaker, under the permission given me, I include as part of my remarks the veto message of President Truman on House Joint Resolution 225, of the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, which was passed by the Congress during the pendency of a suit brought by the Attorney General in the Supreme Court to determine the rights in the land and minerals situated in the bed of the Pacific Ocean adjacent to the coast of California and within the 3-mile limit, as follows:

QUIET TITLES TO TIDEWATER LANDS

(Message from the President of the United States returning without his approval the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 225) to quiet the titles of the respective States, and others, to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles, August 2, 1946, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed)

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my signature, House Joint Resolution 225, entitled "A joint resolution to quiet the titles of the respective States, and others, to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles."

The purpose of this measure is to renounce and disclaim all right, title, interest, claim, or demand of the United States in "lands beneath tidewaters," as defined in the joint resolution, and in lands beneath all navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States, and to the minerals in such lands. The phrase "lands beneath tidewaters" is defined so broadly as to include all lands, either submerged or reclaimed, situated under the ocean beyond the low-water mark and extending out to a line three geographical miles distant from the coast line or to the boundary line of any State whose boundary, at the time of the admission of the State to the Union, extended oceanward beyond three geographical miles. Lands acquired by the United States from any State or its successors in interest, or through conveyance or condemnation, would be excluded from the operation of the measure. There would also be excluded the interest of the United States in that part of the Continental Shelf (lands under the ocean contiguous to and forming part of the land mass of our coasts) which lies more than 3 miles beyond the low-water mark or the boundary of any particular State.

On May 29, 1945, at my direction, the then Attorney General filed a suit in the United States district court at Los Angeles, in the name of the United States, to determine the rights in the land and minerals situated in the bed of the Pacific Ocean adjacent to the coast of California and within the 3-mile limit above described. Thereafter, in order to secure a more expeditious determination of the matter, the present Attorney General brought suit in the Supreme Court of the United States. The case in the district court was dismissed. I am advised by the Attorney General that the case will be heard in the Supreme Court and will probably be decided during the next term of the Court.

The Supreme Court's decision in the pending case will determine rights in lands lying beyond ordinary low-water mark along the coast extending seaward for a distance of 3 miles. Contrary to widespread misunderstanding, the case does not involve any tidelands, which are lands covered and uncovered by the daily ebb and flow of the tides; nor does it involve any lands under bays, harbors, ports, lakes, rivers, or other inland waters. Consequently the case does not constitute any threat to or cloud upon the titles of the several States to such lands, or the improvements thereon. When the joint resolution was being debated in the Senate, an amendment was offered which would have resulted in giving an outright acquittance to the respective States of all tidelands and all lands under bays, harbors, ports, lakes, rivers, and other inland waters. Proponents of the present measure, however, defeated this amendment. This clearly emphasized that the primary purpose of the legislation was to give to the States and their lessees any right, title, or interest of the United States in the lands and minerals under the waters within the 3-mile limit.

The ownership of the land and resources underlying this 3-mile belt has been a subject of genuine controversy for a number of years. It should be resolved appropriately and promptly. The ownership of the vast quantity of oil in such areas presents a vital problem for the Nation from the standpoint of national defense and conservation. If the United States owns these areas, they should not be given away. If the Supreme Court decides that the United States has no title to or interest in the lands, a quitclaim from the Congress is unnecessary.

The Attorney General advises me that the issue now before the Supreme Court has not been heretofore determined. It thus presents a legal question of the great importance to the Nation, and one which should be decided by the Court. The Congress is not an appropriate forum to determine the legal issue now before the Court. The jurisdiction of the Supreme Court should not be interfered with while it is arriving at its decision in the pending case.

For the foregoing reasons I am constrained to withhold my approval of the joint resolution.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 1, 1946.*

Mr. Speaker, I also offer for insertion part of a statement by Mr. Orin deMotte Walker made before a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee which, to my mind, is a very clear and comprehensive summary that establishes the title of the United States in the tide, submerged lands, and inland waters of the United States. I think the House will find this statement very interesting and informative. It is as follows:

From opinions expressed by some of those conducting this hearing, it would appear that those of us who are in opposition to the proposed bill 1988 should apply for a change of venue. We, however, do not believe the opinion and decree of the Supreme Court in *United States* v. *California*, Original 12, is fallacious or holds the implications or contain the elements, which the proponents and supporters of bill 1988 have alleged and presented to this committee.

It is always well in considering any measure, that, first of all, the facts should be discovered and presented, then what laws are applicable, for the purpose of establishing legal rights and interests, if any.

With reference to bill 1988, now before the committee, I think it necessary to submit certain facts which are essential to full and fair consideration of the problem of protecting the natural resources of the Nation, which facts do not seem to me to have been disclosed, as a basis for action on the proposed bill. With your patient indulgence, I should like to present some facts and show or point out, if possible, the errors in fact which have been presented to the committee, and, which do not sustain the deductions or conclusions which the proponents of the measure place upon them, or justify the forecast of confusion and disaster which will result by the application of the opinion and decree in *United States* v. *California* to the States.

In 1948, that part of the territory, embraced in the action of the *United States* v. *California*, was ceded by the Republic of Mexico, under the terms of the Guadaloupe Hidalgo Treaty to the United States. This included all of the territory theretofore owned by Mexico, north of the line of the international boundary set by the Commissioners, appointed for that purpose. This territory, including the islands offshore, to the west of California's coast line, was ceded, not to the State of California, which did not exist at that time as either State or Territory, but to the United States Government. This was a transfer of all rights, title, and interest in the territory to the Government.

California was admitted into the Union as a State in September 1850, at which time it possessed no land, but by virtue of the Enabling Act, became a sovereign political State, upon its admission. The land within the territory ceded, out of which California was created, contained certain grants made by the Governments of Spain and Mexico to their respective citizens, which under the terms of the treaty the United States agreed to confirm, upon proof of grant and allowing 2 years within which the grantees were to establish their claims. As a consequence, on March 3, 1851, the Congress passed an act which provided in section 13, in part, as follows: "and be it further enacted that all lands, the claims to which have been finally rejected by the Commissioners in manner herein provided, which shall be finally decided to be invalid by the District or Supreme Court, and all lands the claims to which shall not have been presented to the said Commissioners within two years after the date of this act shall be deemed, held and considered as part of the public domain of the United States."

We, therefore, have, first of all, the grant or cession by Mexico of all the land north of the international boundary, which contained the uplands, tide, and submerged lands, and the islands off the coast, as well. This act of 1851 provided in the section of the law quoted above that "all lands the claims to which shall not have been presented to the said Commissioners within 2 years after the date of this act shall be deemed, held, and considered as part of the public domain of the United States." We have, therefore, an appropriation by Congress of the land, and the taking of title to the whole territory, subject to the claims of the grantees of Spain and Mexico.

The Congress, by legislative act, provided that the new State of California should be granted 500,000 acres within the boundaries which the State set for itself. But, this grant was subject to certain restrictions in that California was not permitted to select any part of the 500,000 acres until after the territory composing that State had been surveyed by the Government surveyor; and, a further restriction that the selections of sections of land were to be made by the legislature of the State of California. This resulted in California being without any proprietary interests in any land in the State of California, from the date of its admission in 1850 until after the territory had been surveyed and the legislature had made selections of the land. The records of the Interior Department show that the first grant of land made under the grant of 500,000 acres was patented or certified to the State of California in 1865. Therefore, for 15 years, California had title to no lands within its boundaries and yet was a sovereign political State during all that period of time. The point that I wish to emphasize is that proprietorship in land was not an essential element of State sovereignty and did not prevent the State from functioning as a sovereign State.

The next question in our quest of title is, did or did not California select any tide, submerged lands, or inland waters as a part of the Government's donation of 500,000 acres, for only by selection, after survey, could title be acquired. The Department of the Interior states, under date of August 5, 1942, that "this office in the past has not knowingly patented to the State of California any land, shown by our records to be tidal or submerged lands, and we do not find any record of any applications for tidelands as swamps and overflowed lands."

We, therefore, come to the conclusion that inasmuch as the grant by Congress was limited to 500,000 acres which California was to select through its legislature, and that their selections did not include tidal or submerged lands as any part of the acreage donated to California, California acquired no legal title to the tidal or submerged lands within its boundaries. This is the third step in confirmation of title in the United States.

Under the Constitution, Congress alone has the power to dispose of the land of the Government. As Congress has not divested the title of the United States in the tidal or submerged lands, or inland waters, by any specific act, title still remains in the United States.

The fourth step in our chain of title—it, therefore, seems certain and beyond reasonable doubt that California did not acquire title to the tide, submerged lands, and inland

waters by virtue of any law covering the disposition of real property of the United States.

It having been shown that the title to the tide, submerged lands and inland waters, still remains in the Government, and that by the act of 1851, Congress appropriated these lands and made them a part of the public domain, the questions of the alleged rights of California in and to them, have been definitely settled, and the decision of the Supreme Court does not in any way infringe upon her sovereignty with respect to the lands in suit, or the inland waters which were purposely omitted from the action.

The act under which California was granted 500,000 acres of land included the restriction that the selections could only be made after the territory had been surveyed. Further proof that California did not select any tidal or submerged lands will be found in the fact that there has been no survey, up to the present date, of the tidal or submerged lands, and no possible way of acquiring title without having made a selection of surveyed lands. California, thus, is unable to establish a claim of any right, title, or interest in the tidal or submerged lands of California. The recent decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of the *United States* v. *Wyoming*, which was decided in June of last year, with reference to the rights of the State of Wyoming in certain unsurveyed lands which Wyoming claims were granted to it under the enabling act states:

"The interest of the State vest at the date of its admission into the Union only as to those sections which are surveyed at that time and which previously have not been disposed of by the Federal Government," citing in support, *Wisconsin* v. *Lane* (245 U. S. 427); *United States* v. *Stearns Lumber Co.* (245 U. S. 436). This finding by the Supreme Court definitely precludes any claim on the part of California to any particular lands or waters under the Enabling Act, and the title to any property in that State could only vest as to property surveyed at the time of the passage of the Enabling Act. To pass title there must be a conveyance, grant or patent. Nothing passes by implication.

Another step in our chain of title is confirmed by the decree of the Supreme Court, in the California case, which is the fact that the Court granted injunctive relief, to restrain the trespassers in California from continuing to drain the oil from the lands owned by the United States. It is hardly necessary for me to state to the eminent counsels for the States that it is impossible to secure an injunction or restraining order, to enjoin trespassers, unless the applicant for the order of injunction is the owner of the property. The Supreme Court, by granting the injunction to the Government to restrain the trespassers in California was fully aware and advised in the premises that the title was in the United States Government, and so granted the injunction.

There was a further restriction with reference to the donation to the State of California of the 500,000 acres of land, which was set out in U. S. C. A. title 43, chapter 20, paragraph 865, which provided that in granting the land to the State of California, no minerals were included in that grant. It was, therefore, clear, that as far as the sovereignty of the State was concerned, reservations by the Government of minerals in the land donated to California did not in any way affect or destroy the sovereignty of the State. It has previously been shown that the ownership of land was not an essential element in the grant of State sovereignty to California and to that was added the ownership of minerals in the State. Probably the best distinction between political and sovereign authority was made by Chief Justice Field in the case of *Moore* v. *Shaw* (17 Calif. 199), while he was on the bench of the Supreme Court of the State of California. He explains the difference as follows:

"To the existence of this political authority of the State—this qualified sovereignty, or to any part of it—the ownership of the minerals of gold and silver found within her limits is in no way essential. The minerals do not differ from the great mass of property, the ownership of which may be in the United States, or in individuals, without affecting in any respect the political jurisdiction of the States. They may be acquired by the State, as any other property may be, but when thus acquired she will hold them in the same manner that individual proprietors hold their property, and by the same right—by the right of ownership, and not by the right of sovereignty."

It might be well at this point to consider just what sovereign rights could be granted to a new State coming into the Union, under the provisions of the Constitution. What did the Constitution grant to these new States? The Constitution, itself, will be our best guide, and in article IV, section 4, of the Constitution, we find:

"The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government and shall protect each of them against invasion, and on application of the Legislature or the Executive (when Legislature cannot be convened) against domestic violence."

Under this provision of the Constitution, there is no guaranty made by the Federal Government of any sovereign or proprietary ownership in any land or a guaranty that each new State shall be on an "equal footing" with the other States. The "equal footing" clause appears in the Enabling Act. In the words of that act, with reference to the declaration of the admission, appear these words: "shall be one and is hereby declared to be one of the United States of America, admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the Thirteen Original States in all respects whatsoever." The Thirteen Original States or Colonies which formed the Federal Union were each, at the time of entering the Union, owners of all of the territory within their respective borders. They retained their original State ownership of land and their rights or claims to the tide and submerged lands. These rights were not surrendered to the Federal Government as a consideration for joining the Union. The same facts exist with respect to the State of Texas, which was admitted to the Union as a sovereign State and it did not surrender its rights, title, or interest to any part of its land, including tide and submerged lands which formed its southern and eastern boundaries.

Did California, in law or fact, come into the Union on "an equal footing with the Thirteen Original States?" The statutes at large disclose that much the same language was used "on an equal footing" in the enabling act, admitting many of the States to the Union regardless of whether or not they were States bordering on the ocean or landlocked States. The words "on an equal footing" surely were not meant to mean that the landlocked States which had no tide or submerged lands would have the same rights as the Thirteen Original States in tide and submerged lands of other States.

The rights of the States subsequently formed, and admitted into the Union, under the Constitution, were in no respects similar to the Thirteen Original States and Texas. These new States had no land and most of them had no coast lines. They were not sovereign or independent in themselves at the time of admission, and the powers which were granted to them under the Constitution carried no grant of property upon which to found the claim of ownership of land solely upon the basis of political sovereignty.

The enabling act was not a donation of land, a deed to any particular land, or a congressional grant, but on the contrary contained the following provision:

"California is admitted into the Union upon the express condition that the people of the State, through their legislature or otherwise, shall never interfere with the primary disposition of the public land within its limits and shall pass no law and do no act whereby the title of the United States and the rights to dispose of the land shall be impaired, or questioned."

In the light of this provision, a question very properly arises as to whether or not the State of California, since 1929, at least, is living up to the obligations which it assumed under the provisions of the enabling act. Has not California violated the provisions of the enabling act with reference to the rights of the Government in the public lands? Did it not appear before the Supreme Court, questioning title to certain parts of the territory, which by act of Congress were appropriated to the Federal Government? Has it not been and is it not now issuing leases for the taking of minerals, which it has been the policy of the Government to reserve, without respect to the provisions of the enabling act, and to the loss and damage of the Federal Government?

The enabling act also provides that—

"Nothing herein contained shall be construed as recognizing or rejecting the propositions tendered by the people of California as articles of compact in the ordinance adopted by the convention which formed the constitution of that State."

This unusual provision in the enabling act raises a very interesting question as to the validity of any claims which California might make as to property rights, in the State, under the enabling act, and that it has no rights which are not covered by the acts of 1841, 1851 and other specified acts relating to grants of property to California. Whether Congress was suspicious of the good faith of California, or not, it was definitely unwilling to go on record by confirming the provisions of its constitution and ordinances, and certainly failed to do so. This action might even raise the question as to whether or not Congress intended to admit California to statehood on an equal footing with the original States.

It does not appear that California has any rights to the submerged lands or minerals in them, which can be safely based upon the Enabling Act as being a grant of title to any land within the State.

The act of 1851, hereinbefore referred to, provided that after all of the claims to the land within the boundaries of the State had been determined, that all lands "shall be deemed, held, and considered as part of the public domain of the United States." If we are to align the facts and the law, the land in California having been declared to be a part of the public domain and the Enabling Act provided that California shall not interfere with the disposal of the public domain, we must conclude that any acts which California has performed on land not selected by its legislature and certified to it by the Government, was directly contrary to the provisions of the Enabling Act, of which they were advised and had due and full notice; and, they are not now in a position to advance on their own behalf any claims against the Government or to set up any equities which do not conform with the law and the provisions of their admission to statehood.

I think the foregoing fully establishes the title of the United States in the tide, submerged lands, and inland waters.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that the gentleman from California and those States that will be the beneficiaries under this legislation will maintain that the benefits will not accrue to the oil companies but to those respective States. But judging the future by the past it will not take long before these avaricious oil compa-

nies will be able to hoodwink the States the same as they are hoodwinking and trying to hoodwink the United States.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FLETCHER].

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, the issue before this Congress, involved in H. R. 5992, which is identical with a bill which I introduced, H. R. 5010, directly affects all of our coastal and Great Lakes States, and indirectly all States with navigable waters. I refer to the recent Supreme Court ruling that the State is not the owner of all lands below the low-water tideland, a ruling originally expected to apply only to California but actually so broad that it casts a shadow on the title of billions of dollars' worth of property in many States.

California is not the only State concerned, as almost every State in the Union has submerged lands. Members of Congress from Massachusetts could find that their State was deprived of their clam flats. Our friends from North Carolina could wake up one day to find that the Federal Government owns their fishing grounds where so many Members find relaxation.

The fact that oil exists beneath the tidelands in California is irrelevant, since the question at hand is purely that of States sovereignty. Congress must enact legislation acknowledging and affirming ownership of submerged lands and resources in the respective States. From the very beginning of our Nation, it has been assumed that each State has ownership and control of the tidelands in what are known as the navigable rivers, bays, and along the shores of our oceans. The Supreme Court's decision of June 23 questions the ownership of the submerged lands of at least 42 States, and the decision was based almost entirely upon the right and responsibility of the Federal Government to have whatever power necessary to protect this country against danger to the security and tranquility of its people. This is a direct threat to the doctrine of States rights, and could be applied on a national scale in such a manner as to be a distinct step in the direction of totalitarianism. The Federal Government has always had constitutional methods for acquiring that which it needs for the national defense. I believe this is part of what looks to be a determined plan to direct all government from Washington. It gives good grounds for the people to call Washington the Octopus on the Potomac, because of the grasping methods by which Federal bureaucracy is trying to extend its controls and influence into everything within the States. Think of the magnitude and the power that could be concentrated in the hands of a few bureaucrats if Congress does not act favorably upon this bill to affirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath the navigable waters within States boundaries. I urge the passage of this bill in order to forever allay the fears and doubts caused by this shadow cast upon the sovereignty of the States.

Before I close I do want to say, that when the gentleman from Illinois states that the Federal Government is being asked to give away oil which belongs to the Federal Government, he is misrepresenting the facts. The Supreme Court in its decision, merely stated that ownership of these submerged lands did not vest in the States. This decision did not affirm ownership of submerged lands vested in the Federal Government. Under this bill we are giving away nothing, but merely we are clearing title in this situation by quitclaiming any right the Federal Government might claim to have.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] may be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to testify before public hearings several weeks ago, affirming Maryland's opposition to the tidelands decision of the Supreme Court in the case of United States against California, and I rise today in support of H. R. 5992, confirming and establishing titles of States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries, and natural resources within such lands and waters, and providing for use and control of said land and resources.

I have always supported legislation providing for State ownership and shall vote today for full State ownership of submerged lands and the power to use such lands in any manner that does not interfere with constitutionally delegated Federal powers.

The State of Maryland owns approximately 1,600,000 acres of submerged lands of which substantially all is covered by the tidal waters of the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries. In addition, the State owns 61,440 acres of submerged land on the Atlantic Coastal Plain within 3 miles of the shore. In and around the city of Baltimore, millions of dollars have been invested in port facilities in reliance on ownership of the submerged lands by the State. During 173 years the State of Maryland and its citizens have derived great benefit from the submerged lands belonging to the State. There are 275,000 acres of oyster beds, of which 8,638 have been leased for a period of 20 years to private oyster growers. The oyster bottoms not under private cultivation are being cultivated by the State for the public. The State of Maryland derives each year from the fish, crab, and oyster industries conducted on the submerged lands belonging to the State approximately $110,000 and the State appropriates each year for the promotion and development of the oyster and fish industries the sum of approximately $500,000.

In the brief time permitted me, I cannot discuss the law involved in the California tidelands case. But suffice it to say, this decision disregards the rule of property law that is as old as our Nation itself. In fact, the whole theory of Federal and State relationship is violated by this extraordinary decision, and I share and wish to express the amazement and resentment of the people and the public officials of Maryland over it, and, this new ideology of government which would establish and enable the Federal Government to confiscate the tidelands and submerged lands within the boundaries of our State—or any State in the Union.

There is involved in this matter much more than meets the eye—much more, perhaps, than can even be dreamed of. Only last week, we read in the press of the recent "discovery of significant geological structures underlying the Continental Shelf from 20 to 75 miles from shore in the Gulf of Mexico, and that these structures may, like the similar domes lying inland from the Gulf, contain vast stores of petroleum recoverable by modern drilling techniques."

Unless the tidelands decision is refuted by the Congress, what is there to prevent the Federal Government from asserting paramount rights in and power over all of the lands of the different States, whether they be submerged lands of the Atlantic Coastal Plain and the Chesapeake Bay, or whether they be in the beds of the Gulf of Mexico, adjacent to Texas.

If the United States can take from the States the title of the land under navigable waters, or assert "paramount rights" thereto, then the Federal system and the rights of the sovereign States under that system will become a mockery. Our last vestige of the Federal system created by the Constitution will be gone. For these reasons, and being a believer in States' rights, I cannot urge too strongly the passage of this legislation recognizing and affirming State ownership of these tidelands, submerged lands, and their natural resources to the States in accordance with their heretofore long-recognized rights.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks that I intend to make in Committee of the Whole may be revised and extended so as to include some statistics concerning the effect of this legislation on the State of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides consideration for H. R. 5992, a bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

This bill is aimed specifically at settling the question of title to the tidelands, which has been a controversial matter for the past decade.

The tidelands are the lands lying beneath the tidewaters. The term does not refer only to the land beneath the low and the high-water marks—but, as defined by numerous court decisions—it embraces all of the lands lying beneath the waters of the 3-mile belt extending

seaward from the coast. For more than 150 years following the founding of this Nation, the States have been recognized as the owners of the tidelands lying off their respective coasts.

In the early 1920's oil was discovered in the tidelands off the coast of California—which understandably created some interest in the ownership of the land. California entered into leasing agreements with private operators—and tremendous investments were made in exploiting the oil resources. But no question of ownership of the lands was ever raised by the United States until 1937.

There were many applicants for Federal oil leases about that time, and some of these applicants were demanding their due under the New Deal patronage system. It was the lawyers for these oil operators who first raised the question of ownership of the tidelands. Harold Ickes, who was then Secretary of the Interior, was quick to see the advantages that would accrue to the administration if ownership of the tidelands were vested in the Federal Government. With the Federal Government in control of the tidelands, leases could be let in satisfaction of patronage demands on the New Deal, and Federal revenues to cover New Deal spending could be increased at the expense of the individual States.

In an attempt to secure ownership of the tidelands for the Federal Government, a number of bills have been introduced during the past 10 years, but each one has failed of passage. Harold Ickes was determined to get the tidelands, however, and he made continuing threats to grant Federal leases on portions of the submerged lands. To settle the question, House Joint Resolution 225 was passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress. This resolution, which would quiet title to the tidelands in the States, was vetoed by President Truman. The House failed to override the veto.

On May 29, 1945—while House Joint Resolution 225 was still being considered—Attorney General Clark brought a suit against the Pacific Western Oil Corp. to recover for the Federal Government a part of the submerged lands which were being leased by the corporation from the State of Califonia. This suit was subsequently dropped, and another action was brought before the Supreme Court by Attorney General Clark against the State of California. In this suit, the Attorney General alleged that the United States "is the owner in fee simple of, or possessed of paramount rights in and power over" the submerged lands within 3 miles of the California coast. On October 27, 1947, a decree was entered—giving the Federal Government paramount rights in, and full dominion and power over the lands, minerals, and other things underlying the Pacific Ocean lying seaward 3 nautical miles.

The Supreme Court refused to hold the United States owner in fee simple of the tidelands, but merely held that the Federal Government had paramount rights.

But even though it was only a momentary victory, this decision by the Supreme Court giving the Federal Government paramount rights in the tidelands must have gladdened the calloused old heart of the New Deal. Another victory had been won—another right which formerly belonged to the States had been usurped by the Federal Government.

Of course, we must recognize that it is within the province of the Supreme Court to define the law as the Court believes it to be at the time of the opinion. However, the Supreme Court does not pass upon the wisdom of the law—that decision is exclusively within the power of Congress. That is the purpose of this bill—in the name of common justice and equity—to quiet title to the tidelands in the several States. This bill does nothing more than to enunciate by statutory enactment—rights and title which had been recognized for more than 150 years before the New Deal program started to systematically reduce our States to vassals.

The resolution now under consideration embodies a simple open rule. It merely provides consideration and 2 hours of general debate on H. R. 5992. Amendments to the bill are allowed under the 5-minute rule. Nothing about this rule can possibly be repugnant to any Member of the House, and I urge you all to vote for its adoption.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand the front page of last evening's Washington Daily News. The block headline states "GOP won't pick Stassen.—TAFT." The news item underneath this headline quotes Presidential Candidate TAFT's opinion regarding Republican Presidential primaries:

> I wouldn't say they have a great influence in determining the result.

In other words, Presidential Candidate TAFT, by that statement, completely repudiates the vast majority of Republican voters who went to the polls in Wisconsin, Nebraska, and Pennsylvania, and registered the fact that the rank-and-file voters in the Republican Party want Harold Stassen for President of the United States.

If Candidate TAFT's statement of yesterday holds forth, our two-party system is in danger of collapse. It means in effect that the American people who vote in Republican Presidential primaries are being fooled and misled and are the victims of a gigantic political confidence game.

I am today asking Democratic National Chairman HOWARD MCGRATH to insist that National Republican Chairman Reese either confirm or deny the statement of Candidate TAFT and inform us whether the National Convention in Philadelphia will ignore the wishes of the great majority of Republican voters in this country who have declared themselves for a progressive liberal as the Republican nominee.

The American people will not tolerate another smoke-filled room in Philadelphia where the party leaders will ignore the wishes of the voters. In 1920, the great liberal and people's candidate, Hiram Johnson, swept the Republican Presidential primaries, but in that Chicago convention the Penroses, the Mellons, the Pews, and other Republican bosses gathered in a smoke-filled room and selected Warren G. Harding as the Republican nominee. The result is now history. That election gave us the Doughertys, the Falls, the Denbys, the Forbes, Teapot Dome, and led up to the depression of 1929.

As long as the rank and file of the American people can choose the nominees of their respective parties, our country will be safe. Democracy, not dictatorship, must rule our major party conventions when we select the person who is to occupy the highest office in the land.

That confidence in our two-party system be upheld, I call upon National Chairman Reese to clarify, by either affirming or denying the statements made by Candidate TAFT yesterday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman grant the gentleman an additional minute so I can ask him a question?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana which one of these Republican candidates he is supporting?

Mr. MADDEN. I have a personal admiration for Candidate Stassen because of the great progressive record he made as Governor of Minnesota; furthermore, because he is the only liberal Presidential candidate on the Republican side.

I forgot to mention the statement of my good friend the gentleman from Ohio, CLARENCE BROWN, who is Candidate TAFT's campaign manager. He also made a statement which was reported in last night's Star that Stassen would get only 1 of the 72 delegates out of Pennsylvania. I claim that statement is an insult to every liberal in Pennsylvania who went to the polls and voted for Harold Stassen and gave him a great majority last Tuesday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, just to keep the record straight: I believe every Member of the House will agree that the gentleman from Indiana, who is well known as a radical New Dealer, is not interested in any way in the welfare of the Republican Party, and many, many times I have questioned whether he was even interested in the welfare of the people of this country.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, the Foreign Affairs Committee has announced hearings beginning next Tuesday on a resolution introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and myself, together with six Members from the Republican side and six Members from the Democratic side. On Thursday of next week Members of the House will be heard in support of this resolution.

This resolution has for its purpose the exploring of possibilities under articles 51 and 109, the former provision pertaining to regional security, the revision of the United Nations Charter, so as to limit the power of the veto which has been invoked on 22 occasions, and otherwise to strengthen this agency for peace.

I hope many Members of the House will appear before the Foreign Affairs Committee to urge the adoption of these resolutions, strictly bipartisan in character, to give the Nation a valid hope of lasting peace.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF MAY 3

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute to announce the program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. On Monday the Consent Calendar will be called.

On Tuesday the Private Calendar will be called and there will be called up for consideration the bill (H. R. 4954) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance, under Federal reclamation laws, of the Kennewick division of the Yakima project, Washington; and House Joint Resolution 334, giving the consent of Congress to the compact on regional education entered into between the Southern States at Tallahassee, Fla., on February 8, 1948.

On Wednesday the legislative appropriation bill for 1949 will be considered.

On Thursday the District of Columbia appropriation bill for 1949.

Friday is undetermined.

Conference reports may be called up at any time.

If rules are granted any time after Tuesday the following bills may be considered: S. 2287, to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes; H. R. 6263, extension to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes; and H. R. 5852 to combat un-American activities by requiring the registration of Communist-front organizations, and for other purposes.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday next may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

APPROPRIATION BILLS MADE IN ORDER

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any rule of the House it may be in order to consider the legislative and District of Columbia appropriation bills any time next week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

THE ECONOMY OF HAWAII IN 1947

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I present House Concurrent Resolution 151, authorizing the printing as a House document of the report entitled "The Economy of Hawaii in 1947" and authorizing the printing of additional copies thereof (Rept. No. 1838).

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the letter of the Secretary of Labor, transmitted to the House and referred to the Committee on Public Lands on February 4, 1948, together with the report of The Economy of Hawaii in 1947, with special reference to wages, working conditions, and industrial relations, which was prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics pursuant to the Organic Act of the Territory of Hawaii in 1900, as amended April 8, 1904, be printed as a document, and that 2,000 additional copies be printed, of which 1,500 shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and 500 copies shall be for the use of the Senate.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELLA J. ICKES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 539 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Ella J. Ickes, widow of William G. Ickes, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said William G. Ickes.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY A. CONRAD

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 566 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Mary A. Conrad, widow of Dorsey B. Conrad, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said Dorsey B. Conrad.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUTLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement he made a year ago.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HARDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution.

CONTROL AND USE OF CERTAIN TIDELANDS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5992) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5992, with Mr. HOEVEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of H. R. 5992, like that of House Joint Resolution 225, which passed the Seventy-ninth Congress by a very substantial majority but was vetoed by President Truman, is to confirm and establish the rights and claims of the 48 States, long asserted and enjoyed with the approval of the Federal Government, to the lands and resources beneath navigable waters within their boundaries; subject, however, to the right of the United States to exercise all of its constitutional regulatory powers over such lands and waters.

Throughout our Nation's history the States have been in possession of and exercising all the rights and attributes of ownership in the lands and resources beneath the navigable waters within their boundaries. During a period of more than 150 years of American jurisprudence the Supreme Court, in the words of Mr. Justice Black, had "used language strong enough to indicate that the Court then believed that the States also owned soils under all navigable waters within their territorial jurisdiction, whether inland or not."

That same belief was expressed in scores of Supreme Court opinions and in hundreds of lower Federal courts' and State courts' opinions. Similar beliefs were expressed in rulings by Attorneys General of the United States, the Department of the Interior, the War Department, and the Navy Department.

Lawyers, legal publicists, and those holding under State authority accepted this principle as the well-settled law of the land.

The claims of the States in this particular were first challenged by Federal officials in 1937. From that time on there has been controversy between the States and the Federal Government.

On June 23, 1947, the Supreme Court rendered its opinion in the case of United States against California, and on October 27, 1947, a decree was entered which reads, in part, as follows:

1. The United States of America is now, and has been at all times pertinent hereto, possessed of paramount rights in, and full dominion and power over, the lands, minerals, and other things underlying the Pacific Ocean lying seaward of the ordinary low-water mark on the coast of California, and outside of the inland waters, extending seaward three nautical miles and bounded on the north and south, respectively, by the northern and southern boundaries of the State of California. The State of California has no title thereto or property interest therein.

It naturally follows that this Supreme Court decision overruling that which had generally been accepted as the law of the land for so many years has caused not only confusion but consternation in many instances, and in reality it is intended in this bill to restate that which we thought was the law before the California decision.

Mr. Chairman, I come from Michigan, which is one of the Great Lakes States, and naturally and necessarily Michigan is vitally interested in who owns the submerged lands affected by the recent California case, and which would be affected by the enactment of this legislation.

In the hearings before the joint committee the Attorney General of the United States testified that he intended to bring in the near future similar suits against other coastal States and that, although each State would probably urge special defenses based upon the law and facts under which it joined the Union, the California decision was a precedent for the suits he intended to bring against other States.

The attorneys general of several Great Lakes States and other qualified witnesses testified that the California case was likewise a precedent which the Federal Government could properly urge in any suit against the Great Lakes States to recover for the Federal Government the submerged areas under the Lakes within the boundaries of such States. These witnesses called attention to the fact that the Supreme Court in *Illinois Central Railroad* v. *Illinois* (146 U. S. 387) held that because the Great Lakes partook of the nature of the open sea, the same rule of ownership would be applied to them that had been followed by the Court with reference to ownership of lands under tidewaters on the borders of the sea. These witnesses also pointed out that the Great Lakes are located on an international boundary and the Federal Government has the same right to conduct international negotiations involving the Lakes as it does with respect to the 3-mile belt off the shore of California.

The Attorney General of the United States when questioned on the applicability of the rule as announced in the California case to the submerged lands of the Great Lakes within the borders of the Great Lakes States was somewhat equivocal. He insisted that Lake Michigan was wholly an inland lake and, consequently, in his opinion, the rule in the California case could not apply to Lake Michigan. He also stated it to be his opinion that the rule would not apply with respect to the other Great Lakes. However, he was frank to say that this was a personal opinion without study and that he had not conferred with or consulted other members of his staff on this point. The Attorney General also conceded that all of the Great Lakes except Lake Michigan constituted international-boundary waters. Later in the testimony it was developed that the Chief of the Land Division of the Department of Justice and others in that Department had, soon after the Court decided the California case, held the opinion that in the event the United States should discover anything of value in the beds of the Great Lakes that it needed for national defense or which should become the subject of international negotiations, the Government could then, under the theory of the California case, assert its paramount power and full dominion over the lands and resources in such lands lying under the waters of the Great Lakes to the same extent and with the same force and effect as it had done within the 3-mile belt on the coast of California.

Apparently, in anticipation that the rule applicable to California submerged lands would be applied to the Great Lakes, an applicant following the California case applied to the Department of the Interior for a Federal oil lease on a part of Lake Michigan within the boundaries of the State of Michigan; thus, the State of Michigan is at the moment actually confronted with this legal problem, and it follows that the other States bordering on Lake Michigan and the other Great Lakes are directly affected.

The implications in the California decision have clouded the title of every State bordering on the sea or on the Great Lakes, and the committee is unable to estimate how many years it would take to adjudicate the question of whether the decision is applicable to other coastal and to the Great Lakes States. We are certain that until the Congress enacts a law consonant with what the States and the Supreme Court believed for more than a century was the law, confusion and uncertainty will continue to exist, titles will remain clouded, and years of vexatious and complicated litigation will result.

This bill, if it becomes a law, will affect to some extent every State in the Union. Be it thoroughly understood that this legislation is not aimed solely at preserving the rights of the States in coastal or tidewater lands.

Mr. Chairman, it is to avoid this confusion and clarify the rights of the States that this bill is presented to the Congress. Briefly:

(a) It confirms, establishes, and vests in the States or persons lawfully entitled thereto under State law all right, title, and interest of the United States, if any it has, in and to the lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States, and the natural resources within such lands and waters, and the right and power to control, develop, and use such natural resources, subject to the reservation of all Federal powers under the Constitution.

(b) It releases any claims that it may have arising out of the previous operations conducted on the submerged lands or in the waters covering them under State authority.

(c) It gives the United States a preferential right in time of war, or at any other time, when necessary for national defense, to purchase any of the natural resources produced from the lands included in the bill.

(d) The bill protects the jurisdiction and authority of the United States Government and all of its agencies, such as the Federal Power Commission, and all departments of the Government, such as the Army, Navy, Interior, and Commerce, to exercise constitutional powers to control and improve navigable waters in aid of navigation and commerce, or to regulate navigable waters for flood control, and to use such waters for the development of hydroelectric power and for all other purposes necessary to regulate commerce. It protects the jurisdiction of the Federal Government and all rights exercised under the reclamation laws by an express provision that the act may not be construed to repeal, amend, or modify any of the reclamation acts or amendments thereto. It protects and confirms the rights of those holdings under Federal authority with respect to the beds of streams now or hereafter constituting a part of the public lands of the United States not meandered in connection with the public survey of such lands under the laws of the United States. By the express provisions of the bill, all rights and claims of the United States to the Continental Shelf lying outside the boundaries of the States are preserved.

(e) Finally, it is the intent and purpose of this bill to establish the law for the future so that the rights and powers of the States and those holding under State authority may be preserved as they existed prior to the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the California case.

Mr. Chairman, the hearings were held by Subcommittee No. 1, and an exceptionally detailed and complete report accompanies the bill. The bill and the report have been available to the membership for some time, and I assume those having a special interest in this proposal have already studied the report. The bill will be thoroughly explained by members of the subcommittee, and germane amendments will be in order when the bill is read under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED], chairman of the subcommittee in charge of this matter.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it is my desire very briefly to discuss the necessity for the enactment of H. R. 5992 which I consider a bill to quiet title, to preserve and maintain our dual form of government and to prevent the confiscation of property upon which individual States, relying upon treaties, our Federal Constitution, acts of our Congresses, and decisions of our courts, covering a period of 160 years, have expended untold millions of dollars in dams, wharves, harbors, piers, bridges, breakwaters, sewage-disposal systems, and other improvements and have encouraged and promoted the extraction and development of minerals, oil, gas, kelp, fish, sponges, and other marine life. More than 36 bills, similar to the one now before us, were considered in extensive joint hearings for 17 full days by the Committees on the Judiciary of the House and Senate. This legislation has the approval of 44 out of the 48 Governors of the respective States of the Union, several of them appearing in person to urge its passage. It is likewise endorsed by such organizations as the National Conference of Attorneys General, National Conference of Mayors, American Association of Port Authorities, and the American Bar Association.

A similar bill—House Joint Resolution 225—was passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress because of a threat by the Department of the Interior that that Department intended to grant Federal oil and gas leases on tide and submerged lands off the coast of California in spite of repeated decisions of the Supreme Court that the title to these lands vested in the States. While that legislation was pending in the Senate, a suit was instituted in the Supreme Court challenging the title of the State of California to these lands, nevertheless the Senate passed the resolution, but it was vetoed by President Truman largely on the ground that the litigation then pending would probably settle the matter without the necessity of legislation.

A decision was rendered in June of 1947. Instead of clarification, it has created a condition of confusion confounded. It states that the State of California has no title or property interest in the lands in question. Although urged by the Attorney General to declare that the United States was the owner in fee simple or had paramount rights of proprietorship, it merely held that the United States is possessed of paramount rights in and full dominion and power over the lands, minerals, and other things underlying the Pacific Ocean lying seaward three nautical miles from the California coast.

The situation, therefore, resolves itself into this:

It is a general rule of law that all land within the boundaries of any sovereign State of the Union must have an owner. The Supreme Court has said that these lands, part of the geographic limitations of the State of California, do not belong to that State. It says that the United States of America has paramount rights in them, but it does not declare title in the Federal Government.

As Justice Frankfurter aptly observed in his dissenting opinion:

> Of course, the United States has "paramount rights" in the sea belt of California—the rights that are implied by the power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce, the power of condemnation, the treaty-making power, the war power.

The paramount interest, said Mr. Justice Reed in his dissent, is "precisely as it is over every river, farm, mine, and factory of the Nation." Yet here is a judicial finding by the majority of the Court that the State has no title. The Federal Government has paramount interest. Yet there is no owner. What happens in such contingencies? Why, it is a rule of law, of course, that where there is no owner real property escheats to the State.

So here we are back to where we started with at least a probability that the State still owns these lands in spite of the Supreme Court decision.

This is a proposition that needs clarification. The Congress can perform that task simply and thoroughly. The enactment of this legislation is sufficient. It will place title to these lands in the States, where it has been from the time of the adoption of the Constitution, where it has been recognized by Congress after Congress and by the Supreme Court in many, many decisions too numerous to mention.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that the Members will pass this piece of legislation and clear once and for all this situation that now amounts to confusion confounded.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation under consideration is necessary because of the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of United States against California, decided last year and reported in 330 U. S. The legislation is necessary because, in my judgment, the Supreme Court has again invaded the legislative field. Up to the time of the unfortunate decision which has created the chaos my distinguished friend from Illinois discussed, nobody had any doubt but that the title to the submerged lands contiguous to the States was in the several States. As proof of that statement I call to your attention the language of Justice Black, contained in the majority opinion, that during a period of more than 150 years of American jurisprudence the Supreme Court has used language strong enough to indicate that the Court then believed that the States also owned soils under all navigable waters within their territorial jurisdiction, whether inland or not.

In further support of my statement that there was no doubt up to the time of the decision as to the ownership, I call to your attention a statement made by Harold Ickes, who at the time he made the statement was Secretary of the Interior. He stated:

> Title to the soil under the ocean within the 3-mile limit is in the State of California, and the land may not be appropriated except by authority of the State.

Then, further, in the pleadings filed by the Attorney General of the United States in this case, he alleged:

> The United States is the owner in fee simple of or possessed of paramount rights in and power over these submerged lands.

It certainly seems to me that nobody believes that the United States has any authority at all over the waters adjacent to the several States except for navigation purposes.

The Constitution did not delegate to the Federal Government any proprietary interest in the submerged lands within State boundaries, and not having been given authority expressly then, of course, the authority over that land was reserved to the States. Under the tenth amendment to the Constitution, the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

In that connection, I should like to call to your attention the views of Justice Reed, who filed a very strong dissenting opinion in this case.

He said:

> In my view the controversy brought before this court by the complaint of the United States against California seeks a judgment between State and Nation as to the ownership of the land underlying the Pacific Ocean, seaward of the ordinary low-water mark, on the coast of California and within the 3-mile limit. The ownership of that land carries with it, it seems to me, the ownership of any minerals or other valuables in the soil, as well as the right to extract them.
>
> The determination as to the ownership of the land in controversy turns for me on the fact as to ownership in the Original Thirteen States of similar lands prior to the formation of the Union. If the Original States owned the bed of the sea, adjacent to their coasts, to the 3-mile limit, then I think California has the same title or ownership to the lands adjacent to her coast. The Original States were sovereignties in their own right, possessed of so much of the land underneath the adjacent seas as was generally recognized to be under their jurisdiction. The scope of their jurisdiction and the boundaries of their lands were coterminous. Any part of that territory which had not passed from their ownership by existing valid grants were and remained public lands of the respective States. California, as is customary, was admitted into the Union "on an equal footing with the Original States in all respects whatever" (9 Stat. 452). My S. 3 of the Act of Admission, the public lands within its borders were reserved for disposition by the United States. "Public lands" was there used in its usual sense of lands subject to sale under general laws. As was the rule, title to lands under navigable waters vested in California as it had done in all other States. (*Pollard* v. *Hagan* (3 How. 212); *Barney* v. *Keokuk* (94 U. S. 324, 338); *Shively* v. *Bowlby* (152 U. S. 1, 49); *Mann* v. *Tacoma Land Co.* (153 U. S. 273, 284); *Borax Consolidated, Ltd.* v. *Los Angeles* (296 U. S. 10, 17).)
>
> The authorities cited in the Court's opinion lead me to the conclusion that the Original States owned the lands under the seas to the 3-mile limit. There were, of course, as is shown by the citations, variations in the claims of sovereignty, jurisdiction or ownership among the nations of the world. As early as 1793, Jefferson as Secretary of State, in a communication to the

British Minister, said that the territorial protection of the United States would be extended "three geographical miles," and added:

"This distance can admit of no opposition, as it is recognized by treaties between some of the powers with whom we are connected in commerce and navigation, and is as little, or less, than is claimed by any of them on their own coasts." (H. Ex. Doc. No. 324, 42d Cong., 2d sss., pp. 553–554.)

If the Original States did claim, as I think they did, sovereignty and ownership to the 3-mile limit, California has the same rights in the lands bordering its littoral.

This ownership in California would not interfere in any way with the needs or rights of the United States in war or peace. The power of the United States is plenary over these undersea lands precisely as it is over every river, farm, mine, and factory of the Nation. While no square ruling of this Court has determined the ownership of those marginal lands, to me the tone of the decisions dealing with similar problems indicates that, without discussion, State ownership has been assumed. (*Pollard* v. *Hagan, supra; Louisiana* v. *Mississippi* (202 U. S. 1, 52); *The Abby Dodge* (223 U. S. 166); *New Jersey* v. *Delaware* (291 U. S. 361; 295 U. S. 694).)

Let us look at that just for a moment. Was there any doubt in the minds of anybody in the Thirteen Original States or in the States as to the ownership of the submerged lands adjacent to the States? No, because if you examine all of the transactions between the States and the United States relative to these submerged lands, you will find that the United States entered into agreements with the sovereign States for the use of these lands. In my own State of Pennsylvania, the United States entered into an agreement for the construction of the League Island Navy Yard. Certainly if there was any question even as to the right to use the submerged lands contiguous to the State of Pennsylvania, the United States would not have gone to the State of Pennsylvania in order to obtain permission to erect a navy yard along the Delaware River.

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BRADLEY of California. I offer the congratulations of the people of California and the Members of the House upon your very excellent and fair exposition.

Mr. WALTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. May I say in all modesty and without throwing bouquets at myself as a former instructor of constitutional law, when the gentleman suggests the fundamental question relative to the position taken by the original States as against the United States, he hits the nail exactly on the head.

Mr. WALTER. Of course, the gentleman very clearly remembers that the treaty of peace with Great Britain was made with the Thirteen Original States and not with the United States, so that at the time the treaty was entered into all the rights that the colonists had under the common law belonged to the several States.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Yes, I recall it. The gentleman is absolutely correct, and without taking any further time, I want to say that I follow you and the majority 100 percent. Over and over again I have said and I repeat, the Federal Government should not be allowed to encroach upon the rights reserved to the States by the tenth amendment. I shall always attempt to maintain the fundamental conception of the founders, which involves both or either the life or death of our representative form of government.

Mr. WALTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Reference has just been made to the clear memory of the gentleman from Vermont concerning the treaty between Great Britain and the Thirteen Colonies. Was that because of his presence at the time the treaty was made?

Mr. PLUMLEY. The gentleman from California does not embarrass me by his interrogation. I confess I am an aboriginal original. Vermont, which was an independent republic, got into the Union under almost its own protest, certainly because it insisted upon the reservation of its rights not theretofore or ever granted to the Union.

With that background, I certainly will back the Chadwick bill to the last ditch. So should all Representatives of every State. The tideland characterization is well made. The tide ebbs and flows. If when it goes out this time, the rights of the States float out with it or are in the backwash there go the reserved rights of the States into water so deep no diver will ever bring them back. "There is a tide, and so forth"—you know. It is time to watch your step lest you get into the undertow. Now is the time for the States to undertake to maintain and to preserve the rights they reserved or forever after to hold their peace.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. May I inquire of the gentleman whether in the list of those people and organizations who are opposed to the project any statement was made by the State legislature of the State of Pennsylvania? I do not find any in this document.

Mr. WALTER. The legislature of the State of Pennsylvania did not act on this matter because the legislature was not in session when the bill was before the committee. But under our constitution when the legislature is not in session, then the Governor has certain powers in connection with matters of this sort. The Governor delegated the Attorney General of the State of Pennsylvania to appear in support of this legislation. His deputy appeared before the committee and made a very fine logical and convincing statement in support of the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point certain statistics showing the effect of this legislation on the State of Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

STATEMENT OF FACTS, SHOWING IN PART THE AREA OF PENNSYLVANIA'S SUBMERGED LANDS, THE RESOURCES THEREIN, AND THE NUMBER AND VALUE OF DEVELOPMENTS AND IMPROVEMENTS UPON OR CONTIGUOUS WITH SUCH SUBMERGED LANDS

PORT OF PHILADELPHIA

The distance in statute miles from the head of tidewater at the upper railroad bridge, Trenton, N. J., to Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, is estimated as 33.72 miles. The distance on the Schuylkill River from the Fairmount Dam, the head of tidewater, is 8.6 miles. This portion of the Schuylkill River is available for commerce from both sides, giving a water frontage of 17.2 miles. The Philadelphia city water front on the Delaware and Schuylkill Rivers is 37 miles long, about one-half of which is improved. The water frontage at Chester is 10 miles.

The United States Army Engineers credit Pennsylvania with a total of 20.23 square miles of submerged land in the tidal basin at mean high tide, as follows: 19 square miles in the Pennsylvania section of the Delaware River and 1.23 square miles in the Schuylkill River.

Every port facility in Philadelphia is built on State property under grant by license. The director of wharves, docks and ferries is also the agent of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Of the city piers, 28 percent are city-owned. The city is still spending $1,500,000 annually towards amortization of bonds for improvements costing over $40,000,000 prior to 1942. Annual rental receipts from city-owned piers approximate a half million dollars annually. The estimated value of other improvements undertaken in the port is approximately $1,000,000,000.

Examples of the facilities in the port of Philadelphia are as follows:

1. Two hundred and sixty-seven wharves, of which 159 are projecting piers and 108 are individual sections of bulkhead frontage. Of the projecting piers, 41 represent the water front terminals of the Pennsylvania, Reading, and Baltimore & Ohio railroads. Fourteen are large municipal piers. Three are piers built by the United States Government and are devoted exclusively to ocean commerce.

2. Along the water front are 8,000,000 square feet of covered storage space and a total berthing space of 190,000 lineal feet. There are two modern coal tipples, two large grain elevators, two large rapid oil-handling piers, and the largest shipbuilding yards on the American Continent.

The annual net volume of commerce in the port of Philadelphia is approximately 45,000,000 tons, which represents imports and exports of 18 municipalities served by the Delaware River and its tributaries. Only 5 of these 18 municipalities are in Pennsylvania, but the total tonnage of imports and exports for these 5 municipalities is 42,191,266.

An act of June 8, 1907 (Pennsylvania, Public Laws 321) created the department of wharves, docks, and ferries and delegated to it responsibility for the development of the waterfront within the city of Philadelphia. Dredging in the waterways shoreward from the pierhead line must be under permit from the director of that department (act of April 27, 1925, Pennsylvania Public Laws 191); for example, permits to the United States Maritime Commission to dredge at piers 96, 98, and 100.

The Navigation Commission, an administrative commission in the Department of Forests and Waters, issues licenses and permits for the Delaware River and its tributaries not within the city of Philadelphia. (Act of June 8, 1907, Pa, Public Law 496, supplemented and amended by the acts of 1913, 1919, 1921, 1925, and act of June 21, 1937, Pa. Public Law 1960).

It has not been possible to determine the value of park improvements along the rivers at Philadelphia, nor the acreage or the value of the land reclaimed from the river bed along the Delaware, at the southern limits of the City of Philadelphia.

LAKE ERIE

Pennsylvania owns the land and water in Lake Erie to the international boundary line between the United States and Canada, that is, to the middle of the Lake. Therefore, Pennsylvania exercises sovereign jurisdiction over the 570,240 acres beneath Lake Erie and its water front of 46 miles.

The Pennsylvania Water and Power Resources Board issues permits in writing for dredging or removing sand and gravel from Lake Erie. (Act of June 25, 1913, Public Law 555, sec. 1808 of the Administrative Code of 1929, as amended by Act No. 137, approved May 6, 1937.)

For nearly 20 years this dredging for sand and gravel has been done under permits issued by the Water and Power Resources Board of the State Department of Forests and Waters (no revenue to the State) in designated areas, totalling 9,990 acres.

The Erie Park Commission on Presque Isle peninsula, at Erie, reports that roads, improvements and protective works have cost approximately $2,000,000. The city of Erie receives no revenue. The docks are privately owned. The Erie Park Commission receives annually a minimum of $800 from private licenses for dockage for pleasure boats and $1,100 from concessions.

In the Port of Erie, the Pennsylvania Railroad owns and operates all the terminal facilities with the exception of the Sand and Gravel Company Pier, and the Municipal Steamboat dock constructed by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in 1909 at a cost of $150,000 but now used as a boat landing wharf for pleasure and fishing boats.

The principal efforts of recent years have been to prevent beach erosion on the outer shore of the Presque Isle peninsula—the drifting of sand into Erie Harbor has been a detriment rather than a benefit. Engineering plans for improvements in the Port of Erie contemplate an expenditure of one and one-half million by the Federal Government for the dredging of the Harbor Channel in order to justify economically a proposed expenditure of eight and one-half million by private, State and local interests.

The State Geologist reports that there has been no exploratory drilling in the Pennsylvania portion of the bed of Lake Erie, but there is a definite probability that gas supplies will be developed in this area and at least a strong possibility that drilling will develop additional oil resources.

INLAND WATERS

Pennsylvania contains about 15,000 streams, in the Delaware, Susquehanna, Ohio, Potomac, Lake Erie, and Genesee Basins. The combined area drained by these streams is 45,126 square miles and 95.2 percent of the area is within three of the basins, namely, Susquehanna, Ohio, and Delaware.

	Percent
Susquehanna	46.4
Ohio	34.5
Delaware	14.3
Potomac	3.5
Lake Erie	1.1
Genesee	.2
	100.0

Approximately 4,400 streams are designated by name and listed in the Gazeteer of Streams. Descriptions for 644 of the most important streams have been collected and published in that publication. About 570 of the named streams drain areas greater than 25 square miles. Of this number, two have tributary areas greater than 10,000 square miles, 4 streams drain from 5,000 to 10,000 square miles and 420 have areas from 25 to 100 square miles.

The Department of Forests and Waters has surveyed 293 lakes in Pennsylvania. Of this number 256 contain water surface areas greater than 20 acres each, while 19 of the latter cover more than 200 acres each. These lakes are found principally in the northeastern portion of the State; the remainder, with the exception of one each in Carbon, Rauphin, Fayette, and York Counties, are located in Crawford, Erie, and Mercer Counties. The largest natural lake in the State is Conneaut, situate in the west central part of Crawford County, with an area of 928.5 acres. Lake Wallenpaupack, in Pike and Wayne Counties, contains the greatest volume of water stored in an artificial lake in the Commonwealth; it covers 5,760 acres.

There are 5,900 dams in the streams of the State, of which 645 are important structures storing large volumes of water situated above cities and boroughs. The portion in Pennsylvania of the Pymatuning Reservoir constructed by the Water and Power Resources Board of the Department of Forests and Waters, floods the greatest surface in the State with an area of 12,170 acres and has a shore line of 61 miles, but does not store as great a volume of water as Lake Wallenpaupack.

According to information compiled from surveys by the Pennsylvania Water and Power Resources Board (see Annex hereto attached), our nine navigable rivers have a water frontage of 2,849 miles and submerged lands totaling 148,616 acres. Excluding approximately 61 miles of water frontage, and the 12,947 acres of submerged lands beneath the tidal waters of the Delaware and Schuylkill Rivers, the inland water frontage of our nine navigable rivers is 2,788 miles, and an area of 135,668.2 acres.

The water frontage of the principal lakes and ponds, including the portion of the Pymatuning Reservoir in Pennsylvania, but excluding Lake Erie—46 miles water front and 570,240 acres—totals 241 miles and the area of the submerged lands thereunder is 39,680 acres.

Therefore, the total area of submerged lands beneath all of the inland waters of Pennsylvania is 175,348.8 acres, and the total water frontage 3,029 miles.

Fifteen thousand and five hundred applications for stream encroachments have been investigated by the Encroachment Division of the Water and Power Resources Board. About 80 percent of these represent bridges across the streams, 10 percent fills along the stream banks, and the remaining 10 percent channel changes, wharves, docks, and other miscellaneous projects. About 500 encroachment applications are handled annually.

The only revenue to the State is comprised of filing, investigation, and inspection fees and, in addition, the general fund of State treasury receives approximately $12,000 annually in fees for limited hydroelectric power permits for operations at Lake Wallenpaupack, Safe Harbor, and at reservoir of the Conewingo Dam. (The Administrative Code of 1929.)

Dams have widened the rivers in some areas which are underlain by coal, and in some of these areas productive oil sands underlie the surface, e. g., (1) the Pittsburgh coal bed underlies the Monongahela River from Brownsville to Greensburg; and (2) the Allegheny coals, some of which are thought to be workable, underlie all of the Monongahela River in Pennsylvania, the Youghiogheny River below Connellsville, and the lower Allegheny and Ohio Rivers from Pittsburgh to Beaver. The valuable clays of Pennsylvania are mostly associated with the Allegheny group coals, the Upper Freeport to the lower Kittanning, and will underlie the rivers in the same areas as the Allegheny coals do.

Rivers draining from the anthracite region have yielded annually one-half to one and a half million tons of fine anthracite coal. Many industries are dependent upon coal so recovered, notably from the Susquehanna River at Harrisburg.

Statement of facts on behalf of Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

AMOUNT OF WATER FRONTAGE AND AMOUNT OF SUBMERGED LANDS OF PRINCIPAL RIVERS AND LAKES AND PONDS IN PENNSYLVANIA

[All statistical data approximate]

River	Length (miles)	Water frontage (miles)	Average width (miles)	Land submerged (acres)
DELAWARE BASIN				
Delaware River	255	255	0.12	19,600
Schuylkill River	131	262	.08	7,040
Lehigh River	100	200	.06	4,480
Total	486	717	.....	31,120
SUSQUEHANNA BASIN				
Susquehanna River	112	224	.74	53,376
North Branch	166	332	.22	23,050
West Branch	228	456	.06	8,450
Juniata River	86	172	.07	3,840
Total	592	1,184	.....	88,716
OHIO BASIN [1]				
Ohio River	39	78	.2	5,820
Allegheny River	260	520	.07	11,950
Monongahela River	92	184	.14	7,940
Youghiogheny River	83	166	.06	3,070
Total	474	948	.....	28,780
LAKES AND PONDS				
Lake Erie	.....	46	.....	570,240
Pymatuning Reservoir	.....	61	.....	12,170
Wallenpaupack	.....	45	.....	5,760
Miscellaneous lakes and ponds	.....	135	.....	21,750
Total	.....	287	.....	609,920
Total, all streams, lakes, and ponds	1,552	3,136	.....	758,536

[1] The water frontage and submerged lands at Pittsburgh are included in the Ohio Basin figures.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHADWICK], the author of the bill.

Mr. CHADWICK. Mr. Chairman, I hope that I can say all that I have to say which will be of any assistance or contribution to you in less than 15 minutes.

It seems to me it might be well worth while to spend a few minutes translating to those of you who are not lawyers, the situation as it prevailed in the Supreme Court, and as it has prevailed since the adjudication of the Supreme Court in the case of United States against California; because you are bound to be asked that by your constituents. In all probability this bill will become a controversial issue in the United States. It is not impossible that this bill and the decision of the Supreme Court which preceded it, will lay the foundation of an issue almost as fundamental as the Missouri Compromise; because the fundamental problem for us to resolve, and for all Americans to resolve for themselves, is the question of States' rights as against the encroachment of the Federal Government, against the superstate.

Let me remind you, if I may, that what was presented to the Supreme Court was a simple lawsuit, differing from the normal lawsuit only in the fact that the case was brought in the Supreme Court;

the Attorney General sought original jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court, rather than starting in the lower court and having it come up in the normal fashion to the Supreme Court.

I listened to the testimony of the Attorney General at the interesting joint hearings conducted by the Senate Judiciary and our own Judiciary Committees, and if I read his mind aright, he would have preferred that this case should have come up in the normal way. There is strong testimony in the record from at least one person who was a very active witness, Mr. Ickes, that the Attorney General was urged from a higher quarter to institute this bill, although there was already a suit pending which would have raised the same question, in the District Court for California.

The only disadvantage of that particular kind of proceeding is that the Supreme Court, like all courts, is human. The reason we accomplish something like justice, equality, and great judicial policy is because cases being started at the lower level, are carried up by appeal and looked at again and again, until the Supreme Court usually gets a proposition which is preserved like a fried fish on a platter. If it does not like the side which is up, it turns it over and sends it back with the other side up; and that is a rather dependable judicial procedure.

However, if the Supreme Court takes initial jurisdiction it must examine the matter de novo, and it must arrive at a judgment which is dependably sound and according to law, we hope, without any review or appeal.

I realize we are on delicate ground in this particular aspect of the matter. This great body has the highest respect for the Supreme Court of the United States. We all individually have that high respect, but, as attorneys we are under a special obligation of regard. Yet, as lawyers, we are inclined to feel that the Supreme Court reached an unfortunate conclusion in this case. How we can convey that to the public and to you gentlemen without bad taste is a problem. So I am going to tell you a little story of my college days.

We had a German professor of mathematics at the University of Pennsylvania who was very forceful and emphatic in all his statements. One of his students, who had become illuminated with his interest but had gotten off the track, indulged in some special demonstration of higher mathematics, in which he reached a conclusion that Professor Schwatt could not justify. The student stuck to his ground. Finally Dr. Schwatt lost his patience and said, "If Gott in himmel came down and pointed to that demonstration and said, 'Dr. Schwatt, that is correct,' I would have to say, 'Gott, you vas mistaken.' "

What did the Supreme Court actually say in this case? It decided as a matter of adjudication that the State of California does not own title to the strip of land along its shores. That is all that is decided. They did not decide, and it has never been decided, that Oregon does not own its strip of land under the marginal sea; or that Florida does not own that strip of land; least of all that the Thirteen Original States do not own that piece of land; and perhaps particularly that Texas does not, because Texas came into the Union under a treaty which reserved that very right to Texas.

The Attorney General very frankly said, and I listened to him with great attention—I think that his presentation of his case was fair and careful, properly enthusiastic as behooved the advocate of the Government's case; he needs no apology for his enthusiasm for his client, but I have a lurking suspicion that he does not believe in it himself—the Attorney General of the United States frankly states that no decision has been finally adjudicated with respect to even a square inch of land, whether under the marginal seas or inland rivers or elsewhere, except in the strip off California. This bill therefore, when it undertakes to quitclaim back to the States the rights which they have heretofore been uniformly known and accepted to have for over 150 years, is not going contrary to any judicial decision of the Supreme Court or any other court; it is doing something which is in line with the rights of all the other States as they have been uniformly recognized.

With respect to California, the situation is different. There I take it that we must agree that the Supreme Court has decided, first, that California does not own that land, and, second, while not deciding that the United States does have title, it has declared that the United States has a paramountcy of right, amounting to dominion over that land, as an incident of its having the duty to defend the United States and to carry on foreign relations.

Now, just look at how far around Robin Hood's barn the Supreme Court had to go to get there. They had to find a rationale of reasoning under which these lands under the marginal seas of California should be rendered stateless, converted into a no-man's land; they had to become "displaced lands"; they had to be made a deodand—if you lawyers remember that word—like a cask or a crate washed up out of the sea.

The Supreme Court could not have reached this decision if it followed the approach of title which even the least of us lawyers know something about, because title is very basic in the law. You would not believe that the Supreme Court could decide this case without deciding the matter of title. When you say that the United States owns something, it means that the United States has title; and why not say it? Because the United States has everything else, paramountcy of right, dominion, and the right to take and dispose of the unseparated minerals and oils in the land.

That would mean title in my State; that would mean title in your State. It just is not admitted to be title in the Supreme Court.

Let me take just a moment of time to call your attention to the hearings; they took about 15 days. When you see the pile of books representing the hearings, it will appall you. The hearings in this matter were worthy of the witnesses we had there, great Governors from many, many States. We had the attorney generals of practically every State, and on the negative we had—I say this in a kindly way—we had the bureaucracy of the United States Government testifying the other way.

It was a very gratifying thing that among all the testimony which was adduced, in my humble opinion, the finest, most statesmanlike declaration came from the Governor of California, which seems to me to be appropriate. I had never heard Governor Warren before. I left that hearing with a profound sense of recognition of the great qualities of this man. Since you, I know, will not take time to read these reports, will you permit me to read to you now what Governor Warren said about this bill, which, I think, constitutes a great contribution of a great statesman to a great question of government. I am quoting from Governor Warren's statement:

> I am a believer in a strong Central Government within the limits of the Constitution, but I do not believe that the Federal Government should encroach upon the powers and rights which were reserved to the States by the tenth amendment to the Constitution.
>
> During the first half of the existence of the Nation, the States were strong, and the Federal Government was weak. It was during this time that our great leaders strove to strengthen the Central Government, so that it could perform its functions as a true sovereign; but now the situation has materially changed. As so often happens, the pendulum which in our early history had swung too far toward States' rights, is now swinging in the opposite direction toward Federal power, until now it has reached a point where the continuance of our States as independent, sovereign political entities is threatened.
>
> If we are to preserve our constitutional system of a Federal Union made up of sovereign States, it is just as important now to protect the States from excessive concentration of power in the Federal Government as it was 150 years ago to protect the Federal Government from an excessive concentration of power in the several States.
>
> In 1819, Chief Justice Marshall said: "No political dreamer was ever wild enough to think of breaking down the lines which separate the States, and of compounding the American people into one common mass." (*McCullough* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat 403).) Let us hope that Marshall was right. Nevertheless, it must be recognized that the constant encroachment of Federal power and the extension of the jurisdiction of Federal bureaus over every aspect of our life has tended to weaken our States to such an extent that I believe now it is the duty of everyone who believes in the American Constitution to exert his efforts to bring back to the States the political and property rights which have been taken from them and to restore the just balance as between local and national power which is indispensable to the maintenance of our constitutional system.
>
> And what would the Federal Government lose by the enactment of this bill? Precisely nothing. The States have never interfered in any way with the sovereign rights of the Government to impose its will over and its use upon these tidelands for the purposes of national defense, navigation, and international relations. We have never claimed nor wanted any such jurisdiction. The legislation before you expressly disclaims any such intent. The Federal Government now determines beforehand whether any proposed use by the States would be an interference with any of those national interests.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHADWICK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Governor Warren is not only a great Governor; he is a great lawyer. He was the greatest attorney general California ever had. The gentleman is making a very learned and convincing argument for which I want to compliment him. It is tragic that a man with his talents and courage will not be with us in the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. CHADWICK. I can believe that. I did not sit there exactly spellbound, but I was very much moved when I listened to Governor Warren's statement, as we are when we find a great character which we have not been privileged to identify before. It is to our national disadvantage that we have not known Governor Warren better in the East.

There were several great statements made. All are good. Governor Caldwell, of Florida, made a fine, scholarly, lawyerlike presentation on this question. It has already been suggested that my own State of Pennsylvania was very adequately represented with a very fine argument made by a deputy attorney general, M. Vashti Burr, sent there by the Governor, who himself had been attorney general and who was much interested in this problem.

It would be almost invidious to pick which were the best among so many fine statements. But there is one more that I wish I had time to tell you about. There was present an expert witness—this is unusual in these cases—called by the State of Texas, a gentleman by the name of Hudson, former judge of the World Court, former member of the International Court of Arbitration, and now a professor of law at Harvard. If I may turn aside for a personal touch, when I saw him come down to the witness chair I realized that here was a man; and I turned to my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT], and I said, "Ed, now you and I are going to find out what we missed by not going to Harvard Law School."

My prophecy was correct. His contribution was tremendously effective. That is the only other matter I would like to have a chance to read to you today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHADWICK. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. FELLOWS. I want to take this opportunity of saying this is a great exposition the gentleman has made of this question. I want to say more than that. It has been a wonderful privilege to serve with the gentleman on the Committee on the Judiciary, not only because he is a fine lawyer, a fine legislator, but a real fine gentleman, and we have all come to know that in the last year and a half. If anything lately might indicate to any of us that everybody does not feel just like that, it is their loss. I am but 1 of 435 Members of this House, all of whom I believe feel just as I do.

Mr. CHADWICK. I am overwhelmed at the kind words of the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHADWICK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. I want to concur in what my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Maine, has stated, and say one thing more, that it not only has been a great privilege to me and other members on the Committee on the Judiciary to serve with the distinguished gentleman, who has worked so hard on this problem, but I am sure that he has made as great a contribution to the work of that committee during his short service on it as any other man has made in the same length of time.

Mr. CHADWICK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHADWICK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I want to say to the gentleman that I do not want to embarrass him, but as he knows, he and I are in some slight disagreement on this particular measure before us, so that perhaps this can come more appropriately from me than from some of the others. I do not feel that this moment should pass without expressing to the gentleman the great pleasure and profit which I have had in sitting next to him during many hearings in the Committee on the Judiciary. It is a matter of great regret to me and a great loss to the people of this country that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is not likely to serve in this body during the next session. Wherever he is and to whatever task he may bring his unusual talents, we who have served with him so intimately wish him success and happiness without limit.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHADWICK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, the great chairman of our committee.

Mr. MICHENER. I want to join the others in what has been said about the services of the very capable gentleman from Pennsylvania who is now addressing us. I have served on the Committee on the Judiciary of this House for 26 years. I have never known a member of the committee who commanded more general respect than has the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and in addition to that I have never known a member to make progress faster on the committee. I am sure he has the love, respect, and confidence of every member of the committee, regardless of politics.

Mr. CHADWICK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHADWICK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I just want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the State of California is indebted to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for authorizing this bill. We appreciate the interest he has taken, and we are conscious of his ability to present facts to the Committee on the Judiciary relating to the advantages of this bill as a fundamental act to protect States' rights. It is with deep regret to the State of California and, I am sure, to all Members of the House, that he will not be with us in the next Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I represent one of the largest oil-producing districts in the State of Louisiana, and our State is the third largest oil-producing State in the United States, and aside from this fact, I am a strong believer in, supporter of State's rights, and I will defend States' rights to the last ditch. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am supporting to the full limit of my capacity H. R. 5992, to confirm and establish the title of States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries, and natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for use and control of said lands and resources.

Since the Supreme Court's decision on June 23, 1947, in the case of the United States against California, the subject and the decision covering the matter has been of great concern to the people of Louisiana and their State officials, and I share and wish to express the amazement and resentment of the people and the public officials of the State of Louisiana over this decision and the new ideology of government it would establish by enabling the Federal Government to confiscate the tidelands and submerged lands within the boundaries of our State or any State in the Union.

The State of Louisiana is not the only State affected by the decision of the Supreme Court in this matter. Practically every other State in the Union is affected by this decision, and in order to preserve to my State and all other States title to tidelands and lands beneath the navigable waters within their boundaries, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote for the enactment of H. R. 5992. The Chairman, I would go further and say that I urge the defeat of any legislation which would divest the States, parishes, counties, or cities of title to and ownership of their lands and natural resources, without compensation, and vest same in the Federal Government or any agency thereof in any capacity.

Mr. Chairman, I have studied the testimony before the joint Senate and House committees of the attorney general of Louisiana, Attorney L. H. Perez, of Louisiana, the Governor of Texas, and other public officials, and their arguments are so clear and convincing that I am taking the liberty to quote in this statement from some of these officials the legal phases and implications of the California decision of the Supreme Court, and, as was so properly said, this decision "disregarded the rule of property law that is as old as our Nation itself."

It is the first United States decision holding that any private or governmental agency has the right to take property and resources beneath the soil without lease or fee ownership or without compensation to the true owner.

It is also the first decision in America holding that the Federal Government's responsibility to protect the shores can give it rights heretofore identified with the ownership of shores.

Since the Declaration of Independence, both State and Federal Governments had recognized that the ownership vested in the States of all submerged lands within their respective boundaries. Throughout these years legal background was established, and precedent—bulwarked by 244 Federal and State court decisions, 49 United States Attorney General opinions, 32 Department of the Interior opinions, and 52 Supreme Court decisions—became so firmly established that State ownership of these lands became recognized as invulnerable to successful attack.

Under these circumstances, Louisiana felt certain and secure in our title to our submerged land and all public lands, for revenues amounting to approximately $60,000,000 has been dedicated and appropriated largely for school purposes. The loss of this continued revenue would seriously affect the economy and tax structure of our State.

All of the tidelands States, since their entry into the Union, have had and exercised their proprietory rights in these submerged lands.

While the Supreme Court denies proprietory rights in these lands to California, it is significant that the Court failed to find that the Federal Government owned the property.

It stated:

> The crucial question on the merits is not merely who owns the bare legal title to the land under the marginal seas. The United States here asserts rights in two capacities transcending those of a mere property owner.

These rights asserted by the Supreme Court are, first, the right and responsibility of the Federal Government to conduct the national defense of this country, and, second, the right and responsibility of the Federal Government to conduct the relations of the United States with other nations.

In this decision the Supreme Court has announced Federal powers which the Congress has refused or failed to convey. Twice the Congress refused to grant specific authority for the Attorney General to sue California for these lands. The Eightieth Congress passed a resolution recognizing State ownership and quitclaiming to the States, only to have it vetoed by the President.

President Truman vetoed the legislation for the alleged reason that the question of ownership was then before the Supreme Court to decide. Now that the Supreme Court's decision has evaded and transcended the question of legal ownership, it is now logical and proper for the President to vouchsafe to the Congress the consideration and determination of the question of ownership.

The Supreme Court's decision and the purport and effect of the so-called administration and Cabinet bills to effectuate it proclaims a new ideology of government in America. This decision and the bills referred to establish a national policy of the Federal Government having paramount rights and dominion over oil, one of the vital natural resources. It would establish a policy and a precedent of nationalization of vital resources. It would further unbalance the Federal-States' powers and relationships which were well balanced and defined by the Constitution of the United States. If we are to maintain our form of government in the United States, we cannot afford to take this step toward nationalization and further centralization of power in our Federal Government.

The power and duty of the Congress is crystal clear in its decision of this question. This will not be the first time that the Congress will have found it necessary to nullify decisions of the Supreme Court which result in legislation rather than judicial interpretation and decision. Justice Reed, in dissenting from the Supreme Court decision in the California case, said:

> This ownership in California would not interfere in any way with the need or rights of the United States in war or peace. The power of the United States is plenary over these underseas lands precisely as it is over every river, farm, mine, and factory of the Nation. While no square ruling of this Court has determined the ownership of these lands, to me the tone of the decision dealing with similar problems indicates that without discussion State ownership has been assumed.

Some of the more than 54 decisions handed down by the United States Supreme Court in the past 100 years and more have finally held as follows:

In the cast of *Martin* v. *Waddell* (16 Peters 410), the United States Supreme Court, in 1842, held:

> For when the Revolution took place, the people of each State became themselves sovereign, and in that character held the absolute right to all their navigable waters and the soils under them for their own common use, subject only to the rights since surrendered by the Constitution to the General Government.

Again, in 1845, the United States Supreme Court held in the case of *Pollard* v. *Hagan* (3 How. 223):

> When Alabama was admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, she succeeded to all the rights of sovereignty, jurisdiction, and eminent domain which Georgia possessed at the date of the cession, except so far as this right was diminished by the public lands remaining in the possession and under the control of the United States, for the temporary purposes provided for in the deed of cession and the legislative acts connected with it. Nothing remains to the United States, according to the terms of the agreement, but the public lands. And, if an express stipulation had been inserted in the agreement granting the municipal right of sovereignty and eminent domain to the United States, such stipulation would have been void and inoperative, because the United States has no constitutional capacity to exercise municipal jurisdiction, sovereignty, or eminent domain within the limits of a State or elsewhere, except in the cases in which it is expressly granted.
>
> The right of Alabama and every other new State to exercise all the powers of government which belong to and may be exercised by the original States of the Union must be admitted, and remain unquestioned, except so far as they are temporarily deprived of control over the public lands. (Such waste and unappropriated lands ceded to the United States under the old Congress of September 6, 1780, to aid in paying the public debt incurred by the war of the Revolution, providing that "whenever the United States shall have fully executed these trusts, the municipal sovereignty of the new States will be complete, throughout their respective borders and they, and the original States, will be upon an equal footing in all respects whatever.)

The above case was affirmed in 1850 in *Goodtitle* v. *Kibbe* (9 How. 478).

In *McCready* v. *Virginia* (94 U. S. 391, in 1876) the United States Supreme Court again decided:

> The principle has long been settled in this court that each State owns the beds of all tide waters within its jurisdiction, unless they have been granted away. * * * And, in like manner, the States own the tide waters themselves and the fish in them so far as they are capable of ownership while running. For this purpose the State represents its people and the ownership is that of the people in their united sovereignty. * * * The right which the people of the State thus acquired comes not from their citizenship, alone, but from their citizenship and property combined. It is in fact a property right and not a mere privilege or immunity of citizenship.

Citing the elder cases of *Pollard* v. *Hagan* (3 How. 212); *Smith* v. *Maryland* (18 How. 74); *Mumford* v. *Waddell* (6 Wall. 436); *Weber* v. *Harbor Comrs.* (18 Wall. 66).

In the Abby Dodge case decided in 1912, reported in Two Hundred and Twenty-three United States 166, the United States Supreme Court held that the State of Florida owned the soil and the sponge beds in the water bottoms of the Gulf of Mexico within the boundary of the State of Florida.

It is unnecessary to cite from the numerous decisions of the United States Supreme Court sustaining the same principle of ownership of submerged lands within their borders by the various States of the Union. These are covered fully in a memorandum filed by the Attorney General of Louisiana and various others.

But here let me cite only some of the United States Supreme Court decisions relative to the ownership of the State of California by virtue of its inherent sovereignty, as granted and recognized by the act of Congress admitting California as a State into the Union, which at this late date the Secretary of the Interior would deny, and the recent decision of October 1946 confounds with the Federal Government's paramount power and dominion.

In 1873 the United States Supreme Court again held in the case of *Weber* v. *Harbor Comrs.* (18 Wall. 57)—

> Upon the admission of California into the Union upon equal footing with the original States absolute property in, and domination and sovereignty over, all soils under the tide waters within her limits passed to the State, and with the consequent right to dispose of the title to any part of said soils in such manner as she might deem proper, subject only to the paramount right of navigation over the waters, so far as such navigation might be required by the necessities of commerce with foreign nations or among the several States, the regulation of which was vested in the general Government.

In 1867, in *Memford* v. *Wardwell* (6 Wall. 423, 436), the United States Supreme Court again held that when California was admitted into the Union in

1850, the act of Congress admitting her declares that she is so admitted on an equal footing in all respects, with the original States and that the—

> Settled rule of law in this Court is, that the shores of navigable waters and the soils under the same in the original States were not granted by the Constitution to the United States, but were reserved to the several States and that the new States since admitted have the same rights, sovereignty and jurisdiction in that behalf as the original States possess within their respective borders.
>
> When the Revolution took place the people of each State became themselves sovereign and in that character held the absolute right to their navigable waters and the soils under them, subject only to the rights since surrendered by the Constitution.
>
> Necessary conclusion is that the ownership of the lot in question (flat in San Francisco Bay), when the State was admitted into the Union, became vested in the State as the absolute owners, subject only to the paramount right of navigation.

And, as recently as in 1935, the United States Supreme Court again held in *Borax Ltd.* v. *Los Angeles* (296 U. S. 10), that tidelands in California passed to the State upon her admission to the Union, said that the Federal Government had no right to convey tideland which had vested in the State by virtue of her admission.

In that case the city of Los Angeles brought suit to quiet title to lands claimed to be tidelands owned by it under a legislative grant by the State of California; while the Borax Co. claimed under a patent of the United States in December 1881 which, in the words of the Court "purported to convey land on the Pacific Ocean."

The Court through Chief Justice Hughes quoted from the above-cited case of McCready against Virginia, and held that the lands in question were tidelands.

The Federal Government had no right to convey tidelands which had vested in the State by virtue of her admission.

Specifically, the term "public lands" did not include tidelands.

In this connection the United States Supreme Court again held:

> The soils under tidewaters within the original States were reserved to them respectively, and the States since admitted to the Union have the same sovereignty and jurisdiction in relation to such lands within their borders as the original States possessed (p. 15).

And, that these lands being tidelands, "title passed to California at the time of her admission to the Union in 1850."

That the Federal Government had no power to convey tidelands which had thus vested in a State—citing Pollard against Hagan, Goodtitle against Kibbe above.

It has been stated that all courts of the land consistently have followed the decisions of the United States Supreme Court, establishing a well-settled jurisprudence in this country, that the States and their grantees own the submerged lands within their borders.

By contrast the United States Supreme Court in October 1946, pretended that the State of California had invaded the title or paramount right asserted by the United States to an area of tideland within that State's boundary, and that California had converted to its own use oil which was extracted from these tidelands, which had never before been recognized as its own property.

This alone—

Said the Supreme Court—

would sufficiently establish the kind of concrete, actual conflict of which we have jurisdiction under article III.

That smacks of the fabled wolf that ate up the helpless little lamb.

The United States Supreme Court had repeatedly recognized and judicially stated the right and title of the coastal States of the Union, including California, to the tidelands within their boundaries or jurisdiction.

In 1876, in McCready against Virginia, above, the United States Supreme Court adjudicated with almost solemn and poetic dignity upon the united sovereignty of the people of the States, and held that the principle was long settled in this Court that each State owns the beds of all tidewaters within its jurisdiction, and owned the tidewaters themselves and the fish in them so far as they are capable of ownership, and that for this purpose the State represents its people, and that such ownership is that of the people in their united sovereignty and in fact is a property right and not a mere privilege or immunity of citizenship.

What a far cry is that decree of the highest Court of our land of the free, from that of the highest Court of the same land of regimented nationalization, which now solemnly holds that where that sovereign right of ownership in the people of a State, which it now refers to as the "bare legal title" to the lands under the marginal sea is questioned by this Federal Government, the right of power and dominion of the United States transcends those of a mere property owner.

Thus for the first time the United States Supreme Court has adopted and put into effect the totalitarian doctrine of the supremacy of the State over the people, or that the people have no property or right whenever the Federal Government wishes to appropriate, because of its power and dominion.

The Supreme Court ignored all its prior jurisprudence on the subject of tidal ownership by the individual State for its sovereign people, and its repeated decisions since 1842 that the Original Thirteen States absolutely owned all their navigable waters and the soils under them for the common use of the sovereign people of each State, subject only to the rights surrendered by the Constitution to the Federal Government—navigation, interstate and foreign commerce and national defense—and that all States since admitted into the Union succeeded to the same ownership and rights of sovereignty.

However, the Supreme Court did, with seeming compuction, admit the right and power of Congress to legislate on the matter of recognizing the century-old fact of tidal ownership in the States for their sovereign people, or ratify and confirm their totalitarian decree, either by positive action or inaction.

Further, to cap the climax, Mr. Ickes, former Secretary of the Interior, who agitated this Federal land grab, declared officially that he recognized the settled law that title to the soil within the 3-mile limit is in the State and cannot be appropriated except by the authority of the State. In his letter dated December 22, 1933, to Mr. Proctor, of Long Beach, Calif., rejecting his application for a lease under the Federal Leasing Act of 1920, Mr. Ickes stated:

> It has been distinctly settled that * * * the title to the shore and lands under water in front of lands so granted inures to the State within which they are situated * * Such title to the shore and lands under water is regarded as incident to the sovereignty of the State * * *.
>
> The foregoing is a statement of the settled law, and therefore no right can be granted to you either under the Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), or under any other public-land law to the bed of the Pacific Ocean either within or without the 3-mile limit. Title to the soil under the ocean within the 3-mile limit is in the State of California and the land may not be appropriated except by authority of the State.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BEALL].

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Chairman, since the founding of our Nation, the States have exercised sovereignty over the tidelands, the submerged lands, including the soil under navigable inland waters and soils under all navigable waters within their territorial jurisdiction, whether inland or not.

Under the common law and civil law, the States' sovereignty and authority over and title to said lands has been long acknowledged, affirmed, and respected by the Federal Government whose only powers were expressly delegated to it by the States at the time of the formation of our Government.

The States did not delegate unto the Federal Government authority or power over or title to said lands but retained same to and for the States.

The recent decision of the United States Supreme Court, while not deciding the question of ownership of tidewater lands, cast a cloud on the States' title to said lands and the oil and other minerals beneath. The decision of the Supreme Court recognizes that the matter of ownership of tidewater lands is still a question for Congress to decide.

The title to the tidelands and submerged lands of the States is clouded by this decision and the language therein is so broad as to be extendable to the soil under navigable inland waters and soils under the navigable waters within the territorial jurisdiction of the States, and even to other minerals or important elements on or beneath the soil of the States

This cloud of uncertainty should be removed and I urge the House to approve H. R. 5992 today.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, under date of April 17, 1948, a joint communication was addressed to me as chairman of House Committee on Public Lands by the Secretary of Defense, United States Attorney General, and the Secretary of

Interior with reference to tidelands legislation.

I have also received a resolution passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco requesting the enactment of the present legislation.

These communications are as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., April 17, 1948.

Hon. RICHARD J. WELCH,
Chairman, Committee on Public Lands, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: We are enclosing the joint statement made today by the Office of Naval Research and the United States Geological Survey, announcing the discovery of significant geological structures underlying the Continental Shelf from 20 to 75 miles from shore in the Gulf of Mexico. This discovery indicates the possibility that structures exist in this region comparable to those that have constituted reservoirs of petroleum inland from the Gulf. While these indications must be examined further and the area explored in detail, they provide the first definite evidence of the existence of such structures beneath the floor of the Gulf at such distance from shore.

This area is within that claimed for the United States by the President by proclamation and Executive order dated September 28, 1945. However, S. 1988, now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary, attempts to deprive the United States of the resources in this area. This is strikingly evidenced by recent attempts by two States to extend by State statutes their boundaries far beyond the 3-mile belt. Louisiana, by statute in 1938, attempted to extend its boundary 27 miles out in the Gulf of Mexico. In 1941 Texas, by statute, attempted to extend its boundary 27 miles out in the Gulf of Mexico, and as recently as 1947 attempted to extend its boundary to the outer edge of the Continental Shelf, more than 100 miles from shore.

This discovery of a potential source of oil emphasizes the fact that Congress should not attempt to disturb the rights of the United States in the marginal seas, as decided by the Supreme Court. It also points up the urgency for appropriate legislation to provide for the development, exploitation, and conservation of the resources in such areas. Such legislation would be provided by the proposed bill which we submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, by letter of February 6, 1948, and which was introduced as H. R. 5528.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL,
Secretary of Defense.
TOM C. CLARK,
Attorney General.
J. A. KRUG,
Secretary of the Interior.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR INFORMATION SERVICE

(Joint release office of naval research geological survey)

EXISTENCE OF SALT DOMES ON CONTINENTAL SHELF INDICATED

Indications of the existence of salt domes, some of which may be oil-bearing, have been discovered during the course of a joint scientific exploration of the Continental Shelf in the Gulf of Mexico by the Office of Naval research and the geological survey.

Working under a contract with the geological survey, the Tidelands Exploration Co. of Houston, Tex., was conducting gravity studies of the continental shelf when the presence of structures believed to be salt domes was revealed. These structures have the same gravimetric characteristic as oil-bearing salt domes found on land. The discoveries were made in the course of a regional survey of an area much of which lies well beyond that explored so far by commercial interests.

The Continental Shelf investigations now being carried on by the Geological Survey and the Office of Naval Research include the collection of data on oceanographic conditions, bottom topography of the shelf areas, and bottom composition. The gravimetric surveys are conducted in order to give an insight into the structure of the shelf with the hope of throwing light on the entire structure of the outer part of the Earth's crust. The discovery of possible oil-bearing structures was incidental to the over-all program.

The area in which these possible salt domes have been located is rectangular in shape and extends seaward about 75 miles from the shore between Sabine Pass, Texas, and Grand Cheniere, Louisiana. The structures that have been charted lie from 20 to 75 miles off the Gulf Coast in this area.

Spokesmen for the two governmental agencies concerned in the survey point out that experts will have to determine by more detailed exploration whether or not oil exists in this area and if it is present in sufficient quantity to warrant exploitation.

This discovery also emphasizes the economic practicability of governmental agencies conducting basic research and reconnaissance surveys in new or relatively inaccessible areas in order to point the way for the development and exploitation of the economic possibilities of such areas.

The gravimetric map of the area described above is being placed on open file by the Geological Survey and may be examined in its offices in Washington, D. C., and in the field offices located in room 234, Federal Building, Tulsa, Okla., room 712, City Hall, Houston, Tex., and at 302 West Fifteenth Street, Austin, Tex., and at the offices of the State Geologist of Louisiana, at University Station, Baton Rouge, and of Texas at the Bureau of Economic Geology, University of Texas, at Austin.

OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
San Francisco, Calif., April 22, 1948.

To Congressman RICHARD J. WELCH:

Your attention is hereby directed to the following, passed by the board of supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco:

"Resolution 7401

"Resolution requesting Congress to enact legislation now pending before it to reaffirm California's unquestioned title to its tide and submerged lands.

"Whereas the city and county of San Francisco has heretofore recognized the urgent necessity for enactment of Federal legislation which will have the effect of removing the cloud cast upon the title of the State of California and all of its subdivisions or persons acting pursuant to its permission, to the tide and submerged lands off the coast of the State of California extending seaward 3 miles, which cloud was created by a recent decision of the United States Supreme Court; and

"Whereas the State of California, its subdivisions and persons acting pursuant to its permission have spent enormous sums of money improving and developing the tide and submerged lands along the coast of California, which improvements and developments are in jeopardy unless the Congress enacts legislation to remove the cloud on the title to said lands created by the Supreme Court decision; and

"Whereas the cloud created by the decision of the Supreme Court not only affects the investment, development and improvement already made on and to the tide and submerged lands off the coast of California, but it will prevent further investments in and development to and improvements of these tide and submerged lands off the coast of California, to the detriment of the people of the State of California and of the United States; Now therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco does hereby respectfully request the Congress of the United States to enact legislation now pending before the Congress to reaffirm California's unquestioned title to its tide and submerged lands; and, be it further

"*Resolved*, That the clerk of the board is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to Senators DOWNEY and KNOWLAND, to Congressman HAVENNER and WELCH, to the Committee on Judiciary of the United States Senate, to the Committee on Judiciary of the House of Representatives, and to the President of the United States; and be, it further

"*Resolved*, That the clerk of the board is directed to send a copy of this resolution to the secretary of the senate of the State of California."

Adopted: Board of supervisors, San Francisco, April 12, 1948.

Ayes: Supervisors Christopher, Fazackerley, Gallagher, Halley, Lewis, Mancuso, McMurray, Mead, J. Joseph Sullivan, John J. Sullivan.

Absent: Supervisor MacPhee.

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

JOHN R. MCGRATH, *Clerk.*

Approved, April 15, 1948.

ELMER E. ROBINSON, *Mayor.*

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I am going to state a very positive and definite conclusion in the beginning, a conclusion which I think can be unquestionably supported by the facts and the evidence.

The bill we have under consideration simply seeks to reaffirm the law as prior to 1937 all competent authority in the United States thought it to be. I am anxious that the Members understand this very simple proposition. This bill does no more and no less than reaffirm and reassert the status quo as everyone considered it to be prior to 1937.

How then you ask, does this bill arise? This is one of the most curious and phenomenal developments in American jurisprudence. For 150 years no one questioned the law as this bill asserts it to be, then a Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Harold Ickes, who was very much interested in taking over the oil business and running it as an adjunct of the Federal Government, dreamed up this theory that the Federal Government owned the soil beneath navigable waters.

I have here a photostatic copy of a letter which Mr. Ickes wrote in 1933 in response to an inquiry by an applicant for a lease on the tidelands or the lands under the so-called marginal sea. Mr. Ickes replied on December 22, 1933, quoting from the case of *Hardin* v. *Jordan* (140 U. S. 371):

With regard to grants of the Government for lands bordering on tidewater, it has been distinctly settled that they only extend to high-water mark, and that the title to the shore and lands under water in front of lands so granted enures to the State within which they are situated, if a State has been organized and established there.

Then he said:

The foregoing is a statement of the settled law, and therefore no rights can be granted to you either under the leasing act of February 25, 1920, or under any other public-land law.

So prior to 1937 no lawyer or layman, so far as the record goes, had ever asserted in this country that the Federal Government had ownership or any character of right over the resources in or the lands under the marginal seas.

What is the situation facing us today? The Supreme Court in the California case held that the State of California did not own the so-called marginal sea, but nowhere in this opinion of the Court will you find any assertion of title in the Federal Government. The Court simply stated that the Federal Government has power and dominion over this so-called marginal sea. They left the question of the title and ownership entirely up in the air.

On certain things all persons agree. Everybody agrees that chaos and confusion now exist as between the asserted claims of the Federal Government on the one hand and the asserted titles and rights of the States on the other. Everybody agrees that the Congress is the only forum that can straighten out this chaos and confusion; and all agree that Congress must act to affirm and clarify what we have always contended prior to the California case was the status quo, or we must implement the claim of the Federal Government.

We have pending in the Congress in both branches bills prepared by the Interior and Justice Departments, two sets of bills. One is S. 2165 and companion bills, and one is S. 2222 and companion bills. One set of these bills seeks to quitclaim to the States the title beneath internal navigable waters, and the other set of bills seeks to set up in the Department of the Interior a gigantic bureau for handling this new domain claimed by the Federal Government.

WE MUST PURSUE ONE OF TWO COURSES

One we might call the Ickes trail. The other is the congressional road of constitutional democracy. The principle involved here is tremendously important, and I think we overlook it in many instances. This California case and its necessary implications sets up an outpost along the road to national socialism farther than we have ever heretofore gone. This Ickes trail goes into a veritable jungle of litigation of doubt and difficulty Involving endless and complex litigation. If his philosophy were maintained, it would lead onto the plains of national socialism, thence into the swamps of desperation and despair, and from there to the sea of communism. I am sure nobody in the Congress wants to follow such a trail. Time will not permit the amplification of these allegories.

Let us consider the opinion of the Court itself. We are not criticizing the Court, but we are criticizing the opinion. Justice Black, in the majority opinion, says this:

> In the light of the foregoing, our question is whether the State or the Federal Government has the authority and power to determine in the first instance when, how, and by what agencies, foreign or domestic, the ordinary resources of the soil of the marginal sea known or hereafter discovered may be exploited.

Reading further, he says:

> The Government does not deny that under the Pollard rule, as explained in a later case, California has a qualified ownership of the lands under inland navigable waters.

What is meant by qualified ownership? That phrase itself creates doubt and confusion as to the lands under the marginal seas and in inland waters and inland lakes in every State in the Union. Bear in mind that nearly twice as much land is involved within the internal boundaries of the States as in this marginal sea. Incidentally, the Great Lakes are very much involved here. I wish to say to the Members from the States bordering the Great Lakes, that in the case of the Illinois Central Railway Co. against the State of Illinois, the court specifically held that the rule in the Great Lakes was the same as the rule that applied to the open sea. In other words, under the California decision, if carried to its logical conclusion, a conclusion to which the Attorney General claims that it should be carried, it means ownership of the soil under and the resources in navigable waters. Under the California case, the Federal Government can certainly assert title to the beds of the Great Lakes. I want to read just another statement or two from the Court's opinion.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman is a very able member of the Committee on the Judiciary. Some of us here are seeking light and information on this very controversial and highly important subject. I can well understand, I believe, why California would be interested in this, and I believe I can understand why Florida would be interested in this bill. We have heard the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Texas, who come from States where there are great oil fields. I understand that the State of Texas has by treaty reserved its rights, but other Members from certain inland States would like some additional information on this. Could the gentleman tell us who opposed the bill? I understand that some 40 Governors favored it, and probably eight do not favor it. Can the gentleman give us some light and information on those who oppose the bill and their reasons and logic for doing so? Information on that score would be helpful and very much appreciated.

Mr. GOSSETT. I would be very glad to do that. May I say to the gentleman that within my memory so far as I know there has never been in congressional history such an imposing array of competent authority from all over the United States appearing in behalf of any legislation. This bill was endorsed by the governors' conference, in which 44 governors actively participated. They approved the bill. It was endorsed by the Attorneys General Association of the United States, in which all but three attorneys general, I believe, participated. It was approved by the American Title Association of America, by the American Bar Association, and by hundreds of other associations and numerous State legislatures. You will find in the hearings or in the report, if you will get a copy of it, a list of all those appearing in behalf of the bill and those appearing against it.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I would like to call to the attention of the Members that the list of those appearing in favor of and against the proposed legislation appears on page 25 of the report. There are practically none appearing against it.

Mr. GOSSETT. I wish the Members of the House would get a copy of the report which does contain the list.

Secretary of Interior Krug, one of the few witnesses appearing against this bill based most of his testimony on first, the need of the Federal Government for the oil, and, second, the value of the oil deposits in the marginal sea. We submit that value and need do not justify wrongful taking. However, the evidence conclusively shows that national defense and the public welfare will be far better served under our operations prior to the California case than under Federal ownership and control. Furthermore, whether a thing is worth $1 or $1,000,000,000 is immaterial. Wrongful taking is wrongful taking and theft is theft, regardless of the value of the thing taken.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. HALE. Does not the gentleman feel that a great deal of the reporting on this subject in the press has been extremely unfair and distorted?

Mr. GOSSETT. I certainly do. Much of it has been of a propaganda nature that has been entirely deceiving.

In further reference to those testifying for this bill, there were six governors appearing in person: Governor Tuck, of Virginia; Governor Caldwell, of Florida; Governor Thurmond, of South Carolina; Governor Carlson, of Kansas; Governor Warren, of California; and Governor Jester, of Texas.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. LYLE. The gentleman might call attention, in response to the inquiry by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], to the fact that there are many people in this country who are opposing this bill, who believe that none of the natural resources of this country should belong either to individuals or the States, but they ought to belong to some sort of a Socialist federation. They are the ones who are fighting title and ownership which has been purchased with blood and history.

Mr. GOSSETT. The gentleman is entirely correct. This is the first attempt by Government itself that has ever been made to upset the accepted property laws and rights of persons and property in the history of this Nation as far as I know.

Mr. LYLE. If titles are not good in the States in this matter, then there is

no piece of ground that belongs to anybody, except the Government, particularly in our State?

Mr. GOSSETT. Under a reasonable interpretation of this decision the Federal Government could go into your district and take your farm, under the same rule of paramount right and dominion as asserted in the California case. Let me read what Justice Reed said in his dissenting opinion:

> The power of the United States is plenary, precisely as it is over every river, farm, mine, and factory of the Nation.

In other words, one of the justices himself is saying that this rule applies to everything within the land as it does to the marginal sea; every kind of factory, farm, and home in the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. In reading some of the press reports it is indicated that the Justice Department thought they could sit down and make certain consent agreements, and waive Federal rights. It is your opinion that if this decision stands it means that it is the bounden duty of the Attorney General and administrative officers to reclaim every piece of land and improvements thereon that was once under water permanently—bordering on the ocean—and later filled in and structures built thereon?

Mr. GOSSETT. The Attorney General has so testified as to the power although he disclaims any such intent. He has stated before the committee that it is his duty and his intention to file suit against all of the States bordering on the sea when there appears to be anything of value in the soil of the marginal sea which the Federal Government might recover. He proposes to quitclaim certain rights, and reserve other rights. It is admitted by everybody that endless litigation will result unless the Congress acts to clear up this situation.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. And it will apply to property on which there is invested millions of dollars in the form of buildings?

Mr. GOSSETT. I should say a billion dollars of improvements placed by States on the marginal sea and on filled-in land are involved. Some cities are built largely on filled-in land. Where are you going to draw the line between the marginal sea and inlets and bays and harbors? As Judge Hudson says:

> The result is a veritable pandemonium. The alarm is Nation-wide. The decree of last October has opened a Pandora's box from which germinating influences may spring to upset acquired titles and established procedures. These titles and procedures exist in vast areas of this country in which our citizens have been wont to invest their energy and their capital, not for one but for scores of phases of our national economy.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. FELLOWS. The gentleman from Tennessee asked the question about the effect upon an inland State. Would the gentleman indicate what effect it might have and does have upon inland waterways—the navigable streams and rivers and things like that? It affects them all; does it not?

Mr. GOSSETT. It affects them in just exactly the same way as it does the States bordering the sea. Under this California case the Federal Government would own the bed of every inland stream and lake, and if they sought to project the philosophy a little further they could move out on the hills and take the coal mines and the lead mines and everything else without compensation. This bill does not take from the Federal Government any right in the world that it ever had prior to the California decision. The Federal Government can go in, under its priority, and take oil, but this philosophy is confiscation without compensation. It is abhorrent to our American philosophy of government and to the American way of life. I urge the passage of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, several Members of the House have asked me if the bill now before the House is substantially the same as the series of bills several of us introduced some months ago. May I say to the membership that this bill, introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the distinguished lawyer [Mr. CHADWICK], is the same bill perfected in committee, and that those who have introduced these bills previously need have no doubt but what this is intended to carry out the exact purposes which they had in mind.

Mr. Chairman, I am not a lawyer and I would not think of talking law after the presentation of the question before us, which we have heard from such distinguished lawyers. I am just a layman from the viewpoint of those learned in the law. Therefore, I am going to use a few visual aids rather than utilize all my time for talk.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] spoke of the jungle into which this Supreme Court decision is leading us. I doubt if many of you know what kind of jungle you are getting into if you fall into the trap which this decision of the Supreme Court might unintentionally set for us.

We have been speaking of inland waters at times this morning. This bill would quitclaim the lands under inland waters. You may say there is nothing in this bill which covers inland water. That is just the point I want to make. The Supreme Court had never before made a clear-cut decision on tidelands so they declare they may make any decision they deem necessary. Then can do exactly the same regarding inland waters and so we must consider them in relation to the Supreme Court's decision in this case. Let us look at what their decision does to certain waterfront areas along the coast of the United States.

I have here a series of maps of several important coastal cities of this country. The red areas indicate what would be owned by the Federal Goverment if this Supreme Court decision stands.

Here is Boston. The red splotches show what Boston would lose to the Federal Government. There is not much left of Boston, is there?

For the benefit of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, here is a map showing what Philadelphia would lose.

This shows what Baltimore would look like if it lost the lands covered by this Supreme Court decision.

Let us jump down to the South. I call the attention of the Members from Alabama as to what Mobile would lose to the Federal Government.

Let us get over to New Orleans. This is quite a big splotch that Louisiana would lose to the Federal Government.

Now, going to Texas, here is the city of Houston.

I am sorry to jump around like this but I am taking only a few cities, to show just where the coastal areas of the country would stand if this legislation is not passed.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Has the gentleman any maps of the Great Lakes?

Mr. BRADLEY. I believe I have one. I am sorry I have not more.

Now, getting to the west coast, here is San Diego. And here is my own city of Long Beach as well as the harbor of Los Angeles. This shows what would be taken over by a bunch of bureaucrats here in Washington; what they would get their hands on and use to build up a lot of fine jobs for thousands of employees and high-salaried officials.

Then we will go on up to San Francisco. That is pretty good. The Members from California might look at it. And here we have Oakland. Now, let us get up to Washington. Tacoma would lose the entire eastern end of Commencement Bay. And see what Seattle would lose. Pretty enlightening, is it not?

And now for the benefit of the gentleman from Michigan, although I do not have a map of any city in Michigan, I do have a map here which shows the reclaimed lands of Chicago, and well illustrates what you who wonder about inland waters might lose, and what great areas in all parts of the Nation would become the property of the Federal Government under this Supreme Court decision.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. In addition to all this real estate the Federal Government would take title to each oyster and clam under all that water; would it not?

Mr. BRADLEY. I assume that in time you would find "U. S." engraved on the shell of every oyster and of every clam if the Federal Government gets control of all these areas.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield.

Mr. NORBLAD. Does the gentleman have any map of the State of Oregon or the coast of Oregon?

Mr. BRADLEY. I am sorry, but I do not have such a map with me. It is an oversight which I regret.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I speak in favor of the passage of this measure, H. R. 5992, for I believe that this legislation when passed will provide the equity and justice undeniably due the State of Washington and all other States wherein title to tide and submerged lands has been or may be contested, and where a cloud has been cast upon the status of inland waters and the lands beneath them by the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of the United States against California—which decision, I believe, can be considered only the first of an extensive series of similar decrees yet to come unless there be enacted clarifying legislation as provided in the bill before the House.

The Constitution of the State of Washington was adopted and was, pursuant to the enabling act of Congress approved February 22, 1889, proclaimed by the President of the United States as having been formed and adopted in a proclamation dated November 11, 1889, thus admitting the State of Washington into the Union. The boundaries of the State of Washington were established, as proclaimed by the President, to begin—

at a point in the Pacific Ocean one marine league, and running parallel along the coast line from the mouth of the north ship channel of the Columbia River, to a line which is the boundary line between the United States and British Columbia.

In its Constitution proclaimed by the President and adopted by act of Congress, the State of Washington declared in article 17, section 1, that—

The State of Washington asserts its ownership to the beds and shores of all navigable waters in the State up to and including the line of ordinary high tide in waters where the tide ebbs and flows, and up to and including the line of ordinary high water within the banks of all navigable rivers and lakes.

It will be seen, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that the State of Washington since its admission into the Union, has claimed title to all submerged land within the 3-mile limit on the ocean front and also has claimed title to the beds and shores of all navigable waters within its territorial limits.

Mr. Chairman, the State of Washington is a large area. In air miles, its boundary reaches north and south almost 160 miles, and if one extends its westerly boundary one marine league—or 3 miles—it would demonstrate that in these 160 miles between the southern and northern boundaries there are approximately 300,000 acres of submerged land.

In addition to the ocean tidelands there is also within the State a large body of water known as Puget Sound. On Puget Sound are located the important cities of Seattle, Tacoma, Everett, Bellingham, Bremerton, and others. There is also a large body of water known as Grays Harbor, on which are located the important cities of Aberdeen and Hoquiam. There is also an inland body of water known as Willapa Harbor, on which are located the important cities of South Bend and Raymond. Up the Columbia River, which forms the boundary between the States of Washington and Oregon and which is affected, too, by tidal flows, are the important cities of Vancouver and Longview.

The United States Coast and Geodetic Survey office indicates that more than 1,500 square miles of tidal areas—approximately 1,363,000 acres, not counting those areas on the Columbia River, Grays and Willapa Harbors—lie within the State's boundaries.

It is in defense particularly of these ocean tidelands, Mr. Chairman, and primarily of the tidelands within the Puget Sound area, that we of the State of Washington desire favorable action on the bill now before the House.

Since its admission to the Union the State of Washington has sold and leased thousands of acres of these tidal lands along the Straits of Juan de Fuca, in the Puget Sound, Grays Harbor, Willapa Harbor, and Columbia River areas. Some of our Pacific-coast beaches have been declared to be a part of the public highway of the State by terms of law dating as far back as 1901. Many of our industrial cities are constructed on reclaimed and filled tidelands. The city of Seattle, for example, has a major portion of its south industrial district built entirely on reclaimed tidelands. All of the dock and warehouse facilities along the waterfront in Seattle are also constructed on tideland. This area of the city of Seattle that has been reclaimed and now used for highly industrialized purpose, Mr. Chairman, is approximately 3,300 acres.

In the city of Tacoma the portion of the city on which the large lumber mills and plywood plants are constructed is all reclaimed tideland. In the city of Olympia all the port facilities and large portions of the downtown business district are constructed on reclaimed tidelands. This is true, too, of other Puget Sound cities—Everett, Bellingham, Bremerton, Anacortes, and the cities of Port Townsend and Port Angeles, along the Straits. It is also true of the other towns on Grays Harbor, Willapa Harbor, and the Columbia River.

Unless legislation such as contained in the bill before this House is enacted into law, a cloud has been placed on the title to all these important lands, Mr. Chairman—tidelands, some of which are still in State ownership, but the greater portion of which have been deeded by the State to private individuals and companies.

The State of Washington, Mr. Chairman, certainly has a stake and a duty to defend all trusts imposed upon it. The incongruity of the existence of any claim other than the State of Washington to the tide and submerged lands covering so vast a portion of its total area, Mr. Chairman, must be emphasized. The existence of any cloud on titles to these inland waters must not be permitted.

It is an uncontroverted fact, Mr. Chairman, that all States were admitted to the Union on an equal footing in all respects whatsoever. The State of Washington was admitted to the Union with the express stipulation that it was the primary owner of all the tidelands along its ocean front westward 1 marine league, or 3 miles. It is also the primary owner as provided in the enabling act which admitted it to the Union to all tideland and submerged land in the Straits of Juan de Fuca, in the Puget Sound area, the Grays Harbor area, the Willapa Harbor area, and the Columbia River within the boundaries of the State of Washington. The manner of our admission into the Union, and the fact that the State of Washington has since its admission exercised jurisdiction over and claimed title to all of its tidelands and submerged lands, makes it mandatory, Mr. Chairman, that the Congress of the United States, through proper legislation enacted into law, clear title of the State of Washington to these lands. The passage of this measure will dispose of the myriad of problems as to titles and equities in the manner suggested by the Supreme Court in the statement—and I quote:

We cannot and do not assume that Congress, which has constitutional control over Government property, will execute its power in such a way as to bring about injustices to States, their subdivisions, or persons acting pursuant to their permission.

Mr. Chairman, the passage of this measure will be consistent with this statement of the Court, and will eliminate the now-existing confusion in titles and rights which has resulted and which will continue to exist in the absence of this legislation. I earnestly urge upon all Members of this House, Mr. Chairman, passage of the bill.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS].

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, there may be some differences of opinion among us as to whether this bill should be passed, but certainly there can be no differences of opinion in regard to the importance of the question involved. I dare say that no bill considered by the House in recent times has been of more importance to all of the people of our country.

The question is far greater than the mere issues of who owns the oil in the tidelands and submerged lands off our coasts. Only three States having ocean boundaries are known to have any sizable deposits of oil along their coasts. These are California, Texas, and Louisiana. Yet the almost unanimity with which the governors, attorneys general, land commissioners and other responsible officials of States throughout the Union have actively supported this legislation is indicative of the fact that a principle is here involved which is of vital concern to every State and to every citizen.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COMBS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BRADLEY. Might I simply say that out of the 1,200 miles of California coast lines that less than 16 are known to have any oil deposits whatever.

Mr. COMBS. Let me make this further observation. Of course, the oil companies, big and little, which hold leases that have been granted by the several States where this oil is being produced, want to retain the title that they thought they got from the States. Other oil companies that would like to get leases perhaps do not favor this legislation, since the Supreme Court decision might open up tidelands for leases. I want to point out that one of the witnesses who appeared before the committee during the hearings in opposition to this bill was a very distinguished former United States Senator who frankly said, "I appear as a lawyer for 12 applicants for leases." He filed the names of those applicants. All of them were filed prior to 1935 on the coastal lands of California, and if his contention should be upheld and should this bill not be enacted, then those 12 companies would get those tideland leases under the present leasing laws of the United States for 25 cents an acre, and 25 cents a year bonus, and one-twentieth royalty. So, there is no monopoly of oil interest on one side or the other on this question. Let us recognize that.

The distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] suggested that we are here called upon to nullify a decision of the United States Supreme Court. He is just not familiar with the situation. He said this bill would give away these vast oil resources by confirming title in the States. This bill would give nothing away, it merely confirms title of the States as recognized by our courts for more than 100 years. The Federal Government has no oil in the tidelands to give away. I would remind him that the Supreme Court in the California case did not hold that the Federal Government owns the California tidelands. It specifically refused to do so. And because the Court refused to do so, the Attorney General ruled that they were not subject to the Federal leasing laws which apply to federally owned lands and minerals. Thus the Attorney General has recognized that the Court did not adjudge ownership of the California oil in the United States.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COMBS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that before 1842—1810 I believe—Chief Justice Marshall laid down the rule that has been followed uniformly all the way up to this last decision.

Mr. COMBS. The gentleman is correct. I had in mind a case in 1842 in which the specific question of ownership of the beds underneath tidal waters was involved.

This legislation was endorsed by officials representing 46 States. It was endorsed by the Council of State Governors, by a unanimous vote of 44 Governors, it was endorsed by the National Association of Attorneys General, the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers, representing 503 cities; it was endorsed by the American Association of Port Authorities, it was endorsed by the National Conference of Mayors, it was endorsed by the American Bar Association, and by something more than 70 State, city, and county bar associations throughout the Nation, including the Texas Bar Association which sent Hon. Robert L. Bobbitt, former Attorney General to Washington, to assist in presenting testimony at the hearing.

It was endorsed by the National Association of State Land Officials, and by the National Water Conservation Conference, and by many other State and National organizations—too numerous to mention.

During the hearings which were conducted jointly by the subcommittee of the House and Senate 92 witnesses from 44 States appeared in person in support of this bill. These included the Governors of Kansas, Maryland, Alabama, Arkansas, California, Florida, Texas, Virginia, South Carolina and North Carolina. A number of other Governors who could not personally appear sent personal representatives to testify in support of the bill. These included the Governors of Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. The Attorneys General of 42 States appeared either in person or by representative or filed written statements in support of this bill.

As far as I am aware, not a single responsible State official came to Washington to oppose it.

It is worthy of note that the State officials from inland States which have no tidelands at all were just as strong in their support of this bill as were the officials of the States having tidelands.

Why this great national concern over the holding of the Supreme Court in the California case?

Let me pause here to make an observation. There has been a good deal of confusion in people's thinking about one's right to criticize the opinions of a court. During my 30 years of law practice, approximately 17 were spent on the trial and appellate benches of my State, and both as a trial lawyer and as a judge I have been on the giving and the receiving end of criticisms in court.

It is never proper in a country that lives under law, as we do, to impugn the motives of a court or any justice of it, because that would be an attack upon the institution as an institution. It is never proper to speak contemptuously and disrespectfully of the court because that would tend to breed contempt of a judicial institution, and we live in a land of law administered by courts to protect our rights and liberties. But it is always proper to question the soundness of a court's decision. Courts themselves do that. It is always proper to point out that the court is not in line with the holdings of a former court, just as able, extending back through the years. I am not going to criticize the Supreme Court of the United States or any other court, but I am going to question the soundness of the California opinion and point out briefly what it does and does not do.

Why this great national concern over the holding of the Supreme Court in the California case?

The reason is simple. That decision which held that the State of California does not own the oil in the tidelands along her coasts runs counter to the holdings of all the courts of our country. State and Federal, dating almost from the beginnings of our Republic. It affects a vital principle of the relation between the States and the Federal Government. The principle announced can change the whole future of States' rights and States' sovereignty.

The opinion announces a strange, new principle of paramount right of the Federal Government which, carried to its logical conclusion, is tantamount to asserting the right of the Central Government to appropriate the lands and minerals of any and every State in the Union for national use without compensation. The majority opinion, in effect, said the Federal Government has a paramount right to take the oil in the marginal lands of the sea regardless of the question of naked title to the lands themselves. On that principle the Federal Government would have an equal right to take the coal of West Virginia, the phosphates of Florida or Montana, the timber of Washington, or the fisheries of Maine. If it can thus appropriate the oil in the tidelands of California, it can likewise appropriate the minerals of the river beds and streams of every State and the mineral resources that underly the more than 60,000 square miles of the beds of the Great Lakes which, under prior decisions of our courts, unquestionably belong to the five States bordering upon those Lakes.

There is a lot of confused thinking on this question by reason of the fact that some overlook the distinction between ownership and the right of control.

Certainly the Federal Government has the right to control navigation and use of coastal waters for purposes of national security and convenience. It can also prevent waste of our great natural resources because they are charged with a national interest. But it does not have to own the lands along the coasts nor the minerals whose production and use it controls. For example, in the early 1930's a great, new oil field was brought in in east Texas, and because it was owned in small tracts by thousands of individual owners a wild scramble of oil-well drilling and oil production began, creating a condition of chaos and waste.

As a result, a bill authored by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas, the Connally Hot Oil Act was passed governing the production and marketing of oils. The application of that act with the cooperation of the Texas Railroad Commission, which is our conservation agency, resulted in bringing order out of chaos and in setting up, through the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, a system of excellent oil-conservation practices. But the Federal Government did not own the

oil it regulated. Neither does it have to own the lands or oil beneath the tideland waters, in order to see that it is conserved in the national interest. The Government got the oil it needed to win the war—and it did not come from federally owned lands.

State ownership of lands within State boundaries, is an essential attribute of State sovereignty. And State boundaries are coterminous with the Federal boundary along the coasts.

In one early case, *Mumford* v. *Wardwell* (6 Wall. 423, 436), handed down in 1867, it was held:

The settled rule of law in this court is, that the shores of navigable waters and the soils under the same in the original States were not granted by the Constitution to the United States, but were reserved to the several States, and that the new States since admitted have the same rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction in that behalf as the original States possess within their respective borders. When the Revolution took place, the people of each State became themselves sovereign, and in that character hold the absolute right to all their navigable waters and the soils under them.

That quotation sets forth clearly the basic principle of the ownership of tidelands.

To illustrate the universal acceptation of this principle, I shall quote a few brief excerpts from the opinions of some eminent Justices of our Supreme Court of the past.

Mr. Chief Justice Waite in 1876 said:

Each State owns the beds of all tidewaters within its jurisdiction.

Mr. Justice Gray in 1894 said:

The new States admitted into the Union since the adoption of the Constitution have the same rights as the original States in the tidewaters, and in the lands under them, within their respective jurisdiction.

Mr. Chief Justice White said in 1912:

Each State owns the beds of all tidewaters within its jurisdiction.

Mr. Chief Justice Taft in 1926 said:

All the proprietary rights of the Crown and Parliament in, and all their dominion over lands under tidewater vested in the several States.

Mr. Chief Justice Hughes said in 1935:

The soils under tidewaters within the original States were reserved to them respectively, and the States since admitted to the Union have the same sovereignty and jurisdiction in relation to such lands within their borders as the original States possessed.

In all more than 240 decisions of American courts, State and Federal, have adhered to the principle that the States own their tidelands and submerged lands. The ownership of land carries with it ownership of all minerals. Thus until the decision in the California case, every State rested in the belief that it owned the tidelands and the minerals in them. As a result, they exercised dominion and control of their tideland waters. They leased them for oil production. They governed their fisheries and the removal of oyster and clam shells, sponges and other marine products from their littoral seas and the Federal courts protected them in these rights against encroachment of Federal authority.

By virtue of a statute passed in 1921, the State of California began producing oil from her submerged coastal lands through leasing to private oil operators. Her right to do so was not questioned by anyone until about 1937. Prior to that, Secretaries of the Interior, including Mr. Ickes himself, refused to grant applications for leases on these tidelands within the 3-mile limit on the ground that they belonged to California and the Federal Government, therefore, had no right to lease them. Thus in 1933 Mr. Ickes himself wrote:

Title to the oil within the 3-mile limit is in the State of California and land may not be appropriated except by the authority of the State.

But in 1937 Mr. Ickes began to assert the claim that lands underlying the coastal waters within the 3-mile limit, roughly referred to as tidelands, belonged to the Federal Government and not the States. As a result of that assertion of title in the Federal Government the now famous California suit was filed, resulting in the decision that makes the enactment of this legislation necessary. The principle announced by the Supreme Court in the California case would destroy the right of California to her tidelands and the rights of those claiming title through grants from California. More than that, broadly applied, it would all but destroy the sovereignty of the States of this Union and completely upset the relations between the State and Federal Governments that have existed from the foundations of the Government.

No wonder, then, governors, attorneys general, State officials, and thoughtful citizens everywhere are gravely disturbed and are calling upon Congress to enact this bill, to reaffirm, clarify, and make sure the title of our States to their tidelands as recognized from the beginning of this Republic.

To illustrate the general feeling of fear and apprehension upon the part of responsible State officials everywhere and the interpretation they place upon the effect of the Supreme Court decision in the California case, I want to quote just a few typical statements, among many, made during the hearings.

Resolution adopted by 44 governors at Salt Lake City on July 16, 1947:

The title to the tidelands and submerged lands of the States is clouded by this decision and the language therein is so broad as to be extendable to the soil under navigable inland waters and soils under the navigable waters within the territorial jurisdiction of the States, and even to other minerals or important elements on or beneath the soil of the States.

Gov. Millard F. Caldwell, of Florida:

Finally, the fundamental principle of our constitutional law that powers and rights not expressly granted to the Federal Government are reversed to the sovereign States was completely disregarded. * * * It is to the interest of every State, whether inland or coastal, that Congress nullify the unfortunate effects of the California decision and restore the law as recognized for over a century and a half.

Gov. Dwight H. Green, of Illinois:

Of course, all of us will agree that in time of war the Federal Government has the right to the use of every resource we possess; but that right does not imply the confiscation of existing property rights in those resources or the lands which contain them. The new principle enunciated in *United States* v. *California* might be applied to effect the nationalization of all property useful or vital to the national defense or which might become the subject of international negotiations.

Gov. Beauford H. Jester, of Texas:

It is also the first decision in America holding that the Federal Government's responsibility to protect the shores can give it rights heretofore identified with the ownership of the shores.

Gov. R. Gregg Cherry, of North Carolina:

It violates the sound principles upon which this Government was formed and extended to its conclusion could easily make vassal States out of every American Commonwealth.

Maurice M. Moule, assistant attorney general of Michigan:

Therefore, the rule in the California case might very well be extended to inland States, especially those Great Lakes States whose boundaries, in part, constitute international boundaries.

Nels Johnson, attorney general of North Dakota:

In fact, the case carries implications that defy the imagination of anyone as to the possibilities of the further expansion of Federal power and its dominion over the mineral resources of the Nation, particularly those under submerged lands, both inland and coastal.

Gov. George T. Mickelson, of South Dakota:

The implications of the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the recent case of *United States* v. *California* are frightening.

John M. Daniel, attorney general of South Carolina:

Following the decision of the *United States* v. *California*, South Carolina's rights to regulate fishing and conserve its natural resources within the boundaries of the State has been questioned. An injunction was sought in the Federal courts of South Carolina to restrain the board of fisheries from enforcing the laws.

Gov. William Preston Lane, Jr., of Maryland:

Unless the tidelands decision is refuted by the Congress, I see nothing to prevent the National Government from asserting paramount rights in and power over any and all of the lands of the State of Maryland and of the other States.

Leander I. Shelley, general counsel, the port of New York and legislative chairman, American Association of Port Authorities:

So far as I know, until approximately 10 years ago no responsible person—not even the then Secretary of the Interior—claimed that the Federal Government owned the lands beneath the marginal sea, or that the boundaries of the various coastal States did not extend at least to the 3-mile limit.

Walter J. Mattison, city attorney of Milwaukee, Wis.; past president, National Institute of Municipal Law Officers:

It is impossible to describe the consternation that the decision of the Supreme Court, confined as it is in its effect to the marginal sea, has created in the member municipalities of the Institute, and in their officials and citizens. If the contentions of the Government are ever validated as to inland waters also, the municipal financial situation, in many cases, will amount to a crisis, and unparalleled confusion will reign supreme.

Hon. Walter R. Johnson, attorney general of Nebraska:

You are now considering one of the most profound questions that has ever been presented to Congress for inquiry. In fact, it is not a mere question but a vital issue that affects the very foundation of our dual-sovereignty system of government. It involves traditional equities, elemental principles of real-property law, the economic welfare of the several States, and the bedrock of Federal-State relations.

Hon. Price Daniel, attorney general of Texas:

The bill makes it clear that State ownership shall never interfere with paramount Federal powers, but that neither shall the exercise of these governmental powers give unto the Federal Government any right to appropriate the lands or resources which it is obliged to protect and defend, except through due process of law and with just compensation.

Gov. Earl Warren, of California:

We are not here asking for anything new. We are not seeking to extend our rights at the expense of our Government. We are asking only to retain those rights which have been ours for the first century and three-quarters of our Nation's existence. We are asking Congress to confirm to us the fundamental States' rights which are essential to the virility of the Republic.

That the fears so expressed by leading officials are not without reason, I want to quote briefly from an exchange that occurred between Attorney General Price Daniel, of Texas, and Mr. Justice Black, who wrote the majority opinion in the California case. I will remark that the very able attorney general of my State has taken a leading part in this tidelands matter and made an argument before the Supreme Court in the California case. Mr. Daniel made the point that since the States own the tidelands they naturally own the oil within them. Mr. Justice Black interrogated him on the point and Mr. Daniel said:

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. Justice Black, oil under the surface, under the beds of rivers and under the soil, has been held by this Court time and again to be property that goes with the soil.

Justice BLACK. Well, I don't know that it has been held that the oil goes with the soil. Suppose they discovered something about 4 miles under the surface of the earth. Do you mean that the old property concept would have to apply to that, even though it were something the Government desperately needed?

This, of course, was but a remark from the bench by one of the Justices but it indicates the feeling of Mr. Justice Black that title to land does not carry with it title to the oil in and under those lands. And, as I construe the opinion of the Court in the California case, it embodies that philosophy and it further asserts paramount right of the Federal Government to appropriate the oil regardless of the question of title to the land. Thus in the course of the opinion it is stated:

The crucial question on the merits is not merely who owns the bare legal title to the lands under the marginal sea. The United States here asserts rights in two capacities transcending those of a mere property owner.

Hence one's title to land would no longer give him ownership of the mineral in it as against the paramount right of the Federal Government.

The opinion goes even further and suggests that the oil in the lands beneath the sea may belong to the family of nations.

Under that theory what right or authority would our Government acting through the Congress have to provide leasing laws governing the production and use of oil from these lands? Certainly this Nation acting alone would not be free to deal with minerals in which all other nations own an interest. What is even more, that doctrine promulgated by our highest Court amounts to a waiver of claim of ownership on behalf of our Government and would all but invite other nations to come in and claim their cut.

I want to say in all seriousness not merely the interest not only of the States and persons holding title under them requires the enactment of this bill into law, but the interest of the National Government itself demands it. For, by the enactment of this bill the Congress will be asserting the right and title of this country through the component States of the Nation to the absolute ownership of the lands beneath the sea adjacent to our shores, and every right incident to such ownership. Thus we will be asserting a claim dating from the beginning of our Government entirely consistent with the uniform holdings of our courts. As such it is a right recognized by international law.

The pending bill has been drawn with care to do just that. It does nothing more than to fix and establish the property rights and ownership of the States as they had been established and recognized in practice and by the courts for more than a hundred years. It will safeguard and secure the ownership of the States not only in their tidelands but in the stream beds and the beds of lakes. It will put at rest the confusion, fear, and uncertainty that has been created by the decision in the California case. And by specific provision it will leave the right of the Federal Government to control navigation and all other national functions over the submerged lands which it has exercised in the past. This legislation, therefore, vitally affects every person of the Nation. It is sound and just and right. It ought to be overwhelmingly passed.

But while it goes far beyond any question of oil ownership, it is of vital importance to such States as California, Texas, and Louisiana because of their interest in the oil. In Texas, for example, all the public domain of the State belongs to the school system. It was wisely set aside for that purpose in the days of the Texas Republic at the request of its second President, M. B. Lamar. Incidentally, boundaries off the coasts of Texas were fixed first by the laws of Spain and then by the laws of Mexico and then by the Constitution of the Republic of Texas as extending three marine leagues, or 10½ miles from shore. The treaty between the United States and Texas, by which it became a State of the Union, reserved to Texas ownership of her public lands. In that respect Texas occupies a unique position and from a legal standpoint is probably in better position than any other State in the Union to retain title to her tidelands. But the doctrine of paramount right, that strange new doctrine, which asserts the right of the Federal Government to take lands and mineral resources regardless of ownership likewise threatens the coastal oils which belong to the school children of Texas.

The President, by his veto message of the relinquishment bill passed in the Seventy-ninth Congress, suggested that the Supreme Court should be given an opportunity to determine the question of ownership as between the States and Federal Government as involved in the California case, which at that time had not been decided. Last fall the Supreme Court decided that case and in deciding it in effect said the United States does not own the California tidelands. The opinion goes further, however, and suggests that a question of policy—the relation of the State and Federal Government—is involved, which is a matter for the legislative branch of the Government to determine. Consequently, if I construe these facts and circumstances correctly, both the other branches of the Government have now said this is a legislative question, and indeed it is. Here in the Congress it is not only our right but our high privilege and duty to settle this grave question of policy and of State and National relation as it affects State ownership of tidelands—the lands under the rivers and inland waters.

The simple truth is that our Supreme Court could not, in the face of the decision of the courts, assert ownership in the Federal Government, and since it could not assert such ownership, the Congress would be powerless to create such ownership under the theory adopted. What we can do and what this bill will do, if enacted into law, is to recognize that these tidelands and the oil and minerals within them have from the beginning of sovereignty belonged to the several States to which they are adjacent. By so declaring, we will affirm the absolute right and ownership of the people of America through its component States to these lands and minerals and hold them in title absolute against all comers under long-established principles of international law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. COMBS. Justice, reason, and common sense suggest that we confirm the title we have asserted since the days of the Colonies, with full approval of our

own laws and our own Constitution and in accord with international law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FOOTE].

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Chairman, the decision of the United States Supreme Court in United States against California, issued June 23, 1947, and the decree of the Court issued October 27, 1947, declare that the State of California has no title to or property interest in the lands, minerals, and other things underlying the Pacific Ocean lying seaward of the ordinary low-water mark on the coast of California, and outside of the inland waters. This opens the door to a multitude of questions concerning property rights and State jurisdiction in Connecticut which hitherto had been considered settled for centuries.

There is nothing in the decision or in the decree which provides any assurance that the Court might not at any time rule that Connecticut has no title to or property interest in the lands under Long Island Sound and Fishers Island Sound.

In its decision and decree, the Court gives its opinion that the Federal Government, for the proper discharge of its responsibilities for the national defense and for the conduct of international affairs, must have full control of the marginal sea and of the lands beneath it, and of such other waters and lands beneath them as the Court may specify at a later date without being handicapped by any State commitments concerning such waters or lands.

The Federal Government has fulfilled those responsibilities for a good many years and, during all of that time, it was universally accepted that the States owned the land beneath tidal and navigable waters. At no time was this fact a handicap to the Federal Government in defending the country or in conducting foreign affairs. It is an unwarranted assumption that a continuation of State ownership will be any detriment in the future.

There has never been any question but that ownership by the States of land beneath tidal or navigable water is without the right of substantial impairment of the interest of the public in the waters and is subject to the right of the Federal Government to control navigation. In asking that State ownership be confirmed by the Congress, the States are not asking for any change in those limitations on their ownership.

The Court decision states that the oil resources in the lands beneath the tidal waters of California are required by the Federal Government for the national defense. If this is so, they can always be obtained directly by act of the Congress. It is not necessary to obtain them by indirection through court action, which gives rise to limitless questions concerning title to property and the authority of the States to exercise their police powers.

It has been indicated that Federal agencies which pressed the California case may seek to weaken this bill by offering to give up in some way all claims to submerged lands and improvements thereon and to seek only the title to minerals under such lands, but soil by itself and water by itself are vital natural resources. If the Federal Government can single out one mineral resource of the soil at this time, it might easily claim any other mineral component, or all of the soil and all of the water at a later date.

Many States are receiving large sums of money annually from coal, oil, iron ore and other minerals produced from beneath rivers, lakes, bays, and tidelands. The present and future possibilities of revenues from such lands are most important to our own State institutions.

It is, therefore, seen that California is not the only State concerned. While the decision of the Supreme Court is res adjudicata only as to it, the decision establishes a dangerous precedent which it might be difficult to overcome in the event of future litigation.

So far as the State of Connecticut is concerned, the tidal or navigable waters include Bridgeport, New Haven, New London, and other harbors, the Norwalk River, 5 miles from Long Island Sound, the Housatonic River to Shelton, 12 miles from Long Island Sound; the Connecticut River to Holyoke, Mass., 85 miles from Long Island Sound; the Thames River to Norwich, 15 miles from Long Island Sound; the Pawcatuck River to Pawcatuck, 7 miles from Fisher's Island Sound, and other rivers for shorter distances.

Approximately 600 square miles of Long Island Sound and Fisher's Island Sound are within the boundaries of the State of Connecticut and the lands under them have been owned by the State and its predecessor, the Connecticut Colony, since 1662 when they were granted by Charles II.

Franchises and leases to approximately 150,000 acres have been granted by Connecticut municipalities or the State for cultivation of oysters. Such franchises have been traded and bequeathed for generations and are subject to property taxes levied by the municipalities and the State.

At many places along the coast, in the harbors, and along the banks of tidal or navigable rivers, private interests, municipalities, and the State have constructed piers, wharves, bulkheads, and other structures which extend beyond the low-water mark. The right of ownership of these properties by private, municipal, or State interests is now in jeopardy as a result of the Court's decision in the California case.

In the interests of navigation, the Federal Government is about to commence a major project in New Haven Harbor. Disposal of the material to be removed is a big problem. The Connecticut State Highway Department has agreed to accept 5,000,000 cubic yards in one corner of the harbor and to build thereon an important link of the No. 1 Highway in the United States. Under the California decision, it might be construed that Connecticut does not own the land where the road is being built.

Even though the Federal Government never claims for itself the ownership of the land on which structures are built or of the lands which municipalities and the State have granted by franchise and leases for oyster cultivation, the decision in the California case opens the door to claims by other parties that the owner of a pier or of an oyster franchise or lease does not have a proper title. Endless litigation is foreseeable, all of it subject to adjudication by the United States Supreme Court.

The decision might easily give rise to claims that the Court's decision has made the oyster beds, for example, the property of the United States and that they are, therefore, not subject to taxation by the municipalities or the State.

Private interests, municipalities, and the State have erected bridges which have piers below the ordinary low-water mark, and similar questions may be raised concerning them. A new toll bridge is being built by the State at the mouth of the Connecticut River, with piers beyond the low-water mark. It has been ruled that a State may not collect tolls on a road financed in part by the Federal funds. A result of the California case may be that Connecticut cannot charge tolls on its new bridge which has been named for United States Senator RAYMOND E. BALDWIN.

The many questions raised by the Court decision and decree should not be left to court determination from time to time throughout an indefinite future. The matter should be settled now by act of Congress.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to add my support to H. R. 5992. I was one of a number of Members who have introduced bills dealing with this subject that are nearly identical.

My bill (H. R. 5461) is identical with that introduced by the Congressman from California, the Honorable WILLIS W. BRADLEY (H. R. 4999). I mention this because this version has been declared more acceptable to both management and labor associations concerned with our most important fisheries industry. These same groups have expressed themselves in opposition to terms of section 4 of the bill introduced by the Congressman from Mississippi, the Honorable WILLIAM M. COLMER, relating to jurisdiction over fishing waters in the areas affected by the bills.

While the spotlight in the tidelands controversy has been aimed at the highly prized oil resources along the shores of California and Texas, our State of Washington has a definite interest in this case. To me it is somewhat startling that the Federal Government never seriously asserted a claim to the disputed lands until certain Government officials became aware of the rich resources underlying them. As I am sure most witnesses on this subject will testify, the great bulk of precedent holds that such lands have always rightly been the property of the several States. If the Federal Government should be empowered to assert ownership to any portion or classification of lands in which important resources

should be discovered, there would be little left to prevent it from asserting title to mineral deposits under the mountain tops, as well as under the sea water. We might easily jeopardize the status of virtually every important piece of property in the Nation.

But there are two particular arguments I wish to state to the Committee. The first is the subject of lands at tidewater which have been reclaimed by the enterprise and activity of individuals and municipalities in such States as Washington. Along Puget Sound, for instance, lands previously in the category of being submerged beneath the low-water mark have been reclaimed by filling-in and now constitute valuable surface property within and near such important cities as Seattle. The Supreme Court decision of June 23, 1947, might place title to all such reclaimed lands in jeopardy or at least throw them into fear of litigation causing stress to current owners and local tax authorities alike. No doubt similar situations obtain in several other States of the Union which must be clarified by the Congress immediately. It is to me essential that Congress immediately enunciate a policy whereby enterprising individuals and local communities may safely engage in such reclamation activities without fearing that the fruit of their efforts will be expropriated upon the whim of Federal officials seeking further control over our national resources.

It is further significant that, so I am advised, subsequent to the Court's decision and prior to the entry of the order and decree of October 27, 1947, the Attorney General of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior had entered into two stipulations with the attorney general of California, in which the two Federal officials renounced and disclaimed paramount governmental power over certain particularly described submerged lands on the California coast, and authorized that State under certain conditions to enter into leases on these certain lands. It would be well for the Committee to inquire by what caprice the Federal Government, through its officials, is so anxious to assert title to these lands in general, to gain control, then immediately renounces its paramount rights to—presumably—those portions of the lands in which it is not interested.

Of particular interest to the Government of the State of Washington, however, is the effect of the Supreme Court decision upon provisions of the State constitution and the policies and precedents of the State and local governments which are predicated upon that constitution.

Pursuant to the enabling act of Congress approved February 2, 1889, the constitution of the State of Washington was adopted and was, pursuant to said act, proclaimed by the President as having been formed and adopted pursuant to said enabling act—Proclamation No. 8, November 11, 1889; Twenty-sixth Statute 1552. By terms of this act and upon this proclamation, the State of Washington was admitted to the Union.

By article XXIV of the constitution of the State of Washington, thus proclaimed by the President and approved by the enabling act of Congress, the boundaries of the State of Washington were established as follows:

SEC. 1. State boundaries: The boundaries of the State of Washington shall be as follows: Beginning at a point in the Pacific Ocean one marine league, and running parallel along the coast line from the mouth of the north ship channel of the Columbia River to a line which is the boundary line between the United States and British Columbia—

And so forth. In the same constitution of the State of Washington, approved by Congress and the President of the United States upon the State's entry into the Union, the State of Washington declared, in article XVII, section 1, as follows:

Declaration of State ownership: The State of Washington asserts its ownership to the beds and shores of all navigable waters in the State up to and including the line of ordinary high tide in waters where the tide ebbs and flows, and up to and including the line of ordinary high water within the banks of all navigable rivers and lakes.

It will be seen, therefore, that from the date of its admission, the State of Washington has claimed, without challenge, title to all submerged land from the 3-mile limit—one marine league—on the ocean front to the high-water mark. The recent Court decision, in my mind, places title to these lands in jeopardy and may even affect title to submerged lands on inland bays and waters of the State.

With the continued encroachment of the Federal Government on the lands and resources of the States, it becomes increasingly difficult for local governments to finance their necessary obligations for education and other local government. While I recognize that it is often necessary for the Federal Government to take certain lands for purposes of national defense or for the development of certain resources which are beyond the capabilities of private enterprise or local government properly to develop in the public interest, I can see no justification for this current attempt of the Federal Government to seize certain properties merely because they have high value. In the State of Washington, I might point out to the Committee, the Federal Government already owns some 36 percent of the land area. The effect of sustaining the Supreme Court decision would be to reduce even further the remaining portion of the land charged with responsibility of supporting local government. The Committee may be interested to know there is one county in my congressional district in which 83 percent of the land is owned by the Federal Government. This means that owners of 17 percent of the land must pay 100 percent of the cost of local government in that county. I urge these committees to help place an end to Federal acquisition of more and more land by passing the bill presently under consideration.

In conclusion, I should like to stress to the Committee that compromise proposals, whereby the Federal Government would give up its claims to the submerged lands or portions thereof but seek to retain the minerals under such lands, are not acceptable to the people whose local enterprise and initiative have been responsible for the discovery and development of these areas. Such would be no compromise at all but would merely defer the time when another and more insistent Federal administration would void the compromise and again assert claims to full title and control.

By the same token, passage of this measure is necessary to remove the cloud left upon title to lands beneath the inland bays and inlets which in the State of Washington amount to many thousands of acres.

In my estimation, the clear interest of the people I have the honor to represent can be served only by the explicit definition of the title to these lands in the several States. For that reason and the reasons cited above, I urge the Committee to approve the version of the bill under consideration, which I hereby endorse.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 5992, the consideration of which is pending before the committee.

The enactment of the bill will reaffirm the rules of law with reference to the rights of States in the lands off their respective shores or submerged within their boundaries as the rule was thought to be for many years prior to the recent decision of the Supreme Court which held to the contrary.

The enactment of the legislation will preserve and protect the rights of the several States to control and exercise sovereignty over the territory within their respective boundaries in the manner that has been the custom in our country since its formation.

The enactment of the legislation will remove possible clouds from the title to lands which have been developed by improvements, structures, and otherwise and which have long since been properly supposed to be the private property of the owners who claim them.

I urge the favorable consideration of the legislation.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, this legislation, H. R. 5992, is of great importance to my State of Oregon as it has an extensive ocean shore line and many rivers and harbors. Large investments have been made in improvement of these submerged lands. I urge the passage of this bill.

While it is true that oil deposits on submerged land have given rise to this legislation, the principle involved is applicable to all interests in such lands and is equally applicable to every State in the Union having submerged lands and particularly to those States bordering upon the ocean and the Great Lakes.

Oregon has no commercial oil fields but is interested in the broad question involved as it is equally applicable to docks and to the structures over waters adjacent to the shore line, as well as to mineral deposits under the waters.

The contention has been raised by certain officials and by the Supreme Court decision in the California case that the individual States do not have title to the submerged lands below low-water mark and extending out to the 3-mile limit, but that the United States, by virtue of its power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce and to provide for the national defense and maintain a Navy, and by reason of its national sovereignty, has a right to appropriate petroleum products in the submerged lands below low-water mark and within the 3-mile limit.

Mr. Chairman, I maintain the following propositions:

First. Title to such submerged lands in question is owned by the State in whose territory the lands lie.

Second. The United States has no title of any kind in and to these lands or to the petroleum products or minerals under the soil. Its only rights therein are such as are given to it by the Constitution, extending power over interstate and foreign commerce.

Third. Under the Constitution the United States is a Government of delegated powers and has only such powers as is given to it by the Constitution. The States retain all the sovereign powers they originally had before the compact was entered into in establishing the United States, and all of these residuary powers are still held by the States except the powers delegated by the Constitution to the United States.

Fourth. The National Government has the right to provide and maintain a navy and provide for the national defense, but in doing so it is subject to the provisions of the Constitution and cannot deprive a State or an individual of its property or rights without due process of law, including just compensation.

I call attention to the act of Congress admitting the State of Oregon into the Union, wherein it is provided in section 1:

Admission of State—Boundaries: That Oregon be, and she is hereby, received into the Union on an equal footing with the other States in all respects whatever, with the following boundaries: In order that the boundaries of the State may be known and established, it is hereby ordained and declared that the State of Oregon shall be bounded as follows, to wit: Beginning one marine league at sea, due west from the point where the forty-second parallel of north latitude intersects the same; thence northerly, at the same distance from the line of the coast lying west and opposite the State, including all islands within the jurisdiction of the United States, to a point due west and opposite the middle of the north ship channel of the Columbia River; thence easterly, to and up the middle channel of said river, and, where it is divided by islands, up the middle of the widest channel thereof, to a point near Fort Walla Walla, where the forty-sixth parallel of north latitude crosses said river; thence east, on said parallel, to the middle of the main channel of the Shoshone or Snake River; thence up the middle of the main channel of said river to the mouth of the Owyhee River; thence due south to the parallel of latitude 42 degrees north; thence west along said parallel to the place of beginning, including jurisdiction in civil and criminal cases upon the Columbia River and Snake River, concurrently with States and Territories of which those rivers form a boundary in common with this State.

There are two provisions of this act that are important in considering this legislation: First, Oregon was admitted into the Union on an equal footing with all other States in all respects whatever; second, it is recognized that the territorial boundaries of Oregon extend one marine league at sea. From this specific provision it was recognized by the United States in its compact in admitting the State into the Union that the submerged lands in question are a part of the territory of Oregon. The rule with respect to ownership of the submerged lands lying above low-water mark and those lying outside of the low-water mark and to the 3-mile limit is the same. The courts have made no distinction with respect to such submerged lands.

The question of the title and ownership to these submerged lands in Oregon has been adjudicated by the United States Supreme Court on two separate occasions. The cases to which I refer are *Shively* v. *Bowlby*—decided March 5, 1894—(152 U. S. 1) and *United States* v. *Oregon*—decided April 1, 1935—(295 U. S. 1). It is submitted that the principles of law enunciated in these two decisions determine definitely that the title to the submerged lands under consideration is vested in the State, and the Federal Government has no title therein or any interest or control over them other than such rights as have been given to the United States by the Constitution with respect to interstate and foreign commerce.

The Court in Shively against Bowlby said—page 11:

I. By the common law, both the title and the dominion of the sea, and of rivers and arms of the sea, where the tide ebbs and flows, and of all the lands below high-water mark, within the jurisdiction of the Crown of England, are in the King. Such waters, and the lands which they cover, either at all times or at least when the tide is in, are incapable of ordinary and private occupation, cultivation, and improvement; and their natural and primary uses are public in their nature, for highways of navigation and commerce, domestic and foreign, and for the purpose of fishing by all the King's subjects. Therefore, the title, jus privatum, in such lands, as of waste and unoccupied lands, belongs to the King as the sovereign; and the dominion thereof, jus publicum, is vested in him as the representative of the nation and for the public benefit.

Page 13:

In England, from the time of Lord Hale, it has been treated as settled that the title in the soil of the sea, or of arms of the sea, below ordinary high-water mark, is in the King, except so far as an individual or a corporation has acquired rights in it by express grant, or by prescription or usage.

It is equally well settled that a grant from the sovereign of land bounded by the sea, or by any navigable tidewater, does not pass any title below high-water mark, unless either the language of the grant, or long usage under it, clearly indicates that such was the intention. * * *

By the law of England also every building or wharf erected without license below high-water mark, where the soil is the King's, is a purpresture and may, at the suit of the King, either be demolished, or be seized and rented for his benefit, if it is not a nuisance to navigation.

Page 15:

The English possessions in America were claimed by right of discovery. Having been discovered by subjects of the King of England and taken possession of in his name, by his authority, or with his assent, they were held by the King as the representative of and in trust for the nation; and all vacant lands, and the exclusive power to grant them, were vested in him. The various charters granted by different monarchs of the Stuart dynasty for large tracts of territory on the Atlantic coast conveyed to the grantees both the territory described and the powers of government, including the property and the dominion of lands under tidewaters. And upon the American Revolution, all the rights of the Crown and of Parliament vested in the several States, subject to the rights surrendered to the National Government by the Constitution of the United States. (*Johnson* v. *McIntosh* (8 Wheat. 543, 595); *Martin* v. *Waddell* (16 Pet. 367, 408–410, 414); *Commonwealth* v. *Roxbury* (9 Gray 451, 478–481); *Stevens* v. *Paterson & Newark Railroad* (5 Vroom (34 N. J. Law), 532); *People* v. *New York & Staten Island Ferry* (68 N. Y. 71).)

IV. The new States admitted into the Union since the adoption of the Constitution have the same rights as the original States in the tidewaters, and in the lands below the high-water mark, within their respective jurisdictions.

Pages 26, 27, and 28:

In *Pollard* v. *Hagan* (1844), this court, upon full consideration (overruling anything to the contrary in *Pollard* v. *Kibbe* (14 Pet. 353), *Mobile* v. *Eslava* (16 Pet. 234), *Mobile* v. *Hallett* (16 Pet. 261), *Mobile* v. *Emanuel* (1 How. 95), and *Pollard* v. *Files* (2 How. 591)), adjudged that, upon the admission of the State of Alabama into the Union, the title in the lands below high-water mark of navigable waters passed to the State, and could not afterward be granted away by the Congress of the United States. Mr. Justice McKinley, delivering the opinion of the court (Mr. Justice Catron alone dissenting), said: "We think a proper examination of this subject will show that the United States never held any municipal sovereignty, jurisdiction, or right of soil in and to the territory of which Alabama or any of the new States were formed; except for temporary purposes, and to execute the trusts created by the acts of the Virginia and Georgia legislatures, and the deeds of cession executed by them to the United States, and the trust created by the treaty with the French Republic of the 30th of April 1803 ceding Louisiana. When the United States accepted the cession of the territory, they took upon themselves the trust to hold the municipal eminent domain for the new States, and to invest them with it to the same extent, in all respects, that it was held by the States ceding the territories. When Alabama was admitted into the Union, on an equal footing with the original States, she succeeded to all the rights of sovereignty, jurisdiction, and eminent domain which Georgia possessed at the date of the cession, except so far as this right was diminished by the public lands remaining in the possession and under the control of the United States, for the temporary purposes provided for in the deed of cession and the legislative acts connected with it. Nothing remained to the United States, according to the terms of the agreement, but the public land (3 How. 221–223). Alabama is therefore entitled to the sovereignty and jurisdiction over all the territory within her limits, subject to the common law, to the same extent that Georgia possessed it before she ceded it to the United States. To maintain any other doctrine is to deny that Alabama has been admitted into

the Union on an equal footing with the original States, the Constitution, laws, and compact to the contrary notwithstanding. Then to Alabama belong the navigable waters, and soils under them, in controversy in this case, subject to the rights surrendered by the Constitution to the United States" (3 How. 229).

Pages 29 and 30:

In *Weber* v. *Harbor Commissioners*, it was held that a person afterward acquiring the title of the city in a lot and wharf below high-water mark had no right to complain of works constructed by commissioners of the State, under authority of the legislature, for the protection of the harbor and the convenience of shipping, in front of his wharf, and preventing the approach of vessels to it; and Mr. Justice Field, in delivering judgment, said: "Although the title to the soil under the tidewaters of the bay was acquired by the United States by cession from Mexico, equally with the title to the upland, they held it only in trust for the future State. Upon the admission of California into the Union upon equal footing with the Original States, absolute property in, and dominion and sovereignty over, all soils under the tidewaters within her limits passed to the State, with the consequent right to dispose of the title to any part of said soils in such manner as she might deem proper, subject only to the paramount right of navigation over the waters, so far as such navigation might be required by the necessities of commerce with foreign nations or among the several States, the regulation of which was vested in the general government (18 Wall. 65, 66).

In the very recent case of *Knight* v. *United States Land Association*, Mr. Justice Lamar, in delivering judgment, said: "It is the settled rule of law in this Court that absolute property in, and dominion and sovereignty over, the soils under the tidewaters in the Original States were reserved to the several States; and that the new States since admitted have the same rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction in that behalf as the Original States possess within their respective borders. Upon the acquisition of the territory from Mexico, the United States acquired the title to tidelands equally with the title to upland; but with respect to the former they held it only in trust for the future States that might be erected out of such territory" (142 U. S. 183). In support of these propositions he referred to *Martin* v. *Waddell*, *Pollard* v. *Hagen*, *Mumford* v. *Wardwell*, and *Weber* v. *Harbor Commissioners* above cited.

The Court, after reviewing the law in its former decisions, specifically held with respect to the title to the submerged lands in Oregon that the title was vested in the State, saying—page 52:

By the law of the State of Oregon, as declared and established by the decisions of its supreme court, the owner of upland bounding on navigable water has no title in the adjoining lands below high-water mark, and no right to build wharves thereon, except as expressly permitted by statutes of the State; but the State has the title in those lands, and, unless they have been so built upon with its permission, the right to sell and convey them to anyone, free of any right in the proprietor of the upland, and subject only to the paramount right of navigation inherent in the public. (*Hinman* v. *Warren* (6 Oreg., 408); *Parker* v. *Taylor* (7 Oreg., 435); *Parker* v. *Rogers* (8 Oreg., 183); *Shively* v. *Parker* (9 Oreg., 500); *McCann* v. *Oregon Railway* (13 Oreg., 455); *Bowlby* v. *Shively* (22 Oreg., 410). See also *Shively* v. *Welch* (10 Sawyer, 136, 140, 141).)

The Court's conclusions are significant—pages 57 and 58:

Lands under tidewaters are incapable of cultivation or improvement in the manner of lands above high-water mark. They are of great value to the public for the purposes of commerce, navigation, and fishery. Their improvement by individuals, when permitted, is incidental to or subordinate to the public use and right. Therefore, the title and control of them are vested in the sovereign for the benefit of the whole people.

At common law the title and the dominion in lands flowed by the tide were in the King for the benefit of the nation. Upon the settlement of the Colonies, like rights passed to the grantees in the royal charters, in trust for the communities to be established. Upon the American Revolution, these rights, charged with a like trust, were vested in the Original States within their respective borders, subject to the rights surrendered by the Constitution to the United States.

Upon the acquisition of a Territory by the United States, whether by cession from one of the States, or by treaty with a foreign country, or by discovery and settlement, the same title and dominion passed to the United States, for the benefit of the whole people, and in trust for the several States to be ultimately created out of the Territory.

The new States admitted into the Union since the adoption of the Constitution have the same rights as the original States in the tidewaters, and in the lands under them, within their respective jurisdictions. The title and rights of riparian or littoral proprietors in the soil below high-water mark, therefore, are governed by the laws of the several States, subject to the rights granted to the United States by the Constitution.

The United States, while they hold the country as a Territory, having all the powers both of national and of municipal government, may grant, for appropriate purposes, titles or rights in the soil below high-water mark of tidewaters. But they have never done so by general laws; and, unless in some case of international duty or public exigency, have acted upon the policy, as most in accordance with the interest of the people and with the object for which the Territories were acquired, of leaving the administration and disposition of the sovereign rights in navigable waters, and in the soil under them, to the control of the States, respectively, when organized and admitted into the Union.

Grants by Congress of portions of the public lands within a Territory to settlers thereon, though bordering on or bounded by navigable waters, convey, of their own force, no title or right below high-water mark, and do not impair the title and dominion of the future State when created; but leave the question of the use of the shores by the owners of uplands to the sovereign control of each State, subject only to the rights vested by the Constitution in the United States.

The donation land claim, bounded by the Columbia River, upon which the plaintiff in error relies, includes no title or right in the land below high-water mark; and the statutes of Oregon, under which the defendants in error hold, are a constitutional and legal exercise by the State of Oregon of its dominion over the lands under navigable waters.

It is submitted that this holding by the Supreme Court definitely establishes that the ownership and control of all of the submerged lands within the territorial boundaries of Oregon which extend out 3 miles from the shore line on the Pacific Ocean are vested in the State of Oregon; that the United States has no ownership over the same; that such powers as are delegated to it by the Constitution with respect to navigation and commerce are not to be construed as ownership and do not give to the Federal Government any indicia of ownership, that the ownership with respect to such lands is vested in the States and not in the Federal Government.

The Supreme Court in the later case in which the State of Oregon was a party—United States against Oregon—reexamined this same question and again laid down this definite rule, the Court speaking through Mr. Justice Stone, said:

Page 6:

The State of Oregon was admitted to the Union on February 14, 1859. At that date the area within the meander line was a part of the public domain of the United States. No part of it has ever been disposed of, in terms, by any grant of the United States. Decision of the principal issues raised by the pleadings and proof turns on the question whether the area involved underlie navigable waters at the time of the admission of Oregon to statehood. If the waters were navigable in fact, title passed to the State upon her admission to the Union. (*Shively* v. *Bowlby* (152 U. S. 1, 26–31), *Scott* v. *Lattig* (227 U. S. 229, 242, 243), *Oklahoma* v. *Texas* (258 U. S. 574, 583, 591), *United States* v. *Utah* (283 U. S. 64, 75).) If the waters were nonnavigable, our decision must then turn on the question whether the title of the United States to the lands in question, or part of them, has passed to the State.

Page 14:

Dominion over navigable waters and property in the soil under them are so identified with the sovereign power of government that a presumption against their separation from sovereignty must be indulged, in construing either grants by the sovereign of the lands to be held in private ownership or transfer of sovereignty itself. (See *Massachusetts* v. *New York* (271 U. S. 65, 89).) For that reason, upon the admission of a State to the Union, the title of the United States to lands underlying navigable waters within the States passes to it, as incident to the transfer to the State of local sovereignty, and is subject only to the paramount power of the United States to control such waters for purposes of navigation in interstate and foreign commerce. But if the waters are not navigable in fact, the title of the United States to land underlying them remains unaffected by the creation of the new State. (See *United States* v. *Utah* (supra, 75), *Oklahoma* v. *Texas* (supra, 583, 591).) Since the effect upon the title to such lands is the result of Federal action in admitting a State to the Union, the question, whether the waters within the State under which the lands lie are navigable or nonnavigable, is a Federal, not a local one. It is, therefore, to be determined according to the law of usages recognized and applied in the Federal courts, even though, as in the present case, the waters are not capable of use for navigation in interstate or foreign commerce. (*United States* v. *Holt State Bank* (270 U. S. 49, 55, 56), *United States* v. *Utah* (supra, 75); *Brewer-Elliott Oil Co.* v. *United States* (260 U. S. 77, 87).)

It is submitted that, as shown by the holdings of the Supreme Court in the two cases in which titles to Oregon lands were involved, which cases follow the uniform rule laid down by the Court, the titles to the submerged lands under consideration are vested in the respective States within whose boundaries they lie, and, therefore, the contention that the title is vested in no one is untenable. The title being in the State, it follows that the United States does not have ownership of the lands themselves or the petroleum products or minerals that may lie beneath the soil.

In the State of Oregon the commission of public docks, a municipal corporation, has through authority vested in it by the State made extensive improvements and has erected docks, grain elevators, and other dock facilities involving large expenditures on these submerged lands. Other municipal corporations in the State have erected on such lands flour mills, wharves, and docks, and issued bonds thereon for the payment of same. If the contention advanced by the Government is sustained it will deprive the States of the vested titles they now hold in these submerged lands, which property rights have been recognized by the courts for over a century as shown by the cases I have cited.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, as Representative of the Sixth Congressional District of Washington State, I wish to rise in support of H. R. 5992. I have studied H. R. 5992 and am satisfied that it contains one of the major provisions necessary to protect the rights of the States affected. In the constitution of the State of Washington, article XVII, section 1, is the following wording:

> Declaration of State ownership: The State of Washington asserts its ownership to the beds and shores of all navigable waters in the State up to and including the line of ordinary high tide in the waters where the tide ebbs and flows, and up to and including the line of ordinary high water within the banks of all navigable rivers and lands.

And article XXIV states:

> State boundaries: The boundaries of the State of Washington shall be as follows: Beginning at a point in the Pacific Ocean one marine league, and running parallel along the coast line from the mouth of the north ship channel of the Columbia River, to a line which is the boundary between the United States and British Columbia.

It will be seen therefore that the State of Washington, ever since its admission into the Union, has claimed title to all submerged land within the 3-mile limit on the ocean front and also has claimed title to the beds and shores of all navigable waters within its territorial limits.

While the Supreme Court of the United States has decreed the Federal Government to be the owner of the lands under the 3-mile marginal limit, the Court also states that the same question has never arisen regarding inland waters, bays, and inlets, and that the controversy regarding lands and such waters is to be decided later by the Court on such facts when presented. This statement definitely places a cloud upon the title of the submerged land under our bays and inlets, and most certainly at some time in the future will have an adverse effect not only on Port Commission property but also as to oyster and clam beds within the boundaries of our State. H. R. 5992 will, I am sure, clear up all of these points and give to the State of Washington clear title to all of the submerged lands under bays and inlets as well as to the land within the 3-mile limit on the ocean front.

This controversy between the Federal Government on one hand and the various States on the other reaches much further than any claim on submerged lands on the ocean, beneath the tide, and abutting thereon, because it strikes at the very foundation of State and Federal relations. It is evident that one of the fundamental reasons for the success of our Federal system of government has been our plan of leaving many sovereign rights and powers to the State and local governments. It is evident from reading the Supreme Court opinion, that the Court has taken upon itself to give to the Federal Government certain rights and powers that Congress has never claimed or asserted at any time during its history. The opinion itself indicates that the vital question of ownership of these submerged lands is a matter for Congress to decide. A careful reading of the bill mentioned will demonstrate that the Federal Government's rights for national defense are fully protected.

I earnestly urge upon you immediate favorable consideration of this legislation.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH].

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the committee for bringing this bill to the House in the form it is brought to us, in spite of the fact that a previous Congress had passed a similar bill which was subsequently vetoed by the President.

I want also to say that the State of California especially is grateful to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHADWICK], who, unfortunately, will not be with us in the next Congress.

This is a vital thing to the State of California, not only to California but to the Nation as a whole. This question strikes at one of the fundamental tenets of the type of government we know in this country. It invades the rights of the States to possess that which is within their own borders. In my State of California alone, if you consider a 3-mile border along the shore 1,200 miles long, the Federal Government has said that 3,600 square miles of the State of California is not under the possession of the State, but is vested in the Federal Government.

Our great harbors are clouded by the Supreme Court decision. Our world-renowned public beaches and shore-line recreational developments are at a standstill until the State's ownership of tidelands is reaffirmed. One city alone, Long Beach, finds many of its important community projects paralyzed until this matter is cleared up.

Thousands of homes and pieces of land owned by thousands of persons are up in the air while we wait to see whether the Federal Government is to be empowered to take at will, and without compensation, such lands as it needs or wants.

To illustrate what this means to real estate in California, the California tidelands in dispute include the land under San Francisco's ferry building and the land under San Diego's civic center and municipal airport. Half of Los Angeles Harbor and much of Long Beach Harbor are of uncertain status. Who owns these great facilities? The people who had the foresight and took the risks to invest millions in building them, or the bureaucrats in Washington?

There are some 65,000 statute miles in the various other States of the Union that would be affected by the decision of the Supreme Court. Every State in the Union has submerged land either along the shores of the ocean, the gulfs, the inland bays, the rivers, or the lakes, with the exception of one State, the State of Colorado.

The question has been raised that the natural resources off the shores of California are vital to the national defense of the Nation. We do not dispute that; we agree that it is vital and necessary, but is there any question as to the loyalty of the State of California to yield its natural resources to the Nation in the event of a national emergency? There never has been, either so far as manpower or resources of the State are concerned. Why, therefore, should there be any question that because there might be oil in certain places and in very limited places along the 1,200-mile coast of the State of California that oil should have such preponderant effect in the decision of the Supreme Court and in the argument that has been given to the Nation by the former Secretary of the Interior, on what logical premise can we determine—and I am now speaking of a fundamental question on the over-all picture—on what logical premise can we determine that all submerged lands in the United States belong to the Federal Government? That is the effect of this decision.

It has been said that there is no intent to extend this into the other States. There is no question about the fact that Supreme Court decisions have a very definite effect upon future decisions and set precedents by which future decisions may be made.

Mr. Chairman, I recommend that this legislation be supported and I trust that the other Members of the House will support it when the proper time comes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, the passage of this legislation means a great deal to Louisiana. We will be very much hurt if the Supreme Court decision should stand. I do not know of any single piece of legislation that is of more importance to the State of Louisiana as a whole than the pending bill to quiet the title of tidewater lands in favor of the States. We have had this matter before Congress previously and it passed by a large vote and was vetoed by the President. By the pending bill we undertake to set at rest again this controversy over submerged lands of the various States.

The legal question involved has been fully discussed by others and I will not take the time of the House to go into that

question. It is sufficient to say that since the State of California lost in the Supreme Court, similar suits will be brought against the various other coastal States and the State of Louisiana will probably be next.

We are faced with the fact under the Supreme Court decision that Louisiana will lose great acreage of submerged lands and every other coastal State will likewise lose heavily. This loss, Mr. Chairman, will be immediately felt by the treasuries of these various States. Louisiana is the greatest fur-producing State in the Union, most of it being muskrat, and this bill might vitally affect the fur industry. Louisiana is a great producer of oysters and all kinds of fish and if the title to the tidelands passes to the Federal Government, it will wreck that great industry in Louisiana. On the question of oil, Louisiana for many years has enjoyed great revenue from oil produced from her tidelands on the Gulf of Mexico. To say that the fiscal affairs of that State would be greatly upset by losing this revenue, would be putting it mildly.

"In Louisiana, the State mineral board has supervision of 731 leases, involving 2,289,713 acres of land. Inland leases, numbering 217, include both uplands and lands beneath bays, lakes, rivers, bayous, and streams. The leases on lands in our marginal waters, off coast, number 524 and comprise 1,885,689 acres. The leases on water bottoms far exceed the uplands in the acreage involved in State oil, gas, and mineral leases." The quoted part above is from the testimony of Mr. B. A. Hardey who testified before the committee.

The States have been exercising full jurisdiction over coastal lands throughout their history. Until this tidelands issue came up, the right of the States with reference to it has hardly been questioned. At this late date when the States have developed the fish industry, the fur industry, the oil industry, and when some of these industries have proved very profitable to the States, and when the fiscal affairs of the States have been so interwoven with the funds derived from the tidelands, it seems to me that it comes with poor grace upon the part of the Federal Government to come in and undertake to take from the States that which has been recognized as the property of the States since the foundation of our Government.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that the Congress will pass this legislation by an overwhelming vote and if the President should again veto it, I sincerely hope the veto will be overridden so that the uncertainty now hanging over the whole tidelands question will be once and for all settled, and settled, I think, in keeping with justice and right.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX].

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Chairman, Louisiana has a great interest in the protection of the rights of States to lands beneath navigable waters within their respective boundaries. It is estimated that Louisiana alone has a billion dollars at stake in this matter. I have long been interested in the effort to bring about a settlement of this issue in favor of the States concerned, and in January of this year I offered House Joint Resolution 286 for this purpose, which measure was referred to the Judiciary Committee.

As I pointed out at the time I introduced the above-named legislation, the great resources of Louisiana involved in this matter include oil, gas, and mineral development, the oyster and shrimp industries, commercial fisheries, royalties on oyster and clam shells, sand and gravel, and sulfur deposits. Revenues from these sources are used in the operation of Louisiana's State government.

Through all of these years Louisiana, in good faith, has gone about its business of developing and leasing the beds of its marginal waters, without a word from the Federal Government other than approval. Authority to lease the State's submerged lands was given the State land office in 1915. By 1916 there were more than 700 leases, covering 1,871,000 acres. The State collects severance taxes and, in addition, bonus money is required for such leases and payment of annual delay rentals in appropriate instances must be made. In event of production the operator must remit to the State minimum royalties of one-eighth on all oil and gas produced and saved. According to the register of the State land office, who collects this revenue, the grand total of this income from the beginning of the receipts until November 30, 1945, was $29,169,844.21.

Eighty percent of the money goes into the State's general fund, while the remainder is credited to the parishes, or counties, where the leases are located. The Parish of Plaquemine, for example, which is situated on the Gulf, derived $141,081 from this source in 1945.

These revenues make it possible to carry out many improvement projects throughout the State. Of the income from oil, gas, and mineral leases, rentals and royalties, 10 percent goes into the road fund for highway maintenance. The balance, less certain deductions, is security for State bonds, proceeds of which are dedicated to the construction, improvement, repair, and equipment of buildings operated for charitable and correctional institutions.

That gives you a pretty good idea of what it would mean to Louisiana if the Federal Government was to step in and take over these submerged lands which have been so long recognized as under the State's jurisdiction. Louisiana is not merely defending an attack on her sovereignty in this matter, but is fighting to save her financial stability and advocating the rights of countless private interests which have placed complete confidence in State ownership of these lands.

Aside from the financial factor, however, there is something even greater involved and that is the issue of whether the Federal Government can take over the rights and properties and revenues of Louisiana or any other State, or whether these rights and properties and revenues shall remain within the individual States in accordance with the spirit of the Constitution.

It is clearly the duty of Congress to adopt this legislation and thereby restore the title of lands to the States which have held it by tradition, usage, and legal proceedings for over a century and a half. Congress previously recognized the rights of the States to these lands, but the legislation was vetoed by President Truman who had expressed the desire that the United States Supreme Court pass on the matter of title. This, of course, led to the California Tidelands case in which the Federal Government prevailed.

The Supreme Court, in my opinion, definitely encroached upon States' rights in that decision. It must be remembered that the Court does not have the authority to alone decide this issue and that such a ruling is only advisory to Congress which has the opportunity and duty to reject it. The Court merely affirmed a title which Congress had already decided to renounce.

The States to which this matter means so much are appealing to Congress to quitclaim to them these submerged lands which they have always considered theirs since the birth of the Republic. They see in this effort of the Federal Government to dispossess them of lands they have owned for more than a century an ominous indication of steadily increasing domination, or efforts at domination, over the rights both of States and individuals. They discern in this anxiety to establish Federal title, an impatience to extend sway over the country's entire 23,000 square miles of coastal belt and thence to all navigable waters as well.

It has been contended by opponents of H. R. 5992, including some high Government officials, that this legislation would represent a gift from the Federal Government to the several coastal States. There is no logic in this reasoning, which evidently must be based on the theory that the bill would take from the Federal Government a right which it has heretofore enjoyed and bestow it upon the States. There is nothing to show that prior to 1937 the Federal Government ever asserted any right in these submerged lands, but that, on the contrary, it recognized that ownership rested with the States and that they had complete sovereignty and dominion over these lands, subject to the constitutional right of the Federal Government to regulate commerce.

In the matter of national defense—another point raised in discussion of this legislation—H. R. 5992 gives the United States a preferential right in time of war, or at any other time, when necessary for national defense, to purchase any of the natural resources produced from the lands included in the bill. This would seem to be sufficient.

In the interest of justice and democratic government, this issue should be settled now, once and for all, by adoption of this legislation.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill is not only of utmost importance to the United States but is likewise of tremendous import to the people of the State of Louisiana. No State in the United States has as irregular

and uncertain a coast line as does the State of Louisiana. The land along the coast is low and very marshy and merges into the Gulf of Mexico. At many points arms of the Gulf reach up for many miles into the lower part of the State. The coast line is especially difficult to survey or to map.

This is the reason why this area of Louisiana was a habitat in the early days of bands of pirates. The Lafitte brothers, whose place in history is well, although not too gloriously known, used the bays and bayous in the section of Louisiana to carry on their marauding commerce against all who dared use the Gulf of Mexico. When hotly pursued by forces of law and order they slipped from one bay or bayou into the next and alluded their pursuers almost with impunity. At times the pirates became bold and during the course of the battle of New Orleans the Lafitte Brothers left their swampy habitat and joined forces with Andrew Jackson to defeat the British in the Chalmette Battle Field below New Orleans.

Ten years ago under State supervision, guidance, and in fact by use of State laws an oil field was discovered about three miles off the coast of Louisiana and since that time it has been in constant operation, producing quantities of petroleum throughout the years. People have purchased valuable rights based upon interests obtained from the State of Louisiana and have used these rights since the discovery of the field, trading and trafficking in them. In recent years the work of locating and exploiting oil resources has proceeded rather rapidly. Seismograph crews have explored the bottom of the ocean and other development has already occurred. All of this has happened under the guidance, control, and authority of the State of Louisiana and valuable rights have been definitely fixed, so people of this section of the world felt until the decision of the Supreme Court last year.

Mr. Chairman, in 1803 President Thomas Jefferson purchased the great territory of Louisiana from the Emperor Napoleon of France. Soon after that, Louisiana became a State and retained control of the tidelands so to speak from the day it was organized as a separate State until this very hour. During this period of almost 150 years of the existence of Louisiana as a State, the great rivers and harbors of our State have been developed, all on the theory that the State of Louisiana owned title to them. Most valuable rights along these streams and bayous have been established and have been developed, all based upon the ownership and authority of the State of Louisiana. No one questioned this right until in the year 1939 when Secretary of the Interior, Harold Ickes, began to agitate this matter. In recent years more discussion has arisen but not until the decision of the Supreme Court last year was there any serious doubt raised in the minds of people that title reposed in the commonwealth.

Our State of Louisiana has grown, developed, prospered and, in fact blossomed under our theory of government, that the States are sovereign States of the Union. Throughout the many years this theory has not only been conducive to the development of my own State but has likewise proved profoundly successful in developing every other one of the 48 States of the Union. Under this theory we have seen our country grow from 13 struggling colonies on the Atlantic seaboard to a Nation of 140,000,000 people. We have seen forests felled and great cities built in their stead. We have seen our people cultivate the soil and then boldly dig deep into the very bowels of the earth in search of mineral deposits. We have reared a swaddling infant to full grown, sturdy manhood. Under this theory of governmental authority we have seen our Nation successfully complete two world wars and reach the high point of achievement which brings to us the commendation of the free peoples of the world. We now see that other nations far and wide all over the world depend upon us for our help and our assistance.

Mr. Chairman, I think the hour is too late to change. Our Nation will go on in the future for further development and further triumphs under the theory that the State still is sovereign and has sovereign control over its tidal lands. Any other conclusion will, in my judgment, seriously affect and undermine the future of this country and its people. I, therefore, hope that this bill will pass by a record vote and will very soon set at rest forever the title to the tidelands throughout the United States.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, this measure should pass by all means.

If the boundaries of each State are going to depend on the last guess of the Supreme Court from now on we will likely find ourselves in a most unfortunate situation.

So far as my own State of Mississippi is concerned I read from the constitution of that State showing what the boundary is. After describing the western, northern, and eastern boundaries down to a certain point, it says:

> Thence on a direct line to a point ten miles east of the Pascagoula River on the Gulf of Mexico; thence westwardly, including all the islands within six leagues of the shore, to the most eastern junction of the Pearl River with Lake Borgne.

In other words, there is the constitution of the State of Mississippi that was approved by the United States Senate before it could ever become the constitution of the State of Mississippi, saying that our territory extends out six leagues to take in Cat Island, Ship Island, and all of those other islands along the boundary of the Mississippi Sound.

To come in here and say that that territory belongs to the United States and is to be taken over by the Department of the Interior is ridiculous. I want to show you what it would mean to every State that borders on the ocean or the Gulf. It would mean that you would have a bureaucracy between you and your outlet to the ocean. They could tell you if, when, and where you could even fish in the waters that have always been considered as belonging to your State.

Let me show you what that bureaucracy is doing in Alaska. Let us take the State of California or Mississippi or New Jersey or Georgia or any other State. Suppose they had imposed upon them the same conditions as are imposed on the Territory of Alaska. Alaska has the greatest salmon fisheries on earth.

All salmon are born in fresh water. They come down the streams, go out into salt water, stay for 2 or 3 years, and when they get ready to spawn they come back to the identical stream they came out of. They go back up that stream to spawn. Then all the old salmon die and a new crop is born.

An expert on this subject from Leland Stanford University accompanied us on a trip to Alaska in 1923, and he said that if you should destroy all the salmon in one stream, the ones from other streams would never go to it. Its salmon supply would be entirely depleted.

In the Territory of Alaska certain big interests have been given the right to build traps across, or near, the mouths of those streams and catch practically every salmon that comes in. They only let enough get by to keep the breed going. The people who live in Alaska are not even permitted to fish for a living.

You can go along the coast of British Columbia, where such a condition is not permitted to exist, and you will see hundreds of small fishermen out in their little boats fishing for a livelihood. But when you get up to Alaska you find that the Department of the Interior has turned the fisheries of Alaska over to the big fish canning monopolies that are not even domiciled in Alaska.

Do you want that situation to exist in your State? If so, then vote against this bill.

This bill is just the beginning. Mind you, when they take over the land under the water they take over the surface of the water. Who has jurisdiction then to enforce the law? Is that all going to be transferred to the Federal Government? Are they going to depend on the State of Mississippi or California, New Jersey, Maine or Massachusetts to enforce the law over territory they do not even own?

If they can take the land up to the water's edge, the next step might be to go onto the mainland.

I say that if you are going to preserve the rights of the States to the property that has always been admitted to belong to them, by all means this bill should be passed.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that his argument is the argument advanced by Justice Frankfurter in the minority views in the California case.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, that was one time Mr. Frankfurter really got on the beam.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Speaking of the land up to the shore, in the city of Los Angeles we have built the harbor on reclaimed land. If they claim that that is 3 miles from the mean-high-tide land, then they would own all the reclaimed land and all of the buildings on that land now above the surface.

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly; one Member called my attention to the fact that the Government would own a large portion of the city of Boston, and a large portion of the city of San Francisco and other cities that are situated along the water's edge.

I say this bill should pass, and if it receives a veto, it should pass over the veto. It is the one way to preserve the jurisdictional integrity of the various States and to guarantee to the people of those States that they will not be interfered with in this way in the years to come.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I am reluctant to discuss this bill since I am not a member of the committee. However, the things that are claimed about this bill are so fantastic that unless you have had some personal experience with this matter, you would not believe that they were true. My colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY] indicated to you on a map some of the land that would be taken in the city of San Francisco. I want to call your attention just to the land around and up from the Ferry Building on either side of Market Street, which land was once under water, and when it was filled in, it became a part of the city. On that land in that area, within a radius of a mile, there is property worth perhaps $500,000,000. We all know that the land includes the improvements on it. There are great skyscrapers erected on it, some big hotels, great industries, the title to all of which would be in doubt if this decision remains on the books.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. PHILBIN. I may say to the gentleman that exactly the same situation obtains in the city of Boston. Unless this unsound decision is corrected, it will work a great hardship on the city.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, which parallels the situation in San Francisco and other coastal cities.

Now, a layman does not usually know that you cannot obtain title as against the Government by adverse possession. That means although some of these structures have been there for over 50 years, they still do not have title against the United States Government, if the doctrine of the California decision stands. The United States Supreme Court decision has the effect of vesting title in the United States. Now, I hold that if that is the case, it is the duty of the United States Attorney General and other Government officials to prosecute these owners and determine where the title to that property is. It is their duty to reclaim those lands from the owners, no matter if they have been in their possession for a century.

I had an experience one time in a case which illustrates how this can work. Eighty-eight miles inland from the Golden Gate we have the port of Stockton. In 1927, when we were acquiring land for this port, we got a piece of land which the title company told us had once been the bottom of the San Joaquin River, a navigable stream. A bend in the river had been cut out, the old river had been filled in, and for 36 years a farmer had occupied that property. He farmed it. He put improvements on it. He had fruit-bearing trees on the property, but we had to tell him, "You do not own the land; the State of California owns the property."

The Attorney General said, "Yes, we are the owners of the property, and we insist that the purchase money for that land be paid to us. The land having been the bed of this navigable stream, it become ours when the navigability was abandoned. You obtained no right to it by occupying it as you cannot obtain title against the State by adverse possession."

That is only one case, 88 miles inland from the ocean, where this thing occurred under my personal observation. I predict that if this decision remains the law, in San Francisco alone you will have thousands and thousands of lawsuits to determine who are the owners of the property which was once submerged land. We must change this, Mr. Chairman. We will have chaos in every coastal city and State of the United States otherwise.

Way back in 1915 there was a group of cases in the State of California, People against Banning, People against Johnson, and People against Southern Pacific, and so forth, where this very thing was tested. The California Supreme Court there held that the tidelands of the State belonged to California and to nobody else. It also held that California could assert its title at any time it wished, no matter how long structures had been on the land, or who built them. At that time it was my privilege to review hundreds of cases, and I found that there was complete unanimity among the decisions of the United States Supreme Court that the tidelands of our States belonged to the States. That ought to be the law, and if it is not, we ought to put it on the books and make it the law. I hope this bill passes, so we may again have stability in our titles in coastal States.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, the legal implications of this bill have been debated here today in an exceedingly able manner. I should, therefore, like to take the few minutes allotted to me to discuss the type of propaganda which has been directed against the proposed legislation.

The charge has been made that those of us who are supporting this legislation are the tools of a vast and sinister oil lobby. The second charge has been made that by the passage of this legislation we are depriving the Federal Government of resources which have always belonged to the Federal Government, and in so doing we are vitally weakening the oil reserves needed for national defense. These charges would be ridiculous if they were not so widespread and had not been accepted by so many people—so many editorialists who have never seen an oil well or been in an oil field and whose knowledge of reserves is limited to say the least.

First, let us talk about the so-called oil lobby. In my State of Louisiana this Supreme Court decision, as has been pointed out so ably, not only affects our oil resources but our vast fisheries, our shrimp, our sulfur, our salt, our seaports, and countless millions upon millions of dollars in resources. To assert that one's judgment under these circumstances is influenced by a so-called oil lobby is plain silly.

No. 2: As everyone knows these lands have never belonged to the Federal Government. To say that we are taking them is to ignore the truth. That brings us to a discussion of the practical question of oil reserves. As I understand the position which has been advocated by the Navy Department—I do not know whether it still is or not—but it gave vent to the following type of propaganda—the oil resources of this country are dwindling so rapidly that some effort must be made by the Federal Government to set aside reserves; the best way to set up reserves is in a proved area where no development is permitted, the thought being that the area will be held in readiness for an emergency.

Finally, it is contended that the best such reserves are the so-called tideland areas. Let us examine all three of these contentions.

First, the contention concerning our dwindling reserves. I served for a time as general counsel for the State Department of Conservation in Louisiana. In my humble opinion we have one of the finest oil-conservation statutes in the United States, and any idea or notion that we permit the wasteful use of our oil resources is completely contrary to the facts. But more important—at the end of the year 1939, the known reserves in this country were about 12,000,000,000 barrels. At the end of 1947, they were about 22,000,000,000 barrels. The world's reserves at the end of 1939, were about 34,000,000,000 barrels. At the end of 1947, they were 71,000,000,000 barrels. Why? Because oilmen, despite all these charges about these fantastic lobbies and so on, are the real rugged individualists in this country who by their speculative enterprise spend many millions of dollars at no cost to the Government and prove up these oil reserves. We have more oil reserves today despite the heaviest demand and the heaviest consumption that we have ever had in the history of the world. It is estimated that we have known reserves which will last about 50 years. In addition to that, we have established pilot plants whereby we have proved beyond a shadow of a doubt

that we can make high-quality gasoline and fuel from coal. There is enough coal to produce all the gasoline and fuel requirements of this Nation for a thousand years to come. So the argument about the lessening reserves falls by the board.

Let us take the second argument—that the Navy is going to maintain these reserves so that in time of emergency they will be available for use. What a fantastic concept of the development of oil. That argument presupposes that all you have to do is go out on a bright, sunny morning and sink a pipe in the ground and lo you will have an oil well producing 500 barrels of crude oil per day. In this day of the atom such a concept is even more absurd.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend and colleague who has done so much to secure the passage of this vital legislation.

Mr. HÉBERT. Will the gentleman inform the House with reference to the oil reserves of the Navy at Elk Hills whether those reserves were developed by the Navy or by a private company, the Standard Oil Co.?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. My information is that those reserves were developed by private interests.

Mr. HÉBERT. And if it had not been for private interests that oil would not have been available for our Navy; is that not correct?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. That is correct.

After all, do you think for one moment, does any Member of the Congress think for one moment, that we would appropriate, let us say, $10,000,000 for exploration for oil by the Navy Department? Of course we would not; and if we did appropriate $10,000,000 to sink oil wells in the Gulf of Mexico or in the Pacific Ocean, think of the congressional investigations that we would have when they brought in dry holes. So the Navy says that they are going to maintain these reserves without drilling a single, solitary oil well. Finally, they are going to do it in the Pacific Ocean or in the Gulf of Mexico, which would be two of the most vulnerable places that you could think of in the event of an attack. I say that that argument is so silly it is ridiculous. Moreover, Mr. Chairman, oil is not granite; it is not coal. It is something that moves; it is fugitive. When you drill a well here the oil in another area may be drained off, so that the so-called preservation of these reserves may not actually be any preservation. It may be drained.

This legislation, Mr. Chairman, is designed to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

From the very inception of the United States of America, it has been consistently recognized that the ownership, control, and development of all lands beneath navigable waters and tidewaters within the respective boundaries of the individual States, together with all natural resources therein was in the States and the people, and that this ownership is a vital part of State sovereignty, preserved for the respective States by the tenth amendment to the Constitution.

On June 23, 1947, the Supreme Court, in a widely discussed decision, United States against California, held that the question of ownership, control, and disposition of these respective resources and lands is inherently within the Federal area of jurisdiction.

The issue involves unlimited amounts of property and resources in our 48 States, inclusive of 65,000 square miles of marginal seas on our three coasts; vast areas on inland navigable streams and lakes, with their fisheries, sponges, and so forth, as well as all resources such as coal, iron, copper, gold, and silver. In Louisiana alone, an estimated total of State revenues obtained so far from oil, gas, and mineral development of State-owned lands, including water bottoms, is over $58,000,000. The development of these submerged lands in the production of oil, gas, and minerals is the result of much long-range planning by all of these States. Louisiana has diligently worked to develop her sulfur industry, oyster culture, and shrimping, all of which have contributed to the prosperity of our State.

To shift ownership and control to the Federal Government would deprive the State of this revenue needed for roads, public works, public welfare, educational institutions, and other essential services.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to settle for once and for all the States' rights to ownership of these lands so that not only may the individual States be lawfully assured jurisdiction over that which is rightfully theirs, but also that an end may be put to endless litigations in this regard. The bill clearly states that—

> Title to and ownership of the lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States, and the natural resources within such lands and waters, and the right and power to control, develop, and use these natural resources in accordance with applicable State law are hereby recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in the respective States, or the persons lawfully entitled thereto under the law as established by the decisions of the respective courts of such States, and the respective grantees, lessees, or successors in interest thereof.

The bill also provides that the United States releases and relinquishes unto said States and persons aforesaid all right, title, and interest of the United States, if any it has, in and to all said lands, improvements, and natural resources, and releases and relinquishes all claims of the United States arising out of any operations pursuant to State authority upon or within said lands and navigable waters.

Enormous sums of money have been spent by the individual States in the development of the natural resources within these lands and waters, and the States have always maintained full powers of ownership and control of these lands, with full authority of the courts of the United States, without interfering with Federal rulings affecting commerce, navigation, or national security.

It should be pointed out that this legislation provides that the United States shall retain control of these lands for purposes of "commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs" (not conflicting with the powers of the States previously granted). This insures the harmonious relationship between the Federal and State Governments affecting matters of our national security.

The Attorney General of the United States, a few weeks ago, indicated that the Government would soon file suits against Louisiana, Texas, and possibly other States. This makes doubly important the immediate passage of this legislation. His statement that this legislation seeks to give away rights vested in the Federal Government is absurd. He knows that prior to the recent California case, the Supreme Court had repeatedly confirmed these rights to the States in a long line of decisions.

The administration bills, which he urged, represent nothing more than cheap politics. A scheme to permit the sharing of these resources by inland States, in order to secure votes for passage of the legislation. Incidentally, Louisiana not being a so-called reclamation State would derive no revenues whatsoever from the so-called reclamation portion.

If Congress fails to enact the tideland legislation sponsored by the State of Louisiana and many others, our State will be done irreparable damage, and its fiscal structure will be hopelessly damaged. I am proud to be one of the sponsors of the legislation being considered here today.

The time has come to halt the spread of Federal bureaucracy into every field of State and community activity. This legislation is a direct challenge to every State and to every Member of Congress, and none should be led astray by the clever barrage of propaganda directed against it by those who have either been deceived by the smoke screen argument of national defense or who are deliberately doing the bidding of the bureaucratic bigwigs.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, it was pointed out by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] that in Boston it would take about 25 percent of the city—and that is true. However, I do not feel that the Federal Government has any claim to tidewater lands in Massachusetts, because we got our charter from King James, the same as Virginia did.

Further than that, in 1747, 200 years before this decision was made, we had a dispute with the State of New Hampshire about our boundary line, and the then King George II was the arbiter. He established the bounds, as far as Massachusetts and New Hampshire were concerned, at the town of Saulsbury and 3 miles out at sea. In 1598, or some date like that, at least before 1600, it was recognized throughout the then world that there was a 3-mile limit. We still have that 3-mile limit.

It seems to me that whether this affects Massachusetts or not, it is my opinion it does not affect either Massachusetts or Maine—but if it affects one State of the Union alone, the other 47 States should come to the rescue of that State and say, "We have the same right under this Constitution that the other States have." I think that is what it rests on.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the Federal Government has grabbed about all the powers it was possible for them to grab, and here is another one they want to get. This is a union of States, and when we entered the Union we brought in all the tidelands with us, and if the Federal Government attempts to take one foot of Massachusetts, whether it is tideland or not, they are violating not only the tenth but the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

So it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that every Member of this Congress who believes in the sovereignty of the States, should vote for this bill. It also seems to me it is about time that the States woke up to the situation that the Federal Government does not do anything for them. It is we who have to put in our money and everything else for the Federal Government, and when we get it back we get it back in percentages of about 40 or 50 percent.

I hope we can go on record here in this body 100 percent in favor of State rights.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] has expired.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a brief general statement concerning H. R. 5380 which I have introduced and which will quitclaim our tidelands and waters to our States.

I am one of those who believe that we should keep our Government close to home. It is my belief that this committee is considering one of the most important questions before the Congress at this time.

I am not a lawyer and I will not attempt to discuss any legal angles concerning this case but common sense tells me that after the Supreme Court ruled 102 years ago that the tidelands belong to the States and since that time this case has been cited with approval by other courts 296 times. The Attorneys General of the United States have followed this ruling made 102 years ago 49 times; the Federal Government has recognized it 30 times by its buying or leasing land from the States; the Department of the Interior recognized it 31 times. Relying upon these decisions and opinions billions of dollars have been invested in these waters and the soil under them. If ever property rights were thought to be settled this was it.

In Texas we have felt secure in our title to our submerged land and all public lands, because when Texas came into the Union in 1845 the question of ownership of the State's public lands was in issue, and the United States Congress expressly agreed that Texas would retain title to these lands. Every Texan is personally interested in this case. Every Texan has some oil and owns some tidelands, because the Texas Legislature has dedicated all mineral revenues from tidelands to the public-school funds of Texas; therefore every Texan receives some benefits in the education of our children and in less direct taxation for school purposes.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to include in this statement three good reasons which justify the outrage that most Texas citizens feel over the attempt of the Federal Government to seize control of our submerged lands in the Gulf of Mexico. These reasons were recently given by Mr. Price Daniel, the attorney general of Texas, and I do not believe that I could improve upon them:

First, this property commonly known as the tidelands was included within the original boundaries of the Republic of Texas. Upon annexation to the United States, Texas reserved all the vacant and unappropriated lands within its boundaries and did not grant or cede any of our submerged lands to the Federal Government. For 100 years these submerged lands have been recognized as the property of the State of Texas. Before our annexation agreement, the Supreme Court of the United States had twice decided that the original Thirteen States and those subsequently admitted upon an equal footing owned all lands beneath the navigable waters within their respective boundaries. By both this established general rule of law and by the special provisions of the annexation agreement, Texas has had every right to believe that our State ownership of submerged lands would be respected and defended by the Federal Government. To deny State ownership and attempt to seize control of these lands and resources after 100 years of State ownership is to destroy the previous general rule of law upon which we were entitled to rely and to reduce our special annexation agreement to a mere scrap of paper.

Secondly, every Texan has a direct and personal interest in continuation of State ownership, because all the revenues from these lands were dedicated many years ago to the public-school fund of Texas. Already these lands have yielded over $25,000,000 to the public schools of Texas. It is certain that they will yield many more millions annually within a few years. If the lands are lost, the taxpayers of Texas will have to make up the millions of dollars which would be taken away from our public schools each year.

Thirdly, practically all Texas citizens believe that the powers and the rights of the Federal Government are limited to those expressly granted to the national sovereign by the Constitution, and that all other rights and powers are reserved by the tenth amendment to the States and to the people. We prefer to resist all attempts of the Federal Government to centralize other rights and powers in Washington at the expense of the States and the people. Federal claims and the decision of the Supreme Court in the California case announce a new theory of inherent Federal rights to control lands and resources even though such rights were not delegated to it by the Constitution and even though the lands are not owned by the Federal Government. It is a new theory of super-Federal powers which, if allowed to stand, would destroy State rights and responsibilities, our whole system of dual State and Federal sovereignties, and cloud the titles of resources beneath private property.

Now, Mr. Chairman, although I am particularly interested as far as Texas is concerned, I am more concerned about the pattern which is developing of our Federal Government taking more and more power unto itself. It is my opinion that we have too much power in Federal Government at this time and that we in Congress should fight every bill which tends to take more and more power from our States. I respectfully urge the Members to favorably consider this legislation, which will quitclaim these lands to the various States.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, unless this Congress passes this bill it will stab the sovereignty of the States in the back and will bleed the States white. By that I mean that this is particularly a matter of State sovereignty, and certainly this Congress should sustain that doctrine.

At the Conference of Governors, held at Salt Lake City, Utah, on July 16, 1947, the following resolution was unanimously passed:

Since the founding of our Nation, the States have exercised sovereignty over the tidelands, the submerged lands, including the soil under navigable inland waters and soils under all navigable waters within their territorial jurisdiction, whether inland or not.

Under the common law and civil law, the States' sovereignty and authority over and title to said lands has been long acknowledged, affirmed, and respected by the Federal Government, whose only powers were expressly delegated to it by the States at the time of the formation of our Government.

The States did not delegate unto the Federal Government authority or power over or title to said lands, but retained same to and for the States.

The recent decision of the Supreme Court did not decide the question of ownership of tidewater lands, but it did cast a cloud on the States' title to said lands and upon the oil and other minerals beneath, and it is apparent from the decision that the Court did recognize the ownership of tidewater lands as being a question for the Congress to decide and pass upon.

The title to the tidelands and submerged lands of the States is clouded by this decision and the language therein is so broad as to be extendable to the soil under navigable inland waters and soils under the navigable waters within the territory or jurisdiction of the States, and even to other minerals or important elements on or beneath the soil of the States.

Certainly this cloud of uncertainty and confusion can be removed by the passage of this bill by the Congress and it is therefore the duty of Congress to clarify this situation which is of national importance and for the welfare of its citizens.

The passage of this measure will do no State any harm but will benefit every State having a shoreline.

Article I of the Constitution of the State of Florida, adopted in 1885, sets

forth the boundaries as they exist today. The Florida Constitution, article I, provides:

The boundaries of the State of Florida shall be as follows: Commencing at the mouth of the River Perdido; from thence up the middle of said river to where it intersects the south boundary line of the State of Alabama, and the thirty-first degree of north latitude; thence due east to the Chattahoochee River; thence down the middle of said river to its confluence with the Flint River; thence straight to the head of the St. Marys River; thence down the middle of said river to the Atlantic Ocean; thence southeastwardly along the coast to the edge of the Gulf Stream; then southwestwardly along the edge of the Gulf Stream and Florida reefs to, and including the Tortugas Islands; thence northeastwardly to a point 3 leagues from the mainland; thence northwestwardly 3 leagues from the land to a point west of the mouth of the Perdido River; thence to the place of beginning.

Under our laws the management of the tidelands is vested in a governing board designated the Trustees of the Internal Improvement Fund of the State of Florida. Since approximately 1853 the administration of the submerged lands of Florida, both inland and coastal, have been administered by said trustees.

They have leased these lands for the removal of oyster and coquina shell, lime rock, salt, seaweed, precious metals, and buried treasure. Other lands have been leased for public ports, docks, seaplane runways, oyster farms, and so forth. Recently lands have been leased for oil exploration, and the Supreme Court of Florida has upheld the legality of such action.

You can see, therefore, that millions of dollars have been invested in projects along the coast line, and vested rights have been acquired. Also millions of dollars have been expended in filling in land and extending the low watermark outward into the sea, and on such land costly buildings have been constructed.

Thus, you can see how the people holding vested rights might become affected and disturbed unless this bill is passed, which would quiet the title to each and every vested-right holder.

It is my opinion that the decision of the Supreme Court has assigned the province of settling this tidelands question to the Congress, and I am sure that the passage of this bill by Congress will be unanimously approved by the Supreme Court of the United States in the event the question should ever be brought before the Supreme Court for another decision.

In conclusion I desire to congratulate the Governor of my State, the Honorable Millard Caldwell, who was a former Member of this House, for the convincing, lucid, and forceful statement before the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary who held hearings on this bill. It is difficult for anyone to read this statement of Governor Caldwell and not favor the passage of this bill.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The State of Florida has 5,277 statute miles of shore line affected by this decision.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 5992 is an important piece of legislation to all the Members of this House and particularly those who live in the Great Lakes area. Every one of the Great Lakes except Lake Michigan is international boundary water and affected by the decision in the so-called California case.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. POULSON. Are there any oil wells in the gentleman's area?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes; I am coming to that.

Michigan, at the present time is an oil-producing State. To show how widespread and how far the effect of the California decision has gone, an applicant for an oil well lease has refused to apply to the authorities of the State of Michigan but has come to Washington and has made his application to the Department of the Interior. No longer does Michigan have control over the marginal lands on Lake Michigan.

Not only has the decision thrown great doubt and clouded the title to marginal land on the shores of the ocean but also of the Great Lakes, they too are involved. My State has invested millions of dollars in works and improvements along the shores of the Great Lakes. I might say to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] that Michigan like his State has some 1,700 miles of coast line that are affected by the California decision. I wonder whether the Federal Government under the California decision owns the title to the land under those improvements? At the present time along the Detroit River, which is an international boundary line, private investment is taking minerals from under the bed of the Detroit River.

I wonder whether under this decision they have any further right to do so under our State law. Must they now apply to the Federal Government for permission to take out such mineral? Even though the statement is made that the Federal Government is only interested in oil, I am not sure, as I read the decision, that it does not apply to other minerals as well as oil. Therefore, this creates great doubt and confusion in industry and the municipalities, private citizens and the States themselves.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. If this is applied to oil it can be made to apply to the fisheries and to every other right that the people of the States have.

Mr. DONDERO. The decision seriously invades the sovereignty of the States. The bill now before the House is to restore that sovereignty. I am heartily in favor of the passage of this bill and I hope it passes this House without a dissenting vote.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BRADLEY. May I express to the gentleman the very great thanks of California, especially of my own city of Long Beach, for his great courtesy and the courtesy of the other gentlemen who have spoken in favor of this just legislation.

Mr. DONDERO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I was going to suggest that this bill primarily effects the bottom of the sea or lake and does not deal with the water. The fish migrate anywhere in the ocean or in the lake.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The point I was making about that is this decision, if carried to its logical conclusion, might interfere with the rights of the people to the fishing grounds along these coasts.

Mr. DONDERO. It might also interfere with all buildings and structures which have already been erected along the seacoasts of the country and the Great Lakes.

Mr. RANKIN. I raised the question whether or not the States have a right to enforce their own laws in the area, too.

Mr. DONDERO. Yes. It throws great doubt and confusion over the entire matter.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. POULSON. The point I wanted to bring up when I asked the gentleman the question a few minutes ago was the fact that this is not strictly an oil bill. This is a bill which covers a problem far greater than the fact that there happens to be oil along a small part of the California coast.

Mr. DONDERO. This bill is of as much importance to the people of the country as the California decision has been disastrous in confusing the rights of the people of the various States.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I want to confirm what my colleague from California [Mr. BRADLEY] said about the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of my committee, in giving his time and his attention to helping this bill to pass. In reference to the oil question along the coast of California, of the 2,800 statute miles affected only 15 miles of that is oil-bearing land according to present known researches.

Mr. DONDERO. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I believe now as I have always believed that these lands belong to all of the States that touch the water. I want to put into the RECORD one thing, however, and that is that the State of Texas stands on a little different footing from any other State.

In 1845 we were admitted into the Union as a State, retaining all of our public domain, and the metes and bounds of Texas as a republic we interpret are the boundaries of the State of Texas today. The first Congress of the Texas Republic in 1836 passed this law fixing the boundaries of the State of Texas with reference to the tidelands, quote:

> Beginning at the mouth of the Sabine River, and running west along the Gulf of Mexico 3 leagues from land, to the mouth of the Rio Grande.

That means that Texas was admitted into the Union under this agreement and that we claim as the property of the State of Texas not 3 miles but 3 leagues or 10½ miles.

Our title to 10½ miles of water in the Gulf of Mexico is as definite and as valid, in my opinion, as the inland public domain about which there can be and is no question.

I simply wanted this record to show that if this matter comes up at a later date, that we assert that that is our boundary—10½ miles offshore.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, when the American Colonies won their independence from England, they won it as a federation of States, and all the rights won, including boundaries and properties, were reserved to the individual Colonies until such time as some of these rights were ceded to the Federal Government for the purpose of effecting the United States. When the Constitution was adopted, the various States gave to the Federal Government the right to regulate commerce, both foreign and between the various States. This, of course, gave them the right to control the navigable waters in the several States, but no title to the lands or minerals under these waters or any indication of ceding them to the Federal Government was ever made by the States.

The principle of the State's ownership of submerged lands, both under the inland waters and under the sea to the extent of the 3-mile limit, has been affirmed again and again by both the State and Federal courts. In fact, I am informed that this principle has been enunciated in 244 State and Federal cases and has been affirmed 52 times by the Supreme Court itself. Twice in recent years, because of the question raised, the Congress has passed acts affirming the title of these lands in the States—once in the Seventy-sixth Congress and again in the Seventy-ninth Congress. Both of these acts were vetoed by the President. To further confuse the issue, the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of the United States of America against the State of California, rendered June 23, 1947, Justice Black, in expressing the majority opinion of the Court, states that "qualified ownership of lands under inland navigable waters such as rivers, harbors, and even tidelands down to the low-water mark" was retained in the States.

In using the term, "qualified ownership," this opinion clearly casts a cloud on all the lands under navigable streams, bays, and beach property extending beyond the low-water mark. Inasmuch as millions of dollars worth of property has been developed along the waterways of the States and on the beaches of the States, both for commercial and recreational purposes, the rights of individual citizens is by indirection involved and the titles to their properties in some instances, at least, questioned. The Honorable J. Strom Thurmond, the Governor of South Carolina, in testifying before the Senate committee, stated that approximately 265,000 acres of tidelands were involved on the South Carolina coast, and approximately 450,000 acres of lands under inland waters and bays were involved. All told, a clear title to nearly three-quarters of a million acres of lands will be lost to my State and its citizens unless this bill passes—lands that the State has owned without question for more than 150 years.

Section 2038 of the 1942 Code of Laws for South Carolina states that—

> On the east the State is bounded by the Atlantic Ocean from the mouth of the Savannah River to the northern boundary near the mouth of Little River, including all islands.

Section 3300 of the same code says:

> The waters and bottoms of the bays, rivers, creeks, and marshes within the State or within 3 miles of any point along the low-water mark on the coast thereof.

Our State court has ruled that—

> The jurisdiction of the State extends into the ocean for as much as 3 miles.

Thus, by the treaty following the Revolutionary War, by judicial interpretation, and by legislative action, that part of the marginal lands under the sea within 3 miles of the low-water mark along the coast or the islands adjacent thereto is included within the boundaries of the State of South Carolina. The same principles, of course, apply to the other States in the Union. The decision of the Supreme Court last year not only casts a cloud upon the title of the State to submerged lands, but it also casts a cloud upon the rights of the State to regulate the fishing industries, including the shrimping and oyster industry. In my State, the authority of the Tax Commission to license fishermen and fishing boats has already been questioned, and probably will be questioned again if the decision of the Supreme Court is allowed to stand. This will cause a loss of considerable revenue in my State, as well as the authority to protect a great many of its natural resources.

The matter is a very serious one and in order to protect the rights of the State and the individual rights of its citizens, this legislation should be passed by an overwhelming vote.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States of America, recognizing—

(a) that the several States, and the others as hereinafter mentioned, since July 4, 1776, or since their formation and admission to the Union, have exercised full powers of ownership of all lands beneath navigable waters within their respective boundaries and all natural resources within such lands and waters, and full control of said natural resources, with the full acquiescence and approval of the United States and in accordance with many pronouncements of the Supreme Court and decisions of the executive departments of the Federal Government that such lands and resources were vested in the respective States as an incident to State sovereignty and that the exercise of such powers of ownership and control has not in the past impaired or interfered with and will not impair or interfere with the exercise by the Federal Government of its constitutional powers in relation to said lands and navigable waters and to the control and regulation of commerce, navigation, national defense, and international relations; and

(b) that the several States, their subdivisions, and persons lawfully acting pursuant to State authority have expended enormous sums of money on improving and reclaiming said lands and in developing the natural resources in said lands and waters in full reliance upon the validity of their titles; and

(c) that a recent decision of the Supreme Court held that the Federal Government has certain paramount powers with respect to a portion of said lands without reaffirming or settling the ultimate question of ownership of such lands and resources, but said decision recognizes that the question of the ownership and control of said lands and natural resources, is within the "congressional area of national power" and that Congress will not execute its powers "in such way as to bring about injustices to States, their subdivisions, or persons acting pursuant to their permission";

it is hereby determined and declared to be in the public interest that title to and ownership of the lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States, and the natural resources within such lands and waters, and the right and power to control, develop, and use the said natural resources in accordance with applicable State law be, and they are hereby, recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in the respective States or the persons lawfully entitled thereto under the law as established by the decisions of the respective courts of such States, and the respective grantees, lessees, or successors in interest thereof; and the United States hereby release and relinquishes unto said States and persons aforesaid all right, title, and interest of the United States, if any it has, in and to all said lands, improvement, and natural resources, and releases and relinquishes all claims of the United States, if any it has, arising out of any operations of said States or persons pursuant to State authority upon or within said lands and navigable waters: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this act shall affect the use, development, improvement, and control by or under the authority of the United States of said lands and waters for the purposes of navigation or flood control or the production or distribution of power, or be construed as the release or relinquishment

of any rights of the United States arising under the authority of Congress to regulate or improve navigation or to provide for flood control or the production or distribution of power.

SEC. 2. As used in this act—

(a) the term "lands beneath navigable waters" includes (1) all lands within the boundaries of each of the respective States which were covered by waters navigable under the laws of the United States, at the time such State became a member of the Union, and all lands permanently or periodically covered by tidal waters up to but not above the line of mean high tide and seaward to a line three geographical miles distant from the coast line of each such State and to the boundary line of each such State where in any case such boundary, as it existed at the time such State became a member of the Union, or as heretofore or hereafter approved by Congress, extends seaward (or into the Great Lakes or Gulf of Mexico) beyond three geographical miles, and (2) all lands formerly beneath navigable waters, as herein defined, which have been filled or reclaimed; the term "boundaries" includes the seaward boundaries of a State or its boundaries in the Gulf of Mexico or any of the Great Lakes as they existed at the time such State became a member of the Union, or as heretofore or hereafter approved by the Congress, or as extended or confirmed pursuant to section 3 hereof;

(b) the term "coast line" means the line of ordinary low water along that portion of the coast which is in direct contact with the open sea and the line marking the seaward limit of all estuaries, ports, harbors, bays, straits, and sounds, and all other bodies of water which are landward of the open sea;

(c) the terms "grantees" and "lessees" include (without limiting the generality thereof) all political subdivisions, municipalities, and persons holding grants or leases from a State to lands beneath navigable waters if such grants or leases were issued in accordance with the constitution, statutes, and decisions of the courts of the State in which such lands are situated; and the term "person" shall include corporations, partnerships, and associations;

(d) the term "natural resources" shall not include water power or the use of water for the production of power;

(e) the term "lands beneath navigable waters" shall not include the beds of streams in lands now or heretofore constituting a part of the public lands of the United States if such streams were not meandered in connection with the public survey of such lands under the laws of the United States.

SEC. 3. Any State which has not already done so may extend its seaward boundaries (or its boundaries in the Great Lakes) to a line three geographical miles distant from its coastline. Any claim heretofore or hereafter asserted either by constitutional provision, statute, or otherwise, indicating the intent of a State to extend its boundaries to a line three geographical miles distant from its coastline is hereby approved and confirmed, without prejudice to its claim, if any it has, that its boundaries extend beyond that line.

SEC. 4. There is excepted from the operation of the first section of this act—

(a) all lands and resources therein or improvements thereon which have been lawfully acquired by the United States from any State or from any person in whom title had vested under the decisions of the courts of such State, or their respective grantees, or successors in interest, by cession, grant, quitclaim, or condemnation, or from any other owner or owners thereof by conveyance or by condemnation, provided such owner or owners had lawfully acquired the title to such lands and resources in accordance with the statutes or decisions of the courts of the State in which the lands are located; and

(b) such lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States and such interests therein as the United States is lawfully entitled to under the law as established by the decisions of the courts of the State in which the land is situated, or which are held by the United States in trust for the benefit of any tribe, band, or group of Indians or for individual Indians.

SEC. 5. (a) The United States retains all its powers of regulation and control of said lands and navigable waters for the purposes of commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs except those rights to the ownership, use, development and control of the lands and natural resources, which are specifically recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in the respective States and others by the first section of this act.

(b) In time of war or when necessary for national defense, and the Congress or the President shall so prescribe, the United States shall have the right of first refusal to purchase at the prevailing market price, all or any portion of the said natural resources, or to acquire and use any portion of said lands by proceeding in accordance with due process of law and paying just compensation therefor.

SEC. 6. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to affect the determination by legislation or judicial decree of any issues between the United States and the respective States relating to the ownership or control of that portion of the subsoil and sea bed of the Continental Shelf lying seaward and outside of the area of lands beneath navigable waters, described in section 2 hereof.

SEC. 7. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to amend, modify or repeal the acts of July 26, 1866 (14 Stat. 251), July 3, 1870 (16 Stat. 217), March 3, 1877 (19 Stat. 377), and June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

Mr. REED of Illinois (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and printed in the RECORD at this point, and that it be open to amendment at any point thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments?

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REED of Illinois: On page 1, line 9, after the word "resources", insert the words "including fish and other marine life."

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment at the request of several Members who come from States with extensive fishing industries. Likewise, many members of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries have urged its insertion. The amendment simply adds after the word "resources" the words "including fish and other marine life." It is merely clarifying, and makes for certain that the word "resources" does include fish and marine life. I have conferred with majority and minority members of the committee. There is no objection to its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the Chair, Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5992) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, pursuant to House Resolution 548, he reported the bill to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 257, nays 29, answered "present" 3, not voting 141, as follows:

[Roll No. 54]

YEAS—257

Abernethy	Dawson, Utah	Jenison
Allen, Calif.	Delaney	Jensen
Allen, La.	Devitt	Johnson, Calif.
Anderson, Calif.	D'Ewart	Johnson, Ill.
Andresen, August H.	Dolliver	Johnson, Tex.
	Domengeaux	Jones, Ala.
Andrews, N. Y.	Dondero	Jones, N. C.
Angell	Donohue	Jones, Wash.
Arends	Doughton	Jonkman
Barrett	Elliott	Judd
Bates, Ky.	Ellis	Kean
Bates, Mass.	Ellsworth	Kearns
Beall	Elsaesser	Kee
Beckworth	Engel, Mich.	Kersten, Wis.
Bennett, Mich.	Fellows	Kilday
Bishop	Fenton	King
Blackney	Fernandez	Knutson
Bland	Fisher	Kunkel
Bloom	Flannagan	Landis
Boggs, Del.	Fletcher	Lane
Boggs, La.	Fogarty	Larcade
Bolton	Foote	Latham
Bradley	Fuller	Lea
Bramblett	Gamble	LeCompte
Brehm	Gary	LeFevre
Brooks	Gathings	Lemke
Brown, Ga.	Gavin	Lodge
Brown, Ohio	Gearhart	Love
Bryson	Gillette	Lucas
Buffett	Goff	Lusk
Bulwinkle	Goodwin	Lyle
Burke	Gossett	McConnell
Burleson	Gregory	McCulloch
Butler	Griffiths	McDonough
Byrnes, Wis.	Gwynne, Iowa	McDowell
Camp	Hagen	McGarvey
Cannon	Hale	McGregor
Case, N. J.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	McMahon
Chadwick		McMillan, S. C.
Chelf	Hall, Leonard W.	McMillen, Ill.
Chiperfield		Mack
Church	Halleck	MacKinnon
Clark	Hand	Macy
Clason	Hardy	Mahon
Clevenger	Harness, Ind.	Maloney
Cole, Kans.	Harris	Martin, Iowa
Cole, N. Y.	Hart	Mason
Combs	Havenner	Meyer
Cooper	Hays	Michener
Cotton	Hébert	Miller, Conn.
Cox	Herter	Miller, Md.
Cravens	Heselton	Miller, Nebr.
Crawford	Hinshaw	Mills
Cunningham	Hoeven	Morris
Curtis	Hoffman	Morrison
Davis, Ga.	Holifield	Muh'enberg
Davis, Tenn.	Holmes	Mundt
Davis, Wis.	Horan	Murray, Tenn.

Nicholson	Riehlman	Talle
Nixon	Riley	Teague
Norblad	Rogers, Fla.	Thomas, Tex.
Norrell	Rogers, Mass.	Thompson
O'Hara	Rohrbough	Tibbott
O'Konski	Rooney	Tollefson
O'Toole	Ross	Towe
Pace	Russell	Trimble
Passman	Sadlak	Twyman
Patterson	St. George	Van Zandt
Peden	Sarbacher	Vinson
Peterson	Sasscer	Vorys
Philbin	Schwabe, Okla.	Wadsworth
Phillips, Calif.	Scrivner	Walter
Pickett	Seely-Brown	Weichel
Plumley	Shafer	Welch
Poage	Simpson, Ill.	Wheeler
Potter	Simpson, Pa.	Whitten
Poulson	Smathers	Whittington
Preston	Smith, Kans.	Wigglesworth
Priest	Smith, Wis.	Wilson, Tex.
Rankin	Snyder	Winstead
Rayburn	Stefan	Wolcott
Reed, Ill.	Stevenson	Wolverton
Reed, N. Y.	Stigler	Wood
Rees	Stockman	Woodruff
Reeves	Stratton	Worley
Regan	Sundstrom	Youngblood
Richards	Taber	

NAYS—29

Andersen, H. Carl	Fulton	McCormack
Bakewell	Gordon	Madden
Blatnik	Granger	Marcantonio
Buchanan	Huber	Murray, Wis.
Chapman	Hull	O'Brien
Cooley	Jackson, Wash.	Powell
Dawson, Ill.	Javits	Price, Ill.
Eberharter	Karsten, Mo.	Sabath
Feighan	Keating	Spence
	Kelley	Whitaker

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Evins	Folger	Lanham

NOT VOTING—141

Abbitt	Gillie	Miller, Calif.
Albert	Gore	Mitchell
Allen, Ill.	Gorski	Monroney
Andrews, Ala.	Graham	Morgan
Arnold	Grant, Ala.	Morton
Auchincloss	Grant, Ind.	Multer
Banta	Gross	Murdock
Barden	Gwinn, N. Y.	Nodar
Battle	Harless, Ariz.	Norton
Bell	Harrison	Owens
Bender	Hartley	Patman
Bennett, Mo.	Harvey	Pfeifer
Bonner	Hedrick	Phillips, Tenn.
Boykin	Heffernan	Ploeser
Brophy	Hendricks	Potts
Buck	Hess	Price, Fla.
Buckley	Hill	Rains
Busbey	Hobbs	Ramey
Byrne, N. Y.	Hope	Redden
Canfield	Isacson	Rich
Carroll	Jackson, Calif.	Rivers
Carson	Jarman	Rizley
Case, S. Dak.	Jenkins, Ohio	Robertson
Celler	Jenkins, Pa.	Rockwell
Chenoweth	Jennings	Sadowski
Clippinger	Johnson, Ind.	Sanborn
Coffin	Johnson, Okla.	Schwabe, Mo.
Cole, Mo.	Kearney	Scoblick
Colmer	Keefe	Scott, Hardie
Corbett	Kefauver	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Coudert	Kennedy	Sheppard
Courtney	Keogh	Short
Crosser	Kerr	Sikes
Crow	Kilburn	Smith, Maine
Dague	Kirwan	Smith, Ohio
Deane	Klein	Smith, Va.
Dingell	Lesinski	Somers
Dirksen	Lewis	Stanley
Dorn	Lichtenwalter	Taylor
Douglas	Ludlow	Thomas, N. J.
Durham	Lynch	Vail
Eaton	McCowen	Vursell
Elston	Manasco	West
Engle, Calif.	Mansfield	Williams
Fallon	Mathews	Wilson, Ind.
Forand	Meade, Ky.	
Gallagher	Meade, Md.	
Garmatz	Merrow	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hedrick for, with Mr. Forand against.

Mr. Patman for, with Mr. Folger against.

Mr. Price of Florida for, with Mr. Hobbs against.

Mr. Redden for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Albert for, with Mrs. Douglas against.

Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Arnold of Missouri for, with Mr. Sadowski against.

Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Gore against.

Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. Isacson against.

Mr. Harvey for, with Mr. Lanham against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Lesinski against.

Mr. Engle of California for, with Mr. Morgan against.

Mr. Sikes for, with Mr. Gorski against.

Mr. Fallon for, with Mrs. Norton against.

Mr. Graham for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Kennedy against.

Mr. Stanley for, with Mr. Kirwan against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Hardie Scott with Mr. Williams.

Mrs. Smith of Maine with Mr. West.

Mr. Bennett of Missouri with Mr. Dorn.

Mr. Dague with Mr. Deane.

Mr. Eaton with Mr. Bonner.

Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Garmatz.

Mr. Kilburn with Mr. Courtney.

Mr. Rich with Mr. Durham.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Meade of Maryland.

Mr. Mathews with Mr. Byrne of New York.

Mr. Busbey with Mr. Carroll.

Mr. Taylor with Mr. Rains.

Mr. Rockwell with Mr. Heffernan.

Mr. Allen of Illinois with Mr. Battle.

Mr. Rizley with Mr. Grant of Alabama.

Mr. Coudert with Mr. Harrison.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Ludlow.

Mr. Lichtenwalter with Mr. Manasco.

Mr. Short with Mr. Crosser.

Mr. Carson with Mr. Boykin.

Mr. Dirksen with Mr. Mansfield.

Mr. Schwabe of Missouri with Mr. Buckley.

Mr. Jenkins of Ohio with Mr. Sheppard.

Mr. Sanborn with Mr. Rivers.

Mr. Elston with Mr. Pfeifer.

Mr. Kearney with Mr. Colmer.

Mr. Chenoweth with Mr. Lynch.

Mr. Coffin with Mr. Somers.

Mr. Cole of Missouri with Mr. Harless of Arizona.

Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Jarman.

Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., with Mr. Kefauver.

Mr. Gillie with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.

Mr. Grant of Indiana with Mr. Abbitt.

Mr. Bender with Mr. Barden.

Mr. Jennings with Mr. Murdock.

Mr. Gross with Mr. Monroney.

Mr. Meade of Kentucky with Mr. Multer.

Mr. Morton with Mr. Hendricks.

Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Kerr.

Mr. Brophy with Mr. Andrews of Alabama.

Mr. Gwinn of New York with Mr. Bell.

Mr. McCowen with Mr. Smith of Virginia.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Texas, Mr. PATMAN. If he were present, he would vote "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HARVEY. If he were present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at the point following my remarks in general debate and to include two communications referred to by me at that time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN (at the request of Mr. PHILLIPS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include some material about William Tyler Page.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

HATS OFF TO MR. TABER

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, under the heading "Hands Off, Mr. TABER," a Washington paper yesterday morning paid a high compliment to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, which I do not think should go unnoticed on this floor. It was not intended to be a compliment.

The editorial said—and I quote:

> The interest manifested by Chairman TABER of the House Appropriations Committee in Administrator Hoffman's plans for allocation of ECA funds is decidedly perturbing.

Mr. Speaker, I want the House to think of that carefully. The chairman of the House Appropriations Committee is by his position required to investigate, through the several subcommittees, every expenditure, every appropriation. That is what that committee is expected and required to do.

We were furnished with a great deal of information, and a great many figures, while the ERP bill was on the floor of this House. The most outstanding characteristic of these figures and alleged facts was their inadequacy, probably their inaccuracy. I can only point out the article in the Wall Street Journal of a few days ago which said that "The figures furnished during the discussion on the European recovery plan were educated guesses," or words to that effect.

I also call attention to the fact that one analyst, attempting to get the authority for certain figures, was advised from abroad that the information would not be available until June 1.

I rise today to ask how Mr. Hoffman knew so much about these figures so soon after he had been sworn in. The newspaper said:

> Mr. Hoffman has not even had time to check and revise these estimates.

Yet Mr. Hoffman has already been on the Hill before the committee, and has been quoted as saying that $5,300,000,000 is not adequate.

The editorial adds that—

> The major danger suggested by Mr. TABER's probing activities is the possibility that he will use the information placed at his disposal to work out some plan of his own for distributing ECA funds, or attach conditions to the utilization that would tie the hands of the Administrator and impair the effectiveness of the recovery program.

In other words, the only program which would satisfy the people who have been responsible for this deception upon the citizens of both America and Europe, would be the blank check policy with which we were so unhappily familiar from 1932 until January 1947.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices, which has before it the budget for the Veterans' Administration, the Atomic Energy Commission, and 29 other agencies of the Government, I can report that a somewhat similar situation occurred before that committee a year ago. The Atomic Energy Commission, with Mr. Lilienthal and his colleagues as newly appointed commissioners, came before that subcommittee and frankly said that they did not have adequate information upon which to give the committee the figures they felt the committee should have. We extended the time, gave them partial appropriations, and contract authorizations, and in every way that Commission has attempted to cooperate with the Committee on Appropriations. I can only say again, that this type of criticism should be regarded as a great compliment, both to Mr. TABER and to Congress. The caption should have been "Hats Off to Mr. TABER!"

RECESS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Chair to declare a recess at any time this afternoon subject to the call of the Chair.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there is pending in the Senate at the present time the extension of title VI of FHA. That title expires at midnight tonight, and some action must be taken by this House, if it is to be continued, when the Senate concludes its deliberations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

STEEL SCRAP

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, you have heard me frequently allude here on the floor to the overriding importance of replenishing the country's depleted supply of steel scrap to knock down the black markets and bolster our national defense.

Our Black Markets Investigating Committee 6 weeks ago wrote Secretaries Marshall and Forrestal and Admiral Smith, of the Maritime Commission, inquiring as to whether it was not entirely feasible to use our ships returning empty after delivering relief abroad to bring back the steel scrap that is lying in the destroyed Ruhr section of Germany. This possibility has been apparent for well over a year.

After pressing our suggestion steadily for a month, a hearing was held before our subcommittee less than a fortnight ago to which were called the most expert authorities in the steel trade and in those Government departments especially concerned. Every contention made by our committee was fully substantiated, and I am now happy to report that this morning's papers record that an intergovernmental body has now been set up to accomplish just exactly what our committee recommended.

This again proves the value of a congressional committee of inquiry in that it has wide power to acquire information with great speed, present the facts to the public, and make recommendations accordingly. So our Committee on Black Markets focused upon the basic commodity—steel—and found its way directly to the core of the trouble. Obviously the remedy lies in translating what apparently all authorities are now agreed upon into action, and we shall call further hearings to make certain that such action does take place, and with all possible speed.

PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpenaed to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify on Monday, May 3, 1948, at 10 a. m., in the case of the United States against Albert Maltz, which is a congressional contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this supbena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I, therefore, submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpena.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

> DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT
>
> THE UNITED STATES *v.* ALBERT MALTZ, DEFENDANT NO. 1354–47, CRIMINAL DOCKET
>
> The President of the United States to Congressman JOHN MCDOWELL, of Pennsylvania, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
>
> You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday, the 3d day of May 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and not depart the court without leave thereof.
>
> Witness the honorable chief justice of said court, the 27th day of April A. D. 1948.
>
> HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk*,
> By MARGARET W. BOSWELL,
> *Deputy Clerk*.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 568) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> Whereas Representative JOHN MCDOWELL, a Member of this House, has been served with a subpena to appear as a witness before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify at 10 a. m., on the 3d day of May 1948, in the case of the *United States* v. *Albert Maltz*, Criminal Docket No. 1354–47; and
>
> Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify, but by order of the House: Therefore
>
> *Resolved*, That Representative JOHN MCDOWELL is authorized to appear in response to the subpena of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia at such time as when the House is not sitting in session; and be it further
>
> *Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena of said court.

The resolution was agreed to.

REGISTRATION OF COMMUNISTS

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to register my whole-hearted approval of the statement made by Senator FERGUSON, of Michigan, yesterday to the effect that there are ample laws now on our statute books to permit the Attorney General to bring a test case into the courts so that it can be determined legally once and for all whether the Communist Party is a political party or a foreign conspiracy. I have long felt that that is the approach that should be made to the problem, that we should have that legal determination before we are called upon to vote on legislation that would require the registration of all Communists. It seems rather inconsistent when in one statute we recognize the Communist Party as a political party and recognize it in Federal elections, and in another statute we say that membership in the Communist Party is ample reason for the discharge of a Federal employee. I hope a case can be brought into courts and a legal determination made. At the present time, without such a determination, I certainly could not bring myself to vote for legislation that required the registration of members of the Communist Party, because there is always the danger that the next week we might be asked to require the Republicans and the Democrats to register likewise.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD regarding the amendment to the GI bill of rights just reported unanimously by the Committee on World War Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. McDOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Baltimore Sun entitled "On Sticking to the Facts in the Condon Matter."

Mr. RIEHLMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DEVITT (at the request of Mr. LODGE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by General Bradley.

HON. JOHN SANBORN

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I think this House should know that the absence of our friend the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. SANBORN] is due to the fact that he is on his way to Vermont to observe with his mother the one hundredth anniversary of her birth. We should congratulate both of them upon the fact that they are alive and in Vermont.

JACK KROLL

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the following statement about the Representative of the Second District of Georgia was contained in the April 28, 1948, issue of the alleged newspaper PM:

KROLL DENIES CHARGES HE IS AN ALIEN

(Washington Bureau)

Jack Kroll, chairman of the CIO Political Action Committee, charges that Representative E. E. Cox was lying when Cox stated Monday that Kroll had registered with the Justice Department as an alien.

Cox said that Kroll, born in England in 1885, had never even applied for citizenship and was actually registered as an alien in 1946.

The facts, Kroll said, were that he was brought to this country as an infant and that his father, Marks Kroll, was naturalized 5 years later. Under then existing naturalization laws, Kroll also attained citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, ordinarily I would hesitate to dignify with notice an intemperate attack which appeared only in this uptown edition of the Daily Worker and which also received similar attention in the Communist Daily Worker itself. However, since a statement I made to this House earlier in the week has been brought into question, I want to set forth the facts.

Mr. Kroll says I was lying when I said that he had registered with the Justice Department as an alien. I will not stoop to return the compliment. I merely repeat that he did so register and the records of the Alien Registration Division of the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice will bear me out, if President Truman will make the record available to this House.

Mr. Kroll also said in his answer to my charges that I made other statements I knew to be false. This, of course, is untrue.

Whatever I had to say about Mr. Kroll, his citizenship status and his CIO Political Action Committee was based upon a careful analysis of the facts and evidence available to me and was said only after I gave due consideration to all the circumstances.

When I said last Monday that Jack Kroll had been in this country for 50 years and has not applied for citizenship, I was making a true statement based upon the record.

Mr. Kroll contends that he became a citizen when a man by the name of Marks Kroll was naturalized. He claims that Marks Kroll was his father.

Now, it is true that one Marks Kroll became a citizen in Rochester, N. Y., in 1891, but there are no records to show that he was ever married or that he had a son named Jack.

In fact, although dozens of Krolls resided in Rochester over the years, there is no record of any Jack Kroll ever having lived there. There were some John Krolls, but they were all born in the United States, and Mr. Jack Kroll admits that he was not born in this country.

It is quite possible and even probable that Jack Kroll is the Jacob Kroll who resided in Rochester in the late nineties and early nineteen hundreds.

But Jacob Kroll's father was not named Marks Kroll, according to the records. Jacob Kroll's father was Max Kroll.

The record shows that Max Kroll was born in Russia and that Jacob Kroll was born in England. These facts coincided with what is known of Mr. Kroll's history and antecedents.

There is no question in my mind that this official record concerns Mr. Jack Kroll's family.

I have here in my hand a certified copy of a transcript from the New York State census record of 1892, which lists the Kroll family in which we are interested. The father's name is listed as Max. The name of an 8-year-old boy—which corresponds to Mr. Jack Kroll's age at that time—is listed as Jacob.

Remember this census was taken in the year following the naturalization of a certain Marks Kroll. In fact, even in the same year that Marks Kroll became a citizen, Jacob Kroll's father was listed in the Rochester city directory as Max Kroll.

Now, either Mr. Jack Kroll is wrong in his statements or the official records of Monroe County in the courthouse at Rochester, N. Y., are wrong.

I wonder if Mr. Jack Kroll's claim to citizenship is as authentic as the information given the census taker by one who appears to be his brother Isadore, who claimed—and the certified record bears this out—that he was born in the United States 15 years before his parents came to this country.

There may be a very simple explanation of the inconsistencies in Mr. Kroll's claims. It may be that Jacob Kroll just assumed a new name and has been calling himself Jack Kroll.

It may be that his father, in his fifty-third year, changed his name from Marks to Max and kept that name for the rest of his lifetime and that now his son, Mr. Jack Kroll, is changing it back again.

But if this is true, if Max Kroll was the Marks Kroll who became a citizen in 1891, and Mr. Jack Kroll knew this as he claims, then why did Mr. Jack Kroll register with the Department of Justice as an alien?

If Mr. Kroll contends that my characterization of him as an alien is wrong and that, in spite of the record and the facts, he is actually a citizen, then Mr. Kroll should set the record straight.

He should tell us if his name is Jack or Jacob.

He should tell us if his father's name was Marks or Max.

In his statement to the newspapers Mr. Jack Kroll claims to be a "damn sight better Democrat" than I am because he says in matters before this House I sometimes voted as the Republican Members voted.

I have always cast my vote as an American in what I considered to be the best interests of our whole people. That is the way every good Democrat votes and I have no apologies to make for any vote I ever cast. But Mr. Kroll would not understand that.

Mr. Kroll claims to be a Democrat and yet his statement filed with the Department of Justice, where he registered as an alien, shows that in his early years he voted the Socialist ticket. Back in his early years the Socialist Party comprised the same Marxist elements who today are the Communist Party.

In fact, Earl Browder, just a few years ago when he was the head of the Communist Party, told the National Press Club in Washington:

The program of the Socialist Party and the program of the Communist Party have a common origin in the document known as the Communist manifesto. There is no difference in final aim.

I need not dwell on the "final aim" of the Communist Party or the Socialist Party—they both want to destroy our American system of society and government—they both want to destroy the United States under the Constitution.

If Mr. Kroll's support of such a subversive program makes him a better Democrat than I am, then I do not know the meaning of the word.

And what would a good Democrat, like Mr. Kroll claims he is, be doing giving his own and his CIO Political Action Committee's support to the gentleman from New York, Mr. VITO MARCANTONIO, as was reported by the Special Committee on Campaign Expenditures of this House in 1946 and which included the statement that—

Congressman MARCANTONIO had the active support of the Communist Party.

Mr. Kroll owes it to himself, to the CIO Political Action Committee which he heads, and to the American voters he presumes to advise, to explain just who he is, just who his father was, and just why, if he believed he was a citizen, he registered with the Department of Justice in 1946 as an alien.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GARMATZ (at the request of Mr. SASSCER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GRANGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. STIGLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, during the vote which was just taken on the tidelands oil bill, I was called out of the chamber. Is it too late for me to be recorded as voting in favor of the bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is too late.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, in the past I have supported the tidelands oil bill which was just passed by the House. A few minutes ago I was called away from the floor on a very urgent matter, believing the debate would run long enough so that I could get back in time to vote on the bill. I find that I got here a minute or so too late. I am making this statement because I wanted to be recorded as being in favor of the bill. I have supported this legislation in the past and will continue to support it in the future, even to the extent of voting to override a Presidential veto if that becomes necessary. I am glad the bill passed by an overwhelming majority.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER], I desire to say that the distinguished Senator to whom he referred is evidently unfamiliar with the bill that has been reported by the Committee on Un-American Activities.

There are many weaknesses in the present law, and for that reason we have large numbers of subversive individuals in this country taking advantage of our hospitality and attempting to undermine and destroy American institutions.

The Committee on Un-American Activities has brought out a bill which we hope will enable the Attorney General to put a stop to those activities. Some parts of the bill will put a stop to some of them whether the Attorney General acts or not. I am sure the Senator mentioned did not intend to criticize the House, and I am sure the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] is in sympathy with the purposes of the committee.

Until the last few years, the Senate has been the investigating body. They now seem to have left this burden to us, and we are doing the very best we can with it.

I think you will all, or most all, be satisfied with the bill reported by the Committee on Un-American Activities when it is brought to the floor of the House for final passage, which I understand will be one day next week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

HON. JOHN TABER

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to defend the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, of which committee I am a member. I felt and many of those on the Committee on Appropriations felt that the gentleman from New York, JOHN TABER, was unjustly accused yesterday morning by the Washington Post because he was carrying out his duties as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for the Congress in going over meticulously all of the funds expended in the name of the people of the United States for European relief. I trust the Washington Post will apologize very soon to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I heartily agree with the gentleman. I think it is out of order entirely for the Washington Post or any other newspaper to question the activities of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] in searching out and trying to find out if certain appropriations are justified.

Mr. HORAN. That is right. Service on the Committee on Appropriations is not always popular, but we are at least entitled to fair treatment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a summary of the State laws of Arizona as they affect veterans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TWYMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

RETIRED ARMY AND NAVY OFFICERS IN CIVILIAN GOVERNMENT POSITIONS

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are in many ways getting away from the original intentions of the founders of this Republic. Our forefathers tried to protect us by insisting that this Government be headed by civilians. Safeguards were enacted to prevent the participation of the military in any but a professional way. They were specific in providing that the Secretary of War and Secretary of the Navy should be civilians. The President has consistently led us away from this original sensible concept. I feel that the present tendency is dangerous and I wish to call attention to the fact that it could lead to serious consequences. I have no quarrel with the military. To the contrary, I have the highest admiration for them. However, I believe that the military should remain in their fields and confine themselves to their specialities. Recent events have demonstrated that the military does not do well when it operates in other fields such as the diplomatic. President Truman has seen fit to staff the traditionally civilian positions of Government, particularly in the diplomatic and consular service, with retired Army and Navy officers. I wonder if you realize that these retired officers are still part of the Regular Army and Navy? By definition of the Congress, a retired Army officer is a member of the Regular Army, even though retired—see section 4, title 10, of the United States Code Annotated. A further act of Congress provides:

> Officers retired from active service shall be entitled to wear the uniform of the rank on which they may retire. They shall continue to be borne on the Army Register, and shall be subject to the Rules and Articles of War, and to trial by general court martial for any breach thereof. (Sec. 1023, title 10, U. S. C. A.)

A similar provision applies to retired naval officers, and the law with respect to their status is the same as that which applies to Army officers—section 389, title 34, United States Code Annotated.

The Supreme Court has upon several occasions, construed this act of the Congress to mean just what the language states: That a so-called retired Army officer is in fact a member of the Regular Army; that should he desire, he may continue to wear his uniform, and that he may be tried by general court martial for any breach of Army Regulations committed after his retirement.

I urge the House to consider the following words of Mr. Justice Miller in the case of *United States* v. *Tyler* (105 U. S. 244 (1881)):

> It is impossible to hold that men who are by statute declared to be a part of the Army, who may wear its uniform, whose names may be borne on its register, who may be assigned by their superior officers to specified duties by detail as other officers are, who are subject to Rules and Articles of War, and may be tried, not by a jury, as other citizens are, but by a military court martial for any breach of those rules, and who may finally be dismissed on such trial from the service in disgrace, are still not in the military service. * * * We are of the opinion that retired officers are in the military service of the Government.

Very significant is the fact that retired Army officers may be subject to court martial for acts committed after retirement, and this under the vague charge of "conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman" or "prejudice of good order and military discipline"—*Runkle* v. *U. S.*

(122 U. S. 543) and *Closson* v. *U. S.* (7 App. D. C. 460).

In the Closson case, the facts are interesting. A retired Army colonel, George Armes, some 2 years after his retirement, wrote a letter to Lt. Gen. John M. Schofield, in which Armes demanded an apology from General Schofield for certain alleged acts and statements made by the general. The letter was strong and offensive in character. The general, apparently piqued by Armes' letter, ordered his immediate arrest. Armes was taken from his home by the military without anything resembling a warrant and was held in close arrest at the Washington Barracks. Some days later, he was charged with conduct to the prejudice of good order and military discipline and conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman. Armes, who apparently thought he was safely civilian and thus free to criticize the military, sought a writ of habeas corpus. The court of appeals of the District of Columbia refused to grant habeas corpus relief and held that it was perfectly proper for the Army to deal with retired officers in so brusque a fashion, in that retired officers are members of the Regular Army and subject to the Articles of War.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TWYMAN. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman is making a very, very interesting statement and one which should have a far-reaching effect on the foreign policy of the United States. In the case cited was the colonel retired from the Army, as these others are who have been put in the diplomatic service, or was he still a member of the Reserves? Did he have a Reserve status?

Mr. TWYMAN. No; he was a retired Army officer. A retired Army officer does not receive a pension; he receives retired pay.

From the foregoing it is apparent that all retired Army officers are required to refrain from any criticism of Army personnel or policy, however righteous or necessary the criticisms may be, under penalty of court martial. This would apply to retired officers in civil positions—to a minor consular official, to an ambassador—yes; even to a Secretary of State.

In this connection, it might be well to note that although in time of peace a retired officer may generally not be recalled to active duty without his consent, there appears to be no prohibition against ordering a retired officer to immediate and active duty of any kind. In fact, the statute authorizes such an assignment and it does not provide that the retired officer must consent, as do related statutory enactments—section 996, title 10, United States Code, Annotated. Thus it would appear that there exist various ways of handling such a civil officer who happens to be critical of Army policy without resorting to a court martial.

I submit that this state of events is a severely crippling and most dangerous limitation to traditionally civil public service. All that is further needed to complete the amalgamation of the civil into the military is for the legion of generals to don their uniforms as we have already authorized them to do.

It is inherent in our constitutional system of government that the military should be subject to civilian control and not contrariwise. Moreover, there exists the time-honored common-law principle that one should not hold two offices which are mutually incompatible. I submit that since a retired officer is a member of the Regular Army and subject to Army control, he cannot be made amenable to effective civilian processes. The concepts are each to the other contrary. A man cannot honestly and conscientiously swear to perform faithfully the duties of a civil office and yet be bound by an oath of allegiance to the military. An oath under which he may be summoned to military duty during his civil term without his consent. Does he elect then to be loyal to his civilian oath and serve his term or does he respect his military oath and accept the military assignment? A man with a divided loyalty is a man beyond control.

To explore this matter further, suppose our present Ambassador to Russia, a retired general, deems it expedient in the public interest to criticize General Clay's administration in Germany. If his thoughts were offensive to the military, he theoretically and actually could be court-martialed although at this time I do not believe public opinion would condone the practice. But the threat is there.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TWYMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Is the gentleman advocating that there be some revision of the responsibilities of a Reserve Army officer in the event he assumes a civilian status in order to remove the possibility of his losing his honorable discharge?

Mr. TWYMAN. I believe that will be answered as I go on. I merely point out the dangers that present themselves. The remedy I leave to others. My own personal opinion is that a retired officer who accepts the responsibility such as I am going to describe should resign completely from the Army or the Navy and not be in the position that some find themselves today.

It has come to my attention that retired officers must clear certain public statements with the War Department before making them. One wonders how this would apply to our Secretary of State and other retired officers currently in civil life.

Let us drop the subterfuge of calling these men retired officers; they are a part of the Regular Army. The question thus presents itself as to whether such officers may legally hold statutory civil positions. It is my firm belief that such civil officeholding by members of the military is illegal as being contrary to the common law, to the Constitution, and to the statutes establishing any such civil office. Congress at one time recognized this by barring retired officers from the diplomatic and consular positions of Government. Later the prohibition was removed—section 577, title 10, United States Code Annotated.

The two most influential men in the Government on foreign affairs, Secretary of State Marshall and Admiral William D. Leahy, are both technically subject to the rules and regulations of the Regular Army and the Regular Navy. The same can be said of Brig. Gen. Marshall S. Carter, who is an assistant to the Secretary of State. An assistant of the Under Secretary of State is Col. C. H. Bonesteel, who is actually on active duty, receiving Army pay and serving with the State Department.

There is an increasing tendency to appoint retired Army and Navy officers as ambassadors to many of our important posts. We have Lt. Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, who served admirably in this last war, serving as Ambassador to Russia. Admiral Allen T. Kirk is Ambassador to Belgium and Luxemburg. Gen. Thomas Holcomb is Ambassador to the Union of South Africa. Gen. Frank T. Hines was formerly Ambassador to Panama. Admiral William W. Smith is a member of the Maritime Commission. The President endeavored to have Gen. Laurence S. Kuter serve as Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board. It was originally intended that these positions would be filled by civilians. If we were to continue to follow the policy now being pursued by President Truman, every ambassadorial post would be filled by some retired Army officer or Naval officer. As far as I am concerned, I am willing to give all of these officers credit for having served well in the Army. However, there is nothing in their military training that fits them to serve as diplomats. Without being specific, there have been several situations that could have been handled much better by civilians than by retired Army officers serving as diplomats.

Strictly speaking, General Marshall and Admiral Leahy are subject to the orders of the Chief of Staff of the Army or the Chief of Naval Operations of the Navy. By reason of this, we have reversed the fundamental principles of the founders of this country. We have permitted the civilian operations of the country to become dominated by the military. It is a policy which we must discontinue at the earliest possible moment or it will have unfortunate consequences for the United States of America.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TWYMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I take it the gentleman distinguishes between what is called a professional soldier and a citizen soldier.

Mr. TWYMAN. All of these men that I have described are professional soldiers.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, but I mean the gentleman distinguishes between a citizen soldier and a professional soldier.

Mr. TWYMAN. I think that is a proper distinction.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now coming to the professional soldier, is the gentleman opposed to the appointment of General Marshall as Secretary of State?

Mr. TWYMAN. Does the gentleman not agree that it is dangerous to have the Secretary of State responsible to the Chief of Staff of the Army?

Mr. McCORMACK. I asked the gentleman a question. If he will answer that, I will answer the gentleman's question, but I think he ought to answer my question first. My question is—Is the gentleman opposed to General Marshall's appointment as Secretary of State and his continuation as Secretary of State?

Mr. TWYMAN. May I answer the gentleman in this way: I have not engaged in any personalities. I am opposed to the principle of an Army officer being Secretary of State and coming under the Chief of Staff of the Army, and being responsible to the Army.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman think that a man like General Marshall, in retirement, as Secretary of State would be subordinate to the Chief of Staff?

Mr. TWYMAN. Technically and legally, that is true. The gentleman is a lawyer, I presume.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman mean to say that the Chief of Staff, General Bradley, can order General Marshall, as Secretary of State, to do something that General Bradley, as Chief of Staff, thinks that General Marshall, as Secretary of State, ought to do?

Mr. TWYMAN. Legally and technically, that is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am inclined to think that I cannot go that far. If the gentleman was to say that he could call him back into the service like General MacArthur was called back from retirement for duty in the Philippines, by the late President Roosevelt, that would be a different matter. But, to say that technically the Chief of Staff could give orders to General Marshall, as Secretary of State, I think that I cannot agree with the gentleman there.

Mr. TWYMAN. I did not ask that the gentleman agree with me. I just ask that you agree with the Army and the Navy regulations.

Mr. McCORMACK. But the gentleman takes the position that General Marshall——

Mr. TWYMAN. I take no position except that I am calling your attention to a situation.

Mr. McCORMACK. But the gentleman must take a position when he calls our attention to a situation. The gentleman cannot make a speech without taking a position. I take it that the gentleman is opposed to a professional soldier receiving civilian appointment after retirement.

Mr. TWYMAN. I am calling your attention to the dangers of having our State Department under the domination or possible domination of the War Department.

Mr. McCORMACK. Why does the gentleman call it to our attention unless he has some views of his own? I understand that we are waiting for the Senate to act, so this colloquy probably is helping out.

Mr. TWYMAN. This is not a colloquy on my part. This is a very earnest effort on my part to bring to the attention of the Congress what I consider to be a very serious situation.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure that that is so, but I am trying to ascertain what the gentleman has in mind, for the enlightenment of myself and other Members. The gentleman apparently is against the professional soldier who has given his entire life for the defense of our country, getting any appointment in civilian life after retirement. Is that the gentleman's position?

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TWYMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I think the gentleman covered that in his talk, when he said that any professional soldier who is in retirement and is called into the Government service can remove the objection the gentleman raised by merely resigning from the reserve as long as he is in the Government service and under the direction of the civilian authorities. I think the gentleman is very correct in saying that if a man remains in the Army he is under the direction of the Chief of Staff, and in the case of General Marshall he is also under the direction of the Commander in Chief, who is the President of the United States.

Mr. TWYMAN. As long as the gentleman speaks of General Marshall, and I did not want to be specific, may I point this out to the gentleman from Massachusetts: I presume the gentleman realizes that General Marshall is not receiving a salary as Secretary of State. He is receiving his salary directly from the Army as retired pay, for the purpose of certain benefits in connection with the income tax. The gentleman understands that.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Am I not correct in saying that the gentleman thinks General Marshall, therefore, should resign from the Reserve Corps of the Army or as a professional soldier as long as he is Secretary of State?

Mr. TWYMAN. I would make it broader than that, that any retired Army or Navy officer should have the courage to resign from either service and, therefore, not continue as a retired officer.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TWYMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I am very much interested in what the gentleman has said. I think the gentleman has worked hard on his speech and has a lot of substance in it. May I ask two things, however: Would the gentleman apply the same principle about the retirement of officers of the Regular Establishment who are subsequently employed by the Government, to private industry, where a member of the Regular Establishment retires and is receiving retirement pay and is subject to the orders of the Regular Establishment, yet obtains a very fine job in civilian industry? Would the gentleman say then that the Regular Establishment could have any control whatsoever over that civilian industry?

Mr. TWYMAN. That would be an entirely different situation. I thank the gentleman for having brought out that difference.

Mr. BROOKS. The rules regarding retirement remain the same for both personnel.

Mr. TWYMAN. The industry that employs a retired officer who remains on the retired rolls——

Mr. BROOKS. He is still subject to the orders of the War Department.

Mr. TWYMAN. That man could be recalled to active duty and could be court-martialed for any of the reasons an officer on active duty could be court-martialed. He comes under the same rules and regulations as any Regular Army or Navy officer on active duty.

Mr. BROOKS. Does the gentleman feel that is inimicable to the best interests of business?

Mr. TWYMAN. That is something for business to decide for itself, that is not for me to pass upon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal commending the Committee on Un-American Activities for bringing out legislation requiring Communists to register with the Department of Justice.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 569) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas in the case of the *United States* v. *Dalton Trumbo* (No. 1353–47, Criminal Docket), pending in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, subpenas duces tecum were issued by the chief justice of said court and addressed to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, directing him to appear as a witness before the said court on the 26th day of April 1948, at 10 o'clock antemeridian, and to bring with him certain and sundry papers in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needed for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promotion of justice, this House will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice, consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further.

Resolved, That John Andrews, Clerk of the House, be authorized to appear at the place and before the court named in the subpenas duces tecum before mentioned, but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in his office or under his control or in his possession as Clerk of the House; be it further

Resolved, That when said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers and documents called for in the subpenas duces tecum then the said court through any of its officers or agents have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceedings and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House and take copies of any documents or papers in possession or control of

said Clerk that the court has found to be material and relevant, except minutes and transcripts of executive sessions, and any evidence of witnesses in respect thereto which the court or other proper officer thereof shall desire, so as, however, the possession of said documents and papers by the said Clerk shall not be disturbed, or the same shall not be removed from their place of file or custody under said Clerk; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpenas aforementioned.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 570) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas in the case of the *United States v. Albert Maltz* (No. 1354–47, Criminal Docket), pending in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, subpenas duces tecum were issued by the chief justice of said court and addressed to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, directing him to appear as a witness before the said court on the 3d day of May 1948, at 10 o'clock antemeridian, and to bring with him certain and sundry papers in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promotion of justice, this House will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

Resolved, That John Andrews, Clerk of the House, be authorized to appear at the place and before the court named in the subpenas duces tecum before mentioned, but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in his office or under his control or in his possession as Clerk of the House; be it further

Resolved, That when said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers and documents called for in the subpenas duces tecum then the said court through any of its officers or agents have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House and take copies of any documents or papers in possession or control of said Clerk and that the court has found to be material and relevant, except minutes and transcripts of executive sessions, and any evidence of witnesses in respect thereto which the court or other proper officer thereof shall desire, so as, however, the possession of said documents and papers by the said Clerk shall not be disturbed, or the same shall not be removed from their place of file or custody under said Clerk; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpenas aforementioned.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, it seems that the presentation to the House by Members of the House or officers of the House of subpenas, or subpenas duces tecum, has become a regular, daily occurrence. In an endeavor to be as cooperative with the courts as possible, and at the same time comply with the rules and precedents of the House, our very capable Parliamentarian, as well as others, has given careful consideration.

Up to this time, in each case specific action has been taken by the House. To the end that the House might have the authorities and precedents brought together by an impartial authority, I requested the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to prepare a brief. That very obliging and reliable Service has complied with my request. I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The memorandum is as follows:

MEMORANDUM

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
April 16, 1948.

To: House Judiciary Committee.
From: Federal Law Section.
With reference to subpena duces tecum directed to the Clerk of the House.

I. IS AN IMMUNITY AVAILABLE TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE?

The following noted precedents taken from Hinds' Precedents of the House of Representatives of the United States indicate that there is no special immunity available to the Clerk; however, in responding to a subpena duces tecum he will appear or produce papers only upon instruction from the House. This answer is predicated on the following:

1. The Clerk is merely one of the elective officers of the House. Hinds' I, section 187.

2. Neither the Constitution nor the statutes afford the Clerk any special immunity from arrest or service of process.

3. At final adjournment of a Congress, the Clerk becomes custodian of bills and other papers referred to committees. Hinds' V. section 7260. This includes evidence taken by a committee under the order of the House and not reported to the House. Section 7260.

4. When leave is given for the withdrawal of a paper from the files of the House, a certified copy of it is to be left in the office of the Clerk. Hinds' V, section 7256.

5. The House, in maintenance of its privilege, has, on occasion, refused to permit the Clerk to produce in court, in obedience to a summons, an original paper from the files, but has given the court facilities for making certified copies. Hinds' III, section 2664.

6. The House on occasion has permitted the clerk of a committee and the Clerk of the House to respond to a subpena or subpena duces tecum and to make deposition with the proviso that they should take with them none of the files. Hinds' VI, section 585.

7. Where the Clerk has failed to get permission from the House, he has disregarded an order of the court to produce certain papers. Hinds' VI, section 587.

8. The general rule is, then, that no employee of the House may produce any paper belonging to the files of the House before a court without the permission of the House. Hinds' III, section 2663, Hinds' VI, section 587.

II. IF THE CLERK DOES RESPOND, HOW CAN THE SUBPENA DUCES TECUM BE LIMITED IN SCOPE OR SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED?

The applicable court rule (see Rules of Criminal Procedure for the District Courts of the United States) reads:

Rule 17. Subpena

* * * * *

(c) For production of documentary evidence and of objects: A subpena may also command the person to whom it is directed to produce the books, papers, documents, or other objects designated therein. The court on motion made promptly may quash or modify the subpena if compliance would be unreasonable or oppressive. The court may direct that books, papers, documents, or objects designated in the subpena be produced before the court at a time prior to the trial or prior to the time when they are offered in evidence and may upon their production permit the books, papers, documents, or objects or portions thereof to be inspected by the parties and their attorneys.

The note to rule 17 (c) merely states: "This rule is substantially the same as Rule 45 (b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure" (S. Doc. No. 175, 79th Cong., p. 31).

A. Case Annotations

The application of rule 45 (b) (see Bender's Federal Practice Manual, 1948, pp. 272–274) indicates the following:

1. Documents to be produced in answer to a subpena duces tecum must serve only as evidence. (*U. S.* v. *Aluminum Co. of America* ((1939) 1 Fed. Rules Serv. 45 b. 311, case No. 3, 1 F. R. D. 62).)

2. A subpena duces tecum must be limited to a reasonable period of time and specify with reasonable particularity the subjects to which the desired writings relate. (*U. S.* v. *Medical Society of the D. C.* ((1938) 26 F. Supp. 55).)

3. A motion to quash a subpena may be granted even without an active showing that the subpena is unreasonable and oppressive. One seeking the production of documents has been denied a subpena in the absence of a showing of materiality or probable materiality of the documents sought, or evidence. The court applied to rule 45 the limitations which it deemed present under rule 34, namely, a requirement that documents be shown to be material before a court may which the desired writings relate. (*U. S.* v. *American Aluminum Co. of America*, supra; *Chase National Bank* v. *Portland General Electric Co.* ((1942) 6 Fed. Rules Serv. 45 b. 311), case No. 1.) But it is not necessary to establish the admissibility in evidence of the documents sought. (*Campbell* v. *American Fabrics Co.* ((1942) 6 Fed. Rules Serv. 45 b. 31, case No. 1; 2 F. R. D. 345).)

4. The materiality of documents must appear: The materiality of the documents desired should appear from the pleadings or otherwise. And if the subpena for production of documents is too broad and sweeping it will be quashed. Ordinarily, some time limitation as to the period covered by the documents is required to prevent a subpena duces tecum from being too broad, but the time may be inferred from the allegations of the complaint. (*403–411 East 65th Street Corp.* v. *Ford Motor Co.* ((S. D. N. Y. 1939) 27 F. Supp. 37)). The fact that the documents called for cover an extended period of time and are voluminous does not in itself render the subpena unreasonable. (*Savannah Theatre Co.* v. *Lucas and Jenkins* ((N. D. Ga. 1944) 8 Fed. Rules Serv. 45b 31, Case No. 1)). Such a subpena must also specify with reasonable particularity the subject to which the desired writings relate. (*United States* v. *Medical Soc. of the District of Columbia* ((D. D. C. 1938) 26 F. Supp. 55)). But the fact that a subpena does not enumerate in

detail the books, records, and documents to be produced does not render it oppressive, since the party issuing the subpena cannot know what may be material. (*Matter of Chopnick* (S. D. N. Y. 1942) 6 Fed. Rules Serv. 45b, 413, Case No. 1).) Subpena seeking to have practically all of Department of Justice's files available at trial, for use in disproving testimony of Government witnesses, is unreasonable. (*United States* v. *Schine Chain Theatres, Inc.* (W. D. N. Y. 1944), 8 Fed. Rules Serv. 45b, 315, Case No. 2, 4 F. R. D. 108).) However, particular files may be subpenaed if not privileged. *Ibid.* Somewhat similar is *Miller* v. *Adelson* ((W. D. Pa. 1944), 8 Fed. Rules Serv. 45b, 315, Case No. 1).

B. The Word "Designated"

Note should be taken of the use of the word "designated" in rule 17 (c). The use of this word in rule 34 of the Rules of Civil Procedure received the following illuminative comment in the report prepared by the Advisory Committee on Rules for Civil Procedure (H. Doc. No. 473—80th Cong. p. 97.)

An objection has been made that the word "designated" in rule 34 has been construed with undue strictness in some district court cases so as to require great and impracticable specificity in the description of documents, papers, books, etc., sought to be inspected. The committee, however, believes that no amendment is needed, and that the proper meaning of "designated" as requiring specificity has already been delineated by the Supreme Court. (See *Brown* v. *United States* ((1928) 276 U. S. 134, 143)) ("The subpena * * * specifies * * * with reasonable particularity the subjects to which the documents called for related.") (*Consolidated Rendering Co.* v. *Vermont* ((1908) 207 U. S. 541, 543–544)) ("We see no reason why all such books, papers, and correspondence which related to the subject of inquiry, and were described with reasonable detail, should not be called for and the company directed to produce them. Otherwise, the State would be compelled to designate each particular paper which it desired, which presupposes an accurate knowledge of such papers, which the tribunal desiring the papers would probably rarely, if ever, have.")

III. SUMMATION

While no special immunity is provided for the Clerk, he can appear and produce files and documents only upon instruction from the House. In the instant case, he could be instructed to appear and promptly file a motion to quash or modify the subpenas on the ground that they are unreasonable or oppressive, or call for matter not material to the case. Other alternatives, which are indicated in the foregoing memoradum, are available.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Shrevesport Journal on Postal Pay.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, if I had been present when the tidelands oil bill was before the House for consideration earlier in the afternoon, I would have voted in favor of the enactment of the legislation.

REPORT ON FUEL OIL, GASOLINE, AND OTHER PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communications, which were read by the Clerk and referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

APRIL 30, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the Honorable, the Secretary of the Interior, the Clerk has received a letter dated April 30, 1948, accompanied by a report concerning the amount of fuel oil, gasoline, other petroleum products, and coal now available in the United States, made pursuant to the provision of House Resolution numbered 385 of the Eightieth Congress.

The letter of the Secretary of the Interior and the accompanying report are transmitted herewith.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, April 30, 1948.

Mr. JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. ANDREWS: In accordance with my letter of March 6, and pursuant to House Resolution 385, I am enclosing a report concerning the amount of fuel oil, gasoline, other petroleum products, and coal now available in the United States, together with suggestions as to the steps the Government should take to make the proper and necessary supply available.

I wish to point out that as to petroleum this report does not attempt comprehensively to delineate a national policy but presents an interim program only, which is the best that we can do at the present time.

Supplemental information on petroleum is contained in the report on the oil situation by Max W. Ball, Director, Oil and Gas Division, Department of the Interior, which is also enclosed. Additional copies of both reports can be furnished, if desired.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. KRUG,
Secretary of the Interior.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. STIGLER, indefinitely, on account of official business.

To Mr. SHEPPARD, for 30 days, on account of official business.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair. The bells will be rung 15 minutes before the House is to reconvene.

Thereupon (at 3 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore at 5:46 p. m.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. REEVES (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for 1 week, on account of urgent business.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REEVES (at the request of Mr. KEATING) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. D'EWART (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in two separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a short statement he made before the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next I may address the House for 15 minutes following the regular business of the day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 15 minutes today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

BIPARTISAN COOPERATION IS THE KEY TO A SUCCESSFUL FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as the United States Representative from the Nineteenth District of California, I am deeply concerned with the trend throughout the world toward a potential world war III. Every possible effort must be made to establish a family of nations responsible to international law. We must exert every effort possible, while there is time, to strengthen the United Nations so that it can accomplish its original purposes. The people of my district are aware of this need and have given me every indication possible of their support. This support is not based on narrow partisan political lines. I have served the Nineteenth Congressional District of California for the past 6 years. The people of my district have honored me by showing their confidence in my service by electing me in three general elections. I have been doubly honored in that I have received the majority vote of both the Republican and Democratic Parties. I am humbly appreciative of the bipartisan support of the many fine Republican and Democratic citizens who have honored me with their support. I have tried to serve them in an unselfish and nonpartisan manner. It is for this reason that I state that the people of my district are

interested in the solution of problems without regard to partisanship or political affiliations. In view of these attitudes and in line with my own convictions, I pledge my continued service on a nonpartisan basis. Each and every problem must be decided on its merits. The yardstick I have used and will continue to use is: "The best interests of all the people of my district and the Nation."

We are faced in these days of confusion and fear with tremendous problems. Three years have passed since the ending of World War II, and the peace we thought we had won has not been established. Throughout the world we see strife between the people of the conquered nations, and among the Allies who achieved the victory.

Our relations with Russia—U. S. S. R.—have steadily deteriorated since VJ-day. It is necessary to improve those relations to avoid a third world war. Nothing is to be gained by accusations of blame at the present time. Blunders have been made and leadership has failed. Our only chance to correct the situation is to approach the problem from a new angle, possibly through different negotiating personnel and with a new determination to find a solution based on justice. The will to find a solution must exist in a stronger measure, on the part of the U. S. S. R. and the United States than ever before, or we shall fail.

I said that leadership has failed their respective people in finding a plane upon which agreements could be made. I honestly believe that the Soviet leadership has been guilty of obstructive practices and has given very little cooperation in reaching vital agreements. On the part of our own leadership, I believe that in some instances, a lack of firmness and a lack of consistency has contributed toward the present muddled condition of world affairs. The sudden emergence of our Nation as one of the two great world powers—both from a military and an industrial level—found us unaccustomed to world leadership. Our foreign policy has never been based on a long-range, bipartisan program, as has been the policy of the United Kingdom and other experienced world powers in the past. Unfortunately our foreign policy has varied with the change from Republican control to Democratic control, and vice versa.

In view of our new responsibility as a world power, we cannot afford the changeable, short range, and often partisan political approach used in the years of our comparative international unimportance. Unless we know where we are going and what our foreign program is, over a reasonable period of future years, we will lose our effectiveness and the respect of other nations. Other nations cannot plan their economic and political programs for the future in harmony with us, unless they are aware of our policy and have confidence in the continuity of our program.

We must develop a foreign policy which contains certain vital factors as its main objectives:

First, it should be a long-range program, and not limited by Presidential terms—4 years—or partisan political changes in governmental control.

Second, it should be clearly stated in its important objectives, in order that our own people and other nations might know its direction and purposes.

Third, approval of such a long-range and clarified foreign-policy program should be given, after due consideration and debate, by both Houses of Congress. Such approval should be by majority vote of both political parties in each House, so that the evils and vagaries of political bickerings would be eliminated in the over-all national interest.

I believe that the above outline on foreign policy is the minimal objective toward which we can work. The establishment of a stable world depends upon the agreements between the two great world powers—the United States and Russia. If these two great powers can agree, I am sure the other nations will cooperate with such agreements.

Before we can advance a firm policy or program of foreign relations, we must be united on its principles. First, steps must be taken at home so that we can advance our foreign-policy in a clear and united basis. I believe that we are making progress toward a united or bipartisan foreign policy. In a political campaign year this is admittedly difficult. Many of the issues in foreign relations are complicated and controversial. The answers to the problems before us are hard to find, and in many instances the answers are impossible to find, because many of the factors in the problem are unknown or unpredictable.

We are, I repeat, making progress, however, and I wish to inform my listeners of specific instances of great importance.

THE FIRST GREAT POSTWAR PROBLEM WAS THE PASSAGE OF LEGISLATION TO CONTROL ATOMIC ENERGY

While this legislation applied specifically to domestic control, it was important because the basic question of control by the Government or by private corporations had to be settled first, before methods of international control could be advanced. Atomic energy had been produced under the urgency of war, by the expenditure of over $2,000,000,000 of tax money. The people of the United States had furnished the money to build the great experimental plants at Oak Ridge, Tenn.; Hanford, Wash.; and Los Alamos, N. Mex. The people had paid the salaries of the scientists and the expenses of the great development out of tax moneys. The people, therefore, owned in the name of their Government all rights and titles to these projects and the great new discovery of atomic energy.

A determined attempt was made in the House and in the Senate to take the control of atomic energy away from the Government and place it in the hands of the military forces—a subordinate and specialized department of our Government. A determined attempt was made to divert from governmental civilian control to private corporations, the inestimable benefits of commercial adaption and exploitation. Without going into the pro and con arguments in detail, an agreement was finally reached by both Republicans and Democrats that Government ownership and operation should be maintained, and that the future operation should be maintained under the direction of a civilian board of five men appointed by the President, subject to confirmation by the Senate.

This great victory could not have been won if political partisanship had intervened. The welfare of the people was exalted above narrow political partisanship, and a unified Congress established the two great principles of Government ownership and Government control through a civilian board of the newest discovery of science—atomic energy was saved for the people. The basis had been established for responsible negotiations with foreign governments for the international control of atomic energy, without which universal peace cannot be established or guaranteed. Great credit for this bi-partisan legislation goes to the two great Senators who were the ranking members of the Senate Special Committee on Atomic Energy Legislation. The chairman of this committee was Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, a Democrat from Connecticut, and the ranking Republican member of the committee at that time was Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, of Michigan. Through their statesmanlike approach to the atomic energy problem, and their leadership, most important legislation to face Conpurpose, and direction was given to the gress since the war.

In the House, I regret to say, the original hearings on atomic energy were limited to 4 days—over 9 months were consumed by the Senate committee. The May-Johnson bill was reported from the Military Affairs Committee of the House, and it contained most of the objectionable features I have mentioned; for example, military control and private corporation concessions. As a member of that committee, I fought the May-Johnson bill, and voted against the committee action in reporting same. I can modestly claim that I led the fight in the committee against the May-Johnson bill and for the principles which finally became law, embodied in the McMahon bill.

The important point to remember, however, is that when the basic atomic energy legislation was passed by the House and the Senate, it was passed by a majority of the members of the Republican and Democratic Parties in both Houses. Statesmanship had risen above political partisanship, and, as always happens in such cases, the people benefited thereby.

BIPARTISAN PASSAGE OF THE EUROPEAN RECOVERY PLAN (MARSHALL PLAN)

The Senate and the House passed on April 2, by a large majority of the Members of both the Republican and Democratic parties, the European Recovery Plan, commonly called "the Marshall plan." This is a further important indication of nonpartisan action in the field of foreign relations. This action on the part of both political parties is in response to the tremendous challenge of our time, the establishment of a stable world in order that we might have world peace. This action was possible because both Republicans and Democrats forgot their political differences and worked for the best interest of all the American people. Primary credit

for the development and passage of this great piece of legislation must go to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, Republican, of Michigan. In my opinion, Senator VANDENBERG has developed in the past few years into one of our greatest Americans. He has acquired a maturity of judgment, a concept of international problems, and the experience in working with his colleagues, which years of service, coupled with great ability, alone can give. Senator VANDENBERG's address to the Senate on March 1, 1948, when he presented the European recovery legislation for consideration, was masterful and statesmanlike. It will be recorded for future Americans to read along with other great speeches of American statesmen. I insert at this point part of his fine address:

"The greatest nation on earth either justifies or surrenders its leadership. We must choose. There are no blueprints to guarantee results. We are entirely surrounded by calculated risks. I profoundly believe that the pending program is the best of these risks. I have no quarrel with those who disagree, because we are dealing with imponderables. But I am bound to say to those who disagree that they have not escaped to safety by subjecting or subverting this plan. They have simply fled to other risks, and I fear far greater ones. For myself, I can only say that I prefer my choice of responsibilities. This legislation, Mr. President, seeks peace and stability for free men in a free world. It seeks them by economic rather than by military means. It proposes to help our friends to help themselves in the pursuit of sound and successful liberty in the democratic pattern. The quest can mean as much to us as it does to them. It aims to preserve the victory against aggression and dictatorship which we thought we won in World War II. It strives to help stop world war III before it starts. It fights the economic chaos which would precipitate far-flung disintegration. It sustains western civilization. It means to take western Europe completely off the American dole at the end of the adventure. It recognizes the grim truth—whether we like it or not—that American self-interest, national economy, and national security are inseparably linked with these objectives. It stops if changed conditions are no longer consistent with the national interest of the United States. It faces the naked facts of life.

* * * * *

The exposed frontiers of hazard move almost hourly to the west. Time is of the essence in this battle for peace, even as it is in the battles of a war. Nine months ago Czechoslovakia wanted to join western Europe in this great enterprise for stability and peace. Remember that. Today Czechoslovakia joins only such enterprise as Moscow may direct. There is only one voice left in the world, Mr. President, which is competent to hearten the determination of the other nations and other peoples in western Europe to survive in their own choice of their own way of life. It is our voice. It is in part the Senate's voice. Surely we can all agree, whatever our shades of opinion, that the hour has struck for this voice to speak as soon as possible. I pray it speaks for weal and not for woe. The committee has rewritten the bill to consolidate the wisdom shed upon the problem from many sources. It is the final product of 8 months of more intensive study by more devoted minds than I have ever known to concentrate upon any one objective in all my 20 years in Congress. It has its foes—some of whom compliment it by their transparent hatreds. But it has its friends—countless, prayerful friends not only at the hearthstones of America, but under many other flags. It is a plan for peace, stability, and freedom. As such, it involves the clear self-interest of the United States. It can be the turning point in history for 100 years to come. If it fails, we have done our final best. If it succeeds, our children and our children's children will call us blessed. May God grant his benediction upon the ultimate event." [Applause on the floor, Senators rising.]

Senator VANDENBERG's address was followed by the former chairman of the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee and now the ranking Democratic member, Senator TOM CONNALLY, of Texas. Here, again, we see no indication of partisan political bitterness, but a challenging appeal to unity in behalf of America's best interest. Senator CONNALLY cooperated with Senator VANDENBERG in every way in which he was capable to pass this vital legislation. Part of Senator CONNALLY's address on the same occasion is inserted at this point:

"The United States cannot afford to be false to its ideals and purposes. We cannot be false to the men who died on battlefields to maintain our liberties and our prestige. We cannot forsake the great historic personages of the past. We must not fail the world. The world looks upon us as the greatest power in the world. It has faith in us. It knows that we do not want to conquer other lands. It knows that we do not want reparations and indemnities. We must not fail the world; and these nations are an important part of the world to us. We must not fail them.

* * * * *

It has been our ambition and purpose to contribute to the peace of the world. To my mind that is the dominant thing upon which we are voting tonight. We are voting upon the peace of the world. If the nations of western Europe can regain their independence, their stability, and their economic powers, peace in Europe will be much more secure than it is now, with threats and dangers coming out of the east which may overwhelm or submerge the democracies and the freedom-loving peoples of the western part of Europe. So tonight my appeal is, let us contribute to the peace of the world. Let us not be content with the provisions in this bill, but let us fill it with the spirit of peace and security for those peoples who believe in democracy, who are devoted to liberty and freedom, and who will join the United States in working out, together and bilaterally, the plans which we have in mind for the rehabilitation of Europe, which will save its people from chaos, misery, and ruin, and reestablish in those fair lands a standard of equality and independence, making them vital nations in the world in the future development of our historic policies and precepts." [Applause.]

In the House of Representatives we witnessed a similar cooperation between the Republican and Democratic leadership. A final majority vote of both political parties was given to this great attempt to establish international stability. We are approaching maturity as a Nation; we are rising to the responsibility of world leadership; we must continue to advance.

We must evolve a clear, long-range, and united foreign policy without which our national security is endangered. It cannot be done by discord and disunity between the two great political parties here in the United States. We can no longer afford narrow political partisanship, nor vicious and petty political attitudes. Faced with the encroaching tide of communistic ideology and the potential destruction of civilization by atomic warfare we must rise to levels of statesmanship heretofore unknown. A public servant must have this high concept of responsibility and the desire to rise above political partisanship in his approach to the problems of the atomic age.

During my 6 years' service as United States Representative from the Nineteenth District of California, I have tried to represent the people of my district in strict conformity with the idea that I should represent all of the people to the best of my ability. My office has served all of the people, without question or regard to their political affiliation. In my appointments of the fine young men of my district to the West Point Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy, I have neither inquired nor considered the political affiliations of their families. The appointments have been made fairly on the basis of civil service examinations of merit.

I am deeply conscious and humbly appreciative of the great honor which the people of my district have conferred on me in electing me as their Federal Representative in our Nation's Capital. I have felt that I have been doubly honored by receiving both the Republican and Democratic nominations. This great compliment which has been given to me and the confidence which has been placed in me by the majority of both the Republican and Democratic people of my district has caused me to exert every effort in my power to justify their trust. I hope that I have discharged that trust through my sincere effort to represent all of the people of my district honorably and efficiently.

Great problems face our Nation, problems which can be solved by experienced men, energetic men, and, above all, honest, sincere men who realize the gravity of our times. Public servants must be willing to rise above pettiness, partisanship, and selfishness to the plane of statesmanship, which the people of our beloved country deserve.

With faith in God, we press forward with hope in our hearts:

I read the age-old parable of time
Unfolding now before my wondering eyes;
Above our finite ways a power sublime
Lifts mankind toward the golden skies.

Let hope triumphant fill my mind and heart,
The hope that peace shall reign throughout the earth.
Oh, let me work in faith to do my part
In building human dignity and worth,
That brotherhood at last may come to birth.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did, on April 29, 1948, present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 334. An act for relief of legal guardian of James Harold Nesbitt, a minor;

H. R. 344. An act for relief of Sylvester T. Starling;

H. R. 761. An act for relief of estate of Anthony D. Chamberlain, deceased;

H. R. 762. An act for relief of Dudley Tarver;

H. R. 1275. An act to authorize the payment of certain claims for medical treatment of persons in the naval service; to repeal section 1586 of the Revised Statutes, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1667. An act for relief of the estate of T. L. Morris;

H. R. 1747. An act for relief of Mrs. Margaret Lee Novick and others;

H. R. 2399. An act for relief of Joseph W. Beyer;

H. R. 2622. An act to authorize loans for Indians, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2728. An act for relief of Darwin Slump;

H. R. 3113. An act for relief of Bessie B. Blacknall;

H. R. 3328. An act for relief of Mr. and Mrs. Russell Coulter;

H. R. 4090. An act to equalize retirement benefits among members of the Nurse Corps of the Army and the Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4399. An act for relief of James C. Smith, Stephen A. Bodkin, Charles A. Marlin, Andrew J. Perlik, and Albert N. James;

H. R. 4571. An act for relief of the estate of Carl R. Nall; and

H. J. Res. 242. Joint resolution to confirm title in fee simple in Joshua Britton to certain lands in Jefferson County, Ill.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, May 3, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1507. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 in the amount of $13,963,000 for the Veterans' Administration (H. Doc. No. 630); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1508. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 in the amount of $20,500,000 for the Housing Expediter (H. Doc. No. 631); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1509. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, approved February 16, 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1510. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the ninth report of the Department of State on the disposal of United States surplus property in foreign areas; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1511. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 107 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1512. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the Fifteenth Quarterly Report on Contract Settlement, covering the period January 1 through March 31, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1513. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 10, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Dunkirk Harbor, N. Y., as requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives adopted on September 18, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 632); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1514. A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, transmitting a preliminary draft of the first three parts of a report on the operation of the trade-agreements program from July 1934 to April 1948; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1515. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the supplies of coal and petroleum and petroleum products in the United States with suggestions for Government action to make proper and necessary supply available; to the Committee on Public Lands.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 6114. A bill to amend title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, so as to increase the interest rate on title I loans, to provide for the redemption of nondelinquent insured mortgages, to authorize advances for the preservation and protection of the insured loan security, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1837). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 151. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of a report entitled "The Economy of Hawaii in 1947" and authorizing the printing of additional copies thereof; without amendment (Rept. No. 1838). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 539. Resolution providing for the payment to Ella J. Ickes, widow of William G. Ickes, late employee of the House, 6 months' salary and $250 funeral expenses; without amendment (Rept. No. 1839). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 566. Resolution for the relief of Mary A. Conrad, widow of Dorsey B. Conrad; without amendment (Rept. No. 1840). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 5508. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to extend the benefits of such act to certain mothers of veterans; with amendments (Rept. No. 1841). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HINSHAW: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 5960. A bill to amend section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1842). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HINSHAW: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6116. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1843). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MUNDT: Committee on Un-American Activities. H. R. 5852. A bill to combat un-American activities by requiring the registration of Communist-front organizations, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1844). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 6400. A bill to provide an appropriation for the reconstruction and repair of roads and other public facilities in the States of Minnesota and North Dakota which were destroyed or damaged by recent floods; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 6401. A bill to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 6402. A bill to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. R. 6403. A bill to establish within the Department of the Interior an Office of National Minerals Resources, Production, and Conservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 6404. A bill to broaden the cooperative extension system as established in the act of May 8, 1914, and acts supplemental thereto, by providing for cooperative extension work between colleges receiving the benefits of this act and the acts of July 2, 1862, and August 30, 1890, and other qualified colleges, universities, and research agencies, and the United States Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 6405. A bill to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and to repeal section 2402 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 6406. A bill providing procedures for the control of the use of penalty mail by Government departments; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 6407. A bill to encourage the development of an international air-transportation system adapted to the needs of the foreign commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 6408. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 6409. A bill to make Friday, December 24, 1948, a holiday in lieu of Saturday, December 25, 1948, for all officers and employees of the United States, including officers and employees of the field postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 6410. A bill to make Saturday, December 25, 1948, a holiday to the same extent as though it did not fall on a Saturday, for all officers and employees of the United States, including such employees of the field postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 6411. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in further-

ance of national safety against traffic and other accident hazards; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 6412. A bill to codify and enact into law title 3 of the United States Code, entitled "The President"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 6413. A bill to amend section 3 (a) of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, relating to exempted securities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey:

H. Con. Res. 191. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings held before the Committee on Un-American Activities on the bills (H. R. 4422 and H. R. 4581) to curb or control the Communist Party of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Con. Res. 192. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings held before the Committee on Un-American Activities relative to the Communist infiltration of the motion-picture industry; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. Res. 567. Resolution authorizing Charles W. Vursell to review certain papers in the files of the House; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey:

H. Res. 571. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report prepared by the Committee on Un-American Activities on the organization American Youth for Democracy; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 572. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of parts 1 and 2 of the hearings held before the Committee on Un-American Activities on the bills (H. R. 1884 and H. R. 2122) to curb or outlaw the Communist Party of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 6414. A bill for the relief of Lois E. Lillie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 6415. A bill for the relief of Leslie Fullard-Leo and Ellen Fullard-Leo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 6416. A bill for the relief of Anna Der A. Wing Jee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 6417. A bill for the relief of James Flynn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STIGLER (by request):

H. R. 6418. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Higbee, Jr.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1854. By Mr. HART: Memorial of the House of Assembly of the State of New Jersey, urging that the United States Senate and House of Representatives do not ratify any treaty or agreement with the Dominion of Canada or pass any legislation which may provide for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway; to the Committee on Public Works.

1855. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution by Racine Taxpayers Association, Racine, Wis., in opposition to Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1856. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Miss Elizabeth Anderson, Zephyrhills, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1857. Also, petition of Mrs. H. M. Jarvis, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1858. Also, petition of the National Office Machine Dealers Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for repeal of that portion of the existing tax law imposing an excise tax on office machines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1859. Also, petition of T. S. Kinney, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1860. Also, petition of W. A. Butler, Jacksonville, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1861. By Mr. WELCH: Resolution No. 7401 passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation now pending before the Congress with reference to California's title to tide and submerged lands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 3, 1948

(Legislative day of Friday, April 30, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. John W. Rustin, D. D., minister, Mount Vernon Place Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Father of us all, we pause in the midst of the busy rush of life to ask Thy direction. Help us, when that direction comes, not to ignore it.

Grant, we pray Thee, to this body wisdom and unselfish understanding so that all action taken here today shall be to the best possible interest of all Thy people everywhere.

Save us from weak resignation and futile despair. Undergird us with a sense of Thy presence so that calmness and peace shall be in our souls.

Through Christ our Lord we pray. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, May 3, 1948, the President had approved and signed the following act:

S. 1263. An act for the relief of fire district No. 1 of the town of Colchester, Vt.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2245. An act to repeal the tax on oleomargarine; and

H. R. 5992. An act to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 151) authorizing the printing as a House document of a report entitled "The Economy of Hawaii in 1947" and authorizing the printing of additional copies thereof, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUR OF MEETING—POINT OF ORDER

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized to make a point of order.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Senate is not legally convened and is not legally in session. My point of order is based upon the fact that under the Constitution of the United States each House may determine the rules of its procedure. Pursuant to that constitutional authorization, at the beginning of the session, on motion of the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senate adopted a resolution which reads as follows:

Resolved, That the hour of daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian unless otherwise ordered.

On Friday, April 30, being the last day the Senate was in session, on motion of the Senator from Nebraska that the Senate take a recess until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon, the Senate took a recess until Monday, May 3, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian. Therefore, Mr. President, under the rule of the Senate and under the phraseology of the resolution, the Senate recessed until 12 o'clock meridian—or noon; it makes no difference.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the act of March 19, 1918, chapter 24, section 2, Fortieth Statutes, page 451 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 15, sec. 262), establishes the standard time throughout the United States as follows:

In all statutes, orders, rules, and regulations relating to the time of performance of any act by any officer or department of the United States, whether in the legislative, executive, or judicial branches of the Government, or relating to the time within which any rights shall accrue or determine, or within which any act shall or shall not be performed by any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, it shall be understood that the time shall be the United States standard time of the zone within which the act is to be performed.

When, therefore, the Senate recessed last Friday until 12 o'clock meridian today, it recessed in accordance with its resolution that the hour of daily meeting of the Senate will be 12 o'clock meridian and in accordance with the Federal statute, which I have just quoted, fixing the

time for any order of the legislative department as being standard time of the zone within which the act is to be performed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Was the Senator addressing his inquiry to the Chair?

Mr. OVERTON. I was waiting until I could receive the attention of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has the full brief of the Senator from Louisiana, as he submitted it to him this morning, so the Chair is not uninformed with respect to the point the Senator is making.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I took great pleasure in sending a copy of my brief to the President pro tempore, in order that he might be advised in advance of what the Senator from Louisiana intended to do.

The act passed at this session authorizing the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District, and their acting under this statutory authority advancing standard time applicable to the District 1 hour on Sunday, May 2, does not amend or alter the Senate rule I have quoted or the Federal statute referred to. It was not intended that it should. A reading of the District of Columbia daylight-saving law shows that it was meant to be applicable to the District of Columbia and not applicable to the procedures of the Senate, or of the House of Representatives, for that matter. Rules for procedure in the Senate are fixed by the Senate itself, and are fixed, under the constitutional authority, by the Senate as to the time of its meeting after recess or adjournment. The Senate has fixed that time as being 12 o'clock meridian, and until that rule is changed, until the rule that was adopted at the beginning of this session on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska is changed, then the rule is written into the recess, and therefore the Senate recessed last Friday until 12 o'clock meridian today.

The District of Columbia statute does not undertake to amend that rule. It could not amend it. Under the Constitution, the Senate has the sole and exclusive right of establishing its own rules of procedure, and in accordance with that constitutional authority and mandate it has established 12 o'clock meridian as the hour for the convening of the Senate unless otherwise ordered. It was not otherwise ordered when the Senator from Nebraska moved last Friday that the Senate take a recess. He moved that it recess until 12 o'clock noon. According to the statement contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, "The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.), under the order previously entered, the Senate took a recess until Monday, May 3, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian."

Of course, Mr. President, if the Senate desires to adjourn or recess to a time corresponding to 12 o'clock noon, daylight saving time, it can do so. To do that, however, it will be necessary for the Senate to do at least one of two things, first, recess or adjourn until 11 o'clock a. m.; or, second, change its rule by prescribing that the hour of daily meeting of the Senate shall be 12 o'clock District of Columbia daylight-saving time, unless otherwise ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Unless otherwise ordered.

Mr. OVERTON. Unless otherwise ordered. The Senate, however, did neither of these things; and when, therefore, the Senate recessed until today at 12 o'clock noon, its action must be interpreted under the provision of its rule that its hour of daily meeting shall be 12 o'clock meridian, reinforced by the Federal statute that in all orders, rules, or regulations relating to the time of performance of any act by any department whether legislative, executive, or judicial, "it shall be understood and intended that the time shall be the United States standard time of the zone within which the act is to be performed."

I submit the point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able Senator from Louisiana very kindly gave the President pro tempore advance notice of his point of order, and the Chair is prepared to rule.

First, let the facts in the matter be entirely clear.

At the beginning of the present session the Senate adopted an order that the hour of daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian unless otherwise ordered. The first controlling question here, therefore, is whether it has been "otherwise ordered" by subsequent action.

Now in searching for a correct answer to this question let the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD be consulted. The final statement in last Friday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 5114 that "under the order previously entered," on April 30, "the Senate took a recess until Monday, May 3, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian," is in error, as clearly disclosed by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD itself.

The statement on which the able Senator from Louisiana relies in this connection is the statement of the official reporter at the conclusion of the day's proceedings. To find out what happened actually one must consult the motions and requests made by Senators themselves.

The "order previously entered" is found at page 5102 when the Senate agreed to a unanimous-consent request submitted by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. The request and the order are for a recess until 12 o'clock noon—not 12 o'clock meridian. Thus the Senate "otherwise ordered" in respect to meridian time.

Subsequently, when it came time for the Senate actually to recess, the "previous order" was executed on a motion submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] on page 5114 of the RECORD. His motion recessed the Senate until "Monday next at 12 o'clock noon"—not 12 o'clock "meridian." Thus the Senate again "otherwise ordered," as is its unquestioned right.

Meanwhile the controlling Senate record is the Senate Journal—not the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—and the Senate Journal, which is before the President pro tempore at the moment, states that the recess was taken "until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next."

Under such circumstances, the real question submitted to the Chair is this: "What is 'noon' in the Senate when the District Commissioners, acting under authority of a law passed by this Congress, advance standard time by 1 hour by an order effective yesterday; particularly when the District Commissioners are acting under a law favorably acted upon by the Senate within the last 60 days which it itself asserts that when daylight-saving time is established by the District Commissioners for the period for which it is applicable, it shall "be the standard time for the District of Columbia."

In the opinion of the Chair, Congress is bound by its own legislation in this respect, and any statutes or rules must be read in this interpretation. There is a vast body of precedent—as, for example, when the Senate recognized so-called daylight-saving time all through the first session of the present Eightieth Congress and consistently fixed its meeting time as 12 o'clock noon instead of 12 o'clock meridian. In the opinion of the Chair, borne out by the clocks in the Senate Chamber, it is now 12 o'clock noon, which is the hour to which the Senate recessed.

The point of order is overruled.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 30, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ROY W. HARPER TO BE DISTRICT JUDGE, EASTERN AND WESTERN DISTRICTS OF MISSOURI

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, notice is hereby given that on the morning of Tuesday, May 18, 1948, at 9:30 o'clock, daylight-saving time, there will begin in room 424, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C., further public hearing with respect to the nomination of Roy W. Harper, of Missouri, to be United States district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri, before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, which subcommittee is composed of Senator MOORE, of Oklahoma; Senator EASTLAND, of Mississippi; and Senator DONNELL, of Missouri.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained consent that Mr. PEPPER and Mr. HOLLAND be excused from attendance on the Senate today and tomorrow.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained permission for the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary considering the nomination of Edward A. Tamm to sit during the session this afternoon.

OWNERSHIP OF LAND BENEATH WATERS

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask that the President pro tempore lay before the Senate House bill 5992.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate House bill 5992, just received from the House, which will be read by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5992) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be regarded as having been read the second time, as is the usual procedure, for the purpose of permitting the Senator from California to be heard.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I desire to object to any further proceedings on this measure at the present time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. What is the status of the bill at present?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill has been read the second time; and, under rule XIV, paragraph 4, objection to further proceedings results in placing the bill on the calendar instead of referring it to a committee. From the calendar any Senator at any time the bill is before the Senate for consideration can move to have it sent to the committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand that at the present time the bill will not go to the calendar?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill goes to the calendar and not to a committee, under the objection of the Senator from California.

Mr. LUCAS. Then it will be necessary for some Senator to move to take it from the calendar and refer it to a committee?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TOBEY. Is this the bill which would nullify, cast aside, and destroy the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would say that in its staggering impact that is hardly a parliamentary question. The Chair does not undertake to meet that impact.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AIKEN. Can a bill be placed on the Senate Calendar without reference to a committee by simple majority vote?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is placed on the calendar, under the rules of the Senate, on objection by any single Senator to further consideration of it when it has been read twice.

Mr. AIKEN. Then, under this procedure, all further hearings on the part of the Senate are bypassed?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unless some Senator in his own right moves at the parliamentary point when he can, to refer the bill to a committee.

Mr. AIKEN. Then does he have to have a majority vote in order to take the bill off the calendar and refer it to a committee?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, it is not my disposition nor I think that of any other Senator, so far as I know, to attempt at this time to make the bill the business of the Senate or in any way preclude the Committee on the Judiciary from bringing in a report upon the bill which is pending before it. This action merely places the bill upon the calendar. There is no disposition to force it out onto the Senate floor at this time.

Mr. AIKEN. Then, Mr. President, does it have the same position as any other bill on the calendar and does the same right exist to have it brought up at any time?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That would be the view of the Chair.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, one further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I correct in my understanding now that a similar bill is pending before the Committee on the Judiciary?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. And is being considered by the Committee on the Judiciary?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. I merely want to say now that I serve notice on the Senate now that I shall move to refer the bill to committee.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. I merely wish to inquire whether the bill, respecting which the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] made such a pertinent inquiry, is the so-called tidelands bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois repeat what he said, so as to enable those of us on this side of the Chamber to know what was the purport of his remarks? I did not hear what the Senator said.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois gave notice that at the proper time he would move to take the bill from the calendar and refer it to committee.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if I may, I should like to say, not in the nature of a parliamentary inquiry, that I think this procedure is one of the most high-handed, outrageous procedures ever attempted on the part of any Member of the Congress. I cannot conceive of anyone attempting to bypass committee hearings, or do anything of this nature which would have the effect of robbing the people of the country of the naval oil reserves, and of overthrowing the decision of the Supreme Court.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair trusts that the able Senator from Vermont will acquit the Chair of any part in his indictment. The Chair is following subsection 4 of rule XIV, as required.

Mr. AIKEN. I was not questioning the action of the Chair in the least. I simply say that it is an outrageous proceeding.

Mr. DOWNEY obtained the floor.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I decline to yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Will the Senator give me 30 seconds?

Mr. DOWNEY. No; I decline to yield.

Mr. President, I am sure the distinguished Senator who last spoke would not characterize this as an outrageous proceeding if he understood it. In the first place, nothing has been done here except in accordance with the well-established Senate rule. There is no chicanery about it. There is no disposition to bypass the Judiciary Committee.

I should like to recall to the Senate these facts: This same bill was passed by a substantial majority of the House and Senate last year, but we had no opportunity to vote upon the veto because the President vetoed it too late. It has now passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 10 to 1; and it is my personal opinion that there is not only a substantial majority in the Senate for this bill, but a two-thirds vote for the bill.

Pending before the Judiciary Committee in the past two or three months has been a similar bill. I shall urge the Senate to keep this bill upon the calendar so that if for any reason the Judiciary Committee does not bring in some kind of a report in time for the Congress of the United States to express its opinion, the Congress of the United States, and not a small minority, may have its will prevail.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, Charles Dickens wrote many books. One of the most interesting was a book entitled "Great Expectations." I think the distinguished Senator from California must have been reading the book when he indulged in the gift of prophecy and stated that in his judgment the bill would pass by a tremendous majority, or by a two-thirds vote over the President's veto.

I wish to tell the Senator—I cannot use the word, but if I could I would use the word "damndest"—the Senator is going to have that kind of a fight on this floor, such as we have never seen before. Some people who believe in the decisions of the Supreme Court, and believe that it is greater than the State of California, are going to fight tooth and nail to stop this thing. To use the language used in the Battle of the Marne, it shall not pass. I give notice that the Senator is in for an interesting time.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, all I desire is to have a majority of the Senate given the opportunity to express itself. If the distinguished Senator has in mind, by a filibuster or any other method such as he uses, and I will not use——

Mr. TOBEY. What is the Senator referring to? I challenge the indictment. I challenge the Senator to name an instance when I filibustered in the 15 years I have been a Member of Congress. I challenge the Senator to name such an instance. He cannot do it.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I have no desire to——

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator made the charge. Now let him answer my challenge.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California has the floor.

Mr. DOWNEY. If the Senator from New Hampshire or any other Senator has no desire to filibuster this bill, there is no reason for heat or emotion. If the Judiciary Committee does not report the bill in time for the Senate to express its will upon it, the Senate will then have two methods by which to proceed—either a motion to discharge the committee, or, if this bill is still upon the calendar, a motion to make it the business of the Senate. Why all this heat and excitement, I do not understand, unless Senators are afraid to give the Senate an opportunity to express its majority will.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment? He made a charge against me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California has the floor.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President——

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TOBEY. It is this: The distinguished Senator from California, within the last 2 minutes, made a charge against me by referring to my stopping the bill by a filibuster, "as the Senator has done" or words to that effect. I challenge that statement. I challenge him to cite one instance during my 10 years in the Senate, when I have used dilatory tactics or resorted to a filibuster. I ask him to name it. He is on the spot.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I did not have the slightest intent to use any language with the interpretation which the Senator has in mind.

Mr. TOBEY. The record will speak for itself.

Mr. DOWNEY. The Senator used certain language on the Senate floor within the past 5 minutes that I do not care to use.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator is ducking the question. The Senator from California made the statement that he could not understand the reason for heat or emotion. I will tell the Senator why there is some heat here. It is because there will be in America some righteous indignation against the tremendous lobby which has been working on the bill for several years, formerly represented by the gentleman from California, Mr. Ed Pauley, of unsavory reputation, and his cohorts. This is only the beginning. Do not ever again challenge me and impute to me filibustering tactics or unfair procedure.

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAXES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. While the President pro tempore is holding court this morning, he would like to conclude the "hangover" responsibilities at the desk by taking up House bill 2245 for reference. This is the oleomargarine bill which has come over from the House.

In the opinion of the Chair, the situation is as follows: The Chair would be very desirous, if it were possible, to submit the question of reference to the Senate for its own decision, because the point is so close that a persuasive argument can be made both ways in respect to reference, as between the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Under the old rules of the Senate it was possible for the Chair to submit a question of reference or a point of order to the Senate without himself ruling. However, under the Reorganization Act, when a question of jurisdiction arises, the act provides:

> The question shall be decided by the Presiding Officer of the Senate without debate, in favor of that committee which has jurisdiction over the subject matter which predominates in the proposed legislation, but such decision shall be subject to an appeal.

Therefore, the only way, in the judgment of the Chair, that he can submit this question to the Senate for its judgment is for the Chair to make a preliminary ruling of reference, and then let an appeal be taken to determine the Senate's position on the question of reference if an appeal is desired.

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is there any reason why House bill 2245 cannot be placed on the calendar in the same way that House bill 5992 was placed on the calendar?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks so, in view of the fact that the question of reference has been reached, and submitted to the Senate by the Chair himself.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does this action of the Chair preclude the operation of rule XIV?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Has the bill been read the first and second time?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has not.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. May I be permitted to make an objection to further action?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognized the Senator from Nebraska. The Chair will have to ask the Senator from Nebraska if he yields to the Senator from Arkansas for that purpose, because the situation must be left in the hands of the Senate, under the rules.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Chair has laid down the business. It is the desire of the Senator from Nebraska that the ruling be made on the question of reference of the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand the Chair to say that a point of order cannot be made under any circumstances, against what is now being attempted by the Chair?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not understand the Senator's inquiry.

Mr. LUCAS. Do I correctly understand the Chair to rule that simply because the Chair recognized the Senator from Nebraska, a point of order cannot be made or a statement cannot be made by the Senator from Arkansas in respect to a situation which, it seems to me, is on all fours with the similar situation which arose a few moments ago?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair did not intend to rule to that effect. The Chair was trying to indicate that, inasmuch as the Senator from Nebraska had been recognized, the Chair thought any affirmative action should be in the hands of the Senator from Nebraska until he had at least concluded his right to the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, inasmuch as this is a highly controversial issue in regard to reference, this bill is not in the same category as the bill which was brought up before. So I restate my request that ruling be made by the President pro tempore in regard to the reference of this bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the opinion of the Chair that when the question of jurisdiction is raised, it is necessary for the Chair to rule. The other rule to which the Senator is referring is subordinate to the necessity for the Chair to rule under the Reorganization Act.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I cannot quite agree with the distinguished occupant of the chair. I cannot see why a matter of mere reference, a question as to whether a bill shall be referred to the Committee on Agriculture or whether it shall be referred to the Finance Committee, should make any difference in regard to the fundamental proposition. When a bill which has been passed by the House of Representatives comes to the Senate and when the Senator from Arkansas desires to do the same thing regarding it that the Senator from California did in regard to the other bill—namely, make an objection, to the effect that the bill be placed at the end of the calendar, rather than have reference made—it certainly is beyond my comprehension how in one case a ruling can be made whereby there is no reference at all to a committee, and yet in another case, simply because some Senator raises a question of jurisdiction, reference is made. I do not follow the logic of that procedure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the Chair make a further observation, because the Chair can understand the confusion of the Senator from Illinois.

Section 137 of the Legislative Reorganization Act reads as follows:

> In any case in which a controversy arises as to the jurisdiction of any standing committee of the Senate with respect to any proposed legislation, the question of jurisdiction shall be decided by the presiding officer of the Senate, without debate, in favor of that committee which has jurisdiction over the subject matter which predominates in such proposed legislation; but such decision shall be subject to an appeal.

It is the view of the Chair that the question of precedence in a case of this character depends entirely upon which point is raised first. Since the question of jurisdiction has been raised first, it is

the view of the Chair that the question of jurisdiction takes priority.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, section 137 was in effect just as much in regard to the tidelands oil bill as it was in regard to the oleomargarine bill. Both bills came to the Senate under identically the same circumstances.

I have the greatest possible respect for the Chair. I have never seen a fairer Presiding Officer. But we are adopting a very dangerous precedent in the Senate if the Chair can raise a question of jurisdiction and thereby deny to one bill the same rights which are inherent in respect to another measure, simply because the Chair does not see fit to raise any question of jurisdiction as to the other measure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the Chair interrupt the Senator from Georgia for a moment, to say that in the view of the Chair, the Chair did not raise the question of jurisdiction. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] raised the question of jurisdiction.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have been here on the floor. If the Senator from Nebraska raised any question or point of jurisdiction, I did not hear him do so. The Chair announced that there was a question of jurisdiction; and after making that announcement, the Chair recognized the Senator from Nebraska. The Senator from Georgia heard the Senator from Nebraska state only that he hoped the Chair would go ahead and rule on the question of jurisdiction. He made that statement once or twice or three times.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I raised the question of jurisdiction and I pointed out the difference between the bills. The bill which came to the Senate and as to which the Senator from California objected to any further proceeding, after it had been read twice—with the result that the bill then went to the end of the calendar—was in regard to an entirely different matter.

In this case, the question is one of jurisdiction. I stood on my feet and said that I felt that inasmuch as the measure was a highly controversial one, the question of jurisdiction should be decided, and I asked for a ruling by the Chair.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Chair had already stated that a question of jurisdiction was involved in regard to the bill. I respectfully submit that a question of jurisdiction is involved in regard to any bill. It may not be controversial in some cases, but a question of jurisdiction is involved in regard to every bill which comes to the Senate.

In this case two bills have come to the Senate from the House of Representatives. They did not come to the Senate under different rules or circumstances. Both of them came to the Senate under section 137 of the Reorganization Act and under rule XIV of the standing rules of the Senate. With all deference to the Chair and with the great respect which I have for the Chair, I say it is very unfortunate that the Chair raised a question of jurisdiction before the Senator from Arkansas had an opportunity to submit with respect to the oleomargarine bill the same point which was submitted by the Senator from California with respect to the tidelands bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the Chair made this additional observation: In the initial statement made by the Chair, the Chair was not trying to raise a question of jurisdiction. On the contrary, the Chair was trying to disclose to the Senate why it was necessary for the Chair to make a preliminary ruling if he wished to submit the question of jurisdiction to the Senate.

The whole purpose of the Chair is to avoid the necessity of ruling on the question of jurisdiction, but there seems to be no way of doing so, under the rule. What the Chair was anxious to state was that after the ruling had been made, the Chair hoped the Senate would take its own jurisdiction without prejudice or respect to the Chair's ruling, and thus settle the problem for itself. The Chair was not raising the question of jurisdiction himself.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Chair stated that a question of jurisdiction was involved; and when the Senator from Arkansas rose to his feet and addressed the Chair, the Chair asked the Senator to defer until the Chair had an opportunity to make a statement concerning the jurisdiction of this bill.

With all respect to the Chair, I say it is a most unfortunate precedent that different rules should be applied with respect to these two bills.

Mr. FULBRIGHT and Mr. MAYBANK addressed the Chair.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wishes to state that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] has been on his feet for some time, addressing the Chair. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from South Carolina at this time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Not just at this time.

Mr. President, I do not believe House bill 2245 has been read the first and second time by the clerk.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to propound my own parliamentary inquiry first.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I insist that a parliamentary inquiry is always in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas does not have to yield for a parliamentary inquiry unless he wishes to do so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as I understand the situation, House bill 2245 has not been read the first and second time. Is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As soon as it is, at that point is it in order for me to object to further proceedings in regard to the bill?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to obtain an answer to my inquiry, first.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield for that purpose?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Not until I have an answer to the inquiry I have propounded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Arkansas restate his inquiry?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is this: After House bill 2245 has been read the first and second times by the clerk, is it in order for me at that time to object to further proceedings in regard to the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator is recognized, he can do so. The sole question is one of priority in respect to recognition because either procedure is in order.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In other words, regardless of whether rule XIV applies, it is within the discretion of the Chair, is it not, to recognize the Senator from Nebraska? Is that the situation?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It seems to me that is a rather odd situation respecting the application of rule XIV.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is scarcely anything odd in permitting the Chair to recognize Senators. That is what the Chair is here for.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But, for the purpose of applying rule XIV, it seems to me, under the California case, the objection to further consideration should be in order, before that action is taken.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield for an inquiry?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to inquire as a matter of information whether or not the oleomargarine bill has yet received a first and second reading?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has not.

Mr. DONNELL. Then, Mr. President, I make the point of order that it cannot be placed on the calendar at this time because of the fact that rule XIV, subdivision 4, says:

> Every bill and joint resolution of the House of Representatives which shall have received a first and second reading without being referred to a committee shall, if objection be made to further proceeding thereon, be placed on the calendar.

My point is that the Chair is entirely correct in proceeding to make his ruling, and that this bill cannot now be placed on the calendar because a first and second reading of the bill has not yet been had.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct, up to this point.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may we have the first and second reading of the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the rule bills may be read twice by title.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. LUCAS. I respectfully present this hypothetical question: When the Senate is considering any bill which comes from the House, would it be in order to question committee jurisdiction of the bill, in order to keep it from going to the calendar?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator repeat his question?

Mr. LUCAS. My question is, with respect to any bill coming from the House, would it be in order for any Senator to question to which committee the bill should be referred, in order to keep it from going to the calendar?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It would be, after the second reading.

Mr. LUCAS. And if the Senator could obtain recognition?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, as I understand the parliamentary situation, the bill cannot be placed on the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator repeat his question?

Mr. MAYBANK. As I understand the parliamentary situation, the bill is not to be placed on the calendar without reference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill has not yet been read.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like first to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Overton
Baldwin	Hayden	Reed
Ball	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Brewster	Hoey	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Butler	Kem	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kilgore	Smith
Cain	Knowland	Stennis
Capper	Langer	Stewart
Chavez	Lodge	Taylor
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McClellan	Thye
Donnell	McFarland	Tobey
Downey	McGrath	Tydings
Dworshak	McKellar	Umstead
Eastland	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ecton	Maybank	Watkins
Ellender	Moore	Wherry
Ferguson	Morse	White
Flanders	Murray	Wiley
Fulbright	O'Conor	Williams
Gurney	O'Daniel	Wilson
Hatch	O'Mahoney	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. PEPPER and Mr. HOLLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The Chair lays before the Senate House bill 2245, the oleomargarine bill, which has come from the House and which will be read the first time by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2245) to repeal the tax on oleomargarine.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the second reading of the bill?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will go over automatically until tomorrow or the next legislative day.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I regret that the situation is such that the Chair could not rule today on the question. The bill, which came from the House of Representatives, was introduced by the Representative from my district and from my home, Representative RIVERS. After a long fight the bill was finally passed by the House, and I was hopeful that today the Senate would take it up and that the Chair would rule on the committee to which the bill should be referred.

In 1943 and 1944 a similar fight took place in the Senate. I submitted to tax bill after tax bill amendments proposing to repeal the taxes on oleomargarine. Extensive hearings were held by the Finance Committee, of which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] was at that time chairman. The distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate was at that time the ranking Republican on the Finance Committee. The oleomargarine interests and other witnesses testified. Through all those hearings the measure was handled by the Finance Committee. Of course I should like to see the bill placed on the calendar, as was done in the case of the tidelands oil bill. I hope that the Chair, who has always been fair in the reference of bills, will not forget that the hearings on oleomargarine were held before the Finance Committee in 1943, 1944, and 1948, which committee already has a great deal of information on the subject. I therefore trust that the bill as passed by the House will be referred to the Finance Committee.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the chairman of the Finance Committee, recently made the statement in the Senate, in answer to me, that he considered it to be a tax matter and that the Finance Committee would take it up in due time.

So, Mr. President, without further statement, I trust that when the matter comes up tomorrow, unless the bill can be placed on the calendar, the distinguished President pro tempore will refer the bill to the Finance Committee which heard the arguments in 1943, 1944, 1947, and 1948.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PRINTED REPORT ON AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a printed copy of a report on the agricultural experiment stations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON OPERATION OF THE TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting, pursuant to Executive Order 9832, a preliminary draft of the first three parts of a report on the Operation of the Trade Agreements Program, for the period July 1934 to April 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

AUDIT REPORT OF GORGAS MEMORIAL LABORATORY—GORGAS MEMORIAL INSTITUTE OF TROPICAL AND PREVENTIVE MEDICINE, INC.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the audit of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory—Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT OF THE TEXTILE FOUNDATION

A letter from the Chairman of The Textile Foundation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Foundation for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Governors of the Western States, assembled in conference in Sacramento, Calif., favoring an appropriation of $20,000,000 as a part of the authorization set forth in the Federal Highway Act of 1944, for the improvement of the Forest Highway System within the United States, including Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the governors of the Western States, assembled in conference in Sacramento, Calif., favoring statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 4721. A bill to remove the statutory limit of appropriation expenditures for repairs or changes to a vessel of the Navy; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1226).

By Mr. THYE, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 2152. A bill to increase the maximum travel allowance for railway postal clerks and substitute railway postal clerks; without amendment (Rept. No. 1227); and

H. R. 1189. A bill to establish the methods of advancement for post-office employees (rural carriers) in the field service; without amendment (Rept. No. 1228).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 2432. A bill to amend the Alien Registration Act of 1940; with amendments (Rept. No. 1229); and

S. J. Res. 200. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; without amendment (Rept. No. 1230).

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing a nomination, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Herman E. Moore, of Illinois, to be judge of the District Court of the Virgin Islands of the United States; and

John Joseph McGowan, of Minnesota, to be United States marshal for the district of Minnesota.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 2592. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Air Force to return certain lands situated in Puerto Rico, in accordance with the terms of the conveyances to the United States Government, and final judgments in certain condemnation proceedings; and

S. 2593. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Commonwealth of Virginia a right of way for public highway purposes in certain lands at Pungo, Va.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILEY (by request):

S. 2594. A bill for the relief of Edwin B. Anderson; and

S. 2595. A bill for the relief of the Madison Street Building Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. THYE):

S. 2596. A bill to grant travel and subsistence allowance to the next of kin attending group burials of remains of known individuals returned to the United States for interment; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 2597. A bill for the relief of James G. Smyth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED MEETING OF PRESIDENT-ELECT OF UNITED STATES AND MARSHAL STALIN

Mr. TAYLOR submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 54), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas in order to achieve universal peace and justice, it is necessary to replace the present condition of international anarchy with an organization capable of maintaining permanent peace under law; and

Whereas the committee to frame a world constitution has now completed a proposed constitution to be presented to a world constitutional convention for adoption as the framework of a true world government; and

Whereas the possibility for adoption of such a constitution is greatly lessened by the tension existing between the two great world powers, which tension is caused largely by the lack of sincere negotiations between the present leaders of both nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that a meeting should be held at Geneva, Switzerland, during November 1948 between the President-elect of the United States and Marshal Stalin of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics for the purpose of arriving at a just agreement on all matters of contention between the two countries. Upon completion of such an agreement, the President of the United States shall then initiate action to provide for election of delegates to a world constitutional convention to be held next year.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR POSTMASTERS AND POSTAL EMPLOYEES—AMENDMENT

Mr. MORSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1949) to provide additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the postal service, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1917 AND NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940—RECOMMITTAL OF BILL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 1975) to amend subsection (6) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917 and subsection (a) of section 338 of the Nationality Act of 1940, be taken from the calendar and recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The bill is order No. 1239 on the calendar. It was reported from the Judiciary Committee by mistake.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930—INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT OF BILL

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 2459) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, and that it be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, would the Senator care to make an explanation of the request?

Mr. BREWSTER. I shall be happy to do so.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the committee do anything about the bill? Did it hold hearings?

Mr. BREWSTER. No. The bill was a product of the hearings and record of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board. It was understood we were to introduce many such bills in the House and Senate. This bill was introduced through inadvertence, it not being appropriate even as a Senate bill. It deals with finance, and must come from the House. No one had noticed the mistake. When I was apprised of the situation, I immediately wished to ask that the bill be withdrawn from the committee and indefinitely postponed. I was advised that this was the correct method of disposing of it.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Committee on Finance will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and it will be indefinitely postponed.

THE PRESIDENT'S CIVIL-RIGHTS PROGRAM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR UMSTEAD

[Mr. UMSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the President's civil-rights program delivered by him in Wilmington, N. C., on April 24, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

KEYNOTE SPEECH BY SENATOR KEM AT MISSOURI REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the keynote speech delivered by him at the Republican State Convention at St. Louis, Mo., on May 1, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHURCHILL ON BRITISH SOCIALISTS—ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD part of an article entitled "Churchill Says Socialists Live on United States Dole," published in the May 1, 1948, issue of the Washington Times-Herald, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT DO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WANT FROM THEIR POLITICIANS?—LECTURE BY SENATOR MORSE

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the Edmund J. James lecture on Government, on the subject What Do the American People Want From Their Politicians? delivered by him April 28, 1948, at the University of Illinois, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRODUCTION AND SALE OF OLEOMARGARINE—ADDRESS BY WILL W. HENRY

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the repeal of laws governing the production and sale of oleomargarine delivered by Will W. Henry, manager of the Dairy Cooperative Association of Portland, Oreg., on March 30, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

FARM LEGISLATION—LETTER FROM LAURENCE PIATT

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter regarding farm legislation from Laurence Piatt, of McClave, Colo., which appears in the Appendix.]

AIR POWER—EDITORIALS FROM THE NEW YORK JOURNAL-AMERICAN

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials, the first entitled "Citizens, Consider Carefully the Effective Way To Defend Yourselves and Your Country," by William Randolph Hearst, dated March 27, 1938, the other entitled "The Wings of Security," dated January 21, 1948, both having been published in the New York Journal-American, which appear in the Appendix.]

REVIEW BY WILLIAM E. BOHN OF BOOK BY HENRY A. WALLACE

[Mr. RUSSELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a review entitled "Henry Wallace and God," by William E. Bohn, relative to the book Toward World Peace, by Henry A. Wallace, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE STRIKE OF THE PACKING-HOUSE WORKERS

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD correspondence between E. Howard Hill, president of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation, and Ralph Helstein, president, United Packing House Workers of America, an editorial from the Des Moines Register, an editorial by K. M. Landis 2d, in the Chicago Sun-Times, and two articles in the Moorhead Daily News of Moorhead, Minn., dealing with the packing-house workers' strike, which appear in the Appendix.]

GOOD LAWS, BAD LAWS—STATEMENT BY G. C. STEVENSON

[Mr. ECTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Good Laws, Bad Laws," issued by G. C. Stevenson, executive secretary, Montana Petroleum Industries Committee, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNITED STATES POLICY MAKERS—EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

[Mr. ECTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Devil's Advocate Might Help Our Policy Makers," published in the May 1, 1948, issue of the Saturday Evening Post, which appears in the Appendix.]

TEACHING OF THE CONSTITUTION IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by John S. Herron, superintendent of schools of Newark, N. J., relative to the study of the Constitution of the United States in the schools of America, and a copy of the Superintendent's Monthly Conference with Principals and Supervisory Staff, which appear in the Appendix.]

TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF TITLE VI OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2565) to provide for a temporary extension of title VI of the National Housing Act, as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state the parliamentary situation. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] to Senate bill 2565.

The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise briefly on the pending amendment——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield for a quorum call? If the Senator will permit me, I shall ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be displaced and that the Senate take up the so-called science bill, Senate bill 2385, in order to reach a conclusion on the matter possibly by Wednesday.

Mr. HATCH. My remarks will be very brief. They will not consume more than 10 or 15 minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. HATCH Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the pending amendment. I shall not go into the question of motives or purposes on the part of any Senator who supports the amendment. To my mind however, the plain, unadulterated fact is that if this amendment is adopted, it will be a death blow to the housing bill the Senate only recently passed. Regardless of the merits of the housing bill in its entirety, the Senate has expressed its approval of that measure. The House of Representatives should be given full opportunity to act upon the bill as a whole and not be confronted with having it injured, damaged, and perhaps nullified, by piecemeal legislation as the pending amendment. The pending bill reported by the committee which is sought to be amended would give ample time for the House to act appropriately and squarely upon the issue presented by the general housing bill which passed the Senate. If it should become apparent that the House will not act on the housing bill, or perhaps that the measure which passed the Senate will be defeated in the House, and it is necessary to have legislation extending the authority of the public-housing provision for a year, as is contemplated by the pending amendment, such authority can be given in ample time by the Senate committee reporting the housing bill which is already before it, which grants such extension, and which has already passed the House of Representatives.

Therefore, Mr. President, there is no need or occasion for adopting the pending amendment, except it be desired to confuse the issues in the House of Representatives and, in all likelihood, destroy any chance of passing the Senate bill at this session of Congress. I hope the pending amendment will be decisively defeated, and the bill reported by the committee enacted.

In mentioning the housing bill, Mr. President, I am reminded of other measures, and also that this is the third day of May and time is rapidly passing. If present plans for adjournment are carried out, and this session of Congress should end sometime between the middle of June and the 1st of July, time for enactment of all the important legislation pending before the Congress is indeed short.

Today I have in mind, Mr. President, four measures which, with others, should be passed upon before we adjourn. Defeat of these measures, or failure to act, will subject the Congress to most severe and rightful criticism, for the measures which I mention are measures which affect the general welfare of the country as a whole and, with one exception, apply only to domestic affairs. Also, with one exception, they contain no tint or taint of partisan politics. It is true that some of them are controversial, and the passage or failure to pass them may have political repercussions, but with one exception they cannot be in any sense construed to be political or partisan in nature.

One of these measures is the bill I have already mentioned, the housing bill. The need for housing legislation was so thoroughly debated in the Senate at the time we passed the Senate bill, there is no need to elaborate upon or discuss the grave necessity for acting upon the Senate bill. There is but one legitimate argument against the measure—that is, one which I consider to be legitimate—and that is the possible tendency to increase the inflationary spiral. There may be merit to this argument. However, it is not sufficient reason why the housing measure should die without our facing the issue and frankly voting it up or down. That, Mr. President, insofar as the housing legislation is concerned, is all that I ask. The Senate faced that issue, and now I do not think it is any violation of rules to express the strong opinion that the House of Representatives is under obligation likewise to face the bill in its entirety and either pass it or defeat it by votes and not by inaction or by keeping it bottled up in some committee, or not have it destroyed by the adoption of such an amendment as that under consideration today.

Recently the Senate passed a bill relating to Federal education, a measure which has long been before the Congress. The Senate bill met this issue as wisely as seemed possible. It is a bill which vitally affects the education of the youth of America. It, like the housing bill, is entitled to be voted up or down by the House of Representatives.

There is another matter which I shall only mention today, but it is one which ought to have quick action in the House of Representatives. More than a year ago the Senate approved a bill proposing that the United States adhere to the World Health Organization. As yet, the House has not acted on that measure. I understand that the House Rules Committee by a vote of five to two, tabled it, and it lies now in the House of Representatives unacted upon, and will so remain until the Congress adjourns, unless aggressive and vigorous action is taken in the other body of the Congress.

Adherence to the World Health Organization is not any new move for the United States. We participated in a similar agency under the League of Nations. We have been the strongest proponents of measures to safeguard and protect not only the peoples of the world, but also our own people, against the dread ravages of disease. Russia, Britain, China, and France have ratified this organization, and thirty-odd other nations have joined in such ratification. Yet we, the United States, its chief proponent and advocate, allow the measure to remain in the House Rules Committee, dead or dying, and it will die with the

ending of this session of Congress unless action is taken soon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this point to have inserted in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled, "World Health—A Must" from yesterday's New York Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD HEALTH—A MUST

How much longer will Congress allow a handful of men to frustrate the clear intention of its Members? In 6 weeks the first World Health Organization assembly will meet in Geneva. But unless quick action is taken by the more progressive elements in Congress, the United States will be represented only as "observer" on crucial problems affecting all humanity, instead of as a participating world power.

Over a year ago the Senate approved a bill proposing that the United States adhere to WHO. The House Foreign Relations Committee unanimously approved that bill. Yet on March 12 the House Rules Committee, with 7 of its 12 members voting, decided 5 to 2 to table the measure. Because of this maneuver, the United States finds itself in a paradoxical and absurd position. It is in the position of boycotting the very organization it helped create.

The United States was among the original signers of the constitution of this international agency for the good and logical reason that the battle against germs and ignorance was practical. Since then WHO has been ratified by 35 nations, including Russia, Britain, and China; France is expected to come in shortly. Only the United States of the big powers stands aloof. Presumably because of that example, so has all of South America, except Mexico and Haiti.

It is unthinkable that Congress will allow this situation to go unchallenged. Experts have shown that, apart from crucially needed medical aid for children, malaria and tuberculosis have reduced man's productivity by 85 percent. To take the single instance of Europe, where the first ERP goods are arriving, it is elementary economics that the health of those peoples must be safeguarded and disease arrested. The cost to the United States—and WHO has the support of the American Medical Association, the American Red Cross, the American Social Hygiene Association, the American Psychiatric Association, and many others—is but $2,000,000.

The question is: Can the United States afford not to join—indeed, to lead—this crusade for physical and mental health?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, again I, too, vigorously urge, as does the New York Times, that adherence to the World Health Organization be placed on the must list and that we adhere to that organization soon enough for us to participate in the assembly which will meet in Geneva within the next few weeks.

Mr. President, the fourth and last measure I mentioned is one which must be acted upon before the end of this Congress, lest all the progress made since 1934 be lost and we retreat and go backward into a position of logrolling tariff methods which in times past gravely and seriously injured the economy of our own country as well as the economy of other nations.

The reciprocal trade program will expire unless it is extended before we adjourn. Today I shall not debate this issue. I merely call attention to the grave necessity of passing on this, as well as the other important measures I have mentioned, before we have any thought of concluding the business of the present session.

Today I shall make no partisan or political references, except to say, Mr. President, that the leadership in the Congress of the United States rests in the hands of the Republican party. If it is desired to have action on these measures—all of which are of supreme importance—the Republican leadership of the Congress can submit them for actual vote and let the chosen representatives of the people say by their votes whether we shall progress and go forward on these matters, or whether we shall lapse and go backward.

I commend the Congress for its strong and close attention and devotion to the mighty problems of European recovery and of the national defense, of its willingness to appropriate whatever sums of money are necessary to carry out these great programs, for all of which I voted, and all of which I shall continue to support; nevertheless, Mr. President, in the consideration of these issues which some may seem to be the greater issues, we have no right to overlook what may be considered the minor or lesser ones. Often, Mr. President, in the moving events of the world and domestic affairs, that which seems to be the greater today because the lesser tomorrow.

I have no hesitancy in saying that these measures of long-range programs for the welfare of the men and women of America, perhaps of the people of all the world, programs of decent housing, education of our children, the prevention of disease at home and abroad, and the establishment of proper, just, and fair trade relations, may, although they seem to be the lesser today, become the greater tomorrow.

I hope the Congress will not even consider adjourning until these and all other measures of importance shall be finally determined.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business, the bill for the temporary extension of title VI of the National Housing Act, as amended, be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 1186, Senate bill 2385, entitled "A bill to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2385) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask the Senator from Nebraska when it is the intention of the majority, or the majority leadership, again to take up the housing bill?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is our intention to proceed with the housing bill as quickly as possible. Request for delay, however, was made on the floor of the Senate Friday on behalf of certain Senators who would like to be present when the bill is further debated. Such request was made by Senators on both sides of the aisle. In view of those requests, and statements by Senators who were apparently of the opinion that no detriment would result from permitting the existing law to terminate—and the termination point has now been reached and passed—I humbly ask the Senator from New Mexico to permit the Senate to proceed with the science bill, and when we have concluded it and other important legislation we will recur to the consideration of the housing bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Still reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I will say that while it is true that Senators made statements, as indicated by the Senator from Nebraska, nevertheless the action taken did prove detrimental. I notice by the local press that the hotels in Washington are already raising their prices. I should like to see the housing bill acted on once and for all one of these days. If the Senator can secure unanimous consent that the housing bill shall be taken up on a certain day, I shall have no objection to temporarily laying it aside as the unfinished business of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I hope the distinguished Senator will have faith in me when I say we will bring up the housing bill as quickly as possible, for the reason that we cannot make a commitment for a certain day or hour any more at which a particular bill can be taken up. I will say to the Senator from New Mexico that I am satisfied the bill will be taken up as early as possible.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Can the Senator give me any idea as to when it will be taken up?

Mr. WHERRY. I think it will be taken up on Wednesday, but I am not even sure of that. If the Senator will withhold his objection, I think he will come to agreement with me that the procedure suggested is the proper one to take at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I desire to interrogate the Senator from Nebraska in order that we may have an answer to the question which the Senator from New Mexico has raised. It is my understanding that the majority will try to bring up the title VI amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] sometime this week. Is that correct?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, important legislation confronts us for action. We must take up for consideration the matter of airplane production, the procurement bill, concerning which the Senator knows the facts.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am very much in favor of it.

Mr. WHERRY. We also may take up the civil functions appropriation bill, concerning which the Senator from South Carolina knows the facts. There are at least three or four very important bills which must be acted upon quickly. It was hoped that we could

have concluded action on the bill extending title VI on Friday last. I think the Senator will agree with me that I did everything I could to secure such extension.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes. We could, however, have agreed to such extension for 1 month or 2 months. The trouble was that the amendment provided for extension for a year.

Mr. WHERRY. I did everything I could so far as procedure was concerned, regardless of whether the amendment might be acted upon favorably or rejected.

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me ask the Senator a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Permit me to finish my observation, please.

Mr. MAYBANK. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. I did my level best to have action on extension of title VI concluded on Friday. Now, this morning we are in the same position in which we were on Friday. The honorable and distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is not in the city, but will return, as I understand, on Tuesday night. He will be present in the Senate on Wednesday. It was my understanding that the plea was made by many Senators, even Senators on the other side of the aisle, as well as Senators on this side of the aisle, that the distinguished Senator from Ohio be present to participate in the debate.

Mr. President, I should rather not have gone into detail respecting this matter now. I am trying to have the proposed legislation considered as quickly as possible, and have action upon it terminated one way or the other. I will say to my distinguished colleagues that the reason why I selected Wednesday was that the Senator from Ohio would be present on that day. It is very difficult, however, for me to guarantee that a certain measure will come up for action at a certain hour. It is difficult to secure unanimous consent respecting such a matter. We all know that the housing bill is of such importance that it will receive consideration. I am satisfied that there is no disposition at all on the part of the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] to proceed with action on the measure now, and that would suit me. In order to carry out the wishes which were apparently expressed by Members of the Senate on Friday, it was my thought that we might displace the pending business with some other legislation, and then take up the housing bill at the earliest possible moment which would be satisfactory.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, there is no opposition of any consequence to the 70-group Air Force measure. I think the Senator from Nebraska will agree with me that the Air Force bill should not require more than a few minutes to be passed. But there is considerable opposition to the Army civil-functions appropriation bill. Debate on that bill might take considerable time. I know the Senator from Nebraska cannot determine the program, but I am hopeful that the housing bill may be considered and disposed of as soon as action has been taken on the 70-group Air Force legislation, which I believe all Senators favor.

Mr. WHERRY. Permit me to make an observation. We attempted to bring up for consideration the bill dealing with the oleomargarine tax today. I had hoped that unanimous consent could have been obtained for having the bill read the first and second times today, and that the matter could have been considered today. But the distinguished Senator knows that some Senators wish to have it lie over until tomorrow. They have a perfect right to ask for strict adherence to the rules of the Senate. They did so, and therefore action could not be had today on that bill. The science bill is on the calendar, and so request was made that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and the science bill be considered.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] a question. Have I been correctly informed that it is the wish of the junior Senator from Vermont and the wish of the senior Senator from Ohio that the amendment presently before the Senate should be passed over until Wednesday of this week.

Mr. FLANDERS. I will say to the junior Senator from Washington that he is correct in that assumption. We talked with the senior Senator from Ohio on the telephone this morning and the Senator from Ohio expressed a strong wish that debate and action might be deferred on the amendment until he can be present, which will be the first thing Wednesday morning.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington is necessarily most desirous of bringing the issue involved in the amendment to a satisfactory conclusion at the earliest possible date, but the wish having been expressed by two distinguished Senators of this body, both of whom represent leadership in this matter, I think it reasonable that the pending housing bill, if we can be given any assurance respecting it, should go over until Wednesday of this week. But I should like to say to the Senator from Nebraska that I trust he will lend his very strong efforts to the end that the housing bill may be concluded not later than Wednesday, because we all remain conscious of the fact that title VI loans of the National Housing Act are no longer authorized.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to observe that I can find no desire on the part of any Senator on either side of the aisle or on any side of the question to defer consideration of the bill beyond Wednesday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2385?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2385) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in order that there may be further light on the procedure for tomorrow and the next day, I will state that it is the present inention to adjourn when the Senate has concluded its business today, until tomorrow at noon. At that time there will be a morning hour, and I announce now that, if it meets with the approval of the Senate, the legislative calendar will be called for the consideration of bills, to which there is no objection, commencing at the place where the Senate left off on April 26, with order No. 1211, House bill 4068; and that after the calendar has been called, if the so-called science bill has not been finished, it is our hope to continue with that measure tomorrow afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would like to make it plain in connection with the same announcement that since the Senator is proposing to adjourn, the oleomargarine bill will be laid down for its second reading tomorrow.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, Senate bill 2385 is the well-known National Science Foundation bill, which has been before two sessions of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, would the Senator prefer to have a quorum call at the beginning of his remarks?

Mr. SMITH. I think it might be well to have a quorum call, inasmuch as a number of Members of the Senate want to hear the presentation of the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Overton
Baldwin	Hayden	Reed
Ball	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Brewster	Hoey	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Butler	Kem	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kilgore	Smith
Cain	Knowland	Stennis
Capper	Langer	Stewart
Chavez	Lodge	Taylor
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McClellan	Thye
Donnell	McFarland	Tobey
Downey	McGrath	Tydings
Dworshak	McKellar	Umstead
Eastland	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ecton	Maybank	Watkins
Ellender	Moore	Wherry
Ferguson	Morse	White
Flanders	Murray	Wiley
Fulbright	O'Conor	Williams
Gurney	O'Daniel	Wilson
Hatch	O'Mahoney	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the bill now pending before the Senate is designed to establish a National Science Foundation to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

My cosponsors of the bill are the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

The bill now before the Senate has been considered by a special subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It was reported to the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and was unanimously reported to the Senate by that committee.

As my colleagues in the Senate well know, responsible leaders in all fields of national endeavor have come to recognize the imperative need for the immediate establishment of a National Science Foundation. Numerous bills designed to achieve that purpose have from time to time been introduced in the Congress. Over the last several years, comprehensive public hearings have been held on this subject. The evidence presented at those hearings has overwhelmingly demonstrated the need for early and effective national action in this all-important field.

A number of bills, after careful committee consideration, have been favorably reported and thoroughly debated on the floor of the Congress. But notwithstanding all the efforts which have thus far been expended, notwithstanding the extensive public hearings which have been held by Congressional committees, notwithstanding the numerous messages submitted by responsible Government officials, and notwithstanding the pleas of outstanding scientists and educators, the fact remains that the Government of the United States has not yet succeeded in establishing a National Science Foundation to stimulate, coordinate, and lend direction to the scientific endeavors of the Nation.

During the first session of the Eightieth Congress—that is the present Congress—on my own behalf and on behalf of several other Senators—the same Senators as those whose names I have just read and who are cosponsoring the bill I introduced—Senate bill 526. That bill was carefully considered in committee, in conjunction with a similar bill, S. 525, introduced by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], for himself and other Senators. After careful deliberation, an amended version of S. 526, with the full cooperation of the Senator from Utah, was unanimously reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. That was early last year.

That bill, after full, complete, and careful debate, was passed by this body. It was subsequently passed by the House of Representatives in a somewhat modified form. The differences between the Senate and House versions were resolved in conference. The report of the conferees was agreed to by both Houses of Congress and the bill was sent to the President for his consideration. On August 6, 1947, after the first session of Congress had adjourned, that bill was vetoed by the President.

I may say here, Mr. President, that when the Congress reassembled this year, I immediately took up with the President in person the question of reintroducing the bill, to see whether we could smooth over some of the differences and come to a satisfactory conclusion. I may say that the bill which we are now considering has met most of the objections the President raised. We did not agree to all his objections. We stood by our position in originally presenting the bill. But I think the bill we are presenting today, if passed by the Senate and House, as I hope it may be, will overcome the President's objections, and I am very hopeful that he will sign it.

BACKGROUND OF S. 2385

On the basis of the President's objections to S. 526, as set forth in his veto message, and on the basis of such other information as had since become available on the subject, on behalf of myself and a number of my colleagues, I introduced the pending bill S. 2385. That bill, with slight modifications, is now before the Senate, having been unanimously reported, as I stated a moment ago, by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. President, because this subject was so thoroughly debated during the last session of Congress, and because most Senators are fully conversant with the problems involved in the enactment of legislation of this type, I do not intend to discuss now at length the numerous factors which make the enactment of this proposed legislation essential. I wish merely to point out that the record as to the need for legislation of this character is exceedingly comprehensive, and includes several volumes of responsible testimony compiled in public hearings, a number of committee documents and reports, and many days of congressional debate. There is no need for me to review again the details of that record.

Before proceeding to a discussion of the various sections of the bill, I wish to make it clear that, in my opinion, the pending legislation goes far toward meeting the objections raised by the President in his veto message on S. 526. At the same time, I feel that the pending bill retains and reaffirms those basic principles which the Congress has consistently endorsed in drafting legislation of this type.

At this point, Mr. President, I desire to set forth for the RECORD a summary of the provisions of the bill, which I think will make clear what it aims to accomplish.

In the first place, the name, the National Science Foundation, is identical with the name used in previous bills. It is the same as the name used in all official measures and correspondence on the subject.

Section 2 establishes an independent agency in the executive department of the Government for the support of basic research, the awarding of scholarships, and for other purposes.

Section 3 provides for membership in the Foundation, and states that 24 individuals, eminent in the sciences, engineering, education, or public affairs, shall comprise the Foundation. The members are to be selected on the basis of their established records of distinguished service, and with the view to securing the widest possible geographical representation.

In connection with appointments of members of the Foundation the bill contains a provision which was in last year's bill, and which I think meets the approval of all who have been studying the matter. That provision is to the effect that in making nominations the President is requested to consider recommendations submitted to him by recognized associations of scientists and educators. We made that provision because we wanted all sections of the country to be considered and institutions of learning, of all sorts to be included. Section 3 of the bill specifically designates the National Academy of Sciences, the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, the National Association of State Universities, the Association of American Colleges, and other scientific or educational organizations, thus making it sufficiently broad.

I am not maintaining that the President can be limited in his choice, but it seemed to me that by placing in the bill the request that the President consider recommendations by these organizations we would insure, so far as we could, the cooperation between scientists and the President of the United States, and between our educational organizations and the President, in setting up the Foundation. The President's appointments are subject to confirmation by the Senate. The term provided for is 6 years, with a limit of 12 years' continuous service.

In order to prevent continuity of the same persons in office, the bill provides that after a person has served for 12 years, an intervening term of at least 2 years must elapse before he can be reappointed. This language, I may say, is similar to the provision in last year's bill. In the pending bill, as in last year's bill, the number of members of the Foundation is reduced from the first proposal of 48 to 24, in order to make the operation more effective.

Section 4, having to do with the powers and duties of the Foundation, provides by its terms that the Foundation is authorized and directed (1) to develop a national policy for promoting basic research and scientific education; (2) to make grants and loans for research; (3) after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to support research for national defense; (4) to award scholarships and fellowships; (5) to foster interchange of information among scientists in the United States and foreign countries; (6) to correlate the Foundation's program with other public, and with private, research; and (7) to establish such special commissions as the Foundation may from time to time deem advisable.

I may say that in defining the powers and duties of the Foundation we had the judgment of experts in the field of scientific research. The hearings covered nearly 3 years, certainly over 2 years, and we tried to incorporate the definition the best thought we could obtain from scientific leaders throughout the country.

Section 4 also contains an admonition against geographic concentration of activities. It further provides for selection of a chairman and vice chairman by the Foundation, the submission of annual reports, and the appointment of such committees, including an executive committee, as the Foundation may deem necessary.

Section 5 provides for a director of the Foundation, who is to be appointed by the President, by and with the consent of the Senate.

I shall refer to this matter in a few moments in discussing some of the controversial features of the bill.

The director is to serve as an ex officio member of the Foundation and also as the chief executive officer of the Foundation. He is to be paid a salary of $15,000 per annum, and is to serve for a term of 6 years, unless sooner removed by the President.

The next section, section 6, provides for four divisions within the Foundation, as follows:

(1) A Division of Medical Research; (2) a Division of Mathematical, Physical, and Engineering Sciences; (3) a Division of Biological Sciences; and (4) a Division of Scientific Personnel and Education, which is to be concerned with the program of the Foundation relating to the granting of scholarships and graduate fellowships in mathematical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences.

I desire to call attention to a matter which is important to many of those who have been studying the subject and who feel that there should be a division of the social sciences. After much debate we felt that we should limit the bill, so far as mandatory division was concerned, to what might be called the basic sciences, such as chemistry, biology, physics, and so forth, and not, for the moment, require that there be a division of the social sciences. The bill sets forth, however, that the Foundation may explore the needs of the social sciences and provide for the establishment of a special scientific research project in some field of social science. We felt that was wiser than to include a mandatory provision covering the subject. This language was contained in the bill last year; it was passed by both Houses, and it has been carried over into this bill. It is identical with the language in the previous bill. I may say that this disposition of the matter met with the approval of the executive department.

Section 7 provides for divisional committees. These are groups of five or more for each division, to serve the Foundation and its Director by advice, consultation, and recommendation. The divisional committees are selected by the Foundation and may be members or nonmembers of the Foundation. We felt that in the field of divisional committees, in the different areas of scientific research, it was not necessary to limit the membership merely to members of the Foundation. The bill widens the number of scientific persons whose services can be availed of, thus adding to the development of the whole program.

Section 8 provides for special commissions. Originally it was contemplated that there should be, for example, a special commission on cancer, a special commission on heart diseases, a special commission on poliomyelitis, and so forth. We finally reached the conclusion that it was wiser not to designate certain commissions under specific names, but to leave discretion in the Foundation to determine from time to time what ad hoc commissions should be established in order to deal with special subjects, such as those I have mentioned.

Each such commission would "make a comprehensive survey of research, both public and private, being carried on in its field" and "formulate and recommend to the Foundation" an over-all research program.

As I have just stated, previous bills have made mandatory the creation of special commissions for cancer, heart diseases, and other afflictions, but our committee has left the matter to the Foundation.

Since we reported the bill some Members of the House have suggested to me that they would like to see provision for these special commissions restored to the bill and renamed. I stated to them that if the House brought up the matter in conference I personally would have no objection, although I felt that the bill would be in better form if no special commissions were named, because if two or three were named, other groups would want to be named. I thought it would be better to leave it to the Foundation, which would be prepared to use its discretion in establishing special groups.

Section 9 has to do with scholarships and graduate fellowships. It authorizes the Director, with the approval of the Foundation, to award scholarships and fellowships to outstanding students to pursue studies in accredited nonprofit institutions of the student's own choice. Such scholarships and fellowships may be awarded here or abroad if the students desire to go abroad. Selections are to be made on the basis of ability. Where ability is substantially equal among two or more contenders, selection is to be made so as to result in a wider geographical distribution of scholarships and fellowships. We feel that was an important principle to embody in the proposed legislation, to the end that if there were a preponderance of scholarships and fellowships from the eastern section of the country, an effort would be made to equalize the scholarships and fellowships so as to include the Middle West or the West.

Section 10 provides specifically for the authority which the Foundation can exercise. It provides that the Foundation may (a) make rules and regulations; (b) make expenditures; (c) enter into contracts for research within or without the United States. That will be one of the most important functions of the Foundation.

Also (d) to make advance payments, progress payments, and other payments; (e) acquire and hold property; (f) receive and utilize donations; (g) disseminate information; (h) accept voluntary services; and (i) account for funds.

Section 11 covers the question of patent rights. In this section the committee has used substantially the same language which was used in the bill last year. The matter was fully debated and both House and Senate passed the provisions of the bill last year. I think the provisions in the bill the year before were almost the same. So there should be no controversy at this time in that field.

Section 12 provides that the Foundation may cooperate in international research activities; namely, it may cooperate with scientific institutions abroad in developing special fields of research.

Section 13 provides for appropriations, and merely authorizes the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary. No amount is named. We felt it should be within and incumbent on the Foundation each year to present to the Congress an estimate of the amount of money which would be needed to carry out its program, and the Congress each year could determine whether the program justified the appropriation.

Section 14 covers a number of general provisions which I shall run through rapidly.

The Director, with the approval of the Foundation, may appoint his own Deputy Director. The Director and his Deputy are to devote full time to the Foundation. Other provisions of this section include per diem allowances for members; procedures to be followed in the employment of necessary personnel; and a prohibition against operating laboratories or pilot plants by the Foundation itself.

I think that is a very important point. The Government is not going into the business itself. The work is to be contracted for through existing institutions. We are not trying in any way to compete with existing institutions.

Other provisions of the section include a provision against encroachment on other Government activities; transfer of the National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel from the Department of Labor to the Foundation at the instance of the President.

I point out that in preparing the legislation we have sought complete accord with the Atomic Energy Commission, so that there will be no overlapping or conflict. There is covered in the bill denial of participation in the field of atomic energy without the concurrence of the Atomic Energy Commission, and denial of any interference with the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act; and consultation with the Secretary of Defense and thereafter publication of regulations for the security classification of information or property in connection with scientific research.

Finally, in section 15, the bill provides for the coordination of the work of the Foundation with our foreign policy. This section requires that contractual arrangements involving foreign countries or individuals in foreign countries conform to the foreign policy of the United States. Any negotiations with foreign countries in conformation with the National Science Foundation Act are required to be carried on by the Secretary of State.

Mr. President, having reviewed the main provisions of the bill, which those who are familiar with the proposed legislation will see have been very much sim-

plified, I should like to discuss the major differences between the pending bill and Senate bill 526, which Congress passed last year, with particular reference to the objections raised by the President to Senate bill 526 in his veto of last year.

THE DIRECTOR

First of all is the matter of the Director of the Foundation.

Probably the most far-reaching change made in the pending bill over S. 526 is concerned with the office of the Director. Under this bill, the Director is to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. He will serve for a term of 6 years, unless sooner removed by the President.

I should like to call attention to one very important feature of section 5. It provides that the Director shall be appointed by the President after the members of the Foundation have been appointed and qualified. Our reason for inserting that provision was that originally we felt it might be proper to provide that the President should make his appointment from among a panel submitted by the Foundation. Then we felt that such a provision might constitute a constitutional limitation on the President's power of appointment, and might be questionable from that angle. We felt the same result would be brought about if the President first appointed the members of the Foundation, and they were confirmed by the Senate and became a going and operating body, and after they were instituted, the President should nominate the Director of the Foundation. We felt that if that sequence of events were brought about, the President would naturally look to the Foundation for advice and counsel in determining who would be an acceptable Director. By this route we feel we cover one of the difficulties encountered last year, when the controversy was over whether the Foundation itself or the President should name the Director.

We believe and submit that we have provided a solution which should be satisfactory, and should insure the Foundation's having a Director appointed by the President entirely acceptable to its members. Of course, there always remains the safeguard of action by Members of the Senate on the President's nomination.

This represents a substantial departure from the corresponding provision of S. 526. Under that bill, it will be recalled, the office of Director was filled, not by Presidential appointment, but by the Foundation itself. In his veto message on S. 526, the President said he could not approve such an organizational arrangement or appointment procedure, because that procedure deprived the President of the means necessary to discharge his constitutional responsibility of seeing to it that the laws are well and faithfully executed.

In other words, what we debated with the President and his advisers was how we could channel through to the President the responsibility for watching over the operations of the Foundation, and at the same time leave to the Foundation the policy-making power. We conceived that probably from an operational standpoint, the President should name the Director—but, as I have said, after the Foundation is set up and under the pending proposal, there can be no doubt that the manner of appointing and removing the Director fully meets the objections raised in this regard by the President's veto message, but still leaves the Director subject to the control of the Foundation in all matters of policy making.

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Another primary objection raised by the President in his veto message was that two layers of organization, both comprised of part-time personnel, were interposed between the Director and the President. Under the pending bill, that criticism has been effectively met.

I may say that those two layers were, first, the Foundation itself, and, second, the executive committee which was created by the previous bill. In order to remove the difficulty, we have eliminated from the bill—and this is one of the amendments now before the Senate—the provision for a special executive committee. We have left the center of gravity, the control of policy making in the Foundation itself.

The executive committee created by S. 526 has been eliminated from the pending bill. This elimination of the statutory requirement that an executive committee be established and that it perform certain designated functions should go far toward meeting the President's criticism of S. 526. The present bill does, however, empower the Foundation to appoint such committees and special commissions as it deems necessary to carry out the purposes of the proposed act, including, if it so desires, an executive committee to function with the Director.

We realized that by eliminating the executive committee we were leaving in the hands of a body of 24 men the conduct of the whole organization. That might be an unwieldy body, so the bill, therefore, provides that the Foundation may appoint an executive committee to cooperate with the Director in carrying out the purposes of the act.

DIVISIONAL COMMITTEES

Another of the President's most determined objections to S. 526 was the provision in that bill vesting in the divisional committees the authority "to exercise and perform the powers and duties of its division. In other words, in the bill last year we gave these various divisions a very wide power, but, on reflection, and after discussion with the President's advisers, we felt it probably would be wiser, from an administrative standpoint, to constitute these divisional committees as consultative and advisory groups only, under the general direction of the Foundation itself.

While the pending bill does not abolish the divisional committees, it is to be noted that under the pending proposal these committees perform no functions other than purely consultative and advisory ones. This arrangement in no way upsets the traditional lines of organizational authority. It merely serves to provide a valuable reservoir of consultation and advice for the responsible operating officials.

Let me now briefly summarize, Mr. President, the organizational arrangement created by the pending proposal, and restate the steps which have been taken to insure the effective operation of the contemplated organization and to meet certain objections raised by the President in his veto of S. 526.

First. No substantial departure from S. 526 has been made with respect to the procedure to be followed in appointing the members of the Foundation, nor with respect to the powers and responsibilities which the Foundation must meet in carrying out the purposes of the act. The Foundation is, and must remain, the responsible policy-forming body in carrying out the program envisioned by this bill.

I cannot emphasize that too strongly. The center of gravity, if that be the correct expression, is in the Foundation itself.

Second. The Director of the Foundation is now appointed by the President by and with the consent of the Senate. He is the chief executive officer of the Foundation. His principal task is to carry out and administer the policy developed and the program established by the Foundation.

There we have the Foundation, the same as it was in the previous bill, and the Director, the executive officer, appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, but, as I have said, so far as policy making is concerned, the Director is completely subject to the Foundation.

Third. The bill establishes no intervening layer of organization between the Director and the Foundation. In other words, we wiped out the executive committee, which might have been the cause of trouble. Neither does the act interpose any barriers, organizational or otherwise, between the Director and the President. Thus, the pending proposal fully answers certain of the more fundamental objections which the President raised with respect to S. 526.

Fourth. By limiting the divisional committees to advisory and consultative functions, the pending bill effectively meets the objections raised by the President to S. 526 in this regard.

On deliberating over this matter we felt that that was probably the best way for these divisional committees to function; that is to make them consultants, bodies that would recommend. The chances are that in every case their recommendations would be accepted and carried out, but if not, the ultimate decision would lie in the Foundation, and the Director would be instructed by the Foundation whether or not to carry out the recommendation made by the committees.

It is my individual belief, Mr. President, and the collective belief of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare that these changes insure a clear-cut organizational arrangement and a sound administrative basis for the proper execution of any program developed by the Foundation.

OTHER MAJOR DEPARTURES FROM S. 526

There are certain other major departures from Senate bill 526 which I should

like to mention so we will have them in the RECORD.

In the consideration of the pending bill, specific mention should be made of certain other deviations from S. 526.

First. In the pending bill, no provision has been made for a division of national defense. This omission has come about by reason of the fact that Public Law 253 of the Eightieth Congress, the so-called National Security Act, provided for the establishment of a Research and Development Board within the National Military Establishment. This Board is now functioning under the direction of Dr. Vannevar Bush, an eminent and respected scientist who has been so active in scientific work for the Government during the war and since.

Second. The pending bill contains no provision for the creation of an Interdepartmental Committee on Science. This omission has come about by reason of the fact that an Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific Research was established by Executive Order 9912, issued on December 24, 1947. Since this organization is now functioning, it was deemed best not to include it in the pending legislation. We were afraid there might be some confusion, and apparently the Executive order has been adequate to take care of that kind of cooperation.

Third. The pending bill does not specifically establish any named special commissions. It will be recalled that S. 526 made specific provision for a special commission on cancer research, a special commission on heart and intravascular diseases, and a special commission on poliomyelitis and other degenerative diseases. The pending bill merely gives to the National Science Foundation the authority to establish such special commissions as it deems necessary for carrying out the purposes of the act. It was the belief of the committee that this represented the wiser approach, in that it would permit the Foundation to make its own provisions for meeting pressing medical and scientific problems as they arise.

As I said earlier in my remarks, Mr. President, I have been advised that Members of the House feel that they might want to restore to the bill the provisions for special commissions. If they should and the question arises in conference, I think our group would not necessarily object, although we feel that the best legislative practice would be not to name any special commission in this particular measure.

Mr. President, the foregoing represents the principal differences between S. 526, passed last session, and the pending proposal. Otherwise, it may be said in general that those sections of the bill dealing with the membership of the Foundation, the powers and duties of the Foundation, the divisions within the Foundation, the provisions concerning patent rights, and the procedures to be followed in the awarding of scholarships and fellowships closely parallel the provisions of S. 526.

The Labor and Public Welfare Committee collectively and I, individually, believe that the provisions contained in the pending bill provide for a sound and clear-cut organization which will make possible the efficient and democratic attainment of the objectives set forth in the bill.

SOCIAL SCIENCES

Because the question has been raised, I wish to make it absolutely clear that under the pending proposal, as under S. 526, the Foundation may, whenever it deems such action necessary or advisable, establish a specific division for the social sciences, or any other branch of science not now covered. I wish to make it absolutely clear that nothing contained in this bill is designed to deter the Foundation from giving full and continuing consideration and recognition to the problems raised by the social sciences.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think the point last mentioned by the Senator from New Jersey is one of the strongest and most encouraging features of the bill. I believe, by including that section in the bill he has made a great contribution to what I think is a reasonable solution of the differences which at times in the past have arisen in the Senate over a National Science Foundation bill. It is my understanding—and the Senator can correct me if I am mistaken—that the bill in its present form makes it possible in the future for the Foundation to give consideration to needed research in the field of social science when a worthwhile project is presented to the Foundation and the project meets the criteria for research laid down by the Foundation.

Mr. SMITH. That is correct, and I thank the Senator sincerely for his remarks on that point.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I wish to again point out that this proposal has—as its various predecessors have had—a strong bipartisan support, as is shown by the list of sponsors, whose names I set forth earlier in my address. The bill has supporters on both sides of the aisle, both Republican and Democrats, who have united in trying to smooth out the rough places and to bring before the Senate a bill we can all support. This proposal represents a sincere attempt to draft legislation which will effectively bridge the gap between the two conflicting philosophies which have grown up around this problem, while at the same time preserving those elements of organization and approach which have consistently been approved by the Congress.

The Labor and Public Welfare Committee feels that the bill which it has reported for your consideration is an effective step in that direction. The committee further feels that in view of the pressing need for a National Science Foundation this bill should have the active support and prompt approval of the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wish the Senator well in his effort to have Senate bill 2385 enacted. I feel very certain that the bill is greatly improved over the last measure which the Senate considered; and I am hopeful that this bill will be passed, and that it will survive and be approved at the White House.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I thank the Senator from Colorado. I can directly answer his expression of hope by saying that I think it will be realized.

Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] in behalf of the National Science Foundation bill. In doing so, let me say that this type of legislation can be understood by anyone who is aware of what we had to go through during wartime, who realizes the great fundamentals of our Government and of our body politic which contribute to our well-being in times of emergency, who realizes that our peace-time structure is very much more important to us as a Nation, even in times of emergency, than our wartime structure, and who knows what has happened in our country in regard to loosening the strings of information and allowing the mind of man to exercise his curiosity and use the knowledge he gains to discover new truths.

Probably in the history of civilization there has never been an invitation on the part of government any greater than the invitation offered by this proposed legislation to the youth of the land. Probably in the history of governments never has so much thought been given to the fundamental theory that man can live better and finer if he knows what he is living about. Probably never before, even in the discussion of education bills, has it come to our attention how much we in our daily life, for all the things we enjoy, depend upon thoughts and ideas which have been brought into existence by those who have been delving after the truth.

The bill is therefore a great compliment not only to the American people, but to the genius behind the American Government. It is a culmination of all the fine things that a man such as Jefferson dreamed for our Government when once knowledge became diffused among the people, and when once the people were invited to contribute through knowledge to add to that which had been given to them in the past.

It is really and truly difficult to argue for this bill. I cannot become excited in trying to argue in favor of the proposition that a straight line is the shortest distance between two points. Those things which seem so patently true to us are things which we take for granted. The marvel is that we have to pass a law of this kind at all in the year 1948. Why did we not do it 100 years ago? It is a striking vindication of the way our people grow and develop.

The bill which is now before the Senate is the result of a series of compromises, and not merely compromises growing out of the desire to make this bill consistent

with the President's veto message and with the last bill which we passed. The first bill on this subject which came before us contained a number of controversial provisions, and differences of opinion developed to such an extent that now, as we look back on those times, we see that we attempted to do things which probably it would have been unwise to do, had we been successful with any one of the earlier bills.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator raised the question of the veto of the last bill by the President of the United States. Does this bill remove the objectionable features referred to in the veto message?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think there is no doubt whatever that this bill removes the objectionable features which the President had in mind. At the same time the bill retains the good features, but makes it possible for the Foundation to work, in its scientific aspects, independent of political control.

Mr. LUCAS. As I recall, when the previous bill was before the Senate, certain amendments were included which, along with divesting the President of certain powers, were responsible for the veto at that time.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Probably that is true. However, I thought the Senator was referring to the President's control of the Director.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct. Many of us objected to the provision in the original bill, but were not successful in our position.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. One of the two bills introduced in the last session provided for the Presidential appointment of a director. The plan which now goes to the President is one upon which I think the Senate has already passed, not in its fullness but in its theory. I ask the Senator from New Jersey if that is not true.

Mr. SMITH. Yes. Our purpose in redrafting that particular section is to maintain the idea that the center of gravity and determination of policy should remain in the Foundation, but that the Director, as executive operator of the entire program, should be directly answerable to the President of the United States.

I may say to the Senator from Illinois that I believe the redrafted provision will meet the main objection which the President had to the bill last year. That bill provided that the Director should be appointed directly by the Foundation. I think we have covered, in our analysis and in our conference with the President's advisers, most of the points which were raised, in order to have an acceptable bill from every standpoint.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator for his explanation. If I may make one further statement, I personally know that the President of the United States is greatly interested in this bill. As I recall, the basic reason for the veto last year was that the bill took from him power which he felt was his under the Constitution. As I understand, that feature has been corrected.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Let me add to what the Senator from Illinois says that the President's own words in his veto message show that he is greatly interested in the bill. But going even further back, all the bills on this subject had their origin in a committee on which the President served. At the beginning of our consideration of a national science foundation the President was a member of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs.

I think I can say that without exception every fear entertained by those who have been thinking about this bill has to a large extent been removed.

The bill is not a streamlined proposal for carrying on research. It is not a streamlined proposal for the development of scientific thought in our country. But it does create a foundation of 24 men learned in their respective fields, representative of the various branches of science, representative also of scientific endeavor in the world at large, and, therefore, men who in the wise opinions they express will represent both in a quantitative and qualitative way the entire field of science and, in addition, the entire geographical area of the United States.

The bill does not prescribe that in making appointments to the Foundation the President must select men on that basis; but I think all the guaranties of that sort which are needed are afforded by the provisions of the bill relative to appointments to the Foundation, in view of the fact that recommendations for appointments will be made to the President by various scientific organizations, and after the nominations are made by the President, they will have to be confirmed by the Senate of the United States. As a result of such procedure, we shall know that the fields of study, knowledge, education, and training which, from the very beginning, our Government has tried to keep removed from ordinary, narrow, political, partisan influences will continue to be so removed, and at the same time scientists can be brought together at the request of the President or the request of their country to work loyally for a given objective, if such a need presents itself.

As the bill now stands, it is the result of the experiences we have had in our country with education, of the experiences private industry has had in conducting research laboratories, and of experiences our whole country has had in regard to patent discoveries and the encouragement of research by guaranteeing ownership of the knowledge discovered. In other words, from the standpoint of political theory the bill in all its aspects is completely American, democratically American; and all phases of our life which contribute to the development and cultivation of knowledge will be reached by the Foundation and will have representation on it. I do not think that is too broad a statement to make.

Of course, the fundamental theory of the bill is to facilitate the development of scientific knowledge in its pure aspects. As a result, applied science is neglected by the bill. Social science is not neglected by it, but at the same time is not set apart as one of the requirements under the program to be inaugurated by the bill. If I may speak in harmony with the statement made a few moments ago by the Senator from Oregon, let me say that the social sciences will have a place in the program of the foundation, not only in the way the Senator from New Jersey indicated when he answered the Senator from Oregon, but also because of the fact that the Foundation itself undoubtedly will have within its organization many outstanding social scientists. Of course, social scientists are as representative of science as are any of the other classes of scientists.

The divisions between the sciences are growing narrower every day. It is difficult any longer to state what is social science, what is natural science, and what is physical science. As knowledge increases, those divisions will become less apparent. That is understood by everyone. Scientists do not work in narrow grooves. They do not fail to recognize a truth which they discover, simply because the truth may be outside the field of science in which they are working. Even when we consider the forces behind the atomic bomb, I doubt very much whether there could be such a thing as an atomic bomb without some social activity on the part of the elements of the atoms which make up the bomb. Man and his government and what man is to do are the things which governments will always work for. No matter how fine and how complete a bit of knowledge may be, if it cannot be used for social purposes it is hardly worth discovering.

So, Mr. President, one of the byproducts which I anticipate will be achieved after two or three generations of work by this scientific Foundation will be a breaking down of the barriers which even in the fields of knowledge have made for prejudice and have caused some men to feel that they are not like some other men—perhaps some men who have come out of Nazareth. Provided the Foundation evidences vision and acts in accordance with it, this bill provides the opportunity for our country to become united intellectually, educationally, and in regard to all the problems we must face in a political and social way.

The field of the science of government or the science of political theory, or whatever we may call it, is becoming greater every day; and more and more, in every field, the man who works by himself in a narrow groove is discovering that he is very much alone in the world if he does not realize that he is dependent upon knowledge and information in other fields.

So, Mr. President, the great good which will flow to our country as the result of the enactment of this bill in itself justifies its passage of the bill, aside from the fact that the bill is actually necessary because of a dearth of scientifically trained persons to carry on our public, professional, educational, and scientific life.

Mr. President, I need not say more, except that I came into the picture in regard to this science bill as a person who is sentimentally attached to seeing to it that our Government becomes interested in using the knowledge and ability of the scientists we already have, and in developing more scientists. In wartime I was party to the creation by Executive order of the science work which resulted in great accomplishments. All of us participated in that work, in one way or another. It was one of my duties to keep track in a general way of what was being done. When controversies arose in regard to the form of the Foundation and the theory upon which this bill should rest, I happened to be called into the picture in an attempt to work out some kind of compromise which would bring unity where it did not then exist. That happened more than once. So if ultimately this bill becomes law and the National Science Foundation erected under it becomes the great force for good in the life of our people and their Government which I think it will become, and contributes to our national welfare in peacetime as well as during national emergencies, then I myself will take great personal satisfaction in having been connected with the bill.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am very happy that the bill is again being considered, and I trust that it will be enacted into law.

Mr. President, before I take my seat, I may say further, in order to show the Senate some of the compromises that have to be worked out, that even in the midst of war, when our service departments were guarding research, as they should, we had the aid and assistance of the Secretaries of the Navy and the War Departments, in regard to the pending bill. At the beginning of our work on the unification plans, we got from them the assertion that with the establishment of a National Science Foundation, working in peacetime and operating as it should, the services would have all the resources they might need, in case it should become necessary for them to turn to the scientific aspects of war. And so this bill will contribute even more than we think, when once it becomes law.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to say a brief word in behalf of the pending bill. As one who followed the development of the basic sciences, in a small way, during the war, and who watched the tremendous development of scientific knowledge, I became convinced as a layman that the Government must take an interest in the development of basic sciences. The subject had become too broad and too expensive for private institutions to carry on all the work with the funds at their command. The Government, I then felt, and I now feel, should not itself go into the field of basic science, but should stimulate institutions by affording them financial assistance. It should stimulate institutions in ways that would avoid duplications of effort.

Two years ago the subject was before the Congress, and was at that time first called to my attention, when the Senator from Utah who has just taken his seat was then chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs. That committee was then considering the subject. He invited me to participate in the committee conferences. I helped in a very small way to develop the bill that was presented to the Senate 2 years ago. That bill passed the Senate, but failed of passage in the House. Last year, an improved bill was passed by both bodies, but was subjected to veto by the President.

Mr. President, I believe the pending bill is a vast improvement on the two bills which preceded it. It carries forward the principle of the development of basic sciences under governmental supervision, through governmental coordination, and by governmental stimulation. It keeps the Science Foundation out of the field of basic research, in and of itself.

The objections which were prevalent during consideration of the two previous bills , I believe have been very substantially avoided in the present bill. In the first place, the President has entire freedom of appointment of the members of the Foundation. He has entire freedom in appointing the director, subject to the advice and consent of the Senate. Scientific leaders are given an opportunity to consult with the President, and he is asked to give consideration to any suggestions they may make; but he is in no way bound by what they may recommend.

In the same way, the Director is given much freedom as an executive in carrying out the powers that are given to him under the general direction of his Chief Executive, the President of our country.

On the other hand, the scientific leaders who are appointed members of the Foundation create the policies under which the Director acts. In other words, by this means the bill seeks to reconcile the ideas that were expressed by the President in his veto message, and the ideas that were expressed by the Members of Congress in passing the bill. It cannot become a bill that will lead to logrolling and to politics. The President, after appointing members of the Foundation, must leave it to them to stimulate the general policies under which the Foundation shall operate. But those policies are carried forward by a Director who is subject to the President's appointment and subject to removal by the President for cause.

So I believe that in that way the bill seeks to bring together those two ideas in such a way that our basic sciences will be developed under the leadership of the executive department free from politics, because the policies by which they should be developed will be stimulated and laid down by the members of the Foundation.

I should like to call attention to one other point in the bill which I think is of great importance. It was the suggestion, I believe, of the committee itself, rather than of those who drafted the bill, namely, the elimination of the executive committee and of other committees unless the members of the Foundation themselves decide they can perform their duties better by creating such a committee or committees. If they create a committee, they will specify the powers the committee shall have. In other words, the members of the Foundation may delegate power to the committee, but they need delegate it to the committee only if they think it will be helpful to themselves in carrying forward their duty to develop science.

I desire to refer to another point which, as I recall, was mentioned and developed by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. Since the bill was originally suggested, a bill providing for unification of the armed services has become law. In that law there is a provision for a research group. To avoid duplication of effect, this bill merely suggests that the members of the Foundation can initiate scientific resarch, which will help in the development of our security, among the armed forces. But the Foundation will initiate such research only after consultation with the Secretary of National Defense. In that way there will be avoided a duplication of effort between the Foundation and the Research Board established by the Unification Act which was passed last year.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope this bill will become law this year. I know the Senator from New Jersey, who presented it, has worked extremely hard over it and deserves much credit. He has consulted with a great many persons. The final draft is the result of much effort on his part in getting ideas from all types of people interested in the subject, and finally developing them into the language of the bill which is before the Senate. I hope, Mr. President, the bill may be passed by this body and become law before Congress prorogues this year.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in general I share the views contained in the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts in regard to the pending bill. Before I say anything further I should like to have the RECORD show my sincere compliments to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] for the work he has done on the bill this year in ironing out many of the objections which were raised on the floor of the Senate to the old National Science Foundation bill, and in eliminating most of the grounds of the President's objections to the new bill.

I want the RECORD to show, because I want no colleague to misunderstand my position, that I have asked that the bill go over until tomorrow, to which request the acting majority leader has very kindly acceded, as has also my friend from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. I have been away on leave of the Senate and have simply not had time to analyze certain objections to the pending bill which have been sent to me by various scientists, and I am not in position this afternoon to say whether any of those objections merit the submission of an amendment to the pending bill. My tentative opinion is that they do not. My tentative opinion is that tomorrow I shall be able to support the bill as the best compromise we can obtain in the settlement of differing points of view over what should be included in a National Science Foundation bill.

During the past week I talked to two university presidents and to approximately half a dozen scientists in the Middle West. They would have pre-

ferred that the bill include the Morse amendment of last year, which was the amendment, as the Chair will recall, which sought to set aside 25 percent of the funds on condition that any land-grant college or university which could meet the research criteria of the Foundation with respect to any project should have a priority in grants to that extent.

The college presidents and scientists with whom I talked last week in person also expressed the view set forth in many letters in the file which I hold in my hand, that they have been informed that to press for that amendment might mean there would be no National Science Foundation bill at all. It has never been my intention at any time, either in the debate last year or at this time, to jeopardize the passage of the National Science Foundation bill by insisting upon the Morse amendment. The presidents to whom I talked last week and the scientists with whom I conferred said they thought it would be satisfactory if the record in the debate made very clear that educators and scientists of land-grant colleges and State universities will watch very carefully the administrative policies of the National Science Foundation, once it is established, in regard to the distribution of funds, and that if any of the fears they have in regard to distribution of funds should develop into reality they will call upon me at a later time to press for an amendment to the National Science Foundation bill in respect to a formula for the distribution of the funds.

So, Mr. President, I want the RECORD to be very clear at this point that I now say to the members of the faculties and to the presidents of the land-grant colleges, State universities, and other tax-supported institutions that if any of the fears we entertained last year when the Morse amendment was introduced by me in their behalf should develop, I shall, upon their request in the future, proceed to offer whatever amendment is deemed necessary in order to correct any difficulties which may develop by way of administration in respect to funds under the National Science Foundation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. In a moment I shall yield.

With so many years of academic work behind me, and with the understanding which those years have inculcated in me as to the importance of scientific research, not only to the development to the maximum extent of the economic potentialities of our Nation, but also because of my appreciation of the direct relationship between research in science and national security, I certainly intend to go along with at least the framework of the bill without insisting this year upon the Morse amendment. I say that because I think it is of the utmost importance that the Foundation be established. This evening I intend to study the file before me, as I have said to the Senator from New Jersey, and if the scientists who have written letters of constructive suggestions and constructive criticism of the pending bill have anything in the letters which, in my opinion, justifies an amendment to the bill, I shall prepare it this evening and hand it to the Senator from New Jersey tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock, as I have told him, for a discussion between us, and then decide whether it shall be offered tomorrow afternoon.

I want to express my thanks to the Senator from New Jersey and to the acting majority leader for extending to me the courtesy of having the matter go over until I can complete my study of it.

I now yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of the Senator from Oregon, in connection with the so-called Morse amendment of last year, an interesting item which the Senate has already adopted this year.

Perhaps the Senator will remember that Congress has appropriated funds to permit an experiment to be carried on at the University of Alaska on weather reporting and weather conditions in the Aleutian Islands, and in that area of our country. I mention this because it is one example, it seems to me, of the need, in these days, of diversification of funds for scientific research. The development of science has so advanced that the institutions which the Senator had in mind last year, I believe, could not, even if they so desired, and even if the members of the Foundation so desired, carry on all the work in the development of science that is necessary.

Another example, as we all know, in a broad, general way, is the development of atomic energy and the research in connection therewith. It seems to me that the force of circumstances will require the Foundation to spread the funds broadly, and I, as one who is very much interested, certainly hope they will do so, and without any statutory requirement such as that which would have been inserted in the bill by the Morse amendment last year. I agree with the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Massachusetts that the remarks he has just made are music to my ears, because perhaps I wrongly interpreted a speech the Senator from Massachusetts made on the Morse amendment last year on the point of centralization of control in regard to this matter of science research. I can recall very distinctly that the Senator from Massachusetts in the course of his remarks cited the program in research which the record showed was being followed in Russia, and I remember good naturedly saying to the Senator that the Russian policy was no argument that carried very much weight with me. I stated in my reply to the Senator from Massachusetts last year that I thought it was very important that we get away from centralization in conducting science research and that was why I thought the funds should be more widely distributed among the colleges of the land. I am glad that we are of one mind this year, or at least understand each other as being of one mind.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I merely call the Senator's attention to the fact that the Senator from Massachusetts argued against putting requirements in the statute. The Senator from Massachusetts has always been in favor of a principle directly contradictory to what is being done in Russia. He does believe, however, that the development of science must have Government direction and Government stimulation. So I hope we are in absolute accord, providing the Senator does not offer the amendment this year.

Mr. MORSE. We are in accord as to the objective, but I would say to the Senator that of course the best way to assure diversification is to set up administrative machinery which requires it, and that is all the Morse amendment ever sought to accomplish in regard to a guaranty that the funds would be more widely distributed than I feared would be the case if the amendment were not adopted.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I express to the Senator from Oregon my appreciation of his fine cooperation in his decision not to offer the so-called Morse amendment at this time. I also assure him that if in the operation of the law, if the bill shall become law, we discover any of the abuses he thinks might arise, of course I shall be with him in bringing about any sort of amendment necessary to cure such abuses. I am glad to say this, and I thank the Senator for his cooperation. I am more than glad to agree that the bill go over until tomorrow to give the Senator opportunity to examine his correspondence and to take up with me, if he desires, any amendment designed to make the bill a better measure.

OWNERSHIP OF TIDELAND WATERS—REVISION OF REMARKS

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, this morning when the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] was speaking on the tidelands bill and making his rather unique, at least never-before-used, motion to put the bill on the calendar rather than to have it referred to a committee, he spoke in glowing terms about his expectation as to the successful disposition of the bill when, as, and if it came before the Senate for debate.

I spoke very earnestly, because I had deep convictions in the matter. The Senator from California said:

> Mr. President, all I desire is to have a majority of the Senate given the opportunity to express itself. If the distinguished Senator has in mind, by a filibuster or any other method such as he uses—

And so forth. I objected, and very naturally, because I am one Member of this body—and I hope their name is legion—who hates filibusters, and never once in my 14 years in the Congress have I been particeps criminis in one. I objected, and a colloquy ensued, and the Senator denied that he said that. But the official RECORD confirms he did say it, as I have read it.

The Senator from California—as is the custom of 96 Senators, for he is not alone in that procedure—took his pencil and expurgated and struck out the statement I have read, and other subject matter was put in, leaving my remarks and the subsequent colloquy entirely ephemeral and extraneous, having little to do with the subject matter he had changed.

So I bring this question before the Senate, as I told the Senate I was going to do.

In the interim the distinguished Senator from California has come to me, man fashion, and very forthrightly said that in view of the fact that I object to the deletion of these things, he has instructed the Official Reporters to put back into the RECORD his original statement, so the matter is clear and resolved between us, and I compliment him on his forthrightness. But the point I make is that I want to go on record as deprecating the custom which has grown up in the Senate of the United States that any Senator can, when he sees the official notes of his remarks, change, alter, delete, or repair what he said on the floor of the Senate, to the effect that he misrepresents the subsequent statements made by another Senator or other Senators in colloquy with him. It ought not so to be, Mr. President, under the rules of the Senate. When you or I or any other Senator makes a statement dogmatically which bears on any other Senator in the debate, that statement ought not to be changed in import so that the answers made by other Senators are made to look rather foolish.

Mr. President, I do not know what the rules of the Senate prescribe with respect to this subject, but I believe this discussion of mine is timely. I hope that a rule of the Senate prohibits such changes as I have spoken of being made, even though the rule is an unused one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). The Chair wishes to state for the information of the Senate that an examination of the rules themselves does not show any indication that the general practice, which has been followed, of making typographical or other changes in spoken remarks has any foundation in the rules of the Senate. As a matter of fact the rules of the Senate are entirely silent on the question of changes made in the remarks of Senators. A custom which has been followed generally over many years is that a Senator may correct and revise his remarks, if he so desires.

The Chair has had some research made on the subject, and finds in the Precedents of the House of Representatives, on page 624 of Cannon's Precedents, the following language, under subsection (4) dealing with the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

> It has been the practice to allow a Member, with the approval of the Speaker, to revise his remarks in the RECORD, provided such revision does not affect the remarks of another Member. Volume V, section 6971.

Further it goes on to say:

> A Member should not correct the notes of his own speech in such a way as to affect the remarks of an opponent in controversy without bringing the correction to the attention of the Member. Volume V, section 6971.

That is from Cannon's Precedents of the House.

However, there apparently are no precedents which we have yet found so far as the Senate is concerned, and there is no mention of this subject in the rules of the Senate itself.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I shall yield in a moment if the Senator will kindly permit me to make one statement. I may say to the distinguished Presiding Officer that I quite agree in the soundness and saneness and virtues of those rulings of the House, and I hope that the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate may see fit to make such change in the Senate's rules as to embody the spirit of the rules of the House on this subject. I think that would be a sound and fair way of doing things. That is all I wish to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands, the Senator from New Hampshire is not raising any point at this time, and the matter has been adjusted between himself and the senior Senator from California.

Mr. TOBEY. Yes, Mr. President. I now yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I want to say that earlier today in my colloquy with the distinguished Senator I did not mean to say anything that would be critical of him or offensive to him, and since he did feel that my remarks were of a somewhat improper nature so far as he was concerned, I merely wanted to correct my statement by striking out what he objected to, and stating that I did not mean to say anything that was offensive to him. I am very happy, however, at the desire of the distinguished Senator, to leave the RECORD exactly as the reporters made it.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Apropos of the discussion which has just been going on, I might say that I made some remarks earlier today which might not be considered as unduly flattering to the senior Senator from California. I wish to say that I have a very kindly feeling for the Senator from California, and that if my remarks seemed a little bit harsh it does not mean that I do not like him or that I do not consider him a valuable Member of this body. I feel, however, as does the Senator from New Hampshire, that, since we operate under a rule which permits any Member of the Senate to prevent reference of a bill coming from the House to a committee of this body, we should change that rule just as soon as we can get it changed.

Mr. TOBEY. I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably without amendment the bill (S. 2575) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and I submit a report (No. 1231) thereon. This is a bill which makes changes in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. I have discussed the bill with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and he would like to have the bill referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration so that that committee may consider the portion of the bill which relates to changes in the rules of the Senate.

It so happens that this bill is of such nature that it almost had to originate with the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and be considered by that committee. It relates to matters which concern both the House and the Senate. That portion which relates to the rules of the Senate is perfectly within the scope of the Committee on Rules and Administration. I ask to have the bill referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration so that it may be considered by that committee before being placed on the Senate Calendar. That is in accord with the conversation I had with the Senator from Illinois this morning. I am not sure that this bill might be a good one on which to place an amendment rescinding the Senate rule which permits a single Member of the Senate to prevent the reference of a House bill to a Senate committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Is there any question as to the jurisdiction of this committee? Is there any question as to where the bill should be referred?

Mr. AIKEN. No. The Reorganization Act of 1946 contemplated that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments would continue the work of the so-called LaFollette-Monroney committee of the last session of Congress, and the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is required by law to evaluate the effect of the Reorganization Act and to make such recommendations as it deems advisable for making it still more workable. Therefore our committee has made the report and implemented that report with a bill which we report favorably, and are now asking that the bill be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, so that that committee may consider such portions of the bill as relate to the Senate rules.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, before I discuss briefly Senate bill 2385, I desire to refer to the colloquy just had between the able Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the able Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. It seems to me that the pleas of confession and avoidance I heard here on the floor of the Senate are extremely helpful to the dignity of this legislative body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report submitted by the Senator from Vermont will be received and the bill will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration as requested by him.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2385) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

Mr. LUCAS. In discussing Senate bill 2385, I desire briefly to refer to Senate bill 526, which was passed last year and vetoed by the President of the United States. I call special attention of the Senate to that bill because of its unusual terms. That bill bested the determination of vital national policies and the expenditure of money, as well as its administration, into the hands of some 24 private citizens from which an executive committee of nine would be selected, empowered with enormous responsibilities. It was on that basis that the President primarily disapproved the bill, and without doubt rightly so. Mr. President, there usually is a tendency in the Congress of the United States, when the Congress has been controlled by one party and the executive branch of the Government by the other—to take away from the executive branch of the Government its rightful and constitutional duties. It seemed to me that in the bill last year that was exactly what the legislative branch of the Government was attempting to do with the executive branch. It was in reverse of what the late President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, did in connection with the Supreme Court of the United States. At that time many Democrats and Republicans contended that the executive branch of the Government had no right, authority, or power to invade the judicial branch of the Government by attempting to pack the Supreme Court.

As one United States Senator I desire to see the democratic processes prevail under the three branches of Government, with neither branch attempting to encroach upon the other. Unless this fundamental conception of our Government is adhered to rigidly we may whittle away the democratic processes upon which this Government stands.

I am very happy now that the provisions of this bill have met the test which was laid down by the President of the United States in his veto message of last year. There is no Member of the Senate who is not interested in promoting the purposes of the present bill to the limit. Without doubt they are of great importance from the standpoint of our own national defense, our security, our health and education. As society grows more complex and as problems of national and international importance become more intricate, we discover that research is not keeping pace with that development.

I am sure that everyone is happy to see a bill before the Senate which we can all support. I congratulate the Committee on Labor and Education in reporting this constructive legislation.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes tomorrow, Tuesday, at noon, at the conclusion of the morning business the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Order No. 1211, the point where the call of the calendar was concluded when it was last called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is entered.

DENIAL OF CIVIL RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, in the early days of the West at times certain lawless elements would obtain control of our Government out there and the law-abiding citizens would be prohibited from voting. In that manner we would not have representative government. Many times in the development of the West the Federal Government had to step in to see that the rights of the people were restored, and that the constitutional rights and liberties guaranteed to the people were made real.

I believe that in America today there are certain sections of our country where citizens are being denied their constitutional rights and privileges. I see no possible way for them to regain those rights and privileges without help from the rest of the country through the Federal Government. In the West many times citizens who were being denied their rights appealed to the Federal Government to help them. I think it is only proper that the Federal Government should intercede in such cases. Today there are a great many Americans who are unable to vote for one reason or another—because of poll taxes, or because of provisions requiring that citizens interpret the Constitution. In such cases it has happened that college professors, teachers of history and political science, have been flunked and could not pass the test of interpreting the Constitution, while at the same time some person utterly ignorant, who happened to be on the right side of the political fence, would be passed as a qualified voter to participate in elections and Government.

Heretofore I have been rather disposed to look with a certain degree of sympathy upon the arguments made on the floor of the Senate to the effect that if the Federal Government would only keep out, certain inequities and injustices existing in various parts of our country would be corrected by the people of those sections. I fail to see how that can happen when a small minority of the people do the voting and the vote is denied to the others. It seems to me that they have no way of getting out from under the injustices being inflicted upon them, because they have no voice in electing officials, and the officials perpetuate themselves in office by keeping inequitable practices alive.

In the past when I had a cowboy band I have sung the old song "Birmingham Jail." Today, Mr. President, that song has a new meaning to me—very personal. I understand it better. I could sing it with more feeling today. I have just come from Birmingham. Tomorrow I shall return to Birmingham. I went down there to address a meeting of the Southern Negro Youth Conference. They had quite a time getting their meeting under way in Birmingham. They made arrangements with four or five different colored churches to hold their meeting. The pastors of the churches were called down to the city hall, where a gentleman by the name of Mr. Connor talked to them. It seems that he is a "big shot" in Birmingham. Incidentally, he is called Bull Connor. I have heard the term used without being hyphenated—just "Bullconnor"—meaning one who is active in peddling the "bull." I do not know whether that has any relation to Mr. "Bull Connor's" name or not. At any rate, he intimidated the pastors of those churches. As I say, the youth group made arrangements for four or five different places. Segregation was insisted upon.

Finally the meeting got under way and there was segregation, the whites being seated on one side of the aisle and the colored people on the other. The officers came in and decided that that was not sufficient, that there should be more segregation than that, so they carted off to jail three or four persons attending that meeting.

Previous to that time, a white woman who came from Holland approximately 20 years ago, who is an American citizen, and who owns two or three residential properties in Birmingham, went to consult a Negro attorney about arrangements for the meeting to be held. While she was there a detective came into the attorney's office and arrested her. She was taken to jail and booked on a charge of vagrancy, notwithstanding the fact, as I have pointed out, that she is a substantial property owner in Birmingham. She was held incommunicado for 8 hours, I believe, and finally released on bail.

When the meeting was raided, three persons were taken into custody—the pastor of the Negro church, a gentleman by the name of Dombrowski, who is a resident of the State of Alabama, and another gentleman who was there as an observer or participant for the seamen's union. They did not beat up the pastor of the church. They did not beat up Mr. Dombrowski, who is a rather substantial citizen; but I presume they figured that a sailor was fair play, and they beat him up unmercifully.

I was supposed to address an evening session of the meeting. We of the new party have made it a hard and fast rule that we cannot and will not address a segregated meeting, Mr. President. I was notified before the time for the meeting that it was segregated. I said I could not go. They said, "Well, come out and just make an appearance and tell why you cannot address the meeting."

So I went there. At the meeting place one door was for colored people—that was the front door—and around on the side was a door for white people. Mr. President, if there were a law that you had to spit in the face of every Negro you passed on the street, I would disobey the law; and I cannot see much difference between that and a law which

makes Negroes go in one door and sit in one place and white people go in another door and sit in another place. So I decided that I would go in the front door of the building. I am not accustomed to sneaking around to the side doors of buildings, anyway.

So I walked up to the front door. I expected possibly to be stopped and placed under arrest. I thought it would be done in the usual friendly fashion when a person who thinks he is of some consequence is involved. I thought probably they would say to me, "You can't go in here," and that when I said, "Oh, yes; I am going in here," they would stop me and would take me by the arm and would lead me gently away, and that would be that. Of course, that would not have stopped me, if I had known what would transpire. So I walked up to the front door. There was a policeman there. In fact, the whole yard was full of big policemen; they have them big in Alabama. I walked up to the door, and the policeman said, "Buddy, you can't go in here." As a matter of fact, Mr. President, I was "buddy" to all the officers in Alabama. The policeman said, "The entrance for white people is on the side."

I said, "I am not particular about those things," and I started to walk past him. He shoved me backward. There was a little porch or stoop, if it can be called that, about 3 feet high. So that officer and some other officer shoved me backward, and I fell off the porch. I managed to land on my feet. As I straightened up, another officer—a nice, big, handsome gentleman—was standing there, and he clasped his hands together and gave me the elbow so hard that it spun me across the yard, and I fell across a little fence about 3 feet high. The press account says that I stumbled across the fence. Perhaps I did. I was going rather fast, and it was hard to stop when I went over there. My suit was torn. The suit I have on now is the same suit I had on then. You do not tear your suit unless the action is rather violent. I made no move at any time to resist anyone. I was very careful not to. My leg is bruised and skinned for some 4 or 5 inches. I have a cut on my hand that is not inconsequential by any means.

When I got up, another officer grabbed me by the arm and shoved me toward a police car and said, "Get in there, buddy." I said, "All right; I am not trying to make any trouble."

He said, "Keep your mouth shut, buddy."

So buddy got into the car.

Then my secretary walked up beside the car and I started to speak to him, to tell him not to try to get me out, but that I would stay in jail as long as they wanted to keep me. The officer who was starting to drive the car said, "Keep your mouth shut, buddy." But I did speak to him. I said I would stop speaking when I got ready to.

Then another officer got into the car with me, behind the officer who was driving the car, and the car started. Mr. President, I had no ill will toward anyone when I got there. I would have been happy to converse with the officer about Alabama weather and the country there—which is very beautiful, and the weather was very nice while I was there. But the officer who sat in the back of the car with me just glared at me. Mr. President, I have faced a rattlesnake in the West, and that incident reminded me very much of that experience. The officer just glared at me as if daring me to open my mouth or do anything else.

They started out for the jail, I imagine. They went very fast, over intersections where there were dips, and when the car hit those depressions or dips, I would go up in the air and almost hit my head on the ceiling of the car; in fact, I had to hold my hands over my head to keep from hitting the ceiling.

Finally, a little later, I started to light a cigar. The policeman said, "Throw that ——— ——— thing out. It makes me sick."

I was beginning to be worried by then. The car was going down dark streets, and had been going a long time, and I thought to myself, "This jail must be a long way off." But when the officer told me to throw the cigar away, I did not argue with him; I threw the cigar away. I figured that after they had been as rough as they were in the vicinity of the church, I would not care to discover what they might do to me on a dark street, with two such officers there.

Then they started to drive out into the country. I thought to myself, "This jail is a long way off." They started asking me questions. I did not answer. I did not refuse to answer; I just did not open my mouth. I figured it was not the duty of the officers to question me. When I did not answer, the officer sitting near me looked at the officer who was driving, and he started to slow down the car. So then I started to answer questions. Mr. President, I am a brave man, but I am not a fool.

Finally we got to the jail. Much to my surprise, I found that my secretary and some other persons who had left the church after I did and had gone to the jail, had gotten there before I arrived and had waited there 10 minutes before I was brought there in the police car, even though the police car had driven at breakneck speed all the time. So, Mr. President, evidently the policeman driving the car in which I had been placed had taken a detour out into the country, hoping that I would provoke some action. I am not at all certain that if I had provoked any action at all I would be here today speaking—in fact, I am not sure that I would be here at all, in view of the way things were proceeding.

As I have said, finally we arrived at the city jail. I saw a rather corpulent gentleman there, near a window. I heard him say, "Yes; he is right outside here. Don't be afraid of him. Treat him tough. Give him the works." I could see him through the window, about 10 feet from me.

So they brought me inside and shoved me around, and said, "Go over there, buddy. Line up." So I did. They said to me to empty my pockets. I did. I forgot to take my pocket handkerchief out of my breast pocket, and so they grabbed it out. In doing so, they found my cigarette lighter, which I had in my pocket, and they also found some toothpicks which I had there. They grabbed those, too, and glared at me for keeping such lethal weapons on my person.

At that time I had the unique experience—I cannot say it is a pleasure—of seeing them handle a Negro, while I was there. Incidentally, at the jail there is a window to which persons can go when they wish to get out. I did not go to the window, but it was segregated, too. It was about 2 or 3 feet wide, and there was a division in the middle, with one side for whites and the other side for blacks. A young Negro was in the reception hall, or whatever it should be called; and after the officer searched him, he said to him, "Come over here, nigger." He did not say Negro; he said nigger. He said, "Come over here, nigger." The young boy, probably about 20 years old, and a good deal shorter than I am, and quite slight in stature, shuffled over. The officer grabbed him and twirled him around, and said to him, "Come over here, nigger, before I knock your head off." Mr. President, there was no particular animosity about it. It evidently was spoken in the way in which they habitually address Negroes.

The account in the press says that after they arrested me, I was fingerprinted. As a matter of fact, I was not fingerprinted, Mr. President, although I do not know why. I would have had no particular objection to that, because I was fingerprinted when I was working in a war plant. But after that, they locked me up in the bull pen. I would have had no particular objection to that, for I am used to a certain amount of "bull." But I must say the folks in the bull pen were much nicer than the officers. I introduced myself around, and we had a very pleasant visit there for three-quarters of an hour or so, until my friends provided bail and I was released. When I went out, I was asked to sign a release of some kind. I am not an attorney; I had never been in jail before; so I did not know. I said, "Well, I don't know whether I want to sign anything or not, until I have seen a lawyer." The fellow said, "All right, you don't have to sign it; you can go back in there and stay if you want to." My friends spoke through the window and assured me it was the regular thing to do in order to get out on bail, so I signed it and was released. I had had a radio broadcast scheduled, but I was in jail at the time, and the broadcast was postponed.

I later made the broadcast, after which I went to the hotel. Mrs. Taylor told me that for quite some time, in fact, ever since it had been announced on the radio that I was under arrest, the telephone in the room had been ringing. She did not know where I was or what had happened. People were calling up, saying we had better get out of town, and this, that, and the other thing. One lady called and begged Mrs. Taylor to please take her husband out of town, saying that her husband had become involved in a similar incident in behalf of the Negroes, he had had his skull fractured, he had been kicked, he had had a hernia, which aggravated the situation, the hernia necessitating an operation on him

while he was still unconscious as the result of skull fracture. She said he was practically an invalid now, and she urged Mrs. Taylor to please take her husband home before that happened to him. And I am not at all sure it could not have happened, Mr. President, when they took me for the ride out in the country, and one thing and another.

So that is America today—the South, at least. But these things are going on all over America. In other parts of the country there is more freedom, more representative government; anyway, the people are permitted to vote. But this Fascist technique, according to which anybody opposing the status quo is a labeled red, a subversive of some kind, is permeating all America. Henry Wallace is running into it, I am running into it.

Meanwhile, in West Virginia we recently had an organization meeting for the new party, with morning and afternoon sessions. We made arrangements with a rabbi to open one session with prayer, and with a Protestant minister to open the other. The day before the meetings, a call came from the publisher of the local papers, a Mr. Long I believe the name is, in Huntington, W. Va. There are two papers, one man owns them both—a thing which is becoming common in America. Incidentally, the publisher was the treasurer of the Protestant minister's church. He called our chairman the day before the meeting and said, "Reverend Bromley is not going to be up there to pray for you tomorrow." Our man said, "Well, he has not notified us." The newspaper publisher said, "That is all right; he does not have to notify you. I am telling you, and he is not going to be there to pray for you." And he was not there. He did not show up; neither did the rabbi.

The same thing happened in St. Cloud, Minn., the other day, when I was there. All arrangements had been made to have a minister open our meeting. He called up, frankly admitting he could not do it, and saying the pressure was too great from his congregation. That is something that has happened several other times, at other places.

Mr. President, we do not even have freedom of religion any more in America. It is a sad state of affairs when a preacher cannot come to one of our new party meetings to pray for our poor, benighted, Red-smeared souls. One would imagine that, if we were half as bad as it is contended we are, our adversaries would round up all the preachers in town and send them down in a body to pray for us. We would welcome them, too. But that is the situation. Freedom of speech is fast disappearing. In many places people cannot vote, they cannot assemble peacefully, and freedom of religion is a thing of the past. Our Government is largely responsible.

The President issued a loyalty order. You may go back, Mr. President, and look at what Hitler did. He issued a very similar order, aimed at the Reds. I have on my desk an article written by Mr. A. Pomerantz, who was chief counsel at the trial of Nazi industrialists at Nuremberg. The article is entitled "Dissent Becomes Disloyalty." In it he points out the similarity between the things that occurred in Hitlerite Germany and the things that are happening in America. I should like to have the article included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, Mr. President.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISSENT BECOMES DISLOYALTY

(By Abraham Pomerantz, New York attorney, chief council at the trial of Nazi industrialists in Nuremberg)

Our Nuremberg autopsy of Hitler Germany exploded some popular misconceptions concerning the rise of Nazism. One of the most widely held myths is that when Nazism arrived in Germany, it came full blown—to a people predisposed to its virus.

The truth, however, is quite different. And because I feel that there are some ominous and sickening parallels between Germany, 1933, and America today, I think it would be helpful briefly to retrace the principal stages along the road to Hitler's seizure of power.

To begin with it must be recalled that the the Nazis' coup d'etat in January, 1933, was achieved without their ever receiving a majority of the vote; in fact between the elections held in July, and again in November 1932—the eve of the coup—the Nazi party had had lost some 2,000,000 votes. How then did Hitler accomplish his advent to power?

The decisive tactic used by the Nazis to divide and conquer the opposition was that old, but ever effective bugaboo, the red scare.

The German press and radio were inundated with tales of atrocities, of the Reichstag fire, of plots to deliver up the German folk to Russia. The campaign was so effective that, after a while, the mere use of the epithet "Communist" produced a mechanical blind hate reaction.

Having created this conditional reflex the Nazi propaganda machine proceeded to the second step: the label "Communists" was pinned indiscriminately on all opponents of the Nazi party including, ironically enough, the inveterate enemies of the Communists, the social democrats. It was unnecessary to prove the charge—it was enough to make it.

Soon all of Germany was frantically searching for "Reds" under beds.

The Social Democrats and the Communists were bleeding each other in a death struggle, the rallying cry being "Red" and "Red-baiter." And while these anti-Hitler forces were embroiled, Hitler seized power.

But power thus achieved was by no means secure. The National Socialists realized that their only chance of survival was to prevent the threatened unification of the majority opposition.

In spite of a popular illusion to the contrary, Hitler was punctilious in disarming his enemies by "legal" means—at least during the early days of his regime. It isn't that he particularly wanted to be legalistic, but the German people, like our own, were great believers in their laws and in their constitution.

One of the first laws passed in the spring of 1933 outlawed the Communist Party and denied jobs to all Communists. Soon thereafter the Social Democratic Party was dissolved.

This took care of the organized opposition, but there were still dissenters whose only crime was that they were critics of the regime. How to take care of them?—legally, mind you. The resourceful Nazis cooked up a new one. It was called the Loyalty Act—does it have a familiar ring? That law provided loss of job and penalties for those found to have "violated their duty of loyalty to the Reich and the German people" (just substitute the words United States for Reich and you have our own Loyalty Act).

Every whisper of dissent was interpreted as disloyalty and was punished by that effective form of economic pressure, loss of employment.

Thus the Nazis proceeded by legal means, ostensibly aimed at the Communists but actually designed to eliminate the last vestige of opposition in Germany, until the only voices left were those of Herren Hitler, Goebbels, Goering, and company.

It is a tested historical phenomenon that, once the disintegrating process of eroding civil liberties sets in, whether the avowed target is the Christian or the Communist, or whoever, it tends to continue until all civil liberties are destroyed. It is a sort of social law of inertia.

It has happened before in history that the conquering nation has absorbed the culture of the conquered nation. Judging from what I see on my return to the United States, we Americans have been made to assimilate, and are assimilating daily, a terrifying amount of Nazi culture.

There is a hysterical campaign raging here ostensibly directed against the ever-popular target, the Communists. When you examine it more closely, however, it becomes apparent that the attack is really aimed at the liquidation of all resistance to the mounting tide of reaction.

This campaign is achieving its purpose. The progressive movement is at low ebb in America today. The ADA won't speak to the PCA; the AFL won't have any truck with the CIO; the AVC, the ALP, and hundreds more are tearing themselves asunder while shouting the battle cry of Red and Red-baiter.

Having whipped up a hate mentality, we are proceeding to the next stage: laws and decrees are enacted. Let us take, for example, the President's loyalty order. This applies to 2,500,000 workers in the Federal Government. The order provides that if you are or ever were a member of, or in sympathetic association with, any organization on the black list of the Attorney General of the United States—you are out of a job. And the Attorney General gets unrestricted discretion in compiling such lists.

This is no light sentence. This is an economic death sentence. For you know that the chances of an employee discharged for disloyalty to find employment anywhere are about the same as a Jew in Germany with the word "Jude" branded into his flesh.

The condemned organization gets no day in court. Neither do you. Even the Nazis whom we tried at Nuremberg were given a more humane, a more American trial.

The pretext for this loyalty order and others that have been passed and are being passed in hundreds of county, municipal and State legislatures, is that they are searching for Communists. I want to say plainly that even if this were so it would be inexcusable, for I have never heard that the Communist Party is an illegal organization. I have indeed read the opposite. The decision of the Supreme Court of the United States holding that the Communist Party is legal and not subversive.

But this pretext is, in any case, hollow. The drive is plainly against all New Dealers, all dissenters. Listen, for example, to Congressman HOFFMAN'S explanation of who are the real targets of this campaign:

"The issue is not whether the individuals named (by the Committee on Un-American Activities) are Communists. The issue is, do the people want on the pay roll those New Dealers, those dreamers?"

How far removed is this statement from Herr von Papen's when he formed his coalition with Hitler in 1933? He declared that the aim of the government was:

"The elimination of Social Democrats, Communists, and Jews from leading positions in Germany."

These are the kinds of practices which reveal fascism in its growing state.

What is the game? What's behind this attack on our civil liberties? When civil liberties are attacked—whether it is in Germany, Spain, Italy, or Japan—you can be sure someone is trying to put something over. It isn't just a contempt for civil liberties, as such. In America the game is plain. When you're trying to whip up a war mentality, you can't afford the luxury of dissent. And you can see the outlines of warmongering here. Dozens of United States Senators, heads of national industrial organizations, men high in the State Department—and mentors outside of it—are ringing the tocsin for war. And it is the same crowd that is crushing civil liberties.

Now is the time for all of us to take our battle stands. The contest is by no means hopeless, or the prospects bleak. We progressives outnumber the enemy. Our weakness is that we are disorganized. Our strength will lie in uniting—in spite of efforts to disunite us on phony issues. We must work not as individuals but as organizations.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have a press release issued from the new party headquarters by Mr. Baldwin, our chairman, dealing with the situation in West Virginia, where our petition circulators are being intimidated. If they cannot be intimidated, attempts are made to bribe them. They are offered money if they will sell the petitions and not circulate any more of them. It is very difficult for them. I ask that the release be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

C. B. Baldwin, Henry Wallace's campaign manager, today demanded that Attorney General Tom Clark and Gov. Clarence Meadows of West Virginia take action against a campaign of intimidation, violence, and attempted bribery being waged against Wallace petition circulators in West Virginia.

"Public officials sworn to uphold the law have been using their office to instil a reign of terror in Logan County," Baldwin charged. "In Lorado, Logan County, the constable and two aides, all armed, illegally took away the credentials of a petition circulator, confiscated his petitions, visited the homes of those who had signed his petitions, and intimidated them into removing their names. The campaign worker was offered $150 if he would beat up any Wallace circulators. A sworn deposition attests to this.

"Another witnessed statement reveals that a deputy sheriff tried to bribe a circulator into surrendering his credentials. These and similar specific events give no hint of the atmosphere of terror that has been created in the county against Negro citizens who are courageously trying to exercise their constitutional rights. It is common knowledge that county officials endeavored to break up Senator GLEN TAYLOR'S rally at the Logan County courthouse on April 4.

"In several other counties intimidation is a daily occurrence. In Cabel County a circulator has been threatened by a Ku Klux Klan. In Fayette County a rally was broken up by hoodlums while police stood by and took no action.

"The most elementary sense of justice and respect for democratic rights demand that this campaign of intimidation be stopped by governmental action," Baldwin said. "The Jim-Crowed people of West Virginia have the right to a choice in November. When local officials attempt to interfere with that right, the Federal and State Governments must act, if they take their sworn duties seriously."

Baldwin also announced that Paul Robeson, cochairman of the National Wallace for President Committee, will tour Logan County Saturday and Sunday, May 1 and 2.

The Wallace group needs to file 7,200 signatures by May 10 to win a place on the ballot. Under West Virginia law, anyone who signs the petition will be liable to a $1,000 fine and a year in jail if he also votes in the other parties' primaries May 11. In several counties, Baldwin charged, county officials have been using this fact to imply that anyone signing the petition is automatically subject to the penalty.

NOTE.—For further details, phone Arthur Behrstock, West Virginia Wallace Committee, Charleston, W. Va. 61-064. Correspondents who have expressed interest in covering the violence in Logan County should contact Mr. Behrstock at above number or at 120½ West Washington Street, Charleston 2, W. Va.

Mr. TAYLOR. The press in Pittsburgh, Pa., has embarked upon a project of printing the names and addresses of all persons in Pennsylvania signing new party petitions—30,000 of them. They print a full page each day containing the names of brave patriots who have the guts to sign the new-party petition. They run a special column, making special mention of any teacher, labor leader, Townsend organization official, or other person of any consequence. They are very courteous in that way. They also say, "If anybody signed the petition unknowingly, or unwittingly, if he will let us know, we will print the facts in the paper." I was in Pittsburgh the day the first list of names was printed. On that day there were 10 people who retracted. I went through the city again. About 10 days later I got another issue of the paper. The lists were still being printed, 10 people having on that day retracted. That is not many. That is pretty encouraging, Mr. President. The people of America have guts. They will stand up and fight, if they have a little leadership that will stand up and fight with them. But the Government, and particularly United States Senators, on both sides of the aisle, have a great responsibility in this drive, this drift, if anyone wants to call it that. It is assuming the proportions of a drive toward fascism, Mr. President, because measures calculated to suppress freedom of speech in America are countenanced and actively supported.

I have an article from today's issue of the newspaper PM entitled "The Un-American Bill," dealing with a bill introduced in the House to outlaw the Communist Party. What it really does, Mr. President, is to make possible the outlawing of the new party. In fact, any party could be outlawed. It is very similar to an edict issued by Adolf Hitler. I hold no brief for the Communists as such, but I certainly do not want to see our American freedoms sacrificed as an incident to hunting a small Communist minority. I should like to have this article by Mr. Saul K. Padover inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UN-AMERICAN BILL

The Mundt anti-Communist bill (H. R. 5852), which the House Un-American Committee has unanimously approved, will be voted on this week. In view of the reactionary temper of the present Congress, one may expect it to pass overwhelmingly. "It is really a pretty tough bill," Congressman KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, said of his pet creation.

The Congressman is guilty of an understatement when he describes his bill as tough. It is more than tough. It is dangerous. It is dangerous not for Communists but for Americans in general. Mundt's measure will be a major blow at the Bill of Rights and other such cherished American ideals which it proposes to defend. That is why I call it an un-American bill.

WHAT THE BILL PROVIDES

The bill does not outlaw the Communists. Instead it provides that the Communist Party, as well as Communist-front organizations, register with the Attorney General. It makes illegal any movement designed to establish dictatorship. Penalties for violation are severe. They include loss of citizenship, loss of the right of passports, loss of Federal employment, fines up to $10,000, and imprisonment up to 3 years.

Many an anti-Communist will be tempted to shrug his shoulders at this and say, "So what? After all, the bill is designed to punish only Commies, and they deserve what they get." But let us look at this thing closer.

SUBJECT TO FOUR MAIN OBJECTIONS

The Mundt bill is, I think, subject to four main objections:

Underlying philosophy: The bill's general approach is definitely antidemocratic. If I understand the American-Jeffersonian ideal of democracy right, it means a system wherein men are free to speak, write, and assemble without fear of punishment by the Government. The Mundt bill sharply limits these basic freedoms and sets up machinery for punishment for ideas—the most dangerous kind of political abuse there is. It establishes a precedent for intellectual persecution that could not, even if it would, stop with any one particular group. In the name of defending democracy, the Mundt bill would actually lead to its destruction.

Thought control: The bill is so loosely drawn that, if executed at all, it must abrogate the most precious rights of all Americans, and not just Communists. It provides for the punishment of persons who make any attempt in any manner to organize a dictatorship. If this means anything, it means that the Government could fine and imprison any American who made any gesture—be it a speech, an article, or even simple advice—that is in any way critical of existing powers and politics. Any attempt in any manner could, in other words, be interpreted in any way by any unfriendly judge or official.

The worst aspect of this is, moreover, that it could paralyze all liberal action and movements in the United States. Progressive groups or reform parties, being normally critical of whatever abuses may obtain at a given moment, would hesitate to speak out in public. Men would be afraid to join anything that is not out-and-out standpat and ultraconservative. For any advocacy of change might easily be labelled "Communist" under the Mundt bill. This would be thought-control at its most vicious, for it would affect progressive and reform-minded citizens everywhere, Maybe this is the real objective of the bill.

TOTALITARIAN PRINCIPLE

Guilt by association: The bill makes law out of the totalitarian principle of guilt by association. It states that communism is directed by Moscow and, therefore, calls for punishment of all those individuals who knowingly and willfully participate in the Communist movement. Whether or not Communist leaders take orders from the Kremlin, it is a fact that the rank and file does not. The average follower of the Com-

munist Party has as much connection with Moscow as, say, the average Catholic has with the Vatican. The Mundt bill, nevertheless, will penalize thousands of citizens for belonging to a group that is led by a few men who may or may not be tied up with Russia.

DIFFICULT TO KEEP AN EYE ON THEM

Communist underground: Mundt's bill is bound to make the Communists more dangerous, and certainly much more of a problem, than they are now. Already William Z. Foster, Communist national chairman, has warned that his party would refuse to register and would rather go underground. Should the Communists thus be driven into illegal channels, they will resort to conspiratorial methods in secrecy, and it would then be difficult to keep an eye on them. Moreover, by becoming martyrs they will, aided by clever propaganda, attract Nationwide sympathy—and almost certainly many recruits. Instead of checking communism, the Mundt bill would, therefore, only succeed in strengthening it.

Should then, the Government pass no legislation against the Communists? At this time, it seems to me, there is no real need for such curbs, because there is no real danger. The truth is that, reactionary propaganda of the professional Red-baiters to the contrary, this country has so far handled the Communist situation very well and with marked success. I should think that a healthy nation of 145,000,000 ought not to lose sleep—and even less ought it not deliberately to curtail its liberties over a few thousand radicals. As a matter of fact, the United States has proportionately fewer Communists and sympathizers than any major civilized country in the world.

There are plenty of laws on the statute books for the preservation of the peace and for the punishment of treason. There is no need for special repressive legislation. Such laws as the Mundt bill can only damage American democracy, and do little if anything against communism.

SAUL K. PADOVER.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I have a full-page advertisement from a Birmingham newspaper, the Birmingham News-Age-Herald. I want to say this for that newspaper, that it is a pretty good one. It gave the incidents which happened down there full and decent coverage. It even contained an editorial concerning the woman property-owner who was arrested and booked on a vagrancy charge. It was a critical editorial. I think it is a pretty good newspaper.

As I have stated, this is a full-page advertisement. There is a political campaign going on down there now; and when one is told that they love the Negroes and will take care of them eventually, if we will just let them alone and give them time, it is hard to believe when we see things like this. The editorial says:

Defeat Truman's civil-rights program. Safeguard segregation.

What civil rights mean to you.

President Truman has asked Congress to pass his civil-rights program—aimed at the destruction of the South's segregation laws. Here is what this program calls for:

1. Abolishment of segregation in all public schools—both as to children and teachers.

Would not that be terrible, Mr. President? My son has attended schools with colored children. It never rubbed off on him. He came home just the same as he had left. He looked all right.

2. Abolishment of segregation in all colleges, including church schools, such as Judson, Howard, Birmingham-Southern, and Huntingdon.

Church schools, Mr. President. Can we imagine Christianity part black and part white? It is difficult for me to conceive of these things. I never did conceive of them until I traveled in the South where these things happen. They have been brought home to me.

Reading further from the editorial:

3. Abolishment of segregation in State-supported colleges such as Alabama, Auburn, Montevallo, and the teacher colleges.

4. Abolishment of segregation in restaurants, hotels, picture shows, streetcars, buses, barber shops, beauty shops, and swimming pools.

In Birmingham, I turned on the radio for a few moments. The first commercial I heard was with reference to a beauty parlor. It mentioned the beauty parlor and then said "where discriminating people go." The word "discriminating" hit me. I noticed it. I thought, That is likely to be in almost any advertisement. People are discriminating all over America. They can be discriminating in many different ways.

The next commercial was with reference to a barber shop, and it was also for discriminating people. The next one was for a restaurant, and, lo and behold, it was for discriminating people. Practically every commercial contained the word "discriminating."

Here is another thing that will happen:

5. Compulsory employment of Negroes in every business establishment (up to approximately 40 percent in Jefferson County) and the discharge of present employees where necessary to achieve a ratio of employment in all businesses of 60 percent white employees and 40 percent Negro employees.

6. Compulsory association of whites and Negroes, working side by side in offices and factories, food, drug, and department stores.

Of course, Mr. President, that is hypocritical, because they do work side by side. Colored bus boys carry one's dishes away, and the waitresses bring food, passing back and forth. But they will not have them working at the same jobs in the same establishment. They keep the Negroes in the more menial jobs.

The editorial continues:

7. Compulsory upgrading of Negro employees to positions of supervision over whites in the same racial ratio.

Mr. President, this program of divide and conquer has been used by Great Britain in her colonies for centuries. In India it nourished and fed the caste system. Now that the Hindus have freedom, they are taking steps to abolish that system. In America there are demagogues who are trying to strengthen the caste system at the very same time it is being eliminated in other parts of the world. Racial discrimination in America is losing us more friends than we are gaining by the money we are spending under the Marshall plan.

The editorial continues:

Enforcement of these requirements by fine and jail sentences.

That is listed as the last terrible thing that will happen.

Then the editorial says:

Vote for these delegates and electors who won't vote for Truman or any one who favors "civil rights" for Negroes. A delegate or an elector who votes for Truman for President also votes for Truman's civil rights program. They are tied together. The way to kill "civil rights" is to defeat Truman.

I do not believe that. I am not convinced that Mr. Truman was sincere in his civil-rights message. I think it was a case of politics. If he were sincere he could abolish discrimination in the armed services and in the executive departments with a stroke of the pen, as I understand. It seems incredible to many Americans that such things are going on in this country today. In the South we see white and colored waiting-rooms; benches for white and colored persons to sit on in order to wait for street cars. Negroes are seated in the back of a bus, although I understand that when the seats for whites are all taken, the Negroes have to stand up so that the whites can be seated.

I cannot conceive of such things. I look upon human beings as God's children, no matter what color they may be. I was raised on an Indian reservation in the West. I certainly never thought of my Indian schoolmates as being anything but Americans, which they were. I do not know how they felt regarding me, as a white interloper, as to whether I should be discriminated against. I deplore these things. I shall continue to oppose them as vigorously as I possibly can. If I should come to some untimely end, which I thought I came close to the other night when they rode me through the countryside in Alabama, I think it would be well worth while to end up by trying to make this a better world for everyone, black and white, in which to live.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from which I have quoted be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFEAT TRUMAN'S CIVIL-RIGHTS PROGRAM—SAFEGUARD SEGREGATION—WHAT CIVIL RIGHTS MEANS TO YOU

President Truman has asked Congress to pass his civil-rights program aimed at the destruction of the South's segregation laws. Here is what this program calls for:

1. Abolishment of segregation in all public schools, both as to children and teachers.

2. Abolishment of segregation in all colleges, including church schools, such as Judson, Howard, Birmingham-Southern, and Huntingdon.

3. Abolishment of segregation in State-supported colleges such as Alabama, Auburn, Montevallo, and the teacher colleges.

4. Abolishment of segregation in restaurants, hotels, picture shows, streetcars, busses, barber shops, beauty shops, and swimming pools.

5. Compulsory employment of Negroes in every business establishment (up to approximately 40 percent in Jefferson County) and the discharge of present employees where necessary to achieve a ratio of employment in all business of 60 percent white employees and 40 percent Negro employees.

6. Compulsory association of whites and Negroes, working side by side in offices and factories, food, drug, and department stores.

7. Compulsory upgrading of Negro employees to positions of supervision over whites in the same racial ratio.

8. Enforce of these requirements by fine and jail sentences.

Vote for those delegates and electors who won't vote for Truman or anyone who favors civil rights for Negroes before or after the Philadelphia convention.

A delegate or an elector who votes for Truman for President also votes for Truman's civil-rights program. They are tied together. The way to kill "civil rights" is to defeat Truman, the man who will impose it on us, if he is elected President. Don't single shot. That kills your vote. You must vote for 8 delegates at large and 11 electors.

(Paid political advertisement, published by Jefferson County Democratic Campaign Committee, R. DuPont Thompson, chairman, Birmingham, Ala.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to make an observation with reference to the parliamentary situation tomorrow and also with reference to the so-called tidewater oil bill and the so-called oleomargarine bill.

For the record I should like to point out that the tidewater oil bill is now on the Senate Calendar. It is in the same situation as is any other bill on the calendar. The only way the bill can be taken up either for committee reference or for consideration is to get it up in the same way any other bill is brought up, and have whatever motions the mover desires made with reference to it.

The oleomargarine bill has been read once. Under section 2 of rule XIV, after its second reading, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] could follow the same procedure followed today by the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] in his efforts to place the bill on the calendar, by objecting to any further consideration of the bill. The oleomargarine bill, after the second reading, tomorrow, will be considered in the morning business. There is already a unanimous consent agreement providing for a call of the calendar of unobjected-to bills, starting with Calendar No. 1211. When the morning hour is concluded, the consideration of the National Science bill will automatically be resumed, or if the discussion of the oleomargarine bill does not consume all the time up until 2 o'clock, it will be my purpose to ask that the National Science bill be made the unfinished business earlier, so that we can have as early a conclusion of the matter as possible.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. With respect to the oleomargarine bill which is coming up tomorrow, will it be debated under the 5-minute rule?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the Chair's understanding that it will not be.

Mr. LUCAS. Do I correctly understand that if a motion be made to refer the oleomargarine bill to the Finance Committee or to the Committee on Agriculture, Senators can take all the time they desire on that motion?

Mr. WHERRY. Up until 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair believes that the occupant of the chair at that time would make the ruling.

Mr. LUCAS. That leaves me just where I started, and I have no information as to what might happen to the oleomargarine bill, so far as debate is concerned. Someone should be able to tell me what will happen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the occupant of the chair at that time will make the referral without the matter being subject to debate. Any appeal, of course, would be debatable.

Mr. WHERRY. The debate might continue until 2 o'clock, at which time the unfinished business would become the question for the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Did I hear an affirmative answer to the last statement made by the Senator from Nebraska? I thought the Parliamentarian said "Yes," but I do not know what the Presiding Officer said.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Having just come into the chair, if the present occupant understood what was going on, the Presiding Officer answered "Yes."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I brought this matter up to call the attention of the Members of the Senate to what the business would be tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. After the hour of 2 o'clock arrives, I understand debate will be closed. What will happen to the oleomargarine bill after that?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator repeat his question?

Mr. LUCAS. I understood the Chair to rule that the debate on the oleomargarine bill, in the event it shall come up tomorrow—and I understood from the remarks made by the acting majority leader that it will come up—may be considered until 2 o'clock. The morning hour will then be closed, and the debate on the oleomargarine bill will be concluded. When will we get back to the oleomargarine bill? That is my query.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. At 2 o'clock the oleomargarine bill would go to the table, to be taken up subsequently by motion.

Mr. LUCAS. By another motion?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I am supposed to be in Birmingham, Ala., tomorrow to answer to a charge of disturbing the peace. I ask unanimous consent that I be excused from the session of the Senate tomorrow in order that I may attend to that chore.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's request is granted.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the work of the Senate for the day apparently having been concluded, I move that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 4, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 3 (legislative day of April 22), 1948:

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR

Howard Bruce, of Maryland, to be Deputy Administrator for Economic Cooperation.

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT

Paul P. Rao, of New York, to be judge of the United States Customs Court, vice Hon. David H. Kincheloe, resigning April 30, 1948.

IN THE NAVY

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL

Rear Adm. George L. Russell, United States Navy, to be Judge Advocate General of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate May 3 (legislative day of April 22), 1948:

POSTMASTER

Mrs. Addie Ridenour to be postmaster at Steen, in the State of Minnesota.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 3, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. C. Howard Lambdin, minister, St. Luke's Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, we invoke Thy divine blessing upon us as we turn our thoughts toward the duties of this day. In ways so wondrously Thine own, move upon our minds and make clear our understandings and our judgments.

We are grateful to Thee for the abundant blessings that are ours because we live in this land of freedom and opportunity. We remember with deep devotion those of other days who laid deeply the firm foundations of our national life. Because of the example they have set before us, help us in these times to give ourselves to the larger destiny ahead with unbroken devotion.

We pray for peace, for orderly government, and for understanding for all men everywhere. Give us faith, and give us firmness, too. With loyalty, help us to maintain liberty; and in these days of tension give us courage, high purpose, and noble character.

We pray in the spirit of Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 30, 1948, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amend-

ments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4966. An act directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and lease certain houses, apartments, and lands in Boulder City, Nev.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 52. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of Senate Report 440, part 6, of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program; and

S. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Report No. 949, entitled "National Aviation Policy."

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6055) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 22 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate further insists upon its amendments in disagreement, asks a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BALL, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. RUSSELL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, tomorrow, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the shortage of oil and gasoline.

FIVE-STAR GENERALS AND ADMIRALS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning the Sunday Star carried the following item on page 2:

General Eisenhower was scheduled to depart from Fort Myer early today for New York preparatory to assuming the presidency of Columbia University.

In addition to his pay as president of Columbia, General Eisenhower, under the special law which created five-star generals and admirals, will continue to receive his Army pay of some $15,000 annually.

He will hold his rank for life and technically is merely on inactive status, subject to call to duty at any time. Under the special law, a five-star general is granted an allowance for a small group of assistants for life, and the following will be in New York with General Eisenhower: Maj. Robert L. Shultz, aide-de-camp; Warrant Officer Margaret Hayes, private secretary; and Sgt. Leonard Dry, chauffeur.

Mr. Speaker, when the five-star general special legislation was under consideration on consent file, I was the one who objected to its consideration. It seems to me that we have been entirely too liberal in continuing the full pay of these admirals and generals, while at the same time we give them three assistants for life. I am suggesting to the Armed Services Committee and to this Congress that they review the special legislation which created five-star generals and admirals that gives them special consideration upon retirement.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. First, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Nebraska for being alert and on his toes. I am glad to inform him that the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House has taken this up with the Department of Defense.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the gentleman understand that when we passed the legislation it provided for three assistants?

Mr. SHORT. Of course not, but they are riding high, wide, and handsome down there.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Does not the gentleman believe that General Eisenhower will probably give up these officers who have been assigned to him and send them back to the Army where they are needed, because he believes we want universal military training? Get them back in the Army where they belong.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I understand that Admirals Nimitz and King now enjoy having three assistants for life. This order should be reviewed and stopped at once.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. LOVE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. JONES of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in each extraneous matter.

PEACETIME CONSCRIPTION

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, the President, the Secretary of National Defense, the Secretary of State, and other administration officials are demanding peacetime conscription in one or more forms.

In response to this demand, I ask this question: Has the President or any of these officials ever officially told the American people what they, the executive officials, consider our defensive boundaries to be?

Until that is done in a straightforward and unequivocal manner, Congress and the American people cannot fairly determine our defense necessities.

I am sending a letter today to Secretary of Defense Forrestal seeking the answer to this question. When I receive a reply I will apprise the House of its contents.

COMMUNISM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House will be receiving through the mail, if they have not already received them, little printed cards, all printed up in advance, urging you to vote against the so-called Mundt bill, a bill to control communism, by compelling Communists to register, H. R. 5852. I urge you not to be too much influenced by these printed cards, however, because one came in today which had printed across it, in the handwriting of the sender, this little legend which sheds a lot of illumination on this inspired correspondence campaign to defeat Communist-control legislation. It says:

We are asked by our leaders to urge Congress to kill this bill. That is not what we want, but large numbers of our unions want the Communist Party outlawed at once. We dare not sign our names.

So, I think you can be sure that even among those whom the Communists are trying to stir up to act in opposition to this effective legislation to control communism, there is a liberal percentage of good Americans among the workers, and many people who insist that now is the time for the United States to move effectively against these subversive un-American groups.

Elsewhere in today's RECORD the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has inserted the full text of H. R. 5852. I hope each of you will study it carefully and support it actively. In the Appendix

of today's RECORD, also, I am inserting an editorial endorsement of this legislation by the Washington Evening Star.

RUTH AND HER TRAIN TRIP

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, during the 5 years in which I have been a Member of this distinguished body, many thousands of letters have reached my desk. None ever portrayed more pathos, hope, or yearning or tugged harder at my heartstrings than this one. Listen:

DEAR MR. BREHM: We are enclosing a letter of a train trip we have planned to Gallipolis for May 14. Now we hear that there may be a railroad strike which will spoil our plans. We would like for you to talk to the National Mediation Board to stop the strike, or put is off till after May 14. Ninety percent of the 200 children in our school have never ridden on a train. We would like so much for you to do all you can.

Yours hopefully,

RUTH HANBY.

That letter was written by a sixth-grade pupil. Mr. Speaker, we are prone to visualize strikes as slowing down much needed production, loss of wages to the workers, and income to the operators, and at times much inconvenience to great segments of the public by interfering with national health, safety, and interest.

Mr. Speaker, if the railroad strike materializes in this instance it will do more than interfere with the national health, safety, and interest so far as Ruth and her classmates are concerned. It will not only dash their hopes in realizing a dream about to come true by taking their first train ride, but it might do irreparable harm toward developing the minds of these young children regarding the rights and privileges of all the people.

Anyone who, after reading this little girl's letter, would refuse to do everything in his power to assist Ruth and her 199 schoolmates in realizing their ambition, just must not love children. At least they could not be a daddy and still continue to wreck Ruth's doll house. I sincerely trust that mediation and conciliation may prevent this scheduled walk-out and I here and now publicly pledge my efforts in behalf of the problem of Ruth and her little schoolmates.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TIBBOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. DELANEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX and Mr. FLANNAGAN asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include excerpts.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Evening Star on the subject of controlling communism in America.

Mr. FERNANDEZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an outline of benefits to the veterans of New Mexico.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 4488.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may sit during the session of the House tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

FOOD PRICES AND CHEAPER REFRIGERATORS THE NEED

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on the General Electric program last Thursday night a part of the program was devoted to a rebroadcast of a speech made by our distinguished colleague the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS]. I do not care to discuss her position in complaining about food prices at this time. I do call attention to the fact that the farmers of this country are evidently to become public enemy No. 1 in the minds of some people. Knowing as I do that the 14 largest dairy corporations in the United States made $4,000,000 less in 1947 than they did in 1946, and knowing that the leading dairy States did not have much of any increase in the price of milk for their farmers—as a matter of fact, Wisconsin had 2-percent increase and Minnesota milk prices did not increase even 1 percent—I was interested in checking up and seeing what is going on in the electrical world. I found that 74 electrical equipment companies made $113,000,000 net in 1946 and $272,000,000 net in 1947. I might say that the percentage of return on their investment jumped from 9 percent in 1946 to 19 percent in 1947.

I also checked up with the Library of Congress and found that General Electric had a net of $43,000,000 in 1946 and $95,000,000 in 1947. I do not expect General Electric to do much about producing any food. If they will just lower the price of their refrigerators at least we can keep the food cool a little bit cheaper and thus save a little more food. This will have something to do with the cost of living and they will be helping to lower the cost of living. They cannot then be accused of giving aid and comfort to those among us that are evidently bent on making the American farmer public enemy No. 1 at this time.

BILL DONALDSON

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, the press gallery is a vitally important link between this body of the Congress and the country. I rise at this time, both as a Member of the House, and as a newspaperman by profession, to express appreciation for the long, faithful, and efficient service of Bill Donaldson as superintendent of the House Press Gallery. Bill Donaldson completed 35 years of service in that capacity last Saturday. Tonight at the National Press Club his newspaper associates and other friends will honor him in a special program.

The first day of May 1913 he became superintendent of the Press Gallery. While May Day may hold some apprehension in some quarters, it has been a lucky day for Bill Donaldson. On May 1, 1917, his first son was born, and 3 years later, on May 1, 1920, twin sons came to bless his home.

I am sure all of us join with his newspaper colleagues in congratulating him today and extending him very best wishes for all the years ahead.

Mr. Donaldson has attended all national conventions of the two major political parties since 1912. He has attended all of the conferences of the United Nations and many other national and international meetings. He has, in all his career, been consistently courteous, congenial, and cooperative to Members of Congress and the press.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

MAY 3, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: A certificate of election in due form of law showing the election of the Honorable WILLIAM LEWIS, as a Representative-elect to the Eightieth Congress from the Ninth Congressional District of the State of Kentucky, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the Honorable John M. Robsion is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks, and include a bill reported by the Committee on Un-American Activities and an excerpt from today's Washington Daily News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I am personally gratified that the Committee on Un-American Activities has reported out a bill, for the purpose of controlling the menace of communism in this country. The committee has wisely included the principle of compelling Communists to register as agents of a foreign power, which principle was included in a bill I introduced for the same purpose. I have always approved of and supported the Committee on Un-American Activities from its very beginning and intend to do so as long as I am here. It is the only committee in the House of Representatives to which any Member of the House may appeal for information on groups and individuals of a subversive character. That is not intended as any reflection on the FBI because under existing law the information which the FBI can give is very restricted. They will help in any way that they can, but not to the degree that the Committee on Un-American Activities have helped many Members of the Congress. I hope the bill which they have recently reported, known as the Mundt bill, will receive the support of an overwhelming majority of the House.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Is it not a fact that Congress has appropriated $6,400,000,000 to eradicate it in Europe? If the Members of Congress feel that they ought to spend all that money and send it to Europe, we ought to get rid of them here before we go bankrupt.

Mr. DONDERO. No one will disagree with you on that.

MILITARY RETIREMENT PRIVILEGES

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called this morning by numerous Members of the House to the situation wherein officers of the Army and Navy of five-star rank are retired with full pay and all allowances, and in certain cases they are receiving, in addition, the help of certain assistants such as chauffeurs and what not. I might say that the five-star retirement bill was developed through a conference between myself, representing the then Committee on Military Affairs, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], the then chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs. When we passed the Five-Star Retirement Act, providing for full pay with all emoluments, there was no thought whatever, nor was there any provision in the bill, under which life assistants would be given to any of these five-star generals and admirals. My attention has been called to the fact that this has been extended to certain five-star admirals of the fleet in the Navy and to five-star generals in the Army by order of the President. I may say, and I am quite sure that all members of the Committee on Armed Services, when their attention has been brought to it, will agree with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and myself, that this new provision is outside the purview of the Retirement Act, and it will have to be changed. Attention has been called to the fact that this has been done with some idea of bringing these generals and admirals in line with General Pershing's retirement. Most of the emoluments which accrued to General Pershing came to him as a result of his becoming head of the Graves Registration Service.

General Pershing's rank was quite different from any of these five-star generals and admirals, in that his title was General of the Armies.

The situation must be corrected.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If the gentleman will yield, how will you correct it?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

FARM PROSPERITY

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] has complained with respect to the remarks made last Wednesday by the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] bearing on the high cost of living.

I know that the gentleman from Wisconsin cannot maintain that the farmers and agriculture have not made more money in 1947 than ever before in history and are perhaps doing still better now, but that is not the point. The gentleman must realize that notwithstanding the fact that some prices went down for a few days, since you passed the law giving industry the right to enter into voluntary agreements to reduce prices, prices not only on agricultural products but on all necessities of life have again gone up. However, as I listened to the gentlewoman from California she did not especially direct her remarks to the high profits of the dairy and packing industries.

Mr. Speaker, I say it is absolutely necessary that something be done to relieve the consumers, that we must stop the ever-increasing cost of living.

As the gentleman from Wisconsin has shown, there are many industries that doubled their income in the last 2 years, and are still further increasing their profits in 1948. The consumers of the country have come to the conclusion that they are being gouged, while business and industry are enjoying huge profits, and this condition cannot and will not be much longer endured because the people of low income cannot continue to maintain themselves and their families. They have been obliged to sell their Government bonds and are now buying necessaries of life on easy installment payments, and going further in debt by reason of these increasing prices. They are crying for relief from these intolerable conditions but, unfortunately, I feel no relief will be forthcoming while your party is in power.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party does not seem to realize it is digging its own political grave by refusing to reenact price controls and rationing that would arrest the unconscionable high prices and bring down to a decent level the cost of living which, naturally, in the main, consists of the purchase of foodstuffs.

Within the past few weeks the people of the country have given evidence that they have lost confidence in the reactionary Republican policies, notably in Nebraska, Wisconsin, and Pennsylvania and will shortly do so in other States. People realize that the majority in this Congress has been dominated by the National Association of Manufacturers from which it has not been in position to release itself. That is the reason that the people are turning against the Republican Party and turning to Stassen and, later on, they will turn to the progressive Democratic Party.

My advice to the gentleman from Wisconsin and to others is that they read the constructive summary of the food and price investigations made by the gentlewoman from California that calls for relief for the consumers.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CARROLL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an analysis submitted by the Disabled American Veterans of Colorado.

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech made by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, last week I obtained permission to extend a certain matter in the Appendix of the RECORD. I am informed by the Public Printer that it exceeds the limit set by the Joint Committee on Printing, that it will take 3½ pages, and cost $248.50. Notwithstanding the excess I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the excess, without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

HOUSE MEMORIAL DAY MAY 17

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to remind the membership that 2 weeks from today, May 17, the House will hold memorial services for Members who have passed on during the past year.

On such occasion, the families of deceased Members, many coming from long distances, will be present. Therefore, let me express the hope that a large majority of the Members of the House will be in attendance to honor the memory of our departed colleagues.

AMENDMENT OF SURPLUS PROPERTY ACT

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2239) to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, with Senate amendments, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the gentleman from Michigan when we are going to get a bill on this surplus property disposal matter that will take out all the red tape and expense incident to the sale of war surplus. It seems that in almost every sale that is made, the amount received from the sale of this property is eaten up by salaries.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In reply to the question raised by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who is a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I here now appoint him a committee of one to write a bill. We will take it up any time he has it ready.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I have been trying to find some way of eliminating the red tape we have here in Washington. I am unable to do it. If you have anybody who can write such a bill I wish he would do it, for it is high time it was done, and I am not fooling about it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HOFFMAN, HARVEY, and HOLIFIELD.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Lands may sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

AMENDMENT TO ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1946

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar, H. R. 5216, to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 so as to provide that no person shall take office as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission or as General Manager of such Commission until an investigation with respect to the character, associations, and loyalty of such person shall have been made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is the first bill to be reported to the House from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. As the Members well know, the existing Atomic Energy Act requires all employees of the Atomic Energy Commission to be investigated by the FBI as to their character, associations, and loyalty.

The bill now under consideration has been on the calendar for several weeks and proposes to modify existing law by requiring the President to call upon the FBI for similar character and loyalty investigation prior to making his appointments, and likewise authorizing the Senate unit of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy which passes upon the confirmation of those appointments to call upon the FBI for the results of its investigations as to those Presidential appointments requiring Senate confirmation.

Since the bill has been reported to the Congress by the Joint Committee, the Senate has acted upon it by striking out that provision of the bill requiring the President to call upon the FBI prior to making the appointment; so that as the bill has passed by the Senate, it simply authorizes the Senate unit of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to call upon the FBI for an investigation of those persons who are appointed by the President under the authority of the Atomic Energy Act, as to their loyalty, associations, and character.

Mr. Speaker, if consent is granted for the consideration of this bill, it is my purpose to ask for the substitution of the Senate bill in place of the House bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say to the gentleman from New York that I have a petition on the Clerk's desk to bring to the floor of the House a bill making the FBI an independent agency. The time has come when the FBI must be made an independent agency and it must have the power to find out what is going on all over the world in this age of atomic energy, atomic threats, and so forth. I submit that it is going to be necessary to have such an agency as the FBI to do this and I hope all the Members will sign Petition No. 15 to bring this bill to the floor of the House for consideration.

Mr. COLE of New York. I may say that this procedure is being followed after consultation with members of the minority, especially with the ranking minority member of the House unit of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], and there appears to be no objection.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, this bill was reported favorably by the joint committee and applies to Presidential appointees the same as the Atomic Energy Act presently applies to all employees of the Atomic Energy organization. We see no reason why it should not be passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute in lieu of the House bill the Senate bill, S. 1004.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I forgot to mention it, but when the bill that I have introduced comes to the floor of the House, I will seek to increase the salary of Edgar Hoover, the head of the FBI.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 15 (e) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "The Senate members of the joint committee, as a committee, hereafter referred to in this subsection (e) as the Senate committee, and independent of the similar power included in the broader authority of the joint committee as specified in the preceding sentence, may, prior to the giving of advice and consent or refusal to advise and consent by the Senate to any appointment by the President under this act that requires such advice and consent, direct the Federal Bureau of Investigation to investigate the character, associations, and loyalty of any such appointee. The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall cause such investigation to be made and, upon completion thereof, shall report to the Senate committee, in writing, setting out the information developed by such investigation, and shall thereafter furnish such amplification or supplementation thereof as the Senate committee may direct."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The bill, H. R. 5216, was laid on the table.

AMEND IMMIGRATION LAWS RELATING TO STOWAWAYS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5119) to amend the immigration laws relating to stowaways, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know a little more about the bill. It has been objected to several times. I do not know whether those who previously objected are present now or not.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. There are about six Members present who are going to object.

Mr. SABATH. I understand so.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. SABATH, Mr. BLAND, Mr. DOMENGEAUX, and Mr. PASSMAN objected.

AIR-MAIL DELIVERY BY GOVERNMENT-OWNED TRUCKS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2588) requiring all mails consigned to an airport from a post office or branch, or from an airport to a post office or branch, within a radius of 35 miles of a city in which there has been established a Government-owned vehicle service to be delivered by Government-owned motor vehicles.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2286) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

ASSISTING STATES IN COLLECTING SALES AND USE TAXES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5645) to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. SHORT. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SHORT, Mr. SHAFER, Mr. BULWINKLE, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina objected.

EXPEND INCOME FROM FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1648) to authorize the expenditure of income from Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for training of Federal prisoners.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when this bill came up the first time I asked unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice. I have since consulted the introducer of the bill and I understand that Attorney General Clark is favorable to its passage. So, I have no objection to the bill being considered at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the act of May 27, 1930 (46 Stat. 391; 18 U. S. C. 744 a-h), relating to the training and schooling of prisoners in trades and occupations shall be construed as applying to all inmates of Federal penal and correctional institutions qualified for such training and schooling without regard to their industrial or other assignments. The prison industries funds established by section 4 of the act of June 23, 1934 (48 Stat. 1211; 18 U. S. C. 744-L), may be employed in paying the expenses of such training and schooling.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill insert "within the limits of amounts specifically authorized annually in the Government Corporations Appropriations Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STAR-ROUTE CONTRACTS

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 347) to authorize the Postmaster General to withhold the awarding of star-route contracts for a period of 60 days.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to withhold the awarding of star-route contracts for which bids have been received in the second contract section for a period of 60 days after March 30, 1948.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAYMENTS FOR DISABLED VETERANS' CONVEYANCES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4007) to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill carries too much money for its consideration on the Consent Calendar, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

DEVELOPMENT OF IMPROVED PROSTHETIC APPLIANCES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5820) to aid in the development of improved prosthetic appliances, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is authorized to be appropriated annually to the Veterans' Administration and to remain available until expended the sum of $1,000,000 to be expended, in accordance with laws now or hereafter applicable to the Veterans' Administration, for prosthetic research, including all forms of prosthetic and orthopedic appliances and sensory devices.

SEC. 2. In carrying out the research program authorized by this act the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to make available the results of his investigations to private or public institutions or agencies and to individuals in order that the unique investigative materials and research data in the possession of the Government may result in improved prosthetic appliances for all disabled persons.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LIMITING PARTICIPATION AS BENEFICIARY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5680) to provide for limiting participation as beneficiary under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 601 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended effective as of October 8, 1940, to read as follows:

"(f) The terms 'parent,' 'father,' and 'mother' include a father, mother, father through adoption, mother through adoption, persons who have stood in loco parentis to a member of the military or naval forces at any time prior to entry into active service for a period of not less than 1 year, and a stepparent, if designated as beneficiary by the insured: *Provided*, That if either parent shall have abandoned his or her family for seven or more years, and shall have remained in abandonment as of the date on which national service life insurance matured by reason of the death of his or her child, such person shall not be considered as the 'parent,' 'father,' or 'mother' of such child and shall not be entitled to participate in such insurance."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by section 1 of this act to section 601 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, shall not be construed (1) to require the discontinuance of any insurance award, for any period prior to the receipt in the Veterans' Administration of evidence of such abandonment, or (2) require duplicate payments of benefits in any case.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISH ELIGIBILITY FOR BURIAL IN NATIONAL CEMETERIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4203) to establish eligibility for burial in national cemeteries, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill (S. 1620) be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That burial in national cemeteries of the remains of the following classes of persons is authorized under such regulations as the Secretary of the Army may prescribe: (a) Any member or former member of the armed forces of the United States whose last service terminated honorably, by death or otherwise; (b) any citizens of the United States who, during any war in which the United States has been or may hereafter be engaged, served in the armed forces of any government allied with the United States

during such war, and whose last service terminated honorably, by death or otherwise; and (c) the wife, husband, widow, widower, minor child, and, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Army, unmarried adult child of any of the persons enumerated in (a) and (b) herein: *Provided*, That the remains of those persons enumerated in (c), above, may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Army, be removed from a national cemetery proper and interred in the post section of a national cemetery or in a post cemetery if, upon death, the related member of the armed forces of the United States or allied government is not buried in the same or an adjoining grave site. Persons who were members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States at any time during the period between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, may also be buried in any national cemetery: *Provided*, That the interment is without cost to the United States.

SEC. 2. Section 4878, Revised Statutes, as amended (24 U. S. C. 281), is hereby repealed.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEAN: On page 2, line 16, insert "As used in this section the term 'widow' includes the widow of any member of the armed forces of the United States lost or buried at sea or officially determined to be permanently absent in a state of missing or missing in action."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid of the table.

NATIONAL CEMETERIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4722) to provide for the utilization as national cemeteries of surplus Army Department owned military real property at Fort Devans, Mass.; Fort Logan, Colo.; and Fort Lewis, Wash.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PLUMLEY, Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma, Mr. JONES of Washington, and Mr. TOLLEFSON objected.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4393) to provide for the distribution, promotion, separation, and retirement of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STEFAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I previously asked that this bill be passed over without prejudice, but since then we have studied the bill and found it to be very meritorious. I have no objection to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. That this act may be cited as the "Coast and Geodetic Survey Commissioned Officers' Act of 1947."

AUTHORIZED NUMBERS IN GRADE

SEC. 2. (a) Of the total authorized number of commissioned officers on the active list of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, there are authorized numbers in permanent grade, in relative rank with officers of the Navy, in the proportion of 8 in the grade of captain, to 14 in the grade of commander, to 19 in the grade of lieutenant commander, to 23 in the grade of lieutenant, to 18 in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade), to 18 in the grade of ensign.

(b) Whenever a final fraction occurs in computing the authorized number of officers in any grade, the nearest whole number shall be taken, and if such fraction be one-half the next higher whole number shall be taken: *Provided*, That the total number of officers as authorized by law shall not be increased as the result of the computations prescribed herein, and if necessary the number of officers in the lowest grade shall be reduced accordingly.

(c) No officer shall be reduced in grade or pay or separated from the active list as the result of any computations made to determine the authorized number of officers in the various grades.

(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed as requiring the filling of any vacancy or as prohibiting additional numbers in any grade to compensate for vacancies existing in higher grades.

PROMOTION AND SEPARATION OF OFFICERS

SEC. 3. Promotion to fill vacancies in all permanent grades above that of lieutenant (junior grade) shall be made by selection from the next lower respective grades upon recommendation of the personnel board hereinafter provided for.

SEC. 4. Irrespective of any vacancies, each officer in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade) and lieutenant shall be considered by the personnel board for promotion to the grade of lieutenant and lieutenant commander in sufficient time so that, if found fully qualified, such officer may be promoted to and appointed in such grade upon completion of 7 and 14 years of service, respectively. All promotions under this section shall be made on the date on which the required service is completed, and the authorized number of officers in the grade of lieutenant and lieutenant commander shall be temporarily increased, if necessary, to authorize such appointments: *Provided*, That an officer found not fully qualified in accordance with this section may be promoted on such later date on which he may be found fully qualified.

SEC. 5. Irrespective of any vacancies, any officer in the permanent grade of lieutenant commander who has completed 21 years of service and any officer in the permanent grade of commander who has completed 30 years of service may be considered by the personnel board at any time for promotion to the grade of commander and captain, respectively. If selected, he may be promoted at any time and the authorized number of officers in the grade of commander and captain shall be temporarily increased, if necessary, to authorize such appointments.

SEC. 6. (a) Officers in the permanent grade of ensign shall be promoted to and appointed in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) on completion of 3 years of service, and the authorized number of officers in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) shall from time to time be temporarily increased as necessary to authorize such appointments.

(b) Whenever there are vacancies in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade), officers in the permanent grade of ensign may, if found fully qualified, be promoted to and appointed in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) upon completion of 2 years of service.

(c) Ensigns who are found not fully qualified at any time shall have their commissions revoked and be separated from the commissioned service.

SEC. 7. Each officer shall be assumed to have, for promotion purposes, at least the same length of service as any officer below him on the lineal list, except that an officer who has lost numbers shall be assumed to have for promotion purposes no greater service than the officer next above him in his new position on the lineal list.

SEC. 8. As recommended by the personnel board, officers in the permanent grade of captain, commander, and lieutenant commander may be transferred to the retired list and officers in the permanent grade of lieutenant and lieutenant (junior grade) may be separated from the service: *Provided*, That in any fiscal year, the total number of officers so retired and separated plus the number of officers retired for age shall not exceed the whole number nearest 4 percent of the total authorized number of commissioned officers on the active list, except as otherwise provided by law: *Provided further*, That all retirements and separations pursuant to this section shall become effective on the first day of the sixth month following the date of approval of the retirement or separation by the Secretary of Commerce, unless the officer concerned requests earlier retirement or separation, in which case the date shall be as determined by the Secretary of Commerce.

SEC. 9. Any officer in the grade of lieutenant or lieutenant (junior grade) who is separated from the service in accordance with section 8 of this act shall be paid a lump-sum payment computed on the basis of 2 months' active-duty pay with longevity credit at the time of separation for each year of service, but not to exceed a total of 2 years' active-duty pay with longevity credit: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this section a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year in computing the number of years of service upon which to base such lump-sum payment.

SEC. 10. (a) Promotions to all permanent grades shall be made by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(b) In time of emergencey declared by the President or by the Congress, and in time of war, the President is authorized, in his discretion, to suspend the operation of all or any part or parts of the several provisions of law pertaining to promotion.

SEC. 11. Nothing in this act shall be construed to modify the provisions of existing law relating to examination of officers for promotion, and no officer shall be promoted until he shall have passed the prescribed examinations.

RETIREMENT OF OFFICERS

SEC. 12. (a) When any commissioned officer serving in a rank below that of rear admiral has attained the age of 60 years, he shall be placed on the retired list: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not become effective until a date 6 months subsequent to the enactment of this act, and until such effective date the retirement age for officers serving in a rank below that of rear admiral shall be 62 years.

(b) When any officer serving in a rank above that of captan has attained the age of 64 years, he shall be placed on the retired list.

SEC. 13. When any commissioned officer has completed 30 years of service, he may at any time thereafter, upon his own application, in the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce, be placed on the retired list.

SEC. 14. When any commissioned officer is found incapacitated for active service and his incapacity is the result of disease or injury incurred in line of duty, he shall, upon approval of the Secretary of Commerce, be placed on the retired list.

SEC. 15. In computing service for the purpose of retirement of a commissioned officer, there shall be included, in addition to active commissioned service in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, all active service counted on June 30, 1922, for longevity pay, service as authorized in section 2 (b) of the act of January 19, 1942 (56 Stat. 6), and all service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast

Guard which is now or hereafter may be authorized by law to be counted for the purpose of retirement of an officer of those services.

SEC. 16. (a) Each commissioned officer on the retired list, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section or in some other provision of law, shall receive retired pay at the rate of 2½ percent of the active-duty pay with longevity credit of the rank with which retired, multiplied by the number of years of service for which entitled to credit in the computation of his pay while on active duty, not to exceed a total of 75 percent of said active-duty pay with longevity credit: *Provided*, That a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year in computing the number of years of service by which the rate of 2½ percent is multiplied.

(b) Each commissioned officer retired for physical disability incurred in line of duty shall receive retired pay at the rate of 75 percent of the active-duty pay with longevity credit of the rank with which retired.

SEC. 17. (a) Each commissioned officer heretofore or hereafter retired pursuant to any provision of law shall be placed on the retired list with the highest rank, permanent or temporary, held by him while on active duty, if his performance of duty, in the case of temporary rank, has been satisfactory as determined by the Secretary of Commerce in regard to officers who served in such rank under his jurisdiction, or as determined by the Secretaries of War or Navy in regard to officers who were promoted to such higher ranks in accordance with section 1 (1) of the act of December 3, 1942 (56 Stat. 1038), while serving in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, and shall receive retired pay based on such higher rank.

(b) Officers on the retired list returned to an inactive status with higher rank pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall receive retired pay based on such higher rank.

SEC. 18. Nothing in this act shall prevent any officer from being placed on the retired list with the highest rank and with the highest retired pay to which he might be entitled under other provision of law.

PERSONNEL BOARD

SEC. 19. At least once a year and at such other times as may be necessary, the Secretary of Commerce shall appoint a personnel board consisting of not less than five officers not below the permanent rank of commander on the active list, to recommend such changes in the lineal list as the board may determine, and to make selections and recommendations for the promotion, separation, and retirement of officers as herein prescribed: *Provided*, That in case any recommendation by the board is not acceptable to the Secretary of Commerce or to the President, the board shall make such further recommendations as shall be acceptable.

AMENDMENTS TO AND REPEAL OF APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND RETIREMENT LAWS

SEC. 20. (a) Section 5 of the act of February 16, 1929 (45 Stat. 1186), as amended by the act of March 18, 1936 (ch. 147, 49 Stat. 1164), is hereby further amended by deleting the word "not" in the third line.

(b) Section 8 of the act of January 19, 1942 (59 Stat. 8), is hereby amended by deleting the word "not" in the fourth line, by changing the period at the end of the section to a colon, and by adding the words *"Provided further*, That any officer, upon expiration of his appointment as Director or Assistant Director, shall, unless reappointed, revert to the grade and number that he would have occupied had he not served as Director or Assistant Director. Such officer shall be an extra number in his grade and the authorized number of ensigns shall be decreased accordingly."

SEC. 21. (a) Sections 1, 2 (except the second proviso of sec. 2 (b)), 3, 4, 5, and 6 of the act of January 19, 1942 (59 Stat. 8), are hereby repealed.

(b) The word "physicial" in the first line of section 7 of the said act of January 19, 1942, is hereby amended to read "physical."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out number "1947" and insert in lieu thereof the number "1948."

Page 4, line 9, strike out the subsection (b) beginning with the words "(b) Whenever there are vacancies" and ending on page 4, line 13, with the words "years of service."

Page 4, line 14, strike out the letter "c" within the parenthesis marks and insert in lieu thereof the letter "b."

Page 5, line 5, after the word "officers", strike out the words "so retired and separated" and insert in lieu thereof the words "selected for retirement and separation."

Page 6, line 24, strike out words "sixty-four" and insert in lieu thereof the words "sixty-two."

Page 6, line 25, change the period to a colon and add the words *"Provided*, That the President may, in his discretion, defer placing any such officer on the retired list for the length of time he deems advisable but not later than the date upon which such officer attains the age of sixty-four years."

Page 7, line 3, strike out the words "Secretary of Commerce" and insert in lieu thereof the word "President."

Page 7, line 8, strike out the words "Secretary of Commerce" and insert in lieu thereof the word "President."

Page 7, line 16, after the word "Navy", add the words "Air Force,".

Page 8, line 16, after the words "as determined by the", strike out the subsequent words to and including the words "Marine Corps," in line 22, and insert in lieu thereof the words "Secretary of the Department or Departments under whose jurisdiction the officer served,".

Page 8, line 23, after the words "higher rank", change the period to a colon and add the words *"Provided*, That for the purposes of this section, the words 'temporary rank' shall mean temporary rank held prior to June 30, 1946."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5886) to amend section 332 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

COLONIAL NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, YORKTOWN, VA.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1545) to authorize a bridge, roads and approaches, supports and bents, or other structures, across, over, or upon lands of the United States within the limits of the Colonial National Historical Park at or near Yorktown, Va.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, upon such terms and conditions as to location, type, or design of the structure or otherwise as to him and to the Secretary of the Navy may appear proper to protect the interests of the United States, is authorized to grant to the Commonwealth of Virginia or to its agency, the highway commission of said Commonwealth, right-of-way or other easement as may be proper to enable a highway bridge, the level and design of which shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Navy, such bridge to be erected, operated, and maintained across the York River in the State of Virginia at or near Yorktown, Va., and for the purpose of permitting such portions of said bridge, the roads and approaches thereto, together with any necessary structures connected therewith as may be necessary for the construction, maintenance, and operation of said bridge, and for safe, reasonable, and proper ingress thereto or egress therefrom, to be located and erected across, over, or upon the property of the United States forming a part of the Colonial National Historical Park.

The Secretary of the Interior is directed and authorized to secure and accept payment in cash or by land exchange as compensation to the United States for any lands used for such right-of-way and any moneys received may in turn be used by the Secretary of the Interior for the purchase of other privately owned historical lands within the boundaries of Colonial National Historical Park. Any lands so received or so purchased shall become part of Colonial National Historical Park.

The value of the park lands to be conveyed to the Commonwealth of Virginia as herein provided shall be determined by a committee of three appraisers, one each to be selected by the Governor of Virginia and the Secretary of the Interior, with the third appraiser to be mutually satisfactory to them. The Secretary may, in his discretion, approve the value agreed upon by a majority of the appraisers or he may require a new appraisal to be made in a similar manner. The decision of the Secretary shall be final and conclusive as to the value of the easement lands conveyed pursuant to the provisions of this act.

Nothing in this act or in any grant of right-of-way or other easement issued pursuant to this act shall be construed to affect the provisions of the General Bridge Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 847).

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I read with much interest yesterday of the invasion by Governor Dewey, of New York, into the campaign in Oregon for delegates to the coming Republican National Convention. What interested me particularly was the type of campaign he was making, when he called for broad public power development on a "self-sustaining and self-liquidating basis," also that such a program be designed to advance the irrigation program needs of the Pacific Northwest, and that it must be carried forward "more rapidly than ever before." Among other things he said, according to the newspaper:

> I propose an aggressive and a continued orderly program of developing all such major resources for the benefit of the Nation.

When I read that, my mind went back to last year, when the Republican-controlled Congress sharply reduced appropriations for all such projects throughout the country, and this particularly hit the West and the Northwest. Then

there was the fiasco of last December when they realized that a political year was coming, and they undertook to recoup not only by appropriating the fund that they had cut out, but by making appropriations in excess of the budget estimate. Then I recall the situation of last January when the committee, of which our distinguished friend from California [Mr. WELCH] is chairman, an outstanding legislator and a great man, reported out unanimously the bill H. R. 2873 which was a progressive measure in connection with reclamation and irrigation, and the bill successfully went through the Committee of the Whole resisting all amendments. Then a motion to recommit was made that the Committee report the bill back with certain amendments which cut the heart of the bill out and which would destroy this progressive measure. On that the entire Republican leadership of the House voted to cut out the heart of that progressive measure, and they voted against their own committee which reported the bill out unanimously—every Republican on that committee having voted for the bill. On that motion to recommit, 41 Democrats and 169 Republican Members of the House voted in favor thereof; and against the motion, 105 Democrats and only 47 Republicans. In other words, Governor Dewey is faced with a situation that while he is talking in favor of a program, the Republican Party which does the acting in the Congress is acting the wrong way. They voted just as the private power interests wanted them to vote on this bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I am sure the gentleman wants to be fair and I am sure he wants to tell the truth. If he does want to tell the truth, then tell this Congress and the United States of America that the first session of the Eightieth Congress under Republican control voted more money for reclamation and irrigation than any Congress has every done in the history of the United States. Tell the American people that, my friend.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman overlooks the fact that the Eightieth Congress reduced the budget estimates.

Mr. JENSEN. Tell them the truth.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman overlooks the fact that the first session of the Eightieth Congress reduced the budget estimates for these projects nearly $150,000,000 to $175,000,000. Then you came back and wanted to cut more off.

Mr. Speaker, I have made my statement showing that Governor Dewey is out in the West making speeches one way, and the Republican Party in Congress is acting the other way, going in an opposite direction.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair must observe that it is not good practice to interrupt the call of a calendar in order to engage in political debate. After the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] concludes his remarks, the Chair hopes that the House will proceed with the legislative business.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, is it against the rule to proceed under the 5-minute rule?

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the remarks of the gentlemen must be confined to the bill under consideration, and the Chair cannot, even with the greatest latitude, hold that has been the case.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] may be permitted to proceed out of order, which permission I received, so that the gentleman may speak on this matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I voted for the bill which the gentleman referred to and which he claims all Republicans voted against. I also want to say I hope Mr. Dewey, when he is in the West, will make it very plain that in the development of western reclamation projects he includes public-power projects. That was the plan of Theodore Roosevelt when he started the reclamation program in 1902. That has been the plan throughout the entire development of reclamation in the West. That was what the voters of California, in 1932, voted for when they approved and asked for the Central Valley water project and that is the plan that Governor Warren believes in. We do not propose to build all these public works and these reclamation projects and then meekly turn them over to the private utilities so that they can determine the policy that should be carried out in the distribution of this power. We want an integrated system of power development, including transmission lines, necessary standby facilities, and so forth, so we may choose our customers and not be at the mercy of one customer.

We want to give private utilities a chance to buy our juice, but we also want the agency involved to control the disposition of it and to see that it may go to cities, reclamation districts, public utility districts and private utilities. I now yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Why get into a lot of campaign oratory over this matter? Regardless of what any candidate for the Presidency says, or how he reacts, the problem is in the hands of the Congress of the United States; and I presume we are better informed and better qualified and have greater responsibility to see that the West is properly developed and the American people are properly legislated for than any candidate for Congress or the Presidency.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The point I wish to make is that here is a man who might be our next President and I want to be sure that he has the right idea about this particular problem.

Mr. JENSEN. It is not going to make a lot of difference whether he has the right idea or not; it is up to the Congress to determine.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I agree with the gentleman, and I hope Congress decides the matter in accordance with the principles briefly stated by me.

Mr. JENSEN. It was proved this year.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is all right. Of course, we can override a veto if we have to.

Mr. JENSEN. And we are going to use our own good judgment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT SAUK RAPIDS, MINN.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1611) to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Sauk Rapids, Minn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River, at or near Sauk Rapids, Minn., authorized to be built by the Minnesota Department of Highways and the counties of Benton and Stearns in Minnesota, by an Act of Congress approved October 9, 1940, heretofore extended by an Act of Congress approved June 1, 1944, is hereby extended 3 years from October 9, 1946.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAM ACROSS LUMBER RIVER, N. C.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5543) granting the consent of Congress to Carolina Power & Light Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in the Lumber River.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to Carolina Power & Light Co., its successors or assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in, and modify the channel of, the Lumber River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, approximately 3½ miles south of Lumberton, N. C., and approximately 1½ miles below the United States Highway No. 74 bridge in Robeson County, N. C.: *Provided*, That the work shall not be commenced until the plans therefor have been submitted to and approved by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and by the Secretary of the Army, and a permit for the construction be issued by them: *Provided further*, That this act shall not be construed to authorize the use of such dam to develop water power or generate hydroelectric energy.

SEC. 2. That the authority granted by this act shall cease and be null and void, unless actual construction of the dam hereby authorized is commenced within 2 years and completed within 5 years from the date of approval of this act: *Provided*, That from and after 30 days' notice from the Federal Power Commission, or other authorized agency of the United States, to said Carolina Power & Light Co., its successors or assigns, that desirable water-power developments will be interfered with by the existence of said dam, the said company, or its suc-

cessors or assigns, shall alter the dam, without expense to the United States, so as to remove said interference and, upon failure to do so within a reasonable time, the authority hereby granted to construct, maintain, and operate said dam shall terminate and be at an end; and any grantee or licensee of the United States, proposing to develop a power project at or near said dam, shall have authority to remove, submerge, or utilize said dam, under such conditions as said Commission or other agency may determine, but such conditions shall not include compensation for the removal, submergence, or utilization of said dam: *And provided further*, That the Carolina Power & Light Co., its successors or assigns, shall hold and save the United States free from all claims for damage which may be sustained by the dam herein authorized, or damage sustained by the appurtenances of the said dam by reason of operations by the United States for flood control, the preservation or improvement of navigation, or for other purposes.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FORT DES MOINES VETERANS' VILLAGE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6188) to confer jurisdiction over the Fort Des Moines Veterans' Village upon the State of Iowa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That exclusive civil and criminal jurisdiction, including the right of suffrage, over the Fort Des Moines Veterans' Village is hereby conferred upon the State of Iowa. Such jurisdiction shall terminate whenever the rights and privileges granted to the city of Des Moines by the instrument executed on December 24, 1946, by the United States (acting by the Commissioner of the Federal Public Housing Authority) and the city of Des Moines shall terminate.

SEC. 2. As used in this act, the term "Fort Des Moines Veterans' Village" means the land leased by the United States to the city of Des Moines on December 24, 1946.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect upon the acceptance by the Executive Council of the State of Iowa of the jurisdiction conferred by the first section.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CIVIL AIR PATROL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5298) to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force, and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Civil Air Patrol be established as a volunteer civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force; and that, to assist Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives as set out in section 2 of act of July 1, 1946 (Public Law 476, 79th Cong.), the Secretary of the Air Force is hereby authorized, to the extent and under such conditions and regulations as he may prescribe—

(a) to make available to Civil Air Patrol by gift or by loan, sale, or otherwise, with or without charge therefor, obsolete or surplus aircraft, aircraft parts, and other matériel, supplies, equipment, and facilities of the Air Force Establishment;

(b) to permit utilization, with or without charge therefor, of supplies, matériel, equipment, and facilities of the Air Force Establishment which, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Air Force, are required by Civil Air Patrol in carrying out its mission;

(c) to establish, maintain, supply, and equip liaison offices of the United States Air Force at the National and State headquarters of Civil Air Patrol, and to detail and assign military and civilian personnel of the Air Force Establishment to such liaison offices;

(d) to detail military and civilian personnel of the Air Force Establishment to units and installations of Civil Air Patrol to assist in the training program of Civil Air Patrol.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized in the fulfillment of the noncombatant mission of the Air Force Establishment to accept and utilize the services of Civil Air Patrol and to issue to Civil Air Patrol such property of the Air Force Establishment as he may deem necessary for the efficient performance of such services.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to let this occasion pass without saying a word about the Civil Air Patrol, which was authorized by the above-numbered bill, and also a word concerning the persons who are in the organization.

The organization has about 110,000 people who are actively engaged in the program of the Civil Air Patrol. There are another 200,000 who are inactive, but who stand ready to do something if they are called upon. The chairman of the national board is George A. Stone, of Columbus, Ohio. There are many men who are prominent and successful in almost every walk of life who are in the organization. I might say that the basic purpose of the CAP is the teaching of Americans, especially young ones, by example, that they have a responsibility to do something unselfish for their country. The CAP express this purpose through the medium of aviation. They provide means for teaching Americans to fly; many volunteer for work such as teaching preflight students and then teaching flying. They foster interest in aviation in local communities.

During the war the CAP conducted antisubmarine patrols, border patrols, flood patrols, transportation services, and search and rescue services, to name but a few of their activities.

I wish every American could know some of these men and have the knowledge of their unselfish services that I have. These men buy their own uniforms, spend their own money for travel and other expenses, because they are interested in aviation but even more interested in doing something for the United States. More power and success to them. The national commander of the group is Maj. Gen. L. V. Beau.

ARKANSAS-MISSISSIPPI BRIDGE COMMISSION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3915) to increase the size of the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN RAILWAY POSTAL CLERKS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5272) relating to the compensation of certain railway postal clerks.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the proviso in the paragraph headed "Railway mail service" in the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1917, which reads "*Provided further*, That hereafter when railway postal clerks are transferred from one assignment to another because of changes in the service their salaries shall not be reduced by reason of such change:" (U. S. C. 1940 ed., title 39, sec. 632), is hereby amended to read as follows: "*Provided, however*, That railway postal clerks of any grade transferred or reassigned after June 30, 1945, from one assignment or classification to another because of classification or changes in the service shall not be reduced in grade or salary by reason of such classification or change, and while serving in miscellaneous assignments they will be carried on the roster of their own organizations and retain the promotion status authorized by law for the positions from which withdrawn and be paid after this enactment by the hour for actual services performed when on other than road duty, and shall be paid for road services performed according to the time value of the trip of such road service including a proper allowance for all services required on lay-off periods, as are provided for regular employees assigned to road duty, until again restored to regular positions, the hourly rate for such pay to be determined by dividing the annual salary by 2024, the number of working hours in a year."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE FEDERAL TORT CLAIMS ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4682) to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act to increase the time within which claims under such act may be presented to Federal agencies or prosecuted in the United States district courts.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 420 of the Federal Tort Claims Act is amended to read as follows:

"Every claim against the United States cognizable under this title shall be forever barred, unless within 3 years after such claim accrued or within 1 year after the date of enactment of this amendatory sentence, whichever is later, it is presented in writing to the Federal agency out of whose activities it arises, if such claim is for a sum not exceeding $1,000; or unless within 3 years after such claim accrued or within 1 year after the date of enactment of this amendatory sentence, whichever is later, an action is begun pursuant to part 3 of this title."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, strike out the word "three" and insert the word "two."

On page 2, line 3, strike out the word "three" and insert the word "two."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VALIDATION OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS MADE BY UNITED STATES DISBURSING OFFICERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1298) to validate payments heretofore made by disbursing officers of the United States Government covering cost of shipment of household effects of civilian employees, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That payments heretofore made by disbursing officers covering the cost of shipment of household effects of civilian employees of the Government of the United States made under orders directing permanent change of station of said employees where such shipments were made from the last permanent-duty station of said employees or from some other place, to some place other than the new permanent-duty station of such employees, are hereby validated, if otherwise proper, and such employees shall be relieved of indebtedness to the United States on account of such shipments to the extent that such payments do not exceed the cost which would have been properly borne by the United States for such shipments under laws and regulations in effect at the time of such shipments, had such shipments been made from the old to the new permanent-duty station of such employees: *Provided*, That in any case where a civilian employee has made refundment to the United States on account of payments herein validated, reimbursement of the amount so refunded is hereby authorized to be made to such employee on the presentation of a claim therefor to the General Accounting Office: *Provided further*, That employees who paid the carriers the amount due covering the shipment of their household effects shall be entitled to reimbursement of so much of the amount expended, if otherwise proper, as does not exceed the cost of such shipment from the old to the new permanent-duty station upon presentation of a claim therefor to the General Accounting Office: *And provided further*, That amounts due deceased persons or persons determined to be mentally incompetent shall be paid to the extent herein provided upon presentation of a claim therefor to the General Accounting Office by their heirs or personal representatives.

SEC. 2. The Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to allow credit in the settlement of accounts of disbursing officers of the Government of the United States covering payments for the shipment of household effects of civilian employees which are, and to the extent that such payments are, validated by section 1 hereof.

SEC. 3. Such appropriations as may be required for the settlement of claims under the provisions of this act are hereby authorized.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 13 OF SURPLUS PROPERTY ACT OF 1944

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2277) to amend section 13 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, to provide for the disposition of surplus real property to States, political subdivisions, and municipalities for use as public parks, recreational areas, and historic monument sites, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, millions of dollars are involved in this legislation. It is entirely too important to be considered on the Consent Calendar. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman knows it actually refers to only a limited type of property. I am not objecting to the gentleman's thought, but I remind him that it has some limitation.

Mr. WALTER. I understand that perfectly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]?

There was no objection.

AMENDING JUDICIAL CODE IN RESPECT TO ORIGINAL JURISDICTION OF UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 127) to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

AMENDING BOULDER CANYON PROJECT ADJUSTMENT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1985) to amend the act entitled "Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act," approved July 19, 1940.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of July 19, 1940, entitled "Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act" (54 Stat. 774), is amended by adding the following new paragraph to section 2:

"SEC. 2. (e) Annual appropriation for the fiscal years 1948, 1949, 1950, and 1951 for payment to the Boulder City School District, as reimbursement for the actual cost of instruction, during each school year, in the schools operated by said district, of pupils who are dependents of any employee or employees of the United States living in or in the immediate vicinity of Boulder City, such reimbursement not to exceed the sum of $65 per semester per pupil and to be payable semiannually, after the term of instruction in each semester has been completed, under regulation to be prescribed by the Secretary."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MODIFICATIONS IN THE PREPAYMENT CONTRACTS WITH LOWER YELLOWSTONE DISTRICTS NOS. 1 AND 2

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3731), authorizing modifications in the prepayment contracts with the lower Yellowstone irrigation district No. 1 and the lower Yellowstone irrigation district No. 2.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make modifications, necessitated by a reclassification of lands within the lower Yellowstone Federal reclamation project, Montana, pursuant to section 8 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, in the repayment contracts with the lower Yellowstone irrigation district No. 1 and the lower Yellowstone irrigation district No. 2.

SEC. 2. Any modifications in the repayment contract with the lower Yellowstone irrigation district No. 1 may be made effective as of September 19, 1945. Any modifications in the repayment contract with the lower Yellowstone irrigation district No. 2 may be made effective as of October 31, 1945.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to section 8 of the act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) is authorized (a) to enter into appropriate amendatory repayment contracts with lower Yellowstone irrigation district No. 1 and lower Yellowstone irrigation district No. 2 for the purpose of effecting changes, modifications, and financial adjustments in the existing district repayment contracts and (b) to make appropriate adjustment of project accounts, all consistent with the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 2. With respect to the lower Yellowstone irrigation district No. 1.

"(a) Payment of construction charges against one thousand three hundred and forty and four one-hundredths acres of lands classified under the act of May 25, 1926, as productive and found to be possessed of insufficient productive power to be continued in a paying class shall be suspended until the Secretary of the Interior shall declare them to be possessed of sufficient productive power properly to be placed in the paying class, whereupon payment of construction charges against such areas shall be resumed. While said lands are so classified as temporarily unproductive, and the construction charges against them are suspended, water for irrigation purposes may be furnished upon payment of the usual operation and maintenance charges or such other charges as may be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, the advance payment of which may be required in the discretion of the said Secretary. Should said lands temporarily classed as unproductive, or any of them in the future, be found by the Secretary of the Interior to be permanently unproductive, the charges against them shall be charged off as a permanent loss to the reclamation fund;

"(b) The charges in the amount of $12,165 against 220.36 acres of lands classified in a paying class under the act of May 25, 1926, and found to be permanently unproductive shall be deducted from the contractual obligation of said Lower Yellowstone irrrigation district No. 1;

"(c) The contractual obligation of Lower Yellowstone irrigation district No. 1 shall, by reason of a finding that 452.96 acres of lands previously classed as permanently unproductive, possess sufficient productive power properly to be placed in a paying class, be increased in the sum of $25,008; and

"(d) The construction charges against 462.87 acres of lands included in drain and lateral right-of-way and found to be excluded from the irrigable area of the project shall be included in the principal obligation of the district, but said lands are to be relieved of future assessment by the district.

"SEC. 3. With respect to the Lower Yellowstone irrigation district No. 2:

"(a) Payment of construction charges against 662.90 acres of lands classified under the act of May 25, 1926, as productive and found to be possessed of insufficient productive power to be continued in a paying class shall be suspended until the Secretary of the Interior shall declare them to be possessed of sufficient productive power properly to be placed in the paying class, whereupon pay-

ment of construction charges against such areas shall be resumed. While said lands are so classified as temporarily unproductive, and the construction charges against them are suspended, water for irrigation purposes may be furnished upon payment of the usual operation and maintenance charges or such other charges as may be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, the advance payment of which may be required in the discretion of the said Secretary. Should said lands temporarily classed as unproductive, or any of them in the future be found by the Secretary of the Interior to be permanently unproductive, the charges against them shall be charged off as a permanent loss to the reclamation fund;

"(b) The charges in the amount of $911 against 16.50 acres of lands classified in a paying class under the act of May 25, 1926, and found to be permanently unproductive, shall be deducted from the contractual obligation of said Lower Yellowstone irrigation district No. 2;

"(c) The contractual obligation of Lower Yellowstone irrigation district No. 2 shall, by reason of a finding that 182.22 acres of lands previously classed as permanently unproductive, possess sufficient productive power properly to be placed in a paying class, be increased in the sum of $10,060; and

"(d) The construction charges against 431.38 acres of lands included in drain and lateral right-of-way and found to be excluded from the irrigable area of the project shall be included in the principal obligation of the district, but said lands shall be relieved of future assessment by the district.

"SEC. 4. The contractual modification provided for in this act shall be effective as to Lower Yellowstone irrigation district No. 1 as of September 19, 1945, and as to Lower Yellowstone irrigation district No. 2 as of October 31, 1945."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHMENT AND OPERATION OF AN EXPERIMENT STATION IN THE APPALACHIAN REGION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5133) to provide for the establishment and operation of an experiment station in the Appalachian region for research on the production, refining, transportation, and use of petroleum and natural gas.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ADDING CERTAIN LANDS TO THEODORE ROOSEVELT NATIONAL MEMORIAL PARK, N. DAK.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5587) to add certain lands to the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following-described lands are hereby made a part of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, subject to all laws and regulations applicable thereto:

Beginning at the southwest corner of section 17, township 147 north, range 100 west; thence north along the west boundaries of sections 17, 8, 5, township 147 north, range 100 west, and sections 32 and 29 to the west quarter corner of section 29, township 148 north, range 100 west; thence east to the east quarter corner of section 29; thence north along west boundary of sections 28 and 21 to the west quarter corner of section 21; thence east to the east quarter corner of section 21; thence north along west boundary of section 22 to the northwest corner of section 22; thence east along the north boundaries of sections 22, 23, 24, township 147 north, range 100 west and sections 19 and 20 to the north quarter corner of section 20, township 148 north, range 99 west; thence south to the northwest corner of the southeast quarter of section 20; thence east to the east quarter corner of section 20; thence south to the southeast corner of section 20; thence along the north boundaries of sections 28, 27, and 26, township 148 north, range 99 west, to the northeast corner of section 26; thence south along east boundaries of sections 26 and 35 to the east quarter corner of section 35, township 148 north, range 99 west; thence west to the north bank of Little Missouri River; thence following the north bank of the Little Missouri River in a generally westerly direction to where the north bank of the river crosses the north boundary of section 4, township 147 north, range 99 west; thence west to the northwest corner of section 4; thence south to the southeast corner of section 5; thence west along the south boundaries of sections 5 and 6, township 147 north, range 99 west, and section 1, township 147 north, range 100 west to the northeast corner of section 11; thence south along east boundaries of sections 11 and 14 to the southeast corner of section 14; thence west along the south boundaries of sections 14, 15, 16, and 17 to the point of beginning, all west of the fifth principal meridian.

SEC. 2. That for the purposes of acquiring non-Federal lands within the boundaries of said park as established by this act, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to exchange federally owned lands within sections 1, 12, and 13, township 148 north, range 100 west, and sections 6, 7, and 18, township 148 north, range 99 west. Administrative jurisdiction over any of such lands that the Secretary of the Interior finds are not required for exchange purposes as herein provided may be conveyed to other Federal agencies by the Secretary of the Interior without exchange of funds, or if such lands are not required by other Federal agencies they may be conveyed to the State of North Dakota without reimbursement to the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 8, strike out "147" and insert "148."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEMKE:

Page 1, line 9, strike out the letter "s" in the word "sections," and after the figure "32" strike out the word "and" and the figure "29," and then at the end of the line strike out the words "west quarter," and insert in lieu thereof the word "southwest."

Page 2, line 1, after the word "to", strike out the following: "the east quarter corner," and insert in lieu thereof, "the southwest corner of the southeast quarter of section 29; thence north to the northwest corner of the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter of section 29; thence east to the northeast corner of the southeast quarter of the northeast quarter."

Page 3, line 12, after the word "west" and period, insert a new sentence: "Reserving, however, to the stockmen of the surrounding area a perpetual right-of-way through the park for the trailing of livestock, to and from the railroad, along and adjacent to the Little Missouri River, being the same trail or route which has been used by the stockmen for that purpose since the beginning of the livestock industry in the area."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRIBUTION AMONG THE STATES OF COLORADO, NEW MEXICO, UTAH, AND WYOMING OF THE RECEIPTS OF THE COLORADO RIVER DEVELOPMENT FUND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5901) to provide for the distribution among the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming of the receipts of the Colorado development fund.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, for this is my own bill, I may say that it involves four States in the upper Colorado River Basin, namely, Wyoming, Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado. About 7 years ago the representatives of those four States, appointed by the Governors of the respective States and constituting the Colorado River Basin Committee, met and approved the provisions of this bill. They met again about a month ago and unanimously approved this bill.

The bill provides that the sum of $500,000, accruing annually from the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, will be divided as nearly equal as practicable during the fiscal years 1949 to 1955, inclusive, among the States of the upper division. The States of Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico constitute the upper division of the Colorado River Basin. The funds appropriated will be used for the investigation and construction of projects in the Green River Basin in Wyoming, as well as in the other States of the upper division of the Colorado River system. The division of the funds from the power income of the Hoover Dam at Boulder under existing law was left entirely to the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, but under the provisions of the Barrett bill, the division will be practically on an equal basis.

The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Public Lands and it seems to me that as no other State is involved in this legislation and inasmuch as the four States involved are unanimously in favor of the bill there should be no objection to it.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who made the request that this bill be passed over advised me on the floor just a moment ago that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH] had wired him asking to pass the bill over without prejudice. Is that the fact?

Mr. KEAN. That is what the office of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH] told me. They stated that they had a telegram from him.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, this bill was passed over in committee at the request of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL]. After investigation he joined in the unanimous report sending this bill to the floor of the House and so I am somewhat surprised that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH] would request that the bill go over at this time.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Are the funds mentioned in this bill Federal or State funds?

Mr. BARRETT. The funds mentioned in the bill are derived from the income from power under the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act and under the law they are set over to the Upper Colorado Basin States from 1941 to 1955.

All this bill does is to provide that these funds shall be expended as nearly equally as practicable among these four States. All of the States involved have agreed to such a division.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman from Michigan asked whether they were Federal funds or State funds. I might say to the gentleman that this entire fund is paid by the consumers of power in southern California for the benefit of the Northern States. I hope the gentleman understands that. We have an interest in the bill, and I will say that if the gentleman from New Jersey had not asked that the bill be passed over without prejudice, I would have done so, in the absence of the California member of the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. BARRETT. I will say to the gentleman from California that the Colorado River Board of California filed a resolution in the hearings approving this bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would still like to talk to the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON] about it.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I shall insert at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the Denver Post of April 9 last:

WELDING THE EMPIRE

Colorado Members of Congress should push for speedy action on the Colorado River development bill sponsored by Congressman BARRETT, Republican, of Wyoming.

One member of the Colorado delegation already has rendered an important service by getting the bill approved by a subcommittee on reclamation and irrigation. He is Congressman ROCKWELL, Republican, of Paonia.

Another Coloradan, Congressman CHENOWETH, Republican, of Trinidad, is in a position as a member of the House Rules Committee to be effective in getting the Barrett bill onto the House floor.

The Barrett bill is vital to all the States of the upper Colorado River Basin. Upper-basin States have a community of interest in the development of their part of the river. They must stand together to resist California's ambitious water-grabbing schemes.

Solidarity may be difficult to achieve, however, if Colorado Congressmen do not show a willingness to support Congressman BARRETT'S proposal.

The purpose of the Barrett bill is simple. Before any reclamation project can be built, preliminary engineering must be done. When the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act was passed by Congress several years ago, it set aside $500,000 a year from Hoover Dam power revenues to be spent in preliminary work on upper Colorado River reclamation projects.

The act provided the money should be divided "equitably" among the States. In practice, the Reclamation Bureau has spent approximately 70 percent of the money investigating projects in Colorado—largely because projects in Colorado reached the preliminary engineering stage ahead of most of the proposed projects in other upper-basin States.

Now, however, a number of projects in other upper-Basin States have reached the point where investigatory studies should be made.

The Bartlett bill would assure preliminary work on many of those projects. For one thing it would divide the $500,000 as evenly as possible among the upper-basin States.

More important, it would allow the Reclamation Bureau to use "general investigating funds," in addition to the special power revenue funds, on upper-basin projects. In the past, the Budget Bureau has ruled that general funds may not be used in the upper basin because of the existence of the special fund.

Some foes of Congressman ROCKWELL have tried to make it appear that the Barrett bill would jeopardize Colorado interests. There is no substance to any such claim. If general investigating funds as well as special funds are made available for Colorado River studies there is no reason to believe any Colorado project would suffer.

Colorado and its Congressmen should support the Barrett proposal to the limit. Colorado would lose nothing under the bill and other upper-basin States definitely would gain.

Colorado has a stake in the development of the entire upper river basin—not merely the part of the basin which lies in this State. Any new wealth created by upper-basin projects will benefit the entire region.

The Barrett bill gives Colorado the opportunity to put into effect the region-wide approach to river problems which full development of our empire resources demands.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

AMEND ACT OF CONGRESS APPROVED FEBRUARY 9, 1881

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6056) to amend an act of Congress approved February 9, 1881, which granted a right-of-way for railroad purposes through certain lands of the United States in Richmond County, N. Y.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of Congress approved February 9, 1881, entitled "An act to grant the right-of-way for railroad purposes through certain lands of the United States in Richmond County, N. Y.," being chapter 41 of the Public Acts of the Forty-sixth Congress of the United States passed at the third session thereof be, and it hereby is, altered or amended to read:

"That a right-of-way by tunnel through the lands of the United States, now occupied by the Coast Guard in the Department of the Treasury and by the Post Office Department, in the vicinity of the municipal ferry terminal at Saint George, in the Borough and County of Richmond, in the city and State of New York, is hereby granted to The Staten Island Rapid Transit Railway Co., its successors and assigns, for the purpose of widening, to facilitate the reconstruction of said municipal ferry terminal, the existing tunnel constructed pursuant to the grant contained in the act hereby amended, and for the purpose of continuing the operation of its railroad through the same, in, through, and beneath the surface of all that plot, piece, or parcel of land, bounded and described as follows: Beginning at a point where the prolongation southerly of the easterly side of Richmond Terrace intercepts the south line of South Street, said point having coordinates south five thousand eight hundred fifteen and six hundred forty-four one-thousandths, west eight thousand eight hundred eighty-six and eight hundred fifty one-thousandths in the City of New York coordinate system established by the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey for the Borough of Richmond, and running thence in an easterly direction along said south side of South Street by a curve to the right with a radius of three hundred five and sixty-five one-hundredths feet, a distance of twenty-one and three one-hundredths feet, to a point; thence continuing along said south line of South Street north eighty degrees twelve minutes twenty-six and five-tenths seconds east, thirty-six and forty-nine one-hundredths feet to a point; thence south fourteen degrees two minutes eighteen seconds west, twenty-seven and seventy-three one-hundredths feet to a point; thence south thirty-three degrees thirty-seven minutes forty-five seconds west, twenty-five and twenty-six one-hundredths feet to a point; thence south ten degrees fourteen minutes twenty-seven seconds west, four hundred forty-four and sixty-two one-hundredths feet to a point in the dividing line between the lands of the United States of America and lands of The Staten Island Rapid Transit Railway Co.; thence along said dividing line north eighty degrees forty-five minutes twenty-two seconds west, forty-nine and one one-hundredths feet to a point; thence north ten degrees fourteen minutes twenty-seven seconds east, four hundred fifty-six and sixty-four one-hundredths feet to a point; then north twenty-three degrees fifty-three minutes twenty-four seconds west, fourteen and fifty-three one-hundredths feet to a point in the aforesaid south line of South Street; thence in an easterly direction along said south line of South Street by a curve to the right with a radius of three hundred five and sixty-five one-hundredths feet, a distance of sixteen and ninety one-hundredths feet, to the point or place of beginning; together with the right to construct and maintain said tunnel for the purposes aforesaid in, upon, across, and beneath the surface of lands of the United States lying in the bed of South Street immediately adjacent to and abutting upon the lands above described.

"SEC. 2. That the reconstruction of the existing tunnel shall be carried out in accordance with plans and specifications which shall have been, prior to the commencement of such reconstruction, submitted to and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to reconstruction through the lands now occupied by the Coast Guard and submitted to and approved by the Federal Works Administrator with respect to reconstruction through the lands now occupied by the Post Office Department.

"SEC. 3. That whenever said right-of-way shall cease to be used for the purpose of a tunnel through which to operate a railroad, it shall revert to the United States.

"SEC. 4. That the right to repeal, alter, or amend this act is reserved to Congress."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPAYMENT CONTRACT WITH NORTHPORT IRRIGATION DISTRICT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6067) authorizing the execution of an amendatory repayment contract with the Northport irrigation district, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into such contracts as he shall determine appropriate to amend or modify the terms and provisions of existing repayment contracts between the United States and the Northport irrigation district to accomplish the following general repayment plan: (a) Application annually of such net profits as are allocable to the district from the sources specified in subsections I and J of section 4 of the act of December 5, 1924 (43 Stat. 703), to the extent necessary to meet the annual costs to the district for water carriage through the Farmers' irrigation district canal; with any net profits in excess of such annual carriage costs being applied in reduction of the district's total repayment contract construction charge obligation to the United States; (b) payment by the district to the United States of $3,500 as an annual construction charge installment: *Provided*, That in the event the annual net profits for application under (a) hereof are not sufficient in any given year to meet that year's cost of water carriage through the Farmers' irrigation district canal, all or any part of the said $3,500 may be applied to pay the portion of the carriage charge not so met, and the construction charge installment for payment to the United States for that year shall be reduced accordingly: *Provided further*, That the proviso respecting application of net revenues from power plants connected with the North Platte Federal reclamation project contained in the act of March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1141, 1167), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is hereby authorized to perform any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act and any contracts made pursuant thereto.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WITHDRAWAL LANDS UNDER HAWAIIAN HOMES COMMISSION ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6091) to withdraw certain land as available land within the meaning of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920 (42 Stat. 108), as amended, and to restore it to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the portion of Hawaiian Homes Commission land of Waiakea-Kai or Keaukaha, South Hilo, Hawaii, T. H., more fully described as follows, is withdrawn as "available land" within the meaning of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920 (42 Stat. 108), as amended, and is hereby restored to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii:

Portion of Hawaiian home land of Keaukaha, tract 2, Waiakea, South Hilo, island of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii, as returned to the Commissioner of Public Lands of the Territory of Hawaii by resolution numbered 85 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission, dated July 18, 1944, and more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a spike at the northwest corner of this tract of land and on the southeast corner of the intersection of Nene and Akepa Streets, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "Halai" being five thousand two hundred and eight and twenty-one one-hundredths feet north and twenty-four thousand eight hundred and eighteen and six one-hundredths feet east, and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

1. Two hundred and ninety degrees eleven minutes five hundred and sixty-one and eighty-two one-hundredths feet along the south side of Nene Street;

2. Thence along same on a curve to the left with a radius of one thousand four hundred and sixty-five and four-tenths feet, the chord azimuth and distance being two hundred and sixty-eight degrees thirty-seven minutes one thousand and seventy-seven and thirty one-hundredths feet;

3. Two hundred and forty-seven degrees three minutes five hundred and ninety-six and sixty-two one-hundredths feet along same;

4. Three hundred and sixty degrees no minutes one thousand two hundred and thirty-seven and eighty-five one-hundredths feet;

5. Ninety degrees no minutes two thousand one hundred and fifty-three and sixty-nine one-hundredths feet;

6. One hundred and eighty degrees no minutes one thousand one hundred and seventy-three and four one-hundredths feet along the east side of the proposed extension of Akepa Street to the point of beginning, and containing an area of fifty acres, more or less.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 14, add a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this act, if, at any time, in the opinion of the Commissioner of Public Lands, use of the above-described lands has been discontinued by the Department of Commerce, upon the making of such a determination by the Commissioner of Public Lands such lands shall become available lands within the meaning of section 203 of title II of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POSTMASTER GENERAL TO USE POWERBOAT SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1608) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Postmaster General to contract for certain powerboat service in Alaska, and for other purposes," approved August 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 1338).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That an act entitled "An act to authorize the Postmaster General to contract for certain powerboat service in Alaska, and for other purposes," approved August 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 1338), is amended to read as follows:

"That the Postmaster General may, in his discretion, contract for a period of not exceeding 4 years, without advertisement therefor, for the carriage of all classes of mail, by steamboat or other powerboat of United States registry, on the route from Seward, by points on Kenai Peninsula, Kodiak Island, Alaska Peninsula, the Aleutian Islands to Umnak Island, and points on Bistol Bay, Alaska, and vicinity, and back, by a schedule and under the conditions prescribed by the Postmaster General; the contractor to furnish and use in the service a safe and seaworthy boat of sufficient size to provide adequate space for mail, passengers, and freight, payment therefor to be made from the appropriation for powerboat service."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the act entitled 'An act to authorize the Postmaster General to contract for certain powerboat service in Alaska, and for other purposes,' approved August 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 1338), is amended by striking out '$125,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$250,000.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 40 OF THE SHIPPING ACT, 1916

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1132) to amend section 40 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (39 Stat. 728), as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 40 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (39 Stat. 728), as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the first paragraph a comma and the following: "or any other official thereof duly authorized by such corporation to execute any such declaration."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDE ANNUITIES FOR CERTAIN REMARRIED WIDOWS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1896) to amend the act of May 29, 1944, so as to provide annuities for certain remarried widows.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of section 4 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal," approved May 29, 1944, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, title 48, sec. 1373c), as precedes the second proviso therein, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. Annuities granted under the provisions of this act shall commence from the date whereon the act takes effect and shall continue during the life of the annuitant: *Provided, however*, That in such case as where a deceased person, had he been alive on the date whereon the act takes effect, would have been entitled to receive an annuity hereunder, and shall have been survived by a wife undivorced from him, who was his wife living with him at least 1 year of his service on the Isthmus of Panama during such construction, and has not since remarried, or who, having remarried, has again become a widow, such survivor shall be entitled to receive such annuity from the effective date of the act until her death:".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEY BEAR LAKE FISH CULTURAL STATION TO STATE OF UTAH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5144) providing for the conveyance of the Bear Lake Fish Cultural Station to the Fish and Game Commission of the State of Utah.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to convey, subject to such conditions and reservations as he deems needful to protect the interests of the United States, to the Fish and Game Commission of the State of Utah all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to those lands and improvements thereon designated as the Bear Lake Fish Cultural Station, described as follows: Beginning at a point south thirty-three degrees forty-one minutes west, two thousand three hundred and eighty feet from the northeast corner of section 4, township 12 north, range 5 east, Salt Lake meridian; thence south one thousand two hundred and ninety-seven and eight-tenths feet to a point two rods south of the south bank of the Upper Round Valley Canal; thence north eighty degree ten minutes west, seven hundred and three and seven-tenths feet to a point two rods south of the south bank of said canal; thence north five hundred and seventeen and five-tenths feet; thence east two hundred and ninety-seven and four-tenths feet; thence north six hundred and sixty feet; thence east three hundred and ninety-six feet to the point of beginning, containing fifteen and nineteen one-hundredths acres, together with a strip of land two and five-tenths rods wide, being one and twenty-five one-hundredths rods on each side of the center line described as beginning at a point south thirty-three degrees forty-one minutes west, two thousand three hundred and eighty feet and west one hundred and seventy-nine feet from the northeast corner of section 4, township 12 north, range 5 east, Salt Lake meridian; thence following along the center line of road north five degrees forty-three minutes west, five hundred and thirty-nine feet; thence north seventeen degrees six minutes east, four hundred and eighteen feet; thence north fifty-two degrees forty-seven minutes east, ninety-three and nine-tenths feet; thence north seventy-eight degree nineteen minutes east, four hundred and eighty-one and six-tenths feet; thence south eighty-six degrees thirty-two minutes east, five hundred and eighty-five and five-tenths feet; thence south eighty-six degrees fifty-one minutes east, two hundred and ninety-nine and four-tenths feet, more or less, to the east boundary of said section 4, at a point nine hundred and forty-two feet south of the northeast corner of said section 4; thence south eighty-six degrees fifty-one minutes east, two hundred and forty-nine and one-tenth feet; thence north sixty-six degrees four minutes east, two hundred and ninety-one and two-tenths feet to the center line of a county road bearing northwest and southeast and being seventy-five feet wide at this point, containing in all seventeen and seventy-six one-hundredths acres, more or less.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMEMORATIVE STAMP OF NEW YORK CITY

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 371) to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the golden anniversary of the consolidation of the Boroughs of Manhattan, Bronx, Brooklyn, Queens, and Richmond, which boroughs now comprise New York City.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to issue, during 1948, a special 3-cent postage stamp, of such design as he shall prescribe, in commemoration of the golden anniversary of the consolidation of the Boroughs of Manhattan, Bronx, Brooklyn, Queens, and Richmond, which boroughs now comprise New York City.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "3-cent" and insert, "5-cent air mail."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAR DAMAGE COMPENSATION

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1605) to provide for the payment of a sum not to exceed $12,000,000 to the Swiss Government as partial compensation for damage inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights, and authorizing appropriations therefor.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides too much money for consideration on the Consent Calendar, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over with prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of the Consent Calendar.

STAR-ROUTE CONTRACTS

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, when Consent Calendar No. 488, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 347) to authorize the Postmaster General to withhold the awarding of star-route contracts for a period of 60 days, was called, the objectors on the Consent Calendar were not advised that a similar Senate joint resolution had passed. We have since been so advised. Therefore I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 488, and that the proceedings by which the House joint resolution was passed be vacated.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate joint resolution (S. J. Res. 198) be considered in lieu of the House joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to withhold the awarding of star-route contracts for which bids have been received in the second contract section for a period of 60 days after March 30, 1948.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 347) was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. KEAN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. PLOESER (at the request of Mr. SHORT) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address he delivered last night in St. Louis, Mo.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. GAVIN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some excerpts from the Maine laws.

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include newspaper articles in each.

Mr. ROSS and Mr. GRANGER asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LEA (at the request of Mr. PACE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mrs. LUSK asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include a telegram.

Mr. NIXON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include some letters.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by the President of Cuba, on April 19, 1948.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. GRAHAM (at the request of Mr. GAVIN), from May 3 to May 6, on account of illness.

To Mr. PEDEN (at the request of Mr. MORRIS), for 1 week, on account of official business.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK] is recognized for 60 minutes.

POLAND'S CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, each year with justifiable pride, for all the world to know, we point to the day which marks our own American independence. It is a day linked with freedom as no other day. It is at one and the same time the envy and the symbolic hope of all peoples because freedom is basically inherent in us all.

The 3d of May is the Fourth of July to a nation whose friendship has always been ours and whose role as our ally in the recently terminated holocaust has evoked commendation from every western ally.

Today is Poland's Constitution Day, but the celebrators have little cause for rejoicing while their country lies prostrate, absorbed by Russian expansionism. There can only be a quiet, hopeful observance; there is no jubilation. There is prayer and there is faith. There is unswerving devotion to the cause of liberty. There is undiminished the desire to secure the blessings of liberty.

Today the eyes of every Pole turn to these United States searching for an answer, for a way out of its present unjustified dilemma. They are remembering their great document of the 3d of May 1791, the constitution adopted by the Congress of the Republic of Poland which in fundamental principle was so much like our own. It is not difficult to visualize that through the mind's eye of every citizen of Poland there passes today a thorough review of the history of its years upon years of struggle for independence. Brought into sharp focus there, no doubt, is the picture of generation after generation bearing the task and paying a huge price in the attempt to recover the nation's freedom. There is also the land that bears proof of the ravages of war and serves as a constant reminder that the foes of liberty covet this parcel and are bent on the extermination of a people determined to be free. Vividly recalled must be the brief years untouched by oppression when sovereignty was achieved after the First World War. Having tasted of freedom the hunger for it is the more intensified now that it has been usurped by a totalitarian aggressor who under the guise of alliance was enabled to eliminate Poland from the ranks of truly free nations. All this occupies the thoughts of every Pole today on this, Poland's Constitution Day of May 3.

On the other hand, there should be thoughts occupying this great Nation of ours with regard to the unredeemed pledges and the treaty obligations involving our tried and true ally, Poland. Shall we let pass into the limbo of the forgotten the shameful, secret machinations of Yalta and Tehran? This all has worked to the disadvantage of Poland and encouraged the swallowing up of other nations by the gravest menace with which this world has ever been confronted. It has made the position of the United States an obviously difficult one from the international, economic, and social standpoint. It has precipitated world-wide chaos and definitely shut the door on any semblance of stability in the foreseeable future. The direct results of these secret agreements are in evidence everywhere today. It was for Russia the go-ahead signal, the beginning of a chain reaction that is now touching all the nations of the globe and is aimed specifically at the No. 1 target on the Soviet agenda—the United States of America. We are No. 1 on the Communist "hit parade"—No. 1 to be hit the hardest blow—No. 1 to be exterminated.

This in itself may appear far removed from the observance of Poland's Constitution Day. But is it? Need we look further than here where, if we take notice, there is taking place an insidious nibbling away at our Constitution piece by piece by forces thoroughly schooled in the methods planned for the eventual overthrow of our form of government. Is there need for additional proof that the variegated carriers of misleading names, the proponents of Communist philosophy, are the ones who shout loudest on behalf of freedom and for selfish reasons extract the most from the privileges of freedom.

In commemoration of Poland's Constitution Day, let us honor the valiant, the steadfast, the brother-in-arms, the defender of Christianity and civilization, the lovers of liberty and constitutional government—the Poles. And in so doing, let us draw forth a reminder that we must take our stand for the protection of our own Constitution and our form of government. We must gather our strength and with realism face the impending storm. And there must be on our part an affirmative declaration that the shackles that bind Poland should be broken so that at long last a true Republic of Poland with a Constitution reflecting the will of the people is again established to function and contribute to the future peace of the world.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADLAK. I yield.

Mr. DEVITT. I compliment the gentleman on the fine expression that he has made and join with him in the wish that Poland will some day rise again to be the great nation that it once was.

Mr. SADLAK. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADLAK. I yield.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in commending the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK] for the splendid address he has delivered on behalf of the people of Poland on the anniversary of the adoption of their Constitution, a document so much like our own.

I want to commend the gentleman for bringing to the attention of Congress and the American people the situation in which the Polish people find themselves today, all through no fault of their own.

The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK] has well said that the Polish people have turned to the United States for an answer for a way out of their present, unjustified dilemma. May we hope and pray that the time may not be too far distant when the patriotic people of that great country—a people who love liberty and constitutional government—may be loosed from the shackles that bind them and establish themselves under the protection and freedom of the great Constitution they adopted and for which they have fought so valiantly during a period of 150 years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GAVIN). The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORSKI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the one hundred and fifty-seventh anniversary of the Polish Constitution, it was on May 3, 1791, that Poland adopted this great document granting far-reaching freedom to its people. Today people who believe in the principle that men should be free, hail and salute the people of Poland, who have suffered so much in freedom's cause. Poland has been the battling ground of Europe in many wars. In World War I, the armies crossed and recrossed the land of Poland, destroying their homes and fields, as the armies advanced or retreated, each time leaving a great deal of misery to the people of that land. When Germany was defeated in the First World War it was not German territory that was devastated but the homes of the Polish people were the ones that felt the ravages of war; their people were the ones who were hungry and cold during the period of hostilities. Although at that time a great deal of what was Polish territory was under the domination of both, either Germany or Russia, those brave people never lost hope that their land would be free and that they would regain their freedom and independence. They never gave up hope through the many years of servitude under both the Germans and the Russians, and like all brave and freedom-loving people, they kept a strong desire in their hearts to be free and shake off the yoke of their oppressors. After the defeat of Germany in the First World War, the Republic of Poland was again restored, and though their independence was but short before the Second World War, they made great strides and advancements. Their people were happy and contented, industrious and hard working; they were solving their great postwar problems which befell them after their independence was restored. Their farms were very productive; they were self-sustaining. Although not a people who were militarily inclined and who tried to live in peace and friendliness with their neighbors, they were threatened from both the east and the west, for they had neighbors whose one aim was to crush democracies. We remember the threats of Hitler to all the small nations of Europe, and we still vividly remember that Poland was the one nation which did not yield to Hitler and his barbaric hordes, but stood up for their independence and fought back the invaders with all the might at their command. The whole world marveled at their bravery, and the defense of Warsaw will stand as one of the monumental battles of all times. When their country was overrun their brave soldiers did not surrender but fled to other lands and carried on the battle with their allies. We know the bravery that they displayed in the battle of

Mount Cassino, in Italy; we know what great inspiration they were to the British in the dark days of the battle for Britain; we honor them for their fighting spirit in the British Air Force; we all know of the splendid aid they gave to the Allies, and the war that was carried on by the Polish underground, aiding and helping our allies in every way they possibly could. Poland will never be a satellite of any nation; they love freedom and liberty and will fight until they regain it. They may be temporarily under the domination of a government forced upon them, that government like all governments that are not the choice of their people will not last very long.

The people of our country have been very sympathetic toward the people of Poland; our Government has aided them very much after both wars, and through UNRRA we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars helping to relieve the sufferings and hardships of the people of Poland.

On this, their great national holiday, we salute them and send them our greetings. The people of Poland know our attitude toward all small nations and our deep desire to see all of them enjoy the kind of Government which they themselves choose without any outside interference. We hope that those brave and freedom-loving people will soon regain their full freedom and independence, which we know they do not now have. We hope that when the final treaty of peace is drawn Poland will regain the land which was taken away from her. She does not deserve to be treated as an enemy for their soldiers have contributed very greatly toward the defeat of our enemies; they are a democratic nation and want to stay a democratic nation, and when the strong and powerful nations of the world adopt the attitude of fairness toward the smaller and weaker nations we will then begin to reach an understanding whereby peace in the world may be achieved, and we will attain that goal that has been sought by those who bear the miseries and havocs of war, mostly the hard-working people of the world. There is no good reason why difficulties and problems among nations cannot be solved the same as problems of individuals are solved—peacefully.

We have found that there is nothing gained by war, and if the money spent in the prosecution of war was spent for the advancement and benefit of humanity this would be a pretty good world to live in. Let us hope that our experience gained in the last two global wars will bring about an understanding and some kind of a world agreement among all the nations to end all wars. So that we may at last realize the hope which the people of the whole world for centuries have prayed for.

If we can bring about good will among all nations we will attain peace on earth.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, a year ago when we paused in our deliberations to commemorate Polish Constitution Day, I raised my voice in protest against the tragic betrayal of Poland. I then related in some detail the steps which our Government had taken, or more properly had failed to take, which, unfortunately, make it impossible for us as a Nation to escape some of the responsibility for the enslavement of the Polish people, the theft of 46 percent of the Polish territory, and the death blow to Polish industry by the removal of a large part of her machinery to Russia.

Although no useful purpose could be served by repetition of this sad story of treachery, one of the blackest pages in our diplomatic annals, it is appropriate indeed that we again set aside the 3d day of May as one on which our thoughts turn to the sturdy, courageous people of Poland, the victims not alone of their strong enemies, but, alas, of their faint friends. We want the people of Poland to know that when the secret commitments were made at Tehran, at Yalta, and at Potsdam, some of them apparently undisclosed to this very hour, they did not bespeak the will of the American people.

No effort was then made, nor has ever since been made, to subject these clandestine arrangements to the scrutiny of the United States Senate, the only body under our Constitution empowered to give approval to international commitments. Despite the action taken by the executive branch of our Government, its legislators, those to whom the people have directly entrusted power, have never placed their stamp of approval on this shameful sell-out of a loyal ally. Indeed, again and again, our voices have emphatically protested, with the most severe condemnation of those in high places in our Government, who, with such utter disregard of fundamental principle and complete oblivion of the ideals for which our Nation struggled and sacrificed, dared to pledge our country to support such iniquitous engagements.

Perhaps we have reaped as we have sown. How tragic it is that from the land of those great patriots, Generals Pulaski and Kosciusko, now dominated by a foreign power, come nothing but villification and abuse of the United States. We must not forget, however, that these outbursts do not spring from the hearts of the Polish people themselves. Between them and our people, whose nations had their constitutional birth within 4 years of each other, there exists a bond of true friendship and regard which Poland's alien rulers will never be able to sever.

When in 1791 the Polish Constitution was adopted, its liberality and loftiness of objective caused neighboring nations, unsympathetic to democratic tendencies, to shudder and shake. Thus we read therein such a grant of freedom as the following:

> Every person, upon coming to this Republic from whatsoever parts of the world or one returning to this, the country of his origin, as soon as his foot touches the Polish soil, he is entirely free to indulge in whatsoever enterprise he wishes to enter, in the manner and place of his own choice; that person is free to enter into contract for purchase of property, for work, for rent in whatever manner and for whatever time he himself agrees upon; he is at liberty to settle in the city or in the village; he is free to live in Poland or to return to whatever country he himself chooses after his commitments in Poland which he voluntarily embraced are duly performed and completed.

Yet to this land, professing in its basic law these lofty sentiments, there are today in England 100,000 Polish veterans of the last war who fought side by side with our own boys for the preservation of freedom, who dare not return, knowing that for them and their loved ones such a step would mean death or worse. Because they advocate their country's freedom, its portals are closed to them.

Many of these fine upstanding young men desire to come to this country. Their character and their experience would make them useful citizens. Their sacrifices and their courage are in harmony with the finest American traditions. Careful and sympathetic consideration should be afforded legislation which has been introduced to make possible an orderly absorption of modest members of these true patriots into the economy and society of our own country. This is a tangible method by which we can demonstrate the underlying friendship which binds the peoples of these two republics, as well as our everlasting debt of gratitude to the Polish patriots who helped to turn the tide for the ragged Continentals of George Washington and without whose assistance our own struggle for independence might have had quite different issue.

Today in Poland, a land of 30,000,000 people, it is authentically reported that only 600,000 are members of the Communist Party, a bare 2 percent. Yet, dominated by a tiny minority, largely alien, Poland will presumably give little attention to Polish Constitution Day. Its constitution, its democratic processes have been trampled under foot by the aggressor, now its master. May it not, however, go unnoticed here in America, where so many citizens of Polish descent have made significant contributions to our ecoonmic, social, and political life and where the true spirit of Poland still lives, not alone in our democratic institutions, but as well in the minds and hearts of freedom-loving Americans.

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER].

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, it is a very great pleasure for me to take part in this day commemorating the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Polish independence. I feel, however, that the speech made on yesterday by my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON] more eloquently expresses my feelings, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to insert the speech made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON] on the Voice of America program commemorating the constitution of Poland of May 3, which is today being broadcast to Poland.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The speech of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON] referred to follows:

Mr. GORDON. This is the 3d of May. It is a magnificent and important day for Poles as well as for their friends all over the world. The date of May 3 symbolizes the freedom and independence of Poland. On this day 157 years ago, the Polish so-called 4-Year Diet, a great Parliament of independent Poland, approved the new constitution which was a bold attempt to reorganize Poland in the spirit of the Constitution of the United States and the French declaration of the right of man and citizen. The constitution of May 3 is a great and cherished Polish national legacy. It also constitutes a great historic contribution to the cause of democracy in the world. Its preamble contains the following memorable words: "Valuing above life and personal happiness, the political existence, external independence, and internal freedom of the nation, we have resolved upon the present constitution."

When the news was brought to the United States that the constitution of May 3 had been approved by the Polish Diet, it was received with the greatest enthusiasm. The Gazette of the United States wrote at that time that the Polish constitution of May 3 was the most wonderful unheaval with the consent of the awakened nation. Another American newspaper, American Daily Advertiser, stated that the constitution of May 3 taught the world a new lesson. It unanimoustly emphasized that the new Polish constitution guaranteed the basic individual freedom, including the freedom of the press. For without this freedom there can be no freedom.

Unfortunately, the constitution of May 3 could not be put into effect. The Imperial Russia of Catherine II intervened in the internal affairs of Poland. Russian armies invaded Poland. The new constitution was trampled under the boot of the Russian soldiers. But the constitution has lived in the hearts of the Polish people. Wherever the Pole lives, the 3d of May was celebrated as a symbol of Polish freedom and independence, and when Poland regained her independence in 1918, after the victory of the Western Powers over Prussian imperialism, a special Polish statute gave legal sanction to the long-time-honored tradition of the Polish nation which celebrated May 3 as the greatest Polish national holiday of freedom.

In present-day Poland the 3d of May has ceased to be a national holiday. This fact is meaningful. It brings to mind historical events. At the end of the eighteenth century Russian bayonets ripped the constitution of May 3 and prevented the recovery of the thousand-year-old Polish state. Again present-day Poland is controlled by Russia—this time by Soviet Russia. No wonder that there is no place in Poland for the celebration of the constitution of May 3. Centuries have elapsed. Generations have come and gone. Great changes in ideas have taken place. But Russian imperialism has remained unchanged. Soviet imperialism is the direct heir of czarist imperialism. Imperial Russia initiated and carried out the three successive partitions of Poland. Imperial Russia erased Poland from the roster of independent states. More than 150 years later secret Nazi-Soviet documents, recently published, revealed that Soviet Russia has continued the traditional policy of Russia's Catherine II. In 1939 Soviet Russia, in conspiracy with Hitler's Germany, brought about the fourth partition of Poland. Soviet Russia stabbed Poland in the back while Poland was fighting for her life against Hitlerite aggressors. Soviet armies occupied the eastern provinces of Poland.

The 3d of May has ceased to be an official Polish national holiday in Poland, by decree of the present regime of Poland. But the 3d of May remains a Polish national holiday in the hearts of all true Poland and in all centers in the United States where Poles or Americans of Polish extraction live. In numerous Polish national homes the Polish flag hangs proudly on this day side by side with the American Stars and Stripes. Thousands of people listen attentively to the voices of the past. They hope that there will again be a Poland which in the spirit of the constitution of May 3 will be independent once more and free from foreign invasions.

On this day of the 3d of May, the hearts and minds of the American people are at one with the Polish Nation, linked by indissoluble bonds of friends with the United States. For the principles of the 3d of May constitution are in line with the ideals on which the American Nation bases its existence and the realization which America desires for all the people of the world.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORSKI] for bringing before the American public today the situation now existing in Poland. Poland has always been friendly to the United States and its interests in every war fought by the United States and by the Colonies before they became an independent Republic. Its citizens aided our citizens in securing their independence. We frequently recount the splendid heroic exploits of Generals Pulaski and Kosciusko in the Revolutionary War. It is far easier to speak of them who have won for themselves outstanding places in our national history than to give proper credit to their brave descendants, the present great Polish people. During the recent world struggle their soldiers and their citizenry defended their homeland against most powerful neighbors and ultimately suffered tremendous losses in life and in property in a heroic defense of their capital city, Warsaw. It seems to me that at this time when we commemorate Poland's Constitution it would be well for the American people to give consideration to the present needs of the Polish people.

Poland, of course, is most unfortunate in its territorial location. Its people through the centuries have been democratic in spirit. I believe that if Poland had, like the United States, been located in some continent other than Europe it would have been possible for its people to have gone forward to a much higher standard of living and to have made their counterpart of our own beloved United States.

Today thousands of young Polish men are in army camps in England. They are truly exiles from their fatherland.

I am glad that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS] and the members of his subcommittee have seen fit to report favorably a bill for the admission into the United States of displaced persons in Europe.

I hope, however, that when the bill comes to the floor for consideration the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORSKI], or the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK], or some other Member will see fit to offer an amendment to permit the soldiers of Poland as well as those of any other allied countries who fought alongside of American soldiers in the recent war, to be given preference in admission to the United States. I believe these Polish soldiers have already won the regard of the American people and that all Americans would be pleased to know that at this time in their lives when they cannot return to their native land for fear of oppression, they may be allowed to enter the United States ahead of other displaced persons who also merit consideration from us. They would become loyal American citizens.

In closing, may I express the hope that the Polish people will shortly be able to regain complete independence and freedom of action under their national constitution.

Long live Poland.

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a real privilege and with pride that I am permitted to stand before this microphone in this House of Representatives, to freely and under no restrictions, address the Members on the occasion of the one-hundred-and-fifty-seventh anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3, adopted in 1791, by the Congress of the Republic of Poland, which was the most liberal, most democratic of its day. Upon rereading it today, one is profoundly moved at its wisdom and magnanimity which assured rights and freedom to the people of Poland.

May I quote at this time a part of that constitution?

Every person, upon coming to this republic from whatsoever parts of the world or one returning to this, the country of his origin, as soon as his foot touches the Polish soil, he is entirely free to indulge in whatsoever enterprise he wishes to enter, in the manner and place of his own choice; that person is free to enter into contract for purchase of property, for work, for rent in whatever manner and for whatever time he himself agrees upon; he is at liberty to settle in the city or in the village; he is free to live in Poland or to return to whatever country he himself chooses after his commitments in Poland which he voluntarily embraced, are duly performed and completed.

This constitution of May 3 abolished restrictions upon the freedom of the individual and gave the Polish Nation a democratic form of government. However, due to the aggressiveness of its neighbors, the Polish Nation was allowed but a short time in which to enjoy the blessings of its democratic rule. The three powerful neighbors of Poland—Russia, Germany, and Austria—were dissatisfied with the reforms introduced in Poland by this constitution. They connived among themselves and partitioning Poland, put an end to the freedom and democracy of the Polish Nation. It was not until much later, that, thanks to the efforts of one of our Presidents, Woodrow Wilson, it regained its freedom and independence.

It is impossible to day to recall the constitution of May 3, without comparing the events of the eighteenth century with what has taken place in Poland.

After years of unfortunate appeasement of Germany, during the dark days of September 1939, it was the Polish Nation which first took up arms against the evil forces of violence and aggression. The events of war developed in such a

way that many of us subconsciously forget the part that Poland played in World War II. We forget the ideals and the principles, which Poland rose to defend, and which are being fought for today by almost the entire world. We forget that the chief slogan at the outbreak of war was the struggle for individual freedom, the defense of the weaker against the stronger, the struggle for justice above evil.

In the opening days of World War II, President Roosevelt called Poland an inspiration to all nations because Poland alone dared defy the Germans in their ruthless challenge of those freedoms and democratic liberties championed by Poland.

It was but a short-lived appellation. Poland, that inspiration to all nations, was most ignominiously sold down the Soviet river and today it is languishing in the throes of Russian-forced slavery.

Today Poland's sons scattered through the various parts of the globe dare not place their foot upon Polish soil for fear of unjust reprisals, uncertain of their property and life in the land of their origin because Poland's political life is dominated by Soviet secret police and puppet agents of Soviet Russia who control its political life.

At this point, I again reiterate the remarks I made last year on the occasion of Poland's Constitution Day, that in today's Poland—Poland which emerged from Tehran and Yalta's conferences—freedom is nonexisting. American press and our own officers in diplomatic service therein testify to the fact. As long as this status quo will be permitted to persist, as long as the United States and Great Britain will not justly repair the harm done Poland and the other countries similarly mistreated in Tehran's and Yalta's secret dealings—until then there will be no peace in the true sense of the word.

Lasting peace, God's peace, must of necessity rest upon a solid foundation of justice. Heretofore we are trying to build peace upon the crumbling foundation of the gravest kind of injustice.

Strictest justice demands that the United States and England redeem Poland from that onerous yoke of Soviet domination which they thrust upon Poland at a time when it was politically impotent to resist it.

Poland must be free, since without a free Poland there will be no true peace.

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues, Mr. GORSKI and Mr. GORDON, from Illinois, in paying tribute today to Poland's Constitution Day.

In so doing they call to the minds of free men the world over that 157 years ago today, May 3, 1791, a doctrine was promulgated in the land of their ancestors that guaranteed freedom and equality.

The Polish Constitution placed the peasants under protection of the law, mitigated serfdom and established absolute religious tolerance. It was hailed as one of the most liberal charters in Europe at the time.

Today we honor this doctrine which can be compared with the American Declaration of Independence and the British Magna Carta. May 3 is like July 4.

As we observe the anniversary of this great day in Polish history we must emphasize the need for a rededication of faith in Poland's freedom. In many churches throughout America prayers will go up today in a plea that Poland may soon again see a rebirth of the freedom it dreamed of a century and a half ago.

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] may be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, since the cessation of hostilities in Europe 3 years ago, the eyes of all peace-loving and freedom-inspired peoples of the world have become more and more focused on the all important issue of communism versus democracy.

The settlement of this issue may decide the fate of this country, as it did the case of Poland even before the cease-fire orders were issued in World War II.

Despite the serious threat to her freedom, which culminated in invasion by Germany in 1939, Poland remained true to the principles written into her constitution and proclamation of May 3, 1791, the anniversary of which we observe today. She did not falter in her determination to preserve at all costs the independence which was won after centuries of constant effort, suffering, and exploitation at the hands of her neighbors, Russia, Austria, and Germany.

Poland courageously bared her breast to the invading hordes of both Germans and Russians, despite her realization that she could not stand for long the onslaughts which could have but one result—annihiliation and return to a state of subjugation and servitude. In the face of great odds, Poland did not hesitate to defy the enemy. No nation could have shown such courage and determination except one whose hearts were thoroughly imbued with the spirit of conviction that all men are created equal and have the right to freedom of religion, freedom of speech and thought, freedom from want, and freedom from fear.

Poland's history is replete with acts of heroism and patriotism such as those of her great leaders, Jan Sobieski, who in the seventeenth century saved Christian Europe from falling into the hands of the Turks; Kosciusko and Pulaski, who fought for American freedom in the Revolutionary War. In every war since the eighteenth century Polish patriots were found on the side of democracy.

Because of her great historical background, there is hope, and we believe that eventually Poland will regain her position in the world of free nations, to enjoy once again the blessings and privileges found only in a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Poland today is an enslaved Christian, democratic, and liberty-loving nation, deprived of independence and national sovereignty through the slow infiltration of the Comintern's efficiency. She must, and I am sure she will, exercise eternal vigilance as did our forefathers when we, too, were faced with oppression and imperialism by despotic governments. Like Poland, we too must take every precautionary measure to insure our continued freedom. We must take a bold stand and defy any subversive force, be it from within or from without.

The example of Poland's fate should stir us to greater effort to stem the tide of this dictatorial form of government which already has reduced more than half of Europe into slavery and oppression. By strengthening the cause of democratic government we may help Poland to rise from her knees and regain her status of a free, prosperous, strong, and independent nation.

As stated by Secretary of State George C. Marshall in his report to the Nation on the Moscow Conference, the next few years will be important milestones in the pathway of future peace. As compared with the centuries past and the distant future, these next few years are small indeed; but nations that believe in liberty and peace should consecrate the next few years to asserting and insisting on self-government and religious freedom for all nations, whether great or small.

Poland's struggles have been incessant. Poland continues to fight, and her indomitable spirit will certainly restore her as the symbol of Christianity, justice, and perseverance .

I am very happy, therefore, to extend my greetings to all my constituents of Polish extraction on this anniversary of Poland's national holiday, and it is my sincere prayer and hope that in the not too distant future we may all rejoice with this great nation and its sons in the celebration of its deliverance from its present shackles.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, Polish Constitution Day has a particular significance for America. It has a particular significance because the great Polish patriot Thaddeus Kosciusko, who participated in signing the Constitution of Poland on May 3, 1791, 15 years earlier made a brave and vital contribution to the birth of our own Republic. His name is, therefore, indelibly associated not only with American independence but also with the founding of the Polish Republic.

It has a particular significance because many fine citizens of Poland have, through the years, come to our country to lend their talents, their industry, and their loyalty to the development of this great Nation and to become a precious part of the social fabric of America. It has a particular significance because through the years there have existed strong cultural and political ties between the people of America and the people of Poland. It has a particular significance because during World War II the members of the Polish armed forces fought

with heroic determination to vanquish the common enemy. They fought with conspicuous valor in the skies over England. They fought at Narvik. They fought on the Maginot Line. They fought with stubborn fortitude in Tobruk. They fought in the terrible hell of Monte Cassino. On the slopes of this Italian town alone 3,600 of these brave men gave their lives. They gave their lives and in so doing they saved the lives of many of the Americans in Gen. Mark Clark's Fifth Army; they saved the lives of many of the Britishers in the Eighth Army of General Alexander; they saved the lives of many Frenchmen in the army of General Juin. They gave their lives in a common cause. But they have not reaped the fruits of a common victory. In the eloquent and tragic words which form the title of the book written by the former Polish Ambassador to the United States, Jan Ciechanowski, they suffered "Defeat in Victory."

Not for them the return to their homes and loved ones. Not for them the freedom which their allies are now enjoying. Not for them the dignity of independence for which they fought.

Many of these Polish soldiers have refused to return to Poland. This refusal is, of course, due to the somber fact that Poland is enslaved today as totally and as brutally as she was enslaved by the Nazis. The men of the Polish Army who fought Hitler's panzer divisions in September, 1939, and who went on to fight the battles which I have enumerated, have lost their country. These men, the flower of Polish manhood, have not seen their native land or their loved ones for 8 years. Many of them will never see their loved ones again.

Polish Constitution Day has also a very special meaning for us at this time. On April 18 the Italian people voted to retain their freedom and their independence. Had the Polish people been allowed to vote under similar conditions in January, 1947, they would have voted overwhelmingly against the enslavement of their country by the evil gang of despots who now rule that forsaken land. It has been reliably estimated that there are no more than 3 percent Communists in Poland. But through bribery, corruption, intimidation, and coercion, the Polish people have been deprived of the freedom which they had so richly earned by their persistent and heroic efforts during the years of titanic struggle. They were the first to fight the Nazi tyrants; they were the first to be conquered by the Communist barbarians.

Though we have from time to time given mealy-mouthed lip service to our friendship for the Poles and to our recognition of the significant part which they played in defeating the common enemy, we have carefully refrained from suiting the action to the word. True, we have not consciously sought to encompass their enslavement. But we have by the secret agreements into which we entered at Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam aided and abetted the Russian despots. Whether through ineptitude, immaturity, or weakness, we helped them to achieve their sinister objectives. Our responsibility for the present plight of Poland is a measure of our present duty to assist that battered country. Our part in the perpetration of this infamy must be a constant reproach to those who had it within their power to achieve the liberation of this martyred people.

And so I think it is clear that our desire to help the Poles is not merely a product of the humanitarian sentiments which are characteristic of us as a generous people. It is based on our knowledge that, though Poland owes her present condition largely to the actions of Soviet Russia, she owes it also in part to the inaction of the United States.

The Congress of the United States has passed the European Recovery Program and will before its adjournment take steps to strengthen our national defense establishment.

We shall by such measures have demonstrated our awareness that, in the tense struggle in which we are involved, it is important that our diplomats should have these elements of power at their command. Millions of people look to us to save the world from self-destruction—they look to us for constructive leadership. We must recognize that an essential ingredient of that leadership is moral fiber. Without this, it will be impossible for us to solve the dire difficulties which beset us. The present condition of Poland is a constant reminder that we failed to provide the leadership which was called for at that time. It testifies to the moral weakness which prompted our representatives to sacrifice principle to expediency. Subsequent events have exposed this immorality as ruthlessly as they have shattered these feeble expedients.

Oh, I suppose that it would be more tactful not to bring this matter up. We have a lot of troubles these days, and it would be nice to turn our backs upon the past and try to forget this ugly blot on our national honor. But the trouble is that this past is still very much with us. It is with us in the sense that from these fuzzy gestures of indecision and appeasement have stemmed many of the troubles which surround us now. It is with us because at this very moment there are millions of Poles languishing in the Stygian horror of the torture chambers, in the fetid squalor of the prisons, and in the indecent stench of the concentration camps created by our Soviet allies. The cause of freedom which unites the overwhelming majority of our people demands that we pause today in recogni- freedom-loving Poles are still enveloped.

No man is wise enough to say when or by what means Poland will be liberated. Since her enslavement by Stalin's lackeys, cumulative crises have created a world dilemma so vast and so complex that this original sin is all but swallowed up in the gathering clouds of conflict. The fate of Poland must wait upon the fate of the world. It will not be decided until a general settlement has been arrived at. In the meantime, however, there is something which we can do to express our sympathy for the Poles and our interest in the Polish tragedy—something which will serve at least in part to mitigate our guilt.

I have for some time been deeply sympathetic with the plight of the displaced persons. I have also felt that it was urgent and just that the members of the Polish armed forces should be included in that group on a preferential status. We give preference to our veterans in this country. We should give preference to the veterans of our allies who are displaced. Virtually the only ones who are in that category are the Poles since Poland is our only wartime ally which is under the domination of Russia. It is time to give tangible evidence of our desire to help these people. It is time to give active recognition to the part that these men played in achieving the peace which we are now enjoying.

And so I have taken this opportunity to introduce a concurrent resolution which provides that there should be enacted legislation which will admit into the United States of America "with their wives and children, all officers, enlisted men, and others who have served with the Polish armed forces in World War II provided they qualify under all the provisions of the existing immigration laws except those with respect to annual quotas."

I need hardly point out that these men have given ample proof that they deserve to become citizens of the United States. Their skills, their vitality, their love of honor, their hatred of slavery, their indomitable courage, their spiritual fervor, will constitute a mighty contribution to American life. The ideals which have sustained them during their long years of combat and loneliness, of pain and privation will help America in her hour of trial. They will inject into our national bloodstream the kind of physical, mental, and moral attributes which we associate with our own beloved land.

Let us make this atonement for the wrong we committed at Yalta. Let us make this gesture to our gallant wartime ally. Let us give this additional recognition to the cause of freedom. Let us do this in partial redemption of our solemn pledges. Let us by this means reassure the Polish people as to our intentions and in so doing help ourselves to achieve the peace with freedom so devoutly desired by the American people.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to extend their remarks may do so at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GAVIN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROPHY. Mr. Speaker, on this May 3, 1948, we are again privileged to be granted another opportunity to mark and commemorate Polish Constitution Day, the anniversary of the date on which Poland was first converted into a hereditary limited monarchy. On May 3, 1791, the Polish people discarded class distinction, and the personal privileges were made available to all the people; absolute religious toleration was established on that memorable day, and provision was made for further reforms from time to time.

This day is Poland's Fourth of July, and it is with a feeling of personal pride that I again raise my voice on behalf

of one of the enslaved Christian, democratic, and liberty-loving nations, now deprived of their liberty, their independence, and national sovereignty. For centuries the Polish people were denied liberty. Through almost superhuman effort they overcame all obstacles and established themselves as leaders in fields of art, culture, and science, contributing their share to the progress and betterment of our universe.

Poland, a full-fledged ally of the United States in World War II, and one of the original signatories of the Declaration of the United Nations of January 2, 1942, has been deprived of her independence and national freedom as a result of a victorious war. The history of the last three centuries testifies to the friendship existing between the American and Polish people, and it is our solemn and patriotic duty to employ all rightful means at our disposal to maintain that friendship, to work together with the freedom-loving people of Poland, to help reestablish their independence, and assist in dispossessing the present alien rulers of Poland who have manifested their hostility toward the American people and to our Government. To me it is imperative that the same aggressive forces which are so anxious to destroy free America, as they have already succeeded in destroying the liberty of Poland, be made to retreat and return that which they have acquired through illegal means and with actions which I can only describe as repulsive.

I have every confidence that the true freedom-loving Pole will succeed in this fight for right. Our unqualified help and support is needed. We must not fail them in their hour of need. We must give them encouragement, and let them know that their friends and allies have not deserted. We must remember that the present situation in Poland and of its enslaved people has been brought about as a direct result of a series of secret agreements signed at Teheran and Yalta. None of these agreements have ever fully been made public, and none of them have been embodied into a treaty ratified by the United States Senate, and therefore none of the deals made by the executive branch of the United States Government have any legal validity. The recognition of the present Soviet dominated Government of Poland which stems from secret agreements which are invalid, is also invalid under the United States Constitution and therefore should be withdrawn. Such withdrawal of recognition of the present puppet Government of Poland would convince the Polish people that the United States does not condone nor approve of the terrorist regime and thus takes a stand on the side of the Polish people in their present struggle with enemy forces occupying their homeland and country. We cannot overlook or pardon such transgression and aggression. We must assume the responsibility which is ours, and help to right the wrong which has been done.

I have complete faith in the future of Poland, and know that she will once again proudly stand erect, side by side with us, free and independent, as a testimonial to an indomitable courage and unconquerable spirit which has always marked the history and background of that land of liberty-loving people.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, May 3 is the day when the people of Poland celebrate the establishment of their constitution, and this year it marks the one hundred and fifty-seventh anniversary thereof. The people of our Nation are also pleased to honor the day which means so much to all of Polish extraction throughout the country. However, as we pay homage to the memory of great patriots like Gen. Casimir Pulaski and Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko, we cannot help but realize the great injustice which has been done to the Polish Nation by the treaty which was made at Yalta and confirmed at Potsdam. Definite steps should be taken to the end that the Polish people be freed from the bondage which they have suffered all too long because their land, unfortunately, has been forced to act through the centuries as a buffer state for imperialistic nations to whom the word liberty has had little if any meaning.

It has been my pleasure during my first term in Congress to serve the people of the Seventh District of Illinois, which, incidentally, is the largest in the Nation with a population of more than 1,000,000 people, almost one-fourth of whom are of Polish extraction. I appreciate the honor which has been conferred upon me by my election to Congress through the efforts of these fine people, and I have done all within my power during the time I have been in Congress to aid the poor, oppressed relatives and friends in Poland and, especially, to give them an opportunity to become one of the citizens of our great and glorious Nation, the only true citadel of freedom throughout the world today.

Now the Seventh Congressional District has been divided, and several new Congressmen will have the opportunity to represent most of the people whom it has been my pleasure to serve during the past 2 years. Should I, by the grace of Providence, be a Member of the Eighty-first and succeeding Congresses, I shall continue my efforts in the same direction, and shall cooperate with those new Members of Congress to bring to fruition the dreams of all Polish-Americans who look forward to the day when the land of their forebears will enjoy the same type of freedom and comfort which is the heritage of the citizens of America.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, in behalf of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORSKI] and myself, having shared the control of the time during this hour, I wish to extend our sincere thanks and hearty appreciation to the active participants in these exercises, to other of our colleagues who remained on the floor during the speeches, to the members of the press, who have remained in the press gallery, and to the guests of the House in the public galleries for taking part in this commemorative exercise this afternoon.

I wish to congratulate the Speaker pro tempore, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN], who has presided on this occasion so magnificently.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GAVIN). I thank the gentleman. I have been greatly honored to be permitted to occupy the chair at this time.

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the annual custom of this House, it is fitting and appropriate that we should pause in the midst of our busy deliberations on this great natal day of the Polish nation to pay time-honored and respectful tribute to the Polish cause and all that it stands for.

Reference has been made—and justly so—to the illustrious history and glorious achievements of the Polish people. It is not too much to say that no people in all history have undergone more bitter persecution and suffering in the name of human liberty than the Polish people. Their own history is replete with struggle and sacrifice. They have pursued the ideal of freedom with never-ceasing zeal and unyielding tenacity.

It is all the more ironical and paradoxical that, while they were the first gallant souls to bear the cruel lash of Nazi oppression, they were also the first to be officially consigned by ill-fated Allied agreements entered into at Yalta and Teheran to the domination of the Soviets. Instead of the liberation they were promised which they fought and died for, the allied governments have therefore in effect stripped them of their birthright and constituted them as the unwilling puppet state of an ideology most of them hate and a political system most of them abhor. Every fiber of their militant Christian loyalty cries out in rebellion against their absorption into the Communist orbit.

I have refused to believe, and will not believe, that these unauthorized and unconstitutional agreements delivering the Polish nation into perpetual slavery command the sanction and support of the American people. To the contrary, I believe that an overwhelming majority of the American people, just as free peoples in other parts of the World, are in their hearts outraged and bitterly resentful of the great injustice which has been inflicted upon the liberty-loving Polish people who fought so staunchly by our side as loyal faithful allies and whose devotion to liberty throughout their long history serves as a deep inspiration to all who cherish the principles of freedom upon which our own great democracy is based.

For these reasons, I am proud to reiterate today the resolution widely felt in this country that the Polish nation shall not be abandoned to permanent Soviet domination, that the great American Government to which the world looks for moral and idealistic democratic leadership, shall insist that this great question, and other similar questions involving denial of self-determination to small nations, be reopened and revaluated in the councils of the world so that fitting recognition may be given to the unquestioned validity of the claim of the Polish people for independence and freedom.

If we remember our own humble origin, our own bitter struggle to secure, protect and preserve our hard-won liberties, if we are mindful of and loyal to

the high-sounding aims for which the last war was fought, if we are true to our own convictions, concerning the moral righteousness of democracy, then we cannot turn our backs upon this gallant noble people who so ardently and so zealously seek their right, God-given and God-ordained, to enjoy a government of their own choosing and not be bound as slaves and chattels in indenture to the Marxist totalitarian state.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GAVIN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

(Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

REPRESENTATIVE BYRNES CALLS UPON PRESIDENT TO RESOLVE DEFENSE DILEMMA: ASKS THAT RECOMMENDATIONS OF NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL BE MADE KNOWN TO CONGRESS AND PUBLIC

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there is no more urgent problem facing this Congress than the problem of bolstering our armed forces in a manner which will give us national security, not only during this present critical period in international relations, but during the long years ahead.

There is an almost complete unanimity among the Members that the bolstering process shall take place. Unfortunately, there is almost as complete a disagreement as to how we shall go about that job.

Elementally, our disagreement, and our confusion, stems from the disagreement and confusion that presently exists in our Military Establishment. I need not belabor that issue. We are confronted with completely dissimilar estimates of the siutation; we are faced with conflicting viewpoints as to objectives; we are asked to place varying degrees of emphasis upon one arm of our Military Establishment or the other. As legislators, with an imperfect knowledge of strategical concepts or technical implementation of our strategy, we have traditionally had to rely upon our military men for guidance in matters relating to our defense. Today, when the question of what kind of an armed establishment we shall build is receiving congressional review, we are confronted with conflicting advice from those we have traditionally relied upon for our facts. This conflict strikes heavily at our sense of proportion and balance at this particular time because we had assumed that the unification of the armed forces would, at least, bring about unification at the policy-making level. We find, to our complete dismay, that this is far from being true, and that unification, in practice, has only served to bring into sharper outline the deep differences between the strategical theories held by the three elements of our armed establishment.

It will serve no purpose to review the conflicts in concept that have been brought out at congressional hearings. Suffice it to say, there is a deep and elemental cleavage of thought between the various members of our national defense team. Mr. Walter Lippmann, in a recent column, described the basic confusion in the following words:

> In a valiant effort to make intelligible what the Army and Navy Register has called a welter of confused recommendations, Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin mentioned uncertainty as to whether the emergency which Truman described in his St. Patrick's Day message, is short term or long term. This is, I think, the chief explanation of the Forrestal-Symington, the Air Force-UMT-draft controversy and confusion.
>
> The Pentagon, having received no clear directive from the President as to whether to prepare for a near or a distant military show-down, finds itself trying to guess what the Russians intend to do. But since the Pentagon cannot be sure that it is guessing right, it is but natural that it should be divided and confused.

Mr. Lippmann goes on to advance the strategic concept that—

> It is not safe to threaten Russia with destruction in 1952, leaving Europe undefended in the meantime. The only safe and wise thing to do is to mobilize at once a defensive and deterrent force for the support of Europe.

It is apparent, then, that the confusion over what we shall do stems from a basic confusion over what we are trying to accomplish. It stems from the failure of the administration to define a clear-cut objective, and for that purpose, to make intelligent use of the machinery furnished to it by this Congress. The confusion of Congress in regard to national security stems from the confusion inherent in the administration's attempt to implement policy without first having disclosed the nature of that policy.

Wherein lies the administration's failure? Why are we foolishly debating means when no decision has been reached as to objective?

Not having all of the facts, I can only hazard a guess, but all evidence available to me indicates that our present national confusion springs from the administration's failure to utilize intelligently the machinery made available to it in the National Security Act of 1947, more commonly called the Unification Act.

The declaration of policy under that act states that it is the intent of Congress "to provide for authoritative coordination and unified direction under civilian control"—of the three military departments—"but not to merge them; to provide for the effective strategic direction of the armed forces and for their operation under unified control and for their integration into an efficient team of land, naval, and air forces."

Title I of that act provides for coordination for national security. By its first section, it provides for a National Security Council, headed by the President, and composed of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Air Force, the chairman of the National Security Resources Board, and such other officers, including Secretaries of other departments, the chairman of the Munitions Board, and the chairman of the Research and Development Board, as the President may designate.

The function of the National Security Council, the act specifies, is "to advise the President with respect to the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policies relating to the national security so as to enable the military services and the other departments and agencies of the Government to cooperate more effectively in matters involving the national security."

Furthermore, it is "the duty of the Council (1) to assess and appraise the objectives, commitments, and risks of the United States in relation to our actual and potential military power, in the interest of national security, for the purpose of making recommendations to the President in connection therewith; and (2) to consider policies on matters of common interest to the departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security, and to make recommendations to the President in connection therewith."

Furthermore, "the Council shall, from time to time, make such recommendations, and such other reports to the President as it deems appropriate or as the President may require."

It should be further pointed out that the Central Intelligence Agency is under the supervision and direction of this Council. It is in effect an arm of the Council furnishing it with every available bit of information on every aspect of foreign capabilities and intentions.

Here, then is a governmental body specifically given the function of determining what our objective and over-all security policy shall be. It specifically includes representatives from all of our military departments; it specifically includes the Secretary of State so that there may be intimate cooperation between the conduct of our foreign affairs and the means to enforce our commitments; it specifically includes the chairman of the National Security Resources Board, who may be expected to know the impact of any defense program upon the national economy; it may include, at the discretion of the President, any other Cabinet member who may contribute to its deliberations.

If any governmental unit, or group of men, can speak authoritatively of our objective in the field of national security, if any governmental agency can speak with great authority on the question of implementing our national policy, I can think of no one that can do so with greater prestige and with more chance of being respectfully listened to than the National Security Council. I can think of no other agency, or legislative machinery, that the Congress could provide, that would be more capable of bringing order out of the monumental chaos in which our defense requirements are now involved.

What are the recommendations of the National Security Council in our present dilemma?

That, Mr. Speaker, is the question that the Congress and the people of this country should be asking.

We have heard the recommendations of Mr. Forrestal, the Secretary of Defense, a member of the Council.

We have heard the recommendations of Mr. Symington, the Secretary of the Air Force, a member of the Council.

We have heard the recommendations of Mr. Royall, the Secretary of the Army, a member of the Council, and we have heard the recommendations of Mr. Sullivan, the Secretary of the Navy, a member of the Council.

But, these recommendations have shown no unanimity of opinion as to objectives nor as to methods. These recommendations have served more to confuse than to illuminate.

What are the recommendations of the National Security Council? What is the considered judgments of our highest ranking and best informed civilian policy makers in the field of national security—makers of military, foreign, and domestic policy—acting in concert and compromising their differences of opinion in an integrated policy satisfactory to all?

The reports and recommendations of this Council are not public property. They are the "property" of the President of the United States. He receives, under the act, such reports and recommendations as the Council deems appropriate or as the President may require. The President, under the act, has the implied power to do as he sees fit with the recommendations of this highest-level policy-recommending body.

I do not question the President's power to keep such recommendations and reports secret, as he may see fit, but I seriously question the wisdom, at this particular time, of keeping under cover the specific recommendations of the National Security Council concerning the dilemma which confronts Congress and the people as a result of the conflicting requests of the Secretaries of our armed branches. If, as seems illogical, the Council has made no recommendations as to our objective and the methods necessary to attain that objective, then they should be requested by the President to do so immediately, and their recommendations should forthwith be presented to the people and the Congress.

As far as I have been able, I have checked into the functioning of the National Security Council since it began operation in the middle of September of last year.

I find that it is in operation. I find that it has met 10 times to date. I find that it has made recommendations to the President.

I find that it has established procedural rules. I find that its recommendations require no majority vote, nor do they require unanimity. It is entirely possible, under its rules, that a "split" report or recommendation can be made to the President.

I find this significant fact: that, to date, no "split" report or recommendation has been made to the President and that its recommendations have been unanimous.

Assuming that the Council has made recommendations concerning our national-security policy with particular reference to the present situation, then consider the peculiar situation facing the American people and their Congress:

Mr. Symington has endorsed the recommendations of the Council. Yet, if Mr. Forrestal's recommendations are the considered recommendations of the Council, then Mr. Symington, since he disagrees with Mr. Forrestal, is in apparent disagreement with the recommendations of the entire Council.

On the other hand, Mr. Forrestal has endorsed the recommendations of the Council. If Mr. Symington's concept more nearly reflects the recommendations of the entire Council, then Mr. Forrestal, since he takes issue with Mr. Symington, is in disagreement with the recommendations of the entire Council.

If neither concept is the concept of the Council, or if the Council's recommendations are a blend of the two, or a radical departure from either, then both of these gentlemen are in serious quarrel with recommendations to which they have both previously agreed.

The point is that we do not know who, if anyone, is championing the considered views of a deliberative body which represents the highest levels of all elements concerning our national-security picture. Nor do we even know whether an integrated policy with clearly defined objectives has ever been enunciated by this body.

It may be said that the President's decisions represent the recommendations of the Council. What are the President's decisions? We do not know, except as they are hinted at in press conferences following Presidential audiences with one of the various secretaries involved in the national defense controversy. We have been given no concrete estimate of the situation, no declaration of short- or long-term policy. The President, by failing to specify our objective, is preventing Congress from intelligently providing means and methods supported by enlightened public opinion. The formation of a cohesive national defense policy with which to back up our foreign commitments is seriously endangered.

The Secretary of Defense has testified that our armed balance rests on the strategic plans which the National Security Act directs the Joint Chiefs of Staff to prepare. He goes on to say that "because of this statutory function of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—and because of the fact that military strategy is both logically and legally a matter for our top military leaders—I shall continue to rely heavily on any recommendations the Joint Chiefs of Staff may make, with regard to the proper composition of a balanced force."

It is this unfortunate tendency to place in the hands of the Joint Chiefs of Staff the last word concerning national security planning which has placed us in our present unfortunate dilemma.

This tendency has brought about the ridiculous spectacle of our Secretary of Defense assembling his Joint Chiefs of Staff to reformulate recommendations which have previously been wrecked by the testimony of the individual Chiefs of Staff themselves.

The Secretary of Defense properly recognizes that the balance of our armed forces rests on the strategic plans of the Joint Chiefs, but he fails to suggest upon what foundation our strategic plans must be based. Certainly they can be based upon nothing other than a clear understanding of what our objectives actually are. In this sense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff are not the final determining factor in our national security planning. In this sense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, upon whose advice the Secretary of Defense relies so heavily, are a subservient body. Logically and legally, the formulation of our national strategy, of which our military strategy is only a dependent part, rests with the National Security Council.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, it is high time that we decide who shall formulate our national security policy. Shall we leave it in the hands of the Joint Chiefs of Staff with their imperfect knowledge of the entire situation? Or shall we make effective use of the National Security Council, upon whom the Joint Chiefs of Staff must necessarily lean for direction? If we decide upon the former course, then we can well abandon the Council and save the $200,000 that we will be asked to appropriate for its operations during the year ahead, but, as I have demonstrated, this would certainly be most unwise.

This reliance upon the infallibility of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and their subsequent failure to speak coherently, has brought about the present confusion in the minds of the people and their Congress. We have, for instance, been placed in the incongruous position of having our appropriations committees receiving testimony as to what our national security policy shall be, and we have been forced to debate our national security policy during our consideration of money bills.

Can all of this be for any other reason except that we are not sure exactly where we are going?

Shall we plan to mobilize at once a defensive and deterrent force for the support of Europe? Should we plan for an atomic war in 1952? Or should we do both, simultaneously and with dispatch? What is our objective—both for the short and the long term? What is the nature of the crisis?

These are the questions to which no authoritative answer has been given by the executive branch. Yet, the executive branch has the knowledge, the power, and the machinery to furnish those answers to all concerned.

We should neither be lulled into a false sense of security, as happened prior to the last war, nor panicked into taking ill-considered or hit-and-miss action through ignorance of the whole situation, as we appear about to do. We should be given the facts, and those facts should come from the source best equipped to obtain them.

If the people and their Congress are presented with the considered judgment of a group which it has specifically charged with the formulation of a national security policy, a group which has the specific mission of integrating our domestic, foreign, and military policy and of bringing about cooperation between the elements in our national defense set-up, is there any reason why we cannot approach this whole problem with a clear insight into our total requirements?

Indeed, if we are not given the benefit of the deliberations of this body, will

it be possible at all to implement properly the national policies concerning which we are kept totally in the dark?

Without benefit of this information, we will perforce be required to legislate blindly and to evolve a program which represents the views of that branch of service whose case is most forcefully presented. It is difficult to see how we can arrive at any other result unless our objective is made clear. That objective cannot be made clear until those responsible for our national policies tell us what those policies are.

Mr. Speaker, for all of these compelling reasons, I strongly urge the President to make available immediately to the people and the Congress the recommendations of the National Security Council concerning our national security policy. If such recommendations are not readily available in a form suitable for that purpose, I strongly urge the President to request of the National Security Council a report of its national security recommendations in a form suitable for transmission to the Congress.

This is the only practical way to resolve our present national security dilemma.

TAFT-ELLENDER-WAGNER BILL

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include letters from the mayors of the cities of Pittsburgh and Philadelphia, Pa.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, today the Committee on Banking and Currency commenced hearings on S. 866, the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill—a bill to establish a national housing policy.

Certainly, no one is in a better position to know and to state with authority than the mayors of our large metropolitan areas.

I have received communications from the mayor of Pittsburgh, Pa., the Honorable David L. Lawrence, a Democratic mayor, and from the mayor of Philadelphia, Pa., the Honorable Bernard Samuel, a Republican mayor, both of whom heartily endorse the provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Housing is certainly a bipartisan issue, and it is my sincere wish that the House committee will report out this legislation substantially in the same form as it passed the other body.

The letters I refer to are as follows:

URBAN REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
OF PITTSBURGH,
April 27, 1948.

Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRANK: Both as mayor of Pittsburgh and as chairman of the redevelopment authority, I most strongly urge that you support the Taft-Ellender-Wagner general housing bill when it comes before the House Banking and Currency Committee. I hope that the committee's hearings will be expeditious and that the bill will be reported to the floor for action.

This bill represents a consensus of the Nation's best thinking on our housing problem. It is a reconciliation of all but the most extreme views. It is dedicated chiefly to the stimulation of private enterprise in the housing field, but recognizes the hard fact that a certain amount of public low-rent housing must be provided if we are to solve the housing problem in our cities.

Under its provisions, the city of Pittsburgh, through its housing authority, could build 7,000 low-rent homes. Plans for these houses are in process. Applications have long since been filed with the Federal Public Housing Authority. Such housing is most important to our redevelopment program since it will permit the relocation of families living in blighted areas which we hope to redevelop through privately financed construction.

In addition, the bill provides for a system of loans and grants for redevelopment which is most essential to our success. The bill also confers a great number of benefits to housing construction in general through its guaranteed yield provisions, its regulations on interest rates, and its extension of Federal credit.

I am sure your study of the bill will convince you, as it has convinced the United States conference of mayors and the members of this authority, that its passage will be of enormous benefit to the cities and the people of Pennsylvania and the Nation.

Very truly yours,

DAVID L. LAWRENCE.

CITY OF PHILADELPHIA,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Philadelphia, Pa., April 27, 1948.

Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BUCHANAN: It has been brought to my attention that hearings on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill will be held in the House Banking and Currency Committee on May 3. On behalf of the citizens of Philadelphia I strongly urge your active support of the bill as passed by the United States Senate when this vital legislation is brought to a vote in the House Banking and Currency Committee. Philadelphia's postwar housing and redevelopment programs are dependent on the adoption by Congress of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

Sincerely yours,

BERNARD SAMUEL.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 52. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of Senate Report 440, part 6, of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Report No. 949, entitled "National Aviation Policy"; to the Committee on House Administration.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 4, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1516. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Gorgas Memorial Laboratory—Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (H. Doc. No. 634); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1517. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Air Force to return certain lands situated in Puerto Rico, in accordance with the terms of the conveyances to the United States Government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1518. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 8, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Nome Harbor, Alaska, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives adopted on November 8, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HERTER: Select Committee on Foreign Aid. Final report on foreign aid (Rept. No. 1845). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REES: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 4964. A bill to preserve seniority rights of 10-point-preference eligibles in the postal service transferring from the position of letter carrier to clerk or from the position of clerk to letter carrier; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1846). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLVERTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 5318. A bill to provide for the continuation of the transportation services of the Inland Waterways Corporation, for the disposition of its property and other interests, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1847). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 4488. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to provide homes for veterans, through veterans' homestead associations, and the public facilities essential therefor; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1848). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 6419. A bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 6420. A bill to increase the grants for benefits under State systems of old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to dependent children, and benefits payable under the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance system, to liberalize the eligibility provisions of such system, to encourage recipients to help maintain themselves, to extend the coverage provisions of such system to the self-employed, to permit elective coverage for employees of nonprofit institutions, and, under voluntary compacts, to employees of State and local governments, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 6421. A bill to provide an appropriation for the reconstruction and repair of roads and other public facilities in the States of Minnesota and North Dakota which were destroyed or damaged by recent floods; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 6422. A bill to permit retired officers of the armed forces to act as agents or attorneys for prosecuting claims against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 6423. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of February 18, 1922, so as to transfer from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Attorney General jurisdiction for determination of undue enhancement of prices by cooperative associations monopolizing or restraining trade and proceedings in connection therewith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHENER (by request):

H. R. 6424. A bill to amend section 334 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1150–1157; 8 U. S. C. 734); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUHLENBERG:

H. R. 6425. A bill to amend section 103 of the Judicial Code to provide for terms of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania to be held at Reading, Pa.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

H. R. 6426. A bill to provide an appropriation for the reconstruction and repair of roads and other public facilities in the States of North Dakota and Minnesota which were destroyed or damaged by recent floods; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FOLGER:

H. J. Res. 392. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide a government for the United States in event of a major disaster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LODGE:

H. Con. Res. 193. Concurrent resolution assuming national responsibility for the results of the Yalta Conference as they affect members of the Polish armed forces serving outside Poland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. Res. 573. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Armed Services to investigate the failure of the Secretary of the Army to correct the military record of Edward Zepp; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LODGE:

H. R. 6427. A bill for the relief of Darinka Macuka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H. R. 6428. A bill to reimburse the Luther Bros. Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHENER (by request):

H. R. 6429. A bill for the relief of Dorrance Ulvin, former certifying officer, and for the relief of Guy F. Allen, former Chief Disbursing Officer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1862. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Western Governors' Conference, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of legislation so that statehood may be granted to Alaska and Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1863. Also, petition of Lottie Hornik and others, of New York City, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging the defeat of the legislation entitled "Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 4, 1948

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of pity and God of love, hear us, Thy servants, as we pray.

So often we are misunderstood by our colleagues, our friends, and even by those who love us most.

We fail to understand each other, and so suspicions are born, motives are questioned, and attitudes are misinterpreted.

Since Thou dost understand each one of us, help us to understand each other.

Enable us to put off all sham and pretense, so that from henceforth we may live a life of freedom and sincerity.

Make us willing to be ourselves, but eager for Thy help to become the best selves we can be. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 3, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 3, 1948, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 608. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Growing Four Times;

S. 714. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Claude E. Milliken; and

S. 2409. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 16, 1947.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 1004. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 so as to grant specific authority to the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to require investigations by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the character, associations, and loyalty of persons nominated for appointment, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to offices established by such act;

S. 1132. An act to amend section 40 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (39 Stat. 728), as amended;

S. 1298. An act to validate payments heretofore made by disbursing officers of the United States Government covering cost of shipment of household effects of civilian employees, and for other purposes;

S. 1545. An act to authorize a bridge, roads and approaches, supports and bents, or other structures, across, over, or upon lands of the United States within the limits of the Colonial National Historical Park at or near Yorktown, Va.;

S. 1611. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Sauk Rapids, Minn.;

S. 1985. An act to amend the act entitled "Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act," approved July 19, 1940; and

S. J. Res. 198. Joint resolution to authorize the Postmaster General to withhold the awarding of star-route contracts for a period of 60 days.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1620. An act to establish eligibility for burial in national cemeteries, and for other purposes; and

S. 1648. An act to authorize the expenditure of income from Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for training of Federal prisoners.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2239) to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HOFFMAN, Mr. HARVEY, and Mr. HOLIFIELD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1608. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Postmaster General to contract for certain powerboat service in Alaska, and for other purposes," approved August 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 1338);

H. R. 1896. An act to amend the act of May 29, 1944, so as to provide annuities for certain remarried widows;

H. R. 3731. An act authorizing modifications in the repayment contracts with the Lower Yellowstone irrigation district No. 1 and the Lower Yellowstone irrigation district No. 2;

H. R. 4393. An act to provide for the distribution, promotion, separation, and retirement of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4682. An act to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act to increase the time within which claims under such act may be presented to Federal agencies or prosecuted in the United States district courts;

H. R. 5144. An act providing for the conveyance of the Bear Lake Fish Cultural Station to the Fish and Game Commission of the State of Utah;

H. R. 5272. An act relating to the compensation of certain railway postal clerks;

H. R. 5298. An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5543. An act granting the consent of Congress to Carolina Power & Light Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in the Lumber River;

H. R. 5587. An act to add certain lands to the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial

Park, in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5680. An act to provide for limiting participation as beneficiary under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5820. An act to aid in the development of improved prosthetic appliances, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6056. An act to amend an act of Congress approved February 9, 1881, which granted a right-of-way for railroad purposes through certain lands of the United States in Richmond County, N. Y.;

H. R. 6067. An act authorizing the execution of an amendatory repayment contract with the Northport irrigation district, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6091. An act to withdraw certain land as available land within the meaning of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920 (42 Stat. 108), as amended, and to restore it to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 6188. An act to confer jurisdiction over the Fort Des Moines Veterans' Village upon the State of Iowa; and

H. J. Res. 371. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the golden anniversary of the consolidation of the Boroughs of Manhattan, Bronx, Brooklyn, Queens, and Richmond, which boroughs now comprise New York City.

COIN COMMEMORATING ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF ORGANIZATION OF MINNESOTA AS TERRITORY—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 152)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying bill, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Senate:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, S. 1304 "To authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the organization of Minnesota as a Territory of the United States."

The proposed legislation would authorize the coinage of not to exceed one hundred and fifty thousand silver 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the organization of Minnesota as a Territory of the United States.

We are all proud of the fine achievements of the people of Minnesota. I believe that it is proper for the Nation to share in commemorating the milestones of Minnesota's development. But I am convinced that it is not a wise national policy to issue special coins for this purpose.

On July 31, 1947, I withheld my approval of H. R. 1180, a bill "To authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of Wisconsin into the Union as a State." In my memorandum of disapproval I pointed out that the fundamental difficulty of issuing special coins for commemorative occasions is that such coins would be full legal tender. It is clearly unwise to require a multiplicity of designs on United States coins which would create confusion in our monetary system, facilitate counterfeiting, and encourage traffic in commemorative coins for private profit.

This point was well stated by President Hoover in vetoing a similar bill in 1930. He said:

> There are a great many historical events which it is not only highly proper but desirable to commemorate in a suitable way, but the longer use of our coins for this purpose is unsuitable and unwise. This would seem to be clear from the very number of events to be commemorated, and past experience indicates how difficult it is to draw the line and how such a practice, once it is recognized, tends constantly to grow. If this bill is to become law, it is not apparent on what grounds similar measures, no matter how numerous, may be rejected. Yet their enactment in such numbers must bring further confusion to our monetary system.

The bill which I am now returning illustrates the difficulty of establishing any rule denominating the events of national importance which should be commemorated by the issuance of special coins. Thus, each of the 48 States has an anniversary of statehood to celebrate. Many of them have anniversaries of their formation as Territories and some could appropriately commemorate their establishment as colonies. Furthermore, there are many historic cities and towns whose anniversaries are of national importance. The United States has participated in a number of celebrated wars and campaigns. Moreover, we have had our great explorers, our great pioneers, our great statesmen—our great heritage of notable men and women. If we were to commemorate them all with special coins we would be starting down an endless path.

The accuracy of this statement is indicated by the fact that bills are now before the Congress to issue special coins commemorating no less than 17 other notable events in our history. I am sure that there are many other events equally worthy of national recognition.

In 1890, the Congress of the United States laid down a rule that the design on the coins of the United States should not be changed oftener than once in 25 years. The purpose of this rule was to prevent multiplicity of coinage issues and the consequent confusion of the public and the facilitating of counterfeiting. Every issuance of a special coin is in derogation of this wise rule, and I cannot approve such a practice.

There is a further difficulty. In almost every case in which a commemorative coin is issued, a part of the issue finds its way into the hands of dealers in coins, and the greatest profit is made by them rather than by the worthy organization which sponsors the issue. In this connection, I call to the attention of the Congress a fine report issued in 1939 (H. Rept. No. 101, 76th Cong.) by the late Congressman John Cochran in which he graphically revealed the abuses which have resulted from multiple issues of commemorative coins.

It is for these reasons that President Hoover and President Franklin Roosevelt recommended that commemorative medals, rather than coins, should be issued for events of national importance. I believe this policy is sound, and in February 1947 I recommended that the Congress enact appropriate legislation. I am pleased to note that in January 1948 the Senate passed S. 865, which would carry out this recommendation. I hope that the Congress will complete its action on this legislation in the near future, and that the Congress will then approve a commemorative medal for the 1949 anniversary of Minnesota's organization as a Territory.

For the reasons stated above, I feel compelled to return S. 1304 without my approval.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 4, 1948.*

JEANETTE C. JONES AND MINOR CHILDREN—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 153)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying bill, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Senate:

I am returning herewith without my approval S. 1312, Eightieth Congress, "An act for the relief of Jeanette C. Jones and minor children."

The bill proposes to direct payment of the sum of $4,971.33 to Jeanette C. Jones, of New York, N. Y., for herself and minor children, in full settlement of all claims for alleged losses sustained due to erroneous advice gratuitously furnished by the Veterans' Administration with regard to her entitlement to death compensation benefits, and as retroactive payment of death compensation benefits for the period from April 16, 1932, to June 11, 1939, based upon the death of her husband, Paul Jones, late a veteran of World War I.

The basis of favorable action in this case by the Congress appears to be the alleged erroneous advice furnished Mrs. Jones by the Veterans' Administration, presumably in a letter of May 10, 1932, subsequent to the death of her husband on April 15, 1932. In the letter Mrs. Jones was advised, among other things, that:

> Evidence on file in this case has been carefully considered but it has been determined that the veteran's death is not shown to have been due to his military service, consequently, there will be no compensation benefits payable on behalf of his dependents.

I am informed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs that this advice was not erroneous. The evidence of record at that time did not warrant a determination of service-connected death. It is noteworthy in this connection that for many years prior to death the veteran himself had been unable to establish service-connection for his disability although he had actively pursued his claim. It was not until additional data, never before made available to the Veterans' Administration, was submitted in 1940 by Mrs. Jones, and until a field investigation was conducted by the Veterans' Administration in the same year as a result of the submission of that additional data, that the state of the record in this case warranted an award to Mrs. Jones. In accordance with law, the initial payment of $1,021.93 covered the period from June 12, 1939 (the date claim was filed), through September 30, 1940.

The current award is in the amount of $60 monthly.

It seems to me that the action of the Congress in this case fails to recognize the well-settled principle that the burden of proving entitlement to a gratuity from the Government rests upon the one who claims and not upon the Government. The letter of May 10, 1932, in no wise precluded Mrs. Jones from pursuing a claim for death compensation. As a matter of fact she did just that when she filed a claim in 1939 and furnished additional data in 1940. In my judgment, it was her inaction, and not the action of the Veterans' Administration, which brought about any loss of compensation which she may have suffered.

The reports of the congressional committees which considered S. 1312 disclose a feeling that this case is unique and that there is no danger that congressional recognition of this moral claim will set any dangerous precedent. I am advised by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs that this case is similar in principle to innumerable others wherein by reason of inaction on the part of claimants, and their failure to produce evidence promptly, awards of death compensation are not payable under general law retroactively to the date of a veteran's death, but rather from some later date when the necessary evidence was furnished. In other words, approval of this bill could serve as a precedent for many others.

Under the circumstances, I am constrained to withhold approval.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 4, 1948.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROGRESS REPORT OF WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the War Assets Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the first quarterly progress report of that Administration, for the period January 1 through March 31, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Las Vegas, Nev., favoring the enactment of legislation providing statehood for Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the California Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, San Francisco, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation providing adequate military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the California Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, San Francisco, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for the control of the activities of the Communist Party in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolution requesting the United States Veterans' Administration to carry out its promise to the city of Providence and the State of Rhode Island in the matter of the construction of a regional office at Davis Park for service to the veterans of Rhode Island and southeastern Massachusetts

"Whereas the city of Providence, at the request of the Honorable Dennis J. Roberts, mayor, by act of the city council, on February 16, 1945, with the consent of the State of Rhode Island, gave to the United States Veterans' Administration, Davis Park for the express purpose of the construction of a hospital for the care of veterans and for the construction of a regional office to handle matters between the United States and veterans living in Rhode Island and southeastern Massachusetts; and

"Whereas the present United States Veterans' Administration is located in four separate buildings: 100 Fountain Street, Hope Street High School, third floor of the Post Office Annex, and fourth floor of the Post Office Building; and

"Whereas the separation of the Veterans' Administration regional office in Providence is such as to cause great delay and inconvenience in the handling of veterans' matters and necessitates that veterans travel from building to building, resulting in confusion, delay, and possible loss of irreplaceable records; and

"Whereas the construction of a regional office at Davis Park would result in great financial saving to the Government as the present rentals and overhead expenses amount to much more than if the office were located in a building at Davis Park owned by the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Rhode Island General Assembly requests that the United States Veterans' Administration carry out its promise to the city of Providence and the State of Rhode Island in the matter of the construction of a regional office at Davis Park for service to the veterans of Rhode Island and southeastern Massachusetts; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States and to the Administrator of the United States Veterans' Administration."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House resolution protesting against the Federal embargo on shipment of arms to Palestine

"Whereas on November 29, 1947, the United Nations General Assembly in an historic action voted for the partition of Palestine and since the vote, the Arab States, themselves members of the United Nations, are engaged in arming themselves to resist by force the carrying out of said resolution; and

"Whereas we must not lose sight of the fact that unless the United Nations' decision is carried out the foregoing vote of the United Nations General Assembly becomes a mockery; and

"Whereas the recent Federal embargo on shipment of arms to Palestine will frustrate the carrying out of such decision; and

"Whereas the United States is in a position to take swift action in the immediate emergency and demonstrate to all the world that we stand in back of our commitments and our promise means performance: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Rhode Island House of Representatives now calls upon the Federal Government to lift or modify the embargo on shipment of arms to Palestine in aid of the Jews there, and thereby permit them to defend themsleves from attack and urges the President of the United States of America, the United States delegate to the United Nations, and the Secretary of State to support the following measure:

"A stern warning to the Arab States calling for an end of their resistance to and sabotage of the United Nations' decision; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the recording clerk of the House of Representatives to the President of the United States of America, to the Secretary of State in the United States State Department, to Warren E. Austin, United States delegate to the United Nations, Lake Success, N. Y., and to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

PROTEST AGAINST MILITARY DRAFT—LETTER FROM DR. PAUL B. McCLEAVE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an interesting letter regarding the proposed military draft which has come to me from Dr. Paul B. McCleave, president of the College of Emporia, Emporia, Kans.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COLLEGE OF EMPORIA,
Emporia, Kans., April 28, 1948.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: It is with regret that I have been reading of the action of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs these last few days. Regret in the sense that seemingly our Congress is being swept off its feet because of a fear psychology and because of the pressure of the military interests in our country.

I am writing to you in the interest of the thousands of young men in the State of Kansas and especially those who are on my campus at the present time, and for the seniors of our high schools who graduate this spring. I am writing requesting that you and Senator REED vote "no" on any draft bill which may come on the floor of the Senate within the next few days.

Have you realized that if the 19-year-old draft measure is passed, the seniors in our high schools of today who are 18 will not attend college, because they know the following year they will be drafted. Upon being drafted at 19 they will serve their time, and they will return, not to find an education, but to find a job to continue a common, ordinary sort of life. The need today is for highly trained technical individuals. Individuals who are skilled in their fields with vision of opportunities, and these can only be accomplished by the opportunities which are afforded in higher education. If you vote for the draft, you destroy the opportunities with the possibility of developing these needs in the minds of our youth.

When we prepare as a nation, let us not fool ourselves that we are preparing for peace, for no nation in the history of the

world has ever prepared that it has not led to war. The United States has no one to fear today, and you, as a Senator, knowing the inside of political affairs, know this better than we who strive to find answers to the world's problems in the position as laymen. Thus, why the fear? Why the need of massing infantry? Why the draft?

I plead with you that you stop and think before you vote for a draft. I assure you, though my influence and effort is limited, that I shall do nothing but work toward this end in this State in these coming days.

Sincerely,

PAUL B. MCCLEAVE,
President.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 2479. A bill providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1239);

H. R. 5262. A bill to authorize the sale of individual Indian lands acquired under the act of June 18, 1934, and under the act of June 26, 1936; without amendment (Rept. No. 1232);

H. R. 5651. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in South Dakota for municipal or public purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1233); and

H. R. 5669. A bill to provide for adjustment of irrigation charges, on the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1234)

By Mr. THYE, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 2224. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to the priority rights of veterans entitled to 10-point preference under such act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1235).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

H. R. 3638. A bill to amend section 10 of the act establishing a National Archives of the United States Government; without amendment (Rept. No. 1236);

H. J. Res. 340. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the American Turners Society in the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1237); and

H. J. Res. 341. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of Fort Kearney in the State of Nebraska; without amendment (Rept. No. 1238).

By Mr. ECTON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 5118. A bill to authorize the sale of certain individual Indian land on the Flathead Reservation to the State of Montana; without amendment (Rept. No. 1240).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. LANGER, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

ELIMINATION OF POLL TAX IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF MR. STENNIS

Mr. STENNIS submitted his individual views as a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration on the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers, which, pursuant to the order of the Senate of April 30, 1948, were ordered to be printed with the majority report (No. 1225).

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 4, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 1004. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 so as to grant specific authority to the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to require investigations by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the character, associations, and loyalty of persons nominated for appointment, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to offices established by such act;

S. 1132. An act to amend section 40 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (39 Stat. 728), as amended;

S. 1298. An act to validate payments heretofore made by disbursing officers of the United States Government covering cost of shipment of household effects of civilian employees and for other purposes;

S. 1545. An act to authorize a bridge, roads and approaches, supports and bents, or other structures, across, over, or upon lands of the United States within the limits of the Colonial National Historical Park at or near Yorktown, Va.;

S. 1611. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Sauk Rapids, Minn.;

S. 1985. An act to amend the act entitled "Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act," approved July 19, 1940; and

S. J. Res. 198. Joint resolution to authorize the Postmaster General to withhold the awarding of star-route contracts for a period of 60 days.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Howard Bruce, of Maryland, to be Deputy Administrator for Economic Cooperation;

Thomas C. Wasson, of New Jersey, to be the representative of the United States on the Truce Commission for Palestine;

Ely E. Palmer, of Rhode Island, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Afghanistan; and

John M. Stevens, of the District of Columbia, and several other persons for appointment in the diplomatic service.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCK:

S. 2598. A bill to permit investment of funds of insurance companies organized within the District of Columbia in obligations of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 2599. A bill for the relief of Carl C. Ballard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 2600. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355) as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the postwar construction of highways and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 2601. A bill to improve the administration of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes;

S. 2602. A bill to provide for coordination of aviation policy, and for other purposes; and

S. 2603. A bill to provide for an independent Office of Air Safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2604. A bill to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the International Industrial Exposition, Inc., Atlantic City, N. J., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

S. 2605. A bill for the relief of the widow of Robert V. Holland; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2606. A bill for the relief of Jeno Orgel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2607. A bill to exempt certain proceedings for the adjudication of water rights from the provision of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILSON:

S. J. Res. 211. Joint resolution to establish a joint congressional committee on small business; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(Mr. IVES introduced Senate Joint Resolution 212, to authorize the President, following appropriation of the necessary funds of the Congress, to bring into effect on the part of the United States the loan agreement of the United States of America and the United Nations signed at Lake Success, N. Y., March 23, 1948, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and appears under a separate heading.)

CONSTRUCTION OF HEADQUARTERS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, as many Members of the Senate are aware, during the latter part of March, a representative to the United Nations negotiated a loan agreement in behalf of the United States with the United Nations to cover a loan to be made by the Government of the United States to the United Nations for the purpose of construction of a headquarters for the United Nations. It is not my purpose at this time to go into the merits of the proposal. I wish to point out, however, as I introduce a joint resolution to cover the matter, that it is necessary, if our Government is to proceed with the loan, to point out what has been done thus far by those who are interested parties. I have indicated the action taken by the representative of the United States to the United Nations and

I have indicated that a loan agreement has been negotiated between that representative and the United Nations. Insofar as we are concerned, all that is lacking is the approval of our own Government through legislative action by which the necessary appropriation for the loan can be made. In anticipation of such action, and even before the loan agreement was made, as is generally known, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., contributed approximately eight and a half million dollars for the purpose of a site for the headquarters of the United Nations. In addition to that, the city of New York obligated itself to the extent of $13,000,000, of which the city has already spent two and a half million in preparing the site for the headquarters. Therefore the foundation has already been laid for what is contemplated in this legislation. Everything has been done which can be done, except to get the approval of the Congress of the United States and the approval of the President with regard to the necessary legislation which would permit a loan.

At this time I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution which covers the matter in some detail. It provides for the amortization of the loan. Insofar as it is possible to do so, it lays down rather strict provisions guaranteeing to the United States protection in making the loan. It is not a first mortgage, to be sure. A first mortgage is impossible under the conditions of the loan agreement. A first mortgage would not be desirable. But insofar as it is possible to do so, there is contained in the terms of the resolution, in which is incorporated the loan agreement, stipulations, and specifications which, in effect, give to the United States a prior lien on the structure which will be erected for the headquarters of the United Nations.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 212) to authorize the President, following appropriation of the necessary funds of the Congress, to bring into effect on the part of the United States the loan agreement of the United States of America and the United Nations signed at Lake Success, N. Y., March 23, 1948, introduced by Mr. IVES, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS RELATING TO LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I submit a resolution providing for the printing of 2,000 additional copies of hearings held before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, relative to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. We anticipate that there will be a considerable demand for copies of these hearings, and that is the reason for this resolution. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 229) submitted by Mr. AIKEN, was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That 2,000 additional copies of the hearings held before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments relative to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 be printed for the use of said committee.

PREVENTION OF RETROACTIVE CHECKAGE OF RETIRED PAY OF CERTAIN ENLISTED MEN AND WARRANT OFFICERS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5344) to prevent retroactive checkage of retired pay in the cases of certain enlisted men and warrant officers appointed or advanced to commissioned rank or grade under the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed.

EMANCIPATION OF UNITED STATES INDIANS IN CERTAIN CASES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BUTLER submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1113) to emancipate United States Indians in certain cases, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

JURISDICTION OVER OFFENSES COMMITTED BY OR AGAINST CERTAIN INDIANS—AMENDMENT

Mr. BUTLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4725) to confer jurisdiction on the several States over offenses committed by or against Indians on Indian reservations, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 1608. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Postmaster General to contract for certain powerboat service in Alaska, and for other purposes," approved August 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 1338);

H. R. 5272. An act relating to the compensation of certain railway postal clerks; and

H. J. Res. 371. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the golden anniversary of the consolidation of the Boroughs of Manhattan, Bronx, Brooklyn, Queens, and Richmond, which boroughs now comprise New York City; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1896. An act to amend the act of May 29, 1944, so as to provide annuities for certain remarried widows; and

H. R. 5298. An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3731. An act authorizing modifications in the repayment of contracts with the lower Yellowstone irrigation district No. 1 and the lower Yellowstone irrigation district No. 2:

H. R. 5587. An act to add certain lands to the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6056. An act to amend an act of Congress approved February 9, 1881, which granted a right-of-way for railroad purposes through certain lands of the United States in Richmond County, N. Y.;

H. R. 6067. An act authorizing the execution of an amendatory repayment contract with the Northport irrigation district, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6091. An act to withdraw certain land as available land within the meaning of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920 (42 Stat. 108), as amended, and to restore it to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4393. An act to provide for the distribution, promotion, separation, and retirement of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5144. An act providing for the conveyance of the Bear Lake fish-cultural station to the Fish and Game Commission of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4682. An act to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act to increase the time within which claims under such act may be presented to Federal agencies or prosecuted in the United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5543. An act granting the consent of Congress to Carolina Power & Light Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in the Lumber River; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

H. R. 5680. An act to provide for limiting participation as beneficiary under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 5820. An act to aid in the development of improved prosthetic appliances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. R. 6138. An act to confer jurisdiction over the Fort Des Moines veterans' village upon the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Public Works.

INFORMATION ON AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by him before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry regarding the gathering and dissemination of information on agricultural commodities, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FREEDOM TRAIN—ARTICLE BY DAVID L. KIRK

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "May We All Be Worthy of the Freedom Train," written by David L. Kirk, and published in the Spokane Daily Chronicle of April 10, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

INFLATIONARY PROBLEMS

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a review of inflationary problems from the Monthly Business Review of April 15, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials, one entitled "Anent Cash Awards for Cartoonist," and the other "Socialized Medicine and Communist Purpose," which appear in the Appendix.]

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Warning From History," relating to reciprocal trade agreements, published in the Christian Science Monitor of May 3, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEETING OF COMMITTEE DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary considering Senate bill 1988 be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAXES

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Morse
Baldwin	Hayden	Murray
Ball	Hickenlooper	Myers
Brewster	Hoey	O'Daniel
Brooks	Ives	O'Mahoney
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Cain	Kilgore	Russell
Capper	Knowland	Saltonstall
Chavez	Langer	Smith
Connally	Lodge	Stennis
Cooper	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Downey	McFarland	Tobey
Dworshak	McGrath	Tydings
Eastland	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ecton	McMahon	Watkins
Ellender	Magnuson	Wherry
Ferguson	Malone	Wiley
Flanders	Martin	Williams
Fulbright	Maybank	Wilson
Green	Millikin	Young
Gurney	Moore	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] is absent because of illness.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent because of illness in their families.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on public business.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Under authority of paragraph 1 of rule VII the Chair lays before the Senate for its second reading, H. R. 2245, which the clerk will read by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2245) to repeal the tax on oleomargarine.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wishes to make a general statement of the parliamentary situation so that all Senators may be fully advised of the procedure which is contemplated. There is an unfortunate conflict in construction between rule XIV of the Senate and section 137 of the Reorganization Act. At the moment it is needless to go into the details of this conflict, but it turns finally, apparently, upon the pure question as to who is first recognized by the Chair to assert his rights under these two conflicting rules.

The situation has never heretofore arisen. Therefore, we are making an entirely new precedent—a point which can be of very serious moment to the conduct of the business of the Senate. Therefore, the Chair proposes that the Senate shall settle the matter for itself.

In order to accomplish this result, the following procedure is necessary. The Chair will first recognize the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to raise the question, which he is entitled to raise under section 137 of the Reorganization Act, which requires the Chair, without debate, to make a reference of the pending bill to the committee which in his judgment has appropriate jurisdiction. When that motion has been made by the Senator from Nebraska, and recognized, the Chair will recognize the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] to raise a point of order regarding the priority of his rights under rule XIV of the Senate. When the Senator from Arkansas has made his point of order, the Chair, under rule XX of the Senate, will submit to the Senate itself, for decision, the question whether the Senator from Arkansas is entitled to priority under rule XIV, or whether the Senator from Nebraska is entitled to priority under section 137 of the Reorganization Act. This procedure has been discussed with all concerned, and seems to be the fairest way to resolve an exceedingly difficult and perplexing parliamentary impasse.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, from a reading of the discussion and proceedings in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday concerning House bill 2245, there appears to be a difference of opinion as to which committee of the Senate has jurisdiction over the proposed legislation. In view of the fact that such a controversy has arisen in this case, it is my belief that under the provisions of section 137 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, it now becomes the duty of the President pro tempore of the Senate to decide the question of jurisdiction, and I ask the Chair to rule on that question of jurisdiction and on the question of reference to the committee to which the bill should be referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule, but first recognizes the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I make the point of order that under rule XIV, paragraph 4, after the second reading of the bill, if objection is made to further proceedings, it shall be placed on the calendar. The language of that rule is very clear. I also submit that under the interpretation requested by the Senator from Nebraska that every bill——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is not entitled to debate the point of order until it is submitted to the Senate.

The Senator from Arkansas raises the point of order that he is entitled under rule XIV of the Senate to exercise his priority of right to ask that after the second reading of the bill, which has just occurred, it shall go to the calendar. The Chair proposes to submit that question to the Senate under rule XX. The question submitted to the Senate is as follows: Is the point of order of the Senator from Arkansas well taken? Upon that the Senate will vote yes or no.

The question now submitted under rule XX is subject to debate, and the Chair again recognizes the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I might cite as the first authority for the point of order, the ruling of the Chair on yesterday by which the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] was recognized for a similar purpose respecting a highly controversial bill. In fact I am sure it will arouse and has aroused already as much controversy as the oleomargarine bill. I refer to the so-called tidelands bill. On yesterday that bill was sent directly to the calendar by the ruling of the Chair under rule XIV.

The language of rule XIV is very clear. It is not for me to justify that rule on its merits, because I can see that there is possibility of its use to circumvent the comittees in many instances. The rule has not been often employed, but it stands, and I think that the ruling, under the present conditions, must be in accord with the provisions of paragraph 4 of rule XIV.

For the benefit of some of the Members of the Senate who were not present yesterday, I should like to read the provision. It is as follows:

> 4. Every bill and joint resolution reported from a committee, not having previously been read, shall be read once, and twice, if not objected to, on the same day, and placed on the calendar in the order in which the same may be reported; and every bill and joint resolution introduced on leave, and every bill and joint resolution of the House of Representatives which shall have received a first and second reading without being referred to a committee—

And this is the important part—

> shall, if objection be made to further proceeding thereon, be placed on the calendar.

That last sentence is the whole crux of the matter. It seems to me that in the interpretation and application of the rule there is only one reasonable way to apply it, and that is that after the second reading of a bill the Chair then would be in the attitude of saying to the Senate, "Is there objection?", which would give an opportunity for objection at that point; otherwise the rule would be meaningless; and at that point, if any Senator

does object—exactly as happened on yesterday when the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] did object to further proceedings on the tidelands bill—the bill should be sent to the calendar. I think that is the only reasonable interpretation of rule XIV.

The alternative, I should say, is that the Chair, by recognizing any Senator who might raise a point of controversy respecting a bill—something which is inherent in every bill, of course—would completely nullify the rule. I think the rule must be abided by and interpreted reasonably; otherwise it stands there as a possibility for such action in respect to all legislation, and it is very important that the Senate clarify the application of the rule. If it is applied as it is written, then we shall know how to proceed. If it is applied as the Chair has indicated it may be—by recognizing some Senator to raise the point of controversy under section 137—we shall be in an indefinite position at all times. The Senate will be subject at any time, when any bill comes to the Senate from the House, to having it placed on the calendar without going to a committee. So the only reasonable way for it to be applied is by the recognition under rule XIV of an objection after the second reading.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the point of order were well taken, would it not mean that from now on all bills coming from the House would go on the calendar?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If objection were made after the second reading; that is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Any Member of the Senate could have the bill placed on the calendar.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that that is exactly what happened yesterday in connection with the tidelands bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. That happened yesterday because no Senator had taken the initiative to refer it to a committee. Now we have a motion for a decision on the question of reference. According to the Senator's interpretation of the rule, any Member of the Senate could have the bill placed on the calendar, and then the only way to get it to a committee would be by majority vote.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. On motion.

Mr. FERGUSON. On motion and by a majority vote.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. A tie vote would still leave it on the calendar.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is not that the real meaning of the rule? Is not that what the rule says?

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not so interpret the rule.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. My question has no application to yesterday's situation. As I understand the RECORD of yesterday, there was no attempt by the Chair to refer the tidelands bill. Yesterday, when the bill was read for the second time, there was no action on the part of the Chair to refer that bill to any committee. The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] then objected to further consideration. So my question would not be applicable to that situation, but it would be applicable to this situation.

I shall go a little further, if I may, with the Senator's indulgence. Assuming that the bill is read the first and second time, and having in mind the provisions of section 137 of the Reorganization Act, which now directs the Chair to refer bills to committees, giving the Senate only the right of appeal—in view of that section of the Reorganization Act and the provisions of paragraph 4 of rule XIV, assuming that a bill is read twice, and at that time, even though a Senator has risen to his feet seeking recognition, the Chair, pursuant to his duty under section 137 of the Reorganization Act, seeks immediately to refer the bill to a committee. In that event, would not the provisions of paragraph 4 of rule XIV permit that to be done?

The point I make is that the right of the Chair with respect to reference to a committee is a prior right to the right of a Member of the Senate to object to further consideration.

I now come to the reading of the paragraph to which I wish to invite the Senator's attention. Frankly, I feel that the problem here is of far greater importance than any bill that can ever come before the Senate. It is a question of orderly procedure. That is the only reason I am taking the Senator's time. I hope he will indulge me for a few minutes longer.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator interpret section 137 of the Reorganization Act as directing the Chair to make the reference in the absence of a controversy having been suggested by a Member of the Senate? The language seems to provide that he shall exercise this duty only when some Senator has raised the question.

Mr. CORDON. I shall come to that question in a moment. However, in order to have the two provisions together, permit me to read a portion of paragraph 4 of rule XIV. I shall skip the first portion and start with the second line from the bottom, at the comma, which brings out all that is pertinent to my argument:

> And every bill and joint resolution of the House of Representatives which shall have received a first and second reading without being referred to a committee, shall, if objection be made to further proceeding thereon, be placed on the calendar.

I invite the Senator's attention to the clause "without being referred to a committee." To me the use of those words in that sentence indicates that after the first and second reading there may be a reference to a committee; but if such reference be not made, then any Member of the Senate may object to further proceedings, and objection being made, the bill goes on the calendar. That would seem to me to be perfectly clear. If that interpretation were followed it would lead to a far more orderly handling of the business of the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not see where the Senator finds the duty imposed upon the Chair to make such reference when no controversy has been suggested by a Member of the Senate at that point. Such an interpretation would leave bills coming over from the House in a very indefinite situation. The Chair may, on his own motion, make the reference; or, if he neglects to do so, any bill may be placed on the calendar, with the possible exception of appropriation bills. I believe it is specifically provided under the rules that they shall go to a committee. I believe that all other bills might be placed on the calendar, which is something very unexpected, I think to all Members of the Senate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Arkansas, the Parliamentarian, or anyone else who has been examining the question. The language "which shall have received a first and second reading without being referred to a committee" raises this question in my mind: Does that mean that if a first and second reading of a House bill or joint resolution is had, and then it is intended to proceed to a vote or to a third reading of the bill, objection can be made and the bill can be placed on the calendar, rather than proceeding to a third reading? The statement is not clear, but it seems that that language might lend itself to such an interpretation. I am wondering if that phase of the question has been explored.

Conceivably, a House bill coming over here could go to its first and second reading and then proceed immediately to a third reading, which would be preliminary to passage of the bill. My question is whether or not the rule in Jefferson's Manual means that objection can be interposed immediately after the second reading and before the third reading and passage and the bill placed on the calendar rather than proceeding to a third reading and passage.

It seems to me, with the meager knowledge I have of precedents, that the general connotation of the rule is that after the first and second reading of the bill it is referred to a committee unless an attempt is made to bring it to a third reading and passage immediately. I am making inquiry of the Senator from Arkansas as to the interpretation of the rule. I am not versed in the precedents. However, I think the rule might well be subject to that interpretation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not wish to take up too much time. Being a relatively new Member of the Senate, I do not profess to be an authority on the subject. I shall not undertake to explore the other possibilities in regard to the significance of the rule. It seems to me that generally it would be unfortunate for bills to be acted upon indiscriminately, without notice, under rule XIV. But the point is that the rule has been interpreted in this way; and, in all fairness, I think that, inasmuch as the rule was applied that way yesterday, if the rule means anything at all, it should be applied in exactly the same way in this case. If later on the Senate wishes to revise the rule, that will be a different matter.

But I do not think it would be proper to make a distinction in this case, based solely upon the question as to whether the Senator has raised the point under section 137 of the Reorganization Act. That would leave the matter in a wholly unsatisfactory situation. I believe the Senate must follow the language as it is written.

I should like to close my part of the debate and leave the remainder of the debate to other Senators who have had longer service and are much better versed in the Senate rules, and I shall be glad to have them elaborate on this subject.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, first in raising the question of committee jurisdiction under section 137 of the Reorganization Act, it is my contention that a portion of a paragraph which I shall read later is in contradiction of rule XIV. I think there can be no doubt of that, if we consider the language itself, rather than the background under which the Reorganization Act was passed.

Let me state in the beginning that I am not passing on the merits of this bill when I take the position that I should like to have it referred. The question of the merits of the bill is not at this time before the Senate. Senators may be in favor of or may be opposed to the bill, or they may be in favor of having the bill referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or they may be in favor of having it referred to the Finance Committee, but those questions are not now before the Senate. What is before the Senate is in reality an interpretation by the Senate of paragraph 137 of the Reorganization Act. That is why it is vital that the decision be made today, because we shall be establishing a precedent, which, if adopted, will place section 137 in conflict at least with rule XIV; and if it is not, then I think either the section or the rule should be clarified.

So I should like to have the RECORD show that there is to be no determination on the merits of the bill in this connection. Neither is there to be a determination now as to whether the bill should be referred to one committee or another committee, until the ruling is made. After the ruling is made, if any Member of the Senate disagrees with the ruling as to the reference of the bill, of course he can appeal from the decision, and that question can be debated.

There was a difference between the status of the so-called tidewater lands bill and the oleomargarine bill at the time when the points as to procedure were made. In answering the question asked by the Senator from Iowa, which I think is very pertinent, let me say that we have to read paragraph 4 and all the other paragraphs in order to understand the full import of rule XIV. Let me suggest that paragraph 2 of that rule provides that—

> Every bill and joint resolution shall receive three readings previous to its passage, which readings shall be on three different days—

That means three different legislative days—

> unless the Senate unanimously direct otherwise; and the Presiding Officer shall give notice at each reading whether it be the first, second, or third: *Provided*, That the first or second reading of each bill may be by title only, unless the Senate in any case shall otherwise order.

So, Mr. President, each bill requires three readings, and requires that those readings be had on different days. I point out to the Senate that they must be different legislative days.

The third paragraph of rule XIV provides that—

> No bill or joint resolution shall be committed or amended until it shall have been twice read, after which it may be referred to a committee—

Please note that it is not mandatory that a bill be referred to a committee. It may be referred to a committee, but, as I understand, there is no precedent which makes it mandatory that a bill be referred to a committee. It simply may be referred to a committee, after the second reading.

I read further from paragraph 3 of rule XIV:

> Bills and joint resolutions introduced on leave, and bills and joint resolutions from the House of Representatives, shall be read once, and may be read twice, on the same day, if not objected to—

Of course—

> for reference, but shall not be considered on that day nor debated, except for reference, unless by unanimous consent.

I think that clarifies the situation. In other words, it is not mandatory for the Presiding Officer to refer a bill to a committee after the second reading, but that may be done. That is discretionary with the occupant of the chair.

The portion of the fourth section of rule XIV on the basis of which the Senator from Arkansas relies in making his point of order reads as follows:

> And every bill and joint resolution introduced on leave, and every bill and joint resolution of the House of Representatives which shall have received a first and second reading without being referred to a committee, shall, if objection be made to further proceedings thereon, be placed on the calendar.

The senior Senator from California invoked this rule for the first time since I have been a Member of the Senate. He had a perfect right to do so. He stood on the floor and was recognized, and then said, "Mr. President, I object to any further proceedings in connection with this bill."

Then what happened? What is provided in the rule happened. The bill went to the calendar; and when the bill is on the calendar it takes its place with all other bills on the calendar; and the only way it can be brought before the Senate is by motion. In other words, it would have to be made the pending business, and that could be done by means of a motion for the consideration of the bill, as in the case of any other bill.

After the proceedings in reference to the tidelands bill, the President pro tempore referred to House bill 2245, the oleomargarine bill, and the question relative to the committee to which the bill should be referred. At that point the Senator from Arkansas inquired about the operation of rule XIV in that connection and inquired whether the bill had been read either the first or the second time. At that point it had not been read either the first or the second time. I myself stated that it was my desire that a ruling be made on the question of reference of the bill. I requested such a ruling.

Finally, after much discussion and controversy, which the Senator himself admits in his remarks today, the Chair was asked by the acting majority leader if the bill could be read. After the first reading had occurred the Senator from Arkansas took advantage of the same rule of which the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] also took advantage yesterday in connection with the tidelands bill, and asked that no further proceedings be had on that day in regard to that bill.

Yesterday the Senate adjourned, thus ending that legislative day, with the result that today we have a new legislative day.

Now we have the second reading of the bill. If the Senator's objection is sustained it will mean that after the second reading of the bill is had the bill will go to the calendar.

But prior to all that I raised once again the question of reference. The President pro tempore, who occupied the chair yesterday, as he does at this time, recognized the acting majority leader, the junior Senator from Nebraska, and I made the same statement that I made yesterday; namely, that a controversy had arisen with reference to which standing committee should have jurisdiction of the bill and the standing committee to which the bill should be referred, and I asked the Chair to rule. Of course, if no objection had been made the Chair would have ruled; and, regardless of whether the ruling thus made might have been favorable or unfavorable to any particular Senator, each and every Senator would have had the right, of course, to appeal from the ruling of the Chair, on the basis of the committee to which he preferred to have the bill referred. But a point of order was raised in keeping with the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Section 137, to be found on page 24, which I should like to read at this time, contains the following language:

> In any case in which a controversy arises—

I want Senators to note the language—

> In any case in which a controversy arises as to the jurisdiction of any standing committee of the Senate—

"The jurisdiction of any standing committee of the Senate"—not of this committee, not of that committee. It means, in any case, no matter what it is, when a controversy arises. It does not say a controversy here, or a controversy there, but if any controversy arises—

> as to the jurisdiction of any standing committee with respect to any proposed legislation—

First, in any case; second, any controversy; third, jurisdiction; and last, with respect to any proposed legislation. It seems to me that covers the whole book. Then what happens? When the point is raised, according to section 137, the

Chair makes the ruling. Section 137 provides:

The question of jurisdiction shall be decided by the Presiding Officer of the Senate, without debate—

What else?—

in favor of that committee which has jurisdiction over the subject matter which predominates in such proposed legislation; but such decision shall be subject to an appeal.

It may be argued that that particular section has nothing to do with anything except the jurisdiction of a committee, or of a particular committee. That is what we have got to decide this morning. Does this paragraph mean what it says? Does it mean that the only question that can be raised, in the light of the Legislative Reorganization Act, is the question, to which committee shall a bill be referred? If it means what it says, it seems to me that when a controversy arises and it is pointed out to the Presiding Officer that there is a question of the jurisdiction of a standing committee with respect to any legislation, the Presiding Officer is called upon to make a ruling. If the Presiding Officer in making the determination rules that it shall go to one committee over another, which is a part of his duty, then of course Senators have a right to appeal.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. After one more statement I shall yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Of course, each and every Member of the Senate can do what he thinks proper. It is for Senators to decide whether there is any meaning in section 137. I am convinced that the arguments advanced by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas are correct. I believe a Senator who invokes rule XIV has a right to object to the first reading or the second reading, and that if objection is made, it is mandatory upon the Presiding Officer to have the bill placed on the calendar. I think there can be no dispute about it, if we look only to rule XIV, which I interpret as I see it.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. In a moment, if the Senator please. I do not feel that that interpretation was intended by rule XIV, for the reason suggested by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. There cannot be orderly procedure in the Senate if each and every bill must go to the calendar upon objection. If that rule should be followed, the Senate would have to provide that a motion should be made that each and every bill so placed on the calendar should come off the calendar and onto the floor as the pending business, for assignment to a committee. That is my first point.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. In a moment. I have refused to yield to other Senators. I shall yield later. My second point is, if all bills go to the calendar, then the work of the standing committees would be by-passed. That was not intended. Certainly if we are to put all bills upon the calendar, thus by-passing the committees, which I have an idea is what was done by the distinguished Senator from California yesterday, the rule could be invoked for the benefit of one Senator, overriding the wish of other Senators, in the event of a tie vote, to prevent the Senate, in an orderly manner, sending bills to the standing committees, where they can be considered, where they can be discussed, where evidence may be taken, and the bill reported to the Senate in an orderly fashion, for debate and a third reading, to be followed in turn by either passage or rejection. If that is the correct interpretation of rule XIV, and if we are to invoke that rule each and every time a Senator does not want a bill referred to a standing committee, we shall then have utter confusion and chaos in our legislative procedure. It cannot be argued otherwise.

Mr. President, I am not sure that my interpretation of section 137 will be sustained by the Senate, but we are doing something more than simply passing judgment on the interpretation of section 137. We are in reality determining whether if and when there comes before the Senate a bill in respect to which a controversy arises, and any Senator asks the Presiding Officer for a ruling on the question of jurisdiction, and the Presiding Officer makes a ruling, there shall be an orderly determination of whether or not the bill shall be referred to this committee or that committee. In so doing we shall set a regular pattern that will obviate the difficulties which we now experience.

Just one more point, and then I shall conclude my remarks. Question might arise as to whether or not there was a controversy, and as to how the controversy should be raised. That point was made I think by one of the Senators yesterday, because at the time the Senator from Arkansas made his point of order, the complaint was made that no controversy had arisen, and there was no motion before the Senate. I should merely like to refer Members of the Senate to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday. There certainly was a controversy in the Senate about this bill. There was a controversy concerning whether it should be referred to any committee. There certainly was a controversy implied with respect to its reference to a certain committee. We all know that that is what is involved in respect to this bill, just as it was involved in respect to the bill which the Senator from California had placed on the calendar, as the result of his having invoked this particular rule. I do not know that it is necessary to read all the colloquy, but I shall read a portion of it:

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the chair has laid down the business. It is the desire of the Senator from Nebraska that the ruling be made on the question of reference of the bill.

I raised that question before a point of order was ever made. As for the ruling under section 137 of the Legislative Reorganization Act, which I think I had a right to ask——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will wait a moment, I shall yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I do not yield at this time for a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska declines to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to finish my observations, after which I shall be glad to yield to any Senator.

In the next place, as showing the existence of a controversy, I read the following statement by the Senator from Illinois:

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand the Chair to say that a point of order cannot be made under any circumstances, against what is now being attempted by the Chair?

The President pro tempore of the Senate replied:

The Chair does not understand the Senator's inquiry.

The Senator from Illinois:

Mr. LUCAS. Do I correctly understand the Chair to rule that simply because the Chair recognized the Senator from Nebraska, a point of order cannot be made or a statement cannot be made by the Senator from Arkansas in respect to a situation which, it seems to me, is on all fours with the similar situation which arose a few moments ago?

Of course, the Senator from Arkansas had a perfect right to invoke rule XIV, paragraph 4, if and when it is in order at any time. But I want to say to the distinguished Senators from Arkansas and Illinois that the Senator from Nebraska had already requested a ruling by the Chair, under section 137 of the Legislative Reorganization Act.

From that point, on page 5170 of the RECORD, there was continuous debate. Several times a demand was made for a ruling, and each time it was denied or foreclosed. The point is this: There was a difference, at the time the ruling was made, between the status of the tidelands bill and the status of the oleomargarine bill, although I agree that, at the proper time, in the reading of the bill, the rule could be invoked. That was after the Senator from Nebraska had asked for a ruling on the reference of the bill under section 137, which provides that where a controversy has arisen the Chair shall make a determination of jurisdiction and a further determination as to the committee to which the bill shall be referred.

I first yield to the Senator from Georgia, and then to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I largely agree with the Senator's able argument as to the inherent dangers of bypassing committees of the Senate. I would not favor a policy of parliamentary procedure which would deprive standing committees of their jurisdiction in the case of a bill which I favored any more than I would in the case of a bill which I opposed. Our whole parliamentary system is built upon the investigations conducted by committees. The detail work of legislation is done in the committees, and there should be no device which would enable a Senator to bypass a committee and deny it proper jurisdiction.

Mr. President, I think that some of the Senator's argument is somewhat specious and does not finally settle the question which is here involved. If the Chair had recognized the Senator from Nebraska yesterday, and if the Senator from Nebraska had insisted on the application of rule XIV to the olemargarine bill, if I correctly understand the Senator's argument, the Chair would have been compelled to order the bill to the calendar without any right——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think I could have objected, as did the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. I could have made my appeal and could have brought the question to an issue under section 137, which we are doing today, in reverse.

Mr. RUSSELL. Under the Senator's argument, the Chair and one Senator could bypass a standing committee of the Senate as was done in the case of the tidelands oil bill. It would be left absolutely in the discretion of the presiding officer as to whom he should recognize. That would not be an effective way of complying with section 137 of the Reorganzation Act.

Mr. WHERRY. I think the Senator has improperly stated the situation. It would not have made any difference whether the Chair recognized the Senator from Nebraska under section 137 of the Reorganization Act, or had recognized the Senator from Arkansas, under rule XIV. Each one would have had the right to object and to appeal from the decision of the Chair if a ruling were made.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no. Under the Senator's argument, if the Chair had recognized the Senator from Arkansas first and the Senator had asserted his right under rule XIV, the Chair would have had no option but to order the bill to the calendar. Then how could the Senator raise the question under section 137?

Mr. WHERRY. Would not the junior Senator from Nebraska have had a perfect right to disagree with the Chair's action sustaining the objection, to appeal from the decision of the Chair, and to argue and debate the question under section 137?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not say that the Senator from Nebraska did not have the right to insist on section 137 when he was recognized. The point I raise is that if the Senator from Nebraska had insisted that the bill go to the calendar under rule XIV, there would have been no way to prevent it. There would have been no method of raising the question of jurisdiction under section 137. We have really done nothing toward deciding the question, in the way it is now presented to the Senate, except to say that the Chair and one Senator can operate under rule XIV to keep a bill from a standing committee, but that no single Senator can do so unless he is recognized, and that if a controversy is raised under section 137 the Senator raising it must be recognized first. That does not settle this very grave question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall yield next to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], if the Senator from Georgia has concluded.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator some questions as to what would have happened when the Senator was first recognized if he had said, "Mr. President, I insist that this bill be read the second time and go to the calendar."

Mr. WHERRY. In other words, what would have happened if I had taken the same position as was taken by the Senator from Arkansas? Is that the question?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. The bill would have gone to the calendar. I could have disagreed with the decision of the Chair. I could have appealed and presented in my appeal section 137. But I think the Senator from Nebraska is in a better position than he otherwise would have been under that procedure, because section 137 provides for the event of a controversy. I think the Senator from Nebraska was recognized even before the Senator from Arkansas had a right to make his objection, because the bill had not been read even once when he made his objection. So at the time I brought up the issue that there was a controversy and asked for a ruling, I did it under the provisions of section 137 of the Reorganization Act, which I had the right to do. At that time the President pro tempore made a ruling, and if his ruling had not been satisfactory an appeal could have been taken.

I now yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the Senator indulge me for one further observation before he yields to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; I shall be glad to.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not complaining that the Senator from Nebraska asserted his rights under section 137. I am insisting that we are not making any progress in this matter when the Chair and one Senator can deny the jurisdiction of a standing committee of the Senate if the Chair recognizes a Senator to insist upon rule 14 rather than to raise the issue of jurisdiction under section 137 of the Reorganization Act.

Mr. WHERRY. The only way we can make progress, if we are to invoke rule XIV, is to change the rule. Otherwise any Senator can object to a reference being made; and the only way we can get a bill off the calendar is to get a special order. That certainly would cause chaos in the Senate. By asking an interpretation of section 137 when the Senator from Nebraska was recognized and requested that the bill be referred, a ruling would have been made. If it was a question of reference, we would have had a vote yesterday and the bill would have been referred yesterday. Today where is it? If the objection is sustained, it goes to the calendar. We can get it off the calendar only if there are sufficient votes to bring it up for consideration.

I now yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, in reading rule XIV, paragraph 4, I find a certain vagueness in the last sentence:

> which shall have received a first and second reading without being referred to a committee.

The inquiry I wish to make is, At whose discretion is a bill which is introduced referred to a committee or not referred to a committee?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is reading a section of the rule which is one of the imponderable factors in this entire contemplation. What the language probably means is that if a bill has received a first and second reading, but has not yet been referred in the interlude, this right can be invoked.

Mr. FLANDERS. That means, if the Presiding Officer had not spoken quickly enough.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senate procedure had unrolled in due course. It is perfectly obvious, from the discussion, that the language is subject to various interpretations, and perfectly clearly, under the general situation with which the Senate is confronted, it is very important that the Committee on Rules and Administration should take rule XIV within its jurisdiction for a bit of laundering.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise respectfully to say, in answer to the statement which the Chair has made, that I believe the rule should be interpreted in the light of the second paragraph on page 330 of Jefferson's Manual. I point out to the President pro tempore that yesterday, when the tidelands bill was being read, the President pro tempore said:

> Without objection, the bill will be regarded as having been read the second time, as is the usual procedure, for the purpose of permitting the Senator from California to be heard.

In paragraph 4 of rule XIV this language occurs:

> Every bill and joint resolution of the House of Representatives which shall have received a first and second reading without being referred to a committee shall, if objection be made to further proceeding thereon, be placed on the calendar.

I submit, Mr. President, that the Chair should have said yesterday, before permitting the Senator from California to speak, "The question before the Senate is, Shall this bill be referred?" In the case of a contested bill, if no Senator makes such a motion, then the question may arise as to whether the bill should be read the third time, and at that point the Senator from California could object to its being read the third time.

The Senate is proceeding now under difficulty because of section 137 of the so-called La Follette law. If we adopt the procedure that was adopted yesterday, we shall get into a very difficult situation, because of what may be done in the future, perhaps, if Senators are not aware of what is happening.

I believe that the Chair is entirely correct in recognizing the Senator from Nebraska this morning to make a motion to

refer. I agree with the Senator from Georgia that if the ruling of yesterday shall stand, no Senator should be deprived of a fundamental right, the right to object, by the exercise of the Chair's discretion in recognizing A or in recognizing B.

But I submit, Mr. President, that section 137 of the Reorganization Act and paragraph 4 of rule XIV can be interpreted together. If, when such a question arises, the Chair puts the question, Shall this bill be referred? and if there is no motion that it shall be referred, then any Senator, as in the case of the Senator from California yesterday, can object to a third reading. But if we leave the procedure as it now seems to be, any bill coming over from the House can be read the second time, and if some Senator is on his toes, it can be objected to and placed on the calendar. This may be a very dangerous proceeding, because there will then be no reference to a committee.

I agree with the Chair that the two provisions should be correlated by an amendment to rule XIV, but I submit that in the present situation the Senate should follow the Chair in recognizing the Senator from Nebraska to make a motion to refer the bill to a committee. I personally shall so vote. I hope that then the Senator from Arkansas will appeal from the ruling of the Chair on the reference if he desires to do so, in order that the issue of the reference of the oleomargarine bill may then be debated and decided on the merits.

As I see it, the question before the Senate is one of procedure, and I say most respectfully that I believe the Chair yesterday should have put the question, Shall this bill be referred to a committee? If that had been done and the Senator from California not just permitted to have an opportunity to be heard, then the question as to whether the Senator from Arkansas today was losing a parliamentary right, the right to object, would not have been raised. I say that most respectfully and most humbly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair may make a simple comment, in order to keep the record straight.

The interpretation submitted by the able Senator from Massachusetts is one of several interpretations that could be made of the rule. It may be a preferable interpretation. There should be no preference left to the Presiding Officer in the application of a rule, and in that aspect the Chair totally agrees with the Senator from Georgia, and the sole purpose of the Chair this morning is to relieve the Chair of the privilege of outlawing the parliamentary rights of one Senator by recognizing another.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the statement just made by the distinguished Presiding Officer. Obviously if we follow the rule now attempted to be invoked under section 137 of the Reorganization Act, what the Presiding Officer has stated is evidently correct. I know of no way by which the situation can be cured, under the present rules of the Senate and under the Reorganization Act.

The Senator from Illinois, like the Senator from Nebraska, is not at this time interested in the merits of the case; he is not interested in anything but orderly procedure from the standpoint of parliamentary law in the United States Senate.

In view of the fact that this is the first time any question has been raised under rule XIV during the life of any Senator now a Member of this body, so far as I know, and the distinguished Presiding Officer having made a ruling under rule XIV, thereby establishing a precedent on yesterday, the Senator from Illinois insists that in order for the Senate to be consistent as the result of that ruling, the Presiding Officer cannot make a different ruling the following day on a similar bill.

Mr. President, let me call attention to what happened yesterday. I refer to page 5168 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under the caption "Ownership of tideland waters." The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] was recognized, and the following debate followed:

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask that the President pro tempore lay before the Senate House bill 5992.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate House bill 5992, just received from the House, which will be read by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5992) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within Stae boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be regarded as having been read the second time, as is the usual procedure, for the purpose of permitting the Senator from California to be heard.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I desire to object to any further proceedings on this measure at the present time.

Then the Senator from Illinois propounded a parliamentary inquiry as to the status of the bill, and the President pro tempore said:

The bill has been read the second time; and, under rule XIV, paragraph 4, objection to further proceedings results in placing the bill on the calendar instead of referring it to a committee. From the calendar any Senator at any time the bill is before the Senate for consideration can move to have it sent to the committee.

Mr. President, there is the precedent which the distinguished Presiding Officer laid down yesterday in connection with the tidelands bill. In other words, the Presiding Officer recognized the objection made by the Senator from California as valid under rule 14, and sent the tidelands bill to the calendar. That is the first precedent we have had under rule XIV for many, many years; no Senator can find any precedent prior to this time with respect to it.

Mr. President, I agree with the distinguished Presiding Officer that the conflict is an unfortunate one. I agree with the Presiding Officer that this is one of the serious moments in the history of the Senate, so far as parliamentary law is concerned, and I agree with all that has been said with respect to rule XIV, insofar as the creation of chaos and confusion is concerned as a result of some Senator coming forward at the proper time, making an objection, and having a bill sent to the calendar.

On the other hand, that is not the point before the Senate. The question is one of following a precedent laid down by the Presiding Officer yesterday, and if chaos and confusion result under this rule, the Committee on Rules and Administration should meet at once and do exactly what the Presiding Officer has suggested, namely, prepare an amendment to the rule so that chance for such difficulty in the future will be eliminated.

Mr. President, this is the position in which the Senate finds itself at the moment: Yesterday the tidelands bill went to the calendar upon objection. I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] in what he has said. In my humble opinion, under the strict construction of rule XIV, after the second reading of the bill the Chair should have asked whether there was objection to it, and if there had been no objection, then it should have been referred to the proper committee.

Mr. President, in what situation do we find ourselves today? The Chair, instead of following the precedent he set on yesterday, instead of recognizing the Senator from Arkansas, which would have been consistent with his recognition of the Senator from California, so that the Senator from Arkansas could have made objection and the bill have gone to the calendar—instead of that, the distinguished President Officer recognized the able Senator from Nebraska for the purpose of telling the Chair that a controversy exists as to what committee the oleomargarine bill should be referred. In my humble judgment, if we follow rule XIV strictly, and follow the precedent laid down on yesterday, before a bill can reach the point of reference it must have a first and second reading, and there must be a pronouncement by the Chair requesting whether or not there is objection to the bill, and if so, it goes to the calendar, and if no objection is made, then the reference is in order.

Mr. President, I totally disagree with the meaning which is ascribed to section 137 as taking any priority over the rule XIV of the Senate. Why is section 137 in the Reorganization Act?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to finish the point if I may. Under the old system in vogue before the Reorganization Act came into being, a Senator would arise, receive recognition, and introduce a bill, and request that it be referred to, let us say, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. If there was any question about it at all the Senator himself had to raise the question. He could request or he could move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The only difference between the old system and the system which prevails under section 137 of the Reorganization Act is simply that section 137 places the responsibility upon the Chair in the first instance of making the order of referral, and then if a Senator is not satisfied with the decision of the Chair he has the right to appeal. It seems to me that that is the only dis-

tinction between what we did in previous days and what we are doing at the present time under the Reorganization Act.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I was not on the floor when the distinguished Senator from Illinois began his remarks. I do not know whether he called to the attention of the Senate the fact that I adopted a somewhat unusual procedure in asking the Chair to lay the bill before the Senate. The ordinary procedure is that when a bill comes to the Senate from the House, as a matter of routine action, unless some Senator calls for its presentation to the Senate, it automatically is referred to committee. A Senator has, however, under the rules, the right to ask that when a bill comes from the House it be presented to the Senate. I made that request. I held the floor. The distinguished Presiding Officer did what seems to me is clearly provided for; he followed the usual routine of asking unanimous consent to have the bill read the first and second times. I was then in possession of the floor. As I understand, I had three alternatives. I could have asked unanimous consent to have had the bill read the third time, and it would then have been on the Senate floor and open to amendment. I had the opportunity to ask that it be referred to a particular committee, and have raised the issue, or, clearly under the rule, I had the right, as I stated, to object to further proceedings, to prevent the bill going to a third reading, or to prevent it going to a committee, thus having it placed upon the calendar.

I might add that I cannot see that the Senate has been placed in a difficult situation. There is a bill on the subject now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate. A majority of the Senate must consent to the bill being made the business of the Senate before any action can be taken. If a majority of the Senate wants to refer the bill to the committee it can do so.

I should like, with the kindness of the Senator from Illinois, to add one further thought.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from California will not take too much of my time.

Mr. DOWNEY. I shall take only 2 or 3 minutes. The course I followed may be considered to be an unusual one, but I took it in order to avail myself of my right or remedy. I think I was clearly entitled to do what I did. I did it for one reason. By a heavy majority vote the House and the Senate passed a similar bill last year. By a vote of 10 to 1 the House this year passed the bill we are discussing. Without any reflection upon members of the Committee on the Judiciary, I will say that I understand that there is a question whether they will be able, for reasons of their own, and I am not critical, to report the bill now in committee in time for the Senate to act upon it. I have no desire to bypass the committee. I still think the committee has ample time to report the bill they have before it. I hope they will do so. But believing, as I do upon good ground, that there is a strong majority of the House and Senate now for the bill, I think I was entitled to use the ordinary parliamentary procedure to place the Senate in a position where a majority of the Senate could pass upon this question, if it desired, or if a majority of the Senate wanted to abide by the decision of the Committee on the Judiciary, and not even vote to have the bill taken up, a majority of the Senate could do that. In any event, I want to assure the distinguished acting majority leader and the Senate that there is not the slightest disposition on my part to fail to give the Committee on the Judiciary full opportunity either to report the bill now in committee favorably, or table it, or take whatever action it desires.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. In one moment. I thought the Senator from California was going to ask me a question. However the statement made is perfectly all right in my time. Let me assure the Senator from California that I am not one who has been complaining about the procedure he took on yesterday. In my judgment he did what was within his right under the rules of the United States Senate. Criticism of what he did came from the other side, and I think it was unjustified, I will say to the Senator from California, so far as the rules of the Senate are concerned.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to make one further observation, Mr. President, and then I shall yield the floor, so far as the present discussion is concerned. I am still talking about orderly procedure in the United States Senate, and I am talking about fundamental parliamentary law. I seriously contend that when we adopt a policy one day and then repudiate it the next day we are not making substantial parliamentary law for the future of the Senate. That, however, is exactly what is being done here. In other words, the power is left in the hands of the Presiding Officer as to whom he shall recognize, and if the Presiding Officer is to be consistent with his ruling made on yesterday he must recognize the Senator from Arkansas because the Senator from Arkansas was on his feet yesterday to make the objection at the proper time, and the Senator from Arkansas was following yesterday the precedent which had been laid down by the Presiding Officer a few minutes before.

So what has happened? This great power has been left in the hands of the Presiding Officer, to be exercised as between one Member of the Senate and another, according to his whim, his caprice, his prejudice, or his political views. I say that with the utmost kindness to the distinguished Presiding Officer who is now in the chair, the President pro tempore, because in the time I have been in the Senate I have seen four presiding officers, and I will say to the Senate and to the country that the distinguished present Presiding Officer is one of the most fair and one of the most just men we have had to preside over the deliberations of this body.

The point I make, however, is that the President pro tempore laid down yesterday a precedent for the first time respecting rule XIV, and on the following day the same Presiding Officer, the President pro tempore, instead of recognizing the Senator from Arkansas in order to be consistent with what he did the day before, recognized the Senator from Nebraska, in order to get away from the point that the Senator from Arkansas was going to make.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to clarify one point which was made by the Senator from Nebraska with respect to the timing of this action. Actually the question of controversy was raised by the Chair himself in the first instance. I invite attention to page 5170 of the RECORD of yesterday, in the second column. I submitted a parliamentary inquiry:

> Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is there any reason why House bill 2225 cannot be placed on the calendar in the same way that House bill 5992 was placed on the calendar?

This was before the Senator from Nebraska made any point about a reference or a controversy. The presiding officer answered:

> The Chair thinks so, in view of the fact that the question of reference has been reached, and submitted to the Senate by the Chair himself.

The question had not been presented by the Senator from Nebraska at that point at all. The Chair had raised the question in a preliminary stage. It was not subsequent to the statement of the Senator from Nebraska.

> Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does this action of the Chair preclude the operation of rule XIV?

I may say for the information of the Senate that I had inquired of the Parliamentarian on last Friday if rule XIV would apply. He informed me that he did not think so. I am referring, of course, to the operation of the rule with respect to placing the bill on the calendar. I may say further that the conditions are quite similar to those in connection with the tidelands bill, because a bill identical with the oleomargarine bill is now pending before the Finance Committee of the Senate. I introduced the bill last December. Similarly, there is a tidelands bill pending before the Committee on the Judiciary. So the argument that the bill is already before the committee, and that our action makes no difference, would apply in this instance.

I may add further that I had no real intention of placing this bill on the calendar, or even attempting to do so, until the action taken with reference to the tidelands bill. I had prepared no motion and had no intention of doing so.

I agree with everything the Senator from Illinois says about the merits of this rule. I seriously doubt that any bill should bypass the committee. I join in this appeal today largely because of the wish to clarify the situation, and not because of its bearing upon the oleomargarine bill. I hope Senators will understand that in my mind this has no bearing whatever on the merits of the

oleomargarine legislation. This is purely a question of parliamentary law, and I do not want the Members of the Senate to be confused.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I shall conclude with one further observation. I agree with everything that has been said with respect to rule XIV. Rule XIV is ambiguous; it is vague; it is uncertain; it is cockeyed, so far as reaching any agreement upon its proper interpretation. However, I undertake to say that we are not helping the situation by what we are about to do in connection with using section 137 to get around the rule. An interpretation of rule XIV has been made. That interpretation should be sustained if we are to have orderly procedure, and for obvious reasons the Chair should be relieved of the difficult situation involved in recognizing individual Senators on the floor of the Senate, when recognition amounts to a decision as to what may be done.

I sincerely hope that the point of order made by the Senator from Arkansas will be sustained; and I hope that after that the oleomargarine bill will go to the proper committee so that hearings may be held upon it. I am not trying to place the oleomargarine bill on the calendar in order to avoid hearings. What I am attempting to do is to sustain parliamentary procedure in the United States Senate, in order that we may avoid weaving all over the place, with a decision one day and, because of the power of the Chair, doing just the opposite the next day. That is not good for Senate procedure. It is not good for the country.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not intend to detain the Senate long. I think it should be perfectly clear, however, that my colleague the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] should not be subject to any criticism for invoking a rule which is plainly a rule of the Senate, albeit it has apparently not been used for a considerable time.

Every protection we enjoy on the floor of the United States Senate rests on the rules, and usually there are good reasons for the rules. As a new member I have at times differed with my colleagues as to the advisability of some of the rules; but until they are changed, the Senate should, of course, follow them.

However, I believe that the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has raised a point which has not been given sufficient consideration. It involves the background of the rule which was invoked by my colleague, the senior Senator from California.

Those of us who have from time to time read the early proceedings of the United States Senate know that the committee system which we have gradually built up has been the result of evolution. In the early days of the Republic Senators did not have the volume of business that confronts the Senate today. Therefore in those days it was not customary to have standing committees. After the first and second reading of a bill, in many cases it was the procedure of the Senate to go to the third reading of the bill. The Senate might have adopted the alternative of meeting in Committee of the Whole, or referring the bill to a special committee. Our present system of numerous standing committees is something which has evolved over the years.

With particular reference to the rule which has been invoked, I invite attention to what the Senator from Massachusetts has already referred to, namely, page 330 of Jefferson's Manual. I read:

> In the Senate of the United States, the President reports the title of the bill, that this is the second time of reading it; that it is now to be considered as in a Committee of the Whole; and the question will be whether it shall be read a third time, or that it may be referred to a special committee.

In the Senate we operate according to a great many precedents. Apparently the rule under which we are proceeding, rule XIV, paragraphs 3 and 4, grew out of Jefferson's Manual.

I agree with the sentiments which have been expressed on the floor today. I speak as a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration. I think we have uncovered a rule which, unless it is corrected, will obviously lead to a great deal of legislative chaos. Therefore, regardless of the result of the vote on the pending question, I sincerely hope that the able chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], will call a meeting of the committee at the earliest possible time so that we may correct this situation. However, so long as the rule exists as it is now written, the senior Senator from California was merely standing on his rights as a Member of the United States Senate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to address an inquiry to the distinguished Senator from California. I was not present yesterday, and my question may duplicate questions which arose yesterday. If so, I am sorry to intrude on the time of the Senator.

I notice that section 101 (a) of the Reorganization Act states that the rules contemplated by it shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith. The referral provision in section 102 with respect to each standing committee contains the following language:

> To which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

The distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] has pointed out section 137 of the Reorganization Act. I should like the opinion of the Senator from California as to whether or not the language which I have read supersedes other matters in the rules which might be in conflict.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator has posed a $64 question in that regard. I am not seeking to evade the question, because I think it is one to which the Senate must give very careful consideration at this time. So far as legislative procedure is concerned, I think there is very little doubt in the minds of most of us that if as a matter of common practice we prevent committees from considering legislation, we shall develop a great degree of legislative chaos. I call the attention of the able Senator from Colorado, however, to the fact that the Constitution itself gives to each House—I do not have the exact language before me now—the power to establish its own rules and procedures. The Legislative Reorganization Act, of course, is an act of both Houses of Congress. I assume that to that extent the Senate rules may be amended by that act; and if that be the case, that has the effect, as I think the Senator from Colorado will agree with me, of having the House participate in an amendment of the Senate rules, inasmuch as the bill was passed by both Houses of Congress.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the Reorganization Act itself takes full recognition of that constitutional provision, when it says, in section 101 (b):

> With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

My point is that these rules supersede the previously existing rules, to the extent that they have not been changed since and to the extent that there is conflict. These rules say without equivocation that all proposed legislation shall be referred to the respective committees, according to the jurisdiction outlined in the act.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Colorado that I think he has raised a very important point and one which I believe might very well be taken, namely, that inasmuch as the Reorganization Act came later than the particular rule referred to, the Reorganization Act, in effect, to that extent amended rule XIV.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If it did not, then there is no validity in the Reorganization Act.

Mr. KNOWLAND. And if so, then certainly there is a conflict between the Reorganization Act, particularly the section 137 to which the Senator has referred, and the existing rules of the Senate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Section 137 fits in perfectly with the language which I have read, which makes it mandatory to refer bills to these committees.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I had not intended to go into a discussion of this matter at this time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this point?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to say, in further answer to the Senator from Colorado, that I believe the provision of the Reorganization Act to which he has referred does not directly supersede rule XIV. The purpose of rule XIV is to give the Senate notice that the bill has been received at the desk, and it is read once so that the Senate has notice, and then it is read twice so that the Senate has notice. Then the question arises whether the bill should be referred under rule XIV. If there is a reference under rule XIV, then a bill which relates to agricultural mat-

ters must be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the whole burden of the debate on the part of those Senators who support the objection, and who are thus opposed to a reference of the bill, seems to be that we are violating a precedent under rule XIV; and that under all the precedents if objection was made a bill went to the calendar; and that therefore we are in complete violation of rule XIV if we make a determination under section 137 of the Reorganization Act.

I should like to state that if that is all that is at stake in reference to this particular bill, it seems to me that the Senate might act on the question of eliminating rule XIV entirely or making some amendment to it. If the acting majority leader were now to request unanimous consent that rule XIV be suspended for the purpose of permitting a decision to be made in regard to the reference of this particular measure, would such unanimous consent be given? Would any Senator object to such a request, which would be made solely for the purpose of permitting a determination to be made in regard to the reference of this one bill?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I would object, because I think the Reorganization Act has already rendered that part of rule XIV inoperative, for the simple reason that the Reorganization Act says that all bills shall be referred to this, that, or the other committee, according to its jurisdiction. That provision conflicts with placing the bill on the calendar, without referral. By the express language of the Reorganization Act, anything which conflicts with it shall be governed by its terms.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I have been greatly impressed by the point which has been made by the Senator from Colorado, and I think it well deserves the study and the respectful consideration of the Senate.

However, before considering that point, I should like to address myself to this proposition: It seems to me that clearly by the terms of subdivisions 3 and 4 of rule XIV it is contemplated that an opportunity to refer the bill shall have been afforded. Mention has been made today that subdivision 3 of rule XIV provides that—

> No bill or joint resolution shall be committed or amended until it shall have been twice read, after which it may be referred to a committee.

Obviously, that portion of rule XIV means that there may be an opportunity for the reference of a bill to a committee, before some Senator may say that he instantaneously objects to any further proceedings, and may ask that the bill be placed on the calendar.

Therefore, it seems to me that both paragraph 3 and paragraph 4 of rule XIV obviously contemplates that before any Senator immediately following the second reading of a bill shall have a right by mere objection to prevent any further proceedings, with the result that the bill is then placed on the calendar, opportunity must be afforded to the Senate or to the Presiding Officer of the Senate, or both, to refer the bill.

I was greatly impressed by the point made by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and it seems to me that in substance it is precisely the point I have referred to, namely, that when a bill has been read the second time, it does not follow, therefore, that the instant after it has been read, during the momentary drawing of breath before there is a referral, some Senator may, by means of objecting to further proceedings, cause the adoption of a course contrary to reference. It seems to me that clearly there should be afforded both to the Presiding Officer and to the Senate an opportunity, first, to determine whether the bill shall be referred. I think that is doubly true because of the provisions of paragraph 3 of rule XIV, which distinctly contemplate, not that after a bill has been read the second time it may then be placed on the calendar as a result of the action of one Senator, but, obviously, as I have indicated, that no bill or joint resolution shall be committed or amended until it shall have been twice read, after which it may be referred to a committee. Clearly that opportunity is not afforded if the construction urged by the Senator from Arkansas is to be applied.

With respect to section 137 of the Reorganization Act, I do not see that there is any conflict between it and rule XIV. It would appear to me that if an opportunity to have a bill referred must be afforded before the remedy which was invoked yesterday by the Senator from California may be applied, then it likewise follows that an opportunity to present a controversy in regard to a decision as to the committee to which the bill shall be referred must likewise be afforded to the Senate before the course of action taken by the Senator from California can be properly taken.

So it appears to me that the Senator from Nebraska is perfectly within his rights and that the Senate is protected by the position he takes today. Therefore, I think that under the terms of both section 3 and section 4 of rule XIV of the Senate Rules, it is clearly the intention, not that instantly after its second reading the bill can be placed on the calendar simply because one Senator makes such a request, but that at that moment there shall be an opportunity during which, to quote section 3 of rule XIV, the bill or joint resolution "may be referred to a committee."

It would appear to me, inasmuch as that inference obviously follows, that today the Senate has a right to consider whether the bill shall be referred, and that as an ancillary right, it may consider which committee shall receive the bill.

Mr. President, as I have indicated, I think the point raised by the Senator from Colorado is likewise exceedingly interesting. It had not occurred to me, and I have not given it sufficient thought to express with any finality an opinion upon it, but it would seem to me that certainly the fact that the language of the reorganization plan as applied, for illustration, to the Committee on Banking and Currency, which I think is illustrative of all, namely, "Committee on Banking and Currency, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects," at least raises a very strong point in favor of the proposition suggested by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The language is precisely the same in connection with every other standing committee.

Mr. DONNELL. I assumed it was, though I had not taken the time to see.

Mr. MILLIKIN. No exceptions are carved out. It does not say "subject to an exception contained in rule XIV." The language is completely mandatory that all bills shall be referred to the committees having jurisdiction.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I would say in that regard that I am greatly impressed by that proposition, though I do not think it necessary to rely upon that in order to sustain the action taken here by the Senator from Nebraska this morning. It would appear to me, therefore, that on the ground that the rules of the Senate, rule IV, subdivisions 3 and 4, clearly contemplate an opportunity being afforded to Senators to seek reference of a bill before one Senator can block reference, and inasmuch as it logically follows from that that the opportunity to present a controversy as to which committee the reference shall be made likewise exists, the action taken this morning, the suggestion made, and the motion made by the Senator from Nebraska should be sustained, and the point of order raised by the Senator from Arkansas should be overruled.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I accept the Senator's argument sustaining the position of the Senator from Nebraska. I was not clear how the Senator sustained the correctness of the ruling of the Chair yesterday with regard to my point of order.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, with great respect to the Chair, my judgment is that the ruling was in error. I think, as does the Senator from Massachusetts, if I may answer the question, that the proper position to have been taken at that moment was to have given the Senate the right to determine whether the bill should be referred.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I may say to the Senator from Missouri that it was because of that ruling that the point of order was made.

Mr. DONNELL. I am sorry; I could not hear the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It was because of that ruling, which was made immediately preceding the bringing up of this matter, that the whole point arose. I think the Senator will admit it is rather difficult procedure to have two rulings so inconsistent in the course of 2 days. That is really the only reason for the argument today. It is not to try to settle

the question involved on the real merits of oleomargarine legislation.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, as has been pointed out, I think the situation today is different, in fact, from what it was yesterday, because, as I understand, the motion of the Senator from Nebraska was made after the second reading.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. But I am free to say that in my judgment—and I understand it is also the judgment of the Senator from Massachusetts, who has spoken—the proper procedure yesterday would have been not to permit one Senator to take the bill beyond the control of the Senate with respect of reference and place it upon the calendar. I think the proper procedure would have been to give to the Senate the opportunity, which is clearly contemplated, I think, by rule XIV, to itself exercise the right of determining whether a reference should be made. Today the Senator from Nebraska has presented that proposition. He has presented it along the line of a controversy as to which of two committees shall have jurisdiction over this particular bill. But what he has presented is clearly a corollary of and arises by virtue of the right of the Senate to pass upon the question as to whether the bill shall be referred.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. WHERRY. The morning hour will be concluded at 2 o'clock, will it not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. If a vote is not had between now and 2 o'clock, then the pending business would automatically be set aside, and the Science Foundation bill would be the pending business before the Senate, would it not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is true, as the Senator from Nebraska well knows.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will realize that fact. If possible, I should like to have a vote between now and 2 o'clock on the motion which is before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not wish, of course, to engage in any controversy with any Senators regarding their interpretation of the RECORD in the last 24 hours, but inasmuch as there is considerable importance attaching to what the RECORD will disclose, and without intending to be controversial but merely to state the other side of the situation, the Chair would like to say he thinks there is no collision whatever between the precedent of yesterday and the precedent of today. The Chair thinks that the tidelands bill was in a totally different parliamentary situation from the oleo bill, that there was no question of reference to a committee involved, no question of controversy regarding what committee had jurisdiction, that there was nothing of the sort involved, and that therefore paragraph 137 of the Legislative Reorganization Act was not even a part of the first precedent to which Senators have referred.

Therefore the Chair, preserving his own reputation for some degree of alleged logic and consistency, respectfully states for the RECORD that he thinks the precedents do not collide.

The question before the Senate is, the point of order raised by the Senator from Arkansas, and the precise point upon which the Senate will vote is this: Is the point of order of the Senator from Arkansas well taken?

May the Chair undertake in just two sentences to indicate to Senators precisely what they are voting on, in that connection. If the point of order raised by the Senator from Arkansas is sustained, the bill (H. R. 2245) will not be referred to a committee but will go to the calendar.

If the point of order raised by the Senator from Arkansas is not sustained, the Chair will then rule upon the reference of the bill (H. R. 2245) to the committee he thinks has jurisdiction under the instructions of the Reorganization Act. That reference, if unsatisfactory to the Senate, will in turn be subject to an appeal. The pending question is, Is the point of order of the Senator from Arkansas well taken?

Mr. MAYBANK. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if there is to be a record vote on this question, I feel I must make a brief statement.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I realize that the Senator has a perfect right to debate this question. If a yea-and-nay vote is insisted upon, it will go beyond the hour of 2 o'clock. I wonder if the request for a yea-and-nay vote may not be withdrawn, so as to permit us to vote on this question before the hour of 2 o'clock.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia has the floor. Does he yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, due to the lateness of the hour, it being 10 minutes to 2, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays have already been ordered. Is there objection to rescinding the order?

Mr. WATKINS. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, every sympathy I have in connection with this question is with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] regarding the point of order he has made. I do not see any difference between the situation existing in this case and that obtaining in the case of the tidelands oil bill. The question of jurisdiction is inherent as to any piece of legislation coming before the Senate. It is there, whether the point be raised by a Senator or whether it be not raised. If section 137 of the Reorganization Act takes precedence over the Senate rules, there can be no question that the Senator from Arkansas will have been done an injustice with respect to the point of order he has raised simply because he was not recognized before the Senator from Nebraska.

I further sympathize with the Senator because I am strongly committed to the proposition which he seeks to espouse; namely, the repeal of taxes on oleomargarine. I shall not debate the merits of that question further at this time other than to say that I do not think such taxes can ever be justified by either reason, justice, or logic. In my mind, the overweening question before the Senate today is whether we shall establish a system whereby the jurisdiction of standing committees of the Senate can be bypassed. Under the precedent of yesterday, in the tidelands bill case, if the Chair sees fit to recognize any Senator for the purpose of interposing an objection, such jurisdiction can be taken from committees. If I happen to be upon the floor at any time in the future when an objection is lodged under rule 14, I shall respectfully appeal from the decision of the Chair, because it is manifestly unfair to have a rule that the Chair can recognize one Senator for the purpose of defeating the wishes of the Senate or for the purpose of denying a Senate committee of jurisdiction, or that the Chair can, at his option, recognize another Senator for the purpose of raising the question of jurisdiction. It should be settled. I regret very much that on yesterday we were all caught somewhat off our feet and did not give the ruling the serious consideration to which it was entitled. An appeal should have been entered to the Chair's ruling. I believe that if it had been fought out on the floor of the Senate the Members of this body could have seen the irreparable injury that would be worked on our committee system and would have established definitely the proposition that section 137 had precedence over rule 14 and that all bills should be referred to committee. I sympathize with the Senator from Arkansas. I know he has not been treated exactly fairly as a Member of the Senate when he is denied the same treatment which was accorded to the Senator from California yesterday. I shall take every step possible to have his bill dealt with fairly but I cannot by my vote, even in this situation, establish a precedent which will destroy the committee system of the United States Senate and of the Congress, because if that be done we shall have destroyed our parliamentary system. So, reluctantly and sick at heart at being compelled to do so, I shall vote against the motion of the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I want to say that I certainly did not enter into this controversy with the idea of its having any bad effect upon the oleomargarine bill. Personally, I think the rule is a bad rule, and I so stated yesterday. I entered into the controversy today largely with a view of clarifying a point which I think the Senate now admits involves a serious danger. I think it is well

to have the Committee on Rules and Administration consider it. A vote not to sustain the point of order, in my own view, is certainly not a bad vote. I was not approaching it from that standpoint. I think the question has been clarified. It has nothing to do with the merits of the oleomargarine bill.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Chair restate the question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question upon which the Senate will vote is this: Is the point of order of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] well taken? Those Senators who agree with the viewpoint of the Senator from Arkansas will vote "yea"; those who disagree will vote "nay." The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] are necessarily absent. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], if present and voting, would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] is unavoidably detained on official committee business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent because of illness in their families.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent on official business.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 15, nays 56, as follows:

YEAS—15

Connally	Kilgore	Murray
Fulbright	Lucas	O'Daniel
Green	McClellan	O'Mahoney
Hatch	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
Johnston, S. C.	Moore	Tydings

NAYS—56

Aiken	Brewster	Butler
Baldwin	Brooks	Byrd
Ball	Buck	Cain
Capper	Knowland	Robertson, Wyo.
Chavez	Langer	Russell
Cooper	Lodge	Saltonstall
Cordon	McCarthy	Smith
Donnell	McFarland	Stennis
Downey	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	McKellar	Thye
Ecton	McMahon	Tobey
Ferguson	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Gurney	Malone	Watkins
Hayden	Martin	Wherry
Hickenlooper	Millikin	Wiley
Hoey	Morse	Williams
Ives	Myers	Wilson
Johnson, Colo.	Reed	Young
Kem	Robertson, Va.	

NOT VOTING—25

Barkley	Hawkes	Sparkman
Bricker	Hill	Stewart
Bridges	Holland	Taft
Bushfield	Jenner	Taylor
Capehart	McCarran	Umstead
Dworshak	O'Conor	Wagner
Ellender	Overton	White
Flanders	Pepper	
George	Revercomb	

So the Senate refused to sustain Mr. FULBRIGHT's point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the unfinished business, the so-called National Science Foundation bill, is in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business, Senate bill 2385, be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2245, the oleomargarine bill, in order that the Senate may have a ruling from the Chair on the reference of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. RUSSELL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, would that mean that we would follow through to a conclusion of the matter?

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to see that done, if it meets with the approval of the Senate. We might just as well go through with it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I had hoped to have an opportunity to consult the chairman of the Committee on Finance, but he is temporarily absent from the Chamber. I thought we were to proceed with the science bill. I personally am ready to proceed, but I notice the chairman of the Committee on Finance is not in the Chamber at present. He was here a moment ago.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WHERRY. I hope there will be no objection. I should like to get a ruling in the RECORD, and if there is to be an appeal there will be plenty of time to debate the question, and opportunity to consult with the chairman of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall defer to the wishes of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not want delay. I am prepared to proceed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask the Senator from Nebraska whether it is his intention, if a controversy shall develop over the ruling of the Chair on the reference of the bill, to proceed to dispose of that controversy immediately, or merely to get the ruling of the Chair in the RECORD, and then let it go over a day.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like very much to get a ruling from the Chair, and of course if we proceed to that point, there will be nothing to prevent an appeal being taken. I cannot guarantee that some Senator will not appeal from the ruling, but I should like at least to have a ruling. Furthermore, I must ask unanimous consent and in a unanimous-consent agreement it is not possible to make provision of the kind suggested by the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, should not the Senator from Nebraska divide his request into two parts, first, to have the bill referred, and then, if an appeal is taken, would not further unanimous consent be required to permit debate on the appeal and the reaching of a decision?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the unfinished business shall be temporarily laid aside to conclue the process of reference, that will be a conclusive agreement on the part of the Senate to finish that particular task this afternoon.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, that is my hope. I do not wish to mislead the Senate. So long as the question has been raised, I think it would be well to conclude the discussion. That is the only good method of procedure. I should like very much to have a ruling, and if any Senator then cares to take exception to the reference, he can appeal, and we can proceed to conclude the consideration of the appeal. That is my intention.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I had intended to ask the very question the Senator from Nebraska has answered. In other words, we should conclude consideration of the question of reference this afternoon, if possible.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Reserving the right to object, I wonder if the Senator could delay his request until I have an opportunity to locate the Chairman of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WHERRY. I hope the Senator will not object.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall not object.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield for that purpose?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; I yield. I will do anything I can at all times.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not ask the Senator to yield for that purpose. I make the suggestion in my own right.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall wait until the Senator surrenders the floor, and then suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia suggests the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Morse
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Murray
Ball	Hoey	Myers
Brewster	Ives	O'Daniel
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Reed
Butler	Kem	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Kilgore	Robertson, Wyo.
Cain	Knowland	Russell
Capper	Langer	Saltonstall
Chavez	Lodge	Smith
Connally	Lucas	Stennis
Cooper	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McFarland	Thye
Downey	McGrath	Tobey
Dworshak	McKellar	Tydings
Eastland	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ecton	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
Green	Maybank	Williams
Gurney	Millikin	Wilson
Hatch	Moore	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]? The Chair hears none, and the Chair will proceed to rule, under the requirements of section 137 of the Reorganization Act, in respect to the reference of House bill 2245.

The Chair confronts the parliamentary duty of referring this bill to the appropriate committee under the rules. There is a strong argument to be made in favor of reference either to the Committee on Finance or to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Under such circumstances, the Chair wishes to afford the Senate an opportunity, so far as possible, to decide the reference for itself. This could have been done, under the old rules, by direct submission. But the Reorganization Act provides that a question of jurisdiction "shall be decided by the Presiding Officer of the Senate, without debate in favor of that committee which has jurisdiction over the subject matter which predominates in the proposed legislation." But "such decision shall be subject to appeal."

Confronting this injunction of law, the Chair will proceed to make an initial reference in open session, without presuming, of course, to pass upon the merits of the legislation in any aspect whatever. But the Chair specifically invites an appeal without prejudice if the Senate desires a different parliamentary disposition of the measure.

The Chair's decision is moved by the following considerations:

Reference of the bill to the Finance Committee may be strongly urged on the basis of its oversimplified title, "An act to repeal the tax on oleomargarine," because the first duty assigned to the Finance Committee under the Reorganization Act is jurisdiction over revenue measures generally. On the other hand, it can, in the opinion of the Chair, be even more persuasively contended that revenue is only incidental in the purposes of this bill; and that "the subject matter which predominates"—that being the controlling phrase in the Reorganization Act—is the agricultural economy, which clearly lies within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

House hearings on the bill disclose a statement by Under Secretary of the Treasury Wiggins that "revenue considerations are not involved." This is particularly significant since the Supreme Court itself has said in *Millard* v. *Roberts* (202 U. S. 429) that "revenue bills are those that levy taxes in the strict sense of the word, and are not bills for other purposes, which may incidentally create revenue."

Again reference of the bill to the Finance Committee may be strongly urged on the basis of the fact that two previous Senate bills, S. 985 and S. 1907, for this same purpose have been referred in the Senate, during the present Congress, to the Finance Committee although no action has ever been taken on them in that committee. This was done on the basis of their titles in usual routine at the legislative desk when no occasion arose to examine the full text of the bills to determine the subject matter which predominates.

On the other hand, it can, in the opinion of the Chair, be even more persuasively contended that the most recent full exploration of this subject matter in the Senate was made in connection with S. 1744 in the Seventy-eighth Congress which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry which held hearings that have been used in these current debates.

On this point, it is significant to note that when this same legislation originally came to the Senate on June 7, 1886, precisely the same sort of controversy which still reigns today was settled by a Senate vote of 22 to 21 in favor of reference to the Committee on Agriculture.

It is further significant to note that though the House Ways and Means Committee is particularly tender of its revenue prerogatives, the present bill was handled in the House by the Committee on Agriculture.

In the Senate there is a mixed record of reference over the years in respect to various types of oleo legislation. As a result, the precedents are far from clear. But it seems clear to the Chair, after a faithful examination of the entire subject, that the pending bill is not a revenue measure in the appropriate sense of that phrase as defined in the Reorganization Act; but that the subject matter which predominates—the controlling phrase in the Reorganization Act—lies preponderantly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The Chair rules that the House bill H. R. 2245 is referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Chair invites an appeal, if the Senate disagrees, so that the will of the Senate may control.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, is the time appropriate to enter an appeal?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Certainly. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I had hoped that members of the Committee on Finance might have been sufficiently interested in this bill to have raised this point. I wish to take only a few minutes of the time of the Senate to invite attention to a few very interesting questions.

On December 18, 1947, 6 months ago, I introduced Senate bill 1907, which is identical with the Rivers bill, House bill 2245. My bill, without question, was referred to the Finance Committee of the Senate, which was in accordance with the practice of the Senate for many years; and I have a great many precedents which I shall cite a little later.

I believe that the files of the Senate Finance Committee will reveal a great many letters and petitions addressed to the Senate in this connection, which were referred to that committee.

Soon after the introduction of my bill in December, which, as I say, was identical with the bill we are now considering, I wrote to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], requesting hearings. He replied as follows, under date of January 21, 1948:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
January 21, 1948.

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: Thank you very much for your letter of January 15, requesting that hearings be scheduled on S. 1907, which relates to taxes on oleomargarine.

The subject matter of the bill is directly connected with the revenues of the Federal Government and, therefore, under the Constitution such legislation must originate in the House. Since the Senate Committee on Finance is not advised as to whether the House will take action on proposed legislation of that kind, or what the action might be if it should be gone into on the House side, I doubt whether the committee would consider it as practical or desirable to start hearings on the Senate side.

With very best regards, I am,

Sincerely,

EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
Chairman.

That happened on January 21 of this year. Of course, the Senator from Colorado had in mind article I, section 7, of the Constitution, which provides that bills for the raising of revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives. After the experience in the House Committee on Agriculture with this legislation, it seems very peculiar to me that suddenly, within the course of 2 or 3 months, this bill has changed its character to such an extent that today the subject matter which predominates is agriculture.

No one doubts that the chairman of the Committee on Finance is an expert on taxation. We recall that a few weeks ago he persuaded the Senate, largely by his own eloquence, I think, to support his position on the reduction of income taxes. He certainly knows, if anyone knows, what a tax measure is.

As the Constitution provides that the Senate may propose amendments, I offered my bill, the same bill which I had introduced as an original bill, as an amendment to the income-tax reduction bill. On March 18 of this year my amendment and that of the Senator

from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] were debated on the floor of the Senate. A reading of the debate on these amendments will convince one, if he has an open mind, that they were resisted and defeated largely because they were excise tax measures, and should not be attached to the income tax bill. It will be recalled that many times it was stated that excise taxes were being considered by the House, and that our amendments were proper amendments or features to be included in that kind of a bill. Let me read a few excerpts from the debate on the floor of the Senate on the 18th of March of this year:

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I strongly urge that the pending amendment be rejected. A series of amendments of this type came before the Senate Finance Committee. We did not go into the merits of those amendments, and I wish to emphasize that the vote on the amendment is not at all to be considered a necessary reflection of the opinion as to the merits of the amendment of those who, for example, may vote against it. This amendment and the related amendments have to do with excise and occupational taxes. That is a subject which is not directly related to the business of the bill now before us. The Senate Finance Committee necessarily had to delineate the scope of the bill which the committee wished to bring before the Senate. It was perfectly apparent that if we commenced to open up this bill in order to take care of excise taxes and other forms of taxes, we would wind up in a state of complete scatteration. There are many, many inequities in our excise-tax structure. Many of our present excise taxes cannot be justified from the standpoint of logic, or from the standpoint of the competitive situation in which the articles concerned are placed by the taxes thus imposed upon them, or from the standpoint of equity. For that reason, I believe there is sound opinion that all those taxes should be considered together and dealt with in a revision bill.

However, if we make any other approach to the subject, it seems to me clear that every Senator would have an amendment to propose; and if we allow the pending amendment to come into the bill now before us, there no longer will be any valid reason for keeping out other amendments with respect to which claims for justice can also be made.

Those are the words of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. At no time during that debate or in the preceding consideration before the committee, when I appeared in support of the bill, did any member of that committee raise the question that this was not a proper tax bill for the consideration of that committee in any respect.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. What the distinguished Senator from Arkansas has just read was in answer to a question which I propounded, as he suggested, to the distinguished Senator from Colorado on March 18.

I join with the Senator in saying that although I appeared before the committee, as he did, at no time did any member of the committee suggest that his bill or my amendment should not be considered by the Finance Committee. In 1943, and again in 1944, similar amendments to the tax bill were refrred to the Committee on Finance, and at that time extensive hearings were held. Copies of those hearings are available, as the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate well knows, because he was a member of the Finance Committee at that time, and as other Senators well know. Former Senator Bennett Champ Clark, of Missouri, was chairman of the subcommittee which held hearings. Hearings were held in 1943 and 1944 on the repeal of the oleomargarine tax.

I thank the Senator from Arkansas for bringing this question before the Senate. Since I have been a Member of the Senate, beginning in 1941, the Senate Committee on Finance has had charge of this legislation. It seems to me that some members of that committee should join the Senator from Arkansas, as I am joining him, in asking for consideration of the bill by the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not hear all the preliminary remarks made by the Senator from Arkansas when he took the floor. Did I correctly understand him to say that he was appealing from the ruling of the Chair? I ask this question because I should like to know whether there will be anything before the Senate if the appeal is not made. I do not wish to cut off the Senator, but I merely wish to ascertain what he proposes to do.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it necessary for me to make the appeal at this time, in order to address myself to the question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks not, because the Chair will not conclude the process of committee reference until the Senator from Arkansas has had an opportunity to make an appeal.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as a part of my next statement I should like to present other excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 18, at the point where the Senator from South Carolina asked the following specific question:

Does the Senator agree that it is a tax question?

The Senator from Colorado replied:

I agree with that.

Later in the same debate, other Senators joined in making statements very similar to that one. I wish to quote some of them:

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There are many people in Massachusetts who are very much in need of a repeal of this tax. I have expressed my sympathy with their purpose many times. I understand the distinguished Senator to say that their cause will not be helped at the present time by voting for the pending amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That distinctly is my opinion, and that gives me the opportunity to make clear something that I intended to come to. Neither the majority nor the Senate Finance Committee is taking any position on the policy involved in the merits of the amendment. A Senator may vote to keep this amendment out of the bill, without prejudicing his position in favor of removing the taxes from oleomargarine. We are not going into the merits of that. Our position is that it has no place in the pending bill, and that if it were put in the bill, it would necessarily be dropped in conference; that it is unwise to put it in this bill, because if we opened the door to extraneous matters, we would wind up here in a state of complete scatteration, instead of getting the kind of bill we wish to get.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The bill it is proposed to pass is strictly an income-tax bill, is it not?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Later, the following occurred:

Mr. CAIN. If the pending amendment is defeated, can the Senator from Colorado recommend a course of action which would result in bringing the subject of oleomargarine taxation to the floor of the Senate so that it could be thoroughly studied and explored?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am very glad the Senator has asked that question, and I shall discuss it at once.

Mr. President, I can understand the desire of those who favor this amendment to have it added to this bill. I understand there have been some difficulties in advancing an amendment of that kind in the House of Representatives.

I wish to say that the House of Representatives Ways and Means Committee is considering a general revision bill. Not only do I understand that it is to take care of administrative provisions, but I also understand that inequities in the taxes and rates of tax at various points along the line are likewise being considered.

Of course, I am not in position to promise what will happen in the House of Representatives with respect to an amendment of this kind.

Here is a repetition on the floor of the Senate of the same sentiment:

But I believe it is clear that, under the Constitution, the House of Representatives has the initiating jurisdiction in respect to taxes; and I am thoroughly convinced that in a major matter of this kind, no matter what the Senate did in the way of amendment its action would not meet with the approval of the House of Representatives. The House cherishes—and properly so—its right to initiate tax legislation. It is true that we have a right to amend such legislation; but when we propose revolutionary amendments, particularly amendments which at the time do not meet with the sentiment of the House, we are simply wasting time.

I am quite sure that if an amendment of this kind were adopted by the Senate and were sent to conference, it would be rejected in conference, because the House does not intend that the Senate shall have the initiating power in these important matters of legislation, and especially where there is such a substantial deviation from the bill which the House of Representatives has sent to us.

Mr. President, I cannot see how we could have a more positive statement than that as to the opinion of the very able chairman of the Finance Committee in regard to the character of this bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall yield, although I should like to finish my statement. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I was going to ask the Senator if he had put in the RECORD today a statement in regard to the tax on uncolored oleomargarine.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Last year the tax was approximately $7,000,000, as represented by income to the Government. It is 10 cents a pound on colored margarine,

which is approximately 25 percent of its present retail price. It is one-fourth of a cent a pound on uncolored margarine. For colored margarine there is an annual license tax of $600 on manufacturers, $480 on wholesalers, and $48 on the retailers, and there is a license tax of $600 for manufacturers of uncolored margarine, $200 for wholesalers, and $6 for retailers.

Mr. MAYBANK. So the tax on colored margarine is 10 cents a pound; is that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. If that is not a heavy tax on the poor people of the United States, then I do not know what such a tax is, because it amounts to about 10 percent or more on the poor man's income. Poor people must fill their stomachs with bread, and a family of five will consume 2 pounds of oleo a week. That means at least a $10 Federal tax, not to mention as much as $15 State and other oleo taxes which are passed on to the low-income consumer annually. I do not know of any tax now on the statute books which is more regressive. Certainly this is an important consideration in connection with this legislation and should be a concern of the Finance Committee, not the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, after the procedure in the House and the great controversy on this subject, if the bill were now referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry such action would establish a precedent which in my opinion would cause great difficulty in the future.

I think reference should be made to the attempt to set a precedent yesterday. Today the Senate by overwhelming majority has refused to follow that action as a precedent. That is the way I interpret the vote which has recently been had. I think the real significance of that vote is that the Senate disapproves having that procedure regarded as a precedent for future application. If we do not follow the obviously proper procedure of referring the bill to the Finance Committee, but, instead, if the bill is referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, in view of the obviously difficult tax problems in connection with the bill and the necessity of giving certain interests an opportunity to study the bill at great length, as they have studied it at great length when the bill was before the House, I think it will be a precedent which we shall regret.

We should consider that one result of such action would be that if a bill of this sort is referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, then, I assume, if there is such a thing as consistency in the Senate, in the future any bill concerning agriculture would be subject to a tax amendment similar to the one we have been discussing, because such an amendment then would be germane to an agricultural bill. I see no way to avoid that conclusion, for I assume we would be consistent.

There is no question that the oleomargarine taxes are discriminatory, and that they affect one aspect of agricultural economy as against another. Even the proponents will admit that, though they claim in all sincerity that the discriminations are justifiable. But they also affect the consumer as tax measures. And they discriminate by means of taxes. The whole structure of the discrimination is based upon taxation—from the manufacturers, to the wholesalers, to the retailers, and to the consumers.

So, if the precedent of this referral is to stand, we should follow it to its logical conclusion. Remember that, as a revenue measure, it was referred to that committee which has jurisdiction over that constituent of our economy which it most directly affects. For that is the essence and the basis of the referral.

Thus, tobacco and liquor taxes should be under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as that committee has jurisdiction over matters affecting "public health," to which those articles are related. Every one knows that the taxes on liquor, for example, are much higher percentagewise than are taxes on other articles, because there is a feeling that they have a direct bearing upon public health; so, if we were to follow the reasoning in this case as to which subject matter is predominant, a very excellent case could be made for sending matters related to liquor and tobacco taxes to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I think the same reasoning could be applied to gasoline taxes. Gasoline taxes, most directly affecting interstate commerce, should go to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or perhaps to the Committee on Public Works, which handles matters concerning roads.

Tariffs and tariff agreements should be handled by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Withholding taxes on wages should be handled by Labor and Public Welfare, which, under rule XXV, as amended by the Reorganization Act, should have all "measures relating to labor." Certainly with respect to such taxes the predominating subject matter is their influence on labor.

Likewise, an exemption in favor of servicemen should be under the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee, because, under rule XXV, the Armed Services Committee is charged with "matters relating to pay and other benefits and privileges of members of the armed services."

On the other hand, taxes on almost everything should be handled by the Committee on Banking and Currency, for, under rule XXV, all matters should be referred to it which relate to "control of prices of commodities, rents, or services."

This goes on in endless progression, until it results in complete lack of jurisdiction of the Finance Committee. For that matter, the same analogies can be made with reference to matters handled by the Appropriations Committee. For there is no tax or appropriation that does not affect an article, a profession, a class, an industry, or an element of the Nation's economy, as the margarine taxes affect agriculture, directly or indirectly.

The significance of all this, I think, is that what is intended by the organization of the Senate and its committees is that jurisdiction should be determined in the cases of taxes, appropriations, and perhaps other functions, not by the affect particular proposed legislation has upon a particular element of the economy, but, rather, the method of affecting it. And where the method chosen is by taxation, the Finance Committee should have jurisdiction.

Thus, there is nothing to prevent the Agriculture Committee, within the limits of the Constitution, from legislating, or considering legislation, dealing with the margarine and butter question, so long as it does so by general legislation and not taxation.

If price controls on meats were to be reimposed, would that question be handled by the Committee on Agriculture? It certainly affects the agricultural economy. I think it would affect it to a much greater extent than would the taxes on margarine. But what is the method of affecting it? Control of prices—which is a subject within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The fact is that each committee has general jurisdiction over matters expressed within its title, with special jurisdictions added. But that jurisdiction extends to general measures of regulation, assistance, and so forth, only, and in any case where the method of legislation is within the purview of another committee, the latter should have and does have jurisdiction.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an announcement?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I inquired a few moments ago from the Senator from Arkansas whether or not an appeal is to be taken, my reason being that several Senators had asked whether it was the intention to have a calendar call. By reason of the lateness of the hour, I think it should now be announced that the calendar will not be called today. Announcement will be made later of the time at which it will be called.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think a decisive test on the issue as to where the bill should be referred can be made by inquiring where the bill would be required to originate. If we were now attempting to impose an initial tax, would the bill have to originate in the House of Representatives? In other words, could a bill imposing a tax on oleomargarine, under the Constitution, have originated in the Senate?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I just read to the Senate the opinion of the chairman of the committee and his remarks on the floor. No one at that time raised the question about his statement. It was so clear that no one ever debated or questioned it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then if that be true, the tax provisions of the bill are bound to predominate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think there is any question about it. I am coming now to cases showing what the Supreme Court said about the original bill. As the Senator knows, the oleomargarine tax bill originated in the

House in 1886, and later came to the Senate. Of the two cases I am about to discuss, the first one deals with the act of 1886, the second, with the act of 1902. The cases specifically dealt with the point that it was a tax measure.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad the Senator is aproaching it from that viewpoint. I think that would be controlling.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I want to reinforce the opinion of the chairman of the Committee on Finance with the opinion of the Supreme Court. These cases are referred to as the famous oleomargarine cases. I think they are directly in point. The first case is entitled "*In re Kollock, petitioner* (165 U. S. 526)." It was decided in 1897, and it involved the 1886 oleomargarine tax of one-fourth of a cent per pound. The 1902 act related to taxes imposed on manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers, in the form of special tax on colored margarine. The second case deals with that particular law.

Kollock, the appellant, appealed on the ground that there had been an unconstitutional delegation of power, vesting in the Commissioner of Revenue the power to determine what acts should be criminal, and empowering him to provide stamps to be placed on particular articles, and to prescribe regulations for enforcement of the tax.

I desire to read a few excerpts from the Kollock case, for the benefit of Senators. I shall read first from page 536.

This is a unanimous decision. I realize that it is almost unbelievable, but at one time the Court did hand down a unanimous decision.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. For what purpose?

Mr. BREWSTER. I thought that possibly, while the Senator was looking up his authorities, he might yield to me for a moment to make a statement regarding an insertion in the RECORD.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How long will it take? I have my authorities here, and I prefer to put them in at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In order to protect the Senator from Arkansas, lest a point of order be made subsequently, the Chair will say that if the Senator contemplates making a point of order he must do it consecutively with the ruling of the Chair, and that if any matter intervenes he has lost his right.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Chair. I must decline to yield.

I read from page 536 of the Kollock case. This has reference to the original oleomargarine act. The Court said:

> The act before us is on its face an act for levying taxes, and although it may operate in so doing to prevent deception in the sale of oleomargarine as and for butter, its primary object must be assumed to be the raising of revenue. And, considered as a revenue act, the designation of the stamps, marks, and brands is merely in the discharge of an administrative function and falls within the numerous instances of regulations needful to the operation of the machinery of particular laws, authority to make which has always been recognized as within the competency of the legislative power to confer.

I continue reading from the next page, page 531:

> The oleomargarine legislation does not differ in character from this, and the object is the same in both, namely, to secure revenue by internal taxation and to prevent fraud in the collection of revenue.

I remind the Senate that in addition to its character as a tax bill or revenue bill, the object is to prevent fraud in the collection of revenue, not the alleged fraud of the substitution of oleomargarine for butter, which is often cited as one reason for the continuation of the tax, but it was to prevent fraud in the collection of such revenue.

The opinion of the Court continues as follows:

> Protection to purchasers in respect of getting the real and not a spurious article cannot be held to be the primary object in either instance, and the identification of dealer, substance, quantity, etc., by marking and branding must be regarded as means to effectuate the objects of the act in respect of revenue.

Mr. President, I cannot conceive how there could be a more direct ruling by the Supreme Court of the United States on oleomargarine legislation as to its character as a revenue measure in the sense in which we are dealing with it here.

The next case is the *McCray case* (195 U. S. 27). I should particularly like to call the two cases to the attention of the chairman of the Finance Committee, because I know he is a great constitutional lawyer and will have some respect for the opinion of the Supreme Court and its views as to the character of the legislation practically at the time the original legislation was passed and put into force.

I should like to give a little of the background by reading the statement of the case:

> The judiciary is without authority to avoid an act of Congress lawfully exerting the taxing power, even in a case where to the judicial mind it seems that Congress had, in putting such power in motion, abused its lawful authority by levying a tax which was unwise or oppressive, or the result of the enforcement of which might be to indirectly affect subjects not within the powers delegated to Congress, nor can the judiciary inquire into the motive or purpose of Congress in adopting a statute levying an excise tax within its constitutional power.
>
> While both the fifth and tenth amendments qualify, insofar as they are applicable, all the provisions of the Constitution, nothing in either of them operates to take away the grant of power to tax conferred by the Constitution upon Congress, and that power being unrestrained except as limited by the Constitution. Congress may select the objects upon which the tax shall be levied, and in exerting the power no want of new process of law can possibly result, and the judiciary cannot usurp the functions of the legislature in order to control that branch of the Government in exercising its lawful functions. * * *
>
> The Oleomargarine Act of 1886 (24 Stat. 209), as amended by the act of 1902 (32 Stat. 93), imposing a tax of one-quarter of 1 percent on oleomargarine not artificially colored any shade of yellow so as to look like butter and 10 cents a pound if so colored, levies an excise tax and is not unconstitutional as outside of the powers of Congress, or an interference with the powers reserved to the States, nor can the judiciary declare the tax void because it is too high, nor because it amounts to a destruction of the business of manufacturing oleomargarine, nor because it discriminates against oleomargarine and in favor of butter.

The facts were that the defendant had sold some oleomargarine in which there had been incorporated some color.

I read from page 29 of the statement of the case:

> From these averments it was charged that if the law imposed a tax of 10 cents upon the oleomargarine in question the statute was repugnant to the Constitution, because it deprived the defendant of his property without due process of law; because the levy of such a burden was beyond the constitutional power of Congress, since it was an unwarranted interference by Congress "with the police powers reserved to the several States and to the people of the United States by the Constitution of the United States."

In that case that very point was raised.

In the argument for the plaintiff-in-error it was said:

> The tax is so large that it is evident that it was imposed, not as an excise for revenue, but as a prohibition.

That is the point, I assume, that must be involved in the reasoning that the bill should go to the Committee on Agriculture. That point was raised by the plaintiff-in-error.

Reading from page 50, in the opinion of the court itself, it is stated:

> Did Congress in passing the acts which are assailed exert a power not conferred by the Constitution?
>
> That the acts in question on their face impose excise taxes which Congress had the power to levy is so completely established as to require only statement.

On page 51 the Court quotes from the Kollock case from which I read a moment ago, and reaffirms it. I read only a part of that and shall pass on to the original decision in this case:

> The act before us is on its face an act for levying taxes, and although it may operate in so doing to prevent deception in the sale of oleomargarine as and for butter, its primary object must be assumed to be the raising of revenue.
>
> We might rest the answer to the contention as to the want of power in Congress to enact the laws in question upon the foregoing cases. But in view of the earnestness with which the validity of the acts is assailed in argument and the assertion that the necessary effect of the amendment to the act of 1886 by the act of 1902 is to make both of the laws in question so peculiar as to cause them to be beyond the reach of the previous rulings of this Court, we propose to review and dispose of the propositions pressed upon us at bar as indubitably demonstrating that the acts in question were beyond the power of Congress to adopt.
>
> That the power of internal taxation which the Constitution confers on Congress is given to that body for the purpose of raising revenue, and that the tax on artificially colored oleomargarine is void because it is of such an onerous character as to make it manifest that the purpose of Congress in levying it was not to raise revenue but to suppress the manufacture of the taxed article.

On page 52, the Court continues:

> Whilst it is true—so the argument proceeds—that Congress in exerting the taxing

power conferred upon it may use all means appropriate to the exercise of such power, a tax which is fixed at such a high rate as to suppress the production of the article taxed, is not a legitimate means to the lawful end, and is therefore beyond the scope of the taxing power.

I read these excerpts to point out that these very questions as to the character of the tax were raised by the plaintiff in error before the Court, and it was not a matter which was ignored or was not before the Court. Those are the arguments of the plaintiff in raising the question.

Now I wish to read two paragraphs giving the Court's views, on page 59:

Undoubtedly, in determining whether a particular act is within a granted power, its scope and effect are to be considered. Applying this rule to the acts assailed, it is self-evident that on their face they levy an excise tax. That being their necessary scope and operation, it follows that the acts are within the grant of power. The argument to the contrary rests on the proposition that, although the tax be within the power, as enforcing it will destroy or restrict the manufacture of artificially colored oleomargarine, therefore, the power to levy the tax did not obtain. This, however, is but to say that the question of power depends, not upon the authority conferred by the Constitution, but upon what may be the consequence arising from the exercise of the lawful authority.

Since, as pointed out in all the decisions referred to, the taxing power conferred by the Constitution knows no limits except those expressly stated in that instrument, it must follow, if a tax be within the lawful power, the exertion of that power may not be judicially restrained because of the results to arise from its exercise.

It seems to me that the theory that the pending bill should go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has reference entirely to the results which may arise from the exercise of the power of taxation, which is predominantly characteristic of this legislation.

One more statement from the court in the McCray case, on page 61:

The right of Congress to tax within its delegated power being unrestrained, except as limited by the Constitution, it was within the authority conferred on Congress to select the objects upon which an excise should be laid. It therefore follows that, in exerting its power, no want of due process of law could possibly result, because that body chose to impose an excise on artificially colored oleomargarine and not upon natural butter artificially colored. The judicial power may not usurp the functions of the legislative in order to control that branch of the Government in the performance of its lawful duties. This was aptly pointed out in the extract heretofore made from the opinion in *Treat* v. *White* (181 U. S. 264).

Mr. President, it seems to me that those two cases, directly concerning the legislation which this bill would repeal should certainly settle the question as to the characteristics of the legislation.

I wish to say a word or two about the case cited by the Chair in support of the position that the bill is not predominantly a tax measure.

The referral of H. R. 2245 to the Senate Committee on Agriculture was made, I understand, in reliance upon the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *Millard* v. *Roberts* (202 U. S. 429), decided May 21, 1906.

This case did not, of course, decide that the oleomargarine legislation was a tax measure. The cases I have cited did that specifically. Therefore, even if this case, as a matter of general law, could not be distinguished, the oleomargarine cases would be controlling. Those cases were made upon the very question here involved:

Is the oleomargarine legislation which would be repealed tax legislation?

Millard v. *Roberts* (202 U. S. 429), decided May 21, 1906, involved these facts:

The Congress had passed three acts providing for the abolishment of dangerous grade crossings of railroads and removing railroad tracks from the Mall and for the construction of Union Station.

The Court said:

The case is practically that of a contract between the United States and the District of Columbia on the one side and the railroad companies on the other, whereby the railroad companies agree to surrender certain rights, * * * and to construct a work of great magnitude, * * * which Congress deems to be demanded for the best interests of the National Capital and by the public at large; and for this surrender of right * * * Congress agrees to pay a certain sum, partly out of the funds of the United States and partly out of the funds of the District of Columbia. It is a simple case of bargain and sale, like any other purchase.

That is what the Supreme Court said about that case, that it was simply a case of bargain and sale.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Has the Senator examined the legislative history of these oleomargarine acts, the debates which occurred when they were first written on the statute books?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have here a great many instances of referrals of bills, to which I shall come in a moment.

Mr. McMAHON. My question is, When the matter was originally debated, what were the reasons given by the Members of the House and the Senate for being for this tax?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Being for the tax on its merits, or for the referral?

Mr. McMAHON. On its merits.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The motive was to use the taxing power to protect the butter industry.

Mr. McMAHON. I know that was the underlying motive, but what I was getting at was what constitutional basis did the sponsors lay in the debate for using the taxing power? Did they claim that oleomargarine was deleterious to health?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In the arguments on the floor?

Mr. McMAHON. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They did claim that. Until very recently the proponents of the legislation have so claimed. They have abandoned it lately, I would say within the last 10 years.

Mr. McMAHON. They have abanboned it because of the placing of vitamins in the product, I suppose.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And the refinement, purity, and improvement of the product. I think that is correct.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator claim that there is any limitation on the taxing power?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think what I read from the Kollock case and the McCray case indicates that there are limitations in the Constitution itself as to the apportionment of direct taxes. But outside of those two limitations, the power of the Congress to tax I think is practically unlimited. The Court states, by way of obiter dicta, that there might be a case so unreasonable that it might be unconstitutional.

Mr. McMAHON. They have never come up with such a case.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know of such a case, but in the case mentioned they said there might be, but that this was not one of them.

Mr. McMAHON. I may say to the Senator that some years ago I was arguing in the Supreme Court the constitutionality of a tax upon firearms. The Senator remembers the machine guns and shotguns and sawed-off shotguns.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. McMAHON. They had to be registered and a tax paid on them. An attack was made on the constitutionality of the statute on the ground that it was an improper use of the taxing power. I well remember during the argument of the case that the late Mr. Justice McReynolds asked me the question, "Suppose Congress put a $10,000 tax upon each package of cigarettes?", and knowing the Justice's aversion to tobacco, I rather felt he might have thought it was a good thing to do, but the very absurdity of the example rather stopped me, and I stated that I believed it would be open to question. He thereupon stated that he did not think it would be. That always made an impression upon me as to at least one Supreme Court Justice's interpretation of the wide extent of the taxing power. I was curious whether in the Senator's argument he was making any point that the Congress did not have the right to put on any tax it saw fit.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I hope I did not leave that impression. If the Senator did not hear the first part of my argument I shall say that I was reading the statement of the plaintiff-in-error merely to lay a foundation for the conclusion of the court, which was that the Congress did have the power. The point is that the oleomargarine legislation, the very legislation that is now sought to be repealed, was the subject of those two cases, and in both cases the Court emphasized time after time that the law was a tax measure, an excise tax measure.

The question had been raised before the Senator came in that the chairman of the Finance Committee refused to hold hearings on a bill identical to the one now being referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on the ground that it was a revenue bill and had to originate in the House. That has been the common feeling, I know, around the Senate. That is one specific example of what is contended by some, that such

a measure is a revenue bill, and must originate in the House. The two cases referred to very clearly state that the original law was a tax measure and must be considered as a tax measure, in the words of the Supreme Court which I just read into the RECORD.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for another question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I was detained in my office and did not hear the ruling of the President pro tempore upon the reference of this bill. Will the Senator give me, if he can briefly, the reasons the President pro tempore gave for the referral to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would not undertake to do it precisely, for I might do some injustice to the ruling. The President pro tempore gave it a short while ago and I have not seen it in writing. But under section 137 of the Reorganization Act, which says that the Presiding Officer shall refer bills about which there is a controversy to the committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter which predominates, the President pro tempore felt that the bill should go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. McMAHON. It is the Senator's position that what predominates in this measure is the tax?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is the method of dealing with the subject matter, not the effect, which predominates. I have gone over this point previously, but for the Senator's information I will say that we can take the analogies of taxes on white sulfur matches, on liquor, on tobacco, or on any agricultural product. Let us consider the various tariffs. They all affect agriculture. They were intended to affect agriculture. Matters relating to them go to the Finance Committee.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator know of any precedents for the referral to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of any other piece of taxing legislation?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The only precedent I know of, in a case which was an out-and-out tax bill, was the original oleomargarine bill, which was referred, after a very bitter fight, to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry by a vote of 22 to 21. That was long before the present Reorganization Act, as the Senator knows, and the action then taken in the Senate was inspired, in my opinion, by the judgment on the merits of the bill, just as I know the same action was inspired in the House. It was the belief that the agricultural interests concerned could protect themselves better by such a referral. But subsequent to that time in the Senate practically every bill which on its face and in its title purported to be a tax bill affecting margarine went to the Finance Committee. If the Senator wishes, I can give him some examples. Here is one to which the Chair referred a moment ago which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in 1944. The bill was introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the late Senator Smith of South Carolina. Following is the title of the bill:

A bill to provide for the more efficient utilization of the agricultural resources of the Nation during peace and war, to regulate the production and distribution—

Regulate, not tax—

to regulate the production and distribution of margarine, a product of certain agricultural commodities in interstate commerce, to remove certain obstructions to the distribution of such product in interstate commerce, and for other purposes.

That was the title of the bill. The bill was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. On its face it appears to be just what it is, a regulatory measure. There is no question that a regulatory measure coming before the Senate which provides that no colored margarine shall be produced should go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. In my opinion, that is the proper committee to which to refer such a bill. That is general legislation affecting agriculture.

Mr. McMAHON. There is a tax on railroad tickets. If an interpretation similar to that made by the President pro tempore in his ruling is made with respect to that tax, a bill dealing with it should be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, should it not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Certainly it should. That is the point I made.

Mr. McMAHON. There has never been any suggestion that such a thing be done, has there?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator knows that Congress had before it legislation concerning withholding taxes on members of the armed services. Certainly that was legislation which was not greatly concerned with income taxes. The Chair's theory would seem to be that if a bill would provide for the raising of a considerable amount of revenue it would be a revenue bill; that if it would raise only a little revenue it would not be a revenue bill. If the theory of the President pro tempore were to be followed legislation affecting withholding taxes on members of the armed services obviously should be referred to the Committee on Armed Services. I cannot imagine that the amount of the tax raised, that is the absolute dollars and cents amount, should be the consideration which determines whether it is a tax measure or not.

Mr. McMAHON. If that ruling or theory were to be followed it would result in destroying the integrity of the whole system.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator. I think if the Senator will examine the bills dealing with margarine he will find that wherever such a bill appeared on its face and in its title to be a regulatory measure it was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. But practically every bill except the first, the original bill dealing with oleomargarine, was referred to the Committee on Finance whenever it purported to concern a tax of any kind on margarine. There have been many such bills. There were such bills dealing with margarine during practically all the years following the original bill. I shall give an example. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] presented a petition of the Pomona Grange, of Butler, Pa., favoring legislation to regulate the composition of margarine. It was perfectly proper that such a bill should be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, for that was a regulatory measure. That petition was presented in 1942. In 1943 Mr. Gillette presented a resolution of the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Association opposing legislation to repeal Federal commodity and license taxes on margarine. That resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance. Resolutions of various kinds, as well as bills were submitted year after year, and whenever they had to do with repeal of the tax or increase of the tax, or stated on their face that they had anything to do with a tax on margarine, they were referred to the Committee on Finance. If a bill was a regulatory one it was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. That is the distinction the Senate has followed in the past.

Mr. President, I want to make a distinction between the case cited by the Chair, Millard against Roberts, and the cases which dealt with margarine itself. In the Millard against Roberts case the court said:

The titles of the acts are the best brief summary of their purposes.

Here are the titles of the acts—the acts referred to in the case of Millard against Roberts:

An act to provide for eliminating certain grade crossings or railroads in the District of Columbia, to require and authorize the construction of new terminals and tracks for the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. in the city of Washington, and for other purposes.

An act to provide for eliminating certain grade crossings on the line of the Baltimore & Potomac Railroad Co., in the city of Washington, D. C., and requiring said company to depress and elevate its tracks, and to enable it to relocate parts of its railroad therein, and for other purposes.

An act to provide for a Union Railroad Station in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Only so far as the contribution by the District of Columbia is concerned was a tax involved. A levy or assessment upon properties in the District was made to effect this contribution. The decision was summed up in this sentence:

Whatever taxes are imposed are but means to the purposes provided by the act.

Contrast this language with that of In re Kollock, which involved the very laws which this bill would repeal, and the very issue here involved, namely, whether the oleomargarine legislation is tax legislation. I quote again from In re Kollock:

The act before us is on its face an act for levying taxes, and, although it may operate in so doing to prevent deception in the sale of oleomargarine as and for butter, its primary object must be assumed to be the raising of revenue; and, considered as a revenue act, the designation of the stamps, marks, and brands is merely in the discharge of an administrative function and falls within the numerous instances of regulations needful to the operation of the machinery of particular

laws, authority to make which has always been recognized as within the competency of the legislative power to confer.

* * * * *

We concur with the Court of Appeals that this provision does not differ in principle from those of the internal-revenue laws, which direct the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to prepare suitable stamps to be used on packages of cigars, tobacco, and spirits; to change such stamps when deemed expedient; and to revise and regulate the means for affixing them.

I may say further that with regard to the act respecting the District of Columbia, under standing rule XXV of the Reorganization Act, the Committee on the District of Columbia has jurisdiction over taxes in the District of Columbia. In other words, the Congress exercises a direct police power and a special taxing power over the District of Columbia, and I cannot think of a weaker example than that case to support the theory that this bill is not a tax measure.

The Chair also made reference to the Treasury report on this bill as supporting the Chair's view about the character of the legislation. The Treasury Department says in its report on the bill:

The basic issue raised by the oleomargarine taxes is the propriety and desirability of using the tax laws to affect the relative position of competing industries, both of which use domestic agricultural raw materials.

In other words, the question is, Should the tax laws be used to discriminate between agricultural products? The question of when and under what circumstances the tax laws should be used is properly one for the committee which has jurisdiction over tax laws.

Here it should be pointed out that the Internal Revenue Bureau of the Treasury Department has sole responsibility for administration of the laws which this bill would repeal. The regulations are made by that Bureau, and they are directed solely, as the Supreme Court has held in the Kollock case, toward enforcement of the tax provisions.

The laws themselves are parts of the Internal Revenue Code.

Inasmuch as that report of the Treasury Department on the proposed legislation now before the Senate has been urged in support of the reference made, I think I should read one or two excerpts from that report, which I believe supports the view that this is predominantly a tax bill. I quote from page 2 of the report:

The basic issue raised by the oleomargarine taxes is the propriety and desirability of using the tax laws to affect the relative position of competing industries, both of which use domestic agricultural raw materials. In the case of oleomargarine the taxing power is used as a punitive measure against one industry to advance the interests of another. In the process the public is deterred from the free exercise of its consumer preferences. Without passing judgment on the relative merits of the two products from the viewpoint of the public health, it is the view of the Treasury Department that the use of the taxing power to distort the normal development of competing industries and to deprive them of the full benefit of the free-enterprise system conflicts with the public interests and, in the absence of compelling considerations, should be avoided.

I quote further:

The Department is not qualified to appraise the validity of these assertions. They illustrate, however, that the punitive use of the taxing power can result in the inefficient use of resources and support the principle that the tax system should not be used for these ends, except where the objective is clearly in the public interest.

* * * * *

The tax burden, however, reflects only part of the cost of these taxes to consumers. The existence of the oleomargarine taxes interferes with the availability of oleomargarine in certain areas and induces individuals who would otherwise buy oleomargarine to forego table fats or buy butter. Where, for example, as a result of the occupational taxes, consumers with equal preference for the two products are unable to procure 40-cent oleomargarine and are obliged to purchase 90-cent butter, the burden of these taxes approximates the difference between the selling price of these items.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. May I ask once again, Does the Senator intend to appeal? I wish to formulate the program for the remainder of the afternoon.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will say to the Senator that I am approaching the end of this discussion. I shall not be much longer.

I quote further from the report of the Treasury Department:

The legislative history of these taxes indicates that they were first enacted to assist in preventing the fraudulent sale of oleomargarine as butter. The taxing power has on several occasions been used for regulatory purposes. Taxes imposed on the production or distribution of narcotics, white sulfur matches, firearms, and national-bank notes are examples. In these cases, the taxing power supports the Government's control over certain activities in the public interest. However, in the case of oleomargarine, the need for regulation through the taxing power has been affected by several developments in recent years.

That excerpt, I may say, is so clearly on the point of whether this is a tax bill that I think it goes far to offset, and does offset, the idea that because these taxes do not produce a great deal of revenue in the aggregate, the measures, therefore, are not tax bills.

I read further from the report of the Treasury Department:

In summary, it is the Treasury Department's view that the present oleomargarine taxes distort the competitive position of two domestic industries, interfere with the optimum utilization of national resources, and unnecessarily burden consumers far in excess of the amount paid in taxes. Revenue considerations are not involved.

The last five words are relied upon by the Chair in saying that this is not a tax bill—

Revenue considerations are not involved.

This report is signed by the Secretary of the Treasury. It was presented by the Under Secretary of the Treasury when he appeared before the committee. I believe that if the last five words are read in connection with the entire report, it will be perfectly obvious that what the Secretary meant was that there was not a great deal of money involved in these taxes. The testimony had revealed that back in the 1930's the revenue amounted to $2,000,000 or $3,000,000. It has gradually grown to about $7,000,000. Although that is not an entirely immaterial or insubstantial sum, in terms of present-day finances it is not a very large sum. I am quite confident that is the only meaning which could properly be attached to that particular expression on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury. So I believe that fact meets and explains the point upon which the Chair based his ruling.

Let me give a few other references to some of the precedents in the Senate. This afternoon we have had quite a lengthy debate on the value of precedents, and I think the Senate very decisively by its vote upon the point of order decided that the precedent as of yesterday was not a correct one, and I believe that will be the way the action of the Senate will be interpreted. However, I know the Senate values consistency in its rules and in the interpretation of its rules. I wish to mention a few instances in that connection, for the benefit of the Senate, going back some years, and referring to the reference of various bills.

For example, in the Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, in 1915, a resolution of the Farmers Booster Club, of Renville, Minn., opposing the proposed repeal of the tax on coloring of oleomargarine, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

In the Sixty-fifth Congress, first session, in 1917, Senate bill 294, to reduce the tax on oleomargarine was referred to the Committee on Finance.

In the Sixty-sixth Congress, first session, Senate bill 461, to reduce the tax on oleomargarine, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

The same action was taken in the Sixty-seventh Congress and in the Sixty-eighth Congress.

Mr. President, to show the distinction between a bill which had to do with the taxing of margarine and a bill relating to the regulation of the sale of margarine, I wish to refer to the first case of that sort we come to: In the Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, the Vice President laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin favoring legislation to prohibit the manufacture or sale of oleomargarine in the United States. That joint resolution properly was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry because it was an outright prohibition of the manufacture or sale of oleomargarine, and it dealt directly with that subject matter. That shows the real distinction which we find running all through the various references of such measures. I hold in my hand a list showing the references of a great many measures of that sort, but I shall not take the time of the Senate to read the entire list. A number of measures were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but in practically every case the bills referred to that committee called for amendments of acts

defining butter and "also imposing a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of oleomargarine." As an example, I refer to Senate bill 5745, in the third session of the Seventy-first Congress. That was a bill to amend the act entitled "An act defining butter, also imposing a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of oleomargarine, approved August 2, 1886, as amended." As will be seen from the title, the purpose of that bill was to amend that act. The bill did not provide for a repeal or change in the tax itself.

At another time, a bill which prohibited the interstate shipment of margarine in certain cases was introduced. That bill was referred to the Interstate Commerce Committee, where it might very well have gone, because the purpose of the bill was to prohibit the transportation of oleomargarine in interstate commerce.

But I think in no case except the first one—and in that case the decision was made, as the Chair has stated, by a very close vote of 22 to 21—has a bill similar to this one, relating to either the imposition of the tax or the repeal of the tax, as does the bill now before the Senate, been referred to any committee except the Finance Committee.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I noticed that the Senator from Arkansas said he had a statement giving various additional references to such measures and their reference. I do not know whether the Senator has referred to all of them, but I suggest that if he has not, at least he insert the statement in the RECORD.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall be glad to insert the entire statement at the conclusion of my remarks. There are several pages of the statement, and of course I do not like to take the time of the Senate to read all of it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the complete statement may be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my statement, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from New Mexico that I think under the former procedure the decision as to the reference of the bill was not based upon the entire bill. That point is brought out by the statement to which I have just referred. When it appeared from the title or face of the bill that it was a tax bill, the bill almost invariably was referred to the Finance Committee. When it appeared on the face of the bill that it was a regulatory bill, it was referred to the Committee on Commerce, in one case, or the Committee on Agriculture. I think that was the theory behind the reference of such bills, in all those cases.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. My only thought in suggesting that the statement be placed in the RECORD was that undoubtedly the Senator from Arkansas has done a great deal of work on this matter, and I thought that for the sake of future reference it would be well to have the entire statement available in the RECORD.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. In regard to the statement by the Senator from Arkansas that tax bills on this subject were referred to the Finance Committee and that other bills relating to oleomargarine were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I wish to point out that the bills which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry did not call for the removal of tax on oleomargarine, but simply called for removal of obstructions to the free distribution of that commodity. That was the fact in the case of the last oleomargarine bill upon which the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry held extended hearings some 3 or 4 years ago. In that case, the bill did not provide for removing the tax on oleomargarine, but simply provided for removing the obstructions to the free distribution of that commodity.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, may I say that I did not read the full text of all the bills, but from their face it is obvious that the decision as to their reference was based solely upon a brief reading of what the bill purported to be, particularly as shown by its title. Whenever it was obvious that the bill was a tax bill, it was referred to the Finance Committee. I think the Senator will agree that that is the case, and that in practically every case where a cursory examination of such a bill showed that it related to tax matters, the bill was referred to the Finance Committee.

One of the best examples was a bill relating to the shipment of oleomargarine in interstate commerce. That bill was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. That fact further illustrates, I think, the theory applied in the reference of such bills.

Mr. President, a further point which I think the Senate should consider here as a matter of pure, practical fairness in regard to this proposed legislation is that, as everyone knows, this subject has been before the Senate, on and off, for 62 years. Everyone also knows that the Senate never has had an opportunity to vote upon such proposed legislation to repeal these taxes, on its merits, by itself.

After the vote on the amendment I offered to the tax bill, several Senators came to me and said that they felt obligated to do what they could to have the Senate pass the income-tax-reduction bill, the so-called Knutson bill, by itself, and that they felt obligated to oppose any controversial amendments which might jeopardize the final passage of that bill. But several of those Senators said, "We are in favor of the repeal of these oleomargarine taxes, on the merits of the matter, and we shall support a bill which does that."

Today, after the unprecedented action of the House of Representatives in taking the proposed legislation, by petition, from the Committee on Agriculture, and passing it by a vote of nearly 3 to 1, with the result that now the proposed legislation comes to the Senate, we find that the same officials of the Senate, after having referred an identical bill to the Finance Committee in December, now decide that the bill presently under consideration must be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Foresty. Mr. President, that fact in itself raises a question as to the reason for such action. If they are interested in the bill on its merits and in an objective way, why was not the question raised in December in connection with the reference of the other bill? That is the question which bothers so many of us who are solely interested in presenting the bill to the Senate for a vote—a vote on the merits of this issue alone.

It seems to me that after all that has been gone through and after all the trouble that has been taken by the proponents and, no doubt, also by the opponents, it would be a very sorry and sad thing for this measure to be buried in a committee. Of course, I do not say that I believe the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will not proceed to consider the bill on its merits, but I call attention to the fact that an identical bill already has been the subject of hearings before the Finance Committee. I appeared before the Finance Committee in support of the bill I introduced, which is the same as the Rivers bill which now is before the Senate. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] also appeared before the committee, not only this year but in 1944 when he had an amendment very similar to this measure. In other words, during the past several years, and in modern days, let us say, in connection with the matter of taxes, the Finance Committee has considered this proposed legislation.

I may say that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is now deeply engaged in the consideration of the long-term agricultural program; and after consultation with some of the members of that committee, I am informed by them that they could not proceed to hold hearings on this proposed legislation this week. They say they might get to it next week.

Mr. President, when we consider how close we are now to the end of the present session of Congress, and in view of the fact that the leadership of the House, I know—and I believe this is also true of the leadership of the Senate—has said they hope to have the Congress adjourn by the 18th of June, and in view of the further fact that we know that practically all the major appropriation bills are yet to be acted upon or are just now beginning to come before the Senate, obviously it may well happen that if this proposed legislation is sent to a committee which already is burdened with the consideration of other important legislation and is not familiar with the recent hearings on this subject which have been held by another Senate committee, the result may be that there will be a fatal delay in the consideration of the bill by that committee.

I therefore submit that today there is no excuse for shifting the reference of

this measure to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and to deprive the Committee on Finance of the jurisdiction which it so long has exercised. Incidentally, I believe it can be correctly stated that the Finance Committee at the present time has practically no important legislation pending before it. If it has, I am not aware of it. I know one member of the committee told me yesterday he knew of no important tax legislation now pending. It would therefore be logical and reasonable to assume that this bill could be considered by the Committee on Finance and reported in time to be acted on at the present session. If the bill is not acted upon, if it should in accordance with the ruling of the President pro tempore go to the Agriculture and Forestry Committee and should not be acted upon, it seems that the Senate and the committee in so voting will have taken the responsibility of denying the right of the Senate to have an opportunity of voting on this legislation. The legislation has been, it may be said, pending on and off for 62 years. This is the first opportunity in all that time we have had of voting upon it. That is assuming the committee will report it to the Senate.

EXHIBIT A

OLEOMARGARINE TAXES

1947

S. 985 (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina). A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine. Referred to Committee on Finance.

S. 1907 (Mr. FULBRIGHT). A bill repealing certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to the tax on oleomargarine, and for other purposes. Referred to Committee on Finance.

1946 AND 1945

None.

1944

S. 1744 (Mr. Smith of South Carolina). A bill to provide for the more efficient utilization of the agricultural resources of the Nation during peace and war; to regulate the production and distribution of margarine; a product of certain agricultural commodities, in interstate commerce; to remove certain obstruction to the distribution of such product in interstate commerce; and for other purposes. Referred to Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

1943

S. 1426 (Mr. MAYBANK). A bill to provide that certain taxes imposed with respect to the sale or manufacture of oleomargarine which is yellow in color shall be suspended until the expiration of 6 months after the termination of hostilities in the present war. Referred to Committee on Finance.

Mr. BUSHFIELD presented a resolution of the South Dakota State Dairy Association opposing H. R. 2400, relating to taxes on oleomargarine and license taxes on manufacturers. Referred to Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. Gillette presented a resolution of the National Cooperative Milk Producers Association, opposing legislation to repeal Federal commodity and license taxes on oleomargarine. Referred to Committee on Finance.

Mr. CAPPER presented a similar resolution. Referred to Committee on Finance.

1942

Mr. Davis presented a petition of Pomona Grange of Butler, Pa., favoring legislation to regulate the composition of oleomargarine. Referred to Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

1941

S. 1921 (Mr. Gillette). A bill to promote and protect the public welfare by prohibiting the shipment and sale in interstate and foreign commerce of oleomargarine containing any milk or its products, or which is yellow in color, or which is in semblance or imitation of butter as to color, flavor, or appearance; to regulate the advertising of oleomargarine; to provide for the enforcement of this act; to provide penalties, and for other purposes. Referred to Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

1940

Resolution of the National Cotton Council of America remonstrating against the penalties imposed on the use of margarine. Referred to the Committee on Finance.

1939 AND 1938

None.

1937

Mr. Duffy presented a joint resolution of the legislature of the State of Wisconsin opposing the passage of House bill 3905, relating to the sale of oleomargarine. Referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

1936

Resolutions adopted by milk producers' locals of New England opposing interstate shipments of oleomargarine, favoring the retention of duties on foreign vegetable oils for domestic purposes, and an additional tax on oleomargarine. Referred to Committee on Finance.

Resolutions of New York branch of Dairymen's League Cooperative Association, asking for a tax of 5 cents per pound on fats used in producing oleomargarine. Referred to Committee on Finance.

1935

Mr. La Follette presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin favoring an increase in the tariff on foreign fats and oils used in the manufacture of oleomargarine. Referred to Committee on Finance.

1934

The Vice President laid before the Senate a resolution of the St. Lawrenceburg (N. Y.) Pomona Grange favoring the passage of H. R. 6612, relative to the manufacture and sale of products manufactured for butter substitutes. Referred to Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 3203. (Mr. Smith of South Carolina (by request)). A bill to amend an act entitled "An act defining butter, also imposing a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of oleomargarine," approved August 2, 1886, as amended, and for other purposes. Referred to Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

1933

None.

1932 AND 1931 (72D CONG., 1ST SESS.)

S. 2846 (Mr. Dill). A bill to prohibit the interstate shipment of oleomargarine in certain cases. Referred to Committee on Interstate Commerce.

S. 2950 (Mr. Hébert). A bill to authorize the packing of oleomargarine and adulterated butter in tin and other suitable packages. Referred to Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 4065 (Mr. Hébert). A bill of the same title as S. 2950. Referred to Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(NOTE.—This bill became a law.)

SEVENTY-FIRST CONGRESS, THIRD SESSION (DECEMBER 1929–MARCH 3, 1931)

S. 5745 (Mr. Townsend of Michigan). A bill to amend the act entitled "An act defining butter, also imposing a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, importation, exportation of oleomargarine," approved August 2, 1886, as amended. Referred to Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(The above bill was reported from the committee, and H. R. 16836, a bill of an identical title, was subsequently passed. S. 5745 was postponed indefinitely.) H. R. 16836 became a law.

S. 5750 (Mr. Howell of Nebraska). A bill of the same title as the two preceding bills. Referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(Did not get out of committee.)

(Several petitions in favor of above legislation were referred to Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.)

SEVENTY-FIRST CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION (1929 AND 1930)

S. 3838 (Mr. Hébert). A bill of the same title as the foregoing. Referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 6. A bill to amend the definition of oleomargarine contained in the act defining butter, etc., approved August 2, 1886, as amended. Referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(This bill passed the Senate by a vote of 44 to 32 and became a law.)

SEVENTY-FIRST CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION (1929)

S. 560 (Mr. Schall). A bill of the same title as H. R. 6. Referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(Not reported.)

S. 1552 (Mr. Norbeck). A bill of the same title as S. 560. Referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution of a local grange in the State of Connecticut remonstrating against any change in the oleomargarine laws. Referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SEVENTIETH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION (1928–29)

None.

SEVENTIETH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION (1928)

S. 3737 (Mr. TYDINGS). A bill to amend the definition of the words "manufacture of oleomargarine" and to amend the limitation upon oleomargarine taxable at one-fourth of 1 cent per pound in the act entitled "An act defining butter, etc.," approved August 2, 1886, as amended. Referred to Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SIXTY-NINTH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION (1927)

None.

SIXTY-NINTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION (1925–26)

The Vice President laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the legislature of the State of Wisconsin favoring legislation to prohibit the manufacture or sale of oleomargarine in the United States. Referred to Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SIXTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION (1924–25)

None.

SIXTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION (1923–24)

S. 392 (Mr. MCKELLAR). A bill to reduce the tax on oleomargarine. Referred to the Committee on Finance.

SIXTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS, SECOND, THIRD, AND FOURTH SESSIONS

None.

SIXTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION (1921)

S. 329. (Mr. MCKELLAR). A bill to reduce the tax on oleomargarine. Referred to the Committee on Finance.

SIXTY-SIXTH CONGRESS, SECOND AND THIRD SESSIONS

None.

SIXTY-SIXTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION (1919)

S. 461 (Mr. MCKELLAR). A bill to reduce the tax on oleomargarine. Referred to Committee on Finance.

SIXTY-FIFTH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION (1918)

None.

SIXTY-FIFTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION (1917)

S. 294 (Mr. McKELLAR). A bill to reduce the tax on oleomargarine. Referred to Committee on Finance.

SIXTY-FOURTH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

None.

SIXTY-FOURTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION (1915)

A resolution of the Farmers Booster Club, of Renville, Minn., opposing the proposed repeal of the tax on coloring of oleomargarine. Referred to Committee on Finance.

Mr. President, I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry in regard to this bill. As I understand, the Chair referred it to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG in the chair). That is correct. The bill was so referred.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have indicated I might appeal from the decision of the Chair. May I inquire what would be the effect of my doing that? Could a vote be had immediately upon the decision, or might it be expected that it would result in further parliamentary entanglement similar to that which was encountered today as the result of the question raised yesterday? In other words, I should like the Chair to state what would be the parliamentary situation if I were to appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The appeal, if made, would be debatable.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, the appeal would be open to debate, and if the Senator desires, the debate could be continued. If that is the desire of the Senator, it would be perfectly agreeable to me. Otherwise, I should ask for the regular order, in the hope of accomplishing the very thing the Senator has been talking about—the expediting of the program, so we can go on with other legislation and get it out of the way. But if the Senator is going to appeal, it means we shall debate this question until it comes to a vote. That would be perfectly within the rights and prerogatives of the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator feel that we may get to a vote?

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, yes. As indicated earlier when I made a request for unanimous consent, my hope is that we may be able to terminate this matter definitely one way or another.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I appeal, then, from the ruling of the Chair, and I request that the bill be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

NEED OF MANPOWER IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I shall not engage in a discussion of the issue before the Senate. I have been waiting for some time to obtain permission to insert in the RECORD figures which I feel would be of extreme value in connection with a matter which we must very shortly consider. That is the question of manpower in the armed services.

In the last few weeks the country has been treated to a somewhat tragic spectacle in the confusion prevailing in administration proposals concerning manpower required for the National Defense Establishment.

In congressional committees and in press statements we have heard the most confusing figures concerning the number of men needed in the armed forces. Accompanied by widely varying presumptions and suppositions these different sets of figures range from manpower strength of 1,385,216 to 2,006,000. In some cases, the estimates were changed from day to day, and the figures also differed according to who was the spokesman for the armed forces at the particular time.

Congress and the country has been carried into hopeless confusion on what kind of defense we need, on what manpower we now have and the manpower we still need, and whether we must get the needed manpower by draft, by UMT, or in some other way.

The main difficulty in all these confusing figures is the lack of standards showing how many men are needed.

Too much elasticity is allowed to the military estimators. What determines whether the army should have 5,000 or 20,000, or 50,000 soldiers in Japan, or in Germany, or Trieste, or in Austria? What determines how many soldiers are needed to service an air base, if 200, 500, or 1,000 planes are to be based there? What determines how many men are needed to maintain the defense of the continental homeland? What determines whether we should have more or less air forces and mechanized units or more or less foot soldiers?

In short, military manpower is an instrument to achieve certain ends. It should be calculated scientifically with some reasonable relation to what the men are expected to do in national defense and in foreign policy. It should not be done in guesswork off the cuff.

Nowhere has the Military Establishment set forth the standards which determine the number of men needed. They apparently prefer to leave this to their own elastic guesswork.

In order to aid the Senate get a better perspective of this military manpower, I have caused a survey to be made of all the different guesses made since the President raised the subject in his St. Patrick's Day address. The survey covers only official testimony and authentic press statements of officials.

It shows two things clearly: The defense establishment has not yet achieved real unification; and the men charged with the defense of the country have presented no clear conception of the nature and needs of future warfare.

If we had unification and a clear sense of the strategy of future warfare, we should not be floundering around with these diverse estimates of what the armed services need. Senators will certainly find these different estimates very interesting, and I hope the figures will be examined with the care and attention they deserve.

I now ask unanimous consent that these figures, compiled from official statements by the various committees in recent days, may be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, for the information of the Senate and of the country.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I. Authorized military strength [1]

Army	[2] 669,000
Air Force	[2] 401,000
Total	[3] 1,070,000
Navy	[4] 557,000
Marine Corps	[4] 107,200
Total	664,200
Total	1,734,200

[1] "The authorized strength of all branches of the military service are regulated by Congress, and presumably so regulated to the size necessary to take care of the duties that Congress gives to the military forces." (Senator CHAN GURNEY, Apr. 2, 1948.) "The authorized strength is a figure assigned by Congress really as a ceiling." (Secretary of Defense James Forrestal, Mar. 18, 1948.)

[2] These figures represent a division on basis of Executive order and administrative agreement between Army and Air Force. Secretary Royall on Mar. 18 stated: "There is some question as to whether the 669,000 is a ceiling or an authorization." (Hearings, Universal Military Training, Senate Armed Services Committee, p. 39.)

[3] War Department Circular 119, dated Apr. 24, 1946. An amendment to the Selective Service Act of 1940 stated the combined strength of Army and Air Force was not "to exceed 1,070,000 men as of July 1, 1947." This ceiling figure expired with the Selective Service Act.

[4] Public Law 347, 79th Cong.

II. Military strength recommended by President Truman in budget messages

	Fiscal year 1948 [1]	Fiscal year 1949 [2]
Army	1,070,000	560,000
Air Force		362,290
Navy	571,000	417,589
Marines		83,548
Total	1,641,000	1,423,427

[1] Message dated Jan. 3, 1947.
[2] Message dated Jan. 6, 1948.

III. Military strength based on appropriations, fiscal year 1948 [1]

	Average man-year strength [2]	Average man-year strength
Army	665,037	[3] 583,205
Air Force	[4] 391,549	[3] 338,355
Navy	439,180	(439,180)
Marine	87,019	(87,019)
Total	1,582,785	1,447,750

[1] Army Department Statistical Division (Mr. Bonis).
[2] Military strength during any fiscal year is dependent upon actual appropriations by Congress.
[3] After rescission of budget fiscal year 1948; first deficiency appropriation bill, H. R. 6055.
[4] Personnel to provide 40 groups fully activated at peacetime strength and 15 skeletonized groups (Senate, UMT, p. 393).

IV. Actual current military strength [1]

Army	542,000
Air Force	364,450
Navy	397,107
Marines	81,659
Total	1,385,216

[1] Hearings, UMT, Senate Armed Services Committee, Mar. 18, 25, 1948, pp. 353, 362, 381.

V. Military strength proposed by Secretary of Defense Mar. 25, 1948

Army	782,000
Air Force	[1] 400,000
Navy	460,000
Marines	92,000
Total	1,734,000

[1] Personnel necessary to provide 55 air groups fully activated at peacetime strength. Six of 55 are to be "special striking groups" having 50 percent additional planes and with 2 crews for each plane. Estimated cost of increase: $3,000,000,000.

VI. Military strength recommended by Joint Chiefs of Staff, Apr. 14, 1948 [1]

Army	837,000
Air Force	502,000
Navy, Marines	668,000
Total	2,007,000

[1] Premises a "balanced" force in line with 70 air groups. Based "solely on military considerations." $9,000,000,000 cost.

VII. Military strength proposed by General Bradley, Apr. 15, 1948

Army	[1] 822,000
Do	[2] 15,000
Do	[3] 95,000
Total	932,000

[1] Provides 12 divisions. "Barest minimum for security."

[2] Additional if Air Force is expanded to 70 groups.

[3] Additional if UMT is passed.

VIII. Military strength recommended by Secretary of Defense for a 66-group Air Force, Apr. 21, 1948 [1]

Army	790,000
Air Force	453,000
Navy, marines	552,000
Total	[2] 1,795,000

[1] Recommendation approved by President Truman and Joint Chiefs of Staff. Cost—$3,481,000,000. Based on impact of preparedness program on economy.

[2] New York Times, Apr. 22, 1948.

IX. Military strength proposed in revised H. R. 6274, selective-service bill, Apr. 21, 1948

Army	837,000
Air Force	[1] 502,000
Navy	556,000
Marines	111,000
Total	2,006,000

[1] Based on a 70-group air force.

X. Military strength proposed by Secretary Royall in Senate Armed Services draft-UMT plan, Apr. 27, 1948

(Draft: 161,000 (18–19 age group), 1 year UMT; 190,000 (19-25 age group), 2-year service to bring Army up to par.)

UMT draftees distribution:

Army	110,000
Air Force	15,000
Navy	30,000
Marines	6,000
Total	161,000

Army, 790,000 + 110,000 [1]	900,000
Air Force, 453,000 + 15,000 [1]	468,000
Navy, Marine Corps, 522,000 + 36,000 [1]	588,000
Total	1,956,000

[1] See table VIII.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be absent for the next 3 days, in connection with attending the funeral services of a very old friend.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1004. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 so as to grant specific authority to the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to require investigations by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the character, associations, and loyalty of persons nominated for appointment, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to offices established by such act;

S. 1132. An act to amend section 40 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (39 Stat. 728), as amended;

S. 1298. An act to validate payments heretofore made by disbursing officers of the United States Government covering cost of shipment of household effects of civilian employees, and for other purposes;

S. 1545. An act to authorize a bridge, roads and approaches, supports and bents, or other structures, across, over, or upon lands of the United States within the limits of the Colonial National Historical Park at or near Yorktown, Va.;

S. 1611. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Sauk Rapids, Minn.;

S. 1985. An act to amend the act entitled "Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act," approved July 19, 1940; and

S. J. Res. 198. Joint resolution to authorize the Postmaster General to withhold the awarding of star-route contracts for a period of 60 days.

EXPENDITURE OF INCOME FROM FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC., FOR TRAINING OF FEDERAL PRISONERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1648) to authorize the expenditure of income from Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for training of Federal prisoners, which was, in line 12, after "schooling" to insert "within the limits of amounts specifically authorized annually in the Government Corporations Appropriations Act."

Mr. AIKEN. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF SURPLUS PROPERTY ACT OF 1944

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2239) to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. AIKEN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. THYE, and Mr. MCCLELLAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON AMENDMENTS TO LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement which I issued as chairman of the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations announcing that that committee will hold public hearings, beginning on May 24, on various proposed specific amendments to the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947. The statement indicates some specific questions on which the committee invites testimony.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOSEPH H. BALL, REPUBLICAN, OF MINNESOTA, CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

The Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations will hold public hearings, beginning May 24, on proposed specific amendments to the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 and on problems which have arisen under it.

The committee especially invites testimony directed toward the following five points:

1. The provisions requiring an authorization election before a union shop contract. The NLRB is flooded with petitions for such elections and the great majority held so far have been won by large majorities, while in some industries like construction, where employment is intermittent, holding the elections presents serious administrative problems. Should the law be amended, in the interest of more efficient administration, either to prohibit all forms of compulsory membership in unions, or to eliminate the authorization by election requirement while retaining the other restrictions?

2. What steps can be taken to speed up the handling of both representation and unfair practice cases to final decisions? Do the NLRB's interpretation of the non-Communist affidavit provisions, its refusal to apply the free-speech amendment to representation cases, and its failure to speed up its own procedures, indicate a trend which make it advisable to transfer enforcement to the Federal courts directly, or to some new labor courts?

3. How should the law's provisions regarding industry-wide bargaining and stoppages be strengthened to meet, for instance, the current threat of a railroad strike, or the situation if the present 80-day injunction period fails to bring about a settlement in a basic industry like coal or steel? Possible approaches to the fundamental problem, which is the concentration of economic power that industry-wide bargaining inevitably develops, are strict regulations, such as compulsory arbitration or seizure in the public interest, or applying the antitrust law principle of breaking up the concentration of power on both sides of the bargaining table.

4. What is a sound, permanent solution to the problem of union welfare funds? The NLRB recently ruled that employers must bargain on welfare funds, and some unions have prevailed on employers to make initial contributions to welfare funds in existence prior to January 1, 1946, thereby avoiding the restrictions of the Taft-Hartley Act, while there is grave doubt as to the actuarial soundness of some such funds. Is a jointly administered welfare fund desirable or workable, particularly where a large employer may deal with a dozen or more different unions? The committee invites testimony on these and similar points pertaining to welfare funds.

5. There have been recently some strikes and numerous threats of strikes aimed at forcing employers to agree to contracts either violating the law or evading it. Should such strikes or threats of strikes be made unlawful?

Witnesses desiring to testify should write to either Senator BALL, chairman, or Representative FRED HARTLEY, vice chairman, of the committee, indicating specifically the nature of their proposed testimony. The committee is not interested in broad, general statements either for or against the Taft-Hartley Act, but rather in specific suggestions, preferably related to factual experience, for its improvement.

SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT BY LEO GOODMAN IN OPPOSITION TO CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATION OF T. E. WOODS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the supplemental statement of Leo Goodman in opposition to the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. T. E. Woods to be the Housing Expediter.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT BY LEO GOODMAN APPEARING IN BEHALF OF WALTER P. REUTHER, CHAIRMAN OF CIO HOUSING COMMITTEE, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY COMPLETING HIS TESTIMONY OF APRIL 21 IN OPPOSITION TO THE CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATION OF T. E. WOODS, OF WASHINGTON, D. C., TO BE THE HOUSING EXPEDITER

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
NATIONAL HOUSING COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., April 26, 1948.

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Chairman, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Under permission to supplement my remarks, I hereby submit the following additional information for the benefit of the committee. I wish to list the following reasons why Mr. Woods should not be confirmed:

1. Mr. Woods' interpretation of the provision of Housing and Rent Act regarding local advisory boards constitutes malfeasance of office.

2. Mr. Woods decontrolled maximum rents in Bremerton, Wash., on April 7, 1948, even though the evidence available to him indicated that the need for rental housing had not been reasonably met as required by the act.

3. Mr. Woods, in an effort to gain support for confirmation to the position of Housing Expediter officially initiated a policy on the continuance of rent control which is not supported by the act and which will result in weakening the rent-control program.

4. Mr. Woods, in an effort to obtain confirmation support discharged able and effective key personnel in the program.

5. Mr. Woods made drastic changes in the rent regulations which were not required by the new law and which will result in widespread confusion and hardship on both landlords and tenants.

I shall discuss each of these points in turn.

1. I charge that the position of Mr. Tighe Woods regarding the recommendations made by local advisory boards under the Housing and Rent Act of 1948 that the present conditions constitute malfeasance.

The 1948 rent-control law provides that recommendations of local advisory boards are binding on the Housing Expediter if "approximately substantiated and in accordance with applicable law and regulations." But the 1948 act, as distinguished from the 1947 law, sets forth several specific conditions which must be met in order for recommendations to be "appropriately substantiated and in accordance with applicable law and regulations." These requirements include public hearings after due notice at which evidence may be presented by interested parties. The new law further provides in section 204 (e) (4) for review by the emergency court of appeals of all recommendations which are turned down by the Housing Expediter.

In spite of the clear mandate of the act as to the conditions necessary for recommendations to be "appropriately substantiated and in accordance with applicable law and regulations," Mr. Woods, on April 5, stated in a press release that he was advising local boards that they could ignore the statutory requirements as to public hearings after due notice, and the making of a public record. He stated also that if the local boards did not follow the requirements of the act as to public hearings they could not obtain a review in the emergency court if he rejected the recommendations.

This statement of April 5 represented a departure from his public statement of April 1, in which he outlined the steps to be taken by local boards in order to comply with the law.

Mr. Woods' new notions of the law which he expounded on April 5 apparently stemmed from one of the questions put to him by the chairman of Subcommittee on Rent. I respectfully submit that this theory of alternate procedures for local boards is flatly contrary to the letter and the spirit of the Housing and Rent Act of 1948.

I understand that it is defended on the ground that other sections of the act authorize and direct the Housing Expediter to decontrol rent areas and to make general rent increases on his own initiative, and that he may therefore rely on recommendations of local boards even though the boards do not follow the procedural requirements of the act. The act clearly provides that he may decontrol or raise rents generally on his own initiative. But I submit that he cannot lean on or, so to speak, hide behind local board recommendations to support him unless the local boards comply with the procedural requirements of the act in every detail. One of the salutary provisions of the new act was that such drastic action as decontrol or across-the-board rent hikes would receive a public airing at the local level.

2. On April 7, 1948, Mr. Woods decontrolled maximum rents in Bremerton, Wash., over the objection of the local advisory board for Bremerton and to the consternation of the community at large. Mr. Woods' action was not supported by the evidence available to him. (See appendix A attached for a summary of the evidence and for the sequence of events leading up to this shocking action of Mr. Woods in decontrolling Bremerton.)

3. Mr. Woods, in order to obtain support for his confirmation to the office of Housing Expediter, initiated an official policy which is not supported by the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 as amended and which will result in weakening the rent-control program. This policy is to reject recommendations for the continuation of rent controls if they are not "appropriately substantiated." While this policy appears on its face to be reasonable, an examination of its application shows that it is absurd and can lead to bad results. While everyone will agree that it is better for any recommendation to be supported by factual data this particular type of recommendation is not covered by the Housing and Rent Act. Mr. Woods, prior to the hearings before this committee on the rent-control legislation, communicated with all of the local advisory boards, throughout the country and requested that they submit to him their recommendation concerning the need for the continuance of rent control after the expiration of the 1947 law on February 29, 1948. He made it clear that these recommendations were to be presented to Congress for its information. In response to his request concerning such recommendations 358 local boards out of a total of more than 600 stated that rent control should be continued. Such recommendations in many cases were not supported by elaborate findings or factual data. These recommendations or expressions of opinion, to use Mr. Woods' term for them, were presented to the subcommittee on rent for whatever assistance they might give the Congress. The act makes no reference to this type of recommendation and such recommendations are not binding on the Housing Expediter. The basic theory of the Housing and Rent Act is that rent controls are to be continued in the various rent-control areas until the termination of the act on March 31, 1949, unless a local advisory board makes a binding recommendation to the Housing Expediter that an area be decontrolled. To be binding, such recommendations must be appropriately substantiated and in accordance with applicable law and regulations.

During the course of the hearings, however, Mr. Woods changed his official position in regard to recommendations that rent controls be continued and accepted the patently false premise that he will reject such recommendations when they are not appropriately substantiated. At several points in the hearings on rent control Mr. Woods referred to such recommendations as being illegal. The absurdity of this position becomes apparent when one considers its strange results. For example, if a local advisory board remains silent a defense-rental area will remain under rent control, but according to this singular theory, the area will be decontrolled if the local advisory board submits a recommendation for the continuance of controls without supporting evidence. The act, as stated earlier, makes no provision for such recommendations, but continues the preexisting controls by authority of the statute, placing a limited authority in local advisory boards to recommend changes in rent-control conditions either by the way of decontrol or rent increases, with appropriate guaranties that such actions are justified under the standards of the act.

4. I charge that in order to secure support for his confirmation Mr. Woods discharged Mr. Henry Zetzer, of Cleveland, the very able and effective regional administrator for the third region, and discharged Mr. Robert Yost, of New York City, the able deputy rent administrator in the second region.

5. Mr. Woods changed his rent regulations in March to provide that rent increases were to be thereafter retroactive to the date on which a landlord files petition for a rent increase. He gave as the reason for this drastic departure from the historical position of the rent-control program that it was unfair to landlords to deprive them of rent increases during the time their petitions for such were under consideration. This change in the regulations has already resulted in widespread confusion concerning the rights and liabilities of landlords and tenants affected by these rent increases. Mr. Woods

must have known that this would be the result of this change in the regulation. In most situations the retroactive rent increase cannot be of benefit to the landlord because under local State law the landlord will not be able to collect an increase in rent for a past period during which the tenant has already paid the rent. Of course in some situations tenants will not be advised of their rights under local law and will therefore be coerced into paying rent increases for considerable periods of time which they will not be legally liable for. In addition, I submit that an effective rent-control program requires certainty, insofar as possible, regarding the maximum rents. With the possibility of retroactive rent increases maximum rents will be uncertain.

Administration of the law requires honest, fearless men with a high degree of integrity. I hope, therefore, that the committee, in the case pending before it, will give complete and full analysis of the charges made above, and I am sure will conclude after close study that Mr. Woods does not have those qualities of judgment which are so necessary in the Administrator of this particular agency and will, therefore, reject his nomination.

Respectfully yours,

LEO GOODMAN,
Director, CIO National Housing Committee.

ELEVEN YEARS AGO NORTH DAKOTA BEGAN THE FIGHT AGAINST THE MOTION-PICTURE MONOPOLY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in 1937, 11 years ago, in North Dakota the legislature passed an act divorcing the producers of films from the owners of moving-picture theaters. They did that because our legislature was satisfied at that time that a monopoly had been created. The great trust would go into a city and say to the owner of a theater, "Unless you sell out to us, we are going to erect another theater in this town and you will not be able to get first pictures, but we will show all the fine pictures in our own theater, and later you can get them as seconds."

This great trust went to the town of Grand Forks, N. Dak., where there was a young man by the name of Bennie Berger, who owned three theaters. They said, "Unless you sell out to us we, who produce or distribute these movies, are going to put our own theater into the city of Grand Forks and you will get only seconds." So Mr. Berger sold out, and the legislature of North Dakota became the first legislature in the history of the United States to pass a divorcement bill.

Immediately the law was attacked in the courts. Three Federal judges came to Fargo, N. Dak., to hold a hearing, which lasted a considerable length of time. The trust sued for an injunction against the attorney general of our State, Mr. Alvin C. Strutz, to keep him from enforcing the new law. Within a short time the three judges handed down a unanimous decision upholding the law. The trust promptly appealed.

About that time the theater trust met in Milwaukee, Wis. On that occasion the governor-elect of Wisconsin, a young man, who unfortunately died a week or 10 days afterward, Mr. Lommis, appeared with me at that time, and one of the heads of this gigantic trust had the audacity to rise in Milwaukee and say that the theater trust was so strong that if necessary it could spend a billion dollars in any fight in this land in order to maintain its power.

Upon that occasion, Mr. President, I had the great pleasure of telling these gentlemen of the Movie Trust that, although we did not have a billion dollars to spend in the State of North Dakota, we would spend all that was necessary in order to enforce the statute passed by our legislature. At the time the hearing had been held at Fargo, N. Dak., the Department of Justice had two Assistant Attorneys General sitting in the courtroom. They ordered a transcript of the testimony, and the Government was vitally interested in that particular hearing.

Mr. President, when the case against North Dakota came into the Supreme Court of the United States, out of a clear sky, after the case had been set for hearing, the two houses of the Legislature of North Dakota repealed the act inside of half an hour. I regretted that I no longer occupied the governor's chair so that I could veto the repeal.

I am not going into what took place in North Dakota, Mr. President, because that is a matter of record in that great book written by Kenneth Crawford.

But what North Dakota did 10 years ago bore fruit, and the Attorney General of the United States brought an action. Yesterday, May 3, we got that great decision for the people from the Supreme Court of the United States. The Supreme Court sustained the findings of a three-judge district court, in United States against Paramount Pictures, Inc., et al., that the eight major film distributors have engaged in a Nation-wide conspiracy to violate the antitrust law. Upon the Government's appeal from the failure of the courts below to order divestiture of the theaters owned by five of the major distributors, the Supreme Court vacated the findings of the court below to the effect that these defendants had no exhibition monopolies, and ordered the court to reexamine its conclusions in this respect. The Supreme Court flatly rejected the district court's conclusion that a system of competitive bidding would give adequate relief against the violations found, and ordered this provision of the judgment vacated. It directed the district court to grant theater divestiture of the kind sought by the Government, but the extent of the divestiture is left to the lower court for determination in accordance with a further inquiry into the monopolistic aspects of the defendants' theater holdings.

The decision of the Supreme Court also affirmed the district court's injunctions against block booking, price fixing, and unreasonable clearance. The holding that all clearance agreements made by the major distributors are presumptively invalid is affirmed, and this particular practice may no longer be used in the future as it has in the past to protect theaters affiliated with the distributors and large theater circuits from the competition of independents.

The trial court's determination that the pooling of theaters is illegal, regardless of the form in which the pooling occurs, whether by agreement, ownership of stock in theater corporations, or otherwise, was also affirmed. The trial court was directed to dissolve these pools by a sale of theater interests acquired from independents, except where such an acquisition was an investment unrelated to the defendants' illegal practices. This ruling alone should go far toward breaking up the largest affiliated theater circuits, which were put together and maintained in large part by pooling arrangements with independents.

In short, while Monday's decision could not itself be the ultimate victory for which the Government has striven, since the Supreme Court did not itself undertake to write or specify the details of the final decree, it represents assurance that the final decree, when written, will conform to the basic principles advocated by the Government in this litigation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the opinion of the Supreme Court, delivered by Associate Justice Douglas in the case of Schine Chain Theaters, Inc., and others, against the United States of America, be made a part of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Supreme Court of the United States—No. 10—October term, 1947]

SCHINE CHAIN THEATRES, INC., ET AL., APPELLANTS, V. THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

(May 3, 1948)

Mr. Justice Douglas delivered the opinion of the Court.

This is a companion case to No. 64, United States against Griffith (ante, p. —), and is here by way of appeal from the District Court. The appellants, who were defendants below, are a parent company, three of its officers and directors, and five of its wholly owned subsidiaries—to whom we refer collectively as Schine. As of May 19, 1942, Schine owned or had a financial interest in a chain of approximately 148 motion-picture theaters [1] located in 76 towns in 6 States,[2] the greater portion being 78 theaters in 41 towns in New York and 36 theaters in 17 towns in Ohio. Of the 76 towns, 60 were closed towns, i. e., places where Schine had the only theater or all the theaters in town.[3] This chain was acquired beginning in 1920 and is the largest independent theater circuit in the country. Since 1931 Schine acquired 118 theaters. Since 1928 the closed towns increased by 56. In 1941 there were only three towns in which Schine's competitors were playing major film products.

The United States sued to prevent and restrain appellants from violating sections

[1] These figures do not include 18 which were closed and had been or were being converted to other uses.

[2] New York (78), Ohio (36), Kentucky (18), Maryland (12), Delaware (2), Virginia (2).

[3] Schine had the only theater in each of 21 towns, both theaters in 21 towns that had two each, all theaters in 16 towns that had 3 each, and all theaters in 1 town that had 6 theaters and in another that had 4 theaters.

Of these theaters approximately 87 percent are located in cities or villages with populations under 25,000 and 60 percent in cities or villages with populations under 10,000.

1 and 2 of the Sherman Act (26 Stat. 209, 50 Stat. 693, 15 U. S. C., secs. 1, 2). The complaint charged that the Schine interests by pooling their entire circuit buying power in the negotiation of films from the distributors so as to combine its closed and open towns got advantages for itself and imposed restrictions on its competitors which otherwise would not have been possible. It charged that the distributors granted certain favors to Schine which were withheld from Schine's competitors, for example, giving Schine the first run, refusing at times second runs to Schine's competitors, charging Schine with lower rentals than it charged others, licensing to Schine films in excess of Schine's reasonable requirements.

The complaint also charged that Schine had forced or attempted to force competitors out of business and where competitors would not sell out to Schine had threatened to build or had built an opposition theater, had threatened to deprive or had deprived competitors of a desirable film or run, had cut admission prices, and had engaged in other unfair practices. In these and other ways it was charged that Schine had used its circuit buying power to maintain its monopoly and to restrain trade. The conspiracy charged was between the Schine defendants themselves and between them and the distributors.

The district court found that the appellants had conspired with each other and with the eight major film distributors [4] to violate section 1 and section 2 of the Sherman Act. Its findings may be summarized as follows:

The entire circuit buying power was utilized to negotiate films for all the theaters from the distributors, the negotiations ending in master agreements between a distributor and the exhibitor. This large buying power [5] gave Schine the "opportunity to exert pressure on the distributors to obtain preferences." Moreover, Schine by combining its closed and open towns in its negotiations for films was able "to dictate terms to the distributors." Schine bought films for some theaters in which it had no financial interest (but as respects more of which it had an option to purchase). It also performed the service (under so-called pooling agreements) for groups of theaters in which it and others were interested. Through the use of such buying power Schine arbitrarily deprived competitors of first- and second-run pictures, was able in many towns to secure unreasonable clearances [6] year after year of from 90 to 180 days, obtained long-term agreements for rental of film (franchises) which gave it preferences not given independent operators,[7] and received more advantageous concessions from the distributors respecting admission prices than competitors were able to get. Schine made threats to build or to open closed theaters in order to force sales of theaters in various towns or to prevent entry by an independent operator. Schine cut admission prices. Schine obtained from competitors whom it bought out agreements not to compete for long terms of years, which agreements at times extended to other towns as well. Schine obtained film-rental concessions not made available to independents. The district court entered a decree enjoining these practices and requiring a divestiture by Schine of various of its theaters (63 F. Supp. 229).

First. For the reasons stated in *United States* v. *Griffith*, the combining of the open and closed towns for the negotiation of films for the circuit was a restraint of trade and the use of monopoly power in violation of sections 1 and 2 of the act. The concerted action of the parent company, its subsidiaries, and the named officers and directors in that endeavor was a conspiracy which was not immunized by reason of the fact that the members were closely affiliated rather than independent. (See *United States* v. *Yellow Cab Co.* (332 U. S. 218, 227); *United States* v. *Crescent Amusement Co.* (323 U. S. 173).) The negotiations which Schine had with the distributors resulted in the execution of master agreements between the distributors and exhibitors. This brought the distributors into unlawful combinations with the Schine defendants. (See *United States* v. *Paramount Pictures, Inc.*) The course of business makes plain that the commerce affected was interstate (*United States* v. *Crescent Amusement Co.* (supra, pp. 180, 183–184).)

Second. Appellants object to admission in evidence of numerous interoffice communications between officials of the distributors with whom Schine dealt. The district court placed considerable reliance on them in making its findings. We will advert later to the use of these documents to prove the unreasonableness of clearances. It is sufficient at this point to ray that since a conspiracy between Schine and each of the named distributors was established by independent evidence, these interoffice letters and memoranda were admissible against all conspirators as declarations of some of the associates so far as they were in furtherance of the unlawful project. (*Hitchman Coal & Coke Co.* v. *Mitchell* (245 U. S. 229, 249); *United States* v. *Crescent Amusement Co.* (supra, p. 184); *United States* v. *Gypsum Co.* (333 U. S. —).)

Third. Appellants make detailed challenges to many of the other findings of the district court on which it based its holdings that appellants violated the act.

1. They vigorously attack the findings that Schine abitrarily deprived independents of first- and second-run pictures. Their chief contention is that there is no support for the finding of arbitrary action on the part of Schine, that Schine did not buy pictures beyond its needs in order to keep them away from its competitors, that any successful purchaser of a first- or second-run picture has an exclusive privilege that necessarily deprives competitors of the film for the period of the run, and that any advantage which Schine obtained in this regard was the result of the operation of forces of competition.

As we read the evidence underlying this finding, it was the use of Schine's monopoly power—represented by combining the buying power of the open and closed towns—which enabled it to obtain that which its competitors could not obtain. Deprivation of competitors of first- and second-run pictures in that way was indeed arbitrary in the sense that it was the product of monopoly power, not of competitive forces. That is the construction we give the finding of the district court; and as so construed it is supported by substantial evidence. There may be exceptions in the case of some subsidiary findings. But we do not stop to relate them. For even if we lay them aside as clearly erroneous for lack of support in the evidence, the conclusion is irresistible that Schine so used its monopoly power to gain advantages and preferences which, on a purely competitive basis, it could not have achieved.

2. Defense of the long-term film-rental agreements—the franchises—is made on the ground that they were accepted methods of doing business in the industry,[8] that they were favored by distributors as devices to stabilize their end of the business and to save expense, and that they were not chosen by Schine as instruments to suppress competition. But it seems to us apparent that their use served to intensify the impact of Schine's monopoly power on its competitors. For when Schine's buying power was used to acquire films produced by a distributor for 2 or 3 years rather than for 1 year alone, it plainly strengthened through the exercise of monopoly power such dominant position as Schine had over each of its competitors.

Appellants also challenge the finding that Schine obtained preferences through the franchises, in addition to long-term supplies of pictures, which were not granted independent operators. One of these preferences was found to be the unfair and inequitable clearance provisions; another, special film-rental concessions. We will consider these later. The other aspects of the findings we do not stop to analyze. For the franchise agreements as employed by Schine are unreasonable restraints of trade for the reasons stated; and they must be permanently enjoined, even though we assume their collateral aspects are not accurately described by the district court and so may not be condemned.

3. Appellants challenge the finding that Schine made threats to build theaters or to open closed ones in order to force sales of theaters in various towns or to prevent entry by an independent operator. There are inaccuracies in some of the subsidiary findings. There are episodes which are susceptible of two interpretations, one wholly innocent and the other unlawful. There are still other episodes which have the unmistakable earmarks of the use of monopoly power with intent to expand an empire and to restrain competition. On the whole we think the district court was justified in drawing the inference of unlawful purpose from the ambiguous episodes and that those coupled with the others are adequate to support these findings of the district court.

4. We reach the same result as respects the agreements not to compete which Schine exacted from competitors whom it bought out. It is not enough that the agreements may be valid under local law. Even an otherwise lawful device may be used as a weapon in restraint of trade or in an effort to monopolize a part of trade or commerce. Agreements not to compete have at times been used for that unlawful purpose. (See *United States* v. *American Tobacco Co.* (221 U. S. 106, 174); *United States* v. *Crescent Amusement Co.* (supra, p. 181).) If we had here only agreements not to compete, the inferences drawn by the district court might not be warranted. But in the setting of this record, and against the background of Schine's other monopolistic practices, it seems to us that the district court might infer that the requisite purpose was present and that these agreements were additional weapons in Schine's arsenal of power through the use of which its monopoly was sought to be extended.

5. The finding that Schine obtained film-rental concessions not made available to independent operators is not intelligible to us. For the district court went on to state that "These provisions were also in contracts with

[4] Fox, Loew, Paramount, RKO, Warner, Columbia, Universal, and United Artists.

[5] In the 1939–40 season Schine paid $1,647,000 to six distributors in film rental.

[6] By clearance is meant the period of time agreed upon which must elapse between runs of the same feature within a particular area or in specified theaters.

[7] The district court used "independents" or "independent operators" to mean competitors other than the exhibitor-distributors. Schine, of course, is an independent circuit, as that term is used in the industry.

[8] A consent order was entered in the present case on May 19, 1942, which provided, *inter alia*, that appellants would not enter into any agreement licensing films released by any distributor during a period of more than 1 year and that all agreements in existence having a longer term should be void as to all films released after the 30th day following the date of the consent order.

independents." How those concessions constitute a restraint of trade is therefore not apparent. We set aside this finding so that it may be clarified on remand of the cause.

6. There is challenge to the findings that Schine's rental agreements contained minimum admission prices, or minimum admission prices lower than those to be charged by the independent operators for subsequent runs, or relieved Schine of requirements for minimum admission prices though imposing them on its competitors. There is evidence to support the findings that minimum prices were fixed. It is well settled that the fixing of minimum prices like other types of price fixing, is unlawful per se. (*United States* v. *Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.* (310 U. S. 150).) The findings that Schine was either granted minimum admission prices more favorable than those required of its competitors, or that Schine, unlike its competitors, was relieved of all requirements for minimum prices, are also supported by evidence. It is said that these provisions of the agreements were not adhered to. But since they did exist, it is not for us to speculate as to what force or sanction they may have had.

7. There is also challenge to the finding that Schine cut admission prices. This seems uncontroverted. But price cutting without more is not a violation of the Sherman Act. It is indeed a competitive practice which this record shows to have been common in the industry. It may be used in violation of the act. Thus it may be the instrument of monopoly power to eliminate competitors or to bring them to their knees. But since it is not unlawful per se, facts and circumstances must be adduced to show that it was in purpose or effect employed as an instrument of monopoly power. Here there is nothing except a bare finding that at times Schine cut admission prices. That finding is not sufficiently discriminating to withstand analysis and is not adequate to support an injunction against price cutting.

8. The finding as to unreasonable clearances presents rather large issues. We have elaborated the point in *United States* v. *Paramount Pictures, Inc.*, and need not repeat what is said there. Clearance is an agreement by a distributor not to exhibit a film nor to license others to do so within a given area and for a stated period after the last date of the showing of the film by the licensee with whom the agreement is made.[9] It is, in other words, an agreement by a distributor to license films only for specified successive dates. It is in part designed to protect the value of the license which is granted. While it thus protects the income of the first exhibitor, there is no contention that clearance agreements are per se unlawful restraints on competition by reason of the effect they may have on admission prices or otherwise. All the district court purported to condemn, and all the appellee maintains is unlawful, are "unreasonable clearances." If reasonableness is the test, the factors which bear on it would appear to be numerous.[10] The findings and opinion of the district court, however, do not greatly illuminate the problem. What standards or criteria of unreasonableness were applied does not clearly appear. There are, however, in some of the subsidiary findings in this case a few clues as to the basis used by the district court in classifying clearances as unreasonable. Thus it said that Schine got some clearances "over towns in which Schine did not operate." But that is irrelevant to the problem of reasonableness of clearances, since by definition clearances run to both theaters and towns not owned by him who has the clearance.

The district court also found that clearances "were given over towns over which there had been no previous clearance." But that without more would not make a clearance unreasonable. The district court found that Schine got clearances over "some towns distant from 10 to upward of 20 miles" and that clearances were also obtained over "outside towns of comparably small population, distant so far that no clearance is justified." If the basis for these findings is that the towns were in different competitive areas, it would come closest to revealing the standard used by the district court in determining whether the clearances were or were not reasonable, unless possibly it be the finding that in a few instances Schine got clearances over towns where there were no theaters.

The district court cites instances of clearances which in its view were illegal because unreasonable as to time. But some of these turn out to be situations where clearances were granted over towns where Schine had the only theater in town. So perhaps the district court used as a basis for some of its findings of unreasonable clearances the absence of any competition between the theaters in question. But as to that we can only guess in each case and then wonder whether our guess was correct, because appellee suggests that one vice of Schine's clearances was that they ran not to specified theaters but to specified towns. We are, however, left somewhat in the dark whether the district court followed that theory or made the reasonableness of clearances turn on whether or not the theaters affected were in different competitive areas.

Appellee also suggests that proof of the unreasonableness of Schine's clearances is that their periods were almost uniformly the same even though there were wide variations in the condition, size, and type of pictures played in the various theaters. But we are given no clue in the findings whether that was the view of the district court. On its face it seems more like an attempt of the appellee to show what findings could have been made on the basis of the record had some discrimination been made in appraising the evidence.

Appellee seems to argue that standards of reasonableness can be dispensed with by reason of statements in the interoffice memoranda of the distributors that many of Schine's clearances were unreasonable. On the matter of clearances, however, the interests of distributors and exhibitors are not necessarily identical. For the self-interest of exhibitors which would call for long clearances would militate against the best interests of distributors.[11] So it is not clear that these declarations can properly be said to fall within the scope of the unlawful project which the two groups were sponsoring. (Cf. *Pinkerton* v. *United States* (328 U. S. 640, 647–648.) But, however that may be, these statements do not advance us very far with the problem because they too fail to give specific content to the concept of unreasonable as applied to clearances.

As a last resort appellee seeks to sustain these findings on the ground that Schine got at least some of its clearances by refusing to make any deal for the circuit unless its terms were met. But any clearance so obtained, though otherwise reasonable, would be unlawful, for it would be the product of the exercise of monopoly power. It is evident, however, that that was not the theory adopted by the district court, for it did not look to see what clearances had been obtained in that manner.

The short of the matter is that since we do not know for certain what the findings of the district court on clearances mean, they must be set aside. In doing so we, of course, do not intimate here, any more than we do in case of the other findings we have set aside in the case, that the record would not sustain findings adverse to Schine. We only hold that before we can pass on the questions tendered, findings on clearances must be made which reflect an appraisal of the complex of factors bearing on this question of reasonableness. That is a function of the district court.

Fourth. The decree entered by the district court enjoins appellants from specified acts or practices.[12] To the extent that these provisions are directed to practices reflected in findings which we set aside, they must be

[9] See note 6, supra.

[10] See Bertrand, Evans & Blanchard, The Motion Picture Industry—A Pattern of Control 40–41 (TNEC Monograph No. 43, 1941):

"The establishment of clearance schedules is an intricate procedure. It involves a complex bargaining process and the balance of a variety of opposing economic interests. It may be stated initially that the primary objective of the distributor is, of course, to maximize his total revenue from each picture. This aim gives him a very direct interest in clearance periods. The higher rental fees paid by the prior-run exhibitor are directly conditioned on the extent of the protection which he is granted, and in general the longer the clearance period before subsequent showing, the higher the rental fee the prior-run exhibitor will pay.

"On the other hand, the distributor's revenue from subsequent-run exhibition is also important to him; this income may mean the difference between black or red ink on his ledgers. But the longer the clearance period, the smaller will be these returns— not only because more customers will have attended the prior showing rather than wait for subsequent exhibition, but also because the effects of the advertising and exploitation efforts made when the picture was released will have been vitiated over this time. In general, the greater the total box-office return earned by a film in all showings, the greater will be the distributor's revenue.

* * * * *

"The relation between run, clearance, and zoning, admission price, seating capacity, and rental fees is indeed a complex one. The range covered by these factors is indicated by this fact: a license fee amounting to many thousands of dollars may be paid for the first showing of a film in a large metropolitan theater, and within a year the same film may be exhibited in some small theater in the same city for a fee of less than $20."

[11] See note 10, supra.

[12] This part of the decree provides:

"Each of the defendants is hereby enjoined and restrained:

"1. From monopolizing the supply of major first-run films in any situation where there is a competing theater suitable for first-run exhibition thereof and from monopolizing the supply of second-run film in any situation where there is a suitable theater for second-run exhibition thereof.

"2. From demanding or receiving clearance over theaters operated by others which unreasonably restricts their ability to compete with a theater owned or operated by a defendant corporation controlled by it and from attempting to control the admission prices charged by others by agreement with distributors, demands made upon distributors, or by any means whatsoever.

"3. From conditioning the licensing of films in any competitive situation outside of Buffalo, N. Y., upon the licensing of films in any other situation and from entering into any film franchise.

* * * * *

"5. From enforcing any existing agreements heretofore entered into (1) not to compete or (2) to restrict the use of any real estate to nontheatrical purposes.

"6. From using any threats or deception as a means whereby a competitor is induced to sell.

"7. From continuing any contract, conspiracy, or combination with each other or with any other person which has the purpose or effect of maintaining the exhibition or theater monopolies of the defendants or of preventing any other theater or exhibitor from competing with the defendants or any of them, and from entering into any similar contract, conspiracy, or combination for the purpose or with the effect of restraining or monopolizing trade and commerce between the States."

reexamined by the district court on remand of the case.

Appellants object to the generality of the injunction against "monopolizing" first- and second-run films.[13] The statutory requirement is that these injunctions "shall be specific in terms, and shall describe in reasonable detail, and not by reference to the bill of complaint or other document, the act or acts sought to be restrained" (38 Stat. 738, 28 U. S. C. sec. 383; and see Fed. R. Civ. P., 65 (d)). We need not determine whether the provision in question if read, as it must be, in light of the other paragraphs of the decree (*Swift & Co.* v. *United States* (274 U. S. 311, 328)) would pass muster. For we think the public interest requires that a more specific decree be entered on this phase of the case. The precise practices found to have violated the act should be specifically enjoined.

We have considered the objections to the other parts of the injunction (apart from provisions as to divestiture which we discuss later) and find them without merit.

Fifth. The district court included in its decree a divestiture provision adjudging that appellant companies be "dissolved, realined, or reorganized in their ownership and control so that fair competition between them and other theaters may be restored and thereafter maintained." The parties subsequently submitted various plans and after hearings the one submitted by the Department of Justice was approved with modifications. The plan does not provide for the dissolution of the Schine circuit through the separation of the several affiliated corporations as was done in *United States* v. *Crescent Amusement Co.* (supra, pp. 188–189). It keeps the circuit intact in that sense but requires Schine to sell certain theaters. The plan requires Schine to sell its interest in all but one theater of its selection in each of 33 towns, all but two in each of four larger towns, and two of four theaters in Rochester, New York.[14] Schine is to be divested of more than 50 of its theaters. The towns affected are over 40 out of the seventy-odd in which Schine is operating.[15] The one-theater towns of Schine are unaffected.

The decree also dissolves the pooling agreements. A trustee is appointed to make the sales which are ordered. Schine is prohibited from acquiring any financial interest in additional theaters "except after an affirmative showing that such acquisition will not unreasonably restrain competition." Schine is ordered not to buy or book films for any theater other than those in which it owns a financial interest. The district court concluded that this program of divestiture was necessary in order to restore "free enterprise and open competition amongst all branches of the motion-picture industry."

As we have noted, the district court did not follow the procedure of *United States* v. *Crescent Amusement Co.*, supra, and order the dissolution of the combination of the affiliated corporations. Schine presented such a plan and it was rejected. That plan contemplated the division of the Schine theaters among three separate corporations, with members of the Schine family owning each corporation. The district court rejected that plan because it did not furnish such separation of ownership as would assure discontinuance of the practices which had constituted violations of the act. The district court did not pursue further the prospect of dismemberment of the Schine circuit through separation of the theaters into geographical groupings under separate and unaffiliated ownerships. Nor do the findings reflect an inquiry to determine what theaters had been acquired by Schine through methods which violate the act. So far as the findings reveal, the theaters which are ordered divested may be properties which in whole or in part were lawfully acquired; and theaters which Schine is permitted to retain may, so far as the findings reveal, be ones which it obtained as the result of tactics violating the act.

In this type of case we start from the premise that an injunction against future violations is not adequate to protect the public interest. If all that was done was to forbid a repetition of the illegal conduct, those who had unlawfully built their empires could preserve them intact. They could retain the full dividends of their monopolistic practices and profit from the unlawful restraints of trade which they had inflicted on competitors. Such a course would make enforcement of the act a futile thing unless perchance the United States moved in at the incipient stages of the unlawful project. For these reasons divestiture or dissolution is an essential feature of these decrees. (See *United States* v. *Crescent Amusement Co.*, supra, p. 189, and cases cited.)

To require divestiture of theaters unlawfully acquired is not to add to the penalties that Congress has provided in the antitrust laws. Like restitution, it merely deprives a defendant of the gains from his wrongful conduct. It is an equitable remedy designed in the public interest to undo what could have been prevented had the defendants not outdistanced the government in their unlawful project. Nor is *United States* v. *National Lead Co.* (332 U. S. 319, 351–353), opposed to this view. For in that case there was no showing that the plants sought to be divested were either unlawfully acquired or used in a manner violative of the antitrust laws.

Divestiture or dissolution must take account of the present and future conditions in the particular industry as well as past violations. It serves several functions: (1) It puts an end to the combination or conspiracy when that is itself the violation. (2) It deprives the antitrust defendants of the benefits of their conspiracy. (3) It is designed to break up or render impotent the monopoly power which violates the act. (See *United States* v. *Crescent Amusement Co.* (supra, pp. 188–190); *United States* v. *Griffith.*)

The last two phases of this problem are the ones presented in this case. But the district court purported to deal with only one of them. It did not determine what dividends Schine had obtained from the conspiracy. In *United States* v. *Crescent Amusement Co.* (supra, pp. 181, 189), some of the affiliated corporations through which that empire was built were products of the conspiracy. Hence that fact without more justified the direction in the decree to unscramble them. There are no findings which would warrant such a course in this case. But an even more direct method of causing appellants to surrender the gains from their conspiracy is to require them to dispose of theaters obtained by practices which violate the antitrust acts. We do not know what findings on that score would be supported by the record, for the district court did not address itself to the problem. The upshot of the matter is that the findings do not reveal what the rewards of the conspiracy were; and consequently the court did not consider what would be the preferable way of causing appellants to surrender them. The case must therefore be remanded so that the district court may make appropriate findings on this phase of the case.

While such an inquiry is the starting point for determining to what extent divestiture should be ordered, the matter does not end there. For it may be that even after appellants are deprived of the fruits of their conspiracy, the Schine circuit might still constitute a monopoly power of the kind which the act condemns (see *American Tobacco Co.* v. *United States* (328 U. S. 781, 809, 811)), in spite of the restrictive provisions of the decree. Monopoly power is not condemned by the act only when it was unlawfully obtained. The mere existence of the power to monopolize, together with the purpose or intent to do so, constitutes an evil at which the act is aimed (*United States* v. *Griffith, ante; United States* v. *Aluminum Co. of America* (148 F. 2d 416, 432)). But whether that condition will obtain in this case must await the findings on the other phase of the case.

We accordingly set aside the divestiture provisions of the decree so that the district court can make the findings necessary for an appropriate decree. We approve the dissolution of the pooling agreements, the prohibition against buying or booking films for theaters in which Schine has no financial interest, and the restriction on future acquisitions of theaters. See *United States* v. *Crescent Amusement Co., supra,* pp. 185–187. We do not reach the question of the appointment of a trustee to sell theaters as that merely implements the divestiture provisions which must be reconsidered by the district court.

The judgment of the district court is affirmed in part and reversed in part and the cause is remanded to it for proceedings in conformity with this opinion.

So ordered.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter concurs in the result.

Mr. Justice Murphy and Mr. Justice Jackson took no part in the consideration or decision of the case.

[13] See note 12, supra, paragraph 1.

[14] It also requires Schine to sell specific theaters remaining unsold under the consent decree of May 19, 1942.

[15] Schine had withdrawn from five towns pursuant to the consent order of May 19, 1942.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, sometimes in this great country of ours there is an individual who is not very well known, an individual who sometimes, because of the magnificent fight he puts up for the interests of the common people, finally is raised from obscurity.

Everyone of us is familiar with that fine old Scandinavian in the State of Minnesota, that farmer who, when he went to purchase a little piece of machinery to repair his binder which cost $2 found that he had to pay $4 for the express charges on it. He went to New York City and there instituted a lawsuit, which resulted in express rates being cut all over this country.

We are all familiar with how, on the trip to New York, when that farmer from Minnesota got into an upper berth, he found that he was charged the same for the upper berth as he would have been charged for the lower berth, and how he then brought that famous lawsuit which resulted in a 40-percent cut in the cost of upper berths as compared with lower berths, which is in effect all over this country today. That man was so poor that during the time he was bringing these lawsuits through his attorney, James Manahan, of St. Paul, Minn., he slept in the YMCA of New York City at 15 cents a night.

In North Dakota there is a man named Benny Berger, a man who, when he was forced to sell his three theaters at Grand Forks, organized the independents all through the Northwest. He organized the Alliance of Independent Theater Owners, which was back of this lawsuit just concluded. He helped get the testimony, helped to institute lawsuits against

the big Movie Trust for triple damages; he put in days and weeks and months and years of his life, during the last 10 years, to get what was obtained in the Supreme Court yesterday—a decision which, in my opinion—will wipe out forever the combination between the manufacturers of films or the distributors of films and the owners of theaters which have been forcing out the little fellow from the theater business.

Mr. President, some time ago the Attorney General of the United States, Tom Clark, proceeded to take a personal interest in this law suit. Mr. Clark went to New York City and worked on the case, and when it was finally argued in the Supreme Court of the United States, on the one side were to be found what in my opinion was the greatest array of counsel that money could procure, men who had long been in the Government employ and had recently left it. Certainly they were then before the Supreme Court of the United States arrayed against the Government. It was a perfect example, Mr. President, of what a corporation or a group of corporations worth billions of dollars can do. They hire the men who have the finest reputation, men with reputedly the best brains. On the other side of the case was the Attorney General of the United States, Tom Clark, personally, in there fighting for the interest of the common people of the United States. In view of the magnificent victory that Tom Clark gained there in the interest of the common people of the United States I cannot permit this opportunity to pass without rising on the floor of the Senate and paying tribute to this man. He is paid but a small sum of money as Attorney General of the United States, a small salary which we have time and again attempted to raise, as we have attempted to raise the salaries of the heads of other departments. Nevertheless, Mr. Clark not only ably protected the interest of the common people of the country but the decision has routed the enemies of the common people.

Mr. President, I only hope that the time will soon come when the new method of law enforcement instituted by Tom Clark will be accepted all over the country. Until the time he became Attorney General of the United States the Sherman antitrust law had never been enforced by means of criminal prosecution. Not a single individual had ever been sent to jail for violating the Sherman Antitrust Act. If a GI stole a loaf of bread, if a small merchant violated the OPA regulations by selling a loaf of bread for a penny more than the price fixed by OPA, he would be put into jail. But those representing the great, rich, powerful corporations, who would manipulate and connive so that they could have control of the milk and the bread of the country, and raise the price of milk and bread so that they would be almost prohibitive to the little children and the mothers who needed them, such men never were arrested until Tom Clark became Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. President, although Tom Clark is a Democrat and I am a Republican, I desire to pay public tribute to him because he is a man who has the stamina to move forward and do something which no Attorney General, whether Democrat or Republican, has done since the law was enacted in 1890, approximately 57 years ago. Nothing was done until this young man from Texas became the Attorney General of the United States. Every American citizen can well be proud of this fine public official.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to rise upon the floor of the Senate and say to the American people that at long last, after 57 years, we now have a man as Attorney General of the United States who is enforcing the Sherman Antitrust Act, by criminal procedure, although that was not involved in this particular case, and who has served notice to all the country that if men get together to violate the Sherman Antitrust Act they will be pulled up short by the Department of Justice of the United States of America.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to compliment the Senator from North Dakota on the statement he has just made with respect to the attitude of the Attorney General, Mr. Tom Clark, with respect to the enforcement of the antitrust laws. I listened with a great deal of interest and approval to what the Senator had to say about the decision of the Supreme Court with respect to the motion-picture case. It involves one of the aspects of the general problem of economic concentration which has been going on for years without number.

The Senator has presided as chairman of a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary at several very illuminating hearings on the bill which has been introduced to amend the Clayton Act so as to plug the gap which was created by several decisions of the Supreme Court some 20 years ago, by which the teeth were taken out of the old Clayton Act. I know the Senator's sympathy for that proposal. The bill, which was introduced in the House by the distinguished Representative KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, was, as the Senator knows, approved by the House Committee on the Judiciary, and was then sent to the Committee on Rules where, like some other bills, it has been buried very silently for about a year.

The companion measure, which I had the privilege of introducing upon this side, is in the Committee on the Judiciary. I feel, and I know the Senator from North Dakota feels, that great progress can be achieved toward the attainment of the objectives which the Senator holds in his heart, and to which he has given such eloquent expression this afternoon, of breaking down monopoly, if we can get that bill out on the floor. I know, from what the Senator has said at the hearings, that he sympathizes with the objectives of that measure. May I ask the Senator what prospects he thinks there may be now for favorable action by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on this measure?

Mr. LANGER. I may tell my distinguished colleague from Wyoming that personally I have been ready to report the bill for months. I am for the bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming; I am for every word of it, for every comma, for the dotting of every "i" and the crossing of every "t" just as it is. The trouble has been that one member of the subcommittee has been ill a great deal of the time, and is ill now, the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. The other member of the subcommittee, the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] resigned from the subcommittee several weeks ago. No Senator has yet been appointed to take his place. The hearings have been completed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The chairman of the full Committee on the Judiciary is on the floor. Perhaps he would be willing to serve on that committee in the vacancy, and help to bring forth the bill.

Mr. LANGER. I simply wish to say that I have not the least doubt that in a very short time the distinguished and very able chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary will appoint another Senator to take the place of the Senator from Michigan on the subcommittee. I think it has not been settled from what subcommittee the Senator from Michigan will retire and of what subcommittee he will remain a member. I am sure we will have in the future, as we have always had in the past, the cooperation of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from North Dakota for that statement, and I express the hope, in the presence of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] that we may have prompt action upon that bill. I say this in all sincerity because I believe that unless we take positive steps to control monopoly in the United States it will be difficult to maintain a free economy. Concentration has been going on in every industry. The practices which the Senator from North Dakota has described in the motion-picture industry, under which independent theater owners were being bludgeoned into the sale of their properties, are not at all confined to that industry. The independent operator is finding great difficulty in every single industry. The statistics before us show that the degree of concentration which has taken place in every industry in the United States is such that the independent operators scarcely have the opportunity to exist.

Mr. President, I shall take more time a little later to discuss this issue, with facts and figures.

THE BATTLE OF BUNKER HILL, 1948 VERSION—TRIBUTE TO THE PEOPLE OF BUNKER HILL, ILL.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I desire to pay tribute today to the 1,380 citizens of the heroic community of Bunker Hill, Ill.

At 6:45 a. m. on March 19, 1948, Bunker Hill was struck by a devastating tornado. In approximately 60 seconds, 20 persons were killed, 126 others were injured, and 80 percent of the area was leveled to the ground.

In 1 minute a century of work, progress, and enterprise was virtually nullified.

Four-fifths of all the buildings were destroyed or damaged seriously, resulting in an estimated property loss of $4,700,000.

Approximately 125 homes were destroyed and another 125 were damaged severely. Most of the public buildings were leveled or otherwise damaged, including the new city hall, the fire engine house, the public library and all its books, and the school gymnasium. Four of the community's five churches were destroyed—the Catholic, the Congregational, the Lutheran, and the Methodist—while the fifth, the Baptist church, was damaged badly.

Hardly any of the Bunker Hill's 65 business and professional men escaped personal loss, as most of the business district was destroyed.

In spite of this staggering blow, Bunker Hill is rising from its rubble, determined to live again as a happy, thriving community, and to regain its rightful place among the cities and towns of our Nation.

These heroic efforts to restore and revitalize the area are combined in a community-wide project which the citizens there have so bravely and appropriately described as "the Battle of Bunker Hill—1948 version."

A citizens' committee is directing this program, which has inspired assistance from various groups and organizations in neighboring towns and cities and which has received commendation from several newspapers in Illinois and Missouri.

Among the leaders are Kenneth Miller, mayor of Bunker Hill; Rev. M. E. Burke, president of the Bunker Hill Commercial Club; and Arthur E. Strang, president of the Allied Clubs' Council and also publisher of the Bunker Hill Gazette-News.

Incidentally, Mr. Strang is one of the community's outstanding veterans, having served more than 5 years with the Air Transport Service in the Pacific theater.

Mr. Strang participated in the invasions of Bataan and Corregidor. He was taken prisoner by the Japanese at Corregidor and remained a prisoner for 41 months. Despite the fact that his own building establishment was badly destroyed, Mr. Strang has continued to publish the Bunker Hill Gazette-News without missing a single issue, largely through the cooperation and good will of publishers in adjacent communities.

In tribute to the citizens of Bunker Hill, I praise them for their fortitude, their determination, and their vision. This is reflected by the comments of Editor Strang in the April 29, 1948, issue of the Bunker Hill Gazette, in these words:

If you are one of those who doesn't believe that history repeats itself, lend an eye to this—the hectic Battle for Bunker Hill, 1948 version, waged by approximately 1,200 of the 1,400 pretornado population of Bunker Hill, who have stayed by their guns to battle for their homes, their businesses, their town, and their continued happiness in the community they love and know as home, reminds your editor of another Battle for Bunker Hill that was fought some 173 years ago with the same typical brand of American courage, and against the same terrific odds—we're referring of course to the Battle of Bunker Hill in Boston, against the British in the Revolutionary War days. To refresh your memories we'll recall for you that on the night of June 16, 1775, Col. William Prescott and 1,200 poorly equipped American militia captured the heights, commanding Boston, called Bunker Hill, to prevent their fortification by the British. Before morning, Colonel Prescott and his men had thrown up an earthworks fortification on the hill and challenged the British advance. The heavily armed British warships in Boston Harbor opened fire on the brave defenders, but could not drive the Americans from their positions. General Howe with an overwhelmingly force of red coats was ordered to storm the height. Twice he marched his men up to within 50 yards of the Americans, and twice the militia, who withheld their deadly fire until they could see the whites of the enemy's eyes, drove them back, inflicting terrific losses. The British charged a third time, but the Americans were out of ammunition, and so retired without disorder. They had won a moral victory, and gave the infant American Nation new hope and great encouragement.

The plucky residents of Bunker Hill, Ill., too, have withstood two terrific charges by devastating tornadoes, almost as deadly and destructive as their forefathers met on that historic morning in 1775, and they are still in there fighting, and rebuilding their ramparts, but they, too, have run short of ammunition—ammunition to replace their civic losses that mean so much to the continued life of their town. They however, are undaunted and have implicit faith in their powers to recoup these losses to their city, although they are faced with the possibility that it may take many, many years to do the job.

Already some of the rural newspapers in the State are championing this cause, endeavoring to get them some monetary assistance, and three metropolitan newspapers have called the plight of Bunker Hill to the attention of their readers. Most noteworthy of these was the effort made by the St. Louis Star-Times, which carried a splendid feature story in their last Friday's edition. They followed this up with a short news story on Saturday stating that Bunker Hill needed aid in their uphill fight, and in their Monday's edition they again stressed the fact in their lead editorial. The Chicago Sun-Times also carried an appealing story in their Monday's issue, which was well done. The St. Louis Globe-Democrat gave some publicity to the fact to their readers Sunday, and although in our opinion their story did not reach home, because they did not use much of the publicity presented them, still they did try, and should be commended for the effort.

Although only a few donations have reached the Allied Clubs Council to date, we are more than pleased with the response by the metropolitan newspapers to our letters to them which contained most of the same publicity as used in last week's issue of the Gazette-News, when we touched off the "Battle for Bunker Hill" fund raising campaign.

We think it is well worth mentioning here, the sentiments expressed in a poem that accompanied a 25-cent donation by an anonymous St. Louis donor, since it expresses the sincere feelings of the sender. Here it is, to wit:

A quarter alone is weak,
But thousands together can't be beat
And surely they'll seek
A way to keep,
Bunker Hill out of the deep.

If you too, dear former resident or Bunker Hill friend, wish to aid in this gallant fight by the "town that refused to die" your donation, no matter how small, will be accepted and appreciated by the people of Bunker Hill. Thank you kindly.

OSCAR LITTLETON CHAPMAN

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, 15 years ago today President Roosevelt appointed as an Assistant Secretary of the Interior a distinguished citizen of Colorado, who is now serving as Under Secretary of the Department of the Interior. He has been in continuous service since May 4, 1933, and has the distinction of having served longer as an assistant secretary of a Federal department than any other person in the history of the Government.

I am referring to Hon. Oscar Littleton Chapman, of Denver. I feel that the occasion should not pass without at least a brief reference to the distinguished service which he has rendered in the Department of the Interior. He has been alert to the needs of the country and to the interests of the people; and he is an administrator of exceptional capacity.

I was very happy to observe that the President of the United States and Mr. Julius A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior, have themselves taken note of this record-breaking term of service. I ask unanimous consent that as a part of my remarks there be printed in the RECORD at this point a letter addressed to Mr. Chapman by President Truman, and a letter addressed to him by Secretary Krug.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 28, 1948.

The Honorable OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Under Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR OSCAR: I have just learned that on May 4 you will have served for 15 years as a member of the "little Cabinet"—the longest period of such service in our history. I can testify from my personal experience that this service has been marked by the utmost competence and by a rare devotion to the interests of our country.

Please accept my cordial congratulations and my hearty good wishes.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, April 30, 1948.

Mr. OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Under Secretary,
Department of the Interior.

DEAR OSCAR: Nowhere in the Federal Government have we more closely approached the ideal of a "permanent Under Secretary" than in your association with the Interior Department. Your 15 years in a command post here have been an outstanding contribution to American Government in policy, procedure, and in understanding of the problems of the ordinary American citizen for whom the Government should always be run. You have both my personal and my official thanks and best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

CAP,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it is only fitting that a man of the high character, integrity, and ability of Under Secretary Chapman, who has served with such distinction for 15 years, should have tribute paid to him by Members of this body who have known by personal association of the splendid work he has performed.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in connection with the remarks made by the Sentor from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] with reference to Under Secretary of the Interior Chapman, I wish to join in the tribute which has been paid to Mr. Chapman by the Senator from Wyoming. In this connection, I should like to give something of Mr. Chapman's history.

Oscar Littleton Chapman, Under Secretary of the Department of the Interior, was born at Omega, Va., October 22, 1896. He attended public schools in Virginia and Randolph-Macon Academy, joined the United States Navy in 1918, and established residence in Denver, Colo., in 1920. While in Denver, he attended the University of Denver and Westminster Law School.

Mr. Chapman became an assistant to Judge Ben Lindsey, Juvenile Court of Denver, 1921–27. In 1929 he entered law practice with the late Senator Edward P. Costigan, and was appointed Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior on May 4, 1933, by President Roosevelt. On March 27, 1946, he was promoted to Under Secretary of the Department, serving longer continuous service in the Little Cabinet than any man in history.

Having long been active in civic and political affairs, he has been charter member of the American Legion, former member of the Legion's Committee on Child Welfare, and a member of Phi Alpha Delta.

During the period of time while Mr. Chapman has been in the Department of the Interior, necessarily, coming from a State in which there are large acreages of public lands, and many and vast interests with which the Department of the Interior deals, including irrigation, reclamation, Indian affairs, and other subjects, we have had many contacts with Mr. Chapman and his work. Throughout that period of time Mr. Chapman has not only shown ability and industry, but he has evidenced a vast knowledge of and interest in matters peculiar to our Western States. As a Senator from a Western State, where these subjects are of such great importance, I am glad to add my word of praise of Mr. Chapman and his long and distinguished record in the Department of the Interior.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleague from New Mexico and with the Senator from Wyoming in paying tribute to the wonderful services of Oscar Chapman in the Department of the Interior.

As has already been said, he has been a good servant of the people. He has not forgotten the West and its very great problems. He is in position to render valuable service to the West, and he has not failed or faltered in performing his duties in the Department of the Interior in dealing with the peculiar problems with which the West has to contend today. Not very many members of the Cabinet or very many representatives of official Washington come from the West; but Oscar Chapman has made up for the lack of the quantity of such persons by the quality of his services.

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAXES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the appeal of Mr. FULBRIGHT from the decision of the President pro tempore referring to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry the bill (H. R. 2245) to repeal the tax on oleomargarine.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. WILEY, Mr. MAYBANK, and Mr. FULBRIGHT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire to speak briefly to the question now before the Senate. I wish to compliment the President pro tempore for what I think is a very laudable and clear presentation of the situation facing the Senate, and also on reaching what I believe is the correct conclusion and decision.

I desire to state briefly the reasons why I believe the decision of the Chair should be sustained.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Legislation relating to oleomargarine has its most important impact on the agricultural economy of the country. It affects agriculture more importantly than it does any other segment of the economy. The Reorganization Act of 1946 explicitly confers jurisdiction on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to consider all proposed legislation relating to agriculture generally, all proposed legislation relating to the dairy industry, all legislation relating to nutrition and home economics, and all legislation relating to agricultural production and marketing and stabilization of prices of agricultural products.

Mr. President, I do not know how anyone could draw up a bill or a proposed law, so clearly relating to a product such as oleomargarine, which is made out of fats such as coconut oil or products of cottonseed or soybeans, that would have, as we shall develop during the debate before the Senate, a more significant effect—one side will say it is a detrimental effect, and the other side will say it is a beneficial effect—upon the agricultural interests of the United States.

The subject of the regulation of oleomargarine is inextricably bound up with all four of the subjects which under the Reorganization Act are committed to the Committee on Agriculture. That the legislation "relates" to the "dairy industry" is clear from the very definition of the subject of the excise—oleomargarine, section 2300, United States Code Annotated—which provides the clue to the purpose and intent of the regulation in the following words:

> If (1) made in imitation or semblance of butter, or (2) calculated or intended to be sold as butter or for butter, or (3) churned, emulsified, or mixed in cream, milk water, or other liquid, and containing moisture in excess of 1 percent or common salt.

NOT IMPORTANT AS A REVENUE MEASURE

Mr. President, the Chair must take judicial notice that it is not contended by either those who favor or those who oppose the proposed legislation that the law sought to be repealed by the bill is designed as a revenue measure. Plainly, it is regulatory in character.

The executive branch of the Government, through the Under Secretary of Treasury, A. Lee M. Wiggins, recently testified on the pending measure before a committee of another body, stating:

> Revenue considerations are not involved. (Transcription, House Committee on Agriculture, hearings, p. 11.)

PRECEDENT FAVORS REFERRAL TO THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

The measure now being discussed is a bill to repeal "An act defining butter, also imposing a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of oleomargarine approved August 2, 1886, as amended."

Mind you, Mr. President, the purpose of this measure is to repeal an act defining butter. This measure would repeal that act. Although I do not have the statistics at hand, yet all of us know that butter is a vital product of agriculture; and butter, combined with the other fats, constitutes the richest segment of the agriculture industry in the United States.

The most recent occasion on which Congress amended this law was during the third session of the Seventy-first Congress. At that time Senate bill 5745 was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 2312. Extensive hearings were held by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and an amended bill was reported by that committee—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 3915. The House vehicle on that occasion was House bill 16836. After passage by the House, it was placed on the Senate Calendar—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 6068. House bill 16836 passed the Senate in lieu of the Senate bill—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 6704, and consideration of Senate bill 5745 was indefinitely postponed.

PROCESSING TAX LEGISLATION CONSIDERED BY COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Mr. President, a persuasive precedent for referring this measure to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is found in the history of the legislation which enacted processing taxes on agricultural commodities.

The original Agricultural Adjustment Act, including its processing tax provisions enacted during the first session of the Seventy-third Congress, was considered by the Senate through House bill 3835. The bill was referred to and considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 786. It eventually became Public Law No. 10 of that Congress—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 3499.

During the second session of the Seventy-third Congress, House bill 7478 was the vehicle used to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act. After passage by the House, the bill was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

In the Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, House bill 8492, another amending bill, after passage by the House was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 9620. A bill to repeal the processing tax features of the Triple A, Senate bill

2506, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 4983.

The situation of the proposed oleomargarine legislation is similar to the situation of the processing tax legislation in that in both cases the tax was intended to benefit a specific segment of agriculture. Even though the processing taxes raised a very substantial amount of revenue, nevertheless the subject was referred to and considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY HELD MOST RECENT HEARINGS

Mr. President, the most recent Senate hearings on proposed legislation to repeal oleomargarine regulation were conducted by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. These hearings, on Senate bill 1744, Seventy-eighth Congress, were extensive. The Chair should understand that some of the proponents of repeal rely on these hearings for their present purposes.

For the 20-year period up to the beginning of the Eightieth Congress, all bills proposing to repeal oleomargarine regulation have been referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with the single exception of Senate bill 1426, by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], introduced in 1943.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not quite understand the last statement the Senator made. Did he say that the only bill which was referred to the Finance Committee was the Maybank bill?

Mr. WILEY. I said that for the 20-year period up to the beginning of the Eightieth Congress, all bills proposing to repeal oleomargarine regulation have been referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with the single exception of Senate bill 1426, introduced by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] in 1943—the so-called Maybank bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator certain of that?

Mr. WILEY. I had a search made, and I also have something that I shall place in the RECORD that seems to sustain it. I have not traced down all the bills; but I have had a search made.

During the present Congress two bills (S. 985 and S. 1907) have been referred to the Committee on Finance without objection. That was discussed very fully this morning by the President pro tempore, who indicated it was done as a routine matter, the bills having been thus referred because they seemed to affect finance. The Chair, on investigation, found that one of the bills related almost wholly to agriculture, and he of course came to the conclusion, which was the right one, that under the Legislative Reorganization Act, the bill should have gone to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

But, aside from the exceptions noted, the practice has been to refer legislation of this type to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The Chair, and I am sure all Senators, should be well aware, from the long history of this issue, that the original law and its subsequent amendment has been for the dual purpose of impeding the sale of yellow-colored oleomargarine as and for butter, and, in so doing, to afford protection to the dairy interest against such fraudulent sale. That was the very purpose of it. When the tax was imposed, butter itself was selling for about 10 cents, and the tax was fixed at 10 cents. The tax is now, of course, only a fraction of the price of butter. However, I shall not go into the merits of the bill until the proper time arrives, except to say that the very purpose of the statute in its beginning was to benefit consumers in America, and the finest piece of misrepresentation imaginable really of a mesmeric sort, has been practiced in connection with this very subject. I know of none equalling it. I am sure that when we get down to a discussion of the merits, we shall find that the real purpose of saying to oleo "you cannot be yellow," was to prevent the butter market being taken over to the detriment of American consumers.

The Chair has indicated, and all of us are undoubtedly aware, that those in other branches of agriculture, particularly the producers of cotton and soybeans, believe benefit will accrue to such segments of agriculture by repeal of the present law. Remember, I am speaking to the question that is before the Senate. Considerations involving the proper balance between these branches of agriculture and the dairy industry, which is a branch of agriculture, and the total effect on agriculture, as it may impinge on our whole economy, should seem, as the Chair indicated, to be particularly appropriate for deliberation by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. President, I have had prepared a statement showing oleomargarine legislation, commencing with a bill introduced in 1928, showing committee references in both the House and Senate. I ask that this exhibit be printed following my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OLEOMARGARINE BILLS

NAME, NUMBER, YEAR INTRODUCED, AND COMMITTEE REFERENCE

Mr. Haugen, H. R. 10958; 1928; House Agriculture.
Mr. Culkin, H. R. 3868; 1929, House Agriculture.
Mr. Haugen, H. R. 6; 1930; House Agriculture.
Mr. Townsend, S. 5745; 1931; Senate Agriculture and Forestry.
Mr. Brigham, H. R. 16836; 1931; House Agriculture.
Mr. Kleberg, H. R. 1119; 1932; House Agriculture.
Mr. Hebert, S. 4065; 1933, Senate Agriculture and Forestry.
Mr. Kleberg, H. R. 8050; 1934, House Agriculture.
Mr. Boileau, H. R. 9865; 1936; House Agriculture.
Mr. Culkin, H. R. 19; 1937; House Agriculture.
Mr. Kleberg, H. R. 66; 1937; House Agriculture.
Mr. Smith, H. R. 93; 1937; House Agriculture.
Mr. Boileau, H. R. 1487; 1937; House Agriculture.
Mr. Pierce, H. R. 2255; 1937; House Agriculture.
Mr. Withrow, H. R. 4088; 1937; House Agriculture.
Mr. Celler, H. R. 5752; 1937; House Agriculture.
Mr. Crawford, House Joint Resolution 625; 1938; House Committee on Expenditures.
Mr. Culkin, House Resolution 29; 1939; House Committee on Rules.
Mr. Kleberg, H. R. 62; 1939; House Agriculture.
Mr. Celler, H. R. 220; 1939; House Agriculture.
Mr. Culkin, H. R. 245; 1939; House Agriculture.
Mr. Kleberg, H. R. 64; 1939; House Agriculture.
Mr. Smith, H. R. 10515; 1940; House Agriculture.
Mr. Walsh, S. 1959; 1941; Senate Committee on Naval Affairs.
Mr. Hobbs, H. R. 5894; 1941; House Agriculture.
Mr. Gillette, S. 1921; 1941; Senate Agriculture and Forestry.
Mr. Fulmer, H. R. 3754; 1941; House Agriculture.
Mr. Cooley, H. R. 3753; 1941; House Agriculture.
Mr. Culkin, H. R. 122; 1941; House Agriculture.
Mr. Andresen, H. R. 5700; 1941; House Agriculture.
Mr. Maybank, S. 1426; 1943; Senate Committee on Finance.
Mr. Fulmer, H. R. 2400; 1943; House Agriculture.
Mr. Randolph, House Joint Resolution 37; 1943; Committee on District of Columbia.
Mr. Fulmer, H. R. 4; 1943; House Agriculture.
Mr. Smith, S. 1744; 1944; Senate Agriculture and Forestry.
Mr. Maybank, amendment to H. R. 3687; 1944; ordered to lie on table and be printed.
Mr. Maybank, S. 195; 1945; Senate Agriculture and Forestry.
Mr. Rivers, H. R. 579; 1945; House Agriculture.
Mr. Johnston, S. 985; 1947; Senate Finance.
Mr. Fulbright, S. 1907; 1947; Senate Finance.

APPROPRIATIONS—OLEO

NATURE, NUMBER, YEAR, AND COMMITTEE REFERENCE

Executive Office; H. R. 7922; 1941; House Appropriations.
Deficiency; H. R. 1975; 1943; House Appropriations.
Executive Office; H. R. 1762; 1944; House Appropriations.
Department of Labor, etc.; H. R. 2935; 1944; House Appropriations.
Military Establishments; H. R. 2996, 1944; House Appropriations.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Arkansas, the debate has now continued to nearly 5 o'clock, and I am wondering if it meets with the approval of the Senator that a unanimous-consent request be proposed that the Senate vote on the pending question, which is the Senator's appeal from the decision of the Chair, tomorrow at 1 o'clock, let us say.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to make a very few additional remarks, in rebuttal of some of the statements which have just been made. I think 1 o'clock is a little early. I understand the Senator from South Carolina wishes to speak,

although I do not know how long. He is the only Senator I know of who does desire to speak.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not desire to foreclose any Senator. I was merely suggesting to the distinguished Senator an hour which might be suitable for all.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Would not the Senator agree on the hour of 2 o'clock tomorrow?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to make any proposal that will be satisfactory. I ask unanimous consent that a vote be had upon the pending question at the hour of 2 o'clock tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I presume the distinguished Senator from Nebraska will provide that the time be divided between 12 o'clock and 2 o'clock between himself and, I would suggest, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. WHERRY. I did not include that in the unanimous-consent request because I understood it was not known how many would desire to speak. I thought probably that could be arranged later. But if it is necessary to include that, I shall be glad to do so. I shall be glad to make the hour 2 o'clock.

Mr. MAYBANK. And divide the time?

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. I suggest, as a part of the unanimous-consent request, that between the hour when the Senate convenes at 12 o'clock noon and 2 o'clock, the time be divided equally between the proponents and the opponents of the question, that the proponents' time be in the control of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the time of the opponents I suggest be in the control of the ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], or anyone the chairman might designate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2385) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not wish to divert the discussion from the question of the appeal which is now before the Senate, but I should like to address the Senate briefly on the business which was temporarily laid aside, namely, the National Science Foundation bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. We should like to resume the debate on that bill as soon as the pending appeal is disposed of. Would it be possible to persuade the Senator to delay his remarks on the National Science Foundation bill until the question of the appeal can be determined by a vote?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was given assurance that would be done earlier. The discussion has continued throughout the day.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. Sentors had a perfect right to continue it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have a few remarks to make in connection with the National Science Foundation bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I am wondering whether the Senator would allow us to get a vote first on the pending question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I assure the Senator my speech will not be a long one.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator desire a quorum call before he speaks?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; but I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington is recognized, to speak on whatever subject he desires.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the bill (S. 2835) which is the unfinished business of the Senate, was introduced by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] on behalf of himself and several other Senators. It is one of the most important pieces of legislation to come before the Senate at the present session. I feel sure the bill will be enacted into law at this session. It is the result not merely of a study conducted over many months, but a study that has been conducted for some years by various Members of the Senate and House. Its far-reaching implications could well make it one of the most important bills ever come before this or any preceding Congress. Legislation on this subject is long overdue.

I think the RECORD should show that a National Science Foundation was first proposed in Congress by the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] some years ago. At that time his proposal was the result of many months of research in this particular field. I, at the same time, joined with the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MAYBANK. Was not the distinguished Senator from West Virginia chairman of the subcommittee which investigated the subject at that time?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct. At that time, the Senator from West Virginia was chairman of a subcommittee of the so-called Truman committee, which had charge of this and kindred matters. He spent much time and effort on the subject, and was assisted by a competent research staff. Later on, I joined him in introducing the first so-called National Science bill. Other Senators joined us, of whom I believe the Senator from Michigan was one. Several other Senators expressed interest.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like the RECORD to show that the bill was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. That was before the passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Extensive hearings were held by the committee. As the Senator will remember, I was privileged to serve as a member of that subcommittee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct. Many hearings were held by the committee. The matter was also referred to another great committee of the Senate, where hearings were held for many weeks. As a matter of fact at the hearings 2 years ago, I think probably the most distinguished array of witnesses ever to appear before any committee testified in support of the national science foundation bill. There not only were great American scientists, but scientists from other countries as well, particularly those of the Western Hemisphere. Some of the Nation's top industrialists, such as presidents of large corporations, appeared, as well as the presidents of universities, and other famous educators, from all over the country. As a matter of fact, the record of those hearings could almost be considered a reference Bible on the subject of the foundation and the need in this country of both science legislation and scientific research.

The committee later on reported the bill, which received action on the floor of the Senate. Several amendments were proposed. There were two main sources of controversy in the original bill, although all witnesses testified as to the need of legislation on the subject. One controversy had to do with the organization of the Science Foundation itself, namely, who was to appoint the director; how large the board should be; whether the President should have the authority to remove the director and appoint the board, and many other subjects which related to the establishment of such a large organization as the National Science Foundation. There was a great difference of opinion among Senators regarding the matter. The bill finally passed the Senate and was passed by the House, but was vetoed by the President of the United States, mainly upon the premise that the administration which would be responsible for the expenditure of the money for scientific research should have some say in the appointment of the director who was, in turn, to have a great deal to say regarding the expenditure of money.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was diverted for a moment. The Senator said there were two principal points of controversy and that one was the organization of the Science Foundation itself. What was the other point?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I had not stated the second point. It was raised very ably by the distinguished Senator from Oregon. He and I believed that in any expenditure of funds for educational purposes it should be mandatory that the money be distributed to all the 48 States, rather than to leave it to the discretion of the so-called policy-making members of the Board. My distinguished colleague from Arkansas has himself been an educator. It was felt that we might well put such a provision into the bill so that the so-called Ivy League would not get all the money. Those were the two main points of controversy.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I remember those two points very well. I was in accord with the Senator's view regarding the distribution of the funds. I should like to mention a further controversy when I tried on two occasions to amend the bill with regard to specifically including in it social sciences. Subsequent to that time I discussed the subject with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and he has assured me that under the language of the bill—and I have read the bill, too—there is no question that there is authority for research in the social sciences, although, as I recall, it does not specifically name the social sciences as a division. For the purposes of interpretation in the future, I should appreciate it if the Senator from Washington would state his position as to the authority for research in the social sciences.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate the Senator's calling it to my attention. That was a third phase of controversy. There were discussions in the committee pro and con regarding the subject. The original bill provided that the Foundation should establish certain divisions, specifically a division of social sciences. But, after much discussion and hearing of many witnesses, including prominent educators in the field of social science, we felt it would probably bring about on the floor of the Senate and the House a great deal of discussion and misunderstanding as to what the Foundation intended to do. It was decided that by specifically and directly mentioning social science it might be a directive to the Foundation, once it became operative, to enter fields somewhat beyond the original intent and purpose of the bill; in other words, to use appropriations for objectives which might not necessarily come strictly within the domain of scientific research. Social science covers a broad field. After a great deal of discussion, the pending bill provides for a division of medical research, a division of mathematical, physical, and engineering sciences, a division of biological science, and a division of scientific personnel in education. Under the fourth division and under other provisions of the bill which give wide authority to the Foundation, research in social science can be directed by the Foundation as a matter of policy. It was thought that it was not legislatively wise to use the term "social science."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I offered the amendment providing for that. After the amendment was rejected, some Senators asked me what I had in mind by including social science. They inquired whether I meant socialism. I explained that I did not mean socialism. What was contemplated was the study of such questions as economics and politics, two fields in which I think this country is much more deficient than it is in mathematics, physics, or engineering science.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And such things as population trends and living conditions.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. My purpose was not to promote socialism. That was apparently the way my amendment was understood by some Senators. If I now understand correctly the attitude of the committee, they feel there should also be within the Foundation such other divisions as the Foundation may from time to time deem necessary. I understand it authorizes research in the fields of politics and economics. Is that the Senator's understanding?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is my understanding, and I am sure it is the understanding of all the Senators whose names appear on the bill as sponsors.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to make a brief statement, in view of my deep interest in the bill. I have been absent from the Senate for the past 2 hours, having been suddenly called to attend a meeting of the Armed Services Committee. I had the pleasure of asking the distinguished Senator from Arkansas two questions on the oleo bill. I shall read the remainder of the Senator's speech which I was unable to hear. I intend to speak at some length on the matter later this afternoon, when the Senator from Washington has finished his discussion of the National Science Foundation bill.

Does not the Senator from Arkansas construe the statements which have been made to mean that studies of housing and health may be made, in order to obtain records and figures?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. So far as health is concerned, if I correctly remember, there is a specific authorization for research in health and in biological science. A broad term is what we may call human relationships, which relate to economic matters which could be investigated under the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate the fact that the Senator from Arkansas has called attention to that phase of the bill.

After months of hearings, Mr. President, and of discussions participated in not only by Members of Congress but by distinguished educators, scientists, business industrialists, and other persons interested in the subject, the bill was vetoed. The President was very specific in his reasons. He was not objecting to the original intent of the bill or the need for the bill.

Mr. President, I wish to refer again to the fact I pointed out originally, the amount of work which has been done on the proposed legislation. I can not too highly compliment the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] whom I see in the Chamber, has also been deeply interested in the bill, as have several others of us.

I think the bill represents as much work as has any bill I have known of in Congress, and that as much testimony has been taken regarding it as regarding any other measure.

When the bill becomes law, because of its far-reaching effect not only on the economy, but the welfare of the Nation, I think it would be well that the RECORD should carry the names of those on the outside who have done such yeoman work in attempting to create interest in the necessity for such legislation not only in the Congress, but throughout the United States.

The leader in this movement is probably one of the most distinguished scientists in the entire Nation, so recognized by his own scientific groups and by scientists everywhere. I refer to Dr. Vannevar Bush, who so successfully and so ably headed the Office of Scientific Research and Development during the war years. He was responsible for all the scientific development, and the mustering of all the scientific personnel who made America so strong scientifically during the trying days of the war. Dr. Bush has worked tirelessly on this matter. Dr. Isaiah Bowman, the distinguished president of Johns Hopkins University, came to Washington on several occasions to help us settle our differences on certain details of the bill. Again I say it is the result of a great deal of work both by Members of this body and those on the outside.

The need for the legislation, the need for its quick passage by the Senate and by the House of Representatives, has been pointed out time and time again. Whereas 2 years ago the need was obvious, it is even greater now. Those engaged in scientific research publicly and privately in the United States, at the atomic energy plants, and the great scientific developments at the General Electric and all the others of the great corporations which have scientific research within their operations, find that it is most difficult to obtain even the basic number of scientists they need in order to keep scientific research alive so that America may keep abreast or ahead of the rest of the world. In my own State, at Hanford, those in charge at the atomic-energy plant have been desperately trying to get even the minimum number of scientific personnel needed in that great project.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I am very happy that the Senator from Washington has paid a glowing tribute to Dr. Bush and others who have taken part in this enterprise. I am glad to state for the RECORD that the Senator from Washington himself from the beginning has been identified with the activity leading up to the enactment of the legislation. I was happy last year to have him as one of the cosponsors of the bill, and again this year. There is no one who has done more to bring about understanding between the factions working on the bill than has the distinguished Senator from Washington. I think that when history records the passage of the legislation—as I hope it will tomorrow—the Senator from Washington will appear as one of those who made most outstanding contribution to the accomplishment of this important purpose. I congratulate him now for the

part he has played, for the splendid patience he has shown, and for the full cooperation he has given us on this side of the aisle in making the legislation possible.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from New Jersey, and I share his hope that the Senate will speedily pass this very important bill. I know he will speak to Senators on the other side of the aisle about the importance of having it passed before the adjournment of Congress.

At the moment Congress is in the throes of great discussion as to what is necessary for the defense of America. This bill could mean more to the national defense than all the appropriations we might make for the next 10 years for the Army, Navy, and Air Force. No one can define today what is the defense of America. The bill provides for an integral part of it, as much a part of it as a tank, a battleship, or an airplane.

The United States was the only country during the war which drafted all its men, regardless of whether they were working in scientific laboratories, or war machines, war implements, or war research. All other countries exempted such workers. There has been a hiatus of seven long years in which we have trained hardly one basic scientist in the United States. This bill, we hope, will help to fill the gap. It will, we hope, make America not only defensively strong, but will aid in making it a better place in which to live. It is high time that the Government took an interest in this matter. In view of the world situation, with which the distinguished occupant of the chair is so throughly familiar, it is high time that we proceed scientifically as the bill provides. I hope the bill will be passed at an early moment.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to inquire of the Chair if, after the vote is taken tomorrow in the Senate on the appeal by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] from the ruling of the Chair, the bill providing for the establishment of a National Science Foundation automatically becomes the pending business before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that the National Science Foundation bill then automatically becomes the pending business before the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think the RECORD should show that after the vote is had tomorrow at 2 o'clock, the bill providing for the establishment of a National Science Foundation then will be the pending business before the Senate. It is our intention, if it meets with the approval of the Senate, in the event there is early action on that bill tomorrow afternoon, to proceed to the consideration of the bill providing for the extension of title VI of the National Housing Act, which is now pending.

I now move that the Senate recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 5, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 4, 1948:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Robert Butler, of Minnesota, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Australia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Cuba.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Harry Alfred Curtis, of Missouri, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the term expiring 9 years after May 18, 1948.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade and corps specified, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Army, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, and title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.):

To be lieutenant colonel

John S. Oartel, DC.

To be majors

Robert F. Corwin, MC, O225096.
Frederick M. Jacobs, MC, O397758.
Samuel J. Newson, MC, O284343.
Carl J. Welge, MC, O350292.

To be captains

Herbert M. Alston, MC, O1775866.
Michael J. Eyen, DC, O397667.
Peter M. Margetis, DC, O1755592.
Evan W. Molyneaux, MC, O1691020.
John C. Patterson, MC, O325884.
Alfred G. Siege, MC, O463703.
Justin S. Zack, DC, O479775.

To be first lieutenants

John C. Adam, MC, O1717010.
Glenn R. Carwell, DC.
Alvin Cohen, MC, O1774845.
Lyle H. Edelblute, MC, O1765588.
Oliver C. Hood, MC, O1746597.
James H. Johnson, MC, O1715935.
Frederick F. Krauskopf, MC, O927574.
Sidney L. Marvin, MC, O1746446.
Revere A. Nielsen, DC, O945356.
Horace H. Osborne, MC, O1736488.
Richard M. Paddison, MC, O479955.
Alexander C. Peat, MC, O1747263.
Irvin C. Plough, MC, O475459.
Raymond E. Ponath, MC, O472818.
Stanley D. Rapinchuk, MC, O1705253.
Irwin E. Rosen, MC, O1756989.
Wilson R. Scott, MC, O461988.
Henry E. Segal, MC, O1726901.
Donald J. Strand, MC, O1767181.
Julius W. Taylor, MC, O1746874.
Robert S. Tolmach, MC, O1715114.
Lewis F. Townsend, Jr., DC, O1736469.
Harvey H. Waldo, MC, O1764979.
Donald M. Wright, MC, O1785931.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARKANSAS

Otis W. Neely, North Little Rock, Ark., in place of R. M. S. Butner, removed.

CALIFORNIA

C. B. Childers, Arvin, Calif., in place of O. G. Nance, resigned.

Kenneth W. Dyal, San Bernardino, Calif., in place of H. P. Thoreson, resigned.

CONNECTICUT

Newman C. Clark, Old Lyme, Conn., in place of C. C. Peck, deceased.

GEORGIA

John D. Watts, Brinson, Ga., in place of D. K. Talbert, deceased.

ILLINOIS

Eula McCawley, Chesterfield, Ill., in place of Verda Malone, resigned.

Arthur E. Maloney, Mooseheart, Ill., in place of M. D. Davis, resigned.

Charles H. McGough, Secor, Ill., in place of Henrietta Hinds, resigned.

INDIANA

Marion E. Maxwell, Darlington, Ind., in place of D. C. Thompson, transferred.

Dow Haimbaugh, Rochester, Ind., in place of H. G. McMahan, retired.

IOWA

Joseph L. Torpey, DeWitt, Iowa, in place of H. L. Smith, transferred.

Stanley H. Nelson, Terril, Iowa, in place of C. C. Lockner, resigned.

KENTUCKY

Walter G. Towles, Stamping Ground, Ky., in place of E. T. Breen, transferred.

MASSACHUSETTS

Elizabeth R. Colby, Byfield, Mass., in place of C. E. Bowden, resigned.

Leo G. Tetreault, Colrain, Mass., in place of R. B. K. Johnson, resigned.

Donald P. Steele, Gloucester, Mass., in place of G. W. O'Neil, deceased.

George M. Olin, Seekonk, Mass., in place of L. A. Monahan, removed.

Richard S. Patterson, South Egremont, Mass., in place of C. T. Williams, deceased.

MICHIGAN

John B. Seidl, Jones, Mich., in place of R. L. Schell, retired.

MINNESOTA

Fred J. Peterson, Laporte, Minn., in place of A. E. Child, removed.

Helene A. Ingstad, Marcell, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Lyle R. Martinson, Shafer, Minn., in place of R. E. Grandstrand, transferred.

MISSOURI

Lola E. Frohse, High Ridge, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Carl E. Schreiner, Lamar, Mo., in place of W. G. Warner, resigned.

Doris N. Cornine, Nelson, Mo., in place of A. R. White, deceased.

Mildred F. Parsons, Syracuse, Mo., in place of M. T. Keevil, removed.

MONTANA

James Charles McCue, Winnett, Mont., in place of E. V. Leslie, resigned.

NEBRASKA

Winton E. Newcomb, Cambridge, Nebr., in place of K. R. Newcomb, transferred.

NEW YORK

Naoma Brown, Fair Haven, N. Y., in place of W. S. Brown, deceased.

Frank A. McEvoy, Mount McGregor, N. Y. Office became Presidential October 1, 1946.

T. Leo Ford, Oak Hill, N. Y., in place of E. E. Ford, retired.

Walter R. Cumiskey, Port Washington, N. Y., in place of T. E. Roeber, resigned.

Althera Wahl, Sylvan Beach, N. Y., in place of M. M. Rice, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Grady R. Hemphill, Julian, N. C., in place of E. L. Whitaker, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Donovan J. Dolan, Bowbells, N. Dak., in place of I. E. Schultz, resigned.

Herbert J. Clark, Powers Lake, N. Dak., in place of E. J. Powell, resigned.

OHIO

Charles L. Sparks, Sabina, Ohio, in place of E. H. Barns, resigned.

Mabel I. Linson, South Solon, Ohio, in place of Emma Duff, retired.

OREGON

Dorothy L. Halverson, Lacomb, Oreg., in place of W. J. Bird, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

William S. Simpson, Jr., Iva, S. C., in place of S. E. Leverette, retired.

Emily K. Bishop, Port Royal, S. C., in place of F. W. Scheper, retired.

TENNESSEE

John B. Overstreet, Celina, Tenn., in place of A. J. Dale, deceased.

TEXAS

Napoleon B. Ballard, Baytown, Tex., in place of E. M. Thomas, resigned.

Robert A. Runyon, Brownsville, Tex., in place of J. A. O'Brien, deceased.

Alfred M. Weir, McAllen, Tex., in place of H. S. Merts, resigned.

UTAH

Edward W. Vendell, Ogden, Utah, in place of R. B. Porter, retired.

VIRGINIA

David W. Paulette, Farmville, Va., in place of J. A. Garland, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

Anne M. Bailey, Kingston, W. Va., in place of D. W. Proffit, removed.

WISCONSIN

Laura E. Maxfield, Browntown, Wis., in place of E. L. White, deceased.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 4, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou in whose presence our souls take delight, consider and hear our humble prayer. Thy ways are in the deep and mighty waters, yet Thy hand is over us in divine love.

Thou hast not promised us to withhold affliction, calm without storm, or sun without a cloud, but Thou hast vouchsafed unto us a divine sympathy and an unfaltering strength whose heights and depths give triumph on the battlefields of life. Blessed be Thy holy name. O let Thy wisdom be our guide, Thy service our ambition, and Thy peace our richest possession. In the name of Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include an article by a former Member of the House, Mr. Pettengill, and also an article by Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky.

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter to a constituent.

Mr. ROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. ROBERTSON and Mr. SMITH of Kansas asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

STEEL EXPORTS

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I have two pieces of paper here in my hand that I think tell quite an interesting story. The first is an advertisement appearing in the Commercial Journal of recent date, and it reads as follows:

We offer, as representatives of a leading European mill, API line pipe, 300-500 tons monthly, commencing October. Kurt Orban Co., Inc., 17 Battery Place, New York City.

The other thing I should like to read is section 112 of Public Law 472:

The Administrator shall provide for the procurement in the United States of commodities under this title in such a way as to (1) minimize the drain upon the resources of the United States and the impact of such procurement upon the domestic economy; and (2) avoid imperiling the fulfillment of the vital needs of the people of the United States.

I believe we ought to have a so-called watchdog committee. Such a committee should look for just this sort of thing. It is obvious that as we are shipping about 1,000,000 tons of steel to Europe in the second quarter of 1948, that steel will arriye in Europe by October, and these people are commencing to ship it back to us, to be paid for in American jobs and dollars. I hope this watchdog will be a lean and hungry hound, and not a sleek and comfortable house pet.

Mr. Speaker, the steel export quota for the second quarter of 1948 is 846,150 tons, plus tin sheet and terneplate in the amount of 125,000 tons, or a total of 971,150 tons. This is a tremendous amount and is already having a serious effect on the economy of our country.

Add to that that we are to ship in the second quarter a little less than 14,000,000 barrels of petroleum products, and it is very evident that by next winter many of our people will be suffering from cold and the high price of fuel, and these same people will, quite properly, come to their Representatives in Congress and call them to account.

Mr. Speaker, do not let us wait, as we generally do in all our foreign affairs, until the horse has left the barn before we close the door. Let us see that the law is enforced now and at all times.

Many of us were fearful that in voting for Public Law 472 we might be harming our own country, but we were assured by the authors and the protagonists of the measure that that would not be the case.

We believe that the words of section 112 of the law mean exactly what they say, and I, for one, shall constantly watch out for any violation or deviation from the policy proclaimed in this section.

HON. PAUL G. HOFFMAN

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it has just been brought to my attention that the new Chairman of the ECA, the Honorable Paul G. Hoffman, in an address before the National Association of Securities Commissioners on November 16, 1945, made the following statement—I quote:

Frequently businessmen give me a bad case of the jitters by asserting that if the shackles are taken off from free enterprise all will be well; that nothing more is needed. This comes close to being nonsense.

I have also been informed that close to a year later he said about the same thing before an American Bankers Association convention in the following words. Again I quote:

Those that claim that all we have to do is unshackle free enterprise are guilty of loose, irresponsible talk.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Appropriations Committee will question Mr. Hoffman closely concerning his belief in free enterprise. No doubt Mr. Hoffman is a man of many accomplishments, but these statements would seem to raise the question as to whether on occasion he himself is guilty of loose talk. We should find out definitely whether he believes in a free or a managed economy. During the next few years he will have the power in his hands to shape the destiny of the future world economy. Those of us who believe so strongly in free enterprise would like to have the assurance that this man is also a firm believer in a free economy. Government controls impede production and should be removed at the earliest possible moment. They are at the root of Europe's economic troubles. I trust the members of the Appropriations Committee will be able to assure us that Mr. Hoffman will work for the removal of these shackling controls which are hampering world recovery.

CONSTRUCTION OF MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 574, Rept. No. 1849), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6342) to authorize the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force to proceed with construction at military installations, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

DIRECTING EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS TO FURNISH INFORMATION TO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 575, Rept. No. 1850), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 342, directing all executive departments and agencies of the Federal Government to make available to any and all standing, special, or select committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, information which may be deemed necessary to enable them to properly perform the duties delegated to them by the Congress. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FOOTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

THE FARMER'S PLIGHT

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal about inconsistencies in Government. Consistency is just as much of a jewel today as it ever was. This morning representatives of the Department of Agriculture came before our committee and urged that public funds be made available to get farmers to sow their land down to grass and get more cows. Last week the action of the House of Representatives removed the last bit of protection that the dairy industry and the good old cow had in this country. Now, 4 days later, the Department of Agriculture comes before the committee and asks for public funds to assist and encourage the development of pastures and the purchase of dairy cows in the South. Ye gods! will we not turn this thing around when we Republicans take over next year?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some informational material from the Department of Agriculture.

PROPOSED COMMODITY SHIPMENTS OF ECA

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, a recent dispatch from London indicates that a number of our British friends are disturbed about the dumping of unwanted American surpluses.

I have looked over the entire list of proposed commodity shipments of ECA and I have not been able to find a single item which could be considered in oversupply with domestic prices at the present high level. I do not know how anyone could intelligently say that we have an oversupply of any of these commodities. In fact the very opposite is true. This country today is suffering from great shortages, particularly in many of the items which we propose to ship to the participating European countries such as agricultural machines, petroleum products, freight cars, copper, newsprint, chemicals, meat, and many other things.

Mr. Speaker, I feel it is the duty of the authorities at ECA and the State Department, particularly the Voice of America, to let every European know that America is not suffering from any overproduction of these vital products and that this program represents a real sacrifice on the part of American workers, as well as consumers. If the Voice of America can get this fact over, it will go a long way toward proving its value to those of us who must vote for its appropriations. So long as Europeans look upon our sacrifices as selfishness, our shipments will build hatred and discontent rather than the recovery we all desire.

LET US KEEP A SOLVENT AMERICA

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we hear much about our national defense. Let me tell the membership that a solvent Government is our strongest defense. We also hear much about this country's being the richest country on the face of the earth. Assuming we are the richest country on the face of the earth, let us analyze our situation just a little.

The Treasury Department statement of April 29 shows that we are $252,237,000,000 in debt. The President sent us a budget of $40,000,000,000 this year, and State and local governments have a budget of about $15,000,000,000. This makes the cost of running this country $55,000,000,000. That is as much as our total income in 1930.

Coming before the Congress out of its committees are many bills that require million and hundreds of millions—yes, billions of dollars. Let me tell you that if you are to have a solvent Nation you want to keep your eye on the matter of spending. It is tremendous. Study it. Some of the bills are as follows:

Public works, millions and millions.

Army and Navy public works: Army, $207,930,350; Navy, $130,800,000.

Military deficiency, $500,000,000.

Air power, $3,000,000,000.

War training, $1,500,000,000.

Increased salaries, $800,000,000.

Flood control, $450,000,000.

World health, $3,000,000.

Aid to education, $300,000,000.

And many other bills requiring large sums of money.

I say to you to remain solvent we must stop, look, and listen.

Think, think, think, think, before you spend and spend and spend.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes tomorrow after the legislative business of the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

DR. MITCHELL FRANKLIN

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, what does it profit us if we shout down communism from our roof tops while we let our front doors open to all who would destroy that for which we stand?

If those who would destroy the policies of this Government would first confuse us, they are well on their way to success.

This Congress, on a bipartisan, nonpolitical basis, adopted the so-called Marshall or European recovery program, whichever one you want to call it. This program was inaugurated to fight the spread of communism in western Europe.

The American people stood as a solid phalanx behind this Government in its fight against communism's attempt to take control of Italy in the recent elections. The President of the United States stood before this Congress on March 17 and asked for a selective-service law to bolster our preparedness program. On yesterday, the House Armed Services Committee, by an overwhelming vote of 28 to 5 gave to the President of the United States what he asked for. The Senate has before it a combination selective-service and universal military training program, in answer to the President's request.

These are not nebulous programs; these plans are not wishful thinking; they are a definite and positive program, forthrightly setting out the position of this Government, and its attitude toward communism, and our international policy. There can be no doubt where we stand. It is written here in bold letters, and unmistakable language. In the face

of this position, how can those of us who subscribe to this program subscribe to the appointment of individuals like Dr. Mitchell Franklin, professor of law at Tulane University in New Orleans, who, according to recent announcements, has been granted a leave of absence for the academic year of 1948–49 to serve as legal officer to the United Nations.

Who is this Dr. Mitchell Franklin, and where does he stand as related to the expressed policy of this Nation and its relation with communism and the international problems which now confront us?

Surely it is to be assumed that if Dr. Mitchell Franklin, or anybody else, is to be appointed to the legal staff of the United Nations he would subscribe to the principles for which this country stands and to its policies.

But does he?

I have outlined already here the position of this country and this Congress. Now let us see where this Dr. Mitchell Franklin stands.

On February 6 he stated this in New Orleans—and I quote:

> The adventuresome Marshall plan leads straight to war. Henry Wallace's plan, together with his opposition to universal military training and to a multibillion-dollar war budget, is a plea for peace.

On March 19, after President Truman's address to this Congress, Dr. Franklin said—and I quote:

> First, the message was intended to influence the impending Italian elections and to coerce the Italian people into accepting that status of an American colony by reducing their country to a base of military operations against the Soviet Union. Second, Mr. Truman's message was intended to justify an increase in the amount of military expenditures, and thus to prevent an impending American economic depression caused by the American monopolists, cartelists, and inflationists. Third, President Truman's message also was inspired by his political desperation and was an effort to restore himself as a serious candidate in the Presidential election of 1948.

How can anyone reconcile the appointment of Dr. Franklin to the United Nations in a legal capacity? No matter how inferior, subordinate, or small the job, we cannot forget that the cancer starts as a small sore on the body or that the forest-fire conflagration usually comes from a small lighted match.

Who is responsible for the appointment of this man, who certainly does not represent the policies of this administration, or this Congress, or the people of this country. How can we hope for unity and a solid front against those who would destroy us if we open small holes in the dyke through such appointments.

When I first heard of this man's appointment I asked our United Nations delegate, the hard-working, sincere Warren Austin, to let me know who was responsible for his appointment, because I knew that Senator Austin would not condone such an appointment if he was in possession of this man's record.

Today I received the following letter from Senator Austin, and I quote:

> DEAR FRIEND HÉBERT: As I wrote you on April 23, I had inquires made concerning Dr. Mitchell Franklin's appointment to serve as a legal officer of the United Nations.
>
> I have just received a report in substance as follows: It appears that Dr. Franklin has been offered and accepted a temporary appointment, effective May 15, for a period of 3 months, as a legal officer with the Division for the Development and Codification of International Law in the Legal Department. Presumably the Director of the Division, Dr. Yuen-Li Liang, requested the appointment.
>
> The Bureau of Personnel at United Nations had carefully checked Dr. Franklin's professional qualifications prior to making the appointment and I am informed that he had excellent references from the deans of several top-flight law schools in the eastern United States.
>
> This appointment appears to have been accomplished in strict accordance with existing regulations, as prescribed by the General Assembly resolutions.
>
> I hope that this gives you the desired information.
>
> With kind regards, I am
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> WARREN R. AUSTIN.

I wonder who originated the appointment of this man.

I wonder in whose mind was born the idea to plant him in the United Nations circle, where he can spread his communistic venom and anti-American propaganda to the comfort and solace of the Kremlin.

If these things are to continue I wonder where do we go from here.

However, in order to be completely certain about this man's activities, I went beyond his published statements which I have just given you, and asked the Committee on Un-American Activities of this Congress to give me a full report on this man.

Here it is:

A check of the files, records, and publications of the Committee on Un-American Activities has shown that Mitchell Franklin, of New Orleans, La., is vice president of the National Lawyers Guild. This affiliation is revealed in a National Lawyers Guild letterhead of June 11, 1947, and in a program of a guild meeting on "Legislative Investigation?" or "Thought Control Agency?" dated October 20, 1947, page 4. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944, cited the National Lawyers Guild as a Communist-front organization. Several prominent lawyers resigned from the organization; among them was the Honorable A. A. Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State, who wrote in his letter of resignation, June 5, 1940, that the leadership is not prepared "to take any stand which conflicts with the Communist Party line."

Mitchell Franklin was a sponsor and a committee member of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, according to an official letterhead, September 11, 1940, and a leaflet, Citizens Rally, advertising the rally in New York City on April 13, 1940, sponsored by the organization. The American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom was cited as a Communist front in two reports of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944, the latter report describing it as a front which defended Communist teachers.

Franklin's affiliation with the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties is shown by a letterhead of November 6, 1940, and the program leaflet, Call to a Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America, June 7, 1940, page 4, where his name appears as a sponsor. He also signed a message to the House of Representatives which was sponsored by the organization, according to an undated leaflet attached to a letterhead of the National Federation. Two separate reports of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities have cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as a Communist front—reports of June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944; and Attorney General Biddle said that it was "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program"—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, page 7687. It has also been named subversive by Attorney General Clark, who included it in his list of such organizations which was released to the public by the Civil Service Commission on December 4, 1947.

Soviet Russia Today, June 1943, page 21, shows Mitchell Franklin as a signer of an open letter to the mayor of Stalingrad which was sponsored by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. This organization was first cited as one of the principal fronts for all things Russian in the report of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities dated March 29, 1944. Recently it was classed as a subversive organization by Attorney General Clark—see press release of the United States Civil Service Commission, December 4, 1947.

The program for a dinner sponsored by the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee in New York City on October 27, 1943, lists Mitchell Franklin as a dinner sponsor; and a letterhead of the organization, June 19, 1942, shows that he was a sponsor of a victory fiesta held by the group. The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee has been cited by both the Special Committee on Un-American Activities —report of March 29, 1944; and by Attorney General Clark—press release of United States Civil Service Commission, December 4, 1947.

Other organizations with which Franklin was associated and which were cited as Communist fronts in the March 29, 1944, report of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities are: American Council on Soviet Relations, the American Committee to Save Refugees, the Citizens Committee for Harry Bridges, and the National Emergency Conference. An official letterhead of the American Council on Soviet Relations shows Mitchell Franklin as a signer of an open letter to the President of the United States urging declaration of war on Finland. The leaflet, For the Rescue of Refugees, issued by the American Committee to Save Refugees listed him as a sponsor. He is revealed as one of the committee members and sponsors of the Citizens Committee for Harry Bridges by its letterhead of September 11, 1941. The letterhead of the National Emergency Conference, dated May 19, 1939, lists him as a sponsor.

An article by Mitchell Franklin appeared in the Communist-front publication, Soviet Russia Today, January 1943, page 21. The publication was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in two separate reports, dated June 25, 1942 and March 29, 1944.

The Communist Party's organ, the Daily Worker, has contained the name of Prof. Mitchell Franklin in several recent issues, mentioning him as chairman of the Louisiana Wallace for President Committee—see the Worker, February 15, 1948, page 2; Daily Worker, February 25, 1948, page 7; the Worker, February 29, 1948, page 2; and April 4, 1948, page 2.

Perhaps many of you never heard the name of Mitchell Franklin until I called it on the floor of this House today.

Nobody ever heard of Corp. Adolf Schicklgruber, in World War I either, nor the remote newspaper scribbler named Mussolini, until it was all too late.

Not that this man would ever become a Hitler or a Mussolini, but it is just an example of how those to whom we pay the least attention sometimes cause the most trouble.

It seems to me that it is about time we gird ourselves for the fight against communism from within, before we attempt to blot it out from abroad.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Was Dr. Franklin appointed by the Supreme Court?

Mr. HÉBERT. The gentleman would have more information on that than I.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CAMP asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Atlanta Constitution of May 3.

Mr. KELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of Polish Constitution Day.

Mr. FERNANDEZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an excellent editorial appearing in the Santa Fe New Mexican on February 28.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. SNYDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two reports.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Beaver Dam Daily Citizen.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article written by Walter Thoran.

THE MARSHALL PLAN

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, this is a fateful year for the American people. They have given much in toil and treasure, plus blood and tears, to achieve peace. At the close of the shooting period of the late war, mankind looked hopefully toward the dawn to discern if enduring peace had come at last.

The United Nations, upon which we have placed our hopes for a just and lasting peace, is now beset with growing pains and is as yet only partially effective. It is a young organization, but, even so, it is our hope for peace in the world. We insisted on a veto when we went into the United Nations organization. We wanted it to use to veto war. Russia wanted the veto also before she would join. To our chagrin and dismay, she has used the veto 23 times so far to veto the peace.

We, in the United States, have done everything we know, almost even to appeasement, to let Russia know that we want peace above everything else in the world; that we want her to enter the family of nations in the spirit of cooperation and good will, so there will be no more war. We had hoped that she would do that. Lately we have come to the very definite conclusion that she is determined to impose her ideas of government upon the rest of the world, if she can. To meet that challenge, good intentions on our part are not enough. We have decided that we must implement our good intentions with proper action. We have established, therefore, two major programs, and I may say that each of these programs is a bipartisan program supported by both the Republican and Democratic leaders.

One of these is what is known as the Marshall plan. This plan is based upon the idea that we will not give relief any further but that the countries in western Europe and in China must help themselves. When they determine to do that, then we are to step in and help them to get their farms and their factories and their businesses back on their feet. This is one of the greatest movements for peace ever undertaken by mankind. It certainly is the first time the United States has undertaken so great a program for peace. If the Marshall plan is carried out to its ultimate conclusion, the cost to the people of the United States for a 4-year period will be in the neighborhood of $17,000,000,000. This vast sum of money is almost beyond our imagination. Yet it amounts to only a small fraction of the $300,000,000,000 we poured into war.

If our venture in this direction succeeds in bolstering the hope of the peoples in western Europe and Asia and encourages them to keep their freedom, then we will have established a bulwark against communism which will stand us in good stead in the years ahead while we labor to strengthen the United Nations so that it can keep the peace for which we strive.

Already, we see the fruits of this program beginning to show. Recently, the Italian people, encouraged by our program, have slapped communism back and we have every reason to believe that western Europe will be saved.

If this can be done, it will help us through trade to recover the amount of money which we are now spending through the Marshall plan to encourage these nations to help themselves. Not only will it help our farmers, our merchants, our laboring people, but it will help our business people move the goods that are so vital to good business.

Another result for good appears now to be taking form and that is the organization of the western European countries into a bloc of states friendly to our form of government, who will, if war should come again, be on our side and give us a landing spot to fight on foreign soil rather than forcing us to defend on our home ground. God forbid that we ever have another war. The American people are instinctively for peace. As a Nation, we are unselfish and are as willing to sacrifice for peace as we always have been willing to sacrifice to win a war.

The other of our programs for peace is the strengthening of our defenses. The best insurance against war is our own strength. We must stay strong.

As for my own part in the difficult days that lie ahead of us, I want, with Judge Almond, of Roanoke, to quote the following from the King's Message:

> And I said to the man who stood at the gate of the year: "Give me a light that I may tread safely into the unknown."
>
> And he replied: "Go out into the darkness and put thine hand into the hand of God. That shall be to thee better than light and safer than a known way."

PROTECTING THE AMERICAN PEOPLE FROM THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, there must have been a celebration in Moscow last night; for the Communists won their greatest victory in the Supreme Court of the United States on yesterday, when that once august body proceeded to destroy the value of property owned by tens of thousands of loyal Americans in every State in the Union by their anti-covenants decision.

Thomas Jefferson, the wisest political philosopher of all time, once said that if this Republic is ever destroyed it will be destroyed by the courts.

That day seems to have arrived.

That tribunal recently upheld the atheists in outlawing religious exercises in our public schools.

I seriously doubt if it would be legal under that decision to repeat the Lord's Prayer or to read a passage from Holy Writ in any public school in America.

The members of that tribunal recently attempted, by judicial fiat, to redraw the boundary lines of every State that happens to border on the ocean, the Gulf, or the Great Lakes. They attempted to justify their decision by the cry of "Oil"—which was one of the least things involved.

They now attempt to reverse the laws of nature by their own edict and destroy the peaceful relationships existing between different races in every State by outlawing the restrictive covenants that have existed for more than 100 years.

Which all adds up to the fact that white Christian Americans seem to have no rights left which the present Supreme Court feels bound to respect.

Unless the Congress comes to the relief of the American people in these critical hours and turns back this tide of fanaticism, then God save the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I just want to say that the Supreme Court decision of yesterday did more to bring about a revival of the Ku Klux Klan in the United States than anything else that has been done in the last 40 years.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

ECA

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I propose to give to the House specific information as to the ECA program as it is unfolding in hearings that have been conducted now for several weeks before the Deficiency Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations. The Congress, in my opinion, is entitled to the information as the information becomes available.

Point No. 1: The country has been aroused, and Members of Congress have repeatedly referred to the fact that the ECA program contemplates the gift or grant to Portugal and Switzerland of large sums of money.

I may say that is a complete misstatement of fact and that there is no fund provided for either Switzerland or Portugal in the proposals that will shortly be brought before the Congress.

Point No. 2: The price of meat in America is in some quarters charged to the fact that the ECA program proposes to drain off the markets of American meat that is needed by local consumers.

There is not one pound of meat involved in the ECA program that has been submitted to the committee except some horse meat.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include some extraneous material. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD, and will cost $301.75, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an excellent article appearing in the Washington Star of last night by Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan, and also an editorial appearing in the Boston Herald of May 2.

THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Foreign Affairs began hearings this morning on the whole question of what to do about the United Nations, how to strengthen it, if possible, so that it can become a genuinely effective instrument for peace and against aggression and thus able to do what most of the people of the world want it to do and what obviously, in its present form, it cannot do or is not being permitted to do.

Tomorrow Secretary Marshall is to testify in the morning and the United States Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Austin, is to testify in the afternoon.

The following day there will be opportunity for Members of the House and Senate to testify. The committee will be happy to hear any Member who cares to make a statement or to file a statement of his views on whether we ought to go ahead with the United Nations as it is, or try to strengthen it, modify it, correct it, so that it can function to stay the present rapid deterioration in international relations.

JESSE L. PURDY

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3550) for the relief of Jesse L. Purdy, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 7, strike out "$55.47" and insert "$41.12."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MISSISSIPPI CENTRAL RAILROAD CO.

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3089) for the relief of Mississippi Central Railroad Co., with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 8, after "for", insert "payment made in settlement and satisfaction of liability to which said Mississippi Central Railroad Co. was subjected by."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HEMPSTEAD WAREHOUSE CORP.

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1498) for the relief of Hempstead Warehouse Corp., with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Hempstead Warehouse Corp., a New York corporation, against the United States for loss or damage sustained by it as owner of land adjacent to Mitchel Field, in Nassau County, N. Y., growing out of the extension and enlargement of Mitchel Field and any plans preparatory thereto and any use of said land in connection with the construction, use, and operation of said airfield as extended and enlarged, including but not limited to the temporary possession and use of the land by the United States under an order for immediate possession made by the United States district court for the eastern district of New York on the 30th day of June 1942. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, and appeals from, and payment of, any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which the Court of Claims has jurisdiction under section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LIZZIE REYNOLDS

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 550) for the relief of Lizzie Reynolds, administratrix of the estate of Grace Reynolds, deceased, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$6,000" and insert "$5,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

MOSE ALTMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1801) for the relief of Mose Altman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. POTTS and Mr. DOLLIVER objected.

NORTHWEST MISSOURI FAIR ASSOCIATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3983) for the relief of Northwest Missouri Fair Association, of Bethany, Harrison County, Mo.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. POTTS objected.

ANNA PECHNIK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1142) for the relief of Anna Pechnik.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Anna Pechnik, of Los Angeles, Calif., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of her last actual entry into the United States, upon payment by her of the visa fee of $10 and the head tax of $8.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the attorney general is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding warrant of arrest, order of deportation, and bond issued in the case of Anna Pechnik, of Los Angeles, Calif. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Anna Pechnik shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which any such warrant and order have issued.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 6, add a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Poland for the year then current or the next following."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SGT. JOHN H. MOTT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 182) for the relief of Sgt. John H. Mott.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Sgt. John H. Mott, of Denver, Colo., the sum of $83, in full satisfaction of this claim against the United States for refund of a forfeiture of pay which was imposed upon him on November 11, 1944, by the commanding general, Second Air Force, who subsequently determined that he had erroneously punished the said John H. Mott: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAN C. RODGERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 576) for the relief of Dan C. Rodgers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dan C. Rodgers, of Coquille, Oreg., the sum of $213.12, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for damage to his automobile which occurred when a United States Navy airplane crashed near his residence in Coquille, Oreg., on October 15, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARL W. SUNDSTROM

The Clerk called the bill (S. 981) for the relief of Carl W. Sundstrom.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $92 to Carl W. Sundstrom, on account of money taken from his person and destroyed by prisoners on or about the 2d day of May 1946, during a riot at the United States penitentiary, Alcatraz, Calif.: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DORIS D. CHRISMAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1164) for the relief of Doris D. Chrisman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Doris D. Chrisman, of Daytona Beach, Fla., the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her, and for reimbursement of hospital, medical, and other expenses incurred by her, as a result of an accident which occurred when the automobile in which she was riding collided with a United States Army vehicle, on United States Highway No. 1, 3 miles south of Oak Hill, Fla., on November 12, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUIS L. WILLIAMS, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1630) for the relief of Louis L. Williams, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Louis L. Williams, Jr., of the Public Health Service, is hereby relieved of all liability, both as to principal and interest, under the claim of the United States arising out of the reimbursement to him of the sum of ¢560.16 from the appropriation "Preventing the Spread of Epidemic Diseases, Public Health Service, 1940," for payment made by him in December 1939 for one Ford coupe automobile purchased in Kunming, China, and for various items incident to repair, maintenance, and operation of the automobile; and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Louis L. Williams, Jr., an amount equal to the aggregate of any amounts which may have been paid by Louis L. Williams, Jr., or which may have been withheld from amounts otherwise due him, in partial satisfaction of such claim. In the settlement of the accounts of Louis L. Williams, Jr., as a disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given him for such sum of $560.16.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENSIGN MERTON H. PETERSON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1806) for the relief of Ensign Merton H. Peterson, United States Naval Reserve.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $197.43, to Ensign Merton H. Peterson, United States Naval Reserve, Sioux Falls, S. Dak., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for hospital and medical expenses incurred by him while hospitalized in Sioux Valley Hospital, Sioux Falls, S. Dak., as a result of having been

stricken with appendicitis on January 1, 1946, while on leave from the United States naval service: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANCIS D. SHOEMAKER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1875) for the relief of the estate of Francis D. Shoemaker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to E. P. S. Newman and Richard J. Taggart, as executors of the estate of Francis D. Shoemaker, the sum of $54.49, which sum was awarded to Francis D. Shoemaker by the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia on December 24, 1925, as compensation for land condemned for streets in the District of Columbia and was paid into the court but was returned, under the rules of the court, to the United States Treasury when it was not claimed, the said Francis D. Shoemaker having died before collecting the sum: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MYRTLE HOVDE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 633) for the relief of Mrs. Myrtle Hovde.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Myrtle Hovde, Westby, Wis., the sum of $420. Such sum is equal to the compensation which the said Mrs. Myrtle Hovde would have received for the year 1945 pursuant to the act entitled "An act to compensate widows and children of persons who died while receiving monetary benefits for disabilities directly incurred in or aggravated by active military or naval service in the world war," approved June 28, 1934, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, title 38, sec. 503, and the following), if her annual income for such year had not been in excess of $1,000. After the death on July 3, 1944, of her husband, Joseph B. Hovde, a World War I veteran and an employee of the Post Office Department, the said Mrs. Myrtle Hovde made immediate application to the United States Civil Service Commission for the amount of $1,993.30 standing to the credit of the said Joseph B. Hovde in the civil-service retirement and disability fund. Due to the delay of the Commission, the said Mrs. Myrtle Hovde did not receive such amount until January 15, 1945, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs denied payment of compensation to the said Mrs. Myrtle Hovde for the year 1945 on the ground that such amount constituted annual income for such year in excess of $1,000. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED DAUGHTERS OF THE CONFEDERACY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2634) for the relief of the Tampa Chapter, No. 113, United Daughters of the Confederacy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Tampa Chapter No. 113, United Daughters of the Confederacy, the sum of $1,100. The payment of such sum is to assist in repairing Confederate memorial monument in Tampa, Fla., which was damaged under date of October 27, 1946, by an accident caused by certain men of the United States Navy, and the payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Tampa Chapter No. 113, United Daughters of the Confederacy, against the United States on account of property damages to the Confederate memorial monument in Court House Square, Lafayette and Franklin Streets, Tampa, Fla.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not to exceed $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,100" and insert "$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EVA C. NETZLEY RIDLEY AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2688) for the relief of Eva C. Netzley Ridley, William G. Stuff, Lois Stuff, and Harry E. Ridley; and the estates of Clyde C. Netzley and Sarah C. Stuff.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Eva C. Netzley Ridley, of Naperville, Ill., the sum of $1,000; to the administrator of the estate of Clyde C. Netzley, deceased, late of Naperville, Ill., the sum of $5,000; to William G. Stuff, of Mercersburg, Pa., the sum of $1,000; to William G. Stuff, as administrator of the estate of Sarah C. Stuff, deceased, late of Mercersburg, Pa., the sum of $2,000; to Lois Stuff, nee Greenawalt, of Mercersburg, Pa., the sum of $3,500; and to Harry E. Ridley, of Naperville, Ill., the sum of $168.85; in all, $12,668.85, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, death, and property damage sustained in a collision with a National Park Service truck, operated in connection with the Civilian Conservation Corps, on August 24, 1935, at the intersection of Thirty-first Street with Illinois State Highway No. 54, near Hinsdale, Du Page County, Ill.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE HAMPTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3984) for the relief of George Hampton.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

EAST COAST SHIP & YACHT CORP., OF NOANK, CONN.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6184) for the relief of the East Coast Ship & Yacht Corp., of Noank, Conn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the East Coast Ship & Yacht Corp., of Noank, Conn., the following sums: (1) $2,100, representing liquidated damages withheld by the Government under a contract numbered W-51, qm-412, entered into by said corporation with the War Department for repairs to the United States steamer *Colonel Barnett*; and (2) $4,518.74, representing payment for additional repairs which said corporation was required to make upon said steamer and which were not specified by said contract. The payment of such sums shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of said corporation against the United States arising out of said contracts or in connection with the repairs made on said vessel: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD WOOLF

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5517) for the relief of Edward Woolf.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edward Woolf, Boston, Mass., the sum of $1,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Edward Woolf against the United States arising out of his being struck, on November 9, 1943, on Brattle Street in Boston, Mass., by a vehicle in the service of the Army of the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "1943" and insert "1942."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN E. PARKER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 810) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of John E. Parker, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of John E. Parker, of Hilton Village, Va., his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States for alleged damages caused by the alleged wrongful allowance by the United States Army authorities in charge of Camp Patrick Henry, Va., of the flow of sewage from said camp over and across certain oyster grounds, situated in the Warwick River, in Warwick County, Va., which grounds had been leased by the said John E. Parker.

SEC. 2. Proceedings for the determination of said claim shall be had in the same manner as in cases of which said court has jurisdiction under the provisions of section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended: *Provided*, That suit hereunder shall be instituted within 4 months after the enactment of this act: *And provided further*, That this act shall be construed only to waive the immunity from suit of the Government of the United States with respect to the claim of said John E. Parker, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, and not otherwise to affect any substantive rights of the parties.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERNEST L. GODFREY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 929) for the relief of Ernest L. Godfrey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ernest L. Godfrey, one-quarter degree Klamath Indian, the sum of $2,500. Such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising from injury to his right arm on October 26, 1926, which was caught in the mangle of the laundry on the Hoopa Indian school grounds, California, during a period when he was a student in the school and was assigned to duty in the laundry in part compensation toward his tuition: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with this claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "October 26" and insert "November 13."

Page 2, line 1, strike out "and was assigned to duty in the laundry in part compensation toward his tuition."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROSELLA M. KOSTENBADER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1642) for the relief of Miss Rosella M. Kostenbader.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Miss Rosella M. Kostenbader, 235 West Homer Street, Freeport, Ill., the sum of $37.64, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of the cost of travel from Freeport, Ill., to Sweetwater, Tex., while under official orders to report for Women's Airforce Service Pilot training, which training was terminated while the claimant was en route to Sweetwater, Tex., as a result of administrative action based on recommendations by Members of the House of Representatives: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARL E. LAWSON AND FIREMAN'S FUND INDEMNITY CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2246) for the relief of Carl E. Lawson and Fireman's Fund Indemnity Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000, to Carl E. Lawson, of San Mateo, Calif., and to pay the sum of $1,038.79 to the Fireman's Fund Indemnity Co., of San Francisco, Calif., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and medical and hospital expenses sustained by Carl E. Lawson, and for reimbursement to the Fireman's Fund Indemnity Co., for expenditures as the result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle on a pier on the water front, San Francisco, Calif., on September 30, 1942.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,000."

Page 2, at the end of the bill insert the following: ": *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall make such payment only after the receipt of evidence satisfactory to him that the judgment in the sum of $5,000 entered by the Superior Court of the State of California in and for the city and county of San Francisco, Calif., in case No. 322,295, minute book 671, page 403, in favor of Carl E. Lawson and against Joseph A. Rice, has been satisfied and discharged of record: *And provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DORIS MARIE RICHARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2898) for the relief of Doris Marie Richard.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Doris Marie Richard, of Dorchester, Mass., the sum of $1,156.50, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries, property damage, and loss of earnings sustained by her and for reimbursement of hospital, medical, and other expenses incurred by her as a result of an accident which occurred when the autmobile in which she was riding was struck by a United States Army vehicle at the intersection of Beach Street and Billings Road, in Quincy, Mass., on June 10, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction

thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,156.50" and insert "$904."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAMIE L. HURLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2325) for the relief of Mamie L. Hurley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., that notwithstanding the provisions and limitations of sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, secs. 765–770), the Bureau of Employees Compensation is hereby authorized and directed to receive and consider, when filed, the claim of Mamie L. Hurley for compensation under such act, within 6 months from the date of enactment of this act, on account of the death of her husband, Edwin L. Hurley, deceased, whose death on March 21, 1945, is alleged to have been the result of injuries, with consequent disability, received in August 1940, in the performance of his duty as a machinist in the Veterans' Administration at Kecoughtan, Va.; and the Bureau, after such consideration of such claim, shall determine and make findings of fact thereon and make an award for or against payment of compensation provided for in such act of September 7, 1916, as amended: *Provided*, That no benefits shall accrue prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LESTER L. ELDER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3500) for the relief of Lester L. Elder.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury, not otherwise appropriated, to Lester L. Elder, Rocky Comfort, Mo., the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising out of the accident which occurred approximately 16 miles east of Wells, Nev., on United States Highway No. 40 on January 21, 1946, when the automobile in which the said Lester L. Elder and certain members of his family were traveling was struck by an Army vehicle being operated by an Army officer acting outside the scope of his employment: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "Appropriated", strike out the bill down to the colon on page 2, line 3, and insert in lieu thereof: "to Lester L. Elder and Esther E. Elder, husband and wife, of Rocky Comfort, Mo., the sum of $1,183.49, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damages and personal injuries sustained and medical and hospital expenses incurred by them and their two minor daughters, Donna Lee Elder and Evelyn Mae Elder, as the result of an accident involving an Army vehicle, which occurred on United States Highway No. 40, about 16 miles east of Wells, Nev., on January 21, 1946."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Lester L. Elder and Ester E. Elder."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. LUCILLE DAVIDSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5449) for the relief of Mrs. Lucille Davidson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,075.40 to Mrs. Lucille Davidson, Morrison, Va., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage sustained as the result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle, which occurred on March 14, 1944, in Newport News, Va.:

With the following committee amendments:

Line 7, after the word "for", strike out "property damage" and insert in lieu thereof "personal injuries sustained and medical and hospital expenses incurred."

At the end of bill add "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HANS KRANEY AND CLARE FELTEN KRANEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6251) for the relief of Hans Kraney and Clare Felten Kraney.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the restrictions on the issuance of visas in Germany pursuant to the President's directive of December 22, 1945, the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to instruct the American consul at Frankfurt, Germany, to consider applications for immigration visas filed by Hans Kraney and Clare Felten Kraney now residing in Frankfurt, Germany.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SYLVIA M. MISETICH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 744) for the relief of Sylvia M. Misetich.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

HARRY TANSEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5546) for the relief of Harry Tansey.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. POTTS and Mr. DOLLIVER objected, and under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the call of the bills on the Private Calendar.

AMENDING SECTION 13 OF SURPLUS PROPERTY ACT OF 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, when the bill (S. 2277) to amend section 13 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, to provide for the disposition of surplus real property to States, political subdivisions, and municipalities for use as public parks, recreational areas, and historic-monument sites, and for other purposes, was called objection was made to its consideration. That objection has been withdrawn. I therefore ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 13 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (55 Stat. 756), as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, any disposal agency designated pursuant to this act may, with the approval of the Administrator, convey to any State, political subdivision, instrumentalities thereof, or municipality, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any surplus land, including improvements and equipment located thereon, which, in the determination of the Secretary of the Interior, is suitable and desirable for use as a public park, public recreational area, or historic monument, for the benefit of the public. The Administrator, from funds appropriated to the War Assets Administration, shall reimburse the Secretary of the Interior for the costs incurred in making any such determination.

"(2) Conveyances for park or recreational purposes made pursuant to the authority contained in this subsection shall be made at a price equal to 50 percent of the fair value of the property conveyed, based on the highest and best use of the property at the time it is offered for disposal, regardless of its former character or use, as determined by the Administrator. Conveyances of property for historic-monument purposes under this subsection shall be made without monetary consideration.

"(3) The deed of conveyance of any surplus real property disposed of under the provisions of this subsection—

"(A) shall provide that all such property shall be used and maintained for the purpose for which it was conveyed for a period of not less than 20 years, and that in the event that such property ceases to be used or maintained for such purpose during such period, all or any portion of such property shall in its then existing condition, at the option of the United States, revert to the United States; and

"(B) may contain such additional terms, reservations, restrictions, and conditions as may be determined by the Administrator to be necessary to safeguard the interests of the United States."

SEC. 2. Section 13 (f) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(f) Except as otherwise provided by this section, the disposal of surplus property under this section to States and political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof shall be given priority over all other disposals of property provided for ir this act except (1) transfers to Government agencies under section 12 of this act, as amended; (2) disposals to veterans under section 16 of this act, as amended; and (3) purchases made under section 208 (a) of their joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution to extend the succession, lending powers, and functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation,' approved June 30, 1947 (61 Stat. 202). Disposals of real property to States, political subdivisions, and instrumentalities thereof for any of the purposes specified in section 13 (a) (1) (A), section 13 (a) (1) (B), section 13 (c), section 13 (d), section 13 (e), section 13 (g), or section 13 (h) of such act, as amended, shall be given priority over all other disposals of property provided for in this act except transfers to Government agencies under section 12 of this act, as amended. The Administrator may prescribe a reasonable time during which any such priority shall be exercised."

SEC. 3. The second sentence of section 208 (a) of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to extend the succession, lending powers, and functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation," approved June 30, 1947 (61 Stat. 202), is amended to read as follows: "The purchase of surplus property under this section shall be given priority under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, immediately following (a) transfers to Government agencies under section 12 of such act, as amended; (b) disposals to veterans under section 16 of such act, as amended; and (c) disposals of property to States, political subdivisions, and instrumentalities thereof under section 13 (a) (1) (A), section 13 (a) (1) (B), section 13 (c), section 13 (d), section 13 (e), section 13 (g), or section 13 (h) of such act, as amended."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, strike out "55" and insert "58"; and after the word "Stat.", strike out "756" and insert "770."

On page 2, line 20, insert *"Provided,* That, in determining the status of property as historic-monument character, due consideration shall be given to the period of time during which the United States has enjoyed continuous ownership."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS of California: To amend the title of the act by inserting the words italicized: "To amend section 13 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, to provide for the disposition of surplus property to States, political subdivisions, and municipalities *for use in connection with any of their governmental functions, and* for use as public parks, recreational areas, and historic-monument sites, and for other purposes."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS of California: On page 2, line 6, after the word "desirable", insert the following: "for use in connection with any of its governmental functions or."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS of California: On page 2, line 12, after the word "for", insert the following: "use in connection with a governmental function or for."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, these amendments that have just been agreed to have been suggested by the Federal Works Administration, which have to do with the administration of the provisions of this bill. I know of no objection to it. The purpose is to correct an earlier condition and make it possible for a municipality to secure a piece of the property under discussion, thus wiping out a question in the minds of the War Assets Administration.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: On page 2, line 4, after the word "land", insert "not to exceed 500 acres."

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the amendment offered requires no explanation. It limits the amount of land that can be turned over to 500 acres. All of the projects contemplated under this act are of acreage considerably less than 500. Therefore, the adoption of this amendment would not in any wise affect the purposes that were in the minds of the committee at the time the bill was reported.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Has the gentleman some instance in mind where the 500-acre limitation would apply?

Mr. WALTER. Yes; I have in mind the military reservation in Pennsylvania, a reservation of approximately 20,000 acres which includes practically an entire township. If that tract is turned over to a State for recreational purposes, it will mean that the township will be bankrupt, and there will be no way at all to get any revenue except through the taxes that come from this property when it is in private hands. It is a very valuable tract and ought not to be given away.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, both having to do with radio broadcasts, one from Boston, Mass., on May 1, over the World-wide Broadcasting Foundation to the citizens of Poland, and in the second instance to include a statement by him over radio station WHDH in Boston to commemorate the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution in 1791.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

KENNEWICK DIVISION, YAKIMA PROJECT

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 550 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4954) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance, under Federal reclamation laws of the Kennewick division of the Yakima project, Washington. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Lands, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides consideration for H. R. 4954, a bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance, under Federal reclamation laws, of the Kennewick division of the Yakima project, Washington.

Under this bill the Kennewick division of the Yakima project in Washington would be extended to provide irrigation of an additional 16,700 acres. The project would also include a small hydroelectric power development with a capacity of about 12,000 kilowatts.

It has been estimated that the additional land which would be irrigated under the provisions of this bill will produce $2,000,000 in foodstuffs yearly. The land is now arid, and has little value. The increased value resulting from irrigation will also increase tax payments to the local, State, and Federal Governments.

The estimated cost of the project is $10,736,000, of which $10,030,000 is reimbursable. The other $705,000, which is

not reimbursable, will be allocated to fish and wildlife preservation. But even this $705,000 will eventually be repaid out of tax payments on the improved land.

The proposed project is contiguous to the Hanford Engineer Works, which is operated by the Atomic Energy Commission. The condemnation of land for this atomic energy project took about 7,000 acres out of food production. This caused a 50-percent reduction in the supply of asparagus and soft fruits available for processors and shippers in the town of Kennewick. Therefore this legislation is urgent to restore the economy of Kennewick and to provide electricity for the increasing population of the surrounding area.

This rule provides 1 hour of general debate on the bill but it does not alter any of the other rules of the House governing procedure during consideration of a bill of this character. There is nothing in the rule which could possibly be objectionable to any Member of the House, and I urge that you all vote for its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], has explained the purpose of the bill made in order by this rule. Having voted during all my service in this House for reclamation and irrigation projects, naturally I am not opposed to this proposed legislation.

However, Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to the fact that in past years the repayments provided for have not been made, nor was the interest paid. Of course, the conditions prevailing at that time made it impossible practically for those who lived on irrigated land and reclamation lands to obtain sufficient prices to meet their obligations under the legislation previously passed. But conditions have changed. Today the people who will derive the benefits from these 16,000 acres of land, which I consider of extremely high value, are able to pay. After this bill goes into effect land which formerly was worth $2 to $3 an acre will be worth $200 to $300 an acre. I do not see any reason why we should grant the extremely long, additional time for repayment as provided in this bill. Originally the bill provided 60 years for repayment, most of it without interest to the Government.

I feel that the Government, which will expend this large sum of money, over $10,000,000, should receive interest, especially in view of the tremendous increase in the value of the property to the owners of that property and the benefits they will receive.

As I said previously, in years gone by this long time has been granted, but I do not think that is necessary today in view of the high prices that the farmers obtain for all their crops. In fact, when this project is completed by the men owing this land, they will be able or should be able to repay to the Government within 10 years, not 66 years, and should pay interest on that money in view of the great benefits that will accrue to them. Of course, there was a justification on the part of the Congress to be liberal in connection with these irrigation and reclamation projects in past years. I voted to extend the time on many of these projects and also voted to waive payment of interest. But at this time as I have stated, when prices are high I feel that the time should be reduced. I repeat it should be repaid in 10 years and with interest.

With the prices that the farmers today are obtaining I think it would be possible for them to do that under this bill. In former years when I voted for these extensions and the long time for repayment, the farmers were getting about a quarter or not even a quarter of what they are receiving today for the crops that they raised.

I recollect in 1930, 1931, and 1932 the price of wheat, corn, and rye was about one-tenth of what those commodities bring today. At that time the prices were 16 cents, 26 cents, and 32 cents a bushel, approximately. Cattle and hogs were bringing to the farmers about 3 to 3½ cents a pound on the hoof. Today they are receiving from $26 to $36 a hundred for their stock when it is brought to the market.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the great prosperity that the farmers have enjoyed I feel that should be taken into consideration and that the Government and the administration that have made this possible, especially in the last 14 or 15 years, should be fairly treated.

I know that the farmers in proportion to their earnings and their profits pay much less income tax than any other group of people. They have all the advantages, but they do not seem to appreciate those who made that possible for them. I feel that if they will take time and give it real consideration instead of assailing and attacking the New Deal, they will offer prayers that there was such a thing as the New Deal that made it possible for them to eliminate their mortgages, rebuild their farms, restock and increase their herds, and derive the great profits which are theirs. I do not envy them the prosperity, and the chances are that in proportion they are not making, perhaps, any more money on their investments than some of the corporations that were mentioned by the agricultural gentleman from Wisconsin yesterday. I realize that many of these industrial organizations are mulcting the American people and making profits up to 100, 150, and 200 percent above what they made in former years, but notwithstanding that fact they have failed to and refused to increase the meager salaries or wages of their employees, notwithstanding the accumulated profits and benefits that have accrued to them. Consequently they are responsible for the strikes that are facing us now. In my home city today there is a strike in the stockyards. I have evidence and you have evidence showing how much the big four packers have made. Their net income for 1946 was $63,000,000 and jumped to $87,000,000 in 1947. Yet in the face of these huge profits and which they are making today, they maintain that they cannot increase the low wages of their employees. With the prevailing high prices for which the packers and many other of these industrialists are responsible, the employees and their families cannot live decently and are in debt.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman, since he has been talking about the farmer, for yielding to one. Does the gentleman think that the administration has contributed one advantage toward our farm prosperity by legislation, or was it caused more by the fact that we got into a war? Was it the New Deal that made us farmers economic royalists so that we could pay all these big income taxes? Will the gentleman answer that?

Mr. SABATH. Long before the war, and ever since the election of Roosevelt as President, and ever since the Democratic Party came into power in 1933, the prices of farm products started to rise. I have given you the prices that the farmers received in 1930, 1931, and 1932, and how they were losing their farms during the Hoover administration and were obliged to pay 6 and 8 percent interest on the money which they owed. Now, since the Roosevelt administration, most of these mortgages have been repaid and in addition to that money has been accumulated by the vast majority of the good farmers of this land. I will say this, that not only since the war, but the gentleman knows that prices started to rise in 1934, 1935, 1936, and 1937, and prices have gone up continuously, because it was the aim of the New Deal to help the farmers and assist the farmers. At the same time the administration has believed and hoped, and I, as one, believe that the laboring people who aided the farmers to produce these big crops, who made the big profits possible, will also join with me and others to aid the unfortunate wage earner who is unable today to cope with the conditions that face him due to the extremely criminal high prices of the necessaries of life. Now, that is what I demand. You do not realize what the people of the large cities are subjected to.

I answered the gentleman, did I not?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; but I have another question.

Mr. SABATH. I shall implement those figures and make it clear for your own satisfaction, and then I know you, too, will come to the conclusion that a great deal has been done for the farmers and for the country, because under the New Deal we prospered as never before.

We are a greater and richer nation than any other in the world, and I hope we will continue to be so. The only thing I am pleading for is that the wage earner be taken into consideration, especially when all the industries are making such tremendous profits. The wage earner should be able to exist and provide decently for himself and his family. That is my contention.

I have said all I desire to say on this subject. I have voted for these reclamation and irrigation projects for 42 years, and shall continue to vote for them if it will help the people, will help to produce

additional crops, and will increase the wealth of our Nation and produce more food.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] assailed the Supreme Court because of the ruling it made. Personally, I am of the opinion that Chief Justice Vinson, who has been a Member of this House and has held many important positions, is an outstanding American who has the interest of America at heart. What applies to him applies to other Justices of the Supreme Court. I think when they have rendered an important decision depriving individuals of the right to do what the Government itself cannot do, they deserve credit, and ought not to be criticized by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. HORAN, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1851), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FOGARTY reserved all points of order on the bill.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the consideration of the bill making appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1949 it may be in order to consider without intervention of a point of order a section which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Except as otherwise provided herein, all vouchers covering expenditures of appropriations contained in this act shall be audited before payment by or under the jurisdiction only of the Auditor for the District of Columbia and the vouchers as approved shall be paid by checks issued by the Disbursing Officer without countersignature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

TERM OF ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on a joint resolution I have just introduced.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States that would extend the terms of election of Members of the House of Representatives to 4 years.

There have been various proposals over the period of years to adjust the term of years for Members of the House and this is not a new thought. However, I believe this proposal should have more general approval and support by the Congress and the people throughout the country.

It not only provides that the term of the Members of the House shall be 4 years, but it also provides that the Members shall be elected at the same time of the election of President.

In other words, this provides, Mr. Speaker, that the Members of the House and the President of the United States, shall be elected for the period of 4 years.

Furthermore, I propose that a Member of the House shall not be eligible to become a candidate for Senator during the term of his House membership unless he resigns from the House. This would avoid the general contention that a Member of the House would take advantage of the off year to run for the Senate. I have given much thought and study to this practical problem and I believe the proposal is thoroughly justified to resolve this difficulty.

Mr. Speaker, I have studied the history of this provision of the Constitution. I am convinced that in view of conditions existing in these modern days that this proposal would be for the best interest of our country. Travel and communications as well as the vast improvement of the press and radio makes our present-day approach to elections and services in the Congress so much different than it was in the early history of our country.

The public would be better served by the adoption of such an amendment. First, for the reason that the election to a 4-year term of office will be likely to attract to or retain in the Congress men of greater ability than does the present 2-year term.

Second, that a substantial part of the time of a Member of Congress under the 2-year-term basis necessarily is taken up in building up the fences for reelection at the end of 2 years and a 4-year term would relieve him of this reoccurring 2-year period, thus enabling him to devote a greater part of his time to the problems of his district and the country.

Third, it would be a long step in the direction in recognizing intelligence and statesmanship over financial ability in the election of Members of the House.

The activities of the Federal Government have expanded to such an extent within the last 10 or 12 years that it is practically impossible for any Member of Congress to get an intelligent grasp of the scope of problems that arise in the functioning of the Government in a 2-year period. If a Member is elected only for 2 years, his time and the taxpayer's money have not made any great contribution to the welfare of the country.

This would give a greater opportunity for a Member of the House to render more valuable service to his country. It would give greater opportunity for more study and consideration of the vast number and tremendous problems so vitally affecting our people.

There are some who think otherwise but I am convinced from past experience and even during the Eightieth Congress that it would be a wiser policy to have the Congress and the Executive of the same party. This would produce this desired result except in extreme and extraordinary circumstances.

I ask attention of each Member of the House to this proposal.

KENNEWICK DIVISION OF THE YAKIMA PROJECT, WASHINGTON

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4954) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance, under Federal reclamation laws, of the Kennewick division of the Yakima project, Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4954, with Mr. BREHM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration, H. R. 4954, was carefully considered by the subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Public Lands and again considered by the full Committee on Public Lands, where it was explained in every possible detail by its author, the able gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES] to whom I now yield as much time as he desires.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, the construction of this division of the Yakima project would provide for the bringing into cultivation of 16,700 acres of dry arid land, and supplemental water to 4,300 acres already under irrigation. The development of the project is urgently needed. Construction during the war of the Hanford Engineer Works, a large plutonium plant only a few miles from the Kennewick division, took out of production about 7,000 acres of irrigated land, which in turn reduced the supply of agricultural produce to processors, shippers, and consumers in this area by approximately 50 percent. Similarly the McNary Dam, now under construction by the Corps of Engineers on the Columbia River will reduce the farm lands contributing to the Kennewick market by an additional thousand acres. The construction of the project would serve not only to counteract these reductions in farm areas, but would at the same time supply additional food crops to help meet the demands placed upon local food supplies by reason of the increase in industrial population in the area.

Since 1940 our national population has increased 10 percent, and the increase in the far West is approximately 40 percent. The number of families has increased 13½ percent Nation-wide, and in the 8 years we have had 14,000,000 people or more than the total population of Canada. Every month the increase in the population in this country is equal to the addition of a city of approximately 200,000 people. The increase in population has caused a steady expansion of markets and it is becoming increasingly more difficult to feed our people. In the past few years, several millions of people have moved from rural to metropolitan areas. These facts combined with the international food problem mean just one thing—more food. One of the greatest migrations of population in the history of this country has been during the war years to the Pacific coast. The State of Washington is holding its increase. In other words, we have a great and permanent increase. New lands available are in the West. They must have water to give them life. One of the most valuable commodities on the face of the earth is water on the arid lands of the West. I do not think it is necessary here to take additional time to explain in detail the features of the program. They were fully covered by the chairman of the Committee on Rules when he was presenting the rule.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES. I yield.

Mr. NORBLAD. Can the gentleman advise us if he knows how Mr. Robert Lucas one of the most outstanding editors in the Pacific Northwest and now editor of two Yakima newspapers, stands on this particular project?

Mr. HOLMES. He is very enthusiastically for it, and has been a strong supporter of this project.

Mr. NORBLAD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I have not had a chance to read the bill carefully, but does it provide for the building of necessary transmission lines?

Mr. HOLMES. There are no transmission lines. They handle most of the power on the project itself. If any transmission lines are needed, they will be built.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. What is the life of the project as far as the retirement of the loan is concerned?

Mr. HOLMES. Forty years for the water users, plus a 10-year construction period, and 66 years in relation to power, at 2½ percent interest.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The local interests agree under the terms of the bill, as I read the report of the committee, that $10,031,000 is reimbursable of the total $10,736,000 total cost; is that correct?

Mr. HOLMES. That is right.

Mr. McDONOUGH. And that $705,000 allotted to fish and wildlife preservation is for the general benefit of the whole Nation.

Mr. HOLMES. That is right.

Mr. McDONOUGH. It therefore will cost the Nation as a whole practically nothing and it will be of great benefit to the western arid lands in the State of Washington.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I notice that the original bill called for an amortization period of 78 years. The committee has cut it down to 66. I remember that last January the committee reported out a bill covering all reclamation projects and extending the amortization period from 50 years to 66 or 68, I forget which.

Mr. HOLMES. There are some precedents.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am for this. The gentleman does not have to worry about me, I am worrying about his Republican colleagues, that is all I am worrying about.

Mr. HOLMES. There is one project in Colorado which is to be amortized over a 68-year period and the Gila project in Arizona over a 60-year period.

Mr. McCORMACK. That was the bill of last January which passed the House and when it passed the Congress and is signed will become organic law.

Mr. HOLMES. It passed the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. But as I understand existing practice the amortization period is 50 years.

Mr. HOLMES. That is true, but it is not the law of the land. I think it has not passed the other body.

Mr. McCORMACK. What is the amortization period under existing law?

Mr. HOLMES. It varies with the feasibility report on the project as drawn up by the engineers and the estimated ability of the project.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does not the gentleman himself believe there ought to be at least a 66-year period of amortization?

Mr. HOLMES. Yes; I should like to see that.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know about this project; it is a very fine one. It is of great benefit not only to the State of Washington, but it is of national interest and importance.

Mr. HOLMES. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. I view these things from a national angle, and I am frank in stating that I am very glad to see this extended period of amortization; as a matter of fact, 78 years would have been all right with me because there are real sound investments; they are not investments for a generation, they are investments for many generations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Washington five additional minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES. I yield.

Mr. RICH. The pending bill provides:

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into contracts for the sale of electric power and energy not required for project uses, hereinafter termed commercial power and energy, at such rates as in his judgment will produce power revenues which, together with power revenues from all other sales of power and energy, will be at least sufficient to cover (1) an appropriate share of the annual operation and maintenance cost, including reasonable provision for replacements—

And so forth. If we are going to leave it to the secretary of the interior to establish the rate structure it had better not be on the formula used in TVA, where they do not take into consideration the cost and the money that the Government has invested in the project plus interest on the money and overhead cost. On that basis we would not get enough money in 65 years to cover any part of the cost.

In the TVA project the electric-power part of it is being operated by the Federal Government at a loss of millions of dollars annually. If all these power projects are going to be operated on the same basis, then we had better quit. It is not even as good as a socialistic form of government when you try to do things that way.

Why do we not get a little business into government and change the base of the rate structure at TVA so that we get a proper return? Why do we not start out on a proper base in this project?

Mr. HOLMES. I can assure the gentleman that the engineering report on this project shows that these rates will pay the money back plus 2½ percent interest. We were very careful in seeing to it that it was drawn up in that way. I was careful in seeing that it was drawn up in that way.

Mr. RICH. We are going to hear something about this bill and some comment on TVA rates. Some people in this House would stand up and try to defend those rates, but there is no defense for TVA rates.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania shadow-boxed around until he almost knocked himself out before he quit.

The truth of the matter is that 20 years ago his administration was in power. They were selling the power generated at Muscle Shoals to private power companies at 1.59 mills a kilowatt-hour wholesale and proved to Congress that the project would be amortized within a reasonable time. Today, we are paying about 4½ mills a kilowatt-hour wholesale for that power. We are paying more than twice as much as the private power companies did at that time and we are willing to do it.

Mr. RICH. Who do you mean by "we"?

Mr. RANKIN. We are amortizing the entire investment.

Mr. RICH. Who do you mean by "we"?

Mr. RANKIN. We, the people who are buying this power. I am one of them. Look at me.

Mr. RICH. Yes; but we are the people who are furnishing the money and we want to know if you are going to pay at least the principal back.

Mr. RANKIN. It will not cost the State of Pennsylvania a penny, it will not cost the gentleman from Woolrich [Mr. RICH] a penny. That great project down there, the greatest development in ancient or modern times, is amortizing itself just as this project will, according to the presentation of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES].

Mr. HOLMES. I thank the gentleman for his comments and I can assure the Members from the long experience I have had with irrigation and reclamation that it is not wise to bring anything before the House unless it is sound.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill was unanimously reported out of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation and, as I remember, it was unanimously reported out of the full Public Lands Committee. I want to go on record, first, without reservation as favoring this bill, and, having said that, I want to refer to a matter raised by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

He noted that the committee amendment reduces the repayment time from 78 years to 66 years. Yes; that was a committee amendment. I was not too enthusiastic about the amendment, however, because I did not think it was necessary. But when I saw that the committee intended to pass the amendment, I wanted the bill to be reported unanimously, so raised no question about it. May I say to the gentleman from Washington, author of the bill, that, so far as I am concerned, I should have preferred that it remain as it was originally written.

The gentleman from Massachusetts pointed out that we western people, in our struggle to develop our part of the country as it ought to be developed, have run into some pretty serious difficulties. When we want to make improvements upon land, which improvements will stand for generations, the costs of which are reimbursable, every cent of which is repaid to the Public Treasury, we are often told that we must repay it in 40 years or we will not get the money. A foolish and restrictive financial policy is put forth in the name of good business.

Not long ago I stood at Hoover Dam on the occasion of the celebration of the tenth anniversary of its production of power and I was told by the engineers in charge of Hoover Dam that in 10 years, through the sale of power, it had paid 25 percent of its cost. Certainly Hoover Dam will pay out in 40 years. But will Hoover Dam be no good after 40 years? I see no reason why Hoover Dam should not be functioning 400 years from now just as it is today, if you can keep the mud out and the maintenance up. The power demand is there, and it will be creating wealth centuries hence.

Mr. Chairman, when we make investments of that sort in concrete form, in revenue-producing wealth that will stand for generations and generations, we are accomplishing something of increasing value. Mind you, Uncle Sam will get back every penny in repayment that he puts into these projects. In some cases he is getting it back with interest. He is getting back the capital investment many times over in income taxes from them. His equity in the matter is improving year by year as these installment payments are made, so that the debt is more secure and the significance of these wealth-creating projects to the United States Treasury grows with each passing year.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me folly that when we develop that great landed estate of Uncle Sam west of the Mississippi River, we should be so picayunish about our appropriations and about repayment terms, and that some among us insist on squeezing to the last degree these repayments so that they must be made absolutely in a shortened period. Such a policy cramps rather than promotes such development.

I certainly agree with my friend from Massachusetts that we have much to hope for; that you will not only enact this bill, but that you will follow the philosophy that the committee has followed in reporting bills on other reclamation projects throughout the 17 Western States.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I would like to know if the gentleman has in mind any period of time that he thinks is reasonable for any large advance of money by the Federal Government to be retired for the cost of a project. If there is no period of time, that means that the Federal Government is financing the whole project without any possibility of return, or when the return comes, it is so late that it is of no value to the people as a whole.

Mr. MURDOCK. Repayments are made on an annual basis, varying according to the years of the repayment period.

For my own part, I have confidence in the Secretary of the Interior. I have seen a lack of confidence expressed on the floor of this House many times. It does not make any difference to me what party the Secretary is a member of or what his name is, I have confidence in the man who is nominated to that high office, and I, for one, would be perfectly willing to let the repayments be specified not in a short number of years but a liberal period or within the useful life of the project.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Has the gentleman seen any of the department heads in the last 5, 8, or 10 years do things that were not good sound business?

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not hold any briefs for all of the departments of Government. I quarrel with them some myself, but not on a partisan basis. I want to say this about this bill: I have been up in the Columbia Basin. I know of the growth of the great Pacific Northwest, I think perhaps the fastest growing section of America. However, it has a close rival in the Pacific Southwest, as I happen to know. Now, here is a vast undeveloped empire along the Columbia River. The war developments, such as the founding of the atomic bomb plant along the Columbia River, took off of the tax rolls a good many fruitful acres. I think that as a matter of repairing wartime damages the Government of the United States owes something to this particular project in this community in order that we may replace the investment which has otherwise been taken off the tax rolls and the land taken out of production. That is exactly what this bill will do.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I want to say this, that I quite agree that there are a lot of things that we can do to put our country in shape, things that ought to be done, rather than building up all the nations of the world which sometimes I think might be used against us rather than for us.

Mr. MURDOCK. I perfectly agree with the gentleman on putting our country in shape. Now, gentlemen, this country must increase its food producing facilities, and this is one way of doing it. We must bring under cultivation more and more fruitful acres, not in competition with the eastern part of the country, but in the growing of specialty crops such as they grow out there, and which they grow most abundantly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. In the consideration of these matters we must bear in mind that this is 1948. It is not 1848. We are a nation now of 145,000,000 people. We are a great industrial and agricultural nation, and we are very fortunate in that respect. But, in connection with these great problems we have to consider the national interests of the country in the light of our national economy in 1948 and the years to come, and not think in terms of 100 or 200 years ago when our population was less, and when our country was confined to that portion of the United States east of the Mississippi, and when we had mainly an agricultural economy.

Our problems are entirely different today, and legislators have to give that consideration in connection with the economic life of our people today and tomorrow.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman from Massachusetts has time and time again wisely and generously gone along with us on western development, when some of our own neighbors have failed us.

The gentleman is exactly right. This great country is e pluribus unum. That is what we have written on the dollar. From 13 small States on the Atlantic coast we have spread clear across this magnificent continent to the Pacific. It is men with vision on the eastern seaboard, as exemplified by the gentleman from Massachusetts, that have made this possible. That is what I am pleading for not only with regard to this bill but with regard to many other bills which would develop the great West as a national estate ought to be developed.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. What does the gentleman think about a lot of Members of Congress who are not only trying to take care of the people in this country but seem to think that we have to give the foodstuffs we grow and the things we manufacture to foreign countries by the billions of dollars, when at the same time we increase the price of our own commodities to our own people? How does the gentleman reconcile a lot of the things this country has been doing, and what does he think our people are going to say when they have to pay 10, 15, or 20 percent more for the food and the clothing they need for themselves?

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the gentleman for his contribution but it has little bearing on this bill. I simply want to say to my friend from Pennsylvania that I will give consideration to his philosophy on foreign matters. We are talking now about a domestic matter, the development of this country as it ought to be developed.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course the observation of the gentleman from Pennsylvania is in no way even remotely relevant to the matter under discussion today.

Mr. RICH. Certainly it is.

Mr. McCORMACK. I said not even remotely relevant. However, the gentleman did make some observation about the increase in the cost of living. The increase in the cost of living is due entirely to the fact that our Republican friends kidded the public 2 years ago and then took off price controls. The reason the cost of living went up is that price controls were taken off, and the responsibility rests with the Republican Party.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask my friends on the Democratic side and the Republican side to give their support to this meritorious measure.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I am taking only a minute to answer the gentleman from Massachusetts. The gentleman talks about the regulations they put on the American people and screwed down in every way possible private initiative, getting us back to a country like Russia, where they regulate everything. I want America free. I want America to produce. I am interested in investing money in these projects in order that we may grow the things the American people want so that we may have happiness and contentment; but, after we do all these things for our own American people, I do not want to give everything away to foreign countries without any remuneration or thought of trying to help the American people. I am for America and free enterprise. That is the reason I do not want to give America away to some other nation that is going to turn around after a while and probably give us the boot. I do not want anything like that. You have gone too far for other nations and not far enough for our American citizens.

Keep America to the front. Keep America strong. If we do not save America and our American free enterprise and our American freedom, I am certain no other nation will do it for us. I am not selfish. I just want to be safe and sound for our people.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of irrigating lands; of generating, transmitting, and marketing hydroelectric energy; for the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife; and looking to the completion of the Yakima project, there is hereby authorized to be constructed, operated, and maintained, in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) the Kennewick division of the Yakima project, composed of the following principal units, to wit:

Prosser-Chandler power canal.

Chandler hydroelectric power and hydraulic pumping plant.

Main canal.

Kiona wasteway.

Amon siphon and hydraulic pumping plant.

Amon wasteway.

Lateral system.

Improvements for fish and wildlife.

SEC. 2. Construction costs allocated to the conservation and propagation of fish and wildlife by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 14, 1946 (Public Law 732, 79th Cong.), and operation and maintenance costs attributable to operations for the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife shall be nonreimbursable.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into contracts for the sale of electric power and energy not required for project uses, hereinafter termed commercial power and energy, at such rates as in his judgment will produce power revenues which, together with power revenues from all other sales of power and energy, will be at least sufficient to cover (1) an appropriate share of the annual operation and maintenance cost, including reasonable provision for replacements; (2) the return, within 78 years from the date upon which each feature becomes revenue producing, of an appropriate share of the construction investment properly allocable by the Secretary to commercial power and energy together with interest on the unpaid balance at a rate of not less than 2½ percent per annum; (3) the return, without interest, within a period of 78 years, and, with respect to each irrigation block, within a period conforming so far as practicable to the period within which water users are required to repay their share of the irrigation costs of that share of the investment found by the Secretary to be properly allocable to irrigation but assigned for return from net power revenues.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into contracts for repayment of those construction costs of the development assigned to be repaid by the project water users, which, in the discretion of the Secretary, may require, among other things, that those charges be distributed between the presently irrigated lands and the new lands and among farm units in a manner that takes into account the productivity of the land and in the case of new lands the estimated cost of preparing the land for irrigation, all in the manner and to the extent that the Secretary shall find to be proper: *Provided*, That these charges shall be such as will provide for the payment of (1) an appropriate share of the annual operation and maintenance cost, including reasonable provisions for replacements, and (2) repayment within a period of 78 years without interest of an appropriate share of that part of the construction cost which can properly be allocated to irrigation and probably be repaid by the water users.

SEC. 5. The power and energy revenues to be applied toward the fulfillment of the obligation to return that share of the investment found by the Secretary to be properly allocable to irrigation but assigned for return from net power and energy revenues may include one-fifth of the revenues derived from the interest component of power rates in addition to any and all sums otherwise assigned for such purposes from power revenues.

SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to construct extra capacity in the main canal for the future irrigation of approximately 7,000 acres of land, in addition to the presently proposed development, and to recognize the cost of providing such extra capacity as a deferred obligation to be paid at such time as the additional area may be brought into the project.

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required for the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 3, strike out "seventy-eight" and insert "not exceeding sixty-six."

Page 3, line 10, strike out "of seventy-eight" and insert "not exceeding sixty-six."

Page 4, line 6, strike out "of seventy-eight" and insert "not exceeding sixty-six."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BREHM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4954) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance, under Federal reclamation laws, of the Kennewick division of the Yakima project, Washington, pursuant to House Resolution 550, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 551 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 334, giving the consent of Congress to the compact on regional education entered into between the Southern States at Tallahassee, Fla., on February 8, 1948. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides consideration for House Joint Resolution 334, which gives the consent of Congress to the compact on regional education entered into between the Southern States at Tallahassee, Fla., on February 8, 1948.

The purpose of this joint resolution is to make possible the continued operation of Meharry College at Nashville, Tenn.

Meharry College is devoted to training Negro doctors, dentists, and nurses. It is one of the outstanding medical schools in the country, supplying medical men and women to the 7,000,000 Negroes in the Southeast.

For the past 10 years Meharry College has been largely supported by grants from the Carnegie Foundation, and other endowments. A large portion of these grants terminate on June 30 of this year, and the college finds itself without the wherewithal to continue its operations.

The financial plight of the college was brought to the attention of the Conference of Southern Governors at their meeting at Tallahassee in February. At that time the college offered to turn over all of its land, buildings, equipment, and the income from its endowments to the Southern States jointly. The Governors of 14 States entered into a tentative agreement to establish a board of control for southern regional education to administer Meharry College. Under this tentative agreement, each of the Southern States would make an annual contribution to the college, and thereby allow it to continue in operation.

Now, this agreement between the Governors is tentative pending the approval of this joint resolution giving the consent of Congress to it. It is specifically provided in article I, section 10, clause 3 of the Constitution that "No State shall, without the consent of Congress, enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power." Congress has already given its consent to 101 of these interstate compacts, so House Joint Resolution 334 does not establish a precedent.

Under the rule, 1 hour has been allowed for general debate. The joint resolution is simple in form and substance, and 1 hour should be more than sufficient to provide adequate consideration of it. The rule does not provide any preferential treatment for the joint resolution except consideration, so I know there can be no objection to it.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 334, giving the consent of Congress to the compact on regional education entered into between the Southern States at Tallahassee, Fla., on February 8, 1948.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 334, with Mr. DOLLIVER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, this resolution was considered and reported to the full Committee on the Judiciary by Subcommittee No. 1, of which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] is chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this resolution is to make it possible for the Southern States named in the resolution to enter into a compact or agreement relating to the establishment of a board of control for southern regional education, to the end that the several States signatory to the compact shall pool their interests and their resources so that better colleges, universities, and other institutions looking to more complete educational facilities can be provided in the region covered by the compact.

The enactment of this resolution will in no way obligate the Federal Government financially. All expenses of the proposed projects are to be borne by the respective States interested.

This proposal is before the Congress because the Constitution of the United States requires that—

No State shall, without the consent of Congress, * * * enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power (art. I, sec. 10, clause 3).

In short, all that is here contemplated is the approval of the Congress of the compact referred to.

Many compacts in the past have been entered into between two or more of the States. I can think of no legitimate objection that can be raised to the desire of these States to jointly provide better educational facilities for their children. Everybody favors adequate education for all the children throughout the land. Some States are more able financially than some other States to furnish these facilities.

The only question that might be raised here is as to the issue of segregated schools. It is clear that the Governor and State officials of a State cannot enter into any compact or agreement with other States except that such compact comes within the scope of the State constitution and the State statutes. It is true that some Southern States, like Alabama, provide for separate schools for colored children and white children. If this compact is approved, then the Governor of Alabama cannot bind his State to help finance any type of school other than an Alabama constitutional school.

The fourteenth amendment to the Constitution, as interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States, is the law of the land insofar as race discrimination is concerned. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE] a very capable member of the Judiciary Committee, made a statement to the committee in this regard, and I hope that he will repeat that statement for our information here today.

Mr. Chairman, we do not have segregation in the schools in the State from which I come. We do have splendid schools, and it is the intent of the people of the State of Michigan to give all of our youth equal opportunity to acquire higher education in our public schools. Now if the children in some of the Southern States do not have the same advantage, whether they be colored children or white children, I can see no reason why this Congress should prevent either the white or the colored children from having better educational opportunities. While I realize that these States, in providing the schools contemplated in this compact, must, unless their State constitutions and laws are changed, conduct colored schools and white schools and regardless of how I feel about segregation in the schools, nevertheless I recognize the situation as it is. I shall, therefore, vote to approve this resolution, thereby aiding the children of these States to receive more educational advantage even though for the present that education must be given in segregated schools.

The recent Oklahoma case guarantees equality of facilities. If we believe in educating our youth, and certain States do not agree with other States as to segregation, it seems to me that our obligation to the young people—white and colored—is such that we should do the practical thing and approve this compact and let the constitutionality of segregation be determined in the proper forum in due course. In voting for this resolution I am not voting to establish segregation in the schools; I am only voting to improve the type of schooling the children in these States are now receiving.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED], who

will control the time for the majority of the committee.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this resolution was voted out of the Committee on Judiciary and is the result of a conference of the governors of the Southern States, wherein they propose, with the consent of Congress, that their respective States be authorized to pool their interests in the matter of establishing and maintaining institutions of higher education. It requires no Federal aid and has no bearing whatsoever on the high schools or intermediate schools, but only those above the high-school grade. This, I am informed, has been in contemplation by the conference of southern governors and by the legislatures of the various Southern States since 1935. It proposes on a larger scale a program that has prevailed within a great many States of the Union with regard to schools of a lower grade. In Illinois, for instance, we have for many years been establishing consolidated grade- and high-school districts. These districts so consolidated have pooled their resources in order to establish and maintain better educational facilities for the children they serve.

Under this resolution the Southern States, with the consent of Congress, and with the approval of their own State legislatures will likewise cooperate, each with the others who are parties to the compact to share proportionately the expenses incident to the establishment and maintenance of institutions of higher education. The funds necessary for this project would be prorated to each State in accordance with its respective population.

The system will be governed by a commission of which each of the governors of the participating States will be ex officio members, together with two other members chosen by the governor of each individual State. The commission, thus formed, will be the governing body which will control the institutions and the colleges that will be established.

It seems a fair and logical way in which these States will be enabled to improve and expand the opportunities for their citizens to avail themselves of high-class institutions of learning that would be burdensome if attempted by each State individually. It has the approval of many noted educators and is a progressive step that will be highly beneficial.

I believe the resolution ought to receive the consent of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, the resolution under consideration is the usual type of resolution that has been adopted by the Congress on upwards of a hundred occasions. It is designed to meet the constitutional requirements that the Congress give its consent to compacts entered into between the States.

In the instant case a number of States, as the gentleman from Illinois just stated, have entered into a compact the purpose of which is to provide institutions of higher learning in sections of the country which otherwise would not have the advantage of these institutions.

As I understand, there is presently a college being maintained by several of the States. It is hoped that this institution will be enlarged and that its advantages can be extended to citizens of all of the contracting States.

I. THE COMPACT OF SOUTHERN GOVERNORS FOR REGIONAL EDUCATION WILL PERPETUATE SEGREGATED EDUCATION

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, the proposed resolution will give the approval of Congress to the compact entered into by the governors of nine Southern States which provides for the ownership and operation of Meharry Medical College at Nashville, Tenn., on a joint basis by a Board of Control for Southern Regional Education and for the purchase and operation of other institutions of higher learning on a regional basis. Aside from the specific mention of Meharry Medical College, the compact gives no indication on its face that it is intended to support the system of segregation. However, since the laws of each of the States participating in the plan require segregated education in some instances under threat of criminal prosecution, there can be no doubt that the compact will crystallize the pattern of segregation and furnish the economic underpinning for the support of segregated education in the South which is staggering under the recent Supreme Court decisions and the aroused demands of Negro Americans for equality in education. That the southern governors propose to run the institutions on a segregated basis is demonstrated by the speeches made at the meeting of the southern governors, legislators, and educators held in Washington on February 24, 1948, immediately preceding the introduction of this resolution into Congress—see New York Times, February 25, 1948. Speakers at that conference made it clear that the proposal to take over Meharry Medical College stems from their fear that should Meharry close its doors, all the Negro students there would demand admission to the white medical schools supported by the States.

II. THE PROPOSAL THAT CONGRESS APPROVE THIS COMPACT IS A POLITICAL MOVE TO COMMIT CONGRESS TO THE SUPPORT OF SEGREGATION

While article I, section 10, of the United States Constitution provides that no State shall enter into any compact or agreement with another State without the consent of Congress, there is ample legal authority that this restraint is concerned not with such matters as extradition, wage scales, or education, but merely with compacts or agreements which affect the national supremacy and encroach upon the power of the Federal Government—*Virginia* v. *Tennessee* (148 U. S. 503), *Wharton* v. *Wise* (153 U. S. 155), and *Dixie Wholesale Grocery* v. *Martin* (278 Ky. 705, 129 S. W. 2 (d), 181). See also charge to the grand jury of Federal District Judge William Clark, of New Jersey, reported at Fourteenth Federal Supplement, page 596.

If the purposes of the compact are bona fide, the Southern States can provide education for all their citizens by mutual assistance without coming to Congress for approval. It is only because the compact seeks to weaken the Supreme Court opinions in the Gaines case and the Sipuel case that congressional approval is sought. It is also true that since Congress knows that the laws of the contracting States require segregation, congressional approval of this compact would constitute a complete repudiation by Congress of the findings and recommendations of the President's Committee on Civil Rights and the President's Commission on Higher Education.

III. THE PROPOSAL TO SEND NEGRO STUDENTS FROM ALL OVER THE SOUTH TO MEHARRY MEDICAL COLLEGE INSTEAD OF ADMITTING THEM TO THE EXISTING STATE UNIVERSITIES IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL

As the result of two cases taken by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People to the Supreme Court, it is now established that the responsibility of the Southern States to educate their Negro citizens cannot completely be met by any plan which would force a Negro student from Texas to attend a regional medical school in Tennessee while his white compatriot attends the University of Texas Medical School. In *Gaines* v. *Canada* (305 U. S. 337), decided in 1938, Missouri was told that its plan of providing out-of-State scholarships for Negroes was unconstitutional. In 1948, in the Sipuel case, Oklahoma was told that Negroes could not be forced to wait until the State had time to set up a segregated institution, but must receive their education as soon as it is furnished to white students. The proposed compact appears to be based upon the theory that with congressional approval the States can, for purposes of education, extend their boundaries to a region and that the requirements of the Supreme Court will be met so long as education is furnished within that region. This is a twisted reasoning, which argues that what each Southern State is forbidden to do individually can be accomplished if some of them act together. In reality, so long as a State provides education to white students within its boundaries there is no legal way for it to deny such education to its Negro citizens.

IV. SEGREGATION IN EDUCATION IS DISCRIMINATORY AND UNEQUAL AND IS IN ITSELF UNCONSTITUTIONAL

The NAACP is now preparing to carry at least two cases, involving the University of Texas and the University of Oklahoma, to the United States Supreme Court on evidence which will conclusively establish that under a segregated educational system Negroes receive unequal treatment and that segregation in education is therefore unconstitutional. Should Congress approve this compact during the pendency of those cases in the face of the findings of the President's Committee on Civil Rights and the President's Commission on Higher Education, it will be tantamount to Congress making a legislative finding that there is no discrimination in the educational systems of those States. Such a finding would be extremely dangerous and harmful in presenting these cases to the Supreme Court.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, the pending House joint resolution giving consent of the Congress to a compact

entered into by a number of Southern States should be adopted without delay.

This compact is not, as some have supposed and intimated, being proposed on the spur of the moment because of an opinion of the United States Supreme Court. It has, on the other hand been contemplated for many years and considerable research by experts in the field of higher education has been done in preparation for this program.

It is rooted in a clear recognition that the problems relating to higher education, particularly in professional and specialized fields can better be solved on a regional than on a State basis.

While the program envisioned under the provisions of this compact is broad and of long range, there is a particular reason why early action by the Congress should be taken because of a situation confronting an educational institution in my own district.

Unless some plan is adopted looking toward the future operation of Meharry Medical College in Nashville, Tenn., that institution will be forced to close its doors at the end of the present term.

This college is highly accredited and recognized as a leading institution. Because of the dwindling income of the endowment funds an operating deficit has faced the college each year for the past 5 years, that deficit ranging from $120,000 to $300,000.

At present there are 482 Negro students pursuing courses in medicine and dentistry at Meharry. About 63 percent of these are from the South; 32 percent from the North and the remainder from the West and our possessions and Territories.

The foundations have agreed to continue financing providing the Congress, by its approval of this resolution, gives assurance that the transfer of Meharry to the Southern States as a regional college can be effected at a reasonably early date. Otherwise the college will close its doors in July and 482 Negro students will have no place to go.

It is extremely unfortunate that some elements have injected into this proposal the question of discrimination or segregation. With the exception of Howard College here in the Capital and Meharry College, there were in 1947 only 86 Negro students studying medicine in 21 colleges that admit them on a competitive basis with white students.

Meharry and Howard have trained more than 85 percent of the Negro doctors practicing in the country and Meharry alone has trained about 56 percent of the total.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, if a competitive basis applying the national average on aptitude tests by 14,000 applicants for admission last year, had been rigidly followed Meharry could have accepted only 5 and Howard 9 students for the freshman classes.

This regional plan offers the only hope for continued operation of Meharry. It can be acquired under the terms of this compact and Negro students in even larger numbers may there be trained to render medical services in a highly credited institution.

This compact, in my opinion, and the program that will become possible in the South under its provisions, may well become a pattern that will be followed in other sections of the country in the field of higher education.

Its approval by the Congress is of far-reaching importance.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, recognizing the great need of opportunities for higher learning for Negroes in the fields of medicine, dentistry, and other professional and educational pursuits, I am loath to vote against any resolution or bill which will give aid and assistance toward achieving this goal.

Notwithstanding the high purposes nor intending to impugn the motives of those who sponsor House Joint Resolution 334, for my part I desire to keep the record clear on racial segregation. In my opinion congressional approval of this resolution could very well be interpreted as placing the stamp of approval on the principle of segregation.

In view of recent Supreme Court decisions and in view of the gradual progress that is being made, I decline to take any action which possibly can be interpreted as tending to nullify the Supreme Court decisions, and therefore have decided to cast my vote against the passage of this resolution.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the compact entered into at the conference of southern governors at Tallahassee, Fla., on February 8, 1948, between the States of Alabama, Arkansas, South Carolina, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Texas, and such other States named therein who have or may become parties thereto, to wit, the States of Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, Kentucky, Louisiana, and Oklahoma, said compact relating to the establishment of the Board of Control for Southern Regional Education, providing for the planning, establishment, acquisition, and operation of educational institutions on a regional basis, supported by public funds derived from taxation by the constituent States, in accordance with the terms, provisions, and conditions set out and contained in said compact, is hereby consented to by the Congress of the United States of America——

Mr. REED of Illinois (interrupting the reading of the joint resolution). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the joint resolution be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD together with the committee amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Committee amendment: Page 2, after line 7, add the following: "said compact 8 herein referred to being as follows:

"Whereas the States who are parties hereto have during the past several years conducted careful investigation looking towards the establishment and maintenance of jointly owned and operated regional educational institutions in the Southern States in the professional, technological, scientific, literary and other fields, so as to provide greater educational advantages and facilities for the citizens of the several States who reside within such region; and

"Whereas Meharry Medical College of Nashville, Tenn., has proposed that its lands buildings, equipment, and the net income from its endowment be turned over to the Southern States, or to an agency acting in their behalf, to be operated as a regional institution for medical, dental and nursing education upon terms and conditions to be hereafter agreed upon between the Southern States and Meharry Medical College, which proposal, because of the present financial condition of the institution, has been approved by the said States who are parties hereto; and

"Whereas the said States desire to enter into a compact with each other providing for the planning and establishment of regional educational facilities; and

"Now therefore, in consideration of the mutual agreements, covenants, and obligations assumed by the respective States who are parties hereto (hereinafter referred to as 'States'), the said several States do hereby form a geographical district or region consisting of the areas lying within the boundaries of the contracting States which, for the purposes of this compact, shall constitute an area for regional education supported by public funds derived from taxation by the constituent States for the establishment, acquisition, operation, and maintenance of regional educational schools and institutions for the benefit of citizens of the respective States residing within the region so established as may be determined from time to time in accordance with the terms and provisions of this compact.

"The States do further hereby establish and create a joint agency which shall be known as the Board of Control for Southern Regional Education (hereinafter referred to as the 'board'), the members of which board shall consist of the governor of each State, ex officio, and two additional citizens of each State to be appointed by the governor thereof, at least one of whom shall be selected from the field of education. The governor shall continue as a member of the board during his tenure of office as governor of the State, but the members of the board appointed by the governor shall hold office for a period of 5 years except that in the original appointment one board member so appointed by the governor shall be designated at the time of his appointment to serve an initial term of 3 years, but thereafter his successor shall serve the full term of 5 years. Vacancies on the board caused by death, resignation, refusal, or inability to serve, shall be filled by appointment by the governor for the unexpired portion of the term. The officers of the board shall be a chairman, a vice chairman, a secretary, a treasurer, and such additional officers as may be created by the board from time to time. The board shall meet annually and officers shall be elected to hold office until the next annual meeting. The board shall have the right to formulate and establish bylaws not inconsistent with the provisions of this compact to govern its own actions in the performance of the duties delegated to it including the right to create and appoint an executive committee and a finance committee with such powers and authority as the board may delegate to them from time to time.

"It shall be the duty of the board to submit plans and recommendations to the States from time to time for their approval and adoption by appropriate legislative action for the development, establishment, acquisition, operation, and maintenance of educational schools and institutions within the geographical limits of the regional area of the States, of such character and type and for such educational purposes, professional, technological, scientific, literary, or otherwise, as they may deem and determine to be proper, necessary, or advisable. Title to all such educational institutions when so established by appropriate legislative actions of the States and to all properties and facilities used in connection therewith shall be vested in

said board as the agency of and for the use and benefit of the said States and the citizens thereof, and all such educational institutions shall be operated, maintained, and financed in the manner herein set out, subject to any provisions or limitations which may be contained in the legislative acts of the States authorizing the creation, establishment, and operation of such educational institutions.

"The board shall have such additional and general power and authority as may be vested in it by the States from time to time by legislative enactments of the said States.

"Any two or more States who are parties of this compact shall have the right to enter into supplemental agreements providing for the establishment, financing, and operation of regional educational institutions for the benefit of citizens residing within an area which constitutes a portion of the general region herein created, such institutions to be financed exclusively by such States and to be controlled exclusively by the members of the board representing such States provided such agreement is submitted to and approved by the board prior to the establishment of such institutions.

"Each State agrees that, when authorized by the legislature, it will from time to time make available and pay over to said Board such funds as may be required for the establishment, acquisition, operation, and maintenance of such regional educational institutions as may be authorized by the States under the terms of this compact, the contribution of each State at all times to be in the proportion that its population bears to the total combined population of the States who are parties hereto as shown from time to time by the most recent official published report of the Bureau of Census of the United States of America or upon such other basis as may be agreed upon.

"This compact shall not take effect or be binding upon any State unless and until it shall be approved by proper legislative action of as many as six or more of the States whose governors have subscribed hereto within a period of 18 months from the date hereof. When and if six or more States shall have given legislative approval to this compact within said 18 months period, it shall be and become binding upon such six or more States 60 days after the date of legislative approval by the sixth State and the Governors of such six or more States shall forthwith name the members of the Board from their States as hereinabove set out, and the Board shall then meet on call of the Governor of any State approving this compact, at which time the Board shall elect officers, adopt bylaws, appoint committees, and otherwise fully organize. Other States whose names are subscribed hereto shall thereafter become parties hereto upon approval of this compact by legislative action within 2 years from the date hereof, upon such conditions as may be agreed upon at the time.

"After becoming effective this compact shall thereafter continue without limitation of time: *Provided, however,* That it may be terminated at any time by unanimous action of the States: *And provided further,* That any State may withdraw from this compact if such withdrawal is approved by its legislature, such withdrawal to become effective 2 years after written notice thereof to the Board accompanied by a certified copy of the requisite legislative action, but such withdrawal shall not relieve the withdrawing State from its obligations hereunder accruing up to the effective date of such withdrawal. Any State so withdrawing shall ipso facto cease to have any claim to or ownership of any of the property held or vested in the Board or to any of the funds of the Board held under the terms of this compact.

"If any State shall at any time become in default in the performance of any of its obligations assumed herein or with respect to any obligation imposed upon said State as authorized by and in compliance with the terms and provisions of this compact, all rights, privileges and benefits of such defaulting State, its members on the Board and its citizens shall ipso facto be and become suspended from and after the date of such default. Unless such default shall be remedied and made good within a period of 1 year immediately following the date of such default this compact may be terminated with respect to such defaulting State by an affirmative vote of three-fourths of the members of the Board (exclusive of the members representing the State in default), from and after which time such State shall cease to be a party to this compact and shall have no further claim to or ownership of any of the property held by or vested in the Board or to any of the funds of the Board held under the terms of this compact, but such termination shall in no manner release such defaulting State from any accrued obligation or otherwise effect this compact or the rights, duties, privileges or obligations of the remaining States thereunder.

"In witness whereof this compact has been approved and signed by the Governors of the several States, subject to the approval of their respective legislatures in the manner hereinabove set out, as of the 8th day of February 1948.

"By MILLARD CALDWELL,
"Governor, State of Florida.
"By WM. PRESTON LANE, Jr.,
"Governor, State of Maryland.
"By M. E. THOMPSON,
"Governor, State of Georgia.
"By ———, ———,
"Governor, State of Louisiana.
"By JAMES E. FOLSOM,
"Governor, State of Alabama.
"By F. L. WRIGHT,
"Governor, State of Mississippi.
"By ———, ———,
"Governor, Commonwealth of Kentucky.
"By JIM MCCORD,
"Governor, State of Tennessee.
"By ———, ———,
"Governor, Commonwealth of Virginia.
"By BEN LANEY,
"Governor, State of Arkansas.
"By ———, ———,
"Governor, State of North Carolina.
"By J. STROM THURMOND,
"Governor, State of South Carolina.
"By BEAUFORD H. JESTER,
"Governor, State of Texas.
"By ———, ———,
"Governor, State of Oklahoma.
"By ———, ———,
"Governor, State of West Virginia."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the pending resolution, which places the congressional stamp of approval on segregation in education. Congress cannot permit itself to place its stamp of approval thereon. How we can do it in light of the decision which the Supreme Court handed down only yesterday is beyond me.

I read from a letter which I received from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, a letter that was sent to every Member of Congress:

We solicit your vigorous opposition to House Joint Resolution 334. This resolution asks Congress to approve a compact entered into on February 8, 1948, and signed by 14 Southern governors to make Meharry Medical School, located in Nashville, Tenn., a regional school for Negroes and to establish other regional schools. It was reported favorably by the House Judiciary Committee on February 16 without careful analysis, public hearings, or any opportunity whatsoever for the groups gravely affected by the compact to express their views.

Our principal reasons for opposing this resolution are these:

1. The testimony of the proponents of this legislation before the subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee established by their own admission that the regional institutions would be operated on a segregated basis. It is also an undisputed fact that the laws of every State signatory to this compact require segregation in education.

2. It is our conviction after careful consideration of all the facts and surrounding circumstances, that it represents a bold attempt to circumvent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States in Missouri vs. University of Oklahoma (January 12, 1948) which require States to furnish to Negro students educational opportunity equal to that furnished white students within the State boundaries.

3. Congress should not put its stamp of approval on racial segregation.

Mr. Chairman, on the basis of the reasons set forth by the association, on the basis of the decision in Missouri against University of Oklahoma, on the basis of the decision handed down yesterday with reference to restricted covenants, in the light of conditions that exist throughout the world today, to pass this resolution is simply placing the stamp of approval on segregation. By this resolution Congress gives its blessing to the brazen violations of the fourteenth amendment that exists in these States that have entered into this compact. I most strenuously urge the membership of this House to reject the resolution.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard these attacks from this so-called Association for the Advancement of the Colored People before. The organization does not represent the better element of the Negroes of this country. In fact it is doing the Negroes of this country, and especially of the South, infinitely more harm than good. It is not interested in the welfare of the Negroes of the South, and neither is the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

We passed a bill for the establishment of a Negro veterans' hospital in Virginia recently. It was supported and sponsored by the Booker T. Washington Foundation, and by the Negroes of the Booker T. Washington Institute who came here and worked incessantly for the passage of that measure. Yet, we had this bunch representing enemy interests come in here and try to block its passage, because they say they are opposed to segregation.

Here the people of the South are offering the Negroes an institutfon the like of which they have never had before. Yet, this organization, which I regard as a Communist front, is bending every effort to defeat it.

If you really want to do something for the Negroes of this country, and at the same time maintain peace between the two races, vote for this resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the argument advanced by the distinguished gentleman from New York is answered in the very decision he mentions, the decision handed down by the Supreme Court late yesterday afternoon. From a very casual examination of that decision I have reached the conclusion that if there are any agreements whereby colored people would not be provided with the same educational advantages which the white people have, under this decision that agreement would not be valid and would be stricken down.

In this connection, I would like to call your attention to part of the decision in which the Court said:

> The power of the Federal courts to enforce the terms of private agreements is at all times exercised subject to the restrictions and limitations of the public policy of the United States as manifested in the Constitution, treaties, Federal statutes, and applicable legal precedents. Where the enforcement of private agreements would be violative of that policy, it is the obligation of courts to refrain from such exertions of judicial power.
>
> We are here concerned with action of Federal courts of such a nature that if taken by the courts of a State would violate the prohibitory provisions of the fourteenth amendment. Shelley versus Kraemer, supra. It is not consistent with the public policy of the United States to permit Federal courts in the Nation's Capital to exercise general equitable powers to compel action denied the State courts where such State action has been held to be violative of the guaranty of the equal protection of the laws. We cannot presume that the public policy of the United States manifests a lesser concern for the protection of such basic rights against discriminatory action of Federal courts than against such action taken by the courts of the States.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, this very decision is a complete answer to the argument advanced by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to assure the distinguished gentleman from New York, and any others who may have any doubt, that the purpose of this resolution is to comply with the decisions of the Supreme Court. This is the first opportunity that the South has ever had, due to poor financial status, even by pooling resources, to build really worth-while institutions of higher learning for any of its citizens in all the broad field of graduate study.

May I point out, too, that not only is this compact approved by the very foundations that have made the appropriations to make it possible for Meharry College at Nashville, Tenn., to exist and to render the most efficient service that has ever been rendered to our colored friends, graduating more than half of the doctors and dentists of that race, and also approved by its student body of over 500 pupils; not only that, but you all received this letter from Meharry College, from which I quote:

> This plan is supported by the Meharry alumni who as professional men and women realize the profound consequences. It is supported by the Meharry undergraduates who see at stake their whole professional careers and their opportunity to be of service to their people. It would be supported, if its implications were correctly understood, by the majority of the Negro population.

Not only that, members of the committee, but it is endorsed strongly by the head and by the board of directors of the Carnegie Foundation, the Russell Sage Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, and every other foundation that is interested in the promotion of better race relations and of giving adequate postgraduate schooling to both races. It is the only chance we have ever had. What we want to do is to cooperate with the Julius Rosenwald fund that has done so much for us in the South and with these other agencies, and with the 410 best minds in the educational field. There is not a single one, so far as the record shows, or so far as I know, who, as an educator of national standing, is opposed to the purpose of this compact. There is not a thing in the world in this resolution or in the imagination of anyone who understands, that could promote any ill will or hatred. There is not a thing here that could possibly lead to anything but good for both races. We beg of Congress nothing but its consent to this compact so that it may be employed to give us the only chance we have ever had of giving to our brothers in black, and our own children, the higher education to which we feel they are entitled.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. CHELF. For the purpose of the record, I might say to the gentlemen here who make up the committee, that I happened to serve on Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary which had to do with this bill when it was first introduced. I happen to know that no one appeared in opposition to the bill, and when the subcommittee, under the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED], our beloved subcommittee chairman, reported the bill to the full committee of the Committee on the Judiciary, we delayed it for another two or three meetings so as to give anyone in opposition an opportunity to be heard. I believe that the only communication which our chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] received, was a wire from the city of New York, from some organization, that said they were displeased. So, there was no one who appeared in opposition to the bill at all, before our committees, yet we still postponed action by the full committee until the opposition had been given full hearing by the Senate subcommittee.

Mr. HOBBS. The passage and approval of this resolution would cost the National Government nothing. It would simply give the consent of Congress to the compact tentatively entered into at the conference of southern governors at Tallahassee, Fla., on February 8, 1948.

The Constitution of the United States requires:

> No State shall, without the consent of Congress * * * enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power (art. I, sec. 10, clause 3).

One hundred and one interstate compacts have been approved by Congress. None, seriously suggested, has ever been denied.

This compact is set forth in extenso in the resolution.

The conference of southern governors has been working toward this laudable end since 1935. The signatory States have now, for the first time, become financially able to establish and support such schools. For many of them, if not all, it is still impossible to finance, individually, such schools of the high standard of excellence contemplated.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, the compact—House Joint Resolution 334—sponsored by the Governors of our Southern States for the regional education program should be adopted. It is my information that for the past several years the Southern Governors' Conference has been studying and considering and working toward solution of the problem of providing better educational facilities in the South on a regional basis in the field of higher education. The compact which the southern governors have presented for approval by the Congress has been thoroughly debated and considered for many months. The resolution which we are considering here today giving congressional approval to the compact has been the subject of extensive hearings both by the Senate and the House Judiciary Committees and the resolution has been passed by the Senate. Final approval of the compact now only requires passage by the House and approval by the President to insure the accomplishment of the long-planned higher education program in the South.

I have studied the compact and the hearings on this measure. This measure is one of the most progressive and forward moves that has been presented in many years and I therefore hope that the resolution will be adopted without dissent. With the adoption of this compact two or more or several of the Southern States may construct and build extensive higher educational institutions and advance the cause of education in the South, particularly in the professions and fields of highly specialized technical training. Someone has advanced the idea that each State should provide individually such educational institutions. This is entirely unnecessary and cannot in reality be accomplished for practical reasons. Such a move would be too expensive and furthermore the number of students from individual States attending these advanced and higher educational institutions would be too limited and small in number to justify such schools in every State. On a regional basis all of the States in the southern area can participate and construct and build great institutions of higher learning.

The program offers immediate advantages that cannot be realized by the several States independent of each other for a great number of years. Furthermore, educators have long pointed out the advantages of providing regional educational institutions. Dr. Oliver C. Carmichael, president of the Carnegie Foundation, along with many other outstanding educators, has endorsed the scheme. Inevitably, such a program

will follow in other sections of the Nation. Various regions of our country are becoming known as sections for specialized education. As an example, Georgia Tech at Atlanta is considered one of the most outstanding engineering schools in the South. Vanderbilt University School of Medicine is considered one of the most outstanding, if not the most outstanding, medical school in the South. Students desiring to study medicine come from all over the South and other States to attend Vanderbilt University School of Medicine. All of the States of the South do not have comparable medical schools and some States do not afford medical education to students of their State at all. There is no reason why this compact should not be approved, thereby permitting the States of the South to pool their resources and work toward the building and maintaining of regional universities—schools of higher learning in the technical sciences and professions. There is a great need for such educational institutions, especially in the South, and the adoption of this resolution will implement and forward this most worth-while planning and endeavor. With its adoption we will see in time the growth of large medical and dental schools, schools of forestry, mining, engineering, and veterinary science, and other professional and technical schools providing advanced training in the South on a regional basis. As an initial step in this direction the compact provides for the acquisition of Meharry Medical College located at Nashville, Tenn., to be jointly owned, operated, and controlled by the Southern States and to be operated as a regional institution through funds afforded by contributions from the Southern States. This is only one of several such schools that will result from the adoption of the resolution authorizing regional educational institutions.

Mr. Chairman, this is a step in the right direction and represents a solution to a most pressing problem. I am pleased to give the measure my support and I trust that the compact may be speedily approved and higher education advanced in the South.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DEVITT: On page 2, line 7, after the comma insert "*Provided*, That the planning, establishment, acquisition, and operation of educational institutions under the compact be not in conflict with the Constitution and laws of the United States."

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in accordance with a suggestion made by the Attorney General of the United States speaking through Peyton Ford, Assistant to the Attorney General. The recommendation was made in a letter dated March 15, 1948, sent by Mr. Ford to the Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate, in connection with hearings held in that body on Senate Joint Resolution 191, a companion measure to the resolution we are considering today. It appears that the objectives of this House joint resolution were very commendable, but I think we should make very sure that the Congress does not put its stamp of approval upon any contemplated action which may be contrary to the Constitution or the laws of the United States. The amendment I have offered seeks to negative any such intent on the part of the Congress.

Article I, section 10 of the Constitution requires that the Congress give its consent to any agreement or compact between the States. This resolution today is a technical compliance with the requirements of the Constitution. It is not within the province of the Congress to determine legislative policy within the various States. The constitutions and laws of some of the States of the Union contain provisions which may well be at variance with the Constitution and laws of the United States. For this Congress to give its blanket approval to the compact without an expression of the kind embodied in my amendment would be an action which by inference would give congressional approval to those doubtful provisions of the various State constitutions and laws dealing with discrimination and segregation.

Just yesterday the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of Hurd against Hodge, et al., held that the judicial branch of the Government would not give its approbation to real-estate covenants prohibiting the transfer of certain properties to persons of the colored race, and denied the use of the Federal judicial machinery in an action seeking to enforce such covenants. The judicial branch of the Government has refused its approbation of such nonconstitutional principle; the legislative branch of the Government should refuse to give its sanction to a compact, the execution of which will undoubtedly involve the application of State constitutional provisions and laws which are of doubtful constitutionality. The amendment offered seeks to withhold congressional approval of State constitutional and legislative enactments at variance with our United States Constitution and laws.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVITT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman merely provides in his amendment that nothing in this resolution shall be in violation of the Constitution?

Mr. DEVITT. That is right.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. With all due respect to the gentleman, we might as well add the Lord's Prayer to that amendment.

Mr. DEVITT. I would be glad to add that if it were germane.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think the gentleman ought to be realistic and put in what the Supreme Court said.

Mr. DEVITT. If the gentleman wants to amend my amendment, the gentleman is free to do so. I will be very happy to have him do so.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. With all due respect, may I say to the gentleman that his amendment is meaningless?

Mr. DEVITT. I will leave that to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: On page 9, line 24, insert a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 2. This consent of the Congress of the United States of America shall not constitute nor be construed to constitute an endorsement of the principle of segregation in education."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a serious objection which I have heard voiced to this legislation is that by passing it this Congress would be placing its stamp of approval upon the principle of segregation in education. As we all know, there are some States, in fact, I think this applies to all of those who are signatories to this pact, which have in their State statutes or in their constitutions, or both, provisions for segregation in education. It is not within our power to change those provisions. There are other States, however, which do not recognize the principle of segregation in their public schools. It seems to me we should be extremely careful, if we adopt this legislation, not to take a step which the American people will construe as an effort to place the stamp of Federal approval upon the principle of segregation in education.

My friends from the Southern States, including the able author of this joint resolution, have repeatedly said that it was not the intention of this measure to approve of segregation.

It seems to me, therefore, that this proposed additional section, if it is not in conflict with the remainder of the joint resolution, is not objectionable. If it is in conflict with the remainder of the resolution, if the resolution is intended to say that we are placng the Federal stamp of approval on segregation in education, then there are many here, I feel sure, otherwise favorable to the resolution, who under those circumstances would oppose it.

As a matter of fact, I have serious doubt about the necessity for passing this joint resolution at all. All the measures heretofore adopted which approved compacts between the States relate to such things as apportionment of waters, construction of bridges or tunnels, boundary agreements, and the like. None of them have to do with anything akin to such an agreement as we are here discussing today.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Do I understand the gentleman to say there is no need for this resolution?

Mr. KEATING. In my judgment, the States in question could probably accomplish what they are here seeking to do without a compact between them of such a nature as to require approval by the Congress.

Mr. WALTER. I would call the gentleman's attention to that part of article I, section 10 of the Constitution which

provides that no State shall, without the consent of Congress, enter into any agreement or compact with any State.

Mr. KEATING. I am familiar with the constitutional provision. That is the very reason we are here. What I am saying is that the Supreme Court has held that the compacts referred to in the Constitution as requiring congressional consent are those which transcend Federal jurisdiction, rights, and powers, not all agreements. That point was emphasized by Governor Caldwell, of Florida, a witness before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. He referred to the Tennessee-Virginia case in which the Supreme Court so held.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Was this amendment which is now under consideration submitted to the committee?

Mr. KEATING. The committee that had the bill under consideration is my own committee, I will say to the gentleman. I have submitted the amendment to certain members of the committee, some of whom think it is all right. The objection which others make to it is that it is in conflict with the main provisions of the bill itself. In other words, their position is that necessarily inherent in the joint resolution is a Federal pronouncement that we approve of segregation in education and that this amendment is, therefore, inconsistent with the underlying purpose of the measure. If that is its purpose, I cannot support it. The action taken on this amendment clarifies the issue.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, of course no one could think for a moment that the passage of this joint resolution would be an endorsement by the Congress of the principle of segregation in education. It simply does exactly the reverse. It gives its consent to the 15 Southern States to pool their resources and provide adequate post-graduate schooling for white and black under the existing segregation laws of those States, and that could not possibly include any endorsement by Congress of the principle of segregation. But it does recognize that under the Constitution of the United States, the Federal Government has nothing whatsoever to do with the local affairs nor the powers of police in the several States. This resolution works hand in glove with the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States by complying with the requirement that equal educational opportunity be offered each race. It does not lie within the power of Congress to strike down the segregation laws of any State which are now in existence. It does not endorse them. It simply gives consent of the Congress that the cooperating States might pool their resources and continue to operate in line with the Supreme Court decisions, by offering equal educational opportunities. It does not approve the status quo. It does not seek to change it. Therefore, with all due respect to the profound knowledge of my colleague of the Committee on the Judiciary, I do not believe that his amendment is either apropos or wise.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am so happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. KEATING. In view of the fact that it is the contention of the gentleman that this bill does not give Federal sanction to the principle of segregation, does the gentleman see any harm in our saying so in so many words?

Mr. HOBBS. Not at all, except that I think it would encumber the record in a way that you do not intend and that it is perfectly innocuous and of no effect. I think it would open the way to argument which would be hurtful. I beg your consideration of the main point that I am seeking to make, namely, that Congress could not if it would, and would not if it could, pass any law that is contrary to the Constitution of the United States and invade the province of the Southern States under our constitutional system of dual sovereignty.

For those reasons and for the further reason that the adoption of your amendment would be absolutely ineffective, save to stir up useless questions, debate, and possible strife, I urge that it be voted down.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word generally on the subject of compacts. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] has said, the Constitution provides that no compact shall be entered into between the States without the consent of the Congress. This provision was inserted in the Constitution without much debate, and so far as I know without any opposition.

I have always felt that this matter of compacts between the States should be encouraged by the Congress and not discouraged. Many times States in the same general region might solve their problems by this compact method instead of coming down to Congress to have them solved here. For example, I think this resolution indicates a proper field within which the States may well operate. I know, for instance, that we have in Iowa one of the best agricultural colleges in the country. There are other nearby States that do not have our agricultural resources. We might well consider in Iowa the pooling of our agricultural resources with the mining resources and technical knowledge of other States, Minnesota, perhaps, and by our joint efforts with much less expenditure of money build up colleges which would be able to compete with the large colleges in the East.

I do not believe that the question of racial discrimination is involved at all in this resolution. The fourteenth amendment limits what a State may do in the matter of segregation and racial discrimination. That fourteenth amendment, of course, applies to the action of the States individualy as well as collectively through a compact; so I say the question of racial discrimination is all beside the point in this debate.

Someone has suggested that ratification is not necessary, that the States might act without ratification of the Congress. I do not so understand it. In most States a taxpayer's suit is the proper method of testing the legality of any expenditure. In most States the legislative body could not appropriate money to a college in some other State unless it proceeded through this method given in the Constitution. It could be challenged if done by a taxpayer's suit.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. With reference to the amendment, would it not be true that it would be presumed, without the language of the amendment, that Congress intended in this resolution that it should follow the Constitution and the laws of the land?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. The Congress is obligated to follow the Constitution. I think a statement that we intend to do so adds nothing. The whole matter of racial discrimination is regulated by the fourteenth amendment as interpreted by the Court.

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The South has been driven into a corner by Supreme Court decisions against the total denial of professional and graduate training to Negroes in southern tax-supported universities. But the old South is determined to hold on to racial segregation even in the face of bankruptcy if they obey the edict of the Supreme Court that they must supply substantially equal facilities to Negroes. To get off the horns of this dilemma, even temporarily, there has been introduced House Joint Resolution 334, asking the "consent of Congress to the compact regional education entered into between the Southern States at Tallahassee, Fla., on February 8, 1948."

Enactment of such legislation is required by the Federal Constitution, which prohibits States entering into compacts without prior consent of the Congress. The southern governors piously declare that such regional schools are to be created for both white and Negro students. Not one of them believes for a minute that within foreseeable and calculable time the existing white schools of law, medicine, engineering, dentistry, pharmacy, forestry, and graduate education are going to be abandoned and their students sent off to regional schools.

Whatever shrinking of private funds for education may make necessary in the future, the sole purpose and intent at present of the regional plan, which experienced and wise Americans should have been intelligent enough to see, is to set up segregated regional schools for Negroes and not for whites. Intelligent Negroes and whites, particularly the former, see through this dishonest scheme and will oppose it with all the organizational and political power at their command. The Supreme Court has repeatedly ruled that each State must meet its obligations to its citizens within the boundary of that State—which incidentally happens to be the bible of the States' righters.

Obviously aware both of the doubtful constitutionality of such enabling legis-

lation as well as of the rising opposition, proponents of the plan are attempting to jam this legislation through Congress with unprecedented speed. Representative SAM HOBBS, of Alabama, secured almost instant approval by a Judiciary Subcommittee of the resolution—House Resolution 334—he introduced in the House of Representatives. Almost equally swift was the Senate in announcing hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 191. But they were not swift enough to stop requests of the opposition to be heard.

One of the immediately apparent manifestations of the real purposes back of the legislation is its failure to include provision that there shall be neither discrimination nor segregation in the proposed regional schools.

Even if the Congress is either so deluded or dishonest as to approve Senate Joint Resolution 191 and its House counterpart, it can be safely predicted that the constitutionality of the legislation will be promptly and unequivocally challenged in the courts. The establishment or attempted establishment of regional schools for Negroes while existing State graduate and professional schools for whites continue in operation will be in direct opposition to the entire trend of United States Supreme Court decisions of the past decade.

This attempt of the South, aided and encouraged by Messrs. Young and Carmichael, provides an ironic as well as amusing commentary on the current revolt of some of these same southern governors who emit daily tirades against northern and Federal interference. An Associated Press dispatch from Gainesville, Fla., dated March 5, reports that the Southern Regional Educational Council proposed a $76,400 budget to get its plan for cooperative schools rolling. The story adds that "the funds will be sought from several philanthropic educational organizations," presumably from way down south on Fifth Avenue in New York City where the offices of the Carnegie Corp. are located.

These same governors threaten virtually every act of nonviolence or violence against congressional legislation to abolish lynching, the poll tax, and job discrimination. But it seems to have no reluctance in asking the same Congress to enact Federal legislation to enable the South to perpetuate educational discrimination and segregation and to circumvent the clear and unmistakable mandate of the United States Supreme Court. We can believe that the southern governors are honest only when they come into court as well as the Congress with clean hands by abolishing the legal fiction and judicial myth of separate but equal facilities.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I strongly recommend to Members of the House House Concurrent Resolution 133, which would give congressional authority to the interstate education compacts proposed by 15 Southern States as the best method of improving facilities for higher education. The educational implications of this proposal are tremendous. The various States, by combining their resources, can make available to the young people of that section, both white and Negro, a system of higher education that the States, acting individually, could not afford.

This plan was devised after a series of conferences and months of investigations by the chief executives of the 15 States and their educational advisers. It is a sound plan, and one that can only result in a higher standard for the South.

The State and Federal Governments should cooperate to the fullest extent in providing adequate educational opportunities, and this compact is a long step in that direction.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DOLLIVER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 334, giving the consent of Congress to the compact on regional education entered into between the Southern States at Tallahassee, Fla., on February 8, 1948, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 551, he reported the resolution back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 236, nays 45, answered "present" 1, not voting 149, as follows:

[Roll No. 55]

YEAS—236

Abernethy	Beall	Byrne, N. Y.
Albert	Beckworth	Byrnes, Wis.
Allen, Calif.	Bennett, Mich.	Camp
Allen, Ill.	Bishop	Canfield
Allen, La.	Blackney	Cannon
Andersen, H. Carl	Boggs, La.	Chapman
	Bradley	Chelf
Andrews, N. Y.	Bramblett	Chiperfield
Angell	Brehm	Church
Arends	Brooks	Clark
Arnold	Brown, Ga.	Clason
Auchincloss	Bulwinkle	Coffin
Banta	Burleson	Cole, Kans.
Barrett	Busbey	Cole, Mo.
Bates, Mass.	Butler	Cole, N. Y.
Combs	Holmes	Rayburn
Cooley	Hope	Redden
Cooper	Hull	Reed, Ill.
Corbett	Jenison	Reed, N. Y.
Cotton	Jensen	Rees
Coudert	Johnson, Calif.	Regan
Courtney	Johnson, Ill.	Rich
Cox	Johnson, Tex.	Riley
Cravens	Jones, N. C.	Rizley
Crow	Jones, Wash.	Robertson
Cunningham	Jonkman	Rogers, Mass.
Curtis	Judd	Rohrbough
Dague	Kean	Ross
Davis, Ga.	Keefe	Russell
Davis, Tenn.	Kefauver	Sadlak
Davis, Wis.	Kilday	St. George
Dawson, Utah	Landis	Sanborn
Deane	Lanham	Sarbacher
Dolliver	Latham	Sasscer
Domengeaux	LeCompte	Schwabe, Okla.
Dondero	LeFevre	Seely-Brown
Donohue	Lemke	Shafer
Dorn	Lodge	Short
Doughton	Love	Simpson, Ill.
Durham	Lucas	Simpson, Pa.
Eaton	Lusk	Smith, Kans.
Elliott	Lyle	Smith, Va.
Ellis	McDonough	Snyder
Elsaesser	McGarvey	Spence
Engel, Mich.	McMahon	Stanley
Evins	McMillen, Ill.	Stefan
Fellows	Mack	Stevenson
Fenton	Macy	Stockman
Fernandez	Mahon	Stratton
Fisher	Martin, Iowa	Taber
Flannagan	Mason	Talle
Fletcher	Meyer	Teague
Folger	Michener	Thomas, Tex.
Foote	Miller, Md.	Thompson
Fuller	Miller, Nebr.	Tibbott
Gallagher	Mills	Tollefson
Gamble	Morris	Towe
Gathings	Morrison	Trimble
Gavin	Muhlenberg	Twyman
Gearhart	Murdock	Vail
Gillette	Murray, Tenn.	Van Zandt
Goff	Murray, Wis.	Vinson
Goodwin	Nicholson	Vorys
Gore	Norblad	Vursell
Gossett	O'Hara	Wadsworth
Gregory	O'Konski	Walter
Gross	Pace	Whitaker
Gwinn, N. Y.	Passman	Whitten
Gwynne, Iowa	Patterson	Whittington
Hale	Philbin	Wigglesworth
Hall, Leonard W.	Phillips, Calif.	Wilson, Tex.
	Phillips, Tenn.	Winstead
Hardy	Pickett	Wolcott
Harris	Plumley	Wolverton
Hart	Poage	Wood
Hébert	Potter	Woodruff
Herter	Potts	Worley
Heselton	Preston	Youngblood
Hinshaw	Priest	
Hobbs	Rankin	

NAYS—45

Bloom	Griffiths	Lynch
Brophy	Hagen	MacKinnon
Buchanan	Havenner	Mansfield
Buck	Heffernan	Marcantonio
Buckley	Holifield	Miller, Conn.
Buffett	Huber	Morgan
Burke	Isacson	Multer
Carroll	Jackson, Wash.	O'Brien
Dawson, Ill.	Karsten, Mo.	Owens
Delaney	Keating	Powell
Devitt	Kelley	Price, Ill.
Fogarty	Kennedy	Sabath
Forand	Keogh	Sadowski
Gordon	King	Somers
Gorski	Klein	Welch

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Hall, Edwin Arthur

NOT VOTING—149

Abbitt	Carson	Feighan
Anderson, Calif.	Case, N. J.	Fulton
Andresen, August H.	Case, S. Dak.	Garmatz
	Celler	Gary
Andrews, Ala.	Chadwick	Gillie
Bakewell	Chenoweth	Graham
Barden	Clevenger	Granger
Bates, Ky.	Clippinger	Grant, Ala.
Battle	Colmer	Grant, Ind.
Bell	Crawford	Halleck
Bender	Crosser	Hand
Bennett, Mo.	D'Ewart	Harless, Ariz.
Bland	Dingell	Harness, Ind.
Blatnik	Dirksen	Harrison
Boggs, Del.	Douglas	Hartley
Bolton	Eberharter	Harvey
Bonner	Ellsworth	Hays
Boykin	Elston	Hedrick
Brown, Ohio	Engle, Calif.	Hendricks
Bryson	Fallon	Hess

Hill	McCormack	Ramey
Hoeven	McCowen	Reeves
Hoffman	McCulloch	Richards
Horan	McDowell	Riehlman
Jackson, Calif.	McGregor	Rivers
Jarman	McMillan, S. C.	Rockwell
Javits	Madden	Rogers, Fla.
Jenkins, Ohio	Maloney	Rooney
Jenkins, Pa.	Manasco	Schwabe, Mo.
Jennings	Mathews	Scoblick
Johnson, Ind.	Meade, Ky.	Scott, Hardie
Johnson, Okla.	Meade, Md.	Scott,
Jones, Ala.	Merrow	Hugh, D., Jr.
Kearney	Miller, Calif.	Scrivner
Kearns	Mitchell	Sheppard
Kee	Monroney	Sikes
Kerr	Morton	Smathers
Kersten, Wis.	Mundt	Smith, Maine
Kilburn	Nixon	Smith, Ohio
Kirwan	Nodar	Smith, Wis.
Knutson	Norrell	Stigler
Kunkel	Norton	Sundstrom
Lane	O'Toole	Taylor
Larcade	Patman	Thomas, N. J.
Lea	Peden	Weichel
Lesinski	Peterson	West
Lewis, Ky.	Pfeifer	Wheeler
Lewis, Ohio	Ploeser	Williams
Lichtenwalter	Poulson	Wilson, Ind.
Ludlow	Price, Fla.	
McConnell	Rains	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Abbitt for, with Mrs. Douglas against.
Mr. Graham for, with Mr. Hand against.
Mr. Battle for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.
Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Miller of California against.
Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Celler against.
Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Lesinski against.
Mrs. Smith of Maine for, with Mrs. Norton against.
Mr. McMillan of South Carolina for, with Mr. Rooney against.
Mr. McCormack for, with Mr. Kirwan against.
Mr. Williams for, with Mr. Dingell against.
Mr. Harrison for, with Mr. O'Toole against.
Mr. Gary for, with Mr. Eberharter against.
Mr. Bonner for, with Mr. Blatnik against.
Mr. Patman for, with Mr. Sundstrom against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Halleck with Mr. Bryson.
Mr. Case of New Jersey with Mr. Fallon.
Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Engle of California.
Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hays.
Mr. Hoeven with Mr. Boykin.
Mr. Chenoweth with Mr. Richards.
Mr. Bakewell with Mr. Smathers.
Mr. Rockwell with Mr. Granger.
Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., with Mr. Rivers.
Mr. Kearns with Mr. Stigler.
Mr. Jenkins of Ohio with Mr. Jarman.
Mr. Kilburn with Mr. Rogers of Florida.
Mr. McConnell with Mr. Jones of Alabama.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Crosser.
Mr. Mathews with Mr. Grant of Alabama.
Mr. Nodar with Mr. Andrews of Alabama.
Mr. Riehlman with Mr. Barden.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Norrell.
Mr. Hardie Scott with Mr. Harless of Arizona.
Mr. Bennett of Missouri with Mr. Hedrick.
Mr. Hess with Mr. Kee.
Mr. Maloney with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Mundt with Mr. Bland.
Mr. Weichel with Mr. Kerr.
Mr. Ramey with Mr. West.
Mr. August H. Andresen with Mr. Rains.
Mr. Bender with Mr. Price of Florida.
Mr. Hoffman with Mr. Ludlow.
Mr. Harness of Indiana with Mr. Barden.
Mr. Johnson of Indiana with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.
Mr. Ploeser with Mr. Wheeler.
Mr. Reeves with Mr. Feighan.
Mr. Schwabe of Missouri with Mr. Lane.
Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Lea.
Mr. Clevenger with Mr. Larcade.
Mrs. Bolton with Mr. Manasco.
Mr. Carson with Mr. Meade of Maryland.
Mr. McGregor with Mr. Madden.
Mr. Lichtenwalter with Mr. Monroney.
Mr. McCowen with Mr. Peden.
Mr. McCulloch with Mr. Peterson.
Mr. Ellsworth with Mr. Hendricks.
Mr. Elston with Mr. Sikes.
Mr. Grant of Indiana with Mr. Bland.

Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MORGAN, and Mr. BUFFETT changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL changed his vote from "aye" to "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON THE SOUTHERN STATES COMPACT BILL

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their own remarks in the RECORD immediately following the conclusion of general debate on House Joint Resolution 334.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include the remarks of Lucian O. Hunter, Jr., post commander, at a luncheon given in honor of Speaker MARTIN by AMVETS Post, No. 19, on Monday, May 3.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a citizen's letter on the reciprocal trade agreements.

Mr. WALTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech delivered by Mr. Kenneth F. Kressler on Tuesday, April 20.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter on the Marshall plan.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement made by a constituent.

Mr. McMAHON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by Ralph Hendershot.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes on Thursday next following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next, following the gentleman from Virginia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in respect to Polish Constitution Day.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HOEVEN (at the request of Mr. DOLLIVER), for the balance of the week, on account of death in family.

CHRYSLER WORKERS

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

(Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include an advertisement that appeared in yesterday's Washington Post.)

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's Washington Post appeared a statement by the Chrysler workers' local union, which is one of the finest statements I have seen put out by any organization at any time. It is particularly interesting and I commend it very highly to every Member of the House. I likewise want to commend the CIO union for bringing this matter to the attention of the people.

I believe that the statements made require an answer from the Chrysler Corp.

This statement says that the Chrysler workers need a wage increase and that Chrysler can pay it and cut car prices, too.

The profits of the Chrysler Corp. in 1947 were 50 percent higher than the average for all corporations in the highly profitable automobile industry. The profits of the Chrysler Corp. in 1947 came to 25.6 percent on its investment. Chrysler profits were so great in 1947 that they could have cut retail prices $145 on every car and still have made 8 percent on its investment.

Mr. Speaker, this complete statement by the Chrysler workers follows:

CHRYSLER WORKERS NEED A WAGE INCREASE—CHRYSLER CAN PAY IT AND CUT CAR PRICES, TOO

HERE'S PROOF

The corporation profits

1. Chrysler profits: Profits of the Chrysler Corp. in 1947—fasten your seat belt—50 percent higher than the average for all corporations in the highly profitable automobile industry.

2. Chrysler profits: Profits of the Chrysler Corp. in 1947, after taxes, came to 25.6 percent on its investment. The industry average was 17 percent.

3. Chrysler profits: Profits of the Chrysler Corp. in 1947 were so great that each Chrysler worker produced 68 cents in profit for the corporation every hour he worked.

4. Chrysler profits: Profits of the Chrysler Corp. in 1947 were so great that it could have cut retail prices $145 on every car it produced

last year and still have made 8 percent on its investment.

5. Chrysler profits: Profits of the Chrysler Corp. in 1947 prove that the corporation can grant every Chrysler worker a 30-cent-per-hour wage increase and still make 14¼ percent on its investment, after taxes. It can cut prices, grant the wage increase and still make a good 6 to 8 percent on investment.

The workers' needs

1. The Chrysler workers: The Chrysler workers, like other American workers, have taken the rap for the reactionary crime of destroying price controls in the summer of 1946. Since that time, profits after taxes have gone up 57 percent—but wages and salaries have gone up only 18 percent. Profits rose over three times as fast as the income of the workers. Industry wanted the profits of inflation—and got them.

2. The Chrysler workers: The family of the average Chrysler worker must live on an income of $13 below the minimum weekly income fixed by the United States Bureau of the Budget for a city worker's family of four.

3. The Chrysler workers: The average auto worker's earnings rose 12 percent between June 1946 and January 1948—but the cost of living went up 27 percent.

4. The Chrysler workers: The Chrysler worker's family could afford less than 90 percent of the food, clothing, and other necessities which the breadwinner's pay check could buy in the month price controls were destroyed (June 1946).

5. The Chrysler workers: The Chrysler workers, through their union, repeatedly called on Congress and Big Business to roll back prices, and made it clear that they would prefer a price roll-back to a wage increase. Both Congress and industry ignored that call. Since prices were not rolled back, and since they will continue to rise, a wage increase is necessary. The Chrysler workers refuse to take the rap for the reactionary crime of inflation.

CHRYSLER'S OWN FIGURES PROVE UAW CASE

Here, from Chrysler's own 1947 annual report, are the figures that prove that the Chrysler Corp. can pay the wage increase asked by Chrysler workers and still make extravagant profits.

Fact 1: Chrysler's pay roll last year, including President K. T. Keller's salary, was $259,148,583.

Fact 2: Our 30-cent demand, with equivalent percentage increases for white-collar workers, amounts to 21.1 percent of the total pay roll, or $54,680,351.

Fact 3: Chrysler's 1947 profits before taxes amounted to $123,657,346.[1]

Fact 4 (fact 3 minus fact 2): After a 21.1 percent pay-roll increase to Chrysler workers, Chrysler's profits before taxes would still be $68,966,995.

Fact 5: Income taxes would then take $28,614,406.[2]

Fact 6 (fact 4 minus fact 5): Leaving profits after taxes of $40,352,589.

Fact 7: Stockholders' total investment in the corporation at the beginning of 1947 was $282,912,028.

Fact 8 (fact 6 as a percentage of fact 7): Chrysler's rate of profit, after a 21.1 percent wage and salary increase and after taxes, would be 14¼ percent.

THE A, B, C OF THE CHRYSLER WORKERS' WAGE DEMANDS

A. The Chrysler Corp. can increase wages without raising prices.

B. The Chrysler workers need this wage increase to recover lost ground and make a little progress.

C. The issue can be settled peacefully on the basis of the facts.

Will the Chrysler Corp. heed the facts? Chrysler workers want to know.

NATIONAL CHRYSLER DEPARTMENT AND CHRYSLER LOCAL UNIONS, UAW-CIO.

[1] This profit figure includes $5,166,126 charged by the corporation for extraordinary depreciation. This deduction is inconsistent with the corporation's past policy and probably will not be recognized by the U. S. Treasury for tax purposes.

[2] Chrysler figured its tax payments at 41.49 percent of its profits before taxes. We used the same percentage.

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

WHERE ARE WE GOING?

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, according to a statement made by one of our colleagues it is hardly parliamentarily correct to follow the addressing of the Speaker by addressing the Members of the House; but on this particular occasion I wish to say to those who are present and to those who by any chance might read in the RECORD what I have to say on this occasion that I am addressing myself in that way at the present time.

I am thinking about that which is most important to all of us—the question of, Where are we going? What is our destination? I am speaking from a consideration of world affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I voted for ECA, ERP or the Marshall plan, whichever you might decide to call it, feeling that it was destined to aid us in the reestablishment of a democratic life particularly in Europe and finally with something of a gesture toward China.

The word "communism" has become something of a byword which condemns every segment and section of people anywhere under any circumstances. Of course, we realize that communism is a definite danger and a definite threat to the world as well as a terrible life for any people to live under in any domain. But if we make the mistake in our earnest and justified effort to eliminate the influences of communism in our own country and as far as we may in other lands, we should not forget that there is such a thing as totalitarian government on the other side and there will never be an end or the consummation of an end to be desired with respect to communism as long as we have tyrannical, totalitarian, undemocratic, unrepresentative governments in other countries. People want to be free. They want to enjoy what we spoke about in our Constitution and in our Declaration of Rights as the privilege of enjoying the fruits of our own labor and pursuing happiness unhindered by authority, if you please, in high places.

Let me read you something. I have forgotten who wrote it, but I am sure that whoever it was will not accuse me of plagiarism in appropriating it on this occasion:

UNFINISHED ANTI-RED BUSINESS

In the midst of rejoicing over Communist defeats in Colombia and Italy, responsible leaders know that the Red problem in such countries is still unfinished business. Far more effective preventive measures are required. They are necessary on both international and national levels.

No country alone can deal adequately with a conspiracy which is international in origin, organization, and purpose. This is recognized by the Colombian Government and by the Inter-American Conference in Bogota, which the Reds almost succeeded in killing. So the 21 nations there have agreed unanimously to cooperate in urgent measures to prevent agents in the service of international communism, or of any other totalitarianism, from tampering with the true will of the peoples of the Western Hemisphere. Likewise the Italian Government is seeking membership in the new western European defensive alliance against Russian aggression and penetration.

While these international agreements are essential, they are not sufficient. At best they can reduce Moscow interference. But they cannot cure the unhealthy national conditions in which communism breeds and thrives. That can be done only by drastic social and economic reforms not yet attempted by either Italy or most Latin-American countries.

In Colombia and many of her sister republics, the chasm between the small rich ruling class and the impoverished semi-illiterate people is dangerously deep and wide. No amount of suppression can permanently prevent revolution against such conditions, or prevent the better organized Red underground from capturing those popular revolts when they occur. Decent living and working conditions, equal economic and educational opportunities, must be included in any democracy strong enough to withstand totalitarianism from left or right.

In Italy the left wing, despite its defeat, polled nearly half a million more votes than 2 years ago. Almost one-third of all Italians went along with the Commies. They did this in the face of warnings by their church and by their American relatives, in disregard of the announcement that United States relief and Marshall plan aid would be cut off by Red victory, despite Stalin's refusal to return Trieste, and despite the horrible example of Soviet enslavement of Czechoslovakia and eastern Europe.

Most of those 8,000,000 Italian voters are not Stalinists at heart and not traitors. They are simply the hopeless and misguided poor—the landless peasants, the unemployed workers, the middle-class victims of inflation and black market.

We do not believe that country is now or will be safe from revolution until the inhuman poverty of Italy's millions is alleviated—until Marshall plan recovery is allowed to seep down to those who need it most.

For that reason we are tremendously impressed by the postelection statements of the Pope and the Premier. Premier de Gasperi now will have a sufficient parliamentary majority to put through any legislation he desires. He pledges agrarian reform, fairer distribution of wealth, and "ever-quickening steps toward conditions corresponding ever more closely to social justice."

Pope Pius XII says the election victory "should hasten material social reconstruction of the country so necessary if justice is to be done to all, especially to the workingman and the unemployed."

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that our pitiable attempt to bolster the government in China is a futile one simply because of the fact that there are so many underprivileged, underfed, despairing, destitute, more or less, in that country, whose plight does not appeal to the government in charge, and that we will find our efforts quite in vain unless we strive by moral persuasion and, if you please, by warning, that we will not support a government that does not offer liberty and freedom and democracy to its citizens. I am afraid, too, that in Greece we will never have the elimination of that element and that program which

has obtained in Greece and which we ascribe largely to communism, and probably unjustifiably so, until by moral suasion or warning we tell the totalitarian Government of Greece that she must put her house in order and recognize everyone within that boundary as a citizen of that country entitled to all of the benefits that mankind can enjoy and which his diligence and his thoughts and his desires may lead him to.

A great headline in the afternoon paper says, "Greeks execute 152 in 1 day in wake of Minister's slaying."

For what? The charges that they say were made in 1944, but they were slain because to them was attributed the death of the Minister of Greece. I cannot make an accusation about that, but I do think that with all that we are trying to do to reestablish democratic thought and living within the countries of this world we ought to have something to say to the tyrannical, totalitarian, undemocratic governments of the countries we are pouring our money into and with it our hopes for readjustment and the establishment of a better government. If we do not, and if we are not mindful of that and waste all that we have, including universal military training with all of its dislocations of our own citizens, especially the youth of the land, carrying along with it conscription and things of that kind, depending upon these to lift the world back to a status of democratic living, we may find ourselves as having lost all this if we do not try to accomplish these things at least with a purpose and with a determination as far as within us lies to teach and to urge the peoples of every country and the governments themselves particularly that their totalitarian regimes, their tyrannical conduct, make it impossible for us or anybody else to deliver them from the woes and the damnation of communism sooner or later.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. Does the gentleman not believe it would be a good idea for us to be an example to the other nations of the world by showing our real freedom here in the things we do?

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I am so proud of my country that I will make hardly any mention of that situation now. Of course, we do often need amendments to our way of life. But I live in the very great faith that wherever mistakes are made, sooner or later this great democratic principle which permeates our population and our Government and our law-making power will correct those evils and bring to the United States as good a Government as is possible to be had.

Mr. OWENS. The gentleman does say, then, we should be an example?

Mr. FOLGER. I think we occupy that position, where we should be an example, and that we should carry our influence by all the persuasion possible and by the example that we set to other nations that this democracy of free people is the only government that mankind ought to be required to live under.

Mr. OWENS. Putting youngsters into the Army without their consent in peacetime would hardly be the act of a free nation, would it?

Mr. FOLGER. I saw something today, Mr. Speaker, that I did not like at all. It is a repetition of something I have seen before, that men who do not think, honestly and truly, that with the exercise of this great power the Government has to reach down and get 18- and 19-year-old boys and put them into the service, and accompany that with a conscription law, are acting for a personal political benefit; and with great respect to him, I refer to some remarks that are attributed to Mr. Justice Roberts, a former Supreme Court Justice, in which he makes the charge that our Speaker and a Member of the Senate are moved in these things by the desire to get votes. I do not believe a word of it. For my own self, I repudiate such a suggestion. I am opposed to it and I am going to remain opposed to it until I see the necessity for it, whether I ever get another vote so long as I live; and I believe those men who are honestly opposed to it are opposing it on the same basis and for the same reason.

I can see no common sense in trusting to toy guns in an atomic age, where technical methods of defense have supplanted the outmoded means of pitiable inability.

The rule of reason ought to have some place in our thinking. We have the greatest Navy in the world. We may supplement it as research and progress may allow. One of our highest military men has said that so far as the Army is concerned we should maintain an army of reasonable proportions, but devote our energies, too, to the discovery and improvement of methods.

In considering what is adequate and competent, I remember that adequacy does not depend so much on the number of soldiers we have, but on the character of war mechanism we shall use. Have we not learned anything from Hiroshima or Nagasaki or Bikini?

And, again, do we hope to kill communism by supporting Fascist totalitarian governments, or by rebuilding the military power of Germany? I fear such a course will not reduce communism, but may well tend to its growth.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DEVITT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, last week in the District court an indictment charging the Maryland-Virginia Milk Producers' Cooperative and seven Washington milk-distributing companies with restraint of trade and conspiracy in price fixing was summarily dismissed on the grounds that under the Capper-Volstead Act of 1922 a cooperative may not be prosecuted for violation of the antitrust laws.

The court accepted the argument of the attorney for the secretary-treasurer of the cooperative, who said:

> Elimination of competition is a perfect legal right of a cooperative (and) * * * the very end and purpose of a cooperative.

That is a shocking statement, but what this lawyer went on to say presents an even more dangerous doctrine. He said:

> When we act to eliminate competition, we're within our rights, so long as we do so in our own self-interest. Bet your life we try to deprive noncustomer retailers of their milk supply. We'll persuade them to come into our organization as customers if we can. And when we do so, we're fully within our rights in the economic struggle. We're fully authorized by Congress and protected by law, and unless the net result is undue price enhancement, we haven't violated the law.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time that law was changed. I have previously pointed out that cooperative associations have three highly important privileges which are denied to other businesses: First, they may be wholly or largely exempt from payment of Federal income tax; second, farmer cooperatives are legally absolved from the requirements of the Securities and Exchange Act of 1933; third, farmer cooperatives are permitted—even encouraged—to create monopolies in restraint of trade under the liberal provisions of the Capper-Volstead Act.

This third privilege—freedom from prosecution under the antitrust laws—is being used today in direct violation of the public interest.

Through this legalized monopoly, the price of milk in the District of Columbia has been boosted to the highest figure in the Nation. Even in seasons of plenty, when milk prices are reduced in most cities over the country, Washington babies are deprived of the milk they need because it is in the self-interest of this monopolistic cooperative to kill competition and to prevent nonmember dealers from securing the supplies they might otherwise obtain and might sell at more reasonable prices.

I cannot believe that it was the purpose or intent of the authors of the Capper-Volstead Act to bring about such an unhappy result. In fact, it is clearly stated in the act that a cooperative may be prosecuted if it abuses the privilege of creating a monopoly or if it restrains trade by unduly enhancing prices.

The loophole in the law is its further provision that determination of what may constitute undue enhancement of prices is left solely within the power of the Secretary of Agriculture—though since the passage of the Capper-Volstead Act other powers and duties that have been imposed upon the Secretary of Agriculture have made it virtually impossible for him to bring monopoly action against any cooperative.

Mr. Speaker, the position of the Secretary of Agriculture is today contradictory and anomalous. Under the Agricultural Marketing Act, the Secretary is required to create artificially high prices for farm products, to the end that farmers may

be assured an adequate profit for their labors. Under the Capper-Volstead Act, it becomes his duty to prosecute these same unduly high prices in the interest of consumers.

The Secretary of Agriculture cannot serve two masters. If he is to protect high farm prices, he can hardly be expected to protect consumers against those high prices and the monopolies that establish them.

I have therefore introduced an amendment to the Capper-Volstead Act, H. R. 6423, to relieve the Secretary of Agriculture from the embarrassing position in which he now finds himself, and to place the responsibility of prosecuting cooperative monopoly and cooperative restraint of trade upon the shoulders of the Attorney General, through the Department of Justice.

If the Capper-Volstead Act is thus amended, there will be transferred to the Attorney General the duty of inquiring into those cases where cooperatives have unduly enhanced prices and to bring the necessary restraining action in the public interest. Through this transfer, checks and balances will be created which will permit a neutral umpire to determine whether a cooperative is taking undue advantage of its monopoly to raise prices to the detriment of the consuming public.

The legitimate aspirations of agriculture cannot be hampered by the enactment of this amendment. Cooperatives will still have the special privilege of creating monopoly, which is denied to other businesses, but a neutral umpire will be given the right to determine whether this special privilege is being abused.

Mr. Speaker, a conspiracy to which both cooperatives and other businesses are parties can now be prosecuted by the Department of Justice. This was done in 1941, when the California Fruit Growers Exchange and numerous selling agencies acting for the Sunkist co-op were indicted under Department of Justice action for violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act. The cooperative entered a plea of nolo contendere and paid a fine of $80,000. In the following year the Department of Justice, under Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold, again brought action against the California Fruit Growers Exchange and other fruit shippers and auction companies, charging them with restricting markets, fixing prices, conspiring to eliminate competitors, and so forth. This was a civil action. The Sunkist co-op and other defendants denied their guilt, but agreed with the Government to the entry of a consent decree enjoining them from further restraint of trade. It is my understanding that that consent decree is still in effect.

Similar action might have been taken in the recent District of Columbia milk case, for other defendants besides the Maryland-Virginia co-op were named. The Court appears to have been in error in deciding that the Capper-Volstead Act fully applied.

The amendment I propose, giving full authority to the Department of Justice, will correct this situation and uphold the hands of the Attorney General in the appeal which is to be taken and the prosecution of this milk monopoly which should then follow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DEVITT). Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New Mexico [Mrs. LUSK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE FORGOTTEN FAMILIES OF AMERICA

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing belief among the friends of the Gold Star wives of World War I that legislation in behalf of the forgotten families of America by Congress is long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, it is my desire today to speak frankly in terms of obligation and duty which this Government undertook by virtue of its calling the young men of the United States to enter the armed services to keep this country free and safe. My discussion, while keeping sentiment and good conscience in mind, is based upon what the Government, by implication if not directly, bound itself to do in return for services of husbands and fathers when it called them into the armed services.

This country has always been generous in providing for its war veterans and rightfully so. The men who risk their lives to defend their country deserve special recognition. The benefits of compensation for disabled men and the provisions of the GI bill, giving them education privileges and loan grants to aid them in business, are small, but just rewards for sacrifices they have made. For the young men and women who returned, at the end of the war, Public Law 346 and Public Law 16 were designed to assist with the readjustment to civilian life to make up for the years spent in Government service insofar as it was possible that this could be done.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUSK. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the distinguished gentlewoman from New Mexico on her interest in and work on this legislation. A Gold Star Mother herself, there is no better qualified person in the House to speak on this legislation.

Mrs. LUSK. I thank the gentleman.

For those who were interested, an opportunity was provided to complete their education interrupted by war; for those who wished to learn new skills, an on-the-job training program was provided. Those who had difficulty in securing employment again at the termination of military service, were assured of some income through a system of unemployment benefits for a period of 52 weeks.

There was little dissention for the wisdom of the program or its essential appropriateness. A grateful people were prepared to reward and repay in the most practical form for the magnificent effort these young men and women had made. It has worked well and will some day be called, I am sure, the wisest investment in its future, our Government ever made.

There are many other phases of these aid programs which I do not detail now because they are known to you. They form parts of the whole pattern of readjustment of vets which Congress attempted to establish. To my mind that pattern in general terms was to discharge partially the obligations which the Government owes to those men and women who had saved our American way of life. I say the object was to discharge partially the obligation, because the sacrifices made can never be fully recompensed.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUSK. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I wish to join the gentleman from Texas in complimenting the gentlewoman on the fine work she has done. She is an able legislator and has accomplished a great deal for the Gold Star Mothers of America. She herself is a Gold Star Mother. I should like to ask her in her capacity as a legislator if she is familiar with what happened to the bill yesterday sponsored by the Gold Star Mothers, the purpose of which was to set up three national cemeteries within the Nation, one in particular to serve the gentlewoman's area of New Mexico. I think the RECORD ought to show clearly who opposed that bill on the Consent Calendar, not so much the names of the individuals who objected to it, as the forces working in back of the scene, and with her permission I should like to take a minute.

Mrs. LUSK. I should be glad to hear the gentleman's discussion of the matter.

Mr. CARROLL. The purpose of the bill was to set up national cemeteries in order that the bodies of the veterans who died overseas, might be interred in a national cemetery if the next of kin of the deceased veteran so desired.

I think the RECORD should show that the Army can spend only $75 for such burial. There are many people in this Nation who lost their children who cannot afford to spend more than $75. On the other hand the private cemeteries will not provide space for interment for $75 and the cost of burial exceeds many times the amount the Army can spend for a burial.

Here are the facts of the opposition to that legislation. The witnesses who appeared before the Public Lands Committee protesting said that this was evidence of the encroachment of the Federal Government into the field of private enterprise, that it was an example of how far the Federal Government would go in being unfair to the private enterprise system. The bill was objected to by the private cemeteries. The other day I was informed that the tombstone makers objected to the passage of this bill.

I think it is only fair to the Gold Star Mothers that these facts be brought to their attention. I think they should exert their influence on the Rules Committee so that the bill can be brought to the floor and have the membership put themselves on record. It has a very sordid tale in back of it, and I mention this for the RECORD in order that the people may know the forces moving behind the scenes to kill this legislation. Not only should the Gold Star Mothers themselves know what is going on, but the veterans also should know about the situation.

I thank the gentlewoman from New Mexico.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUSK. I yield.

Mr. SHAFER. I think one goes a long way when one accuses Members of Congress of being on the side of the tombstone makers.

Mrs. LUSK. Perhaps it should not be said that Members of Congress side with the tombstone makers, but the fact they do not take action on the other side is still a mark against them.

Mr. CARROLL. If the gentlewoman will yield further. I think the record speaks for itself and the record of the hearings before the Committee on Public Lands is there for anyone of the public who wants to read it. I think that an investigation, and debate on the floor of this House, will reveal the forces that are at work. It is to be said that this bill did not originate with me. It originated with Senator SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts. Cemeteries were to be established in Massachusetts, at Fort Lewis, Wash., and in Fort Logan, Colo.

The Fort Logan Cemetery was to serve the Rocky Mountain area. I am not impugning the motives of the Members themselves because I do not think they understand fully except one with whom I talked and he said that the granite industry of his State was objecting to the bill.

That is why I make the statement before this body. I am sorry to take the gentlewoman's time, but as a legislator interested in veterans, I am hoping that the gentlewoman of New Mexico, a Gold Star Mother, will advise this group to appear before the Rules Committee so that we may have a full hearing on this important legislation.

Mrs. LUSK. I am glad to have the information and I think it should be reemphasized for every interested person to read.

One part of the pattern is incomplete and that incomplete part is made more noticeable by the thought and attention which have been given to perfecting the other parts. Do not misunderstand me. I believe our effort should not slacken as to the part of the program already started, but the picture of what has not been done is made clearer by comparison with that which has been done, and it is obvious now that we should give immediate attention to correction of what makes the pattern so out of balance.

The provisions made for the wives and children of those men who made the greater sacrifices and gave their lives, have not been so generous. It does not become the Government charged with legislation for the public welfare, to ignore this situation. It smacks of the kind of negligence which fosters lack of confidence in the Government. These young women whose husbands lives were lost should not be denied the rewards that would be due the veteran had he lived to claim them.

Speaking generally, it seems to me that the Government should make available to the dependents of the members of the armed forces, the same benefits which were made available to members of the armed forces who did return.

The law as presently written denies to the children and wives of deceased veterans the opportunities so generously extended by the Government to returning veterans, their wives, and children. Discriminated against are the dependents of those men whose sacrifices for their country were the greatest. No provision was made for extending to these dependents the helpful benefits of the GI bill of rights, although it seems to me that their claim is equally as great and it represents to my mind a breach of faith on the part of the Government.

As indicated, every member of the armed forces has the right to expect that his family would be the recipient in equal amounts with every other member's family, the benefits which naturally accrue to families under the GI bill of rights. Having that right to expect such benefits for his family, it is wrong now not to make substitute provisions for families of deceased veterans.

The problem is complicated but not insurmountable. The existing provisions of law give the average widow with one child a pension of $78 per month. It is unnecessary for me to say that these few dollars cannot compensate them for their loss. No amount of money could fully do that, but these courageous women want and deserve the opportunity to help themselves. In a large number of the cases, the widow who has found herself suddenly in the position of having to provide for herself and children, to determine her own future, is in need of help. She faces just as difficult a problem of readjustment as ever faced the returned serviceman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUSK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. May I add my voice to those who have already commended the gentlewoman from New Mexico on the splendid statement she is giving to the House, as well as for the wonderful work she has done on behalf of the veterans as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. As a veteran of World War II, and I probably should say a disabled veteran, I agree with the gentlewoman wholeheartedly in the statements she has expressed on the floor today and may I say that, in my opinion, no one is more deserving of the gratitude of the American people than those who have had their loved ones make the supreme sacrifice so that we in the United States might continue to be a land of the free and the home of the brave.

Mrs. LUSK. I thank the gentleman.

I believe it is to ignore realities to contend that the present level of compensation paid to dependents of deceased members of the armed forces is adequate. It is also to ignore realities to believe that there is equality in the law for the men who served in the armed forces during World War II.

Legislation should be enacted that would give the wives of servicemen an opportunity to make a place for themselves in the economic life of the community under Public Law 346. They should be granted educational benefits that would prepare and equip them to provide for their children and for their own future. They should be granted the loan benefits for the purchase of homes for themselves and their children, or that they may enter into gainful business to provide a livelihood. The enterprise and courage of our modern women has proven equal to the obstacles of competitive business.

The children of men who did not return home again should be permitted to receive the educational legacy their fathers did not return to collect.

During the first session of the Eightieth Congress I introduced a bill to provide for extension of loan benefits of Public Law 346 to the widows and children of the men who died in service. My colleagues on the House Veterans Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Ohio, Judge RAMEY; the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]; and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PHILLIPS] have introduced measures to extend other benefits of the law to dependents of veterans.

We realize that the children of the men who gave their lives in service have been handicapped seriously by the loss of their fathers. It is our obligation to see that these wives and children are given a chance in this land of equal opportunity, to make a place for themselves in the world. These forgotten families of America must be given the full measure of reward that their husbands and fathers would have been entitled to receive had they returned.

It is not my purpose to be critical of the work that Congress has done. There has been a tremendous amount of legislation to consider. But I would like to stress that this young group of Gold Star wives could be helped very materially if the veterans' service organizations—the VFW, American Legion, and AMVETS, who clearly understand their need would lend a hand in securing early consideration of much-needed legislation.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUSK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE. I have been very much disappointed that there has not been a single veteran's organization that has made any effort in behalf of legislation for the widows and orphans. I remember reading last year where the national convention did pass a resolution supporting this legislation, but I have seen no action by the different groups here in Washington.

Mrs. LUSK. I would like to say again that I think it is really the responsibility of the service groups to assist these young women, the Gold Star wives, to initate this work. Many of these women are inexperienced. Lately they have become more aggressive and they are making some headway, but they could be helped a great deal if the VFW, the American Legion and the Amvets would get behind their plans and help them to secure the proper legislation before Congress.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUSK. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to add my voice to that of my colleagues here, young men who are veterans of the recent war. I know what the gentlewoman from New Mexico has been doing in her efforts, and I want to commend her. I feel we are too prone to give lip service to those who made the supreme sacrifice. I want to help the gentlewoman in her efforts to give more than mere lip service to those who defended and made this land a safe place for us.

Mrs. LUSK. I thank the gentleman. I would like to say that it would be becoming of more Members of Congress to make the same statement and to lend the same efforts. After, all this Nation owes a debt of honor to the heroes who gave their lives, and a more fitting memorial to the memory of the men who gave their lives could not be offered than to provide educational benefits for their children under the GI bill of rights.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUSK. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I would just like to say that I commend the gentlewoman as one of the most outstanding Members of the House, and a very valued Member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives. It has been my privilege to sit on the committee with the gentlewoman and to cooperate and work with her. I know of no member who has devoted more sincere and earnest and capable service for the benefit of World War veterans than has the gentlewoman from New Mexico [Mrs. LUSK]. She is a very valued Member of the Congress and a very popular one.

Mrs. LUSK. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUSK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE. There is one thing that men who were in danger of being killed wanted to know, that is, that their mothers and fathers and wives and children would be taken care of. I, for one, certainly do not believe this country has done what it should have in behalf of the mothers and fathers and the widows and orphans of the boys who were killed.

Mrs. LUSK. In closing, Mr. Speaker, I should like to stress the fact that I have thought for a long time about fitting memorials that would be of service, and I believe an educational program for the children left behind would be most appreciated by future generations as well as by the boys who made the sacrifice.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Hartford (Conn.) Times entitled "Authorization for the Extermination of Mice from a Post Office."

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1004. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 so as to grant specific authority to the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to require investigations by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the character, associations, and loyalty of persons nominated for appointment, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to offices established by such act;

S. 1132. An act to amend section 40 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (39 Stat. 728), as amended;

S. 1298. An act to validate payments heretofore made by disbursing officers of the United States Government covering cost of shipment of household effects of civilian employees and for other purposes;

S. 1545. An act to authorize a bridge, roads and approaches, support and bents, or other structures, across, over, or upon lands of the United States within the limits of the Colonial National Historical Park at or near Yorktown, Va.;

S. 1611. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Sauk Rapids, Minn.;

S. 1985. An act to amend the act entitled "Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act," approved July 19, 1940; and

S. J. Res. 198. Joint resolution to authorize the Postmaster General to withhold the awarding of star-route contracts for a period of 60 days.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1036. An act to provide for the licensing of marine radiotelegraph operators as ship radio officers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4490. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to provide salvage facilities, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5448. An act to amend sections 212 (b) and 231 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 5, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1519. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a printed copy of the report on the agricultural experiment stations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1520. A letter from the Administrator, War Assets Administration, transmitting the first quarterly report for the calendar year of 1948, covering the period from January 1 through March 31; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1521. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 574. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 6342, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force to proceed with construction at military installations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1849). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 575. Resolution for consideration of House Joint Resolution 342, joint resolution directing all executive departments and agencies of the Federal Government to make available to any and all standing, special, or select committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, information which may be deemed necessary to enable them to properly perform the duties delegated to them by the Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1850). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HORAN: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 6430. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1851). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. S. 2256. An act relating to the meat-inspection service of the Department of Agriculture; without amendment (Rept. No. 1852). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHAFER: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5871. A bill to provide for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency, established pursuant to section 102, National Security Act of 1947, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1853). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6396. A bill to authorize for a limited period of time the admission of displaced persons into the United States for permanent residence, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1854). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 6430. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BRADLEY:

H. R. 6431. A bill to incorporate the Retired Officers Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREHM:

H. R. 6432. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 6433. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to add to the free list certain books and music to be used for reference purposes, and for certain other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 6434. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional Federal district judge for the southern district of Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 6435. A bill to provide for an independent Office of Air Safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 6436. A bill to improve the administration of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 6437. A bill to provide for coordination of aviation policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 6438. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to return certain lands situated in Puerto Rico, in accordance with the terms of the conveyances to the United States Government and final judgments in certain condemnation proceedings; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CROW:

H. R. 6439. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to conduct an investigation and study of the feasibility and desirability of adopting the plan, known as the West Virginia plan, for the construction and financing of low-cost housing facilities for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McMAHON:

H. R. 6440. A bill increasing the immigration quotas for Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 6441. A bill to create the Board of Postal Rates and Fees in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 6442. A bill to establish a procedure for the appointment of postmasters at post offices of the first, second, and third classes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 6443. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and the National Bank Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 6444. A bill to enact the National Voluntary Enlistment Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. J. Res. 393. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 576. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4488; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. Res. 577. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives with respect to motions to strike from the RECORD the remarks of Members; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. Res. 578. Resolution authorizing the Select Committee To Conduct a Study and Investigation of the Problems of Small Business to conduct a study and investigation of certain monopolistic practices; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 6445. A bill for the relief of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 6446. A bill to grant a certain parcel of land in St. Louis County, Minn., to the University of Minnesota; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 6447. A bill for the relief of Max Schlomowitz (also known as Alec Frederick Reeves); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred, as follows:

1864. By Mr. GOFF: Petition of Mrs. Lorna M. Schuette and 148 other voters of Latah County, First Congressional District of the State of Idaho, in favor of a world federal government with limited powers adequate to maintain peace, and urging adoption by the Congress of the United States of Senate Concurrent Resolution 24 and House Concurrent Resolutions 59–68 calling for Charter revision to enable the United Nations to enact, interpret, and enforce world law to prevent war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1865. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the chairman, Citizens Protective League, Inc.; petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of legislation for an American War Criminals Code for punishment of American military and civilian officials who during the war and since then have in this country violated their oaths of office by misuse of positions of authority or neglect of duty for purposes of monetary or other personal gain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1866. Also, petition of J. C. Michael and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1867. Also, petition of the city clerk, city of Mount Vernon, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner National Housing Commission bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 5, 1948

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 4, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, come nearer to us than we have ever known and stay with us through the deliberations of this day, lest we give way to selfishness.

We pray for our country, thrust by world events into high responsibility.

May she be willing to grow up, and, with adult maturity, looking unto Thee for guidance and wisdom and courage, assume her role of leader among the nations.

So may her statesmen act and her people think that Thou canst bless her and use her.

In Jesus' name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 4, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 4, 1948, the President had approved and signed the following act and joint resolution:

S. 1393. An act to provide additional subsistence allowances and to raise the ceilings on wages and allowances pertaining to certain veterans; and

S. J. Res. 189. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 182. An act for the relief of Sgt. John H. Mott;

S. 576. An act for the relief of Dan C. Rodgers;

S. 981. An act for the relief of Carl W. Sundstrom;

S. 1164. An act for the relief of Doris D. Chrisman;

S. 1630. An act for the relief of Louis L. Williams, Jr.;

S. 1806. An act for the relief of Ensign Merton H. Peterson, United States Naval Reserve; and

S. 1875. An act for the relief of the estate of Francis D. Shoemaker.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1142) for the relief of Anna Pechnik, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2277) to amend section 13 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, to provide for the disposition of surplus real property to States, political subdivisions, and municipalities for use as public parks, recreational areas, and historic-monument sites, and for other purposes, with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 550. An act for the relief of Lizzie Reynolds, administratrix of the estate of Grace Reynolds, deceased;

H. R. 1498. An act for the relief of Hempstead Warehouse Corp.;

H. R. 3089. An act for the relief of Mississippi Central Railroad Co.; and

H. R. 3550. An act for the relief of Jesse L. Purdy.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 633. An act for the relief of Mrs. Myrtle Hovde;

H. R. 810. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of John E. Parker, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States;

H. R. 929. An act for the relief of Ernest L. Godfrey;

H. R. 1642. An act for the relief of Miss Rosella M. Kostenbader;

H. R. 2246. An act for the relief of Carl E. Lawson and Fireman's Fund Indemnity Co.;

H. R. 2325. An act for the relief of Mamie L. Hurley;

H. R. 2634. An act for the relief of the Tampa Chapter, No. 113, United Daughters of the Confederacy;

H. R. 2688. An act for the relief of Eva C. Netzley Ridley, William G. Stuff, Lois Stuff, and Harry E. Ridley; and the estates of Clyde C. Netzley and Sarah C. Stuff;

H. R. 2898. An act for the relief of Doris Marie Richard;

H. R. 3500. An act for the relief of Lester L. Elder and Mrs. Esther E. Elder;

H. R. 4954. An act to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance, under Federal reclamation laws, of the Kennewick division of the Yakima project, Washington;

H. R. 5449. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lucille Davidson;

H. R. 5517. An act for the relief of Edward Woolf;

H. R. 6184. An act for the relief of the East Coast Ship & Yacht Corp., of Noank, Conn.;

H. R. 6251. An act for the relief of Hans Kraney and Clare Felten Kraney; and

H. J. Res. 334. Joint resolution giving the consent of Congress to the compact on regional education entered into between the Southern States at Tallahassee, Fla., on February 8, 1948.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 550. An act for the relief of Lizzie Reynolds, administratrix of the estate of Grace Reynolds, deceased;

H. R. 1498. An act for the relief of Hempstead Warehouse Corp.;

H. R. 3089. An act for the relief of Mississippi Central Railroad Co.; and

H. R. 3550. An act for the relief of Jesse L. Purdy.

MEETING OF COMMITTEES DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained consent for the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary considering Senate bill 1988, the so-called tidelands bill, to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. HOEY asked and obtained consent for the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to meet during the session of the Senate today.

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAXES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the appeal of Mr. FULBRIGHT from the decision of the President pro tempore referring to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry the bill (H. R. 2245) to repeal the tax on oleomargarine.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The matter under consideration by the Senate is the appeal of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] from the decision of the Chair referring to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry the bill (H. R. 2245) to repeal the tax on oleomargarine,

The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate? Under the unanimous-consent-agreement of yesterday the Senate will proceed to vote on the question at 2 o'clock p. m. today, and the intervening time will be equally divided between those favoring the appeal and those opposed thereto, and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the ranking majority member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have been asked to suggest the absence of a quorum, and with the permission of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] in charge of the time for the proponents, and if there is no objection by the opponents that the time be charged equally, I ask that a quorum be called.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska suggests the absence of a quorum, the time required to be charged equally, one-half to each side. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Ball	Hill	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hoey	Pepper
Bricker	Holland	Reed
Brooks	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Byrd	Kem	Saltonstall
Cain	Kilgore	Smith
Capper	Knowland	Stennis
Chavez	Langer	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McFarland	Thye
Donnell	McGrath	Tobey
Downey	McKellar	Tydings
Dworshak	McMahon	Vandenberg
Eastland	Magnuson	Watkins
Ecton	Malone	Wherry
Ellender	Martin	White
Ferguson	Maybank	Wiley
Flanders	Millikin	Williams
Fulbright	Moore	Wilson
Green	Morse	Young
Gurney	Murray	
Hatch	Myers	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent because of illness in their families.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. FULBRIGHT obtained the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Senator from Arkansas expect to speak at this time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I expect to speak for a short time now, and to reserve a short time in which to speak at the end of the debate, before the vote.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, day before yesterday I made a brief statement on the subject now pending before the Senate. I ask the Senator if he will be kind enough to permit me to make a request for inclusion of that statement in the RECORD at this time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the statement I made on day before yesterday respecting the pending bill. In it I gave the reasons for my belief that the bill should be submitted to the Committee on Finance. Inasmuch as I have asked to have the speech included in the RECORD at this point, and since a vote is to be taken on the question of reference of the bill at 2 o'clock today, I do not intend to make any remarks at this time on the subject.

There being no objection, Mr. MAYBANK'S statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I regret that the situation is such that the Chair could not rule today on the question. The bill, which came from the House of Representatives, was introduced by the Representative from my district and from my home, Representative RIVERS. After a long fight the bill was finally passed by the House, and I was hopeful that today the Senate would take it up and that the Chair would rule on the committee to which the bill should be referred.

In 1943 and 1944 a similar fight took place in the Senate. I submitted to tax bill after tax bill amendments proposing to repeal the taxes on oleomargarine. Extensive hearings were held by the Finance Committee, of which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] was at that time chairman. The distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate was at that time the ranking Republican on the Finance Committee. The oleomargarine interests and other witnesses testified. Through all those hearings the

measure was handled by the Finance Committee. Of course I should like to see the bill placed on the calendar, as was done in the case of the tidelands oil bill. I hope that the Chair, who has always been fair in the reference of bills, will not forget that the hearings on oleomargarine were held before the Finance Committee in 1943, 1944, and 1948, which committee already has a great deal of information on the subject. I therefore trust that the bill as passed by the House will be referred to the Finance Committee.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the chairman of the Finance Committee, recently made the statement in the Senate, in answer to me, that he considered it to be a tax matter and that the Finance Committee would take it up in due time.

So, Mr. President, without further statement, I trust that when the matter comes up tomorrow, unless the bill can be placed on the calendar, the distinguished President pro tempore will refer the bill to the Finance Committee which heard the arguments in 1943, 1944, 1947, and 1948.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the Chair state that the Senate is proceeding under a division of time, and all the present proceedings are being charged to the time of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Under those circumstances, I do not yield further at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair was about to suggest to the Senator that, without objection, if the Senator is willing to continue to yield, the time now being consumed may be divided. However, if the Senator prefers to proceed, he is entitled to do so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Under those circumstances, I think I shall proceed.

Mr. President, under the existing parliamentary situation, I am sure that the opponents of this repeal legislation will argue that a vote to sustain the ruling of the Chair is not a vote on the merits of the bill. Senators will recall that the same argument was made when this measure was offered as an amendment to the tax bill. Technically, that argument is correct; but practically, as a matter of fact, a vote on this referral may well be the only opportunity to vote on the bill at this session.

I have already heard that representatives of the butter interests are seeking to have held hearings lasting a month. One rumor which I heard this morning from a representative of the press is that they expect to present at least 100 witnesses. I have on my desk a copy of the hearings which have already been held on this question during the past 5 years. The record consists of approximately 2,000 pages. It is perfectly obvious that almost all that could be brought out by further hearings is already in evidence. There may be other ways to kill a cat than by choking it with butter; but the experience of 62 years clearly demonstrates that that is the favorite way to kill an oleomargarine tax-repeal bill. It is plain to anyone that by the simple device of delaying the hearings or permitting them to be long drawn out, the Senate would be denied an opportunity to vote on the bill. I realize that members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry cannot guarantee any precise time; but the real difficulty in my position and that of others who propose this legislation is the feeling that there may be long delay during the last few days of this session.

Mr. President, much emphasis has been placed upon the fact that the bill under consideration was referred to the Committee on Agriculture of the House. However, we should not overlook the fact that that committee did not actually report the bill, and in that sense did not handle it. By a majority of 2 to 1 in the House, the House itself took the bill from the committee and acted upon it directly. So in a very real sense by that action the House disapproved the reference of the bill to the Committee on Agriculture.

One basis for the decision of the Chair is the fact that the original bill which created the oleomargarine tax in 1886 was referred to the Committee on Agriculture. That action is cited by the Chair in support of his decision. In that instance the referral was made by the closest possible vote of 22 to 21, and was made, as will be disclosed by an examination of the debate, by very evident deception as to the action proposed by the committee.

The motion to refer the House-approved bill to the Senate Agriculture Committee was made by Senator Miller, of New York, the chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee.

Senator Beck, of Kentucky, immediately objected in these words:

I think if Senators will look at the bill they will readily understand that if the bill as it came from the House does not go to the Finance Committee it is hard to imagine any bill that ought to go to that committee. A tariff bill might as well go to the Committee on Agriculture, for that has to do with farmers, with their shoes and stockings, their sugar, their salt, and everything else.

Senator Miller, of New York, then stated the first of the two main arguments for sending the bill to his own committee—the Agriculture Committee. He said:

The bill comes to us from the other House, having been perfected there in the Committee on Agriculture, having passed the House entirely under charge of that committee, as the RECORD will show, never having been referred to the Ways and Means Committee which corresponds to the Finance Committee of this body.

Senator Miller, who was to lead the fight for the original antimargarine law, then dropped this curious—and I think we must say misleading—suggestion into the debate:

What will be the condition of this bill when it shall reappear from that committee (the Agriculture Committee), if referred there, I cannot tell—whether there will be anything of a tax in it or not.

This was misleading because only a few months before the dairy interests had held a great convention in New York City at which the whole antimargarine campaign had been planned. That campaign had as its end purpose the drastic curtailment or destruction of the margarine industry—an industry whose chief crime was that it dared to make a food product which competed with butter. That curtailment or destruction, it was generally agreed by the butter interests, could most effectively be achieved through the imposition of an excessive tax. I call attention to the further fact, as evidence of the dairy interests' real purpose, that the original bill, as presented in the House, proposed a straight 10-cent tax on all margarine—a tax which, if approved, would have probably wiped out the whole margarine industry.

Senator Aldrich, of Rhode Island, then rose to challenge Senator Miller, who had just told the Senate that his committee was already considering this subject. Senator Aldrich said:

It is a tax bill and nothing else and refers in every one of its provisions to the taxation of an article of merchandise and the regulation of its sale by the Internal Revenue Bureau of the Treasury Department.

Senator Aldrich continued—and I think his argument is equally valid today:

The Senator from New York says that the bill affects the agricultural interests of this country. Does not the tax upon whisky affect the agricultural interests of this country?

If we are to send every tax bill that relates to, or interests, or affects the agricultural interests of this country to the Committee on Agriculture they would usurp all the functions of the Committee on Finance and all other committees of the Senate.

Senator McPhersen then asked Senator Miller this question:

Is the Senator from New York ready to say that it is not a revenue bill?

Senator Miller, with what can only be called deceptive frankness, gave this amazing reply:

As I said before, I do not care to go into a discussion of the bill or any other that we may pass—no revenue will be derived at all.

That was the language of the principal proponent of the original bill. Mark that statement by the chairman of the Agriculture Committee in 1886:

No revenue will be derived at all, for I hope the legislation passed here will forever make such a fraudulent manufacture as the imitation of butter impossible in this country, and I will state that frankly.

Senator Blair, who also worked manfully for the passage of the original antimargarine law, then rose to supplement Senator Miller's argument. He said:

If after a primary consideration of the main question, which is that of some method of affording a remedy for this great evil of substituting a fraudulent manufacture for the genuine article to be purchased in the market as an article of food, if after the general question has been considered, the matter of tax should still be retained in the bill and it should come from the Committee on Agriculture as a bill involving taxation to some extent then there could be no impropriety in referring it to the Committee on Finance.

That is the language of Senator Blair and of Senator Miller. In other words, the entire theory of that referral was that the original bill was not expected to involve any revenue. It was expected to be strictly and purely a prohibition

against the manufacture of margarine. I need not say that the bill was never referred to the Committee on Finance, and I suppose it would be difficult to prove what I think is obviously the case, that it was never intended that it be done. The whole maneuver, by which the original margarine tax bill was referred in 1886 to the Agricultural Committees of the two Houses—which were supposed to be favorable to the butter cause—rather than the tax committees which would normally have considered them, was most unusual. Today we should look at the facts as they are and act in the light of realities.

The value of this action as a precedent cannot be greater than the value of any previous or subsequent referral. As I have shown, this precedent broke older and previously unbroken precedents. Further, it has not been followed with any consistency since that time.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. The Senator will recall that the housing bill which was recently before us contained a provision repealing or waiving a tax. Is it not a fact that provision went out on a point of order on the ground that a bill to repeal a tax is as much a tax bill as a bill to impose a tax?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator is entirely correct. I cannot see any basis for argument about the matter in any other way.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I think it has been consistently held in both the Senate and the House of Representatives that a bill to repeal a tax is as much a tax bill as is a bill to impose a tax. I wish to say to my colleague the Senator from Arkansas that during the 10 years I served on the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, I always insisted that any bill relative to taxes, either a bill to impose a tax or a bill to repeal a tax, should be referred to the Ways and Means Committee, because of necessity the tax feature had to be the major feature of the bill and in considering the reference of a bill the indirect effects which might flow from a given piece of legislation should not be given the major consideration.

No doubt the Senator from Arkansas recalls that when the House of Representatives framed a bill to provide a pension for railway employees, that bill was referred to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It carried a tax. The Supreme Court declared that bill unconstitutional, because the tax was not properly levied. When the House came to remedy that defect, it split the proposed legislation, and sent the tax phase of the Railroad Retirement Act to the Ways and Means Committee, and in that committee we framed a tax which stood up in the courts.

The Senator from Arkansas also will recall that when it was proposed in the House of Representatives to pass a Bituminous Coal Act, the purpose of which was, as was claimed, to eliminate cutthroat competition and to stabilize the coal industry and provide more stable employment in that industry, although the tax on the producers was only a nominal tax, that bill was referred to the Ways and Means Committee because the bill carried a tax.

The same situation applies in the case of the Social Security Act, I may also point out.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Virginia that I covered that matter at great length yesterday. There are endless examples. The question of jurisdiction is determined by the method by which such matters are reached and not by the indirect or ultimate effects. I could not possibly agree with the Senator from Virginia more fully than I do.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I simply wish to make clear why I shall support the appeal of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, with all due deference to the ruling of the Chair, because the Chair plainly left the decision up to the Senate on a close issue. So, without any reflection upon the Chair, we may decide how we shall vote on the question of having this bill referred to the Finance Committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is true.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas one question. He is opposed to this tax because he says it is unfair competition to put an excise tax upon a competing food product. Does not the Senator think it would be unfair competition to an established product not to require in any new law on the subject that those who sell the competing product shall put their customers on notice as to what they are being served?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Virginia that I am in thorough accord with that position. I have discussed it with those who oppose this proposed legislation; and I have told them that certainly, for myself, and, I think, for everyone else who is supporting this matter, we shall support any kind of direct regulation, with any kind of penalties they wish, that will prevent any deception in the sale of oleomargarine. But that should not be done through the taxing power. The approach should be the same as the approach in connection with the pure-food laws.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I wish it understood, because the Senator from Arkansas is leading the fight here on this matter, that when this bill is referred to the Finance Committee, if it is, he will not oppose a provision in this proposed law which will require those who sell margarine to notify their customers what they are selling them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have already submitted to the Senator from Vermont two proposed amendments framed on the idea that we shall work out something of that sort. I certainly shall not oppose it.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, time is passing. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a short summary of some further history of this legislation.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In summary of the statements made by those who support the appeal from the reference of this bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I should like to restate, point by point, the reasons advanced by the Chair for referral to that committee. The statement of the Chair, I think, is the best possible case which can be made for the decision, and contains all arguments which have been made.

The Chair in referring a bill to a committee is actually performing a judicial function. He examines a bill, without regard to its merits, and with due regard to the law, the precedents, and the rules of the Senate, refers it to a committee.

By the same token, then, the Senate of the United States is performing a judicial function, in the nature of an appeal. And it, too, in all justice, should be bound by the law, the precedents, and the rules, without regard to the merits of the bill.

Indeed the Chair, in referring this bill, has cited precedent, rules, and one case in the Supreme Court of the United States.

The Chair says, first, that the bill has an oversimplified title. What is the title? Quoting, "A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine." True this is simple, but is it not precisely what the bill does? Of course it does not tell precisely what effect its enactment will have upon any segment of our economy. But could any possible title of any bill do that?

Next the Chair makes the point that "revenue is only incidental in the purposes of this bill, and that 'the subject matter which predominates'—that being the controlling phrase in the Reorganization Act—is the agricultural economy." If this be true, is it not equally true of any tax bill, particularly any excise tax bill, and any tariff? The essence of this interpretation is that a bill should be referred to that committee which has jurisdiction over that constituent of our economy which it most directly affects. By this same interpretation, tariffs and tariff agreements should be handled by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Withholding taxes on wages should be handled by Labor and Public Welfare, which, under rule XXV, as amended by the Reorganization Act, should have all measures relating to labor. Certainly with respect to such taxes the predominating subject matter is their influence on labor.

Likewise, an exemption in favor of servicemen should be under the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee, because, under rule XXV the Armed Services Committee is charged with "matters relating to pay and other benefits and privileges of members of the armed services."

This goes on in endless progression until it results in complete lack of jurisdiction of the Finance Committee. For that matter, the same analogies can be made with reference to matters handled by the Appropriations Committee. For there is no tax or appropriation that does not affect an article, a profession, a class, an industry, or an element of the Nation's economy, as the margarine taxes affect agriculture, directly or indirectly.

The significance of all this, I think, is that what is intended by the organization of the Senate and its committees is that jurisdiction should be determined in the cases of taxes, appropriations, and perhaps other functions, not by the effect particular proposed legislation has upon a particular element of the economy, but, rather, the method of effecting it. And where the method chosen is by taxation, the Finance Committee should have jurisdiction.

Thus, there is nothing to prevent the Agriculture Committee, within the limits of the

Constitution, from legislating, or considering legislation, dealing with the margarine and butter question, so long as it does so by general legislation and not taxation.

If price controls on meats were to be reimposed, would that question be handled by the Committee on Agriculture? It certainly affects the agricultural economy. I think it would affect it to a much greater extent than would the taxes on margarine. But what is the method of affecting it? Control of prices—which is a subject within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The fact is that each committee has general jurisdiction over matters expressed within its title, with special jurisdictions added. But that jurisdiction extends to general measures of regulation, assistance, and so forth, only, and in any case where the method of legislation is within the purview of another committee, the latter should have and does have jurisdiction.

The next point made by the Chair is that "revenue considerations are not involved," quoting from a statement by the Under Secretary of the Treasury in House hearings on this bill.

I shall not dwell upon the dangers of misinterpretation by quoting out of context, with which all Senators are familiar. But I should like to quote also, from the report of the Secretary of the Treasury on my bill—which is identical to this one—as follows:

"The basic issue raised by the oleomargarine taxes is the propriety and desirability of using the tax laws to affect the relative position of competing industries, both of which use domestic agricultural raw materials. In the case of oleomargarine the taxing power is used as a punitive measure against one industry to advance the interests of another. In the process the public is deterred from the free exercise of its consumer preferences. Without passing judgment on the relative merits of the two products from the viewpoint of the public health, it is the view of the Treasury Department that the use of the taxing power to distort the normal development of competing industries and to deprive them of the full benefit of the free-enterprise system conflicts with the public interests and, in the absence of compelling considerations, should be avoided."

In the light of this quotation, I think the Treasury's statement, as quoted by the Chair, can only be interpreted as meaning that there is insufficient revenue derived from the taxes to have a material effect. Certainly it is not the Treasury's position that the laws are not tax laws. And cannot the statement quoted by the Chair be applied with evident truth, to practically all tariffs and many, many excise taxes?

The Chair next cites the Supreme Court case of *Millard* v. *Roberts*, as holding that "revenue bills are those that levy taxes in the strict sense of the word, and are not bills for other purposes, which may incidentally create revenue." I attempted to analyze that case yesterday and shall not repeat. Suffice it to say that the Court, in that case, held that the acts in question were best described by their titles, which are as follows:

"An act to provide for eliminating certain grade crossings or railroads in the District of Columbia, to require and authorize the construction of new terminals and tracks for the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. in the city of Washington, and for other purposes.

"An act to provide for eliminating certain grade crossings on the line of the Baltimore & Potomac Railroad Co., in the city of Washington, D. C., and requiring said company to depress and elevate its tracks, and to enable it to relocate parts of its railroad therein, and for other purposes.

"An act to provide for a Union Railroad Station in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

Furthermore, the case in no way involved, directly or remotely, the oleomargarine taxes. On the other hand the cases I cite: *In re Kollock and McCray* v. *United States*, hold that the very laws in question are tax laws, and so depend for their existence.

Only so far as the contribution by the District of Columbia is concerned was a tax involved in the case of *Millard* v. *Roberts*. A levy or assessment upon properties in the District was made to effect this contribution. The decision was summed up in this sentence:

"Whatever taxes are imposed are but means to the purposes provided by the act."

Contrast this language with that of *In re Kollock*, which involved the very laws which this bill would repeal, and the very issue here involved, namely, whether the oleomargarine legislation is tax legislation. I quote again from *In re Kollock:*

"The act before us is on its face an act for levying taxes, and, although it may operate in so doing to prevent deception in the sale of oleomargarine as and for butter, its primary object must be assumed to be the raising of revenue; and, considered as a revenue act, the designation of the stamps, marks, and brands is merely in the discharge of an administrative function and falls within the numerous instances of regulations needful to the operation of the machinery of particular laws, authority to make which has always been recognized as within the competency of the legislative power to confer.

* * * * *

"We concur with the court of appeals that this provision does not differ in principle from those of the internal-revenue laws, which direct the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to prepare suitable stamps to be used on packages of cigars, tobacco, and spirits; to change such stamps when deemed expedient; and to revise and regulate the means for affixing them."

The Chair cites the precedent of the referral of S. 1744, in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to the Committee on Agriculture. In reply, I call your attention to the great preponderance of bills on the subject which were referred to the Committee on Finance. I also call your attention to the fact that in practically every case of referral to the Committee on Agriculture, the bills and other matters can be distinguished by a preponderant purpose to prohibit, regulate and affect oleomargarine otherwise than by taxes.

The Chair next cites the fact that this bill, in the House was handled by its Committee on Agriculture. We are not in any respect bound by that peculiar circumstance, and I am sure the Chair does not mean to imply that we are. Nor should this reason have any effect, for it has not affected the referral of my bill in this body, nor was it made upon the basis of anything other than precedent created by special rule of the House, without regard to the nature of the bill. We should also not overlook the fact that the House, by a large majority, took the bill from the committee, against the will of the committee, and acted upon it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] the 2 minutes which I think he requested.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington represents a State in which there are large and very successful dairy interests. He is being urged by those interests, among which are many of his personal friends, to support the maintenance of the oleomargarine taxes and to vote in favor of referring House bill 2245 to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The junior Senator from Washington has not committed his vote on the margarine-tax problem because his study of the facts involved is far from being completed. He is only convinced that in this day of high prices charged to housewives and other consumers, the margarine tax question should be decided on the floor of the Senate at an early date.

A companion bill to House bill 2245 has, as I understand, been before the Senate Finance Committee for some time, where presumably, no doubt, it has received some consideration. This is one reason why I shall vote in favor of referring House bill 2245 to the Finance Committee. I should like to believe that that committee will report a bill to the Senate in time for the Senate to take action during the present session of Congress.

In referring House bill 2245 to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the President pro tempore said that his decision to refer the bill to that committee, rather than to the Finance Committee, was extremely close. It seems to me that he ruled in favor of the subject of food, rather than taxes.

I strongly feel that the tax question should be granted priority consideration. For this second reason, I shall vote to support the appeal made by the Senator from Arkansas to the referral decision laid down yesterday by the President pro tempore of the Senate. In so voting, Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington believes he is helping to insure a floor debate on House bill 2245, out of which, as an individual Senator, he can register his vote on the merits of an important public question.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator from Washington seems to be quite concerned about the position of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Senator from Arkansas met, the night before last, with four members of that committee who represent the butter industry. At that time we gave him assurance that our committee would not hold up this bill, but would report it to the Senate in time for consideration of the Senate. I think anyone interested in the dairy industry should favor the reference of the bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, where the dairy interests can receive due consideration.

Members of our Agriculture Committee are considering amendments which may be acceptable to the oleomargarine interests themselves. In fact, there is one which I think is entirely reasonable and which is predicated on the thinking that oleo has been sold for years and years, and is a good product, and ought to be able to stand on its own feet now. There is no reason, in my opinion, why oleo could not be colored just a little different shade than butter, and sold on its own merits, rather than to be colored and sold as butter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Washington has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator some of the time allotted to the proponents of reference of the bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, particularly to permit the Senator to answer a question which I should like to ask him. My question is this: Does the Senator from Washington believe that the amendment to the long-range agricultural program bill which was submitted by his colleague, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and which, in effect, would give the President the right to raise the tariff against Canadian apples—which now are coming into the United States in very large quantity, seeking a market in this country—should be referred to the Finance Committee, and not be considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry? Certainly it would affect the revenue of the United States.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me first to reply very briefly to the Senator from North Dakota, who addressed an observation to me?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. I think there is sufficient time for everyone, Mr. President.

Mr. CAIN. The junior Senator from Washington feels that the Senator from North Dakota and himself have no quarrel on the subject of sharing a deep concern and interests in the dairy interests of the country. I have such an interest. My vote will be cast in favor of the appeal taken by the Senator from Arkansas, primarily for two reasons. Either rightly or wrongly, I think the matter will be more rapidly brought to the floor of the Senate through referring the bill to the Finance Committee. Secondly, I think primarily the subject under discussion is a tax matter and should be given prior consideration by the Finance Committee. After its action has been taken, and on the assumptions of the Senator from North Dakota and myself that that committee will report a bill to the floor of the Senate, it seems that every Senator will be given ample opportunity to express his personal convictions and feelings on the merits of the proposal which is offered to the Senate.

Mr. YOUNG. Of course, that argument, advanced by the oleo interests, has made the whole situation as complicated and uncompromising as it has been. What greater assurance could the oleo interests have than the assurance by the majority of the Committee on Agriculture that they would report the bill? We were even considering a certain date. If they have no more faith in the Members of the Senate than that, it indicates there is no settlement of this question at all. It seems to me that the Senator from Washington ought to consider the dairy interests of his State, who would prefer having the Agricultural Committee work out a compromise, rather than a tax committee not dealing directly with agricultural interests.

Mr. CAIN. I may say to the Senator that I have had not a single minute of conversation with any representative of what he refers to as the oleomargarine industry. I am basing my decision on what seems to me to be a clear need to send this bill, in the interest of speed and of tax consideration, to the Finance Committee. That is not precluding what all Senators want, which is a thorough and full-scale debate on the subject as soon as some committee sends the approved measure to the floor, so we can decide it in the public interest at the earliest possible time. If the bill goes to the Agricultural Committee, I hope it will report the bill.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. There is far more involved in this measure than simply taxes. It involves the interests of the dairy industry, which goes back for centuries. There is also involved soil conservation and diversified farming. Further, it seems to me only reasonable to believe that the oleo interests themselves would agree that anyone eating in a public place ought to know whether he is eating oleomargarine or butter. It would be to their best interest. The color would be slightly different from butter. It may even facilitate the sale of their product and probably result in a greater sale of it.

Mr. CAIN. As I understand, we are not debating the subject of oleomargarine at the moment. We are debating which committee ought to have jurisdiction over the subject.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. CAIN. But the statement by the Senator from North Dakota impels me to ask this question: As I understand, an identical bill introduced by the Senator from Arkansas has been before the Finance Committee for some time. I am not aware of the fact that any question has been raised publicly on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from North Dakota or by any other Senator, or that any exception has been taken to where the bill has been for quite some time. If this matter is so important, according to the terms of the definition of the Senator from North Dakota, where have all Senators been, for some weeks past, that they have not expressed themselves concerning the matter?

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I probably would have raised the question at the time this bill was referred to the Finance Committee, had it been appropriately introduced. The Senator well knows that a revenue or tax measure cannot be initiated in the Senate, anyway; it must originate in the House. So we were not concerned about the reference of the bill of which the Senator speaks.

Mr. CAIN. I was taking it for granted that nothing would happen, one way or another, in connection with the measure.

Mr. YOUNG. It could not. Under our rules, nothing could happen.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from North Dakota was equally aware with me that in due course, when the House took action on the oleomargarine bill, of that sort, a committee in which a bill on this subject had been held for some time would immediately be called into sturdy action.

Mr. YOUNG. I think the remarks of the distinguished President of the Senate are in point.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont is in control of the time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yielded time to the Senator from Washington, to enable him to answer a question of mine. I should be glad to yield further time to other Senators. I asked the Senator from Washington if he believed that the plea of the apple growers of the State of Washington to the Agricultural Committee, to seek a solution to their problem so far as the heavy importation of Canadian apples into this country is concerned, should be referred to the Finance Committee, and no further consideration be given to it by the Agricultural Committee? In my opinion it is analogous to the present situation. It concerns a tariff imposed in order to regulate the amount of apples and the price at which apples can be imported into this country. I should like to know whether the Senator thinks the Agricultural Committee also should relinquish jurisdiction of that matter.

Mr. CAIN. If the Senator from Vermont will permit, I should like to express my gratitude for his willingness to allow me to reply to the question of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont was very glad indeed to yield the time.

Mr. CAIN. With reference to the question of the Senator from Vermont, I may say that I do not feel qualified to answer it. However, I am glad the Senator has called to my attention the matter of the jurisdiction of that particular bill, which was introduced by my colleague, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. I shall very promptly study it and give the Senator my opinion for whatever he may think it to be worth.

Mr. AIKEN. I shall be glad to have the opinion of the Senator from Washington. I had hoped that he would be sufficiently familiar with the situation to enable him to give his opinion at this time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it not true that reciprocal trade agreements go to the Finance Committee?

Mr. AIKEN. The reciprocal trade agreements go to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why are they sent there, instead of to the Committee on Agriculture? The Committee on Foreign Relations does not handle agricultural legislation.

Mr. AIKEN. I was asking the junior Senator from Washington if he thought the Committee on Agriculture could turn down the plea of the apple growers of the State of Washington, with reference to apples?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it confuses the issue. No one is saying that general legislation, in the form of a tax bill, designed to promote agriculture, including

the dairying industry, should not go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think it confuses the issue at all. It may possibly confuse some of those who are insistent that the Chair erred in his reference of the oleomargarine bill, but the issue is the same in each case. That issue is, Where does the preponderance of interest lie—with agriculture or elsewhere?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the issue generally is in respect to the manner in which a particular subject matter would be affected. For example, when a bill came to the Senate to prohibit the shipment of oleomargarine in interstate commerce, it was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The bill specifically provided that the power to control interstate commerce should be invoked. No objection was raised. I think the means by which a thing is to be regulated is determinative of the issue.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Arkansas says that certain bills were referred to the Finance Committee. I may say that of about 40 bills relating to oleomargarine, which have been introduced during the past few years, only 4 or 5 of them have been referred to committees other than that on Agriculture and Forestry.

The Chair, however, yesterday answered the question which has been raised this morning, as to why one or two Senate bills introduced previously this year were referred to the Finance Committee. I quote from the statement by the Chair, which is found at page 5230 of yesterday's RECORD:

> Again reference of the bill to the Finance Committee may be strongly urged on the basis of the fact that two previous Senate bills, S. 985 and S. 1907, for this same purpose have been referred in the Senate, during the present Congress, to the Finance Committee although no action has ever been taken on them in that committee.
>
> This was done on the basis of their titles in usual routine at the legislative desk when no occasion arose to examine the full text of the bills to determine the subject matter which predominates.

In other words, no one knew when the bills were referred. They were referred in a routine manner.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a point of order?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to myself to complete my statement. When the bill was referred, I doubt that the Chair himself was aware of the reference, in view of the routine manner in which it was handled, based on scanning titles.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I will yield to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], because the Senator from Arkansas has an hour's time, and I would rather that some of the yielding be on his time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to correct that statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wanted to ask the junior Senator from Washington a question. Is the tax which we are now discussing placed on the food content in a pound of oleomargarine?

Mr. CAIN. I have never before heard such a question raised. I presume the tax is placed upon the sale price of oleomargarine.

Mr. THYE. I did not think the Senator had ever thought that question out. That is the reason I asked him the question. The tax is placed upon the color which is in a pound of oleomargarine, and not on the food content. The food itself is always tax-free. But if it is colored and camouflaged as butter there is a tax placed upon the pound of oleomargarine. I did not think the Senator from Washington had given that question a complete study.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington had been previously so informed, but he had not considered the question in exactly the form in which the Senator raised it. It seems to me we are all talking about exactly the same thing, and that is the need for discussing the problem publicly on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for an observation?

Mr. AIKEN. I will yield very briefly to the Senator from Arkansas. If he takes over a minute he will have to have the time taken out of his own time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall not take more than a minute.

The Senator from Vermont made the statement that I introduced a bill and no one knew anything about it. I made a speech of, I think, 1 hour's duration in explaining the bill on the day I introduced it in the Senate. I am sure that any Senator who read the RECORD had full notice of the character of the bill. There was no secret about it. A similar bill had been previously introduced. It did not slip by unnoticed.

The next observation I wish to make is to correct the statement of the Senator from Minnesota, that white oleomargarine is sold tax-free. There is a tax of one-quarter of a cent. There is no tax on the housewife who puts the yellow color into the oleomargarine. Therefore, I do not see why the Senator argues that the color is what is being taxed, because he is perfectly free, as I am, to buy the oleomargarine and put the color in it. It is the colored margarine that bears a tax.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. In reply to the remarks of the junior Senator from Arkansas regarding color and the housewife placing color in the product, of course there is no penalty against the housewife putting the color in the product, because the product comes with a capsule or some sort of container with the color in it. But there is no food content in the color. The Senator will admit that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is exactly the same color that is put into butter.

Mr. THYE. The fact is there is no food content in the color. Therefore the tax does not deprive the consumer of the benefit of the food contained in the pound of oleomargarine.

Speaking of excise taxes and the one-quarter-of-a-cent tax on oleomargarine, the processors of all other commodities have to pay a license fee or an excise tax in order to do business. So that subject could be debated from now until sundown, and we could both be correct. The one-quarter-of-a-cent-a-pound tax on the uncolored food content of a pound of oleomargarine is mostly an identification of the product's having been sold. Of course, that is an argument which I would say is minor and is not a question on which we should take any time. But, getting back to the main question, there is no tax on the food content if the product is sold uncolored. It is entirely a question of whether one should be permitted to color it in the form of a camouflaged product to be placed on the tables in public eating places in the form of what might well be butter, where there are more than 62,000,000 meals served every day. The processor has found the greatest opportunity of sales promotion in continuing fighting and feuding between legislative Members representing the dairy interests and legislative Members representing the deep South or the Cotton Belt and, in more recent years, those who produce soybeans. They have come in for a little share in the debate on the question of whether the product should be camouflaged to deceive the public when it is placed on tables in public eating places, or when it is openly placed and served on the tables.

I might well say, Why the importance of the argument? The housewife, if she were using oleomargarine in her mashed potatoes, would not care what color it was. It would not make any difference, because the mashed potatoes would melt it and the color would disappear, whether she used butter or colored or uncolored oleomargarine. If the housewife wants to use oleomargarine for cooking purposes, the color makes no difference. If she were serving it as a sandwich spread the color, again, would make no difference. If she served it on the table to have it used as an open spread for a slice of bread, then the color would become a factor in connection with having it look like the real thing. The housewife does not want to say to her family or to her neighbors, "We are eating oleomargarine today." That is the reason she comes back to the idea that when she openly serves oleomargarine on the table she wants to have the color in it, so that no one will raise the question of whether it is butter or an imitation product.

So I say to the Senators from the South, and especially to the junior Senator from Arkansas, the processor has found it to be the best publicity, the best advertisement he can possibly conceive of or develop or write, to continue this fighting and feuding which has been so successfully carried on between the dairy and cotton interests and, in more recent years, the soybean producers.

I warn the Senate that if this tax is removed the housewife is going to pay just about the same for the product colored as she is now paying for the product; that she will not be really the

beneficiary of the removal of the tax on the colored product; and that so far as the producer in the South, or the soybean producer in the Middle West, is concerned, he will not be much better off financially at the end of the year than he is at the present time.

I also wish to call attention to the fact that if and when the processor can import coconut oil at a cost a little below what the soybean oil and the cottonseed oil now cost him, he will import coconut oil and process his oleomargarine with that, and the cotton producer and the soybean producer will not be the beneficiary of the color, so to speak, in the product.

I wish to say further, in speaking about the entire question, Mr. President, that there is nothing that has lent itself, in the way of general assistance, to diversification of agricultural operations of the South, so much as the dairy cow has lent itself to the general diversification and soil-building practices being followed. In the event the butter market is ruined by the competition which colored oleomargarine will make possible and will bring to it, then I would say that the diversification and progress made in agriculture in the Southern States will have a set-back. As a Nation we have spent a great deal of money in the support of soil-conservation programs and payments in order to bring about that diversification, and if the attempt is successful to throw on the market in competion with butter a camouflaged product it will have a tendency to destroy the splendid progress which has been made in soil conservation in recent years.

I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I rose to take about 5 minutes of the hour which was allotted to the friends of agriculture in the Senate, to debate the question as to whether the reference made by the Chair of the oleo bill should be upheld.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I would rather not yield until I made a short statement. I am not going to take much time, because I do not think it is necessary to do so.

The arguments of the Senator from Arkansas and the other Senators who maintain that the bill should not be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry are based on two assumptions, both of which are false. The first assumption is that the President of the Senate is not familiar with the legislative processes. The President of the Senate has been around here a long time, longer than those who criticise his reference have been.

Mr. FULBRIGHT and Mr. MAYBANK addressed the Chair.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the opposition has an hour of its own. I wish to get in some time on behalf of the friends of agriculture.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont declines to yield, and under the division of time, it is not fair to impose on his control of his own time.

Mr. AIKEN. The inference was made that the President of the Senate referred the oleomargarine bill yesterday practically not caring what the decision was on his reference. That is not so, and if one will study the RECORD of yesterday and read what the President pro tempore said, he will learn that he had very definite reasons for referring the bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The reasons which the President pro tempore gave are unanswerable. Let me read his summary. He said:

> But it seems clear to the Chair, after a faithful examination of the entire subject, that the pending bill is not a revenue measure in the appropriate sense of that phrase as defined in the Reorganization Act; but that the subject matter which predominates—the controlling phrase in the Reorganization Act—lies preponderantly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

In reaching the decision he did reach, the Chair was absolutely correct. The opposition goes back to the days before the Reorganization Act was passed, and the arguments against the decision of the Chair in themselves are not sound, for all bills relating to oleomargarine for 20 years have been referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and they have been referred to that committee because the oleo interests wanted them referred to it, and they got honest and fair treatment and full hearings, and no one can successfully say they did not.

The other argument of the Senator from Arkansas is based on an equally false assumption, namely, that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry cannot be trusted to give a fair hearing to a bill of which some of its members may not personally approve. That is a sad reflection to come from those who hold that attitude toward the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Why is it that the Committee on Agriculture can be trusted with everything except this oleomargarine bill? Why is is that when the citrus growers of Florida get into a desperate condition, they come to the Committee on Agriculture and trust that committee? Why is it that when the peanut growers of Georgia get into trouble, they come to the Committee on Agriculture and trust that committee to help solve their problems? Why do the apple growers from the State of Washington come to the Committee on Agriculture and trust that committee to help them with their problems, as well as the cotton growers, the wool growers, and the meat producers? These all seem to trust the Committee on Agriculture, and in fact, Mr. President, during the past year the Committee on Agriculture has virtually been the lifeline of the agriculture of those States whose representatives here now question the right of that committee to deal with the subject of oleomargarine, and question that the committee will be fair.

The Senator from Arkansas stated a few minutes ago that the Committee on Agriculture was going to have a hundred witnesses and prolong the hearings indefinitely. I should like to know who made that statement. I will yield him time to answer. Who said the Committee on Agriculture would hear a hundred witnesses and prolong the hearings indefinitely?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe the Senator did not hear my remark. I said that I got the rumor from a newspaperman that it was planned by the butter interests to have a hundred witnesses. I did not say the committee planned that. I said the butter interests planned to produce a hundred witnesses. That has been the practice in the past, so it did not seem unusual. It was not any reflection on the committee.

Mr. AIKEN. Has the Senator from Arkansas so little regard for the Committee on Agriculture that he thinks it will be influenced by this unknown source, some nebulous rumor which he has heard?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me say to the Senator——

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator think the committee would not give a fair hearing?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We have had such a recent demonstration of the conditions which may arise in the Committee on Agriculture in the House that I thought it would be proper to take notice of it. The real situation is that the great Committee on Agriculture has so much other important legislation now pending before it that we really fear it may not have a chance to get around to the consideration of this legislation. The Senator himself told me only yesterday that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry had before it the long-range agricultural program, and it was doubtful whether hearings could be called for in the immediate future because of the pressing business before the committee. That was the whole reason for the statement.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. Not just now.

The Senator from Arkansas has referred to the conversation which he had with certain members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I will say that the Senator from Arkansas was insistent that we bring the oleomargarine bill out on the floor not later than May 17, and we were not in any position to promise that, and we are not now in any position to promise it. There are 13 members of the committee. Some of us have talked with the Senator from Arkansas on the subject. We told him we would not sit on this bill, but would try to bring it out in ample time for the Senate to vote on it. That is as far as we could go and can go. We made that statement as individuals and not as an official report of the committee, because we had no right to report on behalf of the committee.

I should like, however, to have the Senator from Arkansas or any other Member of the Senate point out one single instance since the first of January 1947 when the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has sat upon a bill or refused to let the Senate vote on a bill that was of national interest.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I now yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wish to state that naturally I believe the bill should be referred to the Committee on

Finance, where the original oleomargarine tax bill and the amendments to that bill were referred. It is my understanding from a conversation I had yesterday with the distinguished Senator from Vermont—and if I have misunderstood the Senator I wish he would correct me—and from one even at the late hour of 12:30 today, that the Senator intends to get the bill out on the floor, so that the Senate may vote on it, with or without amendments on it.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is entirely correct about that. The Senator from Vermont said to the Senator from South Carolina, and he says to anyone who may be listening now, that so far as he is concerned the bill will be brought out on the floor of the Senate in ample time for the Senate to vote on it.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. But the Senator from Vermont will further say that he does not believe that all other business of the Senate should be dropped to one side to take up the oleomargarine bill at once. We are working in committee day and night. Many of us met last evening until late in the evening trying to hurry through a good, workable, long-range farm program, and I would be less than frank if I do not say that I believe that farm program should have precedence over the oleomargarine bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not wish to be misunderstood on the Senate floor. I believe that since 1943 and 1944 legislation dealing with the tax on oleomargarine has been referred to the Finance Committee. I shall vote to have the bill referred to the Committee on Finance. I appreciate what the Senator from Vermont has told me, and I want to express my opinion to him that no committee has done more for agriculture in the South than has the Committee on Agriculture, and no Senator has done more for parity and such things in agriculture than has the Senator from Vermont. But I want to say that I think the Senator from Vermont is wrong in this matter, and I shall oppose him and vote to have the bill sent to the Committee on Finance. I want to thank the Senator from Vermont, however, for being so frank and honest with me in the period of the past 2 or 3 days.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from South Carolina. Mr. President, I think the Senator from South Carolina understands the situation. I appreciate his words of kindness as regards myself. I have always had a very deep concern for the agriculture of the Southeast. It does need consideration, and will receive consideration so far as it lies within my power to give it. But I do not believe that we should overthrow the decision of the Chair, which is an absolute correct decision, by taking away from the Committee on Agriculture that type of legislation which it has in the main been considering for the past 20 years. This is no time to start taking bills away from one committee and giving them to another simply because one thinks he can receive more votes in some other committee. That is not good legislative practice. It is merely a perversion of legislative practices.

Mr. President, I do not think I have anything more to say, and I yield the floor.

How much time have we left on our side, may I ask?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time remaining under the control of the Senator from Vermont is 15 minutes, and the time remaining under the control of the Senator from Arkansas is 30 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may I make one further remark? Considerable reference has been made to two bills which were referred to the Finance Committee early in January. Am I correct in the month?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. One of them was referred to the committee in December.

Mr. AIKEN. And the fear has been expressed that the Committee on Agriculture would not hold hearings on this latest oleo bill, and that therefore it should be referred to the Finance Committee. I may point out that the Finance Committee has had since December to consider those other bills. The bills have been in that committee during January, February, March, April, and May, 5 months, without consideration, and I do not think the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should be expected to bring the present bill out within a week.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me to correct him in that statement?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I ask the Senator to yield for a correction.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Arkansas has more time than I have. Let him answer in his time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, with regard to the last remark made by the Senator from Vermont, I will say that I have previously placed in the RECORD the reason why the Senate Finance Committee would not hold hearings on the bill referred to it in December. The reason was that the bill was a tax bill, and under the Constitution it must originate in the House. That is a complete answer to the ruling of the Chair. If it is a tax bill, then it ought to go to the Committee on Finance. The bill under discussion, which has come from the House, is identical to my bill, it is a tax bill, and, under the Constitution, it properly originated in the House. The reason the Committee on Finance did not hold hearings on my bill was because it had not originated in the House.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. In line with the Constitution, the rule of the House provides that tax bills shall originate with the Ways and Means Committee of the House.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Did the present bill originate in the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I placed in the RECORD a statement of the way the House perverted that rule, and has succeeded, for 62 years, in preventing any bill being reported on this subject.

Mr. President, I thoroughly believe that the Senator from Vermont is sincere in his attitude of wanting to bring the bill out from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but he has just stated that that committee is working day and night on important legislation which they have before them. It is for that reason I feel they may be unable to get around to the pending bill in time for action at this session. We have only a little over a month left until the time for the adjournment, according to the statements of the leadership in, I think, both Houses. Therefore, the time is very short. The Senate Finance Committee has nothing on its agenda I am informed, of any great importance, and could proceed immediately to consideration of the bill. The Committee on Finance has already held hearings on the proposed legislation in the past several years, and are very well equipped to handle it promptly now.

Mr. President, I have the greatest respect for the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but I may say that I believe all committees have certain pet subjects which, for one reason or another, have been difficult to deal with in the past, and I think this is one of them. That is in no way due to the influence of the Senator from Vermont. I have no criticism to make of his integrity or the integrity of the committee.

I may say further that I certainly did not say or intimate in any manner or form that the Chair is not acquainted with and perfectly familiar with the procedures of the House and the Senate—of the whole Congress. I have the greatest respect for his judgment in all matters of importance to the Congress, and particularly in matters of legislation of national interest. But I think it is also well known that the Chair has not the time to investigate every point of order that is raised or every request for a ruling which is made. We have a Parliamentarian who takes care of such matters. I believe it is quite proper to question a ruling which is made under these circumstances purely as a matter of his not having had opportunity to give sufficient consideration to the subject, as thoroughly as is possible. I do not think it is any reflection on either his judgment, his intelligence, his integrity, or any other characteristic to make a point of order against his ruling.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to say that I agree with the Senator from Arkansas that the Chair does not have time to read all bills and to determine what shall be done with them. He made it clear yesterday when he stated that the oleomargarine bills introduced last December and January were sent to the Finance

Committee in a routine manner on the basis of their titles.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Last December when I introduced the bill I explained at great length to the Chair and to the Senate—and it is in the RECORD for all to see—exactly what the bill meant. Furthermore, I doubt whether either the Senator from Vermont or the Senator from Michigan has any doubt about the contents and purposes of these bills. As the Senator well knows, similar bills have been introduced every year for 40 years.

Mr. President, I now yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, section 137 of the Reorganization Act provides that—

> In cases in which a controversy arises as to the jurisdiction of any standing committee of the Senate with respect to any proposed legislation, the question of jurisdiction shall be decided by the Presiding Officer of the Senate without debate, in favor of that committee which has jurisdiction over the subject matter which predominates in such proposed legislation, but such decision shall be subject to appeal.

In defining the jurisdiction of Senate committees under section 102 of the Senate rules, jurisdiction is conferred upon the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry over the subject of agriculture generally, as well as over the subject of animal industry and diseases of animals. By the same section, subparagraph 8, jurisdiction is conferred upon the Senate Committee on Finance respecting revenue measures generally before the Senate.

In the RECORD of May 4, yesterday, the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate, in his reference of this bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, used the following language:

> The Chair confronts the parliamentary duty of referring this bill to the appropriate committee under the rules.

Skipping a little, the Chair further said:

> Under such circumstances, the Chair wishes to afford the Senate an opportunity, so far as possible, to decide the reference for itself.

Subsequently the distinguished President pro tempore said, after reading section 137 of the Reorganization Act, which I have just read:

> Confronting this injunction of law, the Chair will proceed to make an initial reference in open session, without presuming, of course, to pass upon the merits of the legislation in any aspect whatever. But the Chair specifically invites an appeal without prejudice if the Senate desires a different parliamentary disposition of the measure.

The distinguished President pro tempore has made it clear that this is not a matter of prestige on the part of the President pro tempore. The Chair has not put himself in a position where it would in any sense of the word be regarded as a rejection of our distinguished President pro tempore or a repudiation of his construction of the issues involved if the Senate itself should accept his invitation to refer the pending measure to the Committee on Finance instead of to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Did I not feel that way about the matter, I would feel some personal embarrassment in voting, as I intend to vote, that this bill should properly be referred to the Committee on Finance, because I have the honor to be a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. If I felt that the integrity or prestige of my own committee were involved, I certainly sufficiently appreciate membership on that committee, and I am sufficiently loyal to it and to my eminent colleagues on the committee, to vote with them. But, Mr. President, under the Reorganization Act and the rules of the Senate there is involved a question of divided jurisdiction. Obviously the bill pertains to agriculture generally and to animal industry generally, but it is a revenue measure as well. Therefore, the Chair could appropriately refer the bill either to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or the Committee on Finance.

Mr. President, what has been the precedent of the Senate since the Reorganization Act has been in effect? If I may say so without impropriety, I had the honor to be a member of the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of the Congress, and I think that act has achieved a salutary improvement in the procedures of the Congress in the interest of a more efficient democracy. However, the Reorganization Act, recognizing that jurisdiction lay in both these committees, gave authority to the Senate itself, upon appeal, to make the decision as to which committee could more effectively, and in the opinion of the Senate more promptly, and perhaps more properly, deal with the legislation.

If I am not in error about the parliamentary history, since the Reorganization Act has been in effect I believe there have been at least three bills on the subject introduced in the Senate. If I correctly recall, the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] introduced two of the bills. He informed me this morning that both those bills were referred to the Committee on Finance, because it was made to appear that they were revenue measures. The eminent Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] was joined by the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who has been so active in this entire effort, in the introduction of a similar bill in December. That bill is identical with the pending bill. It was referred to the Committee on Finance, and is now pending in that committee. It has been there since December.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield another 5 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if the Senate Committee on Finance has had referred to it by the distinguished occupant of the Chair three bills identical with the pending bill, under the rules under which we are now operating, and under the Reorganization Act, it seems to me that it can with propriety be said that a fair precedent has already been established for the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee over this piece of legislation.

So, Mr. President, the Finance Committee already having three bills before it, one of them being a bill identical with the pending bill, which is a House bill, it seems to me that we might continue the jurisdiction of that committee without divesting the committee of jurisdiction and conferring jurisdiction upon another committee, which would approach the subject de novo so far as the present session of Congress is concerned, it not having had prior jurisdiction of the subject since the Reorganization Act has been in effect.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to my distinguished colleague on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Florida maintain that the bills to which he refers as being before the Finance Committee are properly before the Finance Committee?

Mr. PEPPER. I am saying that there is a divided jurisdiction. This is a revenue measure, and in that sense it may properly be referred to the Committee on Finance. It is also a bill affecting agriculture generally and animal industry, because it affects the dairy industry. Therefore, it might with propriety be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. There being a proper jurisdiction in either committee, the Chair might have referred the bill to either committee. The Chair referred three identical bills to the Committee on Finance. That committee has already exercised jurisdiction. Such jurisdiction having been conferred, I believe that it would be in the interest of the progress of this legislation to continue that jurisdiction rather than divest the Committee on Finance of such jurisdiction and confer jurisdiction upon another committee, although that committee might with propriety have had the bill referred to it in the first instance.

I am in favor of this proposed legislation. I believe that it would correct a discrimination which long ago should have been removed from the statute books of this land. What does the present law do? It penalizes one section of American agriculture and prefers another by the power of the Congress to tax. It discriminates against oleomargarine, which is made from vegetable oils—oils from soybeans, peanuts, or cottonseed, which are products which are legitimately and honorably grown in our land. Also, I am told, it contains a milk product, either natural milk or skim milk, some manufacturers using one and some the other.

That commodity is penalized by a tax of 10 cents a pound if it happens to be colored a certain color, whereas there is no penalty upon butter, which is similar in character and food value, but bears no tax.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 5 minutes more to the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida is recognized for an additional period of 5 minutes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, this is one land and we are one people. It is not in the interest of American prosperity or integrity or solidarity for us to tax a product which comes from one part of the country in order to give preference to a product produced in another part of the country. If we do that, we go back to the very divisive and selfish influences which our Constitution was established to circumvent and prevent. Mr. President, when our Nation was founded, our Constitution, setting up our present system, was placed in effect, because, among other reasons, there was an attempt to tax the commerce on one waterway at the expense of the people interested in another waterway in this country. There were conflicting economic interests. Let us permit the several commodities involved to compete for the American market, for the American table, according to the appeal they make to the people, who are the market.

Mr. President, today in the United States three-quarters of the families have incomes under $3,000 a year, and one-half of the families have incomes under $2,300 a year. This tax is a tax upon the food of the poor. It is a tax upon the diet of the American families, one-half of whom have gross incomes of less than $2,300 a year. Therefore, it is not fair to make the American consumer, the American housewife, and those who sit at the American family table pay a tax or tariff which will subsidize a product of the agricultural interests of one part of the United States at the expense of an equally legitimate and equally honorable agricultural product of another part of the United States.

Believing in those principles, I favor the appeal from the decision of the Chair. Believing that with propriety the Committee on Finance has jurisdiction, I shall support the appeal, in favor of reference of the bill to the Finance Committee.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; if I have time.

Mr. THYE. I wish to ask the Senator a question: In what manner does the 9¾-cent tax on color deprive the housewife of any food product?

Mr. PEPPER. In the first place, I am informed that there is a considerable difference between the price of butter and the price of oleomargarine on the market today.

Mr. THYE. My question is, In what manner does the 9¾-cent tax on the color which may be placed in a pound of oleomargarine deprive the housewife of a food product—realizing, on the other hand, that she might buy the pound of oleomargarine without color and without the tax.

Mr. PEPPER. It simply means that if she desires to purchase a commodity that has a certain color, she has to pay 10 cents a pound more for it because of the efforts of some persons to penalize that product in order to give preference to another product of American agriculture. In other words, that principle, if applied to Florida, would mean a preferential-tax treatment for uncolored oranges as against colored oranges. There are certain of our oranges which, although they may be better in content, may not have the golden lustre which some persons prefer to see in the skin of an orange. Under our laws, we are permitted to color the skin of oranges, and there is no deception because color is attached or applied to the orange in that way. But it would be unfair if those who colored the skin of oranges were required to pay a tax, when those oranges were in competition in the market with other oranges which were not colored.

Mr. President, the American housewife is not deceived. She knows when she is buying butter and she knows when she is buying oleomargarine. But there is no right to tax her 10 cents for each pound of colored oleomargarine simply because she prefers oleomargarine which is yellow in color, instead of white.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

The Senator from Arkansas has 11 minutes remaining. The Senator from Vermont has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, is the Senator from Vermont willing to proceed to use his time now?

Mr. AIKEN. No other Senator on my side of the question is requesting time just now. If I thought the Senator from Arkansas had used his time, I would suggest the absence of a quorum, so that we might get ready for the vote at 2 o'clock.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have just a few observations to make, to sum up some of the points which seem to me to be of interest in this debate.

I should like to point out the result of a vote sustaining the referral of this bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

I and other Senators, who have introduced bills identical to that now in question, are denied hearings on the bills because they are revenue measures which must originate in the House. Yet, the Committee on Finance, which has jurisdiction over revenue measures, is denied that jurisdiction because an identical bill is not a revenue measure.

To put this situation in another way, it has this effect: The Senate of the United States is denied the right to initiate a bill, which it would otherwise have the right to initiate, because it is a revenue measure. Yet, it is not a revenue measure.

The only logical conclusion which can be reached from these circumstances is this: The bill is a revenue measure for the purpose of denying hearings, but it is not a revenue measure for the purpose of referral to a committee.

Also, according to the Supreme Court of the United States, the laws which would be repealed by this bill are revenue measures, but the bill which would repeal them is not a revenue measure. The judicial function of examining and sustaining the laws results in a determination that they are tax laws. But the judicial function of examining a bill repealing those laws and referring it to a committee results in a determination that they are not tax laws.

These are the rather peculiar results of a vote sustaining the referral to the Committee on Agriculture. If it is the decision of the majority that the bill should go to that committee, the issue will be settled. But can the reasons for the decision be satisfactorily explained to the majority of the people, who, I am convinced beyond the slightest doubt, favor the repeal of the margarine taxes? I think the evidence in the House of Representatives a few days ago is conclusive as to that particular subject. As the Senate well knows, the vote there was nearly 3 to 1; it was well over 2 to 1.

Mr. President, I merely wish to reiterate that, as has been intimated, our position is not that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has no desire to be fair and to give consideration to this proposed legislation. A great many matters are involved in the decision relative to the referral of the bill to the Committee on Finance, if that is done. One of the principal ones, in so far as the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is concerned, is the fact that that committee now is so busy, as the acting chairman of the committee has just stated, that it has to meet at nights during this week. The committee is so busy that there is no probability that it will be able to initiate hearings on this measure in the near future. I think that fact alone is sufficient to justify the Senate in not breaking a precedent which has been so firmly established under the Reorganization Act, as was pointed out yesterday, and as was pointed out just a few moments ago by the senior Senator from Florida.

I hope the Senate will consider this question in its proper perspective, and will realize that we are dealing with a procedural matter, and are setting precedents that will be used in connection with the future legislation. I believe great confusion would result from the precedent which would be set by a referral of a tax bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I can well imagine that in the future bills affecting other phases of agriculture, such as bills to tax liquor or tobacco, may be met in each case with the question of where the bill shall be referred. Under the precedents, I think it is very clear that the pending legislation should be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if because I objected to a product I should attempt to impose upon it a tax which would deprive the public of an opportunity of purchasing the product, I should be wrong. My reason for objecting to color in oleomargarine is that it would become utterly impossible to police the product if it were sold in a form perfectly imitating butter. There would be no way of determining the nature of the

product when served in public eating places. As I have previously stated, about 62,000,000 meals are served daily in public eating places.

We know, of course, that the processors of oleomargarine desire that their product shall imitate the color of butter, for in that manner it could be sold and served indiscriminately. The question then would be whether the public in buying and consuming a product would be unable to determine whether it was really a true dairy product. The cost of processing butter is actually more than double the cost of producing oleomargarine, when made of coconut oil, which in most instances is cheaper than either cottonseed oil or soybean oil. The only question with which we are all concerned is, Is the public to be protected, or is it to be permitted in some manner to be deceived?

Those who have had experience in legislative bodies in previous years know there was a necessity for regulating the sale of oleomargarine. They imposed a tax on color only, which tax deprives no one of any of the food content of a pound of oleomargarine. The processors of oleomargarine concede that the color has nothing to do with the food content. The color plays only one minor part, and that is to deceive the public. When colored oleomargarine is placed on the table its appearance deceives the eye, though, as I have said before, when used in cooking it makes no difference, it is not noticed. The only time a person would notice whether it was white or yellow would be when he proceeded to spread it on a slice of bread. He could then tell whether it had the color of butter, or whether it was white, indicating that it was something other than butter.

I repeat, Mr. President, I would be wrong if I tried to deprive the public of any food. It is not the purpose of the pending legislation to deprive the public of any food. It is to cause the product to be marketed on its own merits rather than through coloring it to make it simulate butter. Butter has been known to man from the first day that butterfat was separated from milk.

That is the real argument. The feuding and fighting that have been carried on legislatively have been a profitable source of advertisement to the processors of oleomargarine, who could never have purchased the publicity afforded by headlines in the press and by discussions on the radio and in the Senate. I repeat, color does not materially affect the intrinsic value of a pound of oleomargarine; it merely makes it impossible to police it in channels of trade, whether it be on the shelf of the grocery store or elsewhere. That would become utterly impossible.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator from Vermont for yielding to me.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Ball	Hill	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hoey	Pepper
Bricker	Holland	Reed
Brooks	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Byrd	Kem	Saltonstall
Cain	Kilgore	Smith
Capper	Knowland	Stennis
Chavez	Langer	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McFarland	Thye
Donnell	McGrath	Tobey
Downey	McKellar	Tydings
Dworshak	McMahon	Vandenberg
Eastland	Magnuson	Watkins
Ecton	Malone	Wherry
Ellender	Martin	White
Ferguson	Maybank	Wiley
Flanders	Millikin	Williams
Fulbright	Moore	Wilson
Green	Morse	Young
Gurney	Murray	
Hatch	Myers	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has 3 minutes remaining. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have so far taken no part in the debate on the question which is pending before the Senate. It so happens that the Senator from Illinois is a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and is also a member of the Committee on Finance, so that whatever the decision of the Senate may be, the Senator from Illinois must participate in committee hearings before the bill finally comes back to the floor of the Senate.

I wanted to pay tribute, before the debate closed, to the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, my good friend from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] for the very vigorous, progressive, and persuasive way in which he has championed the rights of the Senate Finance Committee. I could not let the opportunity pass without some commendation, because the Finance Committee is one of the most, if not the most, important committees in the Senate. It has great powers. It has the power of handling all revenue questions before the Senate. In view of the fact that this bill has a revenue feature in connection with repealing a tax, many Senators thought that the able chairman of the Finance Committee would defend the authority, the right, and the power of the Finance Committee to consider it. It is seldom that any committee wants to lose power or be discharged from its rightful and legal obligation. Under the circumstances I shall be compelled to vote for the motion of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] to refer the bill to the Finance Committee.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, before the Senate votes on the question I should like to point out that it will not be a vote on the merits of oleomargarine versus butter. It will be a vote on whether the Senate shall sustain the ruling of the Chair in referring the bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. In my opinion, the reasons given by the Chair for referring the bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry are completely unanswerable. Before the vote is taken I wish to read from the statement which was made by the Chair yesterday in referring the bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

> House hearings on the bill disclose a statement by Undersecretary of the Treasury Wiggins that "revenue considerations are not involved." This is particularly significant since the Supreme Court itself has said in *Millard* v. *Roberts* (202 U. S. 429) that "revenue bills are those that levy taxes in the strict sense of the word, and are not bills for other purposes, which may incidentally create revenue."

Mr. President, I think the logic used by the Chair yesterday in referring the bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is completely unanswerable. The bill is properly an agricultural bill. The revenue created is purely incidental. Only by being a tax measure could it be referred to the Finance Committee.

I hope the decision of the Chair will be sustained, because that decision was absolutely correct and is backed by all the force of argument.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont still has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont has run out of anything more to say. That is all there is to say, Mr. President.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I am sorry. I have thought of something else. [Laughter.] I want to repeat to the Members of the Senate that this is not a vote on the merits of the bill or on the merits of oleomargarine versus butter. It is purely and simply a question of whether the Senate shall sustain the correct and just decision of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time for debate has expired. The question before the Senate is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays have been requested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOBEY (when his name was called). I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who is absent on public business. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were free to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. VANDENBERG (when his name was called). Present.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is necessarily absent, and is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], who is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea," and the

Senator from New Jersey, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is necessarily absent, and is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea," and the Senator from Massachusetts, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent because of illness in their families.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas, 30, nays 47, answered "present" 1, as follows:

YEAS—30

Aiken	Ecton	Reed
Ball	Ferguson	Robertson, Wyo.
Bricker	Flanders	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Gurney	Thye
Capper	Hickenlooper	Watkins
Chavez	Ives	Wherry
Cordon	Langer	White
Donnell	Magnuson	Wiley
Downey	Malone	Wilson
Dworshak	Morse	Young

NAYS—47

Baldwin	Holland	Murray
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Myers
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor
Buck	Kem	O'Daniel
Byrd	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Cain	Knowland	Pepper
Connally	Lucas	Robertson, Va.
Cooper	McClellan	Russell
Eastland	McFarland	Saltonstall
Ellender	McGrath	Smith
Fulbright	McKellar	Stennis
Green	McMahon	Taft
Hatch	Martin	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	Maybank	Tydings
Hill	Millikin	Williams
Hoey	Moore	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Vandenberg

NOT VOTING—18

Brewster	Jenner	Sparkman
Bridges	Lodge	Stewart
Bushfield	McCarran	Taylor
Capehart	McCarthy	Tobey
George	Overton	Umstead
Hawkes	Revercomb	Wagner

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this vote the yeas are 30, the nays are 47. The decision of the Chair does not stand as the judgment of the Senate. The Chair refers H. R. 2245 to the Committee on Finance.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House further insisted on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6055) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. ENGEL of Michigan, Mr. STEFAN, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. KEEFE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. KERR, and Mr. MAHON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5728) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. KEEFE, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. HENDRICKS, and Mr. FOGARTY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to Senate Concurrent Resolution 48, authorizing the appointment of a joint committee to arrange for the inauguration of the President-elect of the United States on January 20, 1949.

REPORT ON UNITED STATES FOREIGN-AID PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 636)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For text of President's message, see todays proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 5321.)

COMMITTEE TO ARRANGE FOR INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT-ELECT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wishes to make the following announcement: Senate Concurrent Resolution 48, which has passed both the House and Senate, requires the appointment of a committee of three Senators and three Representatives to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect of the United States on the 20th day of January 1949. The Chair appoints on behalf of the Senate the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for an expanded air force and universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Petitions of the Orlando Townsend Club No. 2, of Orlando, the Fourth Congressional District Townsend Council, of Miami, and sundry citizens of St. Petersburg, all in the State of Florida, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan, to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

The memorial of Mrs. Diena Van Sluys, of Sheboygan, Wis., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

The memorial of Mrs. Alberta A. Nickerson, of Pomona, Calif., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the drafting of boys under 20 years of age for military service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 2510. A bill to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1241).

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL PERSONNEL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an additional report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures relating to Federal personnel, February–March 1948, together with a statement by me, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES, CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, PURSUANT TO SECTION 601 OF THE REVENUE ACT OF 1941, ON FEDERAL PERSONNEL, FEBRUARY–MARCH 1948

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH, MARCH 1948, AND COMPARISON WITH FEBRUARY 1948

(The following report is compiled from signed, official personnel reports by the various agencies and departments of the Federal Government. Table I of the report shows personnel employed inside continental United States, by agency. Table II shows personnel employed outside continental United States, by agency. Table III shows total personnel employed inside and outside continental United States, by agency. Table IV gives by agency the industrial workers employed by the Federal Government. For purposes of comparison, figures for the previous month are shown in adjoining columns.)

According to monthly personnel reports submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, the total Federal personnel for March increased 17,093 from the February total of 2,013,768 to the March total of 2,030,861. (See table III.)

Exclusive of the National Military Establishment, there was an increase of 7,838 from the February total of 1,177,078 to the March total of 1,184,916.

Total employment for the National Military Establishment showed an increase of

9,255 from the February figure of 836,690 to the March figure of 845,945.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense increased 76 from the February figure of 675 to the March figure of 751.

The Department of the Army reported an increase of 7,752 from the February figure of 382,204 to the March figure of 389,956. Inside continental United States the Army increased its civilian personnel 3,803; outside continental United States it increased 3,949.

The Department of the Air Forces increased civilian employment 1,651 from the February figure of 113,680 to the March figure of 115,331. Department of Air Force figures cover civilian personnel within the United States only.

Department of the Navy reported a decrease of 224 civilian employees, from the February figure of 340,131 to the March figure of 339,907.

Inside continental United States

Federal personnel within the United States increased 13,789 from the February total of 1,788,200 to the March total of 1,801,989. (See table I.)

Excluding the National Military Establishment, personnel inside the United States increased 8,400 from the February total of 1,122,017 to the March total of 1,130,417.

Total civilian employment within the United States for the National Military Establishment for March was 671,572, an increase of 5,389 over the February total of 666,183.

Department of the Army personnel within the United States increased 3,803 from the February figure of 255,798 to the March figure of 259,601.

The Department of the Air Force increased civilian personnel within the United States by 1,651 from the February figure of 113,680 to the March figure of 115,331.

The Navy Department within the United States decreased its civilian employment by 141, from the February figure of 296,030 to the March figure of 295,889.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense increased 76 from the February figure of 675 to the March figure of 751.

Outside continental United States

Outside continental United States, Federal personnel increased 3,304 from the February total of 225,568 to the March total of 228,872. (See table II.)

A decrease of 662 was reported in overseas civilian personnel by the departments and agencies other than the National Military Establishment, from the February total of 55,061 to the March total of 54,499.

Total overseas civilian employment for the National Military Establishment increased 3,866 from the February total of 170,507 to the March total of 174,373.

The Department of the Army reported an increase of 3,949 civilian employees overseas, from the February figure of 126,406 to the March figure of 130,355.

The Department of the Navy decreased its overseas civilian employment 83, from the February figure of 44,101 to the March figure of 44,018.

Industrial employment

Total industrial employment during the month of March increased 7,420 from the February figure of 551,131 to the March figure of 558,551. (See table IV.)

The departments and agencies, exclusive of the National Military Establishment, increased their industrial employment by 292, from the February figure of 20,285 to the March figure of 20,577.

The National Military Establishment increased its total industrial employment 7,128 from the February total of 530,846 to the March total of 537,974.

The Department of the Army increased its industrial employment 7,836 during the month of March, from the February total of 293,173 to the March total of 301,009. Of this total increase 3,931 was within continental United States and 3,905 was outside continental United States.

The Department of the Navy decreased its industrial employment 708 from the February figure of 237,673 to the March figure of 236,965.

The term "industrial employees" as used by the committee refers to unskilled, semiskilled, skilled, and supervisory employees paid by the Federal Government who are working on construction projects such as airfields and roads, and in shipyards and arsenals. It does not include maintenance and custodial employees.

TABLE I.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during March 1948, and comparison with February 1948*

Department or agency	February	March	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)			
Agriculture	68,427	69,917	+1,490
Commerce	35,482	36,575	+1,093
Interior	42,404	43,189	+785
Justice	25,754	26,030	+276
Labor	4,479	4,583	+104
Post Office	470,293	480,030	+9,737
State	7,496	7,665	+169
Treasury	87,216	88,968	+1,752
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT			
White House Office	220	223	+3
Bureau of the Budget	603	605	+2
Executive Mansion and Grounds	102	78	−24
National Security Council [1]	11	14	+3
National Security Resources Board	84	107	+23
Council of Economic Advisers	54	43	−11
Office of Government Reports	18	18	
EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES			
Office of Defense Transportation	41	44	+3
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Philippine Alien Property Administration	3	2	−1
War Assets Administration	28,839	25,259	−3,580
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	3	3	
Atomic Energy Commission	4,944	4,952	+8
Civil Aeronautics Board	569	576	+7
Civil Service Commission	4,007	4,092	+85
Export-Import Bank of Washington	112	113	+1
Federal Communications Commission	1,322	1,323	+1
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,148	1,129	−19
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	367	374	+7
Federal Power Commission	793	804	+11
Federal Security Agency	[2] 32,820	[3] 33,081	+261
Federal Trade Commission	559	558	−1
Federal Works Agency	22,226	22,163	−63
General Accounting Office	9,353	9,302	−51
Government Printing Office	7,398	7,312	−86
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,783	11,767	−16
Indian Claims Commission	11	11	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,257	2,265	+8
Maritime Commission	6,802	7,006	+204
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	6,249	6,235	−14
National Archives	335	345	+10
National Capital Housing Authority	284	292	+8
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	24	24	
National Gallery of Art	317	311	−6
National Labor Relations Board	1,130	1,365	+235
National Mediation Board	108	116	+8
Office of the Housing Expeditor	4,608	4,482	−126
Office of Selective Service Records	665	690	+25
Panama Canal	542	536	−6
Philippine War Damage Commission	9	7	−2
Railroad Retirement Board	2,769	2,759	−10
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	5,857	5,745	−112
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,123	1,122	−1
Smithsonian Institution	512	505	−7
Tariff Commission	223	219	−4
Tax Court of the United States	125	125	
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,111	14,326	+215
Veterans' Administration	205,026	201,032	−3,994
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	1,122,017	1,130,417	+16,534 −8,134
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			+8,400
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Office of Secretary of Defense	675	751	+76
Department of the Army	255,798	259,601	+3,803
Department of the Air Force	113,680	115,331	+1,651
Department of the Navy	296,030	295,889	−141
Total, including National Military Establishment	[4] 1,788,200	1,801,989	+22,064 −8,275
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			+13,789

[1] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.

[2] This figure has been adjusted to include 1,226 employees of Howard University and 99 employees of Columbia Institution for the Deaf, who have not been included in this report previously. Decision on their actual status is still pending.

[3] Includes 1,175 employees of Howard University and 97 employees of Columbia Institution for the Deaf.

[4] The total for February has been adjusted to include the employees referred to in footnote 2.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during March 1948, and comparison with February 1948*

Department or agency	February	March	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)			
Agriculture	1,717	1,724	+7
Commerce	2,712	2,714	+2
Interior	4,810	4,711	−99
Justice	421	423	+2
Labor	77	79	+2
Post Office	1,575	1,582	+7
State	13,974	13,703	−271
Treasury	623	637	+14
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Philippine Alien Property Administration	168	163	−5
War Assets Administration	446	441	−5

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during March 1948, and comparison with February 1948*—Continued

Department or agency	February	March	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	100	115	+15
Atomic Energy Commission	3	3	
Civil Aeronautics Board	19	19	
Civil Service Commission	5	5	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	2	2	
Federal Communications Commission	37	36	−1
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	3	3	
Federal Security Agency	1,399	1,337	−62
Federal Works Agency	351	357	+6
Housing and Home Finance Agency	42	40	−2
Maritime Commission	146	98	−48
National Labor Relations Board	5	6	+1
Office of the Housing Expediter	27	27	
Office of Selective Service Records	15	16	+1
Panama Canal	24,190	23,976	−214
Philippine War Damage Commission	562	685	+123
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	26	20	−6
Smithsonian Institution	6	6	
Veterans' Administration	1,600	1,571	−29
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	55,061	54,499	−742, +180
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment			−562
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Department of the Army	126,406	130,355	+3,949
Department of the Navy	44,101	44,018	−83
Total, including National Military Establishment	225,568	228,872	+4,129, −825
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			+3,304

TABLE III.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1948, and comparison with February 1948*

Department or agency	February	March	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)			
Agriculture	70,144	71,641	+1,497
Commerce	38,194	39,289	+1,095
Interior	47,214	47,900	+686
Justice	26,175	26,453	+278
Labor	4,556	4,662	+106
Post office	471,868	481,612	+9,744
State	21,470	21,368	−102
Treasury	87,839	89,605	+1,766
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT			
White House Office	220	223	+3
Bureau of the Budget	603	605	+2
Executive Mansion and Grounds	102	78	−24
National Security Council [1]	11	14	+3
National Security Resources Board	84	107	+23
Council of Economic Advisers	54	43	−11
Office of Government Reports	18	18	

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE III.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1948, and comparison with February 1948*—Continued

Department or agency	February	March	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES			
Office of Defense Transportation	41	44	+3
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Philippine Alien Property Administration	171	165	−6
War Assets Administration	29,285	25,700	−3,585
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	103	118	+15
Atomic Energy Commission	4,947	4,955	+8
Civil Aeronautics Board	588	595	+7
Civil Service Commission	4,012	4,097	+85
Export-Import Bank of Washington	114	115	+1
Federal Communications Commission	1,359	1,359	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,151	1,132	−19
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	367	374	+7
Federal Power Commission	793	804	+11
Federal Security Agency	[3] 34,219	[3] 34,418	+199
Federal Trade Commission	559	558	−1
Federal Works Agency	22,577	22,520	−57
General Accounting Office	9,353	9,302	−51
Government Printing Office	7,398	7,312	−86
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,825	11,807	−18
Indian Claims Commission	11	11	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,257	2,265	+8
Maritime Commission	6,948	7,104	+156
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	6,249	6,235	−14
National Archives	335	345	+10
National Capital Housing Authority	284	292	+8
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	24	24	
National Gallery of Art	317	311	−6
National Labor Relations Board	1,135	1,371	+236
National Mediation Board	108	116	+8
Office of the Housing Expediter	4,635	4,509	−126
Office of Selective Service Records	680	706	+26
Panama Canal	24,732	24,512	−220
Philippine War Damage Commission	571	692	+121
Railroad Retirement Board	2,769	2,759	−10
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	5,883	5,765	−118
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,123	1,122	−1
Smithsonian Institution	518	511	−7
Tariff Commission	223	219	−4
Tax Court of the United States	125	125	
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,111	14,326	+215
Veterans' Administration	206,626	202,603	−4,023
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	[4] 1,177,078	1,184,916	+16,327, −8,489
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			+7,838
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Office of Secretary of Defense	675	751	+76
Department of the Army: Inside continental United States	255,798	259,601	+3,803
Outside continental United States	126,406	130,355	+3,949

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE III.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1948, and comparison with February 1948*—Continued

Department or agency	February	March	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT—con.			
Department of the Air Force	113,680	115,331	+1,651
Department of the Navy	340,131	339,907	−224
Total, including National Military Establishment	2,013,768	2,030,861	+25,806, −8,713
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			+17,093

[1] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.

[2] This figure has been adjusted to include 1,226 employees of Howard University and 99 employees of Columbia Institution for the Deaf, who have not been included in this report previously. Decision on their actual status is still pending.

[3] Includes 1,175 employees of Howard University and 97 employees of Columbia Institution for the Deaf.

[4] The total for February has been adjusted to include the employees referred to in footnote (2).

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during March 1948, and comparison with February 1948*

Department or agency	February	March	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)			
Commerce	1,165	1,372	+207
Interior	5,260	5,189	−71
State	367	366	−1
Treasury	3,671	3,652	−19
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
Atomic Energy Commission	268	239	−29
Housing and Home Finance Agency	2	2	
Panama Canal	2,148	2,134	−14
Tennessee Valley Authority	7,404	7,623	+219
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	20,285	20,577	+426, −134
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			+292
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Department of the Army: Inside continental United States	198,008	201,939	+3,931
Outside continental United States	95,165	99,070	+3,905
Department of the Navy	237,673	236,965	−708
Total, including National Military Establishment	551,131	558,551	+8,262, −842
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			+7,420

NOTE.—On special Military Establishment compilation, table V in the monthly personnel report for January-February 1948, the reference to the Unification Act establishing the National Military Establishment and divorcing the Air Forces from the Department of the Army should read "Public Law 253 (80th Cong.), September 1947," instead of "September 1946."

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD, CHAIRMAN, JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES, IN CONNECTION WITH FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT DURING THE MONTH OF MARCH AND THE FIRST QUARTER OF 1948

Civilian employment in the Federal Government increased at the rate of more than 500 employees per day during the month of March. The net increase for the month was 17,093, bringing the total to 2,030,861, according to reports submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures by the various agencies of the Government.

Of the March increase, civilian agencies exclusive of the National Military Establishment accounted for an additional 7,838 employees, and civilian employment in the National Military Establishment rose 9,255. Total civilian employment in the Military Establishment was 845,945 for the month, and in the civilian agencies it reached 1,184,916.

Major increases during the month were reported as follows: Agriculture, 1,497, Commerce, 1,095; Post Office, 9,744; Treasury, 1,766; Department of the Army (inside U. S.) 3,803 and (outside U. S.) 3,949; Department of Air Force, 1,651.

Principal decreases during the month were reported as follows: War Assets Administration, 3,585, and Veterans' Administration, 4,023.

FIRST QUARTER 1948

March was the third consecutive month in which civilian employment increased, the net increase for the first quarter of the calendar year 1948 totaling 35,365.

More than half of this increase since January 1 has occurred in civilian agencies, exclusive of the National Military Establishment. Civilian employment increases in civilian agencies during the quarter totaled 18,653, and agencies of the National Military Establishment increased their civilian pay rolls by 16,712 employees.

Among the civilian agencies, larger increases were reported during the 3-month period by Post Office Department, Treasury Department, Commerce Department, Interior Department, Justice Department, and State Department, whereas major decreases were recorded by the War Assets Administration and the Veterans' Administration.

There was a net civilian employment increase during the quarter for all of the agencies of the National Military Establishment, although the Navy Department reported a slight decrease in March.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BALL:

S. 2608. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the reconstruction and repair of roads and other public facilities in the States of North Dakota and Minnesota which were destroyed or damaged by recent floods; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 2609. A bill to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 2610. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of an experiment station in the State of Utah for research on the production, refining, transportation, and use of petroleum and natural gas from coal; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 2611. A bill to amend section 5 (a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 2612. A bill for the relief of Bram B. Tellekamp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. WHITE (by request) introduced Senate bill 2613, to authorize the construction and equipment of a radio laboratory building for the National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. IVES introduced Senate bill 2614, to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to eliminate the necessity of holding an election as a condition to the making of an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 2615. A bill to incorporate the Retired Officers Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 2616. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the dedication of the Palomar Mountain Observatory; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 2617. A bill to include certain lands in the Carson National Forest, N. Mex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RADIO LABORATORY BUILDING FOR NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, at the request of the Secretary of Commerce, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize construction and equipment of a radio laboratory building for the National Bureau of Standards, and I request that a letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Foster, explaining the purpose of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2613) to authorize the construction and equipment of a radio laboratory building for the National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce, introduced by Mr. WHITE (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, April 8, 1948.

The Honorable the PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I recommend to Congress for its consideration the attached draft of a proposed bill "to authorize construction and equipment of a radio laboratory building for the National Bureau of Standards."

The purpose of this bill is to give to the National Bureau of Standards the necessary authority to construct a new building to house the Central Radio Propagation Laboratory.

There are two principal reasons why this building is urgently needed:

(1) It would enable the Bureau to centralize the activities of the Central Radio Propagation Laboratory, which are now scattered in four buildings on the Bureau grounds, and, in addition, there are certain activities in three locations in Virginia and Maryland which should be performed in the central laboratory.

(2) It would relieve congestion in existing buildings on the Bureau grounds and enable the Bureau to transfer other activities to the space released by the radio laboratory and thus permit the removal of 10 temporary buildings, some of which were constructed to meet wartime needs, buildings which are entirely inadequate for the operations now being conducted in them. For example, there are a dwelling, a stable, quonset huts, and several sheds which are now being used for laboratory and office purposes.

Since 1941 the appropriation for research and testing work and for operation of the Bureau has increased threefold as is indicated by the following comparison between fiscal years 1941 and 1948:

1941	$2,157,000
1948	7,865,000

During this period additional laboratory or office space has not been provided consistent with increased appropriations to the Bureau. The greater share of this increase in appropriations has been for the radio-propagation research work, and it is considered urgent that adequate space be provided at this time for the purpose of housing this activity.

In addition to the activities carried on by direct appropriations, the Bureau also has had extremely large increases in funds transferred or advanced to it by other Government agencies during the period from 1941 to date, as will be noted by the following comparison:

1941	$1,153,000
1948	9,411,000

A large portion of this work for other agencies has been that carried on for the Office of the Chief of Ordnance of the War Department for which the War Department provided a building on the Bureau grounds. This building cannot be used to relieve other congested buildings of the Bureau, however, since the space is fully utilized, the work performed therein is of a secret nature, and the area is barred to persons not cleared for security reasons.

Further evidence of the need for additional space by the Bureau is indicated by the increase in personnel which has occurred since 1941. This increase is indicated by the following comparison:

Year:	*Number personnel*
1941	1,204
1947	2,495
1948	2,517

The Central Radio Propagation Laboratory, alone, is planning to employ 100 additional employees in the fiscal year 1949.

The purpose of the Central Radio Propagation Laboratory is to provide for (1) the essential experimental and theoretical work on radio standards and measurements and radio propagation, and (2) the radio research and information service to the public and to the Government. Prominent among the information services rendered by the laboratory are the periodic forecasts of conditions which affect radio transmission and reception. Through its research the laboratory is able to determine the effect of different atmospheric conditions on radio reception and transmission and on frequency requirements, throughout the United States. This information is of particular value to American aviation since adequate radio reception and transmission is an important factor in the safe operation of the air lines. It is also of vital importance to the Armed Forces and in the development of defense weapons. Since these functions are all interrelated and require common facilities and equipment for maximum efficiency, the centralization of all the Radio Propagation Laboratory functions

in one building would result in greater efficiency and a saving in operation costs.

The present Radio Building was constructed in 1918 and provided space only for a small group working on radio propagation, the development of standards for a single quantity, i. e., frequency, a limited amount of testing and calibrations which was hampered for lack of standards, and some research work which grew into the Ordnance Development Division of the Bureau. A third floor, added in 1944, provided a 50-percent increase in space which was at once completely occupied by microwave standards work. At present other radio work is widely dispersed in various buildings on the Bureau grounds, occupying space which should be available for other purposes. The remainder of the activities of the laboratory which should be centralized in one building at the Bureau are carried on at Sterling, Va., Hybla Valley, Va., and Beltsville, Md., in buildings of various sizes and descriptions, all of which are needed for regular field station work. In addition to the lack of adequate space, there are the very serious problems of transporting departmental employees to these outlying stations and of properly administering their activity when it is so widely dispersed.

The proposed new building would have a total of 1,700,000 cubic feet distributed as follows: 629,000 for measurement standards research, development, and testing work, with special facilities such as screened rooms, development shops, space on the roof for measurements free from wall reflections, and full development laboratory facilities; 280,000 for all the radio propagation data coordination, centralization, analysis, predictions, publication, and information services; 280,000 for basic research and analysis of propagation phenomena at all frequencies, including work on utilization of frequencies and special frequency allocation studies; 435,000 for experimental propagation research and development, carrying on the work that has been done by other agencies during the war and which made the United States a leader in the field, and 76,000 for administrative activities.

This laboratory building will require a number of special features which will materially increase the cost of the structure over the average office building of this size. It will be necessary to shield electrostatically approximately one-third of the area of the building above the ground in order to protect the low power measurements from the large fields created by some of the other activities in the building and elsewhere on the Bureau grounds. These rooms would require local temperature and humidity controls in addition to the general air conditioning of the entire building.

Many of the rooms will require the standard frequencies which will be available in the building. This means an elaborate set of coaxial and wave guide fittings leading throughout the building. Since much of this work is experimental and the fixture requirements will vary from one project to the next, large under-floor conduits must be provided to give required flexibility.

Another special feature of the building is the necessity for a copper roof. Since an antenna transmits not only the direct waves but also a mirror image of this direct wave reflected from the ground beneath, this ground must be of highly conductive material. It will be necessary to cover the copper roof with a protective tile wearing surface because there will be considerable laboratory activity on the roof. This places additional weight on the roof, requiring that the total structure be strengthened all the way to the basement. Because much heavy equipment will be carried to the roof, it will be necessary for the freight elevator to extend an extra floor.

In the subbasement vaults will be installed with special air-conditioning and temperature-control equipment to house the crystal clocks which are the basis of the national primary standards of frequency.

On the basis of the present level of construction cost, it is estimated that the radio laboratory building will cost $4,475,000, of which $4,115,000 is the cost of construction and installation of utilities and $360,000 is the cost of equipment. In view of anticipated fluctuations in construction costs, it is difficult to know exactly what the actual cost at the time of construction will be. A limit of cost determined by the prevailing price might prove excessive or inadequate when the construction contract is finally negotiated.

To give required flexibility to the limit of cost, it is proposed that an escalator proviso be inserted in section 1 of the bill. It would authorize the adjustment of the stated limit of cost of $4,475,000 on the basis of price levels prevailing at the date of award of the construction contract. The Federal Works Administrator would be designated to determine the necessary adjustment and make the required decrease or increase in the stated limit. Since the Public Buildings Administration of the Federal Works Agency is the organization which will be charged with constructing the laboratory, it would seem proper to place this determination with the head of that Agency. The effect of such a clause would be to furnish the Department of Commerce with authority to request an appropriation for the construction of the building which would represent the exact cost of its construction at the time of award of the major construction contract, and, therefore, such a request would not be subject to a point of order if the amount needed is in excess of $4,475,000 by an amount proportionate to the determined increase in price levels.

Section 2 of this proposed bill would authorize the transfer of all funds appropriated for the construction of the radio laboratory building, except such part thereof as may be necessary for the incidental expenses of the Department of Commerce, to the Public Buildings Administration, the Government agency charged with supervision of building construction for the Federal Government.

I am informed by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of the proposed bill to the Congress for its consideration.

If we can provide you with any further information on this matter or otherwise assist you in consideration of this recommendation, do not hesitate to call upon us.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM C. FOSTER,
Acting Secretary of Commerce.

UNION SHOP AUTHORIZATION ELECTIONS

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the Joint Congressional Committee on Labor-Management Relations has scheduled public hearings, beginning May 24, on proposed specific amendments to the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, and on problems which have arisen under it.

The committee has invited testimony directed toward several specific points, to one of which I shall now direct my remarks, and that is the requirement in the act for a separate authorization election before a union shop contract may be negotiated.

As I said on the floor of the Senate when addressing myself to the discussion of the overriding of the President's veto of H. R. 3020, which subsequently became the Labor-Management Act of 1947, I was not entirely satisfied with the legislation in its final form.

I would point out, however, that in all probability it was as near perfection, insofar as legislation of this nature is concerned, as we could hope to reach at that particular time. It probably reflected as completely as was then possible the composite thinking of the Congress of the United States.

I point out further that the Joint Congressional Committee on Labor-Management Relations has been assigned two very definite areas of responsibility. First, it must see that there is no sabotage in the administration of the law. That is one task which, above all others, it must assume—to see that the administration is as we intended it to be, that there is fairness and justness under the law, and that the new law is interpreted according to our intentions.

The second main function of the joint committee is the job of ascertaining those parts of the law which may not be perfect, which may not work satisfactorily. There may be a few provisions which may not work as intended and, therefore, one task of the Committee is to prepare appropriate amendments and to see that such amendments are offered and properly supported at this session of the Congress.

During the short time the act has been in effect, at least one provision has not worked as was intended. There has been forcibly brought to my attention one acute situation which necessitates correction, a problem which has caused and is causing great administrative difficulty and which in some instances is impossible of equitable effectuation.

The National Labor Relations Board is now flooded with petitions for authorization elections, the handling of which prevents effective administration of other far more important provisions of the new law. Further, almost without exception, elections held so far have been won by large majorities favoring the negotiation of union shop contracts. In some industries, particularly construction, where employment is intermittent and labor to a degree migratory, serious administrative problems have arisen which in effect will prescribe the rights of the employees themselves to determine whether or not they desire their representatives to negotiate union shop contracts on their behalf.

The Board and the office of the General Counsel are to be commended upon the job they are doing in this particular instance in the face of the overwhelming impact of heavy case loads.

The purpose of the provision for authorization elections, as written into the law, was to protect the workers themselves—that they might not be forced under union-shop contracts against their wishes.

The evidence has shown that, in a great number of cases where employees are represented by a union of their own choosing, they wish the union through its representatives to bargain collectively for a union-shop provision in their contract with the employer.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD the most recent figures available with respect to this problem.

There being no objection, the figures were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NLRB union-shop elections, Aug. 22–Mar. 31, 1948

Total number of petitions filed[1 2]	12,660
Total number of elections held[3]	5,968
Number authorized	5,874
Number not authorized	93
Number indeterminate	1
Number of employees eligible to vote	685,838
Number of valid votes cast	611,876
Number voting for authorization	577,465
Number voting against authorization	34,411
Percent of cases authorized	98
Percent of eligible employees voting	89
Percent of valid votes cast in the affirmative	94
Percent of eligible employees voting in the affirmative	84

[1] As of Apr. 30, this figure is approximately 17,900.

[2] Or 70 percent of all types of cases filed.

[3] As of Apr. 30, this figure is approximately 9,500.

Mr. IVES. The legislation I am introducing today would amend the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 by merely striking out those provisions of the act which require the authorization election and which establish the procedure under which authorization elections may be held.

My proposed amendment in no way changes the complete abolition of the closed shop. It does not detract from those protections against abuses of the union shop. The union must still accept new employees to membership and not expel them for anything other than nonpayment of dues. It must have filed non-Communist affidavits and financial statements.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce the bill in question, and request that it be appropriately referred. Inasmuch as the bill is relatively short, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in full in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2614) to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to eliminate the necessity of holding an election as a condition to the making of an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment, introduced by Mr. IVES, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 8 (a) (3) (ii) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "(ii) unless, following an election held as provided in section 9 (e) (2) within 1 year preceding the effective date of such agreement, the Board shall have certified that at least a majority of the employees eligible to vote in such election have voted to rescind the authority of such labor organization to make such an agreement, and if the Board shall have certified that such labor organization has complied with all the requirements imposed by sections 9 (f), (g), and (h) as conditions precedent to the Board's processing of a petition or a charge:".

SEC. 2. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 9 (e) of such act is hereby repealed.

(b) Paragraph (2) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Upon the filing with the Board, by 30 percent or more of the employees in a bargaining unit covered by an agreement between their employer and a labor organization made pursuant to section 8 (a) (3), of a petition alleging they desire to rescind the authority of such labor organization to make an agreement with the employer of such employees requiring membership in such labor organization as a condition of employment in such unit, the Board shall take a secret ballot of the employees in such unit and shall certify the results thereof to such labor organization and to the employer."

SEC. 3. Subsections (f), (g), and (h) of section 9 of such act are amended by striking out the words "no petition under section 9 (e) (1) shall be entertained," where they appear in each of such subsections.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORTS ON UMPQUA HARBOR AND RIVER, OREG. (S. DOC. NO. 154)

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for reference to the Committee on Public Works, and to have printed as a Senate document, a letter received by the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, transmitting a report of the Chief of Engineers, with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on the Umpqua Harbor and River, Oreg., with a view to providing further improvement of Winchester Bay, Oreg. This investigation was requested by a resolution of the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted September 28, 1945.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles, and referred or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 633. An act for the relief of Mrs. Myrtle Hovde;

H. R. 810. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of John E. Parker, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States;

H. R. 929. An act for the relief of Ernest L. Godfrey;

H. R. 1642. An act for the relief of Miss Rosella M. Kostenbader;

H. R. 2246. An act for the relief of Carl E. Lawson and Firemen's Fund Indemnity Co.;

H. R. 2325. An act for the relief of Mamie L. Hurley;

H. R. 2634. An act for the relief of the Tampa Chapter, No. 113, United Daughters of the Confederacy;

H. R. 2688. An act for the relief of Eva C. Netzley Ridley, William G. Stuff, Lois Stuff, and Harry E. Ridley; and the estates of Clyde C. Netzley and Sarah C. Stuff;

H. R. 2898. An act for the relief of Doris Marie Richard;

H. R. 3500. An act for the relief of Lester L. Elder and Mrs. Esther E. Elder;

H. R. 5449. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lucille Davidson;

H. R. 5517. An act for the relief of Edward Woolf;

H. R. 6184. An act for the relief of the East Coast Ship & Yacht Corp., of Noank, Conn.; and

H. R. 6251. An act for the relief of Hans Kraney and Clare Felten Kraney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4954. An act to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance, under Federal reclamation laws, of the Kennewick division of the Yakima project, Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. J. Res. 334. Joint resolution giving the consent of Congress to the compact on regional education entered into between the Southern States at Tallahassee, Fla., on February 8, 1948; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR FERGUSON AT A MEETING OF MICHIGAN COMMERCIAL SECRETARIES

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from remarks made by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] before a meeting of the Michigan Commercial Secretaries in Washington, D. C., on April 26, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED REVISION OF UNITED NATIONS CHARTER — ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the necessity for revision of the United Nations Charter, delivered by him in New York on May 4, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

SCOUT EDUCATION FOR CITIZENSHIP—ADDRESS BY JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Scout Education for Citizenship," delivered by the Honorable James A. Farley at the recognition and foundation dinner, Huroquois Area Council, Boy Scouts of America, Wheeling, W. Va., on April 27, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISPLACED PERSONS — EDITORIAL AND ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial and an article dealing with the subject of displaced persons, published in the New York Times of May 3, 1948, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE CIVIL-RIGHTS PROGRAM — EDITORIAL FROM COLLIER'S MAGAZINE

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Need Something Stronger Than Law," published in the April 24, 1948, issue of Collier's magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

A POLICY FOR SURVIVAL—STATEMENT BY THE EMERGENCY COMMITTEE OF ATOMIC SCIENTISTS OF PRINCETON

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "A Policy for Survival," by the Emergency Committee of Atomic Scientists of Princeton, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF PAUL P. RAO TO BE JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, May 12, 1948, at 10 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee Room, Room 424, Senate Office Building, upon

the nomination of Mr. Paul P. Rao, of New York, to be Judge of the United States Customs Court, vice Hon. David H. Kincheloe, resigned April 30, 1948. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], chairman, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

STATEMENT OF WORLD PEACE AND BROTHERHOOD MISSION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have a brief statement issued by the World Peace and Brotherhood Mission which is headed by Paul B. Studebaker, 105 Sierra Drive, Modesto, Calif. They have representatives in 14 States and I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the outline of the two courses of action they propose.

STATEMENT OF THE WORLD PEACE AND BROTHERHOOD MISSION

Our mission includes 83 men and women, young and old, from city and rural areas of 14 States and from 12 Christian denominations and 8 other organizations. As Christians, representing more than 100,000 others, we bring to you our concern relative to the world situation.

We are a spiritual mission bearing witness to our deep Christian conviction that in this serious and difficult hour we must, as a Nation, confessing our sins, turn and walk in the ways of peace as taught by Jesus Christ, the Prince of Peace. The evidence of history confirms this conviction that there is no other way.

We propose two courses of action:

I. Reverse the movement toward war and the militarization of our country by the following means:

A. Cease war propaganda.

B. Restore true civilian control in the government.

C. Take the profits out of war.

D. Defeat such war-provoking measures as: universal military training, selective service, or any other form of conscription or compulsory military service.

E. Defeat the 70-group air force bill.

F. Discontinue building of atomic bombs and dismantle the present stock pile.

G. Defeat any bill to give military aid to European countries.

H. Disarm unilaterally.

II. Plan and implement a positive peace-building program, with willingness to spend as much for peace as we have for war:

A. Strengthen the United Nations by full and democratic participation:

1. Pass bill providing a $65,000,000 loan for erection of permanent UN buildings.

2. Join World Health Organization and International Relief Organization.

3. Increase financial and moral support of UN and its agencies.

4. Use UN for all agreements between nations.

5. Work to expand UN into full world government.

6. Work for international disarmament and abolition of conscription.

B. Create a Department of Peace, with full cabinet status, to work continuously in developing means of creating and maintaining peace in the world.

C. Solve our own internal problems—economic, social, cultural, educational, racial, and moral.

"Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. McGRATH asked and obtained leave to be absent from the Senate tomorrow on public business.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. LANGER asked and obtained consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary dealing with anti-monopoly legislation be permitted to sit during the remainder of the day.

Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained consent that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments be permitted to meet during the remainder of the session today.

ANNA PECHNIK

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1142) for the relief of Anna Pechnik, which was, on page 2, after line 5, to insert:

SEC. 3. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Poland for the year then current or the next following.

Mr. WILEY. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

ESTABLISHMENT OF ELIGIBILITY FOR BURIAL IN NATIONAL CEMETERIES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1620) to establish eligibility for burial in national cemeteries, and for other purposes, which was, on page 2, line 16, after "States.", to insert "As used in this section, the term 'widow' includes the widow of any member of the armed forces of the United States lost or buried at sea or officially determined to be permanently absent in a status of missing or missing in action."

Mr. GURNEY. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

PRINTING OF REPORT ENTITLED "THE ECONOMY OF HAWAII IN 1947"

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate, House Concurrent Resolution 151, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the letter of the Secretary of Labor, transmitted to the House and referred to the Committee on Public Lands on February 4, 1948, together with the report on The Economy of Hawaii in 1947, with special reference to wages, working conditions, and industrial relations, which was prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics pursuant to the Organic Act of the Territory of Hawaii in 1900, as amended April 8, 1904, be printed as a document, and that 2,000 additional copies be printed, of which 1,500 shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and 500 copies shall be for the use of the Senate.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF SURPLUS PROPERTY ACT OF 1944

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2277) to amend section 13 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, to provide for the disposition of surplus real property to States, political subdivisions, and municipalities for use as public parks, recreational areas, and historic-monument sites, and for other purposes, which were, on page 1, line 3, to strike out "55" and insert "58"; on page 1, line 4, to strike out "756" and insert "770"; on page 2, line 3, after "land," to insert "not to exceed 500 acres,"; on page 2, line 5, after "desirable" to insert "for use in connection with any of its governmental functions or"; on page 2, line 11, after "for" to insert "use in connection with a governmental function or for"; on page 2, line 19, after "consideration" to insert "*Provided*, That, in determining the status of property as historic-monument character, due consideration shall be given to the period of time during which the United States has enjoyed continuous ownership"; and to amend the title so as to read "An act to amend section 13 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, to provide for the disposition of surplus real property to States, political subdivisions, and municipalities for use in connection with any of their governmental functons, and for use as public parks, recreational areas, and historic-monument sites, and for other purposes."

Mr. GURNEY. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House; ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. BYRD conferees on the part of the Senate.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, several Senators have asked what would be the order of business at the conclusion of consideration of the pending bill, the National Science Foundation bill.

It is our intention, if it meets with the approval of the Senate, to proceed to the consideration of the bill to provide for the temporary extension of title VI of the National Housing Act, which was not concluded last Friday, provided there is time to debate that bill this afternoon.

It will be recalled that a unanimous-consent order has been made under which Senate Joint Resolution 191, dealing with a compact on education among Southern States, was to be the order of business on Thursday. That arrangement was contingent upon whether or not the supplemental national defense appropriation bill, which is the airplane procurement bill, would be ready. That

bill is ready. I have consulted the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. The compact will be displaced tomorrow, and the national defense appropriation bill will come before the Senate for consideration. I hope that both the National Science Foundation bill and the bill providing for a temporary extension of title VI of the National Housing Act may be successfully concluded today, so that we may proceed with the supplemental national defense appropriation bill tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Am I to understand that Senate Joint Resolution 191 will not come up for consideration tomorrow?

Mr. WHERRY. It has already been made the special order for tomorrow, unless some other disposition is made. At the present time the unanimous-consent order stands. Under that order the idea was that if the supplemental national defense appropriation bill was ready it would temporarily displace Senate Joint Resolution 191; so that will be the order of business tomorrow.

WATER-WELL-PIPE SHORTAGE IN NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, during the little more than 3 years I have been in the Senate I have spent more time and met with less success attempting to get water pipe for the farmers of North Dakota than in anything else I have attempted. I believe that at long last I have found a partial answer.

In normal times scrap-iron dealers deal in scrap iron alone; but as a result of the shortage of steel they have gone into the manufacture of steel products in many cases. Almost universally they demand in trade from steel industries, for the sale of scrap iron, a return of water pipe and steel pipe of all kinds. I have learned on good authority that they are selling such water pipe for three or four times its normal retail price. I read a letter from the president of the North Dakota Well Drillers' Association:

THE NORTH DAKOTA WELL
DRILLERS' ASSOCIATION,
Oakes, N. Dak., May 1, 1948.

United States Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: At our annual convention held at Jamestown, N. Dak., the members voted the following resolution.

"Be it resolved, That the secretary contact the United States Senators and Representatives of North Dakota in regard to alleviating the critical water-well-pipe shortage in North Dakota."

The situation was not benefited very much by the War Assets Administration's allocation of pipe last fall, as very little pipe was received.

Also, the situation is further aggravated by seeing pipe advertised at three and four times the market price. There must be some laws governing black- or gray-market operations.

Water-well pipe has been very short, here in North Dakota, for the last 6 years. There must be something you can do so that we can continue operating. North Dakota is strictly a food-producing State and water is essential for livestock production.

Anything you can do to alleviate the situation will be greatly appreciated.

Yours truly,

FRED V. SLETVOLD,
Secretary.

This problem is common all over the Midwest. It affects both farmers, the builders of homes, and many other industries. The situation is further aggravated by pipe being advertised at three or four times the established retail price. There must be some law governing black-market and gray-market operations.

Two weeks ago, in talking with one of the largest manufacturers of combines and other farm machinery, I was told that he not only had to turn over the scrap iron which they collected to scrap-iron dealers in order to get pipe which was necessary to build combines, but also that combine manufacturers had to pay black-market prices to get this vitally needed material.

I hope the Congress will not adjourn without initiating a thoroughgoing investigation of one of the dirtiest, cheapest rackets in America.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2385) to promote the progress of science to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare to secure the national defense, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, on Monday last I outlined the main provisions of Senate bill 2385, the pending bill, which is briefly stated, a bill to establish a National Science Foundation. I also pointed out in my remarks on Monday wherein the bill differs from Senate bill 526, which was passed last year, and vetoed by the President.

I stated in my remarks on Monday that it was my understanding that the arrangements arrived at in preparing the pending measure were satisfactory to the President and his advisers, and that I felt that all the main points which had been raised in the President's veto message of last year had been covered.

Since that time—indeed, only this morning—I received a letter dated May 5, signed by James E. Webb, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, which letter raises certain questions with respect to the pending bill. After talking with Mr. Webb I advised him that I would insert his letter in the RECORD in full, and then comment on it, giving my interpretation of the points raised by his letter, and explaining the intent of the proposed legislation with respect thereto. The letter reads as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE
PRESIDENT, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., May 5, 1948.

Hon. ALEXANDER SMITH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR SMITH: The discussion of National Science Foundation legislation in the Senate on May 3 has been called to my attention. In particular, I have noted your remarks that the bill, S. 2385, meets the objections raised by the President in his veto of S. 526 last year.

S. 2385 in its present form has not, to my knowledge, been referred to any agency of the executive branch for comment.

I may say, at this point, that I am not aware of any procedure or practice of referring to the Executive branch of the Government bills reported by a legislative committee, although in this instance the provisions of this bill, were very fully discussed with members of the executive branch.

The letter continues as follows:

The Bureau of the Budget memorandum commenting on S. 2385 in its original form made certain suggestions for clarifying the role of the Director, the Executive Committee, and the 24-man Foundation.

It appears that the bill as presently drawn, vests complete authority to make grants and contracts in the 24-man foundation. By including specific reference to functions of the director in sections 7, 9, and 12 and striking out the reference to the director's authority with respect to grants in section 5 (b), it could easily be inferred that it was the intent of the Congress that the director should have no responsibility with respect to grants and contracts. As you know, in all of our discussions concerning the organization of the foundation, the awarding of contracts had been vested in the director with the concurrence of the Executive Committee. In this way, both the interest of the scientists and the interest of the Government were adequately safeguarded. Without the safeguarding of both of these interests the bill is subject to one of the major criticisms advanced by the President in disapproving S. 526. This was a key point in previous drafts of the bill to which Dr. Shapley and Dr. Bush fully agreed.

It is my impression from reading the report of the Senate committee, that the above resulted from an oversight in revising the original bill. In order to remove any doubt as to the role of the director in the making of grants and contracts, I recommend, strongly, that the following language be included as a new section 5 (b) in the revised bill:

"The director shall carry out the policies established by the foundation and is authorized to exercise the authorities vested in the foundation in section 10 of this act: *Provided,* That he shall exercise the authority granted in paragraph (c) of section 10 only with the approval of the foundation."

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. WEBB,
Director.

Mr. President, upon receiving this letter, I called up Mr. Webb's office and discussed the matter with his advisers. The point they made was that they feared, that in view of certain other provisions in the bill, it might be implied that the Director did not have any authority in negotiating the Foundation's contracts for research work. My reply was that there was no intention to remove the Director from his logical place in the handling of contracts. We had this matter up before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, at a full meeting of the committee. The committee discussed pro and con whether or not a provision similar to the one the Director of the Bureau of the Budget proposes in the letter I have just read should be included in the bill. In the light of the fact that we had redefined the provisions dealing with the appointment of the Director and what his powers are to be, the committee felt that the matter was adequately covered by the language of the bill as it now stands.

To clarify my point, I wish to read section 5, which provides for the Director, as that section stands in the bill as reported by the committee. Section 5 as reported by the committee reads as follows:

DIRECTOR OF FOUNDATION

SEC. 5. There shall be a Director of the Foundation who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, after the members of the Foundation have been appointed and qualified. He shall serve as an ex officio member of the Foundation. In addition thereto he shall be the chief executive officer of the Foundation. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum and shall serve for a term of 6 years unless sooner removed by the President.

It was the feeling of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare that the appointment of the Director as the chief executive officer of the Foundation would make his duties correspond with those of the president of a corporation. Obviously he would be the one who, under the authority of the Foundation, would negotiate the contracts which the Foundation is authorized to complete. The provisions of section 10, which set forth the authority of the Foundation, would obviously be read with that concept in mind. At least that is the conclusion of the committee. That is why the committee felt that it would lead to ambiguity and misunderstanding to put in a special paragraph, such as that Mr. Webb suggests, which paragraph would indicate that in certain areas the Director would have to have the approval of the Foundation and that in other areas he would not.

It is our belief that the Director would, of course, act in the way that the president of a corporation acts, and that he would be the moving figure in the negotiation of contracts into which he would be authorized by the Foundation to enter. It seems to us that the bill as it now stands is better than it would be if amended in the manner suggested by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The only reason I ask the Senator to yield is because of some remarks I made the other day and a colloquy I had with him. In that colloquy I was given to understand that the objections raised in the President's veto message were taken care of by the new bill.

Following that debate I, too, received a memorandum from Mr. Webb, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. He sent it to me after he read the remarks I made during that debate in the Senate. His memorandum gives me practically the same information as that which the Senator from New Jersey has just disclosed to the Senate.

In view of the fact that section 5 states definitely that the Director of the Foundation, who is to be appointed by the President, shall be the chief executive officer of the Foundation, and in view of the further fact that under that language he would have the power to carry out the policies established by the Foundation and would be authorized to exercise the authority vested in the Foundation by section 10 of the act, it seems to me there can be no question about the matter, and that if we were to write into the bill the provision suggested by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, it would be merely surplusage.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, that is my feeling; I think the Senator from Illinois has made a correct interpretation. The chief executive officer of the Foundation is the one who will act for the Foundation, under its general policies.

Mr. LUCAS. And under section 10, the Director can exercise that authority only with the approval of the Foundation.

Mr. SMITH. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. That is the way I interpret the provisions of the bill.

Let me say that I am satisfied, from this brief explanation of legislative intent that now is being made on the floor of the Senate that the executive branch of the Government will have no objection to the bill as it is now written.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, with that explanation and the remarks which I made on Monday in outlining this bill and describing the differences between this bill and S. 526, to which objection was made last year in the veto message of the President, and inasmuch as I have already pointed out the ways in which I believe that the President's objections have been reconciled by the pending bill, I am glad to submit the bill to the Senate for its action; and I suggest that it is now in order for the Senate to consider the committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ECTON in the Chair). The clerk will proceed to state the amendments of the committee.

The first committee amendment was, on page 4, in line 16, after the word "establish", to strike out "for such period of time as it may determine a special commission on cancer, on heart and intravascular diseases, on poliomyelitis and other degenerative diseases, and such other special commissions as the members of the Foundation may from time to time deem necessary for the purposes of this act" and insert "such special commissions as the Foundation may from time to time deem necessary for the purposes of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 2, to insert:

(e) The Foundation is authorized to appoint from among its members, an Executive Committee and from time to time to appoint from among its members or otherwise, such other committees as it deems necessary and to assign to such Executive Committee or other committees such powers and functions as it deems appropriate for the purposes of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, beginning in line 14, on page 6, to strike out:

Such report shall include in full the report of the Executive Committee to the Foundation provided for in section 5 (d).

CREATION AND POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby established an Executive Committee of the Foundation which shall consist of the Director ex officio as provided for in section 6 of this act, and nine other members elected by the members of the Foundation from among their number. The term of office of each member of the Executive Committee shall be 2 years except that (1) any member elected to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was elected shall be elected for the remainder of such term; and (2) the term of office of four of the members first elected after the date of enactment of this act shall be 1 year. Any person who has been a member of the Executive Committee for six consecutive years shall thereafter be ineligible for election during the 2-year period following the expiration of such sixth year. The Executive Committee shall implement the policies developed by the Foundation under this act. The membership of the Executive Committee shall so far as practicable be representative of diverse interests and shall be so chosen as to provide representation, so far as practicable, for all areas of the Nation.

(b) The Executive Committee shall meet at the call of its chairman or at such times as may be fixed by itself, but not less than six times each year.

(c) A majority of the voting members of the Executive Committee shall constitute a quorum.

(d) The Executive Committee shall render an annual report to the members of the Foundation, and such other reports as it may deem necessary, summarizing the activities of the Executive Committee, making such recommendation as it may deem appropriate, and setting forth the recommendations of the divisional committees and special commissions. Minority views and recommendations, if any, of members of the Executive Committee, the divisional committees, and special commissions shall be included in such reports.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, in line 7, after the word "after", to strike out "receiving recommendations from the Foundation. He shall serve as a nonvoting ex officio member of the Foundation and also as the nonvoting Chairman of the Executive Committee" and insert "the members of the Foundation have been appointed and qualified. He shall serve as an ex officio member of the Foundation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 16, to strike out:

(b) The Director shall, in accordance with such general directives as the Executive Committee shall from time to time prescribe, exercise the powers set forth in this act within the general policies developed by the Foundation: *Provided*, That he shall exercise the authority granted in paragraph (c) of section 11 only with the approval of the Executive Committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, in line 19, to strike out "Executive Committee" and insert "Foundation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, in lines 2 and 3, to strike out "Executive Committee" and insert "Foundation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in lines 5 and 6, to strike out "Executive Committee" and insert "Foundation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 11, to strike out "Executive Committee" and insert "Foundation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 19, to strike out "Executive Committee" and insert "Foundation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, in line 1, after the word "section", to strike out "14" and insert "13."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, in lines 8 and 9, to strike out "Executive Committee" and insert "Foundation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, in line 5, after the word "such", to strike out "general directives" and insert "policies"; and, after the word "the", to strike out "Executive Committee" and insert "Foundation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 12, after the word "such", to strike out "general directives" and insert "policies."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 13, to strike out "Executive Committee" and insert "Foundation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, in line 1, to strike out "Executive Committee" and insert "Foundation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 6, to strike out "Executive Committee" and insert "Foundation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 8, to strike out "Executive Committee" and insert "Foundation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 7, to strike out "11" and insert "10 (e)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 13, to strike out "Executive Committee" and insert "Foundation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 24, to strike out "11" and insert "10 (c)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 1, to strike out "13" and insert "12 (a)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to renumber the sections.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be none, the question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "National Science Foundation Act of 1948."

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

SEC. 2. There is hereby established in the executive branch of the Government an independent agency to be known as the National Science Foundation (hereinafter referred to as the "Foundation").

MEMBERSHIP OF FOUNDATION

SEC. 3. (a) The Foundation shall have 24 members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The persons nominated for appointment as members (1) shall be eminent in the fields of the basic sciences, medical science, engineering, education, or public affairs; (2) shall be selected solely on the basis of established records of distinguished service; and (3) shall be so selected as to provide representation of the views of scientific leaders in all areas of the Nation. The President is requested, in the making of nominations of persons for appointment as members, to give due consideration to any recommendations for nomination which may be submitted to him by the National Academy of Sciences, Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, the National Association of State Universities, Association of American Colleges, or by other scientific or educational organizations.

(b) The term of office of each member of the Foundation shall be 6 years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and (2) the terms of office of the members first taking office after the date of enactment of this act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, eight at the end of 2 years, eight at the end of 4 years, eight at the end of 6 years, after the date of enactment of this act. Any person who has been a member of the Foundation for 12 consecutive years shall thereafter be ineligible for appointment during the 2-year period following the expiration of such twelfth year.

(c) The President shall call the first meeting of the members of the Foundation, at which the first order of business shall be the election of a chairman and a vice chairman.

POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE FOUNDATION

SEC. 4. (a) The Foundation is authorized and directed—

(1) to develop and encourage the pursuit of a national policy for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences;

(2) to initiate and support basic scientific research in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences, by making contracts or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) for the conduct of such basic scientific research and to appraise the impact of research upon industrial development and upon the general welfare;

(3) after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to initiate and support scientific research in connection with matters relating to the national defense by making contracts or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) for the conduct of such scientific research;

(4) to grant scholarships and graduate fellowships in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences;

(5) to foster the interchange of scientific information among scientists in the United States and foreign countries;

(6) to correlate the Foundation's scientific research programs with those undertaken by individuals and by public and private research groups; and

(7) to establish such special commissions as the Foundation may from time to time deem necessary for the purposes of this act.

(b) In exercising the authority and discharging the functions referred to in subsection (a) of this section, it shall be the objective of the Foundation to achieve the results of scientific research in the most efficient manner possible and to strengthen basic research and education in the sciences, including independent research by individuals, throughout the United States, including its Territories and possessions, and to avoid undue concentration of such research and education.

(c) The members of the Foundation shall meet annually on the first Monday in December and at such other times as the Chairman may determine, but he shall also call a meeting whenever one-third of the members so request in writing. A majority of the members of the Foundation shall constitute a quorum. Each member shall be given notice, by registered mail mailed to his last-known address of record not less than 15 days prior to any meeting, of the call of such meeting.

(d) The first Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Foundation shall be elected by the Foundation to serve until the first Monday in December next succeeding the date of election at which time a Chairman and Vice Chairman shall be elected for a term of 2 years. Thereafter such election shall take place at the annual meeting occurring at the end of each such term. The Vice Chairman shall perform the duties of the Chairman in his absence. In case a vacancy occurs in the chairmanship or vice chairmanship, the Foundation shall elect a member to fill such vacancy.

(e) The Foundation is authorized to appoint from among its members, an executive committee and from time to time to appoint from among its members or otherwise, such other committees as it deems necessary and to assign to such executive committee or other committees such powers and functions as it deems appropriate for the purposes of this act.

(f) The Foundation shall render an annual report to the President for submission on or before the 15th day of January to the Congress, summarizing the activities of the Foundation and making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate.

DIRECTOR OF FOUNDATION

SEC. 5. There shall be a director of the Foundation who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, after the members of the Foundation have been appointed and qualified. He shall serve as an ex officio member of the Foundation. In addition thereto he shall be the chief executive officer of the Foundation. The director shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum and shall serve for a term of 6 years unless sooner removed by the President.

DIVISIONS WITHIN THE FOUNDATION

SEC. 6. (a) Until otherwise provided by the Foundation there shall be within the Foundation the following divisions:

(1) A Division of Medical Research;

(2) A Division of Mathematical, Physical, and Engineering Sciences;

(3) A Division of Biological Sciences; and

(4) A Division of Scientific Personnel and Education, which shall be concerned with programs of the Foundation relating to the granting of scholarships and graduate fellowships in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences.

(b) There shall also be within the Foundation such other divisions as the Foundation may, from time to time, deem necessary.

DIVISIONAL COMMITTEES

SEC. 7. (a) There shall be a committee for each division of the Foundation.

(b) Each divisional committee shall be appointed by the Foundation and shall consist of not less than five persons who may be members or nonmembers of the Foundation.

(c) The terms of members of each divisional committee shall be 2 years. Each divisional committee shall annually elect its own chairman from among its own members, and shall prescribe its own rules of procedure, subject to such restrictions as may be prescribed by the Foundation.

(d) Each divisional committee shall make recommendations to, and advise and consult with, the Foundation and the Director with respect to matters relating to the program of its division.

SPECIAL COMMISSIONS

SEC. 8. (a) Each special commission established by the Foundation pursuant to section 4 (a) (7) shall consist of 11 members appointed by the Foundation, 6 of whom shall be eminent scientists and 5 of whom shall be persons other than scientists. Each special commission shall choose its own chairman and vice chairman.

(b) It shall be the duty of each such special commission to make a comprehensive survey of research, both public and private, being carried on in its field, and to formulate and recommend to the Foundation, at the earliest practicable date, an over-all research program in its field.

SCHOLARSHIPS AND GRADUATE FELLOWSHIPS; REGISTER OF SCIENTIFIC PERSONNEL

SEC. 9. (a) The Director, with the approval of the Foundation, is authorized to award, within the limits of funds made available pursuant to section 13, scholarships and graduate fellowships for scientific study or scientific work in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences at accredited nonprofit American or nonprofit foreign institutions of higher education, selected by the recipient of such aid, for stated periods of time. Persons shall be selected for such scholarships and fellowships from among citizens of the United States, and such selections shall be made solely on the basis of ability; but in any case in which two or more applicants for scholarships or fellowships, as the case may be, are deemed by the Director and the Foundation to be possessed of substantially equal ability, and there are not sufficient scholarships or fellowships, as the case may be, available to grant one to each of such applicants, the available scholarship or scholarships or fellowship or fellowships shall be awarded to the applicants in such manner as will tend to result in a wide distribution of scholarships and fellowships among the States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia.

(b) The Foundation shall maintain a register of scientific and technical personnel and in other ways provide a central clearinghouse for information covering all scientific and technical personnel in the United States and its possessions.

AUTHORITY OF FOUNDATION

SEC. 10. The Foundation is empowered to do all things necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, and without being limited thereby, the Foundation is specifically authorized—

(a) to prescribe such rules and regulations as it deems necessary governing the manner of its operations and its organization and personnel;

(b) to make such expenditures as may be necessary for administering the provisions of this act;

(c) to enter into contracts or other arrangements, or modifications thereof, for the carrying on, by organizations or individuals in the United States and foreign countries, including other government agencies of the United States and of foreign countries (without legal consideration, without performance of other bonds, and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes), of such basic scientific research activities as the Foundation deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this act;

(d) to make advance, progress, and other payments which relate to scientific research without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C., sec. 529);

(e) to acquire by purchase, lease, loan, or gift, and to hold and dispose of by sale, lease, or loan, real and personal property of all kinds necessary for, or resulting from, scientific research;

(f) to receive and use funds donated by others, if such funds are donated, without restriction, other than that they be used in furtherance of one or more of the general purposes of the Foundation;

(g) to publish or arrange for the publication of scientific and technical information so as to further the full dissemination of information of scientific value consistent with the national interest, without regard to the provisions of section 87 of the act of January 12, 1895 (28 Stat. 622), and section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (40 Stat. 1270; 44 U. S. C., sec. 111);

(h) to accept and utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and to pay the actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses (including, in lieu of subsistence, per diem allowances at a rate not in excess of $10 for such personnel incurred in the course of such services); and

(i) to prescribe, with the approval of the Comptroller General of the United States, the extent to which vouchers for funds expended under contracts for scientific research shall be subject to itemization or substantiation prior to payment, without regard to the limitations of other laws relating to the expenditure of public funds and accounting therefor.

PATENT RIGHTS

SEC. 11. (a) Each contract or other arrangement executed pursuant to this act which relates to scientific research shall contain provisions governing the disposition of inventions produced thereunder in a manner calculated to protect the public interest and the equities of the individual or organization with which the contract or other arrangement is executed: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the Foundation, by any contractual or other arrangement, to alter or modify any provision of law affecting the issuance or use of patents.

(b) No officer or employee of the Foundation shall acquire, retain, or transfer any rights, under the patent laws of the United States or otherwise, in any invention which he may make or produce in connection with performing his assigned activities and which is directly related to the subject matter thereof: *Provided, however,* That this subsection shall not be construed to prevent any officer or employee of the Foundation from executing any application for patent on any such invention for the purpose of assigning the same to the Government or its nominee in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Director may establish.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

SEC. 12. (a) The Foundation is hereby authorized to cooperate in any international scientific research activities consistent with the purposes of this act and to expend for such international scientific research activities such sums within the limit of appropriated funds as the Foundation may deem desirable.

(b) The Director, with the approval of the Foundation, may defray the expenses of representatives of Government agencies and other organizations and of individual scientists to accredited international scientific congresses and meetings whenever he deems it necessary in the promotion of the objectives of this act.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 13. (a) To enable the Foundation to carry out its powers and duties, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Foundation, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

(b) The funds hereafter appropriated to the Foundation, as herein authorized, shall, if obligated during the fiscal year for which appropriated, remain available for expenditure for 4 years following the expiration of the fiscal year for which appropriated. After such 4-year period, the unexpended balances of appropriations shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 14. (a) The Director shall, in accordance with such policies as the Foundation shall from time to time prescribe, appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. Such appointments shall be made and such compensation shall be fixed in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided,* That the Director may in accordance with such policies as the Foundation shall from time to time prescribe, employ such technical and professional personnel and fix their compensation, without regard to such laws, as he may deem necessary for the discharge of the responsibilities of the Foundation under this act. The Deputy Director hereinafter provided for, and the members of the divisional committees, and special commissions, shall be appointed without regard to the civil-service laws or regulations. Neither the Director nor the Deputy Director shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment than that of serving as such Director or Deputy Director, as the case may be; nor shall the Director or Deputy Director, except with the approval of the Foundation, hold any office in, or act in any capacity for, any organization, agency, or institution with which the Foundation makes any contract or other arrangement under this act.

(b) The Director may appoint, with the approval of the Foundation, a Deputy Director who shall perform such functions as the Director, with the approval of the Foundation, may prescribe and shall be Acting Director during the absence or disability of the Director or in the event of a vacancy in the Office of the Director, and who shall receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $12,000 per annum.

(c) The Foundation shall not, itself, operate any laboratories or pilot plants.

(d) The members of the Foundation, and the members of each divisional committee, or special commission, shall receive compensation at the rate of $25 for each day engaged in the business of the Foundation pursuant to authorization of the Foundation, and shall be allowed actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses (including, in lieu of subsistence, per diem allowances at a rate not in excess of $10) when engaged, away from home, in the duties of their offices.

(e) Persons holding other offices in the executive branch of the Federal Government may serve as members of the divisional committees, and special commissions, but they shall not receive remuneration for their services as such members during any period for which they receive compensation for their services in such other offices.

(f) Service of an individual as a member of the Foundation, of a divisional committee, or of a special commission shall not be considered as service bringing him within the provisions of section 109 or section 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 18, secs. 198 and 203) or section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, unless the act of such individual, which by such section is made unlawful when performed by an individual referred to in such section, is with respect to any particular matter which directly involves the Foundation or in which the Foundation is directly interested.

(g) In making contracts or other arrangements for scientific research, the Foundation shall utilize appropriations available therefor in such manner as will in its discretion best realize the objectives of (1) having the work performed by organizations, agencies, and institutions, or individuals in the United States or foreign countries, including Government agencies of the United States and of foreign countries, qualified by training and

experience to achieve the results desired, (2) strengthening the research staff of organizations, particularly nonprofit organizations, in the States and Territories and the District of Columbia, and (3) aiding institutions, agencies, or organizations which, if aided, will advance basic research, and (4) encouraging independent basic research by individuals.

(h) The activities of the Foundation shall be construed as supplementing and not superseding, curtailing, or limiting any of the functions or activities of other Governmen agencies authorized to engage in scientific research or development.

(i) Funds available to any department or agency of the Government for scientific or technical research, or the provision of facilities therefor, shall be available for transfer, with the approval of the head of the department or agency involved, in whole or in part, to the Foundation for such use as is consistent with the purposes for which such funds were provided, and funds so transferred shall be expendable by the Foundation for the purposes for which the transfer was made, and, until such time as an appropriation is made available directly to the Foundation, for general administrative expenses of the Foundation without regard to limitations otherwise applicable to such funds.

(j) The National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel shall be transferred from the Department of Labor to the Foundation, together with such of the personnel, records, property, and balances of appropriations as have been utilized or are available for use in the administration of such roster as may be determined by the President. The transfer provided for in this subsection shall take effect at such time or times as the President shall direct.

(k) The Foundation shall not support any research or development activity in the field of atomic energy, nor shall it exercise any authority pursuant to section 10 (e) in respect to that field, without first having obtained the concurrence of the Atomic Energy Commission that such activity will not adversely affect the common defense and security. Nothing in this act shall supersede or modify any provision of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946.

(l) The Foundation, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall establish regulations and procedures for the security classification of information or property (having military significance) in connection with scientific research under this act, and for the proper safeguarding of any information or property so classified.

COORDINATION WITH FOREIGN POLICY

SEC. 15. (a) The authority to enter into contracts or other arrangements with organizations or individuals in foreign countries and with agencies of foreign countries, as provided in section 10 (c), and the authority to cooperate in international scientific research activities as provided in section 12 (a), shall be exercised in such manner as is consistent with the foreign policy objectives of the United States as determined by the Secretary of State after consultation with the Director.

(b) If, in the exercise of the authority referred to in subsection (a) to carry out the purposes of this act, negotiation with foreign countries or agencies thereof becomes necessary, such negotiation shall be carried on by the Secretary of State in consultation with the Director.

TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF TITLE VI OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT, AS AMENDED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, Senate bill 2565, to provide for a temporary extension of title VI of the National Housing Act, as amended.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2565) to provide for a temporary extension of title VI of the National Housing Act, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not necessary to move that the bill be made the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Ball	Hill	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hoey	Pepper
Bricker	Holland	Reed
Brooks	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Byrd	Kem	Saltonstall
Cain	Kilgore	Smith
Capper	Knowland	Stennis
Chavez	Langer	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McFarland	Thye
Donnell	McGrath	Tobey
Downey	McKellar	Tydings
Dworshak	McMahon	Vandenberg
Eastland	Magnuson	Watkins
Ecton	Malone	Wherry
Ellender	Martin	White
Ferguson	Maybank	Wiley
Flanders	Millikin	Williams
Fulbright	Moore	Wilson
Green	Morse	Young
Gurney	Murray	
Hatch	Myers	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, Senate bill 2565 was before the Senate last Friday, April 30. It provides simply for a temporary extension of title VI loans of the National Housing Act for a period of 30 days, in the sum of $250,000,000.

The junior Senator from Washington offered an amendment on Friday to Senate bill 2565, which would extend title VI for a period of a year and in the sum of $1,600,000,000. This amendment is the pending question.

Mr. President, last Friday was a confusing day of debate for all of us in the Senate. The basic reason for this confusion was both clear and understandable. Members within the Senate were trying to resolve and take action on two problems and subjects at one and the same time. As a result of this approach the Senate took no action of any kind, and the title VI loan provisions of the National Housing Act expired as of midnight, April 30.

During Friday's debate no Senator attempted to deny the building-construction advantages contained in the amendment. Everyone will agree and has agreed that the construction industry would benefit from a year's extension for title VI loans. A year's extension would permit and encourage the construction industry to plan for and continue an accelerated building program. As these virtues are so much a part of the amendment before us, they are conspicuously lacking in Senate bill 2565, which simply says that no assurances will be provided to the construction industry after 30 days from now. It should be borne in mind that title VI loans have been extended recently under a 30-day extension, which began on April 1 of this year. Senate bill 2565 would simply provide another 30-day extension. In consequence, builders, uncertain about the future, would, logically enough, hold up their intended plans and programs until the Congress determined a longer-range credit-extension authorization.

In recent weeks both the Senate and the House have gone on record favoring a 1-year extension of title VI loans. House bill 5854 was passed by the House and messaged to the Senate on March 24. This bill provides for an extension of a year for title VI loans. On April 22 the Senate passed Senate bill 866, and its title 1 provided that title VI loans of the National Housing Act should be extended for a year.

In the face of this evidence and this declaration by both Houses of the Congress that title VI loans of the National Housing Act deserve to be extended for another year, it must appear to be strange indeed to the general public that the Senate permitted the loan privileges to expire last Friday night.

Mr. President, there is nothing strange at all about this seeming paradox. The opposition to the amendment which provides for a year's extension of title VI loans has come entirely from those who believe that Senate bill 866, the omnibus housing bill, will either fail of passage in the House or be scuttled by the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, if title I of the bill, which in fact is the amendment before us, is eliminated from Senate bill 866 by the adoption of the amendment which I have offered. To the opponents of the amendment this simply means that the public housing title of Senate bill 866 will not be adopted or even debated by the House. If it were not for this opposition, conviction, and fear, I very much doubt if a single vote would be cast by the Senate against my amendment.

I wish, Mr. President, that I might guarantee that the opponents of the amendment have no real cause for concern. I can make no such guaranty because no man knows what fate the public housing problem will meet in the House. I can make clear, however, my considered feeling that the issue of public housing will be debated by the House. I have been given such assurances by the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee. He has willingly admitted that a serious effort will be made within the committee to strike the public housing title from Senate bill 866. This is to be expected, for there are those who simply do not believe in undertaking a public housing program at this time.

The chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee has further said to me in person that Senate bill 866 in some amended form will be reported by his committee to the House Calendar. This clearly means, as I see it, that any Representative will have a positive right to offer any amendment to the bill he thinks proper. There will be no attempt by Mr. WOLCOTT or by the House leadership to restrict or prevent the offering of amendments. If we believe in these assurances—and I do—which have been willingly given by House leaders, I can see no valid reason why we should not adopt an amendment at this time which carries out an intention previously declared by both the House and the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly, sir.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have been unavoidably absent from the Senate during the consideration of this particular measure by the Senate. If the House committee and the House itself entertain such views as to the possibility of passing the bill which passed the Senate a few days ago containing title VI, what assurance is there that the House will pass this bill, which is the bone of contention in the other bill?

Mr. CAIN. Does the Senator mean the bill which is presently before the Senate?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that I had prepared this statement at reasonable length because of the absence of several Senators, and in the course of it I shall endeavor to give an answer to the Senator's question.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thought the Senator had concluded his statement.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, with the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. As I read the Senator's amendment, it includes not only the extension of title VI, with very many amendments to the present title VI, but it also includes the amendment to title I and title II of the FHA Act, the National Housing Act, which amendments have been embodied in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill for several years, and we have been trying to get them through. In his amendment the Senator selects out of the bill those things which he favors, and tries to put them in another bill and send it to the House.

I cannot understand why, if the House is to report the bill, the Senator wants to amend title I and title II.

Mr. CAIN. The distinguished Senator from Ohio knows better than I do that there are eight titles in the bill known as S. 366. Title I of S. 866 contains titles I, II, and VI of the National Housing Act. Title VI of the National Housing Act is designed, as we all agree and know, to be a temporary piece of legislation to provide mortgage insurance and loans to the building industry for a limited time. Titles I and II, related subjects in the mortgage-loan field, are, as I understand it, permanent pieces of legislation.

For the reason that the three titles are related, it seems most logical and reasonable that if we were to send to the House a request for a year's extension of title VI, we might well, in fact, do no harm, but achieve some good, by sending titles I and II on the same subject at the same time.

Mr. TAFT. The House now has before it the title II amendments which are in the Senator's amendment and the title I amendments which are in the Senator's amendment, and is now having hearings on those titles in connection with the other bill. I cannot see the sense in sending the House the same bill again in a separate bill, unless the theory is that the Senator desires that they take this bill and omit all the other provisions of the bill which the Senate passed a few days ago.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I can understand the assumption the Senator makes, although I do not think it is a reasonable one from my point of view, for in my judgment, the House of Representatives will accept title I as title I was approved conclusively by the Senate, as an amendment. The amendment is merely title I of S. 866, and I think the House will accept it without conference and it will become law in a matter of hours.

With the indulgence of Senators who are keenly interested, I should like to finish my statement, and then I shall gladly answer any question which may be addressed to me.

The omnibus housing bill which the Senate passed and sent to the House on April 22 contains eight titles, most of which are aids to private housing. The sooner these titles of assistance to private industry can become law the better off the Nation will be. Most of these titles were designed to materially assist in building homes in this country today and tomorrow, next week and next month, both for rent and for sale. Most of these titles represent an attempt to satisfy emergency housing needs which confront this country at this time. Through these titles the Congress has recognized a prevailing housing shortage, and taken steps to find a remedy.

It is obvious that there is no direct relationship between some of the titles. For example, what have insured housing loans got to do with public low-rent housing? There is no connection between the two, yet both are contained in the same bill. Title VI loans have been recommended for a year's extension. On the other hand, public low-rent housing stands forth as a long-range and permanent development.

The proponents and advocates of public low-rent housing are certainly entitled to a full hearing. They recently got that hearing on the floor of the Senate. They can look forward to such a hearing on the floor of the House. If the issue of public housing is fully debated by the House and fails of passage, the proponents can justifiably feel keenly disappointed, but they will not be able to say that they were not given a full opportunity to urge the adoption of their point of view.

The junior Senator from Washington sincerely hopes that the House will consider the subject of public housing on its own merits. He believes that no public good will be served if a public-housing program is approved merely because it is but one part of an over-all national housing program.

If the amendment I have offered is defeated and the 30-day extension provided for in S. 2565 is passed, I cannot predict the fate of title VI loans in the House. The House may very well refuse to take action on a 30-day extension proposal. It has been so related; but, in common with most Senators, I place no reliance in rumors whatsoever.

If what I have stated shall happen, those builders throughout the country who need and must have title VI loans must wait to see what action the House finally takes on S. 866, which includes a year's extension for title VI loans. If this happens the building industry will undeniably curtain its operations and we shall be without those additional housing units which the Nation so hopefully waits for and so desperately needs.

Though I cannot prophesy what will happen if our amendment fails of adoption. I can safely predict what will happen if it shall prevail. If the amendment prevails, we can substitute S. 2565, as amended, for H. R. 5854, and then there will be every reason to believe that the House will accept the amended bill without conference, and that title VI loans, which we all favor, can be reestablished and granted in a few hours' time.

Mr. President, were it not for the public-housing question we should have taken positive action last week to continue title VI loans for a year. Because of assurances I have given that the House will not pigeonhole or by-pass or restrict a debate on the public-housing issue, I am very hopeful that the State will see fit today to approve a year's extension for title VI laws through the amendment I have offered. I am satisfied that all of us believe the construction industry to be entitled to a year's extension of title VI laws. If we grant this extension, America will build more homes and more citizens will have a better opportunity to become better housed. To deny the construction industry the year's extension of title VI loans, which other pending legislation has provided for, is to deny the builders of America an opportunity to satisfy our emergency housing needs and requirements, about which we speak so feelingly so often on the floor of the Senate.

The junior Senator from Washington would be happy, Mr. President, to join with others in a debate of any length which would cover the merits of the amendment in question. He can, however, think of no valid reasons for continuing a debate in which the issue is both simple and clear. I hope the Senate will vote soon in favor of extending title VI loans for a year. If the amendment fails, I think we should promptly pass the 30-day extension proposal. Even though I think this latter proposal, if approved, is likely to encounter some serious trouble in the House, I believe we ought, in whatever form we can agree upon, try our best to reestablish title VI loans without delay.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment of the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]. I voted to keep the public housing title,

title VI, in Senate bill 866. I did not like to cast that vote. I cast it because I could find no basis upon which to hope that private enterprise could take care of rebuilding in the slum areas of the older cities of the country. I voted for that title because I felt that the necessities existed which compelled me to vote to require government, both on the national and the local level, to exert public effort to take care of that condition.

I believe in private enterprise in America, and I am confident my colleagues believe in private enterprise. I recognize, as everyone who pays any attention whatever to what goes on in the passing days must recognize, that circumstances arise when there must be Government intervention and Government assistance. I feel that was the case with reference to title VI as it appears in Senate bill 866. However, in that bill title I was the same as the amendment offered in this instance to the pending extension bill. In other words, as I view the picture at the moment the Senate has put its O. K. upon title I of Senate bill 866, which is title VI of the existing National Housing Act, implemented so as to be effective in the coming year.

That title, Mr. President, is one that every legislator who gives more than lip service to private enterprise must be in favor of. It represents the action, and I think the considered action, of the Congress in offering the credit of the Nation to private enterprise so that the construction work so sorely needed may be carried forward under private enterprise. Certainly there can be no objection to that. None has been heard to the principle involved. None has been heard to the provisions of that particular title.

Mr. President, we now are in this position: We have passed a complete housing bill, Senate bill 866. Incorporated in it is title I, which provides for the loaning of the credit of the United States to private enterprise to take care of a critical housing shortage. Under that title private enterprise has done a marvelous job, and I am here to commend the builders of the country upon what they have accomplished. The record is clear in that respect. It is true that housing built under that title, as housing built under any title at present prices, is terrifically high. But housing is not alone in that respect.

As Senate bill 866 passed the Senate, title I of S. 866, which is title VI of the present National Housing Act, was extended and supplemented, with additional credit funds included. The bill contains seven other titles, among them the controversial public housing provision, known as title VI. The bill is in the House. I take it that those who oppose the amendment of the Senator from Washington do so upon the basis that the House has indicated, or they feel the House has indicated, opposition to the public housing title of S. 866, and support of title I of S. 866, which is the Senator's amendment to the pending bill, and that those here who are strongly in favor of the public housing title must have that title tied to title I in order to have a chance to pass the whole bill in the House.

I have tried to make what seems to me the conclusion that must be drawn or there can be no basis for opposition to the pending amendment.

There are cases, Mr. President, when I believe we can justify duress of that character, and that it is duress I think no one can deny. Whether we can justify it in this case is something for each of us to determine for himself.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator has said that no one could deny it is duress. I deny it is duress. It seems to me it is a most extraordinary procedure to send a bill to the House, and when the House is considering it, take a piece out of that bill and send it over to the House as another bill. It seems to me to be a duplication of legislation. I do not see, however, that it is duress. I see no justification for such a procedure. We have considered this whole subject and placed it in a general bill and sent it to the House. Why should we send the House a bill containing a piece of a bill which we have already sent to the House? What is the object of doing that?

Mr. CORDON. Does the Senator from Ohio feel that any ill would result from doing that? If so, what ill would result?

Mr. TAFT. I think it is a duplication of legislation.

Mr. CORDON. Assuming it is a duplication of legislation, then what?

Mr. TAFT. It is not a question of the extension. The pending amendment contains 20 amendments to the existing titles I and II, which the House committee is now considering. Why should we send them a part of that bill, as a new bill for it to consider?

Mr. CORDON. Is that the only ground on which the Senator from Ohio bases objection?

Mr. TAFT. No. As I see it, there is no purpose of doing what is proposed now to be done except to relieve the House from the duty or the obligation of considering the other bill. There can be no other purpose for it.

Mr. TOBEY, Mr. CAIN, and Mr. ELLENDER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to answer the Senator from Ohio, and then presently I shall be happy to yield to any Senators who have observations to make or questions to ask.

Mr. President, I cannot for the life of me see how the acceptance of title I of the bill, which contains seven titles and is now pending in the House, could relieve the House of Representatives from the obligation of considering the remaining six titles. The obligation remains, if it be an obligation. I certainly agree with the Senator from Ohio that an obligation to consider it exists. How is the House relieved from that obligation? The Senator proves my first statement by his statement. The House is relieved only to this extent: If the Members of the House believe so strongly in title I of the bill, which is the title which furnishes Federal credit to private enterprise, that they must have it, but do not believe in public housing, we urge them to take public housing in order to have title I.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. We do not force them to do anything of the kind. They have a perfect right to reject the public-housing section of the other bill if they want to. I think, however, that the Senate itself has the right to ask the House, when we have formally passed a comprehensive program, to consider each provision in the bill, and I cannot see any object in the pending bill except to relieve the House from the necessity of doing so. Why should we pass over again title I of the bill, which was already passed in a somewhat longer form? What is the purpose of doing so except to relieve the House from the necessity of considering the other titles of a longer bill?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. In listening to the Senator from Ohio I am impressed by the fact that he says that the House owes the Senate the duty to consider all the titles. I think that is true I believe that each of the eight titles will be singularly considered by the House of Representatives. But, as it is true within the House, it must likewise be true within the Senate. The Senator from Ohio is undoubtedly aware of the fact that on the 24th of March, if my date is correct, the House of Representatives sent to the Senate, by which it was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, a bill, the substance of which was to extend title VI for 1 year. The Senate has thus far given but very meager consideration to the desire of the House of Representatives to extend title VI for a year, which is nothing less than it is attempted to do by the pending amendment.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from Washington says that we have done very little about it. We have incorporated title VI in the bill which we have passed unanimously and sent over to the House. That is what we have done.

Mr. CAIN. Indeed we have—to be acted upon and considered at some future date by the House of Representatives, when we are conscious that title VI loans are no longer being extended to private business. Having made up our collective minds in the House and Senate to extend title VI for a year, we are simply saying, Why not do it today—as some of us thought should have been done last Friday—rather than at some time in the future?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to emphasize what the Senator from Ohio has said. This proposal is no doubt designed to give the House of Representatives or the Committee on Banking and Currency a

good alibi for refusing to act on the bill we sent over to the House.

Mr. TOBEY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. If we pick out the noncontroversial features of the bill we sent over to the House and pass them separately and send them to the House, the House can act upon them without ever having a conference, and the remainder of the bill which we passed will never see a conference. Therefore the Senate and House both will be denied an opportunity to work out in conference the measure which the Senate passed.

Mr. TOBEY. Alben, you are so right.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky has borne out the statement which seems to have precipitated all the interest in what otherwise would probably have been a most uninteresting discussion, the statement being that those who are opposing the amendment of the Senator from Washington seek to keep title I of Senate bill 866 in the bill as a matter of duress to force consideration of the remainder of the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is no duress involved.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I decline to yield further.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CORDON. If the Senator will permit me to make my statement, I shall be more than happy to yield; but I will not be taken off my feet.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know of anyone on earth who could take the Senator off his feet when he once plants them anywhere.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield to my friend the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from Oregon had a thirst for knowledge 2 or 3 minutes ago, when he propounded this question to the Senate: Can any harm be done the housing bill by adopting the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Washington and sending it along? I come back and say, manifestly yes. Here is the answer. This is not the testimony of CHARLES TOBEY, of New Hampshire. It is the testimony of HARRY CAIN, the distinguished Senator from Washington. Listen to HARRY CAIN'S answer to the question. Turn to page 5096——

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I yielded for the usual question——

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator asked for knowledge.

Mr. CORDON. I yielded for a question.

Mr. TOBEY. No.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, may we have order?

Mr. TOBEY. Let me point out to the Senator——

Mr. CORDON. I yielded for a question. I shall be happy to yield for a brief statement from my distinguished friend, and later I shall be more than happy to hear him on his time.

Mr. TOBEY. I appreciate that courtesy. The Senator asked me a question, and I am about to answer it by reading the statement of the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] asked the Senator from Washington:

> But may we infer that there is in the Senator's mind no doubt that if title VI is extended for 1 year, there will be much less likelihood of the housing bill being passed by the House?

What did the Senator from Washington say?

> The Senator has asked the question a great many times. To the best of my ability I would answer by saying I think there would be less chance of passage of certain of the remaining portions of Senate bill 866, though, as I have tried to indicate, that is not my concern at the moment in connection with the pending question.

Therefore, the liability does rest upon us, according to the statement of my friend on the right, that if we adopt the amendment we are manifestly lessening the chances of getting Senate bill 866 through the House. I am not going to be a party to it.

Mr. CORDON. I appreciate the statement of my good friend the Senator from New Hampshire. Again I invite attention to the fact that I have further cumulative evidence of the truth of my first statement, that the substance of the opposition is that of duress, or holding this title as a club over the head of the House. I do not criticize that at all. I did not intend to criticize it. I am satisfied that that is the view——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not wish to take the time of the Senator. Nothing is further from my mind than to undertake to exercise duress over the House of Representatives. I do not so regard this procedure. As a matter of legislative comity between the two Houses, we passed a comprehensive housing bill and sent it to the House. If there were duress involved here—which I deny—it is no more reprehensible for the Senate to undertake that sort of legislative maneuver than it is for another branch of the Congress to hold up a bill and refuse to consider the whole subject and try to iron it out between the two Houses, because there is one title to which it objects.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

Mr. CORDON. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Kentucky. I shall be glad to yield to my friend from Louisiana in just a moment.

Mr. President, if I have the chronology correct in my mind, the House sent to the Senate the substance of title VI of the National Housing Act in the first instance; and if we are to discuss comity here, perhaps we ourselves are not without sin in that respect.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. CORDON. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Having that particular segment of the housing program before us, we tied on six other titles when we sent it back to the House. I added my vote to the votes of other Senators who tied it on. But I will not stand here and discuss lack of comity in the House, in view of the lack of comity which existed prior to that time in the Senate.

I now yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. If we were dealing in duress, it might be as logical and fair to say that the House was exercising duress against the Senate in sending one provision here and requiring that we act upon it, under the threat that otherwise the House would not act upon the entire bill which we passed. So by a process of arithmetical cancellation, the two cancel each other.

Mr. CORDON. There must be a beginning and an end. The beginning was the first bill which came to the Senate from the House as one title.

I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that in addition to suggesting the passage of title I, as is incorporated in Senate bill 866, the House has also under consideration the passage of title II of Senate bill 866, which creates a secondary market for GI loans and FHA-insured mortgages. A separate bill to incorporate that title was introduced some time ago in the House. It has been reported by the House Banking and Currency Committee, and I am informed it is now on the calendar for final passage.

I ask the Senator, if the House is successful in having the Congress pass titles I and II of Senate 866 now before the House for consideration, what else is there left in the bill of any consequence but public housing, slum clearance, and farm housing? That is all that will be left?

Mr. CORDON. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. If we adopt the pending amendment, and if a bill comes from the House adopting title II of Senate 866, then I am certain that the House will take no further favorable action on the remaining titles of Senate bill 866. It will die in committee or on the calendar if it is reported back from the committee.

Mr. CORDON. Is the Senator of the opinion that a majority of the House is opposed to public housing?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know; but for some reason the House Banking and Currency Committee has seen fit in the past not to take action on any housing bills that were passed by the Senate in which public housing was made a part. I understand that hearings on Senate bill 866 are now in process. Certainly those hearings can be concluded within the next 2 weeks for the reason that a subcommittee from the House Banking and Currency Committee sat with a subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, and extensive hearings on housing needs were held by the joint committee. As I pointed out in debate some time ago when Senate 866 was up for final passage, the joint committee recommended public housing as now included in Senate 866. It is therefore my view that the subject can be before the House for debate very shortly. The Senator from Washington has indicated that if his pending amendment should fail, he would be in favor of extending title VI of the National Housing Act for 30 days. I would favor such action. In the meantime, the House would

have ample opportunity to pass upon every provision in Senate bill 866.

Mr. CORDON. I appreciate the contribution of my friend from Louisiana.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Louisiana has just indicated that if title I is eliminated from Senate bill 866, there is nothing left but public housing.

Mr. ELLENDER. Slum clearance and——

Mr. CAIN. Unless I misunderstood, the Senator did not mention slum clearance.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure I mentioned it. The RECORD will speak for itself.

Mr. CAIN. I share the feeling of many Senators that the problem of Senate bill 866 is so complicated and large and confusing that a number of Senators actually do not know what the bill contains. The bill has eight titles. I have heard very few of them referred to on the floor of the Senate. I am inclined to think that it was because Senators were not aware that they were in the bill. Perhaps the RECORD would be clearer if I were to recite those titles:

Title I, insured loans.

Title II, secondary market for GI and FHA-insured loans——

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. CORDON. Will the Senator please permit the Senator from Washington to complete his recitation of the titles?

Mr. CAIN. Title III, housing research.

Title IV, rental housing aids—yield insurance on capital invested in rental housing.

Title V, slum clearance.

Title VI, public low-rent housing.

Title VII, farm housing.

Title VIII, administrative and miscellaneous provisions.

I think there are a number of good titles within the bill. If we eliminate one good title in order to make it effective tonight, if we can, I think the remaining portions of the general housing bill are deserving of the full and careful debate and consideration which they are going to receive in the House of Representatives.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I shall take but a few moments of the time of the Senate to present my views. I appreciate the general debate we have had, which may clarify several issues which are involved in the pending matter.

I believe I had reached the statement that, as I view the situation, the opposition to the pending amendment is designed to defeat the amendment, so as to force action in the House of Representatives on Senate bill 866 in its entirety. I wish it to be perfectly clear that when I voted in favor of Senate bill 866, I voted in favor of it because I wanted it to pass. I have not changed my view. When I vote for the pending amendment, I still shall hope for the passage of titles II to VIII, inclusive, of Senate bill 866.

But, Mr. President, I am primarily interested in the building of homes in the United States. I am interested in having as many homes as possible built under the private enterprise system prevailing in the United States. I am interested in maintaining without interruption the present high rate of construction of homes in the United States. I am interested in doing anything which will further that construction program.

I recognize that the credit of the United States, when utilized to make loans all over the United States to those who are using their money and their time for the building of these homes, will further the building program and will increase the rate of building. To my mind, that is the one thing we seek in all housing legislation.

In my view, it would be foolish and utterly silly, simply because we believe that public housing is necessary in connection with slum areas, for us to do anything at this time—in an attempt to get such public housing—which would slow down the building of housing in all the other categories. After all, Mr. President, 90 percent of the public-housing needs in the United States exist in areas outside the slum areas. Certainly that 90 percent has some right to be heard. Because of that fact, I shall support this amendment. I hope the amendment will be adopted, so that we can go forward with at least the program which now is under way; and certainly I shall do everything within my power to further the remainder of the program in any orderly way. I have every hope that proper attention will be given to it in the House of Representatives, but I do not believe we can force such action in the House. What we seek to do here is for the good of the most people who are in need of housing in the United States. Let us keep what we know we can keep, and take the necessary chances as to what we hope we can obtain.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I am wondering whether the senior Senator from Oregon and the junior Senator from Washington, who are so concerned lest the situation in which we find ourselves shall hold up the proceedings under title VI, would have their fears completely removed if the motion now before the Senate to extend title VI for 30 days were changed to provide for an extension of 60 days. That would afford an opportunity for the House of Representatives to perform its function properly, without haste and without the duress of which we have heard so much. Certainly I should be very glad, indeed, to have the measure amended so as to remove any possibility or question of such duress, and to do so in such a complete manner that we would not have to hear that word again in connection with this undertaking.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, in answer to the very distinguished Senator from Vermont, let me say that it seems very clear to me that if the Senate is going to take the time and the energy required to amend the 30-day extension proposal which now is before the Senate, we should most definitely make the amendment correspond to what both the House of Representatives and the Senate already have said they wished to do with reference to the housing industry in the United States. I would see absolutely no virtue in adopting an amendment providing for another 30-day extension, when at the time of the first 30-day extension we hoped the problem could be satisfactorily solved on a long-range basis.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I have two observations to make in response to the views the junior Senator from Washington has stated.

In the first place, no great amount of energy and no great depth of perplexing thought are necessary in order to change the figure "30" to "60", and to change the amount from $250,000,000 to $500,000,000, if that is necessary. I think that energy and that thought are well within the mental capacity of the Members of this body. That is my first observation.

I shall have to think for a moment, to recall what the Senator's second point was. I hope he will excuse me if it has temporarily escaped my mind. I wonder whether the junior Senator from Washington realizes that, at least in the eyes of others, he has put himself in the position of asking the Senate to reconsider the bill it has passed, because that is what his present proposal amounts to. It is asking us to reconsider, it is asking us to withdraw without conference, it is asking us to abdicate our position as a coordinate member of the legislative branch, equal in position and authority to the body on the other side. There is at present an even balance on the matter between the two Houses. On the same day on which the bill S. 866 was introduced, on that very day, there was introduced in the House a bill extending title VI for 1 year. Why not preserve that balance? Why not leave the negotiations between the two bodies to the ordinary course of legislative procedure which has been followed from a time before either the Senator from Washington or I was born, instead of talking about duress one way or the other?

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for 1 second?

Mr. FLANDERS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator. And, in addition, asking us to agree to his amendment extending the title for a year, when last Friday on the floor he twice stated that if we adopted his amendment it would lessen the chances of the House adopting the general housing bill which the Senate passed unanimously. Are we going to commit harakiri? I ask you, sir.

Mr. FLANDERS. Is it hara-kiri or HARRY CAIN? [Laughter.]

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator knows what it does. It takes the bowels and heart out of a thing.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I am very glad the Senator from Vermont has said that the junior Senator from Washington—he referred to me individually—has requested a number of things which are not proper. But what is the reason for the request? The reason is undeniably a very clear one. There is no title VI insurance coverage at this time. We are determining, are we not, the length of time that loan operations should be extended? The Senate, after due consideration, has agreed upon an extension for 1 year.

The House has done likewise. In the absence of any coverage, it would seem that now is the time and this the place to do what we are all anticipating we shall do at some future time.

With reference to the very interesting and enlightening comment made by my equally good friend the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]——

Mr. TOBEY. Was it not pertinent as well as enlightening?

Mr. CAIN. I consider it pertinent. I refer to the Senator's observation that twice before the junior Senator from Washington had been asked the question and that he had answered that in his opinion the controversial subject of public housing remaining in the bill, S. 866, if title I were removed, would have less chance of passage. Those were the questions asked me, and those were the answers I gave; but they were given on my own individual responsibility. The questions were such questions as anybody would have a right to ask.

Mr. TOBEY. And was the Senator giving us the benefit of his judgment on what effect it would have on the bill in the House?

Mr. CAIN. It seems a bit strange to me that the Senator should, by inference, credit me with knowing precisely what is going to happen in the House of Representatives.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the point.

Mr. FLANDERS. Must I yield alternately to the two Senators, or is there some way of giving them blanket coverage? [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will have to leave that to the discretion of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to propound a question to the Senator from New Hampshire. I think it is very important. The Senator from New Hampshire, with whom the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] has cooperated so finely and so closely, has said in effect that we must maintain title I in Senate bill 866, because if we eliminate it, the junior Senator from Washington has said that title VI of S. 866, the public housing provision, will fail. I said, "The senior Senator from New Hampshire believes that the junior Senator from Washington knows what he is talking about." Now, may I ask this question? If there were reason to believe that any 30-day extension proposal approved and sent by the Senate to the House would automatically fail of adoption, would the Senator give further consideration to the amendment presently on the desk?

Mr. FLANDERS. I may say to the junior Senator from Washington that I have been in this body no longer than he; but I feel, within the short period I have been here, a certain jealousy of the prerogatives of this wing of the Capitol. I have a feeling that similar jealousy is felt in the other wing of the Capitol, and I believe that each side should do its duty as it sees it, and that they should then iron out any differences in conference.

If the Senator from Washington will permit, I may say it appears to me he is in the position of applying duress in the matter in order to make sure that the public housing provision of the general bill shall not go to conference. That, I shall certainly oppose to the utmost extent of my ability.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask another question or two?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. I think the Senator is conscious of the fact that during this debate I have not once used either the word "coercion" or the word "intimidation." I have left that to others, and I have paid no attention to it.

Mr. FLANDERS. No, I have not used either the word "coercion" or the word "intimidation." I have used the word "duress," which was used a number of times in the course of the past hour.

Mr. CAIN. I merely wanted to make certain the Senator understood that I had not made reference to it. But I am curious about the Senator's suggestion that the junior Senator from Washington wants to make certain the public housing features of S. 866 do not go to conference. I do not know exactly what that means, for I have given this assurance, coming to me from the House leadership, that S. 866, as passed by the Senate, is presently before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House. The public-housing provision may or may not be eliminated by the committee before reporting an amended bill to the floor. But, once the bill is on the floor, in the face of all these very fine arguments, I can conceive that scores of Representatives may offer amendments to restore public housing if it is not included within the bill. But it will be the House of Representatives, I wish to make very clear to the Senator from Vermont, that will determine whether or not the public-housing feature shall go to conference. It cannot be prevented, however, because if the provision is eliminated on the floor of the House, would it not follow automatically that, it having been included in the Senate bill, a conference would have to settle those differences? If that be so, I may say that I believe a debate on the merits of public housing is practically assured on the floor of the House.

Mr. FLANDERS. It occurs to me, Mr. President, the Senator from Washington is giving pretty strong assurances at this end of the Capitol as to what will be done at the other. I do not share his confidence. If we lift from the general housing bill certain provisions in which powerful groups are particularly interested, and send them to the House in the pending bill, I do not feel at all sure, in spite of any assurance the Senator from Washington thinks he may have, that we shall have at least an opportunity to discuss under favorable conditions the other elements of the general bill.

I want to say for myself that I am tremendously interested in the public-housing part of the bill. I have been in large cities in European countries in which I could not find a slum. They are poor countries as compared with ours. For the life of me, I cannot understand why private industry has not been generous enough to provide decent housing for the lower-paid groups, and I cannot see why we should not make a provision for the moderate undertaking of a direct attack on this particular problem. In the way in which the matter is presented it is more difficult to have a fair and free discussion than would result from the ordinary courses of procedure which have been followed by the two Houses of Congress long before the Senator from Washington and I were born.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. The junior Senator from Washington would like to admit to having one advantage over the junior Senator from Vermont, inasmuch as he has had the happy opportunity to discuss the subject of the bill with those who represent the House leadership. I think it was on last Friday that I had an opportunity to confer with the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, Mr. WOLCOTT, on the floor of the Senate. I know it was on that afternoon that I had an opportunity to confer with the House majority leader; and it was because of what they said to me and authorized me to say that I gave on Friday afternoon, on the floor of the Senate, the assurances about which the junior Senator from Vermont continues to remain in doubt, namely, that there would be no restriction placed against the right of Members of the House to offer against amended Senate bill 866 any amendments they desired to offer. The Senator from Vermont has clearly spoken in his own right and for himself his major concern that any elimination from the omnibus bill will put in dire jeopardy that portion of the bill relating to public low-rent housing to which the Senator has made reference.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to say that I did not have the advantage which the Senator from Washington had of being on the floor at the time the colloquy took place. I am told by a reliable witness, or auditor, or whatever he may be called, that Representative WOLCOTT would give no assurance of reporting Senate bill 866 if the title VI extension went through. Therefore, if we are in that position, the thing to do is to leave our bill as it is, let it go to the House, and go through the customary procedure.

Again I offer the suggestion that I should be glad to change my suggestion of 30 days to 60 days, and to change the sum of $250,000,000 to $500,000,000, and in so doing we would completely remove the need for such undertaking as is proposed in the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, this is one of the most remarkable attempts I have ever observed in my 14 years on Capitol Hill. I substantiate my statement by saying that in this body, approximately 2 weeks ago, after a long debate, we voted upon the public-housing section of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, Senate bill 866, and passed it by a considerable majority, and on the following day we passed the entire bill unanimously, with the inclusion of title VI, extending it for 1 year. Having done that, our responsi-

bility is over until such time as the House passes the same bill. If it differs from our bill, conferees will be appointed and will sit together and thrash the matter out. But we have passed the bill. We had a reason for the faith that was in us as manifested in the terms of the bill.

Now there comes an attempt, through the amendment which has been offered and which is now pending before the Senate, to do exactly what we did in the omnibus bill itself, namely, extend title VI for 1 year, which bill is now pending before the House, and hearings are being held by the House Banking and Currency Committee.

In the course of the debate last Friday my good and sincere friend from Washington [Mr. CAIN], in the course of a colloquy, gave his answers honestly. There are two instances in the RECORD in which he said, in response to questions, that if his amendment, which is now pending, were agreed to, in his judgment it would weaken the chances of the general housing bill we believed in and passed reaching the floor of the House of Representatives. Therefore, what we are asked to do by his amendment is to nullify the accomplished fact of the action of the Senate in passing the bill containing that provision. I cannot be a party to that. No one could justify it.

Let us look behind the scenes a little bit. I wish to read to the Senate, if I may, a statement of one of the exponents of a real-estate lobby which has been functioning around Washington for some time in connection with the housing bill. They issued a bulletin called the Washington Letter on April 30, 1948. This statement will disclose how much these people are interested in a housing bill. Oh, no; it is not a housing bill they want at all, with slum clearance and public housing pro bono publico. They want to take care of themselves and get Government loans under a profit system in which I believe. But here is the answer given through the president of the organization in his weekly bulletin to the faithful:

> It is my personal conviction, and that of our executive committee, that S. 866 must be defeated in its entirety.

That is the bill which the Senate passed unanimously.

> The Wolcott bill, H. R. 5854, recently passed by the House, gives the industry a year's extension of title VI and other necessary aids.

Here the heart speaketh. Again, "to make assurance double sure," he said:

> I believe we should have no part of S. 866—

It is anathema to them—

> and I am confident that our directors' meeting here May 9 will support this position.
>
> In a previous letter we outlined the provisions of the Wolcott bill, H. R. 5854, as it passed the House. Because of the possibility of securing Senate action on this bill and because it would break the current stalemate, we again list its provisions.

That is the prayer of their hearts, to get through a bill giving them financing, to make money. But we have a larger prayer in our hearts. We have Senate bill 866, which recognizes that the greatest need at this time is to begin housing and slum clearance, to help eliminate marital infelicity and juvenile delinquency, and to give veterans the homes they want to have.

Mr. President, I believe there is no justification for any Senator, realizing what we have done, to stand on the floor of the Senate and cast his vote for an amendment which the distinguished Senator from Washington himself says will lessen the chances of Senate bill 866 being made law by House action.

I shall now read a telegram from Mr. Green, the president of the American Federation of Labor. He says:

> WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 3, 1948.*
>
> Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
> *United States Senate:*
>
> Attempt to secure Senate approval of separate authorization for home financing is nothing short of a brazen maneuver to scuttle general housing bill already approved by Senate. American Federation of Labor strongly protests this parliamentary trick and urges defeat of this proposal. Must press for final and rapid approval of general housing bill which the wage earners of America and their families have been long awaiting in their dire housing need.
>
> WILLIAM GREEN,
> *President, American Federation of Labor.*

And now comes the American Legion, that great organization with its magnificent charter which, in its opening statement, contains the organization's aims and purposes. The organization opposed the bill for a long time. They opposed it at their last convention, but they have finally seen the light, and within 24 hours the American Legion has come out wholeheartedly, 100 percent, for the entire Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. I quote their message.

> INDIANAPOLIS, May 4.—The American Legion's national executive committee today endorsed the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, long opposed by the Legion. A report * * * said that the bill as amended and passed by the Senate * * * eliminated the chief ground for Legion opposition.

So I say this afternoon, Mr. President, that the real estate building lobby, which has been doing what I would characterize if I could, has to learn that the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is primarily aimed at getting homes for Americans, and not to provide a hand-out for the builders of the country. The objective is people—little people, most of them—who need homes.

We passed a housing bill in good faith, under deep convictions. Under God we have worked for years to pass such a measure, under such men as the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and no man knows better than he that we debated the bill and passed it.

Now the Senator from Washington wants us to adopt his amendment, which will lessen the chances of the House of Representatives passing the bill which we sent to them.

What have we come upon? Strange times indeed. Let common sense and sanity return to this Chamber, and let us back up the endorsement unanimously given by the Members of the Senate to the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, and help make it a law. That is our responsibility.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire has just said, if I understood him correctly, that the public housing section of S. 866 is designed to create, to build, and establish houses for people to live in. That is precisely what the intention behind the bill was, but I necessarily ask the Senator when, if Senate bill 866 were to be passed by the House and signed by the President this afternoon, there would be any houses available under title VI of the public housing section of S. 866.

Mr. TOBEY. Does the Senator want an answer?

Mr. CAIN. Yes.

Mr. TOBEY. We would get them proportionately quicker than we will if the matter is delayed any longer. Let us get busy and enact the law.

Mr. CAIN. I must only burden the Senator to answer accurately a question.

Mr. TOBEY. I have done so.

Mr. CAIN. It seems to me that those of us who have sincerely proposed the amendment, as the Senator most sincerely opposes it, are not of necessity by any means restricting or preventing, by a single minute, the passage by the House of the sections which the Senator favors in S. 866. There is going to be a determination made by the House as to what they want to do with public housing. The Senator says it is a great human social-welfare enterprise. I agree with him.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator said that.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington has said so, and I agree with those principles. But a determination of when those principles are to become effective in this country in terms of public housing must first be decided by the House of Representatives, and I take it that is a subject which is removed and apart from the basic reason why the sponsors and proponents of the pending amendment attempt to extend the privileges and benefits of title VI loans for a year.

We want houses in America today. Our building program is a credit to the building industry. In part, that is true because the builders knew of the credit extensions they could expect in months gone by from the Federal Government. We are saying, if the amendment shall prevail, that "For the next year, Mr. Builder, you know precisely what you must show and what steps you must take to obtain credit from the Federal Government." We think the logic is undeniably superior as between a 30-day extension, which would have to be reconsidered, probably, in a few weeks, and a 1-year extension.

I always listen as carefully and as cheerfully as I can to the remarks of the Senator from New Hampshire whenever he speaks. In recent weeks I have been deeply impressed by his reference constantly to the activities of lobbies. It is only my own interpretation, but the junior Senator from Washington would like to point out to the Senator from New Hampshire, and everyone else who may listen, that any person worth while is a lobbyist either for or against those projects in which he believes or which he fights.

The Senator has made reference to the very distinguished Mr. William Green, the president of the American Federation of Labor, who expressed his opposition to the amendment which the junior

Senator from Washington has proposed before the Senate. I do not resent for a single second the resistance of Mr. Green, but I am not impressed by it, because I think him wrong. I think Mr. Green in that instance is precisely what he ought to be, a lobbyist for something which he thinks is worth while.

I hold in my hand a short article from the Washington Post dated Monday, May 3, 1948, quoting another lobbyist who found it quite correct to make his own comments, not only about me as an individual, but about some of my colleagues. I read:

UAW-CIO Chieftain Walter Reuther, in his first public statement since the attempt to assassinate him, last night issued a blistering denunciation of the surprise attempt to scuttle the TEW housing bill.

There was no surprise about the attack—if anyone wishes to construe it as an attack—by the junior Senator from Washington on the bill. What steps he took he took openly, as the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Vermont are well aware.

The article continues:

Public-housing-minded Senators in a snarled session Friday succeeded in delaying a vote on the Cain proposal until today so they could marshal their forces.

That indicates a willingness, at least on the part of some Members of this body, to have resolved the matter last week, prior to the extension of title VI, which matter can still be resolved in favor of or in opposition to the amendment which provides for a year's extension.

From his hospital bed Reuther bitterly scored the attempt to take advantage of the absence of Senator ROBERT A. TAFT (Republican, Ohio) and other leading supporters of the TEW measure and rush through the extension. The present authority for home-loan insurance expired Friday but applications are still being taken in the knowledge the authority will eventually be continued.

The junior Senator from Washington has not had an opportunity to discuss this situation with the Senator from Ohio, but I dare say the Senator from Ohio would probably be the last to think that an attempt had been made to do something merely because he was absent on important business somewhere else.

The fiery Reuther centered his blast at those he called the four horsemen of the real-estate lobby, Senators CAIN; JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, Republican, Wisconsin; and Representatives JESSE P. WOLCOTT, Republican, Michigan; and CHARLES L. FLETCHER, Republican, California.

"It is surprising to me that these two freshmen Senators by bold tactics are able to abuse the legislative process and put in jeopardy the legislation which was passed by the Senate," said Reuther.

I merely wanted to read this article into the RECORD. I may say to the Senator from New Hampshire that this is evidence from another lobbyist, and I think the Members of the House and the Senate are lobbyists for what they think is right. It is proper to point that out, for it is materially and substantially unfair, it seems to me, to accuse some lobbyists of being bad because an individual does not like what they are lobbying for or against, and to say that other lobbyists are good because an individual favors what they attempt to help him accomplish.

The fact that those of us who have proposed an amendment have been opposed by Mr. Green and Mr. Reuther, and a good many others, is as natural as that day follows night. We respect and appreciate their opposition but we hope to show them that, while they are well intentioned, they are wrong, and that the building industry will benefit substantially from being given a year's protection, rather than a loan extension of 30 short days, 3 days of which have already passed.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, we have had a field day of intellectual and emotional content, which I for one have thoroughly enjoyed. I wonder whether, having thus expressed ourselves, it is not possible to come down to a little discussion involving nothing more violent than sweet reasonableness, and the suggestion I again offer is that I should be glad to amend the bill which I introduced extending title VI for 30 days by doubling the time and doubling the amount, giving time for the bill which the Senate passed, S. 866, to go through the ordinary, time-honored, practice-tested course of procedure without resorting to extraordinary means for attaining the end which all of us want, which is that title VI shall be extended for 1 year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a moment ago in a colloquy with my distinguished friend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], I made the statement that there was pending in the House at the present time a separate bill to enact into law title II of Senate bill 866. I also made the statement that if title II of S. 866, and the pending amendment should be adopted by the Congress, then there would be nothing left to Senate bill 866 except public housing, slum clearance, and farm housing. I should have added—nothing left for the benefit of the Federal Home Loan Association and the real-estate lobbyists.

Mr. President, ever since the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill was reported to the Senate during the Seventy-ninth Congress, and the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill was considered by the Senate a few weeks ago, there has been an effort made by members of home-loan associations and the real-estate lobbyists to snipe at the bills and have Congress enact or amend certain provisions of the National Housing Act in which they were interested.

Let me give a few examples of what has happened during the Eightieth Congress and also during the Seventy-ninth Congress. When S. 866 was originally reported it contained a provision for Federal savings and loan participation in home improvements and repair activity. The Federal Home Loan Association was desirous of a law of that character. It succeeded in having Congress adopt Public Law 372, which was approved by the Eightieth Congress on August 6, 1947. So that when the Senate Banking Committee reported S. 866 by way of a substitute, it was necessary to delete that provision from it.

S. 866 improved the credit-reserve facilities of Federal home-loan banks by authorizing them to utilize such facilities with respect to mortgages with maturities of up to 25 years. The Federal Home Loan Association wanted the time increased from 20 years to 25 years. A bill to that effect was fostered by the association, and Congress adopted it. The bill in question became Public Law 311, Eightieth Congress, approved August 1, 1947, and so it was necessary to delete that provision from the original version of S. 866.

S. 866 provided for the removal of the time limitation on FHA's title I of the National Housing Act program of insurance on home-improvement and repair loans. The same group interested in that particular provision of the bill came before Congress, and by the adoption of Public Law 120, Eightieth Congress, approved June 26, 1947, they attained that goal. Again it was necessary to delete from S. 866, in its original form, that provision.

S. 866 provided for modification of the construction-cost limitations on public housing. A bill to that effect was likewise adopted by the Congress, in Public Law 301, Eightieth Congress, approved July 31, 1947.

S. 1592, which was the Wagner-Ellender-Taft measure, introduced and reported during the Seventy-ninth Congress, provided for removal of limitations on FHA participation in mortgage insurance on existing homes. These lobbyists to which I have referred desired such a change, and they impressed Congress to such an extent that during the Seventy-ninth Congress there was passed Public Law 480, approved July 1, 1946, by which they attained their goal. Other goals were similarly reached, and I will not take time to go into detail.

Today we are confronted with a proposal of adopting title I of the present Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. That is one of the two titles of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, S. 866, in which the real-estate lobbyists and the Federal home-loan association are really and truly interested. That title makes it possible for a real-estate operator to purchase a tract of land in or on the outskirts of a city, develop it, build some homes on it, and have the Government guarantee 90 percent of the cost of each dwelling erected on such a tract of land and also the cost of the land and other services, if you please. That title operates more or less for the benefit of families that can afford to pay from $50 to as much as $150 per month toward the amortization and other costs of loans made under the title. It also operates for the benefit of those who would undertake to build homes for rental on a basis of from $60 to $160 per month. It is not meant for little people.

I am certain, Mr. President, that if the Senate should adopt the pending amendment there will follow another bill coming from the House or probably proposed by some Senator, wherein title II of S. 866, which provides for a secondary market for GI home loans on FHA-insured mortgages, will have to be considered.

So, Mr. President, if the Congress should adopt legislation whereby titles

I and II of Senate 866, are enacted into law, my guess is that the remainder of S. 866 will never see the light of day. It will never be enacted by the House and the real-estate lobbyists will attain their most cherished goal.

Mr. President, far be it that I desire to take the time of Senators to further indulge in a full explanation of S. 866. The bill seeks to provide methods by which all segments of our society will be able to live in a decent home in a suitable environment. It is a well-rounded bill. I am willing to assist those able to help themselves, but at the same time I am unwilling to overlook those in the low-income groups, who are also entitled to our consideration.

Senators, I ask that the suggestion, by way of compromise, made by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], be followed. The House will then have ample time to hold hearings. During that period of time we will be in a position to determine whether or not the House means to give full consideration to S. 866 and permit it to come to a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill (S. 2565) offered by the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hayden	Myers
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Barkley	Hill	O'Daniel
Bricker	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Brooks	Holland	Pepper
Buck	Ives	Reed
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Cain	Kem	Russell
Capper	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Connally	Knowland	Smith
Cooper	Langer	Stennis
Cordon	Lucas	Taft
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McFarland	Thye
Dworshak	McGrath	Tobey
Eastland	McKellar	Tydings
Ecton	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ellender	Malone	Watkins
Ferguson	Martin	Wherry
Flanders	Maybank	Wiley
Fulbright	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ECTON in the chair). Seventy-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the amendment of the Senator from Washington. It seems to me very extraordinary procedure that we should pass a housing bill covering five or six very important features of housing and constituting together an over-all, well-thought-out housing program dealing with the entire subject of housing, and that, then, in considering a bill which is merely for the purpose of extending one temporary emergency measure, we should try to change it into a bill which is in effect the enactment of one title of the over-all housing bill which we have already passed.

It is not as though the Senator from Washington were merely offering an amendment to extend title VI for a period of 30 days. The amendment which he offers has in it 20 different amendments of title VI. It contains all the amendments of the existing law which were contained in title I of the bill which the Senate passed. Those amendments must be considered by the House committee. They are now being considered by the House committee. It is not true that the House has already passed this provision, because there are 20 amendments in it which the House did not consider until it received our omnibus housing bill, where the amendments appear in title I.

Title I is a section of the bill which deals only with the stimulation of construction under the emergency provisions of the war-housing law, in order to induce private builders to construct houses. It is exceedingly favorable to private builders. In my opinion, it is too favorable to private builders, although I was willing to accept it as a 1-year proposal in order that there might be no charge whatever that we were checking the housing program.

Title I contains a very extraordinary loaning provision with respect to private builders, in which the Government guarantees a mortage for 90 percent of the value of the house which is built. In other words, under it a private builder—not the man who was going to live in the house, but any builder—could, in effect, get a larger Government mortgage, a mortgage up to 90 percent of the value of the building. He would not have to invest any capital; under this provision a man could go into that operation on a shoestring and could build 100 houses, with no investment of his own; and after not having invested any money of his own, he could hold the houses or could rent them until he finally sold them at a profit. That would be exceedingly profitable to the private building industry. Builders could make a very considerable profit under such an arrangement. I am willing that they shall make a profit, simply in order at the present moment to stimulate the construction of houses and to bring about the construction of more houses. But the only person who will be helped by such a provision will be the private builder.

There is nothing anywhere in this amendment which deals with houses costing less than $6,000; and houses costing $6,000 can be lived in or purchased by persons with incomes of $3,000. The average income of families in the United States is less than $3,000. Therefore, more than half of all the families in the United States will not be benefited in any way by this particular provision. It will benefit only somewhat less than half of all the families, inasmuch as less than half of all the families in the United States have incomes of $3,000 or more.

I think it is desirable to make these amendments. I think it is desirable to have what Mr. Eccles has criticized as an overinflation of credit, simply in order to have more houses on hand, more houses built, as long as a market for them can be found. But certainly it is a very lopsided program; it is a program for a limited number of houses; and it provides a very profitable opportunity for all the builders of houses. Certainly, this provision should not be removed from the over-all bill and placed in a separate bill in order that the House may enact such a separate bill only.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Senator from Ohio, in stressing what is in this amendment, is doing a real service to a number of Senators, because I think a great number of the Members of the Senate have been under the impression that this amendment merely provides an extension of the present law for 1 year. But my understanding is that the amendment covers far more ground than that. I believe the Senator from Ohio mentioned a moment ago that in the amendment there are some 20 different propositions that have not been considered by the House of Representatives. I think the Senator should lay a little more stress on that point, because many Senators have been laboring under the delusion that the amendment of the Senator from Washington simply provides for an extension of this title of the act for 1 year.

As I understand the situation, there is much more in the amendment than a mere extension of this title of the present law for 1 year.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. In response to the observation just made by the senior Senator from Illinois, I think it should be pointed out that on innumerable occasions during this debate the statement has been made on the floor of the Senate that the amendment now before the Senate is but title I in its entirety of Senate bill 866. For that reason, the sponsors and proponents of the amendment have proceeded on the assumption that all Members of the Senate are familiar with the details of that title of the bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the pending bill starts out as being only an extension of title VI of the FHA; but in this amendment there are various provisions dealing with title I and title II of the National Housing Act—permanent amendments, with no relation even to a 1-year extension.

If this amendment is adopted, we shall enact not only the provisions for extension of the temporary emergency financing for builders, but also a number of permanent changes in the FHA law which happened to be included in title I. So there seems to be no reason whatever, so far as I can see, for us to reclass one section of the general housing bill and send it to the House of Representatives in the form of a separate bill.

I certainly cannot agree with the Senator from New Hampshire that this represents the wishes of the general real-estate interests. Of course, the National Association of Home Builders has stated its position on this matter. I do not object greatly to lobbyists. I have been called names both by Mr. Reuther and by the National Association of Home Builders. But they make their position perfectly clear, as does the president of

the association in this document, which reads, in part:

> It is my personal conviction and that of the executive committee that Senate bill 866 must be defeated in its entirety.

Mr. President, why must Senate bill 866 be defeated in its entirety? The association takes that position simply because it has built up a propaganda against the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. There is no other reason.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am confused about one thing. From the statement the Senator from Washington made last Friday, I can understand the argument that if the Cain amendment is adopted, such action might hold up the consideration by the House of Representatives of the remaining titles of the over-all bill. I can also understand the reverse: Namely, that the Senate will be imposing upon the House of Representatives a Senate version of the bill, and the House of Representatives may not wish to accept that version. So I can see the controversy there.

But is there any difference between title I in the general housing bill and title I in the pending amendment?

Mr. TAFT. There is no difference at all. Title I has simply been taken out of the bill, and an attempt now is being made to have the Senate pass title I in the form of a separate bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. Inasmuch as the Senate has already passed the complete bill which contains, among other things, title I, about which we are talking, what will be the position of a Senator who now votes against it? Will such a vote simply settle the public-housing issue and the question as to whether the House of Representatives should be sustained in its position or whether the Senate should be sustained in its position on that one point? Is that all that is in issue here, in regard to the Cain amendment?

Mr. TAFT. No. Usually if a bill is passed, that is a very good reason for not passing it a second time. [Laughter.]

That is the reason for not voting for this amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. There is a very good reason for extending this provision of the law, as will be done under this amendment. That is why I insisted last Friday that we take action in some way on title VI. The reason for taking such action is that these loans have temporarily been discontinued.

I submit, in all fairness, that if we forget for the time being the argument as to whether the House version or the Senate version should prevail, at least we certainly would have the Housing Authority loaning feature settled if this amendment were accepted. Am I correct as to that?

Mr. TAFT. No; I do not think the Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. If we agree to this extension, whether we do so by means of the Cain amendment—and I shall vote for an extension of 30 days, if the Cain amendment does not prevail——

Mr. TAFT. It should be extended for at least 60 days, so that it will continue at least beyond the end of the present session of Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. The point I have in mind is that I can understand that if the Senate bill goes to the House of Representatives in this way, the result might be that the matter would be held up. On the other hand, the Senate voted to approve this measure in its entirety. Now there is a desire to extend its application. It seems to me that we shall be in an awkward position if, after we have already voted in favor of the provisions of the Cain amendment, we now vote against them.

I am simply seeking information. I am not a direct party to this debate, although I am rather in the middle of it; but certainly I shall have to vote on this question pretty soon.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there is no reason to adopt this amendment again, inasmuch as it has once been adopted. Obviously, if it is adopted, that will give the House an opportunity to accept this provision and forget about the remainder of the over-all bill. Perhaps the House committee will not do that. I have no doubt that it does not intend to do so; but that is what the real estate lobby intend to have done. They say they want Senate bill 866 defeated in its entirety. Of course, the reason why they want this bill passed is that they want Senate bill 866 defeated in its entirety. But that is an entirely unreasonable position, because Senate bill 866 contains many other provisions for the benefit of the private building industry. In that bill there is the provision for the secondary market for GI loans and the provision for insured loans. There is the provision for research to help the private building industry. The bill contains a provision for housing for lower-income groups, and that provision will be of a less costly character than the one contained in title I and in this amendment. In the bill there is a provision for equity investments by insurance companies in subdivisions—a provision which is distinctly for the benefit of private building industry. The bill contains a provision for urban development, which should do exactly what the private builders want to do—in other words, eliminate slums, and leave such areas open for use by private builders, instead of for the general purposes of public housing.

So the real estate people are utterly unreasonable in saying that they are opposed to that entire bill. That has been my dispute with them all the way through. If they had been willing to present to us their particular objections, and say to us, "Here are our objections, and here is what we think should be done," there never would have been any controversy about the general housing bill. But they have built up a tremendous propaganda against it, and they say they choose to oppose all the provisions of the bill simply because they are afraid one part of the bill might be enacted.

So far as the public housing provisions are concerned, the House of Representatives may reject them. I do not know how the House feels about them. We cannot force them on the House, if the House does not want them. But certainly it is proper for the House of Representatives to consider all the provisions of the bill. So why take only one section of the general bill and hand it to the House of Representatives in the form of a separate bill, and say to the House, "Will not you please pass this separately," and thus remove that provision from the omnibus bill, so that then the private builders may oppose all the remainder of the bill, inasmuch as they would have succeeded in getting all the parts of the bill they wanted?

Those are frankly the tactics of the real-estate group. They are not the tactics of the House committee, I think. I do not think the House committee is trying to do that. But that is what the real-estate group is trying to do.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. What will happen if the House of Representatives takes no action on the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill?

Mr. TAFT. If the House should strike out all the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill except title I, the bill would go to conference, and then the conferees on the part of the Senate would have a right to sit down with the conferees on the part of the House and argue about all the other provisions of the bill.

So if the House did that, that is what would happen.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me state what bothers me: When did the House become so impudent that it could strike out any part of a bill that it did not like, and when did it become so tongue-tied that it could not talk about it or was afraid to talk about it?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I think that is the point.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under such an arrangement, the House might pass a tax bill and send it to the Senate, and then later pass only one portion of that bill, in the form of a separate bill, and send it to the Senate, on the theory that in that way only that portion of the original bill would be enacted, and all the other provisions of the bill would fail of enactment.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to suggest to the very distinguished Senator from Kentucky that in my opinion he is not quite fair. There is a very good reason for those of us who are advocating the pending measure to recommend an extension of 1 year. No loans under title VI are being granted today, so we are in the position of deciding whether we shall continue the operation for 30 days or for a period of 1 year. It has been decided by both Houses that an extension of 1 year is proper. We publicly and very sincerely ask, why not do it now? If the original bill for a 30-day

extension should be passed, further action would have to be taken within a short time, which does not seem reasonable to the proponents of the amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I may interject at this point, the House will have ample time to consider the whole subject between now and the day of adjournment. The House may, if it sees fit, strike out all after the enacting clause and send the bill to conference. There would then be an opportunity to argue all the points of difference. If the pending bill were to be passed, it would never get to conference, and we should then be confronted with the alternative of agreeing to this one thing or having no legislation at all.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. May I ask what justifies the assumption?

Mr. BARKLEY. The fact that the bill is here in my opinion justifies the assumption.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in the event the amendment is defeated, I understand the Senator from Vermont will propose an amendment to the pending bill, providing for an extension of 60 days instead of 30. Since the House may not act by the 1st of June, I think the House should be given a longer time. I should not like to have to go over this whole controversy again.

I feel, Mr. President, that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington should be rejected, and that the bill should then be amended to make it a 60-day bill.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, last Friday there was, of course, considerable discussion of the bill. At that time I should have hesitated to say that which was said this morning by the Philadelphia Inquirer. Of course, the Inquirer is not a Democratic newspaper, it does not subscribe to the political philosophy to which some Senators on this side of the aisle subscribe, although I may say it has advocated many of the programs advanced by the present administration. Nevertheless, the Inquirer this morning published an editorial entitled "A Plot To Scuttle the Housing Program: Smash It."

I said on Friday the effect of the Cain amendment would be to scuttle the housing program. Our purpose Friday was to delay the vote. On that day many speeches were made on behalf of the Senator from Ohio, probably more than will ever again be made on this side of the aisle under similar circumstances. We wanted the Senator from Ohio to be present, he having been the author of the housing bill, and we felt this was an attempt to stab him in the back while he was in Ohio. We also wanted to delay the vote, because the chairman of the subcommittee who reported the bill was absent.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CAIN. May I inquire further with respect to the Senator's intimation that in his opinion there was an effort by somebody to stab the senior Senator from Ohio in the back?

Mr. MYERS. I do not say the knife was in the hand of the junior Senator from Washington, but many people thought the effect of the amendment was to destroy public housing. Many thought the matter should have been postponed until the Senator from Ohio could return to the Chamber, before an attempt was made to scuttle public housing. I thought that, too. I also thought we should wait for the chairman of the committee, the Senator from New Hampshire. Those were the reasons for our fight on Friday. I am glad the vote was delayed until today, so that the two Senators could be present.

I may say that in my native city of Philadelphia there is another newspaper, the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin. It is, I understand, the largest evening newspaper in the United States. It is conservative. As illustrative of its conservatism, I may say that many years ago when they were looking for a slogan for the paper, an employee said to the owner, "I think the slogan should be, 'Everybody reads the Bulletin.'" The owner replied, "No; that is not true. We should not adopt that slogan." "Well," said the employee, "nearly everybody reads the Bulletin." Said the owner, "That is our slogan, 'Nearly everybody reads the Bulletin.'" That is still its slogan.

On April 25, the Evening Bulletin published the report of a survey it had made in Philadelphia, showing that its readers, 4 to 1, favored Government low-cost housing. The Bulletin devoted a full page to public housing. When the housing bill was under consideration, a fight was made on that provision. As shown by the list of names which I read Friday, 49 Members of this body, as I recall, voted against the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington, designed to destroy public housing. The issue was clear. The record was made. I do not think we should now come through the back door with an amendment seeking to destroy public housing.

I should like to read the editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer. I think it sums up the whole argument. I should not have given it this heading. Nevertheless, the Inquirer this morning said:

A PLOT TO SCUTTLE THE HOUSING PROGRAM—SMASH IT

The bald attempts by a few Senators to sabotage the Government's badly needed housing program should be smashed, completely and permanently.

In the guise of a separate bill to extend for 11 months Federal insurance of home-building loans, the move is scheduled for a vote today. It is the vehicle for another drive by die-hard opponents of public housing to delay, if not block entirely, the start of a real effort to alleviate the shortage of housing space.

As coauthor of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner long-range housing bill, which the Senate has already passed, Senator TAFT is justified in his blistering denunciation of the sudden interest in extending loan insurance.

This provision, as TAFT pointed out, is already part of the TEW bill, now awaiting action in the House. It is the one section of the over-all housing measure which is desired by real-estate interests.

If the Senate passes the extension all over again, it will provide the House with a ready-made device to avoid a vote on the housing program, and still act on the loan guarantee extension. It is no secret that hopes for prying the Taft bill out of a House committee depend largely on this extension provision.

There is little question that an extension of loan insurance is necessary, to attract funds for continued investment in home-building. But there is unfortunately nothing in the record of the years since the end of the war to indicate that this alone would be enough to solve the housing problem.

The lack of construction during the war, the growth of the population, the return of veterans and the increased marriage rate have confronted the Nation with a problem which only a well-rounded, long-range program can remedy. In the construction of low-rental homes, and in slum clearance work, we have evidence that Federal intervention is needed.

Backers of the TEW bill provided a program which promised some success. Many cities, Philadelphia among them, began making plans to take advantage of the provisions for Federal loans for housing projects, as soon as the bill passed the Senate.

Those plans will be blasted, and with them hopes for a sensible housing program, unless the House passes the entire measure.

The Senate acted wisely in approving the Taft-Ellender-Wagner measure. It should follow through by defeating any measure to provide tools for the House to bury it.

There were on the floor of the Senate on Friday afternoon several leaders of the House of Representatives. The House had recessed and was waiting to resume its session as soon as the Senate passed the 1-year extension. The House was waiting patiently in order immediately to consider it on Friday afternoon, pass it, and thereby to kill public housing.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. I gladly yield.

Mr. CAIN. Has the Senator any reason to assume that the House of Representatives would not have stood in recess and have awaited action of the Senate if the extension had been a 30-day extension? The Senator's implication is that they were waiting in recess only in order to sabotage the long-range so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. I certainly would have faith enough in the House of Representatives to assume that it recognized the expiration date and hour of the present law as being last Friday night at 12 o'clock.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, everyone knew we could have waited until Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday. We lost no time by delaying the vote until this week. The purpose is to kill and destroy public housing. As I have stated, the vote on the amendment will determine how we stand on public housing. I will not object to an extension for 60 days, but it seems to me to be rather foolish to have an extension for 60 days. That will take us up until approximately July 6. As I understand,

it is proposed that Congress shall adjourn a few days before the Republican Convention, which would be the 17th, 18th, or 19th of June. We shall then be in recess, and probably shall have adjourned by the 6th of July. I should think we could extend it for 30 days and let the House stand up and be counted. Let us see where they stand on public housing. If they strike out our extension we can take it to conference. I will go along with the extension of 60 days, but I think it is foolish, because when we reach the expiration date the Congress will probably be in adjournment

So I say, Mr. President, in conclusion, that a vote for the amendment extending title VI for 1 year will have the effect of destroying and killing, at least for this session, public housing which the Senate overwhelmingly approved only a short time ago.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. As to the 60-day provision, if it is extended for 60 days we might be in adjournment by June 20, and it is obvious that action would have to be taken before that date. But the mere fact that it might expire at that time would be no argument against a 60-day extension. We would again have the problem of extending it for another 30 days.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I understand that there is now a bill pending, which proposes to extend the provision 1 year. If it should develop that the House would not pass it, could not action be taken on it at that time?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia (when his name was called). On this amendment I have a pair with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who is absent on public business. If he were present he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of illness in his family and is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. The Senator from Indiana, if present and voting, would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is necessarily absent, and is paired on this vote with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea" and the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is necessarily absent, and is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea," and the Senator from Massachusetts, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are detained on official committee business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] is absent because of illness.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent because of illness in their families.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] are absent on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay."

I announce further that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES]. If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "nay," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—28

Bricker	Ferguson	Millikin
Brooks	Gurney	Moore
Buck	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Butler	Hoey	Russell
Byrd	Holland	Stennis
Cain	Kem	Wherry
Cordon	McClellan	Wiley
Dworshak	McFarland	Williams
Eastland	Malone	
Ecton	Martin	

NAYS—43

Aiken	Hill	O'Connor
Baldwin	Ives	O'Mahoney
Ball	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Barkley	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Capper	Kilgore	Smith
Connally	Knowland	Taft
Cooper	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	Lucas	Thye
Downey	McGrath	Tobey
Ellender	McKellar	Tydings
Flanders	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Fulbright	Maybank	Watkins
Green	Morse	Young
Hatch	Murray	
Hayden	Myers	

NOT VOTING—25

Brewster	McCarran	Stewart
Bridges	McCarthy	Taylor
Bushfield	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Capehart	Overton	Umstead
Chavez	Reed	Wagner
George	Revercomb	White
Hawkes	Robertson Va.	Wilson
Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.	
Lodge	Sparkman	

So Mr. CAIN's amendment was rejected.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to offer the amendment which I suggested during the course of the debate, to strike out, in line 6, after the word "thereof", the figures "'$5,600,000,000'" and insert in lieu thereof "'$5,850,000,000'"; and on line 8, after the word "thereof,", to strike out "'May 31, 1948'" and insert in lieu thereof "'June 30, 1948.'"

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] joins me in the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont for himself and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2565) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1254, House bill 6226, the supplemental national defense appropriation bill, designated as the appropriation bill for procurement of the Air Forces.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6226) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year

ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Maj. Gen. Muir Stephen Fairchild, AO10555, United States Air Force, to be Vice Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, with the rank of general, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATIONS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles Sawyer to be Secretary of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Russell B. Adams to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that the nomination go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Delos Wilson Rentzel to be Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harrington Wimberly to be a member of the Federal Power Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Otto T. Ault to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is agreed to.

THE COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Herman E. Moore to be judge of the District Court of the Virgin Islands of the United States.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the reappointment of Judge Herman E. Moore for an additional 4-year term to the bench of the District Court of the Virgin Islands is an event in which I take a deep personal pleasure. At the time of his last appointment, in 1944, he was the only Negro in the United States serving in the capacity of Federal judge.

Judge Moore is a distinguished leader of the Negro community in the United States, as well as an impartial and illustrious jurist. He was born in Jackson, Miss., and received his training in the law at Howard University and Boston University. He is a member of the bar of the State of Illinois, where he engaged in the practice of law for 14 years. Since his first appointment to the bench in August 1939, he has made a record which has earned him praise from all quarters. He has been characterized by the American Bar Association as a man of notable judicial temperament, whose qualifications to the particular judgeship to which he has been appointed are outstanding. The comment of the Bar Association which most attracted my attention was the statement that it was rather difficult to judge whether he is a conservative or a liberal, but that it seemed obvious that as a judge he would decide cases on the basis of the law and the facts, on their merits, without fear or favor. To my mind, no higher tribute can be paid to a judge in our system of jurisprudence.

During his term of office, Judge Moore has maintained the dignity and the high standard of respect which the Virgin Islands court has enjoyed. His broad vision and his sympathetic understanding of human nature make him firm yet gentle in applying the force of the law. His outstanding characteristic is his love of fairness.

A testimonial to his character has been spread on the records of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, to which appeals from the District Court of the Virgin Islands lie. In a case on appeal from the judgment of Judge Moore, Circuit Judge Maris had this to say concerning the conduct of Judge Moore:

> In rendering this judgment, the judge delivered an opinion in which he discussed the evidence and his duty with respect to the case in a manner which reflects great credit upon his character and demonstrates his ability to administer the law impartially and justly in an atmosphere of intense public excitement and under circumstances which doubtless compelled him to subordinate his own natural feeling.

Judge Moore's nomination has been unanimously endorsed by the Virgin Islands Bar Association. The Honorable William H. Hastie, Governor of the Virgin Islands, has strongly endorsed his nomination. He has likewise received the endorsement of the Chicago Bar Association.

I am happy to pay tribute to a judge whose strong convictions and belief in our American institutions and the orderly enforcement of the law make him a distinguished ornament to the Federal bench. It is a source of great gratification to me that I have been able to play some part in the appointment of such a distinguished and successful citizen of the State of Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John Joseph McGowan to be United States marshal for the district of Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION—HOWARD BRUCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Howard Bruce of Maryland, to be Deputy Administrator for Economic Cooperation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask that the nomination go over.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection long enough for me to ask a question?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. May I ask why the Senator requested that the nomination go over?

Mr. LANGER. I should like the nomination to go over for 24 hours while I make an investigation.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from North Dakota has no disposition to withhold his approval of the nomination, or to hold it up for any length of time, has he? If we have an executive session tomorrow, might I assume that the Senator will be in a position to vote for or against the nomination?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask the question of the Senator from North Dakota on behalf of my colleague [Mr. O'CONOR] and myself. Both of us are familiar with the character and attainments of Mr. Bruce. For whatever our testimony may be worth, I will say that we consider him to be one of the most outstanding and public-service-minded citizens of this country. He is a man who rendered exceedingly distinguished service to the Nation during the war. I would certainly feel, knowing the Senator from North Dakota as I do, that he would not compromise himself or violate any of his noble motives at all if he were to accede quickly to the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Bruce. I say this on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] and myself, who have conferred about the matter.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to assure the Senator that I shall be ready in respect to this matter tomorrow.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from North Dakota will be ready tomorrow, because this is a key position in connection with this terrifically important enterprise. I want to

say for the RECORD that the Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration considers himself, as he stated to the committee, very fortunate to have been able to obtain the consent of Mr. Bruce to accept this deputyship. Mr. Bruce was seriously considered for the major post, and was fully qualified for it.

I want to say to the Senator from North Dakota that the Committee on Foreign Relations had Mr. Bruce before it for an hour and a half on yesterday, and I think he passed about as completely satisfactory an examination as any nominee who has ever appeared before the committee for any position. I respectfully suggest, in view of the sacrifice which he makes in order to take a position of this character, that we be not too reluctant to be at least partially generous in our sense of appreciation for the service which Mr. Bruce is prepared to render his country.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I very much hope that the Senator from North Dakota will be prepared to let us act upon this matter tomorrow, if the Senate shall be in session then.

I have known Mr. Bruce for a good many years. He is an outstanding citizen, and a distinguished businessman in Maryland. He is not a job seeker. He does not want this position because it will be of any personal advantage to him. He is accepting it at a great personal sacrifice to his comfort and his convenience. All those who know him, who appeared before the committee, testified in the highest terms of his character, his reputation, and his valuable service during the war. He rendered very distinguished service to the War Department and was awarded a certificate of merit or some recognition of that kind.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Distinguished Service Medal. He is one of four civilians who has been awarded the Distinguished Service Medal.

Mr. CONNALLY. The service he then rendered was without financial reward or remuneration. It is seldom we have an opportunity to procure in these difficult positions, these trying positions, the service of a man who accepts it through a sense of public duty and patriotism, with no hope of financial or personal reward. I feel, sincerely, that that is the case with Mr. Bruce, and I hope that the Senator from North Dakota will be prepared to act on the nomination tomorrow, because this delay in a measure holds up the activities under the Economic Cooperation Administration.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I agree in toto with the fine things that have been said about Mr. Bruce. I know of no individual whom the Small Business Committee contacted more often than it did Mr. Bruce. He has been very helpful to the committee and to its personnel. I have profound respect for Mr. Bruce. I think this is the first time in my experience in the Senate that I have eulogized anyone who has been nominated, and whose name came to the Senate for confirmation. I desire to say that the Senator from North Dakota, however, is not doing anything unusual by making the request he has made. All he does is ask that the nomination go over for 24 hours. I am satisfied that when the Senator from North Dakota examines Mr. Bruce's record he will be prepared to have the nomination considered tomorrow. The nomination has just been placed on the calendar. I am satisfied that by tomorrow the nomination will be considered, and I am confident that if the distinguished Senator from North Dakota will examine Mr. Bruce's record, he will have no opposition to the nomination.

I realize that the post to which Mr. Bruce has been nominated is a very important one. For that reason I also ask that the distinguished Senator from North Dakota be prepared, if possible, to act upon the nomination tomorrow. The Senator is well within his rights, however, in making his objection.

Mr. LUCAS rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas still has the floor. The Chair was under the impression that he had yielded to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CONNALLY. Perhaps I unconsciously yielded.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator very much for yielding to me. I thought he had yielded the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I want to stress the fact that the delay now requested in a measure holds up the beginning of the activities of the Economic Cooperation Administration, which is of the highest importance not only to the United States but to the world. The Senator from North Dakota, of course, is entitled to make the examination he requests, and I am not complaining, but I do express the hope that if he will look into Mr. Bruce's record and consult the hearings before the committee, and read the statements of those who know Mr. Bruce, on tomorrow he will express his approval of the nomination.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not remotely complain of the Senator from North Dakota for asking that the nomination go over for 24 hours. He is within his rights in asking that it go over for that time, and such a request is frequently made in regard to nominations.

I was not present when Mr. Bruce appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations because of my absence from the city. I did not have to be present to know of Mr. Bruce's qualifications for this important mission. I have known him for many years as an honorable businessman, as a forthright, outspoken businessman as well as American citizen. I think Mr. Hoffman is justified in feeling most fortunate in having a man of such caliber and experience and outlook as his chief deputy in this great enterprise.

There is no advantage that Mr. Bruce could obtain from holding a position of this sort. If there is any weight to be given on either side of the scale, he is the loser. Certainly financially he is the loser. The loss financially, however, is compensated by the satisfaction he will undoubtedly feel that he has participated in the performance of a highly important duty and a great service to his country and, we hope, to the world. So I am satisfied that when the Senator from North Dakota looks into the matter he will be prepared to act.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that I approved very heartily and sincerely the nomination of Mr. Paul Hoffman to be Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration. I think the appointment was a very fine one. I merely want 24 hours to consider the present nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On objection, the nomination will be passed over.

UNITED NATIONS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas C. Wasson, of New Jersey, to be representative of the United States of America on the Truce Commission for Palestine, established by resolution of the Security Council of the United Nations April 23, 1948.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the diplomatic and Foreign Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the diplomatic and Foreign Service are confirmed en bloc.

Without objection, the President will be notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

CONSIDERATION BY COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE OF POSTMASTER NOMINATIONS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, while we are talking about individuals who have rendered distinguished service to their country, I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota when he expects his committee to report the nominations of approximately 700 postmasters. As I understand, 75 percent of them are veterans who have rendered distinguished service to their country.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that we have already reported more than 50 such nominations. Forty-three were confirmed less than 2 weeks ago. For the past 2 weeks we have been unable to obtain a quorum in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, because Senators were engaged in other committees. We are considering the nominations. I rather think that some will be reported very shortly. As a matter of fact, the nominations of postmasters were on the agenda last Tuesday, but only four members of the committee were in attendance. Some of the absentees are Senators from the other side of the aisle. Only the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] was present representing the Democratic side of the Chamber. He was present on Tuesday, and he was the only Democrat who showed up.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I do not know about that, but I was present.

Mr. LANGER. On the other hand, three Republicans were present. I do not know of any disposition whatever on the part of any member of the committee to hold up the nominations. In an overwhelming majority of cases these men are acting postmasters, so they are not being hurt, with the exception of one in

Houston, Tex. We propose to hold a hearing on his nomination.

Mr. LUCAS. This is the early part of May. The Senator's committee has reported only 50 postmaster nominations since January. Is that correct?

Mr. LANGER. Yes; we reported forty-three 2 weeks ago.

Mr. LUCAS. The primary reason for calling this matter to the attention of the Senator is the fact that there had been some talk about high and distinguished public service rendered by Mr. Bruce, which is absolutely true. I understand that about 75 percent of the 700 men whose nominations are now being held in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service rendered distinguished public service to our country in the last war. If we are going to talk about public service, and base our action upon public service, it seems to me that the little fellows who shouldered muskets and went to war ought to have an opportunity to administer these post offices and obtain a little compensation.

Mr. LANGER. I believe that with two or three exceptions everyone of these men is an acting postmaster.

Mr. LUCAS. Not all of them are.

Mr. LANGER. Practically all of them are acting postmasters, and are drawing salaries.

DISPOSITION OF BUSINESS ON THE EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to make one observation. I point with pride to the fact that until today there has not been a nomination on the Executive Calendar which has not been confirmed promptly. We have handled them in an orderly fashion. It will be my purpose to continue to do so as soon as nominations are reported and placed upon the calendar.

While we are talking about distinguished service, I remind Senators that the Executive Calendar is clear, and we are trying to clear the Legislative Calendar as rapidly as possible.

Mr. President, the Senate having concluded its business for the day, I now move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, May 6, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 5 (legislative day of May 4), 1948:

IN THE AIR FORCE

Maj. Gen. Muir Stephen Fairchild, AO10555, United States Air Force, to be Vice Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, with the rank of general.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 5 (legislative day of May 4), 1948:

UNITED NATIONS

Thomas C. Wasson to be the representative of the United States of America on the Truce Commission for Palestine.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO AFGHANISTAN

Ely E. Palmer.

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 3, CONSUL, AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

John M. Steeves.

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 4, CONSULS, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

John M. Echols
William Koren, Jr.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Charles Sawyer to be Secretary of Commerce.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

Delos Wilson Rentzel to be Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Harrington Wimberly to be a member, Federal Power Commission, for the term expiring June 22, 1953.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Herman E. Moore to be judge, District Court of the Virgin Islands of the United States.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Otto T. Ault to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Tennessee.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

John Joseph McGowan to be United States marshal for the district of Minnesota.

COAST GUARD

TO BE ENSIGNS IN THE COAST GUARD, TO RANK FROM JUNE 4, 1948

Irving Louis Apgar 2d
Stuart Scott Beckwith
Kenneth Judson Boedecker, Jr.
Robert John Bosnak
James Byron Brook
William Parker Butler, Jr.
John Kerwin Byerlein
Wayne Eugene Caldwell
Donald Morgan Chapman
Maxwell Seymour Charleston
James Timothy Clune
Luigi Colucciello
John Denis Crowley
Harry Augustus Davenport 3d
Robert Ellwood Deaver
Robert Emerson Dolliver
Joseph Clyde Dorsky
Robert Alan Duin
Robert Walker Durfey
Norman Paul Ensrud
William Henry Fitzgerald, Jr.
Philippe Cheney Gaucher
Robert Franklin Goebel
Harry Frederick Gregg
Robert Saxby Hall
Clarence Reinhold Hallberg
Charles Briggs Hathaway
Edward LeRoy Hauff
James Richard Hope
Herbert Edward Lindemann
Carl Stevens Mathews
Robert James McCune
Samuel Murray Moore 3d
Eli Curtis Nielson
Walter Charles Ochman
Howard William Pagel
Alfred Prunski
LeRoy Reinburg, Jr.
Virgil Willard Rinehart
Duane Gordon Ross
George Schmidt
Stuart Talmage Scharfenstein
Bernard Shapiro
Darrel Williams Starr, Jr.
Richard Chatfield Taylor
Robert Charles Taylor
Bernie Eunie Thompson
Paul Wilbur Tifft, Jr.
Richard Joseph Tomozer
Robert Everett Walsh
William Randolph Weadon
Thomas Trask Wetmore 3d

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 5, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, source of all power, hold captive every waiting thought as we contemplate anew the duties of this day. Make us considerate in conservation and diligent in all things. Give us persistence in our ever-changing tasks; persistence when the outlook is forbidding, and persistence to subdue all subversive elements in our own dear land.

Constrain us, O God, from yielding to weakness, and make us to serve devotedly our own national house. Give us courage to identify ourselves with every cause of human need, trustfully walking with Thee, whose ways are paths of peace. In our Master's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On April 27, 1948:

H. R. 4931. An act to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights."

On April 28, 1948:

H. R. 1799. An act for the relief of Eva L. Dudley, Grace M. Collins, and Guy B. Slater.

On May 3, 1948:

H. R. 344. An act for the relief of Sylvester T. Starling;

H. R. 761. An act for the relief of the estate of Anthony D. Chamberlain, deceased;

H. R. 1667. An act for the relief of the estate of T. L. Morris;

H. R. 2728. An act for the relief of Darwin Slump; and

H. R. 5328. An act to amend paragraph 1803 (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, relating to firewood and other woods.

On May 4, 1948:

H. R. 762. An act for the relief of Dudley Tarver;

H. R. 1275. An act to authorize the payment of certain claims for medical treatment of persons in the naval service; to repeal section 1586 of the Revised Statutes; and for other purposes;

H. R. 1747. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Lee Novick and others;

H. R. 2399. An act for the relief of Joseph W. Beyer;

H. R. 3113. An act for the relief of Bessie B. Blacknall;

H. R. 3328. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Russell Coulter;

H. R. 4399. An act for the relief of James C. Smith, Stephen A. Bodkin, Charles A. Marlin, Andrew J. Perlik, and Albert N. James;

H. R. 4490. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to provide salvage facilities, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5448. An act to amend sections 212 (b) and 231 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1648. An act to authorize the expenditure of income from Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for training of Federal prisoners.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 2239) entitled "An act to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. THYE, and Mr. MCCLELLAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Army.
3. Departments of the Army and the Air Force.
4. Department of Justice.
5. Department of the Navy.
6. Department of the Treasury.
7. Post Office Department.
8. Administrative Office of the United States Courts.
9. Housing and Finance Agency.
10. Veterans' Administration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1948

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6055) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, ENGEL of Michigan, STEFAN, CASE of South Dakota, KEEFE, CANNON, KERR, and MAHON.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FOOTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MATHEWS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

SAVE AMERICA

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for a half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I hope somebody will save this country from some of the people in it who are trying to save the world.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SEELY-BROWN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered at the Republican State convention at Nashville, Tenn., on Friday, April 30, 1948, by Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

STAMP COMMEMORATING ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF COMING OF SWEDES TO CENTRAL WEST

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I feel that I should announce that I had a very good letter from the President yesterday stating that he had reconsidered his action with reference to the 5-cent stamp commemorating the one hundredth anniversary of the coming of the Swedes to the Central West. He has authorized the Postmaster General to issue such a stamp, and tentatively it has been decided that the first-day sale will be at the Swedish Club of Chicago on June 4, 1948. That being the case, no further action will be necessary by this body.

THE GREEK SITUATION

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I reckon I have a right to read this telegram because I did not vote for the Greek-Turkish loan because of its military implications. The telegram is as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *May 4, 1948.*

Hon. JOHN H. FOLGER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

One hundred and fifty-four Greek anti-Fascists were executed today. Eight hundred and thirty more face possible execution within 10 days in mass reprisal action against assassination Justice Minister Ladas imprisoned since 1944–45. The patriots could not have participated in present Greek conflict. Their only crime is that they fought with resistance forces during World War II for democracy. Their lives depend upon you. Protest immediately through public statements and wires to State Department, Congressmen, and Greek Embassy, Washington.

M. MENDELENAKIS,
Secretary, American Council for Democratic Greece, 152 West Forty-second Street.

THE SUSTAINED HIGH COST OF LIVING

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the high cost of living which is getting higher daily can be attributed to five particular reasons: First, insufficient, costly production; second, high wartime taxes, open and hidden; third, the Marshall plan; fourth, the colossal cost of the Federal Government; and, fifth, our national food policy which includes the Steagall Act, which is very definitely responsible.

I hope that the Republican Party will take the leadership in bringing to the country the relief to which it is entitled and the relief we must have if we are going to have peace, higher production, and maintenance of good government here.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may include as part of my remarks an article from the Philadelphia Inquirer of today, written by John C. Bell, Jr., former Governor of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

(The article referred to follows:)

TODAY

HIGH COST OF LIVING—FIVE FACTORS BLAMED—STRIKES KILL PRODUCTION—STEAGALL ACT RUINOUS—ACTION IMPERATIVE

(By John C. Bell, Jr., former Governor of Pennsylvania)

Russia's recent warlike actions, the Italian elections, the European recovery program, tax reduction, the 70-group air force, John L. Lewis, and the recent primaries have captured the newspaper headlines and temporarily caused the people to forget one of the Nation's worst headaches—the high cost of living. Nearly everyone wonders whether something can't be done about it. The answer is undoubtedly "Yes."

Five major factors are keeping up the high cost of living: (1) Insufficient, costly production; (2) high wartime taxes, open and hidden; (3) the Marshall plan; (4) the colossal cost of the Federal Government; and (5) our national food policy.

The cost of the Marshall plan will be greatly reduced if and when prices in America are reduced. The colossal cost of the Federal Government and its unnecessary bureaucracy will be reduced only if an economy-minded Republican President and Congress are elected next November. Fortunately, Congress has given, not one group, but all of the people of the United States, a reduction in taxes. That leaves for consideration (1) production, and (2) food.

Production suffers from high costs, high taxes, high profits, strikes, and not enough real work. Nearly every economist, labor leader, and business leader agree that the

quickest, surest cure of the high cost of living is greater production at lower cost. The greatest blow to production is undoubtedly strikes. Right now our country is threatened with an epidemic of strikes which will hurt all of us and further increase the high cost of living.

When strikes occur in basic industries, do the strikers, or the management if it causes the strike, ever stop to realize the hardships and the loss in wages and profits they cause millions of their fellow Americans or the misery that inevitably results to millions of destitute people in Europe? When a giant corporation raises the cost of some of its products at a time when its profits are tremendous, do you blame people for wondering whether our business leaders realize the dangers of inflation or care much about the welfare of our Nation?

On the other hand, an important step has been taken toward reducing the high cost of living by three recent announcements—one by General Electric that they have cut prices $60,000,000 a year; another by Westinghouse of substantial price cuts; and still another by U. S. Steel of cuts totaling $25,000,000 a year. Can't we keep the ball rolling? We can if we don't have strikes.

One of the main reasons for strikes is because the take-home pay, the money left over after taxes, will not buy or pay for the real necessities of life. It is sometimes difficult to realize that while our take-home pay is very important, it is not nearly as important as what are often called real wages. Real wages means what we can actually buy with our take-home pay.

In other words, if a man or woman who makes $40 a week can buy more food, household goods, and other necessities or luxuries than one who makes $50 a week, isn't it obvious that the man or woman who makes $40 a week real wages is much better off than the one making $50 a week? What is the sense in strikes which increase the cost of living for everyone and actually reduce real wages?

Food is the largest item in the high cost of living. Food makes up approximately 33 percent of the necessary living expenses of the average family and since 1935–39 the cost of food has risen over 100 percent. Why can't its cost be substantially reduced, thus easing the living problem of every American and still give the farmer (whose income has increased, since the war, over 150 percent), a fair profit, to which he is certainly entitled.

One-third of the answer is the Government's exports of food; one-third of the answer is the Steagall Act; and another third is that 1948 is an election year and no politician wants to alienate the farm vote. Everyone knows that the Government is buying from time to time, vast supplies of food for export to the undernourished peoples of Europe which can't be eliminated, although the cost can be considerably reduced by more intelligent policies and more economical buying.

But the most important reason that food prices are not dropping very substantially is the above-mentioned Steagall amendment, passed by the Democrats in 1939, which requires the Government to support food prices at 90 percent of parity. The result is that when butter or wheat or any one of 20 different kinds of food drop in price, the Government steps in, buys and puts in storage hundreds of millions of dollars worth of food supplies which it does not need, in order to keep the cost of food from going lower.

One example will suffice—the CCC, an agency of the Government of the United States, bought last year 95,000,000 bushels of potatoes out of a total potato crop of 478,000,000 bushels in order to keep up the price of potatoes. Our Federal Government, which urges us to conserve food and to eat less, then added an act of criminal folly to its stupidity by burning millions and millions of bushels of potatoes. Our Government didn't even have the sense to ship their surplus potatoes or their surplus prunes or their surplus poultry or their other food surpluses to the destitute peoples of Europe, millions of whom are living on a starvation diet.

Why not, for the sake of ourselves and the welfare of our country, do something about it? Why shouldn't business abandon its greed for inordinate profits and reduce prices wherever possible; why shouldn't labor give up strikes in basic industries and increase production; why don't the politicians substantially modify the Steagall Act—with the result that real wages will be increased; the cost of food and the high cost of living will be greatly reduced; inflation will be licked; and all the people of the United States and of western Europe will be tremendously benefited.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Did the gentleman see the statement of subsidies that are being paid by the Federal Government on page A2724 of the Appendix of the RECORD, inserted by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY]? If we study that table we will find one reason for the high-price situation.

Mr. GROSS. I am familiar with it. The gentleman is right.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article entitled "Global Recovery and States' Debts" by Thurman Sensing, before the Southern Industrial Council.

Mr. KELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KILDAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address he made recently.

PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURAL COMMITTEE OF 1949

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 48 authorizing the appointment of a joint committee to arrange for the inauguration of the President-elect of the United States on January 20, 1949.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That a joint committee consisting of three Senators and three Representatives, to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, is authorized to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect of the United States on the 20th day of January 1949.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TRANSMITTING FIRST REPORT OF FOREIGN-AID PROGRAM (H. DOC. NO. 636)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, and together with the accompanying report referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the first quarterly report of expenditures and activities under the United States foreign-aid program authorized by Public Law 389 of the Eightieth Congress, approved December 17, 1947. This report covers the activities immediately before and during the brief period from the approval of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947, on December 17 through December 31, 1947.

By its enactment of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947, the Congress provided the interim aid to bridge the gap between the end of the United States foreign-relief program, authorized under Public Law 84, and the beginning of a general long-range-recovery program.

A break in the flow of supplies during this period could have irreparably jeopardized what the long-range-recovery program is expected to accomplish. The effectiveness of interim aid has made it possible for the European recovery program to build on sure foundations which nowhere are undermined by the inevitable ravages of intolerable hunger and cold. No better proof is needed of the wisdom of providing this interim aid.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 5, 1948.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend and revise the remarks he will make in the Committee of the Whole and include tables and other extraneous material.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 2 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and the other half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6430, with Mr. REES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a rather odd but to me pleasing observation. I have a constituent in the gallery who was born in Emporia, Kans. It so happens that the choice of the Chairman of the Committee today is the gentleman who represents that city in the Congress of the United States, the Honorable EDWARD REES, of Emporia.

Mr. Chairman, there is not much I can say about this bill that you have not already read in the newspapers. No one can have the job of chairman of the District of Columbia Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, which considers the appropriations for this political workshop we call a Federal reservation or the District of Columbia, and say anything that has not already been printed in the papers long before the bill reaches the floor of the House for consideration. Therefore I will limit my remarks to observations that I think are pertinent to this bill.

The bill carries a particularly significant increase in the Police Department. We all recall that on the occasion of the meeting of the political leaders of the Western Hemisphere at Bogota recently that those who would upset the peaceful progress of the free and democratic republics saw fit to organize and to put through a rather disastrous riot in Bogota, in South America. Our subcommittee recognized that that can happen here in the Nation's Capital. It can happen because we preserve the freedom of everybody here. We give the people freedom of speech and action, which is proper; but in so doing there is a possible threat to the safety and the security and the peace of this political workshop of Washington, D. C., should the strategic occasion come.

The bill before you carries very few increases over the budget that was sent to the Bureau of the Budget by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. In my opinion, the Commissioners did a splendid job in cutting down the original requests.

The departments of the District of Columbia originally requested some $140,000,000 to implement and to run the Nation's Capital through the fiscal year 1949. The Commissioners cut this down to approximately $101,500,000. They did such a good job that when the budget was sent to the Bureau of the Budget, it was not changed one jot or tittle.

Very few requests that come up to the Hill have that experience when they go through the Bureau of the Budget. We met and considered this budget in detail and without hurry. There are nearly 1,300 pages of hearings.

Again this year we paid particular attention to the Welfare Department and to the Department of Health. In my book those are what you could call the open-door departments. We feel that there is where the emphasis of administration should be placed: one, to see that fraud is not committed against a beneficent and liberal society; and, two, to see that those who need the services of those departments are able to get those services.

Again this year we called in all of the other welfare organizations that operate here in the Nation's Capital. We called in the Catholic Charities, the Community Chest, the Board of Social Welfare, and all of the other many, many private institutions that operate in the welfare field in the District. We did that, because in the absence of home rule we felt that we were obligated to invite them in to help us consider what was near and dear to them. As an additional innovation this year we called in the hospital associations and the doctors' associations and all of those engaged in private operations or semiprivate institutions that have to do with the health of the people of the District.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I want to take this opportunity to compliment the gentleman and his committee for a fine job done on his District budget. Anyone who examines the hearings and notices the amount of time that has gone into the preparation of the bill can readily understand what a tremendous labor of love the gentleman from Washington and his subcommittee have performed. I think he is eminently deserving of the plaudits and the acclaim and the gratitude not only of the citizens of the District of Columbia, but of the Members of the Congress and the country as well. I extend my heartiest personal congratulations as chairman of the legislative Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. HORAN. I thank the gentleman. I would be less than human if I did not appreciate it, and I appreciate it especially coming from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who knows so much about the District of Columbia and its problems.

We called in all of these people who are associated in any way with the health problems of the District of Columbia. We did that because we know and you know that the health of our society is mighty important. We did it for another reason. We did it because the costs of running all sorts of government, public and private, are constantly increasing; that the costs of running all sorts of enterprises are costing the citizens of the District of Columbia, for purposes of welfare, health and recreation, in excess of $31,000,000 annually. That is the amount of money that is being extracted from the common purse of the people of the District of Columbia each year; the same purse that makes donations to private institutions, and pays taxes to the Government. Of that $31,000,000 about 73 percent is paid through taxes, and is found in the budget before you.

When we called in these private hospital associations, for instance, during these health hearings, we found that quite a number of them were having serious difficulties. Many of them are housed in old buildings. Many of them are in need of repair. The cost of operating their institutions has grown by leaps and bounds. The cost of personnel has gone up. The emphasis that we have been properly placing upon the health of the general public has found them treating more and more tax eligibles. We found that there were three hospitals that the District had had contracts with for years.

In other words, any emergency case or even any other case of a medical indigent who was eligible for treatment by the general public either at Gallinger Municipal Hospital or in some private hospital might be sent to Casualty, to Emergency, or to Children's Hospital. That part was all right, but then as we considered the budget, testimony was offered to us showing that several other hospitals had been doing tens of thousands of dollars worth of treatment for tax-eligible medical indigents. If you will refer to page 875 of the hearings you will find that Garfield Hospital, for example, had done a total of $93,000 worth of work for medical indigents for which they received no pay, and testimony before our committee indicated that unless they were assisted they would have to close some of their wards and possibly their doors. The same thing was true of Providence Hospital. So the committee, realizing that in appropriating for Gallinger Hospital we were injecting additional competition into the field against these deserving District private hospitals, saw fit to increase the amount and the scope of contract hospitalization in the District. We did that for the simple reason that we do not want through the influence of an appropriation bill to set the health pattern of the District of Columbia. You will find in the bill a total of nearly $800,000 under the heading of medical charities. In taking that action you will find the hearings eloquent of this admonition on the part of our subcommittee to the medical fraternity of the District. We said to them in effect, "We are going to take this action now, but we do trust that you doctors and you nurses will study this problem and that we will work out a health pattern here in the District of Columbia with which we all can live and which will not work any undue or unfair hardship on any private hospital or any doctor or anyone else in the District of Columbia.

In our hearings on public health—and they comprise nearly one-fourth of the total hearings of 1,300 pages—we also reviewed the work that resulted from the action of this subcommittee a year ago, when we went above the budget to institute the TB survey. Last year when we had this bill before us, we found that 63 percent of all those who were admitted to Glendale Sanitarium with tuberculosis were dying. We felt that that was entirely too high a percentage,

so last year we allowed money which, in conjunction with the Public Health Administration, enabled the District of Columbia to have the benefit of a District-wide TB survey, and I expect that many Members of Congress have had their own chests photographed. The results of that are rather encouraging. Whereas we recognized that there might be a total of 6,000 who would be found to be in various stages of TB, the testimony before the committee indicates that it will be less than 5,000, and probably only about 10 percent of those who have it will have to be institutionalized. In the hearings this year we made an inventory of the available beds at Gallinger, at Glendale, and at the Ambulatory Hospital on Fourteenth and Upshur, and also of the beds that were available for TB treatment at the other hospitals, including the contract hospitals.

There was another item that attracted our attention in this bill. It has to do with the cleaning of snow from our streets. It has to do with what is known as the Sanitation Division now. We used to call it the Refuse Division. It has to do with the building through a capital outlay item of a central garage for that Division. They have a garage not far from here now. It is an old structure. It has been condemned by the fire marshal. It can burn down any time. If it were to burn down, there would be a lot of refuse lying around this District for quite a while, because all the refuse trucks are in that garage. It is an old structure, as I have said. When the snows come in the wintertime—and the traffic here in Washington, D. C., is always subject to being tied up by any change in the weather—it is necessary now to get over 100 men out on a short-order call. It is difficult to get the trucks out of this garage. So in the bill we have made provision for a new central garage. We have also made provision for new-type mechanical snow-removal equipment, and for leaf-cleaning equipment. The whole should speed up the business of the house cleaning of the District of Columbia.

In this bill—and this is an interesting observation, I feel—we have found it necessary to allow for two new schools that could not have been anticipated when the District departments prepared this budget last September. It is an odd thing, but those of you who have studied the school needs of any community realize that when you and I were young we sometimes moved out into a community where all of our neighbors were young, too, and there were children, and you had to build schools. Quite often you and I live there and grow old. Our children are born and move out of that area into another area, and the same process has to be repeated. The result is that we have this condition in the Nation's capital, particularly with the schools. We do have areas where there are empty schools. We have other areas where there are empty floors in school buildings. The reason for that is, as I have said, that those who move there at a time when they had children have now grown older and their children have moved away. This happened last September. A contractor got hold of a bulldozer and went down into southeast Washington to place known as Oxon Run. He started pushing over trees. Then the carpenters, bricklayers, and electricians came in and in a few months you had a new community. The result is today we have many, many children in that area. There are more coming along. We have made a study of the situation. Today those children overcrowd the Patterson and Congress Heights schools. In the bill we made provision to start construction on what is known as the Stanton School in the Naylor Gardens area. Then we made provision to allow a contractor to start a new school to be built at Oxon Run. Those things could not have been anticipated when this budget was first drawn up. It shows you how fast the District grows.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Quite possibly the folks at home will not appreciate the work you have been doing as a Member of this Subcommittee on Appropriations, but I am quite sure that many of the other Members of the House and particularly your colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations realize the interest you have shown in these matters. The fine presentation that you have made of this budget today shows how well you grasp the problems involved.

Mr. HORAN. I thank the gentleman.

I do not know if there is any other detail that I want to bring to your attention. My good friend from Kansas raised the point that perhaps my constituents back home will not appreciate my service on this committee. I think they will. This is not only the Nation's Capital, but today it is the political workshop of freedom-loving people around the globe. I appreciate and love that responsibility of maintaining law and order here and, as far as we can, the security of that workshop.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I take this opportunity to compliment the gentleman for his unselfish service to the District of Columbia. It has been my privilege to know something about the work that he has done. I know how faithfully he has served and with what very great detail he has gone into these very perplexing problems. I would like to ask the gentleman—and I think I know the answer—whether he is familiar with the work that the so-called Home Rule Subcommittee of the District has been doing, of which I have the honor to be chairman. Recognizing the fact that the gentleman's Subcommittee on Appropriations has had so much difficulty and trouble in trying to find out a balancing figure for the District budget all these years, we are endeavoring to work out a formula. With the gentleman's permission, may I speak on that for a few moments?

Mr. HORAN. Surely.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. This formula is based on the amount of taxes raised in the District of Columbia. We accepted the $11,000,000 plus the $1,000,000 for water which the Congress appropriated last year as the base, and, taking the percentage of that amount of money which is Federal contribution, we found it came to 14 percent of the amount of taxes raised in the District. In the bill, therefore, which will presently come before the Congress we provide that 14 percent of the taxes collected in a previous year would in turn be the authorized contribution of the Federal Government to the District. According to the figures available at this time, it comes to exactly $11,000,000. To that will be added the cost of water, and the gentleman's excellent committee has determined that to be about a million dollars, which is a very accurate figure. Added to that will be the cost of services rendered by the District government to the Federal Government. Subtracted from this latter figure will be the cost of services rendered by the Federal Government to the District government, and the balancing figure will be the net contribution.

We provide that the contribution shall never be more than $15,000,000, but this does not necessarily mean that that is a fixed appropriation, for the Committee on Appropriations will have to appropriate whatever money they think is right to the District. It is only an authorization so that if under this act which will presently come before the Congress, the District budget is not properly worked out the Appropriations Committe can refuse to appropriate the amount of money which this bill may provide as the Federal contribution.

I thank the gentleman for his kindness in letting me explain this.

Mr. HORAN. And I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman on the good work for the Nation's Capital that he and his committee have rendered. He and I both come from the far West where we have many different things that we must look after for our constituents in that new and fast developing country. I know how difficult it is for some of us to give due and proper consideration to the affairs of the District of Columbia which rest upon our hearts and consciences. I am sure the gentleman's constituency will understand that he is not neglecting his duties to his district, his State, and his constituents because of the good work he is doing for the District of Columbia I know of no more energetic and effective Member than the gentleman from Washington. I congratulate the gentleman on doing a fine piece of work in all respects.

Mr. HORAN. I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I do not want the opportunity to pass without saying to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] that I know he has put in a great deal of work

upon the finances of the District of Columbia, he, his committee, and his secretaries and clerks.

As chairman of the subcommittee dealing with public health, welfare, and the schools, I realize what a tiresome and almost thankless task the gentleman has in dealing with the complicated financial picture of the District. As chairman of the subcommittee I have had the opportunity of visiting several times the different institutions that come under the public welfare and the health departments; and I am sorry to say that it seems that some of the institutions like the Children's Receiving Home, the Blue Plains Hospital, Gallinger Hospital, particularly the psychopathic end of it, are sometimes the forgotten children of the District. Public welfare problems sometimes seem to take the tail end of appropriations.

This is the Nation's Capital. We ought to make it the finest place there is in the United States, if that be possible. We had a hearing in our committee this morning on the need for more hospital beds in private institutions in the District as well as Gallinger; and I am happy to say, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] and his committee have given diligent service and attention to the affairs of the committee; and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare and the schools, I appreciate the attitude he has taken relative to these problems.

Mr. HORAN. I want to say that, together with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] is performing a real service to the District of Columbia.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. HESELTON. May I, too, add my own personal word of appreciation for the outstanding work the gentleman and his committee have done. Obviously it relieves the rest of us of a very great deal of work.

May I ask a question at this point? As the gentleman knows, throughout the year I have been deeply interested in the over-all problem of the fuel-oil situation throughout the country as well as in the District of Columbia. I have not had an opportunity to read these hearings carefully. I have discussed the matter with the gentleman and with members of the committee. I think I know the answer to the question I wish to ask. I notice that there is a sharp increase in fuel obligations and the oil obligations in the school budget, and I was very much pleased to note on page 1059 of the hearings that in discussing the fuel situation at St. Elizabeths Hospital the chairman made the remark that the fuel-oil situation is extremely desperate. I have not the slightest doubt but what throughout the hearings the gentleman and the committee have had in mind the probability that we will not be out of this situation for at least another winter.

In view of the construction and the extensions provided for in the District of Columbia budget, it is correct to say that the committee does not intend that any of his appropriation shall be used for either the installation of new oil-burning equipment or for conversion from coal to oil-burning equipment?

Mr. HORAN. That is the intention of the committee. I am glad the gentleman brings up that question because I would like to make another interesting observation in this connection.

If you will read the hearings you will find that I requested the municipal architect to go down to the Bertram Briar Pipe Co., 908 Fourteenth Street to investigate their set-up. Their store is air-conditioned in the summertime and heated in winter with the natural temperature of the earth. It has an installation known as a heat pump. In order to make it operate you have a coil down a deep well. The casing in this well has to be at least 4 inches in circumference. There has to be at least 20 feet of water for the average standard installation. There are, I understand, other installations which have coils laid deeply into the crust of the earth and do not use water at all. Then, in conjunction with an electric motor, they are able to bring that temperature out of the earth which cools the premises in the summertime and heats them in winter and does all of that by the mere use of electrical energy, a motor to run the pump. These are being installed quite generally in the State of Washington where we have plenty of electricity. However, the municipal architect rejected it on the basis that electricity was not so available here. He said it would cost too much on that basis.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I mention that because the price of coal has risen twice within the last fiscal year, which is part of the reason at least that our budget is higher. And, as everybody knows, oil is extremely tight and it is one of the most menacing detonators in our world-wide political picture too.

Mr. HESELTON. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me it is not only a question of the price of oil, but also the amount of oil that is available for all the essential purposes in this country.

Mr. HORAN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. I know the gentleman is very much interested in rural electrification. May I call to his attention the fact that certain of these associations have encouraged the installation of this equipment for the purpose of heating farm homes. It is working very successfully and is now an adjunct to the use of electricity under rural electrification. I think it is a splendid thing and that in the future a lot of farm homes will be heated in that way.

Mr. HORAN. Yes. I have hopes that there may be a lot of big buildings heated with it in the near future. The principal manufacturer of the heat pump is a gear works in Muncie, Ind.

INVESTIGATION OF HEAT PUMPS

Mr. HORAN. Will you cause to be instituted an investigation of heat pumps with the possible application of those pumps to some buildings?

Mr. HEINMILLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. HORAN. Will you report the progress of the results of that investigation back to us?

Mr. HEINMILLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. HORAN. I don't know anything about it, but I notice that you have an uncontrollable fuel bill, and it is possible that heat pumps might be used. That is, you might be able to both heat and air-condition a building with the use of a heat pump. Whether it could be applied to a school building or not, I do not know.

Mr. HEINMILLER. I think the large majority of our heating plants are now operated with fuel-electric pumps.

Mr. HORAN. The heat pump might be used, and whether it can be applied to a large building or not, it might be well for us to find out.

Mr. HEINMILLER. We shall be glad to find that out, Mr. Chairman.

(The report of the investigation is as follows:)

"Forwarding, herewith, outline description of heat-pump heating and cooling system which was reqested by the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia.

"An investigation by the chief, mechanical engineer, Office of the Municipal Architect, which was made for the purpose of determining the applicability of the heat pump for heating and cooling District government buildings revealed the following:

"1. SOURCE OF HEAT

"Well water is the most desirable source of heat since its temperature is higher than other sources even in winter and, consequently, a large amount of heat may be removed in relation to the weight of water handled.

"Air may be used, but its specific heat is low and its temperature uncertain. When the most heat is needed the temperature of the air is lowest, thus resulting in the least favorable temperature combination.

"Experiments are now being conducted with a view toward obtaining heat by freezing water.

"2. CONCLUSIONS

"From the foregoing it is apparent that efficient and economic operation of the heat pump is dependent upon the availability of well water, which is not obtainable at economic depths in all areas of the District of Columbia.

"In event of a break-down of either the well or the heat-pump equipment, conventional equipment would be required for auxiliary service, which in turn would necessitate a high initial cost.

"'In the case of schools and other buildings similar in nature, it is the present practice to furnish heat by the unit ventilator system. This system is one by which air and heat are introduced into the occupied spaces through units installed in each room without the use of ducts, whereas the heat-pump system requires ducts leading to each room, thereby necessitating an increased nonusable cube in the structural dimensions of the buildings.

"Economic operation is possible in localities where electric current costs are $0.007 per kilowatt-hour as compafed to oil costs at $0.06 per gallon.

"Locally, however, fuel oil costs $0.0755 per gallon which, for economic operation would require that current be obtained at a cost not in excess of $0.086 a kilowatt-hour, whereas the cost of current furnished for buildings under the jurisdiction of the Superintendent of District Buildings is $0.009 a kilowatt-hour and the average cost for school buildings is $0.02 per kilowatt-hour. The cost of coal is

approximately 90 percent of the cost of fuel oil.

"Another important factor is one of operating personnel for the reason that greater skill would be required for operation of the heat pump than is now required of personnel employed for operation of the many low-pressure heating plants.

"There is no specific information available as to the amount of fuel which would be conserved, but the general opinion is that it would require for the necessary electric energy about 50 percent of the fuel normally consumed by the conventional type of heating plant.

"From an economic standpoint it is my opinion, based on the foregoing, that the heat-pump system of heating is not generally feasible at this time for District government buildings.

"ARCHIE G. HUTSON,
"Director of Construction."

Mr. HORAN. The heat pump uses the natural temperature of the earth to air-condition in the summertime, and also to heat in the wintertime.

Mr. HEINMILLER. Isn't the installation of that pump rather expensive?

Mr. HORAN. It costs money, but if a study of it would indicate a saving in fuel could be had, it might be practical. I don't know.

Mr. HEINMILLER. I have seen drawings of some installations which used well water for heating and air conditioning. As I recall, Mr. Chairman, those installations were for private dwellings.

Mr. HORAN. As I understand it, an average room house would require a 3-horsepower motor. They are being used.

Mr. HEINMILLER. As I have stated, we shall be glad to look into that and give you a report on the matter.

Mr. HORAN. I suspect that the Municipal Architect would be of considerable assistance in that investigation.

Mr. HEINMILLER. It would have to be done in cooperation with that office.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Will the gentleman comment on the formula that we propose because I have an idea it is something along the line the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. HORAN. I think now due to the increased cost of running the Nation's Capital that a fixed formula should be arrived at so that we may end once and for all this controversy over how much the Federal portion should be. In the budget before you and for the purpose of running the Nation's Capital the Federal Government does contribute more than $12,000,000. We contribute in several ways. We contribute through the matching of funds because the District of Columbia to all intents and purposes is a State. There are contributions made to the welfare department through the Social Security Administration.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Of course, the matching of funds is done with the States too.

Mr. HORAN. Oh, yes; what I was pointing out is that the Federal Government does contribute toward the District expenses more than $12,000,000. The District gets Federal aid for its highways and secondary roads. The Federal Government, of course, operates the park system. For instance, the Memorial Bridge is operated entirely by the Department of the Interior. This is quite an assistance to the District of Columbia.

In other ways I suspect that the total Federal payment to the District of Columbia, for the purpose of helping materially in running the District, is in the neighborhood of $15,000,000. I do not say that in any way of criticism of working out a fixed formula, but I think we ought to recognize that fact.

I am about ready to yield the floor, but first I want to pay a tribute to the clerk of this committee, Mr. J. Howe, who has proved himself capable in connection with the preparation of this bill. It was the first time that he had taken the management of a bill unto himself alone. He had assisted others with appropriation bills, but this was J. Howe's maiden voyage, and I submit that he has done a splendid job. Those of you who have perused it are probably impressed with the clear and concise nature of the report. I think you can all understand clearly what the fiscal state of the District is. I also want to pay tribute to my colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. He was diligent in attendance at hearings and was of material assistance. We are in agreement on the major phases of this bill; in fact, I know of no disagreement, and it was a pleasure to work with the gentleman from Rhode Island, JOHN FOGARTY. I want to pay, as usual, my respects to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], under whom it is my privilege to serve on the Commerce, State, Justice, and Judiciary Subcommittee and who helped me so much on this bill. I also want to pay my respects to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN], as well as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BATES], who attended the hearings and was especially helpful, as well as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS], who was as faithful as ever.

In closing I just want to point out something that will bear out what the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS] hinted at when he first asked me to yield. He is going to bring out a bill next week that will include provisions for the fiscal affairs of the District of Columbia to be considered by one body of this Congress. I think that is important, because this budget before you reflects the supersonic age, while our revenue base is still horse and buggy.

I have here a chart that I am going to put in the RECORD. This chart shows you graphically that in 3 years the actions of this body have increased the District of Columbia appropriations by $20,272,000, but despite that fact our revenue base is in the horse and buggy age, and the same people that have to shoulder the responsibility of seeing that law and order and progress and peace and security is maintained here in Washington, D. C., ought to have some voice in saying something about the revenues to meet those bills. So I am going to put this chart in the RECORD and I ask the Members to read it, because it shows you that anytime you take action on the Hill here we are going to feel it in regard to the budget before you.

This chart is as follows:

Estimated recurring costs to the District of Columbia from 1945 to 1948 as a result of salary legislation

	Cost
Increases directly attributable to pay legislation:	
Public Law 200, 77th Congress, approved Aug. 1, 1941 (uniformly scheduled within-grade salary increases):	
1945	$406,228
1946	609,341
1947	624,733
1948	640,125
Total	2,280,427
Public Law 106, 79th Con., approved June 30, 1945 (basic salary increase, overtime, night differential, and acceleration of within-grade promotions, for classified employees)	3,840,706
Public Law 151, 70th Cong., approved July 14, 1945 (salary adjustment for policemen and firemen)	1,530,118
Public Law 158, 79th Cong., approved July 21, 1945, (salary adjustment for teachers and school officers)	1,402,136
Public Law 390, 79th Cong., approved May 24, 1946 (basic salary increase for classified employees)	2,276,437
Public Law 491, 79th Cong., approved July 5, 1946 (basic salary increase for policemen and firemen)	1,112,278
Public Law 163, 80th Cong., approved July 7, 1947 (salary adjustment for teachers and school officers)	2,366,300
Cost of reverting to 40-hour work-week (189 additional positions, only. Does not include positions that were absorbed or the 8 percent allowed policemen and firemen, $695,532, included in the cost of Public Law 151)	337,117
Public Law 624, 79th Cong., approved Aug. 7, 1946 (public school teachers' retirement)	$1,098,000
Increase in policemen's and firemen's relief (increase resulting from Public Laws 151 and 491)	425,000
Increase in Civil Service Retirement and Disability fund	695,532
Increased rate for patients at St. Elizabeths (estimated increased cost for personal services)	1,288,604
Total	18,652,655
Increase attibutable to corollary action of the Commissioners:	
Revision of wage scale by Commissioners' Order 450965, dated Apr. 13, 1945	810,000
Revision of wage scale by Commissioners' Order 301801/1, dated June 11, 1946	810,250
Total	1620,250
Grand total	20,272,905

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there is not much that I can add to the remarks that have just been made by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia. As he has stated in his remarks, we are in agreement on practically everything in this bill, with the exception of the so-called Red rider at the end of the bill, and at the proper time, when the bill is being read for amendment, I hope to offer the same amendment that I offered last Thursday to the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill to strike that language from this appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, serving on this committee at times is a very thankless job, not so much for those of us who are on the committee, but on the shoulders of the chairman of the committee falls the entire brunt of the work, and it is not an easy task by any means. But I do want to state for the record that I believe the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN], the chairman of this subcommittee, is one of the hardest-working of the chairman of subcommittees on appropriations. He has been very diligent in the 6 or 7 weeks of hearings that have been held on this bill. He has been very considerate to those of us on the minority side. He has given us every consideration, and it has been a real pleasure to work with him on this committee.

When I say it is not an easy task, it is something that does not affect his district at all, it is just an added responsibility that he has assumed here in Congress. All during the legislative year we are here in Washington he is called upon by the District Commissioners and by the various heads of government in the District of Columbia for all kinds of advice, and called on to make inspections of the various activities of the District Government. That all takes a great deal of time.

I join with my chairman in extending to the clerk of our committee, Jay B. Howe, our sincere thanks for the splendid work he has done in writing this report. He, too, has been very considerate to those of us on the minority side. He has made a splendid contribution to all the work on this bill. It is something we all appreciate, because serving on a committee like this we need an active and efficient clerk, and we have just that in Jay B. Howe.

The chairman has gone into most of the operating procedure of the District of Columbia and has covered the bill in very general terms in practically every aspect of the bill, and I do not believe there is much I can add to what he has already stated to the committee.

As far as the policemen and firemen in the District of Columbia are concerned, we have given them everything they have asked for in the budget. I know this Congress has been blamed in the past by people in the District government, and sometimes by the press in this city, for not having an efficient, good-working Police Department and Fire Department. There will be no excuse in the next fiscal year if we do not have a good, efficient Police Department and Fire Department, for we gave the Police Department $25,000 more than they asked for in their budget for some equipment they need very badly, and we expect them in the next fiscal year to have a well-operated department. Congress will not take the blame for any inefficiency that may develop in those two departments, because we have given them every cent they have asked for.

The chairman talked about an added appropriation we have in this bill. It was something in which I was very much interested. It has to do with the voluntary hospitals in the District of Columbia. As he stated, we have had a contract with three of the hospitals for tax-eligible cases, in-patient, and out-patient, at the rate of $7.50 a day for in-patients and $2 a day for out-patients. All the other voluntary hospitals in the District have been doing the same work and taking care of the same type of cases as have these three hospitals that have contracts with the District of Columbia, but they have not been receiving a dime for the care that is a legal obligation, and I belive a moral obligation, of the District of Columbia. So this year we have attempted to help them by including them with the other three and raising the contractual obligation from $7.50 to $9 a day for in-patients, and allowing them $2 a day for out-patients. That, Mr. Chairman, does not even come anywhere near the operating expenses of these hospitals, because it has been shown that the national average cost per day for in-patients is $12.50, and we are allowing them but $9 per day. However, I think it is an agreeable solution to those who appeared before our committee in behalf of voluntary hospitals, and it is a contribution that we as Members of Congress should be proud to make, to make sure that they get their just and fair share for the work they contribute in the hospitals.

We have the same rider attached to this bill as was attached to the Labor-Federal Security supplemental appropriation bill last week. That amendment was put on that bill last week without an hour or even 10 minutes of a hearing of any kind. In my opinion, it is legislation in the form of a limitation on an appropriation bill, which is just another way of an appropriation committee legislating or taking away the responsibilities of the proper legislative committees of the House of Representatives. Last week I offered the amendment to the Labor-Federal Security bill to strike this language from the bill. I intend to do that in this case when we come to read the bill for amendment this afternoon, because I do not believe there is any place for it in a bill of this kind. We have the proper legislative committees, and if the Congress wants to take action such as this, a bill should be presented and in the proper legislative way it should be brought to the floor of the House after the necessary hearings such as are held on every piece of legislation that is brought to the floor of the House so that the proponents of this type of legislation can be heard and also so that the opponents of this type of legislation may have a chance to speak their minds on this particular provision.

I am not in too much disagreement with the intent of the language of this part of the bill. I think we are all pretty well together on the intent. But it goes much further than what the proponents would like to have you believe. It was admitted on the floor of the House last week that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor and Federal Security appropriations conceded that it was going to hurt many innocent people. This rider, and that is all it is, was designed by someone—I do not know who—and it was put in this bill at someone's request without a hearing of any kind. We have no idea how many thousands of Government workers are going to be hurt by this type of legislation. Regardless of the number of people that it may hurt, regardless of the number of innocent people who are going to be affected by this type of legislation, if it were only 10 people out of the thousands of Government employees, there is no reason in the world to take away the rights of even 10 people to get at two people, which we all know is the intent of this rider. Everyone knows who the two people are. They are the heads of the United Public Workers of America who have refused to sign the anti-Communist affidavit under the Taft-Hartley law. This will affect all Government employees who hold a card at this time in every union in the country. It can go as far as this: We have in the Government Printing Office about 1,700 Government employees who belong to the typographical union. Because the leaders of the typographical union have not signed this affidavit, these 1,700 people will either have to give up their jobs in the Government Printing Office or give up their membership in this particular union.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT].

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I have for this afternoon may be vacated.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have to submit that request in the House.

The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION AND THE COMMUNISTS

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that Alice in her wanderings in Wonderland never came upon more fantastic revelations than we do here in Washington almost daily.

If it were not for the seriousness and the downright tragedy of the situation, we could find much amusement in these fantastic revelations which, regretfully, are not fantasy after all but are only too true.

Today I want to reveal to the Members of this House a situation which is almost beyond the realm of understanding. But let us take the story in its chronological order and present it as it moves along. Somebody has said that a picture was

worth 10,000 words, well this picture which I am going to attempt to paint today needs no words, except the application of the brush of factual and documentary evidence. Let me begin.

I hold here in my hand four documents. You will recognize them as documents issued by the Federal Communications Commission of Washington. They are issued in the name of the Federal Communications Commission and signed by T. J. Slowie, secretary.

The first document is dated March 15, 1948, and is an order issued by the Federal Communications Commission granting to the Unity Corp., Inc., of Springfield, Ohio, a permit for construction of an FM broadcasting station on 100.7 megocycles, channel No. 264; 10 kilowatts effective radiated power; antenna height of 175 feet above average terrain. The number of this release is 18479.

The next document that I show you is a similar order issued to the Unity Corp., Inc., Mansfield, Ohio, also for an FM construction permit for a station to be erected at Mansfield, Ohio, on 105.3 megocycles, channel No. 287; 7.25 kilowatts effective radiated power; antenna height of 345 feet above average terrain. This document is identified by the serial 18480.

The third document I exhibit to you is Public Notice 19603, dated March 18, 1948, and grants two permits for the construction of television broadcast. One is granted to the Dispatch, Inc., of Erie, Pa., and the other is to Picture Waves, Inc., of Columbus, Ohio.

I now exhibit another document, identified as 19971 of the Federal Communications Commission, dated March 31, 1948, granting another permit to the Unity Corp., Inc., of Erie, Pa., for an FM station.

I call to your attention the dates on which these permits were issued. Two were issued on March 15, two were issued 3 days later on March 18, and a fifth was issued on March 31, some 11 days later.

Now I will admit there is nothing unusual in the Federal Communications Commission issuing five permits in a period of 2 weeks, but let us examine the composition of these corporations to whom these permits were issued.

We find three of the permits issued to what is known as the Unity Corp., Inc. Now who is the Unity Corp., Inc.? An examination of the records will reveal that a man named Edward Lamb, 1014 Edison Building, Toledo 4, Ohio, is the president, treasurer, and director, of the Unity Corp., Inc. In addition to being its treasurer, president, and director, Mr. Lamb is recorded as owning 1,175 shares of stock, a total percentage of 47 percent of the stock issued. A little along we find the second largest holder of stock in the name of Prudence H. Lamb, Indian Hill, Perrysburg, Ohio, who is listed as a director and owns 375 shares, or 15 percent of the total stock. Investigation will show that Prudence Lamb is the wife of Edward Lamb, therefore, between the pair they control 62 percent of the stock of the Unity Corp., Inc. So when the Federal Communications Commission gives to the Unity Corp., Inc., a permit, they in effect give it to Lamb who controls the corporation.

Let us progress a little further. Let us see who owns Dispatch, Inc., which was given a permit by the Federal Communications Commission. Here we find that the same Edward Lamb is listed as owning 1,000 shares of stock out of a total of 1,600 shares of stock. So there can be no doubt that he individually controls a majority of the stock, although for good measure his wife, Prudence Lamb, owns 380 shares. And keep in mind that it was this same Dispatch, Inc., which received such expeditious and kindly treatment from the Federal Communications Commission.

We are not finished. Let us now see the identity of Picture Waves, Inc., the third corporation which participated in this wholesale permit award activity of the Federal Communications Commission. An examination of the stock owned will reveal that Edward Lamb owns 55 shares of stock, and his wife, Prudence Lamb, owns 60 shares. They together, being by two to one, the holders of more stock than anybody else in the corporation.

You may well now say, so what. Edward Lamb, like other industrious Americans, and ambitious business men, in a free country, through initiative and free enterprise, yes, under the American way of life if you please, has been able to acquire control of three corporations, namely: Picture Waves, Inc., Unity Corporation, Inc., and Dispatch, Inc., and has been able to persuade the Federal Communications Commission to grant him five radio permits in a period of 2 weeks, where it is not uncommon that other people have to wait weeks, months, and yes, years, to get even as much as one permit. But Mr. Lamb is able to get five permits in 2 weeks' time. Obviously, Mr. Lamb is a very remarkable and energetic individual. Undoubtedly he must possess great persuasive powers. He must have a burning desire to contribute something to his country. Whenever a man can get five permits out of the Federal Communications Commission in 2 weeks' time, I say, and not facetiously, he must be Superman himself, because it is indeed a great feat. I know, because I am acquainted with the activities of good, ordinary, businessmen, who have tried and tried to get some action out of the Federal Communications Commission over years, and have only come up with excuses, delays, and zero as net result.

So, who is this Mr. Lamb who is so great and powerful and strong. He must have a splendid background. As a matter of fact I was so intrigued with his background and his ability to get things accomplished before the Federal Communications Commission, that I took the trouble to look him up, and what I found is an amazing story. I found in the files of the Un-American Activities Committee, that he has one of the most expansive records of association with the Communist Party in America, front organizations, and fellow travelers, of anybody to come to the committee's attention. Let me read to you, from the file of the Committee on Un-American Activities, Mr. Lamb's record:

A check of the files, records, and publications of the Committee on Un-American Activities has shown the following references concerning Edward Lamb:

Edward Lamb was affiliated with the International Labor Defense as its executive vice president (Daily Worker, February 23, 1938, p. 4); as a member of the legal advisory committee (undated official letterhead of the national office, Equal Justice, April 1938, p. 3, and official letterhead dated October 27, 1938): as a member of the national committee (official letterheads dated Christmas, 1939, and October 1943); and as a speaker at the national conference in Washington, D. C. (Daily Worker, June 15, 1937, p. 4).

The International Labor Defense has been cited by both the Special Committee on Un-American Activities and Attorney General Biddle as the legal arm of the Communist Party. The committee's June 25, 1942, report stated: "Our committee found unanimously in our report to the House 2 years ago that the International Labor Defense was the legal arm of the Communist Party. In his order for the deportation of Harry Bridges, the Attorney General concurred in this finding. Three of the four principal officers of the International Labor Defense are publicly avowed members of the Communist Party." (See report of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, June 25, 1942, p. 19. See also, committee report of March 29, 1944, and CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7442.)

Edward Lamb was also a member of the national committee of the International Juridical Association, according to the pamphlet, What Is the IJA? and an official letterhead dated May 18, 1942. The International Juridical Association was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist front and an offshoot of the International Labor Defense. (See Rept. No. 1311, March 29, 1944, p. 149.)

In 1938 Edward Lamb was executive vice president of the National Lawyers Guild as shown in the organization's publication, Equal Justice, April 1938, page 3. New Masses, June 21, 1938, page 2, also shows this affiliation. A 1939 membership list of the National Lawyers Guild contains the name of Edward Lamb, of 1014 Edison Building, Toledo, Ohio. In 1940 Lamb was one of the members of the guild's lawyers committee to keep the United States out of war who attended the Emergency Peace Mobilization in Chicago and, from there, sent telegrams to the President and the House Military Affairs Committee condemning the Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill as un-American and unconstitutional. (Daily Worker, September 4, 1940, p. 3.) Lamb appeared in the capacity of attorney for Mrs. Sarah V. Montgomery, a witness before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in executive hearings on March 4, 1941, and in response to a question of a committee member, stated that he was attorney for the American Peace Mobilization as well.

The National Lawyers Guild, the Emergency Peace Mobilization and the American Peace Mobilization were all cited as Communist-front organizations by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities of its report 1311, March 29, 1944. Several prominent sponsors resigned from the National Lawyers Guild for the same reason as the Honorable A. A. Berle, Jr., then Assistant Secretary of State, who in his letter of resignation, June 5, 1940, stated that the leadership is not prepared to take any stand which conflicts with the Communist Party line.

The Emergency Peace Mobilization, and later the American Peace Mobilization, came forth to oppose the national defense program, lend-lease, conscription, and other warmongering efforts. (Report of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 29, 1944, p. 105.) The American Peace Mobilization has also been cited by Attorney General Biddle (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, pp. 7442–7443) and by Attorney General

Clark (list of subversive organizations compiled by Attorney General Clark for Loyalty Review Board of the Civil Service Commission, released December 4, 1947).

Edward Lamb was elected a vice chairman of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, according to the Daily Worker, March 31, 1941, page 4. An undated letterhead of the organization, which summarizes the 1946 work, also lists Edward Lamb of Toledo as a vice chairman. In 1941, he was a sponsor of the organization according to an official letterhead dated September 11, 1941. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its June 25, 1942, report, stated: "Numerous witnesses who have appeared before our committee have given testimony indicating that the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born is a Communist-dominated front.* * * Galleani testified that the Communist Party, of which he was a member, assigned him to work in the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born and that there was no doubt about the party's complete control of the organization." The organization was cited as a Communist front again in the committee's report of March 29, 1944.

Several sources show that Edward Lamb was a member of the executive committee of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (i. e., official letterheads of November 6, 1940, and July 3, 1942; and the organization's Call, National Action Conference for Civil Rights, Washington, D. C., April 19–20, 1941). The program leaflet, Call to a Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America, June 7, 1940, page 4, lists Edward Lamb as a sponsor, as does a letterhead of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, dated November 6, 1940. He signed an appeal issued by the federation in behalf of the Communist, Sam Darcy (Daily Worker, December 19, 1940, p. 5), and a message issued in support of a policy of the organization (leaflet, attached to an undated letterhead).

The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties was cited as a Communist front in two separate reports of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944, and by Attorney General Biddle, who said that it was "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program. * * * The defenses of Communist leaders * * * have been major efforts of the federation." (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7443.)

The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties and the International Labor Defense merged to form the Civil Rights Congress, an organization which was made the subject of a separate report by the Committee on Un-American Activities, September 2, 1947. The committee's report concluded "that the Civil Rights Congress is an organization dedicated to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party, that the organization is controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it, and that in carrying out its defense aims, the organization has at the same time engaged in a campaign of vilification against the American Government" (p. 19). Edward Lamb is a sponsor of the Civil Rights Congress, according to the program of the national conference held in Chicago, November 21–24, 1947. (Program leaflet, Let Freedom Ring.)

According to the Daily Worker, March 5, 1941, page 2, Edward Lamb signed a statement to the President of the United States defending the Communist Party. He also signed the Open Letter for Closer Cooperation With the Soviet Union which appeared, with list of signers, in Soviet Russia Today, September 1939.

This open letter was cited as a Communist-front project in two reports of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944).

Articles contributed by Edward Lamb appeared in the magazine of the Friends of the Soviet Union, Soviet Russia Today, October 1935, page 6, and March 1936, page 11. Both organizations and its publications have been cited as Communist fronts by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on two occasions. (See committee reports of June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944.)

The call for a national emergency conference, Washington, D. C., May 13 and 14, 1939, lists Edward Lamb as a sponsor of this Communist-front conference (cited in report No. 1311, Special Committee on Un-American Activities, p. 49).

Edward Lamb was listed in the Daily Worker of February 21, 1940, as a signer of a letter to President Roosevelt and Attorney General Jackson protesting attacks on the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade and condemning the war hysteria being whipped up by the Roosevelt administration. The veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in the report of March 29, 1944, and as a subversive organization by Attorney General Clark in his list of such organizations which was released by the Loyalty Review Board of the Civil Service Commission on December 4, 1947.

On June 10, 1941, Alex Balint, the witness called before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, was accompanied by his lawyer, Edward Lamb. At this time Lamb identified himself as an attorney of Toledo, Ohio, and general counsel for the National Association of Die Casting Workers, affiliated with the CIO. (Public hearings, p. 8604.) "In April 1941 the National Association of Die Casters tied up the plants of the Aluminum Co. of America in Cleveland, Ohio. The committee's investigations turned up the fact that Alex Balint, leader of the strike, was an alien, an exconvict, and an old-time Communist Party member who had used the name Al Barry." (See Rept. No. 1311, Special Committee on Un-American Activities, p. 14.) At present Alex Balint is being held for deportation. (Daily Worker, February 13, 1948, p. 6.)

Rather illuminating, is it not?

The question naturally raised in your mind is that this information was only in the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities. Of course that would be no excuse, but let us assume that that is where this information on Mr. Lamb has been resting. That is not a fact, however. If you will examine the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 23, 1947, more than a year ago, you will find that our distinguished colleague from New Jersey, J. PARNELL THOMAS, chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, had quite a bit to say about Mr. Lamb on pages 538 and 539 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Now again you might say, well of course that is very well and good, but neither Mr. THOMAS' statement on the floor of this House, nor the record of the Un-American Activities Committee had come to the attention of the Federal Communications Commission, because surely in the face of such evidence they would never have issued these permits to a man of such dubious character, while good, clean, honest, sincere Americans, men who believe in our concept of government, men who believe in constitutional government, are trying in vain, and with utter futility, to get some action out of the Federal Communications Commission.

If you will examine the record you will find in the contest against Mr. Lamb's application a witness by name of S. A. Horvitz made this statement, and I quote him:

I say that after reading this book—

The Planned Economy in Soviet Russia—

I am convinced that Mr. Lamb is a Communist, and he has proposed the overthrow of the United States form of government for the communistic form of government.

That testimony, Mr. Chairman, was given to the Federal Communications Commission, so we cannot say they did not know anything about it. In furtherance, as of this date, a protest, setting forth all these facts, is now before the Federal Communications Commission; and in case the Federal Communications Commission has not heard about it yet, the docket numbers are 7589, file No. B2–PH–560; Docket No. 7590, File No. B2–PH–587; and Docket No. 7591, file No. B2–PH–723.

So there, Mr. Chairman, is this amazing story. The story of a man saturated and drenched in Communist writings, associations, and affiliations, given five radio permits in a period of 2 weeks by the Federal Communications Commission, which keeps untainted, red-blooded Americans cooling their heels outside their corridors, waiting for decisions and issuances of permits which are never reached.

I wonder where does this pattern of operations lead us. We have been told repeatedly that the communistic method of infiltration has been to concentrate on key positions and effective means of production, transportation, and communications. We have seen this pattern operate only too recently in Czechoslovakia and other countries where the Communists first gained control of labor and stopped production, then gained control of the police and military to take by physical force if necessary, the people, and in all instances, have seized the radio stations.

The action of the Federal Communications Commission in issuing in this unprecedented display of cooperation, five radio permits within a period of 2 weeks to one man, makes me wonder just how many Edward Lambs in this country today are the recipients of such favors from the Federal Communications Commission, and why.

I think it of more than passing interest, and certainly a credit to a former member of this body, now a member of the Federal Communications Commission, that he, and he alone, stood against these practices. I refer to our former distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Robert Jones, who resigned this body to become a member of the Federal Communications Commission, and who has brought clear thinking, dignity, and courage to that body since he became a member. On each one of these five cases that I have cited, you will find that our former colleague, Commissioner Jones, has stood alone to the limit of his ability and jurisdiction against this disgraceful action.

Would that we had more Bob Joneses on the Commission to protect our American way of life, and to protect outstanding Americans from discrimination by those who would coddle the Lambs of this country, who perhaps are in reality the Russian wolves of the Kremlin.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in my previous remarks on the pending bill I failed to state something which is of utmost importance. The budget we are considering and for which this bill is prepared anticipates that there will be a sales tax. This anticipation was voiced by the District Commissioners; consequently we refer to it as a balanced budget all right, but it is based on that anticipation.

Mr. Chairman, we have cut the budget a total of about $747,000. There are other ramifications which are explained in detail in the report. I take the time now merely to tell you that when this bill is passed, if it is passed in its present form, one of two things will have to occur; either this House through its appropriate legislative committee will have to take action and propose new revenue measures or the Commissioners themselves will have to resort to the powers vested in them by virtue of District of Columbia Code No. 20–501, the title of which is "Assessment of Taxes on Real and Personal Property—Rate of Taxation—Collection," which reads as follows:

For the purpose of defraying such expenses of the District of Columbia as Congress may from time to time appropriate for, there hereby is levied for each and every fiscal year, a tax at such rate on the real and personal property subject to taxation in the District as will, when added to the other taxes and revenues of the District, produce money enough to enable the District to pay promptly and in full all sums directed by Congress to be paid by the District, and for which appropriation has been duly made; and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia hereby are empowered and directed to ascertain, determine, and fix annually such rate of taxation as will, when applied as aforesaid, produce the money needed to defray the share of the expenses of the District during the year for which the rate is fixed; and the Commissioners of the District shall, in accordance with existing law, cause all such taxes and revenues to be promptly collected and, when collected, to be daily deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the District for the purposes herein set out.

This simply means if there are not sufficient revenues to balance the budget the Commissioners are empowered—in fact, they are directed—to increase the rate of taxes on real and personal property.

Mr. COLE of New York Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. In the event that a sales tax is not adopted, can the gentleman advise us the approximate increase in the real-estate tax which would be required?

Mr. HORAN. No; I cannot. A lot depends on the action of this House prior to adjournment of the present session. If we allow an increase in pay it will mean approximately $7,000,000 in cost to the District of Columbia. I refer to the pay bills now pending. The amount of actual unbalance in the bill before us, when everything is distilled down to a minimum figure, as against available revenues, is somewhere between three and four million dollars, so a small increase in the real-estate tax would probably take care of it. But if we grant a pay raise I do not believe that the District property should be saddled with the entire cost. I think if this House passes a pay raise this House should take parallel action and pass a sales tax at the same time.

Mr. COLE of New York. What does the gentleman mean when he says a small increase in the real-estate tax? As much as 25 cents per thousand?

Mr. HORAN. No; about a 14-percent increase. That would be about 28 cents. Now, that is just an educated guess.

Mr. COLE of New York. Twenty-eight cents per thousand?

Mr. HORAN. No; per hundred.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman from Washington has spoken about an increase in the real-estate tax for the future. Of course, in the last tax bill we increased the property tax, as I recall, about 24 percent.

Mr. HORAN. We not only raised the rate, as I understand from $1.75 a hundred to $2, but we also directed the Assessor to reassess all of the property in the District, which has been done. Of course, the combination made a considerable increase. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to change the educated guess I gave my colleague from New York, but I think it is approximately correct.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DEANE. I, personally, appreciate the splendid work done by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] in trying to cope with the serious financial problem facing the District of Columbia. Of course, the District is faced at the present time with a serious emergency so far as hospitals are concerned. I wonder if the gentleman would care to discuss that briefly?

Mr. HORAN. Well, I did in my general remarks. I stated then its full import and why this committee, in defense of the private hospitals, increased the amount for medical charities at least. Also in my general remarks I pointed out that we invited in all phases of the health life of the District; we invited in the doctors' associations and we invited in the hospital associations. We asked them all to come, and many of them did. Our hearing room was filled, and we opened up the hearings, which are by way of a report to the people of the District, asking for the inclusion of any information that they might have that would contribute to the building of an intelligent and all-inclusive health pattern here in the District. Really what we asked the people of the District to do, especially those who by training or profession have talents that could lend themselves to the building of such a program, was to study this problem as we had to study it in its entirety, and we expressed the hope that they would get busy on it and would work together with their colleagues, and would themselves become the architects of a sensible health program. I expressly made it understood that our subcommittee could not do anything about changing that pattern; that we were reluctant to handle our appropriations in any way that would arbitrarily change that pattern. We made it plain to them, or tried to, that we felt that they were the ones who ought to study this problem and suggest legislation up on the Hill that would embody the modernization and an adequate remodeling of the health pattern here. It was evident, as the gentleman knows, that they have not always worked together. Some hospitals felt that they were in competition with each other. Today they know that if they are going to survive, they will have to cooperate and get together on this thing, and that each one who has something to contribute should do so.

Mr. DEANE. Do I understand the gentleman feels then that before additional appropriations or authorizations are made, that a complete picture be submitted relating to the present needs of the hospitals, so far as concerns beds and impact of the metropolitan area upon the District hospitals is concerned?

Mr. HORAN. I very definitely do, and I think all of those who have made appearances before our subcommittee should be invited by the District of Columbia Legislative Committee to make like appearances before the Legislative Subcommittee handling health and see what we can develop out of this. I trust that there will not be any arbitrary action on the part of the Legislative Committee in this field.

Mr. Chairman, there are no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to points of order and amendments at any place.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will now entertain points of order. The Chair will not consider points of order after amendments are under consideration.

If there are no points of order, the bill is open to amendment.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BEALL: On page 15, line 23, strike out lines 23 and 24, and on page 16 strike out lines 1 and 2.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Chairman, the authority and responsibility of the District of Columbia to educate children whose parents are employed officially or otherwise in the District is found in the District of Columbia Code. District of Columbia Code, 1940 edition, title 31, section 301, page 863, provides:

All pupils whose parents are employed officially or otherwise in the District of Columbia shall be admitted and taught free of

charge in the schools of said District (Mar. 3, 1915, 38 Stat. 910, ch. 80, sec. 1).

The authority to teach the children of the military free in the schools of the District of Columbia even though they are not residents of the District is provided in sections 304 and 305 of title 31 of the code and may be found on the same page as the above. Those provisions, however, originated in different acts, namely, the acts of March 28, 1918, Fortieth Statutes, page 470, and May 10, 1926, Forty-fourth Statutes, page 433.

We find that this law was actually tested in the District of Columbia courts in the case of *Ballou* v. *Kemp* (68 App. D. C. 7, 92 Fed. (2d) 556), which holds that the statute is mandatory and clear and that the duty of the Superintendent of Schools to admit the pupil in that case was purely ministerial and that mandamus is the proper remedy to compel such action. The court held that, the section being mandatory, it was the duty of the Superintendent to admit the pupil even though hardship would come about due to insufficient funds to take care of resident pupils.

Mr. Chairman, the District of Columbia is a small area of 70 square miles. It is almost impossible for all the people employed by the Government to live in the District, and some of them must live out in Maryland and in Virginia. We are very glad to have them, of course, but we do think they should have the right to enjoy the privileges of the District schools. I hope my amendment will be adopted.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEALL. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. May I ask the gentleman from Maryland if these people who have property in Maryland pay taxes in Maryland or in the District of Columbia?

Mr. BEALL. Those who own property of course pay taxes in Maryland.

Mr. STEFAN. Can the students who live in the District of Columbia go to the Maryland schools without paying tuition?

Mr. BEALL. I do not know that. I may say to the gentleman from Nebraska that this law would even affect Members of Congress, some 14 of whom live and own property in Montgomery County.

Mr. STEFAN. The members of the committee are well aware of that. We make no denial of that. However, the amount as represented in this amendment is approximately $500,000, which the gentleman seeks to have the taxpayers of the District of Columbia pay, to relieve the people in the Maryland and Virginia counties surrounding the District of Columbia from paying certain taxes and school tuition.

Mr. BEALL. This is not just the opinion of the gentleman from Maryland, this is a law passed by Congress as early as 1915. It has been customary to allow these students to attend the District schools, and the courts have upheld this law. They did so in the case I just quoted.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman must realize, of course, that this is a permissive law.

Mr. BEALL. Yes.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish we could be bighanded here in the District of Columbia. Certainly we give everything away to Europe and elsewhere. But we are dealing now with a very, very tight budget. The District government does not have its hand in the Treasury of the United States. The money it gets from the Treasury of the United States is very, very carefully rationed out to it. I submit that the District of Columbia is a very fixed territory. As far as property is concerned, the taxable base stops at Eastern and Western Avenues. In 1846 this body gave back to the State of Virginia those counties that now are Arlington and Fairfax. At that time they said, "My, this Nation's Capital now has a total of 60,000 people, and it is inconceivable that we will ever need all of that land." Yet today if we had those two counties back we would not have the tight fiscal situation that we now have. Last year we saw this tight fiscal situation coming along. We also saw 6,500 of our own school children here in the District of Columbia on part-time instruction. We needed revenue and we needed more schools. Recognizing that our taxable property was limited by the boundaries of the District of Columbia, we decided that the District could no longer afford to educate free of charge those who were residents outside of the District of Columbia, or, for example, who live in Maryland. Such residents ought to send their children to Maryland schools as I do. I live barely outside the District of Columbia and all five of my children have been educated in the Montgomery County schools. I want to say at this point that they are very fine schools.

We recognize that on the basis of last year's computation there will be a saving of $421,000. Certainly in the light of the fiscal situation and in common justice, a restriction should be in this bill. I trust that the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. SASSCER. What is the amount that the District government receives from the Federal budget?

Mr. HORAN. The amount that the District of Columbia receives from the Federal budget, as I discussed with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS] some time ago, is about $15,000,000 in total, that is Federal aid to highways, the Federal contribution, welfare grants, and all that sort of thing.

Mr. SASSCER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, a number of years ago the Congress of the United States laid down a policy by passing a law which in substance permitted the children of nonresident persons who are employed in the District of Columbia to send their children to schools in the District of Columbia without the payment of any charge. I think there is justification for that law. But before discussing the justification for it, when a law is upon the books, is it not bad policy for the Congress by a rider to an appropriation bill to repeal the existing law and the established policy? If the majority of the Congress feels that these children should not come to the District of Columbia schools, then a bill should be reported by the District of Columbia Committee so that the Congress may vote on the question. But today this policy that was established by law is on the books, and this rider on the appropriation bill would, in effect, nullify the existing statute.

As the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has just said, $15,000,000 of Federal money is given to the District of Columbia. I think it is rightfully given to the District because this is the Capital of the Nation. There are many people here who claim residence all over the United States where taxpayers contribute to this fund who are affected by this rider. Not just the children of Virginia and Maryland, but the children of the Carolinas and the far West, New York, and Pennsylvania, whose parents are employed by the Federal Government and who retain their legal residences for reasons of their own in their respective States, States whose taxpayers contribute to the $15,000,000 grant to the District of Columbia. All that my distinguished colleague from western Maryland and I are asking is that as long as that money is given to the District of Columbia by all of the taxpayers of the country, and as long as there is a law on the statute books permitting these children to come to the District of Columbia schools, that the Congress not nullify a previous action of the House of Representatives by a rider on an appropriation bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. Chairman, none of us can blame the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER] in pressing for the adoption of this amendment. Both represent their districts ably in this House, and if any of us had the responsibility of representing districts on the borders of the District of Columbia, we perhaps would endeavor to the best of our ability to relieve our own taxpayers from burdensome expenses.

In the first place, the gentleman from Maryland knows that the Federal contribution for the District of Columbia is not $15,000,000, it is $12,000,000. He also knows that this law he so ably discussed is a permissive law. Let us read you the decision of Justice Letts on this subject. In his opinion, issued in the case of Wirth against Corning, Justice Letts made the following statement:

> Free instruction of children residing outside of the District as provided in title XXI, section 303, of the District of Columbia Code, is a gratuity and all legal rights flowing from the enactment are subject to the will of Congress. Congress may withdraw the privilege of free instruction at any time or may at its will place limitations upon it.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a new problem for us. In the 14 years that I have represented my district in the House of Representatives amendments to eliminate free tuition of pupils living outside the District have been matters of debate in this House when the bill making appropriations for the District of Columbia came up. It is no new matter.

If you want to save the people of the District approximately half a million dollars they should not be required to pay for free tuition of children living outside of the District of Columbia, I suggest that you vote down this amendment.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. BEALL. The gentleman states that for the past 14 years this amendment has been defeated in the House and has gone over to the Senate and they have always adopted the principle in the Senate. Does not the gentleman believe it would be a good idea this time to reverse the order and let it originate in the House of Representatives?

Mr. STEFAN. As of today, pupils of Maryland and Virginia are paying approximately $56,000 a year for the privilege of attending the schools of the District of Columbia. There is no opposition on the part of the people of Maryland and Virginia to pay their just expenses if they are going to have their children educated in the District of Columbia.

If you pass this amendment you will penalize the pupils of the District of Columbia who are only receiving part-time instruction today, and I know you do not want to do that. The District needs increased facilities badly at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BEALL) there were—ayes 10, noes 14.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: Page 54, line 14, after the word "violence", strike out the remainder of line 14 and down through the figures "1947" in line 18.

Page 55, line 4, after the word "violence", strike out the remainder of line 4 down through "1947" in line 8.

Page 55, line 16, after the word "violence", strike out the remainder of line 16 down through "1947" in line 20.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, this rider that was put on the pending appropriation bill, in my opinion, is legislation in the form of a limitation on an appropriation bill. The rider was specifically put in the Labor-Federal Security appropriation, which we considered last week with no hearings of any kind. Those of us on the minority side were not notified that this rider was to be attached to this appropriation bill until we had finished marking it up. In this Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia there were no hearings held, there was no discussion within the committee as to the reasons for this rider being put on the appropriation bill. So here we have again another example of the Committee on Appropriations attempting to deal with a legislative matter.

Mr. Chairman, we have the proper legislative committees of this House to deal with these matters that we are talking about today. There is no valid reason, in my opinion, for the Appropriations Committee assuming the responsibilities of the legislative committees of this House as it has been doing more and more in connection with every appropriation bill reported to the House.

The intent and purpose of this rider, as everyone knows now, is to get at the United Public Workers of America, headed by Mr. Flaxer, of New York, who most people believe is a Communist and has refused to sign the anti-Communist affidavit requested by the leaders of organized labor under the Taft-Hartley bill.

What is the penalty for the leader of an organized labor group which comes under the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law and refuses to sign this affidavit? The only penalty imposed on these particular unions or the members of those particular unions is to deny them the facilities of the National Labor Relations Board in a dispute. That is the only penalty. But the penalty that we impose upon the members of these unions we are attempting to get at is much more drastic than we imposed under the Taft-Hartley law. This is in effect amending the Taft-Hartley law. That is how much legislation it is, because the unions that we are attempting to get at now do not come under the Taft-Hartley Act.

Any union of Government employees does not come under the Taft-Hartley law, because we as Members of Congress determine the amount of wages they are to receive. They are not allowed to strike against the Government and every person working for the Government has to sign one of these anti-Communist affidavits. Why, even the people in our various offices here on the Hill have to sign such an affidavit. But the rider that we have on this appropriation bill goes much further than just to get to one or two people in the UPWA.

I understand we have 1,700 employees in the Government Printing Office who belong to the typographical union, and because the leaders of the typographical union have refused to sign this anti-Communist affidavit it means those 1,700 men have either got to give up their job in the Government Printing Office or give up their union. I do not know what benefits that union gives to its members, but I suppose there are many down there who have been paying dues into the union for maybe 10 or 15 years. They have an interest in the amount of money in the union treasury at the present time, because by paying in annual dues they are paying toward sick benefits, and they are paying toward death benefits. Whether or not this particular union has a pension fund, I do not know. But, what we are telling him is, "You have either got to give up your union or give up your job." Perhaps he might have paid three or four hundred dollars into that particular union fund and we are demanding that he throw that three or four hundred dollars down the sewer.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Is there not another alternative which the gentleman overlooks? The gentleman says that they either have to give up their jobs or give up their union. Is it not also possible for them to elect a president of the union who is not a Communist?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is possible, but at the same time it is none of our business. We have no right to go in there and vote as a member of that union. The only ones responsible for the leadership of that union are the union members themselves.

I understand that this particular union that we are trying to get at is holding a convention this summer at Atlantic City, and there is a strong movement on foot here in Washington by the members of this union to overthrow that leadership. But it is no responsibility of ours to attempt to overthrow that leadership. The vast majority of the members of this union are not Communists. I doubt whether any of them are, because all who work for the Government have signed this anti-Communist affidavit or they would not be working for the Government at the present time.

Now, I would like to give an example of my own case. My international union officers have signed this affidavit, so that it would not affect me except in this way: I have been paying dues into my union since 1930. At the present time I am paying $48 a year, or $4 a month. I have an interest in the funds of my international union here in Washington. What do I get out of that? We have sick benefits that would help my family if I became ill. We have death benefits of $1,000 that goes to my family when I die. We have an old-age-pension system that would help my family if I was unable to work when I reach the age of 65. Those things I have been paying in for, because I hope to have a little security in my old age. But if I were not elected to Congress this fall and got a job in the Government next year, and if my particular international officers had not signed this affidavit, you would demand by this action that I give up everything that I have paid for 18 long years into the treasury of this particular union or else give up my job in the Government. That is how far it goes, and I do not care what union it is. There are numbers of cases; I do not know how many, but they may run into the thousands. The proponents of this legislation do not know how many it is going to harm, how many innocent people are going to be affected by this type of legislation. Why, if a person worked in the coal mines for 20 years and belonged to the coal miners' union, and

he got a Government job here in Washington 10 years ago, because John Lewis has not signed this affidavit that man, although he has had no direct connection with this union for 10 years, has got to give up his job in the Government or give up everything that he has paid into that particular union, and there is no question about it. In the case of the workers that we have in the Government Printing Office, the people working in the press rooms belong to the same typographical union, and we are imposing on these people the extreme penalty of getting rid of them in Government service or having them drop their union membership.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. We are imposing a much more drastic penalty on these people than we are imposing on the people who work for the newspapers that belong to the typographical union. There is no harm coming to them at all. The only thing they are denied under the Taft-Hartley law is that they are refused the facilities of the National Labor Relations Board. It has no effect on the individual member of the union. It does not have any effect on the leader of the union that has not signed this particular affidavit. So we are going further, much further than was intended by this rider on this particular appropriation bill. I think everybody wants to be fair about the whole thing. I think we should look at it in a way so that we can do something about some of these people who have extreme left-wing tendencies, but we are not going at it in the right way by legislating like we are, by going ahead and bringing in legislation on an appropriation bill to Congress when the membership of this body has had no report to read. There has not been an opportunity for the opponents of this type of legislation to be heard. No committee of this House has had any testimony by the proponents of such legislation as we are attempting to put into the bill at this time. It is not the right way to legislate. It is not fair. We are harming countless thousands of innocent victims in the Government today by this type of legislation. By attempting to get at two people we are saying to perhaps thousands of people working for the Government who hold union cards, "We are going to impose upon you this extreme penalty of making you give up your job or give up your union if this type of legislation is adopted by the House."

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KEEFE. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I am advised that the situation in New York City is this. They have 230,000 on relief. The relief workers are organized in this Public Workers Union. Instead of trying to take people off relief, they are trying to get them on and increase the size of the relief bill. Does not the gentleman feel it would be a terrible thing if that got into the District of Columbia?

Mr. KEEFE. I do not know that I am competent to answer that question.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island has offered an amendment to strike from this bill the so-called limitation which the committee has placed in the bill, which was most thoroughly discussed when the supplemental Federal Security Agency appropriation bill was before the House last week. He has advanced no new argument, he has simply repeated the argument he made at that time, and has given voice on the floor to the argument that has come to my desk from Mr. Abram Flaxer and his left-wing crowd. That is all there is to it.

You can build up a great big mountain of opposition to a thing of this kind if you want to do so, a lot of suppositions that have perhaps no basis whatever in fact. The House passed the other bill and it is pending over in the Senate now.

In the argument on that bill I stated on the floor of the House that as chairman of that subcommittee I have no pride of authorship of this particular amendment. The amendment came from the full Committee on Appropriations and was inserted as a provision of limitation, and the announcement was made that it would be in every appropriation bill from now on that comes before the House. I stated at that time that it might be that when consideration of this bill was taken up in conference with the Senate or upon the Senate floor, if there were any kinks in the bill or any inequalities that might be discovered in the bill, they could be taken care of at that time.

As a matter of fact, I regret very much that my distinguished friend from Rhode Island has seen fit to place the welfare of and loyalty to his country—and I know the gentleman does not mean it—on a lower level of allegiance than loyalty to any labor union. I do not believe he is speaking for the rank and file members of any union when he places loyalty to that union ahead of the loyalty of those employees to the United States of America. That is virtually what he said in making his appeal in behalf of the untold thousands of employees whom he depicted as going to be hurt by this amendment. All there is to it is just this: If there there are any Government employees that are members of organizations that are headed up by Communists, and the leaders of those organizations, whether they are Communists or non-Communists, are not willing to take the oath you have to take as a Member of Congress so you can draw your pay, or take the oath that every man or woman in your office has to make by affidavit, if they are not willing to do that in the interest of trying to solve this problem of communistic penetration into this country of ours, then there is something pretty small in their attitude.

If I were a member of a union such as the printers' union that the gentleman is talking about, whose officers have no good reason that anybody can understand for refusing to sign the non-Communist affidavit provided in the Taft-Hartley law, I would demand, as the membership of that union has demanded, that the officers of the union sign such an affidavit. The overwhelming majority of the officers of the unions of this country have already signed that affidavit and have complied with the law. Nobody is going to be hurt, because they can just resign from their union, and there are plenty of other good unions that have complied with the law which they can join so that their interests will be protected. I say we are in this fight to stop this communistic infiltration at all points; and if this were a usurpation of legislative rights, as the gentleman from Rhode Island has stated, then why does he not make a point of order against this proposal as contained in this bill? That would be the proper legislative procedure in such a case, instead of the gentleman from Rhode Island standing up and saying that the Committee on Appropriations is usurping the function of the legislative committees by adding riders on an appropriation bill. If that is true, and if this is legislation on an appropriation bill, then he should make a point of order against it, and it would be ruled out. However, he knows and everybody else knows that it is not legislation on an appropriation bill; it is merely a limitation in connection with a great many other limitations that have been carried for years on this appropriation bill. It seems to me that nothing more has to be said.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. REES, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of such

District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5728) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KEEFE, H. CARL ANDERSEN, SCHWABE of Oklahoma; CHURCH, ROONEY, HENDRICKS, and FOGARTY.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER (at the request of Mr. FOGARTY) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances in the RECORD, in one to include a statement made by him on the so-called Johnson bill.

BILL AMENDING RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION MADE IN ORDER ON MAY 6

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on tomorrow to consider the bill (S. 2287) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes, under the general rules of the House; that there may be not to exceed 1 hour of general debate, to be confined to the bill and to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and that all points of order against the bill or committee-substitute amendment thereto be considered as waived.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

MILITARY INSTALLATIONS BILL

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a rule has been granted on the bill (H. R. 6342) which pertains to the construction of certain military installations. It was not specifically indicated that this bill was likely to be taken up this week. It was suggested, however, in the announcement of the program for the week that rules which might be reported might be called up at any time.

My understanding is that this is a matter of considerable emergency in connection with our national defense, and for that reason we expect to call that rule up tomorrow, and it is hoped that we can dispose of the bill tomorrow.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Is the gentleman able to tell us whether or not the so-called Mundt bill will come up this week?

Mr. HALLECK. I cannot make any statement on that. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I understand the Rules Committee is meeting on that bill tomorrow. What the action of the Committee on Rules will be I do not know. I do not know how much time will be allowed for general debate. It is possible, of course, that we might take it up on Friday, at least for general debate. It may be that it will be considered better parliamentary procedure to program the bill for a later time. I cannot say at this time.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. KUNKEL. Is it contemplated to adjourn over from tomorrow until Monday?

Mr. HALLECK. I cannot say about that. I am sorry I cannot inform the gentleman.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 550. An act for relief of Lizzie Reynolds, administratrix of the estate of Grace Reynolds, deceased;

H. R. 1498. An act for relief of Hempstead Warehouse Corp.;

H. R. 3089. An act for relief of Mississippi Central Railroad Co.; and

H. R. 3550. An act for relief of Jesse L. Purdy.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 550. An act for the relief of Lizzie Reynolds, administratrix of the estate of Grace Reynolds, deceased;

H. R. 1498. An act for relief of Hempstead Warehouse Corp.;

H. R. 3089. An act for relief of Mississippi Central Railroad Co.; and

H. R. 3550. An act for the relief of Jesse L. Purdy.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 6, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1522. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, in compliance with section 5 of Public Law 657, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 7, 1946, the report that settlement of a claim by Corpus Christi Shipbuilding Co., Corpus Christi, Tex., was effected under the above-mentioned public law by payment to Corpus Christi Shipbuilding Co. of $33,850.07; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1523. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on developments in the campaign against foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1524. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 9, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of, and a review of reports on, Grays Harbor, Wash., with a view to improvements at Bay City, Westport, and Hoquiam, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945, and requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on April 24, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 635); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 1050. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the mining of potash on the public domain," approved February 7, 1927, so as to provide for the disposition of the rentals and royalties from leases issued or renewed under the act entitled "An act to authorize exploration for and disposition of potassium," approved October 2, 1917; without amendment (Rept. No. 1856). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 1874. An act authorizing the head of the

department or agency using the public domain for national defense purposes to compensate holders of grazing permits and licenses for losses sustained by reason of such use of public lands for national defense purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1858). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 4874. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent to the county of Del Norte, State of California, to Pelican Rock in Crescent City Harbor, Del Norte County, Calif.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1859). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 5071. A bill to extend the public-land laws of the United States to certain lands, consisting of islands, situated in the Red River in Oklahoma; with amendments (Rept. No. 1860). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 5936. A bill to provide for the addition of certain surplus Government lands to the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, in the States of Georgia and Tennessee, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1862). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 5957. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Fort Vancouver National Monument, in the State of Washington, to include the site of the old Hudson's Bay Co. stockade, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1863). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6073. A bill to provide for the acquisition of lands for grazing and related purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1864). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6229. A bill to authorize the extension of leases of certain land in the Territory of Hawaii; without amendment (Rept. No. 1865). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6302. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, to permit the exercise of certain options on or before August 8, 1950; without amendment (Rept. No. 1867). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. House Joint Resolution 363. Joint resolution providing for the ratification by Congress of a contract for the purchase of certain lands and mineral deposits by the United States from the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians; with amendments (Rept. No. 1868). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4566. A bill for the relief of William Nally; without amendment (Rept. No. 1855). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 1771. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in Powell townsite, Wyo., Shoshone reclamation project, Wyoming, to the James S. McDonald Post 5054, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Powell, Wyo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1857). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 5151. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to James P. Love a patent to certain lands in the State of Mississippi; without amendment (Rept. No. 1861). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6252. A bill to authorize the issuance of a land patent to certain public lands, situated in the county of Kauai, T. H., for school purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1866). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee:

H. R. 6448. A bill to direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land in Tennessee to the city of Johnson City; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 6449. A bill to provide for the payment of a uniform allowance to officers of the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army, Air Force, or of the National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

H. R. 6450. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, approved February 16, 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H R. 6451. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to provide for the better control of the alcoholic-beverage industry in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

H R. 6452. A bill to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 6453. A bill to create a corporation to provide cafeteria, restaurant, and related services in Federal buildings in the District of Columbia and elsewhere and to define the responsibility of the Federal Works Administrator with respect thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 6454. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain Federal employees who have rendered at least 20 years' service in the investigation and apprehension of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 6455. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to eliminate certain elections required by such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 6456. A bill to establish within the Department of the Interior an Office of National Minerals Resources, Production, and Conservation, and for other purpose; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. R. 6457. A bill to provide for disposition of land on the Cabazon, Augustine, and Torres-Martenez Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. J. Res. 394. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to treason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NODAR:

H. Res. 579. Resolution directing the Committee on Un-American Activities to conduct an investigation in the State of New York with respect to subversive activities in the public schools and other public educational institutions of such State; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 580. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the required course of study in the public elementary and secondary schools should emphasize instruction in the history and government of the United States and the study of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and other great writings; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARDY:

H. R. 6458. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Richard G. Adams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 6459. A bill for the relief of Nicolae N. Ionnitiu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1868. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Rhode Island in General Assembly calling upon the Federal Government to lift or modify the embargo on shipment of arms to Palestine in aid of the Jews there and thereby permit them to defend themselves from attack, and urging the President of the United States of America, the United States delegate to the United Nations, and the Secretary of State to support a measure which would give a stern warning to the Arab states calling for an end of their resistance to and sabotage of the United Nations decision; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1869. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolutions submitted to Wisconsin Association of School Administrators, meeting in Milwaukee, Wis., April 15, 1948, urging passage of S. 472; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1870. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Massachusetts Chiefs of Police Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of H. R. 5401 and urging its enactment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1871. Also, petition of I. W. Winegard, Pine Castle, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308 (b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly,

as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received for the first calendar quarter of 1948.

To carry out the provisions of the Lobbying Act three forms were printed and used in making detailed statements (Form A), registrations (Form B), and filing quarterly reports (Form C).

Section 308 (b) requires the printing of information received and filed. Forms B and C, upon which this information was submitted, are reproduced as follows:

FORM B

REGISTRATION (IN DUPLICATE) WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SECRETARY OF THE SENATE UNDER THE LOBBYING ACT

(Public Law 601, 79th Cong.)

Name _____

Business address _____

INFORMATION REQUESTED FROM PERSON REGISTERING

(1) The name and address of the person by whom employed:

(1) _____

(2) In whose interest he appears or works:

(2) _____

(3) The duration of such employment:

(3) _____

(4) How much he is paid and is to receive:

(4) _____

(5) By whom he is paid or is to be paid:

(5) _____

(6) How much he is to be paid for expenses:

(6) _____

(7) What expenses are to be included:

(7) _____

See Form C for quarterly report to be filed.

OATH OF REGISTRANT

[Omitted in printing]

FORM C

QUARTERLY REPORT OF PERSONS REGISTERING UNDER LOBBYING ACT TO BE FILED, IN DUPLICATE, WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

(Public Law 601, 79th Cong.)

Name _____

Business address _____

INFORMATION REQUIRED IN QUARTERLY REPORT

Each such person so registering shall, between the 1st and 10th day of each calendar quarter, so long as his activity continues, file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and Secretary of the Senate—

(1) A detailed report under oath of all money received and expended by him during the preceding calendar quarter:

(1) _____

(2) To whom paid:

(2) _____

(3) For what purposes:

(3) _____

(4) The names of any papers, periodicals, magazines, or other publications in which he has caused to be published any articles or editorials:

(4) _____

(5) The proposed legislation he is employed to support or oppose:

(5) _____

OATH OF REGISTRANT FILING QUARTERLY REPORT

[Omitted in printing]

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were received for the first calendar quarter 1948, and filed, using Form B, with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate:

(NOTE.—In order to reduce space, the questions in Form B (see above) are not repeated. Only the answers to questions are printed and are indicated by numbers in parentheses.)

Abbott, Charlotte E., 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (2) The above committee. (3) At will. (4) Salary at $385 per month, plus reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket expenses. (5) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. (6) Actual amount of out-of-pocket expenses. (7) To include such items as railroad fare, travel, subsistence, and telephone and telegraph tolls.

Abram, Morris B., 537 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) John H. Ferguson, executive director, 537 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (2) Citizens Committee for the Marshall Plan. (3) Approximately 2 months. (4) $600 per month. (5) Citizens Committee for the Marshall Plan. (6) $10 per day plus transportation, communication, and stenographic expense. (7) Personal food and lodging up to $10 per day as mentioned under (6) above.

American Short Line Railroad Association, The, 1120 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Three hundred and four member common-carrier railroads. (See returns to Form A for explanation.) List showing names and addresses attached.[1] (2) For the 304 lines listed in reply to question (1). (3) Indefinite. (4) For account of legislation from $8 to $84 annually from each of the 304 members. (See returns on Form A for full explanation.) (5) Three hundred and four members listed in reply to question (1). (6) All of the amount listed under reply to question (4) is for expenses of the association. (7) Compensation of officers and employees, printing, postage, travel, and entertainment.

Associated Third Class Mail Users,[2] 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Associated Third Class Mail Users. (2) Third-class mail users who are members of the association. (3) Indefinite. (4) Association's income is based on contributions of members. Amount is therefore indefinite. (5) Contributions from members. (6) Unknown. (7) All expenses of running the association.

Bailen, Mrs. Elise Thompson, National Committee for the Marshall Plan, 537 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) National Committee for the Marshall Plan, 537 Fifth Avenue, New York City, Mr. John Ferguson, executive director. (2) National Committee for the Marshall Plan. (3) Six weeks. (4) One hundred and twenty-five dollars per week. (5) National Committee for the Marshall Plan. (6) Actual travel expenses, such as transportation, hotel, meals, etc. (7) Nothing other than those specified under question (6).

Baker, Frederick E., and Associates (a partnership composed of Frederick E. Baker, W. Dent Dowler, and Robert A. Baker), 317 Vance Building, Seattle, Wash. (1) Twenty-nine separate companies, as advertising agents and public-relations counsel, including Washington State Medical Association, Cobb Building, Seattle, and Alaska Steamship Co., Pier 42, Seattle. (2) Alaska water-transportation problems, health and welfare. (3) All clients are of permanent duration, subject to termination by either party at any time. No work is done for any client on a single-purpose basis. All work includes, (1) advertising, (2) management consulting, (3) public relations. (4) Compensation is in form of advertising commissions (15 percent) received from media, and public relations and management consulting monthly retaining fees. No specific compensation is paid for any legislation service. If at any time work for clients exceed the amount provided by monthly retainer our firm bills client additional in amount $75 per day of additional service. Retaining fee monthly of Washington State Medical Association is $250 and of Alaska Steamship Co. is $300. (5) All 29 clients compensate our firm on basis of advertising commissions earned, plus service charges for production of advertising, and/or a constant monthly retainer for management consulting and public-relations counsel. (6) Normal expenses of business are paid by Frederick E. Baker and Associates except when one of the firm's partners are required to leave Seattle for extended business trip. (7) Only actual traveling, meals, cabs, tips, and hotel.

Baker, Gibbs L., 1011 Investment Building, Fifteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Charles Niedner's Sons Co., Inc., Malden, Mass.; The United States Rubber Co., New York City; The Firehose Mfg. Co., Inc., New York City; The Approved Equipment Mfg. Co., Inc., New Milford, N. J.; and the Federal Firehose Mfg. Co., Inglewood, Calif., (2) Same as above. (3) Undetermined. (4) Undetermined. (5) Charles Niedner's Son's Co., Inc. and United States Rubber Co. and possibly other manufacturers named above. (6) Costs—undetermined. (7) Telephone, telegrams, transportation, stenographic, and sundry out-of-pocket disbursements.

Baldinger, Mary Alice, 4607 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Council for a Permanent FEPC, 930 F Street NW. (Room 901), Washington, D. C. (2) Same as (1). (3) Since February 5, 1943. (4) $20 a day. (5) National Council for a Permanent FEPC. (6) Actual out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Transportation, office supplies, etc.

Baldwin and Mermey,[2] 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Citizens Committee for Reciprocal World Trade, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (2) Citizens Committee for Reciprocal World Trade, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (3) To June 15, 1948. (4) Retainer of $21,000 to June 15, 1948. (5) Citizens Committee for Reciprocal World Trade, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (6) Reimbursement at cost for out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Mimeographing, printing, postage, telephone, telegraph, and traveling.

Barlow, Joel, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Northwest Horticultural Council, Wenatchee, Wash. (2) Northwest Horticultural Council, Wenatchee, Wash. (3) The employment is of indefinite duration. See answer to question (4). (4) This employment is an ordinary attorney-client retainer for the purpose of rendering general legal advice and assistance. Considerable time is being currently spent and may continue to be spent in the preparation of materials for presentation to Congress in support of proposed legislation to improve marketing conditions in the fruit industry during the postwar interruption in normal export marketing. Compensation for services has not yet been agreed upon. (5)

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[2] Registration with the Clerk only.

[2] Registration with the Clerk only.

Northwest Horticultural Council. (6) Actual expenses incurred. (7) Travel, telephone, telegraph, and similar miscellaneous expenses.

Barron, Harriet, 23 West Twenty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, 23 West Twenty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (2) American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. (3) Permanent. (4) $50 per week. (5) American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. (6) Fares, hotels, taxis, telephones. (7) Fares, hotels, taxis, telephones.

Bass, Frank E., legislative-Federal relations division of National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Legislative-Federal relations division, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Legislative-Federal relations division. (3) February 20 to 28, inclusive. (4) Paid at the rate of $458.33 per month. (5) Legislative-Federal relations division. (6) Refund of actual expenses. (7) Travel, meals, cabs, hotel bills, tips, and usual personal expenses.

Bauer, Charles J., room 517, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Building Owners and Managers Association of Metropolitan Washington, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Same as (1). (3) Appointed secretary effective February 1, 1943, for indefinite period. (4) $5,000 per annum; $5,500 effective March 10, 1948. (5) Building Owners and Managers Association of Metropolitan Washington. (6) No fixed amount; to be reimbursed for authorized expenses as need arises. (7) Transportation.

Bealle, Morris A., national judge advocate, Irish War Veterans of the U. S. A., 127 B Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Irish War Veterans of the U. S. A. (2) Membership. (3) Until a successor is elected at a subsequent national convention and qualifies. (4) Nothing. (5) No one. (6) Nothing. (7) Nothing.

Beirne, Joseph A., president, Communications Workers of America, 917 G Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Communications Workers of America, 917 G Place NW., Washington, D. C. (2) In the interest of the organization whose name apepars in (1) above. (3) For the term of office which expires in June 1949. (4) $13,200 per annum. (5) The organization whose name appears in (1) above. (6) No specific amount authorized. Reimbursed for actual expenses. (7) See answer in (6) above.

Bemmels, Violet G., 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (2) The above committee. (3) At will. (4) Salary at $420 per month, plus reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket expenses. (5) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. (6) Actual amount of out-of-pocket expenses. (7) To include such items as railroad fare, travel subsistence, and telephone and telegraph tolls.

Berge, Wendell, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Council of Business Schools, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Council of Technical Schools, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) As above. A description of the services to be performed is attached.[1] I do not believe that I am required to file this statement under the Lobbying Act, but do so to avoid any question concerning the application of the act. (3) Two years. (4) $10,000 annually. (5) As above. (6) Reimbursement. When traveling, per diem of $12.50. (7) Telephone, telegraph, travel.

Bernard, Lawrence J., 914 Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Self-employed; member of law firm of Sullivan, Bernard & Shea. (2) (1) United States Leather Co.; (2) An informal group of small-loan companies. See attached statement[1] for details of employment. (3) Indefinite. (4) Reasonable fees to be determined when employment is terminated. (5) Clients mentioned in (2) above. (6) Fees will cover out-of-pocket disbursements. (7) [Blank.]

Berry, Raymond H., 1000 Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) Automobile Club of Michigan, 139 Bagley Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (2) Automobile Club of Michigan, 139 Bagley Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (3) Indefinite. (4) No payment for services to date has been made nor has any amount been agreed upon. (5) Automobile Club of Michigan, 139 Bagley Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (6) Actual amount. (7) Transportation, hotel, meals, taxies, tips, telephone, telegraph, and any matters related thereto.

Bodary, D. A., national legislative and general representative, Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 107 West Linwood Boulevard, Kansas City, Mo. (2) Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America. My duties include the handling of legislative matters and the handling and progressing of grievances and other activities of my organization. (3) Indefinite. (4) $6,000 per year. No segregation is made or is possible as to the portion of this amount which is compensation for legislative activities. (5) Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America. (6) $12 per diem. (7) Hotel, meals, and other miscellaneous expenses.

Borkin, Joseph, 1017 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Federation for Railway Progress, Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) In the interest of the public and the Federation for Railway Progress. (3) No specific period of employment has as yet been stipulated. (4) Compensation is as yet undetermined. (5) Federation for Railway Progress. (6) I am reimbursed for expenses for travel, hotels, and meals. (7) Expenses for travel, hotels, and meals.

Bowden, B. E., 267 Robbins Drive, Newark, Ohio. (1) The American Train Dispatchers Association, 10 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill. (2) The American Train Dispatchers Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) $410 per month. (5) American Train Dispatchers Association. (6) Actual living expense. (7) Lodging, meals, transportation, and laundry service.

Boyd, William R., Jr., 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Answers to items 1–7: The registrant is president of the American Petroleum Institute (the Institute), a national trade association of the petroleum industry. The registrant has been advised by counsel and believes that he is not now subject and has not previously been subject to the provisions of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act (the act), and that he is not now required and has not previously been required to register or to file any statements under the act. The registrant has not engaged himself for pay for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States. He is elected to serve for a 1-year term and receives an annual salary to perform all of the duties of his office as chief executive and administrative officer of the Institute. To the extent that he may deal with Federal legislative matters, he does so only as an incident to the performance of his over-all responsibilities as directing head of the Institute. The registrant spent only a very small portion of his business time during the calendar year 1947 on matters relating to Federal legislation. Even his minor activities in this field appear for the most part to have been of a character specifically excluded from the coverage of section 308 of the act. The Department of Justice has nevertheless expressed the view that the registrant is subject to the act. Pending an authoritative construction of the act by the courts, the registrant is registering under the act. By doing so, however, he does not admit that he is subject to the provisions of the act or that he is required to register. Since the registrant receives a salary to perform all the duties of his office, it is his view that he is not paid any sum for the purpose of attempting to influence Federal legislation. For the purposes of filing the periodic statements (Form C) called for by section 308, the registrant will apportion a part of his annual salary to Federal legislative purposes on the basis of his best estimate of the proportion of time spent by him on matters relating to Federal legislation. The making of any such apportionment is not to be construed as an admission that the registrant is employed for the purpose of influencing Federal legislation. Since there is no way of determining in advance the proportion of his business time, if any, which the registrant may devote to Federal legislation, no attempt will be made at apportionment in this report. No fixed sum is allowed the registrant for expenses incurred in the performance of his duties nor is any amount allocated for such purpose. The expenses for which the registrant expects to be reimbursed in the event he incurs any expenses in connection with Federal legislative matters are of a character similar to those customarily incurred by the managing head of an organization in the discharge of his official duties. In general, such expenses would cover travel, sustenance, and communication. Form C for the calendar year 1947 is being filed contemporaneously with this statement. Form C for the first quarter of 1948 will be filed on or before April 10, 1948.

Brady, Joseph E., 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink, and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. (2) International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink, and Distillery Workers of America. (3) Elective office for 2 years; term to expire December 31, 1948; subject to reelection. (4) $8,500 per year. (5) International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink, and Distillery Workers of America. (6) $12 per day in lieu of subsistence plus reimbursement for other expenses. (7) Transportation, telephone, telegraph, and other extraordinary expenses.

Breed, Arthur H., Jr. (James D. Hahn, employee), 310 Fifteenth Street, Oakland, Calif. (1) Waterfront Employers Association, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif. (2) Waterfront Employers Association, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif. (3) Indefinite. (4) $175 per week during continuation of employment. (5) Waterfront Employers Association, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif. (6) Actual expenses incurred. (7) Telephone, telegraph, stationery, postage, traveling, salary of Mr. Hahn.

Byoir, Carl, and Associates, Inc., 10 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Schenley Distillers Corp., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (2) Schenley Distillers Corp. (3) Annual contract which expires August 31, 1948. (4) Annual fee $36,000. Up to this date no portion of this fee has been compensation for activities covered by Public Law 601. It is anticipated that only a small portion of the remainder of the fee will be compensation for necessary activities under Public Law 601. (5) Schenley Distillers Corp. (6) No fixed amount. Actual expenses incurred in connection with activities covered by Public Law 601 to be reim-

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

bursed. (7) Travel, telephone, telegraph, postage, printing, mimeographing, and reimbursement of employees' salaries for time during which employees are engaged on behalf of this client in necessary activities covered by Public Law 601.

Byrum, George N., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. (3) Casual; as the interests of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen may require. (4) $12.50 per day when actually engaged as per question 3. (5) Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. (6) $12.50 per day. (7) All necessary personal expenses up to $12.50 per day.

Cadden,[2] Joseph, room 1613, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Civil Rights Congress, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (2) Civil Rights Congress. (3) Indefinite. (4) $3,380 per year as executive director of Civil Rights Congress, including all duties. (5) Civil Rights Congress. (6) Full expenses of transportation to Washington and living expenses in Washington when there. (7) All transportation and living expenses.

Caldwell, Louis G., member of Kirkland, Fleming, Green, Martin & Ellis, 914 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C., an informal organization of 16 licensees of clear channel broadcast stations (KFI, WSM, WLW, WGN, WSB, WJR, WBAP, WFAA, WHAS, WWL, WLS, KDKA, WHO, WHAM, WOAI and WCAU). (2) Clear Channel Broadcasting Service. (3) Indefinite. (4) $1,200 monthly plus fees on a per diem basis (against which the $1,200 is credited), for work principally on contested proceedings before the Federal Communications Commission (and in court, if court proceedings should develop). In further answer to item 4, registrant states that no definite portion of the fees he is to receive are assignable to work in connection with legislation. For over 3 years he has represented Clear Channel Broadcasting Service in a proceeding before the Federal Communications Commission, which commenced February 20, 1945, and involves the same issues as a bill now pending in the Senate, S. 2231, introduced February 26, 1948. Hearings on this bill are now scheduled for April 5, 1948. So far as registrant knows, it is solely in connection with this bill, and particularly the hearings thereon, that registrant may have any duties of a legislative character to perform for Clear Channel Broadcasting Service. Such duties will be entirely incidental, registrant having been principally engaged to represent said organization before the Federal Communications Commission. In registrant's opinion his work in connection with said bill has not been and will not be such as to fall within the scope of the Federal regulation of Lobbying Act; but, in order that there may be no doubt or question in the matter, he is filing this registration. The above-mentioned fees and expenses are paid to registrant's law firm and not to registrant individually. They also cover legal services by lawyers other than registrant who are members or employees of said firm. Registrant, however, is th only lawyer connected with said firm who will have any duties relating to the above-mentioned bill which might conceivably fall within the scope of said act. (5) Harold Hough, treasurer of Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, care of WBAP, Fort Worth, Tex. (6) No definite amount has been stipulated. (7) The expenses usually associated with legal representation in contested proceedings including employment of experts, statistical, and stenographic help and overtime, transcripts of hearings, mimeographing, printing, telephone tolls, telegrams, traveling, and taxi fares.

Casey, Joseph E., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Committee for Equalization of Tobacco Taxes, No. 701, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (2) In the interest of the above committee. (3) For the balance of the calendar year. (4) $15,000. (5) Committee for Equalization of Tobacco Taxes. (6) None. (7) None.

Cassiday, George L., national commander, Irish War Veterans, Inc., U. S. A., 127 B Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Irish War Veterans, Inc., U. S. A., 127 B Street SE., Washington, D. C. (2) Irish War Veterans, Inc., U. S. A. (3) Four years. (4) Nothing. (5) None. (6) Nothing. (7) Nothing.

Colgan, Howard O., Jr., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant is a member of the law firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y., which firm receives an annual retainer from the Chase National Bank of the City of New York for professional services. Registrant does not believe he is subject to the provisions of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. (2) The Chase National Bank of the City of New York, 18 Pine Street, New York, N. Y. (3) Annual retainer. (4) It is impossible to determine in advance (prior to filing of Form C for a given quarter) what portion of the annual retainer, based on an allocation of time expended, might be attributable to registrant's Federal tax legislative work. Such work comprises only an incidental and minor part of registrant's duties. (5) See answer to (1). (6) The firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley will be reimbursed for actual out-of-pocket expenses incurred by any member or associate of the firm. (7) See (6) above. Usual disbursements customary in legal work.

Cone, John C., Pan American Airways, Chrysler Building, New York, N. Y., and Pan American Airways, Bowen Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Pan American Airways, Inc., Chrysler Building, New York, N. Y. (2) Pan American Airways, Inc. The registrant was originally employed 11 years ago to organize and manage the Atlantic division of Pan American Airways. Approximately 3 years later he was promoted to assistant vice president and transferred to the general offices, where he is available and is used for various matters pertaining to the operation of Pan American Airways' world-wide system. Since promotion to assistant vice president he has been sent on missions of various natures to many foreign countries and colonies, including Central and South America, and to Europe. He is available for special duties whenever and wherever needed throughout the entire system. He is a liaison officer for the company with the Air Transport Association. He is assigned to special missions from time to time, in which he represents the company at aviation conferences, aviation clinics, and on many aviation programs conducted by civic organizations, chambers of commerce, schools and colleges, aviation forums, etc. He is called upon, when the necessity arises, to confer with various government agencies, Federal, State, and city, in connection with operational problems, development of traffic, public relations, etc. He is an officer of the company and is not employed for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States, and disclaims the necessity for filing this registration, which is being filed to eliminate any possible question if, in the course of his duties, it should be necessary for the registrant to attempt to influence the passage or defeat of legislation by the Congress. (3) He is an officer of the company on permanent status. (4) $15,000 per annum as compensation for full-time service to the company, as described in the attachment, no part of this compensation being for legislative matters in particular. (5) Pan American Airways. (6) No specified amount, but is reimbursed for all legitimate expenses incurred in behalf of Pan American Airways. (7) Usual expenses incurred in discharging his various duties.

Cosgrove, James L., 110 South Dearborn, Chicago, Ill. (1) Railroad Employees' National Pension Association, Inc., Room 807, 110 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (2) Legislation sponsored by the Railroad Employes' National Pension Association, Inc. (3) I have represented the above-mentioned association since June 1937. Present term expires June 1949. (4) $450 monthly. (5) The above-mentioned association. (6) Reasonable expenses would be approved by two members of the board of directors. (7) Transportation, lodging, subsistence, etc.

Costello, John M., 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The American League for an Undivided Ireland, 165-167 William Street, New York, N. Y. (2) Same. (3) Indefinite. (4) $250 monthly. (5) The American League for an Undivided Ireland. (6) For actual expenses incurred. (7) Telephone, telegraph, traveling, and similar expenses incident to the activities of the organization.

Couch, Mary Beth, 27 West Ohio Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) Communication Workers of America, Indiana Traffic Division No. 56. (2) Same as in (1) above. (3) Elective office—term expires October 1949. (4) $160. (5) Same organization identified (1) above. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Any expense incurred.

Creed, Joseph M., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Bakers Association, Chicago, Ill. (2) American Bakers Association. This statement is filed despite the fact that in the opinion of the registrant Public Law 601 is not applicable to him or his activities since it is not the principal purpose of said registrant or his employer to aid in the accomplishment of, or to influence, directly or indirectly, the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States. (3) Indefinitely. (4) Salary basis—no portion of salary allocated for activities within purview of this act. (5) American Bakers Association. (6) No specific amount is to be paid but will be reimbursed for all expenditures made in the carrying out of duties of employment. (7) Regular expenses incurred in performing duties of employment.

Cutler, John Ward, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Dwight, Harris, Koegel & Caskey, 100 Broadway, New York City. (2) Same as (1). (3) Indefinite. (4) Ten percent of any recovery on debt claim under Trading With the Enemy Act, subject to approval of Office of Alien Property, Department of Justice, pursuant to section 20 of that act. Any activity before the Congress is incidental to normal presentation of claims before Office of Alien Property and arises from possible suspension of debt-claim payments under H. R. 4044. (5) Party named in (1). (6) Reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Telephone, telegraph, taxis, travel (if any), and the like.

Dacci, Guy P., president, National Voters League of America Against Vivisection, suite 203, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., or 221 West Fourteenth Street, New York City. (1) National Voters League of America Against Vivisection. Address above. (2) Members of the organization. (3) Until a change takes place. (4) $100 per week was the first stipulation. This was scaled down to $75 per week. At no time has the amount paid me covered the above amount and out of what payment was received I paid my weekly return trip New York to Washington, meals, and hotel bills while in Washington. Late in June began to work at home and allowed myself only $85 month—not enough to keep

[2] Registration with the Clerk only.

body and soul properly together. (5) By treasurer of the organization. (6) All legitimate expenses—whatever they may be—travel, eating away from home, hotel, etc. (7) Travel, eating away from home, hotel, etc.

Daly, Harry J., National Metropolitan Bank Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Hillsdale Broadcasting Co., Hillsdale, Mich.; Hobart Stephenson, radio station WCNT, Centralia, Ill.; Milton Edge and Edgar Korsmeyer, radio station WLDS, Jacksonville, Ill.; Pekin Broadcasting Co., radio station WSIV, Pekin, Ill.; Mississippi Broadcasting Co., radio stations WMBS, WCOC, WJQS, Jackson, Mich.; Kewanee Broadcasting Co., Kewanee, Ill.; George P. Anderson, radio station KJSK, Columbus, Nebr. (2) Same as (1). (3) Indefinite. (4) $600 by all but KJSK for Daytime Skyway matters originating in Federal Communications Commission. KJSK on regular retainer of $50 per month covering many other broadcast matters. (5) By those listed in (1). (6) Only out-of-pocket expenditures as accrued. (7) Long-distance telephone, telegrams, duplicating work, etc.

Davies, Aled P., 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill. (2) American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill. (3) Continuous since August 8, 1940. (4) $8,000 per annum. (5) American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Out-of-pocket travel expenses such as transportation, meals, lodging, entertainment, etc., when out of Chicago.

Davies, William D., 27 Water Street, New York. (1) D. C. Andrews & Co., 27 Water Street, New York, N. Y. I am also chairman of the forwarders committee but receive no compensation in that capacity. (2) Same as No. 1. (3) Indefinite. (4) Registrant receives compensation from Andrews for ordinary business services but receives no additional or special compensation connected with legislative matters. (5) See No. 4. (6) Registrant is reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses by D. C. Andrews. (7) Registrant will receive reimbursement for phone, telegrams, transportation, and hotel accommodations while away from New York.

Dawes, Bourbon A., 1331 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Hotel Association of Washington, D. C., Inc., 1331 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Same as (1). (3) At the pleasure of the association. (4) $6,500 per annum. (5) Hotel Association of Washington, D. C., Inc. (6) No fixed amount. (7) Only such miscellaneous expenses as are incurred from time to time.

Dawson, Clarence E., 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant is a member of the law firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., which firm receives an annual retainer from the Chase National Bank of the City of New York for professional services. Registrant does not believe he is subject to the provisions of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. (2) The Chase National Bank of the City of New York, 18 Pine Street, New York, N. Y. (3) Annual retainer. (4) It is impossible to determine in advance (prior to filing of Form C for a given quarter) what portion of the annual retainer, based on an allocation of time expended, might be attributable to registrant's Federal tax-legislative work. Such work comprises only an incidental and minor part of registrant's duties. (5) See answer to (1). (6) The firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley will be reimbursed for actual out-of-pocket expenses incurred by any member or associate of the firm. (7) See (6) above. Usual disbursements customary in legal work.

Dawson, Joseph Martin, 1628 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The Joint Conference Committee on Public Relations for the Baptists (Northern, Southern, National, Inc., and national conventions). (2) The above. (3) Indefinite. (4) $7,000 per annum, plus house and traveling together with office expense. (5) By the joint conference committee. (6) No specified amount, and thus far the total is negligible but itemized and accounted for, as also office expenses. (7) Traveling for executive secretary and office expenses in conduct of the work.

DeGroot, E. H., Jr., attorney at law, 924 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State, 924 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C. (2) As in (1) above. (3) Continuing. Organization incorporated January 29, 1948. Registrant is treasurer. (4) Nothing. (5) No one. (6) Reimbursed for actual expenditures for postage, record books, and any office incidentals. (7) See (6) above.

Dickson,[3] Col. Charles M., AUS, retired, room 579, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., temporary; room 505 St. Anthony Hotel, San Antonio, permanent. (1) Self-employed; attorney with offices in the following cities: South Texas Building, San Antonio, Tex.; and First National Bank Building, Laredo, Tex. (2) Appears and works in his own interest. Also may work in the interest of one or more clients; also chief advocate of Follow Eisenhower Organization. (3) Approximately 3 months. (4) No compensation at the present time. (5) No compensation as noted in 4 above, except Army disability pay for life at the rate of $302.50 per month. (6) No compensation for expenses at the present time. (7) No expenses are to be included at present.

Dillas, Miss Jessie R., 205 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. (1) Communications Workers of America, Illinois Traffic Division, No. 14, 205 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. (2) In the interest of the organization whose name appears in (1) above. (3) Elective office, term expires February 1949. (4) $190. (5) The organization whose name appears in (1) above. (6) No specific amount authorized. Reimbursed for actual expenses. (7) See answer in (6) above.

Disney, Wesley E., 434 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Wilcox Oil Co., Tulsa, Okla.; Marlboro Cotton Mills, Inc., McColl, S. C.; American Hotel Association, New York, N. Y.; Penobscot Chemical Fiber Co., Boston, Mass.; Lowell Liquidation Corp., Boston, Mass.; Rudolph Wurlitzer Co., Chicago, Ill. (2) Those listed in (1) above. (3) Retainer for indefinite period. (4) Retainer of $5,000 with additional fees to be agreed on the basis of work involved and time and effort expended. (5) By persons named in (1) above. (6) No expenses involved or to be paid except possible telephone or taxi, reimbursable by clients. No expense account involved or furnished. (7) No expenses involved or to be paid except possible telephone or taxi, reimbursable by clients. No expense account involved or furnished.

Disney, Wesley E., 434 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Western Oil and Gas Association, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (2) Same as (1) above. (3) Regular annual retainer. (4) Retainer of $12,000 annually. One-half allocated to legislative purposes. (5) By company named in (1) above. (6) No expenses involved or to be paid except possible telephone and taxi, reimbursable by clients. No expense account involved or furnished. (7) No expenses to be included except possible telephone or taxi, reimbursable by client. No expense account involved or furnished.

Dixon, Loy Thomas, Continental Hotel, Washington, D. C. (1) Panama Railroad Employees Association, P. O. Box 1900, Balboa, Canal Zone. (2) Panama Railroad Employees, on the Isthmus of Panama. (3) March 1948 to June 1, 1948. (4) Expenses while in Washington. (5) Panama Railroad Employees Association. (6) Necessary living expenses. (7) Living expenses, taxi fares.

Dorsett, J. Dewey, Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (2) Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (3) Am general manager of the association, subject to election each year at annual meeting of the association. Have been an association employee for approximately 10 years. (4) Impossible to segregate salary paid for regular duties as general manager of association and salary paid for infrequent occasions I present views of association with respect to Federal legislation. Any such legislative activity is incidental to my principal duties. (5) Association of Casualty and Surety Companies. (6) No allowance but am reimbursed for actual expenses. (7) Out-of-pocket expenses, including transportation, meals, and hotel accommodations.

Downs, Scheib, Becker & Walsh, a partnership composed of Thomas J. Downs, Gerard Rody Scheib, Ralph E. Becker, and Bailey Walsh and associates Mearl G. Adams and F. Trowbridge vom Baur, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See statements filed by Thomas J. Downs. Registrant firm does not believe that it is required to register or report under the act with respect to the matters contained therein. (2) Same. (3) Same. (4) Same. (5) Same. (6) Same. (7) Same.

Drysdale, Robert M., Jr., 2412 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) The Federation for Railway Progress, 2412 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) In the interest of the public and the Federation for Railway Progress. (3) I am employed at an annual salary of $8,500, payable in equal monthly installments. Except for the implications contained in the annual salary paid in equal monthly installments, no specific period of employment has been stipulated. (4) As treasurer my salary is $708.33 a month. Ninety-five percent of my duties and time as treasurer are devoted to matters other than legislation concerning the railroad industry. No specific part of my time and services deal with the opposition or support of railroad legislation. The compensation which I receive for time and work devoted to railroad legislation is approximately $31.25 a month. (5) Federation for Railway Progress. (6) I am reimbursed for expenses incurred in travel, hotel, and meals. (7) Expenses for travel, hotel, and meals.

Dunn, William M., assistant to the president, Communications Workers of America, 917 G Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Communications Workers of America, 917 G Place NW., Washington, D. C. (2) In the interest of the organization whose name appears in (1) above. (3) For the term of office which expires in June 1949. (4) $8,000 per annum. (5) The organization whose name appears in (1) above. (6) No specific amount authorized. Reimbursed for actual expenses. (7) See answer in (6) above.

Earle, C. E., 448 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Independent Business Council of America, Inc., 448 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Independent Business Council of America, Inc. (3) [Blank.] (4) Without compensation. (5) Without compensation. (6) Reimbursed for actual expenses. (7) Cost of travel, stamps, stationery, etc.

Eaton, Edna L., 687 Boyleston Street, Boston, Mass. (1) Townsend National Recovery Plan. (2) The Townsend plan. (3) Permanent. (4) $75 weekly, including expenses. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan. (6) Varies; is included in weekly check. (7) Meals away from home, hotel, traveling.

Edwards, Burton E., Suite 100, Barr Building, Washington, D. C., 257 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) National Apartment Owners Association, Suite 100,

[3] Registration with the Secretary only.

Barr Building, Washington, D. C.; 257 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (2) National Apartment Owners Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) $200 per month. (5) National Apartment Owners Association. (6) All expenses necessary to the conduct of official business. Estimated yearly expenses, $2,000. (7) Travel, living expenses away from headquarters (Los Angeles, Calif.), and incidental expenses necessary to the conduct of official business.

Eichelberger, Frank, 50 Union Square, New York, N. Y. (1) United Zinc Smelting Corp., 50 Union Square, New York, N. Y.; Goldfield Consolidated Mines Co., 1 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.; personal interests and some of the small producers of northeast Washington. (2) The above corporations as consulting engineer in mining and metallurgy. (3) As consulting engineer for the above corporations permanently, but work in connection with legislation is to be confined to the present session of Congress. (4) United Zinc Smelting Corp., $15,000 per annum; Goldfield Consolidated Mines Co., $3,000 per annum. (5) By the respective firms monthly. (6) Actual. (7) Hotel accommodations and meals, plus actual traveling expenses from New York to Washington and return.

Ely, Northcutt, Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) American Public Power Association, Washington, D. C. (2) As general counsel for American Public Power Association. (3) Indefinite; month to month. (4) Reimbursement of expenses; legal services as general counsel to the association are donated as a public service. (5) American Public Power Association. (6) Reimbursement of actual expenses. (7) Telephone, telegraph, travel, etc., but not general office overhead.

Ely, Northcutt, Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Water Resources Board of the State of California. (2) As special counsel for Water Resources Board of the State of California. (3) Indefinite; month to month. (4) No compensation paid by this board, see No. 5 below. (5) Services as special counsel are loaned by the Water Project Authority of the State of California, which pays a fee of $500 per month. See registration under that employment. (6) See No. 7 below; these are paid by water project authority. (7) Telephone, telegraph, travel, etc., but not general office overhead.

Euler, F. W. A., 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) The Ore & Chemical Corp., 80 Broad Street, New York City; United Zinc Smelting Corp., 50 Union Square, New York City. (2) United Zinc Smelting Corp., 50 Union Square, New York City. (3) Permanent, but work in connection with legislation is to be confined to the present session of Congress. (4) $8,000 to $10,000 annual salary. (5) Corporations listed under (1). (6) Actual. (7) Hotel, meals, railroad and train fares (New York to Washington), and other out-of-pocket expenses (phone, wire, etc.).

Evans, Mrs. Ruth M., legislative-Federal relations division of National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Legislative-Federal relations division, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Legislative-Federal relations division. (3) 5 months. (4) Quarterly salary, $1,650. (5) Legislative-Federal relations division. (6) Refund of actual expenses. (7) Travel, meals, cabs, hotel bills, tips, and usual personal expenses.

Fahy, Kathleen (Mrs. Jack B. Fahy), 300 B Street SE, Washington, D. C. (1) American Parents Committee, 300 B Street SE, Washington, D. C. (2) American Parents Committee. (3) Started February 18, 1948. (4) $100 per week and expenses. (5) American Parents Committee. (6) [Blank.] (7) Travel, entertainment, and so forth.

Fakler, Herman, 847 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Millers' National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (2) Millers' National Federation. I am not employed for the specific purpose of influencing legislation, and therefore I do not believe I am required by law to register. However, I am filing this registration voluntarily to remove any possible doubt. (3) I have been employed by the Millers' National Federation since 1925. Since 1933 I have been employed as vice president and Washington representative, subject to reemployment once a year. (4) I am paid a salary of $20,000 per annum as an officer of the Millers' National Federation. Legislative work is only incidental to my duties as an officer of the association, and no part of my salary is specifically allocated for that purpose. Legislative work is estimated to require not more than 5 percent of my time. (5) Millers' National Federation. (6) Any expense, if and when actually incurred in attempting to influence legislation, will be paid by me, subject to reimbursement by the association, and reported as required by law. (7) Such expense as is actually incurred.

Farshing, Donald D., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Federation of American Shipping, Washington, D. C. (2) National Federation of American Shipping, of Washington, D. C., which offers consultative services on administrative and Government problems. (3) Indefinite. (4) At the rate of $650 per month. (5) Exclusively by National Federation of American Shipping. (6) Telephone and telegraph facilities plus normal out-of-pocket expenses for transportation, and so forth. (7) Transportation and normal out-of-pocket expenses.

Fillius, Maurice W., 703 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) The National Association of Alcoholic Beverage Importers, Inc., National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Alcoholic-beverages importing industry for repeal of amendment of paragraph 813 of Tariff Act of 1930. (3) Indefinite. (4) $1,000 retainer; subsequent compensation, if any, to be negotiated. (5) The National Association of Alcoholic Beverage Importers, Inc. (6) Actual out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Traveling, telephone, telegraph, taxis, and incidental.

Ford, John B., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Federation of American Shipping and the United States merchant marine. (3) At the pleasure of the board of directors of the federation. (4) I believe that a fair estimate of the amount of my salary which should be allocated to influencing legislation is $100 per month. (5) National Federation of American Shipping, Inc. (6) To be reimbursed for any and all actual business expenses incurred on behalf of the federation. (7) All actual business expense.

Freeman, Milton V., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Silver Rod Sales Co., Inc., 660 Newark Avenue, Jersey City, N. J.; Ace Mail Order Co., East Orange, N. J.; Black Cigar Store, Newark, N. J.; Globe Mail Order Co., Jersey City, N. J. (2) Same; in opposing H. R. 5645. (3) Year 1948. (4) $5,000 legal fee. This employment is an ordinary attorney-client retainer for the purpose of assisting in the preparation and presentation of constitutional and legal considerations in opposition to H. R. 5645. (5) Silver Rod Sales Co., Inc.; Ace Mail Order Co.; Black Cigar Store; Globe Mail Order Co. (6) Actual expenses incurred. (7) Travel, telephone, taxicabs, printing, etc.

Fuchs, Joseph, 408 Wesley Temple, Minneapolis, Minn. (1) Townsend National Recovery Plan, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Townsend National Recovery Plan. (3) Indefinite. (4) On a commission basis of 25 percent of all incomes from the State of Minnesota. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (6) Actual expense such as traveling, hotel, meals. (7) Railroad fare, hotel, meals.

Fyffe & Clarke (David R. Clarke, John Harrington, Albert J. Smith), 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Self. (2) Illinois Manufacturers' Association, Chicago, Ill., for which this law firm is general counsel. (3) Indefinite. (4) An annual retainer for all legal services rendered of which not over $1,000 (after payment of office expenses) per year can reasonably be allocated to Federal lobbying. (5) Illinois Manufacturers' Association, Chicago, Ill. (6) Actual disbursements. (7) Cost of transportation, hotel rooms, and meals for registrant.

Galvin, M. J., 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn. (1) Great Northern Railway, Great Northern Building, St. Paul, Minn.; Northern Pacific Railway Co., Northern Pacific Building, St. Paul, Minn.; Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co., 516 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.; Chicago & North Western Railway Co., 400 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.; Chicago, Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste Marie Railway Co., First National Soo Line Building, Minneapolis, Minn.; Minneapolis & St. Louis Railway Co., Northwestern National Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.; Duluth, Missabe & Iron Range Railway, Wolverine Building, Duluth, Minn.; Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad, 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.; Chicago Great Western Railway Co., 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.; Illinois Central Railroad Co., 135 East Eleventh Place, Chicago, Ill.; Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railroad Co., La Salle Street Station, Chicago, Ill.; Canadian Pacific Railway Co., Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada. (2) Same as shown in No. 1 above. (3) Regularly employed from month to month. (4) Work of watching Federal legislation is only incidental to other work as attorney for the railroads and terminal companies owned by them for which a regular salary is paid, and it is difficult to estimate the portion of salary chargeable to this work, but it would not exced $85 per month average. (5) Same as shown in No. 1 above. (6) Any actual expenses paid or incurred. No amount is fixed. (7) Any actual expenses such as hotel, meals, postage, supplies, etc.

Gammons, Earl H., Warner Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc. (hereinafter called Columbia), 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (2) Columbia. (3) Not fixed. (4) As vice president in charge of Columbia's Washington office, registrant's duties includes: supervision of Columbia's contacts with all Federal agencies, the Army, Navy, and Air Force; the making of arrangements for Presidential broadcasts and broadcasts by Members of Congress, Cabinet officers, members of governmental agencies, and other Government officials; general supervision of all network programs, including news programs, originating in Washington; general supervision of the operation of radio station WTOP, Washington, D. C., a 50,000-watt station owned by Columbia; assistance to representatives of approximately 160 broadcasting stations affiliated with Columbia in their contacts with various Federal agencies; and occasional discussions with Members of Congress in connection with legislative matters which might affect the operations of Columbia. No part of registrant's salary has been allocated to this last-named activity. (5) Columbia. (6) Registrant is reimbursed by Columbia for reasonable expense incurred by him on behalf of that corporation. (7) Same as (6).

Gardiner, Elizabeth, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (2) The above committee. (3) At will. (4) Salary at $335 per month, plus reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket expenses. (5) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. (6) Actual amount of out-of-pocket expenses. (7) To

include such items as railroad fare, travel, subsistence, and telephone and telegraph tolls.

Geiselman, R. H., 759 South Washtenaw Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) John F. Jelke Co., 759 South Washtenaw Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (2) John F. Jelke Co. (3) Incidental to regular employment as legal counsel and assistant secretary of the company. (4) No salary other than regular salary as legal counsel and assistant secretary of the company. (5) John F. Jelke Co. (6) Reimbursement only. (7) Transportation, meals, and lodging.

Gillerman, Jeanette M., 37 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.; 1710 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Committee of One Thousand, 37 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.; 1710 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) To further the aims of the Committee of One Thousand. (3) Indefinite. (4) $100 weekly (but only small part of my time to be spent lobbying). (5) Committee of One Thousand. (6) Exact amount not known—not expected to run more than $25 weekly on an average. (7) Train fare to and from Washington; room in Washington (if necessary); taxis, telephone, and telegraph.

Gilliam, A. W., 727 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill. (2) American meat industry. (3) Since February 1934. (4) $8,687.64. (5) American Meat Institute. (6) Out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Transportation, meals, and all hotel and travel expenses out of Washington.

Goddard, Livingston, 4500 Chrysler Building, New York, N. Y. (1) The Federation for Railway Progress, 2412 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) In the interest of the public and the Federation for Railway Progress. (3) I am employed at an annual salary of $3,333.33, payable in equal monthly installments. Except for the implications contained in the annual salary paid in equal monthly installments, no specific period of employment has been stipulated. (4) As secretary my salary is $277.77 a month. Ninety-five percent of my duties and time as secretary are devoted to matters other than legislation concerning the railroad industry. No specific part of my time and services deal with the opposition or support of railroad legislation. The compensation which I receive for time and work devoted to railroad legislation is approximately $1.25 a month. (5) Federation for Railway Progress. (6) I am reimbursed for expenses incurred in travel, hotel, and meals. (7) Expenses for travel, hotel, and meals.

Goldman, Olive Remington, 1740 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Committee for the Marshall Plan, 537 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (2) [Blank.] (3) About 2 months. (4) $8,000 per annum. (5) Committee for the Marshall Plan. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Travel, telephone, and other miscellaneous expenses.

Goodman, Leo, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Membership of the Congress of Industrial Organizations. (3) Indefinite. (4) Indeterminate, will be submitted at later date. (5) Congress of Industrial Organizations. (6) Indeterminate, will be submitted at later date. (7) Indeterminate, will be submitted at later date.

Gray, David G., P. O. Box 2180, Houston, Tex. (1) Humble Oil & Refining Co., P. O. Box 2180, Houston, Tex. (2) Registrant does not consider that he is employed for purposes which make him subject to Public Law 601, 79th Congress. He is employed as assistant to the executive vice president and in such capacity from time to time may discuss legislation affecting the company's business. The registration effected hereby is made only in view of the indefiniteness of the act, and neither the registration, nor any reports that may be filed by registrant, constitute an admission that registrant is subject to its provisions. (3) Registrant is a permanent employee of Humble Oil & Refining Co. (4) Of his total annual remuneration, a maximum of $3,000 might be considered applicable to services in connection with consultations with reference to legislation. (5) The foregoing sum is paid to registrant by Humble Oil & Refining Co. (6) Registrant receives reimbursement for his actual traveling and out-of-town living expenses. (7) The expenses mentioned in (6) above include traveling expenses and necessary living expenses while out of town, together with miscellaneous incidental expenses.

Green, Angus, 90 Broad Street, New York N. Y. (1) American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (2) American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. and its subsidiaries. Represent interests of company and subsidiaries with regard to legislation affecting the shipping industry; such representation is only incidental to registrant's general employment. (3) Until otherwise determined by employer or registrant. (4) Current salary of $556.33 per month plus reimbursement for expenses; total annual compensation determined at end of year. Foregoing compensation is for all registrant's services (see No. 2). (5) American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (6) Reimbursement for expenses indicated under No. 7. (7) All expenses incurred on behalf of employer, including cost of transportation, communications, stenography, hotel service, meals, etc.

Greenman, Shea, Lane, Sandomire & Zimet, 46 Cedar Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Ion Stanescu, Ambassador Hotel, New York, N. Y. (2) Ion Stanescu, a Rumanian subject and former diplomatic official of the Kingdom of Rumania, who hopes for the introduction of a private bill in the United States Senate authorizing himself and his wife to remain in the United States, notwithstanding the restrictions imposed by the immigration laws. (3) From January 13, 1948, for an indefinite period. (4) Legal fee of $1,000, subject to possible revision upward, covering both this matter and all other matters relating to the status of Mr. and Mrs. Stanescu as aliens. (5) Ion Stanescu. (6) Reimbursement of actual expenses. (7) Normal expenses incident to legal representation, including travel, telephone charges, etc.

Hadley, Harlan V. (supersedes previous registration), 830 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Automobile Manufacturers Association, New Center Building, Detroit, Mich. (2) Automobile Manufacturers Association. (3) Calendar year 1948. (4) Registrant is manager of Washington Reporting Service of said association and in that capacity performs a variety of services, of which those of a nature covered by the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act will be purely incidental. At the present time, it is impossible to tell the extent of such services, and no amount has been fixed or agreed upon as his compensation therefor. As soon as the extent of such services can be determined, the amount of his compensation will be fixed and reported as required by the act. (5) Automobile Manufacturers Association. (6) Amount to depend upon actual expenditures, no fixed amount having been determined. (7) Only the usual traveling, living, and miscellaneous expenses incurred in connection with the performance of services under the act.

Hadley, Harlan V. (registration supplemental to form B filed January 20, 1948), 830 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Automobile Manufacturers Association, 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich. (2) See above. (3) Calendar year 1948 or until terminated. (4) Registrant is manager of Washington Reporting Service of said association, and in that capacity performs a variety of services, of which those of a nature covered by the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act will be purely incidental. The amount of compensation for any and all services to be performed by registrant of a nature covered by said act is $2,500 for the year 1948. (5) See (1) above. (6) Amount to depend upon actual expenditures, no fixed amount having been determined. (7) Only the usual traveling, living, and miscellaneous expenses incurred in connection with the performance of services under the act.

Haines, Earl S., Fairfax, Va. (1) Employed by no one, simply doing some voluntary work for repeal of the ancient antimargarine laws. (2) In the interest of the low-income families of the South who are unable to buy butter, who generally can't obtain margarine because of Government taxes and restrictions. (3) [Blank.] (4) None; paying own expenses. (5) No one. (6) None. (7) [Blank.]

Hale, William C., Kingsport, Tenn. (1) Tennessee Eastman Corp., Kingsport, Tenn. (2) Tennessee Eastman Corp., Kingsport, Tenn. (3) At the pleasure of the company. (4) No remuneration other than as assistant comptroller of the company. (5) Tennessee Eastman Corp. (6) All necessary out-of-pocket disbursements. (7) Travel, long-distance telephone, telegrams, and like expenses.

Hamel, Charles D., 1000 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) The Toilet Goods Association, Inc., 9 Rockefeller Plaza, room 1427, New York, N. Y. (2) The Toilet Goods Association, Inc. (3) One year, 1948. (4) The law firm of which registrant is a member, Hamel, Park & Saunders, 1000 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C., is employed on an annual basis as Washington counsel for the Toilet Goods Association under the following fee arrangement: $1,000 annual retainer, plus $150 per man-day for each day of work done, plus whatever further reasonable fees may be agreed upon by the parties. This compensation covers all services wherever rendered, including legal services, and no particular part of it has been allocated, or is allocable, specifically to services in connection with legislation. (5) The Toilet Goods Association, Inc. (6) Direct reimbursement for all out-of-pocket disbursement. (7) Long-distance telephone, telegraph, travel, and other such out-of-pocket expenses.

Hamlet, Harry G. (filed on account of change from assistant executive vice president to executive vice president), 1600 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Retired Officers Association, Inc., 1600 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. Not maintained for the principal purpose, nor does it solicit, collect, or receive funds principally for the purpose of influencing legislative action. (2) Retired Officers Association, Inc., whose membership is retired officers, warrant officers, and nurses of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, and of Reserve components of those services. (3) Indefinite. (4) $2,400 annually, as president of the Retired Officers Association, no part of which is paid or received specifically for attempting to influence legislative action. (5) Retired Officers Association, Inc. (6) Nothing. (7) None.

Hansen, Harry, 305 Royal Union Building, Des Moines, Iowa. (1) Property Owners Association of America. (2) Same. (3) Indefinite. (4) Expenses only. (5) Property Owners Association of America. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Traveling, living, and stenographic.

Haren, Herbert F., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Townsend National Weekly, Inc., and Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) The Townsend plan. (3) Indefinite. (4) Approximately $5,000 per year. (5) Townsend National Weekly, Inc.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc. (6) Only living expenses when away from home and on

company business. (7) Hotel, travel, and meals when away from home.

Harmanson, L. James, Jr., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. Since legislative activities form only a small part of my work and I do not receive my salary "to be used principally to aid, or the principal purposes of which person is to aid, in the accomplishment of * * * the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States," or to "influence directly or indirectly the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States," I have been advised that I am not required to register under the Lobbying Act, but since neither my employer nor I have anything to conceal with respect to my activities, I am giving such information in this registration statement as I would be required to give if I were required to register. (2) National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (3) Until terminated. (4) Salary of $6,500 per year, which includes services of all kinds rendered by me to my employer; my complete legislative activities, much of which consists in appearing before committees of Congress, will consume less than 10 percent of my time. (5) National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (6) Limited to actual expenses. (7) Traveling expenses only.

Hawes, Robert N., 1028 Barr Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Grays Harbor Industries, Inc., Aberdeen, Wash. (2) Grays Harbor Industries, Inc., Aberdeen, Wash. (3) December 31, 1948. (4) $10,000. (5) Grays Harbor Industries, Inc., Aberdeen, Wash. (6) Not in excess of $1,000. (7) Telephone, telegraph, transportation, hotel, luncheons, dinners.

Hebert, Felix, 702 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I. (1) Associated Factory Mutual Fire Insurance Cos. Following are individual members of the Associated Factory Mutual Fire Insurance Cos.: Manufacturers Mutual Fire Insurance Co., Providence, R. I.; Boston Manufacturers Mutual Fire Insurance Co., Boston, Mass.; Firemen's Mutual Insurance Co., Providence, R. I.; Arkwright Mutual Fire Insurance Co., Boston, Mass.; Blackstone Mutual Fire Insurance Co., Providence, R. I.; What Cheer Mutual Fire Insurance Co., Providence, R. I.; Cotton & Woolen Manufacturers Mutual Insurance Co., Boston, Mass.; Philadelphia Manufacturers Mutual Fire Insurance Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; Protection Mutual Fire Insurance Co., Chicago, Ill. (2) Those mentioned in (1) above. (3) Continuous. (4) Annual retainer, $12,500 per annum. No special compensation for any services in connection with legislative matters. (5) Those mentioned in (1) above. (6) Actual amount incurred for travel and expenses. (7) See (6) above.

Hedges, Marion H., 2117 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Committee for the Extension of Labor Education, 2117 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Committee for the Extension of Labor Education. (3) Employment for lobbying is on a month-by-month basis. (4) $2,400 a year. (5) National Committee for the Extension of Labor Education. (6) No fund for expenses. (7) [Blank.]

Henney, Miss E. C., 423 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (1) John J. O'Connor, same address. (2) National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis. (3) Indefinite. (4) Retainer of $325 per month. (5) National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis. (6) No arrangement. (7) Any exceptional.

Hensel, Robert E., 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Patino Mines & Enterprises Consolidated, Inc., 20 Exchange Place, New York, N. Y. (2) Patino Mines & Enterprises Consolidated, Inc., 20 Exchange Place, New York, N. Y. (3) Annual retainer. (4) Registrant is an associate of the law firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, which firm receives an annual retainer from Patino Mines & Enterprises Consolidated, Inc., for professional services. Registrant will receive no compensation in addition to his regular salary from that firm for legislative activities covered by the act, which activities comprise only an incidental and minor part of the registrant's duties. (5) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside is to be paid by Patino Mines & Enterprises Consolidated, Inc. (6) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside will be reimbursed for actual out-of-pocket expenses incurred by any member or associate of the firm. (7) See (6) above. The usual disbursements customary in legal work.

High, Mrs. Mary W., 229 East North Avenue, Baltimore, Md. (1) Communications Workers of America, Maryland Clerical Division, No. 16, 229 East North Avenue, Baltimore, Md. (2) In the interest of the organization whose name appears in (1) above. (3) Elected to office. Term expires 1949. (4) $50. (5) The organization identified in (1) above. (6) No specific amount authorized. Reimbursed for actual expenses. (7) See answer in (6) above.

Hoffmann, Frank N., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (2) Members of the United Steelworkers of America. (3) Indefinite. (4) $6,000 per year. (5) United Steelworkers of America. (6) Legitimate expenses. (7) Transportation, hotel, food, etc.

Hoffmaster, John E., 2203 South Bonsall Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Philadelphia Depot Employees Development Association, 2800 South Twentieth Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (2) Philadelphia Depot Employees Development Association. (3) Intermittently from January 15, 1948, to close of second session, Eightieth Congress. (4) $17 per day. (5) Philadelphia Depot Employees Development Association. (6) $13 per day. (7) Registrant's railroad fare, meals, hotel room, taxi fare, telephone calls and telegrams, service charges, and tips.

Holste, Oscar W., room 301, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express & Station Employees, Court and Vine Streets, Cincinnati, Ohio. (2) Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees. (3) Indefinite. (4) $16 per day. (5) Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees. (6) Living expenses. (7) Hotel, meals, cab and car fare, laundry service, and traveling expenses.

Hood, J. M., president, the American Short Line Railroad Association, 1120 Tower Building, Washington D. C. (1) The American Short Line Railroad Association, 1120 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (2) The 304 members of the American Short Line Railroad Association listed in detail in the registration of the association. (3) Subject to the pleasure of the board of directors of the association. (4) Annual salary $16,500 of which an indefinite amount, estimated at $800 per annum, is to cover services in connection with legislation. (5) The association. (6) Reimbursement for expenses incurred for account of the association. Amount indefinite, but based on past experience amount for account of legislation estimated at $2,500 per annum. (7) Travel, hotel, restaurant, and entertainment.

Hooks, Homer E., Canners League of Florida, postoffice box 1567, Lakeland, Fla. (1) Canners League of Florida, postoffice box 1567, Lakeland, Fla. (2) Canners League of Florida, a trade association of Florida citrus canners. Work on pending legislation is incidental to principal activities. (3) Permanently employed as secretary-manager of association. Working on two particular bills only so long as this legislation is pending. (4) $6,000 annually. (5) Canners League of Florida. (6) To cover routine expenses incurred. (7) Routine—travel, hotel, etc.

Huff, W. T., 806 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Transcontinental & Western Air, Inc., 101 West Eleventh Street, Kansas City, Mo. (2) Transcontinental & Western Air, Inc. (3) Indefinite. (4) $6,000 per annum. (5) Transcontinental & Western Air, Inc. (6) As necessary for incidentals. (7) Taxis, telephone and telegraph, luncheons, and public documents.

Hutson, John B., 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Tobacco Associates, Inc., Raleigh, N. C. (2) Tobacco growers, the tobacco trade, and other business groups in the flue-cured tobacco producing area interested in maintaining international trade. (3) Indefinite. (4) None to influence legislation but will favor legislation that will encourage the free flow of commodities generally in international trade. (5) Receive salary of $25,000 per year from Tobacco Associates, Inc., for other work in connection with international trade and keeping tobacco groups advised as to developments affecting such trade. (6) None for legislative activities. (7) None.

Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See attachments 1, 2, and 3.[1] (2) See attachments 1, 2, and 3.[1] (3) See attachments 1, 2, and 3.[1] (4) See attachments 1, 2, and 3.[1] (5) See attachments 1, 2, and 3.[1] (6) See attachments 1, 2, and 3.[1] (7) See attachments 1, 2, and 3.[1]

Ishikawa, Isamu Samuel, 49 West Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Japanese American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, Inc., 403 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (2) Japanese American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, Inc. (3) During remainder of Eightieth session of Congress. (4) $300 per month as complete salary. Only part of his time will be devoted to legislative activities. (5) Japanese American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, Inc. (6) Only actual expenses involved, such as traveling, hotels, taxi fares. (7) Actual expenses.

Jhung, Walter, P. O. Box 1706, Hotel Pennsylvania, Washington, D. C.; residence, 105 East Houston Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Won Soon Lee (Korean-American Trading Co.), 105 East Houston Street, New York, N. Y. (2) Korean Immigration and Naturalization Committee, post-office box 1706, Washington, D. C., and 105 East Houston Street, New York, N. Y. (3) Until action taken by Congress. (4) $4,000 per year. This salary as employee of the Korean-American Trading Co. as its public relations and promotional manager. Services to Korean Immigration and Naturalization Committee are gratis. (5) Won Soon Lee (Korean-American Trading Co.), 105 East Houston Street, New York, N. Y. (6) No specific amount guaranteed. (7) Hotel room rentals, general office expenses, communication expenses, traveling expenses.

Johnson, James G., Jr., 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Cox, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Graves, Kizer & Graves, Old National Bank Building, Spokane, Wash. (3) Present session of Congress. (4) Usual attorney's fee, varying with amount of time spent and work performed. (5) Graves, Kizer & Graves (see above). (6) Reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Traveling and other miscellaneous expenses.

Johnson, Walter R., 917 District National Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Association of Attorneys General, 917 District National Building, Washington, D. C. (2) National Association of Attorneys General. (3) To July 31, 1948. (4) $1,500 per month salary and expenses. (5) National Association of Attorneys General. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Housing and ordinary living

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

expenses while in Washington, D. C.; transportation, telephone service, and conference meals.

Jones, T. L., vice president, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (2) Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes. (3) Work in connection with legislative matters is only on a temporary basis, my principal duties cover other matters in connection with the general work of the organization. (4) Salary at rate of $8,600 per year. No segregation is made or is possible as to the portion of this amount which is compensation for legislative activities. (5) Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Hotel, meals, transportation, and other incidental expenses.

Kadans, Joseph, 16 St. Paul Street, Baltimore, Md. (1) Veterans' Aid Society, Inc., 16 St. Paul Street, Baltimore, Md. (2) Veterans' Aid Society, Inc. (3) As the board of directors determine. (4) Depends upon amount and character of work performed. No payments made as yet. (5) Veterans' Aid Society, Inc. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Transportation, telephoning, telegrams, and any other expenses incident to carrying on of work that may arise.

Kelly, Eugene, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) State of California. (2) State of California. (3) Two weeks. (4) $1,000. (5) State of California. (6) Unknown. (7) To be negotiated.

Kennedy, Gilbert F., partner of law firm of Breed, Abbott & Morgan, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Mr. Louis Dreyfus, president of Chappell & Co., Inc., RKO Building, New York, and of Chappell & Co., Ltd., 50 New Bond Street, London. (2) Mrs. Jeanne Dreyfus, wife of the above. (3) Do not know. (4) Do not know at present, but the fee will be determined on the basis of legal services rendered and time involved. (5) By above party (see answer No. 2). (6) Actual expenses. (7) Travel, telephones, telegraph, and incidental out-of-pocket expenses customarily reimbursed in connection with legal services.

Kennedy, Harold L., 605 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 308 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla. (2) I am an attorney and for the purposes of this registration, one of my clients is the Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association mentioned in No. (1) above. (3) Indefinite and terminable without notice at the will of either party. (4) I am paid a retainer computed on the basis of $12,000 per year. (5) Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association. (6) No fixed amount; reimbursed for actual, out-of-pocket expenditures such as meals, taxis, etc. (7) See No. (6) above.

Kent, Arthur H., 1720 Mills Tower, San Francisco, Calif. (1) American Contractors Engaged in Foreign Work (an informal association), 140 Cedar Street, New York, N. Y. Members: Bechtel International Corp., 141 Battery Street, San Francisco, Calif.; Bethlehem Steel Co., Bethlehem, Pa.; Chicago Bridge & Iron Co., 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Hegeman-Harris Co., Inc., 331 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.; Johnson, Drake & Piper, Inc., 86 Trinity Place, New York, N. Y.; the Lummus Co., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.; Morrison-Knudsen Co., Inc., 319 Broadway, Boise, Idaho; Raymond Concrete Pile Co., 140 Cedar Street, New York, N. Y.; Standard Dredging Corp., 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; J. G. White Engineering Corp., 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; Williams Bros. Corp., Tulsa, Okla.; Merritt-Chapman & Scott Corp., 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y. (2) On behalf of the association and its members in connection with the legislation in which they are interested. (3) Indefinite period, while the legislation desired is pending or under consideration. (4) Compensation for services to be agreed upon at conclusion of work, probably within the range of $25,000 to $50,000. (5) By the officers of the above association. (6) Reimbursement of transportation costs and out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Transportation between San Francisco and Washington, telephone and telegraph charges, hotel, meals, and other out-of-pocket expenses.

Kern, George A., 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa. (1) Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa. (2) Steam railroads operating in State of Iowa. (3) Continuous. (4) Salary of secretary of Iowa Railway Committee, $6,200 annually. Apportionment to time in connection with Federal legislation at the rate of $20 per day on basis of 310 working days each year. (5) Iowa Railway Committee. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Travel and subsistence while away from home office.

King, Joseph T., suite 1028, Barr Building, 912 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Robert N. Hawes, suite 1028, Barr Building, 912 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Grays Harbor Industries. (3) Through the balance of 1948. (4) $500 retainer. (5) Robert N. Hawes. (6) Actual. (7) Travel, business luncheons and dinners, cab fares.

Klepinger,[2] Robert F., 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant has never accepted compensation for supporting or opposing legislation. Employment as counsel is accepted only under legislation requiring legal services after enactment—special acts, for example, conferring jurisdiction upon Federal courts to hear and determine causes; and acts requiring proof, pleadings, arguments, etc., in matters relating to demands, claims, or determination of rights thereunder where the United States is or may be a party. (2) See 1, supra. Registrant's employment as counsel in litigation and prosecution of matters thereunder is usually on a contingent basis. He does not construe the Lobbying Act as applicable to such employment and files this registration merely as a matter of public record and in view of the uncertain language of the law. Since compensation has never been accepted for supporting or opposing legislation, it is registrant's view that the filing of quarterly reports are unnecessary and not required of him. (3) See (1) and (2), supra. (4) None. See (1) and (2), supra. (5) No one. See (1) and (2), supra. (6) None. See (1) and (2), supra. (7) None. See (1) and (2), supra.

Kneipp, Leon F., 3700 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The Organization of Professional Employees of the Department of Agriculture, comprised of appointees of that Department in classified grades P–1 to 9; SP–6 to 8, and CAF–7 to 15. The officers of the association, as employees of the Department, are stationed in the Washington, D. C., buildings of the Department of Agriculture. (2) In the interests of the members of the Organization of Professional Employees of the Department of Agriculture. (3) The months of January to June, inclusive, and of October to December, inclusive, of the calendar year 1948, and indefinitely thereafter. (4) $100 per month for the months specified above in item (3). (5) By the secretary-treasurer of the Organization of Professional Employees of the Department of Agriculture. (6) Reimbursement of actual expenses only. (7) Car, bus, and taxicab fares; costs of complimentary luncheons, dinners, etc.; and minor supplies, materials, and service in amounts too small for formal settlement by the treasurer.

Krebs, Alfred U., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant is employed by the National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., as counsel. All of registrant's time with respect to legislative activities is spent in appearing before committees or in the preparation of correspondence directed to the chairmen of such committees. Registrant is, therefore, of the opinion that the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act is not applicable to him. However, this registration is being filed in order that the Congress may be fully informed of his duties with respect to Federal legislation. (2) National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., and its members. (3) Indefinite. (4) Registrant believes that $166.66 per month represents a fair estimate as to the amount of his salary allocable to the activities referred to in item (1). (5) National Federation of American Shipping, Inc. (6) Actual disbursements. (7) Taxicab fares and similar expenses.

Lane, John F., care of Gall & Lane, 401 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Steel, Foundry, and Scrap Industries' Committee for Expediting Iron and Steel Scrap. (2) Steel, Foundry, and Scrap Industries' Committee for Expediting Iron and Steel Scrap. (3) Indefinite; subject to termination by either party at any time. (4) Indefinite; dependent on time required. (5) Steel, Foundry, and Scrap Industries' Committee for Expediting Iron and Steel Scrap. (6) Indefinite; but only those actually incurred. (7) Travel, such as to and from committee meetings, local transportation, telephone and telegraph expense, etc.

Larkin, Frederick, Jr., 448 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Frederick Larkin, Jr., 448 Washington Building, Washington, D. C., employed by Independent Business Council of America, Inc. (2) Independent Business Council of America, Inc. (an association to encourage the growth and development of independent and small business). (3) Permanent. (4) No compensation. Future compensation to be determined. (5) Compensation to be paid by Independent Business Council of America, Inc. (6) He will be reimbursed for out-of-town expenses which may be incurred in developing the Independent Business Council of America, Inc. (7) Nominal traveling and living expenses.

Leete, Malcolm R., 41 Mount Vernon Street, Boston, Mass. (1) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (2) The above committee. (3) At will. (4) Salary at $385 per month, plus reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket expenses. (5) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. (6) Actual amount of out-of-pocket expenses. (7) To include such items as railroad fare, travel subsistence, and telephone and telegraph tolls.

Leith, W. Gordon, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. Since legislative activities form only a small part of my work and I do not receive my salary "to be used principally to aid, or the principal purpose of which person is to aid, in the accomplishment of * * * the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States," or to "influence directly or indirectly the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States," I have been advised that I am not required to register under the Lobbying Act, but since neither my employer, nor I, have anything to conceal with respect to my activities, I am giving such information in this registration statement as I would be required to give if I were required to register. (2) National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (3) Until terminated. (4) Salary of $6,000 per year, which includes services of all kinds rendered by me to my employer; my complete legislative activities, much of which consists in appearing before committees of Congress, will

[2] Registration with the Clerk only.

consume less than 10 percent of my time. (5) National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (6) Limited to actual expenses. (7) Traveling expenses only.

Lerner, Mortimer M., 280 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) National Association of Subscription Agencies, Inc., 280 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (2) The above association (of which I am executive director and general counsel) and its members. (3) December 1, 1947, to December 1, 1948. Organization did not begin active functioning until January 1948. (4) $10,000. (5) National Association of Subscription Agencies, Inc. (6) To be reimbursed for actual expenses, amount of which cannot presently be determined. (7) Printing, mimeographing, postage, telephone, traveling, and other out-of-pocket expenses necessarily incurred as executive director and general counsel.

Levy, Herman M., 152 Temple Street, New Haven, Conn. (1) Theatre Owners of America. (2) Theatre Owners of America. (3) Annual retainer. (4) No stipend in addition to annual retainer. (5) Theatre Owners of America. (6) Out-of-pocket, i. e., transportation, meals, lodging. (7) [Blank.]

Littell,[3] Norman M., 1422 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Navajo Tribe of Indians, residing in Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, and Colorado. Address of superintendent, Window Rock, Ariz. (2) In the interest of the Navajo Tribe of Indians, if, as, and when matters pertaining to the tribe come before committees of Congress. (3) Undersigned is employed as chief counsel for the Navajo Tribe of Indians for 10 years, with possible termination in 5 years. (4) $7,500 per annum as compensation for legal services by the undersigned and his associates, S. King Funkhouser and Leland L. Yost. That portion of compensation payable for possible appearances before congressional committees is not separately indicated, but may be said to be a very small portion of the $7,500 retainer, which is primarily for legal services in the handling of the many legal problems of the Navajos. (5) From funds in deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Navajo Tribe of Indians. (6) There is no provision for expenses other than a general limitation that the travel and other expenses of general counsel shall not exceed $2,500. This sum is for expenditures involved in the legal work of the tribe, and it is not anticipated that any such expenses will be incurred for possible appearances before congressional committees in connection with tribal business. (7) None except as indicated in question (6).

Lofgren, Charles E., 429–433 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Fleet Reserve Association, 429–433 Investment Building, Fifteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (2) The membership of the Fleet Reserve Association, a veteran naval organization chartered November 11, 1924, under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania. (3) Elected to the full-time office of national secretary of the Fleet Reserve Association to serve for a term of 2 years from August 26, 1947, and is chairman of the national service committee of the Fleet Reserve Association. (4) $6,000 per annum. (5) Fleet Reserve Association. (6) None. (7) None.

Lomen,[3] Carl J., Colman Building, Seattle, Wash. (1) Common Council, City of Nome, Alaska. (2) Common Council, City of Nome, Alaska. (3) Present session of Congress. (4) No salary, not to exceed $1,000 for expenses. (5) Common Council, City of Nome, Alaska. (6) Not to exceed $1,000. (7) Railroad, pullman, hotel, and taxi fares.

Lopinsky, Frances, 1016 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Curry, Cohen, & Bingham. James E. Curry, attorney for National Congress of American Indians, Indian communities of southeastern Alaska, Mescalero, Yavapai, Jicarilla, and San Carlos Apaches, Pyramid Lake and Fort McDermitt, and Paiutes. (2) Above-named organization and Indian groups. (3) Indefinite. (4) To be determined. (5) Curry, Cohen & Bingham. (6) Out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Cabs.

Lovelady, Rufus M., care of James B. Burns, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Lodge No. 14, American Federation of Government Employees, Balboa, C. Z. (2) All citizens of the United States employed by the Government in the Panama Canal Zone. (3) Four to five months. (4) $750 per month, $400 as salary, $350 for expenses. (5) Same as No. (1). (6) $350 per month. (7) Subsistence, lodging, travel, stationery and supplies, periodicals, etc.

Lyon, R. B. H., attorney at law, suite 701, Evans Building, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Kinsman Optical Co., 1320 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Kinsman Optical Co. (3) Indefinite; depends upon the life of H. R. 5241, Eightieth Congress, second session, and its final disposition. (4) Up to this time nothing. The compensation is contingent and dependent upon the amount of work and legal services that may be required, and at this time no charge has been made, nor can any estimate of said charge be made, with the client other than a reasonable fee for services will be expected at the final disposition of this proposed legislation. (5) Kinsman Optical Co. (6) Nothing, as the expenses involved will be very small and probably will be covered by any fee that may be received. (7) Out-of-pocket items, such as printing or mimeographing.

Lyons, J. J., 759 South Washtenaw Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) John F. Jelke Co., 759 South Washtenaw Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (2) John F. Jelke Co. (3) Incidental to regular employment as director of personnel. (4) No salary other than regular salary as director of personnel. (5) John F. Jelke Co. (6) Reimbursement only. (7) Transportation, meals, and lodging.

McDermott, Mrs. Hope H., 401 Lyric Building, Richmond, Va. (1) Communications Workers of America, Virginia Division, No. 33, 401 Lyric Building, Richmond, Va. (2) Communications Workers of America, Virginia Division, No. 33, 401 Lyric Building, Richmond, Va. (3) Fall of 1949. (4) $100. (5) Communications Workers of America, Virginia Division, No. 33. (6) No specific amount authorized. Reimbursed for actual expenses. (7) See answer in (6) above.

McDonald, Angus H., 300 B Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 3501 East Forty-sixth Avenue, Denver, Colo. (2) National Farmers Union. (3) Permanent. (4) $3,800. (5) National Farmers Union. (6) For actual expenses. (7) Newspapers, taxis, etc.

MacMillen, William C., Jr., 4500 Chrysler Building, New York. (1) The Federation for Railway Progress, 2412 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) In the interest of the public and the Federation for Railway Progress. (3) I am employed at an annual salary of $5,000, payable in equal monthly installments. Except for the implications contained in the annual salary paid in equal monthly installments, no specific period of employment has been stipulated. (4) As president, my salary is $416.67 a month. Ninety percent of my duties and time as president are devoted to matters other than legislation concerning the railroad industry. No specific part of my time and services deal with the opposition or support of railroad legislation. The compensation which I receive for time and work devoted to railroad legislation is approximately $10 a month. (5) Federation for Railway Progress. (6) I am reimbursed for expenses incurred in travel, hotel, and meals. (7) Expenses for travel, hotel, and meals.

Macnamee, W. Bruce, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) Indefinite. (4) $4,200 per annum. (5) National Federation of American Shipping, Inc. (6) Actual disbursements. (7) Travel, hotel, and entertainment.

Markham, Baird H., 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Answers to items 1–7: The registrant is employed by the American Petroleum Institute (the Institute), a national trade association of the petroleum industry. The registrant has been advised by counsel and believes that he is not now subject and has not previously been subject to the provisions of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act (the act), and that he is not now required and has not previously been required to register or to file any statements under the act. The registrant has not engaged himself for pay for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States. He is employed from year to year and receives an annual salary to perform all of his duties as director of the American Petroleum Industries Committee of the American Petroleum Institute. By far the preponderant part of his duties in that position have nothing to do with Federal legislation. The registrant spent only a very small portion of his business time during the calendar year 1947 on matters relating to Federal legislation. The Department of Justice has nevertheless expressed the view that the registrant is subject to the act. Pending an authoritative construction of the act by the courts, the registrant is registering under the act. By doing so, however, he does not admit that he is subject to the provisions of the act or that he is required to register. Since the registrant receives a salary to perform all the duties of his employment, it is his view that he is not paid any sum for the purpose of attempting to influence Federal legislation. For the purposes of filing the periodic statements (Form C) called for by section 308, the registrant will apportion a part of his annual salary to Federal legislative purposes on the basis of his best estimate of the proportion of time spent by him on matters relating to Federal legislation. The making of any such apportionment is not to be construed as an admission that the registrant is employed for the purpose of influencing Federal legislation. Since there is no way of determining in advance the proportion of his business time, if any, which the registrant may devote to Federal legislation, no attempt will be made at apportionment in this report. No fixed sum is allowed the registrant for expenses incurred in the performance of his duties nor is any amount allocated for such purpose. The expenses for which the registrant expects to be reimbursed in the event he incurs any expenses in connection with Federal legislative matters would in general cover travel, sustenance, and communication. Form C for the calendar year 1947 is being filed contemporaneously with this statement. Form C for the first quarter of 1948 will be filed on or before April 10, 1948.

Marks, Raymond E. (amending registration filed April 7, 1947), 139 North Virginia Street, Reno, Nev. (1) Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (2) Three major steam railroads operating within the State of Nevada, viz: Southern Pacific Co., Union Pacific Railroad Co., the Western Pacific Railroad Co. (3) Continuing. (4) In original statement filed April 7, 1947, that part reading: "As tax agent for the Southern Pacific Co. registrant is paid an annual salary of $5,160 per year and for his duties in connection with Nevada State and Federal legislative matters he is paid additional compensation of $2,700 per year, such additional

[3] Registration with the Secretary only.

amount being paid jointly by the three railroads above named" should be amended to read, effective as of September 1, 1947, as follows: "As tax agent for the Southern Pacific Co. registrant is paid an annual salary of $5,640 per year and for his duties in connection with Nevada State and Federal legislative matters he is paid additional compensation of $3,600 per year, such additional amount being paid jointly by the three railroads above named." (5) Railroads named in answer to question 2. (6) No specific sum. Expenses as incurred. (7) All out-of-pocket expenditures.

Marran, Donald J., 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (2) Chile Exploration Co., 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (3) Annual retainer. (4) Registrant is an associate of the law firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, which firm receives an annual retainer from Chile Exploration Co. for professional services. Registrant will receive no compensation in addition to his regular salary from that firm for legislative activities covered by the act, which activities comprise only an incidental and minor part of the registrant's duties. (5) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside is to be paid by Chile Exploration Co. (6) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside will be reimbursed for actual out-of-pocket expenses incurred by any member or associate of the firm. (7) See (6) above. The usual disbursements customary in legal work.

Marshall, J. Paull, 528 Union Trust Building. (1) Magothy River Association, 908 St. Paul Street, Baltimore, Md. (2) Magothy River Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) Not determined. (5) Magothy River Association. (6) No payment for expenses contemplated. (7) None.

Mays, Mrs. Mattie Lou, 1714 Jackson Street, Dallas, Tex. (1) Communications Workers of America, Southwestern Division, No. 20, 1714 Jackson, Dallas, Tex. (2) In the interest of the organization whose name appears in (1) above. (3) Elective officer; term expires in the fall of 1949. (4) $300. (5) The organization whose name appears in (1) above. (6) No specific amount authorized. Reimbursed for actual expenses. (7) See answer in (6) above.

Melius, F. N., Jr., 40 Rector Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Universal Carloading & Distributing Co., Inc., 40 Rector Street, New York, N. Y. (2) In the interest of Universal Carloading & Distributing Co., Inc. (3) At the will of the corporation. (4) $10,000 per annum. (5) Universal Carloading & Distributing Co., Inc. (6) Actual out-of-pocket business expenses. (7) Ordinary business expenses.

Miles, Harold M., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (2) Southern Pacific Co. (3) Indefinite. (4) $615 monthly. (5) Southern Pacific Co. (6) All living, hotel, and traveling expenses while away from headquarters. The amount cannot be stated until known at the end of each month. (7) All living, hotel, and traveling expenses while away from headquarters.

Morgan, Gerald D., and Calhoun, Leonard J., constituting the law firm of Morgan & Calhoun, Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (1) The Toilet Goods Association, Inc., 9 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y. (2) The Toilet Goods Association, Inc. (3) During 1948. (4) Have received retainer of $500 applicable to representing interests of association in tax legislation and also applicable to other matters not involving the influencing of legislation. Allocation of this retainer impossible. In addition to retainer, association has agreed to pay compensation to firm at rate of $100 per man-day for time necessarily spent in performing the services. (5) The Toilet Goods Association, Inc. (6) Firm to be reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Telephone, telegraph, and travel.

Morgan, George W., 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (2) Association of American Ship Owners. (3) Indefinite. (4) The portion of registrant's compensation which is applicable to services referred to in Public Law 601 is estimated to be $5,000 per annum. (5) Association of American Ship Owners. (6) No specific sum authorized. (7) Actual expenses necessarily incurred.

The Morris Plan Corp. of America, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) The corporation acts as a principal in its own behalf. (2) The corporation's activities are in the interest of itself and its stockholders. (3) The term for which the Morris Plan Corp. of America is organized is perpetual. (4) The corporation will receive no fee whatsoever. It will have expenses, as shown in answer to question (7). These will be paid from its corporate funds. Although the corporation has no present arrangement with its subsidiary banks under which they will share in such expenses, such an arrangement may be made in the future. (5) (See answer to question (4).) The income of the corporation is largely received from subsidiaries by way of dividends. (6) (See answer to question (4).) No specific amount is allocated to legislative expenses. (7) Telephone, telegraph, letters, printing, and mimeographing, travel expenses, legal advice, and miscellaneous expenses.

Murphy, D. P., general chairman, International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers, care of A. E. Lyon, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers, 330 South Wells Street., Chicago, Ill. (2) International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers. (3) Temporary. (4) $300 per month. (5) International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers. (6) $7 per diem. (7) Hotel, meals, telephone, etc.

Murphy, Ray, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (2) Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (3) Am general counsel of the association, subject to election each year at annual meeting of the association. Have been an association employee for approximately 10 years and expect continuance of such employment. (4) Nothing. Reimbursed for actual and necessary travel expenses incurred in occasional attendance at legislative hearings in Washington, D. C. Any such legislative activity is purely incidental and only occasional (5) Expenses as above-mentioned paid by employer. (6) As above stated, only necessary and actual travel expenses. (7) As above. Perhaps an occasional business luncheon or dinner might be held for the expense of which I would be reimbursed.

Myers, Abram F., 729 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (law office). (1) Allied States Association of Motion Picture Exhibitors, that being the name of a conference of 18 regional associations of independent motion-picture exhibitors (list attached).[1] (2) The independent motion-pictures exhibitors who are members of the constituent regional associations. (3) Annual retainer of indefinite duration of which legislative work is a sporadic and negligible item. (4) That portion of annual retainer which can fairly be allocated to legislative work. Such allocation will be made in quarterly report on basis of service rendered. (5) Above-named association. (6) Will recoup out-of-pocket outlays—only expense thus far mimeographing advance copies statement for House Judiciary Committee. (7) Only expenses for printing or mimeographing and possible traveling expense; stamps, telephone, and telegraph,

National Association of Real Estate Boards, Its realtors' Washington committee and its public-relations department (amended form), Chicago (22 West Monroe Street); Washington (1737 K Street NW.). (1) This is a trade association. (2) In the interest of the public and of the members of the association. (3) This organization has been in existence for 40 years. (4) The amount is not fixed; it varies with the needs of the organization and its members; the exact amount actually received appears in the required quarterly reports. (5) By dues and contributions of members and nonmembers. (6) Nothing in addition to the amount described in paragraph (4) above. (7) Salaries, office supplies, printing, travel, maintenance of office.

National Economic Council, Inc.,[3] Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) See attached rider.[4] (2) See attached rider.[4] (3) See attached rider.[4] (4) See attached rider.[4] (5) See attached rider.[4] (6) See attached rider.[4] (7) See attached rider.[4]

National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See attachment A.[1] (2) The federation appears and works in the interest of its members, and in the interest of the United States merchant marine. (3) Indefinite. (4) It is estimated that approximately $45,000 will be received and expended for legislative purposes during the calendar year 1948. Approximately $15,000 of such amount will be solicited as outlined in attachment A, and is a nonrecurring item. The remainder of such amount will be expended from the general funds of the federation. (5) See items (1) and (4). (6) See items (1) and (4). (7) See item (6).

National Savings and Loan League, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Member savings and loan associations of the league. (See copy of directory attached.[1]) (2) Same as (1). However, we have an opinion from counsel (attached)[1] stating that the influencing of or attempting to influence legislation is not the principal purpose of the league. (3) So long as the organization is maintained by the membership. (4) Dues of one two-hundredths of 1 percent of the assets of the member associations of the league. (See article XIX of the attached constitution and bylaws.[1]) (5) By the member associations. (6) The expenses are authorized by an annual budget approved by the board of governors. (See attached copy of 1948 budget.[1]) (7) All operating expenses of the league (see attached copy of financial report as of December 31, 1947[1]).

Nau, Carlton L. (amended form), 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Public Power Association, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (2) American Public Power Association and its member systems, which are operating electric utilities owned by cities, counties, States, or political subdivisions or wholly owned instrumentalities thereof. (3) Indefinite. (4) $7,500 per annum. However, legislative activities are only incidental to primary function as employee of service and management organization. (5) American Public Power Association. (6) Uncertain, but nominal. (7) Actual expenses incurred, such as travel, communication, and miscellaneous.

Neal, Dr. T. V., 610 Insurance Building, San Antonio, Tex. (1) Not employed, serve

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[3] Registration with the Secretary only.
[4] Not printed. Filed in the Secretary's office.

without pay, executive director of Property Owners' Association of America. (2) As officer of the above association. (3) Appearing in hearings on rent control. (4) Nothing; services donated. (5) No payment. (6) Necessary traveling, hotel, and incidentals. (7) As above (see (6)).

Nelson, Herbert U., 22 West Monroe, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Association of Real Estate Boards. (2) National Association of Real Estate Boards. (3) Registrant has been continually employed by the National Association of Real Estate Boards for approximately 25 years. (4) Registrant receives an annual salary of $25,000 which includes his compensation both as executive officer of the association and as a representative of its interests in legislation. (5) National Association of Real Estate Boards. (6) Registrant receives $20 per diem as travel expenses when his duties require his absence from his Chicago residence, in addition to actual expenses of travel. (7) All of registrant's additional personal living expenses away from his Chicago residence.

Norgord, Christian P., 1617 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Robert F. Sellar, president, American Humane Association, Albany, N. Y. (2) For or against legislation affecting children and aged people and domestic and wild animals. (3) Indefinite. (4) $10 per day when there is work to do and expenses connected with the work. Last quarter of 1947, per diem last quarter 1947, $398.89. (5) The American Humane Association. (6) Last quarter, $76.13. (7) Office expense and necessary travel on behalf of the work.

Northam,[3] Harry E., 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) By the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, a voluntary association of dues-paying physicians and surgeons, having members throughout the United States. The headquarters office is at 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (2) I work for the medical profession in general and for the said association in particular. Possibly no more than 10 percent of my total time for the association is devoted to legislative activities affecting the medical profession. (3) Indefinite, from year to year, under contract. (4) $10,000 per annum. (5) Association of American Physicians and Surgeons. (6) No specific amount is fixed. See answer to succeeding question. (7) Actual expenses of individual travel, hotel, and subsistence. I am not allowed any entertainment expenses.

Noffsinger,[3] J. S., 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Home Study Council, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., a trade association of private home-study schools. (2) I am the chief executive officer of (a) the National Council of Business Schools; (b) the National Council of Technical Schools; and (c) the National Home Study Council, and as such am responsible for all of the interests of all non-tax-supported schools holding membership in these organizations. Their legislative interests, however, are relatively minor. (3) Indefinite. (4) $33 per day as chief executive officer, which includes all incidental legislative services. (5) National Home Study Council. (6) Whatever incidental expenses are necessary. (7) Telephone, taxi, and similar incidental but necessary expenses.

Noffsinger,[3] J. S., 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Council of Technical Schools, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., a trade association of private technical schools. (2) I am the chief executive officer of (a) the National Council of Business Schools; (b) the National Council of Technical Schools; and (c) the National Home Study Council, and as such am responsible for all of the interests of all non-tax-supported schools holding membership in these organizations. Their legislative interests, however, are relatively minor. (3) Indefinite. (4) $33 per day as chief executive officer, which includes all incidental legislative services. (5) National Council of Technical Schools. (6) Whatever incidental expenses are necessary. (7) Telephone, taxi, and similar incidental but necessary expenses.

O'Gara, Herrick J., Veterans of Foreign Wars, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, national headquarters, Broadway at Thirty-fourth Street, Kansas City, Mo. (2) (a) Personnel of the armed forces and their dependents; (b) veterans of the armed forces and their dependents; (c) the entire population of the United States in matters of national security. (3) Indefinite. (4) $3,600 per annum. (5) Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, national headquarters, Broadway at Thirty-fourth Street, Kansas City, Mo. (6) No stated sum. To be reimbursed, upon claim, for luncheons, taxicab or streetcar fares in connection with official duties, out of a small budget appropriated for such purpose. (7) Luncheons, taxicab or streetcar fares in course of official duties.

O'Neal, Sam, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Distributors information committee of the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, electric power board, Chattanooga, Tenn. (2) Distributors information committee of the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) $625 monthly. (5) Distributors information committee of the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association. (6) No fixed sum. (7) Travel and other necessary expenses on business trips for the association.

O'Neal, Sam, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 105 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (2) National Council on Business Mail, Inc. (3) Annual contract. (4) $10,000 per year. (5) National Council on Business Mail, Inc. (6) Actual out-of-pocket expenditures for necessary expenses. (7) Hotels, meals, travel, and miscellaneous.

Orndorff, Gerald, 307 Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (2) Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, Chicago, Ill., as grand lodge representative, performing such duties as handling grievances, negotiating agreements covering wages and working conditions, and such other duties in connection with the operation of a labor organization as may be assigned to me. (3) Indefinite. Appointed by the grand executive council of the above-named organization. Have filled position since June 1, 1945. (4) $4,650 covering all service rendered. (5) Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America. (6) Actual necessary expenses while in the field. (7) Board, lodging, transportation, postage, etc.

O'Donnell,[3] Richard J., 1400 Chamber of Commerce Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Ketchum, Inc., 1400 Chamber of Commerce Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (2) National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) 2 months. (4) $1,500. (5) Ketchum, Inc. (6) $500. (7) Room, meals, travel.

Parker, James P., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Association of Private Schools, Raleigh Hotel, room 116, Washington, D. C. (2) Private trade and vocational schools who are members of the association. (3) Indefinite. (4) The amount is undetermined at the present time but is expected to be compensated on the basis of straight fees for legal services rendered. (5) To be paid by the National Association of Private Schools. (6) The amount is undetermined at the present time, but he is reimbursed for actual expenses incurred. (7) All expenses incurred as Washington counsel for the association such as transportation, communications, entertainment, necessary office and administrative supplies.

Parks,[2] Gilbert L., 1628 Sixteenth Street NW. (1) Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State, 924 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Same as above. (3) Week by week until notice of termination. (4) $100 per week. (5) E. H. De Groot, Jr., treasurer. (6) None arranged so far. (7) [Blank.]

Peterson, Oliver A., 1740 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Committee for the Marshall Plan To Aid European Recovery, 537 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (2) Committee for the Marshall Plan. (3) 3 months. (4) $700 per month. (5) Committee for the Marshall Plan. (6) $10 per diem plus actual travel expenses. (7) Travel and miscellaneous.

Petty, Don, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C., 1025 Security Building, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C. (See rider A[1] attached hereto and made a part hereof.) (2) National Association of Broadcasters. (3) Indefinite. (4) Annual, $15,000, for services as attorney for National Association of Broadcasters. (5) National Association of Broadcasters. (6) No specific amount is paid for legislative expenses. General expense account provided. (7) No specific expenses are to be included.

Pirnie, W. Bruce, president, Pirnie, Lee & Co., Federal Inc., U. S. A., 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., and Pedder Building, Hong Kong. (1) Kwangtung, Kwangsi, and Hunan Provincial Governments of China, as negotiating agents for reconstruction. (2) Kwangtung, Kwangsi, and Hunan Provincial Governments of China. (3) 3 years. (4) Each province to pay Pirnie, Lee & Co., Federal Inc., U. S. A., 12,000 CN or less than 10 cents yearly. (Present rate of exchange.) (5) Kwangtung, Kwangsi, and Hunan Provincial Governments of China. (6) Nothing. (7) None.

Pogue, L. Welch, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Committee for World Travel, Inc., Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Same as No. 1 above. (3) See attached memorandum.[1] (4) See attached memorandum.[1] (5) Same as No. (1) above. (6) Actual out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, taxi fares, and any necessary travel expenditures.

Posner, Stanley I., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Council of Business Schools, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Council of Technical Schools, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) As above. A description of the services to be performed is attached.[1] I do not believe that I am required to file this statement under the Lobbying Act, but do so to avoid any question concerning the application of the act. (3) 2 years. (4) $10,000 annually. (5) As above. (6) Reimbursement; when traveling, per diem of $12.50. (7) Telephone, telegraph, travel.

Pray, Kenneth L., 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Schenley Distilleries, Inc., and affiliated companies. (2) Same as (1). General Washington representative of person named in (1) of which possible interest in legislation may be a factor. (3) January 1, 1948–December 31, 1948. (4) At rate of $1,666 per month. (5) Same as (1). (6) As incurred, at maximum of $420 per month. (7) Personal and general aside from direct office expense.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Registration with the Clerk only.
[3] Registration with the Secretary only.

Quinlan, William A., 1317 F Street NW., Washington D. C. (1) The registrant believes that this registration, with some possible exceptions, is not required of him by the terms and intent of the act, but files this registration as a precaution to comply fully with the requirement to the extent if any that it might be held applicable and valid. Registrant is engaged in the general practice of law and is presently employed as legal counsel on general retainers by the following general purpose nonprofit trade associations or industry organizations and by the following business concern, the interests of which may require registrant as counsel to attempt to influence legislation: Associated Retail Bakers of America, 1135 Fullerton Avenue, Chicago 14, Ill.; United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C.; National Candy Wholesalers Association, Inc., 1424 K Street NW., Washington 5, D. C.; National Council of Private Motor Truck Owners, Inc., National Press Building, Washington 4, D. C.; Ward Baking Co., 475 Fifth Avenue, New York 17, N. Y. In addition, registrant without fixed retainer regularly serves as Washington legal counsel to the following business concern, the interests of which may require registrant as counsel to attempt to influence legislation: Taylor Food Co., post-office box 2508, Raleigh, N. C. None of the foregoing employments is either principally for the purpose or necessarily in any part for the purpose of influencing legislation, but rather is general employment of registrant as general legal counsel or Washington legal counsel in the course of which need for attempting to influence legislation may or may not arise. In addition, registrant is presently employed by the following business concerns with particular reference to their problems under the Fair Labor Standards Act, including exemption of driver-salesmen under section 13 (a) (1) of that act and the administrative definition of outside salesmen, and possible portal-to-portal liabilities requiring clarification of that act or of the Portal-to-Portal Act which registrant will attempt to aid in obtaining: Purity Bakeries Corp., 919 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; Continental Baking Co., 630 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (2) Registrant would appear or work on legislative problems in the interests of those listed under item 1 and of members of the baking, grocery wholesaling, and confectionery wholesaling industries, and of private motor-truck owners, generally. (3) The employments listed under item (1) are from 60 days to 60 days for the Associated Retail Bakers of America, from year to year for the Ward Baking Co., and from month to month for the others. (4) In respect to the Purity Bakeries Corp. and Continental Baking Co., where registrant's employment may or may not involve principally the influencing of legislation, registrant has received no compensation and none has been determined; registrant's fees will later be determined in the light of usual professional considerations, including total time involved, training experience and skill required, importance of the subject matter, and results obtained. In respect to other employments listed under item (1), registrant is not paid and has no present expectation of being paid either particularly or principally for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation, such attempts, if any, being only incidental to registrant's general employment as legal counsel. (5) See (4). (6) See (7). (7) In respect to employments on general retainers listed under item (1) registrant bears all the usual expenses of his law office and professional activities, not including most long-distance telephone and telegraph, traveling, document, or other direct special expense incurred on the business of particular clients, for which he usually is reimbursed. In respect to the problems of the Ward Baking Co., Purity Bakeries Corp., and Continental Baking Co. under the Fair Labor Standards Act, registrant expects to be reimbursed for all expenses other than regular expense of his law office and minor expenses such as local telephone and transportation.

Radner & Zito (the firm members and associates are William Radner, Frank J. Zito, J. Franklin Fort, Odell Kominers, and Mary L. Schleifer), room 528 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Federation of American Shipping, Inc. (3) Indefinite. (4) Reasonable compensation, hereafter to be agreed upon. (5) National Federation of American Shipping, Inc. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Telephone and telegraph.

Rainey, Charles A., Irish War Veterans, Inc., U. S. A. Charles A. Rainey, legislative officer, 127 B Street SE. (1) Irish War Veterans, Inc., U. S. A., 127 B Street SE., Washington, D. C. (2) Irish War Veterans, Inc., U. S. A. (3) Until relieved by national commander. (4) Nothing. (5) No one. (6) Nothing. (7) None.

Rapp, Leslie M., 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Simpson Thacher & Bartlett, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (2) Jack & Heintz Precision Industries, Inc., for whom the law firm of Simpson Thacher & Bartlett is counsel. (3) Indefinite. (4) Simpson Thacher & Bartlett (by whom registrant is employed as a full-time associate attorney on an annual-salary basis) will receive compensation for registrant's services at the customary rate for professional services charged by that firm. Registrant expects to devote only a small portion of his time to the legislative matter covered by his registration and will receive no special or additional compensation therefor. (5) (See (4) above.) (6) Registrant will be reimbursed by Simpson Thacher & Bartlett for necessary expenses incurred by him. Simpson Thacher & Bartlett will in turn be reimbursed by Jack & Heintz Precision Industries, Inc. (7) Ordinary and necessary expenses actually incurred for hotel, meals, transportation, telephone, telegraph, etc.

Rapp, Leslie M., 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Simpson Thacher & Bartlett, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (2) Paramount Pictures, Inc., for whom the law firm of Simpson Thacher & Bartlett is counsel. (3) Indefinite. (4) Simpson Thacher & Bartlett (by whom registrant is employed as a full-time associate attorney on an annual salary basis) will receive compensation for registrant's services at the customary rate for professional services charged by that firm. Registrant expects to devote only a small portion of his time to the legislative matter covered by his registration and will receive no special or additional compensation therefor. (5) (See (4) above). (6) Registrant will be reimbursed by Simpson Thacher & Bartlett for necessary expenses incurred by him. Simpson Thacher & Bartlett will in turn be reimbursed by Paramount Pictures, Inc. (7) Ordinary and necessary expenses actually incurred for hotel, meals, transportation, telephone, telegraph, etc.

Reidy, William G.,[2] 602 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.; 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; 602 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C. (2) Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc. (3) Indefinite. (4) $6,500 annually. (5) Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc. (6) Travel and actual living expenses when away from Washington, D. C. (7) Actual living expenses only, maximum $7 per day.

Reynolds,[2] Ottis J., attorney at law, Kidd Building, Roanoke Rapids, N. C. (1) Mr. Frank E. Russell, president of National Star Route Mail Carriers Association, 112 C Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Star Route Mail Carriers of the United States of America. (3) There is no specific period of employment. Under employment contract Ottis J. Reynolds is to use any and all means that he knows to get a favorable report from the Civil Service and Post Office Committee on H. R. 3935. Contract terminates when the bill is reported favorably. (4) The actual expenses of Ottis J. Reynolds are to be paid, and in addition thereto $1,000 when said bill is reported out favorably by said committee of the House. (5) Mr. Frank E. Russell, president, National Star Route Mail Carriers Association. (6) Only such actual money as is needed for transportation, hotel bills, telephone bills, food, while said Ottis J. Reynolds is in Washington, D. C., working on this matter. (7) As above set forth.

Richards,[2] D. D., 1238 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Mail Order Association of America, an Illinois corporation whose registered agent's address is 1061 West Thirty-fifth Street, Chicago, Ill. (2) Member of the Mail Order Association of America. (3) Year to year. (4) $1 per year. (5) Mail Order Association of America. (6) Nothing; organization pays such expense as is incurred, if any. (7) Lunches, travel, and taxis.

Romney, George, New Center Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) Automobile Manufacturers Association, New Center Building, Detroit, Mich. (2) Automobile Manufacturers Association. (3) Calendar year 1948. (4) Registrant is managing director of said association, and in that capacity performs a variety of services, of which those of a nature covered by the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act will be purely incidental. At the present time it is impossible to tell the extent of such services, and no amount has been fixed or agreed upon as his compensation therefor. As soon as the extent of such services can be determined, the amount of his compensation will be fixed and reported as required by the act. (5) Automobile Manufacturers Association. (6) Amount to depend upon actual expenditures, no fixed amount having been determined. (7) Only the usual traveling, living, and miscellaneous expenses incurred in connection with the performance of services under the act.

Rudy,[3] John Forney, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Employed as Director of Public Relations for and by National Federation of American Shipping, 1809 G Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. It is not believed that the duties performed as director of public relations come within the scope of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. However, this registration is being filed in order that there may be compliance with the act in the event it is interpreted to cover such activities. (2) See (1). (3) Indefinite. (4) See (1). (5) See (1). (6) Actual disbursements. (7) Travel, hotel, and meals.

Rule, Gordon W., room 427, Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Committee for World Travel, Inc., Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Same as No. 1 above. (2) See attached memorandum.[1] See attached memorandum.[1] (5) Same as No. 1 above. (6) Actual out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, taxi fares, and any necessary travel expenditures.

Rule, Gordon W., Union Trust Building (room 427), Washington, D. C. (1) Consolidated Steel Corp., Los Angeles, Calif. (2) Same as (1). (3) During the pendency of H. R. 4377, a private bill for the relief of the Consolidated Steel Corp. (4) Amount

[2] Registration with the Clerk only.
[3] Registration with the Secretary only.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Registration with the Clerk only.
[3] Registration with the Secretary only.

undetermined. $1,000 retainer received, and balance to be determined on basis of time spent. (5) Same as (1). (6) Actual expenditures. (7) Long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, and taxicabs.

Rule, Gordon W., Union Trust Building (room 427), Washington, D. C. (1) Harbor Boat Building Co. and Wilmington Welding & Boiler Works, Los Angeles, Calif. (2) Same as (1). (3) During the pendency of H. R. 4379, a private bill for the relief of companies listed under (1) above. (4) Amount undetermined. Will depend upon time spent. (5) Same as (1). (6) Actual expenditures. (7) Long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, and taxicabs.

Rutherford,[3] F. S., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Republic Steel Corp., Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Republic Steel Corp. (3) Permanent. (4) No part of my compensation is earmarked for the purposes set forth in Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. My services, insofar as legislative matters are concerned, consist primarily of factually reporting the status and content of pending proposals affecting the steel industry. The maximum part of my compensation which may be allocated to services within the scope of Public Law 601 will not exceed $5,000 per annum. (5) Republic Steel Corp. (6) Undetermined; estimated not to exceed $500 per year for expenses incident to legislative work. (7) Travel, meals, and miscellaneous.

St. Clair, Labert, 2633 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Stran steel division, Great Lakes Steel Corp., Detroit, Mich. (2) See above. (3) Indeterminate. (4) $500 per month. (5) See above. (6) Nothing. (7) See above.

Scanlon, Miss Theresa F., 12 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Self. (2) Self; although, if legislation I intend proposing is enacted, legislative clerks will benefit. (3) I don't know. (4) Nothing at my expense. (5) [Blank.] (6) Nothing at my expense. (7) None.

Schell, S. D., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Vice president, National Federation of American Shipping, Washington, D. C. Also, an attorney at law. (2) In connection with interest in matters relating to United States merchant marine and various legal implications of maritime activities with private industry and Government departments it may be necessary to discuss acts of Congress and pending legislation; may also be called upon for advice by Members of Congress on legislation, hence this registration. Legislative work is negligible. (3) Indefinite. (4) My activities on legislation are a negligible portion of my time, mainly in response to inquiries from Government departments and Members of Congress. A reasonable estimate of the proportion of my salary allocable to legislative work would be approximately $100 per month, which includes time consumed in answering inquiries from Members of Congress and Government departments concerning maritime matters. (5) National Federation of American Shipping. (6) Will be reimbursed actual business expenses incurred on any legislative work as outlined in Public Law 601. (7) See answer to (6) above.

Schmidt, Henry P., care of Hartman Barber, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees. (2) Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees. (3) Temporary. (4) $332.60 per month. (5) Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees. (6) Actual. (7) Transportation, meals, lodging, telephone, etc.

Scott, Margaret I., room 311, 3701 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) [Blank.] (2) Blaze-National Pension Circle. (3) [Blank.] (4) No salary. (5) Blaze-National Pension Circle. (6) Not to exceed $100 per month. (7) Office rent and expense, including typewriter rent, stenographic service, postage, telephone, etc.

Sears, W. J., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) The Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., a trade association of rubber N. Y. (2) The Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., a trade association of rubber manufacturers. (3) Regularly employed as a member of the staff of the Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc. (4) To be prorated based upon time devoted and subsequently reported on form C. (5) The Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc. (6) No fixed amount, such routine expenses as travel, hotel, meals on the road, cabs, etc., varying from month to month depending upon the extent of travel required. (7) All expenses for items shown in paragraph No. 6.

Selby, John A., 730 Fifteenth Street, Washington, D. C. (1) Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (2) Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (3) Indefinite. (4) Indefinite and indeterminate. (5) Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc. (6) Necessary disbursements, if any, for incidentals. (7) For incidentals only.

Selvage & Lee, 1 East Forty-third Street, New York City. (1) National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (2) National Association of Margarine Manufacturers. (3) Indefinite. (4) $1,500 monthly. (5) National Association of Margarine Manufacturers. (6) Out-of-pocket costs. (7) Travel, entertainment, meals, printing, distribution costs, etc.

Shackelford, P. L., international representative, Sheet Metal Workers' International Association, 642 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Sheet Metal Workers' International Association, 642 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (2) In the interest of railroad membership of our association when legislation is pending which would effect their interest. (3) Spasmodic and incidental to my work as international representative of the Sheet Metal Workers' International Association. The only time I do any legislative work is when any legislation is pending which would affect the railroad membership of our organization. (4) $9,000 per year as international representative of the Sheet Metal Workers' International Association. (5) Sheet Metal Workers' International Association. (6) I receive no expenses for legislative work. (7) None.

Smith,[3] Harry D., room 317, National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Manchester Boddy, Rancho Del Descanso, La Canada, Calif. (2) Farragut College and Technical Institute, Farragut, Idaho. (3) Indefinite. (4) $100 per week. (5) Manchester Boddy, Rancho Del Descanso, La Canada, Calif. (6) Not to exceed $50 per week. (7) Cabs, telephone call, telegrams, traveling expenses, stationery, stamps, special luncheons and dinners, books, and so forth.

Smith, Hilda W., 2117 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Committee for the Extension of Labor Education, 2117 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Committee for the Extension of Labor Education. (3) Employment for lobbying is on a month-by-month basis. (4) $2,400 a year (according to budget reduction voted by the National Committee for Extension of Labor Education in September 1947). (5) National Committee for the Extension of Labor Education. (6) $35 a month or less. (7) Taxis, telephone calls, and so forth.

Snyder, James D., room 1040, LaSalle Hotel, Chicago, Ill. (1) Illinois Legislative Committee, a committee representing all class I Illinois railroads, 1236 LaSalle Street Station, Chicago, Ill. (2) Illinois railroads represented by Illinois Legislative Committee. (3) Year-to-year basis. About 85 percent of my time is devoted to matters pending before the Illinois Legislature and my activities with respect to Federal legislation are merely incidental to my general employment. (4) $10,000 per annum which is paid for all the services rendered for the Illinois Legislative Committee, including my incidental activities relating to Federal legislation. (5) Illinois Legislative Committee. (6) Amount actually and necessarily expended in behalf of the Illinois Legislative Committee in connection with my entire employment, only a part of which concerns Federal legislation. (7) Actual expenses necessarily incurred on business of the Illinois Legislative Committee, including that part which concerns Federal legislation.

Snyder, James D. (amended form), room 1040, LaSalle Hotel, Chicago, Ill. (1) All class I railroads in Illinois, set forth on the attached rider, acting through a committee known as Illinois Legislative Committee, 1236 LaSalle Station, Chicago, Ill. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, Chicago; Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, Chicago; Baltimore & Ohio Chicago Terminal Railroad, Chicago; Belt Railway of Chicago; Chicago & Eastern Illinois Railroad, Chicago; Chicago & Northwestern Railway, Chicago; Chicago & Western Indiana Railroad, Chicago; Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad, Chicago; Chicago Great Western Railway, Chicago; Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad, Chicago; Chicago River & Indiana Railroad, Chicago; Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., Chicago; Chicago Short Line Railway Co., Chicago; Chicago West Pullman & Southern Railroad, Chicago; Elgin, Joliet & Eastern Railway Co., Chicago; Grand Trunk Western Railroad, Chicago; Gulf, Mobile & Ohio Railroad, Chicago (incl. Alton Route), Illinois Central Railroad, Chicago; Illinois Terminal Railroad Co., Chicago; Indiana Harbor Belt Railroad, Chicago; Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., Chicago; Minneapolis & St. Louis Railway Co., Chicago; Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railroad, Chicago; Missouri Pacific Railroad, Chicago; New York Central System, Chicago; New York, Chicago & St. Louis Railroad Co., Chicago; Pennsylvania Railroad, Chicago; Peoria & Pekin Union Railway Co., Chicago; St. Louis & O'Fallon Railway Co., Chicago; Wabash Railroad, Chicago; Pullman Co., Chicago. (2) Illinois railroads above named. (3) Daily as directed. (4) $50 a day and necessary expenses. (5) By above-named railroads, through said committee. (6) Amount of reasonable and necessary expenses. (7) Actual expenses necessarily incurred. In addition to work above stated, the undersigned is regularly employed by above-named railroads as their special representative in Illinois State legislative matters, for which he receives an annual salary of $10,000 and necessary expenses, in addition to the per diem of $50 and expenses hereinabove stated for work on Federal legislative matters. No part of said salary of $10,000 covers any Federal legislative work by the undersigned. This amended statement is filed because of changed method of compensation since statement of January 19, 1948, was filed.

Starling, Howard M., 837 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Association of Casualty and Surety Cos., 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (2) Association of Casualty and Surety Cos., 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (3) Permanently employed as manager, Washington office, of the above-named association. (4) I receive no special compensation for any attempts to influence legislation by Congress. Activities in this respect are an incidental part of my regular duties. (5) Association of Casualty and

[3] Registration with the Secretary only.

[3] Registration with the Secretary only.

Surety Cos., 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (6) No exact sum or limit is specified. (7) Out-of-pocket expenditures including transportation, meals, hotel accommodations, etc.

Strachan, Paul A., 1376 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1376 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (2) American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc. (3) Elected by convention for 2-year term. Present term expires August 22, 1948. (4) By convention action, $6,000 per year salary, with expenses to cover attendance upon conferences; meetings; taxis, luncheons, dinners, etc. (5) The above federation. (6) Such as may be properly reimbursable, covering conferences, meetings, luncheons, dinners, taxis, etc. (See attached letter.) (7) Conferences, meetings, dinners, luncheons, taxis, etc.

Stratford,[2] Carl F., fourteenth floor, Chamber of Commerce Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Ketchum, Inc., Chamber of Commerce Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (2) National Education Association. (3) 3 months. (4) $550 per month. (5) Ketchum, Inc. (6) Not more than $750. (7) Hotel, meals, and transportation.

Swope,[2] Harold W., 211 Locust Street, Harrisburg, Pa., and 1006A LaSalle Building, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Minerals Conservation Council, 211 Campbell Street, Madison, Wis. (2) Copper, lead, and zinc mining industry. (3) Indefinite. (4) $800 per month. (5) National Minerals Conservation Council. (6) Approximately $450 per month. (7) Taxicab, travel, and office expenses.

Tanouye,[2] Harry, 629 South Hill Street, Los Angeles, Calif., care of Harry Hirsh. (1) Harry Tanouye. (2) In every parent who has lost a son in World War II. (3) No expiration date. (4) Optional. (5) Harry Tanouye, 629 South Hill Street, Los Angeles, Calif., care of Harry Hirsh. (6) Optional. (7) All expenses.

Taylor, Tyre, 712 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C. (1) National Association of Retail Grocers, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (2) General counsel, National Association of Retail Grocers. The undersigned registrant is an attorney engaged in the general practice of law. For many years have been retained as general counsel to the National Association of Retail Grocers and in this capacity, probably 85 percent of time normally devoted to this client is spent on legal and other work not believed to be within the scope of Lobbying Act. However, I expect to do more legislative work for the association during this session of Congress (primarily in the effort to bring about repeal of oleomargarine taxes) and in order to be certain that I have complied with the spirit as well as the letter of the law have filed this registration. (3) Annual retainer. (4) $10,000. (5) National Association of Retail Grocers. (6) No fixed amount. (7) Only traveling expenses when on trips for National Association of Retail Grocers.

Terrell, John U., Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) Colorado River Association, Preston Hotchkis, president, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif; Washington address, John U. Terrell, Hay Adams Hotel. (2) Colorado River Association. (3) Since March 4, 1948. (4) At rate of $12,000 per annum. (5) Colorado River Association. (6) Ordinary business expenses. (7) Transportation, fares, telegrams, phone calls, etc.

Thames,[2] Virginia, 23 Broad Street SW., Atlanta, Ga. (1) Communications Workers of America, Southern Division No. 49, 23 Broad Street SW., Atlanta, Ga. (2) In the interest of the organization whose name appears in (1) above. (3) Elective office; term expires 1949. (4) $250. (5) The organization listed in (1) above. (6) No specific amount authorized. Reimbursed for actual expenses. (7) See answer to (6) above.

Thompson, Worthington, 2118 Massachusetts Avenue NW. (1) National Security Committee, 2118 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Security Committee. (3) October 17, 1947. (4) $125 weekly salary. (5) National Security Committee. (6) $100 weekly allowance for living expenses in Washington. (7) Living expenses only; none for lobbying.

Thompson, Yeaman, 556 East Thirty-eighth Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Committee for the extension of social legislation, 5025 Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (2) Any person or group interested in further passage of social legislation. (3) An indefinite period. (4) Varying and arbitrary amounts. (5) Any person or group employing my services. (6) Whatever they may be. (7) Telephone, transportation, meals, laundry, lodging, postage, telegram, office space, help, and supplies.

Tool Owners Union, Inc. (1) Tool Owners Union, Inc., 1802 Massachusetts Avenue, Lexington, Mass. (a nonstock, nonprofit, research and educational organization, which at times may be interested in legislation proposed or pending before Congress, but which is not normally its principal purpose). (2) In the interests of its members, all of whom are individual citizens, with savings in some form—savings accounts, life-insurance policies, corporate security, pension and trust funds, etc., the principal funds of which are invested in various facilities and tools of production. (3) During the corporate life of Tool Owners Union, Inc. (4) Unknown; income is derived from voluntary contributions of individuals, chiefly comprising contributions varying with the choice of the individual from $1 per annum, $5, $10, $25, $50, and $100, and a life membership of $1,000 (of which there have been two since organization in 1946). All officers of this organization have and continue to serve without compensation. (5) Individual citizens (partnerships and corporations are not eligible to membership) who voluntarily contribute from year to year, and who may resign and cease to contribute at will. (6) Expenses include all costs of operation of the organization, including research, educational publications and reports, and vary according to voluntary contributions received. No amount is specifically earmarked for expense of activities which may come within the scope of title 601. (7) None specifically designated for activities which may, if and when undertaken, come within the scope of title 601; in general, expenses for such would be strictly limited to reimbursement of necessary out-of-pocket transportation and subsistence of officers on trips, and such printed material as may be used incident thereto.

Tumulty, Joseph P., Jr., partner of law firm of Breed, Abbott & Morgan, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Louis Dreyfus, president of Chappell & Co., Inc., RKO Building, New York, and of Chappell & Co., Ltd., 50 New Bond Street, London, England. (2) Mrs. Jeanne Dreyfus, wife of the above. (3) Indefinite. (4) No fee yet determined. The fee will be determined on the basis of legal services rendered and time expended. (5) Louis Dreyfuss and Mrs. Jeanne Dreyfus. (6) Actual. (7) Telephone, telegraph, and incidental out-of-pocket expense customarily reimbursed in connection with legal services.

Tuhy, Stephen, Jr.,[3] 406 Albee Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Radio Stations WNAR, Norristown, Pa.; WKOP, Binghamton, N. Y.; WGTL, Kannapolis, N. C.; KGAR, Garden City, Kans.; WABZ, Albemarle, N. C.; and Tyler Broadcasting Co., Tyler, Tex. (2) The above-named stations. (3) On an annual retainer basis. (4) Retainer fee of $600 per year each. (5) No payment for this appearance, except annual retainer received from broadcast stations. (6) Nothing. (7) None.

Vernon, Weston, Jr., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant is a member of the law firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y., which firm receives an annual retainer from the Chase National Bank of the City of New York for professional services. Registrant does not believe he is subject to the provisions of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. (2) The Chase National Bank of the City of New York, 18 Pine Street, New York, N. Y. (3) Annual retainer. (4) It is impossible to determine in advance (prior to filing on Form C for a given quarter) what portion of the annual retainer, based on an allocation of time expended, might be attributable to registrant's Federal tax legislative work. Such work comprises only an incidental and minor part of registrant's duties. (5) See answer to (1). (6) The firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley will be reimbursed for actual out-of-pocket expenses incurred by any member or associate of the firm. (7) See (6) above. Usual disbursement customary in legal work.

Versen, Albert F., 319 North Fourth Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) Missouri Valley Chapter, Association of Refrigerator Warehouses, 319 North Fourth Street, St. Louis, Mo. (2) Thirty-seven members. (3) Indefinite. (4) $3,000 annually, or at the rate of $250 per month. (5) By association named. (6) Actual traveling expenses, stationery, printing, postage, and occasional meeting expenses. (7) [Blank.]

Versen, Albert F., 319 North Fourth Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) St. Louis Local Meat Packers Association, 319 North Fourth Street, St. Louis, Mo. (2) Five members. (3) Indefinite. (4) $7,200 annually, or $600 per month. (5) Above-named association. (6) Actual traveling and meeting expenses incidental to two meetings monthly; also, postage, stationery, printing, and such incidentals. (7) [Blank.]

Viles, A. L., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) The Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (2) The Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., a trade association of rubber manufacturers. (3) Permanent member of the organization. (4) To be determined on basis of time devoted to legislative activities with prorating of salary and expenses on basis of time spent, as will be shown in quarterly report. (5) The Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc. (6) No fixed amount; will cover such routine expenses as travel, hotel, meals, etc., varying with amount of time required for this activity. (7) All items of expense shown in paragraph 6.

Waller, Theodore, 537 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Committee for the Marshall Plan. (2) Same as (1) above. (3) Early March 1948. (4) $800 per month plus actual traveling expenses. (5) Same as (1) above. (6) Actual traveling expenses. (7) Rail, hotel, cabs, and communication.

Waller, Theodore, 1710 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Foreign Affairs Research Council, United World Federalists, Inc., World Government House, 31 East Seventy-fourth Street, New York, N. Y. (2) Foreign Affairs Research Council, United World Federalists, Inc., World Government House, 31 East Seventy-fourth Street, New York, N. Y. (3) Approximately July 1, 1948. (4) At the rate of $8,100 per year. (5) Foreign Affairs Research Council, United World Federalists, Inc., World Government House, 31 East Seventy-fourth Street, New York, N. Y. (6) Actual expenses incurred in travel, includ-

[2] Registration with the Clerk only.
[3] Registration with the Secretary only.

[3] Registration with the Secretary only.

ing rail, telephone and telegraph, hotel, taxicab, and public stenographic charges. (7) See (6).

Walters, Thomas G., room 1008, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Government Employees Council of the American Federation of Labor, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Government Employees Council of the American Federation of Labor. (3) Elected by council delegates every year to serve as operations director. Duties are administration of operating force which include lobbying as a minor phase. (4) As operations director, receives a monthly salary ($580) minus withholding tax and social-security tax. (5) Government Employees Council of the American Federation of Labor. (6) None for lobbying purposes. Total expenses not to exceed $500 per annum. (7) None for lobbying purposes. Travel and miscellaneous expenses incurred in the operation of the Washington office.

Ward, Mary H., Fairfax Hotel, Washington, D. C. (1) Workers of Wake, Guam, and Cavite, Parma, Idaho. (2) Civilian workmen captured on Wake Island, Guam, and Cavite. (3) Part time, no set time. (4) No salary. (5) Workers of Wake, Guam, and Cavite. (6) Whatever they amount to. (7) Hotel, food, transportation, miscellaneous expenses.

Wasserman, Jack,[3] 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) I was retained in this matter by Maurice Schwartz, of 7 South East Street, Raleigh, N. C., to secure the passage of a private bill for Bessie and Patricia Schwartz (S. 1739 and H. R. 5716). I have been paid $500 by the said Maurice Schwartz which is the total amount for all fees and disbursements. No additional fees or disbursements are to be paid. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.] (6) [Blank.] (7) [Blank.]

Weingarten, J. W., 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr. (1) Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (2) Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. (3) Have been in the service of said company since 1909 without any definite termination date. (4) Present annual salary from said company is $12,800. (5) Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. (6) Actual necessary expenses. (7) Actual necessary expenses.

Wiesner, Edward W., Grand Lodge representative, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) International Association of Machinists, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C. (2) For International Association of Machinists incident to his regular duties as headquarters staff official. (3) Indefinite. (4) $6,000 yearly for his regular duties as staff official; no additional allowance for legislative work. (5) International Association of Machinists. (6) $12 daily for hotel, meals, local transportation, and phone (no allowance for legislative work). (7) None.

Weisser, L. A., 2005 Leeland Avenue, Houston, Tex. (1) Am not employed; all services are donated. (2) Property Owners Association of America, national headquarters, Kansas City, Mo.; office of the president, 1340 South Cincinnati, Tulsa, Okla. (3) Services given whenever needed. (4) Only necessary and actual expenses; no salary or other remuneration. (5) To be paid actual expenses—no salary—by Property Owners Association of America. (6) For actual traveling, hotel, meals, and other necessary and incidental expenses. (7) Traveling, hotel, meals, postage, and other necessary and incidental expenses.

Wieting, C. Maurice, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Council of Farmer Cooperatives (see statement on reverse side of this form), 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (3) [Blank.] (4) Salary of $6,600 per year, which includes services of all kinds rendered by me to my employer; my complete legislative activities, much of which consists in appearing before committees of Congress, will consume less than 10 percent of my time. (5) National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (6) Limited to actual expenses. (7) Traveling expenses only.

Wilkinson, Ernest L., and Wilkinson, Glen A., 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C. (1) Radio Service Corp. of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah. (2) Same as (1). (3) Until disposition of S. 2231 is made. (4) Reasonable compensation while actually engaged in work on behalf of Radio Service Corp. of Utah. (5) Same as (1). (6) Actual amount of out-of-pocket disbursements incurred in carrying out assignment. (7) Only nominal expenses covering transportation, communication, etc.

Willard, A. D., Jr., 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C. (See rider A attached[1] hereto and made a part hereof.) (2) National Association of Broadcasters. (3) Indefinite. (4) $25,000 for services performed as executive vice president of the National Association of Broadcasters. (5) National Association of Broadcasters. (6) No specific amount is paid for legislative expenses. General expense account is provided. (7) No specific expenses are to be included.

Willenbucher, Franz Otto, 1600 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (filed on account of change from assistant executive vice president to executive vice president). (1) Retired Officers Association, Inc., 1600 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. Not maintained for the principal purpose, nor does it solicit, collect, or receive funds principally for the purpose of influencing legislative action. (2) Retired Officers Association, Inc., whose membership is retired officers, warrant officers, and nurses of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, and of Reserve components of those services. (3) Indefinite. (4) $6,000 annually, as executive vice president, treasurer, legal counsel, and editor of the Retired Officers Association Bulletin, no part of which is paid or received specifically for attempting to influence legislative action. (5) Retired Officers Association, Inc. (6) Nothing. (7) None.

Williams, Myers & Quiggle, a law partnership, consisting of the following partners: Paul F. Myers, James Craig Peacock, Martin W. Meyer, John E. Skilling, and Robert H. Myers, 817 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Food Brokers Association, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Washington Food Brokers Association, care of R. J. Dannemiller, president, 2653 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Approximately 1,450 member food brokers of National Food Brokers Association and approximately 25 member food brokers of Washington Food Brokers Association. (3) The employment is of indefinite duration. (4) No payment has been made but Williams, Myers & Quiggle expect to be paid at the per diem rate of $150 for each day of ordinary legal services rendered subject to the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. (5) National Food Brokers Association or Washington Food Brokers Association, or both. (6) No payment has been made for expenses, but Williams, Myers & Quiggle expect to be reimbursed for its out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Ordinary law practice expenses such as taxi fares, telephone and telegraph charges, transportation and traveling expenses.

Wilson, Clarence P., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. (3) Casual, as the interests of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen may require. (4) $12.50 per day when actually engaged as per question 3. (5) Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. (6) $12.50 per day. (7) All necessary personal expenses up to $12.50 per day.

Winston, James H., 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salt Producers Association, Book Building, Detroit, Mich. (2) Salt Producers Association. (3) Until such time as H. R. 2717, H. R. 4211, or proposed legislation similar thereto is disposed of. (4) Registrant is a member of the firm of Miller, Gorham, Wescott & Adams, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill., which firm is retained as legal counsel for Salt Producers Association on an annual retainer of $3,600. No arrangement for additional compensation in connection with the foregoing legislation has been made but if the total amount of time exceeds that covered by the annual retainer additional compensation will be billed at the rate of $200 per day. (5) Salt Producers Association. (6) Only actual out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Traveling and hotel bills, and miscellaneous out-of-pocket expenses.

Wood, Harlan, 301 McLachlen Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Local No. 4, International Brotherhood of Bookbinders, 720 Fifth Street NW. (2) Members of this union. (3) Indefinite. (4) The amount of compensation has not yet been agreed upon. (5) Local No. 4, International Brotherhood of Bookbinders. (6) $200 for the present. (7) Stationery, printing, postage, stenographic assistance, and similar items.

Woodward, Albert Young, 811 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) Signal Oil & Gas Co., 811 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (2) Signal Oil & Gas Co. (3) Permanent regular employee of Signal Oil & Gas Co.; current assignment in Washington, D. C., is temporary. (4) No compensation other than compensation as regular company employee. It is impossible to segregate or allocate between salary for regular duties and for duties which might be construed as for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any proposed legislation. (5) Signal Oil & Gas Co. (6) Out-of-pocket expenses for transportation, meals, telephone, etc. (7) See (6) above.

Work,[3] McClean, 1400 Chamber of Commerce Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Ketchum, Inc., 1400 Chamber of Commerce Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (2) National Educational Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) 3 months part time. (4) $2,000. (5) Ketchum, Inc. (6) $500. (7) Room, meals, travel.

Wright, James Skelly, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Baumer Food Products Co., 4300 Tulane Avenue, New Orleans, La. (2) Baumer Food Products Co. (3) Pendency of bill. (4) 10 percent of any relief money obtained by Baumer Food Products Co. (5) Baumer Food Products Co. (6) Nothing. (7) [Blank.]

Young, Robert R., Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) The Federation for Railway Progress (without salary), Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) In the interest of the public and the Federation for Railway Progress. (3) Chairman, Federation for Railway Progress, elected 1948 to serve 1 year, without salary. (4) No salary. (5) [Blank.] (6) I am reimbursed for expenses incurred in travel, hotel, and meals. (7) Expenses for travel, hotel, and meals.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[3] Registration with the Secretary only.

[3] Registration with the Secretary only.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were received for the first calendar quarter, 1948, and filed, using Form C, with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate:

(NOTE.—In order to reduce space the questions in Form C (see p. 5334) are not repeated. Only the answers are printed and are indicated by numbers in parentheses.)

Abbott, Charlotte E., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admission Act.

Abram, Morris B., Committee for the Marshall Plan To Aid European Recovery, 537 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, January 26–March 31, 1948, $1,385; travel and transportation expenses, January 26–March 31, 1948, $587.94 (services terminated March 31, 1948). (2) Salary received used for personal expenses, no part of it spent on behalf of the Committee for the Marshall Plan To Aid European Recovery. Travel and transportation expenses covered my actual expenses traveling on behalf of the committee. (3) Same as (2) above. (4) None, except through ordinary press channels. (5) Legislation to provide for a European recovery program.

Addis,[5] Rhoena I., box 1804, Lincoln, Nebr.; Townsend National Recovery Plan. (1) Twenty-five percent on all revenue from States of Iowa and Nebraska, gross amount $797.97, less $115.30 withholding tax, $7.98 old-age benefits. Tax, $364.46, traveling, hotel and meals, office supplies; net, $310.23. (2) Undersigned. (3) For acting as State representative and organizer of Townsend National Recovery Plan. (4) None. (5) Legislation to effectuate the recovery plan and better the conditions of the aged.

Addis,[6] Rhoena I., Box 1804, Lincoln, Nebr.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Twenty-five percent commission of all revenue from Iowa and Nebraska; gross, $672.23, less $110.10 withholding tax, $6.73 old-age benefits tax, $347.21 traveling, hotel and meals, office supplies; net, $208.19. (2) Undersigned. (3) For acting as State representative and organizer of Townsend National Recovery Plan. (4) None. (5) Legislation to effectuate the recovery plan and better the conditions of the aged.

Addis,[7] Rhoena I., box 1804, Lincoln, Nebr.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) 25 percent on all revenue from States of Iowa and Nebraska; gross $743.34, less $111.50 withholding tax, $7.45 old-age benefits tax, $377.72 traveling, hotels, and meals, office supplies; $246.67 net. (2) Undersigned. (3) For acting as State representative and organizer of Townsend National Recovery Plan. (4) None. (5) Legislation to effectuate the recovery plan and better the conditions of the aged.

Addis, Rhoena I., box 1804, Lincoln, Nebr.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Receive 25 percent of revenue from Iowa-Nebraska, from which salary as well as promotional expense is covered. Amount for 13 weeks: Gross $1,069.27, less $10.72 old-age benefits tax, $166.20 withholding tax; expenses $397.83; net, $494.55. (2) Undersigned. (3) For acting as State representative and organizer of Townsend National Recovery Plan. (4) None. (5) Legislation to effectuate the recovery plan and better the conditions of the aged.

[5] Filed for second quarter, 1947.
[6] Filed for third quarter, 1947.
[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

Adkerson, J. Carson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Expended $180.81. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) Interested in any legislation having to do with manganese or strategic minerals.

Albers,[5] Wayne B., 7 McGinley Building, West Palm Beach, Fla.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) April, May, June, 1947, approximately $40 per week. Organization and promotion work. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Supporting H. R. 16, known as the Townsend National Recovery Plan.

Albers,[6] Wayne B., 7 McGinley Building, West Palm Beach, Fla.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) July, August, September, 1947, approximately $40 per week. Organization and promotion work. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Supporting H. R. 16, known as the Townsend National Recovery Plan.

Albers,[7] Wayne B., 7 McGinley Building, West Palm Beach, Fla.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) October, November, December 1947, approximately $40 per week. Organization and promotion work. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Supporting H. R. 16, known as the Townsend national recovery plan.

Albers, Wayne B., 7 McGinley Building, West Palm Beach, Fla; Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Approximately $40 per week. Salary and expenses. (2) None. (3) Used for promotion and organization expenses. (4) None. (5) Supporting Townsend national recovery plan, introduced in the Eightieth session of the National Congress as H. R. 16.

Alifas, Nels Peter, District No. 44, International Association of Machinists, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,999.98; $30 legislative expenses during quarter. (2) Taxi drivers and operators of eating and refreshment places. (3) Lobbying; i. e., supporting or opposing, as the case may be, legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general. Not more than 25 percent of time spent on this work. (4) The Federal Machinist, a monthly periodical, of which he is editor. (5) All legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees, and occasionally organized labor in general.

Allen, William, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) None for legislative purposes. (2) None for legislative purposes. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at the present time.

Allman, Roy G., 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received; however, expended approximately $100 per month. (2) Transportation, taxis, telephone, cables, postage, entertainment. (3) To promote bills to pay Americans for damages received as result of war in the Far East. (4) None. (5) To pay Americans for war damages.

American Nurses' Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Five dollars for postage. (2) Edith M. Beattie, chairman of American Nurses' Association Special Committee on Federal Legislation. (3) See item (1). (4) The American Journal of Nursing is the official publication of the American Nurses' Association. Through the medium of the American Journal of Nursing, membership is kept informed of pending legislation affecting nurses, nursing, or health by means of editorials or signed articles. (5) Legislation pertaining to health, nurses, or nursing. Specifically, promotion of legislation to amend the Social Security Act to extend the coverage of Federal old-age and survivors insurance to the self-employed and to employees of nonprofit agencies. Legislation affecting nurses in the Army and Navy Nurse Corps, active and retired, and promotion of United States participation in world health organization.

[5] Filed for second quarter, 1947.
[6] Filed for third quarter, 1947.
[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

American Short Line Railroad Association, 1120 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (304 common carrier raidroads members of the association). (1) Contributed by 304 member lines during first quarter 1948, $94,776.31, only a small portion of which is for the purpose of influencing legislation. (2) J. M. Hood, $200; Washington Baseball Club, $200; Wilson Epes Printing Co., $321.70; A. C. Mellichampe, $17; Wilson Epes Printing Co., $293.15; Congressional Secretaries Club, $40; proportion of president's time and supporting secretary and clerks, telegraph, telephone, postage, rent, office supplies, taxes, etc., estimated at $382.25. (3) For salaries, office expenses, printing, and reimbursement of personal expenses in futherance of the legislative program of the 304 member lines of the association. (4) Legislative program, copy attached,[1] and distributed to all Members of Congress and to officers of member lines. Weekly information bulletin, sample copy attached, sent to officers of member lines each Monday. (5) See legislative program referred to in item (4) and attached hereto.[1]

Aring, Hector M., 826 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See original registration form for complete explanation. No other contributions received. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Opposed to appropriation for cotton subsidy under section 32 of the Agricultural Appropriations Act, 1947; tax legislation.

Arnold,[7] W. C., Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash. (1) $467. (2) Travel expenses. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) None.

Associated Third Class Mail Users, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Period of May 26, 1947, to March 31, 1948: Income, $26,665.94; expenses, $18,239.27. (2) Lobbying activities: Abner H. Ferguson, quarter ending June 30, 1947. Nonlobbying activities: Edward M. Kriz, John H. Smith, Jr., Patricia Mortell, John H. Reardon, Mary Malone, Mrs. John Schaffer, Lilian Neuner; plus miscellaneous expenses. (3) The general purpose of the association is to foster more efficient use of third-class mail by those enterprises employing the use of it. (4) None. (5) All legislation relating to postal laws and regulations.

Avent,[8 9] I. M., 1413 Wenonah Avenue, Berwyn, Ill.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Fourth quarter, 1946: Salary, $1,252.50. (2) No particular individual; goods and services; food, rent, shelter, and lodging for self and family; travel expenses; hotel; garage; rail and bus fare, etc. (3) Commodities of livelihood. (4) Townsend National Weekly, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (5) H. R. 16.

Avent,[7 9] I. M., 1413 Wenonah Avenue, Berwyn, Ill.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, $993.93. (2) No particular individual; goods and services; rent, food, clothing, etc., for self and family; travel expenses; hotel; restaurant; garage; etc. (3) Commodities of livelihood. (4) Townsend National Weekly, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (5) H. R. 16.

Avent,[9] I. M., 1413 Wenonah Avenue, Berwyn, Ill., Townsend National Recovery Plan,

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.
[8] Filed for fourth quarter, 1946.
[9] Filed with the Clerk only.

6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, $1,345.80. (2) Hotels, restaurants, garage, rail and bus fares, etc.; goods and services or commodities of livelihood; rent, food, clothing for self and family (no particular individual). (3) Travel and expenses of maintaining supervision and direction of organization as well as personal and family maintainance. (4) Townsend National Weekly, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (5) National Economic Recovery Act (H. R. 16) (Marshall plan for America instead of Europe).

Ayer, N. W., & Son, Inc. (Ayer), a New York corporation, and J. Vance Babb, an employee thereof (collectively herein called registrant), National Association of Electric Companies, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y. (1) Ayer received from National Association of Electric Companies $7,144.45, of which $6,343.42 represented compensation to Ayer and $801.03 was for out-of-pocket expenses (see item 2 below). The only money received or spent by registrant, J. Vance Babb, was for out-of-pocket expenses noted in item 2 below. (2) J. Vance Babb, R. C. Baker, B. J. Kelly, A. C. Michel, and Oscar Leiding, employees of Ayer, for traveling and miscellaneous expenses, $313.48; materials, postage, messengers, clippings, telephone and telegrams, mimeographing, prints, etc., $487.55 (3) The amounts described in item 1 and 2 above were received or expended by Ayer in the performance of its services in advising on public relations and in connection with publicity affecting the electric industry as described in registration dated March 3, 1947. Neither the services, nor the expenditures involved lobbying within the meaning of the Lobbying Act. (4) None. (5) None. This quarterly report is filed subject to the reservations contained in the registration dated February 28, 1947.

Babcock, Charles E., Route 4, Box 73, Vienna, Va.; National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics of the United States of North America, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Have an expense account of $50 per month for out-of-pocket expenditures. No salary whatever. (2) Various, see below. (3) Automobile transportation, postage, phone, telegrams, meals, and hotel rooms (all personal). (4) The Junior American Official organ of the Junior Order United American Mechanics of the United States of North America. Address Philadelphia, as above. (5) Immigration, deportation and naturalization matters, free public schools measures, and occasionally other legislation that the order considers of importance to its members.

Bailey, C. Lloyd, Friends Committee on National Legislation, 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Gross salary, January, February, March 1948, $1,000; travel expense, $169.74. (2) Various. (3) Travel is for the purpose of attending yearly meetings, quarterly meetings, or conferences of Friends and other groups to interpret developments in national and international policy, with special reference to legislation, and for other committee business. (4) We send a news letter to a limited number of subscribers and Friends about once a month. (5) In general, to support measures lending to peace and humanitarian ends, such as world organization and world economic stability, world disarmament, foreign relief, aid to refugees, protection for racial minorities; support for the rights of conscience; opposition to conscription and the militarization of America.

Bailey,[6] Frazer A., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $3,750 received as salary from the National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., during the third quarter of 1947, which is allocable to legislative activities. (2) No expenditures. (3) See item (2). (4) None. (5) As president of the Federation, am not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation.

Bailey,[7] Frazer A., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $3,750 received as salary from the National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., during the fourth quarter of 1947, which is allocable to legislative activities. (2) No expenditures. (3) See item (2). (4) None. (5) As president of the federation, am not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation.

Bailey, Frazer A., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,250 received as salary from the National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., during the first quarter of 1948, which is allocable to legislative activities. (2) No expenditures except for taxicabs and similar items. (3) See item (2). (4) None. (5) As president of the federation, am not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation. However, during past quarter opposed phases of ERP and supported overtime-on-overtime legislation.

Baker, Gibbs L., 1011 Investment Building, Fifteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.; Charles Niedner's Sons Co., Inc., Malden, Mass.; the United States Rubber Co., New York City; the Firehose Manufacturing Co., Inc., New York City; the Approved Equipment Manufacturing Co., Inc., New Milford, N. J.; and the Federal Firehose Manufacturing Co., Inglewood, Calif. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5608.

Baldinger, Mary Alice, 4607 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; American Civil Liberties Union, 170 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Expenses, January 1 through April 1, $113.46; salary, same dates, $432.90. (2) Expenditures made for transportation, office work and supplies, etc. (3) Same as (2). (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation affecting civil liberties.

Baldinger, Mary Alice, 4607 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; National Council for a Permanent FEPC, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expenses, February 5 through April 1, $34.60; salary, same dates, $480. (2) Expenditures made for transportation, office supplies, etc. (3) Same as (2). (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation for a permanent FEPC, S. 984 and H. R. 2824.

Baldrige, H. M., United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C., and 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $2,000 per month or $6,000 for the quarter. No money expended on any legislative activity. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Baldwin & Mermey,[9] 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.; Hershey Corp., Hershey, Pa. (1) Retainer received, $6,750; reimbursement of expenses, $168.89. (2) New York Telephone Co., Henry Wallace, photographer, Baldwin & Mermey. (3) Telephone and telegraph service, postage, messenger service, and photographs. (4) [Blank.] (5) Sugar legislation.

Bannister, L. Ward, 804 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.; California Electric Power Co., 3771 Eighth Street, Riverside, Calif. (1) Received $975.90, whereof $760 was for professional services and $215.90 for disbursements as outlined in paragraph 2 below. (2) Telegraph, telephone, traveling expenses, etc. (3) See (5) below. (4) None. (5) Support bills for development of water resources of river basins in the West by Bureau of Reclamation and Army engineers and oppose developments under regional authority bills unless they subordinate consumptive uses of water to State law. Services and payments completed in March 1948.

Barber, Hartman, room 301, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, seventh floor, Brotherhood Building, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) No money received except regular salary and expenses. Total salary for quarter, $1,320; total expenses for quarter, $567.19. (2) Railroad fare, hotels, etc. (3) Various. (4) None. (5) All legislation directly or indirectly affecting labor in any manner whatsoever, especially railroad labor.

Barker, Richard B., 306 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, N. Y. (1) No funds received. Expenses, January 9, 1948, telephone call to Rochester, N. Y., $1.69; January 29, 1948, telephone call to Rochester, N. Y., $3.56. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) Not applicable. (5) Excise tax on photographic materials.

Barker, Richard B., 306 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; The Haloid Co., Rochester, N. Y. (1) No funds received. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) Not applicable. (5) Excise tax on photographic materials.

Barlow,[7] Joel, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Northwest Horticultural Council, Wenatchee, Wash. (1) Received $300, expended $144.65. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $97.68; Western Union, $14.67; cab drivers and miscellaneous, $32.30; total, $144.65. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, teletype messages, transportation within the District of Columbia, and miscellaneous expenses. (4) None. (5) This employment is an ordinary attorney-client retainer for the purpose of rendering general legal advice and assistance. Considerable time is being currently spent and may continue to be spent in the preparation of materials for presentation to Congress in support of proposed legislation to improve marketing conditions in the fruit industry during the postwar interruption in normal export marketing.

Barlow, Joel, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Northwest Horticultural Council, Wenatchee, Wash. (1) Received $2,200, expended $165.44. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $102.39; Western Union, $5.11; cab drivers and miscellaneous, $57.94. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, teletype messages, transportation within the District of Columbia, and miscellaneous expenses. (4) None. (5) This employment is an ordinary attorney-client retainer for the purpose of rendering general legal advice and assistance. Considerable time is being currently spent and may continue to be spent in the preparation of materials for presentation to Congress in support of proposed legislation to improve marketing conditions in the fruit industry during the postwar interruption in normal export marketing.

Barnett, Arthur R., National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary of $3,375 as an officer and employee of the National Association of Electric Companies, and reimbursements of $248.01 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all duties and assignments, only a part of which salary and expenses were for those purposes described in section 308 (a) or otherwise within the scope of Public Law No. 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, railroads, airlines, telephone and telegraph companies, taxicabs, book stores, and stationers. (3) Railroad and transportation, $47.10; hotel and restaurants, $146.85; book stores and stationers, $3.50; telephone and telegraph, $7.16; gratuities and miscellaneous, $43.40. (4) None. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies of which I am an officer and employee, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and

[6] Filed for third quarter, 1947.

[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

[9] Filed with the Clerk only.

take appropriate action on problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association therefore is interested in legislation that might affect its members as going business concerns.

Bass, Frank E., legislative-Federal relations division of National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $458.34. (2) Self (salary). Expenses: Hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein). (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Bauer, Charles J., Building Owners and Managers Association of Metropolitan Washington, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) BOMA Letter (bimonthly newsletter). (5) I was not employed to support or oppose any proposed legislation. I was employed as permanent secretary of Building Owners and Managers Association of Metropolitan Washington, with duties including appearance at public hearings on legislative and regulatory matters of direct concern to the association.

Bemmels, Violet G., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Bennett,[10] William F., 416 Fifth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) (See attached letter and statement.[4] (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Repeal of the 7-percent excise tax on new trailercoaches, incidental to regular trade association activities.

Bennet,[10] William S., 44 Wall Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received, $105.19; expended, $125.32. (2) Railroad; Hotel Willard, Washington, D. C. (3) Traveling expense, hotel accommodations, and meals. (4) None. (5) S. 1765, S. 1766, and S. 1767.

Benson, Ernest H., 105 Chaddock Avenue, Hornell, N. Y.; Brotherhod of Maintenance of Way Employes, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) Received salary March 22 to 31, $133.10, and expenses, $90.22. No money expended in connection with legislative work. (2) Hotel Hamilton, various restaurants, phone, postage, laundry, pullman, and taxi fares. (3) Necessary living and transportation expense. (4) None. (5) Work in opposing H. R. 5711 and supporting H. R. 5875 and H. R. 5993.

Berge, Wendell, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Council of Business Schools, 739 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Fee, $1,200. (2) Disbursements are for postage, transcripts of hearings before Veterans' Affairs Committee, telephone, and similar items. (3) As counsel for the client in its controversy with the Veterans' Administration. (4) None. (5) Legislation relative to education and training of veterans.

Berge, Wendell, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Council of Technical Schools, 739 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Fee, $4,000; reimbursement, $48.80. (2) Disbursements are for postage, transcripts of hearing before Veterans' Affairs Committee, telephone, and similar items. (3) As counsel for the client in its controversy with the Veterans' Administration. (4) None. (5) Legislation relative to education and training of veterans.

Bergin,[7] Preston B., American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $400; expenses, $20.10. (2) Taxi drivers and restaurants. (3) Transportation and meals. (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor law revision, social security law revision, inflammable fabric legislation.

Bergin, Preston B., American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary $400; expenses, $31.25. (2) Taxi drivers and restaurants. (3) Transportation and meals. (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor law revision, social security law revision, inflammable fabric legislation.

Berckes,[7] Herbert C., secretary, Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 Canal Building, New Orleans, La. (1) Received for services as secretary, $750; expended for travel expense (includes transportation and per diem) $1,371.03. (2) See item (1). (3) Legislation. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the southern pine-lumber industry.

Bernard, William S., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Expenses received as stated on registration statement. Compensation adjusted as of January 1, 1948, to $835 per month, or $2,505 for this quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Berns, Karl H., legislative Federal relations division, National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,750, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service expenses, $350. (2) Self (salary). Expenses: Hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative-News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein). Informative articles in State educational magazine. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Biorn, Norman E., Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Inc., 511–516 Commerce Building, St. Paul, Minn. (1) Salary from Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Inc., none. Received for actual expenses, $310.67; spent for legislative activities, none. (2) St. Paul Book and Stationery, $9.30; United States Government, $11.05; Mary Lou Kustelski, $200; Northwest Airlines, $39.68; Northwest Bell Telephone Co., $26.14; M. S. Martin, $3.50; miscellaneous, $21. (3) Stationery, postage, stenographic services, travel, phone calls, and telegrams, multigraphing, taxi fares, meals, newspapers. (4) None. (5) Elimination of inequalities in tax legislation.

Bison, Henry, Jr., Tyre Taylor, 712 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $1,581.27, expenditures for living purposes only. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) Legislation favorable to the maintenance of the free enterprise system.

Bledsoe, Samuel B., 1730 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Selvage & Lee, 1 East Forty-third Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $96.83. (2) Car fares, taxicabs, $63.15; meals, etc., $16.78; phone calls, $16.90. (3) Transportation, etc.; luncheons; long-distance and local calls. (4) I did all in my power to assure the publication and dissemination of news and radio comment favorable to margarine legislation desired by our client, but I cannot say categorically that I caused any articles to be published or any radio comment. (5) Any margarine legislation.

Bloch, Charles J., 614–618 Persons Building, Macon, Ga.; Georgia Southern & Florida Railway Co., Washington, D. C. (1) Only money received by registrant were six semimonthly payments of $150 to his firm on annual salary as stated in paragraph 4 of registration. Salary for clerk paid by Georgia Southern & Florida Railway Co. directly to Miss Gertrude Thorner. (2) Salary paid to registrant's firm was retained by it, and salary paid clerk was retained by her. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) The primary purpose of registrant's employment is not to support or oppose any legislation. As counsel for Georgia Southern & Florida Railway Co., as stated in paragraph 4 of registration, sworn to June 25, 1947, and filed June 26, 1947, he has been requested to and will support the passage of Senate bill 110 and H. R. 1639.

Blumberg, Samuel, Blumberg, Singer & Aberman, 200 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) As general counsel to Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, my firm received $3,700 during preceding calendar quarter from this association on account of annual retainer of $15,000, no part of which was expended for any of the purposes specified in the Lobbying Act. (2) None paid. See above. (3) None paid. See above. (4) None. (5) Our office as general counsel has prepared and filed a brief with the Ways and Means Committee indicating the need for revision of the excise taxes on cigars. No compensation as such has been paid for this service.

Blunt, Joseph R., 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; West Coast Lumbermen's Association, 1410 Southwest Morrison Street, Portland, Oreg. (1) No money received or expended during the quarter for lobbying purposes. (2) Same as (1). (3) Same as (1). (4) None. (5) Legislation directly affecting the west coast lumber manufacturing industry.

Bodary, D. A., national legislative and general representative, Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 107 West Linwood Boulevard, Kansas City, Mo. (1) January 1948 annual compensation of $6,000; $12 per diem for expenses, hotel, meals, etc. (2) D. A. Bodary. (3) As national legislative and general representative, Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, my duties include the handling of legislative matters and the handling and progressing of grievances and other activities of my organization. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of the Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America.

Bodfish, Morton, United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received and expended $130.88. (2) Various. (3) For travel, hotel, and maintenance in Washington, D. C. (4) None (other than the customary materials found in our trade papers, in our trade-association periodicals, and in our trade-association bulletins). (5) Support all legislation favorable to thrift and home ownership and particularly helpful to savings and loan associations and cooperative banks in carrying out their thrift and home-financing objectives, and oppose legislation detrimental to home ownership and these institutions.

Boehne, John W., Jr., 1058 National Press Building, Washington D. C. (1) National Association of Employees of Collectors of Internal Revenue, $900; postage and printing, $83.10. (2) John W. Boehne, Jr. (3) Counsel for this organization. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting employees of collectors' offices.

Bohannon, John N., Asheville, N. C., and 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y. (1) Personal remuneration, including expenses, during the preceding calendar quarter $4,500. Money expended. See (3) below. (2) See (3) below. (3) Personal subsistence, transportation, routine, and other customary expenses only. Also see (6), form B, heretofore filed. (4) None. (5) Any legislation that might affect production, gathering, transportation, distribution, or sale of natural gas.

[4] Not printed. Filed in the Secretary's office.

[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

[10] Filed with the Secretary only.

Bonamarte, Robert F., Sr., Fleet Reserve Association, 429 Investment Building, Fifteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Naval and veteran legislation.

Bourg, Clarence J., 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; American Sugar Cane League, New Orleans, La.; Farmers and Manufacturers Beet Sugar Association, Saginaw, Mich. (1) $178.45 has been received and expended in connection with legislation and other contracts with Government, of which not more than one-fourth has been expended in connection with legislation, such as taxicab fares about Washington and an occasional lunch when Congress is in session. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) Sugar Bulletin of New Orleans, La.; Sugar Beet Journal of Saginaw, Mich. (5) Any legislation affecting the domestic sugar producer.

Bowden, Benjamin Edward, 267 Robbins Drive, Newark, Licking County, Ohio; American Train Dispatchers Association, 10 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, $880.88; expense, $494.03; no money expended except for personal maintenance. (2) Hamilton, Annapolis hotels; taxicabs, telephone, postage, laundry, cleaning, pullman fare, and various restaurants. (3) Necessary living, transportation, communication, lodging, meals, laundry, and cleaning service, transportation, telephone, and telegraph. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting railway labor and particularly to oppose bills detrimental to existing railroad retirement and railroad unemployment insurance systems.

Bowden, Ray B., National Grain Trade Council, 608 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,871.70; all used for personal purposes, none used under the Lobby Act. Travel expenses, $723.83; all used to defray personal travel and subsistence expenses, none used for purposes covered under this act. (2) None for lobbying work. (3) None under the act. (4) None to my knowledge. (5) Did no lobbying for or against specific pending legislation. Employed to oppose or support legislation proposed to affect the interest of the established grain and/or feed trade.

Boyd, H. B., United States Beet Sugar Association, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) [Blank.] (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Interested in legislation affecting sugar but not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing any legislation.

Boyd, William R., Jr., American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) to (5) For calendar year 1947, see attached schedule [1] for answers to items (1) to (5).

Boyd, William R. Jr., American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) to (5) See attached schedude [1] for answers to items (1) to (5).

Boyle,[9] James J., Room 410 Hill Building, Washington, D. C.; United Public Health League, 450 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Received from employer, United Public Health League, $3,054.40. (2) To the undersigned, salary, $2,048.88; conferences, $200.52; rent, $225; travel, $468; telephone, $17.95; office supplies, $16.97; clerical service, $77. (3) All moneys received were paid for salary, rent, miscellaneous services, travel, conferences, office supplies, postage. (4) An occasional bulletin by the United Public Health League, San Francisco, Calif. (5) To support any and all legislation in the interest of the Public Health and to oppose what may not be of interest.

Bradley, Otis T., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; Guaranty Trust Co. of New York as trustee of the several trusts described as the Frances G. Phipps trust, Herbert Sanford Ward trust, Sarita E. Barclay trust, and Colville Herbert Sanford Barclay trust, under indenture dated December 24, 1913, and various indentures supplemental thereto made by Charles H. Sanford, 140 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) None received; funds used those of Davis Polk Wardwell Sunderland & Kiendl, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y., of which firm undersigned is a member; amount expended, $70.14. (2) Airplane, meals, taxies, and other transportation and similar miscellaneous travel expenses New York and Washington, $70.14. (3) Transportation and similar expense, New York to Washington. (4) None. (5) The employment is for the purpose of attempting to secure an amendment to the Federal Gift Tax Acts involving gifts in trust and the effect for gift-tax purposes of the surrender by the grantor of a retained power to alter the disposition of the property but not in any way beneficial to himself, and the employment is expected to continue until such amendment is either secured or rejected.

Brewbaker, James M., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: Salary, $2,125; expenses reimbursed by employers, $846.92. Expenditures: $846.92. (2) Expenses paid to various restaurants, hotels, taxicabs, and railroads. (3) Traveling, attending meetings to discuss general conditions in Washington of interest to business and industry in particular. (4) [Blank.] (5) All bills affecting the following subjects: National labor policy, portal-to-portal wage claims, tax laws, reduction of Federal expenditures, control of atomic energy, Federal subsidization of research, patents, and trademarks, wartime control powers, and revision of the SEC and RFC acts.

Bright,[7] O. O., 1302 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Southern Pine Industry Committee, New Orleans, La. (1) Salary, $1,050; expenses, $65.60. (2) To various hotels, cab drivers, etc. (3) See No. 2 above. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the lumber-manufacturing industry.

Bright,[7] O. O., 1302 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Southern Pine Industry Committee, New Orleans, La. (1) Salary, $1,050; expenses, $80.30. (2) To various hotels, cab drivers, etc. (3) See No. 2 above. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the lumber-manufacturing industry.

Brightman,[7] Melvin H., Dairy Industry Committee, 1112 Barr Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $3,000 salary as executive secretary of Dairy Industry Committee. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To observe legislation possibly affecting the dairy industry.

Brightman, Melvin H., Dairy Industry Committee, 1112 Barr Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $3,000 salary as executive secretary of Dairy Industry Committee. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To observe legislation possibly affecting the dairy industry.

Bronson, Ruth M., 1426 Thirty-fifth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; secretary, National Congress of American Indians, Claremore, Okla. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) The Church Woman. (5) All legislation concerning North American Indians.

Brooks, A. E., American Chamber of Commerce of Mexico, 2202 Fort Worth National Bank Building, Fort Worth, Tex. (1) American Chamber of Commerce of Mexico, $50. (2) Raleigh Hotel, Washington, D. C., $35.55; meals and taxis, $14.45. (3) Room, telephone, telegrams, and tips, $35.55; meals and taxis, $14.45. (4) None. (5) To exempt from income taxes income derived from sources abroad by nonresident United States citizens actively engaged in a trade or business abroad.

Brooks, William F., National Grain Trade Council, 607 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary and expenses received during period amounted to $3,151.13, of which less than $5 was spent for any purpose covered by the act. (2) Taxicab fares, no one of which was in excess of $1.50. (3) Transportation. (4) None, other than weekly newsletter published by employer. (5) Legislation affecting agriculture in general and the grain trade in particular.

Brown, Earle Palmer, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received $58.25 for expenses. (2) Various. (3) Expenses. (4) Attached list [1] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by those publications is not available. (5) Legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Brown, Frederick E., Investment Building, Washington, D. C., National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) La Roe, Brown & Winn, law firm, received from the National Independent Meat Packers Association, $4,500, total of monthly payments for general legal services, of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payment made to any other person. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) S. 2256; H. R. 5675; appropriation for meat inspection, Department of Agriculture.

Brown, Russell B., Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary previously reported plus the following expenses which might be considered within the scope of the act, $40. (2) See (3) below. (3) Taxi fares. (4) My normal duties include periodic reporting to members of the association on pending legislation. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. My duties include that of maintaining surveillance of legislation which might affect the petroleum industry and taking such action with respect to such legislation as directed by the association.

Brylawski, A. Julian, Motion Picture Theater Owners, District of Columbia, 702 Warner Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Motion Picture Theater Owners, District of Columbia, $51. (2) A. Julian Brylawski. (3) Expenses. (4) None. (5) All legislation relating to the motion-picture industry.

Buck, Mrs. J. L. Blair, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C. (Not employed for pay. Elected to office of president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs June 1947.) (1) Allotment for travel and general expenses in connection with work of the general federation, total for 3 months, $1,218.65. (2) See above. (3) See question (1). (4) The General Federation Clubwoman and State federation publications. (5) Not employed for pay. The president of the general federation supports or opposes legislation, and asks the organization membership to do likewise, when authority for such action has been provided through the adoption of a resolution in national convention.

Bulow, William J., Jr., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received, none; money expended, $26.40. (2) Various transportation, telephone and telegraph companies, and United States Post Office. (3) Customary business expense for transportation, telephone calls, telegrams, and postage. (4) None. (5) Postage rate legislation.

Burke, Harold, United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary for 3 months at $708.33 per month equals $2,125. No expenses received or expended on any legislative activity. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[9] Filed with the Clerk only.

[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Burke, Thomas F., the Employees Committee for Low-Cost Retirement Benefits, 1186 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $25 on February 3, from Employees Committee for Low Cost Retirement Benefits as part payment of $64.32 due me for expenses June through December 1947, leaving a balance $39.32 due me plus $62.80 expended by me during January through March 1948. Also received $50 on March 1, 1948, as part repayment of previously reported loan of $200, leaving balance of $150. (2) The $62.80 mentioned above was spent by me for carfare, telephone, and other miscellaneous expenses incurred on behalf of committee work. (3) Carfare, telephone, and other miscellaneous expenses. (4) None during period January through March 1948. (5) Crosser Act, passed into law July 31, 1946.

Burke, William R., 6612 Sunset Boulevard, Hollywood, Calif., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Burrows, Orrin A., International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, A. F. of L., 1200 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,683.88; expenses, $69.15, minus withholding and railroad retirement deductions. The expenses are deductible expenses, such as for transportation and other incidental items. Nothing allowed for lobbying purposes. (2) Telephone, taxi and bus companies, hotels and restaurants. (3) Transportation, meals, lodging, and telephone calls. (4) The Electrical Workers Journal. (5) All legislation affecting the electrical workers in particular and labor in general.

Butler, Eugene J., National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for 3 months, $1,758.96; expense account for 3 months, $90.75. (2) Eugene J. Butler. (3) Salary, taxi fare, meals. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting religious, charitable, and educational institutions and organizations.

Byoir, Carl, & Associates, Inc., 10 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y.; Schenley Distillers Corp., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) We have been retained as public-relations counsel for Schenley Distillers Corp., for more than 8 years, at a fixed fee of $3,000 per month, plus disbursements. The fee received for the period covered by this report, since our registration on January 19, 1948, amounts to $7,258. While this fee of $7,258 includes payment for all lobbying activities it is the identical amount that would have been paid and received if no lobbying activities had been performed. Salaries of employees of Carl Byoir & Associates working full time on general public relations for Schenley Distillers Corp., including work on legislative matters, $4,061.48. Charges of specialty departments of Carl Byoir & Associates for time devoted and work done on Schenley account, $2,078.50. Official transcripts of congressional hearings, and transcripts of radio broadcasts on legislation limiting grain to distillers, $1,447.85. Expenses for travel, hotel, telephone, telegraph, and messenger service, $781.73. Expenses for mimeographing, mailing, and distribution of stories and pictures relating opposition of Schenley Distillers Corp. to legislation limiting grain to distillers, $416.23. (2) Salaries and bills payable as indicated in (1) above. (3) Reimbursement of expenses incurred as indicated above in opposing legislation limiting grain to distillers. (4) Stories or pictures were distributed at one time or another during the period covered by this report to every daily newspaper, press association, major radio network, and liquor trade publication in the United States, with the exception of Kansas, Oklahoma, and Mississippi. (5) Incidental to our engagement as public-relations counsel for Schenley Distillers Corp., we have worked with Schenley in opposing proposed legislation limiting grain to distillers.

Byrum, George N., 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, $150; expenses, $164.44. (2) To George N. Byrum. (3) For salary and personal expenses while working in behalf of legislation in which the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen is interested. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting the interests of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

Cadden,[5] Joseph, Civil Rights Congress, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) January 1948, $30.60; March 1948, $255; total, $285.60. (2) Pennsylvania Railroad, American Airlines, hotels, and restaurants. (3) Transportation and living expenses in Washington. (4) [Blank.] (5) Civil-rights legislation, including support of bills to outlaw lynching, abolish poll tax, establish permanent FEPC.

Caffrey,[7] Charles G., 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Cotton Manufacturers Association, Charlotte, N. C. (1) One-fourth of per annum salary of $8,000. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Caffrey, Charles G., 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Cotton Manufacturers Association, 203A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C. (1) Received same salary as previously reported. Expenditures for the period about $10. Cab fare, lunch, and telephone. These expenditures were made by me on trips to the Capitol during the quarter for which this report is made. (2) As stated in (1) above. (3) As stated in (1) above. (4) None. (5) I am not hired to support or oppose legislation of any kind.

Caldwell, Louis G., member of Kirkland, Fleming, Green, Martin & Ellis, 914 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) February 10, 1948, $3,734.45; March 10, 1948, $8,944.74; March 24, 1948, $2,805.19. Break-down: $3,600 retainer at $1,200 per month; $8,476 legal fees in excess of retainer; $3,408.38, disbursements on behalf of client; March disbursements for which payment has not been received, $637.09. (2) Various. (3) Salaries and expenses. (4) None. (5) S. 2231, to limit the power of broadcast stations and to break down clear channels.

Calhoun, Leonard J., Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; National Rehabilitation Association, care of H. Earle Correvont, president, 900 Bauch Building, Lansing, Mich. (1) $450 received from the National Rehabilitation Association by the firm of Morgan & Calhoun for all services as Washington counsel for the association. (2) No expenditures. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) No particular legislation. The association is interested in any legislation affecting the vocational rehabilitation program.

Calhoun, Leonard J., Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; National Tax Equality Association, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $2,800 received by Morgan & Calhoun for all services as Washington counsel for National Tax Equality Association. Allocation between legislative and nonlegislative activities is not feasible. Expended $99.65 for travel to and from Chicago, for which the firm was reimbursed by the association. (2) Travel, Inc., for air ticket, $75.90; taxis, $5; hotel, $9; meals and tips, $9.75. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Firm retained as Washington counsel to prepare and present to congressional committees legal aspects of tax advantages enjoyed by cooperatives and other tax-exempt corporations.

Calhoun, Leonard J., Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc., 229 East Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis. (1) $1,000 received by Morgan & Calhoun for all services as Washington counsel for Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc. Allocation between legislative and nonlegislative activities is not feasible. Expended $369.43 for travel to and from Los Angeles, Calif., for which the firm was reimbursed by Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc. (2) Travel, Inc., for air ticket, $307.28; taxis, $7; meals, $27; hotel, $26; telegrams, $2.15. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting social-security benefits and contributions.

Carothers,[6] R. B., 1103 First National Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio; Ball Clay Producers. (1) Received $2,103.96; expended $2,103.96. (2) Various. (3) Expenses. (4) None. (5) Percentage depletion on Ball and Sagger clays.

Carpenter, James W., FEDCB & Co., 704 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. No business ever transacted. This is intended to be a notice of cancellation of registration effective on date of filing original notice of registration. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Carter, Albert E., 1026 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Received $3,000 as compensation; reimbursed $885.98 for expenses advanced; expended $764 which will be reimbursed as follows: Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $69.50; Munsey Real Estate Co., $525; stamps, United States Post Office, $10; incidentals, $7.50; stenographer, $152. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.; Munsey Real Estate Co.; incidentals; Dorothy Torr. (3) Telephone service, rent, stamps, stenographer, incidentals. (4) None. (5) Retained to represent the company before administrative agencies and commissions and on legislative matters affecting company's interest.

Carter, Asa L., 325 Ashland Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa. Employed by petitioners and their due succession and joining associates at and after War Department File No. 7040—April 7, 1933 (287 U. S. 627), address (supra) extended to all abutters on B-lines duly and precisely mapped herein. (1) I received and expended only $117.84, costs and disbursements, herein divided: Petty cash, clerical work, searching records, and addressing mail $79.64; and for postage, printing, telephoning, carfare, etc., $38.20. (2) It was paid to postmasters, printers, public-service companies, and standard clerical help at Pittsburgh, Pa. (3) For the purpose of furthering sentiment for a "Rainhill Prize" for the best B-line electric pipe train locomotive for major heavy freight—maximum ton-miles and minimum time and space for passageway, rolling stock, etc. (low price ocean electric power and no tunnel costs at sea). (4) I publish nowhere except by first-class mail to abutters and contributors, and their due and immediate representatives. (5) Everything for or against B-line.

Carter, Jack, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $375 per month as salary minus social-security and withholding taxes; $35.35 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare

[5] Filed with the Clerk only.

[6] Filed for third quarter, 1947.

[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combating of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration.

Carver, Leslie O., associate general counsel, National Paint, Varnish, and Lacquer Association, 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary at the rate of $6,800 per annum for performance of regular duties as associate general counsel. Miscellaneous expenses for travel, transportation, hotel and subsistence, automobile mileage, and usual incidentals totaled $354.71. Of this only 80 cents was spent for lobbying activity. (2) Eighty cents paid to two taxicabs, from office to House Office Building and return. (3) Transportation. (4) None. (5) I am employed as an attorney to perform general legal services; lobbying activity is incidental, negligible, and all but nonexistent. The 80 cents was expended for transportation to enable me to present the association's viewpoint to two Members of the House of Representatives re H. R. 5348 and H. R. 5350.

Casey, D. E., American Taxpayers Association, Inc., 419 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received as salary, $2,649.99. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None specified.

Castiglioni, Paul M., National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees, 112 C Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $811.89 less withholding and social-security taxes. Expenses for quarter of $323.52. (2) Paul M. Castiglioni. (3) To promote the welfare of the motor-vehicle employees of the Post Office Department. Covering both legislation and nonlegislative work. (4) Rotor and bulletins called Motor Vehicle News. (5) Supporting all legislation of benefit to motor-vehicle employees.

Cates, Larry, 1185 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Air Line Pilots Association, 3145 West Sixty-third Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received for services rendered, $1,500. Received $234.55 as expenses. (2) Transportation, meals, communications, general expenses. (3) Transportation, meals, communications. (4) Air Line Pilot. (5) Support any legislation to improve the safety of commercial aviation or concerning the working conditions of the air-line pilots.

Chace, W. E., the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $75 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 869, H. R. 2494, H. R. 3421, H. R. 4562, H. R. 4752, H. R. 4417, and S. 1251.

Chamblin, Walter, Jr., 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Manufacturers, 14 West Forty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Receipts: Salary, $6,250; expenses in Washington reimbursed by employer, $978.27. Expenditures in Washington, $978.27. Out-of-town expenses (railroad fare, hotels, taxis, meals), $461.11; reception for the new NAW president, January 22, 1948, Hotel Carlton (invitations sent out over my name but bill paid by NAM New York office), $2,976.80. (2) Expenses paid to hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, telephone company, trade associations, and clubs. (3) Attending meetings and making speeches to discuss general conditions in Washington of interest to business and industry in particular. (4) [Blank.] (5) Bills affecting national labor policy, tax laws, reduction of Federal expenditures, control of atomic energy, Federal subsidization of research, patents and trade-marks, control powers, revision of the SEC and RFC Acts, and foreign aid.

Chandler, E. L., room 703, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Society of Civil Engineers, 33 West Thirty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) From American Society of Civil Engineers, $19. (2) Taxicabs, postage. (3) Taxicab fares, $15; postage, $4. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting engineers or regarding which engineers can make constructive suggestions.

Chase, Paul (period ended August 31, 1947), 237 East Genessee Street, Syracuse, N. Y.; American Pension Committee, Inc., 15 E Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received no salary. (2) Received no salary. (3) Received no salary. (4) None. (5) Was connected with the American Pension Committee, Inc., as vice president, treasurer, and organization director. The organization was supporting H. R. 781. I left Washington July 24 and only back in Washington for a few days and left permanently on August 8. Have been on leave of absence granted by the board and have not been in Washington since.

Christman,[5] Miss Elisabeth, National Women's Trade Union League of America, 317 Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,105 salary as secretary-treasurer of the National Women's Trade Union League. Legislative work is only one phase of the program of the league. My work is predominantly administrative, but a small percentage of my time is spent in activities in furtherance of our legislative program. (2) No money expended except for an occasional taxi fare. (3) [Blank.] (4) Life and Labor bulletin, the league's monthly publication. (5) [Blank.]

Christman,[6] Miss Elisabeth, National Women's Trade Union League of America, 317 Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,105 salary as secretary-treasurer of the National Women's Trade Union League. Legislative work is only one phase of the program of the league. My work is predominantly administrative, but a small percentage of my time is spent in activities in furtherance of our legislative program. (2) No money expended except for an occasional taxi fare. (3) [Blank.] (4) Life and Labor bulletin, the league's monthly publication. (5) [Blank.]

Christman,[7] Miss Elisabeth, National Women's Trade Union League of America, 317 Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,105 salary as secretary-treasurer of the National Women's Trade Union League. Legislative work is only one phase of the program of the league. My work is predominantly administrative, but a small percentage of my time is spent in activities in furtherance of our legislative program. (2) No money expended except for an occasional taxi fare. (3) [Blank.] (4) Life and Labor bulletin, the league's monthly publication. (5) [Blank.]

Christman, Miss Elisabeth, National Women's Trade Union League of America, 317 Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,105 salary as secretary-treasurer of the National Women's Trade Union League. Legislative work is only one phase of the program of the League. My work is predominantly administrative, but a small percentage of my time is spent in activities in furtherance of our legislative program. Testified for women's equal-pay bill; for labor extension service bill; for appropriation for United States Women's Bureau. (2) No money expended except for an occasional taxi fare. (3) [Blank.] (4) Life and Labor Bulletin, the league's monthly publication. (5) [Blank.]

[5] Filed for second quarter, 1947.
[6] Filed for third quarter, 1947.
[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

Church, R. R., 6000 Champlain Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; National Council for a Permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission, 930 F Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) I receive $10 per day for hotel and meals, only as incurred plus railroad transportation when necessary. I advance out of my funds paying these expenses after which I am reimbursed by the National Council for a Permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission. Said council is at the present time indebted to me for advancement for hotel and meals. I receive no salary. (2) Baltimore and Ohio Railroad; Pennsylvania Railroad; Dunbar Hotel, Washington, D. C.; McAlpin Hotel, New York; Bellevue-Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, Pa. (3) For subsistence of myself, when actively engaged for aforesaid council. (4) None. (5) Ives-Fulton antidiscrimination bill.

Clements, J. C., Carroll Arms Hotel, Washington, D. C.; National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 105 W. Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $833.33 compensation for month of January 1948. Contract of employment terminated February 1, 1948. Will not be renewed. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Postal rate legislation.

Clorety, Joseph A., Jr., American Veterans Committee, 1200 I Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary at rate of $5,600 per annum. No more than $10 a month expenses. (2) Joseph A. Clorety, Jr. (3) For performance of all duties as national secretary of organization. Activities under Lobbying Act constitute no more than 25 percent of these duties. (4) AVC Bulletin. (5) Legislation affecting veterans, national and international platforms of the American Veterans Committee.

Clott, Herman, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, CIO, Suite 818, 431 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (note new address). (1) $1,144 salary, $110 taxi fares. (2) Herman Clott. (3) Paid as salary and taxi expenses around Washington. (4) The Union, official organ of the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers. (5) Support all legislation in favor of membership of above-mentioned union and to oppose all legislation detrimental to said membership and to the welfare of the American people.

Cohn, Marcus, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) During a typical month, the registrant devotes a maximum of 5 percent of his time to matters which may possibly be regarded as embraced in section 308 (a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. The figures set forth here for the months of January, February, and March 1948 are based upon that percentage: Salary, $93.75; travel, $4.29; telephone, $19.22; office and miscellaneous expenses, $71.63. (2) Marcus Cohn. (3) See (1) above. (4) I have supplied information to the general press on immigration and other matters in which the American Jewish Committee is interested. (5) No specific legislation with the exception of immigration. See original registration statement and (1) above.

Colborn, Miss Fern M., Division of Social Education and Action, Board of Christian Education, Presbyterian Church, USA, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Salary, quarterly, $300; personal expenses refunded, i. e., travel, $86.24; lodging, $44; food, $60.63; total, $190.87. (2) [Blank.] (3) Lobbying in the interest of social legislation on which the Presbyterian General Assembly has taken action. (4) Social Progress magazine, special bulletins. (5) Same as No. (3).

Coles, Marvin J., 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; New York Foreign Freight Forwarders and Brokers Association, 27 Water Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Since January 1, 1948, we have received a total amount of $535 as legal fees from members of the New York

Foreign Freight Forwarders and Brokers Association. Our expenses have been $197.54. (2) Expenditures have been purely for incidental matters, such as telephones, lunches, transportation, and mimeographing, and have been paid to the telephone company, taxicab company, mimeographers, restaurants, etc. (3) Telephones, luncheons, transportation, mimeographing. (4) [Blank.] (5) Registrant has been employed as attorney to present to the Congress and to the governmental agencies concerned information concerning foreign freight forwarders and use of their services under the foreign relief programs.

Colgan, Howard O., Jr., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; the Chase National Bank of the City of New York, 18 Pine Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant is a member of the law firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York 5, N. Y., which firm receives an annual retainer from the Chase National Bank of the City of New York for professional services. As stated in his registration statement on Form B, registrant does not believe he is subject to the provisions of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. Registrant's Federal tax legislative work comprises only an incidental and minor part of his duties. If any of registrant's activities are subject to the provisions of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, the portion of the annual retainer from the Chase National Bank that might be attributed to attention to Federal tax legislative matters based on an allocation of time was $187.50 during the first quarter of 1948, and disbursements pertaining to such activities were $6.53. (2) See answer to (1). Expense payments were made to the firm under the terms of the annual retainer for hotel rooms, meals, transportation, postage, telephone, and miscellaneous expenses of registrant, and of members and employees of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley. (3) See answers to (1) and (2). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Chase National Bank of the City of New York.

Colgan, Howard O., Jr., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y. (1) The only money received by registrant was his aliquot share of income of the law firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York 5, N. Y., which firm receives an annual retainer from the New York Stock Exchange for professional services. That portion of such annual retainer attributable to attention to Federal tax legislative matters based on an allocation of time was $87.50 during the first quarter of 1948, plus disbursements of $22.59. (2) Expense payments were made to firm for hotel, meals, transportation, postage, telephone, and miscellaneous expenses of registrant, and of employees of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley. (3) See answers to (1) and (2). (4) None. (5) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

Collett, F. G., 1844 Mintwood Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Indians of California, Inc., 1078 University Avenue, Berkeley, Calif. (1) Received $2,365.74; expended, $2,357.96. (2) To various persons and concerns for miscellaneous services, such as stenographic services, stationery and supplies, rooms and meals, telephone and telegraph, postage and transportation, and expenses and maintenance of delegates representing Indians of California, and of other persons (see attached report of expenditures). (3) To secure remedial legislation. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to Indians of California.

Compton, R. T., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: salary $3,750; expenses reimbursed by employer, $425.20; expenditures, $425.20 (see detailed report attached). (2) Expenses paid to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, telephone company, etc. (3) For expenses incurred in course of business, such as travel, meals, and hotel accommodations, and expenses of conducting conferences for discussion of business matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting industry, such as legislation relating to national labor policy, taxation, public expenditures, industrial controls, social security, research, patents, and investments.

Comstock, Boyd, legislative assistant, legislative Federal relations division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary: $1,175, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service, $235. (2) Self (salary). Expenses: Hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash. NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Condon, Arthur D., attorney, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Military and Naval Distributors Association, Inc., 295 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) January, February, March 1948, received $1,500 and further reasonable compensation to be paid as may be agreed upon. Expended none. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Condon, Arthur D., 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Morton Salt Co., 310 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) January, February, March 1948, no money received (reasonable compensation to be paid as may be agreed upon). No money expended. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Conn, Donald D., Transportation Association of America, 105 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, $6,250; expenses, $430.60. (2) Various. (3) Hotel charges, railroad fares, etc. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Connaughton, John H., 717 District National Building, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. Cecil N. Broy, 524 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Work for passage of H. R. 4044.

Conover, Julian D., American Mining Congress, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received no compensation other than regular salary as previously stated. Expended, $101.75. (2) Sundry payees. (3) Taxicab fares, $16.40; telephone, $42.10; travel, $43.25. (4) Am editorial director of Mining Congress Journal, a monthly magazine for the mining industry. (5) Measures affecting the mining industry.

Conroy, Eugene J., the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (1) None. No activities during this quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Cooley, Thomas M., II, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and reimbursement of expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 2910.

Cooperstock, John, 30 Bellingham Avenue, Revere, Mass.; Veterans' Association Federal Employees Naval Ship Yard, Lenruth Hall, Waverley and Myrtle Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y. (1) No salary. Expenses only for travel, meals, hotel meals when on official business regarding veterans' legislation. (2) Self. (3) Travel, hotel, and meals. (4) None. (5) Support or oppose legislation affecting veterans' preference in Federal employment.

Corbett, John T., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1118 Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $2,681.70 as wages; $200.01 for office rental; $995 expense allowance May 8, 1947, to January 1, 1948; $105.60 traveling expenses, January, February, March 1948. (2) $200.01 to Labor for office rental; Pullman Co. for berth; Morrison Hotel, Chicago, Ill.; Hollenden Hotel, Cleveland, Ohio; and different restaurants at Chicago; baggage, taxis, etc. (3) As assistant grand chief engineer and national legislative representative, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, covering all services rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislation and legislative matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interest of labor.

Cortright, Frank W., National Association of Home Builders, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, January, February, and March, 1948, $4,375.02; per diem, January, February, and March, 1948, $637; expenses, travel (transportation, meals, tips, taxies, and entertainment), $195.66; taxies in town, $90; telephone, $11; express charges, $77.70; entertainment, $70.25; out-of-pocket expenses incurred in connection with attendance at annual convention and exposition of association, $150. As indicated upon my registration, I have been advised by counsel that I am not subject to the Lobbying Act. Such registration and this report are therefore filed under protest and merely as a matter of personal precaution in view of the indefiniteness of said act and the lack of judicial interpretation thereof. Neither said registration nor this report in any way are intended to constitute an admission by me that I am subject to the act. The payments reported above as my salary and per diem are for general services as executive vice president of the National Association of Home Builders, and are not dependent upon rendition of services which might be considered "lobbying" within the meaning of the act. Similarly, expenses reported include substantial amounts for routine association business which could not be regarded as lobbying within the meaning of the act. Expenses reported do not include items of association expense such as travel, secretary's salary, telephone, and rent, which are part of the general administrative budget of the association and do not represent moneys received by me from the association. (2) Paid out in cash to taxies, restaurants, hotels, telephone and telegraph companies, etc. (3) Transportation, telephones, telegrams, tips, etc. (4) News releases are sent to the Associated Press, INS, UP, and other national newspaper wire services by the association for publication in subscriber papers and magazines, some of which releases may contain material deemed to affect legislation directly or indirectly. Neither the association nor I have any means of ascertaining a complete list of the publications utilizing such releases. I also write an article each month for the American Builder, a monthly publication devoted to the interests of the housing industry. The association publishes a weekly news letter called the Washington Letter and a monthly magazine, the Correlator, containing material of interest to the membership, including information on legislative matters. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any legislation, but I am the executive vice president of the trade association of the home-building industry. In that capacity it is incumbent upon me to supervise, among other things, the work of the association's legislative department. The function of that department of the association is to follow all legislation affecting the home-building industry; to advise the membership of the association of all such legislation; and to make known to the public and to the Congress the opinion of the membership on all such legislation.

Cosgrove, James L., Railroad Employees' National Pension Association, Inc., 110 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Wages received, $600. Expenses: Lodging, $174.50; subsistence, $147; stenographic hire, $3.50; transportation (Chicago to Washington and return), $67.04; postage, $4; telephone, $1; and taxi, $3.50. (2) James L. Cosgrove. (3)

To defray expenses in the interest of proposed legislation to liberalize the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act. (4) None. (5) A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act approved by the delegates to the association's tenth convention, January 1947.

Costello, John M., The American League for an Undivided Ireland, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received as fee for services, $750; received as reimbursement for expenditures, $234.71. (2) Public Printer, Washington, D. C., $182.83; Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., $17.28; miscellaneous expenditures, $34.60. (3) For reprints of speech in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; for long-distance tolls and telegrams; for gas, oil, and traveling expenses. (4) CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. (5) Any legislation which may tend to effectuate the unification of all of Ireland into a united nation.

Covington, J. Harry, 3d,[7] American Smelting & Refining Co., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received, none. Expended in connection with all matters for client, $191.07. (2) Telephone and telegraph expense, $40.58; travel expense, including hotel accommodations, $150.49. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, transportation, and hotel accommodations. (4) None. (5) Appropriation for continuation of drainage tunnel by Bureau of Mines at Leadville, Colo.

Covington, J. Harry, American Smelting & Refining Co., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $22,000 for legal services rendered in connection with all legal matters for client. Expended in connection with all matters for client $109. (2) Telephone expense, $15.78; travel expense, including hotel accommodations, $89.47; miscellaneous, $3.75. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, transportation, and hotel accommodations. (4) None. (5) Appropriation for continuation of drainage tunnel by Bureau of Mines at Leadville, Colo.

Cowan, Nathan E., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; United Steelworkers of America, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Salary for January through March 1948, $1,400; expenses for January through March, $940.70. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers, etc. (3) [Blank.] (4) Union News Service and CIO News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Cowling, W. C., National St. Lawrence Association, 1728 Buhl Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) Expenses, $350. (2) Expenses, $350; train fare to and from Washington, hotel expenses, meals, taxies, etc. (3) For purposes of promoting seaway. (4) None. (5) St. Lawrence seaway legislation.

Crampton, Charles J., attorney, 700 Insurance Building, San Antonio, Tex.; State Rights Association, Post Office Box 2559, Houston, Tex. (1) Statement attached.[1] (2) Statement attached.[1] (3) (Statement attached.[1] (4) None. (5) Statement attached.[1]

Crawford, James M., Indemnity Insurance Co., of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) As indicated in previous reports, deponent has received no money except as reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses for transportation and subsistence in connection with trips to Washington, D. C. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3998, now pending before the Senate Committee for the District of Columbia.

Crowley, Leo J., 922 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.; Colorado Railroad Association. (1) Received attorney fee of $900 for period from October 1, 1947, to January 1, 1948; only a small part of which could be allocated to Federal legislation. During this period required $316 expense money, approximately $60 of which had to do with Federal legislation. (2) Morrison Hotel, Chicago; restaurants, Pullman Co., dining cars, taxicabs, and theaters. (3) Approximately $60 of my entire expenses were expended in connection with a meeting in Chicago October 16, at which pending Federal legislation affecting railroads was discussed, was spent for hotel bill, meals, taxicabs, and Pullman fares. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting railroads operating in and having trackage in the State of Colorado.

Crowley, Leo J., 922 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.; Missouri Pacific, Union Pacific, Rock Island, Santa Fe, Burlington, Colorado & Southern, and Denver & Rio Grande Western railroad companies. (1) Received attorney fee of $900 for period from January 1 to March 31, 1948, only one-ninth of which could be allocated to Federal legislation. During the same period required $376 expense money, approximately $200 of which was expended in connection with Federal legislation. (2) Mayflower Hotel, Washington; restaurants, Pullman Co., dining cars, taxicabs. (3) Expense money was expended for hotel bills, meals, taxicabs, Pullman fares and incidentals during stay in Washington and en route to Washington from Denver, Colo. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting railroads operating in and having trackage in the State of Colorado.

Cullum, Robert M., Committee for Equality in Naturalization, 261 Constitution Avenue, Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary totaling $1,500 for quarter; traveling expenses, $88.45. (2) Paid out miscellaneous traveling expenses: Fare, hotel, taxis, etc. (3) To attend executive board meetings in New York City. (4) None. (5) Legislation to provide that the right to become a naturalized citizen of the United States shall not be denied or abridged because of race.

Cuneo, John C., 922 Jay Street, Modesto, Calif.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Receipts for California operations of Townsend plan, $2,154.56; less deductions made by national office, $400.28; reimbursement from State legislative committee for expenses previously paid, $986.13; total deposited in State office account for conduct of Townsend work in California, $2,740.41. John C. Cuneo personally received for his services from above, $480. (2) Total disbursements in connection with operation of Townsend State operations, $516.43. (3) Various. (4) None. (5) [Blank.]

Curran, Roland, Central Valley Project Association, Box, 15, Bakersfield, Calif. (1) Received from Central Valley Project Association July 1, 1947, to March 31, 1948, for all activities connected with association, $12,316.38. Expended, $3,240.48. (2) Various. (3) Salary and to maintain office and activities in California and to defray personal expenses to and from Washington, D. C., in connection with my work. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting Central Valley project and flood-control projects in same area. Lobbying very small part of activities.

Curry, James E.,[7] 1016 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; NCAI (Yavapai, Mescalero, Jicarilla, Pyramid Lake Paiute, Angoon, Craig, Douglas, Haines, Hoonah, Juneau, Kake, Kasaan, Karluck, Klawock, Klukwan, Metlakatla, Petersburg, Pribilof, Saxman, Shungnak, Sitka, Stebbins, Unalakleet, Wrangell, and Yakutat). (1) [Blank.] (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation relating to economic and political rights of American Indians, particularly those above named.

Curry, James E., 1016 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Congress American Indians, various Apache and Paiute Tribes, Southeastern Alaskan Indians, NCAI, Claremore, Okla. (1) $166.50 from NCAI. (2) W. T. Peck & Co., Philadelphia, Pa., $150; Fraternity Press, Washington, D. C., $16.50. (3) Printing miscellaneous material in connection with bills affecting Alaskan Indian land titles. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation dealing with economic and political status of Indians and particularly legislation concerning the tribes mentioned.

Curtiss, Ralph E., 111 Kellogg Building, 1422 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Associated Tavern Owners of America, Inc., 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis. (1) Received, $675; expended, $3.60. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. (3) Telephone call. (4) ATOA News (monthly publication of the association). (5) Any legislation affecting the tavern industry.

Cutler, John Ward, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Dwight, Harris, Koegel & Caskey, 100 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant's portion of fee received upon completion of work on claim under section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act (fee approved by Department of Justice), $1,141.77. Not employed specifically with respect to any legislation and legislative activity incidental to representation before Office of Alien Property, Department of Justice. Reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses, $14.40. (2) Telephone company, $9; taxi fares, $5.40. (3) Communication with client and attendance at conferences, etc. (4) None. (5) Section 2 (title I) of H. R. 4044 (opposition to proposed suspension of debt-claim payments under Trading With the Enemy Act).

Dacci,[5] Guy P., president, National Voters of America Against Vivisection, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; members of the National Voters League, etc. (1) Moneys received, $1,675.20; moneys spent, $1,471.56. (2) Various. (3) Rent, salaries, secretarial purposes, charter stamps, phone calls, railroad fares, etc. (4) [Blank.] (5) Lemke bill, H. R. 462, or any other antivivisection legislation.

Dacci,[6] Guy P., president, National Voters League of America Against Vivisection, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Moneys received, $938.10; moneys spent, $1,114.55. (2) Various. (3) Rent, stenographic services, salary, stamps, stationery, charter account. (4) [Blank.] (5) The Lemke bill, H. R. 462.

Dacci,[7] Guy P., president, National Voters League of America Against Vivisection, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received, $233; spent, $285.05. (2) Various. (3) Rent, salary, stamps, stationery, bank charge. (4) [Blank.] (5) Lemke bill, H. R. 462.

Daley, William L., 528 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Editorial Association, 222 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Receipts and expenditures on behalf of National Editorial Association, $975.94. (2) Railroads, telegraph and telephone companies, taxicabs, office supply companies. (3) Reimbursement for expenses, transportation and communications and supplies, $150.94. (4) Interpretative articles in official bulletins of national and State publishers associations; also in trade publications of publishing industry. (5) Measures affecting the press.

Dameron, William V., grand lodge representative, International Association of Machinists, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Danielian, N. R., National St. Lawrence Association, 1830 I Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) January 1, 1948, to March 31, 1948, $3,000 received from National St. Lawrence

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for second quarter, 1947.
[6] Filed for third quarter, 1947.
[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

Association (retainer); $179.62 received as reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and incidental expenses; total, $3,179.62. (2) Railroads for fares, hotels, etc. (3) Official travel for association. (4) None. (5) The principal purpose of engagement by the National St. Lawrence Association is to foster and increase trade for the products of manufacture, agriculture, natural resources, and any and all other forms of commerce between the ports of the Great Lakes, its tributaries and waterways of the United States and Canada relating to the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin for the development of navigation and power.

Daugherty, Paul J., 820 Huntington Bank Building, 17 South High Street, Columbus, Ohio; Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Columbus, Ohio. (1) $487.73 for expenses. (2) Pennsylvania Railroad and Statler Hotel. (3) Actual and necessary traveling expenses on employer's business. (4) None. (5) Legislation dealing with social security, business, taxation, and other matters of interest to our organization.

Davies, William D., D. C. Andrews & Co., Inc., 27 Water Street, New York, N. Y. (1) During the past 3 months I have received approximately $600 for expenses incurred on trips from New York to Washington. The purpose of these trips has been only in small part connected with any activities which might conceivably be under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. (2) My expenses have been paid for railroad transportation, hotels, food, and similar items relating to ordinary travel. (3) These expenditures have been made for the purpose of providing my transportation to and living in Washington on business trips required to discuss freight forwarding with private customers and representatives of the Government. (4) [Blank.] (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any legislation. As chairman of the Joint Committee of the Forwarder's Industry I have been interested in the European recovery program legislation, as it might affect the commercial freight-forwarding industry.

Davidson, John B., Michigan Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 902 Olds Tower Building, Lansing, Mich. (1) No money received or expended for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) None.

d'Avila, Sarah H., National Committee To Abolish the Poll Tax, 127 B Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $72.92 (volunteer basis most of period). (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to abolish the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in Federal elections.

Davis & Gilbert, a partnership consisting of A. M. Davis and A. M. Gilbert, 1 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.; The Best Foods, Inc., 1 East Forty-third Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Expenditures: $520.25 for transportation, meals, lodging, telephone and telegraph expenses; and $94.11 to Dr. H. J. Deuel, Jr., for transportation from Chicago, Ill., to Washington, D. C., and from Washington, D. C., to Cincinnati, Ohio, and for his hotel and living expenses during the course of this 2-day trip. Receipts: The registrant was reimbursed in part by the Best Foods, Inc., during the quarter for the aforementioned expenditures and will be reimbursed by said company for the entire sum thereof. Registrant has received from the Best Foods, Inc., the usual equal monthly installments of its annual legal fee of $35,000, which fee the registrant has received every year for many years. (2) $520.25 to railroads, air lines, cabs, hotels, restaurants, telephone and telegraph companies. $94.11 to Dr. H. J. Deuel, Jr., School of Medicine, University of Southern California. (3) $520.25, travel to and from Washington, D. C., living expenses in Washington, D. C., and telephone calls and telegrams; $94.11 paid to Dr. Deuel to reimburse him for expenses incurred in connection with his appearance as a witness on March 1, 1948, before the House Committee on Agriculture which was then considering margarine legislation. (4) None. (5) Registrant is not and was not employed specifically for the purpose of supporting or opposing any pending legislation nor was registrant employed specifically for the purposes set forth in the first sentence of section 308 (a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. We are paid a yearly retainer for acting as legal counsel to the Best Foods, Inc., and, in addition to our major duties as such counsel, we presented the cause of the company in respect to legislation affecting margarine which is one of the many products manufactured by that company.

Davis, John H., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for January, February, and March 1948, $3,000 (before withholding taxes were deducted). Less than 20 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Washington situation, a weekly mimeographed newsletter of the National Council of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Dawes, Bourbon A., Hotel Association of Washington, D. C., 1331 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,583.32; expenses, $183.41. (2) Various. (3) Normal operating expenses. (4) Hotel World Review, Hotel Gazette, Southern Hotel Journal, and other hotel trade papers. (5) Legislation affecting the District of Columbia hotels.

Dawson, Clarence E., 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; the Chase National Bank of the City of New York, 18 Pine Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant is a member of the law firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C., which firm receives an annual retainer from the Chase National Bank of the City of New York for professional services. As stated in his registration statement on Form B, registrant does not believe he is subject to the provisions of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. Registrant's Federal tax legislative work comprises only an incidental and minor part of his duties. If any of registrant's activities are subject to the provisions of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act the portion of the annual retainer from the Chase National Bank that might be attributed to attention to Federal tax legislative matters based on an allocation of time was $187.50 during the first quarter of 1948, and disbursements pertaining to such activities were $6.53. (3) See answer to (1). Expense payments were made to the firm under the terms of the annual retainer for hotel rooms, meals, transportation, postage, telephone and miscellaneous expenses of registrant, and of members and employees of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley. (3) See answers to (1) and (2). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Chase National Bank of the City of New York.

Dawson, Clarence E., 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y. (1) The only money received by registrant was his aliquot share of income of the law firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C., which firm receives an annual retainer from the New York Stock Exchange for professional services. That portion of such annual retainer attributable to attention to Federal tax legislative matters based on an allocation of time was $87.50 during the first quarter of 1948, plus disbursements of $22.59. (2) Expense payments were made to firm for hotel, meals, transportation, postage, telephone and miscellaneous expenses of registrant, and of employees of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley. (3) See answers to (1) and (2). (4) None. (5) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

Day,[7] Mary R., lawyer, 741 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; Massman Construction Co., 20 West Ninth Street, Kansas City, Mo. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Bill for the relief of the Massman Construction Co., H. R. 2192.

Day, Mary R. (lawyer), 741 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; Massman Construction Co., 20 West Ninth Street, Kansas City, Mo. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Bill for the relief of the Massman Construction Co., H. R. 2192.

DeGroot, E. H., Jr., Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State, 924 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C. (1) See typewritten statement attached,[1] and made part hereof, to which the oath of registrant filing this form applies without reservation. (2) See statement above. (3) See statement above. (4) See statement above. (5) See statement above.

Denning, William I., 1518 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; (formerly) National Publishers Association, Inc., (now) National Association of Magazine Publishers, 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) $1,875 was received as retainer for services rendered plus reimbursement of $625.92 for personal expenses in connection with work for the association. (National Association of Magazine Publishers, 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.) ($515 of the above amount covers the salary of an economist employed in my office.) (2) William I. Denning. (3) For general legal representation in Washington, D. C. (4) None. (5) Not called upon during quarter in connection with any legislation.

Dickerman, John M., National Association of Home Builders, suite 1116, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary from January 1 through March 31, 1948, $2,500; expenses, including lunches, taxis, tips, telephone, etc., from January 1 through March 31, 1948, $92.15; out-of-pocket expenses incurred in connection with attendance at annual convention of association, $103.93; total, $2,696.12. The salary and expenses listed under (1) are charged against that portion of the association's budget allocated to the legislative department, of which I am in charge, which allocation is $20,000 for 1948. Only some of the functions of this department might be deemed as coming within the purview of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. (2) Paid out in cash to taxis, restaurants, hotels, telephone and telegraph companies, etc. (3) Transportation, telephone, telegrams, tips, hotel rooms, etc. (4) News releases are sent to the Associated Press, INS, UP, and other national newspaper wire services by the association for publication in subscriber papers and magazines, some of which releases may contain material deemed to affect legislation directly or indirectly. Neither the association nor I have any means of ascertaining a complete list of the publications utilizing such releases. The association publishes a weekly news letter called the Washington Letter and a monthly magazine, the Correlator, containing material of interest to the membership, including information on legislative matters. (5) All legislation affecting the home-building industry.

Dickinson, A. W., American Mining Congress, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $1,375 salary for this activity; expended, $7.60. (2) Sundry payees. (3) Taxicab fares, $7.60. (4) Am associate editor of Mining Congress Journal, a monthly magazine for the mining industry. (5) Measures affecting the mining industry.

Disbrow, Walter L., Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, Room 314, 900 F Street

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary through March 31, 1948, $1,067.70. (2) Walter L. Disbrow. (3) To represent members of the Retirement Federation on legislation affecting their welfare. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any and all legislation affecting the civil-service retirement laws.

Disney, Wesley E., Independent Natural Gas Association of America et al., 434 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C., $1,249.99; Western Oil and Gas Association, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif., $1,500; Minerva Oil Co., St. Louis, Mo., $2,000; Rosiclaire Lead & Fluorspar Co., Rosiclaire, Ill., $4,325; Perry & Lloyd, Marion, Ky., $150; Cider Bros. Fluorspar Co., Princeton, Ky., $250; Haynes Fluorspar Co., Marion, Ky., $200; Frazer Mining Co., Marion, Ky., $100; Inland Steel Co., Chicago, Ill., $2,500; Delhi Fluorspar Corp., Marion, Ky., $150; Kentucky Fluorspar Corp., Marion, Ky., $500; Neva Deardorff Co., Elizabethtown, Ill., $1,250; Crystal Fluorspar Co., Elizabethtown, Ill., $1,250; Zuni Milling Co., New York, N. Y., $500; Aluminum Co. of America, East St. Louis, Mo., $2,500; American Potash Co., Los Angeles, Calif., $2,500. None expended except incidentals, such as taxi fares, telephone calls, etc. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Natural Gas Act amendments; percentage depletion.

Dixon, Loy Thomas, Continental Hotel, Washington, D. C.; Panama Railroad Employees Association, Balboa, C. Z. (1) Expended, $250. (2) [Blank.] (3) Living expenses at Washington. (4) None. (5) Support of H. R. 3749.

Dodge, Homer, 1244 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City. (1) $600 salary and $225 expense allowance. (2) Chesapeake & Ohio Telephone Co., the postmaster, the Superintendent of Documents, and others. (3) Telephone service, postage, Government publications, rent, and minor office expenses. (4) None. (5) None.

Dorsett, J. Dewey, Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant does not receive funds earmarked for purposes set forth in this act. Registrant has estimated, however, that $75 received by registrant during the first quarter of 1948 might come within scope of act as registrant understands act has been interpreted by the Department of Justice. Registrant does not believe he has engaged in any activities in this quarter within the purview of this act. Registrant has expended no money in this quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Three articles on accident-prevention work of Association of Casualty and Surety Companies appearing in January 3, 1948, issue of the Weekly Underwriter, January 21, 1948, issue of the Journal of Commerce and Commercial, and January 1948 issue of the Casualty and Surety Journal. (5) Registrant doubts that he is employed to support or oppose legislation. However, on very infrequent occasions, he has supported or opposed legislation as it specifically affects capital-stock casualty insurance and surety companies.

Dougherty, John E., the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $619.36 per month, which is paid for all the services rendered to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., only a part of which have to do with legislation; $155.60 was expended by me as expense money, during the first quarter of 1948, for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. In addition to this amount, I also received $233.40 for expenses incurred in connection with other duties performed for the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., which have no relation to the purposes covered by this act. (2) Various transportation companies, restaurants, garages, communication companies, etc. (3) $155.60 was expended by me as expense money, during the first quarter of 1948, for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

Dougherty,[5] Robert E., National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,333.33; expenses, $286.30. Only a part of these sums expended in the course of duties having to do with legislation. (2) Local hotels, restaurants, cab drivers, phone calls, and tips. (3) Meals, tips, $167.60; cab fares, phone calls, $118.70. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the lumber manufacturing industry.

Dougherty,[6] Robert E., National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,333.33; expenses, none; hospitalized for entire period. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Dougherty,[7] Robert E., National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,333.33; expenses, $29.35. Only a part of this sum expended in the course of duties having to do with legislation. (2) Mayflower Hotel, $10.25; Carroll Arms, $4; miscellaneous cabs, tips, and local telephone calls, $14.50. (3) Meals, cab fares, tips, local phone calls. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the lumber manufacuring industry.

Dowd,[6] M. J., Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif. (1) For third quarter of the year 1947: Salary, $939 per month; incidental traveling expenses, $694.78. (2) The salary is regular compensation for my full-time employment as consulting engineer for the Imperial irrigation district on irrigation, power, drainage, and related matters. Expenses represent reimbursement to me for personal travel, hotel, and subsistence expenses. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to the Colorado River and affecting Imperial irrigation district.

Dowd,[7] M. J., Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif. (1) For fourth quarter of the year 1947: Salary, $939 per month; incidental traveling expenses, $493.06. (2) The salary is regular compensation for my full-time employment as consulting engineer for Imperial irrigation district on irrigation, power, drainage, and related matters. Expenses represent reimbursement to me for personal travel, hotel, and subsistence expenses. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None during this quarter.

Dowd, M. J., Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif. (1) For first quarter of year 1948: Salary, $960 per month; incidental traveling expenses, $731.02. (2) The salary is regular compensation for my full-time employment as consulting engineer for Imperial irrigation district on irrigation, power, drainage, and related matters. Expenses represent reimbursement to me for personal travel, hotel, and subsistence expenses. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to the Colorado River and affecting Imperial irrigation district.

Downs, Thomas J., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Associated Fur Coat & Trimming Manufacturers, 393 Seventh Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation affecting the fur industry.

Downs, Thomas J., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Dresie, Grey, 202 Bitting Building, Wichita, Kans.; Kansas Independent Businessmen's Association, 205 Orpheum Building, Wichita, Kans. (1) $56.49 received as reimbursement for actual expense. (2) Telephone company, $6.49; miscellaneous expenses while traveling, $50. (3) Telephone company, for telephone calls. Miscellaneous traveling expenses, for meals, telephone calls, cab fare, hotel room, etc. (4) Friendly Dollar, Wichita Independent. (5) Tax equality.

DuBois, Ben, Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn. (1) My salary as secretary of the Independent Bankers Association is $6,500 per year. The total membership dues for this quarter is $19,831.25, but practically all of our membership collection is usually made in the first quarter. During this quarter the association has disbursed $8,476.90. We circularize bankers in support or in opposition to certain bills. We occasionally appear in Washington in support or opposition to certain bills. The only time during the quarter that I was in Washington was from February 21 to March 2. At that time we had a meeting of our executive council. On February 24 and 25 we had a representative from each of 28 States, including my secretary, a total of 30. We discussed the association affairs, planning for the future. We gave a dinner with 23 Senators in attendance, besides representatives from the three banking agencies. The association, of course, paid for the dinner and it paid the expenses both hotel, food, and railroad transportation for the members of the council present. Our total expenditures in connection with this meeting of the executive council was $4,807.47. Most of our council members called on their Representatives at the Capitol. I called on one Senator and two Congressmen. We made our headquarters at the Willard Hotel. Frankly, I do not know how to make out what might be considered a proper statement for our limited lobbying activities. I do not believe the law intends that a director of an organization such as ours, calling on his own Congressman, comes in the category of a lobbyist. I believe that I come under the lobbyist category, as at times I visit Senators and Congressmen, urging support of certain measures and further, I have on a number of occasions testified before the banking committees. We are attaching our financial statement[1] for the calendar year 1947 which indicates clearly that we are a rather small organization with limited funds. This statement is attached and forms a part of our quarterly report of a person registering under Lobbying Act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. We use letters and circulars to present the organization's views. (5) The legislation that we are most interested in is the passage of the Tobey-Wolcott bill, S. 829, in the Senate; H. R. 3351 in the House.

Dudley,[7] Harold and Ruth, American Council of Commercial Laboratories, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $300 a month for October, November, and December; total of $80 for traveling expenses. (2) Harold and Ruth Dudley. (3) For representing the interests of the American Council of Commercial Laboratories before Government agencies. (4) [Blank.] (5) Revision of Internal Revenue Form 990.

Dudley, Harold and Ruth, American Council of Commercial Laboratories, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $500 a month for January, February, and March; total of $210 for travel and office expense. (2) Harold Dudley, Washington Liaison Service. (3) For serving as executive secretary of the

[5] Filed for second quarter, 1947.
[6] Filed for third quarter, 1947.
[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

American Council of Commercial Laboratories and representing the council before Government agencies. (4) [Blank.] (5) Revision of Internal Revenue Form 990.

Dunbar, Charles E., Jr., Phelps, Dunbar, Marks & Claverie, United Fruit Building, New Orleans, La.; Louisiana Community Property Tax Payers Committee, Joseph W. Montgomery, chairman, United Fruit Building, New Orleans, La. (1) Retainer fees as attorney, $3,000; received as reimbursement for traveling expense to Washington, etc., $224.46. (2) Self. (3) Retainer for January, February, and March 1948. Expenses for travel. See explanatory statement attached to Form A, filed March 6, 1947, and supplemental statements filed July 14, 1947, and January 10, 1948. (4) None. (5) See explanatory statement attached to Form A, filed March 6, 1947, and supplemental statements filed July 14, 1947, and January 10, 1948.

Dwyer, Joseph L., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary previously reported. Expenses reimbursed by employer, $1,141.99. (2) Various railroads, hotels, restaurants, retail stores, taxicabs, telephone companies, Government Printing Office, Hickey Bros. (3) Administrative, traveling, and incidental expenses, newspapers, periodicals, cigars, cigarettes, etc., meals, and entertainment. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting petroleum and its products, or natural gas.

Earle, Clarence C., secretary-treasurer of Independent Business Council of America, Inc., 448 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) Though not in an employed status, Mr. Clarence C. Earle will be reimbursed for actual expenses incurred. (3) For out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation that in the opinion of the members of this organization affects the welfare of small and independent business men and women.

Eaton, Edna L., 687 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) The Townsend plan.

Echols, Oliver P., Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Nothing received except salary, no part of which was paid for activities covered by Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. No expenditures. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to establish a national air policy.

Edelman, John W., 1031 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.; Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, 99 University Place, New York, N. Y. (1) $1,300 salary; $300.67 to reimburse actual expenses incurred, $96.79 of this amount for expenses incurred in Washington; remainder for expenses outside of Washington. (2) Railroads, hotels, restaurants, cab drivers, bus companies, air lines. (3) Personal expense and travel. (4) Textile Labor, CIO News, Labor Press Associates. (5) Support legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Edwards, Burton E., National Apartment Owners Association, 257 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif., and 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See attached report,[1] general fund account, NAOA; see attached report,[1] president's fund, NAOA. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) Full page ad March 9, 1948, Times-Herald, Washington, D. C.; Western Housing, published by the Apartment Association of Los Angeles County, Inc. (5) Any legislation affecting the multiple housing industry.

Elliott, John Doyle, 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary of $60 per week, plus reimbursable traveling expense allowance of approximately $30 per week (covering mileage, fares, meals, and hotel whenever work requires absence from residence location. (2) Contacting citizens, organizations, and Townsend Clubs for purposes of information, education, and legislative promotion. Expenditures during quarter ending March 31, 1948, $54.45. (3) Contacting citizens, organizations, and Townsend Clubs for purposes of information, education, and legislative promotion. (4) None. (5) H. R. 16, Eightieth Congress, first session, generally known as the Townsend plan.

Ellis, Clyde T., 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $3,000; car allowance, $300; expense accounts, $129.51; American Airlines, $355.84; total, $3,785.35. (2) Self for salary and expenses, including reimbursement for meals, hotel, transportation, and tips. (3) Travel incident to members' meetings, board of directors' meetings, etc. (4) Rural Electrification magazine. (5) Legislation affecting the growth and welfare of rural electric cooperative corporations, public-power and public-utility districts, and legislation affecting public-power developments where they would in turn affect the rural electric cooperative corporations, public-power and public-utility districts.

Ellison, Newell W., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Arabian American Oil Co., 200 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) None received and none expended during previous quarter, except incidental expenses for long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, and for taxis. (2) Telephone companies, telegraph companies, and taxicabs. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) Proposal to amend provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to United States corporations doing business abroad.

Ellison, Newell W., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; R. W. Britton, 1416 Cherry Street, Erie, Pa. (1) The firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb, of which I am a partner, received a fee of which $300 is considered applicable to registerable activities. (2) None expended. (3) None expended. (4) None. (5) Proposal to amend provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to partnerships.

Ellison,[5] Newell W., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; St. Joe Paper Co. and affiliated companies, Barnett National Bank Building, Jacksonville, Fla. (1) None received and approximately $61.88 expended during the previous quarter for incidental expenses such as long-distance telephone, telegram, and taxicab costs. (2) Telephone companies, telegraph company, and taxi operators. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) Retained in connection with investigation by subcommittee of Senate Judiciary Committee into question of any impairment of credit of Florida.

Ellison,[6] Newell W., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; St. Joe Paper Co. and affiliated companies, Barnett National Bank Building, Jacksonville, Fla. (1) No money received and approximately $44.54 expended for long-distance telephone expenses and photostat costs. (2) Telephone companies and photostat costs. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) Retained in connection with investigation by subcommittee of Senate Judiciary Committee into question of any impairment of credit of Florida.

Ellison,[7] Newell W., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; St. Joe Paper Co., and affiliated companies, Barnett National Bank Building, Jacksonville, Fla. (1) No money received and $1.94 was expended for long-distance telephone calls. (2) Telephone companies. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) Retained in connection with investigation by Subcommittee of Senate Judiciary Committee into question of any impairment of credit of Florida.

Ellison, Newell W., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; St. Joe Paper Co., and affiliated companies, Barnett National Bank Building, Jacksonville, Fla. (1) The firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb, of which I am a partner, received during the preceding calendar quarter $5,116.42; $5,000 for fee and $116.42 for miscellaneous expenses, including long-distance telephone calls and telegrams. (2) $116.42 to the telephone company for telephone calls and telegrams, and to reimburse the firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb for other miscellaneous costs. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, and other miscellaneous costs. (4) None. (5) Retained in connection with investigation by subcommittee of Senate Judiciary Committee into question of any impairment of credit of Florida.

Ely,[11] Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; general counsel for American Public Power Association, 1129 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Services to date have not involved the supporting or opposing of legislation. At the request of the association, legal analyses and opinions are rendered from time to time on legislation affecting public power.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; special counsel for Colorado River Board of California and Six Agency Committee, 315 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) $7,360 representing legal fees for services of this office and in California in legislation and litigation affecting California's interests in the Colorado River. Of this figure $2,000 was paid by the Colorado River Board and $5,360 by the Six Agency Committee, and of the total $3,240 represents payment for services rendered during the previous quarter ending December 31, 1947. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telephone and telegraph companies, suppliers of office materials. Approximately one-third of the total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice, it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Conferences and reports to clients on H. R. 2873, 3194, 5776, 5777, 5901; House Joint Resolution 226, and related bills; S. 1175, 1306, 2255, 2392; Senate Joint Resolution 145, and related bills.

Ely,[7] Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; attorney for Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif. (1) $2,100 as legal fees for services of this office and in California in connection with power and water contracts, conferences with Government departments, etc. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telephone and telegraph companies, suppliers of office materials, etc. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice, it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) None under this employment during the quarter covered by this report; work done related to litigation and departmental conferences; see the report filed as special counsel of the Colorado River Board and the Six Agency Committee for references to work covered by that employment.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; attorney for Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif. (1) $2,100 representing legal fees, etc., for services of

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[5] Filed for second quarter, 1947.

[6] Filed for third quarter, 1947.

[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

[11] Filed for first quarter, 1947.

this office and in California in negotiating with other water and power users, the Government departments, litigation, and legislative matters relating thereto. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telephone and telegraph, supplies of office materials. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice, it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telephone, telegraph, office rent, and general maintenance of law office. (4) None. (5) Conferences and reports to client on H. R. 2001, 2373, 3194; House Joint Resolution 225, and related bills; Interior Department appropriation bill (not yet numbered); S. 1175, Senate Joint Resolution 145.

Ely,[7] Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; special counsel, Department of Water and Power, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) $2,008.76, of which $208.76 represents reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses and $1,800 represents legal fees for services of this office and in California in connection with litigation, departmental matters, etc. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telephone and telegraph companies, suppliers of office materials, etc.; approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) None under this employment during the quarter covered by this report; see the report filed as special counsel of the Colorado River Board and the Six Agency Committee for references to work covered by that employment. Data was also obtained at request of Appropriations Committee staff.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; attorney for the Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) $1,500 representing legal fees for services of this office and in California in connection with power and water contracts, conferences with Government departments, and legislative matters incidental thereto. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telephone and telegraph companies, suppliers of office materials. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telephone, telegraph, office rent, and general maintenance of law office. (4) None. (5) Conferences and reports to clients on H. R. 727, 728, 2873, 3194, 4989, 5776, 5901; House Concurrent Resolution 123; House Joint Resolution 225, and related bills; S. 36, 37, 1175, 1985; Senate Joint Resolution 145.

Ely,[7] Northcutt, Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; attorney for Salt River Valley Water Users' Association, Phoenix, Ariz. (1) $2,100 legal fees for services in connection with power contracts, tax matters, and departmental business. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telephone, and telegraph companies, suppliers of office materials, etc. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice, it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) None under this employment during the quarter covered by the report; work done related to litigation and departmental conferences.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; attorney for Salt River Valley Water Users' Association, Phoenix, Ariz. This employment terminated January 5, 1948, effective February 5, 1948. (1) $722.25, of which $22.25 represents reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses and $700 represents legal fees for services in connection with power contracts, tax matters, and departmental business, and such incidental legislative questions as arose in connection therewith. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telephone and telegraph companies, suppliers of office materials. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice, it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telephone, telegraph, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Conferences and reports to clients on H. R. 2873.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; special counsel for Water Project Authority of the State of California, Public Works Building, Sacramento, Calif. (1) $1,500, the entire amount of which represents legal fees for services of this office and in California in connection with Central Valley power and water questions, and legislative matters incidental thereto. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telephone and telegraph companies, suppliers of office materials. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice, it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telephone, telegraph, office rent, and general maintenance of law office. (4) None. (5) Conferences and reports to clients on legislation related to Central Valley, including H. R. 2873, 3194, 4152, 4157, 5524, 5927, 5938; Interior Department appropriations bill (not yet numbered); S. 912, 2255, 2377.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; special counsel for Water Resources Board of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif. (1) None; services as special counsel are loaned by the Water Project Authority of the State of California, which pays a fee of $500 per month. See registration and report under that employment. (2) See No. (1) above. (3) See No. (1) above. (4) None. (5) Hearings and conferences on H. R. 4152, 4157, and 5524, 5927; S. 2377; Interior Department appropriation bill for fiscal year 1949 (not yet numbered).

Evans, Mrs. Ruth M., legislative-Federal relations division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,650. (2) Self (salary). Expenses: Hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash; NEA Journal (articles therein); informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Fahy, Kathleen (Mrs. Jack B. Fahy), 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.; American Parents Committee, 300 B Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $10.94 for miscellaneous expense; expended, $10.94. (2) Various. (3) Telephone calls, cab fares, lunches, and other miscellaneous expense. (4) [Blank.] (5) National School Health Services Act. Nation Science Foundation bill. Appropriatons for United States Children's Bureau. Federal aid for education bill.

Fairbanks, Joseph, 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Descendants of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence, Milton Addison Thomas, secretary-general, 212 West Highland Avenue, Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) None. (2) No payments. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2673, a bill to incorporate the Descendants of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence.

Fakler, Herman, 847 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Millers' National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) During the quarter for which this report is made, I received $5,000 salary as an officer of the Millers' National Federation. Legislative activity is only incidental to my duties as an officer of the association and no part of my salary is specifically allocated for that purpose. Legislative work is estimated to require not more than 5 percent of my time. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) I am not employed with respect to any specific legislation. As an officer of the association I am expected to keep the association informed concerning legislation directly affecting this industry and to engage in such activity as the association directs. This is the first quarter since the effective date of the act during which I have engaged in any legislative activity.

Farrington, Charles J., National Coal Association, 804 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $2,472.34 salary and out-of-pocket expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) Taxi and lunches. (4) [Blank.] (5) All bills affecting the coal industry.

Farshing, Donald D., Management Planning of Washington, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,300 gross salary received; $117.25 expenses. (2) Transportation, hotels, and restaurants. (3) Transportation and other out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Farshing, Donald D., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,950 gross salary received; $64.20 expenses. (2) Transportation, hotels, and restaurants. (3) Transportation and other out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Fawcett, Carlos J.,[10] 281 Summer Street, Boston, Mass. (1) I appeared before Senate and House Agriculture Committees in 1947 about the time of original filing in support of S. 1498 wool bill, for which no money was received or other form of remuneration. No activity since that date, hence no reports. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Fenning, Karl, National Press Building; R. D. Pittman, Bowen Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $245; expended $44.06. (2) Railway, hotel, telephone company. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2860.

Ferguson, Abner H.,[7] Associated Third Class Mail Users, 1139 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Fee for services, $7,500; expenses consisting of telegrams, telephones, taxi fares, travel, and printing, $137.15; total, $7,637.15. (2) To taxi drivers, Telephone & Telegraph Co., railroads, and printing company. (3) For services rendered. (4) None. (5) Postal rate increase bill.

Ferguson,[11] Abner H., 1139 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; United States Building and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Taxicabs, telephone calls, and telegrams, $55.02; general retainer as Washington counsel, United States Building and Loan League, less than one-half of work is in connection with legislation, $1,750; total, $1,805.02. (2) Taxicab drivers, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., and Western Union Telegraph Co. (3) Charges for services rendered. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting building and loan associations and general mortgage lending.

Ferguson,[8] Abner H., 1139 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; United States Building and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Taxicabs, telephone

[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

[8] Filed for second quarter, 1947.

[10] Filed with the Secretary only.

[11] Filed for first quarter, 1947.

calls, and telegrams, $36.05; expenses, trip to Wilmington, Del., $13.90; general retainer as Washington counsel, United States Building and Loan League; less than one-half of work is in connection with legislation, $1,750; total, $1,799.95. (2) Taxicab drivers; American Telephone & Telegraph Co.; Western Union Telegraph Co., and Pennsylvania Railroad Co. (3) Charges for services rendered. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting building and loan associations and general mortgage lending.

Ferguson,[6] Abner H., 1139 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; United States Building and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Taxicabs, telephone calls, and telegrams, $36.05; dinner for executive committee of league, $84.45; expenses to San Francisco, Calif., to attend annual convention of league, $522.32; general retainer as Washington counsel, United States Building and Loan League, less than one-half of work is in connection with legislation, $1,750; total $2,392.82. (2) Taxicab drivers, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., Western Union Telegraph Co., Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., and various hotels and incidental expenses. (3) Charges for services rendered. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting building and loan associations and general mortgage lending.

Ferguson,[7] Abner H., 1139 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; United States Building and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Taxicabs, telephone calls, and telegrams, $36.05; general retainer as Washington counsel, United States Building and Loan League; less than one-half of work is in connection with legislation, $1,750; total, $1,786.05. (2) Taxicab drivers, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., and Western Union Telegraph Co. (3) Charges for services rendered. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting building and loan associations and general mortgage lending.

Ferguson, Abner H., 1139 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Taxicabs, telephone calls, and telegrams, $19.45; hotel, railroad, and other expenses, trip to Chicago, $101.83; general retainer as Washington counsel, less than one-half of work in connection with legislation, $2,250; total, $2,371.28. (2) Taxicab drivers, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., Western Union Telegraph Co., Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., Bismark Hotel. (3) Charges for services rendered. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting building and loan associations and general mortgage lending.

Ferguson, John A., Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary (allocated), $3,125; expenses, $718.82. (2) Reported as disbursements by Independent Natural Gas Association of America; miscellaneous including taxis, tips, luncheons, etc., $395.14; travel and hotel, $323.68. (3) See (2) above. (4) Natural Gas News Letter. (5) Amendments to Natural Gas Act.

Ferguson, John H., Committee for the Marshall Plan to Aid European Recovery, 537 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, January 1 to March 31, 1948, $2,999.10; travel and transportation expenses, January 1 to March 31, 1948, $611.31. (2) Salary received used for personal expenses, no part of it spent on behalf of the Committee for the Marshall Plan To Aid European Recovery; travel and transportation expenses covered my actual expenses traveling on behalf of the committee. (3) Same as (2) above. (4) None, except through ordinary press channels. (5) Legislation to provide for a European recovery program.

Fernbach,[7] Frank L., United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Salary, $1,175; expenses, $880. (2) The salary was paid to the undersigned, and the expenses to railroads, airlines, and to hotels and restaurants. (3) Expenses were paid for transportation, hotels, and meals. (4) I have distributed printed material on the nature of the proposed bill to editors of the labor press generally. I have also written, for the fall 1947 issue of the Arbitration Journal, an article entitled "Training for Arbitration," which makes reference to the labor extension service bill. (5) In support of a labor extension service bill which will establish a Labor Extension Service Division in the United States Department of Labor.

Fernbach, Frank L., United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Salary, $1,175; expenses, $850. (2) Salary paid to the undersigned and expenses to railroads and air lines, to hotels and restaurants. (3) Expenses were paid for transportation, hotels, and meals. (4) I have distributed material on the nature of the proposed bill to editors of the labor press generally. (5) In support of a labor extension service bill which will establish a Labor Extension Service in the United States Department of Labor.

Ferris, Muriel, League of Women Voters of the United States, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $172.92 salary every 2 weeks. Received and expended: Carfare to and from the Capitol and travel, $41.60. (2) None expended in carrying on work except for carfare and travel. (3) Carfare and travel only. (4) Trends in Government action, publications of the League of Women Voters, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (5) I am employed principally to inform league members on legislative matters; secondarily to influence legislation. For legislation, see league program adopted by national convention, 1946, attached.

Filer, Harry L., New York, New Haven & Hartford Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn. (1) Salary $5,300 and expenses $588.05. (2) Hotels, restaurants, transportation companies, taxis, telephone, etc. (3) Expenses for traveling and as shown in item (2). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting employer.

Fillius, Maurice W., National Association of Alcoholic Beverage Importers, Inc., 703 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received retainer from National Association of Alcoholic Beverage Importers, Inc., reported on Form B, filed March 15, 1948. Reimbursed also in the amount of $1.60 for expenditures made. (2) $1.60 paid to taxicab operators. (3) Taxicab fare to Capitol and return. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5965.

Fillius, Maurice W., Puerto Rico Rum Institute, 703 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received retainer from Puerto Rico Rum Institute as reported on Form B, filed January 7, 1947. No receipts and no expenditures made for purpose of influencing legislation during quarter ending March 31, 1948. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3282 and H. R. 3283.

Finkel, William H., Employees Committee for Low-Cost Retirement Benefits, 1186 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $25 on February 3 from Employees Committee for Low-Cost Retirement Benefits as part payment of $157.75 due me for expenses incurred June through December 1947, leaving balance of $132.75 due me, plus $60.90 expended January, February, March 1948. Also received $50 on March 1, 1948, as part repayment of previously reported loan to committee of $250, leaving a balance of $200. (2) The $60.90 mentioned above was spent by me for carfare, telephone, and other miscellaneous expenses on behalf of committee work. (3) Carfare, telephone, and miscellaneous. (4) None during period January through March 1948. (5) Crosser Act, passed into law July 31, 1946.

Finucane, James F., National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $900 salary, $62 expenses. (2) Inapplicable clause. (3) Inapplicable clause. (4) Routine news releases moved on press wires to clients throughout United States as well as local dailies and general circulation religious magazines. (5) To oppose UMT and similar bills of a war-provoking nature; and to support such bills as the bills for disarmament and world peace.

Fisher, Lewis H., 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association Retired Civil Employees, Canal Construction Service Committee, Balboa Heights, C. Z., and 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts from the National Association of Retired Civil Employees, Washington, D. C., $300; receipts from Canal Construction Committee, Balboa Heights, C. Z., none. (2) Various individuals and companies. (3) Taxicab fare, $10; postage, $9; telephone, $22.50; office help, $85; stationery, $6.50; meals, $1.50. (4) Annuitant. (5) Support of legislation in the interest of annuitants, potential annuitants, and civil pensioners.

Fitzpatrick, F. Stuart, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received: Salary, $3,250. Expended: Transportation, $2; lunches, $30. (2) Taxi companies and the Statler Hotel. (3) Transportation to and from, and communication with, the Capitol; other necessary normal expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in the general fields of public works, city planning, urban redevelopment, and housing.

Fleming,[5] Charles Henry, 1011 DuPont Circle Building, 1344 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Coast Guard League, 1300 E Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) Nothing. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting veterans of service in the United States Coast Guard or any legislation affecting the United States Coast Guard in which the league has a definite interest.

Fleming,[6] Charles Henry, 1011 DuPont Circle Building, 1344 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Coast Guard League, 1300 E Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) Nothing. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting veterans of service in the United States Coast Guard or any legislation affecting the United States Coast Guard in which the league has a definite interest.

Fleming,[7] Charles Henry, 1011 DuPont Circle Building, 1344 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Coast Guard League, 1300 E Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) Nothing. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting veterans of service in the United States Coast Guard or any legislation affecting the United States Coast Guard in which the league has a definite interest.

Fleming, Charles Henry, 1011 DuPont Circle Building, 1344 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Coast Guard League, 1300 E Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) Nothing. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting veterans of service in the United States Coast Guard, or any legislation affecting the United States Coast Guard in which the league has a definite interest.

Flinn, W. G., grand lodge representative, International Association of Machinists, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Floyd, William M., 1115 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. Regular Veterans' Association. (1) Salary from January 1, 1948, through March 31, 1948, $900. (2) No

[6] Filed for third quarter, 1947.
[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

[5] Filed for the second quarter, 1947.
[6] Filed for the third quarter, 1947.
[7] Filed for the fourth quarter, 1947.

one. (3) [Blank.] (4) The Regular, 1115 Fifteenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (5) Legislation in behalf of veterans.

Forbes, E. F., Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Salary, $5,000.04. (2) Personal use only. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Not employed to propose or oppose legislation. This work is only incidental to the regular work of the president and general manager of the association.

Ford, Mrs. J. A., 305 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE., Washington, D. C.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) In carrying out his work approximate average $30 per week. (2) Meals, hotel, and traveling expenses when away from my own home. (3) Above. (4) The Townsend National Weekly. (5) H. R. 16, H. R. 2476, S. 1510, to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys.

Ford, John B., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) A fair allocation of my salary to lobbying activities since registration (and for the period) is $100. I also spent $3.50 for taxi fares in connection with lobbying. Both amounts were paid to me by the National Federation of American Shipping, Inc. (2) To me. (3) Compensation for personal services and $3.50 for expenses. (4) No articles or editorials. (5) To oppose legislation authorizing the foreign transfer of United States vessels. To support Panama Canal toll decreases. Other legislation affecting shipping from time to time.

Ford, Tirey L., Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Fort, J. Carter, Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) For all services rendered the Association of American Railroads, as described in registration form B, filed in December 1946, registrant received salary at the rate shown in such registration and in the supplement to the registration filed by registrant on January 10, 1948, and received in addition $199.15, as reimbursement for traveling expenses while away from Washington and certain expenses incurred in Washington. Of the salary received, $5,925 is estimated as allocable to legislative activities. Of the expenses for which registrant was reimbursed, $75.85 is estimated to be allocable to legislative activities. The expenses above shown do not include expenses incurred in the last quarter of 1947, for which registrant was reimbursed in January 1948 and which were included in registrant's report on Form C for the last quarter of 1947. (2) The expenses above shown were paid to the Hotel Biltmore, New York, N. Y.; Chicago Club, Chicago, Ill.; railroad dining cars, various restaurants, taxis, etc. (3) Traveling expenses while away from Washington and such expenses in Washington as business meals, taxis, etc. (4) None. (5) Generally, to support all legislation in the interests of the railroads and a sound national transportation policy and to oppose all legislation contrary to the interests of the railroads and a sound national transportation policy. Bills supported during the first quarter of 1948 included H. R. 221, S. 110, H. R. 5711, S. 1567, H. R. 1639, H. R. 2298, H. R. 2759, and H. R. 5476 (with amendments). Bills opposed during the same quarter included Senate Joint Resolution 111, House Joint Resolution 192, House Joint Resolution 194, H. R. 4092, and S. 1812.

Fort,[9] Josiah, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Tobacco Association of United States, Greenville, N. C. (1) Salary, $2,500; stenographer, 6 weeks at $45, 8 weeks at $50, $670; rent, $235; travel, $83.97; entertainment, $81.30; office supplies and periodicals, $213.56; miscellaneous service $232.25; total, $4,016. (2) Receipted bills available for inspection. (3) See (1) above. (4) [Blank.] (5) To assist in getting fair consideration for American leaf tobacco in connection with aid programs, for delivery through private trade channels.

Fox, O. J., Welfare Federation Act Committee of One Thousand, Inc., Post Office Box 916, Oklahoma City, Okla. (1) to (5) No activity.

Frampton, Merle E., New York Institute for the Education of the Blind, 999 Pelham Parkway, New York City. (1) None. I receive no money from anyone or any source for my expenses or activities in the interest of the handicapped. (2) No one. (3) [Blank.] (4) Labor Review. (5) House Joint Resolutions 302 and 303; Senate Resolution 176—January 20–21—to provide funds for the President's Committee on the Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

Francis, Joseph H., National Board of Fur Farm Organizations, Post Office Box 338, Morgan, Utah. (1) $4,560 from National Board of Fur Farm Organizations. (2) $3,000 salary, acting secretary of organization; $1,560, travel and per diem. Paid to transportation companies and hotels for lodging, telephone, and telegraph. (3) Shown under item (2). (4) American Fur Breeder, National Fur News, Fur Journal, Black Fox magazines. (5) Any and all legislation affecting fur-farming industry of the United States.

Fredrickson, Fred J., Lafayette Hotel, Washington, D. C. (home address: Valley City, N. Dak.); North Dakota Resources Board, 311 North Broadway, Fargo, N. Dak., and State Water Conservation Commission, Bismarck, N. Dak. (1) Quarterly salary for January, February, and March 1948, before deductions for withholding and social-security taxes, $1,350; and reimbursed expenses for same period, $1,343.41. Only a small part of those items was for legislative work. (2) Lafayette Hotel, Washington, D. C., and other hotels and eating establishments; railroad, air-line, telephone, and telegraph companies; taxicabs; busses; mimeographers; lithographers; office supplies; and post office. Only a small part of those items was for legislative work. (3) Lodging and office space; meals; transportation; communications; mimeographing; office supplies and postage. (4) None. (5) Bills affecting irrigation, reclamation, water conservation, flood control, land and mineral development and utilization in North Dakota, and allied legislation.

Fuchs, Joseph, 408 Wesley Temple Building, Minneapolis, Minn.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Received from my employer $106.70 which is for railroad fare, hotel, and meals while in Washington, D. C., several days during the month of February. Otherwise I am carrying on my actual work, and not lobbying. (2) Nothing has been paid out by me. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) In support of H. R. 16.

Fuller, George M., National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) January, $392.70; February, $111.58; March, $285.94. (2) Miscellaneous. (3) Entertainment and transportation. (4) None. (5) Oppose any legislation inimical to the interests of the lumber industry and support any legislation which would be helpful to it.

Fyffe & Clarke (David R. Clarke-Albert J. Smith-John Harrington), Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $375. (2) Railroads, hotels, taxicabs, restaurant, etc., for registrant. (3) Registrant's personal expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation affecting manufacturers generally.

Galvin, M. J., Minnesota Railroads, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn. (1) None (all of the undersigned's clients as listed on his registration have paid the expenses reported herein and the undersigned's salary on the ratio of the mileage which they have within the State of Minnesota. Amount paid is the same as that shown expended). (2) January 26 to 29, 1948, inclusive; Hotel Raleigh, $71.60; Mayflower Hotel, $48; Shoreham Hotel, $88; Statler Hotel, $25; all Washington, D. C., and St. Paul Union Depot, St. Paul, Minn., railroad transportation, $23.12; total, $255.72. (3) Board and room, transportation, etc. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting railroads, such as Bulwinkle bill, etc.

Gammons, Earl H., Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., 801 Warner Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $125.50. (2) Restaurants, hotels, and incidental expenses. (3) Entertainment and out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) None.

Gardiner, Elizabeth G., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Geary, Paul M., National Electrical Contractors' Association, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No expenses incurred and no money received other than salary originally reported on Form B, filed May 22, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) None. (4) None. (5) No special legislation under consideration.

Gebhard, Mrs. Paul, 1751 N Street, NW., Washington, D. C.; Presbyterian Church, United States of America, Division of Social Education and Action, Board of Christian Education, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Personal expenses refunded; travel, $261.82; lodging, $85.36; food, $35.45; total, $382.63. (2) [Blank.] (3) Lobbying in the interest of social legislation on which the Presbyterian General Assembly has taken action. (4) Social Progress magazine, special bulletins. (5) Same as (3).

Geiselman, R. H., John F. Jelke Co., 759 South Washtenaw Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) No money is received other than salary, incidental to regular employment as legal counsel and assistant secretary of the company, and reimbursement for transportation, lodging, and meals. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Support of proposals for repeal of taxes on oleomargarine.

George, Leo E., National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 1510 H Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, January, February, March, 1948, $2,499.99; travel and organizational expenses not connected with the enactment of legislation, $605.07. (2) The travel and organization expenses referred to in (1) above were a reimbursement for actual expenses for transportation, hotels, meals, and incidental minor expenses. (3) See above. (4) The Union Postal Clerk, the Federation News Service bulletin, the Federation Press Service. (5) Support of measures designed to improve the civil service retirement system; improve and strengthen the civil service; improve the hours, wages, and conditions of post-office clerks and to improve the postal service.

Gerrity, Harry J., Washington Bridge Co., 1001 Hill Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) S. 569 and S. 570.

Giddings, Ernest, assistant director, legislative-Federal relations division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,300,

[9] Filed with the Clerk only.

which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service, $250. (2) Self (salary). Expenses: Hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Gilbert, C. C., Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn. (1) $1,725, salary as secretary, Southern States Industrial Council. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Such legislation as affects industry.

Gillerman, Jeanette M., Committee of One Thousand, 37 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received: Salary, $200, and for expenses, $131.79. (2) Various. (3) Furthering aims of Committee of One Thousand. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Glazier, William, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, CIO, 604 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Salary, $1,105.02; expenses, $227.50. (2) Expenses paid out for taxicabs, phone, meals, etc. (3) See (2) above. (4) Dispatcher, publication of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, CIO. (5) To support all legislation in interest of American workers and longshoremen and warehousemen specifically; oppose undemocratic legislation.

Glazier, William, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards, CIO, 86 Commercial Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) No salary or personal expenses; $300 or $100 per month received toward cost of office operations. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) Voice, publication of the National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards, CIO. (5) To support all legislation in interest of American workers and maritime workers specifically; oppose undemocratic legislation.

Goldman, Olive Remington, Committee for the Marshall Plan To Aid European Recovery Program, 537 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, January 9–March 6, 1948, $1,665; travel and transportation expenses, January 9–March 6, 1948, $516.89 (services terminated March 6, 1948). (2) Salary received used for personal expenses, no part of it spent on behalf of the Committee for the Marshall Plan To Aid European Recovery. Travel and transportation expenses covered my actual expenses traveling on behalf of the committee. (3) Same as (2) above. (4) None, except through ordinary press channels. (5) Legislation to provide for a European recovery program.

Goodbee,[10] Ann Dodge, Wardman Park Hotel, Washington, D. C. (1) I received a $250 retainer, no expenses were allowed and as the bill failed to pass the Senate District Committee the entire project came to a close with the recess of Congress (this covers the entire period since my registration). (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) An amendment to the District of Columbia unemployment compensation tax law.

Goodman, Leo, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $750. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) CIO News, Autoworker. (5) Rent control, housing, and community development, and planning.

Gordon, Spencer, Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; American Institute of Accountants, 13 East Forty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None received; $750 expended. (2) $750 to Gordon Rule. (3) Associate work. (4) The Journal of Accountancy and the Certified Public Accountant. (5) Opposing H. R. 2657.

[10] Filed with the Secretary only.

Goss,[9] Albert S., the National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,875. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Goss, C. Bert, 725 Fifteenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C.; Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 3301 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) received no money other than salary as vice president of Hill & Knowlton of New York. Only very small proportion of time was spent on activities that could be deemed to indirectly influence legislation. (2) During the quarter the principal expenditures paid out that could be interpreted as having any influence indirectly on legislation consisted of expenditures for cab fare to and from Capitol Hill and to and from Government agencies concerned with legislation; and for lunches for Members of Congress and staff members of various congressional committees. Expenditures for lunches were paid to the Senate Restaurant, the Carroll Arms Hotel, the National Press Club, etc. Total expenditures for cab fare and lunches during the quarter in this connection amounted to less than $100. (3) See (2) above. (4) Caused no articles or editorials to be published. (5) Insofar as any activities intended to influence legislation indirectly, they were concerned with legislation to establish a national air policy. In general, represents interests of all clients of Hill & Knowlton.

Gourley, Lawrence L., 902 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; American Osteopathic Association, 136 North Clark Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Retainer $3,000. (2) [Blank]. (3) [Blank]. (4) None. (5) Bills affecting the public health.

Graham, Chester A., Friends Committee on National Legislation, 2111 Florida Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Gross salary, January, February, March $962.40; travel expense, $1,107.92. (2) various. (3) Travel is for the purpose of discussing developments on universal military training legislation, and to organize opposition against it. (4) The organization sends a news letter to a limited number of subscribers and Friends about once a month. (5) In general, to support measures leading to peace and humanitarian ends, such as world organization and world economic stability, world disarmament, support for the rights of conscience, opposition to conscription and the militarization of America.

Green, Abner,[9] 23 West Twenty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) The Lamp, published monthly by the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. General releases to the press. (5) Naturalization, immigration, citizenship.

Green, Angus, American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Receipts: $1,668.99 salary, plus $1,100.79, reimbursement of the expenditures referred to in Nos. (2) and (3) below. (2) Transportation and communications services; post office; hotels; restaurants, etc. (3) Travel, living, and business expenses connected with employment. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting shipping industry which concerns employer.

Greene, Ernest W., 731 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, P. O. Box 2450, Honolulu, T. H. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any legislation and did not during the first quarter of 1948.

Greenman, Shea, Lane, Sandomire & Zimet, 46 Cedar Street, New York, N. Y; Ion Stanescu, Ambassador Hotel, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) A private bill authorizing Ion Stanescu and his wife, Catherina, Rumanian subjects, to remain in the United States notwithstanding the immigration laws.

Greenway, J. Cole, New York State Conference in Opposition to the St. Lawrence project, 30 Vesey Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) No expenses incurred in connection with work done for New York State Conference in Opposition to the St. Lawrence project. Greenwood, Joseph R., 1029 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Grimes, Weston B., 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn. (1) Received (includes office and general expenses totaling $1,489.78), $4,814.77; expended (for purposes designated in the Lobbying Act), $5.50. (2) Taxicabs. (3) Taxicabs to and from the Capitol. (4) None. (5) Legislation concerning commodity exchanges, international commodity agreements, export and imports, taxes, and regulation of business generally.

Grinberg, P. Irving,[9] Jewelers Vigilance Committee, Inc., 17 West Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Expended $71.60. (2) Hotels and railroad fare. (3) [Blank.] (4) National Jeweler, Jewelers' Circular-Keystone, Jewelry, Jewelers' Outlook, Jewelers' Newsletter, Executive Jeweler, ANRJA Bulletin, NACJ Bulletin, Mid-Continent Jeweler, Northwestern Jeweler, Southern Jeweler, Pacific Goldsmith, Trader and Canadian Jeweler, Manufacturing Jeweler. (5) Interested in securing relief from excise taxes as applied to jewelry.

Groom, B. E.,[9] North Dakota Tax Equality Committee, 11½ Broadway, Fargo, N. Dak. (1) Received from membership, $1,776; office expense, January, February, and March 1948, $1,928.27. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) In support of a program of tax equality.

Haas, Frank E., Western Association of Railway Executives, 204 South Canal Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary as per original registration and reimbursement of expenses in the total amount of $1,029.56. (2) To Stevens and Congress Hotels, Chicago, Ill.; to Raleigh Hotel, Washington, D. C.; to Statler Hotel, St. Louis, Mo.; to St. Francis Hotel, San Francisco, Calif.; to Oklahoma Biltmore Hotel, Oklahoma City; to Marion Hotel, Little Rock, Ark.; to the Pullman Co.; and to various restaurants, taxicab companies, and various individuals in nominal amounts. (3) To meals, $388.05; to hotels, $217.64; to Pullman fare, $170.02; to taxi fare, $98.30; to miscellaneous for telephone, postage, stenographic services, and miscellaneous expense, $155,55. (4) None. (5) All legislation of mutual interest to the class I railroads operating in the western district of their employees.

Haas, Herbert A., the Employees Committee for Low-Cost Retirement Benefits, 1186 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $25 on February 3 and $80 on February 25, 1948, for total of $105, from Employees Committee for Low Cost Retirement Benefits as part payment of expenses of $125.40 due me for period June through December 1948, leaving a balance of $20.40, plus $152.80 expenses incurred January, February, March 1948. Also received $50 on March 1, 1948, as part repayment of $200 loan to committee (previously reported), leaving balance of $150. (2) The $105 mentioned above was spent by me for carfare, telephone, and other miscellaneous expenses. Also includes sum of $15.93 paid to Lafayette Hotel, Washington, D. C., and $10 to United States Government Printing Office for literature used during my stay. Also cab fares. (3) Various appointments in Washington, D. C., in connection with proposed bills relative to railroad-retirement system. (4) None during period

[9] Filed with the Clerk only.

[9] Filed with the Clerk only.

January through March 1948. (5) Crosser Act, passed into law July 31, 1946.

Haas, John A., the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expended $13.80. (2) Various. (3) Phones and taxis. (4) None. (5) Any legislation which may effect milk producers.

Haddock, Hoyt S., CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,440 in salary and $100 for expenses. About one-fourth of time spent on legislative activities. (2) Taxi companies, telephone company, dispensers of periodicals. (3) Taxis, telephone calls, periodicals. (4) CIO News, NMU Pilot, IFAWA Fisherman, American Marine Engineer. (5) Any legislation affecting members of member unions.

Haddon, George A., Philadelphia Police Pension Fund Association, 420 City Hall Annex, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Received and paid out $1,090 for living expenses, train and taxi fares, meals, refreshments, entertaining, etc. (2) George A. Haddon, treasurer, Philadelphia Police Pension Fund Association, Philadelphia, Pa. (3) Commuting daily to Washington, D. C., for train and taxi fares to, from, and in Washington, meals and refreshments on trains and in Washington and entertaining, etc. (4) None. (5) Trying to have Federal and municipal employee pensions under $1,440 exempt from income tax the same as under the Railroad Retirement Act. Also to keep existing pensions out of Social Security.

Hadley,[6] Harlan V., 830 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.; Committee on Taxation, Automobile Manufacturers Association, 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) Salary, as secretary, committee on taxation, Automobile Manufacturers Association, months of July, August, September 1947, $750; phone calls, taxi fares for same period, $4.50. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) Federal automobile excise taxes and miscellaneous taxes affecting motor industry and motorists.

Hadley, Harlan V., 830 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.; Automobile Manufacturers Association, New Center Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) None, other than one-quarter of the annual compensation set forth in supplemental registration statement and miscellaneous office expenses and taxi fares not exceeding $10. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Federal excise-tax legislation, materials control, and such other legislation as the association may hereafter from time to time indicate.

Hallbeck, E. C., National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, January, February, March 1948, $2,333.31; legislative expenses, January, February, March 1948, $557.21; travel and organization expenses not connected with the enactment of legislation, $59.69; executive board meeting expenses, $28.30. (2) Incidental expenses, streetcar, taxi, meals, etc., $182.55; Government Printing Office, $135.91; travel and incidental expenses of Mrs. Herman H. Lowe, Nashville, Tenn., president, Women's Auxiliary, NFPOC, $100; joint Senate and House recording facility, $72; expenses attending legislative meetings, $66.75. (3) Travel and organization expenses, incidental expenses and expenses of attending legislative meetings are an actual reimbursement for cash expended for transportation, meals, hotels, and minor incidental expenses. Government Printing Office expense is the cost of reprints from CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Joint Senate and House recording facility, copies of radio transcriptions. (4) The Union Postal Clerk, the Federation News Service Bulletin, the Federation Press Service. (5) Support of measures designed to improve and strengthen the civil service; improve Civil Service retirement law; improve the hours, wages, and conditions of post-office clerks, and to improve the postal service.

Hamlet, Harry G., Retired Officers Association, 1600 Twentieth Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $600. No part of this sum was received specifically for the purpose of attempting to influence legislative action. Expended nothing. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) Retired Officers Association Bulletin. Release of the association's president concerning retirements for physical disability to the Army-Navy Journal, Army and Navy Register, Armed Forces, and selected newspapers, and other miscellaneous brief announcements to said publications. (5) Legislation affecting retired officers, warrant officers and nurses, of the Army, Navy, Air Corps, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey and Public Health Service.

Hanscom, William A., 1118 Twenty-fifth Street, NW., Washington, D. C.; Oil Workers International Union-CIO, 301 East Fifth Street, Fort Worth, Tex. (1) Received salary, $1,125; expenses, $345. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) Union News Service and the International Oil Worker. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to those objectives.

Haren, Herbert F., Townsend National Weekly, Inc., and Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Approximately $1,250. (2) All money used in living expenses and no record kept. (3) [Blank.] (4) Townsend National Weekly, Inc. (5) The Townsend plan.

Harper, Elsie Dorothy, National Board of the Young Women's Christian Association, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $375; expenses, $269. (2) Elsie Dorothy Harper. (3) Presenting to the President, the Cabinet, and both Houses of Congress (a) the opinion on subjects related to (5) below, of the convention of the Young Women's Christian Associations held triennially and (b) the opinion of the National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations in line with actions taken by the convention. (4) None. (5) Legislation related to international security, social and economic justice, education, health, and civil liberties.

Harris, Ronald B., 602, T. W. Patterson Building, Fresno, Calif.; Irrigation Districts Association of California, 932 Pacific Building, Fourth and Market Streets, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Expenses of two trips to Washington, D. C., January 5 to January 20, $473.22; February 22 to March 2, $410.09. (2) The foregoing amounts cover entire expenditures and nothing paid to anyone except for own personal living expenses and travel expenses. (3) See (1) and (2). (4) None. (5) H. R. 3194.

Harris, Winder R., 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received, $255.37; expended, $255.37. (2) Various. (3) Soap and towel service, copies of Federal Register, typewriter rental, rental of electric water cooler, purchase of office clock, stationery and office supplies, telegrams, stamps, purchase of Government publications, streetcar, bus, and railroad transportation, hotel accommodations, association dues, taxicab fares. (Office rent, telephone account, and secretary's salary paid directly by employer from New York.) (4) None. (5) Not employed for the purpose, but took interest in S. 2202, Senate Joint Resolution 173, and Senate Joint Resolution 111.

Hart, Merwin K., National Economic Council, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) For lobbying activity, $116.24; salary, $2,883.32; total, $2,999.56. (2) Pennsylvania and B. & O. R. R. Co., Willard Hotel, two or three restaurants in Washington, taxi drivers, and miscellaneous, $116.24. (3) In connection with appearances before Senate Foreign Relations Committee and House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and for getting about Washington to secure information on other legislation. (4) Economic Council Letters, issued semimonthly. (5) So-called Marshall plan, bills for Federal aid to education, immigration, etc.

Hart, Stephen H., National Livestock Tax Committee, Denver, Colo. (1) During the quarter the National Livestock Tax Committee paid to me a per diem of $50 a day for actual time spent in study, advice, conferences, and correspondence concerning general livestock tax questions including the analysis of the present provisions of the Internal Revenue Code and current rulings and decisions concerning Federal taxation of livestock operators. Such activities also included work in connection with proposal of the National Livestock Tax Committee to amend the Internal Revenue Code, recognizing capital gains in sale of breeding livestock and permitting deduction of ordinary recurring ranching expenditures. It is impossible to determine what part of my services related to this problem, but it is my opinion that none of my activity during the preceding quarter could be interpreted as lobbying. During the quarter a total of $800 for legal services was paid to me for all my activities and services. I was also reimbursed $161.95 for out-of-pocket expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Harter, Dow D., Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receive annual retainer from the B. F. Goodrich Co. for all services as its Washington counsel. Allocation of amount paid for my services between legal and legislative activities is not feasible. Amount received during first quarter of 1948, $1,875. In addition, receive reimbursement for long-distance telephone, travel, taxicab fares, and out-of-pocket expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) The B. F. Goodrich Co. is interested in legislation relating to the maintenance of facilities for the production of an ample supply of synthetic rubber in the United States for commercial and national defense purposes. It is interested in various proposals now under study by Congress for a long-range rubber program for this country. It is also interested in the repeal of the present excise taxes on tires and tubes, and in other legislative proposals which come before Congress from time to time.

Hawes, Robert N., 1028 Barr Building, Washington, D. C., Grays Harbor Industries, Inc., Aberdeen, Wash. (1) From Grays Harbor Industries, Inc., $2,500. (2) Joseph T. King, associate, $500; Congressional Secretaries Dinner Committee, $25; cut-of-pocket, $14.10. (3) Joseph T. King, retainer, $500, to assist in legislation. Congressional Secretaries Dinner Committee, ad in program, $25. Taxis, restaurants, telephone, telegraph, $14.10. (4) None. (5) Reference to Olympic National Park.

Hawkins, Paul M., 1401 K Street, NW., Washington, D. C.; American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $1,800 salary, only a small fraction of which was for lobbying activities; $281.37 expenses, only a small fraction of which was expended for lobbying activities. (2) Taxicabs, railroads, restaurants, hotels, air lines. (3) Transportation, meals, rooms. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the hotel industry.

Hayden, Harry Vere, Jr., 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; the American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) $250 salary semimonthly, less withholding and social-security taxes, $44.80 incidental expenses for months of January, February, and March

[6] Filed for third quarter, 1947.

1948. (2) Harry Vere Hayden, Jr. (3) $44.80 incidental expenses for months of January, February, and March 1948; taxis, carfare, phone calls, meals. (4) The American Legion magazine, New York City, the National Legionnaire, Indianapolis, Ind., National Legislative Bulletin, Washington, D. C. (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations, the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the national convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion.

Hays, Joseph H., Western Association of Railway Executives, 204 South Canal Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary as per original registration and reimbursement of expenses in the amount of $1,851.75. (2) Mayflower and Shoreham Hotels, Washington, D. C.; St. Charles Hotel, New Orleans, La.; the Pullman Co.; to various taxicab companies, restaurants, hotels, and various others in nominal amounts. (3) To Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., $500.63; to Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., $108.94; to St. Charles Hotel, New Orleans, La., $25.16; to the Pullman Co., for pullman space, $135.90; to various cab and bus companies, etc., for local transportation, $127.40; for phone calls and telegraph, $95.46; to various restaurants, hotels, etc., for meals, $695.66; for postage, stenographic services, stationery, supplies, and miscellaneous expense, $162.60. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting class I railroads operating in the western district.

Hazen, John C., 1008 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West Thirty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Meals, $177.65; hotel, $16.02; taxis, $46.60; transportation, rail-plane, $71.95; miscellaneous, $15.80. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) [Blank.]

Heberton, K. W., 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary of $800 per month, which is paid for all services rendered, only a part of which concerns legislation. Out-of-pocket travel and incidental expenses, $153.60. (2) Taxi drivers and restaurants. (3) Transportation and luncheons. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the interest of the Western Union Telegraph Co.

Hecht, George J., 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y.; American Parents Committee (without salary), 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $37.13 for traveling expenses, entertainment, etc.; expended, $37.13. (2) Various. (3) Railroad fare, miscellaneous expense. (4) The Parents' Magazine and School Management. (5) National School Health Services Act; National Science Foundation bill; appropriations for United States Children's Bureau; Federal aid for education bill.

Hedges, Marion H., National Committee for the Extension of Labor Education, 2117 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $600, legislative consultant services. (2) paid to self. (3) Living expenses for self. (4) [Blank.] (5) A bill to establish a Labor Extension Service in the Department of Labor.

Heiney, Robert B., National Canners Association, 1739 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,625 as one-quarter year's salary as assistant to secretary of association for all work performed; $92.46 has been received as reimbursement for expenses incurred. (2) Taxi fares and miscellaneous expenses, $52.15; traveling expense incident to attendance annual meeting, Tennessee-Kentucky Canners Association, Nashville, Tenn., February 16–17, 1948, $40.31. (3) See above. (4) National Canners Information Letter (5) Opposing S. 2173, supporting H R. 6050 and S. 2409. Routine following through CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and newspapers, and otherwise keeping informed of legislation affecting the canning industry

Henderson, Elmer W., National Council for a Permanent FEPC, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Travel, telephone calls, and living expenses, January 1 to March 31, 1948, $1,486.10; no salary. (2) [Blank.] (3) For travel, telephone calls, and living expenses, $1,486.10; no salary. (4) [Blank.] (5) Permanent fair employment legislation, S. 984 and H. R. 2824.

Henderson, Joseph D., American Association of Small Business, 602 Carondelet Building, New Orleans, La. (1) Salary of $1,500 (based on $6,000 per year) received this quarter, from the American Association of Small Business. No money expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Small Business Review, official monthly publication of the American Association of Small Business; routine news releases to newspapers and radio stations. (5) To support legislation favorable to small business; to oppose legislation unfavorable to small business, standing always for that which is right for the country and the will of the majority.

Henney, Mrs. Elizabeth C., Mr. John J. O'Connor for National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, room 423, Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $912.50 for two and a half months' retainer fee at $325 a month. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) The National Science Foundation bill.

Hensel, Robert E., Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, of the above address, of which registrant is an associate, expended $5.39 in connection with the proposed legislation described in item (5) hereof, for which it was or will be reimbursed by the American Tobacco Co. (2) The New York Telephone Co. (3) Telephone toll calls. (4) None. (5) Tax legislation extending the 85-percent dividend-received credit to dividends received from resident foreign corporations to the extent that such resident foreign corporations derive income from United States sources.

Hensel, Robert E., Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, of the above address, of which registrant is an associate, expended $18.88 in connection with the proposed legislation described in item (5) hereof, for which it was or will be reimbursed by Patino Mines & Enterprises Consolidated, Inc. (2) New York Telephone Co., $7.23; miscellaneous public taxis, restaurants, etc., $11.65; total, $18.88. (3) Telephone toll calls, $7.23; out-of-pocket expenses for meals, taxis, etc., $11.65; total $18.88. (4) None. (5) Tax legislation amending statute extending period of limitation for claiming foreign tax credit beyond 7-year-limitation period proposed by Treasury Department in its recommendations to the House Ways and Means Committee under date of March 3, 1948.

Herndon, Maurice G., Washington Loan & Trust Building, Ninth and F Streets, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Insurance Agents, 80 Maiden Lane, New York, N. Y. (1) No money received or expended during preceding calendar quarter. Status of registrant the same as stated in original Form B and accompanying letter of explanation, filed March 6, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Herrmann, Louis F., 1731 I Street, NW., Washington, D. C.; the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (1) $3.15. (2) Taxi fare. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Any legislation which may affect milk producers.

Hester, Ewart A., Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, January, February, and March, $2,500. (2) No expenses or disbursements for this quarter. (3) None. (4) None. (5) See supplementary statement paragraph 2 attached to Form B filed by me January 9, 1948.

Hewes & Awalt, a law partnership, consisting of the following partners: Thomas Hewes, F. G. Awalt, Samuel O. Clark, Jr., Harold E. Mitchell, Raymond Sparks, Henry L. Shepherd, John S. Murtha, and Maxwell M. Merritt, 93 Elm Street, Hartford, Conn., and 822 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Life Insurance Association of America, 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) This registrant received during the first quarter of 1948 the sum of $10,000 from the Life Insurance Association of America, to apply on account of services rendered during the calendar year 1947. This registrant also received during the first quarter of 1948 the sum of $221.74 in reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenditures incurred during the calendar year 1947, and represents all expenditures as reported on Form C for the quarters ending June 30, 1947, September 30, 1947, and December 31, 1947, with the exception of one item amounting to $1.86 for which registrant has not yet received reimbursement. (2) This registrant expended $69.31 during the calendar quarter ended March 31, 1948, in connection with its employment by the above-named association, for which registrant has not received reimbursement. (3) The money received was in payment of legal services rendered and reimbursement for expenses, as set forth in the attached statement. The money expended represents expenses for transportation and communication, also listed in the statement attached. (4) None. (5) Any revision of Internal Revenue Code affecting life insurance and annuities.

Hines, Lewis G., national legislative representative, American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for 3 months, $2,080. Expenses for January 1948, $36.80; February, $32.60; March, $34.80; total for 3 months, $107.80. (2) Taxi drivers, phone company (away from office), messengers, and incidentals. (3) As shown in No. 2. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting workers.

Hinman, Ray C., Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary (this represents one-quarter of the amount of registrant's annual remuneration which is attributable to the performance of duties which are subject to the Lobbying Act), $1,250; reimbursement for traveling expenses, $216.48; total, $1,466.48. Money expended (in connection with duties related to the Lobbying Act), $216.48. (2) Railroads, air lines, taxis, hotels, restaurants, telephones, and tips. (3) Normal traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

Hoffman, Frank N., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) $225 salary, $387.10 expenses. (2) Hotels, railroads, air lines, restaurants, cab drivers, etc., for expenses (3) Personal expenses and travel in and away from Washington. (4) [Blank.] (5) Support legislation authorized by the convention and ex-

ecutive board of the United Steelworkers, and by the convention and executive board of the national CIO; oppose legislation contrary to the stand of these organizations.

Hoffmaster, John E., 2203 South Bonsall Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Philadelphia Depot Employees Development Association, 2800 South Twentieth Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) A total of $410 was received from the Philadelphia Depot Employees Development Association. (2) $204 retained by undersigned as personal compensation at $17 per day; $206 paid by undersigned for railroad fare, meals, hotel, room, taxi fares, telephone calls and telegrams, service charges and tips. (3) For personal compensation and personal living expenses as set forth above. (4) None. (5) To oppose H. R. 612 and S. 286, providing for establishment of quartermaster research and development laboratories at Boston, Mass.

Hollister, R. F.,[5] [9] Independent Bankers Association Twelfth Federal Reserve District, 802 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg. (1) Money received, salary, $1,800, money expended, none. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Federal legislation controlling bank holding companies.

Hollister, R. F.,[6] [9] Independent Bankers Association, 802 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg. (1) Money received, salary, $1,800; money expended, none. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Federal legislation controlling bank holding companies.

Hollister, R. F.,[7] [9] Independent Bankers Association, Twelfth Federal Reserve District, 802 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg. (1) Money received, salary, $1,800; money expended none. (2) [Blank.]. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Federal legislation controlling bank holding companies.

Holloway, William J., Santa Fe Railway Co., Oklahoma City, Okla. (1) $1,500 attorney's fee (January 1 to April 1); $930.50 expenses (January 1 to April 1). (2) William J. Holloway. (3) (a) Attorney's fee at rate of $50 per diem; (b) actual necessary expenses for transportation, hotel bills, meals, telephone and telegraph and incidentals. (4) None. (5) The Jennings bill relating to venue in actions for damage against railroads. Passed House of Representatives—now pending in United States Senate.

Holman, Charles W., National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $65.70. (2) Taxi and phone calls. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Any legislation which may affect milk producers.

Holmes, George T., Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky. (1) No money was received or expended for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Holste, Oscar W., 10 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) Salary, $1,072; expenses, $467.59. No money expended except for personal maintenance. (2) Hamilton Hotel and Annapolis Hotel, taxicabs, postage, streetcar fare, laundry, cleaning and pressing, pullman fare and pullman dining cars, and various restaurants. (3) Necessary living, transportation, communication, and living expenses. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting railway labor and particularly to oppose bills detrimentally affecting the existing Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Acts.

Hood, J. M., president, the American Short Line Railroad Association, 1120 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary received from the American Short Line Railroad Association, $4,125; expenses incurred for account of the American Short Line Railroad Association and for which reimbursement has been or will be made, $1,060.67; impossible to accurately allocate either salary or expenses, but carefully calculated estimate is that 5 percent of salary, $206.25, and 10 percent of expenses, $106.07, total, $312.32, expended for purpose of influencing legislation. (2) Expenses paid to hotels, clubs, transportation, and communication companies. (3) For travel and entertainment in connection with the furtherance of the legislative program of the 304 common carrier by rail members of the American Short Line Railroad Association. (4) None, except as reported as an officer of the American Short Line Railroad Association in the return of that association. (5) Legislation affecting member lines of the American Short Line Railroad Association. (See legislative program in full, attached to return of that association.)[1]

Hooks, Homer E., Canners League of Florida, P. O. box 1567, Lakeland, Fla. (1) Received total salary for quarter, $1,500; expended, one trip to Washington, D. C., $245.06. (This figure includes routine expenses incurred, rail fare, hotel, meals, etc.) (2) Homer E. Hooks. (3) To further league's opposition to two pieces of pending legislation. (4) Tampa Morning Tribune, Lakeland Ledger, Orlando Sentinel, West Volusia Journal, Palmetto News, De Land Sun News, Clearwater Sun, St. Augustine Record, St. Petersburg Times, Tallahassee Democrat, Florida Times-Union, Jacksonville Journal, Auburndale Journal, Bradenton Herald, Sarasota Herald-Tribune. (5) S. 2173 and H. R. 5688.

NOTE.—Work on pending legislation is only incidental to principal activity as secretary-manager of organization.

Horsky,[7] Charles A., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; P. E. Harris & Co., Dexter Horton Building, Seattle, Wash.; Libby, McNeill & Libby, food products, Chicago, Ill.; New England Fish Co., Smith Tower, Seattle, Wash.; Kodiak Fisheries Co., Lowman Building, Seattle, Wash.; Pacific American Fisheries, Inc., South Bellingham, Wash. (1) Received and expended, none. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) This employment is an ordinary attorney-client retainer on a per diem basis for the purpose of assisting in the formulation and presentation of a proposed legislative program, being developed jointly for presentation to Congress by various interested salmon-canning companies and the Department of the Interior, relative to stabilizing certain phases of the Alaska salmon industry. The per diem is computed at $250 a day for each day of legal services rendered.

Horsky, Charles A., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; P. E. Harris & Co., Dexter Horton Building, Seattle, Wash.; Libby, McNeill & Libby, food products, Chicago, Ill.; New England Fish Co., Smith Tower, Seattle, Wash.; Kodiak Fisheries Co., Lowman Building, Seattle, Wash.; Pacific American Fisheries, Inc., South Bellingham, Wash. (1) Received fee of $2,875 and disbursements of $114.83 covering period from November 14, 1946, to December 31, 1947; expended, $32.46. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $23.76; Western Union, $6.80; cab drivers, $1.90; total, $32.46. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, and transportation within the District of Columbia. (4) None. (5) This employment is an ordinary attorney-client retainer on a per diem basis for the purpose of assisting in the formulation and presentation of a proposed legislative program, being developed jointly for presentation to Congress by various interested salmon-canning companies and the Department of the Interior, relative to stabilizing certain phases of the Alaska salmon industry. The per diem is computed at $250 a day for each day of legal services rendered.

Hosking, Floyd J., Corn Industries Research Foundation, 1329 E Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $3.40 ($1.40 for transportation, $2 notary fees). (2) Taxi driver, Christabel Hill. (3) Transportation, notary fees. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Howard, Paul,[1] American Library Association, national relations office, 1709 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Library Association, headquarters, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) See attached.[1] (2) See attached.[1] (3) Operation of office. Not more than one-third of expenditures applicable to legislative activity. (4) ALA Bulletin, Library Journal, San Antonio Express, New York Times, and any other newspapers which have picked up our releases. Since we do not subscribe to a clipping service, we do not know who they are. (5) Any legislation affecting American Library Association members.

Howard, S. H., 1328 Evergreen Avenue, Millvale, Pa.; Brotherhood of Railway Signalmen, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) No money received as salary or expended. No activities. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Howard, W. J., Performing voluntary services for Tax Equality Association of Montana, 107 East Main Street, Missoula, Mont. (1) $516.66. (2) W. J. Howard. (3) To reimburse for expense in traveling to and from meetings. (4) None. (5) Not employed. Revision of the Revenue Act to eliminate income-tax exemptions now enjoyed by organizations engaged in buying or selling or rendering services normally competitive with such activities conducted by others for profit.

Howe, Harold K., 2480 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Institute of Laundering, Joliet, Ill. (1) Received $1,500 as salary and $410.52 as reimbursement for general expenses. (2) Various. See answer to question (3). (3) Miscellaneous and incidental, including local transportation, lunches, gratuities, committee meeting expenses, and other incidental expenses of Washington Office, American Institute of Laundering. (4) Not applicable under section 308 (a). (5) I am interested in all legislation affecting the laundry industry and the members thereof. My primary function as to legislation is to report status, prospects, etc., to my employer—the American Institute of Laundering. See, also, letter attached to registration Form B, which is made a part hereof.

Howe, Robert E., Jr., United Mines Workers of America, 900 Fifteenth Street NW., and 907 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Since January 1, 1948, there has been received by affiant as salary the sum of $2,125 and as per diem for personal living expenses the sum of $546, a total of $2,671. (2) No sums in any amount have been paid by affiant to any person other than affiant's expenditures for normal, everyday living expenses such as transportation, meals, etc., in the regular discharge of his duties. (3) Answered in (2) above. (4) None. (5) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.

Howell, W. J., performing voluntary services for Tax Equality Association of Montana, 107 East Main Street, Missoula, Mont. (1) $211.63. (2) W. J. Howell. (3) To reimburse for expense in traveling to and from meetings. (4) None. (5) Not employed. Revision of the Revenue Act to eliminate income-tax exemptions now enjoyed by organizations engaged in buying or selling or rendering services normally competitive with such activities conducted by others for profit.

Howrey, Edward F., 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Peanut and Nut

[5] Filed for second quarter, 1947.
[6] Filed for third quarter, 1947.
[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.
[9] Filed with the Clerk only.

[1] Not printed. Filed in Clerk's office.
[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Salters Association, 914 Eleventh Street SE., Washington, D. C., fee, none this quarter; expenses, $18.93. (2) Telephone company, notary fees, and taxis. (3) As indicated by items above. (4) None. (5) Proposals affecting peanuts and tree nuts, particularly those placing limitations and restrictions on importation of nuts.

Huff, George B.,[9] secretary, the Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 38 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) Money received for salary, none; money received for reimbursement of actual travel expenses, $48. (2) For hotel and transportation. (3) For hotel and transportation. (4) Seymour Daily Tribune and Rensselaer Republican. (5) Legislation to promote tax equality between competing businesses.

Huff, W. T., 806 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Transcontinental & Western Air, Inc., 101 West Eleventh Street, Kansas City, Mo. (1) $110.90. (2) Taxicabs, restaurants, telephone and telegraph, Government Printing Office. (3) To attend meetings of Congress and its committees and obtain reports thereof. (4) None. (5) To support the program of the Presidential Air Policy Commission and the Congressional Air Policy Board for the advancement of aviation.

Huntress, Carroll B., 17 Battery Place, New York City; National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Carroll B. Huntress, vice president, Republic Coal & Coke Co., 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y., acting as chairman for the National St. Lawrence Project Conference without compensation and for reimbursement of expenses. (2) Railroads, hotels, $1,315; New York Telephone Co., $77.07; United States post office, $48.46; newspaper subscriptions, $22.50. (3) To carry on duties as chairman. (4) [Blank.] (5) Senate Joint Resolution 111; House Joint Resolution 192.

Hushing, W. C., chairman, National Legislative Committee, American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for 3 months, $2,080; expenses for January 1948, $42.40; February, $30.40; March, $37.50. Total for 3 months, $110.30. (2) Taxi drivers, phone company (away from office), messengers, and incidentals. (3) As shown in No. 2. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting workers.

Hutson,[9] John B., 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Tobacco Associates, Inc., Raleigh, N. C. (1) Salary at the rate previously reported on form B, which registrant filed as a matter of information to the Congress, although of the opinion that he does not come within the purview of the act (Public, No. 601, 79th Cong.). (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Independent Natural Gas Association of America,[11] 1700 I Street NW.., Washington, D. C. (1) All money received is shown on schedule A attached to form B; registration dated January 1, 1947. Expended: John A. Ferguson, executive director, salary, $3,125; W. E. Disney, general counsel, retainer, $1,250; Louis E. White, news director, salary, $725; office rent, $141; furniture and fixtures, $138; printing, $872.88; telephone and telegraph, $652.08; office supplies, $362.20; miscellaneous (includes postage), $45.55; travel and hotel expenses for staff and counsel to attend business meetings, conferences, etc.,. Dallas, St. Louis, Fort Wayne, Cleveland, Kansas City, Chicago, $687.87; miscellaneous expenses including entertaining members of association and prospective members, conferences, luncheons, and routine activities of the association, $427.08; total, $8,326.66. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) Regular association publications. (5) Natural Gas Act amendments. General duty to keep the industry informed of any matters which affect its members.

[9] Filed with the Clerk only.
[11] Filed for first quarter, 1947.

Independent Natural Gas Association of America,[5] 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) All money received is shown on schedule A attached to Form B; registration dated January 1, 1947. Expended: John A. Ferguson, executive director, salary, $3,125; W. E. Disney, general counsel, retainer, $1,250; Louis E. White, news director, salary, $725; office rent, $141; furniture and fixtures, $7.10; printing, $110.70; telephone and telegraph, $416.15; office supplies, $309.67; miscellaneous (including postage), $140.91; travel and hotel expenses for staff and counsel to attend business meetings, conferences, etc., Tulsa, St. Louis, and Memphis, $327; miscellaneous expenses including entertaining members of association and prospective members, conferences, luncheons, and routine activities of the association, $471.99; total, $7,024.60. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) Regular association publications. (5) Natural Gas Act amendments. General duty to keep the industry informed of any matters which affect its members.

Independent Natural Gas Association of America,[6] 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) All money received is shown on schedule A attached to Form B; registration dated January 1, 1947. Expended: John A. Ferguson, executive director, salary, $3,125; W. E. Disney, general counsel, retainer, $1,250; Louis E. White, news director, salary, $725; office rent, $141; furniture and fixtures, $29.21; printing, $40.38; telephone and telegraph, $1,244.52; office supplies, $494.38; miscellaneous (includes postage), $358.30; travel and hotel expenses for staff and counsel to attend business meetings, conferences, etc., Kansas City, St. Louis, $444.80; miscellaneous expenses including entertaining members of association and prospective members, conferences, luncheons, and routine activities of the association, $282.05; total, $8,135.09. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) Regular association publications. (5) Natural Gas Act amendments. General duty to keep the industry informed of any matters which affect its members.

Independent Natural Gas Association of America,[7] 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) All money received is shown on schedule A attached to Form B; registration dated January 1, 1947, and attachment 2[1] to this report. Expended: John A. Ferguson, executive director, salary, $3,125; W. E. Disney, general counsel, retainer, $1,250; Louis E. White, news director, salary, $725; office rent, $141; furniture and fixtures, $138; printing, $872.88; telephone and telegraph, $652.08; office supplies, $362.20; miscellaneous (includes postage), $45.55; travel and hotel expenses for staff and counsel to attend business meetings, conferences, etc., Dallas, St. Louis, Fort Wayne, Cleveland, Kansas City, Chicago, $687.87; miscellaneous expenses, including entertaining members of association and prospective members, conferences, luncheons, and routine activities of the association, $427.08; total, $8,326.66. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) Regular association publications. (5) Natural Gas Act. General duty to keep the industry informed of any matters which affect it.

Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See schedule A[1] for all money received during preceding calendar quarter. Expended: John A. Ferguson, executive director, salary, $3,125; W. E. Disney, general counsel, retainer, $1,250; Louis E. White, news director, salary, $725; office rent, $141; printing, $86.20; telephone and telegraph, $457.31; office supplies, $187.11; miscellaneous (includes postage), $211.32; travel and hotel expenses for staff and counsel to attend business meetings, conferences, etc., St. Louis, Mo., and Dallas, Tex., $323.68; miscellaneous expenses, including entertaining members of association and prospective members, conferences, luncheons, and routine activities of the association, $395.14; total, $6,901.76. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) Regular association publications. (5) Natural Gas Act. General duty to keep the industry informed of any matters which affect it.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for second quarter, 1947.
[6] Filed for third quarter, 1947.
[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

Ingles, William, Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. et al., 1624 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., $900; American Mining Congress, $900; J. I. Case Co., $900; the Falk Corp., $900; Foremen's League for Education and Association, $1,800; Inland Steel Co., $900. Expenditures: Office salaries, $750; lunches, taxi fares, and incidentals (no individual expense exceeding $10), $360; office rent, $370; telephone, $90.24; office services, supplies and general expenses, $130.86; traveling expenses, $267.89. (2) See (1) above. (3) Normal office operating expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting industry.

Irvon,[7 9] Isaiah Tucker, box 291, DeLand, Fla.; National Conference of Veteran Trainees, 810 West Highland Boulevard, DeLand, Fla. (1) Receipts, $695.38; expenditures, $695.70. (2) Various. (3) Hotels, transportation, tips, stamps, etc. (4) DeLand (Fla.) Sun News, Daytona Beach (Fla.) News-Journal, Orlando (Fla.) Sentinel, Washington (D. C.) Star, Army Times, Washington, D. C., wire news services. (5) Liberalized legislation for veterans of World War. II.

Jackson,[7] Boyd J., Klamath Tribes of Indians of the State of Oregon, Klamath Agency, Oreg. (1) No money was received during the preceding calendar quarter since no legislative activities were engaged in. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) During the present calendar quarter, registrant is instructed to support H. R. 2502 and oppose S. 1222.

Jackson, Boyd J., 1730 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Klamath Tribes of Indians, Klamath Agency, Oreg. (1) Salary of $10 daily and $6 per diem while actually engaged in work as official delegate of Klamath Tribes of Indians, Oregon. (2) No payments to others. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) Supporting H. R. 2501, 2502, and 2775; opposing S. 1222 and H. R. 4725.

Jackson, Charles E., general manager, National Fisheries Institute, Inc., Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Taxicabs to attend hearings on Alaska salmon traps, 80 cents; taxicabs to attend House debate on Interior Department appropriations bill, 80 cents; taxicabs to Capitol to discuss hearings on State Department appropriations with committee clerk, 80 cents. (2) Taxicab operators. (3) Transportation to Capitol. (4) None (5) Alaska salmon traps; Interior Department appropriation; State Department appropriation.

Jackson, Robert C., National Cotton Council of America, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) In addition to regular salary from National Cotton Council as reported on form B, received expense reimbursements amounting to $54.20 that might be construed as relating to legislative activity. (2) Meals for guests, $17.50; taxi fares, $31.90; phone calls, $4.80. (3) Luncheon conferences, transportation, and communications. (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. During past quarter have supported efforts to repeal laws that discriminate against margarine; have supported certain appropriation items for United States Department of Agriculture and Bureau of the Census, supported European recovery program; supported S. 2376 to provide revolving fund for purchase of agricul-

[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.
[9] Filed with the Clerk only.

tural commodities to be processed in occupied areas and sold.

Jackson, Thomas J., Retired Officers League, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Interested in veterans legislation, H. R. 2744 and others. (This same report could be used for one missing due October 1, 1947.)

Jacob,[11] Betty Muther, 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expenses, $48.20 (for period February 1–15, 1947.) (2) Carfare, $29.45; meals, $5.90; telephone and telegraph, $0.75; miscellaneous, $12.10; total, $48.20. (3) Expenses include railroad fare to and from her home in Philadelphia, taxis, trolleys, telephone, meals, and overnight lodging if needed. (4) None. (5) To support proposed legislation allocating for foreign relief purposes the so-called "frozen fund" earned by conscientious objectors under the Selective Service and Training Act, as amended.

Jhung,[6] Walter, Hotel Pennsylvania, Washington, D. C.; Won Soon Lee (Korean-American Trading Co.), 105 East Houston St., New York, N. Y. (1) None for third quarter, 1947. During congressional recess, offices of Korean Immigration and Naturalization Committee do not function. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) S. 152; H. R. 860 (superseded by H. R. 2932).

Jhung,[7] Walter, Hotel Pennsylvania, Washington, D. C.; Won Soon Lee (Korean-American Trading Co.), 105 East Houston Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None for fourth quarter, 1947. During congressional recess, offices of Korean Immigration and Naturalization Committee do not function. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) S. 152; H. R. 860 (superseded by H. R. 2932).

Jhung, Walter, Hotel Pennsylvania, Washington, D. C.; Won Soon Lee (Korean-American Trading Co.), 105 East Houston Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None for first quarter, 1948. Offices of Korean Immigration and Naturalization Committee did not function due to absence of its executive secretary, Walter Jhung, from this country. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) S. 152; H. R. 860 (superseded by H. R. 2932).

Jobe,[7] William T., National Association of Ice Industries, 1706 L Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Employed on a full-time annual basis as general counsel for the National Association of Ice Industries at a salary of $10,000 per annum. I have received my regular monthly salary for the past calendar quarter of 1948 and nothing more. Pursunt to the requirements of Public Law 601, I have expended no money. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Jobe, William T., National Association of Ice Industries, 1706 L Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Employed on a full-time annual basis as general counsel for the National Association of Ice Industries at a salary of $10,800 per annum. I have received my regular monthly salary for the past calendar quarter of 1948 and nothing more. Pursuant to the requirements of Public Law 601, I have expended no money. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Johnson, Curtis E., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Johnson, Elmer, president, National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The sum of $523.12 was received during the first quarter of 1948. (2) None. (3) Fee of $100 per month; $223.12 to cover transportation, meals, and entertainment. (4) The Annuitant. (5) In support of any measure designed to improve the Federal retirement system.

Johnson,[7] Gilbert R., Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Johnson, Gilbert R., 874 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio; Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Prorate of annual retainer as legal counsel as set forth in my letter of April 9, 1948, amending initial registration dated January 10, 1947, and reimbursement of traveling expenses amounting to $63.78 (2) Retainer to self; expenses incurred in connection with travel. (3) See (2) above. (4) An article which I wrote, The Case Against Tolls on the St. Lawrence, appeared in the October 1947 issue of the Clevelander, organ of the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce. I received no compensation for the article and paid nothing for its publication. This notation should be considered as an amendment to my report for the last quarter of 1947. (5) During this quarter I have given attention to legislation relating to Great Lakes shipping as part of my work as legal counsel for Lake Carriers' Association. I do not consider that I am engaged for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation and this report is made without prejudice to that position.

Johnson,[7] Lee F., National Public Housing Conference, Inc., 1015 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,500 salary, less withholding tax. No funds expended under Public Law 601 except as perhaps 10 percent of my time was devoted to national legislative work. No expense account received. (2) Nothing paid out except for living expenses and transportation. (3) [Blank.] (4) Public Housing; editor of that journal. (5) Taft-Ellender-Wagner general housing bill, S. 866.

Johnson, Lee F., National Public Housing Conference, 1015 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,500 salary, less withholding tax. No funds expended under Public Law 601 except as perhaps 10 percent of my time was devoted to national legislative work. No expense account received. (2) Nothing paid out except for living expenses and transportation. (3) [Blank.] (4) Public Housing; editor of that journal. (5) Taft-Ellender-Wagner general housing bill, S. 866.

Johnson, Vernon A., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif. (1) Total received, $3,177.49; $2,500.03 of this received as salary. Expense reimbursement, $677.46, spent as follows: $42.65 for taxi fares, $57.99 for telephone calls, $484.45 for entertainment, $11.56 for hotels, $55.56 for travel tickets, $22.95 for meals, and $2.30 for auto mileage. All above money received from the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. (2) Expense items paid to various taxis, telephone company, restaurants, hotels, travel carriers, etc. (3) Paid in normal course of business travel and business relationships. (4) None. (5) all legislation affecting aviation.

Johnson, W. D., Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Order of Railway Conductors of America, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. (1) January 1948, annual compensation of $8,500. (2) W. D. Johnson. (3) As vice president and national legislative representative of the Order of Railway Conductors of America, covering all services rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislative matters. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor generally, employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act, and particularly the interests of various classes and crafts of railway employees represented by the Order of Railway Conductors of America.

Johnson, Walter R., National Association of Attorneys General, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for January, $1,500 ($3,000 due for February and March). Expenses: $878.35 for January; $549.80 for February; $416.60 for March; total, $1,844.75, (2) Registrant. (3) Transportation, $414.60; meals for self and guests, $1,335; miscellaneous, $95.10. (4) None. (5) To confirm and establish titles in States to land beneath navigable waters within State boundaries.

Jones,[10] Bascom F., executive secretary, Tennessee Railroad Association. (1) During the said quarter I have neither received nor expended any money in connection with Federal legislation and have caused no articles or editorials to be included in any publication. While I am not employed to support or oppose any legislation, I spent a total of 2 days in Washington during said quarter for the purpose of discussing with two Tennessee Representatives the merits of proposed legislation embodied in H. R. 5711. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Jones, J. M., National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) Salary, $2,100; expenses, none. (2) [Blank.] (3) No lobbying expense for first quarter, 1948. (4) The National Wool Grower, coeditor, J. M. Jones. (5) None sponsored or opposed.

Jones, L. Dan, Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary previously reported plus the following expenses which might be considered within the scope of the act, $33.45. (2) See (3) below. (3) Taxi fares. (4) None. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. My duties include that of maintaining surveillance of legislation which might affect the petroleum industry and taking such action with respect to such legislation as directed by the association.

Jones, Lyle W., 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.; National Small Businessmen's Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $600 monthly, less withholding tax and social-security tax; $125 personal expenses during January, February, and March 1948. (2) Lyle W. Jones. (3) Luncheons, taxicabs, and miscellaneous incidental expenses. (4) Pulling Together, monthly bulletin, National Small Businessmen's Association. (5) [Blank.]

Jones, T. L., vice president, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) Salary at rate of $8,600 per year. No segregation is made or is possible as to the portion of this amount which is compensation for legislative activities. Actual expenses are paid such as hotel, meals, transportation, and other incidental expenses. (2) T. L. Jones. (3) Activities in connection with legislative matters which are on temporary basis as my principal duties cover other matters in connection with the general work of the organization. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees.

Jones, Walter J., 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., or room 220, Littauer Center, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; Canal Zone Central Labor Union, Balboa, C. Z. (1) $500 per month, January, February, and March 1948; total, $1,500. Nothing last year between July–December 1947 (reason for not submitting a report). (2) Railroad fares from Boston to Washington and return each week; cab fares; hotels; meals; and public stenographer. (3) Transportation expenses and subsistence and stenographic service. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any affecting the employees of the Panama Canal.

Judd & Gurfein, 39 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Metropolitan Motion Picture Theatres

[6] Filed for third quarter, 1947.
[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.
[11] Filed for first quarter, 1947.

[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

[10] Filed with the Secretary only.

Association, 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) The only money received by registrant has been reimbursement of that portion of the annual retainer attributable to Federal legislative matters. Based on allocation of time, the compensation amounts to approximately $250 during the first quarter of 1948. No disbursements. (2) No one. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Kadans, Joseph, Esq., 639 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Veterans' Aid Society, Inc., 16 St. Paul Street, Baltimore, Md. (1) No money received or expended. (2) No money paid. (3) No money received or paid. (4) None. (5) Any legislation pertaining to veterans.

Kane, John E., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received regular salary as previously reported in form B, heretofore filed pursuant to act; expenses reimbursed by employer, $221.20. (2) Various taxicab companies, restaurants, hotels, other service establishments. (3) Administrative expenses, transportation, meals, gratuities. (4) None. (5) Matters affecting the petroleum industry and its customers.

Keller, Joseph E., secretary, District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee, 930 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $139.60 as treasurer of District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee. $139.60 has been expended on behalf of the committee during preceding calendar quarter. (2) Various. (3) Hotels, telephones, etc. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the sale and distributtion of petroleum products in the District of Columbia.

Kelly,[11] Eugene, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Retail Credit Institute of America, 917 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Consumer-credit control.

Kelly,[5] Eugene, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Retail Credit Institute of America, 917 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) [Blank.] 4) None. (5) Consumer-credit control.

Kelly,[6] Eugene, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Retail Credit Institute of America, 917 Fifteenth Street NW, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Consumer-credit control.

Kelly,[7] Eugene, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Retail Credit Institute of America, 917 Fifteenth Street NW, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Consumer-credit control.

Kennedy, Harold L., 605 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.; Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 308 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla. (1) Received 3 months' retainer in the amount of $3,000. Expended $37. (2) See (3) below. (3) Expended $22 for 55 taxi fares (40 cents each) to and from the Capitol; 10 meals at $1.50 each, comprising a total of $15. (4) None. (5) All proposed legislation that might affect the oil and gas industry.

Kern, Geo. A., Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa. (1) Apportionment of annual salary at $20 per day (August 2, 1946, to March 31, 1948), $360; travel and subsistence, $644.20. (2) Travel and subsistence payments to railroad companies, Pullman Co., hotels, taxis, etc. (3) Travel and subsistence. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the railroad industry.

Ketchum, MacLeod & Grove, Inc., 411 Seventh Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Main & Co., First National Bank Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Received from Main & Co., $647.84. (2) (a) Romeike Press Clipping Bureau, $21; (b) Ketchum, MacLeod & Grove, Inc., $0.84; (c) Ketchum, MacLeod & Grove, Inc., $626; total, $647.84. (3) (a) Clipping service, (b) postage, (c) services. (4) News releases sent to Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, Wall Street Journal, Associated Press, United Press, International News Service, and general distribution to Washington news and radio correspondents. (5) The incentive income-tax plan, a program of income-tax revision prepared by Frank Wilbur Main and other partners in Main & Co., certified public accountants, with headquarters office in Pittsburgh.

Ketchum, Omar B., Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $833 per month as salary minus social security and withholding taxes; $106.50 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combatting of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration.

King,[10 11] Karl V., 409 Boston Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) Received $50 from each of the persons listed below for a total of $550: Bartolome Errea, Marcelino Yturbe, Francisco Lorono, Pete Elquezabal, Zenon Zubiet, Francisco Allunitz, Damin Gandiaga, Manuel Zulueta, all of Elko, Nev.; Jose Anton Odriozola, Fidel Acordarrementeria, Pedro Bastida, all from Battle Mountain, Nev. (2) To United Air Lines, $221.40; New Colonial Hotel, $187.50. (3) Transportation, hotel room, and meals. (4) None. (5) Private bills for the relief of the above-named persons.

King,[5 10] Karl V., 409 Boston Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) None received in second quarter. (2) None paid, second quarter. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Private bills for the persons named in Forms A and B.

King,[6 10] Karl V., 409 Boston Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) None paid third quarter. (2) No expenditures, third quarter. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Private bills for the persons named in forms A and B.

King,[7 10], Karl V., 409 Boston Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) No money received fourth quarter. (2) No money paid fourth quarter. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Private bills for the persons named in Forms A and B.

King, Joseph T., National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, Ring Building, Eighteenth and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,800 salary and $242.13 expenses. (2) Pullman Co., railroads, restaurants, hotels, cab drivers. (3) Meals, taxi fares, and tips while traveling on official business. Business luncheons. (4) National affairs reports and bulletins. (5) Legislation directly affecting the retail building-supply dealers, such as Emergency Price Control Act, Fair Labor Standards Act, wage-and-hour legislation, housing legislation, tax legislation, and Second War Powers Act.

King, Joseph T., Barr Building, 912 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Robert N. Hawes. (1) $500 retainer received from Robert N. Hawes. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to Olympic National Park.

King, Willford I., Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) During this past quarter I received an over-all of $2,055.28 (net), including salary and expenses. (2) I am not a disbursing officer and have made no payments for the Committee for Constitutional Government, by whom I am employed. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Not employed for this purpose, but, incidentally, I occasionally oppose legislation which I believe to be antisocial and favor that which I believe to be socially beneficial.

Kirk, Jesse Lee, Klamath Tribes of Indians of the State of Oregon, Klamath Agency, Oreg. (1) No money was received during the preceding calendar quarter since no legislative activities were engaged in. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) During the present calendar quarter, registrant is instructed to support H. R. 2502 and oppose S. 1222.

Kitchen, C. W., United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 2017 S Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Various articles have been prepared and published in trade periodicals and association yearbooks on marketing subjects, none dealing specifically with legislative matters. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation.

Kline, Allan B., American Farm Bureau Federation, 58 East Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $365.01 expended. (See item (6) of Form B, filed January 1948.) (2) Taxi fares, train fares, hotel, and restaurants. (3) Transportation, lodging, and luncheon conferences. (4) None. (5) In accordance withe annual meeting, resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Long-range agricultural program, taxation, agricultural appropriations, Commodity Credit Corporation, regulation of commodity exchanges, coordination of agricultural conservation services, Fair Employment Practices Act, farm credit, fertilizer, European recovery program, continuation of postwar construction of highways, transfer of United States Employment Service from Federal Security Agency to Labor Department (in proposed Reorganization Plan No. 1), transfer of Army Remount Service to United States Department of Agriculture, eradication of cattle grubs, amendment to Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act, universal military training, means for controlling inflation, 1-year extension of Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act by Secretary of Agriculture, St. Lawrence seaway, Federal meat inspection, Tennessee Valley Authority, Federal aid to education, library demonstration bill, irrigation and reclamation, Labor Extension Service.

Kline,[10] Robert E., Jr., 322 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Kneipp, Leon F., 3700 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Organization of Professional Employees of Department of Agriculture, Administration Building, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C. (1) Only money received was compensation for services at rate of $100 per month; total, $300. (2) No money paid to any person, company, or corporation, or otherwise. (3) None. (4) Department publication USDA of March

[5] Filed for second quarter, 1947.
[6] Filed for third quarter, 1947.
[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.
[10] Filed with the Secretary only.
[11] Filed for first quarter, 1947.

29, 1948, carried paragraph on OPEDA. No others. (5) Measures relating to interests of Federal professional employees, viz, retirement, pay increases, disability compensation, per diem allowances, etc.

Koch, Robert M., National Agricultural Limestone Association, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) It is estimated that, as secretary of the National Agricultural Limestone Association, Inc., $1,000 of my salary represents that part of my time covered by Public Law 601 during the first quarter of 1948. This was all disbursed for personal living expenses. In addition, I received $20 for reimbursement for taxis and carfare in connection with legislation of interest to members of the association. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation directly or indirectly affecting the agricultural limestone industry.

Krebs,[10] Alfred U., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant has stated in Form B that he does not believe Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act applicable to him for the reason that all of his time in connection with legislative activities is spent in appearing before congressional committees or in preparing correspondence addressed to chairmen of such committees. Registrant believes that $166.66 per month represents a fair allocation of his salary to these activities. (2) No expenditures except for taxicabs and similar items. (3) See item (2). (4) None. (5) Registrant is not employed to support or oppose any legislation.

Kreutz, Oscar R., National Savings and Loan League, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $4,500 salary and $1,252.31 special expense. During this quarter not more than 5 percent of my time was devoted to legislation matters so that only $225 of my salary and none of my special expense can be construed as being allocable. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) National Letter and National Savings and Loan Journal. (5) Bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing are supported. Legislation inimicable to interests of savings and loan industry opposed.

Krooth, David L., National Association of Housing Manufacturers, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) From organization of National Association of Housing Manufacturers, March 3, 1947, to date, I have received a total of $4,200 for services rendered to the association as its general counsel. I am paid under a temporary retainer arrangement of $600 per month. I am not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing any particular legislation, but act as general counsel (rendering legal and informational services to the association). (2) From March 3, 1947, to date, the association has expended a total of $6,922.43 as follows: Retainer to general counsel, $4,200; stenographic services, mimeographing, stationery, publications, printing, stamps, cabs, and other transportation, $1,447.82; telephone and telegraph, $285.56; meeting of association in Washington, D. C. (February 27 and 28, 1947, at Statler Hotel (organization meeting), August 5 and 6, 1947, at Mayflower Hotel (meeting of membership), $989.05. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) As indicated above, I am not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation. Only a small part of my time is devoted to keeping members informed on pending legislation with a view to advising and assisting them on any such legislation that may be helpful or harmful to them in accomplishing their objective of producing sound, attractive, low-cost housing through modern mass-production methods and new improved building materials.

Kruse, Herman C., Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Salary for quarter, $2,100 for all services to employer, only part of which pertained to legislation. Reimbursement of hotel, travel, and incidental expenses for quarter, $1,225.04. (2) Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., $397.20; railroads and air lines, $492.69; restaurants, telephone and telegraph companies, taxis, and incidentals, $335.15. (3) Hotel, travel, and incidental expenses, as stated above. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting water and power projects, flood control, and reclamation.

Lacques, Paul H., Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received various sums during the quarterly period (January, February, March) at various times, a total of $502.25 from Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston. None of such receipts exceeded $100. (2) Railroad companies, hotels, and club. (3) Transportation, accommodations, meals, telephone and telegraph charges. (4) None. (5) H. R. 669, H. R. 4044.

Lane, John F. (care of Gall & Lane), Steel, Foundry, and Scrap Industries' Committee for Expediting Iron and Steel Scrap, 401 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Money received as fees for all services possibly within scope of act, $3,000 (estimate). Money expended consisted only of minor actual expense disbursements (such as local transportation, telephone and telegraph charges, etc.) in the estimated amount of $150 (estimate). (2) Fees paid to Gall & Lane; expense disbursements paid to taxi companies, telephone company, telegraph company, etc. (3) Fees paid for legal research, information, advice, consultations, and memoranda. (4) None. (5) Legislation bearing upon United States ferrous scrap stocks.

Lanham, Fritz G., Woodley Park Towers, 2737 Devonshire Place, Washington, D. C.; A. E. Brooks, Fort Worth National Bank Building, Fort Worth, Tex. (1) I have received no money and have made no expenditures except small sums for postage. (2) No payments. (3) No payments. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting nonresident citizens of the United States engaged in business abroad.

Lanham, Fritz G., Woodley Park Towers, 2737 Devonshire Place, Washington, D. C.; National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West Eleventh Avenue, Gary, Ind.; American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 1434 West Eleventh Avenue, Gary, Ind.; Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 1308 Commercial Standard Building, Fort Worth, Tex. (1) From National Patent Council as retainer, $1,500; from American Fair Trade Council as retainer, $1,000; from Trinity Improvement Association for rental and other expenses and clerical help, $750. There have been no expenditures except small sums for postage, and $2 to Truman Ward for copying. (2) No payments except as indicated above. (3) Clerical help, rental, garage, traveling, and other expenses incidental to service rendered. (4) None. (5) Those I represent are all nonprofit organizations, and I serve in an advisory capacity and not for the purpose of supporting or opposing legislation in Congress. Their purposes are principally educational with reference to the objectives of their organizations.

Lanham, Fritz G., Woodley Park Towers, 2737 Devonshire Place, Washington, D. C. (1) As a representative of the State Rights Association, Houston, Tex., I have received no money and have expended none except small sums for postage. (2) No payments. (3) No payments. (4) None. (5) Legislation to preserve and promote the rights of the States under our system of government, to return to the States such normal functions as they should rightfully assume, to restrict Federal agencies to Federal functions, and to equalize taxation in accordance with State laws.

Larkin, Frederick, Jr., Independent Business Council of America, Inc., 448 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $150. (2) Frederick Larkin, Jr. (3) For living expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation that in the opinion of the members of this organization affects the welfare of small and independent business men and women.

La Roe, Wilbur, Jr., Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) La Roe, Brown & Winn, law firm, received from the National Independent Meat Packers Association, $4,500; total of monthly payments for general legal services, of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payment made to any other person. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. . (5) S. 2256; H. R. 5675; appropriation for meat inspection, Department of Agriculture.

Lawrence, John V., American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration. He expended a total of $42.50. (2) The money was paid to various taxi drivers employed in taking registrant between his office and the Capitol or House or Senate office buildings, and to clerks and cashiers for lunches at restaurants. (3) The money paid taxi drivers was for transportation to and from my office as indicated in (2). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the trucking industry.

Lawrence, Joseph S., M. D., American Medical Association, 1302 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts, $4,229.41; expenses, $903.35. (2) Various. (3) Travel, local transportation, hotels, etc. (4) None. (5) Bills relating to public health endorsed or opposed by the section of the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association or the principles espoused by that body.

Laylin, John G.,[7] American Smelting & Refining Co., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received, none. Expended in connection with all matters for client, $191.07. (2) Telephone and telegraph expense, $40.58; travel expense including hotel accommodations, $150.49. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, transportation, and hotel accommodations. (4) None. (5) Appropriation for continuation of drainage tunnel by Bureau of Mines at Leadville, Colo.

Laylin, John G., American Smelting Refining Co., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $22,000 for legal services rendered in connection with all legal matters for client. Expended in connection with all matters for client, $100. (2) Telephone expense, $15.78; travel expense including hotel accommodations, $89.47; miscellaneous, $3.75. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, transportation, and hotel accommodations. (4) None. (5) Appropriation for continuation of drainage tunnel by Bureau of Mines at Leadville, Colo.

Lee, Ivy, and T. J. Ross, United States Cuban Sugar Council, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) See appended statement I.[1] (2) See appended statement I.[1] (3) See appended statement I.[1] (4) See appended statement II.[1] (5) Registrant advises the United States Cuban Sugar Council on public relations matters pertaining to sugar legislation relating to the Sugar Act of 1948.

Lemmon, James H., Lemmon, S. Dak.; president of National Wool Marketing Corp., 281 Summer Street, Boston, Mass. (1) No money received or expended by me. (2) None. (3) Since filing my quarterly report on April 1, 1947, have done no work on legislation in Washington and consequently received no pay and no expenses were paid for or by me, this being the reason that I thought it was not necessary to file a report. It is doubtful

[10] Filed with the Secretary only.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

if I will again appear in the interests of legislation. (4) None. (5) Called on Senators and Congressmen relative to wool legislation in which I represented the wool growers. The original filing of the bill was S. 1498, wool bill.

Leopold,[8] Joseph F., 936 Liberty Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.; National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Regular salary received. Nothing expended for lobbying purposes. (2) Nothing paid out other than regular travel expenses for which I was reimbursed by National Tax Equality Association. (3) Hotel, transportation, and usual travel expenses. (4) None. (5) No particular legislation; tax equality in general.

Letts, David S., attorney, 901 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; American Transit Association, 292 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $1,350 salary as attorney for the American Transit Association. Received $221.58 reimbursement for actual business expenses. (2) Railroads, taxicabs, etc.; hotels and restaurants; merchants and others. (3) Traveling and living expenses away from Washington. Expenses in Washington for transportation, fees, dues, entertainment, and miscellaneous. (4) None. (5) Applicant has written letters to approximately 17 members of the association in opposition to S. 290, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended.

Levine, Seth, CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,365 in salary; $130 expenses; one-third of time devoted to legislative activities and two-thirds of time spent on research work. (2) Taxi companies, telephone companies, dispensers of periodicals. (3) Taxis, telephone calls, periodicals. (4) NMU Pilot, IFAWA Fisherman, American Marine Engineer, CIO News. (5) Support legislation in the interest of seamen, fishermen, allied maritime workers, and oppose legislation detrimental to them.

Lewis,[7] George J., Kentucky Railroad Association, Louisville, Ky. (For fuller details see form B, filed by me on June 3, 1947.) (1) No moneys received. None expended. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Employed to support legislation favorable to the railroad industry, and to oppose legislation detrimental to that industry.

Lewis, George J., Kentucky Railroad Association, Louisville, Ky. (For fuller details see form B, filed by me on June 3, 1947.) (1) No moneys received, except reimbursements for out-of-pocket expense amounting to $165. (2) Hotel, restaurant, dining car, railway, pullman, taxis, telephone, etc. (3) For living and traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Employed to support legislation favorable to the railroad industry, and to oppose legislation detrimental to that industry.

Libby, Frederick J., executive secretary, National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,149.99; expenses, $152.04; total, $1,302.03. (2) Expenses for railroad tickets, hotels, taxis, porters, telephone and telegraph service, postage, and miscellaneous expenses. (3) Speaking trips, attending conferences and meetings, etc. (4) Peace Action, monthly news bulletin of National Council for Prevention of War. (5) Supports, in pursuance of the purposes of the organization, legislation which promotes peace and opposes legislation which, in our judgment, leads to war.

Liljenquist, L. Blaine, Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1415 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; E. F. Forbes, 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Salary for quarter January 1 to April 1, 1948, $1,916.66; expenses incurred with respect to legislation, $54.07. (2) Various. (3) Taxi fares and correspondence. (4) None. (5) As Washington representative of association many of my duties do not come within the purview of the act. This quarter I have supported the passage of Senate bill 2256 and H. R. 5675.

Linton, D. H., Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates, 250 Stuart Street, Boston, Mass. (1) $1,903.99 ($800 compensation and $1,103.99 expenses). (2) Carlton Hotel, Washington, D. C.; railroads; air lines; food; taxis; telephone; tips; and miscellaneous expenses. (3) Traveling and incidentals. (4) None. (5) H. R. 4099, 5475, 5392.

Lloyd, David D., Americans for Democratic Action, 1740 K Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) The ADA World. Articles under my own name. (5) Major legislative issues to extent that my other duties permit. In the first quarter of 1948, I appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee on behalf of ERP and arranged for the appearances of others, or was otherwise active in behalf of ERP and price and rent controls.

Littell, Norman M., Navajo Tribe of Indians, 1422 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) For quarter ended March 31, 1948, $1,875 as retainer for legal services as general counsel and $727.54 for expenses. (2) To employees of registrant's law office, including stenographers. (3) For legal services in connection with Navajo business. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation, but registrant is to represent the Navajos as requested at any hearings when legislation affecting the Navajos is being considered.

Little, Charles R., executive secretary, Ohio Valley Conservation and Flood Control Congress, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) Total received for salary, $900; total received for expenses, $600; total expenses, $668.16. Actual amounts directly chargeable to lobbying are less than totals shown above. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, railroads, etc. (3) Transportation, $235.20; lodging, $149.43, meals, $109.41; tips, $35.53; office (periodicals, communications, postage, stationery, supplies), $138.59. (4) None. (5) Not solely employed for this purpose, but concerned with any legislation dealing with conservation and flood control in the Ohio Valley, including appropriation bills.

Little, Walter J., Southern Pacific Co., et al., 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) Received from Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railroad, Southern Pacific, Union Pacific, Northwestern Pacific, and Western Pacific railroads for expenses, $808.91. (2) (a) Carlton Hotel, Washington, D. C., $261.22; (b) Pullman Co., Pennsylvania Railroad, and Chicago & Northwestern Railroad, $314.69; (c) Taxicab companies; Western Union, various restaurants, etc., $233; total $808.91. (3) (a) Hotel and meals, $243.96; telephone, telegraph, and postage, $17.26; (b) Transportation and Pullman fares, $314.69; (c) Taxies, meals, tips, postage, telephone calls, telegraph messages, etc., $233; total, $808.91. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting the railroads.

Lockwood, Maurice H., The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $200 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Fertilizer News, Fertilizer Review, and Agronomic Notes, all published by the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., Washington, D. C. I issued and distributed, in the customary manner, two press releases—one on the fertilizer industry's prospects of producing increased amounts of nitrogen and potash; the other on the fertilizer industry's preparedness to assist farmers in meeting the Government's food production goals. However, I do not know what publications may have published these releases in whole or in part. (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 869, H. R. 2494, H. R. 3421, H. R. 4417, H. R. 4562, H. R. 4752, and S. 1251.

Lodge, F. S., The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $50 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 869, H. R. 2494, H. R. 3421, H. R. 4417, H. R. 4562, H. R. 4752, and S. 1251.

Lofgran, Charles E., Fleet Reserve Association, 429 Investment Building, Fifteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $1,500 salary from Fleet Reserve Association; expended, none. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Naval Affairs magazine and CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. (5) Naval personnel and veteran legislation.

Loft, George, Friends Committee on National Legislation, 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Gross salary January, February, March, 1948, $1,000; travel expense, $505.32. (2) Carfare, $198.53; room, $64.88; meals, $104.27; telephone and telegraph, $68.12; miscellaneous, $69.52; total, January–March, $505.32. (3) Travel is for the purpose of discussing developments on universal military training legislation, and to organize opposition to it. (4) The organization sends a news letter to a limited number of subscribers and friends about once a month. In addition, press releases covering Mr. Loft's activities have appeared in some newspapers. (5) In general, to support measures leading to peace and humanitarian ends, such as world organization and world economic stability, world disarmament, support for the rights of conscience, opposition to conscription and the militarization of America.

Lopinsky, Frances, Curry, Cohen & Bingham, James E. Curry, being attorney for National Congress of American Indians, Indian communities of Southeastern Alaska, Mescalero, Yavapai, Jicarilla, and San Carlos Apaches, Pyramid Lake, and Fort McDermitt, and Paiutes, 1016 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1.80. (2) Cab fares. (3) To and from Capitol. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation concerning Indian affairs particularly concerning members of National Congress of American Indians, Alaskan natives, Apaches, Paiutes.

Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, 1216 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; Agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) $25,000. (2) No disbursements made during first quarter of 1948. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 4043, Eightieth Congress, and other legislation having relation to World War I claims.

Lorence,[8] Walter E., the Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc., 730 Federal Reserve Bank Building, Cincinnati 2, Ohio. (1) Regular salary for January, February, and March, 1948 as reported on form B; reimbursements of $144.56 for personal out-of-pocket expenses. (2) Self (salary); expenses (various). (3) Personal out-of-pocket expenses for lodgings, food, travel, telephone calls while in Washington, D. C. (4) Progress News, a publication of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc. (5) Appearances before the House and Senate Subcommittees on Appropriations for Civil Functions (Army) in the interest of navigation and flood-control projects in the Ohio Valley.

Lovelady,[6] Rufus M., in care of James B. Burns, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Lodge No. 14, American Federation of Government Employees, Balboa, C. Z. (1)

[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.
[8] Filed with the Clerk only.

[6] Filed for third quarter, 1947.
[8] Filed with the Clerk only.

Transportation from Canal Zone to United States and return to Canal Zone; lodging, subsistence, stationery and supplies, stenographic assistance; transportation and miscellaneous while in Washington, $785. (This amount was expended between May 1 and June 29, 1947, at which time my activities came to an end.) (2) Landlord, various restaurants, stores, taxicab drivers, etc. (3) As indicated under (1) above. (4) None. (5) To oppose a rule permitting admission of Panamanian citizens to civil service examination for employment by the Panama Canal and the Panama Railroad Co. on the Isthmus of Panama.

Lovelady,[7] Rufus M., in care of James B. Burns, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; not employed as legislative representative during this period; American Federation of Government Employees, Lodge No. 14, Balboa Heights, C. Z. (1) None during period covered by this report. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Not employed during this period.

Lovelady, Rufus M., care of James Burns, 900 F. Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Lodge No. 14, American Federation of Government Employees, Balboa, Canal Zone. (1) For rent, subsistence, transportation, stationery, and supplies, $967.80 (based on flat expense account allowance of $350 per month from January 9 to March 31, 1948). (2) Landlord at 1230 Massachusetts Avenue NW., and 1505 W Street SE., for rent; various grocery stores and restaurants; various service stations for gasoline and oil for personal automobile. (3) Ordinary expenses as outlined under (1) and (2) above. (4) None. (5) Support revision of Canal Zone Retirement Act; increase in pay for Federal employees; lifting of $10,000 ceiling on salaries; increased benefits under Employees' Injury Compensation Act of September 7, 1916.

Lucas, James C., American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $200 salary, $20.65 expenses. (2) Taxi drivers. (3) Transportation. (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor law revision, social security law revision, inflammable fabric legislation.

Lunn, Dr. Carl E., 1501 West Washington, Phoenix, Ariz. (1) No salary; receive a slight commission on dues paid from Arizona to National headquarters, barely enough, at times less than enough, to cover needed mailing and incidental expenses. I pay balance myself. (2) Dr. Carl E. Lunn. (3) Postage, mailing, and other incidental expenses. (4) No expenditures for the above items. (5) I support Townsend plan, H. R. 16, and H. R. 2476, paying my own money when feel necessary.

Lyon, A. E., executive secretary, Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received except regular salary and expenses. No money expended for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation. Total salary for quarter, $2,250; total expenses for quarter, $712.08. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Incidental to other and varied duties which comprise the major part of work, all legislative proposals of concern to labor and railway labor in particular.

Lyon, R. B. H., 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Kinsman Optical Co., 1320 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None received. (2) Franklin A. Steinko Mimeographing, $2.80; Courtesy Associates, for stencils, $3.95 and $4.45; total of all payments, $11.20. (3) Mimeographing statement filed with Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Recreation for the District of Columbia. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5241, Eightieth Congress, second session.

[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

Lyons, J. J., John F. Jelke Co., 759 South Washtenaw Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) No money is received other than salary, incidental to regular employment as director of personnel of the company, and reimbursement for transportation, lodging, and meals. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Support of proposals for repeal of taxes on oleomargarine.

McAvoy, Harold,[8] 907 Lorimer Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.; National Association Post Office & Railway Mail Service Mail Handlers, Watchman & Messengers, 1113 Arch Street, North Side Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) $1,395, which must take care of all expenses for the quarter. (2) Harold McAvoy, our legislative representative. (3) Legislation for the benefit of all mail handlers, watchmen, and messengers employed by the Post Office Department. (4) Mail Handlers Journal. (5) He must support all legislation that will benefit all mail handlers, watchmen, and messengers employed by the Post Office Department.

McBride, Don,[10] secretary-manager, National Reclamation Association, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Total receipts for period, $7,960.25 (see schedule VI).[4] Total expenditures for period, $9,105.91 (see schedule V).[4] (2) See attached schedules V and VI.[4] (3) See attached schedules V and VI.[4] (4) National Reclamation Association Bulletin (see enclosed).[4] (5) Amendment to the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 and any other legislation affecting resources of the 17 Western States (see sec. 3, Purposes, first page, our constitution enclosed in first quarterly report.)

McBride, Jonas A., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salaries: Jonas A. McBride, $2,500; Glenn C. Russell, clerk, $955; personal expenses of J. A. McBride, $610.62; printing and supplies, $121.45; rent, $270; telephone and telegrams, $50.56; postage, $20. (2) Salaries to Jonas A. McBride and Glenn C. Russell were paid to those two individuals. Personal expenses were paid to hotels, for pullman accommodations, restaurants, etc. Printing and supplies to various printers and stationers. Telephone, telegrams, and postage are self-explanatory. Rent to Labor, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C. (3) For maintenance of the office of the vice president, national legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting the interests of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

McCarthy, Frank J., the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,232.50 per month, which is paid for all the services rendered to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., only a part of which have to do with legislation; $306.78 was expended by me as expense money, during the first quarter of 1948, for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. In addition to this amount, I also received $460.17 for expenses incurred in connection with other duties performed for the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., which have no relation to the purposes covered by this act. (2) Various transportation companies, restaurants, garages, communication companies, etc. (3) $306.78 was expended by me as expense money, during the first quarter of 1948, for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

[4] Not printed. Filed in the Secretary's office.

[8] Filed with the Clerk only.

[10] Filed with the Secretary only.

McClure, Warren C., box 207, Camden, Ark.; Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) None for legislative purposes. (2) None for legislative purposes. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at the present time.

McDonald,[9] Angus H., 300 B Street SE, Washington, D. C.; National Farmers Union, 3501 East Forty-sixth Avenue, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All major pending legislation.

McDonald, E. L., 524 Governor Building, Portland, Oreg.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Total amount received, $939.08. (2) Transportation and living expenses. (3) Living costs and travel. (4) None. (5) H. R. 16.

McElhoes, S. I., Public Service Co. of Oklahoma, 502 Chickasha Avenue, Chickasha, Okla. (1) Expenses: Railroad fare, $159.05; hotel, $47.89; meals, $71.54; other expenses, $167.47; total, $445.95. Am in partial retirement. Regular salary as stated in original statement. The above expenses are my total expenses for the company. I have done many things besides working on legislation, but it is just impossible to even estimate a correct division. (2) Paid out in the ordinary course of travel, hotel, and incidental expenses. (3) As above outlined. (4) None. (5) Legislation connected with Southwestern Power Administration.

McFarland, Rev. A. J., the Christian Amendment Movement, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans. (1) $750 salary, $250 expenses; $1,000 total. (2) Salary and expenses were used for home and travel by myself. Made a trip to New York, Boston, and points east. (3) Answered above. (4) The Christian Patriot, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans.; the Covenanter Witness, 1121 Buchanan Street, Topeka, Kans. (5) A Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States (H. J. Res. 239; S. J. Res. 150). The preamble shall be amended to read "We, the people of the United States, devoutly recognizing the authority and law of Jesus Christ, the Saviour and King of Nations, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

McGough, Richard, 515 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.; Northern Pacific Railway Co., Union Pacific Railroad Co., Great Northern Railway Co., the Milwaukee Road, Seattle, Wash. (1) Salary as stated in original registration. Expenditures for: Meals, $95.95; taxi fares, $14.45; Pullman fares, $29.27; baggage, $1.95; hotel accommodations, $85.48. (2) Various restaurants, hotels, taxi companies, railroad companies, etc. (3) Living and traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting transcontinental railroads operating in the State of Washington.

McGrath, Thomas Edward, 626 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Approximately $165. (2) Thomas Edward McGrath. (3) To use as I see fit which I consider most beneficial lobbying-petitioning for constructive legislation and against destructive legislation. (4) Submitted for publication, none.

McGrath, Tom J., 324 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates, Boston, Mass.; National Coal Association, Washington, D. C. (1) No payments received. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Participating in the consideration of natural-gas legislative matters as the interests of clients may appear to be affected by such legislation.

McKeehan, Merrick, Arter & Stewart, a partnership, 2800 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio; the Holstein-Friesian Association of America, Brattleboro, Vt. (1) Expended nothing. Received $3,450 for services from April 1, 1946, to November 1, 1947, in connection with supporting legislation referred

[9] Filed with the Clerk only.

to in (5), as well as for services from November 1, 1946, to November 1, 1947, in connection with other matters. (This amount was received on December 12, 1946, but due to misunderstanding of bookkeeper as to information required was inadvertently omitted from report for previous quarter.) (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To support H. R. 3884.

McKeehan, Merrick, Arter & Stewart,[7] 2800 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio; the Lincoln Electric Co., 12818 Coit Road, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Received $412.21; expended, none. (2) McKeehan, Merrick, Arter & Stewart. (3) Reimbursement of traveling expenses, $61.21; attorney's fees, $350. (4) None. (5) Pension trust statutes, and Internal Revenue Code section 23 (a).

McKeehan, Merrick, Arter & Stewart, 2800 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio; the Lincoln Electric Co., 12818 Coit Road, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Received $850; $69.14. (2) Fees to McKeehan, Merrick, Arter & Stewart; traveling expenses. (3) Attorneys' fees, $850. (4) None. (5) Pension trust statutes; and Internal Revenue Code, section 23 (a).

McKercher, M. C., the Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo. (1) Received salary for month of March $325, and expenses $316.67. No money expended in connection with legislative work. (2) Hotel Hamilton, various restaurants, telephone, telegraph, postage, Pullman, streetcar, and taxi fares. (3) Necessary living and transportation expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the welfare of railroad employees.

McLaughlin, Robert E., 410 Central Building, 805 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No expense money drawn or expended, except petty cash for taxi fares. Since March 1, 1948, I have been acting national legislative director for AMVETS at a modest per diem rate for time actually consumed. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) National AMVET and AMVET Letter. (5) To support legislation providing care and assistance for veterans of World War II and their dependents.

McLaughlin, Robert E., National Association of United States Storekeeper-Gaugers, 805 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received quarterly retainer (see form B). (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) To support legislation beneficial to this client and civil service employees in general.

McMahon, John A., president, National Association of Postal Supervisors, 171 Milton Street, Dorchester Center Station, Boston, Mass. (1) $587.75 received from Michael C. Nave, treasurer, National Association of Postal Supervisors, room 326, Main Post Office, Chicago, Ill. (2) John A. McMahon, president, Boston 24, Mass.; Pennsylvania and New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroads, Boston, Mass.; Hotel Continental, Washington, D. C. (3) Reimbursement for loss of salary while absent from regular post-office duties; railroad and pullman transportation between Boston and Washington, D. C.; hotel rooms and meals, telephone and telegraph services. (4) The Postal Supervisors, the official magazine of the National Association of Postal Supervisors. (5) Legislation pending in Congress involving salary adjustments, retirement legislation for Federal employees in the interests of the supervisory officials employed in the field postal service.

McMains, W. H., Distilled Spirits Institute, 1135 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary $3,000, which is in payment for all services rendered, only a part of which deals with legislation. No expenses have been authorized or incurred for purposes listed under this act. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the industry represented is reported to members, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as S. J. Res. 186, S. 1842, S. 265, and H. R. 4388.

McMillan, Robert W., Management Planning of Washington, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,100, with less than one-twentieth of the time and services for which such compensation was paid being for activities which might conceivably be construed as coming within the purview of any of the provisions of title III of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; $43.45, reimbursement of expenses allocable to foregoing activities. (2) Taxi drivers and operators of eating and refreshment places. (3) Transportation and other normal out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

McQuatters,[6] Geneva F., 1917 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,050; expenses, $106.04. (2) Telephone Co., railroad, post office. (3) Telephone, travel, postage. (4) Independent Woman. (5) Supports the merit system in Government, adequate appropriations for the Women's Bureau, equal-rights amendment, the principle that the right to work for compensation shall not be abridged or denied by reason of race, religion, sex, economic, or marital status; opposition to discrimination against women, Federal aid in support of public education with State control of funds, jury service for women, legislation regulating child labor, participation of the United States in the United Nations, the retention of women as a component of the military services, and universal military training.

McQuatters,[7] Geneva F., 1917 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,050; expense, $128.50. (2) Telephone company, railroad, post office. (3) Telephone, travel, postage. (4) Independent Woman. (5) Supports the merit system in government, adequate appropriations for the Women's Bureau, equal-rights amendment, the principle that the right to work for compensation shall not be abridged or denied by reason of race, religion, sex, economic or marital status, opposition to discrimination against women, Federal aid in support of public education with State control of funds, jury service for women, legislation regulating child labor, participation of the United States in the United Nations, the retention of women's units as component branches of the military services, and universal military training.

MacCracken, William P., Jr. (amendment, fourth quarter, 1947), National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (5) In addition to the legislation set forth in my quarterly report for the quarter ending December 31, 1947, I propose to support the following: On behalf of the Laurel Harness Racing Association, Inc., I propose to request an amendment to the provision of the 1948 bill extending the Housing and Rent Control Act by eliminating the section which places control in the office of the Housing Expediter over construction to be used for recreation and amusement purposes.

MacCracken, William P., Jr., Remington Rand, Inc., the American Optometric Association, 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received from the American Optometric Association Development Fund $2,500 for services rendered and $205.82 as reimbursement for expenditures previously reported. (2) Telephone and telegrams, $16.10; taxicabs and miscellaneous, $10.40; total, $26.50. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) On behalf of the American Optometric Association, I have continued to support the action of the District of Columbia Optometric Association in requesting an amendment to the optometry law for the purpose of raising the standards of the profession and providing better visual care for residents of the District of Columbia. Also to support legislation which would afford veterans who are entitled to visual care at Government expense outside of the veterans facilities to select the services of a licensed optometrist where the veteran so elects. The right is at the present time denied him by the Veterans' Administration. On behalf of Remington Rand, Inc., I have been requested to support an amendment to the provision in the appropriation bill limiting the price which the Government can pay for typewriters. At the present time, the statutory limitations are so restrictive that it is practically impossible for the Government to purchase any typewriters.

Mack, James Edward, National Home and Property Owners Foundation, 4817 Thirty-sixth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Since January 1, 1948, I have received no salary or expenses from the National Home and Property Owners Foundation or any other organization for the purpose of influencing legislation. (2) No money received. (3) No money received. (4) None. (5) A minor fraction of my time is spent in furtherance of legislation of benefit to property owners and those interested in the private ownership of property. I no longer receive a salary from the National Home and Property Owners Foundation.

Mackenzie, James,[6] Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6108 Northeast Eighth Avenue, Portland, Oreg. (1) July, August, September 1947, $876.12, including out-of-pocket expenses. (2) Me. (3) Organizer of Townsend Clubs. (4) None. (5) Townsend bill. I am not employed here now.

Mackenzie, James,[7] Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6108 Northeast Eighth Avenue, Portland Oreg. (1) October, November, December 1947, $912.81, including out-of-pocket expenses. (2) Me. (3) Organizer of Townsend clubs. (4) None. (5) Townsend bill. I am not employed here now.

Macleay, Lachlan, Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) Total reimbursable expenses in connection with general work done for the Mississippi Valley Association, all reimbursed by association, $908.47. (2) Railroads, etc., $292.03; hotels and miscellaneous, $616.44. (3) Travel subsistence, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) A portion of Mr. Macleay's time was used in regard to legislation relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement; the American merchant marine; soil conservation; flood control; regulation of domestic transportation.

Macnamee, W. Bruce,[7] Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Macnamee,[10] W. Bruce, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,050 received as salary from the National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., allocable to legislative activities. $267.66 received for expenses (registrant registered with Sea-Air Committee since January 1947). (2) No expenditures except for transportation, hotels, and meals. (3) See item (2). (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation.

Madaris,[7] James B., 220 South Alfred Street, Alexandria, Va.; Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America, 107 West Linwood Boulevard, Kansas City, Mo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Madaris, James B., 220 South Alfred Street, Alexandria, Va.; Brotherhood Railway Car-

[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

[6] Filed for third quarter, 1947.

[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

[6] Filed for third quarter, 1947.

[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

[10] Filed with the Secretary only.

men of America, 107 West Linwood Boulevard, Kansas City, Mo. (1) $197.28 for salary and $48 per diem for expenses. Also $7.20 for miscellaneous expenses. (2) Paid out for transportation, meals, hotels, and other miscellaneous expenses, James B. Madaris. (3) Living expenses, hotels, meals, transportation, etc. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly or indirectly affecting Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America.

Magee,[7] Miss Elizabeth, National Consumers' League, 348 Engineers' Buildings, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, part time, October 1 through December 31, 1947, $416.65; travel, Washington, D. C., October 20–27; December 7-13, $70.91. (2) [Blank.] (3) Travel and living expenses. (4) National Consumers' League Bulletin. (5) Supporting minimum-wage legislation; extension of social security.

Magee, Miss Elizabeth S., National Consumers' League, 348 Engineers' Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, part time, January 15 through March 31, 1948, $333.33; travel, January 25–February 1, 1948, Washington, D. C., $78.70. (2) [Blank.] (3) Travel and living expenses. (4) National Consumers' League Bulletin. (5) Supporting minimum-wage legislation; extension of social security.

Manly, Milo A., National Council for a Permanent FEPC, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Travel, telephone calls and living expenses January 1, 1948, to March 31, 1948, $915.33. Salary after tax deductions January 1, 1948, to March 31, 1948, $1.070.40. (2) [Blank.] (3) For travel, telephone calls, and living expenses, $915.33; salary after tax deductions, $1,070.40. (4) [Blank.] (5) Senate bill 984 and House bill 2824.

Mann, Charles B., Foreman's Association of America, Chapter No. 151, 438 West Sixtieth Place, Chicago, Ill. (1) None. I did not actively participate in any lobbying during the second quarter of 1947 and will not actively lobby again on proposed labor legislation. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Margolin, Mrs. Olya, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) $1,050 (gross, before income-tax deduction) in salary received from National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y., none of which spent in connection with work. $31, received from above, spent for carfare, postage, and office supplies. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Not employed specifically to support or oppose any legislation, but for the purpose of securing information to be transmitted to headquarters for the preparation of educational and other material.

Margolin, Leo J., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Mark, James, Jr.,[7] 900 Fifteenth Street NW. and 907 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Since October 1, 1947, there has been received by affiant as salary the sum of $1,750 and as per diem for personal living expenses the sum of $552, a total of $2,302. (2) No sums in any amount have been paid by affiant to any person other than affiant's expenditures for normal, everyday living expenses such as transportation, meals, etc., in the regular discharge of his duties. (3) Answered in (2) above. (4) None. (5) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.

[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

Mark, James Jr., United Mine Workers of America, 900 Fifteenth Street NW., and 907 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Since January 1, 1948, there has been received by affiant as salary the sum of $2,000, and as per diem for personal living expenses the sum of $546, a total of $2,546. (2) No sums in any amount have been paid by affiant to any person other than affiant's expenditures for normal, everyday living expenses such as transportation, meals, etc., in the regular discharge of his duties. (3) Answered in (2) above. (4) None. (5) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.

Markham,[12] Baird H., American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Expended in 1947, $15, estimated. (2) [Blank.]. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Markham, Baird H., American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Estimated expenditure, $5. (2) Various. (3) Taxies and meals. (4) Except for publications of the institute itself (listed in Form A filed by the institute contemporaneously with this form), the registrant has not caused any articles or editorials to be published with respect to Federal legislation. (5) The proposed legislation with respect to which the registrant concerned himself is set forth in the above table. In general, it may be described as legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

Marks, Raymond E., Southern Pacific Co., 139 North Virginia Street, Reno, Nev. (1) Expended and was reimbursed, $803.58, which was expended as follows: Meals, $375.25; hotel, $140; Pullman accommodations, $155.55; streetcar, taxicab, and bus fares or gasoline, $40.75; tips, $65.30; miscellaneous expenditures, including telephone tolls, postage, incidentals, $26.73. (2) Hotel Statler, Washington, various restaurants, pullman and railroad companies, taxi drivers, porters, bellboys, waiters, telephone companies, et al. (3) Meals and lodging, pullman accommodations, taxi and bus service, telephone calls, postage, porter, bellboy, waiter, and other services. (4) None. (5) Federal legislation affecting Nevada railroads (Southern Pacific, Union Pacific, Western Pacific), e. g., S. 110, Reed-Bulwinkle; S. 670, Hawkes; H. R. 1639, Jennings; H. R. 3150, Howell; H. R. 5711, Simpson; and any other affecting interests of those railroads.

Marran, Donald J., Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, of the above address, of which registrant is an associate, expended $5.39 in connection with the proposed legislation described in item (5) hereof, for which it was or will be reimbursed by the American Tobacco Co. (2) The New York Telephone Co. (3) Telephone toll calls. (4) None. (5) Tax legislation extending the 85-percent dividend received credit to dividends received from resident foreign corporations to the extent that such resident foreign corporations derive income from United States sources.

Marsh, Benjamin C., Peoples Lobby, Inc., 810 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Total receipts, largest contribution, $75; $3,041.53 salaries and wages, $1,187.99; bulletin and printing, $945.75; postage, $382.13; rent, $165; Andrew Walker, $30.75; Government Printing Office, $49.40; addressograph, $11; Remington Typewriter Co., $33.43; incidentals, $114.35. (2) Benjamin C. Marsh, Arlene Ryan, Marie McEnaney, Graphic Arts Press, postage, United States post office, J. B. Stein, Andrew Walker, Government Printing Office, Addressograph, Remington Typewriter Co. (3) Salaries, wages for publicity and clerical work other for maintaining office and getting out material. (4) We haven't caused any article to be published but have sent material and releases to hundreds of papers. (5) Support attached program and oppose that against it.

[12] Filed for calendar year, 1947.

Marshall, J. Paull, Magothy River Association, 528 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,000 received from Magothy River Association; $7.80 expended. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. and taxi drivers. (3) Telephone calls to Baltimore and taxis. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3314, S. 1675, S. 230.

Marshall, Mrs. Katharine Lee, 1734 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (United States section), national administration headquarters, 2006 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) $670 salary, $103.04 expenses. (2) $670 (salary) to landlord, grocers, United States Government, savings, etc.; $103.04 (expenses) to railroads, restaurants, cab drivers, etc. (3) $670 (salary) for personal living expenses, taxes, savings, etc.; $103.04 (expenses) for my own expenses while attending meetings, conferences held by WILPF or other organizations; cab fare to such meetings and to Capitol Hill. (4) Four Lights (organization's publication for membership). (5) Support: Strengthening UN and its specialized agencies; extension reciprocal-trade program; European recovery program and aid to reconstruction; emergency admission displaced persons on nonquota basis; permanent and Federal FEPC; Federal antilynch and anti-poll-tax laws. Oppose: UMT; United States arming of Latin American countries; reduction Federal income taxes; restriction of imports.

Marston, R. B., director, legislative Federal relations division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,012.50, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service, $402.50. (2) Self (salary). Expenses: Hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash. NEA Journal (articles therein). Informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Masaoka, Mrs. Etsu, 501 B Street NE, Washington, D. C.; Japanese-American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, Inc., 403 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) All moneys received include only monthly salary and expenses as explained in form B, filed January 6, 1948; expended, $165.33. (2) Telephone and telegraph companies, taxicabs. (3) Information, contacts, transportation. (4) News stories in Japanese language and Japanese-American newspapers relating to work here are only articles known to have been published because of our contacts with them. (5) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States.

Masaoka, Mike M., Post Office Box 1628, Washington, D. C.; national legislative director Japanese-American Citizen's League Anti-Discrimination Committee, Inc.; 403 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) All moneys received include only monthly salary and expenses as explained in form B, filed January 6, 1948; expended, $165.33. (2) Telephone and telegraph companies, taxicabs. (3) Information, contacts, transportation. (4) News stories in Japanese language and Japanese-American newspapers relating to work here are only articles known to have been published because of our contacts with them. See list. (5) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States.

Maslow, Will, American Jewish Congress, 1834 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received fee for services of $112.50. Expended, $30. (2) Rail and hotel expenses, one trip to Washington, D. C.; miscellaneous cabs, telephone calls in New York City. (3) Same as (2). (4) Congress Weekly, January 23, 1948, article Group Libel Reconsidered; January-February 1948 issue of Law and Social Action. (5) Legislation designed to implement the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights; to keep separate church and state; to liberalize immigration laws.

Mason, Walter J., national legislative representative, American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for 3 months, $2,080. Expenses for January 1948, $37; February, $39.50; March, $47; total for 3 months, $123.50. (2) Taxi drivers, phone company (away from office), messengers, and incidentals. (3) As shown in No. 2. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting workers.

Mathews, John Clifford, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans.; the Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America, for the Christian Amendment Movement; denominational headquarters, 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Salary received from J. S. Tibby for January, February, and March, $750; preaching fees from Olathe, Denison, Southfield, Winchester, Stafford, and Topeka congregations, to be applied on expense account, $225; from J. S. Tibby for expenses, $125. (2) Salary used for personal and family expenses only. Receipts for expenses sent to J. S. Tibby, $120; balance used for paying railway fares, hotel rooms, meals, and other incidentals in necessary travel for the Christian Amendment Movement. (3) See above. (4) The Christian Patriot; the Covenanter Witness, 1121 Buchanan Street, Topeka, Kans. (5) In support of House Joint Resolution 239 and Senate Joint Resolution 150, joint resolutions proposing an amendment to the preamble of the Constitution of the United States to acknowledge Jesus Christ as Saviour and King of Nations.

Mathews,[6] P. H., 179 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.; New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 71 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn. (1) Total expenses, $1,301.07; salary (net), $2,379.88; total, $3,680.95. It is to be noted that the registrant's principal employment is legislation and public-relations work within the State of Massachusetts and only a small part of registrant's time is devoted to Federal legislative work. However, all moneys received for salary and expenses are reported herewith. (2) Various sources for living expenses, transportation, and such other sources as necessary when living away from home. (3) See item 2. (4) None. (5) Legislation pertaining to the railroad industry.

Mathews,[7] P. H., 179 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.; New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 71 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn. (1) Total expenses, $1,433.76; salary, (net) $2,268.96; total, $3,702.72. It is to be noted that registrant's principal employment is legislative and public relations work within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. While only a small part of time was spent on Federal legislative work, all moneys received by registrant are reported herewith. (2) Various sources for living expenses, transportation, and other necessary expenses when traveling and living away from home. (3) See item (2). (4) None. (5) Legislation pertaining to the railroad industry.

Mathews, P. H., 179 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.; the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 61 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn. (1) Total expenses, $1,856.77; salary (net), $2,268.84; total, $4,125.61. It is to be noted that registrant's principal employment is legislative and public relations work within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. However, all moneys received by registrant for salary and expenses are reported herewith. (2) Various sources, for living expenses, transportation, and other necessary expenses when traveling and living away from home. (3) See item (2). (4) None. (5) Legislation pertaining to the railroad industry.

Maudlin, C. V., 716 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.; Georgia Power Co. and its associate company, Savannah River Electric Co., Electric Building, Atlanta, Ga. (1) Receipts and receivable, $4,042.22 from Georgia Power Co. for all services and expenses including both legislative and nonlegislative activities. Expenditures, $188.22, exclusive of stenographic and research services furnished by my office personnel. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Western Union, Federal Power Commission, Superintendent of Documents, cab drivers, and various others. (3) Telephone calls, telegrams, Government publications, taxi fares, and out-of-pocket miscellaneous expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting interests of the Georgia Power Co. and the Savannah River Electric Co.

Mechem, Frank L., P. E. Harris & Co. et al., 603 Central Building, Seattle, Wash. (1) As stated in answer to question 4 on form B, the only money received by registrant is (a) legal fee on per diem basis for services performed and (b) reimbursement for traveling expenses. During the last preceding quarter, there was received on account of services performed by registrant in carrying on his lobbying activities as defined by law the amount of $2,800. The total amount of reimbursement for traveling expenses during such quarter was $742.36. (2) See (3). (3) The only expenditures during the preceding calendar quarter consisted of traveling expenses covering railroad transportation, hotel, meals, telephone and telegraph tolls. (4) None. (5) The formulation and presentation of a proposed legislative program designed to stabilize certain phases of the Alaska salmon industry.

Meeks, E. A., National League of District Postmasters of the United States, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,500 salary for quarter ending March 31, 1948. (2) E. A. Meeks. (3) Salary. (4) The Postmaters' Advocate, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (5) Any legislation affecting postmasters.

Messer, Ross A., 527 Victor Building, P. O. Box 1611, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Post Office Custodial Employees for January and February; National Association of Post Office Mechanics and Custodial Employees, March. On March 1 the custodial employees' organization went out of existence and the new organization was formed. (1) Salary, $1,250; expenses, $317.41; expenses includes telephone, telegraph, post-office-box rent, taxi, office supplies, etc., necessary for the operation of an office handling legislation and grievances. (2) [Blank.] (3) In support of all beneficial legislation for postal employees, and handling grievances between the membership and the Post Office Department. (4) The Post Office Custodial News. (5) All beneficial legislation for postal employees and custodial employees in particular.

Middleton, P. Harvey, Railway Business Association, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) The only money received by me during the period from January 1 to March 31, 1948, was $5,666.66 in salary gross. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) The only item of legislation dealt with by me in this period was a letter to the members of the Railway Business Association, dated January 30, in which I sent them an extract from the minority report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations regarding the St. Lawrence seaway, for their consideration in discussing legislation with members of the House and Senate committees.

Miles, Clarence R., United States Chamber of Commerce, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary, $4,125; expenses, $133.35; expended; transportation, $31.10; meals, $46.35; phone, $55.90. (2) Taxi and other transportation companies, restaurants, telephone company. (3) Transportation to and communication with the Capitol; other normal and necessary expenses. (4) None. (5) All legislation of interest to business.

Miller, Charles C., 715 Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW, Washington, D. C.; The Rubber Manufacturers Association, 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) I have received from my employer during the quarter ended March 31, 1948, prorated to cover time spent in legislative activities during this period, a total of $3,413.72. (2) $133.10 to various hotels and restaurants for guest luncheons; $32.65, cabs; $94.50, Miss Genevieve Foreman for mimeographing; $57.49, United States Post Office; $2.08, office supply houses; $96.08, United States Government Printing Office and Congressional quarterly; $322.50, Ring Engineering Co. for rent; $2,360.99 in salaries for Washington office staff of RMA. (3) [Blank.] (4) Press coverage consisted of general news reports covering routine monthly reports on tire production and rubber consumption and statements of industry views on legislation now embodied in Public Law 469. (5) Bills pertaining to national rubber policy, revision of excise taxes, and regulation of transportation of flammable material.

Miller, Dale, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.; Dallas Chamber of Commerce, Dallas, Tex.; Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, Houston, Tex.; Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N. Y. (1) Received $1,500, plus $750 expenses, from Dallas Chamber of Commerce; $1,500, no expenses, from Intracoastal Canal Association; $1,500, plus $769.35 expenses, from Texas Gulf Sulphur Co. Expended $1,519.35. This sum includes all business expenses in Washington, only a small portion of which would apply to activities within the purview of the act. (2) Carlyn Apartments, Mayflower Hotel, United States Post Office, telephone and telegraph companies, local transportation facilities, stationers, food and beverage establishments. (3) Apartment rent, $462.50; office rent, $525; taxi fares, etc., $110; telephone and telegraph companies, $82.10; stamps, stationery, other usual office expenses, $142; entertainment and miscellaneous, $197.75. (4) Monthly article in Dallas Magazine, official publication of Dallas Chamber of Commerce. (5) Legislation affecting flood control, water transportation, river and harbor improvement, appropriations, and taxes.

Milton, Charles J., Milton, McNulty & Augelli, 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N. J. (1) None. (2) None paid. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3237 and S. 249.

Miskimins,[9] Scott A., Townsend National Recovery Plan, 103 Pendleton Street, Independence, Mo. (1) October 1, 1947 to January 1, 1948. Finance by commissions received, $506.58. Expenses, while away from home, $242.30. (2) The usual expense incurred when traveling about the State of Missouri. (3) To educate our citizens in regards to need of a broader social-security plan, to preserve free enterprise, to promote the Townsend national recovery plan, to protect the dignity of all the people of the United States. (4) None. (5) To support the Townsend national recovery plan, pending legislation.

Mollin, F. E., American National Livestock Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo. (1) Have had no special contributions for lobbying purposes. The association finances handled in normal fashion. (2) No payments to anyone in connection with lobbying activities. Only part of the expense of myself as executive secretary of the

[6] Filed for third quarter, 1947.

[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

[9] Filed with the Clerk only.

association on trips to Washington in past quarter could be chargeable to such. Total expense for this purpose was, $642.65; telephone and telegraph, $68.47; Washington stenographer, $31.36. (3) [Blank.] (4) Our own official magazine, the American Cattle Producer. (5) Price-control and rationing legislation; land and forest matters; garbage-disposal bill; administrative-law bill.

Montgomery, Donald E., 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW-CIO), 411 West Milwaukee, Detroit, Mich. (1) Salary, $1,300; subsistence, $819; expenses, $567.63; total, $2,686.63. This amount covers nonlegislative work as described under (4) in Form B as well as legislative work. Legislative work accounts for less than half of total duties. (2) Subsistence, transportation, hotel, etc. (3) Subsistence and travel. (4) Auto Worker, Ammunition and Washington Report (UAW-CIO publications). Economic Outlook (CIO publication). Antioch Review. Labor and Nation. (5) Support all bills favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Mooney, William W., 505 South Eleventh Street, Tacoma, Wash.; Townsend National Recovery Plan Organization, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Total received $1,478.99 with taxes out. Total expenditures $721.70, for complete travel expenses over States of Washington and Idaho, including hotels, meals, auto, train, bus, travel in promotion work and incidentals in advertising special and regular meetings and conferences, special letters, and bulletins, etc., leaving a balance of $757.29. (2) William W. Mooney, Townsend national recovery plan, State representative in the States of Washington and Idaho. (3) Visiting clubs and groups, setting up meetings, advertising same in cities counties, congressional district, and State-wide meetings in Washington and Idaho to create interest in the Townsend plan. (4) Send notices or articles at times to Townsend National Weekly, printed at 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. Also mimeograph letters and bulletins to create interest, and making announcements and to create morale. (5) Townsend national recovery plan bills now in the Ways and Means Committee, as H. R. 16, and H. R. 2476.

Moore, Chester B., Western Growers Association, 606 South Hill Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) Regular salary as managing director of Western Growers Association, plus traveling expenses. (2) To all regular accounts of my personal and business life. (3) [Blank.] (4) Western Grower and Shipper. (5) Am paid regular salary. Not directly employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. I do oppose or support any legislation of interest to our members.

Moore, Clayton, R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Fourth and Main Streets, Winston-Salem, N. C. (1) Actual expenses incurred, $48.27. (Salary for full-time services as associate counsel same as amount in last quarterly report and for the purposes more fully set out in registration form.) (2) Railroad and pullman fares, $21.77; hotel, meals, and phones, $22.50; taxicabs, $4. (3) Travel, hotel, meals, phones, and taxi fares. (4) None. (5) Tax legislation affecting R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.

Moran, Raymond H., 46 Burnside Avenue, Cranford, N. J.; International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Ninth and Mount Vernon Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $200 (March 1 to April 1, 1948); expenses, $95.14; no other expenses other than living expenses. (2) Hotels Annapolis and Hamilton, taxicabs, telephone and telegraph, postage, laundry, meals, etc. (3) All living, transportation, telegraph and telephone expense. (4) None. (5) All legislation pertaining to railroad labor, particularly all bills affecting the now existing Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Acts.

Morelock, Phil D., Massman Construction Co., Kansas City, Mo. (1) None with respect to this or any other matters before the legislature. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2192 for the relief of Massman Construction Co., Kansas City, Mo.

Morgan, Gerald D., Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; Alaska Transportation Co., Pier 58, Seattle, Washington. (1) Engaged in legislative activity on behalf of Alaska Transportation Co. for approximately 9½ days, for which firm of Morgan & Calhoun received $947.95. Expended during this period $135.64 for telephone and teletype messages, for which the firm received reimbursement from Alaska Transportation Co. This sum includes expenses in connection with nonlegislative matters, but an allocation is impossible. (2) $135.64 paid to Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., for telephone and teletype service. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Legislative activity consisted of conferences with various persons in the Maritime Commission, the Department of the Interior, as well as various Members of Congress respecting legislation to take the place of Public Law 12, Eightieth Congress, relating to Alaska shipping, when that law expires on June 30, 1948.

Morgan, Gerald D., Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; The Toilet Goods Association, Inc., 3 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y. (1) $833 received by Morgan & Calhoun for all services for the Toilet Goods Association, Inc., of which $500 represents an annual retainer fee. Allocation between legislative and non-legislative activities is not feasible. Expended $7.36 for telephone and travel expenses, which was reimbursed by The Toilet Goods Association, Inc. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $2.63; Pullman Co., $1.73; meals and tips, $3. (2) See above. (4) None. (5) Legislation providing for relief from the existing 20 percent retail tax on toilet preparations.

Morris, Curtis, East Texas Chamber of Commerce, Box 1592, Longview, Tex. (1) Salary and expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) Expenses traveling to and from Washington and in Washington: transportation, $243.90; hotel, $464.34; meals, $172.21; taxi fares, $70.85; telephone and telegraph, $3.88; stenographer, storage, postage, and miscellaneous, $97.97. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the interests of East Texas business or communities.

Morrow, Giles, Freight Forwarders Institute, 225 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary of $2,499.99, plus $287.95 as reimbursement for traveling expenses, taxi fares, and other incidental expenses incurred on office business. (2) Pennsylvania Railroad, B. & O. Railroad, Palmer House Hotel, Chicago, Ill., and taxicabs and restaurants in Washington and Chicago. (3) For actual expenses while away from Washington and for transportation on office business in Washington. Only expenditures in connection with legislation were taxicab fares to and from the Capitol in connection with testimony presented on pending bills. (4) Editor of I. C. C. Practitioners' Journal. (5) Any legislation directly affecting the interests of freight forwarders subject to part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act. Testified on bills S. 571, S. 935, S. 1194, S. 2426, and H. R. 2759, endorsing last named and opposing others.

Morse, Henry Hoyt, 99 Pearl Street, Gardner, Mass.; Institute of Cooking and Heating Appliance Manufacturers, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C. (1) No money received. (2) No money paid. (3) No work undertaken. (4) Stove Builder. (5) None.

Mosier, Harold G., Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C.; the Glenn L. Martin Co., Middle River, Baltimore, Md. (1) As previously reported, registrant receives compensation of $1,000 per month for his services. As described in greater detail below, in the course of performing these services, registrant has made certain expenditures for travel, subsistence, communications, etc., for which he has been, or will be, reimbursed. Payment of these amounts so expended has been made directly to the hotels, railroads, restaurants, etc., which rendered the services to which reference is here made. Following is a summary of the expenditures referred to: Rail fare, $45.56; pullman fare, $3.46; taxis, $131.60; room rent, $31.50; breakfast, $21.40; lunch, $7.75; dinner, $42.70; postage, $7.70; telephone and telegraph, $89.31; tips, $56.25; material, $1; entertainment, $1,009.24; total, $1,447.47. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting aviation.

Munro, Walter J., Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received or expended in connection with legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) None. (4) None. (5) None. My work pertains entirely to public relations.

Murph, Daniel S., the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $100 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 869, H. R. 2494, H. R. 3421, H. R. 4417, H. R. 4562, H. R. 4752, and S. 1251.

Murphy, Dr. Emmett J., 5737 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Chiropractic Insurance Co., Webster City, Iowa. (1) None received. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Reported the introduction of H. R. 5468 in the NCA Journal and Chiropractic News. (5) None specified. At present time supporting S. 1428, the Langer bill, and H. R. 5468, the Patterson bill.

Murphy, Ray, Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant does not receive funds earmarked for purposes set forth in this act. Registrant has estimated, however, that $75 received by registrant during the first quarter of 1948 might come within scope of act as registrant understands act has been interpreted by the Department of Justice. Registrant does not believe he has engaged in any activities in this quarter within the purview of this act. Registrant has expended no money in this quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Article on State regulation of insurance rates appearing in January 3, 1948, issue of the Weekly Underwriter. (5) Registrant doubts that he is employed to support or oppose legislation. However, on very infrequent occasions, he has supported or opposed legislation as it specifically affects capital stock casualty insurance and surety companies.

Myrup, Andrew William, 932 Bowen Building, 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Bakery and Confectionery Workers' International Union of America, 2719 North Wilton Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary of $108 per week, $1,404 quarterly. (2) To the registrant. (3) Salary for conducting the research department of the international union with the following duties in the interest of our membership; to collect and compile statistical data for the use of the member locals in negotiations, such surveys to cover hours and earnings, contract clauses, economic data on the industries in which our members work. Also to act as liaison between our organization and various Government agencies, such as NLRB, Labor, Commerce, Agriculture, Social Security, etc., and to watch progress of Federal and State legislation. (4) None. (5) None.

National Association of Real Estate Boards, its Realtors, Washington Committee, and its public relations department, Chicago and Washington Headquarters.[13] (1) See amended schedule attached.[1] (2) See amended schedule attached.[1] (3) See amended schedule attached.[1] (4) Original report shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by those publications is not available. (5) All legislation affecting real estate.

National Association of Real Estate Boards, its Realtors, Washington Committee, and its public-relations department,[5] Chicago and Washington headquarters. (1) See amended schedule attached,[1] (2) See amended schedule attached.[1] (3) See amended schedule attached.[1] (4) Original report shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by those publications is not available. (5) All legislation affecting real estate.

National Association of Real Estate Boards, its Realtors, Washington Committee, and its public-relations department,[11] Chicago and Washington headquarters. (1) See amended schedule attached.[1] (2) See amended schedule attached.[1] (3) See amended schedule attached.[1] (4) Original report shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by those publications is not available. (5) All legislation affecting real estate.

National Association of Real Estate Boards, its Realtors, Washington Committee, and its public-relations department,[5] Chicago and Washington headquarters. (1) See amended schedule attached.[1] (2) See amended schedule attached.[1] (3) See amended schedule attached.[1] (4) Original report shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by those publications is not available. (5) All legislation affecting real estate.

National Association of Real Estate Boards; its Realtors, Washington Committee, and its public-relations department,[6] Chicago and Washington headquarters. (1) See amended schedule attached.[1] (2) See amended schedule attached.[1] (3) See amended schedule attached.[1] (4) Original report shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by those publications is not available. (5) All legislation affecting real estate.

National Association of Real Estate Boards; its Realtors, Washington Committee, and its public-relations department,[7] Chicago and Washington headquarters. (1) See amended schedule attached.[1] (2) See amended schedule attached.[1] (3) See amended schedule attached.[1] (4) Original report shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by those publications is not available. (5) All legislation affecting real estate.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for second quarter, 1947.
[6] Filed for third quarter, 1947.
[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.
[8] Filed for fourth quarter, 1946.
[11] Filed for first quarter, 1947.
[13] Filed for third quarter, 1946.

National Postal Committee for Books, room 305, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (see registration for statement of membership of committee). (1) No receipts during said period. Expenditures, $8.25 for mimeographing and postage. (2) American Book Publishers Council, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (3) For mimeographing and postage. (4) Publishers Weekly, New York, N. Y. (5) The committee opposes unfair increases in postal rates and discrimination in postal rates such as contained in H. R. 2408 and H. R. 3519.

National St. Lawrence Project Conference,[10] 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Carroll B. Huntress, vice president, Republic Coal & Coke Co., 17 Battery Place, acting as chairman for the National St. Lawrence Project Conference, without compensation and for reimbursement of expenses of travel and hotel. (2) Railroads, hotels, $1,315; New York Telephone Co., $77.07; United States Post Office, $48.46; newspaper subscriptions, $22.50. (3) To carry on duties as chairman. (4) [Blank.] (5) Senate Joint Resolution 111, House Joint Resolution 192.

National Savings and Loan League,[13] 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Approximately $80 of the National Letter expense item might remotely be considered as legislative in nature due to the fact that the National Letter is the league's reporting medium of legislative matters (it is a bulletin to members). (We were advised by counsel that in their opinion the National League does not come within the purview of the lobbying act.) (2) Batt Bates & Co., and Darby Printing Co. (printers of the National Letter). (3) Printing the National Letter. (4) National Savings and Loan Journal and National Letter. (5) Bills to improve the facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home ownership are supported while legislation inimical to the interest of the savings and loan industry is opposed.

National Savings and Loan League,[8] 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Financial statement attached.[1] Of the items contained therein, $136.66 of FHLBA committee expense and only approximately $230 of National Letter expense could be construed as pertaining to legislation. (2) Darby Printing Co. and Batt Bates & Co., $230 and $14.86; Dr. H. E. Hoagland (to attend hearings of House Select Committee to Investigate Acts of Executive Agencies Which Exceed Their Authority), $121.80. (3) Printing National Letter and special reports, and for attendance at House select committee hearings. (4) National Letter and National Savings and Loan Journal. (5) Bills to improve the facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home ownership are supported while legislation inimicable to the interest of the savings and loan industry is opposed.

National Savings and Loan League,[11] 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Financial statement attached.[1] (The item of $200 Federal legislation committee, represents payment to C. H. Ellingson for reimbursement for legal services). In the report filed by Mr. O. R. Kreutz, it was stated that no portion of his salary was allocable to legislation during the quarter. Perhaps $125 of the National Letter charge may be allocable. (2) See (1). (3) Legal services and legislation as stated in (1). All other expenditures were for routine League business not connected with legislation. (4) National Savings and Loan Journal. (5) Bills to improve the facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home ownership are supported while legislation inimicable to the interest of the savings and loan industry is opposed.

National Savings and Loan League,[5] 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Financial statement attached,[1] Approximately $147 of National Letter expense may be applicable. (See previous reports.) (2) Batt Bates & Co. and Darby Printing Co. (3) Printing National Letter. (4) National Savings and Loan Journal and National Letter. (5) Support S. 801, S. 802, S. 803, S. 804, S. 913, S. 1149, and President's Reorganization Plan No. 3. Oppose some provisions of S. 866 and H. R. 3756.

National Savings and Loan League,[6] 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Financial statement attached,[1] Approximately $115 of National Letter expense may be applicable. (See report of first quarter.) (2) Batt Bates & Co. and Darby Printing Co. (3) Printing National Letter. (4) National Savings and Loan Journal and National Letter. (5) Supporting S. 801, S. 802, S. 803, S. 804, S. 913, S. 1149, and President's Reorganization Plan No. 3. Opposing some provisions of S. 866 and H. R. 3756.

National Savings and Loan League,[7] 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Financial statement attached.[1] The following items may be applicable: $60 for National Letter. Also $375 of officers' salaries and approximately $432.19 of other expense items may be applicable, as reported in Form C filed by the executive manager of the league, Oscar R. Kreutz. (2) Post Office Department, Western Union, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., C. H. Ellingson, Statler Hotel, Congressional Country Club, Batt Bates & Co., Darby Printing Co. (3) Postage, telegraph, telephone, fees for drafting bills, entertainment, also printing. (4) National Savings and Loan Journal, National Letter, Investment Dealers Digest. (5) Support Reorganization Plan No. 3, S. 801, S. 802, S. 803, S. 804, S. 913, and S. 1149. Opposing some provisions of S. 866 and H. R. 3756.

National Savings and Loan League, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Financial statement attached.[1] The following items may be applicable: $145 for National Letter, $255 of executive manager's salary, and $211.66 of legislation. (2) Batt Bates & Co.; Darby Printing Co.; Oscar R. Kreutz, executive manager; Western Union. (3) Printing special reports, telegrams, and portion of executive manager's salary. (4) National Savings and Loan Journal and National Letter. (5) Bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing are supported. Legislation inimicable to interests of savings and loan industry is opposed.

The National Tax Relief Coalition, Box 94, Route 7, Greensboro, N. C. (1) Received $2,395, January, February, March 31, 1948. (2) $1,685.75 paid for auto upkeep, 700 miles per week, at 6 cents per mile, 13 weeks, $546; lodging, meals, at $8.65 per day, for 13 weeks, $519; salary for L. S. Franklin, $375; stamps, mailing costs, $150; phone, $30; mimeographing bulletins, $65.75. (3) Printing, transportation, salary, and general expenses. (4) None. (5) Tax reform.

Nau, Carlton L., American Public Power Association, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) As stated in the original registration, only occasionally does it become necessary for me to undertake any activities which come within the purview of section 308 of Public Law 601. My full-time employment is secretary-manager of this service organization. During the first quarter of 1948, my only efforts to influence legislation were with respect to the following bills, which appear to deal directly with matters of interest to members of this associa-

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for second quarter, 1947.
[6] Filed for third quarter, 1947.
[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.
[8] Filed for fourth quarter, 1946.
[10] Filed with the Secretary only.
[11] Filed for first quarter, 1947.
[13] Filed for third quarter, 1946.

tion: H. R. 3036; Senate Joint Resolution 111; H. R. 3826, H. R. 2873, H. R. 1277. Expenditures incurred for above purposes are allocated as follows: Time of manager, $375; time of stenographer, $170; mimeographing (Union Letter Service), $55; telegrams, postage, taxi, and miscellaneous, $35; total, $635. The only funds received by me were my regular salary as manager of the association, which for the first quarter amounted to $1,620.42 (excluding withholding tax and social security). No funds were received from anyone or any source for the financing of the specific activities listed. They were paid for out of the general funds of this association, which are obtained from its member systems. Membership fees are based upon a fixed percentage of the gross income of the operating system and generally cover a 1-year period. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) See (1).

Neal, William S., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,000 a month salary for 3 months; expenses of $366.45, or a total of $3,366.45 for the period. (2) Expenditures for taxi transportation, rail transportation, hotel bill on trip to New York; lunches, dinners, telephones, similar miscellaneous expenses. (3) Continuing above, for incidental and social purposes. (4) National Association of Manufacturers News (regular contributor). (5) NAM program: For tax reduction, for reduction of Government expenditures, against economic controls legislation, against continuation of Office of Technical Services, for European recovery program. Note: It is my opinion that not more than half of my time could be charged to duties requiring registration; same as to receipts and expenses.

Neel, Samuel E., 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) I am retained by the Mortgage Bankers Association of America as Washington counsel to the association on the usual lawyer-client relationship. I am reimbursed by the association on an annual retainer basis. Also paid by the association are actual traveling expenses incurred by me while traveling outside of Washington representing the association. The association also reimburses me for the Washington office expenses incurred by me on their behalf and necessary in the representation of the association. For the quarter ending March 31, 1948, the answers to the questions on form C are as follows: Money received (January 1 to March 31, 1948), (a) retainer, $2,749.98; (b) traveling expenses, $750.80; (c) office expenses, $1,387. Money expended: (a) traveling expenses, $750.80; (b) office expenses, $1,387. (2) The only money expended was that for travel expenses and office expenses. The travel expenses were paid to various railroads, hotels, etc., and the office expenses were paid for postage, office supplies, etc. (3) See (2). (4) Washington News Letter, published biweekly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America; Letter to Members, published irregularly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America; The Mortgage Banker, published irregularly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America. (5) Matters affecting the mortgage banking industry.

Nelson, G. W., 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) None received. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Opposing antilabor legislation and favoring legislation of benefit to labor.

Nelson, George R., grand lodge representative, International Association of Machinists, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Nelson,[14] Herbert U., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) See attached.[1] (2) See attached.[1] (3) See attached.[1] (4) Attached list[1] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Nelson,[12] Herbert U., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) See attached.[1] (2) See attached.[1] (3) See attached.[1] (4) Attached list[1] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Nelson, Herbert U., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Reimbursement by employer for travel expenses and per diem, $2,222; salary, 20 percent of time devoted to legislative activities, $1,250; total, $3,472. (2) See attached itemized statement.[1] (3) See attached itemized statement.[1] (4) Attached list[1] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Newton, R. Wayne, National Association of Cooperatives; 407 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, $2,100; expense account, $177.04. (2) R. Wayne Newton. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Employed to counteract the antifarmer-coop lobbying activities of (1) the National Tax Equality Association; (2) Vernon Scott and Loring Schuler, whether lobbying individually, as officers and employees of the National Tax Equality Association, or as a firm of organization and industry counselors claiming the National Tax Equality Association as a client; (3) all State and local tax-equality associations and all National, State, and local small-business or other corporations, however known, which are subsidized from or contributors to the lobbying funds of the National Tax Equality Association.

Nixon, Russ, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,060; expenses, $150. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers, etc. (3) Personal expenses in Washington and travel. These expenses cover both legislative and nonlegislative activity. (4) UE News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Noffsinger,[7] J. S., National Council of Business Schools, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) None anticipated at present.

Noffsinger,[7] J. S., National Home Study Council, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) None anticipated at present.

Noffsinger,[7] J. S., National Council of Technical Schools, 839 Seventeenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) None anticipated at present.

Noffsinger, J. S., National Home Study Council, National Council of Business Schools, National Council of Technical Schools, and National Federation of Private School Associations, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None from the National Council of Business Schools. (2) Testified one time before veterans' subcommittee of the House. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation in the Congress is a very small part of my duties. If legislation should arise as to affect either or all of the above associations, I would act in the proper interest as I may be advised.

Noble, William R. National Retail Farm Equipment Association and National Retail Hardware Association, 1028 Barr Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Out-of-pocket expenses, $136.25. (2) Public transportation, telephone company, restaurants, and hotels. (3) Taxi fares, phone calls, luncheons, and hotel. (4) Farm Equipment Retailing and Hardware Retailer. (5) Have taken position on wage and hour legislation, taxation matters, and several minor bills.

Norgord,[10 11] Christian P., 1617 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $666.44 per diem and expenses. (2) $110.53 railroad and hotel expenses; $23.41 supplies. (3) Travel to conferences. (4) [Blank.] (5) Proposed amendment of 28-hour livestock transportation law. Not submitted. S. 1447.

Norgord,[6 10] Christian P., 1617 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $836 per diem and expenses. (2) $204.34 railroad and hotel expenses; $61.67 office supplies. (3) Travel to conferences. (4) National Humane Review, Albany, N. Y. (5) Proposed amendment to 28-hour livestock transportation law. Not submitted. S. 1447.

Norgord,[6 10] Christian P., 1617 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $592.76, per diem and expenses. (2) $128.36 to railroads and hotel; $17.90 office expenses. (3) Travel to conferences and general office expenses. Proposed amendment to 28-hour law protecting animals in transit from inhumane treatment. S. 1447. Protecting wild animals imported from inhumane treatment. (4) National Humane Review, Albany, N. Y. (5) See statement No. 3.

Norgord,[7 10] Christian P., 1617 Rhode Island NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $475.12 per diem and expenses. (2) $49.75 to railroads and hotels, $26.13 office expenses. (3) Travel to annual meeting and general office expenses. (4) National Humane Review, Albany, N. Y. (5) S. 1447 to protect wild animals and birds imported from inhumane treatment.

Norgord, Christian P., 1617 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) During last quarter of 1947, per diem, $389.89 spent for personal use; $76.13 to firms in Washington for office supplies and to railroad companies and hotels for necessary travel on account of the work. (2) To railroads and hotels for travel necessary in connection with the work. To firms in Washington for office supplies. (3) For travel and office supplies. (4) National Humane Review, Albany, N. Y. (5) S. 1447 to protect wild animals and birds imported into the United States, from cruelty en route.

Nortman,[5] Walter, Wisconsin Railroad Association, 122 West Washington Avenue, Madison, Wis. (1) Salary in the total sum of $1,050 plus out-of-pocket expenses incurred while in, going to and from Washington, D. C., in the total sum of $141.80. (2) Out-of-pocket expenses as stated were paid to hotels, for lodging; restaurants and

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for second quarter, 1947.
[6] Filed for the third quarter, 1947.
[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.
[10] Filed with the Secretary only.
[11] Filed for first quarter, 1947.
[12] Filed for calendar year, 1947.
[14] Filed for year ending 1946.

hotels for meals; Pullman Co. for Pullman fares; taxicab drivers for taxi fares, and other small miscellaneous items. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Reed bill (S. 110) and Jennings railroad venue bill.

Nortman,[6] Walter, Wisconsin Railroad Association, 122 West Washington Avenue, Madison, Wis. (1) Salary in the total sum of $750 plus out-of-pocket expenses incurred while in, going to and from Washington, D. C., in the sum of $237. (2) Out-of-pocket expenses as stated were paid to hotels for lodging; restaurants for meals; Pullman Co. for pullman fares; taxicab drivers for taxi fares, and other small miscellaneous items. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) The Jennings railroad venue bill.

Nortman,[7] Walter, Wisconsin Railroad Association, 122 West Washington Avenue, Madison, Wis. (1) Salary, Wisconsin Railroad Association, of $600 plus out-of-pocket expenses incurred by affiant while in the State of Wisconsin, and which might be construed as being in behalf of pending Federal legislation, in the sum of $79.50. (2) Out-of-pocket expenses were incurred in meals, gasoline, and lodging expense, while within the State of Wisconsin. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) The Reed bill, known as S. 110.

Nortman, Walter, Wisconsin Railroad Association, 122 West Washington Avenue, Madison, Wis. (1) Salary, Wisconsin Railroad Association, $600, plus out-of-pocket expenses incurred while in, going to, and from Washington, D. C., in the sum of $142. (2) Such out-of-pocket expenses were incurred in hotels for lodging; restaurants and hotels for meals; Pullman Co. for pullman fares; taxicab drivers for taxi fare; and other small miscellaneous expenditures. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5711.

O'Connor,[8] Edward H., Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary received during quarter, $2,499.96. Reimbursement for traveling expenses, $803.29. (2) Paid out $803.29 in traveling expenses to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, and miscellaneous items of personal expense. (3) For personal traveling expenses of the undersigned incurred in carrying out my work for the Insurance Economics Society of America. No moneys expended during this quarter for lobbying activities. (4) None. (5) The Howell bill, H. R. 3150, and its companion Senate bill, S. 670, by HAWKES, and S. 1320 and its companion H. R. 3548.

O'Dunne, Eugene, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 396 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) $54.65 expenditures. (2) [Blank.] (3) $54.65 taxicab fares, telephone tolls, and telegrams. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2860, amendment to section 1 (b) in Eightieth Congress, second session; House Joint Resolution 131 in Eightieth Congress, second session; section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 in Eightieth Congress, second session.

Ogg, William Raymond, 857 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; American Farm Bureau Federation, 58 East Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $51.75 expended (see item (6) of Form B, filed December 1946). (2) Taxis, restaurants. (3) Transportation, luncheon conferences. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Long-range agricultural program, taxation, agricultural appropriations, Commodity Credit Corporation, regulation of commodity exchanges, coordination of agricultural conservation services, Fair Employment Practices Act, farm credit, fertilizer, European recovery program, continuation of postwar construction of highways, transfer of United States Employment Service from Federal Security Agency to Labor Department (in proposed Reorganization Plan No. 1), transfer of Army Remount Service to United States Department of Agriculture, eradication of cattle grubs, amendment to Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act, universal military training, means for controlling inflation, 1-year extension of administration by Secretary of Agriculture of Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, St. Lawrence seaway, Federal meat inspection, Tennessee Valley Authority, Federal aid to education, Library demonstration bill, irrigation and reclamation, Labor Extension Service.

O'Hara, Bart W., secretary-treasurer, Colorado Associated Businessmen, Inc. (previous report made by Colorado Tax Equality Committee, Inc. Name of organization was changed as of January 1, 1948, by amendment of articles of incorporation), 450 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation that may be designed to bring about tax equality concerning corporations.

Oliver, John P., Reserve Officers' Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) January 1948, $5843.33 plus $8.90; February 1948, $583.33 plus $24.50; March 1948, $583.33 plus $36.20. (2) The grocer, the baker, the landlord, the taxi driver, etc. (3) Living expenses for self and family, transportation, taxes of various kinds. (4) The Reserve Officer, 2517 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C. (5) Legislation for the development of a military policy for the United States which will provide adequate national security.

O'Neal, Sam, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Distributors Information Committee of the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Electric Power Board, Chattanooga, Tenn. (1) Received: $1,926.93 from Distributors Information Committee, including fees of $1,875 and expenses of $51.93. Expended: $51.93 for travel and meals on trip to Knoxville, Tenn. on official business. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation pertaining to private and public power.

O'Neal, Sam, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 105 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received, $1,716, including fees of $1,666.66 and $50 expenses; expended, $50 for flowers. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation pertaining to postal matters, including rates and regulations.

Oxholm, Mrs. Theodor, volunteer worker for Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) $37.27 railroad fare, hotel accommodations, meals, taxies, New York to Washington, D. C., and return; $97.08 railroad fare, hotel accommodations, meals, taxis, New York to Chicago and return; $36.65 stationery, stamps, office supplies; $25, 1 year subscription to Congressional Intelligence; $46 stationery. (2) Travel expenses to Mrs. Theodor Oxholm; $46 to Freeman Publishing Co.; other expenses as indicated. (3) Trip to Washington January 27, 28, 29, 30 to attend meetings of Spokesmen for Children and National Commission on Children and Youth. Trip to Chicago, February 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 1948, to attend conference on rural health of the American Medical Association. Other expenses as indicated. (4) [Blank.] (5) Federal legislation specifically affecting children and child welfare.

Parel, James Donald, 857 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; American Farm Bureau Federation, 58 East Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $43.75 expended (see item (6) of form B, filed December 1946). (2) Taxis, restaurants. (3) Transportation, luncheon conferences. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Long-range agricultural program, taxation, agricultural appropriations, Commodity Credit Corporation, regulation of commodity exchanges, coordination of agricultural conservation services, Fair Employment Practices Act, farm credit, fertilizer, European recovery program, continuation of postwar construction of highways, transfer of United States Employment Service from Federal Security Agency to Labor Department (in proposed Reorganization Plan No. 1), transfer of Army Remount Service to United States Department of Agriculture, eradication of cattle grubs, amendment to Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act, universal military training, means for controlling inflation, 1-year extension of administration by Secretary of Agriculture of Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, St. Lawrence seaway, Federal meat inspection, Tennessee Valley Authority, Federal aid to education, library demonstration bill, irrigation and reclamation, Labor Extension Service.

Parker, James P., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Private Schools, Raleigh Hotel, room 116, Washington, D. C. (1) A total of $1,185 has been received; $1,000 of which was received as an advance on payment and the remaining $185 as a refund for expenses incurred. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Veterans' education and training program outlined in Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended.

Patton,[9] James G., National Farmers Union, 3501 East Forty-sixth Avenue, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All major pending legislation.

Paul,[9] Randolph (a partner in the law firm of Paul, Weiss, Wharton & Garrison), 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Gillette Safety Razor Co., Boston, Mass. (1) Receipts, none; expenditures, none. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None relating to the subject below. (5) An amendment to eliminate section 131 (b) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Paulson, Nathan J., 1621 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C. (1) $260.10. (2) Railroads, taxis, telephone company, stenographer, stationer, etc. (3) Transportation, telephone calls, stenographic work, office supplies, etc. (4) I wrote a monthly column for the League bulletin. (5) All legislation affecting the investor.

Payne, Albert Alford, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received and expended $117.20. (2) Various. (3) Phones, taxis, etc. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Peebles, Ivey E., Maryland Public Expenditure Council, Inc., 636 Equitable Building, Baltimore, Md. (1) Transportation, $68.31; hotels, $24.88; meals, $36.59; entertainment, none; telephone, $0.50; gratuities, $3.70. (2) Miscellaneous service agencies and institutions in Maryland. None in District of Columbia. (3) Promoting demand for tax economy. (4) None. (5) All affecting budget reduction and tax relief.

Perry,[7 9] Leslie S., National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary at the rate of $4,200 per annum. No expenditures in connection with lobbying activities. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) NAACP Bulletin. (5) FEPC, anti-poll-tax, antilynching, minimum wage, Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing, Murray-Dingell health, Wagner-Murray-Dingell social security, and similar social-welfare legislation.

Perry,[9] Leslie S., National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary at the rate of $4,400 per annum.

[6] Filed for third quarter, 1947.
[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.
[8] Filed with the Clerk only.

[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.
[9] Filed with the Clerk only.

Expended, $15.15. (2) Various. (3) Lunches and taxis. (4) NAACP Bulletin. (5) FEPC, anti-poll-tax, antilynching, minimum wage, Wagner - Ellender - Taft housing, Murray-Dingell health, Wagner-Murray-Dingell social security, and similar social-welfare legislation.

Petersen, William J., Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, 704 Insurance Building, Madison, Wis. (1) Received my regular salary as executive secretary for the Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, for which I performed my regular duties as chief administrative officer of the chamber, which said duties were related only incidentally to Federal legislation. Aside from my regular salary, nothing was received nor spent for the purpose of influencing Federal legislation. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Such legislation affecting business and industry generally as I may be instructed to give attention to from time to time.

Peterson, Dutton S., Friends Committee on National Legislation, 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Gross salary, January, February, March, $962.40; travel expense, $648.71. (2) Carfare, $275.21; room, $40.85; meals, $56.45; telephone and telegraph, $77.39; miscellaneous, $198.81; total, January-March, $648.71. (3) Travel is for the purpose of discussing developments on universal military training legislation and to organize opposition against it. (4) The organization sends a newsletter to a limited number of subscribers and Friends about once a month. (5) In general, to support measures leading to peace and humanitarian ends, such as world organization and world economic stability, world disarmament, support for the rights of conscience, opposition to conscription, and the militarization of America.

Peterson, Esther, 1034 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.; Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 15 Union Square, New York, N. Y. (1) Received salary of $1,222. Received $575.79 to reimburse actual expenses incurred; $264 of this amount was for expenses incurred in Washington; remainder for expenses outside of Washington. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Personal expense and travel. (4) CIO News and the Advance. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Petty, Don, National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,500 received for services as attorney for the National Association of Broadcasters from February 3 (date of registration) to April 1, 1948; $940.46 received as reimbursement for business expenses for same period. (2) Various air lines, railroads, taxi companies, hotels, and restaurants, etc. (3) The amounts set forth in (1) above were received and/or expended in carrying out my normal duties as general counsel directing or handling all of the legal affairs of the National Association of Broadcasters, only a small part of which duties directly or indirectly involved Federal legislation. None of this money was received or expended for the specific purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any Federal legislation. (4) None. (5) None. I am interested in any legislation—Federal or State—which may affect the radio-broadcasting industry.

Pierson, A. T., New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn. (1) Salary, $1,815, and expenses, $308.30. (2) Hotels, restaurants, transportation companies, taxis, telephone, etc. (3) Expenses for traveling and as shown in item (2). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting employer.

Place, Henry C., care of Townsend, Elliott & Munson, 1100 Provident Trust Building, Seventeenth and Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.; National Association of Electric Companies. (1) The firm received from the National Association of Electric Companies $6,225 for legal services for the quarter and reimbursement of $1,196.57 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all legal services to the association, only a part of which fee and expenses was for those purposes described in section 308 (a) or otherwise within the scope of Public Law No. 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, railroads, taxicabs, telephone and telegraph companies. (3) Railroad and transportation, $398.54; subsistence expenses away from Philadelphia, $568.43; telephone and telegraph, $191.39; miscellaneous, $38.21. (4) [Blank.] (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which our firm is counsel, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on all problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association therefore is interested in any and all legislation that might affect its members directly or indirectly as going business concerns.

Plumley, Fletcher D. P., Rialto Building, State Street, Montpelier, Vt.; National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,950 gross salary received; $44.20 expenses. (2) Transportation, hotels, and restaurants. (3) Transportation and other out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Pogue, L. Welch, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Committee for World Travel, Inc., Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None received. Following amounts expended: $0.80 taxicabs, $2 miscellaneous. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) See memorandum filed with Form B.

Pollitzer,[9] Miss Anita, National Woman's Party, 144 B Street NE., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Senate Joint Resolution 76 and House Joint Resolution 62.

Pope & Ballard, 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill., hereby withdraws registration, with respect to employment by Inland Steel Co. under act. (1) No longer employed by Inland Steel Co. on any activity within the purview of the Lobbying Act. No money received or expended since November 1946. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Pope Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. California Fruit Growers Exchange, Los Angeles, Calif.; California Walnut Growers Association, Los Angeles, Calif.; California Almond Growers Exchange, Sacramento, Calif.; Northwest Nut Growers, Dundee, Oreg.; Texsun Citrus Exchange, Weslaco, Tex.; California Deciduous Council, Sacramento, Calif. (1) Receipts, none; disbursements, $275.09. (2) Various. (3) Taxis, postage, lunches, etc. (4) None. (5) S. 2173, H. R. 3601, H. R. 5525, S. 2202, 26 U. S. C. 101 (12), 19 U. S. C. 1351.

Popper, Martin, 902 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Robert W. Kenny, 629 South Hill Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) Expended, $3,060.48. (2) Various. (3) Various. (4) None. (5) House bills 363, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 374, 375, 376, 377.

Posner, Stanley I., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Institute of Industrial Launderers (formerly National Industrial Launderers and Cleaners Association), Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) February, disbursements, $529.49. (2) Disbursements are for postage, mimeographing, travel, and telephone. (3) In connection with legal services as general counsel for client. (4) Bulletins to members of the association. (5) Labor legislation.

Posner, Stanley I., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Linen Supply Association, 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) January, fee, $500; reimbursement, $18.08; February, fee, $500; reimbursement, $2.64; March, fee, $500; reimbursement, $28.54. (2) Disbursements are for postage, travel, telephone. (3) In connection with legal services as general counsel for client. (4) None except routine bulletins to members of the association. (5) Labor legislation.

Posner, Stanley I., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Council of Business Schools, 739 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) February, fee, $1,200. (2) Disbursements are for postage, transcripts of hearings before Veterans' Affairs Committee, telephone, and similar items. (3) As counsel for the client in its controversy with the Veterans' Administration. (4) None. (5) Legislation relative to education and training of veterans.

Posner, Stanley I., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Council of Technical Schools, 739 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) February, fee, $800; reimbursement, $48.80; March, fee, $3.20. (2) Disbursements are for postage, transcripts of hearing before Veterans' Affairs Committee, telephone, and similar items. (3) As counsel for the client in its controversy with the Veterans' Administration. (4) None. (5) Legislation relative to education and training of veterans.

Poston, Robert R., 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; the American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) $201.63 salary semimonthly, less withholding tax; $5.51 incidental expenses for January 1948. (2) Robert R. Poston. (3) $5.51 incidental expenses for January 1948, carfare, luncheons. (4) The American Legion magazine, New York City; the National Legionnaire, Indianapolis, Ind. (5) [Blank.]

Poulton, J. E., grand lodge representative, International Association of Machinists, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Powell, W. Royce, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) (a) $1,200, Committee of Americans, Inc., 122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.; (b) $1,000, Magothy River Association, Annapolis, Md. (2) [Blank.] (3) (a) Educational literature in the matter of tax reductions and in the matter of explaining the Taft-Hartley law to industry; (b) preparation materials, taxicab fares, telephone tolls. (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 3314 in the Eightieth Congress, second session.

Pratt, Foster J., International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftsmen's Union, AFL., 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) As president he received a monthly salary of $600 minus withholding and social-security taxes, expended for personal living expenses. (2) Foster J. Pratt. (3) Salary received and expended for personal services as administrative and executive head of the International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftsmen's Union, AFL (lobbying is minor and incidental). (4) International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftsmen's Unions, AFL, Weekly Federal News Letters, and Monthly Outlook for the dissemination of organization news, including legislation. (5) Beneficial to the employees in the engineering and architectural professions.

Prentice, Howard A., Corn Industries Research Foundation, 1329 E Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $2.06 as miscellaneous expenses (see below). (2) Christobel Hill, notary public, $2; stamps, $0.06. (3) Notarizing registration statements, postage. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Press, William H., Washington Board of Trade, 204 Star Building, Washington, D. C.

[9] Filed with the Clerk only.

(1) Salary, $3,000; expenses, $289.37. (2) Miscellaneous taxi and transportation, $52.40; miscellaneous travel expenses, $10.05; miscellaneous dinners, lunches, etc., $49; membership dues, other organizations, $126.67; miscellaneous expenses of visitors, $51.25. (3) Normal operating expenses. (4) Releases sent to Washington, D. C., newspapers—Evening Star, Washington Post, Times-Herald, and Washington Daily News. (5) Legislation affecting the District of Columbia.

Pritchard, E. Anthony, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.; National Lead Co., 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) All money received by this registrant was for salary and traveling expenses in connection with his usual duties as assistant to the manager of the National Lead Co., Washington office, and no part of it whatsoever was expended during this quarter in an attempt to influence legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the operation of the National Lead Co., including the manufacture and sale of its products.

Proctor, Harry E., attorney at law, 1110 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; Oliver & Donnally, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $2,000 paid the registrant as salary by Oliver & Donnally. No expenditures. (2) No expenditures. (3) None. (4) The registrant contributed articles for the January, February, and March issues of Mutual Savings Banking, a trade publicatfon of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks. (5) The registrant studied and analyzed a number of bills pertaining to banks, savings and loan associations, taxes, railroads, veterans, and housing.

Proffitt, George W., National Apartment Owners' Association, 100 Barr Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for legislative work, $1,200; expenses prorated to this work, $90.15. (2) George W. Proffitt. (3) Expenses for transportation. (4) [Blank.] (5) Rent control and housing legislation.

Purves, Edmund R., director of public and professional relations, the American Institute of Architects, 1741 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None, except salary for this period, which amounted to $2,500. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation in relation to the architectural profession.

Pyle, Schuyler Shelby, Fleet Reserve Association, 429 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Quigley, Frank, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 725 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) General office expenses, Washington, D. C., $185; travel expenses, $255; transportation charges (automobile), $682.50; total, $1.122.50. (2) Hotels, clubs, restaurants, taxicabs, toll roads and bridges, auto transportation, and incidental travel expenses. (3) Conferring with representatives in the field of American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and associated Bell Telephone companies (20 States), on general practices relating to information and public relations matters. (4) None. (5) None.

Radner & Zito (the firm members and associates are William Radner, Frank J. Zito, J. Franklin Fort, Odell Kominers, and Mary L. Schleifer), 528 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting maritime industry, particularly in relation to wage-and-hour law.

Raesly, Leon, 1218 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Thornton & Taylor, 311 California Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None paid. (4) None. (5) H. R. 669.

Ramsey, Donald J., Silver Users Association, 1730 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary (before tax withholdings), $3,000; reimbursement for expenditures, $1,065.35. Expended, $1,065.35. (2) Railroads, airlines, hotels, restaurants, cab drivers, telephone companies, office suppliers, etc. (see schedule A). (3) Maintaining office, visiting members of the association, and attending conferences (see schedule A). (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the silver-using industry.

Ramspeck, Robert, Air Transport Association of America, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received regular salary as previously reported. Expended, $14.15. (2) (a) $8.90, taxi fares to and from Capitol Hill; (b) $5.25, LaFayette Hotel, (3) Luncheon. (4) None. (5) Legislation for the proper advancement of the air-line industry in the public interest. For specific legislation supported and opposed during this quarter: (1) Supported legislation to repeal the transportation tax; (2) supported H. R. 5448 relating to reciprocal exemption of foreign aircraft earnings; (3) supported legislation to authorize the Coast Guard to operate Loran and ocean weather stations; (4) opposed S. 1812 to establish a Department of Transportation; (5) opposed H. R. 5090 and H. R. 5730, and supported S. 2281—legislation to establish air parcel post; (6) testified on H. R. 4953 to establish a Board of Postal Rates and Fees, and suggested certain amendments.

Rankin, J. Lee, Beghtol & Rankin, a partnership, 714 Stuart Building, Lincoln, Nebr. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation designed to bring about equality of taxation between private business and cooperatives.

Ray, J. Franklin, Jr., 1740 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Committee for the Marshall Plan To Aid European Recovery, 537 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, January 1 to March 27 (services terminated), $2,220; travel and transportation expenses, January 1 to March 27, $134.18. (2) Salary received used for personal expenses—no part spent on behalf of the Committee for the Marshall Plan. Travel and transportation expenses cover my actual expenses traveling on behalf of the committee. (3) Same as above. (4) None, except through ordinary press channels. (5) European recovery plan.

Ray, L. S., 2015 Lanier Drive, Silver Springs, Md.; the Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $600. (2) Myself. (3) Salary as legislative adviser. (4) None. (5) Legislation effecting disabled retired emergency officers.

Reck, Jacob, 1023 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; National Beauty & Barber Manufacturers' Association, 270 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Printing, mimeograph, and binding costs for petitions and bulletins, $60.95; postage, $6.50; taxis, $13.20; photographs, $7. Total amount received and expended, $87.65. (2) Photographs, Reni, Washington, D. C. Printing, mimeograph, etc., charges paid by National Beauty & Barber Manufacturers. (3) Petitions printed were distributed to persons engaged in beauty and barber industry for signatures. Petitions urged Members of Congress to support H. R. 3825 which provides for the repeal of the excise tax on cosmetics used in beauty and barber shops. Bulletins urged industry members to contact Members of Congress regarding H. R. 3825 and solicit support. (4) National Beauty & Barber Manufacturers' Association Legislative Bulletin which is issued by registrant in his capacity as Washington representative. Brokmeyer Bulletin. (5) H. R. 3825 and H. R. 4287. Registrant is paid an annual retainer as counsel for the National Beauty & Barber Manufacturers' Association. No determinable amount of compensation is paid or received on account of legislation. Normally the total time used by him in activities covered by this law are infinitesimal. However, activity on legislation has consumed 50 percent of his time since February 25, 1948.

Reidy, William G., 602 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.; Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc. (through March 14, 1948), 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received salary $1,359.18 for period January 1 to March 14, 1948. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) National health insurance.

NOTE.—As of March 14, my connection with the Committee for the Nation's Health was terminated by resignation.

Reinhold, James P., 525 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary for calendar quarter as reported in January 10, 1948, quarterly report form C; also reimbursed in the amount of $499.92 expended during calendar quarter, of which $249.96 was expended for purposes other than covered in the act. (2) Paid for meals in hotels and various restaurants, expended for taxicabs and automobile, telephone calls, and postage, telegrams. (3) In furtherance of duties described in registration form B, of which personal legislative activity is not my principal purpose but is occasional and incidental. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interest of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co.

Restor, Stanley, Washington Hotel, Washington, D. C.; U. B. A., Inc., 229 East Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis. (1) All business disbursements paid for by employer and reported by the employer. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) The Advisor. (5) Social security and related legislation.

Rhodes, Hubert M., 3308 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Credit Union National Association, Inc., P. O. box 431, Madison, Wis. (1) Registrant is a regular employee of the Credit Union National Association and receives no additional compensation for service on legislative work. The amount received and expended by him was $6.51. (2) Taxicab fares to various taxicabs, and car mileage, $6.36. Telephone tolls, $15. (3) Trips to House and Senate Office Buildings and Capitol, and telephone calls. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting credit unions.

Rice,[7] Richard M., Wisconsin Associated Businessmen, Inc., formerly Wisconsin Tax Equality Association, 231 West Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis. (1) No money was received for salary. No money was received or expended for purposes falling within the scope of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation designed to effect tax equality as between similar businesses.

Rice, Richard M., Wisconsin Associated Businessmen, formerly Wisconsin Tax Equality Association, 231 West Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis. (1) No money was received for salary. No money was received or expended for purposes falling within the scope of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation designed to effect tax equality between similar businesses.

Rice, Robert A., 507 A. F. of L. Building, Washington, D. C.; Railway Mail Association, Ninth and Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant is president, Railway Mail Association, elected by membership for a term of 2 years at annual salary of $8,500. No money received and expended for activities which fall within the terms of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) See No. 1. (3) See No. 1. (4) Registrant writes report to membership of RMA in monthly issues of official journal, the Railway Post Office. (5) Activities consist of serving as president, RMA, and supporting such legislation as is beneficial to members of this organization. Membership consists of employees of the Railway Mail Service.

[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

Richards,[9] D. D., 1238 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Mail Order Association of America, 1061 West Thirty-fifth Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None specifically.

Richman, Paul, 1003 K Street NW, Washington, D. C.; Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 212 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Approximately $125. (2) Paul Richman. (3) Office telephone. (4) Washington Newsletter. (5) Fair employment practices; immigration.

Riggle, John J., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for January, February, and March 1948, $1,999.98 (before withholding taxes were deducted). Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Legislative Digest, a mimeographed résumé of legislation introduced which is of interest to agriculture. Distributed to members of National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Riggs, Frank E., Philadelphia Police Pension Fund Association, 419 City Hall Annex, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Received and paid out $1,090 for living expenses, train fares, meals, entertainment, taxis, etc. (2) Frank E. Riggs, Philadelphia Police Pension Fund. (3) Train and taxi fares commuting to Washington, daily, meals and refreshments on trains and in Washington and entertaining. (4) None. (5) Trying to have Federal and municipal employee pensions exempt to $1,440 from income tax as in the Railroad Retirement Act. Also to try to keep members of existing pension systems out of social security.

Rising, E. W., 1215 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Western Beet Growers' Association, Great Falls, Mont.; National Water Conservation Conference, 1215 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) (a) Western Beet Growers Association, $182.57; (b) National Water Conservation Conference, $520.55. (2) Miscellaneous persons for office expenses, postage, stationery, etc., in connection with information service furnished members of Western Beet Growers Association, including time of E. W. Rising. (3) Received by E. W. Rising, and expended as follows: Stenographic service, $366.90; telephone and telegraph, $33.74; paper punch, $10.95; postage, $64.78; stencils, $18.50; carbon paper, $4.98; miscellaneous stationery, $20.70. Principally for members information service. (4) None during first quarter of 1948. (5) (a) Legislation of interest to beet growers, none in first quarter 1948; (b) legislation in connection with development and conservation land and water resources and in preservation of State water rights. Tidelands legislation. Valley Authority legislation.

Rivers, T. E., National Recreation Association, 315 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) During the quarter ending April 1, 1948, I have received and expended $11.51. (2) Railroad company, restaurants, taxis. (3) Transportation and meals. (4) [Blank.] (5) S. 1229 and H. R. 5723.

Roark,[7] L. E., National Founders Association, 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Annual salary, National Founders Association, $15,000. Expenses, nominal travel, hotel, and meals. (2) Common carriers for travel. Hotels for room and meals. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) Labor legislation, tax legislation, and legislation affecting the foundry industry.

Robb, George Mackay, 2517 South Salina Street, Syracuse, N. Y.; Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America, 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Received from J. S. Tibby, treasurer, on expenses, $140. Expended, $97.01. I am not now receiving salary from the Christian Amendment Movement (which is supported by the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America). (2) Various. (3) For expenses on a 2-week stay in Washington, D. C., in the interest of our legislation; also for postage and the notarizing of lobbying documents. (4) The Covenanter Witness, editor, D. R. Taggart, 1209 Boswell Avenue, Topeka, Kans.; the Christian Patriot, editor, J. C. Mathews, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans. (5) Senate Joint Resolution 150 and House Joint Resolution 239.

Robbins, Paul H., National Society of Professional Engineers, 1359 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary, $500, and expenses, $50, for January, February, and March 1948 for attention to legislative matters. (2) Regular office and travel expenses. (3) As executive director, National Society of Professional Engineers. (4) American Engineer. Legislative Bulletin, National Society of Professional Engineers. (5) All legislation affecting the welfare of professional engineers.

Rogers, Watson,[15] National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Romney, George, Automobile Manufacturers Association, New Center Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) No receipts or expenditures. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None.

Root, Ballantine, Harlan, Bushby & Palmer, 31 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y., 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Greenwich Country Day School, Inc., Old Church Road, Greenwich, Conn. (1) No receipts or expenditures. (2) See No. (1). (3) See No. (1). (4) None. (5) Legislation to extend old-age and survivors insurance benefits on a permissive basis to schoolteachers. (NOTE.—Registrant is performing no services covered by its registration filed March 25, 1947, and this is its final quarterly report pursuant to that registration.)

Rowan,[11] James F., Household Goods Carriers' Bureau, 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received or expended for the purpose designated in paragraph (A) or (B) of section 307, Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Rowan,[5] James F., Household Goods Carriers' Bureau, 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received or expended for the purpose designated in paragraph (A) or (B) of section 307, Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Rowan,[6] James F., Household Goods Carriers' Bureau, 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received or expended for the purpose designated in paragraph (A) or (B) of section 307, Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Rowan,[7] James F., Household Goods Carriers' Bureau, 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received or expended for the purpose designated in paragraph (A) or (B) of section 307, Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Rowan, James F., Household Goods Carriers' Bureau, 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received or expended for the purpose designated in paragraph (A) or (B) of section 307, Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Rowe, Roland H., United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 837 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money was received by the undersigned for the purpose of influencing legislation except: (a) $30 (10 hours' time—estimated—at $3 per hour) as part of annual salary of $5,480 as vice president and secretary of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., allocable to preparation of questionnaire and compilation of results of questionnaire to members on repeal of tax on oleomargarine, which was used in the Association's appearance before congressional committee in public hearing; (b) $39 (13 hours' time—estimated—at $3 per hour) also as part of annual salary of $5,480 as vice president and secretary of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., allocable to preparation of other association mimeographed material in which Federal legislation was advocated, opposed, or mentioned. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) Washington news letter service of United States Wholesale Grocers Association. (5) No legislation in particular, any legislation in general affecting the interests of wholesale grocers. He was later specifically authorized by the executive committee of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., to support or oppose general labor legislation and fair employment practice legislation.

Rule, Gordon W., Committee for World Travel, Inc., Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None received. Following amounts expended: $9.10 taxicabs, $13.62 long-distance phone calls, 8 miscellaneous. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) See memorandum filed with form B.

Rule, Gordon W., Room 427, Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C., Consolidated Steel Corp., Los Angeles, Calif. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 4377, a private bill for the relief of the Consolidated Steel Corp.

Rule, Gordon W., Room 427, Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Gillette Safety Razor Co., Boston, Mass. (1) $895.85 received, only part of which represents time spent on legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Retained in connection with a proposed amendment to the Internal Revenue Code relating to the foreign tax credit.

Rule, Gordon W., Room 427, Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Spencer Gordon, counsel for American Institute of Accountants, 13 East Forty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $750 received from Spencer Gordon for services rendered. (2) [Blank.] (3) Associate work with Mr. Gordon in opposing H. R. 2657. (4) None. (5) Opposing H. R. 2657.

Rule, Gordon W., Room 427, Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Harbor Boat Building Co. and Wilmington Welding & Boiler Works, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 4379, a private bill for the relief of companies listed above.

Rumely, Edward A., Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City. (1) I received only my salary, commissions, and expenses, as reported on earlier form B. The corporation has reported its disbursements separately on form A. (2) Disbursements were corporation disbursements and are reported separately on form A. (3) [Blank.] (4) We never pay to have news articles printed but issue news releases, some of which are reprinted, and of these I have no record. (5) I am not employed for the purpose supporting or opposing legislation. Sometimes the committee trustees take a stand for or against an issue (on legislation) where they think a constitutional principle is involved. Then I distribute educational material on the question.

[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.
[9] Filed with the Clerk only.
[5] Filed for second quarter, 1947.
[6] Filed for third quarter, 1947.
[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.
[11] Filed for first quarter, 1947.
[15] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947, and first quarter, 1948.

Rush, Charles J., Washington Real Estate Board, 1417 K. Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $666.66 per month as executive secretary. (2) None paid out. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Measures affecting the ownership and operation of real estate.

Russell, Francis M., National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $462.45 (expended for matters relating to legislation). (2) See (3). (3) Telephone and telegraph; taxi fares; entertainment. (4) None. (5) As an incidental part of registrant's duties as vice president in charge of Washington office of National Broadcasting Co., Inc., including operation of the company's radio stations in Washington, registrant may engage in activities relating to legislation affecting radio communications companies.

Russell,[6] Frank E., National Star Route Mail Carriers Association, 112 C Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Office rent, $210; salary of office help, $250; hotel and living expenses, $160; total, $620. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) The Star Carrier. (5) Legislation of benefit to star route mail carriers.

Russell,[7] Frank E., National Star Route Mail Carriers Association, 112 C. Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Office rent, $210; salary paid office help, $500; total, $710. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) The Star Carrier. (5) Legislation of benefit to star route mail carriers.

Russell, Horace, 7 South Dearborn, Chicago, Ill.; United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received retainer payable monthly at the rate of $11,000 per annum from January 1 to March 31, 1948, a small fraction of which is for Federal legislative activity. Also received and expended $472.81 for expenses. (2) Various. (3) Travel, etc. (4) Contents of the Legal Bulletin of the United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.; Private Housing Versus Public Housing, the Directors Digest, United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.; Federal Aid to Housing; Argument for and Against Voting Federal Funds, American Bar Association Journal, February 1948, American Bar Association, 1138 North Dearborn, Chicago, Ill. (5) Legislation affecting the savings and loan business.

Russell, Richard M., estate of Charles W. Taintor (administrators: Merchants National Bank and Alexander Whiteside), care of Alexander Whiteside, 30 State Street, Boston, Mass. (1) Money received, January 5, 1948, $500 for services rendered last July from administrators of estate of Charles W. Taintor. Money expended, none. (2) None. See answer to (1). (3) None. See answer to (1). (4) None. See answer to (1). (5) Amount reported as received in (1) was on account of services last July at which time the estate was interested in S. 438 and its companion bill, H. R. 1597.

Ryan, M. O., 1405 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary for quarter, $3,300. January 1, 1948, to March 31, 1948, inclusive, total personal expenses for taxis, lunches, and dinners, phones, etc., in Washington, D. C., were $696.76, of which insignificant amount was for activities related in any way to lobbying. (2) Taxis, Washington restaurants, and hotels. (3) Transportation, lunches, and dinners. (4) Organizational bulletins for American Hotel Association. (5) Any legislation affecting hotel industry.

Sabin,[7] L. C., Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

[6] Filed for third quarter, 1947.
[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

Sabin, L. C., Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None (5) None.

Sanders,[8] J. T., the National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Transportation, $15.90; meals and incidentals, $32.02. (2) Transportation agencies and restaurants. (3) Transportation, food, etc. (4) The National Grange Monthly. (5) General agricultural legislation, labor legislation, and other bills related to agriculture.

Sands, Charles E., 4211 Second Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Hotel & Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, AFL, 528 Walnut Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) Nothing except salary at the rate of $7,200 per year and $5 day, expense office, etc. (2) Nothing paid. (3) None. (4) One article in our official magazine on the grain question. (5) Support all labor and social legislation. Oppose all antilabor legislation.

Sasuly,[6] Elizabeth, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., Food, Tobacco, Agricultural & Allied Workers of America, CIO, Twentieth and Race Streets, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Salary, $1,125; expenses, $821.87. (2) Hotels, restaurants, railroads, air lines, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) FTA News. (5) My organization supports all legislation to advance the interest of peace, security, democracy, and the general welfare of the working people. We oppose legislation which would defeat these objectives.

Sasuly,[7] Elizabeth, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Food, Tobacco, Agricultural & Allied Workers Union of America, CIO, Twentieth and Race Streets, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Salary, $1,125; expenses, $644.48. (2) Hotels, restaurants, railroads, busses, air lines, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) FTA News. (5) My organization supports all legislation to advance the interest of peace, security, democracy, and the general welfare of the working people. We oppose legislation which would defeat these objectives.

Sasuly, Elizabeth, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Food, Tobacco, Agricultural, and Allied Workers Union of America, CIO. Twentieth and Race Streets, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Salary, $1,125; expenses, $269.43. (2) Hotels, restaurants, railroads, busses, air lines, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) FTA News. (5) My organization supports all legislation to advance the interest of peace, security, democracy, and the general welfare of the working people. We oppose legislation which would defeat these objectives.

Saville,[7] Russell, American Pension Committee, Inc., 15 E Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $75 per week salary and actual travel expenses when outside the city of Washington, D. C. (2) Paid to Russell Saville. (3) Salary and travel expenses when, as, and if travel is necessary. (4) American Pension Committee issues Comet, an official weekly report to its subscribers. (5) H. R. 781 and all legislation for the improvement of old-age pensions and social security.

Sawyer, Ray, AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) I served as national legislative director for AMVETS from January 1, 1948, to March 1, 1948, at an annual salary rate of $6,000. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) National AMVET and AMVET Letter. (5) To promote proper care and assistance for veterans of World War II, consistent with the best interests of the country.

Saylor, Richard D., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.; National Lead Co., 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) All money received by this registrant was for salary and expenses in connection with his usual duties as manager of the National Lead Co., Washington office, and no part of it whatsoever was expended in an attempt to influence legislation. (2) Office lessor, telephone company, stationers, etc. (3) Rent, telephone service, supplies needed in carrying out duties as manager of the Washington office. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the operation of the National Lead Co., including the manufacture and sale of its products.

Scanlon, Theresa F., 12 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Unemployment compensation for legislative clerks, civil-service legislation; leave—annual, sick, and termination leave; welfare, housing.

Schell, S. D., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received approximately $100, ratio of regular salary for services performed on matters relating to legislation. The legislation was S. 2202 and H. R. 4387. There was also received $25.73 for miscellaneous expenses for meals, taxicab fares, and train porters. Expenses paid out totaled $25.73. (2) Hotel, for meals, taxicab drivers for taxi fares, and railroad porters. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) S. 2202 and H. R. 4387. Activity consisted of several conferences with Members of Congress who were interested in activity on these two bills.

Schmidt, Henry P., care of Hartman Barber, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) Salary, $105.92; expenses, $85.08. (2) Hamilton Hotel, Washington, D. C.; cabs, streetcars, and train fares; telephone, laundry, cleaning, postage, and various eating establishments. (3) Necessary living, transportation, and communication expenses. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting railway labor, particularly to oppose all bills detrimentally affecting the existing railroad retirement and unemployment system.

Schoen, Paul W., Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 692, Valdosta, Ga. (1) Salary, $480 (1 month which was maximum time spent on legislative activity); expense, $263.74; mimeographing, postage, telegraph and telephone, and clerical help, $174.50; total expended, $918.24. (2) No payments made to anyone; only personal salary and expense allowed as part of regular association activity. (3) Expenditure for salary, mailing, and expense while working for forestry appropriations in United States Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. (4) The Forest Farmer and press releases of which no record of publication is available. (5) Forestry legislation applicable or affecting private timberland owners.

Schoene, Freehill & Kramer (formerly Schoene, Freehill, Kramer & Fanelli), a law partnership composed of Lester P. Schoene, Joseph H. Freehill, and Milton Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) None received or expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) All written materials are delivered to the client and dissemination is entirely in the client's control. (5) Railroad retirement, unemployment insurance, and employers' liability matters.

Scott, Jack Garrett, National Association of Motor Operators, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No receipts except annual retainer for general legal services as shown in registration statement. No expenditures for legislative purposes. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Generally all legislation affecting the intercity motorbus industry. Thus far this season I have made presentations before congressional committees on S. 110, H. R. 221, excise-tax

[6] Filed for third quarter, 1947.
[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.
[8] Filed with the Clerk only.

legislation, H. R. 584 and S. 1126, House investigation of Fair Labor Standards Act, and S. 1812.

Scott, John W., 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Victor J. Evans & Co. et al. (1) None other than salary received at the total monthly rate of $700 from Victor J. Evans & Co., Harvey B. Jacobsen, John N. Randolph, and Patrick D. Beavers. No expenditures made. (2) Does not apply. (3) Does not apply. (4) None. (5) As previously stated in my registration statement. (NOTE.—The firm of McMorrow, Berman & Davidson is attempting to cancel contract of employment with me and is not currently paying me any sum of money. Additionally, the firm of Randolph & Beavers has dissolved, and I now represent each of them individually. While the total amount received from them is the same, each pays but one-half.)

Scott, Margaret I., 3701 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Blaze—National Pension Circle. (1) $190 collected in small amounts from clubs and individuals. (2) Margaret I. Scott. Office rent and office expense including postage, telephone service, etc. (3) Office rent and office expense including postage, telephone service, etc. (4) Blaze, weekly news letter. (5) Old-age-pension legislation, H. R. 781 or other equally good bills.

Scott, Vernon, and Loring A. Schuler, constituting the partnership of Vernon Scott and Loring A. Schuler, organizers and counselors, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) National Associated Businessmen, Inc., Washington, D. C., $20,000; the Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind., $250; Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, Louisville, Ky., $200; Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Inc., St. Paul, Minn., $250; North Dakota Tax Equality Committee, Inc., Fargo, N. Dak., $250; Ohio Associated Businessmen, Inc., Columbus, Ohio, $250; Wisconsin Associated Businessmen, Inc., Milwaukee, Wis., $250. No money expended for purposes within the scope of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) No one. See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (2). (4) None. (5) Legislation designed to equalize the taxes borne by various types of business corporations.

Scott, William C. (report as attorney for National Postal Committee for Books), 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) No receipts during said period, except refund of $4.37 to firm of which I am a member, for unused transportation previously carried as an expense. No expenditures during said period. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to postage rates on books.

Sears, W. James, Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 44 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) During the quarter ended March 31, 1948, I devoted approximately 70 percent of my time to legislative work. On this ratio, my reimbursements from my employer for salary and expenses totaled $3,287.44. (2) See attached statement[1] of expenditures other than salary. Also is statement of expenditures authorized by registrant and paid by employer. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Bills pertaining to national rubber policy, specifically Public Law 469, second session, Eightieth Congress.

Seay, Temple W., 902 Bowen Building, 815 Fifteenth Street, Washington, D. C.; Massman Construction Co., Kansas City, Mo. (1) None with respect to this or any other matters before the legislature. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2192, for the relief of Massman Construction Co., Kansas City, Mo.

See,[†] Harry, 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Opposing antilabor legislation and favoring legislation of benefit to labor.

See, Harry, 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $77.90. (2) Restaurants. (3) Lunches. (4) None. (5) Opposing antilabor legislation and favoring legislation of benefit to labor.

Selby, Ann Meredith, Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (Compensation and reimbursement of expenses received as stated on registration statement.) (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 2910.

Selby, John A., member of the law firm Baker, Selby & Ravenel, 730 Fifteenth Street, Washington, D. C. (1) Baker, Selby & Ravenel, the law firm of which I am a partner, is employed by the Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., on an annual basis. The services we perform are general and include representations for the CMA before such Government agencies as the State Department, Department of Agriculture, Department of Commerce, War Assets Administration, Bureau of Internal Revenue, etc. We receive for such services an annual retainer of $5,000, payable quarterly. No portion of any payment received from the CMA has been or can be readily allocated to such service as we have rendered on matters relating to legislation in which the CMA is interested, namely, H. R. 4986. (2) There has been no disbursements by me or the other members of the law firm of which I am a member of moneys received under our contract of services with the Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc. (3) [Blank.] (4) Aside from the printing and filing of memoranda with the Treasury Department, the Joint Committee on Revenue Taxation, and Members of Congress, there has been no publication of any character. (5) H. R. 4986, introduced by Congressman MILLER of Connecticut, January 15, 1948.

Shandros, Geraldine, American Communications Association (CIO), 5 Beekman Street, New York City, and 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary $280. (This constitutes one-half of salary received and is so reported since time spent in activities covered by the act constitute about one-half of working time.) Travel expense, $11.50; miscellaneous, $25; total, $316.50. (2) Travel, Pennsylvania Railroad; miscellaneous, taxes, telephone calls, newspapers, etc. (3) Explained above. (4) ACA news. (5) Legislation affecting workers in the communication industry and American working men and women generally.

Shaw, Mark R., secretary, National Council for Prevention of war, 114 Trenton Street, Melrose, Mass. (New England office); 1013 Eighteenth Street NW, Washington, D. C. (national office). (1) Salary, $800; traveling expenses, $38.84; total, $834.84. (2) Railroads, bus lines, gas stations, restaurants, etc. (3) Travel to speaking dates, conferences, meetings, etc. (4) Bulletins of the NCPW. (5) Universal military training, oppose. Renewal of selective service, oppose. Other measures related to issue of peace and war.

Shealey, R. Preston, 503 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.; National Retail Credit Association, 218 Shell Building, St. Louis, Mo. (1) From October 1 to December 31, 1947, $1,125 (retainer). This retainer includes services of every description performed for the National Retail Credit Association during the period indicated, none of which during that period was for lobbying. An additional $90.73 was expended by way of an expense account. Affiant also corrects the statement made in the prior quarterly report that this retainer was $1,050. This occurred through a mistake of the stenographer. It should have been $1,125 as in this report. (2) Stenographer, $364; rent, Colorado Building, $31; Chesapeake & Potomac Co., $35; stamps, $15; cabs, $10.15; office supplies, $1.85; trips, $12.75; lunches, $9.90. Trips, $75.55, were overlooked in the statement for the quarter ending September 30, 1947. (3) Legal services, surveys, information releases. (4) November 1947 issue of the Credit World. (5) There is no legislation pending or considered which affiant has been authorized to support or oppose.

Shearon, Marjorie, Ph. D., legislative consultant, the Shearon Medical Legislative Service, 610 Columbian Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Sale of subscriptions to American Medicine and the Political Scene and sale of publications (for period January 1–March 31, 1948), $7,626.02. (2) Printing (Gibson Bros.), $3,506.61; mimeographing, $629.28; rent (Shannon & Luchs), $592.50; clerical help, $1,055.73; furniture and equipment, $742.92; telephone, $25.45; postage, $580; miscellaneous, $210; salary, $800; travel, $129.38; total, $8,271.87. (3) Publishing and mailing analytical news releases to subscribers. Publishing and mailing pamphlets to persons who buy them. (4) None. I myself am editor and publisher of the weekly analytical release, American Medicine and the Political Scene. I have published pamphlets, including Blueprint for Nationalization—Plans to Enchain Medicine by Unwarranted Regulative Interference, and Federal Propaganda for the Welfare State, etc. (5) None.

Shields, Robert H., United States Beet Sugar Association, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Interested in legislation affecting sugar but not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing any legislation.

Shufelt, Bernard E., ward 44, McGuire Veterans' Hospital, Richmond, Va.; Paralyzed Veterans' Associations of America, 218 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received from Paralyzed Veterans' Association of America, $300; expended, $152.34. (2) Various. (3) Accommodations, travel, attendant service. (4) None. (5) Wheel-chair housing bill, amputee car bill (affecting quadriplegics), charter bill for Paralyzed Veterans of America.

Shuford, Helen Alcott, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (Compensation and reimbursement of expenses received as stated on registration statement.) (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 2910.

Sifton, Paul, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, CIO, 411 West Milwaukee Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) $1,400 salary; expenses, $1,059.13; total, $2,459.13. (2) Subsistence, transportation, hotel, etc. (3) Subsistence and travel. (4) Auto Worker. (5) Support all bills favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Singer, Leon,[†] member of firm of Blumberg, Singer & Aberman, 200 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) As general counsel to Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, my firm received $3,700 during preceding calendar quarter from this association on account of annual retainer of $15,000, no part of which was expended for any of the purposes specified in the Lobbying Act. (2) None paid. See above. (3) None paid. See above. (4) None. (5) The association concluded it was advisable for counsel to prepare and file memoranda with the Ways and

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[†] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

Means Committee indicating the need for revision of the excise taxes on cigars. Some members of the committee were interviewed to explain and amplify the memoranda. No compensation as such has been paid for this service.

Singer, Leon, Blumberg, Singer & Aberman, 200 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) As general counsel to Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, my firm received $3,700 during previous calendar quarter from this association on account of annual retainer of $15,000, no part of which was expended for any of the purposes specified in the Lobbying Act. (2) None paid. See above. (3) None paid. See above. (4) None. (5) Our office, as general counsel, has prepared and filed a brief with the Ways and Means Committee indicating the need for revision of the excise taxes on cigars. I personally conferred with some members of the Ways and Means Committee to amplify the brief and explain the statistical material set forth therein. No compensation as such has been paid for this service.

Slayman, Charles H., Jr., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Smart, Miss Elizabeth A., National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 100 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $665.07 salary. Received and paid out $209.53. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington Times-Herald, E. Morrison Paper Co., Western Union, Ace Letter Service, Penn Flower Shop, Washington College Press, Bethesda Duplicating Service, post office. (3) Telephone, subscription, office supplies, telegrams, address House Members and furnish envelopes, wreath for Senator Sheppard's portrait, 5,000 No. 10 envelopes, 1 ream blue letterheads, postage. (4) The Union Signal. (5) Legislation dealing with alcoholic beverages, motion pictures, radio, children, women in industry, peace and international relations, narcotics, gambling, social hygiene, interracial relations.

Smith, Allen L., Louisiana Tax Equality Association, Inc., Post Office Box 1526, Baton Rouge, La. (1) No money received nor expended for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To support any legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to improve basic taxation principles providing for removal of tax disparities between business competitors.

Smith,[6] Anthony W., Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Portion of salary allocable to legislative employment for third quarter, $75. This is computed as stated in registration statement at $300 a year. No expenditures. (See covering letter.) (2) None. (3) Compensation as above received for legislative work. (4) CIO News, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (5) Forestry legislation, river-valley developments, resource conservation.

Smith,[7] Anthony W., Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Portion of salary allocable to legislation employment for fourth quarter, $75. This is computed as stated in registration statement at $300 a year. No expenditures. (See covering letter.) (2) None. (3) Compensation as above received for legislative work. (4) CIO News, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (5) Forestry legislation, river-valley developments, resource conservation.

Smith, Anthony W., Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Portion of salary allocable to legislative employment, $75. This is computed as stated in registration statement, at $300 a year. No expenditures. (2) None. (3) Compensation as above received for legislative work. (4) CIO News, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (5) Forestry legislation, river-valley developments, resource conservation.

Smith, Donald W. (report as attorney for American Nurses Association), 49 Wall Street, New York N. Y.; American Nurses Association, 1790 Broadway, New York N. Y. (1) Receipts: $5,666.18 for legal fees and disbursements, paid to Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens for services by firm as counsel in all capacities. Expenditures: $155.24 for transportation, meals, and hotel rooms. (2) The Pennsylvania Railroad, New York Central Railroad, and various restaurants and hotels and taxicab companies. (3) Transportation, meals, hotel rooms, and telephone calls. (4) The American Journal of Nursing, New York, N. Y. (5) Legislation relating to nurses, nursing, or health, on which the American Nurses Association has taken a stand; specifically, to support the extension of social-security coverage to include employees of nonprofit institutions and private-duty nurses.

Smith, Dudley, Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,250 monthly from the Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, but not for the principal purpose of influencing legislation, which is a minor part of my activities. (2) None for the purpose of influencing legislation. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Smith, Harold O., Jr., United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc. 837 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) During the past quarter, I did not have occasion to engage in any activities which I believe could be construed as lobbying. Serving full time as executive vice president of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., my activities are those of a trade association executive and any contacts with Members of Congress are purely incidental to my many other activities in connection with trade association work. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Smith,[7] Hilda W., National Committee for the Extension of Labor Education, 2117 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington. D. C. (1) Salary, $600; $35 per month allowed for taxis, telephone calls, etc. No expense money received or expended this quarter. (2) Paid to self. (3) Living expenses for self. (4) Can Reason Solve Industrial Disputes? reprint of radio forum, over NBC network; occasional articles sent out through Labor Press Associates related to recent essay contest sponsored by this committee. (5) Bill for a labor extension service in the Department of Labor.

Smith, Hilda W., National Committee for the Extension of Labor Education, 2117 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $400. (2) Paid to self. (3) Living expenses for self. (4) Occasional articles sent out through Labor Press Associates. Committee leaflet describing bill and the proposed services to be given under it. (5) A bill for a labor extension service in the Department of Labor.

Smith, Howard J., Central Arizona Project Association, 507 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz. (1) January, salary, $750, plus travel expense, $158.97; February, salary, $750; March, salary, $375. (2) Howard J. Smith, executive secretary, Central Arizona Project Association, 507 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz. (3) Salary, travel expense (board and room when engaged in travel). (4) The Case for Water in Central Arizona, Work for Water, California's Stake in Arizona's Share of the Colorado River. (5) Employed to support Senate bill 1175.

Smith, Lloyd W., Shoreham Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.; Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary of $1,650 for the period January 1–March 31, 1948, for services as special representative of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., as well as reimbursement for routine expenses of $283.75 in January, $415.53 in February, and $330.40 in March. (2) Various restaurants, hotels, taxicabs, telephone, telegraph, Pullman Co., stationers, etc. (3) In furtherance of duties described in Registration Form B, which involve legislation only incidentally and to a limited extent. Affiant states upon information and belief, that none of his activity during the period covered by this report was within the scope of section 307 of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting interests of Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. Other duties for said company comprise the major part of this work.

Smith, Purcell L., National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary $16,250 as president of the National Association of Electric Companies and reimbursements of $840.80 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all official duties, only a part of which salary and expenses were for those purposes described in the act. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, clubs, railroads, air lines, taxicabs, telephone and telegraph companies. (3) Railroad and transportation, $29.42; hotels, clubs, and restaurants, $604.85; gratuities and miscellaneous, $150.28; subscriptions, $48; telephone and telegraph, $8.25. (4) None. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which I am president, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association, therefore, is interested in legislation that might affect its members as going business concerns.

Smith, Robert E., Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $3,000, expended $315.25. See exhibits attached.[1] (2) [Blank]. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Smith, Robert E., National Conference of Railroad Investors, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $440.40. See exhibits attached.[1] (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Smith,[9] Russell, 300 B Street SE., Washington, D. C.; National Farmers Union, 3501 East Forty-sixth Avenue, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All major pending legislation.

Smith, Sylvester C., Jr., the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Snyder, Calvin K., Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $1,534.13 for expenses. (2) Various. (3) Taxicabs, lunches, transportation, etc. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Snyder, James D., 1040 Hotel LaSalle, Chicago, Ill.; all class I railroads in Illinois, acting through a committee known as Illinois Legislative Committee, 1236 LaSalle Station, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received $672.67, covering 8 days' salary at $50 per day and expenses in the amount of $272.67. (2) Carlton Hotel, Pullman Co., meals, tips, porters and redcaps,

[6] Filed for third quarter, 1947.
[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[9] Filed with the Clerk only.

taxis, telephone. (3) Carlton Hotel, $58.68; Pullman Co., $82.73; meals, $81.25; tips, etc., $15.90; taxis, $16.35; telephone, $17.75. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the interests of the Illinois railroads.

Spencer,[7] Lyndon, Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Spencer, Lyndon, Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Stack, Thomas George, National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West One Hundred and Fourth Place, Chicago, Ill. (1) $712.35 paid to me by the National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., covering all expenses incurred on trips to Washington and during stay in Washington, D. C., for the first 3 months of 1948. (2) Thomas George Stack, registrant, (3) To get before Congress bills to protect the interests of the rank and file of railroad employees on pension matters and to secure a more adequate pension for railroad men at lower cost to the employee. (4) Rail Pension News, which costs $700 each edition; one for December–January and one for February–March, total $1,400. The publication of National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., with 50,000 circulation. (5) Oppose unjust part of Crosser amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act, Public Law 572.

Starling, Howard M., 837 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant does not receive funds earmarked for purposes set forth in this act. Registrant has estimated, however, that $150 received by registrant during the first quarter of 1948 might come within scope of act as registrant understands act has been interpreted by the Department of Justice. Registrant has also been reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses in the amount of $23.60. (2) Capital Transit Co. and various taxicab drivers. No single item $10 or more. (3) Local transportation to and from Capitol, Senate Office Building, and House Office Building. (4) None. (5) Registrant doubts that he is employed to support or oppose legislation. However, on very infrequent occasions, he has supported or opposed legislation as it specifically affects capital stock, casualty and surety insurance companies.

Steele, Raymond E., general counsel, National Fisheries Institute, Inc., 228 Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) 90 cents taxicabs to Capitol to secure copy of tidelands water bill in Judiciary Committee; $3.20, taxicabs to Capitol to see committee clerks and discuss Marshall plan. (2) Taxicab operators. (3) Transportation to Capitol. (4) None. (5) Tidelands water case and Marshall plan.

Steffan, Arthur A., Petrol Corp., 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) All fees and expenses received during the months of January and February 1948 from Petrol Corp. were for handling matters not connected with the proposed legislation and no activity in connection with the said proposed legislation was engaged in during said months. A very minor portion of the fees and expenses received from Petrol Corp. for the month of March 1948 were for activities in connection with the proposed legislation, but since the relative amounts cannot be segregated, fees and expenses for all services performed during said month are submitted herewith: Fees, $700; expenses, $852.68. (2) Railroads, hotels, employees, restaurants, etc. (3) Secretarial, travel, and office expense. (4) None. (5) Bill for the relief of Petrol Corp.

Stein, Harold, 1740 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Committee for the Marshall Plan To Aid European Recovery, 537 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, January 1 to March 31, 1948, $2,548; travel and transportation expenses, January 1 to March 31, 1948, $491.12. (2) Salary received used for personal expenses—no part spent on behalf of the Committee for the Marshall Plan. Travel and transportation expenses cover my actual expenses traveling on behalf of the committee. (3) Same as above. (4) None, except through ordinary press channels. (5) European recovery program.

Stein, Margaret I., 602 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.; Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received salary, $1,000.02. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) National health insurance.

Stellwagen, Herbert P., Indemnity Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) As indicated in previous reports, deponent has received no money except as reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses for transportation and subsistence in connection with trips to Washington, D. C. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3998, now pending before the Senate Committee for the District of Columbia.

Stengle, Charles I., American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $42. (2) Taxicab drivers. (3) Riding to and from the Capitol. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting Federal employees.

Stewart, Charles T., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Reimbursement by employer for travel expenses, incidental expenses and per diem, $104.30; salary, $3,000 (50 percent of time devoted to legislative activities); total, $3,104.30. (2) Various. (3) Taxi fare, lunches, etc. (4) Attached list[1] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Stoll, Edwin L., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) January 1, 1943, to March 31, 1948, expended $39.01. (2) Various. (3) Incidental expenses. (4) Attached list[1] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Stone,[5] Mrs. Margaret F., National Women's Trade Union League of America, 317 Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Full salary, $367.83, about half of which was paid me for legislative work. No money expended by me for legislative activity. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Our own National Women's Trade Union League monthly publication, Life and Labor Bulletin. (5) See copy of league's legislative program filed with previous quarterly report.

Stone,[6] Mrs. Margaret F., National Women's Trade Union League of America, 317 Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No legislative activity was carried on by me during this quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Publication of Life and Labor Bulletin is suspended during August and September. (5) [Blank.]

Stone,[7] Mrs. Margaret F., National Women's Trade Union League of America, 317 Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Full salary $239.45, about half of which was paid me for legislative work. No money expended by me for legislative activity. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Life and Labor Bulletin. (5) Support of the European recovery program was added to our legislative program in October, and a great deal of my legislative activity was spent on this item.

Stone, Mrs. Margaret F., National Women's Trade Union League of America, 317 Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Full salary, $376.49, about half of which was paid me for legislative work. No money expended by me for legislative activity. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Life and Labor Bulletin, the League's monthly publication. (5) See regular legislative program of League already on file with your office.

Strachan, Paul A., American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1376 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Attendance upon conferences, taxies, luncheons, dinners, approximate $100 per month. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) AFPH proposes national legislation for our 28,000,000 physically handicapped citizens. At present only S. 2319 (a bill to provide for a survey of physically handicapped).

Strackbein, O. R., America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 601 Carpenters' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts, $3,880; expenses, $3,315.96; salary, $2,600 and remainder, or $715.96 expenses. (2) No payments made to individuals. Expenses paid out for purposes listed below. (3) Rent, telephone, office supplies, taxicab fare, printing (a pamphlet, entitled "A Selective Tariff"), three or four lunches a month with individuals, one trip to New York, subscription to newspaper, purchase of governmental publications, purchase of office rug, payment for typing letters and reports. (4) Editorials in the Photoengraver, a monthly publication of the International Photoengravers Union. (5) Tariff legislation. Specifically, extension of the Trade Agreements Act.

Stringer, Harry R., Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Strong,[7] Arthur D., Upper Mississippi Waterway Association, 1034 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn. (1) Salary, October 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, $825; reimbursement for expenses, $634.11; total, $1,459.11. (2) Arthur D. Strong. (3) Salary and reimbursement for traveling, hotels, entertaining, attending meetings, hearings, and conventions. (4) None. (5) Registrant is employed to support legislation relating to the improvement and development of navigable waterways in the upper Mississippi River, together with legislation relating to flood control, conservation, pollution, recreation, fish and wildlife, including all legislation that has to do with the development of water resources of upper Mississippi River and its tributaries as this legislation relates to all types of public benefits. He is employed to oppose legislation determental to the above.

Strong, Arthur D., Upper Mississippi Waterway Association, 1034 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn. (1) Salary, January 1, 1948, to March 31, 1948, $825; reimbursement for expense, $564.23; total, $1,389.23. (2) Arthur D. Strong. (3) Salary and reimbursement for traveling, hotels, entertaining, attending meeting, hearing, and conventions. (4) None. (5) Registrant is employed to support legislation relating to the improvement and development of navigable waterways in the upper Mississippi River, together with legislation relating to flood control, conservation, pollution, recreation, fish and wildlife,

[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for second quarter, 1947.
[6] Filed for third quarter, 1947.
[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

including all legislation that has to do with the development of water resources of the upper Mississippi River and its tributaries as this legislation relates to all types of public benefits. He is employed to oppose legislation detrimental to the above.

Sturgis, Arthur, Jr.,[7] American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $200; expenses, $13.55. (2) Taxi drivers and restaurants. (3) Transportation and meals. (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor law revision, social-security law revision, inflammable fabric legislation.

Sturgis, Arthur, Jr., American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $200; expenses, $9.20. (2) Taxi drivers and restaurants. (3) Transportation and meals. (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor law revision, social-security law revision, inflammable fabric legislation.

Sturrock, J. E., Texas Water Conservation Association, 605–609 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex. (1) Salary for January, February, and March 1948, $1,500, less income and social-security taxes. Traveling expenses for January, February, and March 1948, $513.42. (2) $513.42 traveling expenses paid to various railroad and taxi companies, hotels, and restaurants. (3) Covering transportation, meals and lodging, and entertainment. (4) Texas Water Conservation Association bulletins and pamphlets and various analysis of bills pending in Congress. (5) Employed to support all legislation, both State and national, having to do with the development, conservation, protection, and utilization of Texas' land and water resources through existing State and Federal agencies; to oppose all legislation creating Federal valley authorities and all legislation which seeks to superimpose Federal control over State control in the distribution of the State's water resources.

Sullivan, Francis M., Disabled American Veterans, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, January, February, March 1948 (after withholding and social-security tax), $1,672.65; incidental expenses, January, February, March, $29.60; travel expense, $33.89. (2) Francis M. Sullivan, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) Salary, January, February, March 1948 (after deduction of withholding and social-security taxes), $1,672.65; incidental expenses, taxi, lunches, $29.60; travel to New York City, $33.89. (4) DAV Semimonthly. (5) Any legislation affecting service-connected disabled veterans, their families, and the widows and orphans of deceased veterans.

Sutlive, Carey R., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: Salary, $2,125; expenses reimbursed by employer, $270.30. Expenditures, $270.30. (2) Expenses paid to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, etc. (3) For expenses incurred in course of business, such as travel, meals, and hotel accommodations and expenses of conducting conferences for discussion of business matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting industry, such as legislation relating to national labor policy, taxation, public expenditures, industrial controls, social security, research, patents, and investments.

Swanson, Walter S. J., National Highway Users Conference, 938 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration. He expended a total of $3.60. (2) The money was paid to various taxi drivers employed in transporting registrant between his office and the Capitol. (3) For taxi transportation between office and Capitol. (4) Prepared, circularized, and filed a supplemental petition to Congress urging the repeal of the Federal automotive excise taxes. Prepared articles for Highway Highlights and certain bulletins released by the National Highway Users Conference. (5) Within the general responsibility of my office I carried on the work outlined above. The only legislation in which this activity has been directed has been the filing of a petition and the above-mentioned supplemental petition urging a modification of the Federal automotive excise taxes.

Swomley,[10] John M., Jr., director, National Council Against Conscription, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $321.85 for travel and out-of-pocket expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) For above-mentioned travel and out-of-pocket expenses. (4) Conscription News, weekly news bulletin of National Council Against Conscription; Gospel Messenger, January 24, 1948. (5) [Blank.]

Taylor,[9] Hugh W., 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc., 620 South Broadway, Lexington, Ky. (1) Amount received from Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association: For salary, less social security and tax, $2,250; for expenses incurred, $370.26. (2) Various. (3) Railroad fares, rooms, etc. (4) None. (5) Legislation which affects tobacco production and foreign trade in leaf tobacco.

Taylor, John Thomas, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; the American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) $500 salary semimonthly, less withholding and social-security taxes; $24.34 incidental expenses for January, February, and March 1948. (2) John Thomas Taylor. (3) $24.34 incidental expenses for January, February, and March 1948. (4) The American Legion Magazine, New York City; the National Legionnaire, Indianapolis, Ind.; National Legislative Bulletin, Washington, D. C. (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations, the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the national convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion.

Taylor, Margaret K., the National Cooperative Milk Poducers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expended, $23.30. (2) Various. (3) Phones and taxis. (4) None. (5) Any legislation which may affect milk producers.

Taylor, Russell J., United Shoe Workers of America, CIO, 917 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $80 per week; expenses, $21 per week; hotel, $12 per week. (2) Russell J. Taylor. (3) Legislative representative, United Shoe Workers of America, CIO. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Taylor, Tyre, 712 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Retail Grocers, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received $2,500 as one-fourth of adjusted annual retainer by National Association of Retail Grocers. Expenditures as follows: (a) Adjusted regular office expenses amounting to $877.89; (b) traveling expenses, $76.70. (2) (a) Landlord, secretary, postage, telephone, etc.; (b) Washington taxicab operators. (3) See (1) above. (4) National Grocers' Bulletin (published monthly). (5) Repeal of margarine license taxes and other legislation of interest to independent retail food distributors.

Taylor, Tyre, 712 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.; Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn. (1) Received $3,862.50 as one-fourth of adjusted annual retainer by Southern States Industrial Council. Expenditures as follows: (a) Adjusted regular office expenses amounting to $527.89; (b) research and technical assistance, $1,581.27; (c) travel expense, $76.70. (2) (a) Landlord, stamps, telephone, etc.; (b) Henry Bison, Jr.; (c) Washington taxicab operators. (3) See (1) above for purposes. (4) Semimonthly News Bulletin of Southern States Industrial Council. (5) The general legislative program of the council, with particular emphasis on legislation favorable to the maintenance of a free-enterprise system.

Terrell, John U., Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.; Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) Colorado River Association, $1,403.22 in March 1948. (2) The sum of $1,403.22 was expended for transportation, hotels, personal living expenses, and routine business expenses. (3) Public relations. (4) News releases to all wire services and to California newspapers. (5) Senate Joint Resolution 145, House Joint Resolution 225.

Thompson, Chester C., the American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary from the American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., $5,000 covering January, February, March 1948. (2) Miscellaneous expenses, $60.75. (3) Local transportation expenses. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting domestic water carrier and operator industry of the United States.

Thompson, Louis E., Small Business Association of New Jersey, Inc., Box 188, Glen Ridge, N. J. (1) Contribution received in first quarter of 1948, $140. (2) Bloomfield Press, Bloomfield, N. J.; Bloomfield Letter Service Co., Bloomfield, N. J.; post office; and the expenses of one trip to Washington, D. C., and other small expenses; total not over $150. (3) To urge support of the policies advocated by the Conference of American Small Business Organizations by small-business people in New Jersey. (4) None. (5) To support any bills that would promote the policies of (3) above. Proceedings of the Conference of American Small Business Organizations have been filed with Members of the Senate and of the House.

Thomson, Mrs. Dorothy W., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.; American Parents Committee, 300 B Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $50.54 for miscellaneous expense; expended, $50.54. (2) Various. (3) Telephone calls, cab fares, lunches, and other miscellaneous expense. (4) The Parents' Magazine and School Management. (5) National School Health Services Act, National Science Foundation bill, appropriations for United States Children's Bureau, Federal aid for education bill.

Tinney, William, the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1)

[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

[9] Filed with the Clerk only.

[10] Filed with the Secretary only.

Salary $519.36 per month, which is paid for all the services rendered to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., only a part of which have to do with legislation; $177.48 was expended by me as expense money, during the first quarter of 1948, for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. In addition to this amount, I also received $266.22 for expenses incurred in connection with other duties performed for the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., which have no relation to the purposes covered by this act. (2) Various transportation companies, restaurants, garages, communication companies, etc. (3) $177.48 was expended by me as expense money, during the first quarter of 1948, for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

Tobin, Fred A., 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers Union of America, 222 East Michigan Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) My salary is $1,250 per month or $3,750 for quarter year. I do not incur any expenses in performance of legislative work. (2) Fred A. Tobin. (3) I am an attorney representing the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers Union and its affiliated locals before the Interstate Commerce Commission and the National Labor Relations Board. Am the liaison representative between various Government agencies and international union and the affiliated locals. The above includes general services of a nonlegislative nature pertaining to business and operation of International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its affiliated locals; also for part-time services in connection with legislation both Federal and State for the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its affiliated locals. (4) I do not have any connection with any newspaper. (5) Legislation, Federal and State, which may affect the interests of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its affiliated locals particularly in the field of labor law.

Tobler, H. Willis, 857 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; American Farm Bureau Federation, 58 East Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $45 expended. (See item (6) of Form B, filed December 1946.) (2) Taxis. (3) Transportation. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Long-range agricultural program, taxation, agricultural appropriations, Commodity Credit Corporation, regulation of commodity exchanges, coordination of agricultural conservation services, Fair Employment Practices Act, farm credit, fertilizer, European recovery program, continuation of postwar construction of highways, transfer of United States Employment Service from Federal Security Agency to Labor Department (in proposed Reorganization Plan No. 1), transfer of Army Remount Service to United States Department of Agriculture, eradication of cattle grubs, amendment to Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act, universal military training, means for controlling inflation, 1-year extension of administration by Secretary of Agriculture of Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, St. Lawrence seaway, Federal meat inspection, Tennessee Valley Authority, Federal aid to education, library demonstration bill, irrigation and reclamation, Labor Extension Service.

Tone, Joseph M., legislative representative (International Association of Machinists), Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,875; expenses, $5 per day, excluding Sunday and holidays. (2) Personal. (3) Personal. (4) None. (5) None.

Tool Owners Union, Inc., 1802 Massachusetts Avenue, Lexington, Mass. (1) See attached schedule.[1] (2) See attached schedule.[1] (3) See attached schedule.[1] (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Truitt, Paul T., National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $182.61. (2) Taxis, carfare, miscellaneous phone calls, notary fees, bank fee, luncheons, etc. (3) As above. (4) None. (5) Any margarine legislation.

Tumulty, Joseph P., Jr., partner of law firm of Breed, Abbott & Morgan, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Mr. Louis Dreyfus, president of Chappell & Co., Inc., R. K. O. Building, New York, and of Chappell & Co., Ltd., 50 New Bond Street, London, England. (1) Nothing received during the quarter; $49.93 expended during the quarter. (2) Railroad (Washington, D. C., to New York City) and hotel (New York), $44.78; photostats, $4.55; taxies, $1.60. (3) The only expenses during the quarter covered traveling, transportation, hotel and meals, photostats, taxis. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5704, Eightieth Congress, second session, a bill to facilitate naturalization of Jeanne Bouchet Dreyfus.

Tumulty, Joseph P., Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; John Frederick Firth-Hand, 1744 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) S. 1742, Eightieth Congress, first session, a bill for the relief of John Frederick Firth-Hand.

Tumulty, Joseph P., Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia; the Insurance Co. of the State of Pennsylvania, 308 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation for the just payment of French spoliation claims.

Van Arnum, John R., National League of Wholesale Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Distributors, 512 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) At present I am interested in securing the enactment of H. R. 5995, but have not received or spent any funds in connection with this bill.

Vance, C. W., Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Order of Railway Conductors of America, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. (1) Salary, $1,190; expenses, $790.61. No money expended except for personal maintenance. (2) Annapolis Hotel, taxicabs, telephone, postage, laundry, cleaning, pullman fare, and various restaurants. (3) Necessary living, transportation, communication, and living expenses. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting railway labor and particularly to oppose bills detrimentally affecting the existing railroad retirement and railroad unemployment insurance system.

Van Nostrand, George C., American Airlines, Inc., 1437 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) As assistant vice president of American Airlines on a permanent basis, I received a monthly salary of $833.33, or $2,500 for the quarter for all my activities. Only a minor portion of my activities involved legislation. Expended in connection with activities involving legislation, $21.10. (2) Taxi fares and telephone calls. (3) Taxi transportation and telephone calls. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting air transportation.

Van Osdol, Paul, Jr., Missouri-Kansas Businessmen's Association, Inc., 1210 Waltower Building, Kansas City, Mo. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None. (NOTE.—I am secretary-treasurer of the Missouri-Kansas Businessmen's Association. As secretary of this association I may, in the future, write letters to businessmen, civic organizations, and to the public, which may encourage them to write letters to Members of Congress with regard to pending or proposed Federal legislation, including legislation relating to taxes. Although I am of the opinion that my activity has not as yet come within the requirements of the Federal Regulation of Lobbing Act, since a part of my activities may include the writing of letters to Members of Congress or to encourage the members of our association to do so, I will keep the records required by the act and submit the required reports.

Vernon, Weston, Jr., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; the Chase National Bank of the City of New York, 18 Pine Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant is a member of the law firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y., which firm receives an annual retainer from the Chase National Bank of the City of New York for professional services. As stated in his registration statement on Form B, registrant does not believe he is subject to the provisions of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. Registrant's Federal tax legislative work comprises only an incidental and minor part of his duties. If any of registrant's activities are subject to the provisions of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act the portion of the annual retainer from the Chase National Bank that might be attributed to attention to Federal tax legislative matters based on an allocation of time was $187.50 during the first quarter of 1948 and disbursements pertaining to such activities were $6.53. (2) See answer to (1). Expense payments were made to the firm under the terms of the annual retainer for hotel rooms, meals, transportation, postage, telephone and miscellaneous expenses of registrant, and of members and employees of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley. (3) See answers to (1) and (2). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Chase National Bank of the City of New York.

Vernon, Weston, Jr., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y., New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y. (1) The only money received by registrant was his aliquot share of income of the law firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y., which firm receives an annual retainer from the New York Stock Exchange for professional services. That portion of such annual retainer attributable to attention to Federal legislative matters based on an allocation of time was $87.50 during the first quarter of 1948, plus disbursements of $22.59. (2) Expense payments were made to firm for hotel, meals, transportation, postage, telephone, and miscellaneous expenses of registrant, and of employees of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley. (3) See answers to (1) and (2). (4) None. (5) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

Viles, A. L., the Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) During the quarter ended March 31, 1948, I devoted approximately 7 days to legislative activity for which I was reimbursed by the association at the rate of $150 a day for salary and expenses. (2) Expenditures were made for routine rail and air transportation, lodging, meals, etc. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Bills relating to rubber policy and regulation which culminated in Public Law 469, Eightieth Congress, second session.

Virkus,[5] Frederick A., Conference of American Small Business Organizations, 141 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) Compensation, $3,000; expenses, $563.75. (2) [Blank.] (3) Expenses; primarily travel,

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[5] Filed for second quarter, 1947.

some miscellaneous. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation or proposed legislation affecting small business.

Virkus,[6] Frederick A., Conference of American Small Business Organizations, 141 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) Compensation, $3,000; expenses, $325.55. (2) [Blank.] (3) Expenses; primarily travel, some miscellaneous. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation or proposed legislation affecting small business.

Virkus,[7] Frederick A., Conference of American Small Business Organizations, 141 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) Compensation, $3,000; expenses, $176.31. (2) [Blank.] (3) Expenses; primarily travel, some miscellaneous. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation or proposed legislation affecting small business.

Virkus, Frederick A., Conference of American Small Business Organizations, 141 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) Compensation, $3,000; expenses, $615.50. (2) Pennsylvania Railroad, Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, Mayflower and Wardman Park Hotels, taxi drivers, telephone company, telegraph company. (3) Expenses; primarily travel, some miscellaneous. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation or proposed legislation affecting small business.

Vogt, Joseph F., the Employees Committee for Low-Cost Retirement Benefits, 1186 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $25 on February 3, from Employees Committee for Low-Cost Retirement Benefits, as part payment of $103.70 due me for expenses incurred June through December 1947, leaving balance of $78.70, plus $58.30 expended during January, February, March 1948; also received $50 on March 1 as part repayment of previously reported loan to committee of $200, leaving balance of $150. (2) The $58.30 mentioned above was spent by me for carfare, telephone, and other miscellaneous expenses incurred on behalf of committee work. (3) Carfare, telephone, and other miscellaneous expenses. (4) None during period January through March 1948. (5) Crosser Act, passed into law July 31, 1946.

Voorhis,[7 8] H. Jerry, the Cooperative League of the United States of America., 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $89.05; report subject to the qualifications stated in my registration of June 10, 1947. (2) Airplane companies, taxi drivers, restaurants. (3) Transportation and food. (4) None. (5) Interested in legislation affecting farmers, consumers, and some legislation on cooperatives, but not employed for the purpose of supporting or approving legislation.

Voorhis,[9] H. Jerry, the Cooperative League of the United States of America, 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $80.24; report subject to the qualifications stated in my registration of June 20, 1947. (2) Railroads and airplanes and restaurants. (3) Transportation and food. (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose legislation but interested in legislation affecting farm and city cooperatives and agriculture in general.

Waller, Theodore, Committee for the Marshall Plan To Aid European Recovery, 537 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, January 9–February 28, 1948, $1,332; travel and transportation expenses, January 9–February 28, 1948, $1,727.33. (Services terminated February 28, 1948.) (2) Salary received used for personal expenses, no part of it spent on behalf of the Committee for the Marshall Plan To Aid European Recovery. Travel and transportation expenses covered my actual expenses traveling on behalf of the committee. (3) Same as (2) above. (4) None, except through ordinary press channels (5) Legislation to provide for a European recovery program.

Walter, Stephen M., National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary of $6,625.02 as an employee of the National Association of Electric Companies, and reimbursements of $461.80 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all duties and assignments only a part of which salary and expenses were for those purposes described in section 308 (a) or otherwise within the scope Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) Various restaurants, telephone and telegraph companies, taxicabs, bookstores, and stationers. (3) Transportation, $144.95; meals and incidental expenses on account of association members in Washington, $270.10; telephones and telegraph, $11.25; newspapers and publications, $4.45; miscellaneous, $31.05. (4) None. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies of which I am an employee, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association, therefore, is interested in legislation that might affect its members as going business concerns.

Walters,[7] Thomas G., Government Employees Council of the American Federation of Labor, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) As operations director, receives a monthly salary ($580), minus withholding tax and social-security tax, expended for personal living expenses. (2) Thomas G. Walters. (3) Salary received and expended for personal services as operations director of council; lobbying is minor and incidental. (4) Washington newspapers, international union publications, weekly council bulletin for the dissemination of organizational news including legislation. (5) Favorable to Federal Government employees and opposition to adverse legislation.

Walters, Thomas G., Government Employees Council of the American Federation of Labor, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) As operations director, receives a monthly salary ($580), minus withholding tax and social-security tax, expended for personal living expenses. (2) Thomas G. Walters. (3) Salary received and expended for personal services as operations director of council; lobbying is minor and incidental. (4) Washington newspapers, international union publications, weekly council bulletin for the dissemination of organizational news, including legislation. (5) Favorable to Federal Government employees and opposition to adverse legislation.

Ward, D. J., 1129 Vermont Avenue NW. Washington, D. C.; Imported Nut Section, Association of Food Distributors, Inc.; 161 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting imports of tree nuts.

Warfel, George L., president, the National Association of Special Delivery Messengers, 112 C Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary (gross, withholding and social-security taxes deducted), $1,250; expense vouchers, $40.55; total, $1,290.55. (2) George L. Warfel. (3) To promote the welfare of the special-delivery messengers of the Post Office Department, including liaison contacts with administrative Government officials, and legislative work. (4) The Special Messenger; Special News (mimeographed bulletins to membership). (5) Supporting all legislation of benefit to special-delivery messengers.

Warfield, Ethelbert (report as attorney for American General Corp.), 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y., American General Corp., 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N. J. (1) No receipts or expenditures during said period. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To oppose S. 829 and H. R. 3351.

Warfield, Ethelbert (report as attorney for National Postal Committee for Books), 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) No receipts during said period. Expenditures: For transportation, meals, hotel rooms, etc., $68.99. (2) The Pennsylvania Railroad and various restaurants, hotels, and taxicab companies. (3) Transportation, meals, hotel rooms, and telephone calls. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to postage rates on books.

Waring, Frank R.,[10] Federal Employees Veterans Association, 311 North Sixteenth Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) January 27 and 28, 1947; April 17 and 28, 1947; July 17 and 18, 1947: Total expenses on above 6 days (meals, transportation, hotel room), $56.95; total remuneration on above 6 days at rate of pay of place of daily work, $83.52; grand total, $140.47. (2) Expenses as incurred en route. (3) For living and dining services. Transportation, etc. (4) None. (5) To recommend enforcement and strengthening of Public Law 359 (Veterans' Preference Act of 1944).

Warner, Milo J., the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 1631 Nicholas Building, Toledo, Ohio. (1) Received from the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J., for professional services; conferences with various Members of Congress in regard to legislation for the period October 1 to December 31, 1947, inclusive, $2,000; expenses for transportation and traveling to and from Washington, hotel, meals, telephone, telegraph, entertainment, and expenses in Washington, $290.81. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) Services were rendered in connection with housing, credit, labor, railroad reorganization and general welfare legislation and protective of the interests of the policyholders of the Prudential Insurance Co. of America.

Wasserman, Jack, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) I was retained in this matter by Maurice Schwartz of 7 South East Street, Raleigh, N. C., to secure the passage of a private bill for Bessie and Patricia Schwartz (S. 1739 and H. R. 5716). I have been paid $500 by the said Maurice Schwartz which is the total amount for all fees and disbursements. No additional fees or disbursements are to be paid. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Watson,[7] J. R., Mississippi Railroad Association, Room 1, Illinois Central Railroad Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss. (1) No reportable receipts and expenditures. (No segregation of salary as between principal employment and possible incidental concern with matters of Federal legislation. The registrant is of the opinion that his activities for the period covered by this report do not fall within the scope of the Lobbying Act.) (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Annual employment, primarily for services not related to Federal legislation. Matters of Federal legislation are other and different from and only incidental to principal employment and purpose, but as an incident thereto, legislation pertaining to railroads in Mississippi. None within the period covered by this report. (This report for quarter ending December 31, 1947.)

Watson, J. R., Mississippi Railroad Association, Room 1, Illinois Central Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss. (1) Salary monthly, without segregation; and reimbursement of expenses incurred in the amount of $298.26. (2) Raleigh Hotel for room and other charges; Pullman Co. for Pullman tickets; telephone

[6] Filed for third quarter, 1947.
[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.
[8] Filed with the Clerk only.
[9] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.
[10] Filed with the Secretary only.

company and telegraph company, and various restaurants, dining cars, taxicabs, and nominal sums, including tips, to individuals, postage, and other incidental travel and subsistence expenses in the aggregate sum of $298.26. (3) For hotel, travel, meals, and other expenses incident to my employment. (4) None. (5) Employment is primarily for purposes not related to Federal legislation, but as an incident thereto, any such legislation pertaining to railroads in Mississippi.

Waybur, Bruce, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,060; expenses, $130. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers, etc. (3) Personal expenses in Washington and travel. These expenses cover both legislative and nonlegislative activity. (4) UE News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Weathersby, Newton Patrick, District No. 44, International Association of Machinists, Room 303, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary $1,000, $30 legislative expenses during quarter. (2) Taxi drivers and operators of eating and refreshment places. (3) Lobbying, i. e., supporting or opposing, as the case may be, legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general. Not more than 3 percent of time spent on this work. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Webb, William H., 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Money received: salary, $1,057.25; expenses, $361.43; money expended, $592.25. (2) Various. (3) For miscellaneous office, personal, and traveling expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) All laws and regulations needed to promote the maintenance and improvement of waterways, the development and protection of water transportation, etc.

Weingarten, J. W., 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.; Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) The undersigned is registering under the act with this report and has made no previous reports. Since the effective date of the act, August 2, 1946, the undersigned in the months of May and June 1947 received his regular compensation at that time for time spent, approximately 12 days, in connection with Federal legislation, the sum of $403.80 and in addition thereto expenses aggregating $286.67. (2) Expenditures made by the undersigned of $286.67 were incurred on two trips to Washington. (3) Necessary traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the railroad business.

Welliver, Edward M., American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration. He expended a total of $24.50. (2) The money was paid to various taxi drivers employed in taking registrant between his office and the Capitol or House or Senate Office Buildings, and to clerks and cashiers for lunches. (3) The money paid taxi drivers was for transportation to and from my office as indicated in (2). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the trucking industry.

Wescott, James B., 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.; Salt Producers Association, Book Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) The law firm of Miller, Gorham, Wescott & Adams, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill., of which firm registrant is a partner, received from Salt Producers Association, Detroit, Mich., $5,381.81 during the preceding calendar quarter. Of this amount, $5,200 was on account of legal services rendered; the remainder of $181.81 was for reimbursement to the firm for cash disbursements made. (2) Various. (3) The expenses incurred were in connection with H. R. 2717 and H. R. 4211. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2717 and H. R. 4211.

West, Oscar H., 1001–2 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Insurance Agents, 80 Maiden Lane, New York, N. Y. (1) No money received or expended during preceding calendar quarter. Status of registrant the same as stated in original Form B and accompanying letter of explanation, filed March 6, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) American Agency Bulletin, monthly publication of National Association of Insurance Agents. (5) [Blank.]

White, John C., care Fulbright, Crooker, Freeman & White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.; American Cotton Shippers Association. (1) $39.05. (2) Batt, Bates & Co., Inc., 1407 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) Mimeographing statements of witnesses before Senate Agriculture Committee on minimum margin legislation. (4) [Blank.] (5) Support: S. 2202, European Recovery Act; S. 2376, revolving fund for occupied areas; reciprocal trade agreements extension. Oppose: Minimum margin legislation on futures exchanges; tax exemption of cooperatives.

White, Richard P., American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 636 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts of salary, $2,500; expenses reimbursed by employer, $324.18. (2) Expenses paid to various air lines, railroads, hotels, clubs, restaurants, taxis, associations, etc. (3) Attending meetings of association committees, local associations, and payment for miscellaneous publications. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation affecting the nursery industry.

Whitlock, Douglas, 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) From Building Products Institute, Washington, D. C.: Fee, $1,500; expenses, $163.06. (2) Telephone, $87.74; traveling, $9.62; restaurant, $38.40; taxi, $6.50; testimony joint committee hearings, $20.80; total, $163.06. (3) As indicated by items above. (4) None. (5) All legislation which may affect the producers of building materials.

Whyte, Louis E., Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary (allocated), $725; expenses, $6. (2) Reported as disbursements by Independent Natural Gas Association of America (miscellaneous) for taxicabs. (3) Transportation. (4) Natural Gas News Letter. (5) Am interested in legislation proposing changes in the Natural Gas Act.

Wickenden, Elizabeth, 522 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.; American Public Welfare Association, 1313 East Sixtieth Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $800 (half time) salary received. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) APWA Letter to Members. (5) Any legislation affecting public-welfare administration.

Wicklein, L. M., general vice president, Sheet Metal Workers' International Association, 642 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money received except regular salary and expenses. No money expended for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation. Total salary for quarter, $2,250, Total expense for quarter, $3,327.74. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) I am employed to handle my many and varied duties as general vice president of the Sheet Metal Workers' International Association. My work in connection with legislation is incidental to these other duties and consumes a very small part of my time. It is confined to giving attention to legislation affecting railway employees in which we are interested.

Wiesner, Edward W., International Association of Machinists, 1642 Abbott Road, Buffalo, N. Y. (1) $500 from January 15 to February 15, 1948; $12 per day expenses. (2) Personal. (3) Personal. (4) None. (5) General interest of labor.

Wiley,[10] Mrs. Harvey W., chairman of legislation, District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs, 2345 Ashmead Place, Washington, D. C. (1) Not any. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) District of Columbia Federation Clubwoman, January and March 1948. (5) Not employed for pay. A volunteer worker for the District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs, interested especially in legislation affecting the District of Columbia, after given authority through the adoption of resolution by the delegate body of the District of Columbia Federation.

Wilkinson, Ernest L., Francis M. Goodwin, Glen A. Wilkinson, and Woodruff J. Deem, doing business under the name of Ernest L. Wilkinson, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Klamath Tribes of Indians, Oregon, Klamath Agency, Oreg. (1) Received $1,125 for legal services; only a small portion of the time spent is directed toward legislative matters. (2) None, except small items for telephone, telegraph, and transportation. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) Supporting H. R. 2501, 2502, and 2775; opposing S. 1222 and H. R. 4725.

Wilkinson, Ernest L., Francis M. Goodwin, Glen A. Wilkinson, and Woodruff J. Deem, doing business under the name of Ernest L. Wilkinson, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Menominee Tribe of Indians, Wisconsin, Menominee Indian Agency, Keshena, Wis. (1) Received $650 for legal services; only a small portion of the time spent is directed toward legislative matters. (2) None, except small items for telephone, telegraph, and transportation. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) Supporting H. R. 5300; opposing H. R. 4725 and S. 1222.

Wilkinson, Ernest L., and Glen A. Wilkinson, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Radio Service Corp. of Utah, 10 South Main Street, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Opposing S. 2231.

Willard, A. D., Jr., National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $4,166.67 received for services as executive vice president of the National Association of Broadcasters from February 3, 1948 (date of registration), to April 1, 1948; $1,240.93 received as reimbursement for business expenses for same period. (Advance to cover miscellaneous expenses, European trip, $500.) (2) Various air lines, railroads, taxi companies, hotels, and restaurants, etc. (3) The amounts set forth above were received and/or expended in carrying out my normal duties as executive vice president, acting as administrative officer at the headquarters of the National Association of Broadcasters, only a small part of which duties directly or indirectly involve Federal legislation. None of this money was received or expended for the specific purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any Federal legislation. (4) None. Miscellaneous information is furnished to members through weekly bulletin. (5) None. I am interested in any legislation, Federal or State, which may affect the radio-broadcasting industry.

Willenbucher, Franz Otto, Retired Officers Association, Inc., 1600 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $1,250. No part of this sum was received specifically for the purpose of attempting to influence legislative action. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) Retired Officers Association Bulletin. Release of the association's president concerning retirements for physical disability to the Army-Navy Journal, Army and Navy Register, Armed Force, and selected

[10] Filed with the Secretary only.

newpapers, and other miscellaneous brief announcements to said publications. (5) Legislation affecting retired officers, warrant officers, and nurses of the Army, Navy, Air Corps, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

Williams, Myers & Quiggle, a law partnership consisting of the following partners: Paul F. Myers, James Craig Peacock, Martin W. Meyer, John E. Skilling, and Robert H. Myers, 817 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; National Food Brokers Association, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Washington Food Brokers Association, care of R. J. Dannemiller, president, 2653 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C. (1) No money was received but $8 for taxicab fares and $6.13 for long-distance telephone calls were expended on account of services to National Food Brokers Association; $14.15 were expended for taxicab fares on account of services to Washington Food Brokers Association. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5317, H. R. 5563, H. R. 5919, H. R. 6050, and S. 2409.

Williamson, John C., Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $500 per month as salary minus social-security and withholding taxes; $102.05 as expenses for transportation and luncheon in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combating of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; others matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration.

Wilson, Clarence P., 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, $137.50; expenses, $144.13. (2) Clarence P. Wilson. (3) For salary and personal expenses while working in behalf of legislation in which the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen is interested. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

Wilson, E. Raymond, Friends Committee on National Legislation, 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Gross salary (January, February, March 1948), $1,500; travel expense, $152.16. (2) Various. (3) Travel is for the purpose of attending yearly meetings, quarterly meetings, conferences of Friends and other groups to interpret developments in national and international policy, with special reference to legislation, and for other committee business. (4) We send a news letter to a limited number of subscribers and Friends about once a month. (5) In general, to support measures leading to peace and humanitarian ends, such as world organization and world economic stability, world disarmament, foreign relief, aid to refugees, protection for racial minorities; support for the rights of conscience; opposition to conscription and the militarization of America.

Wilson, Eugene E., Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to establish a national air policy.

Wilson, Everett B., Jr., 728 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $750 monthly from Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, but not for principal purpose of influencing legislation, which is a minor part of my activities. (2) None for purpose of influencing legislation. (3) None. (4) Newspapers in Puerto Rico only. (5) None.

Wilson, J. B., Wyoming Wool Growers Association, McKinley, Wyo. (1) Salary, Wyoming Wool Growers Association, $1,500; $894.33 paid by National Wool Growers Association and Wyoming Wool Growers Association for expenses. (2) J. B. Wilson, whose principal employment is as secretary of the Wyoming Wool Growers Association; lobbying for or against legislation is a part of his duty, but not his principal occupation and for which he receives no added compensation. His expenses, however, are paid by the National Wool Growers Association as chairman of their legislative committee and by the Wyoming Wool Growers Association. (3) Transportation, hotels, etc. (4) J. B. Wilson is secretary of the Wyoming Wool Growers Association and editor of the Wyoming Wool Grower, a semimonthly publication, published by the Wyoming Wool Growers Association for its members. (5) To support any legislation affecting wool-growing industry, including wool bills, tariff, public-land legislation, etc.

Wilson, Lacey C., 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, $1,075; expense, $1,075. During this quarter the amounts shown on Form B filed January 28, 1948, were increased as follows: (4) Salary, $250; (6) expenses, $250. (2) Lacey C. Wilson. (3) Salary and personal expenses while working in behalf of legislation in which the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen is interested. (4) Sunday Star, Wilmington, Del. (5) All legislation affecting the interests of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

Wingert, E. L., 1 West Main Street, Madison, Wis., Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, 119 Monona Avenue, Madison, Wis. (1) Received my share of retainer fee paid my firm for general services as legal counsel for Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, involving mainly services unrelated to Federal legislation. Aside from that, received nothing for use in influencing Federal legislation; and expended nothing for that purpose. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Such legislation affecting business and industry generally as I may be instructed to give attention to from time to time.

Winn, Arthur L., Jr., Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) La Roe, Brown & Winn, law firm, received from the National Independent Meat Packers Association, $4,500, total of monthly payments for general legal services, of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payment made to any other person. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) S. 2256; H. R. 5675; appropriation for meat inspection, Department of Agriculture.

Winston, James H., 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill., Salt Producers Association, Book Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) The law firm of Miller, Gorham, Wescott & Adams, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill., of which firm registrant is a partner, received from Salt Producers Association, Detroit, Mich., $5,381.81 during the preceding calendar quarter. Of this amount $5,200 was on account of legal services rendered; the remainder of $181.81 was for reimbursement to the firm for cash disbursements made, as follows: John Crerar Library, bibliography on iodine sensitivity, $175; Western Union Telegraph Co., telegrams, $1.06; Illinois Bell Telephone Co., telephone calls, $5.75; total, $181.81. (2) See (1) above. (3) The expenses incurred were in connection with H. R. 2717 and H. R. 4211. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2717 and H. R. 4211.

Winter, Everett T., 705 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.; Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) Total reimbursable expenses in connection with legislative matters, $817.83; all reimbursed by Mississippi Valley Association; three round-trips, Omaha to Washington, D. C. (2) Railroads, air lines, etc., $415.24; hotels and miscellaneous, $402.59. (3) Travel, subsistence, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement; the American merchant marine; soil conservation; flood control; regulation of domestic transportation.

Wisdom, John Minor, care Wisdom & Stone, 312 Whitney Building, New Orleans, La.; Louisiana Community Property Taxpayers Committee, care Joseph W. Montgomery, chairman, United Fruit Building, New Orleans, La. (1) Retainer fee, as attorney, $1,249.98; received as reimbursement for traveling expense to Washington, etc., $256.40. (2) Self. (3) Retainer for January, February, and March 1948. Expenses for travel. See explanatory statement attached to Form A, filed March 6, 1947, and supplemental statement filed July 14, 1947. (4) None. (5) See explanatory statement attached to Form A, filed March 6, 1947; supplemental statements filed July 14, 1947, and January 10, 1948.

Woodrum, Clifton A., American Plant Food Council, Inc., as president, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Clifton A. Woodrum, president of the American Plant Food Council, Inc., certifies that neither he nor the American Plant Food Council, Inc., has received nor expended during the preceding calendar quarter any funds whatsoever for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States. (Please refer to letter filed with original registration). (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Woodson, George W., 424 North Washington Avenue, Lansing, Mich.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) I have received a commission of 25 percent on all income from the State of Michigan amounting to $485.66 since January 1. (2) I have employed no one. (3) For hotel, postage, travel, telephone, telegraph, taxis, and meals. (4) None. (5) H. R. 16 (Townsend plan).

Woodul, Walter F., Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.; Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex.; Burlington-Rock Island Railroad Co., Houston, Tex.; the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex.; Fort Worth & Denver City Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex.; Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Co., Galveston, Tex.: the Kansas City Southern Railway Co., Kansas City, Mo.; Louisiana & Arkansas Railway Co., Kansas City, Mo.; International-Great Northern Railroad, Houston, Tex.; Missouri-Kansas-Texas of Texas, Dallas, Tex.; New Orleans, Texas & Mexico Railway Co., Houston, Tex.; Panhandle & Santa Fe Railway Co., Amarillo, Tex.; Paris & Mount Pleasant Railroad Co., Paris, Tex.; Quanah, Acme & Pacific Railway Co., Quanah, Tex.; St. Louis, San Francisco & Texas Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex.; St. Louis, Southwestern Railway Co. of Texas, St. Louis, Mo.; Southern Pacific Co., San Francisco, Calif.; Texas Electric Railway Co., Dallas, Tex.; Texas & New Orleans Railroad Co., Houston, Tex.; Texas South-Eastern Railroad Co., Diboll, Tex.; the Texas & Pacific Railway Co., Dallas, Tex.; the Texas-Mexican Railway Co., Laredo, Tex.; the Union Terminal Co., Dallas, Tex.; Wichita Falls & Southern Railroad Co., Wichita Falls, Tex.; the

Wichita Valley Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex. (1) Compensation as previously reported and reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses for month of December 1947, and January and February 1948, in sum of $1,040.70. (2) Missouri Pacific Lines, $40.77; Wardman Park Hotel, $155.68; Shoreham Hotel, $968.06; and to various other hotels, eating places, and others, in amounts less than $10. (3) Transportation, $40.77; hotels, $1,123.74; meals, $130.90; entertaining, $230.60; tips, taxis, and incidentals, $85.74; long-distance telephones, $20.93. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting Texas railroads.

Woodward, Albert Young, Signal Oil & Gas Co., 811 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) In addition to compensation as regular employee of Signal Oil & Gas Co., received $1,853.83 as reimbursement for expenses itemized below. Included in reimbursement and expenses are items which were not directly or indirectly related to the passage or defeat of legislation but which amounts are not readily segregated. (2) Telephone and telegraph companies, hotels, taxicab operators, garages, stenographer, etc. (3) Telephone and telegraph, $23.75; transportation (including cabs, car allowance, mileage allowance, and parking), $233.55; reportorial and secretarial services, $778.30; social and business engagements, $689.95; postage, express, and miscellaneous, $128.28. (4) None. (5) In addition to general activities unrelated to legislation, observes, analyzes, and reports on the several items of legislation introduced in Congress affecting oil and oil operations.

Wootton, Edward W., Wine Institute, 900 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $3,000 quarterly, salary as manager of the Washington office of the Wine Institute; principal offices at 717 Market Street, San Francisco. (2) Received by the undersigned for all personal services rendered as manager of this office, some of which services involve legislative activity. (3) See (1) and (2) above. No expenditures were made by undersigned to any other person for legislative purposes. (4) None. (5) Proposed amendments to Internal Revenue Code affecting wine and brandy production and representations with respect to agricultural exemptions under Fair Labor Standards Act. Brief informal discussions relative to possible changes in law with respect to winery operations and also with respect to S. 265, S. 2352, and S. 2365, noticed for public hearing next quarter, also with respect to extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Work, McClean, Ketchum, Inc., 1400 Chamber of Commerce Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) $4,000. (2) Paid to self and assistants. (3) For services and living and travel expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) S. 472 and H. R. 2953, supporting in behalf of National Education Association.

Worley, Harry F., president, National Customs Service Association, 5353 Reno Road NW., Washington, D. C. (1) He received only salary and reimbursement of travel, postage, office supplies, and office and incidental expenses. No part of money received for salary or expenses was expended in support of or opposition to any legislation. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) Customs Service News, published monthly by the National Customs Service Association. He is editor. It covers the activities of the association, news of prospective and enacted legislation, and news of personal interest to the membership. (5) He supports legislation which would benefit officers and employees of the Federal Government and opposes legislation which is against their interests. He directs legislative, administrative, or court action affecting the interests of the officers and employees of the United States Customs Service. His appearance before the committees of Congress is incidental to other activities, and forms only a small portion of the aggregate.

Wormhoudt, Marion P., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; R. W. Britton, 1416 Cherry Street, Erie, Pa. (1) The firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb, of which I am a partner, received a fee of which $300 is considered applicable to registrable activities. (2) None expended. (3) None expended. (4) None. (5) Proposal to amend provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to partnerships.

Wozencraft, Frank W., Independent Bankers Association, 410 Gulf States Building, Dallas, Tex., 605 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $2,500, fees for services (received by firm of Case & Wozencraft); $669.93, reimbursement for traveling, telephone, and telegraph expenses. (2) Air lines, hotels, etc., in connection with travel involved; Western Union and telephone company. (3) See (2) above. (4) [Blank.] (5) Bank holding company legislation.

Wright, James Skelly, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; Baumer Food Products Co., 4300 Tulane Avenue, New Orleans, La. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 3186, Eightieth Congress, a bill for the relief of Alvin A. Baumer, doing business as the Baumer Food Products Co. of New Orleans, La.

Wright, Mrs. Leslie B., chairman of legislation, General Federation of Women's Clubs, 4620 Thirtieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) For postage, office supplies, etc., $6 board meeting expense, $9.05. (2) See answer No. 1. (2) See answer No. 1. (3) See answer No. 1. (4) D. C. Clubwoman. (5) Not employed for pay. A volunteer worker for the General Federation of Women's Clubs. The General Federation suports legislation which pertains to the welfare of the home and to the general welfare, after given authority through the adoption of resolution by the delegate body.

Wright, Walter C., Jr., Tax Equality Committee of New Jersey, Inc., 44 Cooper Street, Woodbury, N. J. (1) Receipts, $13.71; expenditures, $13.71. (2) New Jersey Bell Telephone Co. (3) Pay calls on telephone. (4) None. (5) I am supporting any and all legislation tending to place cooperative associations on the same tax basis as noncooperative associations. More particularly, I am opposed to the virtual exemption from Federal income taxes the co-ops enjoy at present.

Yonkers, Andrew J., Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $875 (this represents one quarter of the amount of registrant's annual remuneration which is attributable to the performance of duties which are subject to the Lobbying Act). Reimbursement for traveling expenses, $626.99. Money expended (in connection with duties related to the Lobbying Act), $626.99. (2) Railroads, air lines, taxis, hotels, restaurants, telephones, and tips. (3) Normal traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

Young, Donald A., Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received, salary, $2,500; expenses, $21.15; expended, transportation, $16; meals, $2.15; telephone, $3. (2) Taxi companies, restaurants, telephone company. (3) Transportation to and from, and communication with, the Capitol; other normal and necessary expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation of interest to business.

Zook, John D., 17 South High Street, Columbus, Ohio; Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Columbus, Ohio. (1) Columbus to Washington, D. C., and return, January 19–21: Transportation, $50.49; hotel, $18.31; miscellaneous expense, $47.30; total, $116.10. (2) Pennsylvania Railroad and Statler Hotels. (3) Actual and necessary traveling expenses on employer's business. (4) None. (5) Legislation dealing with social security, business, taxation, and other matters of interest to our organization.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 6, 1948

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 4, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Hear us, our Father, as we pray for a freshness of spirit to renew our faith and to brighten our hopes.

Create new warmth and love between the Members of the Senate and those who work with them, that they may go at their work not head first but heart first.

May they be able to disagree without being disagreeable and to differ without being difficult.

In an atmosphere of team spirit, give them freedom to be honest without tension and frank without offense, that Thy spirit will not be driven from their midst.

This we ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 5, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 182. An act for the relief of Sgt. John H. Mott;

S. 576. An act for the relief of Dan C. Rodgers;

S. 981. An act for the relief of Carl W. Sundstrom;

S. 1142. An act for the relief of Anna Pechnik;

S. 1164. An act for the relief of Doris D. Chrisman;

S. 1630. An act for the relief of Louis L. Williams, Jr.;

S. 1648. An act to authorize the expenditure of income from Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for training of Federal prisoners;

S. 1806. An act for the relief of Ensign Merton H. Peterson, United States Naval Reserve; and

S. 1875. An act for the relief of the estate of Francis D. Shoemaker.

MEETING OF COMMITTEES DURING SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments be permitted to hold meetings, or a meeting, during the remainder of the present day, or any part thereof, which may be necessary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained consent that the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

COUNTING OF ELECTORAL VOTES—EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON GLOBE

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the Boston Globe of yesterday, which is in support of the joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment which was reported favorably last Monday by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and which provides that in Presidential elections the electoral votes shall be counted in proportion to the popular vote.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"THE DOOMED ELECTORS"

While the boys in the Republican fold are busy with their pencils over the returns from the Ohio primaries and Democratic Party bigwigs are wondering how to rally recalcitrant factionaries who threaten to wander off into the wilderness come convention time, a proposal to effect a revolutionary change in the election of Presidents was moving nearer test in Congress.

The Senate Judiciary Committee has voted, 6 to 1, to approve a measure sponsored by Senator LODGE which would, in effect, make the selection of a President a matter much more directly related to the voter than it is under the present electoral-college arrangement. This bill is now before the Senate Republican policy committee, which will decide when floor action may be sought in the Senate.

Simultaneously, the House Judiciary Committee has given assent to an identical bill which waits action by the Rules Committee. If the proposal is approved in Congress, a brand-new constitutional amendment will be on its way to the States for ratification.

The core of the pending measure concerns the electoral vote of each State. It is proposed that, in the election of President and Vice President, the electoral vote of a State shall be counted for candidates in proportion to the popular vote they receive. Thus, a State whose entire electoral vote now goes to the Presidential candidate winning the majority of the popular vote would, under the new plan, present opportunity to the defeated candidate to win one or more electoral votes. Under this arrangement, the winning of the Presidency would entail capture of a popular majority throughout the Nation.

The system instituted when the Constitution was framed, and represented by the electoral college and its electors, was expected to operate in a fashion quite other than it has. The plan was to choose electors who would select the man they preferred. The power of discretion still remains as a constitutional fact, but the record shows that it has not been exercised as intended since the days of George Washington.

A consensus of views made Washington the unanimous choice. But the struggle between Jefferson and Adams immediately thereafter stamped the impress of party preference upon electors. They began to divide accordingly. Nor did the method of selecting a Vice President fare much better. When Jefferson and Burr tied for the position of Chief Executive in 1800, the idea of giving second place to the unsuccessful candidate became snarled up in the problem of discovering who should get first place. A long-drawn-out battle of ballots among the electors made it clear that original provisions of the Constitution needed change. The twelfth amendment resulted.

Presidential electors have as a consequence become more and more useless. They exercise not discretion, but the function of recording secretaries for the returns of their States. The desirability of eliminating them has strengthened, despite the fact that in only one instance (when Monroe was chosen) has any elector ever ventured to invoke his discretionary right.

It is sound procedure to clip off this piece of constitutional deadwood. In so doing, however, it needs to be remembered that abolishing the Presidential electors and abolishing the electoral college are two entirely different matters. Any proposal to abolish the college would immediately run into a basic difficulty. The system of the electoral college involves one of the most important compromises effected by the makers of the Constitution—the right of all States, regardless of size, to equal representation in the Senate. No amendment aimed at canceling the foundations of that compromise would have a ghost of a chance of ratification by the smaller States of our Union today.

The merit of the proposed change in allotting electoral votes in each State is that it would make our Presidential elections truly national. Every vote would count save in a few one-party States. Even in these the amendment would speed growth of a real two-party system. Democrats in Vermont would have something to fight for. So would Republicans in South Carolina and Georgia.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF REVISED STATUTES RELATIVE TO COVERAGE INTO TREASURY OF CERTAIN MONEYS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 3552 of the Revised Statutes relating to the covering into the Treasury of all moneys arising from charges and deductions (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

COST-ASCERTAINMENT REPORT OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, the cost-ascertainment report and appendix, Post Office Department, for the fiscal year 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of March 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ACQUISITION OF ADDITIONAL LAND ALONG MOUNT VERNON MEMORIAL HIGHWAY

A letter from the Chairman of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the acquisition of additional land along the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway in exchange for certain dredging privileges, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIM OF CORPUS CHRISTI SHIPBUILDING CO.

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, reporting, pursuant to law, the settlement of a claim by the Corpus Christi Shipbuilding Co., Corpus Christi, Tex., in the amount of $33,850.07; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as inhicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A petition of sundry citizens of the State of Florida, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan, to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Citizens' Protective League, Inc., of New York City, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for an American War Criminals Code for the punishment of military and civilian officials who have violated their oaths of office by misuse of positions of authority or neglect of duty for purposes of monetary or personal gain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TOBEY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 2549. A bill to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington; without amendment (Rept. No. 1242).

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 6067. A bill authorizing the execution of an amendatory repayment contract with the Northport Irrigation District, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1243).

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 153. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to have prepared a replica of the Dade Monument for presentation to the State of Florida; with amendments (Rept. No. 1244).

By Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 2077. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to exchange certain property with the city of Kearney, Nebr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1245).

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 2223. A bill to authorize the promotion of Lt. Gen. Leslie Richard Groves to the permanent grade of major general, United States Army, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1246).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 2233. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the East Bay Municipal Utility District, an agency of the State of California, an easement for the construction and operation of a water main in and under certain Government-owned lands comprising a part of the United States naval air station, Alameda, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1247).

By Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 2291. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army or his duly authorized representative to quitclaim a perpetual easement over certain lands adjacent to the Fort Myers Army Airfield, Fla.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1248).

By Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 1562. A bill to increase temporarily the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1249).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 5035. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the Eighty-second National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held in Grand Rapids, Mich., September 26 to 30, 1948; without amendment (Rept. No. 1250).

By Mr. BALDWIN, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 5805. A bill to extend the time within which application for the benefits of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 may be made by veterans discharged from the armed forces before the effective date of such act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1251).

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 2359. A bill to authorize the payment of a lump sum, in the amount of $100,000, to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y., as a contribution toward the cost of construction of a water-filtration plant, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1252).

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 5553. A bill to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1253);

H. R. 5933. A bill to permit the temporary free importation of racing shells; without amendment (Rept. No. 1254); and

H. J. Res. 296. Joint resolution to maintain the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage; with amendments (Rept. No. 1255).

BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. WATKINS, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (S. 2618) to provide for disposition of lands on the Cabazon, Augustine, and Torres-Martenez Indian Reservations, which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944—AMENDMENT

Mr. BUTLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1268) to amend subsection 200 (c) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

REGIONAL EDUCATION COMPACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. MORSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 334) giving the consent of Congress to the compact on regional education entered into between the Southern States at Tallahassee, Fla., on February 8, 1948, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 6, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 192. An act for the relief of Sgt. John H. Mott;

S. 576. An act for the relief of Dan C. Rodgers;

S. 981. An act for the relief of Carl W. Sundstrom;

S. 1142. An act for the relief of Anna Pechnik;

S. 1164. An act for the relief of Doris D. Chrisman;

S. 1630. An act for the relief of Louis L. Williams, Jr.;

S. 1648. An act to authorize the expenditure of income from Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for training of Federal prisoners;

S. 1806. An act for the relief of Ensign Merton H. Peterson, United States Naval Reserve; and

S. 1875. An act for the relief of the estate of Francis D. Shoemaker.

HOW TO WRITE YOUR SENATOR—ARTICLE BY SENATOR BALDWIN

[Mr. FLANDERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "How to Write Your Senator," written by Senator BALDWIN and published in the magazine Freedom and Union, which appears in the Appendix.]

CELEBRATION OF ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF DICKINSON COLLEGE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at a special convocation at Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa., on the occasion of the observance of its one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary, which appears in the Appendix.]

PENNSYLVANIA INTERCOLLEGIATE CONFERENCE ON GOVERNMENT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR FRANCIS J. MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him on Friday, April 9, 1948, at Philadelphia, Pa., to the Pennsylvania Intercollegiate Conference on Government, which appears in the Appendix.]

DELAWARE'S VETERAN LAWS

[Mr. BUCK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a résumé of the State laws of Delaware relating to veterans, their wives, widows, children, and orphans, and their organizations, compiled by James B. King, national service officer for the Disabled American Veterans, which appears in the Appendix.]

PART 1 OF A TWO-PART ADDRESS DELIVERED BY HENRY A. WALLACE AT YORK, PA.

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD part one of a two-part address delivered by Henry A. Wallace at Pennsylvania People's Convention, Pennsylvania Wallace Committee, Sunday, March 17, 1947, at William Penn High School, York, Pa., which appears in the Appendix.]

SOUTHERN STATES COMPACT ON REGIONAL EDUCATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the joint resolution which by special order is the business of the Senate at the moment. The clerk will read the joint resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. J. Res. 191) giving the consent of Congress to the compact on regional education entered into between the Southern States at Tallahassee, Fla., on February 8, 1948.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the order that was made last week, on the request of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], also provided that in the event the supplemental appropriation bill were ready, he would agree to have the joint resolution temporarily displaced after it was made the order of business, and that the Senate should then proceed with the appropriation bill, returning to the consideration of the unfinished business when the appropriation bill had been acted on.

I therefore ask unanimous consent, in order to make the record clear, that the Senate temporarily lay aside Senate Joint Resolution 191 and proceed with the consideration of House bill 6226, making supplemental appropriations for the national defense. I would suggest the absence of a quorum if the acting minority leader thinks it should be done in order that the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] may be present.

Mr. HATCH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I merely wish to state that I am advised that the Senator from Nebraska has correctly stated the situation, therefore there will be no necessity for a quorum call. I wish to inquire, however, whether it is the intention of the Senator from Nebraska to return to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 191 as soon as the appropriation bill shall have been acted on.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; that is the unfinished business, and will automatically be resumed when the appropriation bill is out of the way.

Mr. HATCH. I have no objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska.

SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement just entered into, the Chair lays before the Senate, House bill 6226, which the clerk will state by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6226) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. BRIDGES obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from New Hampshire if he will yield for the purpose of a quorum call.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield for that purpose?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Myers
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Conor
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hoey	Pepper
Bridges	Holland	Reed
Brooks	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kem	Smith
Cain	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capper	Knowland	Stennis
Chavez	Langer	Taft
Connally	Lodge	Taylor
Cooper	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McFarland	Thye
Downey	McKellar	Tobey
Dworshak	McMahon	Tydings
Eastland	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ecton	Malone	Watkins
Ellender	Martin	Wherry
Ferguson	Maybank	White
Flanders	Millikin	Wiley
Fulbright	Moore	Williams
Green	Morse	Wilson
Gurney	Murray	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is necessarily absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent because of illness in their families.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the bill which is now before the Senate would provide funds for the procurement of aircraft by both the Air Force and the Navy. In the judgment of your Appropriations Committee, both the Army and the Navy have justified the funds the committee recommends.

To be specific, the bill provides $923,100,000 in cash and $2,275,000,000 in contract authorizations for aircraft procurement and related matters. These funds are divided as follows between the Department of the Air Force and the Bureau of Aeronautics, Department of the Navy:

For the Air Force, the bill provides $473,100,000 in cash from the 1949 budget; and $135,000,000 in cash from the supplemental estimate presented by the President, or a total of $608,100,000 in cash for the Air Force.

Again for the Air Force, the bill provides $550,000,000 in contract authorization from the 1949 budget; $315,000,000 in contract authorization from the supplemental estimate presented by the President; and an additional $822,000,000 in contract authorization inserted in the House of Representatives, or a total of $1,687,000,000 in contract authorization for the Air Force.

For the Navy the bill provides $255,000,000 in cash from the 1949 budget and $60,000,000 in cash from the supplemental estimate presented by the President, or a total of $315,000,000 in cash for the Navy aircraft procurement.

Again for the Navy, the bill provides $373,000,000 in contract authorization from the 1949 budget, and $215,000,000 in contract authorization from the supplemental estimate presented by the President, or a total of $588,000,000 in contract authorization for the Navy aircraft procurement.

Mr. President, at this point I should like to insert in the RECORD a tabular presentation of these financial statistics.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Procurement of aircraft and related functions

	Air Force		Navy		Total	
	Cash	Contract authority	Cash	Contract authority	Cash	Contract authority
Total	[1] $608,100,000	$1,687,000,000	[2] $315,000,000	$588,000,000	$923,100,000	$2,275,000,000
From 1949 Budget	[1] 473,100,000	550,000,000	[2] 255,000,000	373,000,000	728,100,000	923,000,000
Supplemental	135,000,000	315,000,000	60,000,000	215,000,000	195,000,000	530,000,000
House addition		822,000,000				822,000,000

[1] Includes $250,000,000 to liquidate previous contract authority.
[2] Includes $150,000,000 to liquidate previous contract authority.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, of these amounts, $250,000,000 cash appropriation will be used for the liquidation of previous contract authorization for the Air Force and $150,000,000 cash appropriation will be used for the liquidation of previous contract authorization for the Navy.

Furthermore, the committee has found it necessary to recommend an appropriation of $35,100,000 for the Corps of Engineers which is in no way related to the plane procurement program.

Thus, the total appropriations in the bill are $958,200,000 in cash and $2,275,000,000 in contract authorization. It is identical with the bill as it passed the House with the exception of the above-mentioned item for the Corps of Engineers.

These appropriations and authorizations, if granted, will permit the institution of a maximum of 70 air groups which is the minimum peacetime Air Force required for national security.

The items about which there is dispute involve Army Air Force expansion only. It is with reference to those items that I speak to the Senate.

The National Defense Supplemental bill which is now before us allocates to the Department of the Air Force certain additional funds for the fiscal year 1949.

By our action upon this bill, we shall help to determine what weapons this country will have at its disposal in the period 1951–53. We are warned that it is in that period that Russia may have erased the great military advantage which we now hold by virtue of our exclusive possession of the atomic bomb.

The question before us is, At that future date, when our monopoly of atomic weapons may be reduced to preponderance or even to equality, what physical guaranty of this country's security is to exist in its place? In one sense, the action which we take is conclusive and irrevocable, because if the Congress should determine not to provide the means for commencing now the procurement of weapons and the training of units for a possible crisis in 1952, we shall have determined beyond recall that weapons and units which take 4 years to produce and train shall not be ready at that future date. In another sense, our action is not conclusive and irrevocable, because if we do now appropriate funds adequate for the so-called 70-group air force program, we shall still retain the power to review subsequent appropriations for this program. If, by some happy, unexpected turn of international affairs, the tensions which now hold the world in the grip of fear should be relaxed, this program could be abandoned or reduced and further drains upon our resources eliminated.

At the moment, however, we must face facts as they are, not facts as we hope they will be. The dominant fact is that the peoples of the globe have thus far failed to achieve the hope of one world. At the moment, we face a two-world situation. We have hope that the power of good will ultimately prevail, but until that day comes we must be prepared to live with a situation in which the present division continues.

Ours, then, is the obligation of constant vigilance. We must have friends and we must have strength. The European recovery program is designed to bolster the economies and restore the strength of our friends in Europe. Fully adequate air power, including the weapons of defense and the weapons of retaliation, is, in my judgment, the first-priority item of the strength we must have.

There are certain basic facts behind the 70-group program.

First, as to the nature of Russian military power. Russia is a land power. She has more divisions now active than we had at the peak of our wartime effort; and the only limit on the number of her divisions of disciplined manpower is the will of the tenants of the Kremlin. With this we can never hope to fully compete, even if events should make the effort necessary.

Russia is not a naval power. Our fleets dominate the seas with a Navy greater by far than all the sea power of the rest of the world combined. This United States supremacy must be preserved, with particular emphasis upon modern underseas craft.

Russia is an air power. The testimony we have heard as to the rate and quality of growth of the Russian Air Force makes expansion of our own Air Forces necessary in a Communist-threatened world. It must be categorically stated that the belief that the research and development resources of Russia will not permit the design of high-performance aircraft and that the industrial resources of Russia are not adequate for the precision manufacture of large numbers of aircraft, is unjustified. It must be remembered that the Soviets captured many of the leading German scientists and engineers, and all the evidence points to the conclusion that the Russian military leaders have bent these scientists and engineers to their will.

Second, let us look at the position of air power in a plan of national security for the United States. No one thinks, least of all the Senator from New Hampshire, that air power alone can secure America or win a war. We must have balanced air, ground, and sea forces. But it is also clear that in a contest between two great nations on different continents, the nation which has air supremacy cannot lose the war, and the nation which lacks air supremacy cannot win. Dominant air power can give to the United States the defensive strength to try to ward off the first blow by which an enemy could hope to inflict upon us a super Pearl Harbor. It can also give to us the offensive weapon of retaliation which may induce an aggressor not to run the risk of attacking us or, if he does, can throw the enemy off balance and keep him at bay while our war machine is being brought up to full strength. Let it be noted that these two tasks of defense and retaliation add up to the total responsibility for protecting this country from the risk of losing a war in its first 30 days. No ground forces and no sea forces can assume this responsibility. In later phases of a possible war, air, ground, and sea forces will build up together into the particular striking arm which the circumstances may call for. But in the initial phase our line of defense is necessarily in the air.

Furthermore, the military machine of the only possible opponent we have in the world today is sustained by industries deep in the interior of the Eurasian supercontinent. The problem of destroying these industries is similar to the problem we had in destroying the Nazi war machine, but it is more difficult because of the distances involved. Interior targets must be reached in the face of defenses which commence on the perimeter. We must rely upon long-range air power, possibly over the Arctic approaches, to perform this basic task.

In order to meet the responsibilities of American air power as I have just outlined them, it is necessary that the air forces have four resources: First, adequate numbers of men and machines to meet operational needs; second, constant modernization of equipment to avoid the dangers of becoming obsolete; third, adequate reserves to establish a cushion capable of absorbing attrition; and fourth, a healthy aircraft industry capable of meeting demands for wartime expansion. It is in these terms that I shall describe the 70-group program which the Air Force has presented, which was urged upon us by General Eisenhower 2 years ago as the minimum requirement for air safety, which the President's Air Policy Commission adopted and recommended, and which was confirmed by our colleagues in the report of the Congressional Air Policy Board.

In terms of men, machines, and units, the Air Force program is designed to bring into existence by June 30, 1949, 70 combat groups of aircraft fully manned and equipped. But these groups will have two defects in terms of war operations. A considerable number of these groups will have been recently formed. Their personnel will lack the thorough training which would be necessary to make them ready for combat. The aircraft and equipment of the groups will largely be drawn from the storage reserves of World War II, and will, therefore, be obsolete. Thus, as of the end of fiscal year 1949, the 70-group program contemplates adequacy of number of units, but the force will of course not be fully modernized or completely trained.

Modernization is a process which must strike a balance between the needs of the Air Force for wholly modern equipment and the long-range requirement of a healthy military aircraft industry. It would be unwise, even if it were possible, to foster a rapid peacetime expansion of production facilities, reaching an early peak of production, followed by a sharp decline in units required. Therefore, the air force program calls for a steady increase of contracts for military aircraft in accordance with the following figures:

1949	2,911
1950	4,096
1951	4,589
1952	5,200

The program contemplates a leveling-off of military aircraft production at a constant figure of 5,200. During 1950 and 1951, this production will be largely devoted to replacing, in the 70-group regular establishment, the obsolescent aircraft of the storage reserve. Beginning in 1951 and 1952, the new production will be devoted in part to keeping the regular establishment modernized, in part to developing an adequate modernized storage reserve, and in part to continuing the modernization of the 27 groups of the first-line Air National Guard which is an essential part of the program designed to create an Air Force capable of sustained operations. It is obvious that our security requires more than a one-punch air force.

In view of the fact that the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense have now adopted the principle of the 70-group air force, it is less necessary today than it would have been some time ago to point out the difference between the 55 groups, as originally recommended to the Congress by the Secretary of Defense, and the 70 groups which now have been accepted in principle, with the temporary deferrment of four of those groups in the fiscal year 1949. But I wish to point out, Mr. President, that 10 of the additional groups comprise the very-long range bombers which, together with the atomic bomb, make up this country's threat of retaliation to any aggressor.

The thing that stops an aggressor from plying his evil trade is the fear that the intended victim can strike back equally as hard or twice as hard.

It remains to translate the program which I have just described into dollar appropriations for the fiscal year 1949. The proposals which are now before us or will shortly be presented consist of one original and three supplemental appropriations.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, or does he prefer not to yield until he has finished his statement?

Mr. BRIDGES. I should prefer to complete this statement, and then have questions asked, if that is agreeable to the Senator.

Mr. MAYBANK. Certainly.

Mr. BRIDGES. The original budget presented by the Secretary of Defense allocated $3,054,000,000 to the Air Force, and was intended to support a 55-group force. The Joint Chiefs of Staff recently agreed to an ultimate 70-group program, with 66 groups for the fiscal year 1949. As a means of financing this increase over the original proposals, the Joint Chiefs concurred in the allocation to the Air Force of an additional $1,133,000,000. This supplemental figure permits an increase in numbers of air units and personnel, but does not provide for the modernization program. The modernization program is given financial support by the supplemental appropriation of $822,000,000, which was overwhelmingly voted by the House of Representatives. It is this supplemental amount which assures the quality of the 70-group Air Force, as the other appropriations assure its quantity. Finally, there is to be expected a proposal for $345,000,000 for construction of installations over a period of time, and it is believed that military and Budget authorities are agreed upon this figure. Thus, the total financial support of the 70-group program for fiscal 1949 is as follows:

	Million dollars
Original appropriation	3,054
Supplement agreed by Joint Chiefs	1,133
Modernization program voted by House of Representatives	822
Construction of installations	345
Total	5,354

It will be noted that, looking ahead, the construction of installations which are necessary will add something over $300,000,000.

At one time it was suggested that appropriations for the Air Force in these amounts would produce an unbalanced force, although I understand that the recent agreement of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has eliminated that factor. It is, of course, vital that our forces should be balanced; but the criterion of balance is

the important thing. Balance must be determined according to the task that could be ours. For example, it would seem clear that the composition of forces which would provide balance in such a war as was waged against Japan in 1941 to 1945 would be a classic example of imbalance in such a war as was waged against Germany in the same years, and in the present situation.

In former days when the great powers numbered six or eight, any nation had to be prepared for a turn of the wheel of international politics which would put it at war in any combination of allies against any combination of enemies. But one compensating advantage in the present unhappy world situation is that we know who will attack us if anyone attacks, and whom we must be prepared to meet. This simplifies and sharpens the focus of our military problem. Balance is no longer an abstract thing; it is a question of meeting the military potential of only one potential enemy.

The balance we need is that combination of armament and men which will throw up the strongest wall of defense and pack the heaviest punch of offense against that one adversary. There can be no justification for absolute ratios between the three services, or of vested interests of any service in particular numbers of men or amounts of appropriations. The balance required is an external military balance against Russia, not an internal political balance to preserve the relative status of any one service.

In that same connection we should be watchful of any tendency on our part or on the part of our military advisers to commit the classic military crime of balancing one against the other. Weapons cling to life far beyond their usefulness and military institutions cling to relative position far beyond their importance because the careers of men are wrapped up in them. Wars have been lost and nations have fallen by failing to keep pace with military developments. This lesson ought not be too difficult for a nation which saw France fall after ignoring De Gaulle's pleas to mechanize and which finished off its latest war with the atomic bomb.

It is perhaps a coincidence that within the last month there has appeared that part of the Memoirs of Winston Churchill which deals with the day in March 1935 when the British made the bitter discovery that Germany had already achieved air parity and had developed the production and training facilities for achieving clear air superiority. Let me quote his words:

> Owing to the unlucky discovery by an immature civilization of the internal combustion engine and the art of flying, a new weapon of national rivalry had leapt upon the scene capable of altering much more rapidly the relative war power of states. * * * A disaster of the first magnitude had fallen upon us. Hitler had already attained air parity with Great Britain. Henceforward he had merely to drive his factories and training schools at full speed, not only to keep his lead in the air but steadily to improve it. Henceforward all the unknown immeasurable threats which overhung London from air attack would be a definite and compelling factor in our decisions * * * (this) gave Hitler the foundation for the successive acts of aggression which he had planned and which were now soon to take place. * * * The outbreak of the war found us with barely half the German numbers.

This, Mr. President, is no tale from ancient history. It happened just 13 years ago in a situation which is alarmingly similar to the one in which we find ourselves at the present date. We must heed its lesson.

We have no need to take counsel of despair. Air warfare is an enterprise which puts a premium upon the qualities in which Americans excel—courage, initiative, quickness of hand and eye, mechanical skill, ingenuity. But if our young men are to give this country the protection of air power and the retaliatory weapon that will deter aggression, they must have the tools with which to work. I do not believe we can run the risk of failing to provide the funds proposed in this bill. In recommending these appropriations; I, for one, am refusing to gamble with the safety and security of my country.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the fact that we have before us today this appropriation bill calls for a few observations on just what preparation for total war under modern conditions actually involves.

I speak as one who has always been in favor of legislation for national defense. I believe I was one of the first advocates of compulsory service and of an increased Air Force before the United States entered World War II, and was the author in June last year of an amendment to the then pending appropriation bill to provide for 70 air groups. I have for a long time been convinced that aviation is the spearhead of our military strength.

But let us be accurate. It is noteworthy that 70 air groups, as proposed by me last June, and as proposed by the Finletter Commission—that is, the President's Air Policy Commission—in January, would have entailed approximately 400,000 men and about 750 additional planes. Seventy air groups today, according to the Department of the Air Force, provides for 502,000 men and, I presume, a corresponding increase in planes. The committee report does not say. In other words, an air group is a very elastic unit, which can be stretched as conditions require, and it is not strictly accurate to say, as the committee report does, that "this 70-group program" has been supported by authorities "for the past 3 years." This is a larger and more substantial 70 air group than we have ever had before. I intend to support this appropriation, however, partly because the committee has studied all the facts and heard all the evidence and has reported it by such an overwhelming majority and partly because it is impossible in this field to say dogmatically that any one figure is too large or too small. And if the committee says 70 groups and Secretary Forrestal says 66 and the groups themselves are collapsible and expansible, it is impossible to pinpoint and get sharp focus in an argument like that.

But the same logic which impelled me last June to offer an amendment to provide for 70 air groups impels me also to point out today that we cannot achieve security simply by building airplanes. If we could, this world would be very simple. The truth is that if we thought that we were facing war this year we would do a great deal more than build 70 air groups; and if we are preparing for a possible war several years ahead, we would, above all, be sure that at the moment we went to war we had an industry which was capable of turning out the weapons which would be as modern and effective as science could design.

Our decision on this whole question can only be intelligently made in the light of two factors. The first factor is the imminence of war. On this we appear to have divided counsels from the executive branch of the Government. The second factor is the amount of governmental expenditure which must occur before economic controls become essential. On this, too, we are completely in the dark. Yet these are the two vital prerequisites to an intelligent judgment.

Think of it. The two things we need to know in order to make that decision are the two things we do not know.

The Secretary of the Air Force, for whom I have very real regard, in addition to pleading the cause of aviation which it is his specific duty to do, has, in response to questions from Members of Congress, made comments in fields regarding which he does not speak with especial or exclusive authority.

His view on the imminence of war must, of course, be matched up with that of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the President of the United States, and the President pro tempore of the Senate. We do not know to what extent he was speaking for any of the officials in the executive branch.

His estimate that Russia will go to war on us as soon as she has the atomic bomb involves judgments regarding which, again, he does not speak with any professional or technical authority. Here, too, the opinions of the Secretaries of the Army and Navy and of the Secretary of Defense are also to be considered, and here again the most decisive opinion of all would be that of the Secretary of State. So far as I know he has not expressed an opinion. It appears to me to be at least debatable whether Russia will automatically go to war as soon as she develops the atomic bomb. She might be much more likely to go to war once she is satisfied that we are so loaded up with obsolete equipment and that our productive capacity has so lost its elasticity because of premature drains on its manpower and natural resources that we were incapable of fighting effectively. To me it is obvious that the time for the enemy to strike may not necessarily be at the moment that they develop the bomb, but at the moment when our capacity to retaliate is at its lowest.

Every thoughtful professional military man knows very well that our prime military asset is our industrial productive power, because it is an asset which is possessed to the same degree by no other nation.

Other nations have oil; other nations have minerals; other nations have young manhood; other nations have huge geographic areas, but no nation has pro-

ductive power to the same degree that we have. That is our prime military asset.

We must not load ourselves up with equipment too early and do it at such a rate that we are forced to impose controls and thereby militarize our economy in a time of relative peace. The true test of statesmanship is whether we can do the job we need to do without militarizing our economy—without spending so much that we must enact wartime controls—thereby severely hampering our capacity for industrial growth.

In addition to the normal expenditures of government, we have just embarked on huge expenditures for foreign economic recovery. Today we decide to spend vast new amounts for our own defense. Tomorrow we may decide that we must appropriate more sums to arm certain foreign countries. Where is all this going to end? The European recovery program and our own civilian economy are, I am told, already threatened by steel shortages on account of our defense program. There must be a limit. Where is the limit?

There should, I believe, be a thoroughly scientific determination of what the point of public expenditures is at which we have to militarize our economy and go to allocation, priorities, rationing, and other controls. Perhaps the Committee on the Economic Report or the Joint Committee on the Budget should give us a finding on this subject. Certain it is that we cannot legislate wisely without having a sure and definite idea of just exactly what straw it is that breaks the camel's back. We know there is one, but which one is it?

We must also develop a better system for making our large-scale military preparations. Obviously, the Secretary of Defense needs more help. Obviously, too, the Congress must approach the task with more balance and more understanding.

In fact, it has become painfully clear that no satisfactory method at present exists to resolve the differences between the armed services and to produce an intelligent and integrated plan. The services have massive staffs and long experience with which to back up their recommendations. The Secretary of Defense, although an extremely competent official, is, as the past few months have proven, so lacking in professional help that he cannot possibly resolve the differences. What happens? The controversy is passed on to Congress and we here are thus required to resolve a technical dispute between professionals. It is utterly preposterous and would be comical if the consequences were not so dangerous. Let it also be noted that this situation is subjecting the heads of our armed services to bitter criticism which, while often undeserved, shakes confidence in our military men to a degree which can be dangerous.

Clearly, we must set up an intelligent method for resolving the differences between the services in a prompt, professional and authoritative manner and we must do so without delay. I have said that we can ruin ourselves by destroying our economy just as surely as we can be ruined by atomic bombs. There is yet another way—which is due to the fact that if we had to fight a future war along the organizational lines now existing between the three services we might well be defeated without extensive enemy action. We would simply have been snarled up in our own red tape. Our preoccupation lest some of the services lose some of their prerogatives can well result in our losing a war. Let us hope that the inexpressible confusion which has shrouded the topic of preparedness in the past few weeks has finally taught us that the whole is more important than any of its parts.

Even if we take this lesson to heart and set up an intelligent method for resolving service differences, Congress will still have plenty to do insofar as the common defense is concerned. Our function is to match up the requirements of all the armed services with all the other aspects of national life which involve the common defense. For example, there is just so much manpower in the United States; our task is to prescribe policies for its use. There is just so much productive power in the United States; our task is to prescribe policies for its apportionment as between military and civilian items. There are just so many raw materials and natural resources in the United States; our task is to develop policies for their conservation and use.

In these days of total war and total foreign policy, we in Congress have enough to do without getting into the disputes between the uniformed services. Except where these disputes impinge on the broad field of national policy, these matters should be settled in the Pentagon—and they should be well and authoritatively settled.

Congress, therefore, must not ask witnesses questions which lie outside of their special province. We must proceed with balance and understanding. We must not conduct ourselves in such a way as to deserve the remark attributed to James Reston, of the New York Times, that "when you tell Congress nothing, they go fishing; but when you tell Congress the facts they go crazy." We must get some balance and some moderation in our views of these matters.

Mr. President, I hope future historians will not record that in these years Russia merely sat back and by angering the American people caused us to make such vast expenditures of money, materials, and manpower for so long a period of time that the United States, because of its so-called preparedness program, actually killed the goose that laid the golden eggs. If we increase appropriations every time we get angry, we can, over a period of years, bleed ourselves to death. In matters like these, which involve the life and death of our country, I want no foreign nation to call the tune or to set the time. It is a new thought, I think, in American foreign policy, to have no foreign nation call the tune or set the time. Let us always maintain the initiative.

I object to being bullied or hornswoggled by any foreign state into weakening, if not destroying, our prime military asset—which is our productive capacity. Measures of immediate preparedness must not be of such a nature that they force us to militarize the American economy; our desire to be ready for the first blow in any future war must not force us to take steps which would make it difficult, if not impossible, for us to win the closing battle.

It is high time that professional military men, in common with Members of Congress, cease taking the narrow view that if Congress provides for one particular military activity, all will be well. They ought to be equally concerned with the maintenance of our productive capacity. In fairness, I shall say that many of them already are. They ought to be equally concerned with the vital necessity for maintaining a free economy in this country because the experience of the last war should have taught us all that this productive skill will be the decisive factor in any war of the future.

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I deeply appreciate the Senator's yielding to me, because I have a very important engagement I must keep in less than 5 minutes, and I wish at this time to say a few words in connection with the pending measure.

Last year I supported the Senator from Massachusetts in his amendment to the appropriation bill then pending, providing for the additional funds necessary for the Air Force. The problem before us is a simple one. It is merely a question as to whether we will depend for our security on equipment of World War II, or whether we will keep pace with technological developments both here and abroad—developments which are reflected in the armed forces of our potential enemies.

The solution to this problem is apparent once we consider two essential facts—first, that the minimum strength the United States Air Force must maintain in peacetime is represented by the 70-group program with which we are familiar; and, second, that the air groups in this program must be equipped with modern airplanes.

On the first point, the Air Force has presented consistently for almost 3 years, and before both Houses of Congress, that the strength represented by the 70-group program is the minimum we must have in being during times of peace in order to give reasonable assurance of a reasonable ability to provide for our national security. This requirement has been supported by the findings and recommendations of the President's Air Policy Commission and by the Congressional Air Policy Board. It has been supported by the recent action of the House of Representatives, and has been favorably reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

The second point: That the Air Force groups must be equipped with modern aircraft, is a sensible corollary. It is in the long run wasteful of money, of men, of effort, and of effectiveness to equip an air force with second-rate equipment. It may be compared to a deliberate plan to hold the second-best poker hand.

We have failed in our duty if we take the risk of bringing World War II equipment out of storage to equip our Air Force, and make no provision now for the replacement of such aircraft at the earliest possible date with equipment designed and developed for the age in which we are living. Technical progress has been marked in the aircraft fields since that equipment was designed and developed from 5 to 10 years ago. To fail to provide for the modernization of an air force of the proper size and composition would leave us with a false sense of security and would be most dangerous.

The immediate issue involves the sum of $822,000,000 for the procurement of new aircraft, the bulk of which will be delivered in 1950 and 1951. The total number of aircraft procured with this money is 1,056, 804 of which are jet-engine fighters.

The fighter aircraft is the primary weapon for defense. Should any of our great cities be subjected to attack, it would be on the fighters that we would place the greatest share of reliance for our protection. The responsibility for the air defense of the United States is placed upon the Air Force Air Defense Command. The Air Defense Command discharges this vital function by the operation of some Regular Air Force fighter groups, but its main defense effort will be carried out by the National Guard.

I am told that the 804 fighters included in this program will equip approximately 10 fighter groups. I do not know what proportion of these specific aircraft will go directly to the Regular Establishment, and what number will go directly to the National Guard. I assume this specific assignment will remain flexible so as to best meet changing conditions. It is apparent, however—and I have been assured that this is correct—that a major part of this procurement program will be reflected in the number of jet-type aircraft assigned to National Guard units. Whether these aircraft come directly from procurement or indirectly, as a result of replacement in the Regular Air Force, is immaterial. The important fact is the National Guard will have modern jet-propelled fighters with which to carry the burden of the air defense of continental United States, with which to defend our vital cities and industries, rather than the P–47's and P–51's, the Thunderbolts, and the Mustangs of World War II.

The defense of our homes and of our industries has certainly the first call on our time, our effort, and our resources. The aircraft provided in this program will constitute a significant step toward the provision of an adequate and effective defense force. The pending measure provides directly for the protection of our homes, of our cities, and of our industries. It gives further assurance of preserving American life and American institutions. It is a form of national insurance.

The bill we are considering also provides for modern bombers and other type of supporting aircraft which are just as essential to the over-all problem of being prepared to meet an emergency, and just as necessary to the strength of the United States. I have stressed the fighters because the requirement for the air defense, which they will assist in providing, is a vital consideration of every American.

We cannot provide for such defense after an emergency. If we are to achieve a reasonable degree of modernization by 1951 or 1952, we must start this program now. We must have the strength necessary for our own security. We must have the strength commensurate to the position and responsibilities of the United States.

I urge, therefore, that the recommendations of the Senate Appropriations Committee, which call for the immediate modernization and strengthening of the United States Air Force, be approved by the Senate.

I again thank the Senator from Nebraska for yielding to me.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I was deeply interested in the observations made by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who has charge of the pending bill, and also the remarks made by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who of course is informed on military matters, and whose judgment I highly respect.

In his remarks the Senator from Massachusetts is concerned with the proper defense of the United States of America, but at the same time he has expressed the opinion that it is necessary that we preserve the domestic economy. With that observation I am in total agreement. In fact, from the very beginning of the consideration of appropriations this year it has been my thought that if the appropriations for ERP, the national security, and the other activities could all have been presented to the Congress at the same time, it would have given us some idea of what the budget ought to be, and whether or not our economy could stand the strain being placed upon it because of appropriations.

As I figure it, we are likely to have a budget calling for expenditures close to forty-six or forty-seven billion dollars, and the Senator from Massachusetts might as well make up his mind now that our economy is strained, and the problem now is whether or not we can continue under the free enterprise system without the imposition of wartime controls. That is a problem which concerns us all.

Today we have before us a bill providing for supplemental appropriations for procurement by the air branch of the armed services. As the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts recounted and as the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire also stated, the Senate will have before it later bills making appropriations for the Army and also for the Navy. I am not sure what the amounts involved in those bills will be, but I want the RECORD to show clearly that I, for one, believe that even though appropriations are to be cut, either along the economic front or along the military front, yet I want to see a strong defense in the air for our own national security. It is for that reason that, regardless of the fact that the other appropriation measures are not yet before the Senate and will have to be considered later, I want the RECORD to show that I desire that we have a strong air force capable of defending the national security of the United States of America, and that if cuts in expenditures are to be made they should be made in some other place, either in the other branches of the military or on the economic front. I believe the first line of defense for national security is in the air. For that reason I supported the pending legislation in the committee of which I am a member, and followed the leadership and the judgment of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. President, there was one thing I had hoped the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts would mention, because I know he is very much interested in stopping the expansion of communism abroad; and that is that we must stop communism at home. When the Senator described the types of warfare we might expect, there was one form he left out, and that is that atomic bombs might be used against us here within the United States. That form of warfare ought to be of concern to us in giving consideration to the types of defense we shall make appropriations for in the future. Certainly there exists a threat today that atomic bombs can be used against us within the United States by those who today are not only attempting to destroy Europe but are menacing the form of government we have in the United States. I say that is a matter which must be borne in mind when we consider what branch of the service we must strengthen. We should have in mind that here at home we may be attacked by means of the atomic bomb.

Mr. President, we have before us today the appropriation measure relating to the strengthening of our Air Forces. As I have unqualifiedly said, I believe in strengthening our Air Forces. I think our air power is our first line of defense. I happened to have belonged to the Air Corps in the First World War. I was convinced then, as I am now, that our national defense is just as strong as the defense we have in the air, both at home and abroad. So, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I voted favorably to report the pending bill, H. R. 6226, to the calendar, and I am certainly glad the bill is now before the Senate for consideration, because I feel it represents a "must" appropriation. I feel that this is one thing we must do. We must strengthen our air defense.

In the debate in the Senate on the ERP it was my feeling that the Senate adopted the wrong approach in its attempt to stop the expansion of communism. Of course, when the vote was taken, the arguments I made did not prevail. The vote against the position I took was 3 or 4 to 1. But I expressed the feelings I had at the time, and those are my feelings now. I thought we made the wrong approach in our attempt to stop communism, because, as I said then, it is useless to continue financing a bankrupt foreign policy. I stated on the floor of the Senate many times during the debate, based upon my personal observations in Europe, that, while we should provide food for relief, economic aid alone would not stop the infiltration of communism into the border countries of eastern

Europe. I said it then and I say it now. The fact that Russia overran Czechoslovakia at the very time the debate on ERP was under way was ample evidence of the justice of the position I took at that time.

I feel, as was expressed by the Senator from Massachusetts, that while we must seriously consider the strain on our own economy, voting appropriation for an increased Air Force is voting first things first; and that if any cut is to be made in the budget it should be made in a direction other than what I think is the first line of defense for our national security. For that reason I should like to see measures dealing with appropriations for national defense come before the Senate at an early moment, and acted upon.

Mr. President, to my mind, unless military aid is also granted in connection with economic aid to Europe what we have done will not result in stopping the threat of communism in Europe.

During the debate I also stated that there was only one way to stop the expansion of communism, and that was to tell Russia how far she could go; to mean what we said, and to say what we meant, and to put our own house in order so that we would be able to defend ourselves in case our defenses should be attacked here or over there.

I hope Senators will recall that I made that statement on the floor, and I now make it with greater force than I made it then. I am of that opinion 100 percent. That is the way to stop them. That is the only way to stop them. By doing so we would speak the language that they can understand.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, it was my opinion then, and it is my opinion now, that a strong air force will do more to assure our national security than any other one thing. In fact, the crying need of the hour by way of a strong defense, is for modern jet-propelled fighter and bomber planes. I say that because I believe I have been reliably informed that jet-propulsion engines are being manufactured in England and have been sent to Russia to be installed in airplanes. On the floor of the Senate I fought to prevent such an occurrence when we were considering the passage of the ERP legislation.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I did not yield to the Senator from New Hampshire, and I shall not yield to the Senator from Massachusetts now, but shall do so at the conclusion of my remarks.

I said it has been reliably reported to me that jet-propulsion engines are being manufactured in England and sent to Russia. If that be true it is a further reinforcement of the argument I made respecting the ERP legislation when it was considered by the Senate, that at least we should retain some control over what will be sent to Russia from countries that are receiving aid from us. If Russia is to receive jet-propulsion engines from England, while we send materials to England—and it was the testimony before the committee that such engines are being sent to Russia—we must meet this new kind of modern warfare, because Russia is equipped with jet-propelled planes, and we should act favorably upon the pending appropriation bill as a strong measure for our protection.

If we are going to stop communism abroad we had better stop England from sending to Russia the implements of warfare I have described, which would equip Russia to attack us in the event she should decide to do so.

Mr. President, I trust that the watchdog committee, in which I have implicit confidence, will watch the further shipments of such implements of warfare as have been shipped, and I think it is generally admitted are being shipped, to Russia, which can be used in a war, especially if she attacks the United States of America.

Mr. President, whoever addresses himself to the problem of national security in these times of cold war, must look with particular concern on our Arctic frontiers. There were days not long ago, when America could rightly contemplate the vast expanses of our buffer oceans, with a feeling of safe remoteness from the explosive uncertainties of the world. But not so today.

The oceans have not shrunk, but they have become somewhat ignored because the advent of the military aircraft, unfettered as it is by surface barriers, has opened a new route to the New World, over the ice, over the Polar regions, and over the top of the world.

What if, for trite and terrible example, the rulers of Russia should decide to attack Seattle, Omaha, or Chicago? Is the problem one of traveling 7,000 miles across the Pacific, or of traversing the distance of Europe and the 4,000 miles of the Atlantic? It is not. It is, instead, only a relatively routine flight of 2,000 miles from eastern Siberia to the State of Washington, and only 3,000 miles to Chicago—a flight of no great consequence to present-day aircraft.

Permit me to emphasize this point. I am reliably informed that the capabilities of aircraft presently in the hands of nations such as Russia permit the flight of bombers from bases in eastern Siberia to Seattle, or to Portland, or to other cities of the United States.

The capabilities, which I just mentioned, of modern bombers available to nations such as Russia permit the flight of bombers from Siberia to Seattle. In fact, present-day bombers—B–29 type bombers, of which the Russians have many—can easily make the flight from Siberia to Seattle and return. This is a most disturbing fact. It indicates my reason for intense concern with air routes traversing the Arctic frontier.

The deadly realities of military geography are today pregnant with dangers engendered for us by the short, cold route from the Old World to the New. Down over the so-called ice barriers of the North Pole can come aircraft loaded heavy with fatal freight. We cannot fail to provide against this chilling possibility.

The military geography of Alaska provides us with a position from which we can intercept messengers of death streaking across the polar ice before they reach their targets. From Alaska we can, in fact, neutralize the bases, the launching sites, from which such bloody excursions might originate.

These cold facts lead me to an inescapable conclusion. The air defenses of the United States, and our American capability for air counterattack, must be brought to instant, effective readiness. Only thus can our northern frontier be amply safeguarded—only through the flashing mobility of air power can the short route to our cities over the Arctic frontier become the road to defeat for aggressors.

It is this compelling consideration which indicates to me the course I must follow in respect to the legislation presently before the Senate. There is, in fact, no choice. On the one side lies safety; on the other, as the Senator from New Hampshire has said, is dangerous risk. If we accept the risk of not providing adequate air power, we accept a risk in which we gamble American lives and American futures.

It is, therefore, my recommendation that the Senate approve the immediate modernization and strengthening of the United States Air Force as recommended by its Appropriations Committee.

I now yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I merely wished to add a word to the statement the Senator made about the British manufacturing jet-propelled planes for Russia.

Mr. WHERRY. I said that they were manufacturing jet-propulsion engines which were being shipped and used in the production of airplanes.

Mr. LODGE. Speaking as a member of the so-called watchdog committee, I hope the Senator will give me, as soon as he can, all the information he has on that subject, so that we can consider it immediately, because in my view it is contrary to the whole principle of the Economic Cooperation Act.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for the invitation. He will have the information. It was given before the Appropriations Committee the other day, but I shall be glad to give the Senator personally any information I have.

As I have said before, I have a wholesome respect for the distinguished Senator, and I am satisfied that he will make all the effort necessary to see to it that such things as jet-propulsion engines are not shipped, by one route or another, through satellite countries, to be unloaded in Russia and installed in airplanes to be used in an emergency if the United States is attacked.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I cannot let this opportunity pass without supporting the able report of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] on the airplane-procurement program.

In the first place, I wish to call attention again to what I have previously said on the floor of the Senate, relating to the complete absence of any foreign policy in this administration. In the

first place, neither the State Department nor the President of the United States has indicated in any manner whatsoever what areas and nations in Europe, Asia, and the South Seas we must currently protect for our ultimate safety. As a result, neither our own people nor the nations of the world know what we will fight to protect.

I wish to support the statements by my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. However, we are just 2 months late with this debate. This subject of our own defensive and offensive organization should have preceded the Marshall-Bevin plan. Our own safety should come first. If we had considered such a plan as is now before the Senate, the Marshall plan as such would have been unnecessary.

I wish to quote briefly from a 25-minute address which required 2 days for me to deliver before this body because of the running debate on March 4 and 5. In that speech I quoted the statement of President Monroe in 1823, when he laid down what was later known as the Monroe Doctrine, a doctrine which would be perfect at this time. President Monroe said:

> We owe it therefore to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part—

Meaning the European nations—

> to extend their system to the Western Hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.

At that time I suggested that we could simply leave out "Western Hemisphere," and it would still be a perfect doctrine. We should name the areas and nations which we must currently protect for our own ultimate safety.

I further stated:

> We should then build at once a military force, spearheaded by an air corps that would bear silent evidence to all concerned that we were ready and able to enforce the extended doctrine, just as we have enforced the original Monroe Doctrine covering the Western Hemisphere for more than 125 years, and which kept us out of a major war for more than 75 years.

I further stated at that time:

> The Congressional Air Policy Board has recommended a long-range military plane-purchase program which would provide a 35,000-plane striking force, costing $16,800,000,000, over a 5-year program. The President's Air Policy Board's recent report closely parallels this document.

The two committees made practically the same report.

I further stated on the 5th of March:

> The Armed Services Committees of Congress should immediately check these reports, and, if found correct, recommend their adoption and the appropriation of the necessary funds by the Congress of the United States for the entire 5-year program.
>
> Congress could apply the Marshall-plan 4-year funds of $17,000,000,000 to the $16,800,000,000 5-year plane-purchase program and have approximately enough left to continue the necessary European nations' feeding program until they raise a third crop, and to furnish the necessary funds to the RFC or the World Bank for the rehabilitation of the European nations' industry under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation rules as applied to American citizens.

Mr. President, this is not the first time this question has been before the Senate. We have already appropriated $17,000,000,000 for the European recovery program—at least we have authorized an appropriation of $17,000,000,000. In my opinion, just as my friend, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] has said, it will have no effect whatever, and no relation to what we are about to do here. We must still rebuild the military organization at great expense despite the large gift-loans amounting to $41,000,000,000 since the close of World War II.

The military forces and administration heads testified before committees—and their testimony was headlined all over the country—that unless we adopted the Marshall plan we would require a large Air Corps and large military force, indicating, by implication, that if we had the Marshall plan we would not need a plan for the large Air Corps.

We are not equipped here to determine the size of the military organization and Air Corps necessary to convince the nations of the world that we mean business.

Russia is not the only country stepping out of bounds—other countries are expanding, and such expansion is dangerous. England is going into South America, and beyond, in the Antarctic. The Netherlands is expanding in the East Indies, using our material and the money we lend them to do their expansion work throughout the East Indies.

We have no effective United Nations organization for the very simple reason that the major nations do not want one until they have reestablished their empires—and we seemingly do not have the gumption to realize that we are the only nation that can put strength in the United Nations.

Mr. President, in my judgment we must rebuild our military organization and spearhead it by an air corps that will convince any ambitious nation that we are prepared to resist such expansion. As the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] has indicated, we should name the nations and the areas which we intend to protect. We have not yet done that. We should do that for two reasons: First, so that the nations of the world may know what we will fight about—what areas in the world we intend to protect. Few believe that either the Kaiser or Hitler would have started a world war if they had known that we would be in the fight, but we not only denied we would fight, but upon investigation no one believed we would fight—so we had to fight.

The Appropriations Committee, led by my colleague, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], has investigated the recommendations for an additional air corps. The $822,000,000 added to the House version of the bill for that purpose is the only amount in dispute. I inquire from the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire if that is correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct. I may say to the Senator from Nevada that the only thing that I think is at all in dispute is the item of $822,000,000 for contract authorizations, which simply constitute the one means we have today of making sure that in 1950, 1951, or 1952, when Russia may have the atomic bomb, or when there may be new dangers in the world, we shall have a modernized air force. As the Senator from Nevada—who is an engineer—knows, it takes 4 years from the time an airplane is in the blueprint stage until it is actually in flying operations as a fighter.

Mr. MALONE. Then I ask the Senator whether one of the basic matters before the Senate today is not only to assure ourselves that we are ready, but to assure the world that we recognize that there is danger of another war and that the best method to avoid war is to be ready. Is it not necessary to have this money available, so that long-range contracts may be let and so that companies in the business may be kept in operating condition and that the plans and specifications on the drawing boards may be kept at least even with or, if possible, ahead of those of any other nation in the world, and to have these companies in such shape, with their dies and machinery, that at any time they may receive additional orders, they will be ready to fill them promptly? I say that is necessary. Is that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct. Although it is obviously out of place to state here on the floor of the Senate the confidential reports we have received concerning what some other nations are doing in the airplane field, yet I may tell the Senator that such reports are coming to us. For instance, Russia now has large numbers of long-range bombers. That situation has developed as a result of the landing of some of our B–29's in Russia during the war, when Russia was supposed to be an ally of ours. But Russia refused to let those B–29's take off again, and held them there. Apparently the Russians have used those B–29's as patterns, and have copied from them, with the result that now they have a perfected or improved B–29 which they are flying in vast numbers today. They have those long-range bombers in large quantities, and they are in production there.

Moreover, we know that the most modern fighter planes are jet-propelled planes, and we know that that same country has jet-propelled planes in major production, so much so that great swarms of them have been observed flying over certain territory.

A second-rate Air Force is of no use to America, if we are to meet the challenge of the times and the dangers which may arise. If there is any hope of preserving peace in the world, one way, at least, will be by keeping ourselves strong and letting all nations know not only that we can defend ourselves but that we are able to deliver a strong punch in a retaliatory manner. That must be done through the skies.

So I think we would be sadly derelict in our duty today if we did not prepare in that manner. If, as of 3 or 4 years from today, or possibly even tomorrow we should suddenly confront another Pearl Harbor, I would not wish to have on my conscience or on my shoulders the responsibility that we here in the Senate

of the United States did not take the necessary steps to develop and modernize the great striking air force which must be the spearhead of defense and offense in any action in which we may become involved.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague, the Senator from New Hampshire.

Does the Senator agree with me that the United States must take the initiative in this matter, and that we must have a strong Air Corps, and that we must spearhead our military organization with an Air Corps that could keep any other nation on the ground within a reasonable time in case of war, and that we must be able to do this at least until such time as the United Nations might take over the job or until the major problems of the world were settled?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do. Of course, I think we must have a well-balanced military defense. I may point out to the Senator that today we have the largest Navy in the world, a greater Navy than all the other navies in the world combined. I wish to keep America strong on the seas, by means of her Navy. This bill provides for a naval aircraft procurement program.

I wish to see us have a strong Army. But I recognize that if we ever attempted to maintain the kind of standing army which Russia has, we would soon be bankrupt as a country.

Therefore, we have to develop the type of defense, as a spearhead here in America, in which American ingenuity and American production, as well as American fighting ability, can be combined. That type of defense is a modern air force.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator again, and I think he is absolutely correct.

Mr. President, twice in my lifetime it has been my lot to see American boys being murdered in a war without proper preparation. For instance, I myself took a battery of field artillery to France in 1918. Just after the Armistice, we received our nice, shiny American-made 4.7 field artillery, but before that we used French 75's.

What was the situation in the Second World War? In 1942 and 1943, I visited various military posts and installations. For instance, we landed by airplane at Nome, Alaska in 1942. Apropos of what the Senator from New Hampshire has just stated, let me point out that just before we reached Nome, a Russian plane had taken off. We were informed that when that plane landed, the Russians threw a guard around it, and no one was permitted to examine the plane or study it in any way. However, the Russians who landed from the plane inspected everything the United States had at that point, including all our fortifications, although such fortifications were very meager. Our country had practically nothing there in the way of adequate military equipment for defense.

Today we realize that such a situation may confront us a third time. Let us not let our young men walk into this thing unprepared again. When you send an American boy into battle with an airplane that flies a little slower than that of the enemy, or with a shorter range that is not war, it is just plain murder.

Again I say to the Senate that we have taken up the wrong program first. We should have taken up the air program before the Marshall plan was considered. The Marshall plan will not stop communism, but this program, if it is handled correctly, will stop communism if a definite foreign policy is inaugurated.

We need a training program for our country which will furnish the proper kind and proportion of physical and technical training for our young men. Not only must they be trained, but for those who passed the proper aptitude tests there must be additional technical training available—perhaps through high school, college, and into the laboratories in the field of electronics and related sciences.

Mr. President, adequate technical training cannot be accomplished in a few months. Such training will require a considerable period of time and must not be neglected.

Mr. President, I want to again call attention to the long-range plan to redistribute the wealth of this Nation.

The three steps projected by the economic one-worlders for that purpose are:

First. The established policy of exporting American money to make up the annual trade balance deficits—from all sources—of the European, Asiatic, and South American countries. Our chief export is money. The occasion may be the UNRRA, $3,000,000,000; the Greek-Turkey, $400,000,000; the English gift-loan of $3,750,000,000; or the Marshall-Bevin plan of exporting $17,000,000,000 to Europe, but the master-minded policy is the same, the economic equalization and the redistribution of the wealth of the 57 nations of the world, starting with the United States of America. This is a definite part of the international policy as supported in Senate debate, the English and Marshall-Bevin-plan gift loans are simply successive moves in establishing the first step of the policy.

Second. The selective free-trade method of dividing the production of this country with the nations of the world through the Trade Agreements Act, known by the catch word "reciprocal trade," is the second step in the economic one-world plan. Through the Trade Agreements Act industries selected by the State Department are frankly traded to one or more nations for a fancied advantage in furnishing them a market for their goods to secure money—dollar exchange—presumably to buy our processed and manufactured products.

Third. The International Trade Organization—ITO—through which 57 nations, each with one vote, will meet each year and frankly allocate the production and markets of the world between such nations, presumably finally on a population and cost of production, without regard to the differential of production cost due to the difference in the standards-of-living basis, thereby completing the job of international redistribution of the wealth of this Nation.

This Organization is to be the final leveler of the wage-living standards of the world.

International conferences and world wars are incidents, and even time is unimportant in the plan of the internationally minded "one economic world" group.

The "one economic world" group prematurely launched the "one political world" idea in the 1940 Presidential campaign. The emphasis has now shifted back to economics through the three definite policies; and when the "one economic world" goal is reached, the "one political world" is expected to follow in the natural course of events.

What is the answer?

A. A definite international policy, naming the areas and nations we must currently protect for our own ultimate safety and rebuilding our military organization, spearheaded by an air corps that can keep any nation on the ground until such time as the United Nations can take over, or the major problems of the world have been settled.

B. A flexible import fee under the Reciprocal Trade Act representing the differential of the cost of production between this Nation and where our chief competition is located on each specified product—in place of the selective free-trade program under the Reciprocal Trade Act.

The standard of living of the nations of the world cannot be lifted up overnight through redistribution of the wealth of this Nation or a division of our markets or of our production. Any such continuous plan or policy simply means a pronounced lowering of our own wage-living standards and a diminished market for your products. The will to raise their wage-living standards is a prerequisite to any improvement—and must come from the inside in any nation—it cannot be poured in from the top.

Most of the Asiatic and European countries have had access to the same necessary raw materials that we have so efficiently utilized for centuries—some of them, like China, for 5,000 years of recorded history—and have never changed their standard or manner of living perceptibly in all history.

While this country, starting with their bare hands 300 years ago, has risen to the highest wage-living standard in all history, most of our improvement has occurred during the past 150 years.

More on this subject will come later—and has a definite connection with the subject under discussion today.

Mr. President, I want to say again that I am supporting the addition of $822,000,000 to the program, because I have confidence in the committee that submitted the report. I have confidence that they have studied the two programs, the two reports which were made by the joint congressional committee and the President's Air Policy Commission.

We must, as so accurately outlined by the Senator from New Hampshire, provide sufficient money to make possible the letting of contracts over a long period of time, in order to keep our airplane factories in business and in operating condition for immediate expanded production. We must be ready to expand our production immediately in the event of emergency and know that our planes

will be equal to or superior to those of any nation on earth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in addressing myself to the question before the Senate, I am keenly conscious that the Constitution of the United States imposes upon the Congress, and only the Congress, responsibility to raise and support armed forces. Implicit in that responsibility borne by the Congress is the duty to insure that the armed forces raised and supported are adequate for the security of the Nation. This responsibility and this duty are heavy burdens upon the Congress, but their weight may not be shifted to other shoulders; we may not delegate these responsibilities to the executive branch of the Government. The people of the United States rightly expect the Congress to grip and fully meet the problem of national defense.

What, then, is the most effective means available to the Congress to insure the national security? It seems overwhelmingly apparent to civilians, and it has been unanimously agreed among the military, that air power is the decisive factor in military strength. In seeking to provide effective measures for national defense, we must go straight to the core of military strength, to the decisive factor—to air power.

In the critical times which today confront us, and which may confront us for many tomorrows, power is our shield and our spear. In respect to our only potential enemy, Russia, the United States Air Force constitutes the principal element of our military power. Together with the naval air arm, the Air Force holds poised our crucial means of defense and our major means of counterattack. We have come to the crux of the problem before the Congress: Is our air power adequate at present? If not, what is necessary in order to render it adequate? We must consider this question in the shadow of a fearful possibility—the possibility that in our efforts to provide precisely that air power which is adequate to our security, and no more, we may, in human error, provide that air power which is a little less than adequate. Here would be error, indeed. Here is a possibility of error so pregnant with disaster that no agency of the Government other than Congress can shoulder the grave responsibility implicit in its consideration.

We have for our guidance the unanimous opinion of our military advisers that United States air power is not at present adequate. We have available studies made by congressional committees and other responsible groups which advise us that our air power is inadequate and should be promptly strengthened. Differences of opinion between executive agencies of the Government have resolved to the question whether the Air Force shall be equipped with modern or obsolescent aircraft. The United States Air Force, to a man, urges that a 70-group air force with modern equipment is the minimum force with which the vital mission of the Air Force can be accomplished. After the most serious consideration, the House of Representatives approved by an impressive vote the bill now before the Senate, a bill which is intended to provide the minimum initial requirements for adequate air power. The Senate Appropriations Committee, through its chairman, overwhelmingly recommends the passage of this bill. I believe it can be said with authority that the American people are hopeful the Senate will act promptly to approve the strengthening and modernization of American air power. Remembering, as we must, that to err slightly on the side of inadequacy in air power can be fatal and final, I see no rational course for the Senate but to approve the bill before it.

We have, I believe, a manifest destiny in these great United States. We are so generously blessed of God that there must be a great destiny to which the Nation is dedicated. I believe the United States is destined to be the soil from which a true world peace will grow. It is the duty of the Congress to provide adequate protection for this American soil from which world peace will some day arise. It is only by preserving these United States that we can maintain the hope of world peace. No other consideration can be permitted to overshadow the eternal importance of keeping the United States secure. For that reason, and to that specific end, I urge the passage of the bill as reported by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, it is very seldom that appropriation bills which come to the Senate floor exactly suit me. I am strongly opposed to most of the vast appropriations made for foolish projects and for giving away our hard-earned tax dollars. But I want to congratulate the chairman of the Appropriations Committee for finally bringing in a bill which I consider to be of the utmost importance to the welfare and common defense of the Nation. I want to congratulate him for bringing in a bill which provides for a 70-group air force, which is the largest number that has been suggested by any of the various officials in the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. President, if there is one thing for which the Congress is responsible to the people it is the defense of the Nation. That responsibility is squarely upon our shoulders. Ever since I have been a Member of the Senate I have favored supporting the armed services to the fullest extent. I still want to equip and maintain a fighting force in this Nation which will cause any other nation or any combination of nations to hesitate before attacking or insulting us.

So, Mr. President, I was surprised and disappointed when I sat in on a hearing before the Appropriations Committee a week or so ago and heard Secretary of Defense Forrestal argue for a smaller group than the 70-group air force which this bill provides. I was surprised, because I know that the administration we have had for the last 16 years is a very extravagant one. It has stopped at nothing when it comes to spending money or giving it away for any cause, to anyone, anywhere in the world. But there Secretary Forrestal advocated economy in connection with the defense of this great Nation. I endeavored to ascertain, by questioning the Secretary of Defense, if it could be that the attitude which he had taken of holding down the defense of the Nation and making smaller appropriations than most of us thought were needed, was due to the political situation which confronts the Nation at the present time.

Our taxpayers, of course, are tired of seeing Congress and the administration spending and squandering billions of dollars, and would like to see the purse strings tightened. I wondered if it was the purpose of the administration to start practicing a little economy in connection with the defense program just ahead of the Presidential election. I was glad that Mr. Forrestal assured me that political considerations had nothing whatever to do with his attitude.

The members of the Appropriations Committee listened to all the testimony, considered the evidence, and the committee has now reported a bill which provides for a 70-group air force. I sincerely trust that the bill will be passed by the Senate, will become the law of the land, and that not only the appropriations provided for in this bill, but any other appropriations which may be necessary to give us the most outstanding and forceful armed forces of any nation on the earth will be made.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I gladly yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator has spoken with reference to economy. The Senator knows that there is no one in the Chamber more wholeheartedly in favor of economy than I am.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes. I certainly agree with the Senator.

Mr. BRIDGES. I agree with the Senator when he says that we cannot economize on the safety and security of this country. I think the safety and security of America are tied up directly with this appropriation, which is for the purpose of the modernization of our air force, and for that reason I am very glad the Senator has that attitude and that the other Senators who speak in favor of the measure have that attitude.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I thank the Senator for his remarks.

As I said at the beginning, Mr. President, I congratulate the chairman of the Appropriations Committee for increasing the appropriation to bring our Air Force up to a 70-group strength. If we need a stronger air force, I am in favor of further appropriations for that purpose.

It is said that Senators are not supposed to be military men or experts, as are supposed to be some of the officials in the executive branch of the Government. I feel that every Senator has some idea of what is required to defend the Nation. I think most Senators can qualify as experts in that line as well as those persons who have received appointments

in the executive branch. I know that the responsibility is on our shoulders. If we do not defend the United States against aggression there is grave danger of losing everything that is held near and dear by the 140,000,000 people who live in this country.

Regardless of the statements made by those in the executive branch of the Government, we know that we are in danger of war. There is no question about it. We are a great Nation, yet there are other governments utterly opposed to our system of government. They would like to see our system of government fail. They would like to take possession of the United States. There is no use to "kid" ourselves. We know Russia is knocking over smaller nations almost day by day and that the Soviet politburo has its greedy eyes fastened upon us. Also I am not so sure that Russia is the only nation that would like to destroy our Government. There may also be some others which would like to do that. During the course of time some nations have been very friendly to us, but their attitude sometime changes. However, we must maintain and preserve our Republic at all costs. We must be ready for any emergency at any time. We cannot afford to wait to prepare after an enemy sends us a note telling us when it is ready to attack us. We have got to have the power for instant resistance.

I do not think this is the time to quibble regarding the amount of money necessary to furnish airplanes and all the other weapons we need. I realize, of course, that our Air Force is not the only branch of our Military Establishment that performs good and necessary service. We need and should support all branches of the service and make appropriations adequate to keep all our forces in readiness and completely equipped to take care of any emergency that may confront us.

I have been against the policy of trying to buy good will from foreign nations by appropriating billions of dollars and giving it to their governments. We cannot buy peace. We must be ready to maintain peace by being able to fight for peace. We cannot prevent war by giving money to foreign nations. It never has been done. Their governments take our money and denounce us as a "skinflint" and "penny pincher" when the Treasury is drained dry and money lenders are friendless and givers of charity are invariably victims of designing fakers and indolent grafters. People of this caliber sometimes get into Government. It is well to watch after our gifts.

I fear those to whom we give our wealth today will come to look down on us and do everything against us when the time comes, as it inevitably will come, that we can no longer make generous contributions to them.

We are rapidly dissipating our resources, weakening our defense, getting rid of our national resources, squandering the people's money, running this Nation into consuming debt, and doing everything that possibly can be done to weaken our economy. When we have become so weak economically that we cannot support an adequate Air Force, Army, and Navy, then we will not find very much love being bestowed upon us by those who have been the recipients of our generosity down through the wild spree of spending and giving which has been going on during the past few years.

Mr. President, I wish again to say that I heartily support H. R. 6226, and I trust that it will be passed by the Senate promptly.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I agree that this country should have a reasonable amount of armament and mechanical equipment, but I think there is something more important in the fight against communism, which the present activity all boils down to.

It has been said before on the floor of the Senate, not alone by me but by others, that what we have to do is to make our private enterprise system, our democracy, so attractive that countries where we are contesting with the Russians will find our way of life more attractive than theirs.

We have known for a long time—it was amply demonstrated to us in the years of the depression—that the chief failing of our economic system is not the inability to produce. We can produce anything and everything in unbelievable quantities. Our problem is distribution, and I say that we had better have someone working on that problem, trying to figure out how people can buy the things which are produced in a capitalistic private enterprise economy, because if we start letting people starve in the midst of abundance, the whole world will go Communist, for whatever else may be said about communism, while the Communist countries may not produce as much as we do, they do not throw away what they produce. Someone gets what is produced, and consumes it.

I wish to read a paragraph or two from the New York Times of yesterday. I was startled, I was astounded by this article. I recently opposed the European recovery program, not because I did not want to help people, but because I thought we were hurting the United Nations in bypassing it. I wanted aid to be extended through the United Nations. However, I am not convinced now that those who opposed it outright were not on sound ground.

The article I have before me is dated Geneva, May 4, and it appears in the New York Times of May 5. It is an article by Michael L. Hoffman. He says:

A tendency to overproduction that is visible in parts of Europe—

Overproduction in Europe, Mr. President, and we just got through appropriating billions upon billions of dollars to feed the poor starving Europeans.

A tendency to overproduction is visible in parts of Europe because of the hamstringing effects of the bilateral-payments agreements in intra-European trade, a Benelux countries' representative told the Economic Commission for Europe today.

Speaking on behalf of Belgium and Luxemburg, as well as his own government, Anthony Speekenbrink, of the Netherlands, warned that the continuing problem of means of payment was already resulting in the piling up of unsold goods. The Netherlands, he said, is facing a "serious overproduction of foodstuffs."

A serious overproduction of foodstuffs in Europe, where the people were supposed to be starving to death, when we have just appropriated billions of dollars to feed the starving Europeans.

A serious overproduction of foodstuffs that will have to be destroyed—

Destroyed, Mr. President; and we all know that in spite of the things I am reading, there are millions of people in Europe who are living on a very low standard—

in the face of Europe's prevailing food shortage because there is no possibility of selling.

Mr. President, if this happens again, if people starve in the midst of abundance, as they did in the United States during the thirties—as I did during the thirties—capitalism will not be with us very long.

I merely wish to say that while we are thinking about guns we had better be thinking about some way to make it possible for people to consume the goods manufactured and the food produced, or all our efforts, all the guns we can produce, will not keep some other economic form, that will make use of at least what God provides, from taking over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment of the committee, which will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, at the top of page 3, to insert:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—MILITARY FUNCTIONS

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Engineer service, Army

Engineer service: For an additional amount for "Engineer service," including salaries and expenses of district and division offices, master and advance planning, engineering studies, and engineer activities in overseas areas, $30,049,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 9, to insert:

Barracks and quarters, Army: For an additional amount for "Barracks and quarters, Army," including expenses incident to the disposition of surplus facilities, $5,051,000; and in addition $5,900,000 to be derived by transfer in the amounts indicated from the following fiscal year 1948 appropriations: "Special field exercises," $2,600,000; "Training and operation, Army Ground Forces," $300,000; "Medical and Hospital Department, Army," $2,000,000; and "Transportation service, Army," $1,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of the Navy—Bureau of Aeronautics—Construction of aircraft and related procurement," on page 3, line 24, after the word "plants", to insert "or private plants (not to exceed $2,000,000)"; and on page 4, line 7, after the word "purposes", to insert "including not to exceed $20,000,000 for liquidation of obligations incurred during fiscal year 1945 against appropriation 'Aviation, Navy, 1945'."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 7, to strike out:

(b) All contracts entered into under this act shall include a clause providing for final

settlement in accord with the provisions of the Renegotiation Act as it was in effect July 1, 1945.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

(b) All contracts (including subcontracts) in excess of $100,000 hereafter entered into under the authority of this act, obligating funds appropriated hereby, obligating funds consolidated with funds appropriated hereby or entered into through contract authorizations herein granted, shall provide that said contracts shall be subject to renegotiation in accordance with the provisions of the Renegotiation Act as it was in effect July 1, 1945.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which is to replace the amendment in the bill on renegotiation, on page 5, of which subject the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], as chairman of a special subcommittee, has been making a study. I ask that the amendment be stated, and I think the distinguished Senator from Oregon will then explain briefly the reason for my request for the substitution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which the amendment of the committee on page 5, dealing with renegotiation, was agreed to, will be reconsidered, and the amendment is now before the Senate for action. The clerk will state the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 23, it is proposed to strike out "(a)", and on page 5, beginning with line 8, to strike out through line 19 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 3. (a) All contracts in excess of $10,000 entered into under the authority of this act, obligating funds appropriated hereby, obligating funds consolidated by this act with funds appropriated hereby, or entered into through contract authorizations herein granted, and all subcontracts thereunder in excess of $10,000 shall contain the following article:

"Renegotiation article: This contract is subject to the Renegotiation Act of 1948 and the contractor hereby agrees to insert a like article in all contracts or purchase orders to make or furnish any article or to perform all or any part of the work required for the performance of this contract."

(b) Whenever in the opinion of the Secretary of Defense excessive profits are reflected under any contract or contracts or subcontract or subcontracts required to contain the renegotiation article prescribed in subsection (a), the Secretary is authorized and directed to renegotiate such contracts and subcontracts for the purpose of eliminating excessive profits. He shall endeavor to make an agreement with the contractor or subcontractor with respect to the amount, if any, of such excessive profits and to their elimination. If no such agreement is reached, the Secretary shall issue an order determining the amount, if any, of such excessive profits and shall eliminate them by any of the methods set forth in subsection (c) (2) of the Renegotiation Act of February 25, 1944, as amended. The powers hereby conferred upon the Secretary shall be exercised with respect to the aggregate of the amounts received or accrued under all such contracts and subcontracts by the contractor or subcontractor during his fiscal year or upon such other basis as may be mutually agreed upon; except that this section shall not be applicable in the event that the aggregate of the amounts so received or accrued is less than $100,000 during any fiscal year.

(c) For the purpose of administering this section the Secretary of Defense shall have the right to audit the books and records of any contractor or subcontractor subject to this section. In the interest of economy and the avoidance of duplication of inspection and audit, the services of the Bureau of Internal Revenue shall, upon request of the Secretary of Defense and with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, be made available to the extent determined by the Secretary of the Treasury for the purpose of making examinations and audits under this section.

(d) The Secretary of Defense in his discretion may exempt from the provisions of this section any such contract or subcontract both individually and by general classes or types.

(e) Agreements or orders determining excessive profits shall be final and conclusive in accordance with their terms and except upon a showing of fraud or malfeasance or willful misrepresentation of a material fact shall not be annulled, modified, reopened, or disregarded, except that in the case of orders determining excessive profits the amount of the excessive profits, if any, may be redetermined by the Tax Court of the United States in the manner prescribed in subsection (e) (1) of the Renegotiation Act of February 25, 1944, as amended.

(f) The Secretary of Defense shall promulgate and publish in the Federal Register regulations interpreting and applying this section and prescribing standards and procedures for determining and eliminating excessive profits hereunder using so far as he deems practicable the principles and procedures of the Renegotiation Act of February 25, 1944, as amended, having regard for the different economic conditions existing on or after the effective date of this act from those prevailing during the period 1942 to 1945.

(g) The powers and duties hereby conferred upon the Secretary of Defense may be delegated by him to any officer (military or civilian) or agency of the National Military Establishment, with or without the power to make redelegations.

(h) Any person who willfully fails or refuses to furnish any information, records, or data required of him under this section, or who knowingly furnishes any such information, records, or data containing information which is false or misleading in any material respect, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

(i) This section may be cited as the "Renegotiation Act of 1948."

On page 5, line 20, strike out "SEC. 3" and insert "SEC. 4."

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, when the bill was being considered in the House, it was believed that, because of the magnitude of the amounts being made available either by appropriation or by contract authorizations—the amounts running into billions of dollars—there should be some protection for the Government in the matter of excess profits which might be earned under contracts made by procurement. It was recognized that many of the contracts would be not on the basis of manufacturing by the large companies of either aircraft or matériel of various kinds where there are available any yardsticks as to costs. Much of the work will be experimental. In many instances there may be no opportunity for competition. It was, therefore, believed that renegotiation of the contracts, so as to hold profits within reason, would be advisable.

The House adopted in the bill a short provision reading as follows:

All contracts entered into under this act shall include a clause providing for final settlement in accord with the provisions of the Renegotiation Act as it was in effect July 1, 1945.

The committee discussed the matter at length with representatives of the Air Force, of the Navy, and others, and it was apparent, Mr. President, that innumerable difficulties would have to be faced, some of them probably unsolvable, in applying renegotiation procedures to the funds provided in this act by referring to a renegotiation act which is no longer on the statute books, and which in itself depended upon certain revenue provisions in the law, which in turn are not on the statute books at the present time.

It was clear then that in order to provide a workable renegotiation provision it was necessary to write it into the pending bill. The provision which has just been read is the result of that conclusion on the part of the committee. The drafting of the provision was under the direction of the Senate legislative counsel. The counsel had the benefit of consultation with the general counsels of the Department of the Navy and the Department of the Air Force, and after agreement was had with the representatives of both the Department of the Navy and the Department of the Air Force the draft was submitted to the general counsel of the War Contracts Board, which is still engaged in finishing up renegotiations under the old renegotiation law. It was the consensus that the draft which is now offered as a substitute for the committee amendment is practicable, is workable, and will apply renegotiation principles in a workable manner to all funds appropriated in the pending bill, and to all contracts made pursuant to contract authorizations in the bill.

Unless there are some questions of a technical nature, Mr. President, I shall not continue the explanation further.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. As I understand, under the amendment, the Renegotiation Board, so-called, or the Renegotiation Agency, would be established by the Secretary of Defense?

Mr. CORDON. Exactly.

Mr. BALDWIN. He would determine how large the Board should be, and under what terms and provisions it should operate?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct. The whole authority for renegotiation is in the Secretary of Defense, and he promulgates and files and has printed in the Register his rules and regulations under which renegotiation will be had.

Mr. BALDWIN. Will the Senator repeat the sizes of the contract which are subject to renegotiation?

Mr. CORDON. No contract or group of contracts is renegotiable except single contracts in an amount of $100,000 or over, or the aggregate amount of contracts held by one contractor each of which contracts is in excess of $10,000

and the aggregate of which is in excess of $100,000.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is in any one year, is it not?

Mr. CORDON. That is any one fiscal year. And there is authority for the Secretary of Defense to make exemptions in those cases where clearly the renegotiations would be unworkable.

Mr. BALDWIN. Will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. CORDON. Gladly.

Mr. BALDWIN. I assume that under the regulations the contractors and the Government would have the right to appeal. There would be some appeal agency established, if necessary to meet this particular situation?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct. Where a mutual agreement is had, of course, no appeal is necessary. Where the amount of the renegotiated contract is fixed by the Government and is not satisfactory to the contractor, the contractor may appeal to the Tax Court, as under the old Renegotiation Act.

Mr. BALDWIN. And the provisions of the amendment with reference to having the Treasury Department or the Internal Revenue Division of the Treasury Department present for inspection of income-tax returns is limited exclusively to returns and documents which pertain to a particular contract, and not to any individual?

Mr. CORDON. The use of the facilities of the Internal Revenue service is limited purely to the renegotiation of these contracts and goes no further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], for himself and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. IVES. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Brooks	Connally
Baldwin	Buck	Cooper
Ball	Butler	Cordon
Barkley	Byrd	Donnell
Bricker	Cain	Downey
Bridges	Chavez	Dworshak
Eastland	McClellan	Saltonstall
Ecton	McFarland	Smith
Ellender	McKellar	Sparkman
Ferguson	McMahon	Stennis
Green	Magnuson	Taft
Gurney	Malone	Taylor
Hatch	Martin	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	Maybank	Thomas, Utah
Hickenlooper	Millikin	Thye
Hill	Moore	Tobey
Hoey	Morse	Tydings
Holland	Murray	Vandenberg
Ives	Myers	Watkins
Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor	Wherry
Johnston, S. C.	O'Daniel	Wiley
Kem	O'Mahoney	Williams
Kilgore	Pepper	Wilson
Knowland	Reed	Young
Langer	Robertson, Va.	
Lodge	Russell	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I have frequently expressed the view that the American people should create a national defense so strong that no aggressor nation would be tempted to attack us. With that idea in mind I intend to vote for the pending bill.

However, there is one aspect of the situation which intrigues my interest, or perhaps my curiosity. When the so-called European recovery program was pending before this body Secretary of the Army Royall and other officials testified in substance that if the program were not adopted it would be necessary that we immediately create a very strong armament. I quote from the language of Hon. Kenneth C. Royall, Secretary of the Army, before the Committee on Foreign Relations, his testimony appearing on page 444 of the proceedings of that committee. Secretary Royall said:

> I firmly believe that enlightened cooperative economic endeavor as visualized in the European recovery program can go a long way toward reducing the necessity for a larger national armament in the future, and probably reduce our present armament, and without such effort the Army budget and the Army itself should be increased.

Of course, the European recovery program was promptly adopted. The thing which intrigues my curiosity is, if it had not been adopted, what would have been the size of the request from officials with reference to the aviation program? As I understand, we are about to adopt the largest program that has been suggested by any responsible official. We are doing so in the face of our decision to send billions of dollars abroad to create a system of internal improvements in 16 countries of western Europe.

Mr. President, I believe that in one respect we have clearly put the cart before the horse. Instead of considering what it is necessary for us to do properly to defend ourselves, and then what we can do for the countries of western Europe and for China, we have adopted a program for internal improvements in those countries, and we are now considering whether our economic resources will permit us adequately to arm ourselves. It seems to me to be very unfortunate that the debate we are having and the action we are about to take did not precede, instead of follow, the adoption of the so-called European recovery program.

In that connection, let me say that I was very much interested in hearing the able Senator from Massachusetts ask what we could do to arm ourselves without involving the necessity of controls in the economy of our country. I think that is a very pertinent and very important question. But it seems to me it would have been much more timely, if I may be permitted to say so, if my good friend the Senator from Massachusetts had asked the question and made the suggestion when the European recovery program was under consideration.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Do I correctly infer from what the Senator has said that he thinks it is preferable to save American dollars and expend the lives of young Americans in the Air Force?

Mr. KEM. No; I do not think what I have said is properly susceptible of such an inference. I did not mean that. What I have said is that I think our first duty should be to arm ourselves so as to be able to defend ourselves, and that what we can do and what we should do in that respect should be our first and primary consideration. Then what we can do for other nations, however much we may desire to help them, is essentially secondary.

The point I make is that we should first consider and decide what to do in our own situation, and then we should consider the situation of other nations.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Does not the Senator think that if we should have trouble it would be better to have some friends to help us carry the load, and not have the young Americans do all the fighting and suffering?

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I do not care to reargue the European recovery program or resume the debate on it. I think I made my point of view clear when that debate occurred in the Senate. I do not wish to ask the Senate to bear with me while I rehash and rechew that argument.

Another thing the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts said which interested me very much was that in this connection he did not think we should continue to let any foreign country call the tune. Mr. President, it would seem to me, if I may be permitted to say so, that that observation would have been much more appropriate at the time when we were considering the European recovery program, the so-called Marshall plan, which, of course, originated with Mr. Bevin. I think the Senator should have made that observation at that time rather than today, when we are engaged in a debate in regard to how and to what extent we should arm ourselves.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LODGE. It seems to me that one thing which can be said for the Marshall plan, even if nothing else can be said for it, is that it is an attempt on the part of the United States to regain the initiative

in international affairs. For that reason, if for no other, that plan is entitled to support.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, if a distribution of our resources—the resources accumulated in this country by many generations of thrifty, frugal, careful people—to other nations all over the world, even to the outer reaches of Upper Mongolia, is what is meant by taking the initiative in foreign affairs, then for my part I wish to declare myself out of it. I do not approve of that sort of action.

Mr. President, before I take my seat I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to some very pertinent and interesting remarks which were made recently by Mr. Winston Churchill. I inserted them in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They appear at page A2670 of the RECORD. The wartime Prime Minister of England, in speaking to a gathering of the Conservative Party, had this to say:

> While Socialist ministers are boasting of their achievements and of the benefits they have given the public—of which the public is not always conscious—they seem to forget that they are living on the charity of the greatest capitalist free-enterprise state in the world, the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is necessarily absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the senior and the junior Senator from Maine, the Senator from South Dakota, the Senator from New Jersey, the senior and the junior Senator from Indiana, the Senator from Wisconsin, and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] is detained on official committee business. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent because of illness in their families.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 74, nays 2, as follows:

YEAS—74

Aiken	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hill	O'Daniel
Ball	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Holland	Pepper
Bricker	Ives	Reed
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Buck	Kem	Saltonstall
Butler	Kilgore	Smith
Byrd	Knowland	Sparkman
Chavez	Langer	Stennis
Connally	Lodge	Taft
Cooper	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McKellar	Thye
Downey	McMahon	Tobey
Dworshak	Magnuson	Tydings
Eastland	Malone	Vandenberg
Ecton	Martin	Watkins
Ellender	Maybank	Wherry
Ferguson	Millikin	Wiley
Green	Moore	Williams
Gurney	Morse	Wilson
Hatch	Murray	Young
Hayden	Myers	

NAYS—2

Cain	Taylor

NOT VOTING—20

Brewster	Hawkes	Revercomb
Bushfield	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Capehart	Lucas	Stewart
Capper	McCarran	Umstead
Flanders	McCarthy	Wagner
Fulbright	McGrath	White
George	Overton	

So the bill H. R. 6226 was passed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BALL, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. TYDINGS conferees on the part of the Senate.

SOUTHERN STATES COMPACT ON REGIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I inquire what is the unfinished business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business before the Senate is Senate Joint Resolution 191, giving the consent of Congress to a certain compact, which was made the special order today, and which was temporarily laid aside for consideration of the bill which has just passed the Senate.

REVISION OF UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I have been receiving considerable mail from constituents, as I assume other Senators have, in support of the various resolutions introduced in the Eightieth Congress calling for United States initiative toward revision of the United Nations Charter.

Most of the persons who write to me are citizens who took an active part before the war in trying to guide American public opinion away from isolationism and in favor of true international cooperation against aggression. Knowing how I voted on the crucial issues before the war, knowing that I voted against the isolationist efforts to thwart our foreign policy prior to Pearl Harbor, many of these constituents are now puzzled because I have not come out in support of the proposal to revise the UN Charter and primarily to remove the veto power which Russia has used so frequently in blocking effective UN action in certain fields.

Consequently, last July, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from a constituent which posed this question and my answer to his letter. I said that I shared the concern over the weaknesses of the Charter and in the UN as they have developed. I recognized the genuine desire for peace which prompted the introduction of these resolutions, and I certainly had the highest regard for the men and women identified with them, either as sponsors or as supporters. But, as I said then:

> I am frankly afraid that what we might do by proceeding with this show-down—

Meaning a show-down with Russia over the veto and other matters in conflict in the UN structure—

> at this time would be to strike the final cleavage within the United Nations and, instead of strengthening it, actually be destroying it. Can we take that chance?

I said further:

> The United Nations as it is now set up is probably the most effective organization we could hope to have at the present time and still retain the Soviets and their satellites as members. I think it is important to try to hold them as members in the hopes that this present intransigence may be merely a passing period, a sort of adolescence in international cooperation. For this reason, I think that the proposed conference would be premature, and in probably breaking up the United Nations, would, in fact, be responsible for losing us what now appears to be our best present hope for stabilizing peace.

This having been my position, I was highly pleased to learn of the statement which Secretary of State George C. Marshall made yesterday before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on this very subject. As the Secretary said, what the world needs today is not new structures for peace but better use of the organization which already exists.

I made a somewhat similar comment several weeks ago, in addressing the Pennsylvania Intercollegiate Conference on Government, at Philadelphia, when I said:

> We are drifting in a world where the forms exist for peace, but where the mechanics of peace cannot function.

Rather than change the forms, Mr. President, I agree with Secretary Marshall that it is better to try to establish—or reestablish—an international atmosphere conducive to the use of the UN for peace.

The night before the Secretary testified before the House committee, Joseph

C. Harsch, one of the outstanding Washington correspondents, delivered a short commentary over the Columbia Broadcasting System which contained some provocative observations on the matter of revising the UN Charter.

As he puts it:

The perfectly laudable and desirable end of those who propose these reforms of the UN is to produce a stronger UN, and incidentally either get Russia out of it or under control. But no mere words written on a piece of paper and wrapped up even with the most beautiful real silk ribbons are going to achieve that purpose. If you eliminated the veto, over Russia's veto, you would be setting up a second UN, leaving Russia and her satellites in possession of the existing UN. There might be some satisfaction in having a new organization purged of the Russians but it wouldn't solve any of our problems with Russia.

Although Mr. Harsch's commentary covers a number of subjects in addition to this proposal for revising the Charter of the UN, he ties them all together under the theme of "short cuts to peace." I ask unanimous consent that the entire commentary be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. His remarks on the Charter were so well stated that I asked Mr. Harsch to send me his script.

There being no objection, the commentary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The political fortunes of either Harold Stassen or Senator TAFT may at this moment be settled. But if so the secret is still inside the ballot boxes of Ohio, the contents of most of which remain to be counted and tabulated. So we might as well curb any impatience for a few more hours and note some of the other things going on in the world. Here at home it is pretty obvious that a lot of people are still hunting hopefully for easy ways out of difficult problems. Two short cuts cropped up in Congress today. One was the idea of getting out of either the draft or universal military training by offering a bonus to volunteers for the Army—a thousand dollars for a 2-year enlistment, $1,500 for a 3-year term. It is particularly appealing to a Congressman in an election year, of course, yet anyone who takes just a minute to remember his history will realize what a delusion that kind of security would be. All kinds and sizes of states and nations down through the ages have tried to meet their security problems with that answer—and most of them came to grief. You don't buy patriotism with dollars. You can buy a mercenary army with dollars, but no mercenary army in history ever stood up in an equal fight against a citizen army. The British remember, even if some of us may not, how little benefit they got out of their Hessians when a lot of our farmers and backwoodsmen met them at Saratoga. Another of today's bright ideas is that we could solve the problem of the United Nations by writing the veto out and a police force into it. The fallacy of this idea is that it confuses the end with the means. The perfectly laudable, and desireable end of those who propose these reforms of the UN is to produce a stronger UN, and incidentally either get Russia out of it or under control. But no mere words written on a piece of paper and wrapped up even with the most beautiful real silk ribbons are going to achieve that purpose. If you eliminated the veto, over Russia's veto, you would be setting up a second UN leaving Russia and her satellites in possession of the existing UN. There might be some satisfaction in having a new organization purged of the Russians, but it wouldn't solve any of our problems with Russia. There would still be the cold war to be carried on to its ultimate climax, whether of peace or of war. A coalition of the free nations is much the same whether it is technically inside or outside the existing UN. And anyway, it is nonsense to think of this country giving up its own right of veto even to a UN purged of Russia and her satellites. Perhaps we should give it up. But that is beside the point. Right or wrong, we are not in fact ready to delegate to a group of other countries our right to decide how we will dispose of our money, our armed forces, or our atomic energy. We might do that by treaty with some few countries we particularly trust under certain carefully specified circumstances. But that would be membership in a coalition of countries for a specific purpose. It would not be a world federation of states. And as for a police force. The UN will have one whenever the big countries can all reach a settlement among themselves. But the settlement would not be speeded by a UN police force which wouldn't impress any but small countries. The trouble isn't in the UN. The trouble is in the present inability of the big powers to reach a general settlement among themselves. Solve that problem and the UN automatically ceases to be weak. And you can't make the UN strong any other way. Until that time comes we can make alliances and form coalitions as means toward a big power settlement. We may or may not reach the settlement by that road. We are trying it and you and I can only hope profoundly that it works. But tinkering with the UN isn't going to accomplish anything except perhaps give a few people a momentary illusion that they have found a short cut to peace.

Mr. HOLLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to occupy only a few minutes in connection with the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS].

I listened with a great deal of interest to what the Senator from Pennsylvania has said. I should like to associate myself completely with the point of view which he has expressed. I think we have the machinery for maintaining peace in the world, provided we can establish the will to use that machinery and an understanding can be brought about among the leaders of the world that diligent efforts should be made to use it.

BEWARE REESTABLISHMENT OF EUROPEAN CARTELS

There is an associated aspect of the problem of world peace to be found in economic organizations. The reason we have political totalitarianism in the world as a problem is because there has developed a system of economic totalitarianism. The uprisings in Europe which resulted in establishing the arbitrary power of Mussolini in Italy, of Hitler in Germany, and of the Soviet Communists in Russia were due to the fact that economic organization in Europe had given birth to the cartel system. The cartel system, in simple words, is merely a system in which certain large business organizations associate themselves together to control production, to divide territory, to allocate business, and to fix prices. It is contrary to the American ideal of a free, competitive economy. I have long been of the opinion that the greatest step the people of America can take to establish freedom in the world is to make certain that the cartel system shall be abolished. I know that is the point of view of a great many business leaders, even those who are at the head of great national and international organizations.

Several years ago I introuced in the Senate a bill to provide for the registration of cartel agreements. The gentleman who at that time was the president of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey appeared before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, which was conducting hearings upon that bill, to express his general agreement with the purposes of the bill. Nothing has been done about it. The measure is still before the Judiciary Committee.

The State Department of the United States filed its testimony with respect to the measure, giving its approval. All of this appears in the appropriate printed hearings of the Judiciary Committee. It is related, however, Mr. President, to the situation with which we are now confronted by reason of the establishment of the European Cooperation Administration and the approval by the Congress of the Marshall plan.

Great sums of money, many products of American industry and trade are being and are about to be devoted to the rehabilitation of the European economy. But if that rehabilitation results in reestablishing in Europe the cartel system which brought about the appearance of political totalitarianism, I have no hesitation in expressing my opinion that the appropriations which we have made and the efforts of the European Cooperation Administration will be altogether futile.

I have undertaken to lay these views before Mr. Hoffman, the head of the ECA, and before Secretary of State George Marshall. I ask unanimous consent that my letter of April 28 to Mr. Hoffman may be read by the clerk. I do this because I believe that the substance of the letter is of sufficient importance to be called publicly to the attention of all who may be listening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., April 28, 1948.

Mr. PAUL G. HOFFMAN,
Administrator, Economic Cooperation Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: May I first tell you how pleased I was when I learned of your appointment not only because of the very pleasant personal contact I have had with you from time to time, but because of your work as the head of the Committee on Economic Development which demonstrated that you have an enlightened view of the economic problem. As Administrator for the Economic Cooperation Administration you will have the opportunity of making certain that the large sums which the people of America have appropriated for the recovery of Europe shall be used to establish a free economy. No one, I am sure, knows better than do you that the reestablishment of private economic controls in Europe would only revive the conditions which brought the totalitarian philsophy into existence.

I am frankly deeply concerned by the developments which appear now to be taking place in Europe. The Rotterdamsche Bank has recently published a carefully prepared monograph which it calls Benelux an Example of Unity in a Divided World, the whole

theme of which seems to be a recommendation for the reestablishment of the cartel system. "The development of new industries," it says, "will be coordinated in official consultation." There follows the following extremely frank statement:

"Moreover, undersirable competition between Belgium and Dutch industries could in a number of cases be eliminated by cartel agreements. The governments could make the latter compulsory in cases which come into consideration for such regulation. With respect to foreign markets the industries of the Benelux group would act as partners and not as competitors."

I shall not burden you in this letter with a complete citation of the contents of this monograph. I call your attention to it, however, because it seems to me to constitute a warning of the greatest danger that confronts your organization.

The Communists lost the Italian election because Premier de Gasperi promised reforms which would create economic opportunities for the masses of the people of Italy. If these reforms are not established, no amount of money loaned by the United States can stop the sweep of communism. These reforms will not be enacted in Italy nor elsewhere in western Europe if the cartel system is revived. Combinations of private groups to eliminate competition, to divide markets and necessarily to fix prices as outlined in this monograph of the Rotterdamsche Bank would make economic reform utterly impossible.

If the cartel system is reestablished in Europe it will necessarily involve the United States because we have great business organizations engaged in world trade which, in the past, have been closely associated with European cartels. If the cartel system is permitted to gain a new foothold in Europe it will involve the world and the result will be that instead of a now free economy with opportunity for the masses under really democratic auspices we shall have a controlled economy based upon the restraints of trade which American sentiment has always condemned.

May I make bold, therefore, to suggest to you that the utmost care must be exercised in the selection of the personnel to administer the Economic Cooperation Administration.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point, without reading, a similar letter which I addressed on the 1st of May to Secretary of State Marshall, together with a copy of his response.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., May 1, 1948.

Hon. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As one of those who has consistently supported the European recovery plan and has applauded your leadership in its formulation, I write to urge upon you the immediate reaffirmation by this Government of the opposition to the reestablishment of the cartel system in the European economy. All of the expected benefits of the Marshall plan would, in my opinion, be utterly lost if, by indirection or otherwise, it should be made the basis for reviving monopolistic controls of European industry.

This Government has on more than one occasion expressed itself in opposition to the cartel system. As recently as July 19, 1947, Maj. Gen. William H. Draper, Jr., who was then serving as Economic Adviser to the Commander in Chief, European theater, testified before the Senate Committee on Appropriations and, in response to my question as to whether or not there was any basis in fact for reports that the old German cartel system was being reestablished, declared most emphatically that there was no truth in such reports. He went on to say that an anti-cartel law had been passed in the American zone and a similar one in the British zone and that there was no purpose on the part of our Government to permit the reestablishment of the cartel system.

In a formal written statement which was filed with the Appropriations Committee by General Draper at my request and which appears beginning at page 83 of the published hearings on H. R. 4269 on July 19 last, General Draper said:

"The new decartelization law, however, was needed to prevent the old cartel organizations from reviving as German industry begins to recover from the effects of the war. The law was intended to chart a course for competitive enterprise with smaller units and to prevent dangerous concentrations of economic power which formerly existed in Germany and which became ready tools to carry out Hitler's totalitarian and warlike purposes."

During the Seventy-ninth Congress Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. William L. Clayton, testified before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary in support of a bill I had introduced to provide for the registration of cartel contracts. His statement appears at page 23 of the published hearings held on S. 11 on May 17, 1945. In endorsing this bill the Secretary testified that the State Department regarded it "as a useful element in the program to prevent private agreements in restraint of international trade."

The whole purpose of the European recovery plan is, of course, to promote recovery. It is obvious that recovery cannot be promoted under the cartel system, the express purpose of which is to restrain trade, to divide territory, to allocate production and to fix prices. It was the regimentation of the economy of Europe under private controls that was the primary cause of political totalitarianism. European business leaders have been accustomed to these practices and unless the United States Government takes a clear and positive stand there is grave danger that the assistance made available to Europe under the Marshall plan may be used to reestablish the old practices.

Let me cite two examples which show that this is a real danger. In an economic pamphlet published by the Rotterdamsche Bank last year entitled, "Benelux an Example of Unity in a Divided World," there appears on page 33, under the heading "Cartel agreements," the following paragraph:

"Moreover, undesirable competition between Belgium and Dutch industries could in a number of cases be eliminated by cartel agreements. The governments could make the latter compulsory in cases which come into consideration for such regulation. With respect to foreign markets the industries of the Benelux group would act as partners and not as competitors."

The second example is the final report of the French-Italian Mixed Commission for the study of a customs union between France and Italy which was published this year in Rome by the Italian Minister of Foreign Affairs. In this document there are numerous allusions to the desirability of economic coordination to eliminate the differences between the economies of the two countries and to reorganize the two economies on a "complementary basis." That such a reorganization could mean the revival of old-fashioned cartels is a conclusion which must be drawn from the following language in the closing paragraphs of chapter 3 of the final report at page 66:

"The realization of the customs union should permit the achievement of coordination and the abolition of these differences (differences in production). Such a task requires a triple form of collaboration: In the realm of importation of basic products; in the realm of the division of raw materials and capital; and finally in the organization of markets for exports. In these three realms agreements should be sanctioned either at the governmental level or on the level of the parties involved.

"The principle which shall govern the realization of such agreements ought to be the search for a rationalization of industrial organizations and a specialization of production which will permit regrouping the productive energies of the two countries in the larger and more effective framework of the Customs Union."

Thus we have two semiofficial declarations from western Europe supporting a form of economic reorganization out of which it would easily be possible for private monopoly to grow. In view of the fact that many of our own American industrial corporations have, in the past, been parties to world cartels and in view of the fact that much of the personnel which will be called upon to administer the European recovery plan will, perhaps necessarily, come from such organizations, it seems to me to be essential that our Government shall take a forthright stand incapable of misunderstanding against the reestablishment of private monopoly through the use of the economic aid which is being extended by the people of the United States.

This country alone of all the great nations of the world stands for a free economy. This country alone has by law prohibited restraints in trade. It is only by the maintenance of this essentially American policy that the private competitive system can be maintained. It is for this reason that I urge the State Department to make clear that there has been no change in the basic policy of this Government.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY.

MAY 4, 1948.

The Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: Thank you for your letter of May 1 on the subject of the attitude of this country toward any reestablishment of the cartel system in European economy.

I am informed that the Executive Committee on Economic Foreign Policy is scheduled to take this matter up this week with the idea of making a specific recommendation on this general subject.

I will revert to this matter again following the interdepartmental discussions.

Faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this matter deals not only with a movement to prevent the reestablishment of the cartel system, it also involves the problem of decartelization in Germany, in the zone occupied by the United States, and in the zone occupied by Great Britain.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I am wondering if the Senator from Wyoming will not have read General Marshall's reply to his letter. I think we are all interested in hearing it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The reply of General Marshall, I will say to the Senator, is merely an acknowledgment of the re-

ceipt of the letter, and a statement that the Executive Committee on Economic Foreign Policy is scheduled to take the matter up this week, with the idea of making a specific recommendation upon the general subject. I am calling the attention of the Senate to this exchange of correspondence because of what I deem to be the great importance of this issue.

I was about to say that on the 19th of July last, when the Senate Committee on Appropriations was considering the supplemental appropriation for 1948, General Draper, who was at that time with the military government in Germany, appeared before the committee. In response to my inquiry, he said that there had been no change in the decartelization policy, and at my request he then prepared and submitted as a part of the record a statement upon this whole general subject. I ask unanimous consent that the statement of General Draper which was submitted to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and printed in the hearings of July 19 last on H. R. 4269, be also made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOOD PRODUCTION IN GERMANY

Chairman BRIDGES. Mr. Secretary, another thing: What are the prospects for developing sufficient food in these areas, or for increasing the availability of food of their own production, and how soon will they begin to feel the effects of that?

Mr. ROYALL. I am sure we are making every possible effort in the way of furnishing fertilizer, seed, and so forth. I believe I will ask General Draper, speaking as to Germany, to supplement that briefly.

General DRAPER. Secretary Anderson, of the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Chairman, has just returned from Germany. He went into that question very thoroughly. It was one of the purposes of his trip.

We had programed and planned and hoped for about a 10-percent increase in the crop yield this year, as opposed to last year. The winter was the worst winter in 50 years. There was a bad kill of crops all through Europe, not as bad in Germany as in France, but the result is that we will probably not have any better crop this year than last year. The expectation is, however, that next year's crop should be somewhat better.

I should say that Mr. Anderson's conclusion was that 20 to 30 percent over a period of a few years could be achieved in the way of increased yield in Germany with proper fertilizers, and he is making efforts to help us on that.

However, the fact is that 25 percent of Germany's arable land was taken away in Potsdam for Poland and Russia, and western Germany was always the industrial part of Germany, that received food from eastern Germany. And we are receiving none of that food, so it is not conceivable that western Germany can ever support itself and its population from its own food resources. As a matter of fact, the population is up 8,000,000 in the bizonal area over prewar figures, and the crop yields are down about 25 percent. That can be recouped, but even when it is, before the war that part of Germany was very insufficient in food and provided itself with food by shipping out industrial exports to pay for the food that it brought in, largely from the east.

That food now comes from the United States. And it will be a long time before European food sources will develop to a point where that can be changed.

Chairman BRIDGES. What do they hope to do?

General DRAPER. To build up the industry to a point, keeping due regard to the war potential in the heavy industry, but building up its industrial products to a point where its exports will pay for the food.

We have a definite program for that purpose developed, a 3-year program. I cannot guarantee to the committee, obviously, that that will be successful. We are probably 6 months behind in the program now for two reasons. First, the winter which created for 4 months a complete stagnation in Germany. We had to put priorities on transportation and move food and coal alone, and even then we were not able to move all of that during the winter. The result was that most of industry was shut down for that period, and then in March and April when the spring came on and industrial activity began to revive, this food crisis hit us.

On Ruhr coal production we had a point system developed in the Ruhr under which the coal production was mounting very satisfactorily from 180,000 tons in November to 220,000 and 240,000 a day by March in the Ruhr, which was a tremendous increase, and we were planning on 300,000 before the end of the year. That will mean a tremendous difference not only to Germany, but also to western Europe.

The food crisis came and coal production dropped off immediately. Unless food does become available, not only sufficient for the coal miner and his family, but for the general population, the general economic level is likely to sink into almost economic chaos.

Chairman BRIDGES. General, what lines of food are you most hopeful will be produced in great quantity in Germany? What lines will the increase come in? Will it come in grains, potatoes, or what?

General DRAPER. The program is to cut down on the livestock and the pasture lands in order to substitute food for human consumption; wheat, potatoes, rye, the various bread grains, and in addition a tremendous vegetable-garden program. There are this year a quarter of a million more home gardens in western Germany than there were a year ago. That adds a certain value, but it does not have a high calory content. But practically every little patch in any part of western Germany that it is possible is now planted, but the increase would mainly be in potatoes and bread grains.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Florida for having yielded to me.

SOUTHERN STATES COMPACT ON REGIONAL EDUCATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 191) which was made a special order for today.

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 191) giving the consent of Congress to the compact on regional education entered into between the Southern States at Tallahassee, Fla., on February 8, 1948.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on February 25 last there was introduced in the Senate, sponsored by 28 Senators coming from 15 Southern States, Senate Joint Resolution 191, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. An able subcommittee consisting of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] held hearings on March 12 and 13 last.

The record of those hearings has been printed, and Senators will find available in the Senate Chamber printed copies of the record. I take this first opportunity to express my very deep appreciation to the subcommittee for the careful way in which they went into the subject, and for what I think is an excellent record which was built in this matter largely due to their meticulous efforts. The full Committee on the Judiciary subsequently approved the measure, and it came to the calendar, where it has been since April 13.

Day before yesterday, May 4, the House of Representatives, by a vote of 236 to 45, passed a companion measure, House Joint Resolution 334, which yesterday came to the Senate and went to the calendar as Calendar No. 1286. At this time I move that House Joint Resolution 334 be substituted for Senate Joint Resolution 191 and become the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida that House Joint Resolution 334 be substituted for the pending joint resolution?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the motion of the Senator from Florida is agreed to, and the joint resolution is passed, it will have to go back to the House for action, will it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the request is granted it will simply mean that the House joint resolution will be before the Senate for consideration and amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. What I mean is that if something is accepted as a substitute, it is an amendment within itself. It seems to me it would be better to take up the House joint resolution by unanimous consent, rather than consider the Senate joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks the effect of the request of the Senator from Florida, if the Chair understood the request correctly, is that the Senate shall proceed to consider the House joint resolution in lieu of the Senate joint resolution which is now the pending business before the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the motion will have the effect of making the House measure the one before us, well and good.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The effect will be that the House joint resolution will be before the Senate for consideration.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understood that the Senator from Florida moved to substitute the House measure for the Senate measure. If that request were granted, the Senate measure would be before the Senate with an amendment, which would be the House measure, and therefore it would have to go back to the House. What I am trying to do is to have the House measure taken up by the Senate for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood that to be the desire of the Senator from Florida, and if the request of the Senator from Florida is

granted, it is the opinion of the present occupant of the Chair that by substituting the House joint resolution for the Senate joint resolution, the Senate will then have the House joint resolution before it for amendment and passage.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Prior to action on the motion of the Senator from Florida, I should like to ask what the difference is between the Senate version as it left the Committee on the Judiciary and the joint resolution passed by the House?

Mr. HOLLAND. The only difference between the joint resolution as passed by the House—House Joint Resolution 334—and the Senate joint resolution, is that the amendments which were placed in the measure by the Senate committee were not adopted by the House, and I will say for the information of the Senator that it is the intention of the junior Senator from Florida to ask that those amendments be adopted to the House joint resolution rather than to the Senate joint resolution. Such action is requested after conference with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. I understand it to be agreeable to him.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator another question. In effect that would be, would it not, bringing before the Senate the identical bill that left the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. HOLLAND. Exactly. The sole purpose of the effort to take up the House measure rather than the Senate measure is to expedite the final action of both Houses upon the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 334) giving the consent of Congress to the compact on regional education entered into between the Southern States at Tallahassee, Fla., on February 8, 1948.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall now proceed as briefly as possible to discuss the subject of this particular joint resolution. Back in 1934 or 1935 the conference of southern governors, which has been an active regional conference since prior to that time, began consideration of means and methods whereby they could strengthen education in the group of States which they represent. The negotiations looking to that end have continued without interruption from that time, 1934 or 1935, until this time, having been held somewhat in abeyance, of course, during the war, due to the press of other business.

The problem presented has been that much graduate-school work and technical, professional, and scientific work, which is of importance to the South, has not been available anywhere in the South, and in other fields it has been available in an inadequate and insufficient degree. For instance, Mr. President, petroleum engineering, textile engineering, engineering in mining and metallurgy, and ceramics, are exceedingly vital to the South, due to the fact that much of the raw materials in the industries built upon petroleum, textiles, mining and metallurgy and ceramics are produced by the South; yet in those fields there is virtually no educational opportunity or educational facility available in the whole southern region.

In the case of my own State, Mr. President, in which happens to be located a source from which is being produced about 65 percent of the phosphate supply of the Nation, we have no school from which we can obtain trained personnel for our phosphate mines, and the same observation applies respecting all the Southern States which have mining industries.

In addition to these fields in which there is no instruction available, there are other fields in which there is insufficient instruction available. For instance, in the field of medical education, dental education, veterinary science, forestry, and in the field of graduate work, educational facilities available in the southern region as a whole are wholly insufficient. For instance, if Senators will allow me to refer again to my own State, we have no medical school, we have no dental school, we have no school of veterinary science. In the States of Georgia and Florida, which are adjoining sister States and closely alined with each other in every way, there are no dental schools other than one private school, Emory University Dental College. The result has been that a great many young people of the South have either found themselves entirely banned from securing scientific and professional education, or have found grave handicaps interposed to their ambitions.

I happened for a few years, Mr. President, to serve on the board of trustees of Emory University, and only last year, I am sorry to say, the number of applicants to our medical college there was so great that we were able to admit only about 8 or 9 percent of the total number of applicants to take the course of study in our medical school.

So the primary purpose of the compact is to make it possible for any two or more of the States in this region affected, by their joint efforts and joint funds, either to establish and support schools in these fields or to take over and improve greatly facilities which already exist, but which are entirely inadequate.

Article I, section 10, paragraph 3, of the Constitution provides in part as follows:

> No State shall, without the consent of Congress, * * * enter into any agreement or compact with another State.

I am not quoting the entire wording of that section, the remainder of which applies to matters other than compacts. Under that provision of the Constitution and under the development of the States in the various regions there have been more than 100 instances in which interstate compacts have been entered into by two or more States, with respect to which compacts the approval of Congress has been sought and in most cases granted. I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee had prepared and inserted in the RECORD in this case, at pages 9 to 13, inclusive, a complete list, as stated by him, of the instances in which interstate compacts have been developed among several States or groups of States.

In February of this year this effort of long standing happened to come to a head at Tallahassee, the capital of my State. On February 8 the compact was reduced to written form and was executed by a group of governors from the 15 States affected, and has subsequently been signed by the governors of all those States except one, having been signed, as I understand, and as shown by the copy of the compact which is included in the joint resolution, by 14 governors, from all the States in the compact except the State of Kentucky. I understand that the Governor of Kentucky is still considering the matter, and that in all probability he will sign it, though I do not state that as a matter of certainty. That is my information from the Governor of Florida, and I know that he believes that such course is probable.

At the time this general program came to a head and the compact reached written form, as it appears in the House joint resolution which is now being considered, there was a certain school, Meharry Medical College of Nashville, Tenn., which had reached the stage where, under its present condition, it could not continue to operate after the present scholastic year had ended. Meharry College is a medical school for Negroes. It was established at Nashville, Tenn., in 1876, and has continued to exist without interruption from that time until now. It is a school of high standing, a class A medical and dental school, from which have been graduated approximately 56 percent of the doctors and dentists of the Negro race who have served the people of the United States in the period since 1876.

As appears from the record in this case, that college has heretofore had very strong and important financial support from various private sources. The record shows, for example, that the General Education Board has put about $10,000,000 into that effort. It is a school with very fine facilites and with a high-grade professional staff. It is a school which we certainly want to preserve, because of the benefits which it has conferred and is conferring not only upon the members of the colored race who seek their training there, but also upon the entire South and upon the whole Nation.

It so happens that for a period of years Meharry has been operating at a deficit which, according to the record, has at times reached a figure of $350,000 a year. It happens that the foundations which have heretofore supported this good school have decided that it is impossible for them to continue to support the institution, operating in the red as it has been constantly, because of the increased cost of that type of education.

At the time this compact was reaching written form the trustees of Meharry Medical College and the foundations which are supporting that college approached the southern governors with the request that the work on the compact be hastened, and that as one of the first objectives the States operating

under the compact should agree to take over and operate Meharry Medical College and support it by tax funds raised by the 15 States, or any of them which cared to participate.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact, as shown by the record, that that approach was from the board of Meharry College and from the foundations which have heretofore been operating Meharry College, and was coupled with the statement of those foundations and of the board that unless help were forthcoming from the Southern States, the school would have to end its activities in June of this year. The board took unanimous action. Incidentally, the board consists of persons of both races, distinguished educators and citizens throughout the Nation.

It will appear from an inspection of the joint resolution approving the compact, and from the compact as copied therein, that one of the specific objectives cited—and it happens that it would be the first objective to which the compact would be applicable—is the continuance of this very worthy educational effort, Meharry Medical College, at Nashville, Tenn.

As to the substance of the compact, the compact speaks for itself, and is copied into the joint resolution; but I think it would be proper to give a brief résumé of its terms.

It provides that the 15 States shall join together for the purposes which I have just described. It provides that any two or more of such States, working jointly, may support, establish, or operate educational facilities in any of the fields which I have mentioned. It provides that it shall not be in force until it has been approved by at least six State legislatures. It provides that it shall not be in force as to any particular State unless it is approved by the legislature of that State. So far as Meharry College is concerned, one of the conditions which was applied by the trustees and by the foundations was that the compact should not be operative until the consent of Congress has been given.

Under this organization it is provided that three men from each of the States which shall participate—there being now 14 States participating—shall comprise a regional board of education with authority in this field; that as to any separate institution, the members of the board who come from the States which are taking a part in a particular institution shall comprise the board for such institution.

The compact provides that the legislatures of the several States, once having ratified the compact, shall support from tax funds the institution or institutions established under the compact.

There is a provision for withdrawal, to the effect that when a State withdraws it shall forfeit its interest in any facility which has been created. The compact also imposes a reasonable time limit on withdrawals, so that plans for the year immediately ahead may not be disrupted by a withdrawal which is too precipitate.

The program under the compact seems to be carefully outlined. It has already been considered by some of the legislatures and approved by them, and will be considered by others just as quickly as the various legislatures convene.

Mr. President, to carry the matter one step further, let me say that, of course, not only is it necessary that the consent of Congress be given before Meharry Medical College can continue its work by operating under this compact, but it is also necessary that the consent of Congress be given before a very important research survey, which now is outlined, can be made operative. I am informed by a letter from the Governor of Florida, who has served as chairman of the Board of Governors working on this project, that the program is ready to proceed, and that the Rockefeller Foundation is putting up one-third of the money; that officials of the Carnegie Foundation have recommended to their board that the foundation carry one-third of the expense—I understand that even though the Carnegie Foundation has not taken final action on the matter, it will do so when its board next meets—and that the various States will carry one-third of the expense of this very ambitious survey, my own State having paid the $3,000 which was its part for that purpose. Of course, it is desirable to have the survey made with all possible speed, so that if there are existing institutions which can be enlarged and placed upon a stronger basis by the beginning of the fall term, that fact will be determined and their programs will be incorporated in the program which will operate under this compact.

So, Mr. President, I am hopeful that the Senate will take early and favorable action upon this measure. It is a measure of far-reaching importance. In the humble judgment of the junior Senator from Florida it offers much in the form of increased opportunities to the youth of the whole southern region of our Nation, and I include in my statement the youth of the white race and the youth of the colored race. I wish to make it just as clear as possible that I believe that a failure to make this program operative will cause grave hardship to the young people of both races.

Mr. President, I have one more point to make, and then I shall be through. This point is with reference to Meharry Medical College. Not only is it true that Meharry College has, as I have already stated, turned out 56 percent of the doctors and dentists of the colored race who have been graduated in the United States since 1876, but it is now one of the two institutions which, in general, afford medical and dental training for young men and young women of the Negro race. Those two institutions are Meharry College, at Nashville, Tenn., and Howard University, here in the District of Columbia. I am able to state that the number of young persons of the colored race in the medical schools and the dental schools of both those institutions at this time is, as shown by the record, somewhat in excess of 1,000. In contrast to that, I wish to state for the RECORD that there are only 86 Negro students in all undergraduate classes in all the medical and dental schools outside the southern area. So to a great extent the opportunity for such training—and it is an opportunity which I certainly desire to have continued as well as enlarged and improved—depends on the continuance and support of the two splendid institutions I have just mentioned, namely, Meharry Medical College and Howard University. It happens that the Congress has an opportunity each year to assist in carrying on the program of Howard University, because it operates very largely out of Federal appropriations.

As to Meharry Medical College and as to all the other institutions which will come under this compact, it is not desired or intended that one penny of Federal funds shall be made available to them or shall be sought for their support. The purpose is simply to enable the Southern States more effectively to offer better education to their own youth of both races.

I wish to point out that the record shows that approximately 60 percent of the young people at Meharry Medical College come from the Southern States. Therefore, it is only right and just that the Southern States should contribute to the support of that institution and should thus carry the burden of the education of their own youth.

What we seek in this connection in respect to Meharry Medical College is only incidental to the whole purpose. We hope that that institution will be but one of many. It so happens that so far as Meharry Medical College is concerned. we now have an opportunity to consent to a compact or arrangement under which the Federal Government will not carry the burden of the cost. So that situation will be different from the arrangement in regard to Howard University, in the District of Columbia, where the greater part of the cost is carried by the Federal Government. In the case of Meharry Medical College, not only will the Federal Government be spared the burden of carrying the cost, but the States from which come the majority of the student body at that institution will themselves be allowed to undertake the burden, which should rightly fall on them.

Before I close my remarks, I should like to observe, in order that it may clearly appear that no discrimination is involved in this matter, that my own State of Florida does not have either a medical school or a dental school. As a result, at the present time no way is open to us to assist our young white people to obtain medical or dental training. We hope to make such an opportunity available to them. We hope to provide that opportunity under this program.

But regardless of how long it may take us to work out that problem, the State of Florida and, along with it, every other Southern State, is here offering to take its full share of the burden at Meharry Medical College.

Again I point out that the racial question is wholly incidental to this entire matter, and that insofar as the southern Governors are concerned, they favor this compact as the only clearly available means they see by which a higher level of professional, scientific, and graduate training can be made available to the youth of our entire region; and when I use the term "youth," I mean the youth of both races.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to obtain the opinion of the able Senator from Florida upon a hypothetical case, as related to this compact. He has stated that the State of Florida does not have either a medical school or a dental school, such as exist at Meharry Medical College. If the State of Florida, following the giving of the consent of Congress to this compact, were to provide for a medical school for white persons only, could this compact be used as a basis for saying that there was equal protection of the law, in the sense of what was said in the case of Missouri ex rel. Gaines against Canada where it was stated that—

> The equal protection of the laws is a pledge of the protection of equal laws.

Citing *Yick Wo* v. *Hopkins* (118 U. S. 356, 369):

> Manifestly, the obligation of the State to give the protection of equal laws can be performed only where its laws operate, that is, within its own jurisdiction.

So I ask the Senator whether it might be contended that once the compact is consented to by Congress, it could be used as a basis for setting aside the application of that language, and that it could be contended in the Supreme Court or in the other courts of law that the State of Florida was furnishing a school of equal facilities, as referred to by the Supreme Court.

Mr. HOLLAND. In answer to that question, let me say that I expect it would be so contended, but that in the judgment of the junior Senator from Florida the law, as decided by the United States Supreme Court, would still effectively apply, if the new facility were located in Florida. If both of the facilities were located in the State of Tennessee, let us say, possibly a question could arise. That question is no different, I call to the attention of the Senator from Michigan, from the question which now exists as between the facilities of the University of Florida at Gainesville and those offered by the colored college at Tallahassee. It seems to me that the enactment of this joint resolution and the approval of this compact would in no way and in no sense and to no degree whatever change the legal, constitutional question which is presented. I have so stated to the Senator privately, and I now state it for the record as being my judgment in the matter, although I state only my own judgment, of course.

Let me go further by saying that we are not hopeful of having in Florida all the joint institutions which would be set up under this compact. In fact, we might not even have any of them. For instance, it was stated at the hearings—either by the Governor of Florida or by someone else—that there was already under negotiation with the State of Alabama a tentative arrangement under which our young people might attend the veterinary school located at Auburn in that State—which day before yesterday paid such high and signal honor to its distinguished junior Senator whom I see here—thus enabling our young people to have the benefit of the excellent facilities of that institution. Even so, that institution needs bigger and better facilities and could obtain them under such a plan. It may be that such an arrangement will be worked out.

Mr. President, there are infinite possibilities in this program because many of the Southern States do not have medical schools, and more than half of them do not have dental schools. I do not have before me at this time the statistics as to schools teaching veterinary science; and, of course, there are other divisions and branches of science which are not now represented at all by any schools or institutions in the Southern States.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I understand the situation, if the Southern States were to provide in the South a medical school for white students only, to be supported jointly by the Southern States, it could be contended, could it not, that there would be segregation, because the Meharry Medical College would take care of the colored students, providing them with facilities equal to those of some other white school?

Mr. HOLLAND. It could be so contended, yes; just as it can now be contended, though it has not been, that the facilities at the A. & M. school for Negroes at Tallahassee are not equal to those furnished at the University of Florida for white students.

Mr. FERGUSON. So, as I understand, the compact would perpetuate segregation in the South, or could be used for that purpose.

Mr. HOLLAND. All I would say to the Senator is that nothing can perpetuate segregation in the South but the determination of the Federal legal question in the first instance, and the question of policy in the second instance by the States themselves.

If the Senator will refer for a moment to the printed record he will find on pages 126 and following a complete compendium of the constitutional and statutory provisions in the various States—and, by the way, they are not all included in the compact—which have racial segregation in education. Upon reading those various provisions the Senator will note that the differences are many and that the problems are problems which will have to be left to the people of the several States, including both the white people and the colored people, to determine for themselves what constitutional and statutory policy they want to follow. Further than that, I think it is impossible to answer the Senator's question.

There are two problems, neither of which I think is affected in the slightest by the adoption of the compact: First, the legal problem, a judicial problem for the determination of the application of the Constitution of the United States to such facts as may arise; second, the question of public policy, to be determined by each of the States affected—in most cases, in a most solemn way, because in nearly all cases the provisions on this subject are constitutional, as the Senator will note from the compilation to which I have referred.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President——

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, does the Senator from New York desire to discuss this matter?

Mr. IVES. That was the intention of the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I am very much in sympathy, from an educational standpoint, with the over-all educational purpose which presumably is intended to be effectuated by the compact. Wherever greater opportunity for educational advancement or for the raising—so to speak—of educational standards, is offered, I am in favor of that kind of opportunity. I am not quite clear, in view of the terms of the compact and of the discussion regarding it which has taken place this afternoon, exactly what is intended with regard to educational standards; nor am I quite clear as to the manner in which the able Senator from Florida intends to amend the House joint resolution for the purpose of clarifying, so to speak, the matter of segregation. I, for one, can never favor legislation which in any way authorizes or condones segregation. To my way of thinking, segregation is utterly contrary to the basic concepts of our American way of life.

I have talked with the able Senator from Florida about the matter, and I think so far as the question of segregation is concerned, an amendment which I shall offer may meet with his approval.

In the matter of the standard of education, Mr. President, we are dealing with something else. I think it is generally recognized that one of the great problems which is at stake or which is basic in dealing with this question of segregation in the South has been the question of standardization of education. Everyone acquainted with the educational field recognizes that any kind of second-class education, insofar as it affects any segment of our society, will always react to the great disadvantage of that segment and also of society as a whole. It has seemed to me over the years that one of the great needs of education in this country is to raise its standard throughout the United States, and raise it so that it becomes uniform, insofar as it may be possible to have a uniform standard, throughout our whole country.

I feel very strongly, Mr. President, that if the Negroes in the South were to be favored, over a period of years, with a standard of education equivalent in all respects to that with which the white students living in the South are favored, many of the difficulties with which the South is confronted would be thereby eliminated. For this reason, Mr. President, I am not in accord with the joint resolution as now drafted, and I shall propose an additional amendment to require that there be a uniform standard

of education among all the institutions that may be affected by the legislation. In this manner, Mr. President, the way should be paved toward improvement of educational facilities, in the first instance in the South, to be sure, but by its broad influence, throughout the country as a whole.

If there is one area where we are lacking today, it is the field of education throughout the country. That is the principal reason I gave my solid support to Senate bill 472, when it was before the Senate. To be sure, the bill did not contain all the requirements and standards of the type I am now indicating, which I might have desired, but it represented a great step forward. Here, in the present instance, we have a piece of legislation which can be turned into a great step forward, but in taking this step let us make sure that some of the things which education is intended to remove, will be removed, and that some of the corrections which education properly administered should make, will be made. For this reason, Mr. President, I am offering an amendment to the House joint resolution.

I do not think the able Senator from Florida has yet offered any amendment to House Joint Resolution 334. Therefore I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Perhaps the Senator was not present when I began my statement. I stated that in taking up the House joint resolution instead of the Senate joint resolution, the Senate committee amendment would be offered to apply to the House joint resolution. My understanding is that the chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate will offer to the House joint resolution the identical committee amendments which were incorporated in the Senate resolutions. The situation is exactly the same as it would have been if the question had come up upon the Senate resolution, except that the House resolution having been passed, we are taking that up in order to expedite the whole proceeding.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, what I am endeavoring to do I think can be brought about in the manner I propose as well as by the other process. What I am offering by my amendment is contained in the amendments to the Senate joint resolution which was before us, except that my amendment is made to apply to the House resolution, and incorporates the ideas which I have just enunciated in the debate. If my ideas, as I have written them into the amendment, are not satisfactory to the Senate, it is easy enough to have them remedied by a perfecting amendment. The only way by which I could then approach the matter would be by trying to perfect the amendment as offered by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee or the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom reference has been made by the able Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 7, it is proposed to strike out "America", and to insert "America: *Provided*, That the consent of Congress to this compact shall not in any way be construed as approving segregation in education: *Provided further*, That the planning, establishment, acquisition, and operation of educational institutions shall include uniform standards of education under the said compact entered into February 8, 1948, and shall not be in conflict with the Constitution of the United States."

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, in order to explain what I have proposed, I want to point out that if Senators will look at page 2, line 12, of Senate Joint Resolution 191, they will find the basis of the amendment which I have offered. Beginning in line 12 the amendment reads:

> America: *Provided*, That the consent of Congress to this compact shall not in any way be construed as an endorsement of segregation in education—

I stop there, because I deleted, in the amendment which I have just offered, the words "an endorsement of" and substituted the single word "approving."

I read further:

> *Provided further*, That the planning, establishment, acquisition, and operation of educational institutions be not in conflict with the Constitution of the United States under the said compact entered into February 8, 1948.

I make a change there by adding in line 16, as it appears in the Senate joint resolution, this language. After the word "institutions" I incorporate: "shall include uniform standards of education for all such institutions under the said compact entered into February 8, 1948, and shall not be in conflict with the Constitution of the United States."

If it be desired to change that language and return to the original wording as it appears in the amendment to the Senate joint resolution, this can be done by offering perfecting amendments or modifying amendments to the amendment which I have offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, as I understand the amendment offered by the able Senator from New York, it would provide that Congress shall not approve segregation in education. The words used by the committee were that Congress was not endorsing segregation in education, plus a further provision that in case the compact is used by the various Southern States to build so-called white schools and so-called colored schools, there shall be uniformity in the educational institutions so that the facilities of a colored school and the education it provides shall be equal to those of a white school.

Mr. President, I opposed the compact in the Senate Judiciary Committee and voted against it, because I felt that it would perpetuate segregation in education. I agree that there is nothing more important in America than education. I think we can look all about us and find that we need institutions of higher learning. We need to have more students attend such institutions. I am firmly of the opinion that segregation in education, as it has been carried on, is not a good thing, and that the Congress of the United States should not perpetuate it. Eighteen colored students attend the great medical school of the University of Michigan. There are more colored students in that institution than in any other so-called white institution in the United States. I believe that under that system the colored students who attend that institution receive a better medical education than they would receive if they attended an institution in which there were only colored students.

Mr. President, I feel certain that it will not be long, if the Senate passes this resolution, before we shall hear, across the green, in the Supreme Court of the United States, the voices of counsel raised, stating that so far as Meharry College is concerned equal education is provided, and therefore all the Southern States will be able to say that if they build their own white medical institutions and provide for any one State to join them, they have provided equal education. Therefore segregation will continue.

Mr. President, I am informed that Meharry Medical College has performed great service. It has carried on for many years under private endowment. If the question here were only one of continuing Meharry College, it would be one on which we could all agree. I know of no law, I know of nothing, that would prevent the Southern States today, without this compact, giving so much money a year to this institution by legislative act. But that is not what the compact provides for. In the opening paragraph it provides for Meharry College, and then proceeds to say:

> Whereas the said States desire to enter into a compact with each other, providing for the planning and establishment of regional educational facilities.

This question has been before the Supreme Court recently in the case of Sipuel against the board of regents of the University of Oklahoma, in which case the Supreme Court said:

> A Negro, concededly qualified to receive professional legal education offered by a State, cannot be denied such education because of her color. The State must provide such education for her in conformity with the equal protection clause of the fourteenth amendment and provide it as soon as it does for applicants of any other group.

Mr. President, that was a per curiam decision, and covered just about a page. In that case the Court cites *Missouri ex rel. Gaines* v. *Canada* (305 U. S. 337). The facts in that particular case were that the State of Missouri contended that the University of Missouri was to take only white students, and that since the State would pay the tuition and the transportation of colored students to other States which provided a law school such as the University of Missouri maintained, therefore Missouri could require the student, Gaines, to go to Kansas or some other State, as the case might be, and attend law school there. The Court said:

> The equal protection of the laws is "a pledge of the protection of equal laws." Manifestly, the obligation of the State to give

the protection of equal laws can be performed only where its laws operate, that is, within its own jurisdiction.

I am convinced it will be contended that the institution provided for, Meharry College, a school for colored students, is an institution in the jurisdiction of the Southern States, and therefore they can provide within their borders for an equal school for the white students only.

Mr. President, that would be tantamount to the Congress of the United States perpetuating segregation. I, for one, feel that while there is a need for education, for higher education, we would not be benefiting education in America by ratifying this compact, and therefore I shall feel compelled to vote against the joint resolution.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to speak very briefly on House Joint Resolution 334. I desire to say at the outset that I associate myself completely with the very able remarks made by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and with the equally able remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

Before I discuss an amendment I shall offer, I wish to make three points on the joint resolution. First, I share the view of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] that no compact is necessary to enable the Southern States to proceed to set up regional schools if they care to do so. Furthermore, I do not think that the Congress of the United States, under the wording of the joint resolution, should sanction the type of regional schools which I think it will be possible to set up under the joint resolution unless certain protecting amendments are added.

My first point is, Mr. President, that I see no necessity for the compact in order to accomplish the end which the Southern States have in mind if their primary objective is to provide regional schools. I know of no legal impediments to their setting up regional schools. I know of no legal requirements that makes it necessary for them to first secure the approval of Congress.

The second point I wish to make is that it is my good-faith opinion that the compact, if approved by the Congress of the United States, will strengthen the cause of segregation in this country. I cannot vote for the joint resolution in its present form because I am satisfied that irrespective of what the express intention may be on the part of the proponents of the joint resolution, litigation in the whole field of civil rights is bound to arise from time to time in the courts of America, and what the Congress of the United States does on any particular piece of legislation is bound to have great influence upon any court in determining what public policy shall be within the meaning of existing law and the Constitution.

I am not one who ever ignores the fact that public policy is at least interpreted, and in a sense developed, by the courts of America from the terminology of statutes and resolutions passed by Congress. I would even go so far as to say, Mr. President, that within the judicial function itself it is proper and legitimate for the courts to take into account the flexibility of the Constitution in adjusting to changes in social mores and public policy as recognized and formulated by the Congress. In fact I think the Constitution's great strength is its dynamics. By that I mean its flexibility so that it can be interpreted, and properly so, in accordance with the new problems and new policies of each new era of our national life.

I think the history of the decisions of the United States Supreme Court are filled with examples of the Court adjusting the Constitution to the mores of a given generation. Such judicial adjustments of the Constitution to an ever-changing American society come about slowly, and rightly so, in the interest of stability of government by law. I think that is a perfectly proper and legitimate exercise of the judicial function. But the important thing to remember is that our Constitution is a dynamic and not a static document. The recent decision on real-estate covenants proves my point. It is a dynamic document because our forefathers were so far-seeing and so wise and so learned in their understanding of the relationship between the law and a progressing society. They so framed the Constitution of the United States as to include within it great flexible terms rich in their meaning and adjustable to new social conditions, new emergencies, and new crises as they developed from time to time. That explains, in my opinion, why the Supreme Court has, after all, been the great balancing power, the great stabilizer in American democracy. It has recognized the importance of change through law. We should not forget that judicial interpretations make law, too. The flexibility of the Constitution is one reason why it has been unnecessary to add very many amendments to the Constitution as we have proceeded in the development of our country down through the decades.

Such phrases as "due process," and "equal protection of the laws," both legal concepts inherent in any discussion of this broad field of civil rights, are so flexible in their meaning and their adaptability that I am satisfied that the Constitution for many years to come will be adjustable to new crises as they arise in this country over civil rights without the necessity of a great many amendments thereto.

But I say in applying this point of view of constitutional law, Mr. President, to the problem pending before the Senate, that what we do as a Congress in sanctioning the contents of this compact is bound to have its effect on the interpretation of the law by the courts of the country. It will have a direct bearing upon court interpretations of congressional intent as to public policy on segregation. I can just hear learned counsel in the Supreme Court of the United States when cases reach there arising out of the problems which, in my judgment, will be created by this compact, arguing persuasively and maybe effectively, that the sanctioning of this compact by Congress, if we adopt this compact, justifies the court in holding that segregation in regional schools would be consistent with sound public policy as expressed by Congress. I think that the decision of Missouri ex rel. Gaines against Canada to the extent that it sanctions segregation in State schools should not be extended to regional schools. I think that decision should be expanded to meet new social problems which are going to develop over the years in the field of civil rights. I think, as the struggle for putting into practice what I think are the clear guaranties of the Constitution as to civil rights becomes more crystalized in public opinion in America the people of the country will insist upon a public policy that denies the application of the principle of segregation to a citizen's legal relations with government.

So I say, under the second point, that I feel that the sanctioning of the compact by the Congress will set back the cause of civil rights. I think it will have the tendency to prevent us from progressing as rapidly as I think we ought to progress in the field of giving full protection to the civil rights of all people in the country. Of course I recognize there are honest and good-faith differences in points of view on this subject, but I happen to belong to that school of thought in America which believes that segregation cannot be reconciled with civil rights as intended under our Constitution. I call it one of the basic tenets of constitutional liberalism. I hope and trust and believe that in due course of time the Supreme Court of the United States, under an appropriate set of facts, with issues properly joined, will so decide.

I rise to oppose the compact, because I believe, Mr. President, that underlying it is the hope, at least on the part of some, that it may be used as a legal instrumentality for perpetuating segregation for a period of time beyond what otherwise it will be perpetuated if we do not sanction the compact. As I read it and study its history and analyze it in light of Missouri ex rel. Gaines against Canada, I reach the conclusion that there are some who see through this compact a legal opportunity for seeking to meet the segregation problem in the field of higher education by way of the establishment of regional schools on a basis of racial discrimination.

That leads me to my third point. Certainly in the field of higher education, certainly when we are dealing with adult minds searching for the truth, seeking to make new scientific discoveries through the research laboratories and classrooms of our institutions of higher learning, we ought to be willing to agree now that we have reached that stage in our advance toward the ultimate objective of putting civil rights into practice according to their true meanings under our Constitution to do away with segregation in our universities. At least we should not even indirectly give congressional sanction to the establishment of a public policy of segregation. We should be willing to say that a majority of the Congress of the United States, in May 1948, will not put its stamp of approval on any compact which would permit the establishment with Federal sanction of schools

based upon discrimination because of race, color, or creed.

Because I fear that this compact in its present terms would aid the cause of discrimination and set back the cause nondiscrimination, I am urging the amendment which I am about to offer.

I think my record is clear. In the face of much criticism from time to time I have told groups in America who want to progress too rapidly in the field of this very serious racial problem which confronts America that we cannot make progress by way of a social avalanche. We cannot solve the problems of civil rights overnight. It will require social conditioning through the forces of education over the years to bring our people to the realization that the racial problem is inherently bound up in the great fight for freedom which is taking place all over the world. That fight will not be completely won in America until we start by specific action to give to minority groups full protection of their civil rights, which many of them, including the colored race, do not now enjoy.

Rather than sanction this compact, I think the Congress ought to indicate that it is ready to take what I think is a very reasonable step, a minimum step, a proper step, by saying that if any group of States wishes us as a Congress to sanction any regional school program which they wish to adopt, there are certain basic principles of civil rights which they must guarantee in their compact before we will sanction it.

As I read the compact and as I read the suggested amendments to the compact—save and except the amendments submitted by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], with which amendments I find myself in complete accord—I do not believe that the other suggested amendments come to grips with unequivocal clearness on segregation. I think we are entitled on this issue to have a clear-cut statement in the compact against discrimination because of race, color, or creed.

I want to move beyond Missouri ex rel. Gaines against Canada. I want to move beyond Sipuel against Board of Regents. I want to move now into that legal issue which I think the time has come to establish by way of precedent—that discrimination in institutions of higher learning in this country on the ground of race, color, or creed is disapproved by the Congress of the United States as a matter of national policy. I think we should make clear in our action on this compact that it is the conviction of the majority of Congress that such discrimination cannot be squared with the civil-rights guaranties in the Constitution. This compact, in fact, should be looked upon by the Congress as introducing for full debate all phases of civil-rights legislation.

I know that meeting major issues such as this is never pleasant. The history of the Congress of the United States from the time of our beginning shows that historic battles have been fought on the floor of the United States Senate, giving true life and meaning to the great guaranties of individual liberty and civil rights under the Constitution. Honest men, men in good faith—just as in this instance—have differed and will continue to differ over the true meaning of American democracy as guaranteed in the Constitution.

We are walking across the congressional stage for only a few years, Mr. President, but this great fight to give to all the people of our country equal rights, so far as their legal relations to government under the Constitution are concerned, is a fight which is going on until it is won. Freemen will forever struggle to see to it that those rights are made available to their brethren as long as we have freedom in this country. Of course, if we ever lose the basic spiritual motivation of the Constitution itself, the situation will be different. After all, the Constitution is but a byproduct of the Declaration of Independence, which was phrased in terms of the spiritual values of individual rights. I submit that our Constitution is based upon the Christian teaching that all men are equal in the eyes of the Creator. That is the essence of constitutional liberalism in America. Therefore, if we are to preserve democracy in this country over the years, we must eventually come to the type of decision for which I am pleading this afternoon.

Hence because I think this compact cannot be reconciled with the principles of democracy for which I am pleading, and because I think it could be used, and would be used, by able lawyers to set back the great cause of human freedom, I cannot vote for it in its present form. I submit that no matter by what language forms an attempt is made to rationalize out of this compact the issue of civil rights in America, the joint resolution raises it on the floor of the Senate just as much as an FEPC bill, an antilynching bill, an anti-poll-tax bill, or any other of the so-called civil-rights bills within the President's civil-rights program would raise the issue. I think we ought to vote on it knowing full well that no verbal dressing can ignore the fact that, if we sanction this compact, we indirectly, at least, in my opinion, sanction segregation.

So I suggest that there be added, after the word "America", in line 7, on page 2, of this joint resolution, the following——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I shall yield as soon as I complete my main statement.

Mr. President, as I was about to state, I suggest that there be added to the joint resolution, on page 2, in line 7, after the word "America", the following language:

: *Provided,* That any regional school established under this compact shall not apply to any student registration qualifications based upon a discrimination because of race, color, or creed: *Provided further,* That any regional school established under this compact shall maintain standards of education which comply with the minimum standards required for approved rating by the standard accrediting agencies of higher education in the United States.

By standard accrediting agencies I mean such agencies as the Association of American Universities.

Mr. President, I offer this amendment because it certainly raises, as clearly as I can raise it, the issue as to whether the Congress of the United States will sanction a compact which, without the inclusion of this precise language, might permit, under the compact, the establishment of regional schools with approval of the Federal Government, which might be limited to Negroes or to any other minority group, or which might permit the setting up of standards which do not meet the minimum standards for higher education in accredited institutions, as such standards are set forth from time to time by the Association of American Universities.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I shall yield to the Senator in just a moment.

Mr. President, if the Southern States wish to have the sanction of the Federal Government for this compact—even in view of the first point I made, which is that I see no necessity for the compact if the Southern States wish to proceed on their own in establishing regional schools and taking their chances in the courts on the question whether those regional schools, set up under whatever standards they see fit to set them up under, violate the Constitution, then I think they should agree to my amendment. As they are not willing to accept it, then I think we should face the entire question of civil rights, which, I think, is raised by this compact.

Now I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

I understood him to say that he would not favor having the Congress give its approval to this compact because in his judgment that would result in giving congressional approval to the continuation of segregation in education.

I wonder how the Senator feels about having Congress give its approval to appropriations for Howard University, particularly the appropriation of more than $4,000,000 of Federal funds for it for the present fiscal year. That is an appropriation with which I am wholeheartedly in accord, but it is for the maintenance of segregated education. So I should like to know how the Senator from Oregon justifies his support of that appropriation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am pleased to inform the Senator from Florida that Howard University is not a segregated institution, but that it admits white students. At the present time it has white students in its law school, so I am informed. At least I understand that white students are not excluded from Howard University. There are a number of them in attendance there. Furthermore, I wish to say this—and I do so on the assumption that the Senator from Florida could find some school in aid of which Federal money is appropriated, and in which a principle of segregation is applied that I am opposed to any extension of such a program. I think I can help the Senator on that point by mentioning a type of school to which probably Federal money goes even though there is segregation; I think some of the money which goes to the States, by means of

the Smith-Hughes Act, for the benefit of high schools throughout the country, goes to schools in which there is segregation: All I can say to the Senator on that point is that I think it becomes a matter of degree. I do not like segregation, wherever I find it in the school systems of this country, but I do not think it would be appropriate for me to take the position that long-established appropriation policies in connection with giving aid to the agricultural schools of the South, for instance, should be voted against by the junior Senator from Oregon simply because he does not like the fact that a program of segregation is followed in those schools. I do not think that this problem should be attacked indirectly through appropriations. Further I would say that today the Senator from Florida is asking the junior Senator from Oregon to vote in the first instance for what will constitute a new precedent in this field of racial problems. I think it is quite proper, consistent, and logical for the junior Senator from Oregon to take the position that when called upon now to establish a new policy—as I honestly believe one would be established under this compact—inasmuch as I believe, as I do, on this subject of civil rights, I should oppose this compact unless the amendments I have offered to it are included in it.

Now I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I together with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] constituted the two members of the subcommittee which took the evidence in this case. I wish at those hearings we had had the benefit of the advice of the distinguished Senator from Oregon who has just spoken, and also that of the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

At the appropriate time I shall have something to say in regard to this particular measure.

I rise at this time to pose a question to the distinguished Senator from Oregon. To my mind there is no doubt that the Congress of the United States can impose a condition upon a compact of this kind, but certainly we must make sure that any such condition in itself is constitutional.

As is set forth in the printed record in this case, there are 16 States which have constitutional provisions relative to segregation. If I correctly understood the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States on this subject, up to the present time that Court has held that segregation is constitutional if there is equality.

Until recently we in the Congress have considered education to be a matter for local decision. That was my point of view until during the last World War it was found that 1,200,000 of our young men were not qualified to serve in the armed forces because they had not passed the fourth grade in school. Until that fact was known, I had felt that education was 100 percent a matter for decision in the local communities. But when that fact became apparent, I felt there was a Federal issue, a Federal equation in the matter. So I voted for the Taft bill.

This matter raises another problem, and it is in this connection that I have referred to the 16 Commonwealths which have consitutional provisions relative to segregation. Of course, those States basically have a right to determine the educational processes which shall apply within their own territory, so long as they do not run contrary to the constitutional rights of citizens of the United States. As I have said, those States have in their constitutions, their basic laws, provisions for segregation. I have already stated that in a number of cases the Supreme Court has held, as I believe, that such segregation provisions are constitutional, provided there is equality.

If the Senator will pardon me for a moment, I want to say I am not in favor of segregation. I listened with interest and profit to everything the Senator said. I honor him for his earnest and sincere conviction. But this afternoon we were discussing on the floor the world picture. We were talking about a solution of the over-all problem, about changing, or not changing, the Charter of the United Nations. It seems to me, Mr. President, that despite what may be said about mechanisms, unless the heart and spirit of the individual are in harmony with the Golden Rule, the mechanisms do not accomplish the desired result.

In the Southland, there is a problem. The South has not, since the Civil War, had the benefit of a program such as ERP. I know there are many inequalities. The representatives of the 16 commonwealths came before our committee. Neither he nor the Senator from New York lent us any assistance. We listened to testimony of both sides. I have before me a stack of about 400 or 500 letters, some of which came from colored people of Africa, some from students of Meharry College, requesting that the compact be approved. I may say that we, of the North, in spite of our pretensions and our talk about nonsegregation, do not live it. The Senator from Michigan spoke of 16 colored students in a university having a student body of 20,000, as if that proved the nonexistence of segregation. But look at the other 86 universities in the North. We had better clean our own skirts.

Mr. President, I am off the question, but I shall return to it. The governors and other representatives of the South feel that their combined economic strength can give educational facilities to both white and colored students such as the students could not obtain otherwise.

There was written into the pending measure, on a suggestion that came, I think, from a Negro professor in Howard University, a provision to the effect that the consent of Congress to the compact should in no way be considered as an endorsement of segregation in education, and providing that the planning, acquisition, establishment, and operation of educational institutions, under the compact entered into February 8, 1948, should not be in conflict with the Constitution of the United States. That amendment was adopted by the committee, Mr. President, because the argument was advanced, probably not so aptly as here, that the measure would perpetuate segregation. In my humble opinion, if the joint resolution is not passed 500 earnest students at Meharry College will be thrown into the streets, and another blow will be dealt the South.

I have no reason to be particularly grateful to Senators who threw out my St. Lawrence seaway project, and who are now after my butter and almost everything else; but I think I am able to overlook such things, if I see merit in a proposition. Every time a great constructive program comes before the Senate, there are those who oppose it. That is no reflection on my distinguished friend from Oregon.

But I return to the question, which is based on the true assumption that 16 States have constitutional provisions permitting segregation, that the Supreme Court of the United States has not overruled those provisions, and that they are the law of the land. It has just been stated that when a school is opened for white students, the same opportunity must be given to colored students. In the State of Florida there are no medical schools, hence colored students cannot look to the State for medical education. But they, thank God, can look to Meharry College. They can go there as long as it remains open. Historically, Meharry College was established as a private Methodist institution. Funds with which to continue its operation are no longer in sight.

Colored professors appeared before the committee pleading for this legislation. I could read heart-rending letters from the students at Meharry College and elsewhere. The question I would ask is, Under the facts, as I have shown them to be, can we constitutionally impose the condition set forth in the House joint resolution?

I thank the Senator for permitting me to conclude what I had to say.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall answer the Senator's question, but before doing so, I am sure he will agree it is entirely proper for me to make some further remarks. The Senator did much more than ask a question. He raised many other points that I must not permit to go unanswered.

The first point on which I want to comment is a kindly suggestion of his which I appreciate, and which I am sure my friend the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] appreciates. He suggests that we would have been most welcome had we appeared before the Judiciary Committee in connection with the resolution when it was in the committee. I am sure my friend from Wisconsin does not want to leave in the RECORD even an implication that because we did not appear before his committee on this matter, we are now estopped from presenting our point of view on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I should like to point out to the able Senator from Oregon that the sentiment which he is now expressing represents exactly my feeling in the matter. I do not know why the junior Senator from New York should be expected to appear at a hearing on a bill of this nature.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. MORSE. I suggest the Senator from New York finish his statement.

Mr. IVES. I simply want to point out, following the thought expressed by the Senator from Oregon, that I would reserve my right to consider this legislation when it appeared on the floor, as it has now done. There is much legislation in the Senate in which I have a distinct interest, but as to which it would be physically impossible for me to appear at all the hearings. That applies to the pending measure.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I yield further, I want to add to this point that the Senator from New York expresses also my view. I want to point out to my good friend from Wisconsin that I daresay if I started to give him an examination now on legislation pending, even before the committees of which I am a member, to say nothing about other committees of which neither he nor I are members, that he would fail that examination. If I asked him to list the bills that are pending before those committees he could not name many. He knows no more about scores of those bills than I. I want the record to show that I did not know that this compact was pending before the Senator's committee. I did not know of it until it reached the floor of the Senate. The same is true, of course, of each and every Member of this body, with respect to scores of bills.

I did not have the opportunity, as a result of my own lack of knowledge that the compact was pending before the Senator's committee, of testifying before the committee. Furthermore, as the Senator from New York has pointed out we cannot begin to appear before all the committees to testify on all bills that may be pending before them, on which we have very definite opinions.

Furthermore, I want to say good naturedly to my good friend from Wisconsin that my confidence in him as chairman of the Judiciary Committee was so complete that, had I known the compact was pending before his committee, I would not have asked to testify on it because I would have been certain that he would never bring to the Senate a favorable report on the compact.

I am at a loss to understand my good friend from Wisconsin. I do not understand how this compact won his approval, but I know that he has reached an honest judgment on it, though, I think, an ill-advised one. I think he is overlooking the fundamental problems involved in the compact.

Now, Mr. President, to answer the specific question——

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. WILEY. I should like to clear up one particular point. I do not see how it is possible that the distinguished Senators interpreted my remarks as a criticism of their failure to appear before the committee. I know how well they like to talk on this floor, how well they like to raise constitutional questions, and how well they represent their constituents. I assure them that there was no thought on my part of suggesting any failure on their part. It was rather that I regretted that I could not have had the benefit of their judgment and that of the distinguished chairman of the Democratic Party [Mr. McGRATH] before the subcommittee. If they had appeared we might have avoided this argument. But I do not think that would be desirable.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I merely want to reply to the statement of the Senator from Wisconsin regarding the raising of constitutional questions on the floor. The junior Senator from New York is at a great disadvantage in not being a member of the legal profession. Far be it from him to raise any constitutional questions.

Mr. WILEY. I do not think there is any constitutional inhibition in the Senator from New York. I think he has raised a very fine question in his amendment, and that, together with the suggested amendment of the distinguished Senator from Oregon, poses a very interesting legal question which I will now ask the Senator from Oregon to clear up.

Mr. MORSE. First, Mr. President, I want to say in regard to the friendly comment which my colleague from Wisconsin made regarding the fact that the Senator from New York and the Senator from Oregon seemed to enjoy making speeches on the floor of the Senate, that, speaking for myself, I early found, after coming to the Senate, that the best place for me to present my point of view, if it should receive consideration on its merits, was on the floor of the Senate. So long as the junior Senator from Oregon finds himself in the particular position which he occupies within the party organization of the Senate, he will always press his point of view on the floor of the Senate, whenever he thinks it needs to be called to the attention of the people of this country.

To reply to the Senator's question, I started to say that, assuming congressional sanction of the compact is necessary—and I deny that assumption—it must be necessary because some Federal issue is involved. It must be the theory of the proponents that some Federal prerogative is involved, some Federal right or question of constitutional law is involved. It must be that they think that the States would not be allowed, under existing law, to proceed without Federal approval. If that assumption is to be granted for the sake of argument, then I say, Mr. President, assuming a Federal jurisdiction, there is nothing unconstitutional in laying down as a condition to such a compact the provision that there shall be no discrimination on the basis of race, color, or creed. Rather, to the contrary, Mr. President, it is my view as a lawyer that if that assumption is to be granted and congressional approval is necessary, we would violate the Constitution by not laying down a requirement of no discrimination on the basis of race, color, or creed, because the Missouri case and the Oklahoma case are based entirely upon State jurisdiction. They rest upon interpretations of State laws, upon a State system of jurisprudence, and upon the application of the equal protection of the laws and the due process clause to State laws. If we have to have Federal approval for the establishment of a regional school covering an area which extends beyond the boundaries of a State, then, Mr. President, the courts would be faced entirely with Federal law and the constitutional rights which apply on a Nation-wide basis.

As our constitutional law has developed in this country in the whole field of civil rights we see that up to this time there has been some distinction drawn by the courts between what a State can do and what the Federal Government can do.

My specific reply to the Senator from Wisconsin is that if it be necessary to have Federal approval of the compact, then the Federal laws in regard to civil rights, as the Constitution is applied to the Nation as a whole, would apply. I think, assuming the Senator's premise to be correct, that a failure to put in a nondiscriminatory clause would itself be unjustifiable. As chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary he must, in my judgment, either take the position that congressional approval of the compact is not necessary; and if it is not necessary, then let the States proceed in their own way, subject to the gradual litigation of the problem from year to year, as the questions of civil rights go to the courts; or he must take the position that Federal sanction is necessary. If Federal sanction is necessary, then, as far as a sound national policy is concerned, we are duty bound to lay down a principle of nondiscrimination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

Mr. WILEY and Mr. TAYLOR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, if I correctly understood the reply of my good friend from Oregon—and I am not sure that I did—it was that in the case of any Federal or interstate compact the Federal Government could impose any condition whatsoever. That is not the law of the land. The law is that the condition must be constitutional. The Senator further said that the condition could be imposed that white persons and colored persons should be treated alike, equally. That is the decision of the

Court. But whether the Court would then say that two schools could not be constructed, I do not know. I do not know what the Supreme Court would say as to that, in view of the fact that education is a local matter and has been so held. We never thought otherwise until we found out that there was a national interest, due to the failure of certain men in the last conflict to measure up to certain standards.

In view of the fact that the hour is late, in view of the fact that I personally feel that the subject cannot be disposed of quickly, now that this very interesting question has been raised, and in view of the further fact that I have to take a train in the course of the next hour, I shall ask that the acting majority leader let the joint resolution go over. But before that request is made, I want to place certain matters into the RECORD, because I cannot neglect my obligation to the appeal of some of my colored brothers who see this question in but one way, although like most issues debated in this distinguished body, there are two sides.

I have before me, Mr. President, many letters which have come from interested boys and girls who fear their education will be stopped half way. They are entitled to some consideration. In the Meharry institution in Tennessee the education of 500 or 600 students will be brought to an end unless it is continued. The only way it will be continued is for the Southern States, under this compact, to join their economic strength to keep alive that institution. Meharry College was not built by the Southern States to avoid the constitutional rights of any of the colored people. It was built by the Methodists of this land for the colored people, and it is interesting to note that more colored people from the North attend Meharry, as I recall the record, than from the South.

I have in front of me a letter dated April 20, which I shall ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point. It comes from the Gold Coast in Africa.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIS MAJESTY'S CUSTOMS,
POST OFFICE BOX 54, TAKORADI,
Gold Coast, West Africa, April 20, 1948.

DEAR SIR: It is the desire to help my fellow men and the ambition to explore the world of medicine that urge me to send you this letter.

For many a long year have I wished to become a medical doctor, not for the honor attached to the profession, but for the satisfaction I hope to derive from healing mankind.

To make my hopes and dreams become real, I have written to the Meharry Medical College for assistance. Yet, though I am ambitious and determined, my weak financial status almost refutes my desire to attain any height in learning. But so confident I am in the dictum, "Where there is a will, there is a way," that I wrote to Meharry for financial aid.

Meharry, like a good mother, did not discard my desires. She expressed the willingness to help me, but how? Her funds, I am informed, are running out and must needs get succor from some source of hope, the Southern Regional Council for Education. Still, while this beacon of hope is in sight, the sanction of the Congress is needed to reach it.

As a prospective student of Meharry, as a future mender of men's bodies, and as a young aspirant in the field of medical science for the progress of the world at large, I wish to solicit your goodness and benevolence to sanction the compact for funds by passing the Senate Joint Resolution 191.

I do not wish to dictate to you, nor is it my desire to impress you with my viewpoint. I am only praying for help. I am certain that when Meharry continues to operate and I am admitted, I shall be counted an invaluable asset to mankind.

I am determined but I need help. I am willing but I want your sanction of the compact. I am ready but I require your push. I have strong presentiments of object failure in life and wholesale bankruptcy if Meharry fails me. In short, I shall be a nonentity in the world and a burden to my neighbors, the direct opposite of my ambitions, if I do not have even the chance to attend Meharry.

I therefore most humbly request your good-naturedness to aid Meharry. Though I am not American by birth, yet my ambition knows no barrier and I am therefore only anxious to help human beings no matter their color, creed, race or class.

I have now to draw to a close; but may I express the sanguine hope that I shall soon be able to avail myself of your goodness through the Meharry Medical College.

With many thanks, I remain,
Very truly yours,

A. K. GAITUAH.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have another letter signed J. Vanderpuye, care His Majesty's Customs, post office box 68, Accra, Gold Coast, West Africa. It is addressed to me, and the writer says:

CARE OF HIS MAJESTY'S CUSTOMS,
POST OFFICE BOX 68, ACCRA,
Gold Coast, West Africa, April 21, 1948.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is with the feeling of the greatest concern in the future of Meharry that I have today taken up my pen to address you.

I understand from reliable sources that Meharry, a medical college of great repute in these parts of West Africa, and an institution of health I most highly cherish, is now standing on her last legs financially. This is a very serious affair indeed as far as I am concerned, not to mention what anxious moments this distressing news is giving to friends and intending students of Meharry in the Gold Coast, Liberia, and Nigeria.

But it is with mixed feelings of regret and hope that I write to you today. Regret, that this state of affairs should ever at all exist in a college which I am even now preparing to enter as a student; hope, that with the situation well in your hands, students and well-wishers of Meharry should have no cause to fear, I address you as the only man in whom the safety of Meharry lies in her present plight.

Financial support from the southern regional council for education is Meharry's only hope. The sanction of Congress is necessary to make this support a reality. Your duty as a Senator in this matter is, therefore, plain and simple, to go all out to effect the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 191, which sets a seal to the compact. The eyes of West Africa are now on you, and in discharging your onerous duty, I would only ask you to remember that the collapse of Meharry means a stunning blow to the Negro world, not to mention a personal calamity.

I implore you most earnestly, therefore, to do your duty by the Negro world. You will then have yourself to congratulate on the success of this venture of historic import which alone is your enviable reward without mentioning the Te Deum which posterity will sing in your praise.

May God help you. Long live Meharry.

Thanking you in anticipation, I am,
Yours faithfully,

J. VANDERPUYE.

Mr. President, I have here a letter that comes from Robert C. Cornell, Nashville, Tenn., dated April 12. He says:

As a sophomore dental student of Meharry Medical College, I wish to set forth my reasons why I am for the regional plan, or the bill known as Senate Joint Resolution 191:

1. It will give the States concerned a chance to show their good faith in the education of so many thousands of people who are in dire need of same.

2. It will allow many thousands of people who belong to the minority groups to receive a more just return for their tax money.

3. Failure to pass said bill will not end segregation in education.

That is quite a point—that failure to pass the joint resolution will not end segregation in education.

I wish my colleagues who are opposing this beneficial measure will take that as an issue. If we do not pass the joint resolution, what do we do? We create chaos; we interfere with the joint efforts of the southern blacks and whites. Sixteen States are in this effort. They belong to this great Nation.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is not this an effort—a sincere and aggressive effort—of the people of these 16 States to advance the cause of education among these people who it is said are being segregated? We are trying to advance and spread education and knowledge by combining the resources and abilities of these States in order to provide equal educational opportunities for the colored with the white.

Mr. WILEY. If I did not think that this was an honest effort—a sincere effort—a combining of the hearts as well as the minds and the economy of 16 States to better the conditions in those 16 States, I would not be for it. I wish to say that if I could I would lay down my own life to eradicate the differences which exist between races, not only in this country, but which have been the source of war through the centuries everywhere—conditions such as obtain in Europe today. It would not be anything to lay down one's life if he could accomplish the eradication of these conditions.

The letter continues:

4. Passing of bill will not as such end the struggle for freedom in education.

Here is a colored person analyzing the facts and getting at the truth about which the distinguished Senator from Oregon spoke so ardently. The truth will make men free. It cannot be secured by law or by failure to pass a law, but laws can be vehicles, and have been such vehicles.

5. A failure to pass the bill will deny many veterans a chance to continue their education.

(a) Needless to say that one of the things, no doubt, they had in mind while fighting, was to return home and find many doors of opportunity open.

(b) In good faith many of these doors can be opened through the regional plan of education.

6. Meharry, which is the first unit in the regional plan, will be dealt a death blow by failure to pass the bill.

7. Millions of Negro people are depending upon Meharry's existence for their education, health, and happiness.

8. Failure to pass the bill would mean sure closure of Meharry, but closure would not mean assurance that its large student body (about one-half the entire Negro medical students of America) would be able to complete their courses, take their places in society, and at the same time render their people a much-needed medical service.

Note that one-half of the entire Negro medical students of America are attending Meharry College.

I wish to interject here that those who talk about nonsegregation will have the responsibility. What is to be done with these 200 or 300 Negro boys? Are the universities of the North to be opened up to them? That has not been done, though much has been said about it. I am for it. The responsibility will be on those who oppose this joint resolution if they stop 500 Negro boys in medical and in dental schools from getting the education to which they are entitled if, as this boy says, it is just the beginning of what he hopes will be a better system of education for all concerned.

9. Last but not least, when the monster of segregation in education is slain, Meharry can still take her place among the leading educational institutions of America.

On the basis of these facts I heartily support the regional plan.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT C. CORNELL.

This young man's address is 1720 Scovel Street, Nashville 8, Tenn. The letter is dated April 12, 1948.

These letters are from the types of colored boys who would be prevented from getting the benefit of the type of education represented by the schools which would be affected by the joint resolution now pending, and this is the kind of institution that will be put out of business, which might be the opening wedge of an adventure in education which might mean doing away with segregation.

I should like to ascertain what the wishes of the acting majority leader are.

Mr. WHERRY. I will say, Mr. President, that it is my conviction that the joint resolution now under consideration cannot be acted upon tonight. I make that statement after having canvassed the situation. There are several speeches yet to be made on the subject.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, with the indulgence of the Senate for a couple of minutes I wish to ask for the insertion in the RECORD of two exhibits from the hearings held by the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary on this subject, because I think Senators will be much more apt to read them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD than in this voluminous report.

I first offer for insertion in the RECORD the table appearing on page 45 of the printed hearings, which shows the total number of Negro medical students now enrolled in all medical schools of the Nation aside from Meharry and Howard.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The following list of medical schools shows all Negro medical students now enrolled outside of Meharry and Howard:

1. University of Michigan Medical School	18
2. Wayne Medical School	8
3. Evangelists, California	8
4. University of Illinois	7
5. Columbia, College of Pharmacy and Surgery	7
6. New York University Medical College	6
7. Ohio State	5
8. Yale	3
9. University of California	3
10. Washington University	3
11. University of Pittsburgh	3
12. Women's Medical College of Philadelphia	3
13. Loyola Medical College, Chicago	2
14. Long Island Medical College	2
15. Rochester Medical School	2
16. University of Colorado	1
17. University of Indiana	1
18. University of Iowa	1
19. University of Kansas	1
20. University of Pennsylvania	1
21. Harvard	1
Total	86

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I call the attention of Senators to the fact that that list shows that only 86 Negro medical students are now attending the 21 institutions outside of the South which have any Negro students at all in their medical or dental departments; a total of 86, as compared to between 1,000 and 1,100 in the two institutions, Meharry and Howard.

Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the table on page 40 of the hearings, which shows the schedule of applicants to the Meharry School of Medicine—and the heading should include also the dental school—for 1947 entrance.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Applicants to Meharry's School of Medicine (and Dental School) for 1947 entrance

Region	Accepted applicants	Rejected applicants	Not considered applicants	No action taken	Total
North (premedical training received in nonsegregated schools):					
Connecticut	0	0	1	0	1
Illinois	10	8	12	10	40
Indiana	0	2	8	4	14
Iowa	2	1	0	0	3
Kansas	0	0	3	1	4
Maine	0	0	0	1	1
Massachusetts	0	0	2	0	2
Michigan	4	1	8	2	15
Minnesota	0	2	0	0	2
Missouri	1	4	7	4	16
Nebraska	2	0	0	0	2
New Jersey	1	6	8	5	20
New York	12	18	15	20	65
Ohio	0	7	6	10	23
Pennsylvania	4	10	19	5	38
Total	[1] 36	59	89	62	246

[1] 14.2 percent accepted.

Applicants to Meharry's School of Medicine (and Dental School) for 1947 entrance—Continued

Region	Accepted applicants	Rejected applicants	Not considered applicants	No action taken	Total
South (premedical training received in segregated schools):					
Alabama	9	0	14	8	31
Arkansas	0	3	7	3	13
Delaware	0	2	1	0	3
District of Columbia	1	8	8	3	20
Florida	4	5	14	9	32
Georgia	8	6	17	10	41
Kentucky	1	5	4	4	14
Louisiana	5	6	10	6	27
Maryland	1	3	5	1	10
Mississippi	3	4	12	2	21
North Carolina	7	6	24	5	42
Oklahoma	1	2	3	1	7
South Carolina	1	8	15	11	35
Tennessee	9	4	13	8	34
Texas	6	9	20	14	49
Virginia	5	7	19	11	42
West Virginia	0	1	4	4	9
Total	61	79	190	100	430
West (70 percent received premedical training in segregated schools):					
Arizona	0	0	2	0	2
California	0	6	1	4	11
Colorado	1	0	1	1	3
New Mexico	1	0	0	0	1
Oregon	0	0	1	2	3
Washington	0	0	1	1	2
Total	2	6	6	8	22
United States possessions:					
Puerto Rico	0	0	1	2	3
Virgin Islands	1	0	0	0	1
Total	1	0	1	2	4
Foreign countries:					
Africa	0	0	1	1	2
British West Indies	3	6	6	5	20
Panama	0	1	0	1	2
South America	0	1	1	1	3
Total	3	8	8	8	27
Grand total	103	152	294	180	729

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that 729 youths applied to Meharry in 1947 for admission, of whom 103 only could be admitted because of the size of their facilities.

I call attention to the fact that 36 of those 103 who were admitted came from the northern region of the Nation; that 61 came from the South, that 2 came from the West, and those 2 would have to be added to the 36 to make 38 from the rest of the Nation as a whole outside of the South; and that 1 came from the Virgin Islands, and 3 from the British West Indies, for a total of 103.

I call attention likewise to the fact that whereas no Negro medical students are shown attending any medical school in the State of Oregon, it is shown in this list of applicants for 1947 entrance at Meharry that three citizens of Oregon applied for entrance there in that one class alone.

I note also that as for the State of New York 65 applicants applied in the year 1947 for admission to Meharry, of whom 12 only could be admitted because of the size of the school, which number of 12 compares with the total number of 17 in the four medical schools located in the State of New York, as shown by

the first list inserted in the RECORD, namely, 7 at Columbia, 6 at New York University, 2 at Long Island Medical College, and 2 at Rochester Medical School.

I call attention to these facts so that Senators may have the opportunity to see for themselves that the destruction of Meharry means just exactly what is stated in the letters placed in the RECORD by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]; namely, the destruction of opportunity for medical and dental training for a large number of the college youth of the Nation. I want those facts to be in the RECORD of today's debate.

ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON MONDAY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, preliminary to making a motion to adjourn until Monday next, I now ask unanimous consent that on Monday the Senate proceed to consider the calendar for unobjected to bills, beginning with Order No. 1211. That is the point at which we left off when the calendar was called the last time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 2277) to amend section 13 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, to provide for the disposition of surplus real property to States, political subdivisions, and municipalities for use as public parks, recreational areas, and historic-monument sites, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WADSWORTH, Mr. SNYDER, and Mr. HOLIFIELD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committe of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6055) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2287) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1620) to establish eligibility for burial in national cemeteries, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 6055, making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and I request unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6055) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 50, 52, and 54.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 53, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, and 68, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"TEMPORARY CONGRESSIONAL AVIATION POLICY BOARD

"For an additional amount for salaries and expenses for completion of the work of the Temporary Congressional Aviation Policy Board created by the Act to establish a National Aviation Council, and for other purposes (Public Law 287, Eightieth Congress), to be available until June 30, 1948, and to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers approved by the Chairman, $5,000: *Provided*, That expenditures hereunder shall be made in accordance with the laws applicable to inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

"Such sums as may be necessary (not exceeding $4,500,000) are hereby appropriated for making for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1949 payments to States in accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended (29 U. S. C., ch. 4): *Provided*, That the obligations incurred and expenditures made for such purpose under the authority of this paragraph shall be charged to the appropriation therefor in the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1949: *Provided further*, That the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall not exceed the amount paid to the States for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1948, in accordance with such Vocational Rehabilitation Act,"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,555,532"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$970,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$20,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$262,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,234,815"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,450"; and the Senate agree to the same.

STYLES BRIDGES,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
CLARENCE CANNON,
GEORGE MAHON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, there were three main amendments which led the Senate to reject the report last week. One of them was in the case of a deficiency appropriation of $1,850,000 for the unemployment compensation administration grants to States. The House agreed to an amount of $1,555,532 in lieu of $1,850,000, and also agreed to release $698,000, which had been held in reserve to be released if there were an increase in the work. That is a cut of not quite $300,000, and the conferees were all agreed that that could be absorbed.

In connection with the United States Employment Service item, where the Senate proposed a deficiency appropriation for grants to States of $2,560,000, the conferees agreed on $1,234,815 by subtracting from the total in the Senate bill $1,325,185, which, according to the justifications, was for payments to six States for retroactive State contribution to State retirement funds on behalf of employees who had been in the Federal service for 4 or 5 years during the war, had gone back into State service, and had made a lump payment to the State retirement funds for those 4 or 5 years. This item of one-million-and-three-

hundred-odd-thousand dollars was the State employment contribution to the State retirement fund. It was not disallowed completely, but was deferred for later consideration in a later deficiency bill, because the conferees were not sure that there is any authority in law for a Federal appropriation for that kind of a retroactive contribution.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Is the sum which has now been agreed upon adequate, in the opinion of the conferees on the part of the Senate, to take care of the present situation and continue existing services until such time as permanent legislation is enacted?

Mr. BALL. In the opinion of the conferees on the part of the Senate, it is. I think the Senate conferees were agreed that the amount will take care of the present situation. In the Senate bill the full amount requested was given. As I said, the only thing on which we deferred action was the item for retroactive contribution to a retirement fund, which has nothing to do with continuing the service. In a total of more than $2,500,000 a cut of only $300,000 was made, and the conferees were of the opinion that the States would have no trouble absorbing that amount.

The third amendment in controversy was an appropriation for the naval home at Philadelphia, for which the House had allowed $3,800 and the Senate $9,100. We compromised for the amount of $6,450.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Does that take care of the situation at the Philadelphia naval home, which was a matter brought up by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS]?

Mr. BALL. It takes care of the situation as well as the Senate conferees could induce the House conferees to agree to take care of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President pro tempore be authorized to sign the enrolled bill during the recess following today's session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2287) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 1 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1. (a) There is hereby created a body corporate with the name 'Reconstruction Finance Corporation' (herein called the Corporation), with a capital stock of $100,000,000 subscribed by the United States of America. Its principal office shall be located in the District of Columbia, but there may be established agencies or branch offices in any city or cities of the United States under rules and regulations prescribed by the Board of Directors. This act may be cited as the 'Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act'.

"(b) Within 6 months after the close of each fiscal year the Corporation shall make a report to the Congress of the United States which shall contain financial statements for the fiscal year, including a balance sheet, a statement of income and expense, and an analysis of accumulated net income. The accumulated net income shall be determined after provision for reasonable reserves for uncollectibility of loans and investments outstanding. Such statements shall be prepared from the financial records of the Corporation which shall be maintained in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles applicable to commercial corporate transactions. The report shall contain schedules showing, as of the close of the fiscal year, each direct loan to any one borrower of $100,000 or more, each loan to any one borrower of $100,000 or more in which the Corporation has a participation or an agreement to participate, and the investments in the securities and obligations of any one borrower which total $100,000 or more. Within six months after the end of each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948, the Corporation shall pay over to the Secretary of the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, a dividend on its capital stock owned by the United States of America, in the amount by which its accumulated net income exceeds $400,000,000.

"(c) Within sixty days after the effective date of this amendment, the Corporation shall retire all its outstanding capital stock in excess of $100,000,000 and shall pay to the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts the par value of the stock so retired."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a board of directors consisting of five persons appointed by the President of the United States by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Of the five members of the board, not more than three shall be members of any one political party and not more than one shall be appointed from any one Federal Reserve district. The office of director shall be a full-time position. The term of the incumbent directors is hereby extended to June 30, 1950. As of July 1, 1950, two directors shall be appointed for a term of 1 year, two directors shall be appointed for a term of 2 years, and one director shall be appointed for a term of 3 years. Thereafter the term of the directors shall be for a term of 3 years, but they may continue in office until their successors are appointed and qualified. Whenever a vacancy shall occur in the office of director other than by expiration of term, the person appointed to fill such vacancy shall hold office for the unexpired portion of the term of the director whose place he is selected to fill. After the confirmation of the directors by the Senate, the President shall designate one of the directors to serve as chairman for a period coextensive with his term as director. The directors, except the chairman, shall receive salaries at the rate of $12,500 per annum each. The chairman of the board of directors shall receive a salary at the rate of $15,000 per annum."

SEC. 3. Section 3 (a) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) The Corporation shall have succession through June 30, 1952, unless it is sooner dissolved by an act of Congress. It shall have power to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal; to make contracts; to lease or purchase such real estate as may be necessary for the transaction of its business; to sue and be sued, to complain and to defend, in any court of competent jurisdiction, State or Federal; to select, employ, and fix the compensation of such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as shall be necessary for the transaction of the business of the Corporation, in accordance with laws, applicable to the Corporation, as in effect on June 30, 1947, and as thereafter amended; and to prescribe, amend, and repeal, by its board of directors, bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its general business may be conducted. Except as may be otherwise provided in this act or in the Government Corporation Control Act, the board of directors of the Corporation shall determine the necessity for and the character and amount of its obligations and expenditures under this act and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, paid, and accounted for, without regard to the provisions of any other laws governing the expenditure of public lands, and such determinations shall be final and conclusive upon all other officers of the Government. The Corporation shall be entitled to and granted the same immunities and exemptions from the payment of costs, charges, and fees as are granted to the United States pursuant to the provisions of law codified in sections 543, 548, 555, 557, 578, and 578a of title 28 of the United States Code, 1940 edition. The Corporation shall also be entitled to the use of the United States mails in the same manner as the executive departments of the Government. Debts due the Corporation, whether heretofore or hereafter arising, shall not be entitled to the priority available to the United States pursuant to section 3466 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 31, sec. 191) except that the Corporation shall be entitled to such priority with respect to debts arising from any transaction pursuant to any of the following acts or provisions in effect at any time: Sections 5d (1) and 5d (2) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act added by section 5 of the act entitled 'An act to authorize the purchase by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of stock of Federal home-loan banks; to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes', approved June 25, 1940 (54 Stat. 573); sections 4 (f) and 9 of the act entitled 'An act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes', approved June 11, 1942 (56 Stat. 354, 356); section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 26); the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 765 and the following): sections 11 and 12 of the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 214, 215); and section 403 of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act (56 Stat. 245)."

SEC. 4. Section 4 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. (a) To aid in financing agriculture, commerce, and industry, to encourage small business, to help in maintaining the economic stability of the country, and to assist in promoting maximum employment and production, the Corporation, within the limitations hereinafter provided, is authorized—

"(1) to purchase the obligations of and to make loans to any business enterprise organized or operating under the laws of any State or the United States: *Provided*, That the purchase of obligations (including equipment trust certificates) of, or the making of loans to, railroads engaged in interstate commerce or air carriers, engaged in air transportation as defined in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, or receivers or trustees thereof, shall be with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission or the Civil Aeronautics Board, respectively: *Provided further*, That in the case of such railroads or air carriers which are not in receivership or trusteeship, the Commission or

the Board, as the case may be, in connection with its approval of such purchases or loans, shall also certify that such railroad or air carrier, on the basis of present and prospective earnings, may be expected to meet its fixed charges without a reduction thereof through judicial reorganization except that such certificates shall not be required in the case of loans or purchases made for the acquisition of equipment or for maintenance.

"(2) to make loans to any financial institution organized under the laws of any State or of the United States.

"(3) in order to aid in financing projects authorized under Federal, State, or municipal law, to purchase the securities and obligations of, or make loans to, 'public agencies', which term shall include the following: (A) States, municipalities, and political subdivisions of States; (B) public agencies and instrumentalities of one or more States, municipalities, and political subdivisions of States; and (C) public corporations, boards, and commissions: *Provided*, That no such purchase or loan shall be made for payment of ordinary governmental or nonproject operating expenses as distinguished from purchases and loans to aid in financing specific public projects, nor for the acquisition or construction, by any such public agency, of any property or facility for the production, sale or supply of any commodity, product or service, if any private person, firm, or corporation is then actively engaged in the production, distribution or supply of the same commodity, product, or service in the same area;

"(4) to make such loans as it may determine to be necessary or appropriate because of floods or other catastrophes.

"(b) The powers granted in section 4 (a) of this act shall be subject to the following restrictions and limitations:

"(1) No financial assistance shall be extended pursuant to paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) of this section, unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available on reasonable terms. All securities and obligations purchased and all loans made under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) of this section shall be of such sound value or so secured as reasonably to assure retirement or repayment and such loans may be made either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate or by the purchase of participations, or otherwise.

"(2) No loan, including renewals or extensions thereof, may be made under sections 4 (a) (1), (2), and (4) for a period or periods exceeding 10 years and no securities or obligations maturing more than 10 years from date of purchase by the Corporation may be purchased thereunder: *Provided*, That the foregoing restriction on maturities shall not apply to securities or obligations received by the Corporation as a claimant in bankruptcy or equitable reorganization or as a creditor in proceedings under section 20 (b) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended: *Provided further*, That any loan made or securities and obligations purchased prior to July 1, 1947, may in aid of orderly liquidation thereof or the interest of national security, be renewed or the maturity extended for such period not in excess of 10 years and upon such terms as the Corporation may determine: *Provided further*, That any loan made under section 4 (a) (1) for the purpose of constructing industrial facilities may have a maturity of 10 years plus such additional period as is estimated may be required to complete such construction. The Corporation may, in carrying out the provisions of subsection 4 (a) (3), purchase securities and obligations, or make loans, including renewals or extensions thereof, with maturity dates not in excess of 40 years, as the Corporation may determine.

"(3) In agreements to participate in loans, wherein the Corporation's disbursements are deferred, such participations by the Corporation shall be limited to 75 percent of the balance of the loan outstanding at the time of the disbursement.

"(c) The total amount of investments, loans, purchases, and commitments made subsequent to June 30, 1947, pursuant to section 4 shall not exceed $1,500,000,000 outstanding at any one time: *Provided*, That the aggregate amount outstanding at any time shall not exceed under subsection (a) (4) $25,000,000 and for construction purposes under subsection (a) (3) $200,000,000.

"(d) No fee or commission shall be paid by any applicant for financial assistance under the provisions of this act in connection with any such application, and any agreement to pay or payment of any such fee or commission shall be unlawful.

"(e) No director, officer, attorney, agent, or employee of the Corporation in any manner, directly or indirectly, shall participate in the deliberation upon or the determination of any question affecting his personal interests, or the interests of any corporation, partnership, or association in which he is directly or indirectly interested.

"(f) The powers granted to the Corporation by this section 4 shall terminate at the close of business on June 30, 1950, but the termination of such powers shall not be construed (1) to prohibit disbursement of funds on purchases of securities and obligations, on loans, or on commitments or agreements to make such purchases or loans, made under this act prior to the close of business on such date, or (2) to affect the validity or performance of any other agreement made or entered into pursuant to law.

"(g) As used in this act, the term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands."

SEC. 5. Effective as of midnight June 30, 1947, the first sentence of section 8 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "The Corporation, including its franchise, capital, reserves, and surplus, and its income shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States, by any Territory, dependency, or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, except that any real property of the Corporation shall be subject to special assessments for local improvements and shall be subject to State, Territorial, county, municipal, or local taxation to the same extent according to its value as other real property is taxed."

SEC. 6. Subsection (m) of section 206 of title II of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation," approved June 30, 1947 (Public Law 132, 80th Cong.) is amended to read as follows:

"(m) The first section and sections 2, 3, 9, 11, and 13 of the act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 1), as amended."

SEC. 7. Section 208 of title II of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation," approved June 30, 1947 (Public Law 132, 80th Cong.), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 208. (a) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall have the power to purchase any surplus property for resale subject to regulations of the War Assets Administrator or his successor, to small business when, in its judgment, such disposition is required to preserve and strengthen the competitive position of small business. The purchase of surplus property under this section shall be given priority under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, immediately following transfers to Government agencies under section 12 of such act, as amended, and disposals to veterans under section 16 of such act, as amended. The provisions of section 12 (c) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, shall be applicable to purchases made under this section: *Provided, however*, That in exercising the priority provided by this law for the purpose of transferring or disposing of the same to private industry the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall disclose such fact in its offer, together with the names and addresses of the persons, firms, or corporations to whom it intends to transfer such property, together with a full and complete statement as to the intended use or disposition to be made by the transferee of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The Administrator in the exercise of his discretion shall then determine whether or not to transfer such property to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the same manner and to the same extent as though the ultimate transferee of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was the offeror to the Administrator. It is the intent of this section that no person, firm, or corporation shall be accorded any advantage over any other solely by reason of the fact that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is offering to acquire the property for it or them. The Administrator shall reject the offer of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation whenever it appears that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation intends to transfer the property to a person, firm, or corporation who intends to dispose of whole or part thereof, or does not intend to use all thereof in their own business. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall not purchase any real property for resale to small business pursuant to this section in any case where any person from whom the property had been acquired by a Government agency gives notice in writing to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that he intends to exercise his rights under section 23 of the Surplus Property Act, as amended.

"(b) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is further authorized for the purpose of carrying out the objectives of this section to arrange for sales of surplus property to small business concerns on credit or time basis.

"(c) For the purposes of this section the terms 'persons,' 'surplus property,' and 'Government agency' have the same meaning as is assigned to such terms by section 3 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended."

SEC. 7. Section 209 of title II of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation," approved June 30, 1947 (Public Law 132, Eightieth Congress), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 209. During the period between June 30, 1948, and the date of enactment of legislation making funds available for administrative expenses for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, the Corporation is authorized to incur, and pay out of its general funds, administrative expenses in accordance with laws in effect on June 30, 1948, such obligations and expenditures to be charged against funds when made available for administrative expenses for the fiscal year 1949."

SEC. 8. The third paragraph of section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended by section 328 of the Banking Act of 1935, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Loans made to establish industrial or commercial businesses (a) which are in whole or in part discounted or purchased or loaned against as security by a Federal Reserve bank under the provisions of section 13b of this act, (b) for any part of which a commitment shall have been made by a Federal Reserve bank under the provisions of said section, (c) in the making of which a Federal Reserve bank participates under the provisions of said section, or (d) in which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation cooperates or purchases a participation under the provisions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, shall not be

subject to the restrictions or limitations of this section upon loans secured by real estate."

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BUCK, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. MAYBANK, and Mr. FULBRIGHT conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Russell B. Adams, of West Virginia, to be a member, Civil Aeronautics Board, for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1950.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION—HOWARD BRUCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Howard Bruce, of Maryland, to be Deputy Administrator for Economic Cooperation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement for the RECORD. Last night I eulogized the nominee, Mr. Howard Bruce, of Maryland, and stated that I had known him in the Department of Commerce for several years. Inadvertently I got the first names confused. The man I was then talking about was David Bruce. I am glad to pay tribute to Mr. David Bruce, who has had long experience in the Department of Commerce, and whom I have known for some time. I am glad to have had the opportunity to have said what I did about him last night, although I inadvertently spoke of the wrong Mr. Bruce.

The minority leader pointed out to me that I at least spoke of one who was a member of the family of Bruces, because David Bruce is the first cousin of Mr. Howard Bruce.

I now ask unanimous consent for confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I am indebted to the distinguished acting majority leader for his characteristically fair appraisement of the man of whom he spoke, and I can assure him that all the complimentary things he thinks and said of the one Mr. Bruce are also applicable to the gentleman whose nomination is now before the Senate.

I may say that the appointment of Mr. Howard Bruce as Deputy Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration is in fitting recognition of his outstanding contribution in the interest of his country. But more than that, it is a guarantee that the affairs of this program, which are committed to his hands, will be performed conscientiously, impartially, and efficiently.

In a word, and judged by the experience we have had with him, his service will be motivated by one consideration, namely, that which is best for America and the world.

From the day, many years ago, when he came to Maryland to assume a most important position in the industrial life of our State, down to the present day, the name "Howard Bruce" has been a synonymn in Maryland for business competence, financial integrity, and successful administration. It is not an overstatement to assert that no citizen of Maryland enjoys greater respect and greater confidence of our people than he.

Illustrative of the extraordinarily high regard in which Mr. Bruce has always been held in Maryland, is the fact that he, as perhaps no other citizen has been called upon during the past thirty-odd years by the governors of our State, of both political affiliations, for advisory and other services in matters of general public import. Never has there been any question of compensation; never has there been, on his part, the slightest hesitancy in accepting the assignment given him; always his response, in time and thought and results, has been most generous and beneficial to the public.

So well were his capabilities recognized generally that during the most critical period of the war Mr. Bruce was called to Washington to expedite the flow of needed supplies to our armed forces throughout the world. When he undertook, at the request of the President, the exacting duties of Chief of the Conservation Branch, Army Service Forces, Mr. Bruce modestly declined a proffered commission while undertaking the arduous work under Secretary Stimson and Under Secretary Patterson.

During the early months of the war, when the organization of material supplies for the armed forces was under way, his position was that of an ace troubleshooter. Later, as first assistant to General Somervell, Army Service Forces commander, Mr. Bruce's energy, capabilities, and capacity for unending attention to duty were so thoroughly recognized and appreciated that he was accorded the outstanding distinction of being one of only four American civilians to win the Army's Distinguished Service Medal.

An apt summation of his great contribution to the war effort was given in one sentence by the Army Service Forces commander when he described Mr. Bruce as a miracle man, one of the greatest architects in the design of the war machine. By reason of his many years of successful accomplishment in the field of finance and industry and particularly as a result of the vast experience which is his, Mr. Bruce might almost be said to be made to order for the admittedly difficult assignment which is now given him.

To detail the numerous and successful business projects in Maryland and throughout the East in which Mr. Bruce has been a guiding and inspiring force would certainly emphasize to anyone who is not familiar with his work the great capacity and energetic inspiration which he brings to this new post. To do so, I am convinced, is needless. He is so well known here for his endeavors and so highly regarded in business and industrial circles generally, that such a detailed listing of his achievements would seem superfluous.

It bears repetition, however, that Mr. Bruce is a man who is ideally suited and trained to help administer this huge program. He possesses such a rock-ribbed faith in America and in the orderly processes of the democratic system that he can be counted on to think first, last, and always of the interests of America even while helping, with the utmost humanity and consideration, the countries to be assisted. His one abiding interest will be, as it has been in the past, this Nation and its program for the perpetuation of free institutions.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I wish to add a word to what the distinguished Senator from Maryland has just said. I am very happy to pay tribute to Mr. Bruce. I have known him personally for 11 years. There is no man in whose judgment I have greater confidence or who stands higher in my esteem and affection. I am glad to say this for the record as Mr. Bruce's nomination comes before the Senate for confirmation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, when I objected to the confirmation of Mr. Bruce's nomination yesterday I did not know exactly which Bruce in Maryland was referred to, because there are so many of them there. A few years ago there was a very ghastly bank failure which resulted in the loss of millions of dollars to the people of Maryland and to various other depositors in one of the large institutions in Baltimore. I have made a full and complete investigation, and I find that Howard Bruce, the man whose name we are now discussing, had no connection in any way, shape, form, or manner with that financial institution. On the contrary, I find that this man is an outstanding citizen who has made a very fine record. Personally, I have no objection whatsoever to the confirmation of his nomination.

I am deeply grateful to my colleagues who yesterday gave me 24 hours to make this investigation. Because of the very great importance to the American people of this nomination, I felt in duty bound to hold up confirmation for 24

hours. I am delighted to withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Howard Bruce to be Deputy Administrator for Economic Cooperation in the Economic Cooperation Administration?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. WHERRY. The Senate having apparently completed its work for the afternoon, I now move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 10, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 6 (legislative day of May 4), 1948:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be senior surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective date of acceptance:

Henry R. O'Brien

A. William Reggio

To be dental surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance:

Arthur G. Malucky

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 6 (legislative day of May 4), 1948:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Russell B. Adams to be a member, Civil Aeronautics Board, for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1950.

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

Howard Bruce to be Deputy Administrator for Economic Cooperation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 6, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Wayne Reynolds, pastor, First Methodist Church, Grapevine, Tex., offered the following prayer:

O God, who art the hope of all the ends of the earth, remember us in love and guide us by Thine infinite wisdom. Most heartily we beseech Thee to grant Thy blessing upon Thy servants, the President of the United States, the Congress, and all others in authority. Imbue them with the spirit of wisdom, goodness, and truth, and so rule their hearts and bless their endeavors that law and order, justice and peace may everywhere prevail.

Almighty God, who in the former time didst lead our fathers forth into a wealthy place, give Thy grace, we humbly beseech Thee, to us, their children, that we may always prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy favor and glad to do Thy will.

Bless our land with honorable industry, sound learning, and pure religion. Defend our liberties; preserve our unity; save us from confusion, discord, and violence, from pride and arrogance, and from every evil way. Fashion into one happy people the multitudes brought hither out of many kindreds and tongues.

Guide those with the authority of governance to the end that there be peace at home and throughout the world. Keep us mindful of Thy mercy. For Jesus Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 151. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of a report entitled "The Economy of Hawaii in 1947" and authorizing the printing of additional copies thereof.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2385. An act to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes; and

S. 2565. An act to provide for a temporary extension of title VI of the National Housing Act, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1142. An act for the relief of Anna Pechnik; and

S. 1620. An act to establish eligibility for burial in national cemeteries, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that, pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 48, the President pro tempore appointed Mr. BROOKS, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. BARKLEY members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2277) entitled "An act to amend section 13 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, to provide for the disposition of surplus real property to States, political subdivisions, and municipalities for use as public parks, recreational areas, and historic-monument sites, and for other purposes"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. BYRD to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend a speech in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances.

STUDENTS OF FRANKFORD HIGH SCHOOL, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Mr. SARBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SARBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that over 400 students of the Frankford High School, Philadelphia, are visiting the Congress and Washington, D. C., today.

Under their able principal, Mr. John W. Hitner, along with the vice principal, Mr. Martin D. Fetherolf, and Mr. David Harr, head of the school's history department, these students are seeing first-hand their Government in actual operation.

This, to me, is a marvelous example of progressive education, and I am sure will be valuable to them in the classrooms of tomorrow. I only wish more of our youth throughout the country could have this opportunity.

NEW DEAL SOCIALISTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, just as expected, the New Deal socialists who have been chased out of one department after another are taken over by Paul G. Hoffman to administer socialism on a world scale with American taxpayers' money.

First came Mr. Wayne Chatfield Taylor, planted into the Federal Government by Third-Party Candidate Henry A. Wallace on July 5, 1933. He was executive assistant to the Administrator of triple A at the height of the program of plowing under cotton and little pigs. Mr. Taylor has now been appointed Director of Operations of the Economic Cooperation Administration.

Up comes another prospect for appointment to ECA—Howard B. Meyers. His first Government connection was arranged by Harry Hopkins. Mr. Hopkins chose Mr. Meyers as his Assistant WPA Administrator. After that Mr. Meyers was Assistant Administrator of the Federal Works Agency. Mr. Meyers is a dyed-in-the-wool devotee of the New Deal philosophy of spending our way into prosperity. Harry Hopkins' gospel was spend and spend and spend and tax and tax and tax and elect and elect and elect. Mr. Meyers writes books to support this concept. On the staff of the Committee for Economic Development, whose chairman was Paul G. Hoffman, he wrote a book which a noted book reviewer called a plan for a Nazi dictatorship in the United States of America.

So these men are to manage the world economy with the Socialists of other

countries. American oil and lumber and machinery and cotton and tobacco will be given outright to their friends of common ideologies abroad now on test in the world with which to support their self-liquidating, self-defeating, managed economies over there.

The hunger and cold of the people and the spread of communism which the American voters wanted to stop is already largely forgotten. The clamor and the noise of it all to secure the passage of the appropriation has died away.

What sense does it make to ridicule and oppose Henry Wallace, or even to outlaw or stop communism, when we deliver $6,000,000,000 to Wallace's disciples and students who become the American brand of Socialist to manage our own economy and that of the world on a grand scale?

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an outline of Tennessee veterans' laws.

Mr NODAR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a prayer by the Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of Mother's Day and include an article by Dr. Ward on the same subject.

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts.

Mr. BUCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on the United Nations appearing in the New York Times.

TAFT-ELLENDER-WAGNER BILL

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House Committee on Banking and Currency will not be bamboozled into accepting any of the socialistic provisions in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, which they are presently considering. Yesterday in the other body they approved only of a 60-day stopgap extension of the mortgage-insurance program. This was done in the hope that the House will, in the meantime, approve of the TEW bill.

Members of the House, such stop-and-go action only interrupts the whole construction industry. Private enterprise is doing a marvelous job. It constructed 860,000 housing units last year and at the present rate should reach the goal of 950,000 units this year. Why get involved in a long-term public housing project which would cost the taxpayers $6,400,000,000, when private industry can do the job?

The 5-year housing plan is inflationary. Many essential materials are still scarce. By Government entering into the building business, prices would zoom. In England there is no private building industry today because of their adopting a socialistic housing program. We must cut out these New Deal theories.

EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, not a few people in this country are concerned and confused over the European recovery program.

Within the past few weeks many with whom I have discussed ECA are wondering just where our plans on the European situation will place us from the standpoint of aid to Europe. The approach to the issue seems to be based upon conflicting reports on trade within Europe, and between the several countries there, plus the need for our exporting commodities to nations abroad who have already supplies of materials rare at this time to the American people.

One of the many problems in this direction deals with coal. Only about 10 days ago information in one of the leading newspapers of the United States from a reliable reporter of theirs at Geneva is to this effect:

> France is planning to buy 6,700,000 tons of coal from United States suppliers during the next 9 months because she expects to have dollars, while Polish coal, which is at least to some extent substitutable, is going unsold and British coal producers are finding difficulty in recovering the French market. Britain was planning to buy several million dollars' worth of conveyor belts in the United States that turned out to be obtainable in Europe.

In another publication of wide circulation in the United States on the same date as the above-mentioned release, which incidentally is April 30, 1948, the following was written:

> Skyrocketing production of coal is worrying the Poles. They are beginning to wonder where they can sell all they produce. The coal situation in western Europe is easing, as German, French, and British output climbs.

One week later this same publication published the following:

> Coal situation in Britain illustrates the kind of worry that can't be waved away. Production at first glance seems to be satisfactory. It is about 4,225,000 tons a week. That is not up to prewar rate, but it is in line with 1948 target. Absenteeism from the mines is still 10 percent against 6 or 7 percent before the war.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here are factors which should be carefully considered by the administrators of ECA if the American people in support of this program are to have their interests protected. There is little wonder that the people of the United States are concerned over where this program will take us.

YORKCO WILL KEEP CANDIDATES COOL

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvania is not only the Keystone State, but it led the Nation during those dark Revolutionary days when it harbored the Congress of the United States. During World War II, it received national recognition because of the York plan, which was adopted, and which probably brought the war to an earlier and successful conclusion. Now York is going to be prominent in the days that lie ahead in that the York Corp., which is the greatest manufacturer of cooling equipment in our country, has notified us that they are going to send an air-conditioning unit to every one of the rooms in Philadelphia during the two conventions in order to keep the candidates cool. They are not forgetting the Democrats either. Even their lone candidate, Mr. Truman, will have a unit installed in his room just the same as Taft and Stassen, and Dewey, and all of the rest of the famous men who are aspiring to the Presidency. So, York again comes to the rescue in keeping the national leaders cool. If we will keep our heads cool we will know how to elect the next Presidential candidate, and he may be the Speaker of this House, our JOE MARTIN.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Let me congratulate the gentleman on being so hot for his district.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, and we will keep them cool, and we will lead them through again.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a summary of the Oklahoma veterans' laws prepared by the department adjutant of the DAV.

Mr. MILLS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include three editorials.

Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks

in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances, and to include in one a statement by W. Averell Harriman, United States special representative in Europe; in another an article by Peter Edson, the columnist; in another an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch; and in the other an editorial from the Sunday Star, of Washington, D. C.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article and some excerpts.

Mr. MCCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a recent statement by Father Edmund A. Walsh, S. J.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper clipping and a summary of the Massachusetts veterans' laws.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I join gladly with the nonpartisan and forward-looking group of Representatives, led by the gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman JUDD, and the gentleman from Arkansas, Congressman HAYS, who are sponsoring identical resolutions to amend and improve the United Nations Charter.

In July 1947, I introduced two resolutions, House Resolution 116 and House Resolution 117, the purposes of which were similar to those of the present resolution. However, the present Resolutions 163 to 176 goes further into the subject than my resolutions, and deals with additional factors pertaining to the difficult job of establishing international accord. I am, therefore, happy to join with my colleagues on this additional attempt to move toward universal peace.

I firmly believe that the most important problem facing our Nation and the world is the establishing of an international organization which will be a vital functioning vehicle for world peace. Our present United Nations is a noble beginning, but 3 years of experience has disclosed basic organizational faults which must be eliminated. It is the mark of wisdom to recognize defects and move constructively to improve. Those who point out the faults and criticize are morally and spiritually obligated to formulate constructive improvements in the function of the United Nations.

To criticize and condemn is the mark of defeatism. To criticize and improve is the obligation of every honest and sincere public official.

I shall join with every group in our Nation who are loyal, conscientious, and dedicated to the fight against a third world war. That fight must be made intelligently, with sober evaluation of the realities of the present world situation. It is not enough to cry: Peace, peace. It is not enough to decry and condemn war.

We must, if we live up to the challenge of our times, move constructively and in a practical way toward constructing a vehicle for obtaining peace. We must eliminate war for the benefit of suffering mankind and we must realize that war can be eliminated only on the international level. National security can no longer be obtained within national boundaries or through dependence on national strength alone.

It is for these reasons that I gladly join with my colleagues in their nonpartisan sponsorship of a resolution for United Nations revision.

HOUSING

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to the fact that the national executive committee of the American Legion in Indianapolis has recommended that the American Legion endorse the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. The Legion has held out for 3 years, and now it looks as if it is going to fall in line with the other nine major veterans' organizations, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the DAV, the AVC, the Jewish War Veterans, the Catholic War Veterans, the Army-Navy Union, the Marine Corps League, and the Italian-American War Veterans; and the Amvets, the only other major organization, has endorsed the major provisions of the bill as well as the public housing. The House Committee on Banking and Currency is now considering this bill. It is going to bring it out at the end of May, and we hope the committee will endorse all the provisions. We hope we will not have to go back to try to get more signatures to discharge petition No. 6. It is now up to that committee. The veterans of America are wholeheartedly behind this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the following item on this matter appeared in the New York Times of yesterday:

LEGION BOARD BACKS HOUSING BILL

INDIANAPOLIS, May 4.—The American Legion's national executive committee today endorsed the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, long opposed by the Legion. A report submitted by Walter E. Allesandroni, of Philadelphia, chairman of the All-World War II National Housing Committee of the Legion, said that the bill, as amended and passed by the Senate, provided certain priorities for low-income veterans and thus eliminated the chief ground for Legion opposition.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak today of a branch of our Federal Government which is doing a wonderful service for the rural people of this country. It is rendering this service in a manner which will not cost the taxpayers of this country one red cent. I am speaking of the Rural Electrification Administration.

There perhaps has been no branch of the Government which has contributed so much to the betterment of the living standards of the rural people than the REA. This agency operates quietly and efficiently to bring the blessings of electric power to millions of rural homes. It has a record of businesslike financial operations which ought to be an example to other branches of our Government.

The demand for electricity on the farm is greater now than it has ever been. This, I am sure, is because the people in the thinly populated areas of the Nation have begun to realize, through the operation of the REA, that it is not only possible to have electric power on their farms, but also economically feasible. They have seen electric power in operation on their neighbors' farms and know the benefits of this great program.

The REA was organized in 1935 and has grown as rapidly since then as it has been possible to obtain supplies. It is, to me, a good sign that the demand for electric power on the farm is running ahead of the ability of REA cooperatives to get into operation. It means that the farms of this country intend to surround themselves with every available means to make their lives and work more comfortable and efficient.

Under the REA program these farm people know there is hope that they, too, can have electricity. They know it is just a question of time before they get it. It is for these reasons that I offer my word of praise for this program which our Government is operating for the betterment of the farmers of this country.

I receive many letters from the people of the First District of Arkansas on the subject of rural electrification. These people want the Government to provide sufficient funds for this program. They want to hasten the day when the power line will encircle their farm and bring them the badly needed power.

I am happy to pledge my continued cooperation to help this Nation send electric power into the remotest areas of the country.

Let me cite the record of electrification in the eastern section of Arkansas. There are four major REA cooperatives in the area of the 11 counties in the First District. They are the Craighead Electric Cooperative, at Jonesboro; the Woodruff Electric Cooperative Corp., at Augusta; the Clay County Electric Cooperative, at Corning; and the Mississippi County Electric Cooperative, at Blytheville.

Up to the 1st of May, this year, these four cooperatives have been granted loans from the Government totaling more than $8,000,000. This is a fine record of operation when one realizes that

the first REA cooperative was not set up in the State of Arkansas until 1937.

Also of interest is the fact that by the 1st of May of this year these four cooperatives in eastern Arkansas had been allocated a total of 6,530 miles of electric power line with a total of 23,251 consumers. Of that allocation, two-thirds of the mileage of electric power lines has already been energized and some three-fourths of the consumers connected to lines.

Already of the total sum of the loans advanced to these cooperatives nearly $1,000,000 in interest and principal has been repaid to the Government. Not one single loan made to a cooperative in the Arkansas First District was overdue for more than 30 days. That is an excellent record.

The REA operates no electric facilities of its own and makes no grants of money. REA loans are made on a self-liquidating basis and are sufficient to cover the full cost of constructing lines and other electric facilities. The loans bear 2 percent interest and are repaid over a maximum of 35 years. Once the loan is paid back the power line is owned by the consumers.

According to Mr. Claude R. Wickard, the able administrator of the REA, there has been a substantial improvement in the supply of construction material in recent weeks. This will be of particular interest to those rural families who have been unable to obtain needed electric power because of material shortages. This shortage of materials has hampered the program greatly. During the war, there were virtually no materials to be had for rural electric lines. Since the end of the war, the material situation has improved only gradually, up to the present time. Just as fast now as materials can be obtained this great program can grow with the rapidity of the demand.

I look forward to the day when every farmer in the rich delta land of eastern Arkansas will have electric power. Advancement in the science of farming, which is nowhere more evident than in the agriculture lands of Arkansas, calls for electric power. Electricity, in our modern mode of living, is necessary to make the work of the housewife on the farm less burdensome. Nothing in our modern life is more essential than electric power in the rural areas. Wherever electric power lines have penetrated into the rural areas, there you will find greater efficiency on the farm, less laborious farm work, less drudgery for the farm wife, and greater participation in the varied interest of modern living.

I hope that the farmers throughout the Nation will avail themselves of this fine program. I shall continue to do all in my power to provide the necessary funds for the operation of this program. I shall encourage its expansion in every way that I can.

HOMESTEAD BILL

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a report on an amendment to the bill H. R. 4488.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reported out the so-called homestead bill, which was introduced by the chairman of the committee and 29 other Members with a view to getting a certain type of low-rental houses for veterans and for sale to veterans. It fills a very great need. No bill that has ever been introduced in the Congress fills just that need. It is a housing bill for veterans alone. If the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill passes, there is no reason our bill should not pass because, as I said, it fills a special need that the TEW bill does not fill. It has been very ardently supported by the American Legion.

SELECTIVE-SERVICE BILL

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, we of the Committee on Armed Services are receiving so many inquiries at the moment that it seems to me appropriate that I make the following statement:

It is our intention to file the report on the selective-service bill, H. R. 6401, tomorrow, Friday. The report, in some detail, will be available in printed form on Saturday morning.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] may have until midnight tomorrow night to file minority views on that measure.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, the complete hearings, down to and including Monday, the day on which we voted in the committee on the bill, with all the testimony, including that of Mr. Forrestal, will be in print on Tuesday, May 11.

Of course, you cannot figure these things accurately, but I am going to run the risk of making this statement: I am reliably informed by the Speaker and the majority leader that as far as they are concerned there are good possibilities that the bill will come up on the floor on the 17th or 18th, probably the 18th, of May, which is a week from next Tuesday.

In view of the general interest in the bill, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a summary giving the high lights of the bill H. R. 6401 in order to answer the inquiries of many Members of Congress. I may say that a copy of this has been placed in the mail box of each Member, and it should be in each Member's office now.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

HIGH LIGHTS OF H. R. 6401, PROPOSED SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1948

AUTHORIZED STRENGTHS

Army (not to exceed)	837,000
Navy (including Marine Corps) (not to exceed)	666,882
Air Force (not to exceed)	[1] 502,000
Total	2,005,882

[1] Plus persons on temporary active duty.

REGISTRATION (SEC 3, P. 3)

All citizens and aliens from 18 through 30, unless exempted in the act, must submit for registration on dates and at places set by the President.

LIABILITY FOR INDUCTION (SEC. 4, P. 3)

Citizens and declared aliens from 19 through 25, unless deferred or exempted, are liable for induction for 2 years of service. Doctors, dentists, veterinarians, osteopaths, pharmacists and optometrists are specially liable until age 45 and will be called in certain priorities, those deferred during the war and those educated at Government expense to be called first. Two-year voluntary enlistments in the Army are permitted in lieu of induction.

Discharged persons inducted under this act and others with less than 3 years' service must (1) take another year of active service, or (2) stay in the National Guard or an organized Reserve unit for 3 years, or (3) stay in unorganized Reserves for 5 years or until age 35. (See also section 5 (e) (3), page 13 of the bill, giving President authority to call Reserves and Guardsmen with less than 90 days' service to 2 years' active duty without their consent.)

DEFERMENTS AND EXEMPTIONS (SEC. 5, P. 7)

Exemptions

Personnel on active duty.
Purple Heart holders.
Veterans of World War II with over 12 months' service.
Veterans of World War II with 90 days' to 12 months' service, if members of organized Reserve or National Guard unit.
Veterans of World War II with combat service.
Reserves in organized units and National Guard on effective date of the act.
Persons entering organized Reserve units and National Guard after act is passed who enter before 18½ years of age.
Diplomats.
Ministers and ministerial students.
Nondeclared aliens (sec. 4 (a)).

Deferments

ROTC and Navy Holloway plan students until graduation (those enrolled in the advanced course before enactment of bill must serve on active duty for 2 years; those entering the senior division after enactment must serve 3 years after graduation).
Accepted aviation cadets, for 4 months.
State-wide and Federal elective officials.
Essential civilians.
Persons with dependents.
Physically and mentally unfit.
High school and college students, with limitations (section 5 (j)).
Conscientious objectors objecting to any type of military service.

SOLE SURVIVING SON PROVISION

(SEC. 5 (O), P. 20)

An inducted sole surviving son in family whose other son or sons died or were killed in service in World War II cannot be sent outside the United States and must be assigned to noncombatant duty.

STATE QUOTAS (SEC. 7 (B), P. 22)

Requires that States be given credit for soldiers already in active service in fixing induction quotas, and that induction quotas will be proportionate to State population.

REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS (SEC. 8, P. 23)

To qualify for reemployment assistance, the discharged inductees must (1) have certificate showing honorable completion of service, (2) be still qualified to perform the duties, (3) apply within 90 days after discharge or 90 days after 1 year's hospitalization continuing after discharge. Employer must give back same job or one with like seniority, status, and pay. Returning inductee cannot be fired without cause within a year.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM (SEC. 9, P. 30)

Director (Senate-confirmed) to be head. There will be a national headquarters, at least one State headquarters in each State, at least one appeal board in each State, and a local board in each county. President will appoint State directors and local board members on recommendation of Governors. Each local board will have three or more members.

PENALTIES FOR VIOLATION OF ACT (SEC. 11, P. 39)

Five years' imprisonment, $10,000 fine, court martial where applicable, for evasion of act or inciting others to evade or violate the act.

INDUSTRY COMPULSION (SEC. 17, P. 44)

Authorizes compulsory, priority orders for armed forces' supplies when necessary. Those who charge exorbitantly or refuse to comply can have plants seized and operated by the Government (with fair compensation) and be imprisoned for 3 years and fined $50,000.

TERMINATION DATE (SEC. 20, P. 48)

The act will terminate in 2 years, except for certain provisions specified.

EFFECTIVE DATE (SEC. 23, P 49)

Inductions are postponed for 90 days after date of enactment.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one instance with reference to a bill he is today introducing, and in the other to include an editorial from the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle.

Mr. GOFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement on veterans' benefits prepared by the adjutant of the DAV.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and in one to include some excerpts and editorial matter.

Mr. LICHTENWALTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post.

APPROVAL BY AMERICAN LEGION OF THE PRESENT TEW BILL

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, furthering the question which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] brought up a moment ago and which was followed up by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] on the same subject, that is the approval by the American Legion executive committee of the present TEW bill, I think it should be pointed out that this was a qualified approval based very largely, if I am correct, on the fact that now the bill includes the substance of the Veterans' Homestead Act. It was on that special provision for veterans and, on that alone, I am given to understand that the former disapproval was changed to approval. I do not believe, therefore, that anything about the TEW bill is indicated as approved except that particular provision, and it is natural for a veteran organization to approve legislation for the especial benefit of that group.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

HON. JOHN TABER

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the accelerated tempo of this modern life somehow muddies our sense of appreciation now and then and fastens upon us the tragedy that we take so many things for granted. We not only take duty for granted, beauty, and the necessities and delights and miracles, but we take people for granted. Surely in the busy hurly-burly of this controversial atmosphere we can take time off and mark the natal anniversary of a very distinguished Member of the House of Representatives and give him a pat on the back for great service rendered to his constituency and to the people of the United States. I am referring to the Honorable JOHN TABER of New York, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who on yesterday marked the sixty-eighth anniversary of his birth. It is indeed a felicitous custom that we observe the anniversaries of birth and not the anniversaries of transition, for when all is said and done, the important thing is when a life begins, when it begins to unfold and glow and shed its effulgence and to give of its talent and force to the welfare of mankind and particularly to the people of our own country.

Just 68 years ago yesterday, JOHN TABER was born at Auburn, N. Y. The interesting thing is that that is still his home town. He still lives there. In a time when there is so much mobility on the part of people everywhere and there is a disposition to move, when there is a restlessness in the air, continued residence in one place is in itself in my judgment a great testimony to the steadfastness of character and stability of nature of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

When he came into this world 68 years ago Rutherford B. Hayes was the occupant of the White House. JOHN TABER has in his lifetime seen 14 Presidents of the United States come and go. He came to this body in the Sixty-eighth Congress and has rendered valiant service ever since. There have been literally hundreds, I am going to say thousands, of Members who have come and gone during his service in this body, but be carries on, term after term, with a consistency and resolve which has won for him abiding respect and devotion from his colleagues and constituency alike.

A great many Members who are serving the other body today were Members of the House when the gentleman from New York, JOHN TABER, came here. He has carried on in his reliable, in his firm, in his steadfast way, doing the things he thought were right and in serving out of a keen conscience and a noble heart what he esteems to be the best interests of his country.

There have been occasions when some tart things have been said about him on this floor. There were occasions when derogatory statements have appeared in the press, even though they may not have been so intended. On occasion alliterative adjectives have been applied, such as "the terrible Mr. TABER." In my book, whatever appelations may have been applied to him not only do not detract from his stature, but, in fact, increase his stature as a solid citizen and a firm and steadfast public servant. It heightens my affection for him, and I believe the Congress and the country can rejoice that we have a JOHN TABER in our midst today. That is especially true at a time when there are so many cleavages of sentiment and so much dissidence in all parts of the world.

There is such an intense conviction in JOHN TABER'S soul and he is unrelenting in his pursuit of that conviction. It makes him stand like the Rock of Gibraltar even when he stands alone and the lightning bolts of controversy strike all about him. Despite all this he continues to pursue the common good according to the light of his own conscience and by what he esteems to be his public duty. I am sure that every Member of this body today will agree with my estimate that he has been and he is a great public servant in the best and fullest sense of that term.

It has often been said that so much of our value is measured by the enemies that we make. JOHN TABER has made some enemies, not in a personal sense—because anyone who knows him knows what a tender heart beats in that rugged frame—but in the sense that some people disagree with his philosophy of life and government. This simply stems from his unremitting pursuit of that solid philosophy which embraces freedom, sound Americanism, sound governmental practices, and a traditional way of life which cannot be duplicated by any time or generation or in any corner of the globe. He is in truth and in fact a great American who deserves a prominent place in the American tradition.

May his vigor and his power be undiminished for many years to come. May the clarity of his thinking, the clarity of his eye go on undiminished as he continues to serve the Nation. I hope his constituency—that same constituency where he was born—will continue to send him to the Nation's Capital for a long time to come for continued and valiant service in expressing the best and noblest aspirations of this Republic.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1948

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in or-

der to consider the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6055) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, at any time after it is filed, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2 of rule 28.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Friday night to file a report on the Government corporations appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the rules of the House, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Monday next to call up for consideration the Government corporations appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the committees in order on Calendar Wednesday next be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF MAY 10

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to announce the program for the coming week.

Preliminary to that I wish to advise that if the legislation scheduled for consideration today can be completed, we propose to adjourn over until Monday.

On Monday we will take up such bills as may be reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia, and also the Government corporations appropriation bill. If consideration of that appropriation bill is not concluded on Monday it will be the continuing order of business on Tuesday.

With respect to other business for the week, I should like to inquire of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] whether or not rules have been granted on the so-called Bulwinkle bill (H. R. 221) and the subversive activities bill (H. R. 5852)?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The Rules Committee will report at the earliest opportunity a rule on the Bulwinkle bill, giving 2 hours of general debate, and on the Mundt bill from the Un-American Activities Committee, giving 5 hours of general debate on that measure.

Mr. HALLECK. Then, Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday and Wednesday we will call up the bill (H. R. 221) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers, and House Joint Resolution 342 directing all executive departments and agencies of the Federal Government to make available to any and all standing, special, or select committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, information which may be deemed necessary to enable them to properly perform the duties delegated to them by the Congress.

On Thursday it is hoped that we can consider the legislative appropriation bill if it is ready at that time.

After that we hope to call up H. R. 5852, a bill to combat un-American activities by requiring registration of Communist-front organizations, and for other purposes, and continue on Friday with that bill or any unfinished business of the week.

Rules, of course, may be called up at any time they are reported, but they will be called up only after consultation with the minority leader.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech by the Governor of Missouri.

Mr. FORAND (at the request of Mr. FOGARTY) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. COUDERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times.

THE INCOME-TAX BILL

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the income-tax bill of 1948 as well as those of 1947. This was not an easy vote to cast. However, I have no apology to offer anyone for that vote. I believe that our first obligation is to the financial stability of the country in these difficult days.

We owe more than $250,000,000,000 of the $300,000,000,000 which the war cost us. Business is at an all-time high. Profits are greater than at any time in the history of this country. We hope they continue. However, I believe that the time to pay debts is when one is making the money with which to pay them. We could have paid on our debt had we not cut the taxes.

The dollar that was worth 100 cents in 1939 is now a 60-cent dollar or less. Chance that the consumer's dollar might become more valuable in the months ahead is fading. The addition of this $4,800,000,000 tax-reduction cut thrown upon the fire of inflation which prevails is whittling down the value of that dollar.

In 1942, with the war in full swing, the dollar was worth 85 cents; by 1946, the dollar was buying only 71 cents' worth. Now the same dollar is worth less than 60 cents. Buyers of goods and services at retail get less for each of their dollars than they got for 60 cents in 1939.

We do not like price controls. Personally, I hope it never becomes necessary to reimpose them, but, if we continue to cut taxes and increase spending as we are doing in this Congress, we will have to do one of two things. We will either have to let the dollar continue to drop to lower levels of value, which can only end in another depression, or we must slap on rigid controls to stabilize its value.

Right now, as compared with 1939, the food dollar is worth 47 cents; clothing dollar, 51 cents; house furnishing dollar, 52 cents; fuels and ice, 60 cents; rent dollar, 90 cents; and, that rent-control dollar doubtless would be a lot less than 90 cents, had we not continued rent control.

Neither is it fair to shift the burden of taxation from those who made big profits during the war and are still making big profits and place that burden to a greater degree upon the men who left their farms, their homes, their businesses and colleges and went to war. That is not a square deal, but, rather, verges on a raw deal.

Under the new law, as compared to the old law, the following items will give you specific instances to show what I mean by a shift in the tax burden from those most able to pay to those least able to pay:

At $2,500 a year income, a man with a wife and two children gets a tax cut of $78 per year or a dollar and a half per week less than he paid under the old law;

At $3,000 per year income, the same family has a $90-a-year tax cut;

At $5,000 a year income, the same family gets $157 a year cut. A large bulk of that saving comes by reason of the fact that this income-tax bill allows the husband and wife to file separate returns. In other words, divide the income half and half. This feature of the law does not begin to be effective until the income is $5,000 a year, which means that very few of the farmers, small-business men, school teachers and laborers in our district will get any benefit at all from the community-property provision of the bill;

At $7,000 a year income, a man with a wife and two children gets a $265 annual cut;

At $10,000 a year income, the same family gets a $501 cut;

At $15,000 a year income, the same family gets a $1,127 cut;

At $20,000 a year income, the same family gets $2,002 a year cut;

At $30,000 a year income, the same family gets $4,075 per year cut;

At $50,000 a year income, the same family gets $7,533 per year cut;

At $100,000 a year income, the same family gets $16,658 cut;

At $200,000 a year income, the same family gets $30,663;

At $500,000 a year income, the same family gets an income-tax benefit of $47,923; so one can readily see that so far as our district is concerned this income-tax bill does us little good. What we do save in taxes is taken away from us by reason of the rise in costs of living caused by this tax cut's extra buying power.

The community-property feature of the bill and the exemptions which it gives to the old people are very appealing. However, there is a bill in committee now which will take care of the aged people and to a far greater extent than this tax bill because so few of them have more than enough income on which to live anyway. I am supporting that bill.

It is my considered judgment that we are going back to a period of deficit spending unless taxes are increased at the next session of the Congress. I have voted to cut the President's budget $3,000,000,000 this year, and have voted for cuts in the appropriations except upon those vital projects which I think are the lifeblood of the country, including flood control, reclamation, soil conservation, veterans, old-age assistance, and rural electrification.

I am also voting whatever amount is necessary to keep our defense strong and modern in these critical days when we are struggling toward peace.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some newspaper comment in support of the House Committee on Un-American Activities bill to control subversive activities.

AMENDMENT TO INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules reported the following: privileged resolution (H. Res. 581, Rept. 1871), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 221), to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

COMBATING SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 582, Rept. 1872), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 5852) to combat un-American activities by requiring the registration of Communist-front organizations, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 5 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Un-American Activities, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Un-American Activities now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage wtihout intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I have been served with a subpena duces tecum to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia to testify on Thursday, May 6, 1948, at 1:30 p. m. in the case of the United States against Albert Maltz, which is a congressional contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I, therefore, submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I send the subpena to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

THE UNITED STATES *v.* ALBERT MALTZ, NO. 1354–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to JOHN McDOWELL, Old House Office Building:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Thursday, May 6, 1948, at 1:30 o'clock p. m., to testify on behalf of the United States, and bring with you subpena served on Albert Maltz and other related papers, and not depart the court without leave of the court or district attorney.

Witness the Honorable Bolitha J. Laws, chief justice of said court, this 6th day of May A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MARION E. LEWIS,
Deputy Clerk.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged resolution, House Resolution 583, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas Representative JOHN McDOWELL, a Member of this House, has been served with a subpena duces tecum to appear as a witness before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia to testify at 1:30 p. m. on the 6th day of May 1948, in the case of the *United States* v. *Albert Maltz,* criminal No. 1354–47; and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify but by the order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Representative JOHN McDOWELL is authorized to appear in response to the subpena duces tecum of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia on Thursday, May 6, 1948, in the case of the *United States* v. *Albert Maltz;* and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena of the said court.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report from the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House a communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives which was read:

MAY 6, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, I have received a subpena duces tecum, directed to me as Clerk of the House of Representatives, to appear before said court on the 6th day of May 1948 at 10 o'clock a. m., as a witness in the case of the *United States* v. *Albert Maltz* (No. 1354–47 Criminal Docket), and to bring with me minutes of all meetings from January 1, 1947, to date, of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, concerning the hearings which were conducted in Washington, D. C., from October 20 to October 30, 1947, relating to the Hollywood motion-picture industry.

Your attention and that of the House is respectfully invited to a resolution of the House adopted in the Forty-sixth Congress, first session (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 680), upon the recommendation of the Committee on the Judiciary as follows:

"*Resolved,* That no officer or employee of the House of Representatives has the right, either voluntarily or in obedience to a subpena duces tecum, to produce any document, paper, or book belonging to the files of the House before any court or officer, nor to furnish any copy of any testimony given or paper filed in any investigation before the House or any of its committees, or of any paper belonging to the files of the House, except such as may be authorized by statute to be copied, and such as the House itself may have made public, to be taken without the consent of the House first obtained."

And to a resolution adopted by the House in the Forty-ninth Congress, first session (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1295), from which the following is quoted:

"*Resolved,* That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate or process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission.

"That when it appears by the order of a court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that docu-

mentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer for the promotion of justice, this House will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House."

These resolutions result from the issuance of subpena duces tecum upon the Clerk of the House to produce certain original papers in the files of the House.

Permission to remove from their place of file or from the custody of the Clerk, any papers, was denied by the House but court afforded facilities to make certain copies of papers to be secured from the House. This seems to be the uniform procedure in the case of subpenas duces tecum served upon the Clerk of the House of Representatives to produce original papers from the files of the House.

The subpena in question is herewith attached, and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

Very respectfully yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR THE SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* ALBERT MALTZ, NO. 1354–47, CRIMINAL DOCKET

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C::

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Thursday, the 6th day of May, 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you minutes of all meetings from January 1, 1947, to date, of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee thereof, concerning the hearings which were conducted in Washington, D. C., from October 20 to October 30, 1947, relating to the Hollywood motion-picture industry, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justices of said court, the 5th day of May A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL,
Clerk.
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 584) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; Be it further

Resolved, That in all cases involving the failure of witnesses to appear or refusal of witnesses to answer questions before committees of the House of Representatives properly certified pursuant to the provisions of section 104 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended now or hereafter pending during the Eightieth Congress in any court of the United States where subpenas duces tecum may be issued by the due process of said court and addressed to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives or any officer or employee of the House of Representatives directing them to appear as witnesses before the said court at any time and to bring with them certain and sundry papers in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives wherein such documentary evidence is needful in any said court of the United States that John Andrews, Clerk of the House or any officer or employee of the House be authorized to appear at the place and before the court named in the subpenas duces tecum so issued, but shall not take with them any papers or documents on file in their office or under their control or in their possession as officers or employees of the House; and be it further

Resolved, That when any said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers and documents called for in the subpenas duces tecum then any said court through any of its officers or agents have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House and take copies of any documents or papers in possession or control of said officers or employees that the court has found to be material and relevant, except minutes and transcripts of executive sessions, and any evidence of witnesses in respect thereto which the court or other proper officer thereof shall desire, so as, however, the possession of said documents and papers by the said officers or employees shall not be disturbed, or the same shall not be removed from their place of file or custody under said officers or employees; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted by the Clerk to any of said courts whenever such subpenas are issued as aforesaid.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the unanimous-consent request granted yesterday, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2287) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the consideration of the bill in the Committee of the Whole the committee substitute amendment be read as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 2287, with Mr. COLE of Missouri in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, last year we revised the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act and continued the RFC authority for 1 year. The life of the Corporation expires on June 30 of this year. This bill is to continue the Corporation for 4 years. It continues the authority to make loans and function in respect to all of its activities for 2 years, and then gives a 2-year period beyond that in which to liquidate their outstanding obligations. So, for all practical purposes, we continue the power of the Corporation to make loans for 2 years, and continue the life of the Corporation for liquidation purposes 2 years beyond that.

The Senate has passed the bill and the House has stricken out all after the enacting clause because of the number of amendments which were made. The chief differences between the Senate bill and the House bill I shall try to enumerate: It will be recalled that last year we cut the borrowing power of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation from a potential $18,000,000,000 to $2,000,000,000. The Senate in this bill cut that further to $1,000,000,000. The House has restored $500,000,000 of that cut, so that the House bill provides for a loaning authority of $1,500,000,000.

The report covers, I think quite thoroughly, the operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. One difference which I think we should have in mind between the Senate bill and the House bill, a very important difference, is that last year when we passed the Reconstruction Finance Corporation bill we provided in effect that the RFC should not invest in the capital structures of banks and insurance companies. It could not buy or invest in the preferred stock of financial institutions. The Senate restored that authority, although at the same time they reduced its borrowing power. The House has deleted that provision in the Senate bill and put it back where it has been for the last year, so that under the House bill the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will not have any authority to buy preferred stock of banks and insurance companies. It may, however, make loans to financial institutions and may participate in loans made by them for the several purposes set forth in the bill, the encouragement of business expansion, loans to small business, and so forth, activities which are very essential at this time in some cases to assure expansion of production.

As a subsidiary corporation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation there has been in existence the Federal National Mortgage Association. This was set up in 1938. The Federal National Mortgage Association has been the secondary market for FHA mortgages, and it has operated through the years very successfully, without any loss; as a matter of fact, with a substantial profit, about $23,000,000.

Our purpose in housing legislation this year is to continue the momentum of housing construction which got under way last year. Last year we built about 840,000 units. This year the starts so far have been ever so much greater than in the comparable period of last year. So if we do not do anything to discourage home construction, and if we do these other things which are necessary to keep up the momentum of home construction, we are well on the way to building over a million housing units in the United States this year. That will be the largest number of housing units ever built in any one year by any country in the world. The high point previous to this was about 937,000 units in 1925. We hope to build over a million units this year. The key to the production of a million housing units this year

lies in no interference with the basic program under which these units are financed. The industry which is making this record has been accustomed to the use of the Federal National Mortgage Association, which is familiarly known as Fanny May. So the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House, with the idea that there should be no interruption in the secondary market for FHA mortgages, continues the Federal National Mortgage Association as a subsidiary corporation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, notwithstanding the fact that the Senate provided for the dissolution of FNMA. I presume the reasons why the Senate provided for the dissolution of FNMA is because in the Senate bill, S. 866, which passed the other body the other day and on which we are now having hearings, provision was made for the establishment of a new secondary market within the framework of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to replace FNMA. The uncertainty in respect to S. 866 and the controversy which raged in the other body over the controversial features of that bill makes it difficult for us to determine the fate of that particular provision of the bill. For that reason we take no chances that there will be an interruption in the program under which this country expects to build a million units this year. We have restored FNMA in this bill. That is one of the reasons why we have restored the lending power of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation from a billion dollars to $1,500,000,000.

The capital of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is reduced in the bill from $325,000,000 to $100,000,000. The Senate provided in addition to that that the surplus of the Corporation over $50,000,000 be paid into the Treasury. At the present time the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has a surplus of about $500,000,000, which together with their capital gave them a capital and surplus of about $825,000,000. We thought the Senate had cut what is known as their free capital down so low as to make it almost impossible for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to operate in the black, so we left the capital provision at $100,000,000, because that is money received from the Treasury. We restored $350,000,000 of the surplus in addition to the $50,000,000 authorized by the Senate, so we provide the Corporation with $100,000,000 of capital and not to exceed $400,000,000 of surplus, or a total of $500,000,000 capital and surplus. The bill provides that all over $500,000,000 of capital and surplus shall be paid into the Federal Treasury. So in effect we provide in the House bill there will be something over $300,000,000 of capital and surplus of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation paid into the Treasury. At the same time we have the assurance that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation can operate on its capital and surplus in such a manner as to reasonably assure that we will not have to appropriate money directly out of the Treasury to cover deficits in its operation.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. ARNOLD. Has this surplus of the RFC been accumulated out of profits made from its operation?

Mr. WOLCOTT. It has been accumulated from the operations of the Corporation since it was instituted in 1932.

Mr. ARNOLD. It represents profits that they have made in the operation of the Corporation?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not know that we can say it is all profit. However, the accumulated surplus of the RFC on their normal loan and investment operations is very substantial, and I think the testimony shows this to be something over $500,000,000.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I note that in section 4 of the bill the committee proposes to insert the phrase "to encourage small business" and that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has taken over the operations of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. Under the language of the law setting up the Smaller War Plants Corporation it was permitted to make loans which had certain national defense values which authority I understand now is omitted. The problem arose in a particular instance which came to my attention this last week.

Mr. WOLCOTT. This language is to clarify any doubt as to whether they had authority to make loans to small business and to emphasize the fact that they have the authority to make loans to small business.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is the committee doing anything to preserve the Reconstruction Finance Corporation authority to make loans which have a particular national defense value that the Smaller War Plants Corporation had?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; there is nothing that specifically refers to the character of the small business to which they may make loans.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Did the committee give any consideration to the matter in connection with the strategic minerals program?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I may say, if the gentleman will permit me, that the matter was thoroughly discussed by the gentleman's committee in respect to the Commerce Department appropriation bill, and the gentleman's committee made no provision for the continuance of small-business activities in the Commerce Department; so we felt that that matter was rather res adjudicata as far as the House was concerned. There is now, I think, set up within the framework of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation a subagency for the purpose of buying surplus property for small business. We emphasized the fact that the authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was broad enough to make loans to small industry and we put that language in here to emphasize the fact that we want to encourage them to make loans to small business wherever they could.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But the national defense angle was not considered?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Well, not alone. I assume that if a small business were operating in the national defense field that that surely would not be an obstacle to a loan but would further encourage the making of the loan.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The point was not the program of acquisition of strategic minerals but of financing companies which were in that field.

Mr. WOLCOTT. There is no limitation upon the authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans in that field.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I tried to follow the remarks of the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee in his discussion of this bill. Am I right in saying that the bill simply extends the credit facilities of the RFC but does not put the Federal Government directly into the housing field, the construction or building of houses?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; the Federal National Mortgage Association which I think the gentleman has in mind, provides a secondary market for the purchase of FHA-insured mortgages.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. SNYDER. I am wondering about the termination of RFC after a 4-year period, whether or not we are not limiting its usefulness to small business in the matter of loans which they can negotiate.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Under the law they can make a loan within statutory limits without regard to the life of the Corporation. If RFC should be terminated 2 years from now, the loans might continue outstanding for some years beyond the life of the Corporation. After 4 years the further liquidation of the affairs of RFC are turned over to the Secretary of the Treasury provided of course that we let the RFC die in 2 years, which I doubt very much we are going to do. I think the RFC is with us for a great many years to come. It has served a very useful purpose in the past, and is serving a very useful purpose now.

Mr. SNYDER. Then, if I understand the gentleman correctly, they have 10 years in which to liquidate a loan which they might make within the next 2 years.

Mr. WOLCOTT. They have 2 years beyond the termination date of their power to make loans to liquidate them, and then, of course, the Secretary of Treasury takes over what is left of the liquidation projects.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am sorry I was not here during the gentleman's entire presentation of the matter, but will

the gentleman explain with reference to the GI loans?

Mr. WOLCOTT. There is no provision in this bill for the rediscount or purchase of GI loans by the Federal National Mortgage Association, but I may say to the gentleman that we did give consideration to a secondary market for GI loans. We have the bill—S. 866—before the committee at the present time. This is the fourth day of the hearings. We are going to continue hearings until we have the matter adequately covered in order to have a thorough understanding of the problems. This is one of them. It is my personal hope that we can put GI mortgages in such condition that they will be comparable in the market to FHA mortgages, and then we can safely create a secondary market that will be of benefit to home construction. It will be of material benefit to the servicemen because it will give them reasonable assurance that the houses which they buy are going to stand up during the period of amortization.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. So that the subject of GI loans is being treated in another piece of legislation?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. There are several bills now before the Banking and Currency Committee on that subject.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has a very, very deep regard for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its Chairman, John Goodloe. It is to be noted that John Goodloe, who has been with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for many years in various capacities, then as general counsel, then as a member of the Board and finally as Chairman of the Board, finds it advantageous to leave the Government service and go with private enterprise. We cannot blame him at all for that. I think, however, that public recognition should be given to the work of John Goodloe as counsel and as Chairman of the Board of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I regret very much that he has found it advisable to leave Government service. He has been a splendid, efficient, honest, conscientious administrator and has cooperated splendidly with our committee. This perhaps raises the broader question that the Government will have to give further consideration to making Government service more attractive to men who have shown their efficiency in these Government positions.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD to commend the committee for bringing out this bill in its present form.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the Committee on Banking and Currency and its chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], for bringing out this bill in its present form. The members of the committee will explain all the various provisions of the bill.

The particular provision that I have a personal interest in is section 5. The section, as it now reads, eliminates a proviso of section 8 of the original bill, which was placed in it in the last session of Congress. The effect of the reworded provisions of section 8 is that the RFC is taxed and its property is taxable by local subdivisions of a State the same as if the identical property were owned by a private individual. This happens to be very important to some of our California cities and counties. The proviso referred to eliminated from taxation fixtures, personal property, such as tools, and so forth. The effect of this proviso, had it remained in the law, would be to prevent the levying of taxes on property aggregating over $30,000,000. Los Angeles County alone would lose $20,000,000 taxable property from its tax rolls; Santa Clara County would lose $6,000,000, and so forth. The exact amount which would be thus lost to taxation would run into a very high figure. The taxes collected from that property are used for the maintenance of local governments and the schools. The school system of California will benefit by the amendment which the committee placed in the bill or rather by the action that the committee took in eliminating the proviso in the previous bill.

I wish to extend the thanks of the local governments of California, and especially the thanks of the League of California Cities, which sponsored this amendment, for giving a receptive ear to the representations of the league representing the cities of California that the proviso be eliminated. To me as their spokesman, it was only common sense to provide that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation should be taxed in its ownership of property the same as an individual were he the owner of the identical property. That has been the policy of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and we think it is a sound policy. It is only natural that our local government should be pleased to know that the committee, and especially its chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], accepted the amendment which was suggested to correct the inequity which I have heretofore mentioned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is essential that this bill be passed if the splendid services of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation are to continue, because under the existing law the functions of this Corporation will cease on June 30 of this year. It would certainly be a tragedy to see the Reconstruction Finance Corporation expire.

I am not going into detail to discuss the powers, the duties, and the financial transactions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation because they have been explained to you by our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. May I say that no corporation, no agency of Government, more richly deserves the respect and gratitude of the American people than the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Its activities, both in war and in peace, have been essential to the welfare of the American people.

It was the offspring of disaster and depression. It was created in January 1932, at the nadir of the worst depression in the memory of living men, and probably the worst depression in our history. The banks of the country were collapsing like houses of cards. The banking holiday was declared. The banks were all closed at that time. A certain period was allowed for their examination and reorganization. Then the Reconstruction Finance Corporation went to the rescue of these financial institutions and saved them. The RFC advanced loans to make these banks again solvent and to allow them to perform the functions for which they were created. Shortly thereafter the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which insured the funds of the depositors in these institutions, created a confidence and gave the institutions a stability which they had not theretofore enjoyed. Since that time bank failures have been almost nonexistent.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency said that he feels the purchase of preferred nonassessable stock gives the Corporation the power to socialize banking and financial institutions. I do not share his apprehension in that regard. It seems to me that the purchase of nonassessable preferred stock is similar to the purchase of debentures or capital notes. They have no voting power; they have no power to control the institutions. I have also heard it said that some of these institutions have endeavored to repurchase the stock and that they have been prevented from doing so. They were not prevented by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation failing to sell them when they offered to buy, but they may have been prevented by the Federal or local banking authorities not permitting them to use their funds to purchase this stock because it would weaken their financial structure. So I do not think that we need be apprehensive about any of the powers that have been granted to this Corporation. It was originally created to bail out the banks, the insurance companies, and the railroads which were in financial difficulties as a result of the depression, and it originally only did subserve the interests of the big institutions. But it was not until some years afterward that it was given the power to make loans to small enterprises and individuals.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself three additional minutes.

I do not intend to indulge in partisan politics in this consideration, but I think this illustrates the fundamental difference between the two parties. When the Democratic Party came into power it gave this great organization the authority to give financial assistance to the individuals and small businesses. The Republican theory was that if the great corporations were prosperous, the individual did not need any help because he would share in the general prosperity. This Corporation has rendered a service not only to the big corporations, but

to the individuals and small businesses, and I do not think we need fear any socialistic tendencies gaining a hold on our Government by reason of the operation of this Corporation when the purpose is to subserve the general interest of the people. The interest of the state is the supreme law, and this great Corporation has subserved to a marked degree the interest of the Federal Government and the interest of the corporations and the interest of the plain people of America.

It has been managed with great ability. The present Chairman of the Board is now resigning his position and accepting a position in private enterprise at a great salary, whch I am sure is the result of the splendid reputation he made in the service of his Government. He is to be commended for the fine services he has rendered to this Corporation through the years. He is a man of fine ability, of tact, of infinite good humor, who has every quality for success in every field of endeavor. I know he has the respect and the confidence of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House, where he repeatedly appeared to advocate the interest of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The country owes him a debt of gratitude for the great services he has rendered. I know that we, who know him, wish him every happiness and success in his new field.

I have no doubt that there will be no vote against this bill. It is absolutely essential that this great Corporation should be continued. It is all proper that some of its powers and duties may be diminished at this time, but when a great emergency comes, if war should happen to come—and God forbid that it may—or if a depression should come, we would again need its services. The framework still remains and we can place within it the powers necessary for the best interest of the American people and our Government at any time we desire to do so.

I wish to comment on that portion of the committee report which sets forth the reasons why the committee amendment does not restore to the RFC the authority to purchase preferred stock of banks and insurance companies, as is proposed in the bill passed by the Senate. It will be recalled that this authority, which was first granted to RFC in the 1933 emergency, was terminated on June 30 last. With reference to the proposed restoration of this authority, the committee report says, at page 6:

> This proposed stock-purchase authority is in conflict with the fundamental premise that RFC continue as a source of noncompetitive, supplemental credit rather than as a source of equity capital. It is the firm conviction of your committee that authority should not be lodged in the RFC to provide equity capital for business. It is a power which could be abused to effect socialization of important segments of our whole economy. Accordingly, the committee amendment does not include such authority.

Generally speaking, I agree that RFC should not be authorized to provide equity capital for business. But that is not at issue and no such authorization has been suggested. All that has been proposed is that RFC be empowered to purchase, in the event emergency conditions require it, preferred stock of financial institutions. Actually, the purchase by RFC of preferred stock in such institutions is not a device by which they could obtain equity financing in the usual sense. In fact, it affords a useful means whereby RFC could provide financial aid in appropriate cases where aid in the form of a direct loan would not accomplish the desired purposes.

Apart from any question with respect to the merits of the proposal to restore the authority to purchase preferred stock of banks and insurance companies, the language of the committee report unfortunately conveys the impression that a restoration of this authority would create a real danger that the power would be abused by RFC to effect socialization of our credit system. I do not believe that the committee intended to convey any such impression since the record shows that the RFC actually did have the authority for 15 years, that it exercised it wisely and in the public interest, and that there was never any suggestion of abuse of this power.

The facts are that RFC purchased preferred stock, capital notes and debentures from 6,104 banks in the total amount of $1,171,411,111.56, yet there was never any suggestion that the RFC, in carrying out this essential program, attempted either to socialize the banking system or to dictate to local interests, or to do anything else of that sort. It is of considerable interest, in this connection, that the superintendent of the insurance department of the State of New York, the Honorable Robert E. Dineen, recently stated, to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, and I quote:

> For the reasons advanced we recommend that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation again be vested with authority to assist insurance companies through the preferred-stock medium. * * * Through the wise use of its powers in the past, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has kept intact many large and small units of the insurance business. In so doing it has preserved that part of our private-enterprise system, for, as we have shown, the alternative to any considerable default by private companies would most probably be a demand for a system of Government insurance. * * * Most important of all, the assistance so rendered was unobtainable from any other source, and if the RFC had not been empowered to act, the many tragic consequences to which we have referred would surely have followed.

No one in this House is better informed regarding the RFC and its operations than the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]. In commenting on this very matter during the extensive hearings on the RFC which were held last year, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] said, and I quote from page 151 of the printed hearings:

> I want to say publicly that it is to the credit of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that it never took full advantage of its position to socialize banking and credit in this country when it had the power and funds to do so * * * they could have socialized banking back in from 1935 to 1940, perhaps, under the authority contained in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as far as the amount of money which they had available to do it with is concerned. They did not do it. And I think we should give credit where credit is due.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to second the remarks that have been made by the distinguished chairman and the ranking Democratic member, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], as to our regard on the Committee on Banking and Currency for a job well done by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Coming in at the last part of the depression and following their activities through the preparations for war through the mammoth project and contributions this agency made toward winning the war by being able to cut across "red" tape with efficient and effective financing and good management and then through the postwar period I doubt if any agency of Government has proved itself more valuable or more useful to the Nation and to the people than the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

I join my distinguished colleagues in our praise for Mr. Goodloe the retiring Chairman of the Board of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Mr. Goodloe by normal ideas of age in Government is a young man who has distinguished himself in his ability to run a mammoth organization rendering public service and still keeping that organization completely on the beam at all times along the line that Congress intended for it to operate.

I wish more departments of Government could maintain the close liaison and consideration for what Congress has in mind that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has been able to maintain through the years. I think that is due in large part to the distinguished men who have headed up the RFC to the esprit de corps and the careful choice of personnel. Young men can get ahead in RFC, and do, as demonstrated by Mr. Goodloe's outstanding success in that organization.

I agree with the distinguished men who have preceded me that it is absolutely essential at this time to continue the operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I intend to support this bill. I do intend, however, to offer an amendment which I believe will have the almost unanimous support of the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, in order to provide that we shall have an adequate amount in the bill for the financing and purchase of bonds and securities of small municipalities and other municipal subdivisions of government.

The bill provides, as it is before you, a ceiling of $125,000,000 in the category of these municipal subdivision bonds. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation cannot buy these bonds unless, as the bill states, the financial assistance applied

for is not otherwise available on reasonable terms. So this can be in no way in competition with private money lenders or private bond brokers.

There is a problem, however, that I believe is going to face the small municipalities who are hopeful of building hospitals under the Burton-Hill Hospital Act, who are trying to put in new water systems, who are trying to build bridges and make other improvements.

Everyone knows that the money market is beginning to tighten up. You also know and must be reasonable enough to understand that the smaller the municipality the less credit experience it has had with investors, and the more difficult and more expensive it is to sell bonds, and the more conditions will be placed upon these small subdivisions of government.

The bill provides a $125,000,000 ceiling for this type of municipal securities. This type of securities has always been handled by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I do not believe generally a ceiling has been placed on it unless in 1 or 2 years it may have been placed in an appropriation bill by the Corporations Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. The securities the gentleman has reference to will be within the limitations of law and qualified otherwise?

Mr. MONRONEY. Certainly.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. This will merely be the outlet for them?

Mr. MONRONEY. This is a secondary market, where they cannot find other places. The bill strictly provides that these loans must be of such sound value and so secured as reasonably to assure retirement and repayment. Such loans may be made either directly or indirectly, and so on, in cooperation with banks.

Roughly, the $125,000,000 ceiling placed herein is almost all gone today. They have on hand now 10 projects, which total $26,000,000, a large portion of that being the Triborough Bridge project in New York. They are now getting a final review and consideration of 32 projects which total $74,000,000 which brings you up to $100,000,000, and you still have better than a year to go under this limitation of $125,000,000.

They also have 160 projects pending, totaling $157,000,000, which gives you an over-all demand for consideration of $257,000,000 of projects, working against a $125,000,000 ceiling on these municipal-type securities.

I believe $200,000,000 will give them enough elbow room to screen the poor ones and take the good ones for which other financing cannot be found. I believe it is one of the major purposes of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make possible help in the construction of these projects. If you will look at these 160 projects that are applied for, you will find countless ones, totaling $400,000 or $500,000, for waterworks systems for small municipalities, for hospitals, for dormitories, and things of that kind seeking help in this period of reconstruction.

I believe the experience of the Reconstruction Finance Corporaton, which under this section has during the years past handled $316,000,000 worth of these municipal bonds, shows that they have seasoned these securities. They take them only until the communities establish their credit rating and show that they are able to pay out these bonds; then they sell the securities to private investors. They merely act as a seasoning agency. They have handled $316,000,000 worth of these, and the RFC says the record of repayments and sales has been extremely favorable. In other words, the Government made money out of this operation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I think the time has come to enlighten the House of this legislation. When in 1929 I observed the fast-approaching danger of financial collapse, which was borne out by the action of the New York banks and investment companies by drawing on the smaller city and country banks throughout the United States and using the small bankers as their tools to unload upon their depositors many worthless stocks and bonds, I sensed that unless a firm position was taken by the Government a more serious panic was inevitable which would engulf our whole financial structure. As the bankers throughout the country started to collect their loans and ask for additional collateral on loans that they had made to their depositors and clients on the securities they helped unload on them through the influence of the Wall Street manipulators, and even before the first real break came in 1929 due to continuous demand for additional security, the banks commenced to sell the collateral and thereby influenced the break in the market. The Wall Street manipulators, also sensing the situation, started to sell stocks which they did not own, selling them short and thereby unfavorably affected the security market.

I addressed myself to the stock exchange and urged the officials and directors to stop the destructive short-selling practice, but instead of taking my advice they used the radio and other means of publicity in assailing me by saying that short selling served as a "cushion," of which fact I had no knowledge. After many long-distance conversations with Mr. Whitney, president of the New York Stock Exchange, and other representatives, I wired that if not in the interest of the country then they, in the interest of the exchange itself, should stop the practice of short-selling and wash sales. Having failed in my efforts to have Mr. Whitney and the stock exchange to act, I appealed to President Hoover and had a conference with our former colleague, Hon. Ogden Mills, then Secretary of the Treasury, and with Mr. Newton, President Hoover's secretary, also a former colleague of ours, and was led to believe that the President would order the suspension of all stock exchange activities for 3 or 4 months. However, the President, after being visited by Mr. Morgan, Mr. Whitney, and a few other Wall Street gentlemen, failed to act.

Conditions went from bad to worse. Most of the banks were calling their loans and were unable to make new loans, especially to the smaller businessmen and manufacturers, and they were obliged to close their doors and restrict their operations and enterprises.

To relieve and aid the small-business men, I introduced a bill early in 1931 and again on December 9, 1931. The latter bill, H. R. 5116, was drafted along the lines of the War Finance Corporation Act, which was enacted during the First World War to aid the small manufacturers and others in the production of war materials. Unfortunately, I did not obtain a hearing on H. R. 5116 until 4 months after its introduction and, regrettably for the country, the officials of the Republican administration withheld action on it until close to the Presidential election, believing it would then aid the country and help the Republican Party. I was delighted when the bill was passed, but, unfortunately, it was vetoed because President Hoover insisted that the bill should be restricted to loans to municipalities unless the projects would be self-liquidating. It was impossible for municipalities and States to place themselves in position to show that the loans were needed for self-liquidating projects or could be made self-liquidating. If consideration of the bill had not been delayed until the Presidential election year of 1932, I believe that even then we could have saved millions and millions of people from grave losses as well as averting the great panic that took place.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT.]

Finally, we passed the RFC Act. It has had a wholesome effect.

My aim, of course, was to aid small business that was on the verge of bankruptcy. However, under the leadership of the then chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Hon. Charles G. Dawes, former Vice President of the United States, one of the first loan applications to be considered was one from Mr. Dawes' own bank in Chicago which sought a loan of $90,000,000. Officials of the RFC telephoned me at midnight to ascertain if I would raise any objection to such loan or similar loans to banks in dire straits. I assured them, realizing the extremely dangerous conditions that existed, that I would not object provided that the smaller outlying banks and rural banks would be given proportionate loans or aid. There was an understanding and agreement that at least half of the total loan, approximating $40,000,000, would be allocated to save the small banks. But that agreement was not kept and unfortunately within a few days in Chicago alone 42 of the outlying banks had to close their doors because of failure of this unkept promise.

I am familiar with this legislation. I think the legislation has done tremendous good with the exception that the

management from time to time did not give that consideration to small business that it was my aim and hope it would receive. Surely the banks received loans, as well as insurance companies, and most of them I would say needed them because they were also on the verge of bankruptcy. They were insolvent because the securities they held were not worth more than 25 cents on the dollar. The same thing applied to the railroads. So I did not object so much to making the loans to the railroads, to the banks, and to the insurance companies, but I did resent and criticize the failure to aid small business. Finally we amended the law and ultimately passed a law known as the Smaller War Plants Corporation Act to take care of the smaller fellows and even authorized the Federal Reserve Board to make loans. Notwithstanding the shortcomings of the Federal Reserve Board, it has done a great deal of good.

I think the bill before us carries some splendid restrictions and I congratulate the committee on the restrictions they have placed in the bill.

The extension of the life of the RFC is in the right direction, but I do hope that the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency will insist and demand that loans to small business shall be given the same consideration as given those who come asking for loans of millions of dollars.

I realize that nearly all the loans have been repaid to the RFC, even as the loan that was made to its first Chairman, Mr. Dawes; but the smaller loans would also have been repaid and thousands of smaller businessmen and bankers could have been saved. So, taking everything into consideration, I can say that I am immensely pleased that years ago I possessed the foresight in urging this constructive legislation that has accomplished so much good and without any actual loss to the Government.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the House Committee has, by adopting many amendments, strengthened the Senate bill. However, I regret that the committee did not embody a provision to eliminate the so-called advisory boards which the RFC established that invariably operated against the small loans. I feel that the big corporations doing business with the bankers who acted as advisory boards are responsible for the great delay and, in many instances, the refusal of small loans to the smaller businesses. This policy, I hope, will be eliminated because I feel that the members of the RFC and most of its employees are men who formerly were bankers or connected with banks. They possessed sufficient ability and experience not to be subjected to the whims and wishes of these big bank advisory boards. From its very inception it was feared that this legislation would operate against the interest of the private banks. However, these criticisms and fears were erroneous because even the largest bankers had to be aided and assisted by the RFC without which many of them that were not closed before would have been obliged to close their doors.

I make this observation on the history of this legislation today not for the purpose of self-glorification, but to show that had my advice and urgent pleas been heeded and timely acted upon without persistent delay on the part of the Republican administration, thousands of institutions could have been saved, millions of people would not have lost all their life savings, and thousands of farmers would not have lost their farms by foreclosure.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] can justly take pride in his interest and participation in creating and maintaining the Reconstruction Finance Corporation because of the very splendid record which this Corporation has made since its organization.

Every few years we have to bring ourselves up to date on the so-called Dawes loans. I wish to read from the hearings in respect to the Dawes loans what is the most recent report on it:

Mr. BUCHANAN. In the case of the so-called Dawes bank, just what is it that is outstanding there?

Mr. GOODLOE. That loan—I believe there were two loans, the aggregate of which was $90,000,000. That, however, was not a preferred-stock deal and was never included within the category of the figure to which you are referring. That was a loan to a newly organized bank to take over the selected assets of the old bank, and the other assets were liquidated. That was a loan of $90,000,000.

As you recall, there was a long and expensive period of liquidation on it. There was much litigation with reference to stockholders' liability. There was repaid, on that loan, in round figures, $105,000,000. There was a certain residual amount of assets which, in order to terminate the expense of the receivership and get it out of court, we bought for an appraised value, so that whatever we get out of those do not count in the $105,000,000 liquidation from the bank itself.

That $105,000,000 is equivalent to getting back all of the principal—$90,000,000—all of the expense incident to the liquidation and an amount equivalent to about 2½ percent interest on the amount of the loan.

I want to be perfectly clear on that, however. By that calculation you apply your payments on principal, then on expenses, then on interest. Whereas, if you applied your payments on interest first it would still leave an unpaid portion of the principal.

Mr. Chairman, in substance the so-called Dawes loans of $90,000,000 have been paid back in full with $15,000,000 additional which for all practical purposes is a $15,000,000 profit to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation on the loan.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time on this side to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, may I say that Mr. Goodloe, Chairman of the Board of the RFC, deserves the splendid compliment paid him by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, and others.

Mr. Chairman, the bill we are considering makes very few changes in the present law.

Under the present law, the succession and the powers of the RFC terminate June 30, 1948. The pending bill extends the powers granted to the Corporation until June 30, 1950, and its succession until June 30, 1952, thus providing a 2-year period after the termination of the Corporation's powers for the liquidation of its business.

The capital stock of RFC is reduced from $325,000,000 to $100,000,000, and hereafter within 6 months after the close of each fiscal year the Corporation would be required to pay into the Treasury the amount by which its accumulated net income exceeds $400,000,000. Under these two provisions, the RFC will pay into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, during the coming fiscal year, approximately $375,000,000.

The terms of the present directors would be extended from January 22 to June 30, 1950; the terms of directors first appointed after June 30, 1950, would be staggered; and thereafter directors would be appointed for 3-year terms instead of 2 years as at present.

Under the present law, the total amount of investments, loans, purchases, and commitments made subsequent to June 30, 1947, may not exceed $2,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time. Under the pending bill, this is reduced to one billion five hundred million.

The record of achievement of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation since its creation in 1932, is one of consistent and effective contribution to the welfare of the country and the maintenance of a sound economy.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I know something of the substantial contribution of the gentleman from Georgia to making a success of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation program and I agree with him that it has been a success.

I wish the gentleman would permit me to inquire at this time about a matter which disturbs me somewhat. I understand the present bill does not provide a secondary market for GI home loans through the RFC. It had been thought that the provision would be in the bill. I think this secondary market should be provided in the measure before us and I shall support an amendment to that effect.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. It does not provide for a secondary market for GI home loans, but it does provide a secondary market for FHA title II and title VI insured loans. The chairman stated in the committee that the proper place for provision for a secondary market for the GI loans would be in the housing bill we are now considering and that this matter would be taken care of in the bill. That is the reason no amendment was offered in the committee to the present bill.

Mr. MAHON. In view of all the controversy about the housing bill, does the gentleman feel that he can assure the House of Representatives that we will get a chance to vote on the type of legislation to which I have referred?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I hope the gentleman will have the opportunity.

In the past 16 years the Congress, in its efforts to strengthen and preserve our system of free enterprise, has called

upon the RFC to perform many important functions.

When the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was first established, this country was on the verge of national bankruptcy. Fear had spread through the land, a paralyzing fear that our economy was doomed to destruction by forces which it seemed powerless to halt. In this critical period the RFC acted promptly, effectively, and boldly. Armed with the financial resources needed to fight the battle against depression, RFC was able to bring effective aid to the Nation's banks, insurance companies, railroads, and numerous other business enterprises. The billions of dollars which were provided through loans and other forms of financial assistance saved thousands of financial institutions, railroads, and other business enterprises from destruction. Of even greater importance, viewed in terms of the broad national interest, the savings and investments of millions of our citizens were protected and preserved, and confidence and courage returned to the cities and farms of America.

At the risk of repeating much that has been said in the past, it seems appropriate to mention briefly a few of the major achievements of the RFC during the relatively brief period of its existence, achievements which are reflected in the high standard of living enjoyed in America today. In 1933 prompt action by the RFC helped to preserve the Nation's banks, thus saving millions of depositors from financial ruin. Hundreds of millions of dollars of the people's savings which had been invested in homes, farms, and other property were saved by RFC's purchase of mortgages during the grim days of the depression. The unfortunate victims of floods, storms, hurricanes, and other natural catastrophes were provided with funds for a fresh start. Many of the country's railroads, vital to our economic well-being, were saved from bankruptcy and restored to financial stability, enabling them to perform their vital role in the trying period which followed Pearl Harbor. Thousands of enterprises, large and small, were able to continue in business because the RFC came to their assistance at a time when the financial help which they needed was not available through normal channels. Without question, the operations of the RFC during the thirties contributed in no small measure to the ability of the United States to meet successfully the problems created by the outbreak of war.

In 1940, and in the years that followed, the Congress of the United States frequently turned to the RFC as an agency well qualified to perform many of the difficult tasks required to prepare the country for the severe trials which lay ahead. The Congress provided the Corporation with broad powers, probably broader than any ever before granted to an agency of the United States, and those powers were used wisely in the national interest. The investigations of its operations which have recently been conducted have served to justify the trust and confidence in the RFC. There is not a scintilla of reliable evidence that any of the powers conferred upon the Corporation has been abused. As one who has served on the Banking and Currency Committee for many years, participating closely in the discussions with respect to the granting of these broad powers, I am proud of the outstanding record of performance and integrity which the RFC has achieved in 16 years of service to the Nation.

There is one aspect of RFC's activities which should be emphasized. It has demonstrated its ability to work with private industry on a basis of mutual respect and confidence.

In its normal lending operations, in the interest of effective public service and economy of operations, it has successfully enlisted and utilized the services of local banking institutions. This has been achieved through such sound devices as the program of participation with banks in extending financial assistance to business enterprises.

During the war years, the degree of cooperation with industry in expediting the national defense program largely explains the gratifying record of success in those vast undertakings. The work of the War Damage Corporation is a good illustration of a wartime endeavor in which RFC and the insurance industry cooperated in a successful effort to meet a national problem. War Damage Corporation, a subsidiary of the RFC, created in December 1941, was established for the purpose of providing our people with financial security against property loss or damage that might be caused by enemy attack. The potential risks were of such magnitude and the entire program was so vast in scope that no private insurance company could undertake the program and assume the risks. More than 8,700,000 policies or certificates were issued, representing a potential liability of approximately $140,000,000,000. This vast program was carried out expeditiously and efficiently because the RFC commanded the respect of the business community and was able quickly to enlist the facilities and cooperation of 546 fire and 88 casualty and surety insurance companies in receiving applications and premiums and issuing policies. After it was all over and after having provided millions of American property owners with war-damage protection at a relatively low cost, the RFC paid into the Treasury of the United States $209,827,810, representing the net profit realized from this operation, after payment of all expenses including fair compensation to the insurance companies for their services.

RFC's history demonstrates conclusively that there is a continuing need for a source of credit to supplement that which private lending institutions can or are willing to supply. In the field of small business, particularly, it is needed. The very survival of thousands of our small business enterprises depends on long-term and intermediate credit being supplied at the right time and on reasonable terms. The importance to the Nation of this segment of our economy is known to all of us. We are agreed that it must be strengthened and preserved, not only because of its contribution to steady employment in local communities, but because the preservation of our American system of democracy and free enterprise requires that there always be afforded full opportunity to individuals with small means to establish and operate their own enterprise.

Recognizing the special needs and importance of small business, section 4 of the bill as reported states specifically that one of the purposes for which loans may be made is "to encourage small business." While in the past 90 percent of all RFC loans have been in amounts of $100,000 or less, it is nevertheless desirable that the Congress give formal recognition and special attention, in RFC's basic law, to the need for these small loans.

In the over-all administration of RFC's normal peacetime lending operation, there has resulted a profit of over one-half billion dollars. Mind you, this has been accomplished in fields where private credit has not been otherwise available. It shows conclusively that RFC loans can be made on a sound business basis without undue risk to the taxpayer. Moreover, the RFC has consistently followed the policy of disposing of its loans and investments at the earliest practicable moment which is consistent with the public interest. This commendable policy results in the substitution of private investment for Government funds whenever conditions permit, as is shown by the table which appears at page 6 of the committee report, showing the amounts disbursed in the various loan and investment categories from organization of the Corporation in 1932 to February 29, 1948, and the remaining balance outstanding on February 29, 1948.

For example, this table shows that while there has been disbursed to banks and bank receivers a total of $2,198,202,000, the outstanding balance on February 29, 1948, was only $778,000—less than one-twentieth of 1 percent of the total amount disbursed. Another example is the case of mortgage-company loans of which a total of $250,833,000 has been disbursed. The outstanding balance of such loans on February 29, 1948, was only $38,000. Loans on and purchases of preferred stock of banks and insurance companies have totaled $1,222,715,000, but the outstanding balance on February 29 last was only $142,158,000.

The RFC is also to be commended for its effective internal administration, where sound business methods have been successfully applied. For example, in 1938 its total personnel numbered 3,800. Then with the beginning of the national-defense program in 1940, this was rapidly increased until in 1946 the personnel numbered 12,265. With the end of the war the gigantic task of liquidation of RFC's war operations was begun and is rapidly being concluded. Personnel now numbers 5,700, of whom 1,500 are engaged in completing the war-liquidation job. This action on the part of the Corporation to reduce its overhead costs, at the same time maintaining its efficiency and ability to discharge its current responsibilities is refreshing.

Last year when the bill providing for the extension of the life of RFC was before the House, I called attention to the troubled world situation and pointed out

that we would be most shortsighted if we permitted the one agency of the Government which by experience and ability is qualified to meet emergency situations, to end its useful service to the country. Today, the international situation is more unsettled than a year ago, and none of us know what the future may bring. The reasons I advanced last year for preserving intact the RFC organization, with its competence and flexibility, are as compelling now as they were then.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the committee substitute is to be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk will read the committee substitute for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

That section 1 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1. (a) There is hereby created a body corporate with the name 'Reconstruction Finance Corporation' (herein called the Corporation), with a capital stock of $100,000,000 subscribed by the United States of America. Its principal office shall be located in the District of Columbia, but there may be established agencies or branch offices in any city or cities of the United States under rules and regulations prescribed by the Board of Directors. This act may be cited as the 'Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act'.

"(b) Within 6 months after the close of each fiscal year the Corporation shall make a report to the Congress of the United States which shall contain financial statements for the fiscal year, including a balance sheet, a statement of income and expense, and an analysis of accumulated net income. The accumulated net income shall be determined after provision for reasonable reserves for uncollectibility of loans and investments outstanding. Such statements shall be prepared from the financial records of the Corporation which shall be maintained in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles applicable to commercial corporate transactions: The report shall contain schedules showing, as of the close of the fiscal year, each direct loan to any one borrower of $100,000 or more, each loan to any one borrower of $100,000 or more in which the Corporation has a participation or an agreement to participate, and the investments in the securities and obligations of any one borrower which total $100,000 or more. Within six months after the end of each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948, the Corporation shall pay over to the Secretary of the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, a dividend on its capital stock owned by the United States of America, in the amount by which its accumulated net income exceeds $400,000,000.

"(c) Within sixty days after the effective date of this amendment, the Corporation shall retire all its outstanding capital stock in excess of $100,000,000 and shall pay to the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts the par value of the stock so retired."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a board of directors consisting of five persons appointed by the President of the United States by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Of the five members of the board, not more than three shall be members of any one political party and not more than one shall be appointed from any one Federal Reserve district. The office of director shall be a full-time position. The term of the incumbent directors is hereby extended to June 30, 1950. As of July 1, 1950, two directors shall be appointed for a term of 1 year, two directors shall be apopinted for a term of 2 years, and one director shall be appointed for a term of 3 years. Thereafter the term of the directors shall be for a term of 3 years, but they may continue in office until their successors are appointed and qualified. Whenever a vacancy shall occur in the office of director other than by expiration of term, the person appointed to fill such vacancy shall hold office for the unexpired portion of the term of the director whose place he is selected to fill. After the confirmation of the directors by the Senate, the President shall designate one of the directors to serve as chairman for a period coextensive with his term as director. The directors, except the chairman, shall receive salaries at the rate of $12,500 per annum each. The chairman of the board of directors shall receive a salary at the rate of $15,000 per annum."

SEC. 3. Section 3 (a) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) The Corporation shall have succession through June 30, 1952, unless it is sooner dissolved by an act of Congress. It shall have power to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal; to make contracts; to lease or purchase such real estate as may be necessary for the transaction of its business; to sue and be sued, to complain and to defend, in any court of competent jurisdiction, State or Federal; to select, employ, and fix the compensation of such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as shall be necessary for the transaction of the business of the Corporation, in accordance with laws, applicable to the Corporation, as in effect on June 30, 1947, and as thereafter amended; and to prescribe, amend, and repeal, by its board of directors, bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its general business may be conducted. Except as may be otherwise provided in this act or in the Government Corporation Control Act, the board of directors of the Corporation shall determine the necessity for and the character and amount of its obligations and expenditures under this act and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, paid, and accounted for, without regard to the provisions of any other laws governing the expenditure of public lands, and such determinations shall be final and conclusive upon all other officers of the Government. The Corporation shall be entitled to and granted the same immunities and exemptions from the payment of costs, charges, and fees as are granted to the United States pursuant to the provisions of law codified in sections 543, 548, 555, 557, 578, and 578a of title 28 of the United States Code, 1940 edition. The Corporation shall also be entitled to the use of the United States mails in the same manner as the executive departments of the Government. Debts due the Corporation, whether heretofore or hereafter arising, shall not be entitled to the priority available to the United States pursuant to section 3466 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 31, sec. 191) except that the Corporation shall be entitled to such priority with respect to debts arising from any transaction pursuant to any of the following acts or provisions in effect at any time: Sections 5d (1) and 5d (2) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act added by section 5 of the act entitled 'An act to authorize the purchase by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of stock of Federal home-loan banks; to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes', approved June 25, 1940 (54 Stat. 573); sections 4 (f) and 9 of the act entitled 'An act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes', approved June 11, 1942 (56 Stat. 354, 356); section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 26); the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 765 and the following); sections 11 and 12 of the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 214, 215); and section 403 of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act (56 Stat. 245)."

SEC. 4. Section 4 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. (a) To aid in financing agriculture, commerce, and industry, to encourage small business, to help in maintaining the economic stability of the country, and to assist in promoting maximum employment and production, the Corporation, within the limitations hereinafter provided, is authorized—

"(1) to purchase the obligations of and to make loans to any business enterprise organized or operating under the laws of any State or the United States: *Provided*, That the purchase of obligations (including equipment trust certificates) of, or the making of loans to, railroads engaged in interstate commerce or air carriers, engaged in air transportation as defined in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, or receivers or trustees thereof, shall be with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission or the Civil Aeronautics Board, respectively: *Provided further*, That in the case of such railroads or air carriers which are not in receivership or trusteeship, the Commission or the Board, as the case may be, in connection with its approval of such purchases or loans, shall also certify that such railroad or air carrier, on the basis of present and prospective earnings, may be expected to meet its fixed charges without a reduction thereof through judicial reorganization except that such certificates shall not be required in the case of loans or purchases made for the acquisition of equipment or for maintenance.

"(2) to make loans to any financial institution organized under the laws of any State or of the United States.

"(3) in order to aid in financing projects authorized under Federal, State, or municipal law, to purchase the securities and obligations of, or make loans to, (A) States, municipalities, and political subdivisions of States; (B) public agencies and instrumentalities of one or more States, municipalities, and political subdivisions of States; and (C) public corporations, boards, and commissions: *Provided*, That no such purchase or loan shall be made for payment of ordinary governmental or nonproject operating expenses as distinguished from purchases and loans to aid in financing specific public projects;

"(4) to make such loans as it may determine to be necessary or appropriate because of floods or other catastrophes.

"(b) The powers granted in section 4 (a) of this act shall be subject to the following restrictions and limitations:

"(1) No financial assistance shall be extended pursuant to paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) of this section, unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available on reasonable terms. All securities and obligations purchased and all loans made under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) of this section shall be of such sound value or so secured as reasonably to assure retirement or repayment and such loans may be made either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate or by the purchase of participations, or otherwise.

"(2) No loan, including renewals or extensions thereof, may be made under sections 4 (a) (1), (2), and (4) for a period or periods exceeding 10 years and no securities or obligations maturing more than 10 years from date of purchase by the Corporation may be purchased thereunder: *Provided*, That the foregoing restriction on maturities shall not apply to securities or obligations received by the Corporation as a claimant in bankruptcy

or equitable reorganization or as a creditor in proceedings under section 20 (b) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended: *Provided further,* That any loan made or securities and obligations purchased prior to July 1, 1947, may in aid of orderly liquidation thereof or the interest of national security, be renewed or the maturity extended for such period not in excess of 10 years and upon such terms as the Corporation may determine: *Provided further,* That any loan made under section 4 (a) (1) for the purpose of constructing industrial facilities may have a maturity of 10 years plus such additional period as is estimated may be required to complete such construction. The Corporation may, in carrying out the provisions of subsection 4 (a) (3), purchase securities and obligations, or make loans, including renewals or extensions thereof, with maturity dates not in excess of 40 years, as the Corporation may determine.

"(3) In agreements to participate in loans, wherein the Corporation's disbursements are deferred, such participations by the Corporation shall be limited to 75 percent of the balance of the loan outstanding at the time of the disbursement.

"(c) The total amount of investments, loans, purchases, and commitments made subsequent to June 30, 1947, pursuant to section 4 shall not exceed $1,500,000,000 outstanding at any one time: *Provided,* That the aggregate amount outstanding at any one time shall not exceed under subsection (a) (4) $25,000,000 and for construction purposes under subsection (a) (3) $125,000,000.

"(d) No fee or commission shall be paid by any applicant for financial assistance under the provisions of this act in connection with any such application, and any agreement to pay or payment of any such fee or commission shall be unlawful.

"(e) No director, officer, attorney, agent, or employee of the Corporation in any manner, directly or indirectly, shall participate in the deliberation upon or the determination of any question affecting his personal interests, or the interests of any corporation, partnership, or association in which he is directly or indirectly interested.

"(f) The powers granted to the Corporation by this section 4 shall terminate at the close of business on June 30, 1950, but the termination of such powers shall not be construed (1) to prohibit disbursement of funds on purchases of securities and obligations, on loans, or on commitments or agreements to make such purchases or loans, made under this act prior to the close of business on such date, or (2) to affect the validity or performance of any other agreement made or entered into pursuant to law.

"(g) As used in this act, the term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands."

SEC. 5. Effective as of midnight June 30, 1947, the first sentence of section 8 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "The Corporation, including its franchise, capital, reserves and surplus, and its income shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States, by any Territory, dependency, or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, except that any real property of the Corporation shall be subject to special assessments for local improvements and shall be subject to State, Territorial, county, municipal, or local taxation to the same extent according to its value as other real property is taxed."

SEC. 6. Subsection (m) of section 206 of title II of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation", approved June 30, 1947 (Public Law 132, 80th Cong.), is amended to read as follows:

"(m) The first section and sections 2, 3, 9, 11, and 13 of the act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 1), as amended."

SEC. 7. Section 209 of title II of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation", approved June 30, 1947 (Public Law 132, 80th Cong.), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 209. During the period between June 30, 1948, and the date of enactment of legislation making funds available for administrative expenses for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, the Corporation is authorized to incur, and pay out of its general funds, administrative expenses in accordance with laws in effect on June 30, 1948, such obligations and expenditures to be charged against funds when made available for administrative expenses for the fiscal year 1949."

SEC. 8. The third paragraph of section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended by section 328 of the Banking Act of 1935, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Loans made to established industrial or commercial businesses (a) which are in whole or in part discounted or purchased or loaned against as security by a Federal Reserve bank under the provisions of section 13b of this act, (b) for any part of which a commitment shall have been made by a Federal Reserve bank under the provisions of said section, (c) in the making of which a Federal Reserve bank participates under the provisions of said section, or (d) in which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation cooperates or purchases a participation under the provisions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, shall not be subject to the restrictions or limitations of this section upon loans secured by real estate."

Mr. WOLCOTT (interrupting the reading of the committee substitute). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the committee substitute be dispensed with and that it be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONRONEY: On page 24, line 12, after "subsection (a) (3)" strike out "$125,000,000" and insert "$200,000,000."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment I discussed in general debate, to increase the amount of municipal subdivision bonds that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may hold at any one time from $125,000,000 to $200,000,000.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. As far as I am personally concerned there should be no objection to the gentleman's amendment. I cannot speak for the committee, but as I understand the amendment it does not earmark specifically for this purpose $200,000,000, it merely authorizes that much borrowing power to be used for that purpose.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is exactly right. May I say also that it does not raise the total amount that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may operate under, it merely increases the elbow room for the municipalities that are liable to need some kind of emergency market.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to ask the chairman of the committee certain questions. I should like to have the chairman refer to the language in section 4, the committee report on page 15, which appears in italics:

SEC. 4. (a) To aid in financing agriculture, commerce, and industry, to encourage small business—

As I understand the report, the language "to encourage small business" is new language which has been written into the law through the amendment of section 4. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. We were of the opinion that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has had authority right along to make small-business loans, but we wanted to emphasize our intent with respect to loans to small business. For that reason we added this language to remove any uncertainty in respect to their authority to make loans to small business.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think the committee should be congratulated for making that change and for placing that emphasis on this particular phase of the work of the RFC.

There is some additional language on page 22 of the bill, lines 13 to 24 inclusive, which I should like to have the chairman comment on as briefly as he cares to, referring to paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of subsection (a) of section 4. How does that relate to loans made—if I make myself clear?

Mr. WOLCOTT. If the gentleman is still discussing small-business loans, they are not distinguished in category from any other loans, and this standard contained in subsection I of section (b) of section 4 would apply to small-business loans and all other loans made by the Corporation for the purposes set forth in subsections I to III. The gentleman will notice that subsection 4 is not included, which provides "to make such loans as may be determined to be necessary or appropriate because of floods or other catastrophes." We have set aside substantially $25,000,000 for that purpose.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I believe that is an answer to that question.

Now on page 45 of the bill, lines 8 to 10, inclusive, I find this language in subparagraph (g), "as used in this act, the term 'State' includes District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands."

I wish to make this specific inquiry: Recently in presenting some Virgin Islands matters before the Committee on Appropriations, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations raised the question as to why the House Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs should be requesting legislation permitting the Virgin Islands Company to make loans such as agricultural and business

loans in the Virgin Islands, when we had the Reconstruction Finance Corporation organized and operating as it has been for the last few years. I stated to the chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER], that I had no objection whatsoever to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation making the loans and leaving out of the proposed act the power for the Virgin Islands Company to make the loans. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was approached and in the course as I understand the procedure, this language which I have just read was written into the Senate bill. I wish to inquire of the chairman of the House committee as to whether or not in his opinion the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under section 4 and under this bill as here presented is thoroughly authorized to make small business loans and loans for agricultural purposes in the Virgin Islands. Specifically in the opinion of the chairman, is this language sufficiently broad to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans for business purposes, that is, small loans and loans for agricultural purposes in the Virgin Islands under the terms of the proposal as set forth here.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Wherein the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to make loans to agriculture and business in any part of the continental United States or Territories under existing law, they would now be permitted to make the same type of loans under the same standards in the Virgin Islands. It is our intent to include the Virgin Islands on the same basis as the continental United States and the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico have been included under existing law. The only addition that we made was to include the Virgin Islands, and we intended to include them in the same category as the States and Territories.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

THE TRADE-AGREEMENTS PROGRAM AND THE EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I take this time this afternoon to speak on the subject of the trade-agreements program and the European recovery program.

As the time for consideration of the renewal of the Trade Agreements Act approaches, there are many disturbing reports about what may happen to this keystone of our economic foreign policy. For example, I find in the press such alarming statements as: "European recovery may be stopped before it starts by high-tariff Congressmen." Now the European recovery program has been based on agreements at world trade conferences that participating countries would lower their trade barriers. Any curtailment of our own part in this movement would seriously weaken the position of the United States. The reduction of trade barriers in order to influence the interchange of goods and services was considered paramount by the Committee on Foreign Relations of the other body, when it wrote into the European recovery program bill the following language:

> Mindful of the advantages which the United States has enjoyed through the existence of a large domestic market with no internal trade barriers, and believing that similar advantages can accrue to the countries of Europe, it is the hope of the people of the United States that these countries through a joint organization will exert sustained common efforts which will speedily achieve that economic cooperation in Europe which is essential for lasting peace and prosperity.

Thus European countries are not only encouraged to trade with one another but should be encouraged to take steps to lower tariffs and other barriers to the expansion of trade between themselves and with the rest of the world. The United States with its commitments has a large stake in European recovery. If European countries, weakened by hunger and want, should have been permitted to succumb one after another to totalitarian pressure, America's national security would have been jeopardized. The hope of freemen everywhere for liberty and peace can be realized only with economic prosperity and political stability in Europe.

This matter of international trade is so vitally important to us that I want to take a little time to review the European trade situation.

Before the war, Europe was a keystone in the world economic structure. European countries conducted over one-half of the world's foreign trade. Europe was the principal market, not only for United States exports but also for the exports of South America and Asia. The purchasing power of South America and Asia to buy our exports depended upon their ability to sell their own products in Europe. Before the war, European ships carried over two-thirds of the world's total foreign trade. Europe's industrial production exceeded that of the United States.

The war disrupted European economic life. European factories, which used to produce for export—thereby helping Europe pay for its necessary imports—were bombed to rubble. European overseas investments, which also helped Europe to pay for its necessary imports, were liquidated during the war. Transportation facilities were dislocated. Europe can no longer support itself.

European agricultural production in 1947 was 20 percent below the prewar level. European food consumption in 1947 was a third below the prewar level. Industrial production in the British Isles and Scandinavia, in 1947, was equal to or slightly above the prewar level. But, in 1947, industrial production in France, Belgium, and the Netherlands was only 80 to 90 percent of the prewar level, and that of Germany, Italy, and Austria was less than one-half of the prewar rate. European countries, deprived of adequate industrial and agricultural products during 6 years of the war, could not meet their needs at this rate of production. Acute shortages were evident in all lines, and this made economic recovery a slow and difficult task. The result was poverty and hunger in all European countries, and political tension, turmoil, and unrest in many.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I shall not object to this request, but I think it should be understood that there is other business coming up this afternoon and we would like to get through with this bill as soon as possible. I shall object to any further request for extension of time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the graciousness of the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Curency in not objecting. It is my understanding that no further business will be called up this afternoon after disposition of this particular bill, therefore I made the unanimous consent request. I assure the gentleman I will conclude in 5 minutes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman has been misinformed when he says there is no other business because we have an authorization for a billion-dollar public works program to come up this afternoon.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am wondering if that is in excess of the budget request of the President or whether it is below the budget request of the President or whether you on that side are saving any money.

The Marshall plan or the European recovery program, formulated by the European countries at the suggestion of Secretary of State George C. Marshall, is planned to make Europe self-supporting again. Full and speedy economic recovery in Europe is desirable, not only for humanitarian reasons, but also from the point of view of our national security and our foreign trade.

The recovery plan will sustain the United States exports to Europe—and also our total exports to all countries—at approximately the 1947 levels. Contrary to popular belief, it would not increase our exports appreciably above the 1947 level, except in certain products. In 1947, the United States total exports to all countries were approximately two and one-half times our total imports from all countries, and our exports to Europe were over six times our imports from Europe. Without the Marshall plan, or similar financial aid, Europe would have to cut drastically its purchases from us, simply because its supply of dollar exchange is almost exhausted. Economic

prosperity in Europe will provide a sustaining market for our exports directly to Europe, and indirectly to South America and Asia whose ability to buy from us depends upon their sales to Europe.

The Administrator of the recovery program will soon be faced with the difficult problem of determining to what extent aid by the United States will assist European countries in exporting to markets which are partially being supplied by American products. In this connection the House Select Committee on Foreign Aid significantly said—supplement to Report No. 14:

If this achieves its announced objective of a Europe which will be substantially self-supporting at the end of the reconstruction period, it must frankly face the probability that it will be helping to expand and modernize European industry which will compete with United States industry in world markets. Special interests in this country will undoubtedly be directly affected by such competition and may, as a result, bring pressure to curtail further aid. However, as long as such European competition is not given special noneconomic privileges, there is little doubt but that the productive efficiency of United States private industry will be able to meet it successfully.

I am happy to see this able committee of the House take such an optimistic attitude about competition. I agree that the private enterprise system, if given a chance, has little to fear. I say this in spite of the dire warnings by special interest groups who fear competition and wish to maintain tariff subsidies.

I was pleased to find that the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the other body on the European recovery program expressed approbation of East-West trade. The committee stated:

The restoration of this trade, which traditionally has consisted of food supplies, timber, and coal from the east and manufactured goods from the west, is one of the basic assumptions on which the participating countries predicated their import requirements from the Western Hemisphere.

The number of bilateral trading agreements concluded or being negotiated between eastern and western Europe is encouraging. On the other hand, Russia and her satellite states likewise have entered into a number of agreements which may have the effect of retarding the normal flow of trade. This web of trade agreements, together with the Russian grain and barter arrangements, constitute the Molotov plan which has the effect of tightening Russian control over the exports of the satellite countries and diverting their products from the west, where they normally flowed, to the east.

In the light of the Molotov plan and the attitude of the Comiform toward the European recovery program, there can be no certainty that the assumed restoration of trade will actually occur. Healthy trade relations within the European Continent will greatly aid the objective of ERP and the door is left open to the participation of eastern European countries in the program. If restoration of trade between the east and west of Europe does not occur, it is the opinion of the State Department that recovery in the west of Europe will be much slower and more difficult, but not impossible of achievement.

The committee accepts and approves the assumption concerning the desirability of restoring east-west trading. This is another clear indication which should destroy the misconception, ceaselessly propagated, that the economic cooperation bill is designed to split Europe into two economic camps.

There has arisen in the last few days a controversy on this East-West trade which concerns the honor of the United States. Some would seem determined to stop East-West trade altogether, between Soviet Russia and her satellites on the one side and western Europe and the United States on the other. While I do not often quote Herbert Hoover on public matters, when he wrote Speaker MARTIN that if the Marshall plan countries were to become independent of relief they must trade with the satellite countries, I can follow him.

This matter of trade with European countries is directly related to the renewal of the Trade Agreements Act.

Arthur Krock recently said in this connection:

If Congress should fail to renew, or should emasculate, the RTA it would be forbidding the United States to do the very things it requires of the nations under the Marshall plan.

This Government on March 20, 1948, was informed that the Government of Czechoslovakia had signed the protocol of provisional application of the general agreement on tariffs and trade to put the agreement provisionally into effect April 20. This general agreement is a multilateral trade agreement among 23 nations, concluded October 30, 1947, in Geneva, Switzerland. The agreement with Czechoslovakia was only a small part of this wide agreement among the 23 nations which covered one-half of the total world trade.

The United States Government fully examined the implications and obligations of the agreement in the light of recent developments in Czechoslovakia. Notwithstanding these developments, the Government of the United States had no choice other than to honor its signature to an agreement negotiated in good faith on both sides.

There is no reason to believe that the present Czechoslovak Government cannot or will not honor those provisions of the agreement which are of benefit to American traders and which were included in the document as compensation for the concessions which the United States offered during the negotiations. There are adequate safeguards and remedies available to the United States in case of failure of the Czechoslovak Government to meet any of these obligations. The proclamation of the provisional application of the general agreement in no way precludes the United States from using export controls or other measures to safeguard our national security if that becomes necessary.

Under the general agreement, Czechoslovakia grants concessions on products of interest to the United States representing approximately $31,600,000 in terms of 1937 trade and covering approximately 80 percent of Czechoslovakia's total prewar imports from the United States. The agreement includes substantial duty reductions by Czechoslavikia on a number of important items, such as apples and pears, raisins, prunes and certain other dried fruits, canned fruits and fruit juices, canned vegetables, passenger automobiles, and certain types of office machines.

The concessions made by the United States in the general agreement on products of interest to Czechoslovakia represent approximately $22,700,000 in terms of 1937 trade and cover approximately 64 percent of United States prewar imports from Czechoslovakia. Of the concessions granted by the United States, those on household china, table and kitchen glassware, jewelry, certain types of shoes and gloves, and hops, are the items of principal interest to Czechoslovakia.

It is realized that certain industrial groups in this country have expressed fear of what may happen some time in the indefinite and distant future. The House ought to be informed that some of these same groups feared the enactment of the Trade Agreements Act in 1934 and at that time predicted disaster for themselves and the country. They have expressed similar alarming fears at each of the renewals. We heard them in 1937, 1940, 1943, 1945, but happily none of these fears has ever been realized. Profits continued to rise in 1947. The segments of industry, which are still expressing such fear of what might happen in the future are reminded that Executive order 9832, of February 25, 1947, requires an escape clause in each agreement whereby if industry can show injury or threat of injury as a result of increased imports due to a tariff concession, this escape clause supplies an adequate remedy. The agreement with Czechoslovakia contains this escape clause. Applictions for study can be made to the Tariff Commission under this Executive Order. The Tariff Commission has published its procedure for determining the facts about real or even fancied injury to a domestic industry. The items in the agreement with Czechoslovakia are subject to the operations of the escape clause and any complaining industry can have a scientific and careful investigation made by this long-standing bipartisan Tariff Commission. An industry cannot obtain a remedy by doing no more than cry wolf, wolf.

I know there has been some opposition in the House to placing the Czechoslovak agreement into effect. Furthermore, I realize that some in the House are opposed to the reciprocal trade agreements policy, but I believe there are few Members who would vote that this Government should not have honored its signature after the agreement had been signed. I was glad to see from the press that the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] admits that he was sympathetic to the position of this Government in bringing the agreement with Czechoslovakia into effect.

In addition to safeguards with respect to imports, I wish to point out that the United States exercises export controls to protect the American economy generally, to promote the objectives of foreign policy, and to safeguard national security. Since March 1, 1948, no shipments to European destinations, including Czechoslovakia, can be made without appropriate license. These export controls prevent shipment of goods contrary to the national interests of the United States.

It is vital to continue and where possible extend East-West trade if we are to achieve recovery and stability in Europe. Such trade, so long as we continue to build up our own strength and are able to protect our security interests, is positive and constructive.

Economic prosperity will strengthen the democratic countries of Europe. The implications of this fact are highly significant in terms of our own national security. General Eisenhower's concluding report as Chief of Staff, February 1948, stated:

The defeat of the democracies joined in common defense would be a formidable task for any power.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MULTER: On page 26, after line 7, insert the following:

"SEC. 7. Section 208 of title II of the joint resolution entitled 'Joint Resolution To Extend the Succession, Lending Powers, and the Functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation,' approved June 30, 1947 (Public Law 132, 80th Cong.), is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 208. (a) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall have the power to purchase any surplus property for resale subject to regulations of the War Assets Administrator or his successor, to small business when, in its judgment, such disposition is required to preserve and strengthen the competitive position of small business. The purchase of surplus property under this section shall be given priority under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, immediately following transfers to Government agencies under section 12 of such act, as amended, and disposals to veterans under section 16 of such act, as amended. The provisions of section 12 (c) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, shall be applicable to purchases made under this section: *Provided, however,* That in exercising the priority provided by this law for the purpose of transferring or disposing of the same to private industry the RFC shall disclose such fact in its offer, together with the names and addresses of the persons, firms, or corporations to whom it intends to transfer such property, together with a full and complete statement as to the intended use or disposition to be made by the transferee of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The Administrator in the exercise of his discretion shall then determine whether or not to transfer such property to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the same manner and to the same extent as though the ultimate transferee of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was the offerer to the Administrator. It is the intent of this section that no person, firm, or corporation shall be accorded any advantage over any other solely by reason of the fact that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is offering to acquire the property for it or them. The Administrator shall reject the offer of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation whenever it appears that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation intends to transfer the property to a person, firm, or corporation who intends to dispose of whole or part thereof, or does not intend to use all thereof in their own business. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall not purchase any real property for resale to small business pursuant to this section in any case where any person from whom the property had been acquired by a Government agency, gives notice in writing to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that he intends to exercise his rights under section 23 of the Surplus Property Act, as amended.

"'(b) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is further authorized for the purpose of carrying out the objectives of this section to arrange for sales of surplus property to small business concerns on credit or time basis.

"'(c) For the purposes of this section the terms "persons," "surplus property," and "Government agency" have the same meaning as is assigned to such terms by section 3 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended.'"

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to clarify and limit the present priority provisions given to the RFC in the present law. Presently the priority provisions granted the RFC are mandatory to the extent that if one goes to the War Assets Administrator and attempts to buy some property from him and is an unsuccessful bidder there, either because his price is lower than that of his competitors, or because he does not qualify within the language of the War Assets disposal provisions and regulations, some of which require that the purchaser be seeking to obtain the property for use in his own business rather than to speculate with it——

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, at that point, if the gentleman will yield, as I understand the gentleman's amendment, the purpose is to remove any discrimination between small businesses, one of which gets its financing through a loan from RFC and the other who is not purchasing War Assets through RFC.

Mr. MULTER. It does precisely that, sir.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I personally would have no objection to the amendment. I talked with several members of the committee about it, and although the committee did not have the language before it, I think the committee was substantially in agreement with the gentleman's position at that time. If that effectuates the purpose, as I understand it does, I do not think there should be any objection to the amendment.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. Do I understand the gentleman's amendment still permits the RFC to exercise a priority in favor of small business?

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Mr. RIZLEY. At what point do they have to step in to exercise that priority? One of the troubles we found in connection with the War Assets Administration was this, that War Assets has actually made sales of property, accepted bids, received the money, and then RFC would come in as a representative of small business and undertake to exercise priority even after that has been done. That has created a lot of confusion and a lot of trouble at times, and even some lawsuits. Does the gentleman's amendment take care of that sort of thing?

Mr. MULTER. Unfortunately it does not take care of that precise situation, except that when the Reconstruction Finance Corporation does come in, even at that late hour, the War Assets Administrator will have the right to use his discretion to determine what he should do with it, and not follow the mandatory provision of law and say, "I am sorry, gentlemen, we have your money but the Reconstruction Finance Corporation now wants this property and we will have to give it to the RFC." This will stop that to that extent, although it does not put in the limitation of time as to when the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may come in. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation certainly may come in at any time up to the time the War Assets Administration actually delivers title to the prospective purchaser.

Mr. RIZLEY. That has been one of the troubles we have had. Under the Surplus Property Act, unless this amendment changes it, it is within the discretion of the Administrator further to permit the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to exercise its priority after he has actually made a deal for the property. Of course the War Assets Administration, knowing the intent of Congress to protect small business, has gone pretty far the other way in connection with the matter. I was hopeful that we could get something in the bill somewhere, in view of this amendment, so that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would have to step in before the property has actually been sold. Perhaps title may not have passed, but I know numerous instances where property has been advertised, bids have been accepted, and the War Assets Administration has received a check for the money and the bidder was waiting to get the property, and on the strength of that had made commitments in connection with the property, and then the Reconstruction Finance Corporation stepped in and said, "We are going to exercise our priority." That sort of situation should not exist.

Mr. MULTER. The gentleman's experience has been the same as mine and the same as that of other Members of the House. I think, though, that we shall have to cure the limitation of time by offering an amendment to the Surplus Property Act. That is the way we should handle that. I would be glad to sit down with the gentleman and work out a proposed amendment to that very section, which is not germane to this.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'KONSKI: On page 27, after line 13, add the following:

"SEC. 9. In order to encourage and protect small business and to insure widespread and equitable distribution of national defense procurement contracts and such European-aid purchases as are made domestically, under the authority of the chairman of such agency as may be hereafter established to administer the European recovery program, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby expressly empowered to perform the following acts for the benefit of free and independent small business, and to discourage monopoly, in the industrial economy of the Nation.

"The Corporation shall have power and is hereby directed, through its Small Business Division or its successor as duly designated by the Board of Directors of the Corporation, whenever and to the extent that it determines such action to be necessary:

"(a) To make or cause to be made such surveys as in its opinion may be necessary

to determine the facilities of small businesses and their capabilities to perform contracts designated by this section.

"(b) To request information of any other governmental departments as in its opinion may be necessary or advisable to assist in carrying out the intent and provisions of this section, and all departments so requested are hereby directed to furnish such information as they may have available upon the request of the Corporation.

"(c) In any case in which the Board of Directors of the Corporation or such representative of the Corporation as the Board of Directors may designate certifies to the Secretary of National Defense, the Director of the Procurement Division of the Treasury, or the chairman of such Government agency as may hereafter be established by the Congress to administer the European recovery program, that the Corporation is competent to perform on any specific Government procurement contract or any contract placed domestically through the European recovery program, when such contract requires the approval of the chairman of the agency established to administer such program; on any contract so let by or with the approval of such officer, it shall be the duty of that officer to let such procurement contract to the Corporation upon such terms and conditions as may be specified by the Board of Directors of the Corporation or its duly authorized representative. The Corporation is hereby authorized to further subcontract the whole or any part of any such contracts, under such terms and conditions as it may deem advisable, to any companies or groups thereof qualifying under the definition of small business as hereinafter set forth.

"(d) To negotiate with all procurement divisions or officers hereinbefore referred to, and determine if contracts proposed to be let by them are applicable to and can be performed by small business. Such procurement divisions and officers shall make available to the Corporation all such proposed contracts, and shall give full opportunity for and consideration to any bids submitted by small business certified as such by the Corporation. Such procurement officers or divisions are hereby directed to supply the Corporation with all necessary information pertaining to such contracts prior to their letting, and such procurement officers or divisions will be considered to have complied with the provisions of Public Law 413, section 2 (b), of the Eightieth Congress, which require fair consideration to be given to small business, upon such certification by the Corporation. The Congress recognizes the possibility that small business may not be able to manufacture certain articles at as low a unit cost as they may be manufactured by large business, and, in order to prevent undue discrimination against small business, the procurement officers or divisions hereinbefore referred to are hereby empowered to accept bids from small business as may be certified as such by the Corporation, notwithstanding that such bids may be at higher prices than those submitted by large business, and notwithstanding the provisions of any other act of Congress.

"(e) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, the Corporation is hereby authorized to make loans to small business for the purpose of financing contracts described in this section, under such terms and conditions as the Board of Directors of the Corporation may determine.

"(f) The Corporation is authorized to incur, and to pay out of its general funds, such administrative expenses as arise from the discharge of its responsibilities under this section.

"(g) For the purpose of aid to small business as set forth in this section, the Corporation, through its duly authorized delegates, shall be a member of all boards or committees of all or any agencies established or hereafter established which have or shall have the responsibility of allocating such materials as are deemed necessary by the Congress.

"(h) For the purpose of this section, small business shall be defined by the Board of Directors of the Corporation. In no case shall a business or group of businesses be considered as small business if at the time of its application for certification by the Corporation it has in its employ more than approximately 500 people, nor shall it be dominant in its field nor be affiliated with a company dominant in its field."

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides in one of its sections that its purpose is to encourage small business. The long amendment which was just read makes it mandatory on the part of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to set up within the Reconstruction Finance Corporation a division which will deal solely with the problems of small business. I feel in the legislation of this Congress in the past, small business has not fared very well. The Department of Commerce appropriation bill recently passed practically eliminated the Small Business Division within the Department of Commerce. The Smaller War Plants Corporation has already been liquidated. In other words, if the bill as now written is passed, there is nothing on the statute books or within the confines of the Government or within any Department of our Government that confines its activity solely to helping and encouraging small business. This section if added to the bill would merely set up within the Reconstruction Finance Corporation a division which will deal particularly with the problems of small business and the demands that are being made upon the various procurement agencies of the Government. It is difficult for them to go before the various Government departments without help from the Federal Government to get what they need. One of the greatest problems I feel facing the Members of Congress at the present time is the number of requests from small business in their districts seeking somehow to get Government help to help them along. I feel this is a much-needed amendment which would merely make it mandatory on the part of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to do what you say should be done when you say the purpose of this bill is to encourage small business. I hope I have explained the amendment sufficiently and trust that the committee will accept it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, all of us are sympathetic with the purposes of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, but as I heard it read it seemed to me that the activity provided for in the gentleman's amendment might in effect become a primary function of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, especially in that the corporation or subsidiary corporation provided for in the amendment must function in respect to the European recovery program. There does not seem to be any limitation whatever on the use of RFC funds for this purpose in the amendment.

For a good many years we have had before us this question, of small business. Small business is not having as much difficulty now as it used to have in getting loans from banks and other financing institutions. Those loans are or might be participation loans. A goodly amount of the $1,500,000,000 that is authorized in this bill will be made available to small business. As a matter of fact, I believe the record shows that about 90 percent of the business loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation are so-called small-business loans. It has always been difficult to find a definition for "small business." "Small business," of course, is a relative term; what might be small business in one industry might be exceptionally large business in any other industry.

We have emphasized in the bill which was reported out of the committee our intent in respect to loans to small business and to small industries, and we feel that that is sufficient for the immediate purposes. If it develops in the course of the years that we have a recession and small business finds it difficult to get financing, then we have kept this bill in such condition that we can immediately expand it to meet that and other conditions which may arise.

We surely at this time are not prepared to know what the volume of activity might be under the gentleman's amendment, how much it might be necessary to increase the borrowing power of the RFC and how much the contingent liability of the Government might be increased by this activity. For these reasons I hope that the committee will not accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COMBS: Page 22, after line 10, insert the following new paragraph:

"(5) Subject to such terms and conditions and in such manner as it may determine, to furnish a market for loans guaranteed or insured under the provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, by purchasing directly or through State and national banks, and other financial institutions acting as agents or as trustees, loans so guaranteed or insured."

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I have offered would restore to the RFC the privilege that it had up to a year ago of rediscounting GI loans, or loans made under the so-called GI bill by banking and other financial institutions. It is very definitely needed.

I want to call attention to a problem that exists in the small cities and rural areas of Texas and perhaps throughout the entire Nation. Last year when Congress extended the RFC they took away the authority to rediscount or purchase GI mortgage loans. Since then, many banks and other financial institutions in the smaller cities and rural communities have been unable to make loans to GI boys for the purpose of buying farms, equipment, and making improvements. Previously, banks and other similar institutions in our section had an arrangement with RFC whereby in consideration of a small percentage they made the loans, serviced them, and made the collections after RFC had taken them over.

Thus, the local institutions were relieved of the burden of carrying a large amount of these long-time loans. They could retain these loans themselves if they cared to do so, since they were assured of a market for them in case they needed to convert into liquid assets. Now, however, being denied this secondary market for the GI mortgages, many small financial institutions simply cannot make the loans.

Mr. Chairman, unless this provision is put back in the law, there is no existing law I know of that enables the rural GI to secure any help under the GI bill for the purchase of farms for homes and the business of farming. Title VI, Insurance for Housing, helps the fellow in the city or town. There are also other provisions of law covering loans which benefit those who live in the cities and populated areas. But the boys we are trying to rehabilitate on the farms of this Nation appear to be forgotten. So far, I have been unable to find any adequate source of long-time, low-interest financing available to them.

This provision is practically in the same language as the provision that was in the law up to a year ago, and which Congress left out when the RFC was extended at that time. It will simply enable the small banking institutions to make GI loans and by that means give the farm boys the same opportunity to finance the purchase and improvement of farms, thus providing them with a home and a business on the same basis that their city brother GI's now have.

I hope that the amendment will be accepted. I really hope that the committee will accept it. I do not see how there can be any just or reasonable objection to it.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COMBS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I would like to commend the gentleman for offering this amendment and to say to him that the veterans are very much interested in it as well as the small banks and lending institutions. Such a measure has been passed by the Senate and I do not see any reason why it should not be passed by the House.

These GI loans are good loans. There have been very few defaults. The failure to pass this amendment shows favoritism for making loans to the larger institutions. Has it not been said that the RFC made its first loan of $90,000,000 to a railroad corporation? Why not put the provision in this law to make loans to the little man as well as the big boy?

Mr. COMBS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution and I know what he says is absolutely correct.

I went through the rural sections of my district last year and met with groups of these GI's who were attending farm schools. I spoke to many of them. I talked with bankers in these regions, too. The boys on the farms have not been able to get any help from the various types of Government financing. Let me tell you about one of them. When I asked, "Why have you not received loans to buy yourself a farm?", he replied, "There is one outfit"—and he named it—"that offered to make me a loan but I wanted only 20 acres of land. They told me I would have to buy 40 acres. Then when I asked a loan of $1,000 to get some lumber and build me a house, they refused and said, 'No, you have to build it by contract to cost $5,000'." The boy's answer to them was "No"—for, as he said to me, "I am not going in debt that much. I will build myself a pole cabin like grandpappy lived in before I will let them tell me what to do."

Those are the boys who are going to be helped by my amendment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment comes to us rather as a surprise; so in order to bring ourselves up to date let me say briefly that this would restore a power which we very deliberately and after a good deal of debate took away from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation last year. We had a very definite purpose in mind.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation at that time was authorized to make purchases without recourse of these mortgages, the so-called GI home loans. Now, the GI himself has never been the beneficiary of this particular kind of a secondary market. The beneficiary under this financing, which we repudiated last year, was the builder who in some cases had to find ways and means of financing his operations without putting in too much money himself. He would not take the risk. He wanted the Federal Government to take all the risk. Now, we have a secondary market for safe and sound insured mortgages. The reason the banks will not take these GI home loans is not primarily because there is not a secondary market, but because the GI loans and the guaranties are in respect to houses which might tumble down before the period of amortization ends, and you cannot blame any bank or any insurance company for not taking that kind of a risk.

I might say further that it is doing the veteran no service. I am a veteran. I have been the department commander of the VFW in Michigan. I am in their councils now and I know what they are thinking about, and I say that substantially they are in agreement with our position that it does the rank and file of the servicemen no benefit whatever to sell them a $10,000 shack which, at best, is not worth over $3,000. It is going to be our objective in the bills we are now considering in committee to correct that situation, to set up safeguards and to put the GI home loans in such condition that the veteran can be assured that the house is going to stand up during the period that he is making the payments. For that reason and other reasons, the House Banking and Currency Committee should be given an opportunity to do a wholehearted, sincere job in respect to creating a secondary market for GI home loans. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to try and get a little additional information with respect to the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS]. I have heard the argument of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], the chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, and it seems to me that that argument does not touch exactly the problem that has been presented in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas. As I understand, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas merely proposes to authorize the RFC to provide an optional market, the option being with RFC, to rediscount paper which has been accepted by a local bank in financing loans under the GI bill. Is that what I understand the gentleman's proposal does?

Mr. COMBS. I say that the gentleman is absolutely correct. I will say further that the banks in my section and in the rural areas quit making loans, because there was not that type of alternate market.

Mr. KEEFE. That is also the experience I have found in my State, that there is not an optional market available to the banks who are making not crazy loans, as was indicated by the gentleman from Michigan, but who are attempting to make decent, approved loans that are approved by the authority that approved the GI loans. The situation that they are up against is that a small bank cannot tie up a large portion of its deposits in long-term loans unless it is assured that it has a discount outlet through which it can place those mortgages and secure cash with which to continue to do business. As I understand the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, it purposes and proposes to do just that. If I am in error, I will be glad to be corrected.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think both you and the gentleman who offered the amendment are in error in the statements which you have made, because the amendment very obviously and very definitely gives the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the authority to buy these loans.

Mr. KEEFE. That is exactly what I have in mind.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is not exactly what you are talking about. You are talking about a rediscount market. It is not creating a rediscount market. It is creating a secondary market by which they are authorized to purchase without recourse, and I do not believe the gentleman wants that kind of a market for the RFC.

Mr. KEEFE. All right. So far as I am concerned, I understand the situation, and that is exactly the thing that I thought the gentleman from Texas was seeking to reach.

Mr. COMBS. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. In other words, these banks are looking for an opportunity to dispose of these mortgages, and the amendment offers to the RFC the optional right to purchase these mortgages, not mandatory in any sense upon the RFC; but it says to the RFC, "You have the authority to purchase this mortgage

and relieve this bank and liquefy it to the extent of that particular mortgage if, in your opinion, and your judgment, it is a good, sound investment to make." So far as I am concerned, I would like to see the RFC have that right in the same manner in which the amendment is suggested by the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACKINNON. As I see it, the existence of this provision which would provide a guaranteed market will make it possible for the bank to retain the mortgage as part of its own assets because the liquidity of the asset will be assured. Otherwise, a small bank, whose principal liabilities are demand deposits, would be required to dispose of the mortgages because they are primarily long-term investments.

Mr. KEEFE. The bank would be very glad to hold that mortgage and get the return on the investment, provided the business demands on that bank for liquid assets were not such as to make it necessary to dispose of it.

I do not know about the operations of all the banks in America but the banks I do know something about are making sound loans under this GI proposal, and not making loans to build a $2,000 shack that costs $10,000. In any event, under the proposal of the distinguished gentleman from Texas, if a loan of that character is offered to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation they have the right to turn it down and purchase only good, sound loans. It seems to me this is in the interest of the protection of the GI and in the interest of protecting the banks themselves.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment at this time on the theory that when this bill goes to conference if this provision is adopted the proper safeguards will be written in, and on the further theory that there is so much confusion prevailing at the moment on whether or not we are going to get a general housing bill that we had better take this opportunity while we have it.

It is my frank opinion that much of what the gentleman from Michigan, my distinguished chairman, has said is correct, that there have been abuses, and that those abuses should be corrected. The proper place for the correction of the abuses is in the general housing legislation we are now considering and which is a direct result of many months of study by the Joint Committee on Housing. Hearings were held in 32 American cities, and in almost all of those cities the point was brought out most emphatically by the builders and by the bankers and by the veterans that this authority in some form is most essential for the proper functioning of the housing program. The proper place for this authority, the place where it should be administered, is in the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which has been established by the Congress to coordinate and handle all of the housing functions of the Federal Government; but we find ourselves in the position where the House is holding hearings on general housing legislation, and it appears that these hearings are going to last for quite a considerable period of time. The Senate and our own body seem to be in disagreement on certain features of that housing legislation, and we have no assurance that we will get any general housing bill which will incorporate this provision in the legislation.

I do not know whether the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS] has the proper safeguards or not. I do know that some such authority is vital for the continued functioning of the housing program throughout this country. This is an opportunity to write the provision in the bill and perfect it in conference. I hope the amendment is adopted.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I think the Government can render no greater service to Americans, to young Americans, to veterans, than to share its credit with them that they may have a home. I am sure there is no stronger emotion in the hearts and minds of these fine young people of America, who contributed so much to the splendid life we enjoy and who have come home and taken unto themselves a family, than the desire that they might put them in a home which they may call their own.

Homes are high, so very high that many Members of Congress have not been able to have one. In 1942, when I had the privilege of serving in the armed forces, I sold a home for $6,000 which subsequently sold for more than $18,000, and which would require today perhaps $20,000 to replace it. How else am I to take my family back to a home of their own than to let my Government share its credit with me?

I think this is a very sound American manner, to share with the small banks and institutions the credit of the Government. Volumes can be written about abuses. I do not question the sincerity and ableness of the chairman of this splendid committee when he wants to protect Americans from the abuses of unscrupulous builders and financiers. But I do know, sir, that my files are full and my ears are ringing with the pleas of hundreds of fine young Americans who want homes. I do not know whether the long range housing bill will become law or not. I have heard more about it and read more about it, I think, than any other legislation. I do know that the Congress ought not to pass up this opportunity of making possible homes for young Americans.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. COMBS. It might be pointed out that unless this secondary market for these GI loans is provided, the local banks will be unable to hold those mortgages, and furthermore they will have to sell them to such institutions as may gang up to take them.

Mr. LYLE. Yes; and another thing, I know my bankers pretty well. They do not make bad loans. I have tried to influence them once or twice in that respect. They are very careful about that. I sincerely hope the committee will look with favor upon this amendment. I believe it is sound; I believe it is American; I believe it is fair; I believe it is timely. I think that the advantages it offers outweigh the disadvantages.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Is it not a fact that unless this provision is adopted in this bill or in the general housing legislation, that the only other alternative is increase in the interest rates which will further inflate the cost of housing?

Mr. LYLE. Unquestionably, and I am sure you are conscious of just how much of that monthly payment is interest.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. Speaking of safeguards, it might well be pointed out that in the Senate bill there was provided a safeguard that the maximum loan that could be made was $10,000, and in addition to that, such loans would be approved as were made after January 1, 1948. In other words, the authority to be extended would provide a market for new loans and those accumulated in the past. They even failed to give us that. I support the gentleman, and I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we have in mind the many other provisions of law when we are discussing this amendment. I hope we will consider this subject without emotionalism. I do not think there are any of us here who do not want to do the right and just thing by the servicemen of our country. The right and just thing for servicemen is not to put them in a position where they are in any way going to be subjected to the wiles of unscrupulous men in any field of endeavor. We have had here in the District of Columbia within the last few months examples of how servicemen might be taken advantage of under similar circumstances.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. RIZLEY. I know the distinguished gentleman, the chairman of the committee, wants, of course, to do everything he can to safeguard and protect the integrity of these loans. But I have had numerous letters from small banks throughout my congressional district and small building and loan associations saying that they could make legitimate loans.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Permit me to answer the gentleman on that. Every building and loan association in this country and every savings and loan association in this country has a secondary market in the Federal home loan banks and every member bank of the Federal Reserve System can now discount its paper at the Federal Reserve banks. Have your savings banks in your State ever given any consideration to the fact

that they can make application and become members of the Federal Home Loan Bank System and find a ready market to discount almost all of their real-estate paper? Let us go a little further into this amendment. This amendment would not only authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to buy the paper of veterans who want to build homes. In other words, this amendment goes right across the board in respect to all GI loans. It is not confined to mortgages on homes.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. COMBS. Yes; it just goes half across the board.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The amendment reads "subject to such terms and conditions and in such manner as it may determine to furnish a market for loans guaranteed or insured under the provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended."

We had better know where we are going in this before we go anywhere. You argue that you want a secondary market for GI home loans. The language of this amendment provides for a secondary market for all kinds of loans made by the Veterans' Administration under the provisions of the GI bill of rights.

Now let us have one other thing in mind very definitely: That when we took the authority away from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to buy these home loans without recourse the authority which the gentleman seeks to restore and broaden there was not a ripple of reaction in the real-estate-mortgage market, there was not a decrease; as a matter of fact, from then on there was a constant volume of home-mortgage paper, so that during the last year and a half of it without this market we built the second largest number of homes in any year in this country, more than 840,000—without this market. You cannot argue with facts that this particular market is necessary to keep up the volume of home construction. The starts this year without this market have been, I believe, 39 percent greater than they were last year, assuring that without this market we are going to build over a million units this year. Nothing surely can happen to the program in this connection until the House Banking and Currency Committee has had an opportunity to review the whole question, and I can assure you that we are going to do it and we are going to insist that we take a look at this GI market and try to make these loans available to banking and other financing institutions in the market in competition with municipal, State, Federal, and other securities.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman is a very able chairman of the committee, and we have great respect for him—I know I do as a freshman Member—but he made this same statement on the floor last year—that we were going to have time to consider this matter further.

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; I think not. I said it was our purpose then to get rid of the market, and we did, and we did a good job in doing so.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to get into any heated controversy with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan for whom I have the utmost respect and admiration. I just cannot quite understand his attitude in respect to this matter. There is nothing mandatory about the provisions of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, nothing mandatory whatsoever.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. Not for just a moment. I know, of course, the gentleman from Michigan lives up in a section of the country where they have huge building and loan associations, large banks that will take care of this housing situation, but some of us live in smaller communities. Our banks are sound but they are much smaller.

This amendment is purely a permissive matter. Who is going to get hurt by it? I am not going to assume, and I know the gentleman from Michigan does not mean to imply that every bank and every building and loan association is in some sort of a deal to hijack the Federal Government, and they are going to make loans that are not legitimate; and unless it is presumed that they intend to unload bad paper on the Government there could be no sound argument against the amendment. I am not willing to assume that the banks are just going out and overstock themselves, or the building and loan associations in these smaller communities are going to do it or that the RFC is going out to solicit loans that are not good. The amendment does not contemplate that.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. RIZLEY. It seems to me that the gentleman is just a little overexercised about this amendment. Certainly, we know the need for a secondary market for some of these loans. If the gentleman were down in my section of the country he would know that, and he would know that the people whom I am talking about, the bankers down there, the small building and loan associations are substantial. They are not going to load the country and the taxpayers with bad deals of any kind. They just do not have sufficient capital to take care of all the legitimate needs.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. So I think until the gentleman's great committee and the committee over in the other body gets this housing program straightened out that we had better pass this amendment, add this amendment to the bill and provide for this secondary market.

Of course I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has no inspection service. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation as set up could not deny in the matter of purchase in the secondary market a loan to one bank and grant it to another; it cannot discriminate, the RFC cannot discriminate nor any other agency of the Government.

Mr. RIZLEY. No.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has to take these as they come and the gentleman knows as well as I that the practice up to June 30 of last year was for the banks to unload all of their undesirable paper on the Government.

Mr. RIZLEY. No; I do not agree with that statement. The capital structure under the law in the smaller banks will not permit them to make as many of these loans as some of the larger banks can. That is true of the building and loan associations also.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is the reason they cull out all of their undesirable paper at the end of each month and sell it to the RFC; and the RFC cannot refuse to take it in the case of one bank and discriminate by refusing to take it from another.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman is assuming that they are going to load their tills up with a lot of undesirable paper, which I am unwilling to assume. I am not going to charge the banks and the loan companies with that.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman knows that a loan may be sound at the time it is originally taken but become sour at the end of 60 days, at which time the bank would sell the paper to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. RIZLEY. We are lending lots of money and advancing lots of money, which the gentleman favors, all over the world and in order to kind of level off the situation here at home I believe this is one of the things we can do. It certainly would be a great thing for the young folks in this country. I have talked with these youngsters who want to build homes and purchase small acreages, and they cannot understand why the banks will not lend them the money. They cannot understand that if Uncle Sam can send billions of dollars everywhere in the world why the provisions of the law authorizing repurchase of these loans by RFC should not be reinstated. They do not understand it and I do not understand it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The GI can make a loan to take care of his down payment and up to 90 percent under FHA with the guaranty of a house that is going to stand during the period of amortization. That is the only difference between the two.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, if the Congress wants to harm the veteran, vote for this amendment.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take a minute or two to make an appeal to the members of this committee. This is a

spasmodic, ill-considered attempt to write legislation on the floor of the House.

The Banking and Currency Committee has given the fullest consideration to the GI's and their needs and does not propose or intend to neglect them at any point. We have considered this matter and the committee will consider this in the housing bill. We are certain to have some sort of housing bill, but whatever it may be there will be considered in it this very proposition that is so important to the GI's of this country who are being robbed unmercifully by people in the construction of low-cost houses. That applies in the city of Washington and all over this country.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. If we were to adopt this amendment at the present time it would be necessary to at once go into the question of how much the capital of the RFC should be, because if we insert an amendment like this without considering it in connection with the rest of the bill it might use up the entire amount authorized and provided in this legislation, is that not correct?

Mr. FOLGER. That is certainly true. The trouble has been that there has been no inspection or appraisal provision and the GI's, separate and apart from everybody else who has had the benefit of these purchase powers, have suffered because we have not been careful. Now are we going to do worse? We are going to protect the GI against these practices as far as we can. In Washington and in other cities in this country the GI's are going back to the banks, they are going to the builders, they are going to their friends to ask them to help them out on houses that cost eight or nine thousand dollars which will stay together about 60 or 90 days. We have not been careful enough to see that proper inspection and appraisals were made and that these boys got the full benefit of what they were entitled to, even at the high prices we now have.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COMBS. Under the GI bill the same inspection will be made of the country farm under this loan as under the others.

Mr. FOLGER. No, but there is in this amendment no provision for inspection and appraisal so far as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is concerned.

Mr. COMBS. I want to call the gentleman's attention to his answer to the question asked by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. If this is merely permissive, and it is, why would it be necessary to examine the capital structure of the RFC in order to pass it?

Mr. FOLGER. Are we going to pass a bill and then apologize for it by saying that it is nothing but a permissive matter? You can throw out any part of it if you want to. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has got to understand that we mean what we say in all legislation passed by this House.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. If we pass this without giving the RFC sufficient money to make it useful, then adopting such an amendment would be merely a political gesture?

Mr. FOLGER. That is right. We should provide the opportunity of inspection and appraisal which will give these boys a dollar's worth as near as our economy will permit at this time for what they put into this, and not have them coming back crying, which they had a right to do, that people have cheated them out of their boots in the construction of houses that we propose to insure, or to buy their paper, representing overcharges, outrageous, but which the GI will be held to pay.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I might say that the last month this provision was in existence requests for loans were coming into the RFC at the rate of $75,000,000 a week, or approximately $250,000,000 a month, and that is quite a sum of money.

Mr. FOLGER. Indeed it is.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Even if it is merely permissive, it still involves the finances of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. FOLGER. I do not think we ought to expect the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to conclude that we just have some political purposes or otherwise, in mind. They must conclude that we mean what we say in writing legislation. I do not think this legislation is good, and I think it ought not to pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 40, noes 82.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

Page 21, line 23, before "(A)", insert the following: "'public agencies', which term shall include the following."

Page 22, line 7, after the word "projects", insert a comma and the following: "nor for the acquisition or construction, by any such public agency, of any property or facility for the production, sale, or supply of any commodity, product, or service, if any private person, firm, or corporation is then actively engaged in the production, distribution, or supply of the same commodity, products, or service in the same area."

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, the first portion of the amendment merely makes the provisions in section (A) consistent with those in section (B) in subsection 3 at the bottom of page 21, and the next portion of the amendment, page 22, line 7, adds to that paragraph a provision that will prevent the making of loans to public agencies which seek to go into competition with private enterprises, where private enterprise is serving the area.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If I understand the gentleman's amendment, it is to take the Reconstruction Finance Corporation out of the field of investment in enterprises by public agencies which would come in competition with enterprises already operated by private enterprise. I do not think it was our intention—at least, it was not my intention—to do other than that. I am certain, if that is what the gentleman's language does, and I assume that it does, that it should be reasonably acceptable.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am concerned with what effect this might have on the financing of REA projects, or the financing of power developments by municipalities.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. It does not affect municipalities. It is limited to that category of public agencies and is so stated in the amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Public agencies then, would not include the REA?

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. It would not.

Mr. MONRONEY. And cities and municipalities would not be included?

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Cities and municipalities would not be included.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], as to the provisions of the bill now under consideration. May I ask if the bill will permit the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to irrigation districts organized under State laws? What restriction, if any, is contained in this bill as to that?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The irrigation projects are what we call proprietary functions. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation may pass upon irrigation projects. Under the law we have presently the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may not make loans to governments or subdivisions of governments for purely governmental purposes. An irrigation project is a proprietary function, however.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. What does the gentleman mean by proprietary?

Mr. WOLCOTT. A proprietary function is a function which is not necessary to the maintenance and preservation of the Government.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is permitted to make loans under this bill to irrigation districts?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. As distinguished from that, they would not be allowed to make a loan to a State to build a statehouse or a county to build a county courthouse, because those are purely governmental functions.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. What limit is placed on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as to the amount of these loans?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Under the amendment adopted this afternoon, offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], $200,000,000.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. For what terms?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I believe 40 years.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I have in mind the Nebraska Midstate Association irrigation district in central Nebraska; it has been organized under State law. The district, now operating under the State law, can make a levy upon the property in the district for irrigation purposes. They have in mind applying to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a sound loan, one that has been approved by the experts who have checked over the district. I wonder whether it would be possible for them to qualify under this bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I believe they would, because I assume, under the case the gentleman cites, the revenue bonds are issued for the purpose of financing the project, and I am very positive that would be eligible for Reconstruction Finance Corporation financing.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee substitute, as amended, for the Senate bill.

The committee substitute was agreed to.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COLE of Missouri, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2287) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GERMANTOWN HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure today to greet the eleventh-grade students of Germantown High School, of Philadelphia, on the occasion of their tour of Washington under the sponsorship of Prof. Garton S. Greene and Prof. Charles R. Nichols, principal of the school, together with Mrs. Robert Longmire, Mrs. Edward A. Raacke, and Mr. H. Rey Wolf of the high school faculty.

This fine group of boys and girls, full of life, interest, and zestful enthusiasm, will undoubtedly carry back long-lasting memories of their visit to the legislative, executive, and judicial departments of the Federal Government. By reason of the thoughtfulness of their principal, I had the pleasure of addressing the group on the steps of the United States Capitol, and of introducing to them a Germantown High School alumnus of the class of 1934, Mr. Richard G. Jefford, who is assistant to the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives. We made it an all-Germantown affair by having our pictures taken with the Capitol in the background.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may have until midnight Friday to file reports on the bills H. R. 4796 and H. R. 3132, or substitutes therefor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have until midnight, tomorrow night, Friday, to file a report on the selective-service bill, H. R. 6401.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS REAL PROPERTY

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2277) to amend section 13 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, to provide for the disposition of surplus real property to States, political subdivisions, and municipalities for use as public parks, recreational areas, and historic-monument sites, and for other purposes, with amendments of the House thereto, insist on the amendments of the House, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WADSWORTH, SNYDER, and HOLIFIELD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a letter from a constituent, and in the other a document dealing with the proposed extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of a platform adopted by Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. O'KONSKI) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some letters.

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD with reference to the pending railway strike.

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Vicente Villamin.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] may be granted a leave of absence for 10 days on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FERNANDEZ (at the request of Mrs. LUSK] was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Rio Grande Death Watch."

Mr. McCULLOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include part of a column from the editorial page of the Times-Herald.

Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

ALBERT MALTZ

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Speaker, I have been served with a subpena duces tecum to

appear before the district court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify on Monday, May 3, 1948, at 10 a. m., in the case of the United States against Albert Maltz, which is a congressional contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I, therefore, submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* ALBERT MALTZ, DEFENDANT, NO. 1354–47, CRIMINAL DOCKET

The President of the United States to Congressman RICHARD B. VAIL, of Illinois, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday the 3d day of May 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 27th day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I send a privileged resolution (H. Res. 586) to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas Representative RICHARD B. VAIL, a Member of this House, has been served with a subpena duces tecum to appear as a witness before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia to testify at 10 a. m., on the 3d day of May 1948, in the case of the *United States* v. *Albert Maltz*, criminal No. 1354–47; and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify but by the order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Representative RICHARD B. VAIL is authorized to appear in response to the subpena duces tecum of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia in the case of the *United States* v. *Albert Maltz;* and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena of the said court.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. TABER, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6055) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6055) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 50, 52, and 54.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 53, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, and 68, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"TEMPORARY CONGRESSIONAL AVIATION POLICY BOARD

"For an additional amount for salaries and expenses for completion of the work of the Temporary Congressional Aviation Policy Board created by the act to establish a National Aviation Council, and for other purposes (Public Law 287, Eightieth Congress), to be available until June 30, 1948, and to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers approved by the Chairman, $5,000: *Provided*, That expenditures hereunder shall be made in accordance with the laws applicable to inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

"Such sums as may be necessary (not exceeding $4,500,000) are hereby appropriated for making for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1949 payments to States in accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended (29 U. S. C., ch. 4): *Provided*, That the obligations incurred and expenditures made for such purpose under the authority of this paragraph shall be charged to the appropriation therefor in the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1949: *Provided further*, That the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall not exceed the amount paid to the States for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1948 in accordance with such Vocational Rehabilitation Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,555,532"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$970,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$20,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$262,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,234,815"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,450"; and the Senate agree to the same.

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
CLARENCE CANNON,
GEORGE MAHON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

STYLES BRIDGES,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6055) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS

Amendments Nos. 1 to 7, inclusive, relate to miscellaneous items for the Senate and involve additional appropriations of $47,550, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8 appropriates $12,500 for the widow of a deceased Representative, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9 appropriates $5,000 for the Temporary Congressional Aviation Policy Board, as proposed by the Senate, with an amendment added to provide for the completion of the work of the Board concurrent with the expiration date of this appropriation, June 30, 1948.

Amendment No. 10 waives a limitation for the Public Health Service in connection with the purchase of motor vehicles in the Philippine Islands, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11 authorizes the advance to States from the 1949 appropriation of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, as proposed by the Senate, but limits the amount that may be advanced to the sum of $4,500,000.

Amendment No. 12 appropriates $1,555,532 for grants to States for unemployment compensation administration, instead of $1,850,000 as proposed by the Senate. The agency will also release a budgetary reserve of $698,000 for this purpose.

Amendment No. 13 appropriates $970,000 for reconversion unemployment benefits for seamen instead of $840,000 as proposed by the House and $1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14, relating to the Public Buildings Administration, appropriates $50,000 for preparation of plans to eliminate structural and fire hazards in the Executive Mansion, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15, relating to the Office of the Housing Expediter, appropriates $2,000,000 to carry out the functions of Public Law 464, approved March 30, 1948, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16, relating to the National Mediation Board, appropriates $48,800, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17, relating to the National Railroad Adjustment Board, increases a limitation from $65,000 to $75,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18, relating to the Tax Court of the United States, increases a salary limitation from $20,000 to $24,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19, relating to the District of Columbia, appropriates $10,210 for the Office of Administrator of Rent Control, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20, relating to the District of Columbia, appropriates $17,500 for the National Guard, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $20,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 21, relating to the Department of Commerce, appropriates $20,000 for printing and binding instead of $39,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23, relating to the Department of Commerce, transfers $262,500 to the Bureau of Customs for enforcement of the export-control program instead of $225,000 as proposed by the House and $300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24 corrects language.

Amendment No. 25 provides for the transfer of $15,000 to "Printing and binding" of the Department of Commerce as proposed by the Senate instead of $20,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 26, relating to the Department of Commerce, allows $10,000 to be used for emergency medical services in Alaska, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27, relating to the Bonneville Power Administration, appropriates $665,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $625,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 28, relating to the Bonneville Power Administration, increases a limitation by $140,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $100,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 29 increases a limitation in the Bureau of Land Management of the Interior Department from $310,000 to $325,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31 inserts language providing for general fund, construction, in the Bureau of Reclamation, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32, relating to the Bureau of Reclamation, appropriates $3,000,000 for the Colorado-Big Thompson project, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 33, relating to the Bureau of Reclamation, appropriates $1,000,000 for the Central Valley project instead of $1,274,281, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 35, relating to the Bureau of Mines, appropriates $4,000,000 to liquidate contract authorizations, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36, relating to the National Park Service, inserts language to provide for fighting forest fires in Acadia National Park, Maine, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37, relating to the Department of Justice, increases limitation on fees of witnesses from $25,000 to $50,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 38 and 39, relating to the United States Employment Service, appropriates $40,800 for general administration, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40, appropriates $1,234,185 for grants to States for public employment offices instead of $2,560,000 as proposed by the Senate. The action of the conference is to deny an amount of $1,325,185 intended to be paid into State retirement accounts for the period during which the Employment Service was under Federal supervision. The item is denied pending an opportunity for the Committees on Appropriations to review the question and the legality of the proposed payments.

Amendment No. 41, relating to the Department of the Army, provides for the transfer of $143,000,000 for government and relief in occupied areas from the appropriation "Pay of the Army, 1948," as proposed by the Senate, instead of a direct appropriation of a similar amount as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 42, relating to the Department of the Navy, appropriates $6,450 for the Naval Home instead of $3,800 as proposed by the House and $9,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43, relating to the Post Office Department, "Compensation to postmasters," provides for the transfer of $1,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of a direct appropriation as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 44, relating to the Post Office Department, appropriates $665,000 for "Star-route service," as proposed by the Senate instead of $765,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 45, relating to the Post Office Department, "Star-route and air-mail service, Alaska," provides for a transfer of $224,500, as proposed by the Senate, instead of a direct appropriation as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 46, relating to the Post Office Department, "Star-route and air-mail service, Alaska, 1946," provides for a transfer as proposed by the Senate instead of a direct appropriation as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 47, relating to the Post Office Department, appropriates $300,000 for unpaid money orders more than 1 year old, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $321,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 48, relating to the Post Office Department, appropriates $89,000 for transportation of equipment and supplies, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $305,200 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 49, relating to the Post Office Department, provides for the transfer of $100,000 for "Operating supplies, public buildings," as proposed by the Senate, instead of a direct appropriation as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 50 strikes out the proposal of the Senate relating to the Department of State, international obligations and activities, for administration of the program authorized by section 32 (b) (2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended.

Amendment No. 51, relating to the Department of State, international obligations and activities, provides that $1,600,000 shall be available without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 52 strikes out the proposal of the Senate that the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army should handle certain construction work abroad for the Department of State.

Amendment No. 53, relating to the Department of State, allows not to exceed $100,000 for certain moving expenses, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $570,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 54, relating to the Department of State, provides that $60,000 shall be available for activities authorized by titles II, III, and IV of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as proposed by the House, instead of $100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 55, relating to the Treasury Department, Bureau of Accounts, provides $300,000 for refunds, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 56, relating to the Treasury Department, Bureau of Accounts, provides for $1,000,000 for "Payment of certified claims" to be derived by transfer as proposed by the Senate instead of direct appropriation of $700,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 57, relating to the Treasury Department, Bureau of the Public Debt, provides for the transfer of $361,000 for "Distinctive paper for United States currency" as proposed by the Senate instead of a direct appropriation as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 58, 59, and 60, relating to the Treasury Department, Bureau of Customs, provide for refunds in the amount of $4,500,000 and for the use of certain collections for reimbursements, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 61 and 62, relating to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, provide an increase in the limitation on printing and binding in the amount of $140,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 63, relating to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, appropriates $568,000,000 for "Refunding internal revenue collections," as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 64, relating to the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, provides for the transfer of $1,250,000 for "Salaries and expenses," as proposed by the Senate, instead of a direct appropriation of $1,650,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 65, relating to the Secret Service Division, provides for the transfer of $10,700 to reimburse the District of Columbia as proposed by the Senate instead of a direct appropriation of the same amount as proposed by the House.

TITLE II—CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, JUDGMENTS, AND AUDITED CLAIMS

Amendments Nos. 66 and 67 provide for the payment of claims, etc., as set forth in Senate Document No. 132, as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE III—REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATIONS

Amendment No. 68, relating to the Department of the Army, reduces the recession for "Pay of the Army" to $32,300,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $175,300,000 as proposed by the House.

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
CLARENCE CANNON,
GEORGE H. MAHON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6055) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

(The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.)

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the items in disagreement with the Senate relate to the Employment Service and the Unemployment Compensation Commission.

As careful hearings as possible were held this morning by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], chairman of the Subcommittee on the Labor and Federal Security. As a result of those hearings

we developed certain tables which I shall insert in the RECORD.

As a result of those hearings we have reduced the item in amendment No. 12 by $294,468.

In amendment No. 40 we have reduced the amount by $1,325,185, this being the amount of certain retroactive retirement funds about which the authority of the Appropriations Committee to carry funds is in grave doubt. These items can be considered later.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and at this point to include two tables which were developed during the hearings.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

(The tables referred to follow:)

Proposed distribution of deficiency funds to States

	Total	Salary increases	Work-load increases	Retirement	Partial restoration of 9 percent reduction, original budget	Total of 9 percent reduction, original budget
UNITED STATES	$2,550,268	$562,796	$658,122	$34,882	$1,294,468	$3,074,183
Conn. Appeals	3,250	1,280			1,970	4,924
Region I:						
Connecticut	48,558	28,043			20,515	50,288
Maine	11,477		4,477		7,000	17,382
Massachusetts	87,856		27,966		59,890	149,726
New Hampshire	8,921		3,383	210	5,328	13,320
Rhode Island	9,047				9,047	22,617
Vermont	6,706	2,450			4,256	10,641
Region II: New York	546,574	323,675		16,186	206,713	516,784
Region III:						
Delaware	3,121				3,121	7,803
New Jersey	160,293	50,291		1,817	108,185	155,333
Pennsylvania	198,674		47,362		151,312	256,170
Region IV:						
District of Columbia	8,482				8,482	21,205
Maryland	21,252				21,252	52,235
North Carolina	19,672				19,672	48,563
Virginia	18,418		8,772		9,646	24,115
West Virginia	12,386				12,386	30,966
Region V:						
Kentucky	34,904		25,203		9,701	22,375
Michigan	307,850		231,664	10,060	66,126	165,315
Ohio	95,256		44,161	2,261	48,834	122,085
Region VI:						
Illinois	168,084		54,055		114,029	168,314
Indiana	86,066	36,510	34,556		15,000	46,214
Wisconsin	35,924	1,735	21,064	2,300	10,825	27,063
Region VII:						
Alabama	10,719	10,719				36,813
Florida	20,000	20,000				33,090
Georgia	21,350	21,350				36,627
Mississippi	11,810	5,678			6,132	15,329
South Carolina	51,238	24,700	26,538			16,669
Tennessee	19,516	1,206		33	18,277	45,693
Region VIII:						
Iowa	10,844		3,453	35	7,356	17,571
Minnesota	35,983		18,730	524	16,729	41,822
Nebraska	13,223		9,608		3,615	9,037
North Dakota	7,373	1,534	4,492		1,347	3,363
South Dakota	2,721		1,331		1,390	3,232
Region IX:						
Arkansas	23,102		14,009		9,093	22,732
Kansas	29,132		9,132		20,000	20,947
Missouri	57,434	7,954	30,000		19,480	48,700
Oklahoma	9,273				9,273	23,183
Region X:						
Louisiana						35,783
New Mexico	20,270	5,967	10,184	565	3,554	8,884
Texas						68,481
Region XI:						
Arizona	6,304				6,304	15,761
Colorado	12,394		7,832	274	4,288	10,720
Idaho	8,708	2,993			5,715	14,288
Montana	13,247		8,689	261	4,297	10,742
Utah	8,415		2,587	78	5,750	14,374
Wyoming	4,832		1,519		3,313	8,282
Region XII:						
California	173,196				173,196	432,989
Nevada	19,370	10,000	1,592	278	7,500	8,211
Oregon	23,391	6,711			16,680	41,701
Washington	32,944				32,944	82,360
Territories:						
Alaska	2,613				2,613	6,532
Hawaii	8,095		5,763		2,332	5,829

Grants to States for public employment offices—Statement of additional costs arising since July 1, 1947

	(a) Salary revisions	(b) Retirement on salary revisions	(c) Retroactive retirement	(d) Farm placement budgets	(e) Farm placement allocations	(f) Net farm requirements (d)−(e)	(g) Total additional costs (a)+(b)+(c)+(f)	(h) Amounts absorbed by States	(i) Supplemental request (g)−(h)
Alabama	$65,315	$1,855		$51,000	$45,000	$6,000	$73,170	$67,170	$6,000
Arizona	33,754			20,000	20,000		33,754	33,754	
Arkansas				47,100	35,000	12,100	12,100		12,100
California	410,672	19,507		185,000	180,000	5,000	435,179		435,179
Colorado				41,500	31,000	10,500	10,500		10,500
Connecticut	37,000			21,000	15,000	6,000	43,000		43,000
Delaware				6,000	5,000	1,000	1,000		1,000
District of Columbia									
Florida				36,000	35,000	1,000	1,000		1,000
Georgia	35,000			52,000	40,000	12,000	47,000		47,000
Idaho	43,208			31,500	22,000	9,500	52,708	43,208	9,500
Illinois	240,354	3,870		81,000	24,000	57,000	301,224		301,224
Indiana	60,000	1,950	$51,000	30,500	20,000	10,500	123,450	112,950	10,500
Iowa				39,000	26,000	13,000	13,000		13,000

Grants to States for public employment offices—Statement of additional costs arising since July 1, 1947—Continued

	(a) Salary revisions	(b) Retirement on salary revisions	(c) Retroactive retirement	(d) Farm placement budgets	(e) Farm placement allocations	(f) Net farm requirements (d)−(e)	(g) Total additional costs (a)+(b)+(c)+(f)	(h) Amounts absorbed by States	(i) Supplemental request (g)−(h)
Kansas	$30,098			$39,800	$30,000	$9,800	$39,898	$30,098	$9,800
Kentucky	36,661			30,000	10,000	20,000	56,661	36,661	20,000
Louisiana				58,800	55,000	3,800	3,800		3,800
Maine				13,000	5,000	8,000	8,000		8,000
Maryland				17,350	5,000	12,350	12,350		12,350
Massachusetts				7,000	7,000				
Michigan	136,604	$6,830		57,000	25,000	32,000	175,434	143,434	32,000
Minnesota	147,518	4,794		46,000	40,000	6,000	158,312	152,312	6,000
Mississippi				48,000	30,000	18,000	18,000		18,000
Missouri				22,900	10,000	12,900	12,900		12,900
Montana	10,054	302		26,000	18,000	8,000	18,356		18,356
Nebraska	9,194			32,000	23,000	9,000	18,194		18,194
Nevada	9,500	257		6,183	6,000	183	9,940		9,940
New Hampshire				5,400	5,000	400	400		400
New Jersey			$275,000	42,000	20,000	22,000	297,000		297,000
New Mexico				41,200	40,000	1,200	1,200		1,200
New York	313,624	18,073	320,380	105,000	90,000	15,000	667,077	320,380	346,697
North Carolina				58,388	40,000	18,388	18,388		18,388
North Dakota				19,000	18,000	1,000	1,000		1,000
Ohio	61,000	2,074		48,000	25,000	23,000	86,074	63,074	23,000
Oklahoma	61,464			36,800	24,000	12,800	74,264	61,464	12,800
Oregon				25,000	20,000	5,000	5,000		5,000
Pennsylvania	372,338	3,723	616,000	71,000	30,000	41,000	1,033,061	376,061	657,000
Rhode Island	43,455		15,000	3,000	3,000		58,455	32,690	25,765
South Carolina	27,000			41,000	28,000	13,000	40,000		40,000
South Dakota				14,500	12,000	2,500	2,500		2,500
Tennessee	3,000			52,000	40,000	12,000	15,000		15,000
Texas				170,000	170,000				
Utah	6,900	69		19,000	15,000	4,000	10,969		10,969
Vermont	10,000	762		16,500	15,000	1,500	12,262		12,262
Virginia	60,013	396		17,046	12,000	5,046	65,455	60,409	5,046
Washington				52,180	50,000	2,180	2,180		2,180
West Virginia	11,880			8,420	5,000	3,420	15,300		15,300
Wisconsin	25,680	950	47,805	28,500	23,000	5,500	79,935	71,314	8,621
Wyoming				17,000	13,000	4,000	4,000		4,000
	2,301,286	65,412	1,325,185	1,936,567	1,460,000	476,567	4,168,450	1,604,979	2,563,471
Less amount rounded off									3,471
									2,560,000

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this is a highly satisfactory solution of what might have been a very troublesome situation. To have taken any other step would have been to practically paralyze the operation of these two important services in a number of States and, as a matter of fact, it would have imperiled the continuity of the service generally throughout the country. In some States, according to the evidence submitted, it would have been necessary to have dismissed as many as 900 employees; in other States, it would have been necessary to have closed the unemployment offices.

It is to be regretted that when the additional appropriation was made a sufficient amount was not authorized to have taken care of the situation without having to incorporate it in this bill. Certainly the House should have agreed to the Senate amendments without requiring this extra conference. But with the House yielding on the Senate amendments as incorporated in the conference report, the continuation of both the unemployment compensation agencies and the public employment offices is assured.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I take this time merely to keep the record straight in view of the statement that has just been made by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who has the facility for making statements that sometimes do not accord with the facts. The gentleman has sought to give the impression it is unfortunate we are compelled to consider this deficiency because the matter should have been taken care of in the regular appropriation estimate or when the regular appropriations and estimates were considered for the fiscal year 1948.

The fact of the matter is, as the gentleman from Missouri well knows, the figures which are included in this estimate, providing supplemental funds for the administration of the unemployment compensation facilities in the States and providing funds for unemployment services in the States, did not arise as a result of any such situation. They have arisen because of situations that could not be in contemplation of the committee at the time the budget estimate was considered due principally to wage increases that have been given State employees in these two services, many of which wage increases took place and were effective long after the committee considered the budget estimates under which the 1948 budget was prescribed. So it is a well-known fact that in the administration of both the UC and the Employment Service, they are confronted with an imponderable situation as to the necessity of expenditure because of varying work loads and no one could tell at the time the regular estimates were submitted or at the time they were considered exactly what that situation would be. We have had the identical situation as long as I have been a Member of Congress and that is what the Deficiency Committee is for.

When we have gotten the facts together, as we have finally gotten them together as a result of the hearings conducted this morning, we are providing the deficiency funds as a result of situations that have risen since the regular 1948 appropriation and estimates were considered.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in connection with the bill making appropriations for Government corporations and so forth, the minority may have opportunity to file minority views at any time prior to midnight tomorrow and that they be printed in the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 574.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6342) to authorize the Secre-

tary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force to proceed with construction at military installations, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, I am thoroughly conscious of the fact that the House would like to finish its business today on this bill so it can adjourn over until Monday, as has been announced by the leadership. Consequently my remarks upon this rule will be exceedingly brief, and I hope that the Members present will proceed with some expedition to dispose of this rule and later the bill if the rule is adopted.

Mr. Speaker, this rule, if adopted by the House, will bring before the House H. R. 6342, a bill entitled "To authorize the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force to proceed with construction at military installations, and for other purposes." The bill was reported to the House by the Committee on the Armed Services, as I am informed, by unanimous vote.

Just a word about the rule. The rule is of the usual kind. The bill can be debated in the Committee of the Whole for 2 hours, if the Members want to take that long, and upon completion of general debate the bill will be open for amendment under the 5-minute rule, as is the usual practice.

I may say just a word about the bill itself, but I shall not go into details because I will rely and I am sure you will rely on the members of the Armed Services Committee to explain the bill in such fashion as we shall all understand it. If you will examine the committee report as well as the bill itself you will find that this bill, if passed, would authorize a certain amount of construction for the Ground Forces and the Air Force. The amount authorized in this bill, as I recollect, is far below the amount originally requested by the services and contained in the budget. As a matter of fact, it has been carved down about as low as can be done and still meet some of the most urgent projects.

You will note that a good many projects listed in the bill, in fact, more than half of them, measured in dollars and cents, are to be installed outside of the continental United States. A very important group of them is to be installed in Alaska for the use not only of the Ground Forces, but of the Air Force, and without those installations it will be quite impossible for either of those services to maintain forces in Alaska suitable to the defense of the United States in that part of the world. Other extra continental projects are provided for in the Philippines and in the Marianas, which we have now taken under our control, and in which certain elements of our forces must be maintained; in Bermuda, in Newfoundland, and one or two other places outside of the continental United States.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Does it include Nome, Alaska?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not familiar with the entire list of the Alaskan projects. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] will go into detail on that.

Mr. DONDERO. The reason for the question is that our Committee on Public Works has been considering Nome, Alaska, and the question of building a sea wall to keep the town from going into the ocean and to protect the only airport that we have across the Bering Sea from Russia.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The reason that the construction is necessary in the extra continental possessions is this: They were taken over during the war, that is, the islands in the Pacific, and stations in the West Indies, and Newfoundland, and there were erected at different places purely temporary structures. In Alaska it is quite impossible to house troops in that severe winter climate in anything like a temporary shack, like the structures that we erected during the war in other parts of the world. Take Okinawa, for instance, which has become an important post. There are no provisions there for housing troops decently. They are living today under conditions which discourage the men, and it is very doubtful to me that a man would reenlist if he has to live under those circumstances. You might also note some of the disagreeable conditions in the United States, especially in the neighborhood of our air fields which were very hastily laid out during the war. The fields themselves are excellent, but nothing like permanent housing is built on them, with the result that many of the officers and men, family men, are living literally in shacks, and the testimony shows that when a man has served 3 years at a place like that, he simply will not reenlist, with the result that there is demoralization in a good many posts scattered not only in our overseas possessions, but here in the United States. That is the general need for the bill so far as housing is concerned.

The bill also authorizes certain construction to establish communications, especially in Alaska, radio communications, of which there are scarcely any today and which we must have; also to improve some of the posts at which we are making scientific investigations and experiments. As I recollect, the original budget request was for a good many hundreds of millions of dollars. The Committee on Armed Services has cut that to $208,000,000 in authorizations, total, of which $122,000,000 will be spent in those overseas possessions to which I have referred and about $90,000,000 in the United States.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6342) to authorize the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force to proceed with construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6342, with Mr. HILL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill, H. R. 6342, is to authorize the construction of the public works programs of the Army and the Air Force both in the continental United States and overseas. The total cost of the projects included in this bill is slightly under $208,000,000. Of this total sum approximately $86,000,000 is to be expended on projects located inside the United States, out of which funds $54,000,000 or 63 percent is to be spent on housing, barracks, bachelor quarters and family quarters for officers, noncommissioned officers, and civilians.

The provisions of the bill provide that approximately $122,000,000 is to be spent on projects located in our overseas stations including Alaska. Of this amount, $53,000,000 or approximately 44 percent is to be spent on housing facilities.

A number of projects included in this bill are of vital strategic importance to national defense, such as the development of Alaskan defenses, including air bases and port facilities; the development of Ground Force bases and Air Force bases in Guam and of certain air bases in the North Atlantic Ocean areas. Important projects inside the United States include essential technical and research facilities required in connection with the development of rockets, guided missiles, and other weapons; the development of a very heavy bomber air base in South Dakota and the provisions of essential communication facilities and equipment at various Air Force stations throughout the United States.

I would like to call particular attention to the fact that the total authorizations included in this bill represent only about one-tenth of those originally requested, that is, $207,000,000 as against $2,000,000,000 asked for by the field activities of the Army and Air Force.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I would rather proceed with my statement, after which I shall be very glad to yield, unless the gentleman has a question at this particular point.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The question I wanted to ask had reference to the amount of money suggested for building different types of family quarters. If the gentleman would rather have me ask that later, I will be glad to.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I have that in part of my general statement.

In August 1946 the field agencies of the Army and Air Force submitted a construction program for fiscal year 1948 comprised of projects aggregating approximately $2,000,000,000. Subsequently, the Departments adopted a policy to house all elements and activities of the Regular Army in permanent-type facilities by June 30, 1962, for continental United States and June 30, 1960, for oversea areas, exclusive of areas of occupation. This resulted in the $2,000,000,000 construction program being screened down to about $1,000,000,000. However, on December 16, 1946, the Bureau of the Budget set a limit of $225,000,000 on the total amount of construction which could be requested in enabling legislation This figure has been reduced by approximately $10,000,000 by subsequent action of the Bureau of the Budget, which left about $215,046,000 as the total for which an appropriation could be requested for the current fiscal year. The authorization included in the bill total some seven or eight million dollars less. This reduction affected funds for administration of prior year's work, certain planning, termination charges, and certain real-estate administration items. In order to limit the construction-authorization request to such a low figure, it was necessary for the Army and Air Staffs to eliminate from the originally submitted programs all but the highest priority, most urgently needed projects.

With particular reference to the public-works program of the Air Force, I think the following observations are pertinent:

First. Facilities included in the Air Force construction budget for fiscal year 1948 consist of (1) operational facilities, (2) research and development facilities, and (3) family housing. During the war construction of Air Force facilities was necessarily designed to accommodate conventional aircraft which are now obsolescent. It is now necessary to provide airfields and facilities commensurate with the requirements of high-performance aircraft presently leaving the manufacturer's production lines.

Second. Operational facilities for training, maintenance, and for safety of personnel and equipment consisting of communications installations, control towers, crash stations, and so forth, are urgent requirements at certain locations.

Third. Progress in the field of research and development is such that we are behind the times in providing facilities for flight and static test of rockets, high-speed aircraft, and maintenance facilities for advanced aircraft now ready for tactical operations.

We must progressively and to the maximum extent possible with available funds build the airfields and Army posts and installations required for the operations of our post occupation Army and Air Force. Failure to provide sufficient funds for operational facilities denies the armed forces the facilities necessary for the training and the bases necessary to guarantee the future security of the United States.

Inasmuch as this bill includes two projects related to the completion or modification of wind tunnels, a few remarks concerning facilities of this character are appropriate.

Wind tunnels vary, first, depending on the air speeds at which tests are to be made. Depending upon the air speeds, the basic designs must vary substantially. Thus a low-speed tunnel adapted to testing at 180 miles per hour cannot be employed at supersonic speeds, or even at high speeds in the subsonic range, that is, 500 or 600 miles per hour.

Tunnels are also identified as full scale, basic research, airfoil section, free flight, altitude, ice research, gust, and many other designations descriptive of the tests for which the tunnel is designed.

A detailed study of the wind-tunnel requirements of the Government has been completed by the Joint Army-Navy Research and Development Board and all proposed new tunnels or improvements to existing facilities must be approved by that Board.

The Joint Army-Navy Research and Development Board, the National Advisory Committee of Aeronautics, and the research and development groups of Air Force, Army, and Navy are operating in very close collaboration. The recent greatly increased activity in this field of research has resulted in an actual shortage of this facility and the necessity for the establishment of a policy by the Joint Army-Navy Research and Development Board that all wind tunnels be utilized mutually to the maximum possible extent by all service.

The completion of the supersonic tunnel at the California Institute of Technology, an Army-Navy and Air Force installation, is essential for testing the dynamic characteristics of jet-propelled bodies.

Wind tunnel projects included in the fiscal year 1948 budget are as follows:

Station and item	*Total cost*
California Institute of Technology: complete supersonic wind tunnel	$410,700
Wright-Patterson Air Force base: Scavenging building for existing and modifying 10-foot wind tunnel for testing jet engines	330,000

I have discussed briefly what seems to me the most important projects in this bill. It is very evident that these projects are vital for strategic purposes and for the rapid implementation of advanced technical programs concerned with the development of modern-day weapons of warfare.

The critical need of the Army and Air Force for family housing cannot be overemphasized.

Of the total expenditures authorized by this bill well over half will be for the construction of urgently needed housing for officers and enlisted personnel and civilian employees in the continental United States and overseas. This will include barracks, bachelor officer quarters, and family quarters.

Under existing law, monetary limitations are placed on the amounts which may be expended for the construction of family quarters for military personnel. These limitations are set forth in the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 721), as amended by the act of February 1947 (44 Stat. 1235). The limits are as follows:

For officers above the rank of captain	$14,500
For captains and officers below the rank of captain	12,500

Present costs of labor and materials are such that it is impossible to construct quarters within the limits stated above. Accordingly, a provision has been included in this bill which would repeal the existing monetary limitations and substitute in lieu thereof space limitations, based on net floor area in square feet, for the various ranks and grades.

These limitations are as follows:

	Square feet
For general officers	2,100
For colonels	1,670
For majors and lieutenant colonels	1,400
For warrant officers, flight officers, and commissioned officers of and below the rank of captain	1,250
For enlisted men	1,080

Under the space-limitation method, a cost factor will be developed each fiscal year which will be based on current labor and material costs. This factor will represent the current cost of construction per square foot of floor area. It will be applied to the total area in computing the cost in any year of quarters for a given rank or grade. The factor applicable to the year 1948 is $13 per square foot. That figure represents the average cost within the continental United States. Because of transportation and other additional costs, construction at many overseas installations will necessarily be more expensive. Hence, in estimating the cost of overseas construction in a given area, an additional factor will be applied as a multiplier. The additional factor will take into account the differences in the cost of labor, transportation, and other elements in the particular overseas area in question as compared with similar costs in the United States.

Lack of dependent family housing that will permit the accommodation of families on decent standards has resulted in many expensively trained men refusing to reenlist and, instead, accepting positions in private industry where salaries and living conditions permit more desirable family relations.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I may say that I am somewhat concerned on this proposal to lift the dollar limitation on the amount of money that may be expended for officers' quarters. I can remember the day—and I was talking with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MUHLENBERG] a few minutes ago, and he remembers the day because he was in the construction service of the Army—when $7,500 was the limitation upon the amount that might be expended for a certain type of officers' quarters. In this bill the limitation is raised to $20,000.

The gentleman has just said there would be some difference in the cost of

construction as between continental United States and outside of the United States, yet an examination of the report shows that the same figures have been used for estimating the cost of officers' family quarters construction for the entire continental United States without taking into consideration the difference in requirements between building in Texas, let us say, and building in Maine, or building in Oregon and building in Florida.

Now, obviously when you do not have the same heating problems there should be some difference in the cost of construction, and I may say very frankly that as far as I am personally concerned unless some limitation is placed in this bill I shall seek to place a limitation in the appropriation bill for actual construction, for although I know there is a great need for housing, I cannot bring myself to propose agreeing to a construction program that contemplates on officers' quarters, $24,000 for colonels' quarters in the continental United States, $20,750 for lieutenant colonels and majors; $18,750 for captains, lieutenants, and warrant officers, and $16,540 for noncommissioned officers.

If we are going to engage in a construction program, the aim ought to be to provide decent quality certainly, but we need numbers of units and we cannot finance an adequate program of housing for officers if we are going to build $25,000 houses for colonels, $20,000 for lieutenant colonels, and $18,750 for captains, lieutenants, and warrant officers.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Fifty-two Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 56]

Abbitt	Fernandez	Kirwan
Allen, Ill.	Fogarty	Klein
Andrews, Ala.	Foote	Knutson
Andrews, N. Y.	Gallagher	Lane
Bates, Ky.	Gamble	Larcade
Battle	Garmatz	Latham
Beall	Gillie	Lesinski
Bell	Graham	Lewis, Ky.
Bennett, Mo.	Grant, Ala.	Love
Bloom	Gross	Ludlow
Bonner	Gwynne, Iowa	Lyle
Boykin	Harless, Ariz.	Lynch
Buckley	Harness, Ind.	McCowen
Byrne, N. Y.	Harrison	McGarvey
Carson	Hartley	McGregor
Celler	Hays	McMillan, S. C.
Chapman	Hébert	Macy
Chenoweth	Hedrick	Madden
Clark	Heffernan	Manasco
Clippinger	Hendricks	Mason
Cole, N. Y.	Hoeven	Meade, Md.
Cotton	Isacson	Merrow
Crosser	Jackson, Calif.	Miller, Calif.
Davis, Tenn.	Jarman	Mitchell
Dawson, Ill.	Jenkins, Ohio	Morgan
Delaney	Jennings	Morrison
Dingell	Johnson, Ind.	Multer
Dirksen	Johnson, Okla.	Norrell
Dorn	Jones, Wash.	Norton
Douglas	Kearney	O'Toole
Elliott	Kee	Patman
Engel, Mich.	Kefauver	Peden
Engle, Calif.	Keogh	Peterson
Fellows	Kerr	Pfeifer
Plumley	Rooney	Smith, Va.
Potter	Schwabe, Mo.	Somers
Poulson	Scoblick	Spence
Powell	Scott, Hardie	Stigler
Price, Fla.	Seely-Brown	Stratton
Rains	Sheppard	Taylor
Ramey	Short	Thomas, N. J.
Reeves	Sikes	West
Riehlman	Simpson, Ill.	Whitaker
Rivers	Simpson, Pa.	Whittington
Rizley	Smathers	Wilson, Ind.
Rockwell	Smith, Kan.	
Rogers, Fla.	Smith, Maine	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HILL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 6342, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 291 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HILL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6342) to authorize the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force to proceed with construction at military installations, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a very fine statement by Mr. Russell.

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. GRANGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two articles.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

RECEIPT OF MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE AND THE SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

BACON AND BREAD FOR THE BRITISH

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I notice in this morning's paper an article entitled "Bacon and Bread Ordered for British. Hoffman Says $33,500,000 Shipment by ECA Will Be Purchased in Canada."

Mr. Speaker, that means that the people of the United States are furnishing $33,500,000 for the shipment of these commodities to Great Britain and that we are going to Canada to buy them.

I would like to know why we should take American dollars and go over to our neighbor, Canada, a blood relative of Great Britain, and buy their stuff. Canada should aid and assist Great Britain with the things it needs. Yet we have to use American dollars which belong to the American people to buy this food for the British. Now, some people came into my office today asking for aid and assistance for our own American people. They cannot get it. Yet we can do everything for everybody else. Let me tell you that I am for America first, last, and all the time. Canada has a credit in this country right now. Why does Canada not borrow the money from us and take care of the British needs and assist her mother country? Why ask America to furnish foodstuffs for England when Canada has it and we have not? It seems to me that we ought to be sensible and do the things that are right and proper, but I do not think that this is one of them.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

RESTORATION OF GERMAN CARTELS A DANGER TO UNITED STATES SECURITY

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at this time the Congress is earnestly and properly giving the most serious consideration to questions of national security and defense. There is a danger, however, that in concentrating solely on present tensions and difficulties, we may take actions which will serve only to build up greater dangers to our security in the days ahead. I refer specifically to the current emasculation—I might even say, the deliberate sabotage—of our program for eliminating German cartels.

On Friday, April 23, it was reported in the Washington Post that a horrifying memorandum had just been found in Germany. This was a request, written by the I. G. Farben Co. during the war, for permission to build a new crematorium adjacent to the slave labor camp run by this company, which should have

the capacity to cremate 40 bodies per day. It was stated that this evidence was expected to clinch the guilt of the Farben directors under trial as war criminals. However, just as this evidence was uncovered, Gen. Telford Taylor, the hard-working prosecutor in these trials, was suddenly summoned to Washington, over his own protest. On another page of the same paper appeared the news item that 23 of the I. G. Farben officials had been acquitted of the charges of plundering Czechoslovakia and Austria and of a common plan of conspiracy against humanity and of having committed war crimes.

Why has General Taylor been ordered to drop his important prosecution of the Nazi industrial criminals? I challenge our Secretary of War, General Royall, to explain to Congress and the American people the reasons for recalling a man who has been earnestly and tirelessly conducting the prosecution of the Nazi cartelists. Does this recall indicate that General Taylor will be replaced by a different and "softer" prosecutor or does it mean that the war trials are to be ended very soon? Has there been a major change in policy toward the decartelization of Germany industry? Does the recent clearance given Krupp Von Bohlen and the 23 I. G. Farben officials set a new and dangerous pattern—horribly reminiscent of the post-War I period—of rebuilding German monopolies?

It is true that there still remains charges against these men of having plundered Nazi-occupied Poland, Norway, France, and Russia; charges of mass murder and slavery, participation with the Nazis in waging aggressive warfare and membership in the notorious storm troopers. Will they be cleared of these criminal charges, too?

Drew Pearson, in commenting on the recall of General Taylor, said:

> Simultaneously, certain highly placed defense chiefs have started a quiet drive to save both the factories and the personnel of I. G. Farben, the Krupps, and other big munitions makers.
>
> This is probably the most significant development in Germany today.

This news must be considered in the light of certain developments which took place about the middle of March. At that time a new cartel policy was announced by our military government in Germany, a policy which virtually means the end of our decartelization program. The memorandum in which this policy was embodied exempts from the program all vertically integrated concentrations of industry; it suspends the program as to cartels in heavy industry and restricts it to consumer-goods industries; it requires that a clean bill of health be given to the companies thus exempted. This memorandum, which is in direct contravention of the existing decartelization law promulgated in cooperation with the British on February 12, 1947, represents the culmination of a long series of efforts on the part of special interests to weaken and destroy the decartelization program. The quiet drive, referred to by Drew Pearson, is not new. It began while the war was yet in progress. It has continued day in and day out since the ending of the war. Detail for detail, it repeats the process that took place following World War I. If successful, this drive on behalf of the monopolies and the monopolist of Nazi Germany will seriously weaken our efforts toward the establishment of multilateral world trade, and will provide a new totalitarian threat to our national security in the future.

Let me trace for you briefly the evolution of our national policy toward cartels. When World War II broke upon the world, the people of the United States discovered that our country was faced with very serious shortages of many critical and strategic materials. It was found that in many cases this situation had been brought about because of restrictive cartel agreements entered into between United States firms and producers in other countries. These international cartels exercised monopoly control in world trade over many articles of commerce, fixing prices, allocating markets, and restricting production. Many such cartels were dominated by their German members, who used them not merely as trade organizations but as political instruments of economic warfare. Cartels were used by the Nazis to obtain secret technological information, and to keep production low in other countries. Cartels even were used for espionage purposes. This story has been fully documented in hearings before a number of congressional committees. Among them I might mention the extensive investigations of the Subcommittee on War Mobilization of the Senate Military Affairs Committee; hearings held by the Senate Special Committee Investigating the National Defense; and the joint hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and the Special Committee Investigating Petroleum Resources. I will quote two brief paragraphs from a report on cartels and national security, issued by the Subcommittee on War Mobilization just mentioned. These paragraphs tell the story in a nutshell:

> The role which the cartels played in abetting Hitler's seizure of power has been recounted at length in testimony before Congress. Krupp, Thyssen, and other powerful figures on the German industrial scene provided the Nazis with indispensable financial and political support.
>
> Almost immediately, as a consequence of this unholy alliance between Hitler and the cartelists, Germany's plans for economic warfare, aimed at ultimate world domination, were expanded. The German Government became a silent partner in the multitude of cartel agreements among German, American, British, French, and other concerns with which German industry had established cartel relations.
>
> Under cover of cartel agreements, Germany penetrated the economy of other nations, including the United States. Using their cartel affiliates or subsidiaries, German industrialists built up a network which impaired the production of other nations, obtained sources of foreign exchange for Germany, gathered economic intelligence, and spread Nazi propaganda.

The truth about this situation was further brought to light through a series of anticartel suits brought by the United States Department of Justice. Between 1939 and 1944, 37 such suits were begun. In some of them convictions have been obtained. Many were suspended for the duration of the war in order not to hamper the flow of our war production, and are only now reaching trial.

By way of illustration, let me cite one case in which a verdict has been rendered. In July 1945 the National Lead Co. and E. I. du Pont de Nemours Co. were found guilty by a United States district court of violating the Sherman antitrust law by maintaining a monopoly in the manufacture of titanium. The two firms were also held to have been part of an illegal international titanium cartel. Conspirators listed in the complaint included I. G. Farben as well as French, Canadian, and Japanese members. Titanium and its compounds are used for the manufacture of paints, rubber, glass, paper, and other materials of importance both in peace and in war.

In a 45-page opinion, the presiding judge commented upon the fact that prior to the entry of the United States into the war, the cartel members had regarded the war as merely a temporary interruption to their arrangements. The judge evidently doubted the sincerity of protestations on the part of the defendants that they had no intention of renewing these relationships. He said:

> The inference I draw is that there is a preponderant probability that the underlying conspiracy persists.

It was also brought out in this case that patents relating to the manufacture of titanium belonging to I. G. Farben were assigned to the National Lead Co. for the express purpose of preventing their seizure by the Alien Property Custodian in event of war between the United States and Germany. Fortunately, Government action has resulted in the opening of these patents to other concerns on a royalty-free basis—see Hearings on the Foreign Contracts Act, page 61, May 18, 1945, United States against National Lead Co. et al., in United States District Court for the southern district of New York, civil action No. 26–258, opinion filed July 5, 1945.

As a consequence of these revelations, and as the unfortunate economic effects of such restrictive agreements began to be better understood, the United States strengthened its historic policy of promoting competition in trade. Here is an excerpt from a letter written by President Roosevelt to Secretary of State Hull in September 1944:

> SEPTEMBER 6, 1944.
>
> To the SECRETARY OF STATE.
>
> DEAR MR. SECRETARY: During the past half century the United States has developed a tradition in opposition to private monopolies. The Sherman and Clayton Acts have become as much a part of the American way of life as the due-process clause of the Constitution. By protecting the consumer against monopoly these statutes guarantee him the benefits of competition.
>
> This policy goes hand in glove with the liberal principles of international trade for which you have stood through many years of public service * * *.
>
> Unfortunately, a number of foreign countries, particularly in continental Europe, do not possess such a tradition against cartels. On the contrary, cartels have received encouragement from some of these governments. Especially is this true with respect to Germany. * * * The defeat of the Nazi

armies will have to be followed by the eradication of these weapons of economic warfare. But more than the elimination of the political activities of German cartels will be required. Cartel practices which restrict the free flow of goods in foreign commerce will have to be curbed. With international trade involved, this end can be achieved only through collaborative action by the United Nations.

The reply of Secretary Hull stated that the Department of State was preparing policy proposals for the curbing of international cartels, as a basis for discussions with the United Nations. These proposals, after a long series of negotiations among the nations, have been embodied in chapter V of the charter of the International Trade Organization recently drafted at Habana.

The policy toward cartels announced by President Roosevelt has been continued by President Truman, who included the following passage in his message to Congress on the State of the Union, delivered January 14, 1946:

> The view of this Government is that, in the longer run, our economic prosperity and the prosperity of the whole world are best served by the elimination of artificial barriers to international trade whether in the form of unreasonable tariffs or tariff preferences or commercial quotas or embargoes or the restictive practices of cartels.

Committees of the Congress have been definite in their recommendations that German cartels should be eliminated in the postwar period. The Subcommittee on War Mobilization of the Senate Military Affairs Comimttee recommended the following steps: Seizure of and retention by the United Nations of all Nazi cartel interests, including patents and all German property in the various United Nations; outlawing of the international cartel system; free flow of trade as a means to develop high standards of living throughout the world, which will tend to eliminate conditions favorable to the formation of cartels; establishment of machinery for intergovernmental cooperation in this field; exchange of scientific information among nations, within the framework of an international economic organization, and revision of the United States patent law to require nonexclusive licensing of patents on discoveries originating abroad, with payment of a reasonable royalty; free licensing of patents of enemy origin, both those directly vested and those held by vested or supervised business enterprises, and granting of additional domestic enforcement authority to the Department of Justice, if needed. Some, but by no means all of these recommendations have been put into effect.

The House Special Committee on Postwar Planning and Economic Policy, in its sixth report, issued on May 8, 1945, called for an international conference for the purpose of removing trade barriers. In its eighth report, issued on November 12, 1945, this committee commended efforts of American negotiators to further the creation of an international trade organization. The concluding paragraph of the report states:

> The International Trade Organization * * * can become an instrument for American foreign policy in reaching and maintaining agreements to remove trade barriers and restrictions. It may also serve to scrutinize on an international scale cartel policies and commodity agreements. The committee heartily endorses the initiative of the Departments of State and Commerce to this end.

However, in spite of all the investigations and policy decisions, there is ample evidence to show that many cartel arrangements were merely suspended for the duration of the war. Their resumption after the war's end was contemplated and has, in fact, taken place. From time to time voices have been raised on the floor of this House warning of the danger of the postwar revival of German-dominated cartels. Have we forgotten that a meeting of German and British industrialists took place in Dusseldorf immediately after Hitler's entry into Czechoslovakia, at which meeting plans were laid for continued collaboration on a cartel basis? Have we forgotten that a meeting took place in Lisbon just prior to General Eisenhower's landing in Normandy in June 1944, which was attended by representatives of I. G. Farben, Krupp, and other German monopolists, together with representatives of some of the largest American firms? At this meeting was one Daniel Heineman, representative of a huge public utility known as the Sofina Co. This man, a week before the invasion of Brussels was provided by Hitler with a special guard so that he might get safely away, carrying important documents, securities, and cash. Thus the Germans could renew their cartel operations using Spain as a convenient base.

Have we forgotten that careful plans were made by the German cartelists to preserve their Latin-American markets using cloaking devices of various kinds during the war? And that as the defeat of Germany drew near German nationals and German capital poured into some of these countries, especially Argentina?

It is evident that we will disregard these many indications of the continuation of cartel ties, at our peril.

Now let me come to the story of our decartelization policy in Germany.

A directive—JCS 1067—from the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the United States commander in Europe, then General Eisenhower, was issued in April 1945, although not finally approved by the President until May 11. Among its provisions were the following:

> You will prohibit all cartels or other private business arrangements and cartel-like organizations, including those of a public or quasi-public character, such as the Wirtschafts-Gruppen, providing for the regulation of marketing conditions including production, prices, exclusive exchange of technical information and processes, and allocation of sales territories. Such necessary public functions as have been discharged by these organizations shall be absorbed as rapidly as possible by approved public agencies.
>
> It is the policy of your government to effect a dispersion of the ownership and control of German industry.

Note that this directive does not address itself to the question of the level of German industry. It is dealing with the structure of industry. It is evident that the purpose is to break up excessive concentration of industry in whatever form such concentration may exist, and to bring about a condition of economic democracy of that free enterprise in which we profess to believe.

After the formal surrender of Germany, a directive was issued from the United States Forces, European Theater, to the commanding generals of the various military districts, ordering the prohibition of cartels.

On July 5, 1945, the United States Military Government issued General Order No. 2, providing that ownership and control of I. G. Farben property in the United States zone was to be broken up. All such property was to be available as reparations to the United Nations; any such property remaining in Germany consisting of facilities for war production was to be destroyed. A special order issued the same day appointed an I. G. Farben control officer to carry out the general order.

The Potsdam agreement which was announced on August 2, 1945, also contained a provision regarding cartels, in entire harmony with the afore-mentioned directives, as follows:

> At the earliest practicable date the German economy shall be decentralized for the purpose of eliminating the present excessive concentration of economic power as exemplified in particular by cartels, syndicates, trusts, and other monopolistic arrangements.

In November 1945 Law No. 9 was issued by the Allied control authority. It related to seizure and control of property owned by I. G. Farbenindustrie and was similar to General Order No. 2, except that since Farben property was in all four zones its control was made a four-power project, under a control committee made up of officers appointed by the respective zone commanders.

Long and fruitless negotiations followed concerning the promulgation of a quadripartite decartelization law. Since agreement continued to be delayed, the military governments of the United States and the United Kingdom on February 12, 1947, simultaneously issued laws to be operative in their two zones. These laws were in the main parallel. They are generally referred to as the decartelization laws, although their official title is "Prohibition of Excessive Concentration of German Economic Power."

Both laws outlaw—and I quote:

> Cartels, combines, syndicates, trusts, associations, or any other form of understanding or concerted undertaking between persons, which have the purpose or effect of fostering monopolistic control of domestic or international trade or other economic activity, or of restricting access to domestic or international markets.

A list of restrictive practices forbidden under these laws is an almost exact duplicate of similar provisions to be found in the draft charter of the International Trade Organization.

Thus far the policy adopted by the United States concerning German decartelization has been consistent with our over-all policy toward cartels. However, two modifications have since occurred which entirely change the picture.

The first of these was a new directive issued on July 11, 1947, to the commander of the United States occupation forces in Germany, Gen. Lucius Clay,

from the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This directive shifted the emphasis away from the prevention of the resurgence of German power and centered it upon the economic revival of Germany. The section of the directive dealing with economic institutions, while approximating the language used in JCS 1067, allows much more latitude for administrative discretion.

In view of the July 11 directive, is it any wonder that the extreme slowness of the functioning of the decartelization program was noted by the New York Times on September 20, 1947, when months after the passage of the law, the first achievement report by the British and United States officials had not yet appeared. Decartelization officers were reported to attribute this slowness to three major causes: severe personnel cuts; the policy of putting most decartelization work into the hands of the Germans; and a desire to reorganize a cartelized business so thoroughly that the reform would last. Insistence on needlessly complex paper work on the part of the Germans, the newness to them of the economic concepts being followed, and a possible desire to sabotage the undertaking, were mentioned.

The most serious change was made, however, in the memorandum of March 13, 1948, to which I referred at the beginning of my speech. This memorandum, which virtually nullifies the provisions of the decartelization law, was made possible, it is asserted, by the latitude allowed under the directive of July 1947.

Now I want to make clear the purposes which underlie this stultification of the program, and to describe the administration of the law. Before I do so, however, I would like to clarify one very misleading concept which has been carefully fostered by those who wish to protect cartels. This is the idea that cartels are only condemned by left-wingers and that it is necessary to maintain the cartel structure in order to foster a strong Germany as a bulwark against Russia. I will quote to you from the testimony of a representative of that notorious left-wing organization, the National Association of Manufacturers. This is taken from the testimony of R. J. Dearborn, president of the Texaco Development Corp. and chairman of the patent committee of the National Association of Manufacturers, given on May 22, 1945, before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary:

> The National Association of Manufacturers, through its board of directors, has taken the following position on cartels: "* * * The National Association of Manufacturers stands squarely against cartels of every description, both private and governmental."

You will recall also that Eric Johnston, while president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, spoke out very strongly against cartels while on a trip to Great Britain. It has been reported also that two directors of the National Association of Manufacturers were very active on a committee entitled "Free Enterprise versus Cartels" at a meeting of the International Chamber of Commerce held in Montreux, Switzerland, in June 1947. This subject of cartels seems to be one of the few in which the official positions of labor and of big business in the United States are in harmony.

It should be evident to any reader of history that a totalitarian Germany can never serve as a bulwark against a totalitarian Russia. It is only if we help a democratic Germany to emerge—democratic, both politically and economically—that we can expect ties of real friendship to develop. Otherwise, as Walter Lippmann has pointed out, there will be every reason to fear that a strong totalitarian Germany may join hands with Russia against us in a third attempt to win supremacy. We will be criminally foolish if we ignore this danger.

Justification for the weakening of our decartelization program is sometimes sought on the ground that increased German productivity is badly needed to bring about a recovery of western Europe. But maximum production is not attained through a monopoly structure, but through free, competitive enterprise. Surely we would be greatly mistaken to restore the prewar pattern, in which Germany by means of patent and cartel agreements maintained a strangle hold over so much of European industry. What we should and must strive to attain, if we are honest in our professed beliefs, is a healthy productive Europe in which democratic and self-sustaining nations freely compete in the market place. There is no free competition in a cartelized economy.

The weakening of our cartel program is not to be laid at the door of General Clay, who is in no way responsible. Nor is it the fault of the lower echelons of the decartelization branch of our military government. These staff members, on the contrary, launched a strong protest against the new policy, a protest which was reported to this House in full on March 25. The change in policy is to be attributed to the fact that in places of authority are too often to be found men who have had previous connections with the very business firms who have engaged in cartel practices in the past. I am not in any way impugning the patriotism of these men. But it is plain that their past experience and the whole set of their minds is such as to render them sympathetic to cartels and other types of restrictive arrangements.

Some of these men have already been named on the floor of this House. One of the foremost of them is Under Secretary of War, William H. Draper, formerly connected with Dillon Read, the firm which floated a $30,000,000 bond issue for the German steel trust prior to the war. General Draper's son-in-law, Philip Hawkins, formerly with the Hercules Powder Co., is in charge of the Property Division of the military government in Germany, of which the Decartelization Branch is a part. In 1946, when a group of American industrialists was taken on a tour of Germany by the War Department—a group which included representatives of firms with past cartel connections, at least one of such firms being under indictment by the Department of Justice—this group was addressed by General Draper, who was at that time serving under General Clay in Germany. The general so belittled the decartelization program that he was subjected to severe reproof by General Clay.

It is such influences as these that have been building for a renewal of business as usual with the German cartelists, who played so successful a role in support of Germany's militarists. We should awake as to what is going on. The American people should know the state of affairs. The Congress should thoroughly investigate this situation and should demand that our cartel policy be restored to its former vigor. We should scrutinize with greater care the administration of the policy to which we have committed ourselves nationally and internationally.

Mr. Speaker, we know that the German warlords began planning World War II while the First World War was still in progress. We know that they used every device, political and economic, to build toward their second try for world dominance. Let us not be so gullible as to suppose that nazism died with defeat. Let us not be so naive as to think that men who countenanced mass slaughter and the horrors of the concentration camp—men who swallowed the mouthings of a Hitler and arrogantly espoused the theory of a master race—have suddenly become mild and altruistic. Let us rather look straight and fearlessly at realities. Let us combat with all our vigor totalitarianisms of every sort, whether of the right or of the left. Let us foster the truly democratic elements in Germany, give them a chance to develop and grow, unstifled by the unholy alliance of the junker and the militarist.

It is thus, and thus only, that we will build a bulwark against aggression from the east. It is only by a program of this sort that we will win the confidence of the peoples of the world.

We failed to learn our lesson after World War I, and the price has been paid in the outpoured blood of thousands of our young men. We must not fail our people or the world a second time. Cartel "business as usual" cannot heal a world in torment nor avert the doom of an atomic war.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Congress of the United States should call before the proper committee the makers of our economic policy in Germany and investigate the actions of those who are administering that policy. We should find out now, before the Eightieth Congress adjourns, whether we intend to denazify and decartelize Germany, or whether stealthily and by default we are to embrace the Hitler-makers and restore to the Nazi criminals their monopolistic cartels.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

MOTORTRUCK REGULATIONS OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION INTERFERE WITH DISTRIBUTION OF FARM AND FOOD PRODUCTS AND INCREASE THE COST OF THESE PRODUCTS TO THE CONSUMER

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, the Produce News, published in New York on March 27, 1948, carried an article con-

cerning a decision rendered by the Interstate Commerce Commission on December 16, 1947, which decision is an obvious infringement by the Commission on the agricultural exemptions provided in the Motor Carrier Act of 1935. There are many shippers of farm produce in my district who are disturbed by this ruling, and the Virginia Farm Bureau Federation has asked me to look into the matter. This particular decision is merely one instance of abuses in the administration of the Motor Carrier Act of 1935, and I want to call to the attention of the House certain observations I have made.

Farmers and food distributors are becoming more and more concerned about the effect of the Motor Carrier Act of 1935 on the efficient distribution of farm and food products. This concern relates particularly to the manner in which the act is being administered. I believe that when Congress enacted this legislation, bringing motortruck operations under regulation of the Interstate Commerce Commission, it expected at least two results that have not been achieved. First, it wrote into the act an exemption for unmanufactured agricultural commodities—ICC Act, part II, section 203 (b) 6. Second, it obviously expected that rates established by the Interstate Commerce Commission for truck transportation would be fair and reasonable, and based upon the idea of yielding a fair return to truck operators who are performing an efficient service.

Since the enactment of this act, the Interstate Commerce Commission has constantly encroached on the exemptions for farm products, thus interfering with the movement of those products. Moreover, and even more serious, after removing as much competition as possible in the trucking field, the Commission has allowed the trucking companies favored with operating permits to increase their rates time after time with no hearing to establish a need for the increases. In effect, the Interstate Commerce Commission is granting monopolistic favors to trucking lines throughout the country, thus removing competition as a regulator of rates, and then is allowing general rate increases to these lines practically whenever they are desired by the companies.

To illustrate the extent to which the public is being exploited by the acts of the Commission, let us consider the action of that body in the case of the Southern motor carriers. In March 1948 this group of carriers filed tariffs with the Interstate Commerce Commission increasing their rates by 20 percent. On April 19 the Commission issued an order permitting the increases to become effective in spite of numerous protests by the shipping public. The only apparent reason for permitting this increase was that the Commission had granted the railroads a 20 percent increase based on a showing that they needed such an increase. It appears that it has never occurred to the Commission that one type of carrier may need an increase in rates without another type of carrier needing the same increase. Let us consider for a moment how badly these truckers needed the 20 percent increase the Commission has just granted without a hearing. In 1946 the 29 carriers in this group having operating revenues of $800,000 or more had a net income before payment of income taxes of 59.1 percent on their capital stock and an estimated rate of return of 20 percent on everything they had invested in their business. It is estimated that in 1947 they earned 119.5 percent on their stock and 35 percent on their total investment. Yet in the face of these figures the Commission allowed the 20-percent rate increases to go into effect, and these increases are in addition to the 20 percent allowed in the recently decided case known as MCC–538, and in addition to the 10 percent increase granted in December 1947 without an investigation, making a 50-percent increase in less than 2 years.

This situation is not confined to the South. On April 16, 1948, the Commission allowed the Middle Atlantic States motor carriers to increase their rates by 17½ percent over January 6, 1948, without suspension or investigation, despite approximately 30 protests filed by interested parties. In 1946 the average rate of return for all class 1 common carriers who operate principally in this territory, after payment of their income taxes and all other taxes, was 9.17 percent of their investment, and in 1947 it is estimated to have been more than 20 percent.

During the past few years the Commission has allowed truckers under its jurisdiction one general rate increase after another without any hearing to make a record upon which to base the increase. In other cases it has told the public it would have a hearing, but let the increases requested go into effect before the hearing.

This Government has traditionally been opposed to monopolies and has fostered the competitive system. We have agencies in the Government whose function is to break up monopolies, but how many of us realize that we also have an agency of our Government busily engaged in granting monopoly rights to one trucker to operate over this road and another over that—roads built with the taxpayers' money—and then authorizing these favored few to increase their rates at will with utter disregard of the public interest. Evidently the Commission, as far as its trucking policy is concerned, has completely forgotten whose interest it is supposed to protect.

Throughout the years this same Commission has taken one action after another to bring more and more types of trucking under its control, so that it can deny operating rights to trucking lines that would dare compete with its favored few. Bureaucracy is constantly reaching out to control more and more of our everyday life. To cut down the agricultural exemption, the Commission has forced many agricultural haulers to return without a load, thus making it necessary to charge enough for the haul in one direction to pay the cost of the trip both ways. It ruled that such a trucker of farm products could not even haul feed back without losing his exemption rights. It went so far as to say that if a hauler of agricultural products even once hauled a nonexempt commodity for pay, his entire operation, including the hauling of the agricultural commodities, would thereby come under its control—ICC against Parker R. Dunn, Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, No. 12138. Fortunately, the courts blocked this attempt of the Commission to further extend itself.

Since the passage of the act the Commission has steadily tried to limit the commodities that can be called unmanufactured agricultural and therefore keep their exemption. You may be interested in knowing that the Commission has determined that the following are not exempt: Buttermilk, pasteurized milk, corn that has been cracked, peanuts that have been shelled, tobacco that has been dried by any artificial means, shrimp with their heads cut off, and spinach that has been washed and put in a bag. If the trend of performance of this agency continues, it will be reasonable to expect a decision at some future time that an apple in a box is not an agricultural product or that a potato loses its exemption if it is washed and put in a sack.

The Commission is not only granting monopoly rights to its favored few, allowing them one rate increase after another without a showing of need, and trying to eliminate as much competition as possible by cutting down on the exemptions the Congress intended for agriculture, but it is also beginning to try to move in on private carriers hauling their own products. It has been seriously proposed that, if a private carrier obtains any more compensation for a product after he delivers it than he could have obtained if he left it at the factory, he is subject to the Commission. The decision of the full Commission on this is awaited with much interest.

Perishable agricultural products in an area are harvested in a short season. They must be moved speedily from everywhere to everywhere to give the Nation's consumers the variety of foods they need and to get every possible market for the product of the farm. No Government bureaucrat can regulate the routes over which these products can move without interfering with the marketing of the product. No such bureaucrat can say how many trucks will be needed to move these products. There is enough competition in the trucking industry to give us the rate regulation we need. At least competition can do a better job than the Interstate Commerce Commission has demonstrated it can do under its policy of monopoly granting and rate increasing without regard for economic factors.

The record of the Commission in administering the Motor Carrier Act of 1935 has shown such a flagrant disregard of public interest that the place has been reached where the Congress should repeal or amend the Motor Carrier Act or have an investigation of the Commission or particularly of those persons on the Commission who are responsible for these actions in the motortruck field.

I am a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. It might be well for our committee to look into the manner in which appropriated funds for administering

this act are being spent. I shall speak to my chairman about this.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and under the rule referred as follows:

S. 2385. An act to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2565. An act to provide for a temporary extension of title VI of the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 182. An act for the relief of Sgt. John H. Mott;

S. 576. An act for the relief of Dan C. Rodgers;

S. 981. An act for the relief of Carl W. Sundstrom;

S. 1142. An act for the relief of Anna Pechnik;

S. 1164. An act for the relief of Doris D. Chrisman;

S. 1620. An act to establish eligibility for burial in national cemeteries, and for other purposes;

S. 1630. An act for the relief of Louis L. Williams, Jr.;

S. 1648. An act to authorize the expenditure of income from Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for training of Federal prisoners;

S. 1806. An act for the relief of Ensign Merton H. Peterson, United States Naval Reserve; and

S. 1875. An act for the relief of the estate of Francis D. Shoemaker.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, May 10, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1525. A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to continue the authorization for the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1526. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1527. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting the United States Post Office Department Cost Ascertainment Report and Appendix for the fiscal year 1947; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1528. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 3552 of the Revised Statutes relating to the covering into the Treasury of all moneys arising from charges and deductions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1529. A letter from the Chairman pro tempore, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the thirty-fourth annual report, covering operations of the Federal Reserve System during the calendar year 1947; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1530. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide that personnel of the National Guard of the United States and Organized Reserve Corps shall have a common Federal appointment or enlistment as reserves of the Army of the United States, to equalize disability benefits applicable to such personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. S. 1302. An act to aid the associations, groups, organizations, and institutions encouraging participation of the youth of the country in athletic and sports programs by making surplus athletic equipment available to such associations, groups, organizations, and institutions, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1869). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 6419. A bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1870). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 581. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 221, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers; without amendment (Rept. No. 1871). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Committee on Rules. House Resolution 582. Resolution waiving points of order against H. R. 5852, a bill to combat un-American activities by requiring the registration of Communist-front organizations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1872). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1873. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HALE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6078. A bill to amend section 303 (e) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1874). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 4688. A bill to enlarge the Gettysburg National Cemetery; with amendments (Rept. No. 1875). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6227. A bill to provide for home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 1876). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 6460. A bill to provide for additional tax deductions from the gross income for certain working widows of war veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 6461. A bill to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 6462. A bill to provide for the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by farmers for the purpose of soil and water conservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROPHY:

H. R. 6463. A bill to incorporate the Army and Navy Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 6464. A bill to incorporate the National PT Veterans' Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHEWS:

H. R. 6465. A bill to amend and supplement section 2 of the act approved August 30, 1935, relating to the construction and financing of toll bridges over the Delaware River by the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 6466. A bill to permit investment of funds of insurance companies organized within the District of Columbia in obligations of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 6467. A bill to amend section 4 (a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to the salaries of members of the Securities and Exchange Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 6468. A bill to authorize the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 6469. A bill to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BREHM:

H. R. 6470. A bill to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to dental diseases and conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. R. 6471. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to eliminate certain elections required by such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 6472. A bill for the relief of Chattooga County, Ga.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. J. Res. 395. Joint resolution to extend the time for the release, free of estate and gift tax, of powers of appointment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON (by request):

H. J. Res. 396. Joint resolution to continue until December 31, 1949, the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation services to, from, and within Alaska; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 194. Concurrent resolution recommending the revision of the United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Con. Res. 195. Concurrent resolution recommending the revision of the United

Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. Con. Res. 196. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the 7th day of March of each year be known and designated in the several States as Friendship Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. Res. 585. Resolution authorizing the printing of the report of the Federal Power Commission on the natural gas investigation as a House document; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 6473. A bill for the relief of Emma Thompson Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 6474. A bill for the relief of Bram B. Tellekamp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 6475. A bill for the relief of Erwin F. Earl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6476. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth and Lawrence Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 6477. A bill for the relief of Nicoletta and Guilia Pontrelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 6478. A bill for the relief of William Bergen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 6479. A bill for the relief of Maria Geertriude Mulders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 6480. A bill for the relief of William A. Cross; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1872. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Miss Mabel M. Hand, Daytona Beach, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1873. Also, petition of Mrs. Albina Bibeau, St. Petersburg, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1874. Also, petition of the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to support of a house-building program, relative to the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1875. Also, petition of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a request to extend the right of naturalization to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence and to make immigration quotas available to Asiatic and Pacific peoples as provided by House bill 5004; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1876. Also, petition of Sam Wanamaker, New York, N. Y., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging defeat of the House Un-American Activities Committee's proposed legislation entitled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 10, 1948

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Forgive us, Lord Jesus, for doing the things that make us uncomfortable and guilty when we pray.

We say that we believe in God, and yet we doubt God's promises.

We say that in God we trust, yet we worry and try to manage our own affairs.

We say that we love Thee, O Lord, and yet do not obey Thee.

We believe that Thou hast the answers to all our problems, and yet we do not consult Thee.

Forgive us, Lord, for our lack of faith and the willful pride that ignores the way, the truth, and the life.

Wilt Thou reach down and change the gears within us that we may go forward with Thee. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 6, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations and withdrawing a nomination were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

THREATENED RAILROAD STRIKE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may introduce a bill out of order and make a brief explanation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The order at the moment is the morning business. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and the Senator is recognized.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, this Nation is faced with the threat of a major strike which would throttle our rail transportation system, undermine the economic structure of the United States, and thereby endanger the public welfare. That this should happen at a time when the stability of America is the principal guaranty for the peace of the world is unthinkable.

The membership of organized labor is composed of loyal citizens. I feel certain that the overwhelming number of them have a sense of responsibility to the Nation and a recognition of the part our country must play if there is to be a rehabilitation of the war-torn world.

Certainly the responsible leaders of labor must fully recognize the catastrophic nature of a shut-down in rail transportation. It would not only kick the economic props out from under our transportation system, but it would cause untold losses and suffering to other industrial workers, to farmers and consumers alike.

In addition, it would strike a mortal blow at the effectiveness of the European recovery program at a critical moment in international affairs.

This is a power which no responsible leader of organized labor should use. It is most certainly a power which no irresponsible leader should have. No man or group of men has the right to strangle the economic life of 140,000,000 Americans and to endanger the peace and stability of the world.

I am introducing a bill repealing section 212 of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 which made that act inapplicable to the railroads. If this is not sufficient to give the Federal Government, representing all the people, an opportunity to protect the national well-being, then I believe that the Congress of the United States should meet in day and night session until adequate legislation is enacted.

The common welfare of the whole Nation must and shall transcend the special privileges of any segment. If such a thing as this threatened strike takes place, a major part of our economy will grind to a close and the action of the Congress in passing national defense legislation and the European recovery program will be nullified to a large extent. This cannot and must not be.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2619) to make applicable to common carriers by rail the provisions of title II of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, introduced by Mr. KNOWLAND, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE—PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, last week the Senate Committee on the Judiciary by an overwhelming majority reported favorably Senate Joint Resolution 200, proposing a constitutional amendment to provide that the electoral votes in electing the President of the United States shall be counted in proportion to the popular vote. I intend to bring the resolution up for discussion on the floor of the Senate at the earliest opportunity. An identical proposal has been reported unanimously by the House Committee on the Judiciary.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "No Electoral College" from the Boston Herald of May 6, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"NO ELECTORAL COLLEGE"

The process by which the Presidential vote of the States is counted as a unit for each and cast by a peculiar body of Presidential electors who have no visible usefulness is not alone quaintly archaic. It results in the virtual disfranchisement of millions of voters, it centers the major efforts of both parties in the uncertain States, it has permitted the election of a President who was not the choice of the majority of voters, and it involves a complex and unreliable system of election when no candidate receives a majority of the electoral votes. Why we have kept it all these years is a problem in democratic procrastination.

Now the Senate Judiciary Committee has reported a resolution for a constitutional amendment to remedy these defects. Submitted by Senator LODGE, it ingeniously retains what is good of the present system, but corrects what is wrong. A similar bill has

been approved by the House Judiciary group. Passage in this session of Congress would start the amendment along to ratification by the States in time for the 1952 election.

The amendment would do away with the electoral college, but retains the electoral votes of the States. Thus Massachusetts, with its 2 Senators and 14 Representatives, would still have 16 electoral votes. But they would not be cast, as at present, as a unit for whichever candidate received a plurality in the State. They would be cast in the same proportion as the actual popular vote of the State.

For example, in the last election Roosevelt got 1,035,296 votes, Dewey 921,350, and minor candidates 3,019. Under the unit rule, the State's entire electoral vote of 16 went to Roosevelt. In effect, the 924,441 who voted for other candidates had no share whatever in the election of a President.

If the proposed amendment had been in effect, however, the 16 electoral votes would have been divided in proporttion to the popular vote. Carried to three decimal places, this would have been 8.448 for Roosevelt, 7.618 for Dewey, and small fractions for the other candidates. In this way the 924,441 would have a real voice in the election of the President.

Figured in this way, Roosevelt, would have got a national total of 300.736 electoral votes and Dewey 223.529. Instead, Roosevelt was actually credited with 432 to Dewey's 99, which grossly misinterpreted the popular vote. It has happened three times in our history that a candidate with a majority of the popular vote has lost the election.

The effect of this unit electoral voting is by no means confined to the campaign year. Because the electoral vote of the solid South is almost certain to be Democratic, the President in office, whether Republican or Democrat, can neglect it. The same is true, though to a less extent, of New England, which is neglected because of its Republican preponderance.

But under the proposed amendment, there would be no longer any solid section. In the last election, Dewey would have got a little more than two of Alabama's 11 electoral votes, and even .186 of Mississippi's 9. No State would ever again be politically negligible.

This reform simply recognizes changes in the practical operation of the election system that were not foreseen when the Constitution was drawn. Passage this session should be a congressional must.

ENLISTMENT OF ALIENS IN THE ARMY

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Still a Good Idea," from the Houston Post. The editorial relates to the proposal I have been sponsoring in the Senate, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to enlist aliens in the United States Army.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STILL A GOOD IDEA

The military attaché of the American Embassy at London reports a flood of inquiries from aliens seeking to enlist in the "United States foreign legion."

The rush, inspired by a suggestion of Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, of Massachusetts, was so large as to leave no doubt but what the armed forces could easily recruit from 50,000 to 100,000 men by this means, more if desired.

In wartime the bars are let down and anyone is acceptable who is willing to take a rifle and fight. In normal times the "prevailing regulations" apply. These limit enlistments to citizens of the United States.

But the circumstances which have led to the rearmament are by no means normal. We are in the middle of something closely resembling an undeclared state of war.

There are in Europe thousands of homeless men, many of them fugitives from totalitarian tyranny, who would make first-class material for any man's army. Congress could well authorize the organization of a foreign legion to be maintained until the state of alarm is over.

Doing a "hitch" in one of the armed services would give Europe's men without a country a cause to fight for, provide them with employment, offer them some hope for a secure future, and reduce by many thousands the number of young Americans who must be taken from school, college, jobs, or business.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 6th instant,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore, on May 7, 1948, signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 6055) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT, AS AMENDED

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of propcsed legislation to amend section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL AND ALLOCATION POWERS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting pursuant to law, the Third Quarterly Report on Export Control and Allocation Powers (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AUDIT REPORT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

A letter from the Chairman pro tempore of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Thirty-fourth Annual Report of that Board, for the year 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by Donelson (Tenn.) Post, No. 88, American Legion, favoring the enactment of legislation providing universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the board of supervisors of the city and county of Honolulu, T. H., favoring the enactment of House bill 5004, to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence, and to make immigration quotas available to Asiatic and Pacific peoples; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the common council of the city of Milwaukee, Wis., relating to the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill; ordered to lie on the table.

The memorial of Douglas H. Adams, of Clayton, Ala., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing a bonus for volunteers in the armed forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Resolution of the Thirteenth Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands of the United States, 1948 session, declaring the existence of a state of emergency in the government of the Virgin Islands of the United States of America due to inability to finance its institutions in their basic functions

"Whereas a state of emergency now exists in the Virgin Islands of the United States of America, despite the fact that the people of the Virgin Islands have been taxed to the limit in support of their government; and

"Whereas the hopes of everyone concerned with the solution of this problem are almost entirely dependent upon the granting of the return of some part of the internal revenues paid into the United States Treasury on goods shipped to the United States from these Virgin Islands; and

"Whereas House Bill No. 5996 providing for the return of said revenues, which would have assisted in the basic maintenance of the Virgin Islands government, has been tabled by the House Ways and Means Committee; and

"Whereas the proposed budget of the Virgin Islands has already been trimmed to exclude many very necessary articles of maintenance and equipment, and salaries are already far below standard; and

"Whereas the public institutions of the Virgin Islands are in a deplorable and shocking state due to lack of sufficient funds; and

"Whereas the Public Administration Service of Chicago, Ill., which was authorized to make a complete survey of the finances of the government of the Virgin Islands in 1947, reported that the government of the Virgin Islands could not carry on the basic functions of the public service unless it received financial assistance from the Congress of the United States; and other congressional investigators, including the Public Lands Committee, have reported similarly to the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, and it it hereby resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands in session assembled, That said body hereby petitions the Congress of the United States in session assembled to grant such amounts as are necessary for the operation of the public institutions, such as hospitals, public safety, leper colony, schools, and homes for the aged, which sums needed from Congress as a deficiency appropriation total approximately $1,000,000; and be it further

"Resolved, and it is hereby further resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairman and members of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and House, members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, the Finance Committee of the Senate, the chairman and members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the chairman and members of the Public Lands Committee of the House, the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the Division of Territories and Island Possessions, and the Governor of the Virgin Islands."

Thus passed by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands on May 3, 1948.

Witness our hands and the seal of the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands this 4th day of May A. D. 1948.

ROY P. GORDON,
Chairman.

[SEAL] OMAR BROWN,
Secretary.

PROHIBITION AGAINST LIQUOR ADVERTISING—PETITION

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, Anna N. Thomas, department of legislation, Grant County (Ind.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union, has forwarded to me a petition signed by 254 members of that organization, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce. I present the petition for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The petition will be received and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

CONSTRUCTION OF STEAM POWER PLANT AT NEW JOHNSONVILLE, TENN.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement of the action on April 16, 1948, of the board of directors of the Kansas State Chamber of Commerce expressing their opposition to the proposed appropriation of $4,000,000 to start construction of a steam power plant by the TVA. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD, and then referred to the Senate Committee on Appropriations. It is my understanding that the House Appropriations Committee, on May 7, 1948, deleted the item to which the Kansas group objects.

There being no objection, the statement was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE KANSAS STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE REGARDING THE PROPOSAL THAT CONGRESS APPROPRIATE $4,000,000 TO START CONSTRUCTION OF A STEAM POWER PLANT BY THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The request by the President that Congress appropriate $4,000,000 to the Tennessee Valley Authority to start construction of a steam power plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., is in direct conflict with the best interests of the State of Kansas and with that item of the statement of principles of the Kansas State Chamber of Commerce which declares:

"That the engaging in and operation of any business by the Federal Government which can be undertaken and operated satisfactorily by private enterprise is unjust and unfair competition and is inimical to the public interest."

During the past few years, Kansas, as well as other midwestern States which over the years have been predominantly agricultural in their economic nature, has been endeavoring to expand its industrial activity to a point which will allow a proper balance between agriculture and industry. The need for the achievement of such a balance is vital to the economic health of this State.

It is recognized that there is a form of competition between States in this matter of industrial development and there is no objection to this. There should, however, be no competition between the Federal Government and the individual States, nor should the Federal Government take any action which encourages the economic development of any one State or several States to the detriment of the remaining States.

The request by the President that funds be appropriated to begin the construction of this new steam power plant is based on the statement that TVA is reaching the peak of its hydroelectric capacity, even with the addition of 660,000 kilowatts of hydro which will be available upon the completion of dams now being built by the TVA or the Army. The reason that a shortage threatens is that 1,200 new industries, large and small, have been added to the territory served by TVA since 1940. The authority for this figure on the number of new industries is the Southern Blue Book.

In its annual report for 1947, TVA reports that 49 percent of its total output was received by industrials and Federal agencies. It is fair to assume that these industries are taking full advantage of the fact that the rate for power by TVA is heavily subsidized.

It is equally fair to assume that many of these 1200 industries would have located in other States, Kansas included, were the factor of subsidized power rates removed. Because of this situation, Kansas is at a direct disadvantage in competing with Tennessee and the area served by TVA for the location of new industries—and at the same time is required to contribute in Federal taxes a part of the money which enables TVA to maintain this inequitable arrangement.

The principle of private enterprise is likewise endangered by this proposal. As originally conceived, TVA was a flood control and navigation project. Today, TVA is the world's largest hydroelectric operation. The construction of this steam power plant—for which $4,000,000 is asked as a starter and for which a total of $54,000,000 will be needed to complete—will also give TVA the biggest steam power plant in the world.

TVA's industrial rate is virtually the same as the amount per kilowatt-hour paid in taxes alone by the privately owned and operated utility companies. These companies, in 1946, paid $626,000,000 in taxes on 202,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of current sold. This is at the rate of 3.1 mills per kilowatt-hour in taxes. According to TVA's own annual report for fiscal 1947, TVA sold 5,500,000,000 kilowatt hours to industrial customers for $17,193,000, or an average rate of 3.17 mills. It received $43,810,000 for its total sales of 11,500,000,000 kilowatt hours, at an average rate of 3.78 mills.

In the interests of industrial development in Kansas and in the maintenance of free enterprise, the Kansas State Chamber of Commerce, through its Board of Directors, urges that the Kansas Congressional delegation oppose any appropriation for the construction of a steam power plant by TVA. Furthermore, the Kansas State Chamber of Commerce urges that TVA rates reflect interest charges on the money advanced by the Federal Government and that such rates include taxes commensurate with what similar private enterprise would pay.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 107. A bill for the relief of William B. Buol; without amendment (Rept. No. 1257);

S. 1573. A bill for the relief of Marcella Kosterman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1258);

S. 1835. A bill for the relief of Harry Daniels; with amendments (Rept. No. 1260);

S. 2440. A bill for the relief of Charles Duncan Montieth; without amendment (Rept. No. 1259);

H. R. 3805. A bill for the relief of Thomas A. W. Elder; with amendments (Rept. No. 1261);

H. R. 3965. A bill for the relief of John H. Schmitt and Mrs. Mildred Schmitt; without amendment (Rept. No. 1262);

H. R. 4593. A bill for the relief of Abraham Spevak; without amendment (Rept. No. 1263); and

H. R. 4672. A bill for the relief of John Cameron Henry; without amendment (Rept. No. 1264).

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 2878. A bill to amend the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, to revise the roll of the Indians of California provided therein; with amendments (Rept. No. 1265); and

S. J. Res. 203. Joint resolution providing for the ratification by Congress of a contract for the purchase of certain lands and mineral deposits by the United States from the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1266).

WILLOW RIVER POWER CO.—REFERENCE OF BILL TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original resolution providing for reference to the Court of Claims the bill (S. 662) for the relief of the Willow River Power Co., together with accompanying papers, and I submit a report (No. 1256) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 231) was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 662) for the relief of the Willow River Power Co., with the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims in pursuance of section 151 of the Judicial Code, 28 United States Code, section 257, for such action as the Court may take in accordance therewith.

ELIMINATION OF POLL TAX IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF MR. HAYDEN—AMENDMENT

Mr. HAYDEN submitted his individual views as a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration on the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers, which were ordered to be printed as part 2 of Report No. 1225.

Mr. HAYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequsite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. LANGER, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on May 7, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1620) to establish eligibility for burial in national cemeteries, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing a nomination, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, and nomination withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

Jess Larson, Oklahoma, to be War Assets Administrator; and

Rear Adm. Paul L. Mather, United States Navy, retired, to be Associate War Assets Administrator.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. KNOWLAND introduced Senate bill 2619, to make applicable to common carriers by rail the provisions of title II of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2620. A bill for the relief of certain postal employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 2621. A bill authorizing the extension of the functions and duties of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., to military disciplinary barracks; and

S. 2622. A bill to provide that personnel of the National Guard of the United States and the Organized Reserve Corps shall have a common Federal appointment or enlistment as Reserves of the Army of the United States, to equalize disability benefits applicable to such personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUTLER (for Mr. BUSHFIELD):

S. 2623. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Lucille Eagle Horse a patent in fee to certain land;

S. 2624. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Elizabeth Tyon-Brave Heart a patent in fee to certain land;

S. 2625. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Chloe Ford Riley a patent in fee to certain land;

S. 2626. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Louisa Low Dog Hager a patent in fee to certain land;

S. 2627. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Robert Afraid of Bear a patent in fee to certain land;

S. 2628. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Robert Afraid of Bear and other heirs of Frances Afraid of Bear, deceased, to certain land;

S. 2629. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Paul High Horse and his wife, Anna High Horse, a patent in fee to certain land;

S. 2630. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Spencer W. Young a patent in fee to certain land;

S. 2631. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to John M. Red Bear a patent in fee to certain land; and

S. 2632. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Mary Ellen Hudson a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 2633. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in wildlife-restoration projects, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2634. A bill for the relief of the former shareholders of the Goshen Veneer Co., an Indiana corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2635. A bill to authorize the construction of a new post office, courthouse and customhouse building at Evansville, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. 2636. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and the National Bank Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(Mr. LUCAS introduced Senate bill 2637, to provide an appropriation for the reconstruction and repair of public facilities in the State of Illinois which were destroyed or damaged by a recent tornado, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WHERRY:

S. 2638. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation for payments to school districts on certain projects during their construction status; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(Mr. WHERRY also introduced Senate bill 2639, to provide for a minimum diet in occupied Germany, to amend the Immigration Act of 1924, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JENNER:

S. 2640. A bill to authorize grants to the States to assist in the construction of nursing homes for aged persons; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. CORDON):

S. 2641. A bill to amend section 1501 (b) (1) (E) of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, so as to authorize the exercise of certain powers conferred by such act with respect to nitrogenous compound necessary to the manufacture and delivery of nitrogenous fertilizer materials for export; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BUCK (by request):

S. 2642. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, approved February 16, 1942; and

S. 2643. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a lien for moneys due hospitals for services rendered in cases caused by negligence or fault of others and providing for the recording and enforcing of such liens," approved June 30, 1939; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(Mr. WHERRY introduced Senate Joint Resolution 213, to prohibit the exportation of seamless and welded steel pipe, and certain carbon steel sheets, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

RECONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR OF CERTAIN PUBLIC FACILITIES IN ILLINOIS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide an appropriation for the reconstruction and repair of public facilities in the State of Illinois which were destroyed or damaged by a recent tornado. On March 19, 1948, the towns of Bunker Hill, Gillespie, and Fosterburg, in Illinois, were devastated by a windstorm which reached the proportions of a cyclone. Practically everything in those towns was destroyed, including the schools and churches. The streets were virtually torn asunder. The result was that the people in those communities were left in a very critical financial condition. So I am asking for relief by the Federal Government for the very unusual conditions which these people are facing at the moment.

I ask unanimous consent to have a copy of this bill printed at this point in the RECORD, and also a short statement I have prepared on the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, together with the statement presented by the Senator from Illinois, will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2637) to provide an appropriation for the reconstruction and repair of public facilities in the State of Illinois which were destroyed or damaged by a recent tornado, introduced by Mr. LUCAS, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $4,700,000, which shall be available for expenditure by the Federal Works Administrator in cooperation with the appropriate local officials of the State of Illinois for the reconstruction and repair of public facilities which are located in the State of Illinois and which were destroyed or damaged as a result of a tornado on March 19, 1948.

The statement presented by Mr. LUCAS was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LUCAS

I am today introducing a bill in the Senate of the United States for the relief of those areas in Illinois which were stricken by the recent tornado.

This bill appropriates $4,700,000 for the repair and reconstruction of public facilities (such as schools, streets, and waterworks) which were destroyed. The Federal Works Administrator, with the cooperation of the local officials, is to have charge of the expenditure of the money made available under the bill.

On March 19, 1948, the towns of Bunker Hill, Gillespie, and Fosterburg, in Illinois, were devastated by a windstorm which reached the proportions of a cyclone. Other areas in the vicinity also suffered enormously from the effect of the storm. Immediately after receiving word of the storm, I requested the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to declare the area a disaster area so as to make it possible for the Disaster Loan Corporation, an RFC subsidiary, to make loans to residents of the area. I received word that same day that the RFC had declared the area eligible for disaster loans. As a result victims of the disaster were enabled to make loans promptly for the repair of damaged property and to replace losses to personal property, such as machinery, equipment, and household furniture.

I also got in touch with the Federal Works Agency for the purpose of having that agency lend such assistance as it could to the tornado victims. The day following the disaster a representative of the Federal Works Agency came into the area to study the damage and decide what war-surplus equipment could be used for the relief of the storm sufferers. Materials and equipment of all kinds, chiefly from the engineer depot at Granite City, were swiftly moved into place

to start the job of clearing away the debris and attending to the acute housing needs of the people.

Through the cooperation of the War Assets Administration and the RFC, priorities for the purchase of building and materials were made available to the tornado victims.

The time has now come to restore to the people who suffered from this disaster the public facilities which were damaged and destroyed. With so much of their towns laid waste, they obviously do not have the financial means, through taxation or otherwise, to do this job themselves. Prompt action is necessary if these communities are to have once again the public buildings and municipal service which are absolutely essential.

I shall press for an early hearing on the bill introduced today and work for its passage by the Congress.

MINIMUM DIET IN AMERICAN ZONE OF GERMANY—TEMPORARY RESIDENCE IN UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN GERMAN MINORS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill establishing a minimum diet in the United States zone of Germany and modifying the Immigration Act to permit temporary residence in the United States of German minors under certain conditions.

Public thinking on the subject of restoring Germany has undergone a marked change in the United States in the past 3 years. For a long time the emphasis of those genuinely interested in the problem of restoring Germany to a self-sufficient basis, so that it would be a financial obligation of the American people no longer than necessary, was on the subject of avoiding starvation among the German people. Shortly after the war it was reasoned that if we discharged this obligation, the German people would have strength to rebuild a minimum economy, and, under our control, they would be prevented from reestablishing a war potential.

As time went on it became apparent that we were as far from success as we were on the day of victory. The question of maintaining a minimum calorie intake sufficient to maintain health among the German people in the United States zone remains almost as acute today as it was a year or two ago.

Now, however, our American emphasis is on rebuilding the economic self-sufficiency of the German people, and much of our effort under ERP and the appropriations for the American occupation are directed to this end.

Notwithstanding all this, continuing reports from Germany indicate that the minimum 2,000 calories daily which everyone agrees is necessary to support health and industry in individuals anywhere is still an objective rather than an accomplished fact in many parts of Germany. This applies to the American zone as well as other zones.

Further, authentic reports indicate that the children of school age and those even younger are being wasted through malnutrition, hunger, tuberculosis, and other ills which arise from inadequate food supplies.

Such conditions make a mockery of our hopes for a physically and mentally sound Germany in the future unless further specific steps are quickly taken to remedy these conditions.

I believe it is to the selfish interest of the United States to meet these problems. I have said before, and I still believe, that the solution of the problem must be found first before we can solve the European problem or the world problem. Permanent peace in the world, therefore, requires, first, that we unburden ourselves of that part of Germany which today is on an American dole. I say it is to our selfish interest to rid ourselves of the burden of this dole.

Therefore, I now again propose two steps which will be effective toward this end. I am herewith introducing a bill, which will fix 2,000 calories as the minimum mandatory daily food ration per person in those parts of Germany under American control. Additionally, a provision is made for the entry into the United States as temporary residents of German minors under strict restrictions supervised by the Attorney General and the Immigration Service. These temporary entries would be additional to the present immigration restrictions. They would provide an opportunity for charitably inclined American citizens to bring needy German children to be restored to good health and exposed to the lessons of democracy which residence in the United States offers.

None of the cost of transportation to this country or return to Germany would be borne by the Federal Government.

It is my sincere belief that a vast majority of the American people will subscribe to and approve such measures from a humanitarian viewpoint and in the best self-interest of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2639) to provide for a minimum diet in occupied Germany, to amend the Immigration Act of 1924, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WHERRY, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to take such action as may be necessary to provide the inhabitants of such areas of Germany as may be occupied by military forces of the United States with a minimum daily food ration per person containing not less than 2,000 calories, of which not less than 15 percent shall be contained in fats and not less than 15 percent shall be contained in animal protein. Such action may include the procurement and the sale, donation, or other distribution of such food as may be needed to supplement supplies otherwise available to such inhabitants.

SEC. 2. The Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 153), as amended, is amended—

(a) by striking out "or" at the end of subdivision (e) of section 4, and adding at the end of section 4 the following additional subdivisions—

"(g) an immigrant who is unmarried, under 18 years of age, and seeks to enter the United States from Germany, Austria, or Hungary, to reside with an American citizen designated by him or by his legal guardian and approved by the Attorney General, such citizen agreeing to make such reports to the Attorney General as the Attorney General may require, and if such citizen fails to make such reports promptly the approval shall be withdrawn; or

"(h) an immigrant who is an orphan, unmarried, under 21 years of age, and seeks to enter the United States from Germany, Austria, or Hungary, to be adopted by an American citizen designated by him or by his legal guardian and approved by the Attorney General, such approval to be withdrawn if such adoption is not completed within 1 year after the entry of such immigrant into the United States or such additional time as the Attorney General may approve."

(b) by inserting in section 9 (a) after the words "by reason of relationship under the provisions of subdivision (a) of section 4" the following: "or by reason of the provisions of subdivisions (g) or (h) of section 4."

(c) by striking out of section 9 (b) everything preceding "or is entitled to preference" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(b) Any citizen of the United States claiming that any immigrant is his relative, or will reside with, or be adopted by, him and that such immigrant is properly admissible to the United States as a nonquota immigrant under the provisions of subdivisions (a), (g), or (h), of section 4."

(d) by striking out of section 9 (e) "subdivision (a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subdivisions (a), (g), or (h)."

(e) by striking out, wherever it appears in section 15, "subdivision (e)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subdivisions (e) or (g)."

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO PROCEEDINGS ON UNREFERRED BILLS

Mr. LANGER (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. TOBEY) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 230), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That section 4 of rule XIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking out so much thereof as reads as follows: "And every bill and join resolution introduced on leave, and every bill and joint resolution of the House of Representatives which shall have received a first and second reading without being referred to a committee, shall, if objection be made to further proceeding thereon, be placed on the calendar."

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII—DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE FROM CONSIDERATION OF BILL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I submit a resolution providing for withdrawing from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs House bill 49, the Hawaii Statehood bill. I shall ask for as early consideration of this measure as I can under the rules of the Senate. Between now and the time I make the motion to discharge the committee from further consideration of House bill 49, I hope Senators will have an opportunity to read the very complete report presented to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] relative to this subject. I wish to read two paragraphs from that report for the information of the Senate. This is what the Senator from Oregon has to say:

The chairman recommends that H. R. 49, which would enable Hawaii to form a State constitution and a State government and to be admitted into the Union on the same basis as the original States, be favorably reported to the Senate with a recommendation for immediate action. Any other recommendation would be inconsistent with the facts and evidence disclosed during the investigation, the desires of Hawaii's people, and the conclusion reached by the last two congressional investigating committees.

On 29 other occasions the Senate has had to make a decision on bringing a new Territory into the United States. The record of testimony and information built up around the question of statehood for Hawaii is more voluminous and complete than was the case for any other State prior to its admission.

The resolution, Senate Resolution 232, submitted by Mr. KNOWLAND, was ordered to lie over under the rule, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is hereby discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

FREEDOM-RALLY ADDRESS BY SENATOR BRIDGES

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a freedom-rally address delivered by him before the Coordinating Committee of American-Polish Associations, at New York City, on April 11, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

HEALTH INSURANCE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURRAY

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address relative to health insurance, delivered by him on May 3, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PICK-SLOAN PLAN FOR RIVER DEVELOPMENT

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Two Years of the Pick-Sloan Plan," written by John B. Quinn and reprinted from Public Power for March 1938, which appears in the Appendix.]

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD editorials relative to the reciprocal trade-agreements program, published in the Christian Science Monitor of April 28 and May 5, 1948, and the Denver Post of May 7, 1948, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE HOUSING BILL—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Good, Plain Talk," published in the Washington Daily News of May 8, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

WOMEN IN DEFENSE—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Women in Defense," published in the Washington Post of May 7, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained consent that Mr. DONNELL be excused from attendance on sessions of the Senate today and through Thursday next.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] who is unavoidably forced to be absent from the Senate this week, be excused from the sessions of the Senate during the present week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

MEETING OF COMMITTEES DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee considering the supplemental Federal security bill, may meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained consent for the Committee on Public Works to meet during the session of the Senate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is holding hearings on the question as to whether the water rights of the States on the Colorado River should be litigated. This matter concerns seven States, and we have witnesses from those seven States. They have come a long way, and they are anxious to return. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee may be permitted to hold hearings during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed. The calendar will be called under rule VIII.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hill	Pepper
Barkley	Hoey	Reed
Brewster	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Jenner	Russell
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Byrd	Kem	Sparkman
Cain	Knowland	Stennis
Capehart	Langer	Stewart
Capper	Lodge	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Taylor
Cooper	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McFarland	Thomas Utah
Downey	McKellar	Thye
Dworshak	McMahon	Tobey
Eastland	Magnuson	Tydings
Ecton	Malone	Vandenburg
Ellender	Martin	Watkins
Ferguson	Maybank	Wherry
Flanders	Millikin	White
Fulbright	Moore	Wiley
George	Morse	Williams
Green	Murray	Wilson
Gurney	Myers	Young
Hatch	O'Conor	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Senate will proceed with the call of the calendar for unobjected-to bills under rule VIII, commencing with Calendar No. 1211. The clerk will state the first bill on the calendar.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H. R. 4068) to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to construct a building for the General Accounting Office on Square 518 for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MYERS subsequently asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD in connection with House bill 4063 a letter addressed to him by Mr. W. E. Reynolds, Commissioner of Public Buildings, indicating that the Public Buildings Administration has no intention whatever of condemning the property of St. Mary's Church.

The letter from Mr. Reynolds is as follows:

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
PUBLIC BUILDINGS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, May 10, 1948.

Hon. FRANCIS J. MYERS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: You have expressed an interest in the bill that would authorize the construction of a building for the General Accounting Office in Square 518 in the District of Columbia.

This legislation as drafted and in the absence of the legislative history of the project would authorize us to condemn the property of St. Mary's Church. As I testified before the Senate committee when hearings were held on this measure, we have no intention whatever of condemning the property of St. Mary's Church.

You may believe it proper, in which view I would concur, that this letter be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on this project.

Sincerely yours,

W. E. REYNOLDS,
Commissioner of Public Buildings.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2281) to provide for an air parcel-post service, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2285) relating to the fixing of wage rates for employees in navy yards was announsed as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

COURTHOUSE BUILDING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 2284) to authorize the construction of a courthouse to accommodate the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. House bill 5963, Calendar No. 1216, the next

bill on the calendar, is identical with Senate bill 2284. The Chair suggests that the House bill be considered instead of the Senate bill, provided the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is satisfied to have the Senate proceed to consider the House bill.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the two bills are identical, and I ask that the House bill be substituted for the Senate bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 5963) to authorize the construction of a courthouse to accommodate the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate 2284 will be indefinitely postponed.

DAM ACROSS THE LUMBER RIVER, N. C.

The bill (S. 2262) granting the consent of Congress to Carolina Power & Light Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in the Lumber River was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. An identical bill, House bill 5543, is on the calendar, Calendar No. 1277. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill instead of the Senate bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 5543) granting the consent of Congress to Carolina Power & Light Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in the Lumber River was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 2262 will be indefinitely postponed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1025) to authorize public improvements at Nome, Alaska, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McMAHON and Mr. BARKLEY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. MALONE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to revert to Calendar 1218, Senate bill 1025. My reason for making the request is there was an objection made by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], which objection he has now withdrawn. The legislation covers a matter in the nature of an emergency. It was reported by the Committee on Public Works to authorize a Board of Army Engineers to construct shore-protection works at Nome, Alaska. It is in the nature of an emergency, requiring the protection of our own works there. I ask unanimous consent to return to its consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to comply with the request of my distinguished friend, but another Senator also objected to consideration of the bill at the time. He is not now on the floor. As acting majority leader, I think I should protect the rights of all, to see that ample opportunity is afforded them of being present. I understand the call of the calendar has been concluded. It places me in a very difficult situation.

Mr. MALONE. I am sorry; I did not know there was more than one objection.

Mr. WHERRY. As I recall, the Senator from Washington also objected.

Mr. MALONE. No; the Senator from Washington wanted to have the bill considered.

Mr. WHERRY. Did not the minority leader, the Senator from Kentucky, object?

Mr. MALONE. I understand he does not object to the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. If it is with the understanding there will be no prolonged controversy, I shall not object. It has been my policy not to permit a return to the calendar, and I should rather not comply.

Mr. MALONE. I withdraw the request.

Mr. WHERRY. With an understanding that the matter will be terminated speedily, I should not object.

Mr. MALONE. The request is withdrawn.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN INDONESIAN ALIENS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 668) for the relief of certain Indonesian aliens, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to dismiss deportation proceedings against Philip Sumampow, of New York, N. Y., and to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Philip Sumampow as of February 10, 1929.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota of the first year that said quota is available, upon the payment of the visa fee of $10 and the head tax of $8.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Philip Sumampow."

EDWARD WIKNER PERCIVAL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2060) for the relief of Edward Wikner Percival, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "laws", to strike out "Edward" and insert "Edgar", and on page 2, line 4, after the word "Said", to strike out "Edward" and insert "Edgar", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Edgar Wikner Percival, temporarily residing in New York, N. Y., who was admitted into the United States on a visitor's visa, shall, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax be deemed to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his last actual entry into the United States.

(b) Upon enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available quota for nationals of Australia.

SEC. 2. Said Edgar Wikner Percival shall not be deprived of any right or benefit conferred by section 1 of this act by reason of his departure from the United States before or after the date of enactment of this act for the purpose of any temporary visit to any place outside the United States.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Edgar Wikner Percival."

AMIN BIN REJAB

The bill (H. R. 338) for the relief of Amin Bin Rejab was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANDRES QUINONES AND LETTY PEREZ

The bill (H. R. 817) for the relief of Andres Quinones and Letty Perez was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE CHAN

The bill (H. R. 831) for the relief of George Chan was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PETER BEDNAR AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 1022) for the relief of Peter Bednar, Francisca Bednar, Peter Walter Bednar, and William Joseph Bednar was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADMISSION TO THE UNITED STATES OF SARAH JANE SANFORD PANSA

The bill (H. R. 1724) to legalize the admission to the United States of Sarah Jane Sanford Pansa was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHANNES KOSTIUK AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 1749) to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of Johannes or John, Julia, Michael, William, and Anna Kostiuk" was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LUZ MARTIN

The bill (H. R. 2418) for the relief of Luz Martin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANK AND MARIA DURANTE

The bill (H. R. 3224) for the relief of Frank and Maria Durante was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CRISTETA LA-MADRID ANGELES

The bill (H. R. 3608) for the relief of Cristeta La-Madrid Angeles was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANDREW OSIECIMSKI CZAPSKI

The bill (H. R. 3740) for the relief of Andrew Osiecimski Czapski was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MARIA SMORCZEWSKA

The bill (H. R. 3787) for the relief of Mrs. Maria Smorczewska was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. CLETUS E. TODD

The bill (H. R. 3824) for the relief of Mrs. Cletus E. Todd (formerly Laura Estelle Ritter) was considered, ordered to a third reading, reading the third time, and passed.

LUDWIG POHORYLES

The bill (H. R. 3880) for the relief of Ludwig Pohoryles was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADMISSION TO THE UNITED STATES OF MOKE TCHAROUTCHEFF AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 4050) to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Moke Tcharoutcheff, Lucie Baptistine Tcharoutcheff, Raymonde Tcharoutcheff, and Robert Tcharoutcheff was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DENNIS FERNANDEZ

The bill (H. R. 4130) for the relief of Dennis (Dionesio) Fernandez was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANTONIO VILLANI

The bill (H. R. 4631) for the relief of Antonio Villani was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SPECIAL POLICEMEN FOR DUTY ON PROPERTY UNDER JURISDICTION OF THE FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3219) to authorize the Federal Works Administrator or officials of the Federal Works Agency duly authorized by him to appoint special policemen for duty upon Federal property under the jurisdiction of the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Federal Works Administrator or officials of the Federal Works Agency duly authorized by him may appoint uniformed guards of said Agency as special policemen without additional compensation for duty in connection with the policing of public buildings and other areas under the jurisdiction of the Federal Works Agency. Such special policemen shall have the same powers as sheriffs and constables upon such Federal property to enforce the laws enacted for the protection of persons and property, and to prevent breaches of the peace, to suppress affrays or unlawful assemblies, and to enforce any rules and regulations made and promulgated by the Administrator or such duly authorized officials of the Federal Works Agency for the property under their jurisdiction: *Provided*, That the jurisdiction and policing powers of such special policemen shall not extend to the service of civil process and shall be restricted to Federal property over which the United States has acquired exclusive or concurrent criminal jurisdiction.

SEC. 2. The Federal Works Administrator or officials of the Federal Works Agency duly authorized by him are hereby authorized to make all needful rules and regulations for the government of the Federal property under their charge and control, and to annex to such rules and regulations such reasonable penalities, within the limits prescribed in section 4 of this act, as will insure their enforcement: *Provided*, That such rules and regulations shall be posted and kept posted in a conspicuous place on such Federal property.

SEC. 3. Upon the application of the head of any department or agency of the United States having property of the United States under its administration and control and over which the United States has acquired exclusive or concurrent criminal jurisdiction, the Federal Works Administrator or officials of the Federal Works Agency duly authorized by him are authorized to detail any such special policemen for the protection of such property and if he deems it desirable, to extend to such property the applicability of any such regulations and to enforce the same as herein set forth; and the Federal Works Administrator or official of the Federal Works Agency duly authorized by him, whenever it is deemed economical and in the public interest, may utilize the facilities and services of existing Federal law-enforcement agencies, and, with the consent of any State or local agency, the facilities and services of such State or local law-enforcement agencies.

SEC. 4. Whoever shall violate any rule or regulation promulgated pursuant to section 2 of this act shall be fined not more than $50 or imprisoned not more than 30 days, or both.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the bill merely continues in the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency the police powers which have been used by him as a result of emergency war powers which are to expire, as the committee has been advised, on the 30th of June of this year. The bill provides that the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency may employ his uniformed police officers to guard, protect, and maintain not only property under the jurisdiction of the Federal Works Agency, but property belonging to other agencies of the Federal Government, with respect to which a request by the other agency is made to the Federal Works Administrator for the use of uniformed police.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, are these policemen to be entirely in the nature of guards?

Mr. CAIN. Yes. They will be given the power of arrest to protect the property which they are charged with guarding.

Mr. BALL. As I understand, they do not get over into the field of the FBI.

Mr. CAIN. They have no jurisdiction in that field.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

DENIAL OF ADMISSION TO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN PERSONS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1878) to amend the immigration laws to deny admission to the United States of persons who may be coming here for the purpose of engaging in activities which will endanger the public safety of the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the word "or", to strike out "persons", and insert "aliens."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend the immigration laws to deny admission to the United States of aliens who may be coming here for the purpose of engaging in activities which will endanger the public safety of the United States."

PROCEDURE IN SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION UNDER IMMIGRATION ACT

The bill (H. R. 3566) to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this is a bill to amend subsection 66 of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended. Under the present law the Attorney General can suspend deportation of certain aliens if he finds that deportation would result in serious economic detriment to a resident of the United States who is a close relative of the alien. The Attorney General then refers the case to Congress and the Congress may reject the suspension, but if the Congress does nothing, the suspension is final and the alien is allowed to remain in the United States permanently.

The bill H. R. 3566 broadens the class of aliens who would be eligible for this discretionary relief but it also requires that in every case affirmative congressional approval be given before the suspension is final. The new category of persons eligible for discretionary relief is not prospective and, therefore, the provisions of the act do not in any way serve as an inducement to aliens who seek to enter the United States for the purpose of evading our immigration laws.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, does this measure broaden our immigration laws so as to make them more lax?

Mr. WILEY. I should say that it would strengthen our immigration laws.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is proposed, is it not, to expand the category to include those who do not now come within the provisions of the act?

Mr. WILEY. In that case affirmative congressional action is required.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the Senator mean that affirmative congressional action would be required to enforce or continue suspension?

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Unless Congress acts, the suspension is not effective?

Mr. WILEY. That is correct. The bill would strengthen the law, and reverse the process. Heretofore, if the Congress took no action, the alien subject to deportation would remain here; but the bill would require the Congress to take affirmative action.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In other words, Congress would have a voice.

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (54 Stat. 671; 56 Stat. 1044; 8 U. S. C. 155 (c)), is further amended to read as follows:

"(c) In the case of any alien (other than one to whom subsection (d) is applicable) who is deportable under any law of the United States and who has proved good moral character for the preceding 5 years, the Attorney General may (1) permit such alien to depart the United States to any country of his choice at his own expense, in lieu of deportation; or (2) suspend deportation of such alien if he is not ineligible for naturalization or if ineligible, such ineligibility is solely by reason of his race, if he finds (a) that such deportation would result in serious economic detriment to a citizen or legally resident alien who is the spouse, parent, or minor child of such deportable alien; or (b) that such alien has resided continuously in the United States for 7 years or more and is residing in the United States upon the effective date of this act. If the deportation of any alien is suspended under the provisions of this subsection for more than 6 months, a complete and detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the case shall be reported to the Congress with the reasons for such suspension. These reports shall be submitted on the first and fifteenth day of each calendar month in which Congress is in session. If during the session of the Congress at which a case is reported, or if a case is reported less than 90 days prior to the close of the session, then during the next session of the Congress, the Congress passes a resolution stating in substance that it favors the suspension of such deportation, the Attorney General shall cancel deportation proceedings. If during the session of the Congress at which a case is reported, or if a case is reported less than 90 days prior to the close of the session, then during the next session of the Congress, the Congress does not pass such a resolution, the Attorney General shall thereupon deport such alien in the manner provided by law. Deportation proceedings shall not be canceled in the case of any alien who was not legally admitted for permanent residence at the time of his last entry into the United States, unless such alien pays the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization a fee of $18 (which fee shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts). Upon the cancellation of such proceedings in any case in which fee has been paid the Commissioner shall record the alien's admission for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry into the United States and the Secretary of State shall, if the alien was a quota immigrant at the time of entry and was not charged to the appropriate quota, reduce by one the immigration quota of the country of the alien's nationality as defined in section 12 of the act of May 26, 1924 (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 212), for the fiscal year then current at the time of cancellation or the next following year in which a quota is available: *Provided*, That no quota shall be reduced by more than 50 percent in any fiscal year."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MARRIAGES OF ALIENS TO AMERICAN WOMEN

The bill (H. R. 5137) to amend the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this is a bill to amend the immigration act of 1924, as amended. Under the existing law the alien wife of an American citizen is eligible for admission into the United States as a nonquota immigrant, but the alien husband of an American citizen is eligible for admission as a nonquota immigrant only if the marriage occurred prior to July 1, 1932. The effect of this bill is to place the alien husband of an American citizen in the same status as an alien wife of an American citizen provided the marriage of the alien husband of an American citizen takes place prior to January 1, 1948. The bill in no way operates prospectively so there can be no question of future fraudulent marriages for the purpose of evading our immigration laws.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NATURALIZATION OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The bill (H. R. 5193) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this is a bill to amend the nationality act of 1940. The present law grants the right to naturalization to aliens who served honorably in the armed forces during the war but the effective date of the act expired December 31, 1946. The effect of H. R. 5193 is to permit naturalization of members of the armed forces who served during the war period but who have not yet filed their petitions for naturalization. The bill does not include members of the armed forces who served only since the war.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on the Judiciary was, in section 1, on page 1, at the end of line 6, to strike out "is serving or."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 1, line 9, after the word "or", to strike out "World War II", and insert "during a period beginning September 1, 1939, and ending December 31, 1946."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 8, after the word "persons", to strike out "are serving or."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 5, to strike out:

(4) the petitioner shall not be required to speak the English language, sign his petition in his own handwriting, or meet any educational test;

(5) no fee shall be charged or collected for making, filing, or docketing the petition for naturalization, or for the final hearing thereon, or for the certification of naturalization, if issued.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, at the beginning of line 13, to strike out "(6)" and insert "(4)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, at the beginning of line 20, to strike out "(7)" and insert "(5)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 1, after the word "clause", to strike out "(5)" and insert "(4)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 5, after the word "petitioner", to strike out "is serving or."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 7, after the word "or", to strike out "World War II", and insert "during a period beginning September 1, 1939, and ending December 31, 1946;."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4 at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "(8)" and insert "(6)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 15, after the word "or", to strike out "World War II" and insert "during a period beginning September 1, 1939, and ending December 31, 1946."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, at the beginning of line 19, to strike out "(9)" and insert "(7)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

OLLIE McNEILL AND ESTER B. McNEILL

The bill (H. R. 345) for the relief of Ollie McNeill and Ester B. McNeill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. CHARLOTTE E. HARVEY

The bill (H. R. 1392) for the relief of Mrs. Charlotte E. Harvey was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JEFFERSONVILLE FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT

The bill (H. R. 2000) for the relief of Jeffersonville Flood Control District, Jeffersonville, Ind., a municipal corporation, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JERLINE FLOYD GIVENS AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 4129) for the relief of Jerline Floyd Givens and the legal guardian of William Earl Searight, a

minor, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOE PARRY

The bill (H. R. 3189) for the relief of Joe Parry, a minor, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EDWARD W. BIGGER

The bill (H. R. 1653) for the relief of Edward W. Bigger was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN F. REEVES

The bill (H. R. 1953) for the relief of John F. Reeves was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LORRAINE BURNS MULLEN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1703) for the relief of Lorraine Burns Mullen, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, in line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$7,572.10" and insert "$4,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lorraine Burns Mullen, of West Haven, Conn., the sum of $4,000, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for (1) compensation for personal injuries and loss of earnings sustained by her and reimbursement for medical expenses incurred by her as the result of an accident which occurred on October 20, 1944, when a United States Coast Guard vehicle in which she was riding and which was operated by Edward Kiselewski, then a member of the United States Coast Guard, collided with a trolley car in West Haven, Conn.; the said Lorraine Burns Mullen having obtained a judgment for $7,000 against the said Edward Kiselewski in the Superior Court at New Haven, Conn., on account of such injuries; and (2) the costs and expenses incidental to the obtaining of such judgment: *Provided*, That the said Lorraine Burns Mullen furnish to the Secretary of the Treasury satisfactory evidence of the relief of the said Edward Kiselewski from liability for the payment of such judgment: *And provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MAUD M. WRIGHT AND MRS. MAXINE MILLS

The resolution (S. Res. 227) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the bills H. R. 1226 and S. 1585, for the relief of Mrs. Maud M. Wright and Mrs. Maxine Mills, with the accompanying papers, are hereby referred to the Court of Claims in pursuance of section 151 of the Judicial Code, 28 United States Code, section 257, for such action as the court may take in accordance therewith.

PUBLIC AIRPORT IN TERRITORY OF ALASKA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3510) to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in the Territory of Alaska, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 1, line 5, after the word "operate", to insert "improve."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 1, line 6, after the word "Alaska", to insert "a public airport."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 1, line 7, to strike out "such place as he may deem most appropriate", and insert "or near Anchorage and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 1, line 8, after the word "airport", to insert "at or near Fairbanks."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 10, after the word "maintenance", to insert "improvement."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 11, after the word "said", to strike out "airport: *Provided*, That the amount of land so acquired (exclusive of easements and rights of way) shall not exceed 5,000 acres", and insert "airports."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 21, after the words "of the", to strike out "airport", and insert "airports."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 21, to insert:

The Administrator is authorized to construct any public highways or bridges from the cities of Anchorage and Fairbanks to whatever airport locations may be selected. Upon completion said highways and bridges shall be transferred to the Territory of Alaska without charge and thereafter be maintained by the Territory.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 4, after the word "maintenance", to insert "improvement."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 5, after the words "of the" to strike out "airport" and insert "airports."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 15, after the words "upon the", to strike out "airport" and insert "airports."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 16, after the words "of the", to strike out "airport" and insert "airports."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 20, after the words "upon the", to strike out "airport" and insert "airports."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 21, after the words "of the", to strike out "airport" and insert "airports."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 12, after the word "maintenance", to insert "improvement."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 13, after the words "of the", to strike out "airport" and insert "airports."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 25, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$8,000,000" and insert "$13,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 4, after the word "maintenance", to insert "improvement."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 5, after the words "of said", to strike out "airport" and insert "airports."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the Territory of Alaska."

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, in connection with the bill which has just been passed, House bill 3510, I wish to call attention to Senate bill 2451, Calendar No. 1257, which we shall shortly reach on the calendar. Senate bill 2451 deals with this same subject as a matter of general law, and I think that method of treatment is very much preferable.

I have no objection to dealing with the Alaskan situation specifically, in the interest of expedition; but it is my hope that the whole broad aircraft situation may be dealt with under Senate bill 2451, Calendar No. 1257, in which event the bill we have just dealt with, House bill 3510, will be superseded.

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 76) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Let the joint resolution go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

CIVIL-SERVICE APPOINTMENT OF HANDICAPPED PERSONS

The bill (H. R. 4236) to amend the Civil Service Act to remove certain discrimination with respect to the appointment of persons having any physical handicap to positions in the classified civil service was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from North Dakota regarding section 2 of the bill, which the Senate committee added. That section provides that any person having a physical handicap who shall have served at least 1 year in the postal service and whose separation is involuntary and without prejudice, shall acquire a permanent, classified civil-service status. I should like to ask how the situation of such a person would differ from that of a nonhandicapped person. How long would such a person have to

serve in order to acquire such permanent status?

Mr. LANGER. Five years.

Mr. BALL. What privileges does this bill give such a handicapped person?

Mr. LANGER. It gives this privilege: During the war, the Army and the Navy used handicapped persons because they were able to do specific jobs very well. So this bill represents an attempt by the Post Office Department to use such persons.

Mr. BALL. Does that mean that if the Service expands, the Department will have to hire such persons if they are on the classified list?

Mr. LANGER. Only if the Civil Service Commission passes them.

Mr. BALL. Only if the Civil Service Commission passes them as qualified for the job?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with an amendment, at the end of the bill to add the following new section:

SEC. 2. On and after the date of enactment of this Act, any person with a physical handicap who shall have served at least 1 year in the postal service and whose separation from the service is involuntary and without prejudice shall acquire, upon passing such suitable noncompetitive examination as the Civil Service Commission shall prescribe, a classified civil-service status.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

TRAINING OF AIR-TRAFFIC CONTROL-TOWER OPERATORS

The bill (S. 3) to provide for the training of air-traffic control-tower operators was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Let the bill go over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment, until the bill can be explained?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator from Maine explain the bill.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, this bill simply looks toward the training of air-traffic control-tower operators. Enactment of the bill is essential in the interest of safety, so that there will be coordinated activity and all such operators will talk the same language and use the same signals, regardless of where the operators are located.

I had not supposed there would be any question about the bill or any objection to it. It proposes no appropriation, but the Department hereafter will request whatever amount is needed for this purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The bill has the endorsement of the Navy and of the Air Force, has it not?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The bill also has the endorsement of the Civil Aeronautics Board and of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. It is more or less of a defense measure.

Mr. BREWSTER. Oh, yes; and it is also a safety measure. Consequently, it is very important.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It will bring order out of a great deal of chaos which exists at the present time.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It should be remembered, as the Senator from Maine has already stated, that the bill is merely an authorization, and does not provide for an appropriation. Any appropriation will be made only when the Civil Aeronautics Authority makes a recommendation to the Appropriations Committee for an appropriation for a specific purpose, in regard to a situation which it believes needs to be corrected.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from South Carolina renew his objection?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I do not object to this bill. I had in mind the next bill, Calendar No. 1257, Senate bill 2451.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, is Senate bill 2451 now before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Not at this time.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Maine how this bill would affect the postal service?

Mr. BREWSTER. This bill would have no effect on the postal service. It simply relates to air-traffic control-tower operators.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 302 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding a new subsection (d) to read as follows:

"(d) (1) The Administrator is authorized, within the limits of available appropriations made by the Congress, to train civilian and governmental air-traffic control-tower operators or to conduct programs for such training, including studies and researches as to the most desirable qualifications for air-traffic control-tower operators. Such training or programs shall be conducted pursuant to such regulations as the Administrator may from time to time prescribe, including such fees as the Administrator may deem necessary or desirable. Such training or programs may be carried out by the Administrator either through the use of his own facilities and personnel or by contracts with educational institutions, or other persons.

"(2) The Administrator is authorized to lease or accept loans of such real property, and to purchase, lease, exchange, or accept loans of such personal property and facilities, and to repair, maintain, and operate such property and such facilities, as may be necessary or desirable for carrying out the provisions of this section.

"(3) For the purpose of carrying out his functions under this section, the Administrator is authorized to exercise all powers conferred upon him by any other provisions of this act and to appoint and fix the compensation for instructors, airmen, medical and other professional examiners, and experts in training or research without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to contracts with educational institutions and other persons for the use of aircraft, control towers, or other facilities or for the performance of services authorized by this section.

"(4) Any executive department or independent establishment is hereby authorized to cooperate with the Administrator in carrying out the purposes of this section, and for such purposes may lend or transfer to the Administrator, by contract or otherwise, or if so requested by the Administrator, lend to educational institutions or other persons cooperating with the Administrator in the conduct of any such training or program, officials, experts, or employees, aircraft, control towers and other property or equipment, and lands or buildings under its control. For the purposes of this section, the Administrator shall have the power to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services, equipment, facilities, and information of any State, Territory, or political subdivision, or any agency thereof.

"(5) Any executive department or independent establishment is hereby authorized to detail personnel of such executive department or independent establishment to be trained as provided herein at Government expense: *Provided*, That no such personnel shall lose their individual status or seniority rating in the executive department or independent establishment merely by reason of absence due to such training.

"(6) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section."

DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL AIR-TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2451) to encourage the development of an international air-transportation system adapted to the needs of the foreign council of the United States of the postal service and of the national defense, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Let the bill go over.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Over.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, if the Senators will withhold their objection temporarily, I should like at least to point out what the bill involves and what its significance is.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BREWSTER. This bill deals with the development of our international air system. Enactment of the bill is vital in order that it shall be possible for the necessary facilities to be provided. We have found such facilities necessary both as a result of our operations in Europe and in the Pacific.

This bill gives to the Department of Commerce authority to continue the use of the facilities which were developed during the war.

The result of the present situation is that, lacking such authority, many of the facilities which we have developed around the world must now rapidly pass

into abandonment. It is tragic that these great investments should be lost. Their preservation and operation, of course, are entirely dependent upon continued appropriations; but many other countries, particularly in the islands of the Pacific and elsewhere, are unable to deal with this matter, and the disintegration of the American international aviation system, as a result of this unfortunate situation, is a very serious matter.

The earlier bill dealing with this subject provided $15,000,000 for the development of two international airports in Alaska. The pending bill will enable the facilities now existing in the Pacific and in certain other areas of the world to be kept in use, and I think it is a matter that should invite the very serious consideration of Senators who may be interested. I trust, if they are not prepared now to withdraw objection, that they will give the bill early and earnest study to determine whether it is not very much for the interests of this country to further extend the authorization. I may say that all the departments concerned are very keen about this matter.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. How does the pending bill affect the postal service?

Mr. BREWSTER. It would affect it only in that it would benefit the operation of the planes carrying the mails. It would not have any other impact so far as my knowledge goes.

Mr. LANGER. Does it give the Administrator any power, or the Civil Aeronautics Board any power, to fix new rates of postage?

Mr. BREWSTER. No; it has nothing at all to do with that. It has to do with the facilities such as radio beams and other facilities to assist in the operation of the planes.

Mr. LANGER. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, as a member of the committee which considered this bill, I urge its passage. I hope that Senators who have objected to it will withdraw their objections and permit it to be passed. Under international conditions I feel that it might prove fatal if we did not maintain many of the airports and facilities scattered throughout the world, and particularly on the islands in the Pacific. I strongly urge passage of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of Calendar 1257, Senate bill 2451?

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

RETIREMENT PAY OF ASSISTANT COMMANDANT AND ENGINEER IN CHIEF, THE COAST GUARD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4892) to amend the act of July 23, 1947 (61 Stat. 409; Public Law No. 219 of the 80th Cong.).

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to request an explanation of the bill, for the reason that the Committee on Armed Services now has before it several bills concerning the retirement of admirals and generals of the higher grade, and I think this bill proposes to retire an admiral in the upper half in the Coast Guard service. I should like to know how many others have been retired, and whether this is a unique case. I should also like a statement of this officer's particular service.

Mr. BREWSTER. This is an entirely unique case. These men who serve in the positions mentioned in the Coast Guard, assistant commandant and engineer in chief, while serving as such, receive the pay of an admiral of the upper half. We were advised that it was never intended they should be retired at a lower rating. That was apparently the essential construction of the law, and accordingly I never before heard any question about the propriety of the pending legislation, the purpose of it being simply to retire them at the grade and with the pension which they would receive by reason of the position they were holding at the time of their retirement. There are one or two amendments which should be added, in order to make it clear.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, may I ask whether this bill will create a precedent whereby other officers now in the Coast Guard will believe that they are entitled to the same privileges?

Mr. BREWSTER. There is nobody else. It simply applies to the men holding these two positions of rear admiral in the upper half, who will officially receive that status on retiring as they now hold it by law while they are in service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maine propose amendments to the bill from the floor?

Mr. BREWSTER. They are offered for the purpose of correcting an error of draftsmanship. I propose an amendment on page 1, line 4, to strike out all in that line after the word "amended" and insert in lieu thereof the words "by striking."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BREWSTER. I propose, in line 5, to strike out the word "add" and insert in lieu thereof the word "adding."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

STUDIES OF THE NEW ENGLAND SOFT-SHELL CLAM

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1979) directing the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to undertake certain studies of the soft-shell clam in Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Maine, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to undertake in cooperation with appropriate State and interstate agencies in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080), comprehensive studies of the soft-shell clam, Mya arenaria, and the hard-shell clam, Venus mercenaria, with particular respect to the biology, propagation, and methods of cultivation of such clams. Such Service shall from time to time recommend appropriate measures for (1) arresting depletion in existing productive beds; (2) restoring to production beds formerly productive but now barren or unusable; (3) developing new areas which may be found suitable; (4) improving methods and techniques of digging, transplanting, and handling; and (5) otherwise increasing production and improving the quality of such clams for the benefit of both producers and consumers.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, for the 5-year period beginning July 1, 1948, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $250,000 to carry out the studies of the soft-shell clam and the sum of $250,000 to carry out the studies of the hard-shell clam.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like an explanation of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, may I say that while I reported these bills from the committee and they were placed on the calendar, they are really in charge of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I note in the file no copy of the Report No. 1216, which makes it very complicated to find out why anybody is for the bill. I should like to ascertain why we should vote for it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a copy of the Report No. 1216 on the bill which was ordered reported unanimously by the committee. This bill, which was introduced by the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] proposes to rehabilitate the clam beds not only in Rhode Island but also in Massachusetts and Maine. The committee, by unanimous vote, came to the very definite conclusion that it was a worthy cause, one that should be handled by the Federal Government rather than by the States, in that some of the waters touch different States. The bill calls for an appropriation of $250,000. I should be very happy to answer any specific questions.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, the stated purpose of the bill is a very appealing one to me, but I wanted to know what was at the bottom of it, and what was the spirit of it.

Mr. CAPEHART. I might ask the able Senator from Rhode Island, the author of the bill, who is more familiar with the clam industry than I, to explain. Unfortunately, clams are not grown in Indiana.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I shall be very glad to explain the bill, and to say that I heartily approve of the amendment which the committee has suggested. As introduced, it would apply simply to southern New England, where it is of primary concern to those engaged in the production of the clam, an industry which extends all the way along the Atlantic Coast, from Maine down to South Carolina. The provisions of the bill are simply for the scientific study and recommendations by the Federal Commission as to how the States may develop this industry to a greater extent. It is very important nowadays

to increase the food supply of the Nation. The supply of clams has fallen off so that it is only about one-sixth of what it was a few years ago. For that reason, the whole country is interested, as well as the States on the ocean, where clams grow.

I had a letter, as it happened, this morning, from Mr. Charles J. Fish, of the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, of Woods Hole, Mass., a scientific agency of the United States Government, in which, in part, he says:

It is particularly gratifying to learn that provision is made in the bill for an additional appropriation of $250,000 for a hard-shell clam investigation.

The bill itself, as originally introduced, called for a soft-shell clam investigation.

This fishery which, in Rhode Island waters, is of even greater commercial importance than the soft-shell clam, is equally in need of careful investigation. The situation was clearly brought out by representatives from Rhode Island at the hearing of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It was also pointed out that methods and requirements for investigation of the two problems were quite different and each should be provided for separately.

That is provided for by the bill as amended. In other words, the bill is for the benefit of the Nation, and not of particular States. In the first place, as a result of the investigation, the food supply will be, or should be, increased, and, in the second place, the States will benefit——

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to ask why it is limited to Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and Maine? Why does it not include the west coast?

Mr. GREEN. As amended, and as it is hoped it will be passed, it applies everywhere. There are no geographic limitations upon it at all. As originally introduced it applied only to the States mentioned, but it now applies to all the States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, does the amendment provide for the extension of the investigation to all areas as has been suggested?

Mr. GREEN. It does.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing and directing the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to undertake certain studies of the soft-shell and hard-shell clams."

INVESTIGATION AND REHABILITATION OF OYSTER BEDS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3505) authorizing an appropriation for investigating and rehabilitating the oyster beds damaged or destroyed by the intrusion of fresh water and the blockage of natural passages west of the Mississippi River in the vicinity of Lake Merchant and Bayou Severin, Terrebonne Parish, La., and by the opening of the Bonnet Carre spillway, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with an amendment, on page 2, line 6, to strike out: "together with such sums that may be determined, as a result of such investigations and studies, to be necessary to rehabilitate, replant, and maintain such oyster beds in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 14, 1946 (Public Law 732, 79th Cong., 2d sess.)."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, does the amendment provide for extending the investigation to other areas?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will again read the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, beginning in line 6, it is proposed to strike out: "together with such sums that may be determined, as a result of such investigations and studies, to be necessary to rehabilitate, replant, and maintain such oyster beds in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 14, 1946 (Public Law 732, 79th Cong., 2d sess.)."

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection, Mr. President.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended to read: "An act authorizing an appropriation for investigating the oyster beds damaged or destroyed by the intrustion of fresh water and the blockage of natural passages west of the Mississippi River in the vicinity of Lake Merchant and Bayou Severin, Terrebonne Parish, La., and by the opening of the Bonnet Carre spillway, and for other purposes."

MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL AREAS IN CALIFORNIA

The bill (H. R. 107) for the acquisition and maintenance of wildlife management and control areas in the State of California, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY FOR WILDLIFE PURPOSES

The bill (H. R. 4018) authorizing the transfer of certain real property for wildlife, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4071) to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MOORE (and other Senators). Over.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senators who made the objection withhold it for a brief explanation of the bill? I should like to read a letter addressed to me by P. B. Dunbar, Commissioner of Food and Drugs, describing the situation which the amendment is designed to cure. Mr. Dunbar says:

The outstanding need grows out of the fact that, under the restriction imposed by the District and Ninth Circuit decisions in the Phelps Dodge case, the Government can no longer proceed by seizure against foods that become filthy, decomposed, or otherwise adulterated or drugs that become dangerously deteriorated after interstate movement has ceased. This is an authority that existed unchallenged under the Food and Drug Act of 1906 and was firmly believed to be inherent in the act of 1938 until the Phelps Dodge decision.

The danger lies in this: Prior to this decision we removed by seizure on the average of at least 20 tons a day of contaminated foods which would have otherwise gone into human consumption. It is a fair estimate that 10,000 tons were so removed annually. The health hazard of rodent-contaminated food need not be stressed to you.

The danger does not lie alone in rodent-contaminated food. From time to time seizures have been made of foods contaminated by toxins produced by bacteria. Frequently it is impossible to tell whether the toxin developed before or after the end of the interstate journey. The toxins of different organisms cause illnesses of varying degrees of seriousness. That caused by the toxin of the botulinus organism is of high mortality.

Many important drugs are liable to become dangerously deteriorated, particularly if they are not carefully handled in the course of distribution. The wonder drug—penicillin—is a striking example of these. The degree of its deterioration may mean the difference between life and death of patients to whom it is administered.

Every day the enactment of this well-considered amendment is delayed therefore constitutes a serious hazard to public health and welfare.

In view of the statement, Mr. President, that approximately 20 tons of rotten food have been peddled out to the public every day since the Phelps-Dodge decision which deprived the Pure Food and Drug Administration of the right to seize such food, and in view of the shipment of penicillin, upon which life depends, which is not of the standard of purity and strength necessary and which cannot be seized under the law as it now stands, I sincerely trust that the proposed amendment to the law which has been reported to the Senate after passing the House, which has been uniformly recommended by the drug trade, wholesale grocers, and consumer organizations, and which is so earnestly advocated by the Pure Food and Drug Administration, will be allowed to proceed through the Senate.

Mr. MOORE Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2216) to amend section 205 of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to joint boards, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

CHARGES BY MOTOR VEHICLE COMMON CARRIERS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2759) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide limitations on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by or against common carriers by motor vehicle, common carriers by water, and freight forwarders, was announced as next in order.

Mr. AIKEN (and other Senators). Over.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I was on my feet trying to get permission to make an explanation of Senate bill 2216 to the Senators who made objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Kansas will be heard.

Mr. REED. May I inquire which Senator made objection?

Mr. AIKEN. I was one of the Senators who objected.

Mr. REED. The bill has been on the calendar for a long time. When the Interstate Commerce Act was amended so as to place motortrucks under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the importance of making and regulating truck rates was recognized, and provision was made for boards to pass upon such rates. Since that time amendments have become desirable. The only persons concerned are the State commissions regulating motortruck rates, and the Interstate Commerce Commission. I introduced the bill at the request of the State commissions. Hearings were held, and the Interstate Commerce Commission approved the amendment. There is no objection from any source of which I am aware.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to have it go over until the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, may I try to explain the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, we have been endeavoring to bring about the establishment of uniform limitations as between different classes of carriers with regard to the collection of overcharges and undercharges. Finally a bill was introduced in the House which removed all objections which had been made to the earlier bills. We have held hearings on every one of the bills. A subcommittee has reported this bill favorably to the full committee, the full committee has reported it after hearing all witnesses, and the bill is now here without any objection from anyone, so far as I know.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Kansas if the Comptroller General's office has approved the bill?

Mr. REED. The Comptroller General's office did not approve it. That office submitted a request that the bill provide that, in the case of war in the future, the peacetime statute of limitations should be suspended. Both the subcommittee and the full committee considered that, and we decided that we should legislate normally, and for peacetime purposes. If another war should come, in which some differences developed, certainly the President of the United States would be given extraordinary powers to take care of such matters.

Mr. AIKEN. Did the Comptroller General's office recommend the bill?

Mr. REED. It did recommend——

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to have the bill go over until I can consult with the Comptroller General's office. We know that there were millions if not hundreds of millions of dollars of overcharges made against the Government by transportation carriers during the last war. I know that this bill applies to undercharges also, but I have not happened to hear of any undercharges as yet.

Mr. REED. The bill applies only to cases in the future, nothing that has happened in the past. There are some heavy claims pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission. This bill has nothing to do with them. The bill deals only with the application of the statute of limitations to claims made against the different classes of carriers in the future.

Mr. AIKEN. I dare say the Senator from Kansas is correct, but I should like to have opportunity to consult with the General Accounting Office, and for that reason I ask that the bill go over until the next call of the calendar.

Mr. REED. May I ask the Senator if he will be satisfied by that time?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have seen and known of so much monkey business by the transportation companies in their effort to get from the Federal Government more than was their just due that I am naturally suspicious when such bills are brought up.

Mr. REED. Let me say to the Senator from Vermont that this bill does not apply to railroads in any respect.

Mr. AIKEN. There are many other transportation companies.

Mr. REED. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. I think we should know what the General Accounting Office thinks of these bills, whether they affect the prospect of the United States Government recovering in the case of an overcharge by any kind of a carrier.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am not entering into the controversy between the two Senators, but I should like to get into the RECORD a statement by the Attorney General of the United States, who had this to say regarding this bill:

> This bill would achieve a desirable conformity in the adjective law applying to all carriers and forwarders subject to this act, and its enactment is recommended by the Department of Justice.

That was in the report dated March 30, 1948, on House bill 2759.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On objection, the bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2426) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. AIKEN. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

PREVENTION OF COLLISIONS IN INLAND WATERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3350) relating to the rules for the prevention of collisions on certain inland waters of the United States and on the western rivers, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments of the committee.

The first amendment of the committee was, in section 3, page 4, line 12, after the word "vessel", to insert the words "as defined in rule numbered 1."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 4, page 7, line 10, after the word "stern", to strike out "and higher than the side lights;" on page 8, line 18, after the word "elevation", to strike out "of at least 15 feet above" and insert "higher than"; on page 13, line 10, after the word "obstruction", to strike out "and with an efficient foghorn"; and on line 12, after the word "similar", to strike out "foghorn and."

The amendments were agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 10, to insert a new section, as follows:

> SEC. 5. Where any Navy or Coast Guard vessel of special construction, as certified to by the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Treasury in the case of Coast Guard vessels operating under the Treasury Department, or such official or officials as either may designate, is now or may hereafter by virtue of statute, convention, or treaty, be exempt from compliance with any requirements of the international rules of the road, such type of vessel shall similarly be exempt from compliance with any corresponding requirement under the rules specified in this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 20, to insert a new section, as follows:

> SEC. 6. This act shall become effective on January 1, 1949.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 5992) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

REPAIRS TO NAVAL VESSELS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4721) to remove the statutory

limit of appropriation expenditures for repairs or changes to a vessel of the Navy, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, on page 2, after line 7, to strike out section 2, as follows:

SEC. 2. No funds shall be appropriated for the repair or alteration of any vessel if such repair or alteration may result in a change of the category or type of such vessel.

And to insert the following:

SEC. 2. No funds appropriated for the repair or alteration of any naval vessel shall be utilized to make any repairs or alterations to a vessel which result in a change of the category or type of such vessel, unless such funds have been specifically made available for such purpose.

Mr. LANGER. May we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to repeal the act of July 18, 1935, which limits the repairs and alterations on any one ship to $450,000. The act was repealed automatically during the war by the war statutes. The history of the act shows that it was passed originally to relate to percentages of the value of a ship. Ships have grown immensely more valuable, and today it is very necessary to modernize our ships, to install radar, modern fire equipment, and the like.

There is a provision in the bill, section 2, which prevents an appropriation for this purpose which would change the character of the ship. In other words, the purpose of the bill is to permit Government navy yards to repair naval ships, to modernize them, expending the amounts of money necessary properly to modernize ships of war.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

RAILWAY POSTAL CLERKS' TRAVEL ALLOWANCES

The bill (S. 2152) to increase the maximum travel allowance for railway postal clerks and substitute railway postal clerks was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsections (m) and (r) of section 16 of the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, as amended, are amended by striking out "$4 per day" and inserting in lieu thereof "$6 per day."

ADVANCEMENT OF RURAL POSTAL CARRIERS IN THE FIELD SERVICE

The bill (H. R. 1189) to establish the methods of advancement for post office employees (rural carriers) in the field service was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CURRENT ADDRESSES OF ALIENS IN THE UNITED STATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2432) to amend the Alien Registration Act of 1940, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in section 1, on page 1, line 8, to strike out "on July 1, 1948, and on July 1 of any succeeding year, shall", and insert "on July 1, 1948, or on February 1, 1949, or on July 1 or on February 1 of each succeeding year, shall;" and in section 2, page 2, line 9, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$100 or to" and insert "$200 or", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 35 of the Alien Registration Act of 1940, approved June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 675; 8 U. S. C. 456), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 35. Any alien required to be registered under this title who is an alien resident of the United States on July 1, 1948, or on February 1, 1949, or on July 1 or on February 1 of each succeeding year, shall, within 10 days following such dates, notify the Commissioner in writing of his current address. In the case of an alien for whom a parent or legal guardian is required to apply for registration, the notice required by this section shall be given by such parent or legal guardian."

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of section 36 of the said act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) Any alien or any parent or legal guardian of any alien who fails to give written notice to the Commissioner, as required by section 35 of this act, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not to exceed $200 or be imprisoned not more than 30 days, or both."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 200) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President was announced as next in order.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, this is a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment, and should not be taken up during the call of the calendar under the 5-minute rule. I shall ask to have it made the unfinished business at the earliest opportunity. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be passed over at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

SALE OF INDIAN LANDS

The bill (H. R. 5262) to authorize the sale of individual Indian lands acquired under the act of June 18, 1934, and under the act of June 26, 1936, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF LANDS IN SOUTH DAKOTA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5651) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in South Dakota for municipal or public purposes.

Mr. LODGE. May we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, there is in the vicinity of Rapid City, S. Dak., land embracing about 1,000 acres which was set aside once for the use of the Indians. Very little of it has ever been used. The bill provides that small tracts may be turned over to Rapid City for use by public bodies or associations or to religious groups for a price. There is no cost to the Government involved in the transaction.

Mr. LODGE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

IRRIGATION CHARGES ON THE FLATHEAD INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT, MONTANA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5669) to provide for adjustment of irrigation charges on the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment, on page 11, line 10, after the word "reimbursable", to strike out "*Provided*, That it is not the intent of this act to settle any claims said tribes may have for appropriations of water, nor except as specifically provided by this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PRIORITY RIGHTS OF VETERANS

The bill (S. 2224) to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to the priority rights of veterans entitled to 10-point preference under such act, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first proviso in section 8 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 is amended to read as follows: *Provided*, That an appointing officer who passes over a 10-point-preference veteran eligible and selects a 5-point-preference veteran eligible, or passes over any veteran eligible and selects a nonveteran shall file with the Civil Service Commission his reasons in writing for so doing, which shall become a part of the record of the veteran eligible passed over, and shall, upon request, be made available to him or his designated representative; the Civil Service Commission is directed to determine the sufficiency of such submitted reasons and, if found insufficient, shall require such appointing officer to submit more detailed information in support thereof; the findings of the Civil Service Commission as to the sufficiency or insufficiency of such reasons shall be transmitted to and considered by such appointing officer, and a copy thereof shall be sent to the veteran eligible passed over or to his designated representative upon request therefor."

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3638) to amend section 10 of the act establishing National

Archives of the United States Government was announced as next in order.

Mr. REED. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 340) to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the American Turners Society in the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. REED. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 341) to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of Fort Kearney in the State of Nebraska was announced as next in order.

Mr. REED. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2479) providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by locators in the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

SALE OF LAND ON FLATHEAD RESERVATION TO THE STATE OF MONTANA

The bill (H. R. 5118) to authorize the sale of certain individual Indian land on the Flathead Reservation to the State of Montana was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2510) to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. REED. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 334) giving consent of Congress to the compact on regional education entered into between the Southern States at Tallahassee, Fla., on February 8, 1948, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over. The joint resolution is the unfinished business.

EXECUTION OF AMENDATORY REPAYMENT CONTRACT WITH NORTHPORT IRRIGATION DISTRICT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6067) authorizing the execution of an amendatory repayment contract with the Northport Irrigation District, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 1, line 3, after the word "Interior", to insert "upon finding specifically that existing repayment contracts between the United States and the Northport Irrigation District cannot reasonably be carried out by the said district,".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 8, after the words "provisions of", to strike out "existing" and insert "such."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 9, after the word "contracts", to strike out "between the United States and the Northport irrigation district."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2549) to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, because of the importance of the bill, I ask that it go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

CONSTRUCTION OF A WATER FILTRATION PLANT AT HIGHLAND FALLS, N. Y.

The bill (H. R. 2359) to authorize the payment of a lump sum, in the amount of $100,000, to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y., as a contribution toward the cost of construction of a water-filtration plant, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to authorize a lump-sum payment of $50,000, instead of $100,000, as a contribution toward the cost of construction of a water-filtration plant in the village of Highland Falls, N. Y. As I understand, former Secretary of War Patterson recommended $50,000 as a proper contribution. Since that time costs have risen and the House has recommended $100,000. On the evidence submitted to the Senate committee it was felt that we should follow the Army's recommendation, and then perhaps discuss the proper amount in the conference between the two branches. I believe that the contribution is a proper one toward the filtration plant.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I still see no reason for the Federal Government building a filtration plant. I may say that we have passed a bill authorizing a general Federal contribution for all sorts of antipollution measures and health measures, which, if the House passes it, would provide a Federal contribution of one-third.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, this bill represents a definite obligation taken on at a specific time when West Point was expanded to provide air-training facilities at the West Point Academy. Some land was needed, and in taking over the land it did away with the area that Highland Falls had heretofore been using as a reservoir, that is a catch basin for water to provide a municipal supply. The Secretary of War in condemning the land made a direct commitment of the Government to save the city harmless. Therefore, inasmuch as the city still has to secure its water from that area through which now public roads pass, and on which servicemen train, it is necessary that a better water filtration plant be constructed. The Government is definitely obligated in connection therewith. The plant is to cost, I believe, approximately $180,000. The House said the city should pay a part of it, and finally passed a bill providing for $100,000 by way of Federal contribution. Our committee reduced that figure by one-half. This particular case could not be considered as coming within any general category, for there was a definite obligation at the time the land was condemned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, on page 1, line 8, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$50,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to authorize the payment of a lump sum, in the amount of $50,000, to the village of Highland Falls, New York, as a contribution toward the cost of construction of a water-filtration plant, and for other purposes."

FEDERAL AID FOR SUPPORT OF DISABLED SOLDIERS AND SAILORS

The bill (H. R. 1562) to increase temporarily the amount of Federal aid to State or territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR APPLICATION FOR MUSTERING-OUT PAY

The bill (H. R. 5805) to extend the time within which application for the benefits of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 may be made by veterans discharged from the armed forces before the effective date of such act was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROMOTION OF LT. GEN. LESLIE RICHARD GROVES TO PERMANENT GRADE OF MAJOR GENERAL

The bill (S. 2223) to authorize the promotion of Lt. Gen. Leslie Richard Groves to the permanent grade of major general, United States Army, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized and requested to appoint, without confirmation by the Senate, Leslie Richard Groves, Army serial No. O–12043, lieutenant general, Army of the United States, to the permanent grade of major general in the Regular Army, such appointment to be effective as of the day prior to the effective date of his retirement from the active list of the Regular Army and such appointment shall entitle him to receive the

retired pay of major general of the Regular Army.

SEC. 2. The President is further authorized and requested, without confirmation by the Senate, to place the said Leslie Richard Groves on the retired list with the rank and grade of lieutenant general with honorary date of rank thereof as of July 16, 1945, which date commemorates the first explosion by man of an atomic bomb, at the Trinity site, Alamogordo, N. Mex. Such advancement in grade and rank on the retired list, however, shall not result in any increase in retired pay.

SEC. 3. This act shall result in no permanent increase in the authorized number of major generals on the active list of the Regular Army.

The preamble was agreed to.

ATTENDANCE OF UNITED STATES MARINE BAND AT EIGHTY-SECOND NATIONAL ENCAMPMENT, GAR

The bill (H. R. 5035) to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the Eighty-second National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held in Grand Rapids, Mich., September 26 to 30, 1948, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EASEMENT AT UNITED STATES ARMY AIRFIELD, FORT MYERS, FLA.

The bill (S. 2291) to authorize the Secretary of the Army or his duly authorized representative to quitclaim a perpetual easement over certain lands adjacent to the Fort Myers Army Airfield, Fla., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army, or his duty authorized representative, be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered under such terms as he may deem advisable, to quitclaim to the Inter-County Telephone & Telegraph Co., its successors and assigns, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to a certain perpetual right-of-way and easement acquired by the United States in 4.42 acres of land, more or less, for the location, construction, operation, maintenance, and patrol of a telephone line and telephone facilities, and for the construction and maintenance of a road necessary for the patrol of the telephone line and facilities, in, over, and across lands in the vicinity of the Fort Myers Army Airfield, Fla.

EASEMENT AT THE UNITED STATES NAVAL AIR STATION, ALAMEDA, CALIF.

The bill (S. 2233) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the East Bay Municipal Utility District, an agency of the State of California, an easement for the construction and operation of a water main in and under certain Government-owned lands comprising a part of the United States naval air station, Alameda, Calif., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to grant and convey to the East Bay Municipal Utility District, an agency of the State of California, without cost to the said utility district, and subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Navy may deem proper, a perpetual easement for the construction, maintenance, operation, renewal, replacement, and repair of a waterpipe line or lines within a strip of land 10 feet wide extending a distance of seven hundred and thirty-nine and ninety-one one-hundredths feet along the eastern boundary of lands comprising a part of the United States naval air station, Alameda, Calif., contiguous to Webster Street, metes and bounds description of which is on file in the Navy Department.

PRESENTATION OF REPLICA OF DADE MONUMENT TO THE STATE OF FLORIDA

The bill (S. 153) authorizing the Secretary of War to have prepared a replica of the Dade Monument for presentation to the State of Florida was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may we have a statement of what the bill, if enacted, will cost the Government?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, in answer to the question of the Senator from North Dakota I will say that the bill will involve no cost to the Government.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 153) authorizing the Secretary of War to have prepared a replica of the Dade Monument for presentation to the State of Florida, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, upon payment by the State of Florida to the Department of the Army of such sum as may be necessary to defray all expenses necessarily incident thereto, the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to cause to be prepared an exact replica of the Dade Monument, located on the grounds of the United States military reservation at West Point, N. Y., and to present such replica to the State of Florida for erection in the Dade State Memorial Park.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to have prepared a replica of the Dade Monument for presentation to the State of Florida."

EXCHANGE OF PROPERTY WITH KEARNEY, NEBR.

The bill (S. 2077) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to exchange certain property with the city of Kearney, Nebr., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to convey approximately 17 acres of land and improvements thereon owned by the United States in Buffalo County, Nebr., lying in the south half, southeast quarter section 27, township 9 north, range 15 west of the sixth principal meridian, and the Government-owned improvements located on land leased from the city of Kearney, Nebr., in said section 27 constructed by the Army for an automotive equipment repair shop, to the city of Kearney, Nebr., in exchange for approximately four hundred and forty-two and seventy-four one-hundredths acres of land in Buffalo County, Nebr., described as a tract of land situated in section 27, township 9 north, range 15 west, more particularly described as follows: Beginning at the northeast corner of section 27; thence south along the east section line two thousand eight hundred and thirty-five feet, more or less; thence in a westerly direction one thousand six hundred and seventy-five feet, more or less; thence in a southwesterly direction one thousand two hundred and eighty-five feet, more or less; thence south parallel to the east line of section 27 eight hundred and seventy-five feet, more or less; thence west and parallel to the south line of section 27 two thousand five hundred and seventy feet, more or less; thence north along the west line of section 27 four thousand four hundred and sixty feet, more or less, to the northwest corner of section 27; thence east five thousand two hundred eighty feet, more or less, along the north line of section 27 to place of beginning, which is to be conveyed to the United States by the city of Kearney, Nebr., as a part of the Kearney Army Air Field, Nebr.

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 296) to maintain the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

ADMISSION OF NEWSPRINT DUTY FREE—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 5553) to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the bill simply extends the date of the admission of newsprint duty free from July 1, 1948, to July 1, 1949. I desire to offer an amendment to the bill. July 1, 1948, is the date within which standard newsprint paper of a width of from 9 to 15 inches may be admitted duty free. It is a special exemption that was granted during the war, and it was agreed by all that it should be extended for at least another year.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands the Senator from Maine desires to offer an amendment to the bill.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes. First I want to be sure that the bill has been taken up for consideration.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under objection, the bill will be passed over.

TEMPORARY FREE IMPORTATION OF RACING SHELLS

The bill (H. R. 5933) to permit the temporary free importation of racing shells was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, does that conclude the call of the calendar?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The call of the calendar is concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining time within the morning hour, until 2 o'clock, be utilized for consideration of the unfinished business. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of House Joint Resolution 334.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I inquire if House bill 5933 was passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes; that bill was passed.

Mr. BREWSTER. I desire to offer an amendment to the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I withhold my unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the vote by which House bill 5933 was passed is reconsidered, so the Senator from Maine may offer an amendment to the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. What bill is the Senate now considering?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. House bill 5933, which is Calendar No. 1300.

Mr. BREWSTER. This is an amendment dealing with the matter of exemption from import duties on goods brought back by tourists. The present limit of exemption, $100, has been in effect for 50 years.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, is the Senator raising a question as to calendar No. 1300, House bill 5933?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes. I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. MYERS. I did not understand the Senator's explanation.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am explaining my amendment.

This question has been discussed with members of the Committee on Finance, including the chairman, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]; also with members of the House Ways and Means Committee. I understand that it is agreeable to them. The amendment would increase the exemption from $100 to $500. The $100 exemption was originally established in 1897.

Mr. MYERS. I think the Senator is referring to the wrong calendar number.

Mr. BREWSTER. No. I am referring to the bill to permit the temporary free importation of racing shells; and my amendment is in order.

It is my understanding that in conference the House Members will agree to a limitation of $300. My amendment proposes an exemption of $500, and it is my understanding that it will be fixed in conference at $300.

I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Maine will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. Paragraph 1798 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting, after the sixth proviso, the following: "*Provided further*, That in addition to the exemption authorized by the fourth preceding proviso, a returning resident who has remained beyond the territorial limits of the United States for a period of not less than 12 days, shall be permitted to bring into the United States up to but not exceeding $500 in value of articles (excluding distilled spirits, wines, malt liquors, and cigars) acquired abroad by such resident of the United States as an incident of the foreign journey for personal or household use or as souvenirs or curios, but not bought on commission or intended for sale, free of duty: *Provided further*, That any subsequent sale, within 3 years, of articles acquired and brought into the United States pursuant to the provisions of the preceding proviso shall subject the returning resident declaring the articles to double the import duty which would have been collected had this additional exemption not been in effect: *Provided further*, That the additional exemption authorized by the second preceding proviso shall apply only to articles declared in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury by such returning resident who has not taken advantage of the said exemption within the 6-month period immediately preceding his return to the United States:".

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wonder if the committee has considered this amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. What the amendment does is to increase from $100 to $500 the exemption as applied to American citizens who go abroad and return with souvenirs, gifts, or articles which they have purchased for their own use or as gifts for their friends. The Treasury Department, as represented by the Secretary of the Treasury, the head of the department, is very anxious that this amendment be adopted.

Mr. LUCAS. Is this bill now being considered before some other committee?

Mr. BARKLEY. No.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to permit the temporary free importation of racing shells, and increasing the amount of exemptions allowed for personal purchases abroad."

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. BREWSTER, and Mr. BARKLEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that Mr. WADSWORTH had been appointed a manager on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2239) to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, vice Mr. HOFFMAN, resigned.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3998) to provide for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6226) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. ENGEL of Michigan, Mr. STEFAN, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. KEEFE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. KERR, and Mr. MAHON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 2287) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. GAMBLE, Mr. KUNKEL, Mr. TALLE, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, and Mr. PATMAN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 52. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of Senate Report 440, part 6, of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program; and

S. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Report No. 949, entitled "National Aviation Policy."

CLINTON P. ANDERSON

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, an unusual and most interesting article appears in the Washington Post this morning. In the daily column entitled "People in the News," Mr. John W. Ball, one of the top-notch reporters of the Post, and a man who has great familiarity with agriculture and its problems, which is his special assignment for the Post, has an article dealing with the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Clinton P. Anderson. The article speaks for itself, and needs no comment from me, except that I might add that a reporter of the integrity and ability of Mr. Ball would not write an article like this one unless it was highly justified and richly deserved.

However, Mr. President, inasmuch as Secretary Anderson is leaving the office of Secretary of Agriculture today, I am happy to ask unanimous consent that this most favorable article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. My own observations of Secretary Anderson's tenure in office and my many contacts with him, confirm everything written by Mr. Ball.

In addition, Mr. President, I want to add that Mr. Anderson's services as Secretary of Agriculture have reflected credit upon himself, our State of New Mexico, from which we both come, but more, Mr. President, they reflect credit upon President Truman, who reposed confidence in Mr. Anderson and his integrity and ability, to the extent of choosing him as a member of his Cabinet. It gives me particular pleasure to say today that the trust imposed by the President in Mr. Anderson has not been misplaced.

No matter what prejudiced political critics may say, as they often do in campaign years, a fair appraisal of Mr. Anderson's record in office will reveal him as one of our country's great Secretaries of Agriculture.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANDERSON LEAVES AGRICULTURE JOB TODAY AFTER WELDING DEPARTMENT INTO LOYAL UNIT

(By John W. Ball)

When Clinton P. Anderson walks out of the office of Secretary of Agriculture today he will close one of the stormiest and also one of the most constructive periods in that office.

He entered the office a stranger in a strange land. His appearance was greeted with behind-the-palm remarks about another businessman-Congressman farm expert.

He leaves this week with a Department as completely unified behind him as any Agriculture Secretary has had in years.

Anderson's popularity with the employees of the Department recently got a terrific upsurge as the result of a man who dislikes him thoroughly and has opposed him on nearly all of his proposals. That man is Representative AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Republican of Minnesota, second ranking Republican on the House Agriculture Committee.

ANDERSON DEFENDS EMPLOYEES

On December 27, at the height of the turmoil over speculation in commodities ANDRESEN issued a statement that he had learned from a "very reliable source" that 200 Government employees in Chicago had formed a pool to speculate in commodities.

Although ANDRESEN didn't say so, the inference was that these Government employees had inside information about Government plans to purchase commodities, and profited by that inside knowledge. Naturally that meant employees of the Agriculture Department.

Anderson lost no time in a vigorous denial. In a suddenly called Sunday afternoon conference he released a blast at ANDRESEN, challenging him to "put up or shut up," and accusing him of "going bear-hunting with an empty gun." His charges, Anderson said, were "shocking and unconscionable."

EMPLOYEES SHOW APPRECIATION

"Honest Government employees are entitled to protection," he declared.

So far no reply except a repetition of the charges has come from ANDRESEN. But the response from employees in the Department was immediate. At last they had a champion. This reporter had calls from many old-time employees, praising Anderson and asking more recognition for his defense of his force.

ANDRESEN, by his effort to get some of the headlines connected with the commodity speculation row, had given Anderson the opportunity he wanted to weld his Department into a unit behind him. It gave him a much-needed opening to overcome vast discontent among his field force—the old Agriculture Adjustment Agency workers. They had been aroused a year earlier over Anderson's proposal for reorganization of the Production and Marketing Administration. That program, the AAA feared, would center in Washington much of the responsibilities that had been in their hands.

QUIETS AAA REVOLT

It was one of the most widespread revolts the Department had known in years. In formal letters the field force demanded resignations of some of Anderson's top-flight men. AAA State representatives in 40 of the 48 States signed the letters.

Anderson called them all to Washington, worked out a compromise that they agreed to. The reorganization plan, however, still rankled until ANDRESEN came forward with his blast that healed all wounds.

The episode reveals Anderson at his best. He is glib, quick-witted, and fast on his feet to take advantage of any opening.

HELPED HALT FAMINE

To Anderson's credit will stand the remarkable job that America did to feed the world during the last 3 years. Those efforts halted the march of the greatest of the four horsemen—famine—that after most wars takes a greater toll of life than the conflict itself.

He handled the enormous buying program that entailed without a suggestion of wrongdoing by any of the top-flight men in his Department. The closest examination of congressional committees failed to tie any leaks to his Department.

He has been a stalwart defender of what he sees to be the Department's greatest aims. He believes in a price-support program, but with safeguards, such as Government goals for farm crops. Farmers not complying with those goals would lose their claims for price supports.

CONSERVATION ADVOCATE

He is a believer in soil conservation. "Someday, somehow, conservation must become second nature in us," he recently said, "in all those who use the natural resources and in all those who buy the products of these resources."

Soil conservation, he insists, must not be a football. He refuses to tie himself to any plan, urging only that we must not break up our program into little segments under scattered control.

He formulated his policy of organized, sustained, and realistic abundance—in other words a policy to get away from the old periods of surplus food piling up on farms and in warehouses without a market, while large numbers of the population are underfed.

FOUGHT FOR PAY INCREASES

He has fought long and loud for better pay for employees—particularly those in top-flight positions. He has emphasized the strain upon the Department of the early departure of its ablest men to better-paying jobs in private employment.

He has encouraged greater agricultural research, both in the production and marketing of farm products.

With anything but rugged health, he is remarkable for his energy, and his ability to work longer hours than he asks of others. As a youth in South Dakota he was stricken with tuberculosis, and for a time his life was despaired of. He moved to Albuquerque, N. Mex., and while fighting off that dread disease, built up a highly profitable insurance business. He later established his own company which is now the largest writer of compensation insurance in that State. He comments that "it feeds me well."

HEADED WORLD ROTARY

At his New Mexico home he takes a wide interest in social activities. In 1932 he was elected president of Rotary International. Only 36, he was the youngest ever to hold that position. He worked on the Little Theater project in Albuquerque.

Another affliction, in addition to tuberculosis fell upon him—diabetes. How he controls those two serious ailments and carries on at the severe pace he sets for himself is the wonder of all who know him well.

He admits to one ambition, to be a writer. In his younger days he worked on newspapers in both South Dakota and New Mexico. While bedridden in his early visit to New Mexico, he says he gathered a wonderful collection of magazine rejection slips, and wasted a lot of money on postage. He claims as his chief hobby the collection of books, of which he is famed.

This reporter has had many an argument with the retiring Secretary—sometimes angry ones. But he must say, as Anderson leaves the Cabinet to run for Senator from New Mexico, that he is a d—— good public servant.

COLLIER'S MAGAZINE AWARD TO SENATOR BARKLEY AND REPRESENTATIVE HERTER

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, an occurrence took place last week with reference to an honor paid to one of our most distinguished Members which prompts me to make a confession of an error originally committed, one which I long ago privately admitted but have never publicly confessed. Sometimes it is good for one to admit when he has been wrong.

When Collier's magazine first announced its intention to make an award each year to the outstanding Member of the Senate and to the outstanding Member of the House, all of us were asked to express our views as to that proposal. For some reason, Mr. President, I thought the idea was a bad one. Conjuring up in my imagination all kinds of ill effects which might flow from the awarding of such honors, in answering I wrote Collier's a letter in which I set forth various reasons why I thought it was not a good plan. Since the plan has been in actual operation, Mr. President, and as I have watched the awards made each year, I have found, as is so often the case, that all the fears I imagined were utterly groundless and ill-founded. No ill effects whatever have occurred. On the contrary, such public recognition of valuable services rendered by faithful public servants has dissipated and I believe will continue to dissipate, some of the low esteem in which, unfortunately, public men are held by too many people. Frankly, I was wrong in my previous views and am glad today to confess that error.

Needless to say, Mr. President, my remarks today mainly concern the Collier's award given last week to two able and distinguished Members of the Congress. As I have indicated, in connection with what I say today about the awards for 1946, I want it distinctly understood that the honors conferred in previous years upon Members of Congress, so far as I know, have been well deserved and highly merited by the recipients thereof.

Now, I merely want to say that when the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] was named as the Senator entitled to receive this high honor for the year 1946, I was greatly pleased and highly gratified. It has been my pleasure, Mr. President, to serve with the Senator from Kentucky since I became a Member of this body, and especially since he was first elected majority leader, and also, of course, the past 2 years while he has occupied the position of minority leader. In addition to that, it has been my privilege to have had some very pleasant and personal contacts with the Senator from Kentucky on numerous occasions and under circumstances which cause one to know the true depths and meaning of a strong, stalwart character. The Senator from Kentucky is such a man. Every contact I have had with him, in official life, party affairs, and personal association, has proved him to be one

of the truly great men of America, if not as I think he is, one of the great men of the world. Under circumstances not now necessary to mention, sometimes conditions were so adverse that a weaker or lesser man would have failed and have fallen. But, no matter what the circumstances, good or bad, the Senator from Kentucky has grown steadily in stature and strength until the honor conferred last week could not have been bestowed upon a man more entitled to receive the same.

In speaking thus of the Senator from Kentucky alone and not mentioning Representative HERTER, I do so merely because I am so much better acquainted with the Senator from Kentucky and his activities than I am with Representative HERTER or his career in the House of Representatives. From the care exercised in giving these awards, I am certain Representative HERTER is, likewise, fully entitled to be so honored.

I conclude these brief and entirely inadequate remarks by extending my sincere congratulations to the Senator from Kentucky, Representative HERTER, Collier's weekly, and the board which acted so wisely and so well in their selections for the year 1946, even as it acted wisely and well in its previous awards.

THE NATIONAL HEALTH ASSEMBLY

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an excellent summary, by Mrs. Agnes Meyer, of the recent national health assembly. It proves decisively what I have always maintained: That when the doctors, the people, and representatives of government actually sit down together to work out their problems fear and tension disappear and effective cooperation results. As such face-to-face meetings take the place of mutually distrustful editorializing, I am sure the many problems in the field of medical care will, one by one, disappear to the satisfaction of all concerned.

In closing, I should like to warmly commend those who organized the national health assembly, all those who participated in it, and Mrs. Meyer for her excellent interpretation of the proceedings.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT THE NATIONAL HEALTH ASSEMBLY'S 10-YEAR PROGRAM WILL MEAN TO YOU

(By Agnes E. Meyer)

The success of the National Health Assembly was a triumph of the democratic process over tensions that appeared to be insoluble. No less significant than the far-reaching practical program that has been outlined by the delegates, was the fact that for the first time the medical profession and numerous lay groups sat down together and worked harmoniously for the common good on a Nation-wide basis.

This conference will always be memorable because it built a permanent bridge between the medical profession and the labor unions, farm organizations, cooperative health federations and other groups that have long been fighting for better health protection. It has transformed armed and hostile camps into coalescing forces whose impact upon the national welfare will gradually make itself felt throughout the country.

Members of the AMA expressed satisfaction that the labor unions had such expert people on the various committees, and the labor unions' representatives found out that medical practitioners are not necessarily antisocial. The success of their common endeavors brought home to professional and layman that the best interests of the medical professional are served when the layman respects the physician's role in society, and that the best interest of society are served when proper organization makes the skills of the physician available to the maximum number of people.

As a result the skepticism with which many of the delegates came to this conference was transformed by mature and patient deliberations into the certainty that foundations have been soundly laid upon which an all-embracing national health program can be constructed.

TEN-YEAR PROGRAM

The conference was called by the Federal Security Administrator, Oscar R. Ewing, at the request of President Truman, to establish the widest possible "area of agreement" between disparate factions upon a 10-year program for the health and welfare of the Nation. An executive committee appointed by Mr. Ewing joined him and his staff in selecting leaders from all parts of the country as chairmen and members of the 14 committees on problems of organization, facilities, personnel, and finance.

These sections accepted as basic to their considerations the definition of health promulgated by the World Health Organization. "Health is defined as a state of complete physical, mental, and social well being, not merely the absence of disease or infirmity."

Two other trends ran through all the discussions: that a health program is everybody's business, and that its development depends upon local initiative and a knowledge of local needs, and therefore upon the preservation of local autonomy.

What the average person will want to know about the findings of this conference is: "How do they affect me, my family, and my immediate environment?" Therefore I shall give what must necessarily be an oversimplified picture of the new, healthier, and happier community that will come into being when and if the major plans of the health assembly are carried out. I shall therefore list the committees and the names of the chairmen without attempting to give credit to individuals for the different ideas on organization, facilities, personnel, and financing.

Section 1: What is the Nation's need for health and medical personnel? Chairman: Algo D. Henderson.

Section 2: What is the Nation's need for hospital facilities, health centers and diagnostic clinics? Chairman: Charles F. Wilinsky.

Section 3: What is the Nation's need for local health units? Chairman: Haven Emerson.

Section 4: Chronic disease and the aging process. Chairman: James R. Miller.

Section 5: A national program for maternal and child health. Chairman: Leona Baumgartner.

Section 6: A national program for rural health. Chairman: Joseph W. Fichter.

Section 7: What is the Nation's need for research in the service of health? Chairman: Andrew C. Ivy.

Section 8: What is the Nation's need for medical care? Chairman: Hugh R. Leavell.

Section 9: State and community planning for health. Chairman: Florence R. Sabin.

Section 10: Physical medicine and rehabilitation. Chairman: Henry H. Kessler.

Section 11: What can be done to improve dental health? Chairman: Ernest G. Sloman.

Section 12: A national program for mental health. Chairman: William C. Menninger.

Section 13: What can be done to improve nutrition? Chairman: Frank G. Boudreau.

Section 14: A national program of environmental sanitation. Chairman: Arthur D. Weston.

ORGANIZATION

Full-time local health departments in every city and county or combination of counties are essential to a strong health program. This is one of the recommendations made by the National Health Assembly, that is already implemented in a bill now before the Congress, S. 2189, which provides Federal aid to strengthen local public-health units and increase their number so that there will be Nation-wide coverage.

Cooperating with these public officials, local and State health councils, made up of all agencies and individuals concerned with health, as well as business, banking, and industrial groups, will help to plan the local program and keep it close to local needs. In addition, these councils must arouse the interest, aggressive support and participation of the entire community in a medical program that is both preventive and curative.

These councils should emphasize the primary importance of health education, the basic importance of local control of health programs, the necessity of removing inequities in medical facilities as between communities and between economic groups in the community, and the economic values to be derived from lowering high death rates, decreasing incidence of disease and accidents. Health cannot be achieved merely through a medical approach, as adequate housing, a living wage, good working conditions, education, recreation, and other facilities, are all involved in physical and mental well-being.

Yet until adequate services for local health are established throughout the Nation, there will be failure in every other area of endeavor. Local health units, a retail point of distribution for complete medical care, are the basic need. Forty million people at present are not reached by such a program and many others are dissatisfied.

The lack of these retail stores for health services now creates the heavy load on medical care. The public has the right to expect that these local preventive and referral centers shall be decently housed on Main Street with a plate-glass front, not tucked away, as they often are now, in a cellar room of the courthouse or jail. Moreover, medical education and a wide variety of research must go forward to put new goods for sale on the shelves of these local retail health stores and keep them up to date.

RURAL SERVICES FEW

The various services that should be for sale in the local health centers would require:

1. Mechanism for tabulating vital statistics and interpreting their significance.
2. Control of communicable diseases.
3. Sanitation.
4. Diagnostic and laboratory procedures.
5. Hygiene of human reproduction.
6. Information on health education and laws of living.

Such a program involves the need for more factual information as to how many doctors, nurses, other medical personnel and hospital facilities are actually needed in each community. At present local health departments meeting the minimum standards are available to less than half of the Nation, and two-sevenths of the population, largely in rural areas, have no local health units whatever.

Today people clamor for security, security for the family, the community and the Nation. The most important factors in that security are good physical health and stable

emotions that will produce strong, healthy, and happy citizens.

The mental health specialists, whose work is essential to establishing this general sense of security, called attention to the fact that their profession is more tragically understaffed than any other. The need for increased training of psychiatrists and ancillary workers can be gaged if we realize that 62 percent of the inmates of veterans' hospitals are psychiatric cases. The dental division is no less emphatic in demanding more dentists and technical assistants to prevent diseases by early and adequate attention to children. A special program for child care is essential, preferably in close association with the school system.

But the greatest needs are for more doctors and nurses, now that public health services must be expanded. Increased population, increasing Federal, State, and local programs, and increased health consciousness of the people, have accelerated the demand for expanded medical care. The estimates as to how many additional medical schools and doctors may be required are uncertain. But whatever steps are taken to extend medical training, the high quality of our present medical education must and will be maintained.

PROBLEM OF EDUCATION

The committee on personnel recognized that more Negro physicians should be trained. This problem is part of the larger problem of improving the opportunities for the education of Negroes in general, if the number of Negroes qualified to enter medical schools is to meet the acute demand. Here will be the area where follow-up work will be urgent, if this recommendation is to be quickly and effectively implemented.

The need for more hospital beds was definitely estimated at 265,000 general, 291,000 mental, 85,000 tuberculosis, and 245,000 chronic diseases. This deficit, it was conceded, cannot be met within the 10 years' limit set by the President. The Hospital Survey and Construction Act was praised as a sound approach to the problem, but the rural delegates insisted that it should be amended so that the poorer communities could benefit by it.

But however efficient the local health officers, health councils, and health centers may be in bringing medical care to the local community, they cannot solve the whole medical problem of our people. Some form of prepayment plan or insurance, the doctors and lay representatives agreed, is essential.

Different views were expressed as to methods of effectuating the principle of prepayment or insurance. Some believe it can be achieved through voluntary plans. Others believe that a national health-insurance plan is necessary.

PREPAYMENT IS BASIC

Because of their importance, it is best to repeat verbatim the unanimous conclusions of the Medical Care Section in regard to health insurance:

1. Adequate medical service for the prevention of illness, the care and relief of sickness and the promotion of a high level of physical, metal, and social health should be available to all without regard to race, color, creed, residence, or economic status.

2. The principle of contributory health insurance should be the basic method of financing medical care for the large majority of the American people, in order to remove the burden of unpredictable sickness costs, abolish the economic barrier to adequate medical services and avoid the indignities of a means test.

3. Health insurance should be accompanied by such use of tax resources as may be necessary to provide additional: (a) Services to persons or groups for whom special public responsibility is acknowledged, and (b) services not available under prepayment or insurance.

4. Voluntary prepayment group health plans, embodying group practice and providing comprehensive service, offer to their members the best of modern medical care. Such plans furthermore are the best available means at this time of bringing about improved distribution of medical care, particularly in rural areas. Hence such plans should be encouraged by every means.

5. The people have the right to establish voluntary insurance plans on a cooperative basis, and legal restrictions upon such right (other than those necessary to assure proper standards and qualifications), now existing in a number of States, should be removed.

PROPORTION TOO LOW

It was recognized that the insurance plans, as well as those for local health organization, for the training of additional personnel, the construction of hospitals, and the expansion of research work, call for State and Federal aid of huge proportions. But relative to other expenditures in the national economy, too little is now expended in the preservation and maintenance of health.

Recognition and acceptance by the people as a whole of the values to be attained by health must precede the drive for the increase of these expenditures. The State and community planning councils will be the best means of bringing about this general recognition and acceptance. Only insofar as this is attained will public funds be forthcoming in increased volume at the Federal, State, and local levels, and private funds through increased expenditure by families and individuals, by employers of labor and other sources.

Nobody dared, probably nobody could estimate, what the total bill will be if the program of this National Health Assembly is to become a reality. But Dr. Louis I. Dublin, who had been influential in urging upon Mr. Ewing and the President that this assembly should be convened, encouraged the departing delegates by asking the practical question: "What is the value of a man and how much is it worth to save him for his family and community?"

He arrived at the answer by pointing out that when the family wage earner is incapacitated or prematurely killed by disease, the cost of supporting that family is statistically demonstrated to be about $35,000 if the family income was $2,500 a year.

When the head of the family is incapacitated, his care represents an additional economic burden to society of varying dimensions.

We have already reduced this economic waste by conquering many diseases, but the total cost of unnecessary deaths and disabilities still represents a staggering sum. In comparison, the price of adequate health measures as outlined by the National Assembly, will be very small, to say nothing of the productivity in material, mental, and spiritual areas that will be added unto us, all of which are forces basic to a free economy and a democratic social structure.

Immediately after the final session of the National Health Assembly, the executive committee met with Mr. Ewing and decided to continue the assembly and its committees but postponed the details of a permanent organization until a subsequent meeting.

THE RECIPROCAL TRADE PROGRAM

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, foreign trade is of extreme importance to my State of Pennsylvania. The industries of Pennsylvania, the most important economic enterprises in the State, produce and ship abroad millions and millions of dollars worth of goods in normal years, and in normal times those sales represent a significant part of the revenues of those firms. Since foreign trade is a two-way street, imports received from abroad are also of vital importance to many Pennsylvania firms, and thus to the entire State.

Most Pennsylvanians realize the stake which we, as citizens of the Keystone State, have in vigorous foreign trade, in the free flow of goods to and from this country. On the whole, business in Pennsylvania appreciates the importance of the reciprocal trade agreements program in connection with our hopes for full employment and real peace. Of course, there are some influential Pennsylvanians who still cling to the high-tariff philosophy of other eras, but they are a waning army fighting a rear-guard battle.

The reciprocal trade program will be one of the many vital issues to confront this session of Congress. It is an issue closely allied with other foreign-policy matters—for instance, the Marshall plan.

Since in the reciprocal trade agreements debate the charge undoubtedly will be made, and reiterated time and again, that such a program jeopardizes American business and American living standards, I should like at this time to call the attention of the Senate to the views of one of the most important organizations of business and industry in my State, the Chamber of Commerce of Philadelphia. The Chamber of Commerce of Philadelphia contains in its membership a blue-ribbon roster of American industrial enterprise. For that reason, I think the views of that organization on the reciprocal trade agreements program are worthy of consideration.

So I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, copies of two letters sent by Clarence Tolan, Jr., former president of the Chamber of Commerce of Philadelphia. The first is addressed to the Honorable George C. Marshall, Secretary of State. In that letter, Mr. Tolan, on behalf of the chamber, describes as "an important contribution to international trade" the general agreements on tariffs and trade, signed at Geneva, October 30, 1947. The second letter, also addressed to Secretary Marshall, expresses the chamber's commendations of the work of the American delegates who helped to draft the Geneva charter for a proposed international trade organization.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
OF PHILADELPHIA,
November 21, 1947.

HON. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Chamber of Commerce of Philadelphia, in conformity with its previously established policy favoring the further development of international trade through reciprocal trade agreements, conveys to you its interest in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, signed at Geneva, October 30, 1947, and its opinion that the agreement is indeed an important contribution to international trade.

This organization believes the step to be taken on the part of the signatory nations to the agreement to counteract the spread of the various existing forms of restrictions to

world trade is, on the whole, a most constructive one.

It is, therefore, the desire of this chamber that the representatives of the United States Government who participated in the formulation of the agreement be commended for their contributions in this accomplishment.

Very truly yours,

CLARENCE TOLAN, Jr.,
President.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
OF PHILADELPHIA,
November 20, 1947.

Hon. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Chamber of Commerce of Philadelphia, through its World Trade Council, has followed with interest the efforts which have been made toward the creation of an International Trade Organization of the United Nations, which work has culminated in the Geneva Draft Charter for a proposed International Trade Organization.

The Chamber of Commerce of Philadelphia wholeheartedly endorses the purpose and objectives of the proposed organization, which aim at the attainment of increased production, consumption and exchange of goods, and the establishment of fair trade practices for the conduct of international commerce toward freeing trade channels and establishing principles of nondiscriminatory multilateral trading.

It is the express desire of this chamber, therefore, that the United States delegates who participated in the work which has produced the Geneva Draft Charter be commended for their contributions to the accomplishments realized, and the compliments of this chamber are more particularly addressed to former Under Secretary of State William L. Clayton, who so capably led the United States representation, and rendered such outstanding service at the discussions. The efforts of the delegates are considered to be especially praiseworthy in the face of the extreme difficulties which were encountered in the course of the negotiations.

The Chamber of Commerce of Philadelphia sincerely hopes that the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment convening at Havana, Cuba, tomorrow, will be a most successful one, and extends its best wishes in this regard to the United States delegates attending.

Very truly yours,

CLARENCE TOLAN, Jr.,
President.

INCREASE OF COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. BALDWIN. My distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] addressed the City Club at Cleveland, Ohio, a week ago last Saturday. According to press reports, the Senator from Ohio proposed an increase in the wages of Federal employees. He is quoted as saying:

> I think we ought to recognize that there is a new level in wages and prices and increase the pay of Federal employees correspondingly.

He further stated that he "thinks the minimum increase given to all people ought to be 60 percent over prewar," and that he is "inclined to think it should be even higher than that."

This statement is in conformity with what the Senator from Ohio has told the representatives of the letter carriers and other postal workers at Cleveland and Canton, Ohio, last week. On both occasions he announced that he believed "that there should be a permanent increase in the salary of postal employees; that the increase in no case should be less than that included in the Butler bill, namely, $585"; and that "it should be more than that amount."

The statements of the Senator from Ohio are in line with my own views on this vital subject. On January 7, I introduced S. 1949, a bill which proposes to grant all employees on a per annum basis in the field service of the Post Office Department an $800 increase in base pay. That measure was made the subject of extended study by the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 1949 was reported to the Senate on April 7, and it is presently awaiting action on the Senate Calendar.

On February 19, I told my colleagues in the Senate that I, personally, was convinced that postal workers were entitled to an increase in wages. My opinion remains unchanged. I continue to believe that the wage level of postal workers should be raised substantially. Moreover, the justice of the situation remains as obvious today as it did when I publicly made known my position in the matter several months ago.

Undoubtedly, there are those who will claim that any wage increase for postal workers at this time will add to the inflationary spiral in which we find the Nation today. I have faith and confidence in the democratic processes of our Republic. The people of our country have every right to demand that prices be stabilized. However, I am convinced that prices long ago surpassed postal wages. It is my considered opinion that postal employees have lagged far behind other workers in the compensation they receive.

Prior to the introduction of my bill, S. 1949, we made an exhaustive study of the postal pay structure. We found that a large number of the men applying for postal positions were veterans of World War II. My attention was called to the fact that the Post Office Department was experiencing difficulty in recruiting capable young men because of the low entrance salary of $2,100 per annum. Surely no one can blame the military veteran for not accepting appointment to the postal service at that low entrance salary. The passage of S. 1949 would alleviate this condition.

Therefore, I am in complete agreement with the recent statements of the Senator from Ohio concerning postal wages. The issue is clear. Congress has the power to solve the financial problem confronting postal workers.

S. 1949 is the only postal pay bill that has been reported to the Senate by the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. In the interest of maintaining an efficient postal system, manned by career employees, legislation granting a justifiable wage increase should be enacted. I also believe we should and must provide a wage increase for other Federal employees such as proposed in S. 1537, introduced by Senator FLANDERS and myself, and reported favorably by the Civil Service Committee.

SOUTHERN STATES COMPACT ON REGIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I renew my request for unanimous consent that the time remaining within the morning hour until 2 o'clock be utilized for the consideration of the unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 334) giving the consent of Congress to the compact on regional education entered into between the Southern States at Tallahassee, Fla., on February 8, 1948.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the Senator from New York, who was to be present today to present his amendment to the pending joint resolution, is unable to be present. In his absence I am representing him in presenting the amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I desire to speak for a short time in opposition to House Joint Resolution 334, and all the amendments that have been offered or that may be offered to this resolution. When the companion measure, Senate Joint Resolution 191, was first introduced in the Senate, I joined in its sponsorship chiefly because it designates Kentucky as one of the States which may become, through appropriate action of its legislature, a party to the compact, for which congressional approval is sought.

Later, after some reflection upon its implications, I requested that I be permitted to withdraw as a sponsor, and my request was agreed to by the Senate.

Upon the same day I stated in a general way to the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary which, under the able leadership of the distinguished chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], was conducting hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 191, my reason for withdrawal.

My reason was that I wanted to determine at least to my own satisfaction, that the resolution and the proposed compact were not in conflict with the decisions of the Supreme Court, which have thus far prescribed the steps that States must take to assure equality of educational opportunity under the fourteenth amendment, or that they do not violate the spirit of the constitutional guaranty of equal educational opportunity. Since that time I have given the matter some study and I have come to the conclusion that the resolution should not be approved and that all of the amendments which have been or may be offered should be rejected.

I should like to make it clear, however, that I do not believe that the arrangements proposed by the compact for the establishment of regional schools, violate in any way the letter of recent decisions of the Supreme Court, in the cases of *Missouri ex rel. Gaines* v. *Canada* (305 U. S. Repts. 337) and *Sipuel* v. *Board of Regents of the University of Oklahoma* (332 U. S. 631).

In the opinion rendered in the first case, decided in 1938, and delivered by Chief Justice Hughes, the Supreme Court held that if a State provides educational

facilities within the State for white students, it must provide equal facilities within the State for other students and that it cannot discharge or evade its responsibility, by providing facilities without the State or sending students to schools in other States. In the recent case of Sipuel against Oklahoma, the Court extended the decision of the Gaines case, by holding that equal educational opportunities must be furnished Negro students, as soon as they are provided white students. Without arguing the merits of the decision, it must be noted that in the Gaines case, which was cited in the Sipuel case, the Supreme Court of the United States held that a State could meet its obligation, under the fourteenth amendment, of providing equality of educational opportunity, by the establishment of separate schools for white and Negro students, if in fact, the facilities of the separate schools were equal. I do not now argue the rightness or wrongness of that position, but I submit that it is the law of the land today. It follows that the establishment of a regional school at Meharry Medical College, at Nashville, Tenn., or the establishment of any other regional school as proposed by the compact is legal. It follows also that the adoption of this compact could not relieve any State signatory to the compact of its constitutional duty to provide schools for Negro students within the State, if it provides similar schools for white students within the State. It follows also that the establishment of these schools could not take away from any Negro his constitutional right to require the State of his residence to provide for him suitable schools. I make these statements in answer to the suggestion that has been made that the approval of this compact by the Congress would in some way circumvent the decisions of the Court, and relieve the States of its obligation now fixed by law. In that respect I concur wholly with the position taken by my good friend the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. I know also that in addition to his reliance upon that constitutional position, his support of the pending measure flows from his humanitarian spirit and his great desire that educational opportunities of the best sort now available under the law should be provided for the students of Meharry Medical College. I concur in that desire, but I maintain that the States can enter this compact without approval of the Congress. Yet, though I am certain that the approval of this compact could not by any stretch of the imagination deprive any resident of any of the signatory States of any constitutional right now assured him by the courts of the land, I intend upon constitutional grounds to vote against the compact, and all amendments that have been offered or will be offered.

I oppose the approval of the compact itself in whatever form it may be finally submitted upon the ground that it is not a compact that requires approval by the Congress, and that to give it approval, meaningless as it would be in legal effect, would be a wrongful assumption by the States which propose this action and by the Congress itself, that the Congress has some jurisdiction in the field of local State tax supported education.

Article 1, section 10, clause 3 of the Constitution requires, in part, that—

> No State shall, without the consent of Congress * * * enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power.

In the case of *Virginia* v. *Tennessee* found in 148 U. S. 503, decided by the Supreme Court in 1892, concerning a compact for the determination of a boundary line between Tennessee and Virginia, it was stated that there were many matters upon which different States may agree that can in no respect concern the United States, or require the approval of Congress. In a very full discussion, the court established certain standards by which it could be determined if a particular compact required the approval of the Congress.

I believe that a careful study of the decisions will lead to the conclusion which I have reached, that a compact must have at least two elements before congressional approval is required. The first element is that the compact shall contemplate a legislative declaration by each single State which is a party to the compact, of the action which it undertakes and that its action is in consideration of similar legislative action by every other State in the compact. A reading of the proposed compact indicates that this first element is satisfied.

The second element which must appear in a compact before congressional approval is required, and which I think is lacking in this case, is that the action proposed will in some way encroach upon an exercise of Federal authority, sovereignty, or power.

So the question resolves itself into whether there is involved any proposed encroachment upon Federal power. I submit that a study of the situation can lead only to the conclusion that there is no encroachment upon Federal sovereignty in the establishment of regional schools.

I quote an excerpt found on page 518 of the opinion, in the case of Virginia against Tennessee, which is as follows:

> There are many matters upon which different States may agree that can in no respect concern the United States.

And also on the same page:

> If, then, the terms "compact" or "agreement" in the Constitution do not apply to every possible compact or agreement between one State and another, for the validity of which the consent of Congress must be obtained, to what compacts or agreements does the Constitution apply?

On the next page of the opinion, page 519, is the quotation:

> Looking at the clause in which the terms "compact" or "agreement" appear, it is evident that the prohibition is directed to the formation of any combination tending to the increase of political power in the States, which may encroach upon or interfere with the just supremacy of the United States.

Still further on, at page 520, the Court states:

> The legislative declaration will take the form of an agreement or compact when it recites some consideration for it from the other party affected by it, for example, as made upon a similar declaration of the border or contracting State. The mutual declarations may then be reasonably treated as made upon mutual considerations. The compact or agreement will then be within the prohibition of the Constitution or without it, according as the establishment of the boundary line may lead or not to the increase of the political power or influence of the States affected and thus encroach or not upon the full and free exercise of Federal authority.

In the case of *Wharton* v. *Wise* (153 U. S. 155) the Supreme Court held that an interstate compact did not require ratification where its execution could in no respect encroach upon or weaken the general authority of Congress.

If we are required and authorized to approve this compact, it could only be so upon the ground that the Federal Government has some power in the field of State tax-supported education, upon which this compact proposes to infringe. It is a position that I do not believe any State, and particularly any of the States which propose this compact, wants to say is a valid and legal position.

The Supreme Court of the United States has held uniformly that "the education of people in schools maintained by State taxation is a matter belonging to the respective States, and any interference on the part of Federal authority with the management of such schools cannot be justified except in the case of a clear and unmistakable disregard of rights secured by the supreme law of the land." I have quoted from *Cumming* v. *Richmond County Board of Education* (175 U. S. 528, 545).

In the case of *Gong Lum et al.* v. *Rice et al.* (275 U. S. 78, 85) Chief Justice Taft stated: "The right and power of the State to regulate the method of providing for the education of its youth at public expense is clear."

If education is the prerogative of the State, as the decisions of the Court have thus far established, then certainly there can be no doubt that any one of the States which are parties to this compact has the power, subject only to the limitation of its own constitution and laws, to establish or maintain regional schools; and if it has the basic and constitutional power, it is certain that the exercise of the power could not be such an increase of its political power or influence as to require Federal approval.

Further, if the Federal Government has no power, or duty, or responsibility to interfere in the management of State schools, it could not be contended that the establishment or maintenance of a regional school by the States is an interference with nonexistent Federal supremacy, authority, or power in the field of State education.

Mr. President, it is the failure of the second element, which requires that the compact shall result in an increase of State power or infringement of Federal power, which leads me to the conclusion that the compact now before us does not require congressional approval.

I was very much interested to hear the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], both able and

distinguished lawyers, say in their arguments last Thursday that the compact does not require congressional approval.

It has been suggested, however, that the signatory States are fearful of their authority to establish regional schools and make appropriations for their maintenance unless congressional approval is given.

In answer to this argument, I say that the basic question is still the same, "the State's power" to establish or support with other States a regional school, a power which must flow from its own constitution and laws, and not from the Federal Constitution. If its laws give it the power to spend the funds for such schools, it can do so without the approval of Congress. Congress cannot supply any deficiency of authority, cannot confer any authority, additional authority, or deny any authority to the States in this respect by either approving or refusing to approve this compact. As I have said before, congressional approval or refusal of this compact cannot nullify the constitutional rights of any Negro or white student in any of the States to equality of educational opportunity.

The only possible inconvenience that might attach to these States, through the failure of Congress to approve this compact would be a suit by a taxpayer of one of the States asserting that the States had no power to act without congressional approval. In the light of the decisions that I have cited respecting the elements of compacts, and the decisions which establish the power of the States to provide for the education of their people, I do not believe there is any doubt that it would be held by the courts that congressional approval is not required for this compact.

There appears in the printed records of the hearing a list of 112 compacts which have been approved by the Congress, apparently cited as precedents for the approval of this compact. I have not checked the text of the compacts named, but I have checked the subject matter of the compacts as stated in the record, and found that 66 of the compacts referred to rivers, 5 to cession of territory by one State to another, 1 to an international bridge with Canada, 18 to State boundary lines, and there were 22 others of varying subject matter. It should be noted that only six compacts relating to boundary lines have been approved since the rendition of the opinion in the case of Virginia against Tennessee.

It is obvious that the subject matter of rivers, cession of territory, or boundary lines, which could enlarge one State or eliminate a State, are matters in which Congress does have an interest

Mr. President, I now desire to discuss briefly the amendments which have been offered by the committee, by the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and by the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I intend to vote against all of the amendments, because the Congress has no power to act in any manner with respect to this compact. If we have no power to approve or deny the compact, we certainly have no right to amend.

If, in this case, we were appropriating funds or providing services of some character for Meharry College or other institutes to be established, I assume that we could undoubtedly prescribe conditions for the use of such funds.

Also, if the establishment or maintenance of such school was to any degree a Federal function, and Congress were, by this compact, ceding a part of its authority to the State, it could establish conditions for the cession of such authority. But such is not the case, and in the absence of these or similar factors, we cannot make the Federal Government a party to the compact by an attempted amendment. The adoption of such an amendment would only represent an attempted invasion of the powers of the State.

Further—and I wish to make it clear that I believe this very strongly—such amendments, even if we should adopt them, would be absolutely meaningless and without effect. I think it could be construed that they have been inserted for political reasons—and, in saying that, I do not imply that it is true, nor do I cast any aspersion upon any Senator.

The committee amendment providing "that the planning, establishment, acquisition, and operation of educational institutions be not in conflict with the Constitution of the United States under the said compact entered into February 8, 1948," could not prevent the compact from being unconstitutional if, in fact, it were, or if, in fact, it should later become unconstitutional. We cannot make this compact constitutional by saying it is constitutional if, in fact, it is unconstitutional.

Likewise, the amendment providing "that the consent of Congress to this compact shall not in any way be construed as an endorsement of segregation in education" has, to my mind, no meaning.

We can approve this compact only upon the assumption that it is necessary because the Federal Government has some kind of constitutional authority in the field of education. I deny again that we have any such authority, under present decisions of the Supreme Court, but if we have enough to require the ratification of the compact, we cannot deny the results of our action by saying we do not mean what we are doing.

Speaking now of the amendment offered by my friend the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I should like to say that there is no one in this body whose views upon human rights I hold in greater respect or admiration, because I know that they are sincere, consistent, and grow from an understanding of the philosophical and legal bases upon which human rights rest. He does not speak the superficial language that we hear so continually upon this subject. I hold an increasing regard for his views because he has deep respect and devotion to the legal and constitutional processes of our system, and knows that the guaranty and attainment of rights must be through these processes, and not in their disobedience, evasion, or destruction, or by force and power of this Government or of individuals.

While I agree with him often, I wholly disagree with him that the Congress should adopt the amendment which he proposes, either as a matter of law or as a matter of policy. Good and able lawyer that he is, I believe he must admit that the amendment, even if adopted, could in no way have any legal effect against the States.

If his amendment could have any legal effect against the States, then Congress would have the power to pass a law which would forever eliminate the maintenance of segregated schools in any State in this Union. If we could eliminate segregation in regional schools by amendment of this compact, we can simply pass a law eliminating segregation everywhere. This we cannot do.

I am sure the Senator must agree that the States, buttressed by the present holdings of the Court that the matter of local tax-supported education is their prerogative and is not a subject of interference by the Congress, could legally disregard the condition against segregation which his amendment prescribes.

Further, I do not believe we should adopt his amendment as a matter of policy, for I do not consider it a true statement of congressional policy, in view of other action Congress is continually taking.

The Senate recently passed a bill providing Federal aid to the States for education. It did have the right to prescribe conditions upon the use of Federal funds, yet we wrote into the bill, and I believe rightly, a definite provision that the Federal Government should not in any way interfere with the use of funds. We defeated every effort to prescribe conditions upon their use, even attaching a proviso that the Committee on Appropriations could not limit the use of the funds.

Congress appropriates money under the Smith-Hughes Act for the teaching of agriculture and home economics in separate schools, for school lunches in separate schools, to the Veterans' Administration for separate hospitals, to the armed services where they are separate units.

It appears to me that it is wholly inconsistent to attempt to lay down a statement of policy respecting the field of education in the Southern States when we know we have no power to act there, at a time when we have no policy and are stating no policy in Federal fields where we do have power to act in connection with appropriated funds. For that reason I shall not vote for this inconsistent amendment.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield for a question?

Mr. COOPER. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH. I understand from the Senator's argument that he is suggesting that this compact is perfectly legal. He is merely stating that the Federal Government has no part or parcel in it.

Mr. COOPER. I contend that the compact is absolutely legal under the present holdings of the Supreme Court, and I contend that there is absolutely no duty placed upon the Congress to approve or ratify the compact.

The issues which have been raised in this debate will undoubtedly be raised again during this session of Congress in connection with civil-rights bills. When these issues are raised, as far as I am concerned, I intend to vote for measures which either fall within the framework of the present decisions of the Supreme Court, or which reasonably can be interpreted to be within the meaning and spirit of the Constitution. I do not intend to vote for measures, however worthy their objectives may be, if they are clearly unconstitutional and clearly political.

I cannot think of anything worse than to delude and mislead with false hopes, by purely political bills, people who believe that they have a right to rely on our sincerity. The adjustments must be made constitutionally, either by amendment to the Constitution, by progressive interpretations of the courts, or by congressional legislation in fields in which Congress has the constitutional right to act.

Again I wish to call attention to the very able speech which the distinguished Senator from Oregon made Thursday last in which he pointed out the legal processes of our system, and expressed his hope that necessary adjustments could be made through those legal processes.

Again, because I am fearful that the Senator may misunderstand me in the comments I made a few moments ago about possible political implications, I wish to say that I in no wise referred to him or to any other Member of this body, but I am fearful my statements may be so construed. Therefore I again state my high regard for the sincerity of the junior Senator from Oregon, the junior Senator from New York and the senior Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, there are some people in this country who believe that if an objective is worthy, there arises the right, in those seeking to reach it, to evade the law of the land by indirection or by force. They overlook the fact that the determination of the value of an objective is, under our system, the function of all the people, expressed through their representatives and not the function of a few people or of the Government itself. There are some who believe that individual rights can be secured by the cession of a monopoly of power to the Federal Government, and there are certainly many such in the United States today, but it is a process which would ultimately lead here, as it has led in every other land which has adopted the control of its functions by the central state to the limitation of human rights and freedom.

Even though there are injustices, they must be resolved under the law, for the law is the protection of the rights of all the people, and the only certain protection of the rights of minorities.

I submit that the compact should not be approved, and that all of the amendments should be defeated upon the ground that they are not in accord with the Constitution and the law.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have not heard all of the able address of the Senator from Kentucky, but I have heard the last part of it. I want to inquire of the Senator whether the compact, if ratified, would impose any financial obligation whatsoever upon the Federal Government?

Mr. COOPER. I see nothing in the compact which would impose any financial obligation upon the Federal Government.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Whereas the Federal-aid-to-education bill did impose a large financial obligation on the Federal Government?

Mr. COOPER. Yes, if certain conditions were met by the States.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes. Had it been the policy of the Congress to deal with this subject, the subject of the amendment of the Senator from Oregon, then it might have been appropriate to the Federal-aid-to-education measure, because the Federal Government has a direct financial responsibility in carrying out the Federal-aid program. In connection with the pending legislation the Federal Government will have no financial obligation in the carrying out of the compact. Therefore, I very much agree with the Senator from Kentucky that certainly we should not undertake, in this legislation, to set up a policy of Federal interference when the Federal Government will have no further interest and no financial obligation. We did not declare that to be the policy of the Federal Government when we granted hundreds of millions of dollars of financial aid in the field of education to the several States. In fact, as we all know, the Federal-aid bill could not have been passed with an antisegregation provision in it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I desire to make it clear that in presenting the so-called Ives amendment to the pending joint resolution I am not implying that my support of the amendment means necessarily my support of the joint resolution itself. I have been very much impressed by the argument made by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the question in my mind all the way through has been whether any Federal Government approval was necessary in order that the compact might be legal. I feel, however, that if it should be the determination of the Senate that its approval is necessary, as the joint resolution provides, in that case I would want to see in the joint resolution the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York. It is because of that feeling that I am presenting the amendment for the Senator from New York at this time, and I will point out briefly to the Members of the Senate just what it implies.

I will read the amendment first, and then I shall point out that it acts virtually as a substitute for the provisions reported by the Committee on the Judiciary. The amendment provides:

> That the consent of Congress to this compact shall not in any way be construed as approving segregation in education: *Provided further*, That the planning, establishment, acquisition, and operation of educational institutions shall include uniform standards of education for all such institutions under the said compact entered into February 8, 1948—

That is the compact which is now before the Senate—

> and shall not be in conflict with the Constitution of the United States.

From reading the report of the committee, Mr. President, I feel certain that the last clause in the committee amendment providing that the operation of any educational institutions established under the compact shall not be in conflict with the Constitution of the United States was inserted apparently at the suggestion of the Attorney General of the United States as appears from the last paragraph of the Attorney General's letter addressed to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] which appears in the report of the committee.

Quoting from that letter, in support of the last sentence, the Attorney General says:

> While the enactment of this measure presents a question of legislative policy, it is suggested, nevertheless, that attention be given to any possibility of conflict between the laws of the States and the Constitution and laws of the United States. Accordingly it is recommended that the committee give consideration to the advisability of amending the joint resolution by adding at the end thereof, after a colon, the following: *"Provided*, That the planning, establishment, acquisition, and operation of educational institutions under the compact be not in conflict with the Constitution and laws of the United States." (See 33 U. S. C. 11 and 16 U. S. C. 552.)

So much for that point.

With regard to the earlier provisions in the Ives amendment, the Senator from New York feels that the word "approving" is a stronger word than "endorsement." The committee amendment reads—and I am now reading from page 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 191, which shows the committee amendment:

> That the consent of Congress to this compact shall not in any way be construed as an endorsement of segregation in education.

The Senator from New York suggests in his amendment "shall not in any way be construed as approving segregation in education."

That is a matter of words. He feels that "approving" is a much stronger word than "endorsement", and he suggests it for that reason.

His second proviso, however, is the important one. The language which I read requires that there shall be uniform standards. In talking with him on this subject I learned that he means by that language that whatever the standards may be for white pupils the same standards shall obtain in the schools for colored pupils. Therefore, the word "uniform" means equal treatment for

both whites and blacks in the educational institutions which may be approved under this compact.

I have discussed this question with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and I should like to ask him at this point whether he is willing to accept the so-called Ives amendment as I have read it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am willing to accept that amendment. However, I wish to make two observations with reference to it.

First, the committee which gave study to this matter has requested a committee amendment which, it is true, was addressed to the Senate joint resolution, but which is equally, I think, to be considered in connection with the House joint resolution which we are now considering.

A portion of a Senate committee amendment is appropriately covered by the amendment of the Senator from New York which has just been discussed by the Senator from New Jersey. The last part of it has not been included. I call attention to that fact because I certainly do not want in any way to preclude the consideration of the committee amendment, inasmuch as I have agreed to it.

The second point I should like to make is that if the amendment offered by the Senator from New York means what I think it means, it does not add anything to the law as it now exists; and, of course, I could not object to it, because it would be nugatory. I invite attention to the fact that the Supreme Court decisions have uniformly held that, along with any legal segregation in education which they have approved, there has also been the requirement of equal facilities—that equality should go with segregation. If what the second part of the amendment of the Senator from New York intends is to require that equal standards of education for institutions, whether for white students or for colored students, shall be required, I am, of course, glad to accept the amendment. If it has any meaning beyond that, I should like to have the Senator from New Jersey indicate whether such meaning is included. I have stated my interpretation of it.

Mr. SMITH. In the light of my discussion this morning with the Senator from Florida, I called the Senator from New York in Albany, where he is today, and he stated that his intention in this proviso was to make sure that uniform standards for whites and blacks should be maintained. He was quite insistent on the word "uniform"—the same facilities and the same opportunities.

Mr. HOLLAND. Equal opportunities.

Mr. SMITH. Equal opportunities. I do not wish to commit the Senator from New York by anything I may say; but my own judgment is that what he is thinking of is equal opportunities for whites and blacks in these schools; and if there should be different schools, the standards should be the same, without discrimination of any kind.

Mr. HOLLAND. If that is what is meant—and, frankly, that is what I thought was meant—I am glad to accept the amendment. I should like to have the view of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who has had so much to do with the hearings, and who has also offered, or will offer on behalf of his committee, the committee amendment.

Mr. SMITH. It is my purpose to ask the Senator from Wisconsin his attitude on this question, because I am trying to see whether we can have this amendment accepted without having a formal vote on it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Am I to understand that the words "uniform standards of education" would apply to all regional institutions?

Mr. SMITH. That is my understanding.

Mr. FERGUSON. So if there were two regional medical schools, one for white and one for colored, they would have to have the same uniform standards.

Mr. SMITH. I think that is the intention.

Mr. FERGUSON. Or if there were two colored schools, they would have to have uniform standards.

Mr. SMITH. That, I think, is the intention. I agree with the Senator from Florida, who raised this point with me this morning. I can see the possible difficulty. There might be, in two sections of the same area, two schools, which might not have quite the same standards; but if both maintained certain minimum standards, I assume that would meet the implication of this language. However, it would be difficult to make them precisely the same.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what is wrong with the word "uniform."

Mr. SMITH. I am inclined to agree with the Senator; but the Senator from New York felt that there was no other word which he could use which would more clearly state what he has in mind, so I am presenting in his behalf the amendment as he offered it.

Mr. FERGUSON. We speak of uniform standards. As between a dental school, a medical school, a law school, and an engineering school, we should have great difficulty in determining what was meant by "uniform standards."

Mr. SMITH. I believe that all the Senator from New York meant was uniformity as between the treatment of whites and blacks. I do not believe he was dealing with the issue which the Senator is raising. It would be a matter of legal interpretation as to what was meant, and what the legislative intent was, judging from our discussion.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Perhaps I could clear up this question by making the following statement:

It is certainly not the intention or the objective of the people of the Southern States to create or tolerate inferior institutions under this compact. We are striving for better facilities for all groups, and for any class of education in which we may engage. It was for that reason that I stated to the Senator this morning that I was perfectly willing to approve this amendment, provided it was understood as requiring equality of opportunity, on a high level, because that is what we are trying to get—better opportunity for our youth of both races.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I intend to move—and I now so move—that the committee amendment be substituted for the amendment which is pending, offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. I do not know a better time than now to say why I am doing so.

The discussion which took place on the floor a few moments ago between the distinguished Senator from Michigan and the distinguished Senator from New Jersey points up very effectively, I think, why the committee amendment should remain and the Ives amendment should be rejected.

Under the Ives amendment there is a question of interpretation of language. The comittee amendment says:

Provided further, That the planning, establishment, acquisition, and operation of educational institutions be not in conflict with the Constitution of the United States under the said compact entered into February 8, 1948.

The Constitution and the decisions of the courts are very clear. They are to the effect that there must be equality. When we try to say that there must be equality of standards, that is fine. If we mean that two medical schools, one white and one black, shall have equality of standards, we are right. In other words, neither the whites nor the blacks are entitled to higher standards than the other.

But that is not exactly what is said here. While this discussion might be used in the courts to determine the meaning of the language, the language of the committee amendment, which was approved, as I recall, by colored lawyers, professors, and others from Howard University, is very clear. We also submitted it to the Attorney General, I believe. It definitely provides that if and when these institutions are in operation, they must be operated under the laws of the land, the Constitution, and the decisions of the courts.

I see no reason for writing in this conflicting language:

Provided further, That the planning, establishment, acquisition, and operation of educational institutions—

That language is ours, and it is also that of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]—

shall include uniform standards of education for all such institutions under the said compact. * * *

Who is to fix those standards? In the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], to which I shall speak later on, an attempt is made to say that they shall be "the minimum standards required for approved rating by the standard accrediting agencies of higher education in the United States."

Mr. President, if ever there was a time when the camel's nose was under the tent, it is in connection with the Morse amendment. Not only does that

amendment put the camel's nose under the tent, but it puts the camel's entire anatomy under it. Certainly, as was so eloquently stated today by the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], that is none of our business. Education is a local matter. When we attempt as a Federal Government to take over that function, we are following the same course of history which made possible a Hitler and a Mussolini. Of course, I expect to quote what distinguished Senators such as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] have said on the subject. But it seems to me that in relation to the amendment we are now discussing, there is no need to bring in that confusion.

In both amendments, the language is substantially the same until we reach the words "shall include uniform standards of education." In that connection it is now proposed that the Federal Government shall try to tell the States what they must do in relation to education. Mr. President, the appropriate authority to tell that to the States is the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court has said there must be equality. When we in the Congress try to fix such standards, we bring into the picture a confusing situation and go away beyond what we should do in this instance.

I know that Senators will be accused of not having proper sympathy and not seeing with wide open eyes the highway of the future. But in my brief lifetime I have seen the national government of other nations take over everything, including education, with the result that liberty went out the window and human rights disappeared.

We have a pretty good system in our own country, Mr. President. It is a system of checks and balances, not only as a result of constitutional provisions for a tripartite form of government, but also because of the balanced set up which is provided as between the Federal Government and the State governments. It is very important that we keep that system intact; in fact, it is more important than some people may think, simply because in this instance some persons may feel that the door is not wide open for a forward march to progress, we should not break down the house.

I am happy to see that the distinguished Senator from Kentucky is present. I have moved the substitution of the committee amendment, in place of the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment which the Senator from Wisconsin offers as a substitute for the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, in line 11, after the word "America", it is proposed to strike out the period and insert a comma and the following: *"Provided,* That the consent of Congress to this compact shall not in any way be construed as an endorsement of segregation in education: *Provided further,* That the planning, establishment, acquisition, and operation of educational institutions be not in conflict with the Constitution of the United States under the said compact entered into February 8, 1948."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement in relation to this amendment.

As I stated the other day, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] and I held hearings on this subject. I suppose there is no Member of the Senate who has greater sympathy——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to understand the parliamentary situation. Is the Senator from Wisconsin speaking in the time of the Senator from New Jersey or in his own time?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized in his own right.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was saying that this particular amendment has received the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], than whom I think there is no Member of the Senate who is considered to be more liberal in the proper sense, or who is more concerned with the rights of the individual, the rights of the colored people, and, let me also say, the Constitution of the United States and the continuity of our Republic.

He and I listened to the testimony which was presented before our subcommittee. Because there was the fear, which has been expressed here, that this action on the part of the legislative branch of the Government would be interpreted as a ratification of segregation as practised in the Southern States, under the constitutions of those States, we proposed writing this amendment into the resolution:

Provided, That the consent of Congress to this compact shall not in any way be construed as an endorsement of segregation in education:

And then we wrote, further, in order that there could be no question—and this is simply a declaration that we believe in the Constitution of the United States and the rights of the people of this Republic under the Constitution—

Provided further, That the planning, establishment, acquisition, and operation of educational institutions be not in conflict with the Constitution of the United States under the said compact entered into February 8, 1948.

Mr. President, in plain language that simply restates what is obvious to everyone. The language itself is unnecessary. The Constitution of the United States is intact without any declaration by the Congress, thank God, and so are the decisions of the Supreme Court interpreting the Constitution. But in order that we might still the fears which had been engendered, we wrote that language into this amendment. Yet the fears are not stilled. I wish I could show the Senate the telegrams which have come to me from my own State, even since last Friday. Many of the persons sending the telegrams apparently have been told that the Senator from Wisconsin and other Senators are in favor of segregation, and so forth, as practiced under the constitutions of Southern States, and they have cited the Morse amendment as the cure-all.

It is a great system under which we live. In the case of oleomargarine, under the direction of a group of supersalesmen in New York, hired by the oleomargarine interests, consumers have been sold the proposition that they are being deprived of a great right by reason of the present law. I say to my friends from the South, the proposition under discussion is now being sold on the theory that the constitutional rights of the American people, and particularly of the colored people, are being taken away by this compact. The same sort of smart, deceptive propaganda is being disseminated. The sole question present is whether we are mice or men, whether we shall be suckers or statesman, whether we shall stand by our convictions or fall by the wayside. I am not in favor of segregation, but in discussing the amendment, I am talking about my obligation as a Senator of the United States, and as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, with which position I have been honored, and in which I have served for a year and 5 months. We are supposed to be judges of the law. We are not supposed to let emotionalism and a deluge of propaganda affect our balance.

I turn now to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], which I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 2, line 7, strike out "America," and insert "America: *Provided,* That the consent of Congress to this compact shall not in any way be construed as approving segregation in education: *Provided further,* That the planning, establishment, acquisition, and operation of educational institutions shall include uniform standards of education for all such institutions under the said compact entered into February 8, 1948, and shall not be in conflict with the Constitution of the United States."

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I also wish to discuss in connection with the pending legislation the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], which I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 2, line 7, after "America", insert the following: *Provided,* That any regional school established under this compact shall not apply to any student registration qualification based upon a discrimination because of race, color, or creed: *Provided further,* That any regional school established under this compact shall maintain standards of education which comply with the minimum standards required for approved rating by the standard accrediting agencies of higher education in the United States."

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, after hearing the remarkable argument made

by my good friend, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], an argument that I must say was as fine as I have heard in the Senate for a good many moons, I feel that there must be a general statement of the whole subject by myself. The other day I placed in the RECORD certain letters from Meharry College students and prospective students, and before we conclude the debate I shall place in the RECORD a good many more. But now I want to discuss first the question suggested by my good friend from Kentucky, when he said there was no need of approval of the compact by the Congress. We gave that point some consideration, though probably not so much as it should have received because of the pressure of work in the Judiciary Committee. I may say that I took over the hearing, as I recall, after the joint resolution had been referred to another Senator, who was unable to attend to give it his attention. I reached the conclusion that it was merely common sense—I am glad to say I think I can sustain it by judicial authority—that a compact of this kind should have the approval of the Congress of the United States. Sixteen sovereign States desire to enter an entirely new field, the field of education. What does that entail? First, it entails the creation of an organization, a legal entity consisting of representatives of the different States, in the nature of a board of directors or a trusteeship. When that organization is perfected, this group of States proposes to do certain things they have never done before. They must raise taxes, to be paid to an outside interstate organization. That organization must hire teachers, erect buildings, and—note this—acquire land in another State. We were informed that some of the best lawyers in the Southland had reached the conclusion that it was necessary, not merely appropriate—there is a distinction between what is appropriate and what is necessary—to obtain approval by the Congress of this interstate compact.

My good friend from Kentucky has quoted from the case of Virginia versus Tennessee. That was a case involving a boundary line, the determination of the ownership of land on either side of the line. In the present case, States are purchasing land in another State. The organization proposed to be created under the compact is to take title and to supervise the whole great business of education. Let me quote from the case of *Virginia* v. *Tennessee* (148 U. S. Reports). I quote first from page 518:

> There are many matters upon which different States may agree that can in no respect concern the United States. If, for instance, Virginia should come into possession and ownership of a small parcel of land in New York—

There, Mr. President, one State was acquiring a little parcel of land in New York—

> which the latter State might desire to acquire as a site for a public building, it would hardly be deemed essential for the latter State to obtain the consent of Congress before it could make a valid agreement with Virginia for the purchase of the land.

Turning to page 519, because that statement would appear to be against my contention, the language on the lower part of the page is as follows:

> And treaties of confederation, in which the parties are leagued for mutual government, political cooperation, and the exercise of political sovereignty, and treaties of cession of sovereignty, or conferring internal political jurisdiction, or external political dependence, or general commercial privileges.

In that language, they were talking about the term "treaties." I continue the quotation:

> And that latter clause "compacts and agreements," might then very properly apply to such as regarded what might be deemed mere private rights of sovereignty; such as questions of boundary, interests in land situate in the territory of each other; and other internal regulations for the mutual comfort and convenience of States bordering on each other.

That is very important language. But the Court adds:

> In such cases the consent of Congress may be properly required, in order to check any infringement of the rights of the National Government; and, at the same time, a total prohibition to enter into any compact or agreement might be attended with permament inconvenience or public mischief.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Before the Senator leaves that case and that point in his very able argument, with which I want to associate myself, I should like to call attention, if I may, to the fact that whereas that decision has to do only with States bordering upon each other, under the particular compact which we are discussing there is a situation presented in which it is not at all sure that the States will be contiguous, 15 States are included, but the compact may become enforceable when as many as 6 States have, through their legislatures, approved the compact. I call to the attention of the distinguished Senator the fact that it is quite possible that, for instance, my State of Florida might approve the compact, and the States of Alabama and Georgia, which are the only two States contiguous to the State of Florida, might disapprove it, and we might be asked to work jointly with the State of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] when there are several intervening States. It seems to me that that very fact might tend to throw this particular compact into a field which has not been submitted to the Supreme Court of the United States and which would call for a new decision as to what our Constitution means in that regard. I wondered if the distinguished Senator had given thought to that particular possibility?

Mr. WILEY. If I correctly understand the question, I feel that the situation is entirely different. The language of the decision which I think has particular application is language which some of my friends might call social advance. The Court said:

> And other internal regulations for the mutual comfort and convenience of States.

The mere fact that they are bordering on each other would make it all the stronger for States which enter into the compact for mutual comfort and advantage. Certainly there is nothing more important to a group of States or to one State than the quality and character of its education, the improvement of its educational system, and seeing to it that the right kind of ideas get into the minds of its citizens.

So I feel that while the language may be considered as obiter dictum in this particular case, it is only because it attempts to interpret the language of the Constitution which provides that no State shall, without the consent of Congress, enter into any agreement or compact with another State. That is the provision of article I, section 10, of the Constitution.

A great many matters have been suggested by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] which have been settled by compact. What are some of them? Boundary cases, jurisdiction as to rivers, electric power, irrigation, navigation, penal jurisdiction, uniformity, interstate accounting, conservation of natural resources, utility regulation, and taxation.

Mr. President, as I have stated, we have in this particular instance, on the first point which I am arguing, evidence that very distinguished southern lawyers have reached the conclusion that it was not only advisable but necessary to secure the approval of the Federal Government to this compact. There was testimony of southern governors and, as I recall, testimony of attorneys general. We reached the conclusion that when 16 States, sovereign in their rights, come to the parent State and ask for ratification of a compact such as this, they are entitled to serious consideration. They were given that serious consideration. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] and I reported favorably to the committee, and the committee reported the joint resolution to the Senate, with the amendment which is now pending. On the floor of the Senate, on motion of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the House bill was substituted for the Senate bill. That is the situation at the present time.

I feel that it is my duty to oppose the amendments which have been offered, with the exception of the one which I have offered, but not because I favor segregation. I want to make that clear. I do not favor segregation. I was born and raised in the North and I know nothing about that problem. It is only fair to say that many persons from the North who have gone South and seen the social conditions there have become favorable to segregation. I was recently in Missouri speaking before the bar association there. I understand that the Constitution of the State of Missouri provides for segregation. I understand it is quite an issue, but the constitution of the State provides for it. As I shall indicate, that policy is a policy for the States. Let us keep that in mind.

I wish to quote a former President of the United States who was afterward Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court—Mr. Taft. The case from which I shall quote is a leading case, which follows a number of cases which were decided in the Northeastern States.

The resolution which is before the Senate gives the approval of the Congress to the regional interstate compact entered into at Tallahassee, Fla., between the Southern States. In my judgment, the Congress should consent to the compact, on which the House has already taken action. I think some proceed on the assumption that when the House takes action, that is a reason why the Senate should disregard it. I do not proceed on that assumption, but on the assumption that when one House of the Congress takes action, the presumption is that its action is valid until proved to the contrary. But in spite of that presumption, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH] and I held hearings and reached our conclusion. Taking my stand for the compact as reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, and against the amendments, I want it clearly understood that I in no way believe in the abridgement of the civil rights or educational opportunities of any American citizen. I believe that my record through 9 years as a Member of the Senate indicates my complete opposition to racial and religious segregation, and to any other abridgement of civil rights.

However, we are not confronted with that problem, but rather with a straight legal and constitutional question on the issue before us. No one should befog the issue, therefore, by introducing an irrelevant concept, as has been done, unfortunately, many times in the past. I only wish that I could quote the dynamic language of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], who stressed the point I have just made. We are discussing fundamental rights, and if there is anything fundamental in the world today it is rights under the Constitution of the United States.

The specific issue is—and this question arises under the Morse amendment—can the Congress impose the nonsegregation and other conditions set forth in the Morse amendment? As I see it, the answer is that Congress cannot impose such conditions because to do so would be to transgress a constitutional limitation on the Federal Government, the limitation which prevents the Federal Government from imposing conditions in a field in which the State governments have complete jurisdiction, the field of education. There is no constitutional basis whatever for the Federal Government imposing its judgment in the field of education, a field in which States have complete control, and it would in fact transgress State constitutional provisions of 16 Southern States.

I know it is difficult for some to understand, but it is very plain that the telegrams coming in indicate that there is no thinking on that subject. But if someone should transgress the State rights of people in the States of the senders of these messages, we can imagine what would happen.

I repeat, we should know that 16 States actually have provisions within their State constitutions establishing educational segregation, and there is no legal basis for the Congress of the United States altering those State constitutional provisions.

A few days ago I voted for the bill providing for Federal aid to education, stating that the bill would establish State and local control and would not establish Federal control. Now we are presented with a related issue: Can the Federal Government impose its contemplated control in the field of education? In a case like the one before us, when there is an interstate compact, my answer is "No." Much as I dislike segregation, I must take this position, based upon the strict United States constitutional limitations in this field.

In giving its consent to compacts between States, Congress may impose conditions "normally where governmental consent is essential. The consent may be granted upon terms appropriate to the subject and transgressing no constitutional limitation." That is the language of Justice Hughes in a case reported in Three Hundred and Second United States Reports, page 148.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] suggests the following amendment as a condition to the approval of the compact entered into between the States:

> That any regional school established under this compact shall not apply to any student registration qualification based upon a discrimination because of race, color, or creed: *Provided further,* That any regional school established under this compact shall maintain standards of education which comply with the minimum standards required for approved rating by the standard accrediting agencies of higher education in the United States.

Mr. President, I call attention to the following language:

> The right and power of the State to regulate the method of providing for the education of its youth at public expense has long been conceded.

That is from *Cumming* v. *Richmond County Board of Education* (175 U. S. 528, 545).

Mr. President, that is a leading case on the meaning of the fourteenth amendment where the court held that the benefit and burdens of public taxation must be shared by citizens without discrimination against any class on account of their race, and the Court held further that—

> the education of the people in schools maintained by State taxation is a matter belonging to the respective States and any interference on the part of the Federal authority with the management of such schools cannot be justified except in the case of a clear and unmistakable disregard of rights secured by the supreme law of the land.

In that case the Court held that equal protection of the laws was not denied a Chinese citizen of the United States when he was classed among the colored races, the Court saying:

> We think after full consideration that this is the same question which has been many times decided to be within the constitutional power of the State legislature to settle without intervention of the Federal courts under the Federal Constitution.

Mr. President, Chief Justice Taft wrote the decision in *Gonglum* v. *Rice* (275 U. S. 78) and he quoted the language in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* (163 U. S. 537), as follows:

> The most common instance of this is connected with the establishment of separate schools for white and colored children which has been held to be a valid exercise of the legislative power even by courts of States where the political rights of the colored race have been longest and most earnestly enforced.

The compact in question, I believe, is an appropriate one for action by Congress, because in the first place it contemplates joint action by a number of the States to build and construct educational institutions that would serve the several contracting States. This would necessitate the States creating a board of trustees, which board, as the agent of the several States, would operate the institution, take title to property, hire teachers, and provide the things necessary in the operation of an institution of higher learning. It would require the appropriation of money by the various States to be paid to this interstate trustee board for the operation of an interstate educational institution.

It has been argued that it is not necessary to have the approval of the Federal Government for this. I, personally, believe that such a set-up is well within the meaning of the constitutional phrase "agreement or compact with another State."

Now we come to the question of whether or not this is the sort of a condition the Federal Government could or should attempt to impose. We have already reached the conclusion that, under the decisions, the separation of colored and white students in schools it is no abridgment of rights under the fourteenth amendment, if equality is afforded, because as all the cases show, the decision is within the discretion of the State. In the present instance the States that want to enter into the compact have their constitutional provisions, and the distinguished Senator from Oregon would have the Congress of the United States say to these States, "You must change the provisions of your constitutions in a field that the Supreme Court has held is within the province of the State," referring to the regulations of their schools. I refer to doing away with segregation.

The second condition that is sought to be imposed is that the regional schools provided for in the compact shall maintain standards of education required for approved rating by the standard accrediting agencies of higher education in the United States.

Mr. President, anyone reading this simple, unobtrusive language, would say, "Why that is perfectly all right"; but let us see what it would do. Can the Federal Government say to the States, "You have got to have certain educational standards which we shall prescribe in your public schools"? That is what is said here. If this can be done it will mean not only that the camel's nose will come under the tent, but the whole camel will creep into the tent.

Compulsory education laws have been held as a proper exercise of the police power of the State and child labor

laws are proper exercises of the police power for the protection of our young human resources.

The States have a general police power to protect any social interests whereas the Federal Government has the police power only in connection with the express or implied powers given to it.

Where is there an express or implied power in the Federal Government that would require the action of the States here to yield?

I understood the distinguished Senator from Kentucky to contend likewise. He is going to vote against the amendments; and I presume he is going to do so on the ground there is no power in the Federal Government to impose this condition.

Mr. President, education is a subject concerning which a great deal can be said. When I hear some of my distinguished associates talk on the subject, I often feel that they have forgotten what Henry Adams said:

> The chief wonder of education is that it does not ruin everybody concerned in it, teachers and taught.

I wonder if we have not overemphasized the superficial in education. I wonder if we have not given the impression that education simply consists in going to some large built-up structure—a mass of brick and mortar and steel—and believe that education results therefrom.

Bobby Burns said:

> Give me a spark of nature's fire. That is the learning I desire.

I am not the first one to sense our misconception of what constitutes education. Emerson had much to say on the subject. This gives me an opportunity to say a few words of my own in relation to the misconception some have regarding what constitutes education. Following is what Emerson had to say about the matter:

> We are students of words. We are shut up in schools and colleges and recitation rooms for 10 or 15 years and come out at last with a bag of wind, a memory of words, and do not know a thing.
>
> In alluding just now to our system of education, I spoke of the deadness of its details. It is a system of despair.

Mr. President, we have forgotten to a large extent that only those who are truly educated are free men. Lincoln was of that type and he never saw the inside of a school. Education surely is as Aristotle has said:

> An ornament in prosperity and a refuge in adversity.

No greater Americans have come out of our soil than George Washington Carver and Booker T. Washington. Their contribution to the Southland is such that dollars cannot measure it. But if we read their philosophy, Mr. President, as I have read it, we find that they realized that education consisted of something greatly different than simply quarreling about segregation.

Education surely is, as Aristotle said, "an ornament in prosperity and a refuge in adversity."

That is because a man has learned to think, using the angel thoughts that true education brings to him. In other words, Mr. President, no man is really educated by simply going to a school. Man only becomes educated by self-education. That does not mean that he simply becomes learned in books but that he learns how to think, how to act with others, and how to use what he knows of the good and the true and the worth while.

Surely true education makes the man, makes him so that his character shines through his deeds; it makes for intelligence and freedom of thought, for that kind of true balance and judgment that gives man the chief tool for real enjoyment.

Lincoln had the idea when he said:

> I desire to see the time when education, and by its means, morality, sobriety, enterprise, and industry shall become much more general than at present.

And Jefferson said:

> Enlighten the people generally and tyranny and oppression of both mind and body will vanish like evil spirits at the dawn of day.

It will be noticed, Mr. President, that these two great leaders, Lincoln and Jefferson, spoke of education as bringing to men enlightenment, morality, enterprise, sobriety, and industry. Nothing was said by them about segregation. Nothing was said by them about quarreling as to someone else having a little more than others have. When our institutions bring forth this fruit, then indeed do we know they are engaging in the educational profession.

Mr. President, I asked a learned lawyer in the Congressional Library Saturday afternoon the question: "Can Congress impose the conditions as suggested in the proposed legislation?" Meanwhile I had reached the conclusion which I have submitted in my little brief. This, Mr. President, is in substance what the distinguished lawyer to whom I spoke said:

> The clause under which the consent of Congress is necessary to interstate compacts is article I, section 10, clause 3:
>
> "No State shall, without the consent of Congress, * * * enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power."
>
> As an agreement or compact with another State, of a political character, might be in conflict with the agreement and compact of the Union; it was a wise policy, therefore, which prohibited any such action by two States without the consent of the Congress.

It will be noticed that he used the words, "a political character."

> But, the words of this clause, like the other words of the Constitution, are to be taken in their natural and obvious sense and not in a sense unreasonably restricted or enlarged.
>
> Further, the words of this clause do not specifically, nor even by implication, grant any power to Congress to write or to revise compacts between the States; they do one thing and one thing only, and that is they grant the power to consent and by necessary implication to refuse to consent.
>
> Under our Constitution conferring specific powers, a particular power must be granted or it cannot be exercised. (*United States* v. *Fisher* (2 Cranch, 358).)
>
> While there have been over a hundred compacts consented to, and while there have been numerous variations in the forms of the consents, it would appear from a quick check that none has attempted to write or to revise the contexts of the compacts. A conditional assent, as here proposed, would appear to be no assent at all, for it imposes and in effect writes into the compacts conditions absolutely contrary to the intent and underlying philosophy of the parties to the agreement—

Then I have written in the language of Judge Hughes—

> and transgresses congressional limitations.

I continue to read from the memorandum:

> It is true that where the Constitution delegates power to Congress to act, that body in the exercise of its power can by legislation override or supersede State law. See *Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Co.* v. *Hefley* ((1895) 158 U. S. 98); *International Shoe Co.* v. *Pinkus* ((1929) 278 U. S. 261). But as before noted the Federal Government is one of delegated powers only, and under the tenth amendment can claim no powers which are not granted either expressly or by implication in the Constitution. See also *The Collector* v. *Day* ((1871) 78 U. S. 125). Moreover, the sovereign powers vested in the State governments by their respective constitutions remain unaltered and unimpaired, except so far as they were granted to the Government of the United States under the Constitution. And in *Wight* v. *Police Jury* (C. C. A., 5th, 1919, 264 Fed. 705), the court declared: "Except as limited by the Constitution of the United States and the laws made in response thereto, it is within the power of the State to determine the rights to be recognized or conferred by the State constitution and to determine how and when and under what circumstances these rights may be asserted."
>
> Accordingly, the Federal Government has no authority to impose conditions or restrictions contrary to State law or State constitutional provisions unless such action is taken by virtue of some power delegated by the Constitution. In this case, the only power under which Congress assumes to act is that conferred by article I, section 10, clause 3, to assent or dissent with regard to State compacts. As already pointed out, this power is not the power to make the agreement but rather the final power to agree or disagree to one entered into by States acting in their sovereign capacities. Consequently, in this view, Congress has no authority to impose, as a part of the agreement, provisions not sanctioned by the constitutions of the States involved and not assented to by them.
>
> But even assuming the above conclusion is not well taken, it must be conceded that except as limited by the Constitution and laws properly enacted thereunder, the States, as sovereigns, have the power to determine by their constitutions what rights are conferred and recognized. *Wight* v. *Police Jury*, supra; the *Collector* v. *Day*, supra. The United States Supreme Court has acknowledged that segregation, if completely equal facilities are furnished, is a valid policy which a State constitutionally may pursue. *Missouri ex rel Gaines* v. *Canada* ((1938) 305 U. S. 337); *Sipuel* v. *Board of Regents* ((1948) 16 L. W. 4090). It follows, therefore, that Congress cannot constitutionally impose any restrictions contrary to State segregation policies, as expressed in State constitutions, which are undeniably within the power of the States to adopt.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have been listening to the address of the Senator from Wisconsin, and find it most interesting and learned. Now that the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution has been

adopted, which in effect confers suffrage on women, and in view of the general equality of rights which women have and the responsibilities which they largely have as taxpayers, I am wondering if there are any cases which touch the right of women to enter schools supported by the State which are open only to males, unless equal facilities are provided for the education of the females of that State.

Mr. WILEY. I must say that I shall have to plead ignorance. As the Senator knows, we have been so pressed in the Judiciary Committee that we put in only about 80 hours a week. This particular subject came to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH] and me, and we tried to do the best we could on the issues as we saw them.

I have no such case in mind, but I shall be glad to look into that point within the next day or two. I am sure that this argument will continue, because the parties concerned are very vitally interested. I understand that many amendments will be suggested, including some of the equal rights amendments and other amendments which will raise some very fine constitutional points, with respect to which the distinguished Senator from Maryland will be invited to contribute his assistance and learning.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have not made any research into these questions; but listening to the Senator, it seemed to me that a certain amount of logic would flow from the previous decisions of the Supreme Court and the legal philosophy which the Senator from Wisconsin quoted. If it were held that there could be no segregation in education, in State institutions, by the same token, a State would be held liable to create facilities for women equal to those provided for men, because in this day women are going into medicine, law, engineering, aviation, and almost every other field in which men have engaged. Why should not women, under the nineteenth amendment, be permitted to say, "There is no coeducational institution in the State of X at which law is taught. There is no separate female institution in that State teaching law. Therefore I have the right to go to the male institution and make it coeducational, unless you can give me equal facilities within my State. I have as much right to do so as if my color were different." It seems to me that the logic of the proposition is inescapable. As I was sitting here the thought occurred to me, and I suggest it to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I have no particular case in mind. I think the logic of the distinguished Senator is sound. I know of no reason why the fourteenth amendment, so far as the State is concerned, should not be applied just as he has applied it. I assume that the Senator is speaking of a woman of the same color. If men are given a certain opportunity and women are not, with the extension of our concepts in relation to the rights of women, I can see no reason why a woman in a State who pays taxes, or who does not pay taxes, could not demand to be treated on the same basis, with equal facilities under the fourteenth amendment.

Mr. President, I have discussed rather hurriedly, and perhaps not very logically, the issues in this debate as I see them.

There is one further issue which might well be mentioned again, and that is Meharry College. There sits in the gallery one of the distinguished colored gentlemen from Meharry College. There sits in the gallery the President of Meharry College. There are 600 or 700 colored students in that institution. The other day I mentioned that I had received letters from as far away as Africa. Today I received another such letter. It came from Lagos, Nigeria, and the name of the writer is Oluwole Olumuyiwa. The letter is written in very fine English. He says:

LAGOS, NIGERIA, *March 5, 1948.*

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I have received a very sympathetic letter from my sincere friend Mr. D. T. Rolfe, executive secretary of Meharry Alumni Association. I was extremely sorry to read about the serious financial plight in which Meharry is at present.

The tone of the letter reflects the sincere desire of Meharry to give me a study opportunity, but regrets the inability to guarantee my acceptance until after she has received financial aid from the Southern Regional Council for Education. I read further that the sanction of the Congress for the compact is needed to make this financial support a reality. In the Senate, the sanction of the compact is to be obtained by passage of Senate Joint Resolution 191.

I have been advised in my own interest to write to you. As a strong believer in self-help, I cheerfully take up my pen with the full confidence that you will not withhold from me all possible aid.

Long have I been dreaming and hoping to qualify someday as a doctor. It was a radical desire. I have always been fired by the ambition to help suffering humanity in general and particularly the Negro race. My country is in dire need of improved medical services and more qualified doctors. I have a call. I cannot stand akimbo to bemoan the fate of thousands of Negroes pining away to death. I am concerned with the help of my people. This is the best way I can serve my conscience.

Meharry has to her credit a number of helps she has rendered to students, either as scholarships, grants, or loans. She has expressed the willingness to absorb me, too, provided she is helped to tide over her present financial crisis. You will no doubt be prepared to help her at her hour of need, especially when it is remembered that she has helped, and is still prepared to help, a number of capable but financially weak students. One good turn surely deserves another.

In the name of all that is good and noble I earnestly implore that she should be granted all the financial aid she deserves. Who fails to appreciate fully the good work she has done, is doing, and will continue to do? Who fails to realize that through the products of her college millions of valuable lives have been saved? Does such an institution deserve to have its doors closed because of temporary financial handicaps? Surely Meharry deserves all aid, especially when it is remembered that she is both an educational and humanitarian enterprise, and not a money-making or commercial concern.

It is only one stroke of your pen that determines the fate of this beloved institution and mine, indirectly. Were I to be given even a chance at Meharry, believe me, sir, I will be the happiest man alive. If on the other hand I am denied all the help and encouragement to make me realize my ambition, I will be reduced to a miserable specimen of humanity, and life to me will be a mere state of existence. God forbid this, I pray. Therefore, Senator WILEY, please help a needy educational institution, and a needy, ambitious young friend.

Very sincerely yours,

OLUWOLE OLUMUYIWA.

Mr. President, if Members of the Senate could see the large number of letters I have received from such persons, they probably would understand why I am rather sensitive to the need of this institution.

When we realize that a large proportion of the colored doctors and dentists come from the North, it is obvious that we of the North have a stake in Meharry Medical College. When we realize that we who brag about the lack of segregation in our States do not actually practice what we preach—for we permit only one or two Negroes to enter our medical schools, and the record regarding that situation is clear—then we begin to realize the important place occupied by Meharry Medical College and the important work it is doing.

Mr. President, it is about time that we recognize that the answer to the question whether this institution shall die or live depends on whether we approve this compact. More and more persons are beginning to realize that institutions such as the one my good friend the Senator from Michigan attended have only a few Negro students enrolled. I myself spent 2 years at the University of Michigan. That university has only 18 colored students enrolled at its medical school, and that is said to constitute nonsegregation, even though the University of Michigan has a total enrollment of between 20,000 and 30,000 students at the present time. Wayne Medical School has only 8 Negro students. The University of Pennsylvania has only one Negro medical student. The University of Iowa has only one medical student. The University of Kansas has only one Negro medical student. Rochester Medical School has only two Negro students. The University of California has only three Negro medical students and the University of Washington has only three Negro medical students.

If Meharry Medical College is closed, 700 Negroes, our brothers, will be without educational facilities, without opportunity to get a medical or dental education. Half of them are learning to be dentists or doctors, and are preparing to serve their people in that way. Yet it is proposed that that medical college be permitted to close. Why would that be permitted? It would be permitted because there has been injected into this picture the idea this compact would perpetuate segregation. Mr. President, that kind of argument is specious, to my mind. We must realize that the Supreme Court of the United States has definitely ruled that segregation is constitutional, and it is provided for by 16 States. Yet, because certain Senators cannot have their own way about opening up all the institutions of the South to the whites and the blacks indiscriminately, they wish to destroy the institution which takes care of 700 of our colored brethren in their efforts to qualify as doctors or dentists.

Mr. President, as I have stated, this point has struck rather deeply with me. I

have before me, on my desk, a large number of letters which have been written by our colored brothers. The one on top is dated April 22, 1948. I shall read only a part of the letter. It comes to me from E. B. Glenn, of 4609 Clay Street NE., Washington, D. C.:

It is a known fact that heretofore only two medical colleges have contributed 99 percent of the Negro physicians of this country: Meharry contributing 52 percent of the total. It is also a fact that at present the death rate among Negroes is 70 percent higher than that of other groups. The general health status of the Negro population of America is incredibly lower than that of other groups. One of the principal causes of this deplorable situation is obviously the dearth of adequately trained medical personnel. It is needless to say what the loss of Meharry will mean to the Negro population as a whole, and to the multitudinous number of Negro students, of which I am one, who have been trained only for the study of medicine.

Heretofore I have thought that even with Meharry, tenuous was my chance of being admitted there in view of the acuteness of the school situation today. As long as I can remember I have had a desire to become a physician.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Wisconsin on the splendid address he has been making. I congratulate him upon his statement that he believes in States' rights for States other than his own.

We have a great many advocates of States' rights as an abstract proposition. We have even more who are ardent defenders of the rights of their own States where such rights are likely to be affected by Federal legislation. But when it comes to the States south of the Mason and Dixon's line very seldom do most of the alleged advocates of States' rights have the courage, displayed by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, to stand on the floor of the Senate and be consistent and fight for the preservation of our dual system which has enabled us to become the greatest and most powerful nation of the earth. Many Senators place themselves in the position of being great champions of States' rights unless the States happen to be located below the Mason and Dixon's line. In the case of the Southern States their activities would indicate they would deny those States any rights. They are considered provinces. I want to say, though, with respect to the appealing letters being read by the distinguished Senator, that, despite the fact that the Senator is chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, it occurs to me some of those letters should be addressed to the self-elected leaders of the Negroes in this country and their self-elected spokesmen. These self-annointed leaders and spokesmen take the position, to which these Negro correspondents seeking an education do not seem to subscribe, that they would prefer to see 1 Negro student in a medical college with 800 white students than to see a medical college for 800 Negro students that was the equal of the one that only 1 Negro could get into with 800 white students. Of course, if these people were genuinely interested in the education of the Negroes, they would be in favor of adopting any bill that would keep open a great Negro institution like Meharry. But these people are more interested in destroying segregation than they are in advancing the education of the Negro race.

The figures presented by the Senator showing the pitiful handful of Negroes admitted to medical colleges outside the South who make a great fuss about the absence of discrimination in their colleges and assert that they have no segregation whatever speak much louder of their true attitude toward segregation of the races than what they say. These figures show whether the system we propose should be condemned or not. We are at least forthright and frank in our attitude on segregation.

Those who are truly interested in the education of the Negro know that keeping Meharry College open will give the Negro race many more doctors and dentists than they will ever be able to secure through institutions which hypocritically proclaim that they have no segregation or discrimination. We wish to give them a first-class medical and dental education at Meharry instead of seeing them knock on the door of some of these allegedly unsegregated institutions until doomsday without ever being admitted. The letters that the Senator from Wisconsin has been reading clearly indicate that no man who has a real interest in the education of the Negro youth to be doctors and dentists would ever vote to defeat the movement to keep Meharry College going.

I wish again to congratulate and commend the great chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary upon having the courage and the fortitude to be for States' rights when other States than his are involved, and I very much thank the senior Senator from Wisconsin for the magnificent example he has set for others who claim to favor maintaining the principle of local self-government and the rights of the States.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am grateful for those kind words. But I want to say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that there are two facets of this matter which have intrigued me. Probably one of them might be characterized as States' rights. But in the last 25 years, ever since the so-called Hoover depression, and ever since the advent of the Roosevelt administration, I have become very much concerned about the concentration not simply of political power but of every other kind of power in the Federal Government. Through those years, as a result of the concentration of power in the German, Italian, and other governments I have seen that the people have lost their liberty. They have not had in operation the great system of checks and balances that our forefathers established. One facet of the system of checks and balances is that the people, while granting to the Federal Government certain powers, reserved to themselves or to the States other powers that were pretty well defined. Our forefathers, Mr. President, not only observed the tide in their time, but they apparently had the vision to look beyond the horizon to observe the movement of the tide in our time and to see where it carried peoples and nations who lacked a system of checks and balances.

In the Senate, Mr. President, there are 96 Senators, no two of whom have the same economic, philosophical, religious, racial, geographical, and political background. Some people do not like that, but I do, because here we have a conflict of ideas. It is one idea striking another that creates a spark, and that clarifies the atmosphere—again, a system of checks and balances. But the greatest system of checks and balances is that which is found under the Constitution, whereby the powers vested in the Federal Government are divided among three coordinate branches, the Executive, the Judicial, and the Legislative. The power granted to the Government was divided, but there were reserved to the States, which are sovereign, or to the people, certain powers which were not given to the Federal Government. Today we are discussing one of those reserved powers.

Mr. President, I come from the North. I come from a race of people who have known liberty through the centuries, who have never known the whiplash of the slave driver. In Wisconsin we are celebrating our one hundredth anniversary, commencing the 29th of this month. We are an amalgamation of the best blood of Europe, a people who think independently, but we have our eyes open. When we see misery and injustice we do not cut off our nose to spite our face. We try to correct the injustice and the misery without destroying the house in which we live. Too many are willing, because of a few rats in the house, to burn down the house. I am not one of them. I want to see this great heritage of ours descend to my children and grandchildren unimpaired.

Mr. President, I remember the distinguished Senator from Georgia said these letters should have been sent to the colored leaders. I am not saying where they should have gone. They came to me, and my obligation to the Senate and to the country is to bring to their attention the issues involved and then to let the Senate decide.

Mr. President, I have a letter from Lincoln University, Jefferson City, Mo., which says:

The future of Meharry affects many people, in all for whom I have great interest since I have spent years preparing myself to enter into the field of health. * * *

I am a veteran unable to afford the entire 4 years medical education, but thanks to the GI bill and my health, if I'm accepted, I'm sure I will be in a position to serve humanity after the required years of study.

Your consideration of this very important matter and consequent efforts to insure the desired future for Meharry will be deeply appreciated by thousands of people.

That is signed "William J. Morrissey."

I have also a letter from Henry H. McBride, 9 Lucy Street, Sharon, Pa., which reads as follows:

The immediate realization of one of my fondest dreams is about to be shattered unless financial aid is received for the continuance of Meharry Medical College.

I hope to enter Meharry Medical College in September 1948, but right now I am pessimistic because of the school's dismal future. However, there is one hope of obtaining the financial support needed from the Southern Regional Council for Education. If Congress sanctions the compact, then Meharry may continue with its great work. In the Senate I am earnestly asking for your sanctioning of the compact under the Senate Joint Resolution 191.

Mr. President, a thought comes to me with reference to which I perhaps should say a few words. It was my great pleasure a few years ago, when our dear friend, former Senator Davis, of Pennsylvania, was among us, to address, at his request, the Mu-So-Lit Club. That organization is a club in Washington composed of professional colored people, doctors, lawyers, dentists, and churchmen. Senator Davis asked me to pinch hit for him. I did so and found as fine a group of persons as one could meet anywhere. I heard there the best English I have heard in Washington, not even barring that which is heard in the Senate of the United States. Those men were educated. When I read the record and learn that 52 percent of all the colored physicians come from Meharry College, I remember the evening spent with the Mu-So-Lit Club as their speaker, in conjunction with a Methodist bishop from Baltimore, as I recall. I should hate to see that institution go down. If it should go down, what shall be provided in its place? It is not a State institution. It is a private institution which no longer can function. This is the first step in a grand adventure by 16 commonwealths of the Nation to provide education for colored students, and yet there is thrown up to us the statement that it means segregation.

Mr. President, I have a letter from Rayford T. Thomas, of Washington, D. C., who says:

I have spent 4 years in college obtaining premedical work in order to enter Meharry Medical College. I was in the Army for 3 years and 2 months, and after being discharged have applied for admittance to Meharry Medical School. I have been looking forward to entering the 1948 class, but I find that Meharry is in financial difficulty and cannot open in September 1948, unless the Senate Joint Resolution 191 has the sanction of the Congress.

I am asking you to please give this resolution your support if you can possibly do so. There are only two Negro medical schools in this country that I know of, and if one closed, our opportunity for advancement of health in our country will have had a setback. It is my belief that I am voicing the sentiment of thousands of others who happen not to know about the financial condition of Meharry Medical College and expressing the opinions of those who are with me in this serious undertaking.

Again, Mr. President, I step aside to interject a thought suggested by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. He says that the letters should have gone to the leaders of the Negro race. I do not think the leaders of the Negro race are against the joint resolution. The same group appeared before the committee who appear every time legislation is undertaken. There is always a paid person who is running the show. On labor matters there is a paid person. In industry there is a chap at the head of the chamber of commerce. It is his business, of course. But I cannot be convinced that 20,000,000 colored persons in this country are not better heard through these letters than through the voices of persons who come to Washington and say that it is a scheme to perpetuate segregation. It has nothing to do with segregation. Segregation is present until the constitutions of the States of the South are changed. The Supreme Court, in substance, has so held. But because there is something involved which we do not like or at least which we do not apply in our own States, is that any reason why we should lose our judgment and our mental poise and destroy an institution in which 700 men are being educated to become servants of their race?

Here is a letter from Nashville, Tenn., signed by W. L. Silcott, M. D. He says:

In view of the fact that Meharry trains over one-half of the Negroes in the medical profession, and in view of the fact that it has reached and maintained its present high position despite segregation; moreover, since there are existing State laws which prohibit the training of white and Negro students together in southern universities, until such laws are amended, I think Meharry has proven its right to a continued existence. Reviewing the history of Meharry, it is apparent that its progressive growth has outgrown the charities on which it previously existed and must gain tax support (State) or die from financial starvation.

Here is a letter from Meharry Medical College signed by Matthew Walker, M. D., professor of surgery, in which he says:

If Meharry closes, untold damage will be done both to the Negro physicians who play such an important part in the health of the country, as well as to the students here at Meharry who will take their places in the practice of tomorrow. * * * Therefore, I urge you to vote for Senate Joint Resolution 191 in order to give Meharry finances that will keep it open. I do this with full realization that Meharry under these circumstances of segregated education is not carrying out the democratic ideal, and definitely I am not in favor of segregation. Yet, I am forced to admit that I much prefer that other means be found to attack the problem of segregation than by the closing of Meharry.

R. N. Carroll—Mrs. C. M. Carroll, Jr.—Nashville, Tenn., writes:

In the interest of the health of a nation, it is incredible that an accredited medical school should be permitted to close because of financial difficulties, especially when medical care is so urgently needed. Therefore, I ask you as an understanding lawmaker, who is big enough to see the practical side of this important medical problem, to do all that is in your power to promote the passage of such legislation as will foster the continual operation of Meharry Medical College.

Senator WILEY, such legislation will not selfishly benefit the professional college in question, but it will do much toward promoting better health within a group, within the South, and, finally, within a great nation.

Here is a letter from Carmi, Ill., signed by George Archer Cross, who says:

I am in favor of such measures which mean the continuation of this great institution.

As one, its hundreds of applicants this year and the past year, and since Meharry furnishes approximately 50 percent of the Negro doctors, my people and I, in addition to America's high standard of health, will be affected greatly either indirectly or directly by the discontinuance of Meharry.

Mr. President, a few moments ago I said something about the number of students. In 1947 the applicants from the North numbered 246; from the South, counting such States as Kentucky and Tennessee as southern, there were 430; from the far West there were 22; from Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands there were 4; from Africa, 2; from the British West Indies, 20; from Panama, 2; from South America, 3.

Here is another letter:

I completed my premedical work in May 1946 but forewent entrance into Meharry to volunteer for duty with the armed forces and served for 18 months in the Japanese theater of occupation. After my discharge in October 1947, I again met the requirements for acceptance for their September 1948 sessions in medicine to continue the useful career which I chose to interrupt to give service to my country.

* * * * *

Don't let Meharry close. It would be a tragic blow to the health of many of our citizens. I implore you to express yourself in favor of this measure.

JULIUS C. ROBINSON.

Here is a letter from the University of Illinois. I quote only sentences from it.

For the health of the Negro and the health of the country as a whole, let us have a bigger and stronger Meharry Medical College.

I am one of many veterans that have application for admission to Meharry this September and am ready to enter there this fall. Again, sir, may I ask your support of Senate Joint Resolution 191.

JAMES D. SOLOMON.

That is from the University of Illinois college of medicine, Chicago 12, Ill.

Here is a letter from Robert S. Cobb, Jr., 53 Elwood Avenue, Dayton 7, Ohio:

I am a veteran with 3½ years of service. I fought that America may be kept safe. I am pledged to continue this fight until all of America's citizens may be given equal educational opportunities. The Southern Regional Council for Education is an attempt to make these constitutionally endowed rights a reality.

Note that. Here is a colored man by the name of Robert S. Cobb, Jr., who says:

It is with all sincerity, sir, that I ask that you do all that is in your power for the prompt passage of this resolution.

Here is one from Joseph H. Earle, 402 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.:

I urge your support of the passage of Joint Resolution 191, concerning the future of Meharry Medical College.

Here is one from Lincoln University, Jefferson City, Mo.:

I am one of the many applicants who has applied for admittance to the School of Medicine of Meharry Medical College. * * *

The Meharry Medical College mainly is the school of my choice. * * * As you know, Meharry is confronted with a financial problem and they have to close unless it gets support from the Southern Regional Council for Education. * * *

I am of the opinion that a joint resolution of the Senate must be passed before this support is made a reality.

Under that, the signature Claude A. Torrey.

Next is a letter from James L. Flournoy, 9806 Hickory Street, Los Angeles, Calif.:

Personally I have dedicated my life to the betterment of humanity in the medical profession, and am now awaiting admission to the college. To have it closed would not only hinder my progress but also hinder all those persons I might be able to help after completing the course.

Mr. President, I have letters from all over the United States. I even have one from Wiley College, Marshall, Tex. This is a letter signed by Edward D. Pernetter:

For some time it has been my desire to become a dentist and to do my professional studying at Meharry Medical College. I regret very much to learn that my application sent to Meharry cannot be definitely decided upon at present due to the uncertainty of the future of the college.

Meharry needs money to remain in operation and the only remaining hope is to get financial support from the Southern Regional Council for Education. To make this financial support a reality the Senate Joint Resolution 191 must be passed. * * *

Meharry is needed; help to keep it open.

Next is a letter from Carver Hall, Washington, D. C.:

I am writing you requesting that you put forth every effort, in the Senate, to obtain sanction of the compact by the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 191.

It has been my life's ambition to study medicine. There are only two schools that will freely admit Negroes, one of these being Meharry Medical College. Should this institution be allowed to close because of the lack of finance, leaving only Howard University, Washington, D. C., my chances of realizing my ambition will become abated even more than they are at present.

HYRON E. COLEMAN.

Mr. President, as I have stated, I have received a large number of similar letters, all of them favorable, and I exhibit them to the Senate. I suppose they number several hundred. I should like to have put into the RECORD the name of the writer and the underlined portion of each letter I send to the desk. I do this in order that I may not burden the RECORD too greatly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the names and underscored portions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAYTONA BEACH, FLA.

I have been preparing to go to Meharry for many years; then came the war, and I spent 5 years in the service of my country. Now I have just finished my preparation and I am ready to enter Meharry.

Meharry cannot close, because I must get in medical school, and this is my only opportunity. The community in which I plan to work needs me because there are no Negro doctors or dentists. The Negroes of this area need me, and I am willing to give my services to them.

Please help my people and my country by giving your support to the Senate Joint Resolution 191, which would give financial aid to Meharry.

Sincerely yours,

JOHNNY L. CLARKE.

NASHVILLE, TENN.

It is my earnest desire that Senate Joint Resolution 191 sanctioning regional education as an acceptable and desirable principle be adopted. I feel that the plan for pooling educational resources is potentially of great usefulness to progressive as well as so-called backward areas.

The fact that such facilities would most certainly be Jimcrow units if established in the South at this time does not constitute a valid objection to providing education of any sort in a region so desperately in need of enlightenment.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS A. LASAINE.

FORT WORTH, TEX.

I am a veteran, and 1 of 1,000 Negro students competing to gain entrance to Meharry Medical College. Only 65 of us can possibly be admitted this year, but in that 65 lie the hopes of the 1,000.

We have but 2 medical institutions which, together, receive about 2,000 applications per year. Yet together they can only hope to accept and train 150. One hundred and fifty doctors are turned out per year to serve 14,000,000 people. Does that proportion startle you?

To make this compact a reality the sanction of the Congress is needed * * * implore that you make every effort to pass Senate Joint Resolution 191 in our behalf.

Respectfully yours,

M. C. MAXWELL.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

My real reason for writing you is not the effect which Meharry's closing will have on me as one individual, but the effect which it will have on the entire health of my race, who are all American citizens. The health of the Negro is already in the worst condition of any people in America, and the life expectancy is 10 years less than that of other Americans.

If Meharry is forced to close its doors, these conditions will be forced to become much worse than they are now.

Yours very truly,

JAMES T. MONTGOMERY.

COLLINS, MISS.

I am an applicant for admission to the School of Dentistry of Meharry Medical College, Nashville, Tenn., for the September 1948 freshman class. My desire to enter the dental profession has been stimulated by the obvious need for more dentists to serve the Negro population of Mississippi, my home State, and of the South generally. This need is just as urgent in the fields of medicine and nursing as in dentistry. In each of these fields Meharry Medical College has trained Negro leaders primarily to serve the South for approximately three quarters of a century.

It is my sincere hope and request, Senator Wiley, that you will use all the influence within your grasp to secure this sanction.

Very respectfully yours,

ISAAC L. THOMAS.

EUFAULA, OKLA.

I am among many others who desire an opportunity to enter Meharry Medical College. Please don't deny us this opportunity.

Thanking you in advance for favorable consideration of this measure,

Yours truly,

A. H. HUDSON, Jr.

COUNCIL BLUFFS, IOWA.

I am an ex-GI and it has been my hope and dream since finishing high school to attend Meharry. My application for entrance this September was accepted but I have just been notified that Meharry will possibly be closed if resolution 191 is not passed by the Congress. I pray of you to use your influence in favor of its passage.

Yours very sincerely,

WILLIAM T. TEAL.

ATLANTA, GA.

I am a student of Atlanta University in the field of biology.

With the sanction of Congress, this support can be realized by passage of Senate Joint Resolution 191.

The health of Negro America will be jeopardized if the institution that supplies over 50 percent of the Negro doctors of America be allowed to close.

Yours very truly,

OTIS W. SMITH.

ATLANTA, GA.

I now have an application in for admission to the 1948 freshman class. Aside from the blocking of my personal goal, the closing of Meharry's doors will affect the health of the Negro race.

Very truly yours,

JOHN T. BLASINGAME, Jr.

ATLANTA, GA.

Since 1937 I have struggled and worked hard to study medicine and I selected Meharry last year to render my status and application to.

After filing my application with them I did get some consideration such as receiving an application for admittance etc.; to find later that the school is in serious doubt to its future operation due to financial support.

Respectfully submitted.

OTIS K. LEE.

NORFOLK, VA.

To be on the threshold of reaching one's goal, and then have the door slammed in the face is not only a terrific blow to the individual, but to the cause which he has prepared himself.

I have prepared myself for 4 years to enter Meharry Medical College. I have chosen this institution because it represents the very best in professional health training. The products of this institution boast a far reaching unblemished record.

Meharry needs support for its doors to remain open. I speak not only for myself, but for those who are now in the process of preparing themselves. Will you help keep its doors open?

Sincerely yours,

LESTER A. KING.

MONTGOMERY, ALA.

I am taking courses that will lead to the bachelor of science degree, thus qualifying myself for the school of medicine.

I have applied for admission at Meharry Medical College, but since this time it has become very doubtful as to whether this school will be able to continue operating after June this year due to financial deficiency.

I have learned that through the Southern Regional Educational Plan, Meharry may continue to operate. Also that there will be other schools teaching the graduate courses, that will come about through this plan, thus insuring many southern students a chance to attend graduate schools.

I will be very appreciative for any efforts that you put forth to bring the approval of this plan.

Yours truly,

FRANK L. TAYLOR.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

My personal interest is such that it would mean bitter defeat, if denied the privilege of qualifying as a student at Meharry Medical College because its doors no longer remained open.

I have prepared for many years to enter Meharry Medical College.

Mr. Senator, I implore you to do your utmost to bring about the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 191.

The outstanding faculty, graduates, and present student body as well as those who aspire to become students of Meharry Medical College, deserve a far better fate than the closing of its doors.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM A. JONES.

I am a deeply interested citizen in the continuance and security of Meharry College at Nashville, Tenn.

This institution whose alumni is so nobly serving humanity and representing my race is indeed a credit to our country.

Meharry, indeed, holds a very sacred place in the hearts of its sons and daughters. Personally, my wife, who is one of the public school teachers here and educated at Nashville, Tenn., is proud to boast of the lineage her family holds, that is, her father, an uncle, a nephew, and a brother-in-law, all Meharry men.

I most cordially ask your support in the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 191.

Very sincerely yours,

CHARLES J. BROWN,
Bailiff, Criminal Court of Marion County.

JEFFERSON CITY, MO.

As I sit here today, a whole host of memories come crowding about me. I remember so well when I was a boy how I had dreamed of attending Meharry Medical College. I also remember as I grew older how I so tirelessly prepared myself for this cherished goal.

I have been informed that there is a possibility of Meharry closing.

Therefore, I beseech you to do all that is within your power to prevent such a catastrophe from happening.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

SPARTANBURG, S. C.

During recent months there has been much discussion and debate about the future of Meharry Medical College.

Sir, it would be disastrous if the operation of Meharry Medical College should cease. Imagine the decline in the number of Negro doctors and the decline in the health of the Negro race and American people as a whole that would follow.

Sir, if there is anything you are able to do to help this plan get the sanction of Congress, please do so.

Very truly yours,

BAKER T. HOWELL.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

I am a Negro college graduate, and have, during the greater part of my education, prepared myself for entrance into the field of medicine.

Meharry Medical College is the only exception and even here I must await my turn on a list of hundreds who have been accepted before me.

If the doors of Meharry Medical College are allowed to close, a mortal blow will have been dealt to the hopes of thousands of aspiring young men like myself * * * and medical progress and health in America will have slipped back a hundred years.

The passage of Senate Joint Resolution 191 will avert this tragedy.

Yours very sincerely,

NAPOLEON J. PINCKNEY.

WISE, N. C.

I am writing you in the interest of the passage of the Senate Joint Resolution 191. You see, sir, I am an applicant of Meharry Medical College, and perhaps without the passage of this resolution I will not have the opportunity to prepare myself for a much needed servant of mankind, a doctor. I cannot urge you too strongly to exert your influence for the passage of this resolution.

Gratefully yours,

EMMETT J. MCQUEEN, Jr.

CAMERON, TEX.

At present thousands of young men and women are eagerly awaiting letters from Meharry in answer to applications that were written, some 1, some 2, and some 3 years ago. I am one of those applicants. Each day my greatest hope lies in that fact that I may be informed that I am qualified to enter Meharry.

Please see that Meharry stays open.

Yours truly,

LIMONE C. COLLINS.

ELIZABETH CITY, N. C.

The Negro race has suffered greatly in the past and is still suffering from the lack of medical personnel in many areas. Can you imagine our predicament and greater suffering if it had not been for Meharry, who can proudly life her head. * * *

Please do not let Meharry die.

Very truly yours,

CASPER W. HILL.

CHESTER COUNTY, PA.

As a premedical senior here at Lincoln University, * * * I am sure that you are aware of the need for doctors, especially among the minority groups, and that the general health situation for the country as a whole demands that facilities are opened to qualifying premedical students, white and colored.

I'm appealing to you to do all in your power to ensure the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 191, which will enable Meharry Medical College to obtain financial support from the Southern Regional Council for Education.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH S. DARDEN, Jr.

ATLANTA, GA.

As an instructor in health education, I wish to express my opinion concerning the obstacle Meharry Medical College is facing.

As we all know there is a shortage of trained persons in health, especially in the South.

Actually, with Meharry open, the mortality and morbidity of our people is still too high; hence, if the institution would have to close, the situation would obviously be grave.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM R. BENTON.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am sorry to have consumed so much time, but I feel that in expressing the sentiments of the majority of the Committee on the Judiciary I at least have tried to do the best I could to set forth what I think is the truth in relation to Meharry College.

I am truly conscious of the fact that if we permit the destruction of this institution by any course, we shall be inflicting very serious hurt on the country, on the colored race, and on ourselves.

The argument may be made, as it was suggested, that the 16 States join together with the idea of perpetuating segregation by this means. I should like to have my good friend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] show how that would be accomplished, because I am satisfied that the governors, the officials, and the private citizens from the Southern States who appeared before our subcommittee were honest, God-fearing Americans, seeking to meet head-on a situation which it is too evident to all of us exists in the South, and which, as I said heretofore, was emphasized so dramatically when about 1,200,000 of American boys were not taken into the armed forces in World War II because they had not been able to receive an education up to the fourth grade in school.

There is an old saying that in unity there is strength, and I could not, after listening to the testimony and listening to the pleas of representatives and friends of Meharry College, feel that there was anything nefarious or wrong about this situation. That was something brought out by some colored peoplea from the North, who emphasized that it meant perpetuating segregation. I repeat, I am not in favor of segregation. If the question should arise in my own State, I would vote against segregation. I would vote against it if it involved a Southern State. But the question has been settled in that area by the constitutions, for which the people voted.

Mr. President, if the nose of the camel comes under the tent in this case, it will be the opening wedge for a great many other Federal activities, and God only knows where they will finally take us. In this atomic age, some of us feel that we should decentralize politically, as well as economically, industrially, and also geographically.

PROHIBITION OF EXPORTATION OF CERTAIN STEEL PRODUCTS

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, out of order I desire to introduce a joint resolution and I ask for its appropriate reference.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, with what subject does the joint resolution deal?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to make a statement concerning it if the Senator from Oregon will yield to me for that purpose.

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the purpose of the joint resolution is to prohibit the exportation of seamless and welded steel pipe, and certain carbon steel sheets from the United States during a certain period. The measure provides—

That during the period beginning with the day after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution and ending on February 28, 1949, and notwithstanding commitments heretofore made, it shall be unlawful to export seamless or welded steel pipe, or carbon steel sheets of 8 U. S. gage or lighter from the United States—

(1) To any foreign country other than one located in the Western Hemisphere * * * unless—

Among other things—

(A) The Secretary of Commerce has certified that such exportation will not cause the total exports of such commodity to such country during the calendar quarter of exportation to exceed the total exports of such commodity to such country during the corresponding calendar quarter of 1947, or

(B) At least 48 hours prior to such exportation there has been published in the Federal Register, together with a statement of considerations, (i) a specification by the

Secretary of State that such exportation is necessary to carry out effectually the foreign policy of the United States; or (ii) a certification by the Secretary of Commerce that such exportation is necessary to effectuate the importation of products necessary to the domestic economy of the United States; or (iii) a certification by the Secretary of Defense that such exportation is necessary to the defense of the United States.

Mr. President, was the request I made that I be permitted to make a statement in connection with the joint resolution granted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). It was.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in the main that is the portion of the joint resolution which I feel is of interest to the Senator from North Dakota and to other Senators representing the Middle West, because at this time the Middle West is a critical area not only as concerns steel but petroleum products. I might say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that within the past 24 hours we have received requests from small-business men throughout that area for water pipe, in order to water livestock. Once again apparently a shortage in water pipe is appearing.

It should be understood that the joint resolution simply provides that there shall not be an exportation of the steel products in question, as described in detail, unless certain steps shall be taken. One of them, of course, is that the Secretary of State shall file with the Federal Register a statement respecting exportation, and give the reasons why it is necessary. If such a statement is filed, of course, it will clear the export under the recovery program. But in many instances that apparently has not been done. The only time we hear about such a matter is after action is taken. Congress must decide that only in such cases where grave necessity arises shall exports be made. For the sake of our own domestic economy I am quite satisfied that the time has come when the Congress must take steps to see that steel is not exported in the way it has been exported during the past few months.

I am introducing the joint resolution as a last resort. I know of no other way to bring the matter to the attention of the Congress. It is a last-resort measure, an effort to require several executive agencies of the Government to give reasons for their discretionary actions, and to show a deeper concern for the domestic economy of the United States.

In connection with the introduction of the joint resolution I have in mind the export of large quantities of steel pipe and other vital steel material for the construction of 1,100 miles of pipe line across the desert of Saudi Arabia. That is merely one illustration of what is causing the shortage of tubular steel in the United States.

Last June, the oil subcommittee and the steel subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committee held hearings on problems of supply and distribution of those two vital products. The smaller independent businesses in both fields were then suffering by reason of shortage of steel. I mean not only wholesalers and producers of steel, but retailers and jobbers. Refiners of petroleum products were also suffering. Today only 67 percent of the independent refinery capacity is being used in this country to produce petroleum products, by reason of the shortage of steel which exists in this field. So I say the smaller independent businesses in both fields are suffering for lack of materials and because of consequent distribution disturbances.

The shortage of steel pipe and tubular goods became a major point of investigation by both subcommittees. At that time it was revealed that the Department of Commerce had approved a shipment of 20,000 tons of steel pipe to Saudi Arabia for the fourth quarter of 1947. This was the initial shipment on an allocation of 480,000 tons of steel to be shipped in succeeding quarterly periods. It was at that time, a year ago, that our committee protested against tubular steel being sent to Saudi Arabia. Such a tonnage of steel represents the major portion of yearly exports of steel pipe and tubular goods from this country.

Obviously such tonnage could not be accommodated within current quotas, and had to be granted on the basis of a special project.

A strong protest against this shipment and against the whole special project was registered by the Senate Small Business Committee. Other committees, not only of the Senate, but of the House, have registered similar complaints.

There followed a series of hearings by the oil subcommittee, which has succeeded in unraveling an involved tale, which sounds at this date very much like an Arabian pipe dream.

First, in closed session, the committee was told by Secretary of Defense Forrestal, Secretary of Commerce Harriman, and Assistant Secretary of State Lovett that the Saudi Arabian pipe line was necessary in the national interest.

We have had many meetings since that time, and all types of testimony have been taken, but I have still to find out what the national interest is. There has been testimony from men high in military circles that it is not in the interest of the national defense, and that if it were built, there is a question as to whether or not it could be held even for 24 hours if a certain country wanted to take it, Saudi Arabia being a desert country 1,100 miles from the seashore and probably 5,000 or 6,000 miles from the United States. I have yet to find out what is the national interest in developing the Saudi Arabia field at this time.

The decision to approve the allotment of 480,000 tons of steel for the Saudi Arabian pipe line boiled down to a discretionary action that was made at Cabinet level. That decision was made by members of the Cabinet in a meeting called after the protest was made by the Small Business Committee, and after the protest was sent to the White House asking the President to intervene in connection with the proposed order of 480,000 tons of steel for this pipe line for the year.

It is interesting to note that the Secretary of Commerce, who has the last word, according to law, in deciding upon an export license, overrode the initial advice of officers of the Office of International Trade, who told him and this committee that the export of such tonnage of pipe and steel to Saudi Arabia could not be supported in the face of domestic needs. That was the evidence that was adduced a year ago when we were beginning to experience shortages of pipe not only for water, but also in the critical areas of district No. 2.

The Department of the Interior came into the picture with a plea that there is a world shortage of tankers, and that the relief of tanker transportation by the building of the trans-Arabian pipe line would be great. We were led to believe that that would solve the transportation question. However, at about the time of that statement, the Maritime Commission was busy selling 100 United States tankers to foreign nations and nationals, on the basis that they were surplus tankers which we did not need in the United States.

The oil subcommittee entered into a long drawn-out effort to keep those tankers under the American flag. Senators will recall how we protested again to the President. We showed that if they were taken out of operation from the Gulf ports the fuel-oil situation would become acute last winter, which it did. Seated near me is the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR]. He knows the difficulty which a certain firm in Baltimore experienced because of the shortage of tankers which should have brought oil to that city last winter.

The Maritime Commission was busy selling 100 United States tankers to foreign nations and nationals on the basis that they were surplus. The oil subcommittee entered into a long-drawn-out effort to keep those tankers under the American flag in order to serve our national needs; but in spite of all our efforts, a decision by the Attorney General approved the sale of 83 of the tankers to foreign nations or nationals.

Recently information has appeared in the press that the administration is now proposing a huge shipping program, of which 100 new oil tankers are a part.

We must provide steel in this country to build 100 new oil tankers, of the same models and with the same specifications as the 83 tankers which were sold within the past 12 months. Eighty-three perfectly good tankers have been sold to foreign purchasers, at an average price of $1,500,000 each. That is what the United States Government realized from the sale of those tankers. The report is that if we are to rebuild them now, the contract which will be let will provide that the same type of tankers will cost $8,000,000 each. That, of course, will be paid for by the taxpayers of the United States.

How deep are the pockets of the American taxpayer? How far can we go with this kind of business? We talk about a budget. We talk about whether we can stop inflation. This is merely another illustration of what is being done by Executive order, over which the Congress has no control, and with respect to which we have had very little voice in the determination of policies.

Responsible Government officials have repeatedly emphasized the fact that Middle East oil, particularly Arabian-American oil, is vital to relieve the needs

of western Europe and thus lighten the pressure on United States and Western Hemisphere resources.

No one has debated the advantages of having Middle East oil available for those purposes. That is not the question before the Senate this afternoon. No one on this committee has seriously argued that oil equipment to increase the production of Middle East refineries on the Persian Gulf should be withheld. We are for that, but that can be done in the producing field, without building 1,100 miles of pipe line, especially since we are to construct 100 new tankers for transportation. That is a transportation question. We are not quarreling with the contention that we need the oil. Let us get the oil out of the ground and use it. But we say that until the pipe line is finally completed, in 1951, there will be an emergency here; and inasmuch as we are to build the tankers, anyway, they will serve the purpose of transportation. Therefore, we should leave the steel at home and devote it to the development of our own resources. We should use it for our own purposes, especially in the Middle West, and particularly in the second district, where the major part of the food supply of the Nation is produced.

But not 1 pound of steel used to build the Saudi Arabian pipe line will increase this production.

Let me repeat that statement: Not 1 pound of the 480,000 tons of steel will be used to increase production. The production is already there. It is for a pipe line. It is solely for the purpose of transportation. Not 1 pound of steel should be used to build the Saudi Arabian pipe line on the theory of production, because it will not increase production. The refineries of the Arabian-American Oil Co. are yielding an estimated 350,000 barrels of oil a day at the present time. The oil is being shipped by tanker through the Suez Canal to relieve the oil situation.

No evidence has been submitted to this committee that shows that the building of 1,100 miles of pipe line across the Arabian desert will add one more barrel to that production. So why should we not protest at this time, when there is such an emergency within the confines of our own country? Let us be fair. The building of this pipe line will provide a more convenient and less expensive method of transportation for the owning oil companies. There is no doubt about that. It cannot be completed for at least 2 years. Tankers are now being used for Middle East oil transportation, and will continue to be used; and as they are built, more of them will be used.

What will be saved is the additional 16 cents per barrel that it costs the Texas Co., the Standard Oil of California, and the Standard Oil of New Jersey to bring oil from the Persian Gulf through the Suez Canal to the Mediterranean. That is a consideration to those companies. But that has nothing to do with the shortage of steel and its effect upon various segments of industry in this country.

For almost a year the Oil and Steel Subcommittees have been holding hearings on oil and steel shortages. Hearings in Washington and in many field locations have consistently shown shortages of steel pipe and oil-field equipment, which are seriously hampering production of oil and operation of the smaller, independent producers.

The distinguished Presiding Officer [Mr. THYE], as well as both Senators from North Dakota, know that this spring the cooperatives of Minnesota said that they could not get enough fuel oil to service the tractors to plow the fields to plant the crops. What is true in Minnesota is true in the Dakotas. It is true in Nebraska. Why? Simply because we do not have petroleum products; and we do not have them because we have not the steel to provide transportation through pipe lines, and to bring in new wells to develop an increasing use of petroleum products. We use more fuel oil now than we formerly used. Steel is needed for tank cars, for tankers, and for all forms of manufacture. A small manufacturer of farm equipment in Fremont, Nebr., who has been in operation for 27 years cannot get 4,000 tons of steel to continue to manufacture farm implements to be used in the production of food. He has to lock his doors and turn out his employees.

Independent producers in all areas of oil production in the country have shown that in many cases, operations are at a complete standstill because of a lack of oil pipe and casing.

In the Midwest, pipe for oil fields and pipe for watering systems is in desperately short supply.

Shortages of fuel oil and tractor oil to run the machines for food production in all of our great agricultural areas are basically attributable to shortages of steel for oil development and oil transportation.

Sixty-seven thousand more oil wells—please note this figure—could have been drilled in the United States in the past 5 years if oil pipe and casing had been available.

Secretary of the Interior Krug told our committee on April 2 that oil production in this country could be increased 15 percent if sufficient oil pipe was to be had. That was the statement of the Secretary of the Interior. I agree with him about that matter. I think his is a modest estimate, in fact, in view of the testimony we have had.

The development of new oil resources in this country and in the entire Western Hemisphere is at a slow-down because of a lack of steel tubular goods. We must have more and more production of such steel goods. The way to obtain an increased production of oil is to provide more of these materials and to provide for a better distribution of what we have. But until we get it, the question of distribution is not quite so essential as it will be after the crude oil is brought out of the ground. But while new facilities are in the throes of increasing their production, we must make the best use of what can be supplied.

Three hundred and sixty thousand tons of steel pipe destined for Saudi Arabia would go a long way toward relieving the need for carrying lines and installations in both oil-producing and gas-producing fields in this country. The other 100,000 tons of sheet and structural steel is exactly what is needed to keep smaller steel fabricators in the Middle West in business for the rest of this year.

Sheet steel is in equally short supply in this country today, due in no small part to large and uncontrolled shipments in export.

This committee has failed to get a satisfactory answer, either in closed or in open hearings, from the national defense establishment as to the necessity for the pipe line as a national defense measure. Neither could we get a statement as to its defensibility under present unsettled world conditions. We could not get an answer as to either matter. In fact, our evidence is quite to the contrary of the national defense claims.

Secretary Forrestal told the oil subcommittee, on October 9, that the development of Middle East oil was more important than the development of any project in the United States or the Western Hemisphere. On January 19 he came before the House Armed Services Committee and stated that the development of Middle East oil could not be regarded with the same security as developments of oil in the Western Hemisphere. Which one does he mean?

Mr. Forrestal has, of course, repeatedly emphasized that there must be access to Middle East oil for the needs of western Europe.

I submit, Mr. President, that the means of access is available—by tanker from the Persian Gulf. Pipe line or no pipe line, shipment by tanker must be used for the next 2 or 3 years.

Shipments of steel to Saudi Arabia have continued into 1948. Thirty thousand more tons were shipped in the first quarter. Again we protested.

On March 17 the committee learned that a second-quarter shipment of 55,000 tons of steel was under consideration by the Department of Commerce. Mr. President, we have to get this information second-hand. That is why from now on we want them to report in the Federal Register 48 hours in advance what their intentions are.

As I have just said, on March 17 the committee learned that a second-quota shipment of 55,000 tons of steel was under consideration by the Commerce Department. Mr. Forrestal has not told us about the need from the national-defense standpoint. Mr. Forrestal hedged. Mr. Harriman hedged. Mr. Thorp, the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, hedged.

Mr. Forrestal thought he might be better able to advise the committee after the Italian elections. He also stated that there was also under discussion a consideration to use the steel for the pipe line to build more tankers.

Mr. Harriman told us that he would be guided by the decisions of the Military Establishment. Some say this pipe line is needed for national defense, but others say the pipe line could not be defended, even if it were built. So what is the situation there?

Mr. Thorp had already gone on record in the press as believing that the steel for the Saudi-Arabian pipe line should

be reviewed in the light of current events. I agree with him 100 percent.

Although the full second quarter shipment has not been permitted to go forward—3,000 tons of it were authorized for shipment in April. Three thousand tons are to be applied on the 55,000 ton quota.

In checking on this shipment, we were first told the 3,000 tons were to complete an installation at the eastern terminal. That is the eastern terminal on the Gulf; which was to be used for the pipe line, which would transport the oil 1,100 miles. Later, at a hearing on April 30, it was stated that the 3,000 tons would be used to begin construction of the main pipe line. This instance shows the confusion evident in the whole pipe-line allocation. Up to this moment, all the steel that has gone there under the former quotas of 480,000 tons has been used in the producing field, to build facilities for shipment westward; but it can be used in reverse, and be shipped eastward into the producing areas.

Mr. President, the reason I bring these matters to the attention of the Senate now is that in respect to the quota of 55,000 tons, this shipment of 3,000 tons represents the beginning of the transmission line across 1,100 miles of desert, and this in spite of the fact that the pipe line cannot at this time be continued across part of its route, even if the steel pipe were available to build it, for the committee was told on March 17, by the vice president of the Arabian-American Oil Co., Mr. James Terry Duce, that his company did not have ratification by the Syrian Parliament for the building of the pipe line through Syria. As I remember, that distance is approximately 85 or 90 miles, although I may be mistaken. Yet the Syrian Parliament has not even ratified that concession agreement; and if the pipe line cannot go through Syria, there is grave doubt where it could go, in view of the unsettled conditions in the Middle East.

Mr. President, the time has come to take the matter out of the realm of conjecture and personal judgment.

The law requires that the control of exports shall be under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce, who shall have due regard for domestic needs in setting export quotas. Under this delegated authority, the Secretary of Commerce has set up an export advisory committee composed of officials of his own staff, as well as officials from National Defense, State, Interior, Agriculture, and the Office of Defense Transportation. Yet the administration of this authority has deteriorated to the point where the advice of this review board is not sought—nor followed when it is sought. That is the judgment of this committee, on the evidence adduced.

My able colleague the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] has within the past week told the Senate a story of Arabian oil shenanigans, with particular respect to the sale of Arabian-American oil to the Navy. I shall not attempt to duplicate any of the information contained in the very fine report of the Senate War Investigating Committee. Our avenues of investigation—I am referring to the Small Business Committee—did not parallel, except that they involve the same major oil companies and the same corner of the world.

Mr. President, no one has debated the economic value of building a Saudi-Arabian pipe line, under private ownership, if the supplies of steel were available. In other words, Mr. President, I believe in private enterprise, and I am not objecting—when the right time comes and when the steel is available—to having this pipe line built; and thank heaven it is to be built by a private loan, rather than by public money. That is perfectly satisfactory to me. But when steel is scarce and when reserves of oil in our own country and vast new resources in the Western Hemisphere are lying fallow because there is not sufficient pipe to permit drilling to start, that is another matter.

If national defense is a valid argument in this connection—and it is not clear to me that it is—how can oil resources available by means of an unsafe Middle-East pipe line be compared with oil resources in the Western Hemisphere here at home? The testimony is that in time of war our oil supplies should be just as close as possible to the bases from which our operations would be conducted. There can be no argument as to that. In other words, we should develop our own oil resources, those within the confines of our own country, and especially those within the Western Hemisphere, if we are laying emphasis on making these developments on a basis of national defense.

Oil experts have estimated that between 10 and 20 billion barrels of oil are possible of development in Mexico.

The largest other single-country oil reserve is in Texas, with 11,000,000,000 barrels.

Independent American oil producers who can get contracts to develop oil in Mexico have told this committee that purchases of oil pipe and oil country goods by major oil companies—in part for Middle East developments—have reduced the margin to spare for them to zero. Nothing is left for them. Because of these shipments to Saudi Arabia, no materials of that sort are available to them.

Because of Mexican expropriation of oil properties owned by American companies, major oil companies no longer operate in Mexico.

It is also a significant fact that the Texas Co., the Standard Oil of California, the Standard Oil of New Jersey, and Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. are the joint owners of the Arabian-American Oil Co.

I have no point to make against big business as such—or against major oil companies in particular, who are certainly in business to advance their interest and to make money.

I do have a difference with any powerful group of companies in any industry who are able to hog the materials of livelihood and production to the exclusion of other independent operations, or to so influence the national or international thinking of our Government officials as to result in Cabinet-level decisions to export nearly a half-million tons of steel that cannot be spared by our domestic economy, and will not result in immediate or future increased oil production for the betterment of the world. I cannot see but what that conclusion is absolutely undebatable. I simply cannot see, Mr. President, how in the final analysis we can draw any other conclusion than the one expressed in that statement.

There is no alternate but to prohibit the shipment of short-supply steel for such projects—the steel pipe, tubular goods, and sheet steel so desperately needed in this country.

While some flexibility in export policies may be desirable at this time, the measure which I am about to introduce will specifically restrict and limit such exports to those areas and in amounts which will protect the interests of the American people.

By unanimous consent, I am introducing a joint resolution to prohibit the exportation of seamless and welded steel pipe and certain carbon-steel sheets, except as outlined, namely, that 48 hours' notice be given in the Federal Register, and that the State Department shall have the steel available in order to carry out its own foreign policy, together with other provisos contained in the resolution, which are self-explanatory.

Mr. President, the joint resolution is brief, and I ask that it be printed at the conclusion of my remarks for the benefit of Senators. I feel the joint resolution, after it comes back from committee, should me given immediate consideration by the Senate if we are to preserve our own economy in respect to steel and oil. If there is an emergency around the corner, certainly those are two things that should be preserved. We shall have to take action on this resolution, and take it immediately, in order to accomplish the necessary results without a further terrific impact upon the economy of the United States in the production of oil, and upon production in Mexico and other spots of the Western Hemisphere.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the joint resolution will be printed as requested.

Mr. WHERRY. The measure prohibits for the present life of the export control law, the export of those products from the United States to any foreign country other than one located in the Western Hemisphere, unless the Adminsitrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration certifies that such exportation is necessary to carry out effectually the European recovery program. In so certifying, the Administrator must publish a statement of considerations regarding the exportation at least 48 hours in advance of the action in the Federal Register.

Shipments to Western Hemisphere countries (which for the purposes of this resolution means foreign countries in North and South American and adjacent islands), may not exceed the total exports of such commodities to such country during the corresponding calendar quarter of 1947. Any exception to this limitation must be certified to (1) the Secretary of State that the exportation is necessary to carry out the foreign policy of the United States, (2) by the Secretary of

Commerce that such exportation is necessary to effectuate the importation of products necessary to the domestic economy, or (3) by the Secretary of National Defense that the exportation is necessary to the national defense.

Such certifications must be accompanied by a statement of considerations and be published in the Federal Register at least 48 hours in advance of the action.

These stipulations should prove a check to highly discretionary actions which are being taken by the executive branch.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for yielding to me. I appreciate very much the time allotted to me.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 213) to prohibit the exportation of seamless and welded steel pipe, and certain carbon-steel sheets, introduced by Mr. WHERRY, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there are acute shortages in the United States of seamless and welded steel pipe essential to the construction of watering systems, to the discovery and development of the Nation's petroleum resources, and to the production of other commodities necessary (1) to the economic welfare of the United States, and (2) to the success of the European recovery program; and

Whereas large quantities of seamless and welded steel pipe are being exported for the construction of a Saudi Arabian pipe line which will in no way increase the quantity of petroleum products produced or distributed, advance the interests of the domestic economy of the United States, or contribute to the success of the European recovery program; and

Whereas there are acute shortages in the United States of carbon steel sheets of all types; and

Whereas such steel sheets are vital to the manufacture of farm machinery, agricultural implements, housing construction materials, and all types of consumer durable goods; and

Whereas large quantities of carbon steel sheets are being exported from the United States without proper regard for the impact of such export on the domestic economy: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That during the period beginning with the day after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution and ending on February 28, 1949, and notwithstanding commitments heretofore made, it shall be unlawful to export seamless or welded steel pipe, or carbon steel sheets of eight United States gage or lighter from the the United States—

(1) to any foreign country other than one located in the Western Hemisphere (which for the purposes of this joint resolution shall mean the continents of North and South America and adjacent islands) unless at least 48 hours prior to such exportation there has been published in the Federal Register, together with a statement of considerations, a certification by the Administrator for Economic Cooperation that such exportation is necessary to carry out effectually the European recovery program; or

(2) to any foreign country located in the Western Hemisphere unless—

(A) the Secretary of Commerce has certified that such exportation will not cause the total exports of such commodity to such country during the calendar quarter of exportation to exceed the total exports of such commodity to such country during the corresponding calendar quarter of 1947, or

(B) at least 48 hours prior to such exportation there has been published in the Federal Register, together with a statement of considerations (i) a certification by the Secretary of State that such exportation is necessary to carry out effectually the foreign policy of the United States; or (ii) a certification by the Secretary of Commerce that such exportation is necessary to effectuate the importation of products necessary to the domestic economy of the United States; or (iii) a certification by the Secretary of Defense that such exportation is necessary to the defense of the United States.

SEC. 2. Whoever violates the provisions of the first section of this joint resolution shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

SEC. 3. As used in this joint resolution the term "United States" includes the Territories and possessions of the United States.

Mr. LANGER and Mr. RUSSELL addressed the Chair.

Mr. MORSE. I am happy to yield first to the Senator from North Dakota, after which I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Georgia, provided I do not thereby lose my right to the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Nebraska for introducing this very fine resolution. He is one of the Senators upon this floor who realize what the farmers of the Middle West have been up against. In the Middle West, in one county of North Dakota alone, the county of Hettinger, the county agent, a Democrat, testified at a public hearing that the county in 1943 lost more than $1,000,000 worth of wheeling flax, by reason of the fact that the farmers' machinery was inadequate to take care of the situation. Time and time again, I brought that testimony to the attention of the Senate. I did so in 1943, in 1944, in 1945, in 1946, and again in 1947.

The distinguished Senator from Nebraska has given a great deal of his time, Mr. President, to the problem of farm machinery. Today, it is impossible to buy a combine, for either love or money. I know of farmers who have offered as much as $3,000 in the black market, above the regular price, and who say they cannot obtain combines. It is impossible to buy a binder. It is impossible to purchase a mower. I have in my office scores of letters from farmers in North Dakota and Minnesota who are trying to buy drills, and who say they cannot obtain them.

To make matters even worse, Mr. President, the farmers cannot get machine parts. If a farmer has a truck manufactured in 1927, 1928, 1929, or 1930, and a little piece of it breaks, he must go to a blacksmith shop. He must get the blacksmith to fashion a piece out of iron, if he can get it, or a piece of steel, in order to make a little gadget that possibly may fit into the truck, and thus enable him to get the truck operating again.

Mr. President, I believe I was the only Senator on the floor the other day who voted against the confirmation of Mr. Harriman as Ambassador at Large. I think Mr. Harriman's administration of the Department of Commerce has been a disgrace to the United States of America. I wish the time might come when a man sitting in the Cabinet, occupying a place such as Mr. Harriman occupied—the man who made the record which the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has just described, and which is further shown by the resolution which has been introduced—would be put on a farm for 30 days and learn first-hand what conditions are.

The marvel of it is that farmers all over the Northwest are doing as good a job as they are. I am not surprised at all when the distinguished chairman of the Small Business Committee says he cannot obtain certain information from the very distinguished millionaires who have been put into power by the President of the United States. It would seem that the President looks the whole country over to find out who is the richest man who has had the least experience with agriculture, and then appoints him to a job. I remember when Stettinius was appointed. He did not know one kind of steel from another, frankly admitting it when asked about it by one of the committees. Yet, Mr. President, we see one millionaire after another appointed, while men with practical experience, who could really do something for the country, are overlooked. The farmers are writing to their Representatives in Congress. They want to know what the Republican Party is doing about it. They say the Republican Party, when it comes to putting men into places of authority, to take care of the interests of the small men, is just as rotten as the Democratic Party. Indeed, Mr. President, we cannot blame them. They permitted 38,000 prefabricated houses to be sent to England at a time when our own veterans could not get a home. At a time when our own farmers could not obtain boxcars, they authorized the manufacture of 4,000 of them for France, 4,000 for the Argentine, and 2,000 for Mexico. Our farmers could pile their wheat and flax and rye and barley on the prairies, and let the elements take their toll. That is a situation with which farmers all over the Northwest have been face to face. I, for one, am proud of the fact that the other day, when the President had the audacity to name Harriman as a roving ambassador in connection with the Marshall plan, I at least registered my vote in opposition to the confirmation of the nomination of this man, who, as head of the Department of Commerce, has done nothing for the average man in the United States.

The distinguished Senator from Nebraska said he could not get any information. He is not alone in that respect. Ever since I have been in the Senate, Mr. President, as soon as a man is appointed to be at the head of the Army or the Navy or in any Cabinet job, he is very superior to an ordinary Representative or Senator. So far as I am concerned, those people can go hang.

When the highway was built into Alaska a subcommittee was appointed to investigate its construction. Does anyone suppose that we were advised how that road was laid out? We had to get a man from Alaska, whose name was Donald McDonald, to testify regarding it, and his testimony was that the road was

laid out by airplane and that no surveyor had ever gone over it. Part of it went through muskeg. An ordinary bulldozer would sink out of sight in the muskeg. It was indignantly denied, but before it was concluded the testimony indicated that the road went through some 60 or 70 miles of muskeg, with the result that every spring the water washes out the road and makes it utterly useless.

My distinguished friend from Nebraska mentioned fuel oil. In the Northwest this year, in many towns, such as Jamestown, N. Dak., and other places, veterans whom I could name were unable to get fuel oil for the purpose of heating their little homes. I know that the distinguished Senator has knowledge of similar experience in the State of Nebraska.

With regard to automobiles and trucks and the farmers' difficulty in obtaining them, I was in New York a week ago and visited the wharves where automobiles and trucks are exported. I saw the old *Normandie*. She was an enterprise taken over by the late President Roosevelt. She was towed up into the harbor and millions of dollars were spent to recondition her, and when the work was completed she was junked.

But, returning to cars and trucks, I found Kaiser and Frazer cars, Cadillacs and Fords, boxed up ready to be shipped across the seas. I looked into the boxes and found every conceivable kind of car manufactured in this country, with the exception of a Reo. I could not find any Reos. The cars were ready to be shipped to foreign countries, when our farmers cannot even buy a pick-up truck at home. Farmers have written me in regard to the matter.

I was amazed when the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] made his splendid report on what had taken place in the East in respect to oil. The newspapers have said practically nothing about it. One columnist had a little to say regarding it, and a little later Mr. Livingston tried to defend it in one of his famous articles. But, as a matter of fact, we shall not hear much about it until the oil companies get into trouble. Then they will call upon our American boys, 17, 18, 19, up to 25 years of age, to sacrifice their lives for the big oil companies, the same companies described by the Senator from Maine when he told the Senate of the huge profits they made on which they paid hardly any tax.

Mr. President, I again commend the Senator from Nebraska for introducing the joint resolution. I wish he had introduced it a long time ago. I realize the difficulties under which he is operating, because he does not want to do anything to interfere with the national defense or to give the slightest credence to any claim that his committee is interfering with national defense. But, as he said a moment ago, the farmers of the Northwest have not received a square deal at the hands of those in charge of the Government. I hope that the resolution will be considered promptly and be passed by an overwhelming vote of the Senate.

SOUTHERN STATES COMPACT ON REGIONAL EDUCATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 334) giving the consent of Congress to the compact on regional education entered into between the Southern States at Tallahassee, Fla., on February 8, 1948.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is not my intention or desire to speak at any length this afternoon. In fact, after a few preliminary remarks, I shall ask the majority leader if we may not recess until tomorrow. I do want to make a few remarks regarding the speech of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the speech of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. Because of the lateness of the hour, and because—the newspapers to the contrary notwithstanding, I never like to speak at 5 o'clock in the afternoon—I shall ask for a recess very shortly.

The Senator from Kentucky is such a modest man that I would not want to embarrass him by compliments addressed directly to him, but through you, Mr. President, I wish to pay my sincere compliments to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. I mean every word when I say we listened to a brilliant speech this afternoon delivered by the Senator from Kentucky.

The Senator from Kentucky has time and time again demonstrated his sound, judicial approach to legislative issues since he has been a Member of the Senate. He recognizes that all of our legislation should be consistent with those great guarantees of property and individual rights which make our Government under a written Constitution truly one in which self-government by the people is possible in accordance with our theories of checks and balances.

The Senator from Kentucky is truly a constitutional liberal. When I was in Kentucky recently I issued a statement congratulating the people of Kentucky for sending such a sound progressive to the Senate of the United States. I repeat those congratulations today. His sound legal argument presented in opposition to the Senate's approving the pending compact merits the support of the Senate, and particularly merits the support of my colleagues on this side of the aisle.

The arguments he advanced I think are sound in the law and sound from the standpoint of national policy. If the Senator from Kentucky, or anyone else, should move to commit this compact to the committee for further consideration of the arguments he advanced this afternoon, I would vote for it. I think that would be a proper disposal of the issue at the present time.

I do not know whether or not the Senator from Kentucky expected me to disagree with his remarks this afternoon. I could not quite figure it out as I listened to him, but on his major premise, Mr. President, I find myself in complete agreement. In fact, I intended to make it clear in my speech last Thursday afternoon that I did not think congressional approval of the compact proposed was necessary. At that time I did not have an opportunity to go to the cases and prepare myself. It was necessary for me to speak extemporaneously from such background knowledge of constitutional law as I possessed. In that speech I tried to point out that if we assume congressional sanction of the compact is necessary, then it is my premise that we cannot avoid expressing ourselves on national policies in relation to civil rights as they would be raised under that assumption.

That is the position of the junior Senator from Oregon. I completely agree with the Senator from Kentucky that congressional approval of the compact is not at all necessary, for reasons which I shall set out at greater length tomorrow by reference to the cases under our Constitution.

Mr. President, I think the first case, the parent case, so far as I am concerned, to this entire discussion is that of *Virginia* v. *Tennessee* (148 U. S., 503). That case lays down clearly the theory of the United States Supreme Court, which has not been changed in the meantime. Many subject matters can be set out in the compact which do not require congressional sanction. In my talk tomorrow I intend to discuss that case and my thoughts as to the implication of it, so far as the Constitution is concerned, but I want to repeat for the benefit of the Senator from Kentucky that I agree at least with what I understand to be the major premise of his speech. If he will read my speech of last Thursday I do not think he can escape the conclusion that that was my conclusion last Thursday that congressional approval of the compact is not necessary.

Let me quote from the remarks I made last Thursday:

> My first point is, Mr. President, that I see no necessity for the compact in order to accomplish the end which the Southern States have in mind if their primary objective is to provide regional schools. I know of no legal impediments to their setting up regional schools. I know of no legal requirements that makes it necessary for them to first secure the approval of Congress.

At another point I stated:

> Mr. President, if the Southern States wish to have the sanction of the Federal Government for this compact—even in view of the first point I made, which is that I see no necessity for the compact if the Southern States wish to proceed on their own in establishing regional schools and taking their chances in the courts on the question whether those regional schools, set up under whatever standards they see fit to set them up under, violate the Constitution, then I think they should agree to my amendment. As they are not willing to accept it, then I think we should face the entire question of civil rights, which, I think, is raised by this compact.

At still another place, when I was discussing this subject last Thursday, I said as follows:

> To reply to the Senator's question, I started to say that, assuming congressional sanction of the compact is necessary—and I deny that assumption—it must be necessary because some Federal issue is involved. It must be the theory of the proponents that some Federal prerogative is involved, some Federal right or question of constitutional law is involved. It must be that they think that the States would not be allowed, under existing law, to proceed without Federal approval. If that assumption is to be granted for the sake of argument, then I say, Mr. President, assuming a Federal jurisdiction, there is nothing unconstitutional in laying down as a condition to such a compact the provision that there shall be no discrimination on the basis of race, color, or

creed. Rather, to the contrary, Mr. President, it is my view as a lawyer that if that assumption is to be granted and congressional approval is necessary, we would violate the Constitution by not laying down a requirement of no discrimination on the basis of race, color, or creed, because the Missouri case and the Oklahoma case are based entirely upon State jurisdiction. They rest upon interpretations of State laws, upon a State system of jurisprudence, and upon the application of the equal protection of the laws and the due-process clause to State laws. If we have to have Federal approval for the establishment of a regional school covering an area which extends beyond the boundaries of a State, then, Mr. President, the courts would be faced entirely with Federal law and the constitutional rights which apply on a Nation-wide basis.

As our constitutional law has developed in this country in the whole field of civil rights we see that up to this time there has been some distinction drawn by the courts between what a State can do and what the Federal Government can do.

My specific reply to the Senator from Wisconsin is that if it be necessary to have Federal approval of the compact, then the Federal laws in regard to civil rights, as the Constitution is applied to the Nation as a whole, would apply. I think, assuming the Senator's premise to be correct, that a failure to put in a nondiscriminatory clause would itself be unjustifiable. As chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary he must, in my judgment, either take the position that congressional approval of the compact is not necessary; and if it is not necessary, then let the States proceed in their own way, subject to the gradual litigation of the problem from year to year, as the questions of civil rights go to the courts; or he must take the position that Federal sanction is necessary. If Federal sanction is necessary, then, as far as a round national policy is concerned, we are duty bound to lay down a principle of nondiscrimination.

As you can see, I proceeded in my previous speech on the basis of the assumption that if it is necessary—which I deny—then we, the Congress, cannot avoid laying down a matter of national policy as to the terms and conditions under which, not State schools, but regional schools, under this compact, are going to be conducted.

Mr. President, that statement raises the second point I wish to make, and I shall reiterate it throughout the debate, because I think this is going to be an historic debate so far as the issue of civil rights in this country is concerned. I put it this way, that it is quite a different thing to read the decisions of the United States Supreme Court in terms of State educational institutions and to read those decisions from the standpoint of seeking to apply them to regional educational institutions.

Senators will look in vain throughout the decisions of the United States Supreme Court, I submit, to find any basis for one of the premises laid down by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, of whom I am very fond, and as I wish to say, as we start this debate, I am of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. I repeat, Senators will read those decisions in vain to find any support for what is one of the main points laid down by the Senator from Wisconsin—his assumption that when we are dealing with a compact that seeks to extend over regions, we apply the same principles that we would supply to an agreement within a State. It is not within those decisions. As I tried to point out Thursday afternoon, it is one thing when we talk about the prerogatives of the State within the boundaries of a State. It is quite another thing when we talk about laying down a policy that is going to extend beyond the boundaries of a State. Then we have no longer a narrow, limited theory as to State rights, but we get into the realm of Federal rights. We get into a realm where we come face to face with questions of national policy, as to the rights of citizens over and above their rights within a State—their rights from coast to coast and from North to South.

Senators on the other side of the aisle and those on this side of the aisle who are missing that point cannot, at least as far as this RECORD is concerned, and as far the junior Senator from Oregon is concerned, avoid the issue of civil rights that is raised squarely by this compact. We are going to fight it through, so far as I am concerned, from beginning to end, because we cannot pass on this compact without raising the question of civil rights on a Federal level. The whole program of civil rights is raised, in my judgment, under the compact.

There are several ways of handling this matter. The most appropriate I think is to recommit the joint resolution, and before we get through I may move to recommit. But if we are to go ahead with this issue, then I am going to make the fight. And I think as the days pass we are going to find a clarion call raised all over this country for a meeting of the issue of civil rights as raised by this compact.

I think the joint resolution should be recommitted. I think it should be reconsidered in the light of the brilliant argument made by the Senator from Kentucky this afternoon. I think it should be considered from the standpoint of the very important questions of constitutional law which are raised by this debate.

I listened to the Senator from Wisconsin this afternoon, and in the greatest respect, and out of a sincere love I have for the Senator from Wisconsin, I want the RECORD to show that I heard nothing from the lips of the Senator this afternoon which showed any indication that he grasped the major issue that is involved in the fight.

I note that my good friend from Rhode Island (Mr. MCGRATH), chairman of the National Democratic Committee, is a member of the subcommittee which has reported this compact to the floor of the Senate. The Senator from Rhode Island is an exceedingly able lawyer and I have a great deal of respect for his judgment on law. However, I cannot believe that the Senator from Rhode Island has given sufficient consideration to the legal implications inherent in this compact insofar as civil rights are concerned. I do not believe he recognizes that we are dealing here with a proposal which in effect gives the sanction of the Federal Government to a principle of segregation on a regional basis.

I appreciate the fact that the civil-rights issue is a burning issue within the Democratic Party, but I am not at all desirous of having the Republican Party solve that problem for the Democratic Party except on the basis of a solution which is right. I do not consider this compact represents sound policy in the field of civil rights. Therefore, I do not want to see the Republican Party in the Senate approve this compact.

Hence, I may move at a later time that the entire matter be recommitted to the Judiciary Committee for further consideration because I do not think the compact can be reconciled with what I consider to be sound Republican policy in the field of civil rights. I hope that upon reflection my good friend from Rhode Island, will reach the conclusion that it cannot be reconciled with the great defense of civil rights which he has been making throughout the country.

The next point I wish to make about the brilliant speech of the Senator from Kentucky this afternoon is the second premise which I heard him lay down. That, as I recall, was that, after all, a State has the prerogative over education. We must keep it that way, and I completely agree with the Senator from Kentucky. But I say to him—and I do not expect a disagreement from him on this point—I think the best way to avoid the very issue he raises here this afternoon is for the States to go on their independent way under existing decisions of the United States Supreme Court as they relate to State educational policies. I know of nothing that keeps them from doing that, so far as the United States Supreme Court follows through the decisions it has handed down over the years in regard to State prerogatives over education.

I wish to say to my good friend from Kentucky that I quite agree that those prerogatives should be kept within the State. But that is quite a different thing from coming along with a compact that asks the Congress of the United States, in behalf of the Federal Government, to approve a compact which unavoidably has within it a sanction of a policy to which many of us in the Senate cannot, in my judgment, in good faith agree. What I want to say here tonight in closing my argument is that I never want to see the Republican Party agree to it. As a Republican, as a constitutional liberal within the Republican Party, I wish to say to each and every Republican Senator in the Senate today that I do not think sound Republican policy can possibly justify sanctioning the compact that is before us for approval.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I want to know what a constitutional liberal is, as compared with the nine Republicans who said they were liberals. I want to know what a "constitutional liberal" is as compared with a "liberal."

Mr. MORSE. I love all my Republican colleagues in the Senate, I am fond of them all. I think they are all "progressives" so far as some issues are concerned. I will answer the Senator's question only by telling him what I think a constitutional liberal is. He is a man who believes in applying the guaranties and legal principles of the Constitution

to human and property rights in America. Consistently, I try to make that test of my liberalism, recognizing, as I said the other day, the good old Lincoln doctrine, that after all we can best protect property rights by first protecting human rights. That is about as brief a definition of constitutional liberalism as I can give my good friend from North Dakota.

Summarizing my argument on the second point raised by the Senator from Kentucky, it is because I believe that State educational policy should be the prerogative of the States that I think it is a great mistake to ask the Congress to sanction this compact.

Further, as to his next point, the Senator said—and I paraphrase his language as I recall it—that we should not adopt the compact, the Morse amendment, or any of the amendments as a national policy because our educational bill, which we passed recently, is contrary to those amendments. If the Senator from Kentucky and the junior Senator from Oregon have any difference at all it is only a matter of degree, and I am not sure that there is a degree of difference. But I would point out to my good friend from Kentucky that our education bill, which was an appropriation bill, was drafted on the basis of the Senator's own theory of States' rights in education. Our bill was based upon the theory of the State's right to control education within the State. It was based upon the theory that the money would go to State schools or to schools located within the State. It was based upon the theory not of schools resting upon a regional compact, but upon the basis of schools operating as State schools within the boundaries of a State. As a member of the full committee, not of the subcommittee, but of the full committee that brought forth that bill, as the records of the committee will show, I was one of the most insistent members of the committee that States' rights over education be guaranteed under that bill. I insisted that no attempt be made through the bill for the Federal Government to exercise control in any way over State educational policies.

As I said last Thursday when my good friend the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] asked me a somewhat similar question, these things become matters of degree. I do not think that appropriation bills, such as the Smith-Hughes Act—and I used that as an illustration last Thursday—which seek to make Federal funds available to certain educational institutions in our States which are after all, controlled by State policies, constitute a sound argument or a good precedent against my position in opposition to the compact before us. As I see it, here we have now a proposal which seeks to secure Federal sanction for a policy of segregation and discrimination on a regional basis, and to that I cannot agree.

My good friend the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] read a series of letters into the RECORD from people who were concerned about Meharry. I think Meharry is a red herring in this argument. By that I mean, Mr. President, that I do not think Meharry has any relevancy—any materiality—to the issue that is before us—as to whether or not the Senate of the United States should approve a compact which seeks to authorize the setting up of regional schools, when that compact does not contain guaranties and protection of what I consider to be inalienable civil rights.

There is nothing which stops the Southern States from supporting Meharry if they want to. There is nothing which stops the great State of Tennessee from supporting Meharry if it wants to. Since when, merely because an institution, great as Meharry is, finds itself in difficulty financially, can that be used as a justification for coming in here and trying to push through the Senate of the United States a compact which also contains, in my judgment, a national policy proposal in regard to civil rights? I think my good friend the Senator from Wisconsin in all of his argument about Meharry does not come to grips with the import and the implication of the regional aspects of the compact.

He cited a number of letters. I have a couple of letters from Oregon because Meharry has many friends throughout the United States. I always try to be exceedingly fair to my constituents. I have some constituents in Oregon, including the dean of the University of Oregon Dental School, Dr. Harold J. Noyes, and the secretary of the Oregon State Board of Dental Examiners, Dr. Floyd L. Utter, who have written me asking support of this project. As a matter of courtesy to the Senator from Wisconsin, I would be perfectly willing to have those two letters incorporated in the RECORD along with the letters which he introduced because I think that is the most appropriate place. However, I also would be very happy to have them printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letters will be printed in the RECORD as the Senator from Oregon requests.

The letters are as follows:

OREGON STATE BOARD
OF DENTAL EXAMINERS,
Portland, Oreg., April 12, 1948.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Under separate cover I am sending you literature concerning Meharry Medical and Dental College of Nashville, Tenn.

I will appreciate any assistance in this problem as this medical and dental school is recognized as an accredited dental school by the council on dental education of the American Dental Association.

Sincerely,
FLOYD L. UTTER, D. M. D.,
Secretary, Oregon State Board of Dental Examiners.

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
DENTAL SCHOOL,
Portland, Oreg., April 26, 1948.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to enlist the support of Senate Joint Resolution 191, A Compact by Southern States for Regional Education, which, if passed, will permit the continuance of Meharry Medical College, an institution which has produced over half of the Negro physicians and dentists in this country since 1876.

I have personally watched the development of this school and can speak with both feeling and confidence for its great service in a professional field that is disgracefully neglected in our country. Because of my knowledge and acquaintance with Dr. M. Don Clawson, president, and Dr. Clifton O. Dummett, dean of the School of Dentistry, Meharry Medical College, I can testify to their earnest and self-sacrificing efforts to carry on with limited facilities in the past. They are now faced with the possibility of the deletion of their efforts because of the lack of financial support.

The improvement of medical and dental services for the Negroes will not only assist in bettering general health conditions in the country, but also may further adjust the racial problem, the seriousness of which, I am sure, you realize.

I am hopeful that you, together with the other members of Oregon's congressional delegation, will use your influence to secure the passage of this bill.

Sincerely yours,
HAROLD J. NOYES, D. D. S., M. D.,
Dean, University of Oregon Dental School.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, what I want to say is that the two distinguished gentlemen from my State in their letters do not discuss at all the issue that I see in this compact. It is not raised by their letters. But they are friends of Meharry. They feel the importance of keeping Meharry going, as I do, but I think it ought to be done outside of the compact, which raises a civil-rights issue.

In the course of his remarks the Senator from Wisconsin made some comments in regard to the representatives of the colored people who appeared before his committee. Senators will find their testimony in the hearings. I want to say most respectfully to the Senator from Wisconsin that the burden of proof is on him to show that these witnesses, representing the various colored groups, the names of which I am about to read, did not represent the members of those associations. Unless he sustains that burden of proof, then I most respectfully say to the Senator from Wisconsin that he it not justified in giving the impression that the witnesses sent to his committee by those associations do not represent the policy of those associations. I say, Mr. President, without fear of successful contradiction that the Senator from Wisconsin is dead wrong, completely wrong, if he thinks the witnesses representing those associations do not represent the true policy of the great majority of the members of the associations.

I can recognize from the arguments made in his own hearings why it is difficult for my good friend from Wisconsin to meet the logical soundness of the argument that those witnesses presented. But it will be found, Mr. President, in the hearings, and it will be found in the data I shall be able to present, that the representatives from the National Medical Association, which is the Negro medical association, the National Dental Association, which is the Negro association, the National Association of Colored Graduate Nurses, the Conferences of Presidents of Negro Land-Grant Colleges, the American Teachers Association, the

Fraternal Council of Negro Churches, the National Association of Negro Insurance Companies, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and the Negro Newspaper Publishers Association of 65 member newspapers, testified or offered testimony or written memoranda in opposition to this compact.

Since my speech of last Thursday I have received communications from the Negro medical profession of the State of Florida, from the Dade Academy of Medicine, of Miami, Fla., whose president is J. K. Johnson and whose secretary is C. R. Hogan; from the editor of the Atlanta (Ga.) Daily World, C. A. Scott; From C. L. Harper, chairman, Southwide Conference on Regional Educational Plan, Atlanta, Ga.; from L. H. Foster, president Conference of Land-Grant Colleges, and from J. H. Calhoun of the Omega Psi Phi Fraternity, one of the most prominent of the Negro associations, all in opposition to this compact. All are in opposition to this compact, on the ground of the principle of segregation which is inherent therein.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the telegrams and letters referred to printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the telegrams and letters will be printed in the RECORD as requested.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, subject to further argument tomorrow, I say that I am convinced, on the basis of the clear representations from Negro organizations contained in the Judiciary Committee's own hearings, and on the basis of a voluminous quantity of testimony which can be presented from representatives of the Negro race, that spokesmen for the race, by a large majority, are opposed to the principles of this compact.

Mr. President, I regret that the battle over civil rights is to occur in the United States Senate in this particular form. I close tonight, after making a correction of my amendment, with this plea to the Republican Party:

When we write in our convention platforms that we believe in civil rights and that we intend to work toward the end of full civil rights, we either mean it or we do not—taking into account what I have so many times pointed out—that it must be progress, and that we must not seek to accomplish an end by way of a social avalanche. We must recognize that we must do it step by step, but ever forward, never backward. This compact, I submit, is a big step backward so far as protecting civil rights is concerned. My party either means it, and is called upon now to back up its action in the past few Republican conventions, or it must stand before the people of the country who believe in full civil rights as a party of political hypocrisy.

Harsh as that is, Mr. President, I mean it. I believe that the Republicans in the United States Senate cannot take a "walk-out powder" on this issue. We either stand against segregation on a regional basis or we are for segregation. We either stand against segregation when we are called upon to sanction a compact that has within it segregation and therefore approve it as a Federal policy or we are against it. If the Republican Party approves this compact, then the people of the United States will be justified in believing that we are really against the objective of eliminating segregation.

I am not talking about segregation under State laws. I can read the United States Supreme Court decisions. I think I know what they mean. But a Supreme Court decision based upon a set of State facts is something quite different and distinct from a set of facts involving a regional organization. We cannot escape that fact in this debate.

So, Mr. President, whether they like it or not, on this issue Republicans in the United States Senate are up against the question of civil rights. So far as the junior Senator from Oregon is concerned, they will have an opportunity to meet it in full, unless this measure is recommitted. I think it ought to go back to committee, in the light of the brilliant statement of the Senator from Kentucky this afternoon, and in the light of the premise I sought to lay down in my speech last Thursday, when I stated that congressional action on this compact is not necessary.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have my amendment redrafted from the standpoint of sentence structure so as to read:

Any regional school established under this compact shall not apply any registration qualifications based upon a discrimination because of race, color, or creed to any student.

In other words, I transpose the language "to any student" so that a better sentence structure is obtained.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be modified as requested.

EXHIBIT A

OMEGA PSI PHI FRATERNITY,
Atlanta, Ga., May 7, 1948.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Further reference is made to my telegram of May 6, 1948, addressed to you on behalf of the Omega Psi Phi Fraternity, and urging opposition to the Southern regional-education plan, which is now before the Senate for consideration.

Before opposing this plan, a canvas was made among the graduate and undergraduate members of the fraternity of 185 chapters, located in 35 States and the District of Columbia. Only three of the responses received favored the plan as proposed, and these were apparently based upon a misunderstanding of its real purpose. In addition to this, all five of our district meetings, which have been held, with representatives from Maryland, Texas, District of Columbia, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Mississippi, Alabama, Tennessee, Kentucky, Arizona, and California have registered similar opposition in strongly worded resolutions. The other seven districts will probably do likewise when they meet.

There is no question, but that the subtle objective of this proposal is to perpetuate discrimination based upon segregation, in 15 Southern States, and to circumvent the plain intention of decisions of the United States Supreme Court.

Most Negroes feel that Meharry Medical College need not be sacrificed for a principle of democracy, but that each State should provide adequate educational facilities for all of its citizens within its own borders. The State of Tennessee is no exception. It is, therefore, a matter of insincere expediency that these States plead "States' rights" when questions of civil rights are raised, and yet enter into a compact which violates that principle. Counting from the days of slavery, the South has moved toward justice only under pressure of outside public opinion or Federal legislation.

On behalf of the fraternity, Negro citizens at large and their posterity, I wish to thank you for your consideration in the matter and urge you to continue opposition against this vicious resolution.

Sincerely yours,

J. H. CALHOUN,
First Vice Grand Basileus.

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA., *May 10, 1948.*

Senator MORSE,
Senate Chamber, State Capitol:

We, the Negro medical profession in the State of Florida, congratulate you on your stand and object in opposing regional education now before Congress. May God bless your cause.

Dr. V. D. MIZELL,
Executive Chairman.

MIAMI, FLA., *May 8, 1948.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

We congratulate you on your stand in regard to the regional-education plan.

DADE ACADEMY OF MEDICINE,
J. K. JOHNSON, *President.*
C. R. HOGAN, *Secretary.*

ATLANTA GA., *May 8, 1948.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Note with appreciation your stand on regional-education bill. Urge your continued opposition to this scheme to get congressional approval to segregation which would be a backward step for democracy. Bill should be defeated or amended to prevent discrimination on account of race, color, creed, or religion.

C. A. SCOTT,
Editor, Atlanta Daily World.

ATLANTA, GA., *May 8, 1948.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Over 100 educational and civic leaders representing 37 organizations in 8 Southern States today heard proponents and opponents but adopted resolutions condemning regional school compact, especially taking over Meharry and segregation at professional college and secondary levels. We urge your opposition to joint resolution as subtle move to perpetuate discrimination.

C. L. HARPER,
Chairman, Southwide Conference on Regional Educational Plan, Atlanta, Ga.

PETERSBURG, VA., *May 7, 1948.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I share the considered opinion of the Conference of Presidents of Negro Land-Grant Colleges, composed of 24 institutions, that the plan for regional education as proposed should not be approved by the Congress. I hope you will oppose this bill.

L. H. FOSTER,
President, Conference of Land-Grant Colleges.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed tomorrow

when the Senate reconvenes with the argument on the law which I had hoped to be able to make tonight.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I was about to ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Oregon be recognized when the Senate convenes tomorrow. I should like to have the unanimous-consent order modified so as to permit disposition of routine business and requests by Senators for insertions in the RECORD. Then the Senator from Oregon could be recognized to resume the argument which he started this afternoon. Is that arrangement agreeable to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. MORSE. That is perfectly satisfactory to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is the intention of the leadership, provided it meets with the approval of the Senate, to proceed with consideration of the compact until we shall have concluded action upon the legislation. That means that Senators who desire to offer amendments should be prepared promptly to offer their amendments and debate the question, because it is our present intention to complete consideration of the compact and not set it aside for any other legislation. That is the immediate program.

Mr. President, since the Senate appears to have concluded its work for the day, I move that a recess be taken until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 11, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 10, 1948:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 1 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Don C. Bliss, Jr., of Mississippi.
Clarence C. Brooks, of New Jersey.
Edward S. Crocker 2d, of Massachusetts.
Joseph C. Satterthwaite, of Michigan.
Howard H. Tewksbury, of New Hampshire.

Clare H. Timberlake, of Michigan, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Francis Bowden Stevens, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 3 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Aaron S. Brown, of Michigan.
Edmund A. Gullion, of Kentucky.
John C. Pool, of Delaware.
Charles W. Thayer, of Pennsylvania.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 4 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls of the United States of America:

William L. Blue, of Tennessee.
Robert M. Brandin, of New York.
John A. Calhoun, of California.
Adrian B. Colquitt, of Georgia.
David LeBreton, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Paul Paddock, of Iowa.
Claude G. Ross, of California.
Terry B. Sanders, Jr., of Texas.
Byron B. Snyder, of California.

Robert J. Dorr, of California, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Vernon B. Zirkle, of Virginia.
William B. Douglass, Jr., of South Carolina.
W. John Wilson, Jr., of Montana.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

John J. Fitzpatrick, of Fairfield, Conn., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Connecticut, in place of Frank W. Kraemer, removed.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be senior assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance:

Sylvia Ginsberg	K. Barbara Dormin
Anne M. Leffingwell	Helen N. Buzan
M. Dolores Howley	

To be assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance:

Patricia B. Geiser	Mary M. Bouser
Frances Moskowitz	Ruth D. Buckley
Helen M. Ely	Phyllis B. Kyte
M. Elizabeth Leeds	Mary Jean Yardley
Enid L. Taylor	Katherine L. Broyles
Mary A. French	Beatrice E. Nichols
Dorothy G. Young	Loretta D. Banks

To be junior assistant nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective date of acceptance:

Norma Russell

IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy from the 4th day of June 1948, in lieu of appointment as ensigns in the Navy as previously nominated:

Augustine A. Albanese	Harvey R. Humphrey
Levon Berberian, Jr.	Leonard A. Jay, Jr.
Jack Baruch	William E. Johnston
Robert P. Barber	Harold L. Robiner
Floyd E. Bergeaux	Wilburn A. Speer, Jr.
James H. H. Carrington	Hart R. Stringfellow, Jr.
Matthew A. Chiara	Howard A. True
Lawrence C. Hernandez, Jr.	

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy from the 4th day of June 1948, in lieu of appointment as ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy as previously nominated:

Edward A. McManus
Marvin A. Weir

The following-named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Francis L. Ames, June 4, 1948.
Donald W. Baker, June 4, 1948.
Ernest Burks, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Homer L. Burrell, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Rodney B. Carter, June 4, 1948.
Henry E. Covert, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Edward S. Disbrow, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Norman K. Donahoe, June 4, 1948.
Robert S. Donovan, June 4, 1948.
Walter M. Earley, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Ray W. Flickinger, Jr., June 4, 1948.
William F. Fraser, June 4, 1948.
William F. Glass, June 4, 1948.
Ervin E. Goins, June 4, 1948.
William F. Goodman, June 4, 1948.
Harry G. Harber, June 4, 1948.
James "G" Hayes, June 4, 1948.
Frank A. Hayn, June 4, 1948.
Robert F. Henning, June 4, 1948.
Robert L. Jasmin, June 4, 1948.
John F. Kail, June 4, 1948.
Roderick J. Kulus, June 4, 1948.
William C. Lamont, June 4, 1948.
Albert P. Lesperance, June 4, 1948.
Charles A. Luff, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Earl Mann, June 4, 1948.
Charles W. Melville, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Edward L. Miles, June 4, 1948.
George B. Moore, June 4, 1948.
Carl D. Neidhold, June 4, 1948.
Leland E. Nelson, June 4, 1948.
William L. Neubauer, June 4, 1948.
Paul A. Peck, June 4, 1948.
Edward Phillips, June 4, 1948.
John H. Pickering, June 4, 1948.
Edward W. Rhoads, June 4, 1948.
David W. Robertson, June 4, 1948.
Frank H. Sheffield, June 4, 1948.
Bailey D. Sterrett, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Russel A. Walter June 4 1948.
Charles J. White, June 4, 1948.
Lloyd C. Wholey, June 4, 1948.
Alan S. Wilhite, June 4, 1948.

The following named (Naval R. O. T. C.) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Ronald R. Oberle, June 4, 1948.
Duane A. Tarpenning, June 4, 1948.

Herbert E. Reichert (Naval R. O. T. C.) to be an ensign in the Navy from the 4th day of June 1948, in lieu of ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy, as previously nominated and confirmed.

Charles D. Rohay (Naval R. O. T. C.) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy from the 4th day of June 1948.

The following named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

Thomas L. H. Collin	Ralph W. Hopkins
Theodore C. Herrmann	Peter A. Schmitt

The following named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

James E. Beckett	Douglas T. Kitterman
William R. Bracey	Neville S. Long
Carl F. Carrilio	Charles G. Miller, Jr.
Paul "M" Churton	David C. More
Charles E. Diehl	Lawrence F. O'Neill
Paul J. Doyle, Jr.	John J. Reeve, Jr.
John T. Hanley	Carl R. Seitz
Robert H. Heuston	William E. Wilson
Whitney B. Jones	George R. Yount.

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the line of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

John S. Leahy, Jr.

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Marcos A. Godinez
Thomas F. Gowen
Gustave A. Roy

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Samuel A. Heaton, Jr.	Harold T. Meryman
Alanson Hinman	George M. Rugtiv
Walter G. Leonard, Jr.	William M. Strunk

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

George W. Jenkins

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Walter J. Demer
Charles M. Heck
Clarence Y. Murff, Jr.

LIEUTENANTS

Byrnes E. Missman
Edwin M. Sherwood
Wendell Whetstone

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Van L. Johnson, Jr.
Charles W. Lynds
John J. Stifter, Jr.

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Alan D. Grinsted
Claude V. Timberlake, Jr.

LIEUTENANTS

James W. Bagby, Jr. Alf R. Hagen
Benjamin F. Burgess, Jr. Frederick O. Ottie

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Joseph P. Factor Solomon C. Pflug
Joseph J. Martorano Robert F. Rigg

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS

Irena G. Cook
Lois G. Moyer
Alma M. Shebakis

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Julia M. Blair Mary A. Moniz
Lucille F. Finney Rose M. Ralston
Juliet M. Kouns Mary E. Whalen

ENSIGNS

Dorothy M. Moon
Rita A. Sieland

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate May 10, 1948:

POSTMASTER

Mrs. Mabel S. Merz to be postmaster at Ivyland, in the State of Pennsylvania.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 10, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, be Thou our guardian and our guide. We pray that we may serve the state with pronounced conviction and fidelity, with heart and mind assured that these may be hours of wise decisions and selfless endeavors.

Deliver us from frantic boasts and foolish words, and help us to assimilate Thy precepts to the honor of all men.

We praise Thee that with one accord our country has set apart a day called by the most endearing name of all—Mother. For the sake of her who formed our first prayer into words and folded our hands in reverence, we pray that no shame or defilement will ever cause us to shadow her name. O let her memory rule and transform our conduct until our natures are stirred with its blessing. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 6, 1948, was read and approved.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

MAY 10, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: Pursuant to the authority heretofore agreed to, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate on May 7 the following message:

"That the Senate agree to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6055) entitled 'An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.'

"That the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 6226) entitled 'An act making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes,' insists upon its amendments to said bill, requests a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and has appointed Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BALL, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. TYDINGS conferees on the part of the Senate; and

"That the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2287) entitled 'An act to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes,' requests a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and has appointed Mr. BUCK, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. MAYBANK, and Mr. FULBRIGHT conferees on the part of the Senate."

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had on May 7, 1948, examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6055. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on May 6, 1948, he did on May 7, 1948, sign the following enrolled bill:

H. R. 6055. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] on last Thursday, as reported in the daily RECORD on page 5590, made this statement: "the gentleman from Missouri, who has the facility for making statements that sometimes do not accord with the facts."

And later on: "as the gentleman from Missouri well knows."

Mr. Speaker, I do not always hear everything that is said on the floor, and I did not hear the statement at the time and did not know anything about it until I saw it in the RECORD.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a resolution (H. Res. 587) which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] beginning with the words "who has" on page 5590 of the daily RECORD down to and including the words "the facts" be stricken from the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this resolution strikes out 15 words, as follows: "who has the facility for making statements that sometimes do not accord with the facts."

Mr. Speaker, those words are in flagrant violation of the rules of decorum of the House of Representatives, as well as every other parliamentary body in the world. Such words are never printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. As it is a subject which does not admit of debate, I move the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the previous question is ordered, then we will not even have an opportunity to debate this matter; is that not correct?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has stated the situation correctly.

The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 22, noes 29.

So the previous question was not ordered.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to be heard on the question.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for recognition just to say one word.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. RAYBURN. Why the previous question was voted down is a little amazing to me. I cannot conceive of anybody wanting to debate the question of whether or not a Member of this House would tell the truth.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker being in doubt, on a division there were—ayes 33, noes 37.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present, and I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present. The roll call is automatic.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 121, nays 171, answered "present" 2, not voting 137, as follows:

[Roll No. 57]

YEAS—121

Abernethy	Beckworth	Brooks
Albert	Blatnik	Brown, Ga.
Allen, La.	Boggs, La.	Bryson
Andrews, Ala.	Bonner	Buchanan

Bulwinkle	Gregory	Pace
Burleson	Hardy	Passman
Byrne, N. Y.	Harless, Ariz.	Patman
Camp	Harris	Peden
Cannon	Harrison	Pickett
Carroll	Havenner	Poage
Celler	Holifield	Preston
Colmer	Huber	Price, Fla.
Combs	Jackson, Wash.	Price, Ill.
Cooley	Jones, Ala.	Priest
Cooper	Karsten, Mo.	Rankin
Courtney	Kefauver	Rayburn
Cox	Kelley	Regan
Cravens	Kerr	Richards
Davis, Ga.	Kilday	Rogers, Fla.
Davis Tenn.	King	Sabath
Dingell	Lanham	Sadowski
Domengeaux	Lea	Sasscer
Donohue	Lesinski	Schwabe, Mo.
Eberharter	Lucas	Smathers
Elliott	McCormack	Smith, Va.
Evins	McMillan, S. C.	Somers
Feighan	Mahon	Spence
Fernandez	Manasco	Teague
Fisher	Mansfield	Thomas, Tex.
Flannagan	Mason	Thompson
Folger	Merrow	Trimble
Forand	Mills	Vinson
Garmatz	Monroney	Walter
Gary	Morris	Wheeler
Gathings	Morrison	Whittington
Gordon	Muhlenberg	Wilson, Tex.
Gore	Multer	Winstead
Gorski	Murray, Tenn.	Wood
Gossett	Norrell	Worley
Granger	Norton	
Grant Ala.	O'Brien	

NAYS—171

Allen, Calif.	Gamble	Michener
Allen, Ill.	Gavin	Miller, Conn.
Anderson, Calif.	Gearhart	Miller, Md.
Angell	Gillette	Miller, Nebr.
Arends	Gillie	Morton
Arnold	Goff	Murray, Wis.
Auchincloss	Goodwin	Nicholson
Bakewell	Graham	Nixon
Bates, Mass.	Grant, Ind.	Norblad
Bender	Griffiths	O'Hara
Bennett, Mich.	Gross	O'Konski
Bishop	Gwynne, Iowa	Owens
Blackney	Hagen	Patterson
Boggs, Del.	Hale	Phillips, Calif.
Bolton	Harness, Ind.	Phillips, Tenn.
Bradley	Harvey	Potter
Bramblett	Herter	Ramey
Brehm	Heselton	Reed, Ill.
Brophy	Hess	Reed, N. Y.
Brown, Ohio	Hill	Rees
Buck	Hinshaw	Reeves
Buffett	Hoeven	Rich
Burke	Hoffman	Riehlman
Busbey	Holmes	Rizley
Byrnes, Wis.	Hope	Rockwell
Carson	Horan	Rogers, Mass.
Case, N. J.	Hull	Ross
Chenoweth	Jenkins, Pa.	Russell
Chiperfield	Jensen	Sadlak
Church	Johnson, Calif.	St. George
Clason	Johnson, Ill.	Sanborn
Clevenger	Johnson, Ind.	Sarbacher
Coffin	Jonkman	Schwabe, Okla.
Cole, Mo.	Judd	Scrivner
Cole, N. Y.	Keating	Seely-Brown
Cotton	Keefe	Short
Coudert	Kersten, Wis.	Simpson, Ill.
Crawford	Kilburn	Smith, Kans.
Crow	Knutson	Smith, Maine
Cunningham	Landis	Smith, Wis.
Curtis	LeCompte	Snyder
Dague	LeFevre	Stefan
Davis, Wis.	Lewis, Ohio	Stevenson
Dawson, Utah	Lodge	Stockman
Devitt	Love	Sundstrom
D'Ewart	McConnell	Taber
Dirksen	McDonough	Talle
Dolliver	McDowell	Tibbott
Dondero	McMahon	Tollefson
Eaton	McMillen, Ill.	Van Zandt
Ellsworth	Mack	Vorys
Elston	MacKinnon	Wadsworth
Engel, Mich.	Macy	Wigglesworth
Fellows	Maloney	Wolcott
Fenton	Martin, Iowa	Wolverton
Foote	Meade, Ky.	Woodruff
Fulton	Meyer	Youngblood

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Chadwick Jones, Wash.

NOT VOTING—137

Abbitt	Andrews, N. Y.	Battle
Andersen H. Carl	Banta	Beall
	Barden	Bell
Andresen, August H.	Barrett	Bennett, Mo.
	Bates, Ky.	Bland
Bloom	Isacson	O'Toole
Boykin	Jackson, Calif.	Peterson
Buckley	Jarman	Pfeifer
Butler	Javits	Philbin
Canfield	Jenison	Ploeser
Case, S. Dak.	Jenkins, Ohio	Plumley
Chapman	Jennings	Potts
Chelf	Johnson, Okla.	Poulson
Clark	Johnson, Tex.	Powell
Clippinger	Jones, N. C.	Rains
Cole, Kans.	Kean	Redden
Corbett	Kearney	Riley
Crosser	Kearns	Rivers
Dawson, Ill.	Kee	Robertson
Deane	Kennedy	Rohrbough
Delaney	Keogh	Rooney
Dorn	Kirwan	Scoblick
Doughton	Klein	Scott, Hardie
Douglas	Kunkel	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Durham	Lane	
Ellis	Larcade	Shafer
Elsaesser	Latham	Sheppard
Engle, Calif.	Lemke	Sikes
Fallon	Lewis, Ky.	Simpson, Pa.
Fletcher	Lichtenwalter	Smith, Ohio
Fogarty	Ludlow	Stanley
Fuller	Lusk	Stigler
Gallagher	Lyle	Stratton
Gwinn, N. Y.	Lynch	Taylor
Hall, Edwin Arthur	McCowen	Thomas, N. J.
	McCulloch	Towe
Hall, Leonard W.	McGarvey	Twyman
	McGregor	Vail
Halleck	Madden	Vursell
Hand	Marcantonio	Weichel
Hart	Mathews	Welch
Hartley	Meade, Md.	West
Hays	Miller, Calif.	Whitaker
Hébert	Mitchell	Whitten
Hedrick	Morgan	Williams
Heffernan	Mundt	Wilson, Ind.
Hendricks	Murdock	
Hobbs	Nodar	

So the resolution was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hays for, with Mr. McGarvey against.
Mr. Deane for, with Mr. Canfield against.
Mr. Hart for, with Mr. Latham against.
Mr. Redden for, with Mr. Kean against.
Mr. Murdock for, with Mr. Nodar against.
Mrs. Douglas for, with Mr. Towe against.
Mr. Fogarty for, with Mr. Leonard W. Hall against.
Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Hand against.
Mr. Battle for, with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., against.
Mr. Rains for, with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey against.
Mr. Chapman for, with Mr. Corbett against.
Mr. Chelf for, with Mr. Halleck against.
Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Jenkins of Ohio against.
Mrs. Lusk for, with Mr. Hardie Scott against.
Mr. Stanley for, with Mr. Kunkel against.
Mr. Williams for, with Mr. McGregor against.
Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma for, with Mr. Mathews against.
Mr. Kennedy for, with Mr. Taylor against.
Mr. Dorn for, with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania against.
Mr. Hobbs for, with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall against.
Mr. Rivers for, with Mr. Elsaesser against.
Mr. Philbin for, with Mr. Kearns against.
Mr. Riley for, with Mr. Potts against.
Mr. Morgan for, with Mr. Jenison against.
Mr. Lane for, with Mr. Kearney against.
Mr. Madden for, with Mr. Lichtenwalter against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Bennett of Missouri with Mr. Sheppard.
Mr. Butler with Mr. Fallon.
Mr. Case of South Dakota with Mr. Engle of California.
Mr. Jackson of California with Mr. Sikes.
Mr. Jennings with Mr. Clark.
Mr. Banta with Mr. Keogh.
Mr. Andrews of New York with Mr. Pfeifer.
Mr. H. Carl Andersen with Mr. Rooney.
Mr. Beall with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Lynch.
Mr. Cole of Kansas with Mr. Heffernan.
Mr. Ellis with Mr. Abbitt.
Mr. Fletcher with Mr. Marcantonio.
Mr. Fuller with Mr. Isacson.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Bloom.
Mr. Mundt with Mr. O'Toole.
Mr. Lemke with Mr. Miller of California.
Mr. McCowen with Mr. Larcade.
Mr. McCulloch with Mr. Klein.
Mr. Rohrbough with Mr. Kirwan.
Mr. Ploeser with Mr. Delaney.
Mr. Gwinn of New York with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.
Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Jones of North Carolina.
Mr. Weichel with Mr. Barden.
Mr. Poulson with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. Bates of Kentucky.
Mr. Vail with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Welch with Mr. West.
Mr. Vursell with Mr. Whitten.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Durham.
Mr. August H. Andresen with Mr. Stigler.

Mrs. BOLTON changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, on May 6, 1948, immediately following an address to the Congress by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and when he was present, I made this statement, in part:

Mr. Speaker, I take this time merely to keep the record straight, in view of the statement that has just been made by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who has the facility for making statements that sometimes do not accord with the facts.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has asked that those words, "who has the facility for making statements that sometimes do not accord with the facts," be stricken from the permanent RECORD as being an unparliamentary statement.

I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have never knowingly or willfully made an unparliamentary statement on the floor of Congress. I regret exceedingly that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] feels that his reputation as a Member of Congress has been assailed or injured by that statement.

I do not care to have in the permanent RECORD of the Congress any statement attributed to me which could be challenged in any way as being unparliamentary in character. I regret only that the gentleman from Missouri did not come to me in the first place instead of precipitating this episode. I would have been very glad as a colleague and as a Member of Congress to have acceded to any request he might make to change or eliminate those words complained of from the RECORD. He did not do so. The first I knew of it was this morning when he took the floor.

In view of that, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the words com-

plained of may be stricken from the permanent RECORD of the Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from from Wisconsin?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman says I did not come to him and the first he knew of it was when I took the floor. The facts are that I notified him half an hour ago in the committee in which we were meeting in the presence of the committee that I would take up this matter on the floor when the House met, and he acknowledged my notification before the entire committee. So far as hearing him make the statement, I did not hear the remark; neither did the gentleman from Texas, who was sitting beside me here at the time. The first I knew of it was when I saw it printed in the RECORD.

I am constrained to object, Mr. Speaker, to the request of the gentleman. I want the words to remain in the RECORD to show the depths of partisanship to which the leadership on that side of the aisle has descended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. CANNON. I object.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. My parliamentary inquiry is this: It is conceded that both the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from Wisconsin were on the floor and engaged in general debate. The gentleman from Missouri made a statement. Immediately following that statement the gentleman from Wisconsin made the statement which is here in question. Under the rules of the House it would have been the right of the gentleman from Missouri to ask that any unparliamentary words be taken down. Whether or not the words were unparliamentary would then have been decided by the Speaker. The gentleman from Missouri did not pursue that course. Days later, and possibly the day following the publishing of the next RECORD, the gentleman from Missouri moves to strike.

Following the rule, when unparliamentary words are inserted in the RECORD which have not been spoken on the floor they may be stricken out.

I am afraid of the precedent that might be set. I think we are in a bad parliamentary situation. My parliamentary inquiry is this: Does this instance create a precedent which will permit any Member of Congress on any future date during a session to move to strike out any unparliamentary words in the RECORD simply because he says he did not happen to hear the words or understand it even though he was present when the words were uttered?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is glad to answer the gentleman's parliamentary inquiry.

The gentleman from Missouri asked unanimous consent that the resolution be considered. Had any Member of the House objected, the resolution could not have been considered.

The Chair, of course, believes that a unanimous-consent request can be presented at any time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. In order that the ruling may be clearly understood in the future I think the Chair's position should be clear. The inference might be drawn that the resolution was offered directly from the floor without asking unanimous consent. In order to cover the whole situation may I ask the Chair what the Chair's views would be in the event the resolution were offered from the floor?

The SPEAKER. The Chair merely answered the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan. Had this been presented as a resolution it would have been an entirely different question and the Chair would not have recognized the gentleman to call it up. The House in this instance agreed to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan has just spoken about this being a precedent. It is not to be presumed that even though a Member be on the floor of the House he hears everything that is said in the House.

Mr. MICHENER. Under the rules of the House it is so presumed.

Mr. RAYBURN. I think the gentleman will find if he will look at the precedents it has been held otherwise.

Mr. MICHENER. I hope the gentleman will cite those precedents.

Mr. RAYBURN. I think I can and I will do so, if I can——

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, with respect to the gentleman who is now speaking, the contention has always been made since I have been a Member of Congress that with or without the microphone not only people on the floor but in the galleries and within this part of the Capitol have been able to hear the gentleman from Wisconsin quite well.

Mr. RAYBURN. That may be so. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan may try to sugar-coat the vote that has just been cast, but I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that in all the years I have been a Member of this House trying to bring about comity between the Members who are divided by that aisle this is the most unfortunate vote I have ever known this House to cast.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6226) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from New York if it will be possible to take this matter up in the near future and give expeditious consideration to it and if he expects to be able to secure a conference at an early date?

Mr. TABER. I have an appointment for 4:30 for a conference, and I intend to follow the appointment of conferees with the request that we may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, ENGEL of Michigan, STEFAN, CASE of South Dakota, KEEFE, CANNON, KERR, and MAHON.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees just named may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill in question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AMENDING RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION ACT

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 2287) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WOLCOTT, GAMBLE, KUNKEL, TALLE, SPENCE, BROWN of Georgia, and PATMAN.

APPOINTMENT OF NEW CONFEREE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name as one of the conferees on the bill (H. R. 2239) to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, be withdrawn and that the Speaker appoint another Member as a conferee in my place.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] to take the place of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and the Clerk will notify the Senate of the change.

DELETION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the colloquy that took place

between the former Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] and other Members concerning the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], I want to call the attention of the House to an action of 2 years ago when the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] objected to the gentleman from Missouri deleting from the RECORD statements he had made on the floor. He took great exception to it. At the same time I want to say that while the remarks of the gentleman were being deleted from the RECORD by the gentleman from Missouri, my own remarks were deleted by him as well.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, what is the gentleman trying to say?

Mr. BENDER. I am saying that the gentleman from Texas condemned the action of the Members of the House today, so I am calling attention to a comparable action of 2 years ago, much worse than that which the gentleman now complains of.

Mr. RAYBURN. That was not a similar action.

Mr. BENDER. Well, that action was taken 2 years ago. I do not care how much the gentleman objects. It was manifestly worse.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and to include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article written by him.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

SOCIALIST PROGRAM

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, when Adolf Hitler came to power, one of the first things he did was to set prices. He not only set retail prices but he set wholesale prices and thereby the mark-up margin for all engaged in trade. This National Socialist program created at that time great consternation in this country.

Now we find that the Socialist Government of Great Britain is doing the same thing. According to dispatches from London, the price freeze order is even more drastic than it was during the war. It restricts the profit margins of all manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers. It exempts only a very few things such as periodicals, automobiles, and tobacco. There will not be any limit placed on prices charged for their free American tobacco.

Mr. Speaker, this British price freeze was ordered to keep down prices to British consumers. Without American aid the British would find this an impossible task. Without our dollars the British Socialist could not afford to buy our products and sell them to the British public at lower prices than Americans have to pay. I wonder how long American taxpayers will put up with this condition. Britain's Socialist politicians find they must legislate low prices in order to keep in office. But have American taxpayers any obligation to underwrite their campaign funds. It should be noted that American political parties cannot spend more than $3,000,000 in any one year. Under Federal law no American can contribute more than $5,000 to a political campaign committee. Yet there seems to be no limit to our contributions to European Socialist campaign.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the best way to put an end to all this nonsense is to let every American housewife know that her Washington representatives think it is more important that British housewives pay low prices than it is that American workers enjoy the products of their labor at prices they can afford to pay. Frankly I do not think American housewives favor paying more for their food and clothing than British housewives do.

VITAMIN A

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have a short item of some interest to those who participated in the oleomargarine contest a week or so ago.

In the Yearbook of Agriculture entitled "Food and Life," I found a most interesting paragraph on the subject of vitamin A and its beneficial effect upon the body when used in butter.

The paragraph I refer to is on page 3 of that volume. I quote it verbatim:

> The body makes its supply of vitamin A from a yellow substance in plant foods, called carotene. It can also get vitamin A ready-made from certain oils or fats in animal foods—butterfat, for instance. During the World War, Denmark exported its butter because of the war demand and substituted other fats in the diet. Blindness, caused by lack of vitamin A, began to show up among Danish children. Their eyesight had been sold abroad with the butter.

The moral is: Eat more butter and insure the eyesight of your children and yourself.

REGULATING THE REGULATORS

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the legislation to renew selective service, I wrote to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services as follows:

> It has long been my conviction that bureaus through regulations go far beyond congressional intent, without Congress having any control over them except the absurd necessity of passing laws to repeal or correct bureau regulations. To curb that power—to "regulate the regulators"—I have several times suggested a change and proposed legislation to that end. To be effective, such a curb must be made to apply to all legislation granting regulatory authority. For its initiation, however, I have not attempted to draft a provision of general application, but rather have sought to offer amendments to apply the curb to a particular measure at the time under consideration in the House.
>
> In the Seventy-ninth Congress I introduced H. R. 3493 to contain such an amendment to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and on different occasions offered the amendment from the floor to legislation affecting OPA, and the disposal of surplus property. As in part explaining my reasoning in proposing this legislation, attention is invited to my remarks on June 22, 1945, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, volume 91, part 12, page A2994.
>
> In view of the experiences we had during the war in which the War Manpower Commission and the Selective Service failed to recognize the intent of Congress in the deferment of agricultural workers, it would seem desirable that Congress impose some curb on whatever agencies will be charged with the administration of selective service, if and when it is reestablished. Attention is invited particularly to the fact that it was necessary to put on the statute books a specific provision—the Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act, approved November 13, 1942—to provide for the deferment of agricultural labor, and that even this was not carried into effect by the administrative agencies until the Senate had passed S. 729 in the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress.
>
> To that end I am enclosing for the consideration of your committee a copy of a suggested amendment to be included in any measure to authorize the restoration of selective service. I feel so deeply concerning this matter that if the substance of the amendment is not incorporated in the bill reported by the Armed Services Committee I shall feel constrained to offer it as an amendment from the floor when the measure is brought up there.
>
> I shall be glad to discuss the matter with you at whatever time you may find it convenient.

The amendment referred to, which is designed to "regulate the regulators," reads:

> (a) Before any proposed regulation or order to carry out the purposes of this act shall be issued by any governmental agency exercising authority conferred hereunder, other than intra-agency administrative rules or orders governing the conduct of its activities or interagency rules governing relations with other agencies of the Government, a draft thereof shall be submitted to the President of the Senate for the Senate of the United States and to the Speaker of the House for the House of Representatives.
>
> (b) The draft of such proposed regulation or order shall be immediately assigned to the Committee on Armed Services in the Senate and to the Committee on Armed Services in the House of Representatives for study, to consider whether such rule or regulation is made in conformity with the spirit, intent, letter, and purpose of this act, and that no unusual or unexpected use of powers herein granted is proposed. Such regulation or order may be approved or disapproved by

the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate or by the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, or a duly authorized subcommittee of either. In the absence of action by either committee approving or disapproving such regulation or order, it may go into effect not earlier than the fifteenth day following, but not including, the date of the receipt of the draft of such proposed regulation or order by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. If sooner approved by either committee, it may go into effect immediately upon such approval. Disapproval of such regulation or order by either committee shall suspend its issuance; *Provided*, That in the event of conflicting committee actions, the earlier action shall govern.

(c) For the purposes of this section, the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, are authorized to sit and act during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of Congress.

With such an amendment, situations we found existing during the war could not arise. With it we could be certain that regulations to carry the statute into effect would be realistic and in conformity with congressional intent. It would keep the program under congressional control. It should be adopted by the House, even though its incorporation in the reported bill was rejected by the Armed Services Committee.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include two articles.

Mr. DEVITT (at the request of Mr. KEATING) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD regarding a bill he is introducing today.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Quincy (Ill.) Herald-Whig.

Mr. GEARHART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in each extraneous material.

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BUTLER (at the request of Mr. NORBLAD) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. JONKMAN asked and was given permisison to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Nation's Business for May by Junius B. Wood.

Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a talk she gave at the home of Mary Washington in Fredericksburg yesterday.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by United States Senator ED MARTIN before the Fifty-seventh Annual Continental Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and further to extend my remarks and include a letter on militarization by Arthur M. Stevenson, D. D., pastor, the Presbyterian Church, Greencastle, Pa., who expresses probably the sentiments of most thinking people.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from an eminent educator of north Kansas City opposing Federal aid to education, and further ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one a radio address by Jack Beall entitled "Communism."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by the Federation of Small Business. I do not think this exceeds the two-page limit, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact if it does.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

COMPENSATION OF WITNESSES IN TRIAL OF HAROLD CHRISTOFFEL

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am today filing a bill in the House for compensation for witnesses who came from Milwaukee to Washington to testify in the perjury trial of Harold Christoffel.

These witnesses performed a patriotic duty. They came to Washington to bring forth the truth necessary for a proper consideration by the court of the charges made in that case. It cannot be said that there was no danger in their actions because by them they were taking effective measures to unmask Communist activities in the city of Milwaukee.

When they came to Washington they were obliged to stay here during the several days of the trial at their own expense at the time. The statutory amount afforded witnesses came far short of covering their actual necessary expenses. They should not be obliged to personally bear the expense such as they have done. It is no more than just that they be at least compensated for their actual necessary expenses as witnesses attending upon this important trial, which has struck a strong blow at the Communist organization in the Middle West.

The names of the witnesses who performed this patriotic duty are as follows: Claire M. Merten, Milwaukee, Wis.; Mary Fisher, Milwaukee, Wis.; Rudolph Rolli, Milwaukee, Wis.; Carl Haferkamp, Milwaukee, Wis.; Farrell Schnering, Milwaukee, Wis.; Conrad J. Geres, Milwaukee, Wis.: Michael F. Benesch, Milwaukee, Wis.; Julius Blunk, Milwaukee, Wis.; and R. A. DeMint, Racine, Wis.

PUBLIC ENEMY NO. 1

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include certain figures.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the April 27, 1948, Wausau Record-Herald:

PUBLIC ENEMY NO. 1

Public enemy No. 1, who is he today? Not John L. Lewis, of the United Mine Workers, nor even Joseph Stalin—but, to hear some folks burst their defamation on the American farmer, this public enemy No. 1 is the tiller of the soil—the food producer. No; not the cottonseed or linseed producer, but the farmer who has to work 366 days in leap year without a single holiday—the dairyman.

Yes; he's public enemy No. 1, in fact, he's his own worst enemy today, when it's highly unpopular to be producing milk, the cream, the cheese, and the butter that folks are actually scrapping for, not only in the States, but in Canada, and overseas. Life is becoming bitter because of this scarcity of the vital food. Even the large dairy producers have reported that the farmers should be milking more and more cattle to meet the rapidly growing needs of the American population and the cry of peoples overseas for these precious foods.

If public enemy No. 1, the Wisconsin dairy farmer, today had a leader like Lewis, or like the almost forgotten Walter Singler of the Wisconsin milk pool, well, the farmer would have quit work, but he doesn't. He keeps his patience, just as every decent bossy does, instead of doing like Mrs. O'Leary's cow did on October 8, 1871, when as popular versions of Chicago's historic fire say, she kicked the lantern and started the momentous conflagration.

The writer of this editorial has long been recognized as a newspaperman that has been constructive in his approach to all agricultural progress. He has seen many acres of the rough wild land of his county converted into a thriving dairy farm. The natural grass of the area provides feed for efficient milk production. The county is one of the leading dairy counties of the Nation. The farm people of the county are of many nationalities. They have cleared the farms of stumps and stones, and have constructed the needed homes and necessary other buildings.

Mr. John Gumtz, the writer of this editorial, well knows the contribution that his readers made in furnishing food for the war and for peace. He knows that Wisconsin increased its milk production from twelve to fifteen billion pounds during the war. He knows that no other State increased its production 1,000,000,000 pounds and that many

States had a decrease in milk production during this period. He knows that while millions of pounds of butterfat are being given away and scattered all over the world the national school-lunch program is feeding American school children only skim milk that has not even vitamin A added to it, to say nothing about the desirability of adding vitamin D.

What makes me sympathetic to the viewpoint held by Mr. Gumtz are the following official figures of the United States Department of Agriculture:

Average prices received by farmers for wholesale milk per 100 pounds [1]

State	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	9147
Wisconsin	$2.10	$2.60	$2.69	$2.67	$3.44	$3.52
Minnesota	2.15	2.65	2.70	2.70	3.44	3.43

[1] Does not include dairy production payments, October 1943 to June 1946.

Government dairy production payment rates on milk per 100 pounds, annual average basis

State	1943 [1]	1944	1945	1946 [2]
Wisconsin	$0.06	$0.45	$0.49	$0.30
Minnesota	.05	.44	.49	.31

[1] October to December.
[2] January to June.
Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

You will note that the price of milk to the Wisconsin farmer has shown but little change when the subsidy is taken into consideration.

Is it surprising that any State that has made such a remarkable food contribution during the war, and which has made this contribution without any appreciable increase in price, should be somewhat irritated to see Congressmen from other States, where milk is selling from $1 to $2 per hundred pounds above Wisconsin prices, knowingly or unknowingly give aid and comfort to legislation that will really increase consumer costs of milk and beef and will decrease the production and consumption of the greatest single food known to man, which is m-i-l-k?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. NORTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Malvina Lindsay.

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, it is with keen regret that I must take note of the termination today of the public service of one of our most able and distinguished administrators, the Honorable Clinton P. Anderson, who voluntarily retires as Secretary of Agriculture.

As I look back over the years I can find no one holding the same position who has directed the affairs of the Department in a manner comparable with Mr. Anderson. He not only demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the problems of the men and women who till the soil and ride the range; he not only had deep concern regarding their economic welfare and sought to improve their living standards but his broad business training and experience gave him a clear understand of the need for expanded and more efficient markets for the products of the farm and the necessity of cooperation constantly with those who provide such markets.

When we would appraise the work of a man we must measure him by the kind of job he had to do. When Mr. Anderson became Secretary of Agriculture our country was in the midst of a great world war. We were facing serious food shortages. We were trying to feed not only our own people and our troops but in addition were compelled to supply in good measure the requirements of the civilian population and armies of our allies. In every part of the Nation people were complaining of the shortage of meat, butter, sugar, and other necessities.

Previously this House had turned to Mr. Anderson as its choice to serve as chairman of a special committee to investigate food shortages. In that capacity his investigation was so thorough and his recommendations so sound that he not only received the universal applause of the people throughout the country, but he was selected by the President to serve as Secretary of Agriculture to put those recommendations into action.

He met that test with distinction. And when hostilities ceased he set up a program to maintain the same high rate of production to meet the needs of the period of readjustment.

His was a position of the highest responsibility. He measured up in every respect and he leaves office today enjoying not only the sincere appreciation of the American people but also the gratitude of those millions throughout the world who live today because of his labors.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OWENS. May I say to the gentleman from Georgia that I do not know of a more logical or a more proper successor to Mr. Anderson than the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman is very complimentary.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

I concur in the remark just made by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois as to a successor for our present Secretary of Agriculture. I should also like to add just an humble word of tribute on my own part in recognition of the splendid record and outstanding achievement of our former colleague, the retiring Secretary of Agriculture, who has made a wonderful contribution to agriculture.

Mr. PACE. I thank the gentleman.

DR. CONDON

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, to the Members of this body who have been listening to the views of the New Deal commentators on the radio as far as Dr. Condon is concerned I would like to make this observation. Many of the New Deal radio commentators have tried to lead the public to believe that the Committee on Un-American Activities has made charges that Dr. Condon is a Communist, and that Dr. Condon is disloyal. I want to state emphatically that there has never been any such charge made. The statement made against Dr. Condon is simply this, and I quote:

> One of the weakest links in our atomic security is Dr. Edward U. Condon.

Now, there is a great deal of difference between accusing a man of being a Communist or disloyal and accusing him of being a security risk.

The following headline appeared in last Sunday's Times-Herald:

> Defies Thomas group to show disloyalty.

Why should a committee be asked to show Dr. Condon's disloyalty when it has not made such a charge?

This morning's Times-Herald carried the following caption:

> President Truman's Loyalty Review Board has decided to forget, at least temporarily, action on the Commerce Department request that it take over the loyalty case of Dr. E. U. Condon, it was revealed yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, I have no confidence in the President's Loyalty Board because it has not processed a single case in over a year, regardless of the millions of dollars appropriated for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include the American Primer.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement on H. R. 6258.

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in the first instance to include an editorial from the Minneapolis Star, and in the second instance to include an article by Raymond Moley, entitled "Disclosing Communists," and a news release from the American Legion.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. CROW asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the department commander of AMVETS, addressed to the Veterans' Administration.

RECIPROCAL TRADE TREATIES

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, our southern friends are constantly flooding the RECORD, the press, and the radio with propaganda concerning the blessings of our reciprocal trade treaties. While they are eulogizing these blessings and inflicting their doubtful benefits on northern agriculture, they substitute embargoes for the duties or tariffs on their own products. I have today introduced a bill to reduce the import duty on shelled peanuts from 7 cents per pound to 2 cents per pound, and on unshelled peanuts from 4½ cents per pound to 1¼ cents per pound. The peanut crop before the war was never worth 7 cents per pound, so we now have a 100-percent advalorem duty. Before the war farmers usually received between 3 and 4 cents per pound for their peanut crop.

Mr. Speaker, the peanut producers have priced themselves out of the candy business. The price of peanuts has jumped from 3.3 cents per pound in 1940 to 10.2 cents per pound in 1948. Candy manufacturers claim they are compelled to pay up to 18½ cents per pound for shelled Spanish peanuts, or an increase of 249 percent since 1941. The cost of the other ingredients of candy such as sugar, glucose, and milk are on the down grade.

My bill reads:

> That notwithstanding any other provisions of law the rate of duty on all peanuts imported after the date of enactment of this act shall be 2 cents per pound on shelled peanuts and 1¼ cents per pound on unshelled peanuts.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure my southern colleagues who are interested in enjoying the blessings of the reciprocal trade treaties will be glad to cooperate with me in passing this constructive measure. They certainly do not think they can "have their cake and eat it too." Neither should they think they can eat their oleo and hang on to the advantages they enjoy at present on their tobacco, peanut, and cotton crops.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, last week I received permission to make two extensions in the RECORD. The Public Printer informs me that they exceed the amount allowed under the rule, in one case by $260, and in the other by $189. Notwithstanding the additional cost, I ask unanimous consent that those extensions may be made.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DR. BRUCE D. FORSYTH

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to note for the RECORD the appointment of Dr. Bruce D. Forsyth as Assistant Surgeon General and Chief of the Dental Division of the Public Health Service.

The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service is to be commended for this appointment. Here is a young dentist who is a career man, and it is refreshing to learn that his loyal and outstanding work has won recognition.

Dr. Forsyth was graduated from the University of Michigan, one of the great universities of our country. Following his graduation he immediately took up his life work by entering the Public Health Service. He worked hard; he kept abreast of the new developments in his chosen field; he performed each task assigned to him to the best of his ability; he got along well with those with whom he came in personal contact. The PHS is fortunate to have a man of his personality and professional attainments willing to stay with the organization. He could probably make more money as a private practitioner, but he chose to serve the public. For this choice he will have many satisfactions. He is in charge of the research program recently instituted by the PHS, through the authorization of Congress. There is a big field in dental research which will make its impact on the citizens of our country and bring them better teeth and better health. Our country is fortunate that young men like this are willing to enter the public service and devote their lives to the special problems in the field of dentistry. Every person is interested and may benefit by the development of better dentistry and thereby better teeth. We wish this young man many years of usefulness.

MOTHER'S DAY

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was Mother's Day. I could not help thinking as I pinned the little flower on my lapel in tribute to the dearest friend on earth, about those multiplied thousands of deserving and devoted mothers who are striving to live independently of relatives or on our scanty public charities.

Mothers will live in deprivation, rather than be a burden on their children. It is just like mothers to do that. Then those who are forced by circumstances to accept the cold and paltry amounts available as old-age assistance are in a pitiable plight indeed. Mr Speaker, in my opinion, if the record of the true conditions of these devoted American mothers were written in a comprehensive record and read fully before this Congress today, and if that record would show the actual and true conditions under which they are forced to live, I wonder just how we as Members of Congress would feel? I am wondering also what we would do.

If they were mothers living in other lands, I am sure we would do something about it. Yes; billions could be appropriated right here on this floor, and some Members with tears in their voices would plead in humanity's name for immediate and continued action.

But for our own American mothers, it seems to strain us to even provide an amount which is less than the actual cost of one meal per day. That for only those who are entirely destitute, leaving them for shelter nothing, medical care nothing, clothing nothing, incidentals nothing. Mr. Speaker, how do we feel about Mother's Day?

HOSPITALS FOR OLD FOLKS

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to establish nursing homes for the elders of America. This program will cost $75,000,000. The Government will match the States on a 50–50 basis.

Due to the crowded conditions of our hospitals in America, many elders have been deprived the right of hospitalization. Public facilities for boarding, nursing, or convalescent care should be developed, expanded, and improved to meet the increasing needs for such facilities for the chronically ill, especially among the aged, blind, disabled, homeless, and unattached.

Many eligible needy aged and blind persons require boarding or nursing and convalescent care beyond the capacity of the home. Public nursing and convalescent care without the stigma of the poor house must be provided on some planned basis. Federal participation will greatly assist in a program of improvement of such facilities.

This bill also amends the Social Security Act to allow old-age assistance payments to be given to elders residing in these nursing homes. These payments will provide the upkeep for the nursing homes.

This bill will carry out provision 4 of the 1944 Republican platform on security which states:

> The continuation of these and other programs relating to health, and the stimulation by Federal aid of State plans to make medical and hospital service available to those in need without disturbing doctor-patient relationships or socializing medicine.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial entitled "My Mother."

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HARRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an advertisement on behalf of the UAW-CIO in support of their contention that a wage increase is necessary at this time.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes today following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

COMBATING COMMUNISM IN AMERICA

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include three editorials relating to the subject matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House despise communism and naturally want to do everything within their power to eliminate and abolish this menace throughout the United States. We can do this in two ways: one by education, and the other by legislation, or by a combination of both. But if we are going to do it by legislation we must be careful not to burn down the barn in order to dispose of the rats.

I ask that you read carefully the bill presently being considered, H. R. 5852 If it is to be passed, it should be amended in many respects. I am submitting three editorials on this subject, two from the Chicago Daily News, and one from the Sun-Times of Chicago, in which the subject is discussed quite fully, and I ask that you read these editorials when you read the bill. We may decide that laws now on the books are adequate, if move vigorously enforced as they are now written, or with such slight amendments as might be necessary.

(The editorials referred to follow:)

[From the Chicago Daily News of May 6, 1948]

OUST THE UNFIT

Senator FERGUSON, of Michigan, has been looking over the lawbooks and finds that we have statutes giving the Department of Justice all the power it should need to deal with Communists.

That might have been expected. There is plenty of law—common law, Federal law, or State law—to deal with all the things that now vex us so much if we would only put in office the kind of men who enforce laws until they work or until the people force their repeal.

We don't do that. When he lived among us Kipling wrote of the Americans that he had a "cynic devil in his blood that bids him flout the law he makes, that bids him make the law he flouts."

If we want to disprove demoniac possession, the way to do it is to dig up our forgotten impeachment processes and put unfit executives out of office.

[From the Chicago Daily News of May 6, 1948]

ANTIRED MUNDT BILL

(By Dorothy Thompson)

Although I feel strongly that something should be done about the American Communists, I do not quite like the Mundt bill.

I am afraid, for one thing, of legislation directed at a single organization, especially when such an organization is not positively outlawed. The Mundt bill tries to get at communism as an organization, but via the back door. It does not ban the Communist Party, but proposes severe penalties for any attempt to establish a totalitarian dictatorship in the United States.

That legislation is, I fear, useless. The Communist Party only would attempt to establish such a dictatorship after it had governmental power, when it would be too late for the law to operate. According to Senator GLEN TAYLOR, with whom I spoke the other night on the Town Meeting of the Air, "When the new party (which is Communist) comes to power there will be so many secret policemen looking for honest jobs that we may have a temporary wave of unemployment."

I did not have time to ask Senator TAYLOR to elucidate that interesting statement but, by analogy with the Polish, Czech, and other "new" party dictatorships, I take it we would have a purged police to enforce only Communist decrees. What good, then, would any previous law do?

Nor do I like the requirement that Communist political and front organizations be compelled to register with the Attorney General. If Communist organizations, why not all political organizations? That party literature should be marked as such is a good idea; but why should not all special pleading carry the name of the organization that initiates it?

And the Communist Party easily can change its name. It already is doing so, in the Wallace movement.

It seems to me that certain activities ought to be prohibited to American citizens—as the law provides—and the citizen himself made responsible under the law for his acts, defined as menacing to the constitutional order. But it seems to me the law doesn't go far enough in some particulars.

No citizen, for instance, should be permitted to hold membership in or contribute to any organization which: (1) Receives orders from a foreign state or from citizens of a foreign state; (2) is pledged to acts in contravention of American law or ever has consciously infringed the laws of the United States; or (3) whose members are pledged to tender prior loyalty to another state or to defend any other state in war, except as in such a war in which the United States might be formally allied with another power.

The object of a law should not be to impede social change, but to defend the liberty of the Nation and its citizens against international conspiracies masked as legal national movements.

If Communists merely would tell the truth about their movement no laws would be necessary. But since lying and conscious deceit are part of Communist tactic, and there is no way of compelling any person to be truthful beyond the laws of libel, it is necessary—it seems to me—to define practices which are incompatible with the existence and security of the Republic, whether those practices arise from communism or from a movement like the happily defunct German-American Bund.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times of May 7, 1948]

CONTROLLING SUBVERSIVES

The Communists are appropriately outraged by the subversive activities control bill, written by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Nobody need worry much about that. Since Communists themselves have no regard for civil liberties wherever and whenever they take power, their hypocritical championship of civil liberties where and when they are out of power shouldn't fool anybody.

In considering this bill, however, Congress must take many things into account. The bill would declare the Communist Party and "Communist-front" organizations (to be defined by the Attorney General) as a menace to the country. All members of the party, and the officers of the front organizations, would be required to register. If they did not, the party and organizations would be illegal.

One point to be considered is that this approach has seldom proved to be an effective way to deal with communism. Sponsors of the bill argue that they are not outlawing the party, only requiring its members to register. But can you imagine the members of a conspiratorial movement meekly filing their names with the Attorney General? Real conspirators would never comply with the law. They would simply go underground.

As Gov. Thomas E. Dewey said at Portland Monday, in opposing Harold E. Stassen's proposal to outlaw the Communists, Canada, Italy, and even Russia itself found that merely declaring the party illegal or driving it underground didn't dispose of the movement.

There is another consideration, far more important, which should weigh heavily with Congress in studying this bill. Regardless of what it might or might not do to the Communists, what would it do to the theory and practice of political freedom?

The American doctrine of civil rights, founded in the Constitution and developed over many years by the Supreme Court, holds that all citizens have the right to free speech and assembly—which implies free political action—so long as they offer no "clear and present danger" of substantive evil to our society and the lawful processes of democratic government.

The subversive-activities control bill would make it a crime for any person "to perform or attempt to perform any act with intent to facilitate or aid in bringing about" a totalitarian dictatorship under foreign control.

While specific acts and conspiracies to overthrow our Government should certainly be outlawed—in fact, already are outlawed under other statutes—this language goes much further. So far as the wording of the bill reveals, it would make even a speech or a vote cast for certain candidates a crime, even though the speech or the vote presented no real danger of overthrowing the Government.

Congress should carefully consider if there is any safe way to hit the subversive citizen, without hitting others, too, except through the conspiracy statutes already on the books. If a subversive element is driven underground, the Government must be prepared with agents to hunt it underground. These agents can grow to multitudes in proportion to the whisperings that suspicious and eavesdropping neighbors may invent about the use to which honest, law-abiding citizens put their basements or attics, their typewriters, automobiles, or ham radio conversations. History shows that the most outrageous crimes against citizens have come from the agents of governments entrusted with the responsibility of protecting governments from alleged conspirators. It was these outrages upon the homes, papers, and persons of citizens that made mandatory the inclu-

sion of the Bill of Rights in our own Constitution.

Communists and their fellow travelers deserve to be exposed—to be kept in the light of day. But a law which seeks to accomplish this by reviving dangers that would impair our doctrine of civil liberty is too big a price to pay.

We say: Let the Communists and fellow travelers talk and let America answer them. Let the Communists and fellow travelers vote and let America vote them down. Punish conspiracies to seize power, outlaw acts of revolution or violence, but don't undermine the freedoms on which our democracy rests.

MOTHERS' PENSIONS

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few observations along the same line as those made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS].

There have been many beautiful words spoken and written over this week end in tribute to the mothers of men.

I am happy that a greatful Nation will take a day each year to pay our mothers exalted tribute. Those words of praise and endearment must warm the hearts of all mothers.

However, Mr. Speaker, many of us in this Congress are anxious to also honor mother in a very practical way. There are approximately 200 of us who have united to ask the leadership of this House to permit us to consider during this session a bill to provide mothers and fathers with a reasonable American pension. While a subcommittee continues to study the technical aspects of old-age insurance—and I am happy that they are doing this good work—we can enact a reasonable pension to take the place of what we term old-age assistance.

We need a few more names added to our nonpartisan group who are making this united and friendly appeal for action. Those who concur with us and who have not indicated their approval will kindly see either the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] or myself, please, and within the next few days.

Let us show the mothers of America that we meant what we said on Mother's Day.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement on soil conservation by Mr. S. W. Nelken.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the magazine America.

Mr. GOSSETT (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Georgia) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. FERNANDEZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial on revision of the United Nations.

Mr. FERNANDEZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the second part of an article written about the Middle Rio Grande flood-control problem in New Mexico.

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial and also an article from the New York Herald-Tribune.

Mr. SMATHERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Akron Beacon-Journal.

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Tom Stokes.

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he delivered recently.

PROGRAM FOR THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my happy privilege to participate in a conference in this city which started on May 7 and concluded last night, designated as an Emergency Conference to Propose a United States Policy for Palestine and the Middle East.

The conference was summoned by Senators CHARLES W. TOBEY, WAYNE MORSE, and DENNIS CHAVEZ. Among its sponsors were many of our most outstanding citizens who came to Washington from all parts of the country for this purpose. Partisan politics had no part in its make-up or in its deliberations. The results of its activities will be released on Wednesday. At its concluding session I said to the conference:

A REHABILITATION PROGRAM FOR THE MIDDLE EAST

This conference has been called primarily to deal with an emergency which will be upon us with its full force in a matter of hours, if it is not actually upon us at this very moment.

For many weeks I have been urging that the way to avert the grave consequences that can be seen by all except those who will not look, are some very simple expedients. They are:

1. Announcement by our Government that as of May 16 it will recognize the Jewish state in Palestine and deal with it as a sovereign power; and

2. Implement that recognition by treating with the new state as a sovereign, including lifting the embargo on arms as to it, and invoking economic sanctions against its aggressors.

Without in any way lessening my position in that regard, permit me to take a few minutes to comment upon a rehabilitation program for the Middle East.

In our efforts to propose specific actions to halt the bloodshed, warfare, and destruction in Palestine, we dare not ignore the underlying realities which caused this emergency and made possible this upheaval. We must go to the roots of the crisis if we are to achieve a stable and lasting peace in the whole troubled area of the Middle East.

By underlying realities I mean the economic conditions of the region—the level of economic development, the type of economy, the standard of living, the extent of industrialization, and related problems. A survey of the economic conditions of the Middle East brings sharply into focus a single basic fact: With the exception of the Jewish areas of Palestine, all the countries of the Middle East suffer from extremely low standards of living and operate on an extremely low economic level.

Predominantly agricultural, these countries have for centuries made no advance toward more efficient use of such resources as they have. Their methods of cultivation are the same as in Biblical times. Outmoded systems of land tenure have long since destroyed initiative among the rural populations. Inadequate irrigation and inefficient marketing systems result in low yields and much waste. The usual physiological factor accompanying such conditions is an increase of the population of the area. In the Middle East it is at the rate of 600,000 persons a year. This increase only aggravates the problem of existence, because natural and man-made limitations render it impossible to provide for the minimum needs of the people.

Accordingly we find that disease, ignorance, and poverty afflict the vast majority of the peoples.

The impact of the industrial revolution has already caused the almost complete decay of handicraft skills. The modern skills have not begun to take their proper place in their economy.

What are the dangers for us and for the world inherent in such conditions?

Until adequate steps are taken to improve the substandard conditions of life in this area, there can be no hope of peaceful stability or social and political progress. What we have learned to be true of Europe in this respect is tenfold more true in the Middle East. If we hope to reduce the threat of communism in that strategic area, we will have to set about providing for its development toward a better-balanced, more self-sufficient economy capable of offering the down-trodden populations a relatively decent standard of living. We can work no miracles in a short space of time, too many centuries of neglect and disintegration lie behind the present stagnation.

We can make an important beginning. We can help the people of that region to help themselves—a principle to which our Government has committed itself and undertaken to implement in the case of Europe. How much more critical are the needs of the Middle East? Regardless of what brought the condition about, when we recognize it, we must agree to improve it.

We must offer to support a program for the greater use of already existing resources and for the diversification of production, both agricultural and industrial. In return for our technical and financial assistance, we must expect the willing cooperation of the governments whose countries benefit.

Palestine provides a striking example of how the economic potential of the area—meager, sparse, and difficult to exploit as it appears at first glance—can be effectively

turned into economic abundance. In the past two decades the intensive application of western-type initiative, capital, and industry by the Jews has revitalized the Palestinian economy and pointed the way toward resurrection of the entire desert area between Egypt and India. The Jews have reclaimed the land and made gardens bloom where there were bleak wastelands. Between 1923 and 1942 the cultivable area of Palestine was almost doubled; capital investment has increased 21 fold and the number of industrial enterprises 7 fold.

Any program for the economic development of the Middle East will have to take into account the experience of Palestine. Specific factors were at work there which made progress possible. The Jewish community has technical skills that are essential to expanding production. Its social institutions, educational system, and democratic political structure are unique in the Middle East. They need not remain so. They must not remain so. They must be made the universal pattern of progress there.

The economic developments in Palestine will affect the development of its neighbors. Their economies can complement one another in the interest of material progress for the whole region.

This conference will not have done a complete job unless it goes on record as recommending that the United States call upon the middle eastern countries to convene for the purpose of drafting a plan for the economic development of the Middle East—an ERP, or, in this case, an MERP, a Middle East rehabilitation plan.

Certain conditions should be attached to any United States loans and grants provided to finance such a program.

First. Peaceful relations must be established among all the countries, including, of course, Palestine. The only area where there are the technical skills and the industrial potential available to begin the regional development is Palestine.

Second. An economic union providing for the coordination of material resources and waterpower (especially of the Jordan Valley) among the Middle East countries.

Third. Political and social reforms to permit the elevation of depressed populations of the area so that they may participate as healthy, literate, and civilized human beings in the regeneration of their region.

The reasons which led our country to adopt the European recovery program apply with far greater force to the establishment of a Middle East recovery program. Such a project must be an integral part of any long-term planning looking toward permanent elimination of the turbulence spreading through that region.

I join with you in praying for peace in Jerusalem, peace in Palestine, peace in all the world.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

COMMUNISTS INDUCE NEGRO BISHOPS TO ATTACK

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, several days ago Communist agitators induced a group of Negro bishops to pass a resolution asking that I be expelled from Congress because of my opposition to the so-called civil-rights program.

I call attention to the fact that the antilynching bill is a sham and a fraud which does not propose to protect innocent men. I repeated what Finis Garrett said many years ago that it ought to be called a bill to encourage rape.

I join the Governor of Mississippi in his statement on yesterday that we are going to maintain segregation in Mississippi.

There are only four possible solutions of the race question—extermination, deportation, amalgamation, or segregation.

Take whichever one you want, but the white people of the South have carried on a program of segregation that we propose to continue to carry on, regardless of what the Congress or the Supreme Court of the United States say about it.

The less you meddle with the race question in the South the better off those people are going to be.

These agitators, and these Communist fronts, that are going around stirring up this trouble are doing the Negroes infinitely more harm than they could ever possibly do them good.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 532 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 403, Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Public Works, acting as a whole or by subcommittee not to exceed $100,000 additional, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 5, strike out "$100,000" and insert "$50,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON HOUSING

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following resolution (H. Res. 554) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed as a House document the report prepared for the Joint Committee on Housing, entitled "The High Cost of Housing," and that there be printed 2,000 additional copies for the use of said joint committee.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ILLINOIS CENTRAL RAILROAD

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following resolution (H. Res. 567) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That Representative CHARLES W. VURSELL, or such person as he may designate, be, and he is hereby authorized to review, under the supervision of the Clerk of the House of Representatives, the files of the House for the period 1830 to 1861, insofar as they may relate to or bear upon the history of that which is now the Illinois Central Railroad, and to have made photostatic copies of such papers and documents as may be pertinent to such history.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AID

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 189) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Final Report of the Select Committee on Foreign Aid be printed as a House document, and that 5,000 additional copies of volume I be printed, of which 3,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, to be distributed by the House folding room and 2,000 copies shall be for the use of the Select Committee on Foreign Aid.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 2, after the word "That", insert the words "there be printed 6,500 copies of."

Line 3, after the word "Aid", strike out the words "be printed as a House document and", and insert "(House Rept. No. 1845)" in lieu thereof.

Line 4, strike out the words "that 5,000 additional copies of volume I be printed."

Line 6, after the word "Representatives", insert a comma and strike out the words "to be distributed by the House."

Line 7, strike out the first three words "folding room and."

Line 8, after the word "Aid", insert the words "500 copies for the use of the Senate document room, and 1,000 copies for the use of the House document room."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS' BENEFITS MANUAL

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 120) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, within 90 days after adjournment of the second session of the Eightieth Congress, the pamphlet entitled "Manual Explanatory of the Privileges, Rights, and Benefits Provided for Persons Who Served in the Armed Forces of

the United States During World War I, World War II, or Peacetime (After April 20, 1898), and Those Dependent Upon Them, With Special Reference to Those Benefits, Rights, and Privileges Administered by the Veterans' Administration" (House Doc. 772, 79th Cong., 2d sess.) be revised and printed as a House document, and that 91,300 additional copies shall be printed, of which 66,300 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, 20,000 for the use of the Senate, 2,000 for the use of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives, 2,000 for the House document room, and 1,000 for the Senate document room.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged resolution (S. Con. Res. 52) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolutions, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 7,000 additional copies of the report (Rept. No. 440, pt. 6, current session) of the special committee of the Senate authorized and directed to make a study and investigation of the operation of the war program, of which 5,000 copies shall be for the use of the special committee, 1,000 for the use of the Senate document room, and 1,000 for the use of the House document room.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL AVIATION POLICY

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged resolution (S. Con. Res. 53) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 5,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 949, current session, entitled "National Aviation Policy," for the use of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REGULATION OF CERTAIN INSURANCE RATES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House, may I say that we have only one bill concerning the District of Columbia to consider today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3998) to provide for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 22, after "reinsurance", insert "other than joint reinsurance to the extent provided in this act."

Page 3, line 1, after "title", insert "insurance."

Page 3, line 18, strike out "insurers" and insert "companies."

Page 4, line 2, after "upon", insert "the."

Page 4, lines 3 and 4, strike out "purpose of insurance."

Page 4, line 5, after "considerations", insert "attributable to such risks."

Page 4, line 12, strike out "insurers" and insert "companies."

Page 4, line 14, strike out "insurers" and insert "companies."

Page 4, line 15, strike out "be made" and insert "become."

Page 4, line 15, after "immediately", insert "upon filing."

Page 4, line 21, after "act.", insert "Rates for contracts or policies described in the last sentence of subsection (c) of section 4 of this act may become effective when made and filing thereof shall be made promptly thereafter.

"(g) No company, agent, or broker shall make, issue, or deliver, or knowingly permit the making, issuance, or delivery of any policy of insurance within the scope of this act contrary to pertinent filings which are in effect for the company as provided in this act, except that upon the written application of the insured stating his reasons therefor, filed with and approved by the Superintendent, a rate in excess of that provided by a filing otherwise applicable may be used on any specific risk."

Page 4, line 23, strike out "January 1, 1948" and insert "July 1, 1948."

Page 5, line 11, strike out "being made."

Page 6, line 11, after "policy", insert "other than one of workmen's compensation or automobile liability insurance."

Page 6, line 12, after "or" where it appears the second time, insert "a contract or policy of any type."

Page 7, line 1, strike out "admitted insurers" and insert "companies."

Page 7, lines 4 and 5 strike out "insurer" and insert "company."

Page 7, line 10, strike out "admitted insurers" and insert "companies."

Page 7, line 14, strike out "insurers" and insert "companies."

Page 7, strike out all after line 22 over to and including line 3 on page 8.

Page 8, line 8, strike out "insurers" and insert "companies."

Page 8, line 19, strike out "such."

Page 12, lines 6 and 7, strike out "Insurers" and insert "Companies."

Page 12, line 7, strike out "insurer" and insert "company."

Page 12, line 14, strike out "insurer" and insert "company."

Page 12, line 18, strike out "review" and insert "revise."

Page 12, line 21, strike out "insurer" and insert "company."

Page 12, line 25, strike out "insurer" and insert "company."

Page 13, line 4, strike out "insurer" and insert "company."

Page 13, line 21, after "information" insert "as."

Page 13, line 22, strike out "act;" and insert "act. The expense of such examination shall be paid by the company or rating organization examined. In lieu of such examination the Superintendent may, in his discretion, accept a report of examination made by any other insurance supervisory authority."

Page 14, line 5, strike out "insurers" and insert "companies."

Page 14, strike out lines 7 to 14, inclusive, and insert:

"(d) The Superintendent may designate one or more rating organizations or other agencies to assist him in gathering statistical data and in making such compilations thereof as may be necessary for the proper administration of this act. Such compilations shall be made available, subject to reasonable rules promulgated by the Superintendent, to companies and rating organizations.

"The Superintendent shall have no authority at any hearing to compel the attendance of witnesses and he shall not be required to adhere to formal rules of pleading or evidence. At the request of a party or parties in interest made prior to any hearing, he shall administer oaths to witnesses and shall permit such party or parties, at the cost and expense of one who so requests, to have made a record of the hearing, which record upon request of such party or parties the Superintendent shall certify."

Page 15, lines 17 and 18, strike out "take effect October 1, 1947" and insert "become effective 30 days after approval."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6481) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate continue until later in the afternoon, when we can more easily determine how much time will be required, and that the time be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and myself.

Mr. GORE. That is agreeable to me, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6481, with Mr. GRANT of Indiana in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before the committee is an appropriation bill to allow either direct appropriations for the capital funds or expenses of 84 different Government corporations, or to put limitations on their administrative expenses. I think it is quite an interesting fact to know that the Government of the United States today operates 86 different Government corporations, all of

which, with the exception of 2, are included in this particular appropriation bill. When we say we operate that many government corporations, we also say at the same time that we have granted to those corporations, the 86, some twenty-nine and a half billion dollars' worth of borrowing power. That means that these corporate functions of the Federal Government have at their command and disposal approximately $30,000,000,000 worth of cash and credits, which in itself is a tremendous impact upon the economy of this Nation, depending entirely upon the administration of these corporate bodies. I think it must also be said at this point that while they have approximately $30,000,000,000 worth of borrowing power, they are at the present time only using a little less than $12,000,000,000. We have attempted in this bill to make certain rescissions of surplus funds where we think they were unnecessary for the continued successful operation of the corporations. In such cases we have made rescissions. The committee has felt it is their duty as expressed in the Government Corporations Control Act not only to carefully scrutinize the use of Government funds and Government credit, but also to carefully watch where there may be surplus funds wholly unnecessary to the vital functions of such Government corporations and in such cases rescind and pay back into the Treasury such funds. The committee has also felt it is the implied duty or the written duty in the Government Corporations Control Act to see to it that the multiplicity and various ramifications of the construction of these corporations are simplified insofar as possible. That has been done by legislation through the various legislative committees to some degree and by act in the Government Control Act. It has been done over the past three appropriating seasons. This is the third such bill to come before the Congress of the United States subsequent to the Government Corporations Control Act of 1945.

The bill covers all except the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, both of which were included in the agricultural appropriation bill of this year. The bill also excludes the Virgin Islands Company, which corporate charter expires on June 30, 1948. There has not as yet been renewal, though there has been reported out of the Committee on Public Lands a bill which would reconstitute and redesign in its entirety the Virgin Islands Company. The committee has read and has heard the subject matter of new proposed legislation and has developed certain opinions on the subject and made certain recommendations to the legislative committee. If such legislation becomes law prior to the adjournment of this session of the Congress, the committee will be ready to bring rapidly to the floor a second bill which would include the Virgin Islands Company.

Mixed-ownership corporations are not included in this bill. It has been the opinion of this committee, and we wrote into the bill last year, and it was twice passed unanimously by the House, a provision which would have included the so-called mixed-ownership corporations in the Government Corporations Control Act. It did not become law. I think I can safely say it is still the unanimous opinion of this committee that it should become law. We sought this year, as far as humanly possible, not to bring anything in this bill which would have the semblance of legislative action. We are hopeful that legislative action will take place soon, probably in the next Congress, to bring under the supervision of the Congress these mixed-ownership corporations. It seems utterly ridiculous to this committee that Government corporations which are in some instances owned possibly 97, 98, or 99 percent by the Federal Government, should be outside of congressional appropriation control, and, of course, utterly ridiculous that they should be at any time outside of Federal audit control.

In this bill is included appropriations for the administrative expense of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I think the committee should confess at the outset that the extension of the corporate authority for RFC has not yet taken place, although both Houses of Congress have acted, this House last week. We have tried in this bill to make the appropriation because we have confidence that the two Houses will consolidate their thinking and come in here within the next few days with a bill which will become law within probably the next fortnight. In such case, we believe it expedites matters for us to include in this bill, knowing what is in each bill as it has passed each of the Houses, we feel we are safe in our estimates which, in the main, must be, to some substantial degree, guesses on the part of both the RFC and on the part of the Congress.

The RFC, as you know has been stripped back until it is quite a different size. The very nature of its activities are quite different than they have been over most of the past decade, particularly during the wartime period. We felt that the House would not feel there was an imposition exercised by this committee by including the RFC, under the circumstances.

The committee report this year is quite lengthy. I think it might be well understood, without my even mentioning it, that there have been those who have sought to become joco-serious on the subject of the committee report and its length, especially in view of the fact that this committee has a reputation for brevity, having passed its bills in the past sessions in extremely short periods, one of them less than a minute—the second Government corporations appropriation bill for 1948. So that it is out of cast for this committee to make a report of 76 pages. Nevertheless, we felt it necessary because we felt at some time or other there must be a documentation of the list and the scope and activities of these 86 Government corporations, and we have attempted to prepare that type of document in the committee report. We trust the indulgence of the House and we recommend for their edification the reading of this commitee report.

In order to try to brief that which is contained in the report, I am going rather hurriedly through the various corporations and for the RECORD state what the committee has sought to do.

I might say this is the second time in the history of this committee in which there has been a division of opinion, in this case this year only on one subject, which might be referred to as the one "hot spot" in the bill. That is the question of whether or not the Appropriations Committee and the Congress have authority for allowing funds for the construction of a steam plant in connection with the Tennessee Valley Authority.

That is one of the very first subjects of the bill and one of the very first subjects, of course, of the committee report, and that is the only point on which there has been a division of views. The expression of this division is in the committee report.

I want to say for the committee that it is a great privilege to preside over such a group of men. I have never in my life worked with a group of men who more sincerely tried to accomplish a job in a harmonious fashion. There are things in this bill which probably are in disagreement as to the thinking of the various members of the committee but in which the committee has been able to find a common ground of action believing it for the welfare of the Federal Government and of the people served thereby. I have never in my life had a more happy experience than working with this group of men. That applies under the original chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] in the Seventy-ninth Congress, and his able and distinguished successor, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], in the first session of the Eightieth Congress. I come by the present position strictly by inheritance.

In the first portion of the bill we have appropriated for the Tennessee Valley Authority. Direct appropriations from the Treasury, allowed in the current fiscal year 1948, were $18,703,000. The TVA estimate for 1949 was $35,154,600. The committee allowed them $27,389,061.

The total Federal funds in the custody of the TVA, the proceeds from operations for the fiscal year 1948, were some $87,717,930. Under this appropriation bill it would be $78,042,930. Those funds are proceeds from the operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority and not directly appropriated funds from the Federal Treasury.

We have allowed them the same amount of funds to be usable from their own proceeds of operation as they requested. There is one difference, however, that comes about in the ultimate construction of this statement that I have just made, and we have made a difference in the requirement of the pay-back under the amortization plan developed in 1948 than they proposed to make themselves. So the total funds available for TVA for 1949 if these estimates of proceeds from

operations are accurate, is $105,431,991, a considerable sum.

I am putting in the RECORD at this point a summary of their appropriations, capital expenditures and expenses properly segregated so it may be clearly understood by all.

DIRECT APPROPRIATIONS—CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

The following tabulation reflects the recommendations of the committee with respect to the appropriated funds requested:

Direct appropriation recommended for fiscal year 1949

Program or activity	Budget estimate [1]	Recommended by committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
For assets:			
Upper Holston projects	$15,142,000	$15,142,000	----------
Additions and betterments to completed projects	1,378,000	1,176,000	−$202,000
Navigation facilities	480,000	480,000	----------
Power facilities	4,000,000	---------	−4,000,000
Investigations for future projects	96,000	96,000	----------
Chemical facilities	3,551,000	2,337,000	−1,214,000
Facilities and equipment for general use	3,389,600	2,458,000	−931,600
Norris and Wilson villages	23,000	----------	−23,000
Total for assets	28,059,600	21,689,000	−6,370,600
For expenses:			
Fertilizer and munitions research and development	1,367,000	1,134,000	−233,000
Resource development activities	5,150,000	4,265,000	−885,000
Navigation operations	257,000	257,000	----------
Flood-control operations	52,000	52,000	----------
Administrative and general expenses	1,260,000	992,061	−267,939
Operation of Norris and Wilson villages	99,000	100,000	+1,000
Total for expenses	8,185,000	6,800,061	−1,384,939
Total for assets and expenses	36,244,600	28,489,061	−7,755,539
Funds available from prior years and depreciation and clearing adjustment	−1,100,000	−1,100,000	----------
Working capital adjustment	+10,000	----------	−10,000
New appropriation	35,154,600	27,389,061	−7,765,539

[1] Revised to show administrative and general expenses and deficit of Norris and Wilson villages as separate items.

In direct appropriations for so-called capital expenditures the estimates for the South Holston and Watauga Dams and for navigation facilities are approved in full by the committee. This, I think, is worthy of attention because it is ample demonstration, there was no feeling, no intention, no action taken in regard to this bill which would in the slightest degree indicate that the members of the committee are opponents of public power. I must say that during the course of the last few weeks letters obviously incited by various municipalities in the Tennessee Valley, and, I am inclined to suspect, incited sometimes by some branch of the administration of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which have indicated that the word has been sent out that the Congress intended to withhold funds for completion of these dams. There has never been any such suggestion made on the part of any member of this committee during its deliberations. It has been very plain to me that it is nothing but a question of a propaganda effort to try to build in the minds of those good people in the Tennessee Valley that this committee is against the completion of these dams which have for their primary purpose navigation and flood control and which have as an auxiliary result the disposition and sale of a surplus commodity known as hydroelectric power.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, estimates were submitted for additions and betterments to multi-use projects, chemical facilities, and facilities for general use in Norris and Wilson villages, which were reduced by unanimous agreement of the committee.

There was an estimate of $4,000,000 to begin construction of a steam plant in connection with the Tennessee Valley project. The committee has denied that $4,000,000. This $4,000,000 is merely the beginning of a proposed project that would ultimately cost $84,000,000. There was great question in the minds of the members of the committee that the committee had any authority to make an appropriation for a steam plant. I am one who believes that the committee does not have such authority and the committee in its majority sustained that opinion. Yet it must be again pointed out, and I wish to emphasize this, that the hydroelectric turbines, those units necessary for the full use of hydropower as it might be directed into the development of electric current for use in the Tennessee Valley and its tributaries, has been allowed in this bill; but for us to interpret the Tennessee Valley Authority Organic Act to mean that the Congress intended the TVA should create a great Government power monopoly in the Tennessee Valley and its tributaries is something that this committee could not assume as an original intent. Yet that is the proposed program and it is clearly divulged in the request for this appropriation for a steam plant.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does this bill carry any part of the appropriation referred to for the building of a steam plant?

Mr. PLOESER. The bill does not.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does this bill carry any authorization or appropriation for it?

Mr. PLOESER. The bill does not carry any authorization nor does it carry any funds for the building of a steam plant.

Mr. CRAWFORD. At what time would that become an issue so far as a vote on the floor of the House is concerned?

Mr. PLOESER. Well, the Tennessee Valley Authority portion comes in the first part of the bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I understand that.

Mr. PLOESER. It will become an issue very quickly after we begin to read the bill for amendments under the five-minute rule.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, the bill will be subject to amendment so that the steam plant operation may be injected into the bill and put in it, if the House sees fit?

Mr. PLOESER. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, it must be said that in the 1948 act the committee tried to work out a program of amortization, somewhat different from that enacted by the House this year in connection with other hydroelectric projects, because this is not an identical situation so far as investment and ultimate ownership are concerned.

The committee tried to work out a 40-year program of amortization which, after all is said and done, pays little more, if any more, than the actual interest owed the Federal Government. This amortization should be paid, we hoped, one-fourtieth each year. But, we divided it into four sections of 10-year periods, allowing for that unusual circumstance of a drought year in which they may be so handicapped by their income from power that they could not make an adequate payment. We did not have such a year last year, and we do not have such a year this year, and yet the Tennessee Valley Authority came to the committee this year, with Budget approval—whereas it had paid $10,500,000 on amortization last year, which was an amount somewhat in excess of its one-fortieth annually or one-tenth of the quarter period—and offered to pay $2,500,000, which is a fixed charge on the retirement of bonds—1 percent bonds, by the way, and in addition to the $2,500,000 most magnanimously offered $60,000 as a further amount on amortization. To me that constituted a breach of faith of the general understanding that was arrived at in last year's appropriation discussion and action. In my opinion there was utterly no justification for such an extreme abuse of the quarter period which we have written in as compromise in last year's appropriation bill. And, there is considerable evidence—though all the members of the committee may not feel quite as strongly as I do about the subject—that the Members have been taken aback and utterly surprised that the TVA would presume to make such estimates.

By unanimous agreement in the committee we have changed that and ordered a pay-back more nearly commensurate with the one-fortieth by taking into consideration what they overpaid last year and making further allowances for their needs in accordance with contract commitments for the installation of the hydro turbines. Then they come up short on the basis of two-fortieths by

$1,411,862. In the ensuing year we may be able to make them pay up to date on their amortization program. I think any such attitude on the part of the committee is extremely liberal, and, as I said before, it was arrived at by unanimous agreement.

Figures on amortization of power investment

Total amortization requirement (July 1, 1948)	$348,239,420
10-year period	87,959,810
1-year period	8,705,981
Paid in 1948	10,500,000
Overpayment	1,794,019
To pay in 1949	5,500,000
Short	1,411,862

There are many other detailed things which might be discussed as we go on. I do not want to take so much of the time of the committee on this one subject at this point in the discussion, and allow it to overshadow all other things which are included.

Now, in this bill we have the Housing and Home Finance Agency. To the Members of Congress and to the general public it is a rather difficult thing to keep up with the up-to-the-minute title of that agency which deals with housing and all of its ramifications. Under Executive order there have been so many changes that even this Appropriations Subcommittee, which is charged with the direct responsibility of making appropriations over that entire field, finds it difficult at times to keep up with the successive names and titles and reorganization programs instituted by the Executive. But that which a year ago was called the National Housing Agency is now the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and I hope it will keep a similar name long enough for everyone to understand that which is going on. It is another one of those cases where under the reorganization and various groupings of Federal agencies we find a superstructure superimposed on many other structures. Whether it leads to economy is something that I have yet to learn. I must be frank to confess that my observations in my time in government have been that most such reorganizations merely superimpose a new agency for which new appropriations are necessary, and all too frequently appropriations increase and do not decrease. We have not had sufficient experience with the life of this Agency to even predict, except to say this, that the committee has considerable confidence in the man who heads the Agency, and we feel that he is making a sincere effort, and a demonstration of our feeling on the subject is the fact that we have included in this bill allowance for $2,000 increase in his compensation, from $10,000 to $12,000.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. I should like to make an inquiry in connection with the Federal contribution to these low-rent housing projects. Is it correct to say that all cities are treated in a uniform manner in the making of these Federal subsidy payments to the communities?

Mr. PLOESER. No, I would not say it is correct to say they have all been treated in a uniform manner in the arranging—let us put it that way—of these Federal subsidies on the part of the agency which made the arrangement. The committee has sought to treat them as uniformly as is humanly possible, in view of the things which occurred in the past. In the case of payments in lieu of taxes, for example, the only point in controversy, I believe, we have allowed these payments where there is contractual obligation to do so, and where there is not contractual obligation to do so we have not made such allowances.

Mr. BUFFETT. The amount of allowance you make is what the contractual relationship is?

Mr. PLOESER. That is right.

Mr. BUFFETT. You have neither raised nor lowered it?

Mr. PLOESER. That is right.

Mr. BUFFETT. If there is not uniformity it is because the authorities here created a situation of nonuniformity?

Mr. PLOESER. That is certainly correct.

Mr. BUFFETT. You have felt that it is impractical to try to make these payments uniform?

Mr. PLOESER. I think probably it is impossible to do so without breach of contract. There are two members of the committee whom I consider far more expert than I on this subject. If the gentlemen wants a more technical answer, I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT], or the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], who would be able to give the gentleman the information.

Mr. BUFFETT. I am afraid I would be tangled up in the technicalities, but I have a complaint that cities are not being treated uniformly. I should like to get in plain language the answer to that situation. I think the gentleman has given it to me pretty generally.

Mr. PLOESER. We did not create the situation. We are dealing with a thing we inherited under the Government Corporations Control Act. Where uniformity is lacking it was not of our creation. We are dealing with circumstances as they are, and trying our best to be as fair in the handling of those circumstances as we can.

Mr. BUFFETT. Do the public authorities responsible for the nonuniformity make any plausible explanation of the situation?

Mr. PLOESER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] to answer that question.

Mr. COUDERT. I may say to the gentleman from Nebraska that the chairman of our committee has stated the situation as I understand it. In each case the Public Housing Authority made a contract with the individual municipality. This committee has taken the position that it can only authorize the spending of such money as was legally obligated under the existing contractual arrangement. If there is lack of uniformity, it is because the individual municipalities accepted differing contracts. That is all there is to it, I think.

Mr. BUFFETT. In other words, the cities in the first instance made what now turns out to be a bad deal, and the committee does not feel it has the power to remedy that situation?

Mr. COUDERT. The committee has no power to remedy the contractual situation unless they choose to give away something which it is under no obligation to give away.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. I might say that of course there is a great difference of opinion as to what the cities and municipalities are entitled to, but no difference of opinion as to what they would like to get. At the outset the basic law provided that there would have to be a 20-percent contribution on the part of the cities in order to qualify for this program. Some have provided their 20 percent through outright tax exemptions in its entirety. Others have contributed their part in one way or another. They did not exempt them from all taxation. So there were different contracts to start with. Later in those situations where they were not required to give full tax exemptions, the FPHA started making terms. They provided in their contracts that they would make some payment in lieu of taxes where cities have made contributions other than tax exemptions. So it called for different kinds of contracts. But in the largesse, you might say, of the FPHA as it was then operated in its desire to give away Federal money, they took it upon themselves to give up to 10 percent as a shelter rent to all cities, even in those cities where the contract did not so provide. This committee in an effort last year to bring them back within the original contract and within the law struck out such payments where we could; and where the contracts required such payment, of course, we had to leave them alone.

Mr. BUFFETT. I thank the gentleman for his information.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

We have done this briefly in the office of the Administrator in the Housing and Home Finance Agency. In 1948 they had $100,000 in appropriations, plus transfers of $765,000, giving them a total of $865,000. They made estimates for 1949 of $910,000. We have approved $750,000 and we think that the design of the office can pretty well be predicated on the amount of the money they have to spend. There is no explicit requirement for the specified request.

With reference to the Home Loan Bank Board, they had $1,400,000 in 1948. They requested $1,882,000. We have given them $1,800,000 for 1949, which is an increase over 1948 to provide funds for examinations of insurance and savings and loan institutions. They have a backlog of examinations, and we feel it it a very dangerous thing to allow such a backlog to exist. We think these examinations should be up to date and efficient, so we have acted here so that

they might be. With reference to the Federal Savings Loan and Insurance Corporation, they had $532,248. They asked for $635,000 in 1949. We have given them $600,000. The increase was granted for additional personnel for supervision and aid to insured savings and loan associations in financial trouble and to keep them out of trouble. There is much to be said on this subject, and I hesitate to go into it and to take too much of the committee's time today, but I think this much should be said. The committee has been extremely apprehensive about the practices carried on by the savings and loan associations. We find all too frequently where people interested in the contracting business, in the home-building business, or in the legal profession, without any offense to the legal profession or to the builders or the insurance business, which happens be my own particular line, so I indict them, too, along with the others, have formed these associations. Their purpose seems to be the earning of additional fees other than the actual interest and fees chargeable directly to the making of loans. We think that is an extremely bad practice and feel that it brings a constant bearing influence upon their judgment in making insured loans and also upon the judgment incurred in the general conduct of business. We have advocated against it in last year's report, and we repeat that admonition in this report.

When you consider that the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation insures in its constituent members $5,000 of the deposits for each account, you might readily assume that it is substantially a blanket insurance coverage over the assets of each of those organizations.

The same is true of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The same is true, both in its application to commercial banks and its application to mutual savings banks. You can figure the limitation of your insured risk all in one by assuming that the restriction of $5,000 per account is in fact, as well as in theory, a tight restriction. The fact still remains that by insuring every account to the limit of $5,000 you are substantially insuring the balance sheet of that subscribing organization.

So I think it is highly important that the Federal Government see to it that the activities and affairs of these insured institutions are carefully examined, and do not allow themselves to run a course of loose business.

The same applies, and the same admonition might be given, to the Federal Housing Authority. Most of us assume that the Federal Housing Authority, in its program of insurance, has been a most successful venture, because during a period of an inclining economy, greatly accelerated by the war, it has been true that some of the units of insurance have worked themselves out and paid off successfully. But there has never been a test. What would happen during a period of declining economy no one knows. There is no precedent for such insurance. Neither is there any precedent for the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, or for the Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. For us to assume that our reserves are adequate or that our premiums are sufficiently high is to make an assumption predicated upon no experience whatsoever which is adequate to test the situation.

No insurance company is worthy of its name until it can survive the excruciating situation. To merely take in premiums and to have little or no losses to pay out is never a test of an insurance company. When that period of extreme loss occurs—and it will not occur in our housing program or in our bank insurance program in this Nation until we go through a rather long period of a declining economy or perhaps a rather short period of abrupt decline in the economy—not until then will we know whether or not our experiment has been well managed.

So for us to assume that it has been is to accept a false premise.

In the Home Owners' Loan Corporation we have a situation where the continuation of liquidation is the job in hand, and it is declining each year. There is a proviso in this bill to transfer the actual stock of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation from the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to the Treasury, where it really belongs, and have the Treasury cancel a similar amount of HOLC stock, which is $100,000,000. No equities are disturbed, since both corporations belong to the Treasury anyway, but it does clean up some of the ramifications of indirect Government financing, which I might say well parallels in many cases some of the most difficult and problematic situations of which private industry has been accused in the past. I find little difference. The HOLC was established June 13, 1933, and has authority to acquire the mortgages of distressed home owners and their obligations and liens, secured by real estate, in exchange for its own bonds. This authority expired June 30, 1936, and since that time HOLC has been going through liquidation. The outstanding liabilities as of June 30, 1947, total $550,853,000. It is estimated that as of this June 30 such liabilities will be reduced to $385,134,000, and as of the subsequent June 30, or the close of the 1949 fiscal year, it will be reduced to $256,491,000. It is now about 84 percent liquidated. I will put other figures in the RECORD so you may have a comprehensive statement of the subject.

Total obligations authorized to be outstanding amounted to $4,750,000,000, against which a total of $3,489,453,550 was issued. Outstanding liabilities on June 30, 1947, totaled $550,853,000, and estimated for June 30, 1948, will be $385,134,000, and estimated for June 30, 1949, will be $256,491,000. Now about 84 percent liquidated.

From June 1933 to June 1936 HOLC made total of 1,017,801 loans, majority of which ran for 15 years, and some of which have been extended. At June 30, 1947, HOLC had outstanding 351,127 mortgage loans and vendee accounts, having value of $557,018,000.

Deficit:

June 30, 1946	$81,436,000
June 1947	62,146,000
June (estimated) 1948	47,309,000
June (estimated) 1949	36,301,000

In connection with FHA they have $20,200,000 in 1948. They asked for $19,000,000 for 1949. We gave them $19,000,000. It is not yet fully possible to really know what these administrative expenses may be. The Congress has not finished in all probability its final action on the subject in this session and it may be necessary to make further supplemental appropriations depending upon the action of the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

I am putting in a statement about low rental contribution inasmuch as that has been brought up. I am putting it into the RECORD so I will not take any further time on the subject:

Public Housing Administration administrative expenses

1948	$11,500,000
1949 (estimate)	11,000,000
1949 (approved)	9,000,000

Centralization of controls in Washington, closing some field offices, etc., will permit greater efficiency and reductions.

Low-rent contributions (direct appropriation)

1948	$4,000,000
1949 (estimate)	6,200,000
1949 (approved)	4,840,000

Increase granted to provide for decreased revenues due to eviction of high-income tenants, and reserve adjustments. The estimate of $1,360,000 for increased payments in lieu of taxes was denied by committee, on basis of the same position it took last year.

(PHA administers low-rent housing and (so-called) slum-clearance program under United States Housing Act of 1937. Operates all federally owned nonmilitary nonfarm housing. Liquidates public war housing and other programs. Supervises management of temporary housing for veterans and their families under title V of Lanham Act.)

Under the Farm Credit Administration set-up we have quite a multiplicity of functions. I am putting into the RECORD at this point a portion of the report which I hope all of you will read, because we have to delineate in as brief language as possible the break-down in the expenditures. In the central office we have allowed them $500,000 of their request of $531,000. There has been a very definite trend toward reduction in the expense of these activities. The committee is glad to say that and feels that certain trends can be established.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

ORGANIZATION AND FUNCTIONS

The farm-credit system is comprised of the Farm Credit Administration, a nonincorporated governmental supervisory agency, and 51 corporations. For operating purposes, the Nation is divided into 12 farm-credit districts, one of which includes Puerto Rico. At each district office there are four corporations—a Federal land bank, a Federal intermediate credit bank, a production-credit corporation, and a bank for cooperatives—48 corporations in all. The other three corporations are located in Washington, D. C. They are the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation (the land banks act as agents for Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation), the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, and the Central Bank for Cooperatives. The functions of these institutions are:

Farm Credit Administration: Supervises, examines, services, and coordinates the 51 corporations; supervises and examines the joint-stock land banks (privately capitalized—five remained at June 30, 1947, of which four had adopted plans for liquidation), organized under the Federal Farm Loan Act, approved July 17, 1916 (39 Stat. 360); administers the Agricultural Marketing Act, approved June 15, 1929 (46 Stat. 11), and the Cooperative Marketing Act of 1926 (44 Stat. 802). The Farm Credit Administration was established as an independent agency by Executive Order 6084, dated March 27, 1933, and was transferred to the Department of Agriculture effective July 1, 1939, pursuant to section 401 of the first plan on Government reorganization of April 25, 1939.

Federal land banks: The 12 land banks, organized in 1917 under the Federal Farm Loan Act approved July 17, 1916 (39 Stat. 360), provide long-term first-mortgage farm loans. They operate principally through 1,262 cooperative associations, known as national farm-loan associations, owned by the borrowers.

Federal intermediate credit banks: The 12 intermediate credit banks, established in 1923 under the Agricultural Credits Act of 1923 (42 Stat. 1454), discount short-term agricultural and livestock loans for and make loans to production-credit associations, banks for cooperatives, and other financing institutions.

Production credit corporations: These 12 corporations, established in 1933 under the Farm Credit Act of 1933 (48 Stat. 257), supervise and in part capitalize the local production-credit associations which make short-term production loans to farmers and stockmen. There are 504 such associations, 31 of which are entirely owned by the members.

Banks for cooperatives: The Central Bank for Cooperatives and the 12 district banks, established pursuant to the Farm Credit Act of 1933 (48 Stat. 257), extend short-term and long-term credit to cooperative associations dealing in farm products, farm supplies, or farm business services.

Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation: Established under the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, approved January 31, 1934 (48 Stat. 344), to provide first-mortgage loans not eligible for the land banks and second-mortgage loans as provided by section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933 (48 Stat. 48), to assist the land banks financially during periods of emergency, and to make loans to joint-stock land banks. Authority to make mortgage loans ceased on July 1, 1947.

Regional agricultural credit corporations: Established under the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932 (47 Stat. 713) for the purpose of supplying short-term production credit. They were placed in liquidation in 1934, following establishment of the production-credit system, and by February 1, 1944, the 12 corporations had been consolidated into 1—the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C. Since 1941 loaning activities have been undertaken intermittently in restricted areas to meet emergencies only.

In the case of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, they asked for $2,160,000. We gave them $2,000,000. They have been and are liquidating loans. The present borrowing power of the Corporation is $2,000,000,000. They came up with a Budget proposal to reduce it to $1,000,000,000. We reduced it to $500,000,000, because we could find nowhere in any of the justifications or in the statement of anyone at all where there would be any greater demand under the most adverse circumstances for more than $230,000,000 in any one year; and we felt that our action, in view of the fact that they still have a revolving fund of $200,000,000, was extremely on the liberal side. I may say there is no objection on the part of the Farm Credit Administration or any of their constituent units.

The Budget suggested that there might be a return in the coming fiscal year, 1949, of $68,000,000. The bill makes this definite. We pay back into the Treasury surplus funds of $68,000,000 out of the Farm Credit Corporation funds.

Now we come to the Federal intermediate credit banks. I think the committee—and it is probably as much my fault as anyone's—cut them a little too fine in their funds for the fiscal year 1948. It has had a good effect as well as a slowing-down effect on some of the operations of these banks. We have tried to remedy our error. Confession alone is not sufficient. We have given supplemental appropriations of $107,500, and in this current year against their request of $1,647,800 we have given them $1,500,000.

The production credit corporations requested $1,602,000; we gave them $1,350,000.

I could go on at great length on this subject, but I do not care to take that much time of the Committee, but their operation is almost purely paternalistic. The day has arrived when they are not making any extensive investments in production credit associations, but more in the social field than in the actual lending field or the extension of capital.

We found that they had about $65,000,000 invested in Government bonds in which they were obviously speculating. They were speculating to their hearts' content in the Government bond market throughout the year and they were having a good time at it. We see no excuse whatsoever for any agency of the Government using surplus funds just to satisfy their own vanity as investment speculators, and we have written into this bill a provision taking $60,000,000 of their funds and putting it in the Treasury in the fiscal year 1949.

The Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation is operating on a stand-by status. They asked for $46,800, and we have given them $46,800; and by merely a general understanding we reduced their revolving fund from $44,000,000 to $25,000,000, which is comparable to a similar revolving fund allowed to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for emergency purposes. In the case of the St. Paul Land Bank we have a most astounding situation. The conference report of the House and Senate last year recommended that these mixed-ownership situations be cleared up by being sold out so that they would be owned by private interests as soon as possible. In the case of the St. Paul land bank they "pulled" what to me is an unpardonable sin. They borrowed from the Farm Mortgage Corporation the sum of $21,000,000 so that they might have sufficient funds with which to pay off the Federal Treasury for their capital stock. In other words, they borrowed from the Federal Treasury to pay the Federal Treasury in order to get themselves out from under the control of Congress. I can find no place where anyone could give a reasonable excuse for such unpardonable action. In the field of private business, men have not only been subjected to extreme censure for such action in that sort of manipulation of funds but, if my memory recalls correctly, some of them have been indicted and found guilty for such actions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I see no reason to excuse any such action on the part of a Government agency and the committee has sought in this report to adequately censure them for such action. In the case of a repetition I think the committee would seek to take even stronger action than it has in simple words.

In the case of the Panama Railroad, one of the old steady operating corporations, we found that they had $13,000,000 in unnecessary reserves in the form of Government bonds. We saw no reason why they should be in the Government bond market more than anyone else, so the committee has recouped and rescinded the amount of $10,000,000 of the $13,000,000 as dividend payment to the Treasury.

The Inland Waterways Corporation requested $3,000,000 of new capital funds. In view of legislation pending, having been reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, for permission to the Department of Commerce to make a sale in accordance with the recommendations of both the Small Business Committee of the House and the Appropriations Committee last year, we have seen fit to allow them $2,000,000 of their request so that they might continue their operations in the hope such sale might be consummated and such legislation may become law before the adjournment of the present session of Congress.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation requested $25,796,000. We have allowed them $24,796,000.

I have commented on their general operations sufficiently, I believe, but there is one thing to which I call the Committee's particular attention. This will be found on pages 55 and 56 of the committee report. In this appropriation bill we have written off to bring into proper book balance in the Treasury the accounts of the RFC in the sum of $9,313,736,531. I will not attempt to explain this in detail except to say that it has no effect whatever upon the national debt. The impact on the national debt has already been felt. This is simply a bookkeeping operation. There may be further salvage and any further sal-

vage will be paid directly into the Federal Treasury after the RFC has deducted those necessary expenses for disposal of the surpluses retained as a result of its war activities.

Write-off of war and related unrecoverable expenses provided for in bill, in amount of $9,313,736,531.

Summary of the items tabulated in report as follows:

Statement of net expenditures for national defense, war, and related purposes, financed by RFC borrowings from the U. S. Treasury from inception to June 30, 1947

Assets remaining for disposal:			
Defense plants and facilities		$1,984,700,229	
Inventories of commodities		346,967,934	
Loans, advances, and receivables arising principally from trading activities		193,793,099	
Other assets		46,938,993	
			$2,572,400,255
Assets transferred to other U. S. Government agencies without reimbursement:			
Declared surplus:			
Defense plants and facilities	$4,597,579,682		
Commodities, equipment, and supplies	84,200,343		
		4,681,780,025	
Commodities transferred to national stock pile		251,095,164	
Hotel Empire, San Francisco, transferred to Public Buildings Administration		2,137,869	
			4,935,013,058
Subsidies, operating and other losses:			
Direct subsidies		3,035,723,714	
Operating losses:			
Trading in commodities, principally strategic and critical materials	$326,391,190		
Manufacturing and processing operations conducted by agents in plants owned by the Corporation	250,274,593		
Transportation and other miscellaneous activities	−125,013,295		
Preclusive trading abroad, including activities conducted jointly with United Kingdom Commercial Corporation	117,540,613		
Pacific Ocean area operations conducted by U. S. Commercial Company	−3,249,968		
		565,943,133	
Losses on sales and retirements of defense plants		325,216,246	
Expenses incurred in connection with construction, leasing, and disposition of defense plants		175,892,696	
Cost of experimental plywood flying boat		18,247,963	
Interest expense on funds borrowed from the U. S. Treasury		352,798,105	
Administrative expense		110,356,611	
			4,584,178,468
Total			12,091,591,781
Less:			
Defense plants rentals		$821,881,371	
Net proceeds of renegotiation settlements		83,936,935	
Fees collected by U. S. Commercial Company for services to the Department of the Army in connection with trade with occupied countries		2,573,288	
Miscellaneous income and expense (net)		15,847,002	
Recoveries from funds appropriated to other U. S. Government agencies under agreements providing for full or partial reimbursement to RFC of the cost of—			
Defense plants and facilities	$1,379,877,783		
Rubber sold for war use	340,856,259		
Alcohol sold for war use	72,000,000		
Petroleum feed stocks diverted to the aviation-gasoline program	44,580,257		
Other	16,302,375		
		1,853,616,654	
			2,777,855,250
Net expenditures for national defense, war, and related purposes financed by RFC borrowings from the U. S. Treasury			9,313,736,531

NOTE.—The foregoing statement represents a tentative reclassification and resummarization of the balances set forth in schedule 3 (pp. 17 and 18) of the Corporation's published report and financial statements of June 30, 1947.

So, while this is a startling amount, it is already included in the national debt, and the action in this bill is a bookkeeping operation, so that we may clean up and make new the RFC books in accordance with their new authority as it may become them after the Congress has acted on the present proposed extension.

In the case of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, it was the general opinion of this committee 2 years ago and then again 1 year ago that they were in liquidation. We had no sooner passed the appropriation bill last year when they came to the Congress and asked for a 5-year extension. This was reduced by general agreement on the floor of the House to 3 years, and there was an understanding between certain leaders of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and myself that that 3 years was to allow a liquidation of current programs. We find that that was not entirely true, as so frequently is the case in various departments of government, that you do not know the whole truth in the beginning, and we find that they came up with requests for supplemental appropriations which were referred to this committee for $3,848,500 for the institution of new programs, and we denied it. For 1949 they requested $5,000,000. They had a carry-over of $2,000,000. We gave them $2,500,000, so that they can go on during the coming fiscal year with $4,500,000, and we have appropriately cut proportionately their administrative expenses from $980,000 to $490,000.

In the case of the Federal Prison Industries there is not a great deal to be said. We allowed their request. We find it a rather well-managed affair and an old type of corporate activity on the part of the Government. They asked for $267,000 for administrative expenses, and we granted it.

In the case of the Export-Import Bank they asked for $800,000 for administrative expenses, and we granted the same request.

We find ourselves in this final result where the committee over and above any such suggested recision of funds has rescinded capital funds plus $90,775,000, the total rescission being $165,000,000. In the case of appropriations and limitations on administrative expenses the committee has made savings in excess of the prior fiscal year of $19,523,800 and beneath, I should say, the proposed budget for the coming fiscal year of $4,707,600. In the case of appropriated funds from the Treasury the committee has made savings in comparison with the 1948 appropriations of $28,668,000, which is a very substantial percentage as compared to the appropriation request for the coming fiscal year 1949, the same being $16,665,039.

I think in the main that is as near as I can come to briefing the situation as contained in this appropriation bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the personal relationships on this subcommittee have been most agreeable. It has been a pleasure to serve under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER]. He has sought to be fair and considerate of the minority members in all instances. However, to say that it has been a pleasure to serve under his chairmanship is not to say that I am in full accord with his views in respect to this bill and with respect to this report, because I am not. I think the bill could have been much improved, but, as everyone knows, legislation is a matter of compromise.

It has been found in our democracy that the Government can best function in some instances through the vehicle of Government corporations. There are those who have said on previous occasions that all Government corporations should be abolished, but when the Democratic Party was in power in the House it did not seek to abolish them, though it must be said for the Democratic administration that the Corporations Control Act was passed under a Democratic Congress. The Republican Party is now the majority party in the Congress, but it has not seen fit to abolish the Government corporations in wholesale; rather, it is in process of reincorporating these Government corporations. This vehicle is admittedly a useful vehicle of government.

The main item of controversy in this bill has to do with the Tennessee Valley Authority, one of the most amazing experiments ever undertaken in the history of the country. It was established before any of the present members of this subcommittee were Members of Congress. The question of whether or not there should ever have been a TVA is not a question for the House at present to decide, because the TVA is now an existing reality, and it has contributed immeasurably to the peace and happiness of millions of people. I shudder to think what might have happened to our country during World War II if this vast resource had not been at the disposal of the Government in connection with the great aircraft production program and the development of the atomic bomb.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], both members of the subcommittee, live very much closer to

the TVA than I do, and they are more familiar with the details of the operation of the TVA and are more acquainted with the issues which are before the House today in connection with the TVA. Therefore, I shall not undertake to discuss the question at any great length. I do wish to say that I am unequivocally in favor of permitting the TVA to develop and operate along the best possible lines, and I do think that to prevent the construction of the proposed steam plant would be a step in the wrong direction, a step that could not possibly be justified. I shall join with others of my colleagues in doing everything in my power to secure the adoption by the House of the amendment which would provide for the beginning of the steam plant. I shall leave the discussion of other details to those who are more immediately associated with that part of the country.

Mr. Chairman, I represent a great agricultural district. Through the years I have been very much interested, as I know many of you have been, in the development of the Federal Land Bank System and other farm-credit organizations.

The farm-credit structure of this country is on a sound basis. Mind you, I am not in favor of discarding or abolishing private credit. I like to see private credit thrive and flourish in this country. Private credit is essential to the smooth and proper operation of our economy of free enterprise. I am not against private credit. But I do think in certain fields the Farm Credit Administration has performed a great service to the farmers of the country and to the Nation generally. I was rather disappointed that the majority placed in the report a statement which is critical of the Federal Land Banks' operation. I think, if you would leave it to the vote of the farmers of the Nation, regardless of politics or area, you would find that they would cast an overwhelming vote of confidence in the Federal Land Bank System and in the Farm Credit Administration. Farmers and ranchers do not want to see the system impaired. They feel it has been operated, generally speaking, on a very sound basis, and they would agree with me that the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, Mr. Duggan, is doing an outstanding job in the position which he holds.

I take exception to a statement on pages 42 and 43 of the committee report on the bill. This statement deals with the repayment of capital to the Government by the Federal Land Bank of St. Paul, and criticizes the St. Paul bank for returning this Government capital. Congress has heretofore indicated a desire to see the Government corporations pay back Government capital.

It is stated in the report that the $21,000,000 was borrowed from the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, a wholly owned Government corporation, and that such funds were obtained from the Treasury at an interest rate of 1 percent, which was below the then current rate of 1.77 for Treasury borrowings. The Treasury at that time was paying less than 1 percent for 1-year money. This loan was therefore at a higher rate than the cost of the money to the Government.

In another place it is stated that the Government still has $21,000,000 invested in the Federal Land Bank of St. Paul. This statement does not recognize the difference between a loan and funds invested in capital. The $21,000,000 borrowed as a loan is not invested in capital and the loan is secured 100 percent with consolidated Federal farm loan bonds.

I am much surprised that this action of the St. Paul bank should be criticized. The action of the bank should be applauded as an action in the interest of the taxpayer.

The bank pays interest on the money it now uses. The Government capital in the bank had drawn no interest. So, the action taken by the St. Paul bank in securing a loan to combine with other funds in paying off the Government capital is thoroughly sound from the standpoint of the best interest of the Government and the taxpayer.

The report contains the statement that on June 30, 1947, after the repayment of the Government capital, the St. Paul bank had capital and surplus of only $22,700,000. I cannot understand why the word "only" was used, because for the St. Paul bank the ratio of capital and surplus to total assets is about 1 to 6, whereas, for commercial banks that are members of the Federal Reserve System, the ratio of capital and surplus to total assets is about 1 to 16. The language used carries the implication that the bank is in a relatively weak financial condition, whereas the opposite is true.

The whole result of the transaction was not to injure the position of the Government but to protect the Government's interests and to return the Government capital. The repayment and borrowings were made with the approval of the Treasury of the United States. All of the tangible benefits were received by the United States Treasury. These benefits consisted of the Treasury receiving the remainder of its capital investment in the St. Paul bank, and of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, a wholly owned Government corporation, receiving interest on the loan.

The report further states that the Congress has lost all control over the land banks. The Federal Farm Loan Act provides for supervision of the land banks by public officials, including examination by auditors who are public officials who have the same general qualifications as national bank examiners.

I would say that the Production Credit Corporation will not be able to operate with adequate efficiency by reason of the reduction which was made in its operating funds for the Production Credit Corporation. I hope, however, that in that deduction I may be in error. I do feel at this time when we are seeking by every possible means to implement our foreign policy by our agricultural production, it is a mistake to do anything which will cripple the operation of the farm credit program of this country.

The gentleman from Missouri, the able chairman of the subcommittee, has made reference to the Institute of Inter-American Affairs. Over a period of years, beginning, I believe, in 1942, we have been carrying on in cooperation with the republics to the south of us in a program wherein we work with those republics in connection with their agricultural programs, their educational programs, and their programs of health and sanitation. This has been a very worth-while working relationship between our country and the countries to the south. It has brought on much friendship and understanding between our countries. In connection with our health program, scores of water systems throughout South America are being developed. American equipment is being used, and is paid for in cash by the beneficiaries. All the programs—health, education, agriculture—have been beneficial. They not only promote good will, they promote trade and industry. They are in our financial best interest.

Anything we do in this country to cement the feeling of good will which exists between us and the South American countries is in the public interest. Yet that program has been so drastically curtailed by the bill before us that it cannot be carried on efficiently in the future unless some changes are made in the present bill. It seems to me most unwise to place ourselves in that position.

We are spending $5,300,000,000 on the so-called Marshall plan, which is principally a European recovery plan. We all admit that the program may not be as successful as we hope that it may be. It is a great experiment on the part of our Government for the purpose of undertaking to insure the freedom of democratic peoples and the stability of our own country, and the peace of the world. It is a very important objective. But the committee in the present bill was unwilling to spend only a few hundred thousand dollars, relatively speaking, to carry on this program in the Western Hemisphere, which has been operated in the past with such outstanding success, and which has possibilities for great future good. Of course, I know it is always possible to find mistakes in the administration of any program, and no doubt that would be true with respect to the workings of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs. But generally speaking the program has been a great success. It is such an important program that it should be carried on in a continuous way, and I regret to see the program curtailed by the legislation which is before us.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that it is most important for those who want to secure, in a minimum of time, vital statistics with respect to Government corporations, that they take a look at the report which has been prepared on this bill. As I say, I take exception to some of the conclusions that are drawn, but over all it is a very excellent report, and it contains material that is extremely valuable. It would be impossible to get the amount of material contained in this report from any other source without many hours and days of study and research.

In that connection I should like to say that Claude Hobbs, the able clerk of this subcommittee, has done an excellent job in cooperating with all members of the committee in connection with the work which has been done on this bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What Government corporations come under this general program that are not listed in this report?

Mr. MAHON. I think they are all listed.

Mr. COUDERT. I think perhaps the gentleman refers to the Commodity Credit Corporation, which is carried in the Agriculture Department bill. I think there may be one other also.

Mr. MAHON. Yes. The Federal crop-insurance program, which is a program carried on through the vehicle of the Corporation, and the Commodity Credit Corporation are not covered in the bill before us. They are, however, referred to and described in the report which is before us.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Would the Virgin Islands Company be under that?

Mr. MAHON. As you know, under the Government Corporations Control Act, the Virgin Islands Company would expire under the law unless it is renewed.

It has not yet been renewed, and that fact is recited in the report which is before us.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to echo at the outset the remarks of my good friend from Texas about the personnel of this committee and the pleasant relations that have existed during the weeks of hard labor to which it has been subjected. I have the warmest regard for the three distinguished members of the minority and regret only that we were unable to convert them to our majority point of view on one or two matters of some importance. We hope that with time and education they will come to see the light and perhaps find themselves in accord with us.

But even more important than the membership of the committee—able, distinguished, and conscientious as the members are—even more important is the young man who acts as executive clerk of the committee, Claude Hobbs, without whose industry, intelligence, and conscientious work the operation of this committee would be almost impossible—at least, it would be a great deal harder and much more painful for the members—and the result would be much less satisfactory to other Members of Congress who have to read the report.

The chairman has asked me to develop in some detail the position of the subcommittee upon the subject of our only substantial difference of opinion in the committee—the subject of the steam-plant appropriation requested by TVA. Perhaps he asked me to do it because I am the only lawyer member of the majority, and the minority are almost all able members of the bar. So that so far as that phase of the division is concerned the minority has us 3 to 1, but we hope in the final count that that will be reversed.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. Would the gentleman go so far as to say that the three members are distinguished members of the bar and able lawyers?

Mr. COUDERT. That does not necessarily mean that I agree with them, even if I admit that, because lawyers were invented for the purpose of presenting differences of opinion.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is the problem over this steam plant a legal problem or an economic problem?

Mr. COUDERT. It is both.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Would the gentleman go so far as to say it may be a social problem?

Mr. COUDERT. It is any kind of problem you choose to make it. It is a problem which is before this Congress at the present time.

Mr. RANKIN. I would like to know why the gentleman from Michigan says it is a social problem.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the gentleman cares to yield I will answer but I do not want to take up the gentleman's time.

Mr. COUDERT. I suggest that if these gentlemen will permit me to complete my statement, there will be ample time during the remainder of the afternoon in which to present their views.

Mr. Chairman, curiously enough, we are really going to be presented here this afternoon with a spectacle that would test the case-hardened credulity of Believe-It-or-Not Ripley; it is simply an incredible position. The gentlemen in the minority and those who support them, if there be any, are in fact and beyond peradventure of a doubt defending only the right of multimillion and billion-dollar industries to receive the benefit of subsidized public power paid for by the overburdened taxpayers of my State of New York, and of every other State of the Union.

Now, that sounds like a rather startling statement. It is. If you will bear with me for a brief time I think I can show you that there is no alternative to that conclusion, to-wit: That any one who undertakes to support an amendment to provide for the construction of this steam plant is championing no one other than the Aluminum Co. of Amerıct, a billion-dollar corporation, the Tennessee Copper Co., the Monsanto Chemical Co., and numerous other great industries who alone stand to benefit in years to come from this proposed power plant.

Let me make that perfectly clear and tell you why that is an inescapable conclusion. As of today, only one-third of the total power generated and sold by TVA goes to that class of customers that Congress intended to serve—municipalities and cooperatives. Now, just get that—one-third of the total generated power is all that goes to this preferred classification of customers. The balance goes to the great industrial users and to public utilities adjoining the valley area.

The Chairman of TVA testified before our committee and made it perfectly plain when he stated that if he did not have to carry or did not carry the industrial load, there would be sufficient power from existing installations to take care of the preferred municipal and cooperative customers for an indefinite and unlimited period. We can therefore say without any reservation whatsoever that the local municipal and cooperative users in the valley area have no interest whatsoever in this proposed steam plant. They are safe, they are taken care of as far as the eye or imagination can project itself. So that you only have the simple question, Shall TVA now start off with a brand new point of departure, step out of its heretofore existing role, and become for all purposes and without limitation of any kind or character a great public utility free to call upon the Treasury of the United States to construct unlimited plants in size, scope, and expense, to be paid for by the taxpayers of the United States for the purpose of subsidizing any great industry that chooses to settle in the valley and benefit by that cheap subsidized power.

Let us see how this works out. In January TVA announced—and that is the beginning of this whole controversy—that it wanted to begin a new program of additional generating capacity to meet the increasing power requirements of the Tennessee Valley area. Mr. Chairman, you will hear before this debate is concluded a great deal about firming up power. I believe that is all double-talk intended to obscure the issue. We had hours and days of testimony on that before our subcommittee. In truth and in fact it is clearly set forth in the TVA statement that it is for additional generating capacity and the only purpose for which that additional generating capacity is needed is to meet the prospective increasing needs of great industrial users.

What was the original purpose of TVA? Anyone who examines the act objectively and reads it from end to end cannot possibly escape the conclusion that the purpose of Congress in setting up this great agency was navigation control and flood control, and only incidental to those principal and constitutional purposes was any provision made for the generation and distribution and sale of electric power.

The first section of the act makes perfectly clear that those two, flood control and navigation, were the principal purposes. Then you come down to the operating section of the act which authorizes TVA to engage in the electrical business. Section 9 (A) provides that the Board is hereby directed in the operation of any dam or reservoir in its possession and control to regulate the stream flow primarily for the purpose of promoting navigation and control of floods. So far as may be consistent with such purposes the Board is authorized to provide and operate facilities for the generation of electric current at such dams for the use of the Corporation and for the use of the United States, or any

agency thereof, and the Board is further authorized whenever an opportunity is afforded to provide and operate facilities for the generation of electrical energy in order to avoid the waste of water, to transmit to market such power, and so forth, for the purpose of liquidating the cost or aid in the maintenance of the projects of the Authority. Water power runs all through that; electricity from water power and not steam power.

Then you come to section 10 which states that the Board is empowered and authorized to sell the surplus power not used in its operations for the operation of locks and other works generated by it to States, counties, municipalities, and so forth, and in the sale of such current by the Board it shall give preference to States, counties, municipalities, and cooperative organizations, citizens, or firms not organized or doing business for profit but primarily for the purpose of supplying electricity to its own citizens or members.

Now, in an exchange between the chairman of the Authority and the gentleman from Mississippi as to what the position would be if there were inadequate power to supply the needs of industries and those preferred customers, the chairman of TVA admitted without reservation that under the law the first obligation would lie toward those preferred classifications of local customers. So I think that as to that there will be no doubt and there will be no difference of opinion between Members of the House. For many years and until the year 1948 it was the accepted position of the Authority, speaking through its officials, that it was not a public utility for all purposes; that its right to produce and sell electricity was clearly limited to such energy as was produced as a byproduct of the construction and operation of flood-control and navigation facilities. My authority for that statement is not just this committee. The House does not have to rely upon the members of the committee for that, even if it were satisfied to do so. The House has only to turn to the word of David Lilienthal, for a long period chairman of that Authority and only recently leaving it to go to the Atomic Energy Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

I do not believe any Member of the House is going to suggest that Mr. Lilienthal will be charged or can be charged with taking a narrow view of the obligations, opportunities, and rights of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Certainly he would not be suspected of being a reactionary about it.

Let us see what Mr. Lilienthal had to say on this subject before a joint committee of Congress in 1938. He was being examined about the disposition of power and the contracts that had been made with some of the great industrial companies, including the Aluminum Co. of America:

> Yet it is a part of our job to dispose of all this power not 20 or 30 years from now, but as soon as possible and, so far as possible, every year during the life of the plants. That means that some method must be found of disposing of power for relatively short periods—

Get this—

> pending the growth of load by our municipal and cooperative customers. The only solution is sale to industrial and utility customers, that we have been able to devise. * * *
>
> We have been successful in so staggering our contracts that I believe we have in large part solved the problem of reserving power for the growth of our municipal and cooperative customers without presently wasting the power so reserved. I hope that is clear. * * *
>
> And I think, and I think most people feel it was remarkably good fortune that they succeeded so well in handling this very difficult situation of getting revenues as we go along and yet having blocks of power that we can cut off in the years to come to take care of the priority customers' increased needs in the future. * * * Now, with a utility this situation of having to be ready to supply an increased demand by existing customers under a long-term contract presents no problem, no serious problem, because it simply constructs additional plants as they may be needed from time to time.
>
> * * * With the Authority the situation is different, and the problem is acute. Generally speaking, we build our dams when and as required for the purposes of navigation and flood control, and not as market conditions for the power may dictate, and also subject to the general policies of the country with respect to public works for unemployment relief purposes.

It is quite apparent from the remarks of Mr. Lilienthal that he did not recognize an unlimited obligation to meet all the demands of all of the power users in the valley, industrial as well as municipal and cooperative. Yet today that is precisely the position the officials of TVA are taking. They are squarely reversing the position taken by Mr. Lilienthal at that time and they are saying in effect today, "We must meet any and all demands for the production of power, whether it be hydroelectric power produced incidental to the dam operation or whether it be steam power produced by steam plants having no relation whatsoever to navigation or flood control." That is the radical reversal of opinion that presents this very important question to the Congress. If this steam plant is appropriated for it will set a precedent and have far-reaching consequences, to the end that henceforth every time the TVA finds its demand, industrial as well as cooperative, increasing, it will feel entitled to call upon Congress to provide the money for unlimited new facilities, 1 steam plant today, 2 steam plants next year, 10 steam plants 5 years from now.

The chairman of the TVA apparently realizing that his position was not entirely secure and that it certainly was not secure at all while resting only upon the foundation of the initial enabling act, sought to draw comfort from the 1939 authorization of $50,000,000 to purchase the properties of the Commonwealth and Southern in that area. He said:

> That certainly was recognition that the TVA power system was to take on the responsibilities of supplying that region, including the industrial customers.

Unfortunately for the chairman of TVA, however, his conclusion was not at all in conformity with the conclusion of the Senate committee which reported and recommended the passage of that bill. Said the Senate committee:

> The purchase of the properties involved in this tentative sale would bring to the municipalities of a large section of Tennessee Valley the cheap electric rates of the TVA and thus save the citizens of more than 100 municipalities millions of dollars in the purchase price of electric current.

The Senate committee stuck to the original concept of the initial enabling act and held in its report that the purpose of TVA electric power was to supply cheap electric power to the municipalities and cooperatives which TVA is today in a position to do, and for an indefinite period.

Lest I overlook it, let me call the attention of the House to the fact that this bill, far from cutting down TVA or crippling it, carries $29,000,000 for the construction of additional generating and distribution facilities—11 hydro generators which would produce some four hundred thousand kilowatts. In addition to that TVA will shortly take over the distribution of power produced by the dams on the Cumberland River, built by the Corps of Engineers. So that in addition to existing power production of TVA, some six hundred thousands kilowatts of new power will shortly come into existence out of authorized water turbine generators, which is constitutional and proper and in conformity with the whole purpose of the original TVA act.

This question has never been decided by the Supreme Court of the United States. One reason that it has never been decided by the Court is because the TVA never took it there. In the only case, or at least the leading case on various other aspects of the TVA, the counsel of the TVA and the Solicitor General of the United States without reservation unconditionally denied any assertion of the right to operate or build steam plants.

On page 16 of the committee report appear the statement of the Solicitor General and a very interesting colloquy between counsel. Let me read it to you.

> Mr. JUSTICE MCREYNOLDS. Is there a steam plant in connection with this project?
>
> Mr. O'BRIAN. Yes, Your Honor. That was mentioned earlier. There is a large steam plant which was built at Muscle Shoals before the dam was built.
>
> Mr. JUSTICE MCREYNOLDS. For what purpose?
>
> Mr. O'BRIAN. For the purpose of equipping the war munitions plant immediately as quickly as possible with power.
>
> Mr. JUSTICE MCREYNOLDS. Is that used to generate electricity?
>
> Mr. O'BRIAN. No, sir; it has never been used. It stands idle. Much is made in my opponents' brief of the danger of the Government selling power from the steam plant. That steam plant is not in this case. It has never been used. It has been maintained. It has been leased to the Alabama Power Co., which has used it as a stand-by facility with which to meet break-downs in its service. There is nothing in this record to show that the Authority ever intends to use it for the purpose of generating power for sale, and I disavow any such intention at this time.
>
> Mr. JUSTICE BUTLER. I know; but you assert the power; do you not?
>
> Mr. O'BRIAN. No; I do not.

Mr. JUSTICE BUTLER. Do you say that to aid in disposing of the electricity, incidentally produced from this navigation dam, the Congress has no power under the Constitution to build stand-by plants to supply their customers, to keep the current going?

Mr. O'BRIAN. If you mean break-down facilities, yes; it could. It would have to. Any regulated system would have that.

Mr. JUSTICE BUTLER. And then to meet great demands upon the peak?

Mr. O'BRIAN. No; I do not think that could be done in this case.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Justice Reed, presently sitting on the Court, was Solicitor General at that time, appearing for the United States. What did he say? Quoting Mr. Justice Reed:

From the bench and at the bar this controversy has come down to a question of this kind, if we assume that this act was primarily for navigation, then it would be valid. If we determine that this act, while stating that it is for navigation, national defense and flood control, is actually for the purpose of developing power and selling it commercially, the act would be invalid.

That is precisely the position that the present officials of TVA have taken, that they are in the business, first, last, and always, of producing power, no matter how such power may be produced, and without any regard whatsoever to navigation or flood control.

That presents to this Congress two very important questions. First, as to what really was the legislative intent inherent in the original Enabling Act. Second, it presents a major constitutional question: Has the United States, under the Constitution, the right to undertake to supply power commercially, as a primary function, to any particular group of citizens within the United States at the expense of all of the taxpayers of the United States, and not as a byproduct of a clearly constitutional function.

A majority of your committee took the position that this was not a question that should be decided in necessarily summary hearings in an appropriations subcommittee; that it was of such far-reaching importance and scope that it should be determined in orderly fashion by a legislative committee of this House, with full opportunity for hearings and full consideration of all the issues involved. The committee does not undertake to decide the question; the committee merely takes the view that orderly procedure on the merits requires that this important question be decided in orderly fashion after hearings by a legislative committee and proper debate thereon.

The majority members of the committee are not opposed to TVA. We have given TVA everything it asked for. We have given them $15,000,000 to complete its dams; we have approved the $29,000,000 for new generating facilities; we have made it possible for TVA to increase its hydroelectric-power production by an enormous amount.

And a final word, Mr. Chairman: The preferred class of customers—the municipalities and co-ops have no need for this steam plant because there is power enough of hydroelectric variety to supply them as far as we can see. But the question is whether Congress should appropriate the people's money to supply in perpetuity cheap subsidized power for great industries well able to build their own steam plants and to otherwise furnish their own power. This is the question that the committee feels should be carefully considered and acted upon by the proper legislative committee and as decided in this bill.

One more word:

It is recognized that the Authority possesses and operates steam plants at the present time. However, such plants have been acquired or constructed under special conditions and circumstances having no bearing upon the present budget request.

The only plant built by TVA was built pursuant to Joint Resolution 95, Seventy-sixth Congress.

That appropriation, by terms of the resolution, was made "for the Tennessee Valley Authority * * * to provide facilities to expedite the national defense."

In order that there should be no ambiguity as to the intent of that joint resolution, the committee report thereon, on page 2, contains the following unequivocal statement:

"There should not be any confusion in the public mind with respect to this proposal for the Tennessee Valley Authority. Irrespective of the present or past views of anyone with respect to the governmental policy involved in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act or the operations thereunder, this appropriation should be viewed and adjudged solely by its present bearing upon the national-defense program."

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York yields back 2 minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, any discussion of the bill now before us will, of course, naturally come down to the difference of views that have been evident here this afternoon between the majority and the minority members of this committee on this proposed steam plant for the TVA.

This bill covers quite a number of Government corporations. With regard to most of these corporations the bill has to do with limiting the amount of administrative expenses. We do not have the great amount of money involved here that we have in the average appropriation bill where we appropriate for the activities of the department involved. Here, in most cases, we are limited to expense money covering administrative expenses and for that reason the degree of latitude is not wide. Many of the items of this bill do not accord with my own views or those of all the other members of the committee, but we have tried to work out those differences and have done so to the point that I think will permit these various Government operations to function.

As I stated, the chief difference in our committee had to do with the so-called steam plant for the Tennessee Valley Authority. There have been discussions of the TVA Authority to build a steam plant, the need for the steam plant, and then the obligation of the TVA to provide electricity for everybody by the construction of a steam plant if necessary to meet the needs. At the time we had our hearings the various public utilities of the area had their witnesses before the committee on the basis that they had an interest in that provision of the bill providing a steam plant in the Tennessee Valley area. I certainly agree they had a right to appear before the committee and relate to the committee any interest they had or might have in connection with the steam plant. They submitted to the committee—and I happen to be a lawyer, as are most of the other members of the committee—a rather lengthy brief going into the legal proposition of whether there is authority to construct a steam plant. I insisted that TVA likewise be permitted to submit its legal brief. That was done. As I say, I am a lawyer, and other members of the committee are lawyers. It would take actually a lot of detailed and very extensive study on the part of any lawyer to follow the various lines of authority laid down in these two briefs.

Any discussion that may have been had on the other side or on my own side is based on not as thorough a study of those two lines of authority as might be, but, again, this is a question that I dare say the Supreme Court would spend a whole lot of time and study on. Needless to say, I cannot see where there is any serious problem involved here, not as a result of these legal briefs but as a result of the action of the Congress which has gone uncontested throughout the years.

When the TVA was first set up, the first dam that was turned over to them was Wilson Dam, and at the time Wilson Dam was turned over there was also turned over a steam plant which had been used in connection with the water power. The Tennessee Valley Authority in 1939 was authorized to build a steam plant. It built a steam plant and operated a steam plant; in fact, they operate five steam plants today during the dry seasons. So there is nothing new in this proposition to provide a steam plant and it has gone uncontested throughout the years. True, it is, someone says, that in 1939 the seriousness of our national defense situation entered into the proposition and for that reason there was no question but what the Government had a right to provide for the steam plant.

If that be a basis for authority I call attention to the fact that today there is the same basis for permitting a steam plant. The war has not been officially declared at an end. In the press today we read where they are calling on the Congress to reenact the draft act and to pass an act providing for universal miltary training. We read also in the press where the Army is planning to build supersonic facilities which will require some 500,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity per year. We learn, too, that the Senate has passed a bill authorizing an appropriation for a 70-group Air Force which will require airplanes, which airplanes will require aluminum. The aluminum will largely be made in the Tennessee Valley area if electricity is

available—and it is not available anywhere else. So we may take it that the national situation is somewhat serious, I certainly think either it is serious or else we are being misled today by the press, by our own Army and Navy leaders, and by our own President. The situation is sufficiently serious to bring the matter on the same basis as in 1939, which incidentally was a year and a half before we were at war and at a time when we said we were going to have peace and we hoped we would have peace.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. As I understand it, the development of electricity is a byproduct of the activity of controlling the streams for flood control. Is there anything in the law that would prevent us from doing anything that we can to increase the value of byproduct thereby making the electricity pay back the original investment in the entire project? Is there anything wrong in that in principle that the gentleman can see?

Mr. WHITTEN. There is not. You know, when you read an act you can always underscore anything. Very frequently those on one side or the other underscore that which seems to justify their position. But the limitation, as I see it, with regard to the generation of electricity in the Tennessee Valley is this: The TVA must keep the reservoirs sufficiently full of water for navigation. They must keep them sufficiently empty to provide reservoir space for flood control; then it is provided that you must generate electricity to the maximum extent necessary to prevent waste of water power. We have that direction in the TVA Act itself.

I cannot agree with statements that electricity is a byproduct. It is a product that must come within the two limitations. The water must be kept high enough for one, low enough for the other, the power must be generated in between; however you will find throughout the act the direction to generate the maximum amount of water power to prevent waste.

The committee recognized that requirement, because funds are provided in this bill for the installation of generators, the building of dams, and authorizing the TVA to carry out the mandate of the Congress of the United States in the TVA Act to manufacture the greatest amount of water power within these two limitations favoring flood control and navigation.

Now, when they carry out that mandate we find another requirement. We find in the act it is provided that this electricity shall be sold. It does not say that they are limited to municipalities and farmer cooperatives. I think wisely the writers of this act provided that they should have the first priority, and I think that is as it should be. But the act provides any electricity not needed for the priority customers shall be sold to commercial interests and users and distributors for profit. So it is recognized in the TVA Act that the Government is interested in the TVA and in the $440,000,000 that we have invested in the building of the power end of the TVA, and in self-liquidating of that $440,000,000. It was recognized when the act was passed and the chairman and the members of this committee, of which I am a member, recognized last year that the Government had a financial interest in the TVA and its income because the bill that passed the Congress last year provided for what was called repayment. Now, I do not think it is a repayment. The TVA belongs to the Federal Government. Its earnings belong to the Federal Government, and whether you let the money stay in the banks to the credit of TVA or whether you draw it out, it still belongs to the Federal Government. I do not oppose that provision for so-called repayment. I think it is all right to withdraw funds from any agency whenever those funds are not needed for the proper operation of the agency or corporation.

Now let me say something about electricity.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The preamble of the act in 1933 provided for the generation of hydroelectric power for industrial uses, and stated that in the act.

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly it does. Of course, you know a lot of chambers of commerce throughout the United States have been led to believe that the TVA is responsible for the growth of industry throughout the South and other regions. This industrial development is not limited to the TVA area. It is not limited to that area by any manner or means. It has been rather widespread throughout the United States, and I will say that it is not a detriment to the rest of the United States, because for the first time in history we provide a great market for the products that are grown in other areas of the United States. We have more for ourselves and we spend more with them than ever before in history.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I am a coauthor of the bill creating the Tennessee Valley Authority. We had a good deal of wrangling over that provision the gentleman refers to about the generation of power. At that time there was some doubt whether or not the Federal Government had a right to develop the power in these streams. But the Ashwander case, the two dissenting Judges which were quoted by the gentleman from New York, decided that we did have the right, and then later the Appalachian Power case was decided by the Supreme Court which was to the effect that the Federal Government not only owns the hydroelectric power in our navigable streams but also in all their tributaries.

Mr. WHITTEN. I appreciate the contribution of the gentleman. I think the whole country recognizes the contribution he has made to TVA and REA as well.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me call attention to something that has been overlooked by the gentleman from New York. When the Muscle Shoals Dam was first built the Government built a great stand-by plant down at Gorgas, Ala., which was later sold by the Secretary of War, Mr. Weeks, without the consent of Congress, and the then President approved it. But, that stand-by plant was built at that time in order to firm up the power to be developed at Muscle Shoals when the dam was finished.

Mr. WHITTEN. Now the gentleman from New York—and I might say whom there is no finer gentleman in the Congress and none whom I enjoy working with more, and I can say that for the other Republican members of the committee——

Mr. RANKIN. I want to endorse that statement also.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman has made the statement if this power generated down in that region is not sufficient to meet the needs of the many industries of the region the Congress will be called on to provide more and more and more electricity. If this is the only public utility in the area, and it is, and if the public down there must look to the Tennessee Valley for its power, and it must, I trust and hope that this Congress in future years will provide additional electricity when it is required for the people of that area. If you will not do that the only thing to do is to do as some people would do, turn this area over to some private utility, because certainly you could not draw a line and say to this region, or any other region, "You have reached the maximum of your development, and we are putting a stop order on you, and we are doing it today." Certainly, I do not think the gentleman subscribes to any such belief, and I think he will recognize that if the Tennessee Valley is the public utility of that region it should be permitted to meet the needs of that region for electricity, just as the private utilities in other regions have the right to provide electricity, and the duty to do so. I may say that the private utilities are trying to meet that duty and obligation, because all of them have in orders for additional generating facilities. I was told before this committee by one of their witnesses that the private companies now have on order something like 6,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of generating equipment.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the private utilities expect to spend $5,000,000,000 within the next 5 years on an expansion program, and also the technical advice is that they are going to firm up their power with steam generation to the tune of approximately 25 percent, to keep that firm power flowing to their consumers.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman. I know of his untiring interest in the TVA in that region and his untiring efforts to help here in this fight.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman will yield further, I note the Governor of New York and a large number of other leaders in New York are advocating the development of St. Lawrence water power

projects in order to relieve the people of that great northeastern country. If they should, it will be absolutely necessary for them to build some kind of a stand-by plant in order to firm the power up and keep it at its peak.

Mr. WHITTEN. In considering the steam plant we can think of this as the fact: When the Wilson Dam was taken over by the TVA it included the steam plant. During the years of the TVA operation they have operated the steam plant. In 1939 they built a steam plant, and they have operated that steam plant since then. They operate five steam plants today. So it is pretty hard to realize or recognize or think that there is any serious question about their authority to do that, when they have done it for many years, and where, as far as I know, the question has not been raised directly; and where it has come up in connection with other questions, I do not know of a single instance in which the court has intimated that they could not operate a steam plant.

Let us see about the why of the steam plant: As stated, the Tennessee Valley Authority is the sole supplier of electricity to a region comprising parts of seven States. Over 5,000,000 people are dependent upon the Tennessee Valley Authority to supply them with electricity. They generate that electricity from this water power within the limitations which I have mentioned. Anyone knows that water power is available to a much greater extent during a part of the year than it is during the dry season of the year. The Tennessee Valley Authority has other limitations which make it extremely difficult to have an even flow through their dams and through their turbines all the year. If the water gets high enough in their lake to jeopardize having a sufficient reservoir for flood control, they have to turn it out. On the other hand, if the water gets low enough to jeopardize navigation, they have to cut the flow off. So the water power generated in the Tennessee Valley Authority has two limitations on it that do not exist in most areas where you have water power generators. This makes it highly important in the dry season of the year to make the water power that they can generate through a big part of the year firm so that you can sell it and the fellow who buys it can depend on it on a year around basis.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. This situation developed last November and December in the low water period, and therefore one of the big producers of aluminum had to cut down three pot lines, due to the fact that it could not get sufficient power to keep it in operation.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman. It has been recognized by practically all hydroelectric set-ups, including the TVA, that steam power to meet your need in this period of dry weather is highly important. A man who buys electricity wants to know that he can depend on it, just as you would not want to take electricity where they might cut it off or where they might call you up and say that the load is too heavy and that you would have to go to bed because your house would be in darkness. That goes throughout the business world and applies to a great number of consumers of electricity. They want a dependable product. They will pay more for a dependable product than for something that will be up today and down tomorrow, where they might operate one week and have to close down next week. Recognizing that, the TVA throughout the years has operated five steam plants to firm up this power in the dry period of the year. That has been recognized. The testimony in this record, and it is uncontradicted, is that they generated by steam last year 1,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity. You may say that that is enough steam-power generation. But the testimony further shows that they sold between 14,000,000,000 and 15,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, firm, dependable power, whereas in the absence of this 1,000,000,000 hours of steam-generated electricity they would have been able to sell only 9,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of firm water-power electricity. Thus, by having 1,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of steam-generated electricity last year they were able to sell from three to four billion kilowatt-hours of water-power-generated electricity as firm power which they otherwise would not have had to sell and the Government would not have had the profits from it, and, more important, the country would not have had the advantage of the use of that power.

I have before me a report from the Federal Power Commission in which they call attention to the seriousness of the situation facing us in the supply of electricity. A few weeks ago we had less than two-tenths of 1 percent of leeway between the electricity used in this country and that which could be made available. That is a safety margin of only two-tenths of 1 percent.

I would like to call your attention to a factual story appearing in Collier's magazine of a short time ago pointing out that in certain parts of Maine the streets were dark, that in certain parts of California the water supply was being affected, that the Dow Chemical Co. had to lay off some of its employees all because of the shortage of electricity.

We find that in certain other areas, they are borrowing ships from the Navy and the Army. This story was written long before this fight started. The story calls attention to the seriousness of the situation. We find in certain other areas that private suppliers of power are having to call on the people who buy from them to please conserve electricity. In Portland, Maine, electricity is being generated by a ship in order to relieve the situation. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co., one of the Nation's biggest power systems, is buying electricity from other places, and anywhere that they can find an extra kilowatt-hour of current. Some of it is being purchased from the Navy at Mare Island.

Restaurants, hotels, and department-store owners have been requested to cut down their cooling equipment for part of the day in parts of Texas.

The Union Electric Co. of St. Louis offers hints on how to save electricity.

A power company in California asks its customers to save every extra kilowatt of power, but asks for more of the same.

So we have a situation in this country that is critical and very serious. We have reached the point where we need all the electricity that it is possible to manufacture. The testimony shows that if the TVA gets this money, that a billion kilowatt-hours more of electricity will be made available. It is true that the gentlemen on this side may say it will be 1951 before this steam plant will be available. That is true, but it will be that time before the other agency facilities will be available to a large extent. Certainly, if we are going to give to the TVA this additional water power in a time of great national need, whether you want to charge it to national defense or against the electricity that goes to that farm home that you hear so much about, certainly there is every reason in the world to give them a little steam, if, by so doing, you can make three times as much water power available in a time when we have less than two-tenths of 1 percent degree of safety facing us today.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. COUDERT. Is there any reason why the taxpayers of the city of New York should subsidize the Aluminum Co. of America?

Mr. WHITTEN. There is no reason at all. I am glad the gentleman raised that point because I wanted to answer him on that and it had escaped my attention. If you have firm power, that is, water power for a big part of the year, and steam power to carry it on during the dry season, you can sell it to a buyer who must have dependable power. If it is not firm power, you have got to sell it to somebody like the Aluminum Co. of America that can operate when the power is there and can shut down and cut off when it is not there. During the war that is the way the Aluminum Co. operated in many instances. They operated when the Government told them they could and they closed down when they said the power load was too great. So the point I make is this: If you do not want the surplus sold to the Aluminum Co., and their kind, firm up the power and it can be purchased by others who do not have to have it at a low rate, which the Aluminum Co. always must have in order to make aluminum at a price for which you can purchase it.

Mr. COUDERT. The fact still remains, does it not, that the taxpayers of New York have been and will continue to subsidize the Aluminum Co. of America?

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, I do not know. It is six of one and half a dozen of the other. Up until the present time practically the entire output has gone into the manufacture of airplanes. I do not know whether it will pay us to pay more for the aluminum or contribute a little bit for the generation of electricity. But my understanding of it is that last year we provided that our own agency, the TVA, shall pay back into the Treasury the money that we put into it. This bill provides for a continuation of that policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. COUDERT. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. COUDERT. I would like to answer the observation of the other gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] in his reference to the Ashwander case. The Ashwander decision does not touch this question in any way, shape or form, except to emphasize the position taken by the majority here; to wit, that the only power concerned is the power directly produced by water. The language of Mr. Justice Hughes is:

> The Government is disposing of the energy itself which is simply mechanical energy incidental to falling water at the dam, converted into electric energy which is susceptible of transmission.

The steam-plant business does not come into that decision at all, and one reason for that was the fact that the TVA counsel and the Solicitor General, as indicated in our report and my remarks, withdrew the question from the Court and asserted that they had no such right.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I suppose I am the only man in Congress who heard Chief Justice Hughes render that great opinion. He said exactly what I said he did, that this water power belonged to the Federal Government.

Mr. COUDERT. Right.

Mr. RANKIN. And that it had a right to use it. The Appalachian Power case came along later and they said not only that but that the Federal Government owned the power in all the tributaries of our navigable streams. Now, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] keeps saying we are subsidizing it. It is not costing the people of New York one penny, and it never will. This power is being produced and sold at a profit that will pay every dollar that is invested in the TVA and every dollar invested in this stand-by plant.

Mr. COUDERT. I am glad the gentleman is so optimistic.

Mr. RANKIN. I will get some time later and tell you what you pessimists said 15 years ago.

Mr. COUDERT. The TVA came in with its budget request, with a $70,000,000 gross income, and offered to pay $60,000 to the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. As the gentleman pointed out, all the power there comes out of the water. This money for stand-by plants is only to get more power out of the water to the customers. It is just the same sort of thing as buying a new turbine or a new piece of machinery to get more juice out of that running river.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right; and, as the gentleman says, if you will read the act, you will see that the people who wrote it—the Congress which passed it—intended the maximum amount of power to be generated and that it be sold on a business basis so it would meet the needs of the American people.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. COUDERT. Just so that we see quite clearly the issue between us, does the gentleman recognize any limit to the number of steam plants that TVA can construct under the existing law for the purpose of generating power?

Mr. WHITTEN. I would say that if the gentleman—and I do not believe he is going to be governed in his vote by my feelings in this matter—I had my chance to argue with him in the committee and while he listened with patience, he stuck to his original opinion, but I will say that if my opinion should govern or rule in this case it would be immensely pleasing to me—if TVA is to be the sole public utility of a great region I say this Congress must permit it to assume the same obligation that any other utility must assume in other localities. That is it should meet the need of the region for firm power. The TVA Act says that the Authority shall generate the maximum amount of water power and it would follow that up to the point that it would make it most useful you should have enough steam plants to firm it up during the dry season of the year. That is my view.

Mr. COUDERT. The gentleman, in other words, takes the view now that Mr. Clapp, the Chairman of the TVA is taking, and that Mr. Lilienthal repudiated before Congress several years ago, to-wit: The TVA is a great utility; that, therefore, its primary purpose is the commercial production and sale of electricity, and, therefore, it is a great utility monopoly in the Tennessee Valley area.

Mr. WHITTEN. There is no question but what the TVA is a large utility and the sole utility for parts of seven States, 80,000 square miles of territory and 5,000,000 people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Answering the gentleman from New York, I say: When this Congress passed the act that authorized the TVA to buy out the Commonwealth & Southern you provided then by law that the Tennessee Valley Authority was the public utility and the only one in this area. The people in this area are dependent upon it. You will find that in every other area of the United States the private utility companies are trying to expand their facilities to meet the needs of the people, just as TVA is trying to do it here. You are saying to people in every other region in the United States that there is no limit, that the private companies have the right to enlarge. But you are saying to the TVA that in their region alone you are going to take away their right to expand to meet the demand for power in their area.

It is time that you stopped, looked, and listened. As I said before, the supply of electricity in this whole country is dangerously low. We hear a great deal of talk about this 70-group air force and the people sit back and take their ease and think they are secure. But remember that 70-group air force exists only on paper. It will take planes and planes will take aluminum and I venture to say that when you want that aluminum you are coming to the Tennessee Valley area to get it.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. In just a minute.

The TVA is integrated with private power companies, and if by the generation of steam electricity you can make available a whole lot of dependable water power, as you can here, to a country that needs it you can make it so that the power can be used by the other power companies in that region—and there is not one of them that does not need it, and they say—and it is in this record—that they would be glad to have it.

It is said that you ought to let the power companies firm this up. They cannot get enough equipment to have any surplus to firm up this water power. But if they could, the record shows that they can make $2,000,000 clear profit by firming up this power, selling it at firm rates, buying at dump rates. If you are going to back up the majority of our committee and our efforts to allow the TVA to pay for itself even though it will still belong to us, you do not want to pass up a chance where by building a steam plant you can make an additional $2,000,000 a year profit, thereby liquidate the Government's investment in this plant at an early date.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. If the private power companies cannot get the equipment to build steam plants, does the gentleman think a municipally owned unit can get the equipment?

Mr. WHITTEN. It is doubtful if any of them are going to get half enough.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman did say that the power companies could not get the equipment. If that is true, then TVA cannot get the equipment either.

Mr. WHITTEN. If it comes to a choice of whether it is better to have this one steam plant used by TVA, which has available this water power that will be multiplied by firming up during the dry season, or to provide a steam plant for one of the private companies, I say it is better for TVA to use the steam plant in this time of emergency where by its use additional water power is made dependable. The demand on the power companies is so great that they will be required to use any plants they get the year around to meet their own needs and they will have no surplus plant to use in the summer to firm up this hydro power of the TVA.

Mr. PLOESER. Does the gentleman know of any place in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act where the Congress has decreed it shall be the controlling monopoly power utility in that area?

Mr. WHITTEN. When we permitted the TVA to purchase all other competing

power manufacturers in that area, we recognized it is a monopoly and that it is the only supplier of electricity in that valley. That is the situation today.

Mr. PLOESER. The purchase did not preclude anyone from building a power plant down there, did it?

Mr. WHITTEN. No, it does not preclude them, as a matter of law, but, as a matter of fact it has.

Mr. PLOESER. The TVA in its contracts with these municipalities sought to inject itself as a monopoly proposition in the contracts it made with the municipal authorities?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is because we had some folks on the Appropriations Committee and in the Congress of the United States, and rightly so, who demanded that they operate on a sound business basis.

Mr. PLOESER. Does the gentleman think this is being operated on a sound business basis?

Mr. WHITTEN. The utility business is practically a monopoly. It is controlled by the various rate boards in the States. It has always been a monopoly in this country, and I think it has got to continue that way, else you will have duplication of lines, you will have duplication of facilities, and you will have a tremendously high cost. So we all recognize it can best be run as a monopoly.

With regard to the question raised by the chairman of the subcommittee that it required a municipality to buy all of their current from them, may I ask: Why should they put up a $100,000 transformer to supply a given town current if the town is going to turn right around and not buy current from them? If that occurred, I would be the second one on this committee to give them the devil, because I think the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Missouri, would be the first.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

NATIONAL RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT IS THE KEY TO OUR PROSPERITY AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I deem it apropos in the consideration of this bill providing funds for Government corporations to discuss the over-all subject of natural resource development in the United States. I am sure that many of us charged with the responsibilities of protecting the well-being of our Nation here in the Congress are deeply concerned over the apparent misunderstanding of some of our colleagues in the necessity of providing a long-range program for the conservation, development, and full use of our natural resources within the confines of our own United States. We have spent billions of American tax dollars in foreign lands for aid and rehabilitation of war-torn countries and we are now considering a program of large expenditures for expanding our national defense program. It should not be overlooked that if we are to maintain the front rank which we occupy economically and as a preserver of world peace, we must not overlook the fact that our success will depend upon the full expansion and utilization of our own resources. Foremost among these are the great water resources of the country which not only make available millions of fertile acres to produce food stuffs, but which also provide arteries of commerce so essential to our industry and furnish hydroelectric power without which the wheels of industry would not move and the defense of our country would come to a sudden halt.

The authorized river and harbor construction program includes 200 projects on which work has been undertaken although not fully completed, and 76 authorized new river and harbor projects for which no funds have been appropriated by Congress. The latest estimated cost for completing the construction of these improvements is $1,830,000,000. Included among the projects that have been initiated is the McNary lock and Dam on the Columbia River, now in an early stage of construction, and the project for improvement of the Snake River, which is in the advanced-planning stage of development.

At the present time there are some 1,200 river and harbor projects now actively in force. The construction activity in connection with these projects includes the maintenance of channels and harbor areas, channel control works, breakwater work, snagging and the operation and care of facilities which have been provided in the interest of navigation.

Since April 6, 1802, when an appropriation of $30,000 was made for piers in the Delaware River by the Corps of Engineers, the total funds appropriated through the fiscal year 1948 for river and harbor projects in the continental United States, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Hawaiian Islands, amounted to $3,370,000,000.

As you know, the Federal Government has jurisdiction over the improvement and control of navigable waterways by reason of the commerce clause in the Constitution. Under this authority the Government has constructed many multiple-purpose projects, not only for navigation but also for flood control, reclamation, and hydroelectric power. Hydroelectric power is a most important factor in the program by reason of the fact that it brings into the Federal Government revenues from such projects which not only reimburse the Government for the cost of the power facilities, but help to retire the indebtedness for other portions of the improvements, such as reclamation. It has been the policy of the Government, for many years, to retain control over generation of hydroelectric power in such projects, which is a wise one and should be continued. I am a firm believer in private enterprise and hold the view that the Federal Government should not inject itself into commercial operations where private enterprise may carry them forward adequately and successfully. However, it is my view that in these large river developments which have power development as one of the major factors, the ownership and control over the entire project, including power, should be retained by the Federal Government.

The industrial machine of America runs full speed by reason of our oil, coal, and hydroelectric energy. Our coal and oil supply is expendable, but hydroelectric power will continue as long as the sun shines and the rivers run. We in America would be recreant in our duty if we failed to make full utilization of this immense storehouse of hydroelectric power in order to preserve our front-rank position in production, as well as maintain an impregnable national defense.

I crave your indulgence to review this whole problem of national resource development and its relationship to our national economy and to call your attention particularly to the part the great Columbia River and my own State of Oregon and the Northwest have played in the forward-looking long-range program for the development and utilization of the natural resources of the Pacific Northwest.

The new program for increased air power for national defense recently passed by the House will require for its fulfillment an immense quantity of hydroelectric power for the production of aluminum and magnesium. The Columbia River is the reservoir for potential hydropower in the Nation, containing over 50 percent thereof. There are a number of projects either in the planning stage or under actual construction which should be put in the must category as emergency projects and pressed to completion at the earliest possible time. Foremost among them is the completion of the remaining generators at Coulee Dam, completion of McNary Dam and Foster Creek dams on the Columbia River, Hungry Horse Dam in Montana, and the Snake River dams and some some smaller hydro dams in the flood-control projects in the Willamette Basin. I believe the House made a grievous error recently in cutting down the appropriation recommended by the Bureau of the Budget from $30,000,000 to $20,000,000 for McNary Dam, and failing to appreciate the urgent necessity in increasing hydroelectric power by adopting the recommendation made by the Army engineers for a $40,000,000 appropriation which would permit power from this project to be brought in by the fall of 1953. It is not too late to correct our mistakes with reference to these projects and I feel sure that you will agree with me if you give full credence to the facts I am presenting.

Mr. Chairman, for many years I have investigated the various angles of our national resource problem, and several times each year I have addressed the House on various parts of this problem. Early in 1939, before the European war had started, I first called attention to our serious defense situation resulting from our small supply of critical materials. In May 1940, some 2 weeks before the late President Roosevelt addressed a joint session of both Houses on the need for his declaration of a defense emergency, I presented a detailed analysis of the Nation's critical material position. The conclusions derived from my 1940 analysis were to the effect that this Nation was not then prepared to fight a modern war because of our lack of modern electrochemical and electro-metallurgical industrial-plant capacity and the resulting

materials. Our national experience between Pearl Harbor and VJ-day has confirmed all of these early suggestions. What I then presented to the House is just as applicable today—and more so, since we have discovered the secrets of atomic fission. With the development of the A bomb, our big defense has assumed vast importance.

In 1940 we started the consideration of an expanded air program, and had reached the point where we had set out the required number of planes of various types and sizes, but in so doing we failed to recognize the amounts and kinds of critical materials needed to construct such an array of ships, the energy required to process the raw materials, and the fuels and lubricants needed to keep such numbers in operation. We are going through the same cycle today, without tracing all the requirements back to the basic supply of critical materials, energy, and fuels.

Furthermore, since 1940 we have become the storehouse for the world. In assuming this world supply position I also feel that we have not given the requisite attention to what we are doing to our own resource base. When this is investigated we will find serious depletions.

From time to time I have reviewed and amended my original analysis. Each time that I attempt such a revision I find that the over-all results indicate a compounding depletion condition, which has now become extremely serious. Anyone who has worked on this problem both from a historical and factual viewpoint will be impressed with the lessons of history. These lessons show that nations which have allowed the critical material depletion cycle to continue first dropped from a major world position to a secondary role, and then later became decadent nations. History also shows that when the causes of war are analyzed we will find in the majority of cases the conflicts were nothing more than struggles for the control of critical materials. If we can organize the controls applying to the distribution of critical materials we will have made real progress in outlawing war. Any frenzied nation can start a war, but the ability to successfully wage a war under modern technological conditions depends entirely on the availability of critical materials, and industrial capability. Therefore, it is axiomatic that the only means of preventing or limiting the spread of war is through a tight control over critical materials. Progress toward peace must therefore originate with those nations that can develop the critical materials and have ready access to the materials of friendly nations. The world position of "have not" nations is necessarily weak. Such "have not" nations therefore are not in a position to promote peaceful progress. China is an outstanding example of a nation which permitted its resources to become depleted. In this condition China has become the prey of scheming nations. The power to prevent or limit war therefore rests in possessing or controlling a majority of the critical materials; keeping control of the sea lanes; expanding industrial production; and maintaining a modern defense organization.

As nations grow and develop, they progress from a solely agricultural status to a combined agricultural and industrial economy. It is only through effective coordination and the balancing of agriculture with industry that a nation can maintain and then improve its standard of living. The expansion of industrialization necessarily requires an increasing volume of critical raw materials and many other resources. Under the natural order, it appears that no nation has been endowed with a full line of critical resources. With technological advances, industry on a world-wide scale is bound to expand. Such an expansion results in the industrial raw-material situation changing from a serious to an acute problem. This is the situation that this Nation now faces, since we have become the world's leading industrial and mass-production nation.

From these brief preliminaries it is obvious that any complete discussion of the critical- and strategic-material situation must fall into four categories, namely: First, our own national-resource base; second, the resource base of potential enemies; third, the requirements of our own expanded industry; and, fourth, the use of industrial power as a means of preventing war. These four elements are not independent or isolated items. Each element is just one component of a huge over-all problem which will take a long period of readjustment to completely solve. It is a problem that does not permit a static approach; it is one that requires long-range development.

Volumes can be written on all the phases of this huge problem, but such an attempt is far beyond the scope of this discussion. Therefore, this discussion must be limited to a brief inventory of our own resource condition, and the needed correction measures, in order to supply continuing facts and to point out the contribution that my section can make toward repairing our weakened foundations. The West is rich in certain types of potential resources, but these resources can never become effective until they are made a part of a quick-moving, dynamic system.

Technological developments are largely responsible for our present resource condition. This same type of development can also be used to provide corrective measures, through the application of electrochemical and electrothermal processes. These processes require large volumes of low-cost power, and there are very few places where such a type of energy can be secured. The past contributions of Columbia River power have demonstrated what can be accomplished through modern electro processing. What is before us is nothing more than the continuation of the modern applications which have been so successful during the past 7 years.

When I started the resource discussions in 1939, only two small generating units were in process of installation at Bonneville, and none at Grand Coulee. During the emergency we saw Congress complete the 10 units at Bonneville and provide 9 units at Grand Coulee. Since that time we have seen the Coulee unit appropriations grow to 15 units, and McNary, Foster Creek, the Willamette, and the Snake River developments authorized. The early foresight of Congress in accelerating the Columbia River power program enabled the Pacific Northwest to contribute a substantial portion of the tools of victory.

Beginning with 1939 we have witnessed wide developments in the fields of electrometallurgy and electrochemistry. The most satisfactory materials for airplane construction became the products of the electric furnace and the electrochemical cell, since the products of the older conventional blast-furnace processes did not have the requisite lightness or strength for the high-speed duty of airplanes and all other types of transportation equipment. Early in these discussions I pointed out that the Michigan automotive industry would not have been possible if the early Niagara electric metals were not available.

COLUMBIA RIVER CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. Chairman, in September 1940 the first aluminum production in the Pacific Northwest commenced. This was the time when the Vancouver ingot plant of the Aluminum Co. of America began operations. Between that date and September 2, 1945, when the Japanese capitulated aboard the U. S. S. *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay, the two Columbia River plants generated 26,088,000,000 kilowatt-hours for use in the war effort. Seventy-three percent of this output went directly to the following defense plants located on the lines of the Bonneville Power Administration: Five aluminum pig ingot plants; one large aluminum rolling mill; three commercial shipyards; three carbide and alloy plants; three chemical plants; one manganese operation; one metallurgical operation; and the Bremerton Navy Yard. In addition, 13 military and naval establishments received their principal power from these plants. Twenty-seven percent of the total output of the Columbia River plants went to distributing agencies which, in turn, transmitted power to the smaller fabricators. The war plants directly served with Columbia River power represented a plant investment of $476,151,000 and the estimated value of the products turned out by these plants represented $6,660,000,000. Of this total dollar value, $1,876,000,000 represented the production of aircraft; $3,737,000,000 the production of Liberty and Victory ships, tankers, and baby carriers; $177,000,000 represented ordnance items; $2,000,000 communication equipment; $275,000,000 ingot aluminum; and $593,000,000 miscellaneous smaller items. At the end of the war period, the total Federal investment in the Columbia River power facilities amounted to $266,000,000. Therefore, for every dollar invested in power facilities the Nation secured $25 in defense materials. The influence of low-cost Columbia River power on the price of these products was very pronounced. For example, in 1939 the current price of aluminum was around 20 cents per pound. When the full influence of the low-cost Columbia River plants became effective, the pound price dropped to

around 14 cents. This represents approximately a 30-percent reduction. If we use the very conservative saving of 10 percent in costs, we will find on the basis of these figures that the resulting saving to the Government was around $2.50 per dollar of power investment.

The above figures do not include the Hanford plant, as the process at that plant is a secret of the highest order. The nearest that we can come to an evaluation of this highly successful plutonium plant is that it represents an investment totaling over $300,000,000, or in excess of the total then invested in the Bonneville and Grand Coulee power facilities. Stop and think how this Nation would have suffered in the last war without these highly important defense contributions. As a result of the early and wise congressional vision and action, the Columbia River power produced around 40 percent of the metals and chemicals going into the Nation's wartime air program. The remarkable fact in connection with this accomplishment is that these power plants were able to maintain a continuous high-production rate while producing a full financial payout, as I fully demonstrated on January 24, 1948, when I appeared before the House War Department—Civil Functions—Appropriations Committee.

COLUMBIA RIVER PAY-OUT

When I appeared before the War Department Subcommittee I fully detailed the power pay-out capability of the two operating Columbia River hydro plants. This demonstration can be found on page 789 of the House hearings covering the 1949 civil functions of the Department of the Army. Therefore, at this time it will suffice to state that since 1940 the Columbia River power projects have deposited in the United States Treasury $105,000,000 of gross revenue derived from the sale of power. This revenue covers all costs, including interest and amortization and, in addition, has provided a surplus—or additional profit over all such costs—in the amount of $23,000,000. This was accomplished in a short period. The costs that are covered by this gross revenue include full annual interest charges on the total Federal power investment; the complete annual component of amortization costs to fully pay out the Federal investment in 50 years' time; all replacement costs within the amortization period necessary to maintain the property in 100 percent condition; and all operation and current maintenance costs including what has been designated as a tax equivalent.

The House Appropriations Committee investigators have recently examined the books of the Bonneville Power Administration and the agencies operating the two generating stations. The report of these investigators was recently made public by the chairman of the House Interior Appropriation Subcommittee and is a source of considerable satisfaction, as it confirmed the position I have taken for the last 4 years covering the pay-out capability of these hydro projects. The investigators' report further stated that the books of the Bonneville Administration were found to be in the best condition of any governmental books they had examined. I cite these facts to show that the resource corrections I am urging can be accomplished on a sound, self-liquidating business basis.

OUR RESOURCE POSITION

On numerous occasions I have called attention to this Nation's low potentiality applied to the following highly critical and essential industrial materials: Asbestos, bauxite, chromium, industrial diamonds, graphite, manganese, mercury, manila fiber, mica, nickel, quartz crystal, rubber, tin, and tungsten. In previous discussion of these deficiencies I have enumerated the industrial use of these materials, all of which are highly important. To further exemplify this importance I will now cite a few facts relative to the metal manganese and its application in the metallurgical manufacturing processes of the steel industry. For 60 years our technicians have endeavored to find a satisfactory substitute for manganese, but have not been successful to date. It takes only a small quantity of manganese, namely, 14 pounds per ton of steel produced, but its importance is so far-reaching that if our manganese supply were cut off it would be impossible to continue the manufacture of steel. Without steel the modern machinery of defense and industry would be nonoperative. For years our principal supply of manganese came from Russia and British India. Since the invasion of Russia, however, we have had to turn to South Africa, Brazil, and Cuba for our principal supplies. When steel production is up to plant capacity the industry requires in excess of 800,000 short tons of manganese annually.

The United States takes nearly half of the world's tin output, but we have not been able to find in this country even a very small commercial deposit of this material. The world's tin supply is controlled by a tight foreign governmentally owned monopoly and by agreements between the few large producing countries. We did not suffer greatly during the last war because of the lack of tin as we were able to develop many substitutes. However, we were not able to compensate for the indispensable use of this metal in bearings, solders, bronzes, and gun metals, and for these uses we depended on friendly countries.

A recent analysis of the antimony, lead-zinc, and copper-ore-supply situation brings out the amazing fact that within the next 10 years we will have exhausted our available high-grade ores. Possibly by 1960 we will also find that we have exhausted our supply of high-grade-copper ores. A few years later the indication points to supply exhaustion of hematite iron ores and petroleum. Late figures prepared by a national industrial conference board clearly set out that this Nation is reaching exhaustion in many highly important defense and industrial resources. The only major items that this industrial board found that were not approaching the depletion stage were in the fields of coal and potential hydroelectric power. In short, we still have large energy resources which can be used to develop corrective measures.

For years timber has been the No. 1 resource of the Pacific Northwest. The timber industry through a long period of time has supported in excess of one-fourth of the total regional economy. Through these years we have thought that our large forests were inexhaustible. However, surveys and studies by the United States Forest Service tell an entirely different story. Since World War I we have reduced our reserve stock of saw timber about 45 percent. At the present rate of cutting, all privately owned timber will be cut in about 17 years. The timber on public as well as private reserves will be depleted in about 25 years. When this depletion occurs, where will the employment now used in the logging camps, sawmills, pulp mills, and other lumber pay rolls be used? We must stop and think of ways and means of finding replacement jobs. If this is not done, what will happen to our lumbering cities with their large property values? The people of the Northwest can visualize causes and effects when we talk in terms of such a well-known and extensive industry. The same chain of events is occurring in the mining industry. The country is digging out and exporting its industrial base. The solution lies in finding substitutes and synthetics, processing low-grade ores through electro processes, and strategic stock piling.

Going hand in hand with this resource depletion is the continued erosion of our agricultural acreage. Recently our State agricultural schools have estimated that 1 agricultural acre out of every 10 acres is lost for productive uses during a 10-year period. We do not have to look very far to find much evidence to confirm the fact that our entire resource base is undergoing serious erosion.

OTHER STRATEGIC MATERIALS

It has become one custom to consider strategic materials as those necessary for defense which must be procured outside of the continental limits of a given nation. This definition is too narrow, as strategic materials are just as necessary for peaceful commerce as for war, since both activities are becoming increasingly mechanized through scientific development. No list of strategic materials can be considered fixed over any long period of time. Industrially this type of material is generally used in combination with other materials and results in what are called alloys. Mechanization depends largely on alloys, and a developed shortage in one line may induce a shortage in another line of materials.

There are other major and minor materials over those that I have cited which are included in official strategic lists. I will mention a few of these to exemplify what can be done in the field of synthetics and substitutes.

Silk is used to make balloons, parachutes, and powder bags, and, as we know, our principal prewar sources of silk were Japan and Italy. When these sources were eliminated by war, our technicians were able to manufacture synthetic textiles which proved satisfactory for aerial uses. Current supplies of

waste silk and chemically treated cotton gave us our powder bags. A special rare quartz crystal is used in radio control. To date we have found no substitutes, but a developed source exists in Brazil. In time we can develop a substitute through electro processes.

Mica sheets have extensive use for electrical insulation, and come principally from India. Recently synthetic mica sheets have been produced from absorbent clay and ground mica, both of these materials occurring abundantly in the United States. Quinine is another such material, and comes from the cinchona bark grown in the Dutch East Indies—tightly controlled by a Dutch monopoly. We now have the synthetic drugs atrabine and plasmochin, which are effective in the majority of malarial cases and can be substituted for quinine. Coconut shell char was formerly considered essential for gas mask fillers. Recently effective chemical and charcoal fillers have been developed.

We are all familiar with the success of the war-developed synthetic rubber program, and the progress made in the development of synthetic liquid fuels and lubricants. Although there is room for improvement in the processing of such major volume commodities, the progress has been so substantial as to provide the incentive to develop synthetics in other strategic fields.

SOLUTION OF RESOURCE DEPLETION PROBLEM

At this time, considering our own depletions, this Nation must depend on foreign sources for many of the necessary critical materials. From time to time we will find that importations will be progressively restricted, reduced, and then cut off. When this stage of the trade cycle is reached, we will then find this Nation drawn into an economic conflict. From this point on, the whole matter will become one of defense, involving a comprehensive program of preparedness. Before the Nation reaches the last-mentioned condition we must set up a sound program designed along specific lines, with emphasis on those parts involving long term objectives. We should make a substantial start at an early date.

Mr. Chairman, it would appear that resource corrective measures can be classified as follows:

First. Prospecting discovering, and exploiting all possible new domestic material sources.

Second. Developing methods of utilizing the lower grades of raw material in order to make properly located raw-material supplies immediately available. This type of development is one that must be built around an adequate low-cost energy supply.

Third. Encouraging the development of domestic production of synthetic products. This, again, will largely rest on adequate low-cost supplies of power.

Fourth. Planning and developing the production of alternative and substitute materials. Again, this is an element which must rest on a solid energy base.

Fifth. Building up and maintaining reserve stock piles. These stock piles should only be used when other sources fail, and in the interim during which new sources are being rapidly developed. During the past 2 years, as the result of heavy commercial demands, our aluminum and other metal stock piles have been exhausted.

Sixth. Making arrangements to increase available supplies in friendly foreign countries that can be transported over sea lanes which can be maintained at all times.

Seventh. Reclaim for use all critical scrap obtainable from industrial, consumer, and governmental sources. This, again, involves the use of electro processes.

Eighth. Conserving existing home supplies by changing operating methods.

Ninth. Controlling exports by licenses, and then later establishing limited priorities and consumption curtailment when all other methods become ineffective.

It will be seen from these classifications that our major future potentialities largely rest on a substantial energy foundation for the large-volume critical materials principally used in the heavy industries, engaged in mass production. All items affecting the proper development of a substantial air program fall within this category. We simply cannot develop and maintain an adequate atom defense without large supplies of low-cost power. This fact cannot be overstressed if we are to maintain security.

In order to relate such large-volume critical materials to the energy base I will now specifically discuss a few of these principal items.

LIGHT METALS INDUSTRIES

In this category fall aluminum and magnesium. Both occur more abundantly on the earth's surface than any other materials, but they are so mixed with other adulterating materials that processing is difficult and complex. Both types of material can only be reduced commercially by electro processes, and such large quantities of power are required in this processing that these metals are often called frozen kilowatts.

These are the metals of the future, and will be increasingly used to supply deficiencies in other metals. The use of these materials represents an increasing horizon, and the outlook seems to be unlimited. No nation can build or support an adequate air program without full control of all parts of the light metal industry. Light metals depend entirely on low-cost, large-volume power. Other metal deficiencies make the outlook for aluminum use brighter year by year, and these prospects will be shared by the more youthful magnesium industry. The principal contribution of the Pacific Northwest will come in this field, and these operations will assume year by year a greater proportion of the over-all economy of the region and the Nation. The outlook for light metals in the next decade will depend entirely on the availability of adequate and proper supplies of energy. The relative postwar expansion of aluminum exceeds all other materials. In 1947 the aluminum industry was producing and selling four times the highest prewar poundage. More could be produced and sold if sufficient power were available, since we have depleted a large stock pile to meet consumption.

Before the war, half of the primary aluminum production was fabricated into sheets. This type of product has encountered sharp use increases due to development of multiple economic uses and the extremely short supply of steel sheets. Commercially, the use of aluminum is young compared with iron, steel, lead-zinc, and copper. This country's war-time expansion of aluminum ingot capacity was sixfold. In terms of volume use, aluminum has now passed copper and is next only to steel.

In 1930 the United States annual production of primary aluminum was 114,500 short tons. In 1939 this production increased to 163,545 tons. Due to inadequate early power planning before Pearl Harbor the Administration found it necessary to undertake the Shipshaw Canadian project and import some 650,000 tons of Canadian ingot. The maximum estimated war peak aluminum demand was around 1,750,000 tons, but this was not realized due to inadequate power supplies. This condition caused the armed services to curtail necessary aluminum uses to preserve metal for the air forces.

Our previous short-sightedness also caused us to rapidly expand our ingot aluminum production capacity to over 1,000,000 tons, largely at the taxpayers' expense. Such rapid expansion resulted in building commercially unfeasible plants, not usable in the postwar period. As a result, approximately 450,000 tons of federally owned ingot plant capacity is now either shut down permanently or cannibalized. The United States peak year wartime ingot production amounted to 920,179 short tons. To this must be added the Canadian importations to secure the total peak amount used. Today all aluminum ingot plants that can be operated are in full production, turning out aluminum ingots at the annual rate of 600,000 tons. Forty-seven percent of this production comes from the Pacific Northwest. Nonmilitary aluminum demands under the most conservative estimates will reach 1,000,000 tons by 1952, which represents an increased need for 800,000 kilowatts to process ingot alone. To this must be added, say, 200,000 kilowatts for alumina production and fabrication. If we then add, say, 250,000 kilowatts for expanding air force requirements we arrive at the early need for 1,250,000 additional kilowatts, which is some 30 percent in excess of the ultimate development at McNary Dam site. If this Nation is to preserve its critical material economy, it must immediately plan additional self-liquidating large-volume, low-cost power sources.

Careful extended estimates point to a national aluminum consumption of around 2,100,000 tons within the next 15 years. This figure is predicated upon average economic conditions, and may vary upward or downward about 30 percent depending on the economic climate in the intervening years. The average additional power requirements to meet such a demand would be about 3,000,000 kilowatts, or the equivalent of four McNary projects. We must realize, in thinking in these terms, that an adequate air defense against the atom bomb is going to require large volumes of pow-

er such as can be developed on the Columbia. Such a power supply is a vital link in the atom chain.

The industrial use of magnesium is in the development stage, and since it is the lightest of all metals, the future—under diminishing supplies of other metals—is also extremely bright. Magnesium occurs in nature in compounds which exist in ores, subterranean brines, and sea water. Extensive primary sources of this metal occur in the Pacific Northwest. The extraction of the metal is entirely an electro process which also requires large volumes of power. Magnesium, when alloyed with small amounts of other metals, acquires more strength per pound than any other known metal.

The industrial use of magnesium is very new. Aluminum is also a new metal, but industrially it is over twice the age of magnesium. When we compare the outstanding characteristics of magnesium with the 2,000 years of history behind the metallurgy of iron and steel, we can readily see how the uses of magnesium will rapidly multiply when scarcity develops in other metals. The domestic market for magnesium is still small, but is expanding. It is a conservative prediction that within the next 15 years the market for mangesium will reach 150,000 tons, compared with the present market of approximately 20,000 tons annually.

The existing Spokane magnesium plant is being held in reserve stand-by condition by the War Department. This plant took, during the war, 55,000 kilowatts to produce at the rate of 24,000 tons annually. Therefore 150,000 tons would take approximately 350,000 kilowatts. The introduction of the modern jet engine in aircraft will greatly increase the need for magnesium, as more than 40 percent of the weight of these new engines will consist of magnesium castings. The extraction of magnesium from sea water has prospects of producing the lowest cost magnesium, and future plants will therefore most likely be of this type.

PETROLEUM RESERVES AND CONSUMPTION

Mr. Chairman, a recent analysis made by the American Petroleum Institute indicates that the existing proven petroleum reserves as of last year amounted to 21,900,000 barrels. In the past, increasing discoveries of new fields were adequate to take care of consumption increases. However, the new discovery rate is now rapidly dropping. Ten years ago new discoveries represented a rate of 930,000,000 barrels annually. Recently new discoveries have dropped almost to the vanishing point.

In 1947 the United States annual rate of petroleum consumption exceeded 2,000,000,000 barrels, which is more than the world-wide prewar consumption. The per capita United States consumption of petroleum products increased from 370 gallons in 1938 to 608 gallons in 1947, or an increase of 65 percent.

There are no indications that the present consumption rate will stabilize within the next 5 years, but it will probably increase. This Nation now has only about 30 percent of the world's known petroleum reserves, and our domestic consumption is nearly two-thirds of the world's production. During the past winter the effect of oil shortages suddenly became very pronounced, resulting in distress calls from many sections of the country. Our present petroleum demand exceeds the war's peak consumption. I feel that this serious petroleum situation should receive vigorous and early attention. We cannot maintain an adequate air force if we allow our petroleum reserves to vanish.

It is no wonder that Arabian oil is now receiving major international attention. The stated proven reserves in the Middle East are 25 percent higher than the total like United States reserves. Surveys indicate that the Middle East oil reserves will probably exceed those of the United States by 50 percent. Geophysical soundings and surveys indicate that the greatest existing oil pools lie in Russian territory. Russia's supplies of critical materials are not fully proven, but what knowledge we have clearly shows that the vast Russian reserves of all kinds of critical materials have been largely untouched. Russia today—from a resource standpoint—is about in the same reserve position that this Nation occupied a century ago.

Our usable oil-refining capacity is now being operated at the highest possible rate and on a very efficient basis. The oil industry is making every effort to expand refining facilities to keep abreast of increasing domestic demands. In this atomic age, all our defense arms move on petroleum products. The preservation of our national security therefore rests upon an adequate petroleum base. With consumption doubling, new discoveries dropping 75 percent in 10 years, and reserves being depleted, it is apparent that this Nation is rapidly drifting into a very insecure liquid-fuel position. One of the important corrective devices in this field lies in the utilization of other energy sources. The most efficient power plants of the country produce about 550 kilowatt-hours per barrel of oil, but 500 kilowatt-hours per barrel is a conservative round figure representing the best present average practice. One kilowatt-year of hydro-power is therefore equivalent to about 14 barrels of oil, but when we add the incidental transmission losses we will find that 1 kilowatt-year will represent about 15½ barrels of oil. Some of the older generating plants in the Pacific Northwest only produce 300 kilowatt-hours per barrel, or 23 barrels per kilowatt-year.

The potential high-quality power located on the Columbia River and its tributaries represents about 20,000,000 kilowatts. Of this amount 18,500,000 kilowatts are now flowing to the sea unused. If this oil-replacement energy were developed, the oil saving would be, in round numbers, 290,000,000 barrels per year, or about 95 percent of the total European oil consumption, or close to one-quarter of this Nation's prewar consumption. The 15-unit completed Grand Coulee plant is equivalent to a saving of 28,000,000 barrels of oil annually. When the McNary plant is completed, the oil saving due to this one plant alone will represent close to 16,000,000 barrels annually.

The existing steam generation in the Pacific Northwest is about 275,000 kilowatts, and when this capacity is running to meet low-water conditions 5,000,000 barrels of oil will be consumed; 5,000,000 barrels at $2.50 per barrel represents $12,500,000 annually. The potentiality of the undeveloped proposed Columbia River plants as an oil conserver is enormous.

RELATED IRON METALS

Included in this industrial classification are stainless steel, steel castings, ferro-alloys, electrolytic iron, and electrolytic manganese. There has been little development in the Northwest in this field save for those items directly associated with electro processes. In the conventional lines the past production in the Northwest has been lower than the home consumption.

The conventional fuel-furnace types of iron industries represent a large cross-section of our over-all national industrial set-up. These industries, together with their dependent industries, namely, the automobile, machinery, and equipment industries, use nearly half of this Nation's fuel production and one-quarter of the Nation's power output. As the availability of high-grade ores decreases over the next 15 years we will find this industry turning more and more into the direction that the light-metal industry is now advancing. The power requirement of such a transition will ultimately exceed the requirements I have detailed for the light-metal industry. This industry has many ramifications, but my investigations indicate that the early new power uses will come in the fields of stainless steel, electric-furnace alloys, electrolytic iron, and electrolytic manganese. The power requirements of such a transition in the next decade applicable only to the Pacific Northwest will range from 130,000 to 215,000 kilowatts. Due to the weight of such products, manufacturing locations will be defined by available markets.

OTHER ELECTRO INDUSTRIES

Time will permit only the briefest discussion of the resource correction power requirements of the following types of industries:

First. Nonferrous metals industries.
Second. Nonmetallic industries.
Third. Electrochemical industry.

The nonferrous metals, which include zinc, lead, copper, and antimony are found in the Pacific Northwest in various types of ores. As the better grade ores are mined out, this industry must turn to electro processes to handle the lower grades. Such reduction also requires substantial amounts of power. In these fields the resource correction power feasible for installation in the Pacific Northwest in the next decade will range between 200,000 and 330,000 kilowatts.

The principal industries included in the nonmetallic group include cement and abrasives. The cement industry cannot be strictly designated as an electro industry, but its processes require large quantities of mechanical power. This industry normally consumes between 2 percent and 4 percent of our national power output. The general industry expansion of other lines in the Pacific Northwest will result within the next decade in expanding cement power

requirements ranging between 20,000 and 40,000 kilowatts. The abrasive industry has just recently established its initial plant in the Pacific Northwest. This type of industry feasible of development in the Pacific Northwest within the next decade will require about 15,000 to 30,000 kilowatts.

The electrochemical industry is one with extremely large possibilities in the fields of phosphorus, sulfuric acid, chlorine, carbon, and rayon as substantially all the basic raw materials are available in the Pacific Northwest in large quantities. These types, when combined, also require large amounts of power, and within the next decade the power requirements of this type of activity applicable to the Northwest will range between 350,000 and 750,000 kilowatts. The largest part of this power application will come in the fields of phosphate and fertilizer on account of the extremely large deposits of the base material located in the Northwest. Ultimately all our national agricultural activities will depend on the extensive Northwestern deposits.

AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Approximately 52,000,000 acres, or one-third of the total land area of the States included in the Pacific Northwest, represent all types of farming acreage. The land actually used for crops represents 34 percent of this total, the remainder being used for range land, pastures, woodlands, roads, and homesteads. To balance industrial population increases, some two million to three million additional acres must be brought into production within the next decade. This additional acreage must largely depend on irrigation and drainage, and a substantial part will be dependent on power for pumping. Food processing will also increase power demands. Conservatively, all agricultural uses will in the next decade call for 150,000 to 200,000 additional kilowatts.

The Pacific Northwest is the largest timber-producing section in the country. The total national softwood lumber production runs about 20,000,000,000 board feet; of this amount, 45 percent comes from the Pacific Northwest. About 95 percent of the national shingle output comes from the Pacific Northwest; also 20 percent of the paper pulp; 97 percent of the Nation's plywood; and 50 percent of the wood laths.

As timber reserves diminish, the use of power will increase as wastes become more valuable commercially. Within the next decade such power additions in the Northwest due to timber operations will conservatively range between 250,000 and 450,000 kilowatts.

NORMAL GROWTH POWER REQUIREMENTS

Mr. Chairman, on January 6, 1948, all the power-distributing agencies in the Pacific Northwest agreed upon the normal regional power needs over and above all presently contracted generating units. These confirmed estimates show normal load power deficiencies by years as follows:

	Kilowatts
1949	356,000
1950	587,000
1953	924,000
1956	1,607,000

In listing these requirements I have made allowance for Grand Coulee units No. 13, No. 14 and No. 15, recently initiated, authorized, and covered by appropriations. I have corrected the Tacoma agreement figures accordingly. These generation deficiencies cover only normal residential, rural, and commercial increases, and exclude all additional military requirements growing out of the Air Force expansion activities. They also exclude all resource correction requirements which I have covered in my discussion today.

I have purposely omitted any discussion of highly secret new power additions which must go to the Pacific Northwest under existing conditions. These additional requirements will start with the need for about 300,000 additional kilowatts by 1950 and will increase to about 900,000 kilowatts by 1956 or 1957. This item is over and above all power increases that I have cited.

I wish that time were available to outline what Russia is doing to expand its resource base. It will suffice to say that Russia is rapidly developing bulk hydro power to form the foundation of an all-out electro industry, which will be usable for modern military effort, when they have mastered the production of the atom bomb.

POWER REQUIREMENTS FOR RESOURCE CORRECTION

All of the cited power resources correction figures, plus the military uses which I have outlined, normal growth, and accessory needs including transmission losses, add up to some 8,500,000 average kilowatts as needed within the next 15 years. This amount of power is equivalent to less than 50 percent of the ultimate potential of the Columbia River. In presenting these facts I am not urging that all these facilities be located on the Columbia, as I know that other considerations must—and will—govern. However, it is obvious that if a considerable amount of the basic mass production power is not developed in the Nation, the electro processing will be diverted to foreign countries which are rich in low-cost hydro potentials, such as Canada, Scandinavia, and South America. All of these cited resource-corrective devices represent new basic industries, and do not take away existing industries from other sections of the country. The basic raw materials produced by Columbia River power will go to the eastern, southern, and midwestern sections for fabrication. For example, Alcoa has recently constructed a large rolling mill in Iowa to fabricate Columbia River aluminum ingots, and investigation shows that the Columbia ingots go to some 800 different locations for processing.

The corrective power required by 1952 will total about 5,000,000 kilowatts, over and above normal load increases resulting from population increases and normal commercial activities.

Every section of the country is short of power, due to material curtailments during the war years. To overcome these normal shortages the private power industry is planning generation increases totaling between 12,000,000 and 15,000,000 kilowatts in the next few years. Most of this increased capacity represents high-cost steam power which is not commercially feasible for use in resource correction, but is the kind of power that can be efficiently used in the home, on the farm, in stores and in those fabrication industries where power represents only a small portion of the over-all cost of the product. In the basic critical material industries, where power is a large part of the over-all product, cost, resource power must be sold at a price less than half of the best steam cost or lower, in order to meet world competition. Therefore, resource correction power must come from high-grade hydro, located within economic distance from the source of other raw materials.

At this point I wish to add an observation applying to the resource correction figures I have submitted. The only way in which it is humanly possible to judge any future occurrence is through a proper and adequate extension of past experience. This is the approach used in this discussion. Obviously, it should be stated that such an approach has limitations, especially when past occurrences cover short periods. To make such an analysis completely conservative I have used mean values in reaching a total of 8,500,000 kilowatts. To these values a "tolerance allowance" can be applied. Investigations indicate that such a tolerance is possibly in the neighborhood of 30 percent in either direction. On such a basis the most probable minimum resource value would be the stated mean values, less some 30 percent. Such an irreducible minimum greatly exceeds what has been considered by the Congress for new projects to be located on the Columbia and elsewhere, and it is safe practice to start with this ultraconservative base for the purpose of outlining immediate needs. Such a start will necessarily have to be modified from time to time in the light of continued experience. This can be done, in my opinion, without creating an unwise or inefficient set-up. I will therefore now present conservative suggestions for early hydro construction on the Columbia.

ADDITIONAL GENERATION

Eight Army projects have been authorized for the Columbia and its tributaries, and four for the Bureau of Reclamation. Present proposed construction schedules for these projects will give the following self-liquidating peak load rated capacities in the period shown:

Period	Army projects	Bureau of Reclamation	Total
	Kilowatts	*Kilowatts*	*Kilowatt.*
1950–51	----------	339,000	339,000
1951–52	----------	216,000	216,000
1952–53	50,000	123,000	173,000
Total	50,000	670,000	728,000

During these same years the following power deficiencies will occur under these schedules, excluding all cited military, defense, and critical material power loads which I have presented in this discussion: .

Year and shortage	*Kilowatts*
1950–51	328,000
1951–52	515,000
1952–53	253,000
Total	1,096,000

It is therefore obvious that present generator schedules will not prevent a shortage in the required supply to meet the needs of existing customers, to say nothing of any kind of defense or critical material expansion.

Moreover, the recent budget submissions to the Congress will even slow down the projected schedules, so that a year's delay over the dates I have given will result, even if Congress appropriates up to the full budget submission. Unfortunately, the War Department civil functions bill went through the House with cuts approximating one-third of the budget requests. This will result in another year's delay in the proposed schedule.

It is therefore obvious that at the rate construction on these projects is progressing, curtailments will be necessary in a low-water year, and not a single kilowatt will be available for the defense or correction measures that I have outlined in this discussion.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the foregoing I feel that it is necessary to suggest that the following minimum action be taken to remedy a situation that cannot be permitted to continue:

First. Accelerate all possible those projects which provide upstream storage, like Hungry Horse and Albeni Falls. The latter project has not been authorized but can quickly provide around 1,000,000 acre-feet of storage, which in turn, will give at the site and in the downstream plants 100,000 additional kilowatts by the critical period of 1951–52. Hungry Horse, with its 3,000,000 acre-feet of storage, must be accelerated by 1 year over present submissions, which call for the first generating unit by 1952.

Second. The present schedules for the McNary project call for three units totaling 207,000 kilowatts by 1953–54; four more units in 1954–55, totaling 276,000 kilowatts; three more units in 1955–56; and the remaining two units by 1956–57 peak period. Additional appropriations will be necessary to advance this schedule by 1 year. This is highly important, as this project is located close to the areas of indicated deficiency. When I appeared before the House committee I detailed the reasons why this recommendation is in the public interest.

Third. The Foster Creek schedule calls for three units totaling 192,000 kilowatts by the critical period of 1954–55. This is also a highly important installation, and the generator schedule should be advanced 1 or 2 years, depending on the early completion of the necessary plans.

Fourth. The remaining units at Grand Coulee, namely, Nos. 16, 17, and 18, should be so advanced as to be in step with the additional storage to be provided at the upstream plants.

Fifth. The Detroit, Ice Harbor, and Lower Monumental projects of the Army engineers should also have their proposed schedules advanced by one or two years. The Detroit Dam, located on one of the tributaries of the Willamette River in Oregon, is well under way but the power features have yet to be authorized. Ice Harbor and Lower Monumental projects are a part of the authorized Lower Snake River navigational development.

Sixth. The Bureau of Reclamation has four projects being constructed or blueprinted in Idaho, and two small projects in the Yakima Valley, Washington. The power units on these projects should also be accelerated in order that their schedules can be worked into the regional load requirements.

CONCLUSION

One of the most important matters now before the Congress is the expansion of the Nation's air forces. We have talked all around this subject but have failed to show how we can secure the requisite metals and fuels for such an expansion. What I have suggested today for immediate minimum action is governed entirely by the legislative history of pending projects. These suggestions fall far short of meeting this Nation's metal and liquid fuel defense requirements. What I have presented clearly shows that the fundamentals of this large problem need closer examination than has been given, if we are to rebuild our defenses on an enduring, safe foundation.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, it has been a pleasure to work with the chairman and the other members of this subcommittee, including the clerk of the committee. We have had extremely sharp points of difference between us upon numerous questions, but upon no occasion has there been any evidence on the part of anyone of even a frayed temper. Many of our differences have been resolved. Of course, those of us on the minority side of this subcommittee do not yet find ourselves in full agreement with a number of points.

However, in most cases we have yielded to the will of the majority and they, in turn, have yielded to some extent to the opinions of members of the minority. One point of difference, however, we cannot resolve. It must come to the Congress to be settled, and that is the proposal to build a steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., by the TVA.

When the general debate shall have been concluded I will offer an amendment to restore to the bill the $4,000,000 required. I might say further that in the event it is not agreed to in the Committee of the Whole I shall seek to offer it as a motion to recommit. This is a vital problem. This is an important problem. If the forces which seek to place a lid on the development of this great area of America are successful in this instance it will, in my opinion, be but the first step in their determined effort to hamstring public power development throughout the United States.

Perhaps no major commodity has seen such an increase in demand and use as has electric energy. Those who in the past have undertaken to estimate the needs of the future for electric energy have, almost without exception, erred on the side of underestimation.

Let me give you a few facts. The history of electricity in the United States shows that its use has doubled almost three times since 1920. For instance, in 1920 the entire country used 39,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. By 1928 that had increased to 83,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. In 1941 we used 164,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. Last year we used 255,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. So far, the use of electricity in 1948 has exceeded greatly the use of electricity in the same period of 1947. The indications are that we will use more than 280,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours this year.

From one end of the country to the other there is one phrase that has a familiar sound: Shortage of electricity. Everywhere the demand is pressing the ceiling of supply until, as the gentleman from Mississippi said, the Federal Power Commission estimates that we have two-tenths of 1 percent reserve above what is being used. Compare this with a reserve of 25 percent before Pearl Harbor.

What plans are there to meet the growing needs of the country? Well, throughout the United States additional generating capacity is being installed, built, and plans for much more are under way. It is my privilege to serve on the Interior Department Subcommittee. There I have heard the story of the great public power agencies of the West. They, too, are increasing their installed capacity. They, too, are asking for increased capacity. Vast installations are being made.

What is the experience of the private power industry? Everywhere they, too, are meeting demands which are testing to the fullest their capacity. It has been cited here that the private power industry plans to increase its capacity by $5,000,000,000 within the next 5 years. Compare that with a present total investment of $15,000,000,000, and you will find what a great comparative increase they seek.

What is the story in the TVA region? There, too, demand has increased, only there it has increased phenomenally. The people are using more power in their homes, on their farms, and in their industries. When we began, only 1 farmer in 28 in the entire Tennessee Valley had electricity. Today one out of every two farmers has electricity, and the percentage would be more favorable were it not for the fact that during the war the building of electric lines was retarded because of the scarcity of materials. But the story has not ended, make no mistake about it. Five thousand new farmers are receiving electricity every month now in the Tennessee Valley, and just as surely as the farmers of other regions of America are demanding and are getting and are going to get added REA lines, so are we. Plans are under way to almost completely electrify the valley within the next 5 years. We are still behind much of the country. Some States have 90 percent of their farms electrified. We are beginning to catch up, and we are going to stay on the trail.

Now let us take a look at the residential use of electricity. I am talking about the American home. From 1945 to 1947 the annual residential use of electricity in the TVA system increased by 60 percent, rising from 900,000,000 kilowatt-hours to approximately 1,500,000,000

kilowatt-hours, and every month this load goes up. More and more women are leaving the back-breaking scrubbing board, casting aside the old corrugated washboard and cleaning their clothes with electric-washing machines. More and more have electric irons. More homes have refrigerators to preserve their food. I think that is an encouraging sign.

Also, the commercial and industrial loads have increased, but not as much percentagewise as farm and residential use.

When we add these increased demands together, we find that the immense generating capacity of the TVA, like that of the private-power industry, like that of other public power agencies, is being sorely tested to meet the demand.

What are the indications for the future? The combined total indicates that by 1951 or 1952 or maybe sooner, we either must have additional generating capacity within the area, or brown-outs will be our fate. Just as private-power agencies and just as other public-power agencies have plans for increasing their generating capacity, so has the TVA. Were it not so, the TVA would have to confess failure, first in its basic purpose of integrated development of the valley, and second, to prudently plan for the future in the face of these facts. So the TVA comes forward, as does the budget, with a plan for increasing the generating capacity of the TVA system. Included in that and as a vital part thereof is the building of a steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn. Unfortunately, the majority of this subcommittee eliminated this item from the bill. It is for the purpose of restoring it that I will offer the amendment.

The proposed steam plant, plus additional hydroelectric units, is proposed by the TVA to meet normal peacetime loads alone. This additional generating capacity is needed. The urgent need is incontrovertible.

What did the subcommittee do after striking it out? They came forward with their own plan for meeting the needs of this important area, an area, mind you, of 80,000 square miles comprising portions of 7 States in which live more than 5,000,000 Americans. What is this alternative that the majority members of the Committee on Appropriations offers us? Look at the report. There you will see revealed their plan. They propose that the TVA stop selling electricity to industry. When the suggestion was first offered, I thought that it was so preposterous that it would not be taken seriously. Now that it threatens to become a stark reality, I find it abhorrent. It seems to me utterly incredible that the same Congress which so recently enacted the Marshall plan, which I applaud, the same Congress which is now undertaking such vast expenditures to rebuild the industry of our recent enemies, Germany and Japan, would undertake to apply a Morgenthau plan for the future industrial development of the Tennessee Valley. Not only for the future industrial development, but they propose that TVA quit selling power to existing industries in the valley. Surely, surely, the loyalty and the aspirations and contributions to the Nation of the people of that great region deserve more considerate treatment.

In taking this position, the committee points out that under the TVA Act, there are preferred customers, the farm cooperatives, and the municipalities, overlooking the fact that in the TVA Act the Federal Government reserves for itself priority, even about that given local agencies. The committee denies that this publicly owned utility has any responsibility for customers other than the preferred customers set out in the act. Indeed, they deny that this utility, which is the sole supplier of electricity for the region, has responsibility for supplying the needs even of the preferred customers.

Although they deny responsibility for meeting the demands of these preferred customers of the valley, they proceed to say, nevertheless, that all of the demands of the cooperatives and municipal systems can be met in the foreseeable future if TVA will just quit selling electricity to industry. Poor comfort though this would be, if true, this statement of the committee, which was also urged by the private utility lobbyists, does not conform with the facts. For one reason, the committee has overlooked the existence of Federal agencies within that area. They overlook that TVA is furnishing power to the Huntsville Arsenal, the Smyrna Air Base, the TVA Chemical Laboratories, and the Oak Ridge atomic-energy plant. Would the committee stop those Federal agencies from receiving power from TVA, another Federal agency? Of course the atomic-energy plant at Oak Ridge was not set up as a preferred customer when the TVA Act was passed 15 years ago. But who can deny that it is a preferred customer now? If not by the TVA Act, then by subsequent acts. The Congress appropriated the money to build the Oak Ridge plant in the TVA area. The Congress did another thing. It authorized the creation of the War Production Board and gave to it authority to tell, not only public agencies, but private agencies, to whom they would give materials or power. The War Production Board said to the TVA:

You must furnish power to the atomic-energy plant at Oak Ridge.

Indeed, it had the highest priority for both materials and power existent under the priority system. Now, would you say that is not a preferred customer? Such a statement just would not meet the test of common sense. Surely, the committee would not deny power to the Federal agencies served by the TVA. And, yet, it is that premise that the committee report contends that preferred customers use only one-third of TVA power, and, therefore, contends that all preferred customer needs can be met if industrial users are cut off. I want to point out a fallacy, not only in the committee report, but a fallacy and a misleading statement upon which it was based, given in testimony by the private power lobbyist. The committee report said, and now today the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] says, and also Mr. Purcell Smith, the highest paid lobbyist in the world, for the power companies, said that preferred customers use only one-third of the electricity generated by TVA.

Now, let me show you a chart that Purcell Smith presented before the committee and put into the record. Here is his chart. I want you to see this. According to this chart, here is the preferred customers, which, according to his chart, represents about one-third of the energy generated by TVA. Now, when you add the Federal agencies which are also preferred what do you find? Last year you find that the energy used by the real preferred customers is substantially more than shown by this chart of Mr. Smith.

Instead of it being one-third used by preferred customers, including Federal users, it is more nearly two-thirds. So the answers to our needs are not to be found here.

Now let us turn to the power supplied directly to industry. This power is in part secondary and interruptible and, therefore, it is not usable by nor salable to the REA's and municipalities. They want firm power. They want the kind of power that will be available any time and all the time. They want their lights to turn on when the switch is flicked, whether it is at 6 o'clock in the morning or 6 in the afternoon, or whether it is day or night.

True, some of the power sold to private industry is firm, but where is there an industry, a large industry, that will buy this kind of secondary, interruptible power unless they can have at least enough firm power to keep their plants in partial operation when interruptible power is turned off?

I should like to point out one other thing that developed during the war for which the TVA is now being lammed over the head. The aluminum companies in that area were told by the War Production Board not only to step up their production by avoiding interruptions in the operations of existing capacity, but they were told to add additional production capacity. And what was TVA told? They were told to supply 120,000 additional kilowatts to Alcoa alone. They did so. The aluminum company quite naturally contended that if they were to invest their money in additional capacity they would like for this contract for power supply to run for at least a reasonable time. Out of this and similar situations grew long-term contracts between the TVA and private industry. Why now, I ask you, should those private industries which employ thousands of people in those plants, or the TVA, be criticized or condemned for this?

Aside from the ruinous effect upon the valley of such an unfortunate policy as proposed, the fact looms up that even though energy were denied these direct industrial users we would still be faced with an impending power shortage. The committee plan would not answer our need; it would only postpone the necessity of a steam plant for 2 years if we cut off the industrial consumers entirely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the people of the Tennessee Valley ask no alms. I am not embarrassed nor is any representative of the people of that valley embarrassed to ask for this additional generating capacity. We ask only that this utility, owned by the people, serve us adequately just as the people of any other area of America served by a utility system ask and demand that the area and the needs of the people be adequately met. Not only does the Federal Government but the 48 States have agencies a part of the duties of which are to insure that utilities, water, electric, telephone, or transportation, adequately serve the people within their service area. In this respect, we are no different from any other people. The fact that the Government owns this utility does not, it seems to me, as the gentleman from Mississippi has said, alter the fundamental obligation, even though the committee deigns to deny this utility has any such responsibility. Whether this Congress believes in public power or not, whether this Congress believes that the Government should own a utility or not is a moot question. Facts speak louder than words.

The TVA is an established fact. The gentleman from New York asked if the Government has any right to own a utility. Well, it does. The TVA is the largest integrated utility in the world and serves a vital part of America and is owned completely by the United States Government.

If this were a losing venture, if the rates were insufficient to make of this operation a financial success, then there would be some degree of embarrassment for those of us who are served by the agency to ask its owners, represented by this Congress, to augment its development. Such, however, is not the case. The TVA has been a phenomenal success not only in the matter of the service it has rendered but from the strictest and narrowest dollar and cents standpoint.

In the last fiscal year the TVA earned a net profit after depreciation of more than $20,000,000. All of these earnings belong to the people of the United States of which the constituents of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] are a part.

How is it, the gentleman asks, that his taxpayers are called upon to subsidize this area? They are not. Last year on the investment which his people and my people alike have made in TVA more than a 5-percent return, after depreciation, was earned. The Government borrows the money at 2 percent, or thereabouts, and earns approximately 5 percent. How is that a losing proposition? How is it that the people of New York are subsidizing this area?

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. I just want to observe at this point that the gentleman should recognize that the yardstick which he is laying down for actual costs is the yardstick laid down by TVA itself.

Mr. GORE. And approved by the Congress.

Mr. PLOESER. Well, in degree—only in degree. We have never had a judgment on the evaluation and division of the investment and the acquisition of assets. I do not think that the gentleman can take as an absolute yardstick the figures he has given with reference to earnings and profits. It is all right to assume that for the sake of the argument he is making, but it is an assumption and there is not anything well grounded on which he can base it.

Mr. GORE. I am not speaking on assumptions, I respectfully say to the gentleman, I am speaking of facts.

The committee, of which the gentleman is chairman, has submitted a report to this Congress in which it is stated that $440,000,000 have been invested by the American people in the power system of TVA. With that statement I am in agreement. However, it must be recognized that 28 percent of that amount has been earned by the TVA itself from its operations and reinvested in an expansion of the system.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. GORE. Some $97,000,000 has been earned as net profits by the TVA. The TVA belongs to the people of America. Whether we allow it to use its own profits for further development or require those profits to be paid into the Treasury and then appropriate money for further development makes little difference.

The fact stands that the TVA is a profitable, going concern that has been phenomenally successful, and although I respect the gentleman's sincerity, I deplore the fact that he would put a lid upon the further development of industry in that area.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. I did not say anything about putting such a lid on. The gentleman can assume that, too, if he wishes.

Mr. GORE. There again I am not speaking of assumptions; I am speaking of a brutal fact. Such is the recommendation of the committee report.

Mr. PLOESER. Well, show us the brutal fact, please.

Mr. GORE. The brutal part of it is that there you have an area whose development was for so long retarded, there you have an area of great Americans who are now looking up and aspiring, but with a per capita income still only 53 percent of the national average. Here you have an area that is making a growing contribution to the national economy, and yet, by the action of the gentleman's committee, if approved by the Congress, a lid is placed on the future development.

Mr. PLOESER. I hardly think so. I think the gentleman ought to take a look and see what TVA has done to themselves. They have almost sold themselves out of the market as far as priority customers are concerned. That is poor management. Why does not the gentleman take a look at the chart on page 964? Why does he not discuss that? Your management has not been so holy down there. We have not denied you the development of any of these dams for power or hydroelectric facilities that go in. And who, by the way, is so holy in Tennessee that they must look to the other 47 States to see that they alone are guaranteed their welfare.

Mr. GORE. The gentleman has asked two questions to which I will reply. First, he asks why I did not look at the chart on page so and so. The answer to that is I have looked at it. The further answer is that that is the chart of Purcell Smith, and it conveys a wholly fallacious conclusion, and the unfortunate fact is that such a conclusion is the basis of the committee's report rather than depending upon the TVA, which knows about its power needs, its generation, and its supply.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GORE. I will be delighted to.

Mr. PLOESER. I do not think it is quite fair for the gentleman to try to impugn the motives of this committee. Your TVA group has not found fault with that chart and neither has the gentleman until now, except that he does not like the chart. But it clearly explains what has taken place. The TVA has not denied those proportions of power used, and I do not think the gentleman is going to deny those proportions of power used. If you are going to talk about some things, the majority of this committee can get just as brutal, to use the language of the gentleman.

Mr. GORE. I do not impugn the motives of the gentleman nor any other member of the committee, and I hope the gentleman does not think so, but I do deplore the fact that he has been misled by a presentation of facts twisted and couched for a purpose. The gentleman and his majority committee colleagues have reached their conclusion sincerely, of course, but it is nonetheless fallacious.

Mr. PLOESER. Where have we been misled? Does the gentleman deny the accuracy of that chart?

Mr. GORE. I do. I deny the accuracy of either one of the charts put in by Purcell Smith. It is special pleading.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman supply an accurate chart in lieu thereof for the committee?

Mr. GORE. If the gentleman means that I must supply the accurate amount of energy that the atomic-energy plant uses, no, I cannot.

Mr. PLOESER. No one has asked for that. Let us not be ridiculous. I asked the gentleman to supply a chart in lieu of this chart, which deals with the over-all division as between priority customers and others.

Mr. GORE. The full information cannot be presented except to include the amount of energy the atomic-energy plant uses because it, too, as well as other Federal agencies served is a preference customer. Such an exact chart can only be supplied by the revelation of information which the power companies did not have when they made their chart and

which neither the gentleman nor I have, and which I do not want.

Mr. PLOESER. We do have it. The committee was furnished it by the TVA. You are not really revealing anything regarding the Atomic Energy Commission by revealing the total amount of consumption of nonpriority users. The gentleman knows that. You could even reveal the exact amount of electric energy used at Oak Ridge and you would still give no atomic secrets. I am not asking the gentleman to do that. He does not know, so he could not do it. What I am asking the gentleman to do is supply a chart in lieu of that one which we might accept as factual.

Mr. GORE. Does the gentleman deny that the Oak Ridge atomic plant is a priority customer?

Mr. PLOESER. No; I do not deny that. I did not even make that statement.

Mr. GORE. It is not included in the priority customers on Mr. Smith's chart.

Mr. PLOESER. Is the gentleman sure of that?

Mr. GORE. I am sure of that.

Mr. PLOESER. Can the gentleman prove it?

Mr. GORE. Yes; it is plain in the testimony, if the gentleman would read it.

Mr. PLOESER. I have read it, but the gentleman says it is inaccurate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield three additional minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman is making a very excellent statement. He has been a great champion of the TVA. While he is correcting the errors in the statements made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT], may I ask him to answer this statement which he made. He stated that the municipalities and cooperatives are not interested in this matter. That is not a true or accurate statement.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. In view of the remarks of the gentleman from Tennessee, of course I will yield.

Mr. COUDERT. I happen to have the record right in front of me. I said they were not interested in the sense that they would not be affected, because there will be sufficient power available from the existing facilities and the proposed new hydro-generating facilities to supply their needs in perpetuity. The TVA, speaking at the hearing, stated that as of today only 30 to 33 percent of the power distributed by TVA was needed to supply the municipalities and co-ops. That is what I said.

Mr. GORE. I thank both gentlemen for their remarks. I deplore the effort of Mr. Purcell Smith to arouse sectional animosities and prejudice. He came before our committee with a huge chart, the large print over the top of which read, "Taxpayers' money used to lure industries." When I read the material purporting to support the headline I found nothing more than reprints of advertisements which had appeared in certain magazines and newspapers under sponsorship and paid for wholly and entirely by the State of Tennessee. Many other States, perhaps all, do the same.

I asked Mr. Smith to name some industries that had moved from other States into Tennessee. He did not have the answer at his fingertips but said that he would put it in the record. He cited a certain industry, the Wolverine Tube Co., which he said had been lost as a prospective customer by one of his West Virginia clients.

I looked into that. Where did they move from? I found it was a Detroit concern, and that they never had had a plant in West Virginia. They had in mind locating a new plant somewhere. They looked at a great many sites in America, including West Virginia. They finally located in Alabama for several reasons, among which was availability of water transportation. If that is a test of losing a customer—somebody who comes and looks and then turns down the location—then I say that many a prospective customer has been lured away from this region.

Surely such a narrow appeal to sectionalism will not be entertained for long by the Congress. Development in any part of America is an asset to the entire Nation.

Certainly an area that played such a conspicuous part in war production, furnishing at one time 51 percent of aluminum for war planes, should not be cited an example of short-sightedness or have a ceiling placed upon its capacity to produce in the present or any future emergency.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I want to make quite clear the answer I made to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS]. I would like to have it clearly understood that my citation from the testimony was not from Mr. Smith, but from Mr. Wessenauer, one of the officials of TVA, who testified that only 30 to 33 percent of the present power distribution goes to co-ops and municipalities. Let me say further, in regard to the remarks of the other gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who just had the floor, that the committee did not rely on the testimony of Mr. Smith. If he will examine the report, he will find that the committee relied upon the testimony of officials of the TVA, Mr. Clapp, and his associates.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I was in hopes that we might be able to agree on concluding debate by 5:15 p. m. tonight, which would leave us 35 minutes more of debate. I wonder if we might not come to some agreement on concluding general debate.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen on my side are very anxious to have an opportunity to speak for the TVA and are very strong advocates of the TVA. I would hate to limit their time in view of the length of time that others of us have taken to debate this matter.

Mr. PLOESER. I believe the committee has rather well demonstrated the fact that we are not trying in any way to restrict debate.

Mr. WHITTEN. I fully appreciate that fact. The Chairman has been very gracious indeed.

Mr. PLOESER. If we can conclude debate shortly, I will ask then that the first paragraph of the bill be read, after which I will move that the committee rise. It is my understanding that our distinguished majority leader intends to ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tonight, we adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow, so that we will be under the 5-minute rule when we meet in the morning.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact, while the clock shows 20 minutes of 5, it is really 20 minutes of 4, so let us not get excited about the time.

Mr. PLOESER. My dear friend from Mississippi knows that I do not get excited in the first place. In the second place, time means little to me. Every Member of Congress knows that he works day and night until he finishes—and he never finishes. There is no concern about that except that there are other things to do besides debating TVA in the Congress. We have a heavy schedule this week. Could we agree on, let us say, 50 minutes?

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not like to ask for more than half of the time, but the gentlemen on my side are anxious to have 15 minutes apiece, and there are two of them who want to speak.

Mr. PLOESER. It is quite all right with me if the gentleman from Mississippi gets more time than I do.

Mr. WHITTEN. If we can agree that the two gentlemen on my side get 15 minutes each, that will be sufficient for our side.

Mr. PLOESER. Then that would restrict our side to 20 minutes. That is quite satisfactory.

Mr. WHITTEN. Let us agree on 1 hour, and if the two gentlemen on my side get 15 minutes apiece, that will leave the gentleman the full 30 minutes, which he can use in part or in whole.

Mr. PLOESER. That is more than generous. I agree to that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank Purcell L. Smith, the lobbyist representative of the private power companies of this country, on his choice of battleground, his selection of weapons, and his disclosure of the deadly nature of his attack on the TVA and the 5,000,000 people who are wholly dependent upon that Agency for electric current.

In the name of private power monopoly, he seeks to take the industrial life and to forever limit the growth, progress and prosperity of the 5,000,000 people in an 80,000-square-mile area of our country in my State of Tennessee and in 6 other States.

I have read his testimony given as a lobbyist in the Capitol. He is paid

$65,000 per year plus his expenses. These private power companies are paying him a sum yearly equal to that paid to the President of the United States. Evidently, he is as urbane a gentleman as ever sought to cut the industrial throats of 5,000,000 American citizens and to sink a governmental project that benefits all the people of this country. These are the avowed objectives of Smith and they are set out in the Report. His testimony and that of his confederates reveal them.

The report of the committee accompanying the bill in this cause in discussing the proposed steam plant discloses the fact that unless this steam plant is constructed that—

Although substantial additional power can be generated by installation of new hydro generators, it—

The TVA—

is approaching the limit of the amount of electricity which can be generated by water power harnessed primarily for purposes of flood control and navigation. The proposal to construct this steam plant is based upon the recognition of these two factors, and is intended to provide additional generating capacity to meet the currently estimated requirements of the foreseeable future for electric power in the Tennessee Valley area (committee report, p. 12).

The committee then states that the question here involved is one of legislative intent on the part of Congress when it created the Tennessee Valley Authority, and under this heading of the committee's report it is sought to confine the benefit of power produced by the Tennessee Valley Authority to "States, counties, municipalities, and cooperative organizations of citizens and farmers" and to deny its use to the industries in the area upon which the people residing therein must depend for a livelihood.

Under the next heading the position is taken that this steam plant is unnecessary for these privileged customers of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Under the next heading, namely, "No obligation to supply industries" in the area rests upon the TVA is his insistence.

Under the next heading of the committee report "Constitutional question" it is stated that—

There is presented a serious question of whether the TVA has a constitutional right to engage commercially in the development and sale of power.

And to sustain this unprecedented position, supported by neither the law nor the facts, statements made by the Solicitor General of the United States, Mr. Stanley F. Reed, now Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, in an argument which he made before the Supreme Court in the Ashwander case are cited. This excerpt from what Mr. Reed said on that occasion is without any authority in law whatever and its citation but establishes the weaknesses of the position of those seeking to deny the long established powers of the TVA. I shall shortly demonstrate that there is no constitutional question in this matter and that no constitutional challenge can be made against the appropriation for or construction of this steam plant.

It is then stated that "Chambers of commerce oppose steam plant." All of the chambers of commerce throughout the 80,000 square mile area affected and in adjoining sections of the country approve the steam plant.

And now comes a disclosure of the real opposition to the construction of this steam plant in the heading appearing on page 16 of the report, "Private utility companies oppose steam plant."

The effort being made by these private utility companies through their $65,000-a-year plus expenses lobbyist is an attempted invasion of the area served by the TVA and an unblushing attempt to destroy all further industrial growth and development in that great section of our country. To accomplish this purpose these private power companies seek to hamper and destroy the output of aluminum, atomic energy, and other vital war materials whose production is wholly dependent upon electric power produced by TVA. The statement is made that—

TVA and the Federal Government have neither constitutional nor statutory authority, and therefore, no obligation to supply electric energy required by occupants of the Tennessee Valley other than such surplus energy as is generated as an incident to the water power produced by the construction and operation of navigation and flood-control facilities.

Then, it is stated that the authorization of this steam plant would set a far-reaching precedent.

The original TVA Act of May 18, 1933, created the Tennessee Valley Authority as a corporation for the purpose of maintaining and operating the properties now owned by the United States in the vicinity of Muscle Shoals, Ala., in the interest of the national defense and for agricultural and industrial development, and to improve navigation in the Tennessee River and to control the destructive flood waters in the Tennessee River and Mississippi River Basins.

That the corporation thus set up should not be hampered, or its purposes defeated, the act provided:

(f) No director shall have financial interest in any public utility corporation engaged in the business of distributing and selling power to the public. * * * Nor shall any member have any interest in any business that may be adversely affected by the success of the corporation as a producer of concentrated fertilizers or as a producer of electric power.

By the original act it is further provided that the corporation—

(i) Shall have the power to acquire real estate for the construction of dams, reservoirs, transmission lines, power houses, and other structures, and navigation projects at any point along the Tennessee River, or any of its tributaries. * * *

(j) Shall have power to construct such dams and reservoirs in the Tennessee River and its tributaries, as in conjunction with Wilson Dam, and Norris, Wheeler, and Pickwick Landing Dams, now under construction, will provide a 9-foot channel in the said river and maintain a water supply for the same, from Knoxville to its mouth, and will best serve to promote navigation on the Tennessee River and its tributaries and control destructive floodwaters in the Tennessee and Mississippi River drainage basins; and shall have power to acquire or construct powerhouses, power structures, transmission lines, navigation projects, and incidental works in the Tennessee River and its tributaries, and to unite the various power installations into one or more systems by transmission lines.

By section 831f of the act as carried into the United States Code, page 1792, it is provided:

In order to enable the Corporation to exercise the powers and duties vested in it by this chapter—(a) The exclusive use, possession, and control of the United States nitrate plants numbered 1 and 2, including steam plants, located, respectively, at Sheffield, Ala., and Muscle Shoals, Ala., together with all real estate and buildings connected therewith, all tools and machinery, equipment, accessories, and materials belonging thereto, and all laboratories and plants used as auxiliaries thereto; * * * and all other property to be acquired by the Corporation in its own name or in the name of the United States of America, are entrusted to the Corporation for the purposes of this chapter.

By section 831h–1, it is provided:

The Board is further authorized, whenever an opportunity is afforded, to provide and operate facilities for the generation of electric energy in order to avoid the waste of water power, to transmit and market such power as in this chapter provided, and thereby, so far as may be practicable, to assist in liquidating the cost or aid in the maintenance of the projects of the Authority.

That it is contemplated the TVA shall build steam generating plants and that it is authorized so to do is established by section 831n of the original act as carried into the United States Code, page 1796:

In the construction of any future dam, steam plant, or other facility, to be used in whole or in part for the generation or transmission of electric power the Board is authorized and empowered to issue on the credit of the United States and to sell serial bonds not exceeding $50,000,000 in amount, having a maturity not more than 50 years from the date of issue thereof.

The authority of the TVA to construct and operate a steam generating plant is further established by the power conferred upon it by the amendment to the act of July 26, 1939, authorizing the TVA to acquire the properties of the Tennessee Electric Power Co., which included steam generating plants at Nashville, Hale's Bar, and Parksville, and other small plants, which larger plants have since been operated by the TVA when the occasion demanded.

Public Resolution No. 95, approved July 31, 1940, and the pertinent parts of which reads as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the sum of $25,000,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, as an additional amount to carry out the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, approved May 18, 1933, as amended by the acts approved August 31, 1935, and July 26, 1939, including the funds necessary to begin construction of a dam on the Holston River near Jefferson City, Tenn.; to begin installation of two additional electric generating units at Pickwick Landing Dam, Tenn.; and to begin construction of steam electric generating facilities with a rated capacity of approximately 120,000 kilowatts in the area served by the Authority.

It is a further recognition by Congress of the power of the TVA to construct and operate a steam generating plant to supplement and firm up its hydroelectric power, in the enactment by Congress of Public Resolution 95. This resolution was

passed after President Roosevelt had declared that there existed a limited emergency.

Today we are technically at war with Germany and Japan and are waging what is generally termed a "cold war with Russia."

Section 14 of the original act, after providing for an allocation of the cost of Wilson Dam, Norris Dam, and the Muscle Shoals nitrate plants, the only projects already constructed or specifically in contemplation when the TVA Act was passed, provides further:

> In like manner, the cost and book value of any dams, steam plants, or other similar improvements hereafter constructed and turned over to said board for the purpose of control and management shall be ascertained and allocated.

It is thus seen that the appropriation for and construction of the proposed steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., is authorized both by the Constitution and by the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended.

Neither the lobbyist, Purcell L. Smith, nor any of the power companies he represents, can challenge the action proposed to authorize the construction of this steam plant. On page 1014 of the hearings, Mr. R. T. Jackson, attorney for the private power companies, admits that neither he nor any power company can challenge the constitutionality of the construction of said power plant. I now quote his words:

> Consequently if your committee rules the appropriation for this steam plant, and the Congress ultimately does so appropriate, no one can invoke a judicial determination of whether that action was in excess of constitutional authority.

The establishment by Congress of the TVA as the sole source of electric power obtainable by the 5,000,000 people who within the 80,000-square-mile area within Tennessee and six other States, creates a moral and legal duty on the part of the Federal Government to expand its power facilities to keep step with the normal development and power demand of these people. Especially is this true when to do so will not only increase the income of the people dependent on the TVA for power but will increase the income of the Federal Government from the sale of such power.

It is said in the committee's report that the building and operation of a steam plant is not within the power of the TVA, not authorized by the law, that the act itself is unconstitutional. There is an opinion embodied in this report. It is an interesting document. It is as long as the tail of Halley's comet and every bit as obscure and foggy.

Let us get above the fog now and get up to something really worthwhile. I call your attention to a deliverance by the greatest judge who ever sat on the Supreme Court of this country, John Marshall, in which he held in the case of McCulloch against the State of Maryland:

> Although among the enumerated powers of government we do not find the word "bank" or "incorporation," we find the great powers to lay and collect taxes, to borrow money, to regulate commerce, to declare and conduct a war, and to raise and support armies and navies. The sword and the purse, all the external relations, and no inconsiderable portion of the industry of the Nation, are entrusted to its government. It can never be pretended that these vast powers draw after them others of inferior importance, merely because they are inferior. Such an idea can never be advanced. But it may with great reason be contended that a government entrusted with such ample powers, on the due execution of which the happiness and prosperity of the Nation so vitally depend, must also be entrusted with ample means for their execution.
>
> The government which has a right to do an act, and has imposed on it the duty of performing that act, must, according to the dictates of reason, be allowed to select the means; and those who contend that it may not select any appropriate means, that one particular mode of effecting the object is excepted, take upon themselves the burden of establishing that exception.
>
> Let the end be legitimate, let it be within the scope of the Constitution, and all means which are appropriate, which are plainly adapted to that end, which are not prohibited, but consist with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are constitutional.

Under the property clause of the Constitution, under the general welfare clause of the Constitution, under the commerce clause of the Constitution, under the national defense clause of the Constitution, under all of those provisions, the United States Government can build and operate steam generating plants to make profitable the hydroelectric plants it owns in the TVA system. Embodied in the TVA Act, is the express purpose on the part of the Government to benefit, to advance and to make richer, fuller, and more profitable the agricultural and industrial life of my section of this country.

The power of the Federal Government to build a steam plant for the generation of electric current to firm up its supply of hydroelectric current cannot be successfully challenged on constitutional grounds.

TVA has the clear statutory authority to construct and operate this steam plant.

This plant is of vital importance to the farmers, businessmen, the laboring people, and veterans, and, in fact, to all the people of the Second Congressional District, the State of Tennessee, and this entire region. This steam power plant will have three generating units, each capable of producing 125,000 kilowatts of power, or a total of 375,000 kilowatts of power when the plant is completed. If Congress authorizes the construction of the plant the total cost of which will be $54,000,000, the first unit will be in operation in the fall of 1951, the second in the spring of 1952, and the third shortly thereafter.

The power produced by this plant is absolutely essential to meet the ever increasing demand for electric current due to the general economic growth of this region of our country, and for national defense.

Within the last 2 weeks the far-seeing, wise, patriotic, and universally respected Speaker of the House of Representatives, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., has stated that our greatest defense, our greatest weapon of defense and of offense is an air power so strong that it can raise an umbrella of air power above this country and carry war to any power that dares attack us.

You cannot build planes without aluminum. You cannot have aluminum without electric current, and at this plant in my district only sufficient current can be obtained from TVA. The statement has been made here that the Government is subsidizing that plant. I remember that in 1910 the then Congressman from the Second District, Richard W. Austin, interested people who were then engaged in the manufacture of aluminum to come to Blunt County and buy power sites, and in 1913 the first pot, two rooms, of that plant were built. It obtained its limited amount of power from the Knoxville Power Co. Then it built from time to time five great dams upon the Little Tennessee River and its tributaries, and when this Second World War came I saw it expand its facilities until its production of aluminum was stepped up 700 percent. I went into that plant and saw 13,000 men and women, boys and girls, toiling in the production of the aluminum that made possible the construction of planes that were used over every battlefield around the world. Not only that, I saw those great stalwart men from the hill country there about Marysville sweating in those pot rooms until they had to take salt tablets with the water they drank in order to supply the salt they sweated out. They not only projected their labor and their know-how above every battlefield around the world, but they sent their boys into that conflict. Some of them died in battle.

Those who oppose this appropriation say by their action that there should be no further industrial development, no further increased agricultural production, no further increase of the productivity, of the economy of this region. They take the position that the industrial system, the farm progress, the prosperity of this section of our great country has been finished; that it is full grown; that the energy and capacity of our people must be put in a straight jacket; and that any further effort to expand or make progress by the people of this region through the use of electric energy shall be strangled by the arresting hand of greedy private monopoly. This assault upon the prosperity, the development, the industrial output, the coal mines, the copper mines, the zinc mines, the greatest aluminum plant in America, other defense plants and the fabulous $2,000,000,000 atomic energy plant at Oak Ridge, is being waged by selfish men who would cripple and destroy any further progress, any further development of national strength in this region. And hence it is the TVA that is under heavy fire from the private utilites and their allies.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I wish to point out in line with the gentleman's argument that the very fact that in the act, section 20, the word "preference" is used as applying to cities and States, shows that other customers like the ones the gentleman mentioned, were intended to be served by this utility.

Mr. JENNINGS. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Now that we may thoroughly understand just what is involved in this question:

What is the TVA? It is an accomplished fact. This agency was created and now exists by an act of Congress passed May 18, 1933, which has since been amended. It is a corporation set up by the Congress for the purpose of maintaining and operating the properties then owned by the United States in the vicinity of Muscle Shoals, Alabama. It was created in the interest of national defense and to develop the agricultural and industrial resources of the region, to improve navigation on the Tennessee River, and to control the destructive flood waters on the Tennessee River, its tributaries and the Mississippi.

The construction of the TVA dams could not have been undertaken by private companies. They were constructed for a threefold purpose: to make navigable the Tennessee River, to control the destructive floodwaters of the Tennessee River, its tributaries, and the Mississippi, and to develop hydroelectric power.

The Federal Government from time to time has spent billions of dollars along the eastern and western seacoasts of this country, on the Gulf of Mexico, on the Great Lakes, and on the rivers of our country to improve navigation and to prevent floods. The first extensive expenditure of money by the Federal Government for these purposes on the Tennessee River and its tributaries began with the establishment of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The dams constructed by this agency since its organization on the Tennessee River are: Kentucky, Chickamauga, Pickwick Landing, Wheeler, Guntersville, Watts Bar, Fort Loudoun.

The dams constructed by the Authority on the tributaries of the Tennessee River are: Norris, Hiwassee, Cherokee, Douglas, Fontana, Appalachia, Nottly, Ocoee No. 3, and Chatuge.

The Authority now has under construction the Watauga and the South Holston Dams in upper east Tennessee.

It purchased from power companies the following dams: Hale's Bar, Ocoee Dams Nos. 1 and 2, Blue Ridge, and Great Falls.

As a result of the construction of the dams now completed the Tennessee River is navigable the year round from Knoxville, in my district, to the Gulf of Mexico, to the upper reaches of the Mississippi and its tributaries, and to the Great Lakes. With the completion of the Watauga and South Holston Dams the floodwaters of the Tennessee will be wholly under control.

The Government has invested in this project approximately $800,000,000. A portion of this investment is allocated to flood control and navigation, the balance to power production and distribution.

The great supply of electric power made available by the Authority led to the establishment of the Oak Ridge atomic-energy plant by the Government for the production of the atomic bomb in Anderson and Roane Counties in the Second Congressional District. The atomic plant was located in this section of Tennessee for the following reasons:

First. Oak Ridge is far from the sea coast, surrounded by mountains, by the Clinch River and by hills.

Second. Because of the vast amount of electric current which TVA was able to furnish.

Third. Because of the unquestioned loyalty of our people who worked on this project.

More than 1,000 scientists were engaged in the production of the bomb and more than 100,000 people worked on the project.

In addition to this, because of TVA electric current, the Aluminum Co. of America, which itself has built and operates five great hydroelectric dams near its Alcoa plant in Blount County within 16 miles of Knoxville, Tenn., increased its output of aluminum for war purposes 700 percent. And it may be said without the fear of successful contradiction that thousands of American boys are alive today who would have been killed in this World War but for the fact that the Aluminum Co. of America, at its plant in Alcoa, was able to turn out all of the aluminum needed for the production of war planes, and that at Oak Ridge was made and prepared for use the atomic bomb.

The Tennessee Valley Authority, all of its dams, steam plants, hydroelectric installations and its transmission lines are the property of all the people of the United States. It is not a sectional institution. It is a national institution. And the unhallowed hands of Mr. Smith and his power satellites should not be permitted to arrest or stifle its further development, nor to say to the more than 5,000,000 people who are wholly dependent on this great agency for electric current, "Thus far shall you progress and develop, and contribute to the national welfare and the national defense, but no farther shall you go."

It must be remembered that the fight being waged ostensibly against TVA is in reality and in effect a fight against the people who are served by the TVA and who are wholly dependent upon it for electric current. Not only is the TVA under attack but the people who live in this area are under attack. What has the Tennessee Valley Authority accomplished? What is the need for it? What is the need for its expansion? Who does it serve?

The most essential tool of modern progress is electric energy. A more profitable agriculture and a more productive soil go hand in hand with the ability of the farmer to grow more crops on fewer acres. To do this he must not be a one-crop farmer. He must make two blades of grass grow where only one grew before. He must grow two to five bushels of corn where he formerly only grew one. Land, the fertility of which has been exhausted by successive crops of corn, cotton, and tobacco, must be sowed to clover, to grass, to small grains. To achieve these ends the farmer must have electricity to operate milking machines, to furnish water, both hot and cold, to his dairy barn and milk house, to furnish him cold storage and to lighten the toil of his wife in the home.

In 1933 when TVA had its beginning only one farm in 28 in the region had electric service. Today one-half the farms have electric service.

In 1933 all the farms in the area consumed a total of only 10,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year. In 1947 these same farmers used 300,000,000 kilowatt-hours. To increase profitable diversified farming, and to insure the region's prosperity the farms alone will require an ever increasing supply of electric current.

WHAT OF THE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY?

For the people of this region to achieve and retain a permanent economic growth and prosperity they must build upon a stronger and more profitable system of agriculture side by side with a sound and profitable industrial development.

Within the 15 years since the TVA was established more than 1,800 new manufacturing and processing plants have been established in the Tennessee Valley and in the adjoining areas served by TVA power.

The hue and cry which has been raised by the enemies of the people who live in this section of our country that the TVA has been robbing other sections of their industries and has been inducing them to move to Tennessee and into the adjoining area is not true. The industrial growth of this area had begun long before the advent of the TVA. It has expanded greatly since the TVA made abundant electric energy available.

Within the last 6 years approximately 150 plants making furniture, and 9 manufacturers of paper and allied products have been established in the area.

More than 225 food-processing plants, including more than 90 freezer-locker and cold-storage plants have been built, and 16 leather-manufacturing plants have come into existence. None of these plants moved into the area from other sections of the country. Each and all of them are contributing to the balanced prosperity and economy of our people.

The Tennessee Valley is still predominantly a farming area. Within the last 12 years employment in privately owned and operated manufacturing plants has increased by 161 percent. The national gain in such employment during this period is only 131 percent. The young men and young women of this section are thus afforded the opportunities for profitable employment that has heretofore been denied them. The boys and girls from this section of the country who heretofore have been forced to go to distant States to obtain profitable employment are now enabled to remain at home and use their energies and their abilities to upbuild and develop their home land.

In 1933 the per capita income in the Tennessee Valley was only 40 percent of the national average. In 1945 it had risen to 58 percent of the national average. This means that in 1945 our people had $680,000,000 more money than they would have had if they had been held down to the low rate of income which they received from their labor in 1943. They were thus enabled to buy more of the products of the manufacturing plants in other sections of the

country as a result of this increase in income. And they gave more support to the new local enterprises that have been built in their midst.

And by the same token, the individual income Federal taxes paid by the people of the valley were proportionately increased.

In 1933 the total individual income taxes paid from the seven States in which the Tennessee Valley lies was only 3.4 percent of the national total. In 1946 it had increased to 6 percent. As a result, the people of this section are now bearing a larger share of the total cost of the Federal Government.

The demand for power is daily growing throughout this region. The TVA has at this time on order 11 hydro generating units which, when obtained, it will install in existing dams. It is building two new dams, the Watauga and the South Holston.

The Aluminum Co. is installing a new unit at one of its dams. These installations will have a capacity of 440,000 kilowatts.

The Authority has entered into an agreement with the Department of the Interior to market the power from three dams now being built in the Cumberland River Valley by the United States Corps of Engineers. These dams will produce 261,000 kilowatts of power. All this increase in hydroelectricity, bringing the capacity of the TVA system to 3,270,000 kilowatts, will not meet and take care of the rising demands for power by the people and their industries in the region.

The TVA has the responsibility as the sole power producer and supplier for a region of 80,000 square miles to meet the needs of more than 800,000 existing consumers and more than 100,000 additional farms within the next few years.

The $54,000,000 steam plant, the initial work on which is proposed in TVA's budget for the year 1949, will be required to meet the above demands for power on the part of this region, its 800,000 existing consumers and the 100,000 additional farms to be served, if they are served with electric current.

It is being said that the TVA should rely upon such steam plants as it now owns and operates and upon its hydroelectric installations that are now in operation and that it proposes to install and put in operation. But it must be remembered that there are periods of drought when rainfall is not up to the average. When a drought cuts down the ability of a hydroelectric system to produce electric current, then the steam-power plant steps in and maintains the power requirements during dry years. The greater the capacity of the hydroelectric plants the greater must be the capacity of the steam plants to maintain the increased requirements of the users of electric current.

The Second District of Tennessee, which I have the honor to represent in the Congress, is comprised of Anderson, Blount, Campbell, Knox, Loudon, Morgan, Roane, Scott, and Union Counties. The district has a land area of 3,815 square miles, and its population in 1940 was 389,000. It today has a population of 460,000, an increase of 71,000.

In 1933 there were 219 manufacturing plants in the district. In 1946 there were 421, including the atomic energy plant at Oak Ridge, an increase excluding Oak Ridge of 118—39.2 percent.

In 1933, 20,694 persons were employed in manufacturing.

In 1946 58,252 persons were so employed; without Oak Ridge 36,599 were employed. The increase exclusive of Oak Ridge is 10,428—39.8 percent.

In 1930 24,913 persons were employed in agriculture. In 1945, 22,998 were so employed, a decrease of 11.2 percent.

In 1939 35,404 persons were employed in trade and service. In 1946 50,362 were so employed—an increase of 14,858—42.2 percent.

In 1939 retail sales were $79,657,000. In 1946 they were $189,732,000—an increase of $110,076,000—138.2 percent.

In 1940 the people of the district had a spendable income of $117,065,000. In 1946 they had a spendable income of $341,313,000—an increase of $224,238,000—191.6 percent.

In 1941 they had total bank deposits of $55,138,000. In 1946 they had bank deposits of $224,530,000—an increase of $169,392,000—307.2 percent.

AN APPEAL TO SECTIONAL PREJUDICE

The private power companies and their $65,000 per year lobbyist, Purcell Smith and a segment of the United States Chamber of Commerce say that if the TVA can shortly no longer supply the needs of our expanding industrial development and the 100,000 farmers of our section who are clamoring for electricity on their farms, and our increasing population, that the electricity needed by our industrial plants and our mines should be taken from them and sold exclusively to individual consumers. In other words, it is proposed that there shall be no further growth in Tennessee and in this congressional district. The men and women who work for a living cannot buy electricity if the enterprises which employ and pay them are shut down. There can be no more new plants, no enlargement of those we have if they cannot buy electric current. The TVA is our only source of power.

Purcell Smith and the enemies of the growth and prosperity of our people are making war on the owner of every business enterprise big and little in our midst. They are fighting the farmers and the wives and children of the farmers. They will, if they can, stop the growth of our industrial plants and the building of new enterprises that give employment to our people. They are the enemies of our working people.

A week never passes that I do not receive an appeal from constituents for help in obtaining electric service. More than 50,000 soldiers, sailors, and marines from this congressional district served in this World War. Eleven hundred and ninety-one of them were killed in action.

The more than 50,000 of these veterans are vitally interested in the industrial, agricultural, commercial, educational, moral, and spiritual development of this congressional district. They need electric current to light their homes, to read and study, to equip their farms and to build new enterprises.

The Nation is being forced to build the greatest Air Force in the world to preserve the peace and, if war is thrust upon us, to raise an umbrella of air power over our land, and carry the war to any enemy that may attack us. Air power means more than 7,000 of the best planes in the world. Planes are made out of aluminum. Aluminum cannot be manufactured without vast quantities of electricity.

During the war the Aluminum Co. at Alcoa in Blount County employed 13,000 men and women. It spent over $300,000,000 of its own money expanding its production 700 percent.

The metal turned out was in the planes our boys flew over every battlefield around the world.

The only son of Col. A. D. Huddleston, the superintendent of the great Alcoa plant in our midst, flew 98 of these planes from this country across the Atlantic and one across the Pacific and three to India and across the Himalayas to China. With our air power we blasted our victorious march to Berlin and to Tokyo.

Today our far too small armed forces in Germany, Austria, China, Korea, and Japan are face to face with Russia's huge armies. If a land Pearl Harbor occurs, the man or the men who cripples or destroys our power to make aluminum and to build and man planes will be forever odious.

This continued development of this section of our country is vital to its defense. The Nation needs our coal, our iron, our steel, zinc, copper, the atomic bomb and all the products of our skill, labor, and farms.

Those who seek to stop the growth and strangle the development of our people, are fighting not only the TVA. They are the enemies of our people who have poured out their treasure like sand and their blood like water in the defense of this country.

Those who propose to deny our people the right to prosper and to grow might as well try to crowd a full-grown eagle back into the shell from which it was hatched. There is no more favored region in this land than eastern Tennessee. Our section is endowed with great natural resources, our people are energetic, industrious, and they are equal in intelligence, character, and patriotism to any other people in the land. To deprive them of their right to grow, to develop, to prosper, and to enjoy in their homes and schools, their churches, the modern conveniences which can only be had by the use of electric current is a crime against the Second Congressional District and against this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, the President's budget for 1949 contains a recommended item of $4,000,000 which would permit TVA to commence construction of a steam plant to be located at New Johnsonville, Tenn., in the midwestern part of the TVA power system. The plant would have three generating units, each capable of producing 125,000

kilowatts of power, and is estimated to cost $54,000,000. The first unit is scheduled for operation in the fall of 1951, the second for the spring of 1952, with the third following shortly thereafter. Power from these units, together with the capacity of new hydro units already scheduled for installation, is essential to meet the rising demand for electricity resulting from the general economic growth of the region.

During the 9 years that I have been in Congress I do not think Congress has been faced with any problem that is of greater importance to a large section of our Nation or, indeed, to the Nation itself, domestically, than the one we are debating here today. The question involved is of great importance to a large area of our country; 80,000 square miles affecting all of the State of Tennessee, and substantial parts of six other States. The question involves the future welfare of 5,000,000 people of the United States. The issue to be settled here today goes to the development of the entire country. Our progress is a matter of great pride in the Tennessee Valley, and it should be to the Nation itself, that we have made great progress since the advent of the TVA. When the TVA came into being we only had 3 percent of the farms electrified. Now the farmers in our section have 50 percent of their farms electrified. And, another matter of great importance to the whole Nation, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that in 1933 the people of the Tennessee Valley were paying only 3 percent of the taxes of the Nation. Largely as the result of the healthy development in that section the people of the Tennessee Valley are now paying 6 percent of the taxes of the Nation, and yet this iniquitous private Power Trust says that it is not in the national interest that our progress be continued. But, Mr. Chairman, the Tennessee Valley section and the people in the Tennessee Valley are still below the national average in per capita income. We are just beginning to catch up. Our section is still predominantly agricultural. We have many new industries which have grown up in our section. They have grown up there and not moved from other parts of the United States.

Is it in the public interest, Mr. Chairman, that when we are just beginning to get on our feet, when we are beginning to bear a larger share of the national tax burden, when we are getting our per capita income raised to a decent amount, that at the behest of the private power lobby of this country an economic lid is put over our further development? It seems to me that rather than go along with the recommendation of the private power lobby in this matter, this Congress, on both sides of the aisle, ought to be proud of the record that has been made in the Tennessee Valley. That should be a reason for gladness; it should be a reason to give us encouragement. Since we have made such a good record we should be asked to go on and further raise our standard of living and further increase the contribution we are making to the whole United States. This should be your attitude instead of saying to us, "You have gone this far and you can go no further."

POWER AND PROGRESS IN THE TENNESSEE VALLEY REGION

When the Seventy-third Congress established TVA in 1933, the purpose of the act was to develop the area's resources for the benefit of the people, to promote the prosperity of their enterprises, to raise the level of their income, to strengthen the entire Nation by making the valley more productive. At that time, the Tennessee Valley was one of the low-income areas of the Nation, although it was richly endowed with natural resources.

In 1933 the Tennessee River was almost useless for navigation; its power resources were undeveloped; its turbulent floodwaters were a danger both in the valley and beyond the river's mouth along the Ohio and lower Mississippi Rivers. The economy of the region was almost wholly based on agriculture, and the land which supported the people was approaching exhaustion. Great forests and farm woodlands alike were depleted. Abandoned farms, barren and eroded hillsides scarred the landscape and foreshadowed a future of poverty and despair.

To reverse this trend, to control the river, to improve the land and forests, to make a stronger region and a stronger nation by wise use of the Nation's resources, TVA was created.

TVA PROVIDES THE REGION WITH THE ESSENTIAL TOOLS FOR ECONOMIC PROGRESS

Power is one of the essential tools of modern progress. In the Tennessee Valley where a stronger agriculture and a more fertile soil depend upon the ability of the individual farmer to reduce the acres he formerly planted to row crops and to establish instead a system of diversified farming, electricity is vital.

Worn-out land cannot be taken from corn and cotton and tobacco, and planted with clover and grass and small grains unless the soil-conserving crops can earn their share of the farmer's income. They are not fully effective unless the farmer can have electricity for milking, freezing, cold storage, and all the other uses that a diversified system of agriculture requires in order to succeed.

Little by little, the farmer is getting power in the Tennessee Valley. In 1933, when TVA began, 1 farm in 28 had electric service. One in two is served today. In 1933, all the farms in the area used a total of only about 10,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year; last year some 300,000,000 kilowatt-hours were consumed. They must use much more to provide the stable diversified agriculture which the region's prosperity demands.

THE TENNESSEE VALLEY DEVELOPS INDUSTRIALLY

Economic growth in the Tennessee Valley not only rests on a stronger agriculture but on a sound industrial development, for the burden on the land for the support of the people must be reduced. It has been reduced since 1933. In the 15-year period, more than 1,800 new manufacturing and processing plants have been established in the Tennessee Valley and in the adjoining areas served by TVA power.

Many of these new plants are directly related to the change in agricultural and forest and woodland management. Between 1940 and 1946, for example, nearly 150 plants making furniture and finished timber products, and 9 making paper and allied products, have been established in the area. More than 225 plants dealing with food and kindred products—including over 90 freezer-locker and cold-storage plants—have been set up, and 16 plants engaged in leather and leather goods manufacture have appeared. Most of these are relatively small enterprises, none of them have moved from any other section of the country, and all of them together combine to give a better balanced economy in the region.

Although this region is still primarily an agricultural area, between 1933 and 1945 employment opportunities in privately operated manufacturing establishments increased by 161 percent. The national gain was 131 percent, but this valley in its more rapid advance began to catch up a little and to offer its youth more nearly average opportunities for profitable employment. Per capita income in the valley was only 40 percent of the national average in 1933. By 1945 it rose to 58 percent of the national average. In round dollars, that increase in income meant that in 1945 the people of the valley had $680,000,000 more than they would have had if they had continued to be only 40 percent as productive, in terms of earnings, as the rest of the Nation. They bought more of the products of the manufacturing plants of other regions as a result, and they supported more of the new local service enterprises. In the same way, the proportion of individual Federal income taxes paid by the people of the valley has increased. In 1933 the total of such taxes paid from the seven States in which the valley lies was only 3.4 of the national total; in 1946 it amounted to 6 percent. The valley is bearing a larger share of the total cost of the Federal Government.

THE PRESENT TVA POWER SYSTEM

At the present time, to meet the region's needs, the TVA power system has a total installed generating capacity of 2,571,000 kilowatts, 2,121,000 kilowatts in hydro and 450,000 kilowatts in steam. The hydro includes 311,000 kilowatts at dams owned by the Aluminum Co. of America but operated under TVA's direction to achieve the benefits of integrated operation.

To meet growing loads, TVA already has on order 11 hydro generating units to be installed in existing dams and is building two new dams, Watauga and South Holston. The Aluminum Co. is installing a new unit at one of its dams. These installations will total 440,000 kilowatts in capacity. In addition, TVA has entered into an agreement with the Department of the Interior to market the power from three dams under construction in the Cumberland Valley by the United States Corps of Engineers, which will have 261,000 kilowatts of installed capacity.

But all this increase in hydro electricity, an increase which will bring the capacity of the integrated system to a total of 3,270,000 kilowatts, is not enough to meet the rising demands for power

in the region. To carry out its responsibilities as the sole power supplier for a region of 80,000 square miles, to meet the requirements of more than 800,000 existing consumers and more than 100,000 additional farmers to be served in the next few years, the additional steam plant proposed in TVA's budget for 1949 will be required to supplement the power production capacity of the scheduled hydro installations.

THE STEAM PLANT WILL BALANCE HYDRO CAPACITY

In addition to the regulated output which the hydro plants maintain even during extended dry periods, the hydro capacity can produce large amounts of additional power when streamflow conditions are good. In a predominantly hydro system, therefore, the primary function of steam plants is to provide a portion of the power requirements during dry years—to firm up the hydro power which is not continuously available then.

The greater the extent to which the hydro power is developed, the greater the quantity of steam power which must be supplied during the dry periods. For this reason the proportion of steam capacity to hydro capacity should be expected to increase as the development of the hydro resources of a region is carried forward.

In the Tennessee Valley the proportion of generating capacity represented by steam plants, which was nearly one-third in 1936, has been decreasing instead of increasing, because TVA has been building hydro plants so rapidly and has built but one major steam plant. TVA's Watts Bar steam plant brought the steam capacity of TVA's service area up temporarily to a little more than 25 percent of the total, but the general downward trend has now carried the proportion well below 20 percent. With the further additions of hydro capacity scheduled for the next few years, the proposed New Johnsonville steam plant will bring the steam capacity up to slightly over 20 percent of the total generating capacity of the area.

THE RISING POWER DEMAND ON THE TVA SYSTEM

This new steam plant appears to be the individual project which the private power companies have selected as the occasion for an all-out assault against TVA and against the people of the Tennessee Valley. These are not competing power systems speaking, wisely or unwisely striving to protect an investment made on franchise from the people. They have no properties in the area concerned. From 1933 to 1940 the people acted to withdraw from the private power companies the privilege of supplying their electric service in the future. They determined to acquire and thereafter to own and manage their own systems of power distribution and to purchase the power they required at wholesale from TVA. The vengeful private companies now propose that these publicly owned systems should have a limit set on the region's power supply, that a ceiling on its progress should be fixed.

Private companies do not, and they cannot, argue that the additional capacity is not required. All over this Nation power demand is pressing hard upon supply. In some parts of the country demand already has outrun capacity to produce it. There are black-outs. Power conservation and rationing is discussed. The growth in power demand has been steady. At the end of 1940 demand on the Nation's power systems totaled 28,000,000 kilowatts. Five years later—by the end of the war—it had increased by 10,000,000 kilowatts, while in the next 2 years it jumped up more than another 10,000,000 kilowatts to the total of the 49,000,000 kilowatts demand recorded in 1947. Load growth continues. Private power companies expect it. They have announced proposed expenditures of $5,000,000,000 in the next 5 years, an increase of more than one-third in the present capitalization of the 65-year-old industry.

On the TVA power system, too, demand is rising. The people are using more power in their homes, on their farms, and in their industries. This is not a new trend in the Tennessee Valley, either. Electricity use has been expanding in the Tennessee Valley since 1933. The TVA system has a capacity of more than 2,500,000 kilowatts today and last year it produced 15,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, as compared with a capacity of 800,000 kilowatts in the same area in 1933 and a production of one-tenth as many kilowatt-hours a year.

GROWTH OF LOAD ON MUNICIPAL AND COOPERATIVE DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS

Estimates of the growth of load on the TVA system are the results of detailed studies of the prospects of the 140 municipalities and cooperatives which distribute TVA power to the homes, farms, and business enterprises of the area. A summary of their expectations follows.

Consumers served by municipalities and cooperatives are divided into three general classes: residential, commercial, and industrial. During war years growth in residential use of electricity was discouraged to conserve power for essential war uses, and the electrical household equipment which builds a residential load was not obtainable. From 1945 to 1947, however, the annual residential use of electric energy on the TVA system increased about 60 percent, rising from 900,000,000, kilowatt-hours use to nearly 1,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours as the average consumption per family increased from 1,790 kilowatt-hours per year to 2,320. Every month this load goes up. In the next 5 years the use of electricity in the homes of the Tennessee Valley is expected to double.

While growth of the total residential load has been rapid, an even greater rate of growth in use has occurred on the farms than in the urban centers. The availability of power is the major factor liberating the farmers of the Tennessee Valley from some of their back-breaking chores and permitting the development of the more diversified pattern of agriculture upon which the security of the future depends.

The commercial and industrial load of the municipalities and cooperatives is growing too, as the region more nearly approaches national levels in retail, service, and manufacturing industries. Most of these private businesses are relatively small but their number is increasing and their total use of electricity has grown sharply. The small private enterprises whose maximum demands are under 50 kilowatts—grocery stores, filling stations, beauty shops, drug stores, restaurants, tourist camps, small hotels, and the smaller manufacturing plants—increased their use of electricity from 520,000,000 kilowatt-hours in 1945 to 850,000,000 in 1947—an increase in the first two postwar years of 60 percent for this class of consumers. In those 2 years more than 20,000 such small businesses were established in the area. According to present estimates the next 5 years will see a further increase over the present consumption levels of these consumers by at least 65 percent.

The larger commercial and industrial power users served by municipalities and cooperatives—those with demands over 50 kilowatts—have been increasing their consumption at the same time. The whole economy is marching ahead. In the 6-year period ending with December 1947, the number of such establishments, canneries, quick-freezing plants, mines and quarries, foundries, and hosiery mills, for example, increased by 1,500, a growth of more than 100 percent. More than half the increase in number has taken place since the end of the war. The total annual consumption of this group of consumers amounted to over 2,000,000,000 kilowatt hours last year, and based on the business plans of the various enterprises involved, an annual use totaling 3,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours must be anticipated within the next 5 years.

The combined total of these anticipated increases in power use means that these public distributors of TVA power expect to use over 8,000,000,000 kilowatt hours in 1952, 65 percent more than they used in 1947.

This is the demand which TVA must be prepared to meet. To provide capacity to meet the commitments of these public distributors, who last year alone spent $23,000,000 for new lines, transformers, and other distribution facilities required to meet the demands in their service area, more than the hydro additions already authorized is required. This is why the steam plant is needed.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. The gentleman a moment ago spoke of the not unnatural desire of the residents of the valley for more refrigerators and cream separators and more of the other lesser luxuries of life. There are 8,000,000 people in the city of New York, many of whom would be very happy, like their fellow citizens in Tennessee, to have more of such facilities. Would the gentleman from Tennessee prepare to vote an appropriation for the Federal Government to establish a power plant in the city of New York so that we, too, might get cheap, subsidized power?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will say to the gentleman that as far as I am concerned I would be perfectly willing to see the gentleman's city of New York, if the facilities were needed there, and if his area needed developing like the Tennessee Valley, have a similar project. As a matter of fact you have done a very

poor job in New York in harnessing the power of your rivers.

Mr. COUDERT. Of course, cheap electric power is desirable anywhere. I take it the gentleman's position is that he is for the Government's supplying electric power to the entire United States at the expense of the taxpayers?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Your idea that this is subsidized power at the expense of the taxpayers in the long run is a mistaken one. I am certain the gentleman is aware that the power part of TVA is self-liquidating. Whether we agreed with the TVA in its original conception, and personally I did agree and have supported the Tennessee Valley Authority all the way through, we have the accomplished fact that the Tennessee Valley Authority is in existence, that it is the sole supplier of power for this area, and it is either a matter of whether we want the area to continue to make progress, whether we want it to make a contribution to the entire Nation and pay back this amount itself, or whether we want to put an economic limit on one section of the Nation to the prejudice of 5,000,000 people and to the development of that section.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from New York that I was one of the men who has favored from the beginning the development of the St. Lawrence water power. If you do that and use it as a yardstick and break those rates down in New York, those people can get power at reasonable rates.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to permit me to answer the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. COUDERT. We are talking about steam plants and not water power.

Mr. RANKIN. I was afraid of that.

SECTIONAL PREJUDICE REGRETTED

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, we are not going to get anywhere as a nation and certainly Congress is being very short-sighted if we bring into play sectional prejudice. When we say that because something is not taking place in another part of the United States that no one should have this advantage, we are being very short-sighted. Certainly the harbors of the East, the great western projects of irrigation and flood control, as well as flood control in the Mississippi Valley, all of these advantages directly affect the welfare of the whole United States. We of the South do not begrudge the benefits you have secured. We are glad to cooperate in your advancement. Should you now wish to stifle and kill our progress? You do that if you oppose this steam plant.

The private-power lobby and their allies are making the irresponsible assertion that this area has been unfairly favored by the Federal Government. They are invoking the antiquated superstition that industrial growth in one part of the country means industrial stagnation in another. Their representatives are claiming that TVA is soliciting industries to move from other sections of the country to the Tennessee Valley.

Neither charge is true. The Tennessee Valley has not been singled out for Federal attention. Rivers and harbors have been developed all over the Nation at public expense. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent that navigation channels could be provided. Flood control has been promised to other valleys, and millions of dollars are spent each year to keep that promise current. Soil conservation and reforestation are not new activities for the Federal Government to undertake. Vast quantities of power have been produced by Federal Government expenditures, particularly on the rivers of the West. Almost from its beginning the Federal Government has made annual appropriations to create a climate in which the private enterprises of the people can prosper. River control was late in coming to the Tennessee Valley. The benefits have been substantial and they have been swiftly realized. That is the only difference. The objective of all TVA activities was to promote such benefits, obtain just such results. Not only does the region benefit, as other regions have; increased national prosperity has resulted just as the sponsors of the TVA Act hoped it would.

The new businesses locating in the Tennessee Valley are not moving from other areas. They are fulfilling the expectations set forth in the TVA statute which directed that ways and means should be sought for "the application of electric power to the fuller and better balanced development of the resources of the region."

It is more than a theoretical position. During the war when the WPB ordered the plant capacity of these customers increased, TVA officially protested the decision and urged instead erection of a plant outside its power service area at a location where the more extensive Florida reserves could be utilized in order that the smaller deposits of Tennessee could be conserved. Its advice was not accepted. The national emergency prevented a decision TVA believed to be in the national interest. It seems to me that this Congress ought to spurn the iniquitous effort of Purcell Smith, the head of the private power lobby, to play one section of the United States against the other. We all know that in the United States anything that helps one section of our country is going to help the whole country. Likewise, anything that damages 80,000 square miles and 5,000,000 people of our population is going to damage the whole United States.

PROGRESS IN TENNESSEE VALLEY HELPS ALL SECTIONS

There is one thing that I think some of the Members from industrial sections outside of the Tennessee Valley ought to bear in mind, and that is that these generators, this equipment that goes into the hydroelectric plants and steam plants in the Tennessee Valley, which are eventually paid for by the purchasers of power in the valley, is made in other sections of the United States. The making of this equipment gives employment to people at Schenectady, N. Y., and at the Allis-Chalmers plant in Milwaukee. Statistics show that every State in the Union makes some contribution to the equipment and to the articles that come into the Tennessee Valley as a result of this development.

Only today, Mr. Chairman, I had the opportunity of talking with a newspaperman from Memphis, Dick Wallace of the Press-Scimitar. He said that he had been on a trip in upper west Tennessee, in Gibson County, and that the great thing the people were thinking about and wanted was cream separators, frigidaires, electrical equipment, and farm machinery, in greater amount, if they could only have the electricity and the electric power to operate them. Those things are made largely in other parts of the United States. It is going to help give jobs to your people and to build up the entire economy of our Nation if only you do not nip our growth in the bud.

Another example, last month in the National Geographic Magazine the small item of fishing equipment and tackle was mentioned. There was a discussion and a pictorial article about how the lakes of the Tennessee Valley had helped the manufacturers of fishing equipment. Some manufacturer in the Chicago area gave great credit for the increase of business to development of this section in the South.

Gentlemen, this proposition of not appropriating money for this steam plant is the most dastardly disregard of the national interest on the part of private power trusts that I have ever known. Here we are with cooperatives and municipalities which have invested millions of dollars of their own money in partnership with the Federal Government faced with the possibility of not having power to furnish their customers and retire their indebtedness. Here are industries which have been built by the United States Government for our own defense, such as the atomic-energy plant and many others, which may be faced with the emergency of not having enough power to carry on for our national defense. There are other industries. Mr. Purcell Smith says, "Let them build their own steam plants." They are producing aluminum and other things so vitally necessary now. Yet the power lobby would so completely disregard the national defense as to deny this money, even though the people of the valley eventually are going to repay it. I think Mr. Purcell Smith and his private power group would do better to spend some of that $250,000 a year trying to give better service to their own customers instead of using it as a slush fund in trying to kill this worth-while project. I know they would thereby accomplish more for the good of the Nation. As a matter of fact, even the Arkansas Light & Power Co. and other private power companies are short of power themselves. They want power from the TVA to operate aluminum plants. Yet the lobby has the audacity in the face of the needs of our national defense to say that this appropriation should not be granted.

WE CANNOT PLACE OUR FUTURE AT MERCY OF PRIVATE POWER LOBBY

I said in the beginning that this was not only a matter of importance to the State of Tennessee, but it was important to the whole Nation. The attempt here is—and we all know that our economy

cannot operate unless we have electric energy—the attempt here is to let the private power lobby say how much development we can have in this country. It affects the great western projects. It affects all the power projects all over the United States which are going to be curtailed and cut down to what they say they can have. Are we going to really develop the great natural assets of this country, or are they going to allow our progress to be curtailed and cut down?

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. Naturally I assume the gentleman is speaking for himself?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am speaking for myself, but I think I am speaking the real sentiments of most of the Members.

Mr. PLOESER. Certainly the gentleman does not mean to impugn the motives of all the Members of Congress. The gentleman knows that we make our decisions individually as we see fit. If those decisions are influencing the gentleman, I am sorry—I did not know. But who is the gentleman speaking for—is the gentleman speaking for himself?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am speaking my own sentiments, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. PLOESER. I just wanted to be sure.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, this is not a partisan matter. Politics or partisan consideration should play no part in this determination. The gentleman from Tennessee, Judge JENNINGS, who just addressed the House, represents a district which I imagine has more industries and more people dependent on the successful operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority than any other. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PHILLIPS] on the majority side, has a similar district, the very life of which is dependent upon having a sufficient supply of electric power. Both gentlemen happen to be Republicans. The same is true of many other sections of the country. This is not a Democratic or a Republican matter. It is a question of whether we are going to accept what has already been done with the Tennessee Valley Authority as the supplier of power in this section and give this section a chance to go forward, or whether we are going to resort to sectionalism and say, "No; you cannot have any more. We will put an economic lid on your profits in the future." What will that lead to if we adopt that policy all over the Nation?

In the final analysis it seems to me that this is a matter of whether we are going to turn our future economic destiny over to private power trusts or whether we are going to assert ourselves and really try to use the assets of this great Nation, particularly at a time when we need to use those assets for our own welfare and for our own protection.

Mr. Chairman, another point which I think should be stressed is that this is not a grant. This is not like a WPA project or a PWA project, where the Federal Government is giving away the money it is never going to get back. The Congress has already enacted into law a schedule for the amortization of the TVA's investment in power projects. Every cent of this appropriation will of course be charged to power, and in a period of 40 years, under an amendment passed in the last session of Congress, this money will have to be repaid to the Federal Government. But every dollar spent now in this project is going to mean greatly increased employment in other sections of the United States. It is going to mean further development of this area. It is going to mean that we have some cushion of power for national defense, which is so greatly needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has expired.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, at the outset of my brief remarks, I wish to express my appreciation for the action of the committee in having approved the total amount of money recommended for the construction of the Watauga Dam and the South Holston River Dam. As Representative from the First District of Tennessee, I am happy that the committee has seen fit to approve the amount of $15,142,000, which is necessary for the continued construction and furtherance of the two dams which are located in the district which I have the honor and privilege to represent.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is a corporation created by act of Congress on May 18, 1933. It was established to improve navigation and to provide for flood control of the Tennessee River; to provide for reforestation and the proper use of marginal lands in the Tennessee Valley; to provide for the agricultural and industrial development of the valley; to provide for the national defense, and for other purposes. The Tennessee Valley Authority has accomplished these purposes by developing dams and reservoirs in the Tennessee River Basin and its tributaries. It has engaged in the generation of hydroelectric power.

I have had an opportunity to observe the advancement and progress that has been brought about by the development of the Tennessee Valley Authority. There has been some question raised on the floor of this House concerning the power of the Congress to appropriate money to build a steam plant for the development and sale of power. In the early history of TVA many cases were brought into the courts of this country touching on different phases of the power program. The legal authority for the TVA has been established long ago by the Supreme Court of the United States. The legal battles have been fought out in the courts of America, and there is no question about the legal authority for the existence and continuity of the TVA. The constitutional authority to promote the general welfare in the interest of national defense is well established by the courts of this country.

The original act was established for the purpose of flood control, navigation, soil conservation, national defense, and other powers incidental thereto. Under the Constitution, by implication and my implied powers, it follows that a Government corporation can do the necessary things that are incidental to the carrying out and completion of the program as provided and set out in the original act of Congress. It would seem to follow that it has long been recognized that TVA can sell surplus power to commercial establishments, and therefore, in order to keep a continuous flow of power, the erection of a steam plant within the area of the TVA is a logical, necessary, implied power of the TVA Act. It is necessary to have a secondary source of power in order to adequately supply the needs of the people of that great area. A steam plant will guarantee a continuous flow of power during a time when hydroelectric power may be curtailed in production because of dry weather or a drying up of the source of power of water in the dams which produces electric power.

There is no new departure in this procedure. The Congress from time to time has appropriated money to develop the great highways of this country. We have developed the forests and waterways of America. The Congress has appropriated money to develop the rivers and harbors and canal service to accommodate the commerce flowing from the great cities, not only on the eastern seaboard, but throughout America. We as as a nation have encouraged the development of the great reclamation service of the West, which has produced fertile soil where fruits and vegetables and farm varieties now grow, which was at one time a place of poverty and wastelands. These great areas have been turned into intensive and productive agricultural areas, all of which has added to the wealth of the West. Likewise I have seen great development in agriculture, soil, progress and happiness of the people in the Tennessee Valley. More than 5,000,000 people depend upon the TVA for power. A great area consisting of approximately seven States is affected by this great national development. We cannot, as a Congress, allow this great number of citizens to be deprived of the necessary power to run their industries, operate their factories, furnish power for their municipalities, for their farm organizations, nor should the people be denied the necessary amount of electric power to supply light and power in every rural home. Since the TVA is situated in the general area where the TVA operates, then there is no other source of electric power, and it is up to the Congress to appropriate the necessary money to build and develop power facilities, which will guarantee a constant flow of power to meet the needs of the people in question.

We are not dealing with a local problem, but it is one of national concern to everybody throughout this Republic. The Congress recently appropriated the necessary funds to create a 70-group Air Force. We are living in a day and time when the maintenance of a large Air Force which can be supreme in the air is the best guarantee to our national security and proper defense. Electric power is necessary to build up a strong Air Force. We must not forget that in this general area we have the atomic-bomb plant at Oak Ridge, together with

the aluminum plant at Alcoa, Holston Ordnance, and Tennessee Eastman at Kingsport, as well as the North American Rayon and Bemberg corporations at Elizabethton, Tenn. All of these industries played a vital part in the production of war material during World War II. We must not allow our supply of power to be depleted, and then at some future date find ourselves in need of a source of electric power, which we may not have if we do not take the necessary precautions now to produce power.

The national defense of this country is not a sectional problem. It is true that some sections of America have more industries and more taxable property, and because of their ability and prosperity there naturally falls a heavier burden of taxation upon these people, but this Republic must be maintained and saved, and must be built strong and powerful. In time of danger men and women from Alabama, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, and other States fall in line alongside the people from New York, Connecticut, Illinois, Massachusetts, California, and Texas, as well as every State in the Union, to answer the call of our country, and rush to the defense of this Republic. There is no private utility in this great area that can give to the people the necessary power, and it is my conviction that it is the responsibility of Congress to see that in the interest of the national well-being, that there is not a ceiling placed upon the progress and advancement of this great area in America.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill this afternoon may have permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, as everyone knows, I was coauthor with Senator Norris of the bill creating the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Before that bill was ever introduced, I went over it with Senator Norris and saw that it contained those provisions referred to by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT], giving preference to States, counties, municipalities, and cooperative power associations within the distribution radius. At that time the distribution radius had been held by the Army engineers to be 350 miles, and everyone else, including the TVA, now says it is at least 300 miles.

I began a drive at once to get that power to my people, and today they have it in every single voting precinct in the 10 counties I represent.

They get their power from the Tennessee Valley Authority at TVA rates.

We do not have it to every farm house in the district yet, but we are well on our way to that end.

That is one of the greatest services I have ever rendered the people of this country, and especially the people of the district I represent. In carrying out the provision referred to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] I have secured the construction of the longest high-power line yet built out from the Tennessee River, running the full length of the district I represent, in order to enable the TVA to supply power to the municipalities and cooperative power associations in that area.

If the bill reported by the Committee on Military Affairs, known then as the Hill bill, had become law, instead of the Norris-Rankin bill, we would have had one dam on the Tennessee River, at Muscle Shoals, the private power interests would have got all the power generated there, the people today would be paying three, four, or five times the rates for it they are now paying, and the farmers would not be getting any electricity at all.

We simply struck out all after the enacting clause of the Hill bill, and inserted the Norris-Rankin bill, which gave the TVA the right to build additional dams, as well as the right to build power lines, including rural lines, fix the maximum retail rates, and give preference to States, counties, municipalities, and cooperative associations within the distribution radius. If we had lost that fight, the Tennessee River probably never would have been developed, at least in your day and mine; the people I represent would have got none of the power, and the chances are that the farmers of the district would not have seen electric lights in their homes during this generation.

Remember that rural electrification began in the TVA area, in the district I represent, and spread to the rest of the country. It is the greatest economic blessing that ever came to the farmers of this country, and I am in favor of extending it to every farm house.

It is amazing to me to see men fight a small appropriation of this kind and vote against funds for rural electrification, and then vote to give untold billions of the American taxpayers' money to countries of Europe, Asia, and Africa, many of whose people never try to help themselves.

The money for this generating plant, as well as the money loaned for building REA lines and facilities, will be paid back with interest and will enrich the Nation. While these billions you are giving to foreign countries will never come back, and instead of promoting the peace of the world, it will probably have the very opposite effect.

We are told that more than $900,000,000 of that foreign aid, or ERP or Marshall-plan money is to be sent for tobacco. That means that the people of every county I represent, and every county you represent, will have to pay more than $200,000 for tobacco alone to be sent to foreign countries under the pretense of promoting peace under the so-called Marshall plan.

Yet, when we ask for money to loan to the farmers to build rural power lines, or to enable the TVA to build this steam plant to firm up the power generated on the Tennessee River and save billions of kilowatt-hours of secondary power for the people of that area, we find the same Members opposing it with all their might.

But, as Abraham Lincoln once said, "You cannot fool all of the people all the time." They are getting wise to what is going on; and when you Members go back to your farmers and ask for their endorsement for reelection, you are going to find them like the old colored fellow trying to run down a path through a dense wood in a thunderstorm at night and praying to the Lord to give him "less racket and more light."

The gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] asked me how far I would go in building these steam plants. My answer is very simple. I would go far enough to build sufficient steam plants to firm the power up to the peak of production in the average year.

There are a great many people who do not understand the difference between firm power and secondary power. Firm power is that produced the year around in a steady flow. Secondary power is the floodwater power or the power that is produced when the stream is above that flow. As a rule, the secondary power in the Tennessee Valley area comes in the wintertime, as a result of the heavy rains. Along the Columbia River it comes in the summertime as a result of the melting snow and ice, when those people need that water and that power to irrigate their lands. In the Tennessee Valley the secondary power comes in the wintertime when we need it to heat our homes and to furnish the additional power that is needed throughout the cold winter months. I am in favor of building any steam plant that is necessary to firm that power up to the peak of production of the average year in order that none of the water power in the Tennessee River, or any of its tributaries, goes to waste.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] keeps talking about the people of New York paying for this. The people of New York do not pay a dime of it.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COUDERT. Who paid the $400,000,000 that went into the construction of these plants? New York pays only 10 percent of the Government income. Does the gentleman mean that my constituents do not contribute to the welfare of the people of Tennessee?

Mr. RANKIN. The people who pay for the power pay the bill. In the long run, it is will not cost New York a dime.

But let me tell you what you people did when your party was in power. You were selling the power produced at Muscle Shoals for 1.59 mills a kilowatt-hour wholesale to the private power interests, which, as a rule, are owned in New York. You showed that the rate was sufficient to amortize the investment within a reasonable time. Today the TVA is selling that power in the same area at an average of about 4.5 mills a kilowatt-hour, considerably more than twice what you were charging the private power companies for it 15 years ago. Yet you come in here and try to make the public believe that the TVA is selling the power below the cost of production. I

will tell you where your trouble comes from. The private power companies and that great octopus, the big holding companies, sometimes in layers 14 deep, are sucking the lifeblood out of the power consumers of this country through overcharges for distribution.

You people in the Northeast might as well get ready for it. You are either going to develop your water power up there or you are going to suffer just as they suffered in Massachusetts for want of heat last winter.

They have refused to develop that water power with all the help we have offered them. They have no coal, they have no gas, they have no oil to amount to anything in any State beyond Pennsylvania. That applies to New York, New Jersey, Delaware, and all the New England States.

I do not have the figures for 1947 yet, but in 1946 the people of the State of New York were overcharged for their electricity $222,000,000, according to the Ontario rates, just across the line. They have an abundant supply of undeveloped water power. The State of New York alone has 11,300,000,000 kilowatt-hours of undeveloped water power going to waste each year. Properly firmed up it would probably amount to 15,000,000,000, or almost as much as the people of that State now use, from all sources.

They can develop it for the people in that area at rates the people can afford to pay. If they had developed the St. Lawrence, 6,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power a year from that stream would have belonged to the American side of the river. You could have taken that power and reduced the electric light and power rates to the people of New York, New England, and New Jersey by probably $350,000,000 a year, just by the force of the yardstick.

If you had developed the water power of New England and of all that great North Atlantic country, you would not hear those people today complaining of being cold, but you could supply them with the necessary power not only to carry on their industries but to heat their homes, operate their refrigerators, their water pumps, their washing machines, and all the other appliances necessary to make their homes what they should be. Of course, I am supporting this amendment. I think it is absolutely necessary. I am also going to stand by that provision which Senator Norris and I wrote into the law creating TVA in 1933, that preference must be given to the States, counties, municipalities, and cooperative power associations within the distribution area.

I want to see cheap electricity in every farm home in America.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Following the argument of the gentleman, I am wondering whether it is his thought that insofar as steam plants are concerned, he would firm up merely the existing water power or whether his vision of electric power goes so far as to establish a chain of steam plants, if necessary, for some 350 miles.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I would go only so far as to firm up the hydroelectric power in the Tennessee Valley area and elsewhere to the maximum flow of the streams in an average year.

Let me remind the gentleman from Pennsylvania that his State has over 8,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of water power going to waste every year. That State has its supply of oil, and it has an abundant supply of coal. But if the people in that area want to develop that water power, I would go along with them on the same terms that we have developed the water power on the Tennessee River and its tributaries, as well as on the Columbia and on the Colorado. The power consumers of Pennsylvania would pay for it in the long run, and it would reduce their present rates more than $100,000,000 a year.

They talk about scarcity of power. When I took up this fight when I first came to Congress in 1921 the American people were using only 40,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year. I believe the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] said a while ago that they would use 280,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity this year. The party in power told us at that time that they did not need the Muscle Shoals Dam; that we had more power than we had a market for; and voted down the appropriation to finish the dam. The Ford offer aroused the American people and they demanded that the Muscle Shoals Dam be finished. Today we are approaching the 300,000,000,000 kilowatt-hour mark, and in less than 10 years, and I believe in 5 years, this country will be using half a trillion kilowatt-hours of electricity a year, and in less than 25 years from today, certainly less than 50 years, this country will be using a trillion kilowatt-hours of electricity a year.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. I gather from the gentleman's remarks that he seems to have overlooked the fact that this committee has allowed and approved every dollar that TVA has asked for in this bill for the development of water power.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not overlooking that fact. But I am complaining at your cutting out this steam stand-by plant which is necessary to firm this power up and save an abundance of secondary or flood-water power from going to waste, or forcing the TVA to sell it to private power companies at their own prices, while they firm it up and wring the economic lifeblood out of their customers with exorbitant overcharges.

They want to force the TVA to sell this secondary power to private companies, largely in Arkansas, Kentucky, Alabama, and Georgia. In 1946, the people of those four States were overcharged $65,000,000 on their light and power bills, although portions of three of those States were using TVA power at TVA rates.

This power issue is one question on which I have put in more time than any other subject since I have been a Member of Congress. Last year there was produced and sold in this country 255,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, as against 40,000,000,000 in 1921. There was about 45,000,000,000 produced and used by concerns that generate their own power—making a total of about 300,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours produced in this country last year. Studies made by the engineers of both the Army and the Federal Power Commission reveal that there are 394,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power going to waste in this country every year. That power could be firmed up to the average maximum production with 116,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of steam-produced power, which would give us a total of more than 800,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year. That would meet all our industrial and commercial needs, and heat every home and every business establishment in this country for thousands of years to come without exhausting our fuel supply.

I have no patience with those tools of the Power Trust who come here to lobby against public power. The power business is a public business. Electricity is the lifeblood of our advancing civilization. It has become a necessity of our modern life. No home is complete without it. It must be handled by a monopoly. You cannot have four or five concerns supplying electricity to any community; the overhead expenses would eat the people up.

Besides, the water power already belongs to the Federal Government. It is public power to begin with. Therefore we are dealing with a public business and not with a private business. When these agents of the Power Trust come here and accuse the Congress of engaging in a private business, they simply put the shoe on the wrong foot, because what they are trying to do is to have private interests monopolize a public business and pile upon the backs of the American people burdens so heavy they cannot be borne.

I am familiar with the power rates in every State in this Union. I am familiar with the power rates in the various cooperative power associations. I see some of their customers paying three or four times as much as they should have to pay, merely because they are helpless in the hands of this vast monopoly that is today trying to close in on Congress, get its hands on the water power of the Nation at the bus bar, and deprive the American people of its greatest source of wealth, outside of this soil from which we live.

They will never succeed if I can prevent it.

Our rural power program would have gone dead if it had not been for the fight I waged for it here on this floor in 1938, and the fights I have waged since that time. Today there are 2,000,000 electrified farm homes in this country that probably would not have had electric lights in them for a generation if it had not been for the fights I have led here, and in which some of you men who are looking at me now have always joined.

Let us develop our water power, firm it up, and give the American people the

benefit of the greatest wealth in America outside of the soil from which we live.

Let's see to it that this power is supplied to every home and every business establishment at rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission, and distribution.

Let's electrify every farm home in this country at rates the farmers can afford to pay.

Then we can lead the world into a new era of peace, progress, and prosperity the like of which mankind has never known.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill down to and including line 6 on page 1.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GRANT of Indiana, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6481) making appropriations for Government corporations and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENNINGS asked and was given permission to include in his remarks made in Committee of the Whole certain excerpts from statutes and decisions of the Supreme Court.

Mr. McCORMACK at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an editorial from the Boston Herald and in the other the text of the President's address to the National Conference on Family Life.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. LANE (at the request of Mr. GORE), for May 10, 11, 12, and 13, on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

AMERICAN COTTON AND THE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE PEACE

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, today the House Committee on Armed Serices begins hearings on S. 2376 which provides a revolving fund for a revival of textiles in Japan.

I respectfully call attention to this important measure, now passed the Senate, and urge its speedy adoption by the House.

The meaning of cotton is known well by my constituents and their neighbors in the South, but to far too many people, including many of our national leaders responsible for the well-being of our Nation, the true meaning of cotton is unknown. In the least, for them it is another of those God-given essentials accepted without thought and with indifference.

Unlike those of us who have grown up among cotton, who have worked with it, and whose whole way of life is based upon it, those who see it in the indifferent light cannot comprehend its importance.

True, they wear it, sleep in it, and on it, and even eat many products derived from it. The tires which enable their automobiles to ride smoothly contain cotton fiber, and the stuffed chairs they sit in in comfort are made comfortable by cotton. Great public buildings and great public benefits are paid for fully or in part by taxes growing out of income from growing and sale of cotton, and from the production and sale of textiles.

Cotton is one of the great bases of our national economy. It means comfort and warmth. It means livelihood for millions. All this, and so many never give it a thought.

Take cotton away, and they will think about it. They will think about it, and cry over their great loss. But we cannot take cotton away simply to wake up a Nation to its importance. To be without it would be tragedy. However, we can point out its importance, and point a strong finger to those circumstances and individual acts which tend to take cotton away.

Any individual or any action which will hurt the American cotton industry and those millions whose very way of life is dependent upon it is, in a strong sense, taking cotton away.

Today, as we are attempting to unscramble the mess we call our world—a mess made by the teutonic and oriental aggressors—on the horizon of time appears a menace to American cotton, revival of the Japanese textile industry.

It is a truth that we must restore Japan economically in order to obviate the costly burden we now carry in supporting that nation. It is also true that such restoration of that nation is essential to the peace of the world. However, it is not a truth that we must do all that to the detriment of our own Nation and of our own people.

I cannot at the moment think of a better nor a more effective method of stating the problem than by restating the comments made in the other body when S. 2376 was being debated:

> At the outset the Japanese volume may be relatively insignificant, but when we let down the bars and establish a precedent there is no telling how fast it will grow. Furthermore, Mr. President, if the Japanese demonstrate that they can find American dollars here at the expense of the American market, it will encourage every other impoverished nation in the world to do likewise, and we shall soon reduce our domestic market to a veritable hodge-podge of foreign merchandising throat cutting which will demoralize the nearest, biggest, and best market the American farmer has for his cotton, and the result will be a steady elimination of thousands of jobs of our American textile workers.

Quite often, when the protection of the well-being of our cotton and textile production and markets is being discussed, and ways of devising such protection are put forth, one hears comments about the cotton bloc, the southern bloc, or the special interests, and many other such erroneous labels applied to the champions of cotton.

It is not a question of the cotton bloc wanting, or a case of the special interests wanting. It is not a regional problem, either. It is a national problem in which every man, woman, and child in the United States, whether from South Carolina or Oregon, from Georgia or Maine, has a definite interest. Ruin the prosperity of cotton and you ruin the prosperity of our Nation. Throw thousands of cotton and textile workers out of employment and you throw millions of other Americans out of work and precipitate another depression.

All I am doing here today is calling for foresight and early planning to protect our national economy. It is not hard to realize that if we permit the Japanese textile industry to invade our markets and undersell us in competition, that many more than the farmers growing cotton and the workers producing textiles will suffer. The garment worker in New York will lose his job. Those people engaged in selling and transporting textiles will have to close shop; and the millions of people who sell services and luxuries—the laundrymen, bakers, cab drivers, theater people by the hundreds of thousands—will lose out simply because the unemployed cannot afford a fine standard of living which permits luxuries and services.

No; I repeat, it is not a regional problem. It is not simply the problem of the cotton and textile workers and producers. It is every American's problem.

I have been told I am speaking too early in the game, and I decry that thought. Our worst national characteristic is indifference—refusing to recognize the handwriting on the wall—always doing too little too late. Now, and I mean right now, is the time we should take care of this grave matter. Not 5, 10, or 20 years from now when it ceases to be a national problem and develops into an international catastrophe.

Recently I took part in a discussion on the matter of restoration of Japan's industries and listened to an individual brimming with good will for our enemy. The war was over, he stated, and what was done was done. It was not their fault, really. Circumstance, you know. And now what we should do was make things easy as possible for them to restore their economy, become prosperous, and maybe they would forget the scars our bombs left.

The gentleman who had come to love the Japanese so well took ardent exception to the idea of protecting American markets from invasion by a restored former enemy. He claimed that such thinking was placing selfishness against humanitarianism and consequently was laying the foundation for future conflict.

I disagree completely with such philosophy. It is weak at the seams; the argument will not hold water.

The concept of laying protective ground work now in controlling the reestablishment of the Japanese textile trade is not selfishness versus humanitarianism. It is the application of practical humanitarianism. What is proposed is to restore the Japanese textile industry to alleviate us of the burden of paying the way of our former enemy, but doing it in a manner that will not provide detriment to our own national economy.

Japan should be provided with access to the natural Japanese markets—China, Siam, India, Indochina, Formosa, and others, but should not be permitted to compete with and undersell the American producers in American markets.

I know that to the uninformed this might sound monopolistic, greedy, dictatorial, and unfair. However, it is Japan who has the unfair advantage in the long run, and could successfully beat the American producers in competition, hands down.

The American textile worker's base wage is a dollar or better an hour. The Japanese worker will accept a small fraction of that amount. Consequently, in cost of labor alone the Jap is provided the means of underselling the American.

Coming from the largest textile district in the world and representing cotton-growing and textile-producing constituents, I know they will not accept a reduction in their graceful way of life simply because of fallacious theories concerning this vital matter. They are practical people. I know. I worked in the cotton mills of my district for many years, and I know the textile worker and his family to be as strong as the strongest fibers they produce. They are good Americans. They work hard all their lives, and are proud of the essentials and luxuries they produce. They are proud of their contribution to the good way of life and our high standard of living. They want that standard even higher, better, and more comfortable. They will not be undersold, and they will not condone in their leaders lack of foresight and protective planning. As I said before, they are practical people.

As their Representative and as one of them, by inclination, interest, and duty, and in behalf of each and every one of them—whether cotton-growing farmer, spinner or weaver, investor or owner—I am forced to state that I do not believe our officials who are charged with the responsibility of restoring Japan are aware of the gravity of the textile situation. I agree with the statement made in the other body that—

> Probably the principal reasons for the failure of our governmental agencies to exhaust the normal market resources in the Orient are the inability of any army to convert itself into a skilled, expert merchandising organization; the tendency of a Government department, inexperienced in selling, to seek the easy, simple method of allocating goods to countries rather than selling them to private interests which operate professionally in the field; and possibly the attitude of our allies who have interests in the oriental markets, and who may be reluctant to cooperate with us in the rehabilitation of Japanese industry, which we as lovers of democracy know is absolutely necessary for peace and security of the world.

No; I do not believe those people have either the experience or the capacity to permit the good, protective job to be done. It is heartening to observe the activity of two of my constituents, Dr. William P. Jacobs, president of the American Cotton Manufacturers Association, and Mr. Fred Symmes of my home city Greenville, S. C., who along with Mr. Donald Comer, of Alabama, in their mission to Japan, studied the Japanese textile industry and the problems involved in its restoration. With a lifetime of experience behind them these three gentlemen are well equipped to deal with any phase of the textile problem.

It is even more heartening to read the report resulting from that mission, the recommendations of which if accepted and followed will go a long way toward restoring Japan and at the same time protecting the welfare of our Nation.

Dr. Jacobs' committee recommended a revolving fund from the United States Congress for working capital to purchase American cotton for export to Japan in order to provide them with the raw materials they need for their textile production.

That recommendation is contained in the bill S. 2376 now before Congress, providing a revolving fund of $150,000,000, and its early passage will enable the Japanese to sell their textiles in Oriental and colonial markets which have dried up because of the dollar shortages.

The members of the mission also recommended that General MacArthur add skilled textile salesmen to merchandise Japanese textiles under his direction and in cooperation of the Japanese Board of Trade, the Japanese Spinners Association and the leaders of the Japanese textile industry. Merchandising cotton goods requires resourcefulness, ingenuity, freedom of action and quick decisions, and these textile specialists should be given all the latitude possible in their operations. The American cotton textile industry will help out in this, nominating staff members for this merchandising effort.

American methods are what those people need to become self-sustaining, and our American textile people can show them how, and will be happy to do it. That is practical humanitarianism, not conversation.

I will go the mission one further with a recommendation of my own in this matter. I recommend that this Nation provide a "textile watchdog" to cover the planning and operations which go into the restoration of the Japanese textile industry and marketing.

We, who represent the people most directly concerned with cotton and textiles, must act as watchdogs, nationally. However, our job is so big, we cannot devote the concentration in the foreign field which is mandatory. It is a vast job simply in remaining informed on what is going on over there. We need men in the field not only to assist us in keeping abreast with what is happening, but we need them over there to prevent things from being initiated which must later be knocked down because of the fallacy in the thinking which inspired the initiation. Big oaks from little acorns grow. Likewise bad situations can result from crackpot ideas. We want to avoid such situations by guaranteeing as much as possible that foolish ideas concerning the Japanese textile trade do not grow into situations which will harm us in the years ahead.

Actually, there is no need for conflict to grow out of the current problem of restoration of Japanese textile production. Conflict will be the result of foolish action, now, whereas if thoughtful planning and action are undertaken in these days of restoration, both the Japanese and American industries will flourish along with those who provide them their materials.

Historically, the Japanese industry has largely confined its sales to the Orient in the past and to a few more distant markets where low priced and relatively inferior goods were desired. That historical trade should be resumed and encouraged and both Japan and the United States will profit by it.

The Jap industry will grow alive again and consequently will again be a paying customer for the American cotton grower. However, if short cuts are attempted; if there is an attempt to thrust low-priced, low-grade textiles into the American market, we will all suffer, and a harmful precedent will have been set. That must not happen, and it is the duty of the representatives of the people of the United States to see that it does not happen.

One recommendation of the mission that sales be delayed as far as possible until the European recovery program is under way. With the establishment of the Economic Cooperation Administration, that program is under way, and I feel certain it will offer goodly relief for the Japanese industry and economy.

As reported by the mission, since the European recovery program will increase the number of dollars available in certain European countries for rehabilitation, it is conceivable that some of these countries will directly or indirectly make some of the funds available for clothing of their colonies, and the funds will benefit the Japanese trade.

Another of the recommendations of the mission offers great possibilities not only for its intended purpose—assisting the recovery of the Japanese textile trade—but in several other ways very important to us in the United States.

Presently, our two most important international objectives are developing a lasting peace and remaining strong in the face of any would-be aggressor.

The mission's recommendations, if implemented, will help greatly in the achievement of these two objectives. The mission stated:

> In the past, Japanese salesmen have bought dollar cotton and sold their products into sterling areas successfully by bartering the three-cornered trading. They are asking for the opportunity of returning to the same type of operations today. It would result in profit to themselves and at the same time perform a definite service to American cotton farmers as well as producers of other types of raw materials in the Orient. We recommend, therefore, that the Japanese industry be rehabilitated by buying American cotton for dollars and obtaining the dollars by buying from the Orient and the colonies' raw products which are in short supply in the United States and selling them to the United States for dollars, such raw materials to include jute, tin, rubber, copra, tung oil, wood oil, reptile skins, and other items which are needed in the United States.

Remember that recommendation and apply it to the following information I will offer.

A great component of our national defense program in order to remain as strong as possible to thwart the intent of any aggressor in the future until world

peace is achieved is our national stock pile of strategic and critical materials.

These are materials which are absolutely essential in conducting a war successfully. We do not have them in sufficient supply in our own country, and it is mandatory we import them within our borders in peacetime so we shall have them if ever again we are forced to combat an aggressor against world peace.

If we do not have them within our borders in peacetime, it will mean we will have to transport them over dangerous waters during wartime from sources anywhere from 3 to 10,000 miles—miles fraught with the submarine and air menaces, and at a terrific cost in life, money, and time. In war we always have too little time. Saving the time required in transporting these materials into the country now is good, common sense.

Furthermore, during war, bringing those materials in means building additional ships, which, of course, means diverting precious labor, steel, and other premium materials from other essential war projects.

The tin, rubber, and tung oil mentioned in the mission's recommendation are on the list of materials most vitally required in our national stock pile, and nearly every other material required in the stock pile has great sources within the Japanese sphere of trade. If the Japs barter their products for these materials and sell them in the United States for dollars for purchasing more cotton, they will help our national defense as well as become good customers for the American cotton grower. Such an operation makes sense.

The law which provides for our national stock pile prohibits using the stock pile as a subsidy method so it cannot be integrated into the suggested operation. However, one of the elements which is impeding the growth of our stock pile is the simple fact that the materials it requires are also essential in our peacetime, civilian production and economy. Most of the materials have been in short supply, and the stock-piling agency the Munitions Board, does not compete with the civilian economy for goods which are in short civilian supply.

Because of this lack of availability of strategic and critical materials, our national stock pile is not as big as it should be, and is way out of balance. Making these vital materials available in excess of the quantities needed by our industries will help build our stock pile of strategic and critical materials immeasurably.

The idea of permitting the Japanese to barter their finished textile products in their own trade areas in return for critical raw materials which can be sold for dollars which, in turn, can be used in the purchase of the materials vital to her textile industry has vast possibilities, and everything should be done to make it possible, quickly.

The mission to Japan made up of good representatives of the American cotton and textile enterprises has made some excellent recommendations. These recommendations indicate strongly that the Japanese textile industry can be restored without detriment to our own economy, and they should be followed completely. If this type of thinking and planning is followed, we will avoid precipitation of unhappy events in the future.

As I said earlier, the people of my district—the people of the textile world—have a way of life they have worked hard and long to achieve. They will not accept detriment to that way of life without question. It is our sacred trust to maintain it and to better it.

The harmony they possess is illustrated in the way our textile industry is managed. It is a well run, smoothly efficient element of the national economy. Its labor problems are at a minimum. Its personnel have a good minimum wage, and its methods of production are the most modern and efficient in the world, barring none. Moreover, its products are the best in the world.

These are the elements we are proud of. These are also the elements of honest competition. Americans are not afraid to compete fairly. But they do not want to be undersold or to be forced into cut-throat competition.

To avoid such unhappy competition and threat to a happy mode of life, we must plan for the protective restoration of world trade, and avoid all the foolish theories the inexperienced attempt to sell us. We must be as alert as the good watchdog and, when necessary, bite the would-be invader—whether he be an invader armed with subversive propaganda, armed with a gun, or armed with low-grade and low-priced goods. Such invaders are equally dangerous and, oddly enough, too frequently run together or are synonymous.

I have shown the problem. I have mentioned some of the sensible solutions possible. And I have sounded the warning. All I ask of you here today is to heed that warning and do all you can to avert damage and provide well-being.

I must call on my colleagues in the House and Senate of the United States Congress and the members of the Administration to handle this problem with extreme care and sensibility. It is too important for casual treatment.

Our age is called the atomic age, the age of chain reaction. The problem of restoration of the Japanese industry is the first link in a chain of reaction. If good solutions are developed initially, the reaction will be for the good and well-being of everyone. It can go on bringing happiness, comfort, and prosperity to millions of people the world over.

If a bad solution is developed, the chain of reaction will be bitter and dangerous. It can precipitate an unhappy form of competition, throw people out of work and create depression, or worse. It could be one of the causes for war in the future.

Consequently, as a representative of the people of the biggest textile area in the world, I must call upon—no, I must demand of those responsible for handling the problem to handle it in the manner best in the interest of the American cotton and textile workers and producers. For what is in their best interest is in the best interest of everyone affected.

I sincerely hope that the House Committee on Armed Services will expedite the handling of this matter and will report it to the House as early as possible so as to insure its passage before the end of this session of Congress. I believe the passage of the measure is imperative.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned to meet tomorrow, Tuesday, May 11, 1948, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1531. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal years 1948 and 1949 in the amount of $818,000,000 for foreign-relief assistance (H. Doc. No. 639): to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1532. A letter from the assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the adjustment of royalties and like charges for the use of inventions for the benefit of or by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1533. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 in the amount of $1,000,000 for the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation (H. Doc. No. 640); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1534. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Export-Import Bank of Washington for the year ended June 30, 1947 (H. Doc. No. 641); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1535. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill authorizing the extension of functions and duties of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., to military disciplinary barracks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1536. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the third quarterly report required under the Second Decontrol Act of 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1537. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 1853. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1878). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 2122. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1879). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PLOESER: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 6481. A bill making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1880). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ANDREWS: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 6401. A bill to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1881). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 532. Resolution providing for further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 403; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1882). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 554. Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document and the printing of additional copies of the High Cost of Housing; without amendment (Rept. No. 1883). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 567. Resolution authorizing CHARLES W. VURSELL to review certain papers in the files of the House; without amendment (Rept. No. 1884). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 189. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the Final Report of the Select Committee on Foreign Aid, and authorizing the printing of 5,000 additional copies thereof; with amendments (Rept. No. 1885). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 120. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing as a House document of the pamphlet entitled "Manual Explanatory of the Privileges, Rights, and Benefits Provided for Persons Who Served in Armed Forces of the United States During World War I, World War II, or Peacetime (After April 20, 1898), and Those Dependent Upon Them, With Special Reference to Those Benefits, Rights, and Privileges Administered by the Veterans' Administration"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1886). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 52. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of Senate Report 440, part 6, of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program; without amendment (Rept. No. 1887). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 53. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Report No. 949, entitled "National Aviation Policy"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1888). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 5307. A bill to amend the act of August 7, 1946, so as to authorize the making of grants for hospital facilities, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1890). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BUCK: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 6289. A bill to provide for the voluntary admission and treatment of mental patients at St. Elizabeths Hospital; without amendment (Rept. No. 1891). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HINSHAW: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6407. A bill to encourage the development of an international air-transportation system adapted to the needs of the foreign commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1892). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURKE: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 6030. A bill to authorize the exchange of wildlife refuge lands within the State of Washington; without amendment (Rept. No. 1893). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 6204. A bill to extend to commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey the provisions of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946; without amendment (Rept. No. 1894). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5106. A bill to provide for changes in the time of holding court in certain divisions in the eastern and western districts of South Carolina; with amendments (Rept. No. 1895). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6246. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain Federal lands within the Chopawamsic Park to the Secretary of the Navy, the addition of lands surplus to the Department of the Army to this park, the acquisition of additional lands needed to round out the boundaries of this park, to change the name of said park to Prince William Forest Park, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1896). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 692. An act to authorize a mileage allowance of 7 cents per mile for United States marshals and their deputies for travel on official business; without amendment (Rept. No. 1897). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6412. A bill to codify and enact into law title 3 of the United States Code, entitled "The President"; with amendments (Rept. No. 1898). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McCULLOCH: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5891. A bill to repeal an act approved August 24, 1894, entitled "An act to authorize the purchasers of the property and franchises of the Choctaw Coal & Railway Co. to organize a corporation, and to confer upon the same all the powers, privileges, and franchises vested in that company," and all acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 1899). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Eleventh intermediate report relating to investigation of sale of Parkview Heights; without amendment (Rept. No. 1900). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6482. A bill for the relief of sundry claimants, and for other purposes, without amendment (Rept. No. 1889). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4587. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Harry A. Light (formerly Mrs. Elsie Purvey); without amendment (Rept. No. 1901). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1365. An act for the relief of Lowe Way Yuen and Dang Chee; without amendment (Rept No. 1902). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1483. An act for the relief of Guy Cheng; without amendment (Rept. No. 1903). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1729. An act for the relief of Gudrun Emma Ericsson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1904). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. R. 6481. A bill making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BUCK:

H. R. 6483. A bill to amend 42 United States Code 253 (b) (the Public Health Service Act of July 1, 1944); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 6484. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Dixie reclamation project, Utah and Arizona; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 6485. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain fishery facilities within the State of Washington; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 6486. A bill to provide for the award of decorations to former members of the Army in certain cases; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 6487. A bill providing, in the District of Columbia, for the registration of locksmiths and certain other persons and imposing certain other requirements with respect to the practice and professions of locksmithing and keymaking; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 6488. A bill to prohibit the segregation of persons in the public schools of the District of Columbia on account of race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 6489. A bill to provide for the temporary free importation of lead; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 6490. A bill to authorize grants to the States to assist in the construction of nursing homes for aged persons; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 6491. A bill to provide for the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by farmers for the purpose of soil and water conservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 6492. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in diseases of the heart and circulation, and to aid the States in the development of community programs for the control of these diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 6493. A bill to lower the tariff on imported peanuts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 6494. A bill to provide that personnel of the National Guard of the United States and the Organized Reserve Corps shall have a common Federal appointment or enlistment as reserves of the Army of the United States, to equalize disability benefits applicable to such personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 6495. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code by providing an amortization deduction for plants for the hydrogenation of coal, the synthesis of liquid hydrocarbons from gases produced from coal, or the production of shale oil from oil shale; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 6496. A bill to incorporate the American Standards Association, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. J. Res. 397. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. J. Res. 398. Joint resolution to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. Res. 588. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the study prepared for said committee during the Eightieth Congress, Long-Range Agricultural Policy, a Study of Selected Trends and Factors Relating to the Long-Range Prospect for American Agriculture; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States declaring the existence of a state of emergency in the government of the Virgin Islands of the United States of America due to inability to finance its institutions in their basic functions; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 6482. A bill for the relief of sundry claimants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOMENGEAUX:

H. R. 6497. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent for certain land to Dugas & LeBlanc, Ltd.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 6498. A bill for the relief of certain witnesses at the trial of Harold Christoffel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 6499. A bill for the relief of the Plymouth Manufacturing Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1877. By Mr. BUCK: Petition of Dr. and Mrs. Frank E. Becker, containing 2,999 signatures, including those of 698 residents of Staten Island, N. Y., urging the appropriation by the Congress of sufficient funds for the education and general rehabilitation of the Navajo Indians; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1878. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of missionary group I of the First Baptist Church of Ellwood City, Pa., urging the defeat of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1879. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the United Polish Organizations, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to denouncing communism and further aggression of Soviet Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1880. Also, petition of Mrs. Carrie L. McManus, Sarasota, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1881. Also, petition of Mrs. W. A. Nau Mann, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1882. Also, petition of Townsend Club No. 1, Jacksonville, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1883. Also, petition of Mrs. Margaret Scranton, St. Cloud, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1884. Also, petition of C. W. Inglett, Bradenton, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1885. Also, petition of B. M. Stone, Tampa, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1886. Also, petition of Martin Tall and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1887. Also, petition of the executive secretary, American Association of Social Workers, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to ratification of the Constitution of the World Health Organization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1888. By Mr. PATMAN: Petition of Mrs. William A. Hardin and 26 other members of the Tapp Methodist Church, of New Boston, Tex., protesting against the inclusion of tobacco and American wine as a part of the aid to the peoples of Europe under the European recovery program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1889. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. Betty Wrin and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 11, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, May 10, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, be real to each one of us today, that we may become aware how near Thou art and how practical Thy help may be. Deliver us from going through the motions as though waiting for a catastrophe.

Save us from the inertia of futility.

Revive our spirit of adventuresome faith.

Give us nerve again and zest for living, with courage for the difficulties of peace.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., May 11, 1948.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. HARRY P. CAIN, a Senator from the State of Washington, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

A. H. VANDENBERG,
President pro tempore.

Mr. CAIN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 10, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 10, 1948, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 981. An act for the relief of Carl W. Sundstrom;

S. 1132. An act to amend section 40 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (39 Stat. 728), as amended; and

S. 1630. An act for the relief of Louis L. Williams, Jr.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House

had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6226) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10 to the bill and concurred therein with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 120. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing as a House document of the pamphlet entitled "Manual Explanatory of the Privileges, Rights, and Benefits Provided for Persons Who Served in the Armed Forces of the United States During World War I, World War II, or Peacetime (after April 20, 1898), and Those Dependent Upon Them, With Special Reference to Those Benefits, Rights, and Privileges Administered by the Veterans' Administration"; and

H. Con. Res. 189. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the final report of the Select Committee on Foreign Aid, and authorizing the printing of 5,000 additional copies thereof.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 3998) to provide for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

COUNTING OF ELECTORAL VOTES—EDITORIAL FROM THE HARTFORD COURANT

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on May 5 the Hartford Courant published an extremely interesting editorial entitled "No Electoral College?" which gives an enlightening analysis of Senate Joint Resolution 200, which has recently been reported favorably to the Senate from the Committee on the Judiciary by an overwhelming vote. An identical joint resolution was also reported unanimously by the House Judiciary Committee, and, in view of the committee backing the joint resolution has had, I hope it will be set down for early consideration in the Senate.

For the information of Senators, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Hartford Courant be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"No Electoral College?"

The Senate Judiciary Committee has approved a constitutional amendment that would change the electoral-college system. The amendment was submitted by Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., Massachusetts Republican. It would abolish the present practice of giving the entire electoral vote of each State to the candidates for President and Vice President who win a majority of its popular vote. Instead it would split each State's electoral vote in proportion to the popular vote. An identical bill has been approved by the House Judiciary Committee and is now before the Rules Committee. Thus the long-agitated reform comes a step nearer. But the proposal must survive a floor debate in both Houses, if it gets that far, and by a two-thirds majority, at that. Thereafter it must also be approved by three-quarters of the States.

As most of us recall, the electoral college long since ceased to function as the authors of the Constitution intended. It is now a mere formality, though a cumbersome one. Electors are pledged in advance to one or another of the national tickets. Their job is not to decide on a President, but to report what the people of their States have decided. The reason was well put by an indignant Federalist voter in the election of John Adams in 1796. A supposedly Federalist elector from Pennsylvania, one Samuel Miles, had voted for the opposition candidate, Jefferson. The outraged voter protested: "Do I chuse Samuel Miles to determine for me whether John Adams or Thomas Jefferson shall be President? No, I chuse him to act, not to think."

Under the system by which electors act rather than think, the minority in each State, which in the northern ones might be almost as large as the majority, is disfranchised. This makes it possible to put into the White House a man who did not win a popular majority in the Nation. Exactly that happened in the Hayes-Tilden election of 1876. The fact that this is possible under this constitutional vermiform appendix is one reason behind the long-existing demand for a change.

Of the many formulas proposed, Senator LODGE's is the most likely to succeed. It is a relatively modest change. It keeps the electoral votes of the States, which strike a nice balance between outright popular majorities and the equal authority of the States. The electoral vote of any State equals the number of its Representatives in the House, plus its two Senators. To split the electoral vote, as the Lodge amendment proposes, might reduce the influence of the populous States while increasing that of the one-party States in the South. Again, it might on occasion encourage splinter-party candidacies, thereby weakening the two-party system and tending to throw elections into Congress. Yet it does take us closer to the fundamental of democracy than the anachronistic electoral college, without doing violence to the representative system that makes democracy stable. Therefore it may yet survive the process of constitutional amendment, which was wisely made long and hazardous.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am compelled to be absent on official business from the Senate and from the city for the remainder of the day. I ask consent that I may be so absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. THYE asked and obtained consent to be excused from attendance upon the sessions of the Senate during the remainder of this week and on Monday of next week.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am sure the RECORD will disclose that by unanimous-consent agreement the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] was to retain the floor after the Senate convened today, but after routine business had been taken care of.

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the National Society, Dames of the Loyal Legion of the United States of America, Indianapolis, Ind., favoring the enactment of legislation providing universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the National Society, Dames of the Loyal Legion of the United States of America favoring the enactment of legislation that will enable and encourage the Army, Navy, Air Corps, and Marine Corps to institute, secure, and maintain strong reserve forces in their respective branches; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the National Society, Dames of the Loyal Legion of the United States of America, Indianapolis, Ind, favoring the enactment of legislation prohibiting the exportation of potential war materials to noncooperative nations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the National Society, Dames of the Loyal Legion of the United States of America, Indianapolis, Ind., favoring an adequate merchant-marine fleet commensurate with the needs of the country; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the National Society, Dames of the Loyal Legion of the United States of America, Indianapolis, Ind., relating to communism; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the National Society, Dames of the Loyal Legion of the United States of America, Indianapolis, Ind., protesting against any relaxation or weakening of immigration laws for a period of years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the National Society, Dames of the Loyal Legion of the United States of America, Indianapolis, Ind., favoring the enactment of legislation providing ample funds for the use of the House Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the National Society, Dames of the Loyal Legion of the United States of America, Indianapolis, Ind., relating to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its efficacy in the detection and apprehension of criminals, and so forth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the National Society, Dames of the Loyal Legion of the United States of America, Indianapolis, Ind., urging the President to cleanse public offices of alien and subversive influences, and to require of all public servants unquestioned loyalty to the principles of our republican form of government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the National Society, Dames of the Loyal Legion of the United States of America, Indianapolis, Ind., relating to the term of office of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the National Society, Dames of the Loyal Legion of the United States of America, Indianapolis, Ind., relating to the atomic bomb; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

A resolution adopted by the National Society, Dames of the Loyal Legion of the United States of America, Indianapolis, Ind., relating to foreign influences and ideologies and calling for a strict observance of the rights, privileges, and immunities guaranteed to the separate States and to the people by the Constitution; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the National Society, Dames of the Loyal Legion of the United States of America, Indianapolis, Ind., relating to world cooperation and world government; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the National Society, Dames of the Loyal Legion of the United States of America, Indianapolis, Ind., favoring the enactment of legislation providing assistance to the Republic of China to establish a free and stable government and to counteract the inroads of communism; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the National Society, Dames of the Loyal Legion of the United States of America, Indianapolis, Ind., relating to pan-American relations; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the National Society, Dames of the Loyal Legion of the United States of America, Indianapolis, Ind., urging the Congress to reestablish the principles of the founding fathers in the freedom of the individual from Government controls, and that all education be under State and local controls, and so forth; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the National Society, Dames of the Loyal Legion of the United States of America, Indianapolis, Ind., relating to the effectiveness of the press as a weapon to prevent war and maintain peace; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the National Society, Dames of the Loyal Legion of the United States of America, Indianapolis, Ind., favoring the enactment of legislation providing an adequate air force; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. CORDON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 582. A bill authorizing annual payments to States, Territories, and insular governments, for the benefit of their local political subdivisions, based on the fair value of the national-forest lands situated therein, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1267).

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of George P. Shaw, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Nicaragua, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 2644. A bill to provide for the development of civil transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(Mr. KEM introduced Senate bill 2645, to establish a United States Air Academy, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 2646. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Vermejo reclamation project, New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2647. A bill to create the Board of Postal Rates and Fees in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILEY (by request):

S. 2648. A bill for the relief of Dorrance Ulvin, former certifying officer, and for the relief of Guy F. Allen, former chief disbursing officer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. WHITE (by request) introduced Senate bill 2649, to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2650. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Theodora H. Cowie; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2651. A bill to provide additional compensation to widows and other dependents of certain veterans; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2652. A bill for the relief of Andrew L. Johnson and Charles W. Gunstone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2653. A bill for the purpose of erecting a Federal building at Monroe, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. KILGORE):

S. 2654. A bill to aid in the naturalization of persons with wartime service in the merchant marine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. J. Res. 214. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the International Industrial Exposition, Inc., Atlantic City, N. J., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

UNITED STATES AIR ACADEMY

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for the establishment of a United States Air Academy.

The present importance of the Air Force in our national defense justifies the establishment of an Air Academy. I am told that Secretary Symington has endorsed the idea. It seems clear that it should be established near the center of the United States where it will be comparatively free from enemy attack. Obviously it should not be adjacent to either a large center of population, an important military establishment, or strategic industrial development. The Sedalia location meets these requirements.

The Sedalia Airfield was a large air base during the war. The extensive runways and underground utilities built at great expense are intact. The Lake of the Ozarks is nearby.

Incidentally, the State of Missouri has not a single active air installation in it.

I am hopeful that it will be decided, on careful consideration, that the Air Academy at Sedalia will fit into the scheme of what is best for the security of the country.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2645) to establish a United States Air Academy, introduced by Mr. KEM, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, by request, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes, and I request that there may be included in my remarks now being made a section-by-section analysis and explanation of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the analysis submitted by the Senator from Maine will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2649) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WHITE (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The analysis of the bill presented by Mr. WHITE was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANALYSIS OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE BILL TO AMEND THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, AS AMENDED, TO FURTHER PROMOTE THE DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

SECTION 1

This section amends the first sentence of section 215 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, so as to provide for the exclusion from the price to be paid by the Commission for any vessel to be acquired under such section of the cost of "(i) any features incorporated in the vessel for national defense uses, including, but not limited to, excess speed and any other features which were deemed necessary or proper by the Navy Department, and (ii) any features incorporated in the vessel in compliance with the laws or regulations of the United States and which were not required by foreign nations to be incorporated in vessels of a similar type, and (iii) any quarters for crew members in excess of quarters required in a foreign vessel of similar type for similar service," which were paid for by the Commission.

Section 215 presently provides for exclusion of "the cost of national defense features paid by the Commission."

The amendment is necessitated by amendments to section 502 (b), 504, and 509 of the act by sections 4, 8, and 9 of this resolution providing for payment by the Commission of the cost of such features and quarters when incorporated in vessels constructed under the provisions of such sections.

SECTION 2

This section amends section 301 of the act by repealing subsection (a) authorizing the Commission to establish minimum manning scales, minimum wage scales, and minimum working conditions for officers and crews employed on vessels receiving an operating-differential subsidy, and by striking out "(b)" appearing before the subsection.

SECTION 3

This section amends section 501 (c) of the act by adding a provision that the owner of

any reconstructed or reconditioned vessel may have the life expectancy of such vessel recomputed by the United States Coast Guard as of the date of completion of such reconstruction or reconditioning, and use such life expectancy in determining an allowance for depreciation for the purpose of Federal taxes.

Section 501 (c) presently provides for the granting of financial aid in connection with the reconstruction or reconditioning of vessels but does not contain a provision similar to that contained in section 3 of the resolution.

SECTION 4

This section amends section 502 (b) of the act so as to provide (1) that the cost of the features and quarters referred to in section 1 of this resolution shall be excluded from the construction cost of a vessel with respect to which a construction-differential subsidy is paid under such section, and (2) that for any vessel contracted for during the period between July 1, 1948, and July 1, 1951, the construction-differential to be granted by the Commission shall be 50 percent of the construction cost of the vessel paid for by the Commission, excluding the cost of the items referred to above.

Section 502 (b) presently provides exclusion of "the cost of national defense features" from the "construction cost of the vessel paid for by the Commission."

Section 502 (b) also presently provides that the construction-differential subsidy paid by the Commission may equal, but not exceed, the excess of the bid of the shipbuilder constructing the proposed vessel, over the fair and reasonable estimate of cost, as determined by the Commission, of the construction of the proposed vessel in a foreign shipbuilding center deemed by the Commission to be representative for cost purposes. The section further provides that the construction differential approved by the Commission may not exceed 33⅓ percent of the construction cost of the vessel paid for by the Commission, except that a construction differential of 50 percent may be granted under certain circumstances by an affirmative vote of four members of the Commission.

SECTION 5

This section amends section 502 (c) so as to provide (1) that interest at the rate of 2¼ percent per annum shall be paid on those portions of the Commission's payments made to the shipbuilder which are chargeable to the purchase price of a vessel under a purchase contract executed on or after July 1, 1948, and (2) that interest at such a rate shall be paid on unpaid installments on the purchase price under a contract executed on or after such date.

Section 502 (c) presently provides for the payment of interest at the rate of 3½ percent per annum on such payments and installments.

SECTION 6

This section amends section 502 (g) of the act so as to provide for exclusion of the cost of the features and quarters referred to in section 1 of this resolution from the price of any vessel sold by the Commission under such section if such features or quarters were added by the Commission subsequent to its acquisition of the vessel under section 215 of the act.

Section 502 (g) presently provides for exclusion of "the cost of national defense features added by the Commission."

SECTION 7

This section amends section 503 of the act by adding a proviso to the third sentence providing that notwfthstanding any other provisions of law, the payment of sums due under a purchase contract for a passenger vessel with respect to which a construction-differential subsidy has been paid shall be secured only by a first preferred mortgage on the vessel, and the obligation of the purchaser shall be discharged by surrender of the vessel, and all right, title, and interest thereon, to the Commission. The proviso further provides that the sole recourse against the purchaser shall be limited to repossession of the vessel by the seller.

Section 503 presently provides that the purchaser of any vessel with respect to which a construction-differential subsidy has been allowed shall execute and deliver a first preferred mortgage to the United States to secure the payment of any sums due with respect to such vessel.

SECTION 8

This section amends section 504 of the act so as to provide (1) that the cost of the features and quarters referred to in section 1 of this resolution shall be paid for by the Commission where an applicant finances the construction of a vessel with respect to which a construction-differential subsidy is allowed rather than purchasing it from the Commission, and (2) that payments for such features and quarters shall be based on mutual agreement between the parties, or, failing of agreement, on the lowest responsible domestic bid.

Section 504 presently provides that the Commission shall pay for "the cost of national defense features, and that payments for such features shall be based on the lowest responsible domestic bid.

SECTION 9

This section amends section 509 of the act so as to provide that the purchaser of a vessel from the Commission under such section, with respect to which a construction-differential subsidy is not allowed, shall (1) have the cost of the features and quarters referred to in section 1 of this resolution paid for by the Commission, (2) pay interest on installments on the purchase price at the rate of 2¼ percent per annum under a contract executed on or after July 1, 1948, and (3) have its obligation for the balance of the purchase price of a passenger vessel limited in the same manner as the purchaser of a passenger vessel under section 503 of the act, as amended by section 7 of this resolution.

Section 509 presently provides that the Commission shall pay for the cost of national defense features, and that the purchaser of such a vessel shall (1) pay interest on installments on the balance of the purchase price at the rate of 3½ percent per annum, and (2) secure such balance by a preferred mortgage on the vessel and otherwise as the Commission may determine.

SECTION 10

This section amends section 510 (a) of the act so as to provide that the term "obsolete vessel" as defined therein shall include a vessel which is not less than 12 years old.

Section 510 (a) presently provides that a vessel must be not less than 17 years old in order to be included in the definition of an "obsolete vessel."

SECTION 11

This section amends section 510 (d) so as to provide that the allowance for an obsolete vessel acquired by the Commission under the provisions of section 510 shall be the market value thereof for operation in the world trade or in the foreign or domestic trade of the United States.

Section 510 (d) presently provides that the allowance for an obsolete vessel shall be its fair and reasonable value as determined by the Commission, and that in making such determination the Commission shall consider, in addition to the market value of the vessel for operation in the world trade or in the foreign or domestic trade of the United States, the scrap value of the vessel, both in American and in foreign markets, and the depreciated value based on a 20-year life.

SECTION 12

This section amends section 601 of the act by adding a subsection (c) authorizing and directing the Commission (1) to consider, and to approve if satisfactory, the application of any citizen of the United States for fiancial aid in the operation of one or more passenger vessels over an essential trade route in the foreign commerce of the United States, and (2) to enter into separate operating-differential subsidy contracts for the operation of such vessel or vessels without regard to whether the applicant already holds an operating-differential subsidy contract or contracts covering similar or other services over the same or other routes.

Section 601 (a) authorizes and directs the Commission to consider the application of any citizen of the United States for financial aid in the operation of a vessel or vessels which are to be used in an essential service in the foreign commerce of the United States.

SECTION 13

This section amends section 603 (b) of the act so as to provide that increases in costs in subsidizable items of expenses which are necessitated by incorporation of the features and quarters referred to in section 1 of this resolution shall be deducted from the estimated fair and reasonable costs of competitive foreign vessels before the operating-differential subsidy is determined.

Section 603 (b) presently provides for the deduction of increases in costs necessitated by the incorporation of "national defense features" in the vessels.

SECTION 14

This section amends section 603 (c) of the act by striking out the requirement that no operating-differential subsidy shall be paid until the contractor furnishes evidence satisfactory to the Commission that the minimum wages prescribed by section 301 (a) of the act, which is repealed by section 2 of this resolution, have been paid.

The section also authorizes the Commission to modify existing operating-differential subsidy contracts to conform to the amendment.

SECTION 15

This section amends section 605 (b) of the act so as to provide that the provisions of the subsection shall not preclude the payment of an operating-differential subsidy with respect to a vessel whose life expectancy has been extended as provided in section 501 (c) of the act.

Section 605 (b) presently provides that no operating-differential subsidy shall be paid for the operation of a vessel that is more than 20 years of age unless the Commission finds that it is in the public interest to grant such financial aid and enters a formal order thereon, and includes a report of each such action in its annual report.

SECTION 16

This section amends section 607 (b) of the act so as to provide that for the purpose of deposits in the capital reserve fund, depreciation charges on subsidized vessels whose life expectance has been extended as provided in section 501 (c) of the act shall be computed on the life as so extended.

Section 607 (b) presently provides for the computation of such charges on a 20-year life expectance of the subsidized vessels.

SECTION 17

This section amends section 611 (a) of the act so as to provide that if the United States (1) prevents the operation of the subsidized vessels on the routes set forth in the operating-differential subsidy contract, or (2) defaults upon such contract by failing to make subsidy payments within a reasonable time, or by any other act or omission, or (3) cancels such contract without just cause, the contractor may, in addition to any other

rights which it has (a) transfer the vessels to the Commission and receive therefor an amount equal to their cost to the contractor, less depreciation, plus depreciated costs of capital improvements thereon, or (b) transfer such vessels to foreign registry upon compliance with the provisions of the section, or (c) enter into a mutually satisfactory agreement for interim employment or lay-up of such vessels. The section authorizes the Commission to enter into an agreement for the interim employment or lay-up of the vessels, and to make such financial arrangements for payments to the contractor as the Commission finds fair and reasonable.

Section 611 (a) presently provides that in the event that the United States defaults upon or cancels such a contract without just cause, the contractor may transfer the vessels to foreign registry upon compliance with the provisions of section 611.

SECTION 18

This section amends section 611 (b) of the act by (1) designating the subsection as "(c)," and (2) inserting a subsection designated "(b)" reading the same as the last sentence of the present subsection (a) of section 611.

SECTION 19

This section amends section 611 (c) of the act by designating the subsection as "(d)" instead of "(c)."

SECTION 20

This section amends section 905 of the act, which defines terms used in the act, by defining the term "passenger vessel" when used in sections 503, 509, and 601 (c), as amended by this resolution, as "any vessel of not less than thirty-five hundred gross tons documented under the laws of the United States having accommodations for 100 or more passengers."

SECTION 21

This section amends paragraph (1) of section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, by adding a proviso prohibiting the Commission from approving tariffs or allowing the quotation or assessment of rates and charges by any carrier by railroad or motor carrier subject to the provisions of such act which are discriminatory as to traffic susceptible of competitive water transportation which are not in and of themselves compensatory to the land transportation system as compared with other land rates after bearing a full share of all the appropriate overhead and other costs of the land transportation system.

Paragraph (1) of section 4 of the act presently makes it unlawful for any common carrier subject to part 1 (rail) or part III (water) of such act to charge or receive any greater compensation in the aggregate for the transportation of passengers or property for a shorter than for a longer distance over the same line or route in the same direction, or to charge any greater compensation as a through rate than the aggregate of the intermediate rates, but authorizes the Commission to relieve the common carrier from the provisions of the section under certain circumstances.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. JENNER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 233), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures authorized under Senate Resolution 54, Eightieth Congress, agreed to January 17, 1947 (authorizing the expenditure of funds and the employment of assistants by the Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by subsection (o) (1) (D) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, as increased by Senate Resolution 114, Eightieth Congress, agreed to May 21, 1947, and Senate Resolution 142, Eightieth Congress, agreed to July 23, 1947, is hereby further increased by $100,000.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS TO PINELLAS COUNTY, FLA.—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. PEPPER) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 2496) to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described, which were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

RIGHTS, ETC., OF VETERANS UNDER VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION—PRINTING OF HOUSE DOCUMENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 120, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, within 90 days after adjournment of the second session of the Eightieth Congress, the pamphlet entitled "Manual Explanatory of the Privileges, Rights, and Benefits Provided for Persons Who Served in the Armed Forces of the United States During World War I, World War II, or Peacetime (After April 20, 1898), and Those Dependent Upon Them, With Special Reference to Those Benefits, Rights, and Privileges Administered by the Veterans' Administration" (H. Doc. 772, 79th Cong., 2d sess.) be revised and printed as a House document, and that 91,300 additional copies shall be printed, of which 66,300 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, 20,000 for the use of the Senate, 2,000 for the use of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives, 2,000 for the House document room, and 1,000 for the Senate document room.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

PRINTING OF FINAL REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AID

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 189, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 6,500 copies of the Final Report of the Select Committee on Foreign Aid (H. Rept. No. 1845), of which 3,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, 2,000 copies shall be for the use of the Select Committee on Foreign Aid, 500 copies for the use of the Senate document room, and 1,000 copies for the use of the House document room.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

MEETING OF COMMITTEES DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained permission for a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to hold hearings this afternoon on pending aviation legislation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Export Subcommittee of the Small Business Committee, the chairman of which is the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] be permitted to hold hearings this afternoon during the session of the Senate, beginning at 2 o'clock. The subcommittee is investigating the export license procedure of the Department of Commerce.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request is granted.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I desire to obtain the consent of the Senate for a subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to conduct a hearing this afternoon for railway employees interested in Senate bill 1635.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained permission for the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to sit for a short time beginning at 2:30 o'clock today.

Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained permission for the Subcommittee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Appropriations Committee to meet this afternoon.

OBERLIN COLLEGE MOCK CONVENTION—KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY SENATOR SMITH

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a keynote address delivered by Senator SMITH before the Oberlin College mock convention on May 7, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CHAVEZ

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on racial discrimination delivered by Senator CHAVEZ before the Long Beach Forum, Long Beach, N. Y., May 9, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN AND EDITORIAL COMMENTS

[Mr. WILLIAMS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the Taft-Hartley law delivered by Senator MARTIN before the annual convention of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, in Pittsburgh, May 3, 1948, together with editorial comments on the address, which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR IVES BEFORE THE 1948 OBERLIN MOCK CONVENTION

[Mr. SMITH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator IVES before the 1948 Oberlin mock convention at Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio, May 8, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE HOUSING BILL—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WATKINS

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address relative to the Taft-Ellender-Wagner

bill, delivered by him on May 4, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONDITIONS IN PALESTINE

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Sumner Welles relating to Palestine, and an open letter on the same subject addressed to the President signed by sundry individuals, both from the Washington Post of May 11, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR GREAT AMERICAN HERITAGE: LIBERTY—ESSAY BY CHARLES D. MATTHEWS IV

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an essay on the subject Our Great American Heritage: Liberty, written by Charles Davis Matthews IV, and awarded first prize by the American Legion Auxiliary of Missouri for the best essay on Americanism, which appears in the Appendix.]

CALIFORNIA'S VETERAN LAWS

[Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a résumé of veterans' legislation enacted by the State of California, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOUTHERN STATES COMPACT ON REGIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, apparently the routine business has been completed. May I now ask the present occupant of the chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business and also the unanimous-consent agreement that was ordered at the conclusion of the session of the Senate yesterday?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, and under the unanimous-consent order of the Senate yesterday the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is entitled to the floor.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 334) giving the consent of Congress to the compact on regional education entered into between the Southern States at Tallahassee, Fla., on February 8, 1948.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I proceed with my speech proper I think I should offer my apology to the acting majority leader for not being here at the hour of 12, but I have just come from a meeting of the Armed Services Committee, at which it was hoped that a vote might be taken on the armed services bill pending before the committee. There was some delay, and it was impossible to complete discussion of the bill, and thus my failure to reach the floor of the Senate promptly at 12.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senate has just concluded routine business anyway; the Senator was on time, and there was no delay.

Mr. MORSE. I want no misunderstanding of any failure of my vote to be registered with the Armed Services Committee in case the vote occurs in committee while I am speaking here in the Senate. I want the RECORD to show that I have made the request that I be allowed to make my final decision on that armed services bill later this afternoon after the final amendments have been offered in committee. If a vote should come in the Armed Services Committee while I am speaking, I do not want the fact that I am not recorded to be interpreted that I am either for or against the bill. I will vote on that bill, however, before the afternoon is over. It is my present intention to vote to report the bill to the Senate with the distinct understanding that I am in favor of some modifications in the bill. However, I think we must report the bill to the floor and rewrite parts of it on the floor of the Senate. In its present form it has so many compromises in it that it has become a hybrid and a hodgepodge.

Mr. President, I return to a discussion of the issues involved in the proposed compact. I prefer to proceed without interruption until I close my main argument on the legal points involved and then I shall be perfectly willing to subject myself to cross-examination on any point I raise. I shall endeavor to make any reasonable exception to that request if any Senator really feels that he should interrupt me with a question. I want to be perfectly fair and accommodating about it but I believe that my point of view on the law will be better understood by the Senate if you first hear me through on this legal argument.

Mr. President, this speech in the first instance is directed to the proposition whether or not Congress has the power in giving its consent to this interstate compact for regional education to impose a condition that there shall be no racial segregation in the facilities established pursuant to the compact. It is clear that there are areas of interstate compact agreement where the States must have, express or implied, prior or subsequent, the consent of Congress in order to make the compacts binding and operative.

It was pointed out by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] yesterday that, as I recall, more than 100 compacts have been approved by the Congress of the United States, and those compacts have, we shall assume at least until the contrary is shown, fallen under the rule which I have just mentioned. As the Senator from Kentucky made clear, most of those compacts either pertained to rivers, or to boundaries, or to subject matters which clearly fall within the rules of the famous Tennessee case in 148 United States which I shall discuss momentarily. However in my examination of such of those compacts as I have been able thus far in my research on this issue to examine, I have not found a single precedent within them which meets on all fours the precedent which would be established by the pending compact if the Congress approves it. In other words, I agree with the Senator from Kentucky, if I understand his argument correctly, that the fact that Congress has approved some 100 compacts throughout our history does not establish at all that there is any precedent for the pending compact.

I respectfully ask the proponents of this compact to present during the course of the debate some compacts which on the facts involved can be squared with the theory which they advance in support of this compact on regional education. I think it is a fair request, and I think it is a request which must be met in order to comply with certain language in the Tennessee case which I shall set forth later in my argument.

Thus I say, Mr. President, there are likewise areas of interstate compact agreement where the States do not need the consent of Congress in order to make the compacts to be operative and binding. We are not here concerned with the question whether this compact falls within the first or second category. For the purposes of this part of my speech, let us assume this proposed compact is one requiring Congressional assent.

Let me make clear that later on in the speech I shall come back to the point I made last Thursday, which I made again in my speech yesterday afternoon, and which the Senator from Kentucky so brilliantly set forth in his speech, namely, that congressional approval of this compact is not necessary for the Southern States to accomplish the end they have in mind so far as joint support of regional schools is concerned. I shall point out that the counsel for the governors who entered into this compact so advised them before the compact was ever entered into. In other words, the counsel for the governors themselves agreed with the point the Senator from Kentucky made in his able speech yesterday afternoon, and agreed with the proposition I laid down in the first speech I made on this compact last Thursday, that congressional approval of this compact is not necessary.

If that be true, Mr. President, and I may say that I am completely satisfied that as a legal proposition it is true, then I do not think this compact should be pressed upon the Senate of the United States for approval at this time. I submit, therefore, that the proper disposal of this subject matter is by way of a motion to recommit the pending joint resolution to the Committee on the Judiciary for further consideration of the proposition whether or not it is necessary as a matter of law for the Congress of the United States to approve this compact.

I am satisfied—and I dwell a moment longer on this point, Mr. President, that a thorough analysis of that legal proposition will lead the Members of the Senate of the United States to the conclusion that the approval of the Congress of the United States to this compact is not necessary in order to put its objectives into operation; and if such approval is not necessary, then I think it is a mistake to seek to push this compact through the Senate. Therefore, I believe that the appropriate motion is one to recommit. Subject to change of opinion later on as the debate progresses, I announce now that it is my present tentative purpose and intention to make such a motion at the appropriate and proper time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me ask a question so as to clarify a point in my mind.

Do I understand it to be the position of the junior Senator from Oregon that, regardless of the court decisions on the issues involved here as they apply to individual States, they do not apply to a region embracing a number of States?

Mr. MORSE. Let me clarify my position.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not hear the entire argument of the Senator yesterday, and I want to have that point clear in my mind, because there are State decisions on the question of segregation.

Mr. MORSE. I shall summarize my position on that point in this way: It was my position last Thursday, reaffirmed by me again yesterday, and brilliantly set forth yesterday by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] in his able speech, that the compact we are dealing with does not require congressional approval.

Second, I take the position that if we assume that congressional approval is necessary—and I say that is an erroneous assumption, but for the sake of argument let us assume that it is a sound assumption—then we are faced with the proposition of establishing a Federal policy on a regional level, not on a State level, and we are then beyond the decisions of the Supreme Court in respect to States and State prerogatives over education within the boundaries of States. We are dealing then with education on a regional level, which raises a Federal issue if the assumption of the provisions of this compact is a correct one.

Mr. WHERRY. On which there are no precedents.

Mr. MORSE. I know of no precedent on the nose, as we say in the law. I know of no precedent on all-fours with the precedent which the proponents of this compact would seek to establish by this compact. I say that when we start dealing with educational problems on a regional level we are above the State level, and that calls then for the establishment by the Congress of a Federal policy and the making of a Federal precedent. I do not think the Congress of the United States should lay down a Federal issue involved if we assume that segregation in higher education in this country on a regional level. That is the Federal issue involved if we assume that this compact requires congressional approval. That is why I keep saying in this debate that we must face the question of Federal policy as to civil rights if we are called upon as a Congress to approve this compact.

Mr. WHERRY. It involves all 48 States.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct. If we can do it for 15 States, we can do it for 25. If we add 10 more we have 35. If we add 10 more we have 45. Eventually through compacts we would gradually have Federal domination of education.

I wish I could agree to the argument that in the discussion of this compact we are not in fact dealing with a major civil rights issue. But I want to say to my good friend from Nebraska that I cannot see it that way. I do not think we can deal with the regional problem without running into the whole question of civil rights as those rights relate to a Federal policy under the Constitution in connection with regional education once we are asked for congressional approval of a compact.

Let me read from *Virginia* v. *Tennessee*, in 148 United States 503, at page 518. The Court said in that case:

> There are many matters upon which different States may agree that can in no respect concern the United States. If, for instance, Virginia should come into possession and ownership of a small parcel of land in New York which the latter State might desire to acquire as a site for a public building, it would hardly be deemed essential for the latter State to obtain the consent of Congress before it could make a valid agreement with Virginia for the purchase of the land. If Massachusetts, in forwarding its exhibits to the World's Fair at Chicago, should desire to transport them a part of the distance over the Erie Canal, it would hardly be deemed essential for that State to obtain the consent of Congress before it could contract with New York for the transportation of the exhibits through that State in that way. If the borderline of the two States should cross some malarious and disease-producing district, there could be no possible reason, on any conceivable public grounds, to obtain the consent of Congress for the bordering States to agree to unite in draining the district, and thus removing the cause of disease. So in case of threatened invasion of cholera, plague, or other causes of sickness and death, it would be the height of absurdity to hold that the threatened States could not unite in providing means to prevent and repel the invasion of the pestilence, without obtaining the consent of Congress, which might not be at the time in session. If, then, the terms "compact" or "agreement" in the Constitution do not apply to every possible compact or agreement between one State and another, for the validity of which the consent of Congress must be obtained, to what compacts or agreements does the Constitution apply?

I think this should be the guiding principle which ought to govern us in our thinking on this particular case. Let me repeat the rhetorical question which the Court put to itself:

> If, then, the terms "compact" or "agreement" in the Constitution do not apply to every possible compact or agreement between one State and another, for the validity of which the consent of Congress must be obtained, to what compacts or agreements does the Constitution apply? We can only reply by looking at the object of the constitutional provision, and construing the terms "agreement" and "compact" by reference to it. It is a familiar rule in the construction of terms to apply to them the meaning naturally attaching to them from their context.

The Court continues in the next paragraph:

> Looking at the clause in which the terms "compact" or "agreement" appear, it is evident that the prohibition is directed to the formation of any combination tending to the increase of political power in the States, which may encroach upon or interfere with the just supremacy of the United States.

Taking those principles and applying them to the facts of this compact, I see nothing in the facts which led to the formulation of the compact which requires congressional sanction. If Tennessee, Georgia, Louisiana, and the other southern States involved in the compact proceed to use their funds to support schools wherever they want to support them, that is their business, not ours. That is up to them, not to us as a Congress. If Louisiana, Tennessee, Georgia, Florida, and the other States want to support Meharry College, that is their business, not ours.

As I stated yesterday, the Meharry issue is irrelevant and immaterial to this whole debate. I shall not permit myself to be put in the position in this debate of seeming to be against support for Meharry. I think Meharry is a valuable institution. I think it should be supported. My own personal opinion is that it should be supported by the great State of Tennessee, because it is a great credit to that State. It is one of the fine institutions of the great State of Tennessee, and that State should support it. But I do not believe that the proponents of this compact have any right to come before us and say that we ought to support this compact because unless we support it the chances of Meharry receiving any financial support from the Southern States or from some educational foundation is remote. That is their theory, as I understand. In my opinion, Meharry has nothing to do with the issue before the Senate in connection with this compact. We must determine the question of whether or not the Constitution requires congressional approval of this type of compact. I think that it does not.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator for restating his position. I was unable to hear all of his argument yesterday. As I understand, the junior Senator from Oregon and the junior Senator from Kentucky are in absolute agreement relative to one issue, and that is that it is unnecessary to have Federal sanction in order to fulfill the purposes for which Meharry will be reestablished. That is, it is unnecessary to obtain Federal sanction to do the very thing which is intended to be done by this compact.

Mr. MORSE. That is my theory. That is the basic theory of the great speech which the Senator from Kentucky made yesterday, with which I am in complete agreement.

Mr. WHERRY. Then we find ourselves in this position: If Federal sanction is asked for this compact on a regional basis, then, of course, all 48 States are involved.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct, in that we would be laying down a Federal policy permitting of segregation in regional schools.

Mr. WHERRY. So we are then confronted not merely with a compact for this particular region in the South, but in sanctioning that compact we are in reality sanctioning whatever is involved in every State of the Union.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator has stated my position correctly. Let me add for purposes of emphasis that, if we assume the premise from which the proponents of the compact are arguing, that congressional sanction is necessary to put this compact into effect, then, in my opinion, they cannot escape a full discussion of what the Federal policy ought to be in connection with any question of

civil rights on a regional basis raised by the compact.

To put it another way, they cannot then escape the fact that we are confronted with the question as to whether or not we, the Congress of the United States, in 1948 should sanction segregation in institutions of higher learning operating as regional schools with the blessings of Congress granted through approval of this compact.

Mr. WHERRY. The basis for the statement made by the distinguished Senator that he might make a motion to send the compact back to the committee is the fact, first, that it is unnecessary to have this compact at all.

Mr. MORSE. In view of the argument which has already developed on the floor of the Senate on this legal point I believe that the Judiciary Committee ought to take it back, study it further, and then decide whether or not it wishes to report the compact to the Senate again.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. President, I am interested in the Senator's discussion of one phase of the compact. As I have understood what the Senator from Oregon has said, it is that if the Congress gives consent to this compact, it thereby will involve a regional arrangement, and that anything included within the compact and receiving consent will automatically be approved as a national policy, thus resulting in having the regional arrangement become a national policy.

Frankly, I have not given consideration to the legal questions which are raised, but I am wondering whether that is the logical conclusion, or whether as a matter of fact whenever two or more States enter into a compact, which of course is a regional arrangement, a national policy is not involved. I wish to ask the Senator from Oregon if it is not true that in our western States we have had many compacts relating to the division of the waters of streams and rivers. In those States we have established a doctrine of the use of waters, which commonly is referred to as prior appropriation and application to beneficial use. That is not a national policy. There are other provisions of law which involve the use of waters. The water laws of the western States do not prevail generally throughout the United States.

So could it be said that because the Congress of the United States consents to those compacts and those regional arrangements which are made for the use of water, the Congress thereby has established a national policy in that respect? That thought came to my mind during the Senator's argument.

I wish to add that I am interested because the question is an important one, namely, that if the Congress by consenting to a compact among the States thereby ratifies the agreement, whatever it may be, it becomes a national policy.

Mr. MORSE. I am very glad to have the Senator's contribution. However, I think that there is a clear distinction between the type of case the Senator has cited and the type of compact which raises a civil rights issue, because in a compact which affects the rivers of the West, for example, we are dealing only with a question of local property law. In this case the compact in my opinion raises a question of civil rights under the Constitution itself; and when we approve this compact on a regional level, then I think we shall have sanctioned what I, at least, consider to be an invasion of a citizen's civil rights under the Constitution. I think the Senator will agree with me, or at least I shall ask him to hear me through on that point as I go into it, that the stamp of approval or the sanction by the Federal Government of such a diminution of civil rights will, as I think, have a great effect on future civil-rights litigation, and I do not wish to see a precedent of that kind established by this compact.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Then I judge that on that point the Senator thinks—perhaps I misunderstood him before—that in effect and in reality it is not the establishment of a national policy, but it amounts to giving sanction or approval to a policy which may have been established in the region.

Mr. MORSE. I think that is true; but I believe it does establish a precedent for a national policy in the field of civil rights, which is quite a different thing from approving a compact entered into by way of agreement between States as to how they will distribute their water and use the water from rivers which run through two or more States. There is no invasion of anyone's Federal rights under such a compact. However, in this instance, I think that the approval of this compact would affect the Federal rights of all citizens to be protected from the establishment of segregation as a Federal policy even on a regional level.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. With reference to the point which has just been raised by the Senator from Oregon, I wish to state that the very question he is discussing was raised and discussed and briefed in the committee before the report of the committee was made. As stated yesterday by the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the subcommittee which heard the matter consisted of the Senator from Wisconsin, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, who, himself, ought to be reasonably well informed and reasonably able to form a sound conclusion in this or any other legal field, and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], who formerly served, as the Senator from Oregon knows, as Solicitor General of the United States. I point out to the Senator from Oregon that in the opinion of that subcommittee, and based on a research which I suspect has not been possible, under the limitations of time, either to the Senator from Oregon or to the Senator from Kentucky, exactly the opposite conclusions from those now stated by the Senator from Oregon were reached by the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Rhode Island, and were later announced by action of the full Committee on the Judiciary.

I should like also to ask a question of the Senator from Oregon. Has he thought of the fact that the absence of a precedent—and in his argument he has stated that he has been unable to find a precedent on this subject that is on all fours with the question presented here—would, ordinarily, and in the cautious practice of the profession which both he and I have tried humbly to serve, be a good reason for bringing this compact to the Congress for approval, and especially so when added to the other reasons which in the judgment of the junior Senator from Florida offer ample reasons for believing that this matter should necessarily be submitted to the Congress for its consideration and consent? In other words, has the Senator from Oregon given thought to the fact that the absence of a precedent on all fours, which he has referred to, is an additional argument and a good sound argument for the submission of this compact to the Congress for its consent?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall take up the Senator's second question first. Knowing that the Senator from Florida is an exceedingly able lawyer, I am sure he will agree with me that when we are preparing a case on a set of facts and we cannot find any precedent which supports our legal theory regarding the case, we are inclined to say, "The going on this case is rather tough, and we are not in as strong a position as we would like to be, or as strong a position as we would be in if we had some good precedents on which we could support the theory under which we are trying the case."

It is quite true that the fact that at least up until this moment of the debate no precedent on all fours has been advanced in support of this compact, does raise the point, it seems to me, that by this compact we are plowing new legal ground. We are establishing an original precedent, and thus there is all the more reason, I think, why we should consider it very carefully, forward and backward, and be sure that in effect the new law which we shall establish by this new precedent is sound from the standpoint of national policy. Of course, I am never opposed to creating new law if the public interest demands that new law be created, but I like to have at least some historical precedent to go on, if I can find one. I say I have not been able to find one on all fours with this proposal. The very fact that we are plowing new ground by this compact, I think, deserves further consideration by the Judiciary Committee than it has received.

That leads me to the Senator's second question. Yes, I read the hearings. I am satisfied that the problem as to whether or not congressional approval of the compact is necessary was considered. But let me say, with exceeding respect to the subcommittee and to the Judiciary Committee that after reading their hearings I came to the conclusion they had not given sufficiently thorough consideration to that legal problem. I do not think that the members of the Judiciary Committee have given this matter

the careful consideration which it deserves. Irrespective of any question I have raised, I think the argument presented by the Senator from Kentucky yesterday in itself justifies a vote in support of a motion to recommit the compact to the committee.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I have read the record of the hearings held on the resolution, and I believe that only two witnesses testified concerning the necessity of approval by Congress. One witness was the chief proponent of the compact, the distinguished Governor of Florida, Governor Caldwell. The other was Mr. Thurgood Marshall, who appeared as special counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Mr. President, an examination of the record will disclose that the Governor of Florida himself said that he did not believe this compact required approval by Congress. His argument for approval seems to have been one of policy. An argument was made by Mr. Marshall that the compact does not require approvel. He cited some of the cases which the able Senator from Oregon is now citing.

I would like to suggest that the restrictions against the State set out in article I, section 10, of the Constitution are restrictions in chief against the exercise by States of Federal powers. If we apply the legal doctrine of association of terms in the interpretation of this section of the Constitution, the argument is strengthened that the kind of compact which requires approval is a compact which invades Federal powers.

I shall not interrupt the argument further except to point out those subjects of section 10 of article I of the Constitution which are chiefly subjects of Federal power. Section 10 reads as follows:

> No State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation; grant letters of marque and reprisal; coin money; emit bills of credit; make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts—

These matters are functions of the Federal Government. Continuing, section 10 recites—

> pass any bill of attainder, ex post facto law, or law impairing the obligation of contracts, or grant any title of nobility.

These are restrictions imposed by the Federal Government.

> No State shall, without the consent of the Congress, lay any imposts or duties on imports or exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspection laws; and the net produce of all duties and imposts laid by any State on imports or exports shall be for the use of the Treasury of the United States, and all such laws shall be subject to the revision and control of the Congress.
>
> No State shall, without the consent of the Congress, lay any duty of tonnage, keep troops or ships of war in time of peace; enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power, or engage in war, unless actually invaded or in such imminent danger as will not admit of delay.

These matters are within the power of the Federal Government, and section 10 forbids their invasion by the States. It follows, Mr. President, that the agreements and compacts mentioned must be agreements or compacts invading the power of the Federal Government. I say again it is unfortunate that the States which are parties to this compact, which assert always, and rightly so, their freedom from invasion of their powers by the Federal Government, are, in effect, saying in this resolution that education is a field in which the Federal Government has power.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for this further contribution to the argument. He puts it much better than I could put it. Mr. President, you cannot read the compact section of the Constitution, in my opinion, without reaching the conclusion that the purpose of the section was to protect the powers of the Federal Government from invasion by the States, to the extent that those powers were granted to the Federal Government under the Constitution.

Mr. HOLLAND rose.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will permit me to finish this point, then I shall be glad to yield. I think we need to keep in mind the conditions that existed in this country at the time the Constitution was adopted. There was a great struggle as to how much power should be given to the Federal Government in the first place, and it was made a government of delegated powers. As was made clear by the constitutional fathers, the Federal Government could not exercise any power not specifically granted to it. But there were those in the Constitutional Convention who wanted to give it broader power. There was a fear existing at the time the Constitution was adopted that States might organize against the Federal Government, against the weak Federal Government that was just coming into existence—and really it was much weaker in the earlier days of our Constitution than many State governments. There were States more powerful than the Federal Government itself, and there was the fear on the part of some of the constitutional fathers that a combination of States, dissatisfied with the exercise of a specific power delegated to the Federal Government under the Constitution, might gang up on the Federal Government, so to speak, and thus the newborn Government, still weak, still in need of a great deal of implementation so far as new laws were concerned, might really be killed aborning.

That is the interpretation I place on the compact section, which was incorporated in the Constitution in order to protect the Federal Government from any ganging up on the part of the combination of States by way of agreements or treaties or understandings or compacts which might invade or impair the power of the Federal Government. In essence, I think that is the historical background of the compact section. And so no compact, I repeat—I wish I could say it as brilliantly as the Senator from Kentucky—no compact needs the approval of the Congress, unless it impinges upon a Federal function or power or jurisdiction, and then the Federal Government approves of that invasion to the extent that it is stated in the compact, if it meets with the approval of the Federal Congress. Also it should be added that in granting its aprpoval the Congress has the power to lay down conditions binding upon the compact. In my judgment a Federal question must be involved in a compact in order to have it subject to the sanction of the Congress. Hence I ask, Where is the Federal question in the proposed compact? If there is one that requires Federal sanction, then we, the Congress, cannot run away from our responsibility in determining what Federal policy we are going to sanction on a regional level in respect to civil rights. That is the theory of my argument. I agree with the Senator from Kentucky that in this instance there is no Federal section within the meaning of the compact section of the Constitution that requires the approval of the Congress; and, if there is none, then why go through a gesture in the Senate of the United States by approving this compact? Why go through an empty gesture regarding a compact which does not require our approval?

The Senator from Kentucky and the junior Senator from Oregon are either right or wrong on this question of law. I say it is a matter that should be considered further by the Judiciary Committee, and that is why I propose later to make a motion to recommit. I cannot read the court cases and the historical background of the compact section of the Constitution without reaching the conclusion that a question of Federal jurisdiction must be involved in a compact before congressional approval is necessary. I see none in this compact.

As I read the record of the hearings I agree with the Senator from Kentucky, that there is no evidence, at least within the printed pages, that the matter was given very thorough consideration either by the subcommittee or by the full committee. I certainly mean no disrespect by that statement. I merely do not believe that they went into all the ramifications and the facets of the problem before they decided to report the compact favorably to the floor of the Senate. In view of the fact that I am also of the opinion that we are plowing new legal ground in this proposal, with no precedent "on the nose," so to speak, I think we should deliberate long, seriously, and thoroughly before we take final action on the compact. I think it needs further committee consideration.

I now yield to my good friend from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I want to comment briefly on the fact that the remarks just made by my friend the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] fairly bring out the fact that the very point as to whether Federal consent to this compact is necessary appeared in the testimony of witnesses whom he described as the leading witness for the proponents and the leading legal witness for the opponents.

I call further attention to the fact, as stated yesterday by the senior Senator from Wisconsin, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, that after mature research on the question, he and

his committee reached the conclusion that the approval of the Congress was required as to this particular compact. The reasons which he advanced were so cogent that I shall not now repeat them. There is one point, however, which I shall advance at this time in the hope that the Senator who has the floor will consider it and discuss it in the able argument which he is making.

The Senator from Kentucky has expressed the fear that the sovereign States which are participants in this compact are putting themselves in the position of granting that the Federal Government has jurisdiction in a field which is exclusively theirs. I should like to call to the attention of the Senator who has the floor the fact that there is nothing whatever in this compact which brings into the issue in any way the right of each of the States to continue exclusively to control the functions of education on the governmental level within their respective boundaries. All the law on the subject which has been settled up to this time, so far as I know, has been that each of the States within its own boundaries has, under our system of law, exclusive control of the functions of education. In the compact, however, there is no reference at all to the question of the right of any State within its own boundaries to follow the exclusive control of educational governmental functions, but, to the contrary, there is advanced here an effort, in the whole area affected, to carry education further than the State lines. Each of the States, having the right to control education within its own field, desires to go further and to act jointly with other States in forming regional schools for the joint benefit of all the States which may participate.

I should like to have the Senator consider and discuss his attitude on the question why this is not a completely different situation from any which has been adjudicated heretofore, in that the States are trying solely to associate themselves in the purpose of joint education. I call to the attention of the distinguished Senator that they are assuming, by this compact, to exercise jointly governmental functions, namely, functions in the field of education, which is a governmental field. I recall that the distinguished Senator from Kentucky yesterday in his able address remarked that one of the grounds for the exercise of Federal jurisdiction was derogation of the Federal power, the depreciation or diminution of Federal power, while another ground was the enhancement of enlargement of State power, jurisdiction, and responsibility.

It seems to me that the effort of the States jointly to operate in this field with reference to any particular institution which will be beyond the limits of every one of the participating States except solely the State in which the institution is located, does offer a situation under which there is a material enhancement of the governmental activities of the several participating States, not in a new field, in which they are not given authority to operate, for they do have authority to operate in education, but in an extension geographically of their operation so that they may operate jointly with other States.

I call a second point to the attention of the distinguished Senator, that several States may cooperate jointly which do not necessarily have to be even contiguous, for under the compact of 15 States one of the terms is that any two or more of those States, without any condition of contiguity, may operate jointly in a common educational venture which they regard of common importance. For instance, West Virginia and Florida might wish to cooperate, by themselves or in conjunction with other States, in the establishment of a school of mining and metallurgy, because both West Virginia and Florida happen to have important activities in that field.

I should like to have the Senator, if he will, consider and discuss, as he goes forward with his able address, those two questions, whether the enhancement of the field of activities of the States does not present a question which he thinks comes squarely within the rule announced yesterday by the Senator from Kentucky and a situation under which Federal consent should be sought as it is being sought; and further, whether the fact that States under this compact may and no doubt will be called upon to work jointly with other States whose boundaries do not adjoin them presents a new and substantial question. From my information, there is no precedent at all in connection with interstate compacts regarding States not bordering upon each other. I wish the Senator would consider whether that does not present a new question which, in itself, offers a necessary reason for the exercise of Federal jurisdiction and for the granting of Federal consent.

Mr. President, I have tried not to interrupt the Senator. I understood the distinguished Senator to say that he did not want to be interrupted by questions; but when I found other Senators questioning him I interposed the questions which I have just mentioned. I hope I have not trespassed by injecting these particular questions, which I hope the distinguished Senator will discuss, because it seems to me to be crystal clear that it is proposed to do something which have never been done before, which in itself is one ground for proceeding cautiously and with the desire to have questions solved and eliminated in the legal and regular way. It seems to me that here we have a situation in which the extension beyond the boundaries of each State of its activities in education does, by that very fact, present a situation under which a State's activities will be enlarged and in which the Federal Government necessarily has an interest. It does lie clearly within the purview of the constitutional requirement that States must come to Congress for consent to compacts before they may enlarge the scope of their activities.

I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Florida for his questions. I shall discuss them momentarily now, but at greater length further in my remarks.

First, let me tell the Senator that I appreciate his interruption. I did say at the beginning of my remarks that in the interest of continuity I preferred, to the extent I could, to proceed with my legal argument first, and then at the close subject myself to cross-examination. I think the RECORD will show, however, that I said I was going to be very lenient in the application of that request, and if any Senator really felt that some matter was raised in my comments which he thought I should discuss by way of answer to a question put to me by him at that point, I would most courteously yield under those circumstances. Certainly the Senator from Florida and others who have interrupted me have raised very pertinent questions regarding the points I have been making, and I do not object to that type of interruption. I should like to proceed with my legal argument, however, with as much continuity as possible and then have a period of general exchange with Senators on the floor of the Senate who have questions to raise.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, before the Senator proceeds, since I have not been able to hear all his argument, let me ask whether he has discussed the point raised yesterday by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], when he claimed that the enactment of the pending joint resolution would not change the constitutional right of anyone in any of the States which claimed equal educational facilities.

Mr. MORSE. I have discussed the point. I have said, about the speech of the Senator from Kentucky, that I considered it such an able legal discourse on the issue presented to the Senate that I thought that speech alone clearly supported a motion which I contemplate making later, a motion to recommit the joint resolution to the Committee on the Judiciary for further consideration of the legal problems raised by the Senator from Kentucky.

I have already said that the major premise of the Senator from Kentucky, namely, that this compact does not require congressional approval, is completely in line with the position I took last Thursday in my first speech on the subject, and took again yesterday after the Senator from Kentucky finished his able argument, and reiterated this morning. In my opinion this compact proposal involves a very important question of constitutional law, which I have discussed at some length already this morning.

If I understand correctly the point the Senator from Virginia is raising, I say that his point goes into the question as to whether or not a Federal issue in fact is raised by the compact. If so, it is on a regional level, and raises a question then of regional educational policy and what the Federal conditions shall be to any particular regional educational compact. Or to be specific, whether or not on a regional basis the Congress of the United States should sanction segregation in institutions of higher learning. I do not see how we can escape that question of policy if the proponents of this compact press for congressional approval.

I say I do not think we should do that, and if the assumption of the proponents

of the compact is correct—and I do not think it is—that the approval of Congress is necessary, then we cannot escape the whole civil rights issue being raised in this debate.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I cannot agree with my distinguished colleague in the latter conclusion.

Mr. MORSE. I am aware of that.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I became a joint patron of the joint resolution now pending on the advice that the States in the South could not enter upon this joint enterprise to provide schools of higher technical learning for both white students and colored students without the approval of the Congress. But if it can be demonstrated with reasonable definiteness that no such approval is needed, I certainly would not want to insist upon taking up the time of the Senate—when it is hoped to adjourn the Congress by the 19th of June, though we have acted on only one or two minor appropriation bills and a few other vital measures—to discuss legislation which is not needed to enable us to do what we in the South would like to do.

If the distinguished Senator from Oregon can convince me that under the Supreme Court decisions Federal sanction to our compact is not needed, I shall gladly vote for his motion to recommit the joint resolution for whatever action the Committee on the Judiciary may see fit to take, because then I would be indifferent as to whether it took any action at all.

Mr. MORSE. I think it is perfectly obvious, I may say to the Senator from Virginia, that apparently there are differences of opinion over the issue the Senator has raised. For whatever value my opinion may be to the Senator from Virginia, I repeat what I have said in three speeches, that I do not think Congressional approval of this compact is necessary, because I do not believe any Federal issue is raised in terms of the meaning of the compact section of the Constitution. But if we are to proceed on the assumption that approval is needed, then I say we have to go into the whole question as to what Federal policy should be in education in higher institutions of learning on a regional level.

Now let me here say a word, though I expect to go into it in greater detail later, about two questions asked by the Senator from Florida. I am somewhat puzzled, I say to my good friend from Florida, as to whether the proponents of the compact have one or two legal theories on which they are trying their case in support of this compact. As I read the hearings, it was my conclusion that the proponents took the position that it was their predominant theory that this compact rested upon State prerogatives over State education. I agree completely with the theory of State prerogatives over State education. I believe though that the proponents of this compact are violating that theory when they ask for the approval of the Federal Government of a compact dealing with education on a regional level. This may lead to Federal invasion into the field of education which the proponents of this compact will come to recognize as a serious mistake on their part.

As I said yesterday, and now repeat—a point the Senator from Kentucky also made—I am one who believes in State prerogatives over education. As a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare I would not have gone along with the recent Federal aid to education bill had I not been satisfied that the bill protected the States' rights over education within their borders from Federal domination.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. IVES. In view of the remarks of the able Senator from Oregon, and the very interesting address delivered yesterday by the able Senator from Kentucky, I rise to inquire whether the Senator would construe the particular compact which is before the Senate as an entering wedge of the Federal Government in the control of higher education in the States? I think that is pretty fundamental from the educational standpoint.

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator from New York is completely right. If we must have—and I deny we do—Federal approval of the compact for education on a regional level there is a great danger of Federal invasion of our educational system. As I said a few moments ago, the compact pertaining to a region of 16 States can be expanded to 25, 35, or any other number, such as 47 States. In the latter contingency we would have a regional policy covering 47 out of 48 States, practically the entire country, and if we followed a theory then in support of this compact that it was necessary to have Federal approval in order to establish regional schools, we certainly no longer would have State control of education within the boundaries of the States. I say that because the Congress has the right to lay down conditions which must be complied with by regional schools as the basis for obtaining congressional approval of the compact. It does not need much argument to point out the danger that this compact presents as far as Federal interference with education is concerned. The Senator from New York is entirely right in raising the question he has and in pointing out the danger of Federal invasion into the field of education. I agree with the Senator from Kentucky, and believe that his contention in regard to this matter is sound.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I want to get to the two questions if I can, so there will be some relation in the RECORD of my answers to them, but I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like the Senator to spell out a little more clearly how, by any course of logic beginning with the fact that Congress is being called upon to consent to a regional structure covering 15 States, or even 47 States, as the Senator has put it, the Senator comes to the conclusion that the right of each State within its own boundaries, exclusively, to control public education is affected or in any way touched by such a program.

Mr. MORSE. Oh, there is one point which I respectfully suggest the Senator has overlooked, and it is the one over which the debate is all about. If it is essential to have Federal approval for the compact, once jurisdiction over the compact is assumed on the floor of the United States Senate, then we have the power and the right and the duty to impose conditions under which we will accept the compact covering regional education. That is what the debate is all about. I say if we have to approve of this compact in order to have it put into effect, then it becomes the clear duty, in my judgment, for the Congress of the United States to spell out national policy so far as education on a regional level is concerned, which means specifically, according to my sights, a prohibition against segregation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator feel that by the approval of the compact for a regional education structure any condition could be imposed upon the kind of schools that would be operated by each State within its own boundaries?

Mr. MORSE. Absolutely, if—and let the RECORD emphasize the word "if"—if there must be congressional approval of a compact for the setting up of regional schools. I say that because then it becomes necessary to draw a line, let me say to my good friend from Florida, between the geography of land boundaries and, in quotation marks, "the geography of legal principles." Referring now to the "geography of legal principles," so to speak, under the Constitution, we come face to face with the compact section of the Constitution, and if we are met with the theory so ably advanced by the Senator from Kentucky, with which I am in complete agreement, that we are dealing here with a compact which itself in some way comes in contact with Federal power, in some way impinges upon Federal power under the Constitution, then we have the right to determine to what extent we are by way of a compact going to relieve ourselves as a Federal Government of such power. We do not have any right to approve this compact, it seems to me, if the Senator shares my views as to what sound public policy ought to be from the standpoint of segregation, without putting a condition in the compact that the regional schools which we would sanction by approving this compact must operate on the basis of the Morse amendment on discrimination. If the Senator's theory is correct as to the need for congressional approval of the compact—and I do not think it is—then I do not see how we can avoid, or should avoid, laying down some very definite conditions which shall govern the regional schools we are approving. Those conditions should be in accordance with my amendment that there should be no discrimination on the basis of race, color, or creed. In other words, as expressed in the terms of my amendment, that there shall be no discrimination on the basis of race, color, or creed applied to regional education provided for by this compact.

I say most respectfully and most sincerely to the Senator from Florida that I quite agree with the representation which was made by the counsel for the governors themselves when this matter was in the framing stage, that it is not necessary to secure the approval of Congress. May I say most respectfully, that the proponents are making a mistake in trying to raise this issue through the compact. It is an unnecessary move, it seems to me, in view of the fact that there is the point of view expressed by some of us on the Senate floor that we have a duty which we cannot evade so far as our responsibilities, as we see them, are concerned of insisting upon the Morse amendment if the proponents of this compact take the position that Congress should approve the compact.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to correct one misapprehension under which the Senator from Oregon is laboring. It is not a fact that the counsel for the governors all felt, or any great preponderance of them felt, that there was not involved a question for submission to Congress. There was difference of opinion, but the majority of counsel felt that the problem did require submission to Congress. In addition to that, the very able attorneys who were representing the foundations which had a peculiar interest in the matter, in connection with Meharry College, upon making a study of the law and precedents were, as I have been advised, of the opinion that the consent of Congress should be required. The same observation should be made with reference to very able counsel representing Meharry College itself. So that I would not want the Senator to proceed under a misunderstanding of the situation.

As I understand, and I talked not with all the attorneys but with several of them, most of them felt that of necessity the matter had to be submitted to Congress. But there were others of a different opinion, and the divergence of opinion, I submit to the President of the Senate and to all Senators, is as good a reason as we could have for wanting to iron out this question here, so that it will not come up on every taxpayer's suit, as mentioned by the Senator from Kentucky yesterday, and so that it will not operate to defeat the intention, and the necessary intention, of the Meharry College trust authorities who have accepted millions of dollars as gifts and trusts for expenditure in building and maintaining a school for the colored race. They cannot make that school available, they cannot turn it over to the Southern States as they are offering to do, unless they have assurance, Mr. President, that the purpose of the donors—and they were exceedingly generous donors—is safeguarded.

Therefore there was not only the difference of opinion, but the great preponderance of opinion on the part of counsel, as the Senator from Florida has been advised, was that this situation necessarily required the submission of the compact to Congress for its consent under the constitutional provision. I thought I should state that because I believe the Senator was proceeding under a misapprehension as to what the situation was.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very glad to have the statement, because I am sure that the Senator from Florida knows that the junior Senator from Oregon always wants to have the facts. The statement I made with regard to the advice that I understood was given the Governors' Conference on this matter was that counsel advised that it was not necessary to have this compact approved by the Congress. But it is now my understanding that there was a division of opinion among the attorneys. The Senator from Florida says a majority of them advised the governors that they should secure congressional approval, and others, a minority of them, advised that approval was not necessary.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it went further than that. A majority of them felt, at least as I understood, that a submission to Congress was necessary and the procurement of the consent of Congress was necessary. They did not base their opinion solely on the question of policy, but upon their belief as to what the law required. The same opinion motivated the attorneys for the foundations and Meharry College, as I attempted to say.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as to the last statement I want to make further reference. Now we find that some of them advised the governors that approval of the Congress was necessary. But we need to go into the question as to what motivated that advice, and, as I shall show later, or I think I can show later, the whole question of policy is what disturbs the representatives of the governors of the Southern States in regard to this matter, and that, inherent in their advice, was the point of view that the approval of the compact would be helpful in determining the whole question as to civil rights in regard to segregation on a regional level. Now that is quite a different thing from a lawyer advising the governors that as a matter of law under the compact article of the Constitution the compact had to be approved by Congress. It is quite a different thing from advice saying that it would be good policy for various reasons, in the fact of possible future legislation, to get congressional approval of the policy of segregation which would be applied to a regional school, and, of course, that is very important in this debate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator evidently cannot understand, or has not wanted to understand, plain English. I told him as clearly as I could state it that the preponderance of counsel advising the southern governors and of counsel advising the foundations and the college, as I have been informed, felt that the submission of this compact to the Congress for the giving of its consent was necessary. There were others who felt that it was not necessary, but according to my understanding they were of fewer number than those who felt that it was necessary. So any argument which would attempt to predicate the position of the southern governors upon a mere question of policy is again founded upon an unsound statement of the facts and a misunderstanding of the situation. I am trying to make that perfectly clear so that the Senator will not again fall into the error into which he has twice fallen already.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me assure my good friend from Florida that I understand the English language just as clearly as does the Senator from Florida. He is not going to help the cause of a friendly exchange of point of view in this debate by making any such sarcastic remark as he has just made. He and I had better have that understanding at the very beginning of this debate. I am willing to meet him on the legal issues involved, but I am not going to exchange personalities with the Senator from Florida. I only answer his question on the basis of my understanding of what motivated counsel in advising the governors. I am going to let the RECORD speak for itself before I am through with this debate, as to what their motivations were.

I am satisfied that behind the move to have the compact approved by the Congress of the United States is one motivation, among others, which counsel recognize, as I would, if I were counsel for the governors, namely, that it would be very beneficial to have this compact approved by the Congress of the United States for use in legal argument later before the United States Supreme Court. If I had the job of making this compact and the segregation policies which will be applied under it in a regional school stand up before the United States Supreme Court, I should consider myself in a stronger position if I had congressional sanction of that policy. That is one of the issues this debate is all about.

In my judgment, there is no escaping the fact that there are many reasons why counsel want this compact approved; but one of the reasons is the reason which raises the whole question of civil rights in relation to this compact—the question whether or not the Congress of the United States should sanction a compact which permits the establishment of regional schools in which there shall be segregation. I say that such a policy is a mistake for Congress to approve. It must not be done. I am opposed to it and I shall fight it to the very best of my ability.

I wish to say further that I should like to have the advice and the legal opinion of the Attorney General of the United States with relation to this compact. I should like to see him appear before the Judiciary Committee. I should like to have him prepare a brief on this compact so far as any necessity for congressional sanction is concerned. That is one reason why I think we ought to recommit this measure, and why I shall move to recommit it.

I wish to return to Virginia against Tennessee. At page 521 the Court said:

> The Constitution does not state when the consent of Congress shall be given, whether it shall precede or may follow the compact made, or whether it shall be express or may

be implied. In many cases the consent will usually precede the compact or agreement, as where it is to lay a duty of tonnage, to keep troops or ships of war in time or peace, or to engage in war.

That language in the decision is a direct reference to the point already made by the Senator from Kentucky when he brought out the fact that we must read the entire compact section to understand its true meaning. It must be read in relation to other Federal rights, prerogatives, and jurisdiction set out in the Constitution itself.

The Court continued:

But where the agreement relates to a matter which could not well be considered until its nature is fully developed it is not perceived why the consent may not be subsequently given. Story says that the consent may be implied, and is always to be implied when Congress adopts the particular act by sanctioning its objects and aiding in enforcing them—

Note that language—

and is always to be implied when Congress adopts the particular act by sanctioning its objects and aiding in enforcing them.

Have we a situation in which we want to have the Congress sanction segregation in regional schools and aid in enforcing it?

Thus far in my speech today I have dwelt largely upon the question whether or not congressional approval of this compact is necessary. I have made as clear as I can make it my view that it is not necessary. Let me proceed to the next issue.

It now seems well established that where Congress is called upon to give its consent that consent may be granted conditionally. In *Arizona* v. *California*, (292 U. S. 341 at 345 (1934)), it appears that by the act of Congress, August 19, 1921 (42 Stat. 171), Congress authorized an interstate compact regarding the waters of the Colorado River. It further appears that the act of Congress, December 21, 1928 (45 Stat. 1057), approved the Colorado River compact subject to certain limitations and conditions which were inserted by Congress and the States parties thereto had to ratify the compact as so modified. Mr. Chief Justice Hughes, speaking for the majority of the Supreme Court in *James* v. *Dravo Construction Company* (302 U. S. 134 at 148), best summarizes the power of Congress in this respect:

Normally, where governmental consent is essential, the consent may be granted upon terms appropriate to the subject and transgressing no constitutional limitation. The Constitution provides that no State without the consent of Congress shall enter into a compact with another State. It hardly can be doubted that in giving consent Congress may impose conditions.

Let me repeat that, Mr. President. Mr. Chief Justice Hughes, in 302 United States 134, said:

It hardly can be doubted that in giving consent Congress may impose conditions.

If there is a Federal question involved in this compact we can impose conditions such as those set forth in my amendment. If no Federal question is involved, then it is but an empty gesture to have this compact before the Senate. We cannot have it both ways. We either have a Federal question involved or we have not. If we have one, then it is a Federal question which relates to the establishment of regional schools and to the policy which Congress will sanction in respect to such regional schools, in relation to civil rights.

I am not asking that Congress lay down any policy with respect to these regional schools, in that I am not asking for the passage of the compact. I have not raised the issue. The proponents of the compact raised it. But if congressional sanction is to be required in this instance, I for one am going to do all I can to give Members of the United States Senate an opportunity to vote on conditions which, according to my sights, will amply protect civil rights so far as a sound national policy applied to regional schools is concerned.

The only remaining question then is whether the proposed condition prohibiting segregation transgresses constitutional limitation. It is clear that congressional prohibition of segregation in areas subject to Federal control is consistent with Federal public policy, *Morgan* v. *Virginia* (328 U. S. 373). Other cases which I think are in line are *Bob-Lo Excursion Company* v. *People State of Michigan* (68 S. Ct. 358 (1948)) and *Hurd et al.* v. *Hodge et al.* and *Urciolo et al.* v. *Hodge*, decided by the United States Supreme Court on May 3, 1948. In the Bob-Lo case the Court decided as a matter of policy that a Michigan civil rights statute which prohibited discrimination could be applied to an excursion boat operated by a Michigan corporation in foreign commerce. The prohibition against discrimination was held not to be a prohibited burden on interstate or foreign commerce, even though Congress had not acted in the premises. In the Morgan case the Court held that a Virginia statute requiring segregation in transportation within the State could not be applied to passengers in interstate commerce. Thus, the Court in the Morgan case holds that a State statute which attempts to separate the races is an unconstitutional burden on interstate commerce when applied to interstate passengers; whereas in the Bob-Lo case a State statute which prohibits racial discrimination may constitutionally be applied to interstate commerce. The Federal policy is thus clear: That segregation may not constitutionally be applied by the States with respect to interstate passengers.

It is equally clear that this Federal policy would operate to prohibit the extension into interstate commerce of the segregation which is implicit in this regional education compact. Further than this, in the Hurd and Urciolo cases—District of Columbia restrictive covenant cases—the Supreme Court held that the public policy of the United States as laid down in the case of Shelby against Kraemer—the State restrictive covenant cases decided the same day—prohibits Federal courts from judicially enforcing racial restrictive agreements. Here the Supreme Court of the United States is saying that the Federal Government is without power to lend its aid to the enforcement of restrictive covenants. Under this decision not only is it constitutional for this Congress to condition its consent to the proposed regional education compact by prohibiting segregation, but it is submitted that congressional consent to this compact without the proposed amendment is beyond the power of Congress.

Since the Federal Government has the power to prohibit segregation in areas subject to its control, it follows that it may require the prohibition of segregation as a condition to its consent to an interstate compact. The possible contention that the proposed condition is a violation of the provisions of the tenth amendment to the United States Constitution, in that it attempts to control education—a subject reserved to State control—is met by the fact that this urgent request for congressional consent concedes that the matter is within the area of Federal control. Otherwise there would be no necessity for seeking congressional consent. Moreover, not only does this joint resolution and compact represent a concession that the area in question is subject to Federal control, but, what is more important, it represents a request that Congress exercise a Federal power enumerated in the Constitution.

It has been strenuously argued that because the States signatory to this compact have laws requiring segregation in education, the Congress may not constitutionally impose a condition of nonsegregation in consenting to this compact. It is said that to impose such a condition would be a regulation of a local matter and a regulation in conflict with existing State policy. The short answer to this contention is that the Congress in exercising its power to consent is exercising one of its federally enumerated powers, under the Constitution, or that in exercising its power to consent to a compact, under the compact section of the Constitution, is exercising one of the enumerated powers granted to the Federal Government.

It is elementary that the Federal Government may perform its functions and exercise its powers without conforming to State laws. That was held in *Arizona* v. *California* (288 U. S. 423 at 451), a 1931 case. Federal policy is supreme in areas subject to Federal power and control, even where such Federal policy is in conflict with State laws otherwise valid. As to the compact in question, however, the assumption that the State laws requiring segregation in education are constitutional is not supported by the cases. Moreover, the argument that it would be unconstitutional for Congress to condition its consent by prohibiting segregation, is based upon the unwarranted assumption that the United States Supreme Court has held that State laws requiring segregation in education are valid.

It may be stated as a fact that the Supreme Court of the United States has never had occasion to rule directly on the question whether compulsory segregation in education, even where substantially equal facilities are afforded, is a denial of rights under the fourteenth amendment. The Attorney General of the United States so concluded in his

brief for the United States as amicus curiae in the restrictive covenant cases. See page 59 of the brief. In the case of *Missouri ex rel. Gaines* v. *Canada* (305 U. S. 337), it was held that the Negro petitioner was entitled to be admitted to the law school of the State University, no other proper provision for his legal training having been made. It was the Missouri State court which, in 344 Missouri 1238, interpreted the mandate as being fulfilled by furnishing separate and equal facilities; but I submit that the Supreme Court did not say so in that case. In *Gong Lum* v. *Rice* (275 U. S. 78), the issue of segregation was not directly raised, although its validity was assumed by the Court. The case of *Cummings* v. *Board of Education* (175 U. S. 528), involved the question whether an injunction to restrain the collection of local taxes was proper. Here, again, the issue of segregation was not directly passed upon. In the *Berea College case* (211 U. S. 45), the decision, as I read that case, was limited to the validity of a State statute prohibiting a corporation from receiving both Negro and white students. In Sipuel against Board of Regents of the University of Oklahoma, the issue of segregation was not involved because the State provided no legal educational opportunities for the Negro petitioner. The Court held, as it did in the Gaines case, that the Constitution had been violated. The State of Oklahoma has sought to conform its educational policies to the Supreme Court decision by providing separate legal education. Not until this case gets back to the Supreme Court of the United States, or until a similar case coming up from the State of Texas is decided by the United States Supreme Court, shall we be in a position to say whether or not segregation in education is constitutional.

Mr. President, I digress at this time to point out that such a procedure is the good, American way of determining differences over points of law. I am not impressed with any argument that we should ratify this compact in order to avoid taxpayers' suits. I believe a taxpayer suit is all that is necessary to get to the Supreme Court of the United States on this issue and to settle with finality the question of law which is being raised in this debate. I say a taxpayer suit is the proper way to raise this issue and have it determined by the Supreme Court of the United States. I say it is not proper, Mr. President, for the Congress of the United States, for whatever value its action might be in argument by counsel before the Supreme Court, to give sanction to this compact, because one reason—among other reasons—which some persons have for wishing to have this compact approved by the Congress is the fact that it will help them, according to their views, in connection with a Supreme Court decision later to be rendered, after due litigation. They want to secure congressional sanction of segregation. They think it will help them in future cases before the Supreme Court. I am not in favor of having the Senate of the United States participate in that kind of a process.

So I say, Mr. President, that should the Congress consent to the compact without the imposition of a condition prohibiting segregation, it will be approving and aiding in the extension of segregation in education on a regional level, and it will do this in spite of the reports of two Presidential committees, the President's Committee on Civil Rights and the President's Commission on Higher Education, that more than 50 years of segregated education have resulted in gross discrimination against Negroes in their efforts to secure equal educational opportunities. Since the United States Supreme Court has not as yet held that segregated education is constitutional, and since the irrefutable evidence is that segregated education as carried out by the very States signatory to this compact has resulted in gross discrimination against Negroes, the very least that the Congress can do, it seems to me, is to consent to the compact only upon condition that segregation is prohibited in a regional school. Only by so doing can Congress avoid approving and extending segregation in education, in fact and in effect.

In the light of the above arguments that I have endeavored to present, one is led to wonder why congressional approval is so vigorously urged here. I speak my views in answer to that question. It is not unreasonable to conclude that at least one purpose for seeking this approval is to make available evidence of congressional support of the policy of segregation in education when that issue is subsequently presented to the Supreme Court in cases now pending in the lower courts.

THE REGIONAL COMPACT AS PROPOSED IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL

Mr. President, I now desire to discuss briefly the question whether or not the regional compact itself, as proposed, might not be found to be unconstitutional.

The fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, section 1, provides that "no State shall deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." The protection afforded by the equal-protection clause extends "to all persons within the territorial jurisdiction without regard to any difference of race, or color, or of nationality. Supporting that proposition, I cite *Yick Wo* v. *Hopkins* (118 U. S. 356); quoted in *Truax* v. *Raich* (239 U. S. 33). Speaking of the scope and extent of the police power, the Supreme Court, in *Lawton* v. *Steele* (152 U. S. 133), said:

> To justify the State in thus interposing its authority in behalf of the public, it must appear, first, that the interests of the public generally, as distinguished from those of a particular class, require such interference; and second, that the means are reasonably necessary for the accomplishment of the purpose, and not unduly oppressive upon individuals.

As I read the cases—I may read them wrongly, Mr. President, but as I read the cases, as a lawyer, it is my view that in an unbroken line of cases the Supreme Court has tested this equality of protection, as in the language of the fourteenth amendment it must, by the exertion of State power within the boundaries of the State itself:

> Manifestly the obligation of the State to give the protection of equal laws can be performed only where its laws operate, that is, within its own jurisdiction. It is there that the equality of legal right must be maintained. The obligation is imposed by the Constitution upon the States severally as governmental entities—each responsible for its own laws establishing the rights and duties of persons within its own borders. It is an obligation the burden of which cannot be cast by one State upon another, and no State may be excused by what another State may do or fails to do. That separate responsibility of each State within its own sphere is of the essence of statehood maintained under our dual system.

That is a quotation from the *Gaines case* (305 U. S. 337).

Mr. President, I hold to the theory that we are dealing here in the compact not with the geographic or land jurisdiction of a State; we are dealing here not with State boundaries; we are not dealing here even with the question of what legal rights the States may have under existing decisions of the United States Supreme Court, over education within their States—such decisions being related, of course, to State laws in respect to State schools. We are dealing here, Mr. President—and this dilemma cannot be avoided—with the exercise of legal powers beyond the State, through the medium of a regional school plan. That is why I think the quotations I have cited from the Supreme Court decisions are very apropos and much in point.

Each of the 15 States signatory to this regional compact has a State university, a State law school, a State agricultural and mechanical college, and, with one or two exceptions, I believe, each one has a State medical school, all for whites only. I have tried to verify these figures. I think they are correct. If they are not correct, they are incorrect only to a very minor extent, and I shall be glad to have the RECORD corrected later if I have, in trying to find out the type of schools existing in the various States, omitted any school in any particular State. But, I can be sure that the figures I have just given are approximately correct. So far as I can ascertain, in none of the States signatory to the compact is there a medical school, law school, or State university for Negroes. I am referring to State schools. I do not include Meharry, which is not a State school. Texas has a State university for Negroes. There is some question as to the standards of the school, but at least it has a State university for Negroes, so I am told. This regional plan does not propose to close any of these State schools for whites, but proposes to set up regional schools, as its proponents say, for "all the people." But the only school mentioned in the compact, the sole basis for the plan is to set up a regional medical school to save Meharry Medical School, a medical school for Negroes located in Tennessee. On the face of the compact it is to do what the Supreme Court said in the

Gaines case cannot be done. The Court said:

> We find it impossible to conclude that what otherwise would be an unconstitutional discrimination, with respect to the legal right to the enjoyment of opportunities within the State, can be justified by requiring resort to opportunities elsewhere. That resort may mitigate the inconvenience of the discrimination but cannot serve to validate it.

That is not my language, Mr. President. That is the language of the United States Supreme Court, in the Gaines case. I want to see how the proponents can get around it, through it, behind it, over it, or in front of it. I understand the English language, Mr. President. I understand that this is good English language used by the Supreme Court, when the Supreme Court, in the Gaines case, said:

> We find it impossible to conclude that what otherwise would be an unconstitutional discrimination, with respect to the legal right to the enjoyment of opportunities within the State, can be justified by requiring resort to opportunities elsewhere. That resort may mitigate the inconvenience of the discrimination but cannot serve to validate it.

That is a trenchant paragraph. My personal view, speaking only for myself, is that it has caused great consternation in some places. I think that paragraph has rncreased the drive for the passage of this compact through the Senate.

Some of my friends from the Southern States may not realize or appreciate it, but time and time again in the past, and it will be true also in the future, I have been willing to subject myself to severe censure from some so-called liberal groups, because, in my opinion, they want to move too fact in the field of implementing civil rights. Of course, I have no argument by which I can answer the $64 question with which they always hit me between the eyes when they say, "If you are right in your argument that we have these rights under the Constitution, what is wrong with giving them to us now?" I do not have an answer for that, except the answer of a realist, the answer of one who recognizes, as I have said so many times, that we cannot move too fast in the social, economic, and political field in America and retain our system of government. We cannot ignore the fact that we have a tremendous background of social, economic, and political conditioning factors which have developed diversity of points of view in our democracy. So when I argue that there must be time for the operation of educational processes in this democracy some of my liberal friends are just as critical of me as are some of my southern friends, but for different reasons. My southern friends think that I would go too fast, and my liberal friends think I would not go fast enough in ironing out our civil-rights problems. But I think I go just as fast in civil-rights matters as we can go and still keep this strong democracy of representative government, which must be kept if we are to have any civil rights at all. I am only insisting that our march forward in implementing the Constitution of the United States shall never be turned into a march backward. Let us go ahead as the populace of our country becomes conditioned to the truer meanings of democracy to which I think we have not given as yet complete effect in our history in respect to social, economic, and political relationships contemplated by the Constitution.

It is because out of the depths of my heart I am convinced that this compact would be a step backward if Congress sanctioned it, because it would be sanctioning a step backward in civil rights as concerns segregation, that I express myself so deeply on the subject. That also, Mr. President, is why I emphasize the incisive language of the Supreme Court in the Gaines case, because that language, if I correctly understand English, and I think I do, at least, shall I say, intimates, suggests, or implies that the State of Missouri in the Gaines case would not have solved the problem raised in the case through a regional school. I admit that it is not a decision "on the nose," but what else does the language mean? I read it once more, and for the last time, in order to drive home the point which I am endeavoring to make. The Court said:

> We find it impossible to conclude that what otherwise would be an unconstitutional discrimination, with respect to the legal right to the enjoyment of opportunities within the State, can be justified by requiring resort to opportunities elsewhere. That resort may mitigate the inconvenience of the discrimination, but cannot serve to validate it.

Thus I say: It is plain on the face of this regional compact that it proposes to require Negroes to resort to Meharry Medical School outside the borders of each of these signatory States, except Tennessee, and possibly two others, for medical education furnished whites in the State of their residence. This the Supreme Court has declared to be an unconstitutional requirement.

The Supreme Court has consistently held that the exertion of State powers in discriminating against Negroes in the acquisition, use, and occupancy of real property is a violation of the equal protection clause of the fourteenth amendment, by legislation.

That, of course, raises the cases of Buchanan against Warly, Richmond against Deans, Harmon against Tyler, Shelly against Kraemer, and Sipes against McGhee. It raises them in the form of the court's declaring that there cannot be Federal enforcement. That is all I am saying, Mr. President; that is all the court said. But that, too, is rich with implied meaning, so far as concerns the constitutionality of what is behind the proposal which I think is involved in this compact.

In Hurd against Hodge and Urcioia against Hodge the Supreme Court held that Federal courts were without power to judicially enforce racial restrictive covenants, first, because it violated section 1978 of the Civil Rights Act, but that even apart from the statute such judicial action was prohibited; second, by reason of the public policy of the United States laid down in Shelly against Kraemer, supra. It may be argued that in many other cases the Supreme Court has upheld such exertions of State power.

See, for example, *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*, (163 U. S. 537), where the Court upheld a Louisiana statute separating the races in interstate transportation on the grounds of public policy. The public policy there set forth has since been overruled by the Supreme Court in *Morgan* v. *Virginia* (328 U. S. 373), Bob Lo and Shelly against Kraemer. In all cases since that time, Missouri against Canada, supra, the Sipuel case, the Mitchell case, the issue has not been raised. Hence this compact is on its face prohibited by the public policy of the United States. At least I think there is sufficient merit and soundness in the argument, Mr. President, so that it will have to be tried in the Supreme Court of the United States for final determination.

Even if this compact were fair on its face, and constitutional—which I deny—it would be unconstitutional in that it is to be operated in a group of States whose laws provide for separation of the races in education, and for 80 years these States have administered their separate school laws so as to discriminate against the Negro. In addition to schools of law and medicine and the universities mentioned before, each of these States has an engineering school for whites and not a single one has an engineering school for Negroes—that is, a State school. That is the factual result of the so-called "separate but equal doctrine" set forth in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* (163 U. S. 537). Though the law itself be fair on its face and impartial in appearance, yet, if it is applied and administered by public authority with an evil eye and an unequal hand, so as practically to make urgent and illegal discriminations between persons in similar circumstances, material to their rights, the demand of equal justice is still within the prohibition of the Constitution. *Yick Wo* v. *Hopkins* (118 U. S. 56).

Therefore, this history of the administration of separate schools in the States entering this compact, which compact organizes only one school by its terms, and that a segregated medical school for Negroes, shows that even if fair on its face, this compact is unconstitutional, for it is an integrated part of a segregated system which has operated consistently to discriminate against Negroes.

This compact is unconstitutional in that it by its terms and conditions proposes to increase the legal disabilities facing a Negro plaintiff beyond those facing white plaintiffs in each of these signatory States, and there deprive Negroes of liberty and property without due process of law. This compact denies Negroes due process of law in certain instances.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MORSE. No; I shall not yield for that purpose. I am sure we cannot

finish the debate today, and Senators can read my remarks in the RECORD. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Nebraska in suggesting the absence of a quorum. However, there are a considerable number of Senators here and I know that several committees are meeting right now. In fact, I should also be at a meeting of the Armed Services Committee.

Returning to my argument, I wish to point out that Negroes must not only test the equality of laws in respect to a medical school in the States where they live, but must now litigate under this compact the question whether the test of equality, if Congress consents to this compact, is not to be judged on the basis of the region rather than the State. This compact raises this constitutional question for the first time—a legal disability to a Negro citizen under this compact: Does this compact and the assent to it by Congress enlarge the area in which the constitutional test of equality must be applied?

I say that, Mr. President, because according to my theory of the argument a Negro plaintiff now would not be fighting a Supreme Court case on the basis of his rights under State law, but under this compact he would have to fight for his rights on the basis of a regional plan set forth in the compact. I seriously question that the compact conforms to the Constitution, insofar as the question I have raised is concerned, namely, does this compact and the assent to it by Congress enlarge the area in which the constitutional test of equality must be applied? I can see how the Supreme Court might very well find that such is exactly what it does, and therefore that it is deficient on constitutional grounds for that reason.

Further I point out that a Negro plaintiff must now litigate another question not faced by whites under this compact. Does this administrative remedy under this compact and the assent to it by Congress include an application to this board of regents, or recourse to Congress? I think that question has to be answered, too, in order to determine the legality of the compact.

Now, by way of summary of my argument, and reenforcement of what I have already said so many times extemporaneously on the floor of the Senate in my three addresses, I wish to cover, in conclusion, once again, the question as to the requirements of congressional approval of the compact, because I think that is the keystone argument of the whole debate.

If the Senator from Kentucky and I can establish the proposition, as I think we can, as a matter of law, that congressional approval is not necessary, then I think it will be pretty difficult for anyone to make a sound argument against recommitting the joint resolution for further study by the Committee on the Judiciary. I think it is the all-important argument, at least at this stage of the debate, on which I want to rest my case.

THE PROPOSED REGIONAL EDUCATION COMPACT DOES NOT REQUIRE CONGRESSIONAL CONSENT

Article I, section 10 of the United States Constitution provides in part that "no State shall without the consent of Congress enter into any agreement or compact with another State." Literally construed, this provision would apply to all interstate agreements, but it has always been recognized that certain types of interstate agreements are valid and operative without congressional consent.

Interstate compacts to which the constitutional provision applies are those tending to the increase of political power in the States which may encroach upon or interfere with the supremacy of the Federal Government.

In *Virginia* v. *Tennessee* (148 U. S. 503 (1893)), the meaning and scope of the terms "agreement' and "compact" are considered and explained. At pages 517 and 518 of the opinion it is said:

> The terms "agreement" or "compact" taken by themselves are sufficiently comprehensive to embrace all forms of stipulation, written or verbal, and relating to all kinds of subjects; to those to which the United States can have no possible objection or have any interest in interfering with, as well as to those which may tend to increase and build up the political influence of the contracting States, so as to encroach upon or impair the supremacy of the United States or interfere with their rightful management of particular subjects placed under their entire control.

Continuing at page 519, the Court says:

> Looking at the clause in which the terms "compact" or "agreement" appear, it is evident that the prohibition is directed to the formation of any combination tending to the increase of political power in the States, which may encroach upon or interfere with the just supremacy of the United States.

An exhaustive article entitled "The Compact Clause of the Constitution—A Study in Interstate Adjustments," by Felix Frankfurter, now Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, and James M. Landis, is published in 34 Yale Law Journal 685 (1925). In this article a distinction is made between interstate compacts which have as their subject matter activities essentially local in their nature and not directly affecting interests of States other than signatories on the one hand, and on the other, State compacts whose subject matter and/or effect invades areas subject to Federal control. It is that theory I sought to emphasize in my colloquy with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] some moments ago.

It would appear that it is only this latter type of interstate compact whose validity depends upon congressional consent. This article points out further numerous instances of interstate cooperation which have never been thought to require congressional consent. The work of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws is referred to, as well as the technique of reciprocal legislation and conferences of governors and other State officials with or without collaboration with Federal authorities.

In an article entitled "What Did the Framers of the Federal Constitution Mean by 'Agreements or Compacts'?" Third University of Chicago Law Review, 453, 1936, Abraham C. Weinfeld concludes at page 464 that—

> "Agreements or compacts" as intended by the framers of the Constitution included (1) settlements of boundary lines with attending cession or exchange of strips of land; (2) regulation of matters connected with boundaries, as, for instance, regulation of jurisdiction of offenses committed on boundary waters, of fisheries or of navigation.

The basic question is as to whether this regional education interstate compact is, by virtue of its subject matter and/or affect, one requiring congressional consent. It cannot be denied that its subject matter is education and that education in the United States has always been regarded as a State and local matter. Congress has always recognized this fact in its various enactments extending Federal aid to education.

The report of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, relating to this particular compact, at pages 9 to 13 thereof, contains a list of interstate compacts entered into between 1789 and 1947, all of which have received congressional consent. It is significant that, although more than 100 compacts are listed, not one of them has education as its subject matter. No mention is made in the report of the numerous interstate compacts which became operative without congressional consent. Some of this latter type of compacts are listed in Thirty-fourth Yale Law Journal, 749–754, in the article above referred to. It is particularly significant to note that on page 54 of the report of the hearings on this compact Dr. John Dale Russell, Director, Division of Higher Education, United States Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, testified that at least one interstate compact relating to education is already operative without congressional consent. He refers to the contract between Virginia and West Virginia with respect to medical education.

If it is precedent we seek, Mr. President, I offer that at least as one precedent in support of the theory advanced by the Senator from Kentucky and myself that no congressional consent is needed for the approval of the compact.

In 70 United States Law Review 557 (1936), Alice Mary Dodd discusses Interstate Compacts. At page 562 she refers to compacts which were put into operation without congressional consent. Reference is there made to a compact between Vermont and New Hampshire establishing a penitentiary to serve both States. No congressional consent was obtained.

I offer that as my second precedent, Mr. President, in support of my view and the view of the Senator from Kentucky that congressional approval is not required of the compact. May I say in good humor that I do not want to draw any invidious comparisons between institutions of higher learning and penitentiaries, but I do want to point out that if it is proper for Vermont and New Hampshire to enter into a mutual arrangement between themselves for the operation of a joint penitentiary, or for Virginia and West Virginia to enter into an agreement or an arrangement between themselves as to a medical school, then those agreements are good precedents in support of my argument that it is permissible for the 15 States

involved in the proposed compact to proceed without congressional approval of the compact. I wish to make clear that I think they must proceed in the face of any litigation risks they may run as to any future claims that regional schools based upon segregation violate constitutional rights if no equal training is offered in nonsegregated schools. That is the core of my argument. I come back to it, and I shall come back to it throughout the debate, because I am convinced that as a legal proposition the proponents of the compact are asking the Senate of the United States to do something that the Senate of the United States does not need to do. I am convinced that the sanction of the Senate or the approval of the Senate to the compact is not necessary.

It is submitted that under the authorities an interstate compact for the establishment and operation of regional educational institutions is not the type of compact requiring congressional consent, and in fact is the type of compact the United States Supreme Court had in mind in the parent case, the leading case on the whole question of what is involved in a compact, or what need be involved in a compact. I read again what the Court said on page 518 of the Tennessee case:

> There are many matters upon which different States may agree that can in no respect concern the United States.

I say that just as Vermont and New Hampshire had the right to enter into an agreement as to the use of a penitentiary, just as Virginia and West Virginia had the legal right to enter into an arrangement to the use of a medical school, so the 15 States involved in the present compact have the right to enter into an agreement in respect to their educational problems without congressional approval. I am not saying, Mr. President—and let the RECORD be perfectly clear on this point—I am not saying that any agreement they may enter into will receive final approval of the Supreme Court on constitutional grounds. That is their risk. That is their problem. It ought to be determined in the good old American way of following the regular course of litigation to the United States Supreme Court.

It is to be noted, however, that in 35 Columbia Law Review 76 (1935) and 45 Yale Law Journal 324 (1935), the position is taken that all interstate compacts require congressional consent.

I cite the last two authorities, Mr. President, because I always try to present to the best of my ability both sides of an issue, and if there is authority against me I am not one to hide the authority. I offer the citations to those two last articles to the proponents of the compact, if they have not read them, because one thing I insist upon is being a fair debater. In these two articles, in 35 Columbia Law Review 76, and 45 Yale Law Journal 324, the proponents of this compact will find a point of view presented in support of the proposition that all interstate compacts require congressional consent. I think the conclusions of those articles are highly erroneous, they cannot be reconciled with the clear language of the Supreme Court itself and cannot be squared with the Tennessee case, because the Tennessee case says in crystal-clear language that not all matters have to be contained in a compact.

There is one other point I wish to mention before I close, and believe me, Mr. President, I am not mentioning it to cast reflection on anyone or to charge anyone with any improper motivation. I am mentioning it only because it is part of the facts which must be considered in connection with the debate. I want to repeat that if I were one of the attorneys advising the southern governors who brought forth the compact I would advise them that it would help my position very much in the Supreme Court of the United States in any future case if I could present the argument that the Congress of the United States had approved a compact which sets up regional schools based upon the principle of segregation. I should like to be so armed in an argument before the United States Supreme Court, and I am satisfied that the counsel which advised the governors would welcome being so armed. I am also satisfied that this particular point is one which has been thoroughly discussed by many persons interested in the approval of the compact—so thoroughly discussed that there has even been newspaper comment about it.

Mr. President, I wish to read a very clear article written by Mr. John N. Popham, and published in the New York Times. The dispatch is dated February 8 of this year. The article reads as follows:

REGIONAL COLLEGES CHARTED FOR SOUTH—NINE GOVERNORS AGREE ON PLAN TO GIVE HIGHER EDUCATION TO WHITES AND NEGROES

(By John N. Popham)

WAKULLA SPRINGS, FLA., February 8.—An unprecedented step in the educational annals of the country was taken today when the governors of nine Southern States affixed their signatures to a compact that would establish a geographical district with cooperatively owned and operated regional schools to provide higher education for whites and Negroes.

The compact was drafted at a 2-day extraordinary closed session of the southern governors' conference. Copies of the compact will be forwarded for signing to six other southern governors who are members of the conference but were unable to attend the special session.

The governors' signatures, however, represented approval with reservation, since the compact provides that it shall not take effect or be binding upon any State until it has been approved by the legislatures of at least six of the States whose governors have subscribed to it within 18 months from today.

Also, it was learned, the compact will be presented to the Congress of the United States for approval, although experts in constitutional law were reported to have informed the drafters of the compact that they did not regard such approval as necessary but did feel it was a good thing to have.

AN ANSWER TO HIGH COURT

The compact asserts that it is aimed at improving the educational facilities of all people in the South, but proposed implementation steps indicate that for many it also constitutes the South's answer to recent successive Federal court decisions affecting the controversial problems of providing equal but segregated schooling for Negroes.

The fact that 2 weeks ago the trustees of Meharry Medical College for Negroes at Nashville, Tenn., informally offered the school to the southern States as a regional institution is referred to in the compact.

The Supreme Court has ruled several times that States must provide equal educational facilities for Negroes or admit them to whatever institutions are already established.

A month ago the Court made a similar ruling affecting a Negro woman applicant for law-school training in Oklahoma. The situation has also developed in Texas.

Last October 21, at the southern Governors' conference in Asheville, N. C., Gov. Jim Nance McCord, of Tennessee, proposed the establishing of regional schools to provide professional, technical, and graduate training for white and Negro students in the South.

MEHARRY COLLEGE SOUGHT

At that time a committee under the chairmanship of Gov. Millard F. Caldwell, of Florida, was directed to study the feasibility of creating regional schools and also to negotiate for the acquisition of Meharry College as soon as possible on the ground that it was faced with the prospect of closing its doors because of financial difficulties.

The extraordinary session of the southern Governors' conference was called solely to hear the report of the educational committee and take action on a situation which the Governors have already described as acute.

Although there have been suggestions for regional schools in the South for the past 10 or 12 years, the general feeling is that the pressure of the recent Supreme Court decisions made it imperative to southern executives and legislators to seek some solution in line with the South's traditional Jim Crow policies.

From the first proposal, however, the southern Governors have maintained that the need for regional schools affects both whites and Negroes, thus involving the welfare of the region, and that also the Southern States are unable financially to provide many forms of higher educational facilities within their borders.

It was learned that the Governors hope to bring about the establishment of five regional institutions, possibly with a medical and dental school for white students in the South, similar to the proposed use of Meharry College for Negroes in the medical and nursing fields.

INTERIM GROUP SET UP

An interim committee to be known as the regional council, consisting of the Governor and two designees from each State signing the compact, will survey the higher educational problems in the southern States and will hold its first meeting on March 4 at Gainesville, Fla.

Under the terms of the compact the States will enter into a broad educational area with a pooling of funds on a scale without precedent in this country. No one ventured to predict the cost of the regional schools to the participating States. When the legislatures of six States have approved the compact, it will become binding on the six States within 60 days. Other States can join upon conditions to be agreed upon at the time they apply.

Then the member States will set up a board of control for southern regional education, similar in membership to the interim committee at this time, which will be the key organization in the regional compact.

The control board will submit plans and recommendations to the State legislatures from time to time, will be vested with title to the educational institutions, and will direct operation and maintenance of the schools.

The governors who signed the compact were William P. Lane, of Maryland; J. Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina; Ben T. Laney, of Arkansas; Beauford H. Jester, of Texas; James E. Folsom, of Alabama; Fielding L. Wright, of Mississippi; Melvin E. Thompson,

of Georgia; Jim N. McCord, of Tennessee; and Millard F. Caldwell, of Florida.

The legislatures of four Southern States are now in session, but it was considered doubtful that the compact would be presented to any of them at this time.

I have taken the time of the Senate to read that newspaper article—and I shall read another from the Christian Science Monitor—because they are typical of articles which appeared in the American press at the time of the conference of Southern governors which brought forth this compact. Such articles shed light upon the question of the mixed motives which I think are behind this compact.

Speaking for myself, interpreting the hearings, interpreting the newspaper stories, and interpreting what I have heard from many proponents of the compact, I am satisfied that one of the reasons why its proponents want congressional sanction of the compact is that they think that congressional sanction may be helpful to them in future litigation in cases involving allegations by particular litigants of violation of civil rights. I do not believe that the Congress should be a party to approving any compact on that basis, unless our approval of the compact is necessary as a matter of law. If it is necessary as a matter of law, then I think it is our duty to lay down some conditions which will protect the civil rights of the people from what I consider to be a violation of those rights through segregation.

In support of views similarly expressed in the New York Times article, there is one in the Christian Science Monitor under date of February 7, 1948. It reads as follows:

REGIONAL SET-UP FOR TEACHING PLEASES SOUTH

COLUMBIA, S. C.—The plan of a southern governors' conference committee to set up a regional system of graduate education has found general support in the South, but usually with some qualification. The reaction generally is that it is a good plan if it is workable.

The question hinges on whether the plan is accepted as a scheme to solve the dilemma caused by the segregation laws and the edicts of the Supreme Court, or whether it is viewed as an attempt to put all graduate education for both races, on a regional basis.

Gov. Millard E. Caldwell, of Florida, chairman of the education committee, has emphasized repeatedly the regional plan antedates recent decisions of the Supreme Court ordering Southern States to provide Negro and white students with equal educational opportunities.

The plan, it is true, has been discussed at length at every annual session of the governors' conference in recent years. But only within the last few months has any headway been made and obviously it will take months and years to get a regional system launched on a comprehensive scale.

OPPORTUNITY SEEN

"If the Southern States work together they can establish and maintain the very best in educational opportunities in all fields for all citizens, regardless of race," says Governor Caldwell, pointing out that in recent years discussion of the graduate education problem at the meetings of the governors' conference embraced regional schools for both whites and Negroes.

However, to put all graduate education on a regional cooperative basis is admittedly a large order. The governors' conference will meet in emergency session in Tallahassee, Fla., on February 7 and 8 to consider the committee plan, and there is little doubt that it will be wholeheartedly approved.

It generally is agreed to that congressional action would have to be obtained that would authorize States to contract among each other for educational services. The State legislatures would also have to be asked to approve such a plan and provide the funds necessary to start a far-reaching program.

URGENCY NOTED

Most of the southern legislatures do not meet until next year, although a few are meeting now. However, many believe the issue is so urgent that special sessions could be called, if that becomes necessary. All statements coming from members of the conference committee have pointed to the urgency of the matter.

The details of the committee's recommendations to the full meeting of the governor's conference are now being drafted. It is expected the committee will suggest setting up a board of control to consist of three members from each State, including the governor. The committee is also expected to propose that costs be borne on a population basis.

The Atlanta Journal point out that a broad system of regional schools such as is proposed by the committee would help southern States "not only to solve the problem of higher and specialized education for Negro students, but give white students advantages in fields of special training which the individual States cannot afford."

RICH POTENTIALITIES

"A plan so rich in potentialities for the progress and prosperity of the South should be pressed forward wholeheartedly," the Journal concludes.

However, others who view the program in the sole light of an attempt to sidestep the recent Supreme Court decisions suggest that the South should proceed cautiously. The Columbia (S. C.) Record says that the plan was a good idea 10 years ago, before the Gaines case, brought up from Missouri, but that 10 years ago it was impossible to interest the South in such a plan.

"Adopted then," the Record says, "the plan would have put graduate education for Negroes in the South on a plane that otherwise will not be reached for years, if at all."

Now, the newspaper points out, something of a new issue would be presented to the Supreme Court if regional schools are set up and the plan is contested.

The educational committee of the Governors' Conference will undoubtedly recommend the acceptance of Meharry College in Nashville, Tenn., for joint operation by the 15 Southern States as a school for the higher education of Negroes in medicine, dentistry, and nursing. Meharry College has been offered the States as an outright gift for the first unit in the proposed program. The only condition to the gift is that the privately operated $8,000,000 institution be continued at its present high standard.

Mr. President, I repeat that I have cited those two newspaper articles because they are typical and representative of newspaper comment in the early part of February, when this question was first raised. They bear out the contention that there are mixed motives behind this compact. I do not say they are improper motives, for I have the highest respect for the sincerity and the honest judgment of the proponents of this compact. I know them to be sincere in their views as to what would be good policy insofar as the operation of regional schools is concerned.

Mr. President, in concluding my remarks today, I wish to say that I have no intention at any time during this historic debate of imputing to anyone either on the other side of the aisle or on this side of the aisle, who is in support of the idea of securing congressional sanction for this compact, anything but the best of motives. I do not ask anyone to extend to me the same courtesy, because I am always willing to let my record of trying to be absolutely fair in stating the facts in regard to any issue speak for itself. What personal attitudes are or may be toward me never make one bit of difference to me. I shall always come, back, Mr. President, to the question, what are the facts about a given issue involved in debate. In this instance, I shall always come back to the question, What is the law? That is what the Senate of the United States had better determine before it takes a vote on this compact. If it really makes an intensive study of that question, I think it will come to the conclusion that the law is that congressional approval of this compact is not necessary. I think it will also come to the conclusion that, as a matter of law, if it proceeds on the assumption that congressional approval is necessary, then it is faced with the problem of laying down specific conditions, from the standpoint of national policy as to civil rights which shall be applied in these regional schools.

Mr. President, I did not ask for this debate. I did not propose this compact. It was not my idea that at this session of Congress we should enter into a debate on civil rights, over this issue of segregation in higher education. But I cannot be a defender of civil rights, I cannot take the position that I have taken all over this country over the years in support of civil rights, Mr. President, and then, when confronted in the Senate of the United States with a proposal which, in my judgment, raises questions of civil rights, not make a fight to protect civil rights. There are those on this side of the aisle who have said to me privately that they do not think we ought to make the fight for civil rights in connection with this compact. I completely disagree with that point of view, because I take the position that as representatives of the Republican Party we must make the fight for civil rights whenever it is raised on the floor of the Senate of the United States. It has been raised by the proponents of this compact, as I see the issues which are involved in it.

At the proper time I shall make my motion to refer, for the reasons which I have set forth in the three speeches I have made on this compact. I think it is very important that we endeavor to secure from the United States Department of Justice its legal views on the legal prerequisites of a compact, insofar as congressional sanction is concerned. I think the Committee on the Judiciary should go much more thoroughly into the question of the necessity for congressional sanction of this compact than I submit anything in the printed hearings shows the committee in fact went.

Mr. President, I close by saying that so far as I personally am concerned, I have no personal issue with any Senators on the other side of the aisle. I have only an honest and sincere difference of

opinion as to the legal soundness of the position taken by the proponents of this compact. I shall regret it very much if the time ever comes in the Senate of the United States when honest men, following their sincere convictions, cannot debate great issues such as this one without having personal reflection cast upon them. I shall be no party at any time to that style of debate in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, I now wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry, and then I shall take my seat. My inquiry is this: If I should at this time move to refer the compact to the Judiciary Committee, would that in any way hamper proponents of the compact in carrying on a full debate on the merits of the compact as they see those merits? If it would, I certainly would not think of making the motion at this time, because I want them to make their full record on their views in support of the compact.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). The Chair rules that a motion to refer is debatable, and that the motion would not restrain debate by any Senator caring to engage in it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. WHERRY. Is a motion to refer in order at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that a motion to refer is in order, taking precedence over all pending motions.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in view of the fact that debate can proceed under my motion, on the merits of the compact, for as long as any of the proponents want to debate it, or the opponents, either, and would not in any way affect the right of any Senator to full debate, it seems to me that now is the appropriate time for me to move to refer this compact to the Judiciary Committee, for the reasons I have set out in the speeches previously delivered on the floor of the Senate upon this subject. I now so move.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from Oregon to refer the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 334, to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as a member of the Judiciary Committee who voted against reporting the pending joint resolution, I associate myself with the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. This matter was discussed in the Judiciary Committee. We went into it to some extent, but, in my opinion, it was not fully explored. I shall therefore support the motion to refer to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. President, I wish to bring certain facts to the attention of the Members of this body. First of all, I want to quote from the Charter of the United Nations. How well I remember, Mr. President, when the question of ratification of the United Nations Charter was upon this floor, how Senator after Senator, on both sides of the aisle—Senators from the East, from the West, from the North, and from the South—finally declared, "At long last we are going to have peace in the world." Why, there was not one word wrong with the United Nations Charter. The former Senator from Minnesota, Mr. Shipstead, and myself were the only two Senators who opposed it and who ventured to speak against it. The floor was even more completely deserted than at the present time. In my opinion, there never was a better propaganda machine in the history of the United States than the one that put over the United Nations Charter, the provisions of which make it impossible to amend the Charter. When we protested the fact that it could not be amended—that it contained a veto power—the Senators on this floor, those who were here, paid very little attention to it. But, Mr. President, I now call the attention of the southern Senators—those who voted for the United Nations Charter—to chapter 1, paragraph 3. I assume they at least read the first page of the United Nations Charter for which they voted. I shall read it. This, Mr. President, is what every Senator, except the former Senator from Minnesota, Mr. Shipstead, and I, voted on July 28, 1945. I may say to any reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that he can ascertain whether a particular Senator was in the Senate or not by remembering the date, July 28, 1945, when every Senator who was present, except two of us, voted "yea" on ratification. As set forth in paragraph 3, chapter 1, this is what the distinguished Senators voted for:

> To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all—

For all, Mr. President, whether residing in North Dakota, in Alabama, in Florida, in Maine, in Mexico, or in Argentina—for all, everywhere—

> fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion; and
>
> To be a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends.

I have here, Mr. President, the names of the delegates at San Francisco who signed in behalf of the United States. I need not mention them, because Senators are all familiar with them, and Senators know that the list contains the names of both Democrats and Republicans.

Mr. President, we were going to have a new era. We had fought a long, costly and bloody war. We had heard the Democratic President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and Winston Churchill, who told us about the new Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms." There was going to be one world; everybody would love everybody else, regardless of race, color, language, or religion. It would be one great happy family all over the world. That is what my friends voted for, upon the floor of the Senate.

I expected, after the Charter was adopted, to see people of all races walking arm in arm on the streets of Washington. We were all going to be sisters and brothers. We heard upon the floor of the Senate that we would make friends with the Chinese, the Koreans, and the Liberians, because, Mr. President, the Charter was signed by representatives of those nations. The representative of Liberia sat down with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. The Charter was signed by representatives from Haiti and other nations. Not a single Senator objected to this great new brotherhood and sisterhood which was to be established all over the world.

Were colleges promptly opened to the different races and nationalities in the United States? I shall demonstrate in a few minutes, Mr. President, that they were not.

When the pending compact came before our committee, in due course of time the report which I have in my hand was prepared. I am not criticizing anyone. I want to read four sentences and let the Senate decide whether they represent a true and honest statement. They appear on page 4 of the report, and are as follows:

> The conference of southern governors has been working toward the completion of this compact since 1935. The signatory States have now, for the first time, become financially able to establish and support such schools.

I repeat the last sentence:

> The signatory States have now, for the first time, become financially able to establish and support such schools.

What are the signatory States which, for the first time, have become financially able, since 1935, to establish and support such schools? They are the States of Florida, Maryland, Georgia, Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi, Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, Arkansas, North Carolina, South Carolina, Texas, Oklahoma, and West Virginia. Those are the signatory States which this report says were so poor, so desperately hard up, so devoid of money, that now for the first time since 1935 they have become financially able to establish and support schools.

Mr. President, let us find out how honest that statement is. I quote from the speech of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], which he delivered on April 1, 1948, and which appears on page 3933 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. At that time we were considering Federal educational aid to States. What was said at that time by the distinguished Senator from Virginia, who is one of my very best friends and for whom I have the deepest affection? He was speaking of the amount of money that the States had. He said on that day:

> Mr. President, I wish to discuss the ability of the States to operate their own school systems, because, after all, the proponents of this legislation get down to the fact that the States are not able to operate their school systems.

That is exactly what was said in the four lines of the report which I read. They were financially unable to establish and support such schools. That is what

the distinguished Senator from Virginia said. Then he continued as follows:

Let me read the balances in the treasuries of the various States, exclusive of highway and veterans' funds.

He said the States were in splendid shape to take care of all their schools.

In the fiscal year 1946—

Said the Senator from Virginia—

the great State of Alabama had $23,900,000 in its Treasury.

That is exclusive of highway and veterans' funds. He said that Alabama had $23,900,000. This report says that Alabama for the first time became financially able to establish and support such a school.

The Senator from Virginia said that Florida had $17,000,000 in its treasury; Georgia had $15,000,000. Together they had $32,000,000, which, added to Alabama's approximately $23,000,000 makes over $55,000,000 in the treasuries of those three States which were so desperately poor that for the first time since 1935 they had in their treasuries that amount.

Kentucky had $17,000,000; Louisiana, $20,000,000; Mississippi, $15,000,000; Missouri, $40,000,000; North Carolina, $48,000,000; Oklahoma, $10,000,000; Tennessee, $14,000,000; Texas, $13,000,000; Virginia, $53,000,000; West Virginia, $21,000,000.

That is the record, Mr. President, as stated by the senior Senator from Virginia. Virginia was one of the signatory States to the compact which our friends are endeavoring to get through this body. They had more than $100,000,000, but they were too poor, according to the report, to establish, maintain, and support a school such as Meharry, too poor to have such schools in their own States.

I quote further from the distinguished Senator from Virginia, at page 3934:

I say that if we assume that education is a responsibility of the Federal Government, then when the States need additional money they will write to you and to me and to other Senators to try to get the money from the Federal Treasury—

And mark this, Mr. President—

instead of trying to get it from local taxes, where it should come from.

I repeat the statement of the Senator from Virginia, "instead of trying to get it from local taxes, where it should come from."

What does that mean? One of the Southern States advertises that it has a magnificent climate and such wonderful hotels that when one pays $30 a night for staying in one of them he is getting a bargain. Booklets are issued containing pictures of beautiful palm trees, and we are told about the fine roads they have and the splendid fishing facilities and opportunities. The State advertises the fact that it has no State income tax, and it puts in the ads, "Come and become a citizen of our State and get away from the State income tax you are paying in North Dakota."

So, up in Wisconsin and in North Dakota, the two States which have perhaps the highest State income tax rate today, some of our citizens whose incomes had gotten in the higher brackets left and moved down to this Southern State, because they did not have to pay any income tax there.

Yet, Mr. President, this report says that in 1935, at a time when they were advertising in North Dakota, "Come down to our State and avoid the income tax," in 1936, and clear through 1946, the State was so poor that it could not maintain and support a school like the one we are referring to. But the Senator from Virginia said that instead of trying to get this money from the Federal Government they should get it from local taxes, whence it should come.

Not only that, Mr. President, but there are certain industries which can settle in almost any State they choose. The particular State to which I have referred also wants the headquarters of the corporations located there, so they advertise and say, "Establish your business down here in this great big beautiful State. Do not go to North Dakota, do not go to Wisconsin, do not go to the other States where you have to pay a high income tax. Come to this State." So they have gotten the people from the other States to go down South to that State, to leave the States where some of the officers of these corporations were born, and locate their headquarters and main offices down there, so as to get away from the income tax. All they would have had to do was to levy an income tax in order to get as much money as any other State in the Union, where the States did establish and maintain the schools.

Mr. President, I was interested particularly in the speech of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, because, as I have said, being a member of that committee, I sat in and listened to the words he spoke in behalf of the joint resolution now pending. I was particularly impressed when he said yesterday that 1,200,000 boys were unable to get into the Army or the Navy or the Air Corps during the last war because they did not have sufficient education. I investigated that statement, and found it to be substantially true. The number was slightly larger than the figures I was able to obtain, but hundreds of thousands of young men and women were unable to get into the armed forces.

So I procured a small pamphlet edited by W. Montague Cobb, M. D., Ph. D., entitled "Medical Care for and the Plight of the Negro." One heading in the book is "Professional Personnel." I read under that heading:

Negro professional personnel today comprises about 4,000 physicians, 1,600 dentists, 9,000 nurses, and 1,400 pharmacists, a grossly inadequate number by any standard. It is accepted as a minimal standard of safety that there should be 1 physician to 1,500 of population. The national average is about 1 to 750.

That is the national average, 1 to 750 people.

In 1942 the proportion of Negro physicians to Negro population was 1 to 3,377.

Not 1 to 750, the national average, but 1 to 3,377.

The range by States was from 1 to 1,002 in Missouri to 1 to 18,527 in Mississippi.

I wish to repeat that to every 18,527 Negroes in the State of Mississippi there was in 1942 1 Negro physician.

It is not our premise that the number of Negro physicians in the United States should be determined by the number of Negroes, but if physician-population ratio is considered on a racial basis, there should be 9,334 colored physicians today, assuming the Negro population to be 14,000,000. This is more than twice the existing number. Consequently, a large portion of the Negro population receives such medical care as it obtains from white physicians who, in many cases, find the service an inconvenience. The following statement of a prominent white physician in the Washington Star of July 1, 1947, is highly significant in this connection: "In the past we have profitably used the Negro as our guinea pig in clinical medicine. Let us have the good sense to do it in medical economics."

Mr. President, I say that the development of greater opportunities for higher education for all people is a fine objective.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to suggest to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that the pending question before the Senate is a motion to refer the joint resolution. I understood the distinguished Senator to say that he is in favor of the motion. It seems to me that for the RECORD it should be shown just what the effect of referral would be. We have before us a measure which came from the House where it was adopted by a vote of 6 to 1. A great majority of the Members of the House voted in favor of giving Federal approval to a compact which would aid an important Negro school. It seems to me that for the RECORD an attempt should be made to harmonize the proposed action of recommitting the measure with the position taken by the majority of the Members of the House. I hope that before the Senator from North Dakota has concluded his remarks he will endeavor to harmonize the proposed action, because there might be those who would feel that the end result of a motion to refer might be to kill the measure, and the question would arise: By referring the measure, would we be helping or would we be hindering the education which is sought to be provided for the Negroes in that great southern school?

I believe I understand the position of the Senator from North Dakota very well, but I think there ought to be a clear, concise statement made as to just what the effect of referring the measure would be. It is my opinion that such a statement should be made for the RECORD, and especially for the benefit of Senators who may desire to vote to refer. Since the joint resolution came to the Senate after having been passed by the House by an overwhelming vote, the implication at least is that the measure is in furtherance and aid of an educational institution which is providing education for Negro students. It seems to me that the position of both those who believe in segregation and those who believe in nonsegregation should be harmonized with the position taken in voting to send the bill back to the Com-

mittee on the Judiciary for further consideration.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the best way to harmonize our votes with our beliefs is to send the measure back to the committee and have hearings upon it, and permit those who desire to be heard to appear before the committee. So far as I am concerned, however, in its present position I want to kill it just as dead as I can kill it. I will make plain my reasons as I go along. We cannot make it too dead to suit me.

Mr. WHERRY. I am offering what I believed to be a constructive suggestion to the Senator from North Dakota. The debate heretofore has been based on constitutional questions such as have been raised by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. Now we have before us a motion to refer which, in reality, I agree with the Senator from North Dakota, would result in killing the joint resolution. I agree with the Senator that we should do as much as we possibly can to provide education for the Negro.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to make it very plain that so far as I am personally concerned I have nothing but the very friendliest feelings for my colleagues who favor the joint resolution. I want to make it plain that in my whole State I believe there are less than 50 Negro voters.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. In the interest of accuracy I wish to say that the Federal census for 1940 shows that there were 201 Negro citizens in the State of North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. There were 201 Negro citizens in the State, but there is an average of 4 members in each family, so there would be about 50 voters in all. At most there would be 50 Negro voters in my State. Sometimes a Negro family is larger than four members; sometimes a Negro family is smaller than four members. Sometimes such a family is composed of six or seven members. But if there are 201 Negro citizens in my State about 50 of them would be voters. I suppose the distinguished Senator from Florida might say that 50 votes are 50 votes, but I will say that altogether in our State there are roughly from 225,000 to 230,000 voters, so the total number of Negro voters would be very insignificant.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I was simply trying to have the exact figures in the RECORD. I thought that is what the Senator from North Dakota would want. I merely desired to be helpful.

Mr. LANGER. I am deeply grateful to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. President, in my State, so far as I know, I have never seen any inclination to segregate the Negroes from the whites. There is no inclination to separate one nationality from another. The people of the State of North Dakota are of pioneer stock, a group which is proud of being citizens of North Dakota, proud of being citizens of the United States of America.

Mr. President, I say that whenever our brethren in the South are ready to abandon the present system under which they spend approximately $81,000,000 a year for the education of white children and only $4,000,000 towards the education of colored children, it is possible that they can develop better educational facilities. They have shown no disposition to do this, and now they come to the Congress and ask that we give the approval of the United States Government to a scheme which will circumvent recent decisions of the Supreme Court.

I am very anxious to make it clear to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that I favor legislation to provide educational facilities for the Negro. During the short time I have been in the Senate I have introduced bills for the relief of East Indian people, and we have finally made it possible to have 3,000 of them become citizens. I will say that I was assisted by Clare Boothe Luce and by Representative CELLER in the House. I have introduced legislation to help the Estonians, I have introduced legislation for the help of the Jewish people, I have introduced legislation for the help of the German people, I have introduced legislation to aid practically every nationality under the sun. The people of my State believe that there should be no discrimination of any kind or character because of race, color, creed, sex, or language. So I wish to make plain to my friends and to all those who favor the pending measure that what I am saying today is simply carrying out what has been my policy ever since I entered this body.

The compact which was drawn up between the governors of the Southern States declares, in the first paragraph, that it is for the purpose of—

> Looking toward the establishment and maintenance of jointly owned and operated regional educational institutions in the Southern States * * * so as to provide greater educational advantages and facilities for the citizens of the several States who reside within such region.

During the hearings on this proposal Gov. Millard F. Caldwell, of the State of Florida, stated that this question had been in the mill for years, and that he was not much concerned about institutions for Negroes, but that this was an attempt to get better education for white citizens. However, the second paragraph of the compact reads as follows:

> Whereas, Meharry Medical College, of Nashville, Tenn., has proposed that its lands, buildings, equipment, and the net income from its endowment be turned over to the Southern States, or to an agency acting in their behalf, to be operated as a regional institution for medical, dental, and nursing education upon terms and conditions to be hereafter agreed upon between the Southern States and Meharry Medical College, which proposal, because of the present financial condition of the institution, has been approved by the said States who are parties hereto.

Mr. President, the Meharry Medical College referred to in that statement is a school for the training and education of colored doctors and nurses. It is a very peculiar thing that this great plan, which was supposed to provide better educational facilities for all people in the State, mentions as the first institution which will be supported under a regional plan one for the colored people.

If my distinguished colleagues wished to give effect to paragraph 3 of the United Nations Charter, if they wished to carry out the terms of the great document to achieve international cooperation and preserve fundamental freedoms for all without distinction because of race, sex, language, or religion, why did they not pick out the University of Virginia instead of Meharry College? Only 2 years ago a little girl was barred from that university because of a certain article which she wrote in the student newspaper, an article which stated that there should be no discrimination. Why did they not pick out the University of Texas? Why did they not pick out Miami University in Florida, or the University of North Carolina? Why did they not pick out one of the fine, solid institutions which was not broke, instead of picking out little Meharry College, which is said to be insolvent and in need of help?

It is a very peculiar thing that this great plan, which was supposed to provide better educational facilities for all the people in the South, mentions as the first institution which will be supported by a regional plan, one for colored people. Because of inequalities which the colored people have suffered in education in the South, they have resorted to court action to gain admission to State schools of law, medicine, and other professions in the South. The Supreme Court has held, in cases arising in Oklahoma and Missouri, that if the colored people are to have equal educational opportunities they must be provided within the borders of the State within which they reside, if similar educational opportunities are offered for white people.

This fight on the part of our colored citizens goes back to 1934, when they won a decision in the Maryland Court of Appeals permitting them to attend the law school at the University of Maryland. Think of it, Mr. President! There was a young man who happened to be one-eighth Negro. Before he could get into the University of Maryland he had to go to the supreme court of Maryland to get the order. Today there are a score of colored students going to the University of Maryland Law School, and two of them have done such outstanding work that they are on the editorial board of the University Law Review.

Mr. President, when I went to college at Columbia University colored boys were allowed to attend. Some of them were in my class. They were good students. I did not see any evidence of discrimination against them in the city of New York. There were students from Turkey. I think there were students from every country in the world among the 30,000 students who at that time were attending that institution.

I have talked with some of the colored citizens of Maryland who are greatly disturbed because they believe that this regional compact is a poorly disguised attempt on the part of their State to prevent them from going to the medical, dental, and pharmaceutical schools which are established in Maryland. In

my opinion, it is ridiculous to assume that Maryland would abandon this type of education for white people, now that it is well established; but it is not unreasonable to expect that the State will try to shunt its Negro students who seek this type of training down to Tennessee or some other State if this regional compact has the approval of Congress. The colored people have spent thousands of dollars fighting for an opportunity to attend schools which are supported partly from the taxes which they pay. We must not present a new obstacle to their progress by placing the stamp of approval of the United States Government on a compact to extend segregation.

During the fall term at the University of Maryland a colored student sought admission to the university's graduate school of chemistry. He was a veteran. He was a resident of the State. Although he had been sent a card showing that he had been admitted, he was later turned down by the university authorities when it was discovered that he was colored. President H. C. Byrd, of the University of Maryland, was quoted in the Washington Post as saying that Maryland would maintain its system of separation of the races in education. I cite this example to show that even when the State courts—mind you, not the Federal courts, but the State courts—of the State where the university is located give relief to Negroes who are seeking opportunities to benefit from the training offered, some of the officials still seek ways and means of carrying out their plans for segregation.

Senators have frequently taken the floor to say that there must be no Federal interference with the affairs of the States. The same persons who have ardently defended States' rights are seeking to make the Federal Government a party to a policy which flies in the face of all the fine things we have been saying about the equality of man and justice for all, as provided under the Constitution.

Mr. President, I have heard some of my colleagues, on Constitution Day, rise in their places and tell about the Constitution being the finest instrument ever devised by man, ever devised by human hands. Yet now they ask Congress to give its approval to a plan which runs counter to the decisions of the Supreme Court, as those decisions affect the higher education of Negroes.

During the hearings on this proposal it has been said that there are some Negroes who favor this plan. Mr. President, it is always possible to get persons in an affected group to favor almost anything. In the last war there were American citizens who favored Germany. In the Revolutionary War there were Americans who were Tories. Every army has its share of deserters. Even Christ had Judas to contend with. So it is always possible to get persons in an affected group to favor almost anything. However, we cannot decide these questions on the basis of whether some shortsighted persons favor them. We must decide them on the high moral ground of what is right and what is wrong. Nowhere in the Constitution of the United States is it said that a red man or a black man is to be treated differently than a white man. All of us know that the system of segregation in the educational facilities of the 17 States and the District of Columbia where these policies prevail has resulted in an average expense per white pupil in the elementary and secondary schools much greater than the average expense per Negro pupil. In nine Southern States reporting to the United States Office of Education from 1939 to 1940, the average expense per white pupil was almost 212 percent greater than the average expense for each Negro pupil. Only $18.82 was spent per Negro pupil, while the average per white pupil was $58.69. Those same States gave white pupils an average of 171 days of schooling per school term, while the Negroes received an average of 156 days per school term. The average salary for a white teacher in the schools of those States was $1,046, while the average Negro teacher's salary was only $601. In the professional schools, the combined assets value of the plant facilities of the 13 white State-supported schools above the high-school level in the State of Texas was in excess of $72,000,000, while that of the only Negro school of higher learning was slightly more than $4,000,000. On a per capita basis, $12.88 was invested in plant assets for every white person, while only $4.71 was provided for every colored person.

We have often heard gentlemen from some of the Southern States talk about the importance of settling the problems of race relations through education. They may mean what they say. But, Mr. President, how in God's name can we have any settlement when such unequal conditions exist? When $4.71 worth of education is provided for a colored child and $12.88 worth of education is provided for a white child, the result frequently is that the colored people do not get even $4.71 worth of benefits from that system.

If we now give our approval to regional schools, we shall be saying to the States which have this discrimination that we endorse what they are doing; that we, the Senate, as the representatives of the people of the United States, endorse a system under which, because of segregation, it will be impossible for anyone, whether he be colored or white, to get the most desirable type of education. We shall be saying that the United States Government, which today is furnishing the greatest leadership the world has ever known in saving the human race from destroying itself, gives approval to a Nazi-like form of education which will provide that the supermen who are white will be educated at one place and that all other persons will have to take an inferior type of education at another place.

In the cases which recently have been brought against the Southern States by the colored people who are seeking justice in the educational field it has been shown that the white pupils who attend the University of Texas and the University of Oklahoma have voted by an overwhelming majority that they wish to have colored students admitted; that they wish to associate with them; that they wish to have them there. If those young people are left to themselves, they may develop the kind of human brotherhood which not only will be the salvation of the South but will set an example for everyone throughout the world as to how persons of different origins, different religious beliefs, and different racial extractions may live together in peace and with mutual respect. This regional compact—devised by men who, because of their age, will not have to live as long in a world which faces the atom bomb and a number of other means of destroying itself—will dam up and halt the flow of opinion among the young people in the direction of common justice.

In this month's Reader's Digest there is an article about Sarah Lawrence College, in Bronxville, N. Y. I recommend a reading of the article to every Member of this body. According to the article, that college in New York is attended by some of the wealthiest girls in the United States, and it also is attended by daughters of farmers, who may not be so wealthy. It was attended by one of my daughters, who graduated there; and it is now being attended by another of my daughters. That college makes no distinction as to race, color, or creed. At that college a white girl and a colored girl may room together, and a Jewish girl and a colored girl may room together. That college makes absolutely no distinction of any kind or character, according to the article in the Reader's Digest, which states that it is the finest girls school in the entire United States of America; a school which has made an outstanding record; a school so fine that even though it is a girls school, this year 67 male GI's were sent there by our Government; a school, Mr. President, where a white girl and a colored girl go downtown shopping together; a school where all the girls go to the same party together, if they care to go. That is the school which the Reader's Digest says is the finest girls school in the entire United States.

Mr. President, I have no sympathy for, and I do not wish to be associated with, on any bill in the Senate, anyone who says there is a distinction between men and women whom Almighty God made, simply because some happen to be yellow or red or black or white. The men who drafted the Constitution of the United States made no distinction of that sort. Our country, in the era that has gone by, certainly has had enough trouble over the problem. I say, Mr. President, as one Senator upon this floor, so far as any threats against the President of the United States may be concerned, to the effect that he is to be defeated because he dares espouse civil rights, that in my humble opinion those who are taking that attitude are not helping the Constitution of the United States about which they like to brag so much.

The Supreme Court on Monday struck a mighty blow at foreign propaganda against this country when it declared that restrictive covenants based on race cannot be enforced by the courts. The Chief Justice declared that such enforcement was against the policy of the United States. But, Mr. President, I submit that that is exactly what was

declared by the Senate in adopting the United Nations Charter. I repeat, the Senate, by an almost unanimous vote, declared, by paragraph 3 of article 1, chapter 1, that the policy of the United States Government is—

To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

That was approved by this body; and, although I did not vote for ratification of the United Nations Charter, I said, after its adoption, I intended to do all I could to help carry it out. That is what I am doing today, Mr. President, in calling it to the attention of Senators who said everybody should be upon a plane of social and cultural equality, without discrimination as to race, sex, language, or religion.

I am here to help carry out the promise that was made to the people of the United States when the Charter was adopted. I want to help. I want to call it to the attention of Senators, because sometimes, under the stress of great emotion, men want to help, but later they cool off, and their attention must be called again to the fine intentions they had in saying, "Now, come on, boys, let us carry this out."

The decision of the Supreme Court of a week ago Monday will be of untold benefit to our relations with other countries throught the world. But what a joke it will become if we in the Congress follow the decision by placing our stamp of approval on a system of education which, because it will be designed to comply with the constitutions and laws of the participating States, will be a segregated and discriminatory system of education. It will say, if the pending measure is adopted, that the United States speaks with three voices: First, the voice of its Chief Executive, who has said the country believes in civil rights. A civil-rights report was issued. Second, the voice of its courts, who have said it is against public policy to separate citizens into ghettos and racially restricted areas. Then, just as millions of people are gaining new hope from these mighty pronouncements, a third voice speaks. It is the legislative voice, upholding a system of racial restrictions in the one field where intelligence shows that there is no justification for it, namely, the field of education.

We cannot break faith with our children, nor with the founders of this country. We must not destroy the heritage of Jefferson and Lincoln. I, therefore, say that I shall vote against this measure and I call upon members of the Republican Party to rally against it. This is our chance to show that we believe in the many things we have been saying to the colored voters. We have told them that they should have an antilynch law, that they should have an equal opportunity for employment, and that they should have the right to vote, without fear of violence and without unfair taxation.

Because the Republican Party is the party of Abraham Lincoln, we have made these statements in line with our heritage and tradition. We cannot now take a Janus-like position, looking with one face to the promised land of freedom and equality while with the other we smile upon and give approval to a system which will result in gross inequalities and a streamlined plan of segregation.

Mr. President, I say to the members of the Democratic Party, and certainly I say it as one who has had an utterly nonpartisan attitude upon this floor, that President Truman has honored you and the Nation by going on record in support of civil rights for all our people. What kind of President would you have? One who would raise his right hand and swear upon the Bible that he would carry out the Constitution and laws of the United States and then turn his back upon an oath he had taken? Would you have a President who would disgrace the Democratic Party, rather than one who would honor it, and who has honored it? Surely, the Democratic Party cannot now repudiate his program by voting in favor of this proposal. I have mentioned both major parties because there are many people who say that any stand on the civil-rights issue is political.

I believe that it is time we recognize that these pronouncements do not spring from political motivations, but show rather a deep yearning in the hearts of all our people for freedom for everyone. Such pronouncements find their way into political platforms and the resolutions of churches and other organizations, because this is the way we want America to be. This is the way our forefathers intended it to be.

There is a minority of people who, because of the high positions they enjoy, and because the system of segregation and discrimination serves selfish purposes, stand in the way of a realization of these things, toward which the great majority of our people aspire. They are constantly attempting to whittle away the gains we make in the direction of brotherhood and understanding. We have not been successful in stopping them on their own ground, but we must stop them in the Congress of the United States. I say therefore, let us recognize this attempt for what it is, and vote to defeat it.

Before concluding, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that as a part of my remarks, and at the end thereof, there may be printed, from a pamphlet entitled "Medical Care and the Plight of the Negro," by W. Montague Cobb, M. D., Ph. D., published by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the following chapters and tables: Chapter 3, professional personnel; chapter 4, Negro medical ghetto; chapter 5, sources of physicians; chapter 6, inadequate supply of physicians; chapter 7, Howard, Meharry, and separate professional education; chapter 8, reinforcing shackles; chapter 10, no third Negro medical school; chapter 11, State board records, together with the statistics; chapter 12, internships; chapter 13, residencies and assistant residencies; chapter 14, specialists, together with tables 6, 7, and 8, and chapter 15, the latter being entitled "Colleges."

I may say, finally, Mr. President, that I subscribe in toto to everything which has been said by my distinguished colleague from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I think he has given a remarkable analysis of the bill. I agree with him, as I do with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], that the bill is unconstitutional. I agree particularly with the thorough analysis given to it by the Senator from Oregon, and I shall vote with him to recommit the bill to the Judiciary Committee. If it goes back to that committee, Mr. President, I hope that when hearings are held there will be many more witnesses before the subcommittee considering the bill than there were when it was previously considered.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

3. PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL

Negro professional personnel today comprises about 4,000 physicians, 1,600 dentists, 9,000 nurses, and 1,400 pharmacists, a grossly inadequate number by any standard. It is accepted as a minimal standard of safety that there should be 1 physician to 1,500 of population. The national average is about 1 to 750. In 1942 the proportion of Negro physicians to Negro population was 1 to 3,377. The range by States was from 1 to 1,002 in Missouri, to 1 to 18,527 in Mississippi. But two cities in the country, Washington, D. C., and St. Louis, Mo., have a proportion approximating the national average of 1 to 750.

It is not our premise that the number of Negro physicians in the United States should be determined by the number of Negroes, but if physician-population ratio is considered on a racial basis, there should be 9,334 colored physicians today, assuming the Negro population to be 14,000,000. This is more than twice the existing number. Consequently, a large portion of the Negro population receives such medical care as it obtains from white physicians who, in many cases, find this service an inconvenience. The following statement of a prominent white physician in the Washington Star of July 1, 1947, is highly significant in this connection: "In the past we have profitably used the Negro as our guinea pig in clinical medicine. Let us have the good sense to do it in medical economics."

4. NEGRO MEDICAL GHETTO

The Negro medical man has had to work out his problems in a nationally dispersed professional "ghetto." Many have become so conditioned to the arrangement that too often they think it the only one possible and believe, as is frequently asserted, that one is being "unrealistic" if he thinks otherwise.

The heart of this medical ghetto is the Howard and Meharry Medical Schools. The field centers are about 10 Negro hospitals and about 10 additional hospitals in the North and West, where most of these graduates serve their internships and obtain advanced training in residencies and specialties. These few institutions determine to a large extent the type of medical service the public can receive.

None, second-, third-, or fourth-rate hospitals have largely been the portion of the Negro people. This lack of adequate hospital facilities has been the greatest material handicap to the receipt of adequate medical care by the patient and adequate postgraduate training by the profession.

There are 112 Negro hospitals in the United States, of which some 25 are accredited and 14 approved for the training of interns. The number of hospital beds available to Negroes is in the neighborhood of 10,000. It is the current accepted standard that there should

be 4.5 general hospital beds per 1,000 of population. In "some areas where the population is heavily Negro there are as few as 75 beds set aside for over 1,000,000 of this group." In Mississippi in 1938, a survey by the Council on Medical Education and Hospitals of the American Medical Association, found 0.7 bed for Negroes and 2.4 for whites. Although in the 4 years preceding the survey there had been a steady increase in the number of hospital beds, facilities for Negroes had increased less rapidly than those for whites. The comment of the report is extremely enlightening on the attitude apparently of the State and the surveyors toward Negroes. It states, "In appraising medical service in this State one must take into account the fact that over 50 percent of the population in Mississippi are Negroes and that the demand for medical service among this group may fall below the requirements for the white population."

5. SOURCES OF PHYSICIANS

The two Negro schools, Howard University Medical School in Washington, D. C., and Meharry Medical College in Nashville, Tenn., graduate, and from their inception have trained, the large majority of Negro physicians (about 85 percent).

The first American Negro to receive a medical degree was James McCune Smith of New York, who had to go to Europe for his training and was graduated a doctor of medicine from the University of Glasgow in 1837, 110 years ago.

Before the Civil War, there was objection to professional education for Negroes if they intended to practice in the United States, but it was permissible if they proposed to go to Liberia, which was then being colonized. In this way, Dr. William Taylor and Dr. Fleet, of Washington, D. C.; Dr. John V. de Grasse, of New York; and Dr. Thomas White, of Brooklyn received their training. The two latter received their doctor of medicine degrees from Bowdoin College, Maine, in 1849. It was not until the Howard University Medical School was established in 1868 and the Meharry Medical College in 1876, that there was training of Negro physicians in any significant number.

6. INADEQUATE SUPPLY OF PHYSICIANS

At present about 145 Negro doctors are graduated annually. Howard and Meharry produce nearly 70 each and about a dozen are graduated annually from various medical schools in the North. The total is about 3 percent of doctors graduated annually in the United States. The Negro forms 10 percent of the population and is expected to constitute 11.1 percent in 1960. Surgeon General Parran of the United States Public Health Service has estimated that the Nation would need 95,000 more doctors by 1960. This would mean significant stepping up of our annual production of doctors. Obviously, the present production of Negro doctors cannot keep pace even with the growth of the Negro population, much less contribute to the general need.

7. HOWARD, MEHARRY, AND SEPARATE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

It has been a common mistake, even among Negroes, to regard Howard and Meharry as justifying their existence only by being responsible for training nearly all physicians needed by the Negro group. Medical education is an expensive and exacting enterprise. There are 77 medical schools in the United States. Their only ethical justification is the training of first-class physicians, a priority of competence, not race. Fifty years ago, Howard and Meharry might still have been the only solution to a difficult problem, but this is no longer the case. The present indication is for Howard and Meharry to open their doors to more white students and for the other 75 medical schools to admit such qualified Negro applicants as might appear. It is only through a program of intelligent integration that the health needs of the Negro, which are inseparable from those of the general population, can be met. Over the years, the two Negro schools, isolated and struggling alone, have done a remarkable job. They have worked with too many poorly prepared, often ill-chosen students; with faculties in large measure overworked, undermanned, poorly paid, and frequently inadequately trained; and with hospital and preclinical facilities which have been such as, at critical times in the life of each institution, to have jeopardized the standing of the schools.

Recent years have witnessed encouraging improvements in the Negro medical schools, particularly in respect to the training represented by the faculty. At Howard alone 25 members of the staff are certified specialists in clinical fields, and an additional four have passed the first part of their specialty boards; 10 faculty members hold the doctor of philosophy or its equivalent, in addition to the doctor of medicine; and five have the doctor of philosophy in their preclinical specialities. At Meharry a number of faculty members have acquired special formal training in their fields, not necessarily leading to an advanced degree.

The responsibility of medical teaching centers for the prosecution of research has long been keenly appreciated by both Howard and Meharry. Meager staff and resources have prevented until the last several years significant activity in this direction. In the past decade, however, sufficient confidence has become established in the ability and facilities of Negro medical investigators for them to receive grants for the conduct of specific investigations from well-known foundations and commercial firms.

A critical survey, now in preparation by the writer, of publications by Negro medical writers has yielded a total of 1,869 titles by 648 individuals. These have appeared in 191 journals in addition to a few bound volumes. Of these articles, 1,073 or 57.4 percent have appeared in the Journal of the National Medical Association. From this it is apparent that the Journal of the Negro's separate medical organization has been his chief organ for scientific expression. Although more than half of what has been written has appeared in this journal, at least one Negro has had published one article in the standard in practically every field.

8. REINFORCING SHACKLES

A recent survey covering two-thirds of our 77 medical schools, and including all of the principal ones, showed Howard and Meharry to have the lowest top salaries for professors of any of the Nation's schools.

Meharry's salaries are lower than Howard's. The faculty there have a fine team spirit and dedication to the principle of service. It is expected that private practice will compensate an inadequate stipend, but no man can serve two masters. In the face of ever-growing requirements and standards, one asks if anywhere it can be tolerated that the Negro will be expected to produce anything but the best, or that he will be expected to do it with less in facilities and compensation than is the lot of others.

The more deeply one analyzes, the more limited the possibilities of the segregated pattern in medical education appear and the greater becomes the conviction that its abolition, in the manner stated above, is necessary.

Along with the above-mentioned improvements in our Negro medical schools themselves, new dangers appear which threaten to forge even more securely about the Negro medical man the shackles of the segregated medical plan.

One is a plan, which already has some overt expression, for Southern States which may be compelled to provide medical education for Negro residents to contract with Meharry for the training of such students. In thus giving support to an institution which needs money badly, the quietus is placed on the Meharry family, and, at the same time young scholars of great promise are directed to the school early. As a result these young men may be entrapped in the segregated plan so subtly that they may never be able to get around to speaking out against it.

Another is a plan of more or less nebulous nature whereby Meharry upper classmen are "farmed out" for clinical training to Negro hospitals in Southern States. The hospital acquires a kind of affiliation with the school which faculty clinicians visit at intervals for supervisory purposes. Through this type of arrangement, the white community completely dodges its local responsibility without any relaxation of the segregated pattern and the school acquires a greater vested interest in the segregated system. The Negro profession has been frequently criticized for its acceptance of segregation because of the vested-interest aspect.

The need for physicians is so great that Meharry and Howard could hardly want for students in predictable time. What the country needs, however, is not 75 good schools and the best that can be done for Howard and Meharry, but 77 or more first-class medical schools for the best men that can be found for training.

* * * * *

10. NO THIRD NEGRO MEDICAL SCHOOL

Realization of the need for more colored professional personnel has given rise to the suggestion that a third Negro medical school be established. North Carolina, where the former Leonard (Shaw) Medical School was located in Raleigh, has been mentioned as a possible area for such an institution. This proposal is cited only to be condemned.

The two existing schools are not yet adequately supported, and as medical education is a far more costly enterprise than ever before, the problem of finding sufficient funds for building and maintaining a new first-class institution constitutes a prime objection. Obtaining a faculty and student body of satisfactory caliber would present difficulties of coequal order.

There were at one time seven medical school for Negroes in the United States: Howard in Washington, Meharry in Nashville, Leonard in Raleigh, Flint in New Orleans, Knoxville in Knoxville, the medical department of the University of West Tennessee in Memphis, and the National Medical College in Louisville. The famous Flexner report on medical education in the United States and Canada pointed out in 1910 that only two of these were in a position to make any contribution of value to the solution of the problem. Our current interest is Flexner's statement:

"The upbuilding of Howard and Meharry will profit the Nation much more than the inadequate maintenance of a larger number of schools. They are of course unequal to the need and the opportunity; but nothing will be gained by way of satisfying the need or of rising to the opportunity through the survival of feeble, ill-equipped institutions, quite regardless of the spirit which animates the promoters."

Today, 37 years after this report was published, it is more clear than ever that not only will a built-up Howard and Meharry not solve the problem, but any segregated scheme whatsoever; hence the idea of a new Negro medical school is best left alone.

11. STATE BOARD RECORDS

The history of the Negro professional schools reveals an incessant struggle for quality. The accompanying table shows the State board examination records of Howard and Meharry graduates for the 44 years, 1903–46, the entire period of record. For a convenient frame of reference, the same data are presented for three representative schools in the North, South, and Middle West. We find Howard and Meharry to have all-time failure percentages of 16.7 and 28.9, respectively, as compared with Harvard's 3.1 (Boston, Mass.),

Emory's 6.2 (Atlanta, Ga.), and Washington's 3.1 (St. Louis, Mo.). Not until 1930 and 1925 did Meharry and Howard graduates, respectively, show consistently lower than 10-percent failures. It is an ironic compliment to the late Dean Numa P. G. Adams, of Howard, who was unflinchingly insistent upon quality in the practitioner, as opposed to quantity, that the last four classes admitted under him graduated after his death and had no State board failures. This crudest of criteria, success in the examination for certification for competence to practice, indicates that the caliber of Negro graduates as a whole has not been what is to be desired and indicates further need for continuous, self-espoused, postgraduate study and training.

12. INTERNSHIPS

The first level of postgraduate training is the 1-year internship. As this came increasingly to be a requirement for admission to practice, there was struggle to find enough approved hospitals to accommodate the annual crop of Negro medical graduates. As late as the middle twenties, this was an acute problem. Today, fortunately, the number of available approved internships slightly exceeds the average annual number of graduates. A recent tabulation showed 158 such openings, of which 109 were in Negro institutions (table 2).

TABLE 1.—*State board statistics: Howard and Meharry, 1903–46*

No.	Year	Howard				Meharry				Harvard				Emory				Washington, St. Louis			
		Passed	Failed	Percent failures	Number of boards examined by	Passed	Failed	Percent failures	Number of boards examined by	Passed	Failed	Percent failures	Number of boards examined by	Passed	Failed	Percent failures	Number of boards examined by	Passed	Failed	Percent failures	Number of boards examined by
1	1946	104	8	7.1	21	53	4	7.0	14	95	4	4.0	28	92	10	9.8	5	116	1	0.9	15
2	1945	75	5	6.2	16	64	4	5.9	12	45	2	4.3	20	80	0	0	4	110	1	.9	10
3	1944	32	6	15.8	14	10	0	0	6	45	2	4.4	26	85	0	0	4	107	0	0	7
4	1943	23	0	0	8	51	1	1.9	5	50	1	2.0	19	122	1	.8	7	251	2	.9	14
5	1942	28	0	0	12	52	2	3.7	6	76	1	1.3	26	60	0	0	6	111	1	.9	12
6	1941	29	0	0	12	53	3	5.4	5	41	3	6.8	12	69	1	1.4	8	104	0	0	9
7	1940	25	0	0	10	44	0	0	3	46	1	2.1	20	64	1	1.5	7	93	2	2.1	12
8	1939	31	2	6.1	12	37	1	2.6	8	70	0	0	25	68	1	1.4	10	112	2	1.8	12
9	1938	33	1	2.9	12	39	5	11.4	7	96	0	0	24	72	5	6.5	12	104	0	0	16
10	1937	54	5	8.5	13	42	2	4.5	9	108	2	1.8	27	85	3	3.4	9	97	6	5.8	12
11	1936	39	7	15.2	11	41	3	6.8	10	110	3	2.7	29	70	6	7.9	5	103	2	1.9	17
12	1935	50	5	9.1	16	47	4	7.8	11	87	3	3.3	25	80	2	2.4	11	115	4	3.4	15
13	1934	46	6	11.5	16	48	2	4.0	12	78	0	0	28	84	2	2.3	13	90	3	3.2	17
14	1933	46	7	13.2	15	50	4	7.4	14	61	1	1.6	22	56	1	1.8	12	108	0	0	16
15	1932	64	8	11.1	13	52	3	5.5	11	71	2	2.7	20	64	0	0	12	91	2	2.1	14
16	1931	56	7	11.1	17	65	3	4.4	13	62	1	1.6	20	55	1	1.8	12	71	2	2.7	20
17	1930	60	9	13.0	15	53	4	7.0	12	79	1	1.2	23	54	0	0	10	94	2	2.1	16
18	1929	57	10	14.9	17	78	11	12.4	17	80	0	0	24	51	0	0	7	66	0	0	17
19	1928	75	14	15.7	22	52	11	17.4	16	87	1	1.1	22	85	0	0	11	66	0	0	20
20	1927	62	9	12.7	17	83	12	12.6	19	82	0	0	21	66	1	1.5	8	76	1	7.8	24
21	1926	83	18	17.8	20	66	17	20.5	20	96	1	1.0	28	85	1	1.2	10	82	2	2.4	21
22	1925	75	10	11.8	19	60	16	21.1	20	80	0	0	22	133	3	2.2	7	99	4	3.9	24
23	1924	34	11	24.4	10	69	30	30.3	20	87	2	2.2	21	105	1	.9	8	88	2	2.2	16
24	1923	35	13	27.1	17	86	22	20.4	20	130	4	3.0	24	70	5	6.7	10	52	2	3.7	10
25	1922	33	11	25.0	14	49	29	37.2	15	112	1	.9	28	74	2	2.6	8	56	1	1.8	13
26	1921	37	15	28.9	14	57	48	45.7	19	108	4	3.6	19	51	1	1.9	5	48	1	2.0	12
27	1920	27	12	30.8	13	70	59	45.8	20	143	5	3.4	29	42	4	8.7	10	50	1	2.0	16
28	1919	22	7	24.1	11	65	66	50.4	21	159	5	3.0	25	42	8	16.0	10	64	2	3.0	17
29	1918	31	2	6.1	10	92	41	30.8	18	114	3	2.6	14	32	4	11.1	7	26	0	0	10
30	1917	17	2	10.5	11	131	57	30.3	22	103	3	2.8	20	82	7	7.9	10	31	0	0	11
31	1916	19	10	34.5	15	81	67	45.3	20	92	7	7.1	26	142	15	9.6	12	19	0	0	6
32	1915	33	13	28.3	13	91	46	33.6	23	101	7	6.5	16	157	15	8.7	11	35	0	0	7
33	1914	18	6	25.0	12	70	66	48.5	22	78	5	6.0	19	155	12	7.5	5	27	0	0	7
34	1913	35	2	5.4	17	96	47	32.9	18	87	7	7.4	23	113	15	11.7	10	45	0	0	9
35	1912	35	13	27.1	16	81	51	38.6	18	75	10	11.8	20	73	6	7.6	8	65	2	3.0	12
36	1911	37	9	19.6	20	57	53	48.2	18	52	4	7.1	9	67	10	13.0	11	115	5	4.2	22
37	1910	30	14	31.8	20	59	44	42.7	17	94	5	5.1	25	72	9	11.1	6	92	3	3.2	8
38	1909	36	18	33.3	15	68	68	50.0	18	70	3	4.1	12	62	6	8.8	4	80	7	8.0	9
39	1908	34	14	29.2	17	64	65	50.5	19	90	8	8.2	19	46	12	20.7	7	94	13	12.1	10
40	1907	23	5	17.9	11	58	45	43.7	19	97	5	4.9	18	18	2	10.0	3	70	8	10.3	13
41	1906	28	9	24.3	16	60	51	45.9	20	118	3	2.5	21	19	2	9.5	5	83	6	6.7	13
42	1905	28	11	28.2	17	33	25	43.1	16	113	3	2.6	18	12	5	29.4	9	52	8	13.1	20
43	1904	22	15	40.5	14	32	14	30.4	14	155	1	.6	17	36	5	12.2	11	38	8	17.4	17
44	1903	19	8	29.6	9	12	7	36.8	8	132	1	.8	15	42	14	25.0	8	10	3	23.0	8
Total		1,780	357	16.7		2,721	1,113	28.9		3,955	125	3.1		3,192	199	6.2		3,506	109	3.1	
Number examined		2,137				3,834				4,080				3,391				3,615			

TABLE 2.—*Approved internships available to Negro physicians*

Hospital and location	Number of positions	Monthly stipend
Negro medical centers:		
1. Freedmen's (Howard)	17	$50
2. Hubbard (Meharry)	12/29	10
Negro hospitals:		
3. Homer Phillips, St. Louis, Mo	36	25
4. General, No. 2, Kansas City, Mo	12	25
5. Provident, Chicago, Ill	8	15
6. Provident, Baltimore, Md	7	15
7. Mercy, Philadelphia, Pa	5	15
8. Flint-Goodrich, New Orleans, La	4	10
9. Lincoln, Durham, N. C	4	25
10. St. Agnes, Raleigh, N. C	4/80	25
Other hospitals:		
11. Harlem, New York City	35	45
12. Sydenham, New York City	6	50
13. City, Cleveland, Ohio	2	25
14. Cook County, Chicago, Ill	1	12
15. U. S. Marine, Boston, Mass	1	
16. Receiving, Detroit, Mich	2	100
17. Los Angeles County, Los Angeles, Calif	1	60
18. Jersey City, Jersey City, N. J	1/29	25
Total	158	

13. RESIDENCIES AND ASSISTANT RESIDENCIES

The swift, unceasing advance of medical science has in more recent years made requisite additional approved training in hospitals for two or more years beyond the internship. During this period a physician specializes in one particular field of medicine.

Again special and even more arduous efforts to secure openings of the proper type for Negro physicians have been necessary. At present there are 116 such opportunities available, covering the fields of internal medicine; surgery; obstetrics and gynecology; eye, ear, nose, and throat; bone and joint surgery; pathology; pediatrics; psychiatry; X-ray; tuberculosis; urology and anesthesiology (table 3).

TABLE 3.—*Residencies and assistant residencies available to Negro physicians*

Field	Hospitals	Number of positions
Anesthesiology	Harlem	[1] 3
	Freedmen's	1
	Sydenham [2]	[1] 1
Medicine	Freedmen's	9
	Homer Phillips	6
	Harlem	[1] 3
	Cleveland City	[1] 1
	Douglass	1
	Sydenham [2]	[1] 1

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 3.—*Residencies and assistant residencies available to Negro physicians*—Continued

Field	Hospitals	Number of positions
Surgery	Freedmen's	10
	Homer Phillips	5
	Harlem	4
	Hubbard	3
	Mercy	3
	Douglass	2
	Provident, Chicago	2
	Provident, Baltimore	2
	Cleveland City	1
	Sydenham [2]	[1] 1
Obstetrics and gynecology	Homer Phillips	5
	Provident, Chicago	4
	Freedmen's	3
	Hubbard, Nashville	2
	Provident, Baltimore	1
	Harlem	2
	Douglass	1
	Sydenham [2]	[1] 1
Ophthalmology and otolaryngology (eye)	Homer Phillips	3
	Provident, Chicago	1
	Cleveland City	[1] 1
Orthopedics	Freedmen's	1
	Sydenham	[1] 1
Pathology	Harlem	[1] 3
	Provident, Chicago	1
	Cleveland City	[1] 1
	Sydenham	[1] 1
	Homer Phillips	1

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 3.—*Residencies and assistant residencies available to Negro physicians*—Continued

Field	Hospitals	Number of positions
Pediatrics	Freedmen's	2
	Homer Phillips	2
	Provident, Chicago	1
	Harlem	1
	Hubbard	1
	Sydenham [2]	[1]1
Psychiatry	Cleveland City	[1]1
	Bellevue	[1]1
	Homer Phillips	1
Radiology	Hubbard	2
	Provident, Chicago	1
	Homer Phillips	1
	Sydenham	[1]1
	Freedmen's [2]	1
Tuberculosis	Koch, St. Louis	2
	Seaview, New York	[1]1
	Cleveland City	[1]1
Urology	Homer Phillips	2
	Flint-Goodridge	1
Total		116

[1] "Possible" for Negro candidates.
[2] Approval pending.

Eighty-five of these residencies are located in 8 Negro hospitals, of which the 4 institutions, Freedmen's in Washington (27), Homer Phillips in St. Louis (30), Provident in Chicago (9), and Hubbard in Nashville (9), together provide 74. Freedmen's with 17 internships and 27 residencies; Homer Phillips with 36 internships and 30 residencies; and Harlem in New York, a mixed institution, with 35 internships and 13 residencies, are carrying the heaviest training loads and their teaching programs conform to excellent standards (table 4).

TABLE 4.—*Residencies and assistant residencies in leading Negro hospitals*

Freedmen's	27
Anesthesiology	1
Medicine	9
Obstetrics and gynecology	3
Orthopedics	1
Pediatrics	2
Radiology	1
Surgery	10
Homer Phillips	30
Medicine	6
Neurology	2
Obstetrics and gynecology	5
Ophthalmology and otolaryngology	3
Pathology	1
Pediatrics	2
Psychiatry	3
Radiology	1
Surgery	5
Urology	2
Provident, Chicago	9
Obstetrics and gynecology	4
Pathology	1
Pediatrics	1
Radiology	1
Surgery	2
Hubbard	8
Obstetrics and gynecology	2
Pediatrics	1
Radiology	2
Surgery	3
Total	74

14. SPECIALISTS

Another recent development in medicine has been the remarkable growth of specialization. To become a specialist today a physician must comply with rigorous requirements of a specialty board. Here, even greater difficulties faced the Negro practitioner in obtaining opportunities for the training necessary for qualification.

The late Dr. W. Harry Barnes, of Philadelphia, was the first certified Negro specialist. He became a diplomate of the American Board of Otolaryngology in 1927. Since, and including Dr. Barnes, a total of 93 Negro specialists have been certified by various boards. Five of these men have died and one, Dr. Chester Chinn of New York, is a diplomate in both otolaryngology and ophthalmology, making a total of 87 living Negro specialists (table 5).

TABLE 5. NEGRO DIPLOMATES OF MEDICAL SPECIALTY BOARDS—93

AMERICAN BOARD OF INTERNAL MEDICINE—8

Henry A. Callis (Rush, 1921), District of Columbia, C. 1940; John B. Johnson (West, residence, 1935), District of Columbia, C. 1942; James Lowell Hall (Rush, 1926), Chicago, C 1943; Howard M. Payne (Howard, 1931), District of Columbia, C. 1945; W. A. Younge (Meharry, 1925), St. Louis, C. 1943; Leonidas H. Berry (Rush, 1929), Chicago, C. 1946; Edward E. Halloway (Howard, 1935), Philadelphia, C. 1946; Allison B. Henderson (Meharry, 1937), Detroit, C. 1947.

AMERICAN BOARD OF SURGERY—14

Charles R. Drew (McGill, 1933), District of Columbia, C. 1941; Clarence S. Greene (Howard, 1936), District of Columbia, C. 1943; Burke Syphax (Howard, 1936), District of Columbia, C. 1944; J. Richard Laurey (Wayne, 1933), District of Columbia, C. 1942; Henry E. Hampton (Meharry, 1928), St. Louis, C. 1943; Frederick D. Stubbs [1] (Harvard, 1931), Philadelphia, C. 1943; Louis T. Wright (Harvard, 1915), New York, C. 1939; Hartford R. Burwell (Howard, 1912), District of Columbia, C. 1944; Roscoe Giles (Cornell, 1915), Chicago, C. 1938; Ulysses G. Dailey (Northwestern, 1906), Chicago, C. 1942; Carl G. Roberts (Chicago College M. & S., 1911), Chicago, C. 1940; Aubre De L. Maynard (New York University, 1922), New York, C. 1945; Middleton H. Lambright (Meharry, 1938), Cleveland, C. 1946; Matthew Walker (Meharry, 1934), Nashville, C. 1947.

AMERICAN BOARD OF OTOLARYNGOLOGY—9

Ulysses L. Houston (Bennett, 1912), District of Columbia, C. 1938; Donald McC. Harper (Howard, 1928), District of Columbia, C. 1941; J. Francis Dyer (Howard, 1912), District of Columbia, C. 1940; William D. Morman (Howard, 1929), St. Louis, C. 1940; W. Harry Barnes [1] (Pennsylvania, 1912), Philadelphia, C. 1927; Chester W. Chinn (Michigan, 1925), New York, C. 1937; Leon A. Tancil [1] (Howard, 1921), Chicago; Charles M. Harris (Howard, 1924), Jersey City; James W. Nofles (Howard, 1935), St. Louis, C. 1941.

AMERICAN BOARD OF OPHTHALMOLOGY—8

Edwin J. Watson (Howard, 1913), District of Columbia, C. 1941; Chester W. Chinn (Michigan, 1925), New York, C. 1933; Claudius Forney (Ohio State, 1925), Chicago, C. 1936; Henry L. Gowens, Jr. (Hahnemann, 1908), Philadelphia, C. 1942; William M. Jones (Chicago, 1932), Chicago, C. 1939; Roosevelt Brooks (Illinois, 1929), Chicago, C. 1937; James M. Richardson (Howard, 1924), Chicago, C. 1940; H. P. Venable (Wayne, 1940), St. Louis, C. 1944.

AMERICAN BOARD OF UROLOGY—4

R. Frank Jones (Howard, 1922), District of Columbia, C. 1936; Kline A. Price (Howard, 1933), District of Columbia, C. 1943; Robert E. Fullilove (Howard, 1934), New Orleans, C. 1946; Walter S. Grant (Northwestern, 1921), Chicago, C. 1947.

[1] Deceased.

AMERICAN BOARD OF PEDIATRICS—11

Alonzo deG. Smith (Long Island, 1919), District of Columbia, C. 1936; Nolan A. Owens (Western Reserve, 1931), District of Columbia, C. 1941; Warrick W. Cardozo (Ohio State, 1933), District of Columbia, C. 1940; Roland B. Scott (Howard, 1934), District of Columbia, C. 1939; Ronald N. Jefferson (Meharry, 1935), Chicago, C. 1941; Thomas W. Patrick (Berlin, 1935), New York; Samuel A. Jenkins (New York University, 1928), New York, C. 1947; William H. Faulkner (Meharry, 1936), Nashville, C. 1942; Edward Beasley (Northwestern, 1923), Chicago, C. 1941; E. K. MacDonald (Northwestern, 1923), Chicago, C. 1942; Dale Beverly (Rushmore, 1927), Chicago, C. 1945.

AMERICAN BOARD OF RADIOLOGY—15

John R. Randolph (Vermont, 1924), New York, C. 1941; Charles H. Kelley (Howard, 1929), District of Columbia, C. 1939; John W. Lawlah (Rushmore, 1932), District of Columbia, C. 1939; James L. Martin (Leonard, 1906), Philadelphia; Russell F. Minton (Howard, 1929), Philadelphia, C. 1940; William E. Allen (Howard, 1930), St. Louis, C. 1939; Harold E. Thornell (Harvard, 1935), Detroit, C. 1941; Samuel H. Johnson (Meharry, 1930), Miami, C. 1940; John E. Moseley (Chicago, 1936), New York, C. 1944; Benjamin W. Anthony (Rushmore, 1928), Chicago, C. 1941; Jesse J. Peters (Indiana, 1920), Tuskegee, C. 1937; Lawrence D. Scott (Meharry, 1923), Nashville, C. 1940; Charles R. Humbert [1] (Howard, 1915), Kansas City; William P. Quinn (Meharry, 1937), Chicago, C. 1941; Robert I. Greenidge (Wayne, 1915), Detroit, C. 1941.

AMERICAN BOARD OF PSYCHIATRY AND NEUROLOGY—7

Ernest Y. Williams (Howard, 1930), District of Columbia, C. 1941; Justin Hope (Pennsylvania, 1934), District of Columbia, C. 1943; Raphael Hernandez (Meharry, 1928), Nashville, C. 1936–37; George C. Branche (Boston, 1923), Tuskegee; Harold Ellis (McGill, 1920), New York, C. 1939–40; Prince P. Barker (Howard, 1923), Tuskegee, C. 1939; Herbert J. Erwin (Meharry, 1937), St. Louis, C. 1944.

AMERICAN BOARD OF DERMATOLOGY—6

C. Wendell Freeman (Howard, 1926), District of Columbia, C. 1940; Theodore K. Lawless (Northwestern, 1920), Chicago, C. 1935; Ralph H. Scull (Rushmore, 1929), Chicago, C. 1937; Gerald A. Spencer (Lyon, France, 1932), New York, C. 1944; Joseph G. Gathings (Howard, 1927), District of Columbia, C. 1945; Paul Boswell (Minnesota, 1940), Chicago, C. 1947.

AMERICAN BOARD OF OBSTETRICS AND GYNECOLOGY—9

Julian W. Ross (Howard, 1911), District of Columbia, C. 1935; Peter M. Murray (Howard, 1914), New York, C. 1931; Julian H. Finley (Ohio State, 1916), Cleveland; Pedro Santos (Meharry, 1914–15), Chicago, C. 1942; William E. Smiley (Ohio State, 1937), St. Louis, C. 1946; William W. Gibbs (Indiana, 1917), Chicago, C. 1941; Thomas C. Simmons (Howard, 1933), District of Columbia, C. 1944; Leon Wilson [1] (Illinois, 1920), Chicago; Helen Dickens (Illinois, 1934), Philadelphia, C. 1946.

AMERICAN BOARD OF PATHOLOGY—2

Wm. S. Quinland (Meharry, 1914), Nashville, C. 1937; Julian H. Lewis (Rushmore, 1917), Chicago, C. 1943.

Of these, 26 are in Washington, 22 in Chicago, 10 in New York, 8 in St. Louis, 5 in Philadelphia, 5 in Nashville, 3 each in Detroit and Tuskegee, 2 in Cleveland, and 1 each in Jersey City, New Orleans, and Miami (table 6).

[1] Deceased.

TABLE 6.—*Locations of specialists*

Washington, D. C	26
Chicago, Ill	24
New York, N. Y	11
St. Louis, Mo	8
Philadelphia, Pa	7
Nashville, Tenn	5
Tuskegee, Ala	3
Cleveland, Ohio	2
Detroit, Mich	3
Jersey City, N. J	1
New Orleans, La	1
Kansas City, Mo	1
Miami, Fla	1
Total	93

TABLE 7.—*Number of Negro specialists by field*

Medical specialties	49
Internal medicine	8
Pediatrics	11
Radiology	15
Neurology and psychiatry	7
Dermatology	6
Pathology	2
Surgical specialties	44
Surgery	14
Otolaryngology	9
Opthalmology	8
Obstetrics and gynecology	9
Urology	4
Total	93

Forty-three of the specialists are from Negro schools (Howard, 28; Meharry, 14; and Shaw, 1), 48 graduated from 20 northern schools, and 2 from European institutions. They have been about evenly divided between the medical (49) and surgical (44) specialties (tables 7, 8).

Certification for specialties was extremely slow at first, but the greatly increased opportunities for residencies in recent years have permitted the very creditable acceleration of the past decade. No topical review of this nature could give justice to the multilateral efforts responsible for these still modest advances.

TABLE 8.—*Schools from which specialists graduated*

Negro schools	43
Howard	28
Meharry	14
Shaw	1
Other North American schools	48
Rush	8
Northwestern	5
Ohio State	4
Harvard	3
Illinois	3
Chicago	2
Western Reserve	2
McGill	2
Michigan	2
Indiana	2
Wayne	3
Hahnemann	1
Cornell	1
Chicago College M. & S	1
New York University	2
Vermont	1
Bennett	1
Long Island	1
Pennsylvania	2
Boston	1
Minnesota	1

TABLE 8.—*Schools from which specialists graduated*—Continued

Foreign schools	2
Berlin	1
Lyon	1
Total	93

NOTE.—The total number of specialists is 93, but since one man, Dr. Chinn, occupies two, the total number of men is 92, and with the deduction of 5 deceased, the present living total is 87.

15. COLLEGES

In addition to the specialty boards, which are available to all applicants, there are various colleges of specialists of a more exclusive nature, to which the admission of Negro physicians has been more difficult.

The late Dr. Daniel Hale Williams, of Chicago was inducted into the American College of Surgeons at its organization in 1913. Dr. Louis T. Wright was admitted in 1934, but the color bars were definitely up and have been relaxed only in the last 2 years when 15 additional surgeons have been made "Fellows."

The late Dr. Algernon B. Jackson, of Philadelphia is the only Negro to have been admitted to the American College of Physicians. Dr. William E. Allen of St. Louis and Dr. Charles H. Kelley of Washington are fellows of the American College of Radiology and Dr. J. Edmond Bryant of Chicago has just been admitted to the American College of Chest Physicians.

The complete list of Negro fellows of the American College of Surgeons follows. It will be noted that two are graduates of Howard, one of Meharry and the remaining 14 of northern institutions:

Daniel Hale Williams (Northwestern, 1883), Chicago (deceased).

Louis Tompkins Wright (Harvard, 1915), New York.

Peter Marshall Murray (Howard, 1914), New York.

Ulysses Grant Dailey (Northwestern, 1906), Chicago.

Roscoe C. Giles, (Cornell, 1915), Chicago.

Carl G. Roberts (Chicago College of Medicine and Surgery, 1911), Chicago.

Farrow H. Allen (Harvard, 1926), New York.

Alton E. Blythewood (Meharry, 1934), Newark, N. J.

Chester W. Chinn (Michigan, 1935), New York.

Aubre de L. Maynard (N. Y. U., 1926), New York.

Russell Nelson (U. of Pa., 1920), New York.

Ralph H. Young (Columbia, 1914), New York.

W. Yerby Jones (U. of Buffalo, 1924), Buffalo.

Euclid P. Ghee (Harvard, 1927), Jersey City, N. J.

Clement Mervin Jones (Howard, 1934), Bayonne, N. J.

Frederick D. Stubbs (Harvard, 1930), Philadelphia (deceased)

James C. Whitaker (Harvard, 1927), New York.

The International College of Surgeons, a well established organization, has admitted to fellowship Dr. Ulysses G. Dailey, Dr. Charles R. Drew, Dr. Roscoe Giles, and Dr. Peter M. Murray. The late Dr. Frederick D. Stubbs was an associate fellow, having lacked by a year at the time of his election the qualifying age of 40.

The honor society of medical schools which corresponds to the Phi Beta Kappa of the college is Alpha Omega Alpha. This does not have chapters at Howard or Meharry, but it is worthy of mention here that a number of Negro physicians have, by their superior scholarship, earned election to this group. A partial list includes, Numa P. G. Adams (deceased), Rush; Julian H. Lewis, Rush; John W. Lawlah, Rush; Wilder P. Montgomery, Rush; Frederick D. Stubbs (deceased), Harvard; Stanley E. Brown, Western Reserve; Paul B. Cornely, Michigan; Charles R. Drew, McGill; Walter S. Grant, Northwestern; Ira M. Henderson, Northwestern; W. Warrick Cardozo, Ohio State; Elmer E. Collins, Iowa; Vera L. Joseph, Columbia; and Norman H. Pritchard, Columbia.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from North Dakota for his kind remarks, and to assure him that I am in complete support of the splendid defense of civil rights which he has expressed this afternoon I quite agree with him that recommitting the bill is not in issue, but it will permit of a thorough study of the legal propositions I think should be thoroughly investigated before the bill is reported.

So that the RECORD may be perfectly clear, I desire to say, inasmuch as I have talked with some of my colleagues, including the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], that the position of the junior Senator from Oregon is that the bill should go back to the Judiciary Committee for a thorough examination and study of the legal issues which the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and I have raised in opposition to the compact.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILEY in the chair). The present occupant of the chair was detained this afternoon and, therefore, was not privileged to hear the argument of the Senator from Oregon. He has heard the argument of the Senator from North Dakota, however, with which he disagrees 100 percent. Tomorrow, after he has read the argument of the Senator from Oregon, he expects to reply.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2359) to authorize the payment of a lump sum, in the amount of $100,000, to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y., as a contribution toward the cost of construction of a water-filtration plant, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BATES of Massachusetts, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. COLE of New York, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. SASSCER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H. R. 107. An act for the acquisition and maintenance of wildlife management and control areas in the State of California, and for other purposes;

H. R. 338. An act for the relief of Amin Bin Rejab;

H. R. 345. An act for the relief of Ollie McNeill and Ester B. McNeill;

H. R. 817. An act for the relief of Andres Quinones and Letty Perez;

H. R. 831. An act for the relief of George Chan;

H. R. 1022. An act for the relief of Peter Bednar, Francisca Bednar, Peter Walter Bednar, and William Joseph Bednar;

H. R. 1189. An act to establish the methods of advancement for post-office employees (rural carriers) in the field service;

H. R. 1392. An act for the relief of Mrs. Charlotte E. Harvey;

H. R. 1562. An act to increase temporarily the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States;

H. R. 1653. An act for the relief of Edward W. Bigger;

H. R. 1724. An act to legalize the admission to the United States of Sarah Jane Sanford Pansa;

H. R. 1749. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of Johannes or John, Julia, Michael, William, and Anna Kostiuk";

H. R. 1953. An act for the relief of John F. Reeves;

H. R. 2000. An act for the relief of Jeffersonville flood-control district, Jeffersonville, Ind., a municipal corporation;

H. R. 2418. An act for the relief of Luz Martin;

H. R. 3189. An act for the relief of Joe Parry, a minor;

H. R. 3224. An act for the relief of Frank and Maria Durante;

H. R. 3608. An act for the relief of Cristeta La-Madrid Angeles;

H. R. 3740. An act for the relief of Andrew Osiecimski Czapski;

H. R. 3787. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Smorczewska;

H. R. 3824. An act for the relief of Mrs. Cletus E. Todd (formerly Laura Estelle Ritter);

H. R. 3880. An act for the relief of Ludwig Pohoryles;

H. R. 4018. An act authorizing the transfer of certain real property for wildlife, or other purposes;

H. R. 4050. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Moke Tcharoutcheff, Lucie Baptistine Tcharoutcheff, Raymonde Tcharoutcheff, and Robert Tcharoutcheff;

H. R. 4068. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to construct a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4129. An act for the relief of Jerline Floyd Givens and the legal guardian of William Earl Searight, a minor;

H. R. 4130. An act for the relief of Dennis (Dionesio) Fernandez;

H. R. 4631. An act for the relief of Antonio Villani;

H. R. 5035. An act to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the Eighty-second National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held in Grand Rapids, Mich., September 26 to 30, 1948;

H. R. 5118. An act to authorize the sale of certain individual Indian land on the Flathead Reservation to the State of Montana;

H. R. 5137. An act to amend the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended;

H. R. 5262. An act to authorize the sale of individual Indian lands acquired under the act of June 18, 1934, and under the act of June 26, 1936;

H. R. 5543. An act granting the consent of Congress to Carolina Power & Light Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in the Lumber River;

H. R. 5651. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in South Dakota for municipal or public purposes;

H. R. 5805. An act to extend the time within which application for the benefits of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 may be made by veterans discharged from the armed forces before the effective date of such act; and

H. R. 5963. An act to authorize the construction of a courthouse to accommodate the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL DEFENSE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a conference report has the right-of-way over pending business, and I therefore ask that the unfinished business be temporarily set aside and that the Chair lay before the Senate the conference report on House bill 6226 making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the conference report on House bill 6226, which the Chief Clerk read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6226) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, and 11, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In the last line of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the sum "$30,049,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$20,849,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the figure named in said amendment insert "$500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 10.

STYLES BRIDGES,
CHAN GURNEY,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
KARL J. STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, inasmuch as several Senators would like to be present when the report is considered, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Daniel
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hill	Pepper
Bridges	Hoey	Reed
Brooks	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Ives	Russell
Butler	Jenner	Saltonstall
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Capehart	Kem	Stennis
Capper	Knowland	Stewart
Connally	Langer	Taft
Cooper	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McClellan	Thye
Dworshak	McFarland	Tobey
Eastland	McKellar	Tydings
Ecton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Martin	Wherry
Flanders	Maybank	White
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
George	Moore	Williams
Green	Morse	Wilson
Gurney	Murray	Young
Hatch	Myers	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from North Caroline [Mr. UMSTEAD] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the conference report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I was not able to be in the Senate last week when the vote on this measure was taken, and I take this occasion, anticipating that there will not be a record vote on the conference report, to say that had I been present I would have supported the bill, and I shall support the conference report.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Before there is any action taken I wish to discuss briefly the

implications of one provision of the conference report. As to whether this is the appropriate time to do it or later, I shall be guided by the decision of the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. May the Chair inquire of the Senator from Maine as to what portion of the report he desires to discuss?

Mr. BREWSTER. The part I desire to discuss is the renegotiation provision.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That will come later when the Chair lays down a message from the House.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I now ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the action of the House on Senate amendment No. 10.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 6226, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
May 11, 1948.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10 to the bill (H. R. 6226) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes," and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 3. (a) All contracts in excess of $1,000 entered into under the authority of this act, obligating funds appropriated hereby, obligating funds consolidated by this act with funds appropriated hereby, or entered into through contract authorizations herein granted, and all subcontracts thereunder in excess of $1,000 shall contain the following article:

" 'Renegotiation article: This contract is subject to the Renegotiation Act of 1948 and the contractor hereby agrees to insert a like article in all contracts or purchase orders to make or furnish any article or to perform all or any part of the work required for the performance of this contract.'

"(b) Whenever in the opinion of the Secretary of Defense excessive profits are reflected under any contract or contracts or subcontract or subcontracts required to contain the renegotiation article prescribed in subsection (a), the Secretary is authorized and directed to renegotiate such contracts and subcontracts for the purpose of eliminating excessive profits. He shall endeavor to make an agreement with the contractor or subcontractor with respect to the amount, if any, of such excessive profits and to their elimination. If no such agreement is reached, the Secretary shall issue an order determining the amount, if any, of such excessive profits and shall eliminate them by any of the methods set forth in subsection (c) (2) of the Renegotiation Act of February 25, 1944, as amended. In eliminating excessive profits the Secretary shall allow the contractor or subcontractor credit for Federal income and excess profits taxes as provided in section 3806 of the Internal Revenue Code. The powers hereby conferred upon the Secretary shall be exercised with respect to the aggregate of the amounts received or accrued under all such contracts and subcontracts by the contractor or subcontractor during his fiscal year or upon such other basis as may be mutually agreed upon; except that this section shall not be applicable in the event that the aggregate of the amounts so received or accrued is less than $100,000 during any fiscal year.

"(c) For the purpose of administering this section the Secretary of Defense shall have the right to audit the books and records of any contractor or subcontractor subject to this section. In the interest of economy and the avoidance of duplication of inspection and audit, the services of the Bureau of Internal Revenue shall, upon request of the Secretary of Defense and with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, be made available to the extent determined by the Secretary of the Treasury for the purpose of making examinations and audits under this section.

"(d) The provisions of this section shall not apply to any of the contracts or subcontracts specified in subsection (i) (1) of the Renegotiation Act of February 25, 1944, as amended, and the Secretary of Defense in his discretion may exempt from the provisions of this section any other contract or subcontract both individually and by general classes or types.

"(e) Agreements or orders determining excessive profits shall be final and conclusive in accordance with their terms and except upon a showing of fraud or malfeasance or willful misrepresentation of a material fact shall not be annulled, modified, reopened, or disregarded, except that in the case of orders determining excessive profits the amount of the excessive profits, if any, may be redetermined by the Tax Court of the United States in the manner prescribed in subsection (e) (1) of the Renegotiation Act of February 25, 1944, as amended, except that such redetermination shall be subject to review to the extent and in the manner provided by subchapter B of chapter 5 of the internal revenue code.

"(f) The Secretary of Defense shall promulgate and publish in the Federal Register regulations interpreting and applying this section and prescribing standards and procedures for determining and eliminating excessive profits hereunder using so far as he deems practicable the principles and procedures of the Renegotiation Act of February 25, 1944, as amended, having regard for the different economic conditions existing on or after the effective date of this act from those prevailing during the period 1942 to 1945. In any case in which the contract price of any such contract or subcontract was based upon estimated costs, then the Secretary of Defense shall determine the difference between such estimated costs and actual costs and shall, in eliminating excessive profits, take into consideration as an element the extent to which such difference is the result of the efficiency of the contractor or subcontractor.

"(g) The powers and duties hereby conferred upon the Secretary of Defense may be delegated by him to any officer (military or civilian) or agency of the National Military Establishment.

"(h) Any person who willfully fails or refuses to furnish any information, records, or data required of him under this section, or who knowingly furnishes any such information, records, or data containing information which is false or misleading in any material respect, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

"(i) This section may be cited as the 'Renegotiation Act of 1948'."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate agree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I wish to point out some of the implications of such action. I was not present the other day when the matter was under discussion, because I was excused for the purpose of performing other service. I shall not oppose the adoption of the provision, but I think some of its implications should be made clear in the RECORD.

I was naturally gratified by the unanimous approval of the 70-air-group program, and with the statements contained in the Report of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board which studied the matter and made the report regarding it. I ask to have inserted in the RECORD at this point the two reports made by the National Aviation Policy Board dealing with the matter, which appears on page 7 of the Report on National Aviation Policy.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLAN A

From the information made available to the Board by the Air Force and by the Navy separately, it would appear that the initial strength necessary to mount promptly an effective, continuing, and successful air offensive against a major enemy, is what is termed the Air Force 70-group program of 20,541 aircraft, plus the Navy program of 14,500 aircraft, total 35,041 aircraft. At the level-off period in 1953 these programs would require thereafter an annual Air Force procurement of 86,000,000 airframe pounds and an annual Navy procurement of 25,000,000 airframe pounds—total, 111,000,000 airframe pounds annually.

PLAN B

Based on the same sources of information, the strength necessary to prevent the loss of a war upon the outset of hostilities appears to be the same program outlined in plan A above, but without reserve aircraft, which means a combined Air Force and Navy aviation procurement of 63,000,000 airframe pounds annually. For the purpose of comparative budget study (see tabluations) we have assumed that the combined annual procurement of 63,000,000 pounds might be divided into approximately 45,000,000 for the Air Force and 18,000,000 for the Navy. This plan is designed to provide a force sufficient to (*a*) withstand an initial blow intended to cripple the United States, (*b*) form the basis for a strong Territorial defense, and (*c*) provide effective retaliation, but not a sustained offensive action. Under this plan it is estimated that the aircraft manufacturing industry would require a year longer to reach the volume of aircraft production necessary to cope with attrition, than it would under plan A.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, it seems evident that this action has apparently brought miracles judging by the reports we hear this morning from Moscow. I wish we might take entire credit for the results, but at any rate I am sure the action taken by Congress was not lacking as a contributing factor particularly since it was first practically the unanimous action of the House, and later of the Senate.

In the matter of renegotiation, however, I want here to call attention to the fact that under the very careful studies which were made by the War Investigating Committee it was developed that there were very serious gaps in the renegotiation, by the exclusion of certain raw materials, particularly petroleum, from the entire provision of the act. That led us to an exploration of the so-called Arabian oil situation, in which we

found what seemed to the committee in its unanimous opinion to be very excessive profits.

I am disturbed by the fact that the Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable John L. Sullivan, in commenting upon this report, in dealing with the matter of excessive profits, directs himself exclusively to the question of whether or not they could have secured the supplies elsewhere more cheaply, which was not the question with which the committee was concerned.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I have not seen the comment of the Secretary to which the Senator refers. I think we discussed in our report the fact that the Navy was unable to secure oil at a cheaper price, and we pointed that out as one of the evils that we were criticizing; that certain interests had in effect held a gun at the head of our armed forces and compelled the paying of this high price, because there were no other available supplies.

Mr. BREWSTER. That was the question which was put very pointedly by the Senator from New Mexico in connection with the hearings, and brought out very clearly. That was why I was very much disturbed by the later comment of the Secretary of the Navy, which I shall read in a moment, in view of the provision in the bill. I quote now from page 5 of the bill, and I think the same language is to be found in the conference report:

Whenever in the opinion of the Secretary of Defense excessive profits are reflected under any contract.

Apparently the Secretary of the Navy did not consider the question of whether excessive profits were reflected in this oil contract, but in his entire comments upon it he addresses himself exclusively to the question of whether the Government could have secured cheaper oil elsewhere. If excessive profits mean anything they are related to the contract in question, and not to the question of whether or not the Government might have secured oil more cheaply elsewhere. I shall quote from the statement of Mr. Sullivan. I realize that this is not the statement of the Secretary of Defense, but I assume that there is possibly a somewhat greater degree of coordination between the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of Defense than prevailed in the current case between the Secretary of Air and the Secretary of Defense. And so on the assumption that the Secretary of the Navy may have been reflecting the views of the Secretary of Defense I take occasion to quote his comments upon the oil situation, with the idea that if the same theory prevailed this section of the bill regarding the Renegotiation Act of 1948 may have very little meaning. The investigating committee in its very careful study of renegotiation pointed out the undesirability of the exclusion of certain items. The other provision regarding keeping funds available until expended, is included in this measure, and that is most desirable.

Now to the current case. Mr. John L. Sullivan, Secretary of the Navy, on April 28, 1948, in his comment on the oil situation, said:

The Navy first paid $1.05 for oil in October 1945, and will continue to purchase oil at this price from the Middle East until July of this year. During this time 43,000,000 barrels of Navy Special Fuel Oil will have been purchased for $45,150,000. The average price for similar products from the United States Gulf Coast and Aruba during this same period has been $1.84 per barrel.

That is all correct.

It is apparent, therefore, that its purchases from middle eastern sources have cost the Navy $33,000,000 less than would have been the case had its petroleum purchases all been made at Gulf Coast and Aruba prices.

Mr. President, that statement is entirely true. It, however, does not include the companion statement that if the Navy had purchased this oil at the cost which the companies themselves testified of 40 cents a barrel we would have saved not the $33,000,000 which they speak about, but $25,000,000 over the price which the Navy did actually pay. Now, whether or not a payment of $25,000,000 in profit on a $43,000,000 contract is an excessive profit would seem to be a very material question. I had not supposed it was one about which there would be any question. The fact that Mr. Sullivan entirely fails to mention the very pregnant fact which the War Investigating Committee so earnestly pointed out leads one to ponder what will be their position regarding excessive profits in other analogous cases.

Mr. Sullivan goes on to say:

The Brewster committee criticizes the fact that the $1.05 price was increased for the procurement that was made for the last half of 1948.

That is the current contract.

The negotiations for this contract were protracted.

I may say that Mr. Forrestal testified before our committee that if any attempts were made to raise the price of this Arabian oil they would be very firmly resisted.

The prices agreed to were $1.17½ per barrel for the first 3 months of the contract and $1.48 per barrel for the second half of the contract. The average price for the 6 months is $1.32 per barrel. This is an increase of approximately 25 percent from the $1.05 price. In contrast to this increase of 25 percent, the price in the Gulf coast and Aruba for comparable products has increased from $1.05 in October 1945 to $2.63, or approximately 150 percent.

In other words, the Navy is now buying oil in the Middle East at less than one-half the price oil is selling for in the Gulf coast and Aruba.

Again, the whole contention is that we are buying oil cheaper in Arabia than we are in the Gulf of Mexico. It seems to me pertinent to point out that as a result of the renegotiated contract we are now paying to the Arabian-American Oil Co.—Aramco, as it is called—not the $1.05 which it originally charged, not the 40 cents which was originally proposed, and which the oil companies have testified was their cost, but $1.48. In other words, we are paying $1.03 profit, according to the company's own records, on every barrel of oil we buy from them, or a profit of more than 200 percent on their cost of production; and the profit on 43,000,000 barrels of oil, which they testified to, would be more than $45,000,000. If that is not an excessive profit, I cannot understand the use of language.

Most of the time, under the Renegotiation Act as applied to companies in renegotiation, it was considered that approximately 10 percent on the turn-over was a fair profit for the companies concerned. In my judgment, in many instances that represented an excessive profit, as it resulted in a profit of 400 or 500 percent per annum in some instances on the investment of the company, and it seemed to me that was in some instances excessive. But here we have the very reverse. On the most essential product being supplied to our Government for the operation of our Navy and our Air Corps, profits, according to the companies' own evidence, amounted to more than 100 percent; and we are blandly told by the Secretary of the Navy that it would cost us more elsewhere.

If renegotiation is going to mean anything, it must mean renegotiation of contracts of that character to determine whether or not excessive profits are being secured.

I shall not here labor all the other reasons why it seems to me that we have very equitable claims upon these particular companies, because of the very large advance by our Government to the Arabian Government during the period of the War; but it does seem to me that the Congress should scrutinize very carefully the operation of this provision, to determine whether or not excessive profits are being made, and whether or not 250 percent profit on the turn-over is considered anything other than excessive profit so far as that item is concerned.

I shall not here challenge the adoption of the conference report, realizing the extent to which it has gone; but I trust that every committee of the Congress concerned with appropriation and authorization will continue to scrutinize with exceeding care the functioning of this provision of the so-called Renegotiation Act of 1948, in order to insure that any standards of the character implied in the statement of the Secretary of the Navy in this situation shall not be the rule of thumb by which the Renegotiation Act of 1948 shall be administered.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the provisions of the Renegotiation Acts of 1942 and 1943, regarding the exclusion of certain items. I believe that is necessary to an understanding of the situation.

There being no objection, the material referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Renegotiation Act of 1942]

(c) Section 403 of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act (Public 528, 77th Cong., 2d sess.), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsections:

"(i) (1) The provisions of this section shall not apply to—

"(1) any contract by a department with any other department, bureau, agency, or

governmental corporation of the United States or with any Territory, possession, or State or any agency thereof or with any foreign government or any agency thereof; or

"(ii) any contract or subcontract for the product of a mine, oil or gas well, or other mineral or natural deposit, or timber, which has not been processed, refined, or treated beyond the first form or state suitable for industrial use; and the secretaries are authorized by joint regulation, to define, interpret, and apply this exemption.

"(2) The secretary of a department is authorized, in his discretion, to exempt from some or all of the provisions of this section—

"(i) any contract or subcontract to be performed outside of the territorial limits of the continental United States or in Alaska;

"(ii) any contracts or subcontracts under which, in the opinion of the secretary, the profits can be determined with reasonable certainty when the contract price is established, such as certain classes of agreements for personal services, for the purchase of real property, perishable goods, or commodities the minimum price for the sale of which has been fixed by a public regulatory body, of leases and license agreements, and of agreements where the period of performance under such contract or subcontract will not be in excess of 30 days; and

"(iii) a portion of any contract or subcontract or performance thereunder during a specified period or periods, if in the opinion of the secretary, the provisions of the contract are otherwise adequate to prevent excessive profits.

"The secretary may so exempt contracts and subcontracts both individually and by general classes or types.

"(j) Nothing in sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 198 and 203) or in section 190 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 99) shall be deemed to prevent any person appointed by the secretary of a department for intermittent and temporary employment in such department, from acting as counsel, agent, or attorney for prosecuting any claim against the United States: *Provided*, That such person shall not prosecute any claim against the United States (1) which arises from any matter directly connected with which such person is employed, or (2) during the period such person is engaged in intermittent and temporary employment in a department."

[From the Renegotiation Act of 1943]

(i) (1) The provisions of this section shall not apply to—

(A) any contract by a department with any other department, bureau, agency, or governmental corporation of the United States or with any Territory, possession, or State or any agency thereof or with any foreign government or any agency thereof; or

(B) any contract or subcontract for the product of a mine, oil or gas well, or other mineral or natural deposit, or timber, which has not been processed, refined, or treated beyond the first form or state suitable for industrial use; or

(C) any contract or subcontract for an agricultural commodity in its raw or natural state, or if the commodity is not customarily sold or has not an established market in its raw or natural state, in the first form or state, beyond the raw or natural state, in which it is customarily sold or in which it has an established market. The term "agricultural commodity" as used herein shall include but shall not be limited to—

(i) commodities resulting from the cultivation of the soil such as grains of all kinds, fruits, nuts, vegetables, hay, straw, cotton, tobacco, sugarcane, and sugar beets;

(ii) natural resins, saps, and gums of trees;

(iii) animals such as cattle, hogs, poultry, and sheep, fish and other marine life, and the produce of live animals, such as wool, eggs, milk, and cream; or

(D) any contract or subcontract with an organization exempt from taxation under section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code; or

(E) any contract with a department, awarded as a result of competitive bidding, for the construction of any building, structure, improvement, or facility; or

(F) any subcontract, directly or indirectly under a contract or subcontract to which this section does not apply by reason of this paragraph.

(2) The Board is authorized by regulation to interpret and apply the exemptions provided for in paragraph (1) (A), (B), (C), (E), and (F), and interpret and apply the definition contained in subsection (a) (7).

(3) In the case of a contractor or subcontractor who produces or acquires the product of a mine, oil or gas well, or other mineral or natural deposit, or timber, and processes, refines, or treats such a product to and beyond the first form or state suitable for industrial use, or who produces or acquires an agricultural product and processes, refines, or treats such a product to and beyond the first form or state in which it is customarily sold or in which it has an established market, the Board shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to give such contractor or subcontractor a cost allowance substantially equivalent to the amount which would have been realized by such contractor or subcontractor if he had sold such product at such first form or state. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section there shall be excluded from consideration in determining whether or not a contractor or subcontractor has received or accrued excessive profits that portion of the profits, derived from contracts with the departments and subcontracts, attributable to the increment in value of the excess inventory. For the purposes of this paragraph the term "excess inventory" means inventory of products, hereinbefore described in this paragraph, acquired by the contractor or subcontractor in the form or at the state in which contracts for such products on hand or on contract would be exempted from this section by subsection (i) (1) (B) or (C), which is in excess of the inventory reasonably necessary to fulfill existing contracts or orders. That portion of the profits derived from contracts with the departments and subcontracts attributable to the increment in value of the excess inventory, and the method of excluding such portion of profits from consideration in determining whether or not the contractor or subcontractor has received or accrued excessive profits, shall be determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Board. In the case of a renegotiation with respect to a fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1943, the portion of the profits, derived from contracts with the departments and subcontracts, attributable to the increment in value of the excess inventory shall (to the extent such portion does not exceed the excessive profits determined) be credited or refunded to the contractor or subcontractor, and in case the determination of excessive profits was made prior to the date of the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1943, such credit or refund shall be made notwithstanding such determination is embodied in an agreement with the contractor or subcontractor, but in either case such credit or refund shall be made only if the contractor or subcontractor, within 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1943, files a claim therefor with the Secretary concerned.

(4) The Board is authorized, in its discretion, to exempt from some or all of the provisions of this section—

(A) any contract or subcontract to be performed outside of the territorial limits of the continental United States or in Alaska;

(B) any contracts or subcontracts under which, in the opinion of the Board, the profits can be determined with reasonable certainty when the contract price is established, such as certain classes of agreements for personal services, for the purchase of real property, perishable goods, or commodities the minimum price for the sale of which has been fixed by a public regulatory body, of leases and license agreements, and of agreements where the period of performance under such contract or subcontract will not be in excess of 30 days;

(C) any contract or subcontract or performance thereunder during a specified period or periods, if in the opinion of the Board, the provisions of the contract are otherwise adequate to prevent excessive profits;

(D) any contract or subcontract for the making or furnishing of a standard commercial article, if, in the opinion of the Board, competitive conditions affecting the sale of such article are such as will reasonably protect the Government against excessive prices;

(E) any contract or subcontract, if, in the opinion of the Board, competitive conditions affecting the making of such contract or subcontract are such as are likely to result in effective competition with respect to the contract or subcontract price; and

(F) any subcontract or group of subcontracts not otherwise exempt from the provisions of this section, if, in the opinion of the Board, it is not administratively feasible in the case of such subcontract or in the case of such group of subcontracts to determine and segregate the profits attributable to such subcontract or group of subcontracts from the profits attributable to activities not subject to renegotiation.

The Board may so exempt contracts and subcontracts both individually and by general classes or types.

(j) Nothing in sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 198 and 203) or in section 190 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 99) shall be deemed to prevent any person by reason of service in a department or the Board during the period (or a part thereof) beginning May 27, 1940, and ending 6 months after the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, from acting as counsel, agent, or attorney for prosecuting any claim against the United States: *Provided*, That such person shall not prosecute any claim against the United States (1) involving any subject matter directly connected with which such person was so employed, or (2) during the period such person is engaged in employment in a department.

(k) Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit or restrict any authority or discretion of the Secretary of a department under the provisions of any other law.

(l) This section may be cited as the "Renegotiation Act."

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the renegotiation provisions in the supplemental bill are limited in their application to contracts made under the contract authority in that bill, or contracts the payment for which will be made with funds appropriated in that bill. The renegotiation provisions go no further than that.

Perhaps we shall have to give our attention to the preparation and enactment of a more adequate Renegotiation Act. This provision, however, came into the bill, as has been explained to the Senate before, as the result of an amendment on the House side, and represents the application of the principles of renegotiation to the moneys included in

this appropriation, the contract authority in this appropriation, and such funds as may be consolidated with the funds herein appropriated. As I understand, those funds are to be used for procurement purposes in connection with the increase in the Air Force, in the Naval Air Force, and in connection with certain items of Army matériel. They do not apply to supplies. So the act would not apply, for example, to petroleum procurement, although I readily understand that the Senator from Maine may well feel concerned that the principle which was applied should not be applied even to a different type of procurement.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I tried to make it clear that I was under no delusion as to the scope of this act, though I was very much concerned, as I indicated, about the principle involved. I hope I am correct in the impression that if any Member of the Senate, and particularly of the Appropriations Committee, should find a situation in which 250 percent profit was being allowed on a vast volume of purchases by our Government, he would consider it greatly excessive. That was the exact situation with which we were presented. That is why I felt, in the application of what we are pleased to term the Renegotiation Act of 1948, that it should be as clear as this body can make it that no such formula should be applied in procurement under the terms of this act.

Mr. CORDON. I appreciate the Senator's statement. I wish to add only that should the Congress deem it wise to reenact some general renegotiation act to apply to Federal contracts, we should especially direct our attention to the establishment of standards which are essential in any good legislation by which even a poor servant must necessarily measure his acts.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, before the motion is put, let me say that this is the final conference report agreeing to an airplane procurement program for both the Air Force and the Navy, and that in general it provides for a systematic modernization of both the Air Force and the Air Force of the Navy. There was no controversy between the House and Senate on most of the features of the bill. The controversies were only on relatively minor matters. Therefore the conference report is practically unanimous, and I think is a step in the right direction for the protection of the safety and security of our country.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] that the Senate concur in the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 10.

The motion was agreed to.

HIGHLAND FALLS, N. Y., WATER-FILTRATION PLANT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2359) to authorize the payment of a lump sum, in the amount of $100,000, to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y., as a contribution toward the cost of construction of a water-filtration plant, and for other purpose, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, this bill was passed by the Senate a few days ago during the call of the calendar, and there is a disagreement between the House and the Senate, so I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, agree to the conference asked by the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BALDWIN, and Mr. MAYBANK conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE PALESTINE QUESTION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in the House of Representatives, the Foreign Affairs Committee is engaged in discussions on how the United Nations may be made to work better. Without encroaching on the prerogatives of that committee, let me say that there is a matter now engaging world public attention which entitles us to give an answer to the inquiry of the House. The answer is that if the United Nations is to serve as an instrument of the collective will for peace, then we, the United States, should be the first to recognize and lend authority to its decisions. I refer to the fact that on November 29 last, two-thirds of the members of the United Nations, following the leadership of the United States, voted to resolve the Palestine question through partition with economic union. Since that time, we seem to have taken the initiative in trying to immobilize that resolution, and even to rescind it.

In the House of Representatives, and elsewhere, there has been considerable discussion of the uncontrolled and unjustified use of the veto. Whether we have mentioned her by name or not, the finger has always been pointed at the Soviet Union. The time has come, however, to recognize that on this Palestine question the most cynical and unjustified and completely self-serving use of the veto has been practiced by another great power. That power is Great Britain.

The situation which prevails today in Palestine can be laid at the door of Great Britain and its deliberate sabotage of the decision of the United Nations. In that sabotage it has had, and continues to have, regrettably, the cooperation of our own State Department.

The result is that what only 5 months ago was the one great constructive act of the United Nations is being transformed into the weapon by which the United Nations could be destroyed. I have in my hand the conclusive proof of Britain's deliberate sabotage. It is the truth told in the documents of British Military Intelligence in the Middle East and other British official sources. These documents are incorporated in a memorandum submitted to the United Nations, and to the President of the United States, on April 30 by The Nation Associates, the distinguished head of which is Freda Kirchwey, editor of The Nation.

The facts produced show clearly that the situation which exists in Palestine today is the result of British sabotage in order to insure base rights for the British in Palestine, as well as to safeguard British oil, trade, and military interests in the Middle East. And I underscore the word "British."

To achieve these ends the British have allied themselves with the Arab League. The revolt could not have taken place without British connivance which is reflected in the continued arming of the Arab states and in the failure to stop the Arab invasion. Is it not ridiculous to think that the British military force, consisting last December of 80,000 men, one of the most modern armies in the world, could not have stopped the so-called invasion of Arab volunteers?

The memorandum in my hand produces the documentary evidence to show British complicity and that:

First. British representatives attended the meeting of the Arab League where the Arab revolt was first planned, and that the British representative in Egypt, Brigadier P. A. Clayton, regularly attends the league meetings.

Second. The British first suggested the use of volunteers in the Arab invading forces, instead of the regular armies of the Arab states, as a means of avoiding United Nations complications.

Third. British Intelligence is aware of every move of the invading forces in Palestine.

Fourth. The British in Palestine have sent messages to Arab leaders requesting them to ask the invaders to be "as unobtrusive as possible."

Fifth. The Arabs have instructions not to attack the British.

Sixth. In the opinion of the British Military Intelligence, the Arab invaders are a pacifying and stabilizing force.

Seventh. The British have deliberately kept the Arab legion in Palestine to harass the Jews.

Eighth. As far back as February 13, the British knew of King Abdullah's plan to take over Palestine; and under past and current treaties, the Arab legion could not make a single move without British knowledge and consent.

Ninth. The British knew of an effort between Arabs of Haifa to get the Mufti's consent to have Haifa declared an open city, but made no move to assure this when the Mufti declined to do so.

BRITISH DISSIPATE ASSETS

Another section of the document deals with the steps of the Palestine administration to dissipate the assets of the country, on the assumption that at the termination of the mandate a vacuum would be created, and there would be no successor government.

The memorandum presents documents to show that as far back as December 1947, the attention of the chief secretary of Palestine was called to the imminent collapse of the railway and port system. The system has since collapsed.

It also presents official correspondence to show that as far back as last January, 4 months before the Jerusalem water-supply pipe line was mined by the Arabs, the British were aware not only of the danger to the system, but that foreign Iraqui invaders had taken it over.

Evidence is produced to show how the British have induced an artificial deficit.

Information is presented for the first time as to the fashion in which the British have sold state domains, in most instances to the Arabs.

The evidence is conclusive that the British have deliberately created chaos in Palestine in order to force the United States to discard partition and to embark on a policy of appeasement of the Arab world. The reasons for that have nothing to do with our common interests. They relate entirely to the desire of the British Government to retain exclusive control in Palestine, for the British Government has an agreement with the Arab League that if partition is discarded, it, the British Government, will receive base rights in Haifa, the Negev, and Galilee. Within a month after the partition resolution, Foreign Minister Bevin, of Great Britain, was assuring the Lebanese Government that partition would be supplanted by a federal state. I have before me the report which the Lebanese envoy in London sent to his Foreign Minister on a conversation with Bevin. This report, dated December 29, 1947, indicates clearly Bevin's intention to permit a revolt in which he hoped the Jews would be defeated, and thus the way paved for abandoning partition.

In this report, Victor Khouri, the Lebanese envoy, states that official British Government circles believe that—

> The Arabs and Jews would remain alone face to face with the facts. The result would then be the attainment of a solution of the question on the basis of a federal state.

Mr. Khouri also said, in reporting on his conversation with Foreign Minister Bevin on December 23, 1947:

> In the course of the conversation we discussed the Palestine question. He told me that he was convinced that but for American intervention, it would have been possible to reach a satisfactory solution. I believe by that he was thinking of a decentralized federal constitution.

But Mr. Bevin guessed wrong. The Arabs have not been able to defeat the Jews. On the contrary, the Arabs are on the run; the Jews have not lost a single settlement; partition is a fact. The Jewish state will be proclaimed on May 16.

That is why the British are making their last-minute stand in behalf of the Arabs. That is the only explanation for the sudden return to Palestine of several thousand British troops and their show of force. It is to prevent complete Arab defeat. The British have never been concerned with anything except their own security in Palestine and the defeat of the Jews. The conclusive evidence is to be found in a letter dated March 6, 1948, marked "Top secret," signed by E. D. Horne, acting for the Chief Secretary of Palestine, a communication sent to all the British district commissioners of Palestine, which states:

> I am directed to inform you that the Central Security Committee discussed at its last meeting the increasing freedom with which armed Syrians and other members of the Arab Liberation Army appear and congregate in public places and thoroughfares in and near Jerusalem.
>
> It is the opinion of the committee that this development greatly increases the risk of clashes taking place between these persons and the security forces and I am to request that you will take whatever steps are possible to bring this danger to the notice of Arab leaders who would be well advised to secure that the foreign soldiers remain as unobtrusive as possible.

There were no British reinforcements on hand on April 13 when a Hadassah medical convoy, flying a medical symbol, was attacked by Arabs within full sight of a British Army post, in the course of which attack 76 persons were killed and 20 wounded. The casualties included the director of the Hadassah hospital, Dr. H. Yassky, other doctors, nurses, and other medical personnel. The attack took place at a distance only 10 minutes' travel from the heart of Jerusalem. Not only did the British refuse their own help, but they instructed the Haganah not to send reinforcements, and allowed 5½ hours to elapse before they brought the Red Cross representative to the area to arrange a truce.

Last Friday, Colonial Secretary Creech Jones asked for the appointment of an interim authority until the Jews and the Arabs could come to an agreement and to conserve the assets. It is not difficult to fathom the hypocrisy behind this proposal. In the first place, the British have taken good care to dissipate the assets of Palestine. In the second place, if an interim authority is required, why is not the Palestine Commission of the United Nations recognized as such? That is precisely the purpose for which it was created last November. Of course, the answer is obvious: This is another way of destroying partition, by bypassing the Palestine Commission and embarking upon a new procedure which will not lead to recognition of partition. This is the British plan.

What of the American plan? The American plan, I am sorry to say, seems to lead to similar results. Five months ago the American Government led the fight for partition. Now the State Department leads the fight to destroy partition. The American Government initiated the proposals which led to the current special session of the United Nations, which may serve the purpose of destroying partition, despite the American Government's continued lip service to the principle of partition. The American Government ignores the existence of a foreign invasion of Palestine. Not one word of warning has been issued to the Arab states who daily defy the recommendations of the overwhelming majority of the nations of the world as expressed in the United Nations General Assembly's vote last November. Not one word of censure is uttered to the British Government, which ignores the vote of the United Nations General Assembly.

Pressure is reserved for the Jews, who are warned that unless they accept State Department plans, the consequences will be dire for the Jews in Palestine and even for those in the United States. The threats implied are unworthy of the American Government, and cannot have its support.

Now the State Department says there should be no government in Palestine until there is Arab-Jewish agreement on its nature—this despite the incontrovertible fact that the Jews have followed the General Assembly's decision in setting up the apparatus of a state.

Despite the Arab revolt and British and American pressure, the Jews are holding out superbly. Such an unbiased spokesman as the head of the Palestine Commission of the United Nations, Dr. Karel Lisicky, and Dr. Pablo Azcarate, the head of the Palestine Commission's advance party in Palestine, have reported that partition exists and that the Jews are carrying on the functions of government in their own area. Therefore, to talk of a reversal of partition is nonsensical unreality, if nothing worse.

In this morning's Washington Post, seven distinguished representative spokesmen of the American community have addressed an open letter to President Truman asking:

First. United States recognition of the Jewish state on May 15, at the mandate's end.

Second. A loan to that state.

Third. Trusteeship for the Arab areas of Palestine, pending the creation of an Arab government.

Fourth. A general embargo on the shipments of arms to the states comprising the Arab League.

Fifth. A recommendation to the Security Council to recognize that the aggression of the Arab states is a threat to peace.

Sixth. Recognition of Haganah and supplying of arms to it.

The signatories are: Henry A. Atkinson, who is the secretary of the Church Peace Union; Bartley C. Crum, a member of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, and now publisher of PM; Leon Henderson, former director of the OPA, who is now the national chairman of Americans for Democratic Action; Freda Kirchwey, editor of The Nation and president of The Nation Associates; Philip Murray, president of the CIO; James G. Patton, president of the Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union; and T. O. Thackrey, editor and publisher of the New York Post and Home News.

This is a program with which I think the Congress of the United States should be fully associated. It is a practical program; it is a just program; it is in accord with the traditional policy of this country on Palestine; and it is the recognition of the practical aspects of the current situation.

I have risen to speak today because I believe this moment to be a crucial one for the United States and the United Nations. May 15, the date by which Great Britain is supposed to relinquish her mandate over Palestine, is but a few

short days away. The present vacillations of our representatives at the United Nations have no sanction from Congress or from the American people. The action of the State Department is not in accord with the expressed policy of the President of the United States or the legal position of this country. The State Department has not asked for or received permission to reverse the decision, many times affirmed, of the United States to see established in Palestine a Jewish commonwealth. There is no moral justification for such a reversal.

It is the duty of the Members of this august body to call for a new directive to the American delegation to take the leadership in securing implementation of the November 29 resolution. Coupled with this directive must be a firm warning to both the British and Arab Governments.

This is the only realistic way of reestablishing the prestige of the United States and the authority of the United Nations. It is the only way to end the current peril to peace and security.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a very fine editorial dealing with this matter, published in the Washington Post of May 10.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PALESTINE: A NEW APPROACH

Speculation on what is meant by the Presidential reappointment of General Hilldring as Special Assistant Secretary of State in charge of Palestine affairs is world-wide. "What's cooking now?" would be the American idiom of the speculation. General Hilldring is a partitionist. He is a man without a trace of the military psychology which hampers the judgment of military men in dealing with the business of our public affairs. Ideally he should be appointed Ambassador at Large to the Middle East, where the United States is represented around Palestine by men of little minds, men steeped in either oil or their Arab-British environment.

Since the American back-down on Palestine in February the United States has gone from expedient to expedient. And it has always been too late. Such is the tempo of events that the administration remains constantly behind the eight ball. History has been written not at Lake Success but in Palestine, and an entirely new situation has been created. The Jews have made a demonstration of their independence familiar enough in our own history. Palestine has been partitioned by Jewish arms and Jewish determination. In the struggle they have punctured the balloon of Arab power which was sedulously circulated by the anti-partition members of the State Department and the Foreign Service after the UN (led by the United States) declaration of partition policy, November 29.

These officials used to tell all and sundry that partition was criminal because the Jews were courting extermination, and would let in the Russians to save themselves. Now they are saying that the Arabs are in the same danger.

When they were not talking a crocodile humanitarianism they were talking a phony strategy. The United States, they said, must protect middle-eastern oil, particularly the contemplated pipe line from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean. Yet the pipe line has now been abandoned as plain silly; a couple of recalcitrant Arabs, a couple of recalcitrant Jews, could spike a pipe line. Tankers, it is now recognized, are the better, the more strategic, the more economical way of getting oil out of the Middle East. This is what the layman has been saying—before the diplomat, the oil man, and the general came to the same conclusion. But the oil argument had done its work in paralyzing American policy on Palestine.

The low estate to which American foreign policy has been dragged by all these maneuvers is pretty shocking. Equally disturbing is that our backing and filling has injured the United Nations. What is happening at Lake Success is a reminder of the Ethiopian dispute of 1936. That dispute killed the League of Nations. Palestine is strangling the United Nations. In Lake Success, talk; in Palestine, action. Every American has a vested interest in the United Nations. He must raise his voice against the State Department for degrading it.

Wisdom is said to be attention to realities, and the time has long since passed when we ought to catch up with realities.

We suggest that instead of lagging behind history we get in front of it. That is to say, we should make history, as our world power requires. Events have shown that the situation is middle eastern, not Palestinian. The Arab League, which any hour was supposed to be blowing the trumpet of a holy war, is advertised as made of gingerbread. It is our guess that this revelation has had wide repercussions throughout the Middle East. Turkey, for instance, must be full of qualms. That country is weakened in its war of nerves with Russia by the military demonstration of this Arab no-man's land in the Middle East and must be wondering whether Russia will take advantage of it.

Another result is the bankruptcy of the Glubb-Clayton diplomacy. Glubb [Pasha] is the Briton who is King Abdullah's adviser. Without him Abdullah is helpless and would not think of any invasion of Palestine. Brigadier Clayton is Britain's adviser on Arab affairs in Cairo. The Arab League is virtually Glubb and Clayton, dreamers of and 24-hour workers for a Pan Arabia under the British thumb. They have been trying to shake the tail of the outmoded empire that Wendell Willkie excoriated in One World. Their heads are in the nineteenth century. Glubb is the more forceful of the two. Like Cato, he decreed that the French were to be driven out of the Middle East, and he clearly wants to drive out the Zionists. Events have upset his grandiose scheme and have exposed the impossibility of establishing a Pan Arabia on the Glubb-Clayton model.

How different these men from the Lawrences and Wingates who used to deal with Arab affairs. They worked for harmony instead of discord, construction instead of destruction. "I am decidedly in favor of zionism," wrote T. E. Lawrence. "Indeed, I look on the Jews as the natural importers of that western leaven which is so necessary for the countries of the Near East. . . The success of their scheme will involve inevitably the raising of the present Arab population to their own material level, only a little after themselves in point of time, and the consequences might be of the highest importance for the future of the Arab world."

One of these days the Glubb-Clayton machinations will be obvious to the British people. The British will find, we think, that the duo have been operating without check from London. For it is our conviction that the Colonial Office in London has lost control. We have it on unimpeachable authority that the day before British reinforcements were returned to the Middle East, Colonial Secretary Creech-Jones was insisting at Lake Success that the withdrawal from Palestine would proceed as scheduled. Creech-Jones, a former partitionist, is an honest man. The inference is that he did not know what was going on.

The time has come to initiate a Middle East diplomacy of our own. We must stop being the tail of the Glubb-Clayton kite. Let us find a contact with the Arab League other than through this medium, preferably, as we say, by appointing an ambassador-at-large. The object should be to lay the foundation of a Mediterranean confederation, including Turkey and Iran. After all, this country precipitated European federation. Why cannot the idea be explored, beginning with the Arab League, of a Mediterranean union? There is hope of some imaginative approach in the appointment of General Hilldring. He has never faltered, as the administration has, and he has the only equipment, in our knowledge, among the President's Middle East advisers that is capable of statesmanship.

THE MEDICAL PROFESSION AND THE CONGRESS CAN WORK TOGETHER

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, three incidents which occurred last week can mean, I believe, a great deal for the future welfare of our people and of their doctors. Because their implications can mean much to the Members of the Congress and to the doctors of this country, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a statement I have prepared under the title "The Medical Profession and the Congress Can Work Together."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I should like to call to the attention of Senators some events which occurred last week and which bode extremely well for the future welfare of our people and their doctors.

The first was the successful conclusion of the National Health Assembly during which doctors—representatives of the American Medical Association—meeting together with representatives of farm groups, of labor, of Government, and of lay organizations operating in the field of health, found that they could reach sincere and effective agreement in great areas affecting the health of our people. The highly paid propagandists of the National Physicians' Committee who, in full-page advertisements, and purportedly speaking for the doctors of America, had attacked the assembly, stayed home. The doctors themselves came, and found the people and their governmental representatives eager to work with them and anxious to do nothing which would in any way hurt the prestige, the freedom, or the economic position of our doctors. At the close of that assembly, the official representative of the American Medical Association telegraphed the following:

"My sincere congratulations on the best meeting of its kind I have ever attended in Washington."

The second hopeful incident lies in the unanimous and favorable report of the Subcommittee on Health to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of Senate bill 2215—the national heart bill. In this instance the doctors actually working in the field of heart diseases found that by sitting down with the lay groups concerned and with their Representatives in the Congress, a legislative program completely acceptable to the doctors and to everyone else could easily be worked out. Here again the propagandists, who depend for their lush living on keeping our doctors distrustful of the motives of their Government and of the people, were kept out of the picture. The result was a program eminently satisfactory to the doctors and to the people.

In this connection I include in the RECORD at this point an editorial which appeared in the highly influential Washington Post on May 7. It commends our esteemed colleague,

Senator MURRAY, of Montana, for a recent service he rendered the professions of medicine and of journalism.

The editorial reads as follows:

[From the Washington Post of May 7, 1948]

"PRESS BRIBERY

"Senator JAMES E. MURRAY rendered a service to two professions—medicine and journalism—in exposing last week the sordid propaganda tactics of the National Physicians' Committee, an undercover instrument of the American Medical Association. The committee sponsored a cartoon contest, offering eight prizes totaling $3,000 for the best cartoons attacking the idea of a national health insurance program. As Editor and Publisher, journalistic trade paper, put it in commenting on the contest when it was first announced, "The 'contest' rules leave no doubt that this is a subtle bribe to cartoonists to support or oppose certain political beliefs (according to how you look at it) and to obtain general circulation for those beliefs in newspapers and magazines." The catch in the contest is the requirement that the cartoon must first have been published to receive consideration for an award.

"It is improbable that any reputable cartoonist or newspaper will fall for this egregious insult to journalistic integrity. Its evil effects will be felt more by medicine than by the press. For the members of the AMA, an overwhelming majority of whom we are sure would take no conscious part in this attempt at corruption, are subject to its shame. Here if a form of malpractice which the doctors can best cure by excising its source. Their ideas and interests need better—and more honest—representation than they have received from the National Physicians' Committee.

"You and I, who long known of Senator MURRAY'S sincere interest in finding a solution to the problem of paying for medical care, know that he believes it can be done in a way as satisfactory to the doctors as to the people. We know that Senator MURRAY has proved that in the various bills in which he is a cosponsor—his cancer bill, his mental hygiene bill, his work on the hospital construction bill and on the heart bill. We know he is thoroughly opposed to the socialization or regimentation of the medical profession. We know that he, together with five of our other colleagues, is sponsoring a national health insurance bill because his long experience in this field and his knowledge of how strong is the pressure of the people in demanding a better way of paying for medical care, have convinced him that national health insurance will both meet that demand and save our doctors from the socialization of medicine. You and I know that Senator MURRAY is for health insurance because he is opposed to state medicine.

"We here in the Senate know it. But I am afraid that the doctors of America, flooded with propaganda from self-seeking exploiters of both the doctors and the public, do not. Therefore, in view of last week's occurrences, I want to take this opportunity to urge our doctors to have their representatives aid, instead of oppose, Senator MURRAY'S attempts to draft a bill which will meet both the needs of our people and the perfectly justified demands of the doctors that their prestige, their civil and professional freedom, and their economic status be fully protected.

"I know Senator MURRAY has requested and still seeks that cooperation. If it is forthcoming, I know the result will be completely acceptable to the doctors, the Congress, and to the people. I know that even without the doctors' cooperation, Senator MURRAY has written into his health-insurance bill specific provisions for local control, not Federal control, and for specific guaranties to protect both the patient's freedom of choice and the doctor's full professional and economic freedom. Those provisions may already be sufficiently specific. I do not know. But I do know that if the doctors of America will cooperate with Senator MURRAY, those guaranties will be ironclad.

"I myself have not studied the pros and cons of national health insurance. The bill has not been reported from committee. I do not pretend to know the answers. But I do know that Senator MURRAY has worked with the people and the dentists on his dental-research bill, and the results are gratifying to all; he has worked with the cancer specialists and the heart specialists, and the results have been most satisfactory to all. So, if on the broader question of assuring medical care to all, he can have the sincere cooperation of the doctors, then that problem, too, can be solved to the satisfaction and profit of the people and of their doctors.

"If that cooperation is forthcoming, then we in the Congress and our friends the doctors can, together with the American people, forever forget the threat of state medicine, for of one thing we can be sure: In this Congress there is no more sincere and effective proponent of the American way of doing things than Senator MURRAY. He fights regimentation with deeds, rather than with words. The time for our doctors to aid him in that fight is now, for it is later than they think. Good times do not last forever. Given the slightest sign of depression, demagogic demands for state medicine might prove overwhelming. Senator MURRAY believes that prepaid medical care is the only defense against the socialization of medicine. I urge our doctors to help him develop a mutually satisfactory defense. I am sure it can be done."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the pending question, as I should like to have the RECORD show, if the present occupant of the Chair agrees with me, is the motion of the junior Senator from Oregon to refer House Joint Resolution 334.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to refer House Joint Resolution 334 to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WHERRY. The conference report which has been under discussion recently this afternoon has this afternoon been disposed of, I believe.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes; all those matters have been disposed of and approved.

Mr. WHERRY. Inasmuch as the motion to refer House Joint Resolution 334 has been made, and is the pending question, I should like to call the attention of the Members of the Senate, for the RECORD, to the fact that we are about to take a recess. I hope it will be possible tomorrow to conclude the speeches on this motion, at least. I understand there will be four or five speeches on the motion. It seems to me that if we can possibly reach a vote on the motion by tomorrow night, that will be most advantageous.

If the motion prevails, of course that will end the debate on the joint resolution, and some new matters will then come before the Senate.

If the motion to refer prevails, it is my hope to have the civil functions appropriations bill made the unfinished business, and then to have the Senate take a recess until Thursday, so that that matter can be presented on Thursday of this week.

If the motion to refer does not prevail—and if I am not correct I hope the present occupant of the Chair will correct me—then the Senate will return to the consideration of the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], which is a substitute for the Ives amendment. Is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that the Senator from Nebraska has correctly stated the situation: namely, that first the motion made by the Senator from Oregon must be disposed of; and if the vote on it is negative, the Senate will return to the consideration of the amendment previously offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. Of course, if that occurs, I think there will be no chance for the Senate to take up the civil functions appropriation bill on Thursday, and I doubt that it will be possible to take it up on Friday.

I think the statements which have just been made give the Senate a fair idea of the program for the near future.

At this time I should like to have the Senate take a recess in view of the fact that 2 weeks ago it was agreed that the clerks of the Senate would meet this afternoon in the caucus room in the Senate Office Building with the administrative assistants and office staffs of Senators and Senate committee staffs to study the process incident to the introduction and passage of bills and other legislative procedures, and to do some laboratory work in that connection.

So, Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate today, I now move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 12, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 11 (legislative day of May 10), 1948:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

George P. Shaw, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Nicaragua.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 11, 1948

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, before whom we bow in humblest reverence. We praise Thee and trust Thee as our loving Heavenly Father. Thou art the saving power hanging over all the things of time. The smallest sparrow that flutters and falls is cared for by the sublime tenderness of Thy love.

Mercifully regard those who prosper and are happy; lead them to understand

that every man's surplus is another's need; may their overflow of comfort and contentment give blessings of cheer and hope. Regard in great favor those who have been assigned to the great tasks of public duty and obligation. Give them strength and vision to do Thy will. In our Redeemer's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 107. An act for the acquisition and maintenance of wildlife management and control areas in the State of California, and for other purposes;

H. R. 338. An act for the relief of Amin Bin Rejab;

H. R. 345. An act for the relief of Ollie McNeill and Ester B. McNeill;

H. R. 817. An act for the relief of Andres Quinones and Letty Perez;

H. R. 831. An act for the relief of George Chan;

H. R. 1022. An act for the relief of Peter Bednar, Francisca Bednar, Peter Walter Bednar, and William Joseph Bednar;

H. R. 1189. An act to establish the methods of advancement for post-office employees (rural carriers) in the field service;

H. R. 1392. An act for the relief of Mrs. Charlotte E. Harvey;

H. R. 1562. An act to increase temporarily the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States;

H. R. 1653. An act for the relief of Edward W. Bigger;

H. R. 1724. An act to legalize the admission to the United States of Sarah Jane Sanford Pansa;

H. R. 1749. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of Johannes or John, Julia, Michael, William, or Anna Kostiuk";

H. R. 1953. An act for the relief of John F. Reeves;

H. R. 2000. An act for the relief of Jeffersonville Flood Control District, Jeffersonville, Ind., a municipal corporation;

H. R. 2418. An act for the relief of Luz Martin;

H. R. 3189. An act for the relief of Joe Parry, a minor;

H. R. 3224. An act for the relief of Frank and Maria Durante;

H. R. 3608. An act for the relief of Cristeta La-Madrid Angeles;

H. R. 3740. An act for the relief of Andrew Osiecimski-Czapski;

H. R. 3787. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Smorczewska;

H. R. 3824. An act for the relief of Mrs. Cletus E. Todd (formerly Laura Estelle Ritter);

H. R. 3880. An act for the relief of Ludwig Pohoryles;

H. R. 4018. An act authorizing the transfer of certain real property for wildlife or other purposes;

H. R. 4050. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Moke Tcharoutcheff, Lucie Baptistine Tcharoutcheff, Raymonde Tcharoutcheff, and Robert Tcharoutcheff;

H. R. 4068. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to construct a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4129. An act for the relief of Jerline Floyd Givens and the legal guardian of William Earl Searight, a minor;

H. R. 4130. An act for the relief of Dennis (Dionesio) Fernandez;

H. R. 4631. An act for the relief of Antonio Villani;

H. R. 5035. An act to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the Eighty-second National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held in Grand Rapids, Mich., September 26 to 30, 1948;

H. R. 5118. An act to authorize the sale of certain individual Indian land on the Flathead Reservation to the State of Montana;

H. R. 5137. An act to amend the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended;

H. R. 5262. An act to authorize the sale of individual Indian lands acquired under the act of June 18, 1934, and under the act of June 26, 1936;

H. R. 5543. An act granting the consent of Congress to Carolina Power & Light Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in the Lumber River;

H. R. 5651. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in South Dakota for municipal or public purposes;

H. R. 5805. An act to extend the time within which application for the benefits of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 may be made by veterans discharged from the armed forces before the effective date of such act; and

H. R. 5963. An act to authorize the construction of a courthouse to accommodate the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1878. An act to amend the immigration laws to deny admission to the United States of persons who may be coming here for the purpose of engaging in activities which will endanger the public safety of the United States;

H. R. 2359. An act to authorize the payment of a lump sum, in the amount of $100,000, to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y., as a contribution toward the cost of construction of a water-filtration plant, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3219. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator or officials of the Federal Works Agency duly authorized by him to appoint special policemen for duty upon Federal property under the jurisdiction of the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3350. An act relating to the rules for the prevention of collisions on certain inland waters of the United States and on the western rivers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3505. An act authorizing an appropriation for investigating and rehabilitating the oyster beds damaged or destroyed by the intrusion of fresh water and the blockage of natural passages west of the Mississippi River in the vicinity of Lake Mechant and Bayou Severin, Terrebonne Parish, La., and by the opening of the Bonnet Carre Spillway, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3510. An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 3566. An act to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4236. An act to amend the Civil Service Act to remove certain discrimination with respect to the appointment of persons having any physical handicap to positions in the classified civil service;

H. R. 4721. An act to remove the statutory limit of appropriation expenditures for repairs or changes to a vessel of the Navy;

H. R. 4892. An act to amend the act of July 23, 1947 (61 Stat. 409) (Public Law No. 219 of the 80th Cong.);

H. R. 5193. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940;

H. R. 5669. An act to provide for adjustment of irrigation charges on the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6067. An act authorizing the execution of an amendatory repayment contract with the Northport Irrigation District, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3. An act to provide for the training of air-traffic-control-tower operators;

S. 153. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Army to have prepared a replica of the Dade Monument for presentation to the State of Florida;

S. 668. An act for the relief of Philip Sumampow;

S. 1703. An act for the relief of Lorraine Burns Mullen;

S. 1979. An act authorizing and directing the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to undertake certain studies of the soft-shell and hard-shell clams;

S. 2060. An act for the relief of Edgar Wikner Percival;

S. 2077. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to exchange certain property with the city of Kearney, Nebr.;

S. 2152. An act to increase the maximum travel allowance for railway postal clerks and substitute railway postal clerks;

S. 2223. An act to authorize the promotion of Lt. Gen. Leslie Richard Groves to the permanent grade of major general, United States Army, and for other purposes;

S. 2224. An act to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to the priority rights of veterans entitled to 10-point preference under such act;

S. 2233. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the East Bay Municipal Utility District, an agency of the State of California, an easement for the construction and operation of a water main in and under certain Government-owned lands comprising a part of the United States air station, Alameda, Calif.;

S. 2291. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army or his duly authorized representative to quitclaim a perpetual easement over certain lands adjacent to the Fort Myers Army Airfield, Fla.; and

S. 2432. An act to amend the Alien Registration Act of 1940.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5933. An act to permit the temporary free importation of racing shells.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. BREWSTER, and Mr. BARKLEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMEY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the

RECORD and include an article on the St. Lawrence waterway.

Mr. MERROW asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include House Concurrent Resolution 190, which he introduced on April 27, 1948, with reference to foreign policy.

VOLUNTARY ENLISTMENT VERSUS THE DRAFT

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therewith a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TWYMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received a thoughtful letter from two boys who live in my block at home. These boys are typical, I think, of many American boys. They would not hesitate to enlist in the Army voluntarily if they could enlist on the same basis as is proposed under the compulsory plan. Actually, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Army Air Forces are having no trouble meeting their enlisted personnel quotas on a voluntary basis. As far as they are concerned, there is no need to consider compulsory military training or reenactment of the draft. All of the difficulty seems to be with the ground forces of the Army, and these difficulties seem to be due to the types of enlistments they offer. The shortest enlistment is a 2-year enlistment, which means that the volunteer will be unassigned and is assured of no training other than the original basic training. The Army would do well to consider the letter which I quote herewith:

MAY 6, 1948.

DEAR MR. TWYMAN: We are graduating from high school this spring, and although we intend to go to college, we are considering enlistment in one of the armed forces. We inquired and learned that the minimum period is 3 years for all branches. We feel, since there is a great need for men in the services, that inducement should be greater. We consider 3 years too long if one is to attend college.

It is our opinion that a shorter enlistment, 18 months or 2 years, would be more attractive. There are others who think as we do, and who would join if it did not require 3 years.

We think that a short period in the service would make us more mature and thereby give us a greater appreciation of a college education.

We recommend that the enlistment period be cut down to 18 months or 2 years. If you consider the matter from our point of view, we feel that you will agree with us.

Thanking you for your consideration, we remain,

Yours truly,

GERALD GRANT, JR.
R. CHESTER OTIS III.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITTINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address delivered by Oris V. Wells, Chief of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, before the Delta Council of Mississippi.

AIR-LINE RATE COMPETITION FROM EUROPEAN SOCIALISM

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, American trans-Atlantic air lines are up in the air in more ways than one. Most of them have been making a very satisfactory profit. Some have even hoped to develop mass air travel to Europe by further lowering rates. That has been the traditional way for American business enterprises to pass on new efficiencies to consumers, but it is not the European socialist's way. The British and French air lines are government-owned monopolies. They have been operating with heavy deficits. They have felt that trans-Atlantic rates should be raised so they asked our Government, under the Civil Aeronautics Board, to approve rate increase.

Did the CAB follow the wishes of the American companies? Did the CAB allow competition under free enterprise to settle the matter in favor of the traveler?

No, sir.

Deciding in favor of the British and French plea, the CAB has recently raised trans-Atlantic air rates by $25. Once again the American citizen is asked to subsidize the Socialist governments of Europe.

Mr. Speaker, how long are American taxpayers going to let foreign governments tell us what we have to do to maintain their Socialist governments?

The Saturday Evening Post suggests that every trans-Atlantic ticket should carry the legend:

This ticket would have cost $25 less if socialism were working the way Socialists say it is.

It is a good idea. It should be extended to all things that cost more because European socialism does not work.

[From the New York Times of March 29, 1948]

ATLANTIC AIR FARES TO INCREASE BY $25—AMERICAN-FLAG OPERATORS NOT TOO PLEASED WITH THE RISE SOUGHT BY FOREIGN LINES

Air fares across the Atlantic will increase by $25 on Thursday. The Civil Aeronautics Board last week approved the general rate increase determined upon by the rate conference of the International Air Transport Association at Rio de Janeiro last November and all air-line men here yesterday said the rates would become effective for at least 5 months.

Operators of air service across the Atlantic under the American flag are not too pleased with the increase. Their figures for last year show an operating profit as a rule and they feel that every rise in rates is a step away from the $200 round trip to Europe that the industry has long counted on to generate real mass transportation by air overseas.

Foreign operators, particularly the British and the French, however, have been faced with heavy deficits on their Government-owned monopolies and have stood out for the increase for at least the summer season when capacity loads are expected both ways. On the plea that the current rate would drive their foreign competitors out of business, in violation of all international air agreements from the general act of the Chicago conference of 1944, the United States-flag operators have agreed to go along on the increase.

The base rate has been that between New York and London, which has stood for more than 2 years at $325 one way, with rates to other cities in Europe based on mileage beyond the London gateway. The London rate now become $350 with similar increases for all points beyond. With the discounts prevalent for foreign round trips the round trip fares will be increased by $43.20.

Not all of the provisions of IATA's Rio resolutions were approved by the CAB. In both the Atlantic and other conferences the board suspended provisions that, it said, would tend to provide double commissions for agents who were both agents and forwarders of freight. This, the board said, would be in effect an illegal rebate. It also questioned some of the provisions for free and reduced fare transportation for tour conductors and has instituted a general inquiry into the whole matter of free and reduced fares on international air carriers, which are strictly forbidden to domestic air lines.

[From the Saturday Evening Post of May 8, 1948]

FREE ENTERPRISE SEEMS BORN TO BLUSH UNSEEN

There's a lot in what Dorothy Thompson says about this country hiding its light under a bushel and fighting a cold war by imitating the juvenile antics of Communist gangsters instead of demonstrating in a positive fashion what freedom has to offer the miserable inhabitants of this planet. A striking example of our failure to beat the drums was clipped out of the New York Times last month by the Foundation for Economic Education, which deserves credit for rescuing the item from unmerited oblivion. The Times news story explained an announced increase of $25 in the fare for trans-Atlantic air-line flights. The story pointed out that air lines under the American flag had been showing an operating profit on overseas flights and regretted the necessity of increasing the fare. Reason:

"Foreign operators, particularly the British and French, have been faced with heavy deficits on their government-owned monopolies and have stood out for the increase for at least the summer season, when capacity loads are expected both ways. On the plea that the current rate would drive their foreign competitors out of business, in violation of all international air agreements arising from the general act of the Chicago conference in 1944, the United States flag operators have agreed to go along on the increase."

In other words, American private management—aided by Government-mail contracts which foreign lines also get—has outdistanced subsidized socialism, but, in the interest of courtesy, has agreed to waive its advantage. Inasmuch as the right to fly into England and France does rest on agreements with those countries, it is probable that there was no way out for the American lines but to go along on the fare increase. Nevertheless, we do feel that, in this one instance at any rate, such free enterprise as remains in the flying business is entitled to at least as much advertising as the Socialists are forever sponsoring in behalf of the allegedly superior efficiency and economy of their system. Couldn't a ticket on an American transatlantic plane contain some such legend as: "This ticket would have cost $25 less if socialism were working the way Socialists say it is."

This is no gag, but a serious proposal. One of the most important reasons for the low standing of our economic system in the eyes of millions of Americans is that they have been told by everybody from Henry Wallace to the professor in economics 6, that some other system would distribute goods more fairly or make full production available to the people instead of to the profiteers. Never do these apostles of antifree enterprise explain just when and where Socialist economies have delivered the goods. They content themselves with pointing out that a planned society ought to deliver the goods because it's a planned society. What's the matter with asking for details of how they do it; and what's the matter with blowing our own horn, just softly, when we do it?

INAUGURATION OF GOVERNOR LONG

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago today I was present in the city of Baton Rouge, La., and witnessed the inauguration of my neighbor and boyhood friend, the late Gov. Huey P. Long, who later became a distinguished United States Senator. Sixteen years ago today in Baton Rouge, I witnessed the inauguration of my brother, the late Gov. O. K. Allen, who was later elected to the United States Senate and died before taking office.

Today in the city of Baton Rouge, Hon. Earl K. Long, a younger brother of Huey P. Long, and also a neighbor and friend of mine, is being inaugurated Governor of Louisiana. Within a few minutes he will be inaugurated Governor. I had planned to attend the inauguration and had made some reservations for that purpose, but had to cancel the trip because of the heavy legislative docket here this week. But, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of great pride with me that another man with whom I was reared and who now lives in my home town becomes governor of the great State of Louisiana, after having received a majority of over 208,000 votes in the recent primary. This makes three governors of Louisiana that my own home town has furnished.

I believe Governor Long will make Louisiana a great governor. He has broad experience in public life, having been Governor himself for 11 months before and he has a broad knowledge and a sympathetic understanding of the needs of the people. We in Louisiana are proud of his achievements and we are very happy over his election and elevation to the governorship and we are looking forward to the accomplishment of great results under his administration. He goes into office with as great backing of the people as any governor in the history of Louisiana has ever had. His great desire is to give to the people of Louisiana 4 years of good government and bring to our people the greatest measure of happiness and prosperity. This we believe he will do.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy today to salute the new Governor of Louisiana and to extend to him and his gracious lady, Mrs. Blanche Long, my warmest congratulations and fervent good wishes.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time to pay tribute to a truly great American, the Honorable Earl K. Long, Governor-designate of the great State of Louisiana.

Today at high 12, central standard time, Mr. Long will be sworn in as Governor of the State of Louisiana. In effect that means that all Louisianians will enter upon a new phase of life and henceforth Louisiana will have peace, prosperity, and an aggressive form of State government.

Those of us who know Governor Long best know that he possesses great ability, He is a lovable character and his integrity is most certainly above reproach. Gov. Earl K. Long, like his illustrious brother, the late United States Senator Huey P. Long, has ever championed the cause of the lame and the halt, the sick and the blind, the aged and the infirm, and also that large group of underprivileged. Governor Long is the father of the free school-lunch program.

I predict that so great will be Governor Long's administration for the next 4 years in Louisiana that the leadership set by the Governor will soar as a bright example to statesmen and leaders yet unborn. Governor Long has set for his task a very comprehensive program. His program is feasible and will be beneficial to all Louisianians.

I predict that so great will be the accomplishments of Governor Long in the next 4 years that chief executives from many of Louisiana's sister States will look to him for advice and counsel. No doubt history will record Governor Long as one of the great leaders of this age. It would not surprise those of us close to Governor Long to see him drafted for an even greater work and on a national scope.

No doubt, many of my colleagues present on the floor today will sooner or later aspire to the governorship of their respective States, and if that be true, I recommend that they turn their eyes to the South and observe the great program being pursued for the good of mankind under the able leadership of my dear friend, Gov. Earl K. Long.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in extending best wishes and congratulations to Governor Long, and our first lady, Mrs. Long, as he assumes the highest office within the gift of the people of Louisiana. Our new Governor has announced a constructive program of public works and aid to the aged and the indigent. In that program he will have the cooperation of all Democrats in the State of Louisiana as well as my own cooperation.

Our incoming Governor was nominated by the largest majority ever accorded a candidate for governor after full discussion of the issues and programs involved. In carrying out his program he deserves the help and cooperation of all our people.

Governor Long defeated three other candidates in the two primary elections of January and February 1948—Representative MORRISON, Judge Robert Kennon, and former Governor Jones. I supported the latter candidate, but as the Representative in Congress of the Second District of Louisiana, I naturally bow to the majority, and I am glad to join my colleagues in extending congratulations and best wishes and in pledging my cooperation in a program for the advancement of our State.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, all roads today in Louisiana lead to Baton Rouge. A record crowd is in attendance; and the occasion of this tremendous outpouring of the people of Louisiana is the inauguration of Gov. Earl K. Long.

Governor Long was elected after a heated campaign culminating in a brilliant victory produced by a record majority of votes coming from all sections of our State. These votes represented all groups and all parts of Louisiana. This inauguration marks the beginning of a new regime in Louisiana politics. All signs point to an era of unprecedented growth, development, and progress in my native State and for the benefit of its people.

My heartiest congratulations go to the incoming Governor. He has, of course, my full cooperation and desire to work with him for the benefit of our State, its institutions, and its people.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HÉBERT (at the request of Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. FERNANDEZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject World Premiere of Four Faces West, and also to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the third part of an article with respect to the Rio Grande flood problem in New Mexico.

Mr. LANHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Atlantic Journal.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two newspaper articles.

CONSERVATION PAYMENTS TO MINERS OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, a bill by the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. RUSSELL], H. R. 2455, to make conservation payments to miners of strategic and critical minerals required for the national defense is now pending. This bill is designed to supplement the Stock Pile Act of 1946 and to encourage discovery, exploration, and development of minerals within our borders. It will also insure the recovery of marginal ore bodies which were opened up during the war and which may be lost forever if not continuously mined.

We are laggard in these matters. While we talk in terms of mineral inventories other countries take practical action. It is reported that the greatest mineral search in history is under way in other countries. Prospectors will employ parachute, reindeer, camel, pack mule, automobile, and airplane in their efforts to discover new and greater ore beds.

Apparently, cost is no object to other nations when strategic and critical defense materials are needed. It is clear they are making strenuous efforts to become self-sufficient in metals and minerals.

It seems to me that the United States can do no less than make every effort to be self-sufficient in supplies concerning the national defense. I realize we must have some imports, but most certainly every ton of strategic metals we can procure here—every source we can make available on our own continent—adds that much insurance against future needs.

I feel the House should pass H. R. 2455 at the earliest possible moment.

TAXES

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, last year I introduced H. R. 1030 when it was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means. Many members of the committee as well as others not on that committee expected we would quickly make a reappraisal of the whole luxury-tax situation. The chairman told the House:

> We will go over the whole excise-tax list before long and see if we cannot give relief where needed.

We all thought that early action would be possible. I personally pointed out our desire to continue these present war-excise taxes, at least until such time as the Congress has an opportunity to consider the whole budget picture.

It is not surprising therefore that many Members have asked me what we are doing in this matter. I do not undertake to speak for the committee, but I do feel constrained as a matter of good faith to present a bill which will be referred to our committee and enable us to have the subject considered when we get the general revision bill out of the way.

It is possible to make out a good case for any one of the many items which are included under the general heading of excises. However we cannot properly, in my judgment, dispose simply of individual items in piecemeal fashion. Moreover we must consider the revenue situation in the light of budgetary demands, the extent of which we do not yet know.

But we should review the picture, at least, and ascertain just where we stand. When we do so, we should approach the problem with some principle in mind, some standard which may appropriately be applied. We must deal with the retail excise category as a whole. For example, does anyone suppose we should consider luggage only, and not furs or jewelry or cosmetics? Or that we should take up only one classification of cosmetics or one price range of jewelry? Such approach, it seems to me, does not go to the heart of the situation. We must consider all together.

In my view we should not have in peacetime a discriminatory rate of tax on retail sales. It would please me if there were no tax at all on retail sales, particularly where they are superimposed upon local and State sales taxes, thus further through Federal authority, distorting and aggravating a competitive situation already serious to those who have a perfect right to engage in a particular line of legitimate business. But I am practical enough to know that revenue needs must also be considered, and the bill I am introducing today would simply restore the 1941 rate of tax, 10 percent, instead of the 1943 rates of 20 percent which our action last year continued in force.

Oddly, the double burden of the 20-percent rate falls largely on the women of the Nation. A man carries his belongings in his pockets—a woman needs a handbag, and pays a tax of 20 percent for the article. She wants to look presentable, in fact it is essential that she do so—and the women of America are the most beautiful in the world—but the woman pays a penalty of 20 percent for her cosmetics. She buys a fur coat and is taxed $1 for every $5 of the retail price. She buys a bauble for the coat and must pay another 20 percent for the jewelry adornment. Someone said "The woman always pays"—we not only make it legal—we say she must go on paying war tax rates. She gave her husband, her sons to the war, and we make her pay for the war too.

The Federal sales taxes—that's what they amount to—as excises on retail sales, are highly discriminatory to the man in business. The consumer buys an oriental rug or expensive china, and he pays no tax. He buys a locket and a chain as a graduation gift for his daughter, or a wedding present, and he pays $4 tax on every $20 he spends. That simply is not just or right in principle. Either we should have a general Federal sales tax on all items—which I oppose—or we should deal fairly with this retail-excise problem.

At the very least I want the matter to come before our committee. Many other Members of this body want to know and be able to tell their constituents that the problem will receive consideration. Therefore, I am introducing a bill to reduce from 20 percent to 10 percent the rates now applicable to furs, jewelry, cosmetics, and luggage. As soon as our budgetary position will permit, I hope to assist in repealing retail excises entirely as applied to these items.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial appearing in the York Dispatch this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I regret that it is necessary for me to come before this House to criticize certain things in the Department of Agriculture so often. I would like to see that Department cleared up so that the people would get at least some sensible advice or benefit from that top-heavy, expensive department of government. Now they are up in my city putting on a campaign to teach the housewives what to buy and even going so far as to say that they can cut their budget by 50 percent if they will follow their advice. Well, the program calls for the housewives to purchase cabbage instead of asparagus and soybeans instead of meat. These housewives in southeastern Pennsylvania, who have long enjoyed the reputation of being the thriftiest wives and the best cooks and housekeepers in the world, we Pennsylvania Dutchmen, are not going to eat cabbage instead of asparagus at this time of the year, and they are not going to eat soybeans when what they want is beef or pork. They are just crazy down there in the Department of Agriculture. Why do they not go up into the coal regions and try this experiment. There all food is brought in; the people live out of the store. The cellars in the homes in southeastern Pennsylvania actually represent little warehouses when it comes to supplies, and those supplies have been put there to take care of their needs for a year in advance. You can go into a lot of our cellars and find from a hundred to a thousand quarts of canned goods that they have put up themselves, some for as long as 5 years ago, and they are just as good now as the day when they were put up by the housewife. Now the Department of Agriculture agents are up there putting on an extensive program urging the people to buy the foods which are in surplus created by the Government whether they are suitable or not. I shall survey the thing honestly and report to this House their doings from time to time. If they expect us to eat soybeans and cabbages instead of asparagus and beefsteak, they are crazy. The Department of Agriculture should be pushed back into Washington where it belongs. Their recommendations are mostly boloney no matter how thin you slice it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the York Dispatch entitled "It's Still Boloney":

IT'S STILL BOLONEY

So now the master minds of the Department of Agriculture are going to tell housewives how to cut down one-tenth on their food budgets. York and Lancaster counties are to be the testing grounds for a best-buy campaign. It seems Government experts will tell the grocer what is abundant, and therefore cheap, and the grocer will put a label on these goods, and voila. The good housewives will buy the cheap, but nourishing articles. At least Washington says they're nourishing.

As though anybody who has been handling the food pocketbook for the last year or two doesn't know that one has to purchase the best buys or have nothing left to buy anything else. The housewife who pretends to be any kind of manager buys what is a bargain. She walks into a store and sees a pile of canned goods, for instance, with a bargain price on it. If she has any extra money in her purse, which is doubtful in view of present conditions, of course, she will pick up a can or two.

We note that during the experimental period Department of Agriculture representatives will sit in the chamber of commerce to keep tab on developments. We also note that recipe books will be distributed, printed at Government expense, to tell housewives how to prepare meals economically under the title "Money-Saving Main Dishes." More menus would seem to be the last thing we need.

If all the books filled with money-saving menus were placed end to end and side by side and one on top of the other, all the people in the United States, including Alaska and the other Territories, would be knee deep in them. We say let the experts wade in them.

Remember all the hullabaloo about the wonderfully nourishing properties of soybeans? They could be substituted for meat, the pamphlet said. Maybe that is so, but we never could get anybody to like soybeans. We dressed them up with tomato sauce and with mustard and we baked them and we boiled them, and they always turned out soybeans.

And who is paying for the cost of compiling and printing these menus? We, the people. We doubt very much whether one-tenth of the budget which we will theoretically save with suggestions from the Government, all free, mind you, will equal the amount of money spent to pay the home economists to compile the book, the cost of paper and printing, not to mention the salaries of those representatives of the Department who will sit and watch developments.

Seemingly the experts have failed to take into account the fact that many Yorkers buy green groceries at the markets. Will they cover the markets?

We realize that a Government employee in Washington, unless he were York County bred, could not be familiar with the fact that we go to market for certain things. That's what we mean. Washington thinks up something for us to do, some much publicized campaign to save food, and then a most important factor in even starting to make such a plan work is overlooked; that is the local element.

You know, maybe, we are one of those cussed rugged individualists who hate to have a guv'ment man poke his nose into our pots and pans. We have never done anything but try to economize on the grocery bill, and we resent the implication that Washington must send experts to tell us how to run things, even our meals.

Sometimes when we read of all these wonderful things that the Government is doing for us we decide not to try to figure out anything at all for ourselves any more. If our food money fails to reach, we'll just sit down and have a good cry and send Mr. Truman a telegram (collect, of course) so he can tell us what to put on the table for supper. Shades of Charlie Luckman and his ilk. Let them sell their soap; let the Department of Agriculture stick to its agriculturing and let us alone. We'll manage, thank you.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONES of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include three editorials appearing in the Seattle Times, and in the other portions of a statement made by him before the Committee on Ways and Means concerning an amendment to the Foreign Trade Zones Act, H. R. 6160, and a statement on the same subject made by a representative of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce.

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, in writing the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, Members of Congress were farsighted enough to recognize that in assisting the western block of European countries it was likely that from time to time an impact would be felt on the economy of the United States. For that reason, section 112 (a) was written into Public Law 472 of the Eightieth Congress, which provides as follows:

> The Administrator shall provide for the procurement in the United States of commodities under this title in such a way as to (1) minimize the drain upon the resources of the United States and the impact of such procurement upon the domestic economy, and (2) avoid impairing the fulfillment of vital needs of the people of the United States.

The House Small Business Committee in March compiled a summary of requirements for the Economic Cooperation Act in which it was estimated that for 1948, $441,000,000 would be spent in procuring steel and steel-making materials for the Marshall-plan countries, that $576,800,000 would be spent to procure petroleum and petroleum products, and that $175,000,000 would be spent for oil-equipment requirements and that $369,000,000 would be spent in procuring coal to be sent to these countries. All of these items are today in short supply in the United States.

Small businesses are the losers in any period of scarcity. Many small business firms have contacted the House Small Business Committee, complaining that steel in particular was impossible to obtain in needed quantities without paying gray-market prices. This condition exists at a time when we are giving away these items to countries in Europe who themselves are not interchanging goods.

To illustrate this point, I refer you to the New York Times of April 17 which article carries the headline: "Belgium offering steel sheets here." Five hundred and twenty-eight thousand dollars worth in one contract cited, price given as 11 cents a pound or $220 a ton. The article went on to say:

> These offers were taken to indicate that European mills are approaching a point at which they will have an exportable surplus if their entire output is not absorbed by the European recovery program.

It seems unbalanced to have us selling steel for use in ERP operations on a preferred allocation status when some buyers here may have to buy foreign steel at almost double the price of metals we ship abroad.

In the New York Journal of Commerce on April 29 an ad appeared as follows:

> We offer as representatives of a leading European mill API line pipe, 300–500 tons monthly, commencing October, Kurt Orban Co., Inc.

As one good friend of mine remarked to me yesterday, "Why should any European nation buy from another European nation when they can get the materials from the United States for nothing?"

It has been stated several times on the floor of the House by other Members that at the same time France was negotiating for the importation of 6,500,000 tons of coal from the United States in each of the next three quarters that in Poland there would be a glut of coal available at prices far beneath the shipping charges to carry coal from this country.

In the case of petroleum and petroleum products, several days ago we were advised by the Armed Services Committee that in the event of a war, the Nation would face a shortage of 3,000,000 barrels of oil a day, further stating that if the world situation does not improve and voluntary controls are not successful that the Government should consider allocating steel and petroleum products.

In regard to steel for oil equipment requirements which includes steel used for rigs, drills, tubing, pipe and refinery expansion, a good deal of steel must be channeled into these efforts within the next few months, further curtailing the use of steel by all types of other industry.

As a member of the Select Committee on Small Business, I have been carefully following the allocation of steel, especially that part of it that has been going, and we hope continues to be directed, to small manufacturing plants who find that steel is the major element or the general base upon which their entire output is dependent. Hundreds of these small but important manufacturing plants must be provided with steel if they are to continue to keep their plants operating.

In my opinion, the opportunity of the Department of Commerce to mishandle, misjudge, or fumble the allocation of steel, either by persuasion or otherwise, could and probably would directly affect the farm output of many farms in America. Farmers are not only short of farm equipment used in the cultivation of the soil but also short of many other tools and repairs, the basic element of which is steel.

In any plan which contemplates allocation of such scarce items as steel, I fear for the welfare of small businesses.

I recently attended a meeting of the steel warehouse men sponsored by the Department of Commerce, office of industry cooperation, at which time warehouse men were gathered to enter into a voluntary agreement under Public Law 395. Officials of the Department of Commerce, in effect, told the group that they could not expect more than 15 percent of the total steel production for distribution to small users. They further advised that 10 percent of the total steel production is being shipped abroad.

Mr. Virden, Director of the Office of International Trade, at the meeting said:

> Based upon what we know of the steel-production situation, I think we ought to be frank with you and say we don't see any chance of an increased flow of steel to the warehouse industry; indeed, you might face the fact that you might get less steel.

Under Secretary of Commerce William C. Foster said:

> We went up last year to the Congress believing that there were shortages which might need some mandatory powers to alleviate.

From the Department of Commerce, then, we see there is the thinking that small users of steel will get no more, and may get less. Also that mandatory controls are necessary.

If this be true, then it is time that we restudy section 112 (a) of Public Law 472 and call a halt to the exportation of such scarce items that are crippling our own economy at home.

While on the subject of small business, I call your attention to one other disturbing bit of news which has come across my desk recently. In January and February of 1948, Army supply contracts awarded totaled $284,000,000. Of this total amount, less than $20,000,000, or 7 percent of the total in dollars, was awarded to businesses employing less than 500 wage earners.

Small business is a fundamental part of America and must continue to grow and be safeguarded as well as any other cherished American institution.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter appearing in today's New York Herald-Tribune.

Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include a lecture in each.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday of this week the congressional Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy will convene in New London, Conn.

All of us in Connecticut greet our distinguished visitors with a very sincere "Welcome aboard." They will have the opportunity to observe the progress and to study the problems of the Coast Guard Academy. Their constructive suggestions will do much to enable the Coast Guard to maintain its present high standard of achievement in the field of training officers.

We have heard a great deal during the past few years about our naval and military academies. We have also heard a great deal about the uniformity of operation maintained by the various services which bears evidence of the basic training and education received at these academies by our military leaders.

Not many of us, however, are acquainted with the history, dating back to 1876, rich in tradition and significant events, which forms the background of our third and smallest service academy—the United States Coast Guard Academy at New London, Conn. Nor is it generally appreciated that this comparatively small academy, because of the almost boundless range of its functions and scope of training, holds a unique and interesting place among the educational institutions of our armed forces.

Appointments to the Coast Guard Academy are based entirely on Nation-wide competitive examinations. This year 1,222 young men made application for appointment to cadetship. Of this number 840 were found eligible and authorized to take the examinations. Based upon the results of these examinations, appointments of approximately 150 cadets, from the top grades, will be made provided the candidates are physically and otherwise qualified. These cadets will enter the Academy during the first week in July. Thus it may be seen that the candidate receiving an appointment to the Academy must have attained a relatively high examination mark.

Mention has already been made as to the diversified education offered at the Coast Guard Academy. When we consider the manifold duties of our Coast Guard service itself, the reason for this type of education becomes very clear. Let me give you a partial list of these duties: Maritime law-enforcement, life-saving, rescue work, maintenance of almost 37,000 aids to navigation, port policing, prevention of smuggling, narcotics control, protection of fisheries, fur-seal, game and bird reservations, Bering Sea patrol, iceberg and weather patrol. These are the peacetime duties of our Coast Guard—wartime duties carry Coast Guard ships and personnel to all parts of the world.

The Coast Guard is our oldest seagoing service. Here we find a mark of democratic principles dating back to 1876, the year in which the Secretary of the Treasury secured passage of a law establishing the cadet system. Since that early date, candidates for the Coast Guard Academy have been selected by competitive examinations.

Permit me to relate a bit of the interesting history leading up to the present status of the United States Coast Guard Academy.

To begin with, the officer personnel of the Revenue Marine—now the Coast Guard—was composed of Revolutionary War veterans.

It was Alexander Hamilton, our first Secretary of the Treasury, who recommended that naval commissions be given to those in charge of the first Revenue Marine vessels and that such commissioning, "will not only induce fit men the more readily to engage, but will attach them to their duty by a nicer sense of honor."

From 1790 until 1876 the service obtained its officers from the Navy and merchant marine. The resultant mixture of personnel, some with military, some with commercial experience, proved to be of distinct disadvantage in that two separate camps, each with its own peculiar background and sympathies, developed. The duties of the Service, even in those early days, were of a specialized nature, foreign to the common knowledge of other professions. Specialized training, of one kind or another, seemed to be in order.

A specialized training period for candidates for the service was created by congressional law in July 1876, and thus the cadet corps system was established. This same cadet corps system is in effect today, supported solely by means of competitive examination.

In May of 1877, academy life in the Coast Guard began aboard the old topsail schooner *J. C. Dobbin*. The academy year was devoted to 8 or 9 months of academic instructions in port and 3 or 4 months of cruising for practical instructions.

During the period 1878–1900, the *Chase*, a 106-foot sailing vessel, bark-rigged, served as the home of the academy school of instruction. The *Chase*, stationed at New Bedford, Mass., during the winter months, made practice cruises to Europe in the summer. Graduation followed a 2-year course at this floating academy—the cadets became third lieutenants in the Revenue Cutter Service.

The first land-based academy was established in 1900 at Arundel Cove, near Baltimore, Md.

The Arundel Cove location served as a site for the Academy until 1910, at which time all facilities were transferred to historic Fort Trumbull at New London, Conn.

With the creation, in 1915, of the United States Coast Guard through the amalgamation of the Revenue Cutter Service and the Life Saving Service, the Academy was given the official designation United States Coast Guard Academy. It was developed into a technical school comparable with respect to completeness of courses, instructions, and educational facilities to Annapolis and West Point.

The full 4-year course of instruction, established in 1931, contains a greater number of semester hours than the average university engineering course, and nearly three-fourths of the cultural subjects required for a bachelor of arts degree in a liberal-arts college. Since 1941 the Academy has conferred upon each graduate the bachelor of science degree as well as awarding the commission of ensign in the United States Coast Guard.

Since its founding in 1790, so many additional duties have been assigned to the Coast Guard, which I might say are not performed by any other organization, that training, specialized to meet Coast Guard requirements, is mandatory.

Illustrative of the diversified activities of Coast Guard officers, a survey of the graduates of the Academy in 1944 shows that members of that class are now assigned duties as commanding officers of loran stations and buoy tenders, aerologists, and controllers in operation centers, executive officers on large cutters and supply ships, aids-to-navigation duties at various shore establishments, instructors at the Coast Guard Academy and in post-graduate training for aviation, electronics, and naval engineering duties.

Thus, it can readily be seen that training at the Academy must provide a good fundamental knowledge for these various assignments during an officer's career in the Coast Guard.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 6500) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1906), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MAHON reserved all points of order on the bill.

RELEASE OF CERTAIN POWERS OF APPOINTMENT

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 395) to extend the time for the release, free of estate and gift tax, of powers of appointment.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 403 (d) (3) of the Revenue Act of 1942 (relating to the release of certain powers of appointment) is hereby amended by striking out "July 1, 1948" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1949"; and section 452 (c) of the Revenue Act of 1942 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) Release before July 1, 1949:

"(1) A release of a power to appoint before July 1, 1949, shall not be deemed a transfer of property by the individual possessing such power.

"(2) This subsection shall apply to all calendar years prior to 1949 and to that part of the calendar year 1949 prior to July 1, 1949."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 6, add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 2. For the purposes of sections 403 and 452 of the Revenue Act of 1942, a power to appoint created by a will executed on or before October 21, 1942, shall be considered a power created on or before such date if the person executing such will dies before July 1, 1949, without having republished such will, by codicil or otherwise, after October 21, 1942."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STOCK PILES OF STRATEGIC MINERALS AND METALS

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the Committee on Public Lands, may I say that we have been making rather extensive studies in recent weeks concerning the condition of our stock piles under the recent act which provides for stock piling of strategic and critical minerals and metals. The other members of the committee and I are disturbed because of the present condition of the stock piles in this critical stage of world affairs. We have been investigating ways and means of stimulating mining, especially of these strategic minerals and metals.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that we ought to pass legislation of this nature at this session. I am in favor of a form of the Russell bill, which has already been reported out, and on which a rule has been granted. Perhaps certain amendments to the bill may be suggested to improve its national defense feature but something of that sort, I think, ought to be passed before adjournment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

STOCK PILING CRITICAL MATERIALS

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I merely want to make a comment with reference to what my colleague the gentleman from Arizona said. I was on the subcommittee which wrote the Stock Piling Act. The barrier which stands in the way of our building military stock piles is the fact that we put a clause in that law providing that those articles which are in short supply in the civilian economy cannot be stock-piled. I am convinced that we have to have some way of overcoming that barrier, either by modification of that clause, or by the elimination of it. Otherwise we will not get the stock piles of materials that we need at this critical time. Therefore I hope the Russell bill or any other bill containing some provision which will give a little relief from the civilian demands may be passed. I would support such a bill. We are trying our level best to build stock piles, and the progress to date has been very, very disappointing. It has been so slow, in my opinion, because of the clause that we were persuaded to put in the bill, which the last Congress passed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION, 1948

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6226) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6226) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, and 11, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In the last line of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the sum "$30,049,000," and insert in lieu thereof "$20,849,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the figure named in said amendment, insert "$500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 10.

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

STYLES BRIDGES,
CHAN GURNEY,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6226) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendments Nos. 1 through 4, inclusive, relating to the Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, appropriate $20,849,000 for Engineer Service, Army, instead of $30,049,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5, relating to the Department of the Army, appropriates $5,051,000 for, and authorizes transfer of $5,900,000 to the appropriation "Barracks and quarters, Army", as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6, relating to the Department of the Navy, provides for not to exceed $500,000 to be spent for the expansion of private plants in connection with the aircraft construction program instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7, relating to the Department of the Navy, provides for the use of not to exceed $20,000,000 for liquidation of obligations incurred under the appropriation "Aviation, Navy, 1945", as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8 corrects a section number of the bill as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9 strikes out language carried in the House bill relating to contract renegotiation.

Amendment No. 10 reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 11 corrects a section number, as proposed by the Senate.

AMENDMENT IN DISAGREEMENT

With respect to the amendment in disagreement the managers on the part of the House have authorized the following motion to be made:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 3. (a) All contracts in excess of $1,000 entered into under the authority of this Act, obligating funds appropriated hereby, obligating funds consolidated by this Act with funds appropriated hereby, or entered into through contract authorizations herein granted, and all subcontracts thereunder in excess of $1,000 shall contain the following article:

"'Renegotiation article: This contract is subject to the Renegotiation Act of 1948 and the contractor hereby agrees to insert a like article in all contracts or purchase orders to make or furnish any article or to perform all or any part of the work required for the performance of this contract.'

"(b) Whenever in the opinion of the Secretary of Defense excessive profits are reflected under any contract or contracts or subcontract or subcontracts required to contain the Renegotiation Article prescribed in subsection (a), the Secretary is authorized and directed to renegotiate such contracts and subcontracts for the purpose of eliminating excessive profits. He shall endeavor to make an agreement with the contractor or subcontractor with respect to the amount, if any, of such excessive profits and to their elimination. If no such agreement is reached, the Secretary shall issue an order determining the amount, if any, of such excessive profits and shall eliminate them by any of the methods set forth in subsection (c) (2) of the Renegotiation Act of February 25, 1944, as amended. In eliminating excessive profits the Secretary shall allow the contractor or subcontractor credit for Federal income and excess profits taxes as provided in Section 3806 of the Internal Revenue Code. The powers hereby conferred upon the Secretary shall be exercised with respect to the aggregate of the amounts received or accrued under all such contracts and subcontracts by the contractor or subcontractor during his fiscal year or upon such other basis as may be mutually agreed upon; except that this section shall not be applicable in the event that the aggregate of the amounts so received or accrued is less than $100,000 during any fiscal year.

"(c) For the purpose of administering this section the Secretary of Defense shall have the right to audit the books and records of any contractor or subcontractor subject to this section. In the interest of economy and the avoidance of duplication of inspection and audit, the services of the Bureau of Internal Revenue shall, upon request of the Secretary of Defense and with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, be made available to the extent determined by the Secretary of the Treasury for the purpose of making examinations and audits under this section.

"(d) The provisions of this section shall not apply to any of the contracts or subcontracts specified in subsection (i) (1) of the Renegotiation Act of February 25, 1944, as amended, and the Secretary of Defense in his discretion may exempt from the provisions of this section any other contract or subcontract both individually and by general classes or types.

"(e) Agreements or orders determining excessive profits shall be final and conclusive in accordance with their terms and except upon a showing of fraud or malfeasance or willful misrepresentation of a material fact shall not be annulled, modified, reopened, or disregarded, except that in the case of orders determining excessive profits the amount of the excessive profits, if any, may be redetermined by the Tax Court of the United States in the manner prescribed in subsection (e) (1) of the Renegotiation Act of February 25, 1944, as amended, except that such redetermination shall be subject to review to the extent and in the manner provided by subchapter B of chapter 5 of the Internal Revenue Code.

"(f) The Secretary of Defense shall promulgate and publish in the Federal Register regulations interpreting and applying this section and prescribing standards and procedures for determining and eliminating excessive profits hereunder using so far as he deems practicable the principles and procedures of the Renegotiation Act of February 25, 1944, as amended, having regard for the different economic conditions existing on or after the effective date of this Act from those prevailing during the period 1942 to 1945. In any case in which the contract price of any such contract or subcontract was based upon estimated costs, then the Secretary of Defense shall determine the difference between such estimated costs and actual costs and shall, in eliminating excessive profits, take into consideration as an element the extent to which such difference is the result of the efficiency of the contractor or subcontractor.

"(g) The powers and duties hereby conferred upon the Secretary of Defense may be delegated by him to any officer (military or civilian) or agency of the National Military Establishment.

"(h) Any person who willfully fails or refuses to furnish any information, records, or data required of him under this section, or who knowingly furnishes any such information, records, or data containing information which is false or misleading in any material respect, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than two years, or both.

"(i) This section may be cited as the 'Renegotiation Act of 1948'."

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I think it well to record the fact that the House of Representatives by the adoption of this report, and it will adopt the report, will have taken the final action in providing the appropriation for the so-called 70-group Air Force, which was before this body some time ago on the original bill. At that time, there was a roll call on the so-called 70-group Air Force program, and I believe there were only three dissenting votes against it. I am sure the Members of the House have not changed their minds. As one member of the conference committee, I want to say I am glad the Senate has seen fit to go along with the program of the House of Representatives in this very important matter, which is designed to insure to some very considerable extent the security and safety of our own country. I merely wanted to make that statement before the vote is taken on the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, the modernization and expansion of our Air Force as provided in the bill before us is an important step in the direction of peace and security.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Does the gentleman recall what the vote in the Senate was on the 70-group Air Force?

Mr. MAHON. Perhaps our chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] may be able to answer the gentleman's inquiry.

Mr. TABER. The vote was 74 to 2.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. That, Mr. Speaker, shows a very decided preference on the part of the Representatives of the American people for a first-class Air Force. This is a very important thing we are doing today.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman will yield further, Mr. Speaker, I merely wanted to bring out the fact that it was just about as unanimous a vote as that by which any measure could be passed through both Houses of Congress.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 10: On page 5, line 8, insert a new section 3, as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) All contracts in excess of $10,000 entered into under the authority of this act, obligating funds appropriated hereby, obligating funds consolidated by this act with funds appropriated hereby, or entered into through contract authorizations herein granted, and all subcontracts thereunder in excess of $10,00 shall contain the following article:

"'Renegotiation article: This contract is subject to the Renegotiation Act of 1948 and the contractor hereby agrees to insert a like article in all contracts or purchase orders to make or furnish any article or to perform all or any part of the work required for the performance of this contract.'

"(b) Whenever in the opinion of the Secretary of Defense excessive profits are reflected under any contract or contracts or subcontract or subcontracts required to contain the Renegotiation Article prescribed in subsection (a), the Secretary is authorized and directed to renegotiate such contracts and subcontracts for the purpose of eliminating excessive profits. He shall endeavor to

make an agreement with the contractor or subcontractor with respect to the amount, if any, of such excessive profits and to their elimination. If no such agreement is reached, the Secretary shall issue an order determining the amount, if any, of such excessive profits and shall eliminate them by any of the methods set forth in subsection (c) (2) of the Renegotiation Act of February 25, 1944, as amended. The powers hereby conferred upon the Secretary shall be exercised with respect to the aggregate of the amounts received or accrued under all such contracts and subcontracts by the contractor or subcontractor during his fiscal year or upon such other basis as may be mutually agreed upon; except that this section shall not be applicable in the event that the aggregate of the amounts so received or accrued is less than $100,000 during any fiscal year.

"(c) For the purpose of administering this section the Secretary of Defense shall have the right to audit the books and records of any contractor or subcontractor subject to this section. In the interest of economy and the avoidance of duplication of inspection and audit, the services of the Bureau of Internal Revenue shall, upon request of the Secretary of Defense and with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, be made available to the extent determined by the Secretary of the Treasury for the purpose of making examinations and audits under this section.

"(d) The Secretary of Defense in his discretion may exempt from the provisions of this section any such contract or subcontract both individually and by general classes or types.

"(e) Agreements or orders determining excessive profits shall be final and conclusive in accordance with their terms and except upon a showing of fraud or malfeasance or willful misrepresentation of a material fact shall not be annulled, modified, reopened, or disregarded, except that in the case of orders determining excessive profits the amount of the excessive profits, if any, may be redetermined by the Tax Court of the United States in the manner prescribed in subsection (e) (1) of the Renegotiation Act of February 25, 1944, as amended.

"(f) The Secretary of Defense shall promulgate and publish in the Federal Register regulations interpreting and applying this section and prescribing standards and procedures for determining and eliminating excessive profits hereunder using so far as he deems practicable the principles and procedures of the Renegotiation Act of February 25, 1944, as amended, having regard for the different economic conditions existing on or after the effective date of this act from those prevailing during the period 1942 to 1945.

"(g) The powers and duties hereby conferred upon the Secretary of Defense may be delegated by him to any officer (military or civilian) or agency of the National Military Establishment, with or without the power to make redelegations.

"(h) Any person who wilfully fails or refuses to furnish any information, records, or data required of him under this section, or who knowingly furnishes any such information, records, or data containing information which is false or misleading in any material respect, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

"(i) This section may be cited as the 'Renegotiation Act of 1948'."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 3. (a) All contracts in excess of $1,000 entered into under the authority of this act, obligating funds appropriated hereby, obligating funds consolidated by this act with funds appropriated hereby, or entered into through contract authorizations herein granted, and all subcontracts thereunder in excess of $1,000 shall contain the following article:

"'Renegotiation article: This contract is subject to the Renegotiation Act of 1948 and the contractor hereby agrees to insert a like article in all contracts or purchase orders to make or furnish any article or to perform all or any part of the work required for the performance of this contract.'

"(b) Whenever in the opinion of the Secretary of Defense excessive profits are reflected under any contract or contracts or subcontract or subcontracts required to contain the Renegotiation Article prescribed in subsection (a), the Secretary is authorized and directed to renegotiate such contracts and subcontracts for the purpose of eliminating excessive profits. He shall endeavor to make an agreement with the contractor or subcontractor with respect to the amount, if any, of such excessive profits and to their elimination. If no such agreement is reached, the Secretary shall issue an order determining the amount, if any, of such excessive profits and shall eliminate them by any of the methods set forth in subsection (c) (2) of the Renegotiation Act of February 25, 1944, as amended. In eliminating excessive profits the Secretary shall allow the contractor or subcontractor credit for Federal income and excess profits taxes as provided in section 3806 of the Internal Revenue Code. The powers hereby conferred upon the Secretary shall be exercised with respect to the aggregate of the amounts received or accrued under all such contracts and subcontracts by the contractor or subcontractor during his fiscal year or upon such other basis as may be mutually agreed upon; except that this section shall not be applicable in the event that the aggregate of the amounts so received or accrued is less than $100,000 during any fiscal year.

"(c) For the purpose of administering this section the Secretary of Defense shall have the right to audit the books and records of any contractor or subcontractor subject to this section. In the interest of economy and the avoidance of duplication of inspection and audit, the services of the Bureau of Internal Revenue shall, upon request of the Secretary of Defense and with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, be made available to the extent determined by the Secretary of the Treasury for the purpose of making examinations and audits under this section.

"(d) The provisions of this section shall not apply to any of the contracts or subcontracts specified in subsection (i) (1) of the Renegotiation Act of February 25, 1944, as amended, and the Secretary of Defense in his discretion may exempt from the provisions of this section any other contract or subcontract both individually and by general classes or types.

"(e) Agreements or orders determining excessive profits shall be final and conclusive in accordance with their terms and except upon a showing of fraud or malfeasance or willful misrepresentation of a material fact shall not be annulled modified, reopened, or disregarded, except that in the case of orders determining excessive profits the amount of the excessive profits, if any, may be redetermined by the Tax Court of the United States in the manner prescribed in subsection (e) (1) of the Renegotiation Act of February 25, 1944, as amended, except that such redetermination shall be subject to review to the extent and in the manner provided by subchapter B of chapter 5 of the Internal Revenue Code.

"(f) The Secretary of Defense shall promulgate and publish in the Federal Register regulations interpreting and applying this section and prescribing standards and procedures for determining and eliminating excessive profits hereunder using so far as he deems practicable the principles and procedures of the Renegotiation Act of February 25, 1944, as amended, having regard for the different economic conditions existing on or after the effective date of this Act from those prevailing during the period 1942 to 1945. In any case in which the contract price of any such contract or subcontract was based upon estimated costs, then the Secretary of Defense shall determine the difference between such estimated costs and actual costs and shall, in eliminating excessive profits, take into consideration as an element the extent to which such difference is the result of the efficiency of the contractor or subcontractor.

"(g) The powers and duties hereby conferred upon the Secretary of Defense may be delegated by him to any officer (military or civilian) or agency of the National Military Establishment.

"(h) Any person who willfully fails or refuses to furnish any information, records, or data required of him under this section, or who knowingly furnishes any such information, records, or data containing information which is false or misleading in any material respect, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

"(i) This section may be cited as the 'Renegotiation Act of 1948.'"

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously, a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 58]

Andersen, H. Carl	Durham	Kirwan
Andresen, August H.	Ellis	Kunkel
Andrews, N. Y.	Elsaesser	Lane
Barden	Engle, Calif.	Larcade
Barrett	Fuller	Lemke
Battle	Gallagher	Lewis, Ky.
Beall	Granger	Love
Bell	Gregory	Ludlow
Boykin	Hart	Lusk
Buchanan	Hartley	Lyle
Buckley	Hébert	McCormack
Buffett	Hedrick	McCulloch
Butler	Heffernan	Meade, Ky.
Case, S. Dak.	Hendricks	Meade, Md.
Chelf	Hobbs	Miller, Calif.
Clark	Holifield	Mitchell
Clippinger	Holmes	Morgan
Cole, N. Y.	Jackson, Calif.	Multer
Crosser	Jarman	Mundt
Dawson, Ill.	Jenkins, Pa.	Nodar
Deane	Johnson, Okla.	Norton
Dirksen	Johnson, Tex.	O'Toole
Dorn	Jones, N. C.	Patterson
Doughton	Jones, Wash.	Pfeifer
Douglas	Kearney	Philbin
	Kee	Plumley
	Keogh	Poulson

Powell	Sheppard	Thomas, N. J.
Rivers	Sikes	Welch
Rogers, Mass.	Smith, Wis.	West
Rohrbough	Snyder	Whitaker
Rooney	Stigler	Williams
Russell	Stratton	Wilson, Ind.
Scott, Hardie	Teague	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 327 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes on the conference report which was just adopted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I hesitate very much to object, we did have the conference report up for consideration. It was disposed of. We have the pending appropriation bill and hope to dispose of it today, as well as disposing of the so-called Bulwinkle bill, which will follow. We have a full program for the week. Of course, if the gentleman insists, I will not object.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I might say that it has always been customary to inform the ranking minority Member when a conference report is to be called up. I was not informed of it.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] knew last night that it was going to be called up the first thing this morning, and the clerk of the committee called his office in the meantime.

Mr. CANNON. I had no word last night and I was in committee with the gentleman all morning and he said nothing about it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] may extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the gentleman from Oregon, WALTER NORBLAD, from the Reserve Officers Journal; and I also ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks and include several excerpts from letters and articles in my possession.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]?

There was no objection.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the adoption of the conference report this morning, insuring the enactment of the bill providing for a 70-group air program, will rank in history with one of the decisive events of the Second World War.

We have grown to believe, here in America, that we are the greatest, the most advanced, the most progressive, and the most highly civilized Nation in the world, and that because of our preeminence in culture, science, and industry, no retarded nation like Russia can menace our peace and security.

History is replete with accounts of the destruction of great civilizations by barbarian nations. Following the Roman conquest and Christianization of Britain, there flowered in England, in the fourth and fifth centuries, a civilization found elsewhere only on the shores of the Mediterranean and unsurpassed in the British Isles in the next 500 years. We are still uncovering in archeologic sites in the vicinity of London remains of temples and villas with tasselated pavements equaled nowhere save in Rome itself. Yet when the Saxons landed they swept through England, ravaging, burning, and murdering in an orgy of extermination so thorough as to leave no trace of Latin or Celtic speech, law, or religion. Barbarians so primitive that they would burn a Roman villa and stretch their skin tents for shelter beside the ruins, had extinguished a civilization which would have saved the British race centuries of groping in their upward struggle to achieve even medieval economy.

Again, in the thirteenth century when Chinese civilization was centuries old—and, according to Macaulay, cultured Chinese philsophers drank tea from teakwood tables while our contemporary English ancestors were wearing skins and living in caves, Genghis Khan with his nomadic horsemen, only one degree removed from stark savagery, destroyed every major city and left the land a depopulated desert whose rivers flowed with blood to the sea.

I am certain no one has ever stood on the Acropolis and viewed the magnificent ruins of Periclean Athens without experiencing a poignant grief at the thought of the beauty and artistic splendor so ruthlessly obliterated by the barbarian hordes who extinguished not only the light of a great civilization but a race and a nation as well.

Pericles and his age developed an art which is unequaled even today. They founded a democratic government which through many intermediate steps is the progenitor of our own form of government. But they overlooked one essential. They did not develop simultaneously a means of defending either civilization or government.

If along with their matchless statuary and architecture they had instituted research which would have given them one single plane or tank or machine gun, or comparable weapon of defense, they could have held at bay all the savage forces of the avalanche that overwhelmed them.

Let us take a lesson from the past. It is a lesson often repeated and bitterly emphasized. Our cities pyramided by skyscrapers and filled with the wealth of the world are no defense against predatory marauders armed with the latest scientific weapons. Our marts and laboratories and libraries and blazing furnaces mean nothing in a battle of extermination unless we utilize them in the creation of effective agencies of defense.

Let us not be lulled to sleep by the thought that our wealth and preeminence in industry render us invincible. There are hungry plotters upon the globe that do not sleep.

Today Russia has 170 divisions armed, trained, and ready to move at 6 o'clock in the morning. Her satellites have 95 additional divisions ready for immediate service. There are a total of 265 divisions.

How many do we have to meet them? We have nine. And we are told that at any time, with or without notice, Russia can within 30 days sweep the Continent.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. From whence does the gentleman get the figures about Soviet strength?

Mr. CANNON. The figures are authenticated from the highest sources. The War Department advises me this morning that we have nine divisions. They placed no restriction on the information, so I may add that they say the nine divisions can be expanded on short notice. So can the Russian divisions be expanded.

Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Army Chief of Staff, testified before the House Armed Services Committee, on April 14, that Russia has a standing army of 170 divisions plus 95 satellite divisions—and in 60 days can expand them to 300 divisions plus 100 satellite divisions. That is 400 divisions to our 9. Why should Russia wait if we permit our air power to deteriorate?

If war should be precipitated the first test would come in the air. It would be a battle for control of the skies. Germany was through when we took over the air. And we will be through when any enemy secures control of the air above us.

No matter how many atomic bombs we have—we may have atomic bombs stored away by the thousands—but unless we can deliver those bombs to the target in the heart of the enemies' country—thousands of miles away—punctuated by unseen antiaircraft guns and patrolled by jet propulsion planes—they serve only to give us a false sense of security which will be dispelled only when clouds of enemy planes begin to blot out sky and earth and American civilization.

The airplane is the supreme weapon. It is the controlling, dominating, and decisive weapon of any war. And in adopting this conference report today we are making belated provision for a storm which within the range of possibility may break at any minute.

We had 90,000 planes at the peak of our air strength at the culmination of the war. Not one of those planes would be able to stay aloft against modern enemy planes which will be in the air by the close of this calendar year. A jet propelled plane can run rings around the fastest plane we had at the close of the war.

Even with the enlarged program initiated by the pending bill we will not be able to deliver a thousand jet propelled planes before 1951. And Russia is already building a thousand planes a month.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I wish to commend the gentleman for his recognition of the fact that the airplane is the real potent weapon of defense these days and for his commendation of the adoption of this conference report.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from California, who rendered distinguished service in the war Navy, and whose beaches would be among the first objectives in a hostile air raid.

Mr. BRADLEY. Does the gentleman's enthusiasm go so far that he would advocate doing away with the Army and the Navy?

Mr. CANNON. I regret to say I have no enthusiasm on the subject. Quite the contrary. It is not a situation which engenders enthusiasm.

As has been said, our armed forces are like a three-legged stool, Army, Navy, and Air, and would not be serviceable without any one of the three legs.

But adequate air power is indispensable. Even the Navy, in which the gentleman from California served with such distinction, would be sadly ineffective in modern warfare without auxiliary planes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, when Russia occupied Germany the German engineers had just designed an improved submarine which could stay under water indefinitely, recharging its batteries under the surface, and with a cruising range which would permit it to stay out for months at a time. Russia took over the shipyards, shipwrights, and all personnel and equipment, and ever since has been steadily turning out submarines at top capacity. The old-type submarines gave us plenty of trouble during the war. They completely closed Atlantic sea lanes to tankers and produced a serious oil shortage along the eastern seaboard. We can imagine what the more and improved subsurface craft would do in another war. Of course, that would be a task for the gentleman's branch of the service, and as it is no longer necessary for the submarine to surface periodically, the technique is for airplanes to spot submerged submarines from the sky.

So, in the last analysis, the airplane is the supreme war weapon. And in adopting this report with a program for enlarged air power we are taking timely precaution to meet a situation the seriousness of which cannot be too strongly emphasized.

And may I say, Mr. Speaker, that the action of the Congress in adopting this policy and passing this bill has not gone unnoticed. Already it is having an effect on international relations, as is evidenced by the sudden reversal of diplomatic policy by Russia and the surprising suggestion for a conference with a view to peace.

It remains to be seen just how sincere the proposal is. Judging by past experiences, it is merely a delaying maneuver. But the chances are that it would never have been proposed but for the change in air policy implemented by this bill.

So, in passing a bill ostensibly to create an agency of war, let us hope that we are actually passing a bill which will demonstrate to hostile nations the hopelessness of any dream of subjugating America—and that we are passing, to that extent, a bill to contribute to the establishment of early and enduring peace.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech he made.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6481) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6481, with Mr. GRANT of Indiana in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (16 U. S. C., ch. 12A), including purchase (not to exceed one, for replacement only) and hire, maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft; the purchase (not to exceed 270, of which 220 shall be for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $27,389,061, to remain available until expended, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against prior appropriations, together with the unobligated balance of funds heretofore appropriated, of which not to exceed $21,689,000 shall be available for capital expenditures, including construction of dams, additions, and betterments to completed multiple-use facilities, investigations for future projects, chemical facilities, and facilities and equipment for general use.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GORE:

On page 2, line 9, strike out "$27,389,061" and insert "$31,389,061."

Line 13, strike out "$21,689,000" and insert "$25,689,000."

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we would like to get an agreement at this moment, not regarding the over-all time for debate on this amendment, but giving the author of the amendment his 10 minutes and that a Member on this side be permitted to have 10 minutes, everybody else speaking on the amendment to restrict themselves to 5 minutes. We suggest that because of the fact the business of the day is heavy and we want to expedite this matter as much as possible.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the unanimous consent request should, of course, include a request that this time not be taken out of the time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. PLOESER. It cannot, because the gentleman has not been recognized.

Mr. MAHON. I think it would be well to have 10 minutes on this side and 10 minutes on the gentleman's side on this amendment, and when the unanimous consent request is granted, then it will be in order to request further time.

Mr. PLOESER. May I ask the Chair if it is possible to get unanimous consent agreement on that?

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, if the gentleman wishes to take that position, all that is required is to make the statement that beyond the two 10-minute periods he will object to further requests.

Mr. PLOESER. I would prefer not to be put in the position of a perpetual objector. I would rather have the agreement of the Committee on that. If the gentleman will yield to me to make a unanimous consent request at this time, then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the author of the amendment be permitted to speak for 10 minutes and that one Member on this side be permitted to speak for 10 minutes, and all other Members speaking on this amendment be restricted to 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee, the amendment which I have offered is for the purpose of restoring to the bill an amount of $4,000,000, which was stricken out by the committee, for the purpose of beginning the construction of a steam generating plant by the Tennessee Valley Authority at New Johnsonville, Tenn.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. The gentleman uses a term that I think is misleading, namely "restoring." Does the gentleman refer to the fact that TVA asked for the fund, because the committee struck nothing out of the bill?

Mr. GORE. I mean that TVA requested and the Budget recommended the item. It is to restore to the bill the item as contained in the budget which was stricken out by the committee.

I would like to take this brief time to talk primarily to the Members of the majority party who represent in part, as we do on the minority, the people who own this largest integrated utility system in the world. Now, whether you or

I or other people think that the Government should own an electric utility system or not, is a moot question. It is an established fact. It seems to me that the fundamental question then must be whether we, as representatives of the owners of this utility, should operate it in a businesslike manner, in an efficient manner.

Throughout the country there is one phrase that has a familiar sound, as I said yesterday, and that is power shortage. No major commodity has seen the increase in demand which has been the experience of electric energy. Since 1920 the use of electricity has doubled about three times. Just since 1941 we have had a phenomenal increase. In 1941 the country used 164,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. By 1947 that had jumped to 255,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. The experience thus far in 1948 indicates that the country will use more than 280,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity this year.

Throughout the country generating facilities are being put to sore tests to meet demand. The great private utility industry, with $15,000,000,000 invested in their plants, have plans to increase their capacity by $5,000,000,000 within the next 5 years. Other public-power agencies likewise have plans. So does the TVA.

Our experience in power use in TVA has been similar to that in the remainder of the country, except the increase has been more phenomenal.

To deny this utility, which serves an area of 80,000 square miles, in which more than 5,000,000 people live, and which is the sole supplier of electricity in that area, the increased capacity which it must have to meet the demands is to deny the public service concept of a utility that is accepted in each of our 48 States, and that is accepted in fact by the Federal Government through agencies created in part for the purpose of seeing to it that utilities, whether electric, whether communication, whether transportation, adequately serve their service areas.

The TVA now comes forward with a recommendation to build a steam generating plant to firm up the hydro. What do we mean by that? It is nothing new in a hydro system. Throughout the country steam plants are used to firm up the valleys, the dry seasons of hydro systems. In the beginning of TVA the ratio between steam and hydro in the Tennessee Valley was about 30 percent steam and 70 percent hydro. As hydro generators were added the ratio went down, until in 1939 Congress appropriated funds to build a large steam generating plant at Watts Bar. That raised the ratio of steam again. Since then additional hydros have been added until the ratio now is about 84 hydro to 16 steam. That is a wholly uneconomic relationship, because it allows a very large block of secondary or dump power. That is a product that must sell at cut-rate prices. It is not salable to or usable by municipalities and the REA's. They are interested only in the power that is there any time and all the time.

What are the objections? The first objection raised here is one of legality. The private utility industry has no further investment in the Tennessee Valley. Why they should be bothering us I do not know. Yet having lost all of their legal battles in all of the courts, they come to the Congress shouting illegality and unconstitutionality.

As a matter of fact, I think the TVA Act itself clearly authorizes steam plants. Let me read you just one line of section 4. It says that the TVA shall have power to acquire or construct "powerhouses, power structures, transmission lines," and so forth. In other places in the act the specific words "steam plant" are spelled out.

Of course, powerhouses and other power structures cannot be interpreted as excluding steam generating facilities. Indeed, a steam-producing plant is a powerhouse. So this business of illegality seems to me to be coming rather late. Congress has heretofore provided steam plants, and the question was not raised. In fact, TVA operates five steam plants now.

In order to firm up the power which is the property of the people whom you and I represent and make it worth more, additional generating capacity from steam is needed. Furthermore, it is needed in this area.

You know, it seems to me rather ironical that this move to put a ceiling on the productive potential in this great valley of America should come within the same hour that the House of Representatives has given final approval to the 70-group Air Force program. Do you know where you are going to get the aluminum in 1951, 1952, and 1953? Do you know that the TVA at one time furnished the power that was used to make 51 percent of the aluminum which went into our war planes? It takes longer to build a generating facility than it does to build an airplane factory. The real bottleneck in airplane production is the power to produce aluminum.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. I think the gentleman should recall that in the closing days of the war, we had some surplus of aluminum. The gentleman will also recall unto himself, at least, that the power facilities which produced the power to produce the aluminum which the gentleman is talking about are still in the valley and have not left.

Mr. GORE. I recognize fully the truth of the gentleman's statement, but there are other factors that must be recognized. One is the increased demand of homes, stores, factories, and farmers for electricity. Even now the capacity to produce power is being sorely put to the test to meet the demand. What would happen if another emergency should again make it necessary for us to build 50,000 planes a year? Brown-outs and black-outs would be our fate.

I do hope the Committee will recognize that this utility is the sole supplier of power for 5,000,000 of our fellow citizens. It has the obligation of the utility to serve the area and I hope you will let it do an efficient, businesslike job.

Then, much has been said of preference customers. Let it not be forgotten that the Federal Government and its agencies as well as local governments and cooperatives are preference customers. Taken together, these so-called preference customers use in the neighborhood of two-thirds of the generated energy.

Without additional generating capacity, even though direct industrial customers are denied energy, we face an acute power shortage.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have read the debate and the remarks of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] which he presented yesterday afternoon and have had a chance to look over the committee report, to study some of the testimony on this proposition of spending $84,000,000 for an auxiliary steam plant in the Tennessee Valley. If we accept the argument that people are there now and that people are going there, together with the argument that the Federal Government should finance an extension of this plant on 2-percent money, and that the people in my district who buy bonds and pay taxes, for instance, should buy electricity from private industry which pays around 6 percent for the money that they use in building the plants that serve the people in my district, both home owners and industrial users—I say that if we accept that type of philosophy, perhaps the day will come when every community in the United States will feel that the Federal Government should come in and furnish this power and these kilowatts in their homes and factories. It seems to me that we have now come down to the real issue on the Tennessee Valley Authority. It started out as a flood-control proposition, as a matter that would take care of navigation and floods. Communities have been built and industries have been established. When I say "industries," I mean big industries; so-called multi-million-dollar corporations; big industries. Why should they not flock to a community where the Government furnishes such facilities?

We are now being requested to step out of the field of navigation and flood control into the field of supplying a super public utility, financed by Government funds on a 2 percent interest basis, to meet the requirements of growing industry and growing population.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] yesterday presented some arguments. I think his presentation was brilliant from a legal standpoint. He went back into the opinions and decisions of the courts, back into the organic act and the fundamental approach to this whole proposition.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I would like, in that connection, to point out that all of the citations given by the able and distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] were statements made and opinions rendered before the act of 1939, by which this Congress approved, authorized, and made an appropriation for the

TVA to purchase all of the utility operating concerns in that area, and thereby, with the approval of Congress, become the sole supplier of electricity in that region.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. COUDERT. Let me say to the gentleman that with respect to the judicial colloquies, yes; but if the gentleman will examine the report he will see from the statement of the Senate committee, which reported out the Commonwealth & Southern bond authorization, that it thought primarily of the preferential customers in the valley, and did not agree that it was establishing an unlimited utility.

Mr. CRAWFORD. When this was before us in 1939, I do not recall that a bill of goods was sold to Congress and to the country to the effect that if the money was furnished to purchase the private utilities within a certain area, in due course this Government utility would come here and ask us to provide $84,000,000 with which to build an expansion of this plant in the form of steam kilowatt production so as to start out on the idea that the Federal Government was going to furnish all of the kilowatt-hours required by that territory, irrespective of how big it might grow, both from the standpoint of population and industrial needs.

I think this amendment should be voted down. The $4,000,000 has never been in this bill. It is the initial start on an $84,000,000 job, and I am opposed to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily supporting the amendment which would provide an increased appropriation of $4,000,000 for TVA for the purpose of commencing construction of a steam plant by the TVA at New Johnsonville, Tenn., in the midwestern area of the TVA power system.

The plant would have three generating units, each capable of producing 125,000 kilowatts of power. The power from the steam plant, together with the capacity of new hydro units to be installed, is absolutely essential and necessary to meet the rising demand for electricity in the TVA area resulting from the general economic growth of the region and the heavy increase in the use of electricity by residential, farm, commercial, and industrial customers.

When the TVA was established by Congress in 1933, the Tennessee Valley was one of the low-income areas of the Nation although it was richly endowed with natural resources. The per capita income was only 40 percent of the national average in 1933 and by 1945 it had risen to 58 percent of the national average.

The TVA Act expressly provides that the TVA Board is authorized to furnish and operate facilities for the generation of electric energy in order to avoid the waste of water power and to transmit and market such power. TVA belongs to the Federal Government and the TVA will pay back into the Federal Government under an amortization plan over a period of 40 years the entire cost of the construction of the steam plant.

In 1933 when the TVA began, only one farm in 28 in the Tennessee Valley had electric service. Today one out of every two farms there has electricity. In 1933 all of the farms in the area used a total of only 10,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year; last year some 300,000,000 kilowatt-hours were used on farms. From 1945 to 1947 the annual use of electricity by residential users there increased about 60 percent or from 900,000,000 kilowatt-hours to about 1,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours. In the next 5 years the use of electricity in the homes and on the farms of Tennessee Valley is expected to double.

Today there are 140 municipalities and cooperatives that are buying and distributing TVA power in the valley. TVA is the sole supplier of electricity for the entire region. It is the generating company, the transmitting company, and the wholesaler of electricity for the area. The commercial and industrial load of these municipalities and cooperatives is growing rapidly. Small private enterprises are increasing, such as retail stores, filling stations, beauty shops, restaurants, hotels, tourist camps, and manufacturing plants. From 1945 to 1947 20,000 such small business enterprises were established in the valley and the increase in the use of electricity for the period was 60 percent. In addition, during the past 6 years, 1,500 new establishments such as canneries, milk processing plants, cheese plants, quick-freezing plants, furniture and other woodworking factories, cold-storage plants, and food processing plants were located in the Tennessee Valley.

The Tennessee Valley covers portions of seven States, has an area of 80,000 square miles and a population of over 5,000,000. The TVA is now serving 800,000 consumers and expects to add 100,000 farm consumers within the next 2 or 3 years.

The public distributors of TVA power expect to use over 8,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours in 1952 or 65 percent more than they used in 1947. Last year the 140 municipalities and cooperatives who distributed TVA power spent $23,000,000 for transformers, new lines, and other distribution facilities.

Private power companies are vigorously opposing this appropriation for the steam plant. Their many representatives in Washington have been unusually busy spreading propaganda against the appropriation. They are using their fight against the building of this steam plant as a smoke screen to cover up their vicious and unwarranted assaults and attacks upon the entire TVA program.

The high-powered representatives of the private power companies in Washington, Mr. P. L. Smith, president of the National Association of Electric Companies, who is reputed to draw a salary of $65,000 per annum for his services, and their general counsel, Mr. Raymond T. Jackson, of Cleveland, Ohio, appeared before the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee which considered the TVA appropriation and vigorously opposed any appropriation for the building of the steam plant.

While the private power lobby claims it is only opposing the construction of the steam plant, the truth of the matter is that the private power companies are eager and determined to cripple, hamper, and obstruct the entire TVA power program, if they cannot destroy it entirely or take it over for themselves.

There is not a single private power company doing business in the Tennessee Valley. They do not have one penny invested there and residential, rural, commercial, and industrial users of electricity in the valley must depend entirely on the TVA for their power. The private power companies are waging a campaign to absolutely stop all further development of TVA. They are determined that the capacity of TVA for generating electricity shall not be expanded. They are endeavoring to put a ceiling on power supply in the TVA region. They do not and cannot contend that the power to be generated from the proposed steam plant is not needed for the future use of the 140 municipalities and cooperatives in serving residences, farms, small business enterprises, small factories, and larger industries.

They do not and cannot claim that they will be injured in any way if the steam plant is built since they have no competitive investment in the TVA area. The increasing demands of the Tennessee Valley for additional electricity can only be met by TVA.

The proposed steam plant will help to balance the hydro capacity of the TVA. The private functions of steam plants is to provide a portion of the power requirements during dry years. Steam plants are needed to "firm up" hydro power during extended dry periods. The more hydro power is developed, then the greater the need is for increase in the quantity of steam power for use in dry periods. TVA already has five steam plants in operation and in 1940 Congress appropriated the money to TVA for the construction of a steam plant at Watts Bar. However, in 1936 the proportion of generating capacity of steam plants to hydro plants of TVA was nearly one-third. Today is is well below 20 percent. If the new steam plant at New Johnsonville is built, then the proportion will only be a little above 20 percent. The desirable ratio between hydro and steam is about 75 to 25.

All over the United States power demand is pressing hard upon supply. The Federal Power Commission says that the entire Nation today is short of power. The private power companies recently announced that they would spend $5,000,000,000 in an expansion program.

I wish to say frankly that the private power companies in opposing this steam plant are "fouling their own nest." They are making a great mistake and their despicable tactics in this campaign against the project will react against them in the future. Their short-sightedness, their greed, their selfishness and their conduct in this fight against the further expansion of the TVA will not enure to their benefit.

The private power lobby is spreading all kinds of false, insidious propaganda in an effort to defeat the appropriation for the steam plant. They are saying, without foundation, that the TVA is planning to enlarge its territory or area to serve new customers. They are appealing to sectional prejudice by claiming that the TVA is trying to lure industries away from other sections of the Nation to the Tennessee Valley. Officials of the TVA have expressly stated that it has no intention of expanding its territory and that the additional power generated by the proposed steam plant will be distributed entirely to the 140 municipalities and cooperatives now being served by them.

The private power companies would fix a ceiling on the progress and prosperity of the people of the Tennessee Valley and would prevent further improvement and development of the TVA region by stopping the further generating capacity to produce additional power. It certainly is not up to private companies to determine what are to be the limits on available power. This is a question to be determined by Congress.

Surely Congress is not going to do anything that will impede or interfere with the progress and development of the TVA region. This area is doing everything possible to enjoy economic growth with a well-balanced program of both agriculture and industry. The new per capita income of their people is far below the national average. However, these people have made a magnificent recovery since the days of reconstruction after the War Between the States. At that time the people of the Tennessee Valley were prostrate, poverty-stricken, and with little hope for the future, although they were still proud, resolute, and determined to overcome their plight. They made a long, hard fight to rehibilitate themselves and through grit, perseverance, and industrious habits they have established prosperity and progress. They have had no ERP or other relief or rehabilitation program to assist them.

It is certainly strange that the private power companies would now be striving to stop the economic development of the TVA territory just because TVA has been such a great success.

A reduction in power capacity of TVA below the demands of normal load growth would be a great blow to the future development of the Tennessee Valley and would bring stagnation as electricity is the lifeblood of economic development. Surely Congress will not penalize the TVA region in any such manner. This is not a sectional or partisan question. All sections of our great Nation are dependent upon the other sections. Prosperity in one section contributes to the prosperity of other sections. Every part of our country is interested in the progress and economic development of all other parts of the United States.

Economic growth in the Tennessee Valley not only rests upon a stronger, diversified agricultural program but also upon a sound industrial development. TVA is the greatest blessing and asset that the Tennessee Valley has enjoyed since reconstruction days and its program of expansion must not be stopped.

In my opinion there soon will be a serious shortage of power throughout the Nation. This is certainly not the time to stop construction of any hydro or steam plant anywhere in the United States. This would be bad enough in normal times but with unsettled world conditions as they are and with our country starting a vast preparedness program in order to be prepared for any emergency it would be terrible and dangerous to our national security to curb power production. During World War II TVA furnished about three-fourths of its power output to wartime production. It furnished power to the atomic bomb plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., to the Wolf Creek ordnance plant, the Huntsville, Ala., arsenal, and to various military installations such as Camp Campbell, Ky., and the Smyrna, Tenn., air base. It produced 60 percent of the total supply of military phosphorous and at one period during the war furnished the power for the manufacture of 51 percent of all aluminum going into war planes. Both the Aluminum Co. of America and the Reynolds Metals Co. have large plants in Tennessee Valley which are furnished with TVA power. If we are forced into another war, then there will be greatly increased demands for electricity for war requirements over the demands of World War II. TVA will not be in a position to furnish all the power needed for war production unless it can expand the capacity of both hydro and steam plants. The TVA Act recognizes the authority of the TVA to build steam plants, and I hope the membership of the House will approve the pending amendment.

The act establishing the TVA in 1933 expressly stated that it was being created in the interest of national defense and for agriculture and industrial development, as well as for the improvement of navigation in the Tennessee River and for controlling destructive flood waters in the Tennessee River and Mississippi River basins. It also provides for the maximum generation of electric power consistent with flood control and navigation.

The people are rapidly becoming familiar with the subtle methods and deceitful propaganda of the power lobbyists in their irresponsible attacks upon TVA. They know that the private power trust has bitterly opposed the progress of TVA since its inception and that since 1946 they have been conducting a campaign to stop any further expansion of TVA electric power. It seems impossible to reform the Power Trust. They will learn nothing from experience.

Our water resources belong to the people and must be developed for the benefit of all the people; they must not be controlled and exploited by private power companies. The people of the Tennessee Valley, who really know what TVA has meant to the development of the valley, laugh at the ridiculous claims and false charges of the power lobbyists against the progress of TVA. They fully appreciate what a marvelous job TVA has done in providing power at low cost, in controlling floods, and in improving navigation of the Tennessee River. They see their soil conserved and enriched by the proper use of concentrated phosphates and their forests and woodlands protected and developed.

The TVA has contributed more to the economic development of the Tennessee Valley than any other factor. I only wish all of the people in all sections of the United States knew the true story of TVA and its wonderful accomplishments. It was TVA's ability to supply adequate power that caused the location of the great atomic bomb plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn. Today power is being supplied to the people of the Tennessee Valley at a saving of more than $11,000,000 a year. Residential consumers are using 50 percent more electricity than the average residential consumer in the United States and are paying 20 percent less money for it.

The story of TVA is a story of economic development, agricultural diversification, soil and forest conservation, and industrial and commercial development of which everyone should be proud. Of course, the private power trust wants to suppress or distort the true story of the success of TVA.

The unfair campaign of the power lobbyists against TVA is not in the public interest and they will never destroy TVA.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, Tennessee is a long way from California, but, in my humble opinion, wrapped up in this little amendment is the kernel of a very large question. This question is alive in California, in Colorado, in Montana, in Oregon, in Washington, and in all the reclamation States. I want to associate myself with those who believe that when the United States Government enters into an activity like the TVA it will go all the way to make that activity a success, we will give them the power and the money so that the work we have instructed them to do can be carried out.

In this situation the question may be asked: Why is this steam plant required? We have harnessed the waters of this great river. In order to get the most effective use out of a hydro development you have to have steam by-plants. Every private utility has them, all of the public utilities have them, that are owned in the various States by the Bureau of Reclamation, and the like. As I have listened to the debate and read the record in this case, the problem resolves itself

down to this: Do we wish to get the maximum amount of energy out of that river—Tennessee—that it can give us if we have the proper facilities to join with the hydroelectric plants? That is all it is sought to do by this steam plant.

We have the same identical problem in the Central Valley of California and as is the case here we have developed it and now that it looks as if it is going to be a success, the private utility wants to come in, take over and skim the cream off the facility that the United States is trying to develop. That is why I would like to see the House give TVA $4,000,000 to build their steam plant, to supplement the hydro developed by it. That would raise the hydro development to its greatest efficiency and usefulness.

The demand for electricity is mounting every week all over the Nation. Since we have resurrected this old war plant, since we have built it and made a success of it, since it has attracted industry and immigration to that part of the country, I hope we can give them this additional money in order to make better use of the hydro facilities on the Tennessee and the other rivers in that area.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. Of course, the gentleman does not believe that the Tennessee Valley Authority Act authorizes anything for any part of California or any of the water districts, does he? There is no confusion about that.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I understand that thoroughly, but, in my opinion, the principle involved in both cases is identical.

Mr. PLOESER. The principle involved is there is no authorization in the Tennessee Valley Act for the building of steam plants. The gentleman would not want to appropriate money for something that is not authorized by the Congress. He would not request that in the case of the Central Valley of California, would he?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Certainly not; but, in my opinion, after reading the committee's report, the authority is in that act, sections 4 and 10, and I cannot find anything in the judicial opinion cited by the gentleman's colleague from New York which shows that the court has any idea that what is proposed by this amendment is not permissible under the act and under the judicial decisions. Furthermore, in the decision cited only six judges participated.

Mr. PLOESER. I hope the gentleman has read the statements of Mr. Lilienthal before congressional committees.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I am not bound by the statements of Mr. Lilienthal. I have had considerable experience in statutory interpretation cases before the courts in my jurisdiction and I believe there is implied power in the act as it now stands to carry out this identical proposition that is comprehended by the pending amendment. The principle of whether we shall support a public project and make it effective and useful is the consideration involved in this amendment. It applies to the West, it applies to the Northwest, it applies to other places. I remember when Hiram Johnson and Phil Swing battled for 10 years to get the Colorado River Dam built. They came out to California and explained to us that the opposition was that $17,000,000,000 invested in public utilities was not going to tolerate the construction of that project, but, the project was built and has been a tremendous success.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, there has been a unanimous-consent agreement that there will be no extensions of time.

Mr. RANKIN. That was not the agreement. The agreement was that there should be 10 minutes for one Member on the Democratic side and 10 minutes for one Member on the Republican side. There has only been one on the Democratic side. Now you have here one of the leading Republicans in the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], trying to give you information and you do not seem willing to take it.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in the first session of the Eightieth Congress I had the honor and privilege of being chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Government Corporations. I believe I learned something about the TVA during the time I was chairman of the committee. The committee now, as you know, is in the hands of the very able gentleman from Missouri, and I want to back up the statements made by him, as well as the statements made by the other gentlemen on the committee who are opposed to this amendment. I am sorry that it was not possible for me to be present during the hearings on this bill but a very little time this session because of the fact that I have been attending the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Interior Department, of which I am chairman, for the past 12 weeks almost daily. But I do want to say this to every Member of this House: We had better be thinking about the question—and be thinking seriously—as to whether we want the American people and their businesses to be controlled by the Government, or whether we want to continue the free-enterprise system, which has made America great. I think we should have stopped Government encroachment on business a long time ago, but certainly we better start stopping right now. There is no more reason for building this $84,000,000 steam plant in the Tennessee Valley than there is for the Government to build a steam plant for my town or Pumpkin Center or New York town or many other towns in America. They have no more authority and no more reason and are no more entitled to have a steam plant down there than people of any other place where there is any kind of industry or farming.

Now, the facts are that the private utilities surrounding TVA pay over 3 mills for every kilowatt-hour of power they produce in local, State, and Federal taxes. If the private utilities were tax free their rates could be less than TVA rates. You talk about firming up Government power. Well, bless your hearts. If the American people do not firm up the Treasury of the United States and keep firming it up every year, it will not be long until we will have no Government of the United States to operate, let alone the TVA. So, when you talk about firming up in this respect, you might just as well say that the Government should own the farms, in order to firm up the production of food and fiber. Like private utilities, the peanut vendor on the corner, the corner grocer, and the independent farmer have made this Nation great by paying his taxes to keep our United States Treasury firmed up. There is little reason to firm up any Government-controlled agencies to compete against private business which is called on to keep our United States Treasury properly firmed up with approximately $40,000,000,000 each year under our present fiscal program. There is no better time than right now to make a start in proving to private businessmen and our farmers that this Congress is determined to save free and private enterprise.

The pending amendment should be defeated.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, it was suggested by members of our delegation that I discuss the contention made by the private power companies that the construction and operation of the proposed steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., by the Tennessee Valley Authority would be unlawful under the Constitution, contrary to the stated purpose of the TVA Act, and without authorization under that act.

I shall do that briefly, and then, if time permits, refer to the proposal in a general way.

We might begin with the premise that the area served by Tennessee Valley Authority covers 80,000 square miles and has a population of 5,000,000 people, wholly dependent upon TVA for power supply as Congress has heretofore constituted TVA as the sole and exclusive manufacturer and distributor of electric power in that section. It serves 140 municipalities and cooperatives, as well as

directly serving some private industry and a number of important governmental agencies, including the atomic energy plant at Oak Ridge.

Hydroelectric possibilities in the region are virtually exhausted. While a few more dams might be built on small tributary streams, they could contribute little to the power reservoir, and the only feasible way in which that power may be increased, or rather firmed up so that it may be available in a constant flow the year round is by the construction of the proposed steam plant. Such an increase in power is absolutely necessary if TVA is to meet the ever-increasing demand for electricity in the area that it serves, a statement amply supported by the record of the hearings.

The constitutional authority for this undertaking is abundantly clear. The New Johnsonville plant would be used, as stated, for firming up hydro power and its construction would be clearly justified under the property clause of the Constitution—article IV, section 3, clause 2—as a means of permitting fully effective use of the Government's hydroelectric projects. These projects, as well as the electric power which they are capable of generating, are property of the United States—TVA Act, section 4 (h)—*Ashwander* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority* (297 U. S. 289); *Tennessee Electric Power Co.* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority* (21 F. Supp. 947 (E. D. Tenn., 1938) aff'd 306 U. S. 118 (1939)).

The property clause of the Constitution provides:

> The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

The Supreme Court has said of the power conferred under this constitutional provision:

> The power over the public land thus entrusted to Congress is without limitations. "And it is not for the courts to say how that trust shall be administered. That is for the Congress to determine." (*United States* v. *San Francisco* (310 U. S. 16, 29-34 (1940)).)

There is no distinction between the powers granted by the clause with respect to territory and those granted with respect to other Federal property:

> The term "territory," as here used, is merely descriptive of one kind of property; and is equivalent to the word "lands." And Congress has the same power over it as over any other property belonging to the United States. (*United States* v. *Gratiot* (14 Pet. 526, 536-537 (1840)).)

With respect to any of its property, the Federal Government may exercise the rights of an ordinary proprietor—*Camfield* v. *United States* (167 U. S. 518 (1897)); *Light* v. *United States* (220 U. S. 523 (1911)); *Ruddy* v. *Rossi* (248 U. S. 104 (1918)). Among these rights is that of improving Federal property in order to enhance its usefulness and value. This right was exercised at least as far back as 1902, when the Reclamation Act, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to establish, construct, and maintain irrigation projects, was enacted in order "to make marketable and habitable large areas of desert land within the public domain"—*United States* v. *Hanson* (167 Fed. 881, 883 (C. C. A. 9th, 1909)). The power of Congress to legislate for such a purpose was expressly upheld in the Hanson case and in *Burley* v. *United States* (179 Fed. 1 (C. C. A. 9th, 1910)).

Under the situation which now exists in the TVA service area, a steam plant might properly be constructed, under the commerce, power, and property clauses, whether or not it would serve to firm up hydro capacity. In *United States* v. *Appalachian Power Co.* (311 U. S. 377 (1940)), the Supreme Court had this to say with respect to the authority of the Federal Government over navigable waterways under the commerce clause. "Navigability in the sense just stated is but a part of this whole. Flood protection, watershed development, recovery of the cost of improvements through utilization of power are likewise parts of commerce control."

This doctrine was reaffirmed and reemphasized in *Oklahoma* v. *Atkinson Co.* (313 U. S. 508 (1941)).

These cases established that the Government may embark on a program of full-scale development for a given watershed and in so doing may proceed on the basis of an integrated plan which takes full cognizance of potentialities for the generation of electricity as well as for promotion of navigation and flood control.

Tennessee Valley Authority's statutory authority to construct the steam plant is clear. Section 4 (i) of the TVA act specifically authorizes TVA "to acquire real estate for the construction of dams, reservoirs, transmission lines, powerhouses, and other structures."

Section 4 (j) provides that TVA "shall have power to acquire and construct powerhouses, power structures, transmission lines, navigation projects, and incidental work in the Tennessee River and its tributaries."

Section 14, after providing for an allocation of the cost of the Wilson Dam, Norris Dam, and the Muscle Shoals nitrate plants, provides further "in like manner, the cost and book value of any dams, steam plants, or other similar improvements hereafter constructed and turned over to said Board for the purpose of control and management shall be ascertained and allocated."

Section 31 provides that the TVA Act "shall be liberally construed to carry out the purposes of Congress to provide for the disposition of, and make rules and regulations respecting, Government property entrusted to the Authority, provide for the national defense, improve navigation, control destructive floods, and promote interstate commerce and the general welfare."

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COURTNEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. Does that section of the act make any reference whatsoever to the generation or sale of electric energy?

Mr. COURTNEY. Section 31 does not.

Mr. COUDERT. Is not that significant?

Mr. COURTNEY. Furthermore, the legislative history of the TVA Act demonstrates that Congress itself has consistently regarded the construction of steam plants as presenting no special constitutional or legal problem.

In 1939, Congress authorized the TVA to buy existing steam plants and clearly recognized in the course of considering the amendatory legislation involved that TVA might later have to build additional steam plants. Section 15 (c) of the legislation in question was enacted to make possible purchases by TVA of the generating and transmission-line properties of the Tennessee Electric Power Co. as well as similar properties belonging to other subsidiaries of the Commonwealth & Southern Corp. Congress was fully aware when it enacted these statutory provisions that the electric-utility properties which TVA intended to acquire, in accordance with a contract of May 12, 1939, included important steam plants at Nashville, Hales Bar, and Parksville, as well as several smaller plants. And these, with the original steam plant acquired with the Wilson Dam properties have been in operation for years.

From a constitutional and legal standpoint, there can obviously be no distinction between the Government's power to acquire and to construct steam plants for operation in conjunction with an existing federally owned hydroelectric system. Certainly Congress recognized no distinction.

Within 2 years after enacting the 1939 amendatory provisions just referred to, Congress specifically authorized TVA to construct the Watts Bar steam plant. That was Public Resolution No. 95, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session (54 Stat. 781 (1940)). This act became the law on July 31, 1940, 9 months before the limited emergency declared by the President on May 7, 1941, and 16 months before the United States was attacked by the Japanese.

The appropriation for the Watts Bar plant, as well as for other TVA projects, was for the stated purpose of carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "The Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933." Neither the hearings nor the subsequent committee reports and debates indicate that any constitutional or legal question was thought to be presented. The situation which existed then was basically similar to that which exists now. At that time the United States was in a state of defense emergency. Today the state of war has not been terminated and the international situation is unsettled and threatening.

Later, in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1942 (55 Stat. 92, 118), Congress made an additional appropriation for the Watts Bar plant for the

stated purpose again of carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "The Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933."

If Tennessee Valley Authority had constitutional and statutory authority to construct the Watts Bar steam plant, it likewise possesses such authority to construct the new Johnsonville plant.

The distinguished gentleman from New York, and a very able lawyer [Mr. COUDERT], in his argument attacks the legality of the proposal, putting considerable emphasis upon a colloquy that took place between Mr. Justice McReynolds and special counsel for TVA, Mr. John Lord O'Brian, during the oral argument before the Supreme Court in the Ashwander case referred to above, in which Mr. O'Brian specifically stated that TVA had no intention of operating the steam plant that it had acquired with the Wilson Dam property.

In the first place, Mr. O'Brian was special counsel for the TVA in this one case only and that case was his only interest in TVA. Certainly TVA would not be bound by dicta that special counsel in one particular case uttered during the heat of argument before the bench.

However, that case was argued and decided in 1936, 3 years before Congress authorized the purchase by TVA of the assets of the private power companies within its area, including the steam plants, thus setting up TVA as the sole and exclusive supplier of electric power in that section. And it was decided 4 years before Congress specifically authorized the construction of the steam plant at Watts Bar.

As a matter of fact, the private power companies have been raising constitutional and legal questions with respect to the TVA Act since its passage 15 years ago. In every one of a half dozen or more lawsuits instituted invoking such questions, the power companies have been cast in the courts. Now, in desperation, having failed in the courts, they appeal to Congress to overrule the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States and other high tribunals.

Now the private power companies are bold enough to say, through their lobbyists at the hearing: "The Federal Government has and should have no responsibility and cannot lawfully assume responsibility for the supply of power needs for commercial, municipal, and domestic purposes within the area the TVA serves or seeks to serve, and for that matter any other area."

In other words, they say that all the things done by Congress with respect to TVA since 1933 and all the things done by the Tennessee Valley Authority itself since that time are unconstitutional, illegal, without statutory authority, null and void. On this premise, they reason, I presume, that all the dams should be destroyed, all the structures razed, all the transmission lines grounded, and the whole shebang wiped off the map so that private power companies could again move into the area with their exorbitant and unconscionable rates, with their discriminatory tactics, with their utter disregard for human welfare, and with their eyes single to profits and dividends.

Do we want to go that far? Of course not. But, if you vote against this amendment, you are making the first move in that direction. To deny TVA the right to maintain itself in a position to keep pace with progress, to deny it the right to maintain a position of ability to supply the ever-increasing demands of the region it alone serves, to clamp down a ceiling upon its right to grow along with the growth of the orbit that centers about it, to do that is to take the first step in the direction of its utter destruction.

And, now, Mr. Chairman, may I address myself to the proposition generally, first from a selfish standpoint, I grant you, as respects my district, the Seventh Congressional District of Tennessee, comprising 13 counties, with an area of 6,237 square miles and with a population of 231,592, served by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

When TVA started, 1 farm home in 28 in this district had electricity; now the ratio is 1 in 2. In the beginning, the average residential use of electricity was 600 kilowatt-hours per annum; in 1940, it had increased to 1,400, and by 1947 to 2,400. I do not have the figures of the number of consumers served in the early days of TVA in this district, but in 1940 there were 20,000, in 1947, 36,000, an increase of over 75 percent.

In 1940 the total sales of electricity in my district amounted to 80,000,000 kilowatt-hours; in 1945, at the end of the war, it ran to 125,000,000, an increase of over 50 percent.

Since the beginning of TVA, attributable not altogether to it, but to it in no small measure, the number of manufacturing plants in my district has increased from 78 in 1933 to 244 in 1946. The persons employed in private manufacturing has increased from 2,874 in 1933 to 9,587 in 1946. Retail sales rose from $24,157,000 in 1935 to $60,033,000 in 1946. Spendable income rose from $36,028,000 in 1934 to $116,503,000 in 1946, an increase of 189.3 percent. Bank deposits increased from $13,400,000 in 1935 to $68,034,000 in 1946, an increase of 242.3 percent.

In the next 5 years, TVA proposes to build 3,500 miles of new lines in the district and to serve 12,000 new families. If steam plant development and a firming up of its power is permitted this will be done. Otherwise, these 12,000 families are doomed to sit forever in darkness because there is no other source of electric supply.

And, now to approach the matter from the more unselfish standpoint of the seven States served by Tennessee Valley Authority, comprising, as I have said, 80,000 square miles with a population of 5,000,000 people, wholly dependent, by action of Congress, upon TVA for electric power, which serves in this area 140 municipalties and cooperatives. This additional generating capacity is of necessity required if TVA is to meet the growing need for power in its service area, a situation that is being faced and adequately prepared for by every private power industry in the country. In 1933, as I said with respect to my district, when TVA began 1 farm in 28 had electric service, now 1 in 2 have service. In 1933, all the farms in the area used a total of only 10,000,000 kilowatt-hours; last year some 300,000,000 kilowatt-hours were consumed. They must use much more power to provide the stable diversified agriculture which this region's prosperity demands. In a 15-year period, 1,800 new manufacturing plants have sprung up and, contrary to the opinion expressed by many, there has been no luring of industry from other sections. Of these 1,800, only 4 moved into the Tennessee Valley from other established sites. The new industries are mostly home-owned and home-controlled. Employment is up in this area 161 percent.

In 1933, the total of the national income taxes paid from this area was 3.4 percent; in 1946 it was 6 percent of the total.

Judging the future by the past, and guiding our prediction by the light of experience, 65 percent more power will be needed in 1952 than in 1947. Such progress must not be denied.

Recently this country embarked upon a European recovery program that will entail the expenditure before its conclusion of some $17,000,000,000, a great portion of which will be in the form of an outright gift to the participating countries in Europe. Surely this initial $4,000,000 appropriation for the erection of this vitally necessary steam plant, that in the end will cost only $52,000,000, cannot be denied.

This appropriation sought will not be a gift, but a loan that is certain to be repaid. Congress has heretofore set up a 40-year amortization plan whereby TVA, out of its earnings from the power system, is called upon to pay back to the Government, in quarterly payments, the amount of the investment of Federal funds in the TVA power system, covered by appropriation and transfer of property. It is meeting these installment payments promptly, and of course this appropriation will be included in the amount ultimately to be repaid.

And now to look at the proposition from the wholly unselfish standpoint of national interest. I call your attention to the fact that TVA now serves many large governmental operations, the atomic energy plant at Oak Ridge, TVA's own chemical plant at Muscle Shoals, and a large variety of military establishments. Among its important customers, too, is the plant of the Aluminum Co. of America at Alcoa. During the war about 80 percent of TVA's total power was going into outlets that could be classed strictly as wartime production, and during that time it furnished power that provided for the manufacture of 51 percent of the aluminum going into war planes. During the war,

too, TVA produced 60 percent of the total supply of phosphorus used by the armed services for phosphorous bombs, smoke screens, and various military weapons.

With world conditions unsettled as they are, as we rush with haste to bring our Military Establishment up to strength, as we propose to draft some of our boys for service and expect to impose universal military training upon others, are we to deny this necessary steam plant to the TVA, one of the greatest single contributors that we had to our recent war effort and final victory? And thereby say in effect, "We are not interested in seeing you move ahead to keep pace with other power companies. We are not interested in seeing you maintain a position where you can help again in an emergency, but at the behest of jealous private power companies, we are going to withdraw our support and turn you adrift."

I do not believe that we want to do that. So, if you want to vote down the interests of your country and vote up the reasoning and theory of a $65,000-a-year power company lobbyist who is behind the opposition to this proposal and who figured largely in the hearings, then vote against this amendment. If you want to vote up the interests of your country and vote down the avarice of the power companies, then vote for this amendment.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment indicates how far Government ownership and state socialism has fastened itself upon the free government of the United States. First of all, I want to say to the Members of the House that I am in favor of developing whatever power may be developed in the river basins of this country. What I am opposed to, however, is the encroachment of the Federal Government upon private enterprise and private investment. I introduced a bill which provides for the sale of power at the bus bar or dam at wholesale rates wherever that is possible. Where that is not possible, then and then only would the Federal Government be authorized to build transmission lines to take the power where it could be utilized.

Some very interesting things were developed in the hearings on that bill. First, that there is no uniform public policy for the production and sale of electric energy in the United States.

Second, there is one formula provided by the Federal Power Commission used for the fixing of rates on public power or power produced by the Federal Government.

Third, there is another formula provided by the Federal Power Commission for the fixing of rates on power produced by private enterprise or private investment.

Fourth, it was openly admitted that if the same formula was prescribed for both public power and private power, the rates would be exactly the same. In other words, the statement made to the American people that the Federal Government can produce electric energy cheaper than private enterprise is simply fooling the people, because Government pays no taxes—Government has other advantages that private industry does not have. These Federal power projects are subsidized by the taxpayers in other parts of the country. Therefore, private enterprise cannot produce electric energy at the same rate public power is produced.

Fifth, as long as section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 remains on the books, there will be no such thing as private enterprise being able to buy public power produced at any of these public or Federal dams—or very little, to say the least.

Sixth, because of Federal competition at this time in the electric power field, private power companies are finding it difficult to borrow money at a low rate. It is costing them more because the risk is much greater.

Mr. Chairman, I want to repeat that I am not opposed to the production of electric energy in our river basins where the Federal Government owns the water or can construct dams for the production of power, but I am opposed to the Federal Government building transmission lines in competition with private investment already in the field and serving the area or otherwise competing with its own citizens in the same business.

I am opposed to the Federal Government sending its agents throughout the land telling municipalities and other political or governmental units that they can buy power cheaper from the Federal Government than from private enterprise, thereby practically destroying private enterprise and private investment all through this country.

Perhaps people do not know that more than one-third of all money invested in public utilities—I mean owned by private corporations—is held by the life-insurance companies of this Nation. About 75,000,000 policyholders of the country could very well be affected by the destruction of these utilities throughout the land.

This amendment to build a steam plant under the TVA costing $84,000,000 before the House this afternoon simply indicates how far we are going in the direction of public ownership and state socialism. I think this Congress owes a duty and a responsibility to the people of the Nation to fix a public power policy that is definite, that private enterprise can depend on—one that will not destroy private investment through competition by the Federal Government. If that is not done, it seems to me we are well on the road to nationalization of the power and light industry and adopting socialism in this country. If that is so desirable, why not extend it to the coal mines, why not extend it to the meat industry, why not extend it to the railroads and communications, why not extend it to the automobile industry in my State? After we have done all that, it seems to me, we have substituted Russia for America—and I am bitterly opposed to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] has expired.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can come to some agreement as to time on this matter. It has been indicated on this side that probably 30 minutes would be necessary.

Mr. WHITTEN. It is apparent that we still have quite a number on this side who want to talk. I wonder if we could not proceed for a short time and then see what we can do.

Mr. JENNINGS. May I say that I want the extremely long period of 5 minutes to unburden my soul on this matter.

Mr. PLOESER. Very well, Mr. Chairman, I will not press the matter at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, it is most interesting to me to listen to the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], who has consistently voted against all of these water-power developments ever since he has been a Member of Congress.

As I pointed out yesterday, I was co-author with Senator Norris of the bill creating the Tennessee Valley Authority. It never occurred to me that anybody would question the right of the TVA to build a steam plant to firm up its power production in the dry season.

In Mr. DONDERO's home State of Michigan some of the outstanding cities, including Lansing, the capital, have public power systems, and have built their own steam plants. Did they have to get a constitutional amendment or authority from the legislature in order to do that? No, certainly not.

If the gentleman's policy were carried out, it would shut the door in the faces of the people of California, of Oregon, of Washington, of Missouri, Ohio, Illinois, and of all of the other States that border on the great streams of this country.

Now, let us see about this stand-by proposition. Two of the outstanding cities of the Northwest that have water-power systems have stand-by plants. They are Seattle and Tacoma. Let us just take Tacoma. The reason I am taking Tacoma instead of the Tennessee Valley Authority is the fact that the city of Tacoma pays a greater rate of taxes than the private power companies pay, generally, throughout the country.

In 1946, leaving out rural electrification and street lighting, this country used 170,471,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which the people paid $3,134,000,000. Under the Tacoma rates, where they pay a higher rate of taxes than the power companies pay on the

average in the States of the Union, the people of this country would have saved on those bills $1,736,935,000.

Here is a table showing the number of customers in each State during the year 1946, the amount of electricity used in each, the costs, and the overcharges according to the Tacoma rates.

It does not include the power used by the REA, nor that used for street lighting.

The table referred to follows:

TABLE 4.—*Total electric sales, 1946*

State	Estimated sales data for 1946			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in Tacoma, Wash.	
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours (thousands)	Total revenues	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	398,607	4,356,487	$41,257,600	$21,233,246	$20,024,354
Arizona	132,114	738,746	12,890,900	5,168,521	7,722,379
Arkansas	239,146	861,894	19,785,300	8,685,831	11,099,469
California	2,523,882	12,358,139	202,757,800	116,622,361	86,135,439
Colorado	299,995	914,316	24,443,200	10,293,129	14,150,071
Connecticut	569,918	2,619,600	61,082,700	24,490,377	36,592,323
Delaware	78,338	374,929	8,059,200	3,167,544	4,891,656
District of Columbia [1]					
Florida	561,226	1,883,018	53,038,700	19,088,956	33,949,744
Georgia	541,667	3,075,122	51,371,200	25,314,139	26,057,061
Idaho	150,512	948,708	13,116,600	7,054,179	6,062,421
Illinois	2,241,842	10,312,725	215,907,400	90,650,479	125,256,921
Indiana	986,500	4,647,417	91,592,300	39,683,906	51,908,394
Iowa	650,580	2,089,404	50,714,500	22,258,519	28,455,981
Kansas	434,425	1,594,040	36,937,100	15,756,718	21,180,382
Kentucky	486,704	2,038,108	37,105,600	17,381,165	19,724,435
Louisiana	459,209	1,882,175	36,773,200	14,171,497	22,601,703
Maine	259,024	1,002,843	19,986,200	8,071,585	11,914,615
Maryland and the District of Columbia	672,449	3,733,721	67,173,400	32,628,045	34,545,355
Massachusetts	1,403,149	4,779,314	125,970,600	47,141,126	78,829,474
Michigan	1,663,083	8,132,323	157,096,600	70,188,561	86,908,039
Minnesota	729,201	2,453,132	60,841,800	26,296,867	34,544,933
Mississippi	257,620	875,469	18,769,600	7,979,355	10,790,245
Missouri	907,582	3,539,291	74,588,000	34,149,940	40,438,060
Montana	136,030	1,494,597	14,483,000	7,332,727	7,150,273
Nebraska	296,696	885,504	21,419,600	10,119,500	11,300,100
Nevada	39,261	237,858	4,908,900	1,918,899	2,990,001
New Hampshire	168,654	538,640	13,472,300	5,225,253	8,247,047
New Jersey	1,382,696	5,478,749	130,362,900	51,159,550	79,203,350
New Mexico	89,563	222,952	7,360,500	2,609,893	4,750,607
New York	4,346,964	17,986,088	386,053,800	142,946,700	243,107,100
North Carolina	610,833	3,688,483	55,157,306	27,013,332	28,143,974
North Dakota	109,060	226,577	8,089,100	3,164,619	4,924,481
Ohio	2,075,114	11,956,519	204,726,000	94,860,533	109,865,467
Oklahoma	435,346	1,417,868	33,541,700	13,893,864	19,647,836
Oregon	382,791	2,644,324	32,405,600	19,378,153	13,027,447
Pennsylvania	2,671,383	15,243,355	264,280,700	120,291,984	143,988,716
Rhode Island	230,533	846,905	22,141,400	8,078,167	14,063,233
South Carolina	294,105	1,775,935	25,129,894	12,519,245	12,610,649
South Dakota	109,501	256,836	7,956,900	2,949,439	5,007,461
Tennessee	545,508	6,585,398	48,614,600	30,762,662	17,851,938
Texas	1,361,029	5,772,869	113,938,900	50,005,860	63,933,040
Utah	169,476	753,484	13,768,000	6,904,144	6,863,856
Vermont	106,619	377,529	9,454,800	3,887,244	5,567,556
Virginia	563,579	2,695,221	51,552,500	21,865,058	29,678,442
Washington	612,326	7,419,987	62,485,800	39,219,113	23,266,687
West Virginia	356,301	2,808,377	41,110,500	18,070,539	23,039,961
Wisconsin	837,850	3,767,909	75,940,700	34,121,239	41,819,461
Wyoming	58,628	178,997	5,085,500	1,990,850	3,094,650
United States	34,636,619	170,471,882	3,134,700,400	1,397,764,613	1,736,935,787

[1] Included with Maryland.

This steam plant is merely to firm up this power during the dry season in order to carry out the purposes of the original act.

Just as surely as the sun shines you are going to need the same provision in practically every State in the Union.

Take the State of Ohio that has 10,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy running to waste in the Ohio River every year. When the dams on that stream are rebuilt so as to generate that vast wealth of power, it is going to be necessary to build steam plants in order to firm it up to the peak of production during the dry season.

Take the people in the Northeast along the St. Lawrence River. As I pointed out yesterday, when they develop those billions of kilowatt-hours and provide a yardstick for that area, it will bring rates down from two to three hundred millions a year. Then they will need steam plants to firm that power up to the peak of production.

Take the New England States that have been freezing during this last winter, because of the lack of power, whenever they screw their courage to the sticking place and join those of us who believe in developing the water power of the Nation, and proceed to harness the water power of New England and the other Northeastern States, they are going to need steam plants in order to firm that power up to the peak of production.

Take also the Central Valley of California. Oh, the battle that has been waged here and the expenses the Power Trust has paid for propagandists to come to Washington and fight against the building of steam plants in the Central Valley; if that power were firmed up and supplied to the people of northern California at the rates the people of southern California are receiving power from Hoover Dam, the people of the State of California would save, according to the Tacoma rates, $86,135,439 annually.

Take the State of Colorado, take the State of Missouri, if you please, with the Missouri River, not only with its waters going to waste but destroying hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of property by floods; when that river is developed and that 10,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity that is going to waste in that stream is made to serve the people of that great section of the country, they too will need steam plants to firm up the power to peak production during the dry season.

It will also serve Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, Montana, North and South Dakota, and much of the rest of that great Northwestern country.

And along the Columbia River the people are going to need steam plants in the years to come in order to firm that power up to the peak of production.

Remember that every dollar of the money invested in this plant will be paid back with interest. It is not like giving money to Europe or Asia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think we should get a rational approach to this problem. Out of $440,000,000 that the Government has invested in this Corporation at the present time, $10,500,000 has been paid back. It is proposed in this proposition to pay back $5,500,000. What rate of interest is that? One and a quarter percent.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Not at this time. The gentleman can get his own time.

The rates in the TVA are set so low that the people in my district and your districts are paying the electric-light bills of people in the TVA area. Now, that is just the situation, and we might as well be honest about it.

Of course their rates are low.

Now, let us analyze this steam plant business for a minute. Why do they want to build the steam plants? Because the TVA in its set-up has made contracts with the big users of electricity and with the municipalities prohibiting them from building any steam plants that would allow them to generate this cheap power. That is the reason.

We all know that in building and operating a steam plant private industry can do it much cheaper than the Government. Bearing those things in mind, we should meet this situation face on and meet it honestly, so far as our constituents are concerned. I do not want to go back to my people and say that I voted to have them pay the electric-light bill of people in other parts of the country.

Mr. Chairman, these rates ought to be set up honestly and in such a way that these people who get cheap power anyway will be paying for their electric power and not have you and I doing it for them.

In this bill the committee has voluntarily included a very large sum of money for continuation of construction of power plants—hydro plants—in this area. Oh, I would that we meet our responsibilities here, and meet them face to face with due regard for the Treasury of the United States.

I feel that the pending amendment in the interest of all the people of the country should be defeated.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 1 hour.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 1 hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITTEN) there were—ayes 83, noes 44.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, is it understood that prior to the motion there was unanimous agreement that 10 minutes be reserved to the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. That will be observed and it will be so understood.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question. I had earlier discussed this matter with my chairman, and I wonder if in his agreement he had any reservation of time for members of the committee on this side.

Mr. PLOESER. In the original agreement reservation was made for 10 minutes on that side which was reserved for the author of the amendment, a member of the committee and that time has been used. Under this arrangement, in order to get 10 minutes on this side, if the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] and I both want to speak, we will probable have to divide the time between us.

May I ask the Chair how much this will allow to each Member?

The CHAIRMAN. According to the best estimate it will be 2½ minutes for each Member.

Mr. PLOESER. What would the gentleman be satisfied with?

Mr. WHITTEN. It is pretty hard to answer what you would be satisfied with.

Mr. PLOESER. I mean of the hour?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we on this side may have the final 5 minutes of the time allotted for use by our Members on the committee.

Mr. PLOESER. I am perfectly agreeable that the committee on that side may have 5 minutes, but we have reserved 10 minutes for summation on this side. I am perfectly willing to the 5 minutes being allotted under the hour limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOPER. Is the 10 minutes to which the gentleman from Missouri has repeatedly referred included in the 1 hour or in addition to the hour?

The CHAIRMAN. That is included within the hour.

Mr. PLOESER. As I understand, there was no objection to the request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's understanding is correct. There will be 5 minutes for the Members of the minority on the committee and 10 minutes for the Members of the majority. The Chair would like to inquire what Member of the minority side claims the 5 minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet claiming time. I ask unanimous consent that the time which would be given to me under the agreement be given to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], and I would like to know if that would give him 7½ minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. It would, if the House so agreed by unanimous consent.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, it has been suggested on this side very magnanimously by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER], a member of the committee, that he would yield 2½ minutes of his time to make up half of the 5 minutes requested. Now, you cannot just go on cutting these Members down on time.

Mr. MAHON. I am just yielding my time to the gentleman from Mississippi, if I may, in order that he may have sufficient time.

Mr. PLOESER. When you do that, it all comes within the hour, but you cannot keep cutting the other gentlemen down. However, I am not going to object to the gentleman's request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I believe there is a very fundamental question involved in the proposal before the House today, that is, whether or not we are going to embark on Government subsidies of steam plants all over this country. This amendment for $4,000,000 is but the beginning of one plant, the estimated cost of which is $84,000,000, as I understand. We do not know whether this one plant is the beginning of a series of plants in the Tennessee Valley that will be created by the Congress, supported by the Government, and paid for by the taxpayers of every part of the country.

As was so well stated this morning, every part of the country is in need of more power. We find this situation true in the New England area. In my own State in recent days there has been a great deal of publicity as to the necessity for developing more power plants, and we have found through the same press the statements that the private industries of that part of the country are embarking on a tremendous program involving millions of dollars of their own money in order to meet the requirements in that part of the country. This same thing is true in all other parts of the country. Why should we, the taxpayers of our part of the country or the taxpayers of any other part of the country, be called upon to build, support, and maintain at Government expense, which means the expense of the people in our part of the country, this prodigious program of steam generation plants in the Tennessee Valley?

We understand that in the bill today the committee has allowed $29,000,000 to implement the hydroelectric-plant system already existing in the Tennessee Valley. We also understand there will be available power from the dams which are being built by the Army and the hydroelectric plants in that same area which will provide 200,000 more kilowatt-hours. It is a question of where we are going to go if we start here today. I think we ought to defeat this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, upon the success or failure of this amendment depends the continued growth of my city, the western part of Tennessee and Kentucky, and a substantial part of the mid-South. Memphis has been purchasing power from TVA since 1939. That city along with 140 other municipalities and REA cooperatives are bound by contract to depend upon TVA for their entire power supply. The Government has assumed sole responsibility in the area for an adequate supply of electrical energy to support a rapidly expanding economy. Having done this, it owes a solemn duty to the people and industries of the valley to so manage the system that our demand for power shall never fail.

In all the years of my membership in the House of Representatives, I have been delighted to cast votes which I thought would affect the welfare and the progress of sections far removed from the area which I have the honor to represent. In all of those votes I felt that the prosperity of any one section of the country added to the sum total of our national prosperity. It is hard for me to believe that any of my colleagues should take a position which would place a ceiling on the prosperity and growth of any section of our common country.

Since we became purchasers of TVA electricity in 1939, the population in my congressional district has increased 20 percent. We have added 32,000 customers to the line. During that time bank deposits increased 294 percent. This is progress. My city is on the very southwestern end of the TVA system. We have no other place to get our power than from TVA. We must be considered, however, as only a part of this wide area which finds itself in need of additional power to care for the normal progress the section is making.

Purcell Smith, the $65,000-a-year lobbyist for the private utilities, made the statement, and I quote from page 965 of the hearings:

> We believe that an undisclosed motive behind this request is to prepare TVA for other drives to expand still further the territory of its power monopoly.

Anyone who considers the location which TVA has chosen for this plant will see that it would be a very poor plant from which to expand widely TVA power. On the other hand, it is an ideal site from which to serve the growing needs within the area. The New Johnsonville plant will be so placed in the center at

the western half of Tennessee so as to serve the adjoining southern counties of Kentucky which receive TVA power, as well as all of west Tennessee.

Many factors determine the most economical location for a power plant, the primary ones involved being the magnitude and location of the markets to be supplied and the availability of fuel and water in the case of a steam plant. It is obvious that in the development of a system of dams to control the flow and to utilize the power possibility of a river system requires that the major development of dam sites occur in the headwater areas. It is there that water may be impounded in the high hills producing the fall and volume that produce the power. Therefore, the bulk of power is produced in east Tennessee and north Alabama, whereas a substantial part of the TVA markets exist in west and middle Tennessee. It happens that the location of a plant on the Tennessee River at the location chosen would avoid the movement of 300,000 kilowatts over the transmission lines from the eastern and southern extremities of the State to the points of use in middle and west Tennessee.

The location at New Johnsonville is one that permits linking the proposed plant into the existing transmission network in such fashion as to permit these loads to flow into middle Tennessee, western Tennessee, and Kentucky, areas supplied by TVA. The location of the plant in the center of the area served reduces the losses in transmission lines that pile up if the plant should be located on the fringe. The plant serves the purpose of not only firming up hydroelectric power in dry seasons and dry years but it serves to distribute the generating plants more evenly over the whole area served. Its usefulness is greatly enhanced in an integrating system where the amount of power produced can be varied in amount and moved in whatever direction best meets the need of the system at any hour of the year. It supplies a source of power along the river in the long stretch between Pickwick and Kentucky Dams, in which there is no dam. In order to produce large quantities of electricity by steam, it is essential that tremendous quantities of water be available for condensing purposes.

Located available to water and rail routes, coal and other supplies can be delivered to the plant by either water or rail, and it should be apparent that the location is within comparable distance of available coal fields in southern Illinois, Kentucky, and Indiana. From every economical viewpoint, the location is as near ideal as engineers ever expect to find.

The seasonal rainfall in the Tennessee Valley area, the available river flow, and the multitude of other considerations such as the run-off within the watershed tend to make a steam plant a necessary part of the hydro development. In the original development at Muscle Shoals, a steam plant was a part of the project. Later, other steam plants were acquired by purchase. But inasmuch as the work on the Tennessee River included not only power plants but flood control and navigation, it was perfectly logical that the construction of dams and hydro plants have had priority in the program and that steam plants would not become essential until firm power produced by the hydro plants was reaching the limits of its development. It is therefore logical that the hydro plants should have been carried forth first and that development of steam plants follow as the need arises to strengthen and support the hydro-power plants. It must be remembered that the steam plant is not only necessary to firm up hydro power and add installed capacity to the system, but it is a procedure whereby the maximum value can be obtained from money already invested in hydro projects.

These steam plants can be used to stabilize the whole system in a fashion to maintain voltage over the system.

This plant would fail in its potential usefulness if it did not in fact add to the productive capacity of the whole Tennessee Valley Authority system. To the communities served by TVA in the areas north, northwest, west, and northeast of Pickwick Dam, this power plant becomes a necessity to meet the normal growth in an area which is developing in every phase of human activity.

Surely, in a sense of fairness, you will vote for the amendment. We have no other place to go for power. It is very vital to all my people and to my neighbors. It is economically sound. In 1939, when Memphis first became a customer, we used 57,000 kilowatts. During the month of March this year we reached a load of 153,000 kilowatts, or almost three times as much as we used less than 8 years ago.

On the basis of proven experience we will require 175,000 kilowatts by the summer of this year. Next year we will require 200,0000 kilowatts, and by 1953 we will need 300,000 kilowatts, or six times as much as when we joined the system.

If this steam plant is built, by the time it is in operation, our municipality serving our citizens and our farmers will need almost one-half of the total power generated by the plant. This is without regard to the proportionate growth which is bound to come to the whole valley. So you may see the extreme importance of this plant to me and my people. There is no source of private power available. Please do not stifle the hopes and the ambitions of our people.

Our growth is your progress. As our income increases, we have more to spend in your communities for automobiles, refrigerators, air-conditioning plants, vacuum cleaners, clothes, shoes, electrical appliances, and all the items you manufacture. A simple, fair, and considered attitude can lend itself to a vote for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I admire the splendid efforts of the beneficiaries of TVA power in the fight they are making to expand these beneficences in their area. I believe if I were down in Memphis or in the TVA area, I would perhaps make the same sort of appeal. The question, however, it seems to me, is just a little bit broader than that. I have read the brief submitted by the TVA to this committee. I have read the brief submitted by the power companies through Mr. Jackson, one of their counsel. I have read the splendid statements made by my good friend the gentleman from Mississippi, JAMIE WHITTEN, and the speech made yesterday by my friend the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. They are all splendid expositions of the problems that face us. But make no mistake about it. You can stand here from now until doomsday and argue the legal questions that are involved. No one will deny that there are very, very serious legal questions. The briefs that have been submitted are replete with the arguments, pro and con. I happen to be one who has taken the time to study those briefs. I have come to the conclusion on the showing that has been made by the Budget that I cannot conscientiously support this amendment because it would be clearly an invasion of the constitutional authority vested in the Congress, if we were to now embark upon a program which will lead us to no one knows where. No one can claim that if you start on this steam-plant program that it will not expand all over the United States. The simple fundamental question that you must determine here and now when you vote on this amendment is, Are you going to vote for nationalization of the power interests of this country? If you believe in the nationalization of power, then you ought to support this amendment. If you do not, you ought to vote it down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] made the statement that out of the four-hundred-and-twenty-odd-million dollars which have been invested in power in the Tennessee Valley, only $10,000,000 had been paid back into the Federal Treasury. The record shows that the Tennessee Valley Authority has paid back into the Treasury of the United States in excess of $23,000,000 in cash. Also that out of the earnings from the sale of power of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which have been reappropriated for the building of additional facilities—which I do not see that there is any difference whether it is turned back in cash to the TVA, it means the same thing, it is all passed through the Committee on Appropriations—that $92,000,000 in addition to the $23,000,000 has been repaid. The important thing is whether TVA is making money so that it can repay the Federal Government the full amount of this investment.

The record shows that last year on its power properties the TVA earned an income at the rate of 5½ percent on the amount invested. Over the entire period of its operations a little more than 4 percent has been earned on its power properties.

If the Members of the House are truly and sincerely in earnest in cooperating with the TVA to make repayment of every cent that has been invested, they will not jeopardize the TVA in such manner as to refuse to build this steam plant. If the private-power lobby suc-

ceeds in putting a ceiling on the power supply in the Tennessee Valley, it is not only going to adversely affect 5,000,000 people that live in the valley but it is going to adversely affect the entire investment of the Federal Government in that valley.

IF THE PRIVATE POWER LOBBY SUCCEEDS

If the private power lobby succeeds in putting a ceiling on power supply in the Tennessee Valley it will limit the earnings of the distribution systems with loans outstanding from REA to the amount of $30,000,000 and with $52,000,000 of municipal revenue bonds now held by the public. It will threaten the prosperity of the thousands of private enterprises which have made investments dependent on a prosperous region and a continuing supply of power to pay out. It will risk our national security, for TVA's direct power load is vital to defense.

Yet the private power companies do not and cannot claim that they will be injured if the disputed project is constructed. They have no competitive investment in the Tennessee Valley. They cannot pretend to be able to carry the load even if the people of the Tennessee Valley wished to be served by them. As an alternative to the present efficient operations, they propose that each town and city and each industry should provide additional power capacity itself as its load increases, projecting for the valley a system of small isolated plants—a system based on the standards long since abandoned everywhere. To block the New Johnsonville steam plant is to prevent the full and effective use of power from the developed river and the conservation of the fuel resources of the Tennessee Valley.

The campaign of the private power companies to prevent TVA from having an adequate power supply to meet the power needs of its area is based on some of the most remarkable misrepresentations and preposterous suggestions brought forward in all my experience as a Member of this body.

First. The private power companies come forward with the ridiculous statement that they are pleading the case of the 140 municipalities and cooperatives who buy power wholesale from TVA to distribute to their customers. They shed crocodile tears in great abundance for the welfare of the domestic and resident customers of those systems. Nobody who comes from the TVA area could be fooled by that concern for a moment. We have not forgotten that when the private companies served that area there were only 225,000 residential and domestic consumers. Those consumers annually used an average of 600 kilowatt-hours at an average cost of more than 5 cents per kilowatt-hour. We know that today there are 700,000 domestic and residential consumers who use an average of about 2,500 kilowatt-hours a year at a cost of scarcely 1½ cents per kilowatt-hour. Small consumers of electricity in the Tennessee Valley know which agency is protecting their interests. Today more than 50 percent of the farms have electricity. Before TVA 1 in 28 had this essential tool of modern agriculture.

None of us from the Tennessee Valley were fooled by this argument but some other Members of this House, not knowing the difference since we have a public power system to supply our requirements, may have been impressed. Indeed, I think the majority members of the Appropriations Committee were probably impressed with the misleading figures presented in the hearings by the $65,000-per-year lobbyist of the private utilities and his allies. He stated that more than 50 percent of all power sold by TVA went to private industries and contended that the steam plant was not required in order to provide adequate power for TVA's preferred customers, the municipalities, and cooperatives.

Purcell Smith, the private utilities lobbyist, was wrong. He was wrong in his percentages, wrong in his interpretation, wrong in the conclusions he drew.

Let us examine TVA's industrial customers for a moment and see if men from the West, North, and East would look kindly upon the moratorium on their production which would follow if their power supply were cut off. TVA serves governmental agencies; it sells power to its own chemical plant at Muscle Shoals which produces munitions in war, and in peace, fertilizer, which, to most Members of this House, seems critically important right now. The power used in this operation is included in TVA's direct sales report. How about the atomic-energy plant at Oak Ridge? TVA serves that plant and its consumption is included in the total of so-called industrial sales. The Milan ordnance plant, the Huntsville arsenal, Camp Campbell, the Smyrna air base, and other military establishments—these are the customers whom the private power companies suggest should be denied service; a suggestion which should be voted down by this House without delay as a shocking attack on our national security.

Let me go into the privately owned industries for a minute so that we can see what justice there is in the utilities' suggestions that they be cut off. Is any Member of this House willing to place obstacles in the way of aluminum production, or in the steady and, indeed, increased output of the heavy chemical plants which make up the remainder of TVA's large direct sales to private industries?

Let us get the facts straight to match with the misrepresentations which were made in the hearings by spokesmen for private utilities. Let me list them:

First. Utility witnesses misinformed the committee as to the proportion which TVA's direct sales to industry bear to its total sales. The utilities witness knew, although perhaps the committee did not, that TVA's reports of its total direct sales includes sales to the Government itself, to which I have just referred.

Second. Such comparisions of total volume are meaningless because TVA sells to private industry large quantities of interruptible power which cannot be sold to the municipalities and cooperatives and such power can be disposed of in only two ways (a) by sales to a few industries which can use it in their operations; (b) by exporting it from the region to private power companies who can use it on their systems; (c) actually in fiscal year 1949 less than 45 percent of TVA's total sales will go to its direct customers, including the Government and including interruptible power sales. This is a far different picture from the one presented out of ignorance, greed, and malice by the private power companies.

Third. The point of all this emphasis on TVA's industrial sales has been to convince the Congress that if power so used were made available to municipalities and cooperatives there would be no need for the steam plant. The utilities are wrong. They have no expert knowledge of growth of electricity use on the TVA system. They have never been right in the past and they are not right now. TVA could not legally deny power to the private industries it has contracted to serve. Even if it could, it would be against the public interest and shockingly unfair to the companies which have made large investments, particularly during the war at the request of the Government and with the assurance that their power requirements would be met. But even if it were legal and if it were good public policy, such a fantastic proposal would not postpone the need for the steam plant. For the western half of Tennessee, which the steam plant will help to serve, the power demands of the municipalities and cooperatives already exceed the available generating capacity, and power must be brought into the area by transmission from the eastern end of the TVA system.

There is no evading this issue. The customers of the municipalities and cooperatives for whom the private power companies are showing such belated concern need this increase in capacity. There is no feasible alternative. All the proposals made by the private power companies are ludicrous, unjust, and technically primitive. If this great area of the country is to continue to grow—to contribute more to the national welfare, additional power capacity must be provided and the construction of this steam plant is the best way to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] is recognized.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, demand for power has increased as never before. No one ever anticipated that so soon after close of the war we would find ourselves on the verge of a critical power shortage. The facts are, however, that it is now with us. We have a reserve of less than 0.2 of 1 percent above that used today. With the rapid advancement of rural electrification and with industrial development moving upward and upward in less time than we might expect, the wave of progress which our Nation now enjoys might soon falter for lack of electric power. And this is particularly true in that great region served by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Private utilities are moving to meet the emergency in the territories which they serve. They are expanding their facilities through the construction of steam plants and various other methods. It would be a cruel act of this Congress, which created the TVA, to say to the Authority that we will not permit it to meet

an identical emergency in the territory which it serves.

The TVA serves an area of 80,000 square miles, lying partly in seven States. Aproximately 140 municipalities and cooperatives are wholly dependent upon TVA for electric power. There is no other source of supply, positively none, for the 5,000,000 people living within the Tennessee Valley.

Whether you approve of TVA or not, it remains that it is an established agency of the Government, created by the Congress of the United States. Some of you who oppose it cry that TVA is a monopoly. Sure it is a monopoly, but every other power company in the United States has a monopoly in the region which it serves. It would be most impracticable and uneconomical for two power companies to operate in the same territory and therefore they do not follow the practice. Agreeing that the TVA has a monopoly in the Tennessee Valley, the fact remains that it was so created by the Congress. Prior to its establishment the power companies made little or no effort to bring power to the millions living within the valley. In my own district I could count on my fingers the number of miles of rural power lines erected by the private power companies who now wail about the steam plant. With the advent of TVA our people have made great progress socially, economically, and industrially, where before many were living in drudgery, reading by the light of oil lamps, and waiting, waiting, waiting for the private power companies to do a job which they had failed and refused to do. It was then and then only that the Government stepped in and created the TVA and made possible the rapid development which has taken place in the valley over the past 15 years.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that same power lobby which year after year successfully defeated every move and effort to establish the TVA, is again making itself felt in the Halls of Congress. They know that without the steam plant, as proposed by my friend the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], that the TVA may be unable to supply a steady flow of electric power. They hope that it will eventually lead to the death of TVA. Nothing would please them more.

This Congress has appropriated large sums of money for the development of power in the great regions of the far West. On each and every item for the benefit of you who reside in the West, the Members from the Tennessee Valley have upheld your cause, worked for and voted with you. We confidently believe you will help us. And we are grateful to you for that support.

I trust, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that such time as I have yielded back may be yielded to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS.]

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, much has been said about a great special and unfair favor having been conferred upon Tennessee and my section of the State. Tennessee has been a State since 1796. The first considerable amount of money that was ever expended on a public project in my district and in my State, with respect to flood control and navigation, was expended under the TVA Act. For 100 years it had been the dream and aspiration of my people to see the Tennessee River made navigable from Knoxville to the Gulf of Mexico and to the whole world. It was a difficult proposition, because of the rapid flow of the river through Muscle Shoals. Billions and billions of dollars have been spent in other parts of the country on such projects. No private power company could have undertaken this project. The Tennessee River today, as a result of that project, is navigable from my city, Knoxville, to the Gulf of Mexico and to the great ports of the world.

As an incident to the development of the river, it was provided that these high dams should be built high enough to store the water and prevent floods, and so controlled as to release the water when necessary for navigation purposes, and as an incident to that, to translate the energy of the falling waters into electric current. Everybody knows that to make a hydroelectric system profitable, you must have stand-by steam plants.

This leader of the forces called by Theodore Roosevelt, when he was Governor of New York, Black Horse Cavalry, this smooth operator Smith, this $65,000,000 lobbyist, led his crowd of cohorts up here and conducted an attack on my people, and this is what he and his confederates boldly, frankly, and brutally say:

Although substantial additional power can be generated by installation of new hydrogenerators, it is approaching the limit of the amount of electricity which can be generated by water power harnessed primarily for purposes of flood control and navigation.

The proposal to construct this steam plant is based upon the recognition of these two factors and is intended to provide additional generating capacity to meet the demand for electric power in the 80,000-square-mile area served by TVA.

In other words, they propose by stopping the development of the great enterprise on which 5,000,000 people depend for power, to say to my people, "You cannot expand any further industrially nor in agriculture. You can go back to kerosene lamps."

Why did the atomic-energy plant come to my district and to Tennessee? Because it was the only section of the country that had enough power to produce the atomic bomb, and for the further reason that we had a supply of labor within a radius of 100 miles that was of undoubted patriotism. They were 100-percent American. There were no strikes, no slow-downs, no sit-downs in the making of the bomb. This is a fight on the 5,000,000 people who live in Tennessee, in North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Kentucky. They fight 200,000 laboring men and women in my district. They fight 100,000 farmers. They fight 50,000 veterans of World War II. We sent more than 50,000 into this war. We have 460,000 people in the district. Twelve hundred of those men died in battle. Thousands have come back maimed, blinded, and wounded, and wrecked physically.

Not long ago I went to Huntsville in my district to attend a hearing by Army engineers on a flood-control project I had sponsored and made possible. It was hoped the project might mean power, and on a winter's day with snow on the ground, 500 people came, of whom more than half were war veterans looking for power in order that they might have industry that would enable them to remain in their home county and engage in profitable enterprise on the farms and in factories.

Let me say this in addition, the people of east Tennessee helped make the Republican Party with their guns. East Tennessee sent 30,000 soldiers into the Union Army, and I have a district that has remained Republican since 1855. Shall I go back to my people and have them say to me: "Were our aspirations, were our desire to grow, and develop, and to prosper, were they slain in the house of our friends?" I have had to fight to hold that district in the Republican column. I hope you do not create the impression by defeating this appropriation for the steam-generating plant that the future progress and prosperity of the people of Tennessee are in unfriendly hands.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I certainly have no selfish interest in the outcome of this particular appropriation. My State is not directly affected. I do have a great respect, however, for a job well done in the Tennessee Valley. The truth is that the Tennessee Valley Authority, like our great power projects at Grand Coulee and Bonneville in the Pacific Northwest, provided the basis for a great part of our industrial potential in World War II. It is invaluable to our national defense now.

Too many times when we bring up the Tennessee Valley Authority appropriation we get into the issue of whether we should or should not have a TVA. The truth is that it is an accomplished fact. The only question to be decided today is whether or not this is a prudent investment.

If this were a private utility asking for these funds and we were the board of directors, I am sure we would give our wholehearted approval because it would be simply good, sound, business. TVA is merely asking for the same thing that a private utility would ask for under the same circumstances.

I am sure that all of us want to see the Government get the maximum return out of its investment in the Tennessee Valley. By voting for this amendment we will be providing for more firm power which will mean a greater return to the Treasury. We will merely be doing the very thing that we would ask TVA to do

if they had not come in and asked for these funds.

In that connection I venture to say that the Tennessee Valley Authority would have been criticized if they had not come in and asked for these funds.

In closing, may I pay my personal tribute to the untiring efforts of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] in behalf of the Tennessee Valley Authority. It was my pleasure a couple of years ago to make a trip through the Tennessee Valley area with him. Few men in the Congress have a better grasp or understanding of this great project than my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Tennessee, Representative KEFAUVER. He has been its ardent champion. The people of the great State of Tennessee are fortunate, indeed, in having such excellent representation in the Congress.

I hope the Committee will approve this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, back in 1939 or 1940 the statement was made concerning these Government-owned projects that sooner or later it would develop into an octopus and the country would realize that they had something to contend with.

That statement is now proving to be a fact and today finds this Congress faced with it.

I am absolutely opposed to the amendment to establish a steam plant in the TVA.

In certain parts of our country we see these Government-owned projects developed to such an extent that it is driving private industry out of business. We hear much about brown-outs and no power in some sections of the country, yet our Government-owned facilities are selling power from that area to Canada. The claim is made notwithstanding that there is a shortage of power.

We know that private power companies in some sections of the country cannot at the present time borrow sufficient money to expand their facilities to remain in existence even though they are willing. Yet the people of the great United States, the taxpayers, have to pay for people in some parts of the country having cheap power. Of course, that is what they want—cheap power.

The private power company in my particular district is spending this year $113,000,000 to expand their property. They have not come to this Congress and asked for money with which to build power plants. They stand on their own feet and use their own money.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come to recognize all this. Why, in some parts of the country there are condemnation proceedings depriving private industry of their property and for the purpose of using the same property in the Government-owned electric system. What is going to happen to the farmers and other businesses of this country when the Government says to them: "We want your farm; we want your business. Get off it, we will take it." How will they like that? This kind of action is rapidly socializing this great country and now is the time to stop it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN.]

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, when you leave common sense out of legislation you wreck it. This amendment only restores to the bill a common sense provision the committee left out.

Consider these facts:

First. We all realize that the home and factory alike need a dependable supply of electricity. Without dependability electric power is practically useless.

Second. It is a recognized fact that water power alone, except in a very few instances, does not furnish a dependable supply of electricity. The reason is apparent; at certain seasons the water in most streams, due to dry weather, becomes low.

Third. To meet this handicap that nature has placed upon water power, practically all water-power companies have stand-by steam plants that are brought into play to supplement the water power during dry seasons.

Fourth. In the Tennessee Valley the water power has two handicaps that the ordinary water-power plant does not have, namely: (a) The TVA has to keep enough water impounded for navigation, and (b) at the same time it cannot permit its reservoir to become full because this would jeopardize the flood-control aspects of the Authority.

Fifth. The fifth element that enters into the TVA power picture is this: The only source of power in the great TVA area, which embraces parts of seven States and contains a population of around 5,000,000 people, and in which area is located some of the large plants essential to national defense, is TVA power. There are no private power plants within the area, and it is admitted that private power plants cannot be induced to enter the area.

The above facts bring us face to face with these propositions:

First. If the supplemental steam plant is denied the area, then development in the area becomes static. We say to the people of the area the present is also your future.

Second. We jeopardize our national defense by making it impossible for the national defense plants to increase their capacity. It is no answer to say if the emergency becomes acute we will authorize a steam plant. Emergencies do not wait on the erection of power plants.

Considering the facts, the common-sense answer to the problem should be clear.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS.]

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, we have already heard today much about the legality of the TVA, its statutory and constitutional authority, the creation of the TVA, its growth and development, the extent and type of TVA's power customers, as well as the need for the New Johnsonville steam plant to firm up the hydro power generated by TVA to augment the services of TVA to the people of the Tennessee Valley area.

I should like to address my remarks to the partnership which today exists between TVA and the people whom it serves and to urge that this partnership be continued.

The President has recommended in his 1949 budget an item of $4,000,000 which would permit TVA to commence construction of this steam plant to be located at New Johnsonville, Tenn., on the Tennessee River in the western part of my State. This plant is badly needed to help relieve the power shortage and to meet the rising demand for electricity resulting from the general economic growth of Tennessee and the South. The sum requested is very modest and small. The benefits to be derived therefrom are great—great for our people and also for the prosperity of the people of the entire Nation. When one section of our country makes progress all the Nation prospers. Should the TVA be aided rather than its services to the people curtailed, a vast section of our country will continue to prosper and to make progress.

Progress in the South has been made possible through the joint partnership relation which exists between the TVA and the people whom it serves. And when I say "partnership" that is precisely and exactly what I mean. The Federal Government and the people of the Tennessee Valley area have entered into a contract and partnership agreement in the power generating and distributing business in this section of the South. The arrangement is mutually beneficial—and each is dependent one upon the other. The Federal Government is the sole power producer in the area and the people—the municipalities and cooperatives—the sole distributors. This partnership arrangement was entered into when the Federal Government bought out the private utilities in the area—the Commonwealth & Southern utility holdings, the sale of which was negotiated by the late Wendell Willkie. So, now the Federal Government, through the TVA, is the sole supplier of electric power in this vast area of the Southland. The people there are wholly dependent on the Federal Government for their power-supply needs and requirements. Since the Government has formed this joint partnership with the people certainly it should not go back on its part of the bargain. The Congress should not break faith with the people with whom it has agreed to serve.

The Federal Government has an investment of more than $350,000,000 in generating and transmission facilities in the TVA area. This is owned by all of the people of America. The people of the Tennessee Valley—7,000,000 of them—750,000 of whom are users and consumers of electric power within this area—reside in 7 States—Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, and Alabama, an area of more than 80,000 square miles. The people within this region own the distributing facilities with an investment of

$160,000,000. There are 140 municipalities and rural electric cooperatives distributing TVA power in the region.

I should like to stress in a very special way, Mr. Chairman, the fact that the Tennessee Valley power system is not a wholly owned Government corporation as some would have you believe. The Tennessee Valley power system, in its entirety, consists of a joint partnership as I have indicated, the Federal Government owning the dams on the rivers and the generating facilities—the municipalities and rural electric cooperatives owning the distribution facilities. The Government's assets, as indicated, amount to 550 millions of dollars and the investment of the municipalities and cooperatives amounts to 160 millions of dollars. The real value of both the Government and people's investment is dependent upon the continued and proper operation of TVA. Both partners thus have a big investment in this joint business enterprise. The Federal Government is dependent upon its partner—the distributors—to carry TVA power to the ultimate consumer and certainly the people are dependent upon the Federal Government to supply the electric power which it uses, consumes and needs.

There is a definite concern upon the part of the people of the area that the senior partner—the Federal Government acting through the Congress—may not make sufficient appropriations to insure the consumers an adequate source of power supply. The people of the Tennessee Valley have carried out their part of the bargain with the Federal Government in the TVA development, and certainly the people are most hopeful that the Federal Government will continue to carry out theirs. Frankly, there is no reason—certainly no good reason—why this should not be done. In the TVA the Federal Government—all of the people of America—have a sound investment. Figures prove this to be true. Therefore, from an economic and strictly business point of view this mutually satisfactory arrangement should be continued. From the standpoint of service to the people and the prosperity of the Nation, the Congress should not take any action which would, in effect, say, "This much progress you shall make and no more," "Thus far you can go and no farther;" the Federal Government should not put a ceiling on power production nor freeze the amount of power which may be produced when electric power is so greatly needed both for our domestic progress and national defense purposes.

Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of common knowledge that a power shortage exists in America today. Although some people want to debate this fact, everyone—even the most ardent advocates of private power—agree that there is no great surplus or excess amount of power and they also agree that there is an increased consumer demand and a growing need for additional power for industry and national defense purposes. All over the Nation power demand is pressing hard upon supply. This growing demand for power is a testimonial of progress. It is evidence of a growing regional and national strength. It should be hailed as a triumph of democratic achievement.

Mr. Chairman, among the purposes declared by the Congress in passing the TVA Act was to develop the resources of the Tennessee Valley for the benefit of all the people; to promote the prosperity and raise the level of income of the people of the valley; and also to strengthen the entire Nation by making the Valley more productive. The Tennessee Valley, although richly endowed with natural resources, has been one of the low-income areas of the Nation. Progress has been made—progress in the development of our rivers for purposes of navigation and flood control—improvement in the fertility of our soil and the prevention of soil erosion through approved methods of conservation. A major portion of this progress is rooted in the blessings TVA has bestowed upon the people of the Tennessee Valley—the area which it directly serves. Progress has also been made through the extension of rural electrification. Community and farm electrification has been developed and expanded. Our farmers and other individual consumers are making greater use of low-cost electricity. In 1933 when TVA Act was passed, as has been indicated, only 1 farm in 28 had electric service. Today 50 farms out of every 100 are served by electricity through our efficient rural-electric cooperatives cooperating with the Tennessee Valley Authority. Within the Fifth Congressional District of Tennessee, the district which I have the honor to represent, the farms in 1930 were only 5 percent electrified. Today a little more than 51 percent of the farms of the Fifth District are served by electricity. These figures show the trend of the current program, which aims toward further expanded rural electrification within the Fifth District and rural America. In this postwar period alone, approximately 1,000 miles of new power transmission lines have been built within the Fifth District of Tennessee. It is my hope that rural electrification can be extended to the farm areas of all sections of our common country, as each strong region makes for a stronger Nation. Let us not take any action here today which would reverse this trend of progress. This progress should continue for the general health and well-being of all the Nation. The power needs of the Federal Government within the TVA area—including the TVA Chemical Engineering Experiment Station at Muscle Shoals, the Atomic Energy plant at Oak Ridge, and the various military establishments—constitute an additional reason why this steam plant should be authorized and justifies the appropriation here requested.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, if the United States Government is to keep faith with the people and carry out its responsibilities as the sole supplier of power for a region of 80,000 square miles—with 750,000 existing consumers and more than 100,000 additional farms to be served in the next few years, the additional steam plant here requested is required—certainly it should be provided by Congress.

Mr. Chairman, let me ask the membership of this House these questions:

Are we going to break our contract and end our partnership with the people of the Tennessee Valley area?

Are we going to close the door to any further progress in the South?

Are we going to cripple the national defense of our country?

Are we, in short, going to sell out to the private power trusts and utilities and stop our prosperity?

Are we going to go back to the days of the private power monopolies?—To the days of Insull, who had his yacht anchored off the shores of New York ready to set sail for parts of the world unknown?

Are we, by our action here today, going to turn the clock back as far as the future of America is concerned?

No, Mr. Chairman, I do not think so. I certainly hope that the membership of this House will not permit this to happen. It is my hope that the Members of this Congress will vote the modest sum requested by the pending amendment to the appropriation bill for the Tennessee Valley Authority. I urge adoption of the amendment, not only in behalf of the people of Tennessee, but of all the people of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MUHLENBERG].

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we are losing part of the real sense of this amendment when we say that we may be for it or against it based primarily on whether or not the job may make a profit or whether it is a good investment. I do not believe that that small consideration is what should decide our vote, because it comes down to the larger question of whether or not you believe the United States should take money away from its citizens by taxes and then to invest it in any enterprise which it believes may be profitable; and this is what we are really deciding. If we are going to do that, then we are doing something that is questionable as far as our system of government is concerned, the new principle that because the Government can make money, therefore it ought to be in business. I do not believe that that is the kind of legislation we ought to support. Let me say further, that the idea that this is based on merely supplementing the power of falling water by another means, and that therefore it is merely incidental, seems to me to be going far beyond the purpose of the original legislation which never did, in my opinion, include the idea that there should be something supplementary to the falling water, but merely that in multipurpose dams some way should be found to make useful the power of the falling water.

I do believe that when we go beyond that we are going beyond the original purpose of the act, and that is not in the general interest of the taxpayers. I trust the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the author of the amendment a question. When I heard

the amendment read I thought I should like to know specifically what this added $4,000,000 is to do.

Mr. GORE. I stated immediately after offering the amendment that it was for the purpose of restoring to the bill an amount which was included in the budget draft of the bill, of $4,000,000, to be used to commence the construction of a steam generating facility by the TVA at New Johnsonville, Tenn. May I point out further that instead of the cost being $84,000,000, as has been repeatedly cited here, the ultimate cost is to be $54,000,000, and whatever appropriation is made by the Congress for this item will be included in the amortization plan enacted by this Congress last year, by which the total amount will be repaid to the Government in 40 years, at which time the Government will still own the facility and its earning capacity.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am glad to get that statement. Let me say I am heartily in favor of the amendment. I wanted the legislative history to show clearly just what the money was being added for, in case we adopt the amendment. I hope the amendment is adopted.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Clapp's answer to a question by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] was this: "Our present estimate is that this is an $84,000,000 project."

Mr. GORE. If the gentleman will yield, I do not find disagreement with Mr. Clapp's statement, but the program of which he spoke contains not only the steam-generating plant here proposed but the installation of hydroelectric generators in dams already in existence. It is a part of a program. The steam plant itself will cost only $54,000,000.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I come from a part of the country where we have to use every drop of water in every way that is effective. One of those ways is to create hydroelectric power. With the variation that is found in the flow of every river, we cannot get maximum power production unless we do have stand-by plants.

It has always seemed ridiculous to me that those who speak so highly of good business practice will try to prevent the Government from doing the very thing that good business management always does. It has been pointed out many times during the debate that every private utility producing electric power with falling water necessarily has its stand-by plants. It is good business to do so. It is a part of American efficiency, and good business judgment to firm up the hydroelectric power and thus be enabled to contract for the sale of the same on a firm basis at a much higher rate.

Everyone knows that the cheaper the power can be produced and sold the greater the volume of sale of the power. Talk about a planned economy of scarcity—the monopolistic influence of private power utilities who try to keep production down and price up are rarely able to do so to advantage to themselves and always with inevitable harm to the communities they are serving. Electricity is one of the necessities of modern life. To limit its production and its availability to our people is about as wrong as to deprive them of air and water. I have no quarrel with the private utilities, excepting where they attempt to thwart the production of public power and thus throw a blight over a community and tend to bring it into economic bondage. With this in mind, I am giving the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee my full support.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, this matter is an issue which is far greater than the $4,000,000 involved and far greater than the starting and ultimate building of the steam generating plant proposed at New Johnsonville, Tenn. This is a matter which concerns many other projects in the future. If this amendment is defeated, it is going to have a serious effect on the development of many sections of our country and in the conservation and use by the people of the natural resources in many sections of our country.

We have to bear in mind in connection with this project that private capital refuses to or will not enter into this activity and build it with its own money. The purpose of certain private utilities is to try to confine the TVA power operations to being only a byproduct of navigation and flood-control developments, and nothing else.

We have been through this fight for 15 years in this House. There is nothing new in this fight. All through the years those of us who view these questions from a forward-looking or progressive angle have been charged with either state socialism or communism, or some other harsh characterization. Today, in 1948, this is nothing but the Government extending its secondary functions and powers to meet a situation in the interest of the public where private capital has either failed or is unable to enter into the situation and give to the people of the Tennessee Valley area the benefits that this particular steam-generating plant will bring to them. Our development of power projects and the sale of power has strengthened the private utilities and strengthened private competitive business. There has been nothing constructive about it. It is consistent in this economic age with the very necessities, purposes, and objectives of our Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate and regrettable that sectionalism would become a factor in the consideration of this amendment.

Indicative of the propaganda that has been spread about is that the construction of the steam plant would jeopardize industrial expansion outside of the area served by TVA. This has been manifested by letters reported in committee hearings from various chambers of commerce and others, expressing hostility toward TVA. No doubt, the authors of such speculations have been the private utilities whom they follow blindly.

What the power companies are really proposing is a ceiling on progress in the Tennessee Valley. They would perpetuate a poorer-than-average standard for the region, in reckless disregard of the fact that a region which is less productive than it should be is a brake on the prosperity of the entire Nation.

In short, even though the economy of this area is still predominantly agricultural, they say there has now been enough growth of industry in the Tennessee Valley. It must be stopped. At first, ignoring the fact that nearly all industries in the area buy their power through the municipal and cooperative distribution systems, they pretended solicitude for those systems by concentrating attention on the few large industries served directly by TVA. Then, when it became generally understood that the new steam plant was required to meet the growing needs of the consumers served by the municipalities and cooperatives, the attacks were broadened to include assaults on all industries in the area. A campaign of opposition was stimulated throughout the country. Letters and telegrams are pouring into Washington. The theme is identical, frequently the words are the same. They all protest the industrial development in the Tennessee Valley. Some of them assert that industries are moving there from other regions of the country, attracted by low-cost power. A few of them accuse TVA itself of soliciting such removal.

Such charges are false. Although such activities are considered a legitimate activity of every private power company, TVA does not solicit industries directly or indirectly. No single example has ever been cited to support the claim. Nor are industries moving to the TVA area to the detriment of other regions. It is true that industries have been developing there as they have been developing elsewhere, and the growth in the TVA area since 1933 has been rapid. The region is beginning to catch up with the rest of the country. Private enterprise is thriving in the Tennessee Valley, the people are more prosperous. Their progress is a gain to the Nation. The TVA was established to accomplish just this objective.

Production everywhere must be increased today; national security and economic health require it. Everywhere increased production depends upon an increase in this Nation's power supply. Almost every region is threatened with a power shortage. Private power companies are expanding their facilities, belatedly attempting to overtake the demand they earlier denied, and, by their denials, curtailed and discouraged.

Almost alone among the major power companies the management of TVA has kept abreast of the expanding requirement of a growing region. Now the private power companies, hard pressed to meet the rising demands of their own consumers, are intervening to limit the power supply to be available to the consumers of this great public power system in the future. In opposing the New Johnsonville steam plant they are asking the Congress to duplicate in the area served by TVA the restrictive practices

they have fostered in the past in the regions where they are responsible for service.

In 1933 the per capita income of the people in the TVA area was 43 percent of the national average income. At the present time it has increased to 58 percent of the national average. At the same time, we have grown in income to the point that we pay approximately 6 percent of the national taxes, as compared with 3.4 percent before TVA.

It is inconceivable that any argument could be sustained in the support of any measure that has as its aim the suppression of the progress of the people of a large section of the United States.

Let us refrain from indulging in emotional and provincial thinking, and let us resolve that America—to be strong—must not have weak links. Let us recognize that the progress of one section of our country contributes to the progress and the well-being of the whole.

If this amendment fails, we have said in effect to the American people that we can vote $6,000,000,000 for the Marshall plan for help in Europe, yet we are presently invoking the Morgenthau plan against a section of our own United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, it is to be regretted that more adequate time is not available for discussion of this very important question. Most of the remarks made here in opposition to the pending amendment should have been made in 1933 or 1938 or 1940 when legislation with respect to the Tennessee Valley Authority was under consideration. Most of those remarks have no application to the question under consideration here today.

I rise in support of the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] who is a member of the committee in charge of this bill. The sole question here presented for consideration is whether or not the Tennessee Valley Authority, which has already been in existence for a decade and a half, and doing a remarkable job, shall do the businesslike thing in carrying forward this great program; whether they shall be allowed the opportunity of doing the same thing that all of the power companies of this country do, that is, to provide for a standby steam plant, to make it possible to provide firm power for the customers to be served under this program. It is the same type of policy that is followed by every power company in the country. It is in the interest of the Federal Government. It is in the interest of the people of this country, because the people own the Tennessee Valley Authority. So the sole question presented is whether or not the Congress will permit this agency of the Government to do the businesslike thing in carrying forward this great program which has been authorized by the Congress. You placed upon those in charge of the TVA program the responsibility and duty of conducting the affairs in a businesslike manner, and the adoption of this amendment will assist them in doing so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] has expired.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and I yield back the remainder of my time and ask unanimous consent that such time as I have yielded back may be granted to the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished minority leader, Mr. RAYBURN.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I want to direct the attention of the Committee to one vitally important consideration in our discussion of this amendment. It was pointed out in the minority report that TVA is the sole supplier of electric power in an area comprising 80,000 square miles in a portion of seven States in which reside more than 5,000,000 American citizens.

Failure by the Congress to recognize that fact, and to assume its obligation to meet future as well as existing demands for power in the area would be inconsistent with the principles and responsibilities of representative government.

When in its wisdom the Congress enacted the Tennessee Valley Authority Act in 1933 it established as its objective the full-scale development of the Tennessee River for navigation, flood control, and power.

One of the essential parts of the original program was the wide distribution of electric power at low cost.

Exercising clear constitutional authority the Congress in 1939 enacted amendatory legislation that authorized the Tennessee Valley Authority to acquire the existing properties of Tennessee Electric Power Co. and other companies within the area and thus to become the sole supplier of electric power for the area.

Mr. Chairman, it seems crystal clear to me that when the Congress in 1939, approved the acquisition of these properties as the soundest approach to the elimination of a duplication of facilities, and the removal of an unhealthy economic situation, it was the congressional intent that TVA should become the sole supplier of electricity for the area.

The Senate committee report on the bill authorizing this acquisition—S. 1796, Seventy-sixth Congress—said in part, and I quote:

> The agreement reached by the Commonwealth & Southern Corp. and the Tennessee Valley Authority to carry out this sale of the Tennessee Electric Power Co. properties would end all such controversies and do away with any possible competition between the parties.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Notwithstanding the liberal price to be paid for the properties included in the contemplated sale, both the friends and critics of the Tennessee Valley Authority as well as the Commonwealth & Southern Corp., the real owner of the property to be sold, are satisfied with the price agreed upon for the sale of such properties. The elimination of potentially wasteful competition in this area would be a factor of major importance. An audit of the properties to be purchased, made by the engineers of the Tennessee Valley Authority, indicated that the value of the properties involved in the contemplated sale were not worth more than $70,000,000. The difference between this sum and the total consideration of $78,600,000 agreed upon can be regarded as the cost of eliminating this destructive competition, a competition damaging and injurious both to the Tennessee Valley Authority and to the private owner of the properties to be purchased (S. Rept. 189, 76th Cong., 1st sess. (1939), pp. 3–7).

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is wholly inconceivable to me that the Congress could have reached a decision to eliminate this competition and thereby establish TVA as the sole supplier of power for the area without at the same time recognizing the responsibility of TVA, with congressional backing, to provide in the future whatever facilities that circumstances might make necessary to serve the area over which the Authority had been given jurisdiction.

Can any Member of this House conceive of the Congress taking action that would have the effect of freezing the power supply for a great area of the country as of a certain date?

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, in the hearings before the House Committee on Military Affairs, which had House jurisdiction of the legislation affecting TVA prior to the Reorganization Act, it was clearly recognized that there was a possibility that additional generating facilities, including steam-generating plants, might become necessary.

During the hearings before that committee the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] questioned Mr. J. A. Krug, who at that time was power manager for the TVA, in part, as follows:

> Mr. CLASON. And the system of steam-generating plants you are getting from the Commonwealth & Southern, plus this water development that you contemplate, will be sufficient to supply all of that area?
>
> Mr. KRUG. Yes.
>
> Mr. CLASON. And you would not expect to have to build any more steam-generating plants in the near future?
>
> Mr. KRUG. Not in the near future. I think I should make it clear that in the power business it is virtually impossible to plan for longer than a 10-year period. Our plans run over approximately 10 years. After that time the load in this area will grow and additional capacity will have to be installed at some place in that area to take care of the growth in that load, if the present upward trend in the use of electricity continues.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Mr. CLASON. But you have no plans now to develop anything further that will require any more steam-generating plants in this area for the next 10 years?
>
> Mr. KRUG. No, sir. (Hearing before subcommittee of House Committee on Military Affairs, S. 1796, 76th Cong., 1st sess. (1939), pp. 111–112.)

I call your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the emphasis apparently placed on a 10-year period by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] and Mr. Krug. Bear in mind that these hearings were held in 1939, and next year will be 1949.

Mr. Chairman, without going into all of the details, let me point out that the entire legislative history of the TVA Act proves without a single doubt that Con-

gress, from the time it passed the original act until this hour, has assumed that construction of auxiliary or supplementary steam generating plants might be necessary. That assumption has been implemented by congressional authority in the past, and after the 1939 amendment which made TVA the sole supplier, there should no longer be even a remote doubt of the congressional intent.

Bear in mind also, Mr. Chairman, that as of today the TVA is obligated by contract to supply power to a total of 140 municipal and REA cooperative distributors. These towns and rural distributors have signed contracts in good faith with the Agency which the Congress has established as their supplier of power. They have a right to look to the Congress to see that they are not frozen.

It is no more than simple justice to these cities and farm cooperatives to provide for whatever additional generating facilities may be necessary to furnish the power for an expanding economy. I hope very much the amendment of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] is recognized.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, for a long time I have been mixed up in this fight between the public and private power, and power companies in particular. It happens that in 1935 I put through this House, and it was passed by the Senate, the Utility Holding Company Act. Propaganda went throughout the length and breadth of the country that we were putting out of business the private utility companies, but every right-thinking operating utility in the United States today that has local management and local ownership is glad that they were freed from Wall Street.

I am deeply regretful, coming from the section of the country that I do by birth, the district of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS], to hear these narrow appeals to sectionalism. It has always been my thought that a thing that made one section of our country prosperous should be felt in every other section of the country. We cannot improve any particular section of the country without that being reflected in wages and prices and employment in other sections of the country.

We have in this country two schools of thought. One of them does not think there ought to be any private utilities. I do not belong to that school. There is another school that does not think there ought to be any public power. I do not belong to that school. It has been demonstrated in the section of the country where I live, by a contract made with the Southwest Texas Power Administration, a private utility company, that they can get along. They have a contract that is mutually beneficial to both of them, and they are getting along very well. The power companies in that area, even with that competition, with this existing contract are making more money than they ever made before in their history.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

The gentleman from Texas does not respond.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be given the time allotted to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman cannot do that. The fact that the gentleman may not be here at the moment does not mean that he will not be here in another minute.

Mr. GAVIN. I will let the Chair rule on that. The gentleman is not ruling on that decision.

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes, I am, too; because I am going to object to it.

Mr. GAVIN. It is not necessary to put words in the mouth of the Chairman. Let the Chairman speak for himself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to restore to the bill $4,000,000 required to build the proposed steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., by the TVA. It has been pointed out that in 1939 the seriousness of our national defense situation entered into the authorization for TVA to build a steam plant, and that being true there was no question but that the Government had a right to make provisions for such a steam plant. If we could think of no other reason, and the minority members of the committee have pointed out many, the seriousness of world conditions today provides ample justification for building this steam plant. The thinking and activities of the membership of this Congress for months have been in terms of preparedness and, with the billions of dollars appropriated for purposes yet to stand the test, it is easy to see that business-as-usual is not the order of the day.

The importance of TVA is to be seen in the fact that the United States Government has invested in the TVA power system nearly $440,000,000 and that our Government owns the TVA real property, its generating plant, its distributing system, and its earning capacity. We have been shown by the debate here that the TVA alone supplies power to this vast section of the country and that in no other way can the growing demands of this area be met. It has been pointed out that the steam plant is nothing new in the operation of a hydroelectric system or a system which generates most of its electricity by water power and is not even new to TVA operations. Furthermore, we know that where hydro power is available for a greater part of the year that there is a great advantage in having a steam plant to operate during the dry months in order that there may be a dependable flow of power throughout the entire year.

The Tennessee Valley, as the sole supplier of power in an area of 80,000 square miles, parts of 7 States and 5,000,000 people, is an asset to the entire Nation and should be developed to meet the demands for power in that area both now and in the foreseeable future.

There is no doubt but that there is at present a terrific power shortage, not only in this section but throughout the United States. Many people have been seeking TVA for a great number of years and countless rural homes are still waiting to be supplied with electric power which has been denied them due to the heavy load now being carried by the power systems in the sections waiting to be served. The progress of this great service should go forward, not backward.

I plead with you to provide this steam plant to firm up this hydro power which you provide in this bill. The Nation needs this firm power; we need it for the farmers of the Nation, for the municipalities of this region, but, above all, an adequate supply of electricity is needed for the atomic-energy plant at Oak Ridge, and it is needed to provide the aluminum for the 70-group air force you provided today. As a member of the Armed Services Committee I know such an air force is the first move toward peace.

Weeks ago I opened the fight for such an air force because I knew it to be a move toward peace. The Senate backed this measure, 74 to 2, and in the House of Representatives there were only three dissenting votes. We must have such a 70-group air force, and, yet, all this will be in vain unless we have the electricity to provide the aluminum to build the planes.

I plead with you to provide this steam plant to firm up this new water power and thereby make available 1,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity needed for domestic use, and absolutely essential for adequate national defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri, chairman of the committee [Mr. PLOESER], is recognized for 5 minutes. It is the understanding of the Chair that the gentleman is claiming 2½ minutes of the 10 originally reserved to the committee, in addition to the 2½ minutes allowed him because of the fact that he was one of the Members on his feet seeking recognition at the time limitation was fixed.

Mr. PLOESER. That is right; and if I do not consume the time, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that it still may be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, there have been a lot of arguments go over the dam in the last 2 days. The simple fact is that the Committee on Appropriations decided after very exhaustive study of the Tennessee Valley statutes, its history, and the surrounding arguments that have been presented legally over the years that there was no authority in the Tennessee Valley Act for an authorization for the building of a steam power plant. Based upon that opinion the committee acted as it did.

I note that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], a very distinguished member of this committee, who does not agree with the majority opinion of the

committee, has offered an amendment to the bill which merely increases the appropriated amounts by $4,000,000, but deliberately avoids writing into the bill a specific authorization naming the construction of a steam power plant. That may simply be an oversight or it may be fear of the fact that there is no such authorization and that such an amendment would not hold.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I will in a moment, but not right at this point.

We do not believe that there is authority in the law for the construction of this plant. You can twist these arguments all you choose into public versus private power, but the fact remains that this committee has in its history permitted the fulfillment of the program in connection with the development of hydro-electric power and the building of such dams, despite the occasional propaganda which has emanated from the Tennessee Valley born of some government source which has tried to accuse the committee to the contrary.

I do not believe that even if this statement passed—and I do not believe it will pass—but should it pass, should you increase the amount to $4,000,000—I do not believe the Tennessee Valley Authority has the authority to use it for the construction of a steam power plant, and I think before you have finished they will find that they have $4,000,000 which cannot be spent until there is legislative authority which will necessarily have to come from a legislative committee granting them the use of this money for that purpose.

I do not believe in its wisdom that the General Accounting Office could approve the expenditure of this $4,000,000 for that purpose.

You can argue all you want to the contrary, you can satisfy any man's natural ego, but in a degree it is a little bit unfair to say to the people of the Tennessee Valley, many of whom agree with the arguments made by the proponents of the amendment that this $4,000,000 clears the track, gives them the money to begin a great project that will cost ultimately $84,000,000 to construct steam plants and all incidental facilities only to learn at a subsequent date that the administration of the Tennessee Valley Authority would not find in the law sufficient authority and could not obtain approval from the General Accounting Office. That is based upon a rather thorough study of the entire history of this case.

It is easy enough to go on making arguments that we want a steam plant, we need a steam plant, give us a steam plant, but that is not the way to legislate. Of course, the argument that if you deny or give, authorize or not authorize a steam plant for the Tennessee Valley Authority applies to every other hydroelectric project in the United States. That argument borders on the ridiculous. I cannot accept it myself.

I hope the committee will see fit, therefore, to stand by the Appropriations Committee by voting against the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the proponents of the amendment are well aware of the lack of authority. Had language been offered it is my opinion that it would have been lost on a point or order.

The construction of a statute cited as authority for an appropriation presents one of the most difficult problems in parliamentary procedure if that statute fails to specifically authorize, in definite terms, the proposed appropriation. Various decisions of the Chair have dealt with the complications presented in such a case, but the most explicit statement on the point is included in a decision by the Honorable William J. Graham, of Illinois, presiding in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union in 1922, when he stated:

First, the words of this act of November 2, 1921, must be given their fair and ordinary interpretation; and second, it seems to the Chair that the rule doubtless is that a strict construction should be given to every authority that is contained in any act of this kind. In other words, if there is doubt about the authority it ought not to be construed to be an authorization (7 Cannon 1216).

According to another decision the general statement of purpose for which a department is established, as set forth in the organic act creating it, is not to be construed as authorization for appropriations not specifically provided for in succeeding sections of the act providing for bureaus designated to carry out the declaration of purpose. In support of an appropriation in 1919 for the Department of Labor to advance the opportunities for profitable employment of the wage earners of the United States the statement of purpose—in almost identical language—included in the organic act creating the Department was cited. The chairman, the Honorable John N. Garner, of Texas, sustained the point of order. Two years later, in 1921, Mr. Joseph Walsh, of Massachusetts, sustained a point of order raised against a similar appropriation under the same purported authority—Seventh Cannon's Precedents, pages 1264, 1265.

A declaration of policy embodied in a statute has been held by the Chair not to authorize appropriations for purposes germane to the policy but not specifically authorized by the act. The Congress had enacted a law declaring it "the policy of the United States to do whatever may be necessary to develop and encourage the maintenance of a merchant marine," and that declaration was cited, in 1927, as authority for an appropriation for loans to purchasers of ships. The chairman, the Honorable James T. Begg, of Ohio, held the appropriation was not thereby authorized—Seventh Cannon's Precedents, page 1200.

A mere statutory reference to an office was held, in 1921, not to be sufficient authorization to warrant an appropriation for pay of an incumbent. In that case it was proposed to appropriate for pay of Indian police. Indian police had been mentioned in various acts of Congress and had been appropriated for in a number of annual appropriation acts but when the point of order was raised by the chairman, the Honorable Simeon D. Fess, of Ohio, held that, since the laws cited did not specifically authorize their appointment, the appropriation was not in order—Seventh Cannon's Precedents, page 1215.

Certainly there is no specific authority in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act for the construction of steam plants and the appropriation may be supported only by an interpretation of the act. The general counsel of the Authority, in a memorandum on the subject—page 1050, hearings, Government corporations appropriation bill, 1949—states as follows:

TVA's statutory authority to construct steam plants is clear. (See TVA Act, secs. 4 (f), (i), and (j); 14; 15.)

Section 4 (f) merely authorizes the Board to purchase, lease, or hold real and personal property.

Section 4 (i) authorizes the Board to acquire real estate for the construction of facilities.

Section 4 (j) sets forth the power of the Tennessee Valley Authority to construct dams, reservoirs, and so forth. That part of the section which relates to the construction of power houses and power structures generally is quoted below as follows:

and shall have power to acquire or construct powerhouses, power structures, transmission lines, navigation projects, and incidental works in the Tennessee River and its tributaries.

Section 14 directs the Board to establish the value of the various properties of the Authority and to allocate the cost thereof to the various purposes of the act. Steam plants are referred to only incidentally in this connection.

Section 15 authorized the Tennessee Valley Authority to sell bonds for use in the construction of any future dams, steam plants and other facilities. This authority to sell bonds was subsequently repealed so the entire section is without present effect.

Section 4 is the section which delineates the powers of the Authority. The particular provision important to this discussion is subsection 4 (j) wherein the authority to construct power houses is specific, and it is the only place in the act where the authority to construct any type of work or facility is definitely, directly and specifically stated. Therefore, it must be looked upon as being the basic authority for appropriations for construction of facilities necessary to the purposes of the act. When such a specific section exists in a law, the power of the Chair to indulge in speculation as to the meaning of other vague sections of the act to justify a purpose which is not included in the definite specifications is greatly reduced.

Subsection (j) authorizes the Authority to construct power houses and other types of structures "in the Tennessee River and its tributaries." It seems only logical to conclude that this section tends to authorize only the construction of hydroelectric plants inasmuch as powerhouses are specifically authorized for construction "in the river" where certainly a steam plant could not be constructed.

The purposes for which the Tennessee Valley Authority was created are set forth in section 1 of the act, as follows:

For the purpose of maintaining and operating the properties now owned by the United States in the vicinity of Muscle Shoals, Ala., in the interest of the national defense and for agricultural and industrial development, and to improve navigation in the Tennessee River and to control the destructive flood waters in the Tennessee River and Mississippi River Basins, there is hereby created a body corporate by the name of the "Tennessee Valley Authority."

It should be noted that this section does not mention development of power.

The board's authority to sell power founds in subsection L of section 5, which reads as follows:

(L) To produce, distribute, and sell electric power, as herein particularly specified.

The use of the word "particularly" in this section must have some especial significance inasmuch as it is not used in connection with the other powers vested in the Board by section 5 or, for that matter, in connection with the powers of the Authority itself as set forth in section 4. It becomes important, therefore, to determine just what is "particularly specified" in other sections of the act with respect to authority to "produce, distribute and sell electric power." Sections 9a and 10 delineate the powers of the board, and of the authority, in this field. The authority to sell power is set out in section 10 as follows:

The Board is hereby empowered and authorized to sell the surplus power not used in its operations, and for operation of locks and other works generated by it, to States, counties, municipalities, corporations, partnerships, or individuals.

This section refers only to surplus power.

Section 9 (a) authorizes the Board to generate and market power in the following words:

The Board is hereby directed in the operation of any dam or reservoir in its possession and control to regulate the stream flow primarily for the purposes of promoting navigation and controlling floods. So far as may be consistent with such purposes, the Board is authorized to provide and operate facilities for the generation of electric energy at any such dam for the use of the corporation and for the use of the United States or any agency thereof, and the Board is further authorized, whenever an opportunity is afforded, to provide and operate facilities for the generation of electric energy in order to avoid the waste of water power, to transmit and market such power as in this act provided, and thereby, so far as may be practicable, to assist in liquidating the cost or aid in the maintenance of the projects of the Authority.

It should be noted that in this section the Board is required to conduct the operation of the dams and reservoirs primarily for the purpose of promoting navigation and flood control and that the power to generate and dispose of electricity is secondary to navigation and flood control, and that the authority to furnish power to other than Government agencies is only "in order to avoid the waste of water power."

In sections 11, 12, and 12a, the sale of electric power is referred to but in each instance the language of the act meticulously refers to the sale of surplus power.

Sections 22 and 23 of the act authorizes the President, in broad language, to conduct surveys of the Tennessee River Basin and to make plans therefor looking toward the physical, economic, and social development of the area and to make recommendations to the Congress with respect to such legislation as he deems proper to carry out the general purposes so stated, but in enumerating the subjects on which he may recommend legislation the following is stated with respect to electric power:

(3) The maximum generation of electric power consistent with flood control and navigation.

Clearly, that sentence, by its reference to flood control and navigation, could refer only to hydroelectric power. There seems no question that the use of the word "particularly" in section 5L when read in conjunction with other provisions of the act delimits the power of the TVA to the sale of its surplus hydro-produced power.

There is no provision in the act which gives the TVA any authority whatever to construct power facilities, to generate electric power, or to sell electric power, except as the manufacture of such power may be incidental to the primary purposes set forth in the act—navigation and flood control—and as such electric power as is offered for sale is surplus to its own requirements. Indubitably the power business of the TVA is purely an incidental business and authority of law for appropriations for its power activities must therefore be even more specific than for the primary purposes of the act. Consequently, it does not seem appropriate to indulge in strained interpretations of indirect references in the act to support the contention that there is authority for the construction of steam plants. It must be concluded that no such authority subsists, inasmuch as, first, there is no specific authority in such act for the construction of steam plants; second, the authority of the Board to sell power is restricted to the selling of surplus power; and third, the construction of steam plants would be only for the purpose of putting the Tennessee Valley Authority in the power business as a primary rather than an incidental objective.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER].

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, TVA itself admits that it is within 500,000 kilowatt-hours of the ultimate hydro development in its valley; that the dam sites now existing on the various rivers down there will complete all the possible hydroelectric installations.

I have not taken any time in general debate, but I do for a moment wish to direct attention to page 462 of the hearings to an exchange between Mr. Clapp and myself as to the cost of generating power at the Watts Bar steam plant.

(The information requested follows:)

Generating costs—Data for fiscal year 1947

[Mills per kilowatt-hour of net generation]

	TVA hydro plants	Watts Bar steam plant
Operation	0.23	2.44
Maintenance	.05	.25
Total production expense	.28	2.69
Provision for depreciation	.36	.74
Total	.64	3.43

Mr. CLAPP. We will supply those figures, and I think too, that you will be interested in the report of this committee a year ago.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Obviously.

I cannot take too much of your time at present. But you will see that the production at the Watts Bar steam plant is 10 times the cost of hydro production. You will see also that the cost of maintenance is 5 times as much per kilowatt-hour. If you are going to embark on this proposition of providing steam plants I want you to consider that you are going into a field in which they themselves say the cost will be 10 times as great and maintenance 5 times as much.

I want to remind you too that the Monsanto Chemical Co., one of the beneficiaries of this cheap power down there is building a new plant near Dayton in my State. A lot has been said here about Insull, Wall Street, and private companies. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] said yesterday, less than 33⅓ percent of the power developed down there at present is going to the preferred customers. The Monsanto Chemical Co. is building a great plant south of Dayton, in my State, but they are preparing to buy their power and pay for it. They are not asking the United States Government to come into Ohio and build a power plant there.

It just sort of borders on the ridiculous to sit through the committee hearings with these wonderful gentlemen on the minority side, without any heat, without any recrimination, without any charge of sectionalism, and then hear them on the floor, these special pleaders, make these arguments. They simply set-up straw men, then knock them down. It is a question of those who want to continue to feed at the public trough. The municipalities and cooperatives are and can be supplied for any foreseeable period of time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, as we come to the conclusion of debate on this amendment, there are, in my opinion, some facts that have not been clearly brought out by various Members who have discussed this matter on the floor.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is the only utility in a big section of our country. It is the only source of power for parts of 7 States, for 80,000 square miles of territory, and 5,000,000 citizens. Whether the Congress was right in so providing is a moot question, because the Congress so decided and today this 5,000,000 people can look only to the TVA

for power. If the people in that area are to get electricity, it must come from the TVA, because that is the only utility. All utilities in other sections of the United States are putting up steam plants and increasing their producing facilities to meet the needs of the public, and if you turn this amendment down today you are saying to the TVA region and that region alone, "You cannot do what they are doing in every other section of the United States," and that is to increase the production of electricity in an effort to meet the needs and the demands of the people of your section. The TVA is a fact. It is a utility. As someone has said, it is a monopoly in this area. A public utility is a monopoly in practically every other section of the United States. To provide otherwise would be to have duplicate lines, duplicate facilities, and increased costs.

Now, I would like to call your attention to another fact in this case. Opponents of this amendment raise the question of the legality of the TVA building a steam plant: Who raises that question? Those who would vote against this amendment if they knew there was all the authority in the world for such construction; those who have been led to believe that development of the TVA region has hurt them—when in truth the development of the TVA area has given markets greater than ever before existed. There is not a one who raises the question of authorization who would vote for this amendment, regardless of what the law is. Let us see if a steam plant is anything new. When the TVA took over Wilson Dam constructed in 1918, they took over the hydro units, and they also took over a steam plant. When the TVA bought the hydroelectric power units of the Commonwealth & Southern they bought with it steam plants, all with the approval of this Congress. What is the difference in buying and operating a steam plant and building and operating a steam plant? However, in 1939 this Congress specifically authorized the TVA to build a steam plant, they did build it, and today the TVA operates five steam plants in connection with their hydro power system.

It has always been recognized that steam power to firm up hydro power is essential for the maximum benefit of the hydro or water power. It was recognized as stated when Wilson Dam was built. This fact was recognized by Commonwealth & Southern and by this Congress. Last year the TVA developed 1,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity by steam. Why? Because during the dry seasons the hydro capacity is low; it must be raised by steam in order to make dependable the hydro power available most of the year. Under the TVA Act dams were built on the Tennessee River for flood control and navigation, just as we have done in every other section of the United States. In arguments made here this is complained of. In North and South Dakota alone this Congress has provided for the spending of more money for flood control than has ever been spent in the TVA area for flood control, navigation, and electric current all combined, or so I am advised.

Now, we provided nothing more than was provided in other sections when we provided for flood control and navigation in the Tennessee Valley. But here—and I think it was wise, and I think it ought to be done in other sections, but whether you agree with that or not, it was done—we provided that as long as the reservoirs were kept sufficiently empty to provide reservoir space for flood control, and as long as the water was kept high enough to provide navigation, under the TVA Act the TVA, within those limits, was directed to manufacture all the electricity that the water power would produce, so as not to waste water power. Now, we all recognize that need. To fully utilize that power some provision had to be made to supply power needs during the dry seasons, steam-generated power was necessary. The Commonwealth & Southern recognized it. In the building of Wilson Dam we recognized it. This Congress recognized it in 1939 when we authorized the construction of the Watts Bar steam plant by TVA. If you have waterpower only a part of the year, it is common sense in the dry season to operate a steam plant so as to make the water power firm on a year-round basis. There is not a man here that would want to sign up with any company, TVA or otherwise, for electricity, when he knew he could obtain such electricity only when waterpower was available. You want permanent, dependable, reliable power. The TVA last year generated a billion kilowatt-hours of electricity by steam, and as a result they sold from 14,000,000,000 to 15,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity from waterpower and steam. Without the 1,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of steam electricity, they would have been able to sell only 9,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of firm electricity.

In this bill more than a quarter of a billion kilowatt-hours of electricity from water power is provided for the TVA in new hydro generators. If the steam plant is added to firm up that water power, 1,000,000,000 more kilowatt-hours of electricity will be made available to a Nation crying for electricity—not to the TVA region alone, but the country, because any surplus of electrical power the TVA has, is today, and will be made available to the private utilities. They get it now. They want all they can get from the TVA. Last year this Congress said the TVA must repay to the Government the money invested in power facilities. Of course, after the Government is repaid the TVA will still belong to the TVA. Last year a payment of more than $10,000,000 was made. The TVA will make another payment this year. The TVA made a profit because by the use of steam to firm up this water power they were able to sell from 3,000,000 to 5,000,000 more kilowatt-hours of electricity than they would have been able to do in the absence of steam power.

If this new hydro power provided by this bill is firmed up it will mean $2,000,000 per year net profit to the TVA and thus to the Government. If it is not firmed up, it must be sold at dump rates as undependable electricity and if the private companies can firm it up they make this profit.

It is my judgment that since the private utilities cannot meet their own needs they cannot firm up this power. But, if the majority is sincere in its efforts to protect the Government's investment, why do they not firm up this additional hydro power provided in this bill if thereby they can make more dependable electricity available.

Today the entire Nation faces a critical power shortage. There is less than two-tenths of 1 percent margin of safety between the amount of power used and the amount of power that is available. Today we are right on the brink of having insufficient power to meet our domestic needs. Many private companies are having to ask their customers to cut down, street lights are dim, Navy vessels are being used, electrical appliances are being damaged, all because of the national shortage. I do not see how the Congress could afford to pass up this opportunity to make another 1,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity firm and dependable. When you provide the extra hydro in this bill and a steam plant in addition not only makes this 1,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours dependable and reliable in time of great national need, but actually will result in $2,000,000 net profit to the Government over the amortization of the cost of the steam plant. If you do not do this the new hydro power must be sold as dump power, power that is not firmed up. If you do not permit the TVA to firm this power up, in my opinion, they are going to have to continue to sell it at cheap rates to big industry, which can run when the power is available and close down when it is not, and yet that is what the opponents of this amendment say they object to.

Today we have passed through this Congress an appropriation for a 70-group air force. That air force is on paper. It is going to take planes, and planes are going to take aluminum. That aluminum must largely come from the Tennessee Valley, if power is available. In the Tennessee Valley area we have the Oak Ridge plant manufacturing atomic bombs and largely supplied by TVA power. It is requiring today great amounts of electricity and it will take more in the future. I say to you that if you do not grant this steam plant today you are saying to the country that 1,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity that the country needs shall not be made available as firm, dependable power because we do not want to add a steam plant to go with the new hydro power provided for by this bill where there are already 5 steam plants which you have provided for the hydro power already in operation by the TVA. You say you are not interested in the $2,000,000 annual net profit to the Government that would come from the tying of the steam plant into the hydro system—and yet you claim you want the TVA to return the amount invested to the Treasury.

No, the people of other sections have been led to believe that the development of this area has been at their expense. This is not true. If all undeveloped sections could be developed, it would help all the rest of the country. The added purchasing power and goods purchased

in this area is tremendous and provides a great new market for products from all sections of the United States.

The Nation needs this extra firm power a steam plant would bring to the new hydro units provided in this bill. The Government needs the $2,000,000 net profit which would result, to pay for our investment in the TVA. I cannot see how, in view of our dire shortage of electricity, anyone could oppose the construction of this plant. Since this is the only source of power in the area you should want this utility to meet the needs of the people it serves. The private utilities will get any surplus they have.

If the Republican leadership today turns down this amendment, in my opinion, you demonstrate that as a party you are not only against the development of public power, but are for strangling that which we have. You are for continuing our present shortage and for giving this $2,000,000 that the TVA could net from this great natural resource to the private power interests.

Today you make your record and I think for whatever it may be worth, if you defeat this amendment you say to the States of Tennessee and Kentucky, and others as well, and to the great West and Midwest, the Republican Party is opposed to public power development. Not only that, but it is opposed to permitting the production of the maximum power where public power already exists. I do not believe you want to go to the country with any such record.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if there has ever been a time in the history of this House when so much energy and persuasive eloquence has been spent for the benefit, the special benefit, the special privilege of the Aluminum Co. of America, the Monsanto Co., and all the other great industrials who will be the only direct and immediate beneficiaries of this steam plant.

The gentleman from Mississippi who has just had the floor made an impassioned plea for more power in the Tennessess Valley. "If this steam plant is not provided, the Tennessee Valley will run short of power." What is the matter with those great companies who are presently cashing in on the subsidized cheap power? Cannot each one of those companies build a steam plant for its own surplus requirements just as cheaply as can the taxpayers of the United States? Is there any reason, even, why some of the great cities and municipalities of the area should not build their own steam plants? As to those municipalities, that necessity of course will not arise, as was pointed out yesterday and repeatedly today, because the present production of hydroelectric energy by the present installations of the Tennessee Valley Authority is entirely ample to meet the demands of the municipalities and cooperatives as far as the imagination can see, and it was so admitted and conceded without reservation by Mr. Clapp, who is Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Much has been made of the fundamental principle of public development of electric water power. There is nothing in this bill which in any way, shape, or form limits hydroelectric development or limits the right of TVA to take advantage of the water-power resources of the valley. The bill carries $29,000,000 for the development of new and additional generators, 11 of which will produce 400,000 more kilowatts when completed in the next year or two, which is almost 20 percent additional capacity. In addition to that, TVA will shortly have the benefit of 200,000 more kilowatts to be generated from new dams constructed by the Corps of Engineers on the Cumberland River. So that you can look forward to 600,000 more kilowatts of power to be distributed by the TVA in the next 2 or 3 years. So it is quite obvious that the steam plant is not needed for the fundamental purposes of TVA, which was to supply its byproduct—electric energy—to the preferred class of customers in the valley, to wit, municipalities and cooperatives. Therefore, what does this steam-plant proposal in effect do? It in effect marks a departure—a radical and fundamental departure—from the initial purposes of Congress in the enactment of the TVA enabling law. It marks a departure from the philosophy of TVA accepted by David Lilienthal, whom no one can charge with being reactionary in matters of TVA or public power. In the committee report we quote that same distinguished gentleman who is now Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission testifying before a joint committee of the Congress. In his testimony he points out most emphatically the fundamental difference between TVA and a public utility. Says he:

> A public-utility company has no problem of increasing demands. It merely builds new facilities.

"TVA, however," says he, "builds its dams not in response to the power-market situation, but only in response to the demands of navigation and flood control," which were the initial and primary purposes for which TVA was originally set up. Therefore, if this amendment is adopted, you will not only fly in the face of the initial purpose of TVA, you will not only completely flaunt constitutional limitations, you will not only fly in the face of a normal and proper construction of the act and the limitations of authority contained in the act, but you will be opening the door wide to unlimited development of TVA as, primarily a great utility system, by permitting the construction of 1, 2, 10, 20 steam plants—there is no limit. You will be passing beyond the phase of development of water power into the phase of subsidizing a great unlimited public utility for the benefit of a small percentage of the American population who have the good fortune to reside in the Tennessee Valley and those few great industrialists and their stockholders who had the good sense to move in and take advantage of that cheap power. It becomes, in effect, the Tennessee Valley versus the United States and all the other taxpayers. You are confronted with Mr. Lilienthal on one hand and Mr. Clapp on the other. It is not just a question of the steam plant, it is a question of the fundamental principles involved. Is the United States at this time, by means of an appropriation bill to determine a great question of policy, to wit, shall we establish a great Government utility to be subsidized by the taxpayers of the Nation for the benefit of a small group of people who live in the Tennessee Valley? That is the fundamental issue. That is the issue which the committee believes should be decided only after the full and careful consideration afforded by proper hearings before the appropriate legislative committee of the House.

I therefore urge that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, several proponents of the amendment to increase the appropriation for TVA by $4,000,000, the four million to be used to start the building of a steam-generating power plant, have complained that sectionalism has been injected into this debate. I have not heard anyone who opposes this appropriation state that this was a question involving sectionalism.

I recognize the fact the TVA is a going concern. We have spent hundreds of millions of dollars in developing TVA and while I was not a Member of Congress when the Government embarked on this program, I have on several occasions supported recommendations made by the administration for the further development of the TVA area.

The question before us today is different from any we have previously considered. It is admitted that this is the first appropriation for an $84,000,000 steam-generating power plant. By no stretch of the imagination can anyone claim that flood control or navigation is involved in any way.

No one can successfully contend that the taxpayers of the United States are not subsidizing those who purchase electric energy from the TVA. Can there be any sound justification for having the Federal Government pay part of the electric-power bill for consumers of electricity in an expanded TVA program?

If we build a huge steam plant in Tennessee it will not be long before the Members from California will ask for an appropriation for steam plants in the Central Valley area. That prediction is strengthened by listening to the statement of the distinguished Member from the Central Valley area, the gentleman from California, Congressman LEROY JOHNSON, who has today spoken in support of the amendment now before us. Following the request for steam plants in California there will come like requests from every other area in which we now are developing at Federal expense hydroelectric energy. A few years from now and the taxpayers of the United States will be subsidizing the electric-power bills of about a third of the people of the United States. The

next logical step would be to nationalize the electric-power industry in the United States.

A great deal has been said during this debate about the power supplied by TVA for the war industries located in that area. I want the record to show that in my State, and I believe the same can be said of all of the Eastern States, that not a single hour's production was lost during the war years by failure of the privately owned public power companies to provide the necessary electric energy.

In his state of the Union message to Congress President Truman urged that private business expand their various industries, thereby increasing the production of needed consumer goods, making available new investment opportunities and as a direct result of such expanded business activity increase the revenues of the Federal Government. If the Federal Government is going to set up unfair competition for private business where, I ask you, will the needed tax revenues come from in the future.

I wish that before this debate comes to an end some proponent of the requested appropriation would tell us just how much the TVA program has cost the Federal Treasury, the State treasuries in that area, and the local communities who would otherwise be now collecting taxes from privately owned public utilities. In my own State of Connecticut our electric light and power companies in the year 1946 paid taxes to local, State, and Federal governments amounting to almost $12,000,000. On the basis of the kilowatt-hours sold to consumers this tax amounts to 4.81 mills or about a half a cent per kilowatt-hour. In other words, if these companies did not pay taxes they could reduce their charge for electric power by about one-half a cent per kilowatt-hour without reducing their profits and without reducing wages of their employees.

I accept the opinion of the subcommittee who have reported this bill to us in their finding that there is no authority in law for the appropriation of funds for the building of a steam plant. If those who are charged with the responsibility of administering the TVA Act now want that authority, I believe they should come in with legislation requesting such authority and in that way give the Congress an opportunity to thoroughly debate the issue involved from every possible angle.

I strongly urge the defeat of the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. PLOESER and Mr. GORE to act as tellers.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 120, noes 157.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman from Texas whether he knows of any other amendments to be offered and whether he would object to considering the bill as read, amendments to any paragraph of the bill to be——

Mr. MAHON. I may say to the gentleman from Missouri that I personally know of no other amendment to be offered from this side. There may, however, be other amendments.

I have no objection to considering the bill as read.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, the bill to be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there a point of order against any of the remaining paragraphs of the bill? The Chair will entertain them at this time. Points of order will not be entertained after the consideration of an amendment has been undertaken. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word of the section referring to the RFC. That section of this bill which contains the appropriations for the administration of the RFC reminds us that the Committee on Appropriations, and perhaps this particular subcommittee, has a very important job to do. Under the European recovery program, now called the economic cooperation plan, the RFC was authorized, as I understand it, to advance $1,000,000,000 to get the program started. I think it is important that this House should know what that money is being spent for, and in particular, I want to ask this subcommittee how much, if any, of this appropriation we are discussing today, is being used for the administration of the foreign-aid program, thus in effect adding indirectly to the appropriation the Subcommittee on Deficiency Appropriations is discussing for foreign aid. We should know it, Mr. Chairman, if the administration asks for money for one purpose, and uses it for some other purpose; or if it asks for money for one agency, and then implements the appropriation by using funds allotted another agency.

This leads me directly, Mr. Chairman, to another phase of the presently confused subject of foreign aid. For more than a year, since the distinguished occupant of the White House decided there had to be a foreign policy named after him, instead of just a foreign policy credited to his predecessor, we have been told that we were working to "contain communism." The idea is alliterative but deceptive. First, we had the Truman doctrine. To the obvious embarrassment of General Marshall—excuse me, Secretary Marshall—who had only a few weeks before he told the Chinese National Government that it would have to combine with Communists, to receive any more United States aid, we told the nations of Europe they would get no aid from us, unless they separated completely from the Communists.

As the European recovery plan developed, the idea was whooped up that by our mighty efforts and great sacrifices, we would prevent the further spread of communism in Europe. This may also embarrass Secretary Marshall—who is without question an honest man personally, and who doubtless wishes he were just Mr. Marshall—for I now read by the papers that we are still shipping scrap iron to Czechoslavakia, behind the iron curtain. I read that when the head of one of our organizations in Germany called a halt to this practice, the freeze order was countermanded by higher authority. Mr. Marshall might like to explain how this contains communism. I would also like to know if it is true that designs and specifications of our more recent aircraft, furnished by agreement to one of our most trusted allies, also found their way back of the same iron curtain, through the socialistic government now controlling that nation. Does that contain communism?

These are two of many incidents. Ships loading at a New Jersey port, with important machinery and supplies for Russia, at the same time the President was talking about containing communism. The entire output of locomotives from one American manufacturer going to Russia. In a recent speech, Mr. W. Averell Harriman, our new Ambassador at Large, or should I say largess, who was approved for that job by another body of the Congress at the same time the House of Representatives was demanding he release a letter from Mr. J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI, which formed the basis for an entirely proper question concerning the security factor in keeping a much-publicized scientist on the job he still holds in the Department of Commerce; in that speech Mr. Harriman is reported to have said, "This country has embarked on a program to face Communist aggression." In the same speech Mr. Harriman is also reported to have advocated "increased trade between western Europe and Russia, to break down barriers between them" and that he added that "the United States would be ready to extend a friendly hand to the Kremlin."

When I was in college there used to be a joke about one of the professors who was reported to have spoken of going out of the room with his back to the door in front of him. Mr. Harriman is the only other person in my experience who could undoubtedly perform this rather difficult feat.

The truth of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that no nation of Europe, and no intelligent Member of this Congress, and no understanding citizen of the United States has the slightest idea that the Truman doctrine, nor the Marshall plan, nor ERP, nor ECA, will contain communism. The only thing that will contain communism is strength, supported by courage and determination, and backed by a firm and unchanging foreign policy on the part of the State Department of the United States.

Mr. Hallvard Lange, the Foreign Minister of Norway, was undoubtedly expressing the attitude of all foreign ministers when he was quoted in the Norwegian News of Brooklyn on March 4, 1948, as saying that—

> Instead of hampering trade with eastern Europe, the Marshall plan presupposes an increased commerce between eastern Europe (i. e., Russia) and the 16 countries.

Mr. Lange continued:

Thus, we have during the past 2 months signed a new trade treaty with the Soviet Union which for 1948 will give us one-third of our needs of our bread grains in exchange for herring, whale oil, and similar products. Our trade with Poland brings us coal in exchange for fish, horses, and industrial products; and in the near future we will begin discussions with Czechoslovakia for a new trade treaty. In the same manner we hope to expand our commerce with Hungary, Yugoslavia, and the eastern European states where our trade is now small.

Understand me, Mr. Chairman, I am not objecting now to this trade between European countries, particularly when it is confined to non-war-making commodities. But I rise to remark that we should be honest about it, and that the State Department should be honest with the American people. I want the House Committee on Appropriations to take time enough to find out, for all of us, whether this is a program to contain communism or one which in reality extends a friendly hand to communism. I want that committee to find out just what is going behind the iron curtain from this country, and how, and who pays for it. I want to know these answers, and some other answers along the same lines, before the Members of Congress are asked to vote billions of hard-earned money, belonging to the men, women, and children of the United States. I do not want that money used largely to keep alive and underwrite Socialist and Communist governments in Europe.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, it may seem inappropriate, with the temperatures we are enjoying here at this time, to raise this question which I have done repeatedly throughout this session. But I think no one who has had an opportunity to read the report of the Subcommittee on Armed Services, which was recently published, dealing with the situation confronting us as a nation in terms of the lack of petroleum and petroleum products, will take issue with the questions I wish to address to the chairman of the committee with reference to the committee's intention as to expenditures of the appropriations in this bill. I confess I have found very little in the hearings or in discussing the matter with the committee that would indicate any substantial amount of new installations or proposed conversion from coal to oil.

However, in connection with the Panama Railroad there is a provision for dieselizing a number of locomotives in that area. That raises the question which is before us even in this country in terms of the wise extension of Diesel power on our railroads at a time when none of us know whether we are going to be in a fuel-oil shortage next winter, or whether we are going to be, in fact, able to provide the necessary and essential petroleum products with which to operate our military services. I assume, too, that in connection with the operation of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, both directly and probably indirectly, this very problem is involved. I have talked with the chairman. I know he is in accord with the sensible operation of any kind of conservation of our fuel resources.

I simply want to ask this question for the record and for the guidance of those who have to spend these funds: Is it the committee's intention that there shall not be new installations of oil-burning equipment or conversion from coal to oil equipment except where it can be clearly demonstrated that that is economically wise in areas where there may not be any such problem to meet?

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman can certainly feel sure that that is the opinion of the chairman of the subcommittee, and I think it is probably safe for me to express that as the opinion of the entire subcommittee. I know of no exception to that opinion.

Mr. HESELTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GRANT of Indiana, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6481) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GORE. In its present form, I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GORE moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report it back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: On page 2, line 9, strike out "$27,389,061" and insert "$31,389,061"; and in line 13 strike out "$21,689,000" and insert "$25,689,000."

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GORE. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 152, nays 192, not voting 87, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]

YEAS—152

Abbitt	Forand	Morris
Abernethy	Garmatz	Morrison
Albert	Gary	Murdock
Allen, La.	Gathings	Murray, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.	Gordon	Norblad
Angell	Gore	Norton
Bates, Ky.	Gorski	O'Brien
Beckworth	Gossett	Pace
Bland	Granger	Passman
Blatnik	Grant, Ala.	Patman
Bloom	Gregory	Peden
Boggs, La.	Hagen	Peterson
Bonner	Hardy	Phillips, Tenn.
Brooks	Harless, Ariz.	Pickett
Brown, Ga.	Harrison	Poage
Bryson	Havenner	Preston
Buckley	Hays	Price, Fla.
Bulwinkle	Hill	Price, Ill.
Burleson	Holifield	Priest
Byrne, N. Y.	Horan	Rains
Camp	Huber	Rankin
Cannon	Hull	Rayburn
Carroll	Isacson	Redden
Celler	Jackson, Wash.	Regan
Chapman	Javits	Richards
Chenoweth	Jennings	Riley
Colmer	Johnson, Calif.	Rockwell
Combs	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Fla.
Cooley	Karsten, Mo.	Sabath
Cooper	Kefauver	Sadowski
Courtney	Kelley	Sasscer
Cox	Kennedy	Smathers
Cravens	Kerr	Smith, Va.
Davis, Ga.	Kilday	Somers
Davis, Tenn.	King	Spence
Delaney	Klein	Stanley
Dingell	Lanham	Stockman
Donohue	Lesinski	Teague
Doughton	Lucas	Thomas, Tex.
Douglas	Lynch	Tollefson
Durham	McCormack	Trimble
Eberharter	McMillan, S. C.	Vinson
Ellsworth	Mack	Wheeler
Evins	Madden	Whitten
Fallon	Mahon	Whittington
Feighan	Manasco	Williams
Fernandez	Mansfield	Wilson, Tex.
Fisher	Marcantonio	Winstead
Flannagan	Mills	Wood
Fogarty	Monroney	Worley
Folger	Morgan	

NAYS—192

Allen, Calif.	Davis, Wis.	Hoffman
Allen, Ill.	Dawson, Utah	Hope
Anderson, Calif.	Devitt	Jenison
Arends	Dirksen	Jenkins, Ohio
Arnold	Dolliver	Jensen
Auchincloss	Domengeaux	Johnson, Ill.
Bakewell	Dondero	Johnson, Ind.
Banta	Eaton	Jonkman
Bates, Mass.	Elliott	Judd
Bennett, Mich.	Elsaesser	Kean
Bennett, Mo.	Elston	Kearns
Bishop	Engel, Mich.	Keating
Blackney	Fellows	Keefe
Boggs, Del.	Fenton	Kersten, Wis.
Bolton	Fletcher	Kilburn
Bradley	Foote	Knutson
Bramblett	Fulton	Landis
Brehm	Gamble	Latham
Brophy	Gavin	LeCompte
Brown, Ohio	Gearhart	LeFevre
Buck	Gillette	Lewis, Ky.
Buffett	Gillie	Lewis, Ohio
Burke	Goff	Lichtenwalter
Busbey	Goodwin	Lodge
Byrnes, Wis.	Graham	McConnell
Canfield	Grant, Ind.	McCowen
Carson	Griffiths	McDonough
Case, N. J.	Gross	McDowell
Chadwick	Gwinn, N. Y.	McGarvey
Chiperfield	Gwynne, Iowa	McGregor
Church	Hale	McMahon
Clason	Hall, Edwin Arthur	McMillen, Ill.
Clevenger	Hall, Leonard W.	MacKinnon
Coffin	Halleck	Macy
Cole, Kans.	Hand	Maloney
Cole, Mo.	Harness, Ind.	Martin, Iowa
Cole, N. Y.	Harris	Mason
Corbett	Harvey	Mathews
Cotton	Herter	Merrow
Coudert	Heselton	Meyer
Crawford	Hess	Michener
Crow	Hinshaw	Miller, Md.
Cunningham	Hoeven	Miller, Nebr.
Curtis		Morton
Dague		Muhlenberg

Murray, Wis.	Rogers, Mass.	Stevenson
Nicholson	Ross	Sundstrom
Nixon	Sadlak	Taber
Norrell	St. George	Talle
O'Hara	Sanborn	Taylor
O'Konski	Sarbacher	Tibbott
Owens	Schwabe, Mo.	Towe
Patterson	Schwabe, Okla.	Twyman
Phillips, Calif.	Scott,	Vail
Ploeser	Hugh D., Jr.	Van Zandt
Potter	Scrivner	Vorys
Potts	Seely-Brown	Vursell
Ramey	Shafer	Wadsworth
Reed, Ill.	Short	Walter
Reed, N. Y.	Simpson, Ill.	Weichel
Reeves	Simpson, Pa.	Wigglesworth
Rich	Smith, Kans.	Wolcott
Riehlman	Smith, Maine	Wolverton
Rizley	Smith, Ohio	Woodruff
Robertson	Stefan	Youngblood

NOT VOTING—87

Andersen, H. Carl	Hedrick	Mitchell
	Heffernan	Multer
Andresen, August H.	Hendricks	Mundt
	Hobbs	Nodar
Andrews, N. Y.	Holmes	O'Toole
Barden	Jackson, Calif.	Pfeifer
Barrett	Jarman	Philbin
Battle	Jenkins, Pa.	Plumley
Beall	Johnson, Okla.	Poulson
Bell	Johnson, Tex.	Powell
Bender	Jones, N. C.	Rees
Boykin	Jones, Wash.	Rivers
Buchanan	Kearney	Rohrbough
Butler	Kee	Rooney
Case, S. Dak.	Keogh	Russell
Chelf	Kirwan	Scoblick
Clark	Kunkel	Scott, Hardie
Clippinger	Lane	Sheppard
Crosser	Larcade	Sikes
Dawson, Ill.	Lea	Smith, Wis.
Deane	Lemke	Snyder
D'Ewart	Love	Stigler
Dorn	Ludlow	Stratton
Ellis	Lusk	Thomas, N. J.
Engle, Calif	Lyle	Thompson
Fuller	McCulloch	Welch
Gallagher	Meade, Ky.	West
Hart	Meade, Md.	Whitaker
Hartley	Miller, Calif.	Wilson, Ind.
Hébert	Miller, Conn.	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. H. Carl Andersen for, with Mr. Plumley against.

Mr. Deane for, with Mr. Gallagher against.

Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Hartley against.

Mr. Chelf for, with Mr. Nodar against.

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Scoblick against.

Mr. Johnson of Texas for, with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey against.

Mr. Dorn for, with Mr. Andrews of New York against.

Mr. Lane for, with Mr. Kunkel against.

Mr. Crosser for, with Mr. Miller of Connecticut against.

Mrs. Lusk for, with Mr. Hardie Scott against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Jones of Washington with Mr. Engle of California.

Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. Hébert.

Mr. Case of South Dakota with Mr. Kee.

Mr. Poulson with Mr. Sheppard.

Mr. August H. Andresen with Mr. Philbin.

Mr. Bender with Mr. Hobbs.

Mr. Butler with Mr. Sikes.

Mr. Beall with Mr. Lyle.

Mr. Kearney with Mr. Lea.

Mr. Love with Mr. Clark.

Mr. McCulloch with Mr. Hart.

Mr. Meade of Kentucky with Mr. Hedrick.

Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Thompson.

Mr. Mundt with Mr. West.

Mr. Rohrbough with Mr. Jones of North Carolina.

Mr. Rees with Mr. Battle.

Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Larcade.

Mr. D'Ewart with Mr. Kirwan.

Mr. Fuller with Mr. Keogh.

Mr. Welch with Mr. Pfeifer.

Mr. Smith of Wisconsin with Mr. Rooney.

Mr. Snyder with Mr. Heffernan.

Mr. Stratton with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Russell with Mr. O'Toole.

Mr. Ellis with Mr. Multer.

Mr. HAGEN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and include statistics.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the West Memphis News.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two articles on the subject of extending trade pacts and an editorial on the subject of cooperatives.

Mr. MORGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the American Medical Association and one appearing in the Washington Post.

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an editorial.

Mr. THOMPSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LICHTENWALTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. McMAHON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. BAKEWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. REED of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by T. Albert Potter.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $213, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article and an editorial.

WATER-FILTRATION PLANT, HIGHLAND FALLS, N. Y.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2359) to authorize the payment of a lump sum, in the amount of $100,000, to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y., as a contribution toward the cost of construction of a water-filtration plant, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BATES of Massachusetts, ARENDS, COLE of New York, BROOKS, and SASSCER.

PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 589, Rept. No. 1918), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H. R. 6419, authorizing the construction, repairs, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AGREEMENTS BETWEEN CARRIERS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 581 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the considera-

tion of the bill (H. R. 221) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides consideration for H. R. 221, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers.

I do not believe there is any necessity for me to go into a detailed explanation of the bill. It is practically the same bill as H. R. 2536, which we considered here December 10, 1945. At that time we debated the bill for 2 hours. And after all of the aspects and ramifications of the bill were understood, we passed it by a vote of 277 to 45. The bill was reported in the Senate, but died on the Senate Calendar without having been considered. Now the House must go through the mechanics of passing the bill again.

But allow me to review briefly the situation which makes this legislation necessary. At present, common carriers—especially the railroads—are caught in a strangle hold between two Federal statutes. The first requires them to do certain acts while the antitrust division contends it is unlawful for them to do the very acts required of them by the first.

Under the Interstate Commerce Act, carriers are required to join with one another in establishing through routes and joint rates. They are required to make agreements with respect to interchange of cars and equipment between carriers and on a number of other subjects. Now, despite the fact that railroads are required by the Interstate Commerce Act to enter into these agreements with one another, the Department of Justice has sought, and is seeking, to prosecute them under the antitrust laws for the very acts required of them by law.

For more than 50 years, as a matter of convenience, rates have been worked out between the railroads and the shippers by a system that is sometimes referred to as a conference system, or as a system by agreement. Under this system, the members of the railroad association meet and discuss rate problems and try as best they can to arrive at an agreement. If they arrive at an agreement of what the new rate will be on a particular commodity, they then send out notices to interested shippers. The shippers are then given an opportunity to be heard and to protest if they wish. But nine times out of ten the shippers and the railroads agree on a certain rate. The rate is then filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission and becomes effective if no protest is made within 30 days.

Everybody thought these agreements were perfectly legal, proper, and in the public interest until somebody in the Department of Justice came up with the suggestion that such agreements are in violation of the antitrust law, and since then the Government has instituted several suits against the railroads, and they threaten more suits unless something is done to prevent them. This bill is designed to do just that—to prevent the Department of Justice from interfering with a trade practice which has been recognized for more than 50 years and which was recognized as being in the public interest.

This bill exempts a certain class of agreements between the railroads from the antitrust laws, while at the same time protecting the public from price-fixing practices which would be detrimental to the public welfare. This safeguard is provided by requiring approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission of these agreements between railroads and by specifically prohibiting certain agreements.

Under the rule, 2 hours has been allowed to debate this bill. The Rules Committee thought that a sufficient amount of time in view of the fact that we have all had the benefit of 2 hours of debate on the same bill less than 18 months ago. Other than providing consideration, the rule does not give any special protection for the bill. Amendments may be offered to it under the 5-minute rule and points of order may be raised against the bill, although I doubt that the bill is vulnerable in that respect.

I think that the previous vote on a bill which was practically identical to this one shows that an overwhelming majority of you will favor this bill, and I doubt that it will require any special urging on my part to secure adoption of this resolution or passage of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the Rules Committee the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] has stated, it is true that we passed a similar bill in 1945, but it is claimed that this is a better bill than that one. If this is a better bill, perhaps if we wait another couple of years, the committee will report a still better bill, and one which is more just to the shippers and consumers. The underlying reason for bringing out this bill is of course to preclude the State of Georgia and the United States from proceeding with its action against the railroads which are charged with being guilty of violating the antitrust law. I do not see why we should deprive the courts of the right to pass upon that important question. Whether these railroads are guilty or not, I am of the opinion that neither the Department of Justice nor the State of Georgia would have proceeded against them unless they had sufficient evidence to justify the action. The bill before us is in the interest of the railroads that desire to agree between themselves as to rates. The bill favors the steel, oil, and other big shippers, and will operate against the smaller shippers and naturally against the consumers. I know that the gentlemen who have prepared the views of the minority, which I consider a very splendid and honest résumé of conditions will explain later on the unjustifiable desire and insistence upon passing this legislation before the courts can act on it.

So I shall not dwell any further upon the provisions of the bill, because the gentleman who signed the minority report, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA], has devoted much time and study to the bill and can explain it more satisfactorily and in much clearer terms than I possibly can.

But I do say this: You gentlemen claim you want free enterprise. Free enterprise—I hear that every day. This actually kills free enterprise. I do not see how you will be able to justify yourselves in voting for the bill. Of course, the railroads want it. So I know that it will be passed, because, unfortunately, they have a way of misleading Congress and legislative bodies in such smooth and convincing ways that many of you gentlemen feel sorry—and sometimes almost cry—for these unfortunate railroads that have suffered so much. Of course, they did suffer during the years 1930 up to 1934, under Hoover. Many of them went into bankruptcy. But since that time, since the Democratic Party came into power, those railroads have accumulated tremendous profits and surpluses, as my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED], a member of the Judiciary Committee, has stated on the floor so many times. So, really, if his investigation as to the great increase in incomes on the part of the railroads is true—and I have utmost confidence in him, because I know he is an honorable and honest man and has given the House the facts, when he has tried to impress the House with the real facts relative to the railroads—I do not see how you can vote for this bill. Nevertheless, I feel that a vast majority of the Members have again been led astray by the strong and powerful railroad lobbyists and the capable gentlemen representing them here, and they have again impressed the membership with the great need of this legislation that has tied their hands, as it is claimed, in that they were expected to comply with the law of the land and not violate any special secret agreements made against the shippers. After all, it is the consumer who has to pay the bill.

I am not going to detain the House. The rule will be passed, I know, and I strongly suspect, Mr. Speaker, that even this bill will be passed, notwithstanding the fact that the Senate has acted already and has eliminated a provision whereby the action pending against these railroads should be allowed to proceed to a conclusion. In this bill that is brought before us, however, that provision is eliminated. I cannot understand why people should rely on the other House to safeguard and protect their interests.

Up to a few years ago, Mr. Speaker, the country looked to Congress. Now it looks to the Senate to save the people from the arbitrary action of this body. But it seems to me, much as I dislike to say it, that conditions are changing; in

fact, I know they are changing. Consumers will get no protection here. However, I believe that after the next election there will be people elected who will represent the real democracy and the rights and interests of the masses of the people in the country. In conclusion, let me call attention to the following paragraphs which appear in the minority report and more thoroughly explain why this legislation would be against the best interest of the small shipper and the consumer who, after all, as I stated before, will be obliged to foot the bill:

It is denied, that the reason for pressing these suits is the pending suits against the railroads. The proponents of the bill claim that the legislation is needed merely to "clarify" existing law to allow carriers to get together in order to comply with the Interstate Commerce Act, particularly as to the making of joint rates and through routes. The minority maintains that the legislation is not needed for that purpose because the carriers now have authority to collaborate in making such rates.

Some have attempted to interpret opposition to passage of this legislation as an indication of lack of confidenee in the Interstate Commerce Commission. Whether the Commission is competent or whether it would faithfully discharge its duty imposed by this legislation, is not germane. Under the terms of the bill once the basic agreement of the Association of American Railroads and its satellite organizations are approved by the Commission, the subsequent acts performed under the agreements do not have to be approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission but are exempt from the antitrust laws because the acts are carried on pursuant to the basic agreement. It goes without saying that the basic agreements offered for approval will not be likely to indicate practices that would preclude their approval under the vague standards set up by the bill, such as indicated in paragraph (2), typical of which is the requirement that the Commission shall approve the agreement if it finds it is in "furtherance of the national transportation policy declared in this act."

The most vicious feature of paragraph (4) is that it provides for approval of agreements between carriers of different classes, thereby extending the monopoly power to the whole industry collectively. Under these provisions the railroads, motor carriers, water carriers, and so on, could take part in one organization and control the rates and services for each class of transportation so as to determine the freight charges paid by shippers and the service they are to receive. The terms of the paragraph providing for approval of agreements as to joint rates or through routes do not limit the arrangements to connecting carriers actually handling the traffic and thereby participating in the joint rate. An agreement could be approved under which a composite organization of carriers of all classes could determine the joint rates of any connecting carriers. As the greater part of the traffic of the Nation moves on joint rates, such an organization would be one of the most powerful forces for monopoly in the entire economic system.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. This is not on the question of agriculture. Agriculture will be obliged to pay. However, I yield, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman mentions "real democracy." Is the gentleman visualizing Henry Wallace in power?

Mr. SABATH. I visualize that the Democratic Party will in its own right and in its own name bring about the election of progressive Democrats, without the aid of Henry Wallace but with the aid of all honest, sincere, progressive and independent Republicans throughout the Nation.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. That clarifies it.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 3, the Supreme Court handed down a decision that shocked and surprised, in my opinion, a great majority of the people of this Nation. Yesterday, May 10, the Court reiterated this decision and said it was the law.

For many years private citizens on a voluntary basis have entered into covenants and agreements which in effect permitted them to choose their neighbors and associates.

For the last 65 years the courts have said that such voluntary agreements were permissible and enforcible by the State courts. Several times during these years the Supreme Court has said that a State or political subdivision thereof shall not enforce such action, by interpreting the law that it was the right of the private individual and enforcible.

Now in these recent decisions the Supreme Court has said that even private individuals who enter into such covenants cannot as a matter of public policy enforce them. Such a decision is wholly inconsistent, I think, with the practical realities. It is saying to the people of this country that they have a freedom to which they are entitled, but because it may conflict with someone else's civil rights, this freedom cannot be enforced.

We might ask, Mr. Speaker, about the civil rights of those who have entered into these agreements for many years and have proceeded on the basis that such agreements were legal and enforcible. To me this raises a most important question in the life of our Government.

The success of any government, and more especially our democratic form of government, must be based on law and order. Historically many governments were established that were inevitably destined to fall because they did not have as the principles of their government the principle of law and order.

Throughout the history of our Nation I am thankful that this principle has prevailed. It is recognized by our people as the bulwark of our Government. We can continue as a great, free, and strong Nation, the champion of liberty, only in so long as this principle is maintained. Our courts, an intrinsical part of our Government, are designed as the guiding light for this principle.

The integrity of our courts must be maintained. I may not agree with some decisions of the court but we must recognize that the final decision becomes the law.

Of equal importance, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that our Government was established on the principle of majority rule. If the court in its interpretation makes a decision that does not conform to the will of the majority, it becomes the duty of the Congress to change the law as it is the duty of the courts to interpret it.

If the decision of the Court, Mr. Speaker, makes it necessary to amend the Constitution of the United States pursuant to the will of the people, the Constitution should be so amended, as was appropriately provided for.

Since the Supreme Court held that the covenants and agreements were not enforcible as contrary to the Constitution, and since in my opinion the majority of the people are not in accord with such decision, I believe it is time to amend the Constitution.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I am today proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide "that the right of any number of citizens to voluntarily segregate themselves from others for any lawful purpose shall not be denied."

The purpose of such an amendment then becomes obvious. Since there seems to have been such fine distinction in interpreting the Constitution and since there is so much discussion in the press, on the radio, and throughout the Nation on this civil-rights issue, I maintain that it needs definite clarification.

Furthermore, in my opinion, this decision goes much deeper than just nullifying these covenants. It goes to the heart of the whole civil-rights issue. It is another step toward forcing by law fundamental principles on the American people. That was never intended in a free country.

I think it is rather significant also that this decision comes at a most propitious time. It, I believe unfortunately, merely lends credence to the President's civil-rights program.

It is another political year, Mr. Speaker. Just as it has happened in other election years, a great demand is made for the enactment of so-called civil-rights legislation. Could it be, then, for political reasons? The answer is perfectly clear. It becomes a political issue. The timing is too conclusive.

I seriously contend, then, Mr. Speaker, that the President's civil-rights message was a tragic mistake. It is most unfortunate that for political reasons such an attack would be made on the rights and privileges of free people, and with special emphasis toward the South.

The right of people, regardless of race, religion, or group to live together, to associate with one another, and to work together in a lawful manner on a voluntary basis to the exclusion of others is inherent in the life of our country.

It has long been recognized to be the right of a person to choose his associates, and that he or she shall not be forced to associate with those whom he or she does not prefer.

On the other hand, if people of different classes or groups prefer to associate themselves together for lawful purposes it is an inherent right that they should have. I am not adverse to raising political issues in election years or at other appropriate times. To propose, however, in election years issues that would be administratively impossible and that strike at the social structure of this country is like offering "a mess of pottage for a birthright."

The civil-rights proposal stirs the prejudices of our people like no other issue in this generation. Certainly the

rights of the minority must be protected, but it is not necessary to destroy our social and political life and the rights of the majority of our people to safeguard the minority. The minority is affected in this philosophy of life as much as is the majority.

When the President requested this Congress to provide legislation whereby the Federal Government would regulate the qualifications of voters, prohibit segregation in all public places and conveyances, to establish an FEPC and to create a Federal state police under the name of antilynching and antidiscrimination, he acted contrary, in my opinion, to the will and wishes of not only the people of the South, but the majority of the people in the United States.

I do not believe in lynching or any other form of lawlessness. No one condemns such foul crime more than I. But because there was one lynching during the year of 1947 and none so far this year, that is no justification for insulting the South and setting up a Federal police force against all free traditions.

I am not a champion of the poll tax as a requirement for voting, but I am unalterably opposed to the Congress encroaching on this constitutional right of the States.

The question of an FEPC is likewise an encroachment upon the rights of the States. There is a serious constitutional question that should be clarified and would be with this proposed amendment. FEPC is contrary to our system of free enterprise. Any Federal agency with an iron hand over the enterprise of this Nation can result only in arbitrary and capricious action and lead us to state socialism.

It is a well-known fact that consistent demands for antisegregation are nothing more than an attempt to legislate on social as well as economic problems. It is trying to bring about social equality by legislative action.

To me it is axiomatic that no law regardless of its intention can work unless it is supported by a majority of the people. Then we may well ask what is the best and most appropriate course of action.

It is not enough for the leadership and others in our Democratic Party or for the northern intelligentsia to continue to insult the South over the Negro problem. We might as well be perfectly honest and frank about this fundamental issue.

For political expediency they would forcibly impose a philosophy that is not desired by either groups. There has been a consistent improvement of our social, political, and economic relationship. Not only with the Negroes but with many white people, they are far better off today than they were 75 or 80 years ago. No Federal laws have brought about these improvements. They have been realized by the actions of our best and finest southern white people in cooperation with those affected.

There can be no question but what this progress will continue and much more expeditiously to a satisfactory solution if the people are permitted to work it out in their own way instead of saddling on them a lot of Federal laws that cannot possibly work.

We need something stronger than law on these issues. We have something stronger than law. It is a mutual understanding of the moral, economic, and social problems and responsibilities of those of us who are primarily affected.

Subsequent to the President's request for this legislation and the demands from many quarters for compliance, some 80 Members of the House met and organized an unofficial committee in the Congress for the purpose of formulating and effectuating a program to assist in the prevention of the enactment of such unwise and ill-advised legislation.

As one of the officers of that committee and active in the fight against such an iniquitous program, I have been somewhat encouraged that, though the Republican majority of the Congress and the leader of our Democratic Party have endeavored to force these issues on the American people, they would not prevail. It is a mighty undertaking in the face of such great odds, but we are determined in our objective.

There has been much said about the so-called civil-rights program being made a part of the platform of our Democratic Party. I do not read any such language in the platform of our party that was adopted at the convention in 1944. If, however, that platform can be so interpreted by any remote stretch of the imagination, then I say it is time, Mr. Speaker, that my party amend its platform.

Our committee has warned the party against any attempt of including by specific language or interpretation such a program into the platform of our party at the national convention in July.

I am a Democrat, and have during my life been loyal to my party. I expect to remain a true Democrat, holding to the principles of our party founders, Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson.

The people of the South generally are true Democrats and have nurtured and sustained the Democratic Party through the most trying experiences. As has been so well said, we will not accept a program that we think would destroy the principles of our party for the sake of political expediency.

It would be far better, Mr. Speaker, that our party go down in ignominious defeat than to surrender the high principles of States' rights, of freemen, freedom of private enterprise and individual initiative, which have not only made the party a great party, but our Nation a great Nation.

I do not believe in party revolt, but party reform, and since our leader does not apparently believe in the principles of the majority in our party, it is high time for us to get another leader.

We must be vigilant in this fight. We must continue our efforts to prevent our being driven from our own party or keeping it from adopting any policy or principle that disregards the interest and welfare of the Nation.

There are grave responsibilities resting with those who seek freedom, opportunities and privileges in a government like ours. How well we perform our responsibility, how we assume our obligation, is as important as the privileges of enjoying these inherent rights.

Our success in these endeavors will determine our future destiny and only by adjusting our laws and our codes to meet existing circumstances in accordance with the will of the majority of the people, having the utmost faith in the action of the American people, will we continue to be the champion of individual initiative, liberty, and freedom throughout the world.

Mr. SABATH. Mr, Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as sometimes happens, I am forced to differ with my esteemed and loyal former chairman of the Rules Committee. I do not agree with him that this is such a terrible bill. This House passed almost the identical bill in the last session of Congress, as has been said by a vote of 277 to 45. We just never made as big a mistake as that in this House. I think we might just look at this thing for a minute and see what is in it. My good friend who has preceded me would indicate that this was a terrible departure from all good forms and customs and that we were turning the whole situation over to the railroad companies and the big shippers and steel corporations which apparently from anything I have been able to read about it do not have anything to do with the bill, or the bill anything to do with them.

All this bill does, if I understand it correctly, and I think I do, as we have had it up here before, the railroads are under the control and regulation of the Interstate Commerce Commission and this Congress set up the Interstate Commerce Commission for that purpose, to regulate and control; and they have been regulating and controlling the railroads. In order to do so and to do it in an expeditious manner and a competent manner, it has been necessary to get these railroads together in the fixing of rates and have the rates proposed to the Interstate Commerce Commission instead of the Interstate Commerce Commission having to work them out themselves. That has been the custom all these years, done under the approbation and at the request of the Interstate Commerce Commission which is the agency which this Congress set up to regulate the railroads. Now comes the Department of Justice and undertakes to prosecute the railroad companies for things that the Interstate Commerce Commission that we set up to regulate them, has said they could do.

Where does that leave us? Are we going to leave ourselves and the Interstate Commerce Commission and the railroads in that position? All this does is to confirm the previous policy, namely that the railroad companies may suggest and propose rates to the Interstate Commerce Commission. They may propose the method of arriving at those rates, but they cannot do anything at all except that which is approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the agency that you have heretofore set up to regulate the railroads.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see any sense in fighting this bill. We did not fight it

before. I am afraid that we sometimes overlook the great problems involved in the national situation and in the national transportation in this country, which is so vital to every man, woman, and child in it.

Before the war we were figuring around how we were going to keep the railroads out of bankruptcy long enough to even run them. There was a time, you know, when it was politically expedient to get up and abuse the railroads and we abused them to the point that they were destroyed. We destroyed their solvency.

Do not forget that the railroads are the greatest employers of labor in this Nation. They employ more of our citizens, I believe, than any other industry in the country. I am surprised that my good friend from Chicago, who has been a great champion of the rights, privileges, and everything else of labor, should stand up here and oppose this bill which is going to help keep alive the goose that is laying the golden egg for the employees of the railroads, because the employees, after all is said and done here, are about the only people who get anything out of the railroads nowadays. They are getting something out of the railroads because the war came along, the railroads got a little more prosperous, they made a little more money for a few years; but last year when the war was over they dropped back and commenced to lose money. Now, a railroad or any other kind of a commercial corporation cannot keep on losing money. They are bound to get to the point of breaking. You cannot run the railroads like you have been running the United States Government. We have been running the United States Government at a deficit for seventeen long years. I see my friends on the Republican side smiling, but I may say that started back in the Republican administration of Hoover. We have been able to do that with this Government for a long time. I do not know how much longer you are going to be able to do it. But you cannot do that with a commercial corporation. Sooner or later it is going to bankrupt the corporation; it will bankrupt the railroads, and my good friends are going to lose their jobs.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. I called attention to the fact that this is discriminatory legislation in that it relieves the railroads of all antitrust laws. That is what I objected to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman has not read this bill as carefully as he should have. It does not relieve them of anything except by approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Interstate Commerce Commission is the agency that we set up to regulate the railroads, not the Department of Justice.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

AGREEMENTS BETWEEN CARRIERS

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 221) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 221, with Mr. MACKINNON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I request that the sponsor of this legislation, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] proceed first.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in discussing the pending bill, H. R. 221, I deem it advisable to make a brief statement in regard to the legislative history of not only this bill, but the others that have been introduced, and to state the necessity for legislation of this type.

Prior to the year 1887 there was no regulatory control of transportation. In that year Congress passed an act entitled "An Act to Regulate Commerce." It is true that this act was in the nature of an experiment and its objectives were, which failed of accomplishment, to correct many of the abuses which existed in transportation at that time.

I have not the time to speak now of the years that followed, but I wish to remind you—and I ask you to keep it in mind—that the Interstate Commerce Commission, the regulatory body for motor, rail, freight forwarders, and water carriers is the arm of the Congress. Congress, about 1920, passed what is known as the Interstate Commerce Act extending and broadening the powers of the regulatory body, the Interstate Commerce Commission. During many years, 45 or more, everyone has recognized, due to the number of carriers in the United States the necessity for collective agreements between carriers in the public interest.

After the Transportation Act was passed, and in 1941, some attorneys in the Department of Justice made charges that the conference procedure and agreements were in violation of the antitrust laws. These charges resulted in a conflict of jurisdiction between the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Department of Justice.

My recollection is that early in the Seventy-eighth Congress, I introduced a bill, H. R. 3720, which would clear up this matter of jurisdiction. This bill was not acted upon. Upon reconvening in the Seventy-ninth Congress, I introduced a similar bill. These bills applied solely to rates and rate conferences. Then, later on in the Seventy-ninth Congress, I introduced another bill which was known as H. R. 2536 which was broader in its scope than the others and recognized, under certain conditions and regulations, the validity of the agreements.

This bill was reintroduced in the Eightieth Congress, and is now the pending bill, H. R. 221. About the same time, Senator REED, of Kansas, introduced a bill in the Senate, S. 110, which was the companion to the House bill.

The reason for the introduction of the original bill was that in a conversation with Mr. Joseph B. Eastman, Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and later Director of the Office of Transportation, he stated to me that something had to be done to clear up the conflict between the Department of Justice and the Interstate Commerce Commission, and that the Transportation Act of 1940 should be amended to permit the collective agreements between the carriers, and this was prior to either suit. Shortly after this, I introduced the first bill in the Seventy-eighth Congress. Mr. Eastman appeared before the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate and stated:

> I am wholly convinced that if the carriers of the country are to respond to the duties and obligations imposed upon them by the Interstate Commerce Act, and if the rate structure is to be reasonable, free from unjust discrimination or undue preference and prejudice, as simple and consistent as may be, reasonably stable, and sufficient for the financial needs of private ownership and operation, the carriers must be in a position to consult, confer, and deal collectively with many phases of the matter, and that while the ultimate right of individual action should be scrupulously preserved, it is desirable that such action should not be taken without prior notice to fellow carriers and shippers and an opportunity for them to express their views.

The annual report of the Interstate Commerce Commission has recognized the necessity for legisation of this type.

The broad purpose of H. R. 221 is to define the limits within which carriers may lawfully collaborate and to provide means for determining, in specific cases, whether or not proposed collaboration is within those limits and also to furnish continuing supervision to see to it that approved collaborative activity between carriers is held within the limitations provided by Congress.

The language of H. R. 221, as it was originally introduced is sufficient to cover all activities of common carriers where consultation and cooperative action is clearly desirable and in the public interest.

The coverage of the bill included authority, after complete approval and under continuous supervision of the ICC to organize bureaus and committees and to establish and follow procedures to bring about agreement in connection with the initiation of, or changes in, rates and charges, time schedules, operating practices, rules for the interchange of equipment, car supply, the settlement of claims and other similar matters.

The bill, H. R. 2536, was similar to the pending bill. Hearings were held upon it, full and free discussion was had in the House, and on the 10th day of December 1945, it passed the House by an overwhelming vote of 277 to 45. In 1946, after more than a month's hearings, the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce favorably reported the bill, but for

some reason or another—especially the lateness of the time and a legislative jam, no action was taken by the Senate at that time.

At the beginning of the Eightieth Congress, Senator REED, of Kansas, as I have stated, introduced S. 110 in the Senate. Hearings were held at length on this bill, and it passed the Senate by a vote of 60 to 27. Amendments were adopted in the Senate. On July 25, 1947, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House reported H. R. 221 by an overwhelming majority vote. This bill, therefore, has passed the House once. It has been reported by your committee of the House twice. It has been reported in the Senate once, if not twice, and passed the Senate with some amendments.

Briefly, I want to give you the information as to who appeared before the House and Senate committees favoring these bills—as well as those who appeared in opposition to them. In other words, those who supported the bill and those who opposed it: The motor carriers, the rail carriers, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the water carriers, public-service utilities or railroad commissions of 47 of the 48 States.

Mr. J. Van Norman, who for years has been the attorney for the southern governors, individual shippers, shipper organizations, such as the National Industrial Traffic League, and others appeared before one or the other committees. Chambers of commerce of the various cities, and the National Chamber of Commerce. If I am not mistaken, over 1,000 individuals and organizations gave their notice of support to either one or both of the committees. If I were to print the full list in the RECORD, it would take five or six pages of the RECORD alone.

Having given you those who favor it before the committee, it is well for me to state who opposed it. Some former attorneys of the Department of Justice, the former Governor of Georgia, Mr. Arnold, Mr. Henry A. Wallace, while he was Secretary of Commerce spoke against it before the Senate committee. Among the railroads, I have noticed that Mr. R. J. Bowman, president of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad has opposed the bill with qualifications.

It is my own opinion, and that of the great majority of those engaged in or directly affected by transportation, that the scope of the pending bill, covering both rates and matters of service, is not too broad and that it is necessary and desirable for Congress to act on the entire subject in order to keep transportation law in step with the progress which has been made in our system of transportation and in the constructive development of transportation technique.

However, throughout the long period of consideration by Congress and during the many hearings on the bill the greatest interest and public concern have been expressed with reference to the matter of rates and rate practices among the carriers. I believe that to be only natural because the shippers and the general public come in more frequent contact with the carriers in the consideration of rate matters and are consequently more familiar with the problems encountered in that field.

Along this line, I mention that on January 14, 1948, Mr. Bowman, of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad, in a speech, stated:

> We realize that the making of agreements among railroads regarding rates is not only desirable but also necessary.

He further stated:

> We recognize the need for clarification of the present state of the law so as to remove doubts concerning the sphere within which railroads, acting through rate bureaus, may confer, collaborate, and reach agreements about rate matters. We are not opposed to legislation that will provide such clarification to the extent that the Bulwinkle bill, H. R. 221, or the Senate bill, S. 110, provides such clarification. I think it is fair to say that there is no point of difference between the position of the board (Atlantic State Shippers Board) and the position of the Chesapeake & Ohio.

While time schedules and operating practices are no less important, changes with reference to them are less frequent and less controversial.

It is not proper for me to speculate and I do not attempt to predict the ultimate prospect for this bill becoming law when it is once adopted by Congress. However, from conferences with my colleagues I am convinced that the overwhelming majority of both Houses is strongly in favor of a bill of this character covering rates and rate practices. No Member of Congress who favors legislation covering both rates and services would oppose a measure covering in the same way rates alone. On the other hand, there may be some who would favor a measure covering the matter of rates while they may not now be ready to support one covering service matters also.

In order to hasten final action on this legislation, which covers an extremely important phase of the transportation problem, and to place it in its strongest position, I requested the legislative counsel of the House of Representatives to prepare an amendment limiting H. R. 221 to deal only with rates and rate matters and excluding from the coverage of the bill agreements dealing with matters of operation and service. This amendment was adopted last week as a committee amendment by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and will be offered on the floor at the appropriate place in the bill by the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

While in my opinion ultimately the Congress will pass, in furtherance of our national transportation policy, a bill covering all agreements, yet the amendment that will be offered by the chairman reads as follows:

> Relating to rates, fares, classifications, divisions, allowances, or charges (including charges between carriers and compensation paid or received for the use of facilities and equipment), or rules and regulations pertaining thereto, or procedures for the joint consideration, initiation, or establishment thereof.

The adoption of this amendment would eliminate from the coverage of the bill agreements dealing with time schedules, routes, the interchange of equipment, the settlement of claims, the promotion of safety, or the promotion of adequacy, economy, or efficiency of operation or service.

When this bill is narrowed down to permit agreements pertaining to rates and charges and to procedures for considering and initiating rates and changes, and related matters, it should be clearly understood that the bill would not authorize the establishment of rates in any way different from that now required by the Interstate Commerce Act. The carriers would not be permitted to by-pass the Commission in establishing their rates. The authority and power of the Commission would not be limited in any way. The carriers could continue to discuss and argue about proposed rate changes just as they have for the past 50 years. They would still have to file their rate proposals with the Interstate Commerce Commission. And it would still have the full and final power to determine whether or not those proposals can be placed in effect.

The dramatic events of the past few days has again forcefully brought to our minds the importance, the vital necessity, of transportation in our domestic economy. We must not forget that transportation is very important to our national defense. We have recently authorized the expenditure of billions of dollars to rebuild and strengthen our armed forces. Congress is virtually unanimous in its desire to make the Nation strong enough to meet any contingency. The adoption of this bill is just as important to our national defense as it is to our domestic economy.

It is argued that Congress should not act on this bill because there are cases pending in court in which the carriers are charged with conspiracy to restrain trade under the antitrust laws. The fact that those suits are pending is one of the important reasons why we should act now. Certainly any conference or agreement which is in furtherance of the national transportation policy should not be considered an unlawful conspiracy in restraint of trade. This bill would authorize only such action as is in furtherance of the national transportation policy. Surely we do not intend, under the antitrust laws, to prohibit joint action which is constructive and helpful, which actually promotes the public welfare and our national objectives in transportation. Surely the restraints and prohibitions of the antitrust laws should not be applied to a highly regulated industry in the same way they are to be applied to one which is not. The adoption of this bill would make it clear that constructive, helpful action in transportation is not unlawful.

The Congress in 1916 recognized the need of legislation of this type for the oceangoing water carriers and passed an act which has been in effect since that time. No one has thought of seeking repeal of the provision for agreements between this type of carriers.

In 1938 in the Civil Aeronautics Act of that year, the Congress again saw the absolute necessity for placing full power of regulation in the Civil Aeronautics

Board, and no one in Congress knows of anyone who has ever thought of repealing that provision of the law.

The bill, as originally drawn, places motor carriers, water carriers, freight forwarders, and rail carriers under the same provisions which have been given under the Maritime Act of 1916, and which was given to common carriers by air in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938.

Every man here recognizes the absolute importance of transportation from a national standpoint, whether it be on land, sea, or in the air. When this bill is passed and becomes law, I know that you—the Members of this Congress—will have played a great part in promoting the public welfare, and that you are acting in response to the will of the overwhelming majority of the public when you vote for this measure. You may say, and truthfully say, that in the long period of time which transportation laws have been enacted by Congress that never before has there been such an overwhelming public and official support of any transportation measure in the Congress.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, in the limited time allotted for general debate on this measure, it is not possible for me to make as full a statement concerning the bill as I would like. However, suffice it to say that the bill was reported favorably by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with only one dissenting vote. Furthermore, it should be noted that a similar bill, likewise introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] in the Seventy-ninth Congress, was favorably reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and passed this House by a vote of 277 to 45, a majority of 6 to 1. This bill was not reached in the Senate before adjournment.

The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has held extensive hearings on this bill. The hearings showed that there was practically unanimous support for its enactment. In fact, in all my experience in this House, and, with upwards of 18 years of service on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I have never known any piece of transportation legislation that has had such unanimous approval as has this bill.

The bill has the virtually unanimous support of all those directly interested in transportation, including commissions, both Federal and State, charged with the responsibility of regulating transportation, carriers of all kinds, and shippers throughout the country, including industrial, agricultural, and livestock interests. Col. J. Monroe Johnson, Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, said in his testimony before this committee on June 27, 1947, page 219 of the hearings:

> The unanimity of those interested in and with knowledge of transportation in favor of this legislation is perhaps unprecedented.

Among many hundreds of private organizations and governmental departments and agencies that, through representations at the hearings before the House and Senate Committees in the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses, by formal resolution or otherwise, placed themselves on record as favoring legislation of the character recommended by your committee are the following: The Office of Defense Transportation, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, numerous State regulatory bodies, State legislatures, and departments of agriculture of many States, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, numerous shippers' traffic and transportation organizations, including the National Industrial Traffic League and the National Association of Shippers' Advisory Boards, numerous associations of farmers and livestock growers, including the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, the American National Live Stock Association, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, and the United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association; and chambers of commerce and other business organizations of various cities, States, and regions.

I cannot think of anyone who has had any appreciable amount of transportation experience, either as a user, transportation worker, manager, owner, or Government regulator, who has raised his voice against this bill.

This bill recognizes the necessity and advisability of continuing the established system of rate-making that has been followed in this country for upwards of 60 years, without objection by any Federal or State regulatory agency. In fact, these so-called conferences, wherein representatives of railroads, large and small, other transportation agencies, shippers and representatives of the public sit down and discuss together questions of rates, services, and so forth, has become so fixed and has resulted so satisfactorily that they may well be considered as having become a part of our transportation system. It has only been recently that any question was ever raised to challenge their legality on the ground they violate the antitrust laws.

Due to the necessity of devising practical means of dealing with matters requiring joint action by two or more railroads, there have grown up among the railroads during a long period of time, and are now in operation, a large number of joint organizations bearing various designations such as bureaus, associations, committees, and conferences, the purpose of which is to facilitate joint action by the participating carriers with respect to the many matters in connection with which such action is necessary. The nature of these organizations, and the need for their continued existence and operation, under proper control, if the transportation needs of the country are to be adequately met, are fully stated and discussed later in this report.

Such joint organizations are not limited to the railroads. The motor carriers, as they developed and came under regulation similar to that imposed upon the railroads, found it necessary to set up similar organizations and were encouraged by the Interstate Commerce Commission in so doing. The water carriers have also found it necessary to set up similar organizations.

As stated by Commissioner Aitchison, testifying for the Commission in support of the bill, H. R. 2536, in the Seventy-ninth Congress:

> Business has conformed to necessity and realities, and carriers of all types have formed associations and bureaus, and have dealt collectively with each other and with the public openly and seemingly under the assumption that as long as their collective action furthered the purposes of the Interstate Commerce Act, was not coercive, preserved the right of independent action, and did not unreasonably restrain commerce, they violated no law.

These organizations have not only been operated openly, with the full knowledge of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the various State regulatory bodies, the shippers, and all others having knowledge of transportation matters, but in many instances, particularly in the case of the rate associations, they have been maintained with the approval and cooperation of the shippers and have been encouraged by the Commission and various other agencies and departments of the Government as both necessary and desirable. In fact, various departments and agencies of the Government have frequently utilized them to advantage.

In recent years, however, certain officials of the Department of Justice, in speeches delivered in various parts of the country and in other ways, began to question the legality under the antitrust laws of the cooperative activities carried on by the carriers through various joint organizations, and more particularly through their rate associations.

These developments have caused grave concern among all those having direct interest in transportation, who see in the situation a threat to long-standing practices in the transportation industry that were developed in cooperation with the shippers and have proved their worth. This concern is evidenced by the views expressed by the shipping and business interests of the country, and by governmental authorities, during the hearings this year and in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

It is recognized by all who are familiar with the problems of transportation that the carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act cannot satisfactorily meet their duties and responsibilities thereunder, and the basic purposes of that act cannot be effectively carried out, unless such carriers are permitted to engage in joint activities to a substantial extent. The public interest will not be served if there is permitted to continue the existing state of uncertainty as to the extent to which carriers may engage in joint activity without risk of violating the antitrust laws.

The situation is one which clearly calls for prompt action by Congress. The problem involved is one of reconciling and harmonizing two great principles of public policy which have been declared by Congress. One of these principles is embodied in the antitrust laws. These laws, which are enforced by the Department of Justice, apply broadly for the purpose of preventing unlawful restraints upon competition in all fields of inter-

state trade and commerce. The other principle, applicable in the relatively limited field of transportation in interstate commerce by carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, is found in the national transportation policy declared in the Interstate Commerce Act, as follows:

It is hereby declared to be the national transportation policy of the Congress to provide for fair and impartial regulation of all modes of transportation subject to the provisions of this act, so administered as to recognize and preserve the inherent advantages of each; to promote safe, adequate, economical, and efficient service and foster sound economic conditions in transportation and among the several carriers; to encourage the establishment and maintenance of reasonable charges for transportation services, without unjust discriminations, undue preferences or advantages, or unfair or destructive competitive practices; to cooperate with the several States and the duly authorized officials thereof; and to encourage fair wages and equitable working conditions; all to the end of developing, coordinating, and preserving a national transportation system by water, highway, and rail, as well as other means, adequate to meet the needs of the commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense. All of the provisions of this act shall be administered and enforced with a view to carrying out the above declaration of policy.

The Interstate Commerce Commission, in administering the regulatory laws applicable to common carriers engaged in interstate commerce, is under the duty to see to it that the principles of the national transportation policy are carried out.

It is obvious that confusion and uncertainty are inevitable where these two principles of public policy, administer and enforced by different agencies, are applied in such a way that there is conflict between them. It is equally obvious that the Congress cannot itself, by legislation, deal with each instance of joint action by carriers to resolve whatever conflict may exist between the principles of the antitrust laws and the national transportation policy.

The only practical approach to the problem is to grant to a competent administrative agency, as is proposed in the bill, the authority to resolve the conflict in specific instances of proposed joint action by carriers.

Since this problem arises in the relatively circumscribed field of transportation, the agency which is peculiarly well qualified to exercise this authority is the Interstate Commerce Commission. The bill here reported, therefore, places this responsibility upon that Commission.

The bill leaves the antitrust laws to apply with full force and effect to carriers, so far as they are now applicable, except as to such joint agreements or arrangements between them as may have been submitted to the Interstate Commerce Commission and approved by that body upon a finding that, by reason of furtherance of the national transportation policy as declared in the Interstate Commerce Act, relief from the antitrust laws should be granted.

The bill provides for no relief from any provision of law other than the antitrust laws. Notwithstanding the approval of an agreement by the Commission, all provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act will apply to the carriers and to action taken by them to the same extent and in the same manner as though such agreement had not been approved.

As introduced, the bill would permit any carrier, party to an agreement between or among two or more carriers, to apply to the Commission for approval of the agreement, if such approval is not otherwise prohibited by the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act. If the Commission finds that the agreement is in furtherance of the national transportation policy, and approves the agreement, then the parties are relieved from the operation of the antitrust laws with respect to the making and carrying out of the agreement and may act through a conference, rate bureau, or other such organization to fix rates, charges, divisions, and so forth, subject, however, to Interstate Commerce Commission approval of such rates, and so forth.

In granting its approval the Commission may attach such conditions as it deems necessary. The Commission upon complaint or upon its own initiative may recall any agreement previously approved by it for modification or termination. Certain other safeguards requested by shipper organizations have been included in the bill. The most notable of these is the provision which would prevent carriers of a different class, such as railroads and truck lines, from agreeing on matters other than joint rates or through routes.

Our transportation network in the United States is made up of four classes: First, railroad; second, motor carriers; third, inland and coastal water carriers; and, fourth, air carriers. In each of these classes are hundreds of operators. In order that each class, consisting of these hundreds of operators, may provide its through Nation-wide service, it is absolutely necessary for its operators to meet and confer and finally agree on a great many matters, principal among which is rates. If they are to be prohibited from conferring and agreeing on some of these matters, we will have throttled our Nation-wide system of transportation and will be placed in the dilemma of choosing between carriers acting solely for themselves and performing a provincial job of transportation, or sacrificing the benefits of private ownership and operation of transportation for Government operation. In other words, we will either break up our Nation-wide system or force the Government to take it over, unless the Congress authorizes approval of the conference system of doing business in transportation.

At this point I should like to read to the Members of the House a statement made by the late Joseph B. Eastman, the most well-known and most highly respected Government officer in the field of transporation regulation. Mr. Eastman, who served as a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission for a quarter of a century, and who was always considered to be a champion of the public and shippers, made this statement:

It must be clear to any reasonable man that a carrier cannot respond to all the duties imposed by law if the individual carrier acts in a vacuum. It is a situation which, under all the conditions, plainly calls for consultation, conference, and organization and for many acts of a joint or cooperative character. * * *.

I am wholly convinced that if the carriers of the country are to respond to the duties and obligations imposed upon them by the Interstate Commerce Act, and if the rate structure is to be reasonable, free from unjust discrimination or undue preference and prejudice, as simple and consistent as may be, reasonably stable, and sufficient for the financial needs of private ownership and operation, the carriers must be in a position to consult, confer, and deal collectively with many phases of the matter, and that while the ultimate right of individual action should be scrupulously preserved, it is desirable that such action should not be taken without prior notice to fellow carriers and shippers and an opportunity for them to express their views.

Let me also remind you gentlemen of the House that by the enactment of this legislation we are not setting any dangerous precedent for the future. Immunity from the antitrust laws was granted to the coastal shipping lines in 1916. More recently in 1938, a provision much broader than that proposed here for the surface carriers was incorporated into the Civil Aeronautics Act and is now a part of that act. It has been said that if we grant this relief to carriers we will have the steel companies, the oil companies, the automobile companies, and all sorts of big business coming to the Congress demanding the same treatment. Our answer to them need only be—when you submit to regulation and are regulated as completely as common carriers, both by the States and the Federal Government, we will be glad to afford you the same treatment. It is well known that almost every phase of the business of common carriers is subjected to governmental regulation.

Such opposition as has been raised against the pending bill has been aimed chiefly at its broad scope. It has been said that no one wants to strike down the rate bureaus but that this bill would also authorize Interstate Commerce Commission approval of agreements having to do with schedules, air conditioning, and numerous other phases of transportation. The author of the bill, my distinguished colleague from North Carolina, realizing that such objection as has been made was aimed almost entirely at features other than rates which might be the subject of an approved agreement, came before our committee and suggested that we greatly narrow the scope of the bill. The committee is of the opinion that the broader form of the bill is perfectly justifiable in view of the control that the Interstate Commerce Commission would have of the agreements, but in order to avoid controversy and to limit the bill to what is absolutely essential for the operation of the carriers, the committee has decided to limit the subject matter to agreements relating to rate matters. The committee thus has concurred in the author's suggestion and will today offer an amendment limiting the scope of the bill to rate matters, thus removing almost the last semblance of objection that has been heretofore raised.

When so amended, the bill will do simply this: It will authorize any carrier,

party to an agreement, to form a rate bureau or a rate association, to apply to the Interstate Commerce Commission for approval of the agreement to form such a rate bureau or association, and if the Commission finds that the agreement meets the standards set forth in the bill, then the rate bureau or association so formed will not be subject to attack under the provisions of the antitrust laws. It is, of course, the duty of the carriers to initiate reasonable and nondiscriminatory rates. The bill will not authorize the railroads or truck lines or water carriers to make their own rates. It will not give the Commission power to authorize them to make their own rates, it will merely give the Commission the authority to approve the organization of rate bureaus or rate associations. After such approval the members of the bureau or association will meet for the consideration of rates just exactly as they do today and have done for more than half a century. The product of the conference, namely, the proposed new rate or change of an old rate, still will have to be filed in tariff form with the Commission and will by itself require the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission before it can be put into effect. Thus, the public, the shippers, and the Government will have double opportunity to protect themselves against unjust or unduly discriminatory rates on the part of the carriers.

So, we are here confronted with this simple question, Shall we have an orderly system of rate making which has been evolved through more than half a century of Government regulation and shipper and carrier cooperation, or shall we have an era of chaos in which the proven system will be discarded and carriers will be required to make rates without considering the effect on shippers and carriers other than those immediately concerned with the rate being made or changed?

There has been some discussion which would lead the public to believe that the carriers will escape some regulation presently imposed by law if this bill passes. Let me point out that quite the contrary is true. The conference method is not now subject to any regulatory authority under existing law. This bill would place rate bureaus and other carrier conference systems under regulations by the Interstate Commerce Commission, if their deliberations are to be exempt from the operation of the antitrust laws.

Passage of this bill will merely effectuate and make possible the carrying out of the declared policy of the Congress.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, from the experiences heretofore had in respect to this legislation, I was not minded today more than to register my opposition to the bill which is offered to us again in substantially the form which it carried in previous bills presented to the House. That experience was that a similar bill was accepted by this body by a vote of 277 to 45. I do not know that even the election of 1946 or any other circumstance has sufficiently changed the complexion or the determination of the Members of the House for one who is unalterably opposed to the legislation to assume or to think through the wildest imagination that his reiterated opposition to the measure would carry any weight resulting in something different from that that happened before.

Mr. Chairman, I regard this as turning over to the transportation companies of the United States the life of the industry and the commerce of this Nation. It is not only as between railroads, but as between and among railroads, pipe lines, trucking companies, and every other mode of transportation service, which permits them to sit down together and make rates and tariffs covering every commodity conceivable and affecting every part of this Nation, with continued discrimination, if they please, against one section of the country and with impunity on account of the provisions of this bill that they are not answerable to the Sherman antitrust law or any other antitrust law; to say, as was said in the language of this bill, that the Interstate Commerce Commission can take a look at this thing and approve it if it conforms to the standards provided for in certain sections of this bill. Not if they find it to be just to every section and equitable to all industry in this country, but if it conforms to the standards set down, which do not relate to the failure of discrimination or a conspiracy to fix rates and charges as they may please, in one section of the country as much under their domination as another, yet with the privilege and the power to discriminate against any section of this Nation with impunity, and the antitrust laws cannot stop it.

To my mind, Mr. Chairman, this is the most dangerous piece of legislation that has been offered to the economy of this country in many years.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include my previous remarks on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

DANGER OF TRANSPORTATION MONOPOLY TO OUR ENTIRE ECONOMY

(Speech of Hon. JOHN H. FOLGER, of North Carolina, in the House of Representatives, Tuesday, July 22, 1947)

GOOD-BY ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, there can be no question as to these bills exempting railroads, trucking companies, air lines, and other interstate carriers from prosecution under the Sherman antitrust laws.

This legislation is sought and sponsored by officials of the American Association of Railroads, abetted by other freight-forwarding interests.

I guess every Member of Congress knows this. The lobbying for this bill has been notorious and complete.

From an economic point of view, this is the worst bill offered to Congress in the past 25 years. It means economic slavery and opens wide the door to monopolies of the worst sort, with regional cartels in every business in the United States, binding hand and foot the business of the Nation. If enacted into law, we shall be at the mercy completely of the United States transportation systems—railroads, trucking companies, water carriers, and pipe lines—who would be authorized to agree on rates—railroads with railroads, railroads with trucking companies, water carriers with other common carriers. They could discriminate against areas and sections of the United States at will.

The antitrust laws are the bulwark of free enterprise.

They guarantee the freedom of the market place, and against the restraints and evils of monopoly and trust agreements.

The antitrust laws insure the freedom of all men, wherever, in the United States, they may reside and engage in free private enterprise, to feel safe and be safe in these undertakings and businesses, so far as dangers of monopoly and cartels might adversely affect their legitimate activities. In the language of Theodore Roosevelt, these laws would guarantee to every one "a square deal."

To enact legislation, under any pretext, that would insulate or eliminate any one from the application of these laws, is monstrous. And yet we have, in H. R. 221, section (8), page 4, the following:

"Parties to any agreement approved by the Commission under this section (meaning section 5a (b) with subsections (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), and (9)), and other persons are, if approval of such agreement is not prohibited by paragraph (3), (4), or (5), hereby relieved from the operation of the antitrust laws with respect to the making of such agreement and with respect to the carrying out of such agreement, etc."

And in the Senate bill, S. 110, a little more adroitly put, the following:

"(9) No agreement approved by the Commission under this section (meaning section 5a (b), subsections or paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), and (8), and no conference or point or concerted action pursuant to and in conformity with such agreement, as the same may be conditioned by the Commission, shall be deemed to be a contract, combination or conspiracy, or monopoly in restraint of trade or commerce within the meaning of the antitrust laws."

And antitrust laws are aimed at, and make unlawful contracts, combinations, conspiracy, and monopoly in restraint of trade and commerce.

By these bills, such contracts, combinations, conspiracies and monopoly are blessed and made legal, if entered into or carried on by transportation companies.

Why should one ask to be relieved from the operation or application of laws against monopolies and conspiracies in restraint of trade and commerce? Why should such a request be granted?

This is a dangerous bill. It ought never to pass.

Business and free competitive enterprise have the right to be protected by law against monopolies, trusts, conspiracies, and combinations by carriers or anybody else.

I am not willing to make these things lawful on approval by any person or body of persons, agency or commission, or bureau.

The transportation systems constitute America's biggest business; and this system—transportation—substantially controls every other business.

Already discrimination in freight rates has made or retarded business in different sections of the United States. Under this area discrimination some have thrived and grown great, while those in other sections have suffered and dwindled away; or in more instances have been unable to proceed at all.

Why this haste in passing this far-reaching legislation, whittling away the Sherman antitrust law and the Clayton Act? And this at the spot most vital to business and enterprise throughout the country.

Railroads have already been found guilty of these violations of fair play, even though we have all along had standing by the Interstate Commerce Commission. This is not particularly an indictment of the Commission or its personnel; but shows the impos-

sibility of their exercising control over the transportation system of the country; and the necessity of retaining our antitrust laws, applicable to them as fully as to any.

Through the device of a hierarchy of associations, headed by the Association of American Railroads, the transportation monopoly in combination with monopolies in other basic industries, such as steel and oil, has so fixed transportation charges as to maintain the industrial status quo and stifle free enterprise and competitive business, resulting in monopoly practices and prices to the exclusion or suppression of fair competition, attended by high prices to the consumer.

Resort to the antitrust laws has been and will continue to be the only forum for redress or correction of these evils.

The arbitrary rail-rate structure established by the illicit monopoly has prevented the southern and western regions from developing industries.

To concentrate these industries makes for unjustified long hauls, stifles the growth of industries, and unreasonably concentrates population, to the over-all detriment of the Nation. The bill would legalize and perpetuate the coercive power and control by the railroad association of all transportation.

Section 5 of the House bill is an illusion—a snare. It feigns a provision that the Commission shall not approve any agreement establishing a procedure for determination of any matter through joint consideration, unless it finds that under the agreement, opportunity to act contrary to the determination arrived at through such procedure is afforded to each party to the agreement which did not concur in the determination.

What could a small or one large road, or truck line, or water carrier do independently of a determination made by the association? Nothing. Freight that originated on one of these carriers could not move over lines within the association. They just would not get any interstate business.

Competition between the various forms of transportation—railroads, trucks, barge lines, pipe lines, has been effectively curtailed through joint action between the organizations of these various modes of transportation, which have agreed and conspired, successfully, to raise the level of rates in each form to the highest point. This notwithstanding the fact that the Interstate Commerce Commission has been existent.

The proposed legislation would facilitate the strengthening of these combinations in each mode of transportation as amongst the several forms, and as well between and within the various forms with each other.

This legislation would make lawful all such combinations intra and inter the various modes of transportation.

Section 11 of S. 110 would approve whatever may be the judgment of the Supreme Court in Georgia against Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and others, but only so far as any announced principle relates to the parties to that suit.

This may help some—but, even so, not much—only the parties to that particular action.

The bills comprehend agreements to fix rates, to limit services, to control the construction and utilization of equipment and facilities and other matters connected with the transportation industry. It excludes nothing from the conspiracy, made lawful, but pooling, division, consolidation, merger, purchase, lease, acquisition.

Under specific provisions of both bills, the transportation industry could set up and perpetuate a private government which would have the power, through combination and concerted action, to control rates, facilities, and all else affecting transportation in every form, in every part of the United States, limited nowhere, except possibly as any such combination might relate to the parties in the Georgia case and there restricted very little.

The immediate origin of this legislation was likely the exigencies of World War II, when the Government was the principal shipper, in an emergency, and such legislation was only defensible to meet the temporary emergency situation.

Now it has been seized upon as a permanent machinery for the control of transportation rates by the transportation companies acting in concert to the lasting detriment of the public. It ought not to be allowed.

The phrase "agreement between two or more carriers concerning or providing rules, and so forth, for consideration, initiation, or establishment of rates, fares, charges, including charges among or between carriers, classification divisions, and so forth, or the promotion of adequacy, economy, or efficiency of operation," is so broad as to authorize agreements, combinations, conspiracies, and concerted action comprehending every phase and activity of the transportation field. It could hardly be broader. The shipper will have no recourse in law.

Now, the antitrust laws apply to protect independence of action by individual carriers, and to preserve the area of competition within the zone of reasonableness.

Enact into law either of these bills and that public protection is gone.

As the law is, the several carriers are in competition for business; they may, within the zone of reasonableness, acquire business by the adjustment of rates and fares so as to retain the desired traffic for their own lines; but under this proposed law, these charges are fixed by combined agreements, and no one of them would dare breach such agreement, or even refuse to enter into it.

The power to fix rates, and so forth, is not vested in the Interstate Commerce Commission now, but it is in the power of this Commission to say whether rates and fares of carriers are within the zone of reasonableness.

Our antitrust laws say they shall not be fixed by concerted action, in restraint of trade or commerce.

The power to fix each rate is too vast and complicated to be exercised in detail by a responsible agency or regulatory body. The several carriers, individually, may prepare their schedule of rates, charges, and fares, and submit these to the Commission for approval or modification.

But to grant the carriers the power to get together some dark night and agree on fares, rates, charges, and everything pertaining to transportation, including all forms of transportation, is bestowing on them the control of the entire economy of this Nation, affecting every man, woman, and child in it, and those unborn.

To say this vast, complicated machinery is subject to the approval of the Commission is mockery and without force or assurance.

Not even 10 Solomons in all their wisdom could do such a job.

The Commission can operate in single cases, and within the zone of reasonableness to each; if fortified by our antitrust laws against combinations in restraint of trade.

Please do not allow this legislation. It is bad. It menaces not only areas and sections, but the entire Nation.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT].

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I realize that those of us speaking against this bill are simply voices crying in the wilderness. I do not want to cast any aspersions upon the sincerity of the proponents of this legislation in the House. I do not pose as an expert on transportation. There are only a few people who can so qualify. However, I do know something of the origin of this legislation. I know that it was not seriously proposed until after the Lincoln case was filed in Nebraska, and until after the Georgia case was filed in the Supreme Court of the United States.

The Lincoln case was based upon the so-called Western agreement, which everybody admits was a violation of the law. It was an agreement which had not been filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission, rather, concealed from it, and when discovered, the railroads filed it and then revoked it.

There are a few other things I know about this legislation, and it makes me strongly suspicious of it. In the first place, reference has been made to the unanimity of support. There has been no money spent lobbying against this bill. There has been at least $1,000,000 spent, perhaps with good intentions on the part of most proponents in support of this bill. They have gone up and down the land getting resolutions of Chambers of Commerce, including those in my district, saying that the Bulwinkle bill should be passed. It has been dressed up in rather fine raiment, and many people feel that it is necessary for the general welfare of the country. In this I think they are entirely mistaken.

What does the bill do? In the judgment of most of us who oppose the bill, it clearly exempts the railroads from the operation of the antitrust laws. The railroads can do all that is necessary to be done in the matter of rate making under existing law. They do not need the protection which they seek in this legislation.

The Attorney General, testifying against this bill, said:

> Both the Commission and the courts recognize that under the statutory scheme of regulation the railroads possess wide latitude and are charged with individual responsibility and initiative in the establishment and modification of rates and fares and in the provision of facilities and services.

Then speaking of powers conferred by the bill the Attorney General states:

> The bill fails, however, to give any assurance that the private power created by such agreements, once they are approved by the Commission, will be susceptible to public control and supervision.

Assistant Attorney General Berge, testifying against this bill, said it was "a bold and flagrant attempt to get special privileges and special protection" for the railroad "monopoly group already well entrenched."

The railroad industry is a $24,000,000,000 concern. It has allied with it tremendous financial interests of the North and East. They have gotten along fairly well under existing rules and regulations, and they seek now simply to further solidify their tremendous economic power and to eliminate competition.

Now, let me remind you folks what it means when competition is eliminated. There is a certain gentleman in the railroad fraternity, you know, of recent years who has been attacking some of the old rules and regulations. As a result, I can now ride from here to Texas on a through pullman. Other improvements in railroad facilities and services have been made as a result of competition.

If competition is eliminated you will be riding on the same old passenger cars 40 years hence, and public service will deteriorate rather than improve. The last bit of revenue will be squeezed out of the transportation operations with a minimum of service.

Now Mr. Berge makes these further charges against this bill:

1. Through the device of a hierarchy of associations headed at the top by the Association of American Railroads, the transportation monopoly, in combination with the monopolies in other basic industries, such as cement and oil combines, has so fixed transportation prices as to maintain the industrial status quo and to prevent a new enterprise from competing with the industrial monopolies.

2. The arbitrary rail-rate structure established by the illicit monopoly has prevented southern and western regions from developing their industries.

3. This bill would legalize the present unlawful domination and control over the Nation's competitive economy possessed by the Association of American Railroads and its industrial allies.

They come here now and tell us that they need this bill in order to get together on rates. They can now collaborate on rates. But under this legislation if passed, they can do a great deal more than that. What they would do if this bill is passed is not only to fix rates, but also to eliminate competition. Here is a faster carrier that perhaps can get perishable goods to the market a little sooner. He would be restricted in his operations in favor of another carrier. They could also determine whether or not emergency rates can be fixed on shipments and discriminate against movement of traffic in certain areas in favor of the movement of traffic in other areas.

The point has been made that small carriers and many private citizens are writing letters to Congressmen saying, "We approve this legislation." If you talk with the folks who have written you from back home, I venture to say that you will find that nine out of ten of them do not have any idea what the Bulwinkle bill is all about and they will tell you, "I wrote you that letter in response to a request from somebody up the line."

The Association of American Railroads have a way of bringing economic pressure on the small carrier. They simply can cut off the traffic that they give them and route the shipments somewhere else. They can whip them into line. You have an industry here perhaps the biggest and most powerful in the Nation coming in and saying, "We want to be exempted from the anti-trust laws. The railroads cannot serve two masters. We need protection." Protection from what? It is obvious that notwithstanding the claims that are made for this legislation, it seeks to give to the transportation monopoly of the country a further monopoly. I want to say to you that in my judgment, the greatest threat to the economic security of this country now and perhaps for years to come is monopoly of one kind or another. We need trust busting not trust perpetuation. Competition has always been and will always be the lifeblood of trade, and through competition, the public gets better services and better commodities at lower prices. It is ridiculous to be told that in the public interest we must exempt this gigantic railroad monopoly, dominated and controlled by the Association of American Railroads from the operations of the antitrust laws. To paraphrase an old saying, "This is more power than honest operators would want, and more power than dishonest operators ought to have."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CARSON].

Mr. CARSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to keep the record straight for the benefit of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT], who just made a few remarks a moment ago to the effect that this legislation was introduced after two suits were brought in the Supreme Court—that is the Georgia case and the Lincoln, Nebr., case. Let us look at the facts and see if that is true.

The original Bulwinkle bill, H. R. 2720, was introduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress on May 17, 1943. That was 5 years ago. It was not until June 12, 1944, over 1 year later, that the original complaint was filed by the State of Georgia in the United States Supreme Court.

Furthermore, the amended complaint, on which the case is principally founded, was not filed by the State of Georgia until September 15, 1944, a year and 4 months after the introduction of the original Bulwinkle bill.

With regard to the second contention, that is, with respect to the Lincoln, Nebr., case, bear in mind that the original Bulwinkle bill was introduced on May 17, 1943, the original complaint in the Lincoln case was not filed until August 23, 1944, 1 year and 3 months later.

To sum up exactly what I have said, H. R. 2720 was introduced more than a year before either the Georgia suit or the Lincoln suit were ever heard of.

We are trying in this bill to do the thing we have been doing for the past 50 years or more. As the author of this bill and my chairman have so well stated, this came about after the Transportation Act of 1920, which, as we know, was a complete departure from the regulatory plan which had preceded it. It created a new policy, fostering the guardianship of transportation. It distinctly encouraged consolidations of carriers under proper standards, as a means of solving the major problems, leases, controls, mergers, and authorizing the approval of pools of traffic and earnings. The attorney generals recognized the necessity for grouping the carriers to bring about desired equality of rates and rate stability.

I do not know of anyone who has better stated the necessity for this legislation than the present chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Hon. Clyde B. Aitchison, when he appeared before the Senate Committee when this bill was being considered in 1945, when he said, in substance, this:

The carriers should be permitted to do collectively and fearlessly that which the law, as expressed in the Interstate Commerce Act, requires of them, in the large way contemplated by the spirit of the whole act and in conformity with the national transportation policy. But they should be permitted to do this in a manner consistent with the public interest, openly, fairly, without coercion, and so as to preserve the essentials of private enterprise within the permissible bounds of the law.

Our chairman has related to you the many fine organizations that appeared before the committee. By actual count, in the Senate hearings in 1945, there were 1,190 different organizations who appeared before that committee in favor of this legislation, consisting of many of the livestock organizations, agricultural organizations, shippers, and traffic and transportation organizations, business organizations, chambers of commerce, civic and other organizations. Exactly 1,190 of those different organizations appeared before the Senate committee and either supported or spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, no one in this country has a greater interest in the legislation now under consideration than the shippers and receivers of freight. These shippers and receivers know that their business cannot be carried on without conferences among railroads, and between themselves and railroads and other carriers of freight. They know from actual experience that the just and reasonable rates required by the Interstate Commerce Act could never be obtained without conferences between carriers and between shippers and carriers.

For more than 50 years such conferences have taken place, openly and publicly, participated in by shippers and receivers of freight, and with full knowledge of the Interstate Commerce Commission and of State regulatory commissions. And it has been only in the last few years that any question has ever been raised as to their legality or necessity, and this by the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice under a new theory that such conferences, even though admittedly necessary, somehow violate the antitrust laws, and should not be permitted.

The only purpose of the bill now before us is to permit the continuation of the making of a limited and defined class of agreements with respect to rates which are necessary for the carrying on of transportation on a national scale, and to provide additional supervision, regulation, and control over the making of such rate agreements by the regulatory body charged by Congress with administration of the Interstate Commerce Act, to the end that any such rate agreements will not violate the antitrust laws.

The bill in no sense weakens the antitrust laws. On the contrary, it will cause such laws to receive greater consideration with respect to these particular agreements on rate bureaus, because it makes plain the will of Congress as to what extent and what manner the antitrust laws shall be considered and applied in the transportation industry, and this by an agency of Congress created over 60 years ago and charged with protecting the public interest in transportation matters.

No fairer piece of legislation has come before Congress in many years. It gives the railroads and other carriers nothing in the way of authority which they do not already possess, nor does it deprive them of any authority or managerial discretion. It takes nothing whatsoever away from the shippers and users of transportation. If anything, it gives to them the added protection of closer supervision and regulation over practices which affect what they pay for transportation.

The bill hurts no one. It removes the doubt cast by the Antitrust Division upon the legality of agreements which time and practice have proved absolutely necessary, and at the same time surrounds such agreements with additional safeguards to protect the public interest, which includes the preservation of a sound transportation system. The bill deserves and merits prompt enactment.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the measure we have before us this afternoon should be tested not by any of the expert theories that have been advanced or any of the formulae that have been suggested as having been worked out by those who are supposed to be experts. After all, our concern should be, as I see it, for the welfare of the people of America, and I think that this proposal can be tested by two rather simple and understandable yardsticks.

There is, of course, first, a question of principle involved here—a principle the determination of which will decide whether we want to have a corporate economy, the type of economy that was foisted on central Europe prior to World War II where certain favored groups were given monopolies, or whether we believe in an economy of competition where anyone has a right to compete on equal terms with anyone else. It has always been my belief that we should follow the principle of competition. I believe that it results in the highest standard of living for all of our people. I believe that it results in progress, in advancement, in economies of operation, and in improvement of services.

I have never observed the railroads or any other industry giving the people any more than they had to give, any more than competition required. I look therefore with a great deal of trepidation upon any proposal to wipe out competition. It seems to me that on the basis of sound public principles, on the basis of principle, on the basis of what is sound for the Nation, we should defeat this proposal to abandon our free economy and to adopt a program of protected monopoly.

The second test should be on the basis of past experience. On the basis of actual results. The gentleman from Ohio who recently addressed us suggested, and I think correctly, that this was but an extension, a continuation of what we have had for the last 50 years. Does the gentleman from Ohio or does any member of the committee that brings this bill before us suggest to the American people that the freight-rate structure and the passenger-rate structure of this country that has grown up under this monopolistic principle, even though it has been carried on outside of the law, does the gentleman suggest that our past method of freight and passenger rate formation has resulted in anything good for the Nation? Does he think that our rate structures are something to be proud of? Does he think that these rate structures are something that the public can understand, something that is workable and something that is doing the maximum good for our people? Far from it. I think we must all agree that one of the weakest points in our present economy is our tremendously complicated rate structure. The experts do not understand it, neither does anybody else. I do not believe there is a man in this room who will claim he understands what we have done during the last 50 years; yet the gentlemen come to us and suggest that we should legalize the things that have been done for the last 50 years without legal authority. Why, Mr. Chairman, should we continue in the same old way?

If old ways are bad I do not think we should continue them. I do not believe that my section of the country has had a square deal under that system of rate making. The only time we have had any reduction in rates was when we had some competition from unregulated truck lines. During the early days of motor-freight transportation we got some rate reductions in the Southwest, and I trust that they were given in other sections of the country, but they were given in every instance as a result of competition that the railroad had to face before it was possible to pull a cloak of monopoly around the shoulders of the carriers who now seek to have that monopoly they so long enjoyed outside the law whitewashed by this Congress. If you believe in competition, vote against this bill.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that there should be no doubt in the minds of any of us as to the propriety of this proposed legislation known as the Bulwinkle bill. It is clearly the duty of this Congress to state the national policy and to write the law in such a way that the national policy will be carried out. This legislation is necessary to clear up present conflict and present confusion.

In one of the finest statements ever made by Congress we have clearly set forth the national policy in transportation. That declaration of policy is, indeed, a masterpiece. In it we have declared our purpose: To provide fair and impartial regulation to promote safe, adequate, economical, and efficient service; to foster sound economic conditions in transportation; to encourage reasonable charges without unjust discriminations, undue preferences, or unfair or destructive practices; and to encourage fair wages and equitable working conditions.

All to the end of developing, coordinating and preserving a system of transportation adequate to meet the needs of commerce, the postal service, and the national defense.

All this bill does is to say that agreements and cooperative action which is in furtherance of the policy we have stated shall not be unlawful under the antitrust laws.

In other words, by the adoption of this bill, we make it clear that action which is in support of, in furtherance of our policy as stated in one law, will not constitute a crime under another law.

It has been argued that Congress should not act because there are suits pending in court to find out how far the antitrust laws should be applied to transportation. But that is no reason for delay. In fact, it is all the more reason why we should act now. Are we to lay down the policy of Congress and then stand by while suits are dragged through the courts to frustrate our policy? By this bill we do no more than to say that our transportation policy may be carried out and put into effect and that other laws shall not be twisted by court interpretation to prevent that policy from being effective.

This bill just makes plain common sense. We passed this bill on December 10, 1945, by a vote of more than 6 to 1—277 to 45. It took about 2 years for the bill to come back to us. We should clear up this confusion now. The overwhelming endorsement of this bill is convincing evidence that we were right then and that we will be right now if we pass it today.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, what I have to say in a few minutes is the desire of practically everyone with any interest whatsoever in the problem presented by this bill. And this includes the railroads, the motor carriers, the water carriers, freight forwarders, the shippers of the country, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the State regulatory commissions and traffic organizations throughout the land.

In the first place, let me make it clear that I support the passage of the bill because as I understand the amendment proposed by the committee, the only agreements to be considered and approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission are those relating to rate matters. The bill is, to my mind, a necessary addition to the powers already possessed by the Commission with respect to rates, and is the most practical and sensible solution to a muddle in transportation brought about by a useless and unnecessary conflict in authority. The bill presents a positive and most constructive solution. In brief, the bill says in effect to the Commission, you now possess great power over the rates of the various carriers of the country: As the agent of Congress, your powers will be increased to the extent that you will be called upon to inquire into the manner in which these rates are determined—whether the agreements between carriers, the joint action and necessary conferences are in accord with the national transportation policy of Congress, and not violative of the antitrust laws.

And here let me emphasize that the bill does not remove the railroads from

the antitrust laws. It places upon the Interstate Commerce Commission the responsibility of determining, under standards set out in the bill, what can and what cannot be done collectively by carriers with respect to rate matters and authorizes the Commission to exempt from the operation of the antitrust laws, only such rate agreements as are necessary to carry out the purposes of Congress as set forth in the national transportation policy. It grants no immunity from the antitrust laws in any other respect.

From the hearings and reports of both the House and Senate Committees, there is not the slightest doubt that the shippers and regulatory bodies are unanimous in their approval of the continuance of the conference method of dealing with rates. Under the Interstate Commerce Act, it is the duty of the railroads and other carriers to initiate reasonable and nondiscriminatory rates. Without conferences and joint action, no properly related rates could ever be established. The bill provides a means for continuing the present rate procedures under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and at the same time protects the carriers, as well as the public, from violation of the antitrust laws in the process, by requiring Commission approval of any necessary collective activity which otherwise might not be proper.

In effect, the bill is clearly a strengthening of governmental control and supervision over the transportation agencies of the country. And if it is not passed, and if the rate-making procedures of the carriers should be condemned under the antitrust laws, the shippers of the country would suffer a most destructive blow. Orderly and related transportation rates would be impossible and the carrying out of the congressional transportation policy and compliance with the requirements of the Interstate Commerce Act would be impossible.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this legislation. I opposed it as vigorously and as ably as I knew how when it was before us previously, and if by any chance it should come back here again I shall oppose it at that time. I do so with deepest respect to the views of the protagonists of this legislation, and particularly of my own committee. But it seems to me that we have either a simple principle that the antitrust laws ought to be good for the country and all segments of industry or else we ought to abolish them altogether, instead of picking out one of the great industries, the very necessary transportation industry, and giving them a dose of legislative immunization, then saying to the rest of the country, "Well, the antitrust laws apply to you, but not to the railroads."

The people of the United States know that the loss of economic or political freedom by any segment of the world's population, endangers the continued existence of these economic and political rights in our own Nation. Preserving the pattern of freedom, both economic and political, is necessary; once it begins to disintegrate, the rights of all will ultimately be lost.

That is why I am so concerned about the legislation that we are now considering which would allow exemption of the railroads and other transportation agencies from the antitrust laws. On one hand, we can understand that once western Europe has lost its political freedom that our political system is greatly endangered, but on the other hand we may not realize or fully appreciate the danger to our economic system by the loss of economic freedom by a large segment of the economy of the United States such as represented by the common carrier transportation industry as embraced in this legislation.

It seems to me that the basic distinguishing feature between a free-enterprise system such as that which we have long enjoyed and now cherish in the United States and the systems of the various socialistic nations is epitomized in the phrase "free competition." The antitrust laws are the principal means by which free competition has been kept alive in this country, and the result has been economic prosperity in a measure unknown to any other country.

It is unnecessary for me to here assert that our superb and unsurpassed transportation industry has developed within the framework of the free-enterprise system. As the Supreme Court of the United States said in the *Joint Traffic Association case* (171 U. S. 505):

> But, after all, competition is not only the life of trade, but the underlying basis of our social and industrial life. There may be a better way, but we have not yet found it. Competition goes along with freedom, with independent action. This country was founded on the principles of liberty and equality. It sought to secure to every citizen an equal chance under the law.

And in the *Trans-Missouri case* (116 U. S. 290) the Supreme Court said:

> Competition, free and unrestricted, is the general rule which governs all the ordinary business pursuits and transactions of life. Evils, as well as benefits, result therefrom. In the fierce heat of competition the stronger competitor may crush out the weaker; fluctuations in prices may be caused that result in wreck and disaster; yet, balancing the benefits as against the evils, the law of competition remains as a controlling element in the business world.

What is competition and what was the purpose of the Sherman Act? In the *American Linseed Oil case* (262 U. S. 371) the Supreme Court said:

> The Sherman Act was intended to secure equality of opportunity and to protect the public against evils commonly incident to monopolies and those abnormal contracts and combinations which tend directly to suppress the conflict for advantage called competition—the play of the contending forces ordinarily engendered by an honest desire for gain.

Once our transportation industry is freed of the basic concept of competition, other industries have the excuse that they, too, should be allowed to forego the competitive ideal by exemption from the application of the antitrust laws.

If, for example, the Sherman Act is to be scuttled by exempting therefrom the railroads, why should the automobile manufacturers, insurance companies, and typewriter manufacturers not likewise be exempted. A person does not have to buy an automobile, insurance policy, or a typewriter but the railroads affect all our citizens. As the Supreme Court of the United States said, in the Joint Traffic Association case, supra:

> It must also be remembered that railways are public corporations organized for public purposes, granted valuable franchises and privileges * * * and that they all primarily owe duties to the public of a higher nature even than that of earning large dividends for their shareholders. The business which the railroads do is of a public nature, closely affecting almost all classes in the community—the farmer, the artisan, the manufacturer, and the traders. It is of such a public nature that it may well be doubted, to say the least, whether any contract which imposes any restraint upon its business would not be prejudicial to the public interest.

If the Congress here exempts the railroads from the Sherman Act, what then becomes of the system of free competition that we rightly boast has given us the highest economic standards of the ages? Its loss would lead us along the same path followed by other countries that have chosen cartels and monopolies in preference to free competition. Germany and Japan are two of them. Where has their embracing the suppression of free enterprise led those countries? The answer is obvious.

By competition in the field of common-carrier transportation I do not mean a return to the days of cutthroat competition before the Act to Regulate Commerce of 1887. I mean the present system of competition under which the Interstate Commerce Commission has the power to prescribe the floor and the ceiling for rates leaving the zone of reasonableness referred to by the Supreme Court—two hundred and eighty-nine United States 627—within which the various carriers may adjust their rates in the true American competitive fashion.

England is another country that has encouraged monopolies and cartels in preference to free enterprise. Consequently, it has followed the only alternative that can be followed by a nation that substantially foregoes free competition—the adoption of some form of socialism.

The form of socialism to which a nation may drift, after it abandons free competition, may vary from the comparatively mild form now prevailing in England to the more rigorous form now prevalent in Soviet Russia. The economic characteristics of both systems have in common the feature that the living standards of the great mass of the people in both countries are low. Living standards cannot long remain low without causing unrest and changes in political institutions.

It seems to me that our single largest task is to maintain a high standard of living for our people to prove to nations now wavering on the edge of totalitarianism that democracy and free competition offer them the most, not only politically but economically. How can we do this by lessening the application of the basic concept that makes us the greatest Nation—free competition?

The Congress has taken considerable interest in the welfare of small business in the last few years. It is a matter in which I am particularly interested. Not only should small business be given every assistance that the Congress can legally give it, but we should refrain from passing laws or amending present laws that will create conditions that will make it more difficult for the small businessman to survive. This brings me to the great danger inherent in the everyday operations under the proposed legislation, which is designed to work in this way: Once a basic agreement, under which the transportation agencies wish to function, is approved by the Interstate Commerce Commisison, the individual, day-to-day transactions carried on under the agreement are freed from the application of the antitrust laws. True, anyone feeling or finding out that the carriers have done anything improper may protest to the Interstate Commerce Commission, but what chance has a small businessman in Minnesota or Texas with his limited resources against a combination of the great transportation corporations of the United States with their billions and billions of dollars of resources?

Proponents of the legislation would have you believe that the Interstate Commerce Commission can be depended on to protect the public interest and to see that no abuses are carried on if the measure becomes law. It is obvious that the Commission, no matter how diligent it may become, could not adequately police the hundreds of millions of separate transactions that are carried on each year in the field of common-carrier transportation. These transactions are now subject to the antitrust laws; to allow them to be made exempt from the antitrust laws and substitute therefor a possible enforcement by an administrative agency—Interstate Commerce Commission—of 11 men and an already overworked staff is nothing short of ridiculous.

Furthermore there is no administrative similarity between the public interest feature of the Sherman Act and the public interest feature of the Interstate Commerce Act. The public interest dictated enactment of the United States Criminal Code. If the public interest feature of the Sherman Act is to be administered by an administrative agency insofar as the transportation industry is concerned, we might as well turn over to that agency enforcement of the United States Criminal Code to the extent that the transportation industry is involved. Small business is already burdened by problems so great as to be nearly insurmountable. To add to that burden the dangers that are inherent in exempting from the antitrust laws the industry on which nearly all small business is dependent—the transportation industry—is something that no group interested in the welfare of small business should even seriously consider.

As I pointed out in the minority report against reporting favorably H. R. 221, Eightieth Congress, first session, the real purpose of this legislation is to give the railroads relief from an antitrust suit brought by the State of Georgia, against the carriers, in the Supreme Court of the United States and another antitrust suit brought against the western railroads by the United States Department of Justice in the United States District Court at Lincoln, Nebr. In that dissenting report I stated—Report No. 1100, House of Representatives, Eightieth Congress, first session, page 23:

> Passage of this legislation would render these cases moot unless the proponents will include amendments that will exempt these cases. This they have failed to do although the companion bill, S. 110, as passed by the Senate, included a provision that the Supreme Court shall not be deprived of jurisdiction in the Georgia case, or that any principle of substantive or procedural law otherwise applicable shall not be changed by passage of the legislation. (Par. 11 of S. 110, passed by the Senate on June 18, 1947, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 7216.) If the proponents of this legislation wish to give weight to repeated assertions that this bill will not deprive the courts of jurisdiction, or the plaintiffs of a remedy, in the Georgia and Western cases a suitable proviso should be included in this bill that will apply to both cases.

I now repeat, if the proponents of this legislation are sincere in their repeated assertions that the proposed legislation will not deprive the courts of jurisdiction in the Georgia case and the Western case, an amendment exempting those cases will be included in the proposed law.

Let me recount briefly a few of the actions charged against the railroads in these suits:

On October 11, 1941, the Southern Railway submitted to the Southern Freight Association a proposal for a reduced rate upon logs from certain stations in northwestern Alabama to Altavista, Va., the entire movement being over the lines of the Southern Railway. The Southern Railway in its proposal stated that it felt that the reduced rate was necessary in order to permit the logs to move from the Alabama points. When the rate proposal was submitted by the Southern Freight Association to its members, the principal rail objection was predicated upon the dangerous competitive influences that might be set in motion by the establishment of the suggested rate.

The proposal was disapproved initially by the General Freight Committee of the Southern Freight Association by majority vote. It was then appealed to the Executive Committee where it was again disapproved by majority vote. Finally an appeal was taken to the Traffic Executive Association—Southern Territory. On July 20, 1943, 22 months after the proposal was first filed, it was stricken from the docket of the Traffic Executive Association. There was no applicable statute that required that the proposal be even submitted to the Southern Freight Association.

This illustration demonstrates that the plenary power of rail carriers to coerce, prevent, hinder, and delay the filing of rate proposals is not limited to situations where the railroads confer upon the formation of joint rates. Here the entire movement was over the rails of the proponent railroad; even so its managerial judgment and discretion was subjected to the concerted judgment of defendants, none of whom were parties to the rate proposed—plaintiff's trial brief for the Court, Supreme Court of the United States, October term 1945, No. 11, original, State of Georgia against the Pennsylvania Railroad Company et al, page 82.

When schemes are exempted from the antitrust laws whereby individual railroads are denied the right to exercise their managerial discretion in serving patrons on their lines, the free enterprise system has suffered a crushing blow.

The Western railroad defendants, according to the record, have committed such acts as these:

In 1937 a printer of newspaper rotagravure sections in Chicago requested the railroads to publish a passenger train carload rate of 140 cents per 100 pounds from Chicago to California destinations in order to permit him to effectively meet competition from California printers. This rate represented a combination of the Milwaukee Railroad's rate to Seattle of 90 cents and a truck rate from Seattle to San Francisco of 50 cents. The Chicago to California rail route agreed to established the rate requested by the Chicago shippers. Several carriers objected to this rate on the theory that it would jeopardize the existing mail-pay rates and their protest was carried to Commissioner Taylor of the Western Association of Railway Executives.

Commissioner Taylor assumed jurisdiction of the controversy and as the result of his handling the Chicago shipper was denied the rate sought and in addition thereto Commissioner Taylor "persuaded" the Milwaukee to raise its Chicago to Seattle rate from 90 cents to $1.80 and the Chicago Great Western to raise its Chicago to Twin Cities rate from 50 cents to 90 cents.

Commissioner Taylor was also successful, in 1938, in preventing the Wichita, Kansas, Beacon from securing a rate of 60 cents per 100 pounds on magazine inserts in carload passenger train service even though the Chicago Great Western, Missouri Pacific, and Rock Island railroads had indicated their willingness to establish such rate—pages 413, 414, 415, and 416 of plaintiff's trial brief, part II, Civil No. 246, District Court of the United States, District of Nebraska, Lincoln division, United States against Association of American Railroads, et al.

Commissioner Taylor was also successful, in 1934, in preventing the Chicago Great Western Railroad from establishing reduced competitive freight rates on packing house products between Chicago and Missouri River points. For example in his summary of activities for the year 1934, he said:

> This proposal was presented during 1933, at which time report was rendered by me, disapproving the action contemplated. The Chicago Great Western Railroad Co. served notice of intention to proceed with the establishment of such rates. However, at the request of the committee of directors, conference was held between the president of the Chicago Great Western Railroad Co. and the subcommittee of the committee of directors, following which a further meeting of the chief executives of all roads involved was held, and the position formerly taken, disapproving the establishment of rates proposed, was reaffirmed. As a result of the conference with the subcommittee of the committee of directors, the Chicago Great Western Railroad Co. indicated a willingness to

abide by my conclusions under the Commissioner Agreement, and the proposal was withdrawn.

If such acts as these have been committed by the railroad defendants in these antitrust suits, they should suffer the legal penalty for such acts. If the rail lines are innocent of any wrongdoing they should be given ample opportunity, in court, to clear themselves of the serious charges preferred against them. Passage of this legislation in either event is obviously not the indicated action or proper solution. It is not the function of Congress to bail out defendants in lawsuits.

But even more important than these individual court suits is maintenance of a free system of competitive enterprise in the United States—a feature, as I said at the outset, that distinguishes our democracy from the various socialistic and totalitarian governments in the world today. This legislation, or any legislation that proposes to change that system of free competition by allowing exemption of industry from the antitrust laws, turns the United States away from political and economic democracy. The only possible future result can be some form of collectivistic government. We should consider matters that strengthen our free enterprise system, not those that tear it down as does this measure. I therefore earnestly urge you to join me and other advocates of our free enterprise system in casting your vote against this pernicious legislation.

Before exempting the railroads from the antitrust laws, it is well to consider their activities during World War II, during which time they had a measure of immunity from the antitrust laws in connection with the determination of rates, rules, regulations, and practices relating to the transportation of war material for account of the United States Government. Following representations to the Department of Justice, the railroads created a committee known as the Traffic Executive Chairmen's Committee, which legislated upon rate questions affecting the transportation charges on the greater portion of war material handled by the railroads for the Government.

Long before the end of hostilities the activities of this committee were such that the Department of Justice found it necessary to caution the committee, and it was placed on notice that unless its activities were made to conform with the letter of conditional immunity from the antitrust laws it would be necessary to withdraw same.

It is common knowledge that the railroads through this committee—and furloughed railroad employees masquerading as officers in the Army and Navy—gouged the Government hundreds of millions of dollars in the form of extortionate rates. The Attorney General of the United States is now seeking recovery of these damages through a series of civil complaints filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission.

If this is an example of what the railroads might be expected to do in connection with normal peacetime traffic following enactment of this legislation, it would appear that the Congress should proceed with caution in passing this bill.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
SMALL BUSINESS, INC.,
Washington, D. C., May 11, 1948.

Hon. JOSEPH O'HARA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: You will recall the position that the Federation took in its brief filed with the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee opposing the Reed-Bulwinkle bill. We still maintain that position and in behalf of small business of this Nation we reaffirm our position in vigorously opposing any attempt by legislative actions to suspend the antitrust laws in favor of the railroads or any other big industry throughout the Nation.

It is my understanding that this bill will not alone give exemption to antitrust laws in rate-fixing by railroads, but also to motor carriers. I do not think it is an idle statement that there is a close liaison existing between the railroads, certain large motor carrier fleets, and possibly big rubber and oil interests. I understand that the inland water routes will likewise be permitted to fix rates under the proposal.

It is interesting to note that very recently the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice filed charges against certain motor carriers, oil, and rubber interests who were attempting to monopolize the bus transportation system in certain western sections of our Nation.

It is a safe conclusion that if the Congress votes the Reed-Bulwinkle bill, as surely as this letter is written to you, other big industries will come in with the same plea for exemption from the antitrust laws, with the same request that railroad interests did: "We need this relief to protect us against chaos within our industry."

I am attaching herewith a copy of a telegram of May 9 directed to certain important leaders in the House, the message signed by the federation's president, C. W. Harder. After all, what Mr. Harder is stating is following out the wishes of the members of the Nation-wide membership of the federation. He is not speaking for himself, but he is speaking in the interests of Nation's small business.

Just a few days ago I received a communication from the Beaumont Variety Store, at Beaumont, Calif., their letter of April 28, 1948. I am also attaching a copy of a letter from the same people to the Interstate Commerce Commission, dated November 26, 1947, and a copy of the letter from the Interstate Commerce Commission to the Beaumont Variety Store, dated December 3, 1947. A quick review of the situation will give you a good indication of the little or no help to small business that can be obtained from the Interstate Commerce Commission.

During the past 2 or 3 weeks important major decisions have been rendered by the United States Supreme Court—three momentous decisions, for the first time in many years tending to strengthen antitrust-law enforcement, and more important, the decisions a stimulant to small business of this Nation that the antitrust laws mean just what they were set up to do—to protect against monopoly. I cite the decision in the Cement Institute case, the moving picture industry, and the Morton Salt case (price discrimination). What a discouraging situation it would be for the future of small business of this Nation if we find after these three major decisions in putting strength behind the antitrust laws, that the Congress now would suspend the laws for the railroad industry and others, permitting them to fix rates.

If railroad management is vitally interested to protect their industry, the public, their employees and stockholders, they will get on the job at once and find ways and means to revitalize their business through real free competition among members of the industry, and stop depending upon the Congress and the administration for hand-outs and help. The average small business institution of this Nation must find ways and means in the highly competitive market that they face with big business interests to maintain their position in our Nation's economy and the same rule or reason should apply to the railroads of this Nation.

What this Nation needs today to maintain its free competitive position is not suspension of antitrust laws but, on the other hand, what small business is clamoring for and has been clamoring for for years, the strengthening of antitrust laws and the application of the laws to all segments of our Nation's economy, and an all-out vigorous enforcement of the laws by the administration and a directive from the Congress of the United States.

Please feel free to use this statement and the accompanying material in your remarks on the floor in opposition to this bill. Small business is to be congratulated that you will be one of the few that will speak in their interests in this important discussion on this major legislative action.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE J. BURGER.

[Telegram]

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 9, 1948.*

(Night letter sent to certain congressional leaders in the House.)

We are informed that the House of Representatives will debate and vote on the Reed-Bulwinkle bill this week. On behalf of the small, independent business, and professional-man membership of this National Federation of Small Business, we beseech you to vote against this legislation, to use every last ounce of your energies to persuade your colleagues to vote against it. We call your attention to the fact that the membership of this federation, the largest individual, small, independent business and professional-man membership of any business organization in these United States, when polled by mandate ballot during March 1947, voted 80 percent against the Reed-Bulwinkle bill. This Nation-wide sounding, the only such sounding in which small, independent business and professional men sent their ballots directly to their Congressmen, was based on distribution, through the mails and by almost 100 Federation field representatives, of 119,000 mandate ballots. Federation members are convinced that this is an extremely dangerous piece of legislation, that it threatens the welfare of our free, competitive, independent, capitalistic system, that system on which is founded our present greatness. They oppose this bill because it would effectively immunize the railroads, one of the cornerstones of our economy, from the Federal antitrust laws, because it would set a pattern for other industries to follow. Today it is the railroads that are attempting to drive a hole through the antitrust laws. Tomorrow it will be steel, rubber, oil, and other basic industries. And when they are through, monopoly will have a stranglehold on our Nation, then public ownership of industry will follow. And the spirit of communism will have conquered without the firing of a single bullet. Your attention is called to the fact that today Federal prosecutions of price-fixing cases are pending or taking place, yet here is a bill designed to give Government protection to rate fixing in one of our most basic industries. Today our Supreme Court is issuing some of the most significant antimonopoly decisions in its entire history, decisions that are long overdue for reason of the tremendous concentration that has taken place in our business structure, yet here is a bill that gives monopoly concentration the most brilliant green light that it has ever had. Mr. Congressman, we believe that

the welfare of your small, independent business constituents, which is threatened by this bill, is of more importance to you than are the interests of the monopoly groups that are promoting this special interest legislation. We ask if you are going to vote for the interests of small, independent business, as expressed in the mandate ballot or if you are going to vote against it and for the interests of the railroad business monopolists who right now are raising their charges regularly. We urge you to vote against this Reed-Bulwinkle bill.

C. W. HARDER,
President.

BEAUMONT VARIETY STORE,
Beaumont, Calif., April 28, 1948.

Mr. GEORGE J. BURGER,
Director, National Federation of Small Business, Inc,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BURGER: In reply to yours of the 23d, I will try to boil my problem down to a brief but complete as possible review.

It seems that a consignor may elect to ship merchandise in a pool car shipment consigned to a forwarding or carloading company for distribution to predesignated consignees, and that the charges made by the forwarding, or distributing, organization are not subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

This lack of jurisdiction frequently results in charges in excess of those charges which would result had the shipment been made by direct freight.

We have two specific cases apparently involving only the Freight Transport Co. of Los Angeles. And during the past year we had two other cases involving the National Carloading Co., also of Los Angeles, but these latter two were corrected by the consignor, and we no longer have the records in connection with these two cases.

The two cases now in question are identical in nature, being two shipments of cotton underwear shipped from the P. H. Hanes Knitting Mills at Winston-Salem, N. C., via Western Pacific Railroad in a pool car shipment consigned to Freight Transport Co. at Los Angeles for distribution to consignees predetermined by the P. H. Hanes Co. at the time of shipment. Freight Transport Co. turned each of these shipments over to Southern California Freight Forwarders for delivery to us.

The first shipment under date of July 15, 1947, consisted of two cases of cotton underwear weighing 308 pounds, the charges for which, we discover, were as follows:

Rail movement to Los Angeles (308 pounds at $3.72 per hundredweight)	$11.46
Freight transport cartage charge (308 pounds at 48 cents per hundredweight)	1.48
Freight transport distribution charge (minimum charge 60 cents)	.60
Southern California Freight Forwarders delivery charge to Beaumont (308 pounds at 86 cents per hundredweight)	2.81
Total	16.35

The second shipment under date of August 7, 1947, consisted of one case of cotton underwear weighing 173 pounds, the charges for which, we discover, were as follows:

Rail movement to Los Angeles (173 pounds at $3.72 per hundredweight)	$6.44
Freight transport cartage charge (minimum charge 89 cents)	.89
Freight transport distribution charge (minimum charge 60 cents)	.60
Southern California Freight Forwarders delivery charge to Beaumont (173 pounds at 86 cents per hundredweight)	1.77
Total	9.70

According to the Southern Pacific Railroad station agent at Beaumont, this merchandise could have been moved by direct freight from Winston-Salem, N. C., to Beaumont, Calif., at the rate of $4.75 per hundredweight plus Federal tax.

I realize that the amount that these shipments cost me in excess of the cost of direct rail is small, and as such, reimbursement for these excessive charges would not pay me for the time and effort expended in obtaining such refund.

But I realize that my small case must be multiplied by the thousands each month and as such certainly reflects in additional costs to the ultimate consumer as well as it increases the operating overhead of each small-business man in the country.

Therefore, anything that can be done to eliminate the use of these parasitical organizations will prove a service to the retailer as well as the general consuming public.

To further explain the situation I will enclose a copy of my last letter to the Interstate Commerce Commission in regard to this and their reply to same.

I hope that this will explain what I have in mind, but if further explanation is required, I will be happy to try again.

Very truly yours,
BEAUMONT VARIETY STORE,
By GLEN M. RUSSELL.

BEAUMONT VARIETY STORE,
Beaumont, Calif., November 26, 1947.

Re: Informal Complaint No. 176254.

G. W. LAIRD,
Acting Secretary,
Interstate Commerce Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Reference is made to your letter of November 21, 1947, in regard to informal complaint No. 176254.

In your letter you have cited to us section 402 (c) of the Interstate Commerce Act relative to consolidated shipping in order to obtain volume rates and have advised us that forwarding company rates need not be the same as of other transportation agencies.

It seems to us that if the charges made to us are lawful, that forwarding companies have been set up as a means of bypassing the intent of the act. For, you can see by the charges made to us, that we, the consignee, certainly have not benefitted by the services of a forwarding company, but that they have rather served as a detriment to us, inasmuch as we have paid more by using their services than if they had been left completely out of the picture.

It further appears to us that merchandise consigned in carload lots to a forwarding company for distribution to a predetermined consignee is interstate in character from the time it leaves the jurisdiction of the shipper until it is delivered to the final consignee regardless of the number of hands that it passes through en route, providing, of course, that the shipment crosses State boundaries. And as such, it appears that the shipment should be under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission until it reaches such final consignee.

Judging from the statement in your letter that the rates of forwarding companies are not required by law to be the same as other transportation agencies, it would appear that forwarding companies are not considered to be under the jurisdiction of the Commission. If this is true, it is high time that this situation was remedied either by action of the Commission itself if within its jurisdiction, or by act of Congress, if necessary.

It has always been our belief, and we feel that it is the belief of all small merchants that the Interstate Commerce Commission was established to prevent excessive freight charges for the handling of goods and to protect the public from violations of regulations established by such Commission.

If the Commission is powerless to regulate these various forwarding agencies, this fact should be known by the businessman in order that proper legislation may be enacted to place them under regulation or if legislation covering same is impractical, they should know the facts so that they could specify the manner in which their merchandise should be shipped, and thereby eliminate what appears to be a parasitical organization by taking away its source of revenue through designation of more economical means of transportation.

If my assumption is correct that the Commission does not have jurisdiction in such matters, will you please cite to me the pertinent portions of the law and the Commission's line of reasoning in regard to same in order that I may have a working knowledge of the condition as it exists, and may also be in a better position to know how to proceed from here.

I hope that you will realize that I am not intending to be argumentative, nor am I trying to find fault just for the purpose of finding fault—I have too much to do in my own business to find time for that. I realize, too, that the amount of the overcharge we experienced would not compensate for the time and expense of writing any one of the letters which I have written in regard to this matter if we were able to recover the amount of such overcharges.

However, I know that if we found excessive charges to the extent that we have on the few shipments that forwarding companies have handled for us that the amount of money they collect over a period of a year for charges in excess of that which would be charged if shipped by more direct means would run into the millions of dollars. And if I can save the businessman and the ultimate consuming public only a small portion of that I would feel well repaid and that I had rendered a service to the transportation companies and to the general public.

Thanking you very much for your kind cooperation, we are,

Very truly yours,
BEAUMONT VARIETY STORE,
By GLEN M. RUSSELL.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., December 3, 1947.

Mr. GLEN M. RUSSELL,
Beaumont Variety Store, Beaumont, Calif.

DEAR SIR: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of November 26, 1947, same having reference to the charges on a shipment of cotton underwear moving from Winston-Salem, N. C., to Beaumont, Calif.

You will note from the October 13, 1947, letter of Southern California Freight Forwarders, that it received the shipment from Freight Transport Co., a local drayman and pool-car distributor in Los Angeles.

While part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act gives the Commission jurisdiction over freight forwarders, there are certain transportation services exempted from our jurisdiction by law, and for ready reference there are quoted paragraphs (b) and (c) of section 402 (8) of the act:

"(b) The provisions of this part shall not apply (1) to service performed by or under the direction of a cooperative association, as defined in the Agricultural Marketing Act, approved June 15, 1929, as amended, or by a federation of such cooperative associations, if such federation possesses no greater powers or purposes than cooperative associations so defined, or (2) where the property with respect to which service is performed consists of ordinary livestock, fish (including shellfish), agricultural commodities (not including manufactured products thereof), or used household goods, if the person performing such service engages in service subject to this part with respect to not more than one of the classifications of property above specified.

"(c) The provisions of this part shall not be construed to apply (1) to the operations of a shipper, or a group or association of

shippers, in consolidating or distributing freight for themselves or for the members thereof, on a nonprofit basis, for the purpose of securing the benefits of carload, truckload, or other volume rates, or (2) to the operations of a warehouseman or other shippers' agent, in consolidating or distributing pool cars, whose services and responsibilities to shippers in connection with such operations are confined to the terminal area in which such operations are performed."

You do not show specifically how the shipments moved from Winston-Salem. However, it appears that the matter complained of by you seems to resolve itself into the method used by your consignor in forwarding your merchandise. The consignor appears to have consolidated shipments for a number of purchasers in a pool car consigned to a pool-car distributor who adds a charge for his service in distributing this shipment to the various consignees. By referring to paragraph (c) above quoted, you will readily associate that the charges of the distributor are not within our jurisdiction.

As pointed out in our letter of November 21, 1947, it would appear that you should take up with your consignor the matter of how he should bill your merchandise if the present method results in charges in excess of those that would accrue if a different form of transportation were used.

It is suggested that you might contact the traffic officials of the carriers and forwarders who serve Beaumont, Calif., for the purpose of ascertaining rates in your shipments, and with this information before you, you can direct your consignor how to ship.

For your information and in connection with the comment upon the charges of freight forwarders, it is deemed proper to state that the nature and character of freight forwarders and their services are not precisely parallel with those of carriers subject to either part I, II, or III of the Interstate Commerce Act. Section 406 (d) requires the Commission in passing upon the lawfulness of rates and charges of freight forwarders to give due consideration, among other factors, to the inherent nature of freight forwarding. Prominent features of the forwarding business are the customary assembling and consolidating into carload or truckload lots of numerous shipments of merchandise from individual consignors; that the forwarder tenders the assembled and consolidated shipments to common carriers regulated under the act, including rail, highway, and water carriers, for transportation to break-bulk points, where the individual shipments are either distributed to the ultimate consignee for whom they are intended or are reshipped as less-than-carload or less-than-truckload shipments to consignees located at points beyond the break-bulk points.

If you at any time have any specific shipments with respect to which you believe that an improper charge has been assessed, you are at liberty to correspond with us relative thereto, such correspondence, however, should be supported by the transportation papers covering the shipment from the point of origin to the point of destination.

In the absence of information as to how the shipment moved from Winston-Salem, we are not in a position to verify the charges. You will accordingly appreciate that if your consignor insists upon the use of a pool car, there is, of course, nothing that we can do to aid you in that connection.

Respectfully,

G. W. LAIRD,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. This arrangement, as I understand, has been in effect for 40 or 50 years. Now it is proposed, as I understand this bill, to continue it under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission; is that correct?

Mr. O'HARA. In part; yes, sir. If there is a monopolistic practice or if there is a conspiracy which would be in violation of the antitrust laws, suit now would be brought by the Attorney General. If we pass this bill the matter is referred to the Interstate Commerce Commission, and if the Interstate Commerce Commission ratifies what would be, without this bill, a violation of the antitrust laws, then, in my opinion, that ends the violation of law.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. In effect, then, this gives power to the Interstate Commerce Commission to set aside what would otherwise be a violation of the antitrust acts.

Mr. O'HARA. That is right. That is my understanding. I do not think there is any dispute about it.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. On what ground, I am wondering?

Mr. O'HARA. To immunize the railroads from the antitrust laws and bail some of them out of two serious lawsuits.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] has expired.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include as a part of my remarks the letter referred to in the letter from the National Federation of Small Business.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, it is a very strained interpretation of the facts involved here to say the question is one of monopoly or antimonopoly. Let us look at the practical situation, the very practical one, that is presented by this bill.

There are over 200 railroads in the United States. There are thousands and thousands of stations. There are more than a billion railroad rates in the United States. Truckers, busses, water carriers, and freight forwarders are involved. Today a shipper can go down to the depot and deal with his carrier, practically the same as if all the railroads in the United States constituted but a single carrier agency. They are so closely coordinated in operations that their many contractual relations to each other permit the undisturbed traffic from road to road without substantial hindrance.

Ordinarily, rates are initiated by the carrier. Ordinarily, the Interstate Commerce Commission does not interfere until someone makes a complaint. It is impossible to have a policy by which the Interstate Commerce Commission must approve, in advance, all of these rates with the constant changes required.

The proposition here is not to create monopoly. It is a question of how we are going to protect the public where two or more carriers enter into an agreement. They must, of necessity, enter into many agreements. There is no other relation between business concerns in the United States that is so complicated and so vast in intercontractual relations as between the carriers of the country. They include the fixing of joint rates, of through rates, of division of charges, for the use of equipment, schedules, and hundreds of things that must be arranged by contracts between the carriers.

This bill does not take any jurisdiction from the Interstate Commerce Commission. In fact, that Commission already has jurisdiction of everything that is proposed in this bill. What this bill does is to say that before these contracts shall be binding they shall have the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, or else those who enter into the contracts will be subject to prosecution under the antitrust laws. In other words, we attempt to make the Interstate Commerce Commission the protector of these rates and agreements, to see that they are just and reasonable, instead of sending them to prosecution by the Department of Justice. What a crude system it would be in handling these agreements to say that it is a crime to make them. That is what the antitrust law says. The antitrust law does not say, "You shall prosecute because it is an unreasonable or an unjust agreement." A sufficient justification for a prosecution under the Antitrust Act is merely the fact that the agreement is made. No matter how reasonable or just or necessary the contract may be, it may be an offense against the antitrust law for those who enter into it. So here we say as to those essential contracts, matters that must be daily entered into by the railroads of the United States, "Before you get this protection from the antitrust laws, you must have the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission." That Government agency has investigative powers to look into and decide whether the contract may be just or consistent with our transportation policies. In the exercise of that discretionary power of the Commission the public has its protection and the work of the carriers is facilitated. After the Commission gives its approval, those who enter into a useful contract are protected and not prosecuted. It gives protection in a practical and sane way. It gives the public greater protection than it possibly could have by any system which would constantly inject the Department of Justice into criminal prosecutions against those who have made what may be lawful and reasonable and necessary contracts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEONARD W. HALL].

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill.

The need for this legislation and the chaos which will result if this bill is not enacted into law are so well known that they do not have to be described in great detail here.

For many years the conference method of working out matters relating to freight rates and related rules and practices has been followed by carriers and shippers. Such conferences are carried on through the medium of freight and passenger associations or bureaus located in different parts of the country.

They have been systematized with the full knowledge of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Indeed, motor and water carriers, with the encouragement of the Commission, have adopted similar arrangements as those pertaining to railroads.

Such conferences are mandatory if common tariffs are to be issued by the railroads. During the early years of the country it may not have been necessary for expeditious shipment of goods to have such common tariffs, and each carrier published its own. But as the Nation developed it was not long until the need for common tariffs for all carriers became apparent.

With conferences operating as open forums, carriers and shippers are kept informed about matters in which they are mutually interested. Changes in rates, rules, or practices may be worked out through discussion after the proposals have been given publicity to interested parties. Thus, the highly complicated rate structure of our competitive system, with its many thousands of individual rates, may be reduced to some understandable system. Through rates with maximum choice of through routes are obtainable. Local rates of different carriers may be reasonably related to avoid undue discrimination.

Through recent actions by the Department of Justice under the antitrust laws, the conference method has been jeopardized. Without this legislation their continuance is problematical. The resulting confusion would be tremendous.

This bill permits the continuance of the conference method under proper safeguards. The Interstate Commerce Commission would be given the authority over the conferences, and the associations and bureaus under which they operate, which the Commission does not now have. The Commission's present authority to approve or disapprove changes in rates, and related rules and practices, would be extended to the same powers over the agreements governing the organization, operation, and procedure of these conference agencies.

Standards are set up under which the Commission may grant its approval to such agreements. Unless the agreements are so approved they would remain fully subject to the antitrust laws. If so approved, the agreements and actions taken thereunder come within the jurisdiction of the Commission instead of the Department of Justice.

The bill as proposed by our committee contemplates the restriction of the agreements which may be approved by the Commission to those pertaining to rates and related matters. There has been some discussion of whether operating and service agreements covering such matters as train schedules, diversion and reconsignment, ticket and baggage arrangements, use of terminal facilities interchange of equipment, and the like should be treated in the same manner. These matters our committee does not recommend be included in this legislation.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. Already this House has passed similar legislation twice, only to have it fail in other parts of the legislative process. Thus, the bill is not one of first impression in this legislative body.

If the principle in this legislation could be found objectionable by Members here, certainly the form in which it is here presented is as little subject to criticism as any of such bills hitherto receiving our approval.

Because by the committee amendment, the only matter upon which the railroads may agree is the matter of rates. Not schedules or services—but only rates. And such agreements are always to be under the control and supervision of the ICC.

In addition, this bill actually legitimizes procedures which have been carried on between the roads under the auspices and direction of the ICC. The legislation removes a paradox or dilemma which has been a part of our interstate-commerce law for a long time. On the one hand, the Commerce Commission is required to have the railroads to agree upon through and connecting rates. Such rates have been developed through rate conferences under the direct supervision of the ICC.

At the very same time, the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department had taken the position that all such agreements are illegal as in restraint of trade, and violative of the Sherman antitrust law. So there is illustrated the confusion and contradiction existing in this important segment of our transportation industry.

I sincerely hope and believe that this bill will have the overwhelming support of this legislative body, as it has on two previous votes.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I spent a great many days listening to the witnesses from all sections of this country who appeared before our committee during the course of the hearings on this bill. There were more than a hundred of these witnesses, as I recall it. Almost all of them were men who had spent their lives in dealing with the practical aspects of transportation and with governmental regulation of transportation.

Most of them were shippers—shippers of every conceivable commodity from and to every section of the Nation. Others were representatives of governmental regulatory bodies, Federal and State, and still others were representatives of all types of land transportation—truck, bus, rail, and water.

These are the people most directly concerned with transportation. These are the people who know the most about transportation. These are the people who will be most affected by the enactment of this bill or the failure to enact it. These are the people who will be helped or hurt and they are the ones who best know whether they will be helped or hurt.

And they are all in favor of the bill and insistent upon its passage, including shippers from my part of the country and from my own State.

It is unnecessary for me to emphasize the significance of support of this character, but I do wish to call attention to one feature which impresses me very deeply and which certainly will not be overlooked by the House.

Opponents of the bill have said that it would deprive someone of needed protection under the antitrust laws. In fact, this is the only argument which has been advanced against the bill. I have asked myself and I suggest that you ask yourself, Who would be deprived of any such needed protection?

Most assuredly, the shippers would not be deprived of any protection they need. If this were not true they would be against the bill, but they are for it, with an unexampled degree of unanimity. One shipper witness, whose business requires him to travel all over the country, said he had never found one shipper, large or small, who was not in favor of the bill. No shipper appeared before our committee against the bill.

If the shippers would not be deprived of any needed protection under the antitrust laws, who would be? Not the trucks—they want the bill. Not the busses; not the railroads, large or small—they all want the bill. Not the Interstate Commerce Commission, or the Office of Defense Transportation, or the State Commissions, or the Army and Navy officers who were in charge of transportation during the war—they all want the bill.

What I have said is enough to dispose of the only point which has been made against this legislation, but the question can be approached in a different way and the answer is the same.

Shippers do not rely upon the antitrust laws for protection against excessive or discriminatory rates and have no reason to do so. They have a much more effective and comprehensive protection under the Interstate Commerce Act. That act gives to a governmental body—an agency of the Congress itself, the Interstate Commerce Commission—complete control over the rates. The Commission has the power to fix, and does actually fix, not only the level of the rates but also the relationship between the rates. This is what distinguishes regulated transportation from other industry. In regulated transportation there is governmental price fixing. In other industries protection from excessive prices must come largely from the antitrust laws. There can be no doubt that in the field of regulated transportation the protection against excessive prices is far more complete than the protection which the antitrust laws afford in other fields of industry.

This bill would in no way impair the control of the Interstate Commerce Commission over the rates of carriers. It would leave the Commission with all the powers which it now has and, in fact, it would extend the control of the Commission and enable it to supervise the conference method of considering rates.

Rate relationships are of the greatest concern to my part of the country and it is essential to our growth and prosperity that we have transportation rates which are fairly related to transportation rates in other sections of the country. It is self-evident that the relationship of rates can be considered only in

conferences where all the railroads involved are represented and where all the interested shippers can be heard. This is possible only by the use of the conference method of considering rates. Moreover, we think that the Interstate Commerce Commission, a body having centralized authority and having responsibility for the effectuation of the Nation's transportation policy, is the only Government body in a position to fix rate relationships which are fair to all sections of the country.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced, after a careful study of this legislation, with the amendment to be offered by the committee, that it is in the public interest and should be approved.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GILLETTE].

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. Chairman, the Bulwinkle bill defines the intent of Congress with respect to rate matters in the transportation industry—in my opinion, it is long overdue.

It is impossible for me to believe that common carriers by rail, highway, and water, violate the Antitrust Act when, acting either on their own responsibility, or pursuant to the specific requests of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the agency of this Congress, they consult and confer regarding the establishment of rates which will conform to the standards laid down in the Interstate Commerce Act and which will contribute to carrying out the congressional declaration of national transportation policy.

This feeling is concurred in by every witness that appeared before our committee from the State of Pennsylvania. For the information of my distinguished colleagues, the following witnesses from Pennsylvania gave their wholehearted support to this legislation:

Pennsylvania Public Service Commission.
Central Pennsylvania Traffic Club, Williamsport.
Manufacturers Traffic Club, of Lancaster, Pa.
Philadelphia Maritime Exchange.
Pittsburgh Region Chapter of Association of Interstate Commerce Commission Practitioners.
American Farm Bureau.
National Grange.
National League of Wholesale Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Distributors, Philadelphia branch.
National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.
Pennsylvania Association of Cooperative Organizations.
Pennsylvania State Council of Farm Organizations.
Philadelphia Produce Exchange.
Blairsville, Pa., Board of Trade.
DuBois, Pa., Board of Trade.
Easton, Pa., Board of Trade.
Lumbermen's Exchange of the City of Philadelphia.
Manufacturers Association of Delaware County, Chester, Pa.
National Association of Mutual Savings Banks.
Philadelphia Textile Manufacturers' Association.
Railroad Security Owners' Association.
Altoona, Pa., Chamber of Commerce.
Beaver, Pa., Businessmen's Association.
Bedford, Pa., Chamber of Commerce.
Berwick, Pa., Rotary Club.
Butler, Pa., Chamber of Commerce.
Carlisle, Pa., Chamber of Commerce.
Chamber of Commerce and Board of Trade of Philadelphia.
Chambersburg, Pa., Chamber of Commerce.
Columbia, Pa., Chamber of Commerce.
Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia.
Connellsville, Pa., Chamber of Commerce.
Corry, Pa., Chamber of Commerce.
Delaware County, Pa., Chamber of Commerce, Chester.
Ellwood City, Pa., Chamber of Commerce.
Gettysburg, Pa., Chamber of Commerce.
Greater Latrobe, Pa., Association.
Grove City, Pa., Commercial Club.
Harrisburg, Pa., Chamber of Commerce.
Huntington, Pa., Chamber of Commerce.
Lancaster, Pa., Chamber of Commerce.
Lansdale, Pa., Chamber of Commerce.
McKeesport, Pa., Chamber of Commerce.
Milton, Pa., Chamber of Commerce.
Monessen, Pa., Chamber of Commerce.
Monongahela, Pa., Chamber of Commerce.
Mount Carmel, Pa., Businessmen's Association.
Mount Carmel, Pa., Rotary Club.
Mount Pleasant, Pa., Civic and Business Association.
Northeast Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce.
Oakmont, Pa., Chamber of Commerce.
Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce.
Port Allegany Chamber of Commerce.
Pottstown, Pa., Chamber of Commerce.
Punxsutawney, Pa., Chamber of Commerce.
Quakertown, Pa., Chamber of Commerce.
Reading, Pa., Chamber of Commerce.
Renovo, Pa., Rotary Club.
Scottsdale, Pa., Community, Civic, and Industry Association, Inc.
Shamokin, Pa., Chamber of Commerce.
Shamokin, Pa., Rotary Club.
Somerset, Pa., Chamber of Commerce.
Sunbury, Pa., Chamber of Commerce.
Sunbury, Pa., Kiwanis Club.
Sunbury, Pa., Rotary Club.
Titusville, Pa., Chamber of Commerce.
Uniontown, Pa., Chamber of Commerce.
Vandergrift, Pa., Chamber of Commerce.
Warren, Pa., Chamber of Commerce.
Williamsport, Pa., Community Trade Association.
Williamsport, Pa., Rotary Club.
Windber, Pa., Businessmen's Assn.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the Bulwinkle bill, H. R. 221, has previously been considered and approved by the House, I will not take the time of the House to discuss its provisions. Certainly we can all agree that Congress should not and cannot successfully determine the rates to be charged by our various railroads. We have wisely delegated that power to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Based on the testimony presented to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee the overwhelming majority of shippers seem to feel that the Interstate Commerce Commission has done a good job.

All we are trying to do in this bill is to permit railroads, freight handlers, and so forth, to meet and discuss matters of rates, division of fares, and similar subjects without making themselves liable for prosecution under the antitrust laws. Certainly we are not granting immunity to the railroads.

The need for this legislation has been clearly proven and I hope it becomes law at the earliest possible date.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I have the honor of representing a congressional district located in the largest railroad center in the world, Chicago, Ill. In all probability the mail and telegrams I have received regarding H. R. 221 would be about the same as received by other Members of the House of Representatives. I only received one letter in opposition to this legislation.

The following excerpts from a few of the letters and telegrams are typical of the contents of most of the communications received by me:

Regarding H. R. 221, known as the Bulwinkle bill, feel that passage of this act will definitely benefit the shipping public. It seems to us that the rate-making feature of this act is especially important, and will assure shippers in general the fairest possible means of determining freight rates that are fair, reasonable, and for the common good of the entire Nation.

There is now pending before the House of Representatives the so-called Bulwinkle bill—H. R. 221—which I understand is coming up for consideration before the House very soon, and which if enacted, would remove any doubt with respect to the legality of and permit the continuation of the practices which have been carried on by the railroads for many years of maintaining joint freight rate bureaus for the purpose of docketing all proposed changes in freight rates and freight tariff rules and regulations so that all interested shippers and receivers would be afforded an opportunity to appear at public hearings before such bureaus for the purpose of expressing their views with respect to the proposals involved, and so that joint consideration could be given to such proposals by the railroads involved.

A bill containing somewhat the same provisions was passed by the United States Senate on June 18, 1947, by a vote of 60 to 27.

The Midwest Shippers Advisory Board is a voluntary organization composed of approximately 2,000 representatives of shippers and receivers of freight located within the States of Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa and the western half of Indiana and the Upper Peninsula of Michigan. At one of the regular meetings of the board, the members present went on record in favor of the passage of H. R. 221, and authorized me to advise you of their action.

Urge you support Bulwinkle bill H. R. 221 clarifying status of rate-making bureaus. Our company operates 150 moving vans over entire United States. Party to household goods carriers bureau tariff since 1935. Conference method of rate making demonstrated and proven to be best method of preserving stability of the moving industry which Motor

Carrier Act and national transportation policy was designed to accomplish in interests of the public and industry.

One of the bills pending before the House of Representatives is the so-called Reed-Bulwinkle bill, H. R. 221. As you know, the purpose of this bill is to exempt from the Sherman Act railroad activities which are subject to regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The whole purpose of the Interstate Commerce Commission has been that rates should be fixed by public authorities and not be subject to the vicissitudes of unregulated competition. That cannot be done as long as the railroads remain subject to the Sherman Act. Indeed, no one supposed that the railroads were subject to the Sherman Act until the Antitrust Division evolved this idea a short time ago. We believe that doubt should be dispelled and the railroads placed unreservedly under the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Understand Bulwinkle bill, H. R. 221, will be considered tomorrow. Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry board of directors believing preservation of present freight rate-making procedure is desirable and that law eliminating conflict of jurisdiction between Interstate Commerce Commission and Antitrust Division of Department of Justice is necessary.

The Illinois Commerce Commission on November 28, 1945, adopted a resolution, copy of which is enclosed, endorsing the principle of the Bulwinkle bill (H. R. 2536) then pending in the Seventy-ninth Congress. Inasmuch as the Reed bill (S. 110) which passed the Senate June 18, 1947, by a vote of 60 to 27, now pending in the House in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, embodies the principles endorsed by the Illinois Commerce Commission in its resolution of November 28, 1945, I am sending to you a copy of the resolution.

"STATE OF ILLINOIS,
"ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION.

"Whereas in the opinion of the Illinois Commerce Commission it is essential for orderly supervision and regulation of rates and transportation for common carriers in interstate and foreign commerce to confer and pool their experiences and conclusions and determine as most advantageous to them, the general public, and the shippers and receivers of merchandise the most fair, practical, and efficient rates, routes, schedules, services, and agreements for application under published tariffs, subject to the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, without restraining or regulating influence of other Federal agencies not qualified to appreciate either the basic facts or the controlling reasons for the coordinated actions; and

"Whereas it appears the accepted view has been that when Congress vests supervisory power in a commission or other duly constituted body to exercise granted powers of sovereignty, such body in matters over which it has authority should have jurisdiction intended for a final adjudication, subject to court review, in matters of law or abuse of discretion; and

"Whereas it further appears that either before such final adjudication a court as an independent agency of Government can intervene, or the Justice Department of the United States can invoke the rule that the joint action committees and rate bureaus or railroads or common carriers in evolving joint tariffs, rules, regulations, schedules, service, and agreements are basically conspiratory in nature and hence violative of the Sherman antitrust law; and

"Whereas the Bulwinkle bill, so-called, H. R. 2536, now pending in Congress, purports to make legal the acts and agreements among carriers setting up rate bureaus, joint tariffs, and schedules of service, subject to the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and expressly exempts such coordinating rate bureaus, and committees so functioning and agreements consummated thereunder from the provisions of the Sherman Antitrust Act: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Illinois Commerce Commission endorse the principle of the Bulwinkle bill, H. R. 2536, with favorable action recommended on the amendments of the Dr. Splawn committee of the Interstate Commerce Commission to the end that agreements among common carriers may be entered into following the tenor of said act or bill without fear of violation of the said Sherman Antitrust Act, and that the Interstate Commerce Commission may have unquestioned finality in adjudication as to the propriety and sufficiency of such agreements, subject to court review in matters of law, resulting in the continuance of a competitive service consistent with the public interest and a sane national transportation policy; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in Washington, and that a copy be transmitted to the Senators and Representatives from Illinois in Congress.

"This resolution adopted at Chicago, Ill., this 28th day of November 1945.

"JOSEPH F. GUBBINS,
"Secretary."

Mr. Chairman, it should be noted that I did not receive a single telegram from a railroad or railroad association, but every communication was from individuals and concerns that are users of transportation, including truck lines. In other words, the people who use the service that is made available by the motor and rail carriers; the people who, in the final analysis pay the freight, are as wholeheartedly for this legislation as are the railroads.

The legislation now under discussion should contribute much to the orderly process of considering rates. The rate conference in the hands of experienced people, who deal with the business of transportation every day of their lives, should, and I believe will, contribute much under the authority of this legislation toward stability in rate making. Without this legislation giving legislative authority to rate conferences it would be very easy to bring about a condition of confusion and chaos, particularly in view of some of the present tactics being used by the Attorney General.

The passage of this bill would do much toward improving the progress of our transportation systems in the United States, which are so essential to development of a sound and stable economy, and which played such an important part in transporting our troops and materials during the recent war.

I strongly favor this legislation and trust it will receive an overwhelming vote of confidence.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, recently this House has voted billions of dollars for aiding and rehabilitating the countries of Europe. That was needed and in that effort I took a part and commend those who took the lead in this important endeavor. A short while ago—today—the House voted to deny to the people of the South one steam plant costing only $4,000,000. I am unable to reconcile the voting of billions for the rehabilitation and progress of the people of Europe and the denying of a small appropriation request for one section of our country when it would benefit them and all the people of America. The private power interests won out in the fight. Today the next bill that is brought up on the calendar for passage is a measure to relax the antitrust laws and to permit the railroad monopolies to get together and fix prices—to fix the rates—the tariffs which the people pay. I am fundamentally opposed to the relaxing of our antitrust laws but believe, on the other hand, that they should be strengthened and enforced. I am opposed to combinations and conspiracies and the fixing of prices in restraint of trade and against the interest of the people of our country. The antitrust laws which have been on the statute books for a number of years were enacted into law because of their need and necessity. These laws state in substance that all contracts, all combinations in restraint of trade are illegal. These laws prohibit monopolies and the fixing of prices against the public interest. During the growth of railroad empires in this country in the early part of the century practices grew up which necessitated the passage of the antitrust laws in the public interest. Now we come along and relax these laws to permit the railroad executives to get together around a table and to fix prices. Of course, they say subject to approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission. But why pass this law at all because the Interstate Commerce Commission already has authority to regulate the rates, the freight and tariff which the railroads charge the public. There is special interest behind tihs legislation or it would not be here for consideration today. It is not, I submit, Mr. Chairman, in the public interest.

To repeat, we vote billions for rehabilitation of Europe and then deny a modest request of the people of one section of our country because the private power interests oppose it. Next the railroad monopolies ask for special legislation. There is also pending, as the Members of this Congress know, a measure to give special benefits to the gas utilities in the West and Southwest.

Mr. Chairman, I raise only a humble voice and I recognize that the House being constituted as it is that this legislation will pass, but I honestly and sincerely believe that it is fundamentally wrong and that this Congress will be taking an improper step in favoring the railroad monopolies by relaxing the antitrust laws rather than strengthening these laws and enforcing them in the interest of the people of our country.

The so-called Bulwinkle bill has been pending for a long time. The railroad interests have waited for the opportune moment to secure its passage. This legislation should not be passed and as I have said, Mr. Chairman, I raise my humble voice in protest.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HARLESS].

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that this is good legislation. As a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I

have heard powerful and convincing arguments in support of this bill. In addition to that fact, this bill bears the endorsement of a large cross section of the interested people of my State. These include Arizona Wool Growers Association, Arizona Cattle Growers Association, Arizona Vegetable Growers Association, Arizona State Corporation Commission, Salt River Valley Water Users Association, Central Arizona Cattle Feeders Association, Yuma County Chamber of Commerce, Douglas Chamber of Commerce, Bisbee Chamber of Commerce, Santa Cruz County Chamber of Commerce, and Flagstaff Chamber of Commerce.

In addition to these groups many individuals in my State endorse or have testified for this bill, including A. C. Hays, of Phoenix, who testified as State legislative representative of the Order of Railway Conductors.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FOOTE].

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending bill.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, H. R. 221, deals with the application of the antitrust laws to railroads subject to the regulation of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It does not grant railroads immunity from antitrust laws or relieve them from the application thereof. It seeks to dispel the uncertainty and confusion which has arisen during recent years in the application of the antitrust laws to regulated transportation, and to provide a practical method for reconciling two great policies of Congress, namely, the National Transportation Act and the policy of the antitrust laws so that the objective of both can be obtained. This legislation provides a means of drawing a line of demarcation between collaboration and collective action between carriers which is permissible and that which is not. I understand it is identical to a bill passed by the House in the Seventy-ninth Congress, and that the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported it favorably, but that the bill was lost in the legislative jam in the closing days of the session of the Seventy-ninth Congress. I understand this bill has the approval of railroads, truck and bus interests, and water carriers, as well as the United States Chamber of Commerce, and chambers of commerce throughout the country, and numerous associations of farmers and livestock growers including the National Grange and the Farm Bureau Federation. The Connecticut Public Utilities Commission passed a resolution in 1945 recommending the passage of this legislation. No opposition has been presented to me by anyone to this proposed legislation except by one or two chronic objectors. This legislation is not going to increase the burden of the taxpayers, nor will it prejudice their rights. This legislation is important to railroads and other common carriers, and everyone fully realizes that they are important to the welfare of the country.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, obviously it is necessary for the carriers of our country to make agreements with each other on joint rates and other charges and services that are performed by the carriers. If this bill is not passed they will not be able to make such agreements except in violation of the antitrust laws. It is necessary that such agreements be made and that they be approved by a competent jurisdiction, which is the Interstate Commerce Commission.

If the bill is not passed chaos will result absolutely in the transportation industry of the United States. I shall support the bill as I have in the past.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended by adding after section 5 thereof a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 5a. (1) For purposes of this section—

"(A) The term 'carrier' means any common carrier subject to part I, II, or III, or any freight forwarder subject to part IV, of this Act; and

"(B) The term 'antitrust laws' has the meaning assigned to such term in section 1 of the act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes,' approved October 15, 1914.

"(2) Any carrier party to an agreement between or among two or more carriers may, under such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe, apply to the Commission for approval of the agreement, and the Commission shall by order approve any such agreement (if approval thereof is not prohibited by paragraph (3), (4), or (5), if it finds that, by reason of furtherance of the national transportation policy declared in this act, the relief provided in paragraph (8) should apply with respect to the making and carrying out of such agreement; otherwise the application shall be denied. The approval of the Commission shall be granted only upon such terms and conditions as the Commission may prescribe as necessary to enable it to grant its approval in accordance with the standard above set forth in this paragraph.

"(3) The Commission shall not approve under this section any agreement between or among carriers of different classes unless it finds that such agreement is limited to matters relating to transportation under joint rates or over through routes; and for purposes of this paragraph carriers by railroad, express companies, and sleeping-car companies are carriers of one class; pipeline companies are carriers of one class; carriers by motor vehicle are carriers of one class; carriers by water are carriers of one class; and freight forwarders are carriers of one class.

"(4) The Commission shall not approve under this section any agreement which it finds is an agreement for a pooling, division, consolidation, merger, purchase, lease, acquisition, or other transaction, to which section 5 of this act is applicable.

"(5) The Commission shall not approve under this section any agreement which establishes a procedure for the determination of any matter through joint consideration unless it finds that under the agreement opportunity to act contrary to the determination arrived at through such procedure is afforded to each party to the agreement which did not concur in such determination.

"(6) The Commission is authorized, upon complaint or upon its own initiative without complaint, to investigate and determine whether any agreement previously approved by it under this section, or terms and conditions upon which such approval was granted, is not or are not in conformity with the standard set forth in paragraph (2), or whether any such terms and conditions are not necessary for purposes of conformity with such standard, and after such investigation, the Commission shall by order terminate or modify its approval of such agreement if it finds such action necessary to insure conformity with such standard, and shall modify the terms and conditions upon which such approval was granted to the extent it finds necessary to insure conformity with such standard or to the extent to which it finds such terms and conditions not necessary to insure such conformity. The effective date of any order terminating or modifying approval, or modifying terms and conditions, shall be postponed for such period as the Commission determines to be reasonably necessary to avoid undue hardship.

"(7) No order shall be entered under this section except after interested parties have been afforded reasonable opportunity for hearing.

"(8) Parties to any agreement approved by the Commission under this section and other persons are, if the approval of such agreement is not prohibited by paragraph (3), (4), or (5), hereby relieved from the operation of the antitrust laws with respect to the making of such agreement, and with respect to the carrying out of such agreement in conformity with its provisions and in conformity with the terms and conditions prescribed by the Commission.

"(9) Any action of the Commission under this section in approving an agreement, or in denying an application for such approval, or in terminating or modifying its approval of an agreement, or in prescribing the terms and conditions upon which its approval is to be granted, or in modifying such terms and conditions, shall be construed as having effect solely with reference to the applicability of the relief provisions of paragraph (8)."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, in lines 8 and 9, strike out "(3), (4), or (5)" and insert "(4), (5), or (6)"; and in line 11, strike out "(8)" and insert "(9)"; and after line 17, insert the following paragraph:

"(3) Each conference, bureau, committee, or other organization established or continued pursuant to any agreement approved by the Commission under the provisions of this section shall maintain such accounts, records, files, and memoranda and shall submit to the Commission such reports, as may be prescribed by the Commission, and all such accounts, records, files, and memoranda shall be subject to inspection by the Commission or its duly authorized representatives."

Page 2, line 18, strike out "(3)" and insert "(4)."

Page 3, line 3, strike out "(4)" and insert "(5)."

Page 3, line 8, strike out "(5)" and insert "(6)."

Page 3, line 15, strike out "(6)" and insert "(7)."

Page 4, line 9, strike out "(7)" and insert "(8)."

Page 4, line 12, strike out "(8)" and insert "(9)"; and in line 15, strike out "(3), (4), or (5)" and insert "(4), (5), or (6)."

Page 4, line 21, strike out "(9)" and insert "(10)"; and in line 3, on page 5, strike out "(8)" and insert "(9)."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLVERTON: Page 2, line 7, after the word "carriers", insert the following: "relating to rates, fares, classifications, divisions, allowances, or charges (including charges between carriers and com-

pensation paid or received for the use of facilites and equipment), or rules and regulations pertaining thereto, or procedures for the joint consideration, initiation, or establishment thereof."

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I submit the amendment for the approval of the House.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, after examining this bill, H. R. 221, I am convinced its passage will be in the public interest, and accordingly shall support it.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I was under the impression that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] would advise the House of the fact that this amendment was adopted by the committee since the bill was reported. It has, so far as I know, the unanimous consent of the committee. I do not know of anybody who would object to the provisions of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLVERTON: On page 3, line 7, after the word "agreement" insert "is of the character described in paragraph (2) of this section and."

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is of a clarifying nature. I have consulted with the members of the committee, and it has their approval.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLVERTON: Page 3, line 23, strike out the words beginning with the word "opportunity" down through the word "determination" in line 2 on page 4 and insert "There is accorded to each party the free and unrestrained right to take independent action either before or after any determination arrived at through such procedure."

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is also of a clarifying character that changes the bill in a slight particular but not in a way that is considered objectionable. It has had the consideration of the members of the committee here on the floor today and it meets with their approval.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEA: Page 3, lines 16, 17, and 18, strike out the words "for a pooling, division, consolidation, merger, purchase, lease, acquisition, or other" and insert in lieu thereof "with respect to a pooling, division, or other matter or."

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I understand this amendment is satisfactory to the chairman of the committee. It simply clarifies and makes definite this provision to conform with the amendment already adopted.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from California has been considered by the members of the committee here on the floor today and there is no objection to it. It is of a clarifying nature.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA: On page 5, add a new paragraph to amend paragraph (11) of section 5 (a) to read as follows:

"(11) The enactment of this section shall not—

"(a) deprive the Supreme Court of jurisdiction to hear and determine the case of *Georgia* v. *Pennsylvania Railroad Co. et al.*, Docket No. 11 (original), October term, 1945, or deprive the United States District Court for the District of Nebraska, Lincoln Division, or any court to which an appeal may be taken, of jurisdiction to hear and determine the case of *United States of America* v. *The Association of American Railroads et al.*, Civil No. 246, or any proceedings for the enforcement of the provisions of any decrees entered in such suits;

"(b) change any principle of substantive or procedural law otherwise applicable in the determination of such suits or proceedings, or deprive any party to such suits of any relief to which such parties would be entitled but for the enactment of this section; or

"(c) render lawful the performance of any past or future act which shall have been found by the courts in such suits or proceedings as it relates to the parties to such suits to be unlawful or which shall have been prohibited by the terms of any decrees entered therein or any supplements thereto or any modifications thereof."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to the bill and relates to an entirely different subject matter than is incorporated in this bill. This is a bill to amend certain provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act. The amendment relates to cases pending in court, and relates to past or present action whereas the bill relates to future action. It certainly seems to me to be very remote from any provisions of the bill, and therefore is not germane.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, does the Chair desire to hear me on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would be very glad to hear the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, in the bill which passed the other body, the so-called Reed bill, there was a proviso exempting the so-colled Georgia case. There was nothing in that bill which referred to the so-called Western or Lincoln case, which is incorporated in my amendment. Obviously, however, the effect of this legislation, if passed, would be to make moot those two cases, which are in the process of trial and prosecution. In my view, it is obvious that in this legislation it is germane for the Congress to recognize and exempt those suits from this legislation. They pertain to the very same type of legislation, the antitrust law.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MACKINNON). The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota is germane, and overrules the point of order.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, my short statement to the Chair covers the situation as far as the amendment is concerned. If we are bailing out people against whom suits have been brought, if that is the purpose of this legislation, then I hope the Congress will say so by defeating this amendment. If we are concerned in bailing out people who have been prosecuted, then vote down the amendment.

There are two cases referred to in the amendment, one in which the great State of Georgia is involved and the other in which certain violations of the antitrust law are claimed. The first case is being tried by a master appointed by the Supreme Court of the United States.

The other case is now in court at Lincoln, Nebr., and has been in process of trial, I think, since 1944.

Mr. Chairman, the issue is a simple one. If the railroads are not guilty of any violations, then they have nothing to worry about, and this amendment does no harm. If they are in a position where they have committed acts which are in violation of the Sherman-Clayton antitrust laws, then I think they should be treated the same as any other citizen, and they should pay the penalty that the court decides they should pay. Even though you may feel this legislation is necessary, and your views may be different from mine, so far as future acts under the antitrust laws and the right of the Attorney General to prosecute, if you feel that should be removed, I sincerely hope you will vote for my amendment because I believe it is a good amendment.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment points up just what the enactment of this bill would do. It would take from the courts of this country the right to review railroad rates which rankly discriminate, either against other forms of carriers or against sections of our country. Governor Arnall of Georgia fought a hard fight before the Supreme Court of the United States to determine the right, and he did establish the right of States to protest in the courts of their country against rank discrimination against them. Since that suit was determined by our Supreme Court, the Interstate Commerce Commission at long last got around to compelling a partial correction of rates that for years have tended to keep certain sections of our country, including my own, in economic slavery.

This bill we are to vote on would cut out from under the courts the right to determine and forbid discrimination which allows a differential in rates in one direction as against another or in favor of one section as against another in reaching certain markets of our country. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota would prevent that injustice by preserving full power and jurisdiction of the courts in the Georgia case.

Secondly, the other provision of the amendment with respect to the Lincoln, Nebr., suit is also needed. What is involved in that suit? The Attorney General charges in the Nebraska case 87 instances of unfair agreements between carriers which agreements are headed up at No. 40 Wall Street in New York, where two financial institutions together control the destinies of the railroads of this Nation. He charges that certain carriers bring pressure to bear from these financial interests which finance most all the railroads to deny their member carriers the right of applying for reduction in rates. It is charged that they have conspired to prevent modernization of railroad equipment. As part of that, they are using the very section of the Nation in which I live as a dumping ground for the outmoded equipment as they modernize other sections. Do you want a little proof of it? One of the most important transcontinental railroads in the Nation extends from New Orleans through my home city of Beaumont to Los Angeles, Calif. Go out and watch their best train, the Sunset Limited, pass. There is not a bit of modern equipment on it, from the headlight to the tail lights. We have railroads in Texas that have been forbidden by this group to modernize and they are using most cars in passenger service that were manufactured in 1890.

All we are asking by the gentleman's amendment is that, in these cases at least, we leave them to be determined on their merits by the courts. If you are going to exempt the railroads of the Nation from the antitrust laws and turn the country over to their agreements as proposed in this bill, at least we should permit the American people to see behind it in the courthouse at Lincoln, Nebr., and in the other case involving the Georgia suit. The findings in those suits will serve to show the American people what the antitrust laws protect them from. They can then see clearly what passage of this bil' will do in delivering them to the railroad monopoly.

I hope you will allow the courts to determine those cases. If you do not pass this amendment, you will knock those cases off the court records by enactment of this bill, and leave the American people no chance even to see what really lies behind exempting these carriers from the antitrust laws of our country. I cannot imagine a principle more vicious in this system of government than to say we will take the carriers or any other great group that operates as one, and say, "You shall no longer be subject to a law that is still on the statute books for the protection of the American people." I am unalterably opposed to this bill. I was among the 45 who voted against its passage in the Seventy-ninth Congress. I have not changed my mind. It is wrong in principle, and it will prove bad in practice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS] has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON]?

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 3 minutes.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I think we are entitled to be heard on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. LANHAM. How is the time to be divided, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. There is no division of time stated in the motion.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, on a division there were—ayes 78, noes 32.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The count disclosed a quorum is present. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CARSON] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CARSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARSON. Yes; I gladly yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, it does not appear to me that, debate having been shut off in 3 minutes, when the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] was on his feet asking for recognition, it is fair to recognize the gentleman from Ohio for the entire time. It does seem to me that it would be only fair that the gentleman from Georgia would have half of the 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hold that the gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 1½ minutes and the gentleman from Georgia, having been on his feet, will be recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. CARSON. Mr. Chairman, I stated a moment ago that the Georgia and Lincoln cases had nothing whatever to do with this legislation because it was introduced a long time before the cases were ever heard of. If anybody will read the bill and read it carefully, he will find definitely that there is nothing in this bill that will take away the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court to hear the facts in either case.

This bill does not attempt to deprive the Supreme Court of jurisdiction to hear and to determine the Georgia case. Whatever changes the bill may make in the substantive law applicable to rate conferences in the future, it does not impair or qualify in any way the plenary power of the Supreme Court to hear and to decide the Georgia case or the Lincoln case either. That is definite. It was argued in our committee. We had both those cases before our committee. We had the amendment of the Senate and we took it out of this bill because it was the unanimous decision of the members of the committee that it had nothing whatever to do with either of the cases and took no jurisdiction away from the Court.

The only thing we are trying to do is to make a construction of what arose in connection with these delegated powers. Confusion appeared in many of these cases, and if the statute is regarded as creating one rule of substantive law for the parties to the Georgia case and another rule of substantive law for everyone else, a grave question would arise as to its constitutionality. There would appear to be no reasonable basis for this kind of classification which might be regarded as so arbitrary and capricious as to violate the due process clause of the fifth amendment. To avoid this difficulty the courts might be induced to construe this language as meaning that there was to be no change in the general principles of substantive law for any purpose whatsoever. It might be argued that this broad construction of the language would virtually nullify the remainder of the act. We did not want that to happen.

There is enough chaos at the present time without putting more chaos into it. We are only trying to eliminate the confusion and uncertainty. No one is excluded. Anyone can come in as provided in section 8 of the bill:

> No order shall be entered under this section except after interested parties have been afforded reasonable opportunity for hearing.

I oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, since I am a new Member of Congress I have hesitated to speak in opposition to this bill, but I cannot sit still and see the work that our great State has done on behalf of the shippers of the South and the people of the South nullified by this legislation.

If what the gentleman from Ohio says is correct, then there can be absolutely no objection to this amendment, and I do hope that the House will adopt it. Nothing should be done to interfere with the case now pending filed by the State of Georgia seeking to end discrimination in rates against the South.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'HARA) there were—ayes 38; noes 97.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. POAGE: Page 5, line 16, after the last paragraph insert a new paragraph to be numbered 12 as follows:
>
> "Nothing in this act shall apply to any rates which shall exceed the rates charged for like service in any other geographical area."

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered is a simple proposition, saying that if the railroads want the right to get together and fix rates for great areas that they should not discriminate against any section of

the country. If you want to perpetuate an unfair, discriminatory rate system that has been condemned by the Supreme Court, then vote against this amendment. But if you want to carry into effect the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, if you are willing to do justice to all sections of the United States and wipe out the discriminatory territorial freight rate differential that has so long plagued this country, then vote for this amendment. All the amendment says is that the railroads cannot get the advantage that you are giving them of an exemption from the antitrust laws if they discriminate against somebody.

Many of the proponents of this legislation have suggested they were very anxious that the railroads be given this right to get together because, they say, you do not have to prove discrimination under existing laws. They say that under our antitrust laws all you have to do is to prove that they got together and worked in unison to establish uniform rates. That lets us believe that they would not support discrimination. So, now, I am saying that where the railroads have already established discriminatory rates, where they have already penalized three-quarters of the area of this great Nation and imposed upon your people and upon mine an unfair and a discriminatory system which our courts have condemned, which the very shippers who are urging you to pass this bill have condemned, that under these circumstances the railroads cannot take advantage of the exception to the antitrust laws that this bill gives them. It would require proof of discrimination, but when that proof was forthcoming it would deny further exemptions. It would at least limit the exemption this bill gives. It would say to the railroads, "We are not going to let you get together and agree upon a system of freight rates that will perpetuate that kind of unfair territorial differential in your rate system."

That is all there is to the amendment. If you want to perpetuate that system, you vote down the amendment; but if you plan to go home and tell your people that you are in favor of the same treatment for all, if you are going to tell your people that you do not want discrimination against the South and West, then vote for this amendment, because it will prohibit discrimination in freight rates based upon territorial differences. It says that as long as the service is the same the carriers shall give the same rates no matter in what part of our country the freight originates. If the carriers are going to be allowed to form these combinations which are violative of the antitrust laws that apply to others, they should at least refrain from discrimination. If you do not agree to this amendment then you have legalized for all time to come the discrimination in freight rates that has so long plagued this country.

I think the amendment is perfectly clear and I hope the Committee will answer the present unfair discrimination with a clear-cut vote for the amendment.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, I think a consideration of the amendment will lead any reasonable mind to the conclusion that this bill is not the proper vehicle for him or for this House to carry out the purpose embraced in his amendment. Congress is not, and I hope it never will become, a rate-fixing body. Congress, in its wisdom, has designated the Interstate Commerce Commission to be the rate-fixing body. It has been in existence since 1887. I do not know of any regulatory body of the Government that stands in higher repute than it does, and yet this amendment would seek in principle, at least, to take away from the ICC the right to pass on the question of rates and turn it over to the Congress upon the simple declaration of the gentleman from Texas that discriminatory rates exist. Certainly this House, which is called upon to vote upon this amendment at this time, has no evidence before it that would indicate that there is any justice or reason in what the gentleman has said in support of his amendment. If there be, it is not before this House. This House does not have sufficient facts, nor is it in a position to vote intelligently upon a question of rates, whether it deals with regions or otherwise unless and until it has before it all the pertinent facts. It would be a very great mistake for this House, by approving this amendment, to be a party to that which is sought by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I hestitate to speak at this late hour, and I shall not use the 5 minutes. But, to the people who live in the southern part of the United States this matter is of vital importance. I do not know who inspired this legislation. I do not know who sponsored this legislation. I am not making any charges in that respect, but I will say this, gentlemen, that it was not until after Governor Arnall of Georgia waged the first successful fight against discriminatory freight rates in the South that this bill came forward, and every astute lawyer in the Southland branded the Bulwinkle bill at that time as an effort to get around the decision of the Supreme Court, which was in favor of the Southern States. I want to say to you that I cannot justify or cannot understand how anybody can justify why it is lawful to charge more to ship goods from the South to the North than it is to ship goods from the North to the South. If the manufacturers are entitled to ship cheaper from the Northern States into the Southern States, then I cannot agree with the distinguished gentleman who just said that the reputation of the Interstate Commerce Commission is above reproach. That is the body that has permitted this discrimination to exist. I shall not praise them today or any other day until they have laid down fair rates to the Southern States.

Although this amendment may be held by the lawyers not to be germane in this particular fight, it is germane to the extent that it will solve the problems in the Southern States. In the name of the Southern States I ask its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. POAGE) there were—ayes 40, noes 101.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MACKINNON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 221) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers, pursuant to House Resolution 581, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GOSSETT. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GOSSETT moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 273, nays 53, not voting 105, as follows:

[Roll No. 60]

YEAS—273

Abbitt	Andrews, Ala.	Bakewell
Allen, Calif.	Angell	Banta
Allen, Ill.	Arends	Bates, Ky.
Allen, La.	Arnold	Bates, Mass.
Anderson, Calif.	Auchincloss	Bender

Bennett, Mich.	Graham	Morgan
Bennett, Mo.	Grant, Ala.	Morrison
Bishop	Grant, Ind.	Morton
Blackney	Gregory	Muhlenberg
Bland	Griffiths	Murdock
Bloom	Gross	Murray, Tenn.
Boggs, Del.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Murray, Wis.
Boggs, La.	Gwynne, Iowa	Nicholson
Bolton	Hagen	Nixon
Bonner	Hale	O'Konski
Bradley	Hall,	Owens
Bramblett	Edwin Arthur	Passman
Brehm	Hall,	Patterson
Brooks	Leonard W.	Peterson
Brophy	Halleck	Phillips, Calif.
Brown, Ohio	Hand	Phillips, Tenn.
Buck	Hardy	Ploeser
Buckley	Harless, Ariz.	Potts
Buffett	Harness, Ind.	Priest
Bulwinkle	Harris	Rains
Burke	Hart	Ramey
Burleson	Harvey	Rayburn
Busbey	Havenner	Reed, Ill.
Byrne, N. Y.	Hays	Reed, N. Y.
Byrnes, Wis.	Herter	Rees
Canfield	Heselton	Reeves
Carson	Hess	Regan
Case, N. J.	Hill	Rich
Chadwick	Hinshaw	Richards
Chapman	Hoeven	Riehlman
Chenoweth	Hoffman	Riley
Chiperfield	Holifield	Rizley
Church	Hope	Robertson
Clason	Horan	Rockwell
Clevenger	Javits	Rogers, Fla.
Coffin	Jenison	Rogers, Mass.
Cole, Kans.	Jenkins, Ohio	Ross
Cole, Mo.	Jennings	Russell
Cole, N. Y.	Jensen	Sadlak
Cooper	Johnson, Calif.	St. George
Corbett	Johnson, Ill.	Sanborn
Cotton	Johnson, Ind.	Sarbacher
Coudert	Jones, Ala.	Sasscer
Courtney	Jonkman	Schwabe, Mo.
Cravens	Judd	Schwabe, Okla.
Crawford	Kean	Scoblick
Crow	Kearns	Scrivner
Cunningham	Keating	Seely-Brown
Curtis	Keefe	Shafer
Dague	Kelley	Short
Davis, Tenn.	Kerr	Simpson, Ill.
Davis, Wis.	Kersten, Wis.	Smathers
Dawson, Utah	Kilburn	Smith, Kans.
Devitt	King	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Knutson	Smith, Ohio
Dolliver	Latham	Smith, Va.
Domengeaux	Lea	Snyder
Dondero	LeCompte	Spence
Donohue	LeFevre	Stanley
Doughton	Lewis, Ky.	Stefan
Durham	Lewis, Ohio	Stevenson
Elliott	Lichtenwalter	Stockman
Ellsworth	Lodge	Sundstrom
Elsaesser	Lucas	Taber
Elston	Ludlow	Talle
Engel, Mich.	McConnell	Taylor
Fallon	McCormack	Teague
Fellows	McCowen	Thomas, Tex.
Fenton	McDonough	Thompson
Fisher	McDowell	Tibbott
Fletcher	McGarvey	Tollefson
Fogarty	McGregor	Towe
Foote	McMahon	Twyman
Fulton	McMillan, S. C.	Vail
Gamble	McMillen, Ill.	Van Zandt
Garmatz	MacKinnon	Vorys
Gary	Macy	Vursell
Gathings	Maloney	Wadsworth
Gavin	Manasco	Weichel
Gearhart	Martin, Iowa	Whittington
Gillette	Mathews	Wigglesworth
Gillie	Merrow	Wilson, Tex.
Goff	Meyer	Wolcott
Goodwin	Michener	Wolverton
Gordon	Miller, Conn.	Woodruff
Gore	Miller, Md.	Worley
Gorski	Mills	

NAYS—53

Abernethy	Folger	Morris
Albert	Gossett	O'Brien
Beckworth	Granger	O'Hara
Blatnik	Huber	Patman
Brown, Ga	Hull	Peden
Bryson	Isacson	Pickett
Camp	Jackson, Wash.	Poage
Cannon	Karsten, Mo.	Preston
Carroll	Kennedy	Price, Ill.
Colmer	Kilday	Rankin
Combs	Klein	Sadowski
Cooley	Lanham	Trimble
Davis, Ga.	Lesinski	Wheeler
Delaney	Madden	Whitten
Dingell	Mahon	Williams
Douglas	Mansfield	Winstead
Evins	Marcantonio	Wood
Feighan	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—105

Andersen, H. Carl	Hedrick	Nodar
Andresen, August H.	Heffernan	Norblad
Andrews, N. Y.	Hendricks	Norrell
Barden	Hobbs	Norton
Barrett	Holmes	O'Toole
Battle	Jackson, Calif.	Pace
Beall	Jarman	Pfeifer
Bell	Jenkins, Pa.	Philbin
Boykin	Johnson, Okla.	Plumley
Buchanan	Johnson, Tex.	Potter
Butler	Jones, N. C.	Poulson
Case, S. Dak.	Jones, Wash.	Powell
Celler	Kearney	Price, Fla.
Chelf	Kee	Redden
Clark	Kefauver	Rivers
Clippinger	Keogh	Rohrbough
Cox	Kirwan	Rooney
Crosser	Kunkel	Sabath
Dawson, Ill.	Landis	Scott, Hardie
Deane	Lane	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
D'Ewart	Larcade	Sheppard
Dorn	Lemke	Sikes
Eaton	Love	Simpson, Pa.
Eberharter	Lusk	Smith, Wis.
Ellis	Lyle	Somers
Engle, Calif.	Lynch	Stigler
Fernandez	McCulloch	Stratton
Flannagan	Mack	Thomas, N. J.
Forand	Mason	Vinson
Fuller	Meade, Ky.	Walter
Gallagher	Meade, Md.	Welch
Harrison	Miller, Calif.	West
Hartley	Miller, Nebr.	Whitaker
Hébert	Mitchell	Wilson, Ind.
	Multer	Youngblood
	Mundt	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Crosser against.

Mr. Harrison for, with Mr. Pace against.

Mr. D'Ewart for, with Mr. Deane against.

Mrs. Lusk for, with Mr. Kirwan against.

Mr. Chelf for, with Mr. Eberharter against.

Mr. Engle of California for, with Mr. Kefauver against.

Mr. Norrell for, with Mr. Sabath against.

Mr. McCulloch for, with Mr. Forand against.

Mr. Miller of Nebraska for, with Mr. Powell against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Norblad with Mr. Hedrick.

Mr. Beall with Mr. Keogh.

Mr. Andrews of New York with Mr. West.

Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hébert.

Mr. Kunkel with Mr. Fernandez.

Mr. Eaton with Mr. Cox.

Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Larcade.

Mr. Nodar with Mr. Pfeifer.

Mr. Youngblood with Mr. Redden.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Lane.

Mr. Hardie Scott with Mr. Philbin.

Mr. Potter with Mr. Flannagan.

Mr. Plumley with Mr. Barden.

Mr. Holmes with Mr. Lynch.

Mr. Case of South Dakota with Mr. Battle.

Mr. Fuller with Mr. Vinson.

Mr. Mundt with Mr. Walter.

Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., with Mr. Rivers.

Mr. Jackson of California with Mr. Buchanan.

Mr. H. Carl Andersen with Mr. Rooney.

Mr. Clippinger with Mr. O'Toole.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Price of Florida.

Mr. Poulson with Mr. Heffernan.

Mr. Rohrbough with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.

Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. Kee.

Mr. Mack with Mr. Hobbs.

Mr. Meade of Kentucky with Mr. Johnson of Texas.

Mr. Landis with Mr. Sheppard.

Mr. Kearney with Mr. Sikes.

Mr. August H. Andresen with Mr. Multer.

Mr. Ellis with Mr. Miller of California.

Mr. Hartley with Mr. Somers.

Mr. Mason with Mr. Dorn.

Mr. Jones of Washington with Mr. Celler.

Mr. Love with Mr. Stigler.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 110) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended by adding after section 5 thereof a new section as follows:

SEC. 5a. (1) For purposes of this section—

"(A) The term 'carrier' means any common carrier subject to part I, II, or III, and shall include any freight forwarder subject to part IV, of this act; and

"(B) The term 'antitrust laws' has the meaning assigned to such term in section 1 of the act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes,' approved October 15, 1914.

"(2) Any carrier, party to an agreement between or among two or more carriers concerning, or providing rules or regulations pertaining to or procedures for the consideration, initiation, or establishment, of rates, fares, charges (including charges as between carriers), classifications, divisions, allowances, time schedules, routes, the interchange of facilities, the settlement of claims, the promotion of safety, or the promotion of adequacy, economy, or efficiency of operation or service, may, under such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe, apply to the Commission for approval of the agreement, and the Commission shall by order approve any such agreement (if approval thereof is not prohibited by paragraph (4), (5), or (6)) if it finds after public notice in the Federal Register and public hearing not less than 60 days thereafter that the object of the agreement is appropriate for the proper performance by the carriers of service to the public, that the agreement is not unjustly discriminatory as between shippers or geographical regions or areas, that it will not unduly restrain competition, and that it is consistent with the public interest as declared by Congress in the national transportation policy set forth in this act; otherwise the application shall be denied. The approval of the Commission shall be granted only upon such terms and conditions as the Commission may prescribe as necessary to insure compliance with the standards above set forth in this paragraph.

"(3) Each conference, bureau, committee, or other organization established or continued pursuant to any agreement approved by the Commission under the provisions of this section shall maintain such accounts, records, files, and memoranda and shall submit to the Commission such reports as may be prescribed by the Commission, and all such accounts, records, files, and memoranda shall be subject to inspection by the Commission or its duly authorized representatives. No bank or other financial institutions shall be a member of any such conference, bureau, committee, or other organization.

"(4) The Commission shall not approve under this section any agreement between or among carriers of different classes unless it finds that such agreement is limited to freight classifications, or to joint rates or through routes; and for purposes of this paragraph carriers by railroad, express com-

panies, and sleeping-car companies are carriers of one class; pipe-line companies are carriers of one class; carriers by motor vehicle are carriers of one class; carriers by water are carriers of one class; and freight forwarders are of another class.

"(5) The Commission shall not approve under this section any agreement which it finds is an agreement for a pooling, division, consolidation, merger, purchase, lease, acquisition, or other transaction, to which section 5 of this act is applicable.

"(6) The Commission shall not approve under this section any agreement which establishes a procedure for the determination of any matter through joint consideration unless it finds or by condition requires that under the agreement there is or shall be accorded to each party the free and unrestrained right to act contrary to and independently of the initial determination or report, or any subsequent determination or report, arrived at through such procedure, and unless it finds or by condition requires that all carriers of the same class (as defined in paragraph (4) of this section) within the territorial and organizational scope of such agreement shall be eligible to become and remain parties to the agreement upon application and payment of charges applicable to other parties of the same class. Nothing in this section and no approval of any agreement by the Commission under this section shall be so construed as in any manner to remove from the purview of the antitrust laws any restraint upon the right of independent action by any carrier by means of boycott, duress, or intimidation.

"(7) The Commission is authorized, upon complaint or upon its own initiative without complaint, to investigate and determine whether any agreement previously approved by it under this section, or terms and conditions upon which such approval was granted, is not or are not in conformity with the standards set forth in paragraph (2), or whether any such terms and conditions are not necessary for purposes of conformity with such standards, and, after such investigation, the Commission shall by order terminate or modify its approval of such agreement if it finds such action necessary to insure conformity with such standards, and shall modify the terms and conditions upon which such approval was granted and may impose additional terms and conditions to the extent it finds necessary to insure conformity with such standards or to the extent to which it finds such terms and conditions not necessary to insure such conformity. Any person, including the Attorney General of the United States, may make complaint to the Commission of any action taken under or pursuant to an agreement theretofore approved by the Commission and the Commission, upon such complaint or upon its own initiative, shall after hearing determine whether any such action is in conformity with such agreement and with the terms of the approval thereof by the Commission and is consistent with the standards above set forth and whether its approval of the agreement should be modified or terminated or additional terms or conditions be prescribed with respect to the particular action complained of. The effective date of any order terminating or modifying approval, or modifying terms and conditions, or prescribing terms or conditions, shall be postponed for such period as the Commission determines to be reasonably necessary to avoid undue hardship.

"(8) No order shall be entered under this section except after interested parties (including in all cases the Attorney General of the United States and interested State regulatory commissions or other authorities) have been afforded reasonable opportunity for hearing.

"(9) No agreement approved by the Commission under this section, and no conference or joint or concerted action pursuant to and in conformity with such agreement as the same may be conditioned by the Commission, shall be deemed to be a contract, combination, conspiracy, or monopoly in restraint of trade or commerce within the meaning of the antitrust laws: *Provided*, That the approval by the Commission of any agreement concerning, or providing rules or regulations pertaining to or procedures for the consideration, initiation, or establishment of, time schedules, the interchange of facilities, the settlement of claims, the promotion of safety, or the promotion of adequacy, economy, or efficiency of operation or service shall not be deemed to be approval of any subsequent modification or amendment thereof or of any supplemental or other agreement made pursuant to any provision contained in the original approved agreement: *And provided further*, That the approval by the Commission of any agreement providing procedures for the consideration, initiation, or establishment of time schedules, the interchange of facilities, the settlement of claims, the promotion of safety, or the promotion of adequacy, economy, or efficiency of operation or service shall not be deemed to be approval of any joint or concerted action taken pursuant to any provision of such agreement.

"(10) Any action of the Commission under this section in approving an agreement, or in denying an application for such approval, or in terminating or modifying its approval of an agreement, or in prescribing the terms and conditions upon which its approval is to be granted, or in modifying such terms and conditions, shall be construed as having effect solely with reference to the applicability of the provisions of paragraph (9)."

"(11) The enactment of this section shall not—

"(a) deprive the Supreme Court of jurisdiction to hear and determine the case of *Georgia* v. *Pennsylvania Railroad Company, et al.*, Docket No. 11 (Original), October term, 1945, or any proceeding for the enforcement of the provisions of any decree entered in such suit;

"(b) change any principle of substantive or procedural law otherwise applicable in the determination of such suit or proceeding, or deprive any party to such suit of any relief to which such party would be entitled but for the enactment of this section; or

"(c) render lawful the performance of any past or future act which shall have been found by the Supreme Court in such suit or proceeding as it relates to the parties to such suit to be unlawful or which shall have been prohibited by the terms of any decree entered therein or any supplement thereto or any modification thereof."

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLVERTON: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of the bill H. R. 221 as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 221) was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill S. 2287, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Evening Star.

Mr. KING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in each to include an editorial.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a public-opinion poll recently taken in his district.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably away from the House floor for a brief period earlier this afternoon attending a conference with Government officials concerning matters under consideration in the committee of which I am chairman, when a vote was taken by the House on a motion to recommit H. R. 6481 to the Committee on Appropriations with certain amendments. Had I been present I would have voted against sending the bill back to the committee.

I do want to emphasize a thing that is being pointed out in the committee report, as well as by Members of the House with respect to the need of more controls of Government corporations. According to this report there were 19 Government-owned corporations in existence in 1921. Today there are 86 such corporations with total assets of more than $10,500,000,000, and with liabilities of approximately a similar amount. It is understood that a certain amount of expansion was required during the emergency and during the war period. I think it is time for Congress to look the situation over and determine whether some of these corporations may be reduced, or if found unnecessary, be eliminated. It would be interesting to know about the authority granted many of these Government organizations to carry on various types of business. What I mean to say is that it might be a good idea to sort of look them over, especially since investments are made from taxpayers' funds.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. SUNDSTRUM), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. D'EWART, from May 12 through May 18, on account of official business.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, for the past 18 months the United States has been in the unusual and uncomfortable position of having an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease of livestock on a rampage within some 300 miles of our border. As every Member of this House knows, foot-and-mouth disease was reported in epidemic form in Mexico in December 1946.

It is still there. And it is going to be there for a long time yet to come.

It is the first time in history that we in the United States have found ourselves in this position—face to face with endemic foot-and-mouth disease on the North American Continent. There have been previous outbreaks on this continent, but they have been promptly suppressed and eradicated by the Spartan method of slaughtering and burying all diseased and exposed animals.

As you know, this was the method which was first tried in Mexico. For a number of reasons it did not succeed. I have reported at length to the House on that matter—Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A184—and I will not take the time of the Members to go over that ground again.

Suffice it for me to say that we were not able to eradicate the disease by the slaughter and burial method—and having failed in that attempt, our technicians adopted the only possible alternative, measures designed to hold the disease in check—to prevent its further spread particularly toward the United States—while ways were being devised and found to again undertake the business of eradication.

Since the early part of last December our forces, under the direction of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture, have been engaged in this holding action against the disease. The plan of that action, too, was fully discussed in the report to the House I have referred to. It was also set out clearly in the recommendations and report of the Foot-and-Mouth Disease Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture, which appeared in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 13, page A4657.

With one important exception—which I will refer to in some detail in a few moments—the recommendations of that committee appear to have been substantially carried out.

I have recently returned from a trip to Texas and to northern Mexico which I made for the purpose of discussing with the cattlemen in that area the problems presented to this country by the presence of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico—and to see for myself some of the things which are being done to solve that problem. My purpose in taking the time of the House today is to report to the Members briefly on what we saw and heard on that trip.

I was accompanied on that trip by members of the Foot-and-Mouth Disease Subcommittee on the Committee on Agriculture, by a representative of the Committee on Appropriations, and a representative of the Committee on Public Lands.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, may I digress for a moment to comment on the fine cooperation which the Committee on Agriculture has received from the other committees of the House—and from the membership in general—in its efforts to cope with this difficult and dangerous problem. The presence of the two representatives of other committees on this recent inspection trip is typical of the cooperation and assistance I am talking about. Throughout this whole business individual Members of the House and every committee in any way connected with the matter have taken the utmost pains to keep themselves as well informed as could be and have given prompt and sympathetic action whenever action was required.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that this cooperative attitude on the part of the House has been most encouraging to those of us who have been assigned some measure of responsibility in connection with this fight. And I am sure I speak for them when I say that it is also appreciated by the farmers and the cattlemen of this country, who are so much concerned about this disease.

On its recent trip, our committee held public meetings at Amarillo and El Paso, Tex. It discussed the problem of foot-and-mouth disease with many people—not only in those formal meetings, but in informal meetings in and about those two Texas cities, and in Juarez and Chihuahua, Mexico.

I think the main conclusion that could be drawn from the very many ideas, suggestions, and opinions we heard expressed is that there is no easy answer to the problem which faces us. Even down there, where the disease has now a much more threatening and intimate aspect than it has to most of us here—there were almost as many different ideas and suggestions advanced as to the best way of dealing with it as there were individuals to make suggestions.

Some proposals are obviously unworkable. It was seriously advocated by several speakers, for example, that the best course is to "get tough" with Mexico: To close the border, or threaten to close the border, to all commerce whatsoever until that country—by the use of whatever force might be required—takes positive steps to carry out the program of slaughter and burial.

Still other speakers—and at times the same ones who advanced the "get tough" idea—pointed out that our best present line of defense is made up of the cattlemen of northern Mexico—who through their own efforts and at their own expense are doing everything in their power to prevent the spread of foot-and-mouth disease northward into the still undiseased herds of northern Mexico.

Mexico depends heavily on the United States for almost all the things it uses in its day-to-day living. I was impressed to find a display of gardening tools, fertilizers, weed killers, insecticides, and all the usual spring display of things for the gardener, in the window of a hardware store in Chihuahua, Mexico—and every article in the window had been manufactured in the United States.

I am inclined to agree with those who believe that the friendship and cooperation of the cattlemen and other citizens of northern Mexico is one of the strongest weapons we have against the spread northward of this disease—and I am certain that a policy based on economic force is not the way in which to foster that friendship and cooperation.

Others suggested that the United States pour whatever money is necessary into a campaign to buy up all cattle and other susceptible animals in the infected zone of Mexico and destroy them—thus eliminating the disease. This was exactly what we undertook to do in the slaughter and burial program.

I cite these specific proposals merely as samples of the wide variety of ideas which suggest themselves as men deeply concerned with this problem try to work out some solution. There were a great many others.

If there was any consensus of opinion on the subject it was this: That there is nothing basically wrong with the program recommended by the foot-and-mouth disease subcommittee, and that in fact it offers the best available plan of proceeding against the disease—if that program is administered in a manner which will put it into operation effectively. This, I believe, is the position of the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers' Association and of a number of informed cattlemen who talked to the committee.

These same persons are in almost unanimous agreement, however, that the program outlined by the committee and implemented by an international agreement between the United States and Mexico has not been administered as effectively and as energetically as it could be—and must be if it is to achieve its purpose of holding the disease in check and gradually moving in to eradicate it.

The men in our Bureau of Animal Industry are extremely competent—but they are competent veterinarians, scientists, and technicians—not business executives of outstanding ability. I am willing to trust their judgment completely in any matter having to do with the scientific and medical aspects of livestock diseases. But in my opinion, the qualifications required of the person directing our fight against foot-and-mouth disease are first of all that he shall be a top-flight executive.

Following its first trip to Mexico, in late June of last year, the committee which spent several days inspecting the campaign at close quarters urgently recommended that a man of outstanding executive ability and experience, one completely unfettered by bureaucratic red tape, be appointed to direct the campaign in Mexico.

Recommendations similar to that have been made repeatedly since that time by every commission, committee, or respon-

sible individual who has made any serious investigation of the program. Those who have independently urged on the Secretary of Agriculture that he appoint a top-flight executive from outside the Department to head this important work include his own advisory committee on foot-and-mouth disease and General Corlett, who was sent to Mexico by the Secretary as his special consultant and adviser on the subject.

In spite of all these recommendations—in spite of the unanimous agreement of everyone who has studied the problem that what is most needed in Mexico is an outstanding executive with a nongovernmental background.

I do not know why it has taken so long to secure action on this important matter. I do know that failure thus far to do so has been a disappointment to all of us concerned in this business, and I feel that it has had a serious effect on the program. I trust that the Mexican Government will give an immediate clearance when such an administrator is named.

We found a considerable amount of encouraging information on our trip. The cattlemen of northern Mexico are going ahead with their own efforts to keep foot-and-mouth disease south of the quarantine line, and they are making excellent progress in the construction of canning plants to take care of the cut-off cattle population of the northern Mexican states.

In their efforts to bolster the quarantine line and keep foot-and-mouth disease within the presently infected area, the cattlemen of northern Mexico are maintaining their own strict quarantines. They have state quarantines against the movement of any cattle or susceptable animals. With their own police forces they are backing up the official quarantine line to stop the northward movement of the disease.

At the same time, they are working on what they call a buffer pasture. This will be a strip 15 to 25 miles wide north of the official quarantine line from which all susceptible animals will be removed. The purpose of this buffer pasture is to set up a quarantine band that will stop the progress northward of the disease by confronting it with a zone in which there are no animals which can catch the disease.

This "buffer pasture" is being set up by the northern Mexican cattlemen and businessmen at their own expense. Their plan is to buy all the cattle, sheep, goats, and hogs in this zone and send them to market or move them into other pastures. It is to be emphasized that the animals in this zone have not been infected by the disease or exposed to it. All this activity is taking place in the clean area, where the disease has never penetrated.

I am not in a position to report now how extensively this plan is now being carried out but I am informed that some progress is being made. I hope that within the next 2 months the committee will be able to make a personal inspection of the quarantine line and the "buffer pasture" and bring the House an accurate report of those activities.

As the Members are aware, one of the serious problems brought about by the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease is what to do with the disease-free cattle in northern Mexico. The normal market for those cattle is the United States. With the outbreak of the disease, the border was closed to cattle and that market was cut off. Cattle raising is the most important single industry of the northern Mexican States. Its permanent paralysis—as was threatened by the quarantine—threatened to ruin the whole economy of that area.

Several months ago the northern Mexican cattlemen and businessmen—working chiefly through the State cattle associations—undertook to solve the problem in some degree by building canning plants in order to process and dispose of their cattle.

Our committee visited two of these plants—one at Juarez and the other at Chihuahua City. The plant at Juarez is already in operation. It is a small plant, but quite modern in construction and equipment. The committee was favorably impressed by the manner in which this plant has been constructed and is being operated.

The plant at Chihuahua City is much larger. It will be just as modern and efficient as the most up-to-date knowledge and machinery can make it. It is being constructed under the supervision of American engineers experienced in the construction of packing and meat canning plants. It will be a combination packing and canning plant, with capacity for quick freezing and cooler storage.

These plants are typical of 9 or 10 such plants that are either already in production or are nearing completion in northern Mexico. I want to re-emphasize that these plants are being built by Mexican cattlemen and businessmen, with Mexican money. They are not being constructed by the United States, nor are we paying any part of their cost.

I was informed that when the plants now being constructed are in operation they will be able to take care of most of the cattle being produced in northern Mexico.

At the present time the canned meat produced there cannot be sold in the United States. It is in heavy demand for export purposes, however, and it is presumed that when the Mexican Government has established a meat-inspection service that can be certified by our Bureau of Animal Industry, their canned product will be permitted a market in the United States.

Returning to the subject of our direct fight against foot-and-mouth disease, it seems to me that our efforts must be continued along the lines we have been following.

First. We must hold the quarantine line and prevent the disease from coming any farther northward. Second. We must continue unrelentingly to eradicate the disease in areas south of the quarantine line as rapidly as this can be done. Third. And this is very important. We must get our research laboratories built and get our research under way as speedily as we can.

If we can hold the disease in check for a reasonable time, and in the meantime can push research on it with all speed, I have the greatest hope that we will be able to discover through science some effective means of removing this threat from our continent, and possibly from the world, altogether.

RACING SHELLS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5933) to permit the temporary free importation of racing shells, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KNUTSON, REED of New York, WOODRUFF, DOUGHTON, and COOPER.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn from the list of conferees and the name of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] be substituted therefor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3. An act to provide for the training of air-traffic control-tower operators; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 153. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Army to have prepared a replica of the Dade Monument for presentation to the State of Florida; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 668. An act for the relief of Philip Sumanpow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1703. An act for the relief of Lorraine Burns Mullen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1979. An act authorizing and directing the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to undertake certain studies of the soft-shell and hard-shell clams; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2060. An act for the relief of Edgar Wikner Percival; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2077. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to exchange certain property with the city of Kearney, Nebr.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2152. An act to increase the maximum travel allowance for railway postal clerks and substitute railway postal clerks; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2223. An act to authorize the promotion of Lt. Gen. Leslie Richard Groves to the permanent grade of major general, United States Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2224. An act to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to the priority rights of veterans entitled to 10-point preference under such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2233. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the East Bay Municipal Utility District, an agency of the

State of California, an easement for the construction and operation of a water main in and under certain Government-owned lands comprising a part of the United States air station, Alameda, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2291. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army or his duly authorized representative to quitclaim a perpetual easement over certain lands adjacent to the Fort Myers Army Airfield, Fla.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2432. An act to amend the Alien Registration Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 107. An act for the acquisition and maintenance of wildlife management and control areas in the State of California, and for other purposes;

H. R. 338. An act for the relief of Amin Bin Rejab;

H. R. 345. An act for the relief of Ollie McNeill and Ester B. McNeil;

H. R. 817. An act for the relief of Andres Quinones and Letty Perez;

H. R. 831. An act for the relief of George Chan;

H. R. 1022. An act for the relief of Peter Bednar, Francisca Bednar, Peter Walter Bednar, and William Joseph Bednar;

H. R. 1189. An act to establish the methods of advancement for post-office employees (rural carriers) in the field service;

H. R. 1392. An act for the relief of Mrs. Charlotte E. Harvey;

H. R. 1562. An act to increase temporarily the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States;

H. R. 1653. An act for the relief of Edward W. Bigger;

H. R. 1724. An act to legalize the admission to the United States of Sarah Jane Sanford Pansa;

H. R. 1749. An act to amend the act entitled "An Act for the relief of Johannes or John, Julia, Michael, William, and Anna Kostiuk";

H. R. 1953. An act for the relief of John F. Reeves;

H. R. 2000. An act for the relief of Jeffersonville Flood Control District, Jeffersonville, Ind., a municipal corporation;

H. R. 2418. An act for the relief of Luz Martin;

H. R. 3189. An act for the relief of Joe Parry, a minor;

H. R. 3224. An act for the relief of Frank and Maria Durante;

H. R. 3608. An act for the relief of Cristeta La-Madrid Angeles;

H. R. 3740. An act for the relief of Andrew Osiecimski Czapski;

H. R. 3787. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Smorczewska;

H. R. 3824. An act for the relief of Mrs. Cletus E. Todd (formerly Laura Estelle Ritter);

H. R. 3880. An act for the relief of Ludwig Pohoryles;

H. R. 3998. An act to provide for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4018. An act authorizing the transfer of certain real property for wildlife, or other purposes;

H. R. 4050. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Moke Tcharoutcheff, Lucie Baptistine Tcharoutcheff, Raymonde Tcharoutcheff, and Robert Tcharoutcheff;

H. R. 4068. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to construct a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4129. An act for the relief of Jerline Floyd Givens and the legal guardian of William Earl Searight, a minor;

H. R. 4130. An act for the relief of Dennis (Dionesio) Fernandez;

H. R. 4631. An act for the relief of Antonio Villani;

H. R. 5035. An act to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the Eighty-second National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held in Grand Rapids, Mich., September 26 to 30, 1948;

H. R. 5118. An act to authorize the sale of certain individual Indian land on the Flathead Reservation to the State of Montana;

H. R. 5137. An act to amend the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended;

H. R. 5262. An act to authorize the sale of individual Indian lands acquired under the act of June 18, 1934, and under the act of June 26, 1936;

H. R. 5543. An act granting the consent of Congress to Carolina Power & Light Co., to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in the Lumber River;

H. R. 5651. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in South Dakota for municipal or public purposes;

H. R. 5805. An act to extend the time within which application for the benefits of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 may be made by veterans discharged from the armed forces before the effective date of such act; and

H. R. 5963. An act to authorize the construction of a courthouse to accommodate the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 7, 1948 present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6055. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 12, 1948, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1538. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 3, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on the Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis, for construction of a harbor at Davenport, Iowa, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on March 21, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 642); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1539. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 19, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of, and a review of reports on rivers, lakes, and canals of central and southern Florida for flood control and other purposes, made pursuant to congressional authorizations (H. Doc. No. 643); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with five illustrations.

1540. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 22, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Pillar Point, Halfmoon Bay, San Mateo County, Calif., authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 644); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1541. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 22, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and one illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Mystic River, Mass., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 645); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1542. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 12, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of channel at Charleston, South Slough, Oreg., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 646); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1543. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to enhance further the security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information concerning the cryptographic systems and the communication intelligence activities of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1544. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the removal of weeds from lands in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 6500. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1906). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 395. Joint resolution to extend the time for the release, free of estate and gift tax, of powers of appointment; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1907).

Mr. BLACKNEY: Committee on Armed Services. S. 657. An act to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to authorize crediting of service as a cadet, midshipman, or aviation cadet for pay purposes, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1908). Referred to

the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLACKNEY: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1525. An act to provide for furnishing transportation for certain Government and other personnel, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1909). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELSTON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5181. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to exchange certain property with the city of Kearney, Nebr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1910). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union

Mr. GOODWIN: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 5608. A bill to amend paragraph 1007 of the Tariff Act of 1930; without amendment (Rept. No. 1911). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 5612. A bill to provide for the free importation of evergreen Christmas trees; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1912). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOODRUFF: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 5641. A bill to provide for the free importation of salt brine; without amendment (Rept. No. 1913). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELSTON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5642. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the East Bay Municipal Utility District, an agency of the State of California, an easement for the construction and operation of a water main in and under certain Government-owned lands comprising a part of the United States naval air station, Alameda, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1914). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLACKNEY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5758. A bill to amend further the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended, to permit certain payments to be made to surviving brothers and sisters, and nieces and nephews, of deceased members and former members of the armed forces; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1915). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 6242. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1949, the present suspension of import duties on scrap iron, scrap steel, and nonferrous metal scrap; without amendment (Rept. No. 1917). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 589. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 6419, a bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1918). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 5965. A bill to amend paragraph 813 of the Tariff Act of 1930; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1919). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McDOWELL: Committee on Un-American Activities. Report on the Communist Party of the United States as an advocate of overthrow of government by force and violence; without amendment (Rept. No. 1920). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LOVE: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 1082. An act to credit certain service performed by employees of the postal service who are transferred from one position to another within the service for purposes of determining eligibility for promotion; with amendments (Rept. No. 1921). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. S. 1305. An act to amend section 24 of the Federal Power Act so as to provide that the States may apply for reservation of portions of power sites released for entry, location, or selection to the State for highway purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1922). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2766. A bill to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of a probation system in the United States courts, except in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1925, as amended (18 U. S. C. 725); without amendment (Rept. No. 1923). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 3402. A bill to extend the authorized maturity date of certain bridge revenue bonds to be issued in connection with the refunding of the acquisition cost of the bridge across the Missouri River at Rulo, Nebr.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1924). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ELSTON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3883. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to transfer to the Territory of Alaska the title to the Army vessel *Hygiene;* with amendments (Rept. No. 1925). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELSTON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4032. A bill to amend certain provisions of law relating to the naval service so as to authorize the delegation to the Secretary of the Navy of certain discretionary powers vested in the President of the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1926). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOLLIVER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4114. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to permit certain expenditures, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1927). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 4190. A bill to amend the General Bridge Act of 1946; without amendment (Rept. No. 1928) Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4816. A bill to amend section 624 of the Public Health Service Act so as to provide a minimum allotment of $250,000 to each State for the construction of hospitals; without amendment (Rept. No. 1929). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELSTON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5283. A bill to provide for the disposal of surplus sand at Fort Story, Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1930). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 5509. A bill to authorize Defense Homes Corporation to convey to Howard University certain lands in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1931). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 5750. A bill to provide for the extension and improvement of post-office facilities at Los Angeles, Calif., and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1932). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H R. 5842. A bill to provide for the acquisition of additional land along the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway in exchange for certain dredging privileges, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1933). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5922. A bill relating to the issuance of reentry permits to certain aliens; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1934). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 5889. A bill to extend the provisions of title VI of the Public Health Service Act to the Virgin Islands; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1935). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TWYMAN: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 6208. A bill to provide for the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census; without amendment (Rept. No. 1936). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 6275. A bill to exempt from estate tax national service life insurance and United States Government life insurance in certain cases; without amendment (Rept. No. 1937). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 6293. A bill to amend the act of June 19, 1934, providing for the establishment of the National Archives, so as to provide that certain fees collected by the Archivist shall be available for disbursement in the interest of the National Archives; without amendment (Rept. No. 1938). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HESELTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6339. A bill to amend the provisions of title VI of the Public Health Service Act relating to standards of maintenance and operation for hospitals receiving aid under that title; without amendment (Rept. No. 1939). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ELSTON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5836. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army or his duly authorized representative to quitclaim a perpetual easement over certain lands adjacent to the Fort Myers Army Airfield, Fla.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1916). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. R. 6500. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 6501. A bill to provide for the development of civil transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 6502. A bill to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 6503. A bill to repeal the war tax rate on the retail sale of jewelry, furs, and toilet preparations, and to reduce the war tax rate on the retail sale of luggage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 6504. A bill to authorize the sale to Muscogee County, State of Georgia, of topsoil at the Fort Benning installation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PETERSON (by request):

H. R. 6505. A bill to incorporate the Army and Navy Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 6506. A bill to authorize the granting of Federal aid with respect to the construction of certain toll bridges, highways, and tunnels; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HUBER:

H. R. 6507. A bill to amend subsection 602 (F) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize renewal of level-premium term insurance for a second 5-year period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 6508. A bill to amend section 1501 (b) (1) (E) of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, so as to authorize the exercise of certain powers conferred by such act with respect to nitrogenous compound necessary to the manufacture and delivery of nitrogenous fertilizer materials for export; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H. R. 6509. A bill to provide an appropriation for the reconstruction and repair of public facilities in the State of Illinois which were destroyed or damaged by a recent tornado; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. REEVES:

H. R. 6510. A bill to encourage the construction of rental housing accommodations by permitting certain deductions in computing net income for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIZLEY:

H. R. 6511. A bill to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and to repeal section 2402 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 6512. A bill to authorize the issuance of a silver certificate bearing the portrait of Franklin Delano Roosevelt; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 6513. A bill to exclude from gross income lump-sum payments for service as aviators in the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. J. Res. 399. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. Con. Res. 197. Concurrent resolution to continue the Joint Committee on Housing beyond March 15, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take emphatic and positive action under the laws of our land to prevent and estop any person, group, or assembly from the continuance of teachings or actions which have as their basis the motives to destroy our America; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with respect to the limitation of petroleum exports; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation that will definitely authorize veterans entitled to benefits under Public Law 346 to pursue a course of flight training in lieu of, or in association with, such other courses of instruction as they may elect to pursue; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 6514. A bill for the relief of Bradford N. Headley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 6515. A bill for the relief of Theodore Robert Fears; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY:

H. R. 6516. A bill for the relief of Roza Grunfeld Moskovics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACKINNON:

H. R. 6517. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Skio Takayama Hull; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 6518. A bill for the relief of Epaminondas B. Karimpalis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 6519. A bill for the relief of Jack W. Darby; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REDDEN:

H. R. 6520. A bill for the relief of Wade H. Noland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 6521. A bill for the relief of Dr. H. R. Allmon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1890. By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL: Petition of Norma Cummings, Great Neck, Long Island, for herself and on behalf of the Young Citizens of the World (signatures in excess of 500) urging the Congress of the United States to request our delegate to the United Nations to move for the immediate establishment of a police force representing all the nations of the world, to keep the peace and save all our lives; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1891. By Mr. McGARVEY: Petition submitted by the Pinn Memorial Baptist Church, Philadelphia, Pa., in support of the program of action recommended by the President's Committee on Civil Rights and the legislation proposed for implementing the Committee's recommendation to insure equal justice under the laws of the land and equality of opportunity for all people regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1892. By Mr. REES: Petition of citizens of Harvey County, Kans., in opposition to universal military training and selective service draft; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1893. Also, petition of citizens of Sedgwick County, Kans., in opposition to universal military training and selective service draft; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1894. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of the town of Groton, Mass., asking that such steps be taken as may be necessary to have our delegates to the United Nations present or support amendment of the Charter for the purpose of making the United Nations into a limited world government capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing world law to prevent war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1895. Also, petition of the town of Lincoln, Mass., asking that such steps be taken as may be necessary to have our delegates to the United Nations present or support amendments of the Charter for the purpose of making the United Nations into a limited world government capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing world law to prevent war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1896. Also, petition of the town of Littleton, Mass., asking support for all measures to strengthen the United Nations and for such changes in the United Nations Charter as shall make it a limited world federal government with full power over all matters vital to the preservation of peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1897. Also, petition of the town of Concord, Mass., to take all possible steps to promote the strengthening of the United Nations into a government for world affairs, including support of the resolutions for initiating Charter amendments to enable the United Nations to enact and enforce world law to prevent war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1898. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the national president, Dames of Loyal Legion of the United States of America, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to efforts to restore complete independence of foreign influences and foreign ideologies and strict observance of all rights, privileges, and immunities guaranteed to the separate States and to the people by the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.